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Santiago Laxopa Zapotec1 (SLZ, Oto-Manguean) can refer to sequences of a subject’s Motion and a subsequent intended Goal event with a single, morphologically-complex predicate (1b).

(1) **Associated motion (venitive) in SLZ:**

```
a. B-ya’a  Xwa’ha.
   perf-dance Juana.
   “Juana danced.”

```
```
b. B-de-ya’a  Xwa’ha.
   perf-ven-dance Juana
   “Juana came and danced.”
```

Label from recent typological literature: ASSOCIATED MOTION (AM) (Guillaume & Koch, 2021a).

- Well-attested outside Europe, particularly in the Americas.
- SLZ’s system is typologically unmarked, a good entry point.

In SLZ, three key properties:

A. **Event Composition**

B. **Argument Identification**

C. **Intentional Subjects**

Studying AM allows us to learn more about the productivity and limits on the event composition available in a single clause.

In this talk:

- §1: Lay out the key meaning components of AM in SLZ
- §2: Explore whether a plan-based approach can capture intentionality effectively
- §3: Develop an explicit compositional semantics for AM
- §4: Demonstrate how the proposal can generalize to other attested AM systems

---

1Many thanks first and foremost to Fe Silva-Robles for sharing her language and her time and patience. Thanks also to Maziar Toosarvandani, Pranav Anand, Jess Law, Adrian Brasoveanu, Carolyn Anderson, Antoine Guillaume, Guillaume Jacques, Artemis Alexiadou, attendees at Stanford’s Words With Friends and UCSC’s S-Circle, and the other members of the Zapotec Language Project for helpful discussion.

1SLZ is a Northern Zapotec language spoken by at least 1200 speakers in Santiago Laxopa, a municipality in the Ixtlán district of Oaxaca’s Sierra Norte. Well-studied neighbors include Zoogocho (Long C. & Butler H., 2000; Sonnenschein, 2004) and Zoochina Zapotec (Lopez Nicolas, 2009, 2016), and it has been studied together with the Zapotec of speakers from the nearby towns of Yalina and Guijexi as “Sierra Zapotec” (Adler et al., 2018; Toosarvandani, 2020, a.o.). The data here comes from about 30 weekly elicitations with one speaker living in Santa Cruz.
1 Key data

SLZ is VSO, and the two AM prefixes occur amidst other prefixal morphology on the verb.

(2) a. VENITITIVE de- (towards speaker)  b. ANDATIVE ja- (not towards speaker)
   B-de-do Bedw’nh xche’.   ∅-ja-do Bedw’nh xche’.
   PERF-VEN-eat Pedro dinner.   PERF-AND-eat Pedro dinner.
   ‘Pedro came and ate dinner.’   ‘Pedro went and ate dinner.’

Crucially monoclausal: negation, aspect-marking, agreement, causative derivation and aspectual adverbials can only occur once. See Appendix 1 for more evidence for monoclausality via binding.

1.1 Event structure

1.1.1 Two sub-events

AM entails the realization of two events in sequence:

- A Motion event (specified by prefix)
- A Goal event (specified by verb)

(3) AM entails a Motion event.
   B-de-daw =e’ xche’, # perw bitu b-id =e’.
   PERF-VEN-eat =he dinner but NEG PERF-come =he
   “He came and ate dinner, but he didn’t come.” (Contr.) (SLZ5034-105)

(4) AM entails a Goal event.
   a. B-de-do Maziar’e’nh xche’. # Bitu u-daw =e’.
      PERF-VEN-eat NAME dinner NEG PERF-eat =he
      “Maziar came and ate dinner. He didn’t eat.” (Contr.) (SLZ5034-110)
   b. Ja-yep Bedw’nh ya’ado’. # Bitu u-zulho =ba’.
      PERF-AND-climb Pedro mountain NEG PERF-start =he
      “Pedro went and climbed a mountain. He didn’t start.” (Contr.) (SLZ5052-021)

These entailments don’t project from under negation: I conclude they are not presupposed.

(5) Neither event projects.

   a. Context: Pedro ate dinner at home, hasn’t come to the speaker’s house.
      Bitu b-de-do Bedw’nh xche’. NEG PERF-VEN-eat Pedro dinner
      “Pedro didn’t come eat dinner.” (SLZ5062-004)
   b. Context: Pedro came to the speaker’s house to eat lunch, hasn’t eaten dinner.
      Bitu b-de-do Bedw’nh xche’. NEG PERF-VEN-eat Pedro dinner
      “Pedro didn’t come eat dinner.” (SLZ5062-002)
1.1.2 Loosely composed into one

Aspect like perfective applies to the entire sequence as if it were simplex.

