

Graduiertenkolleg: Sprachliche Repräsentationen und ihre Interpretation

Forschungsprogramm: A comparative approach to the interactions of syntax, morphology and argument structure

Ziele des Programms

Taking as a starting point the study of the human language faculty within the generative approach, my general research goals are a) the discovery of the ways grammatical components interact with one another, and b) the discovery of the nature of universal principles of grammar as well as of the variation among grammatical systems. Following Borer (1983) Kayne (1994), Chomsky (1995 and subsequent work), I take language variation to be a reflex of the interaction of language specific properties of lexical items, in particular of morpho-lexical features operating in the structure building apparatus seeking to satisfy the requirements imposed by the interface.

My research program addresses issues that arise from the interaction of various grammatical components: syntax-morphology (considering both inflectional and derivational morphology), syntax-argument structure/lexicon, morphological mapping of grammatical functions, syntax-semantics, and it includes both the verbal and the nominal domain. This is so, as the specific questions formulated for verbal elements transfer to the nominal domain, both in the domain of argument structure and in the domain of morpho-syntax. The research is characterised by its typological nature and it will not only focus on identifying the features which constitute the primitives of the grammar; a further aim is to work towards an approach to linguistic variation, according to which parameters are better understood as *microparameters*, i.e. local, low-level, feature-driven phenomena and not as *macroparameters*, i.e. a small set of binary-valued parameters with very far reaching consequences (see Baker 1996 for a recent discussion in defence of this latter view).

Due to its nature, my research program fits the general goal of the Graduiertenkolleg and complements that of others (von Heusinger, Kamp, Pafel, Rohrer, Schütze, Stein).

Forschungsschwerpunkte

More precisely, my principal interests are divided into three domains, which are explicated below.¹ The main property unifying all aspects of my research program is the idea that structural constraints, and the feature specification of functional elements which participate in structure formation determine not only agreement and word-order asymmetries but also traditionally lexical properties such as syntactic category type and argument structure (see Marantz 1997, though on many points I depart from Marantz's views). In other words, the distribution/projection of features on functional heads regulates/determines transitivity (and lack thereof in the nominal system), verb/noun class membership, the projection of arguments, the status of Case (structural vs. oblique) on arguments, and word order variation. In all domains it is crucial to work towards a definition of criteria on the basis of which the organization of the functional structure can be determined.

I. Agreement relations and clause structure. An important part of this investigation is to derive word order variation and agreement asymmetries among languages by carefully examining their morphological and structural properties. The theoretical goal is to achieve an account that relies on the way languages manipulate a universal set of features by developing the idea that phi-features do not necessarily come as a bundle: (they may or may not), and **that** languages explore all these possibilities giving rise to parametric differences. The empirical domain includes:

- a. Cross-linguistic variation in word order (subject-object) and agreement. Agreement asymmetries.

¹ I explicitly specify links among topics in parentheses.

- b. Position of verbal elements and the distribution of expletives.
- c. Subject-positions and subject-hood.
- d. The role of Case, Extended Projection Principle, and their interaction with Agreement; how these interact with e.g. semantic properties of Case, the interfaces they seem to be related/sensitive to.
- e. Ergative case systems. Nature of ergativity (domain III)
- f. Case: structural vs. oblique (domain III).
- g. Distribution of phi-features in clause structure, link with the internal architecture of noun phrases (see domain II).
- h. Syntactic encoding of Topic/Focus.

II. Parallelism between noun phrases and verbal clauses. In this domain I explore the hypothesis that there is a close parallelism between the nominal and the verbal domain and I examine their interactions. The research on the morpho-syntax of noun phrases concentrates on the following questions, which are all raised in a cross-linguistic perspective:

- a. The articulation of the extended projection of noun phrases, the type and nature of functional projections in the noun phrase (see domain I).
- b. The status and the syntax of arguments in noun phrases (see domain III).
- c. The status and the syntax of modifiers in noun phrases (adjectives, genitives).
- d. Effects of head/phrasal movement inside the noun phrase, placement of nominal elements.
- e. Agreement relations in the noun phrases and the distribution of phi-features in the nominal domain (see domain I).
- f. Case in the noun phrase (see domain I).
- g. Definiteness and its expression across languages; tense in the noun phrase (see domain I)
- h. Constructions that show mixed categorial properties (e.g. nominal/verbal) such as gerunds, nominal infinitivals, but also verbal/adjectival properties e.g. participles) (see domain III).
- i. Nominal compounds (argument structure, see III).

