

# How to modify idioms

Sascha Bargmann<sup>1</sup>

Berit Gehrke<sup>2</sup>

Frank Richter<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Goethe University Frankfurt a.M.

<sup>2</sup>CNRS-LLF / Paris Diderot & Konstanz

40th Annual DGfS Meeting

Workshop 4:

One-to-many relations in morphology, syntax, and semantics

March 7-9, 2018

# One-to-many relations in idioms

- ▶ Idioms are excellent examples of **one-to-many relations**:

In most cases, the morphosyntactic string that can be interpreted as an idiom can also be interpreted literally  $\Rightarrow$  one form to several meanings.

# One-to-many relations in idioms

- ▶ Idioms are excellent examples of **one-to-many relations**:

In most cases, the morphosyntactic string that can be interpreted as an idiom can also be interpreted literally  $\Rightarrow$  one form to several meanings.

- ▶ This becomes especially obvious in so-called **conjunction modification**:  
The modifier modifies the literal meaning of the idiom's nominal part, while the idiom as a whole is still understood in its idiomatic meaning.

# Idioms and modification

- ▶ At least two groups of idioms:
  - ▶ Non-decomposable, e.g. *tighten one's belt* ( $\approx$  'economize') ( $\approx$  'idiomatic phrases' in Nunberg et al. 1994)
  - ▶ Decomposable, e.g. *jump on the bandwagon* ( $\approx$  'join a movement') ( $\approx$  'idiomatically combining expressions' in Nunberg et al. 1994)

# Idioms and modification

- ▶ At least two groups of idioms:
  - ▶ Non-decomposable, e.g. *tighten one's belt* ( $\approx$  'economize') ( $\approx$  'idiomatic phrases' in Nunberg et al. 1994)
  - ▶ Decomposable, e.g. *jump on the bandwagon* ( $\approx$  'join a movement') ( $\approx$  'idiomatically combining expressions' in Nunberg et al. 1994)
  
- ▶ Both types of idioms allow for modifiers (and other intervening material); e.g. examples in Ernst (1981):
  - (1) a. With the recession, oil companies are having to tighten their **Gucci** belts.
  - b. In spite of its conservatism, many people were eager to jump on the **horse-drawn Reagan** bandwagon.

# Idioms and modification

- ▶ At least two groups of idioms:
  - ▶ Non-decomposable, e.g. *tighten one's belt* ( $\approx$  'economize') ( $\approx$  'idiomatic phrases' in Nunberg et al. 1994)
  - ▶ Decomposable, e.g. *jump on the bandwagon* ( $\approx$  'join a movement') ( $\approx$  'idiomatically combining expressions' in Nunberg et al. 1994)
  
- ▶ Both types of idioms allow for modifiers (and other intervening material); e.g. examples in Ernst (1981):
  - (1) a. With the recession, oil companies are having to tighten their **Gucci** belts.
  - b. In spite of its conservatism, many people were eager to jump on the **horse-drawn Reagan** bandwagon.
  
- ⇒ Neither of the two groups of idioms can be seen as fixed morphosyntactic expressions without internal structure.

# Goals of the talk

1. Take a closer look at Ernst's (1981) three-way distinction of modification in idioms: internal, external, conjunction.
2. Zoom in on conjunction modification with non-decomposable idioms: corpus examples.
3. Raise issues for a clear categorisation of some of these modifiers.
4. Point out other idiom examples (beyond modification) that raise similar and possibly even more severe issues.

[WORK IN PROGRESS]

Ernst (1981)

# Ernst (1981)

- ▶ Modifiers in idioms are principally three-way ambiguous.
  1. External modification
  2. Internal modification
  3. Conjunction modification
  
- Context / world knowledge narrows down the interpretative options given the meaning of the adjective and the internal semantic structure of the idiom.

(For further discussion of modification in idioms, see also Stathi 2007, Cserép 2010, McClure 2011, Sailer 2017, among others)

## External modification (Ernst 1981)

- ▶ The modifier modifies the idiom as a unit (as a whole).
  - The modifier allows for an adverbial paraphrase: (2)
  
- (2) He came apart at the **political** seams. (p. 51)
  - ~ **Politically**, he came apart at the seams.
  - (*come apart at the seams* ≈ 'fail')

## External modification (Ernst 1981)

- ▶ The modifier modifies the idiom as a unit (as a whole).  
→ The modifier allows for an adverbial paraphrase: (2)

(2) He came apart at the **political** seams. (p. 51)  
~ **Politically**, he came apart at the seams.  
(*come apart at the seams* ≈ 'fail')

- ▶ Many “domain delimiters”, but also other modifiers that are not lexically of the same class but can be used as such:

(3) He denied that the Saudis, angry over *Death of a Princess*, were seeking some **celluloid** revenge with a movie of their own. (p. 55)

## External modification (Ernst 1981)

- ▶ The modifier modifies the idiom as a unit (as a whole).  
→ The modifier allows for an adverbial paraphrase: (2)

(2) He came apart at the **political** seams. (p. 51)  
~ **Politically**, he came apart at the seams.  
(*come apart at the seams* ≈ 'fail')

- ▶ Many “domain delimiters”, but also other modifiers that are not lexically of the same class but can be used as such:

(3) He denied that the Saudis, angry over *Death of a Princess*, were seeking some **celluloid** revenge with a movie of their own. (p. 55)

- ▶ Even though *celluloid* is not literally a “domain delimiter”, it functions as one in (3), as it is used in its “figurative” meaning (p. 55 + 61).

## External modification (Ernst 1981)

- ▶ The modifier modifies the idiom as a unit (as a whole).  
→ The modifier allows for an adverbial paraphrase: (2)

(2) He came apart at the **political** seams. (p. 51)  
~ **Politically**, he came apart at the seams.  
(*come apart at the seams* ≈ 'fail')

- ▶ Many “domain delimiters”, but also other modifiers that are not lexically of the same class but can be used as such:

(3) He denied that the Saudis, angry over *Death of a Princess*, were seeking some **celluloid** revenge with a movie of their own. (p. 55)

- ▶ Even though *celluloid* is not literally a “domain delimiter”, it functions as one in (3), as it is used in its “figurative” meaning (p. 55 + 61).

→ External modification is not restricted to one lexical class of adjectives.

# Internal modification (Ernst 1981)

- ▶ The modifier modifies the N on its idiomatic meaning.
- ▶ Possible with a wider range of adjectives:
  - (4) In spite of its conservatism, many people were eager to jump on the **horse-drawn Reagan** bandwagon. (p. 52)  
~ to join the outdated Reagan movement

# Internal modification (Ernst 1981)

- ▶ The modifier modifies the N on its idiomatic meaning.
  - ▶ Possible with a wider range of adjectives:
    - (4) In spite of its conservatism, many people were eager to jump on the **horse-drawn Reagan** bandwagon. (p. 52)  
~ to join the outdated Reagan movement
- ⇒ Our observation (implicitly already in Ernst): Access to the idiomatic meaning of the noun should only be possible with decomposable idioms.

