

# 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

# Symmetry, density, and formal alternatives

Andreas Haida · The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

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

Sauerland (2004) shows how the logical relations between a sentence and its alternatives either support scalar inferences (SIs) or ignorance inferences (IIs). Specifically, the logical relations between a disjunctive sentence  $p \vee q$  and its alternatives  $p \wedge q$ ,  $p$ , and  $q$  support a SI about  $p \wedge q$  and an II about  $p$  and about  $q$  because the latter alternatives are “symmetric” to each other relative to  $p \vee q$  (i.e.,  $\neg p \Rightarrow q$  and  $\neg q \Rightarrow p$  if  $p \vee q$  is true) whereas the former has no symmetric partners. This insight carries over to explain the IIs observed in (1): if *at least 5* has *exactly 5* and *more than 5* as alternatives, their symmetry relative to *at least 5* leads to IIs about them (Büring 2008; Kennedy 2013; Buccola and Haida 2017; see also Mayr 2013; Schwarz 2016).

- (1) Ann owns at least 5 dogs  
     $\leadsto$  the speaker is ignorant about whether Ann owns exactly / more than 5 dogs

As discussed in Nouwen 2008, (1) contrasts with (2) and (3).

- (2) Ann owns more than 4 dogs  
    *no inferences*
- (3) Ann owns no fewer than 5 dogs  
     $\leadsto \neg$  Ann owns no fewer than  $n$  dogs (for all  $n > 5$ )

The following three ingredients provide a coherent explanation of most of this paradigm:

- a. The UDM hypothesis: Natural language scales are always dense (Fox and Hackl 2006).
- b. *At least* and *no fewer than* express  $\geq$ ; *more than* expresses  $>$  (Nouwen 2008).
- c. Speaker beliefs about the matter of conversation are relevant (Fox 2016).

(a) explains why (2) doesn’t license SIs (Fox and Hackl 2006). (a) + (b) explains why (3) contrasts with (2) in licensing SIs (Nouwen 2008). (a) + (b) + (c) explains why (2) contrasts with (1) in not licensing IIs (Buccola and Haida 2017).

Here, I want to add that we might also have an understanding of the remaining contrast, i.e., an understanding of why (3) contrasts with (1) in licensing a SI instead of IIs. The SI of (3) is derived by excluding the disjunction in (4a) (Nouwen 2008). The symmetric partner of (4a) is the proposition in (4b).

- (4) a.  $\forall \{[\lambda w. \max_d(\text{Ann owns } d\text{-many dogs in } w) \geq n] : n \in \mathbb{Q} \wedge n > 5\}$   
      = ‘Ann owns more than 5 dogs’
- b.  $[\lambda w. \max_d(\text{Ann owns } d\text{-many dogs in } w) = 5]$   
      = ‘Ann owns exactly 5 dogs’

Here is why (4b) might not be an alternative of (3). The alternatives of a sentence  $S$  are derived by replacing constituents of  $S$  with other linguistic material, in particular, with a lexical item or a subconstituent of a replacement target (Katzir 2007). A structure denoting (4b) cannot be derived from (3) if (i) *no fewer than* is not a constituent (Heim 1985; Abney 1987; Corver 1990; Hackl 2000), which precludes replacement with *exactly*, and /or if (ii) *fewer than 5* is a constituent so that (4b) could only be derived as follows:

$$(5) \quad [\alpha \text{ no } [\beta [\gamma \text{ fewer than}] 5]] \xrightarrow{\alpha/\beta} [\beta [\gamma \text{ fewer than}] 5] \xrightarrow{\gamma/\text{exactly}} [\beta \text{ exactly } 5]$$

The second replacement above is precluded by the independently motivated constraint in (6).

- (6) Atomicity: No replacement target ( $\gamma$ ) may be a subconstituent of a previous replacer ( $\beta$ ) (Trinh and Haida 2015; Trinh 2018).

Although there is support for (i) and (ii), a complete account of the contrast between (1) and (3) requires showing that the coordination in (7), provided by an anonymous reviewer, involves unpronounced elements at the right edge of the conjuncts (i.e. right node raising).

- (7) John owns either [[no more than] or [no fewer than]] 5 horses

## References

- Abney, Steven P. 1987. The English Noun Phrase in Its Sentential Aspect. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Buccola, Brian, and Andreas Haida. 2017. Obligatory irrelevance and the computation of ignorance inferences. Ms. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Büring, Daniel. 2008. The least *at least* can do. In *Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL 26)*, ed. Charles B. Chang and Hannah J. Haynie, 114–120. Somerville, MA: Cascadia Press.
- Corver, Norbert. 1990. The Syntax of Left Branch Extractions. Doctoral Dissertation, Tilburg University.
- Fox, Danny. 2016. On why ignorance might be part of literal meaning: Commentary on Marie-Christine Meyer. Handout from the MIT Workshop on Exhaustivity, Cambridge, MA.
- Fox, Danny, and Martin Hackl. 2006. The universal density of measurement. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 29:537–586.
- Hackl, Martin. 2000. Comparative Quantifiers. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Heim, Irene. 1985. Notes on comparatives and related matters. Ms. University of Texas.
- Katzir, Roni. 2007. Structurally-defined alternatives. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 30:669–690.
- Kennedy, Chris. 2013. A scalar semantics for scalar readings of number words. In *From Grammar to Meaning: The spontaneous logicity of language*, ed. Ivano Caponigro and Carlo Cecchetto, 172–200. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayr, Clemens. 2013. Implicatures of modified numerals. In *From Grammar to Meaning: The spontaneous logicity of language*, ed. Ivano Caponigro and Carlo Cecchetto, 139–171. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nouwen, Rick. 2008. Upper-bounded *no more*: The exhaustive interpretation of non-strict comparison. *Natural Language Semantics* 16:271–295.

- Sauerland, Uli. 2004. Scalar implicatures in complex sentences. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27:367–391.
- Schwarz, Bernhard. 2016. Consistency preservation in quantity implicature: The case of *at least*. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 9:1–47.
- Trinh, Tue. 2018. Keeping it simple. *Natural Language Semantics* 26:111–124.
- Trinh, Tue, and Andreas Haida. 2015. Constraining the derivation of alternatives. *Natural Language Semantics* 23:249–270.

Funding was provided by a post-doctoral grant from the Edmond and Lily Safra Center for Brain Sciences (ELSC) to the author and by grant 2093/16 of the Israel Science Foundation to Yosef Grodzinsky.

Andreas Haida  
[andreas.haida@gmail.com](mailto:andreas.haida@gmail.com)  
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem  
Edmond J. Safra Campus  
Edmond and Lily Safra Center for Brain Sciences  
Goodman Building  
Israel