III. Verb classes and the unaccusative hypothesis. The empirical domain includes:

- a. Properties determining membership to class and the question of what constitutes lexical information. The main hypothesis is that the interaction of syntactic and semantic properties related to specific functional layers of the clause structure and their interaction (e.g. little 'v', Aspect) determine class-membership, i.e. view different types of events in terms of the functional architecture. Verb-deriving morphology.
- b. Causative predicates: analytic, morphological, lexical.
- c. The theoretical issue of whether unaccusativity is determined by syntax only, by semantics only or by both.
- d. Status of transitivity in grammar (domain I & II).
- e. Argument alternations.
- f. The diagnostics for unaccusativity and unaccusativity mismatches.
- g. The role and the distribution of voice morphology in distinguishing verb classes, e.g. the presence vs. absence of 'reflexive/non-active' (intransitivizing) marking on unaccusative and reflexive predicates. Differences and similarities between passives, reflexives and unaccusatives.
- h. Psych verbs: classes thereof, syntax, case on arguments.
- i. Resultatives, and lack thereof in several languages.
- j. Alternations in the noun phrase, noun classes (see domain II).

In this area a psycholinguist dimension complements the more theoretical investigation. For instance, the performance of Greek patients with Broca's aphasia and Parkinson's disease on the production and comprehension of verbs with alternating transitivity is linked to the theoretical proposal concerning the structures that underlie unaccusative verbs.

In all three areas, issues of language change are of importance, e.g. the loss of pro-drop, the raise of expletives, the loss of verb-movement, word order changes in both the nominal and verbal domain, development of English gerunds and the lack thereof in other (genetically) related languages, the loss of auxiliary selection in English.

My approach to the questions sketched above complements semantic approaches advocated within the graduate program, e.g. domain III to Stein's research program, domains II and III to Kamp's, von Heusinger's and Pafel's research, providing thus important points of contact with other researchers in the Kolleg. Moreover, the set of questions outlined here provide also a link to Schütze's research, which focuses on issues of formalism of language variation and change.

Stand der Forschung

Domain I. Relating word order variation to properties of functional heads goes back to the work of Roberts (1985) and Pollock (1989). In the minimalist framework these ideas are expressed in terms of features located in functional heads determining overt displacement (Chomsky 1995). In the area of case, several researchers (e.g. Yip et al. 1987, Marantz 1991) have pointed out that case realization is seen as a morphological property of the clause as a whole. Others do not distinguish between nominative and accusative (Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2001), and view Case as a nominal feature associated with functional heads (T,v) regulating movement.

Domain II. In the generative tradition, the parallel internal structure of noun phrases and clauses, based on subject-properties of genitives (especially in nominalizations), has been on the agenda at least since Chomsky (1970). Later proposals on the status of complementizers, verb inflection and determiners that gave rise to the C-I-V hypothesis for the clause (Chomsky 1986) and the DP hypothesis for the noun phrase (Abney 1987, Horrocks & Stavrou 1987 among others), permitted unification of nominal and verbal projections under X'-theory. Much work in the late 1980s was devoted to establishing the correctness of the 'DP-hypothesis', i.e. that the determiner heads the Det-Noun constituent, by bringing cross-linguistic facts to bear on the issue. Alongside arguments concerning the grammatical and distributional properties of determiners (e.g. Haider 1988 on German), arguments concerning noun movement were crucial. Thus some languages display evidence that N raises to D in overt syntax (cf. Delsing 1988, Taraldsen 1990 on Scandinavian, Ritter 1991 on Hebrew), an instance of head movement within an extended projection paralleling verb movement to I or C. Longobardi (1994) generalises the proposal by arguing that N-raising to D occurs covertly elsewhere. Possessors are viewed as subjects in e.g. Giorgi & Longobardi (1991), Szabolcsi (1987), but as complements elsewhere. Cinque (1993) and much subsequent work address issues pertaining to adjectival syntax in connection with the type and number of projections in the noun phrase. Grimshaw (1990) provides a detailed lexicalist approach to nominalizations, while Marantz (1997), Alexiadou (2001a) and others argue for a syntactic approach.

