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Some **terminology**:

- **dependents** of a predicate: all phrases introduced / made possible by the occurrence of the predicate,

- examples:
  - [John] *put* [the book] [on the chair] [yesterday].
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- **traditional** (early XX century; mostly obsolete) **distinction**:
  - dependents which denote **participants** in the eventuality (state or event),
  - dependents which denote **circumstances** (place, time, manner, etc.) of the eventuality,

- **modern** (since Tesnière 1959 and Chomsky 1965) **distinction**:
  - **arguments**: specific to the predicate, often obligatory,
  - **adjuncts**: not specific to the predicate, always optional (but see below).

Valency **dictionaries**: contain information about **arguments**, not about adjuncts.
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More examples of arguments expressing circumstances rather than participants:

- John put the book on the chair yesterday.
- He resides in La Rochelle.
- He behaved nicely to John.
- He treated the book with respect.
- He worded the letter carefully.
- He spent two hours solving the puzzle.
- Preparing this lecture took him three days.
- He militates for Minimalism.
- He argues against Contextualism.
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How to distinguish arguments from adjuncts?  

**Obligatoriness:** arguments are obligatory, adjuncts are optional.

**Problem 1:** syntactically optional arguments (even in English):
- I lost 20 lbs and nobody has **noticed**. Feeling down about it.
- He will tell you everything when he has **finished**.
- Andrew has already **eaten** and isn’t hungry.

In all these cases **direct (passivisable) objects** – that is, clear cases of arguments – are omitted.

**Attempted solution:** it’s semantic **obligatoriness**, not syntactic obligatoriness, that counts (Panevová 1974, Fillmore 1969, 1986).

Fewer predicates affected, **but still a problem** for predicates such as **EAT**:
- He’s already **noticed** (#but I have no idea **what** he’s noticed).
- He’s already **finished** (#but I have no idea **what** he’s finished).
- He’s already **eaten** (but I have no idea **what** he’s eaten).
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Also, the application of semantic obligatoriness tests depends on context and imagination (Recanati 2010):

Consider a scenario with a patient who has been in a semi-coma, and a technician in another room is reading the output of an EEG... [A] trained technician could know when brain activity signals ‘noticing’, and since for the semi-coma patient, the fact that he’s noticing (something) is all that’s important, one might imagine the technician being able to shout ‘He’s noticing!’ without being in any position to know or say what it is that the patient is noticing.
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Obligatoriness: arguments are obligatory, adjuncts are optional.

Problem 2: obligatory adjuncts (Grimshaw and Vikner 1993):

- The house was built.
- The house was built...
  - ...yesterday.
  - ...in ten days.
  - ...in a bad part of town.
  - ...only with great difficulty.
  - ...by a French architect.

Also e.g. (Goldberg and Ackerman 2001):

- The claim was believed #(in the seventh century / in the South).
- The car drives #(like a boat / easily / 365 days a year / only in the summertime).
- Pat laughed a #(hearty / quiet) laugh.
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How to distinguish arguments from adjuncts?

**Iterability**: adjuncts – but not arguments – of the same type may iterate (Bresnan 1982):


  *John escaped from prison with dynamite [Inst] with a machine gun [Inst].

**Problem**: iteration is possible if iterated dependents of the same type specify the same entity, but then also iteration of arguments (Zaenen and Crouch 2009, Goldberg 2002):

- I count on you, on your kindness.
- He lives in France, in a small village.
- With a slingshot he broke the window with a rock.
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**Specificity:** adjuncts may occur with all verbs, arguments are specific to certain classes of verbs.

**Problem:** counterexamples easy to find, e.g. (McConnell-Ginet 1982):

- *Annie weighs 120 pounds {heavily, beautifully, quickly, elegantly}.
- *Annie weighs 120 pounds {for her mother, with a fork, in an hour, toward Detroit}.

Koenig *et al.* 2003:

- manual examination of **3909 English verbs** (by two independent examiners),
- 0.2% (8) of them do not combine with temporal dependents,
- 1.8% (70) do not combine with locative dependents,
- probably many more with manner, instrument, etc. — **where to put the boundary?**
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A great number of tests for the argument–adjunct distinction have been proposed since Tesnière 1959, many quickly discarded.

Tutunjian and Boland 2008: 633: “the sheer number of these tests underlines the fact that no single test is entirely satisfactory. Furthermore, when the tests are applied as a group, phrases often yield contradictory results, patterning as arguments on some tests and adjuncts on others.”

So, valency dictionaries as models of (aspects of) language are most probably wrong, but they are still useful.

All models are wrong but some are useful (George Box, statistician, 1919–2013).
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Valency dictionaries for your languages?
Two Slavic valency dictionaries

Electronic valency dictionaries of **Czech** made in Prague:
- **VALLEX** – created by lexicographers, based to a large extent on their intuition, contains complete descriptions of lemmata,
- **PDT-Vallex** – heavily based on the *Prague Dependency Treebank*,
- both:
  - developed since early 2000s,
  - based on the *Functional Generative Description* (Sgall et al. 1986),
- only **PDT-Vallex** contains rich phraseological information.

Electronic valency dictionary of **Polish** made in Warsaw – **Walenty**:
- created by lexicographers, with evidence from the *National Corpus of Polish*,
- developed since early 2010s,
- with ideas from generative grammars,
- contains rich phraseological information.

Lectures 3–4 are based on **Walenty**, so it is also the focus of lectures 1–2.
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- Rékl o své ženě, že je zvědavá. (Czech)
  said.M.SG about REFL wife.LOC.F.SG that is.SG nosy.F.SG
  ‘He said about his wife that she is nosy.’

- říci ACT(1) ADDR(3) EFF(4;↓že;↓aby) ?PAT(o+6)

Each argument consists of:

- optional information about semantic optionality of the argument,
- a functor (approximating semantic role),
- optional morphosyntactic specification:
  - preposition (in case of PPs),
  - case (in case of – perhaps embedded – NPs),
  - type of subordinate clause, etc.
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Each argument consists of:

- optional information about **semantic optionality** of the argument,
- a **functor** (approximating semantic role),
- optional **morphosyntactic specification**:
  - preposition (in case of PPs),
  - case (in case of – perhaps embedded – NPs),
  - type of subordinate clause, etc.
An example of **non-phraseological valency** in PDT-Vallex:

- Řekl o své ženě, že je zvědavá. (Czech)
  - said.M.SG about REFL wife.LOC.F.SG that is.SG nosy.F.SG
  - ‘He said about his wife that she is nosy.’
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  - type of subordinate clause, etc.
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- Řekl o své ženě, že je zvědavá. (Czech)
  said.M.SG about REFL wife.LOC.F.SG that is.SG nosy.F.SG
  ‘He said about his wife that she is nosy.’

- říci ACT(1) ADDR(3) EFF(4;↓že;↓aby) ?PAT(o+6)

Each argument consists of:
- optional information about **semantic optionality** of the argument,
- a **functor** (approximating semantic role),
- optional **morphosyntactic specification**:
  - preposition (in case of PPs),
  - case (in case of – perhaps embedded – NPs),
  - type of subordinate clause, etc.
Examples: adresować ‘address’

- Jan adresował list do Marii.
  Jan.NOM addressed letter.ACC to Maria.GEN
  ‘Jan addressed a/the letter to Maria.’

- adresować: _: imperf:
  subj{np(str)} + obj{np(str)} + {preppnp(do,gen)}

Some features:
- negation (here any) and aspect (here imperfective),
- three arguments separated by +, each in {},
- grammatical functions: subject and object,
- grammatical classes (NP, PP, etc.),
- preposition lemma,
- values of morphosyntactic categories (case, etc.),
- structural case (morphological form depends on context).
Examples: adresować ‘address’

- Jan **adresował** list do Marii.
  Jan.NOM addressed letter.ACC to Maria.GEN
  ‘Jan addressed a/the letter to Maria.’

- **adresować:** _: imperf:
  subj{np(str)} + obj{np(str)} + {preppnp(do,gen)}
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- negation (here any) and aspect (here imperfective),
- three arguments separated by +, each in {},
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- grammatical classes (NP, PP, etc.),
- preposition lemma,
- values of morphosyntactic categories (case, etc.),
- structural case (morphological form depends on context).
Examples: adresować ‘address’

- Jan adresował list do Marii.
  Jan.NOM addressed letter.ACC to Maria.GEN
  ‘Jan addressed a/the letter to Maria.’

- adresować: _: imperf:
  subj{np(str)} + obj{np(str)} + {preppnp(do,gen)}

Some features:

- negation (here any) and aspect (here imperfective),
- three arguments separated by +, each in {},
- grammatical functions: subject and object,
- grammatical classes (NP, PP, etc.),
- preposition lemma,
- values of morphosyntactic categories (case, etc.),
- structural case (morphological form depends on context).
Examples: adresować ‘address’

- Jan adresował list do Marii.
  Jan.NOM addressed letter.ACC to Maria.GEN
  ‘Jan addressed a/the letter to Maria.’

- adresować: _: imperf:
  subj{np(str)} + obj{np(str)} + {preppnp(do,gen)}

Some features:
- negation (here any) and aspect (here imperfective),
- three arguments separated by +, each in {},
- grammatical functions: subject and object,
- grammatical classes (NP, PP, etc.),
- preposition lemma,
- values of morphosyntactic categories (case, etc.),
- structural case (morphological form depends on context).
Examples: adresować ‘address’

- Jan adresował list do Marii.
  Jan.NOM addressed letter.ACC to Maria.GEN
  ‘Jan addressed a/the letter to Maria.’

