# Manner adverbs and between- vs. within-event comparison

Berit Gehrke (CNRS-LLF / Paris Diderot)

**Sinn und Bedeutung 20**, Tübingen, September 9-12, 2015

## Introduction

### Two readings of adjectives like *stupid* (Geuder 2000)

(1) a. John is **stupid**. DISPOSITIONAL/ILP
b. John is being **stupid**. AGENTIVE/SLP

### Two (different) readings of related adverbs

(cf. Jackendoff 1972, McConnell-Ginet 1982, Wyner 1994, Eckardt 1998, Geuder 2000, Ernst 2002, Schäfer 2005, Piñón 2010, i.a.)

(2) Alice has **rudely** written the letter.
≈ Alice VP-ed in a rude manner. MANNER
≈ It was rude of Alice to VP. AGENT-ORIENTED

- Different syntactic positions in English:

(3) a. John dropped his cup of coffee **cleverly**. M
b. **Cleverly**, John dropped his cup of coffee. AO

- Morphological distinction in German:
(similar in Japanese, cf. Kubota 2015)

(4) a. Maria hat **dumm** geantwortet. M
Mary has stupid answered
b. Maria hat **dummerweise** geantwortet. AO
Mary has stupid-WEISE answered

### This paper

1. **Comparison classes** in the adjectival domain have a direct counterpart in the verbal domain:
   - SLP vs. ILP: Within- vs. between-individual comparison
   - AO vs. M: Within-event token vs. between-event kinds comp.
2. The **link between ADVs and As** is indirect:
   - AO ADVs are related to dispositional As.
   - Manner ADVs are derived from AO ADVs.
   - Agentive readings of dispositional As involve coercion.

## Building block 1: Geuder (2000)

- Dispositional As [ILPs]
  - Assert the disposition of an individual
  - Manifestation of disposition is in the background
- Agentive As [SLPs]
  - Assert causal efficacy and a state of affairs
  - Disposition remains in the background

### Agent-oriented ADVs

- Derived from agentive As:

(5) $\mathbf{stupid}_{C,w*}(x)(k) = 1$
with $k \approx \langle\{e, x, ...\}, \{P_{w0}(e, x...)\}\rangle$ and:
(i) $C \models \exists e^* : e$ CAUSE $e^*$, &
(ii) $x$ does not intend to bring about $e^*$, the occurrence of $e^*$ is incompatible with the preferences of $x$ in $w_0$, &
(iii) $\forall w' \in W : \exists e[P_{w'}(e)(x)] \Leftrightarrow D_{w'}(x)$.

- Orientation towards agent: indirect (retrieved from thematic relations introduced by event variable; cf. Wyner 1994, 1998)
- AO ADVs involve focus alternatives:

(6) a. Stupidly, John drank the $[\text{water}]_F$.
b. Stupidly, John $[\text{drank}]_F$ the water.

### Manner ADVs: derived from AO ADVs

- Alternatives "generated by abduction from the script"
- Scripts allow for variants, i.e. specification of manner: "alternative ways in which an event can unfold while still falling under the same event type"

(scripts in the sense of Schank & Abelson 1977)

## Building block 2: Ernst (2002)

### Comparison classes of events

(see also Schäfer 2005, Kubota 2015)

- AO ADVs: Comparison of 'Events'

(7) Rudely, she left.
$\exists e[\mathbf{leave}(e) \wedge \mathbf{Agent}(e, \text{she}) \wedge \exists e' : [e' = [\mathbf{leave}(e) \wedge \mathbf{Agent}(e, \text{she})]] \wedge \text{RUDE}(\text{she}, e', \P e'' \P)]$

- Manner ADVs: Comparison of 'Specified Events'
  - ADV is lower, in Spec, PredP (right above VP).
  - In this position, the Manner Rule applies.

(8) She left rudely.
$\exists e[\mathbf{leave}(e) \wedge \mathbf{Agent}(e, \text{she}) \wedge \exists e' : [e' = [\mathbf{leave}(e) \wedge \mathbf{Agent}(e, \text{she})]] \wedge \text{RUDE}(\text{she}, e', \P e'' : \mathbf{leave}(e'') \wedge \mathbf{Agent}(e'', \text{she}) \P)]$

(event semantic notation from his 1998 ms.; cf. Geuder 2000)

## The proposal

E.g. {Stupidly,} John danced {stupidly}.

### Comparison within an event kind: Manner

⇒ John instantiated the stupid dancing event kind.
$\lambda e.\mathbf{dance}(e, \mathbf{John}) \wedge^{\cup} k(e) \wedge \mathbf{stupid}(k)$

### Comparison between event tokens: Agent-oriented

⇒ John instantiated the dancing event kind; this event token was stupid.
$\lambda e.\mathbf{dance}(e, \mathbf{John}) \wedge^{\cup} k(e) \wedge \mathbf{stupid}(e)$

### Adding event tokens/kinds & within/between-event comp.

- VP: domain of event kinds (cf. Carlson 2003)
- Manner: Within-event-kind comparison (of event subkinds)
- AO: Between-event-token comp. (agent is indirectly judged A because the event token (s)he instantiated is judged A)
- Geuder's focus/script alternatives: members of comparison class

## Building block 3: Sassoon & Toledo (2011)

### Comparison classes with gradable adjectives

(cf. McConnell-Ginet 1973, Klein 1980, Bierwisch 1989, Kennedy 1999, i.a.)

