Counting Events and Data

Dirk Wiebel

SFB 441 – University of Tübingen, Germany

`dirk.wiebel@uni-tuebingen.de`

1 Theoretical Assumptions

Temporal adverbs of quantification (QADV) have a great impact on the event structures of languages; they seem to limit possible constructions of tense, *Aktionsarten*, and external information on the event structures. For a subset of QADV in German I will discuss the restrictions that occur within some given temporal contexts. Kratzer's (1978) interval model will be taken as a basis: Quantification requires either countable entities or some sort of container – a general timespan, in which a quantity can be described. Therefore, the given entities can be quantified within a given interval, or sub-intervals can be quantified separately in order to be well-interpretable.

Besides characteristics of the verb or external markers such as frames/spans, the tense sytem is another constructional unit that sets up intervals. For German, Latzel (1967) and Hauser-Suida/Hoppe-Beugel (1972) point out that some frequency adverbs restrict the usage of *Präteritum*. For French *présent*, de Swart (1992) shows problematic constructions with iterative adverbs (IADV), which have equivalents at least in German. In summary, three combinations cause problems in the construction of intervals:

– NEVER type adverbials and *Präteritum*: [?]Kathinka spielte nie Cembalo.
– ALWAYS type adverbials and *Präteritum*: [?]Kathinka spielte immer Cembalo.
– Iterative adverbials and *Präsens*: *Kathinka spielt dreimal Cembalo.

However, the problematic constructions are closely related to the specific *Aktionsart* and externally given intervals. A basic set of *Aktionsarten*, derived from the verb categories based on Vendler (1967) and extended by Klein's (1994) *0-state-predicates* and *Semelfaktiva* is sufficient to separate telicity and durativity. An initial set of examples, based on tense and *Aktionsart*, lead to the following hypotheses:

A1: *0-state-predicates* do not allow quantification with IADV and *Präsens*. Habituality results in *0-state-predicates*.
A2: Non-durative predicates do not restrict quantification with IADV and *Präsens*.
A3: Durative predicates do not restrict quantification with IADV and *Präsens* if a larger frame (topic time, TT) is given explicitly or implicitly.

B1: *0-state-predicates* do not restrict the FADV types *nie*, *immer* and *Präteritum*.
B2: Non-durative predicates do not restrict the FADV types *nie*, *immer* and *Präteritum* if a frame (TT) or sub-intervals are given explicitly or implicitly.
B3: Durative predicates do not restrict the FADV types *nie*, *immer* and *Präteritum* if some subintervals are given. Homogeneous states can be quantified within that TT.

2 Empirical Enquiries

The theoretical issues in this context are very much dependent on the chosen data structures for linguistic evidence, methods and the quantitiy of the data. Latzel's introspective data have shown non-interpretable combinations. However, his large list of exceptions demonstrates the need for additional data. Hauser-Suida and Hoppe-Beugel corroborate Latzel's observations, having found no single example of *nie* or *immer* and *Präteritum*. Nevertheless, numerous such examples can be found in a larger and more heterogeneous corpus than the 28 novel dialogues Hauser-Suida and Hoppe-Beugel used. In my analysis of 1.300 randomly accessed examples from the COSMAS System, *Präteritum* turns out to be the default case for FADV combinations. In additions, *Aktionsarten* and external spans/frames show important impact on interpretability.

A larger set of more heterogeneous corpus data has lead to different conclusions than Latzel's introspective data and Hauser-Suida/Hoppe-Beugel's homogeneous corpus data. Nevertheless, corpus data appears not to be sufficient for the evaluation of interpretability. Large amounts of idioms and the lack of 'exotic' expressions show that possibly difficult constructions seem to be avoided in written data sources. Therefore, a test based on acceptability judgements is planned for early 2004.

References

de Swart, H. (1992). *Adverbs of Quantification. A Generalized Quantifiers Approach.* Ph.D. dissertation, Groningen.

Hauser-Suida, U. and G. Hoppe-Beugel (1972). *Die Vergangenheitstempora in der deutschen geschriebenen Sprache der Gegenwart.* Hueber, München.

Klein, W. (1994). *Time in Language*. Routledge, London.

Kratzer, A. (1978). *Semantik der Rede. Kontexttheorie – Modalwrter – Konditionalsätze.* Scriptor, Königsstein/Taunus.

Latzel, S. (1967). *Die deutschen Tempora Perfekt und Präteritum.* Hueber, München.

Vendler, Z. (1967). *Linguistics in Philosophy.* Cornell University Press, Ithaka.