Workshop ID :	39
Workshop Duration :	Workshop - 1 Day
Workshop Title :	**From argument to adjunct in the Bantu languages and beyond**
Workshop Leader :	Kristina Riedel, University of the Free State

This workshop explores the question of how an event participant can sometimes be realized as an argument and sometimes as an adjunct and the structural relationships between the different realizations.

Participants in an event may be encoded as arguments or adjuncts, both within languages and cross-linguistically. For instance, an agent can be expressed as a subject or an oblique "by" phrase in English. Similarly, in the Spray/Load alternation, the affected object can be expressed either as a PP or a DP; similarly, the instrumental object can be expressed either as a DP or a PP. Thus, it appears semantic functions can be mapped differentially to syntactic structure.

(1)   a. Xolani sprayed **paint** *on the fridge.*

        b*.* Xolani sprayed *the fridge* **with paint**

Similar alternations occur between languages. For instance, a Bantu applicative object is a prototypical argument (2a) whereas in English an applicative is typically a PP adjunct (2b).

(2)   a. unyana   u-sebenz-el-a   **ku.yise**

        1son   SM1-work-APPL-FV   LOC.his/her.father

          'The son is working **for his father**' (isiXhosa: du Plessis & Visser 1992:51)

        b. The son is working **for his father.**

The inverse also applies: typically argument-introducing morphology such as applicative marking can introduce seemingly non-argument categories. In Bantu languages, as in other language families, applicative morphemes typically introduce arguments. The applicative morpheme is one of the most productive in these languages and generally has clear semantics, even while allowing for different semantic roles (e.g. benefactive, malefactive, goal). In the most prototypical case, the applicative argument occupies the position immediately after the verb and is object-markable. But the applicative can also introduce locative, reason or instrumental applicatives (3),that may not display typical object properties or semantics (cf. Bearth 2003; du Plessis &Visser 1992; Marten 2010, 2011, 2012; Riedel and Marten 2012). For example, in Sambaa, instrumental applicatives, unlike benefactive-type applicatives, cannot appear before a non-dislocated object (3a).

(3)   a. * Ni-sheng**ee**   **hamba**   nkuni.

           SM1-cut.APPL.PERF.CJ   5machete   9firewood

'I cut the firewood with a machete.'

b. Ni-u-sheng**ee** **hamba,** mkate.

SM1-OM3-cut.APPL.PERF.CJ 5machete 3bread

'I cut it with a machete, the bread.' (Sambaa, Riedel 2009:121)

Thus, both within languages and comparatively, semantic participants are mapped to syntactic structure in different ways, as arguments or adjuncts. While it is possible to claim that these alternations are merely lexical stipulations, we believe that they raise deeper theoretical questions. We invite papers on the relationships between arguments and adjuncts in Bantu languages, focussing on objects and verbal argument structure, and addressing questions like the following:

(a) What are the parameters that define the range of variation between Bantu languages as well as unrelated languages?

(b) Why should such variation exist at all, especially given a universal semantics? How can a single semantics be reconciled with a diverse range of structures?

What is the structural relationship between arguments and adjuncts and why should the distinction exist at all. An interesting answer to this question is that arguments and adjuncts share a derivational relationship. This possibility is explored by Collins (2004) for English passives and Pesetsky (1995) for prepositional adjuncts which he argues are introduced as complement "cascades