A plea for event kinds

Berit Gehrke
(CNRS-LLF / Paris Diderot & Konstanz)

SinFonIJA 10, Dubrovnik
October 23, 2017

Slides available here: `http://www.beritgehrke.com/uploads/1/0/6/4/106403025/sinfonija_event_kinds.pdf`

Events as concrete particulars

- **Parallelism between the nominal and verbal domain**:

  (1) John saw ...
    a. the house {with a chimney / in the woods}.
    b. Mary read a book {with a flashlight / in the woods}.

⇒ **Event semantics** (Davidson 1967); e.g. Maienborn (2011):
  - Events can be perceived.
  - Events can be located in space and time.
  - Events can vary in the way they are realised.

⇒ **Events in the ontology**

Nominal domain: Kinds and tokens in the ontology

- **Carlson (1977)**:
    - Bare plurals as names of kinds
    - Kinds vs. objects:
      Objects can be realised by stages.
      Kinds can be realised by objects or stages.

  $\rightarrow$ Realisation relation **R** (2)

  (2) a. $[\![\text{Bill ran.}]\!]$: $\exists y^s[\mathbf{R}(y, \mathbf{b}) \wedge \mathbf{run}'(y)]$

       b. $[\![\text{Dogs ran.}]\!]$: $\exists y^s[\mathbf{R}(y, \mathbf{d}) \wedge \mathbf{run}'(y)]$

- **Chierchia (1998)**:
    - Down-operator $^\cap$ turns a property into an individual (3-a)
    - Up-operator $^\cup$ turns a kind into a property (3-b)

  (3) a. $^\cap\text{DOG} = \text{d}$

       b. $^\cup\text{d} = \text{DOG}$

- Both: Kinds can be natural, conventionally established, ad hoc

Theoretical motivation for event kinds

- Common ontological assumptions:
  - Events (as concrete particulars) (Davidson 1967; Parsons 1990, i.a.)
  - Kinds, which can be realised/instantiated by tokens (Carlson 1977; Chierchia 1998; Dayal 2004, i.a.)
- ⇒ **Event kinds** in the ontology
  can be realised/instantiated by event tokens

- Related theoretical assumptions: Event types
  - Situation Semantics (Barwise and Perry 1983; Ginzburg 2005)
  - More fine-grained type systems (Asher 1993, 2011; Cooper 2015)

Empirical motivation for event kinds

- Adjectival passives (Gehrke 2011, 2012, 2013, 2015; Gese 2011; Maienborn et al. 2016)

- Ethnic adjectives (Arsenijević, Boleda, Gehrke and McNally 2014; Boleda, Evert, Gehrke and McNally 2012)

- Manner vs. agent-oriented adverbs (Gehrke 2017)

- Manner modification & kind anaphora (Landman and Morzycki 2003; Landman 2006; Anderson and Morzycki 2015)

- (Pseudo-)incorporation (e.g. Carlson 2003; Carlson et al. 2014; Schwarz 2014)

- Frequency adjectives (Schäfer 2007; Gehrke and McNally 2011, 2015)

- Russian factual imperfectives (Mehlig 2001, 2013, 2016; Mueller-Reichau 2013, 2015; Mueller-Reichau and Gehrke 2015)

- Cognate objects (Sailer 2010)

Carlson (2003) on event kinds

[T]he VP is the domain of a context-free interpretive mechanism specifying an event-type, which is then the input to the usual context-sensitive propositional semantics generally assumed for all levels of the sentence. That is, something fundamentally different goes on within the VP that does not go on "above" the VP – it is only information about types/properties that appears there and not information about (contingent) particulars.

The VP as the domain of event kinds (Carlson 2003)

- ▶ Verbs denote non-functional eventualities (lack argument positions).

- ▶ The set of eventualities (construed as event-types) consists of verbs (and sets of verbs), and each member is related to other elements by the part-of relation (4).

  (4)　a.　$[\![\text{run}]\!] \leq [\![\text{move}]\!]$
  　　　b.　$[\![\text{sing}]\!] \leq [\![\text{sing} \vee \text{swim}]\!]$
  　　　c.　BUT: $[\![\text{laugh}]\!] \not\leq [\![\text{eat}]\!]$

- ▶ In incorporation(-like) structures arguments are added at the VP level.
  - ▶ Such arguments denote properties (following McNally 1998).
  - ▶ These properties modify the verb's denotation and derive a subtype of event ("a more specific event-type") (5).

  (5)　　$[\![\text{eat cake}]\!] \leq [\![\text{eat}]\!]$

Instantiation of event kinds: IP (Carlson 2003)

- NPs that depend on context (times, worlds, truth) to get evaluated can only be interpreted in the IP domain.

  (following Diesing 1992)

  e.g. proper names, definite descriptions, specific indefinites, indexicals, (strongly) quantified NPs

- At the IP level, event types are mapped to event tokens, which are members of the set of possible worlds.

  ephemeral, token events 'get to' make but one 'appearance' in the structure of possible worlds, and then they're done for

  (Carlson 2003, 204f.)

General research questions

- ▶ How do arguments combine with verbs? Two levels:
  - ▶ Concept composition of V and N (VP)
  - ▶ Adding reference (for both individuals and events), somewhere in the 'IP' domain.

