

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 exhaustive relevance of complex conjunctions

Andreea C. Nicolae · Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft

Yasutada Sudo · University College London

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

In typologically diverse languages the same particle used to express an additive meaning is also used to express a conjunctive meaning, e.g., Japanese *-mo*, Romanian *și*, Greek *ke*, Hungarian *is*, Russian *i* (Mitrović and Sauerland 2014, 2016; Brașoveanu and Szabolcsi 2013). For example, in Japanese, *guriinpiisu-mo* means ‘peas too’, while *guriinpiisu-mo burokkorii-mo* means ‘(both) peas and broccoli’.

Given the cross-linguistic prevalence of the additive-conjunctive duality, it is desirable to give a uniform analysis to these two uses of the same particle, something that Kobuchi-Philip (2009) and Brașoveanu and Szabolcsi (2013) do in their analyses. In their additive use these particles introduce an additive presupposition that there is an alternative which is true. For the conjunctive use, the above two studies have suggested that the additive presupposition of each occurrence of *-mo* gets satisfied by the other conjunct. Consequently, the conjunction *A-mo B-mo* carries no additive presupposition.

We point out a serious challenge for a uniform analysis along these lines, which seems to have gone unnoticed in the literature. In a nutshell, *A-mo B-mo* conjunctions, and their cross-linguistic counterparts, presuppose that there is nothing else that is contextually relevant, which we refer to as ‘exhaustive relevance’. To illustrate, consider the following Japanese and Romanian sentences.

- (1) Guriinpiisu-mo burokkorii-mo iru yo.
peas-MO broccoli-MO necessary PRT
‘Both peas and broccoli are necessary.’
- (2) Îmi trebuie și fasole și broccoli.
REFL.1 need ȘI peas ȘI broccoli
‘I need both peas and broccoli.’

We observe that while these sentences are perfectly natural answers to *Which of peas and broccoli do you need to make the soup?*, (3), they are slightly degraded as answers to *Which of peas, broccoli and carrots do you need to make the soup?*, (4). Intuitively, the reason for this degradation is because these sentences do not seem to directly say anything about carrots, and thus fail to be complete answers, unlike the corresponding sentences with a simple conjunction which would be interpreted as implying that carrots are not necessary. Or to put it differently, the above sentences seem to require a Question under Discussion that only concerns peas and broccoli, and as answer to *Which of peas, broccoli and carrots do you need to make the soup?*, they seem to require accommodation of a more specific question *Which of peas and broccoli do you need*, which results in oddness.

- (3) a. Suupu-ni-wa guriinpiisu-to buroccorii-no docchi-ga iru no?
soup-for-TOP peas-and broccoli-GEN which-NOM need Q

- ‘Which of peas and broccoli do you need for the soup?’
- b. *Avem fasole și broccoli. Ce îți trebuie pentru supă?*
 have.1PL peas and broccoli what REFL.2SG need for soup
 ‘We have peas and broccoli. What do you need for the soup?’
- (4) a. *Suupu-ni-wa guriinpiisu-to buroccorii-to ninjin-no dore-ga iru no?*
 soup-for-TOP peas-and broccoli-and carrot-GEN which-NOM need Q
 ‘Which of peas, broccoli, and carrots do you need for the soup?’
- b. *Avem fasole, broccoli și morcovi. Ce îți trebuie pentru supă?*
 have.1PL peas broccoli and carrots. what REFL.2SG need for soup
 ‘We have peas, broccoli and carrots. What do you need for the soup?’

This observation poses an issue for an analysis that aims at reducing the conjunctive use to the additive use, since the additive use does not put a comparable requirement on the set of contextually relevant alternatives. Specifically, the additive presupposition only requires there to be an alternative that is true, independently of what is asserted. If the conjunctive use involves satisfying this additive presupposition within the conjunction, the conjunction should have no presupposition.

We would like to note that *both A and B* in English shows a similar contrast with the simple conjunction *A and B* in terms of its acceptability as an answer to the question *Which of A, B and C?*. Since these construction do not involve an additive particle, the perceived exhaustive relevance cannot be attributed to additivity. This might be suggesting that the exhaustive relevance of *A-mo B-mo* should be attributed to something other than additivity, but it remains unclear what that might be.

- (5) We have peas, broccoli and carrots. What do you need for the soup?
- (6) I need (?both) peas and broccoli.

References

- Braşoveanu, Adrian, and Anna Szabolcsi. 2013. Presuppositional *too*, postsuppositional *too*. In *The Dynamic, Inquisitive, and Visionary Life of ϕ , $?\phi$, and $\diamond\phi$: A Festschrift for Jeroen Groenendijk, Martin Stokhof, and Frank Veltman*, ed. Maria Aloni, Michael Franke, and Floris Roelofsen, 55–64.
- Kobuchi-Philip, Mana. 2009. Japanese *mo*: universal, additive, and NPI. *Journal of Cognitive Science* 10:172–194.
- Mitrović, Moreno, and Uli Sauerland. 2014. Decomposing coordination. In *Proceedings of the 44th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS 44)*, ed. Jyoti Iyer and Leland Kusmer, 39–52. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Mitrović, Moreno, and Uli Sauerland. 2016. Two conjunctions are better than one. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 63:471–494.

Andreea C. Nicolae
nicolae@leibniz-zas.de
 Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft

Schützenstr. 18
10117 Berlin
Germany

Yasutada Sudo
y.sudo@ucl.ac.uk
Chandler House, Room 115H
2 Wakefield Street
London WC1N 1PF
UK