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For the listener, who listens in the snow,
And, nothing himself, beholds
Nothing that is not there and the nothing that is.

From *The Snow Man* by Wallace Stevens
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1 Introduction

This thesis is concerned with implicit objects in Swedish. I will study three different types of objectless sentences with potentially transitive verbs, exemplified in (1)–(3).

(1) Sally läste.
   Sally read
   ‘Sally was reading.’

(2) Det knackade på dörren. Sally öppnade.
   it knocked on door the Sally opened
   ‘There was a knock on the door. Sally opened [it].’

(3) Soldater dödar i krig.
   soldiers kill in war
   ‘Soldiers kill [people] in war.’

What (1)–(3) have in common is that an overt object could be inserted into the word string without altering the grammaticality. In (1) the potential object reference is unknown or irrelevant, i.e. the reading material is not specified anywhere in the context although apparently ‘something’ was being read. Examples like (1) are known to involve a certain set of verbs, sometimes labeled pseudo-transitives or noncore transitives (e.g. Levin 1993, 1999). I will refer to examples like (1) as Implicit Object Read type (IOR). Importantly, IOR examples are perfectly fine when uttered out of the blue.

Compare this with the example in (2), where the reference of the implicit object is specific and salient in the discourse. Here, the speaker can rely on the hearer having enough linguistic or extralinguistic information to disambiguate the object reference. In the particular case of (2), the implicit object is referring to the door mentioned in the previous sentence. Given a different context, something else could be the intended referent, such as for instance a window, a bottle or a package. Thus, (2) is an example of a highly contextual phenomenon, which I will refer to as Implicit Object Open type (IOO).

The examples in (1)–(2) are both episodic, i.e. they describe particular events that take place at a certain point in time. This appears to separate them from the example in the generic sentence in (3). In terms of reference on the other hand, it seems like (3) is more closely related to (1) than to (2) since the understood object does not have specific reference. However, the
The properties of IOR, IOO and IOK is the empirical as well as the theoretical topic of this thesis. The empirical questions relate to the distribution of objectless sentences in Swedish, including the possible interpretations of the implicit object and the restrictions involved in the different types. The theoretical questions concern the syntactic-semantic status of the implicit objects, i.e. how different types of implicit objects are represented in the syntax and how they receive their interpretation. Those questions in turn raise other questions, as for instance the more general questions of where to place argument structure information in a syntactic model, what significance event structure (aktionsart) has when it comes to the restrictions, and how implicit objects can shed light on verb structure and verb meaning in general.

Clearly, any syntactic theory has to handle the issue of whether and how implicit arguments are represented in the syntax. There have been different proposals regarding implicit objects for different languages, partly due to cross-linguistic variation. Previous research on implicit objects in Swedish is limited to a few minor case studies (Martola 2008, Prytz 2009, Bäckström 2013), whereas much theoretical literature is based on English data. In the Swedish reference grammar (Teleman et al. 1999, 3:296f., 4:961f.), examples similar to (1)–(3) are described, but not given any elaborate analysis. A larger study on implicit objects in Swedish will therefore contribute to a fuller description of the Swedish language, and potentially give us a better understanding of implicit objects in general.

1.1 Aim and major claims

The aim of this thesis is to define the essential syntactic-semantic properties of three types of objectless sentences in present-day Swedish. The main focus will be on the Implicit Object Read type (IOR) from (1), whereas the analyses of the Implicit Object Open type (IOO) and Implicit Object Kill type (IOK) in (2)–(3) will be more general and in large respects follow from the analysis of (IOR).

In order to realize the aim of this study, I will first distinguish the relevant licensing conditions through an empirical study of potentially transitive Swedish verbs used in objectless sentences. Then, I will study the restrictions and interpretations involved in the three types.

Like much previous research, I will distinguish more than one type of objectless sentence with potentially transitive verbs but unlike most studies that treat more than one type at once, I will explain similarities as well as differences among the types with separate syntactic-semantic analyses. In other words, I see differences not only regarding the interpretations of the
implicit objects, but also in the licensing conditions and in the syntax of each type. More specifically, I study how event structural properties of different sets of verbs are involved in IOR, and I discuss how the object reference can be resolved for the implicit objects of IOO and IOK.

I will thus maintain the idea that not all implicit objects are alike, stressing the difference not only on the descriptive level but also on the explanatory level. I will assume that argument structure, i.e. information about the number and type of arguments a verb can combine with, is a consequence of syntactic embedding in the verb phrase. I frame my discussion within Ramchand’s (2008) decomposed three-partite verb phrase, which importantly distinguishes between two types of syntactic objects of process verbs. These are inserted into different positions in the verb phrase. UNDERGOER objects are syntactically obligatory and inserted into a specifier position, whereas RHEMES are syntactically optional and when realized inserted into a complement position. I argue that IOR verbs optionally take RHEME objects and, as a consequence of that, I argue that IOR does not involve any object at all in the syntax. Accordingly, IOR is simply an objectless use of a verb with an optional RHEME object. Thus, IOR verbs are not regarded as genuine transitive verbs in this work. In line with Ramchand (2008), I instead show that IOR verbs share the structure of some sets of verbs that are generally considered intransitive. These include intransitive motion verbs like *springa* ‘run’, conflation verbs like *dansa* ‘dance’ and some other intransitive verbs like *arbeta* ‘work’. Thus, although transitivity is not a primitive notion in the model assumed here, it is fair to say that my claim is that IOR verbs are intransitive, although they – like some other intransitive verbs – can take RHEME objects.

IOO, on the other hand, involves an omitted UNDERGOER object with specific reference that is given from and salient in the linguistic or extra-linguistic context. Thus, I argue that the omitted UNDERGOER object involved in IOO refers to a salient and specific referent, and that the reference is resolved pragmatically. In other words, IOO is something entirely separate from IOR. Unlike many previous accounts, I also treat IOK separately and not as a special case of IOR. Whereas I analyze the verbs involved in IOR as being syntactically intransitive, I argue that IOK just like IOO involves transitive verbs and the omission of an UNDERGOER object. I propose that there is a general restriction on IOO as well as on IOK with respect to the interpretability of the object. In other words, an object interpretation is required for an IOO or an IOK sentence to be interpretable and the event to be identified. More specifically, the reference of an IOO object is specific, whereas the reference of an IOK object is non-specific. This separates both IOO and IOK from IOR, where no object interpretation is required or linguistically licensed, although it often can be inferred extralinguistically.
1.2 Terminology and scope

I will use the term *implicit object* as a pretheoretic label, covering all the objects potentially involved in IOR, IOO, and IOK. Likewise, I will discuss examples of IOR, IOO, and IOK as *objectless sentences*. Accordingly, IOR, IOO, and IOK each represent a type of implicit object as well as a type of objectless sentence.

The labels *omitted object* and *object omission* will mainly be reserved for IOO and IOK, i.e. those types of implicit objects that I analyze as UNDERGOER objects. I will also use these terms when referring to some of the omitted objects discussed in previous research.

In my analysis, I will distinguish between optional RHEME objects and obligatory UNDERGOER objects. The former are characteristic for the IOR verbs, which are also referred to as *pseudo-transitive* verbs in order to distinguish them from the *true transitive* verbs involved in IOO and IOK. Pre-analytically, I refer to both types of verbs as *potentially transitive*.

The study is restricted to direct objects, leaving indirect objects aside. The direct objects are in turn primarily restricted to DP objects and bare NPs. However, since the objects are not visible in the examples I study, I cannot base my research strictly on the form of the objects. This thesis is therefore not only concerned with (implicit) objects but to a large extent also with verbs, which are taken as a point of departure into the data. The study focuses on dynamic potentially mono-transitive verbs, but stative verbs are also considered. Verbs are here considered potentially transitive if and only if they (optionally or obligatorily) take a DP object. If they can also take PP or CP complements, they are still part of the study. However, verbs that only take PPs or CPs (but not DPs) are excluded in order to keep the data consistent enough for meaningful comparisons.

I include examples like (4) but not examples like (5) in my study. It is ungrammatical to insert a pronoun after *lämnar* ‘leave’ in (5) but not in (4), which among other things indicate that they are two different structures (cf. Petzell forthcoming).

(4) Det är alltid jag som lämnar barnen och hämtar.
   *it is always I that leave children the and pick up*
   ‘It is always me who leaves the children and picks [them] up.’

(5) Det är alltid jag som lämnar och hämtar barnen.
   *it is always I that leave and pick up children the*
   ‘It is always me who leaves and picks up the children.’

The treatment of these examples depends on the analysis of coordinations, a topic beyond the scope of this thesis. Regardless of which analysis one assumes for coordinations it is however clear that it involves restrictions on null pronouns that are different from the restrictions in non-coordinations.
These differences are not restricted to objects but are well known for e.g. subjects as well (see e.g. Magnusson 2007).

1.3 Data and methodological issues

The examples given in (1)–(3) are all idealized in order to show the differences between the three types of objectless sentences. Constructed examples of this kind will be used throughout the thesis in order to map the restrictions on the different types, and as a diagnostic tool to argue for the three separate analyses. Corpus examples are instead used in order to study what licensing factors are relevant and what types of implicit objects can be distinguished, particularly in chapter 2.1

When studying implicit objects several methodological issues arise. Not only is the object of study invisible in the word string, it is also the case that the distinctions regarding different types of objectless sentences is to a high degree dependent on contextual interpretations of particular examples. Yet another issue concerns the selection of verbs included in the study, which could possibly have consequences for the results. To get a representative overview of implicit objects in language use and to make the corpus searches more restricted, I have included verbs from different semantic domains (such as creation/consumption verbs, contact verbs, motion verbs and some psych verbs) and frequent as well as non-frequent verbs. The verbs were selected in several ways. First, I picked out the fifty most frequent potentially transitive verbs in Swedish from a frequency list (Allén 1971). Next, I added verbs that were either similar or dissimilar to the first 50 with respect to assumed frequency patterns and verb semantics. However, I intentionally disregarded verbs that are well-known to be special in different respects. The verbs that are left out include light verbs (such as ta ‘take’), auxiliaries (such as ska ‘will’) and verbs with homonyms that are auxiliaries (such as ha ‘have’ or kunna ‘can’). All in all, just over a hundred different verbs occur in the data used in this thesis.

The data used in chapter 2 will be presented in more detail in section 2.1.1. However, in general, the data is gathered from Korp, a web-based corpus of Swedish from a wide range of source materials provided by Språkbanken at the University of Gothenburg. Most examples are from the blog material Bloggmix, but I have also used a balanced subcorpus labeled Parole, and a Twitter corpus called Twittermix as well as examples found through Google searches.

Apart from the more systematic study in chapter 2, I use corpora for unsystematic as well as more specific searches. In those cases, I have

---

1 When it is necessary to distinguish between my two kinds of data, I will consistently refer to data from language use as corpus examples or corpus data and to my other data as constructed examples.
searched for particular verbs followed by e.g. a prepositional phrase, but not necessarily compared these results with the search results of (all) other verbs in my study. This procedure was necessary since a more general search for implicit objects is difficult to carry out even in syntactically tagged corpora – there is no search string that would include all sentences with transitive verbs without objects and nothing else. Even with specific predefined verbs it is still difficult to get the relevant search results, because (i) when expressed, the object does not have to directly follow the verb, but can be placed in several places in the word-string; (ii) since the annotation is automatic, the objects are often poorly annotated in the corpus; and (iii) implicit objects are in general not by far as common as expressed objects. This means that there will unavoidably be a significant amount of garbage among the results no matter what general search strings you use. Apart from these drawbacks to using corpora there are of course the usual hedges, like the fact that you cannot use corpus data in order to see what is not possible in a language. The restrictions will simply not show up.

In spite of the empirical take on the topic, the analysis is strictly qualitative since the questions I want to answer are related to what is and what is not possible and why this is so, not to what is common or uncommon. Accordingly, this thesis is primarily about the Swedish grammatical system, not so much about its use.

1.4 Outline of the thesis

In this introductory chapter, I have introduced the object of study, as well as my aim, major claims and data.

In chapter 2, I will discuss and define the three different types of objectless sentences more closely. I will identify different syntactic, semantic, lexical and pragmatic properties involved in the data and relate these to descriptions of similar data and properties in previous research. This is an essential part of the thesis, since it provides much of the empirical ground for the rest of the work. The three types of objectless sentences are then studied in one chapter each.

In chapter 3, I first introduce the syntactic model assumed in this work (Ramchand 2008, 2011) and then go on with a systematic study of the IOR restrictions, framed within Ramchand’s three-partite verb phrase. I confirm previous observations that IOR is restricted to a certain set of verbs, often called pseudo-transitive or noncore transitive verbs (e.g. Levin 1993). I show which subsets of Swedish verbs these include and show that what they all have in common is that they take the kind of object often referred to as an incremental theme (Dowty 1991). I also suggest that the verbs accepting IOR share the same verb phrase structure as unergatives (i.e. agentive intransitive verbs) and those intransitive verbs that are known to display a variable
unergative-unaccusative behavior, as well as with ‘true’ transitive process verbs. I argue that IOR verbs (pseudo-transitive verbs) are in fact intransitive, and accordingly that the syntactic status of the optional object arguments of IOR verbs is distinct from the syntactic status of the objects of ‘true’ transitive verbs. In the verb phrase assumed here, the former are RHEMES in a complement position whereas the latter are UNDERGOERS in a specifier position. As for the verb phrase analysis of different sets of verbs, most attention is given to dynamic verbs. The restrictions among stative verbs are also studied, but this work makes no claims as to the structure of stative verbs nor states.

In chapter 4, I show that the restrictions on IOO unlike the ones on IOR are not primarily related to the verb phrase, although a consequence of my IOR analysis is that IOO is limited to involving other sets of verbs than IOR. I show that the object reference of IOO objects is specific and picked up from the referent most salient in the discourse. I argue that IOO is a pragmatic phenomenon, and that the omitted UNDERGOER object is a free variable which is pragmatically bound.

In chapter 5, I treat objectless examples that cannot be explained by the IOR analysis in chapter 3, or by the IOO analysis in chapter 4. I show that IOK appears to be restricted to generic sentences, but that also IOR and IOO can occur in generic sentences. I propose that IOK involves a bare NP which gets an unambiguous existential interpretation when omitted. Just like IOO, IOK thus involves a free variable, but in IOK the variable is bound by an existential operator above the VP.

The IOR, IOO, and IOK chapters (chapters 3–5) all have an empirical as well as a theoretical approach, although the amount of data varies considerably in the three chapters. In chapter 3, there are a lot of examples from corpora, and more specific contexts and settings are used as diagnostics to map the restrictions. I then propose a verb phrase analysis for IOR, which has consequences for the treatment of IOO and IOK as well. In chapters 4 and 5, I focus on how the interpretation of the omitted object is resolved for IOO and IOK, and the semantic-syntactic analysis is primarily based on that characterization. I present data, but to a much lesser extent than in chapter 3. Consequently, the IOO and IOK chapters are both much shorter than the IOR chapter, but the IOR analysis to some extent also paves the way for my analyses of IOO and IOK.

In chapter 6, the thesis closes with a short recap of my main findings and major claims and with a concluding discussion about the status of verbs, objects, transitivity, argument structure, and about verb meaning in general. Finally, I give a Swedish summary of the thesis.

2 Variable-behavior verbs like springa ‘run’ or resa ‘travel’ are known to be sensitive to telicity when diagnosed in unaccusativity tests. With a telic reading they often behave like unaccusatives, and with an atelic reading like unergatives (see e.g. Larsson 2009:38).
2 Three types of objectless sentences

There is certainly always the risk of circularity when it comes to classifications and definitions, but that risk is no doubt larger when trying to define phenomena that do not leave any traces in the word string. This means that the classification into different types of objectless sentences is necessarily dependent on the interpretations of the referential properties involved (or not involved) as well as on the interpretations of data that on the surface are ambiguous between the different types. Although previous accounts agree that there is more than one type of objectless sentence, there is less agreement on the distinctions, the interpretation of data, the syntactic analyses of each type, and on the status of the object arguments potentially involved.

Most previous accounts also agree on which licensing factors are involved in objectless sentences, but the ways in which those factors are valued and analyzed vary. This is at least to some extent due to a lack of larger empirical studies. Therefore, I have chosen to take an empirical approach to the classification into types of objectless sentences. In section 2.1, I will present some of my corpus data and discuss the data in relation to the contexts where the examples appear, as well as to the referential properties of the implicit object. I will first present rough numbers for the objectless examples observed with 50 different verbs, and then relate this frequency variation to four different conditions: event structure, object reference, genericity, and flexibility in argument structure. In section 2.2, I will relate my findings to previous accounts and then show that some of the conditions that are emphasized in previous research are also found essential among my data, whereas others can instead be collapsed into the same underlying condition. In section 2.3, I will discuss the object interpretations, i.e. the interpretation of the referential properties of the implicit objects, or lack thereof. I will also discuss some types of objectless examples recognized in previous research but disregarded here, as well as my treatment of data that could be considered ambiguous.

My classification will be elaborated with additional data in chapters 3–5, where I assume a syntactic-semantic analysis for each type. In those chapters, the analysis of IOR will be more thorough and formal than the discussions of IOO and IOK, which will both be kept somewhat less definite regarding the technical details.
2.1 Variation in distribution

Since the purpose of this chapter is to study the variation among verbs and their arguments, the emphasis is not on the frequencies per se but on the fact that there is variation in distribution and on finding any systematic pattern behind that variation. I do present figures based on uses without an overt object argument in relation to the total number of the first 100 sentences with a particular verb, but the study should not be mistaken for a quantitative study. A large quantitative study could potentially show how particular verbs behave in various contexts, but my emphasis is neither on the behavior of particular verbs nor on particular contexts. Instead, the reasons for using corpus data here are to gather a sample that can give hints about the variation in distribution among different verbs and to distinguish the licensing conditions as well as the different types of objectless sentences involved. The classification made from this sample is the basis for the syntactic analyses in chapters 3–5, which will in turn strengthen the classification from a more theoretical perspective.

2.1.1 Data

In order to establish empirically the distribution of implicit objects and the licensing conditions involved in the different types of objectless sentences, the data in this particular chapter is mainly gathered from the Swedish blog material Bloggmix. The Bloggmix corpus is a substantial corpus of blog data, containing approximately 500 million tokens gathered from 1998 until 2014. Mainly, I have narrowed down the material to the subcorpus Bloggmix 2014. There is no apparent reason to assume that the conditions involved in objectless examples have changed over the last 15 years, but using more recent data makes it easier to retrieve the original blog posts for more context when needed, since many of the older blogs have been deleted from the web. If I instead would use the entire Bloggmix corpus, most data would have been from the 1990s. For less frequent verbs, however, I have extended the material one or a few years back in time in order to get a total of at least 100 hits.

The presentation here is based on the usage of 50 transitive and pseudo-transitive frequent as well as non-frequent verbs from different semantic...
fields, where I have studied the first 100 hits of each verb – with or without an object – in all verb forms except for participles. Clearly, 100 hits do not make a large body of data, but in order to study the overall patterns of distribution needed to make a classification of types, it is enough. I have also studied additional data to supplement my initial findings, for instance when there are no cases of implicit objects among the first hundred hits. Such cases are discussed in the text. I include 50 verbs in this part of the study, which means that the data consists of a total number of around five thousand sentences. In order to get a more detailed insight into the behavior of particular verbs, I sometimes go beyond the initial 100 search results. Also, for some verbs there are verb forms that have homonyms that sometimes show up among the first hundred hits. In those cases, I have supplemented the first 100 examples with as many as it takes to get a total of 100 hits of just that particular verb.

I have chosen to work with blog data for several reasons. First, some of the objectless uses of a given verb are expected to be highly contextual in character, and language use where the pragmatic context is shared between speaker and hearer can be expected to promote such objectless uses. Secondly, although implicit objects are fully grammatical, textual norms and the editing involved in more official language use might possibly restrict the use of objectless sentences, which is already a rather non-frequent phenomenon. In other words, official texts such as newspaper articles are addressed towards a broad group of readers and consequently aim at being clear and unambiguous. Blogs, on the other hand, are often restricted to more specific topics and typically address a narrow group of readers, where some sort of common ground between speaker and hearer can be expected to exist, even if that common ground is not fully established or opaque. An obvious alternative would be to study the language use found on social networks such as Twitter or on discussion forums, materials that are also available in Korp and subsequently potential source materials for my study. However, while Twitter certainly makes the speakers phrase themselves briefly because of the limitation of 140 characters per tweet, the lack of context presented in the Korp interface makes that material slightly more difficult to work with. One tweet often refers back to a previous tweet, and since these previous tweets are not directly available in the interface, the reference of an omitted object can be difficult to disambiguate. Subsequently, the data could be unnecessarily difficult to interpret. When it comes to the Korp material from

---

5 It is sometimes unclear what constructions should be counted as the same verb. For instance, verb particles are known to affect the verb semantics. In section 3.6, we will see that for some verbs the particles affect the verb semantics as well as the restrictions on objectlessness more than for others. As far as the numbers presented in chapter 2 are concerned, particles are included as long as the verb can still take a DP direct object. This means that I for now consider verbs with or without particles as two versions of the same verb. The examples are, however, restricted to verbs without verb particles.
discussion forums, they are all sorted into sub corpora with particular topics, such as pets, parenting or politics. In this case, the topics of the search results are often too narrow for a general study of implicit objects in Swedish such as the one I want to perform. Since I am interested in contextual restrictions on implicit objects and contextual influence on word meanings, too narrow a context could be misleading.

2.1.2 Frequency

From the figures presented in table 1, it is clear that some verbs are used more frequently without an object than others.

Table 1. Objectless uses of verbs among the 100 first examples of each verb in the Bloggmix corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of objectless uses of verbs</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>varna ‘warn’, vandalisera ‘vandalize’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to interpret table 1 correctly, it is crucial to remember that the figures only indicate the variation among verbs. They are no full descriptions of the restrictions on implicit objects for any particular verb. Instead, the variation in frequency gives incentive to study what underlying factors are involved in objectless uses of potentially transitive verbs and how these factors might possibly interact with each other. The numbers presented in table 1 then function as a starting point for such a qualitative analysis.
For some verbs (e.g. betrakta ‘contemplate, observe’, dra ‘pull’, and älska ‘love’) there are zero (0) examples of implicit objects among the first hundred examples of each verb. For other verbs (e.g. använda ‘use’, bränna ‘burn’, and sakna ‘miss’) there are just a few (1–5) objectless uses among the first hundred for each verb, whereas some verbs (e.g. bygga ‘build’, bära ‘carry’, and skapa ‘create’) occur without any object 6–10 times in the first hundred sentences for each verb. For other verbs (e.g. förstå ‘understand’, mördas ‘murder’), an objectless use seems quite common, i.e. more than 10 out of the first hundred examples have no object, and some verbs (e.g. damma ‘dust’, varna ‘warn’, vandalisera ‘vandalize’ and äta ‘eat’) even reach above 20 or 30. Considering that the verbs are supposed to be transitive, or at least pseudo-transitive, any number of objectless uses above just a few uses could hardly be a coincidence. As we will see further below, the variation is neither completely random nor completely systematic. Instead, there appear to be systematic patterns related to event structure and to the wider context, as well as more random lexical idiosyncrasies and variation due to textual imbalance in the corpus, which all in all can explain much of the frequency variation.

2.1.3 Variation related to event structure

In some cases, the variation in frequency correlates with event structure properties among sets of verbs. Some verbs that have more than 5 hits are verbs that are pseudo-transitive and generally considered different in terms of event structure compared to, for instance, inherently resultative verbs (cf. Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998). Some of the pseudo-transitive verbs can be classified as creation verbs or consumption verbs (in either a concrete or an abstract sense), such as bygga ‘build’, läsa ‘read’, skapa ‘create’, skriva ‘write’ and äta ‘eat’, see the examples in (6)–(7).

(6) Jag bara **skriver** rätt upp och ned och ändrar sällan
    I just write straight up and down and change seldom
    i texten efteråt. (Bloggmix 2014)
    in text.the afterwards
    ‘I simply just write and seldom make changes in the text afterwards.’

(7) Han ville **äta** hela kvällen. (Bloggmix 2014)
    he wanted eat whole night.the
    ‘He wanted to eat all night long.’

With these verbs, there appear to be no particular contextual restrictions on objectless uses. Clearly, this makes them less obvious as transitive verbs, consistent with common descriptions of them as pseudo-transitives, ambi-transitives or noncore transitives (see e.g. Levin 1993, Næss 2007,
Since they can take objects, they are included in my study. We will see that they all describe atelic events when used without objects, which will be essential to the phenomenon here labeled IOR.

2.1.4 Variation related to object reference and to context

There is considerable variation in the data that is clearly not related to event structure or verb semantics more generally. For instance, there is a striking difference between the low figures for, on the one hand, sätta ‘place/put in a sitting position’ and lägga ‘place/put in a laying position’ (2–3%) and the near-synonym verb ställa ‘place/put in a standing position’ on the other (16%). These three verbs share among them at least some of their basic verb semantic properties, and all of them share the transitivity pattern sätta/ställa/lägga + DP/NP + PP/AP ‘place/put + DP/NP + PP/AP’ i.e. ‘place/put something somewhere’. When taking a closer look at the search results for ställa ‘place/put in a standing position’ we can see that a majority of them are found in recipes and that there is a salient object referent given in the context, see (8)–(10).

(8) Rulla varje del till en bulle och ställ på plåten. (Bloggmix 2014)
   roll each part to a bun and place on baking sheet.
   ‘Roll each part into a bun and place [them] on the baking sheet.’

(9) Ställ i frysen i minst 4 timmar. (Bloggmix 2014)
   place in freezer for least 4 hours
   ‘Place [it] in the freezer for at least 4 hours.’

(10) Ställ kallt fram till servering. (Bloggmix 2014)
    place cold up to serving
    ‘Place [it] cold until served.’

Recipes and other instructional texts are known for promoting implicit objects, see e.g. Ruppenhofer & Michaelis (2010). If we remove imperatives from the search for ställa ‘place/put in a standing position’ and instead limit the search to the present tense and the simple past, the numbers decrease to 3%, which compares well with the other put verbs. Obviously, this does not mean that the examples in the imperative do not count as objectless sentences; it only means that recipes and other instructional text types (which are often but not always written in the imperative) are contextual settings that promote the use of objectless sentences. This is a fact that affects the frequency results for the verb ställa ‘place/put in a standing position’ in a way that it does not for the other put verbs. However, the other put verbs also occur in cooking contexts as we can see in (11)–(12).
(11) Först gör man pizzan och sen så rullar man ihop och skär i delar innan man sätter på plåten. (Bloggmix 2014)

First make you pizza and then you roll [it] up and cut [it] into pieces before placing [them] on the baking sheet.

(12) Hacka chokladen fint och lägg i en bunke. (Bloggmix 2014)

Chop the chocolate fine and put [it] in a bowl.

Thus, the frequency variation among the various put verbs clearly does not arise because of the inherent verb semantics, such as event structure properties (since the different put verbs clearly share these). Instead, all three put verbs do allow the object to be left implicit if the referent is salient enough in the context. For some reason, ställa ‘place/put in a standing position’ is the dominant put verb in this context. This might indicate that the ‘place’ component of the put verbs is more prominent for ställa than for sätta and lägga. What is most important here, however, is the fact that recipes provide a context where object referents are particularly salient, and so verbs appearing in recipes naturally have higher numbers of implicit objects.

However, you do not need a recipe in order to provide a salient referent. There are many examples of implicit objects where context provides the reference also outside this genre, see e.g. (13)–(15).

(13) Så nu är jag ute och rullar sovande treåring, bara att bära över till sängen när vi kommer in. (Bloggmix 2014)

‘So, now I am outdoors walking a sleeping three-year-old, I could just carry [him/her] to the bed when we are inside.’

(14) Maken kom och mötte och vi körde hem Johanna, Magdalena och sist Knoll. (Bloggmix 2014)

‘My husband came and met [me/us] and we drove Johanna, Magdalena and lastly Knoll home.’

(15) Jag bankade på dörren så att den nästan gav med sig. (Bloggmix 2014)

‘I pounded on the door until it almost gave in. A sleepy friend opens [it].’
What all the examples in this subsection have in common is that the object reference is specific and given in the context. The fact that some genres or contexts might be more suited than others for providing salient referents does not seem to affect the actual possibilities of leaving the object implicit, only the frequencies. In other words, the variation related to context is two-fold. Firstly, the context has to provide a salient referent for the implicit object with most sets of verbs. Secondly, some genres and contexts provide such referents more naturally than others. For instance, in any recipe there is a list of ingredients, as well as a conventionalized set of particular events and event participants involved in the cooking or baking. These wider contextual circumstances can promote the use of implicit objects, insofar as they supply speaker and hearer with salient referents. Thus, I conclude that much of the contextual variation concerns the type of objectless sentences that I refer to as IOO.

2.1.5 Variation related to genericity

Some verbs with high numbers of implicit objects in the search results (e.g. mörd ‘murder’, plundra ‘plunder’, råna ‘rob’, skövla ‘desolate’, utpressa ‘blackmail’, vandalisera ‘vandalise’, with numbers around 10–40%) neither have the event properties of IOR verbs nor the context requirements typical for IOO. Instead, they appear to exclusively occur in habitual sentences, i.e. they all could be included in a broad definition of genericity:

(16) De framställs som giriga blodiga barbarer som inte gjorde
    they portray.PASS as greedy bloody savages that not did
    annat än att skövla och mörd. (Bloggmix 2010)
    else than to desolate and murder
    ‘They are portrayed as greedy bloody savages that did nothing but desolate and murder.’

(17) Dom river sönder, dom ödelägger, dom förstör. (Bloggmix 2011)
    they tear apart, they desolate, they destroy
    ‘They tear apart, they desolate, they destroy.’

In some previous research, similar and seemingly related examples are considered cases of a special kind of IOR, restricted to generic and habitual sentences (see e.g. Goldberg 2001, Lambrecht & Lemoine 2005). The genericity is often treated as a condition that promotes objectless uses of verbs that do not accept IOR. Since there are examples of verbs in the data that appear to leave their object implicit only in generic sentences, I consider genericity in some sense to affect the frequency for those verbs. It is striking that most verbs in this section could be characterized as verbs of destruction. I will discuss this set of verbs with respect to IOR in section 3.5.3 and then
argue that examples like (16)–(17) are cases of IOK, which will be treated in chapter 5. However, also the verbs trösta ‘comfort’ and varna ‘warn’ have significantly high numbers of objectless uses (28% and 66% respectively). They are common in episodic sentences describing particular events, but a few of the examples seem to involve genericity in some respect. For similar examples, the object reference has been argued to involve a generic component (Rizzi 1986).

(18) [...] träkigt nog har det dykt upp stora skyltar som värna för rasrisken. (Bloggmix 2014)

‘Sadly enough, big signs warning against the risk of collapse have appeared.’

(19) Märkligt hur sådan här mat och godis tröstar. (Bloggmix 2014)

‘(It is) strange how this kind of food and candy comforts [me/them/whoever eats it]’

I will discuss the treatment of examples like (18)–(19) in previous research in section 2.3.3. In chapter 4, I will argue that they are cases of IOO rather than IOK.

2.1.6 Variation related to flexibility in argument structure

For eleven out of the fifty verbs in table 1 (e.g. hålla ‘hold’, and slå ‘hit’) the data show zero objectless sentences among the first hundred uses of each verb. This does not necessarily mean that it is impossible for these verbs to be used without an object. In fact, you can often find them without objects when going through more data (i.e. data not found among the first hundred hits), as can be seen in (20)–(21).

(20) Jag höll i honom i mina armar och Pia slog på masken, I held in him in my arms and Pia switched on mask.the och läkaren tryckte fast den, och höll. (Bloggmix 2014)

‘I held him in my arms and Pia switched on the mask, and the doctor pushed it into place, and held [it].’
De skingrade människorna: **slog**, arresterade och **slog igen**. (Bloggmix 2014)

“They broke up the crowd: hit [them], arrested [them] and hit [them] again.”

This reiterates the well-known fact that a quantitative corpus study is not an appropriate method for studying restrictions on linguistic phenomena. Zero hits for a particular verb do not necessarily mean that implicit objects are impossible with that verb. Even if the corpus were larger, the figures would be uncertain at best and misleading at worst. In fact, it seems like many (but not all) verbs allow implicit objects under the right circumstances. What those circumstances are will be discussed in chapters 3–5.

For now, I will just observe that the verbs in (20)–(21) are more or less ambiguous and quite flexible when it comes to their argument structure. Apart from taking DP objects, they take PP complements as well. Their various alternative uses are likely to affect the figures when counting instances without an object in relation to the total amount of verb uses. Sentences with implicit objects are naturally not the most frequent ones, especially so when several argument possibilities are available. As far as I can tell, this variation potentially affects the frequencies regardless of type of objectless sentence, and therefore it is difficult to study the alternations involved systematically. While noting that objectless uses are marginally possible for these verbs, I will not study them, nor the alternations involved, in any detail.

### 2.2 Licensing conditions

In the previous section, I studied Swedish corpus data and identified several conditions involved in the distribution of objectless sentences: event structure, the salience of the object reference and the wider context (text-type and genre), genericity, and flexibility in argument structure. Most of these licensing conditions have been discussed in previous studies, some of which I will discuss in this section.

#### 2.2.1 Verb types and event structure

Much previous research relevant for the understanding of IOR is part of larger studies on verb types. Crosslinguistically, consumption verbs and creation verbs have been pointed out as commonly occurring in IOR.⁶ For instance, Levin (1993) observes that IOR – in her terminology the intransi-

---

⁶ See Ness (2007:126f.) for an extensive list of languages from distinct language families that allow IOR (IOD in her terminology) with these types of verbs.
tive variant of the Unspecified Object Alternation – occurs with many
English activity verbs, many of which are creation/consumption verbs. More
recent work (e.g. Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998) generally attributes the
pseudo-transitivity among sets of verbs to their inherent event structure
properties.

In Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998) generalizations among sets of verbs
are represented by event structure templates that largely correspond to the
event types from Vendler (1957). This correspondence is demonstrated in
(22), where the event type labels from the Vendlerian tradition (activities,
states, achievements and accomplishments) are decomposed into event tem-
plates with subevents.

(22) **Event types and event templates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Event Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>[x ACT,&lt;MANNER&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>[x &lt;STATE&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>[BECOME [x &lt;STATE&gt;]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishment</td>
<td>[[x ACT,&lt;MANNER&gt;] CAUSE [BECOME [y &lt;STATE&gt;]]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishment</td>
<td>[x CAUSE [BECOME [y &lt;STATE&gt;]]]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998:108)

An obvious difference between Vendler’s aktionsart classification and
Rappaport Hovav & Levin’s event templates is that the latter incorporate
complex accomplishments into the system. Event augmentation – the build-
ning of more complex events from simpler ones – is one of the main
advantages in Rappaport Hovav & Levin’s approach. Another advantage is
that they clearly distinguish between two kinds of arguments, out of which
only one has to be projected into syntax. This allows for the optional reali-
zation of some arguments, such as the optional objects of IOR verbs that are
assumed to describe non-complex events. Thus, in Rappaport Hovav &
Levin’s (1998) view, and in the view of Levin (1999), IOR can be predicted
of pseudo-transitive activity verbs with a simple event structure.

Verb types are less discussed in relation to IOO and IOK, but for instance
Ruppenhofer (2004) argues that what I refer to as IOO is a lexical phenome-
non. Most of the more verb-related observations on IOO are, however, idio-
syncratic rather than systematic, and so I will return to them in section 2.2.4.
Goldberg (2001) and Ruppenhofer (2004) argue against Rappaport Hovav &
Levin’s (1998) generalization, which predicts that inherently resultative
verbs do not accept IOR. Goldberg (2001) presents examples of verbs that in
her terminology and analysis are causative verbs occurring in object omiss-
on under certain circumstances, as for the English verb *kill* which accepts
the omissions in (24)–(25), but not the one in (23).

(23) *The tiger killed.

(24) Scarface killed again.
The data Goldberg (2001) and many others present as evidence is not convincingly cases of IOR, however, considering the variation in acceptability illustrated in (23)–(25). Goldberg (2001) does not neglect that context matters; on the contrary that is one of her main points, but as for many others with a unified approach to implicit objects, the licensing conditions, the interpretations, and the underlying processes are not strictly kept apart. In my opinion, data like (23)–(25) highlight the importance of a clear and consistent classification into types of objectless sentences. Goldberg is right in that the systematic event structure restrictions observed by Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998) and others cannot explain the variation in acceptability in (23)–(25), but there are several possible explanations for this. One possibility, along the lines of Goldberg (2001), is that some contexts can override the event structural restrictions involved in IOR, but there is also the possibility that (24)–(25) are examples of a separate phenomenon. I will argue for the latter of these two alternatives in chapter 5.

2.2.2 The wider context

I can distinguish several different discussions related to context in previous studies on the phenomena treated here. The licensing conditions involved in IOO often refer to contextual concepts, i.e. the reference of the implicit object has to be retrievable from the context. But context alone does not seem to be enough when explaining IOO. It is an often emphasized fact that languages like Swedish and English do not freely allow the object to be absent, even when salient. For instance, Engdahl (1983:11f.) has shown that objects cannot always be omitted even if the reference is highly salient, neither in English (26) nor in Swedish (27).

(26) Q: What happened to John?
A: Someone hit *(him).

(27) Q: Vad hände med John?
    *what happened with John
   ‘What happened to John?’
A: Någon slog *(honom).
    *someone hit him
   ‘Someone hit him.’ (examples from Engdahl 1983:12)

Engdahl (1983) points out that English and Swedish are different in this respect from languages like e.g. Japanese, Portuguese, and Turkish, where the salience of the referent is enough for the acceptability of any pronoun omission, including the ones corresponding to (26)–(27).
Also, Fillmore (1986) notes that IOO in English is sometimes unacceptable no matter how clear the context might be, see (28).

(28) *Did you lock? (Fillmore 1986:98)

According to Fillmore (1986:98), the example in (28) cannot be felicitously used even if there is a particular door that is highly salient in the pragmatic context, and although this door would be the obvious object referent for both speaker and hearer. In this particular example, Swedish seems to be different from English. Unlike (28), the corresponding Swedish example in (29) is fully acceptable, which suggests that there is also cross-linguistic variation between English and Swedish, and that Swedish has weaker restrictions on IOO than English.

(29) Låste du?
locked you
‘Did you lock [the door]?’

Why (28) is not acceptable in English needs some other explanation than the unacceptability of (26)–(27), however. It is unclear if the potential cross-linguistic variation is due to verb types or to syntactic or pragmatic conditions, or if the acceptability difference between (28) and (29) is completely random. While noted, cross-linguistic variation is beyond the scope of this thesis, and the difference in acceptability between the English example in (28) and its Swedish counterpart in (29) must be left for future research. Since there is cross-linguistic variation in various related phenomena like topic drop, *pro* drop and for instance VP ellipsis, there is reason to assume that there is also cross-linguistic variation for IOO. At least since Rizzi (1986), it has been well-known that the restrictions on argument omission in Italian and other *pro* drop languages are weaker than in, for instance, English.

Indeed, much syntactic work on object omission in Scandinavian and Germanic languages has focused on the position of the implicit object, see e.g. Áfarli & Creider (1987) and Vikner (2003) on coordination structures. Sigurðsson & Maling (2008, 2010) and Sigurðsson (2011) argue for an Empty Left Edge Condition (ELEC) on null arguments for many languages:

(30) The left edge of a clause containing a silent referential argument must be phonetically empty (in language or construction X) (Sigurðsson & Maling 2008:4, 2010:62).