  (see Gehrke and McNally submitted, for further discussion)

- ▶ At what point exactly do events get instantiated?
  - ▶ VoiceP? AspP? ModP? TP?

- ▶ Deverbal nouns and adjectives:
  - ▶ How much verbal structure do they contain? (recurring question in the syntactic literature)
    (e.g. simple vs. complex event nominals vs. result nominals; adjectival vs. verbal participles; deverbal adjectives in *-able* ...)

⇒ If the verbal structure is too small, the event does not get instantiated but remains in the kind domain.

Adjectival passives

Gehrke (2011, 2012, 2013, 2015)

Alexiadou, Gehrke and Schäfer (2014)

Gehrke and Marco (2014)

Adjectival passive in German

- Formally distinct from the verbal passive: copula *sein* 'be', (6-a), vs. auxiliary *werden* 'become', (6-b)

- Participle in adjectival passive behaves like an adjective: adjectival *un*-, (6-a) (vs. verbal participle, (6-b))

(6)   a.   Die Aufgabe ist (un-)gelöst.
         'The task is (un-)solved.'
      b.   Die Aufgabe wird (*un-)gelöst.
         'The task is being (*un-)solved.'

Event-related modification of adjectival participles

- Is possible in many cases:

  (7)　a.　Die Zeichnung ist **von einem Kind** angefertigt.
  　　　 the drawing　is by a　　child produced
  　　　 'The drawing is produced by a child.'

  　　b.　Der Brief war **mit Bleistift** geschrieben.
  　　　 the letter was with pencil　 written
  　　　 'The letter was written with a pencil.'

  　　c.　Das Haar war ziemlich **schlampig** gekämmt.
  　　　 the hair was rather　slopp(il)y　combed
  　　　 'The hair was combed in a rather sloppy way.'

⇒ An event is still available for modification.

Event-related modification of adjectival participles

- Is also restricted:

  (8) Der Mülleimer   ist {**von meiner Nichte** / ***langsam** /
       the rubbish bin is by   my   niece   slow(ly)
       *genüsslich   / ***mit der Heugabel**} geleert.
       pleasurabl(e/y)   with the pitchfork   emptied
       Intended: 'The rubbish bin is emptied {by my niece / slowly
       / with pleasure / with the pitchfork}.'

⇒ How to account for the restrictions?

Previous accounts of event-related modifiers

- Only state-related modifiers are acceptable. (Rapp 1996, 1997; Anagnostopoulou 2003)
  Problem: Many of the acceptable modifiers clearly relate to events, not (consequent) states.

- No Voice-related modifiers (Anagnostopoulou 2003)
  Problem: arguments for Voice in adjectival participles (e.g. McIntyre 2013; Bruening 2014; Alexiadou et al. 2014, 2015)

- Event coercion due to modifiers (Meltzer-Asscher 2011)
  Problem: Why coercion if the verbal core should already give you an event?

- Only those that are visible/relevant during the interval at which the (consequent) state holds (McIntyre 2015)
  Ok, but why?

The account, informally

- ▶ The event in adjectival passives remains in the kind domain.
  - ▶ Due to adjectivisation, the event does not get realised/instantiated.
  - → Lack of AspP or higher verbal functional projections

- ▶ Event-related modifiers pseudo-incorporate into the participle before adjectivisation can take place.

- ▶ Restrictions on event-related modification follow from independently motivated restrictions on
  - ▶ Event kind modification: No spatiotemporal modifiers, but manner modifiers are acceptable
  - ▶ Pseudo-incorporation: Only weakly or non-referential NPs in, e.g., *by/with*-phrases

- ▶ Well-establishedness restriction
  - → Reminiscent of definite sg. kinds in the nominal domain
    (Carlson 1977, 2009; Krifka et al. 1995; Dayal 2004)

Empirical arguments for event kind modification

- **The event is not instantiated in space and time**.
  ⇒ No spatio-temporal modification:

(9)   *Der Computer ist vor   drei Tagen repariert.
       the computer is before three days   repaired
       Intended: 'The computer is repaired three days ago.'

(10)   *Das Kind war im   Badezimmer gekämmt.
       the child was in the bathroom   combed
       Intended: 'The child was combed in the bathroom.'

- Only event subkind-deriving modifiers, manner (in the broadest sense).

cf. Landman and Morzycki's (2003) treatment of manner modification in terms of event kind modification

cf. Parallels to nominal kinds: Modification derives subkinds (Carlson 1977).

Event-related modification of adjectival participles

Recall our initial examples:

(11) a. Die Zeichnung ist **von einem Kind** angefertigt.
          'The drawing is produced by a child.'
      b. Der Brief war **mit Bleistift** geschrieben.
          'The letter was written with a pencil.'
      c. Das Haar war ziemlich **schlampig** gekämmt.
          'The hair was combed in a rather sloppy way.'

A locative PP as manner (not event location):

(12) Die Pizza ist in einem Steinofen gebacken.
      the pizza is in a   stone oven baked
      'The pizza is baked in a stone oven.'

(13) Der Mülleimer ist {***von meiner Nichte** / ***langsam** / ***genüsslich** /
      *mit der Heugabel} geleert.
      Intended: 'The rubbish bin is emptied {by my niece / slowly / with
      pleasure / with the pitchfork}.'

