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The Navajo relative prefix can be added to verbs to denote a series of actions.

I carry a suite of things up on my back. (N La 2001)

np-relative-1-up

ha-ja-sh-nilid

(1)

I carry it up on my back (once). (N La 2001)

np-1-up

ha-sh-nilid

(1)

The Navajo relative prefix sometimes has a secondary effect of causative arguments in the

sentence to be interpreted as plural, as in (2) above. In other sentences, the relative does

not cause plural interpretations:

(3)

not-cause-plural-interpretations:

our-ser-rememberable-l-move-motionless

di-co-ml-sh-penal

The relative prefix is primary on my belly. (WM 1980: 284)

1. Weigeste out on my belly.
an overview of the sentence prefix, including morphology, position within the verb, and
prefixes with a brief description of the complete model of the Neavgo verb. Next to prefixes
Section 1 of this paper presents background information related to the thesis. If
changes in site of location, correlate with sentence prefixes.
the thematic role of pluralized participles and proposes that these characteristics,
pro-drop pattern and pro-drop agent roles. This last hypothesis isolates certain characteristics of
specific characteristics and that verbs can assign roles that mix the characteristics of the
hypothesis is based on Dowty's (1977). theory that semantic roles can be decomposed into
inferences, and only inferences are pluralized by the sentence. The Change of Site of Location
hypotheses are based on locatives or semantic roles. The theorem hypotheses is that
hypotheses are based on locatives or semantic roles. The Change of Site of Location
based on their knowledge of the world and the context of the sentence. The second two
sentence prefixes cause plurals, but rather that people interpret arguments as plural or not
hypotheses. The first hypothesis is that there are no specific rules about when the
hypothesis, the third hypothesis, and the Change of Site of Location
this paper will pose and consider these hypotheses as answers to these questions:

3

(a) In cases where plural interpretations occur, which participles are in the event
sentence prefix?
(b) In what types of verb-sentences do plural interpretations result from the
prefix? Sometimes results in plural interpretations and sometimes does not. The questions
raised by this phenomenon include:

Plural interpretations arising from the sentence prefix have been mentioned by both

Young and Morgan (1987) and Leonard Pallaz (1969). Both recognize that the sentence
Unlike the Theme Hypothesis, this Hypothesis does not introduce the change of structure or location Hypothesis, based on certain attributes of the pro-peek and post-peek roles. In Section 3, the Hypothesis presents the basic theory of semantic roles presented by Downy (1991). Next, it interprets as singular or sentences in which agents are interpreted as plural, roles are reversed. However, it cannot account for the sentences in which themes are successfully accounted for serial verb sentences in which the syntactic positions of semantic generalization in the serial verb phrases only objects and intransitive subjects. In Section 3, it discusses the Theme Hypothesis. This Hypothesis is built on the preliminary Hypothesis cannot account for all of the data.

Preliminary, the fact that some serial verb phrases never have phrases at all, and the problems of which objects will be pluralized. However, the fact that intransitive subjects are never pluralized by the serial verb phrases but not transitive subjects. Serial verb phrases lead us to generalize that objects and intransitive subjects may be the cognates of the successive serial verb, and the intransitive serial. The sentences with this distinction usually, but not always, coincide with Young and Morgan's semantic shows that some verbs result in plural interpretations and other verb do not, and that this is not the case with post-peek roles.

Section 3 presents the preliminary Hypothesis and examines its predictions in light of the data. The section concludes that the preliminary Hypothesis can sometimes predict pluralized by the serial verb phrases, but not transitive subjects. Serial verb phrases lead us to generalize that objects and intransitive subjects may be the cognates of the successive serial verb, and the intransitive serial. The sentences with this distinction usually, but not always, coincide with Young and Morgan's semantic shows that some verbs result in plural interpretations and other verb do not, and that this is not the case with post-peek roles.

Finally, it provides an overview of plural in Naurajo's morphology and basic semantic characteristics, according to Lounan-Pilz (1998) and Young and Morgan.
imperfective mode unless otherwise noted.

be an issue for most of this discussion. Throughout this paper the examples are in the
and mode (imperfective). The mode of a verb defines its viewpoint aspect, which will not
being moved; in this case, a heavy load. The verb stem also shows the tense (present)
of classificatory verbs such as (1), the verb stem expresses the type of object which is
The verb stem usually expresses the basic type of action which is occurring. In the case

(1) carry it up on my back (once). (NL'TA 2002)

up-put-heavy-object-lump

adverbial-prefix-prefixinal-prefixal-suffix

(1) heem-xh-[[f]]

stem is-[[f]]

Nautical verbs have their stems at the end of the verb word. For (1) repeated below, the

Section 1. Background

phonology.

or location hypotheses is the most successful at explaining the effects of the sentence on
Section 6 concludes that although there are some exceptions, the change of tense
that it can be made to account for them as well.

plural agrees. The successful sentences are problematic for this hypothesis but it appears
account for sentences in which no argument is plural. It also accounts for sentences with
null prefixes to represent person subjects and objects, and there is also a null classifier.

rule. Finally, the stem-1|1 is in position X, the stem position. Many verbs also have
that if is glossed as IS. The classifier in position IX ! is deleted through a phonological
2000:20). The prefix-sy-meaning 1|1 of, me is in position VIL for subject pronouns, so
underlying (ha) is in position I, which holds adverbial or thematic prefixes (Yellow

usually, a verb does not have prefixes in all of the positions. In example (1), "han-

preverb adv. dist. opt. -suby qualifiers Mode/Subject class stem

X X IX X II VI VIL IV I V A V

(4)

lempatle. 1 mark the disjunct/conjunct boundary with a series of hyphens.

lempatle, I mark the disjunct/conjunct boundary with a series of hyphens.

