

Gennaro Chierchia

Title: Kinds, properties and atelicity.

Abstract: Among the most widely discussed data points, familiar from everyone's graduate school (no matter how far back in the modern era one goes) one finds the distribution of durative and pluractional modifiers (D/P-Mods) with respect to different verb classes (Vendler 1967, Verkuyl 1072):

(1) Activities and states

- a. John ran for an hour/until 10...; cf. also: repeatedly/twice...
 - b. John pushed a cart for an hour
 - c. Mary was in the bathtub for an hour
- Further examples: *eat, smoke, breathe, sleep,...*

(2) Achievements

- a. * John found Bill and Mary for an hour a'. John found mushrooms for an hour
 - b. * John found a mistake for an hour b'. John found mistakes the whole time
 - c. * John found some mistakes for an hour etc.
 - d. * John found every mistake in his paper for an hour
 - e. John found fewer than 5 mistakes in the proofs for the first hour; then he found lots more.
- Further examples: *reach, leave, arrive, land, notice, spot, kill, die, drown, ...*

In fact D/P-Mods like *for/until XPs* are generally regarded as the ultimate test for atelicity crosslinguistically, as they are extremely stable in their behavior across the most diverse languages. In spite of this, disagreement as to *why* this is so remains rampant between two main families of competing approaches:

(3) **Approach 1:** Durative modifiers as universal quantifiers (the quantificational approach)

- a. John ran for an hour \Rightarrow for every (relevant) subinterval t of a one hour period, John ran at t .
[Mittwoch (1977), Dowty (1979), Moltman (1991), Deo and Pinango (2011), *among many others*]

Approach 2: Durative modifiers as aspect sensitive measures (the measure out approach)

- b. John ran for an hour \Rightarrow John engaged in a running event which was at least one hour long, where such event has property P (P = cumulativity or having proper parts or incrementality or...)
[Krifka (1998), Landman and Rothstein (2012a,b), Champollion (2016), *among many others*]

There are also attempts at blending features of both approaches (Champollion 2013, Chierchia 2022), but a real 'way ahead' remains elusive. The impasse is reminiscent, in some ways, of the debate on non C-command ('donkey') anaphora, with situation based vs. dynamic approaches offering irreducibly alternative worldviews, except that in the case of D/P-Mods the contrast is not one among different formal frameworks but on the actual nature of adverbial modification (quantificational vs. measure based). This impasse is understandable, as the data is quite intricate and there is quite a lot at stake.

(4) What is at stake:

- a. The proper characterization of Atelicity
- b. Central aspects of the theory of scope for Adverbial quantifiers vs. D-quantifiers.
- c. The architecture of event semantics and the proper place of interval-oriented quantification.

It would definitely be hubris of anyone to promise a safe way out of this long standing debate. At the same time, given how long we have been at it, it ought to be possible to take steps towards reaching some closure on what the main choice points actually are, before we all move on to a better life. In the present paper I explore a particular view on this question based on an economy constraint, simple but specific to the scope of adverbial quantification ('do not weaken' cf. Bassa Vanrell 2017) combined with the identification of the special role that kinds (Carlson 1977, Landman and Rothstein 2012a,b) and *properties* may play as direct bearers of thematic relations in an event based semantics.