**Instructions for the annotation of German/French data**

When annotating the data, you’ll have to select one of the different readings of the expressions used to classify the verbs, for instance adverbials like *en deux heures, pendant deux heures,* etc, and understand certain specific technical terms. We’ll introduce you to these terms and the different readings of the relevant expressions through simple examples, and give a ‘name’ to each of these readings, that will be used in the questions.

**1. The progressive**

The first thing you are asked to rate is the acceptability of the verb under the reading it has in the sentence at hand with the progressive (***être en train de***in French). For this test, you can forget about temporal adverbials that might be included in the sentence if they trigger a problem with the progressive

We’ll use a scale going from 0 (totally unacceptable) to 5 (totally acceptable)

Totally unacceptable 0----1-----2-----3------4-------5 totally acceptable

Some examples of a plausible rating on this scale are found in the next table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Il a accumulé une somme considérable | 5 (“Il est en train d’accumuler une somme considérable” is completely fine) |
| Pierre aime ses amis pour leur franchise | 0 (“Pierre est en train d’aimer ses amis pour leur franchise” is completely unacceptable) |
| J’ai mangé un sandwich à midi dans la cuisine | 5 (“Je suis en train de manger un sandwich dans la cuisine” is completely fine (“à midi” is strange in this sentence, but remember the comment above) |
| Le fleuve baigne la ville | 0 (“Le fleuve est en train de baigner la ville” is very odd, since it suggests it might stop doing so!) |
| La robe se boutonne mal | 0/2 (“la robe est en train de mal se boutonner” is very strange, but perhaps less than in the previous sentence) |

**2. The completion inference**

When looking at a specific verb, you will have to assume that its internal argument (underlined in the following examples) is used with **a singular indefinite or plural/singular definite** (e.g. *le, les, un*), even if it is not the case in the sentence which is submitted to you. So for instance, you have to evaluate the sentences (1/2/3a) under their counterparts (1/2/3b)

(1a) *Pierre a mangé* ***des*** *pommes.*

(2a) ***Des*** *plantes ont poussé.*

(3a) *Le poêle a mangé* ***beaucoup de*** *charbon.*

(1b) *Pierre a mangé* ***les*** *pommes.*

(2b) ***Les*** *plantes ont poussé.*

(3b) *Le poêle a mangé* ***le*** *charbon.*

**As a general rule, when you evaluate the completion inference, you have to evaluate the sentence as if it contained a perfective tense (e.g. the *passé composé* in French), even if the corpus sentence contains another tense.**

Certain VPs under their perfective forms (*passé composé*) with a definite or a singular indefinite suggest by themselves that the event they describe have an ‘inherent endpoint’. It is for instance the case of “*eat the apple”,* for one cannot eat a specific apple for ever: once it is completely eaten, there is no way to continue eating it. On the other hand, ‘caress the cat’ does not encode an ‘inherent endpoint’: one can caress a specific cat for ever, if one wants to.

We will say that ‘eat the apple’ **triggers a completion inference**, while ‘caress’ the cat’ **does not trigger such an inference.**

Be careful: when you’ll be asked whether a verb triggers a completion inference, you always have to evaluate the verb with a singular indefinite or a definite internal argument, and with a perfective tense.

In some cases, the sentence under the *passé composé* is very strange.

Example:

*Cette fille est bien balancée.*

???*Cette fille a été bien balancée.*

If this is the case, you do not rate the completion inference, but indicates ‘--’ in the column 2. (this will tell us that you do not accept the sentence with a *passé composé*  to begin with).

