

When dispositions turn into manners

Berit Gehrke (CNRS-LLF/Paris Diderot)

1 Introduction

- Geuder (2000): Adjectives like *rude*, *clever*, *stupid* display two readings
 - Dispositional reading (1-a) [I(ndividual-)L(evel-)P(redicate)]
 - Agentive reading (1-b) [S(tage-)L(evel-)P(redicate)]
- (1) a. John is **stupid**.
b. John is being **stupid**.
- Related adverbs also display two readings (Jackendoff 1972; McConnell-Ginet 1982; Wyner 1994; Eckardt 1998; Geuder 2000; Ernst 2002; Schäfer 2005, i.a.):
 - Manner reading (2-a)
 - Agent-oriented reading (2-b)¹ [AO]
- (2) Alice has **rudely** written the letter. (Ernst 2002)
 - a. Manner reading: Alice has written the letter in a rude manner.
 - b. Agent-oriented reading: It was rude of Alice to write the letter.
- English: Different syntactic positions (3) (from Piñón 2010) (cf. Jackendoff 1972)
- (3) a. **Cleverly/rudely**, John dropped his cup of coffee. AO
≈ It was clever/rude of John to drop his cup of coffee.
b. John dropped his cup of coffee **cleverly/rudely**. MANNER
≈ The manner in which John dropped his cup of coffee was clever/rude.
- German: Morphological distinction (-weise on AO adverbs) (4)²
- (4) a. Maria hat **dummerweise** geantwortet. AO
Mary has stupid-WEISE answered
'Stupidly, Mary answered.'
b. Maria hat **dumm** geantwortet. MANNER
Mary has stupid answered
'Mary answered stupidly.'
- Approaches that I will not discuss further:
 - Syntactic accounts (e.g. Alexiadou 1997; Cinque 1999) that propose different functional projections that host adverbs in their specifier
 - Semantic accounts:
 - * Different event structure construals (e.g. Vendler 1984; Pustejovsky 1991)
 - * Higher vs. lower events (Piñón 2010, building on McConnell-Ginet 1982)
 - * Events vs. facts/states of affairs (e.g. Parsons 1990; Moore 1995; Wyner 2008)

¹The AO paraphrase differs from the AO ADV sentence in sem/prag: With the AO ADV in (2-b), it is asserted that Alice has written the letter while rudeness is not at issue; under the paraphrase, in turn, rudeness is asserted and it is presupposed that Alice has written the letter (see also discussion in Geuder 2000, and §3.2).

²Similarly, Japanese AO adverbs appear with the suffix *-mo*; see Kubota (2015) for discussion.

This paper:

- Building on two previous accounts:
 - Geuder (2000): AO ADVs share the lexical semantics of the related adjectives.
 - Ernst (2002): Comparison classes of events for ADVs (see also Schäfer 2005; Kubota 2015)
- ILP/SLP distinction in the adj. domain has a direct counterpart in the verbal domain
 - Some As display ILP vs. SLP readings (here: dispositional vs. agentive) (to be refined).
 - Related ADVs can vary between applying to event ‘individuals’ (event types or kinds) and stages of events (event tokens).
- Comparison classes in the adjectival domain have a direct counterpart in the verbal domain
 - SLP vs. ILP: Within- vs. between-individual comparison (Sassoon and Toledo 2011)
 - AO vs. manner: Within-event token vs. between-event kinds comparison
- However, the link between ADVs and As is indirect:
 - AO ADVs are related to dispositional As (unlike Geuder).
 - Manner ADVs are derived from AO ADVs (like Geuder, Ernst).
 - Agentive readings of dispositional As involve coercion (unlike Geuder).