I mark the disjunct/conjunct boundary with a series of hyphens. Below is a representation of all of the positions in the
known as the conjunct sector. Below is a representation of all of the positions in the
as the disjunct sector; and the rest of the prefixes, with numbers higher than III, are
though IX are the prefixes, and position IX is the stem. Positions I through III are known
though X are the prefixes, and position X is the stem. Positions I through III are known
However, the lempatle model is the most widely used. In the lempatle model, positions I
mother's core through morphological rules so that the order is less arbitrary.

mother's core through morphological rules so that the order is less arbitrary.

with 10 positions that can be filled. Other models have been proposed to generalize the

prefixes are recognizable by the fact that they usually only occur with a particular root
prefixes are recognizable by the fact that they usually only occur with a particular root
which gives about the same level of information as an English verb infinitive. Themetic
which gives about the same level of information as an English verb infinitive. Themetic
the thematic roles. The thematic prefixes together with the verb stem form the verb lemma.
aspect markers, the classifier, and thematic prefixes. This last group is in relation to
The prefixes in Nahuatl include pronouns, nominals, adverbials, mode and

The prefixes in Nahuatl include pronouns, nominals, adverbials, mode and
Theinate (1998: 444) notes that in some cases, the intransitive form takes the position of the transitive form rather than the y-form. This can be seen in the examples below:

**Example 1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-s-megs</td>
<td>Head-initial expressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-s-megs</td>
<td>Head-final expressions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, the intransitive form takes the position of the transitive form rather than the y-form. There are no confinental elements present in the underlying form as y-.

The intransitive prefix appears in Yngve and Morgan's position VIa, which holds...
The objective pronoun is null because the object is in the third person and the subject is not. The meaning
preceded by an object prefix other than the 4th person prefix ḳ, it moves inherently.
serially changes its position if it is directly preceded by an object prefix. If it is
The subject can connect with a following subject prefix. According to Faiz, the
vowel.
subject does not. The classifier is not deleted in this case because it is preceded by a
In this case, there is a third-person subject, and object; the object prefix appears but the

He/she/it rolled them into it one after another. (Faiz 1989:344)

3rd person object-classifier-role prefix.

\[ \text{VIA}\text{-A-III-X} \]

3rd person

changes to the V-form (Faiz 1989:341). There are no distinct prefixes in example (6). Case is in object prefix, position VIA immediately precedes the serially, hence the serially

\[ \text{VIA}\text{-A-III-X} \]

VIA expresses this by saying that it is a conjunct prefix (which in this

position VIE, "when preceded immediately by a prefix of position VIA or by dži-"

According to Young and Morgan (1987) the prefix changes to its alternative form I or Vi.

1 carry a series of things up on my back. (Ni-A 200)

\[ 
\text{np-serialive-I-ling\_jump} \]

\[ \text{Ib-VIA-A-III-X} \]
4th-person prefix to zh-

To make the final form, s are added and consonant harmony changes the form of the

stem

TL

mart (surface)

1

0

d
h

(11)

4th set

TL

mart (underlying, "" in original)

1

0

d
h

(10)

object prefix.万千 1998: 19.万千 illustrates the process in examples (10)-(12). If it is preceded by the 4th person prefix, then the schwa switches places with the

vowels

(6)

and no consonants in this example. There are

changes to a - because it is preceded by a conjunct prefix (万千 1998: 47). To make the final form (6), the default vowel is added where necessary and the

stem

TL

mart (surface)

1

0

d
h

(8)

stem

TL

mart (underlying)

1

0

d
h

(7)
ser-i-shde_progressive
he-eh-lag

This includes (3) replaced below, as well as (14) and (15):

of sequential motion. Examples of such meanings are, "wiggle," "skip," and "hobble."
The second category includes verbs that denote actions that always have a quality

(13)

(right-er) ne-he-lagosh

towards or a point, one at a time (e.g., "(NLA 2001"

They're coming to a point, one at a time (on + legs),"

cessative-serialive-et-moving-on-four-legs"

serialive is sentence (7), and more examples such as (13) are shown throughout the paper:

transitive as "over and over again" or "one after another." An example of this type of

category encompasses verb bases whose serialive forms include a meaning of

categories of meaning: "successive" action and "inherently sequential" action. The first

1987 motion-verb bases using the serialive (η-1) prefix are divided into two broad

meaning as "one-at-a-time-in-a-series motion" (Fיץ 1998:34). In Young and Morgan

meanings involving actions that occur in a series. Leonard Fitz (1998) describes this

The serialive prefix in Navajo is combined with verbs in order to express

changes.

For most of this paper, the serialive prefix will appear in its y-form without position

(12)

Huntoonians (Fitz 1998:34).
and the sentative, entail interpretations of a group of three or more. The roots of some morphemes that cause plural interpretations, such as the da-distinctive plural stems, 

Plurality in Navajo is defined as three or more, rather than two or more.

Compositional to the original verb, for which the sentative is not a part of the verb theme, but simply adds its meaning sometimes else, or nothing at all, without it. However, there are inherent sentatives which change the meaning of the verb, and the verb would differ.

For many sentatives the verb for 'hobble', would have a completely different meaning. 'Hobble' and his meaning related to sexual arousal. (1987: 73) Without the thematic and his meanings related to sexual arousal, 'hobble' means something else, or nothing at all, without it. However, there are inherent sentatives which change the meaning of the verb, and the verb would differ.

