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1 Introduction

The main goals of this study are:

- present data covering possessive copula constructions (PCC) in Urdu and Irish;
- discuss the various usages of these constructions in the two languages;
- apply stage-/individual-level contrast to the data;
- provide a reanalysis of the data on this basis.

2 Data - General Introduction

The study focuses on Urdu and Irish, two languages that do not use verbs for expressing possession. In both languages, PCCs are used to link the possessor KP (Urdu) or PP (Irish) to the possessee subject NP (both languages).

2.1 Urdu Data

- Schmidt (1999), p. 85: two different PCCs in Urdu: 1. possessor KP marked by genitive case marker kA, kE, kI; 2. possessor PP marked by complex postposition kE pAs;
- complex postposition kE pAs: consisting of oblique form of genitive case marker kE & postposition pAs (Butt and King, 2004);
- kA, kE, kI: “inalienable” possession: kin, body parts, reputation, landed property etc.;
- kE pAs: “alienable” possession: (temporary) physical ownership, control of a tangible object;
- BUT: Is this really a valid generalization?

2.1.1 Examples for kA, kE, kI:

(1) a. nAdiyah kE dO bHAI heN.
   ‘Nadya has two brothers.’

b. is mEz kA lAl raNg he.
   ‘This table is red.’

   ∼

   c. yAsIn kI baRI nAk he.
   ‘Y assin has a big nose.’

d. is tAlE kI kOI cAbI nahIN.
   this.Obl lock.Masc.Sg.Obl Gen.F em.Sg any key.F em.Sg not
   ‘This lock has no key.’

from Schmidt (1999), p. 86
2.2 Irish Data

• Irish has two different copula verbs: *is*, called the *copula* in the literature; and *bí*, called the *substantive verb* in the literature;

• possession is expressed by using:
  
  – the copula: [*is*] + preposition *le* + possessor NP + possessee NP;
  
  – the substantive verb: [*bí*] + possessee NP + preposition *ag* + possessor NP;

→ two constructions available for expressions of possession in Irish: *is* ... *le* & *bí* ... *ag* (Stenson, 1981, Ó Siadhail, 1989);

→ BUT: When is the copula used, and when the substantive verb?

2.2.1 Examples for *is*:

(3) a. Is *le* Pádraig an carr nua.
   be.Pres with Patrick.Masc.Sg Art.Def car.Masc.Sg new
   ‘The new car is Patrick’s.’ adapted from Stenson (1981), p. 98

b. Is *le* Seán an teach.
   be.Pres with John.Masc.Sg Art.Def house.Masc.Sg
   ‘The house is John’s.’

c. Is liom an caisleán.
   be.Pres with.1P5g Art.Def castle.Masc.Sg
   ‘The castle is mine.’

d. An leatsa an talamh chomh maith?
   Part.Q with.2P5g.Emph Art.Def ground.Masc.Sg as-well
   ‘Is the ground yours as well?’

2.2.2 Examples for *bí*:

(4) a. Tá *an* carr nua ag Pádraig.
   be.Pres.3P5g Art.Def car.Masc.Sg new at Patrick.Masc.Sg
   ‘Patrick has the new car.’ adapted from Stenson (1981), p. 98

2.1.2 Examples for *kE pAs*:

(2) a. *nAdiyah kE pAs qalam he.*
   Nadya.Fem.Sg.Obl Gen.Obl near pen.Masc.Sg be.Pres.3P5g
   ‘Nadya has a pen.’

b. *dHObI kE pAs sAlkal he.*
   washerman.Masc.Sg.Obl Gen.Obl near bicycle.Masc.Sg be.Pres.3P5g
   ‘The washerman has a bicycle.’ from Schmidt (1999), p. 86

c. *mErE pAs dO sEb heN.*
   ‘I have two apples.’
2.3 Summary

The data presented in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 pose several questions:

• How can we test the appropriate contexts of the constructions involved?
• What governs the use of \( kA, kE, kI \) vs. \( kE \ pAs \) and \( is \) vs. \( bí \) in Urdu and Irish, respectively?
• How can this be formalized, or even implemented in a computational grammar?

