Again reveals multidominance in the structure of spray/load verbs

### Background

- The spray/load alternation:
  1. John sprayed paint onto the wall.
  2. John sprayed the wall with paint.
- Previous work has focused on various semantic correlates of this alternation.
- I investigate these verbs’ syntax using again.

### Again

1. John opened the door again.
   a. rep(etitive) presupposition: the door opened before (event).
   b. res(titutive) presupposition: the door was open before (state).

2. A structural account:
   \[
   \text{[John \{V \{\text{open}_\text{dp}, \text{the door} \} \text{again}_\text{rep} \} \text{again}_\text{rep}]}
   \]

3. Again with spray/load verbs:
   (4) John sprayed [the door with paint] again. (res)
   (5) John [sprayed the door] again with paint. (rep)

4. How can the door be in both places at once?
   (6) John sprayed the bucket dry. (only transitive)
   (7) John sprayed [paint onto the wall] again. (again > 1)

5. Two structures: not general enough, wrong on (6)
6. Null pronoun: Case problems, wrong on (7)

### Multidominance

- Multidominance allows the door to appear in >1 syntactic position, explaining (4–7).

\[
\text{Againrep}
\]

- Severe internal argument [cf. 1] allows one semantics for spray/load roots in with and locative P variants, and accounts for cross-linguistic variability in terms of selectional restrictions (Hindi data courtesy Rajesh Bhatt).

\[
\text{Spray}
\]

\[
\text{Load}
\]

### Implications

- Again shows differences between non-alternating spray/load verbs and put-like verbs.
- Any approach that links the holistic effect to objects will be compatible with the current approach.
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1. The semantics of again
(1) \[ \text{again} = \lambda P. \lambda e : \exists e'[\tau(e') < \tau(e) \land P(e')].P(e) = 1 \]

2. Contexts and additional examples
(2) a. Context: The door was dipped in paint when it was made. Over time, this paint wore off, so ...
    John sprayed the door with paint again. (cf. poster’s (4))

   b. Context: The wooden door had never had paint on it. Over time, it got old and dirty, and John decided to paint it. First, he sprayed the door with water to clean it off. And then, ...
    John sprayed the door again with paint. (cf. poster’s (5))

   c. Context: The door was dipped in paint when it was made. Over time, the paint wore off, so ...
    John sprayed paint onto the door again.

   d. Context: John and Bill were hired to paint the door. Bill showed up early but drunk, and ended up spraying paint everywhere, completely missing the door. Luckily, John showed up later, and then...
    John sprayed paint again onto the door.

   • The same pattern seems to occur with every spray/load verb.

3. Resultatives
   • Why won’t the two structures approach explain (6)?
   (3) John drank the teapot dry. (cf. Kratzer 2005)

   • Kratzer (2005): resultatives are formed from intransitive uses of verbs; (3) is possible even though the teapot is not the argument of drink.

   • Example (6) from the poster cannot receive this interpretation. It only receives a transitive interpretation, where the bucket must be the argument of the verb.

(4) a. Context: John hooked up a hose to the paint bucket’s spigot. Using the hose, sprayed every last drop of paint out of the bucket, resulting in the bucket being dry.
   John sprayed the bucket dry.

   b. Context: The bucket was full of gunk. Using an air hose, John sprayed the bucket, cleaning out all the gunk, and resulting in the bucket being dry.
   John sprayed the bucket dry.
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- This shows that an intransitive structure is not available for *spray*. If it were, such a reading should be possible. However, the two structures approach would explain the restitutive reading as resulting from a structure much like (3) (replace *dry* with a PP).

4. **Problems**

- Instead of having two structures, we could attempt to combine both without multidominance. This could be accomplished by assuming a null pronoun in Spec,PP that is obligatorily coindexed with the object.

\[(5)\]

While a possible reading, this is clearly not the most natural reading, which is one where the paint sprayed in the asserted event differs from the previously sprayed paint (cf. (2d)).

- Some analytical hurdles with this structure: how to enforce coindexation? Where does *pro* get case (Sigurðsson 1991)? Big *pro* or little *pro*?

- An empirical problem: in a restitutive reading, analyzing Spec,PP as a bound pronoun would require identity of the object from the prior event and the object in the asserted event. This is because the semantics is (paraphrasing) *John’s spraying* paint, caused its, *being on the wall*. 