For some sentatives, this is evident. The root word - I used in (14) has two verb themes, one of which uses the sentative prefix and has the meaning 'hobble', and one of which uses 'a-

exhibited in the morphology: the root char-I used in (14) has two verb themes, one of which uses the sentative prefix and has the meaning 'hobble', and one of which uses 'a-

The distinction makes sense immediately, in that the successive sentative seems to be a

(1980: 439)

I am hobbling alone.

ser

1-hop

(15) hee-sh-reel

I hop, hobbling.

ser-1-hobble-lump

(14) hi-sh-cheeh

I hop, hobbling.
boy
(2000) continuous-verb: work

Ashikhe n-naa-i-ni-sh

(19)

The boys are working.
(2000) 14:2

boy
(2000) continuous-verb: work

Ashikhe n-naa-i-ni-sh

(17)

The boy is working.

boy
(2000) continuous-verb: work

Ashikhe n-naa-i-ni-sh

(16)

cause a dual interpretation, even when the stem is not explicitly dual.

forms changing them to the plural form and using them with a non-plural verb stem will allow a mass or count interpretation (Smith 1991:412). While nouns that do have plural

Pronouns are marked on mass Naurujo nouns, and nonnominals and nominal prefixes

necessary to express a direct-o-of more plural (Pali 1998: 22).

second person distinguish only between singular and dual, and an additional prefix is
dual or duoplaural interpretation (PMN 1992: 663). Pronominal prefixes in the first and

verbs have stems interpreted as referring to a group of exactly two, which is known as a

verbs


distributive functions like a simple plural marking: so called because it sometimes creates a distributive interpretation. Usually, the da-
such as (18) it does not entail a distributive meaning, only a plural.

meaning that there is no more than one person under any one.

However, in sentences

In examples (19) and (20) above, -s is usually interpreted in a distributive sense.

They (pl) the down under a pine tee (pine tees). (Yazzie 2000: 142)

pine tee under-1-t-r-ay-down (pl)

Niche Sahel’h Indigenous descendants

(20)

They (two) (each) the down under a separable pine tee. (Yazzie 2000: 143)

pine tee under-1-dist-ray-down (8)

Niche Sahel’h Indigenous descendants

individual subject inferences with a different individual object.

causing inferences in which the participants are separated in space, or even in which each

singularly. The de-distributivity in Navajo sometimes takes this requirement further.

plural subject, a true sentence can be written in which the subject performs the action

plural subject performing an action, then for each individual that makes up part of the

plural sentence describes a distributive

participate in the same event, either as individuals or through identification with the

Distributive readings in any language require that every individual member of the plural

The boys (plural) are working. (Yazzie el al. 2000: 142)
(23) hooghaigone, yéhi, na-da-ha-s-kal

Example below, all three occur:

The relative is often found in the same verb with either da- or the plural stems. In the

I pull them out (of something) one after another. (WM 1992:475)

out-ster-(1-handle-s) schickle-ôp

ha-ha-s-nil

(22)

causes a distributive plural interpretation of the object.

The relative is another way of creating plural in Navafo. In (22), the relative is the

Section 2. The relative prefix and plurality

distributive interpretations.

The plural stems differ from the da- distributive and the relative in that they do not cause

These plural stems can be used in conjunction with the relative and the da-distributive.

(21) nhí-jë-në

They lie down, recline. (WM 1992:262)

terminal-(null cl)-handle plural objects imp
t

The example below, the stem is what causes the plural interpretation.

Example, jë-ô is a classificatory root referring to plural sticklike or animate objects. In

Another important way to create plurals in Navafo is to use plural stems. For
(26) 4-χη-ρεμός

They slide away one after another. (And 1992: 500)

away-diser-ṣile

(27) 4-ς-χη-ρεμός

makes no difference to the meaning.

Groups. Where there is no plural stem, the removal of da- from a sentence clause of a series of events in time, but with the plural stem, these individual participles consist of events. The accusative acts as a distributive in that it separates individual participants into events, that is no da-distributive, so the plural stem can be taken to denote groups instead of separate individuals participating in a series of events.

Both (23) and (24) show plurals, but in (24) there is no da-distributive, so the plural stem

(They entered the hogan separately, or in a series of groups. (Perkins 2002))

hoqan  inisce  into  away-ser-ner-net

(24)

hoqan  gone  υαθ  4-χη-ς-καθ

is removed:

Not all of the plural markers are necessary in order to make a plural sentence. In (24), the

(They entered the hogan one after another. (And 2000 b: 336))

hoqan  inisce  into  away-diser-perf-ner-net

4
A lizard darts up.


andhoodi hairhood

Sentences (28) and (29) provide another example of the serial relative phrasalizing subjects

(100 A 2001)

They're coming to a point, one at a time (on 4 legs).

cessative-serialize-cl-moving-on-four-legs-lump

ne-he-1-double

(13)

or they're going (4-legged animal) is coming to a point, crowding.

cessative-serialize-cl-moving-on-four-legs-lump

ni-l-double

(27)

Interpretation of the subject of the sentence:

As in (26) above, the serialize is the cause of the plural interpretations.

To make it clear that the serialize is the cause of the plural interpretations, make it clear that the serialize is the cause of the plural interpretations.