3 Stage- and Individual-Level Predicates

3.1 Carlson (1977) — The First Encounter

Carlson (1977): predicates differ in their acceptability when occurring in the object of perception verbs:

(5) He saw John in the garden.

(6) a. He saw John naked.
   b. #He saw John intelligent.

(7) a. He saw John smoke a cigarette.
   b. #He saw John love Mary.

Observations by Carlson (1977):

• locative prepositional phrases almost always possible;
• adjective phrases/infinitival verb phrases differ in acceptability;
• depends on nature of the predicate expressed by adjective/verb?

Carlson noticed that unacceptable secondary predicates in the object NPs above generally express permanent, inherent properties, while acceptable ones generally express transitory, coincidental properties. He called the former individual-level predicates (ILPs) and the latter stage-level predicates (SLPs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>individual-level predicates</th>
<th>stage-level predicates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>naked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>love Mary</td>
<td>smoke a cigarette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have blue eyes</td>
<td>shout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>tired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egoistic</td>
<td>angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetarian</td>
<td>hungry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likeable</td>
<td>in the garden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Examples for ILPS and SLPS
3.2 Kratzer (1995) and the Situation Argument

To explain the above contrasts, several analyses were proposed over the years. One of the most successful was presented in Kratzer (1995):

- syntactic function of the copula is uniform across constructions and across languages;
- the semantics differ; in languages such as English and German, both stage-level and individual-level predicates occur in copula constructions;
- Stump (1985), Diesing (1992), Kratzer (1995) (a.o.) have argued that in these languages, we find two homonymous copula verbs with respect to their semantics;
- one copula embeds only stage-level, while the other embeds only individual-level predicates:

(8) \textsc{intelligent}(Ravi)

‘Ravi is intelligent.’

(9) \exists s [\textsc{in-the-garden}(Ravi, s)]

‘Ravi is in the garden.’

- (8) depicts the semantics of an individual-level predicate; includes no additional arguments besides the subject;
  \rightarrow (8) predicates the property/state \textit{intelligent} of the subject \textit{Ravi}, makes a general, time-and-situation-independent statement about \textit{Ravi};
- (9) depicts the semantics of a stage-level predicate; it has an extra argument, called the situation argument, which embeds \textit{Ravi’s} property of being \textit{in the garden} in some situation (Kratzer, 1995, Chierchia, 1995, Maienborn, 1999);
  \rightarrow (9) predicates the property/state \textit{in the garden} of the subject as well as the situation argument, thereby making \textit{in the garden} time-and-situation-dependent.

3.3 Testing for ILPs and SLPs

Apart from the test involving perception verbs, which was part of Carlson’s original motivation to assume the ILP/SLP contrast, other tests have been identified to decide the nature of some predicate. Here, I present a collection of these tests, identified e.g. in Carlson (1977), Diesing (1988) and Kratzer (1995).

3.3.1 The Temporal Modification Test

While SLPs are generally OK with temporal adverbials, ILPs tend to become unacceptable:

(10) a. John is in the garden right now.
    b. John was angry yesterday.
    c. #Ravi is intelligent today.
    d. #John loves Mary now.
    e. #Nadya was a Vegetarian a few hours ago.
3.3.2 The Locative Modification Test

SLPs generally accept locative modification, while ILPs do not:

(11) a. Ravi smokes a cigarette in the kitchen.
   b. Sam shouted on the soccer field.
   c. #Ravi is likeable in the kitchen.
   d. #Nadya is a vegetarian on the soccer field.

3.3.3 The Lifetime Changing Test

Changing the tense of a sentence has an effect on the perceived lifetime of the individual(s) affected by the predication, but only with ILPs:

(12) a. Sam was angry. → does not necessarily imply that Sam does not exist anymore
   b. John was in the garden. → does not necessarily imply that John does not exist anymore
   c. Ravi was intelligent. → implies that Ravi does not exist anymore
   d. Sam loved Mary. → implies that Sam does not exist anymore

4 The Urdu Data Re-Examined

In this section, the Urdu data is re-examined and tested on predication level, based on the standard tests for the ILP/SLP distinction put forward by e.g. Carlson (1977), Diesing (1988) and Kratzer (1995).