2 Building blocks from previous literature

2.1 Geuder (2000)

- Dispositional As [ILPs], e.g. *John is stupid*:
 - Assert the disposition of an individual
 - How this disposition manifests itself is in the background.
- Agentive As [SLPs], e.g. *John is being stupid*:
 - Assert causal efficacy and a state of affairs
 - The disposition remains in the background.
- AO ADVs are derived from agentive As (5) (Geuder 2000, 170)

(5) $\text{stupid}_{C,w*}(x)(k) = 1$
with $k \approx \langle \{e, x, \dots\}, \{P_{w0}(e, x, \dots)\} \rangle$ and:
(i) $C \models \exists e^* : e \text{ CAUSE } e^*, \&$
(ii) x does not intend to bring about e^* , the occurrence of e^* is incompatible with the preferences of x in w_0 , &
(iii) $\forall w' \in W : \exists e [P_{w'}(e)(x)] \Leftrightarrow D_{w'}(x)$.
- Orientation towards an agent is indirect:
 - Retrieved from the thematic relations introduced by the event variable (Wyner 1994, 1998)
 - An instance of predicate transfer (in the sense of Nunberg 1995)
- The interpretation of AO ADVs involves focus alternatives:

(6) a. Stupidly, John drank the [water]_F.
b. Stupidly, John [drank]_F the water.

- Manner readings are derived from AO readings.
 - Alternatives are “generated by abduction from the script” (cf. Schank and Abelson 1977)³
 - “The different manners of an event are the alternative ways in which an event can unfold while still falling under the same event type”. [see also §4]
 - Scripts allow for variants and thus for the specification of manner.

2.2 Ernst (2002)

- The interpretation of ‘predicational’ ADVs involves comparison classes of events.
- AO reading: Comparison of ‘Events’ (7) (from 1998 ms. discussed in Geuder 2000)

- (7) a. Rudely, she left.
 b. $\exists e[\text{leave}(e) \wedge \text{Agent}(e, \text{she}) \wedge \exists e' : [e' = [\text{leave}(e) \wedge \text{Agent}(e, \text{she})]] \wedge \text{RUDE}(\text{she}, e', \llbracket e'' \rrbracket)]$

- Manner reading (8) (from the same 1998 ms.):
 - ADV is lower, appears in Spec, PredP, a projection right above VP.
 - In this position, the Manner Rule applies (turns AO into manner ADVs).
- Comparison of ‘Specified Events’ (e.g. question-answering events)

- (8) a. She left rudely.
 b. $\exists e[\text{leave}(e) \wedge \text{Agent}(e, \text{she}) \wedge \exists e' : [e' = [\text{leave}(e) \wedge \text{Agent}(e, \text{she})]] \wedge \text{RUDE}(\text{she}, e', \llbracket e'' : \text{leave}(e'') \wedge \text{Agent}(e'', \text{she}) \rrbracket)]$

- Geuder’s (2000) objection against comparison classes for events: Intuition that adverb interpretation does not involve scale structure considerations

BUT: Comparison classes are independent of scale structure, as we will see now.

2.3 Comparison classes and the semantics of gradable adjectives

- Comparison classes in standard semantic analyses of gradable adjectives (9) (McConnell-Ginet 1973; Klein 1980; Bierwisch 1989; Kennedy 1999, among many others)

- (9) John is tall.
 a. for a basketball player in the NBA: true if he is, e.g., 2.10m, false if he is 1,95m
 b. for a 10-year-old boy in Germany: true if he is, e.g., 1.45m, false if he is 1,35m

- Toledo and Sassoon (2011); Sassoon and Toledo (2011):
 Which entities are taken into account for determining the comparison class?
 - RELATIVE (uses of) As involve **between-individual comparison**:
 - * E.g. (9): Comparing John’s height with that of other individuals (extensional context)
 - ABSOLUTE (uses of) As involve **within-individual comparison**:
 - * E.g. (10): Comparing different stages that this particular cup could be in (intensional context); other cups/containers do not play a role.

- (10) The cup is full.

³See also Asher (1993); Irmer and Mueller-Reichau (2012); Mueller-Reichau (2015).

- **Relation to ILP vs. SLP** (cf. Gumiel-Molina, Moreno-Quibén, and Pérez-Jiménez 2015):

- ILPs involve between-individual comparison (11-a).
- SLPs involve within-individual comparison (11-b).

