

**Please cite as:**

Bohnenmeyer, J. (1999). A questionnaire on event integration. In D. Wilkins (Ed.), *Manual for the 1999 Field Season* (pp. 87-95). Nijmegen: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics. doi:[10.17617/2.3002691](https://doi.org/10.17617/2.3002691).

---

**REGULATIONS ON USE**

**Stephen C. Levinson and Asifa Majid**

This website and the materials herewith supplied have been developed by members of the Language and Cognition Department of the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics (formerly the Cognitive Anthropology Research Group). In a number of cases materials were designed in collaboration with staff from other MPI departments.

**Proper citation and attribution**

Any use of the materials should be acknowledged in publications, presentations and other public materials. Entries have been developed by different individuals. Please cite authors as indicated on the webpage and front page of the pdf entry. Use of associated stimuli should also be cited by acknowledging the field manual entry. Intellectual property rights are hereby asserted.

**Creative Commons license**

This material is provided under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike license (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0). This means you are free to share (copy, redistribute) the material in any medium or format, and you are free to adapt (remix, transform, build upon) the material, under the following terms: you must give appropriate credit in the form of a citation to the original material; you may not use the material for commercial purposes; and if you adapt the material, you must distribute your contribution under the same license as the original.

**Background**

The field manuals were originally intended as working documents for internal use only. They were supplemented by verbal instructions and additional guidelines in many cases. If you have questions about using the materials, or comments on the viability in various field situations, feel free to get in touch with the authors.

**Contact**

Email us via [library@mpi.nl](mailto:library@mpi.nl)

Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics

P.O. Box 310, 6500 AH, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

## 9. A Questionnaire on Event Integration

Jürgen Bohnemeyer July 1999

Introduction. Eventually, a version of this questionnaire should be part of a larger Event-X questionnaire that allows a researcher to assess the linguistic construal of events in a particular language according to all relevant parameters, not just event integration.

At this point, the investigation of event integration is restricted to the same three types of scenarios that are also featured in the ECOM clips: motion, caused state change, and transfer. The event integration questionnaire is *not* so much meant as an alternative elicitation tool to the ECOM clips. It is rather meant as a check list of scenarios (most of which are also represented in ECOM) that are thought of as providing critical cut-off points at which languages show differences in event integration. You may simply want to search your data base for utterances that instantiate these scenarios, and independent of whether or not you find such instances, you may want to do some elicitation work to get the full range of alternative descriptions of one and the same scenario that the language you work on provides.<sup>1</sup>

The questionnaire. The questionnaire is, again, not a translation questionnaire, but simply a checklist. Therefore, it is not the particular English wording of the examples listed below that is intended to be covered in a description of a particular scenario in your target language, but rather the conceptual schema represented by the formula preceding each example. The examples are merely meant as illustrations of the scenarios. For example, in (a1) to (a4), what matters is how motion as continuous location change defined with respect to a more or less complex series of ground objects is expressed in the target language. *GO* is meant as an abstract representation of that; it does *not* stand for the English verb *go*, and whether the verb in the English examples illustrating scenarios (a1)-(a4) is *go* or *come* or *move* or what have you is not of crucial relevance here.

The aim of the Event Integration Questionnaire study is to find out where the target language draws the line in integrating motion and transfer scenes and causal chains into macro-events. Which of the following scenes are represented as single macro-events in the target language? In first approximation, this will probably amount to asking which (portions) of the scenarios are expressed in single clauses. However, clause-hood and macro-eventhood do not necessarily match. Some semantic criteria for macro-eventhood have been outlined in the general introduction to the Event Representation module of the field manual. Please read these carefully and apply them to the *constructions* used by your consultants in describing the questionnaire scenarios as well.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a revised version of the questionnaire I circulated in May. Comments, suggestions, and data from Felix Ameka, Penny Brown, Nicole Cooper, James Essegbey, Anna Margetts, Eva Schultze-Berndt, and David Wilkins helped me greatly in creating that first version. On the first version, I got responses (in varying degrees of detail) from Felix Ameka, Melissa Bowerman, Penny Brown, Gunter Senft, Sotaro Kita, Aaron Sonnenschein, and David Wilkins. Suggestions I've derived from these responses I have tried to incorporate in the current version. I'm currently preparing the data collected so far for tabulation.