- main argument: distinction between inalienable and alienable is paralleled in the stage-level/individual-level distinction;
- offer a novel analysis of Urdu have-type copula constructions;
- information on predication level must be part of the lexical entries of the possessive markers involved (kA, kE, kI and kE pAs).

4.1 Applying the Predication Level Tests to Urdu PCCs

4.1.1 Temporal Adverbials

Those PCCs with kA, kE, kI markers are judged as questionable by native speakers of Urdu; without any context given, they are borderline sentences.

(13) a. ??Aj nAdiyah kE dO bHAI heN.
    ‘Today, Nadya has two brothers.’

   b. ??Aj is mEz kA lAl raNg he.
    today this.Obl table.Fem.Sg.Obl Gen.Masc.Sg red color.Masc.Sg Obl be.Pres.3PSg
    ‘Today, this table is of red color.’ ~ ‘This table is red.’

   c. ??Ab yAsIn kI baRI nAk he.
    now Yassin.Masc.Sg.Obl Gen.Fem.Sg big.Fem.Sg nose.Fem.Sg be.Pres.3PSg
    ‘Today, Yassin has a big nose.’
4.1 Applying the Predication Level Tests to Urdu PCCs

d. ??Ab is tAIE kI kOI cAbI nahIN.
   now this.Obl lock.Masc.Sg.Obl Gen.Fem.Sg any key.Fem.Sg not
   ‘Today, this lock has no key.’

e. ??Aj is xAndAn kA baRA makAn he.
   today this.Obl family.Masc.Sg.Obl Gen.Masc.Sg big house be.Pres.3P.Sg
   ‘Today, this family has a big house.’

Conversely, the acceptability of the examples with the marker kE pAs is not affected throughout; see (14).

(14) a. Aj nAdiyah kE pAs qalam he.
   today Nadya.Fem.Sg.Obl Gen.Obl near pen.Masc.Sg be.Pres.3P.Sg
   ‘Today, Nadya has a pen.’

b. Aj dHObl kE pAs sAlkal he.
   today washerman.Masc.Sg.Obl Gen.Obl near bicycle.Masc.Sg be.Pres.3P.Sg
   ‘Today, the washerman has a bicycle.’

c. Ab mErE pAs dO sEb heN.
   ‘Now, I have two apples.’

If we assume kA, kE, kI marks IL P of possession in Urdu PCCs, then the data above is expected. It does not make sense to specify temporal adverbials when describing inherent possession — if Yassin had a big nose yesterday/3 months ago/when he was eight, he probably has a big nose today, and will have a big nose in the future.

4.1.2 Lifetime Effects

The following sentences in (15) with the copula in its past form are acceptable; however, the past form of the copula has a lifetime effect on the possessor KP; the sentences imply that the possessor does not exist anymore.

(15) a. yAsIn kI baRI nAk thl
   ‘Yassin had a big nose.’ → implies that Yassin does not live anymore

b. nAdiyah kE dO bHAI tHE.
   ‘Nadya had two brothers.’ → implies that Nadya does not live anymore

On the other hand, the following examples with kE pAs are not only acceptable; they also do not necessarily imply that the possessors do not exist anymore.

(16) a. nAdiyah kE pAs qalam tHA.
   ‘Nadya had a pen.’

b. dHObl kE pAs sAlkal tHA.
   ‘The washerman had a bicycle.’

c. mErE pAs dO sEb tHE.
   ‘I had two apples.’
4.1.3  An Additional Test for PCCs: Choice of the Possessee

If $k_A$, $k_E$, $k_I$ are exclusively used for marking inherent, rather permanent instances of possession, and $k_E p_A$s is exclusively used for marking rather coincidental ones, then we can make a prediction: exchanging them in a given context will have effects on the sentences in terms of acceptability. The prediction is borne out by examples such as the following.

(17) a. ??nAdiyah kA qalam he
    Nadya Gen pen be.Pres
    ‘Nadya has a pen.’

b. ??dHObI kA sAlkal he.
    washerman.Masc.Sg.Obl Gen.Masc.Sg bicycle.Masc.Sg be.Pres.3P.Sg
    ‘The washerman has a bicycle.’