Sigurðsson & Maling (2008) argue that dropped objects just like dropped subjects in V2 Germanic usually must follow the ELEC, i.e. they usually require access to an empty specifier position in CP. This would mean that object drop would mostly occur in sentence-initial position. While such omissions definitely occur, they are not restricted to objects. Instead, more or
less any element in the first position of the clause can be deleted (Mörnsjö 2002, Sigurðsson & Maling 2008, Sigurðsson 2011) and it is a well-known fact that Swedish allows topic drop rather freely regardless of the topic being the subject (31), a referential object (32) or something else, as for instance the propositional object in (33) (examples from Mörnsjö 2002).

(31) Men jag måste försöka få fatt på nån som kan låna mig sovsäck. but I must try get grip on someone who can lend me sleeping.bag. ‘But I must try to get a hold of someone who can lend me a sleeping bag. I don’t know where I’m going to get a hold of that.’ (Mörnsjö 2002:57)

(32) Q: Var är tidningen? where is newspaper.the ‘Where is the newspaper?’

A: Tyckte jag att jag såg nyss på bordet. thought I that I saw recently on table.the ‘I think I saw it on the table just recently.’ (Mörnsjö 2002:61)

(33) Tycker jag är… okänsligt på nåt sätt. think I is insensitive on some manner ‘I think that’s… insensitive in a way.’ (Mörnsjö 2002:57)

The omissions in (31)–(33) are generally analyzed as cases of topic drop, which involve restrictions not applicable to the kinds of objectless sentences treated in this thesis.7 Thus, while topic drop can independently explain the implicit object in (32) it clearly cannot provide an explanation for all implicit objects. It should be clear from my data that implicit objects in Swedish are not restricted to the sentence-initial position, and thus that they do not have to be subject to ELEC. For instance, (13)–(14) on page 26 cannot be analyzed as topic drop, since an inserted pronoun will occur post-verbally. Apart from the special case of topic drop (and possibly coordination structures), I have not seen any restrictions on either IOO, IOR or IOK that are obviously related to the position of the omitted object. Such discussions are therefore left outside this work.

In discussions of context as a licensing condition, it is often the wider context that is considered. The observation that recipes and other instructional texts are particularly apt for IOO has been made by for instance

---

7 I refer the reader to Mörnsjö (2002) for a discussion of topic drop in Swedish, and to Holmberg (2003) for a VP-focus analysis of her data.
Ruppenhofer (2004) and Ruppenhofer & Michaelis (2010). Specific text types and genres arguably make good environments for IOO. It is, however, not clear how they are to be valued, i.e. if they are actually licensing the absence of an object, and if so what that means, as discussed already in section 2.1.4. If instead focusing on the referential properties of the implicit object involved in IOO, it is clearly a requirement that the reference has to be interpretable for the omission to be acceptable. The fact that IOO seems to be more common in some genres thus appears to be subsidiary to the fact that IOO requires a salient referent. The question of how the reference can be resolved in IOO will be further elaborated in section 4.2.

In some respect, context is also essential for IOR and IOK. No language use exists in a vacuum, and as we will see in chapter 3, pseudo-transitive verbs are primarily used without objects (i.e. in IOR) when there is a context that supports an activity reading of the predicate. In contexts that instead focus on the result of the verb action, an overt object argument is generally needed. Rice (1988) phrases this observation regarding IOR as follows:

[…] it is important to note that object omission is neither a process nor does it represent two separate versions of a verb, a transitive and an intransitive one. Rather, certain construals of transitive events are such that they focus on the active participant and leave the acted-upon participant unspecified and, most importantly, to be filled in with a default value. (Rice 1988:203)

Put differently, according to Rice (1988) it is the construals of the events described by pseudo-transitive verbs that determine whether or not IOR is appropriate. What is not explicitly expressed in this quote is that these particular uses are clearly contextual in character. If applying Mittwoch’s (1982) distinction of pseudo-transitive verbs expressing either activities or accomplishments to Rice’s (1988) observation, we can rephrase it as follows: if the context or setting where the utterance is made supports a construal of the event as an activity, then the object can be left implicit. If the event is construed as an accomplishment, the object is syntactically realized. In other words, while IOR is related to event structure restrictions, the actual event interpretations of pseudo-transitive verbs that result in the optional object being realized or not, is influenced by the wider context. The contextual factors potentially involved in IOK are presented in the next subsection.

2.2.3 Genericity

Genericity and/or habituality is sometimes acknowledged as involved in some objectless examples (e.g. Rizzi 1986, Goldberg 2001, Mittwoch 2005). It is however not always clear on what level or in which way an attested generic objectless example is generic. Instead, the role of genericity with
respect to objectless sentences appears to be quite unclear and potentially complex. This is at least to some extent related to the varying definitions of genericity in the literature, where the label genericity is used for kind-referring noun phrases as well as for characterizing sentences.

The semantic-syntactic effects of genericity have provided some challenges for linguistic theory in more than one respect. One such challenge is how to account for the fact that bare NPs with kind reference can occur in argument positions, as well as how to define the exact semantic-syntactic properties of bare NPs. Another challenge involves the characterization of the generic operator $Gen$, which has been assumed to be involved in the logical representation of generic sentences and in the binding of events or situations (see e.g. Diesing 1992, Kratzer 1995, Krifka et al. 1995, Krifka 2004, Carlson 2011). Furthermore, there is no real consensus with respect to habituals, i.e. if they are to be included in the definition of generic sentences or if the relationship should go the other way around, with generic sentences as a subtype of habituals (Carlson 2005, 2012). While the larger generic puzzles must necessarily be kept outside this thesis, the implications for objectlessness will be considered.

Characterizing sentences in general and characterizing habitual sentences in particular have been distinguished as common contexts for IOR (Goldberg 2001, Lambrecht & Lemoine 2005). Goldberg (2001:506f.) regards the discourse conditions involved in generic (34) and habitual (35) sentences as licensing the objectless uses of verbs that do not (otherwise) accept IOR.

(34) Tigers only kill at night.

(35) The sewing instructor always cut in straight lines.

Goldberg (2001) characterizes the implicit objects in (34)–(35) as indefinite and nonspecific, i.e. similar to the definition of implicit IOR objects. For her, the possibility of leaving the object implicit in the above examples has to do with the action being more focused or prominent in the utterance than the result or theme of the action (i.e. the potential object argument), properties promoted by the genericity/habituality involved. In the above examples this would mean that it is the killing event and the cutting event that are prominent in their respective discourse, and subsequently that this action-focus is what makes the objectless use possible.

Whereas these observations seem valid for many examples, I am not convinced that discourse prominence or action focus are the key factors. Or rather, keeping the referential properties of the different types of implicit objects in mind, there are several observations to be made here. Goldberg generalizes her observation regarding action focus to all cases of IOR (and some cases of IOO). Thus, if her generalization holds, the same mechanisms would explain (36).
For Goldberg the difference between IOR, IOO and IOK appears to be epiphenomenal, but as we will see throughout this thesis, different restrictions apply to different types of objectless sentences. Like Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998), I argue that IOR is restricted to certain sets of verbs, where a verb like döda ‘kill’ is not included:

(37) *Sally dödade i morse.
    Sally killed in morning

Upon hearing (37), the hearer would wonder who or what it was that was killed. Thus, neither action focus nor genericity can serve as the sole explanation behind the acceptance of implicit objects for all of the cases in (34)–(36).

However, as Goldberg (2001:507) also notes, the example in (38) is fine.

(38) Scarface killed again.

In (38), neither the subject nor the sentence is generic, but the action is repeated, or rather, it is implied that a similar killing event has taken place before.

The question remains if examples like (34)–(35) are examples of a sub-case of IOR restricted to generic/habitual sentences or if these objectless uses are evidence for a type of objectlessness in its own right. I will return to a more elaborate discussion of genericity and the referential properties involved in the type of objectless sentence that I refer to as IOK in chapter 5.

2.2.4 Lexical idiosyncrasies

Another observation that Fillmore (1986), Ruppenhofer (2004), and many others make is that there are lexical idiosyncrasies involved in the acceptance of implicit objects. Fillmore (1986:98) considers the potential answers in (39)–(41) to the question Why did you marry her?. One of the given answers, he notes, is acceptable whereas the others are not, i.e. only one of the verbs in (39)–(41) accepts IOO whereas the others do not.

(39) Because mother insisted.
(40) *Because mother required.
(41) *Because mother demanded. (Fillmore 1986:98)

Fillmore (1986:99ff.) lists many similar clusters of near-synonym verbs, where some but not all verbs accept IOO. Just like the verbs in (39)–(41),
many of them take CP-complements or PP-complements rather than DP-objects, but the general observation is still worth noticing. From his data, it seems that verbs with a wide range of object options allow one type of object to be left implicit but not the other(s). This is also what Fillmore (1986:99f.) suggests, i.e. that for ambiguous verbs, or verbs with flexible argument structure, the acceptance of IOO is restricted to particular types of objects.

Ruppenhofer & Michaelis (2014) claim that Fillmore’s (1986) data undermines large-scale, single-factor analyses of objectlessness, such as Rappaport Hovav & Levin’s (1998) event structural approach. Whereas such an objection seems valid in the light of much of Fillmore’s data, it is actually not, since his data is concerned with IOO and Rappaport Hovav & Levin’s generalization applies to IOR only. Ruppenhofer & Michaelis (2014) suggest that there is no prediction that can be correctly made regarding the idiosyncratic acceptance of implicit arguments among near-synonym verbs.

In this thesis, I will argue that many of the idiosyncrasies observed can be derived from the event structure of sets of verbs, whereas others fall out from encyclopedic associations and world knowledge. The latter argument to some extent overlaps with observations made by Ruppenhofer (2004), Martola (2008) and Ruppenhofer & Michaelis (2010), who all turn to frame semantics to explain the possible interpretations that arise for implicit objects. I consider many of the observations from frame-semantics reasonable, but outside the scope of more systematic syntactic-semantic generalizations. However, I will return to a more informal discussion of the encyclopedic sides of lexical knowledge in section 3.8 as well as in chapter 6.

It has also been suggested that IOO with ambiguous verbs are distributed differently over different meanings. The standard example of such a verb is *win* (Fillmore 1986, Williams 2012). Consider the examples with the Swedish equivalent *vinna* ‘win’ (cf. Martola 2008:290).

(42) Hon vann (tävlingen).
    *she won* (race.the)
    ‘She won (the race).’

(43) Hon vann *(en miljon euro)*.
    *she won* a million euro
    ‘She won a million euros.’

However, I am not convinced that it is the different meanings of *vinna* ‘win’ in (42)–(43) that provides the differences in acceptability. Instead, it is rather a lack of context that makes the objectless variant of (43) bad. Consider (44)–(45), where a PP is added to each example.

(44) Hon vann i Paris.
    *she won* in Paris
    ‘She won [the race/competition] in Paris.’
In (45), the PP enables the use without an overt object in the ‘win a price’ meaning of the verb also, not only the ‘win a race’ meaning (see section 4.2.2 for a discussion on scene-evoked reference).

It should also be mentioned that Goldberg (2001) speculates (but does not show) that lexical idiosyncrasies could be attributed to frequency patterns, i.e. that frequent verbs would more easily occur in IOR. Although I have not searched for correlations between IOR acceptance and frequency, my data in chapter 3 suggest that non-frequent verbs also accept IOR, as demonstrated by the IOR verbs mangla ‘mangle’ and virka ‘crochet’, none of which are particularly frequent.

2.2.5 Relevance and interpretability

Cote (1996) points out relevance and interpretability as key factors for the acceptability of implicit objects. While I agree that relevance is an essential factor, I do not consider it as restricted to the occurrence of implicit objects, and thus not a licensing condition in its own right. More precisely, relevance is of importance when it comes to particular utterances in a communicative situation. As follows from Grice’s (1975) second maxim of quantity and his maxim of relevance, you do not omit relevant information, and subsequently you only refrain from expressing participants in an event if they are either irrelevant (IOR, IOK) or salient enough in the discourse (IOO). Relevance, or rather salience, is also essential for the hearer when resolving the reference of an implicit object. Nevertheless, neither relevance nor salience is a sufficient condition for an object to be left implicit. In other words, it is not possible to leave an object unexpressed for the single reason that the object could be argued irrelevant, as we saw in the English example in (28) from Fillmore (1986:98), repeated here as (46).

(46) *Did you lock?

In other words, the concept of relevance is essential in order for an object to be left implicit, but it is not enough. Neither is it a condition that is limited to objectless sentences, but a general communicative principle (cf. Grice 1975). While closely related to the notion of relevance, interpretability is more apparently involved in the actual licensing and restrictions of IOO and IOK, which we will see in chapters 3–5.
2.3 The implicit object interpretations

Having discussed the licensing conditions acknowledged in previous accounts, I now turn to the interpretation of the implicit objects. The distinction between IOR and IOO is often made based on referential properties. The common characterizations of IOR as *indefinite* and of IOO as *definite* reflect this fact, although those names are often used vaguely with respect to either the (assumed) form or the reference of the implicit phrases. Thus, there is some variation as to the exact definitions of IOR and IOO and the object interpretations involved. Nonetheless, there is no doubt a rough consensus as to the object being irrelevant or unknown in IOR, whereas the object reference is retrievable from the context in IOO.

In this section, I will discuss the referential properties of the objects potentially involved in the three types of objectless sentences studied in this thesis. Then, I will describe a few other types of objectless examples recognized in the literature and discuss my reasons for not including them in this work. Finally, I will briefly discuss my treatment of data that could be interpreted as ambiguous between the three types and argue that they actually are not.

2.3.1 IOR as not involving any objects

IOR is also known under the labels unspecified NP deletion (Mittwoch 1971), indefinite null complements (Fillmore 1986), unexpressed objects (Levin 1993), indefinite null objects (Cote 1996), unspecified arguments (Mittwoch 2005), indefinite null instantiation (e.g. Lambrech & Lemoine 2005), indefinite object deletion (Næss 2007), missing objects (Erteschik-Shir 2007), and implicit complements (Gillon 2012). IOR is primarily distinguished from other types of objectless sentences on the basis of the object being unspecified or irrelevant, but also on the observation that IOR is restricted to certain verb types with particular event structure properties (e.g. Levin 1993, Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998). In other words, there are at least two separate ways to define IOR, one involving referential properties and one involving event structure.

Although I have primarily defined IOR from an event structure perspective, the distinction towards IOO becomes more apparent when considering the potential object interpretation. Unlike IOO, most examples of IOR in the literature involve what is often referred to as unspecified objects (e.g. Levin 1993), which means that there is no object referent given in the context:

(47) Elsa läste.
   *Elsa read.PAST*
   ‘Elsa was reading.’
It has been proposed that the interpretation of examples like (47) is instead similar to the interpretation of an example with an overt indefinite noun phrase (e.g. Fillmore 1986). The example with läsa ‘read’ in (47) would then be parallel to the example in (48).

(48) Elsa läste en bok.
Elsa read.PAST a book
‘Elsa was reading a book.’

Initially, the intuition that IOR involves something similar to indefinite objects seems likely. However, since (overt) indefinite noun phrases are well-known to be ambiguous between a specific and a non-specific reading, this can hardly be the case. It is clear from the implications of the examples in (49)–(50) that the interpretation is not identical to that of an overt indefinite object.

(49) Elsa läste en bok.
Elsa read.PAST a book
⇒ ‘Elsa read some book.’ (non-specific)
⇒ ‘Elsa read a specific book.’ (specific)

(50) Elsa läste.
Elsa read.PAST
⇒ ‘Elsa read something.’ (non-specific)
⇏ ‘Elsa read a specific book.’ (*specific)

As we can see in (50), IOR cannot be used as a means to introduce a specific referent into the discourse.

It has also been proposed that the unspecified object involved in IOR in some respect is a typical object of the particular verb (e.g. Rice 1988), but as Levin (1993) notes there is no consensus on how to characterize such an interpretation. Instead, as I will show in chapter 3, examples like (50) does not involve any object at all in the syntactic structure, and the object in (49) can be characterized as always being syntactically optional. If such a characterization holds, there is no such thing as an IOR object, and subsequently no referential properties of that object are involved.

2.3.2 IOO as involving salient specific objects

IOO is also known as null complement anaphora (Hankamer & Sag 1976), definite null instantiation (e.g. Ruppenhofer 2004, Lambrecht & Lemoine 2005), context-dependent object omission (Næss 2007), and as involving definite null complements (Fillmore 1986), or salient null objects (Cote 1996). There is a general agreement that the object reference involved in IOO is given in either the linguistic or the extra linguistic context.
A diagnostic commonly used to separate IOO from IOR is based on the intuition that in IOO it does not make sense for the hearer to request more information about the reference of the object. In other words, since the reference is assumed to be familiar or at least interpretable to the hearer, there is no need for clarification on that point. This fact is illustrated by the following quote from Fillmore (1986).

It’s not odd to say things like, ‘He was eating; I wonder what he was eating’; but it is odd to say things like ‘They found out; I wonder what they found out.’ […] The point is that one does not wonder about what one already knows. (Fillmore 1986:96)

A potential flaw with this diagnostic is that in a communicative situation it might very well be odd to wonder about the reference of a potential IOR object as well, since IOR is typically used when the object is irrelevant. Disregarding this communicative oddity, the observation holds and makes for a good diagnostic.

This means that similar semantic conditions appear to be involved in IOO as in sentences with (overt) definite object pronouns. Thus, no referential differences between an IOO example like (51), and a corresponding example with an expressed object like the one given in (52), is generally assumed.

(51) Det knackade på dörren. Elsa öppnade.  

    it knocked at door. the Elsa opened  

    ‘There was a knock on the door. Elsa opened [it].’

(52) Det knackade på dörren. Elsa öppnade den.  

    it knocked at door. the Elsa opened it.  

    ‘There was a knock on the door. Elsa opened it.’

In neither (51) nor (52) is there any confusion as to what it was that Elsa opened. It is obvious that it was a door, and not just any door, but the specific door most salient in the context. In this particular case there is an antecedent in the previous sentence, but importantly the most relevant door could be salient from the extra linguistic context as well. In either case, the reference is specific and salient.

When interpreting data it is essential to know exactly what specific reference means. Specific reference is often associated with uniqueness, but so called weak definites can have specific reference without referring to a uniquely identifiable referent (cf. Carlson et al. 2006):

(53) Det var varmt, så Elsa öppnade fönstret.  

    it was hot so Elsa opened window. the  

    ‘It was hot, and so Elsa opened the window.’
In (53), the weak definite *fönstret* ‘the window’ is referring to an optional window in a set. The set consists of all the windows in the given context that could possibly be opened. This means that specific object reference does not necessarily involve a uniquely identifiable referent. Some examples of IOO involve an object referent that is salient enough to be omitted although still not uniquely identifiable. If (54) were uttered in the same situation as (53), the object interpretation would be similar.

(54) Det var varmt, så Elsa öppnade.
   *it was hot, so Elsa opened*
   ‘It was hot, and so Elsa opened [the window/the door/the air vent].’

However, the set of possible referents in (54) is actually somewhat bigger than the set in (53). More specifically, in (54) the object referent could be a door or possibly some kind of air vent, just as well as a window. Put differently, the set of available referents in (54) is larger than the set available in (53), but the opening event and type of referent remains the same. This means that with the linguistic context given in (54) (‘It was hot’), the IOO object could not refer to a package, a can or a bottle:

(55) Det var varmt, så Elsa öppnade.
   *it was hot, so Elsa opened*
   ⇒ ‘It was hot, and so Elsa opened the window/the door/the air vent.’
   ⇔ ‘It was hot, and so Elsa opened the package/the can/the bottle.’

With a context specification different from the one in (53)–(55), and in a different situation, the set of possible referents could change dramatically:

(56) Jag öppnade med hjälp av en kniv.
   *I opened with help of a knife*
   ‘I opened [the most salient and relevant referent] with a knife.’

In (56), it is unlikely that the implicit object refers to a door or a window, and more likely that it refers to a package, a can or something else. Thus, it is still necessary for the hearer to identify the most salient or relevant referent in order to disambiguate the reference and for the utterance to be acceptable, in (55) as well as in (56). This is done by the identification of a frame of reference which is given in the discourse. Thus, the notions of salience and relevance are both central to understanding IOO.

One could of course argue that the different ways of resolving reference in IOO (anaphorically, deictically etc.) are evidence for several subtypes of IOO. Nonetheless, in spite of some differences regarding how the object reference is resolved in each case, I maintain that the mere possibility of identifying the specific reference is the essential defining property, and subsequently that this is the right level of abstraction for my classification. I will
argue further for this classification in chapter 4, where I propose that omitted I00 objects are like referential pronouns in that they can be analyzed as free variables that are pragmatically bound.

2.3.3 I0K as involving non-specific bare NP objects

What I refer to as I0K is often treated as a special case of IOR, based on the similarities with respect to the object interpretation, which are typically characterized as unspecified and irrelevant (Goldberg 2001, Mittwoch 2005). While it is true that there is no specific object referent in IOR (57) or in I0K (58), it is not clear that the interpretations are exactly parallel.

(57) Jag läste hela dagen igår. (Bloggmix 2008)
    I read whole day yesterday
    ‘I was reading all day long yesterday.’

(58) Även om det handlar om en otrevlig maktmänniska som
even if it deals about an unpleasant power-seeker who
torterar och avrättar. (Bloggmix 2014)
tortures and executes
    ‘Even if the story is about an unpleasant power-seeker who tortures and executes.’

In the IOR example in (57), the object in the reading event is irrelevant in a way the objects in the torture and execute events in (58) are not. More specifically, in (57) it is completely irrelevant if the subject referent has read the same text all day or different texts, and both readings are possible. In (58), on the other hand, the genericity forces a bare plural reading of the object. I will elaborate on this difference in more detail in chapter 5.

There is another set of examples in the literature where genericity is mentioned. In Rizzi (1986:501), the omitted object involved in the English and Italian examples in (59)–(60) is characterized as having arbitrary reference (which entails the features [+ human, + generic, +/– plural]).

(59) a. This sign cautions (people) against avalanches.
    b. Questo cartello mette in guardia (la gente) contro le valanghe.

(60) a. John is always ready to please (people).
    b. Gianni è sempre pronto ad accontentare (la gente).

For Italian, the omissions are claimed to involve a zero generic pronoun with those features specified, whereas for English they are analyzed as involving operations in the lexicon (Rizzi 1986). While at least (59) translates well to Swedish (61), I would not characterize it as involving generic reference.
The interpretation of the objectless version of (61) is not necessarily generic. Instead, it is possibly specific. Arbitrary reference is a notion mostly used to describe arbitrary PRO, i.e. an infinitival subject that is not controlled syntactically. Arbitrary PRO can be used to refer to people in general, but the reference in a particular sentence is interpreted pragmatically. As demonstrated in (62), which is my interpretation of (61), the reference can just as well be specific.

In chapter 4, I will return to examples like (62) and argue that they are cases of IOO, since the omitted object has to be salient in the discourse. In chapter 5, I will return to examples like (58) and argue for an analysis of IOK involving non-salient bare NP objects that receives an existential interpretation when omitted.

2.3.4 Other types of implicit objects

In some previous work (e.g. Levin 1993), some additional types of implicit objects are acknowledged. The reasons for not including them here are mainly language-specific, i.e. they do not apply to Swedish. Nevertheless, I will go through some of these other types below and for each one show why I do not consider it a type of objectlessness in Swedish.

2.3.4.1 Verbs with a reciprocal object interpretation

Levin (1993) and numerous sources cited there note that in English, some verbs with optional object arguments get reciprocal reference when the object is not expressed. Examples of such interpretations include the following:

(63) They met.

(64) They divorced.

(65) They debated.

Arbitrary reference is also discussed with respect to impersonal subject pronouns and empty subject pronouns similar to impersonal one (Egerland 2003) or arbitrary English they (Sigurðsson & Egerland 2009).
In Swedish, reciprocal interpretations are marked with overt morphology:

(66) De möttes.
    they met.RECIP
    ‘They met.’

(67) De skiljde sig.
    they divorced REFL
    ‘They divorced.’

Apparent counterexamples like (68) are actually not transitive, i.e. they do not take a DP object (69) but a PP (70).

(68) De debatterade.
    they debated
    ‘They debated.’

(69) *De debatterade varandra.
    they debated each.other

(70) De debatterade med varandra.
    they debated with each.other
    ‘They debated with each other.’

Whereas English has objectless uses of certain verbs with reciprocal interpretations, it seems like Swedish does not. Therefore, I will not discuss this subtype further. The same goes for the subtype presented in the next subsection.

2.3.4.2 Verbs with a reflexive object interpretation

Levin (1993) and others observe that some English verbs get a reflexive object interpretation when used intransitively:

(71) Alice shaved.

(72) Alice dressed.

(73) Alice showered.

Just like for the reciprocal interpretations, Swedish verbs typically require overt morphology for the reflexive interpretations, as demonstrated by the examples in (74)–(75).

(74) Alice rakade sig.
    Alice shaved REFL
    ‘Alice shaved.’
(75) Alice klädde sig.  
*Alice dressed REFL*  
‘Alice dressed.’

The only two counterexamples I am aware of are the ones in (76)–(77).

(76) Alice duschade.  
*Alice showered*  
‘Alice showered.’

(77) Alice badade.  
*Alice bathed*  
‘Alice bathed.’

However, the two verbs in (76)–(77) display some radically different properties from the verbs in (74)–(75), since their roots can be construed as nouns with a light verb, describing the same events as the verbs:

(78) Alice tog en dusch.  
*Alice took a shower*  
‘Alice took a shower.’

(79) Alice tog ett bad.  
*Alice took a bath*  
‘Alice took a bath.’

(80) Alice tog en *rak/rakning*  
*Alice took a shave shaving*  

(81) *Alice tog en kläd/påklädnings*  
*Alice took a cloth clothing*

Thus, the verbs *duscha* ‘shower’ and *bada* ‘bathe’ could be analyzed as derived from nominal roots, an analysis not available for the predicates *raka sig* ‘shave’ and *klä på sig* ‘dress’. I will assume that the possibilities of the light verb constructions with the Swedish verbs *duscha* ‘shower’ and *bada* ‘bathe’ reflect a structure different from the structure of verbs without reflexive implicit object interpretations. Consequently, I will not consider (76)–(77) as cases of IOR, although I do not state anything about there being a potential subtype here for IOR in English.

---

9 See Alexiadou et al. (2014:10f.) for a partly different analysis of intra-germanic variation in the acceptance of reflexive interpretations of the implicit objects.
2.3.4.3 Verbs with a body-part object interpretation

Yet another subtype, observed by e.g. Rice (1988) and Levin (1993), involves objectless sentences with an implicit body-part reference. English verbs that occur in this subtype are for instance blink and wave:

(82) Sally blinked (her eyes).
(83) Sally waved (her hand).

As Levin (1993) notes, the object interpretation in examples like these ones is found with verbs describing signs made by particular body parts (82) and with verbs describing conventionalized gestures (83). Whereas the objectless variants of (82)–(83) and similar examples are acceptable in Swedish, just like for debattera ‘debate’ in (68)–(70), the transitive variants are not.

(84) Sally blinkade.
Sally blinked  ‘Sally blinked.’
(85) Sally vinkade.
Sally waved  ‘Sally waved.’
(86) *Sally blinkade ögonen.
Sally blinked  eyes.the
(87) *Sally vinkade handen.
Sally waved  hand.the

In order to express the understood body-part with these verbs, a PP instead of a DP is required:

(88) Sally blinkade med ögonen.
Sally blinked  with eyes.the  ‘Sally blinked her eyes.’
(89) Sally vinkade med sin vänstra hand.
Sally waved  with her left  hand  ‘Sally waved her left hand.’

As far as Swedish is concerned then, this subtype of IOR is not relevant. Thus, in this work IOR is restricted to cases with unspecified object reference.

2.3.5 Ambiguous data

It is not always obvious how to interpret all corpus examples with respect to the various types of objectless sentences. Instead, the acceptability judg-
ments as well as the interpretations are highly sensitive to context, making the judgments quite fragile. In some cases, like (90), a particular word string is seemingly ambiguous between IOR, IOO and IOK, because of several possible interpretations, as in (90).

(90) Elsa drack.

⇒ ‘Elsa was drinking some irrelevant liquid at a particular time.’
or: ⇒ ‘Elsa was drinking some specific drink at a particular time.’
or: ⇒ ‘Elsa was an habitual drinker.’

The example in (90) can be compared with the less ambiguous ones in (91)–(94).

(91) Elsa drack ordentligt efter träningen idag.
‘Elsa drank properly after practice the today’

(92) Elsa öppnade en cola och gav till Hugo. Han drack.
‘Elsa opened a coke and gave to Hugo he drank’

(93) Elsa öppnade en cola och drack.
‘Elsa opened a coke and drank [from it].’

(94) Elsa drack alltid ordentligt efter träningen.
‘Elsa drank always properly after practice the’

However, since the same verb dricka ‘drink’ is involved in (91)–(94), it is not obvious that different linguistic operations are involved in these three examples, in spite of the fact that the interpretations are distinct. Judging from (93), it is clear that unambiguous specific interpretations can arise with verbs that otherwise do not require a specific object salient from the discourse. However, in this thesis I will treat all objectless examples with verbs that accept IOR as cases of IOR, thus partly leaving the referential definition of implicit objects aside for the benefit of a definition based on event structure properties. From this it follows that the event structural restrictions involved in IOR have implications for the restrictions on IOO and IOK as well, which in my analysis will not involve IOR verbs. Consequently, in the view taken here, (92)–(93) do not involve IOO. Neither is (94) an example of IOK. Instead, (91)–(94) are all examples of what I define as IOR.
2.4 Summary

In this chapter, I have worked my way through data and literature towards a clear classification into three types of objectless sentences. In section 2.1, I showed what licensing conditions are involved in objectless sentences in Swedish and related them to the three types IOR, IOO and IOK. Event structure restrictions were identified as important in IOR, restrictions concerning the availability of a salient referent were related to IOO, and sentence-level genericity to the type labeled IOK.

In section 2.2, I discussed those licensing conditions in relation to the licensing factors identified in previous research, and showed that the literature in large respects agrees on what the licensing conditions are but that there are differences as to how they are valued and analyzed. I showed that the treatment of the licensing conditions is strongly influenced by which types of objectless sentences are assumed, and how those types are distinguished from each other.

In section 2.3, I discussed the types of objectless sentences with respect to the interpretation of the referential properties of the objects, and once again I related my discussion to previous accounts. I argued that although IOR has often been characterized as involving an indefinite object, in my analysis IOR instead does not involve any object at all. IOO on the other hand involves a specific and salient object, whereas I assume IOK to involve the omission of a bare NP which receives a non-specific interpretation.
3 Implicit Object Read type (IOR)

There has been much research on the relationship between event structure (aktionsart) and argument realization, some of which is highly relevant for IOR. Typical IOR verbs like *eat* have been shown to have a less complex event structure than inherently resultative verbs that do not seem to accept IOR (e.g. Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998). This means that there are event structural restrictions on IOR. Drawing on the event structural accounts of Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998), Levin (1999) and Ramchand (2008), I will show that the understanding of these verbs as well as of their objects is something radically different from much of our previous understandings.

In section 3.1, I present the general verb phrase structure assumed in my analysis in which event structure is built in syntax (Ramchand 2008, 2011). In section 3.2, I introduce a diagnostics for identifying IOR before moving on to studying the Swedish restrictions on IOR in sections 3.3–3.5. I show that the IOR restrictions are related to the event structure properties of different sets of verbs, e.g. creation/consumption verbs and inherently resultative verbs. I then map out the event structure properties of verbs accepting IOR, and verbs rejecting IOR.

The results in sections 3.3–3.5 are then backed up in section 3.6 by data on resultative constructions and in section 3.7 where data from common IOR contexts are presented and discussed. In section 3.8, I argue for an intransitivity account of IOR, i.e. an analysis of the verbs involved in IOR as actually being intransitive verbs and the objects of such verbs as having properties distinct from objects of (true) transitive verbs, but similar to the possible objects of some (other) intransitive verbs.

It should be mentioned that it is not possible to conduct a full analysis for every single Swedish verb here. Therefore, detailed and thorough examinations of lexical idiosyncrasies are excluded from the discussions. Instead, this chapter as well as the rest of the thesis focuses on the more general semantic-syntactic patterns of sets of verbs.

3.1 Verb phrase structure

In order to syntactically analyze the verbs in my study, I adopt Ramchand’s (2008, 2011) three-partite verb phrase where event structure is built in syntax. The event structural properties are thus neither conceptualized as lexical characterizations of particular verbs nor verb semantic characteriza-
tions placed in the lexical component or in some separate interface structure, but instead as syntactic representations of sets of verbs.

3.1.1 The three-partite verb phrase

I assume a structurally decomposed verb phrase where the maximal verb phrase structure includes three subevents, like the one argued for in Ramchand (2008, 2011), see (95).

\[(95) \text{The three-partite verb phrase (cf. Ramchand 2008, 2011)}\]

\[\text{Alice öppnade dörren ‘Alice opened the door’}\]

The complex event in (95) *Alice öppnade dörren* ‘Alice opened the door’ (and all other events) are built using only two linguistic primitives, state (96) and process (97), which are combined with one single compositional rule, the ‘leads-to’ relation (98) (cf. Hale & Keyser 1993).

\[(96) \text{State(e): e is a state}\]

\[(97) \text{Process(e): e is an eventuality that contains internal change}\]

\[(98) \text{Event Composition Rule:}\]

\[e = e_1 \rightarrow e_2: e \text{ consists of two subevents } e_1, e_2 \text{ such that } e_1 \text{ causally implicates } e_2 \text{ (Ramchand 2011:4)}\]

This means that the two primitives, state and process, can be combined recursively and that their internal hierarchical relation is what defines which kind of verb phrase is composed. If a state is above the process in the verb phrase, then that state is the initiating predicate, *initP*. If instead the state is below the process, then that state is the resulting predicate, *resP*. This can be formulated as in (99)–(100) (from Ramchand 2011:15).
The three subevents that emerge in the maximal verb phrase in (95) are (i) a causing/initiating subevent \((\text{init}P)\), (ii) a subevent denoting the process \((\text{proc}P)\), and (iii) a result subevent \((\text{res}P)\). The process subevent, \(\text{proc}P\), is the core of any dynamic event, but presumably absent among stative verbs. The initiating and resulting subevents are only present among some sets of dynamic verbs but absent among others, depending on the syntactic-semantic properties lexicalized by a particular verb.

A maximal verb phrase with three subevents includes a specifier of each subevent. This in turn gives rise to a small set of structural and generalized argument roles, which are the subjects of cause/initiation, process and result, respectively. These roles are labeled INITIATOR, UNDERGOER and RESULTEE, but the labels are supposed to be interpreted in a very general sense. None of these roles are stipulated as a priori concepts, but follow from the internal structure of the verb phrase and the embedding of subevents. Importantly, since no theta-criterion is assumed in this model, one phrase can be inserted into more than one node in the syntax, which makes a few composite roles possible as well. The possible composite roles are UNDERGOER-INITIATOR, RESULTEE-UNDERGOER and RESULTEE-UNDERGOER-INITIATOR. An example of such a composite role can be seen in the case of the RESULTEE-UNDERGOER \(\ddot{d}örren\) ‘the door’ in (95) (cf. Ramchand 2008:39).

In order to avoid an over-generating system, the type of verb phrase that a particular lexical item can identify is restricted by a minimal lexical specification, more precisely a specification of the verbal heads \(\text{init}, \text{proc}\) and \(\text{res}\). An inherently resultative verb like \(\ddot{o}ppna\) ‘open’ is specified for \([\text{init}, \text{proc}, \text{res}]\), which means that \(\ddot{o}ppna\) can identify those verbal heads in the syntax. An activity verb like \(bära\) ‘carry’ or \(springa\) ‘run’, on the other hand, is specified for \([\text{init}, \text{proc}]\), which means that only those two verbal heads are identified by the verb. The heads thus build the verb phrase of a particular verb. In other words, all three heads in the verb phrase must be lexicalized in order for a maximal verb phrase like the one in (95) to be built. As a consequence of the diverse verb phrase structures that different combinations of heads can build, language-specific classifications of verbs emerge, where sets of verbs pattern according to their respective argument structure. Thus, a separate argument structure interface is not needed, and no generalized argument roles need to be predefined nor specified in the lexicon and projected into syntax. This does not mean that there is no argument structure information at all in a lexical item, only that specifying such information is redundant since it follows from the syntactic structure, and consequently there is no need for assuming any argument roles as linguistic primitives. In
other words, the model takes generalizations about argument structure seen among sets of verbs seriously but deals with them in a structural manner. This allows for some flexibility regarding the number and type of arguments of a verb, in line with attested argument alternations (see section 3.1.4).

Ramchand’s (2008, 2011) three-partite verb phrase thus offers a more syntactically approach to argument structure than traditional transformational theory or the more lexical view of Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998) and others. Ramchand (2008, 2011) places the regularities observed among sets of verbs previously captured by e.g. Hale & Keyser’s (1993) \( l \)-syntax and Rappaport Hovav & Levin’s (1998) lexical event structure templates in the syntactic component (more specifically in the VP) instead of in the lexical component, which renders a lexicon with no argument structure information and no lexicon-internal processes. Nevertheless, the basis for Ramchand’s decomposed verb phrase consists of observations in much previous research on regularities in event complexity among sets of verbs (e.g. Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998). Accordingly, the concept of event complexity will be presented in more detail in the following section.

### 3.1.2 Event complexity

There is a general agreement within the syntactic literature that some events are more complex than others and that the notions of resultativity and/or causativity are involved in more complex events (see e.g. Hale & Keyser 1993, Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998, Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1999, 2005). Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998) attribute the acceptance of IOR – the unspecified object alternation in their terminology – to event complexity. They argue that a verb such as *sweep* describes a simple event, whereas the verb *break* describes a complex event and they show that *sweep* but not *break* accepts IOR. In (101), this difference in event complexity is represented with the event templates assumed by Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998):

\[
\begin{align*}
(101) & \quad a. \text{Leslie swept. } [x \text{ ACT-} & \text{SWEEP-} y] \\
& \quad b. \text{*Kelly broke. } [[x \text{ ACT }] \text{ CAUSE } [\text{BECOME } y \text{-BROKEN-}]]
\end{align*}
\]

In (101)a, the verb *sweep* describes a simple event in the form of an activity, whereas in (101)b, the verb *break* describes a complex event, with causative and resultative components involved in the semantics of *break*, which in their account makes it ungrammatical to leave the object implicit. If this observation is correct, all inherently resultative verbs should be expected to resist IOR. In other words, the notion of event complexity is highly relevant for my study.

Rappaport Hovav & Levin’s approach has gained critique from e.g. Ruppenhofer (2004) and Ruppenhofer & Michaelis (2014) for being circular,
since the distinction between different kinds of event participants in the lexical representation is used as evidence in order to predict IOR. However, in my opinion their critique does not hold, since the different kinds of event participants are derived from the event complexity and not the other way around. Moreover, I will show that the implicit objects of IOR verbs behave differently from implicit objects of IOO verbs, and there is no reason to assume that the former are syntactically active (see section 4.3 for a discussion of the syntactic activity of the implicit objects in IOO).