The rest of the examples in this section are words without da', in order to necessary to create the plural, so when the da' is removed, there is no effect on the interpretation of participles that consist of individuals. Only one of the morphemes is

In the sentences above, the serialize and the clausule both cause a distributive plural

They slide away one after another (Perkins 2001)
Given the data that we have already seen, it would seem to make sense that if the

sentence prefix, not the form of the noun, that causes the plural interpretation. To test

The boys crawled in one after another. (NLA 2001)

(31)

boys in seq-crawl-s-imp

ashki yathu, yashena,

The boy is crawling in

boy in-crawl-s-imp

ashki yathu, yashena,

number

causing the plural interpretation. In (30) and (31) the noun ashki! does not have a

the noun does not have a number, we can see that it is the sentence prefix which is

In (28) and (29), the subject is named by the noun that precedes the verb word. Because

Liards come darting up one after another. (W 1980: 390)

(29)

hard up-ser-d-art-long of-jump

naabhoodi ba-ya-j-wood

(28)
verbs used with the *subject* also have plural interpretations for arguments:

The examples above show that the *subject* can pluralize subjects, transitive

singular or other parts of the verb.

interpretation: it simply agrees in number with the interpretation caused by the use of the

as in example (17). Therefore, the plural noun form is not the root cause of the plural

another plural prefix, it would not result in a plural interpretation, but a dual interpretation

Example (32) shows that the singular noun form were used without the *subjective* prefix or

*The boy crawled in one after another.* (NLT 2001, BHS 2002)

Boy in *ser-crawls-jump

*ashhni yath, sheesha.* (32)
In this example we can see that it is not plural by the singular form of the noun, askiya. If
when an object is present, in example (38) below, the boy remains singular as well, and
In (37), the dog remains singular. Once again, the nominative falls to pluralize the subject.

(37) doggy-possessive-ser-topical-object imply
    he-see, I-fall with you-
    he-deal.

he-see, and the pronoun that is not marked for number,

intransitive verbs. However, the subjects of the verbs remain singular. In (37), the noun

singular. We can see from these examples that the subject can pluralize objects of

the sentence (33) and (35), without the subjective prefix, the object is interpreted as

in (34) and (36), which use the subjective prefix, the object can be interpreted as plural. In

(36) person of? ser-cl-roller
    3-pl.
    "I-see them"

(35) person rolls it into it
    3-pl.
    enters

(34) person of? cl-roller
    3-pl.
    "the"
since the classificators verbs always describe the shape of the absolute argument.
only absolutes have already been shown to be a natural class in Hebrew,
could also be shared by an existential-absolutive distinction, whereas the semantic pluralizes
semicolon can pluralize objects and intransitive subjects, but not intransitive objects. This
the semantic pluralizes the subject of a transitive verb. Therefore, I generalize that the
the plural of the subject, I have not begun able to find or else any sentences in which
So far, it appears that the semantic causes the object to become plural and does not affect

(40) (Houghton, drawn behind, beneath the ship, darkroom)

In a sentence with multiple participles, the semantic also pluralizes the direct object:

(39)

The boy is catching the rabbits, one after the other. (TLA 2001)

Boy rabbit 3.qct-topological-ser-topological-object

ashki' ḍāḥi yi-te-ne-deed

(38)

The boy is catching the rabbit.

Boy rabbit 3.qct-topological-object

ashki' ḍāḥi yi-te-dee

render it ungrammatical as in (32) above.

the semantic encoded a plural subject in the example below, the singular noun would
Plural nature of the object:

used with the sentence parts an emphasis on the plural nature of the action, not on the
units of an inherently plural object and plural actions. In the following case, the verb
units of spoonfuls, as plural. There is sometimes a fuzzy distinction between plural units of
spoonfuls, and we might be able to interpret the object as plural if we consider these

In example (42), the liquid being poured into the baby's mouth is divided up into

(Perkins 2001)

spoon liquid into baby's mouth one spoonful after another.

etyl-tye-zidh

(42)

I pour O into P's mouth. (YMM 1992: 749)

bi-zaa-s-sidi

(41)

Example (42) uses the relative prefix and (41) does not:

Plural stems can take on a distributive reading (Yazzie 2000: 143).

participate in a separate sub-event. When used with a, with the relative hi-, or both,
which each of the various individual members of the plural participle must individually
act together in a single event. In general, the relative prefix creates distributive plurals in
singular stems. Plural stems lend to create collective readings, in which the plural objects

The generalization above applies to verbs with plural stems as well as verbs with
1. Take handfuls of plural objects and (in succession) (NLAV 2002)

out-ser-l-handle-plural-objects-lump

ha-na-sh-iq̱-bah (46)

1. Take our plural objects. (WM 1992: 237)

out-l-handle-plural-objects-lump

ha-na-sh-iq̱-bah (45)

Similar way:

The translation 'lump of subtle strokes' shows that there is more than one grouping of weeds, or a distributive interpretation. An example with a different stem behaves in a

Weeds toward each other-reminiscent-move-stemming-object

chil, aθam-hiː-riẕid (44)

He/she raked the weeds (together).

Weeds toward each other-reminiscent-move-stemming-object

chil, aθam-hiː-riẕid (43)
I-walk's-tine Prog
Yi-sen
(46)

Sometimes an inherent serial verb and a successive serial verb can be produced from the same stem. In the examples below, the stem for 'walk' produces an inherent serial verb.

1. am wa-gi-bi' (Smith 2000:216)
set-1-move-jump
hi-sh-bal
(48)

Would call the inherent serial verb, none of the arguments are pluralized.
The serial verb does not always produce plurals. In cases that Young and Morgan

this phenomenon.
plural objects to be divided into a plurality of units. Sentence (24) is another example of
However, the serial verb has an effect that is consistent with his semantics, causing the
(47)  It is not the case that the serial verb alone is creating an interpretation of plural objects.
each of which participates in a different sub-event. In all of the examples (44) through
sup-events. Because of this, the plural objects are divided into groups of units (handsfuls)

have a serial verb prefix, it refers to a plural theme. However, adding the serial verb requires
The stem -gah analysis is meaning related to moving many small objects, and so even without

our-se-t-handle-plural-objects

(2001)
there are plural actions but not plural participants.

