Verbal VP-modifiers in Samoan verb serialization

Jens Hopperdietzel
Leibniz-ZAS Berlin
hopperdietzel@leibniz-zas.de

AFLA 27
National University of Singapore
August 20, 2020
1. Introduction

In Samoan (Polynesian, Oceanic), resultative meaning is expressed via resultative serial verb constructions (RSVCs), in which a **manner V1** denotes an action that causes a change-of-state which is named by a **causative V2**.

(1) a. Sā solo fa’a-mamā e Pita le laulau.
    PST wipe CAUS-clean ERG Peter ART table.ABS
    ‘Peter cleaned the table by wiping it.’

b. Sā lamu fa’a-malū e Malia le mea ai.
    PST chew CAUS-soft ERG Mary ART food.ABS
    ‘Mary softened the food by chewing it.’

(Hopperdietzel to appear, Mosel 2004, Mosel & Hovdaugen 1992)
1. Introduction

This contrasts with resultative constructions in other languages such as English, in which resultative meaning is conveyed by the composition of a verbal and a non-verbal predicate.

Resultative secondary predication:

(2) a. *Peter wiped the table clean.*
   b. 

The *means* construction:

(3) a. *Peter cleaned the table by wiping it.*
   b. 
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1. Introduction

What is the type of morphosyntactic and semantic composition in Samoan RSVCs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RSP</th>
<th>means constructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main predicate</td>
<td>manner</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary predicate</td>
<td>stative/result</td>
<td>manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic composition</td>
<td>complementation</td>
<td>adjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic relation</td>
<td>causation</td>
<td>modification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

➔ What is the type of morphosyntactic and semantic composition in Samoan RSVCs?
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2. RSVCs in Samoan

➢ Austronesian
   ➢ Malayo-Polynesian
      ➢ Oceanic
      ➢ Polynesian
      ➢ Samoic
      ➢ Samoan

➢ spoken by approx. 470,000 speakers, with significant speaker population outside of the Samoan islands. (Ethnologue 2019)

➢ Data from original fieldwork in Hawai‘i carried out in Spring 2019.

➢ Elicitation methods include storyboard elicitation, sentence manipulation and judgement tasks.

(Lynch et al. 2002: 8)
RSVCs in Samoan

3.1 Manner V1

➢ The V1 position is restricted to (causative) manner verbs, i.e. verbal predicates that denote the manner of an action. (Hopperdietzel to appear; cf. Collins 2010)

(4) a. Sā lamu fa’a-malū e Malia le mea ai.  
   PST chew CAUS-soft ERG Mary ART food.ABS  
   ‘Mary softened the food by chewing it.’

   b. Sā fa’ī fa’a-nini’i e Malia le lālā  
   PST break.off CAUS-small ERG Mary ART branch.ABS  
   Lit.: ‘Mary made the branch small by breaking it (with her hands).’

   c. % Sā pese fa’a-moe~moe e Malia le pepe.  
   PST sing CAUS-RED~sleep ERG Mary ART baby.ABS  
   ‘Mary put the baby to sleep by singing.’
RSVCs in Samoan

3.1 Manner V1

 ➢ In contrast, verbal predicates that do not specify the manner of an action, such as fa’a-causatives, cannot appear in the V2 position.

(5) a. # Sā fa’a-mamā fa’a-mago e Pita le laulau.
   PST CAUS-clean CAUS-dry ERG Peter ART table.ABS
   Intended: ‘Peter dried the table by cleaning it.’

b. # Sā fa’a-gao fa’a-la’i<ti>ti e Pita le lālā.
   PST CAUS-break CAUS-<RED>small ERG Peter ART branch.ABS
   Intended: ‘Peter made the branch small by breaking it.’

➔ Only verbal predicates that denote the manner of an action can function as V1 in RSVCs.
RSVCs in Samoan

3.2 Causative V2

- The V2 position of Samoan RSVCs is restricted to fa’a-causatives derived from stative or anticausative unaccusative verbs, which can be morphosyntactically complex.

(6) a. Sā lamu fa’a-malū e Malia le mea ai.  Stative
    PST chew CAUS-soft ERG Mary ART food.ABS
    ‘Mary softened the food by chewing it.’

b. Sā tipi fa’a-pa’ū e Malia le la’au.    Anticausative
    PST cut CAUS-fall ERG Mary ART tree.ABS
    ‘Mary fell the tree by cutting it.’

c. Sā kiki fa’a-ma-tala e Malia le faitoto’a. Derived stative
    PST kick CAUS-STAT-open ERG Mary ART door.ABS
    ‘Mary opened the door by kicking it.’
RSVCs in Samoan

3.2 Causative V2

➢ In contrast, manner verbs and causative manner verbs are infelicitous in the result-denoting V2 position.

