EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL STATES. EXPLORING THE PREDICATE TAXONOMY.

I address the issues in predicate taxonomies, with the focus on the class of states. In the 1960-s, Donald Davidson defined states as a kind of spatiotemporal things that holds during a time interval [Davidson 1980]. If \( p \) is a state and holds in some locus during an interval starting from \( t_0 \) and ending in \( t_n \), that means \( p \) is true in this locus for every time point \( t_i \in \{t_0...t_n\} \), so that \( p \) consists of homogeneous phases, cf. [Maienborn 2007]. Later predicate taxonomies rooting in Davidson usually add to the distinction of spatiotemporal vs non-spatiotemporal things another dimension — the distinction of dynamic vs static situations in the spirit of [Vendler 1957]. Dynamic situations were initially claimed to have an endpoint, i.e. a point of transition from \( p \) to \( \sim p \), contrary to stative situations. This criterion does not work, since all spatiotemporal things have an endpoint according to the Davidsonian analysis. However, the contrast between all types of dynamic predicates and Davidsonian states is captured by the homogeneity criterion: Davidsonian states consist of homogeneous phases, while dynamic predicates do not.

Davidsonian taxonomies leave a possibility of classifying states into different types. This is done in [Bulygina 1982: 82 — 85] and [Seliverstova 1982: 93 – 97], who distinguish spatiotemporal vs non-spatiotemporal stative situations: the latter, called ‘свойства’ or ‘качества’ are analyzed as names of properties abstracted from any referential situations.

The idea that the absence of agreement on a nominal predicate encodes the distinction of spatiotemporal vs non-spatiotemporal stative situations in Russian was first introduced in 1928 by Lev Ščerba who called spatiotemporal predicates состояния i.e. ‘states’ and non-spatiotemporal predicates качества i.e. ‘properties’. The same distinction under the cover terms ‘stage-level predicates” (SLP) vs ‘individual-level predicates’ (ILP) was reintroduced 50 years later by Greg Carlson [Carlson 1977], cf. [Kratzer 1995].

The basic subcategorization of SLPs in Russian and in general is the distinction of internal vs external SLPs [Zimmerling 2018a]. There are three relevant criteria:

(i) **Internal SLPs** denote situations with a priority semantic argument (semantic subject), external SLPs lack it.
External SLPs can be quantified based on their spatiotemporal characteristics, internal SLPs can be only quantified on their semantic subjects.

External SLPs denote sensually (visually or audibly) perceived situations, internal SLPs do not.
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