- Relative As: Between-individual comparison

(9) John is tall.
a. for a basketball player in the NBA: e.g. 2.30m
b. for a 10-year-old boy in Germany: e.g. 1.55m

→ Comparing John's height with that of other individuals (extensional context)

- Absolute As: Within-individual comparison

(10) The cup is full.

→ Comparing different stages that this particular cup could be in (intensional context)

### Relation to ILP vs. SLP (Gumiel et al. 2015)

- ILP vs. SLP: Between- vs. within-individual comp.

(11) a. La reunión {**es**/*está} larga. ILP
the meeting is/is$_{loc}$ long
b. El vaso {*es/**está**} lleno. SLP
the vase is/is$_{loc}$ full (Spanish)

### ⇒ Refinement of Geuder (2000)

- As like *stupid*: dispositional, not lexically polysemous

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

→ Agentive reading could involve coercion (under PROG)

## Building block 4: Landman & Morzycki (2003)

(see also Landman 2006, Anderson & Morzycki 2015, Gehrke 2015)

### Event kind anaphora

- Morphological identity in, e.g., German (13), Polish ...
  - Nominal domain: SO refers back to a kind (Carlson 1977)
  - → Verbal domain: SO refers back to an event kind (manner)

(13) a. **so** ein Hund **wie** dieser
such a dog WH this
b. Jan hat **so** getanzt **wie** Maria.
John has such danced WH Mary

- Kind anaph. denotes a property of the resp. entity (ind./event) that realises a (particular contextually supplied) kind:

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

(Anderson & Morzycki 2015, building on Chierchia 1998)

### Further empirical support

- Unacceptable spatio-temporal event token modifiers:

(15) a. *Maria hat am Dienstag getanzt, und Jan hat auch so getanzt.
Intended: 'Mary danced on Tuesday and John also danced like that.'
b. *Maria hat in Minnesota gegessen, und Jan hat auch so gegessen.
Intended: 'Mary ate in Minnesota and John also ate like that.'

- Spatial modifiers that derive a subkind are acceptable:

(16) M. schläft in einem Schlafsack & J. schläft auch so.
'Mary sleeps in a sleeping bag and John also sleeps like that.'

### ⇒ Manner is event kind modification

## Further support: Word order & prosody

### Some well-known differences

- AO but not manner ADVs can be separated from the V by negation:

(17) a. Maria hat {*nicht} **dummerweise** {nicht} geantwortet.
b. Maria hat {nicht} **dumm** {*nicht} geantwortet.
Mary has not stupid-(WEISE) not answered

- AO but not manner ADVs can be extraposed:

(18) Maria hat **{dumm(erweise)}** geantwortet, **{dumm*(erweise)}**.

- AO but not manner ADVs readily appear in sentence-initial position:

(19) **{Dummerweise/*Dumm/DUMM}** hat Maria geantwortet.

- Manner ADVs are prosodically integrated into verbal complex; AO ADVs form own prosodic unit:

(20) a. Maria hat [**DUMM** geantwortet].
b. Maria hat [**DUMMerweise**] [geANTwortet].

### Under the current proposal:

- Elements forming part of an event kind description stay within the VP (cf. Carlson 2003).
- Event tokens rely on instantiating functional verbal structure, which intervenes between the VP and the event token modifying AO adverb.

## Further support: Semantics/pragmatics

(cf. discussion in Tonhauser 2012)

### Diagnosing at-issueness: Assent/dissent with positive continuation

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

⇒ M: STUPID at issue / ANSWERING EVENT not at issue

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

⇒ AO: ANSWERING EVENT at issue / STUPID not a.i.

### Diagnosing non-at-issueness: Assent/dissent with adversative continuation

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

⇒ M: Neither behave like they are not at issue.
→ (Abbott 2000, Schlenker 2008): Manner ADVs presuppose the events they apply to.

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

⇒ AO: STUPID not at issue / ANSWERING EVENT a.i.

### Under the current proposal:

- Manner ADVs: assert instantiation of event subkind & presuppose event superkind
- AO ADVs: evaluate asserted event token (which instantiates event kind) → Convent. Implicature?
  - Side remark in Geuder (2000): AO ADV ∼ parenthetical
  - Same morphology on German evaluative ADVs (*-weise*)

NB Analyses of parentheticals/evaluative ADVs as CIs: Potts (2005), Bonami & Godard (2005), Liu 2012), i.a.

**Selected references**: Carlson 2003 Weak indefinites. *From NP to DP*, John Benjamins • Ernst 2002 *The Syntax of Adjuncts*. CUP • Gehrke 2015 Adjectival participles, event kind modification and pseudo-incorporation. *NLLT* • Geuder 2000 *Oriented Adverbs*. PhD Tübingen • Gumiel et al. 2015 Comparison classes and the relative/absolute distinction. *NLLT* • Landman & Morzycki 2003 Event-kinds and manner modification. *WECOL 2002* • Liu 2012 *Multidimensional Semantics of Evaluative Adverbs*. Brill • Sassoon & Toledo 2011 Absolute and relative adjectives and their comparison classes. Ms. • Tonhauser 2012 Diagnosing (not-)at-issue content. *SULA 6*