This paper analyses the argument-marking and argument-adjunct prepositions within the Old English lexical domain of speech act verbs. Firstly, we will propose a lexical template for the domain of speech act verbs, since lexical templates are conceived as lexical representations which include semantic and syntactic information within the same format, allowing for the capture of syntactic and morphological phenomena within lexical classes. Secondly, following the theoretical frame of Role and Reference Grammar, we will illustrate the difference between argument-marking and argument-adjunct prepositions. And thirdly, we will provide the Lexical Template Modeling Process with the lexical rules that motivate the different argument-marking and argument-adjunct prepositions from the lexical template codified by the lexical domain of speech in Old English.
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1. Introduction

Based on the typology of prepositions established by Jolly (1991) and Van Valin and LaPolla (1997) within the theoretical frame of Role and Reference Grammar (henceforth RRG), that is, argument-marking prepositions, argument-adjunct prepositions and adjunct prepositions, we will analyse the argument-marking and the argument-adjunct prepositions which combine with Old English speech act verbs.¹

For the writing of this paper, we have taken into consideration speech act verbs with a generic meaning, such as cweþan, scegan and sprecan, together with more specific speech act verbs belonging to the lexical subdomains to say something suddenly/loudly, to say something in a soft way, and to say something unhappily/in a dissatisfied way.² The examples of these predicates have been provided by The Dictionary of Old English Corpus (henceforth DOEC).³

¹ This paper is part of the research projects EX2003–0118 and BFF2002–00659, funded by the Spanish Ministry of Education and the Spanish Ministry of Science and Technology, respectively.
² For the structure of the lexical domain of speech, see Faber and Mairal Usoñ (1999: 288–90).
³ The Dictionary of Old English Corpus, directed by Antonette di Paolo Healey at the University of Toronto, is an online database consisting of at least one copy of every Old English text which has been preserved.
Furthermore, applying the concept of lexical template and the Lexical Template Modeling Process, we will analyse the syntax-semantics interface of Old English verbs of speech by establishing the lexical rules which contribute to the linking between the syntactic and semantic representation of these verbs, and therefore to the assignment of argument-marking and argument-adjunct prepositions.

2. The concept of lexical template

The Functional-Lexematic Model (henceforth FLM), developed by Martín Mingorance (1998), has been devised for the purpose of supplying the lexicon with the onomasiological classification of lexemes within lexical classes, as a way of reflecting the organisation of our mental lexicon and demonstrating the close relationship between syntax and semantics (Faber and Mairal Usón 1994, 1997a, 1997b, 1999; Martín Mingorance 1998).

Following the latest contributions within the FLM (Cortés Rodríguez and Mairal Usón 2001, 2002; Mairal Usón and Van Valin 2001; Mairal Usón and Faber 2002; Mairal Usón and Cortés Rodríguez, forthcoming), lexical templates have been designed as lexical representations which include semantic and syntactic information within the same format, reflecting generalisations across lexical classes and reducing the information to be included in the lexical entries.

In order to construct a lexical template, the logical structures developed by Van Valin and LaPolla (1997) within the theoretical frame of RRG will be complemented by a semantic decomposition in terms of ontological constants or internal variables and semantic primitives corresponding to the different lexical domains, since logical structures lack the semantic information characteristic of each of them. The result will be a procedure of lexical representation where meaning description is encapsulated and interacts with the syntactic behaviour of lexical units. Accordingly, Mairal Usón and Faber (2002: 54) describe lexical templates in the following way: "Lexical templates conflate both syntactic information (those aspects of the meaning of a word which are grammatically relevant) and semantic information (those aspects which act as distinctive parameters within a whole lexical class) into one unified representation."

3. Role and Reference Grammar logical structures

Logical structures (henceforth LS) are based on the classification of predicates attending to their Aktionsart, making reference to the inherent properties of the events that the predicates designate. This classification allows for the capture of syntactic and morphological phenomena, such as the combinatorial possibilities of predicates and case assignment, characteristic of the different verbal classes. Thus, within RRG four classes of verbal predicates are distinguished: states [+static] [-telic] [-punctual], activities [-static] [-telic] [-punctual], achievements [-static] [+telic] [+punctual], and accomplishments (and active accomplishments) [-static] [+telic] [-punctual], together with their causative counterparts. Table 1 on the following page shows the lexical representations corresponding to the verbal classes mentioned above (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 109).