Domain III. While three main positions can be identified, no consensus has been reached as to the cause of the phenomenon of unaccusativity. A) Semantic Approach. Verbs can be differentiated on semantic grounds and the semantic characterization obviates the need to attribute different syntactic representations to the verbs they contain; unaccusativity is not syntactically encoded (cf. van Valin 1990). B) The Linking Approach. An explanation for the unaccusativity of some verbs could be attained by certain linking principles, which force the relevant argument of an unaccusative verb to be realized in direct object position, while requiring that of the unergative to be realized in subject position, cf. include the *Universal Alignment Hypothesis* (cf. Perlmutter 1978), the *Uniformity of Theta- Assignment Hypothesis* (cf. Baker 1988), *Lexical Syntactic Representation* (cf. Levin & Rappaport 1995), and the *Aspectual Interface Hypothesis* (cf. Tenny 1994). C) Syntactic Approach. According to this view, unaccusativity is not fully semantically predicted. Syntactic research on Unaccusativity in the 80s concentrated on the view that a D-structure object is the complement of V (strictly), thus giving a sharp distinction between the two classes. On the other hand, syntactic research

on Unaccusativity in the 90s came to the conclusion that such a representation cannot be all there is to this distinction. This conclusion was due to the impact Larsonian (1988) structures had on the representation of internal arguments and to Hale & Keyser's (1993, 1997) configurational theta-theory. The view that the various verb classes can be distinguished syntactically through differences of phrase structure has been backed up by proposals in Kratzer (1994), von Stechow (1995) and others, according to which a functional (perhaps aspectual) category Voice (or Event Phrase or little vPhrase) is crucial for determining the behaviour of verbal predicates embedded under it. For instance, VoiceP/vP is associated with agentive and causative interpretations. On this view, the meaning of the respective verb is decomposed, each part of it corresponding to a lexical/functional structural layer in a fashion reminiscent of methods of Generative Semantics (see Lakoff 1970, McCawley 1968; see also Dowty 1979, van Valin 1990, von Stechow 1995, Wunderlich 1997 among others for approaches to lexical decomposition in general).

Unaccusativity diagnostics and mismatches are discussed in (Levin & Rappaport 1995, see also Grimshaw 1987, Eisenberg 1989). Levin & Rappaport, following Zaenen (1993), distinguish between diagnostics sensitive to deep and surface unaccusativity.

The manner in which transitivity alternations relate to voice morphology has also received different approaches, see the typological discussion in Comrie (1985), Haspelmath (1993), Nadyalkov & Silnitsky (1973). One influential proposal suggested in the generative literature is that the common property of predicates sharing special morphology is the absence of an external argument (see e.g. Marantz 1984 but cf. Reinhart 1997). Various formulations of this have been developed. But note that the different semantics of the constructions do not follow from this fact. Though all these processes, i.e. reflexivization, passivization and de-transitivization, involve 'suppression' of an external argument, evidently the agent theta-role is present in the structure in passives (adverb test e.g. *the window was broken deliberately* vs. **the window broke deliberately*; see Roeper 1987), the feature [+animate/+volitional] is still present in reflexives (interpretation/structure), while the suppressed causer argument in the anti-causative is not active in any syntactic sense.

Levin (1993) provides a detailed study (and references) of argument alternations in English. With respect to psych verbs, Belletti and Rizzi (1988) conclude that verbs like *worry* and *please* are in fact unaccusative predicates, while Pesetsky (1995) argues that Experiencer Object-predicates of the *worry*-class should be treated as *causative constructions* licensing a nominative causer argument and an accusative causee.