- adresować: _: imperf:
  subj{np(str)} + obj{np(str)} + {preppnp(do,gen)}

Some features:
- negation (here any) and aspect (here imperfective),
- three arguments separated by +, each in {},
- grammatical functions: subject and object,
  - grammatical classes (NP, PP, etc.),
  - preposition lemma,
  - values of morphosyntactic categories (case, etc.),
  - structural case (morphological form depends on context).
Examples: adresować ‘address’

- Jan adresował list do Marii.
  Jan.NOM addressed letter.ACC to Maria.GEN
  ‘Jan addressed a/the letter to Maria.’

adresować: _: imperf:
  subj{np(str)} + obj{np(str)} + {prepn(np(str),gen)}

Some features:
- negation (here any) and aspect (here imperfective),
- three arguments separated by +, each in {},
- grammatical functions: subject and object,
- grammatical classes (NP, PP, etc.),
- preposition lemma,
- values of morphosyntactic categories (case, etc.),
- structural case (morphological form depends on context).
Examples: adresować ‘address’

- Jan adresował list do Marii.
  Jan.NOM addressed letter.ACC to Maria.GEN
  ‘Jan addressed a/the letter to Maria.’

- adresować: _: imperf:
  subj{np(str)} + obj{np(str)} + {preppnp(do,gen)}

Some features:
- negation (here any) and aspect (here imperfective),
- three arguments separated by +, each in {},
- grammatical functions: subject and object,
- grammatical classes (NP, PP, etc.),
- **preposition** lemma,
- values of morphosyntactic categories (case, etc.),
- structural case (morphological form depends on context).
Examples: adresować ‘address’

- Jan adresował list do Marii.
  Jan.NOM addressed letter.ACC to Maria.GEN
  ‘Jan addressed a/the letter to Maria.’

- adresować: _: imperf:
  subj{np(str)} + obj{np(str)} + {preppnp(do,gen)}

Some features:

- negation (here any) and aspect (here imperfective),
- three arguments separated by +, each in {},
- grammatical functions: subject and object,
- grammatical classes (NP, PP, etc.),
- preposition lemma,
- values of morphosyntactic categories (case, etc.),
- structural case (morphological form depends on context).
Examples: adresować ‘address’

- Jan adresował list do Marii.
  Jan.NOM addressed letter.ACC to Maria.GEN
  ‘Jan addressed a/the letter to Maria.’

- adresować: _: imperf:
  subj{np(str)} + obj{np(str)} + {prepn(np(do, gen)}

Some features:
- negation (here any) and aspect (here imperfective),
- three arguments separated by +, each in {},
- grammatical functions: subject and object,
- grammatical classes (NP, PP, etc.),
- preposition lemma,
- values of morphosyntactic categories (case, etc.),
- **structural case** (morphological form depends on context).
Examples: bać się ‘fear’

- Boisz się bezrobocia i że zabraknie Ci środków na utrzymanie?

‘Are you afraid of unemployment and that you’ll have no means of subsistence?’

- bać się: _ imperf:
  subj{np(str)} + {np(gen); cp(że)}

Some features:
- inherent reflexive marker is part of lemma (unlike real reflexive pronouns),
- syntactic position explicitly defined via the coordination test,
- here: a genitive NP, or a subordinate clause introduced by the complementiser of type ŻE ‘that’, or their coordination.
Examples: bać się ‘fear’

- Boisz się bezrobocia i że zabraknie Ci środków na utrzymanie?
  ‘Are you afraid of unemployment and that you’ll have no means of subsistence?’

- bać się: _ imperf:
  subj{np(str)} + {np(gen); cp(że)}

Some features:

- inherent reflexive marker is part of lemma (unlike real reflexive pronouns),
- syntactic position explicitly defined via the coordination test,
- here: a genitive NP, or a subordinate clause introduced by the complementiser of type źe ‘that’, or their coordination.
Examples: bać się ‘fear’

- Boisz się bezrobocia i że zabraknie Ci środków na utrzymanie?
  ‘Are you afraid of unemployment and that you’ll have no means of subsistence?’

- bać się: _ imperf:
  subj{np(str)} + {np(gen); cp(że)}

Some features:
- inherent reflexive marker is part of lemma (unlike real reflexive pronouns),
- syntactic position explicitly defined via the coordination test,
- here: a genitive NP, or a subordinate clause introduced by the complementiser of type źe ‘that’, or their coordination.
Examples: **bać się** ‘fear’

- **Boisz się** **bezrobocia** i że zabraknie Ci środków na utrzymanie?

‘Are you afraid of unemployment and that you’ll have no means of subsistence?’

- **bać się:** _: imperf:
  subj{np(str)} + {np(gen); cp(że)}

Some features:

- inherent reflexive marker is part of lemma (unlike real reflexive pronouns),
- syntactic position explicitly defined via the coordination test,
- here: **a genitive NP**, or a subordinate clause introduced by the complementiser of type **że** ‘that’, or their coordination.
Examples: bać się ‘fear’

- Boisz się bezrobocia i że zabraknie Ci środków na utrzymanie?
  ‘Are you afraid of unemployment and that you’ll have no means of subsistence?’

- bać się: _: imperf:
  subj{np(str)} + {np(gen); cp(że)}

Some features:
- inherent reflexive marker is part of lemma (unlike real reflexive pronouns),
- syntactic position explicitly defined via the coordination test,
- here: a genitive NP, or a subordinate clause introduced by the complementiser of type ŽE ‘that’, or their coordination.
Examples: bać się ‘fear’

- Boisz się bezrobocia i że zabraknie Ci środków na utrzymanie?
  ‘Are you afraid of unemployment and that you’ll have no means of subsistence?’

- bać się: _: imperf:
  subj{np(str)} + {np(gen); cp(że)}

Some features:
- inherent reflexive marker is part of lemma (unlike real reflexive pronouns),
- syntactic position explicitly defined via the coordination test,
- here: a genitive NP, or a subordinate clause introduced by the complementiser of type ŻE ‘that’, or their coordination.
Examples: kazać ‘order’, obiecać ‘promise’

- Jan kazał Marii śpiewać.
  Jan.NOM ordered Maria.DAT sing.INF
  ‘Jan ordered Maria to sing.’

  kazać: _: perf: subj{np(str)} +
       controller{np(dat)} + controllee{infp(_)}

- Jan obiecał Marii śpiewać.
  Jan.NOM promised Maria sing.INF
  ‘Jan promised Maria to sing.’

  obiecać: _: perf: subj,controller{np(str)} +
           {np(dat)} + controllee{infp(_)}

Features:

- infinitival arguments (here: of any aspect),
- syntactic control (also raising).
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- Jan kazał Marii śpiewać.
  Jan.NOM ordered Maria.DAT sing.INF
  ‘Jan ordered Maria to sing.’

  kazać: _ : perf: subj{np(str)} +
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- Jan obiecał Marii śpiewać.
  Jan.NOM promised Maria sing.INF
  ‘Jan promised Maria to sing.’

  obiecać: _ : perf: subj,controller{np(str)} +
  {np(dat)} + controllee{infp(_)}

Features:

- infinitival arguments (here: of any aspect),
- syntactic control (also raising).
Examples: kazać ‘order’, obiecać ‘promise’

- Jan kazał Marii śpiewać.
  Jan.NOM ordered Maria.DAT sing.INF
  ‘Jan ordered Maria to sing.’

- kazać: _: perf: subj{np(str)} + controller{np(dat)} + controllee{infp(_)}

- Jan obiecał Marii śpiewać.
  Jan.NOM promised Maria sing.INF
  ‘Jan promised Maria to sing.’

- obiecać: _: perf: subj,controller{np(str)} + {np(dat)} + controllee{infp(_)}

Features:
- infinitival arguments (here: of any aspect),
- **syntactic control** (also raising).
Examples: funkcjonować ‘function’

- Jan dobrze funkcjonuje w nowej roli.  
  Jan.\textit{NOM} well functions in new.\textit{LOC} role.\textit{LOC}
  ‘Jan functions well in his new role.’

- \textbf{funkcjonować: } _: imperf:
  subj\{np(str)} + \{xp(mod)} + \{xp(locat)}

Features:
- arguments defined semantically:
  - manner,
  - location,
  - ablative, adlative, perlative, temporal, durative,
- morphosyntactict realisations defined externally (specific PPs, adverbial, etc.).
Examples: funkcjonować ‘function’
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  Jan.NOM well functions in new.LOC role.LOC
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  - manner,
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  - ablative, adlative, perlative, temporal, durative,
  - morphosyntactic realisations defined externally (specific PPs, adverbial, etc.).
Examples: funkcjonować ‘function’

- Jan dobrze funkcjonuje w nowej roli.
  Jan.NOM well functions in new.LOC role.LOC
  ‘Jan functions well in his new role.’

- funkcjonować: _: imperf:
  subj{np(str)} + {xp(mod)} + {xp(locat)}

Features:
- arguments defined semantically:
  - manner,
  - location,
  - ablative, adlative, perlative, temporal, durative,
- morphosyntactic realisations defined externally (specific PPs, adverbial, etc.).
Examples: funkcjonować ‘function’

- Jan dobrze funkcjonuje w nowej roli.
  Jan.NOM well functions in new.LOC role.LOC
  ‘Jan functions well in his new role.’

- funkcjonować : _: imperf:
  subj{np(str)} + {xp(mod)} + {xp(locat)}

Features:

- arguments defined semantically:
  - manner,
  - location,
    - ablative, adlative, perlative, temporal, durative,
- morphosyntactic realisations defined externally
  (specific PPs, adverbial, etc.).
Examples: funkcjonować ‘function’

- Jan dobrze funkcjonuje w nowej roli.
  Jan.NOM well functions in new.LOC role.LOC
  ‘Jan functions well in his new role.’

