Event Structure and Grammar

Y is represented as a preparatory stage of ACT (X, Y) & NOT (CLOSED (Y)) and a result state of CLOSED (Y).

(iii) Semantic approaches: These approaches represented in works such as Krifka (1998) and Filip (2000) are quite different from the lexical semantic approaches like Jackendoff's work. These logical semanticists rely more on truth-conditional resources of words and sentences to refer to the semantics of events.

(iv) Syntactic approaches: These approaches represented by works such as Ritter and Rosén (1998, 2000), Travis (2000), Butt and Ramchand (2001), and Borer (2000) take the position that the event is nonlexical and argue that the event type is read off of the clausal functional projections.

These lexical, decompositional, compositional, semantic, and syntactic approaches may overlap and are thus not to be seen as clearly delineated alternatives. The lexical approaches, while intuitive, impose a lot of burden on the lexicon. Decompositional approaches are also intuitive, but a problem is that there is usually no general agreement on what primitives to set. The compositional, semantic, and syntactic approaches may also have their weaknesses but these are among the most promising.

Future Trends
Beyond the current state, two main trends may be noted. First, event structure is currently studied with reference to words and sentences, mostly in isolation. In the future, we need to study it in context, such as in speech and texts. D. Townsend and colleagues (2003) lead this trend. Second, current research mostly studies how different types of objects and other functions influence tense. But we also ought to look at how event structure in complex verbal constructions, such as serial verbs, is computed.

LEXICAL-FUNCTIONAL GRAMMAR analyses like Bodomo (1995, 1997) and Aleina, Bresnan, and Sells (1997) lead this trend.

Tenny and Pustejovsky (2000), Mani, Pustejovsky, and Gaizauskas (2005), and Delling, Hezy-Zybatow, and Schafer (2007) are further recent book-length readings that put most of these issues in perspective.

— Adams Bodomo
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EVIDENTIALITY

This is a grammatical category that has source of information as its primary meaning—whether the narrator actually saw what is being described, made inferences about it based on some evidence, or was told about it, and so on. Tzilani, an Arawak language from Brazil, has five evidentials marked on the verb. If I saw José play football, I will say "José is playing-nuka," using the visual evidential. If I heard the noise of the play (but didn’t see it), I will say "José is playing-manha," using the acoustic. If all I see is that José’s football boots are gone and is on the ball, I will say "José is playing-nikka," using the inferential. If it is Sunday and José is not home, the thing to say is "José is playing-sika" since my statement is based on the assumption and general knowledge that José usually plays football on Sundays. And if the information was reported to me by someone else, I will say "José is playing-pidak," using the reported marker. Omitting an evidential results in an ungrammatical and highly unnatural sentence.

About a quarter of the world’s languages have some grammatical marking of information source. The systems vary in their complexity. Some distinguish just two terms. An eyewitness versus non-evidence distinction is found in Turkic and Iranian languages. Other languages mark only the nonfirsthand information, for example, Abkhaz, a northwestern Caucasian language. Numerous languages express only reported, or hearsay,
Evidentiality

information, for example, Estonian. Quechua languages have three evidentiality specifications: direct evidence, conjunctural, and reported.

Systems with more than four terms have just two sensory evidentials and a number of evidentials based on inference and assumption of different kinds; these include Nambiquara languages, from Brazil, and Fue and Fass, of the Kutubuan family spoken in the southern highlands of Papua New Guinea.

The terms verificational and validational are sometimes used in place of evidential. French linguists employ the term média

Evidentiality does not bear any straightforward relationship to truth, the validity of a statement, or the speaker’s responsibility. The truth value of an evidential may be different from that of the verb in its clause. Evidentials can be manipulated to tell a lie: One can give a correct information source and wrong information, as in saying “He is dead-reported” when you were told that he is alive, or correct information and wrong information source, as in saying “He is alive-visual” when, in fact, you were told that he is alive but did not see this. The ways in which semantic extensions of evidentials overlap with modalities and such meanings as probability or possibility depend on the system and on the semantics of each individual evidential term. In many languages (e.g., Quechua, Shipibo-Konibo, or Tarascan, all from South America), markers of hypothetical and irrealis modality can occur in conjunction with evidentials on one verb or in one clause. This further corroborates their status as distinct categories.

Nonverbal and reported evidentials used with the first person often refer to uncontrolled spontaneous action or have overtones of surprise, known as mirativity.

Every language has some lexical way of referring to information source, for example, English reportedly or allegedly. Such lexical expressions may become grammaticalized as evidential markers. Non evidential categories may acquire a secondary meaning relating to information source. Conditions and other nondeclarative moods may acquire overtones of uncertain information obtained from some other source for which the speaker does not take any responsibility: the best-known example is the French conditional. Part tense and perfect aspect acquire nuances of non firsthand information in many Iranian and Turkic languages, and so do reflexive nominalizations and passives. The choice of a complementizer, or a type of complement clause, may serve to express meanings related to the way in which one knows a particular fact. In English, different complement clauses distinguish on auditory and a hearsay meaning of the verb hear: Saying I heard Brazil beat France implies actual listening, whereas I heard that Brazil beat France implies a verbal report of the result. These evidential-like extensions are known as evidential strategies. Historically, they may give rise to grammatical evidentials.

The maximal number of evidentials is distinguished in statements. The only evidential possible in commands is the reported, to express command on behalf of someone else: “eat-reported!” means “eat following someone’s command!” Evidentials often come from grammaticalized verbs. The verb of “saying” is a frequent source for reported and quotative evidentials, and the verbs feel, think, hear can give rise to a nonvisual evidential. Closed-word classes – delicta (see praxis) and locatives – may give rise to evidentials, both in small and in larger systems.

Evidentials vary in their semantic extensions, depending on the system. Reported information often has overtones of probability or unreliability, while visual evidentials may develop meanings of certainty. They can be extended to denote the direct participation, control, and volitionality of the speaker. Morphemes marking tense, aspect, mood, modality, and evidentiality may occur in the same slot in the structure of a highly synthetic language.

Evidentiality is a property of a significant number of linguistic areas, including the Balto-Slavic, the Baltic area, India, and a variety of locations in Americas. Languages may make their way into English, Spanish, and others. The genre may determine the choice of an evidential. Traditional stories are typically cast in reported evidential. Evidentials can be manipulated in discourse as a stylistic device. Switching from a reported to a direct (or visual) evidential creates the effect of the speaker’s participation and confidence. Switching to a non firsthand evidential often implies a background “aside.” Evidentiality is intertwined with conventionalized attitudes to information and precision in stating its source.

- Alexandra AIkhenvald
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EVOLUTIONARY PSYCHOLOGY

This term is used in several different, related senses. Among behavioral, social, and cognitive scientists, it properly refers to a new scientific paradigm or framework, together with the discipline that has grown up around this framework, and the body of knowledge produced by the researchers working within that framework. Some scholars outside the field, as well as many journalists and lay people, use it more loosely to refer to any finding, speculation, or discussion that links evolution and behavior, whether well informed or not. Evolutionary psychology as both a research framework and as a discipline is organized around the proposition that the design features of the mechanisms comprising a species’ psychology reflect the character of the adaptive problems they evolved to solve. This proposition was controversial when applied by biologists to other species (e.g., Williams 1966). However, it generated significant debate and opposition once it began to be applied to humans, who because of culture,