One fairly standard diagnostic for event complexity, i.e. for distinguishing complex events from simpler ones, is the *again*-test (von Stechow 1996). The argument is that while (102) only has a repetitive reading (where John has read the book before), (103) has two possible readings: one repetitive (John has opened the door before) and one restitutive (the door has been open before).¹⁰

\[(102)\text{ John read the book again.}\]
\[\Rightarrow \text{‘John has read the book before.’} \quad \text{(repetitive)} \]
\[\Rightarrow \text{‘The book has been read before.’} \quad \text{(*restitutive)} \]

\[(103)\text{ John opened the door again.}\]
\[\Rightarrow \text{‘John has opened the door before.’} \quad \text{ (repetitive)} \]
\[\Rightarrow \text{‘The door has been open before.’} \quad \text{ (restitutive)} \]

In (102), the restitutive reading (where the book has been read before) is ruled out. On the restitutive reading of (103), *again* has scope over the end state only, where the UNDERGOER object (*the door*) is also the subject of the result subevent (*the door is open*), i.e. it has the composite role RESULTEE-UNDERGOER. On the repetitive reading, *again* instead has scope over the entire verb phrase. The variation in the scope of *again* is evidence for distinguishing two different subevents in (103), but not in (102), since repetitive readings are possible for all verb phrases.¹¹

Swedish *igen* provides similar evidence as English *again*, see (104)–(105).¹²

¹⁰ For the restitutive reading of (103) to be true, it is not necessarily the case that someone has opened the door before. An entirely new door can be attached to the hinges in an open state, then someone can close the door, and the statement in (103) could still get a restitutive reading, i.e. John can open the door again (von Stechow 1996:88).

¹¹ Dowty (1979) attributes the different readings of *again* to lexical ambiguity, while von Stechow (1996) argues that the different readings are a consequence of differences in syntactic structure. On von Stechow’s account, *again* has a position above the entire VP in the repetitive readings, whereas in the restitutive reading *again* is VP-internal, positioned above the small clause expressing the end state.

¹² Both English *again* and Swedish *igen* behave differently from German *wieder*, which is the basis for von Stechow’s (1996) analysis, since German but not English and Swedish has different word order in the different readings. Nonetheless, the argument holds for English and Swedish as well.

There must be one argument XP in the syntax to identify each subevent in the event structure template (Rappaport Hovav & Levin 2001:779).

The ARP is consistent with their observations of the non-acceptance of IOR among inherently resultative verbs, since it follows from the ARP that complex events, i.e. events where the reading of again is ambiguous between a repetitive and a restitutive reading, should not allow IOR (although they sometimes allow I00, see chapter 4).

Since the resultativity is part of the semantic description of the verb (either lexically or syntactically as in the model assumed in this work) there is reason to believe that the observations behind the ARP should hold cross-linguistically and that they are consequently also valid for Swedish. I will thus refer to the ARP continuously throughout this chapter. In a somewhat revised version, the ARP in (106) could be said to follow from Ramchand’s system. This revised ARP could be phrased as in (107) to align with the three-partite verb phrase, and with the fact that there is no theta-criterion assumed in Ramchand’s (2008, 2011) model. Since one constituent can be inserted into more than one node in the tree, that same constituent can carry more than one argument role.

Every subevent in the verb phrase must be identified by an argument XP in the specifier position of that subevent.

It is important to be clear that the revised ARP is not an underlying principle in Ramchand’s system, but my interpretation of the implications of her model. In line with Ramchand (2008), the revised ARP in (107) allows one

13 Rappaport Hovav & Levin (2001) use the label “argument-per-subevent condition”.

104) Elsa läste boken igen.
Elsa read book.the again.
⇒ ‘Elsa has read the book before.’ (repetitive)
⇏ ‘The book has been read before.’ (*restitutive)

105) Elsa öppnade dörren igen.
Elsa opened door.the again.
⇒ ‘Elsa has opened the door before.’ (repetitive)
⇒ ‘The door has been open before.’ (restitutive)
argument to identify more than one subevent via re-merge, i.e. to be inserted into more than one specifier position. This is seen e.g. in the composite RESULTEE-UNDERGOER role in (95), which allows the [init, proc, res] verb öppna ‘open’ to be analyzed as having three subevents, although it only has two obligatory arguments. Importantly, the revised ARP makes the specifiers in each subevent syntactically obligatory, an assumption motivated by the fact that all predicates need a subject (cf. Ramchand 2008:60). The revised ARP also allows for objects in the complement of proc, i.e. RHEME-objects, to be optional since the processual subevent is already identified by an argument in specifier position. The difference between UNDERGOER objects and RHEME objects in Ramchand’s verb phrase is discussed in the following section, where I also provide semantic motivations for the distinction.

3.1.3 Two kinds of objects: UNDERGOERS and RHemes

In the three-partite verb phrase, the participant roles INITIATOR, UNDERGOER and RESULTEE arise in the specifier positions of the subevents initP, procP and resP, respectively. Whenever there is a resultative subevent (resP), that subevent is embedded in the complement of proc. However, in an event where there is no resultative subevent, there can instead be what Ramchand calls rhematic material (RHemes or PATHS) in that complement position.

RHemes of proc are different from UNDERGOERS not only by stipulation from the syntactic model but also from the semantic properties they have in relation to the verb. What Ramchand calls UNDERGOERS typically refer to entities that are affected by the process of dynamic verbs in terms of change along a path, as in (108).

(108) Elsa bar väskan.
     Elsa carried bag the
     ‘Elsa carried the bag.’

In (108) the UNDERGOER väskan ‘the bag’ changes location as a part of the process. The degree of affectedness can vary according to the type of event, and it not always as prominent as with the UNDERGOER in a carrying event such as the one described in (108). More importantly, UNDERGOERS do not describe or measure out the path of change, i.e. they do not by themselves provide any information about the path involved in the process. This is clear in (108), where the path of change is left unspecified – the hearer gets no information about where or how far Elsa was carrying the bag. Such information can, however, be added by an optional path, as by the DP tjugo meter ‘twenty meters’ in (109).

(109) Elsa bar väskan tjugo meter.
     Elsa carried bag the twenty meters
     ‘Elsa carried the bag twenty meters.’
As opposed to UNDERGOERS such as väskan ‘the bag’ in (109), a RHEME like tjugo meter ‘twenty meters’ in the same example instead describes the subevent by measuring the path of the process that is predicated of the UNDERGOER. In (110)–(111), the motion verb springa ‘run’ is given as an example of a verb that does not take a separate UNDERGOER object, i.e. an object that undergoes the process of running, as (111) would suggest if it were grammatical (cf. Ramchand 2008:34).

(110) Elsa sprang.
    Elsa ran
    ‘Elsa ran.’

(111) *Elsa sprang Alice.
    Elsa ran Alice

Instead, the one undergoing the (self-initiated) process of running is Elsa. As in (108)–(109), an optional DP describing a path can be added:

(112) Elsa sprang tjugo meter.
    Elsa ran twenty meters
    ‘Elsa ran twenty meters.’

This means that Elsa is realized as a composite UNDERGOER-INITIATOR in the verb phrase structure of springa ‘run’, see (113).

(113) Verb phrase structure of springa ‘run’

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{initP} \\
\text{INITIATOR} \\
Elsa \\
\text{sprang} \\
\text{procP} \\
\text{UNDERGOER} \\
<\text{Elsa}> \\
<\text{sprang}> \\
\text{XP}
\end{array}
\]

Into the structure given in (113), a path like the DP tjugo meter ‘twenty meters’ can be optionally inserted into the complement of proc, providing a path of change along which Elsa runs. A bounded path like tjugo meter would give rise to a telic reading of springa ‘run’. The example with bära ‘carry’ in (109) has the same syntactic structure, where the path is inserted into the complement of proc. The only difference between springa ‘run’ on the one hand and bära ‘carry’ on the other is the realization of the generalized UNDERGOER role, i.e. the entity traveling along the path. For springa
'run', the UNDERGOER is realized by the one doing the running, whereas for bära ‘carry’, the UNDERGOER is realized by the object of the sentence, i.e. väskan ‘the bag’ in (109).

Importantly, the kind of direct objects often referred to as incremental themes are known to behave much like paths (see e.g. Dowty 1991). Although they are generally considered objects of the verb, unlike other objects they are also semantically similar to paths in that they give rise to abstract paths or to some sort of scalar structure. With a creation-verb like skriva ‘write’ in (114), the incremental theme object ett brev ‘a letter’ measures out the abstract path of the writing event (cf. Tenny 1987, 1994, Dowty 1991:568, Krifka 1992).

(114) Elsa skrev ett brev.
    *Elsa wrote a letter*
    ‘Elsa wrote a letter.’

This means that the letter in (114) is incrementally being written as the writing event takes place, and that the event ends whenever the letter is finished. Similarly to a bounded path, a quantized incremental theme object (i.e. an object of specified quantity) contributes with an inherent scalar structure that measures out the event path, which yields a telic event. What makes incremental themes semantically able to affect the telicity of the verb phrase is that they are incrementally affected as the event progresses. Krifka (1989, 1992, 1998), Dowty (1991) and others analyze this in terms of homomorphism between parts of the incremental theme and parts of the event. For incremental theme objects, this means that parts of the entity denoted by the object correspond to parts of the process that the verb denotes, see e.g. Dowty (1991) and Ramchand (2008).\(^{14}\)

Apart from providing a scalar structure, RHEMES (incremental themes) are not defined by their own inherent properties but by the properties that arise in the verb phrase of certain verbs when these are combined with incremental theme objects. Thus, just like the case of springa ‘run’ with or without a bounded path, the verbs that take RHEME objects are flexible between atelic and telic readings. Thus, RHEMES as well as other elements that affect the telicity are always inserted into the complement of proc, be it a RHEME or a resP (cf. Larsson 2009:200f.). In contrast, the UNDERGOER argument in the specifier of procP never affects the telicity.

Consider the examples with the incremental theme verb äta ‘eat’ with two distinct types of objects in (115) and (116).

(115) Sally ät potatis.
    *Sally ate potato*
    ‘Sally ate potatoes.’

\(^{14}\) For a partly different analysis, see Rothstein (2001).
The bare singular NP in (115) has a mass interpretation, i.e. it has a homogeneous and unbounded reference and is thus non-quantized.\footnote{15 For some nouns, the bare singular form is used for a mass reading, while for other nouns the bare plural is used, see Delsing (1993:55ff.). It should also be noted that bare singulars do not always have a mass reading, cf. Julien (2005:252ff.).} By contrast, the object in (116) is quantized, i.e. it has a specified quantity and is individuated. In both of the events described in (115)–(116), potatoes are incrementally consumed, as an inevitable part of the eating event. This leads to a telicity effect where the non-quantized object (with non-specified quantification) gives an atelic reading, whereas quantized objects (with specified quantification) gives a telic reading. As we can see in (115)–(116), this means that the verbs taking incremental themes are unspecified for telicity – the telicity will vary depending on the quantizedness of the object.

This flexibility in telicity shows up in classic telicity tests (Dowty 1979, 1991, Mittwoch 1982, 2005, Krifka 1989). For instance, atelic predicates can be modified by for-adverbials but not by in-adverbials (in Swedish, these translate to adverbials with the prepositions i and på respectively). For telic predicates the opposite is true, see (117)–(118).

\begin{itemize}
\item (117) Sally åt potatis (i tio minuter)/(* på tio minuter).
\item Sally ate potatoes (for ten minutes)/(*in ten minutes).
\item (118) Sally åt en potatis (*i tio minuter)/( på tio minuter)
\item Sally ate a potato for ten minutes in ten minutes
\item ‘Sally ate a potato (*for ten minutes)/(in ten minutes).’
\end{itemize}

The eating event in (117) can go on for ten minutes but it cannot be finished in ten minutes, i.e. it is atelic. In (118), the eating event can instead be finished in ten minutes but it cannot be described as going on for ten minutes, i.e. the event is telic.

Compare (117)–(118) to (119)–(120) where the verb bära ‘carry’ has an atelic reading regardless of the quantizedness of the object.

\begin{itemize}
\item (119) Elsa bar väskor (i tio minuter)/(* på tio minuter).
\item Elsa carried bags (for ten minutes)/(*in ten minutes).
\item (120) Elsa bar en väska (i tio minuter)/(* på tio minuter)
\item Elsa carried a bag (for ten minutes)/(*in ten minutes).
\end{itemize}
Also, for an imperfective sentence with a non-quantized object, as in (121), the statement to the right of the arrow holds for any given point in the time interval of the event, which is evidence for atelicity.

(121) Sally håller på och äter potatis. ⇒ Sally har ätit potatis.
*Sally keep at and eat potato* *Sally has eaten potato*
‘Sally is eating potatoes.’
‘Sally has eaten potatoes.’

Whenever Sally stops eating potatoes, it is true that she has eaten potatoes for a while. Hence the event is atelic. For an imperfective sentence with a quantized object, as in (122), the implications are different.

(122) Sally håller på och äter en potatis. ⇒ Sally har ätit en potatis.
*Sally keep at and eat a potato* *Sally has eaten a potato*
‘Sally is eating a potato.’
‘Sally has eaten a potato.’

At any given point in (122), it would not be true that Sally has eaten a potato. Thus, as we can see, the verb phrase is telic. In other words, verbs taking incremental themes cannot be classified as either activities or accomplishments independently of their complements. The telicity instead arises in the verb phrase. The reason that the telicity effect shows up in these tests is that they enhance either atelic or telic properties, and thus make the interpretations less ambiguous. There are a number of other contexts that could be used as telicity diagnostics, such as the adverbials still, gradually or slowly, which all typically combine with atelic events. I will mostly use the implication test in (121)-(122), since that is one of the most wide-spread tests and since it seems to be one of the most unambiguous ones. However, it is important to keep in mind that the implication in (121) is typically that Sally has eaten potatoes for a while, not that she has finished eating potatoes, thus avoiding a resultative interpretation otherwise often associated with the perfect tense. For some sets of verbs, however, I will supplement the implication test with other syntactic tests, such as the test with for- and in-adverbials presented in (117)-(120).

Unlike many others, Ramchand (2008) distinguishes between telicity and resultativity and argues that telicity is not a feature on verbs but arise from a number of different interacting factors, where resultativity is one of many. Thus, no verbs are specified for telicity per se, but verbs that are specified for [res] are by consequence telic. Verbs that are specified for [init, proc] are telic whenever used with bounded path arguments, although the verbs are not inherently resultative. In other words, the path-like scalar structure of incremental theme objects explains how some verbs show flexible telicity properties. Syntactically analyzing such objects as RHEMES instead of UNDERGOERS is a way of systematically accounting for that flexibility. In Ramchand’s model, flexibility among lexical items is thus primarily dealt with through the event structure building verb phrase, and with constraints
on that flexibility through minimal category features in the lexicon (see section 3.1.4).

Finally, it should also be mentioned that RHEMES are not restricted to the complement of proc but can also occur in the complement of res and init, and the position of the RHEME decides which subevent is described. A RHEME in the complement of proc describes the process, whereas a RHEME in the complement of res further describes the final state or final location of the RESULTEE (Ramchand 2008:93f.). Likewise, RHEMES in the complement of init presumably describes the state of stative verbs, see section 3.4.3. In other words, there is an important distinction between RHEMES of proc and RHEMES of res or init. Unlike RHEMES of proc, RHEMES of res and init are not providing any paths, since they describe states.

3.1.4 The lexical specification of heads

Although event structure is built in the verb phrase, and although the argument roles follow from the syntactic structure, the lexical items in Ramchand’s (2008) system carry a minimal lexical specification in order for the syntax not to overgenerate. This means that the lexical information relevant to syntax is not as minimal as in the view of e.g. Borer (2005), Harley (2005, 2012) or Marantz (2013) where the lexicon is minimized to an unstructured list of roots without any syntactic information at all, and where all restrictions on insertion are due to real world knowledge or extralinguistic convention (Ramchand 2008:3ff). Instead, the lexicon assumed in Ramchand (2008) contains a set of category features that specify which event structures a verb can be associated with.

More specifically, the lexical items are specified for identifying a certain number of heads in the verb phrase. A verb like öppna ‘open’ in the maximal verb phrase in (95) is specified as [init, proc, res], i.e. it identifies those three heads in the verb phrase. An intransitive motion verb like springa ‘run’ is, on the other hand, specified for [init, proc], and so is a transitive process verb like bära ‘carry’. In other words, some sets of verbs are distinguished by distinct lexical specifications, whereas some sets of verbs share the same features in the lexicon and consequently the same syntax, although they can display distinct behavior. Accordingly, the question that arises is how the syntax and the language user distinguish different kinds of [init, proc] verbs from each other, if this is not specified in the lexicon.

As Ramchand (2008:64) points out, these verbs need to be distinguished as to the argument roles they realize in the verb phrase, some of which realize separate INITIATOR and UNDERGOER roles (as in the case of bära ‘carry’), and others a composite UNDERGOER-INITIATOR role (as in the case of springa ‘run’). Ramchand (2008:64) loosely assumes that this distinction is not part of the narrow syntactic-semantic system, i.e. there is presumably no syntactic information specified on the lexical items that constrains which
argument is realized as the UNDERGOER, only that some argument is. Instead, the specific argument realization is assumed to follow from the lexical-encyclopedic content of the verbal roots, i.e. encyclopedic information loosely associated with world-knowledge. This means that it is the encyclopedic knowledge about the lexical root that determines if the UNDERGOER role is expressed by the object (as in the case of bära ‘carry’) or by the subject (as in the case of springa ‘run’). The composite UNDERGOER-INITIATOR role of motion verbs can be indicated with co-subscripts, i.e. as [init, proc]. Ramchand does this for convenience in order to indicate that the specifiers of initP and procP are identical, but she also leaves it open if the co-indexing has to be part of the linguistic system or not (Ramchand 2008:74).

Specifying the composite roles in the lexicon leads to a decreased flexibility in the system, but not doing so potentially leads the syntax to over-generate, implying that verbs like springa ‘run’ can take UNDERGOER objects, although they cannot. In line with Ramchand, I leave this question open for now while still using subscripting in the meta-language. A verb like bära ‘carry’ is thus specified as [init, proc] whereas verbs like springa ‘run’ is from now on specified as [init, proc]. What is most important in the following chapters, however, is that argument roles are not specified in the lexicon per se, but emerge in the verb phrase, although still somewhat and somehow restricted by lexical-encyclopedic information.

The realization of composite roles is also restricted by the syntactic positions in the verb phrase, although such a restriction is perhaps not theoretically necessary. Ramchand (2008:53) assumes that there is no composite role consisting of a RHEME and a role in a specifier position, such as a RHEME-UNDERGOER, simply because such a role is not empirically attested, but she does not rule out the possibility that such a role could arise. Syntactically, this would involve movement/re-merge from a complement position to a specifier position, and it would also potentially require more specifications on the lexical items. Like Ramchand, I will assume that such movements are restricted, and keep the lexical specifications as minimal as possible. Thus, for the main part of this chapter, the only lexical specifications I assume, are init, proc, and res, where composite roles realized in the specifier positions of their respective subevents are co-indexed with subscripts, as in the case of [init, proc]. For sake of consistency, I will also specify verbs like öppna ‘open’ as [init, proc, res], although the study does not involve any other [init, proc, res] verbs.

To summarize, there are no selectional features placed in the lexicon in the model assumed here, i.e. no a priori theta-roles are assumed and consequently no theta-grid nor any linking rules are needed. Thematic roles and argument structure follow from the event structure that is associated with a verb and built in the verb phrase. This also means that no lexical-internal processes are assumed. All computational work is instead carried out in the syntactic component. Argument alternations can then partly be taken care of
as a consequence of syntactic structure (in terms of event structure). In the case of composite UNDERGOER-INITIATORS, however, it is unclear how the composite roles arise. It could be the case that they emerge as a consequence of world knowledge, but they could also possibly be specified in the lexicon. I will return to the question of composite roles in section 3.8.

3.2 The IOR diagnostic

I map the event structure restrictions on IOR by using corpus data as well as a particular IOR diagnostic (123), based on the minimal context proposed by Mittwoch (2005).

(123) **The IOR Diagnostic (cf. Mittwoch 2005)**

Any example where a potentially transitive verb is felicitously used in a sentence with a subject but no other arguments or adjuncts in answer to the question *Vad gjorde du igår kväll?* ‘What did you do last night?’ is considered a case of IOR.

The IOR diagnostic is designed to pick out activities. This means that any potentially transitive verb that accepts the IOR diagnostic denotes an activity when used in IOR. An example of a verb that passes the IOR diagnostic is given in (124).16

(124) *Vad gjorde du igår kväll?*

‘What did you do last night?’

_Jag läste._

*I read*

‘I was reading.’

The IOR example in (124) contrasts with the example in (125), which is not grammatical if there is no understood object referent involved.

(125) *Vad gjorde du igår kväll?*

‘What did you do last night?’

*_Jag öppnade._*

*I opened*

Also with an overt object, the example in (125) would be infelicitous with respect to the IOR diagnostic, since it would not describe an activity but an achievement, see (126).

16 This means that also intransitive activity verbs like *springa* ‘run’, *vila* ‘rest’ and *arbeta* ‘work’ accept the IOR diagnostic, although not considered as cases of IOR since the verbs are generally assumed intransitive (although they too can take DP objects). See section 3.8.3 for a more thorough comparison.
(126) Vad gjorde du igår kväll?
‘What did you do last night?’
Jag öppnade dörren.
‘I opened the door.’

As demonstrated in (124)–(126), the IOR diagnostic evokes the idea of an activity by focusing on the verb action rather than any potential result of the activity. It is designed this way to make for a good IOR context.

My reasons for using a contextual diagnostic to trace the restrictions are that without a contextual specification, implicit IOO and IOK contexts could potentially cloud the IOR judgments. See for instance the somewhat unclear out of the blue example in (127).

(127) Anna öppnade.
Anna opened
‘Anna opened.’

(127) is infelicitous in IOR (cf. (125)) but could be uttered in a situational context that supports IOO. In other words, verbs that do not accept IOR sometimes accept IOO or IOK, as can be seen in the unambiguously felicitous examples in (128)–(129).

(128) Anna öppnade för att vädra. (IOO)
Anna opened for to air
‘Anna opened [the door/window] to air out.’

(129) Soldaterna dödade i kriget. (IOK)
soldiers.the killed in war.the
‘The soldiers killed [people] in the war’

It is likely that felicitous IOO and IOK examples such as (128)–(129) influence IOR judgments of examples uttered out of the blue, making them biased and fragile. Thus, the purpose of the IOR diagnostic presented in (123) is to provide a setting where the sentence is unambiguously interpreted as a case of IOR.

There are verbs that clearly pass the IOR diagnostic, and verbs that do not. There are also some verbs where the acceptability is less clear. I will show that the IOR (un)acceptability is not completely random or idiosyncratic but systematically patterns with different sets of verbs with distinct event structure properties, as for instance Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998), and Mittwoch (2005) has already established for English. However, I will not rely solely on the IOR diagnostic in my classification. Instead, I will supplement the diagnostic with corpus data from language use.
In section 3.3, I will present clear cases of Swedish verbs accepting IOR. In section 3.4, I present clear cases of verbs resisting IOR, and in section 3.5 I discuss some unclear cases.

3.3 Clear cases of IOR verbs

Some verbs are clearly pseudo-transitive in the sense that they accept IOR. In the following, we will see that these verbs all take incremental theme objects (see section 3.1.3). In the following three subsections, the Swedish IOR verbs are presented and grouped as follows: creation/consumption verbs, contact verbs with location arguments and contact verbs with theme arguments.

3.3.1 Creation/consumption verbs

The English verb eat is perhaps one of the most described examples of a pseudo-transitive verb in the literature (see e.g. Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998). The corresponding Swedish verb äta ‘eat’ and other creation/consumption verbs (from the physical or psychological domain) like måla ‘paint’, skriva ‘write’, läsa ‘read’, virka ‘crochet’, and sticka ‘knit’ seem to behave very much like English eat, i.e. they take optional objects.

These verbs also work fine in the IOR diagnostic, i.e. as an answer to the question Vad gjorde du igår kväll? ‘What did you do last night?’, see (130).

\[(130)\quad\text{Vad gjorde du igår kväll?}\]
\['What did you do last night?’\]

a. Jag åt.
   I ate
   ‘I was eating.’

b. Jag målade.
   I painted
   ‘I was painting.’

c. Jag skrev.
   I wrote
   ‘I was writing.’

d. Jag läste.
   I read
   ‘I was reading.’

e. Jag stickade.
   I knitted
   ‘I was knitting.’
f. Jag virkade.
   I crocheted
   ‘I was crocheting.’

Corpus examples where these verbs are used without an object are given in (131).

(131) a. Jag åt innan jag gick hem. (Parole)
   I ate before I went home
   ‘I ate before going home.’

b. Jag målade igår. (Google)
   I painted yesterday
   ‘I painted yesterday.’

c. Hon skrev till honom och bad om ett samtal. (Parole)
   she wrote to him and asked for a conversation
   ‘She wrote to him and asked for a conversation.’

d. Frida läste över Konrads axel. (Parole)
   Frida read over Konrad’s shoulder
   ‘Frida read over Konrad’s shoulder.’

e. Jag stickade i morse när jag vaknade. (Google)
   I knitted in morning when I awoke
   ‘I knitted this morning after waking up.’

f. tittade bara på en bild och räknade ut maskantal
   looked just at an image and figured out stitch.numbers
   och virkade på måfå (Bloggmix 2013)
   and crocheted at random
   ‘[I] just looked at an image and figured out the number of stitches
   and crocheted randomly.’

In (132) an object is added to the examples from (131) in order to show that the object version is possible, and consequently that the verbs are not simply regular intransitive verbs.

(132) a. Jag åt en smörgås innan jag gick hem.
   I ate a sandwich before I went home
   ‘I ate a sandwich before going home.’

b. Jag målade tavlor igår.
   I painted paintings yesterday
   ‘I painted paintings yesterday.’

c. Hon skrev ett mejl till honom och bad om ett samtal.
   she wrote an e-mail to him and asked for a conversation
   ‘She wrote an e-mail to him and asked for a conversation.’
d. Frida läste rubriken över Konrads axel.
Frida read headline over Konrad’s shoulder
‘Frida read the headline over Konrad’s shoulder.’

e. Jag stickade en vante i morse när jag vaknade.
I knitted a mitten in morning when I awoke
‘I knitted a mitten this morning after waking up.’

f. Tittade bara på en bild och räknade ut maskantal
looked just at an image and figured out stitch numbers
och virkade filten på måfå.
and crocheted blanket at random
‘[I] just looked at an image and figured out the number of stitches and crocheted the blanket randomly.’

In the cases where the object argument in (132) is quantized, i.e. in all examples except for (132)b, the otherwise atelic verb phrase is transformed into an accomplishment. This flexibility in (a)telicity is demonstrated in the telicity test in (133)–(134), repeated from (121)–(122).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sally håller på och äter potatis.} & \Rightarrow \text{Sally har ätit potatis.} & \text{(133)} \\
\text{Sally keep at and eat potato} & \text{Sally has eaten potato} \\
\text{‘Sally is eating potatoes.’} & \text{‘Sally has eaten potatoes.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sally håller på och äter en potatis.} & \not\Rightarrow \text{Sally har ätit en potatis.} & \text{(134)} \\
\text{Sally keep at and eat a potato} & \text{Sally has eaten a potato} \\
\text{‘Sally is eating a potato.’} & \text{‘Sally has eaten a potato.’}
\end{align*}
\]

In (133), where the object is non-quantized and has an unbounded and homogenous reference, the statement to the right of the arrow is true at any given point during the activity. That is, whenever the activity of eating potatoes is interrupted, Sally has eaten potatoes. However, in (145) where the object is quantized (in this case with a bounded reference), the statement to the right of the crossed arrow is not true if the event is interrupted before the potato is finished. In that case Sally would not have eaten a potato.

In other words, Swedish creation/consumption verbs denote activities when used with non-quantized objects (typically mass nouns and bare NPs), whereas they denote accomplishments when used with quantized (typically bounded or definite) objects (cf. Ramchand 2008:29, Larsson 2009:197f.). This means that creation/consumption verbs are unspecified for telicity and can occur in atelic verb phrases as well as telic ones. For the verbs in this group atelic verb phrases can include mass nouns or bare NPs, but importantly, IOR is a further option used for expressing an atelic verb phrase. In the following two sections we will see that the same holds for some sets of verbs that are not creation/consumption verbs.
3.3.2 Contact verbs with location arguments

Another group of verbs occurring in IOR is contact verbs that can take objects that refer to a location or a surface, like *sopa* ‘sweep’, *damma* ‘dust’, *städa* ‘clean’ and *vattna* ‘water’. As we can see in (135), these contact verbs work fine in the IOR diagnostic.

(135) Vad gjorde du igår kväll?
‘What did you do last night?’

a. Jag sopade.
*I swept*
‘I was sweeping.’

b. Jag dammade.
*I dusted*
‘I was dusting.’

c. Jag städade.
*I cleaned*
‘I was cleaning.’

d. Jag vattnade.
*I watered*
‘I was watering.’

The answers in (135)a–d all describe activities where no specific object is being referred to.

IOR examples from corpus data are given in (136).

(136) a. Hon *sopade* med snabba arga tag. (Parole)
*She swept with quick angry holds*
‘She swept with quick and angry sweeps.’

b. Hon *dammade* och *vattnade* blommorna. (Parole)
*She dusted and watered flowers.*
‘She dusted and watered the flowers.’

c. Det irriterade mej våldsamt att han *städa*. (Parole)
*It annoyed me violently that he cleaned*
‘It was fiercely annoying to me that he cleaned.’

d. I morse när jag *vattnade* så såg jag att det är
*in morning when I watered then saw I that it is*

---

17 Some of these verbs can also take theme arguments (*sopa smulor* ‘sweep crumbs’, *vattna blommor* ‘water flowers’).
‘This morning when I was watering, I saw that four eggplants are on their way out.’

Corresponding examples with objects are given in (137).

(137) a. Hon sopade golvet med snabba arga tag.
   *she swept floor.the with quick angry holds*
   ‘She swept the floor with quick and angry sweeps.’

b. hon dammade fönsterbrädorna och vattnade blommorna.
   *she dusted windowsills.the and watered flowers.the*
   ‘She dusted the windowsills and watered the flowers.’

c. Det irriterade mej våldsamt att han städade lägenheten.
   *it annoyed me violently that he cleaned apartment.the*
   ‘It was fiercely annoying to me that he cleaned the apartment.’

d. I morse när jag vattnade trädgårdslandet så såg jag att det är fyra auberginer på gång.
   *in morning when I watered garden.bed.the then saw I that it is four eggplants on time*
   ‘This morning when I was watering the garden bed, I saw that four eggplants are on their way out.’

Just like creation/consumption verbs, these verbs take incremental themes, i.e. the dusting in a dusting event progresses as the surface is being covered. In other words, when dusting the shelf, the dusting event is typically finished whenever there is no more part of the shelf to dust, see the telicity test in (138)–(139).

(138) Sally håller på och dammar hyllor. ⇒ Sally har dammat hyllor.
   *Sally keep at and dusts shelves Sally has dusted shelves*
   ‘Sally is dusting shelves.’ ‘Sally has dusted shelves.’

(139) Sally håller på och dammar hyllan. ⇐ Sally har dammat hyllan.
   *Sally keep at and dusts shelf.the Sally has dusted shelf.the*
   ‘Sally is dusting the shelf.’ ‘Sally has dusted the shelf.’

In (138), where the object is non-quantized, Sally has dusted book shelves for a while whenever the dusting event is interrupted. In (139), on the other hand, where the object is quantized, it is not true at any given point of the dusting event that Sally has dusted the (entire) shelf for a while.\(^{18}\)

\(^{18}\) For some speakers, a quantized object does not necessarily yield a telic event with these verbs. For them, an event where Sally is dusting the shelf could implicate that Sally has...
Thus, just like the creation/consumption verbs, location verbs can be used without an object and with no specific object referent available in the context.

3.3.3 Contact verbs with theme arguments

There is a set of verbs quite similar to the contact verbs with location arguments from the previous section in that they describe household chores and take incremental theme objects. However, instead of taking objects referring to a location, they typically take objects that could be loosely described as themes. This set includes verbs such as stryka ‘iron’, mangla ‘mangle’ and såga ‘saw’.

Vad gjorde du igår kväll?

‘What did you do last night?’

a. Jag manglade.
   I mangled
   ‘I was mangleing.’

b. Jag strök.
   I ironed
   ‘I was ironing.’

c. Jag sågade.
   I sawed
   ‘I was sawing.’

These verbs are all fine in the IOR diagnostic in (140). When looking for IOR examples in corpora, it turns out that many examples involve pseudo-coordinations, as in (141)a–b, i.e. a structure where two verbs are seemingly coordinated with och ‘and’ but where the first verb functions as a light verb (see e.g. Wiklund 2007, Kvist Darnell 2008 and Lødrup 2014 for analyses of pseudo-coordinations). They are not exclusively restricted to pseudo-coordinations, however, which we can see in (141)c, where the verb is followed by a durative adverbial.

(140) Vad gjorde du igår kväll?
   ‘What did you do last night?’

   a. Jag manglade.
      I mangled
      ‘I was mangling.’

   b. Jag strök.
      I ironed
      ‘I was ironing.’

   c. Jag sågade.
      I sawed
      ‘I was sawing.’

(141) a. Jag stod i tvättstugan hela kvällen och manglade.
      I stood in laundry.room.the whole night and mangled
      (Bloggmix 2011)
      ‘I was in the laundry room all night mangling.’

dusted the shelf for a while. This is probably a consequence of the fact that a completed dusting event (or a sweeping/cleaning/watering event) can immediately start over again, crucially so with the same object. In other words, you can always dust the shelf some more, even if the entire shelf has just been dusted (cf. the observation made by Mittwoch (2005:241f.) that a verb like polish allows atelic as well as telic readings with quantized objects).
b. Han stod och strök när skotten small. (Google)
   *he stood and ironed when shots.the boomed*
   ‘He was ironing when the shots boomed.’

c. Jonas skulle hjälpa henne med att göra i ordning alltanen [sic]
   Jonas would help her with to do in order terrace.the
   så han var ute hela dagen o hamrade och hans
   *so he was out whole day.the and hammered and his*
   mor sågade hela dagen. (Google)
   *mother sawed whole day.the*
   ‘Jonas was helping her with preparing the terrace, and so he was
   out hammering all day and his mother was sawing all day.’

Both pseudo-coordinations with the position verbs *sitta* ‘sit’, *stå* ‘stand’,
*ligga* ‘lie’ and durative adverbials like *hela dagen* ‘all day’ increase the
focus on the verb action, partly because they are imperfective and subse-
quently go well with the atelic version of the predicates in describing activi-
ties. The influence of such contexts will be discussed in section 3.7. In any
case, the verbs in this group are interpreted as describing some atelic action
when used without an object. Obviously, the same holds if there is a non-
quantized object, as in (142).

(142) a. Idag stod en tjej och manglade lakan i tvättstugan.
   *today stood a girl and mangled sheets in laundry.room.the*
   ‘Today a girl was mangling sheets in the laundry room.’

b. Han stod och strök skjortor när skotten small.
   *he stood and ironed shirts when shots.the boomed*
   ‘He was ironing shirts when the shots boomed.’

c. hans mor sågade brädor hela dagen.
   *his mother sawed planks whole day.the*
   ‘His mother was sawing planks all day.’

However, as we can see in the telicity test below, the same is not true if the
object is quantized. Compare the atelic verb phrase with a non-quantized
object in (143) with the telic verb phrase with a quantized object in (144).

(143) Sally håller på och stryker kläder. ⇒ Sally har strukit kläder.
   *Sally keep at and iron clothes Sally has ironed clothes*
   ‘Sally is ironing clothes.’
   ‘Sally has ironed clothes.’

(144) Sally håller på och stryker kläderna. ≠ Sally har strukit kläderna.
   *Sally keep at and iron clothes.the Sally has ironed clothes.the*
   ‘Sally is ironing the clothes.’
   ‘Sally has ironed the clothes.’
It should be mentioned that these verbs all have a rather small range of potential object arguments. If you mangle, you typically mangle sheets or something similar, when ironing, you typically iron shirts or some other cloth, and when sawing you typically saw wood. However, as illustrated in (145), these verbs also have metaphorical or non-conventional uses with other object arguments.

(145) a. Jag manglade min motståndare.
    *I mangled my opponent*
    ‘I crushed my opponent.’

b. Jag strökt pärlplattor.
    *I ironed bead plates*
    ‘I was ironing bead art.’

c. Jag sågade förslaget.
    *I sawed proposal the*
    ‘I dismissed the proposal.’

Obviously, metaphorical or non-conventional uses are not restricted to contact verbs, but the examples in (145) highlight that an IOR sentence can only be used in order to convey an activity that in some respect represents the typical meaning of the verb, as demonstrated in (146).

(146) Vad gjorde du igår kväll?
    *What did you do last night?*

a. Jag strökt.
    *I ironed*
    ⇒ ‘I was ironing things you typically iron.’
    ≠ ‘I was ironing bead art.’

The relationship between IOR, vagueness and conventionalized meanings will be discussed further in section 3.5.

3.3.4 The verb phrase structure of IOR verbs: \([init, proc]_t\)

The three groups of verbs presented in the sections above can be said to represent the clearest cases of IOR verbs, and they largely correspond to the verbs that have been identified as pseudo-transitive verbs in the literature on languages other than Swedish (Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998). As we have seen, the property that these verbs have in common (apart from accepting IOR) is that they take incremental theme objects, and consequently that the verbs are unspecified for telicity.

Since the IOR verbs share these event structural properties, I assume the same verb phrase structure for all IOR verbs, i.e. all sets of verbs presented
in 3.3.1–3.3.3. Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998) assume that these verbs describe simple events, while inherently resultative verbs describe complex events (see the event template in (101)a). Following Ramchand (2008, 2011), I assume a complex structure also for incremental theme verbs, i.e. a structure with two subevents (initP and procP). This means that the verb phrase of incremental theme verbs is still less complex than the verb phrase of resultative verbs, which has three subevents (initP, procP, and resP). The IOR verbs do not have an UNDERGOER as an object, nor a result phrase (resP) in the complement of proc. Instead, they all optionally take a RHEME, see (147).

(147) Verb Phrase Structure of incremental theme verbs

Since the analysis in (147) is a consequence of the analysis of incremental themes as RHEMES, Ramchand (2008:18) assumes this verb phrase for the English verbs eat and read.19 In order to separate verbs like skriva ‘write’ from verbs of process that are not self-initiated like bära ‘carry’, the IOR verbs are here explicitly specified as \{init, proc\}.

What is possibly a bit non-intuitive in the structure given in (147), is that the subject of the sentence is conceptualized as the UNDERGOER of the process. Dowty (1991:568) points out that incremental themes include objects that undergo a change of state, such as the effected objects of creation verbs. In that respect, the incremental theme objects are clearly some kind of UNDERGOER-like participant of the process. However, as Mittwoch (2013:33) points out for the English verb read, the reader of a text can be said to undergo the process of reading. Thus, if anything is affected in a reading-event, it is the event participant realized as the subject of the predicate rather than the text being read. What is important to keep in mind is that the roles in Ramchand’s system are generalized, and that the role labels are not always describing a one-to-one relationship with a role in a particular event. What is clear is that UNDERGOERS are distinct from RHEMES in the respect that they never measure out the event. Instead of overthinking the

19 So does Larsson (2009:200, 2015:170) for the Swedish verbs äta ‘eat’ and läsa ‘read’ in her studies of Swedish participles.


*label* UNDERGOER, what is crucial is the fact that UNDERGOERS participate in the process subevent without providing an abstract path. RHEMES, on the other hand, always provide an abstract path homomorphic to the event, while as Dowty (1991:568) points out, some incremental themes simultaneously participate in the event to some degree. Following Dowty (1991), I preliminary assume incremental themes to be like other objects in many respects, but their homomorphic relationship to the event warrants a distinct syntactic position. When it comes to UNDERGOERS, they instead typically travel along an abstract path of change as a consequence of the event but remain intact in other respects. I will return to the object status of RHEMES in section 3.8.2.

