

## Introduction

### Введение

Uwe Junghanns

Published online: 1 October 2010

© The Author(s) 2010. This article is published with open access at Springerlink.com

This volume comprises written versions of papers that were originally presented at the Workshop on *Verbal Arguments in Semantics and Syntax* held at the University of Göttingen on January 30, 2010.

The status of arguments is one of the central issues of current linguistic research. The on-going debate on how to treat arguments has a substantial impact on linguistic theorizing. According to one line of reasoning, number, type, and hierarchy of arguments are encoded in the semantic representations that constitute part of verbal lexical entries (cf., e.g., Grimshaw 1990; Wunderlich 1997; Bierwisch 1997, 2007). However, an opposing view holds that one can completely dispense with the classical concept of argument structure. In such an approach, arguments are introduced syntactically, licensed by appropriate syntactic heads that are correlated with specific semantic interpretations (cf., e.g., Hale and Keyser 1993; Borer 2005; Reuland et al. 2007; Ramchand 2008). The crucial difference between the two approaches is the following: The classical approach assumes meaning decomposition structures in the lexicon, encoding argument structure. Syntactic projection depends on the number and hierarchy of arguments, on the one hand, and, on the other, on general principles of structure building which are syntactic by nature. Approaches dispensing with arguments in the classical sense have to license them in a special way. The underlying assumption is that syntax is largely determined by semantic factors. Accordingly, clausal structure contains elements that are primarily semantically motivated. They allow the introduction of arguments.

The papers contained in this volume represent different approaches to the formal treatment of arguments and meaning characterizations.

---

The workshop was financed partly through means coming from the Volkswagen Foundation as well as the Ministry for Science and Culture of the Federal State of Lower Saxony. The financial support is gratefully acknowledged.

---

U. Junghanns (✉)

Seminar für Slavische Philologie, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany  
e-mail: [uwe.junghanns@phil.uni-goettingen.de](mailto:uwe.junghanns@phil.uni-goettingen.de)

In their contribution, Dorothee Fehrmann, Uwe Junghanns, and Denisa Lenertová investigate reflexive marking in Slavic. The reflexive marker is assumed to apply at the lexicon–syntax interface, affecting the argument structure of the verb it combines with. Fehrmann, Junghanns, and Lenertová argue for two lexical types of the reflexive marker—argument blocking and argument binding. These suffice to cover all constructions and their cross-Slavic variation (availability of a *by*-phrase, compatibility of the reflexive marker with particular verb classes, null subject realization).

Ljudmila Geist explores the nature of the difference between the short form (SF) and the long form (LF) of predicate adjectives in Russian. She argues for a categorial distinction—verb (SF) vs. adjective (LF). This distinction correlates with different argument structures. Whereas the SF introduces a referential argument for states and instantiates primary predication, the LF does not have a referential argument and instantiates secondary predication. Consequently, the SF combines with the auxiliary *byt'*, and the LF—with the copula *byt'* 'to be'.

In his contribution, Marcel Guhl analyses the Russian marker *-sja* in passives, anticausatives, and antipassives. He adopts the theoretical framework of Distributed Morphology (cf., e.g., Halle and Marantz 1993) assuming that roots do not have argument structure and that arguments are licensed by functional heads. Guhl considers *-sja* as a head. In syntax, it saturates a selectional feature on an argument-introducing head. In semantics, it existentially quantifies over an unsaturated argument variable.

Roland Meyer investigates the diachronic development of reflexive passives and reflexive impersonals. He argues that stepwise reanalysis has led to the differing positions that Czech, Polish, and Russian synchronically occupy on a typological hierarchy of passive constructions. The diachronic comparative approach also reveals the interdependence of some of the features of reflexive passives and reflexive impersonals in Slavic.

In his contribution, Hagen Pitsch exploits the theory of verb cluster formation put forward by Bierwisch (1990) to explain the properties of modal particles in Bulgarian. Pitsch assumes that particles like *ue* and *da* form a cluster with the verb. He regards *da*-expressions as Modal Phrases lacking the CP-layer. Therefore, the predicate's event variable does not get existentially quantified at the level of Semantic Form (absence of existential presupposition). This explains the difference in interpretation between *da*-expressions and *ue*-sentences, the latter being fully-fledged CPs.

In her contribution, Barbara Sonnenhauser discusses reflexivised verbs of emotion in Russian. She rejects the standard analysis according to which these verbs are derived, claiming that they have to be kept apart from subject experiencer verbs and non-reflexivised object experiencer verbs. This is supported by the fact that reflexivised verbs of emotion can appear in the direct-speech construction. Sonnenhauser invokes event structure to explain the special properties of reflexivised verbs of emotion.

Thanks are due to the editors of *Russian Linguistics* for granting the opportunity to publish the papers in one issue of the journal. The staff at *Russian Linguistics* have done a wonderful job preparing the papers. Finally, many thanks to the anonymous reviewers whose suggestions and critical remarks helped to substantially improve the papers.

**Open Access** This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Noncommercial License which permits any noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited.

## References

- Bierwisch, M. (1990). Verb cluster formation as a morphological process. In G. Booij & J. van Marle (Eds.), *Yearbook of morphology. Volume 3* (pp. 173–199). Dordrecht.
- Bierwisch, M. (1997). Lexical information from a minimalist point of view. In C. Wilder, H.-M. Gärtner & M. Bierwisch (Eds.), *The role of economy principles in linguistic theory* (Studia grammatica, 40) (pp. 227–266). Berlin.
- Bierwisch, M. (2007). Semantic form as interface. In A. Späth (Ed.), *Interfaces and interface conditions* (Language, Context, and Cognition, 6) (pp. 1–32). Berlin, New York.
- Borer, H. (2005). *Structuring sense. Volumes I–III*. Oxford.
- Grimshaw, J. (1990). *Argument structure* (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs, 18). Cambridge.
- Hale, K., & Keyser, S. J. (1993). On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations. In K. Hale & S. J. Keyser (Eds.), *The view from building 20* (Current Studies in Linguistics, 24) (pp. 53–109). Cambridge.
- Halle, M., & Marantz, A. (1993). Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. In K. Hale & S. J. Keyser (Eds.), *The view from building 20* (Current Studies in Linguistics, 24) (pp. 111–176). Cambridge.
- Ramchand, G. C. (2008). *Verb meaning and the lexicon: a first-phase syntax* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, 116). Cambridge.
- Reuland, E., Bhattacharya, T., & Spathas, G. (Eds.) (2007). *Argument structure* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, 108). Amsterdam.
- Wunderlich, D. (1997). Cause and the structure of verbs. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 28(1), 27–68.