

Event semantics and discourse connected-movement in Eastern Cham

This talk presents new evidence from event semantics that syntactic features must be able to index meaning components of discourse or rhetorical relations. It also provides empirical support for Kratzer's (1995) analysis of stage- and individual-level predicates and calls for a dynamic event semantics. Baclawski Jr (forthcoming) argued for an \bar{A} -movement operation in Eastern Cham (Austronesian: Vietnam), discourse connected- or DC-movement. For a phrase to be DC-marked, it must be mentioned in a prior sentence that the current sentence is interpreted as explaining or elaborating upon (discourse subordination, in the sense of Asher & Lascarides 2003). DC-movement in (1b) is felicitous, due to previous mention of *lɔ nũʔ* 'chicken meat' and an explanation interpretation with (1a), but it is infelicitous in (1b') due to a lack of explanation or elaboration.

- (1) a. ʔaj měj kăw tũʔ lɔ nũʔ
 older.sibling female 1SG cook meat chicken
 'My older sister cooks chicken meat.'
- b. jwa lɔ nũʔ_{DC} ʔaj měj kăw cəh bǎŋ lə-nũʔ
 because meat chicken older.sibling female 1SG like eat
 'Because chicken meat, she likes to eat.' *Explanation(a,b)*
- b'. #plɔh nǎn lɔ nũʔ ʔaj měj kăw bǎŋ lə-nũʔ
 after that meat chicken older.sibling female 1SG eat
 'After that, she [will] eat the chicken meat.' *Narration(a,b')*

Based just on this evidence, the movement in (1b) could be licensed by a lurking factor, such as a prosodic contour that correlates with explanation and elaboration (perhaps through Zubizarreta's (1998) prosodic-movement). This talk argues that DC-marking has a further restriction that can only be explained in terms of discourse relations: the phrase must be a participant in the two events inferred by a subordinating discourse relation. According to Asher & Lascarides (2003), discourse relations consist of a constellation of inferences, including a relation between two events: explanation infers a causal relation (x caused y), and elaboration a subtype relation (x is a subtype of y).

If DC-marking makes reference to two semantic events, it should be impossible if one of those events is missing. Kratzer (1995) posits that stage-level predicates (temporary properties of the individuals involved) introduce event variables, but individual-level predicates (permanent properties) do not. We find that DC-marking is infelicitous if either the current or prior sentence contain only individual-level predicates. A language-internal diagnostic is proposed, based on negation and the existential marker *hu*: negative stage-level predicates require existential closure over events, which can only be provided by *hu*. Negative stage-level predicates require *hu* (2a), while negative individual-level predicates cannot contain *hu*, as there are no event variables to existentially close (2b). This test diagnoses the predicate *tɔʔ* 'live' as stage-level and *nĩʔ* 'be born' as individual-level.

- (2) a. kăw *(hu) tɔʔ pǎʔ mlěj nǎn ʔo
 1SG \exists live in village that NEG
 'I do not live in that village [temporarily].' (Stage-level)
- b. kăw (*hu) nĩʔ pǎʔ mlěj nǎn ʔo
 1SG \exists be.born in village that NEG
 'I was not born in that village.' (Individual-level)

DC-marking is felicitous if the current sentence contains a stage-level predicate (3a), but it is infelicitous if it only contains an individual-level predicate (3b). Note that the contexts differ to license an explanation relation in both cases, and there is preposition-drop.

- (3) a. CONTEXT: I spend a lot of time in **that village**.
mlěj năn_{DC} kăw tɔʔ pǎʔ mlěj-năn
village that 1SG live in
‘That village, I live in [temporarily].’ (Stage-level)
- b. CONTEXT: I have lived in **that village** for many years.
***mlěj năn_{DC}** kăw nǐʔ pǎʔ mlěj-năn
village that 1SG be.born in
INTENDED: ‘That village, I was born in.’ (Individual-level)

The felicity of the current sentence also depends on the prior sentence: stage-level predicates result in felicity, while individual-level predicates result in infelicity (4).

- (4) CONTEXT: I live in **Saigon** [temporarily]. (Stage-level)
#CONTEXT: I was born in **Saigon**. (Individual-level)
paj kɔl_{DC} mɛʔ mi kăw naw ŋǎʔ pjũʔ pǎʔ paj-kɔl
Saigon mother father 1SG go make work in
‘My parents went to work in Saigon.’

All the contexts above are felicitous with an overt marker of explanation *jwa* ‘because’ and without DC-movement, e.g. (3b’), so DC-marking requires more than discourse subordination; the events inferred by that relation must be introduced in the two sentences.

- (3) b’. CONTEXT: I have lived in **that village** for many years.
jwa kăw nǐʔ pǎʔ **mlěj năn**
because 1SG be.born in village that
‘Because I was born in that village.’ (compare: 3b)

These facts are argued only to be explained if syntactic features can make reference to discourse relational meaning. Alternative analyses of DC-movement such as prosodic movement overgenerate. These data affirm Kratzer’s (1995) analysis of stage- and individual-level predicates. Finally, it provides empirical support for the need for a dynamic event semantics. A DC-particle is proposed that combines with phrases that denote individuals and checks their DC status through a hard presupposition. The semantic value of the DC-particle, as sketched statically in (4e), makes reference to a set of events introduced in a discourse (\mathcal{E}_c) and a set of events inferred by subordinating discourse relations (\mathcal{E}_e).

- (4) a. Let \mathcal{E}_c be the set of events live in a discourse at context c
b. Let \mathcal{R} be a relation between two events, e and e' , such that $e'\mathcal{R}e$ iff e is interpreted as a cause or subtype of e'
c. Let \mathcal{E}_e be the set of all e' such that $e'\mathcal{R}e$
d. Let \mathcal{P}_e be the set of participants in event e
e. $\llbracket \text{DC} \rrbracket = \lambda x : \exists e' \in \mathcal{E}_c \cap \mathcal{E}_e [x \in \mathcal{P}_e \cap \mathcal{P}_{e'}].x$

Asher, Nicholas & Alex Lascarides. 2003. *Logics of conversation*. Cambridge University Press.
Baclawski Jr, Kenneth. Forthcoming. Optional *wh*-movement and topicalization in Eastern Cham. In *AFLA 26: The Proceedings of the 26th Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association*.
Kratzer, Angelika. 1995. Stage-level and individual-level predicates. In Gregory N. Carlson & Francis Jeffrey Pelletier (eds.), *The Generic Book*, 125–175. University of Chicago Press.
Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa. 1998. *Prosody, focus, and word order*. MIT Press.