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1 Introduction

THE BIG QUESTION

• What are the core properties of the mind and how do these influence the way we think and talk about events?

THE BIG PICTURE

(1) Standard Assumption: Telic interpretations emerge at a TELOS, the co-occurrence of an event’s endpoint and its culmination.

Some Challenges to the Standard Assumption

• Events with culminations (thresholds) contained in longer events.

A New Challenge: Empty Accomplishments

(2) a. John read zero emails (in 15 minutes/for 15 minutes).
b. John drank no beer (in 30 minutes/for 30 minutes).

• These cases are challenging because, in a sense, nothing happens . . .
• And yet we can, at first brush, ascribe either a temporal endpoint or a time frame to these empty events.

The Question

• What do empty accomplishments tell us about events, event structure, and the relationship between telicity and telos?

* The initial observations for this paper came out of worrying dream about endpoints with zero and negation and I would like to thank Alexis Wellwood for tolerating my 5AM email to her and her encouragement to pursue my initial observations. I would also like to thank Sherry Chen for her support and thoughtful comments on this work.
The Roadmap

i. Briefly discuss a standard approach to telicity with reference to the internal argument
   • Note some previous challenges to telos

ii. Introduce empty accomplishments and investigate their event structure

iii. Lay out an initial analysis
   • Consider the semantics of zero/no
   • Argue for a separation between quantity predicates and the telos of events.

iv. Conclude

2 A standard theory of telicity

2.1 A standard theory

Since Verkuyl (1972), a fairly standard family of incremental/scalar approaches has worked to understand the relationship between the mereological structure of the internal argument and the event (Bach 1986; Krifka 1992, 1998; Tenny 1987, 1994).

(3) a. John read two emails in 15 minutes/#for 15 minutes.
   b. John drank two beers in 30 minutes/#for 30 minutes.

(4) a. John read #in 15 minutes/for 15 minutes.
   b. John drank #in 30 minutes/for 30 minutes.

(5) a. John read emails #in 15 minutes/for 15 minutes.
   b. John drank beer #in 30 minutes/for 30 minutes.

• Telicity emerges in the special case of a quantized argument in (3).¹

¹ Often this statement is strengthened to say that atelicity is blocked by a quantized argument. This however, does not seem to be the case. Smollett (2005), for instance, observed that atelic interpretations are still available in the presence of a quantized argument as in (i).

(i) a. Carolyn played the tune for 15 minutes.
    b. Carolyn played the tune in 15 minutes.

Borer (2005b) also observes that, modulo individual preferences and world knowledge, standard ‘telic’ predicates in (ii) can receive atelic interpretations.
– The final relevant subpart of the argument coincides with the culmination of the event.  

– The duration of the event can be measured by *in X time*.

• Interpretation defaults to atelicity when the event lacks a quantized internal argument, either in (4) or (5).

The basic idea is that the mereological structure of the internal argument is mapped onto the mereological structure of the event containing it (Bach 1986).

(6) Mapping to Subevents (Krifka 1998)

\[ \forall x, y \in U_P \forall e \in U_E [\theta(x, e) & y <_P x \rightarrow \exists e'[e' <_E e \& \theta(y, e')]] \]

For all individuals x, y and events e, if there is a thematic relation \( \theta \) between x and e and y is a proper subpart of x, then there is an event e’ such that e’ is a proper subpart of e and \( \theta \) holds between y and e’.

(ii) a. We read the Bible in church today for two hours.
b. Pat climbed the mountain for two hours.
c. Kim wrote (and re-wrote) this letter for a week.

Some caution is needed here in that, to me, the interpretations in (i) and (ii) are either incompletive or iterative, suggesting that some form of coercion may be at play.

2 Since Tenny (1987), it has been noted that the object itself may not be ‘affected’, though in these analyses, there is a tracking between subparts of the object and subparts of the event.

3 Although explicitly not an analysis of aspectual composition, a more recent execution that is concerned with subevents can be found in Champollion (2017). Although he does not explicitly propose a theory of aspectual composition, he does argue that the acceptability of *for X time*, and thus atelicity, is reliant on the ability to divide an event such that P applies to the subevents of the event.