- funkcjonować: _ imperf:
  subj{np(str)} + {xp(mod)} + {xp(locat)}

Features:
- arguments defined semantically:
  - manner,
  - location,
  - ablative, adlative, perlative, temporal, durative,
- morphosyntactic realisations defined externally (specific PPs, adverbial, etc.).
Examples: funkcjonować ‘function’

- Jan dobrze funkcjonuje w nowej roli.
  Jan.NOM well functions in new.LOC role.LOC
  ‘Jan functions well in his new role.’

- funkcjonować: _ imperf:
  subj{np(str)} + {xp(mod)} + {xp(locat)}

Features:
- arguments defined semantically:
  - manner,
  - location,
  - ablative, adlative, perlative, temporal, durative,
- morphosyntactic realisations defined externally
  (specific PPs, adverbial, etc.).
Examples of phraseology in PDT-Vallex

- brát si studenta na mušku
  take student on foresight
  ‘to take aim at a/the student’

- brát si  ACT(1)  DPHR(\text{na-1[muška.S4]})  PAT(4)

  \text{na-1} = \text{the preposition \text{NA} ‘on’}; \text{S4} = \text{SG ACC}
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- **brát si studenta na mušku**
  - take student on foresight
  - ‘to take aim at a/the student’

- **brát si**  **ACT(1) DPHR(\text{na}-1[\text{muška}.S4]) PAT(4)**
  - \text{na}-1 = the preposition NA ‘on’; S4 = SG ACC
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Examples of phraseology in PDT-Vallex

- **brát si studenta na mušku**
  take student on foresight
  ‘to take aim at a/the student’

- **brát si ** **ACT(1) DPHR(\textit{na-1[muška.S4]}) PAT(4)**
  \textit{na-1} = the preposition NA ‘on’; \textit{S4} = SG ACC
Examples of phraseology in PDT-Vallex

- Zvládl to na výbornou.
  mastered.M.SG it.ACC on excellent.F.SG.ACC
  ‘He handled it very well.’

- zvládnout
  ACT(1) DPHR(na-1[výborný.FS4@1$11<A>]) PAT(4)
  FS4@1$11<A> = F.SG.ACC POSITIVE AFFIRMATIVE

(Czech)
Examples of phraseology in PDT-Vallex 2

- **Zvládl** to na výbornou.
  mastered.M.SG it.ACC on excellent.F.SG.ACC
  ‘He handled it very well.’

- **zvládnout**
  \[ACT(1) \ DPHR(na-1[výborný.FS4@1$11<A>]) \ PAT(4)\]

  \[FS4@1$11<A> = F.SG.ACC\,POSITIVE\,AFFIRMATIVE\]
Examples of phraseology in PDT-Vallex

- **Zvládl** to na výbornou.
  - mastered.m.sg it.acc on excellent.f.sg.acc
  - ‘He handled it very well.’

- **zvládnout**
  - \( \text{ACT}(1) \ \text{DPHR}(\text{na-1}[\text{výborný.FS4@1$11<A>}]) \ \text{PAT}(4) \)
  - \( \text{FS4@1$11<A>} = \text{f sg acc positive affirmative} \)
Examples of phraseology in PDT-Vallex 2

- **Zvládl** to **na výbornou.**
  mastered.M.SG it.ACC on excellent.F.SG.ACC
  ‘He handled it very well.’

- **zvládnout**
  \[\text{ACT}(1) \quad \text{DPHR}(\text{na-1}[\text{výborný.FS4@1$11<A>}]) \quad \text{PAT}(4)\]
  \[\text{FS4@1$11<A>} = \text{F SG ACC POSITIVE AFFIRMATIVE}\]

(Czech)
Examples of phraseology in PDT-Vallex

- Bral na lehkou váhu, že se mu vysmívala. (Czech)
  took.M.SG on light weight that REFL him mocked
  ‘He took it lightly that she mocked him.’

- brát
  ACT(1) DPHR(na-1[váha.4[lehký.#]]) PAT(4;↓že;↓c)
Examples of phraseology in PDT-Vallex

- Bral na lehkou váhu, že se mu vysmívala. (Czech)
  took.M.SG on light weight that REFL him mocked
  ‘He took it lightly that she mocked him.’

- brát
  ACT(1) DPHR(na-1[váha.4[lehký.#]]) PAT(4;↓že;↓c)
Examples of phraseology in PDT-Vallex

- Bral na lehkou váhu, že se mu vysmívala. (Czech)
  took.M.SG on light weight that REFL him mocked
  ‘He took it lightly that she mocked him.’

- brát
  ACT(1) DPHR(\texttt{na-1[váha.4[lehký.#]]}) PAT(4;↓žє;↓c)

\begin{verbatim}
 Different phraseological structures may be involved in the construction of this sentence.
\end{verbatim}
Examples of phraseology in PDT-Vallex

- **Firma žije z ruky do úst.**
  company lives from hand to mouth
  ‘The company hardly makes ends meet.’

- **žít ACT(1) DPHR(z-1[ruka.S2], do-1[ústa.P2])**
Examples of phraseology in PDT-Vallex 4

- Firma žije z ruky do úst.
  company lives from hand to mouth
  ‘The company hardly makes ends meet.’

- žít  ACT(1) DPHR(z-1[ruka.S2],do-1[ústa.P2])
Examples of phraseology in PDT-Vallex

- **Firma žije z ruky do úst.**
  - company lives from hand to mouth
  - ‘The company hardly makes ends meet.’

- **žít ACT(1) DPHR(z-1[ruka.S2], do-1[ústa.P2])**

(Czech)
Examples of phraseology in PDT-Vallex

A more complicated example – *to be of some opinion*:

- **být**
  
  \[\text{ACT}(1) \ \text{DPHR}(\text{názor.S2[\{jiný,stejný,podobný,opačný\}.#]); }\]
  
  \[\text{názor.S2[že[.v]]; }\]
  
  \[\text{názor.S2[ten.#,že[.v]]}\]

- Jsme všichni stejného názoru.  
  We are all of the same opinion.  
  \(\text{(Czech)}\)

- Byli toho názoru, že je to pravda.  
  They were of the opinion that it's true.  
  \(\text{(Czech)}\)
Examples of phraseology in PDT-Vallex

A more complicated example – *to be of some opinion*:

- **být**
  - \( \text{ACT(1)} \ DPHR(\text{názor.S2[\{jiný, stejný, podobný, opačný\} .#]; názor.S2[že[.v]]; názor.S2[ten.#, že[.v]])} \)

- Jsme všichni **stejného názoru**. We are all of the same opinion. *(Czech)*

- Byli toho názoru, že je to pravda. They were of the opinion that it's true. *(Czech)*
A more complicated example – *to be of some opinion*:

- **být**
  
  \[
  \text{ACT(1) DPHR}(\text{názor.S2[\{jiný,stejný,podobný,opačný\}.#];} \\
  \text{názor.S2[že[.v]];} \\
  \text{názor.S2[ten.#,že[.v]]})
  \]

- **Jsme všichni stejného názoru.** We are all of the same opinion. (Czech)

  \[
  \text{ACT(1) být stejného názoru}
  \]

- **Byli toho názoru, že je to pravda.** They were of the opinion that it's true. (Czech)

  \[
  \text{ACT(1) být toho názoru Že .v}
  \]
He’s passed on! He has ceased to be! He’s expired and gone to meet its maker! He’s a stiff! Bereft of life, he rests in peace! If you hadn’t nailed him to the perch he’d be pushing up the daisies! His metabolic processes are now history! He’s off the twig! He’s kicked the bucket, he’s shuffled off his mortal coil, rung down the curtain and joined the bleedin’ choir invisibile!
He’s passed on! He has ceased to be! He’s expired and gone to meet its maker! He’s a stiff! Bereft of life, he rests in peace! If you hadn’t nailed him to the perch he’d be pushing up the daisies! His metabolic processes are now history! He’s off the twig! He’s kicked the bucket, he’s shuffled off his mortal coil, rung down the curtain and joined the bleedin’ choir invisibile!

PDT-Vallex-style formalisation of a humorous idiom for *dying* in your language?
Dying in PDT-Vallex – proposed solutions

**Slovak:**
- Otrčil kopytá.
  
  straightened.M.SG hooves.ACC
  
  ‘He died.’

- otrčiť ACT(1) DPHR(kopyto.P4)

**Croatian:**
- Prerano je otegnuo papke.
  
  too soon stretched.M.SG hooves.M.ACC
  
  ‘He died too soon.’

- otegnuti ACT(1) DPHR(papak.P4)

**Polish:**
- ktoś wyciągnął nogi
  
  somebody.NOM stretched legs.ACC
  
  ‘somebody died’

- wyciągnąć ACT(1) DPHR(noga.P4)
Slovak:
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  ‘He died.’
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**Slovak:**

- Otrčil kopytá.
  
  straightened.M.SG hooves.ACC
  
  ‘He died.’

- otrčiť \(\text{ACT}(1)\) \(\text{DPHR}(\text{kopyto.P4})\)

**Croatian:**

- Prerano je otegnuo papke.
  
  too soon streched.M.SG hooves.M.ACC
  
  ‘He died too soon.’