Just as with the ECOM study, the critical question is this: for each of the scenarios listed below, the language you are describing will probably provide a range of descriptions. Which of these is the most *compact* one in terms of event integration? In case the most compact description is possible but seems dispreferred, or in case it is only possible/felicitous in certain contexts or under other kinds of conditions, please state these!

(a) *Motion*

(The first four are taken from David's OZ Motion Questionnaire)

- (a1) GO (THEME, SOURCE, GOAL)

*He went from the tree to the rock.*

- (a2) GO (THEME, PATH, GOAL)

*He went into the house through the rear door.*

*He went along the beach to the canoe*

- (a3) GO (THEME, PATH, DIRECTION)

*He came along the road towards our car.*

- (a4) GO (THEME, SOURCE, PATH, GOAL)

*The dog carried the meat from the creek along the path to the tree.*

- (a5) [GO (THEME<sub>i</sub>), TIME<sub>j</sub>]<sup>2</sup> & [DO (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, ACTIVITY), TIME<sub>j</sub>]

*She went singing a song. (She sang while going.)*

- (a6) CAUSE (DO (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, MANNER\_OF\_MOTION),  
GO (THEME<sub>i</sub>, PATH))

or:

[GO (THEME<sub>i</sub>, PATH), TIME<sub>j</sub>]

& [DO (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, MANNER\_OF\_MOTION), TIME<sub>j</sub>]

*The circle rolled up the ramp.*

(Is there a construction available for this different from the construction used to express a5? If so, does the applicability of this other construction depend on whether there is a causal relation between the activity and the location-change component? Think of the circle rolling (rotating!) in a cart, as in the ECOM scene H2!)

- (a7) GO (THEME<sub>i</sub>, GOAL\_ACTIVITY(AGENT<sub>i</sub>))

(i.e. 'motion-cum-purpose')

*She went to talk to her father.*

- (a8) GO (THEME<sub>i</sub>, GOAL\_EVENT(AGENT<sub>i</sub>, THEME))

(i.e. 'motion-cum-purpose'; does the complexity of the goal event matter?)

*The boy came to visit us.*

- (a9) [GO (THEME<sub>i</sub>, PATH<sub>j</sub>), TIME<sub>k</sub>]

& [CAUSE(AGENT<sub>i</sub>, GO(THEME, PATH<sub>j</sub>), TIME<sub>k</sub>)]

*The boy walked down the hill driving the pigs.*

*/ The boy drove the pigs down the hill walking.*

<sup>2</sup> The coindexed TIME variables here and in the following are deployed to represent simultaneity.

(b) *Causation*

(b1) CAUSE (AGENT, BECOME (broken (THEME)))  
*She broke the vase.*

(b2) CAUSE (AGENT, BECOME (hot (THEME)))  
 (this may elicit a variety of different structures, including, besides plain causatives, 'factitive' forms that derive a caused-state-change expression from a stative expression, or even applicative constructions or the like that operate on noun meaning 'heat')  
*She heated the coffee.*

(b3) CAUSE (AGENT, BECOME (awake (THEME)))  
*She woke him up.*

(b4) CAUSE (AGENT, GO (THEME, GOAL))  
*She took him / the letter / to x-place.*

(b5) CAUSE (AGENT, BECOME (dead (THEME)))  
*She killed the pig.*

(b6) CAUSE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, eat (AGENT<sub>j</sub>, THEME))  
*She fed the cows grass.*

(b7) CAUSE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, [GO (THEME<sub>(i+j)</sub>, PATH), TIME<sub>k</sub>]  
 & [jump (AGENT<sub>(i+j)</sub>, TIME<sub>k</sub>)]  
*She jumped the horse over the fence.*

(Note that in English, this construction is restricted to the causer being the rider of the horse (so the internal agent of *jump* might actually primarily be the rider rather than the horse). Otherwise, causation of an internally agentive event such as expressed by *jump* requires a periphrastic causative construction. Does this difference in the construal also trigger a difference in the expression in the language you are studying?)

