

snippets

Issue 37 - December 2019
Special issue in honor of Uli Sauerland

Contents

1.	Andreea C. Nicolae, Patrick D. Elliott, and Yasutada Sudo <i>Introduction</i>	1
2.	Dorothy Ahn <i>ASL IX to locus as a modifier</i>	2
3.	Artemis Alexiadou <i>Decomposing scalar approximatives in Greek</i>	4
4.	Anna Alsop, Lucas Champollion, and Ioana Grosu <i>A problem for Fox's (2007) account of free choice disjunction</i>	7
5.	Anton Benz and Nicole Gotzner <i>Quantifier irgendein and local implicature</i>	10
6.	Jonathan David Bobaljik and Susi Wurmbrand <i>Fake indexicals, binding, and the PCC</i>	13
7.	Brian Buccola and Emmanuel Chemla <i>Alternatives of disjunctions: when a disjunct contains the antecedent of a pronoun</i>	16
8.	Luka Crnić and Brian Buccola <i>Scoping NPIs out of DPs</i>	19
9.	Chris Cummins <i>Some contexts requiring precise number meanings</i>	22
10.	Patrick D. Elliott and Paul Marty <i>Exactly one theory of multiplicity inferences</i>	24

11.	Anamaria Fălăuș and Andreea C. Nicolae	
	<i>Two coordinating particles are better than one: free choice items in Romanian</i>	27
12.	Danny Fox	
	<i>Individual concepts and narrow scope illusions</i>	30
13.	Danny Fox	
	<i>Degree concepts and narrow scope illusions</i>	33
14.	Nicole Gotzner	
	<i>Disjunction, conjunction, and exhaustivity</i>	35
15.	Martin Hackl	
	<i>On Haddock's puzzle and the role of presupposition in reference resolution</i>	37
16.	Andreas Haida	
	<i>Symmetry, density, and formal alternatives</i>	40
17.	Nina Haslinger and Viola Schmitt	
	<i>Strengthened disjunction or non-classical conjunction?</i>	43
18.	Fabian Heck and Anke Himmelreich	
	<i>Two observations about reconstruction</i>	46
19.	Aron Hirsch	
	<i>Modal adverbs and constraints on type-flexibility</i>	49
20.	Natalia Ivlieva and Alexander Podobryaev	
	<i>On variable agreement and scope reconstruction in Russian</i>	52
21.	Hadil Karawani	
	<i>The past is rewritten</i>	54
22.	Manfred Krifka and Fereshteh Modarresi	
	<i>Persian ezafe and proportional quantifiers</i>	56
23.	Paul Marty	
	<i>Maximize Presupposition! and presupposition satisfaction</i>	59
24.	Lisa Matthewson, Sihwei Chen, Marianne Huijismans, Marcin Morzycki, Daniel Reisinger, and Hotze Rullmann	
	<i>Restricting the English past tense</i>	61
25.	Clemens Mayr	
	<i>On a seemingly nonexistent cumulative reading</i>	65
26.	Marie-Christine Meyer	
	<i>Scalar Implicatures in complex contexts</i>	67
27.	Moreno Mitrović	
	<i>Null disjunction in disguise</i>	70
28.	Andreea C. Nicolae and Yasutada Sudo	
	<i>The exhaustive relevance of complex conjunctions</i>	72
29.	Rick Nouwen	
	<i>Scalar vagueness regulation and locative reference</i>	75

30.	Robert Pasternak	
	<i>Unifying partitive and adjective-modifying percent</i>	77
31.	Hazel Pearson and Frank Sode	
	<i>'Not in my wildest dreams': a part time minimizer?</i>	80
32.	Orin Percus	
	<i>Uli and our generation: some reminiscences</i>	82
33.	Jacopo Romoli	
	<i>Why them?</i>	84
34.	Fabienne Salfner	
	<i>The rise and fall of non-conservatives</i>	87
35.	Petra B. Schumacher	
	<i>Vagueness and context-sensitivity of absolute gradable adjectives</i>	90
36.	Stephanie Solt	
	<i>More or less an approximator</i>	93
37.	Giorgos Spathas	
	<i>Plural anaphoric reference and non-conservativity</i>	95
38.	Benjamin Spector	
	<i>An argument for the trivalent approach to presupposition projection</i>	97
39.	Bob van Tiel	
	<i>'The case against fuzzy logic revisited' revisited</i>	100
40.	Lyn Tieu	
	<i>A developmental asymmetry between the singular and plural</i>	103
41.	Tue Trinh	
	<i>A tense question</i>	106
42.	Hubert Truckenbrodt	
	<i>On remind-me presuppositions and embedded question acts</i>	108
43.	Michael Wagner	
	<i>Disjuncts must be mutually excludable</i>	111
44.	E. Cameron Wilson	
	<i>Constraints on non-conservative readings in English</i>	114
45.	Susi Wurmbrand	
	<i>Indexical shift meets ECM</i>	117

Quantifier *irgendein* and local implicatures

Anton Benz · Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft

Nicole Gotzner · Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7358/snip-2019-037-bego>

This snippet focuses on a puzzle concerning the alternatives associated with the German existential quantifiers *einige* ('some') and *irgendeine* ('any') under embedding. In particular, we show that the two quantifiers trigger different implicatures in upward-entailing (UE) and downward-entailing (DE) contexts; see (1) and (2) respectively. In short, *einige* and *irgendeine* trigger the same *not all* implicature when embedded under 'every' (UE), but behave differently from each other when embedded under 'none' (DE). Whereas *einige* triggers a local implicature in DE contexts, *irgendeine* is interpreted as 'none'.

