

Annual Event Semantics Meeting, 2017, Cologne

24.-25 November 2017

24. November		
10.00 - 10.45	Jens Fleischhauer & Thomas Gamerschlag	Interrelating dynamicity, scalarity and telicity with a special focus on fictive motion
10.50 - 11.35	Michael Herweg	Profiling motion events. A frame-semantic account of the diversity of motion verbs.
Coffee break		
11.55 - 12.40	Frauke Buscher	(Re)interpreting verbs of sound emission as transitive verbs of motion
Lunch break		
14.00 - 14.45	Willi Geuder	Einstellungsadverbiale als Intentionale Adverbiale
14.50 - 15.35	Katja Gabrovská	Towards an analysis of <i>sorgfältig</i>
Coffee break		
15.55 - 16.40	Katherine Fraser	Locative subjects and their semantic constraints in an English change-of-state construction
16.45 - 17.30	Henk Zeevat	Object Theory and Events
19.30	Dinner (place will be announced)	
25. November		
10.00 - 11.00	Atle Grønn	On events and the proper treatment of viewpoint aspect
11.05 - 11.50	Sebastian Bücking	Is <i>describe</i> an intensional verb?
Lunch break		
12.25- 13.10	Katja Laptieva	Partitive uses of the German preposition <i>an</i> ('on', 'at')
13.15 - 14.00	Berit Gehrke & Louise McNally	Idioms and the syntax/semantics interface of descriptive content vs. reference

Contact: Carla Umbach (carla.umbach@uni-koeln.de),
Stefan Hinterwimmer (stefan.hinterwimmer@uni-koeln.de)

The meeting will be in **Luxemburgerstrasse 299, 5th floor**

(take Strassenbahn 18 from Cologne main station to Klettenberg/Bonn/Brühl, leave at stop *Sülzburgstrasse*, see <http://www.kvb-koeln.de>, look for Luxemburgerstrasse in Köln-Klettenberg!!!)

Jens Fleischhauer & Thomas Gamerschlag

Interrelating dynamicity, scalarity and telicity with a special focus on fictive motion

The talk focuses on the relationships between the notions of 'dynamicity', 'scolarity' and 'telicity'. In the first part of the talk, we propose a classification of predicates along these three notions, showing that dynamicity and scalarity are independent from each other as well as scalarity and telicity. The second part of the talk deals with the question whether dynamicity and telicity are independent notions as well. In this regard, we will have a close look at ad-verbial modification of fictive motion uses of German change of state verbs.

Katherine Fraser

Locative subjects and their semantic constraints in an English change-of-state construction

This talk investigates a special class of English change-of-state verbs which exhibit unexpected argument structure: e.g., *the lizard grew a tail *or *the boat broke a rudder*. In the constructions, the surface subject is not the theme, as typically expected for an unaccusative predicate, nor is it an external argument. Instead, the subject has a non-canonical thematic role which would normally be a semantic adjunct: namely, the location of the change-of-state entailed by the predicate. In this talk, I will describe the semantic constraints of the construction, concentrating both on how the subject's unusual semantic role restricts the interpretation, and how the part-whole relationship – required between object and locational subject – has implications for the event structure.