- (11) a. La reunión {es/*está} larga.
 the meeting is/is_{loc} long
- b. El vaso {*es/está} lleno.
 the vase is/is_{loc} full

⇒ Refinement of Geuder (2000): Dispositional/agentive As might not be (lexically) polysemous

- There might be just one lexical entry, based on dispositional As (12-a).
- The agentive reading might involve coercion due to the requirements of the progressive (12-b) (which additionally adds temporality associated with an event token).

- (12) a. Juan {es/*está} estúpido.
 John is/is_{loc} stupid
- b. Juan está siendo estúpido.
 John is_{loc} being stupid

2.4 Manner modification as event kind modification

- Kind anaphora in the nominal and verbal domain (13) (Landman and Morzycki 2003; Landman 2006; Anderson and Morzycki 2015)

- (13) a. so ein Hund wie dieser
 such a dog WH this
 ‘a dog such as this’ KIND
- b. Jan hat so getanzt wie Maria.
 John has such danced WH Mary
 ‘John danced the way Mary did.’ MANNER (EVENT KIND)

- In the nominal domain, SO refers back to a kind (Carlson 1977).
- In the verbal domain it refers back to the manner of an event, an event kind.

- Kind anaphora denotes a property of the respective entity (individual, event) that realises a (particular contextually supplied) kind (14) (Anderson and Morzycki 2015).⁴

- (14) $[[\text{so/tak}]] = \lambda k \lambda o : \mathbf{dist}(o, \cup k). \cup k(o)$

- Further empirical support (Landman and Morzycki 2003):

- Spatial and temporal modifiers that have to modify a spatiotemporally located event token are not possible antecedents of SO:

- (15) a. *Maria hat am Dienstag getanzt, und Jan hat auch so getanzt.
 Mary has on Tuesday danced and John has also so danced
- b. *Maria hat in Minnesota gegessen, und Jan hat auch so gegessen.
 Mary has in Minnesota eaten and John has also so eaten

- Spatial modifiers that derive a subkind are acceptable (16).

⁴*o*: objects in general (individuals or events); **dist**: distinguished property, which is manner for events.

- (16) Maria schläft in einem Schlafsack, und Jan schläft auch so.
 Mary sleeps in a sleeping bag and John sleeps also so
 ‘Mary sleeps in a sleeping bag and John sleeps like that too.’

NB: The restrictions on possible antecedents of the event kind anaphora SO directly parallel the restrictions in the nominal domain (cf. Carlson 1977).

⇒ Manner modification is event kind modification: It derives an event subkind.

3 The proposal

- Adding event tokens/kinds and within/between-event comparison:

- Geuder’s focus/script alternatives are the members of the comparison class.
- The VP is the domain of event kinds (following Carlson 2003, see below).
- Manner reading (17-a): Within-event-kind comparison; manner derives an event subkind.
- AO reading (17-b): Between-event-token comparison; the agent instantiates an event kind, that event token is judged to be A (and thus the agent is indirectly judged to be A).

(17) {Stupidly,} John danced {stupidly}.

- John instantiated the stupid dancing event kind.
 $[[[VoiceP \text{ John dance- stupidly}]]] = \lambda e. \mathbf{dance}(e, \mathbf{John}) \wedge^{\cup} k(e) \wedge \mathbf{stupid}(k)$
- John instantiated the dancing event kind; this event token was stupid.
 $[[[VoiceP \text{ John dance- stupidly}]]] = \lambda e. \mathbf{dance}(e, \mathbf{John}) \wedge^{\cup} k(e) \wedge \mathbf{stupid}(e)$

- Events vs. individuals:

- Carlson (1977): Individual objects can be realised by stages, kinds by stages or objects.
 E.g. stages of the individual named John: John at different points in time.
- There are no different stages of an event token at different points in time:
 Event tokens are directly tied to the time-space continuum.
 * Carlson (2003, 204f.): ‘ephemeral, token events “get to” make but one “appearance” in the structure of possible worlds, and then they’re done for’.
- Event kinds only have one kind of realisation, namely event tokens.
- In the domain of events objects and stages necessarily coincide.