In order to attain the argument structure of a verb, Van Valin and LaPolla (1997: 139) propose two general semantic relations, the Actor and Undergoer macroroles, which are
Argument-Marking and Argument-Adjunct Prepositions

“generalizations across the argument-types found with particular verbs which have significant grammatical consequences.” The Actor macrorole comprises those arguments whose nature is closer to that of an Agent and the Undergoer subsumes those arguments closer to a Patient. Macroroles are only assigned to core arguments, that is, arguments with no morphological marking as in Present-day English or marked by a grammatical case as in Old English, in opposition to oblique arguments, which are introduced by argument-marking or argument-adjunct prepositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb class</th>
<th>Logical structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>predicate (x) or (x, y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>do (x, [predicate (x) or (x, y)])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>INGR predicate (x) or (x, y), or INGR do (x, [predicate (x) or (x, y)])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishment</td>
<td>BECOME predicate (x) or (x, y), or BECOME do (x, [predicate (x) or (x, y)])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active accomplishment</td>
<td>do (x, [predicate, (x, (y))]) &amp; BECOME predicate, (2, x) or (y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>α CAUSES β where α, β are LS of any type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Lexical representations for Aktionsart classes

With respect to the criteria that determine the interaction between arguments and macroroles, these authors propose the following default macrorole assignment principles (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 152–53):

a. Number: the number of macroroles a verb takes is less than or equal to the number of arguments in its logical structure
   1. If a verb has two or more arguments in its LS, it will take two macroroles
   2. If a verb has one argument in its LS, it will take one macrorole

b. Nature: for verbs which take one macrorole
   1. If the verb has an activity predicate in its LS, the macrorole is actor
   2. If the verb has no activity predicate in its LS, the macrorole is undergoer

Moreover, Case Assignment Rules are also related to the assignment of macroroles. Based on Van Valin and LaPolla (1997: 359), we propose the following case assignment rules for the Old English verb class of speech:


5. For an exhaustive treatment of Old English syntax from the RRG perspective, with special
a. Assign nominative case to the highest-ranking macrorole argument, that is, the Actor
b. Assign accusative case to the other macrorole argument, that is, the Undergoer
c. Assign dative case to non-macrorole arguments (default)

As will be shown, taking into account the interaction existing between macroroles and grammatical relations, the information to be included in the lexical representations will be greatly reduced.

4. Prepositional analysis within Role and Reference Grammar

Jolly (1991) posits three types of prepositions: argument-marking prepositions, argument-adjunct prepositions and adjunct prepositions. Both adjunct prepositions and argument-adjunct prepositions are predicates “in their own right,” but the difference between them is that the former “introduce an NP into the clause and head PPs which are peripheral (adjunct) modifiers of the core,” whereas the latter “introduce an argument into the clause and share it with the logical structure of the core, rather than taking the logical structure of the core as an argument” (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 159). Compare the examples in (1) and (2):

(1) Robin baked a cake for Sandy

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[[do´ (Robin, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME baked´ (cake)]] PURP [BECOME have´ (Sandy, cake)]}
\end{array}
\]

(2) Sam baked a cake in the kitchen yesterday

\[
\begin{array}{c}
yesterday´ (be-in´ (kitchen, [[do´ (Sam, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME baked´ (cake)]]))
\end{array}
\]

However, argument-marking prepositions, as their name states, signal the core arguments of the verb. Van Valin and LaPolla (1997: 117) point out that with some verbs, such as speech act verbs, the syntactic realisation of their core arguments as oblique core arguments is possible. Thus, the following example presents two prepositional constructions where \(\text{to} \text{ PP} = \beta\) (the hearer) and \(\text{about} \text{ PP} = \omega\) (the topic of the message):

(3) I speak to Sandy about Kim

\[
\begin{array}{c}
do´ (I, [\text{express.(ε).about.(ω).to.(β).in.language.(γ)´ (I, Sandy)]), where \quad Sandy = \beta, [\text{about´ (Kim)}] = \omega
\end{array}
\]

Therefore, in this paper we are going to deal with the argument-marking prepositions and the argument-adjunct prepositions characteristic of the speech domain and the way they

attention to the relationship between arguments, macroroles and grammatical cases, see Roberts (1995), Martín Arista (2001), and Martín Arista and Caballero González (2002).
are provided by the lexical rules derived from the Lexical Template Modeling Process that we present below.