- (1) Jedes der Mädchen fand *einige/irgendeine* ihrer Murmeln.
every of.the girls found *some/any* of.her marbles
'Each of the girls found some of her marbles.'
↪ Each of the girls found *some but not all* of her marbles.
- (2) Keines der Mädchen fand *einige/irgendeine* ihrer Murmeln.
none of.the girls found *some/any* of.her marbles
'None of the girls found some/any of her marbles.'
↪[?] None of the girls found *some but not all* of her marbles.

In *grammatical* accounts (Fox 2007; Chierchia 2013), an embedded occurrence of a scalar element may trigger local calculation of alternatives and their negation. If *einige/irgendeine* trigger a local implicature, then the readings in (1) and (2) result. What counts as an alternative to these kinds of sentences is a central issue for all such theories that have emerged from the neo-Gricean account of implicatures (Horn 1989; Sauerland 2004).

Gotzner and Benz (2018) have developed an experimental paradigm in which participants systematically derived the embedded implicature in the case of *einige* 'some' being embedded under *alle* 'all'. In an interactive version of this paradigm (Benz et al. 2018), we collected a large corpus of production and interpretation data on German sentences of the form 'Q of the girls found Q' of their marbles'. Q and Q' could be, among others, *einige* 'some', *alle/jedes* 'all'/'every', *keines* 'none', and *irgendeine* 'any' (for details see <https://osf.io/qs2vj/>).

In (3) percentages of responses indicating a local *some but not all* reading for interpretation (%int) and production (%prod) are shown. As can be seen, when *einige* and *irgendeine* are embedded under *alle* (A-E and A-I respectively), the interpretation that each girl found some but not all marbles arises consistently for both quantifiers. In the case of embedding under *keine* 'no', however, interpretations diverge: *einige* embedded under *keine* (N-E) is predominantly interpreted as 'some but not all', whereas *irgendeine* embedded under *keine* (N-I) never gives rise to a local implicature. Instead, the sentence with *irgendeine* is interpreted as 'no girl found anything'.

(3)

	N-E	N-I	A-E	A-I
#int/#prod	35/15	98/77	76/50	4/7
%int	77	1	91	100
%prod	100	0	96	100

#int: abs. number of interpreted utterance tokens.
#prod: abs. number of produced utterance tokens,

The data give rise to the following puzzle about alternatives: if one assumes with Buccola and Haida (2017) that ‘all’ is an alternative to *irgendeine*, then this explains why A-E and A-I trigger the same local implicature, but it leaves unexplained why N-E and N-I behave differently. If, alternatively, one assumes that *irgendeine* does not activate the ‘all’ alternative, then the observations about N-E and N-I follow, but the embedded implicature of A-I remains unexplained. One may argue that the *not all* implicature of A-I is the result of *irgendeine* being singular. Note, however, that participants only saw pictures in which girls had either none or at least 2 out of 4 marbles. Hence, the *all found one* interpretation for A-I was contextually blocked.

Another suggestion is that the *not all* inference from *einige* has become conventionalized, whereas the *not all* inference from *irgendeine* is a true implicature that is blocked in DE contexts. Contrary to this assumption, Benz et al. (2018) show cases in which *einige* in UE contexts fails to produce the expected implicature. Solving the puzzle of alternatives associated with German *irgendeine* may also require further investigation of its distribution and NPI behaviour, which seems to differ from that of English *any*.

References

- Benz, Anton, Nicole Gotzner, and Lisa Raithel. 2018. Embedded implicature in a new interactive paradigm. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 22*, ed. Uli Sauerland and Stephanie Solt, 205–222. Berlin: Leibniz-Centre General Linguistics (ZAS).
- Buccola, Brian, and Andreas Haida. 2017. Expressing agent indifference in German. In *Proceedings of the 21st Amsterdam Colloquium*, ed. Alexandre Cremers, Thom van Gessel, and Floris Roelofsen, 165–174. Amsterdam: ILLC.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 2013. *Logic in Grammar: Polarity, free choice, and intervention*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fox, Danny. 2007. Free choice and the theory of scalar implicatures. In *Presupposition and Implicature in Compositional Semantics*, ed. Uli Sauerland and Penka Stateva, 71–120. Basingstoke: Palgrave Mcmillan.
- Gotzner, Nicole, and Anton Benz. 2018. The best response paradigm: A new approach to test implicatures of complex sentences. *Frontiers in Communication* 2:21. 1–13.
- Horn, Laurence R. 1989. *A Natural History of Negation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sauerland, Uli. 2004. Scalar implicatures in complex sentences. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27:367–391.

This work was supported by the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF) (Grant Nr. 01UG1411) and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) (Grant Nr. BE 4348/4-1 and BE 4348/4-2).

Anton Benz
benz@leibniz-zas.de
Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft (ZAS)
Schützenstr. 18
10117 Berlin
Germany

Nicole Gotzner
gotzner@leibniz-zas.de
Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft (ZAS)
Schützenstr. 18
10117 Berlin
Germany