



1. The notion of roles

- ▶ **Intuition:** “roles/functions/capacities” (see Sowa 1984, Steimann 2000)
 - ▶ social constructs connected to particular obligatory and possible actions
 - ▶ independent of the individuals that bear them
 - ▶ for an individual to bear a role, it must stand in certain relationships to other individuals
- ▶ **Standard view on individuals:**
 - ▶ individuals are “atomic” (\rightarrow classical conception in logic)
 - ▶ all properties are ascribed to the individual “as a whole”
- ▶ **Role view on individuals:** use the roles/functions/capacities of a person to “divide” an individual into its different aspects
- ▶ The role view enables us to reinterpret seemingly inconsistent ascriptions as consistent ascriptions in different roles.

Central claim: Language provides the means to express the role view. This role-sensitivity manifests itself in **morpho-syntactic and interpretive effects** connected to **a specific class of nominal expressions**.

- ▶ **Model the role view** via world- and time-relative role structures $\mathcal{R}_x^{w,t}$ of an individual x

2. Distinguish role nouns vs. class nouns

- ▶ **Add to types:** new type r and corresponding domain D_r
- ▶ **Class nouns** denote properties of individuals (type $\langle e, st \rangle$): e.g. *man, woman, dog, cat, tree, animal, plant*
- ▶ **Role nouns** denote properties of roles (type $\langle r, st \rangle$): e.g. *judge, student, janitor, patient, customer, pet*
- ▶ **Artifact nouns:** dual status – object and role/function; e.g., *peeler, paddle*
- ▶ **Modification of a role noun:**
 - (1) a. *judge* \rightsquigarrow *talented judge, young judge* (not roles)
 - b. *judge* \rightsquigarrow *regional judge, military judge* (roles)
- ▶ Role nouns can be used as class nouns (\Rightarrow type shift); they then denote the property of being a bearer of that role.
- ▶ A role use of a class noun or a proper name requires coercion.

3. Effect 1: predicative bare singular nouns

- ▶ In some languages, **predicative bare singular nouns** occur in nominal copular clauses that express role ascription (e.g., Dutch and German)
 - (2) a. *Paul is (een) arts./Paul ist (ein) Arzt.* ('Paul is a doctor')
 - b. *Fifi is *(een) hond./Fifi ist *(ein) Hund.* ('Fifi is a dog.')
- ▶ De Swart et al. (2007): bare nouns denote “capacities” (i.e., “professions, religions, nationalities or other roles in society”)
- ▶ **But:** “capacities” too restricted to capture all potential roles/functions

4. Effect 2: ‘as’-phrases in their role use

- ▶ **Role as-phrases** are used to ascribe the property denoted by the main predicate to the associated individual in the role given by the *as*-phrase.
 - (3) **As a judge**, *Paul earns 3,000 euros.*
(\approx Paul earns 3,000 euros in his judge-role)
- ▶ *As*-phrases with nominal expressions that do not denote roles are grammatical but force a different interpretation.
 - (4) **As a man / as a talented judge**, *Paul earns 3,000 euros.*
($\not\approx$ Paul earns 3,000 euros in his man-role / talented-judge-role)
(\approx Because he is a man / a talented judge, Paul earns 3,000 euros)

5. The role structure $\mathcal{R}_x^{w,t}$

Idea behind the role structure $\mathcal{R}_x^{w,t}$: For each individual x , there is a set of eventualities in which x participates. Associating them with the roles in which x participates creates a structure on this set.

- ▶ A role structure $\mathcal{R}_x^{w,t}$ is world-, time-, and individual-dependent. It is a set of pairs containing a role and an eventuality (= a state or event).
 - (5) $\langle r, e \rangle \in \mathcal{R}_x^{w,t}$ iff x bears the role r at w and t and x 's participation in e is/was in his role r .
- ▶ **Inferences** from x in a role r (in the role view R) to x *simpliciter* (in the standard view S) are regulated by two eventuality-sensitive rules.
 - ▶ For any x, P , **abstract state** s, t , and w : (see Maienborn 2007)
 - (6) $\forall r[\exists e'[\langle r, e' \rangle \in \mathcal{R}_x^{w,t}] \rightarrow \langle r, s \rangle \in \mathcal{R}_x^{w,t} \ \& \ P_R(x)(s)] \Leftrightarrow P_S(x)(s)$
 - ▶ For any x, P , **concrete eventuality** e, t , and w :
 - (7) $\exists r[\exists e'[\langle r, e' \rangle \in \mathcal{R}_x^{w,t}] \rightarrow \langle r, e \rangle \in \mathcal{R}_x^{w,t} \ \& \ P_R(x)(e)] \Leftrightarrow P_S(x)(e)$
- ▶ Cf. term-restriction in Landman 1989, state-structure in Szabo 2003

