ωCKA 39

[COMING: link for refs, &c]

Telicity, teleological modality, and (non-)culmination

Prerna Nadathur
Language, Logic & Cognition Center (HUJI)

Hana Filip
Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf

University of Arizona
April 8-11, 2021

The imperfective paradox

Telic predicates are associated with an inherent or natural endpoint, often realized in terms of a **culmination entailment**

[diagrams to be copied here]

Two approaches to the paradox
(I) **Extensional PROG:** (e.g., Parsons 1990)
- Bare telic Ps denote culminated & non-culminated eventualities, PROG instantiates the latter type (e.g., Parsons 1990)
(II) **Intensional PROG:** (Dowty 1979, Landman 1992, Bonomi 1997, a.o.)
- Telic Ps denote only culminated eventualities
- PROG anchors only the onset of a P-eventuality to w*, culmination (optionally) takes place in a modal alternative

Challenge: the modal relationship between w* and the `culmination' world(s)

A new alternative:
Intensional IP effects are due to intensionality inherent in telic predicates, and not to an intensional PROG

Enrich the mereological structure of telic predicates:
- bare telic Ps denote both culminated and non-culminated eventualities
- P-eventualities involve an inherent limit, or ***telos*** (in a broad sense)
- P-eventualities are parts of **teleologically-optimal worlds**

Telicity and intensionality:
- (non-)culminated eventualities are unified by a **culmination condition (CC)**, specifying the *télos* (Kratzer 2004)
- CC structures [[P]] as a goal structures teleological alternatives

Teleological modality: given a goal G, conv. backgrounds f, g, and world w, the set of teleological alternatives in w is given by:
{w': Best_g(w)((cap f(w)) \cap G)} (cf. von Fintel & Iatridou 2005)
- modal base f is circumstantial, picking out propositions defining G-relevant circumstances at a particular time
- ordering source g is stereotypical, picking out causal laws describing the relationship between relevant propositions in a causal model D (cf. Pearl 2000, Kaufmann 2013)

Telicity and intensionality
For telic P with culmination condition CC, [[P]] contains eventualities which are **nested temporal slices** of teleological alternatives for CC
- given a context-dependant causal model D, context k, and a starting situation s (modal base specifying participants' circumstances, semantic roles, intentions, etc)
- e \in [[P]]^k if e is a **continuous causal development** of starting situation s \subseteq k in a teleological alternative for CC
- the smallest P-eventuality contains s at start time t_0; larger eventualities run from s at t_0 to s' \supset s at t' \prec t_f, where t_f is the time of CC in causally-optimal worlds
- maximal P-eventualities include t_f (verifying CC)
- e_1, e_2 \in [[P]]^k, e_1 \sqsubseteq e_2 iff e_2 is an uninterrupted causa continuation of e_1, and \exists e_3 \in [[P]]^k s.t. e_1, e_2 \sqsubseteq e_3, and e_3 verifies CC at t_f

Consequence: no IP with extensional PROG; PROG can instantiate non-culminated P-eventuality

Insights from intensional accounts:
- [[P]] is sensitive to the utterance context; focus on causal consequences of s, making P-eventualities *inertial* with respect to the internal properties of s (cf. Dowty,Landman)
- the possibility of a CE depends on participants' circumstances, abilities, etc, which also govern the particular way that s develops towards CC
- whether e counts as a P-eventuality depends on what s contains (sensitive to speaker's perspective)

Non-culminating accomplishments