# Conjunction modification (Ernst 1981)

- ▶ The modifier modifies the literally interpreted noun.

- ▶ “in each case there is an additional proposition” (p. 59)

- ▶ “a literary device” (p. 52)

- (5)
- (from an article on the making of the movie *Jaws*)  
Bruce, a shark, found it a part he could really sink his **three rows of teeth** into. (p. 52)  
(*sink one's teeth into* ≈ ‘become fully engaged in’)
  - In spite of the treatment the other refugees received from the rescue party in the desert, he bit his **thirst-swollen** tongue and kept to himself. (p. 59)  
(*bite one's tongue* ≈ ‘stop oneself from saying sth.’)

# Conjunction modification (Ernst 1981)

- ▶ The modifier modifies the literally interpreted noun.
  - ▶ “in each case there is an additional proposition” (p. 59)
  - ▶ “a literary device” (p. 52)
- (5) a. (from an article on the making of the movie *Jaws*)  
 Bruce, a shark, found it a part he could really sink his **three rows of teeth** into. (p. 52)  
*(sink one's teeth into*  $\approx$  ‘become fully engaged in’)
- b. In spite of the treatment the other refugees received from the rescue party in the desert, he bit his **thirst-swollen** tongue and kept to himself. (p. 59)  
*(bite one's tongue*  $\approx$  ‘stop oneself from saying sth.’)
- ▶ In some cases, MOD + N can then be interpreted non-literally again:
- (6) With the recession, oil companies are having to tighten their **Gucci** belts. (p. 60) (reminder: *tighten one's belt*  $\approx$  ‘economize’)

## Ernst's analysis: Two levels of interpretation

- ▶ Simultaneous representation of idiomatic and non-idiomatic meaning, with links between these.
  - ▶ Conjunction modification: (7) & (8) (cp. p. 59f.)

(7) CHECK SPEAKING-CAPACITY  
 BITE HIS THIRST-SWOLLEN TONGUE  
 $\wedge$  HE HAS A THIRST-SWOLLEN TONGUE.  
 He bit his thirst-swollen tongue. (surface string)

(8) ECONOMIZE  
 TIGHTEN THEIR GUCCI BELTS  $\wedge$  THEY HAVE GUCCI BELTS.  
 With the recession, oil companies are having to tighten their Gucci belts.

## Ernst's analysis: Two levels of interpretation

- ▶ Simultaneous representation of idiomatic and non-idiomatic meaning, with links between these.

- ▶ Conjunction modification: (7) & (8) (cp. p. 59f.)

(7) CHECK SPEAKING-CAPACITY  
 BITE HIS THIRST-SWOLLEN TONGUE  
 He bit his thirst-swollen tongue. (surface string)  
 $\wedge$  HE HAS A THIRST-SWOLLEN TONGUE.

(8) ECONOMIZE  
 TIGHTEN THEIR GUCCI BELTS  $\wedge$  THEY HAVE GUCCI BELTS.  
 With the recession, oil companies are having to tighten their Gucci belts.

- ▶ Internal modification: (9) (cp. p. 58)

(9) JOIN CAUSE/MOVEMENT  
 JUMP ON [THE HORSE-DRAWN REAGAN BANDWAGON]  
 Jump on the horse-drawn Reagan bandwagon.

- ▶ no illustration of external modification

# Conjunction Modification

# Our take on conjunction modification

# Our take on conjunction modification

- ▶ Conjunction modification is sometimes discounted as “word play”.

# Our take on conjunction modification

- ▶ Conjunction modification is sometimes discounted as “word play”.
  - ▶ Is it really “word play”? What is “word play”? How do you define it?

# Our take on conjunction modification

- ▶ Conjunction modification is sometimes discounted as “word play”.
  - ▶ Is it really “word play”? What is “word play”? How do you define it?
  - ▶ And even if conjunction modification is “word play”, it is still part of language, and the question of how the A-N composition leads to the interpretation(s) that we get remains.
    - ▶ “Word play” should not be a sign on a linguistic trash can.

# Our take on conjunction modification

- ▶ Conjunction modification is sometimes discounted as “word play”.
  - ▶ Is it really “word play”? What is “word play”? How do you define it?
  - ▶ And even if conjunction modification is “word play”, it is still part of language, and the question of how the A-N composition leads to the interpretation(s) that we get remains.
    - ▶ “Word play” should not be a sign on a linguistic trash can.
- ▶ If conjunction modification, as Ernst claims, adds an additional proposition, conjunction modification should be non-restrictive.

# Our take on conjunction modification

- ▶ Conjunction modification is sometimes discounted as “word play”.
  - ▶ Is it really “word play”? What is “word play”? How do you define it?
  - ▶ And even if conjunction modification is “word play”, it is still part of language, and the question of how the A-N composition leads to the interpretation(s) that we get remains.
    - ▶ “Word play” should not be a sign on a linguistic trash can.
- ▶ If conjunction modification, as Ernst claims, adds an additional proposition, conjunction modification should be non-restrictive.
- ▶ Non-decomposable idioms should only allow for conjunction and external modification, as internal modification requires access to the idiomatic meaning of the noun, which non-decomposable idioms cannot offer.

# Our take on conjunction modification

- ▶ Conjunction modification is sometimes discounted as “word play”.
    - ▶ Is it really “word play”? What is “word play”? How do you define it?
    - ▶ And even if conjunction modification is “word play”, it is still part of language, and the question of how the A-N composition leads to the interpretation(s) that we get remains.
      - ▶ “Word play” should not be a sign on a linguistic trash can.
  - ▶ If conjunction modification, as Ernst claims, adds an additional proposition, conjunction modification should be non-restrictive.
  - ▶ Non-decomposable idioms should only allow for conjunction and external modification, as internal modification requires access to the idiomatic meaning of the noun, which non-decomposable idioms cannot offer.
- ⇒ Let’s take a set of idioms where people tend to agree that they are non-decomposable and check which modifiers we can interpret as conjunction modification.

## Our set of non-decomposable idioms

- ▶ We chose two English and two German non-decomposable idioms. All of them mean 'die':

- (10) a. kick the bucket  
 b. bite the dust

- (11) a. den Löffel abgeben  
 the.ACC spoon on-pass  
 b. ins Gras beißen  
 in-the.ACC grass bite

We searched for occurrences of these idioms in combination with modifiers using the COW corpora at [webcorpora.org](http://webcorpora.org).