- Ascribing a dispositional property by As vs. ADVs:

- To an individual with As: irrespective of space/time (ILP ‘by default’)
- To an event token: necessarily connected to space/time (AO reading)
- To an event kind: necessarily manner (‘distinguished property for event kinds’)

- Making sense of higher/lower position of the ADVs:

E.g. Carlson (2003): The VP level as the domain of event types [\sim event kinds].

- Verbs, which lack argument positions, denote non-functional eventualities.
- At the IP level (propositional semantics), individual-denoting arguments are added and event types are mapped to event tokens, which are members of the set of possible worlds.

⇒ New perspective on some well-known facts, to be discussed in the following.

3.1 Word order and prosody

- Some well-known differences:

- AO but not manner ADVs can be separated from the V by negation (18).
- AO but not manner ADVs can be extraposed to the right (19).
- AO but not manner ADVs readily appear in sentence-initial position (20).

- (18) a. Maria hat {*nicht} **dummerweise** {nicht} geantwortet.
 Mary has not stupid-WEISE not answered
 ‘Stupidly, Mary did not answer.’
 b. Maria hat {nicht} **dumm** {*nicht} geantwortet.
 Mary has not stupid not answered
 ‘Mary did not answer stupidly.’
- (19) a. Maria hat {**dummerweise**} geantwortet, {**dummerweise**}.
 Mary has stupid-WEISE answered stupid-WEISE
 b. Maria hat {**dumm**} geantwortet, {***dumm**}.
 Mary has stupid answered stupid
- (20) a. **Dummerweise** hat Maria geantwortet.
 stupid-WEISE has Mary answered
 b. {***Dumm** / **DUMM**} hat Maria geantwortet.
 stupid stupid has Mary answered

Differences in prosody:

- Manner ADVs are prosodically integrated into the verbal complex (21-a).
- AO ADVs form their own prosodic unit (21-b).

- (21) a. Maria hat [**DUMM** geantwortet].
 Mary has stupid answered
 b. Maria hat [**DUMMerweise**] [geANTwortet].
 Mary has stupid-WEISE answered

- Under the current proposal:

- Event kinds are associated with the VP level; additional elements forming part of an event kind description (e.g. modifiers that derive event subkinds) stay within the VP.
- Event tokens rely on instantiating functional verbal structure; this intervenes between the VP and the event token modifying AO adverb.

NB: The prosodic facts parallel:

- VP-internal PP arguments vs. VP-external PP adjuncts (22) (cf. Gehrke 2008, and references therein)

- (22) a. Maria ist [in den SEE gesprungen]. ‘Mary jumped into the lake.’
 Mary is in the.ACC lake jumped
 b. Maria ist [im SEE] [geSPRUNGen]. ‘Mary jumped inside the lake.’
 Mary is in.the.DAT lake jumped

- Event-kind- vs. state-token-modification of adj. passives (23) (cf. Gehrke 2013, 2015, and references therein)

- (23) a. Die Zeichnung ist [von einem KIND angefertigt]. ‘The drawing is made by a child.’
 the drawing is by a child produced
 b. Er ist [von der MuSÍK] [beËNdrückt]. ‘He is impressed by the music.’
 he is by the music impressed

3.2 Semantics-pragmatics

- Two meaning components of (24):
 - ANSWERING EVENT: Mary answered.
 - STUPID: That/Mary/the answer was stupid.

(24) Mary has stupidly answered.

- Diagnosing at-issue-ness (cf. discussion in Tonhauser 2012):

Test 1 Assent/dissent with positive continuation (to test at-issueness)

- (25) A: Maria hat **dumm** geantwortet.
Mary has stupid answered
B: ?Ja, das stimmt, sie hat geantwortet.
yes that is true she has answered
B': Ja, das stimmt, das/sie/die Antwort war dumm.
yes that is true that/she/the answer was stupid

⇒ Manner reading: ANSWERING EVENT is not at issue, STUPID is at issue.