(i) Stratified subinterval reference (Champollion 2017: 87)

\[ SSR(P)(e) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \lambda e'[P(e') \& \tau(e') < \tau(e)] \]

An event predicate P has stratified subinterval reference with respect to event e iff e can be exhaustively divided into parts (“strata”) that are each in P and whose runtimes are properly included in the runtime of e.

Events with a telos are naturally excluded because their non-final subevents exclude the telos and will not be P. His theory also appears to capture the challenging cases in (8) since event predicates that include have an intermediate “culminations’ will also constitute cases where subevents not including the intermediate “culmination” will not be P.

However, because Champollion (2017) does not analyze telic interpretations or *in X time*, and furthermore excludes full lattice mereologies (thus blocking an account along the lines of Bylinina & Nouwen (2017)), it is not clear to me how (i) might account for telic interpretations of empty accomplishments.
(7) Telicity
\[ \forall e,e' \in U_E [X(e) \& X(e') \& e' \leq_E e \rightarrow Initial_E(e',e) \& Final_E(e',e)] \]
All parts of e that fall under X are initial and final parts of e.

Such analyses tend to assume a ‘measuring out’ to a telos where there is a co-occurrence between the event’s endpoint is reached and it culminates in some result state.

- The final subevent of the event is mapped to the final subpart of the internal argument.
- The events in (3) reach their telos when both emails have been read (1a) or two beers have been consumed (1b).

2.2 A Challenge

The co-occurrence of event endpoint and culmination has been challenged in the literature.

- Particularly concerning events that (may) continue beyond some culmination.

(8) a. John filled the room (up) with smoke. \hspace{1cm} (Schein 2002)
b. Mary ate at least/more than three apples. \hspace{1cm} (Borer 2005b)
c. The boat floated under the bridge in two hours. \hspace{1cm} (Borer 2005b)

In all cases, the quantization of the event is defined not by the endpoint but by some intermediate point.

- Telicity emerges “on the basis of the existence of a particular point, a ‘full’ point or ‘under the bridge’ point, but where that point need not be at the end of the event” (Borer 2005b: 223).

- Borer (2005b) argues, in fact, for a stronger conclusion, that telicity is a consequence of a quantity predicate.

Question: Are there events that have no endpoint or intermediate point that are still telic?
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3 Empty Accomplishments

(9)  
  a. John read zero emails in 15 minutes/for 15 minutes.  
  b. John drank no beer in 30 minutes/for 30 minutes.

Some initial observations and questions:

• Empty Accomplishments appear to be compatible with in X time, suggesting that they license a telic interpretation.

• They also appear to be compatible with for X time, suggesting that they also license an atelic interpretation.

3.1 The aspectual landscape

for X time

(10)  
  a. John read zero emails for 15 minutes.  
  b. John drank no beer for 30 minutes.

spend X time VPing

(11)  
  a. John spent 15 minutes reading zero emails.  
  b. John spent 30 minutes drinking no beer.

in X time

Here I am setting aside the pragmatic inferences one might draw from these examples (e.g. that John failed to get started, was interrupted/taking a break, was otherwise engaged in some distinct salient event, etc.) to focus on what empty accomplishments denote. We will return to this in section 4.4.

My focus here is on verbs which alternate their telicity based on the quantity of their internal argument. Other verbs however are argued to be insensitive to the quantity of their argument, including activity verbs like push or ride and achievement verbs like notice and explode. It appears, however, that both in X time and for X time are compatible with what I would call empty activities given in (i) and empty achievements given in (ii), suggesting that zero/no NP may have a broad effect on a range of aspectual classes.

(i)  
  a. John pushed zero/no carts in 30 minutes/for 30 minutes.  
  b. Bill rode zero/no bicycles in 30 minutes/for 30 minutes.

(ii)  
  a. Mary noticed zero/no cars in 30 minutes/for 30 minutes.  
  b. Zero/No bombs exploded in 30 minutes/for 30 minutes.

