

predicates of events (Kennedy & Levin 2008), (1a) describes an event of *dirtying that table* the most (=to a maximal degree) when compared to other relevant events of *dirtying that table* in a comparison set (e.g., it could be a comparison of these events happening at different times or in different worlds). (ii) Adjectival superlatives also have a comparative reading, which arises in a sentence like *[Bill]_F climbed the highest mountain*, where *Bill* is focalized. It means that, among a set of relevant individuals, *Bill* was the one that climbed the highest mountain (but not necessarily Mount Everest). (1a) with *-su* has a comparative reading when the focus marker *-wa* is added. The sentence with *-wa* in the object (6) means that *that table* was dirtied more than any other thing. The sentence with *-wa* in the subject (7) means that *John* dirtied *that table* more than anybody else. In these cases, *that table* may not be dirtied to a maximal degree in an absolute sense; what matters is that it was dirtied more than any other thing or that *John* dirtied it more than anybody else.

- (6) Juwanu [uka misa-wa] qañu-**cha**-su-i. (7) [Juwanu-wa] uka misa qañu-**cha**-su-i.
 John that table-FOC dirty-**cha**-su-3S John-FOC that table dirty-**cha**-su-3S
 ‘John dirtied that table more than any ‘John dirtied that table more than anyone
 other table.’ else did.

Proposal. I assume the LF in (8) for *v*P/VPs of DAs with *-su* (I assume the external argument is an agent, being introduced by *v* (Kratzer 1996)). Here I sketch an analysis à la Heim (1999): *-su* moves above *v*P leaving a trace $t \in D_d$.

- (8) [[[_{vP} Agent(-wa) [_{VP} [Theme(-wa) [gradable base -cha]] t_i] v] ~C] [UC -su]_i]

I assume gradable bases *P* denote relations between individual *x* and degree *d* (I assume that *ds* are downward monotonic). I adapt Kennedy & Levin’s (2008) proposal to DAs under this approach: I assume that the core meaning of DAs is derived from *P* (labeled P_Δ , which I also use as a variable below), which denotes a relation between *x* and *d* in event *e*, where *d* is the result of subtracting the degree *x* holds at the end of *e* minus the degree *x* holds at the beginning of *e* (i.e., for gradable predicate *P*, individual *x*, degrees *d, d', d''* and event *e*, $P_\Delta(x, d, e)$ holds iff $P(x, d', ini(e)) \& P(x, d'', fin(e)) \& d'' - d' = d$). I assume P_Δ results from combining *P* with *-cha* (cf. Pedersen 2015) and $P_\Delta \in D_{\langle e, \langle d, it \rangle \rangle}$ (t_d saturates its *d* argument; I use *i* for the type of events). I propose *-su* is a superlative morpheme involving comparison of events where degree of change *d* of P_Δ in event *e* is not held in any other event *e'* in comparison class *X* (9). I link this to the absolute reading, where a maximum is reached: with top open scale bases, this degree corresponds with the contextual maximal degree (1a); with top closed scale bases, I assume with Kennedy & Levin that lexical means are maximized, which guarantees that lexical maximums are reached (1b). The absolute reading is exemplified in the denotation of (1a) in (10): (10) says that in event *e* of *John’s dirtying of that table*, *that table* was dirtied to a degree (of change) of dirtiness not reached in any other (relevant) event *e'* in comparison class *X* (where $X=UC$).

- (9) $[-su] = \lambda X \lambda P_\Delta \lambda e \exists d [P_\Delta(d, e) \& \forall e' [e \neq e' \& e' \in X \rightarrow \neg P_\Delta(d, e')]]$
 (10) $[(1a)] = \lambda e \exists d [ag(j, e) \& dirty_\Delta(t, d, e) \& \forall e' [e \neq e' \& e' \in X \& ag(j, e') \rightarrow \neg dirty_\Delta(t, d, e')]]$

Turning to *-wa*, I assume it is a focus marker (Klose 2015) in the sense of Rooth (1992), but adapt the proposal in terms of events here. Expressions like (6,7) have an ordinary *o* and a focus *f* value, where the former is the standard meaning of the expression under consideration and the latter is the set of alternatives. Of importance here for *f* are focalized individuals, so *f* of (6,7) will vary depending on which individual is focalized with *-wa*, i.e., the theme (6) or the agent (7). The set of event predicate alternatives are represented in (11,13) for (6,7), where comparison class *X* is a subset of these sets (Heim 1999). *o* of VP/*v*P of (6,7) (cf. (8)) is represented in (12,14). The

relative reading follows from this. It depends on the focus alternatives: what is relevant is that *that table* is dirtied more than any other thing (12) or that *John* dirtied *that table* more than anyone else (14). Thus, only a relative (not an absolute) maximum need be reached.

$$(11) \llbracket (6) \rrbracket^f = \{\lambda e[ag(j,e) \ \& \ \text{dirty}_\Delta(x,d,e)] \mid x \in D_e \ \& \ d \in D_d\} \quad (12) \llbracket (6) \rrbracket^o = \lambda e \exists d[ag(j,e) \ \& \ \text{dirty}_\Delta(t,d,e)]$$

$$(13) \llbracket (7) \rrbracket^f = \{\lambda e[ag(x,e) \ \& \ \text{dirty}_\Delta(t,d,e)] \mid x \in D_e \ \& \ d \in D_d\} \quad (14) \llbracket (7) \rrbracket^o = \lambda e \exists d[ag(j,e) \ \& \ \text{dirty}_\Delta(t,d,e)]$$

Conclusion. This paper proposes to extend the domain of superlatives beyond adjectives. Aymara illustrates the case of a language with a verbal superlative combining with DAs. I claim that it involves comparison of events, which can be sensitive to focus, just like adjectival superlatives.

References

- Gonzalo, Roger. 2011. La derivación verbal en el aimara de Pomata: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú MA thesis.
- Heim, Irene. 1985. Notes on comparatives and related matters. Ms. University of Texas, Austin.
- Heim, Irene. 1999. Notes on superlatives. Ms. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.
- Kennedy, Christopher & Beth Levin. 2008. Measure of change: The adjectival core of verbs of variable telicity. 156-182. In Louise McNally & Christopher Kennedy (eds.), *Adjectives and adverbs*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kennedy, Christopher & Louise McNally. 2005. Scale structure, degree modification, and the semantics of gradable predicates. *Language*. 345-381.
- Klose, Claudius. 2015. Sentence Type and Association with Focus in Aymara. 63-86. In *Mood, Exhaustivity & Focus Marking in non-European Languages*. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1996. Severing the External Argument from its Verb. 109-137. In Johann Rooryck & Laurie Zaring (eds.), *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Martínez Vera, Gabriel. To appear. On competing degree morphemes in Southern Aymara. *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 22*, University of Potsdam/ZAS Berlin.
- Pedersen, Walter. 2015. A Scalar Analysis of *Again*-Ambiguities. *Journal of Semantics* 32. 372-424.
- Rooth, Mats. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1. 75-116.