Willi Geuder

Einstellungsadverbiale als Intentionale Adverbiale

Dieser Vortrag untersucht die Wortsemantik von sogenannten Einstellungsadverbialen wie etwa absichtlich, widerwillig, und führt insbesondere einige Fragestellungen fort, die in Buscher (2013) angesprochen wurden. Eine Frage ist hierbei auch, ob sich Einstellungsadverbiale überhaupt als eigenständige grammatische Klasse definieren lassen. Zunächst sind Abgrenzungskriterien zu diskutieren: Einstellungsadverbiale sind idealerweise skopustragend und gehen syntaktische Prädikationsbeziehungen mit einem Argument des Verbs ein, anders als Art&Weise-Adverbiale. Sie würden sich von agentiven Adverbialen (Geuder 2002) wie z.B. unhöflicherweise dadurch unterscheiden, dass in ihrem Skopus das Objekt einer Einstellung steht (also eine Ereignisbeschreibung als kognitives Objekt), anstatt einer Ereignisbeschreibung, über die eine Evaluation prädiert wird. Leider jedoch lassen sich Einstellungsobjekte und Evaluationsobjekte nicht scharf trennen, und die betreffenden Adverbiale können auch neben einer Einstellung weitere Bedeutungskomponenten einschließen, womit sie auch in die Nähe von agentiven oder Art&Weise-Adverbialen rücken können. Die semantische Analyse kann also nur auf den Nachweis von Bedeutungskomponenten bauen, die dann in verschiedenen Kombinationen vorkommen. Als prototypisches Merkmal für die Bestimmung von Einstellungsadverbialen möchte ich vorschlagen, dass sie eine Relation zwischen einer Handlungsbeschreibung und einem Handlungsplan (im Sinne von Goldman 1970) enthalten. Für den Fall absichtlich bedeutet dies z.B.: absichtlich (x,e,P), d.h. "ein Ereignis e unter der Beschreibung P ist absichtlich (von x)", wenn es einen Handlungsplan H mit einem Handlungsziel Z gibt, sodass P in H eine vorausgehende Bedingung für Z ist. Handlungspläne

sind dabei konzeptuelle Strukturen, die sich durch Frames im Sinne von Löbner (2015) darstellen lassen. Dieses Modell erlaubt es, das Wortfeld der betreffenden Modifikatoren mit folgenden Parametern aufzuspannen: a) Grad der Bewusstheit des Agens für P, b) Arten der Einordnung von P bezügl. Z, c) Kongruenz / Diskrepanz von P oder seinen Kausalfolgen zu H, d) Korrelation zu Attributen des Handlungsablaufs (Art&Weise). — Diese verschiedenen Komponenten finden sich jedoch tatsächlich nicht nur in klassischen Einstellungsadverbialen.

Atle Grønn

On events and the proper treatment of viewpoint aspect

Partee (1973) changed the way we analyze tense in natural language, criticizing the standard quantificational approach to tense. What about aspect? What is the standard view and should it be challenged?

Viewpoint aspect (Smith 1991), perfective vs. imperfective, mediates between the verb phrase (event predicate) and tense. Klein (1995) popularized the idea that aspects express temporal (inclusion) relations between the assertion time and the temporal trace of the event argument of the underlying VP. The idea was formalized in a compositional setting in seminal papers by Krifka (1992), Kratzer (1998) and a dozen papers by von Stechow. The standard view, following these authors, is that the event argument is existentially closed off at the level of AspP.

In this talk I will discuss cases where interpretation and compositionality require some departure from the standard view, although we clearly want to keep the insights gained from the above-mentioned approaches. The cases under discussion include (i) aspect under direct perception (John saw Mary win/winning – discussed without taking aspect and compositionality into account in Higginbotham 1983), (ii) aspect in Ancient Greek participles (He was speaking praising God – Bary & Haug 2011), and (iii) anaphoric/referential aspect (Grønn 2004, Grønn & von Stechow 2016, Demirdache & Uribe-Etxebarria 2014). Data from Russian aspect will possibly shed some light on these issues.

Michael Herweg

Profiling motion events. A frame-semantic account of the diversity of motion verbs.