Acceptability of for/in X time has not been uniform across my informants. Some were not happy with in X time, finding for X time to be better, while others did not like for X time, finding in X time to be acceptable. My suspicion here is that factors of use and other extra-grammatical issues are at play, and indeed, some informants have, upon further reflection, found their dispreferred case to improve.
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(12)  a. John read zero emails in 15 minutes.
     b. John drank no beer in 30 minutes.

take X time

(13)  a. #It took John 15 minutes to read zero emails.
     b. #It took John 30 minutes to drink no beer.

Progressive to perfect\(^7\)

(14)  a. John was reading zero emails. → John has read zero emails.
     b. John was drinking no beer. → John has drank no beer.

stopped VPing\(^8\)

(15)  a.?#John stopped reading zero emails.
     b.?#John stopped drinking no beer.

finish VPing

(16)  a. #John finished reading zero emails.
     b. #John finished drinking no beer.

almost VPed\(^9\)

(17)  a. John almost read zero emails.
     i) but he ended up overcoming his anxiety and got (counterfactual)
        through several of them.
     ii) but he could only procrastinate for half a day. (incompletive)
     b. John almost drank no beer.
     i) but he couldn’t resist the temptation and decided to (counterfactual)
        have a sip.
     ii) but he only made it a week. (incompletive)

---

\(^7\) Note that the progressive can be odd, especially for states and achievements. My sense is that I can felicitously answer the question *What were you doing (at your desk/in the bar)?* with *I was reading zero emails/drinking no beer.*

\(^8\) These may be ok in the sense that saying John stopped reading zero emails could perhaps be taken to say that he finally got around to reading some emails/drinking some beer.

\(^9\) The incompletive interpretations of *almost* require some kind of time frame in mind. This might reflect a difference between the temporal duration that normal accomplishments have thought some non-trivial endpoint (or intermediate point, see section 2.2) that empty accomplishments lack (in that *zero/no* provide, in a sense, no point).
until X

(18) a. John read zero emails #until noon.
    b. John drank no beer #until 5pm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Empty Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for X time</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>incomplete</td>
<td>iterative</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spend X time</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>iterative</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in X time</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take X time</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROG to PERF</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stop VPing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finish VPing</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>almost VPed</td>
<td></td>
<td>counterfactual</td>
<td>counterfactual/incompletive</td>
<td>counterfactual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>until X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>incomplete</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In favor of telic interpretations: *in X time, almost VPed, until X*
- In favor of atelic interpretations: *for X time, take X time, PROG to PERF*
- Other: *stop VPing, finish VPing*

### 3.2 Resultatives

Resultative secondary predicates are often analyzed as denoting the result state of a culminating event and are argued to induce telicity.

- Involve a process (possibly encoded by the verb) that incrementally leads to a results state (encoded often by AP/PP).
- Are telic in that they have a telos/culmination point (Dowty 1979; Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998: a.o.).
  - Their internal argument must be quantized as in (20) (Borer 2005b; MacDonald 2008; Wechsler 2005)

(19) Kathleen ate the ice cream for 15 minutes.
(20) a. *Kathleen ate ice cream to the last spoonful.* (goal phrase)
    b. *Anne Marie polished granite smooth.* (resultative)
    c. *Kathleen ate up ice cream.* (particle) (Smollett 2005)
Wechsler (2005) observes that resultatives with a homogeneous internal argument where a straightforward telic interpretation fails to emerge, we can detect the presence of telicity in the iterative interpretation of for X time.

(21) a. John painted the canvas red in ten minutes/#for ten minutes.
    b. John painted the canvas red #for ten minutes.
    c. John painted canvases red #in ten minutes.
    d. John painted canvases red ??for ten minutes. [iterative]

Although ‘nothing happens’, linguistically a result state can be attributed to an empty accomplishment.

(22) a. John painted zero canvas red.
    b. John painted no canvases red.
(23) a. John hammered zero cans flat.
    b. John hammered no cans flat.

Both in X time and for X time are licensed, and for X time does not elicit an iterative reading.

(24) a. John painted zero canvas red in ten minutes/for ten minutes.
    b. John painted no canvases red in ten minutes/for ten minutes.
(25) a. John hammered zero cans flat in ten minutes/for ten minutes.
    b. John hammered no cans flat in ten minutes/for ten minutes.

Resultative up particles are allowed with empty accomplishments.