5. Linking the syntactic and semantic representation of verbal predicates within the Old English domain of speech

Following Van Valin and LaPolla (1997), we propose the following template for the Old English domain of speech:

\[
\text{[do} (x, [\text{use} (x, \text{voice}), \text{produce} (x, \text{words})]) \text{ CAUSE [do} (x, \text{express} (\alpha), \text{about} (\omega), \text{to} (\beta), \text{in} \text{language} (\gamma))]) \text{ CAUSE [BECOME aware.of} (y, z)]\],
\]

where \(z = \alpha, \gamma = \beta, [\text{in} (v)] = \gamma, [\text{about} (w)] = \omega\)

This template contains the logical structure of a causative accomplishment, where a speaker (x) performs the activity of using his/her voice to produce some words, so that this activity causes the speaker (x) to express a content (\(\alpha\)) about a topic (\(\omega\)) to a hearer (\(\beta\)) in a language (\(\gamma\)), and then the hearer becomes aware of it. It shows four internal variables \(\alpha, \omega, \beta, \gamma\), marked by Greek letters and making reference to the content of the expression (\(\alpha\)), to the topic (\(\omega\)), to the addressee (\(\beta\)) and to the language used (\(\gamma\)), respectively, and five external variables \(x, z, w, y, v\), where \(x\) makes reference to the speaker, \(z\) to \(\alpha\) or the content of the expression, \(w\) to \(\omega\) or the topic of the content, \(y\) to \(\beta\) or the hearer, and finally \(v\) to \(\gamma\) or the language used. The linking between these internal and external variables is expressed in the chart below:

\[
\begin{align*}
z & \rightarrow \alpha \text{ (content)} \\
w & \rightarrow \omega \text{ (topic)} \\
y & \rightarrow \beta \text{ (hearer)} \\
v & \rightarrow \gamma \text{ (language used)}
\end{align*}
\]

As the template above shows, the first subevent, \([\text{do} (x, [\text{use} (x, \text{voice}), \text{produce} (x, \text{words})])])\], allows for the instrument alternation which “requires that the potential instrument be part of a causal chain and the argument of an implement predicate like \text{use}” (Mairal Usón and Cortés Rodríguez, forthcoming). Then this subevent causes \(\text{CAUSE}\) a second subevent, \([\text{do} (x, [\text{express} (\alpha), \text{about} (\omega), \text{to} (\beta), \text{in} \text{language} (\gamma))])\], where the internal variables \(\text{in} \text{language} (\gamma)\) and \(\text{about} (\omega)\) raise the prepositional constructions \([\text{in} (v)]\) and \([\text{about} (w)]\), respectively. Finally, these two subevents will cause the event \([\text{BECOME aware.of} (y, z)]\). Thus, the syntactic behaviour of a lexeme will be determined by linking the internal variables and external argument positions of a template. Mairal Usón and Faber (2002: 87) describe the process that governs the mapping between a lexical template and the different syntactic structures within a lexical class, namely, the Lexical Template Modeling Process: “Lexical templates can be modeled by suppressing external variables, instantiating internal variables, eliminating operators (e.g. \text{cause}), or else, by
introducing elements resulting from the fusion with other templates if there is a compatibility between the features in the lexical template and the syntactic construction under scrutiny."

Therefore, within the Old English domain of speech act verbs, the variable \( x \) (speaker) takes the macrorole Actor and Nominative case; the variable \( z \) (content) takes the macrorole Undergoer and Accusative case, although it can also be syntactically realised by a subordinate clause, or a clausal subordination in terms of RRG, functioning as a core argument;\(^6\) the variable \( y \) (hearer), as a non-macrorole core argument, is assigned Dative case or is introduced by an argument-marking preposition; and the other two external variables \( w \) (topic) and \( v \) (language used) usually take part of an argument-adjunct prepositional construction.