- (26) A: Maria hat **dummerweise** geantwortet.
Mary has stupid-WEISE answered
B: Ja, das stimmt, sie hat geantwortet.
yes that is true she has answered
B': #Ja, das stimmt, das/sie/die Antwort war dumm.
yes that is true that/she/the answer was stupid

⇒ AO reading: ANSWERING EVENT is at issue, STUPID is not at issue.

Test 2 Assent/dissent with adversative continuation (to test non-at-issueness)

- (27) A: Maria hat **dumm** geantwortet.
Mary has stupid answered
B: #Ja, das stimmt, aber sie hat nicht geantwortet.
yes that is true but she has not answered
B': #Ja, das stimmt, aber das/sie/die Antwort war nicht dumm.
yes that is true but that/she/the answer was not stupid

⇒ Manner reading: neither ANSWERING EVENT nor STUPID behave like they are not at issue.

* Abbott (2000): Manner adverbs presuppose the events they apply to.

→ *answer stupidly* under the manner reading presupposes an answering event.

- (28) A: Maria hat **dummerweise** geantwortet.
Mary has stupid-WEISE answered
B: #Ja, das stimmt, aber sie hat nicht geantwortet.
yes that is true she has answered
B': Ja, das stimmt, aber das/sie/die Antwort war nicht dumm.
yes that is true that/she/the answer was stupid

⇒ AO reading: STUPID is not at issue, ANSWERING EVENT is at issue.

Test 3 Polar questions (testing the QUD that generates alternatives)

- (29) A: Hat Maria **dumm** geantwortet?
has Mary stupid answered
B: ?Ja, sie hat geantwortet.
yes she has answered
B': Ja, das/sie/die Antwort war dumm.
yes that/she/the answer was stupid

⇒ Manner reading: ANSWERING EVENT is not at issue, STUPID is at issue.

- (30) A: Hat Maria **dummerweise** geantwortet?
has Mary stupid(wise) answered
B: Ja, sie hat geantwortet.
yes she has answered
B': #Ja, das/sie/die Antwort war dumm.
yes that/she/the answer was stupid

⇒ AO reading: ANSWERING EVENT is at issue, STUPID is not at issue.

• Under the current proposal:

- Manner ADVs presuppose the event they apply to, the content of the ADV is at issue.

⇒ Assertion of the instantiation of the event subkind derived by the manner ADV

- AO ADVs: The event is at issue, the content of the ADV is not at issue.
- C(onventional) I(mplicature)?
- Side remark in Geuder (2000): AO ADVs are like parentheticals.
- German evaluative ADVs share the morphological make-up with AO ADVs (-weise).⁵
- Parentheticals and evaluative ADVs have been analysed as conveying CI content.
(cf. Potts 2005; Bonami and Godard 2007; Liu 2012)

⇒ Assertion of the instantiation of the event subkind; the ADV evaluates that event token.

4 Conclusion

- The lexical semantics of AO ADVs (e.g. *rudely*) is that of the related dispositional A (e.g. *rude*).
- The interpretation of event-related ADVs involves comparison classes of events:
 - AO ADVs convey CI meaning and evaluate an event token (e.g. *dance*), as compared to other event tokens (e.g. *sing, sit, sleep* etc.).
 - Manner ADVs derive an event subkind (e.g. *dance stupidly*), as compared to other event subkinds of the superordinate event kind (e.g. *dance*).
 - Sentences with manner ADVs assert the instantiation of the respective event subkind and presuppose the superordinate event kind.

⁵Again, the same holds for Japanese; cf. Kubota (2015).

