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Abstract


(1) John closed the window again.
   a. John again performed the action of closing the window. (repetitive)
   b. John brought it about that again the window is closed. (restitutive)

(2) 채우는 창문을 다시 닫았다.
   a. 채우는 창문을 닫은 행위를 반복하였다. (repetitive)
   b. 채우는 창문을 (참시 열어 두었다가) 닫혀 있는 상태로 복원하였다. (restitutive)

1 Data and Issues

- **English and German Data:**

  - Modification of a telic/process predicate with *again* results in a systematic ambiguity between a repetitive and a restitutive reading.

    (1) John closed the door *again*. (Dowty (1979, p.252))
    a. John again performed the action of closing the door.
       (→ a repetitive reading)
    b. John brought it about that again the door is closed.
       (→ a restitutive reading)

    (2) a. Jemand öffnete die Tür um neun Uhr. Eine halbe Stunde später
        Somebody opened the door at nine o’clock. A half hour later
        wurde die Tür *Wieder* geöffnet. (→ a repetitive reading)
        was the door *again* opened
    b. Hans schloß langsam die Tür. Sie wurde jedoch sofort *wieder*
        Hans shut slowly the door. it was however immediately again
        geöffnet. (→ a restitutive reading)

  - A very similar ambiguity between a repetitive and a restitutive reading can also occur with stative predicates.

    (3) Hilary stands by her man *again*. (Blutner and Jäger (2003))
    a. Hilary stands by her man, again. (→ a repetitive reading)
    b. Hilary stands by her man again. (→ a restitutive reading)

    (4) a. Der Bürgermeister ist *Wieder* ein Zwerg.
       The mayor is again a dwarf.
       (→ a repetitive reading)
    b. Der Bürgermeister ist *wieder* ein *Zwerg*.
       The mayor is again a dwarf.
       (→ a restitutive reading)

- **Korean Data:**

  (5) 읽은 문을 다시 닫았다.
      a. 읽은 문을 닫는 행위를 반복하였다. (→ a repetitive reading)
b. 철수는 문을 (잠시 열어 두었다가) 닫히 있는 상태로 복원하였다. (→ a restitutive reading)

(6) 교실이 다시 조용했다.
   a. 교실이 조용한 상태가 반복되었다. (→ a repetitive reading)
   b. 교실이 (조용하지 않은 상태에서) 조용한 상태로 복원되었다. (→ a restitutive reading)

■ Issues:
- Sentence-internal factors determining the interpretation of *wieder*/again
- Explanation of the relationship between the two readings

■ Previous Approaches:
- Lexical ambiguity vs. Structural ambiguity vs. Underspecification
  - Lexical ambiguity: There must be two (or more) lexical entries for *wieder*/again with the same phonological but different categorial or semantic information
  - Structural ambiguity: There is a more abstract level of representation in structures. This level may belong to syntax or semantics.
  - Underspecification: Linguistically encoded information leaves some aspects of interpretation unresolved. Discourse interpretation basically rests on mechanisms of contextual strengthening which (partly) resolve underspecification.
- Reductionistic vs. Non-reductionistic account
  - Reductionistic (typically reducing the restitutive reading to the repetitive one): Restitutive *wieder*/again is described as repetitive *wieder*/again having narrow scope, i.e., having scope only over the state resulting from the event described by telic change-of-state predicates.
  - Non-reductionistic account (polysemistic account): "We have found no way of formulating a unified analysis of *wieder* along these lines. Thus we cannot do better than treat *wieder* as genuinely ambiguous." (Kamp and Roßdeutscher (1994))
- Summary (Blutner and Jäger (2003))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>lexical ambiguity</th>
<th>structural ambiguity</th>
<th>underspecification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
2 Syntactic and Prosodic Configurations

2.1 German Data

- Observation I: A repetitive reading is obligatory when \textit{wieder} precedes the finite verb in V2-position.

\begin{equation}
\text{\textbf{(7)}} \quad \text{\textit{wieder} musste Arnim sein altes Auto reparieren.}
\end{equation}

again must Arnim his old car repair

- Observation II: A repetitive reading is obligatory or strongly preferred when \textit{wieder} precedes an object or the sentence subject in the so-called middle-field.