# Conjunction modification with these idioms

(building on Ernst 1981)

# Conjunction modification with these idioms

(building on Ernst 1981)

1. There is a main proposition  $p_1$ , which includes DIE(x).  
DIE(x) can be interpreted as 'x physiologically dies'  
or 'x stops functioning' or 'x comes to an end' or ...

→*id*

# Conjunction modification with these idioms

(building on Ernst 1981)

1. There is a main proposition  $p_1$ , which includes DIE(x).  
DIE(x) can be interpreted as 'x physiologically dies'  
or 'x stops functioning' or 'x comes to an end' or ...

→*id*

2. There is a secondary proposition  $p_2$ , which can take on two forms:

- ▶ x has an A N.
- ▶ N is A.

# Conjunction modification with these idioms

(building on Ernst 1981)

1. There is a main proposition  $p_1$ , which includes DIE(x).  $\rightarrow id$   
 DIE(x) can be interpreted as 'x physiologically dies'  
 or 'x stops functioning' or 'x comes to an end' or ...
  
2. There is a secondary proposition  $p_2$ , which can take on two forms:
  - ▶ x has an A N.
  - ▶ N is A.
  
3. Sometimes, one or two further steps are necessary:
  - ▶ Interpreting 'A N / N is A' figuratively (e.g. *Gucci belts*)  $\rightarrow fig$
  - ▶ and/or drawing inferences from 'A N / N is A'  $\rightsquigarrow inf$

## Fairly clear cases of conjunction modification

- (12) Venezuela's Friend of the Working Class, Hugo Chavez, **kicked the golden bucket** with an estimated net worth of 2 billion dollars.

## Fairly clear cases of conjunction modification

- (12) Venezuela's Friend of the Working Class, Hugo Chavez, **kicked the golden bucket** with an estimated net worth of 2 billion dollars.

$p_1$ : Hugo Chavez kicked the bucket.  
 $\rightarrow_{id}$  Hugo Chavez died.

## Fairly clear cases of conjunction modification

(12) Venezuela's Friend of the Working Class, Hugo Chavez, **kicked the golden bucket** with an estimated net worth of 2 billion dollars.

$p_1$ : Hugo Chavez kicked the bucket.

$\rightarrow_{id}$  Hugo Chavez died.

$p_2$ : Hugo Chavez had a golden bucket.

$\rightarrow_{fig}$  Hugo Chavez was rich.

## Fairly clear cases of conjunction modification

- (12) Venezuela's Friend of the Working Class, Hugo Chavez, **kicked the golden bucket** with an estimated net worth of 2 billion dollars.

$p_1$ : Hugo Chavez kicked the bucket.

$\rightarrow_{id}$  Hugo Chavez died.

$p_2$ : Hugo Chavez had a golden bucket.

$\rightarrow_{fig}$  Hugo Chavez was rich.

(similar to the Gucci belt example)

## Fairly clear cases of conjunction modification

- (13) It was the great Trinity of the French Revolution, and you can still see it carved in stone over town halls and elsewhere in France: 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity'. But the greatest of these, it turns out, is 'Equality'. 'Liberty' soon **bit the blood-spattered dust** along with 'Fraternity' as the drive to the unattainable goal of 'Equality' took over as it was bound to do.

## Fairly clear cases of conjunction modification

- (13) It was the great Trinity of the French Revolution, and you can still see it carved in stone over town halls and elsewhere in France: 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity'. But the greatest of these, it turns out, is 'Equality'. 'Liberty' soon **bit the blood-spattered dust** along with 'Fraternity' as the drive to the unattainable goal of 'Equality' took over as it was bound to do.

$p_1$ : 'Liberty' soon bit the dust.

$\rightarrow_{id}$  'Liberty' soon died.

(interpreted as 'was soon given up as a goal')

## Fairly clear cases of conjunction modification

- (13) It was the great Trinity of the French Revolution, and you can still see it carved in stone over town halls and elsewhere in France: ‘Liberty, Equality, Fraternity’. But the greatest of these, it turns out, is ‘Equality’. ‘Liberty’ soon **bit the blood-spattered dust** along with ‘Fraternity’ as the drive to the unattainable goal of ‘Equality’ took over as it was bound to do.

$p_1$ : ‘Liberty’ soon bit the dust.

$\rightarrow_{id}$  ‘Liberty’ soon died.

(interpreted as ‘was soon given up as a goal’)

$p_2$ : The dust was blood-spattered.

$\rightsquigarrow_{inf}$  (in the French Revolution context:) Many people died.

## Fairly clear cases of conjunction modification

(Background: Vincent Raven is a 'mentalist' who can bend spoons by sheer mental power, and ProSieben is a German TV channel.)

- (14) Oder Vincent Raven aus Uri Gellers ProSieben-Sendung, der einen Unfall hatte und beinahe **den verbogenen Löffel abgegeben** hätte.  
'Or Vincent Raven from Uri Geller's show on ProSieben, who had an accident and almost **passed on the bent spoon.**'

## Fairly clear cases of conjunction modification

(Background: Vincent Raven is a 'mentalist' who can bend spoons by sheer mental power, and ProSieben is a German TV channel.)

(14) Oder Vincent Raven aus Uri Gellers ProSieben-Sendung, der einen Unfall hatte und beinahe **den verbogenen Löffel abgegeben** hätte.

'Or Vincent Raven from Uri Geller's show on ProSieben, who had an accident and almost **passed on the bent spoon.**'

$p_1$ : Vincent Raven almost passed on the spoon.  
 $\rightarrow_{id}$  Vincent Raven almost died.

## Fairly clear cases of conjunction modification

(Background: Vincent Raven is a ‘mentalist’ who can bend spoons by sheer mental power, and ProSieben is a German TV channel.)

(14) Oder Vincent Raven aus Uri Gellers ProSieben-Sendung, der einen Unfall hatte und beinahe **den verbogenen Löffel abgegeben** hätte.

‘Or Vincent Raven from Uri Geller’s show on ProSieben, who had an accident and almost **passed on the bent spoon.**’

$p_1$ : Vincent Raven almost passed on the spoon.  
 $\rightarrow_{id}$  Vincent Raven almost died.

$p_2$ : Vincent Raven has a bent spoon.  
 $\rightsquigarrow_{inf}$  Vincent Raven bends spoons.

## Fairly clear cases of conjunction modification

- (15) Der vorbedachte Hauswirt hat für die Bedürfnisse seiner Gäste bestens gesorgt. Mehrere Häslein mussten fürs Bauerngericht **ins schneeige Gras beißen** und ein Schwein und Kalb das Leben lassen.

'The thoughtful landlord took perfect care of his guests' needs. For the farmer's dish, several little rabbits had to **bite into the snowy grass**, and a pig and a calf had to give their lives as well.'