Empirical arguments for pseudo-incorporation

- Nominals in *by/with*-phrases with adjectival participles display semantic properties of (pseudo-)incorporated nominals: Only weakly or non-referential nominals (weak (in)definites, bare nominals)
    - Obligatory narrow scope (no scope) (14)
    - No introduction of a discourse referent (15)
    - No modification by (ordinary restrictive token) modifiers (16)

(14)   Alle Briefe sind mit einem Bleistift geschrieben.
       'All letters are written with a pencil or other.'

(15)   Die Zeichnung ist von [einem Kind]$_i$ angefertigt. *Es$_i$ hat rote Haare.
       Intended: 'The drawing is produced by [a child]$_i$. (S)he$_i$ has red hair.'

(16)   *Die Zeichnung ist von einem blonden Kind angefertigt.
       Intended: 'The drawing is produced by a blond child.'

cf.   Restrictions on pseudo-incorporation (e.g. Dayal 2011) and accounts employing event kinds (Carlson 2003; Carlson et al. 2014; Schwarz 2014)

The formal account

- An adjectival passive sentence refers to the instantiation of a consequent state kind of an event kind:

(17) Die Tür ist geschlossen.
      'The door is closed.'

(18) $\exists s_o, s_k, e_k, x_k[\textbf{close}(e_k) \wedge \textbf{BECOME}(s_k)(e_k) \wedge \textbf{R}(s_o, s_k) \wedge \textbf{closed}(\textbf{the door}, s_o) \wedge \textbf{Initiator}(x_k, e_k)]$

The formal account, step by step

(ignoring kind subscripts in the first steps)

- Lexical semantics of *schließ-* (type $\langle e, \langle e, \langle s, \langle v, t \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle$):
  $\lambda y \lambda x \lambda s \lambda e[\textbf{close}(e) \wedge \textbf{BECOME}(e,s) \wedge \textbf{closed}(s) \wedge \textbf{Theme}(s,y) \wedge \textbf{Initiator}(e,x)]$

- Prt^0 *ge-en/t*: $\lambda \wp \lambda y \lambda s \lambda e \exists x[\wp(e)(s)(x)(y)]$

  ($\sim$ target state participle of Kratzer 2000)

- A^0: $\lambda \wp \lambda y \lambda s \exists e_k, x_k[\wp(e_k)(s)(x_k)(y)]$

- *geschlossen$_{adj}$*: $\lambda y \lambda s \exists e_k, x_k[\textbf{close}(e_k) \wedge \textbf{BECOME}(e_k,s) \wedge \textbf{closed}(s) \wedge \textbf{Theme}(s,y) \wedge \textbf{Initiator}(e_k,x_k)]$
  $\lambda s \exists e_k, x_k[\textbf{close}(e_k) \wedge \textbf{BECOME}(e_k,s) \wedge \textbf{closed}(s) \wedge \textbf{Theme}(s,\textbf{the door}) \wedge \textbf{Initiator}(e_k,x_k)]$

(see, e.g., McIntyre 2013; Bruening 2014, on externalisation of the internal argument)

The formal account

(19) Die Tür ist geschlossen.
      'The door is closed.'

(20) $\exists s_o, s_k, e_k, x_k[\textbf{close}(e_k) \wedge \textbf{BECOME}(s_k)(e_k) \wedge \textbf{R}(s_o, s_k) \wedge$
      $\textbf{closed}(\textbf{the door}, s_o) \wedge \textbf{Initiator}(x_k, e_k)]$

▶ Event-related modifiers pseudo-incorporates into the participle:

(21) Mund und Nase waren mit Klebeband verschlossen.
      mouth and nose were with tape   closed
      'Mouth and nose were closed with tape.'

(22) ⟦ be closed$_A$ with tape ⟧ :
      $\lambda s_o \lambda y \exists e_k, s_k[\textbf{close}(e_k) \wedge \textbf{With}(\textbf{tape}, e_k)$
      $\wedge \textbf{BECOME}(s_k)(e_k) \wedge \textbf{R}(s_o, s_k) \wedge \textbf{Holder}(y, s_o)]$

State- vs. event-related *by*-phrases

- Event-related modifiers, e.g. (23-a): pseudo-incorporate into the participle before adjectivisation
- State-related modifiers, e.g. (23-b): Modify the adjectivised participle (which can refer to a state token)

(23)   a.   Die Zeichnung ist von einem Kind angefertigt.
               the drawing   is by a   child produced
               'The drawing is produced by a child.'

        b.   Das Haus ist von Studenten bewohnt.
               the house is by students   inhabited
               'The house is inhabited by students.'

⇒ The above described restrictions are not found with state-related modifiers.

State- vs. event-related *by*-phrases II

- ► Further empirical support from a corpus study into Spanish *by*-phrases with adjectival vs. verbal participles
  (following copula *estar* 'be', vs. auxiliary *ser* 'be')

  (Gehrke and Marco 2014)

- → Quantitative and qualitative differences between state- and event-related *by*-phrases
    - ► Relatively more *by*-phrases with verbal vs. adjectival participles
    - ► Relatively more state-related vs. event-related *by*-phrases with adjectival participles
    - ► Strongly referential complements only with state-related *by*-phrases with adjectival participles

Ethnic adjectives

Arsenijević, Boleda, Gehrke and McNally (2014)
Boleda, Evert, Gehrke and McNally (2012)

Two readings of ethnic adjectives

- Thematic:

    (24)   **French** agreement (to participate in the negotiations)

- Classificatory:

    (25)   **French** wine

- Two types of accounts:
    - Argument-saturating account of thematic EAs
      → e.g. Fábregas (2007), Alexiadou and Stavrou (2011)
    - Uniform account as modifiers of (event or individual) kinds
      → Our account (Arsenijević et al. 2014)

The modifier account, informally

- Nouns: Kinds vs. tokens
  - Common nouns denote properties of kinds.
  - Num(ber) converts kind descriptions into token descriptions.

