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This paper presents new data and an analysis of the andative and venitive construction in San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec, an endangered Otomanguean language of Oaxaca, Mexico (Pérez Báez 2016). In the construction, riel[1] ‘comes’ (venitive) or ria ‘goes’ (andative) appears between the aspect marker and main verb. The construction describes a complex event where a motion event, contributed by the andative or venitive marker, precedes the event described by the second verb.

1. Rata rsily r-i-tyug Lia Petr gyia.

‘Every morning Petra goes and cuts flowers.’

As I show, while this construction is similar to the English ‘go get’ construction (2), a type of pseudo-coordination without overt coordination, it differs with respect to key semantic properties.

2. John will go cut flowers in the morning.

Using original data from fieldwork, I explore the semantics of the English and Zapotec constructions, showing that their meanings differ in several respects. I present a syntactic and semantic account of the constructions that isolates their variation in the size of the motion verb complement.

1 Semantic Properties

The andative/venitive and ‘go get’ constructions share the property that tense and aspect temporally locate the events of both verbs. In the andative/venitive construction, a single aspect marker applies to both the motion event and the event of the second verb (Munro et. al 2002). The perfective venitive construction below entails the completion of the coming event and buying event.

3. Context: Brook came to the market in order to buy a rug, but ended up buying shoes instead.

#Nai chi n-u=a logyia, b-ied-zi Brook teiby tapet.

Intended: ‘Yesterday when I was at the market, Brook came to buy a rug.’

In the ‘go get’ construction, no inflection is allowed on either verb[3] and temporal modifiers locate both the motion event and the event of the second verb. In the example below, ‘the day after tomorrow’ must temporally locate the coming event as well as the signing event.

4. Context: Jeremy is arriving the day after utterance time, but signing the papers a day later.

# Jeremy will come sign the papers the day after tomorrow.

With respect to certain other semantic properties, however, the constructions differ. One important point of variation is whether the construction has an obligatorily agentive interpretation. As early as Shopen (1971), it has been noted that ‘go get’ differs from other kinds of pseudo-coordination because it entails agentivity. Non-human subjects are infelicitous in the ‘go get’ construction, and human subjects must intend to perform the event described by the second verb.

5. Pieces of driftwood will come and wash up on shore. (adapted from Shopen (1971))
6. #Pieces of driftwood will come wash up on shore.

7. Context: Marie will accidentally be infected when she visits.

# Marie will come catch the flu.

---
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1I use the orthography from Munro et al. (2002) throughout, which suppresses certain phonemic contrasts.

2Abbreviations: AND, andative; HAB, habitual; PERF, perfective; ST, stative; VEN, venitive.

3See Pullum 1990 for a discussion of dialectal variation.

In contrast, the San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec construction does not entail agentivity (Lee 1999, Munro & Lopez 1999). It allows non-agentive readings, even with animate subjects.

8. B-ied-gaty  Jwany
PERF-VEN-die  Juan
‘Juan came and died.’

In this paper, I propose a syntactic and semantic analysis of these two constructions motivated by the micro-variation in their semantics that locates the source of their variation in the size of the complement of the motion verb. While English pseudo-coordination has been discussed extensively, this analysis improves on prior work by addressing the semantic properties of ‘go get’ such as its agentivity entailment. Moreover, the andative/venitive construction in San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec has not been discussed outside a brief syntactic sketch in Lee (1999).

2 Analysis

Since tense and aspect temporally locate the events of both verbs, the event descriptions contributed by the verbs must combine at a lower height. Boolean conjunction cannot be used, since the events described are distinct: a going event cannot be identical to a cutting event. I build on Harris (2011)’s approach to English pseudo-coordination, which uses Non-Boolean Conjunction to build a macro-event from sub-events that separately satisfy the two event descriptions.


\[ \lambda e. f(e) \land \lambda e. g(e) \Rightarrow \lambda e''. \exists e, e'[e'' = e \oplus e' \land [f(e) \land g(e)]] \]

However, for type-theoretic reasons, the Non-Boolean Conjunction operation shown above cannot handle the Zapotec andative/venitive, since the constituents combined are not pure event descriptions of type \( \langle \epsilon, t \rangle \), but relations between entities and events (type \( \langle e(\epsilon, t) \rangle \)). For this reason, I introduce a modified form of Non-Boolean Conjunction.

10. Modified Non-Boolean Conjunction:

\[ \lambda x. \lambda e. f(e)(x) \land \lambda y. \lambda e'. g(e')(y) \Rightarrow \lambda x. \lambda e''. \exists e, e'[e'' = e \oplus e' \land [f(e)(x) \land g(e')(y)]] \]

Assuming that the syntactic structure of [8] in San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec is as shown in [11a], the application of Modified Non-Boolean Conjunction will yield the interpretation in [11b].

11. (a) B-ied-gaty  Jwany
PERF-VEN-die  Juan
‘Juan came and died.’


\[ \lambda e. f(e) \land \lambda e. g(e) \Rightarrow \lambda e''. \exists e, e'[e'' = e \oplus e' \land [f(e) \land g(e)]] \]

Because of the contrast in agentivity entailment between the English and Zapotec constructions shown in [7] the analysis given above is not sufficient for the English ‘go get’ construction. Instead I propose that the obligatorily agentive interpretation of the macro-event in the ‘go get’ construction arises from the existence of a higher little-v head that dominates the two VPs (12a).

12. (a) John will come die.
[\( v \) come [\( v \) die]]

\[ \lambda x. \lambda e'' \exists e, e'[e'' = e \oplus e' \land \text{come}(e) \land \text{Pat}(e, x) \land \text{die}(e') \land \text{Pat}(e', x)] \]

Thus, the difference between the two constructions springs from the fact that ‘go get’ has an Agent for the macro-event, while the andative/venitive construction does not.