

# 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 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

# Degree concepts and narrow scope illusions

Danny Fox · Massachusetts Institute of Technology

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7358/snippet-2019-037-foxb>

In (1), from Schwarzschild (To appear), the differential, *one boxcar*, is evaluated in the worlds quantified over by the attitude verb *expect*.

- (1) {Jack and Jill are train enthusiasts. They've been discussing a high-speed freight train planned for their region. They wonder whether the boxcars will be 60 ft. long, like on the Santa Fe line, or 50 ft. long, like on the Caroliner. As far as the engine is concerned, Jack and Jill disagree. Jack's expectation is that the engine will be 2 boxcars long. Jill expects it to be one boxcar long.}

Jack expects the engine to be one boxcar longer than Jill does.

Suppose that this de-dicto interpretation requires the differential to be interpreted within the scope of the attitude verb. This leads to an obvious puzzle: (1) should be unacceptable, under the standard assumption that the phrase headed by *-er* contains both the differential and the *than* clause (and must QR over the attitude verb for ACD resolution).

Schwarzschild uses this observation, among many others, to argue against the standard assumption. While I will not challenge Schwarzschild's other arguments, I would like to suggest that (1) argues, instead, against the assumption that de-dicto interpretations always indicate narrow scope (See Szabó 2010 and Keshet and Schwarz 2019). Consider a version of *-er* that quantifies over degree concepts.

- (2)  $\llbracket \text{-er} \rrbracket(C)(\delta_{sd})(A_{sd,t})(B_{sd,t}) \Leftrightarrow \forall d \in C \cap A \exists d' \in C \cap B [d' \geq (d +_c \delta)]$   
 where  $d'_{sd} \geq d_{sd}$  iff  $\forall w \in \text{domain}(d) \cap \text{domain}(d') [d'(w) \geq d(w)]$   
 and  $d +_c \delta = (\iota d^* \in C)(\forall w \in \text{domain}(d) \cap \text{domain}(\delta) [d(w) +_c \delta(w) = d^*(w)])$

Now, consider a standard logical form for (1), as in (3).

- (3)  $\text{-er}_{13} C \text{ one boxcar}$   
 $\text{than } \lambda d \text{ expects}(\text{Jill}, \lambda w . \text{the engine}_w \text{ is } d(w) \text{ long})$   
 $\lambda d \text{ expects}(\text{Jack}, \lambda w . \text{the engine}_w \text{ is } d(w) \text{ long})$

True iff

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall d \in C \cap \{d_{sd} : \text{expects}(\text{Jill}, \lambda w . \text{the engine}_w \text{ is } d(w) \text{ long})\} \\ & \exists d' \in C \cap \{d_{sd} : \text{expects}(\text{Jack}, \lambda w . \text{the engine}_w \text{ is } d(w) \text{ long})\} \\ & [d' \geq (d +_c \lambda w . \text{the-length-of-the-boxcar in } w)] \end{aligned}$$

To evaluate the predicted meaning, we need to know what  $C$  is. If we assume that the differential makes the following set of degree concepts salient  $\{\lambda w . \text{the length of } r \text{ boxcars in } w :$

$r$  a rational number} (hence a candidate for the denotation of C), the right truth conditions can be derived.

Such an analysis can be extended to other degree constructions, some of which cannot be covered by Schwarzschild's proposal, as illustrated in the examples below.

- (4) {Regulations for a high-speed freight train require the engine to be at least two boxcars long. Other than that, there are no length requirements. In particular the engine can be as short as planners want it to be, provided that the boxcars are shortened accordingly.}

How long is the boxcar required to be?

Possible answers (depending on the set of salient degree concepts):

- a. Two boxcars long
  - b. Any length is allowed (as long as the required proportion with boxcars is adhered to).
- (5) {Jack and Jill's expectations are as in Schwarzschild's scenario. But here's how things turned out. The boxcar was built to be 50 ft. long, and the engine was built to be twice the size of the boxcar as expected by Jack, but not by Jill}
- a. The engine is one boxcar longer than Jill expected it would be. True
  - b. The engine is 50 feet longer than Jill expected it would be. False
- (6) {Jill is an engineer who needs to approve plans for a high-speed freight train. She is told by the planners that the boxcars will be either all 60 ft. long or all 50 ft. long. She demands that the engine be at least 2 boxcars long and that the caboose be at least one boxcar long}

The engine is required to be one boxcar longer than the caboose is.

## References

- 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.
- Schwarzschild, 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, Tikitou de Jager, and Katrin Schulz, 32–41. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

Danny Fox  
[fox@mit.edu](mailto:fox@mit.edu)  
MIT Linguistics and Philosophy  
77 Massachusetts Avenue, 32-D808  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
USA