    (building on Zamparelli 1995)

- Ethnic adjectives (EAs)
  - Modify kinds
  - As a subtype of relational As, they introduce a relation R between the kind described by the nominal property and the nation associated with the EA.

    (building on McNally and Boleda 2004)

  - For EAs this relation is further specified as **Origin**

- Thematic and classificatory readings of EAs
  - Arise when the modified noun is an event (e.g. *discovery*) or an individual noun (e.g. *wine*), respectively.

The modifier account, formally

(26)   a.   **French**(x) iff **Origin**$(x, \textbf{France})$
       b.   **Origin**(x, y) iff x comes into existence within the
            spatial domain of y.

(27)   a. $\llbracket \text{wine} \rrbracket$: $\lambda x_k [\textbf{wine}(x_k)]$
       b. $\llbracket \text{French} \rrbracket$: $\lambda P_k \lambda x_k [P_k(x_k) \wedge \textbf{Origin}(x_k, \textbf{France})]$
       c. $\llbracket [_{NP} \text{French wine}] \rrbracket$:
            $\lambda x_k [\textbf{wine}(x_k) \wedge \textbf{Origin}(x_k, \textbf{France})]$
       d. $\llbracket \text{Num}^0 \rrbracket$: $\lambda P_k \lambda y_o \exists x_k [P_k(x_k) \wedge \textbf{R}(y_o, x_k)]$
       e. $\llbracket [_{NumP} [_{NP} \text{French wine}]] \rrbracket$:
            $\lambda y_o \exists x_k [\textbf{wine}(x_k) \wedge \textbf{Origin}(x_k, \textbf{France}) \wedge \textbf{R}(y_o, x_k)]$

(28) $\llbracket \text{French discovery} \rrbracket$:
       $\lambda y_o \exists x_k [\textbf{discovery}(x_k) \wedge \textbf{Origin}(x_k, \textbf{France}) \wedge \textbf{R}(y_o, x_k)]$

Empirical facts about EAs

- 'Un-adjectival' behaviour in (29) motivated argument-saturating accounts (examples from Alexiadou and Stavrou 2011)

  (29)   a. *The intervention in Cyprus was American.
         b. *the very / more American invasion
         c. *the quick / possible and American intervention

- Our replies:
  - (29-a): Predicative uses of relational As, more generally, are restricted, but not impossible; cf. (30-a).
  - (29-b): Relational As belong to the type of adjectives that are not gradable (or only gradable along a prototypicality scale).
  - (29-c): Kind-modifying As can only be conjoined with As of the same type; cf. (30-b).

  (30)   a. A senior government official explained that because the military deployment was primarily American, "it should be paid for by one nation." (from the web)
         b. the Italian and French intervention

- Problem for nominal, but not for modifier account:
  - The EA does not introduce a discourse referent (31-a), unlike the related nominal (31-b).

(31)   a.   *The American$_i$ proposal to the UN reveals its$_i$/her$_i$ rigid position.

   b.   America$_i$'s proposal to the UN reveals its$_i$/her$_i$ rigid position.

Logistic regression model (Boleda et al. 2012)

- To test predictions of our account
- To predict occurrence of EA (32) vs. N (33)

   (32)   French agreement (to participate in the negotiations)

   (33)   a.   agreement of France
               b.   France's agreement
               c.   agreement by France

$\rightarrow$ Support for modifier analysis

$\rightarrow$ No support for the factors that were supposed to test our particular modifier analysis, employing kinds.
The idea was: collocational strength should be higher with EAs; but maybe this has to be tested in a different way.

Agent-oriented vs. manner adverbs

Gehrke (2017)

Two readings of 'dispositional' adverbs

- Agent-oriented reading:

    (34) **Cleverly/rudely**, John dropped his cup of coffee.
    - $\sim$ It was clever/rude of John to drop his cup of coffee.

- Manner reading:

    (35) John dropped his cup of coffee **cleverly/rudely**.
    - $\sim$ The manner in which John dropped his cup of coffee was clever/rude.

- Different forms in German:

    (36) a. Maria hat **klugerweise** geantwortet.   AO
          'Cleverly, Mary answered.'
         b. Maria hat **klug** geantwortet.   M
          'Mary answered cleverly.'

The general idea

- **Uniform semantics** under both readings:
  - Lexical semantics of the related adjective
  - Adverb applies to an event (kind or token)

- Event-related adverbs: Comparison classes of events

  (building on Ernst 2002)

  - AO Comparison among (different) event tokens
  - M   Comparison within an event kind (of different event subkinds)

    (building on insights from Sassoon and Toledo 2011, on adjectives)

- **Alternatives** for the relevant adverbs:
  - AO Focus alternatives
  - M   Script alternatives

    (building on insights from Geuder 2000)

Towards a formal proposal

(37)   Maria cleverly answered.