(26) a. John polished up zero countertops.
    b. John polished zero countertops up.
(27) a. John drank up no beer.
    b. John drank no beer up.

An Interpretative Effect: Unlike bare empty accomplishments, the inclusion of a resultative strongly implies that some of the underlyingly described event has taken place.

(28) a. John ate zero apples.
    b. John ate zero apples to the core.
(29) a. John drank no mug of beer.
    b. John drank no mug of beer dry.

- In (28a) and (29a), no eating of any apple/drinking of any mug of beer is attributed to John, but the addition of a resultative in (b) allows for some apple eating/beer drinking to have occurred (just not to the core/dry).
4 Analysis

4.1 Are empty accomplishments ambiguous?

One tempting possibility is that empty accomplishments are ambiguous between a telic and atelic interpretation.

- Degree achievements are also known for displaying telic and atelic interpretations.
- And there are analyses that propose that they are ambiguous.

(30) The soup cooled in 10 minutes/for 10 minutes.

Kennedy & Levin (2008) propose that

- Telic degree achievements arise from some maximal degree of change available from closed-scale deadjectival verbs.
- Atelic interpretations of degree achievements arise from some non-maximal degree of change.
  - Default for open-scale deadjectival verbs, and possible for closed-scale deadjectival verbs.

One interesting factor in favor of this analysis is that the atelic interpretation is blocked by a measure phrase.

(31) The soup cooled 20 degrees in 10 minutes/??for 10 minutes.

It is not at all clear to me how such an account could be extended to empty accomplishments.

- There isn’t ambiguity about the number/amount of the internal argument!\textsuperscript{10,11}

\textsuperscript{10} Bylinina & Nouwen’s (2017) idea that zero requires exhaustification could potentially lead to some kind of scope ambiguity, but it isn’t clear to me how this would track the telicity of empty accomplishments.

\textsuperscript{11} One might wonder about the scope of no and whether scope is playing a role in the readings of empty accomplishments. While no might have ambiguous scope, zero, like other numerals, does not appear to take scope.
4.2 Are empty accomplishments negative events?

Empty accomplishments are, at first blush, similar to negative events (De Swart 1996; Higginbotham 2000; Schein 2016; Varzi 2006).

- De Swart (1996) argues that negative events introduce a discourse referent as they can be the referent of a pronoun.
- And are events as opposed to facts, as they can happen (a criteria for event-hood (Vendler 1967)) and can occur under the scope of a frequency adverb (Stockwell, Schacter & Partee (1973), contra Lakoff (1970)).

(32)  
a. John did not ask Mary to dance at the party. It made her angry.  
b. What happened next was that the consulate didn’t give us our visas.  
c. He sometimes doesn’t eat dinner.

Empty accomplishments pass the same tests.

(33)  
a. John read zero emails. It made him very depressed.  
b. What happened next was that the bartender served us zero drinks.  
c. Bill sometimes runs zero miles.

(34)  
a. John read no emails. It made him very depressed.  
b. What happened next was that the bartender served us no drinks.  
c. Bill sometimes runs no miles.

Higginbotham (2000) takes proper negative events to be those that have causal consequences and interact with temporal adverbials.

(35)  
a. I kept the child awake by not turning out the light.  
b. John didn’t play golf until noon.

- There is a property of moments of time t such that the light is not turned off at t; and these moments t might be said to be causally responsible for the child’s being awake.
- There is a property of moments of time t before noon are such that John does not play golf at t, and “identifying the event of John’s not playing golf with this property, we can say that as things are it lasted until noon.”

Higginbotham allows for the construction of negative events.
For all temporal intervals $I$, if there is no event of kind $P$ whose temporal trace overlaps with $I$, then there is an event of the complement of $P$ whose temporal trace is $I$.

It isn’t clear to me how negative events explain the aspectual facts about empty accomplishments.

- Moreover, not all negative events are both telic and atelic.
  - The quantity of the internal argument appears to play a role in licensing in $X$ time (Borer 1998: 78 fn. 24).

(37) a. Bill didn’t eat apples in an hour.
    b. Mary didn’t turn out lights in an hour.
    c. John didn’t play in an hour.

