

PhrasaLex II – 22 July 2021

Valency and Patterns

Marco Fasciolo – Sorbonne Université

marco.fasciolo@gmail.com

1 Approaches to valency

1.1 The standard approach

Valency : the semantic core of the sentence projecting participants (arguments, actants) (cf. Tesnière 1988 [1959])

Requirement : for a given meaning of a predicative verb, the number of its arguments *can* be determined.

Problems : (1) Is there a sharp line between arguments and not-arguments?
(2) What if a predicative verb has many valency schemes?
(cf. Mereu 2020:77)

1 Approaches to valency

Examples of problem (1) of the standard approach

(1a) *He lives on the hill*

(1b) *I discuss with Marianne*

(1c) *I make a quiche with Marianne*

(1d) *Marianne behaves properly*

1 Approaches to valency

Examples of problem (2) of the standard approach

(2a) She sold her apartment to a family vs. She sold her apartment

(2b) She writes French correctly vs. She writes correctly

(2c) She cooked pancakes vs. She cooked pancakes to her children

1 Approaches to valency

1.2 A corpus-driven approach to valency

Assumption: the more frequent a phenomenon is, the more this phenomenon is relevant as a linguistic datum (cf. Tognini-Bonelli 2001:98, Hanks 2013:5, Perek 2015:28-29)

Prototypical valency: the most frequent valency pattern

valency is empirical *a posteriori* notion, extracted *from* corpora

1 Approaches to valency

Difficulties of a corpus-driven approach to valency

- (1) No need for the notion of “argument”; but valency *is defined* in terms of arguments
- (2) Prototypical valency *describes* corpus; but valency *is the keystone* as regard to which corpus should be *explained*
If patterns *are* valency, as regards to what can patterns be explained?

Suggestion: *patterns* are not *valency*
 valency is an eidetic, *a priori* notion projected *on* corpora.

1 Approaches to valency

1.3 An eidetic approach to valency

For a specific meaning of a predicative verb:

- i) explore corpus in order to extract the longest sequence of argument candidates
- ii) evaluate the argument status of each candidate *in vitro* – on the base of corpus independent criteria – in order to suggest an alleged eidetic valency
- iii) come back to corpus and explore the empirical manifestations (patterns) of this eidetic valency
- iv) justify the differences between patterns and the eidetic valency

(cf. Orlandi&Fasciolo 2021, Prandi forthcoming)

1 Approaches to valency

Some remarks on the eidetic approach to valency

Point (ii) is crucial!

A “datum” is not a *pattern*, but a *pattern* questioned on the presupposition of valency. For example:

- Given that the eidetic valency of *to sell* is AGENT, PATIENT, ADDRESSEE, PRICE, why is that in *this* corpus – the most frequent pattern is AGENT, PATIENT?
- What does the fact that ADDRESSEE and PRICE are less frequently specified reveal about *this* corpus?
- Are other patterns more frequent in other kinds of corpora?

Patterns are logically independent from valency. Valency and patterns are ruled by different parameters.

2 Criteria for eidetic valency

- Prerequisites and Tests
- Not a *passe-partout*, but a *tool-box*

2 Criteria for eidetic valency

2.1 Prerequisites

2.1.1 Prerequisites: splitting polysemy

Question about valency: *which are the arguments ?*

Question about patterns: *what arguments are expressed?*

(3a) *He prays*

(3b) *He prays his boss for a pay rise*

(4a) *This blade cuts*

(4b) *I cut Marianne's steak*

(5a) *A lightning struck the Church*

(5b) *This boxer strikes hard*

Question about valency must be raised for a specific meaning

Question about attested patterns must be raised as regards the valency of each specific meaning

2 Criteria for eidetic valency

2.1.2 Prerequisites: saturation

Arguments are participants

Participants are saturated expressions, and not unsaturated expressions

(6a) *He behaves well*

(6b) *He hit him mortally*

(6c) *He went out drunk*

Arguments neither project roles, nor convey selection restrictions

2 Criteria for eidetic valency

2.2 Tests

2.2.2 Tests: extraction (cf. Prandi 2007, 2013)

doing it → verbal phrase expansions (VP-Exp)

this happens → sentence expansions (S-Exp)

(7) *He jumped into the water*

**He jumped. He did it into the water*

Arg.

(8) *They kissed each other on the top of the hill*

They kissed each other. This happened on the top of the hill

S-Exp

(9) *I informed the president of your decision*

**I informed the president. I did it of your decision*

Arg.