(b8) CAUSE (AGENT, ring (AGENT/THEME))  
*She rang the bell.*

(another exception to the exclusion of unergatives from the English causative alternation: 'ambivalent' activities (activities which may but need not be internally caused))

(b9) CAUSE (AGENT, bounce (AGENT/THEME))  
*She bounced the ball.*  
 (as in b8)

(b10) CAUSE (AGENT/FORCE, shiver (AGENT))  
*She / the cold / made him shiver.*

(b11) CAUSE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, process (AGENT<sub>j</sub>, THEME))  
*She had the photographs developed.*  
 (no physical impact of causer on causee)

- (b12) CAUSE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, CAUSE (AGENT<sub>j</sub>, ring (AGENT<sub>k</sub>/THEME<sub>k</sub>)))  
*She had the bells rang.*  
 (no physical impact of causer on causee)
- (b13) CAUSE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, sing (AGENT<sub>j</sub>(, PERFORMANCE\_OBJECT)))  
*She made him sing ("Yesterday").*  
 (check different kinds of impact of causer on causee!)
- (b14) CAUSE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, GO (AGENT<sub>j</sub>, SOURCE))  
*She made the boy go away.*  
 (check different kinds of impact of causer on causee!)
- (b15) CAUSE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, read (AGENT<sub>j</sub>(, THEME)))  
*She made the children read (the book).*  
 (no physical impact of causer on causee!)
- (b16) CAUSE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, CAUSE (AGENT<sub>j</sub>, eat (AGENT<sub>k</sub>, THEME)))  
*She made the boy feed the cows grass.*
- (b17) CAUSE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, search (AGENT<sub>j</sub>, THEME))  
*She made the boy look for the bird.*
- (b18) CAUSE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, CAUSE (AGENT<sub>j</sub>, read (AGENT<sub>k</sub>(, THEME))))  
*She made the teacher make the children read (the book).*
- (b19) CAUSE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, CAUSE (AGENT<sub>j</sub>, swing (AGENT<sub>k</sub>/THEME<sub>k</sub>)))  
*She made the boy swing the swing.*
- (b20) CAUSE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, CAUSE (AGENT<sub>j</sub>, tell (AGENT<sub>k</sub>, THEME)))  
*She got the policeman to make the thief tell the truth.*
- (b21) CAUSE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, CAUSE (AGENT<sub>j</sub>, learn (AGENT<sub>k</sub>, THEME)))  
*She made the teacher teach the poem to the children.*

(The following examples are from Talmy (1976). They illustrate constraints on directness and volitionality of causation.)

- (b22) CAUSE (CAUSE (blow (FORCE, GOAL<sub>i</sub>),  
 descend (THEME<sub>i</sub>, GOAL<sub>j</sub>),  
 topple (THEME<sub>j</sub>))  
*The wind's blowing the branch down upon it toppled the aerial.*
- (b23) CAUSE (tickle (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>),  
 drop (AGENT<sub>j</sub>, THEME<sub>k</sub>))  
*Floyd caused the glass to drop on the floor by tickling Sally, who was holding it.*  
 (cf. \*Floyd dropped the glass to the floor by tickling Sally, who was holding it.)<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> After Jackendoff 1972: 28.

- (b24) CAUSE (push (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>, INSTRUMENT),  
CAUSE (slide (AGENT<sub>i</sub>), GO (THEME<sub>j</sub>, PATH)))  
*I slid the plate across the table by pushing on it with a stick.*
- (b25) CAUSE (throw (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>, GOAL<sub>k</sub>),  
CAUSE (slide (AGENT<sub>k</sub>), GO (THEME<sub>k</sub>, PATH)))  
*I made the plate slide across the table by throwing a stick at it.*
- (b26) CAUSE (damage (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>),  
empty (THEME<sub>j</sub>))  
*I caused the tank to empty by punching a hole in it.*  
(cf. \*I emptied the tank by punching a hole in it.)

(c) *Transfer*

Remember that it is of particular importance to know to what extent a transfer reading - in the sense of change of possession, as opposed to mere motion, or beneficiary or purposive relations, is defeasible. Or, put differently, what is the minimal construction that actually *entails* change of possession?

- (c1) GIVE (AGENT, RECIPIENT, THEME)  
or: CAUSE (AGENT, HAVE (POSSESSOR, THEME))  
(below, mostly only GIVE will be used to represent change of possession)  
*She gave her sister a present.*

(Check whether there is a difference between the expression of this and any of the following scenarios:

- *She* puts the present on the table between *herself* and *her sister*, with the intention of *her sister* taking it, and *her sister* does take it.
- *She* puts the present on the table between *herself* and *her sister*, without any intention of *her sister* taking it, and *her sister* takes the present.
- *She* hands *her sister* the present, but *her sister* refuses it.)