(6) Unlike IMPF, PERF entails culmination in simple forms.
      IMPF.eat Pedro lunch NEG PERF-finish PERF-eat =he
      “Pedro was eating lunch. He didn’t finish eating.” (SLZ5047-021)
   b. U-do Bedw’nh xwe. # Bitu b-iyuhzh u-do =ba’.
      PERF-eat Pedro lunch NEG PERF-finish PERF-eat =he
      “Pedro ate lunch. He didn’t finish eating.” (Contr.) (SLZ5047-019)

(7) PERF also entails culmination of the whole sequence in AM.
   B-de-do Bedw’nh xwe. # Bitu b-iyuhzh u-do =ba’.
   PERF-ven-eat Pedro lunch NEG PERF-finish PERF-eat =he
   “Pedro came and ate lunch. He didn’t finish eating.” (Contr.) (SLZ5047-040)

The Goal need not directly follow Motion, though it must occur within Motion’s result state.

(8) AM permits intervening time, events.
    Context: Juana arrived in Laxopa, slept, and danced at a fiesta on the next day.
    B-de-ya’a Xwanha’ Laxup.
    PERF-ven-dance Juana Laxopa.
    “Juana came and danced in Laxopa.”
    (SLZ5063-010)

The right relationship seems to be enablement (Wolff, 2003; Altshuler, 2016): Motion enables Goal.
1.2 Argument structure

1.2.1 Argument identification

The subject of an AM complex is obligatorily interpreted as both:

- the external argument of the Goal
- the mover in the preceding Motion event

(9) The argument structure of AM sentences

![Diagram of AM sentence structure]

**Argument Identification:**
AM preserves the argument structure of the Goal and identifies its external argument with the external argument of Motion.
1.2.2 Additional subject entailments

But the obligations on the subject are more than those imposed by Motion and Goal.

Even when a predicate typically permits an non-sentient (10a) or unintentional (11a) subject, the corresponding AM complex requires a subject who is sentient (10b) and intentional (11b).

(10) **No non-sentient subjects in AM.**

a. Be-s-bizh wizh =e’n’h beku’ =nh.
   PERF-CAUS-dry sun =the dog =the
   “The sun dried off the dog.” (SLZ5050-034)

b. # B-de-s-bizh wizh =e’n’h beku’ =nh.
   PERF-VEN-CAUS-dry sun =the dog =the
   Int: “The sun came and dried off the dog.”
   Comment: “Only as a metaphor or dream.” (SLZ5050-043)

(11) **No unintentional subjects in AM.**

a. B-xixe Xwanha’. Bitu b- enh =de =ba’ =nh
   PERF-sneeze Juana NEG COMP-do =on.purpose =she =it
   “Juana sneezed. She didn’t do it on purpose.” (SLZ5072)

b. B-de-xixe Xwanha’. # Bitu b- enh =de =ba’ =nh.
   PERF-VEN-sneeze Juana NEG COMP-do =on.purpose =she =it
   “Juana came and sneezed. She didn’t do it on purpose.” (Contr.) (SLZ5072)

© **Intentional Subjects:**

AM complexes require a sentient subject that intends to bring about the Goal.
1.3 Interim summary

Three key characteristics:

A. Event Composition
B. Argument Identification
C. Intentional Subjects

We also observe B. Argument Identification and C. Intentional Subjects in familiar Motion + Infinitive constructions, which are biclausal in SLZ (Appendix 1).

(12) U-yej =ba’ we-chib yiche’e lege =ba’nh.
    perf-go =he INF-cut hair =his
    ‘He went to cut his hair.’ (SLZ5069-034)

Nevertheless, we won’t use an analysis of M+Inf as a starting point here.

- Naively, M+Inf would seem to derive intention from some form of modality in the Goal.
- If we have a modal Goal here, we have to do extra work to get the Goal to still be entailed.
2  Some complex events require plans

To start: What does AM mean?

- **A** Event Composition: two non-contiguous events are seen as one meta-event
- **C** Intentional Subjects: there are extra entailments placed on the subject

**Two questions towards a principled semantics:**
Q1. What consequences does (A) have for theories of single-clause event structure?
Q2. Do (A) & (C) co-occur for any principled reason?

Familiar approach to event composition: complex events can only realize roughly the same maximal template, an externally-caused process along with its result.

- simple Vendlerian (1967) accomplishments (13)
- English resultatives (14) (Rappaport Hovav & Levin, 1998; Levin, 2020)
- morphological causatives (Harley, 2008; Ramchand, 2008; Pylkkänen, 2008)
- consequence: process + result as a limit in semantics (e.g. Rappaport Hovav & Levin, 1998) or syntax (e.g. Borer, 2005)?

