Event Semantics 2019

1. + 2. November 2019

Institut für Slavistik, HU Berlin
Dorotheenstraße 65, Raum 5.57

Freitag, 1. Nov. 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Martin Schäfer</td>
<td>Syntactic options and interpretational variety</td>
<td>Schäfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Curt Anderson</td>
<td>Enriched meanings and pseudo-incorporated bare singular count nouns in English</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>Claudia Maienborn</td>
<td>Wie tanzt Olga, die schöne Tänzerin?</td>
<td>Maienborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>Katie Fraser, Daniel Hole</td>
<td>An event-semantic analysis of the <em>swarm</em> alternation</td>
<td>FraserHole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>Sven Kotowski</td>
<td><em>Out</em>-prefixed verbs in English: evidence against one polysemous affix</td>
<td>Kotowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>Fabienne Martin</td>
<td>Non-culminating telic path descriptions</td>
<td>Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Samstag, 2. Nov 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Sebastian Bücling</td>
<td>Narration without narrating</td>
<td>Bücling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Sebastian Löbner</td>
<td>Reflections of cascade formation in action verb semantics and grammar</td>
<td>Löbner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>Henk Zeevat</td>
<td>Notional Events and Belief</td>
<td>Zeevat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

welcome meeting, Thursday:
19.30 Deponie No. 3 (in den S-Bahn-Bögen Friedrichstraße, [http://deponie3.de](http://deponie3.de))

dinner, Friday:
19.30 Cô Chu (Vietnamesisches Restaurant), Invalidenstraße 29, [https://www.co-chu.de](https://www.co-chu.de)

workshop organization:
Berit Gehrke (HU Berlin)
Carla Umbach (ZAS Berlin / Universität Köln)
Curt Anderson (Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf)

Enriched meanings and pseudo-incorporated bare singular count nouns in English

In this talk look at combinations of a verb and a bare singular count noun in certain varieties of North American English, such as drive truck and teach school. These V+N combinations receive an interpretation where they must denote a profession or some other stereotypical activity. I argue that these are a case of pseudo-incorporation in English, and develop a formal analysis of pseudo-incorporation using frame semantics. With this analysis, I show how the stereotypical interpretation comes about, and am able to explain the relative paucity of attributive modifiers of the noun (*drive fast truck), as well as the restricted modifiability of the entire V+N complex (drive truck for twenty years but not *drive truck slowly).

Sebastian Bücking

Narration without narrating

Narrative discourse structures in literary texts can typically be distinguished by whether they suggest the fiction of a narrator or not. For instance, the opening passage of the short story in (1) suggests that a narrating situation with a narrator exists, whereas the one in (2) does not.

(1) Ich muß immer an diesen roten Teufel von einer Katze denken, und ich weiß nicht, ob das richtig war, was ich getan hab. Es hat damit angefangen, daß ich auf dem Steinhaufen neben dem Bombentrichter in unserem Garten saß ... (Rinser, Die rote Katze)

‘I always have to think of this red devil of a cat, and I don’t know whether it was right what I did. It all started with me sitting on a pile of stones next to the bomb crater in our garden...’

(2) Plötzlich wachte sie auf. Es war halb drei. Sie überlegte, warum sie aufgewacht war. Ach so! In der Küche hatte jemand gegen einen Stuhl gestoßen. Sie horchte nach der Küche. Es war still. Es war zu still und ... (Borchert, Das Brot)

‘Suddenly she woke up. It was half past two. She was thinking about why she had woken up. Oh well! In the kitchen someone had hit a chair. She was listening for the kitchen. It was silent. It was too silent and...’

From a linguistic perspective, Eckardt (2015) proposes that the impression of not having a narrator in a narration simply follows from the narration not providing much information about the narrator; that is, a narrator is always present, but readers lack sufficient knowledge about it. In my talk, I will recap Eckardt’s proposal and its motivation, raise potential problems, and provide an outlook for an alternative analysis in terms of Maier’s (2017) Attitude Description Theory. Particular attention will be paid to the controversial question of how to interpret past tense in German narrative discourse. I will thereby relate the discussion of narrating situations to Hamburger’s (1994) famous hypothesis that German grammar provides an atemporal epic preterit.