- (c2) send (AGENT, RECIPIENT, THEME)  
*She sent him a letter.*

- (c3) write (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>) & send (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, RECIPIENT, THEME<sub>j</sub>)  
*She wrote him a letter.*

(Check whether there is a difference between the expression of this and any of the following three scenarios:

- The letter is written for the benefit of *him*, but in order to be sent to somebody else.
- The letter is written for *him*, because he is illiterate.
- The letter is addressed to *him*, but never sent off.
- The letter is addressed to *him* and has been mailed, but got lost in the mail.)<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> You might want to replace some of the pronouns with names appropriate in the language and culture you're working on.

- (c4) pour (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>) & GIVE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, RECIPIENT, THEME<sub>j</sub>)  
*She poured him a drink.*

(Check whether there is a difference between the expression of this and any of the following three scenarios:

- The drink is poured for the benefit of *him*, but in order to be given to somebody else (*he* can't pour the drink *himself* because *he* has *his* hands full).
- The drink is poured in order to be given to *him*, but then it is given to somebody else instead.
- The drink is poured in order to be given to *him*, but then *he* refuses it.)

- (c5) bake (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>) & GIVE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, RECIPIENT, THEME<sub>j</sub>)  
*She baked her sister a cake.*

(Check whether there is a difference between the expression of this and any of the following three scenarios:

- *She* bakes the cake for the benefit of *her* sister, but in order to be given to *her* sister's boyfriend (*her* sister doesn't know herself how to bake).
- *She* bakes the cake in order to give it to *her* sister, but then *she* decides to give it to somebody else instead.
- *She* bakes the cake in order to give it to *her* sister, but then *her* sister refuses it.)

- (c6) paint (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>) & GIVE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, RECIPIENT, THEME<sub>j</sub>)  
*She painted him a picture.*

(Check the expression of alternative scenarios along the lines suggested for c3-c5!)

- (c7) pick (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>) & GIVE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, RECIPIENT, THEME<sub>j</sub>)  
*She picked the boy an apple.*

(Check the expression of alternative scenarios along the lines suggested for c3-c5!)

- (c8) cut(\_OFF) (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>, SOURCE)  
 & GIVE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, RECIPIENT, THEME<sub>j</sub>)  
*She cut him a slice of bread.*

(Check the expression of alternative scenarios along the lines suggested for c3-c5!)

- (c9) (as with c4)  
*She poured him a poisoned drink.*

(The point here is that the second human participant cannot be a beneficiary. Check whether there is a difference between the expression of this and any of the following three scenarios:

- The drink is poured for the benefit of *him*, but in order to be given to somebody else, whom *he* intends to poison (*he* won't pour the drink *himself* because *he* would be a natural suspect).

- The drink is poured with the intention of poisoning *him*, but then it is given to somebody else instead.
- The drink is poured with the intention of poisoning *him*, but then *he* refuses it.)

(c10) CAUSE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, GO (THEME<sub>j</sub>, GOAL<sub>k</sub>))  
 & GIVE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, RECIPIENT<sub>k</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>)  
 or: CAUSE (CAUSE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, GO (THEME<sub>j</sub>, GOAL<sub>k</sub>)),  
 HAVE (POSSESSOR<sub>k</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>))  
*She brought him the basket.*

(Check whether there is a difference between the expression of this and any of the following three scenarios:

- The basket is brought for the benefit of *him*, but in order to be given to somebody else (he wouldn't transport the basket *himself* because that would have been inconvenient for *him*).
- The basket is brought with the intention of giving it to *him*, but then it is given to somebody else instead.
- The basket is brought with the intention of giving it to *him*, but then *he* refuses it.)

(c11) CAUSE (kick (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, GOAL<sub>j</sub>), GO (THEME<sub>j</sub>, GOAL<sub>k</sub>))  
 & GIVE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, RECIPIENT<sub>k</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>)  
 or: CAUSE (CAUSE (kick (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, GOAL<sub>j</sub>), GO (THEME<sub>j</sub>, GOAL<sub>k</sub>)),  
 HAVE (POSSESSOR<sub>k</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>))  
*She kicked him the ball.*

(Check whether there is a difference between the expression of this and any of the following four scenarios:

- *She* kicks the ball for the benefit of *him*, but kicking it to somebody else (*he* can't kick the ball *himself* because *he* has a broken leg).
- *She* kicks the ball with the intention of hitting *him*, and *she* does hit him.
- *She* kicks the ball towards *him*, but the ball is intercepted by somebody else.
- *She* kicks the ball towards *him*, but *he* doesn't pay attention, and the ball passes by and is picked up by somebody else.)