   ▶ Agent-oriented reading:

(38)   a. $[\![... \text{ cleverly } ... \; [_{VoiceP} \text{ Maria answer}]...]\!]$
            $= \lambda e.\textbf{answer}(e, \textbf{m}) \wedge^{\cup} k(e) \wedge \textbf{clever}(e)$
     b.   Maria instantiated the ANSWER event kind; this
         event token was clever.

   ▶ Manner reading:

(39)   a. $[\![... \; _{VoiceP} \text{ Maria } \{\text{cleverly}\} \text{ answer } \{\text{cleverly}\}]...]\!]$
            $= \lambda e.\textbf{answer}(e, \textbf{m}) \wedge^{\cup} k(e) \wedge \textbf{clever}(k)$
     b.   Maria instantiated the CLEVER ANSWER event kind.

New light on some well-known differences

- ▶ Word order, prosody, (non-)integration

(40) AO Maria hat {*nicht} klugerweise {nicht} geantwortet.
          Mary has not clever-WEISE not answered
      M   Maria hat {nicht} klug {*nicht} geantwortet.
          Mary has not clever not answered

(41) AO Maria hat {klugerweise} geantwortet, {klugerweise}.
          Mary has clever-WEISE answered clever-WEISE
      M   Maria hat {klug} geantwortet, {*klug}.
          Mary has clever answered clever

(42) AO Klugerweise hat Maria geantwortet.
          clever-WEISE has Mary answered
      M   {*Klug / KLUG} hat Maria geantwortet.
          clever clever has Mary answered

(43) AO Maria hat [KLUGerweise] [geANTwortet].
          Mary has clever-WEISE answered
      M   Maria hat [klug geANTwortet].
          Mary has clever answered

Semantics/pragmatics

- ▶ Different behaviour wrt at-issue tests (preliminary results):
  - AO Event at issue, AO-evaluation not at issue
  - M Instantiation of event subkind at issue; event superkind presupposed?

  (employing tests discussed in Tonhauser 2012)

- ▶ In one respect, AO-adverbs display similar behaviour as weak evaluatives (e.g. *unglücklicherweise* 'unfortunately'):
  - ▶ Not ok under negation (44-a)
  - ▶ Ok under other entailment-canceling operators, e.g. (44-b)

(44) a. *Otto hat nicht kluger-/unglücklicherweise geantwortet.
          Otto has not   cleverly/unfortunately   answered
      b. Otto hat vielleicht kluger-/unglücklicherweise geantwortet.
          Otto has maybe   cleverly/unfortunately   answered

→ Evaluation as a conventional implicature?

(building on insights from Liu 2012, 2014)

At-issue test I: Assent with positive continuation

(45)　A:　Maria hat **klugerweise** geantwortet.
　　　　　Maria has clever-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 klug.
　　　　　yes that is true　that/she/the answer　was clever

(46)　A:　Maria hat **klug** geantwortet.
　　　　　Maria has clever answered
　　　B:　?Ja, das stimmt, sie hat geantwortet.
　　　　　yes that is true　she has answered
　　　B':　Ja, das stimmt, das/sie/die　Antwort war klug.
　　　　　yes that is true　that/she/the answer　was clever

At-issue test II: Assent with adversative continuation

(47) A: Maria hat **klugerweise** geantwortet.
          Maria has clever-WEISE 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
          yes that is true but that/she/the answer was
          nicht klug.
          not   clever

(48) A: Maria hat **klug** geantwortet.
          Maria has clever 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
          yes that is true but that/she/the answer was
          nicht klug.
          not   clever

Open issues

- Work out formally: How are the members of the comparison classes determined exactly?
  - Interaction with prosody and focus
  - Test (non-)at-issue-ness more systematically
- Possible extension to other ADVs with manner vs. higher readings
  (see, e.g. Ernst 2002)

ADVs with manner vs. higher readings

- Some speaker-oriented adverbs, e.g. *frankly* (49)

  (49)   {Frankly}, John spoke {frankly}.

- 'Dual evaluatives' (50) (from Ernst 2002), (51)

  (50)   E   **Oddly**, Carol was dancing.
             Appropriately, the treasury official was named Bill.
         M   Carol was dancing **oddly**.
             They had named the dog **appropriately**.

  (51)   E   Carla hat **sonderbarerweise** getanzt.
             Carla has odd-WEISE   danced
         M   Carla hat **sonderbar** getanzt.
             Carla has odd   danced

- All subject-oriented adverbs?

ADVs with manner vs. higher readings

BUT: Not all subject-oriented ADVs display this duality (52)

(from Geuder 2000)

(52) a. in a stupid/clever/rude manner
      b. ??in an intentional/reluctant manner

- ▶ Geuder (2000) calls both types of ADVs 'agentive'.
- ▶ Ernst (2002): The latter are mental-attitude ADVs.

- ▶ *Intentional/reluctant* etc. are not dispositional
  - → Is that why we cannot have a manner paraphrase?

- ▶ Still, one can use these in the same position as a manner
  adverb: (cp. Jackendoff 1972)

  (53)   Mary insulted John intentionally.

