The Andative and Venitive Construction in San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec[*]
Carolyn Jane Anderson

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, $ried$[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	HAB-AND-cut	Miss	Petra	flowers[2]

   '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.
Yesterday	when	ST-locate=1s	marketplace	PERF-VEN-buy	Brook	one	rug

   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.

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

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

[3]See Pullum 1990 for a discussion of dialectal variation.

Example 7 is infelicitious because the use of 'go get' entails that Marie intends to catch the flu.

Although this observation is not new, previous analyses do not account for it (Carden & Pesetsky 1977, Pullum 1990, Jaeggli 1993, Pollock 1994, Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, de Vos 2005, Harris 2011, Bjorkman 2016).

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.

9. **Non-Boolean Conjunction (Krifka 1990)**:

$$\lambda e_\epsilon.f(e) \quad \lambda e_\epsilon.g(e) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \lambda e''.\exists e, e'[e'' = e \oplus e' \wedge [f(e) \wedge g(e')]]$$

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 $\langle e\langle \epsilon, t \rangle\rangle$). For this reason, I introduce a modified form of Non-Boolean Conjunction.

10. **Modified Non-Boolean Conjunction**:

$$\lambda x_e.\lambda e_\epsilon.f(e)(x) \quad \lambda y_e.\lambda e'_\epsilon.g(e')(y) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \lambda x.\lambda e''.\exists e, e'[e'' = e \oplus e' \wedge [f(e)(x) \wedge g(e')(x)]]$$

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.'
$[[_V \text{ -ied }][_V \text{ gaty }]]$
(b) $\lambda x_e.\lambda e''_\epsilon.\exists e_\epsilon, e'_\epsilon.[e'' = e \oplus e' \wedge come(e) \wedge Pat(e, x) \wedge die(e') \wedge Pat(e', x)]$

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.
$[_v[_V \text{ come }][_V \text{ die }]]$
(b) $\lambda x_e.\lambda e''_\epsilon.\exists e_\epsilon, e'_\epsilon.[e'' = e \oplus e' \wedge come(e) \wedge Pat(e, x) \wedge die(e') \wedge Pat(e', x) \wedge Ag(e'', x)]$

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.