This talk presents a frame-semantic account of some of the manifold phenomena that can be observed in motion expressions in typologically diverse languages. The core of the proposed approach is a basic *locomotion* frame complemented with a mechanism of profiling that operates on this frame. The *locomotion* frame, which serves as the basic conceptual representation of motion events, provides a rich structure which features the pivotal elements beneficial for the semantic representation of different types of motion descriptions. The profiling mechanism allows to select, deselect and augment elements of this frame structure, as well as to specify significant relations between distinct parts of the frame. With these means, the profiling mechanism facilitates fine-grained differentiations among motion verbs that considerably exceed the classic dichotomy of path and manner-of-motion verbs. The proposed theory is applied to different kinds of path and manner-of-motion verbs, including those typically found in path-dominant and manner-dominant

languages, as well as in languages which exhibit a pronounced diversity of motion verbs lined up in serial verb constructions. The suggested frame-semantic analyses thus reveal intricate differentiations in a multifaceted linguistic domain.

Henk Zeevat

Object Theory and Events

The question what events are has been put repeatedly, both in arguing against event semantics and in proposing a defense for talking about events. In the talk, I will not answer the question but take the point of view that any natural concept comes with a notion of the object that fulfills it, the internal and external representation of any true representation that is based on the concept. This is the view of Meinong and Twardovski based on a long tradition going back to Aristotle. Events in this view are the internal objects of non-stative verbal concepts and the specification of their external objects comes with exactly the same problems as attend to many nominal concepts, such as hills, holes and hats. I sketch a general way of dealing with such problems and try to apply it to some verbal concepts.

Berit Gehrke & Louise McNally

Idioms and the syntax/semantics interface of descriptive content vs. reference

The syntactic literature on idioms contains some proposals (e.g. Sportiche 2005, Cecchetto & Donati 2015) that are surprising from a compositional perspective: They propose that, in the case of verb-object idioms, the verb combines directly with the noun inside its DP complement, and the determiner is introduced higher up in the syntactic structure, or is late-adjoined. This seems to violate compositionality insofar as it is generally assumed that the semantic role of the determiner is to convert a noun to the appropriate semantic type to serve as the argument to the function denoted by the verb.

In this paper, we establish a connection between this line of analysis and lines of work in semantics that have developed outside of the domain of idioms, including work on incorporation and a recent implementation of a semantics for the “layered” DP (Zamparelli 1995) developed in McNally (to appear), McNally & Boleda (to appear). What all of this research in semantics shares is that in one way or another it separates the composition of descriptive content from that of discourse referent introducing material; what the latter proposal offers is a particularly promising way to handle the compositional difficulties posed by idioms.

S. Bücking

Is *describe* an intensional verb?

In inventories of candidates for intensional transitive verbs such as Forbes (2006, 3.1) or Schwarz (2015, 2.3), *describe* is not mentioned. However, in (1), Mia's description does not target a specific unicorn in the world, but provides an unspecific image of what unicorns in general amount to. Furthermore, on this reading, extensionally equivalent expressions cannot be substituted *salva veritate*, as shown by (2). That is, *describe* seems to comply with the two hallmarks of intensional transitives.

- (1) [friends playing taboo] Mia is describing a unicorn, I am sure!
 (2) a. Let all event semanticists be opera fans, and vice versa.
 b. Mia described an event semanticist. \rightarrow Mia described an opera fan.

Intuitively, the contribution made by *describe* is very similar to the contribution made by depiction verbs such as *paint*. While *paint* relates to the production of pictorial representations, *describe* relates to the production of textual representations. As is well-known, depiction verbs such as *paint* give also rise to intensional effects; see (3)/(4).

- (3) [friends playing a drawing & guessing game] Mia is painting a unicorn, I am sure!
 (4) a. Let all event semanticists be opera fans, and vice versa.
 b. Mia painted an event semanticist. \rightarrow Mia painted an opera fan.

However, this is not the full story. For one, it is fairly controversial whether depiction verbs should in fact receive an intensional analysis; see Forbes (2006), Zimmermann (2016), Bücking (2017) for discussion. Furthermore, the putative analogy between *describe* and *paint* is deceiving. For instance, with *paint*, the slot for the object phrase can be filled by the produced object itself, which is impossible for *describe*, as shown by (5). Similarly, only the pictorial representation is anaphorically accessible, as shown by (6).