Inherent sentential Y-verbs and X-verbs present a third class of sentential verbs in which interpretation differs. However, sentential verbs without plural arguments are not limited to the

The examples above show that inherent sentential never have plural

They go one by one. (Perkins 2001)

Out-dis-sere-walk-shine-jump

(32) ch'i-ju-duh

They follow each other. (WWM 1992: 665)

Out-dis-sere-walk-shine-jump

(31) ch'i-da-ju-duh

With another verb using the same root, Y:

Simply accounts for the semantic character of an activity. Compare a successive sentential

prefix, but the meaning of (50) shows that if is an inherent sentential, where the prefix

The stem -ya meaning, walk, used in (49) and (50) is often used without the sentential

1. Shuffle along, step alone. (WWM 1980: 438)

ser-i-walk-shine-foe

(50) thee-sh-rall

1 am walking alone. (WWM 1992: 74)
Inherent distinction. Appendix 1 summarises the data that need to be accounted for.

To summarise, a successful hypothesis must account for several phenomena that arise in sentences. None of these examples have plurals in them, even though they are successful sentences.

(33) Person (customarily) gets worked at five o'clock. (Perkins 2002)

five-o'clock

get-worked-at

noun

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)

(subject-verb)
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People are quitting work. 

Person goes home from work every day, and so does not need to infer that multiple examples (55), there is no plural. Apparently, listeners can accommodate the idea that the is the same rabbit over and over again, so they infer that there are many rabbits. In accord with the pragmadelic hypotheses, this is because they assume that a dog would not catch the same rabbit over and over again. In example (37), the direct object is interpreted as plural.

The hypothesis' prediction that some arguments will be pluralized while others are not merely to be true. In example (37), the direct object is interpreted as plural.

context.

be able to interpret any argument as plural if such an interpretation is appropriate in about the plurality of the participants. The hypotheses also predicts that a listener should sentence uttered in two different contexts will be able to receive two different inferring.

Since the pragmatic inferences are based on context, the same sentences will cause some arguments to be interpreted as plural, and will let others not to make the sentence felicitous in context. The Pragmadelic Hypothesis predicts that the Pragmadelic Hypotheses predict that people who hear a sentence of the form in order to plurality of participants arises only as a result of pluralizing the overt. According to the plurality of participants arises only as a result of pluralizing the overt. And it applies only to actions, not participants.

to cause actions to happen repeatedly, and it applies only to actions, not participants.

no semantic effect on the participants in an event. The semantic effect of the sentence is on pragmatic inference. The Pragmadelic Hypotheses assumes that the semantic prefix has no pragmatic inference. The Pragmadelic Hypotheses predict that these phenomena are based, Section 3: The Pragmadelic Hypotheses
Interpretations can change according to context.

ungrammatical. This is another piece of evidence that contractions in
sentence could be interpreted with a singular subject and therefore would not be seen as
If the plurality caused by the sentence were optional or dependent on context, the

("The boy crawled in one after another", NL4 2001, Perkins 2002)

boy in serial word's interpret

(32) "a child is a child, isn't

the subject must be interpreted as plural,

that are optionally interpreted as plural. In the case of example (32), repeated below,
While the transitive subjects can never be pluralized, there are some arguments
be interpreted as plural.

interpretations can change according to context, and the prediction that any argument can

cannot be pluralized by the sentence. This goes against both the prediction that
order to use the Pragmatic Hypothesis, we would have to stipulate that transitive subjects
singular interpretation is obligatory for the subjects of these sentences. Therefore, in
they consistently say no, not maybe, or sometimes. This seems to show that the
pluralized. When speakers are asked if a transitive subject could be interpreted as plural,
pluralized by the sentence, it seems that there is no context in which a transitive subject is
However, because there is a clear pattern showing that transitive subjects are not
have examples of the same sentence structure being uttered in different contexts.

Because none of my data is taken from maternal-conversational contexts, I do not
The color of the action is too small to constitute a full event, such as one, "with the...

Tense readings mean that the... verbs which any...

The semantic readings mean that the... predicates that any one of the arguments, any two, all three, or none may be interpreted as plural. In such a case, the Pragmatic Hypothesis can be interpreted as plural. In the case of an event with three participles, we can extend the prediction that...

The Pragmatic Hypothesis should also be able to explain the lack of plurals in the...

Example (7) provides another argument against the Pragmatic Hypothesis. If appears that a...

Example (4) repeated below shows that only the direct object is plural.

I carried the blankets into the house for my mother and another (W. C. 1980: 63).


(4d) Hoogaahm gone, sighted be called of, she在他。
that listeners do not infer plurality for transitive subjects. Since it is intransitive subjects
One of the main problems with the Pragmatic Hypothesis is that we must stipulate

Section 4: The Theme Hypothesis

It is necessary to look for a more restrictive hypothesis.

Sentences or predications which of a number of objects should be pluralized. Because of this,

intransitive intransive sentences. If cannot account for the obligatory plurals in some

obligatory non-plurals, such as the subjects of transitive verbs and the subjects of

prefix appears, because it is very inclusive. However, if cannot account for patterns of

The Pragmatic Hypothesis can account for any one sentence in which the semantic

necessary to stipulate that speakers never infer plurality in the case of intransive sentences.

likely, therefore, to make the Pragmatic Hypothesis account for those cases, it may be

reductions for a plural subject to be performing an inherently semantic action. This is less

this is quite plausible. However, we must also assume that there is no case in which it is

case if is the reductions for a single subject to be performing an inherently semantic action.