\begin{equation}
\text{\textbf{(8)}} \quad \text{a. Arnim hat \textit{wieder} das Dach repariert.}
\end{equation}

Arnim had again the roof repaired

\begin{equation}
\text{\textbf{(8)}} \quad \text{b. Gestern hat \textit{wieder} Arnim das Dach repariert.}
\end{equation}

Yesterday had again Arnim the roof repaired

- Observation III: A repetitive reading is obligatory or strongly preferred when \textit{wieder} precedes an adverbial modifier in the middle-field.

\begin{equation}
\text{\textbf{(9)}} \quad \text{Ich bin \textit{wieder} zu spät aufgestanden.}
\end{equation}

I am again too late got-up

- Observation IV: A genuine restitutiv interpretation is allowed only with telic change-of-state predicates.

\begin{equation}
\text{\textbf{(10)}} \quad \text{Arnim hat die Kategorialgrammatik \textit{wieder} kritisiert. (repetitive)}
\end{equation}

Arnim had the categorial grammar again criticized

- Observation V: Nuclear stress on \textit{wieder}, indicating narrow focus, blocks the restitutive reading in cases where it is not excluded by the constraints listed above.

\begin{equation}
\text{\textbf{(11)}} \quad \text{a. DieTür wurde eine halbe Stunde später \textit{wieder} geöffnet. (repetitive reading preferred)}
\end{equation}

The door was a half hour later again opened

\begin{equation}
\text{\textbf{(11)}} \quad \text{b. DieTür wurde eine halbe Stunde später \textit{wieder} geÖFFnet. (restitutive reading preferred)}
\end{equation}

The door was a half hour later again opened
2.2 Korean Data I: ‘다시’

- No scrambling effects: Observation I, II and III

(12) 철수는 문을 다시 닫았다.
   a. 철수는 문을 닫는 행위를 반복하였다. (→ a repetitive reading)
   b. 철수는 문을 (점시 열어 두었다가) 닫혀 있는 상태로 복원하였다. (→ a restitutive reading)

(13) a. 문을 철수는 다시 닫았다.
    b. 문을 다시 철수는 닫았다.
    c. 다시 문을 철수는 닫았다.
    d. 문을 다시 철수는 닫았다 다시.

(14) a. 문을 철수는 다시 닫았다.
    b. 문을 다시 문을 닫았다.
    c. 다시 문을 철수는 닫았다.
    d. 문을 철수는 닫았다 다시.

- A repetitive reading is obligatory or strongly preferred when ‘다시’ precedes an adverbal modifier.

(15) a. 철수는 다시 너무 늦게 일어났다. (repetitive)
    b. 철수는 다시 세계 문을 닫았다. (repetitive)
    c. 철수는 다시 너무 늦게 서명을 하였다. (repetitive)

(16) a. 철수는 너무 늦게 다시 일어났다. (ambiguous)
    b. 철수는 세계 다시 문을 닫았다. (ambiguous)
    c. 철수는 너무 늦게 다시 서명을 하였다. (ambiguous)

- A genuine restitutive interpretation is allowed only with telic change-of-state predicates.

(17) 철수는 출석카를 다시 비판하였다. (repetitive)

- Nuclear stress on ‘다시’, indicating narrow focus, blocks the restitutive reading in cases where it is not excluded by the constraints listed above.

(18) a. 철수는 문을 다시 닫았다. (repetitive reading preferred)
    b. 철수는 문을 다시 닫았다. (restitutive reading preferred)
2.3 Korean Data II: ‘또’

- No scrambling effects: Observation I, II and III

(19) 철수는 문을 또 달았다.
   a. 철수는 문을 닫는 행위를 반복하였다. (→ a repetitive reading)
   b. #철수는 문을 (잠시 열어 두었다가) 닫혀 있는 상태로 복원하였다. (↗ a restitutive reading)

(20) a. 문을 철수는 또 닫았다.
    b. 문을 또 문을 닫았다.
    c. 또 철수는 문을 닫았다.
    d. 철수는 문을 닫았다 또.