(13)  Marta squashed the can.  

(14)  Marta pressed the can flat.

But AM makes it clear that this isn’t the limit: accomplishments and causatives can be embedded.

(15)  B-de-s-bill  Bedw’nh beku’ =nh.  
    comp-ven-caus-dry Pedro  dog =the  
    “Pedro came and dried off the dog.”  

I cannot offer a new or revised version of an explanatory theory, but I’ll present one apparent limit a full account should capture: certain complex events can only be represented if planned.
2.1 Plans in the grammar

What progress can we make on intention using the notion of a plan?

- Plan for $e =$ mental state held by a director; if successful, causes $e$
- If a plan for $e$ caused $e$, $e$ occurred intentionally
- Part of event structure rather than a thematic relation


(16) Futurates and have-causatives.
   a. The Red Sox play the Yankees tomorrow.
   b. Obama had Clinton travel to France last Tuesday.

(17) Unplannable events are infelicitous.
   a. # The Red Sox beat the Yankees tomorrow.
   b. # Obama had it rain last Tuesday.

(18) Plans are states: They have temporal traces.
   a. Yesterday, John was getting married right now.
   b. In 1999, the DNC had the primaries start with Iowa in 2000.

In the have-causatives, the subject is the director (plan-holder), entails intention and sentience.

(19) Copley’s (2018) account of have-causatives, with liberties

\[ \text{have } Y P \] \leadsto \lambda x. \lambda e. \text{plan}(s, x) \land \text{cause}(s, e) \land P'(e, Y) \]

2.2 Plans for AM

If AM entails a plan for the sequence with the matrix subject as the director, we could capture:

- subject is intentionally involved
- sub-events are united within intention

(20) \[ \text{VEN-} \] \leadsto \lambda P_{(e, st)} \lambda x. \lambda e. \exists e_1, e_2 : e \left[ \text{enable}(e_1, e_2) \land \text{come'}(e_1, x) \land P(e_2, x) \right] \land

\exists s \left[ \text{plan}(s, x) \land \text{cause}(s, e) \right]

Two relevant points of variation from other uses of plans:

- Plan’s state variable is existentially closed, not available for modification (true in SLZ)
- Mandates a plan, whereas Copley (2018) uses a broader class of dispositions: difference in grammaticalization?
2.3 When plans are obligatory

There’s a larger class of situations where plans seem to mandatory in event descriptions which aren’t contiguous in time or force.

- E.g. in English, plan entailments are required for event descriptions which admit gaps, sub-eventualities within the runtime which do not realize or advance the event description.

Context: Max fiddled around with a broken radio for 15 minutes, sat still for 15 minutes, and then worked with his hands actively on the device for 30 more minutes and succeeded.
Max repaired the radio in an hour.

(22) Non-incremental accomplishments require plans.
Context: Unobserved, a monkey came upon a broken radio, fiddled around with the device without purpose for 15 minutes, after which the radio started functioning.
# The monkey repaired the radio.

- The same applies to cases where activities are coerced to accomplishments via a runtime which includes a preceding gap (Moens & Steedman, 1988; Copley & Harley, 2015).

Intuitively, plans seem to be a way for an event description to hang together even if it does not mandate temporal coherence.

Though there is interesting work to be done on the right way to derive this relationship (see Copley & Harley, 2015), we will be content with the generalization, formalized below.

(23) Event Filter: For a prejacent \( P \) to Asp, if \( P \) admits events \( e \) with a gap (a subeventuality which does not instantiate or contribute to \( P \)), then \( P(e) \) must entail the existence of a plan to bring about \( e \).

\[
\forall e \left( P(e) \land \exists e' \left[ e' \sqsubseteq e \land \neg \text{STAGE}(e', e) \right] \right) \left[ \exists s, d \left[ \text{PLAN}(s, d) \land \text{CAUSE}(s, e) \right] \right]
\]

(See also Wolff, 2003 and discussion in Truswell, 2011.)

Under this view, plans license particular kinds of event complexity.

AM in SLZ would need a plan for the same reason repair does: its event description permits gaps.
3 Compositional proposal

So far:

- proposed an analysis for (C) Intentional Subject based on plans
- explored whether plans are connected to event complexity more broadly

What remains:

- a compositional account that captures (A) Event Composition and (B) Argument Identification

The tack: picking up ingredients from proposals for more familiar structures.

3.1 Composing the complex event

Certain morphological causatives also compose a complex event from a prejacent sub-event.