Eigene Vorarbeiten (see also list of publications)

In my earlier research, see e.g. Alexiadou (1997), I was concerned with the syntax of adverbs and their interaction with clause structure, and variation in word order. My most recent work addresses the topics described above as follows:

Domain I. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1998) examine word order variation across languages (see also Alexiadou & Fanselow 2000), and propose that languages split into two types, those that move a phrase to subject position, and those that move the verb to the respective head, thus deriving parametric differences between non null subject languages and null subject languages respectively. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (2001) investigate the intransitivity constraint in subject inverted orders present in e.g. English and French, and the role of Case as a feature determining word order variation. Alexiadou (to appear a) develops an approach according to which features on clausal functional heads are related/sensitive to DP internal features. Alexiadou (to appear), Alexiadou & Fanselow (2000), and Fischer & Alexiadou (2001) examine issues of diachronic change in subject properties and word order in Romance and Scandinavian languages.

Domain II. Alexiadou (2001a,c) is concerned with the distribution and licensing of arguments within nominalizations, the properties of functional categories which are responsible for this, the various types of nominals across languages, and the link between nominalization and ergativity. Alexiadou & Wilder (1998) provide a preliminary investigation

of issues of adjectival syntax and the role of double definiteness. Alexiadou (2001b, 2003) examines double definiteness in a cross-linguistic perspective and proposes that different types of adjectival modification reflect structural differences. Stavrou & Alexiadou (2002) are concerned with the morpho-syntax of thematic adjectives. Alexiadou (2003 c) looks into the syntax of different types of possessors (also in Alexiadou 2004d), and proposes different structures for alienable and inalienable possessors. Alexiadou (2004b) examines the distribution of phi-features in noun phrases, see also Alexiadou, Hageman & Stavrou (forthcoming).

Domain III. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (2004) developed the hypothesis that unaccusative predicates do not have a unified structure. The presence vs. absence of reflexive marking on certain unaccusative predicates, which is also a characteristic of passives and reflexives, is accounted for by proposing that all three classes share a subset of the features located in Voice, but they differ with respect to the extent they express e.g. agentivity or volition. This split is open to parametric variation. Alexiadou (2001a) discusses issues on the argument structure of nominals. The production and comprehension of verbs with alternating transitivity in language disorder was investigated by Katsarou, Z., Stavrakaki, S., Alexiadou, A., Anagnostopoulou E., Kafantari, A. & Bostanjopoulou, S. (2003).

List of publications

- Alexiadou, A. (1997) *Adverb placement: a case study in antisymmetric syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Alexiadou, A. (2001a) Functional structure in nominals: nominalization, and ergativity. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Alexiadou, A. (2001b) Adjective syntax and noun raising: word order asymmetries in the DP as the result of adjective distribution. *Studia Linguistica* 55, 217-248.
- Alexiadou, Artemis (2003a) Subject agreement asymmetries in coordination. In C. Maienborn & M. Krifka 'Asymmetrien', Stauffenburg Verlag. 1-23.
- Alexiadou, Artemis (2003b) On nominative case features and split agreement. In E. Brandner & H. Zinnsmeister (eds). *New Perspectives on Case Theory*. CLSI publications. 23-52.
- Alexiadou, Artemis (2003c) Some notes on the structure of alienable and inalienable possessors. Proceedings of the workshop on the syntax, semantics and pragmatics of the noun phrase. *From NP to DP*. M. Coene & Y. D'hulst (eds), 167- 188. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Alexiadou, Artemis (2003f) Double definiteness. *Festschrift in honour of Christer Platzack. Grammar in Focus volume II* 9.16.
- Alexiadou, Artemis (2003d) Adjective Syntax and (the absence of) noun raising in the DP. Proceedings of the Workshop on Head-movement. UCLA. 1-39.
- Alexiadou, A. (2004a) On the development of possessive determiners: consequences for DP structure. In E. Fuss & C-. Trips (eds.) *Diachronic Clues to Synchronic Grammar*. John Benjamins, 31-58.
- Alexiadou, Artemis (2004b). Inflection class, gender and DP internal structure. In G. Müller et al. (eds) *Exploration in Nominal Inflection*. Mouton de Gruyter, 21-50.
- Alexiadou, Artemis (to appear). Uniform and non-uniform aspects of pro-drop languages. In P. Ackema & al. *Agreement and Argument Structure*. Oxford University Press.
- Alexiadou, A. & E. Anagnostopoulou (1998) Parametrizing Agr: word order, verb- movement and EPP-checking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16.3: 491-539.
- Alexiadou, A. & E. Anagnostopoulou (2001) The subject in situ generalisation, and the role of Case in driving computations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 193-231
- Alexiadou, A. & E. Anagnostopoulou (2004) Voice morphology in the causative-inchoative alternation: evidence for a non unified structural analysis of unaccusatives. In A. Alexiadou, E. Anagnostopoulou & M. Everaert (eds). *The unaccusativity puzzle*. Oxford University Press, 114-136.

