

# snippets

---

Issue 25

March 2012

---

## Contents

1. Matthew Barros. *Sluiced fragment answers: another puzzle involving islands and ellipsis.*
2. Feng-shi Liu. *Change of state and change of location verbs in Chinese.*
3. Joanna Nykiel. *Sprouting tolerates preposition omission.*
4. Jacopo Romoli. *Obligatory scalar implicatures and relevance.*
5. Uli Sauerland. *Where does the Strongest Meaning Hypothesis apply?*
6. Philippe Schlenker. *Complement anaphora and structural iconicity in ASL.*
7. Daniel Siddiqi and Andrew Carnie. *The English modal had.*
8. Benjamin Spector. *Being simultaneously an NPI and a PPI.*



**Feng-shi Liu – University of Arizona**  
***Change of state and change of location verbs in Chinese***

[fliu@u.arizona.edu](mailto:fliu@u.arizona.edu)

---

There are two classes of verbs that involve change: change of state verbs, e.g. *break*, *open*, and change of location verbs, e.g. *come*, *enter*, *put*. The two classes of verbs are similar in a number of aspects. Both are telic, indicating change; when used intransitively, both are unaccusative. In the event structure representation of verb meaning (e.g. Dowty 1991, Pinker 1989, Pustejovsky 1991, Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998, Tenny 1994, Van Valin & LaPolla 1997), change of state of verbs have a complex structure, as in (1a), which can be detransitivized, as in (1b).

- (1) a. [ x ACT ] CAUSE [y BECOME <STATE>]  
 b. y BECOME <STATE>

Similarly, transitive change of location verbs also have a causative, complex structure, as in (2a), which can also undergo detransitivization, as in (2b):

- (2) a. [ x ACT ] CAUSE [y BECOME AT <PLACE>]  
 b. y BECOME AT <PLACE>

In the event structure approach to verb meaning, it is predicted that verbs of change of location would participate in the alternation between (2a) and (2b), in the same way change of state verbs participate in the alternation between (1a) and (1b). Is this prediction supported empirically?

I would like to suggest that support can be found in Mandarin Chinese, although (2b) occurs in inversion only. Consider (3-4):

- (3) a. Xiaoming kai -le men  
 Xiaoming open -PERF door  
 ‘Xiaoming opened the door.’  
 b. Men kai -le  
 door open -PERF  
 ‘The door opened.’  
 c. Houyuan kai -le yige men  
 back-yard open -PERF one-CL door  
 ‘In the back yard opened a door.’
- (4) a. Xiaoming fang -le yifen zuoye zai lanzili  
 Xiaoming put -PERF one-CL assignment at basket-in  
 ‘Xiaoming put an assignment in the basket.’  
 b. Zuoye fang zai lanzili  
 assignment put at basket-in  
 ‘The assignment was put in the basket.’
-

- c. Lanzili fang -le yifen zuoye  
 basket-in put -PERF one-CL assignment  
 'In the basket is an assignment.' (Lit: 'In the basket was put an assignment')

The (a) sentences are causative, the (b) sentences could be causative (with an unexpressed subject) or intransitive, and the (c) sentences are intransitive. Among (3b-c) and (4b-c), it can be shown that (4b) is still agentive, while the other three have undergone detransitivization. The reasoning is as follows. I take detransitivization to mean that the agent is no longer part of the event structure. One way to tell if a verb is used agentively is to determine its compatibility with adverbial modifiers that imply agentivity, e.g. *xiaoxinde* 'carefully'. If a sentence is acceptable with such adverbs, we can assume that the verb retains agentivity in its meaning. (5a) shows that (3b) is not compatible with *xiaoxinde* 'carefully', whereas (5b) shows that (4b) is:

- (5) a. \*Men xiaoxinde kai -le  
 Door carefully open-PERF  
 '\*The door opened carefully.'  
 b. Zuoye xiaoxinde fang zai lanzili  
 assignment carefully put at basket-in  
 'The assignment was put in the basket carefully.'

In contrast, the (c) sentences in (3-4) do not take an agent-oriented adverb, as in (6):

- (6) a. \*Houyuan xiaoxinde kai -le yige men  
 back-yard carefully open -PERF one-CL door  
 'In the backyard was opened a door carefully.'  
 b. \*Lanzili xiaoxinde fang -le yifen zuoye  
 basket-in carefully put -PERF one-CL assignment  
 'In the basket was put an assignment carefully.'

This suggests that detransitivization has taken place in (3b), (3c) and (4c), and the verb no longer has agentivity as part of its meaning; however, it has not taken place in (4b).

It thus seems that the alternation between (2a) and (2b) can only be demonstrated with locative inversion, while the alternation between (1a) and (1b) does not require inversion. Nonetheless, the above examples show that in Mandarin both change of state and change of location verbs participate in the causative-intransitive alternation.

## References

- Dowty, D.R. (1991) "Thematic proto-roles and argument selection." *Language* 67, 547-619.  
 Pinker, S. (1989) *Learnability and Cognition: The Acquisition of Argument Structure*.  
 Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.  
 Pustejovsky, J. (1991) "The syntax of event structure." *Cognition* 41, 47-81.  
 Rappoport-Hovav, M. and B. Levin (1998) "Building verb meanings," in *The Projection of Arguments*, ed. M. Butt and W. Geuder. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, 97-134.  
 Tenny, C.L. (1994) *Aspectual Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.  
 Van Valin, R.D. Jr. and R.J. LaPolla (1997) *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function*.  
 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.