(21) a. 문을 철수는 또 닫았다.
    b. 문을 또 문을 닫았다.
    c. 또 문을 철수는 닫았다.
    d. 문을 철수는 닫았다 또.

- A repetitive reading is obligatory or strongly preferred when ‘또’ occurs, regardless of precedence of ‘또’ with respect to a adverbial modifier.

(22) a. 철수는 또 너무 늦게 일어났다. (repetitive)
    b. 철수는 또 세계 문을 닫았다. (repetitive)
    c. 철수는 또 너무 늦게 서명을 하였다. (repetitive)

(23) a. 철수는 너무 늦게 또 일어났다. (repetitive)
    b. 철수는 세계 또 문을 닫았다. (repetitive)
    c. 철수는 너무 늦게 또 서명을 하였다. (repetitive)

- A restitutive interpretation is blocked when ‘또’ occurs, even with telic change-of-state predicates.

(24) 철수는 출석카를 또 비판하였다. (repetitive)

(25) 철수는 문을 또 닫았다. (repetitive)

- Nuclear stress does not play any role in interpreting the sentences in which ‘또’ occurs.

(26) a. 철수는 문을 또 닫았다. (repetitive)
    b. 철수는 문을 또 닫았다. (restitutive)
2.4 Korean Data III: ‘또 다시’

- No scrambling effects: Observation I, II and III

(27) 철수는 문을 또 다시 닫았다.
   a. *철수는 문을 닫는 행위를 반복하였다. (→ a repetitive reading)*
   b. #철수는 문을 (잠시 열어 두었다가) 닫히 있는 상태로 복원하였다. (↗ a restitutive reading)

(28) a. 문을 철수는 또 다시 닫았다.
    b. 철수는 또 다시 문을 닫았다.
    c. 또 다시 철수는 문을 닫았다.
    d. 철수는 문을 닫았다 또 다시.

(29) a. 문을 철수는 또 다시 닫았다.
    b. 문을 또 다시 철수는 닫았다.
    c. 또 다시 문을 철수는 닫았다.
    d. 문을 철수는 닫았다 또 다시.

- A repetitive reading is obligatory or strongly preferred when ‘또 다시’ occurs, regardless of precedence of ‘또 다시’ with respect to an adverbial modifier.

(30) a. 철수는 또 다시 너무 늦게 일어났다. (repetitive)
    b. 철수는 또 다시 세계 문을 닫았다. (repetitive)
    c. 철수는 또 다시 너무 늦게 서명을 하였다. (repetitive)

(31) a. 철수는 너무 늦게 또 다시 일어났다. (repetitive)
    b. 철수는 세계 또 다시 문을 닫았다. (repetitive)
    c. 철수는 너무 늦게 또 다시 서명을 하였다. (repetitive)

- A restitutive interpretation is blocked when ‘또 다시’ occurs, even with telic change-of-state predicates.

(32) 철수는 숨스키를 또 다시 비관하였다. (repetitive)

(33) 철수는 문을 또 다시 닫았다. (repetitive)

- Nuclear stress does not play any role in interpreting the sentences in which ‘또’ occurs.

(34) a. 철수는 문을 또 다시 닫았다. (repetitive)
    b. 철수는 문을 또 다시 닫았다. (restitutive)
2.5 Discussion

- 독일어의 경우 wieder가 V2 앞에 나오는 정동사 앞에 위치하는지의 여부, 중장(middle 
  filed)의 멘 앞에 나오는지를 여부, 강세의 위치 등을 살펴리로 중의성을 해소한다.
- 한국어는 '위상적 장이론' (topological field theory)에 근거한 그러한 통사적 장치가 
  없다.
- '또'가 쓰인 문장은 항상 반복해석만을 허용하고, 복합적으로 쓰인 '또 다시'도 역시 
  반복해석만을 허용한다.
- 중의적인 '다시'가 '또'에 의해 수식을 받으면, 복원해석이 불가능해진다.
- 한국어의 경우 이휘적으로 독립적인 '또'를 부가적으로 쓰거나 아예 대치하여 중의 
  성을 해소한다.
- 여러 언어에서 repetitive 해석과 restitutive 해석은 상이한 형태소를 통해 중의성이 
  없이 이루어진다.
- 로망스어, 특히 불어에서는 restitutive 해석은 일반적으로 동사의 여간에 re-를 붙임 
 으로서 이루어지고, repetitive 해석은 de nouveau와 같은 부사어를 참가함으로써 이 
  루어진다 (Klein (2001, p.267f.))
- The relationship between the two readings still remains to be explained!