- Alexiadou, A. & G. Fanselow (2000) On the correlation between morphology and syntax: the Case of V-to I. John Benjamins. In W. Abraham, & J.W. Zwart (eds) *Proceedings from the 15th CGSW*, 219-242. John Benjamins.
- Alexiadou, A., L. Haegeman & M. Stavrou (2001) On Nominal Functional Projections: Noun Morphology, Movement and Ellipsis. *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Conference of the Israel Association for Theoretical Linguistics*, 1-8 ed. by A. Grosu.
- Alexiadou, A., L. Haegeman & M. Stavrou (in preparation) *Noun Phrases: a generative approach*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fischer, S. & A. Alexiadou (2001) On Stylistic Fronting: Scandinavian vs. Romance. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 68, 117-145.
- Katsarou, Z., Stavrakaki, S., Alexiadou, A., Anagnostopoulou E., Kafantari, A. & Bostanjopoulou, S. (2003). Verbs with alternating transitivity in Parkinson's disease: Evidence from production and comprehension tasks. *Brain and Language*, 87 (1), 63-64.
- Stavrou, M. & A. Alexiadou (2002) On the idiosyncracies of so-called Group Adjectives: a case at the syntax-morphology interface. Manuscript.

Themen geplanter Dissertationsprojekte

I have been supervising projects in any of the areas listed in detail under Forschungsschwerpunkte above.

Verzahnung des Projekts innerhalb des Kollegs

- Grzegorz Dogil (psycho-/neuro-linguistics; syntax of topic and focus)
- Ulrich Heid (word formation)
- Klaus von Heusinger (nominalisation, structure of the noun phrase)
- Hans Kamp (semantic aspects of variation; lexicon)
- Christian Rohrer (syntactic processing)
- Jürgen Pafel (argument structure, unaccusativity, nominal phrase)
- Hinrich Schütze (language variation and change; argument vs. Adjunct distinction)
- Achim Stein (verb classes; lexicon; argument alternations)

Literatur

- Abney, S. 1987. *The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Baker, M. 1988. *Incorporation: a theory of grammatical function changing*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Baker, M. 1996. *The polysynthesis parameter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bates, E. & al. 1995. Gender and lexical access in Italian. *Perception and psycholinguistics* 57, 847-862
- Belletti, A. & L. Rizzi. 1988. Psych-verbs and theta theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3: 291-352.
- Borer, H. 1983. *Parametric syntax: case studies in Semitic and Romance languages*. Foris: Dordrecht.
- Chomsky, N. 1970. Remarks on nominalization. In R. Jacobs & P. Rosenbaum (eds), *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*. Boston: Ginn, 184-221.
- Chomsky, N. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cinque, G. 1993. On the evidence for partial N-movement in the Romance DP. *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 3.2: 21-40.
- Comrie, B. 1985. Causative verb formation and other verb-deriving morphology. In T. Shopen (ed.) *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, Cambridge, 309-348.
- Delsing, L.-O. 1988. The Scandinavian noun phrase. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 42. 57-79
- Dowty, D. 1979. *Word meaning and Montague grammar*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