(7)  a. # Sā tiʻipī faʻi e Pita le lālā.
     PST cut break.off ERG Peter ART branch.ABS
     ‘Peter broke the branch by cutting it.’

     b. # Sā kiki ta-tala e Pita le faitotoʻa.
     PST kick RED-open ERG Peter ART door.ABS
     ‘Peter opened the door by kicking it.’

➢ Only verbal predicates that do not specify the manner of an action but denote a result state can function as the V2.
RSVCs in Samoan
3.4 Summary

➢ Distribution of verb classes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V1</th>
<th>V2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manner verbs (tr./itr.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>causatives manner verbs (tr.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faʻa-causatives (tr.)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adopting a decompositional approach on event structure, verbal predicates are decomposed into three layers.

1. **Roots:**
   - a-categorial
   - provide lexical information
   - result roots merge within a Result Phrase (ResP)

Adopting a decompositional approach on event structure, verbal predicates are decomposed into three layers.

1. **Roots:**
   - a-categorial
   - provide lexical information
   - result roots form a Result Phrase (ResP)

2. **Verbalizer (v):**
   - categorizes the root
   - introduces the event variable $e$

Two types of resultative constructions

- Adopting a decompositional approach on event structure, verbal predicates are decomposed into three layers.

1. **Roots:**
   - a-categorial
   - provide lexical information
   - result roots form a Result Phrase (ResP)

2. **Verbalizer (v):**
   - categorizes the root
   - introduces the event variable $e$

3. **Voice**
   - locus of agentive semantics
   - introduces the external argument

Two types of resultative constructions

4.2 Resultative secondary predication

➢ In languages such as English, resultative meaning is primarily expressed by resultative secondary predication. The result state is expressed by a non-verbal predicate, e.g. an $aP$. (see Beavers 2012 for a detailed overview)

\[(9)\]

a. *Peter hammered the metal flattened.

b. *Peter hammer-flatened the metal.

c. *Peter hammer-flatened the metal.

➢ Semantically, the two predicates enter a causative relation, in which manner predicate causes the stative/result predicate.

\[(10)\]

a. \([\text{hammer}] = \lambda e. \text{hammer}(e)\]

b. \([\text{flat}] = \lambda s. \text{flat}(e)\]

c. \([\text{hammer flat}] = \lambda e. \exists s. \text{hammer}(e) \land \text{Caus}(e, s) \land \text{flat}(s)\]

(e.g. via configurational interpretation, Alexiadou et al. 2015, Wood 2015, Higginbotham 2000; Principle R, Beck & Snyder 2001; or Predicate Modification, Folli & Harley 2019)
Two types of resultative constructions

4.2 Resultative secondary predication

Adopting a complementation analysis of RSP, the manner predicate takes the result-denoting secondary predicate as a complement/argument.

Two types of resultative constructions

4.3 The \textit{means} construction

➢ An alternative way to express resultative meaning is the \textit{means} construction, in which a causative predicate combines with a \textit{means}-adjunct, e.g. a means \textit{by}-phrase.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(12)] a. Peter \textit{flattened} the metal \textit{by hammering it}.
\item b. Peter \textit{cleaned} the table \textit{by wiping it}.
\end{enumerate}

➢ In the means constructions, the causative relation is entailed by the causative verb, which denotes an underspecified event that causes the result state specified by the root. The underspecified causing event is specified by the \textit{means} adjunct.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(13)] a. [\textit{flatten}] = \lambda e . \exists s . \text{P}(e) \land \text{Caus}(e, s) \land \text{flat}(s)
\item b. [\textit{by hammering}] = \lambda e . \text{hammer}(e)
\item c. [\textit{flatten by hammering}] = \lambda e . \exists s . \text{hammer}(e) \land \text{Caus}(e, s) \land \text{flat}(s)
\end{enumerate}

Two types of resultative constructions

4.3 The *means* construction

- Syntactically, the *means* adjunct PP (here: *by hammering it*) attaches as an event modifier to the causative vP (here: *flatten*).

(14) VoiceP 
    - Peter Voice’ 
    - Voice vP 
      - PP *by hammering it* 
      - v’ v -en ResP 
        - vflat+Res *metal*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic component</th>
<th><em>means</em> constructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main predicate</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary predicate</td>
<td>manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic composition</td>
<td>adjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic relation</td>
<td>modification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two types of resultative constructions

4.4 Overview

Are Samoan RSVCs an instance of RSP or the means construction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RSP</th>
<th><em>means</em> constructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main predicate</td>
<td>manner</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary predicate</td>
<td>stative/result</td>
<td>manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic composition</td>
<td>complementation</td>
<td>adjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic relation</td>
<td>causation</td>
<td>modification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

➔ Are Samoan RSVCs an instance of RSP or the means construction?
Two types of resultative constructions

4.4 RSVCs

- RSVCs have been commonly analyzed as complementation structures, i.e. as RSPs with verbal secondary predicates – e.g. Mandarin, Lao or Édò.