- The event kind/token distinction could shed new light also on other ADVs which can have a manner reading in addition to their clausal reading that is based on the meaning of the related A (cf. discussion in Ernst 2002):

- All subject-oriented adverbs (e.g. mental-attitude adverbs like *reluctantly*)
- Some speaker-oriented adverbs (e.g. *frankly*)
- ‘Dual evaluatives’ (31) (from Ernst 2002), (32) (similar in Japanese; cf. Kubota 2015)

- | | | | |
|------|----|--|------------|
| (31) | a. | Oddly , Carol was dancing. | EVALUATIVE |
| | | Appropriately , the treasury official was named Bill. | |
| | b. | Carol was dancing oddly . | MANNER |
| | | They had named the dog appropriately . | |
| (32) | a. | Carla hat sonderbarerweise getanzt. | EVALUATIVE |
| | | Carla has odd-WEISE danced | |
| | b. | Carla hat sonderbar getanzt. | MANNER |
| | | Carla has odd danced | |

- Why do not all event-related ADVs additionally have manner readings?

E.g. Geuder’s (2000) observation:

- Manner/AO duality found only with *stupidly, cleverly, rudely* etc. (33-a)
- No duality with *intentionally, reluctantly* etc. (only ‘AO’): (33-b) (subject-oriented mental-attitude ADVs in Ernst 2002)

- | | | |
|------|----|--------------------------------------|
| (33) | a. | in a stupid/clever/rude manner |
| | b. | ??in an intentional/reluctant manner |

- The related As are not dispositional (not ILPs) but necessarily SLPs.
- The respective ADVs require event tokens.

Another observation by Geuder (2000): Manner readings are not always possible; cf. (34).

- | | | |
|------|----|---------------------------------|
| (34) | a. | John drove recklessly. |
| | b. | ?John left the room recklessly. |

- Manner readings are only possible if the given event script gives a clue as to what an A event kind could be like.

- General issue: What is a manner adverb? (cf. Schäfer 2005; Geuder 2006, i.a.)

References

- Abbott, Barbara. 2000. Presuppositions as nonassertions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32(10):1419–1437.
- Alexiadou, Artemis. 1997. *Adverb Placement: A Case Study in Antisymmetric Syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Anderson, Curt, and Marcin Morzycki. 2015. Degrees as kinds. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* .
- Asher, Nicholas. 1993. *Reference to Abstract Objects in Discourse*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Bierwisch, Manfred. 1989. The semantics of gradation. In *Dimensional Adjectives: Grammatical Structure and Conceptual Interpretation*, ed. Manfred Bierwisch and Ewald Lang, 71–261. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Bonami, Olivier, and Danièle Godard. 2007. Parentheticals in underspecified semantics: The case of evaluative adverbs. *Research on Language and Computation* 5:391–413.
- Carlson, Greg. 2003. Weak indefinites. In *From NP to DP*, ed. Martine Coene and Yves D’hulst, 195–210. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Carlson, Gregory N. 1977. Reference to Kinds in English. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Published in 1980 by Garland Press, New York.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eckardt, Regine. 1998. *Adverbs, Events, and Other Things: Issues in the Semantics of Manner Adverbs*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Ernst, Thomas. 2002. *The Syntax of Adjuncts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gehrke, Berit. 2008. *Ps in Motion: On the Syntax and Semantics of P Elements and Motion Events*. LOT Dissertation Series 184. Utrecht: LOT.
- Gehrke, Berit. 2013. Still puzzled by adjectival passives? In *Syntax and Its Limits*, ed. Raffaella Folli, Christina Sevdali, and Robert Truswell, 175–191. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Gehrke, Berit. 2015. Adjectival participles, event kind modification and pseudo-incorporation. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* .
- Geuder, Wilhelm. 2000. Oriented Adverbs: Issues in the Lexical Semantics of Event Adverbs. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tübingen.
- Geuder, Wilhelm. 2006. Manner modification of states. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 10*, ed. Christian Ebert and Cornelia Endriss, 111–124. Berlin: ZAS.
- Gumiel-Molina, Silvia, Norberto Moreno-Quibén, and Isabel Pérez-Jiménez. 2015. Comparison classes and the relative/absolute distinction: A degree-based compositional account of the *ser/estar* alternation in Spanish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* .
- Irmer, Matthias, and Olav Mueller-Reichau. 2012. Conditions for the exclusion of *immer noch* in German adjectival passives. Paper presented at Concept Types and Frames in Language, Cognition, and Science (CTF’12), University of Düsseldorf, August 2012.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1972. *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kennedy, Chris. 1999. *Projecting the Adjective: The Syntax and Semantics of Gradability and Comparison*. New York: Garland Press.
- Klein, Ewan. 1980. A semantics for positive and comparative adjectives. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4:1–45.
- Kubota, Ai. 2015. Transforming manner adverbs into subject-oriented adverbs: Evidence from Japanese. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* .
- Landman, Meredith. 2006. Variables in Natural Language. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Landman, Meredith, and Marcin Morzycki. 2003. Event-kinds and manner modification. In *Proceedings of the Western Conference in Linguistics (WECOL) 2002*, ed. Nancy Mae Antrim, Grant Goodall, Martha Schulte-Nafeh, and Vida Samiian, 136–147. California State University, Fresno.
- Liu, Mingya. 2012. *Multidimensional Semantics of Evaluative Adverbs*. Leiden: Brill.