## Fairly clear cases of conjunction modification

- (15) Der vorbedachte Hauswirt hat für die Bedürfnisse seiner Gäste bestens gesorgt. Mehrere Häslein mussten fürs Bauerngericht **ins schneeige Gras beißen** und ein Schwein und Kalb das Leben lassen.

'The thoughtful landlord took perfect care of his guests' needs. For the farmer's dish, several little rabbits had to **bite into the snowy grass**, and a pig and a calf had to give their lives as well.'

$p_1$ : Several little rabbits had to bite into the grass.

$\rightarrow_{id}$  Several little rabbits had to die.

## Fairly clear cases of conjunction modification

- (15) Der vorbedachte Hauswirt hat für die Bedürfnisse seiner Gäste bestens gesorgt. Mehrere Häslein mussten fürs Bauerngericht **ins schneeige Gras beißen** und ein Schwein und Kalb das Leben lassen.

'The thoughtful landlord took perfect care of his guests' needs. For the farmer's dish, several little rabbits had to **bite into the snowy grass**, and a pig and a calf had to give their lives as well.'

$p_1$ : Several little rabbits had to bite into the grass.

$\rightarrow_{id}$  Several little rabbits had to die.

$p_2$ : The grass was snowy.

$\rightsquigarrow_{inf}$  It was cold and wintry outside.

# Conjunction modification with relative clauses

(non-restrictive relative clauses)

- (16) Und während die ausgesperrten siebenunddreißig Reiter ein zorniges Geschrei erhoben, kam es innerhalb des Tores zwischen der Besatzung des Grenzwalles und den drei Abgeschnittenen zu einem Scharmützel, in dem der heilige Zeno Sieger blieb; aber zwei von seinen Soldknechten mußten **ins Gras beißen, das bei dieser mitternächtigen Finsternis kaum zu sehen war.**

‘And while the locked out thirty-seven horsemen clamored furiously, there was a skirmish within the gateway between the garrison of the boundary wall and the three horsemen that had been cut off, in which Saint Zeno was victorious; but two of his mercenaries had to **bite into the grass, which was hardly visible in this midnight darkness.**’

# Conjunction modification with relative clauses

(non-restrictive relative clauses)

- (16) Und während die ausgesperrten siebenunddreißig Reiter ein zorniges Geschrei erhoben, kam es innerhalb des Tores zwischen der Besatzung des Grenzwalles und den drei Abgeschnittenen zu einem Scharmützel, in dem der heilige Zeno Sieger blieb; aber zwei von seinen Soldknechten mußten **ins Gras beißen, das bei dieser mitternächtigen Finsternis kaum zu sehen war.**

'And while the locked out thirty-seven horsemen clamored furiously, there was a skirmish within the gateway between the garrison of the boundary wall and the three horsemen that had been cut off, in which Saint Zeno was victorious; but two of his mercenaries had to **bite into the grass, which was hardly visible in this midnight darkness.**'

- p<sub>1</sub>: Two of his mercenaries had to bite into the grass.  
 →<sub>id</sub> Two of his mercenaries had to die.

# Conjunction modification with relative clauses

(non-restrictive relative clauses)

- (16) Und während die ausgesperrten siebenunddreißig Reiter ein zorniges Geschrei erhoben, kam es innerhalb des Tores zwischen der Besatzung des Grenzwalles und den drei Abgeschnittenen zu einem Scharmützel, in dem der heilige Zeno Sieger blieb; aber zwei von seinen Soldknechten mußten **ins Gras beißen, das bei dieser mitternächtigen Finsternis kaum zu sehen war.**

'And while the locked out thirty-seven horsemen clamored furiously, there was a skirmish within the gateway between the garrison of the boundary wall and the three horsemen that had been cut off, in which Saint Zeno was victorious; but two of his mercenaries had to **bite into the grass, which was hardly visible in this midnight darkness.**'

$p_1$ : Two of his mercenaries had to bite into the grass.

$\rightarrow_{id}$  Two of his mercenaries had to die.

$p_2$ : The grass was hardly visible in this midnight darkness.

$\rightsquigarrow_{inf}$  It was midnight and very dark.

## Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

(Background: Gid as a hypothetical God-like creature)

- (17) He is presumably mortal himself; at least, being a creature of this universe, when (if) it collapses back to a mathematical point again (called the “Big Crunch”), Gid would die then, if he hasn't already **kicked the celestial bucket**.

# Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

(Background: Gid as a hypothetical God-like creature)

- (17) He is presumably mortal himself; at least, being a creature of this universe, when (if) it collapses back to a mathematical point again (called the “Big Crunch”), Gid would die then, if he hasn’t already **kicked the celestial bucket**.

$p_{-mod}$ : ... if Gid hasn’t already kicked the bucket.

$\rightarrow_{id}$  ... if Gid hasn’t already died.

# Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

(Background: Gid as a hypothetical God-like creature)

- (17) He is presumably mortal himself; at least, being a creature of this universe, when (if) it collapses back to a mathematical point again (called the “Big Crunch”), Gid would die then, if he hasn’t already **kicked the celestial bucket**.

$p_{-mod}$ : ... if Gid hasn’t already kicked the bucket.

$\rightarrow_{id}$  ... if Gid hasn’t already died.

Sascha’s & Frank’s interpretation:

$p_2$ : Gid has a celestial bucket.

$\rightsquigarrow_{inf}$  Gid is a celestial being. [Frank: with some additional effort]

# Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

(Background: Gid as a hypothetical God-like creature)

- (17) He is presumably mortal himself; at least, being a creature of this universe, when (if) it collapses back to a mathematical point again (called the “Big Crunch”), Gid would die then, if he hasn’t already **kicked the celestial bucket**.

$p_{-mod}$ : ... if Gid hasn’t already kicked the bucket.

$\rightarrow_{id}$  ... if Gid hasn’t already died.

Sascha’s & Frank’s interpretation:

$p_2$ : Gid has a celestial bucket.

$\rightsquigarrow_{inf}$  Gid is a celestial being. [Frank: with some additional effort]

Berit’s interpretation:

... if Gid hasn’t already kicked the bucket in the celestial domain.  $\sim$  ... if he hasn’t already ceased to exist as a celestial entity. (external modification)

# Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

(Background: Gid as a hypothetical God-like creature)

- (17) He is presumably mortal himself; at least, being a creature of this universe, when (if) it collapses back to a mathematical point again (called the “Big Crunch”), Gid would die then, if he hasn’t already **kicked the celestial bucket**.

$p_{-mod}$ : ... if Gid hasn’t already kicked the bucket.  
 $\rightarrow_{id}$  ... if Gid hasn’t already died.

