

## Maximal and non-minimal change in Salish event structure

Sander Nederveen, University of British Columbia

Data from Secwepemctsin (Interior Salish) supports the claim that (non)-culmination and (non)-change-of-state readings are derived compositionally through an underlying degree semantics measuring the degree of change on the theme argument. Contrastive (in)transitivizing suffixes give rise to different degrees of change: transitive marking on the verb restricts the degree of change to the maximal point on its scale, yielding culmination; theme-oriented middles, which are formally intransitive (Davis 1996; Gerds and Hukari 1998), restrict the degree of change to a non-minimal point on its scale, yielding a Change-of-State (CoS) reading.

**Background and Data:** Secwepemctsin marks (in)transitivity via suffixes, which also encode a distinction between control (CTR) and limited-control (LCTR). The control distinction on transitive verbs plays out as a distinction between a culmination implicature (CTR) and a culmination entailment (LCTR; (1)), a pattern found across Salish (Bar-el 2005; Bar-el et al. 2005; Kiyota 2007, 2008; Jacobs 2011; Huijsmans and Mellesmoen 2021). A discovery in Secwepemctsin is that the contrast between implicature and entailment also plays out between CTR and LCTR theme-oriented middle verbs: a CoS implicature (CTR) contrasts with a CoS entailment (LCTR; (2)):

- (1) a. Jim kúl-en-[t]-s re miṁc, ta7 k s-wi7-s ey  
 Jim make-CTR-TR-3ERG DET basket NEG DET NMLZ-finish-3POSS still  
 ‘Jim made a basket but he still hasn’t finished.’ (CTR-transitive)
- b. #Jim c-tsíq-enwén-[t]-s re tsípwen, kémell ta7 k s-wi7-s  
 Jim LOC-dig-LC-TR-3ERG DET root.cellar however NEG DET NMLZ-finish-3POSS  
 Intended: ‘Jim dug a root cellar but has not finished.’ (LCTR-transitive)
- (2) a. Jim qwl-em te peták, kémell re c-kweltsenélten-s quwúp-úke7.  
 Jim roast-CTR.MID DET.OBL potato however DET LOC-stove-3POSS broken-EVID  
 Ye-rí7 ul peták s[t]-tsixw ey  
 DEM-DIST SO potato STAT-raw still  
 ‘Jim roasted some potatoes, but his stove was broken. That’s why the potatoes are still raw.’ *Consultant’s comment:* ‘This makes sense, but not in English’ (CTR-middle)
- b. #Jim qwl-enwélln te peták, kémell re c-kweltsenélten-s quwúp-úke7.  
 Jim roast-LC.MID DET.OBL potato however DET LOC-stove-3POSS broken-EVID  
 Ye-rí7 ul peták s[t]-tsixw ey  
 DEM-DIST SO potato STAT-raw still  
 Intended: ‘Jim roasted some potatoes, but his stove was broken. That’s why the potatoes are still raw.’ *Consultant’s comment:* ‘No, they cannot all be raw still.’ (LCTR-middle)

**Measuring change:** I propose to account for the event maximalization and change-of-state readings through degree semantics, following work by Kennedy and Levin (2008); Piñón (2008); Wellwood (2015); Martínez Vera (2021); a.o., on degree-based aspectual composition. I propose that the (in)transitivizing suffixes introduce the measure function  $\mathbf{m}_\Delta$  (following Kennedy and Levin 2008), which takes an object  $x$  and an event  $e$  in world  $w$  and returns the degree that represents the amount that  $x$  changes in the property measured by  $\mathbf{m}$  as a result of participating in  $e$  in  $w$ . The degree of change is measured by mapping an argument  $x$  onto a scale whose minimal value is the degree of  $x$  that is measured by  $\mathbf{m}$  at the initiation of  $e$ . The output is the degree of difference between the degree of  $x$  at the beginning and the degree measured by  $\mathbf{m}$  at the end of  $e$ .

- (3) For any measure function  $\mathbf{m}$ ,  $\mathbf{m}_\Delta = \lambda x \lambda e. \lambda w. \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{m}(x)(init(e))(w)}^\uparrow(x)(fin(e))(w)$   
 (adapted from Kennedy and Levin 2008: 18)

**Maximal and minimal Points:** In addition to introducing degrees, the (in)transitivizing aspectual morphology on the predicate restricts where the degree falls on its respective scale and introduces specific points on the scale of  $\mathbf{m}_\Delta$ , namely **min** and **max** (adapted from Morzycki 2016: 128-129):

$$(4) \quad \llbracket \mathbf{max}(S_{\mathbf{m}_\Delta}) \rrbracket = \iota d [d \in S_{\mathbf{m}_\Delta} \wedge \forall d' \in S_{\mathbf{m}_\Delta} [d' \leq d] ]$$

$$(5) \quad \llbracket \mathbf{min}(S_{\mathbf{m}_\Delta}) \rrbracket = \iota d [d \in S_{\mathbf{m}_\Delta} \wedge \forall d' \in S_{\mathbf{m}_\Delta} [d \leq d'] ]$$