(10) *Grandpa repaired the chair with some glue.*

Grandpa repaired the chair. He did it with some glue

VP-Exp

Criteria for eidetic valency

2.2.2 Tests: role controlling

Arguments roles are verbally controlled A verbally-controlled role depends on the meaning of a specific verb

A not-verbally-controlled role does not depend on the meaning of a specific verb; hence, it can be introduced, basically, in any process.

(11a) *This young man bought a bunch of flowers for his mum* benefactive

(11b) *The stranger hit the janitor with a bottle* instrument

(12a) *I am discussing with Marianne* co-agent / co-participant

(12b) *Marianne and I are discussing* co-agent / co-participant

(13a) *I have prepared this conference with Marianne* [Marianne is 6 years old] comitative

(13b) *?Marianne and I have prepared this conference*

Criteria for arguments

2.3 Some applications of valency criteria

- Valency vs. Predicative frame (predicative complements, cf. Strik-Lievers 2012)
- Different kinds of shadowed material (cf. Pustejovsky 2000, Jezek 2012)
- Valency modifications and constructions (cf. Hilpert 2014)

3 Two parameters

3 Valency, patterns and their alignments

Valency has to be distinguished from *patterns*

Valency is an *a priori*, eidetic notion, belonging to the level of *langue* or sentence

VS.

Pattern is an *a posteriori*, empirical notion, belonging to the level of *parole* or utterance

Valency is not a something we make experience of, but rather a model on which we interpret experience.

VS.

Patterns are genuine linguistic experiences, which must be interpreted on the model of an *a priori* valency.

Two parameters

Conceptual integrity vs. Communicative necessity: two virtually independent parameters

Some examples.

Valency level: argument

Conceptual integrity

Pattern level: necessary/discretionary

Communicative dynamism

To meet someone vs. To sell something to someone

Valency level: not-argument, marginal

Conceptual integrity

Pattern level: necessary

Communicative dynamism

To speak (to someone) loudly

To buy (something) on the internet

To pay (for something) in instalments

References

- Roig, A. 2019. Entre l'actant et le circonstant, l'adjet. L'héritage de Lucien Tesnière, 60 ans après la parution des *Éléments de syntaxe structurale*, Sep 2019, Paris, France.
- Hanks, P. 2013. *Lexical Analysis*. Cambridge Mass : MIT Press.
- Hilpert, M. 2014. *Construction Grammar and its Application to English*. Edinburgh : EUD.
- Jezek, E. 2018. Partecipanti impliciti nella struttura argomentale dei verbi. In : Dallabrida, S. et Cordin, P. (dir.) *La grammatica delle valenze. Spunti teorici, strumenti e applicazioni*. Firenze : Franco Casati Editore, p. 55-72.
- Mereu, L. 2020. *Semantica della frase*. Roma : Carocci.
- Orlandi, A et Fasciolo M. 2021. « Corpus Pattern Analysis et Classes d'objets : différences théoriques et retombées pratiques de deux approches à la description du lexique », *Synergies Italie*.
- Perek, F. 2015. *Argument Structure in Usage-Based Construction Grammar*. Amsterdam-Philadelphie : John Benjamins.
- Prandi, M. 2007. « Les fondements méthodologiques d'une grammaire descriptive de l'italien ». *Langages*, 3, 167, p. 70-84.
- Prandi, M. 2013. *L'analisi del periodo*. Roma : Carocci.
- Prandi, M. 2019. Phrase et énoncé. De l'ordre symbolique à l'ordre indexical. In : Neveu, F. (dir.) *Proposition, phrase, énoncé*. Londres : ISTE éditions, p.131-154.
- Prandi, M. 2020. Roles and grammatical relations in synchrony and diachrony : the case of the indirect object, in : Fedriani Ch. et Napoli, M. *The Diachrony of ditransitives*, Berlin : De Gruyter.
- Prandi, M. forthcoming. L'identification des arguments et la hiérarchisation des marges : critères formels et critères conceptuels, *Neophilologica*.
- Pustejovsky, J. 2000. Lexical shadowing and Argument Closure, in : Ravin, Y. et Leacock Cl. (dir.) *Polysemy. Theoretical and Computational Approaches*, Oxford : OUP.
- Strik-Lievers, F. 2012. *Sembra, ma non è, Studio semantico-lessicale sui verbi con complemento predicativo*. Firenze: Accademia della Crusca.
- Tesnière, L. 1959 [1966] *Éléments de syntaxe structurale* [2 éd.]. Paris : Klincksieck.
- Tognini Bonelli, E. 2001. *Corpus linguistics at work*, Amsterdam-Philadelphie : John Benjamins.