Hypothesis can account for the lack of inherent semantic plurals if we assume that in no

The process is similar, but the resultant state is not (Smith 217). The Pragmatic

meanings, it is not the entire event which is sensed, but the individual stages of sub-events.

process and resultant state. When the semantic is applied to verbs with sememal

nonsemantical meanings, it senses the entire event at once, including the sub-events of

nonsemantical bases form successive semantic. When the semantic is applied to verbs with

such as "walk out". The semantical bases form inherent semantic, while the

one "mop the floor". Nonsemantical meanings are ordinary verbs which express whole events,
Hypotheses would predict that the sentential cannot pluralize more than one argument in a sentence. Because there is only one theme in a sentence, this always have the same semantic role. Because there is only one theme in a sentence, this syntactic of a sentence should not affect the plurality of participants if the participants participial is not based on its syntactic position in the sentence, so that changing the obligatory plural or obligatory singular, the hypotheses predicts that the plurality of a obligatory plural or obligatory singular, the hypotheses predicts that the plurality of a participant with other roles are not interpreted as plural. Unlike the pragmatic specifically, participial with the role of theme are interpreted as plural, while sentitive phrase directly affects the plurality of participial based on their semantic role.

Hypotheses, this hypotheses predicts that all participial in sentitive subjects are either participial with the role of theme are not interpreted as plural, unlike the pragmatic specifically, participial with the role of theme are interpreted as plural, while sentitive phrase directly affects the plurality of participial based on their semantic role.
syntactic constructions on sentential sentences. The following sentences show how the

The Theme Hypothesis makes a correct prediction about the effect of different

sentential plural.

Hypothesis because it confines the prediction that no more than one participant will have

generate more than one plural in a sentential sentence. This supports the Theme

Wihous using additional plural morphemes as in the sentences above, one cannot

Willyams (7)

a bunch of us threw stones

(57) willyams (7)

a bunch of us throw one stone (together)


(57) willyams (7)

a bunch of us throw one stone (together)


I would be surprised to find one. When people wish to express ideas which involve more

I find any sentential sentences in which the sentential pluralizes more than one argument, and

it appears that more than one object cannot be pluralized at once. I have not been able to

Because example (4) cannot be interpreted as including a plural hoggen or plural mother,

I called the blankets into the hoggen for my mother one after another (Wm. 1986: 63).
In all of the rabbi sentences, we could describe the rabbi(s) as the theme, because they are causally affected by another participant. Changing the sentence to an inverse construction does not change the fact that the rabbi is the participant which is being

The rabbi is being caustic, one after the other. (TNA 2001)

rabbi inverse-say/handle-topple-object

גָּחַב בְּ-ית-נַ-י-ע-ד-טֵט (19)

The boy is caustic, and one after the other...

boy rabbi ser handle-topple-object

אָסְחֵ֑י גָּחַב י-ת-נ-י-ע-ד-טֵט (69)

A rabbi is being caustic.

rabbi inverse-handle-topple-object

גָּחַב בְּ-ית-נַ-י-ע-ד-טֵט (59)

The boy is caustic inside the rabbi.

boy rabbi ֶץ-וֹ-י-ד-ט-ט handle-topple-object

אָסְחֵ֑י גָּחַב י-ת-נ-י-ע-ד-טֵט (58)

syntactic position. Passive, but it does involve moving the argument linked to the theme to a different inverse construction interacts with the use of the sentive. This construction is not a
In an earlier version of this paper, I expressed a symbolic account for sentence analysis, based on two different syntactic models of the N region of the NRC (1990) and NRC (1994). Following Rice (2000)...

...Instead of using "the" subjects at all, but rather:

is applied to the subjects of infinitival verbs. This brings up the problem that some

word, "active", instead of "subject" suggests a semantic role resembling "agent," although it

and/or, according for sentences such as the inverse constructions above. The use of the

However, the choice of words suggests that semantic roles might play a part in the

way of expressing the idea that infinitive objects and infinitive subjects are pronounced.

make a statement about specific semantic or syntactic roles. Most likely, this is another

"object" when used with transitive verbs. It is unclear whether the authors intended to

The sentence prefix will punctuate "actor" when used with infinitival verbs and

(verbs or, one or more object (infinitival verbs) (JWM 1992: 447)

one after another), or a succession of three or more actors (infinitival

the verb still, either in the sense of a succession of three or more times

Hf-1 is a sentential prefix, containing segmentation of the action denoted by

which constituents are pluralized by the sentential prefix:

the supplementation generalizing pluralizing transitive subjects and provides another perspective on

A passage from Young, Morgan, and Young (1992) on the sentential reitems

reason that the Theme Hypothesis and not an absolutive hypothesis is proposed:

not seem to change which of the arguments is pluralized by the sentential. This is the

pluralized. This supports the Theme Hypothesis by showing that syntactic position does
analyses of Aristotelian verbs is extremely complex and controversial. Until a clearer understanding of

(63) hee-shi-pek

examples (63) - (65),

which is always the case with inherent theta-roles, as we see in

Another problem with the Theme Hypothesis is that some themes are not

because they are pluralized even though they are arguents.

objecs. However, they do not conform to the predictions of the Theme Hypotheses,

only abjectives should be pluralized, because they are inherent arguments, not inherent

theme, because they exhibit motion and motion. They conform to the stipulation that

The semantic roles of the subjects of these sentences is best described as argument, not

3rd person (customarily) gets work at five o'clock. (Perkins 2002)

five-o-clock

reach a-hour

(55)

lizards come darting up one after another. (WM 1980: D390)

hand up-ER-cl-cl-gain of jet

reach a-hour

(29)

They entered the Hogan one at a time. Siniguality. (Perkins 2001)

reach a-hour

entree into away-ER-cen

(62)

Hogan gone with a-hour-yo
The verb "emerge" will be difficult even to test the semantic scope hypotheses.

