

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 |

Persian *ezafe* and proportional quantifiers

Manfred Krifka · Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft

Fereshteh Modarresi · Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft

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

In Persian, nominal complement relations are marked by *ezafe*, a clitic *-(y)e*. It occurs on the head in noun-modifier/complement constructions and on prepositions derived from nouns (cf. Ghomeshi 1997).

- (1) a. manzel-e Maryam
house-EZ Maryam
'Maryam's house'
- b. taxrib-e shahr
destruction-EZ city
'destruction of the city'
- c. dor-e estaxr
around-EZ pool
'around the pool'

Ezafe also is found with certain D-quantifiers (cf. Toosarvandani and Nasser 2017). One generalization not made by these authors is that it is restricted to, and required for, proportional quantifiers. *Ezafe* is thus obligatory for (2) and ruled out for (3).

- (2) Hame-ye / bishtar-e / yek dovom-e / shast darsad-e ketab-ha rooy-e miz hastand.
all-EZ / most-EZ / one half-EZ / sixty percent-EZ book-PL on-EZ table are.PL
'All / most / one half of the / sixty percent of the books are on the table.'
- (3) a. Do-ta mard vared shodand.
two-CL man enter did.3PL
'Two men entered.'
- b. Bazi / tedadi / kheily / chand-ta ay daneshjoo-ha hazer hastand.
some / several / many / few-CL of student-PL present are.3PL
'Some / several / many / few of the students are present.'

This suggests that proportional quantifiers are heads followed by complements, whereas non-proportional quantifiers are specifiers. We propose the structures in (4).

- (4) a. [DP [[_D⁰ hame-ye] [_{NP} ketab-ha]]] proportional, 'all'
- b. [DP yek [[_D⁰ dovom-e] [_{NP} ketab-ha]]] proportional, 'one half'
- c. [_{NP} yek/do-ta [_N⁰ mard]] non-proportional, 'one/two'
- d. [_{NP} bazi [[_N⁰ \emptyset] [_{PP} az daneshjoo-ha]]] non-proportional, 'some'

We propose that proportional quantifiers restrict a discourse referent d the size of which is measured by a proportion of the extension of the noun, as in (5a). Hence the nominal N must be a complement of the quantifier, predicting that *ezafe* is required. For numeral and partitive constructions, the size restriction is independent of the head noun, (5b) and (5c), predicting the impossibility of *ezafe*. Quantifiers in (3b) occur in partitive constructions but are not proportional, as the selected size of d does not depend on the extension of the partitive nominal.

- (5) a. $\llbracket [_{D^0} \text{dovom}] \rrbracket = \lambda N \lambda n [N(d) \wedge \#(d) = n \times \frac{1}{2} \#(N)]$
 b. $\llbracket [_{N^0} \text{mard}] \rrbracket = \lambda n [\text{man}(d) \wedge \#(d) = n]$
 c. $\llbracket [_{N^0} \emptyset] \rrbracket = \lambda n [\#(d) = n]$
 $\llbracket [_{PP} \text{az daneshjoo-ha}] \rrbracket = [d \sqsubseteq \text{the students}]$

This representation contradicts classical Generalized Quantifier theory, (Barwise and Cooper 1981), which assumes that all quantified DPs consist of a determiner that takes a noun meaning as arguments. According to our data, only proportional determiners do.

The following example is an apparent exception regarding *ezafe* placement:

- (6) *Shast darsad zan dar in company estekhdam shodand.*
 sixty percent woman in this company employment got.3PL
 ‘Sixty percent of the employees in this company are women.’

But here the noun *zan* is not used to identify a proportion. It is a non-conservative interpretation, as identified by Ahn and Sauerland (2017); for mechanisms of semantic interpretation, see the discussion there.

Another apparent exception is *har*, which appears to be a universal quantifier:

- (7) *Har sib-i ra ke didam, bardashtam.*
 every apple-IDF OBJ that saw.1SG took.1SG
 ‘I took each apple that I saw.’

But *har* differs from proportional quantifiers: it is strictly distributive, requires a noun that is marked as indefinite (possibly plural, cf. *har do-ta sib* ‘every/each two apples’), and its discourse referent cannot be picked up in subsequent sentences except in cases of modal subordination. We propose that *har* indicates the presence of a universal quantifier whose discourse referent carries the presupposition expressed by the noun (8).

- (8) $\llbracket [[_{DP} [[_{D^0} \text{har}] [_{NP} \text{yek sib/sib-i}]]]] \rrbracket \text{ra bardashtam}] \rrbracket$
 $= \forall d : \text{apple}(d) [\text{speaker took } d]$

Notice that non-universal proportional quantifiers such as “most” could not be expressed in this way. Hence, we suggest that at least in Persian, distributive universal quantifiers and truly proportional quantifiers are represented differently.

References

Ahn, Dorothy, and Uli Sauerland. 2017. Measure constructions with relative measures: Towards a syntax of non-conservative construals. *The Linguistic Review* 34:215–248.

- Barwise, Jon, and Robin Cooper. 1981. Generalized quantifiers and natural language. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4:159–219.
- Ghameshi, Jila. 1997. Non-projecting nouns and the *ezafe* construction in Persian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15:729–788.
- Toosarvandani, Maziar, and Hayadeh Nasser. 2017. Quantification in Persian. In *Handbook of Quantifiers in Natural Language, Vol. 2*, ed. Denis Paperno and Edward L. Keenan, 665–696. Springer Netherlands.

This work was funded by DFG KR 951/10-1, Anaphoric potential of incorporated nominals and weak definites.

Manfred Krifka
krifka@leibniz-zas.de
Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft
Schützenstr. 18
10117 Berlin
Germany

Fereshteh Modarresi
modarresi@leibniz-zas.de
Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft
Schützenstr. 18
10117 Berlin
Germany