- otegnuti \(\text{ACT}(1)\) \(\text{DPHR}(\text{papak.P4})\)

**Polish:**

- ktoś wyciągnął nogi
  
  somebody.NOM stretched legs.ACC
  
  ‘somebody died’

- wyciągnąć \(\text{ACT}(1)\) \(\text{DPHR}(\text{noga.P4})\)
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Dying in PDT-Vallex – proposed solutions

**Slovak:**
- Otrčil kopytá.
  straightened.M.SG hooves.ACC
  ‘He died.’
- otrčiť ACT(1) DPHR(kopyto.P4)

**Croatian:**
- Prerano je otegnuo papke.
  too soon stretched.M.SG hooves.M.ACC
  ‘He died too soon.’
- otegnuti ACT(1) DPHR(papak.P4)

**Polish:**
- ktoś wyciągnął kopyta
  somebody.NOM stretched hooves.ACC
  ‘somebody died’
- wyciągnąć ACT(1) DPHR(kopyto.P4)
Polish:

- ktoś wącha kwiatki od spodu
  somebody\textit{.NOM} smells flowers\textit{.ACC} from below\textit{.GEN}
  ‘somebody is dead’ (Jakub Waszczuk)

- wąchać ACT(1) DPHR(kwiatek.P4[od[spód.S2]])

- Bóg wezwał kogoś do siebie.
  God\textit{.NOM} called somebody\textit{.ACC} to self\textit{.GEN}
  ‘Somebody died.’ (Agata Savary)

- wezwać ACT(Bóg.S1) PAT(4) DPRH(do[siebie.S2])
- wezwać PAT(4) DPRH(Bóg.S1,do[siebie.S2])
Polish:

- ktoś wącha kwiatki od spodu
  somebody.NOM smells flowers.ACC from below.GEN
  ‘somebody is dead’
  (Jakub Waszczuk)

- wąchać ACT(1) DPHR(kwiatek.P4,od[spód.S2])

- Bóg wezwał kogoś do siebie.
  God.NOM called somebody.ACC to self.GEN
  ‘Somebody died.’
  (Agata Savary)

- wezwać ACT(Bóg.S1) PAT(4) DPRH(do[siebie.S2])
- wezwać PAT(4) DPRH(Bóg.S1,do[siebie.S2])
Polish:

- ktoś wącha kwiatki od spodu
  somebody.NOM smells flowers.ACC from below.GEN
  ‘somebody is dead’
  (Jakub Waszczuk)

- wąchać ACT(1) DPHR(kwiatek.P4, od[spód.S2])

- Bóg wezwał kogoś do siebie.
  God.NOM called somebody.ACC to self.GEN
  ‘Somebody died.’
  (Agata Savary)

- wezwać ACT(Bóg.S1) PAT(4) DPRH(do[siebie.S2])

- wezwać PAT(4) DPRH(Bóg.S1, do[siebie.S2])
Polish:

- ktoś wącha kwiatki od spodu
  somebody.NOM smells flowers.ACC from below.GEN
  ‘somebody is dead’
  (Jakub Waszczuk)

- wąchać ACT(1) DPHR(kwiatek.P4,od[spód.S2])

- Bóg wezwał kogoś do siebie.
  God.NOM called somebody.ACC to self.GEN
  ‘Somebody died.’
  (Agata Savary)

- wezwać ACT(Bóg.S1) PAT(4) DPRH(do[siebie.S2])
- wezwać PAT(4) DPRH(Bóg.S1,do[siebie.S2])
Dying in PDT-Vallex – proposed solutions

Croatian: (Ivana Matas Ivanković and Goranka Blagus Bartolec)
- Otišao je na onaj svijet.
  gone.M.SG on that world
  ‘He died.’
- otići  \textit{ACT(1) DPHR(\textit{na[svijet.S4[onaj.#]]})}

Macedonian: (Aleksandar Petrovski)
- go frli topot
  him throws cannon
  ‘to die’ (lit. ‘to throw the cannon’)
- frli \textit{ACT(1) DPHR(top.SD[toj.S4H])}
  \textit{D = DEFINITE, H = SHORT FORM OF PRONOUN}

Russian: (Natalia Klyueva)
- дубу дать
  oak.DAT give
  ‘to die’ (lit. ‘give to an oak’)
- дать \textit{ACT(1) DPHR(дуб.S3)}
### Croatian:

(Ivana Matas Ivanković and Goranka Blagus Bartolec)

- Otišao je na onaj svijet.
  
  `gone.M.SG on that world`
  
  ‘He died.’

- otići  \(\text{ACT}(1)\)  \(\text{DPHR}(\text{na}[\text{svijet}.\text{S4}[\text{onaj}.#]])\)

### Macedonian:

(Aleksandar Petrovski)

- go frli topot
  
  `him throws cannon`
  
  ‘to die’ (lit. ‘to throw the cannon’)

- frli  \(\text{ACT}(1)\)  \(\text{DPHR}(\text{top}.\text{SD}[\text{toj}.\text{S4H}])\)

\(D = \text{DEFINITE}, \ H = \text{SHORT FORM OF PRONOUN}\)

### Russian:

(Natalia Klyueva)

- дубу дать
  
  `oak.DAT give`
  
  ‘to die’ (lit. ‘give to an oak’)

- дать  \(\text{ACT}(1)\)  \(\text{DPHR}(\text{дуб}.\text{S3})\)
Dying in PDT-Vallex – proposed solutions  

Croatian: (Ivana Matas Ivanković and Goranka Blagus Bartolec)

- Otišao je na onaj svijet.
  gone.M.SG on that world
  ‘He died.’
- otići  ACT(1) DPHR( na[svijet.S4[onaj.#]])

Macedonian: (Aleksandar Petrovski)

- go frli topot
  him throws cannon
  ‘to die’ (lit. ‘to throw the cannon’)
- frli  ACT(1) DPHR(top.SD[toj.S4H])

D = DEFINITE, H = SHORT FORM OF PRONOUN

Russian: (Natalia Klyueva)

- дубу дать
  oak.DAT give
  ‘to die’ (lit. ‘give to an oak’)
- дать ACT(1) DPHR(дуб.S3)
French:

- casser sa pipe
  break one’s pipe
- **casser** ACT(1)
  DPHR(pipe.S[son #subj.pers.num #obj.gend.num])

The problem is that 'son' (one’s) agrees both with the subject (in person and number) and with the object (in gender and number). This means notably that 'son' can have two different genders at the same time. I don’t think PDT-Vallex has operators to express this kind of agreement.

- **casser** ACT(1) DPHR(pipe.S[son.#])
Dying in PDT-Vallex – proposed solutions

French: (Agata Savary, Mathieu Constant)

- casser sa pipe
  break one's pipe
- **casser**  ACT(1)
  DPHR(pipe.S[son #subj.pers.num #obj.gend.num])

The problem is that 'son' (one's) agrees both with the subject (in person and number) and with the object (in gender and number). This means notably that 'son' can have two different genders at the same time. I don’t think PDT-Vallex has operators to express this kind of agreement.

- casser  ACT(1)  DPHR(pipe.S[son.#])
Dying in PDT-Vallex – proposed solutions

**French:**

- casser sa pipe
  - break one’s pipe
- **casser** ACT(1)
  - DPHR(pipe.S[son #subj.pers.num #obj.gend.num])

*(Agata Savary, Mathieu Constant)*

*The problem is that ‘son’ (one’s) agrees both with the subject (in person and number) and with the object (in gender and number). This means notably that ‘son’ can have two different genders at the same time. I don’t think PDT-Vallex has operators to express this kind of agreement.*

- **casser** ACT(1) DPHR(pipe.S[son.])
Dying in PDT-Vallex – proposed solutions

French: (Agata Savary, Mathieu Constant)

- casser sa pipe
  break one’s pipe
- casser ACT(1) DPHR(pipe.S[son #subj.pers.num #obj.gend.num])

The problem is that ‘son’ (one’s) agrees both with the subject (in person and number) and with the object (in gender and number). This means notably that ‘son’ can have two different genders at the same time. I don’t think PDT-Vallex has operators to express this kind of agreement.

- casser ACT(1) DPHR(pipe.S[son.#])
French:

- casser sa pipe
  break one's pipe

- casser ACT(1)
  DPHR(pipe.S[son #subj.pers.num #obj.gend.num])

The problem is that 'son' (one's) agrees both with the subject (in person and number) and with the object (in gender and number). This means notably that 'son' can have two different genders at the same time. I don't think PDT-Vallex has operators to express this kind of agreement.

- casser ACT(1) DPHR(pipe.S[son.#])
Hungarian:

- Feldobja a talpát.
  up+throw.3.sg the sole.poss.3.sg.acc
  lit. 'he throws his soles up'
- **feldob** ACT(1) DPHR(talp.S4.poss.3rd)

Greek:

- Είδε τα ραδίκια ανάποδα.
  saw.m.sg the chicories.acc upside down
  'He died.'
- δίνω ACT(1) DPHR(τα.4[ραδίκια.4[ανάποδα]])
- Τίναξε τα πέταλα.
  shaked.sg the horseshoes.acc
  'He died.'
- τινάζω ACT(1) DPHR(τα.4[πέταλα])
Hungarian:
- Feldobja a talpát.
  up+throw.3.sg the sole.poss.3.sg.acc
  lit. 'he throws his soles up'
- feldob ACT(1) DPHR(talp.S4.poss.3rd)

Greek:
- Είδε τα ραδίκια ανάποδα.
  saw.m.sg the chicories.acc upside down
  'He died.'
- δίνω ACT(1) DPHR(τα.4[ραδίκια.4[ανάποδα]])
- Τίναξε τα πέταλα.
  shaked.sg the horseshoes.acc
  'He died.'
- τινάξω ACT(1) DPHR(τα.4[πέταλα])
Hungarian:
- Feldobja a talpát.
  up+throw.3.sg the sole.poss.3.sg.acc
  lit. 'he throws his soles up'
- **feldob** ACT(1) DPHR(talp.S4.poss.3rd)

Greek:
- Είδε τα ραδίκια ανάποδα.
  saw.m.sg the chicories.acc upside down
  ‘He died.’
- **δίνω** ACT(1) DPHR(τα.4[ραδίκια.4[ανάποδα]])
- Τίναξε τα πέταλα.
  shaked.sg the horseshoes.acc
  ‘He died.’
- **τινάξω** ACT(1) DPHR(τα.4[πέταλα])

(Katalin Simkó)

(Elpiniki Margariti)

(George Zakis)
Examples of phraseology in Walenty

- Janek wziął na wstrzymanie.
  Janek. NOM took on stoppage. ACC
  ‘Janek decided to wait / not to take action.’