3 Problems of the Reductionist Approach

3.1 Decomposition and Scope Ambiguity

- Basic Ideas:
  - Repetitive again takes scope over the entire event.
  - Restitutive again only takes scope over the result state of the event that is described 
    by the again-sentence.
  - Both the event and its result state are represented in the semantic analysis of again- 
    sentences.
  - This can be done in the level of semantic representation (Dowty (1979)) or syntactic 
    representation through decomposition (von Stechow (1996)).

(35) The door closed.

(36) $S \text{ [become]} S \text{ [VP [v be]} A\text{ [not-open] [np the door]]} \]
(37) The door closed again.
   a. Repetitive reading: the door closed before
   
   \[ S \]
   \[ \text{become} \]
   \[ S \]
   \[ \text{be not-open} \]
   \[ \text{the door} \]
   
   b. Restitutative reading: the door was closed before
   
   \[ S \]
   \[ \text{become} \]
   \[ S \]
   \[ \text{be not-open} \]
   \[ \text{the door} \]

(38) The door closed again.
   a. \( \exists e [\text{again(} \text{become}(\exists s [\text{be-not-open}(d, s)], e)) \] \)
   b. \( \exists e [\text{become(} \text{again}(\exists s [\text{be-not-open}(d, s)], e)) \] \)

- Definition of \textit{again} and \textit{become} (von Stechow (1996, p.95f.))
  
  \( - i \) and \( j \) represent eventualities,
  \( P \) is a proposition describing an eventuality (the eventuality’s type), and
  \( p \) is a stative proposition.

(39) \( \exists [\text{again}(P(i))] \) asserts that \( \exists i [P(i)] \) and presupposes that \( \exists j [P(j) \land j < i] : \)
  \( \exists [\text{again}(P(i))] / \exists j [P(j) \land j < i] \)

(40) \( \exists e [\text{become}(p, e)] \) is true iff. there is an \( e \) such that \( e \) is the smallest event such that \( p \) is not true of the pre-state of \( e \), but \( p \) is true of the target state of \( e \).

- The assertion of \textit{again} sentence is the same as that of the corresponding sentence without \textit{again}.

(41) Assertion: \( \exists e [\text{become}(\exists s [\text{be-not-open}(d, s)], e)] \)
The door closed.

The door closed again.

- The repetitive reading and the restitutive reading differ from one another only in the presupposition that is triggered.

\[ \exists e [\text{BECOME}(\exists s [\text{be-not-open}(d, s)], e)] / \exists e' [\text{BECOME}(\exists s [\text{be-not-open}(d, s)], e') \land e' < e] \]

\[ \exists e [\text{BECOME}(\exists s [\text{be-not-open}(d, s)], e)] / \exists s' [\text{be-not-open}(d, s') \land s' < e] \]

### 3.2 Problems of Decompositional Approaches


- Lexical decomposition

\[ [S [NP \text{A Delaware}]_{x} [S \text{CAUSE} [S \text{BECOME} [S [NP x] [VP \text{live in New Jersey}]]]]] \]

\[ \exists e \exists x [\text{Delaware}(x) \land \text{CAUSE}(x, \text{BECOME}(\exists s [\text{live in}(x, \text{New Jersey}, s)], e), e)] \]

- The Delaware that becomes an inhabitant of New Jersey is at the same time the agent that settles in New Jersey.