### 3.4 Clear cases of non-IOR verbs

There seem to be at least three separate groups of Swedish verbs that do not accept IOR. One involves inherently resultative verbs as in (148)a, another one involves verbs with separate UNDERGOER objects (i.e. objects that are neither incremental themes nor holders of result states), as in (148)b, and a third one includes stative verbs, as in (148)c.

\(148\)  
\(Vad\ gjorde\ du\ igår\ kväll?\)  
‘What did you do last night?’

a.  *Jag öppnade.
   *I opened

b.  *Jag bar.
   *I carried

c.  *Jag hatade.
   *I hated

In the following subsections (3.4.1–3.4.3), I will present data for each of these verb groups and show that none of them accept IOR. That conclusion is based on the fact that none of these verbs occur in IOR in corpora, and additionally that they do not accept IOR in the IOR diagnostic, as seen in (148).

Since I assume different verb phrase structures for the respective sets of non-IOR verbs, I will conclude each of the data sections below with the verb phrase structure I assume for each particular set of verbs. I will also discuss how they all relate to the revised ARP (see (107) in section 3.1.2).

#### 3.4.1 Inherently resultative verbs: \([\text{init, proc}_\text{i}, \text{res}_\text{i}]\)

Punctual resultative verbs like öppna ‘open’ do not accept IOR, see results from the IOR diagnostic in (149).
Vad gjorde du igår kväll?
‘What did you do last night?’

a. *Jag öppnade.
   I opened

b. *Jag släckte.
   I turned.off

c. *Jag stängde.
   I closed

As introduced in section 3.1.2, inherently resultative verbs denote an event structure that is more complex than the one denoted by [init, proc] verbs. This shows up in tests for event complexity, for instance the again-test (von Stechow 1996). Inherently resultative verbs like öppna ‘open’ in (150) are ambiguous between a repetitive reading and a restitutive reading.

Elsa öppnade dörren igen
⇒ ‘Elsa has opened the door before.’ (repetitive)
Or: ‘The door has been open before.’ (restitutive)

Another test for event complexity is using durative adverbials with the preposition i (corresponding to the preposition for in English). Unlike when i-/for-adverbials are used as a telicity test, they are not contrasted with på-/in-adverbials (cf. section 3.1.3). When used as an event complexity test, i-adverbials instead specify the duration of the result state, see (151). Here, the time span of ‘ten minutes’ indicates the time span of the result state, not the time span of the actions denoted by the verb (although an iterative reading is also possible sometimes).

a. Alice öppnade dörren i tio minuter.
   Alice opened door.the for ten minutes
   ⇒ ‘The door was open for ten minutes.’
   ≠ ‘Alice was opening the door for ten minutes.’

b. Alice släckte lampan i tio minuter.
   Alice turned.off lamp.the for ten minutes
   ⇒ ‘The lights were out for ten minutes.’
   ≠ ‘Alice was turning off the lights for ten minutes.’

c. Alice stängde fönstret i tio minuter.
   Alice closed window.the for ten minutes
   ⇒ ‘The window was closed for ten minutes.’
   ≠ ‘Alice was closing the window for ten minutes.’

75
Thus, in (151)a, the door is open for ten minutes, in (151)b the lights are out for ten minutes, and in (151)c the window is open for the same period of time. Compare this with the IOR verb in (152) where no such result state is implied and consequently cannot be lasting for a given period of time.

(152) Alice åt kakor i tio minuter.

Alice ate cookies for ten minutes.

⇒ ‘Alice was eating cookies for ten minutes.’

⇏ ‘The cookies were eaten for ten minutes.’

Instead, the durative adverbials in (152) unambiguously specify the time span of the actions denoted by the verbs. What these diagnostics show then is that verbs like öppna ‘open’ involve a result state that motivates a more complex syntactic structure.

The inherently resultative verbs in my study do not accept IOR. The corpus examples where verbs with a resultative component occur without an object are instead cases of IOO. This means that the corpus examples in (153)–(154) require the hearer to identify a salient referent in the discourse.

(153) Jag smög till fönstret i köket och öppnade försiktigt.

I snuck up to the window in the kitchen and opened carefully

(Bloggmix 2011)

‘I snuck up to the window in the kitchen and opened [it] carefully.’

(154) Vi släckte, stängde och gick därifrån.

we turned off closed and went there from

(Bloggmix 2006)

‘We turned off [the lights], closed [the door] and left.’

In other words, the sentences in (153)–(154) are not ungrammatical but unacceptable as cases of IOR. The definite interpretations of these and related examples are treated in chapter 4.

Since inherently resultative events are per definition telic, telicity is not affected by the object being quantized or not (cf. section 3.1.3). Moreover, since there are no non-quantized objects of punctual verbs like öppna ‘open’ or släcka ‘turn off’ with mass interpretation, an iterative interpretation naturally arises instead. Therefore, in order to get the right implications from the telicity test in (155)–(158), it is essential to keep in mind that if interrupting the events described in (155) and (157) after Sally having opened just one door or turned off one lamp, it is not true that she has opened doors or turned off lamps for a while.

(155) Sally håller på och öppnar dörrar.

Sally keep at and open doors

⇒ Sally har öppnat dörrar.

‘Sally is opening doors.’

‘Sally has opened doors.’
This means that the objects of resultative verbs do not behave like incremental themes, i.e. whether the object is non-quantized or quantized never affects the telicity.

When it comes to the verb phrase structure of inherently resultative verbs, for the punctual ones I simply assume the maximal verb phrase of Ramchand (2008, 2011). In her model, the result state of a resultative verb is syntactically identified as a result subevent, a \( \text{resP} \), which is the complement of \( \text{proc} \) and adds a telic interpretation. In other words, inherently resultative verbs identify a \( \text{resP} \) in syntax, whereas verbs without inherent result semantics do not, see (159), repeated from (95).

(159) Verb Phrase Structure of inherently resultative verbs

Importantly, the object argument of a resultative verb is base-generated in the specifier of \( \text{res} \) and is therefore interpreted as the \( \text{RESULTEE} \). Since this holder of the result state is the same entity that undergoes the change into that result state, the object argument is also inserted into the specifier of \( \text{proc} \). An incremental theme object on the other hand is base-generated in the
complement of proc in events with no resP, i.e. the very same complement position where the resP is situated in (159) (cf. (147)). Consequently, with this type of decomposed verb phrase there can never simultaneously be both a RHEME object and a resP in the complement of proc. The two types of object arguments are thus inserted into distinct nodes of the tree, and the two nodes provide two distinct interpretations of the arguments, i.e. as either a RESULTEE-UNDERGOER or a RHEME.

With this verb phrase, it is actually expected from the revised ARP in (107) that inherently resultative verbs do not accept IOR. Since the specifiers of each subevent are obligatory, the verb phrase structure assumed in (159) provides a syntactic explanation for the fact that resultative verbs do not accept IOR. Resultativity in relation to IOR will be discussed further in section 3.6.

Ramchand (2008) assumes that all [init, proc, res] verbs are punctual, since the subevents in her system are supposed to overlap in time. Clearly there are resultative accomplishments as well, for instance including examples with verbs appearing in the well attested spray/load-alternation, such as the verb fylla ‘fill’ or lasta ‘load’:

(160) Elsa fyllde flaskan igen

Elsa filled bottle.the again
⇒ ‘Elsa has filled the bottle before.’ (repetitive)
Or: ‘The bottle has been filled before.’ (restitutive)

(161) Elsa lastade vagnen igen

Elsa loaded truck.the again
⇒ ‘Elsa has loaded the truck before.’ (repetitive)
Or: ‘The truck has been loaded before.’ (restitutive)

Which verb phrase to assume for spray/load verbs like fylla ‘fill’ or lasta ‘load’ is unclear. For the purposes of this thesis, I group them together with the öppna ‘open’ verbs. At any rate, it is clear that these non-punctual verbs do not accept IOR, see (162).

(162) Vad gjorde du igår kväll?
‘What did you do last night?’

a. *Jag fyllde.
   I filled

b. *Jag lastade.
   I loaded

I also adopt the analysis of Andersson & Åfarli (2015) who argue that only one of the alternations of spray/load verbs involves a direct object, whereas the other does not. In other words, the verb phrase analysis in (159) applies
to examples like (163), where the RESULTEE-UNDERGOER of lasta ‘load’ is realized by vagnen ‘the wagon’. The example in (164) is, however, assumed to involve a more complex small clause structure and is therefore disregarded here.

(163) Jag lastade vagnen med hö.
I loaded the wagon with hay
‘I loaded the truck with hay.’

(164) Jag lastade hö på vagnen
I loaded hay on wagon.the
‘I loaded hay onto the wagon.’

Again, what is relevant here is the fact that none of these verbs accept IOR. Just like punctual resultative verbs, spray/load verbs do occur without their object arguments in corpora, but such cases are examples of IOO, not IOR:

(165) Jag lastade med donuts, chips, choklad. (Bloggmix 2009)
I loaded with donuts chips chocolate
‘I loaded [a salient referent] with donuts, potato chips, and chocolate.’

(166) Jag sprättade upp ena sidan, fylde med vadd,
I rip up one side the filled with cotton.wool
sydde ihop igen. (Bloggmix 2009)
sewed together again
‘I untacked one side, filled [it] with cotton-wool, sewed [it] back together again.’

In other words, the examples in (165)–(166) require the hearer to identify a salient referent in the discourse. Such examples will be discussed in chapter 4.

3.4.2 Activity verbs with UNDERGOER objects: [init, proc]
Unlike incremental themes, the quantizedness of UNDERGOERS and RESULTEES never affects the telicity of the verb. This has been demonstrated for objects of inherently resultative verbs in the previous section, and we will see that this is true also for non-resultative process verbs with separate UNDERGOER objects, like for instance bära ‘carry’, dra ‘pull’, kasta ‘throw’, and putta ‘push’. As demonstrated in (167), these verbs do not pass the IOR diagnostic.

---

20 The verb kasta ‘throw’ might look like a resultative verb, but the again-test suggests otherwise, at least in the activity reading of the verb intended here:

(i) Sally kastade bollen igen.
Sally threw ball the again
⇒ Sally has thrown the ball before. (repetitive)
⇒ The ball has been thrown before. (*restitutive)
(167) *Vad gjorde du igår kväll?*
‘What did you do last night?’

a. *Jag drog.*
   *I pulled*

b. *Jag bar.*
   *I carried*

c. *Jag kastade.*
   *I threw*

d. *Jag puttade.*
   *I pushed*

Just like for [init, proc., res.] verbs, there are no corpus examples of these verbs that look like cases of IOR. Instead, corpus examples with expressed object arguments are given in (168).

(168) a. Ossian och Fredrik **drog** pulkan hemåt (Bloggmix 2009)
   *Ossian and Fredrik pulled sledge.the home.towards*
   ‘Ossian and Fredrik pulled the sledge back home.’

b. En kvinna **bar** ett gråtande barn på armen. (Bloggmix 2006)
   *a woman carried a crying child on arm.the*
   ‘A woman was carrying a crying child on her arm.’

c. Vi **kastade** sten i vattnet (Bloggmix 2012)
   *we threw stone in water.the*
   ‘We were throwing rocks into the water.’

d. Dessi och Jonas **puttade** bilen genom rondellen
   *Dessi and Jonas pushed car.the through roundabout.the*
   (Bloggmix 2009)
   ‘Dessi and Jonas pushed the car through the roundabout.’

In (169) where the objects in the corpus examples are omitted, an IOR interpretation is not available, and to the extent that these examples are acceptable they are not cases of IOR.\(^\text{21}\)

(169) a. *Ossian och Fredrik drog hemåt*
   *Ossian and Fredrik pulled home.towards*

\(^{21}\) For some of these verbs there are also intransitive [init, proc.,] readings. In such a reading (169)a is clearly grammatical, see section 3.8.3.
Thus, the data in (167)–(169) clearly show that verbs taking UNDERGOER objects do not accept IOR. As with inherently resultative verbs, this can be explained by the fact that the objects are not incremental themes. In the telicity test in (170)–(171), we can see that whenever the activity in the examples is interrupted, the implication holds, i.e. whenever Sally stops carrying her UNDERGOER object it is true that she has carried it (for a while).

\[
\begin{align*}
(170) \quad \text{Sally håller på och bär lådor.} & \Rightarrow \text{Sally har burit lådor.} \\
\text{Sally keep at and carry boxes} & \quad \text{Sally has carried boxes} \\
\text{‘Sally is carrying boxes.’} & \quad \text{‘Sally has carried boxes.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(171) \quad \text{Sally håller på och bär lådan.} & \Rightarrow \text{Sally har burit lådan} \\
\text{Sally keep at and carry box.the} & \quad \text{Sally has carried box.the} \\
\text{‘Sally is carrying the box.’} & \quad \text{‘Sally has carried the box.’}
\end{align*}
\]

In other words, what we see in (170)–(171) is that the form of the object (quantized or not) does not affect the telicity of the verb phrase. With non-quantized as well as quantized objects, the verb phrase is atelic. With a quantized object, as in (171), you can get a telic reading but only if there is a goal phrase that provides the telos and cancels out the atelic reading, see (172).

\[
\begin{align*}
(172) \quad \text{Sally håller på och bär lådan} & \not\Rightarrow \text{Sally har burit lådan} \\
\text{Sally keep at and carry box.the} & \quad \text{Sally has carried box.the} \\
\text{till bilen} & \quad \text{till bilen.} \\
\text{to car.the} & \quad \text{to car.the} \\
\text{‘Sally is carrying the box to the car.’} & \quad \text{‘Sally has carried the box to the car.’}
\end{align*}
\]

Thus, in (172), it is the goal phrase *till bilen* ‘to the car’ and not the quantized object *lådan* ‘the box’ that provides the telos.

The verb phrase analysis of UNDERGOER verbs is given in (173), and it follows the analysis in Ramchand (2008:65).
As demonstrated in (173), this set of verbs does not identify a res head, and subsequently the event structure is not as complex as the one of inherently resultative verbs. Neither is it identical to the verb phrase of IOR verbs, since there is no composite participant role involved with these verbs, and a separate argument must be realized as the UNDERGOER. With the analysis in (173), the revised ARP still holds, since the object DP pulkan ‘the sledge’ is inserted as a specifier in procP, and thus obligatory. The XP in the complement of proc can then optionally expresses a rhematic path argument, as in (172) above.

3.4.3 Stative verbs: [init]

Stative verbs, including inherently relational verbs like betyda ‘mean’, innebära ‘mean’, omfatta ‘comprise’, utgöra ‘constitute’, and likna ‘resemble’ as well as experiencer verbs like gilla ‘like’, ogilla ‘dislike’, älska ‘love’ and hata ‘hate’ do not accept IOR. Since the IOR diagnostic is designed for evoking an activity reading, it is not applicable to stative verbs (which by definition denote states, not activities). This means that stative verbs are unacceptable in the IOR diagnostic both with and without an object, see (174).

(174) Vad gjorde du igår kväll?
‘What did you do last night?’

a. *Jag liknade (min systers).
   I resembled my sister

b. *Jag gillade (lägenheten).
   I liked apartment.the

Compare the corpus examples of relational statives with overt complements in (175) with the corresponding ungrammatical examples with omitted complements in (176).
(175) a. Det innebar både hot och möjligheter. (Parole)
   *it meant both threats and possibilities*
   ‘It meant both threats and possibilities.’

b. Deras glasyr liknade cement. (Parole)
   *their glazing resembled cement*
   ‘Their glazing resembled cement.’

   *it  meant

   *their  glazing resembled

The examples in (176) are clearly ungrammatical, not only in IOR, but in IOO and IOK as well. Thus, these relational non-agents appear to have strictly obligatory complements that must be realized in the word string. However, it is less clear if the complements are best analyzed as arguments or predicates.

The stative experiencer verbs in (177)–(178) behave in a similar fashion. Compare the corpus examples with complements in (177) and the corresponding unacceptable IOR examples in (178).

(177) a. Jag gillade lägenheten. (Parole)
   *I liked apartment.the*
   ‘I liked the apartment.’

b. Hon hatade snö. (Parole)
   *she hated snow*
   ‘She hated snow.’

(178) a. *Jag gillade.
   *I liked

b. *Hon hatade.
   *she hated

The examples in (178) could be marginally acceptable, but in those cases a processual reading of the verbs is forced. Such interpretations are not discussed further here, but see section 4.2.2.

The very fact that the IOR diagnostic does not work for stative verbs, together with the data in (176) and (178), should be enough evidence for the conclusion that Swedish stative verbs do not accept IOR. There is, of course, a fundamental semantic-syntactic difference between stative verbs and dynamic/eventive verbs in that stative verbs lack the processual core meaning of dynamic events. While Ramchand (2008, 2011) assumes a structure like the one in (179) for all stative verbs, it is often argued that the two types
of stative verbs presented above have distinct syntactic structures, although there is no consensus on what the differences are or how they should be represented (cf. the discussion in Rothmayr 2009 and references cited there).

(179) Verb Phrase Structure of stative experiencer verbs

Since there is no procP in the complement of init, the initiating state does not receive a causational interpretation. It is simply a state with no leads-to relation. The object is realized as a RHEME in the complement of init. RHEMES of init describe the state, just like the RHEMES of proc describe the process of dynamic verbs, but since there is no process involved in init, the RHEME does not give rise to any path. The specifier of init is interpreted as the HOLDER of the state (Ramchand 2008:36, 2011:25).

I will argue that the difference between PATH objects and the RHEMES we find in stative predicates is analogous to the difference between locations and paths: stative verbs do not have any part–whole structure as defined by perceptible change and hence they are simple ‘locations’ and their rhematic content also fails to describe any part–whole structure; dynamic verbs on the other hand are ‘paths of change’ and their rhematic objects must also be PATHS in some generalized sense. (Ramchand 2008:36)

I assume the simple initP structure in (179) to hold for experiencer verbs, whereas relational verbs probably have a more complex structure. However, the focus of my discussion is not the structure of stative verbs but the IOR acceptance for different sets of verbs. It is clear from the examples above that stative verbs do not accept IOR. For the relational statives, the restrictions on IOR could very well follow from the supposed complex syntactic structure. For the experiencer verbs, it is at first glance less obvious why RHEMES are obligatory. However, since the stative verbs in the verb phrase in (179) do not involve any subevent, there is consequently no ‘leads-to’ semantics involved and the state does not express initiation. This could be argument enough for them not being covered by the revised ARP. Thus, it is not RHEMES per se that it is optionally realized, but only RHEMES in the complement of a processual subevent. Just like Ramchand assumes a maximal verb phrase with three subevents, we can assume a minimal verb phrase, where there at least has to be a head, a specifier, and a complement. Whether this complement is a RHEME or a procP does not matter. More importantly, the semantics of the RHEME in statives is distinct from other RHEMES in that they lack a path structure, and the relationship between verb and RHEME is
different. The objects of stative experiencer verbs are clearly not incremental themes – they do not affect the telicity, since states do not express telicity (and telicity tests are therefore redundant).

To summarize the section on non-IOR verbs, we can see that there are a range of verb phrases that do not allow IOR, but only one that does, namely [init, proc] verbs. Subsequently, this is the structure that is interesting when explaining IOR. I will return to a thorough discussion of the structure of IOR verbs in section 3.8, but first present some unclear cases of IOR.

3.5 Unclear cases

The examples discussed in sections 3.3 and 3.4 are all fairly unproblematic. There are, however, several sets of verbs with less clear-cut behavior. At least three groups of unclear cases can be distinguished: vague incremental theme verbs (3.5.1), verbs that appear to have a conventionalized IOR meaning (3.5.2), and verbs of destruction (3.5.3). The unclear IOR status of these verbs relates to the fact that they do not behave like IOR verbs in the IOR diagnostic, but all of them show up in objectless sentences in corpora, and some of them share some other properties of IOR verbs. In the first of these groups, the wider context is important for the interpretation of the event, while in the second, there is a conventionalized meaning involved in the IOR cases. What these two sets of verbs have in common is that they take incremental themes and that IOR is possible under certain, but not any, circumstances. This separates them from the verbs of destruction in section 3.5.3, which on the other hand have been argued to represent a subtype of IOR in some previous accounts (e.g. Goldberg 2001). Thus, although the sets of verbs discussed in this section initially display an unclear IOR behavior, the IOR status of each set will be clearer towards the end of this section.

3.5.1 Verbs with vague meanings

The potential object arguments of pseudo-transitive verbs are in general narrowed down by our encyclopedic and lexical-semantic knowledge about the particular verb. For instance, there is only a limited set of things in the world that you can read, and when you eat you would normally eat something that is edible (cf. Rice 1988). However, some pseudo-transitive verbs have a vaguer meaning, and such verbs take a wider range of potential object arguments than others. Verbs in this category include skapa ‘create’ and bygga ‘build’, which are not as good in the IOR diagnostic as other creation verbs (cf. Mittwoch 2005:242f.). I have also included the verb spela ‘play’, which can take non-quantized as well as quantized incremental themes in some meanings (as in spela musik ‘play music’ and spela en låt ‘play a song’), although the examples below are not restricted to such uses but also
include meanings such as *spela* (*basket*) ‘play (basketball)’ that do not have an obvious telic counterpart. I have marked the unacceptable examples in (180)a–c with a hash mark, since they are infelicitous for encyclopedic reasons rather than syntactic ones.

(180) *Vad gjorde du igår kväll?*

‘What did you do last night?’

a. #Jag skapade.

*I was creating.*

b. #Jag byggde.

*I was building.*

c. #Jag spelade.

*I was playing.*

The encyclopedic knowledge tied to the verb root is not enough when it comes to determining the particular event and event participants described by the sentences in (180)a–c. Instead, a context providing a frame of interpretation reducing the number of potential objects is needed. As we can see in (181)–(183), IOR examples of these verbs occur in corpora, and the linguistic context in each example frames the interpretation of the objects, as well as the interpretation of the events.

(181) *Skapade hela dagen igår och det kändes väldigt skönt.*

‘I was creating all day yesterday and it felt very nice.’

(182) *Alice och hennes man var de första som byggde i kvarteret.*

‘Alice and her husband were the first ones in the block to build.’

(183) *Hon spelade i landslaget.*

‘She played in the national team.’

Although you can create/build/play many different things, the specific reference of what was created/built/played is neither available nor important in
these sentences. In other words, these examples do not qualify as IOO examples, but still qualify as cases of IOR. Nevertheless, it is clear that the context favors some interpretations and rules others out. In (181), we can draw the conclusion that it is some kind of creative activity that is being described. Thus, the subject referent could have been creating visual art or music or poetry but not e.g. chances in a soccer game, which could have been the case in another context, see (184).

(184) Boateng slet och **skapade** hela matchen. (Google)  
Boateng struggled and created the entire game.

Likewise, in (182) the context implies that it was a house that was built but the sentence does not exclude other readings entirely, which we can see if we add a preceding sentence, see (185).

(185) Många i området har lärt sig **bygga** cyklar. Alice och hennes man var de första som **byggde** i kvarteret.  
‘Many people in the area have learnt how to build bikes. Alice and her husband were the first ones in their block to build.’

Finally, in (183) we can tell from there being a national team that it is probably some kind of sport that is played, and not music or theater, but there is still no specific referent and we do not have to know exactly which sport the playing event concerns. Another context could give us another frame of interpretation, as in (186).

(186) Wu-Tang Clan **spelade** på stora scenen. (Parole)  
‘Wu-Tang Clan played on the main stage.’

Importantly, both of the **spela** ‘play’ examples in (183) and (186) could include objects as well, see (187)–(188).

(187) Hon spelade ishockey i landslaget.  
‘She played hockey in the national team.’

(188) Wu-Tang Clan spelade sina låtar på stora scenen.  
‘Wu-Tang Clan played their songs on the main stage.’

Just like other incremental theme verbs, the verbs in this section are unspecified for telicity, as we can see in (189)–(192).
It seems clear that although some incremental theme verbs are highly sensitive to context, that context dependence does not make the objectless sentences in (181)–(183) cases of IOO. Put differently, the examples in this section need a more specific frame of interpretation than the IOR diagnostic provides in order for the events to be interpretable, but since no specific object referent is required, they are still cases of IOR. Thus, with vague IOR verbs the hearer needs some kind of clue, but not in order to resolve the reference of some object (which is still irrelevant or unknown) but to identify which playing event is involved (for instance the playing of an instrument or the playing of a sport).

Other pseudo-transitive verbs that behave similarly are, for instance, the household chore verbs skära ‘cut’ and hacka ‘chop’ see (193)a–b. Just like for (180), the examples in (193)a–b are judged infelicitous for encyclopedic rather than syntactic reasons, hence the hash mark (#).

(193) Vad gjorde du igår kväll?
‘What did you do last night?’

a. #Jag skar.
   I cut
   ‘I was cutting.’

b. #Jag hackade.
   I chopped
   ‘I was chopping.’

Just like the verbs bygga ‘build’, skapa ‘create’ and spela ‘play’ above, the verbs skära ‘cut’ and hacka ‘chop’ are attested in IOR uses in corpora,

(189) Sally håller på och spelar ishockey. ⇒ Sally har spelat ishockey.
‘Sally is playing hockey.’
‘Sally has played hockey.’

(190) Sally håller på och spelar en match. ⇒ Sally har spelat en match.
‘Sally is playing a game.’
‘Sally has played a game.’

(191) Sally håller på och skapar musik. ⇒ Sally har skapat musik.
‘Sally is creating music.’
‘Sally has created music.’

(192) Sally håller på och skapar en låt. ⇒ Sally har skapat en låt.
‘Sally is creating a song.’
‘Sally has created a song.’

Vad gjorde du igår kväll?
(193) ‘What did you do last night?’

a. #Jag skar.
   I cut
   ‘I was cutting.’

b. #Jag hackade.
   I chopped
   ‘I was chopping.’

Just like the verbs bygga ‘build’, skapa ‘create’ and spela ‘play’ above, the verbs skära ‘cut’ and hacka ‘chop’ are attested in IOR uses in corpora,
although infelicitous in the IOR diagnostic. Corpus examples are given in (194)–(195).

(194) för jag stod och skar hela dagen i går. (Google)
   *for I stood and cut whole day in yesterday*
   ‘because I was cutting all day yesterday.’

(195) Flera timmar stod vi och knådade, kryddade och hackade i köket. (Google)
   *several hours stood we and kneaded, seasoned and chopped in kitchen.*
   ‘We were kneading, seasoning and chopping for several hours in the kitchen.’

In (194) we have yet another example with pseudo-coordination, and in (195) there is a coordination structure where three different verbs are all used without their respective potential object arguments. Specific syntactic constructions like pseudo-coordinations and coordinations and their influence on IOR acceptance is discussed in section 3.7. For now, let us just note that the potential object interpretations in (194)–(195) are narrowed down by the context. This in turn narrows down the potential event interpretations, just as it does for the verbs skapa ‘create’, bygga ‘build’ and spela ‘play’ discussed above. Also, just like those verbs, skära ‘cut’ and hacka ‘chop’ are unspecified for telicity and take incremental themes, see (196)–(199).

(196) Sally håller på och skär gurka. ⇒ Sally har skurit gurka.
   *Sally keep at and cut cucumber*          *Sally has cut cucumber*
   ‘Sally is cutting cucumber.’              ‘Sally has cut cucumber.’

(197) Sally håller på och skär en gurka. ⊳ Sally har skurit en gurka.
   *Sally keep at and cut a cucumber*       *Sally has cut a cucumber*
   ‘Sally is cutting a cucumber.’            ‘Sally has cut a cucumber.’

(198) Sally håller på och hackar lök. ⇒ Sally har hackat lök.
   *Sally keep at and chop onion*           *Sally has chopped onion*
   ‘Sally is chopping onions.’              ‘Sally has chopped onions.’

(199) Sally håller på och hackar en lök. ⊳ Sally har hackat en lök.
   *Sally keep at and chop an onion*        *Sally has chopped an onion*
   ‘Sally is chopping an onion.’             ‘Sally has chopped an onion.’

This flexibility in telicity adds to the characterization of these verbs as pseudo-transitive verbs. Thus, despite their initially unclear IOR status, these verbs do qualify as IOR verbs.
3.5.2 Verbs with conventionalized meanings

For some verbs, there is a conventionalized meaning linked to some objectless uses of the verb. Consider e.g. the consumption verbs *dricka* ‘drink’ in (200)a and *röka* ‘smoke’ in (200)b.

\begin{align*}
\text{(200)} \ & \text{Vad gjorde du igår kväll?} \\
& \text{‘What did you do last night?’}
\end{align*}

a. Jag drack.
\hspace{1cm} I drank
\hspace{1cm} ‘I was drinking (alcohol).’

b. Jag rökte.
\hspace{1cm} I smoked
\hspace{1cm} ‘I was smoking (a cigarette).’

Thus, as we can see, these verbs accept IOR in the IOR diagnostic, but there is a conventionalized interpretation of the event and event participants. Although you can drink and potentially also smoke a number of things, the default interpretation of the event in (200)a is not that the subject referent drank some beverage in general (like for instance water), but some alcoholic beverage(s). Likewise in (200)b, depending on the hearer’s own cultural (or subcultural) frame of reference and their knowledge about the participant expressed by the subject, the second event participant will be interpreted as either a cigarette, a cigar, a joint or some other object; it will not be interpreted as some general smoking device or substance you can smoke (and certainly not fish, which would involve a resultative reading of the verb). If there is any uncertainty about the substance involved, the hearer would need to ask the speaker for further information.

In contexts other than the IOR diagnostic, readings other than the default ones are possible, even if the object is not expressed. This is particularly clear with the verb *dricka* ‘drink’, see (201).

\begin{align*}
\text{(201)} \ & \text{Elsa drack ordentligt efter träningen idag.} \\
& \hspace{1cm} \text{Elsa drank properly after practice the today} \\
& \hspace{1cm} \text{‘Elsa drank properly after practice today.’}
\end{align*}

In (201), the default interpretation would be that Elsa was drinking water, since that is what you normally do after a workout, especially if you do it properly as in this case.

Both *dricka* ‘drink’ and *röka* ‘smoke’ are consumption verbs with incremental theme objects, see (202)–(205).

\begin{align*}
\text{(202)} \ & \text{Sally håller på och dricker vatten.} \Rightarrow \text{Sally har druckit vatten.} \\
& \hspace{1cm} \text{Sally keep at and drink water} \hspace{1cm} \text{Sally has drunk water} \\
& \hspace{1cm} \text{‘Sally is drinking water.’} \hspace{1cm} \text{‘Sally has drunk water.’}
\end{align*}
Since *dricka* ‘drink’ and *röka* ‘smoke’ take incremental themes, it is not strange that they accept IOR. The special meanings evoked by these verbs when uttered in IOR out of the blue are thus not directly related to verb semantic-syntactic structure, but to encyclopedic conventionalized meanings. It is beyond the scope of this work to explain how conventionalized meanings arise. Nevertheless, I consider it relevant to point out that conventionalized uses and idiosyncratic encyclopedic knowledge also seem to be part of the argument realization patterns of particular verbs, or at least of the interpretation of an IOR event. We have seen that the less conventionalized meanings need a contextual frame of interpretation to narrow the possible interpretations down. It is possible that a realized object is sometimes needed to describe a non-conventionalized event, and that these less typical meanings subsequently are less disposed for IOR uses in a neutral context.

Conventionalized idiosyncrasies are not restricted to incremental theme verbs. Other verbs displaying partly similar behavior include the perception verbs *se* ‘see’, *höra* ‘hear’ but also a resultative verb like *hitta* ‘find’. In contrast to the verbs just discussed, these three verbs do not accept IOR in the IOR diagnostic, see (206).

(206)  
*Vad gjorde du igår kväll?*  
‘What did you do last night?’

a. *Jag såg.*  
*I saw*

b. *Jag hörde.*  
*I heard*

c. *Jag hittade.*  
*I found*

However, they can still be found without objects in language use. In those cases, they seem to describe cognitive understanding or ability rather than the perception of some object, see (207)–(209).
(207) Nu såg hon klart. (Parole)

now saw she clearly

‘She saw clearly now.’

(208) Jag körde ner duskmunstycket under vattnet,

I drove down shower.mouthpiece.the under water.the

så att vi hörde bättre. (Bloggmix 2011)

so that we heard better

‘I put the shower head in the water so that we could hear better.’

(209) Jag hittade till vårdcentralen. (Bloggmix 2007)

I found to health.care.center.the

‘I found my way to the health care center.’

The examples in (207)–(209) seem to share a component of ‘being able’, ‘understanding’ or ‘realizing’. The seeing in (207) implies that the subject referent realizes something as a consequence of seeing (metaphorically or not), likewise the hearing event in (208) implies that the subject referent is able to understand some sounds by filtering others out, and (209) indicates that the subject referent was able to get to the health care center, or understood how to get there. These verbs seem to appear without objects only in examples like the ones in (207)–(209), and crucially not in the perception meaning of se ‘see’ or hör ‘hear’, nor in the resultative meaning of hitta ‘find’. The verb meanings in (207)–(209) could thus in some respect be said to represent verbs other than the usual verb meanings associated with these particular strings of sounds. In other words, the IOR versions of se ‘see’, hör ‘hear’ and hitta ‘find’ could potentially be viewed as instances of lexical verbs other than the perception or resultative verbs they are when having an object. In that case, it is a matter of two distinct lexical specifications for each verb se ‘see’ and so on, instead of a regular argument alternation as in the case of dricka ‘drink’ and other consumption verbs.

3.5.3 Verbs of destruction

As demonstrated in table 1 in section 2.1.2, many verbs that could be labeled verbs of destruction, for instance förstöra ‘destroy’, bränna ‘burn’, plundra ‘plunder’ and döda ‘kill’, appear to be quite common in objectless sentences. However, they do not accept IOR in the IOR diagnostic:

(210) Vad gjorde du igår kväll?

‘What did you do last night?’

a. *Jag förstörde.

I destroyed
b. *Jag brände.
   I burned

c. *Jag plundrade.
   I plundered

d. *Jag dödade.
   I killed

Generally, when these verbs occur without objects in corpora, the context does not provide a salient referent, as demonstrated in (211), repeated here from (16).

(211) Dom river sönder, dom ödelägger, dom förstör. (Bloggmix 2011)
   they tear apart, they desolate, they destroy
   ‘They tear apart, they desolate, they destroy.’

Instead, examples like (211) are typically interpreted as habitual or generic. In very specific contexts, verbs of destruction can also occur in IOO. In the episodic sentence in (212), the interpretation is restricted by the context, more specifically by the fact that the wh-question implies that something was destroyed by some people.\(^{22}\)

(212) Vilka var de som förstörde på Isabellas fest? (Bloggmix 2012)
   who.PL were it that destroyed at Isabella’s party
   ‘Who destroyed [whatever was destroyed] at Isabella’s party?’

Compare (212) with the marginally acceptable example in (213), where no such implication naturally arises. Compare also to the corpus example in (214), which is a headline of a news article and of a type typical for headlines.

(213) ??Gästerna förstörde på Isabellas fest.
   guests.the destroyed at Isabella’s party

(214) Vandaler förstörde på förskolan (Google)
   vandals destroyed at preschool.the
   ‘Vandals destroyed [stuff] at the preschool.’

The headline context in (214) clearly reports a particular event where (some parts of) the preschool have been destroyed. The reader expects to find more

\(^{22}\)There is also the complicating matter of the verb förstöra ‘destroy, ruin’ implying that you ruin something for someone. Thus, in (212) the intended meaning could be that some people ruined the party for the guests and/or the hostess. However, a more natural way to convey that meaning would be not to include the preposition på ‘at’, as in (i):

(i) Vilka var det som förstörde Isabellas fest?
   who was it that destroyed Isabella’s party
   ‘Who destroyed Isabella’s party?’
information regarding what was destroyed in the following news article. In other words, it is a case of IOO. Nevertheless, it is clear that although possible, IOO is quite restricted with destruction verbs.

Verbs of destruction are also different from clear cases of IOR verbs when it comes to sensitivity to the quantizedness of the object with respect to telicity. Instead, in telicity tests the destruction verbs behave just like the transitive \([\text{init, proc}]\) verbs in section 3.4.2:

\begin{align*}
(215) \quad & \text{Sally håller på och förstör bilar.} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{Sally har förstört bilar.} \\
& \text{Sally keep at and destroy cars} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{Sally has destroyed cars.} \\
& \text{‘Sally is destroying cars.’} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{‘Sally has destroyed cars.’}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(216) \quad & \text{Sally håller på och förstör bilen.} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{Sally har förstört bilen.} \\
& \text{Sally keep at and destroy car.the} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{Sally has destroyed car.the} \\
& \text{‘Sally is destroying the car.’} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{‘Sally has destroyed the car.’}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(217) \quad & \text{Sally håller på och plundrar affärer.} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{Sally har plundrat affärer} \\
& \text{Sally keep at and plunder stores} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{Sally has plundered stores} \\
& \text{‘Sally is plundering stores.’} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{‘Sally has plundered stores.’}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(218) \quad & \text{Sally håller på och plundrar affären.} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{Sally har plundrat affären.} \\
& \text{Sally keep at and plunders store.the} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{Sally has plundered store.the} \\
& \text{‘Sally is plundering the store.’} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{‘Sally has plundered the store.’}
\end{align*}

It is clear that in an event where Sally is destroying cars, as in (215), it is implied that Sally has been engaged in destroying cars for a while. Likewise, there is no natural endpoint at which the event \textit{förstöra bilen} ‘destroy the car’ is completed. Thus, when Sally has destroyed the car in (216), she might very well continue to destroy the car. Phrased the other way around, if Sally is destroying the car, it is true that she has destroyed the car for a while. The same types of readings hold for \textit{plundra} ‘plunder’ in (217)–(218). This makes the verbs of destruction different from IOR verbs. The non-sensitivity with respect to quantizedness is possibly made clearer in (219)–(220), where we can see that atelic as well as telic interpretations are available.

\begin{align*}
(219) \quad & \text{Sally förstörde bilen i tio minuter/på tio minuter.} \\
& \text{Sally destroyed car.the for ten minutes in ten minutes} \\
& \text{‘Sally destroyed the car for ten minutes/in ten minutes.’}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(220) \quad & \text{Sally plundrade affären i tio minuter/på tio minuter.} \\
& \text{Sally plundered store.the for ten minutes in ten minutes} \\
& \text{‘Sally plundered the store for ten minutes/in ten minutes.’}
\end{align*}

Another indication that destruction verbs are not IOR verbs is the fact pointed out by Ramchand (2008:70) that some adverbials, like \textit{a little}, are compatible with \texttt{UNDERGOER}-objects but not with \texttt{RHEME}-objects. This
observation holds for Swedish as well, as we can see in (221), which has an **UNDERGOER** object, in (222), which has a **RESULTEE-UNDERGOER** object, and in (223) which has a **DP RHEME** object.

(221) Elsa puttade bilen lite.

> *Elsa pushed car.the little*

‘Elsa pushed the car a little.’

(222) Elsa öppnade dörren lite.

> *Elsa opened door.the little*

‘Elsa opened the door a little.’

(223) *Elsa åt potatisen lite.

> *Elsa ate potato.the little*

Also, it is clearly the case that the adverbial *lite* ‘a little’ specifies the result state of the [init, proc, res] verb öppna ‘open’, whereas it specifies either the duration of the process or the change of location involved with the transitive [init, proc] verb putta ‘push’. The destruction verbs seem to group with the [init, proc] verbs in that they specify either the process or the change of state:

(224) Elsa förstörde bilen lite.