- (5) a. Mia painted a picture of a unicorn. [picture = produced object]
 b. Mia described a text on a unicorn. [text \neq produced object]
 (6) a. Mia painted a unicorn. It_{pictorial repres.} turned out beautifully.
 b. # Mia described a unicorn. It_{textual repres.} turned out beautifully.

In my talk, I will discuss the key characteristics of the verb *describe* and suggest first steps towards its lexical analysis.

References

- Bücking, Sebastian (2017). *painting cows* from a type-logical perspective. (Handout; *Sinn und Bedeutung 22* at the University of Potsdam / ZAS Berlin)
- Forbes, Graeme (2006). *Attitude Problems. An Essay on Linguistic Intensionality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Schwarz, Florian (2015). Intensional Transitive Verbs. I Owe You a Horse. Manuscript, University of Pennsylvania
- Zimmermann, Thomas Ede (2016). Painting and Opacity. In: *Von Rang und Namen. Philosophical Essays in Honour of Wolfgang Spohn* (hg. von Wolfgang Freitag, Hans Rott, Holger Sturm & Alexandra Zinke), S. 225–251. Münster: Mentis

(Re)interpreting verbs of sound emission as transitive verbs of motion

Frauke Buscher

Verbs of sound emission can be combined with directional adverbials, cf. the intransitive version in (1) and the transitive version in (2):

- (1) a. Das Taxi quietscht um die Ecke.
b. Der Wind pfeift durch das Haus.
c. Der Fußballer schnauft über den Platz.
- (2) a. Der Postbote klingelt Max aus dem Bett.
b. Der Schiri pfeift den Stürmer vom Platz.

These examples describe not only a sound emission but also a motion: In (1), the subject referent moves along the path specified by the PP and its motion causes the sound emission described by the verb. (2) establishes a reverse causal relation: the sound emission described by the verb causes a motion of the object referent. Most importantly, neither the combination with the directional PP which is typically classified as an argument nor the interpretation as a motion event is licensed by the lexical semantics of the verb (in contrast to typical motion verbs like *fahren*). For this reason, these examples play an important role in the overall theoretical discussion: they challenge traditional projective approaches assuming a rigid mapping from a static lexicon to syntax. In these frameworks, the meaning of (1) and (2) is not compositionally derivable. Construction grammar approaches analyze these examples via constructions and refer to this phenomenon to motivate their core assumptions in general (e.g. Goldberg 1995, Goldberg & Jackendoff 2004). Taking this dispute between projective approaches and construction grammar approaches as a starting point, I argue that Asher's (2011) dynamic approach to lexical semantics offers a new perspective on the debate by inspiring an analysis of (1) and (2) in terms of meaning adjustments (see also the core idea in Maienborn 1994). My proposal is based on two main hypotheses: (i) The directional PP is not integrated as an argument but as a modifier. (ii) The modificational structure results in a type conflict between the event and the PP which is solved by interpolating a (transitive or intransitive) motion event and reconfiguring the semantic structure. These coercion mechanisms are licensed and restricted by lexical information. I will show that the analysis via coercion captures the phenomenon significantly better than an analysis via constructions (e.g. interpretational and combinatorial restrictions). In this talk, I focus especially on the transitive version in German which differs from the intransitive version in some crucial aspects (e.g. interpretational and combinatorial restrictions, impact on the verb's argument structure).

- Asher, Nicholas (2011). *Lexical Meaning in Context. A Web of Words*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldberg, Adele (1995). *A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Goldberg, Adele & Ray Jackendoff (2004). The English Resultative as a Family of Constructions. *Language* 80(3), 532-568.
- Maienborn, Claudia (1994). Kompakte Strukturen. Direktionale PPn und nicht-lokale Verben. In: S. Felix, Ch. Habel & G. Rickheit (Hgg.). *Kognitive Linguistik. Repräsentation und Prozesse*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 229-249.