(c12) CAUSE (throw (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>), GO (THEME<sub>j</sub>, GOAL<sub>k</sub>))  
 & GIVE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, RECIPIENT<sub>k</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>)  
 or: CAUSE (CAUSE (throw (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>), GO (THEME<sub>j</sub>,  
 GOAL<sub>k</sub>)),  
 HAVE (POSSESSOR<sub>k</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>))  
*She threw the boy the blanket.*

(Check against the expression of alternative scenarios along the lines suggested for c11!)

- (c13) CAUSE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, GO (THEME<sub>j</sub>, GOAL<sub>k</sub>))  
 & GIVE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, RECIPIENT<sub>k</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>)  
 or: CAUSE (CAUSE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, GO (THEME<sub>j</sub>, GOAL<sub>k</sub>)),  
 HAVE (POSSESSOR<sub>k</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>))

*She passed her sister the salt.*

(Check against the expression of alternative scenarios along the lines suggested for c11!)

- (c14) buy (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>) & GIVE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, RECIPIENT, THEME<sub>j</sub>)  
*She bought him a book.*

(Check whether there is a difference between the expression of this and any of the following three scenarios:

- *She* buys the book for *his* benefit, but in order for it to be given to somebody else (*he* has been assigned the task of buying a book for *his* boss, but *she* winds up doing the errand for *him*).
- *She* buys the book in order to give it to *him*, but then *she* decides to give it to somebody else instead.
- *She* buys the book in order to give it to *him*, but then *he* refuses it.)

- (c15) (as with c7/c8)

*She cut him a coconut.*

(The point here is that the cutting action is more specific than the picking one in c7, but doesn't in any sense *create* the theme, as it does in c8. Check against the expression of alternative scenarios along the lines suggested for c3-c5.)

- (c16) (as with c4)

*She poured him some tea.*

(Does the lack of specificity of the theme play a role? Check against the expression of alternative scenarios along the lines suggested for c3-c5.)

- (c17) CAUSE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, EXIST (THEME<sub>j</sub>))  
 & GIVE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, RECIPIENT<sub>k</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>)

*She built / the boy a house / a house for the boy.*

(Check whether there is a difference between the expression of this and any of the following three scenarios:

- *She* builds the house for *his* benefit, but in order for it to be given to somebody else (*he* has been assigned the task of building a house for *his* father, but *he* has to many other things to do).
- *She* builds the house in order to give it to *him*, but then *she* decides to give it to somebody else instead.
- *She* builds the house in order to give it to *him*, but then *he* refuses it.

Also, check whether it matters whether *she* builds the house herself physically, or whether she only pays for the house to be built.)

- (c18) catch (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>) & GIVE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, RECIPIENT<sub>k</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>)  
*She caught / the boy a fish / a fish for the boy.*  
 (Check against the expression of alternative scenarios along the lines suggested for c3-c5.)

- (c19) CAUSE (spear (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, GOAL<sub>j</sub>), die/be\_caught (THEME<sub>j</sub>))  
 & GIVE (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, RECIPIENT<sub>k</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>)  
 or: CAUSE (CAUSE (spear (AGENT<sub>i</sub>, GOAL<sub>j</sub>), die/be\_caught (THEME<sub>j</sub>)),  
 HAVE (POSSESSOR<sub>k</sub>, THEME<sub>j</sub>))  
*She speared / her sister a pig / a pig for her sister.*  
 (Check against the expression of alternative scenarios along the lines suggested for c3-c5.)

- (c20) CAUSE (AGENT, NOT (HAVE (POSSESSOR, THEME)))  
*She took away the ball from the boy.*

(Negative change of possession. The question here is, is it really entailed that the theme was possessed in the source state, or is there a possibility that the putative possessor is really only a spatial source, or even a maleficiary? Check whether there is a difference between the expression of this and any of the following scenarios:

- The ball is on the floor, next to the boy. It neither belongs to the boy, nor has the boy been playing with it. *She* grabs the ball.
- The ball is of massive lead, the boy can hardly hold it. A moment ago, the boy's father gave the ball to the boy, telling him to hold it for him. Now *she* relieves the boy of the burden.)

- (c21) (as with c20)  
*She stole the ring from him.*

(Check whether there is a difference between the expression of this and any of the following scenarios:

- The ring is on the table next to *him*. It belongs to *his* mother, and *he* has not been doing anything with it. *She* grabs the ring.
- The ring is on the table next to *him*. It belongs to *his* mother, who has given *him* the task to guard it. *She* grabs the ring.