> *Elsa destroyed car.the little*

‘Elsa destroyed the car a little.’

(225) Elsa plunderade affären lite.

> *Elsa plundered store.the little*

‘Elsa plundered the store a little.’

(226) Elsa vandaliserade lekplatsen lite.

> *Elsa vandalized playground.the little*

‘Elsa vandalized the playground a little.’

(227) Elsa brände gröten lite.

> *Elsa burned porridge.the little*

‘Elsa burned the porridge a little.’

(228) Elsa dödade stämningen lite.

> *Elsa killed mood.the little*

‘Elsa killed the mood a little.’

For bränna ‘burn’ and döda ‘kill’, the change of state interpretation is strongly favored, but it is not the only option as with öppna ‘open’. In a naïve understanding of resultativity, the destruction verbs are resultative. However, since the resultative reading is not necessary, the resultativity can hardly be inherent to the structure of the verbs. For the [init, proc, res] verbs like öppna ‘open’ in section 3.4.1, I demonstrated their inherent resultativity.
with the *again*-test. Employing the same diagnostic for verbs of destruction yields results that are somewhat hard to interpret. For the verbs *förstöra* ‘destroy’, *plundra* ‘plunder’ *vandalisera* ‘vandalize’, and *ödelägga* ‘desolate’, the diagnostic at first seems to fall out in favor of inherent resultativity:

(229) Elsa förstörde bilen igen.  
\(\text{Elsa destroyed car.the again}\)  
⇒ ‘Elsa has destroyed the car before.’ (repetitive)  
Or: ‘The car has been destroyed before.’ (restitutive)

(230) Elsa plundrade affären igen.  
\(\text{Elsa plundered store.the again}\)  
⇒ ‘Elsa has plundered the store before.’ (repetitive)  
Or: ‘The store has been plundered before.’ (restitutive)

(231) Elsa vandaliserade lekplatsen igen.  
\(\text{Elsa vandalised playground.the again}\)  
⇒ ‘Elsa has vandalised the playground before.’ (repetitive)  
Or: ‘The playground has been vandalised before.’ (restitutive)

(232) Stormen ödelade staden igen.  
\(\text{storm.the desolated city.the again}\)  
⇒ ‘The storm has desolated the city before.’ (repetitive)  
Or: ‘The city has been desolated before.’ (restitutive)

For related verbs, however, the test raises questions. Whereas both repetitive and restitutive readings are available, the interpretations are special in that they evoke a type-reading of the object, rather than an individual-reading:

(233) Elsa brände gröten igen.  
\(\text{Elsa burned porridge.the again}\)  
⇒ ‘Elsa has burned the porridge before.’ (repetitive)  
Or: ‘The porridge has been burned before.’ (restitutive)

(234) Elsa dödade/mördade krukväxterna igen.  
\(\text{Elsa killed murdered plants.the again}\)  
⇒ ‘Elsa has killed/murdered the plants before.’ (repetitive)  
Or: ‘The plants have been killed/murdered before.’ (restitutive)

In (233)–(234), it is hardly the same particular porridge or plants that are *burned/killed/murdered*, but rather a member of a set from which another member has previously been exposed to the action denoted by the verb. This type reading is actually also available in (229)–(232), although in a less straightforward manner. If something has been destroyed (or plundered, vandalized etc.), the destroyed object can often be restored to its previous
state. Consider an example like (235), where a city has been destroyed and built up again from scratch:

(235) Vesuvius förstörde Pompeji igen.

‘Vesuvius destroyed Pompeii again.’

It is clear that we think of Pompeii as the same city before, after and in-between the earthquake and the volcanic eruption, although the physical material in the city has been replaced. By contrast, [init, proc, res] verbs like öppna ‘open’ and fylla ‘fill’ typically involve the same physical object when the event is repeated. In other words, there is clearly some kind of gradual difference involved with respect to our conceptualization of physical objects having the same identity or not. It is also the case that a door is designed for repeatedly being opened (and closed), and a bottle for being filled, emptied and re-filled, whereas to my knowledge there is no physical object in the world (neither a door nor a bottle nor a city) that is designed for being destroyed (nor rebuilt). 23

However, the judgments of (229)–(234) are equal for the repetitive and the restitutive readings. The interpretations appear to promote a reading where the object in the repeated event or restored state is either a modified version of the same (physical) object (229)–(232) or a different member of the same set (233)–(234). The fact that the object cannot refer to the same exact individual in a repeated event indicates that the verbs are not inherently resultative, although they get a resultative reading with a type interpretation of the object. In other words, since the resultative reading is not necessary, I draw the conclusion that the destruction verbs are not specified for res, but that they are instead transitive [init, proc] verbs. I will return to an analysis of objectless examples like (211) in chapter 5 and treat them as cases of IOK.

3.5.4 Summary of unclear cases

Most verbs covered in section 3.5 do not pass the IOR diagnostic, but for separate reasons. The vague verbs like skapa ‘create’ presented in 3.5.1, require a more defined context for the IOR uses to be felicitous, i.e. the set of potential objects and events described by the verb needs some narrowing for the intended meaning to come through, although the object is still non-specific and irrelevant once the appropriate verb meaning is clear. For the verbs in 3.5.2, the case is more or less the opposite, i.e. in a neutral context the objectless use of the verbs is associated with a conventionalized meaning. For some of those, like dricka ‘drink’, the IOR meaning is simply a

23 For physical objects that are designed for destruction, such as fireworks or bombs, the type of event described by destruction verbs typically leads to their malfunctioning.
more specialized variant of the more general meaning, whereas for others, like *se* ‘see’, the objectless use could instead be analyzed as a distinct verb, although I leave whether or not this is related to systematic flexibility an open matter. Thus, the verbs presented in subsections 3.5.1–3.5.2 could be analyzed as IOR verbs when used without objects, although there are some restrictions regarding their IOR interpretations. In other words, the unclear status of these verbs remains with respect to their sensitivity to context and to their rejection of the IOR diagnostic, but in most other respects they seem to behave like IOR verbs, and consequently I have classified the verbs in 3.5.1–3.5.2 as [init, proc] verbs.

The unclear status of the destruction verbs in 3.5.3 is different from the verbs in the preceding subsections. They are unclear in the sense that they are frequent in objectless sentences without salient specific object referents in corpora, but judging from the IOR tests and telicity tests, they are not IOR verbs. Instead, I have concluded that they are transitive [init, proc] verbs and that they are special in the respect that they evoke a type-reading of their objects when used in the *again*-test. The objectless uses of verbs of destruction will be studied in chapter 5.

### 3.6 IOR in resultative constructions

In sections 3.3–3.5, I showed that IOR is incompatible with inherently resultative verbs, and that the potential objects of IOR verbs are semantically-syntactically distinct from objects of other verbs, i.e. they are RHEMES rather than UNDERGOERS. Since RHEMES are placed in the complement of *proc* just like the *resP*, RHEMES are incompatible with a *resP* in the verb phrase. This should be the case even if the *res*-head is introduced by some other element than the verb, as in the case of resultative constructions. In this section we will consider data showing that this is the case, confirming observations by e.g. Mittwoch (2005:240f.). But we will also see that IOR verbs are not always incompatible with *res*-heads, i.e. if the optional RHEME-object is not realized in the syntax the verb can combine with some resultative constructions instead.

Various types of resultative constructions (e.g. the *way* construction, resultative PPs and the fake reflexive) are known to affect the argument realization of verbs (cf. e.g. Goldberg 1995). Resultative constructions, just like inherently resultative verbs, involve actions that create a change of state or location of the UNDERGOER argument. This resulting state is expressed in a result phrase (making the participant not only an UNDERGOER but also a RESULTEE, i.e. a participant with the composite role of RESULTEE-UNDERGOER).

In the following subsections, I will present data with verbs in the fake reflexive and then with resultative particles. I will demonstrate the relation-
ships between IOR restrictions and resultativity by presenting one verb from each set of verbs in sections 3.3–3.5. When idiosyncrasies arise within a set of verbs, I will present data with the best fitting verb in the particular construction, and each subsection concludes with a verb phrase analysis of the different verbs in the resultative construction under discussion.

3.6.1 The fake reflexive

In the fake reflexive (see e.g. Rappaport Hovav & Levin 2001) the verb takes a non-selected argument in the form of a reflexive pronoun and a predicative expression denoting a result state of the subject referent, as in (236).

(236) Beda åt sig mätt.
    Beda ate REFL full
    ‘Beda ate herself full.’

The reflexive pronoun cannot be an argument of the verb on its own, but needs the result state there to make the sentence grammatical, see the ungrammatical example in (237).

(237) *Beda åt sig.
    Beda ate REFL

This is because sig is not a participant in the event, and it does not express an argument that could be interpreted as a RHEME, i.e. it does not measure out the event denoted by the verb äta ‘eat’ (like object arguments of äta ‘eat’ normally do).

The reflexive pronoun cannot be replaced by a non-reflexive object referring to some other referent, as showed in (238).

(238) *Beda åt Emil mätt.
    Beda ate Emil full

In this respect, the fake reflexive can be said to block the RHEME object from being realized, since an object argument cannot be expressed on top of the reflexive pronoun that has taken its place, see (239).

(239) a. *Beda åt sig tårtan mätt.
    Beda ate REFL cake.the full

b. *Beda åt tårtan sig mätt.
    Beda ate cake.the REFL full

If we want to specify what (type of) food or edible substance it was that Beda ate, we have to use an optional prepositional adjunct phrase describing how Beda ended up full, as in (240).
(240) Beda åt sig mätt på tårta.
  Beda ate REFL full on cake
  ‘Beda ate herself full on cake.’

In (241)–(243) we can see that incremental theme verbs, i.e. the clear IOR verbs from section 3.3, can easily be used in the fake reflexive.

(241) Hon åt sig mätt. (Bloggmix 2011)
  she ate REFL full
  ‘She ate herself full.’

(242) treåriga Amina som på knä sopade sig svettig (Google)
  three.year Amina who on knee swept REFL sweaty
  ‘three-year-old Amina whom on her knees swept herself sweaty’

(243) Medan Glen sågade sig svettig packade jag. (Google)
  while Glen sawed REFL sweaty packed I
  ‘While Glen sawed himself sweaty, I was packing.’

Fake reflexive readings are however unacceptable with non-IOR verbs, see (244)–(246).

(244) *Helen öppnade sig trött.
  Helen opened REFL tired

(245) *Helen puttade sig trött.
  Helen pushed REFL tired

(246) *Helen hatade sig ledsen.
  Helen hated REFL sad

The verbs from section 3.5 (Unclear cases) are not that unclear anymore in the fake reflexive. The verbs with vague or conventionalized meanings accept IOR in the fake reflexive just as well as the clear IOR verbs, see (247)–(249), whereas the verbs of destruction behave just like the putta ‘push’ verbs, as expected from the [init, proc] specification that I assumed in the previous section.

(247) Pianisten spelade sig varm där inne. (Google)
  pianist.the played REFL warm there inside
  ‘The pianist played himself warm in there.’

(248) Han rökte sig hög på en joint. (Google)
  he smoked REFL high on a joint
  ‘He got high on a joint.’

(249) de trodde på fyra stycken partier som struntade i sin
  de believed in four pieces parties that disregarded in their
ideologi och helt såg sig blinda på makten.

ideology and whole saw REFL blind on power.

(Bloggmix 2006)

‘they believed in four parties that disregarded their ideology and completely blinded themselves from the power.’

(250) *Axel **plundrade** sig rik.

Axel plundered REFL rich.

(251) *Axel **dödade** sig impopulär.

Axel killed REFL unpopular

In Ramchand’s model, not all constructions known as resultatives involve a resultative subevent, but I propose that the fake reflexive does, at least for Swedish. In the decomposed verb phrase that I assume, there is a resP as a complement to the proc-head where the reflexive pronoun sig refers to the same participant as the subject of the sentence, which is also interpreted as the subject of the result state, see (252).

(252) Verb Phrase Structure of incremental theme verbs in the fake reflexive

![Diagram](image)

Instead of an optionally expressed RHEME in the complement of proc, the verb äta ‘eat’ here takes a resP small clause expressing a result state of the subject of the sentence (i.e. Beda, realized as the anaphor sig). As Ramchand (2008:123f.) points out, it is not clear what identifies the res head in this structure. It is clearly not identified by the incremental theme verb äta ‘eat’, which normally does not take a resP. Instead, like Ramchand does for similar resultative constructions in English, I propose that there is a silent res head in the small clause. This Ø-res requires a specifier that realizes the RESULTEE sig. It also provides the necessary ‘leads to’ semantics that gives rise to the result state of which the RESULTEE is the holder (see Ramchand 2008:124f.).
We can also see that the sentence in (253) is ruled out as ungrammatical, i.e. the otherwise optional object of the verb is impossible in the fake reflexive.

(253) *Alice åt äpplen sig mätt.

Alice ate apples REFL full

This naturally follows from the syntactic position of the RHEME being occupied by the resP. There simply cannot be two different complements of the same head in the decomposed verb phrase.

To summarize, verbs with UNDERGOER objects do not occur in the fake reflexive, whereas the IOR verbs do. In the fake reflexive, no RHEME argument can be expressed on top of the reflexive small clause, and the argument realizing the UNDERGOER-INITIATOR is the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun sig. In a three-partite verb phrase, this can be understood structurally as there being a silent res head that identifies a resP where the RESULTEE is coindexed with the UNDERGOER-INITIATOR argument. Since the UNDERGOER-INITIATOR is also the RESULTEE (the HOLDER of the result state), there cannot be an object argument on top of sig.

Verbs where the object realizes the UNDERGOER (i.e. process verbs with UNDERGOER objects and inherently resultative verbs with a composite RESULTEE-UNDERGOER object) do not accept the fake reflexive. Neither do stative verbs. All of these restrictions can be traced back to the respective verb phrase analysis for the different sets of verbs. Inherently resultative verbs already identify a resP, leaving no room for another one. Process verbs with a separate UNDERGOER argument like putta ‘push’ and förstöra ‘destroy’ are infelicitous because there cannot be another argument between the subject and the anaphor sig ‘herself/himself/itself/themselves’ without the derivation crashing (sig would be bound by the object instead of the subject), and stative verbs do not have a procP and so cannot have a resP in the complement of proc.

3.6.2 Resultative particles

Verb particles carry either bounded or unbounded meanings. This gives them the potential of enhancing a telic or atelic reading of a predicate. In this section, I am only concerned with the former ones, as in (254) where an already telic verb phrase (Johan åt kakan ‘Johan ate the cookie’) is combined with the bounded particle upp ‘up’.

---

24 In examples with particles, the particles are underscored in order not to confuse them with prepositions or adverbs. See e.g. Telemann et al. (1999, 3:417ff.), Svenonius (2003) and Larsson & Lundquist (2014) for characterizations of Swedish particles, which differ in certain respects from particles in other Scandinavian languages as well as from particles in English.
(254) Johan åt upp kakan.
   ‘Johan ate up the cookie.’

With Svenonius & Ramchand (2002) and Ramchand (2008), I analyze bounded particles as having a res feature, thus as being able to identify a res head. From this it follows that the objects of verbs with bounded particles should be obligatory, since the RESULTEE must be expressed in the syntax. As we can see in (255)–(256) this prediction holds for verbs from all the sets of verbs in 3.3–3.4. Although most of the verbs can take bounded particles when an object is expressed, they do not accept IOR with these particles (note, however, that some of these examples are acceptable in IOO).26

(255) Vad gjorde du igår?
   ‘What did you do last night?’
      I ate up *cookie.the
      ‘I ate up the cookie.’
   b. Jag sopade upp *(smulorna).
      I swept up *crumbs.the
      ‘I swept up the crumbs.’
      I sawed up *wood.the
      ‘I sawed up the wood.’

(256) Vad gjorde du igår?
   ‘What did you do last night?’
      I locked up *door.the
      ‘I unlocked the door.’
   b. Jag fyllde i *(blanketterna).
      I filled in *forms.the
      ‘I filled in the forms.’
      I carried in *wood.the
      ‘I carried the wood inside.’

25 Bounded particles can also combine with verbs that are inherently resultative, as with öppna upp ‘open up’. See Ramchand (2008:97f.) for a discussion of underassociated features.
26 For sopra ‘sweep’ in (255)b and other contact verbs from section 3.3.2, the particle requires their alternative theme argument instead of the location/surface argument. This alternation has no consequences for the IOR acceptability with particles, but for the IOO acceptability: (255)b is only interpretable if there is a salient theme argument like skräpet ‘the garbage’. 
What is relevant here for the understanding of IOR is why the verbs in (253) have an obligatory object when there is a bounded particle in the sentence, although the objects of these verbs are normally optional, and the objects are impossible in the fake reflexive.

The holder of the result state is instead realized as a separate argument. In (254), that would be *kakan* ‘the cookie’. This means, that while being a RHEME in (257)a, it is not in (257)b.

(257) a. Johan åt *kakan*.
   *Johan ate cookie.*
   ‘Johan ate the cookie.’

   b. Johan åt *upp* kakan.
   *Johan ate up cookie.*
   ‘Johan ate up the cookie.’

Also, the result state of a resultative particle construction can be expressed with a participle where the particle is incorporated into the state, see (258).

(258) a. *Kakan* är upptäten.
   *cookie. is up.eaten*
   ‘The cookie is eaten.’

   b. *Veden* är uppsågad.
   *wood. is up.cut*
   ‘The wood is sawn.’

Following Ramchand (2008:131f.), I assume a syntactic representation of resultative verb-particle constructions with IOR verbs as the one in (259).

(259) Verb phrase structure of IOR verbs with resultative particles

```
initP
 INITIATOR
    Johan
    init åt
    procP
    UNDERGOER
        proc åt
        resP
        RESULTEE
            res upp
            PP
            DP kakan
            p
            <upp>
```
As we can see in (259), the DP realizing the RESULTEE is inserted into two separate nodes. In English, this accounts for the flexibility in word order for verb-particle constructions. In Swedish, the particle always shifts over the DP, and the DP is realized in the specifier of the small clause PP. I leave it open whether or not the specifier of res should be left empty in the structure for Swedish. In (259), I have associated kakan ‘the cookie’ with both the specifier of PP and the specifier of resP, but nothing hinges on this analysis. For the purposes of understanding IOR, the most important detail in the structure in (259) is that kakan ‘the cookie’ is not realizing the RHEME role, but is a RESULTEE (of some kind) or at least a holder of a state, and as such licensed in a specifier position, which makes it obligatory as opposed to [init,, proc,] phrases where it is a RHEME.

These observations show that the concept of resultativity is essential for the understanding of IOR, not only when inherent in the verb but also when identified by a different lexical item in a resultative construction. In the fake reflexive, there is no place in the structure for an object. The complement of proc, where the RHEME otherwise would be, is occupied by the resP. The composite UNDERGOER-INITIATOR is the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun realizing the RESULTEE, and thus leaves no place for a separate object argument. In resultative particle constructions, on the other hand, the RESULTEE is separate from the UNDERGOER-INITIATOR and realized by the object, even when the object of the verb involved would normally be represented as a RHEME. In other words, the object argument kakan ‘the cookie’ would be a RHEME in (260)a but the holder of a result state in (260)b.

   
   Johan ate cookie.the
   ‘Johan ate the cookie.’

b. Johan åt upp kakan.
   
   Johan ate up cookie.the
   ‘Johan ate up the cookie.’

I still assume that the seemingly resultative state of the cookie in (260)a, where there is no particle, is a consequence of homomorphism, i.e. the quantized RHEME object kakan ‘the cookie’ provides a telic interpretation of the event, which in turn leads the hearer to draw the conclusion that the cookie is eaten. If the object would have been non-quantized, as in (261)a, the event would have been atelic. A resultative particle like upp ‘up’ obligatorily contributes with a telic interpretation of the event, and is therefore incompatible with a non-quantized object argument, see (261)b.

(261) a. Johan åt kakor.
   
   Johan ate cookies
   ‘Johan ate cookies.’
b. *Johan åt upp kakor.
   
   *Johan ate up cookies

Since the object argument kakan ‘the cookie’ in (260)b is the holder of the result state, it has to be identified in the structure as the specifier of the small clause PP and possibly also with the specifier of resP. Consequently, we do not see IOR in sentences with resultative particles. Instead, in order for the word string in (262) to be acceptable, there has to be an omitted but salient object argument involved (see chapter 4).

(262) *Johan åt upp.
   *Johan ate up

Once again, most of the unclear cases from section 3.5 behave like IOR verbs:

(263) Vad gjorde du igår?
   ‘What did you do last night?’

   *I played up a song
   ‘I played a song.’

   *I drank up wine
   ‘I finished my wine.’

c. #Jag såg upp.
   *I saw up
   ‘I looked out.’

d. *Jag plunderade upp/ut.
   *I plundered up out

e. *Jag dödade upp/ut.
   *I killed up out

In (263), the verbs with vague and conventionalized meanings group with the clear IOR verbs in that the object in a particle construction has to be either expressed or salient in the context. In (263)c, the particle construction involves a separate, non-resultative, meaning which allows an objectless use. For the verbs of destruction, there is to my knowledge no particle combination that would make any sense, which makes (263)d–e nonsensical as well as ungrammatical.
3.7 Common IOR contexts

In the previous section, I showed that the notion of resultativity is essential to the understanding of IOR, also when the revP is introduced by some other element than the verb. In other words, resultativity is involved in the restrictions on IOR. There are other contexts that do not relate so much to the IOR restrictions as to the appropriateness of IOR in language use. We typically find IOR examples in imperfective sentences, which go well with atelic events. In section 3.7.1, we will see that in verb phrase coordinations, IOR verbs are naturally coordinated with other (intransitive) process verbs like e.g. *prata* ‘talk’. In section 3.7.2, we will see that IOR verbs go well with pseudo-coordinations, which are known to contribute with imperfectivity in Swedish. Moreover, in 3.7.3, PP adjuncts that also contribute with imperfectivity will be demonstrated to combine well with IOR. These patterns are expected since imperfective settings are contexts where the process component of an event is focused, which is consistent with the prosessual core of IOR verbs (and other [init, proc] verbs).

Neither inherently resultative verbs nor stative verbs should be expected to go well with contexts where the process is focused, whereas we should expect [init, proc] verbs with UNDERGOER objects to be good in imperfective sentences as long as the object is expressed. Moreover, since quantized incremental themes give rise to a bounded reading of some events, such objects are not expected to be grammatical in imperfective sentences with IOR verbs, whereas non-quantized complements should be better.

Thus, the IOR contexts studied in this section do not affect the IOR acceptability among (sets of) verbs, but IOR appears to be more common in imperfective sentences. I will present data in the following subsections in order to prove this point.

3.7.1 Coordinations

Whereas verb phrase coordinations do not necessarily yield an imperfective interpretation, we can see in (264)–(268) that IOR verbs can be used quite naturally without an object when coordinated with other verbs.

(264) Vi *pysslar, bakar, pratar och läser* och jag hoppas det väger upp lite för utblivna kafferep och bilkörningar.

‘We fix, bake, talk and read, and I hope that can make up for the absent coffee parties and car rides.’

(Bloggmix 2014)
Och förutom detta lekte jag med Emelies hund, umgicks, städade, mockade, sopade, krättade,packade höpåsar, fyllde cleaned, dung,cleared swept raked packed hay,bags filled vatten, lindade om Pijanos bandage, ja, allt som tillhör! water winded on Pijano’s bandage yes all that pertains' (Bloggmix 2014) ‘And apart from this, I played with Emelie’s dog, mingled, cleaned, cleared out the dung, swept, raked, packed bags of hay, filled water, winded Pijano’s bandage, yes everything that pertains!’

Här har jag dammat, dammsugit och satt lite färsk blommor på skrivbordet. (Bloggmix 2014) flowers on desk.the ‘Here, I have dusted, vacuumed and put some fresh flowers on the desk.’

Idag ska vi njuta av soligt väder, mysan och så ska vi today will we enjoy of sunny weather relax and so will we mangle. (Bloggmix 2012) mangle ‘Today, we will enjoy the sun, relax and then we will mangle.’

Willie rökte, jag drack, bussen åkte. (Bloggmix 2014) Willie smoked I drank the bus.left ‘Willie smoked, I drank, the bus left.’

Also, when the IOR verbs are coordinated with non-IOR verbs with overt objects, as e.g. packa ‘pack’ and fylla ‘fill’ in (265), the IOR verbs are typically used without an object. For the non-IOR verbs, the pattern is also the expected one, i.e. in coordinations they typically have omitted objects with specific reference as in (269) or overt objects as in (270)–(271).

Han höll honom hela tiden, lekte, bar och klappade. he held him whole time. the played carried and petted (Bloggmix 2014) ‘He held him all the time, played [with him], carried [him] and petted [him].’

När vi skulle sova så tände och släckte when we would sleep so turn.on and turn.off

27 As pointed out in section 1.2, I do not analyze examples like (270)–(271) as involving any omitted objects.
hon lampan hela tiden. (Bloggmix 2008)
she lamp the whole time the
‘When we were going to sleep she kept turning the lamp on and off.’

(271) Jag älskade och hatade det. (Bloggmix 2014)
I loved and hated it
‘I loved [it] and [I] hated it.’

What might be surprising is that some [init, proc] verbs with UNDERGOER objects show up in what looks like IOR in coordinations, see (272).

(272) Han drog och slet och grät av frustration.
he pulled and tore and cried from frustration
(Bloggmix 2011)
‘He pulled and tore and cried from frustration.’

However, in (272), a DP object cannot be inserted, see (273).

(273) *Han drog och slet kläderna och grät av frustration.
he pulled and tore clothes the and cried from frustration

Instead, a PP complement is more natural, as in (274), in spite of the verb dra ‘pull’ otherwise being able to take DPs as well as PPs.

(274) Han drog och slet i kläderna och grät av frustration.
he pulled and tore in clothes the and cried from frustration
‘He pulled and tore at the clothes and cried from frustration.’

This might have to do with the fact that dra ‘pull’ here is coordinated with the verb slita ‘tear’, which does not take DP objects but only PPs. Consequently, the coordination in (272) also implies that the understood complement of the flexible [init, proc] verb dra ‘pull’ is a PP and not a DP. I will not elaborate on this alternation any further, but simply establish that coordination structures seem to promote IOR among IOR verbs whereas non-IOR verbs still do not accept IOR.

3.7.2 Pseudo-coordinations

Another context related to IOR is the progressive-like pseudo-coordination found with the position verbs stå ‘stand’, sitta ‘sit’ and ligga ‘lie’.28 In pseudo-coordinations, two verbs are seemingly coordinated, but the first verb functions more like a light verb and contributes with an imperfective

---

28 For an overview and analyses of pseudo-coordinations see e.g. Wiklund (2007) and Kvist Darnell (2008) for Swedish and Lødrup (2014) for Norwegian.
interpretation of the event expressed by the second verb. Sometimes there is also an adjunct after the first verb, as in (275), or after the second verb (276). In both cases, the adjunct specifies the time and/or place of the event.

(275) Jag stod i tvättstugan hela kvällen och manglade.
     *I stood in laundry: the whole night. the and mangled* (Bloggmix 2011)
     ‘I was in the laundry all night mangling.’

(276) Han stod och strök när skotten small. (Google)
     *he stood and ironed when shots. the boomed*
     ‘He was ironing when the shots boomed.’

As expected, whenever a non-IOR verb is used in a pseudo-coordination there is a specific object referent involved:

(277) Stod och beundrade min fina blombänk i flera minuter.
     *stood and admired my nice flower.box for several minutes* (Bloggmix 2011)
     ‘[I] was admiring my nice flower box for several minutes.’

It is not surprising that the verbs show the same patterns as for the coordinated verb phrases in the previous section, i.e. that IOR verbs occur without objects, whereas non-IOR verbs require objects. The difference is that the pseudo-coordinations exemplified here contribute with imperfectivity. Even a stative experiencer verb like beundra ‘admire’ in (277) gets a processual reading (but it still requires an overt object). What this shows is that imperfectivity alone is not enough for licensing implicit objects, although it combines well with the atelicity involved in IOR.

3.7.3 Prepositional adjuncts

Another context that improves the appropriateness of IOR is adjuncts (see e.g. Mittwoch 2005:242), as in the examples in (278)–(280) that all have manner PPs:

(278) Det lät raspigt och regelbundet, ungefär som om någon sågade med en väldigt liten såg.
     *it sounded scratchy and regular kind.of as if someone sawed with a very little saw* (Bloggmix 2009)
     ‘There was a scratchy and regular noise, kind of as if someone was sawing with a tiny saw.’

29 There are also pseudo-coordinations with the verbs gå ’go’ and komma ‘come’ but they are not unambiguously imperfective, which is why I confine the discussion here to the pseudo-coordinations with position verbs.
The PPs are not syntactically tied to the specific verbs but could be used to specify the manner, time or place for most events. When this extra information is introduced, it describes the process just like RHEME objects, which could optionally describe the process further in the above examples, as demonstrated in the modified versions in (281)–(283).

(281) Det lät raspigt och regelbundet, ungefär som om någon sågade ved med en väldigt liten såg.
‘There was a scratchy and regular noise, kind of like if someone was sawing wood with a tiny saw.’

(282) Dom tre större byggde hus med stenar och kastade några så långt dom kunde i havet!
‘The three older ones built houses with rocks and threw some [of them] as far as they could into the sea.’

(283) Vi rökte cigarrer genom takrutan och vinkade till folk som körde förbi.
‘We smoked cigars through the sunroof and waved to people driving past us.’

For verbs of destruction, we saw already in section 3.5.3 that some contexts with a PP can promote object omission, as in (214), repeated here as (284).
However, as argued in section 3.5.3, this is not a case of IOR but of IOK, as we will see in chapter 5. Thus, it is clearly not the case that PP adjuncts license IOR, although just like pseudo-coordinations, it goes well with the atelic IOR reading.

3.7.4 The IOR contexts in relation to the IOR diagnostic

Compared to the common IOR contexts presented in this chapter, the IOR diagnostic from section 3.2 has the advantage of being a clear IOR context, i.e. it is not so easily confused with IOO and IOK settings. The downside to the IOR diagnostic is that sentences with only a subject and a verb do not always seem that natural, especially if they would not be answers to a question but just uttered out of the blue. Thus, although being perfectly grammatical, the example in (285) is perhaps less natural and probably more peripheral in actual language use than the examples in (286)–(288).

(285) Alice åt.

Alice ate

‘Alice was eating.’

(286) Alice vaknade, läste och åt.

Alice awoke read and ate

‘Alice woke up, read [something] and ate [something].’

(287) Alice satt och åt.

Alice sat and ate

‘Alice were eating (sitting down).’

(288) Alice åt i köket.

Alice ate in kitchen

‘Alice was eating in the kitchen.’

The constructions in (286)–(288) do not only increase the focus on the process or in the case of (288) the location, they are also more informative than (285) and subsequently more felicitous in most communicative situations. The IOR contexts presented in this section could thus possibly be used as IOR diagnostics, in the sense that they display the same verb semantic-syntactic restrictions on IOR as the IOR diagnostic used in section 3.2. However, in these contexts it is more difficult to separate the IOR interpretation from possible IOO and IOK interpretations, which make them less suitable as IOR diagnostics in their own right.
3.8 An intransitivity account of IOR

The data presented so far in this chapter show that IOR in Swedish is restricted to incremental theme verbs. Inherently resultative verbs, verbs with separate UNDERGOER objects and stative verbs all resist IOR. In other words, several sets of verbs with different syntactic-semantic properties do not accept IOR, while only incremental theme verbs do. Against that background, IOR is expected to be explained by properties of the verbs accepting IOR rather than the ones resisting it, i.e. the IOR acceptability among incremental theme verbs should be what is interesting here rather than the IOR restrictions on other sets of (transitive) verbs. In this section, I am therefore concerned with the analysis of IOR verbs as intransitive verbs (3.8.1), and with the object status of RHEMES (3.8.2), whereas inherently resultative and stative verbs are more or less set aside. However, the IOR restrictions seem to cut right through the group of [init, proc] verbs, i.e. some of them appear to be flexible between [init, proc] and [init, proc,] uses. Therefore, restrictions related to the realization of participant roles and the potential flexibility among [init, proc] verbs with UNDERGOER objects are further elaborated upon in section 3.8.3. Finally, in section 3.8.4, I summarize my arguments for an intransitivity account of IOR and argue against detransitivization accounts of IOR.

3.8.1 IOR verbs as intransitive verbs

The textbook definition of intransitive verbs is that they are verbs that do not allow an object argument. There are, however, some well-known examples of intransitive verbs that do take DP objects. This is the case for many motion verbs where an optional path can be realized as a DP, and typically also for those verbs often analyzed as conflation verbs, see (289) from Ramchand (2008:72) and (290) from Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995:187).

(289) a. Michael ran the race.
     b. Ariel danced a waltz.

(290) a. Don’t expect to swim/jog yourself sober!
     b. He danced his feet sore.

As seen in (290), these verbs are also similar to IOR verbs with respect to their compatibility with the fake reflexive (cf. 3.6.1). Ramchand (2008) does not discuss IOR verbs at any length and consequently does not explicitly assume a structure for them, but in passing they are described as transitive [init, proc] verbs with an INITIATOR and a PATH/RHEME (Ramchand 2008:108), see table 2, page 125. Elsewhere, Ramchand treats pseudo-transitive verbs just like intransitive run verbs (Ramchand 2008:66). In any case, the two descriptions essentially reflect identical verb phrases, since the
transitive/intransitive distinction is a consequence of the realization of participant roles rather than a linguistic primitive. Put differently, verbs with the same lexical specifications, such as [init, proc] verbs, can be transitive, intransitive, or pseudo-transitive (disregarding the uncertain status of role specification in the lexicon). With that in mind, it is less important to draw a distinction in terms of transitivity between pseudo-transitive verbs and intransitive verbs than if the argument structure would have been explicitly specified in a lexical module (or elsewhere). In other words, my analysis of IOR verbs is similar to that of Ramchand (2008), regardless if the verbs are labeled transitive or intransitive, and just like her I leave the matter open as to whether or not the roles have to be specified. However, if we by transitive mean that a direct object is obligatory, then IOR verbs are intransitive, or in an even less technical sense pseudo-transitive.

3.8.1.1 The verb phrase structure of IOR verbs

In the syntactic analyses given so far we have seen that an incremental theme object corresponds to a RHEME in the Ramchandian decomposed verb phrase, unlike e.g. DP objects of verbs like *putta* ‘push’, which are UNDERGOERS. The syntactic difference between RHEMES and UNDERGOER objects is that RHEMES are realized in the complement of *proc*, whereas UNDERGOERS are realized in the specifier of *proc*. For incremental theme verbs, the UNDERGOER is not realized by the object. Instead, there is a composite UNDERGOER-INITIATOR realized by the subject of the sentence. For the sake of clarity, the verb phrase structure assumed for incremental theme verbs in section 3.3.4 is repeated in (291), here captioned as the verb phrase structure of IOR verbs and this time with the XP in the complement position marked as optional.

(291) Verb phrase structure of IOR verbs

![Diagram of verb phrase structure of IOR verbs]

The verb phrase I assume for IOR verbs in (291) is identical to Ramchand’s (2008) analysis of intransitive motion verbs, i.e. where the INITIATOR is also the UNDERGOER of the processual change. My analysis of incremental theme verbs thus entails that they identify the same heads in the verb phrase as

(292) Verb phrase structure of intransitive [init., proc.] verbs

Given that the verb phrase of motion verbs like *springa ‘run’ and incremental theme verbs like äta ‘eat’ is identical, the question arises as to why not all [init., proc.] verbs optionally take objects, or if they actually do. Compare the ‘pseudo-transitive’ [init., proc.] verb in (293) with the ‘intransitive’ [init., proc.] verb in (294).

(293) Elsa skrev en bok.  
Elsa wrote a book.  
‘Elsa wrote a book.’

(294) Elsa sprang ett lopp.  
Elsa ran a race.  
‘Elsa ran a race.’

Judging from the examples in (293)–(294), it is not clear what distinguishes the pseudo-transitive incremental theme verb in (293) from the intransitive [init., proc.] verb with the DP RHEME in (294), i.e. if there is a structural difference at all, and if so how this difference is to be characterized.

3.8.1.2 Possible objects and the realization of participant roles

It is well known that IOR verbs have quite a restricted set of possible objects, depending on the events described (cf. Rice 1988). This means that there has to be some restriction that rules out examples like (295).

(295) *Björn åt skogen.  
Björn ate forest.the

Ultimately, argument realization is a question not only of what the verbs and the verb phrase require, but also of what the potential arguments require to be properly licensed. It seems likely that some kind of relevant relationship
between the event and the argument has to be established somehow. Such a relationship can also be established by intransitive \([\text{init, proc}]\) verbs, which are known to sometimes occur with object DPs, as illustrated in (296)–(298).\textsuperscript{30 31}

\begin{itemize}
  \item (296) Björn sprang ett lopp.
    \begin{itemize}
      \item Björn ran a race
        \begin{itemize}
          \item ‘Björn ran a race.’
        \end{itemize}
    \end{itemize}
  
  \item (297) Björn arbetade kvällspasset.
    \begin{itemize}
      \item Björn worked evening.shift.the
        \begin{itemize}
          \item ‘Björn worked the evening shift.’
        \end{itemize}
    \end{itemize}
  
  \item (298) Björn sjöng en aria.
    \begin{itemize}
      \item Björn sang an aria
        \begin{itemize}
          \item ‘Björn sang an aria.’
        \end{itemize}
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

The fact that there are object DPs in the examples in (296)–(298) is generally not sufficient for the verbs to be characterized as transitive. However, that is not an argument against my analysis; instead, it actually supports it since the RHEME in (296) is very similar to the ones in (299)–(300) in that they give rise to telicity.

\begin{itemize}
  \item (299) Björn åt ett äpple.
    \begin{itemize}
      \item Björn ate an apple
        \begin{itemize}
          \item ‘Björn ate an apple.’
        \end{itemize}
    \end{itemize}
  
  \item (300) Björn läste en bok.
    \begin{itemize}
      \item Björn read a book
        \begin{itemize}
          \item ‘Björn read a book.’
        \end{itemize}
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

Unlike **UNDERGOER** objects, DP **RHEMES** serve the double purpose of introducing an event participant as well as providing an abstract path homomorphic to the event. Thus, the potential DP **RHEMES** for a particular verb must be able to carry out both of these tasks, i.e. apart from introducing an event participant, the DP **RHEME** must be able to provide an abstract scale that is somehow relevant to the event in question. Accordingly, the restrictions ruling out examples like (295) above belong to the more encyclopedic side of verb meaning. The example in (295) fails in establishing a relationship between the eating event and the intended object that holds in the

\textsuperscript{30} There is also a transitive \([\text{init, proc}]\) variant of **rabeta** ‘work’ as in **rabeta degen** ‘work the dough’, where the object is not an incremental theme.

\textsuperscript{31} For now, I analyze conflation verbs such as **sjunga** ‘sing’ as \([\text{init, proc}]\) verbs, although they in Ramchand’s analysis for English also carry a nominal specification (N) (see table 2 in section 3.8.3). Regardless of Swedish conflation verbs (which have marginally separate forms from the corresponding nouns) involving an N head or not, the roles that emerge are identical, i.e. a composite **UNDERGOER-INITIATOR** role.
world as we know it. As far as I can tell, such failed establishments can come about in at least three separate ways. In (295), the object could very well be felicitous in a possible world where Björn was, for instance, a giant. The DP skogen ‘the forest’ does give rise to a path structure that in a possible world populated by giants could be compatible with the verb äta ‘eat’. Therefore, (295) is ungrammatical due to restrictions on the world, rather than on language. In (301), however, skogen ‘the forest’ instead fails in providing a relevant scale homomorphic to the running event denoted by the verb, regardless of possible worlds.