**Important: for those sentences which are strange with the *passé composé*, you can stop the test after column 2. (You DON’T have to go through all the other tests for those verbs).**

We’ll ask you to rate the triggering of a completion inference through a 0-5 scale:

Completion inference?

certainly no 0----1-----2-----3------4-------5 certainly yes

Some examples of a plausible rating on this scale are found in the next table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Le chat a grossi* | 0 (the cat can always get bigger and bigger) |
| *La salle s’est vidée* | 5 (once the room is completely empty, it cannot get even emptier ) |
| *Le mur a noirci* | 5 (once the wall is completely black, it cannot get blackier) |
| *J’ai allongé le pantalon* | 3 (trousers cannot be ‘completely long’, but it seems that the job of lengthening the trousers the way the customer wants them to be *has* an inherent endpoint!) |
| *J’ai lu le texte* | 3 (it seems that this event has an inherent endpoint indeed --- once I’ve read the text, I’m finished! --- but I can read it indefinitely, somehow…) |
| *J’ai marché dans le parc* | 0 (I can walk in the park for ever) |
| *Je suis allé à la gare* | 5 (once I’m at the station, there is no way I can continue going to the station!) |
| *Le living a communiqué avec la chambre.* | --- (the *passé composé* is strange here, as the progressive is) |

**3A-C. *Pendant***

**As a general rule, when you evaluate the adverbial *pendant,* you have to evaluate the sentence as if it contained a perfective tense (e.g. the *passé composé* in French), even if the corpus sentence contains another tense.**

When evaluating this adverbial, you will firstly be asked to grade on a scale from 0 to 5 the acceptability of the perfective sentence where the verb is modified by *pendant 5 minutes*, **on any of its readings.**

The test question is:

Is the perfective sentence that contains the verb (with a definite internal argument) modified by *pendant* acceptable?

completely unacceptable 0----1-----2-----3------4-------5 completely acceptable

Some examples of a plausible rating on this scale are found in the next table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *J’ai marché dans le parc pendant 2 minutes* | 5 |
| *J’ai tué le chat pendant 2 minutes* | 0 |
| *Je suis arrivé à Bruxelles pendant 2 minutes* | 0 |
| *J’ai rempli le document pendant 2 minutes* | 5 |
| *J’ai mangé ma pizza pendant 2 minutes* | 3/4 |
| *Elle a rougi pendant 5 minutes* | 5 |
| *J’ai éternué pendant 5 minutes* | 5 |

**If you judge the sentence acceptable (value >2)**, you will be asked about the way you interpret the adverbial when combined with the particular verb considered (again, in a perfective sentence with a definite internal argument).

**If you judge the sentence unacceptable (value < or =2), you don’t have to fill the columns 3B and 3C.**

**Important note:** Sometimes, the test sentence contains an temporal adjunct (ex: *toute la nuit*) or a manner adverbial (ex: *avec la voiture*) that makes the *en*-adverbial a bit strange.

Examples:

*Les moustiques ont mangé Pierre en deux heures* is fine

But

*Les moustiques ont mangé Pierre toute la nuit en deux heures* is strange.

*On a mangé les kilomètres pendant deux heures* is fine

But

*On a mangé les kilomètres avec cette voiture pendant deux heures* is a bit odd

**In that case, you can do as if the problematic adverbial were absent in order to evaluate the acceptability of the adverbials tested (*en, pendant, complètement*).**

When applied to verbs that do not encode an inherent endpoint (eg *marcher dans le parc*), adverbials like *pendant deux heures* receive what we call their `standard’ reading. On the other hand, when these adverbials are acceptable with verbs that encode or tend to encode an inherent endpoint, they select *one* or *several* of the **other** readings of this kind of adverbials, the **partitive** reading, the **iterative** reading, or the **result state** reading.

Under the **partitive** reading (column 3B), the perfective sentence describes an event in progress but (probably) not finished. This reading is **not** available with verbs that do not encode an inherent point.

Examples:

*Il a rempli le camion pendant cinq minutes*. OK Partitive reading of *pendant* (the event of filling the truck is partly performed, but probably not completely).

*Il a marché dans le parc pendant cinq minutes.* No partitive reading of *pendant* (the event of walking in the parc is not understood as ‘partly’ performed only).

You will firstly be asked to grade on a scale from 0 to 5 whether the partitive reading is acceptable.

