

There are no trivalent states and RRG can describe them – Verbs of envy

Rolf Kailuweit (Duesseldorf)

According to Van Valin (2007), almost all three-place predicates are causative constructions. In the field of verbs of emotion, *to interest somebody in something* would be an example of a three-place causative verb assigning the undergoer macrorole to the EXPERIENCER.

However, the EXPERIENCER appears as PSA in verbs of envy. According to Nissenbaum (1985: 108), *envy* “defines three central roles, that of the envier, the envied, and a feature or possession of the one envied, over which he is envied”. Two of the semantic relations could be redefined in terms of RRG as EMOTER, TARGET (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997, Kailuweit 2005, 2013, 2018). In line with two-place stative verbs of emotion such as *love* or *hate*, *envy* requires an EMOTER argument, the person experiencing envy. However, the TARGET argument, seems to the third argument expressing the object or circumstance someone is envied for. The envied seems to be a reference point, SUBJECT MATTER in Pesetsky’s (1995) terms, where the TARGET can be found.

For the English verb *envy*, this third argument could be realised as a direct core argument (1a) or as an oblique (1b).

- (1)
- a. Many people envied the shareholders their large profits.
 - b. Max envied Paul for his wealth.
 - c. Max envied him.
 - d. Max envied his wealth.
 - e. *He was envied his wealth.
 - f. He was envied for his wealth.
 - g. *His wealth was envied him.
 - h. His wealth was envied.

The fact that the TARGET can also occur marked by *for* (1b) may suggests that it is an adjunct which gets incorporated into the core as a direct argument, on the analogy of RECIPIENT-BENEFICIARIES, e.g. *Max baked a cake for Paul* vs. *Max baked Paul a cake*. Thus, a candidate for a LS for (1b) could be **because.of** ([**have**’ (Paul, wealth)], [**envy**’ Max, Paul]). Note that the TARGET is difficult to passivize if the argument denoting the envied person is present (1g in comparison with 1f), and when this argument is the passive PSA, the TARGET must be oblique (1e in comparison with 1f).

However, in (1a) and (1b) the envied person, seems to be the undergoer, adjacent to the predicate, while the *for*-complement becomes the adjacent undergoer in the RECIPIENT-BENEFICIARY-

construction *Max baked a cake for Paul* => *Max baked Paul a cake*. In addition, the TARGET can be passivized alone which is impossible for the RECIPIENT-BENEFICIARY: *His wealth was envied* (1h), but **Paul was baked*.

French *envier* ('envy') shows variable undergoer choice. The envied can be realised either as an undergoer (2a) or as non-macrorole direct core argument in the dative case (2b). As in English (2c), the TARGET is optional if the envied is realised as undergoer.

- (2) a. *Beaucoup d'hommes vous enviaient pour Madame Linné.*
 Many men you ACC.2PL envy-PST.3PL for Misses Linné
 'Many men envied you for Mrs. Linné.'
- b. *Cette belle figure creuse, il la lui enviait.*
 this pretty face haggard, he ACC.3SG.FEM DAT.3SG envy-PST.3SG
 'It was this pretty haggard face that he envied him for.'

The same case variation as in French can be found in German. In addition, the contrast between the two constructions is realised with the help of the applicative construction with the prefix *be-*. German *neiden* ('envy') realises the envied as a non-macrorole direct core argument in the dative case and the TARGET as the undergoer. German *beneiden* realises the envied as the undergoer and the TARGET as a prepositional object: *jemanden um etwas beneiden* ('to envy somebody for something'). Hence, the TARGET seems to be the unmarked choice for undergoer in German. In the light of the French and the German data *to envy sb for sth* and *envy sb because of sth* - **because.of** ([**have**' (y, z)], [**envy**' x, y]) - is not the same. There seems to be a pertinent semantic and syntactic differences. The prepositions *um* and *pour* seem to be non-predicative prepositions. Evidence comes from German *um*, that differs from *für* (German for) in (23):

- (3) a. *Max beneidete dich um / *für deinen Reichtum*
 Max envy-PST.3SG 2SG.ACC PREP your wealth
 'Max envy you for your wealth'
- b. *Max backte einen Kuchen für /*um dich*
 Max bake-PST.3SG a cake PREP 2SG.ACC
 'Max is baking a cake for you'

If verbs of envy were three-place state predicates, there would be a problem of assigning a LS that provides correct information about macrorole assignment and linking. The issues raised by verbs of envy are even more problematic when variable undergoer assignment comes into play.

The aim of the contribution is to discuss the existence of three-valued states using the example of the verbs of envy. We will deal with the envy alternation in English, German, French and other Romance languages. Starting from the RRG framework, a more detailed description of the semantics will be given to account for the linking properties of envy verbs and the effects of marked undergoer choice. A

comparative look will try to find out whether English *envy sb sth* ~ *envy sb for sth* has to be considered a case of lexicalized variable undergoer choice that differs from the argument-adjunct variant (4b), that Pesetsky discusses for verbs of *love* or *hate* (4a):

- (4) a. What Mary hates about Sue is her stubbornness (Pesetsky 1995: 63).
b. What Mary envies about Sue is her stubbornness.

References

- Kailuweit, Rolf. 2005. Linking. Syntax und Semantik französischer und italienischer Gefühlsverben. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Kailuweit, Rolf. 2013. Radical Role and Reference Grammar (RRRG): A sketch for remodelling the Syntax-Semantics-Interface. In Nolan, Brian & Diedrichsen, Elke (eds.), *Linking Constructions into Functional Linguistics. The Role of Constructions in Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 103-141.
- Kailuweit, Rolf. 2018. Activity Hierarchy and Argument Realization in (R)RRG. In Kailuweit, Rolf, Künkel, Lisann & Staudinger, Eva (eds.). *Applying and Expanding Role and Reference Grammar*. Freiburg: Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, Universitätsbibliothek. [NIHIN studies]. 189-211.
- Nissenbaum, Helen Fay. 1985. *Emotion and focus*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Pesetsky, David. 1995. *Zero syntax. Experiencers and cascades*, Cambridge, Mass. / London: MIT-Press.
- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. / LaPolla, Randy J. 1997. *Syntax. Structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press.
- Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. 2007. The Role and Reference Grammar analysis of three-place predicates. *Suvremena Lingvistika* 33.1.63. 31-64.