(301) *Björn sprang skogen.
    Björn ran forest.the

Put differently, in (301) the DP skogen ‘the forest’ simply does not give rise to an abstract path transparent enough for an incremental relationship to the event to be established, and there is no way for the hearer to find a relevant interpretation of the sentence. This contrasts with examples like (302) where a relevant interpretation could be found had the verb been more flexible with respect to the role realization. In other words, if the verb springa ‘run’ also could have been used to describe processes that are not self-initiating, there would have been a possible interpretation consistent with (302), although the example is clearly ungrammatical in Swedish.

(302) *Björn sprang hunden.
    Björn ran dog.the

What yields the ungrammaticality of (302) thus is the choice of verb. There are other verbs with a meaning similar to the intended meaning of (302), such as the verb in (303).32

(303) Björn rastade hunden.
    Björn walked dog.the
    ‘Björn walked the dog.’

The difference between the ungrammaticality in (301) and the ungrammaticality in (302) is that in the former the DP fails in providing a path homomorphic to the event, whereas in the latter, the [init, proc] verb cannot be used as an [init, proc] verb and take a separate UNDERGOER object. Thus, there are at least three distinct types of ungrammatical verb-object relations involved with [init, proc] verbs. The two former ones have to do with the relationship between the event and world knowledge, one of which involves the real world (295), and the other a possible world (301). The third type has to do with the relationship between the verb and the event it describes, and is

---
32 Incidentally, the English translation of (303) involves an [init, proc] verb (walk) with an unselected object (the dog) that transforms the verb into an [init, proc] verb with a separate UNDERGOER (walk the dog) (cf. Ramchand 2008:117).
thus more structural in that it involves restrictions on the realization of argument roles (302). Consequently, the latter is not really a restriction on [init, proc] verbs but on (transitive) [init, proc] readings of an otherwise intransitive [init, proc] verb. This means that unlike common definitions of intransitive verbs as syntactically incompatible with objects, the restriction on taking (rhemetic) complements is highly encyclopedic in character. Put another way, [init, proc] verbs can take RHEME objects as long as the objects are encyclopedically compatible with the event. Accordingly, the restrictions involved are not primarily syntactic.

Whereas an analysis of IOR verbs as intransitive in contrast to detransitivization accounts of IOR does not have to account for the omission of an object (since there is no such object involved in IOR), an intransitivity analysis instead has to explain why not all intransitive process verbs have optional RHEME arguments. My proposal is that they actually do, i.e. syntactically all [init, proc] verbs can combine with a RHEME in the complement of proc. The well-known restrictions on the possible objects of such verbs are instead related to world knowledge and particularly to the ability of providing the verb phrase with a relevant scalar structure.

A trivial but nonetheless crucial consequence of Ramchand’s system is that an object DP can realize different roles in separate structures and as such be inserted into two separate ‘object positions’. Consider the DP object äpplet ‘the apple’ in the two different examples in (304)-(305).

(304) Elsa åt äpplet.
   Elsa ate apple.the
   ‘Elsa ate the apple.’

(305) Elsa bar äpplet till vardagsrummet.
   Elsa carried apple.the to living.room.the
   ‘Elsa carried the apple to the living room.’

For the verb äta ‘eat’, the UNDERGOER is conflated with the INITIATOR, see (306), whereas for the verb bära ‘carry’, the object DP is instead realizing the UNDERGOER role, see (307).

(306) The RHEME-relation of äpplet ‘the apple’ to äta ‘eat’
In (306) the RHEME is realized by äpplet ‘the apple’, which describes what Elsa ate, whereas in (307), äpplet ‘the apple’ is instead an UNDERGOER and the RHEME is realized by the PP path till vardagsrummet ‘to the living room’. Put differently, in (304), the subject Elsa is the UNDERGOER who (at least in some sense) is affected by the process of eating an apple, whereas in (305), äpplet ‘the apple’ is the UNDERGOER of the processual change along a spatial path homomorphic to the carrying event in the same way as the abstract path provided by äpplet ‘the apple’ is homomorphic to the eating event in (306).

In other words, a consequence of the distinction between UNDERGOERS and RHEMES of proc, as well as a consequence of my data, is that the only actual requirement on verbs regarding their arguments is that the specifier roles need to be realized somehow – it can be through composite roles as for [init, proc] verbs or with distinct roles as for [init, proc] verbs. Thus, unlike theories where a theta-criterion is assumed, it is not the case that each argument has to be identified by separate DPs. This is captured by the revised ARP as I have phrased it, see (308) repeated from (107).

(308) Revised Argument Realization Principle

Every subevent in the verb phrase must be identified by an argument XP in the specifier position of that subevent.

Thus, the distinction between RHEME objects and UNDERGOER objects can account for the IOR data in a straightforward manner, and Ramchand’s verb phrase can capture the event structure restrictions involved with a syntactic analysis.

3.8.1.3 [init, proc] verbs with resultative particles

The potentially distinct structures of [init, proc] verbs generally considered intransitive on the one hand and pseudo-transitive IOR verbs on the other, is also made relevant by bounded particles (cf. section 3.6.2).
At least some intransitive motion verbs go well with bounded particles, whereas IOR verbs do not (if still interpreted as IOR), see (309)–(310).

(309) Johan sprang ut.
   Johan ran out
   ‘Johan ran outside.’

(310) *Johan åt upp.
   Johan ate up

This suggests that IOR verbs like *äta ‘eat’ require an overt or omitted object in order to combine with a particle that identifies res, although intransitive motion verbs do not. However, this is not necessarily a syntactic fact distinguishing the two types of verbs, since it actually follows from the encyclopedic meanings of the verbs involved. For motion verbs, the semantically natural RESULTEE would be conflated with the UNDERGOER-INITIATOR, see (311).

(311) Verb phrase structure of springa ‘run’ with a resultative particle

Thus, the predication following from (311) is that springa ‘run’ cannot simultaneously combine with a DP RHEME and a bounded particle. As the example in (312) shows, such a combination is ungrammatical.

(312) *Johan sprang ut loppet.
   Johan ran out race.the

For consumption verbs, however, the rhematic edible substance otherwise optionally introduced by the DP RHEME would be the natural RESULTEE in a
resultative structure, and as such the object realizing the RESULTTEE would have to be syntactically present, see (313), repeated from (259).

(313) Verb phrase structure of äta ‘eat’ with a resultative particle (from (259))

In either case, it is not the verbs springa ‘run’ or äta ‘eat’ that identify the res-head in the verb phrases in (311) and (313). Instead, res is identified by the bounded particle ut ‘out’ and upp ‘up’ respectively. Accordingly, although intransitive motion verbs and IOR verbs here behave differently on the surface, both sets of verbs are still lexically specified for [init, proc], and when combined with a particle that identifies res a RESULTTEE is required in the syntax. In the case of motion verbs, a composite RESULTTEE-UNDERGOER-INITIATOR naturally emerges, whereas for IOR verbs no such composite role can arise. In other words, it is the realization of roles that differs here, not the syntax. The fact that the relationship between the participant roles is somewhat different for different semantic groups of lexical items is not that odd. For consumption verbs like äta ‘eat’, the optional DP RHEME is what is being consumed throughout the event, and in a very concrete sense the referent of the RHEME is affected alongside the UNDERGOER. This is distinct from the RHEMES of motion verbs, which are not affected but simply provide a path.

3.8.2 The object status of RHEMES

In tests for objecthood, the optional RHEMES of IOR verbs and intransitive verbs of motion behave similarly. In (314)–(315) the RHEMES of pseudo-transitive äta ‘eat’ and intransitive springa ‘run’ have been promoted to subjects in the passive, a strong indication that the DP RHEMES are objects.
As we can see in (316)–(317), UNDERGOER objects behave in a similar fashion.

Obligatory RHEME objects of relational stative verbs behave differently: some stative verbs do not passivize at all, as illustrated in (318) from Teleman et al. (1999, 4:363), and some can only passivize with a by-phrase expressing the agent (319).

This indicates that the object status of the complements of stative verbs is different not only from the RHEMES of proc but also from the obligatory objects that are UNDERGOERS of proc. Thus, the transitivity seen among stative relational verbs is different from the one seen in, for instance, resultative verbs.

Another test for objecthood is the impersonal passive with a non-referential expletive subject, det ‘there’. In (320)–(321) the pseudo-transitive verb äta ‘eat’ and intransitive springa ‘run’ are both used in the impersonal passive.
The examples in (320)–(321) both have plural objects. However, with a singular object as in (322)–(323), the impersonal passive is ungrammatical.33

(322) *Det åts ett äpple idag.
there ate.PASS an apple today

(323) *Det sprangs ett lopp idag.
there ran.PASS a race today

This observation is parallel to the fact pointed out by Teleman et al. (1999) that intransitive verbs in the impersonal passive typically involve iterative or plural events, as exemplified in (324) from Teleman et al. (1999, 4:371).

(324) Det talas till och med om revolution.
there talk.PASS to and with about revolution
‘There are even people talking about a revolution.’

The impersonal passive is also a standard test for unaccusativity, where Germanic languages are known to disallow the impersonal passive for unaccusative verbs, but allow it for unergative verbs. This is demonstrated in the following two examples from Larsson (2009:36).

(325) *Det vissnas i vasen.
there wilt.PASS in vase.the

(326) Nu sovs det på mötet igen.
now sleeps.PASS there at meeting.the again
‘Now there are people sleeping at the meeting again.’

In the impersonal passive, unsurprisingly the IOR verbs group with intransitive unergative verbs but not with unaccusatives:

(327) Nu äts det på mötet igen.
now eats.PASS there at meeting.the again
‘Now, there are people eating at the meeting again.’

However, unlike in the usual passive, the behavior of IOR verbs in the impersonal passive is distinct from the behavior of [init, proc, res] verbs like öppna ‘open’. See the grammatical impersonal passive in (328).

(328) Det öppnades en dörr idag.
there opened.PASS a door today
‘There was a door being opened today.’

33 As Teleman et al. (1999, 4:372) point out, the examples with an expletive subject and an object are ambiguous, since the object can also be interpreted as a referential subject, alongside the expletive. This ambiguity is not relevant here, and therefore disregarded.
When instead comparing with transitive [init, proc] verbs like *putta* ‘push’, they group with the pseudo-transitive and intransitive [init, proc] verbs, see (329).

(329) *Det puttades en bil idag.*
    *there pushed PASS a car today*

(330) Det puttades många bilar idag.
    *there pushed PASS many cars today*

‘There were many cars being pushed today.’

Thus, it looks like the impersonal passive with singular objects might be a test for resultativity rather than for objecthood per se. In any case, IOR verbs and intransitive motion verbs display identical behavior regarding passivation. This is evidence that the RHEMES of the two types of verbs have identical status. Returning to the usual passive, however, the optional RHEMES of IOR verbs as well as of motion verbs behave just like UNDERGOER objects (see (314)–(317) above), but only as long as they are DPs. Mass nouns, bare NPs or PPs cannot be promoted to subjects in the passive, see (331)–(334).

(331) *Mat åts av Alice.*
    *food ate PASS by Alice*

(332) *Potatis åts av Alice.*
    *potato ate PASS by Alice*

(333) *Lopp sprangs av Alice.*
    *races ran PASS by Alice*

(334) *Till skolan sprangs av Alice.*
    *to school ran PASS by Alice*

The data in (331)–(334) come as no surprise, but they prove essential when discussing the object status of RHEMES. Since the analysis argued for here allows for RHEMES to be realized by mass nouns, bare plurals, PPs and APs as well as DPs, then as a consequence they all have the same syntactic status in the verb phrase. Traditionally, the label *object* refers to DPs and bare NPs (although sometimes including full CPs or IPs). In order to maintain that definition, the only viable option is to give DP RHEMES an object status separate from the one of UNDERGOER objects. In other words, DP RHEMES may very well be labeled objects in the pretheoretical sense that the word is used in in this thesis, but the difference from UNDERGOER objects and the similarities to other RHEMES must be stressed. That is, in a more technical sense, RHEMES are complements and UNDERGOERS are specifiers.
3.8.3 IOR restrictions related to participant roles

From the three-partite verb phrase, Ramchand (2008:108) derives nine English verb classes distributed over six different combinations of heads in the lexical specification of each verb (corresponding to six different event decompositions), see table 2.

Table 2. Derived verb classes in English, after Ramchand (2008:108).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heads</th>
<th>ROLES</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[init, proc]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Transitive</td>
<td>INITIATOR, UNDERGOER</td>
<td>drive, push, paint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>INITIATOR, PATH</td>
<td>eat, read, paint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Intransitive</td>
<td>INITIATOR_i, UNDERGOER_i</td>
<td>run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[init, proc, res]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Transitive</td>
<td>INITIATOR_i, UNDERGOER_i, RESULTEE_i</td>
<td>throw, defuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>INITIATOR_i, UNDERGOER_i, RESULT-RHEME</td>
<td>enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Intransitive</td>
<td>INITIATOR_i, UNDERGOER_i, RESULTEE_i</td>
<td>arrive, jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Ditransitive</td>
<td>INITIATOR, UNDERGOER, RESULTEE</td>
<td>give, throw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[proc]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Intransitive</td>
<td>UNDERGOER</td>
<td>melt, roll, freeze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[proc, res]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Intransitive</td>
<td>UNDERGOER, RESULTEE_i</td>
<td>break, tear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[init, proc, N]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII N-conflation</td>
<td>INITIATOR_i, UNDERGOER_i</td>
<td>dance, sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[init, proc, A]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX A-conflation</td>
<td>UNDERGOER</td>
<td>dry, clear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contrary to many other verb classifications, this listing is basically a consequence of syntax, i.e. the possible verb meanings that arise from the event building verb phrase fall out as sets of verbs. Since the only lexical specifications are the functional heads that a verb identifies in the syntax, it follows that there should be some flexibility in the system. Thus, among the [init, proc] verbs we find two types of ‘transitive’ verbs and one group of ‘intransitive’ verbs. These three subtypes of [init, proc] verbs are related to the participant roles typically associated with the encyclopedic meaning of particular verbs.

For the purposes of this thesis, the English verb classes seem to correspond fairly well with Swedish verb classes, in the respect that there are verbs that potentially fit each group, at least if we include overt morphology like reflexivizers and particles (which would however lead to a partly different classification). Some verb groups and alternations are certainly more common in English than in Swedish, and possibly the other way around. The main point with the listing however, is that the meanings corresponding to the subevents in combination with the role interpretations should be possible.
verb meanings in any language, no matter how they are realized in a specific language.

My study primarily involves [init, proc] verbs (corresponding to class I–II in table 2) and some of the [init, proc, res] verbs (the first of the two groups corresponding to class III in table 2). The former constitute the same sets of verbs that in the Vendlerian tradition are labeled activities and accomplishments, whereas the latter are achievements. Although there are some interesting things to say about the other classes in Swedish, I will here confine the discussion to these verb groups and leave the full verb classification arising from a system like this for future research. Thus, in table 3, I propose a classification for Swedish [init, proc] and [init, proc, res] verbs, based on the empirical studies in this thesis, but with Ramchand’s list as a model.

Table 3. Derived verb classes in Swedish, adapted from Ramchand (2008:108), classes I–V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Heads]</th>
<th>ROLES</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[init, proc]</td>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>INITIATOR, UNDERGOER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intransitive</td>
<td>UNDERGOER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[init, proc, res]</td>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>INITIATOR, UNDERGOER, RESULTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>INITIATOR, UNDERGOER, RESULTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Intransitive</td>
<td>INITIATOR, UNDERGOER, RESULTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Ditransitive</td>
<td>INITIATOR, UNDERGOER, RESULTEE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One difference between Ramchand’s classification in table 2 and the (partial) classification in table 3 is the collapsing of pseudo-transitive verbs and intransitive verbs in the latter, and that the specifier roles are the only participant roles listed in the table, not rhematic complements.34 Thus, in my view, intransitive [init, proc] verbs like springa ‘run’ and IOR verbs like äta ‘eat’ (and I assume, also their English equivalents) in some sense are representing the same set of verbs, since they are given the same analysis in terms

34 This in spite of the fact that the optional RHEME involved with the IOR verbs by common definitions would be considered an argument of the verb.
of the lexical specification of heads and the co-indexing of participant roles.35

If the roles are not specified in the lexicon, i.e. if the role realization is determined by the encyclopedic content rather than by lexical restrictions, verbs with the same lexical specifications, as for instance [init, proc] verbs, would have an inbuilt systematic flexibility allowing them to alternate between transitive and intransitive meanings, or allowing homonyms where one verb is transitive and the other intransitive, as long as there are activities in the world corresponding to those meanings. There is some suggestive evidence that this might be the case for some verbs. Consider e.g. the homonym of *putta* ‘push’ in (335), and the colloquial homonym of the verb *dra* ‘pull’ in (336), both of which here have meanings clearly distinct from the core meanings of the verbs, but which fit smoothly into the UNDERGOER-INITIATOR-realization of roles.

(335) Annika Sörenstam **puttar** på sista hålet. (Google)
     *Annika Sörenstam putts on final hole.*
     ‘Annika Sörenstam putts on the final hole.’

(336) Vi **drog** innan prisutdelningen. (Google)
     *we pulled before prize.giving.*
     ‘We took off before the prize giving.’

If allowing homonyms to be covered for by flexibility with respect to realization of participant roles, a verb like *lämna* ‘leave; drop off’ could be described as flexible between an [init, proc], res] reading and an [init, proc, res] reading.

(337) Jag **lämnade** barnen på förskolan. (Google)
     *I left children at preschool.*
     ‘I dropped off the children at preschool.’

(338) Jag **lämnade** jobbet klockan fem. (Google)
     *I left work the clock five*
     ‘I left work at five o’clock.’

This means that in an IOO example like (339), the implicit object is the RESULTEE-UNDERGOER, whereas in (340) it is the UNDERGOER-INITIATOR.

(339) Jag **grät** när jag **lämnade** på förskolan. (Google)
     *I cried when I left at preschool.*
     ‘I cried when I dropped off [the children] at preschool.’

35 In table 2, Ramchand does not explicitly mention the UNDERGOER-INITIATOR for the IOR verbs, but instead specifies the RHEME role. In table 3, I do it the other way around. The difference is not as significant as it might appear, since I, just like Ramchand, consider the lexical specification of composite roles a technical detail possibly unnecessary in the system.
Många lämnade innan kongressen var slut. (Google)

Many left before congress was finished

‘Many people left before the congress ended.’

The flexibility between the [init, proc, res] variant and the [init, proc, res] variant of the verb lämna ‘leave’ is different from the flexibility involved with putta ‘push; putt’ and dra ‘pull; take off’, since neither of the objectless versions involves IOR. However, the flexibility among the [init, proc] verbs as well as the [init, proc, res] verbs is allowed and predicted by the system.36

3.8.4 Arguments for an intransitivity account of IOR

What many previous accounts have in common is that they analyze IOR as a detransitivization operation of some kind, i.e. as involving a rule that allows for an intransitive use of a basically transitive lexical item (e.g Fodor & Fodor 1980, Dowty 1981). Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998) and Levin (1999) instead distinguish between two types of objects, where only one is projected into syntax. As we have seen, the more syntactic approach in Ramchand (2008) also distinguishes between two types of objects, where one is inserted into a specifier position and the other into a complement position. In other words, the non-realization of RHEME objects of pseudo-transitive verbs follows from the system and does not have to be stipulated as an independent principle. The intransitivity analysis of IOR verbs is also consistent with the overall intuition behind the event building verb phrase, i.e. the idea that larger structures are built from smaller ones rather than the other way around.

In analyses where pseudo-transitive verbs are instead considered as basically transitive, an IOR sentence would require some kind of lexical detransitivization rule (e.g. Fodor & Fodor 1980, Dowty 1981) or a syntactic detransitivization operation (Alexiadou et al. 2014). In such accounts, IOR verbs like äta ‘eat’ are thus analyzed as transitive verbs that can undergo detransitivization. Adopting a detransitivization account to my data would also require detransitivization rules or operations for verbs like springa ‘run’ and arbeta ‘work’, or the similarities to such verbs require a separate explanation.

Like Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998), Alexiadou et al. (2014) assume that object arguments of IOR verbs are selected and specified in the lexicon but not necessarily projected into syntax, since the verb is also mono-eventive, but the object is still semantically present. Thus, in the analysis of Alexiadou et al. (2014) and many others, pseudo-transitive verbs can be used

36 Apparently, the very same examples could be used as an argument against the encyclopedic view and for the specification of roles on the lexical item, in order to clearly separate homonyms from each other.
without an object although they are essentially transitive. The implicit objects potentially involved in IOR are analyzed as existentially bound, just like the implicit agent in passives. This is completely different from Ramchand’s (2008:89) approach, where the INITIATOR position in passives is assumed as existentially bound by passive morphology, whereas no such mechanism is needed for the “intransitive uses” of IOR verbs.

Following the approach of Ramchand (2008), I have instead characterized the verbs accepting IOR as essentially intransitive. Consequently, what needs to be explained is why these intransitive verbs sometimes take complements, and perhaps why these complements are optional. Ramchand’s decomposed verb phrase provides a solution where the optional objects of pseudo-transitive verbs occupy a position in the syntax distinct from that of other objects, more precisely as complements instead of specifiers in a subevent.

The similarity between IOR verbs and other [init, proc] verbs raises the question if there is any structural difference between an IOR verb like äta ‘eat’ and an intransitive verb like springa ‘run’ at all, and if so what that difference is. The most apparent one is probably that pseudo-transitive verbs are more likely to occur with objects in corpora than intransitive verbs, but this is not necessarily a strictly linguistic fact. On the contrary, I argue that the range of possible RHEME objects is restricted by encyclopedia and real world knowledge, for IOR verbs as well as for (other) intransitive [init, proc] verbs, and that those restrictions are quite naturally stronger for verbs like springa ‘run’ and arbeta ‘work’ than for IOR verbs. Basically, there are more DP objects in the world available for consumption or creation than DP objects denoting a scale that you can physically move through, as in the case of run a race. As for the semantic interpretation of the potential IOR object, that can also be filled in by encyclopedic knowledge without involving any actual event participant. In an abstract sense, what IOR verbs and motion verbs have in common is that they optionally involve an expressed RHEME that gives rise to a path or scale of some sort. Thus, when you run, you typically cover some space along a concrete path, and when you read or eat, the path semantics provided by the RHEME is similar.

A consequence of analyzing IOR verbs as intransitives is that IOR is not a case of object omission in the sense that no argument is present in the syntactic structure but omitted in the word string. Instead, DP RHEME arguments of IOR verbs are always optional, just like many PP RHEMES that can also optionally introduce event participants into the sentence, and RHEMES of intransitive verbs. Thus, IOR is nothing else but the perfectly ordinary atelic RHEME-less version of an essentially intransitive [init, proc] verb unspecified for telicity and with a verb phrase structure that allows for an optional RHEME.
3.9 Summary

In this chapter, I have argued for an intransitivity account of IOR. My data shows that IOR is restricted to a particular set of verbs, in the literature sometimes referred to as pseudo-transitives or noncore transitives. Overt objects of IOR verbs are typically incremental themes, i.e. they give rise to an abstract path or scale that measures out the event described by the verb. This can be explained in terms of event structural restrictions, in line with previous research by e.g. Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998).

In Ramchand’s (2008) system with a decomposed three-partite verb phrase, the IOR verbs are specified for [init, proc]. The incremental theme objects are RHEMES in the complement of proc, whereas objects of transitive [init, proc] verbs like bära ‘carry’ and förstöra ‘destroy’ are UNDERGOERS in the specifier of procP. For IOR verbs, the UNDERGOER role is instead conflated with the INITIATOR role into a composite UNDERGOER-INITIATOR. Whereas this analysis of IOR verbs makes them structurally similar to [init, proc] verbs, the structure as well as the role realization is identical to intransitive [init, proc] verbs like springa ‘run’ and arbeta ‘work’. The IOR restrictions thus cut right through the [init, proc] verbs, and it is unclear if the role realization has to be included in the lexical specifications or not.

The data presented in this chapter also shows that inherently resultative [init, proc, res.] verbs like öppna ‘open’ stative [init] verbs like likna ‘resemble’, and transitive [init, proc] with separate UNDERGOER objects like bära ‘carry’ and förstöra ‘destroy’ do not accept IOR, as the phenomenon is defined in this work.
4 Implicit Object Open type (IOO)

In chapter 3, IOR was demonstrated to be restricted to a certain set of verbs. I analyzed those verbs as intransitive process verbs with the lexical specification [init, proc], sharing the same structure as many other intransitive process verbs. In other words, what I have called IOR does not in fact involve any object omission in the syntax, since the RHEME objects of verbs involved in IOR are always syntactically optional. What remains to be studied is what is going on when ‘true’ transitive verbs are used without overt UNDERGOER objects.

As a consequence of the analysis in chapter 3, I restrict the IOO discussion in this chapter to verbs that are not IOR verbs. Apart from that, I will show that the main restrictions on IOO in Swedish does not relate to event structure but instead to interpretability, i.e. to the fact that the object referent has to be given an interpretation, at least as far as dynamic verbs are concerned. Since the revised ARP as I have phrased it requires the specifiers of each subevent to be obligatory, the verb phrase analysis of ‘true’ transitive verbs requires the omitted UNDERGOER objects to be somehow accounted for syntactically. There are at least two distinct ways for this to be done, either in terms of a null pronoun that is inserted into the syntax instead of the overt object and is interpreted just like any other pronoun, or in terms of an empty specifier position in the syntax requiring an interpretation. Whereas I consider the interpretability important for reference resolution, I am less convinced that there is a huge difference between the two alternatives of accounting for it. While leaving the technicalities of this question open as for the details involved, I will mark the empty specifier position in the verb phrase structure with the symbol $e$ for convenience.

What is clear, however, is that IOO unlike IOR cannot be accounted for in terms of intransitivity. I will give a recap as to why in the following section (4.1). Then, in section 4.2, I will turn to the discussion on how the reference resolution of IOO objects comes about. In section 4.3, I go through a number of syntactic tests in order to establish the syntactic activity of IOO objects. From the tests, it is reasonable to draw the conclusion that the implicit objects involved in IOO are not as syntactically active as pronouns are but more so than unrealized RHEMES of IOR verbs. Lastly, section 4.4 is a summary of the chapter.
4.1 The IOR/IOO distinction

From the analysis in chapter 3, it follows that RHEME objects of pseudo-transitive verbs are optional, whereas UNDERGOER (and RESULTEE-UNDERGOER) objects of ‘true’ transitive verbs are obligatory. However, there is plenty of evidence that UNDERGOER objects can be omitted, i.e. the data I have described as cases of IOO, see (341)–(342).

   it knocked on door.the Beda opened.
   ‘There was a knock on the door. Beda opened [it].’

(342) Jag öppnar! [uttered when there’s a knock on the door]
   I open!
   ‘I am opening [the door]!’

Thus, for the analysis in chapter 3 to hold, the fact that UNDERGOER objects do not always show up in the word string, although assumed obligatory, has to be explained in other terms than intransitivity.

As discussed in chapter 2, the most obvious semantic characteristic of IOO is that there is a salient and specific object referent involved, although there is no object linguistically visible in the word string. The hearer can instead disambiguate the object reference either from the immediate linguistic context, as in (341), or from the situation, as in (342).

In other words, to the extent that ‘true’ transitive verbs can be used without an overt object (in an episodic sentence), a specific object referent salient enough in the context is required. More examples of IOO are given in (343)–(344).

(343) Fönstret var öppet men jag gick och stängde.
   window.the was open but I went and closed
   ‘The window was open but I went over there and closed [it].’

(344) Jag tog fram en säck och fylde med skräp.
   I took up a bag and filled with litter
   ‘I grabbed a bag and filled [it] with litter.’

As these examples show, there is no doubt that ‘true’ transitive verbs can be used without an overt object in Swedish, and that the reference of the object in those cases is specific and salient in the linguistic or non-linguistic context. Furthermore, there should be no doubt that the phenomenon described here is separate from IOR, since the examples in (341)–(344) are not acceptable if the specific reference of the omitted object cannot be disambiguated.

In the rest of this chapter, I will continue to assume that the objects involved in IOO are UNDERGOERS or RESULTEE-UNDERGOERS in the three-
partite verb phrase. Based on the data, I will also assume that the omitted IOO objects all have specific reference and that the acceptability of IOO depends on that reference being felicitously resolved or not. How the reference resolution can come about is the main topic for the chapter. First, however, I will briefly discuss the discourse status of omitted IOO objects, as well as syntactic licensing conditions and potential verb-related restrictions on IOO.

4.1.1 The discourse status of omitted UNDERGOER objects

Even though it is quite clear that the interpretation of the IOO objects involves specific reference, it is less clear how to characterize the discourse status of the omitted objects. Sometimes they behave like pronouns, as in (345) which corresponds to the example with a pronoun given in (346) but not to the example with a definite DP in (347).

(345) Det knackade på dörren. Beda öppna\textit{de}.  
\textit{it knocked on door.the Beda opened}  
‘There was a knock on the door. Beda opened [it].’

\textit{it knocked on door.the Beda opened it}  
‘There was a knock on the door. Beda opened it.’

(347) Det knackade på dörren. #Beda öppna\textit{de} dörren.  
\textit{it knocked on door.the Beda opened door.the}  
‘There was a knock on the door. #Beda opened the door.’

Other times they behave more like DPs, and replacements with pronouns are instead infelicitous, as (348), which is paraphrased felicitously in (349) but not in (350).

(348) Beda öppna\textit{de} för gästerna.  
\textit{Beda opened for guests.the}  
‘Beda opened [the door] for the guests.’

(349) Beda öppna\textit{de} dörren för gästerna.  
\textit{Beda opened door.the for guests.the}  
‘Beda opened the door for the guests.’

(350) #Beda öppna\textit{de} den för gästerna.  
\textit{Beda opened it for guests.the}  
‘Beda opened it for the guests.’

The slight difference in the interpretations of (345) and (348) clearly relates to whether the object referent is previously introduced in the linguistic context or not. If there is a linguistic antecedent, the omitted object is similar to
a pronoun, as in (345), whereas the omitted object is more like a DP when there is no linguistic antecedent, as in (348). In other words, IOO objects share some properties with both pronouns and DPs, and the interpretation of the implicit IOO objects in this respect varies across sentences. The implicit object in IOO has sometimes been characterized as similar to definite descriptions, but unlike a DP, an IOO object cannot introduce a new referent into the discourse, see (351)–(352).

(351) Beda öppnade för gästerna. #Den var trög.
   Beda opened for guests.the it was heavy
   ‘Beda opened [the door] for the guests. #It was heavy.’

(352) Jag tog nycklarna och läste. #Den krånglade.
   I took keys.the and locked it malfunctioned
   ‘I took the keys and locked [the door]. #It was malfunctioning.’

The implicit objects in (351)–(352) are not available as antecedents to the pronouns in the following sentences. This is further demonstrated by the example in (353) where the antecedent of the pronoun in the second sentence must be the full DP nyckeln ‘the key’. There is no way that the implicit object could be the antecedent of the pronoun den ‘it’ in the second sentence.

(353) Jag tog nyckeln och läste. Den krånglade.
   I took key.the and locked it malfunctioned
   ‘I took the key and locked [the door]. It was malfunctioning.’

Instead, implicit IOO object referents are already salient in the discourse, although not necessarily in the linguistic context. When not previously mentioned in the linguistic context, the referents cannot be referred to with pronouns, as shown in (351)–(352). They can, however, when they are previously introduced in the linguistic context, although the acceptability decreases somewhat when the relationship is established across multiple sentences, see (354).

   guests.the knocked at door.the Beda opened it was heavy
   ‘The guests knocked on the door. Beda opened [it]. ?It was heavy.’

In other words, IOO is a way of (implicitly) referring to referents salient in the discourse, regardless of them being previously introduced in the linguistic context or not. The actual behavior of the IOO objects is thus more like that of a pronoun than of a DP, especially since they can refer anaphorically as well as deictically.
4.1.2 Licensing and restrictions

In chapter 3, we saw that IOR is clearly related to event structure. This is not the case with IOO, which we will see in this section. There are restrictions, but they do not seem to correspond to specific sets of verbs nor primarily to particular syntactic constructions. Some syntactic environments do allow IOO for more verbs than others, and when studying data from corpora some verbs and contexts are somewhat more common in IOO than others (see e.g. Prytz 2009, Bäckström 2013), but as we will see in this chapter there are no obvious event structure restrictions involved in IOO, apart from the fact that IOR verbs and other intransitive verbs do not participate in IOO. The differences in distribution among various verbs and contexts appear to instead stem from the interpretability of the implicit objects, and contexts that support a reasonable object interpretation.

In coordinations where the second conjunct is verb initial and where there is an object antecedent in the first conjunct, verbs with different lexical specifications rather freely accept IOO, such as the transitive [init, proc] verb bära ‘carry’ in (355), and the transitive [init, proc, res] verb stänga ‘close’ in (356).

(355) David tog barnet och bar till köket.
    David took child.the and carried to kitchen.the
    ‘David took the child and carried [it] to the kitchen.’

(356) David gick fram till fönstret och stängde.
    David went up to window.the and closed
    ‘David approached the window and closed [it].’

The examples in (355)–(356) might suggest that this coordination structure, much like topic drop, licenses the omission of otherwise obligatory objects. This observation is seemingly confirmed by the ungrammatical example in (358) where the potential anaphora relation needs to be resolved across sentences.

(357) Elsa räckte David bananen. #Han bar till köket.
    Elsa handed David banana.the he carried to kitchen.the
    ‘Elsa handed David the banana. #He carried [it] to the kitchen.’

Judging from (357) above and (358) below, the two verbs bära ‘carry’ and kasta ‘throw’ appear to have different restrictions when used with an object reference intended to be resolved across sentences.

(358) Elsa räckte David bollen. Han kastade till Björn.
    Elsa handed David ball.the He threw to Björn.
    ‘Elsa handed David the ball. He threw [it] to Björn.’
Nevertheless, apart from (358), acceptable examples of IOO with an anaphoric relation across sentences include, among others, the \textit{[init, proc., res.]} verbs in (359)–(363).

(359) Elsa gick fram till dörren. Hon öppnade.  
\textit{Elsa went up to door. she opened.}  
‘Elsa went up to the door. She opened [it].’

(360) Elsa gick fram till dörren. Hon stängde.  
\textit{Elsa went up to door. she closed}  
‘Elsa went over to the door. She closed [it].’

(361) Elsa gick fram till lampan. Hon tändte.  
\textit{Elsa went up to lamp. she lit}  
‘Elsa went over to the lamp. She lit [it].’

(362) Elsa räckte David stearinljuset. Han släckte.  
\textit{Elsa handed David candle. he blew-out}  
‘Elsa handed the candle to David. He blew [it] out.’

(363) Elsa sparkade iväg bollen. David hämtade.  
\textit{Elsa kicked away ball. David fetched}  
‘Elsa kicked the ball away. David fetched [it].’

The variation in acceptance is not necessarily linked to syntactic setting and verb type, since the judgments crucially change with other antecedents and in other contexts. Compare (357)–(358) to (364)–(365).

(364) Vi var i fjällen och turades om att bära  
\textit{we were in mountains. and took turns on to carry}  
tältet. Elsa bar till toppen av berget.  
tent. the Elsa carried to top. of mountain. the  
‘We were in the mountains and took turns carrying the tent. Elsa carried [it] to the top of the mountain.’

(365) Elsa räckte David bananen. \#Han kastade till Björn.  
\textit{Elsa handed David banana. he threw to Björn.}  
‘Elsa handed David the banana. \#He threw [it] to Björn.’

Thus, it seems like most verbs accept IOO under the right circumstances. In other words, there is no obvious set of verbs that accepts or does not accept IOO, the exception being relational stative verbs which I will discuss in section 4.2.2. There is neither any general context that promotes IOO for all verbs, but instead, it seems like the interpretability of the specific object reference is vaguely linked to conventionalized or syntactically available referents that are likely event participants in the specific event described by the verb in a particular sentence.
4.1.3 IOO with arbitrary reference

In section 2.3.3, I introduced examples like (366), adapted from Rizzi’s (1986) English and Italian examples in (367)a–b.

(366) Skylten varnar för laviner.

sign.the cautions for avalanches

‘The sign cautions [people/Elsa/us/…] against avalanches.’

(367) a. This sign cautions (people) against avalanches.

b. Questo cartello mette in guardia (la gente) contro le valanghe.

Although Rizzi (1986) analyzes the implicit objects involved in the English and Italian examples as involving a generic component, genericity is actually not a necessary condition, at least not for the Swedish counterpart in (366). On the contrary, there is a possible specific interpretation of the arbitrary object reference in (366), and the only semantic condition on the referent appears to be animacy. The exact reference is resolved pragmatically, and salience is once again the key factor, just as for the other cases of IOO (cf. the discussion in Lyngfelt 2002:57f.).

Lyngfelt (2002:109) gives an example quite similar to (366):

(368) Vi rekommenderar att ta bussen i stället för bilen
till jobbet.

we recommend to take bus.the in place for car.the
to work.the

‘We recommend [people] to take the bus instead of the car to work.’

Although ‘people’ might seem like a possible referent in (366) and (368), it is not necessarily the case that the warnings or recommendations involved in the events are as non-specific as the bare NP people suggests. Instead, the warnings or recommendations are at least potentially directed to particular people, and whereas the referent does not have to be uniquely identifiable it is still specific. The recommendation in (368) is not aimed at some non-specific people, but at the general public, or an even more specific set of individuals, such as people traveling from A to B at a particular time.

My own data of animate implicit objects with arbitrary reference includes the following examples:

(369) Passar på och varnar för äcklig bild även i detta

pass on and warn for disgusting photo also in this

inlägg. (Bloggmix 2014)

post

‘(I) take the opportunity to warn [the reader/you/…] about a disgusting picture also in this post.’
Skatteverket varnar för bluffmejl. (Bloggmix 2014)

‘Skatteverket (The Swedish Tax Agency) warns [the general public] about scam emails.’

Antingen får man skratta och gratula eller trösta och peppa. (Bloggmix 2014)

‘Either you get to laugh and congratulate [them/her/…] or comfort and pep [them/her/…].’

Märkligt hur sådan här mat och godis tröstar. (Bloggmix 2014)

‘(It is) strange how this kind of food and candy comforts [me/them/whoever eats it].’

Tur att du påminde. (Twittermix)

‘Luckily you reminded [me/us/them…].’

Det var som att det hjälpte. (Twittermix)

‘It was as if it was helping [me/us/them…].’

I will not give examples with arbitrary reference a special analysis, but instead include them in my IOO analysis, i.e. as requiring salient referents.

4.1.4 Omitted RHEMES with specific reference

In section 2.3.5, I stated that I will treat objectless examples with IOR verbs as cases of IOR even when the reference is specific. While maintaining that treatment of data, I still find it important to point out that RHEMES, just like UNDERGOERS can have specific reference and still be left out. Consider (375), where the IOR verb läsa ‘read’ is used in an objectless sentence with specific object reference.

Har du läst? (Twittermix)

‘Have you read [this]?’