Katherine Fraser, Daniel Hole

An event-semantic analysis of the *swarm* alternation

In this talk, we provide the first explicit syntax and semantics of the non-base alternant of the *swarm* alternation as in *The garden is swarming with bees*. We identify locatum and event abundance as well as imperfectivization as entailed components of meaning. At the not-at-issue level we single out the C-level categories of scalar evaluation and mirativity as contributing to the complex semantics of the non-base alternant. Towards the end, we propose a syntax and semantics that implements all of these ingredients.
Polysemy constitutes a core problem of derivational semantics, giving rise to the question of how to best analyze the relationship between similar output forms. English verbs prefixed with *out*- come in at least two guises, locative (e.g. *outsource*, *out-migrate*) and scalar-comparative (e.g. *outrun*, *outsmart*). Although several accounts in the literature assume some form of PATH=SCALE-metaphor to underlie the relationship between these constructions, they are both under-researched and ill-understood—with locative *out*- being downright neglected. Based on a data set of more than 1,000 tokens, I show fundamental differences between the two prefix uses to clearly outweigh their commonalities, arguing for two distinct morphological processes rather than one polysemous, highly underspecified affix. Being at least weakly resultative, both constructions are shown to add sub-event(s) to their base forms, while differences concern the syntactic frames and alternations they occur in, stress assignment, promiscuity regarding allowed base classes, and the number of sub-events the respective constructions add. Generalizing over the data, I formalize this behavior via distinct lexeme-formation rules for different senses of *out*- in (Düsseldorf) frame semantics.

Sebastian Löbner

**Reflections of cascade formation in action verb semantics and grammar**

„Cascades“ in the sense of Löbner (in print), based on Goldman’s (1970) theory of level-generation, are a model of coherent multi-level simultaneous categorization of action. Human doings, by ourselves or others, are not just simple events, but are usually categorized as constituting in one a “cascade” of a multitude of action types. I want to venture the following Cascade Hypothesis: “The human brain inevitably attempts to categorize human doings in coherent cascades of action types realized in one.” If the hypothesis indeed applies, it is to be expected that cascade formation is reflected in language, in particular in the meanings and constructions of action verbs.

Evidence will be presented that reflects cascade formation that is either explicit in certain patterns of word formation or implicit in well-known semantic subclasses of action verbs. The examples presented are taken from Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Lakhota, English, and German. They illustrate where higher cascade formation takes us: to achieving results, to actions of a particular evaluation (such as ‘forbidden’ or ‘pleasant’), and to social interaction.

Claudia Maienborn

**Wie tanzt Olga, die schöne Tänzerin?**


Fabienne Martin

**Non-culminating telic path descriptions**

(joint work with Margaret Grant, Florian Schäfer and Christopher Piñón)
We look at the interpretation of German and English sentences with motion verbs combined with a path-PP expressing a goal, more specifically (up) to/(bis) zu-PPs. The traditional view is that PPs of this type denote a set of paths that end at the DP’s referent. The inference that the goal is reached is thus commonly analyzed as an entailment both with up to and to, see Jackendoff 1983, 1987, Smith 1991, Piñón 1993, as well as with both bis zu and zu, see e.g. Haselbach 2017. A first problem with this view is that VPs formed with manner verbs and to/zu-PPs may have cumulative reference (i.e., they are regularly used with durative adverbials on an event-oriented reading in corpora). A second problem is that with an animate subject, the inference that the goal is reached seems defeasible with both zu- and to-PPs. Our experimental data indeed suggest that the inference that the goal is reached by the critical (animate) referent is cancellable in both languages in an appropriate context with manner of motion verbs as well as with go in English, while in both languages, with come-verbs, it is much more strongly implied.

To explain these data as well as the possibility for to/zu-PPs to have cumulative reference, we propose that to- and zu-PPs have a modal reading that concerns an agent’s intention. To account for the verb-type effect – and more specifically the fact that the inference that the goal is reached is stronger with come-verbs than with goverbs in both languages – we question the common view that come and go have exactly the same assertive meaning (and only differ by their indexical presupposition). Instead, we argue that come/kommen are inherently unaccusative (they cannot have an agentive subject), while go/gehen are not (they can have an agentive subject). A second difference between come-verbs and go-verbs concern their event structure: while the former have have a bi-eventive structure from the start (they introduce a result state argument at the lexical level), the latter do not: the bi-eventive structure only arises at the level of the VP containing the PP or the result particle.
If the subject believes it to be instantiated, the concept is also an object of belief of the subject. As a conceptual entity, the fact that whatever would fulfill the notional event realizes sentences of the right type depends only on the conceptual content of the notional event and on the semantic structure of the sentence and can be understood as an entailment: the notional event E entails S. To believes in S is to believe that some object e realizes S. E is the concept of e and x is committed to E iff x believes that E is instantiated by some object e.