Non-plural themes also appear in successive sentence sentences, such as (66):

In these sentences, the themes are the direct objects: the thing that is injured. The thing that is injured is what the verbs refer to. However, at least with (a) and (c) it is very clear that if over morphemes in the verbs. Moreover, at least with (a) and (c) it is very clear that if over morphemes in the verbs.
the event it undergoes a change of state or location.

not an argument is linked to a theme role, it will be phrased by the semantic prefix in

prefix. The hypotheses is based on the work of Dowty (1991). It states that whether or

isolate the semantic attributes that allow an argument to be phrased by the semantic

roles. In order to address the problems of the Theme Hypothesis, this hypothesis assumes

The change of state or location Hypothesis is also based on theorems of semantic

Section 5: The Change of State or Location Hypothesis

theorems do not.

Hypotheses is not successful because some genres exhibit sentences phrases, while some

construction does not affect which participle use phrasal. However, the Theme

only one participant in an event, and it accounts for the fact that the semantic can phrase

without any special stipulations. It accounts for the fact that the semantic can phrase

Pragmatic Hypothesis. If successfully predicts the subject of transitive verbs as singular.

In sum, the Theme Hypothesis predicts that to phrase more effectively than the

violates the Theme Hypothesis as well.

Hypotheses by saying that it does not apply to the inherent sentences, successful sentences

the theme is not phrased by the semantic. Thus shows that we cannot save the Theme

and dependent on each other, but rather each component separately. This is not an inherent sentence because the actions described are not closely connected

seems to be the theme because it is undergone the action made by another participant.

In this case, the theme is the car, which is represented by a 3rd-person object prefix. It
Continuing properties for the Agent-Proto-Role:

Continuing properties for the Agent-Proto-Role:

(a) undergoes change of state

(c) exists independently of the event named by the verb.

(d) movement (relative to the position of another participant)

(e) causes an event or change of state in another participant

Continuing properties for the Agent-Proto-Role:

Controlling involvement in the event or state

enabled by any one of the previous four in the section.

This paper as follows. The parentheses around letters (e) show that these attributes are

Downy's list of attributes for the theme and agent proto-roles are summarized in

verb-specific.

among thematic roles without creating so many individual roles that they approach being

exhibits various attributes of two proto-roles. In this way Downy accounts for diversity

He discusses with roles such as "goal" and "instrumental" arising out of all semantic roles

therefore, because he believes these semantic roles should not be defined based on syntax.

also refers analogies in which one of the roles in such a situation is taken to be the

whose position is described in relation to another object is called the "figure." Downy

roles even-dependent, and refers roles such as the figure-ground pair, in which an object

even rather than the perspective from which the event is seen. Thus he calls this semantic

Downy (1961) proposes that semantic roles be defined only on the basis of the
Shifting revised attribute, we can propose a new hypothesis using attribute (d) of the agent point, in order to include sentences in which only one participant is described. Using this "motion relative to another participant" we have it include any motion relative to a fixed.

The next hypotheses, we must modify Dowry's attribute (d) of the agent pro-role, different roles regardless of what semantic role we determine them to be. To formulate Downry's list of attributes can be used to isolate certain semantic characteristics of -structure and different situation types.

In both cases, the wall is the incremental theme; even though the sentences have different

(70) John sprayed paint onto this wall for an hour. (Dowry 1991: 591)

(69) John sprayed this wall with paint in an hour.

Dowry gives the examples below to illustrate the incremental theme role:

progress of the event can be observed from the condition of the incremental theme,

describes this type of pro-foo-attribute as one which is involved in an event such that the

Downry's original contribution to the list is the "incremental theme" category. He

Some of these attributes have been suggested in the previous research on thematic roles.
determined by observing which of the arguments has the most pro-foo-attribute.

an example of the relevant semantic pro-foo-roles. The pro-foo-attribute in a sentence can be

Dowry proposes that if a semantic role has any one of the attributes, it can be considered

(Downry 1991: 572)

e. does not exist independently of the event, or not at all

d. stationary relative to movement of another participant

c. causally affected by another participant

b. incremental theme
change of state. In the case of these two examples, the Change of State or Location

The stories come into existence when they are told, which can be characterized as a

I tell a series of stories (WM 1980: 1286)
our-seeing, of-see-er-hand, small, of-story
(72) ch-see-ee-sh-kan

This is exemplified by the verb in (70):

The other characteristic which allows the sentence to create plurals is "change of state."

(solid round object) fall one after another (WM 1980: 1289)
our-set-cl-free-movement, solid, round, object

(71) ha-th-ka-th-

fixed point. In other words, a change of location.

the sentence's interaction with an event participant that experiences motion relative to a

according to this hypothesis, the subject of example (69) is pluralized because of

(although they may be plural for other reasons)

change of state not a change in location will not be pluralized by the sentence prefix

role. If also predicts that semantic roles in sentence structure that exhibit neither a

Hypotheses is that every constituent that exhibits a change of state or change of location

propto-role and attribute (4) of the patient proto-role, The Change of State or Location

out-set [out-set] pound solid round object

(65) the-ha-shi-ne

which do not undergo a change of state of location, including (65) repeated below:

a change in state of location. Many of the transitive intransitive sentivies have these

participants that would be classified as intransitives are not phrased unless they show

location, it is phrased by the sentive prefix.

respect to a fixed point, and independent existence. Still, because it shows a change of

characteristics of a proto-agent than a proto-patient, including volition, movement with

In sentences such as this, the participant that is phrased appears to have more of the

(They go out one by one (Perkins 2001)).

out-set—walk

(52) oh-ri hi-dan

One example of this (52) repeated below, and others appear in the Appendix.

agents, can also be phrased by the sentive if they exhibit a change in state of location.

Participles that show sentence and volition, and would probably be classified as

attribute of change of state can be phrased by the sentive.