- WZIAĆ ‘take’: subj{np(str)} +
  {lex(preppnp(na, acc), sg, ’wstrzymanie’, natr)}

- Janek wziął stronę Marysi.
  Janek. NOM took side. ACC Marysia. GEN
  ‘Janek took Marysia’s side.’

- WZIAĆ ‘take’: subj{np(str)} +
  {lex(np(str), sg, ’strona’, rattr1({possp}))}
Examples of phraseology in Walenty

- **Janek wziął na wstrzymanie.**
  Janek.NOM took on stoppage.ACC
  ‘Janek decided to wait / not to take action.’

- **WZIĄĆ ‘take’: subj{np(str)} + {lex(preppnp(na,acc),sg,’wstrzymanie’,nattr)}**

- **Janek wziął stronę Marysi.**
  Janek.NOM took side.ACC Marysia.GEN
  ‘Janek took Marysia’s side.’

- **WZIĄĆ ‘take’: subj{np(str)} + {lex(np(str),sg,’strona’,ratr1({possp}))}**
Examples of phraseology in Walenty

- Janek wziął na wstrzymanie.
  Janek.NOM took on stoppage.ACC
  ‘Janek decided to wait / not to take action.’

- WZIĄĆ ‘take’: subj{np(str)} +
  {lex(preppn(np(str),na,acc),sg,’wstrzymanie’,natr)}

- Janek wziął stronę Marysi.
  Janek.NOM took side.ACC Marysia.GEN
  ‘Janek took Marysia’s side.’

- WZIĄĆ ‘take’: subj{np(str)} +
  {lex(np(str),sg,’strona’,ratr1({poss})}}
Examples of phraseology in Walenty

- Janek wziął na wstrzymanie.
  Janek.NOM took on stoppage.ACC
  ‘Janek decided to wait / not to take action.’

- WZIĄĆ ‘take’: subj{np(str)} +
  {lex(preppnp(na,acc),sg,’wstrzymanie’,nattr)}

- Janek wziął stronę Marysi.
  Janek.NOM took side.ACC Marysia.GEN
  ‘Janek took Marysia’s side.’

- WZIĄĆ ‘take’: subj{np(str)} +
  {lex(np(str),sg,’strona’,rattr1({possp}))}
Examples of phraseology in Walenty

- Janek wziął na wstrzymanie.
  Janek.NOM took on stoppage.ACC
  ‘Janek decided to wait / not to take action.’

- WZIĄĆ ‘take’: subj{np(str)} +
  {lex(preppnp(na,acc),sg,’wstrzymanie’,nattr)}

- Janek wziął stronę Marysi.
  Janek.NOM took side.ACC Marysia.GEN
  ‘Janek took Marysia’s side.’

- WZIĄĆ ‘take’: subj{np(str)} +
  {lex(np(str),sg,’strona’,ratr1({possp}))}
Examples of phraseology in Walenty 1

- Janek wziął na wstrzymanie.
  Janek.NOM took on stoppage.ACC
  ‘Janek decided to wait / not to take action.’

- WZIĄĆ ‘take’: subj{np(str)} +
  {lex(preppnp(na,acc),sg,’wstrzymanie’,nattr)}

- Janek wziął stronę Marysi.
  Janek.NOM took side.ACC Marysia.GEN
  ‘Janek took Marysia’s side.’

- WZIĄĆ ‘take’: subj{np(str)} +
  {lex(np(str),sg,’strona’,ratr1({poss})})
Examples of phraseology in Walenty 2

- Gorąca krew płynie w jego żyłach.
  hot.NOM blood.NOM flows in his.LOC veins.LOC
  ‘Hot blood runs in his veins.’

  PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (first approximation):
  subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr)} +
  {lex(prepnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr)}

  PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (complete valency):
  subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr({adjp(agr})+{poss})}) +
  {lex(prepnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr({adjp(agr})+{poss})})

- Ta gorąca krew ojca płynie teraz w jego młodych żyłach.
  this.NOM hot.NOM blood.NOM father.GEN flows now in his young.LOC veins.LOC
  ‘This hot blood of his father flows now in his young veins.’
Examples of phraseology in Walenty 2

- **Gorąca** krew płynie w jego żyłach.
  "Hot blood flows in his veins."

- **PŁYNĄĆ** ‘flow’ (first approximation):
  
  \[
  \text{subj}\{\text{lex(np(str),sg,}'krew',ratr)\} + \\
  \{\text{lex(preppnp(w,loc),pl,}'żyła',ratr)\}
  \]

- **PŁYNĄĆ** ‘flow’ (complete valency):
  
  \[
  \text{subj}\{\text{lex(np(str),sg,}'krew',ratr({adjp(agr)}+{possp}))\} + \\
  \{\text{lex(preppnp(w,loc),pl,}'żyła',ratr({adjp(agr)}+{possp}))\}
  \]

- Ta gorąca krew ojca płynie teraz w jego młodych żyłach.
  "This hot blood of his father flows now in his young veins."

---

**Limitations**

- Phrases in Walenty often lack specificity regarding valency.
- The analysis relies on first approximations and may not capture all nuances.

---

**Phraseology in Walenty**

- Gorąca krew płynie w jego żyłach.
  "Hot blood flows in his veins."

- *Płynąć* ‘flow’ (first approximation):
  subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr)} + {lex(preppnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr)}

- *Płynąć* ‘flow’ (complete valency):
  subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr({adjp(agr})+{possp}))} + {lex(preppnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr({adjp(agr})+{possp}))}

- Ta gorąca krew ojca płynie teraz w jego młodych żyłach.
  "This hot blood of his father flows now in his young veins."
Examples of phraseology in Walenty 2

- Gorąca krew płynie w jego żyłach.
  hot.NOM blood.NOM flows in his.LOC veins.LOC
  ‘Hot blood runs in his veins.’

- PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (first approximation):
  subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr)} +
  {lex(prepp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr)}

- PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (complete valency):
  subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{possp}))) +
  {lex(prepp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{posssp})))

- Ta gorąca krew ojca płynie teraz w jego młodych żyłach.
  this.NOM hot.NOM blood.NOM father.GEN flows now in his young.LOC veins.LOC
  ‘This hot blood of his father flows now in his young veins.’
Example of phraseology in Walenty 2

- Gorąca krew płynie w jego żyłach.
  hot.NOM blood.NOM flows in his.LOC veins.LOC
  ‘Hot blood runs in his veins.’

- PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (first approximation):
  subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr)} +
  {lex(prepnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr)}

- PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (complete valency):
  subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr({adjp(agr})+{possp}))} +
  {lex(prepnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr({adjp(agr})+{possp}))}

- Ta gorąca krew ojca płynie teraz w jego młodych żyłach.
  this.NOM hot.NOM blood.NOM father.GEN flows now in his young.LOC veins.LOC
  ‘This hot blood of his father flows now in his young veins.’
Examples of phraseology in Walenty 2

- **Gorąca krew płynie w jego żyłach.**
  hot.NOM blood.NOM flows in his.LOC veins.LOC
  ‘Hot blood runs in his veins.’

- **PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (first approximation):**
  subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr)} +
  {lex(prepnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr)}

- **PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (complete valency):**
  subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{possp}))} +
  {lex(prepnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{possp}))}

- **Ta gorąca krew ojca płynie teraz w jego młodych żyłach.**
  this.NOM hot.NOM blood.NOM father.GEN flows now in his young.LOC veins.LOC
  ‘This hot blood of his father flows now in his young veins.’
Examples of phraseology in Walenty 2

- Gorąca krew płynie w jego żyłach.
  hot.NOM blood.NOM flows in his.LOC veins.LOC
  ‘Hot blood runs in his veins.’

- PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (first approximation):
  subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr)} +
  {lex(prepnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr)}

- PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (complete valency):
  subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr({adjp(agr)})+{possp}))} +
  {lex(prepnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr({adjp(agr)})+{possp}))}

- Ta gorąca krew ojca płynie teraz w jego młodych żyłach.
  this.NOM hot.NOM blood.NOM father.GEN flows now in his young.LOC veins.LOC
  ‘This hot blood of his father flows now in his young veins.’
Examples of phraseology in Walenty 2

- **Gorąca krew płynie w jego żyłach.**
  - hot.NOM blood.NOM flows in his.LOC veins.LOC
  - ‘Hot blood runs in his veins.’

- **PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (first approximation):**
  - subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr)} + {lex(prepnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr)}

- **PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (complete valency):**
  - subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{possp}))} + {lex(prepnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{possp}))}

- **Ta gorąca krew ojca płynie teraz w jego młodych żyłach.**
  - this.NOM hot.NOM blood.NOM father.GEN flows now in his young.LOC veins.LOC
  - ‘This hot blood of his father flows now in his young veins.’
Examples of phraseology in Walenty 2

- Gorąca krew płynie w jego żyłach.
  hot.NOM blood.NOM flows in his.LOC veins.LOC
  ‘Hot blood runs in his veins.’

- PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (first approximation):
  subj {lex(np(str), sg, ’krew’, rattr) + 
  {lex(prepnp(w, loc), pl, ’żyła’, rattr)}

- PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (complete valency):
  subj {lex(np(str), sg, ’krew’, rattr({adjp(agr)}+{possp})) + 
  {lex(prepnp(w, loc), pl, ’żyła’, rattr({adjp(agr)}+{possp}))}}

- Ta gorąca krew ojca płynie teraz w jego młodych żyłach.
  this.NOM hot.NOM blood.NOM father.GEN flows now in his young.LOC veins.LOC
  ‘This hot blood of his father flows now in his young veins.’
Examples of phraseology in Walenty 2

- **Gorąca krew płynie w jego żyłach.**
  - hot.NOM blood.NOM flows in his.LOC veins.LOC
  - ‘Hot blood runs in his veins.’

