

snippets

Issue 26

December 2012

Contents

1. Luka Crnic. *Projection of supplements in alternatives.*
2. Michael Erlewine. *Structurally distant haplology.*
3. Natalia Fitzgibbons. *Pied-pipe your preposition and strand it too.*
4. Michael Frazier and Masaya Yoshida. *Remarks on gapping in ASL.*
5. Sumiyo Nishiguchi. *Shifty operators in Dhaasanac.*
6. Jacopo Romoli. *Strong NPIs and Neg-raising desire predicates.*
7. Philippe Schlenker. *Informativity-based maximality conditions.*



1.

Luka Crnic – Hebrew University of Jerusalem *Projection of supplements in alternatives*

crnic@mit.edu

doi: 10.7358/snip-2012-026-crni

Non-restrictive relative clauses (NRRs) and expressives -- supplements, for short -- have non-assertive import. This note presents data that suggests that the projective behavior of this non-assertive import is *prima facie* distinct from that of presuppositions. We begin by contrasting two classes of examples where supplements are anchored to a nominal containing a bound pronoun, *his mother*. In (1a) and (2a), supplements are anchored to a nominal in which the possessive pronoun *his* is bound by *every boy*. The sentences trigger the inferences described in (1b) and (2b) (see Nouwen 2007 for an approach to deriving these inferences).

- (1) a. [Every boy]_i listens to his_i mother, who loves him;
b. ==> for every boy x, x's mother loves x
- (2) a. [Every boy]_i listens to his_i damn mother
b. ==> for every boy x, the speaker has a negative attitude towards x's mother

These inferences parallel those that are generated by a presupposition trigger like *realize* (3). Thus, on the basis of the data in (1-3), there does not seem to be any difference in the projective behavior of the non-assertive content of supplements and presupposition triggers.

- (3) a. [Every boy]_i realized his_i mother was listening to him;
b. ==> for every boy x, x's mother was listening to x

This parallelism between supplements and presupposition triggers like *realize* disappears when we switch to certain other binding configurations. In (4a) and (5a), we have sentences where supplements are anchored to a nominal in which the possessive pronoun is bound by *only John* -- the sentences can be used to describe a situation in which John, but no other boy, listens to his own mother and all other boys listen to John's mother as well.

- (4) a. Among all the boys, [only John]_i listens to his_i mother, who loves him;
b. !=> for every boy x, x's mother loves x
- (5) a. Among all the boys, [only John]_i listens to his_i damn mother
b. !=> for every boy x, the speaker has a negative attitude towards x's mother

The sentences in (4a) and (5a) do not trigger inferences parallel to those in (1) and (2), as indicated in (4b) and (5b). This clearly contrasts with the projective behavior of the

presupposition trigger *realize* (6). Thus, the data in (4-6) present a discrepancy in the projection of non-assertive content of supplements and presupposition triggers.

- (6) a. Among all the boys, [only John]_i realized his_i mother was listening to him;
b. ==> for every boy x, x's mother was listening to x

Such contrasts can be easily multiplied. For instance, they can be reproduced with sentences in which the NRR is uncontroversially in the syntactic scope of *only* (7). The sentence in (7a) can describe a state of affairs where Facebook but not Yahoo got a report last year that they will have to fire their CFO tomorrow to remain profitable and where, independently, the Facebook CFO but not the Yahoo CFO is planning to go to Bahamas tomorrow. The sequence of tense in (7a) requires the NRR to be in the scope of *only Facebook* (cf. Schlenker 2010a). Accordingly, the supplement should feature in the focus alternatives on which *only* operates. However, its non-assertive content does not project from the alternatives (7b), unlike that of *realize* (7c).

- (7) a. Among Facebook and Yahoo, [only Facebook]_i realized last year that they_i would have to fire their_i CFO tomorrow, who was about to go to Bahamas
b. =/=> Yahoo's CFO is about to go to Bahamas
c. ==> Yahoo's CFO will be fired tomorrow

All in all, we have shown in (4-7) that the projective behavior of supplements and presupposition triggers differs in the scope of *only*. There are at least two related ways of dealing with this puzzling data. First: On the multidimensional treatment of supplements (e.g. Potts 2005), the non-projection of supplements in (4-5) and (7) is explained if we assume that their non-assertive non-presuppositional import does not feature in the focus alternatives. Second: On the unidimensional treatment of supplements (e.g. Schlenker 2010a,b), the data can be explained in a similar way: the focus semantic value of supplements has to be such as to effectively offset them in focus alternatives (e.g. either supplements have vacuous alternatives or their focus semantic value is, non-standardly, an empty set).

References

- Nouwen, R. (2007) "On appositives and dynamic binding." *Journal of Language and Computation* 5(1): 87–102.
Potts, C. (2005) *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Schlenker, P. (2010a) "Supplements within a unidimensional semantics I: Scope," in *Proceedings of the 2009 Amsterdam Colloquium*.
Schlenker, P. (2010b) "Supplements within a unidimensional semantics II: Epistemic status and projection," in *Proceedings of NELS 2009*.