4.3 Zero/no and the role of quantity

As noted in Section 2.1, the quantity of the internal argument plays an important role in licensing telic interpretations.

- If zero/no nominals are quantized, then we predict that a telic interpretation should be available (for those verbs that are sensitive to the quantity of their internal argument).
- If events of read zero emails/drink no beer are quantized, then we predict that a telic interpretation should be available.

4.3.1 A note on the denotation of zero NP

Bylinina & Nouwen (2017) propose a semantics for zero (see also Chen 2017; Marti 2017).\(^{12}\)

- Count predicates denote a full lattice structure (derived by the operator $\times$, distinct from the more familiar semi-lattice operator $\ast$) which includes the bottommost element, $\bot$.

---

12 Bylinina & Nouwen (2017) observe some differences between zero and no, including distributional differences in ellipsis, measure phrases, ratio phrases (DP per N), and ratio comparitives (X times Adj-er than); the licensing of NPIs, and split scope.
• ⊥ has cardinality 0 and no proper parts.

Assuming a modificational approach to numerals (Rothstein 2016) and adopting an at least semantics:

\[
\begin{align*}
(38) \quad [\text{Zero}] &= \lambda x[\#x \geq 0] \\
(39) \quad [\text{Zero students passed the test.}] &= \\
& \quad \exists x[\#x \geq 0 \land \check{x}\text{student}(x) \land \check{x}\text{pass—the—test}(x)]
\end{align*}
\]

Problem: The semantics as they stand are trivial.

• ⊥ is true of any predicate \(^xP\).
• If x in (39) is ⊥, then it must be true.

Bylinina & Nouwen (2017) propose an exhaustification account to get around this problem.

\[
\begin{align*}
(40) \quad [\text{EXH Zero students passed the test.}] &= \\
& \quad \exists x[\#x \geq 0 \land \check{x}\text{student}(x) \land \check{x}\text{pass—the—test}(x)] \land \neg \exists y[\#y > 0 \land \check{x}\text{student}(y) \land \check{x}\text{pass—the—test}(y)]
\end{align*}
\]

Exhaustification is required even in downward entailing environments where it is unexpected because the semantics of zero is just as uninformative in downward entailing environments as it is in upward entailing environments.

• One might now ask how no NP should be treated.

\[
\begin{align*}
(41) \quad [\text{no}] &= \lambda P_{(e,t)} \lambda Q_{(e,t)} [P \cap Q = \emptyset] \\
(42) \quad [\text{No students passed the test.}] &= \\
& \quad [\check{x}\text{student}(x) \land \check{x}\text{pass—the—test}(x) = \emptyset]
\end{align*}
\]

• The sum of the empty set is ⊥.

4.3.2 The quantity of zero/no NP

Taking zero/no NP to denote ⊥ of a full lattice, we can now ask whether zero/no NP is quantized or homogeneous.

• The following definitions are adopted from Borer (2005a)
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(43) \( P \) is quantized iff \( P \) is not homogeneous.

(44) \( P \) is homogeneous iff \( P \) is cumulative and divisive.

a. \( P \) is cumulative iff \( \forall x, y [P(x) \& P(y) \rightarrow P(x \cup y)] \)

   For all \( x \) and \( y \), if \( P \) applies to them, then \( P \) also applies to their union.

b. \( P \) is divisive iff \( \forall x [P(x) \rightarrow \exists y [P(y) \& y < x] \& \forall x, y [P(x) \& P(y) \& y < x \rightarrow P(x - y)]] \)

   For all \( x \), if \( P \) applies to \( x \), then there is a \( y \) such that \( P \) applies to \( y \) and \( y \) is a proper subpart of \( x \); and for all \( x \) and \( y \), if \( P \) applies to them and \( y \) is a proper subpart of \( x \), then \( P \) applies to \( x \) less \( y \).

• Cumulative: the union of zero emails with zero emails is still zero emails
  -- \([\text{zero emails}] = \perp \); and \( \perp \cup \perp = \perp \)

• Divisive: Given that zero emails has no proper parts, it fails to have a proper part \( y \).
  \( \) \( \) \( \) \( \)
  -- \([\text{zero emails}] = \perp \); and \( \perp \) has no proper parts.

