snippets

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

Contents

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

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

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

Exactly one theory of multiplicity inferences

Patrick D. Elliott · Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft
Paul Marty · Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.7358/snip-2019-037-elma

Spector (2007) observes that an utterance of (1) gives rise to the inferences in (1a) and (1b), in which the plural nominal *difficult problems* is interpreted exclusively and inclusively respectively.

(1) Exactly one of my students has solved difficult problems.
   a. One of my students has solved *more than one* difficult problem
   b. None of my other students have solved *one or more* difficult problems

To explain this, Spector proposes that the literal meaning of (1) is *inclusive*, but is pragmatically strengthened relative to (2).

(2) EXH (Exactly one of my students has solved a difficult problem)

The meaning of (2), in turn, is derived by conjoining the (inclusive) meaning of the prejacent of EXH with the negation of its alternative. Spector assumes that *a NP* has *several NPs* as its alternative. As a result, (2) is equivalent to (3).

(3) One of my students solved one difficult problem, and no other student solved any difficult problem.

As the reader can verify, conjoining the literal meaning of (1) with the negation of (2) (i.e., the negation of (3)) entails both (1a) and (1b).

Spector's account relies on unprincipled assumptions concerning formal alternatives: the unexhaustified singular form in (2) must be an alternative to (1), and as noted, the singular form must have an alternative with *several*. Crucially, however, the plural cannot have an alternative with *several*, otherwise the multiplicity inference would not be derived. In other words, alternativehood, for Spector, must be non-transitive.

We propose a different account that does away with these assumptions. In line with Spector (2007), we adopt the view that the exclusive interpretation of the plural is an implicature. For concreteness, we follow Mayr's (2015) account, framed in terms of predicate-level exhaustification: singular NPs, which range over atoms, are scalar alternatives to plural NPs, which range over atoms and groups. Applying EXH to a plural NP yields a multiplicity implicature by winnowing out the atoms (4).

(4) A student has solved EXH [difficult problems]
   $\Rightarrow$ a student has solved *more than one* difficult problem

Second, we draw on Sauerland's (2013:159) analysis of *exactly* as a focus sensitive expression: much like *only*, *exactly* takes a proposition p that contains a focused element (i.e., a numeral) and returns that (i) p is true, and (ii) for every $q \in ALT(p)$ that is not entailed by p, $\neg q$ is true. This is illustrated in (5).

(5) Exactly/Only [ONE$_F$ student came to the meeting]
   a. one student came to the meeting
   b. ¬[*n* students came to the meeting], for any numeral $n > one$

Third, we rely on previous findings (e.g., Gajewski and Sharvit 2012; Alxatib 2014; Bar-Lev 2018) showing that, in the scope of expressions like *only*, implicatures are generated in the upward-entailing (UE) component (e.g., in the prejacent), yet disappear in the downard-entailing (DE) component (e.g., in the negated alternatives). We illustrate this for *exactly/only* below, using the *not-all* implicature associated with *some*.

(6) Exactly/Only [ONE$_F$ student ate some of the cookies]
   a. UE component: implicature
   one student ate some *but not all* of the cookies
   b. DE component: no implicature
   ¬[*n* students ate some of the cookies], for any numeral $n > one$

We propose that the case in (1) is another instance of the above phenomenon: a multiplicity implicature is generated in the UE-prejacent of *exactly*, delivering (1a), but not in its DE-alternatives, hence (1b). The intuition here is that EXH can be rendered vacuous in these DE-alternatives as its working would otherwise weaken their meaning (7). This should ultimately follow from the Economy condition constraining the distribution of EXH (a.o., Fox and Spector, 2018).

(7) Exactly [ONE$_F$ student solved EXH [difficult problems]]
   a. one student solved EXH [difficult problems]
   ⇒ one student solved *more than one* difficult problems
   b. ¬[*n* student solved ~~EXH~~ [difficult problems]], for any numeral $n > one$
   ⇒ none of the other students have solved *one or more* difficult problems

To close, our account relies on decomposing an apparently non-monotonic operator into a UE and a DE component. Hence, we predict that if a non-monotonic operator cannot be analyzed in this way, the implicatures should be distinct.

References

Alxatib, Sam. 2014. Free choice disjunctions under only. In *Proceedings of the 44th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS 44)*, ed. Jyoti Iyer and Leland Kusmer, 15–28. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Bar-Lev, Moshe E. 2018. Free Choice, Homogeneity, and Innocent Inclusion. Doctoral Dissertation, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Fox, Danny, and Benjamin Spector. 2018. Economy and embedded exhaustification. *Natural Language Semantics* 26:1–50.

Gajewski, Jon, and Yael Sharvit. 2012. In defense of the grammatical approach to local implicatures. *Natural language semantics* 20:31–57.

Mayr, Clemens. 2015. Plural definite NPs presuppose multiplicity via embedded exhaustification. In *Proceedings of the 25th Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference (SALT 25)*, ed. Sarah D'Antonio, Mary Moroney, and Carol Rose Little, 204–224.

Sauerland, Uli. 2013. Presuppositions and the alternative tier. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference (SALT 23)*, ed. Todd Snider, 156–173.
Spector, Benjamin. 2007. Aspects of the pragmatics of plural morphology: On higher-order implicatures. In *Presupposition and Implicature in Compositional Semantics*, ed. Uli Sauerland and Penka Stateva, 243–281. Basingtoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Patrick Elliott
elliott@leibniz-zas.de
Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft (ZAS)
Schützenstr. 18
D-10117 Berlin
Germany

Paul Marty
marty@leibniz-zas.de
Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft (ZAS)
Schützenstr. 18
D-10117 Berlin
Germany