Sascha’s & Frank’s interpretation:

$p_2$ : Gid has a celestial bucket.

$\rightsquigarrow_{inf}$  Gid is a celestial being. [Frank: with some additional effort]

Berit’s interpretation:

... if Gid hasn’t already kicked the bucket in the celestial domain.  $\sim$  ... if he hasn’t already ceased to exist as a celestial entity. (external modification)

Frank’s additional interpretation possibility:

... if Gid hasn’t died a very special, celestial death (not your ordinary, run-off-the-mill death, but much more spectacular). (external?)

## Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

(Background: BJU is Bob Jones University, a Christian university)

- (18) BJU may soon join the ranks of “former” Fundamentalist schools that have **bit[ten] the New-Evangelical dust**, a position that eventually winds up at the door of apostasy!

# Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

(Background: BJU is Bob Jones University, a Christian university)

- (18) BJU may soon join the ranks of “former” Fundamentalist schools that have **bit[ten] the New-Evangelical dust**, a position that eventually winds up at the door of apostasy!

$p_{-mod}$ : Fundamentalist schools have bitten the dust.

$\rightarrow_{id}$  Fundamentalist schools have died.

(interpreted as ‘have ceased to be Fundamentalist’)

# Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

(Background: BJU is Bob Jones University, a Christian university)

- (18) BJU may soon join the ranks of “former” Fundamentalist schools that have **bit[ten] the New-Evangelical dust**, a position that eventually winds up at the door of apostasy!

$p_{-mod}$ : Fundamentalist schools have bitten the dust.

$\rightarrow_{id}$  Fundamentalist schools have died.

(interpreted as ‘have ceased to be Fundamentalist’)

Sascha’s interpretation:

$p_2$ : The dust was New-Evangelical.

$\rightsquigarrow_{inf}$  The New-Evangelicals already ruled the place.

(with *dust* as the ground/turf on which the battle took place)

# Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

(Background: BJU is Bob Jones University, a Christian university)

- (18) BJU may soon join the ranks of “former” Fundamentalist schools that have **bit[ten] the New-Evangelical dust**, a position that eventually winds up at the door of apostasy!

$p_{-mod}$ : Fundamentalist schools have bitten the dust.

$\rightarrow_{id}$  Fundamentalist schools have died.

(interpreted as ‘have ceased to be Fundamentalist’)

Sascha’s interpretation:

$p_2$ : The dust was New-Evangelical.

$\rightsquigarrow_{inf}$  The New-Evangelicals already ruled the place.

(with *dust* as the ground/turf on which the battle took place)

Berit’s interpretation:

Fundamentalist schools ceased to exist as Fundamentalist schools **because** of some New-Evangelical trend? (more like **external** then, but not like Ernst’s examples)

# Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

(Background: BJU is Bob Jones University, a Christian university)

- (18) BJU may soon join the ranks of “former” Fundamentalist schools that have **bit[ten] the New-Evangelical dust**, a position that eventually winds up at the door of apostasy!

$p_{-mod}$ : Fundamentalist schools have bitten the dust.

$\rightarrow_{id}$  Fundamentalist schools have died.

(interpreted as ‘have ceased to be Fundamentalist’)

Sascha’s interpretation:

$p_2$ : The dust was New-Evangelical.

$\rightsquigarrow_{inf}$  The New-Evangelicals already ruled the place.

(with *dust* as the ground/turf on which the battle took place)

Berit’s interpretation:

Fundamentalist schools ceased to exist as Fundamentalist schools **because** of some New-Evangelical trend? (more like **external** then, but not like Ernst’s examples)

(Frank: both are possible)

## Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

(Background: giardia are pear-shaped parasites)

(19) Hi, die Giardien sollen doch bei 60-70 °C **ihren birnenförmigen Löffel abgeben**. Warum muss ich dann meine Bettwäsche bei 90 °C kochen?

Hi, the giardia are supposed to **pass on their pear-shaped spoon** at 60-70 °C. Why do I have to wash my sheets at 90 °C then?

## Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

(Background: giardia are pear-shaped parasites)

(19) Hi, die Giardien sollen doch bei 60-70 °C **ihren birnenförmigen Löffel abgeben**. Warum muss ich dann meine Bettwäsche bei 90 °C kochen?

Hi, the giardia are supposed to **pass on their pear-shaped spoon** at 60-70 °C. Why do I have to wash my sheets at 90 °C then?

*p-mod*: The giardia are supposed to pass on the spoon at 60-70 °C.

→*id* The giardia are supposed to die at 60-70 °C.

# Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

(Background: giardia are pear-shaped parasites)

(19) Hi, die Giardien sollen doch bei 60-70 °C **ihren birnenförmigen Löffel abgeben**. Warum muss ich dann meine Bettwäsche bei 90 °C kochen?

Hi, the giardia are supposed to **pass on their pear-shaped spoon** at 60-70 °C. Why do I have to wash my sheets at 90 °C then?

$p_{-mod}$ : The giardia are supposed to pass on the spoon at 60-70 °C.  
 $\rightarrow_{id}$  The giardia are supposed to die at 60-70 °C.

Sascha's interpretation:

$p_2$ : The giardia have pear-shaped spoons.  $\rightsquigarrow_{inf}$  The giardia are pear-shaped.

# Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

(Background: giardia are pear-shaped parasites)

(19) Hi, die Giardien sollen doch bei 60-70 °C **ihren birnenförmigen Löffel abgeben**. Warum muss ich dann meine Bettwäsche bei 90 °C kochen?

Hi, the giardia are supposed to **pass on their pear-shaped spoon** at 60-70 °C. Why do I have to wash my sheets at 90 °C then?

$p_{-mod}$ : The giardia are supposed to pass on the spoon at 60-70 °C.  
 $\rightarrow_{id}$  The giardia are supposed to die at 60-70 °C.

Sascha's interpretation:

$p_2$ : The giardia have pear-shaped spoons.  $\rightsquigarrow_{inf}$  The giardia are pear-shaped.

Berit:

How do we compositionally get from the giardia (literally or metaphorically) having pear-shaped spoons to them being pear-shaped (without spoons now)?

# Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

(Background: giardia are pear-shaped parasites)

(19) Hi, die Giardien sollen doch bei 60-70 °C **ihren birnenförmigen Löffel abgeben**. Warum muss ich dann meine Bettwäsche bei 90 °C kochen?

Hi, the giardia are supposed to **pass on their pear-shaped spoon** at 60-70 °C. Why do I have to wash my sheets at 90 °C then?

$p_{-mod}$ : The giardia are supposed to pass on the spoon at 60-70 °C.  
 $\rightarrow_{id}$  The giardia are supposed to die at 60-70 °C.

Sascha's interpretation:

$p_2$ : The giardia have pear-shaped spoons.  $\rightsquigarrow_{inf}$  The giardia are pear-shaped.