- Hindi-Urdu -vaa (Bhatt & Embick, [2003] 2017; Ramchand, 2008; Bhatia, 2016)
- Japanese productive -sase (Harley, 2008; Pylkkänen, 2008)
- Similar looseness of sequencing ('indirect')

(24) Anjum-ne makan ban-vaa-yaa.
Anjum-ERG house be.made-vaa-PERF.MSG

“Anjum had a house built.” (Butt, 2003, cited in Ramchand, 2008)

We can borrow the basic shape of Ramchand’s (2008) semantics for -vaa:

- Affix as a modifier of event predicates
- Existentially binds sub-event $e_2$ which satisfies prejacent $P$
- Introduces and existentially binds an initial sub-event $e_1$
- Projects a complex event $e$ which contains $e_1$ and $e_2$

(25) $[\text{VEN-}] \leadsto \lambda P_{(e,s)} \lambda x. \lambda s. \exists e_1, e_2 \subseteq e \left[ \text{ENABLE}(e_1, e_2) \land \text{COME}'(e_1, x) \land P(e_2, x) \right] \land \\
\exists s \left[ \text{PLAN}(s, x) \land \text{CAUSE}(s, e) \right]$

But, causatives typically introduce a new argument instead of displaying argument identification, so we need another ingredient.
3.2 Argument identification

The sub-event introduced by AM shares an argument with the prejacent.

We can account for this using approaches to infinitival clauses with no surface subject.

- Road not taken: standard “syntactic” control (e.g. Landau, 2000), see Appendix 1.
  - Two verb-like elements, only one (high) subject
  - Prejacent is a property, slot for subject unfilled
  - Lexical semantics of first verb passes subject down

(26) A quasi-Montagovian restructuring verb imposing semantic control

\[ \text{try}_M \leadsto \lambda P(e_{st}) \lambda x \lambda e_s. \text{try}'(e, x) \land \square_s P(e', x) \]

(27) \[ \text{ven-} \leadsto \lambda P(e_{st}) \lambda x \lambda e_s. \exists e_1, e_2 \sqsubseteq e \left[ \text{enable}(e_1, e_2) \land \text{come}'(e_1, x) \land P(e_2, x) \right] \land \exists s \left[ \text{plan}(s, x) \land \text{cause}(s, e) \right] \]

This requires us to allow a verbal projection to:

- semantically introduce its external argument
- without syntactically selecting for its external argument

This can be achieved by splitting vP (Pylkkänen, 2008; Harley, 2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>License int. arg.</th>
<th>Introduce ext. arg.</th>
<th>Merge ext. arg. in Spec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VoiceP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two points of evidence in Hiaki (Uto-Aztecan; Harley, 2013; 2017):

- transitive and passive morphemes are distinct and can co-occur
- high applicatives require agentivity but can be bound by external argument
3.3 Example derivation

I locate AM as a Mot head between vP and VoiceP.

(29) A proposed composition for (2)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{AspP} \\
\text{Asp} \quad \text{VoiceP}_{(st)} \\
\text{PERF} \\
\text{DP}_e \\
\text{Pedro} \\
\text{Voice} \\
\text{MotP}_{(e, st)} \\
\text{Mot}\langle (e, st), (e, st) \rangle \\
\text{vP}_{(e, st)} \\
\text{VEN} \\
\text{eat dinner}
\end{array}
\]

The semantics for the prefix contains all the properties already discussed.

(30) A sample derivation

a. \([\text{ven-}] \leadsto \lambda P_{(e, st)} \lambda x_e \lambda e_s. \exists e_1, e_2 \sqsubseteq e [\text{ENABLE}(e_1, e_2) \land \text{come}'(e_1, x) \land P(e_2, x)] \land \\
\exists s [\text{PLAN}(s, x) \land \text{cause}(s, e)]

b. \([\text{eat dinner}] \leadsto \lambda x_e \lambda e_s. \text{eat}'(e) \land \text{Th}(e) = \text{dinner} \land \text{Ag}(e) = x

c. \([\text{ven-eat dinner}] \leadsto \lambda x_e \lambda e_s. \exists e_1, e_2 \sqsubseteq e [\text{ENABLE}(e_1, e_2) \land \text{come}'(e_1, x) \land \\
\text{eat}'(e_2) \land \text{Th}(e_2) = \text{dinner} \land \text{Ag}(e_2) = x] \land \\
\exists s [\text{cause}(s, e) \land \text{plan}(s, x)]

d. \([\text{Pedro ven-eat dinner}] \leadsto \lambda e_s. \exists e_1, e_2 \sqsubseteq e [\text{ENABLE}(e_1, e_2) \land \text{come}'(e_1, \text{pedro}) \land \\
\text{eat}'(e_2) \land \text{Th}(e_2) = \text{dinner} \land \text{Ag}(e_2) = \text{pedro}] \land \\
\exists s [\text{cause}(s, e) \land \text{plan}(s, \text{pedro})]
4 The bigger picture

I’ve given an account of the meaning and composition of AM, which derives one of its key properties—\( \mathbb{C} \) Intentional Subjects—from the claim that plans license particularly complex event descriptions.