Towards an analysis of *sorgfältig*

Katja Gabrovská, CRC991, Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf

Abstract

The literature on German adverbs does not have a lot to say with respect to *sorgfältig* ('carefully'). It is mostly assumed that this modifier is an agent-oriented manner adverb based on its behavior with regard to certain paraphrases (cf. Schäfer, 2013). Nevertheless, the lexical meaning of *sorgfältig* is still largely unexplored. Schäfer (2013, 125) suggests that the modifier restricts the number of ways or manners in which somebody might act. Principally we agree with Schäfer and argue that *sorgfältig* restricts the methods available for the realization of an action on a more abstract level than manner adverbs like *zügig* ('quickly') do. Furthermore, we propose that the modifier imposes an overall quality restriction on the result of the action. Both kinds of restrictions are directly connected to the agent's wants and beliefs causing the action (cf. Goldman, 1970). Adopting Goldman's ideas on human action, we propose an analysis of *sorgfältig* which allow us to capture the impact of the adverb on the method and result components, as well as their interaction with the agent.

References

- M. Schäfer. *Positions and interpretations. German adverbial adjectives at the syntax-semantics interface*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 2013.
- A. I. Goldman. *A theory of human action*. Prentice-Hall INC., New Jersey, 1970.

Partitive uses of the German preposition *an* ('at', 'on')

Katja Laptieva (Institute for the German Language, Mannheim)

The starting point of this talk is the question how the prepositional meaning and the entire spectrum of prepositional uses can be best described. I will show that the bottom-up approach to the analysis of corpus data is particularly well suited for this purpose: a thorough analysis of individual sentences in a larger collection of data can enable the detection of (sometimes non-obvious) connections between different prepositional uses so that generalisations about the preposition meaning can be formulated.

This idea is illustrated by the group of semantically similar uses of the German preposition *an* that are shown in (1) to (5). Some of them were already recognised and investigated, e.g. the progressive construction in (1) or the split stimuli construction in (4) (see Filip 1989 and Engelberg 2015 respectively), while the other uses in (2), (3) and (5) have so far been ignored:

- (1) Paul schreibt an einem Aufsatz.
Paul writes on an essay.
'Paul is writing an essay.'
- (2) Paul nippt an seinem Milchkaffee.
Paul sips at his latte.
'Paul is sipping his latte.'
- (3) Seine Stimme gewinnt wieder an Kraft.
His voice gains again at strength.
'His voice gains strength again.'
- (4) Ich schätze an ihm seine Vielseitigkeit.
I appreciate at him his versatility.
'I appreciate his versatility.'
- (5) Paul verletzte sich an der Schulter.
Paul injured himself at the shoulder.
'Paul has injured his shoulder.'

In this talk, I will argue that the uses in (1) to (5) are not mutually independent prepositional readings, but are better captured as belonging to the partitive usage of the preposition *an*. First results of a corpus study will be presented. On their basis, I will describe the individual uses in (1) to (5), their semantic peculiarities and the relationship between them. In particular, I will examine the role of the prepositional phrase with *an* in the process of the meaning composition of the whole sentence.

Engelberg, Stefan (2015): Gespaltene Stimulus-Argumente bei Psych-Verben. Quantitative Verteilungsdaten als Indikator für die Dynamik sprachlichen Wissens über Argumentstrukturen. In: Engelberg, Stefan et al. (Hg.): Argumentstruktur zwischen Valenz und Konstruktion. Tübingen: Narr. S. 469–491. (= Studien zur deutschen Sprache, Band 68).

Filip, Hana (1989): Aspectual properties of the *an*-construction in German. In: Werner, Abraham/Janssen, Theo (Hg.): Tempus - Aspekt - Modus. Die lexikalischen und grammatischen Formen in den germanischen Sprachen. De Gruyter. S. 259–292. (= Linguistische Arbeiten, Band 237).