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

Individual concepts and narrow scope illusions

Danny Fox · Massachusetts Institute of Technology

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

(1), inspired by an example from Schwarzchild (To appear), can be true even if there are no actual boxcars (e.g. no freight train planned for the region). This rules out a de-re construal (even if one is creative about counter-part relations or concept-generators; Percus and Sauerland 2003, Sauerland 2014).

(1) {Jack and Jill, both train enthusiasts, discuss a high-speed freight train that they think will be built in their region. They agree that there will be four different boxcars painted red, blue, yellow and green. Jack is hoping to ride on the red, blue, and yellow boxcars. Jill is hoping to ride the red and blue boxcars.}

Jack is hoping to ride on every boxcar that Jill is.

Given the de-dicto interpretation, we might think that the quantifier phrase *every boxcar* is interpreted within the scope of the attitude verb *hope*. But then Antecedent Contained Deletion (ACD) would not be resolved, contrary to fact.

Should we revisit our assumptions about ACD? The risk is to leave well-known observations about scope unaccounted for (Sag 1976, Williams 1977, Larson and May 1990). To see the challenge, consider a minimal variation on (1) below, modelled on an example from Sag.

(2) {Jill is a train enthusiast. Jack has no interest in trains and has never thought about the properties of boxcars in a train that Jill hopes will be built in the region. However, he's very much interested in impressing Jill. If asked which boxcars he hopes to ride, he'd answer: "Every boxcar that Jill is hoping to ride."}

Jack is hoping to ride on every boxcar that Jill is. [false]
(Cf. *Jack is hoping to ride on every boxcar that Jill is hoping to ride on.*)

(2) is false, and this teaches us that *every boxcar* must take scope outside of the intensional verb *hope* for ACD to be resolved, which in turn means that in (1) this scopal relation still allows the noun *boxcar* to receive a de-dicto interpretation. The conclusion is further supported by the inverse scope de-dicto interpretation in (3); see Geach (1967) for related observations and proposals.

(3) {A group of children discuss a high-speed freight train that they hope will be built in their region. They agree that there will be four different boxcars painted red, blue, yellow, and green. One boy and one girl hope to ride on the red boxcar, another boy and girl hope to ride on the blue boxcar. The other two imagined boxcars do not interest any of the girls (though one of them might interest a third boy).}

A boy is hoping to ride on every boxcar that a girl is.

Based on (1) and (3), we must reject the assumption that a de-dicto interpretation for a noun requires narrow scope for the quantifier that the noun restricts (see Szabó 2010, Keshet and Schwarz 2019). But how are the wide scope de-dicto interpretations in (1) and (3) represented? I would like to suggest a version of *every* that quantifies over individual concepts with the lexical entries in (4) and (5), and a logical form for (1) as indicated in (6), with C a covert domain restrictor. (Considerations brought up in Aloni 2001 will have to wait for another occasion.)

(4) $[\![\text{every}]\!](C_{se,t})(A_{se,t})(B_{se,t}) \Leftrightarrow C \cap A \subseteq B$

(5) $[\![\text{boxcar}]\!] = \lambda x_{se} . \forall w \in \text{domain}(x)[x(w) \text{ is a boxcar in } w]$

(6) every C boxcar $\lambda x_{se}[\text{hoping}(\text{Jill}, \lambda w . \text{Jill ride}_w x(w))]$
$\lambda x_{se}[\text{hoping}(\text{Jack}, \lambda w . \text{Jack ride}_w x(w))]$

Where the denotation of C will have the four salient individual concepts as members: λw . *the red boxcar in* w, λw . *the blue boxcar in* w, ...

References

Aloni, Maria. 2001. Quantification under Conceptual Covers. Doctoral Dissertation, Amsterdam Institute for Logic, Language and Computation.

Geach, Peter. 1967. Intentional identity. *Journal of Philosophy* 64:627–632.

Keshet, Ezra, and Florian Schwarz. 2019. De re / De dicto. In *The Oxford Handbook of Reference*, ed. Jeanette Gundel and Barbara Abbott, 167–202. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Larson, Richard K., and Robert May. 1990. Antecedent Containment or Vacuous Movement: Reply to Baltin. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21:103–122.

Percus, Orin, and Uli Sauerland. 2003. On the LFs of attitude reports. In *Proceedings of the Conference "SuB7 – Sinn und Bedeutung"*, ed. Matthias Weisgerber, 228–242. Konstanz, Germany: Universität Konstanz.

Sag, Ivan. 1976. Deletion and Logical Form. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Sauerland, Uli. 2014. Counterparts block some 'de re' readings. In *The Art and Craft of Semantics: A Festschrift for Irene Heim, Vol. 2*, ed. Luka Crnič and Uli Sauerland, 65–85. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Schwarzchild, Roger. To appear. From possible individuals to scalar segments. In *Degree and quantification*, ed. Peter Hallman. Brill.

Szabó, Zoltán Gendler. 2010. Specific, yet opaque. In *Logic, Language and Meaning: 17th Amsterdam Colloquium, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, December 16-18, 2009, Revised Selected Papers*, ed. Maria Aloni, Harald Bastiaanse, Tikitu de Jager, and Katrin Schulz, 32–41. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

Williams, Edwin S. 1977. Discourse and Logical Form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:101–139.

Danny Fox
fox@mit.edu

MIT Linguistics and Philosophy
77 Massachusetts Avenue, 32-D808
Cambridge, MA 02139
USA