In (375) and similar examples with IOR verbs, the implicit object is still a RHEME and not an UNDERGOER. It follows from my analysis in chapter 3 that examples like (375) do not have to involve a syntactic object, since the RHEME objects are optional. In other words, the specific object reading could
potentially be a matter of inference rather than reference. Certainly, there is nothing that rules out the possibility that there is a null element in the complement of `proc`, but that is a matter of technical detail that I will not go into any further here. What is essential for my IIO analysis is that IIO only concerns implicit UNDERGOER (and RESULTEE-UNDERGOER) objects, not RHEMES.

4.2 Reference resolution

In this section, I will propose that the implicit objects involved in IIO are similar to referential pronouns in many respects, and just like referential pronouns they can be analyzed as free variables that are pragmatically bound by the most salient and relevant referent in the discourse (cf. Heim & Kratzer 1998:239ff.). The pragmatic binding can come about in a few different ways: anaphorically, deictically or from a frame of interpretation provided by the discourse. Anaphoric and deictic reference will only be discussed briefly in their own right, whereas the various ways of providing a frame of interpretation will be discussed more thoroughly. I will discuss two separate but intertwined subtypes: scene-evoked interpretational frames and conventionalized interpretational frames.

4.2.1 Omitted UNDERGOER objects as free variables

In some accounts, IIO has been referred to as involving an empty pronoun of some sort, as in Rizzi’s (1986) analysis of null objects in Italian. As we saw in section 4.1, some IIO examples surely give the impression that IIO is a pronominal phenomenon in Swedish as well, see (376), but the implicit object does not always behave like an overt pronoun, see (377).

(376) Det knackade på dörren. Elsa öppnade __/#dörren / den.
‘There was a knock on the door. Elsa opened __/#the door/#it.’

(377) Öppnar du __/ dörren/ #den? [uttered when there’s a knock on the door]
‘Are you opening __/the door/#it?’

Given textual conventions, the full DP is ruled out in the anaphoric omission in (376), but more importantly, the pronoun is unacceptable in the deictic omission in (377). However, it is not simply the case that anaphoric IIO is pronominal whereas deictic IIO is not.

In (378), the implicit object of `öppna` ‘open’ is interpreted as having anaphoric and specific reference. In other words, the interpretation of (378) is
consistent with the pronoun reading in (i) but not with the non-specific reading in (ii).

(378) Alice smög fram till fönstret och öppnade försiktigt.
    Alice snuck up to window.the and opened carefully.
(Bloggmix 2011)
⇒ i. ‘Alice snuck up to the window and opened it carefully.’
⇏ ii. ‘Alice snuck up to the window and opened [something] carefully.’

In (378), it might seem like the implicit object is obligatorily anaphoric, with the DP fönstret ‘the window’ as its antecedent, but the example in (379) suggests otherwise.

(379) Alice gick in i rummet och öppnade.
    Alice went in in room.the and opened
⇒ i. ‘Alice went into the room and opened [a specific referent].’
⇏ ii. ‘Alice went into the room and opened it.’

The example in (379) does not accept the interpretation in (ii), i.e. it is not rummet ‘the room’ that is opened, but something else, such as a window. In other words, although the implicit object is referential and behaves much like a pronoun, it is not always possible to insert a pronoun into the word string.

In (380), the subject referent walks up to a window just like in (378) but opens something other than the window. This is possible since another openable referent is salient in the discourse.

(380) Alice gave Elias två paket. Han smög fram till fönstret och öppnade försiktigt.
    Alice gave Elias two packages he snuck up to window.the and opened carefully
⇒ i. ‘Alice gave Elias two packages. He snuck up to the window and opened them.’
⇏ ii. ‘Alice gave Elias two packages. He snuck up to the window and opened it.’

In (380), the packages are a more likely referent than the window, although the window is a potential linguistic antecedent. The window is also the closest potential antecedent in the linguistic context and actually the only one on a sentence level, whereas the packages are instead mentioned in the previous sentence. Still, (i) is the more likely interpretation of (380), whereas (ii) is odd given the salience of the packages (but it is still a possible alternative reading).

This suggests that, instead of necessarily picking up its reference from a linguistic antecedent, the reference of IOO objects is interpreted pragmatically. Sometimes this involves an antecedent, but it does not have to. More
precisely, IOO objects refer to salient specific participants that are given in a scene or a frame evoked in the linguistic or situational context. It is this scene or frame that gives the hearer a clue as to what the reference of the omitted object is.

Thus, although the reference is available in the context, the reference is resolved pragmatically rather than syntactically. Accordingly, I propose that the implicit object involved in IOO introduces a free variable, which is pragmatically bound. On a strictly observational level, the variable can be bound in different ways. In other words, the implicit IOO objects can receive their interpretation from a linguistic antecedent, but an analysis of these examples as involving anaphoric binding would not explain all IOO examples, since the reference also can be resolved from the scene evoked by the context. Consequently, neither anaphora nor deixis explain all cases of IOO. An analysis of the IOO objects as introducing a free variable that can receive its reference in seemingly different ways – anaphorically, deictically or by a frame of interpretation – would, however, cover all of the cases above. Syn-tactically, I do not assume that there is any difference between the three types. In the next subsection, I will describe more closely how the pragmatic closure can come about.

4.2.2 Scene-evoked reference

Following standard accounts of variable binding (e.g. Heim & Kratzer 1998:239ff.), I assume that free variables are closed off through a less direct relationship to an antecedent than what is the case for the syntactic binding of bound variables or syntactic anaphora resolution. It is likely that different pragmatic factors contribute to making the referent available enough for the hearer to be picked out. If there is a scene or frame that comes with a set of potential event participants, then all of those participants are available for pragmatic closure. The most salient or most fitting of these participants is the one binding the variable. In other words, it is all a question of providing a scene or frame that enables the reference of the omitted object to be resolved.

As demonstrated in section 2.3.2, specific reference does not necessarily involve an individual that is uniquely identifiable:

(381) Det var varmt, så Elsa öppnade.

\[\text{it was hot so Elsa opened}\]

⇒ ‘It was hot, and so Elsa opened the window/the door/the air vent.’

⇒ ‘It was hot, and so Elsa opened the package/the can/the bottle.’

In (381), it is clear that the implicit object refers to a specific member of a set, and that it disallows a reading where the referent would be a member of another set. Compare the possible interpretations of (381) to the ones of (382).
(382) Jag öppnade med hjälp av en kniv.  
*I opened with help of a knife*

‘I opened [the most salient and relevant referent] with a knife.’

The distinct readings of (381)–(382) show that the set of possible referents could change dramatically across different contexts. It is also clear that the reference is specific, although uniqueness is not required (cf. the overt weak definites in e.g. Carlsson et al. 2006).

In previous research, it has been pointed out that there are some text types or genres where IOO seems to be more common, such as recipes and other instructional texts (see e.g. Ruppenhofer & Michaelis 2010). However, scene-evoked reference also benefits from the hearer’s (assumed) knowledge about the world. In (383), the most salient referent would be the speaker’s own child or children. This interpretation follows from knowledge about how society and everyday family-routines are currently and generally organized.

(383) Igår hämtade jag på förskolan klockan tre.  
*yesterday fetched I at preschool the clock the three*

‘Yesterday, I picked up [the children] at preschool at three o’clock.’

This general understanding of the prototypical case can of course be negotiated. For instance, the speaker does not have to be the actual parent in order to utter (383), as long as the picking-up of the child or children is conventional. The point is that the reference in (383) is dependent on cultural knowledge as well as on the context. The convention of leaving and picking up children at preschool is actually established enough for the PP *på förskolan* ‘at preschool’ to be excluded as well.

(384) Igår hämtade jag klockan tre.  
*yesterday fetched I clock the three*

‘Yesterday, I picked up [the children] at three o’clock.’

If (384) is uttered out of the blue without a specific salient referent in the discourse, the most salient referent would still be the speaker’s child or children. In a different context, however, the referent could be something completely different than children. Consider the utterance in (384) again, but this time uttered at work by one garbage collector to another. Imagine that they are discussing some specific place where they usually pick up the garbage at half past two. The most salient referent in (384) would then be garbage from that specific place.

In (383)–(384), the frame of reference is evoked by linguistic material, more precisely adverbials anchoring the event in time (three o’clock) and space (at preschool). More examples of IOO with an adverbial PP modifying the event are given in (385)–(387). A verb similar to *hämta* ‘fetch, pick up’ is its antonym *lämna* ‘leave’, which displays a similar pattern.
It is clear from these examples that the PPs provide a frame of interpretation that not only provides potential object referents but also indirectly helps in defining the actual event, which could be very different in different contexts.

Scene-evoked reference is not restricted to sentence level. In the corpus examples from Twitter (retrieved from Korp) in (388)–(391), it is not apparent what the reference of the omitted objects is, but it is still obvious that it is specific, and one must assume that it is related to a topic under discussion.

(388) Källan till citaten jag precis tweetade kommer från gårdagens text-tv, även Reinfeldt kommenterade. (Twittermix)

‘The source of the quotes I just tweeted is from yesterday’s teletext, also Reinfeldt commented on [it/them].’

(389) minns hur irri [sic] jag var när det inte funkade på gamla och hur glad jag blev när ni fixade. (Twittermix)

‘[I] remember how irritated I was when it did not work on the old one and how happy I was when you fixed [it/that]’

(390) Då skulle du sett när FP styrde. (Twittermix)

‘Then you should have seen when FP governed [the country].’

(391) Osäker över (6), vore intressant att få data på om det påverkade. (Twittermix)

‘(I am) unsure of (6), (it) would be interesting to get data on whether it affected [the results].’
Thus, to the extent that the respective object reference in (388)–(391) is difficult to track for a hearer, this is due to too little background knowledge, not to any syntactic restrictions on IOO. Even if you cannot disambiguate the exact reference when reading these examples in isolation, there is no doubt that the referents would be salient in any original context of these utterances.

In (392)–(394), the topics under discussion are easier to track, since the background information needed is given by a combination of real world knowledge and a situational context.

(392) Real Madrid förlorade. (Twittermix)

*Real Madrid lost*

‘Real Madrid lost [the game].’

(393) Vann med 5-3 mot Slovakien: Två snabba mål av Jokinen avgjorde. (Twittermix)

*won with 5-3 against Slovakia: Two quick goals by Jokinen settled*

‘We won with 5-3 against Slovakia: Two quick goals from Jokinen settled [the score].’

(394) Nazister från SMR attackerade. (Twittermix)

*nazis from SMR attacked*

‘Nazis from SMR attacked [them/the meeting].’

One can infer from world knowledge that Real Madrid has lost a game of soccer in (392), and in (393) one can infer that it is a game of sports that is settled and won by 5-3 through two quick goals. Likewise, in (394), the nazis from SMR apparently attacked a target of some kind, like a political demonstration or a group of people under discussion.

The point is that in (388)–(394), transitive verbs of different kinds are used in settings where the reference of the object is taken to be salient in the discourse. Unlike with IOR verbs, there is a specific reference that is essential to the interpretation of the event as well as to the interpretation of the entire sentence. The same goes for the examples in (395)–(396), repeated from (373)–(374), where the object reference can be easily understood as involving the speakers themselves, unless some other referent is more salient.

(395) Tur att du påminde. (Twittermix)

*luck that you reminded*

‘Luckily you reminded [me/us/them…].’

(396) Det var som att det hjälpte. (Twittermix)

*it was like that it helped*

‘It was as if it was helping [me/us/them…].’
The fact that the restrictions on IOO are primarily pragmatic, and that the binding of the free variable can come about in different ways does not mean that all transitive verbs accept IOO. For instance, inherently relational stative verbs do not, as we can see in (397)–(399).

\[
\begin{align*}
(397) & \quad \text{*Ingenting betydde.} \\
& \quad \text{nothing meant} \\
(398) & \quad \text{*Det innebar.} \\
& \quad \text{it implied} \\
(399) & \quad \text{*Glasyren liknade.} \\
& \quad \text{glazing.the looked.like}
\end{align*}
\]

There simply does not seem to be a context rich enough to provide a referent salient enough for these sentences to be acceptable. This is not very surprising, since the point of these verbs and utterances is to relate one referent to another. What might be more surprising is that experiencer verbs sometimes occur in sentences involving IOO, as in (400)–(402).

\[
\begin{align*}
(400) & \quad \text{Och Boktipset var riktig riktig bra,} \\
& \quad \text{and Boktipset was really really good} \\
& \quad \text{jag gillade. (Bloggmix 2007)} \\
& \quad \text{I liked} \\
& \quad \text{‘And (the TV-show) Boktipset was really really good, I liked [it].’} \\
(401) & \quad \text{Världens fulaste väder, pulsat i snö,} \\
& \quad \text{world.the.POSS ugliest weather plowed in snow} \\
& \quad \text{ogillade. (Bloggmix 2010)} \\
& \quad \text{disliked} \\
& \quad \text{‘The world’s ugliest weather, I was plowing through snow, disliked [it].’} \\
(402) & \quad \text{Han var helt enkelt en briljant debattör vilket fick till} \\
& \quad \text{he was whole simple a brilliant debater which got to} \\
& \quad \text{effekt att omgivningen antingen älskade honom, eller} \\
& \quad \text{effect that surroundings.the either loved him or} \\
& \quad \text{bara hatade. (Bloggmix 2009)} \\
& \quad \text{just hated} \\
& \quad \text{‘He was simply a brilliant debater which had the effect on his} \\
& \quad \text{surroundings that they either loved him, or just hated [him].’}
\end{align*}
\]

However, it is not clear that the verbs in these examples are still stative. Instead, they have an agentive flavor here, where the subject referent does not simply experience an emotion, but rather actively so. I will not dig into
the semantics of experience verbs any further, but I still note that they sometimes accept IOO. Instead, I will turn to the role of conventionalized activities for reference resolution.

4.2.3 Conventionalized reference

Some frames of reference are highly conventionalized. In some cases they are conventionalized enough for the verbs to intuitively be perceived as intransitives. Importantly, I do not regard these conventionalized events as distinct from the examples with scene-evoked reference. On the contrary, they typically evoke a scene that is necessary for the acceptability of the object omission, often due to lack of linguistic material invoking the scene in question. Due to convention, the scenes can be evoked rather implicitly. A couple of corpus examples are given in (403)–(404).

(403) Vi satt kvar där och pratade tills de stängde klockan tio. (Bloggmix 2008)
we sat remaining there and talked until they closed clock.the ten
‘We stayed there talking until they closed [the place] at ten o’clock.’

(404) Klockan var närmare midnatt när jag släckte.
clock.the was closer midnight when I turned off
(Bloggmix 2012)
‘It was close to midnight when I turned off [the lights].’

The examples in (403)–(404) describe conventional activities of different kinds, involving more or less typical referents. You can stay at a public place with opening hours until they close the place, whereas at night you typically turn off your bedside lamp. These interpretations are not the only ones available, but due to social and real world conventions (rather than linguistic ones), they are the ones that most typically come to mind. In that respect they are much like the preschool examples given in the previous section, (which could fit in under this heading as well).

Thus, there is no clear cut line between the examples I have classified as conventionalized and the ones I have classified as having scene-evoked reference, and there actually should not be. The amount of linguistic or situational context needed for the reference to be resolved instead relates to the degree of conventionalization, which typically varies over times and places. Since it is the events that are conventionalized rather than the verbs involved, any transitive verb that has a potential process reading should thus be a candidate for IOO with conventionalized reference. In (405), a more precise version of the IOR diagnostic used in chapter 3 is used to evoke such
conventionalized IOO readings. Examples of occupational activities that could further specify the reference are given in brackets.37

(405) Vad gjorde du på jobbet igår?
‘What did you do at work yesterday?’

a. Jag plockade. [uttered by a worker at an apple farm]
   I picked
   ‘I was picking [apples].’

b. Jag torkade [uttered by a kitchen worker].
   I dried
   ‘I was drying [the dishes].’

c. Jag öppnade [uttered by a shop assistant].
   I opened
   ‘I opened [the store].’

At first sight, it is neither obvious that all of these examples are acceptable with implicit objects, nor that they involve implicit objects with specific reference, although at least some of the verbs are inherently resultative. What is clear, however, is that the hearer is assumed to understand that the frame of interpretation is narrowed down to very specific activities typical for the work tasks at the work place, social gathering, etc. under discussion. If the examples in (405) are uttered out of the blue, it would be difficult or even impossible for the hearer not only to understand the object reference, but also to understand the activities referred to. Thus, in a neutral context, it is not primarily the reference of the object that is not salient, but the entire scene or frame of interpretation. Whenever such a frame is given, for instance if the hearer knows anything at all about the place where the speaker works or about the particular tasks and participants involved in the different work tasks, it is also clear what activity is being described and what the reference of the object is. Consequently, I consider examples like the ones in (405) to be cases of IOO, and the reference of the UNDERGOER object to be pragmatically resolved, although they bear striking similarities to some cases of IOR.

Even though the special interpretations that arise in the particular contexts in (405) are occupational, it is not the case that all verbs with an occupational reading are analyzed the same way. Consider a verb like operera ‘operate’ where the occupational activity is part of the lexical-encyclopedic meaning of the verb, as in (406).

37 Mittwoch (2005:244) observes that occupational readings of some English verbs with implicit objects can arise in the right context. She exemplifies with e.g. direct (films), produce (films), and conduct (music).
Importantly, the verb *operera* ‘operate’ accepts the IOR diagnostic, at least when the question is put forward to someone who is a doctor, see (407).

(407) *Vad gjorde du igår kväll?*

‘What did you do last night?’

*Jag opererade.*

*I was operating.*

Accordingly, *operera* ‘operate’ is an IOR verb and (407) is not an example of IOO. This means that the examples in (405) and (407) receive two separate analyses although the occupational meaning components in the particular contexts given in (405) are very similar to the one in (407). It is the inclusion of the occupational activity in the lexical meaning of *operera* ‘operate’ that singles it out from the verbs in (405), which only have an occupational meaning in some contexts.

It is also possible to speculate that conventionalized activities in the world could potentially lead to conventionalized meanings of verbs, which in turn could lead to flexibility in argument structure with the same verbs. This would mean that the process verbs with UNDERGOER objects, i.e. \([\text{init}, \text{proc}]\) verbs, are sometimes interpreted as instead having UNDERGOER subjects, i.e. as \([\text{init}, \text{proc}]\) when used without an object, as in (408)–(409) (cf. the discussion in 3.8).

(408) *Alla vägar bär till Rom.*

*all roads carry to Rome*

‘All roads lead to Rome.’

(409) *Björn höll hela loppet.*

*Björn held whole race.*

‘Björn lasted the entire race.’

In (408)–(409), the subject is the argument expressing the UNDERGOER of process, i.e. the verbs in these examples are intransitive, and their meanings are more or less distinct from the meanings of the transitive variants in (410).

(410) *Björn höll medan Elsa slog.*

*Björn held while Elsa hit*

‘Björn was holding while Elsa was hitting [some salient referent].’
If these speculations are on the right track, some verbs with an [init, proc] specification could be truly ambiguous when it comes to transitivity, since they do not take a separate UNDERGOER object in the specifier of procP. Given the verb phrase I assumed in chapter 3, I thus suggest that this pattern is a consequence of inbuilt flexibility in the system. The transitive [init, proc] verbs are particularly suited for an intransitive [init, proc] alternation, a flexibility consistent with the data just described.

It is, however, important to point out that these are mere speculations, and quite informal ones too. The main point here is to emphasize that I/OO is not really restricted by event structure, but by pragmatics. To the extent that some patterns arise that are related to what might look like event structure, these are mostly contextual, since different verbs react differently to pragmatic restrictions in different contexts. In other words, the variation is contextual, not event structural. There are, however, still some unanswered questions regarding the syntactic activity of I/OO objects, which will be addressed in the following section.

4.3 Syntactic activity of omitted UNDERGOER objects

In this chapter, I have assumed that the implicit objects involved in I/OO realize the UNDERGOER (or RESULTSEE-UNDERGOER) role in the verb phrase, but that the specifier position of procP (and resP) is left empty. In the syntax, I/OO examples can thus look like the trees in (411)–(412), where the empty positions are marked with the e symbol.

(411) Verb phrase structure of bära ‘carry’ in I/OO (cf. (364))
This way, I can account for the fact that there are no restrictions relating to the structure of the verb phrase. Instead, the restrictions are pragmatic. In some ways but not others, the discourse status of IIO objects has been demonstrated to resemble the status of pronouns. If the IIO objects would be analyzed as pronouns, we would expect them to be syntactically active. Much like Landau (2010), for implicit arguments in general, I draw the conclusion that IIO objects are not as syntactically active as for instance null pronouns in so-called pro-drop languages, but still visible to some syntactic processes.

Standard tests for the syntactic activity of null elements involve control, binding and secondary predicates (cf. Rizzi 1986, Bhatt & Pancheva 2006). Control is good when testing the syntactic activity for null subjects, but it is less suitable for the systematic testing of syntactic activity of implicit objects. It could only work for verbs with object control, typically ditransitive verbs. A possible example is given in (413) from Lyngfelt (2002:109). However, Lyngfelt (2002) does not treat this as a case of syntactic control, but argues that rekommendera ‘recommend’ is a mono-transitive verb and that PRO receives its interpretation pragmatically.

(413) Vi rekommenderar att ta bussen i stället för bilen.
we recommend to take bus.the in place for car.the

till jobbet.

‘We recommend [people] to take the bus instead of the car to work.’
A similar example from my data is given in (414):

(414) Det är nu tio år sedan Läkemedelsverket varnade
for att behandla barn och ungdomar med SSRI.

‘It has now been ten years since Läkemedelsverket (the Swedish Drug Administration) warned against treating children and adolescents with SSRIs.’

Thus, depending on the analysis, the example in (414) could be argued to provide some support for the omitted objects in IOO as syntactically active, although alternative analyses are available and the test is difficult to use systematically.

Also, compare (413)–(414) with the fully grammatical example in (415) where there is no syntactically active controller, since the non-agentive subject cannot control an intentional phrase.

(415) Grass is green [to promote photosynthesis] (from Williams (1974) via Bhatt & Pancheva 2006)

Given examples like (415), and the fact that a small set of verbs can be tested for object control, control is apparently not the best test for implicit IOO objects. Instead, binding could be a better test. An example where an IOO object is an antecedent of an anaphor (a reflexive pronoun) would be evidence for analyzing the omitted object as syntactically active. There might be such a case in (416) with the verb öppna ‘open’. This can also be compared to the variant with an overt object in (417).

(416) Q: Vad har du gjort med fönstret?  
What have you done with window-the

Det, går inte att stänga.
it can not to close
‘What have you done to the window? It doesn’t close.’

A: Jag vet, jag öppnade e, till sitt, yttersta läge
I know I opened to POSS.REFL outermost position
och så fastnade det, and so stuck it
‘I know, I opened [it] to its outermost position and then it got stuck.’

(417) Jag öppnade fönstret, till sitt, yttersta läge.
I opened window.the to POSS.REFL outermost position
‘I opened the window to its outermost position.’
However, it is well known that the reflexive pronoun is not the unmarked choice for expressing relationships like the ones in (416) and (417). Instead, there is a preference among speakers for the definite DP as an implicit posses- sive. This means that even though at least some speakers accept (416) and (417), the implicit possessor version in (418) is preferred.

(418) Jag öppnade fönstret till det yttersta läget.
    \hspace{1cm} I opened window.the to the outermost position
    \hspace{1cm} ’I opened the window to its outermost position.’

There is also a well-known normative pressure on subject control in Swedish (see Tingsell 2007), which says that the anaphor should be bound by the subject, not the object, as in (419).

(419) Hon öppnade dörren till sitt rum.
    \hspace{1cm} she opened door.the to POSS.REFL room
    \hspace{1cm} ’She opened the door to her room.’

This means that there are independent reasons for speaker disagreements on the acceptability of (416). However, in (420) the [init, proc., res] verb lägga ‘place; put in a laying position’, is used in an example where there is no implicit possessor alternative, probably because of the weak relationship between the book and its place.

(420) Q: Var är boken?
    \hspace{1cm} where is book.the
    \hspace{1cm} ‘Where is the book?’

    A: Jag lade e på sin plats.
    \hspace{1cm} I put on POSS.REFL place
    \hspace{1cm} ‘I put [it] in its place.’

(420) is at least potentially as good as (421) with an overt object, whereas the implicit possessor variant (422) is bad.

(421) Jag lade den på sin plats.
    \hspace{1cm} I put it on POSS.REFL place
    \hspace{1cm} ‘I put it in its place.’

(422) ??Jag lade den på platsen.
    \hspace{1cm} I put it on place.the

Thus, quite as expected, the IOO objects show a potentially syntactically active behavior, but the evidence is not particularly strong. Whether this is due to the tests or to the unclear status of IOO objects is unclear. However,

38 See e.g. Lødrup (2009) for an analysis of possessor raising in Norwegian.
from the data presented here, I do not see any reason to assume that IOO involves a *pro* or some other null pronoun.

### 4.4 Summary

In this chapter, I have shown that the restrictions on IOO in Swedish are not primarily related to event structure, nor to syntax, but to pragmatics. I have analyzed the implicit objects involved in IOO as free variables that are pragmatically bound.

On an observational level, the free variable can receive its interpretation in different ways: anaphorically, deictically, or from the wider context. The anaphoric and deictic relations are resolved through a specific referent that is either mentioned in the linguistic context or highly salient in the situation. The contextual reference is less direct, in that the linguistic context or situation provides a frame of reference for the speaker and hearer, who can pick the most salient or most likely referent out of a set of participants in that scene. This frame of reference can in turn be established either through the situational evoking of a scene or through events that are construed as conventionalized in the world. However, in all of these cases the reference is pragmatically resolved in terms of salience and interpretability. Put another way, the implicit object in IOO refers to the most salient possible referent, regardless of its being previously introduced into the linguistic context or not.

This chapter closes with a brief discussion on the syntactic activity of IOO objects, showing that they have an unclear syntactic status in syntactic control tests and binding tests, which strengthens my assumptions that IOO is a pragmatic phenomenon rather than a strictly syntactic one, and that they introduce free variables that are pragmatically bound.
5 Implicit Object Kill Type (IOK)

This chapter is concerned with a third type of objectless sentence (IOK), which appears to be restricted to generic sentences (including habituals). IOK typically involves the destruction verbs from section 3.5.3, as in (423)–(424).

(423) Soldater dödar i krig. (Google)
soldiers kill in war
‘Soldiers kill in war.’

(424) Vikingarna plunderade i de flesta europeiska länder. (Google)
vikings.the plundered in the most European countries
‘The vikings plundered in most European countries.’

In fact, it is not obvious that the examples in (423)–(424) constitute a type of their own, but since the verbs involved do not pass the IOR diagnostic (as demonstrated in section 3.5.3), and since there is no specific reference salient in the context, they nevertheless deserve special treatment. Moreover, since the objectless sentences with verbs of destruction are characterizing, genericity (in its broad sense) appears to be either a consequence of some types of implicit objects or a necessary condition for such implicit objects to occur. The conditions involved in examples like (423)–(424) is the topic for the present chapter.

First, in section 5.1, I will show that in spite of confining the IOR and IOO discussions in chapters 3–4 to episodic readings, neither IOR nor IOO are actually restricted to episodic sentences but can occur in generic sentences as well. In section 5.2, I will therefore define more precisely how to distinguish what I call IOK from IOR and IOO. Then, in section 5.3, I will briefly discuss the ambiguity of bare NPs and give a short introduction to the quantificational approach to indefinites, following Diesing (1992). In section 5.3.2, I will adopt Diesing’s distinction between quantificational and existential indefinites to account for the existential object interpretation of IOK sentences. I will limit the discussion to what I propose are omitted bare NPs in object position, and I will argue that omitted IOK objects evoke a plural existential interpretation. This small venture into the vast land of bare NPs, indefinites and generics, is neither intended as an account of the status of bare NPs nor of indefinites or genericity, since those topics are all huge research areas in their own right. I will simply refer to the well-known uncertain characteristics of those topics in the search for an account of IOK.
and a better understanding of the conditions involved. Finally, I also want to point out that the empirical base for this chapter is not as solid as for the IOR and IOO chapters.

5.1 IOR and IOO in generic sentences

Although I have limited the discussion in chapters 3–4 to episodic sentences in the past tense in order to avoid unnecessary ambiguity, there is nothing in my analysis that rules out the possibility of IOR as well as IOO occurring in generic (including habitual) contexts as well. If we also consider present tense sentences, we can come up with examples like (425)–(426), which both involve kind-referring subjects and are clearly generic since they both express regularities about their subjects.

(425) En del arter åter bara två gånger om året.
*a part species eat only two times per year*
‘Some species eat only twice a year.’

(426) Riktiga husmödrar stänger till vardagsrummet när de steker lök.
*real housewives close to living room when they fry onions*
‘Real housewives close [the door] to the living room when frying onions.’

Since I have analyzed verbs such as äta ‘eat’ as intransitives, it would be odd if I did not also treat them as intransitives in generic sentences. In (425) we have a generic statement about some species, but it is not the genericity per se that allows the intransitive use of äta ‘eat’, and the example could be defined as a case of IOR, just like the corresponding episodic example in (427).

(427) Axel åt så fort han vaknade i morgon.
*Axel ate as quickly he woke in morning*
‘Axel ate as soon as he woke up this morning.’

Likewise, in (426) we have a generic statement about what constitutes real housewives, but without the PP till vardagsrummet ‘to the living room’ (or some other context providing a frame of interpretation) the sentence would be infelicitous, leaving the hearer puzzled as to what is being closed, see (428).

(428) Riktiga husmödrar stänger när de steker lök.
*real housewives close when they fry onions*
In other words, the PP in (426) provides a context from which a specific referent (the door to the living room) can be inferred. This is true of the generic sentence in (426) as well as its clearly episodic counterpart in (429).

(429) Axel stängde till vardagsrummet igår när han stekte lök.

‘Axel closed [the door] to the living room yesterday when frying onions.’

Thus, although genericity has been identified in previous research as involved in promoting objectlessness, genericity alone is not a sufficient condition since (428) is unacceptable, nor does genericity necessarily give rise to a particular type of objectless sentence in its own right. Instead, (426) is merely a case of IOO in a generic sentence, i.e. as far as the implicit object goes the example in (426) is no different from IOO in episodic sentences (429). However, IOO cannot account for all cases of objectless generic sentences with transitive verbs. Consequently, the rest of this chapter is only concerned with examples that can neither be analyzed as IOR nor IOO. All other examples are set aside.

5.2 IOK in generic sentences

Apart from IOR and IOO in generic sentences, there are generic objectless sentences that cannot be straightforwardly analyzed as IOR or IOO, like the ones in (423)–(424), repeated here as (430)–(431).

(430) Soldater dödar i krig. (Google)

‘Soldiers kill in war.’

(431) Vikingarna plunderade i de flesta europeiska länder. (Google)

‘The Vikings plundered in most European countries.’

As shown in section 3.5.3, verbs of destructions like döda ‘kill’ and plundera ‘plunder’ do not pass the IOR diagnostic, see (432).

(432) Vad gjorde du igår kväll?

‘What did you do last night?’

a. *Jag dödade.
   I killed

b. *Jag plunderade.
   I plundered
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Moreover, in (430)–(431) there is no salient object referent provided by the context, as would have been the case in IOO, as I defined it in chapter 4. Thus, neither IOR nor IOO can explain what is going on in these examples.

The question then is not only what part genericity plays in licensing the implicit object in these examples, but also how to describe and define examples like (430)–(431). As mentioned in section 2.2.3, genericity and/or habituality is often mentioned in previous research as a condition that licenses or improves the use of implicit objects, but it is unclear what status examples like (430)–(431) have. For the reasons just given, I will treat them as separate from both IOR and IOO and refer to them as IOK.

Genericity and habituality are not always distinguished from each other in the literature: sometimes the notion generic includes habitual and sometimes it is the other way around. When a distinction is made between generic and habitual sentences, it is in terms of generic sentences involving a kind-referring subject, i.e. a subject with generic reference, as in (433), compared to the habitual with a referential pronoun as a subject in (434).

What generic and habitual sentences have in common is that they make reference to regularities (Carlson 2012). This in turn distinguishes them from iteratives, which describe a repeated action and thus rather makes reference to a plurality of episodic events. Unambiguous iterative actions include semelfactive verbs such as *knock*, which typically involves repeated action.

Although some corpus examples refer to a regularity that comes about from the repetition of episodic events, they are habitual rather than iterative, as for example (435)–(436).

I will use the term generic as including habitual sentences, and most but not all of my examples are habitual. The IOK examples typically involve verbs

(433) Vargen dödar för att överleva. (Google)

wolf.the kills for to survive

‘Wolves kill [their prey] in order to survive.’

(434) Jag kan sitta och spela spel där jag dödar och härjar

I can sit and play games where I kill and ravage

run (Bloggmix 2011)

around

‘I can sit around and play games where I kill and ravage about.’

(435) De dödar, och mordar och krigar. (Bloggmix 2004)

they kill and murder and war

‘They kill, and murder and make war.’

(436) Dom river sönder, dom ödelägger, dom förstör. (Bloggmix 2011)

they tear apart they desolate they destroy

‘They tear apart, they desolate, they destroy.’

I will use the term generic as including habitual sentences, and most but not all of my examples are habitual. The IOK examples typically involve verbs
of destruction, and my discussion here exclusively concerns such verbs, but I do not exclude the possibility of other verbs accepting IOK.

5.3 The interpretation of IOK objects

The object reference potentially involved in IOK is unclear. On the surface, IOK in this respect resembles IOR with pseudo-transitive verbs, although destruction verbs like döda ‘kill’ are not IOR verbs. Thus, it appears as if the event structure restrictions on IOR discussed in chapter 3 could be overridden in generic/habitual sentences. Some previous accounts (e.g. Härtl 2013) have indeed analyzed IOK as IOR in generic sentences where the verbs undergo a detransitivization operation. The restrictions involved in such an operation are however unclear, since IOO also occur in generic sentences. Also, with my analysis of IOR as involving intransitive verbs with optional RHEMES, a detransitivization account of IOK would not be straightforwardly captured as a special case of IOR. Instead, I will analyze IOK as involving existential binding of a variable introduced by an omitted bare NP. Thus, in my proposal, IOK resembles IOO more than it does IOR, since both IOO and IOK involve free variables. In order to argue for my analysis, I will refer to the well-known ambiguity of bare NPs (see e.g. Krifka et al. 1995, Krifka 2004, Grønn 2006).

5.3.1 Quantificational vs. existential readings

I will phrase my IOK analysis loosely in line with the approach of Diesing (1992), who elaborates on the accounts of Kamp (1981) and Heim (1982) and argues that indefinite NPs (her terminology) introduce variables into the semantic representations. Diesing (1992:109f.) shows that for some sets of verbs, indefinite NPs with weak quantifiers (such as a, some, a few) and bare NP objects are ambiguous between two readings when they occur in generic and habitual contexts, as in (437) from Diesing (1992:105). In one of the readings, the NP has a quantificational/presuppositional reading that arises from quantifier raising of the NP from the VP to IP, where it gets bound by either an overt quantificational adverb like always or usually or by an abstract generic operator (Gen). In the IP, it forms a restrictive clause in the semantic representation (cf. Kamp 1981 and Heim 1982, Krifka et al. 1995). The other available reading is an existential one, where the NP does not

---

39 The distinction between strong and weak quantifiers builds upon the work of Milsark (1974).
undergo quantifier raising to IP and instead receives quantificational force from existential closure.\footnote{The quantificational/presuppositional reading corresponds to what I have labeled specific reference when discussing IOO, whereas the existential reading in large respects corresponds to what I have labeled non-specific reference.}

(437) I always write up a witty story about Millard Fillmore.

Quantificational reading: Whenever I hear a witty story about Millard Fillmore, I always write it up.

Existential reading: First thing in the morning, I always write up a witty story about Millard Fillmore.

In the quantificational reading, the variable introduced by the NP a witty story about Millard Fillmore is bound by the quantificational adverb always, whereas in the existential reading always instead binds some context variable, which can be implicit or explicit. In Diesing’s example that context variable is ‘morning situations’, as in the semantic representations in (438)–(439) (from Diesing 1992:105).

(438) Always, [x is a story about Millard Fillmore] I write up x

(439) Always, [t is in the morning] \( \exists x \) x is a story about Millard Fillmore \& I write up x at t

In the existential interpretation the variable x, introduced by the indefinite NP, a witty story about Millard Fillmore is instead bound by existential closure from the existential operator \( \exists \), and not by the adverb always, which instead bounds the (here implicit) context variable. It is clear from the data in Diesing (1992) that some bare NPs are ambiguous, and that the existential reading allows for some linguistic phenomena that the quantificational reading does not.

Turning to IOK examples, we can see that if a bare NP is inserted instead of the omitted object in such an example, the reading is ambiguous in very much the same way as the example in (437), see (440).

(440) Soldater dödar fiender/ folk i krig.

soldiers kill enemies people in war

‘Soldiers kill enemies/people in war.’

Quantificational reading: Whenever soldiers come across (some) enemies/people in war, they kill them.

Existential reading: Whenever there is a war, soldiers kill enemies/people.

For the sake of clarity, the semantic representations for the two readings are given in (441)–(442).
Always, \( [x \text{ is some enemies/people}] \) soldiers kill \( x \)

Always, \( [t \text{ is when there is a war}] \) \( \exists x, x \text{ is some enemies/people} \land \) soldiers kill \( x \) at \( t \)

In other words, (440) is ambiguous in a similar fashion as (437).

Diesing (1992:120ff.) also relates her discussion to observations by Erteschik-Shir (1973) and Horn (1974) of regularities over the interpretation of indefinite NP objects of verbs belonging to different verb classes. The observations as described in Diesing (1992) are relevant to the destruction verbs that appear to be typical for IOK. According to Diesing (1992:120ff.), the interpretations of indefinite and bare NP objects of verbs of destruction are sensitive to context. A presuppositional reading is strongly preferred, and the only one available in episodic sentences, but for habituals an existential reading is also available. In other words, the ambiguity in (440) arises in generic/habitual sentences but not in episodic sentences.

5.3.2 The existential reading of IOK objects

From the observations made above, I propose that IOK involves an omitted bare NP object. However, as opposed to the ambiguous reading of the overt bare NP in (440), the object interpretation in IOK is unambiguously existential, which is demonstrated in (443).

\[
(443) \text{Soldater dödar i krig.}
\]

\[
\text{soldiers kill in war}
\]

‘Soldiers kill in war.’

*Quantificational reading: Whenever soldiers come across some enemies in war, they kill them.

Existential reading: Whenever there is a war, soldiers kill some enemies.

The difference in ambiguity between (440) and (443) suggests that in IOK, an otherwise ambiguous bare NP object receives an unambiguous existential reading. As noted in section 2.3.3, it seems like the genericity somehow forces this existential or non-specific reading of the bare NP object. 41

The same kind of interpretation as the one for (443) applies to IOK examples with other verbs of destruction from the empirical study in chapter 2. However, it is trickier to analyze the examples from language use, such as

---

41 Mittwoch (2005:249ff.) observes that existential closure in habitual sentences can account for unspecified interpretations of implicit objects. She argues that object drop is facilitated in some habitual sentences and that this can explain why verbs of destruction accept implicit objects in habitual sentences but not in episodic ones. My account is thus similar to hers, although I explicitly confine my analysis to verbs that do not accept IOR.
the ones in (444)–(446), since the verbs are often used in subordinate structures such as relative clauses.

(444) De framställs som giriga blodiga barbarer som inte gjorde
they portray.PASS as greedy bloody savages that not did
annat än att skövla och mördå. (Bloggmix 2010)
else than to desolate and murder
‘They are portrayed as greedy bloody savages that never did anything
but desolate and murder.’

