

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 Crnič 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 Huijsmans, 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

Alternatives of disjunctions: when a disjunct contains the antecedent of a pronoun

Brian Buccola · MSU, LSCP, DEC, ENS, EHESS, CNRS, PSL University

Emmanuel Chemla · LSCP, DEC, ENS, EHESS, CNRS, PSL University

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

For disjunctive sentences of the form “ $f(X \text{ or } Y)$ ”, classical theories of exhaustification crucially rely on the co-existence of the alternatives “ $f(X)$ ” and “ $f(Y)$ ” (see Fox and Katzir 2011, as well as Bar-Lev and Fox 2017). Abstractly, this co-existence prevents disjunctive sentences from implying that “ $f(X)$ ” and “ $f(Y)$ ” have different truth values (see Klinedinst 2005; Chemla 2009).

Now, consider (1). It contains a disjunction and, accordingly, implies the negation of two propositions that resemble the usual “ $f(X)$ ” and “ $f(Y)$ ” alternatives: “Every dad called his daughter” and “Every dad called his daughter’s dog”. In the former, we recognize the usual, first-disjunct alternative “ $f(X)$ ” = (2a). But the latter is harder to find. Keeping only the second disjunct creates “ $f(Y)$ ” = (2b), which does not mean “Every dad called his daughter’s dog”.

- | | |
|---|------------------------|
| (1) Every dad _{<i>i</i>} called [his _{<i>i</i>} daughter] _{<i>j</i>} or her _{<i>j</i>} dog. | = $f(X \text{ or } Y)$ |
| (2) a. Every dad _{<i>i</i>} called his _{<i>i</i>} daughter. | = $f(X)$ |
| b. Every dad _{<i>i</i>} called her _{<i>j</i>} dog. | = $f(Y)$ |

A first option is to take these cases as showing that more involved semantic binding solutions are needed (see Charlow 2019b). In this view, one can argue that a (2b)-like alternative can do the trick: although it does not seem feasible on the surface, at LF “her_{*j*} dog” may receive what is called a paycheck interpretation “his daughter’s dog” (Geach 1962; Karttunen 1969). We further note that a continuation of (1) with (3) cannot mean that no mother looked for her own dog. This would be the case if the LF were as in (4), with $i = j$. Instead, the continuation means that no mother looked for her daughter’s dog. This can be explained if the pronoun x_j in (4) is constrained to receive a paycheck interpretation and refer to x_i ’s daughter, just like one would say about “her_{*j*}” in (2b) then.

- | |
|--|
| (3) But no mother did the latter. |
| (4) But no mother _{<i>i</i>} did ⟨call x_j ’s dog⟩. |

A second option, however, is to abandon the attractive idea that the disjunct alternatives are obtained by deletion of one disjunct (as formalized and motivated in Katzir 2007; see also the potential importance of replacement alternatives for acquisition facts in Barner et al. 2011, and for processing facts in Chemla and Bott 2014). Instead, Uli Sauerland (2004) proposed early on and provocatively (as “more of a technical trick, than a real solution”, he then wrote) that these alternatives could be obtained via the replacement à la Horn (1972) of the disjunction “or” with operators **L** and **R**, which retain both disjuncts structurally, and assert the truth of the **Left** disjunct

and of the **R**ight disjunct, respectively. This has the potential to make both alternatives structurally acceptable, as we would obtain:

- (5) a. Every dad_{*i*} called [his_{*i*} daughter]_{*j*} **L** her_{*j*} dog. = $f(X \mathbf{L} Y)$
 b. Every dad_{*i*} called [his_{*i*} daughter]_{*j*} **R** her_{*j*} dog. = $f(X \mathbf{R} Y)$

The **L/R** operators have the advantage that they retain all the structure of the initial disjunction. Concerning (3) then, it would not be necessary to resort to paycheck pronouns. The continuation could be rendered as in (6), as if “the latter” provided some trace of **R** in the lexicon after all (and likewise for “the former” and **L**).

- (6) But no mother_{*i*} did ⟨call [*x_i*’s daughter]_{*j*} **R** *x_j*’s dog⟩.

In conclusion, whatever option above is adopted, alternatives are best understood at the level of LF because neither (2b) nor (5b) is a helpful English sentence. This provides a new argument for views expressed clearly by Katzir (2007), for which Charlow (2019a) and Chemla (2007) provide some empirical arguments, and for which Buccola et al. (2018) provide conceptual discussion. More generally, we must derive alternatives for disjunctions, whether these structures are obtained by deletion or **L/R** replacements. Studying the interpretations of these structures can provide information about the derivation of alternatives, as well as about the range of abstract semantic processes available for logical forms.

References

- Bar-Lev, Moshe, and Danny Fox. 2017. Universal free choice and innocent inclusion. In *Proceedings of the 27th Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference (SALT 27)*, ed. Dan Burgdorf, Jacob Collard, Sireemas Maspong, and Brynhildur Stefánsdóttir, 95–115.
- Barner, David, Neon Brooks, and Alan Bale. 2011. Accessing the unsaid: The role of scalar alternatives in children’s pragmatic inference. *Cognition* 118:84–93.
- Buccola, Brian, Manuel Križ, and Emmanuel Chemla. 2018. Conceptual alternatives: Competition in language and beyond. Ms. Paris.
- Charlow, Simon. 2019a. Scalar implicature and exceptional scope. Ms. Rutgers University.
- Charlow, Simon. 2019b. The scope of alternatives: Indefiniteness and islands. *Linguistics and Philosophy*.
- Chemla, Emmanuel. 2007. French *both*: A gap in the theory of antipresupposition. *Snippets* 15:4–5.
- Chemla, Emmanuel. 2009. Similarity: Towards a unified account of scalar implicature, free choice permission, and presupposition projection. Ms. Paris and Cambridge, MA.
- Chemla, Emmanuel, and Lewis Bott. 2014. Processing inferences at the semantic/pragmatic frontier: Disjunctions and free choice. *Cognition* 130:380–396.
- Fox, Danny, and Roni Katzir. 2011. On the characterization of alternatives. *Natural Language Semantics* 19:87–107.
- Geach, Peter T. 1962. *Reference and Generality: An examination of some Medieval and modern theories*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Horn, Laurence R. 1972. On the Semantic Properties of Logical Operators in English. Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

- Karttunen, Lauri. 1969. Pronouns and variables. In *Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society (CLS5)*, ed. Robert I. Binnick, 108–116. Chicago: Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago.
- Katzir, Roni. 2007. Structurally-defined alternatives. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 30:669–690.
- Klinedinst, Nathan. 2005. Freedom from authority. Talk presented at *Sinn und Bedeutung 10*, Berlin.
- Sauerland, Uli. 2004. Scalar implicatures in complex sentences. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27:367–391.

We gratefully acknowledge our funding sources: ERC (FP/2007-2013) Grant Agreement n. 313610 and ANR-17-EURE-0017.

Brian Buccola
brian.buccola@gmail.com
Michigan State University
Department of Linguistics and Languages
B-331 Wells Hall, 619 Red Cedar Road
East Lansing, MI 48824-1027
USA

Emmanuel Chemla
chemla@ens.fr
ENS-LSCP
29 rue d'Ulm
75005 Paris
France