6. The irreducibility of roles

- ▶ Roles cannot be reduced to **temporal stages of individuals**. An individual x bears all its roles simultaneously and has all properties connected to a role r even if x does not act in r .
- ▶ Roles cannot be reduced to **the associated obligations and permissions**. An individual x may have properties in a role r independent of these obligations/permissions.
- ▶ Roles cannot be reduced to **sequences of eventualities**. Eventualities can be performed in more than one role simultaneously.
 \Rightarrow **independent ontological objects**

7. Analysis of role ‘as’-phrases using $\mathcal{R}_x^{w,t}$

- ▶ **Syntax:** The *as*-phrase adjoins directly below its associated constituent. Sentence-initial *as*-phrases are topicalized.
 - (8) *Paul as a judge is corrupt.*
 - (9) $[_{TP} \text{ [PRES]} [_{AspP} \text{ [PF]} [_{VP} \text{ Paul } [_{v'} \text{ [}_{asP} \text{ as a judge}] [_{v'} \text{ is corrupt}]]]]]]$
- ▶ **Semantic properties** of ‘ x as R (*is*) P ’
 - ▶ **(Not-)at-issueness** (e.g., Potts 2011): x 's bearing the R -role is presupposed (see Jäger 2003); restriction to x 's participation in his R -role is at-issue
 - ▶ **Ex-/Intensionality:** the matrix predicate P is extensional; the position filled by R is intensional (\rightarrow substitution for co-extensionals)
- ▶ **Role ‘as’ forces the role view.** It relates the role-property R , the predicate P , and the individual x using $\mathcal{R}_x^{w,t}$ to give a set of eventualities.
 - (10) $[[as]^{w_0, t_0, \mathcal{R}^{w_0, t_0}} = \text{(defined iff } \exists r \exists s' [R(r)(w_0) \ \& \ \langle r, s' \rangle \in \mathcal{R}_x^{w_0, t_0}] \lambda R_{\langle r, st \rangle} \cdot \lambda P_{\langle e, vt \rangle} \cdot \lambda x_e \cdot \lambda e_v \cdot \forall r [R(r)(w_0) \ \& \ \langle r, e \rangle \in \mathcal{R}_x^{w_0, t_0} \rightarrow P(x)(e)]]$
 - (11) $[[Paul \text{ as a judge is corrupt}]^{w_0, t_0, \mathcal{R}^{w_0, t_0}} = \exists t [t \circ t_0 \ \& \ \exists s [\tau(s) \subseteq t \ \& \ s \text{ in } w_0 \ \forall r [\text{judge}'(r)(w_0) \ \& \ \langle r, s \rangle \in \mathcal{R}_{Paul}^{w_0, t_0} \rightarrow \text{corrupt}'(\text{Paul})(s)]]]$
(defined iff $\exists r \exists s' [\text{judge}'(r)(w_0) \ \& \ \langle r, s' \rangle \in \mathcal{R}_{Paul}^{w_0, t_0}]$)

8. Accounting for the “rescue property”

- ▶ **The rescue property:** role *as*-phrases can make otherwise contradictory sentences non-contradictory (see e.g., Landman 1989, Jäger 2003, Szabo 2003, Asher 2011; see Box 1).
 - (12) a. $\#$ *Paul is corrupt, but he is not corrupt.*
 - b. *As a judge, Paul is corrupt, but as a janitor, he is not corrupt.*
- ▶ **Captured by the analysis:** *Paul is corrupt* is not inferable from *Paul as a judge is corrupt*
 - ▶ **In standard view:**
 - (13) $[[Paul \text{ is corrupt}]^{w_0, t_0} = \exists t [t \circ t_0 \ \& \ \exists s [\tau(s) \subseteq t \ \& \ \text{corrupt}'(\text{Paul})(s)]]]$
 - ▶ **In role view:** (see rule (6))
 - (14) $[[Paul \text{ is corrupt}]^{w_0, t_0, \mathcal{R}^{w_0, t_0}} = \exists t [t \circ t_0 \ \& \ \exists s [\tau(s) \subseteq t \ \& \ \forall r [\exists e' [\langle r, e' \rangle \in \mathcal{R}_{Paul}^{w_0, t_0}] \rightarrow \langle r, s \rangle \in \mathcal{R}_{Paul}^{w_0, t_0} \ \& \ \text{corrupt}'(\text{Paul})(s)]]]$

References

- Asher. 2011. *Lexical Meaning in Context* • De Swart, Winter & Zwarts. 2007. *Bare nominals and reference to capacities* • Landman. 1989. *Groups II* • Maienborn. 2007. *On Davidsonian and Kimian states*. • Jäger. 2003. *Towards an explanation of copula effects*. • Potts. 2011. *Conventional implicature and expressive content*. • Sowa. 1984. *Conceptual structures: information processing in mind and machine*. • Steimann. 2000. *On the representation of roles in object-oriented and conceptual modelling*. • Szabo. 2003. *On qualification*.
(Supported by the Athene Program of the University of Tübingen.)