**Modification in Dynamic Syntax**

In this talk, modification (both adjectival and adverbial) in Dynamic Syntax (Kempson et al. 2001, Cann et al. 2005) is going to be discussed. The literature on modification in DS is rather poor and no proper discussion has ever been attempted so far besides sparse mentions and incomplete in passing accounts. For example, in Cann (2002), adjectives in predicative position are taken to decorate a predicate node, whereas in Seraku & Ohtani (2016), attributive adjectives are treated in the same sense as relative clauses (i.e. as LINK structures). Adverbs, on the other hand, are treated as involving an underspecified type of the form Ty(X → X), where X is any type, and the type is decided depending on the level of attachment in the underspecified verbal system presented in Marten (2002) or as a LINK structure projected from a propositional node (Ty(t)) to a propositional requiring LINKed node as in Seraku & Ohtani (2016) (it seems that VP adverbs can be modeled similarly but the authors do not discuss these).

In this talk, I will try to get into more detail and discuss ways in which modification can be accounted for in DS. I will start with attributive adjectives and try to argue that a non-LINK analysis is possible and potentially better than a LINK structure analysis. This is based on work on polydefinites in Greek by Chatzikyriakidis (2015), according to which regular attributive adjectives basically project their semantics on the complex argument node. Extending this idea, I will argue that an intersective adjective like *black* in English, will have a similar triggering point to common nouns and will project the following information to the e → cn node: Fo(λy. (adj(y)))∧∃P.Fo(P(y)), where P ≠ adj. The common noun then comes into parse providing the value for P. This idea will naturally take care of recursion with attributive adjectives. On the other hand, postnominal adjectives can then be taken to involve a LINK relation. In case we want to maintain that there is an individual/stage reading distinction between the two positions, we can assume that the stage reading in postnominal adjectives is the result of the LINK evaluation rule (more details in the talk). Other issues that are going to be discussed are different classes of adjectives and their availability in predicative position.

Turning on to adverbs, I will try to motivate a LINK analysis where the LINK relation, depending on the adverb, is projected from either the propositional node (sentence adverbs), the predicate node (VP adverbs) or the event node (this is for example the case for temporal adverbs like *yesterday*). More fine-grained issues in adverbial semantics like speech-act adverbials and agent-oriented ones will be discussed. The first issue to be considered is the level of semantic fine-grainedness we want to encode explicitly. If this is decided, then the analysis will vary accordingly. For example, in the case of speech act adverbials, if one goes for a fine-grained semantics, the DS-TTR version as presented in e.g. Purver et al. (2014), where utterance events are present in the TTR typing ontology, seems to be able to deal with such cases. These issues are going to be discussed in more detail in the talk.
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