Hypothesis correctly predicts that a constituent with either the attribute of motion or the
characteristics of the proto-agent role such as sendence, volition, and existence

move from one point to another. The arguments of these verbs tend to have other

the other verbs: the motion does not necessarily represent a change of location, a

These are verbs describing motion, but there is an important difference between them and

I am watching. (Smith 2000:216)

set-move

(73) hi-sh pregn

Examples of the inherent sentential, with meanings like 'watching'.

actually materialize. The words in Appendix I that do not exhibit phinals are mostly

not being restrictive enough, because if appears to predict phinals where they do not

possible problems with the change of state or location. Hypotheticals come from this

Hypotheticals is adequately inclusive: there are no phinals that are unaccounted for.

change of location. Therefore, we can say that the change of state or location

exhibits a change of location, while only a few exhibit a change of state. All of the

Most of the verbs in Appendix I that exhibit phinals have semantic roles that

predict a non-final.

would predict a final for (5), the change of state or location. Hypotheticals correctly

affected. Therefore, it can be classified as a theme. Although the theme Hypotheticals

Here, the numbered object is situation relative to another participant and is casually
some way, used up. By definition, once a constituent has gone through a change of
these attributes have something in common in that after the action takes place, they are in
role or location constitute a natural class? It appears that semantic roles with either of
undergo a change of role or location. In which way do roles then undergo a change of
us to answer the question of why the sentence phrases constituents linked to roles that
change of location, but he does not become pluralized. This piece of data actually helps
Hypothesis is example (52), the boy running away from school. The boy does exhibit a
The most problematic piece of data for the Change of State or Location
a cumulative effect of all of the sub-events.
that the change of state or location must happen as a result of one of the sub-events, not as
location is a result of the entire series of hopples. As in Smith (1961), we must stipulate
without it. Each individual "hobble" does not cause a change of location; the change of
However, this change of location is incidental to the motion; the motion could go on

(78) I hobble to safety (WM 1992: 72)

safety = ser-1-hobble

(74) [ido-ha-sh-cheh]

verbs clearly do describe a change in location.
the movement described does not represent a change in location. However, some of these
Most of the inherent sentences that lack phinals can be explained by the fact that
pluralized, but because they do not entail a change of state or location.
However, it is not because they are agents that they are not
independent of the event. However, it is not because they are agents that they are not
, I rolled the barrel around in a circle. (WM 1987: 171)

prefix is a prefix denoting circular motion.

ends up at school again. Another prefix which has a similar effect to the reversibility
of un-done change of location, so that the boy never actually gets home, but always
meaning that the boy keeps running back away from school. This might have the effect
of being (45) may be made possible by the fact that the reversibility prefix is used.

According to this explanation of the change in state or location Hypothesis, the

not.

In contrast, if a constituent is "used up" in the course of the action that is performed, the

their previous location or state between each of the sub-events in a semantic event.

For some reason, the semantics of the semantic prefix do not allow for constituents to refer to
interact in a special way with the semantic prefix because it signifies events on a time line.

These change of state or location attributes have a time-embedded to them. Therefore, they

place. Unlike other attributes of the proto-roles such as volition and being stationary.

Otherwise, the second action and further repetitions of the action cannot take
action is to take place again, the constituent must somehow return to its original state or
state of location, if it is in a different state or a different location. This means that if the

prefix, the barrel-fern-immobile-el-toll
small that it is hardly even an even, and usually needs the self-tests in order to form a full
of any inherent self-tests does not use up a particular point because the even itself is so
evens, then it is evident why the inherent self-tests never create phills: one sub-even
applying only to the sub-evens which make up a series and not to the entire series of
constituents ends up in the same place at the end of the even. If the self-tests is taken as
used up. A change of location does not cause the self-tests phills to appear if the
hyposes is the fact that the constituents which experience these changes are in some way
events. These examples show that the root cause of the change of shape of location
the original location, the change of location is undone during each of the successive
experience a change of location because the end result of travel in a circle is to end up at
having self-tests phills, even though the barrel and the four-Celled are in fact
These particular semantic characteristics of motion-in-a-circle keep these verbs from

(1) If rolls around and around in a circle, (WM 1987:171)

barrel, circular-ser-cl-ol

(46) instead of the barrel.

(70) instead of the barrel.

(77)
Section 6: Conclusion

The theme role in order to be used up in the course of an event.
plurals because it does not predict which of the participles in a title (even when interpreted as plural)
were no such counterexamples; the schemes hypotheses cannot stand alone as an explanation of satisfac
I carried them away one after another.

I lost my way in a circle.

She is cutting together objects one at a time.

They are divided into groups, consecutively.

They slide away (off of sight) one after another.

I pull them out of something one after another.

I roll them into one after another.

I carry a series of things up on my back.

Sentences with Prinals

I start to hop or skip along.

I sleep (and wake up) over and over again.

I'm shopping around on it.

I read multiple times.

In shopping (it)

It turns around and around in a circle.

He started to rely on the car (every morning).

He repeatedly starts work (on the car) every morning.

I hurry to Safety.

I learn it our

I search him repeatedly.

I am walking it alone.

3:45 a.m. I am running away (from school).

Every day I'm keeping running away (from school).

Every day I'm running away (from school).

I am hopping alone.

I hope, hop, and I dance it alone and by end.

Appendix: All of these examples contain the serial verb prefix.
They roll one after another.

I set them down one after another (animate objects).

They enunced one at a time.

I shook them up to satisfy one at a time.

They'd done one by one.

I seized their handles in succession.

She raked the weeds with sets of rake strokes.

She poured liquid into (baby's) mouth one spoonful at a time.
WILLIAMSON, GEORGE. "Plural Marking in Navajo." M.S., Halse Collection, Swarthmore College.
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