→ What is manner? Are there different kinds of manner?
(e.g. high vs. low in Schäfer 2008)

Summary and Outlook

Summary

- **Widespread ontological assumptions**:
  - Events and states, in addition to individuals
  - Kinds, in addition to tokens

→ **Event and state kinds**, in addition to event and state tokens
  - VP as the level of kinds, context-free semantics, concept composition
  - 'IP': context, reference, instantiation/realisation of kinds

- **Case studies** to show the usefulness of event kinds
  - Adjectival participles: event-related modification
  - Ethnic adjectives: 'thematic' reading in combination with nominalisations; similarities to 'classificatory' reading
  - Manner readings of agent-oriented adverbs

- In all these cases: **Event-kind modification, which derives a subkind → 'Manner' in the broadest sense**

Some open issues

- At what point do event kinds get instantiated/realised? (AspP or VoiceP?)

- What counts as manner?
    - Broader notion, to also include any event-related modifiers with adjectival participles
    - But also not a homogeneous notion: higher vs. lower manner; only lower manner might be restricted to event kinds.

- What counts as an (established) event kind?

(General issues in the literature on manner and in the literature on kinds)

A plea for event kinds

Hvala! − Danke!

Berit Gehrke
CNRS-LLF / Paris Diderot & Konstanz
berit.gehrke@linguist.univ-paris-diderot.fr

Frequency adjectives

Gehrke and McNally (2011, 2014, 2015)

Three readings of frequency adjectives (FAs)

- Commonly identified by paraphrase:

(54) Mary is a frequent swimmer. INTERNAL
 $\sim$ Mary is someone who swims frequently.

(55) A daily glass of wine is good for you. GENERIC
 $\sim$ Having a glass of wine on a daily basis is good for you.

(56) The occasional sailor strolled by. ADVERBIAL
 $\sim$ Occasionally, a sailor strolled by.

- Two types of accounts:
  - Complex determiner analysis of the adverbial reading
    $\to$ Stump (1981), Larson (1998), Zimmermann (2003)
  - Uniform account as distributional adjectival modifiers
    $\to$ Our account

  (Idea that for adverbial FAs we might still need both: Sæbø 2016)

Revisiting empirical generalisations from previous literature

- Temporal(ly) vs. non-temporal(ly distributing) FAs

  (Gehrke and McNally 2015)

Type of FA	Temporal	Nontemporal	Both
Examples	*(in)frequent, periodic, sporadic daily*, etc.	*odd, rare*	*occasional*
Nontemporal distribution	*	✓	✓
Adverbial reading with non-event nouns	*	✓	✓
Internal reading	✓	*	✓
Predicative use on relevant reading	✓	*	✓
Determiner used with the generic and/or adverbial reading	✓*a* ??*the*[#]	??*a* ✓*the*	✓*a* ✓*the*

[#]except with the rare well-established kind

Some of these empirical facts

- Nontemporal distribution:

  (57) a. The occasional/odd/rare granny is 6 feet tall.
        b. #The weekly/frequent/infrequent/periodic/
            sporadic granny is 6 feet tall.

- Predicative use:

  (58) a. #The mosquito was occasional/odd.
        b. The check-up was weekly/infrequent/frequent/
            periodic/sporadic.

- Determiner restrictions on generic/adverbial use:

  (59) a. {#A(n)/The} odd/rare sailor strolled by.
        b. {A(n)/#The} weekly/infrequent/frequent/
            periodic/sporadic check-up is necessary.

Our proposal, informally

- Temporal FAs (e.g. *frequent, occasional$_1$*):
    - Restricted to events (event kinds *or* pluralities of event tokens)
    - Intersective adjectives ($+$ particular distribution)
    - $\rightarrow$ Adverbial reading only with event nouns
    - $\rightarrow$ Predicative use and internal reading possible
    - $\rightarrow$ Gen/adv readings only with indefinite determiner
- Non-temporal FAs (e.g. *odd, rare, occasional$_2$*):
    - Restricted to kinds (of events or individuals)
    - Predicate modifiers ($+$ particular distribution)
    - $\rightarrow$ Adverbial reading also possible with non-event nouns
    - $\rightarrow$ Predicative use and internal reading not possible
    - $\rightarrow$ Gen/adv readings only with definite determiner
- Different readings as a by-product of different contexts:
    - Internal reading with participant nouns
    - Generic reading in generic sentences (also generic without FA)
    - (Different routes to adverbial paraphrases without actual 'wide scope' of FA)

References I

Alexiadou, A., Anagnostopoulou, E. and Schäfer, F.: 2015, *External Arguments in Transitivity Alternations: A Layering Approach*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Alexiadou, A., Gehrke, B. and Schäfer, F.: 2014, The argument structure of adjectival participles revisited, *Lingua* **149B**, 118–138.

Alexiadou, A. and Stavrou, M.: 2011, Ethnic adjectives as pseudo-adjectives: A case study in syntax-morphology interaction and the structure of DP, *Studia Linguistica* **65**, 1–30.

Anagnostopoulou, E.: 2003, Participles and Voice, *in* A. Alexiadou, M. Rathert and A. von Stechow (eds), *Perfect Explorations*, Interface Explorations 2, de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 1–36.

Anderson, C. and Morzycki, M.: 2015, Degrees as kinds, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **33.3**, 791–828.

Arsenijević, B., Boleda, G., Gehrke, B. and McNally, L.: 2014, Ethnic adjectives are proper adjectives, *in* R. Baglini, T. Grinsell, J. Keane, A. Roth Singerman and J. Thomas (eds), *CLS 46-I The Main Session: Proceedings of the 46th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, pp. 17–30.