- in unmarked contexts, there is no inherent possession relation between e.g. $nAdiyah$ and $qalam$ or between $dHObI$ and $sAlkal$;
- $k_A$, $k_E$, $k_I$ marks inherent possession relations;
→ the above sentences are bad.

4.1.4  Context Construction

Another interesting observation comes from constructing contexts:

- Assume for (17a) that we are looking at a set of pens, and we specifically want to find out for a single one who it belongs to; again, in this context, the sentence becomes acceptable;
→ This is not expected if we just assume an *alienable*/*inalienable* dichotomy as in Schmidt (1999)...

4.2  Summary

After re-examining the Urdu PCC data and applying the tests on predication level, it's safe to make the following statements:

- Urdu distinguishes between stage-level and individual-level instances of possession;
- $k_A$, $k_E$, $k_I$ marks ILP PCCs, while $k_E p_A$s marks SLP PCCs;
- standard tests for predication level can be applied;
- predication level is part of the lexical entry of the possessive marker;
- the *alienable*/*inalienable* dichotomy is not sufficient for explaining the data.

5  The Irish Data Re-Examined

The Irish data is a lot more difficult to establish, since there seem to be multiple phenomena at work; while Topic/Focus and definiteness both play a role, some data are hard to explain without assuming different levels of predication.

- main argument: even though the choice between the copula *is* and the substantive verb *bí* is determined by several factors, predication level must play a part;
- offer evidence for copula expressing ILPS and substantive verb expressing SLPs;
- information on predication level must be part of the lexical entries of the verb.
5.1 Information Structure and Definiteness

The choice of copula vs. substantive verb in Irish seems to be influenced by information structure and definiteness:

- The construction *bí ... ag* allows for different kinds of possessee;
- *is ... le*, on the other hand, *only allows for definite possessees*;
- if there is an indefinite possessee involved, the substantive verb has to be used.

(This is confirmed by Stenson (1981), p. 98).

Assume a dialog such as the one in (18).

(18) a. Tá caisleán agam in Éirinn.
    be.Pres.3Psg castle.Masc.Sg at.1Psg in Ireland
    ‘I own a castle in Ireland.’

b. #Is liom caisleán in Éirinn.
    be.Pres with.1Psg castle.Masc.Sg in Ireland
    ‘A castle is mine in Ireland.’

b. #A castle is mine in Ireland.’

→ Assume a dialog such as the one in (18).

(18) a. Tá caisleán agam in Éirinn.
    be.Pres.3Psg castle.Masc.Sg at.1Psg in Ireland
    ‘I own a castle in Ireland.’

b. #Is liom caisleán in Éirinn.
    be.Pres with.1Psg castle.Masc.Sg in Ireland
    ‘A castle is mine in Ireland.’

b. #A castle is mine in Ireland.’

→ Assume a different dialog:

(19) a. Tá carr nua amuigh.
    be.Pres.3Psg car.Masc.Sg new outside
    ‘There is a new car outside.’

b. Is le Pádraig an carr nua.
    be.Pres with Patrick.Masc.Sg Art.Def car.Masc.Sg new
    ‘The new car is Patrick’s.’ ~ ‘Patrick owns the new car.’ OR ...
5.2 Applying the Predication Level Tests to Irish PCCs

5.2.1 Temporal Adverbials

Irish PCCs with *is ... le* are judged as questionable by native speakers when modified with a temporal adverbial, while the acceptability of sentences with *bí ... ag* is not affected.

(21) a. ??Is le Pádraig an carr nua inniu.
   be.Pres with Patrick.Masc.Sg Art.Def car.Masc.Sg new today
   ‘Patrick has the new car today.’

   b. ??Is le Seán an teach inniu.
   ‘John has the house today.’

(22) a. Tá an carr nua ag Pádraig inniu.
   be.Pres.3PSg Art.Def car.Masc.Sg new at Patrick.Masc.Sg today
   ‘Patrick has the new car today.’

   b. Tá an teach ag Seán inniu.
   be.Pres.3PSg Art.Def house.Masc.Sg new at John.Masc.Sg today
   ‘John has the house today.’