Berit:

How do we compositionally get from the giardia (literally or metaphorically) having pear-shaped spoons to them being pear-shaped (without spoons now)?

Yet, the meaning we get is still: And, by the way, the giardia are pear-shaped.  
 $\rightarrow$  non-restrictive, but does not fit into any of the three categories.

**modification of the possessor?** (how would that work compositionally?)

## Ernst's (1981) 'displaced epithets' (p. 66)

(20) I balanced a **thoughtful** lump of sugar on the teaspoon.  
(P.G. Woodhouse, cited in Hall, 1973)

- ▶ From this example we conclude that the speaker was thoughtful (not the lump of sugar).

## Ernst's (1981) 'displaced epithets' (p. 66)

(20) I balanced a **thoughtful** lump of sugar on the teaspoon.  
(P.G. Woodhouse, cited in Hall, 1973)

- ▶ From this example we conclude that the speaker was thoughtful (not the lump of sugar).

→ Are the giardia's pear-shaped spoons of this kind?

## Ernst's (1981) 'displaced epithets' (p. 66)

(20) I balanced a **thoughtful** lump of sugar on the teaspoon.  
(P.G. Woodhouse, cited in Hall, 1973)

- ▶ From this example we conclude that the speaker was thoughtful (not the lump of sugar).

→ Are the giardia's pear-shaped spoons of this kind?

- ▶ But also then: How would this work compositionally?
  - ▶ How do we get from the speaker having (as part of balancing) a thoughtful lump of sugar to the speaker being thoughtful?
  - ▶ How do we get from the giardia having pear-shaped spoons to the giardia being pear-shaped?

## Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

- (21) Auch die deutsche Geschichte mag im Gesamten alles Andere als rosig sein, doch ich lebe in diesem Staate und somit MIT seiner Vergangenheit, seiner Gegenwart und höchstwahrscheinlich auch zukünftig, was da heissen wird, dass ich eines Tages **in deutsches Gras beissen** werde.

German history as a whole may be anything but rosy as well, but I live in this country and thus WITH its past, its present and most likely also in the future, which means that one day I will **bite into German grass**.

## Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

- (21) Auch die deutsche Geschichte mag im Gesamten alles Andere als rosig sein, doch ich lebe in diesem Staate und somit MIT seiner Vergangenheit, seiner Gegenwart und höchstwahrscheinlich auch zukünftig, was da heissen wird, dass ich eines Tages **in deutsches Gras beissen** werde.

German history as a whole may be anything but rosy as well, but I live in this country and thus WITH its past, its present and most likely also in the future, which means that one day I will **bite into German grass**.

$p_{-mod}$ : One day, I will bite into the grass.  
 $\rightarrow_{id}$  One day, I will die.

## Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

- (21) Auch die deutsche Geschichte mag im Gesamten alles Andere als rosig sein, doch ich lebe in diesem Staate und somit MIT seiner Vergangenheit, seiner Gegenwart und höchstwahrscheinlich auch zukünftig, was da heissen wird, dass ich eines Tages **in deutsches Gras beissen** werde.

German history as a whole may be anything but rosy as well, but I live in this country and thus WITH its past, its present and most likely also in the future, which means that one day I will **bite into German grass**.

$p_{-mod}$ : One day, I will bite into the grass.  
 $\rightarrow_{id}$  One day, I will die.

Sascha's interpretation:

$p_2$ : The grass will be German.  $\rightsquigarrow_{inf}$  The location will be Germany.

## Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

- (21) Auch die deutsche Geschichte mag im Gesamten alles Andere als rosig sein, doch ich lebe in diesem Staate und somit MIT seiner Vergangenheit, seiner Gegenwart und höchstwahrscheinlich auch zukünftig, was da heissen wird, dass ich eines Tages **in deutsches Gras beissen** werde.

German history as a whole may be anything but rosy as well, but I live in this country and thus WITH its past, its present and most likely also in the future, which means that one day I will **bite into German grass**.

$p_{-mod}$ : One day, I will bite into the grass.  
 $\rightarrow_{id}$  One day, I will die.

Sascha's interpretation:

$p_2$ : The grass will be German.  $\rightsquigarrow_{inf}$  The location will be Germany.

Berit's interpretation:

I will die in Germany.  $\rightarrow$  *restrictive* [therefore not conjunction] modification specifying the location of the event as a whole **external?** (but unlike Ernst's examples)

## Not clear: external, conjunction, both, neither?

- (21) Auch die deutsche Geschichte mag im Gesamten alles Andere als rosig sein, doch ich lebe in diesem Staate und somit MIT seiner Vergangenheit, seiner Gegenwart und höchstwahrscheinlich auch zukünftig, was da heissen wird, dass ich eines Tages **in deutsches Gras beissen** werde.

German history as a whole may be anything but rosy as well, but I live in this country and thus WITH its past, its present and most likely also in the future, which means that one day I will **bite into German grass**.

$p_{-mod}$ : One day, I will bite into the grass.  
 $\rightarrow_{id}$  One day, I will die.

Sascha's interpretation:

$p_2$ : The grass will be German.  $\rightsquigarrow_{inf}$  The location will be Germany.

Berit's interpretation:

I will die in Germany.  $\rightarrow$  *restrictive* [therefore not conjunction] modification specifying the location of the event as a whole **external?** (but unlike Ernst's examples)

Frank's additional interpretation possibility: ... and one day I will die as a true German. **external?** (in the domain of all things truly German?)

More problematic data

## Substitution of the N: How to analyse this?

(Background: comment on *The Descent Part 2*, a 2009 British horror film)

(22) [...] wieder ist es in der Höhle meist viel zu hell, und schon wieder mutieren die überlebenden Damen zu wahren Kampfmaschinen, nur um dann doch allesamt **ins Gras respektive ins Höhlengestein beißen** zu müssen.

‘Again, it is way too bright inside the cave most of the time, and again the surviving ladies mutate into true battle machines, but in the end they still have to **bite into the grass, respectively the cave rock(s)**.’

# Substitution of the N: How to analyse this?

(Background: comment on *The Descent Part 2*, a 2009 British horror film)

(22) [...] wieder ist es in der Höhle meist viel zu hell, und schon wieder mutieren die überlebenden Damen zu wahren Kampfmaschinen, nur um dann doch allesamt **ins Gras respektive ins Höhlengestein beißen** zu müssen.

‘Again, it is way too bright inside the cave most of the time, and again the surviving ladies mutate into true battle machines, but in the end they still have to **bite into the grass, respectively the cave rock(s)**.’

p<sub>1???</sub>: The ladies have to bite into the grass.

→<sub>id</sub> The ladies have to die.