Firstly, we will begin by analysing the argument-marking prepositions within this domain. The variable \( y \), when it does not appear in Dative case, is introduced by the preposition \( to \). As the rule for assigning the preposition \( to \) in Present-day English states (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 377), this argument-marking preposition is assigned to a non-macrorole core argument, thus becoming an oblique core argument: "Assign \( to \) to the non-macrorole \( y \) argument in the logical structure segment: ... pred´ (x, y)." The following example illustrates this preposition:

(4) *swa swa drihten to his leorninggnihtum cwæð* (DOEC: ÆCHom I, 36 B1.38)
"As soon as God spoke to his disciples."

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
x & \text{Nominative} & \text{Actor} \\
\hline
y & \text{to + Dative} & \text{Drihten} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Secondly, we will present the argument-adjunct prepositions within this verbal class. The prepositions \( be, embe, for, fram, in, of, ofer, \) and \( on \) allow for the syntactic realisation of the external variable \( w \) making reference to the topic of the message, that is, \([\text{about}(\omega)]\.\) These prepositions are characterised by being themselves predicates introducing an argument which will be shared with the logical structure of the main predicate. This argument is labelled as argument-adjunct since its meaning is not derived from the logical structure of the predicate but instead is given by the preposition which introduces it.

In order to capture this argument-adjunct in Old English, we must apply the following rule: "Assign \( be, embe, for, fram, in, of, ofer, \) and \( on \) to a non-macrorole argument in the logical structure: ... \([\text{about}(w)]\.\)"

(5) *we wyllað eow seogan be sumon gesæligon cyninge* (DOEC: ÆHom 27 B1.4.27)
"We want to talk to you about some prosperous king."

---

6. Within RRG (see Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 454-55) clausal subordinations are classified as either arguments (John persuaded Leon that Amy had lost) or modifiers (Bill went to the party after he talked to Mary).
The prepositions *agen*, *ongean*, *togeanes*, and *wið* also represent the syntactic realisation of the internal variable \([\text{about}(\omega)]\). However, they must be distinguished from the previous ones because they encode a negative axiological value with the meaning “against.” Therefore, we must apply the following rule: “Assign *agen*, *ongean*, *togeanes* and *wið* to a non-macrorole argument in the logical structure: \([\text{against}(\omega)]\).”

(6) *nelle ge sprecan ongean god* (DOEC: Ps GIG (Rosier) C7.8)
“You will not speak against God.”

The preposition *on* implies the syntactic realisation of the external variable \(v\) making reference to the language used to communicate the message, that is, \([\text{in.language}(\gamma)]\). Again, the argument introduced by *on* is an argument-adjunct since its meaning is given by this preposition. The corresponding lexical rule for this preposition is as follows: “Assign *on* to a non-macrorole argument in the logical structure: \([\text{in}(\gamma)]\).”

(7) *Se mæssepreost sceal secgan … þæs godspelles angyt on englisc pam folce* (DOEC: ÆLett (Wulfisge Xa) B1.8.1)
“The masspriest will say to the people the meaning of the gospel in English.”

The last preposition to be dealt with is *mid*. Speech act verbs in Old English are characterised by combining with an intermediary instrument (voice or words) introduced by
the preposition *mid* and shared with the logical structure of the main predicate. According to Levin (1993: 80), *intermediary instruments* must be distinguished from *enabling/facilitating instruments*, since, as the examples below show, only the former can “turn up as subjects,” in Levin’s words, or have the function of Actor from the RRG point of view:

(8) a. David broke the window with a hammer
    b. The hammer broke the window
       intermediary instrument
b. “The spoon ate the ice cream
a. The crane loaded the truck
       intermediary instrument
b. “The pitchfork loaded the truck
facilitating instrument

In order to capture this argument-adjunct, we must apply the rule for assigning *mid* in Old English, being based on Van Valin and LaPolla’s lexical rule for the preposition *with* in Present-day English (1997: 381): “Given two arguments, \(x\) and \(y\), in a logical structure, with \(x\) lower than or equal to \(y\) on the Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy, and a specific grammatical status (macrorole, head of NP), assign *mid* to the \(y\) argument if it is not selected for that status.”