- **PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (first approximation):**
  - subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr)} + {lex(prepnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr)}

- **PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (complete valency):**
  - subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr({adjp(agr})+{poss})}) + {lex(prepnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr({adjp(agr})+{poss})})

- **Ta gorąca krew ojca płynie teraz w jego młodych żyłach.**
  - this.NOM hot.NOM blood.NOM father.GEN flows now in his young.LOC veins.LOC
  - ‘This hot blood of his father flows now in his young veins.’
Examples of phraseology in Walenty

- Gorąca krew płynie w jego żyłach.
  hot.NOM blood.NOM flows in his.LOC veins.LOC
  ‘Hot blood runs in his veins.’

- PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (first approximation):
  subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr)} +
  {lex(prepnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr)}

- PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (complete valency):
  subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{possp})))} +
  {lex(prepnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{possp})))}

- Ta gorąca krew ojca płynie teraz w jego młodych żyłach.
  this.NOM hot.NOM blood.NOM fatherGEN flows now in his young.LOC veins.LOC
  ‘This hot blood of his father flows now in his young veins.’
Examples of phraseology in Walenty 2

- Gorąca krew płynie w jego żyłach.
  hot.NOM blood.NOM flows in his.LOC veins.LOC
  ‘Hot blood runs in his veins.’

- PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (first approximation):
  subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr)} +
  {lex(prepnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr)}

- PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (complete valency):
  subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{possp}))} +
  {lex(prepnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{possp}))}

- Ta gorąca krew ojca płynie teraz w jego młodych żyłach.
  this.NOM hot.NOM blood.NOM father.GEN flows now in his young.LOC veins.LOC
  ‘This hot blood of his father flows now in his young veins.’
Examples of phraseology in Walenty 2

- Gorąca krew płynie w jego żyłach.
  hot.NOM blood.NOM flows in his.LOC veins.LOC
  ‘Hot blood runs in his veins.’

- PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (first approximation):
  subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr)} +
  {lex(prepnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr)}

- PŁYNĄĆ ‘flow’ (complete valency):
  subj{lex(np(str),sg,’krew’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{possp}))} +
  {lex(prepnp(w,loc),pl,’żyła’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{possp}))}

- Ta gorąca krew ojca płynie teraz w jego młodych żyłach.
  this.NOM hot.NOM blood.NOM father.GEN flows now in his young veins.
  ‘This hot blood of his father flows now in his young veins.’
Examples of phraseology in Walenty

- Jak w jej cudownych ustach pełnych białych zębów brzmiało słowo “towarzysz”?  
  How in her wonderful mouth full white teeth sounded the word “comerade”?  
  ‘How did the word “comerade” sound in her wonderful mouth full of white teeth?’

- BRZMIEĆ ‘sound’: subj{np(str)} + {xp(mod)} + {lex(preppnp(w,loc),pl,’usta’,ratr({adjp(agr)})+{possp}))}

- apart from natr, ratr and ratr1, also:
  - atr: any number of dependents of a given type,
  - atr1: up to one dependent of a given type.
Examples of phraseology in Walenty

- Jak w jej cudownych ustach pełnych białych zębów brzmiało
  How in her wonderful mouth full white teeth sounded

  słowo “towarzysz”?  
  word.NOM  comrade.NOM

  ‘How did the word “comrade” sound in her wonderful mouth full of white teeth?’

- BRZMIEĆ ‘sound’:  subj{np(str)} + {xp(mod)} +  
  {lex(preppnp(w,loc),pl,’usta’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{possp}))}

  apart from natr, ratr and ratr1, also:
  - atr: any number of dependents of a given type,
  - atr1: up to one dependent of a given type.
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Jak w jej cudownych ustach pełnych białych zębów brzmiało How in her wonderful mouth full white teeth sounded słowo “towarzysz”? word.NOM comrade.NOM

‘How did the word “comrade” sound in her wonderful mouth full of white teeth?’

BRZMIEĆ ‘sound’: subj{np(str)} + {xp(mod)} + {lex(preppnp(w,loc),pl,’usta’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{possp}))}

apart from natr, ratr and ratr1, also:
  • atr: any number of dependents of a given type,
  • atr1: up to one dependent of a given type.
Examples of phraseology in Walenty

- Jak w jej cudownych ustach pełnych białych zębów brzmiało słowo “towarzysz”?

  How in her wonderful mouth full of white teeth sounded the word “comrade”?

- BRZMIEĆ ‘sound’: subj{np(str)} + {xp(mod)} + {lex(preppnp(w,loc),pl,’usta’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{poss}))}

- apart from natr, ratr and ratr1, also:
  - atr: any number of dependents of a given type,
  - atr1: up to one dependent of a given type.
Examples of phraseology in Walenty

- Jak w jej cudownych ustach pełnych białych zębów brzmiało słowo “towarzysz”? (How did the word “comerade” sound in her wonderful mouth full of white teeth?)

- BRZMIEĆ ‘sound’: subj{np(str)} + {xp(mod)} + {lex(preppnp(w,loc),pl,’usta’),ratr({adjp(agr)}+{poss})})

- apart from natr, ratr and ratr1, also:
  - atr: any number of dependents of a given type,
  - atr1: up to one dependent of a given type.
Examples of phraseology in Walenty

- Jak w jej cudownych ustach pełnych białych zębów brzmiało słowo „towarzysz”?
  - `brzmieć` 'sound': subj{np(str)} + {xp(mod)} + {lex(preppp(w,loc),pl,’usta’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{possp}))}

- ‘How did the word “comerade” sound in her wonderful mouth full of white teeth?’

- apart from natr, ratr and ratr1, also:
  - atr: any number of dependents of a given type,
  - atr1: up to one dependent of a given type.
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- Jak w jej cudownych ustach pełnych białych zębów brzmiało
  How in her wonderful mouth full white teeth sounded
- słowo “towarzysz”?
  word.NOM comrade.NOM
  ‘How did the word “comerade” sound in her wonderful mouth full of white teeth?’

BRZMIEĆ ‘sound’: subj{np(str)} + {xp(mod)} +
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  - atr: any number of dependents of a given type,
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Examples of phraseology in Walenty  3

Jak w jej cudownych ustach pełnych białych zębów brzmiało
How in her wonderful mouth full white teeth sounded
słowo “towarzysz”?
word.NOM comrade.NOM

‘How did the word “comrade” sound in her wonderful mouth full of white teeth?’

BRZMIEĆ ‘sound’: subj{np(str)} + {xp(mod)} +
{lex(prepnp(w,loc),pl,’usta’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{posspl}))}

apart from natr, ratr and ratr1, also:

atr: any number of dependents of a given type,
atr1: up to one dependent of a given type.
Examples of phraseology in Walenty

- Jak w jej cudownych ustach pełnych białych zębów brzmiało słowo “towarzysz”?  
  How in her wonderful mouth full of white teeth sounded the word “comerade”?  
  ‘How did the word “comerade” sound in her wonderful mouth full of white teeth?’

- BRZMIEĆ ‘sound’: subj{np(str)} + {xp(mod)} + {lex(preppnp(w,loc),pl,’usta’),ratr({adjp(agr)}+{poss})}

- apart from natr, ratr and ratr1, also:  
  - atr: any number of dependents of a given type,  
  - atr1: up to one dependent of a given type.
Examples of phraseology in Walenty  

1. How did the word “comerade” sound in her wonderful mouth full of white teeth?

   *Jak w jej cudownych ustach pełnych białych zębów brzmiało słowo “towarzysz”?*

   *How in her wonderful mouth full of white teeth sounded the word “comerade”?*

2. **BRZMIEĆ** ‘sound’:

   *subj{np(str)} + {xp(mod)} + {lex(preppn(w,loc),pl,’usta’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{possp}))}*

3. Apart from natr, rattr and rattr1, also:

   - **atr**: any number of dependents of a given type,
   - **atr1**: up to one dependent of a given type.
Examples of phraseology in Walenty

- Miłosierny Bóg wezwał kogoś do siebie.
  - merciful.NOM God.NOM called somebody.ACC to self.GEN
  - ‘Somebody died.’

- wezwać
  - ACT(Bóg.S1) PAT(4) DPRH(do[siebie.S2])

- wezwać
  - PAT(4) DPRH(Bóg.S1,do[siebie.S2])

WEZWAĆ ‘call’:

subj{lex(np(str),sg,’bóg’,atr({adjp(agr)}))} +
obj{np(str)} +
{lex(xp(adl[preppnp(do,gen)]),sg,’siebie’,nattr)}
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  - ‘Somebody died.’
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  - ACT(Bóg.S1) PAT(4) DPRH(do[siebie.S2])
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- Miłosierny Bóg wezwał kogoś do siebie.
  merciful.NOM God.NOM called somebody.ACC to self.GEN
  ‘Somebody died.’

- wezwać
  ACT(Bóg.S1) PAT(4) DPRH(do[siebie.S2])

- wezwać
  PAT(4) DPRH(Bóg.S1,do[siebie.S2])
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Examples of phraseology in Walenty

- **Miłosierny Bóg wezwał kogoś do siebie.**
  - Merciful God called somebody to self.
  - ‘Somebody died.’