## Substitution of the N: How to analyse this?

(Background: comment on *The Descent Part 2*, a 2009 British horror film)

- (22) [...] wieder ist es in der Höhle meist viel zu hell, und schon wieder mutieren die überlebenden Damen zu wahren Kampfmaschinen, nur um dann doch allesamt **ins Gras respektive ins Höhlengestein beißen** zu müssen.

‘Again, it is way too bright inside the cave most of the time, and again the surviving ladies mutate into true battle machines, but in the end they still have to **bite into the grass, respectively the cave rock(s)**.’

p<sub>1???</sub>: The ladies have to bite into the grass.

→<sub>id</sub> The ladies have to die.

p<sub>2???</sub>: The ladies have to bite into the cave rock(s).

↔<sub>inf</sub> The ladies have to die on/in-between cave rock(s).

## Substitution of the N: How to analyse this?

(Background: comment on *The Descent Part 2*, a 2009 British horror film)

(22) [...] wieder ist es in der Höhle meist viel zu hell, und schon wieder mutieren die überlebenden Damen zu wahren Kampfmaschinen, nur um dann doch allesamt **ins Gras** **respektive ins Höhlengestein** **beißen** zu müssen.

‘Again, it is way too bright inside the cave most of the time, and again the surviving ladies mutate into true battle machines, but in the end they still have to **bite into the grass, respectively the cave rock(s)**.’

$p_{1???}$ : The ladies have to bite into the grass.

→<sub>id</sub> The ladies have to die.

$p_{2???}$ : The ladies have to bite into the cave rock(s).

↔<sub>inf</sub> The ladies have to die on/in-between cave rock(s).

**This is the inference we draw but how do we get there compositionally?**

## Substitution of the N: How to analyse this?

(23) Das soll er doch gesagt haben, der gute Caesar[,] bevor er **statt ins Gras in den Marmorboden vom Senat gebissen hat**.

'He is supposed to have said that, our good old Caesar, before he **bit into the marble floor of the Senate rather than the grass**.'

## Substitution of the N: How to analyse this?

(23) Das soll er doch gesagt haben, der gute Caesar[, ] bevor er **statt ins Gras in den Marmorboden vom Senat gebissen hat**.

'He is supposed to have said that, our good old Caesar, before he **bit into the marble floor of the Senate rather than the grass**.'

p???: Caesar bit into the grass.  
→<sub>id</sub> Caesar died.

## Substitution of the N: How to analyse this?

(23) Das soll er doch gesagt haben, der gute Caesar[,] bevor er **statt ins Gras in den Marmorboden vom Senat gebissen hat**.

'He is supposed to have said that, our good old Caesar, before he **bit into the marble floor of the Senate rather than the grass**.'

p???: Caesar bit into the grass.

→<sub>id</sub> Caesar died.

**BUT:** This is not what the text actually says; it says that Caesar did NOT bite into the grass (due to 'rather than').

## Substitution of the N: How to analyse this?

(23) Das soll er doch gesagt haben, der gute Caesar[,] bevor er **statt ins Gras in den Marmorboden vom Senat gebissen hat**.

'He is supposed to have said that, our good old Caesar, before he **bit into the marble floor of the Senate rather than the grass**.'

p???: Caesar bit into the grass.

→<sub>id</sub> Caesar died.

**BUT:** This is not what the text actually says; it says that Caesar did NOT bite into the grass (due to 'rather than').

p???: Instead of biting into the grass Caesar bit into the marble floor of the Senate.

# Substitution of the N: How to analyse this?

(23) Das soll er doch gesagt haben, der gute Caesar[,] bevor er **statt ins Gras in den Marmorboden vom Senat gebissen hat**.

'He is supposed to have said that, our good old Caesar, before he **bit into the marble floor of the Senate rather than the grass**.'

p???: Caesar bit into the grass.

→<sub>id</sub> Caesar died.

**BUT:** This is not what the text actually says; it says that Caesar did NOT bite into the grass (due to 'rather than').

p???: Instead of biting into the grass Caesar bit into the marble floor of the Senate.

→<sub>id</sub> Instead of dying Caesar bit into the marble floor of the Senate.  
(but what does that mean???)

## Substitution of the N: How to analyse this?

(23) Das soll er doch gesagt haben, der gute Caesar[,] bevor er **statt ins Gras in den Marmorboden vom Senat gebissen hat**.

'He is supposed to have said that, our good old Caesar, before he **bit into the marble floor of the Senate rather than the grass**.'

p???: Caesar bit into the grass.

→<sub>id</sub> Caesar died.

**BUT:** This is not what the text actually says; it says that Caesar did NOT bite into the grass (due to 'rather than').

p???: Instead of biting into the grass Caesar bit into the marble floor of the Senate.

→<sub>id</sub> Instead of dying Caesar bit into the marble floor of the Senate.  
(but what does that mean???)

↪<sub>inf</sub> Instead of dying on grass, Caesar died on the marble floor of the Senate.

## Substitution of the N: How to analyse this?

(23) Das soll er doch gesagt haben, der gute Caesar[,] bevor er **statt ins Gras in den Marmorboden vom Senat gebissen hat**.

'He is supposed to have said that, our good old Caesar, before he **bit into the marble floor of the Senate rather than the grass**.'

p???: Caesar bit into the grass.

→<sub>id</sub> Caesar died.

**BUT:** This is not what the text actually says; it says that Caesar did NOT bite into the grass (due to 'rather than').

p???: Instead of biting into the grass Caesar bit into the marble floor of the Senate.

→<sub>id</sub> Instead of dying Caesar bit into the marble floor of the Senate.  
(but what does that mean???)

↪<sub>inf</sub> Instead of dying on grass, Caesar died on the marble floor of the Senate.

**Again: This is the inference we draw but how do we get there compositionally?**

# Conclusion

# Summary

- ▶ We found some clear examples for **conjunction modification**:
  1. Main proposition: DIE(x) (literally or metaphorically)
  2. Secondary proposition due to modification – two forms:
    - ▶ x has an A N. (literally)
    - ▶ N is A. (literally)
  3. Sometimes, one or two further steps are necessary:
    - ▶ Interpreting 'A N / N is A' figuratively (e.g. *Gucci belts*)
    - ▶ and/or drawing inferences from 'A N / N is A'

# Summary

- ▶ We found some clear examples for **conjunction modification**:
  1. Main proposition: DIE(x) (literally or metaphorically)
  2. Secondary proposition due to modification – two forms:
    - ▶ x has an A N. (literally)
    - ▶ N is A. (literally)
  3. Sometimes, one or two further steps are necessary:
    - ▶ Interpreting ‘A N / N is A’ figuratively (e.g. *Gucci belts*)
    - ▶ and/or drawing inferences from ‘A N / N is A’
- ▶ However, a number of examples were less clear.
  - ▶ Controversy among the authors: conjunction modification + additional inferences, or external modification that is, however, unlike Ernst’s examples?

