
Scalar evaluativity and other secondary meaning types in argument alternations

Katherine Fraser
University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU)
katherineelizabeth.fraser@ehu.eus

Tag
Datum
Zeit
Raum

[Based on joint work with Daniel Hole, Universität Stuttgart]

Although there is extensive work on the semantics and syntax of argument alternations (see, e.g., Levin 2015 for an overview), the literature lacks a systematic investigation of the not-at-issue meanings that the non-base variants contribute. This talk takes a selection of syntactically-high, not-at-issue, categories from the literature (Cinque 1999, Hole 2015) and presents observations on projective meanings—so far overlooked—in non-base variants of a few argument alternations. This work contributes to the growing body of literature that describes morphosyntactic communication between INFL-level categories on the one hand, and C-level categories on the other (Kratzer 2009, Wiltschko 2014, Hole 2015).

References: • Cinque, G. (1999). *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford University Press. • Hole, D. (2015). A distributed syntax for evaluative ‘only’ sentences. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 34(1):43-77. • Kratzer, A. (2009). Making a pronoun: Fake indexicals as windows into the properties of pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40(2), 187–237. • Levin, B. (2015). Semantics and pragmatics of argument alternations. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 1, 63–83. • Wiltschko, M. (2014). *The universal structure of categories: Towards a formal typology* (Vol. 142). Cambridge University Press.