5.2.2 Lifetime Effects

We do get lifetime effects when changing the tense of the copula; however, there is no lifetime effect when changing the tense of the substantive verb:

(23) Ba le Pádraig an carr nua.
   be.Past with Patrick.Masc.Sg Art.Def car.Masc.Sg new
   ‘Patrick had the new car.’ → implies that either Patrick or the car do not exist anymore

(24) Bhí ag Pádraig an carr nua.
   be.Past.3PSg at Patrick.Masc.Sg Art.Def car.Masc.Sg new
   ‘Patrick had the new car.’ → does not necessarily imply that Patrick or the car do not exist anymore
This is confirmed by Doherty (1996), who gives the following examples:

   be.Past doctor.Masc.Sg John.Masc.Sg
   ‘John was a doctor.’
   adapted from Doherty (1996), p. 39

b. Bhí Seán ina dhochtúir.
   be.Past.3P.Sg John.Masc.Sg in-his doctor.Masc.Sg
   ‘John was a doctor.’
   adapted from Doherty (1996), p. 39

While (25a) is unambiguous in that it only allows for the reading where the subject Seán has left the universe of discourse and is probably dead, the second sentence expresses a temporary reading, where the subject may have some other profession. Ramchand (1996) gives a similar example for Scottish Gaelic.

5.3 Summary

After re-examining the Irish PCC data and applying the tests on predication level, it's safe to make the following statements:

- Irish distinguishes between stage-level and individual-level instances of possession;
- the copula is marks ILP PCCs, while the substantive verb bí marks either ILP or SLP PCCs;
- standard tests for predication level can be applied;
- information on predication level is part of the lexical entries of the copula.

6 Towards a Single Analysis for Both Languages

I assume the theory of Kratzer (1995) and explain the data introduced above based on the assumption of a situation argument. However, the analysis departs from Kratzer (1995) in several crucial points.

1. I assume that for both languages, the information about the predication level is part of the lexical entries of distinctive lexical items.
   - Urdu: the possessive markers kA, kE, kl (ILP) and kE pAs (SLP);
   - Irish: the copula is (ILP) and the substantive verb bí (ILP/SLP);

2. It is these lexical items that supply (kE pAs/ bí in its SLP reading), or do not supply (kA, kE, kl/is/bí in its ILP reading), the situation argument;

3. for Urdu: the situation argument percolates up to the top-level from the possessor PP via inside-out functional uncertainty; the copula merely links possessee and possessor; we have two homonymous copulas, one embedding ILPs, the other embedding SLPs;

4. for Irish: the situation argument is provided by the substantive verb on the top-level; the substantive verb can embed both SLPS and ILPS; the situation argument is not provided by the copula; it can only embed ILPS;

5. assumed theories: LFG for syntax, Glue (Dalrymple, 2001, Dalrymple et al., 1993) for semantics.

6.1 The Analysis in View of the Urdu Data

The syntactic part of the analysis employs a predlink analysis, which has been shown to be an adequate copula analysis (Attia, 2008, Sulger, 2009); the Urdu copula kOnA links the subject to a predlink grammatical function (GF). To construct the semantics, I assume the following mapping:

- the predlink (OBJ) GF is rewritten as the possessor argument;
- the subj GF is rewritten as the possessee argument.
6.1 The Analysis in View of the Urdu Data

6.1.1 Urdu ILP PCCs

Let's take a simple ILP example such as the following:

(26) Nadjiyah kA bHAI he.
Nadya.Fem.Sg.Obl Gen.Masc.Sg brother.Masc.Sg be.Pres.3PSg
‘Nadya has a brother.’

\[
\begin{align*}
S & \quad \text{PRED 'hO<(↑ SUBJ)(↑ PREDLINK)>'} \\
Kposs & \quad \text{SUBJ [PRED 'bHAI']} \\
KP & \quad \text{PREDLINK [CASE gen}} \\
NP & \quad \text{NUM sg, GEND fem)} \\
N & \quad \text{bHAI} \\
kA & \quad \text{nAdjiyah} \\
he & \quad \text{Kposs} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Lexical entries:

(27) copula:
\[
hO \ COP (↑ \ PRED) = 'hO<\text{SUBJ, PREDLINK>}'
\[
\{ λX.λY.\text{have}(X, Y) : (↑ \ PREDLINK)_σ → [ (↑ \ \text{SUBJ})_σ → ↑σ] \} → \}
\[
\{ λS.λX.λY.\text{have}(X, S, Y) : (↑ \ PREDLINK \ \text{OBJ})_σ → [ (↑ \ \text{SUBJ})_σ → ↑σ] \}
\]