- Eisenberg, P. 1989. Perfektbildung und Ergativparameter im Deutschen. In J. Buscha & j. Schröder *Linguistische und didaktische Grammatik: Beiträge zu Deutsch als Fremdsprache*. VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie Leipzig, pp. 112-128.
- Giorgi, A. & G. Longobardi. 1991. *The Syntax of Noun Phrases*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grimshaw, J. 1987. Unaccusatives: an overview. *Proceedings of NELS* 17:244-259.
- Grimshaw, J. 1990. *Argument structure*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Grimshaw, J. 1991. Extended projections. Unpublished manuscript, Brandeis University.
- Haider, H. 1988. Die Struktur der deutschen NP. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 7: 32-59.
- Hale, K. & S. Keyser (1993) On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations. In K. Hale & S. Keyser (eds) *The View from Building 20*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Hale, K & S. Keyser. 1997. The basic elements of argument structure. Ms., MIT.
- Haspelmath, M. 1993. More on the typology of inchoative/causative verb alternations. In B. Comrie & M. Polinsky (eds) *Causatives and Transitivity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 87-120.
- Horrocks, G. & M. Stavrou. 1987. Bounding theory and Greek syntax: evidence for wh-movement in NP. *Journal of Linguistics* 23: 79-108.
- Kayne, R. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kratzer, A. 1994. *The event argument and the semantics of voice*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Lakoff, G. 1970. *Irregularity in syntax*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Larson, R. 1988. On the double object construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19: 335-391.
- Levin, B. 1993. *English Verb Classes and Alternations*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Levin, B. & M. Rappaport. 1995. *Unaccusativity: at the syntax-lexical semantics level*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Longobardi, G. 1994. Reference and proper names: a theory of N-movement in syntax and logical form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25: 609-665.
- Marantz, A. 1984. *On the nature of grammatical relations*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Marantz, A. 1991. Case and licensing. *Proceedings of ESCOL*, 234-253.
- Marantz, A. 1997. No escape from syntax: Don't try a morphological analysis in the privacy of you own lexicon. *U. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 4.2: 201-25.
- McCawley, J. 1968. The role of semantics in grammar. In E. Bach & R. Harms (eds) *Universals of Linguistic Theory*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Nadyalkov, V.P. & G.G. Silnitsky. 1973. The typology of morphological causatives. In F. Kiefer (ed.) *Trends in Soviet Theoretical Linguistics*. Dordrecht: Reidel, pp. 1-32.
- Perlmutter, D. 1978. Impersonal passives and the unaccusative hypothesis. In *Proceedings of the fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 157-189.
- Pesetsky, D. 1995. *Zero Syntax: experiencers and cascades*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Pollock, J.-Y. 1989. Verb Movement, Universal Grammar and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 365-424.
- Reinhart, T. 1997. Syntactic effects of lexical operations: reflexives and unaccusatives. *OTS working papers in Linguistics*.
- Ritter, E. 1991. Two functional categories in Noun Phrases: Evidence from Modern Hebrew. In S. Rothstein (ed.), *Perspectives on Phrase Structure* [Syntax and Semantics 26]. Academic Press: New York, 37-62.
- Roberts, I. 1985. Agreement parameters and the development of English modal auxiliaries. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3, 21-58.
- Roeper, T. 1987. The syntax of compound reference. Ms., University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- von Stechow, A. 1995. Lexical decomposition in syntax. In U Egli, P. Pause, C. Schwartz, A. von Stechow & G. Wienold (eds) *Lexical Knowledge in the Organization of Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 81-117.

- Taraldsen, K. T. 1990. D-projections and N-projection in Norwegian. In J. Mascaró & M. Nespó (eds), *Grammar in Progress*. Dordrecht: Foris, 419-431.
- Tenny, C. 1994. *Aspectual Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- van Valin, R. 1990. Semantic parameters of split intransitivity. *Language* 66: 221-260.
- Wunderlich, D. 1997. Cause and the structure of verbs. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28: 27-68.
- Yip, M., J. Maling, & R. Jackendoff. 1987. Case in tiers. *Language* 63: 217-250.
- Zaenen, A. 1993. Unaccusativity in Dutch: Integrating syntax and lexical semantics. In J. Pustejovsky (ed.) *Semantics and the Lexicon*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 129-161.