Thus, although zero/no NPs denote empty objects and therefore have no proper parts to map to subevents as internal arguments

• They are formally quantized, and

• therefore predict that a telic interpretation of an empty accomplishment should be acceptable.

4.3.3 Telic interpretations of empty accomplishments

Assuming aspectual composition, the event inherits the mereological structure of its internal argument.

• Tests for telic interpretation may hinge on there being some quantity that the test can latch on to.

• Any discontinuity in the mereological structure seems to be enough!\(^{14}\)

• Even when such discontinuity leads to no apparent temporal discontinuities.

\(^{13}\) Another case where homogeneity fails though a failure of divisiveness are lower-bounded closed scale adjectives like straight and dry (Husband 2012).

\(^{14}\) Perhaps this is why closed scale adjectives like those in (i) are sometimes acceptable with in X time while open-scale adjectives like those in (ii) sound a bit off.
– Mapping to subevents in (6) will only generate a single event \( e \) because \( \bot \) has no proper parts.
– Having no proper parts, the event \( e \) will be quantized (again, a failure of being divisive).

4.3.4 Atelic interpretations of empty accomplishments

• Some atelicity tests, like \( \text{for } X \text{ time} \) may merely requires some kind of event cumulativity to hold (cf. incremental homogeneity, Landman & Rothstein (2012a,b)).
• Other tests, like \( \text{until } X \), have different requires (e.g. some process described must be realized in some way).\(^{15}\)

4.4 On the use of empty accomplishments

Empty accomplishments are unusual because, semantically, they seem to assert something akin to what Schein (2016: 531) calls “the existence of zones that are asserted to be sterile of what is described” for what is under the scope of negation more generally.

• Why then would someone utter an empty accomplishment?

First note: It isn’t the case that nothing related can be going on.

(45) The company built zero houses in three months.

(i) a. The plate was dry in 15 minutes.
   b. The wire was straight in 15 minutes.
(ii) a. The plate was wet ??in 15 minutes.
   b. The wire was bent ??in 15 minutes.

15 For instance, \( \text{until } X \), which is acceptable with normal activities like those in (i), doesn’t like negative activities like those in (ii) (though these are ok if negation scopes outside of \( \text{until } X \), in which case they are no longer negative activities).

(i) a. John ran until noon.
   a. Mary ate ice cream until noon.
(ii) a. John didn’t run #until noon.
   a. Mary didn’t eat ice cream #until noon.
It could be that a lot of work with the aim to build houses was undertaken by the company in this three month period, but for reasons of incompetence, bureaucratic red tape, delays due to the weather, etc. but no houses come into being.

- The event that the predicate cares about, however, is *build zero houses*, and given that zero houses come about, (45) is true.

In a similar vein (talking about negative negative events), De Swart (1996: 201) notes that “examples are only felicitous in contexts in which the denial that a certain event took place is informative enough to be stated. This requires something like an unfulfilled expectation or the breaking of a regular pattern”.

- Horn (1989: 201) argues that these conditions are pragmatic, a distinction between denial vs. assertion.

5 Reconsidering telicity and telos

Recall the standard assumption in (1), repeated here:

(1) Standard Assumption: Telic interpretations emerge at a TELOS, the co-occurrence of an event’s endpoint and its culmination.

Empty accomplishments have no culmination but do have a telic interpretation.

- This telic interpretation may emerge because empty accomplishments are a single sterile event, and as a single event, are quantized.
- This quantization results from a failure to be divisive, not cumulativity.
  - This event does not have a telos. There is no culmination within an empty accomplishment.

Does the lack of culmination lead to a lack of result?

- Empty accomplishments can still take resultative phrases.
- It is as if we can still say what its result could have been, even though nothing happens.

16 Sherry Chen (pc) has suggested that empty accomplishments may be felicitous only in contrastive contexts. While this certainly seems to be the case for many of the examples considered here, I have not considered more deeply whether this is the case.
6 Conclusions

- At the end of the day, the grammar cares about quantity.
  - Events are sensitive to quantity.
  - The term telicity is somewhat of a misnomer. What is denoted by the term is really the existence of a quantized event (Borer 2005a)
  - Even for events which denote nothing.
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