(28) Nadya:
\[
nAdjiyah \ N (↑ \ PRED) = 'nAdjiyah'
\]
\[
Nadya : ↑σ
\]

(29) genitive case marker kA:
\[
kA \ Kposs (↑ \ CASE) = \text{gen}
\]

(30) common noun bHAI ‘brother’:
\[
bHAI \ N (↑ \ PRED) = 'bHAI'
\]
\[
\text{brother : ↑σ}
\]

Assembling these meaning constructors, this produces the following desired meaning:

(31) have\{Nadya, brother\} : ↑σ

→ Note that to produce the right order in the meaning (semantic subject, then semantic object) the PREDLINK (OBJ) GF is consumed first, then the SUBJ GF; see (27).

→ Since there is nothing in the sentence providing a situation argument, we do not end up with one.

→ This depicts the fact that we are dealing with an ILP here, predicing the inherent property of Yassin having a big nose independently of some situation.
6.1.2 Urdu SLP PCCs

Urdu SLPs will look like the following:

(32) nAdiyah kE pAs qalam he.
Nadya.Fem.Sg.Obl Gen.Obl near pen.Masc.Sg be.Pres.3P.Sg
‘Nadya has a pen.’

Lexical entries:

(33) copula:
\[ hO \text{ COP} \overset{\uparrow \text{PRED}}{=} \langle hO, \text{SUBJ}, \text{PREDLINK} \rangle \]

\[
\{ \lambda X, \lambda Y.\text{have}(X, Y) : (\uparrow \text{PREDLINK})_\sigma \rightarrow [ (\uparrow \text{SUBJ})_\sigma \rightarrow \uparrow \sigma ] \\
| \lambda S, \lambda X, \lambda Y.\text{have}(X, S, Y) : (\uparrow \text{PREDLINK OBJ})_\sigma \rightarrow [ (\uparrow \text{SUBJ})_\sigma \rightarrow \uparrow \sigma ] \}
\]

(34) proper noun nAdiyah:
\[ nAdiyah \text{ N} \overset{\uparrow \text{PRED}}{=} \text{‘nAdiyah’} \]

(35) genitive case marker kE:
\[ kE \text{ Kposs} \overset{\uparrow \text{CASE}}{=} \text{gen} \]

(36) postposition pAs; this lexical entry supplies the situation argument to the semantics:
\[ pAs \text{ Pposs} \overset{\uparrow \text{PRED}}{=} \langle pAs, \text{OBJ} \rangle \]

\[ (\uparrow \text{OBJ CASE}) = \text{c gen} \]

S : (\text{PREDLINK} \uparrow \sigma)

(37) common noun qalam ‘pen’:
\[ qalam \text{ N} \overset{\uparrow \text{PRED}}{=} \text{‘qalam’} \]

pen : \uparrow \sigma

The postposition pAs provides a situation argument to the semantics, and the resulting semantic representation is depicted below.

(38) \lambda S.\text{have}(Nadya, S, pen) : \uparrow \sigma

This depicts the fact that we are dealing with a SLP here, predicking the coincidental property of Nadya having/holding a pen in the context of some situation.
6.2 The Analysis in View of the Irish Data

Again, for the syntactic analysis, a prelink type of analysis is assumed (Attia, 2008, Sulger, 2009). The copula is as well as the substantive verb bí link the subject to a prelink gf. The semantics are constructed using the following mapping:

- the prelink gf is rewritten as the possessor argument;
- the subj gf is rewritten as the possessee argument.

Note that these rules are identical to the ones employed for Urdu. The prepositions le ‘with’ and ag ‘at’ are assumed to be nonsemantic, since they appear to make little or no semantic contribution on their own; they are simply required by the copulas to convey the particular meaning have (Butt et al., 1999).

6.2.1 Irish ILP PCCs

As described above, both the Irish copula is and the substantive verb bí may denote ilps. In consequence, the two examples below may in fact express identical readings.