Note: you are asked to evaluate the sentence such that the adverbial *pendant* under this reading applies to **one event** only. In some cases, the most salient reading of *pendant* is one where the VP describes an *iteration (repetition)* of events (*e.g. “Elle a éternué pendant 5 secondes*”). **This repetitive reading should be discarded** for the rating of the partitive reading.

Partitive reading of *pendant* (when the verb describes a single event)?

completely unacceptable 0----1-----2-----3------4-------5 completely acceptable

Some examples of a plausible rating on this scale are found in the next table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Pierre a joué dans la cour pendant deux heures | 0 |
| Pierre a caressé le chat pendant deux minutes | 0 |
| Pierre a vidé le camion pendant 10 minutes | 5 |
| Pierre a éternué pendant 5 secondes | 0 (*éternuer* can’t be used to describe a sneezing event which is partly performed only) |
| Pierre a rougi pendant 5 minutes | 2/3 (difficult, but perhaps not impossible, to imagine a situation where Pierre partly performed a ‘blushing’ event, although not completely) |

The other ‘non-standard’ reading of *pendant* is what we call the **result state** reading (**column 3C**), under which the adverbial applies not to the action/event/process described by the verb, but rather on the *result* of this event. Therefore, under this reading, the action/event/process could very well be completely performed.

Example: *Pierre a vidé le camion pendant 10 minutes* may mean that Peter finished emptying the truck, and left it empty for 10 minutes. In that context, this adverbial receives what we call the result state reading of *pendant*.

This reading is not always available with verbs that encode an inherent endpoint, for some verbs do not (clearly) describe a result. Take for instance *Pierre a mangé son sandwich pendant 10 minutes*. It is very weird to assume a context where Pierre ate his sandwich, and then ‘left it eaten’ for 10 minutes only! It seems that once the sandwich is eaten, it is forever eaten. Therefore, the result state reading of *pendant* is not acceptable with *manger un sandwich.* The same problem appears with *brosser la cour, nettoyer la cuisine,* etc.

Again, when rating this reading, you are asked to consider the verb in a perfective sentence (with a *passé composé*), with a definite internal argument, and in a non-iterative (non-repetitive) context.

Result state reading of *pendant* (when the verb describes a single event)?

completely unacceptable 0----1-----2-----3------4-------5 completely acceptable

Some examples of a plausible rating on this scale are found in the next table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Pierre a joué dans la cour pendant deux heures | 0 |
| La ville a construit le pont pendant deux ans. | 0 |
| J’ai lu le journal pendant 10 minutes | 0 |
| Pierre a éternué pendant 5 secondes | 0 (*éternuer* can’t be used to describe a sneezing event which is partly performed only) |
| Pierre a rougi pendant 10 minutes | 5 |

**4A-C. *En deux N***

The preference of the adverbial *en deux N* is opposite of *pendant deux N*: under its **standard** reading, it is more naturally used with predicates encoding an inherent endpoint (e.g. *manger une pomme*), and is somewhat less acceptable with those that do not encode such a point (e.g. *caresser le chat*). However, it is a very flexible adverbial and it is easy to get a non-standard reading that makes it acceptable with verbs like *caresser le chat*. This is why it is important to delineate these different readings.

The standard reading obtains if the two conditions (i) and (ii) obtain:

(i) the combination of the verb with *en* is felicitous **and**

(ii) if *en* is replaced by *after*, the meaning of the sentence changes drastically.

Condition (i) obtains in the following sentences:

(1) *Peter ate the sandwich in 10 minutes.*

(2) *Peter reached the summit of the mountain in 10 minutes*.

But condition (ii) only obtains in the first one of these two sentences, for

(1) *Peter ate the sandwich in 10 minutes*

does not mean the same thing than

*Peter ate the sandwich after 10 minutes*

But

(2) *Peter reached the summit of the mountain in 10 minutes*

means the same thing than/can be paraphrased by

*Peter reached the summit of the mountain after 10 minutes*

When evaluating *en*, **you have to consider the verb with a perfective, with a singular definite internal argument and in a non-iterative context**.