Thus, taking into account the first subevent in the lexical template for the domain of speech, \[ \text{do} \; (x, \; \text{[use} \; (x, \; \text{voice}) \; \text{produce} \; (x, \; \text{words})] \] , if \(x\) is chosen as Actor, the Old English preposition *mid* is usually assigned to the arguments *voice*—or any of the organs which produce the voice—or any of the words, which includes any expression semantically linked to this ontological constant, such as *speech*, *message*, etc.7 See the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>(x) organ he <em>mid</em> mycelre stefne hlydan (DOEC: GD 1 (C) B9.5.2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mouth</td>
<td>*gif he hit <em>mid mudē beeceorād</em> (DOEC: BenR B10.3.1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“If he complains about it with the mouth.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jaws</td>
<td><em>clummiād mid ceaflum fār hi scoldan clipian</em> (DOEC: WHom 16b B2.3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“They mutter with their jaws where they should speak aloud.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>words</td>
<td>*Da se eadiga laurentius *mid <em>þysum wordum &amp; ma ofrin bemaende fār he ne moste mid his larowe prowian</em> (DOEC: ÆCHom L 29 B1.1.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Then the blessed Laurentius complained with these and other words that he could not die with his master.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The instrument as non-macrorole argument

7. Otherwise the instruments *voice* and *words* will appear in Dative, Instrumental or Genitive case. Firstly, as we have seen in the Default Macrorole Assignment Principles, Dative is the default case for non-macrorole arguments and in Old English Instrumental case usually merged with Dative, except in some forms of the adjective or the definite article. Secondly, as Van Valin and LaPolla (1997: 665) state, Genitive case can replace Dative case since “Dative is the default case for non-macrorole direct core arguments, and as a default case it must be overridden with certain verbs.”
“Then he began to cry out with a great voice.”

x  Nominative  Actor  he
voice mid + Dative  mid mycelre stefne

“Then the blessed Laurentius complained with these and other words that he could not die with his master”

x  Nominative  Actor  se eadiga laurentius
z  Clausal subordination  ßet he ne moste mid his lareowe prowian
words  mid + Dative/Instrumental  mid ðysum wordum & ma ofrum

However, the preposition mid can also signal a core argument of the predicate, such as the hearer (γ), and then its meaning is derived from the logical structure of the speech act predicate. In this case, this preposition will be labelled as commitative mid. As Van Valin and LaPolla (1997: 379) state, when there exist two potential actors x and ß (represented in the template as x ∧ ß) and only one of them functions as Actor, the other one is introduced by the argument-marking preposition mid. Compare the previous examples with (11):

“Then he may talk with the psalmist.”

x  Nominative  Actor  he
ß  mid + Dative  mid ðam sealm scop
6. Concluding remarks

The notion of lexical template has been integrated in the Functional Lexematic Model framework for lexical analysis as a way of representing the interaction between syntax and semantics within lexical domains. Thus, lexical templates enrich the logical structures as developed by Van Valin and LaPolla (1997) with a semantic decomposition which allows for the capture of generalisations within verbal classes, reducing the information to be included in the lexical entries.

Therefore, the Old English lexical domain of speech act verbs codifies a lexical template, being able to motivate the syntactic behaviour and alternations of the lexemes that integrate it. Thus, according to the lexical rules derived from the Lexical Template Modeling Process applied to the lexical template of speech act verbs, the speaker (x) is always chosen as Actor, the content (z), when it is syntactically realised, takes the macrorole Undergoer, and the prepositions analysed above, both argument-marking and argument-adjunct, are assigned to non-macrorole arguments in the logical structure, that is, the prepositions *be*, *embe*, *for*, *fram*, *in*, *of*, *ofër*, *on* “about” and *agen*, *ongen*, *tegnenes* “against” are assigned to the topic of the message (w); on “in” to the language used (v); *mid* “with” to the instrument (*voice* or *words*) or to the commitative use of $\beta$, and finally to “to” to the hearer (y).
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