The other compositional facts—\( \text{A} \) Event Composition & \( \text{B} \) Argument Identification—can be accounted for by combining ingredients from better-studied constructions.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{A} & \quad \text{B} & \quad \text{C} \\
\text{VEN-} & \quad \leadsto & \quad \lambda P_{(e,s,t)} \lambda x \lambda e_s, \exists e_1, e_2 \sqsubseteq e [\text{ENABLE}(e_1, e_2) \land \text{come}'(e_1, x) \land P(e_2, x)] \land \\
& & \exists s [\text{PLAN}(s, x) \land \text{CAUSE}(s, e)]
\end{align*}
\]

4.1 Allowing for variation

Two pieces of AM’s meaning in SLZ are simply stipulated here in the lexical entry:

- The temporal order of Motion and the prejacent event
- Identification of external arguments

This may be right, because these properties vary in the AM typology (Guillaume & Koch, 2021b).

E.g.: Northern Sahaptin (Sahaptian; NW US), we-\'\-

\begin{align*}
\text{a. Subject Motion prior to prejacent} & \\
\text{i-w} & \text{e-\'wi-cabni-ya} & 3\text{sg-mot}-\text{many-ask-past} \\
& & \text{“He went and asked many people.”}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{b. Subject Motion subsequent to prejacent} & \\
\text{i-w} & \text{e-\'wina'-utp-a} & 3\text{sg-mot}-\text{hurriedly-dress-past} \\
& & \text{“He dressed hurriedly and went.”}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{c. Object Motion concurrent with prejacent} & \\
\text{i-w} & \text{e-\'t'\lq\lqwod-na} & 3\text{sg-mot}-\text{catch-past} \\
& & \text{“He caught it as it went.”} \quad \text{(N. Sahaptin: Jacobs, 1931, p. 149)}
\end{align*}

AM can be less constrained.

Nevertheless, SLZ-type AM is very common, which can be explained by lexicalization pressures.

- Prior AM is most common, harmonic with prelinguistic salience of goals in directed motion events (Lakusta & Landau, 2012; Lakusta & Carey, 2015)
- Subject movers are most common, harmonic with general tendencies for subject control (Landau, 2000), subject agentivity (Dowty, 1991), and subject prominence.
4.2 No intention, no gaps?

The entertained Event Filter can generate a biconditional prediction:

- All AM that requires intentional subjects will permit gaps
- Any AM that can occur with unintentional subjects won’t permit gaps

One point in favor from a distinct Zapotec language: San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec does allow unintentional AM, but indeed does not appear to permit gaps (Anderson, 2019).

(33) Z-ied-cha zhyet ni =a per queity r-acbedi =ëng ca-cha =ëng ni =a. PROG-VEN-warm cat feet =my but NEG HAB-know =it PROG-warm =it foot =my

“The cat is coming and warming my feet but it doesn’t know that it warms my feet.”
(SLQ Zapotec: Anderson, 2019, p. 16)

Overall, the account seems to make the right typological predictions for AM.

Towards further insights:

- Wider study of AM can bring a whole body of new evidence for our theories of event structure to account for.
- If AM is possible, what other meta-events are?
- If this complexity is unique to motion sequences, why?
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A Alternative: Syntactic control?

Why not just use syntactic control?

- No need to split vP
- Two syntactic subject positions
- Lower subject is a controlled PRO

An alternative composition for (2) using syntactic control

Binding evidence reveals that the surface subject is local to the internal arguments of the Goal. Zapotec “backwards binding” allows implicit subjects when co-indexed with an object’s possessor (Black, 1996; Foreman, 2006).

“Backwards binding” licenses implicit subject from possessor

Some locality restrictions observed: no BB with MPI.

Backwards binding blocked out of infinitives

Proposal: Blocked by PIC (Chomsky, 1999), infinitives don’t contain a C but do contain an external argument position (PRO).
But AM is just fine.

(37) Backwards binding permitted in AM
    B-de-chib (=ba’) yiche’e lege =ba’nh.
    PERF-VEN-CAUS.bare =he hair head =his
    “He came and cut his hair.”

**Conclusion:** The AM prejacent lacks a subject position and thus a phase boundary.

This rules out syntactic control, in favor of AM composing below the external argument position.