- There are 4 readings, but only 3 of them can be represented.

\[ \exists e' [\text{AGAIN}(\exists x [\text{Delaware}(x) \land \text{CAUSE}(x, \text{BECOME}(\exists s [\text{live in}(x, \text{New Jersey}, s)], e), e)))] \]

- a repetitive reading
- \text{AGAIN} takes scope over \( \exists x \)
- Some Delaware settled in New Jersey before, and some (possibly other) Delaware is now settling in New Jersey again.

\[ \exists e \exists x [\text{Delaware}(x) \land \text{AGAIN}(\text{CAUSE}(x, \text{BECOME}(\exists s [\text{live in}(x, \text{New Jersey}, s)], e), e))] \]

- a repetitive reading
- \( \exists x \) takes scope over \text{AGAIN}
- There is a certain Delaware that settled in New Jersey before and is now settling in New Jersey again.
Restitutiv e & specific or *non-specific subject

a. $\exists e \exists x [\text{Delaware}(x) \land \text{CAUSE}(x, \text{BECOME}(\text{AGAIN}(\exists s [\text{live_in}(x, \text{New_Jersey}, s)], e), e))]
- a restitutive reading
- $\exists x$ takes scope over AGAIN
- There is some specific Delaware that has lived in New Jersey before and is now settling in New Jersey, thereby restoring his state of living in New Jersey.

b. ?
- a restitutive reading
- AGAIN must take wide AND narrow scope over $\exists x$ simultaneously.
- There is some Delaware that has lived in New Jersey before and some (possibly other) Delaware is now settling in New Jersey, thereby restoring the state of living in New Jersey.

4 An Alternative Analysis

- A revised definition of $\text{again}/\text{다시}$
  - $i$ and $j$ represent eventualities,
  - $P$ is a proposition describing an eventuality (the eventuality’s type), and
  - $p$ is a stative proposition.

(50) $\exists i [\text{다시}(P(i))]$ asserts that $\exists i [P(i)]$ and presupposes that $\exists j [f(P(j)) \land j < i]$: $\exists [\text{again}(P(i))]/\exists j [f(P(j)) \land j < i]$, where $f \in \{\text{IDENT}, \text{REST}\}$.

(51) $\exists e [\text{BECOME}(p, e)]$ is true iff. there is an $e$ such that $e$ is the smallest event such that $p$ is not true of the pre-state of $e$, but $p$ is true of the target state of $e$.

- The assertion of $\text{again}$ sentence is the same as that of the corresponding sentence without $\text{again}/\text{다시}$.

(52) Assertion: $\exists e [\text{BECOME}(\exists s [\text{be-not-open}(d, s)], e)]$
  a. The door closed.
  b. The door closed again.

- The repetitive reading and the restitutive reading differ from one another only in the presupposition that is triggered.

(53) $\exists e [\text{BECOME}(\exists s [\text{be-not-open}(d, s)], e)]/\exists e'[f(\text{BECOME}(\exists s [\text{be-not-open}(d, s)], e')) \land e' < e]$
(54) a. $\exists e [\text{BECOME}(\exists s [\text{be-not-open}(d, s)], e)] / \exists e' [\text{IDENT} (\text{BECOME}(\exists s [\text{be-not-open}(d, s)], e')) \land e' < e$

b. $\exists e [\text{BECOME}(\exists s [\text{be-not-open}(d, s)], e)] / \exists e' [\text{BECOME}(\exists s [\text{be-not-open}(d, s)], e') \land e' < e$

(55) a. $\exists e [\text{BECOME}(\exists s [\text{be-not-open}(d, s)], e)] / \exists e' [\text{REST}(\text{BECOME}(\exists s [\text{be-not-open}(d, s)], e')) \land e' < e$

b. $\exists e [\text{BECOME}(\exists s [\text{be-not-open}(d, s)], e)] / \exists s' [\text{be-not-open}(d, s')] \land s' < e$

- definition of ‘도’ and ‘도 다시’

$P$ is a proposition describing an eventuality (the eventuality’s type), and $p$ is a static proposition.

(56) $\exists [\text{도}(P(i))]$ asserts that $\exists i [P(i)]$ and presupposes that $\exists j [(P(j) \land j < i]$:

$\exists [\text{again}(P(i))] / \exists j [\text{IDENT}(P(j)) \land j < i]$.

(57) $\exists [\text{도 다시}(P(i))]$ asserts that $\exists i [P(i)]$ and presupposes that $\exists j [(P(j) \land j < i]$:

$\exists [\text{again}(P(i))] / \exists j [\text{IDENT}(P(j)) \land j < i]$.

5 Conclusion

- Summary

- Some Residual Problems
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