(445) De jävla huliganer som […] plundrar, bränner, vandaliserar,
the damn hooligans that plunder burn vandalize
bräkar och förstör har det fulla ansvaret för sina
row and destroy have the full responsibility for their
handlingar. (Bloggmix 2011)
actions
‘The damn hooligans who plunder, burn, vandalize, row and destroy
have the full responsibility for their actions.’

(446) Även om det handlar om en otrevlig maktmänniska som
even if it deals about an unpleasant power seeker who
torterar och avrättar. (Bloggmix 2014)
tortures and executes
‘Even if the story is about an unpleasant power-seeker who tortures
and executes.’

If rewriting these examples as simple sentences with generic readings, they
still accept IOK. In (447), which is a modified version of (444), the context
variable involved in the existential reading is implicit, and I have loosely
interpreted it as “whenever given opportunity”.

(447) De skövlar och mördar.
they desolate and murder

*Quantificational reading: Whenever they come across some
stuff/people to ravage or murder, they ravage it and murder them.

Existential reading: Whenever given opportunity, they ravage some
stuff and murder some people.

In (447), just like for (443) and for IOK in general, the quantificational reading
is blocked since there is nothing to quantify over, whereas the existential
reading is available.
5.3.3 Restrictions on the interpretation

The restrictions involved in IOK could be defined as something very similar to the IOO restrictions – that the object can only be omitted if the sentence is interpretable, i.e. in the case of IOK if the existential reading comes across. Consider the infelicitous (428) again, here repeated as (448).

(448) #Riktiga husmådrar stänger när de steker lök.
    real housewives close when they fry onions

Thus, IOK is an operation quite similar to IOO in that it involves variable binding of an omitted object. However, the existential closure of the omitted bare NP involved in IOK renders a sentence more similar to an IOR sentence when it comes to the ‘irrelevance’ of the object participant. Put differently, neither in IOK nor in IOR is there a presupposed/specific referent, whereas the omitted objects in IOO are unambiguously specific and presuppositional, since they involve DPs.

Thus, in the IOK analysis given here, an existential quantifier above the VP is assumed to existentially close off the free variable introduced by the omitted object in the specifier of procP in the verb phrase. As far as the VP is concerned, an IOK sentence could be represented with a tree structure such as the one in (449).

(449) Verb phrase structure of plunder ‘plunder’, used in IOK

![Verb phrase structure diagram]

Just like for IOO, I have marked the empty specifier position with the $e$ symbol, leaving open the question of the precise nature of the null element. The verb phrase of an IOK example and an IOO example are syntactically identical with the exception of the absence of a resP in (449). However, where an omitted IOO object picks up its reference pragmatically, an omitted IOK object is here assumed to be associated with an existential quantifier in the syntax above the VP.
5.3.4 IOK in episodic sentences

I have only included generic and habitual sentences in my IOK analysis above. However, it appears as if there are some very special circumstances under which verbs of destruction can also appear in IOK in episodic sentences. Consider the example discussed by Goldberg (2001:507) in (450), repeated from (38).

(450) Scarface killed again.

In (450), a particular event is reported, and the example is clearly episoedic. Nonetheless, *again* implies that a similar killing event has taken place before, which in this case evokes the idea of a generalization over sets of events. Also, the repeated event is construed as part of more or less habitual behavior, i.e. the sentence is characterizing just like generic sentences. It is hardly a coincidence that the subject in (450) is Scarface, a known killer. Compare this with the bad examples in (451)–(452), where no such general world-knowledge about the subject referent can be assumed.

(451) ??Axel dödade igen.
     Axel killed again

(452) ??Axel plundrade igen.
     Axel plundered again

Although the repetitive meaning of *igen* ‘again’ in (451)–(452) implies that Axel has killed or plundered before, the examples are only acceptable in a world where Axel is a known killer/plunderer. Compare this with the fully acceptable (453), which is similar to (450).

(453) Vandalerna plundrade igen.
     vandals.the plundered again
     ‘The vandals plundered [some village/store/…] again.’

It is clear that the quantificational readings of the omitted objects are blocked in the repeated events in (450) and (453), i.e. there is no object referent to quantify over. It is also clear that there are no implications of the object referring to the same individual in the repeated event as in the implicit previous event.42 Once again, this separates the destruction verbs from the inherently resultative verbs like *öppna* ‘open’:

(454) Axel öppnade igen.
     Axel opened again
     ‘Axel opened [the door] again.’

42 For the verb *döda* ‘kill’ such a reading is blocked for real-world reasons (cf. the discussion in section 3.5.3).
In (454), the object referent is necessarily the same one in the repeated event as in the implied previous event(s).

5.4 The IOR/IOO/IOK distinction once more

I have already distinguished between the specific reference involved in IOO and the existential reading involved in IOK. I have also argued that IOO as well as IOK involves the obligatory interpretation of the omitted object, and that both phenomena can be analyzed as introducing free variables into the logic representation. In other words, the distinction between IOO and IOK does not necessarily have to be maintained syntactically. However, since the interpretation of the omitted object comes about in two different ways, it is clear that a distinction exists on some level. Since IOK only occurs in characterizing sentences, as well as with a particular set of verbs, IOK is different from IOO regarding the binding of the free variable. For IOO, the reference of the omitted object is resolved pragmatically, whereas IOK has been argued to involve existential closure of the free variable introduced by the omitted bare NP object. It is not obvious what the causal chain is, i.e. if there are distinct variables licensed by distinct omitted objects in distinct types of sentences, or if the type of sentence (characterizing or not) instead gives rise to distinct interpretations of the free variable.43 Nonetheless, it is clear that IOO as well as IOK involves an omitted UNDERGOER object. Consequently, they both are equally distinct from IOR, in that the latter does not involve any object at all.

5.5 Summary

In this chapter, I have shown that neither IOR nor IOO is restricted to episodic sentences but can occur in generic sentences as well. I have also showed that there are some objectless generic sentences that cannot be accounted for by IOR or IOO, but instead is a type in its own right. This latter type is what I refer to as IOK. I have proposed that IOK involves an omitted bare NP that receives an unambiguous existential reading when omitted. The omission of the bare NP leaves the specifier of proc empty. Just like for IOO, the empty specifier position requires an interpretation of the omitted object. I have analyzed this in terms of the omitted bare NP introducing a free variable that is closed off by existential closure. In other words,

If indeed assuming empty pronouns, keeping the IOO/IOK distinction could lead to the assumption of two different null pronouns in the lexicon, one with specific reference and one with non-specific/existential reference, both of which introduce distinct variables. The alternative would be to assume one null pronoun that introduces a free variable that either is bound pragmatically as in IOO or by existential closure in the case of IOK.
IOK involves a non-specific existential reading of an omitted bare NP object. The bare NP is typically plural and involves a non-specific member of a set.
6 Objects, verb meaning and flexibility

This thesis is concerned with implicit objects in objectless sentences in Swedish. More specifically, the thesis treats optional and omitted objects in three separate types of objectless sentences with potentially transitive verbs, exemplified in (455)–(457).

(455) Sally läste.
Sally read
‘Sally was reading.’

(456) Det knackade på dörren. Sally öppnade.
it knocked on door.the Sally opened
‘There was a knock on the door. Sally opened [it].’

(457) Soldater dödar i krig.
soldiers kill in war
‘Soldiers kill [people] in war.’

The sentence in (455) is an example of what I refer to as Implicit Object Read type (IOR), (456) is an example of Implicit Object Open type (IOO) and (457) is an example of Implicit Object Kill type (IOK). Three separate syntactic-semantic analyses of the three types of examples are proposed. In line with previous research by e.g. Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998), I show that it is crucial to keep separate the event structural and the referential conditions involved with the different types of examples in order to separate IOR from IOO and IOK and trace the restrictions and interpretations involved.

The unified study of these three partly independent phenomena demonstrates that there are at least two distinct types of syntactic objects. In the Ramchandian (2008) verb phrase assumed here, those two types each realize distinct generalized participant roles in the verb phrase, labeled RHEMES and UNDERGOERS respectively. The two roles are in turn associated with separate syntactic positions in the event building verb phrase. A RHEME can be optionally inserted into a complement position in the processual subevent of the verb phrase of a particular set of dynamic process verbs, whereas an UNDERGOER object obligatorily occupies a specifier position. Thus, the syntactic approach to event structure taken here straightforwardly distinguishes between optional and obligatory objects, a distinction supported by my data. As a consequence of RHEMES being syntactically optional, the pseudo-transitive verbs taking such objects are here recharacterized as being basi-
cally intransitive. This redefinition leads to a clear distinction between IOR, on the one hand, and IOO and IOK on the other, not only regarding the interpretations and the restrictions on the three phenomena, but also with respect to the abstract syntactic-semantic analyses assumed. It should be mentioned that my syntactic analysis of IOR is more elaborate and formal than my analyses of IOO and IOK, which both to a large extent follow from my event structural approach to IOR.

Thus, the main contributions of my thesis relate to knowledge about implicit objects, and to the transitivity status and possible RHEME objects of verbs sometimes labeled pseudo-transitive. Whereas I assume the potential interpretations of a particular objectless utterance to be restricted and guided by the event structure of the verb, I assume much of the restrictions of verb-object relations of pseudo-transitive verbs to be encyclopedic in nature, which in turn raises larger questions about verb meaning and argument structure, some of which I will discuss in this chapter.

6.1 Verbs, objects and transitivity

In Ramchand’s system, the lexical category verb, or the syntactic head V, is decomposed into smaller units, i.e. the heads init, proc, and res. Syntactically, this decomposition is motivated by the fact that a binary and asymmetrical recursive mechanism proves capable of building the predications and participant relations usually seen as lexicalized by single verbs. Thus, in syntactic terms, the VP is built from the embedding of subevents, where init, proc and res are heads of one subevent each. The heads are in turn lexicalized by a single lexical item in some combination or other. Consequently, what is usually conceptualized as the lexical category verb can be characterized as a bundle of category specifications. However, the single lexical item is associated with more information than the minimal lexical specification relevant for syntax. In the approach I have taken here, all non-syntactic information about a lexical item has been dispensed with from the lexicon and instead moved to what I have been referring to as the encyclopedia and to world knowledge. The idea is that the purely linguistic information we have about verbs can be narrowed down to the category information relevant for syntax, whereas all other information, i.e. the idiosyncratic content side of lexical items, is not necessarily strictly linguistic. Instead, such information is potentially part of a larger cognitive-cultural knowledge about the events in the world that verbs describe.

This approach raises the question of what a verb really is. If, like Ramchand (2008:41), we see the dynamic event minimally represented by a proc head as “the topological equivalent to a path”, and accordingly a (dynamic) verb as representing a “single coherent path” (procP) that sometimes obligatorily expresses a beginning point (initP) and/or an end point
(resP), then the category ‘verb’ is conceptualized as a path of change. The 
UNDERGOER argument is what traverses that path, and importantly the 
UNDERGOER can be realized as either the subject or the object in a sentence. 
RHEMES, on the other hand, further describe the path of change, i.e. they 
further describe the event. Thus, RHEME objects are distinct from 
UNDERGOER objects in that they give rise to abstract path structures. In the 
syntactic approach taken here, this difference is not just semantic in charac-
ter but also syntactic. RHEMES and UNDERGOERS have distinct syntactic 
status, where the former is a complement and the latter a specifier of a 
subevent. As a consequence of this view, a verb is not really a linguistic 
primitive, although it definitely still makes sense to talk about verbs as a 
lexical category.

Importantly, the distinction between RHEME objects and UNDERGOER 
objects is related to the event structure of sets of verbs. Although I have 
characterized RHEMES as objects that are incremental themes, the increment-
tality is necessarily tied to the event structure of a verb. Consequently, the 
very same DP object can realize distinct participant roles in distinct events. 
Whereas the DP boken ‘the book’ is a RHEME in the reading event in (458), it 
is an UNDERGOER in the carrying event described in (459).

(458) Elsa läste boken i köket. 
  *Elsa read book.the in kitchen.the* 
  ‘Elsa read the book in the kitchen.’

(459) Elsa bar boken till köket. 
  *Elsa carried book.the to kitchen.the* 
  ‘Elsa carried the book to the kitchen.’

In contrast to (459), boken ‘the book’ in (458) is not what traverses the path 
of change in the reading event, but rather the subject Elsa is. This ability to 
be realized as RHEMES as well as UNDERGOERS singles out DPs and bare 
NPs from other XPs, which cannot be realized in specifier positions. In other 
words, RHEMES can be realized by phrases other than DPs, whereas 
UNDERGOERS cannot. Traditionally, non-DP RHEMES are not characterized as 
objects. However, both DP RHEMES and PP RHEMES can introduce referents 
into the discourse:

(460) Elsa läste en bok. Den var bra. 
  *Elsa read a book. It was good.* 
  ‘Elsa read a book. It was a good one.’

(461) Elsa åkte till Axel. Han var inte hemma. 
  *Elsa went to Axel he was not at home* 
  ‘Elsa went to Axel. He was not at home.’
The DP *en bok* ‘a book’, as well as the PP *till Axel* ‘to Axel’, are RHEMES in the complement of *proc* in the syntactic structures of (460)–(461). Accordingly, they are syntactically identical. Although they much like UNDERGOERS can introduce discourse referents, their primary linguistic task is to provide an abstract path-like scalar structure homomorphic to the path of change, a task not shared by separate UNDERGOER objects.

In this thesis, I have argued that the RHEME objects of IOR verbs like *läsa* ‘read’ are always optional. Accordingly, pseudo-transitive verbs are truly *pseudo*-transitive, i.e. actually intransitive. In Ramchand’s (2008) approach, transitivity is an epiphenomenon in that it follows from the verb phrase structure and from the role realization in each subevent. This means that it is less important if we call the IOR verbs intransitive, pseudo-transitive, or transitive as long as the verb phrase structure and the object status are clear. On the same note, calling RHEMES objects or not is not crucial to the analysis, as long as the term object is used in its pretheoretical sense. However, the splitting of the category ‘object’ into two distinct types, RHEME objects and UNDERGOER objects, is essential, and the distinction is both syntactically and semantically motivated.

The distinction between RHEMES and UNDERGOERS also strengthens the analysis of IOR on the one hand, and IOO and IOK on the other, as two independent phenomena. There has been an understanding of IOR and IOO as two separate phenomena for a long time (see e.g. Mittwoch 1982, Fillmore 1986), but there is also work that has tried to analyze them within a unified approach as two variants of the same phenomenon (e.g. Goldberg 2001). Moreover, IOK has often been analyzed as a special case of IOR (e.g. Goldberg 2001, Lambrecht & Lemoine 2005). Without an understanding of the distinction between RHEMES and UNDERGOERS, particular examples of objectless sentences can indeed be difficult to pin down as cases of either IOR or IOO or IOK. I have shown that empirically they can look very similar. Thus, from a strictly observational point of view there is reason to treat these phenomena if not jointly at least simultaneously, since the distinctions made between the three types highlight the intricacies involved in each phenomenon.

Whereas IOR can be straightforwardly captured by event structure restrictions, IOO and IOK are associated with event structure in a less direct way, in that the verbs in IOO and IOK unlike IOR verbs do not take RHEME objects. Instead, IOO and IOK both involve true transitive verbs with omitted UNDERGOER objects. Since UNDERGOERS as opposed to RHEMES are realized in an obligatory specifier position, the empty position requires an interpretation. I have shown that in IOO a salient and specific referent is required for the reference to be resolved, and I have argued that IOO is pragmatic in nature. IOO appears to be quite free with respect to its distribution without any particular syntactic restrictions. For IOK, I have argued that the omitted object is a bare NP that gets an existential, non-specific inter-
interpretation, and that the phenomenon appears to be restricted to characterizing sentences and possibly also to some episodic sentences that evoke the idea of event plurality (cf. Mittwoch 2005:248). Thus, IOK appears to be a more general operation related to sentence semantics in terms of genericity and event plurality, and as such it is encoded higher in the syntactic structure, i.e. above the VP.

Accordingly, whereas the object interpretation can be said to distinguish IOK from IOO, it is not clear that the object interpretation is indeed the actual dividing line between the two types. Importantly, the destruction verbs typically involved in IOK can also occur in IOO in some very restricted contexts. Moreover, I have demonstrated that IOO also occur in generic sentences. Thus, the exact syntactic characterization of the distinction between IOO and IOK needs further work, ideally based on more data. Nevertheless, it is clear from my analysis that IOK is syntactically distinct from IOR, a conclusion reached upon partly due to my distinction between IOR and IOO.

In a system where the number and types of arguments are not directly specified for the lexical items, and where the event participants are not projected from the lexicon into syntax but instead emerge from the structure, it is not really the case that verbs ‘have’ or ‘take’ objects. Instead, the category specifications for a lexical item only define which structure that item can be inserted into. Thus, the category ‘object’ is internal to the verb phrase structure of a verbal lexical item, and the arguments are not really arguments of lexical items but instead arguments of the predicates introduced by the heads. With that being said, in a less theory-dependent vocabulary, what I propose in this thesis is that:

1. **IOR** does not involve any object at all and pseudo-transitive verbs should be considered intransitive;
2. **IOO** involves an omitted UNDERGOER object with specific reference;
3. **IOK** involves an omitted UNDERGOER object which receives an existential interpretation when omitted.

The particular lexical item (i.e. the verb) that is inserted into the verb phrase consists of some combination of the category information \textit{init}, \textit{proc}, and \textit{res} plus associations to some lexical-encyclopedic content. From a strictly theoretical point of view, transitivity is nothing that is specified in the lexicon, but a property emerging in the verb phrase for each particular verb. However, the verbs specified as \textit{[proc]} and \textit{[proc, res]} in Ramchand (2008:108) are exclusively intransitive. This means that initiation is somehow associated with transitivity, and possibly that an \textit{init} head is a necessary (but not a sufficient) condition for transitivity. It also means that the processual core of dynamic verbs does not necessarily involve transitivity, although it involves a path of change. For stative verbs, initiation seems to be a sufficient condi-
tion for transitivity to arise. This in turn gives more credibility to Ramchand’s simpler analysis of (some) stative verbs as involving only init.

6.2 Lexical knowledge and encyclopedic knowledge

While there has been a long understanding that IOR is restricted to some verbs, the exact characterization of those verbs has remained unclear. In line with work by e.g. Mittwoch (1982) and Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998), I have related IOR to atelicity and event structure, and I have shown that these are both essential notions, although I analyze both of them in terms of Ramchand’s (2008) event structure building verb phrase. My study confirms the prediction made by Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998) that inherently resultative verbs do not accept IOR. I have also shown how IOR is systematically related to the optional RHEME objects of some sets of verbs, such as the creation/consumption set of verbs that have been associated with IOR cross-linguistically (see e.g. Næss 2007). By assuming the verb phrase of Ramchand (2008), I provide a syntactic account of IOR that does not involve any syntactic operations at all. Following Ramchand, I assume that IOR verbs share the lexical specification of some verbs that are commonly described as intransitive, such as intransitive motion verbs. However, I take my claims a step further by proposing that IOR verbs can also be characterized as intransitives. Through the use of syntactic tests for objecthood, I have shown that the object status of the optional DP RHEMES display properties that in some respects are different from UNDERGOER objects. In other words, I provide independent support for the distinction between RHEME objects and UNDERGOER objects.

Whereas these observations are not that surprising against the background provided by e.g. Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998) and Levin (1999), who also distinguish between two kinds of objects, the syntactic approach taken here reduces the burden of the computational processes involved as well as the amount of information required in the lexical component, both of which in Ramchand’s (2008) system are kept to a minimum. In the more lexical approach of Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998), the type of optional objects involved in IOR are characterized as semantic arguments of the root, which are not projected into syntax when not realized in the word string. Such an approach raises two issues. Firstly, it has to account for the semantic interpretation of the IOR object when not present in the syntax, and secondly, the object has to be projected into an argument position when overt. Thus, the optionality in their system is not identical to the one in Ramchand’s. In the approach of Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998), the unexpressed objects are present in the lexical specification of the IOR verbs, although not present syntactically. Considering the other intransitive types of verbs with optional arguments as well, such as springa ‘run’ and arbeta ‘work’, this view
renders an even heavier lexicon than one might first realize. If any optional argument of a verb has to be specified in a lexical module, it is not obvious where to draw the line. Consider, for instance, the syntactically optional instrumental phrases involved in many events, such as the keys involved in a locking event:

(462) Jag låste dörren (med nyckeln).
I locked door.the with key.the
‘I locked the door (with the key).’

It is clear that the key introduced by the instrumental PP med nyckeln ‘with the key’ is in some respect an obligatory participant in the locking event, but syntactically the PP is completely optional, and most approaches would not include it in the lexical specification for the verb låsa ‘lock’. I cannot see that there is any difference in also assuming RHEME objects to be inferable from encyclopedic associations or from world knowledge, just like the keys in a locking event.

Clearly, the view taken here can only be accepted if one accepts some of the lexical information to be moved outside the narrow syntactic-semantic system onto more general cognitive modules where the lexical information is associated with encyclopedic information and real world knowledge. The exact characterization of such knowledge is outside the scope of this thesis, but it is in no way a new idea that much of what has traditionally been seen as part of the lexicon could actually be distributed not only in the syntax but also in terms of a dynamic network of meaning and other associated information.

The lexicon is truly a convenient fiction in linguistics and one that does not stand up to very much scrutiny. This is not to imply that there is no such thing as lexical knowledge. Rather, that knowledge is best thought of as part of a dynamic, interconnected network that can access sound, meaning, context, and speaker intent simultaneously. (Rice 1988:211)

Thus, although my empirical observations in large respects correlate with those of Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998) and others, my syntactic analysis and my theoretical claims are different from theirs.

For the last decades or so, there has been a vivid debate about the place of argument structure in linguistic theory (see e.g. Goldberg 1995, Borer 2005, Áfarli 2007 and Ramchand 2008). The debate is based on empirical observations of systematic argument alternations seen within languages, and it clearly reflects the significance of argument structure information in the understanding of the linguistic system. Ramchand’s three-partite verb phrase provides a systematic approach that radically minimizes the stipulations made for each set of verbs, while still capturing the empirical data on argument alternations and argument realization. In my thesis, I have shown that
this view on argument realization is valid also when considering IOR. The obvious advantage of this account is that the argument realization is built into the syntactic module, and that no theta-roles, theta-grid or subcategorization information have to be stipulated. In other words, Ramchand’s model does not only do away with the argument structure interface, it simultaneously minimizes the lexical specifications of verbs. This is possible since the number of arguments a verb takes follows from the heads that a lexical item is specified for, although the argument realization can be quite flexible within those limitations.

Furthermore, I have shown that the IOR verbs are lexically specified for [init, proc]. However, as demonstrated in table 3 on page 126, it does not follow directly from the lexical specification that those verbs are intransitive, nor can one conclude that intransitive verbs are specified for [init, proc]. Instead, there are transitive [init, proc] verbs as well as intransitive [init, proc, res] and [proc] verbs. For an intransitive [init, proc, res] verb like anlända ‘arrive’, all three specifier positions are realized by the same argument, i.e. if assuming a lexical role specification they would be specified as [init, proc, res]. Whenever the verb anlända ‘arrive’ is used, the place of arrival is necessarily salient in the discourse, and therefore only optionally realized as a RHEME.

There is also some flexibility among transitive [init, proc, res] verbs. In section 4.2.2, I discussed how context and convention can affect the object interpretation of an [init, proc, res] verb like lämna ‘leave’ as in (463)–(464), repeated from (385) and (387) respectively.

(463) Elsa lämnade på förskolan.  
Elsa left at preschool.  
‘Elsa dropped off [the children] at preschool.’

(464) Elsa lämnade till redaktören.  
Elsa left to the editor.  
‘Elsa sent [her text] to the editor.’

However, lämna ‘leave’ displays a flexibility of two distinct kinds, since there is an event interpretation of the verb with what appears to be a rather new use in Swedish, demonstrated in (465), repeated from (340).

(465) Många lämnade innan kongressen var slut. (Google)  
many left before congress the was finished  
‘Many people left before the congress ended.’

In (465), the subject Jag ‘I’ realizes a composite UNDERGOER-INITIATOR role. Thus, an utterance like (466) is ambiguous in more than one way, as showed in the two separate role interpretations (cf. the discussion in section 3.8.3).
I left clock eight
‘I was leaving [the kids/the garbage/the files etc.] at eight.’
Or: ‘I was leaving [the room/the competition/the city etc.] at eight.’

The decomposed verb phrase not only allows for this flexibility but actually predicts it. As long as there is a possible interpretation of the event that is reasonable in a possible world, then composite roles can arise. In the case of lämna ‘leave’, the verb alternates between having a composite RESULTEE-UNDERGOER, as in (463)–(464) and a composite UNDERGOER-INITIATOR, as in (465). This alternation in role realization is not contextual in the same way as the various different [init, proc, res] interpretations (‘leave the children’ vs. ‘leave the garbage’). Instead, the alternation between distinct role realizations is visible in the syntactic representation, and predicted by the system.

I have claimed that transitivity follows from the verb phrase and from the realization of participant roles. However, it is not entirely clear how the exact role realization comes about. In other words, it is uncertain how to account for the composite roles involved with [init, proc] verbs like läsa ‘read’ or springa ‘run’. Either, the subscript notation could be considered as a purely descriptive device, as the discussion in Ramchand (2008) sometimes leans towards, or the roles are actually required to be specified in the lexicon. Although I have used subscripting in the lexical specifications in this work, I have also discussed the possibility of the role realization to be mainly encyclopedic in nature. With such a solution, the potential interpretations a particular verb can receive with respect to initiation, processual change, and resultativity, would still be restricted by the lexical specification of heads. The potential interpretations could then be further restricted by encyclopedic knowledge and world knowledge. Thus, an [init, proc] verb could allow both transitive and intransitive readings, as long as there are process events in the real world, or some possible world, that can be described accordingly.

The syntactic restrictions would still be quite strong for some verbs. For instance, an intransitive [init, proc, res] verb like anlända ‘arrive’ could not possibly have a non-resultative processual interpretation. Since an [init, proc, res] verb necessarily involves a resultative subevent, and since that resP involves a RESULTEE, an [init, proc, res] verb could only describe an event where all three specifiers can be realized by the same argument with a composite RESULTEE-UNDERGOER-INITIATOR role. Also, inchoative intransitive [proc] verbs like smälta ‘melt’ and rulla ‘roll’ could not take an object and still be inchoative. If these verbs are used with an object argument, the subject is instead realizing a separate INITIATOR, and the verb turns into an [init, proc] verb.44 A system without role specification in the lexicon would allow

---

44 This is usually described as a causative/inchoative alternation, see e.g. Levin (1993).
for flexibility in role realization, which could account for cases where an [init, proc] verb like *dra* ‘pull’ has an alternative [init, proc] meaning, ‘leave’ (cf. the discussion in section 3.8.3.).

In other words, there seems to be quite a clear cut between [init, proc] verbs like *putta* ‘push’ and *dra* ‘pull’, on the one hand, and [init, proc] verbs like *åta* ‘eat’ and *läsa* ‘read’ on the other, which would call for the roles to be specified. Nevertheless, there also appears to be quite a systematic flexibility among some [init, proc] verbs that involve separate [init, proc] meanings, as in the case of *putta* ‘put’ and *dra* ‘leave’. If those alternations are to be characterized as polysemous versions of the same verb, the lexical items should be underspecified, as [init, proc]. If they instead should be regarded as homonyms, the separate meanings reflect separate verbs with distinct specifications. I do not make any strong claims with respect to these observations, but the flexibility does appear to be too systematic to be ignored. Accordingly, there is a need for a more systematic study of verb meanings among the entire range of [init, proc] verbs.

In any case, with Ramchand’s (2008) syntactic approach to event structure much redundancy in previous syntactic theory can be made away with. I believe that my study of the implicit *RHEME* objects and the clear distinctions towards the implicit *UNDERGOER* objects of I0O and I0K can give further support to such an approach.

### 6.3 Concluding remarks

This study has demonstrated that a syntactic event structure approach to implicit objects of various kinds makes for a clear cut distinction between two main types of implicit objects: *RHEME* objects that are not syntactically realized when absent from the word string and *UNDERGOER* objects that are represented and interpreted in the syntax even when omitted from the word string. This difference between *RHEMES* and *UNDERGOERS* can account for the distribution of objectless sentences, where I0R can be uttered out of the blue and does not require any object reference and I0O and I0K both require an object interpretation for the utterance to be acceptable. I have argued that the implicit optional *RHEME* objects and omitted *UNDERGOER* objects represent distinct phenomena and that the interpretation of a particular objectless utterance is affected by the event structure of the verb. In other words, since different sets of verbs combine with distinct kinds of objects, an objectless sentence has to be interpreted and categorized accordingly.

Apart from providing an analysis of objectless sentences, the thesis raises the more general question about systematicity in flexibility among different sets of [init, proc] verbs, intransitive as well as transitive ones. My I0R analysis predicts that intransitive [init, proc] verbs systematically allow...
RHEME objects as long as they can provide an abstract scale, measuring the path of change described by the verb, and possibly that transitive \([init, proc]\) verbs should systematically allow for \([init, proc]\) homonyms. Whereas my data points in that direction, further studies with additional \([init, proc]\) verbs are needed in order to strengthen my argument. Such a study could ideally be carried out within a larger study of Swedish event structural verb classes, framed within Ramchand’s (2008, 2011) decomposed verb phrase. As far as this thesis goes, the syntactic event structural approach to implicit objects has revealed that the study of the structural sides of linguistic meaning can also shed light on the contextual, pragmatic and encyclopedic sides of meaning. Thus, further studies into the systematicity of verb meaning and possible verb-object relationships could potentially provide us with more knowledge about how we linguistically organize our knowledge of the world and how in a more general cognitive sense the narrow syntactic-semantic knowledge is associated with contextual and encyclopedic information.
Sammanfattning

Denna avhandling handlar om implicita objekt i tre olika typer av objektslösa satser i svenskan. De tre typerna kallas i avhandlingen för IOR (Implicit Object Read type), IOO (Implicit Object Open type) och IOK (Implicit Object Kill type), se (467)–(469).

(467) Sally läste. (IOR)
(468) Det knackade på dörren. Sally öppnade. (IOO)
(469) Soldater dödar i krig. (IOK)


Syftet med avhandlingen är att definiera de väsentliga semantiska-syntaktiska egenskaperna hos objektslösa satser i modern svenska. Huvuddelen av avhandlingen ägnas åt analysen av IOR, medan analyserna av IOO och IOK är mer generellt hållna och i stora drag följer av analysen av IOR.

I kapitel 2 redogör jag för distributionen av objektsutelämning i svenska. Detta gör jag genom att analysera faktorer bakom den variation i antalet objektslösa satser som förekommer i korpusmaterial. De faktorer jag identifierar i exemplen relateras även till de faktorer som lyfts fram som relevanta för implicita objekt i tidigare forskning. Jag visar att eventstruktur (aktionsart) är avgörande för det jag kallar IOR, att det vid IOO finns en specifik referent som måste vara framträdande i diskursen, och slutligen att objektet vid IOK tolkas som en naken nominalfras som får en entydigt existentiell (icke-specifik) tolkning när den utelämnas.


45 Den tredje bokstaven i förkortningarna motsvarar alltså den första bokstaven i de engelska översättningarna av verben i de typexempel som återges i (467)–(469): läsa, öppna och döda.

(470) **Den tredelade verbfrasen (jfr Ramchand 2008, 2011)**

Alice öppnade dörren

I varje subevent i (470) finns förutom ett huvud en obligatorisk specificerare och en komplementposition. Det översta subeventet i den maximala verbfrasen består av ett intiterande tillstånd (initP), som följs av ett processuellt subevent (procP), som i sin tur följs av ett resultattillstånd (resP). I specificerarpositionerna för respektive subevent uppstår ett fåtal generaliserade deltagarroller som kallas INITIATOR, UNDERGOER och RESULTEE. Eftersom modellen inte antar något theta-kriterium och samma fras kan introduceras i flera specificerarpositioner uppstår även några sammanslagna deltagarroller. Det innebär att det i vissa event finns en UNDERGOER-INITIATOR medan det i andra kan finnas en gemensam RESULTEE-UNDERGOER eller en RESULTEE-UNDERGOER-INITIATOR. I (470) ser vi exempel på en RESULTEE-UNDERGOER där DP:n dörren realiserar både UNDERGOER-rollen och RESULTEE-rollen och därmed återfinns i specificerarpositionen både till proc och till res hos verbet öppna. Den fras som likt dörren i (470) har flera olika deltagarroller samtidigt realiseras således på flera olika platser i strukturen. Typiska objektsroller i Ramchands verbfras är UNDERGOER och RESULTEE-
UNDERGOER, men dessa roller kan även realiseras av subjektet beroende på vilket verb som ingår i verbfrasen.


Min analys av IOR går ut på att IOR-verb involverar ett rheme-objekt som är helt och hållet optionellt. När ett sådant optionellt objekt är realiserat i syntaxen påverkas teliciteten hos verbfrasen i relation till huruvida objektet uttrycker en specifik kvantitet eller ej. Ett objekt med specifik kvantitet ger upphov till ett teliskt event (Sally åt en potatis) medan ett objekt med icke-specifik kvantitet ger upphov till ett ateliskt event (Sally åt potatis). Vid IOR, där något objekt inte finns i syntaxen, uttrycks ingen specifik kvantitet och eventet blir därmed ateliskt. En IOR-mening som Sally åt uttrycker med andra ord en oavgränsad process.


Jag analyserar alltså IOR som en objektslös variant av ett strukturellt sett intransitivt verb i likhet med en del andra grupper av intransitiva verb. Objektsstatusen hos de optionella objekten är en annan än den hos obligatoriska objekt, både på syntaktiska och semantiska grunder, vilket jag visar med både objektstester och telicitetstester. De begränsningar som finns på de olika intransitiva verbens potentiella objekt är således inte syntaktiska utan hänförs istället till encyklopedisk kunskap samt omvärldskunskap associerad med enskilda verb och de event verben beskriver. Detta öppnar även upp för mer systematiska växlingar bland verb som är specifiserade för [\textit{init, proc}].

I kapitel 4 utgår jag från min eventstrukturella analys av IOR, och förtydligar att IOO som en följd av den analysen enbart omfattar utelämnning av det som i Ramchands verbfras är \textsc{undergoer}-objekt (inklusive \textsc{resultee-undergoer}), men däremot inte utelämnande av \textsc{rheomes}. Därefter diskuterar jag diskurstitulen hos utelämnade \textsc{undergoer}-objekt och restriktioner på IOO innan jag går över till att diskutera hur de utelämnade objekten får sin tolkning. Utifrån mina data föreslår jag att IOO-objekten introducerar en fri variabel vars referens kan ges pragmatiskt, dvs. utanför satsnivå.

De empiriska iakttagelser som ligger till grund för kapitel 4 tyder på att IOO är relativt oegrepsat i svenskan. IOO kan förekomma så länge det finns en tänkbar specifik referent som är tillräckligt framträdande i diskursen för att kunna identifieras, och på så vis ge tolkning åt den fria variabeln. Jag visar även att referenten inte behöver vara unikt identifierbar utan att det räcker att den är specifik och framträdande i diskursen. Detta utifrån analysen av exempel där det i den situation som beskrivs enbart är relevant att
referera till en individ vilken som helst bland en uppsättning referenter, eller till hela uppsättningen som helhet. Om t.ex. meningen *Alice öppnade för att vädra* uttrycks i en kontext där det finns ett rum med flera fönster räcker det att uppsättningen fönster är framträdande. Satsen är sann oavsett om Alice öppnade ett eller flera fönster i rummet. Den restriktion som finns här innebär att det utelämnade objektet ska kunna tolkas och identifieras som ’fönstret’ eller ’fönstren’, men att det inte måste vara ett eller flera unikt identifierbara fönster i uppsättningen av fönster som avses. Om rummet även har eller kan tänkas ha andra vädringsmöjligheter, t.ex. genom dörrar och ventil, kan dessa också ingå i uppsättningen av öppningsbara saker. Frasen *för att vädra* ger dock en tolkningsram som just i det exemplet utesluter andra öppningsbara saker såsom burkar, flaskor och paket. Referensen kan således vara specifik utan att vara unikt identifierbar, och ändå vara tillräckligt framträdande i diskursen för att ge upphov till IOO.


Några särskilda begränsningar på verbtyper när det gäller IOO verkar inte finnas för de dynamiska verben, däremot för statiska verb vilka inte tillåter IOO utan att just de statiska egenskaperna hos verben påverkas. En överlighet mellan de tidigare beskrivningarna av IOO ger dessutom tydligt att restriktionerna på IOO är mindre strikta i svenska än i t.ex. engelska. För att kunna ta reda på om detta beror på att engelska till skillnad från svenska har restriktioner avseende eventstrukturerigaegenskaper hos verben eller om det föreligger andra starkare begränsningar när det gäller hur den fria variabeln får sin referens krävs vidare forskning med mer systematiska jämförelser mellan språken.

Kapitel 5 ägnas åt en analys av sådana objektslösa generiska eller habituella satser som inte kan förklaras utifrån mina analyser av vare sig IOR eller IOO. I tidigare forskning analyseras exempel som dessa ibland som en särskild typ av IOR (t.ex. Goldberg 2001). Eftersom verben som är inblandade i IOK är tydligt transitiva och deras objekt inte är RHEMES som kan realiseras
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Analysen av de tre delfenomenen i avhandlingen kan kort sammanfattas med att IOR-verb är intransitiva verb som tar optionella rheume-objekt, samt att både IOO och IOK involverar utelämnade undergoer-objekt. Vid IOO tolkas referensen hos det utelämnade objektet helt och hållet pragmatiskt medan det utelämnade objektet i ett IOK-exempel får en otvetydig existentiell tolkning i generiska satser.

Det ska sägas att där IOR-kapitlet utgår från ett systematiskt studium av olika typer av verb i svenska, är IOO- och IOK-kapitlen skrivna utifrån ett betydligt mindre empiriskt underlag. Samtliga dessa kapitel grundar sig dock på iakttagelser från den empiriska studien i kapitel 2.

Avhandlingen avslutas med en sammanfattande diskussion i kapitel 6 som kretsar kring kategorierna verb och objekt, samt kring gränsdragningen mellan lexikal information och encyklopedisk information samt omvärldskunskap. Utöver analyserna av IOR, IOO och IOK bygger resonemangen i diskussionskapitlet till stor del på data där verb växlar mellan olika rollrealiseringar och tolkningar, växlingar som visar den flexibilitet som är inbyggd i Ramchands (2008) verbfras.

Min analys av IOR förutsätter att även andra intransitiva [init, proc]-verb systematiskt kan kombineras med rheume-objekt, och möjligtvis också att transitiva [init, proc] verbs systematiskt ska kunna ge upphov till intransitiva homonymer. Även om mina data pekar i den riktningen behövs det en mer systematisk studie med fler verb för att stärka den analysen. En sådan studie skulle med fördel kunna genomföras inom ramen för en större studie över eventstrukturella verbklasser i svenska i den här avhandlingen har det syntaktiska eventstrukturella angreppssättet visat att forskning kring den strukturella sidan av språklig betydelse belyser även de kontextuella, pragmatiska och encyklopediska sidorna av betydelse. Vidare studier av den eventstrukturella sidan av verbetbetydelser och av vilka verb–objekt-relationer som är möjliga i språket kan därmed ge oss ytterligare kunskap inte bara om verb och om hur vi organiserar vår kunskap om världen utan även om de sätt som strukturell syntaktisk-semantic kunskap är relaterad till kontextuell och encyklopedisk information mer generellt.
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