- **wezwać**
  - ACT(Bóg.S1) PAT(4) DPRH(do[siebie.S2])
  - ‘Call’:
    - subj{lex(np(str),sg,’bóg’,atr({adjp(agr)}))} +
    - obj{np(str)} +
    - {lex(xp(adl[prepnp(do,gen)]),sg,’siebie’,natr)}
Examples of phraseology in Walenty

Miłosierny Bóg wezwał kogoś do siebie. merciful.NOM God.NOM called somebody.ACC to self.GEN ‘Somebody died.’

wezwać ACT(Bóg.S1) PAT(4) DPRH(do[siebie.S2])
wezwać PAT(4) DPRH(Bóg.S1,do[siebie.S2])

WEZWAĆ ‘call’:
subj{lex(np(str),sg,’bóg’,atr({adjp(agr)}))} +
obj{np(str)} +
{lex(xp(adl[prepnp(do,gen)]),sg,’siebie’,nattr)}
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- Miłosierny Bóg wezwał kogoś do siebie.  
  merciful.NOM God.NOM called somebody.ACC to self.GEN  
  ‘Somebody died.’

- wezwać  
  ACT(Bóg.S1) PAT(4) DPRH(do[siebie.S2])

- wezwać  
  PAT(4) DPRH(Bóg.S1, do[siebie.S2])

- WEZWAĆ ‘call’:  
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- Miłosierny Bóg wezwał kogoś do siebie.
  - merciful.NOM God.NOM called somebody.ACC to self GEN
  - ‘Somebody died.’

- wezwać
  - ACT(Bóg.S1) PAT(4) DPRH(do[siebie.S2])

- wezwać
  - PAT(4) DPRH(Bóg.S1, do[siebie.S2])

- WEZWAĆ ‘call’:
  - subj{lex(np(str), sg, ’bóg’, atr({adjp(agr)})))} +
  - obj{np(str)} +
  - {lex(xp(adl[preppnp(do, gen)]), sg, ’siebie’, natr)}
Examples of phraseology in Walenty

- Miłosierny Bóg wezwał kogoś do siebie.
  - merciful.NOM God.NOM called somebody.ACC to self.GEN
  - ‘Somebody died.’

- wezwać
  - ACT(Bóg.S1) PAT(4) DPRH(do[siebie.S2])

- wezwać
  - PAT(4) DPRH(Bóg.S1,do[siebie.S2])

- WEZWAĆ ‘call’:
  - subj{lex(np(str),sg,’bóg’,atr({adjp(agr)}))} +
  - obj{np(str)} +
  - {lex(xp(adl[preppnp(do,gen)]),sg,’siebie’,nattr)}
Examples of phraseology in Walenty

- Miłosierny Bóg wezwał kogoś do siebie.
  - `merciful.NOM God.NOM called somebody.ACC to self.GEN`
  - ‘Somebody died.’

- `wezwać`  
  - `ACT(Bóg.S1) PAT(4) DPRH(do[siebie.S2])`

- `wezwać`  
  - `PAT(4) DPRH(Bóg.S1, do[siebie.S2])`

- WEZWAĆ ‘call’:
  - `subj{lex(np(str), sg, ’bóg’, atr({adjp(agr)}))} + obj{np(str)} + {lex(xp(adl[preppnp(do, gen)]), sg, ’siebie’, natr})`
Examples of phraseology in Walenty 4

- Miłosierny Bóg wezwał kogoś do siebie. merciful.NOM God.NOM called somebody.ACC to self.GEN
  ‘Somebody died.’

- wezwać ACT(Bóg.S1) PAT(4) DPRH(do[siebie.S2])

- wezwać PAT(4) DPRH(Bóg.S1,do[siebie.S2])

- WEZWAĆ ‘call’:
  subj{lex(np(str),sg,’bóg’,atr({adjp(agr)}))} +
  obj{np(str)} +
  {lex(xp(adl[preppn(do,gen)]),sg,’siebie’,nattr)}

Translating your phraseological expressions for dying from PDT-Vallex to Walenty?
Comparing PDT-Vallex and Walenty


**PDT-Vallex and Walenty:**
- developed independently,
- corpus-based (in slightly different ways),
- have surprisingly similar expressive power.

**Main differences:**
- better human-readability of PDT-Vallex,
- lack of iteration in PDT-Vallex (cf. ratr, atr, etc., in Walenty).
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**PDT-Vallex** and **Walenty**:

- developed independently,
- corpus-based (in slightly different ways),
- have surprisingly similar expressive power.

**Main differences**:

- better human-readability of PDT-Vallex,
- lack of iteration in PDT-Vallex (cf. ratr, atr, etc., in Walenty).
Jak w jej cudownych ustach pełnych białych zębów brzmiało słowo “towarzysz”?

‘How did the word “comerade” sounded in her wonderful mouth full of white teeth?’

BRZMIEĆ ‘sound’: subj{np(str)} + {xp(mod)} + {lex(preppnp(w,loc),pl,’usta’),ratr({adjp(agr)}+{possp})}
Comparing PDT-Vallex and Walenty

- Jak w jej cudownych ustach pełnych białych zębów brzmiało słowo “towarzysz”? (How in her wonderful mouth full white teeth sounded the word “comrade”?)
- BRZMIEĆ ‘sound’: subj{np(str)} + {xp(mod)} + {lex(preppnp(w,loc),pl,’usta’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{poss})})

PDT-Vallex?
- DPHR(w[usta.P6]) – NO
- DPHR(w[usta.P6[.n2;.a#]]) – NO
- DPHR(w[usta.P6[.n2;.a#;n2,.a#]]) – NOT quite
- DPHR(w[usta.P6[.a#+;n2,.a#*]]) – YES (extends the formalism)
Comparing PDT-Vallex and Walenty

- Jak w jej cudownych ustach pełnych białych zębów brzmiało słowo “towarzysz”?
  How in her wonderful mouth full white teeth sounded word.NOM comrade.NOM
  ‘How did the word “comrade” sounded in her wonderful mouth full of white teeth?’
- BRZMIEĆ ‘sound’: subj{np(str)} + {xp(mod)} + {lex(preppnp(w,loc),pl,’usta’,ratr({adjp(agr})+{possp}))}

PDT-Vallex?
- DPHR(w[usta.P6]) – NO
- DPHR(w[usta.P6[.n2;.a#]]) – NO
- DPHR(w[usta.P6[.n2;.a#;.n2,.a#]]) – NOT quite
- DPHR(w[usta.P6[.a#+;.n2,.a#*]]) – YES (extends the formalism)
Comparing PDT-Vallex and Walenty

Jak w jej cudownych ustach pełnych białych zębów brzmiało słowo “towarzysz”? 'How did the word “comerade” sounded in her wonderful mouth full of white teeth?'

BRZMIEĆ ‘sound’: subj{np(str)} + {xp(mod)} + {lex(preppnp(w,loc),pl,’usta’,ratr({adjp(agr)}+{posspl}))}

PDT-Vallex?

DPHR(w[usta.P6]) – NO
DPHR(w[usta.P6[.n2;.a#]]) – NO
DPHR(w[usta.P6[.n2;.a#;.n2,.a#]]) – NOT quite
DPHR(w[usta.P6[.a#+;.n2,.a#*]]) – YES (extends the formalism)
Jak w jej cudownych ustach pełnych białych zębów brzmiało słowo "towarzysz"?

‘How did the word “comerade” sounded in her wonderful mouth full of white teeth?’

BRZMIEĆ ‘sound’: subj{np(str)} + {xp(mod)} + {lex(preppnp(w,loc),pl,’usta’,ratr({adjp(agr})+{possp})})

PDT-Vallex?

- DPHR(w[usta.P6]) – NO
- DPHR(w[uesta.P6[.n2;.a#]]) – NO
- DPHR(w[uesta.P6[.n2;.a#;.n2,.a#]]) – NOT quite
- DPHR(w[uesta.P6[.a#+;.n2,.a#*]]) – YES (extends the formalism)
Currently, neither formalism is able to express **linear constraints**.

- **Wzięli nogi za pas.**
  - took.M.PL legs.ACC.PL behind belt.ACC
  - ‘They ran away.’

- **WZIĄĆ ‘take’ in Walenty:**
  - subj{np(str)} + {lex(np(str),pl,’noga’,natr)} + 
    {lex(prepnp(za,acc),sg,’pas’,natr)}
    (currently)
  - subj{np(str)} + {lex(np(str),pl,’noga’,natr)} < 
    {lex(prepnp(za,acc),sg,’pas’,natr)}
  - subj{np(str)} + ≪{lex(np(str),pl,’noga’,natr)} ≪ 
    {lex(prepnp(za,acc),sg,’pas’,natr)}

Similarly in **PDT-Vallex:**

- ACT(1) DPHR(noga.P4,za[pas.S4])
- ACT(1) DPHR(noga.P4 < za[pas.S4])
- ACT(1) «DPHR(noga.P4 < za[pas.S4])
Currently, neither formalism is able to express **linear constraints**.

- Wzięli nogi za pas.
  took.m.pl legs.acc.pl behind belt.acc
  ‘They ran away.’

- **WZIĄĆ ‘take’ in Walenty:**
  - subj{np(str)} + {lex(np(str), pl, ’noga’, natr)} +
    {lex(prepnp(za, acc), sg, ’pas’, natr)}
    (currently)
  - subj{np(str)} + {lex(np(str), pl, ’noga’, natr)} ♦
    {lex(prepnp(za, acc), sg, ’pas’, natr)}
  - subj{np(str)} + «{lex(np(str), pl, ’noga’, natr)} ◄
    {lex(prepnp(za, acc), sg, ’pas’, natr)}

Similarly in **PDT-Vallex**:

- ACT(1) DPHR(noga.P4, za[pas.S4])
- ACT(1) DPHR(noga.P4 ♦ za[pas.S4])
- ACT(1) «DPHR(noga.P4 ◄ za[pas.S4])
Currently, neither formalism is able to express linear constraints.