  (15) Lisi  ca-gan-le  zhouzi.
     Mandarin
     Lisi wipe-dry-PRF table
     ‘Lisi wiped the table dry.’ (Lin 2004: 91)

- Recent studies highlight that in some languages, RSVCs qualify as a *means* construction, i.e. the manner verb is adjoined to the causative verb – e.g. in Uyghur, Korean or Japanese.
  (Sugar 2019, Ko & Sohn 2015, Tomioka 2006)

     Korean
     John-NOM ant-ACC trample-LK die-CAUS-PST-DECL
     ‘John trampled the ants to death.’ (Lit.: ‘John killed the ants by trampling them’; Ko & Sohn 2015: 6)
4. Manner verbs as modifiers

➢ The discrimination between the two types of resultative construction boils down to the argument/modifier distinction, i.e. complementation (1a) vs. adjunction (1b).

\[
\begin{align*}
(17) \text{ a.} & \quad v_1P \\
& \quad v+ v_1 \quad v_2P \\
& \quad v+ v_2 \quad \text{DP} \\
\text{ b.} & \quad v_2P \\
& \quad v_1P \quad v_2' \\
& \quad v+ v_2 \quad \text{DP}
\end{align*}
\]

➢ In the following, I present two pieces of evidence that Samoan RSVCs are an instance of means constructions.

➔ Semantic evidence from the various readings of repetitive modifiers, such as English again and Samoan toe ‘again’

➔ Morphosyntactic evidence from the presence of causative morphology on the result-denoting predicate.
Manner verbs as modifiers

4.1 Narrow repetitive reading of ‘again’

➢ Cross-linguistically, it has been shown that repetitive modifiers like *again* are often ambiguous with respect to their scope.

➢ In English, for example, *again* licenses both repetitive and restitutive readings in the context of resultative secondary predication.

(18) *Peter hammered the metal flat again.*

a. *and the metal was flat before.* ➔ restitutive reading

b. *and Peter hammered the metal flat before.* ➔ repetitive reading

c. *# and Peter hammered the metal before.* ➔ (narrow) repetitive reading

Manner verbs as modifiers

4.1 Narrow repetitive reading of ‘again’

- Adopting a structural analysis of ‘again’, the syntactic position of the repetitive modifier determines the respective readings. (Lechner et al. 2015, von Stechow 1996)

- In the **restitutive reading**, *again* attaches low to the stative aP. In this position it solely scopes over the result state.

\[(19)\text{a. }⟦\text{again}\⟧(\text{aP}) = \text{again}(\lambda s. \text{clean}(s))\]
\[\text{b. Presupposition: }\exists s’. s’<s \wedge \text{clean (s’)}\]

\[(20)\text{ VoiceP} \quad \text{Peter} \quad \text{VoiceP} \quad \text{Voice} \quad \text{vP} \quad \text{v+v} \quad \text{wipe} \quad \text{aP} \quad \text{again} \quad \text{aP} \quad \text{table clean}\]
Manner verbs as modifiers

4.1 Narrow repetitive reading of ‘again’

➢ Adopting a structural analysis of ‘again’, the syntactic position of the repetitive modifier determines the respective readings. (Lechner et al. 2015, von Stechow 1996)

➢ In the repetitive reading, again attaches high to the VoiceP. In this position it solely scopes over both the causing event and the result state.

\[(21)\]

a. \(\text{\[again\]}(\text{VoiceP}) = \text{again}(\lambda s. \text{wipe}(e) \land \text{Caus}(e,s) \land \text{clean}(s))\)

b. Presupposition: \(\exists s. \exists e'. e'<e \land \text{wipe}(e') \land \text{Caus}(e',s) \land \text{clean}(s)\)

➔ The repetitive reading necessarily entails the restitutive reading. (Lechner et al. 2015, Beck & Snyder 2001)
Manner verbs as modifiers

4.1 Narrow repetitive reading of ‘again’

➢ In Samoan, the repetitive modifier *toe* ‘again’ license both *restitutive* and repetitive readings in the context of lexical accomplishments and RSVCs (Hohaus 2016).

(22) Peter bought a new table from the shop. At home, he puts the new table in his living room. It is spotlessly clean. After dinner, the table was very dirty as it is full of crumbs and sauce. Therefore, Peter wipes the table clean again.

