

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 Huijismans, 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

The past is rewritten

Hadil Karawani · Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft

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

In a snippet from 2002 entitled *The present tense is vacuous*, Uli Sauerland argues that the present tense is vacuous, whereas the past presupposes that t is before the time of utterance. With this, Sauerland (2002) captures the contrast in (1) by accepting the semantics that Abusch (1997) gives to past morphology, but rewriting the semantics of the present tense.

- (1) a. Every Tuesday this month, I fast.
b. Every Tuesday this month, I fasted.
- (2) Abusch 1997
PRES: presupposes that t isn't before the time of utterance.
PAST: presupposes that t is before the time of utterance.
- (3) Sauerland 2002
PRES: no presupposition (but, anti-presupposition).
PAST: presupposes that t is before the time of utterance.

This snippet seeks to argue that the semantics of past morphology in (2) and (3) needs to be rewritten in order to also capture the modal readings of the past in conditionals and futurates – namely the unlikelihood/falsity of the antecedents in (4b)/(4c), in contrast to (4a), and the uncertainty of the future reading in (5b), in contrast to (5a). Basically, while in the above, PAST is defined to vary over times (t), it needs to be able to vary over worlds (w), as well.

- (4) a. If he fasts tomorrow, he will ...
b. If he fasted right now / were to fast tomorrow, he would ...
c. If he had fasted tomorrow (instead of yesterday), he would have ...
- (5) a. He is fasting tomorrow.
b. He was fasting tomorrow, #(right?)

Following the idea put forward in Iatridou 2000 that the past can be “fake”, but maintaining the idea that the semantics of the past needs to be unified to capture both real and fake readings, the following definition is proposed.

- (6) PAST: presupposes that $\langle w, t \rangle \neq \langle w^0, t^0 \rangle$

This captures the range of meanings associated with the past. Its before-now usage, its futurate usage, and its conditional usage can be straightforwardly achieved by changing the value of t^0 , w^0 , or both.

It is worth noting that conditional data, as in (4), suggest that the scale reflects a three way distinction: conditionals marked with zero-past (i.e. indicatives), with one-past (singly marked

subjunctives), and with two-pasts (doubly marked subjunctives, i.e. true counterfactuals). Does this mean that the indicatives are unmarked? The answer might have been easy if we had only a two way distinction – we could then find arguments for having one be the anti-presupposition of the other (cf. Ippolito 2003; Leahy 2011). This will not be straightforward for proponents of a pragmatic theory of presupposition because as it stands, it would fail to incorporate singly marked conditionals. One cannot make both the falsity inference of doubly marked conditionals in (4c) and the unlikelihood inference of singly marked conditionals in (4b) anti-presuppositions of one and the same indicative presupposition in (4a).

Having the past presuppose that the world-time pair is different from the world-time pair consisting of the actual world and time of speech ($\langle w, t \rangle \neq \langle w^0, t^0 \rangle$) means that in its presence one evaluates the proposition against a set comprising of world-time pairs that are one step further away from those that contain the real world and actual time. Applying a second past presupposes that one has to go yet another step further. In its absence, however, a proposition is able to reach within the set that contains $\langle w^0, t^0 \rangle$. This means that it takes two steps to get from an indicative to a counterfactual (in the strong sense): the first brings you to situations that are unlikely (4b), the second to situations that are excluded (4c).

This analysis provides a unified account of past morphology, but also shows that we can capture the fact that past morphology in conditionals is able to do exactly what dedicated counterfactual markers do – namely to exclude the real world from the context set without going back to the real past.

References

- Abusch, Dorit. 1997. Sequence of tense and temporal de re. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20:1–50.
- Iatridou, Sabine. 2000. The grammatical ingredients of counterfactuality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31:231–270.
- Ippolito, Michaela. 2003. Presuppositions and implicatures in counterfactuals. *Natural Language Semantics* 11:145–186.
- Leahy, Brian. 2011. Presuppositions and antipresuppositions in conditionals. In *Proceedings of the 21st Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference (SALT 21)*, ed. Neil Ashton, Anca Chereches, and David Lutz, 257–274.
- Sauerland, Uli. 2002. The present tense is vacuous. *Snippets* 6:12–13.

Hadil Karawani
karawani@leibniz-zas.de
Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft
Schützenstr. 18
10117 Berlin
Germany