- Wzięli nogi za pas.
  took.M.PL legs.ACC.PL behind belt.ACC
  ‘They ran away.’

- WZIĄĆ ‘take’ in Walenty:
  - subj{np(str)} + {lex(np(str), pl, ’noga’, natr)} +
    {lex(prepnp(za, acc), sg, ’pas’, natr)}
  - subj{np(str)} + {lex(np(str), pl, ’noga’, natr)} <
    {lex(prepnp(za, acc), sg, ’pas’, natr)}
  - subj{np(str)} + ≪{lex(np(str), pl, ’noga’, natr)} <
    {lex(prepnp(za, acc), sg, ’pas’, natr)}

Similarly in PDT-Vallex:
- ACT(1) DPHR(noga.P4, za[paś.S4])
- ACT(1) DPHR(noga.P4 < za[paś.S4])
- ACT(1) ≪DPHR(noga.P4 < za[paś.S4])
Currently, neither formalism is able to express **linear constraints**.

- **Wzięli nogi za pas.**
  took.M.PL legs.ACC.PL behind belt.ACC
  ‘They ran away.’

- **WZIĄĆ ‘take’ in **Walenty**:**
  subj{np(str)} + {lex(np(str),pl,’noga’,nattr)} +
  {lex(prepnp(za,acc),sg,’pas’,nattr)}
  subj{np(str)} + {lex(np(str),pl,’noga’,nattr)} ≺
  {lex(prepnp(za,acc),sg,’pas’,nattr)}
  subj{np(str)} + ≺{lex(np(str),pl,’noga’,nattr)} ≺
  {lex(prepnp(za,acc),sg,’pas’,nattr)}

Similarly in **PDT-Vallex**:

- ACT(1) DPHR(noga.P4,za[ps.S4])
- ACT(1) DPHR(noga.P4 ≺ za[ps.S4])
- ACT(1) ≺DPHR(noga.P4 ≺ za[ps.S4])
Currently, neither formalism is able to express **linear constraints**.

- **Wzięli nogi za pas.**
  took.M.PL legs.ACC.PL behind belt.ACC
  ‘They ran away.’

- **WZIĄĆ ‘take’ in Walenty:**
  - subj{np(str)} + {lex(np(str),pl,’noga’,natr)} + {lex(prepnp(za,acc),sg,’pas’,natr)}
  - subj{np(str)} + {lex(np(str),pl,’noga’,natr)} < {lex(prepnp(za,acc),sg,’pas’,natr)}
  - subj{np(str)} + «{lex(np(str),pl,’noga’,natr)} < {lex(prepnp(za,acc),sg,’pas’,natr)}

Similarly in **PDT-Vallex:**
- `ACT(1) DPHR(noga.P4,za[pas.S4])`
- `ACT(1) DPHR(noga.P4 < za[pas.S4])`
- `ACT(1) «DPHR(noga.P4 < za[pas.S4])`
Currently, neither formalism is able to express linear constraints.

- **Wzięli nogi za pas.**
  took.M.PL legs.ACC.PL behind belt.ACC
  ‘They ran away.’

- **WZAŁĆ ‘take’ in Walenty:**
  subj{np(str)} + {lex(np(str),pl,’noga’,nattr)} +
  {lex(prepnp(za,acc),sg,’pas’,nattr)}

Similarly in **PDT-Vallex:**

- ACT(1) DPHR(noga.P4,za[pas.S4])
- ACT(1) DPHR(noga.P4 < za[pas.S4])
- ACT(1) ≪DPHR(noga.P4 < za[pas.S4])
Currently, neither formalism is able to express **linear constraints**.

- **Wzięli nogi za pas.**
  took.**M.PL** legs.**ACC.PL** behind belt.**ACC**
  ‘They ran away.’

- **WZIĄĆ ‘take’ in Walenty:**
  - subj{np(str)} + {lex(np(str),pl,’noga’,natr)} + {lex(prepnp(za,acc),sg,’pas’,natr)}
  - subj{np(str)} + {lex(np(str),pl,’noga’,natr)} < {lex(prepnp(za,acc),sg,’pas’,natr)}
  - subj{np(str)} + «{lex(np(str),pl,’noga’,natr)} < {lex(prepnp(za,acc),sg,’pas’,natr)}

Similarly in **PDT-Vallex:**

- ACT(1) DPHR(noga.P4,za[pas.S4])
- ACT(1) DPHR(noga.P4 < za[pas.S4])
- ACT(1) «DPHR(noga.P4 < za[pas.S4])
Currently, neither formalism is able to express **linear constraints**.

- **Wzięli nogi za pas.**
  *took.m.pl legs.acc.pl behind belt.acc*

  ‘They ran away.’

- **WZIĄĆ ‘take’ in **Walenty**:
  - subj{np(str)} + {lex(np(str),pl,’noga’,nattr)} +
    {lex(prepnp(za,acc),sg,’pas’,nattr)}
  - subj{np(str)} + {lex(np(str),pl,’noga’,nattr)} <
    {lex(prepnp(za,acc),sg,’pas’,nattr)}
  - subj{np(str)} + «{lex(np(str),pl,’noga’,nattr)} <
    {lex(prepnp(za,acc),sg,’pas’,nattr)}

Similarly in **PDT-Vallex**:

- **ACT(1) DPHR(noga.P4,za[pas.S4])**
- **ACT(1) DPHR(noga.P4 < za[pas.S4])**
- **ACT(1) «DPHR(noga.P4 < za[pas.S4])**
Currently, neither formalism is able to express **linear constraints**.

- **Wzięli nogi za pas.**
  
  took.**M.PL legs.**ACC.**PL behind belt.**ACC
  
  ‘They ran away.’

- **WZIĄĆ ‘take’ in Walenty:**
  
  subj{np(str)} + {lex(np(str),pl,’noga’,natr)} + {lex(prepnp(za,acc),sg,’pas’,natr)}
  
  subj{np(str)} + {lex(np(str),pl,’noga’,natr)} \< {lex(prepnp(za,acc),sg,’pas’,natr)}
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Problems with coordination:

- Zrozpaczona matka poruszyła niebo i ziemię.
  distraught.NOM mother.NOM moved heaven.ACC and earth.ACC
  ‘The distraught mother moved heaven and earth.’

- PORUSZYĆ:
  subj{np(str)} + obj{fixed(np(str),’niebo i ziemię’)}

- ...dzieki poruszeniu nieba i ziemi przez zrozpaczoną
  due to moving heaven.GEN and earth.GEN by distraught
  matkę...
  mother

- Manifest... nie poruszył nieba i ziemi...
  manifesto not moved heaven.GEN and EARTH

- obj{lex(np(str),sg,AND(’niebo’;’ziemia’)),natr}
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- obj{lex(np(str), sg, AND(’niebo’; ’ziemia’)), natr}
- Zrozpaczona matka poruszyła niebo i ziemię.
  ‘The distraught mother moved heaven and earth.’
- William obiecał Kate, że poruszy niebo oraz ziemię.
  ‘William promised Kate that he will move heaven as well as earth.’
- Manifest nie poruszył ani nieba, ani ziemi.
  ‘The manifesto did moved neither heaven, nor earth.’

**but:**

- bawić się w kotka i myszkę
  ‘play refl in cat and mouse’
- *bawić się w kotka oraz myszkę*
- *nie bawić się w ani kotka, ani myszkę*
- {lex(prepnp(w, acc), sg, AND[i](’kotek’; ’myszka’)), natr}
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Limitations
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Koordynacja predykatów, np.:

- Cała Kolumbia chucha i dmucha na Falcao.
  whole Columbia puffs and blows on Falcao
  ‘Whole Columbia cares about / dotes on Falcao.’

- Cała Kolumbia chucha na niego i dmucha.
  whole Columbia puffs on him and blows

- Wszyscy chuchamy i dmuchamy na Falcao.
  all puff-1.PL and blow-1.PL on Falcao

Requires more fundamental re-design of both dictionaries...
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Another problem: **paradigmatic constraints** (dependence of phraseology on the form of the verb).

**PDT-Vallex** (and an example from Czech):
- Jobs nenechal v Apple kámen na kameni.
  - Jobs NEG left in Apple stone on stone
  - ‘Jobs left no stone unturned in Apple.’
- nechat ACT(1) DPHR(kámen.S4, na-1[kámen.S6]) ---(.-)

**Walenty** (and an example from Polish):
- Nawet nie kiwnął palcem.
  - even NEG lift finger
  - ‘He didn’t even lift a finger.’
- KIWNĄĆ: neg:
  - subj{np(str)} + {lex(np(inst), sg,’palec’, natr)}
- Nawet nie chciał kiwnąć palcem.
  - even NEG wanted lift-INF finger
  - ‘He didn’t even want to lift a finger.’
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But these treatments of negation **do not generalise** to other paradigmatic constraints, e.g. (Kosek 2008, 2013):

- utopić kogoś w łyżce wody
  
  ‘to do cruel harm to somebody’

  only in:
  - infinitival
  - subjunctive

- urwać komuś głowę
  
  ‘to bite someone's head off’

  not in the past tense
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**Similarly constrained phraseological units in your languages?**
Another problem: **constructional valency**, e.g., resultative constructions such as:

- Pat sneezed **the napkin off the table**.

May be much more **complex** (and partially morphological), e.g., in Polish (Bogusławski and Danielewiczowa 2005:266–267):

- ktoś za-V się na śmierć
  somebody ZA-V REFLECT on death
  ‘somebody V-ed to death, somebody died by V-ing’
- ktoś zaćpał się na śmierć
  ‘somebody drugged himself to death’
- ktoś zagadał się na śmierć
  somebody talked himself to death
- ktoś zabełkotał się na śmierć
  somebody mumbled himself to death
- ...
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