**Maximal and non-minimal change:** In (6)-(7), the (in)transitivizing suffixes compose with a verbal root that is a  $P$ -event of  $x$ . The degree of change on transitives is restricted to being equal to the maximal point on the scale. This yields culmination. The degree of change on middles is restricted to being larger than the minimal point on its scale. This yields a CoS. Thus, culmination or CoS follows from whether the degree-of-change measure represents a maximal degree of change, or whether it exceeds the smallest degree on the scale.

$$(6) \quad \text{a.} \quad \llbracket \text{LCTR-TR} \rrbracket = \lambda P_{\langle e, vt \rangle} . \lambda x . \lambda e . \lambda w [P(x)(e)(w) \wedge \mathbf{m}_\Delta(x)(e)(w) = \mathbf{max}(S_{\mathbf{m}_\Delta}) ]$$

$$\text{b.} \quad \llbracket \text{LCTR-MID} \rrbracket = \lambda P_{\langle e, vt \rangle} . \lambda x . \lambda e . \lambda w [P(x)(e)(w) \wedge \mathbf{m}_\Delta(x)(e)(w) > \mathbf{min}(S_{\mathbf{m}_\Delta}) ]$$

**Implicature and entailment of change:** The limited control forms (6a-b) entail culmination or CoS, because the measure function applies in the utterance world. The control forms implicate culmination or a CoS. This is derived through inertia worlds. In CTR verbs (7a-b),  $\mathbf{m}_\Delta$  returns a degree of change in all inertia worlds  $w'$ , whose history is identical to  $w$ , but may branch off at the *beginning* of the event (Bar-el et al. 2005, cf. Dowty 1979; Landman 1992; Portner 1998).

$$(7) \quad \text{a.} \quad \llbracket \text{CTR-TR} \rrbracket = \lambda P_{\langle e, vt \rangle} . \lambda x . \lambda e . \lambda w . \forall w' [P(x)(e)(w) \wedge w' \text{ is an inertia world w.r.t } w \text{ at the beginning of } e \rightarrow \mathbf{m}_\Delta(x)(e)(w') = \mathbf{max}(S_{\mathbf{m}_\Delta}) ]$$

$$\text{b.} \quad \llbracket \text{CTR-MID} \rrbracket = \lambda P_{\langle e, vt \rangle} . \lambda x . \lambda e . \lambda w . \forall w' [P(x)(e)(w) \wedge w' \text{ is an inertia world w.r.t } w \text{ at the beginning of } e \rightarrow \mathbf{m}_\Delta(x)(e)(w') > \mathbf{min}(S_{\mathbf{m}_\Delta}) ]$$

**Outlook:** This analysis extends the idea that there is a link between CoS and degree semantics, with (a)telicity following from how the measure of change of the theme argument is evaluated, i.e., maximal vs. non-minimal. It is (in)transitivizing morphology that introduces a degree of change calculated by a measure function, and the degree of change may be implicated (CTR) or entailed (LC), depending on the world in which the degree of change is evaluated.

---

**References:** Bar-el, L. 2005. Aspectual distinctions in Skwxwú7mesh. Dissertation, UBC. Bar-el, L, H. Davis & L. Matthewson. 2005. On non-culminating accomplishments. *Proceedings of NELS 35*. Davis, H. 1996. Deep Unaccusativity and Zero syntax in St'át'imcets. *Papers for ICSNL 31*. Dowty, D. 1979. *Word meaning and Montague grammar: the semantics of verbs and times in generative semantics and in Montague's PTQ*. Springer. Gerdts, D, & T. Hukari. 1998. Inside and outside the middle. *Papers for ICSNL 33*. Hay, J, C. Kennedy & B. Levin. 1999. Scalar structure underlies telicity in "degree achievements." *Proceedings of SALT 9*. Huijismans, M, and G. Mellesmoen. 2021. An overview of control and non-control in ʔayʔajuθəm (Comox-Sliammon). *Papers for ICSNL 56*. Jacobs, P. 2011. Control in Skwxwú7mesh. Dissertation, UBC. Kennedy, C. Vagueness and grammar: the semantics of relative and absolute gradable adjectives. *Linguistics and Philosophy 30*. Kennedy, C. & B. Levin Measure of change: the adjectival core of degree achievements. *Adjectives and Adverbs: Syntax, semantics and discourse*. OUP. Kiyota, M. 2007. Aspectual properties of unaccusatives and transitives in Sənčəθən. *Papers for ICNL 52*. Kiyota, M. 2008. Situation aspect and viewpoint aspect: From Salish to Japanese. Dissertation, UBC. Landman, F. 1992. The progressive. *NLLT*. Martínez Vera, G. 2021. On derived change of state verbs in Southern Aymara. *Languages*. Morzycki, M. 2016. *Modification*. CUP. Piñón, C. 2008. Aspectual composition with degrees. *Adjectives and Adverbs: Syntax, semantics and discourse*. OUP. Portner, P. 1998. The progressive in modal semantics. *Language*. Wellwood, A. 2015. On the semantics of comparison across categories. *L&P*.