# Summary

- ▶ We found some clear examples for **conjunction modification**:
  1. Main proposition: DIE(x) (literally or metaphorically)
  2. Secondary proposition due to modification – two forms:
    - ▶ x has an A N. (literally)
    - ▶ N is A. (literally)
  3. Sometimes, one or two further steps are necessary:
    - ▶ Interpreting ‘A N / N is A’ figuratively (e.g. *Gucci belts*)
    - ▶ and/or drawing inferences from ‘A N / N is A’
- ▶ However, a number of examples were less clear.
  - ▶ Controversy among the authors: conjunction modification + additional inferences, or external modification that is, however, unlike Ernst’s examples?
- ▶ Finally, we discussed data beyond conjunction modification which show the need for drawing additional inferences and which we do not know how to analyse compositionally. (recall Caesar biting the marble floor)

## Possible reasons for the disagreement

- ▶ Several interpretations are possible at the same time.  
(Under Ernst's account, this is to be expected.)

## Possible reasons for the disagreement

- ▶ Several interpretations are possible at the same time. (Under Ernst's account, this is to be expected.)
- ▶ Given that Berit has thought a lot more about modification of the external type (mostly outside of idioms), she sees more options for external modification (but not necessarily in the same way Ernst 1981 does).
  - General idea: If external modification is on a par with adverbial modification, we should also get the whole range of possibilities we get with adverbs (heterogeneous group) (on which see, e.g., Geuder 2000, Ernst 2002, Maienborn 2003, Schäfer 2005)
    - ▶ Ernst's "domain delimiters" (~ frame setters)
    - ▶ Spatial modification of the event (e.g. *bite into the German grass*)
    - ▶ Causes for the event (e.g. *bite the New-Evangelical dust*)
    - ▶ ...

## Possible reasons for the disagreement

- ▶ Several interpretations are possible at the same time.  
(Under Ernst's account, this is to be expected.)
- ▶ Given that Berit has thought a lot more about modification of the external type (mostly outside of idioms), she sees more options for external modification (but not necessarily in the same way Ernst 1981 does).
  - General idea: If external modification is on a par with adverbial modification, we should also get the whole range of possibilities we get with adverbs (heterogeneous group) (on which see, e.g., Geuder 2000, Ernst 2002, Maienborn 2003, Schäfer 2005)
    - ▶ Ernst's "domain delimiters" (~ frame setters)
    - ▶ Spatial modification of the event (e.g. *bite into the German grass*)
    - ▶ Causes for the event (e.g. *bite the New-Evangelical dust*)
    - ▶ ...
- ▶ Given that Sascha has thought a lot more about conjunction modification and about idioms in general, he draws more additional inferences necessary for interpreting some of the data.

- ▶ This might be what Ernst had in mind with “literary device” ...

- ▶ This might be what Ernst had in mind with “literary device” ...  
... or why others discard conjunction modification as “word play”.

- ▶ This might be what Ernst had in mind with “literary device” ...  
... or why others discard conjunction modification as “word play”.
- ▶ Nevertheless, we should not discard conjunction modification but should analyze how it comes about compositionally.
  - ▶ Step 1 (DIE(x)) and step 2 (‘N is A / x has A N’) are fairly straightforward.
  - ▶ The challenge is to integrate the additional inferences from ‘A N’ to then decide how the composition of idiom + modifier should be analyzed exactly.

- ▶ This might be what Ernst had in mind with “literary device” ...  
... or why others discard conjunction modification as “word play”.
- ▶ Nevertheless, we should not discard conjunction modification but should analyze how it comes about compositionally.
  - ▶ Step 1 (DIE(x)) and step 2 (‘N is A / x has A N’) are fairly straightforward.
  - ▶ The challenge is to integrate the additional inferences from ‘A N’ to then decide how the composition of idiom + modifier should be analyzed exactly.
- ▶ Given that also for our final examples it was necessary to draw additional inferences, even without conjunction modification, we have to bite this bullet anyways.
- ▶ Finally, we think that our data also show that in the end the distinction between decomposable and non-decomposable idioms might not be as categorical as Nunberg et al. (1994) initially thought (see also Bargmann and Sailer to appear, for further discussion).

# How to modify idioms

Thanks !

**Sascha Bargmann**

Goethe University Frankfurt a.M.  
bargmann@em.uni-frankfurt.de

**Berit Gehrke**

CNRS-LLF / Paris Diderot & Konstanz  
berit.gehrke@upf.edu

**Frank Richter**

Goethe University Frankfurt a.M.  
f.richter@em.uni-frankfurt.de

# References I

- Bargmann, S. and Sailer, M.: to appear, The syntactic flexibility of semantically non-decomposable idioms, in M. Sailer and S. Markantontatou (eds), *Multiword Expressions: Insights from a Multi-lingual Perspective*, Language Science Press, Berlin.
- Cserép, A.: 2010, Premodification in idioms, *Argumentum* **6**, 100–112.
- Ernst, T.: 1981, Grist for the linguistic mill: Idioms and ‘extra’ adjectives, *Journal of Linguistic Research* **1.3**, 51–68.
- Ernst, T.: 2002, *The Syntax of Adjuncts*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Gehrke, B. and McNally, L.: 2018, Idioms and the syntax/semantics interface of descriptive content vs. reference. Paper presented at the OASIS Workshop on Nominal Phrase Meaning, Berlin, January 2018.
- Geuder, W.: 2000, *Oriented Adverbs: Issues in the Lexical Semantics of Event Adverbs*, PhD thesis, University of Tübingen.
- Maienborn, C.: 2003, Event-internal modifiers: Semantic underspecification and conceptual interpretation, in E. Lang, C. Maienborn and C. Fabricius-Hansen (eds), *Modifying Adjuncts*, de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 475–509.
- McClure, S.: 2011, Modification in non-combining idioms, *Semantics and Pragmatics* **4**, 1–7.

## References II

- Nunberg, G., Sag, I. and Wasow, T.: 1994, Idioms, *Language* **70.3**, 491–538.
- Sailer, M.: 2017, The multi-dimensional semantic of kinegrams. Paper presented at EW-HPSG, Paris, March 2017.
- Schäfer, M.: 2005, *German Adverbial Adjectives: Syntactic Position and Semantic Interpretation*, PhD thesis, University of Leipzig.
- Stathi, K.: 2007, A corpus-based analysis of adjectival modification in German idioms, in C. Fellbaum (ed.), *Idioms and Collocations: Corpus-based Linguistic and Lexicographic Studies*, Continuum, London / New York, pp. 81–108.