Asher, N.: 1993, *Reference to Abstract Objects in Discourse*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Asher, N.: 2011, *Lexical Meaning in Context*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Barwise, J. and Perry, J.: 1983, *Situations and Attitudes*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Boleda, G., Evert, S., Gehrke, B. and McNally, L.: 2012, Adjectives as saturators vs. modifiers: Statistical evidence, *in* M. Aloni, V. Kimmelman, F. Roelofsen, G. W. Sassoon, K. Schulz and M. Westera (eds), *Logic, Language and Meaning - 18th Amsterdam Colloquium, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, December 19-21, 2011, Revised Selected Papers*, Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 112–121.

Bruening, B.: 2014, Word formation is syntactic: Adjectival passives in English, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **32.2**, 363–422.

Carlson, G.: 1977, *Reference to Kinds in English*, PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Published in 1980 by Garland Press, New York.

Carlson, G.: 2003, Weak indefinites, *in* M. Coene and Y. D'hulst (eds), *From NP to DP*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 195–210.

References III

Carlson, G.: 2009, Generics and concepts, *in* F. J. Pelletier (ed.), *Kinds, Things, and Stuff: Mass Terms and Generics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 16–35.

Carlson, G., Klein, N., Gegg-Harrison, W. and Tanenhaus, M.: 2014, Weak definites as a form of definiteness: Experimental investigations, *Recherches linguistiques de Vincennes* **42**, 11–32.

Chierchia, G.: 1998, Reference to kinds across languages, *Natural Language Semantics* **6**, 339–405.

Cooper, R.: 2015, Type theory and language: From perception to linguistic communication. Ms. University of Gothenburg.

Davidson, D.: 1967, The logical form of action sentences, *in* N. Rescher (ed.), *The Logic of Decision and Action*, University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, pp. 81–95.

Dayal, V.: 2004, Number marking and (in)definiteness in kind terms, *Linguistics and Philosophy* **27**, 393–450.

Dayal, V.: 2011, Hindi pseudo-incorporation, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **29.1**, 123–167.

Diesing, M.: 1992, *Indefinites*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

References IV

Ernst, T.: 2002, *The Syntax of Adjuncts*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Fábregas, A.: 2007, The internal syntactic structure of relational adjectives, *Probus* pp. 135–170.

Gehrke, B.: 2011, Stative passives and event kinds, *in* I. Reich, E. Horch and D. Pauly (eds), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 15*, Saarbrücken, Universaar - Saarland University Press, pp. 241–257.

Gehrke, B.: 2012, Passive states, *in* V. Demonte and L. McNally (eds), *Telicity, Change, and State: A Cross-Categorial View of Event Structure*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 185–211.

Gehrke, B.: 2013, Still puzzled by adjectival passives?, *in* R. Folli, C. Sevdali and R. Truswell (eds), *Syntax and Its Limits*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 175–191.

Gehrke, B.: 2015, Adjectival participles, event kind modification and pseudo-incorporation, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **33.3**, 897–938.

Gehrke, B.: 2017, The empirical foundation of event kinds and related issues. HDR (habilitation à diriger des recherches) thesis, Paris Diderot.

References V

Gehrke, B. and Marco, C.: 2014, Different *by*-phrases with adjectival passives: Evidence from Spanish corpus data, *Lingua* **149B**, 188–214.

Gehrke, B. and McNally, L.: 2011, Frequency adjectives and assertions about event types, *in* E. Cormany, S. Ito and D. Lutz (eds), *Proceedings of SALT 19*, CLC Publications, Ithaca, pp. 180–197.

Gehrke, B. and McNally, L.: 2014, Event individuation by objects: Evidence from frequency adjectives, *in* U. Etxeberria, A. Falaus, A. Irurtzun and B. Leferman (eds), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 18*, semanticsarchive, pp. 146–163.

Gehrke, B. and McNally, L.: 2015, Distributional modification: The case of frequency adjectives, *Language* **91.4**, 837–870.

Gehrke, B. and McNally, L.: submitted, Idioms and the syntax/semantics interface of descriptive content vs. reference. *Linguistics* SI 'The Grammar of Idioms'.

Gese, H.: 2011, Events in adjectival passives, *in* I. Reich, E. Horch and D. Pauly (eds), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 15*, Saarbrücken, Universaar - Saarland University Press, pp. 259–273.

Geuder, W.: 2000, *Oriented Adverbs: Issues in the Lexical Semantics of Event Adverbs*, PhD thesis, University of Tübingen.

Ginzburg, J.: 2005, Situation Semantics: The ontological balance sheet, *Research on Language and Computation* **3.4**, 363–389.

Jackendoff, R.: 1972, *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Kratzer, A.: 2000, Building statives. Ms. University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Krifka, M., Pelletier, F. J., Carlson, G. N., ter Meulen, A., Chierchia, G. and Link, G.: 1995, Genericity: An introduction, *in* G. N. Carlson and F. J. Pelletier (eds), *The Generic Book*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 1–125.

Landman, M.: 2006, *Variables in Natural Language*, PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Landman, M. and Morzycki, M.: 2003, Event-kinds and manner modification, *in* N. M. Antrim, G. Goodall, M. Schulte-Nafeh and V. Samiian (eds), *Proceedings of the Western Conference in Linguistics (WECOL) 2002*, California State University, Fresno, pp. 136–147.