(39) a. Is le Pádraig an caisleán.
   be.Pres with Patrick.Masc.Sg Art.Def castle.Masc.Sg
   ‘The car is Patrick’s.’ OR ...

b. Tá an caisleán ag Pádraig.
   be.Pres.3P.Sg Art.Def castle.Masc.Sg at Patrick.Masc.Sg
   ‘Patrick has/owns the car.’ (he may or may not own it)

In both cases, there may not be any situation argument: the copula is never supplies one, while in one reading, the substantive verb bí does not do so either.
6.2 The Analysis in View of the Irish Data

Lexical entries:

(40) copula:

: \lambda X. \lambda Y. \text{have}(X, Y) : (↑ \text{PREDLINK})_{σ} \rightarrow [(↑ \text{SUBJ})_{σ} \rightarrow ↑_{σ}]

(41) substantive verb:

: \lambda X. \lambda Y. \text{have}(X, Y) : (↑ \text{PREDLINK})_{σ} \rightarrow [(↑ \text{SUBJ})_{σ} \rightarrow ↑_{σ}]

(42) proper noun Pádraig:

\text{Pádraig} N (↑ \text{PRED}) = ‘Pádraig’

Patrick : ↑_{σ}

(43) prepositions le ‘with’ and ag ‘at’:

le P (↑ \text{PTYPE}) = \text{nosem}

ag P (↑ \text{PTYPE}) = \text{nosem}

(44) common noun caisleán ‘car’:

caisleán N (↑ \text{PRED}) = ‘caisleán’

castle : ↑_{σ}

The meaning resulting by combining the above meaning constructors is given below:

(45) \text{have}(\text{Patrick}, \text{castle}) : ↑_{σ}

→ Again, note that to produce the right order in the meaning (semantic subject, then semantic object) the \text{PREDLINK} GF is consumed first, then the \text{SUBJ} GF; see (40) and (41).

→ In this reading, the absence of a situation argument depicts the fact that we are dealing with an ILP here, predicating the permanent and rather inherent property of Patrick owning the car, independent of some situation.

6.2.2 Irish SLP PCCs

SLPs in Irish can only be expressed by the substantive verb \text{bí}, an example of which is given below.

(46) Tá peann ag an bhfear.

be.Pres.3Psg pen.Masc.Sg at Art.Def man.Masc.Sg

‘The man has a pen.’
Lexical entries:

(47) substantive verb:

\[ \lambda X.\lambda Y. \text{have}(X, Y) : (\uparrow \text{PREDLINK})_\sigma \rightarrow (\uparrow \text{SUBJ})_\sigma \rightarrow \uparrow_\sigma \]

\[ \lambda S.\lambda X.\lambda Y. \text{have}(X, S, Y) : (\uparrow \text{PREDLINK})_\sigma \rightarrow (\uparrow \text{SUBJ})_\sigma \rightarrow \uparrow_\sigma \]

(48) preposition \text{ag} ‘at’:

\[ \text{ag P} (\uparrow \text{PTYPE}) = \text{nosem} \]

(49) common noun \text{peann} ‘pen’:

\[ \text{peann N} (\uparrow \text{PRED}) = '\text{peann}' \]

\[ \text{pen} : \uparrow_\sigma \]

(50) common noun \text{fear} ‘man’:

\[ \text{fear N} (\uparrow \text{PRED}) = '\text{fear}' \]

\[ \text{man} : \uparrow_\sigma \]

The lexical entry of \text{bí} supplies the situation argument to the semantics, embedding the sentence in (46) in a specific situation, making it dependent on space/time; combining the meaning constructors in (47) through (50) produces the following meaning:

\[ \lambda S. \text{have(man, S, pen)} : \uparrow_\sigma \]

→ This illustrates the fact that we are dealing with a SLP here; it predicates the rather coincidental and temporal property of some man having/holding some pen in some situation.

7 Summary

This paper presents a novel analysis for possessive copula constructions in Urdu and Irish in terms of the famous stage- vs. individual-level distinction. It shows that:

- both languages are sensitive to the ILP/SLP contrast;
- both languages employ different lexical items to produce the desired predication;
- by employing the situation argument following Kratzer (1995), a unified analysis can be given.
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