**Column 4A corresponds to the rating of *en* on any reading.**

**When you find *en* unacceptable on any reading (value= or < 2), you don’t have to evaluate the standard or *after* reading of the adverbial (=column 4B and C).**

**When you find *en* acceptable on any reading (value= or >3), you have to evaluate the standard reading of the adverbial (column 4B).**

**When you find *en* acceptable on any reading, but don’t find the standard reading acceptable, you have to evaluate the *after* reading of the adverbial (column 4C).**

Standard/*after* reading of *en* (when the verb describes a single event)?

0: completely unacceptable ----1-----2-----3------4-------5 completely acceptable

Some examples of a plausible rating on this scale are found in the next table. (“--” means that the rating is not required, given the previous rating in 4A)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *En* acceptable?4A | Standard reading?4B | *After* reading?4C |
| Pierre a joué dans la cour en 10 minutes | 0 | -- | -- |
| La ville a construit le pont en deux ans | 5 | 5 | -- |
| J’ai lu le journal en 10 minutes | 5 | 5 | -- |
| Pierre a éternué en 5 secondes | 5 | 2/3 | 5 |
| Pierre a rougi en 5 secondes | 5 | 2/3 | 5 |
| Pierre a trouvé sa clé en dix minutes | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Pierre a pesé 30 kilos en deux ans | 0 | -- | -- |

**5A-B. Adverbials of completion**

Under one of its readings, the adverbial *complètement* indicates that the event/process described by the verb has been realized to its maximum.

You’ll be asked two things:

1. Whether the combination of *complètement* is acceptable with the verb tested, again in a perfective sentence with a definite internal argument in a non-iterative context (=5A)
2. Whether the perfective sentence can be felicitously followed by a denial of completion with *complètement* in its negative form (=5B)

Example:

1. *Pierre a complètement mangé le sandwich.*
2. *Pierre a mangé le sandwich, quoique pas complètement.*

Again, we’ll be using a 0-5 scale:

completely unacceptable 0----1-----2-----3------4-------5 completely acceptable

Some examples of a plausible rating on this scale are found in the next table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | complètement | …. mais pas complètement |
| Pierre a joué dans la cour | 0 (*‘P. a complètement joué dans la cour’* is very odd) | 0 (same thing) |
| La ville a construit le pont | 5 | 3-5 |
| J’ai mangé la pizza | 5 | 3/4 |
| Pierre a éternué | 0 | 0 |
| Pierre a rougi | 3/4 | 4 |
| Pierre a trouvé sa clé | 0 | 0 |
| Pierre a pesé 30 kilos | 0 | 0 |

**6. *Arrêter***

About the verb *arrêter*, you are asked to build a sentence with that verb under its perfective form (the *passé composé*) and with the sentence proposed as the infinitive of this verb, again with a singular indefinite or a definite

Example: if you are given *Pierre mange des pommes*, you are asked to build the sentence *Pierre a arrêté de manger les pommes*.

You are asked to rate the acceptability of the sentence with *arrêter*, **again ignoring the iterative reading of the verb**

Again, we’ll be using a 0-5 scale:

completely unacceptable 0----1-----2-----3------4-------5 completely acceptable

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Pierre a arrêté de jouer dans la cour | 5 |
| Pierre a arrêté de caresser le chat | 5 |
| Pierre a arrêté de vider le camion | 5 |
| Pierre a arrêté d’éternuer | 0 [OK only in the repetitive/iterative reading, very odd in the single-event reading: normally, one can’t stop sneezing!] |
| Pierre a arrêté de rougir | 3/4 |
| Pierre a arrêté de trouver la clé | 0 |
| Pierre a arrêté de tuer le moustique | 0 |
| Pierre a arrêté de peser dix kilos | 0 |