Larson, R.: 1998, Events and modification in nominals, *in* D. Strolovitch and A. Lawson (eds), *Proceedings of SALT 8*, CLC Publications, Ithaca, NY, pp. 145–168.

References VII

Liu, M.: 2012, *Multidimensional Semantics of Evaluative Adverbs*, Brill, Leiden.

Liu, M.: 2014, The projective meaning of evaluative adverbs. Ms. University of Osnabrück.

Maienborn, C.: 2011, Event semantics, *in* C. Maienborn, K. von Heusinger and P. Portner (eds), *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning (Vol. 1)*, de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 802–830.

Maienborn, C., Gese, H. and Stolterfoht, B.: 2016, Adverbial modifiers in adjectival passives, *Journal of Semantics* **33**, 299–358.

McIntyre, A.: 2013, Adjectival passives and adjectival participles in English, *in* A. Alexiadou and F. Schäfer (eds), *Non-Canonical Passives*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 21–42.

McIntyre, A.: 2015, Event modifiers in (german) adjectival participles: Remarks on Gehrke (this issue), *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **33.3**, 939–953.

McNally, L.: 1998, Existential sentences without existential quantification, *Linguistics and Philosophy* **21**, 353–392.

McNally, L. and Boleda, G.: 2004, Relational adjectives as properties of kinds, *in* O. Bonami and P. Cabredo Hofherr (eds), *Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics 5*, http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss5, pp. 179–196.

References VIII

Mehlig, H.: 2001, Verbal aspect and the referential status of verbal predicates: On aspect usage in Russian who-questions, *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* **9**, 99–125.

Mehlig, H.: 2013, Obščefaktičeskoe i edinično-faktičeskoe značenija nesoveršennogo vida v russkom jazyke, *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta Serija 9, Filologija* **4**, 19–47.

Mehlig, H.: 2016, Negation und Verbalaspekt im Russischen, *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach* **77**, 229–265.

Meltzer-Asscher, A.: 2011, Adjectival passives in Hebrew: Evidence for parallelism between the adjectival and verbal systems, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **29**, 815–855.

Mueller-Reichau, O.: 2013, On Russian factual imperfectives, *in* U. Junghanns, D. Fehrmann, D. Lenertová and H. Pitsch (eds), *Formal Description of Slavic Languages: The Ninth Conference. Proceedings of FDSL 9, Göttingen 2011*, Linguistik International 28, Peter Lang, Frankfurt/M., pp. 191–210.

Mueller-Reichau, O.: 2015, Pseudo-incorporation in Russian? Aspectual competition and bare singular interpretation, *in* O. Borik and B. Gehrke (eds), *The Syntax and Semantics of Pseudo-Incorporation*, Syntax and Semantics 40, Brill, Leiden, pp. 262–295.

Mueller-Reichau, O. and Gehrke, B.: 2015, Event kind formation within the VP: Comparing Russian factual imperfectives and German adjectival passives, *in* G. Zybatow, P. Biskup, M. Guhl, C. Hurtig, O. Mueller-Reichau and M. Yastrebowa (eds), *Formal Description of Slavic Languages: Proceedings of FDSL 10, Leipzig 2013*, Linguistik International, Peter Lang, Frankfurt/M., pp. 367–382.

Parsons, T.: 1990, *Events in the Semantics of English: A Study in Subatomic Semantics*, Current Studies in Linguistics Series 19, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Rapp, I.: 1996, Zustand? Passiv? Überlegungen zum sogenannten "Zustandspassiv", *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* **15.2**, 231–265.

Rapp, I.: 1997, *Partizipien und semantische Struktur: Zu passivischen Konstruktionen mit dem 3. Status*, Stauffenburg, Tübingen.

Sæbø, K.: 2016, Adjectives and determiners of distribution. Ms. Oslo University.

Sailer, M.: 2010, The family of English cognate object constructions, *in* S. Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, CSLI Publications, Stanford, pp. 191–211.

Sassoon, G. and Toledo, A.: 2011, Absolute and relative adjectives and their comparison classes. Ms., University of Amsterdam & Utrecht University.

Schäfer, F.: 2008, *The Syntax of (Anti-)Causatives: External Arguments in Change-of-state Contexts*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Schäfer, R.: 2007, On frequency adjectives, *in* E. Puig Waldmüller (ed.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 11*, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, pp. 555–567.

Schwarz, F.: 2014, How weak and how definite are Weak Definites?, *in* A. Aguilar-Guevara, B. Le Bruyn and J. Zwarts (eds), *Weak Referentiality*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 213–236.

Stump, G. T.: 1981, The interpretation of frequency adjectives, *Linguistics and Philosophy* **5**, 221–256.

Tonhauser, J.: 2012, Diagnosing (not-)at-issue content, *Proceedings of Semantics of Under-represented Languages of the Americas (SULA) 6*, GLSA, UMass, Amherst, pp. 239–254.

Zamparelli, R.: 1995, *Layers in the Determiner Phrase*, PhD thesis, University of Rochester.

Zimmermann, M.: 2003, Pluractionality and complex quantifier formation, *Natural Language Semantics* **11**, 249–287.