*Sā toe solo fa’a-mamā e Pita le laulau.*

PST again wipe CAUS-clean ERG Peter SPEC table.ABS

‘Peter cleaned the table again by wiping it.’
In Samoan, the repetitive modifier *toe* ‘again’ license both restitutive and repetitive readings in the context of lexical accomplishments and RSVCs (Hohaus 2017).

(23) Peter and his family were having breakfast at their kitchen table. After the breakfast, the table was full of crumbs, so Peter wiped the table clean. A few minutes later, one of his children spilled some juice over the table. So, Peter wiped the table clean again.

*Sā toe solo~solo fa’a-mamā e Pita le laulau.*
PST again RED~wipe CAUS-clean ERG Peter SPEC table.ABS
‘Peter again cleaned the table by wiping it.’

(Note that (optional) the reduplication on the manner V1 indicates pluractionality.)
Manner verbs as modifiers

4.1 Narrow repetitive reading of ‘again’

Moreover, Samoan RSVCs license a narrow repetitive reading, in which toe ‘again’ scopes over the causing event only.

(24) Peter bought a new table from the shop. At home, he realized that the table had some marks on it. Before he returned the table to shop, he tried to clean it first. He took a cloth and wiped the table, but the table didn’t get any cleaner. Therefore, he got himself some cleansing agent and put it on the cloth. He wiped the table again and now it became clean.

Sā toe solo~solo fa’a-mamā e Pita le laulau.
PST again RED~wipe CAUS-clean ERG Peter SPEC table.ABS
‘Peter cleaned the table by wiping it again.’

(Note the (optional) reduplication on the manner V1 indicates pluractionality.)
Manner verbs as modifiers

4.1 Narrow repetitive reading of ‘again’

- Crucially, this interpretation is only available in adjoined structures, such as means constructions.
- The narrow repetitive reading arises, if ‘again’ attaches to modifying predicate prior to event modification.

(25) a. \[\text{\texttt{[again]}(v_1P) = \text{\texttt{again}}(\lambda e. \text{\texttt{wipe}}(e))}\]
   b. Presupposition: \(\exists e'. e' < e \land \text{\texttt{wipe}}(e')\)

- Samoan RSVCs are composed via adjunction.
Manner verbs as modifiers

4.2 Causative morphology on V2

➢ Further syntactic evidence comes from the presence of the causative prefix on the result-denoting *fa’a-* on the result denoting predicate.

➢ In Hopperdietzel (to appear), I have demonstrated that *fa’a-* is the allomorph of a bare v in causative configurations under Voice.

(27) Sā *fa’a-mamā e Pita le laulau.*
    PST CAUS-clean ERG Peter ART table
‘Peter cleaned the table.’

![Diagram of voice-to-v lowering](attachment://diagram.png)
In complementation structure, the \( v_1 \) intervenes between Voice and \( v_2 \) violating locality constraints on contextual allomorphy and head movement.


(28) *

(29) 

\( \Rightarrow \text{Samoaan RSVCs are composed via adjunction.} \)
Manner verbs as modifiers

4.3 V1 as event modifiers

➢ As manner adjuncts, the manner V1 modifies the underspecified causing event in the event structure of the causative V2.

(see Hopperdietzel to appear based on Zimmermann & Ameachi 2020 for a detailed analysis)

(30) a. \([fa’a-mamā]\) = \(\lambda e.\exists s. P(e) \land \text{Caus}(e, s) \land \text{clean}(s)\)

b. \([solo]\) = \(\lambda e. \text{wipe}(e)\)

c. \([solo \ fa’a-mamā]\) = \(\lambda e.\exists s \text{wipe}(e) \land \text{Caus}(e, s) \land \text{clean}(s)\) (e.g. via Predicate Modification)

➔ Samoan RSVCs are in instance of the *means* construction
# Manner verbs as modifiers

## 4.4 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RSP</th>
<th><em>means</em> constructions</th>
<th>RSVCs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main predicate</strong></td>
<td>manner</td>
<td>causative</td>
<td><em>fa‘a</em>-causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary predicate</strong></td>
<td>stative/result</td>
<td>manner</td>
<td>(causative) manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syntactic composition</strong></td>
<td>complementation</td>
<td>adjunction</td>
<td>adjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semantic relation</strong></td>
<td>causation</td>
<td>modification</td>
<td>modification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Conclusion

➢ To summarize, the analysis of Samoan RSVCs shows that

➔ the causative predicate is the main predicate of the construction.

➔ the manner predicate functions as a vP adjunct modifying the underspecified causing event entailed by the causative predicate.

➔ they are an instance of the means constructions.

➢ Outlook:

➔ What is the status of the internal argument of V1?

➔ What is the exact size of the vP-adjuncts?

➔ How to explain the distribution of verb classes?
Fa'afetai lava! Thank you!
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