- McConnell-Ginet, Sally. 1973. Comparative Constructions in English: A Syntactic and Semantic Analysis. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Rochester.
- McConnell-Ginet, Sally. 1982. Adverbs and logical form: A linguistically realistic theory. *Language* 58.1:144–184.
- Moore, Robert C. 1995. Events, situations, and adverbs. In *Logic and Representation*, 159–170. Stanford, CA: CLSI Publications. Originally published in 1989.
- Mueller-Reichau, Olav. 2015. Pseudo-incorporation in Russian? Aspectual competition and bare singular interpretation. In *The Syntax and Semantics of Pseudo-Incorporation*, ed. Olga Borik and Berit Gehrke, *Syntax and Semantics* 40, 262–295. Leiden: Brill.
- Nunberg, Geoffrey. 1995. Transfers of meaning. *Journal of Semantics* 12:109–132.
- Parsons, Terence. 1990. *Events in the Semantics of English: A Study in Subatomic Semantics*. Current Studies in Linguistics Series 19. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Piñón, Christopher J. 2010. What to do with agent-oriented adverbs. Paper presented at ‘Speaking of possibility and time’ - The 7th Workshop on Inferential Mechanisms and their Linguistic Manifestation, Göttingen, June 2010.
- Potts, Chris. 2005. *The Logic of Conventional Implicature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pustejovsky, James. 1991. The syntax of event structure. *Cognition* 41:47–81.
- Sassoon, Galit, and Asaf Toledo. 2011. Absolute and relative adjectives and their comparison classes. Ms., University of Amsterdam & Utrecht University.
- Schäfer, Martin. 2005. German Adverbial Adjectives: Syntactic Position and Semantic Interpretation. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Leipzig.
- Schank, Roger C., and Robert P. Abelson. 1977. *Scripts, Plans, Goals, and Understanding: An Inquiry into Human Knowledge Structure*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Toledo, Asaf, and Galit Sassoon. 2011. Absolute vs. relative adjectives: Variance within vs. between individuals. In *Proceedings of SALT 21*, 135–154. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.
- Tonhauser, Judith. 2012. Diagnosing (not-)at-issue content. In *Proceedings of Semantics of Underrepresented Languages of the Americas (SULA) 6*, 239–254. UMass, Amherst: GLSA.
- Vendler, Zeno. 1984. Adverbs of action. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 20:297–307.
- Wyner, Adam Zachary. 1994. Boolean Event Lattices and Thematic Roles in the Syntax and Semantics of Adverbial Modification. Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell University.
- Wyner, Adam Zachary. 1998. Subject-oriented adverbs are thematically dependent. In *Events in Grammar*, ed. Susan Rothstein, 333–348. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Wyner, Adam Zachary. 2008. Towards flexible types with constraints for manner and factive adverbs. In *Adjectives and Adverbs: Syntax, Semantics and Discourse*, ed. Louise McNally and Christopher Kennedy, 249–273. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Berit Gehrke
 CNRS-LLF/Paris Diderot
<http://parles.upf.edu/llocs/bgehrke/>
berit.gehrke@linguist.univ-paris-diderot.fr