

snippets

Issue 30

June 2015

Contents

1. Andreea Nicolae, Patrick D. Elliott and Yasutada Sudo. *Pair-list readings of conjoined singular which-phrases.*
2. Rick Nouwen. *Presuppositions of superlatives with neg-raisers.*
3. Philippe Schlenker. *Gestural presuppositions.*
4. Yasutada Sudo. *Japanese nominal conjunction only has the split reading.*
5. Susi Wurmbrand. *Does gender depend on number?*
6. Ed Zoerner and Brian Agbayani. *Stripping, deletion and in subordinators.*



NP conjunction in English is ambiguous between a *joint* and *split* reading (Link 1983, Krifka 1990, Winter 2001, Heycock & Zamparelli 2005, Champollion to appear), e.g. *my colleague and friend* may denote one person who is both my colleague and my friend (the ‘joint reading’), (1a), or a pair consisting of my colleague and my friend (the ‘split reading’), (1b).

- (1) a. My colleague and friend married John.
 b. My colleague and friend are in love.

Heycock & Zamparelli (2005) observe that the split reading is absent in many languages with conjunction of singular NPs like (1b), while a joint reading like (1a) is possible in every language they looked at. They also remark that conjoined plural NPs often have split readings cross-linguistically.

I observe that the Japanese nominal conjunctive connective *-to* only has the split reading, and disallows the joint reading (which is expressible with VP-level conjunction):

- (2) a. # boku-no dooryoo-to yuujin-ga John-to kekkonshita.
 1sg-gen colleague-and friend-nom John-with married
 ‘#My colleague and friend married John.’
 b. boku-no dooryoo-to yuujin-ga aishi-at-tei-ru.
 1sg-gen colleague-and friend-nom love-recip-prog-pres
 ‘My colleague and friend love each other.’

Since DP-conjunction is arguably possible with *-to* (e.g. *John-to Mary* ‘John and Mary’), it is important to show that (2a) can have an NP-conjunction reading. That *-to* allows NP-conjunction is shown by (3).

- (3) boku-no roku-nin-no dooryoo-to yuujin-ga aishi-at-tei-ru.
 1sg-gen 6-cl-gen colleague-and friend-nom love-recip-prog-pres
 ‘Six colleagues and friends of mine love each other.’

(3) is multiply ambiguous, but crucially, it has a reading involving a group of six people that consists of colleagues and friends such that each of them loves someone else in the group. This requires NP-conjunction below the numeral. Then, NP-conjunction should be possible in (2a), even if DP-conjunction might also be available. Nonetheless, it does not have a joint reading.

This observation has implications for theories of conjunction. Champollion (to appear) classifies the existing accounts of *and* into three types: (i) the intersective theory (Winter 2001, Champollion to appear), (ii) the collective theory (Krifka 1990, Heycock & Zamparelli 2005), (iii) the ambiguity theory (Link 1983, 1984, Hoeksema 1988). According to (i), *and* is generalised intersection, which yields the joint reading,

while the split reading requires additional mechanisms. For (ii), the main function of *and* is to form plural entities, and derives the split reading without further ado. (iii) posits two versions of *and* in the lexicon for the two readings.

The Japanese facts seem to favour the ambiguity view (iii), at least in light of the analyses currently available in the literature.

Firstly, (2) poses a serious challenge to Heycock & Zamparelli's (2005) implementation of (ii). According to them, the joint reading is derived as a subcase of the split reading when the two nouns have overlapping extensions. Thus, they predict that whenever the split reading is possible, so is the joint reading.

The data in (2) are also problematic for Winter's (2001) and Champollion's (to appear) versions of (i). Since the split reading is possible, *-to* needs to be able to have an intersective meaning under this view. To save the analysis, one could stipulate that *-to* is marked in the lexicon as always requiring the additional mechanisms that derive the split reading. However, this essentially amounts to the same view as (iii), which postulates two types of conjunction in the lexicon.

References

- Champollion, L. (to appear) "Ten men and women got married today." To appear in *Journal of Semantics*.
- Heycock, C. and R. Zamparelli. (2005) "Friends and colleagues: plurality, coordination, and the structure of DP." *Natural Language Semantics* 13, 201–270.
- Hoeksema, J. (1988) "The semantics of non-Boolean 'and'." *Journal of Semantics* 6, 19–40.
- Krifka, M. (1990) "Boolean and non-Boolean 'and'," in *Papers from the Second Symposium on Logic and Language*, ed. L. Kálmán and L. Pólos. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 161–188.
- Link, G. (1983) "The logical analysis of plurals and mass terms: a lattice-theoretical approach," in *Meaning, Use and Interpretation of Language*, ed. R. Bäuerle, C. Schwarze and A. von Stechow. Berlin: de Gruyter, 303–323.
- Link, G. (1984) "Hydras: on the logic of relative clause constructions with multiple heads," in *Varieties of Formal Semantics: Proceedings of the Fourth Amsterdam Colloquium*, ed. F. Landman and F. Veltman. Dordrecht: Foris, 245–257.
- Winter, Y. (2001) *Flexibility Principles in Boolean Semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.