

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 Crnič 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

Unifying partitive and adjective-modifying *percent*

Robert Pasternak · Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft

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

Ahn and Sauerland (2015, 2017; hereafter A&S) analyze two constructions: proportional partitives like (1a), and “non-conservative” proportional measurement constructions like (1b):

- (1) a. The company hired 70% of the women.
b. The company hired 70% women.
Paraphrase: 70% of the company's hirees were women.

A&S treat (1a) and (1b) as involving distinct syntactic representations that nonetheless both contain proportional partitive structures; in (1a) this is obvious, and in (1b) the partitive structure is embedded in a syntactic environment that generates the non-conservative reading. This snippet deals only with the partitive structure itself, and thus I focus on (1a).

According to A&S, (1a) has a structure like (2).

- (2) [70 [percent [the women]]] λ_1 the company hired t_1

The crucial semantic work is done by $\llbracket \text{percent} \rrbracket$, which A&S define as in (3):

$$(3) \quad \llbracket \text{percent} \rrbracket_{\text{A\&S}} = \lambda x \lambda n \lambda P. \frac{\mu(x \sqcap \sigma y[P(y)])}{\mu(x)} = \frac{n}{100}$$

where μ is a contextually determined measure function, $a \sqcap b$ is the mereological overlap of a and b , and $\sigma y[P(y)]$ is the sum of the members of P .

When $\llbracket \text{percent} \rrbracket$ combines with its arguments in succession, the result is as in (4).

$$(4) \quad \frac{\mu(\sigma x[\text{women}(x)] \sqcap \sigma y[\text{the company hired } y])}{\mu(\sigma x[\text{women}(x)])} = \frac{70}{100}$$

Assuming that context assigns μ to $|\cdot|$ (cardinality), this gets the right result: the cardinality of the overlap of women and hirees, divided by the cardinality of the total plurality of women, is $\frac{70}{100}$.

While A&S's definition of $\llbracket \text{percent} \rrbracket$ gets the right results, it begs for unification with another use of *percent* as an adjectival modifier, as discussed by Kennedy and McNally (2005):

- (5) The glass is 75% full.

How do we unify? I will start with the adjective-modifying case, then translate to partitives. For the former, we define $\llbracket \text{percent} \rrbracket$ as in (6); it takes an adjective denotation A (a relation between degrees and individuals) and number n , and returns a predicate true of x if the maximal degree to which x is A is $n\%$ of the way up A 's scale.

$$(6) \quad \llbracket \text{percent} \rrbracket = \lambda A \lambda n \lambda x. \frac{\max(\{d \mid A(d)(x)\}) - \min(\text{RNG}(A))}{\max(\text{RNG}(A)) - \min(\text{RNG}(A))} = \frac{n}{100}$$

where $\text{RNG}(A) \equiv \{d \mid \exists x[A(d)(x) \text{ is defined}]\}$

The reference to maximal/minimal degrees accounts for the familiar observation that proportional modifiers require closed scales (cf. #70% tall).

Turning to 70% of the women, I roughly follow A&S in adopting the following syntax:

- (7) [SOME [70 [percent [MUCH [the women]]]]] λ_1 the company hired t_1

Partially adopting ideas from Wellwood 2015, the main work here is done by silent MUCH, which takes an individual and returns an adjective-type denotation.

- (8) $\llbracket \text{MUCH} \rrbracket = \lambda x \lambda d \lambda y : \mu(x) \geq d. y \sqsubseteq x \wedge \mu(y) \geq d$

$\llbracket \text{MUCH} \rrbracket(x)(d)(y)$ presupposes that d is no greater than $\mu(x)$, and asserts that y is a part of x and $\mu(y)$ is at least d . As a result, $\min(\text{RNG}(\llbracket \text{MUCH} \rrbracket(x)))$ is the zero-degree of μ ($= 0_\mu$), and because of the presupposition, $\max(\text{RNG}(\llbracket \text{MUCH} \rrbracket(x))) = \mu(x)$. Thus, $\llbracket 70\% \text{ of the women} \rrbracket$ is as in (9):

- (9) $\llbracket \text{percent} \rrbracket(\llbracket \text{MUCH} \rrbracket(\llbracket \text{the women} \rrbracket))(\llbracket 70 \rrbracket) =$

$$\lambda y. \frac{\max(\{d \mid y \sqsubseteq \sigma x[\text{women}(x)] \wedge \mu(y) \geq d\}) - 0_\mu}{\mu(\sigma x[\text{women}(x)]) - 0_\mu} = \frac{70}{100}$$

In plain English, we get a predicate true of a part of the women iff its cardinality is 70% of that of the total plurality of women. This then restricts the existentially quantifying SOME, with the rest of the sentence being the scope; the resulting denotation of (1a) is as in (10):

- (10) $\exists y \left[\frac{\max(\{d \mid y \sqsubseteq \sigma x[\text{women}(x)] \wedge \mu(y) \geq d\}) - 0_\mu}{\mu(\sigma x[\text{women}(x)]) - 0_\mu} = \frac{70}{100} \right]$
 $\wedge \text{the company hired } y$

The final denotation is thus paraphrasable as follows: there is a plural individual y that is a collection of women whose cardinality is 70% of that of the total plurality of women, and is such that the company hired y . This matches the intuitive truth conditions of (1a), while adopting a unified semantic analysis for $\llbracket \text{percent} \rrbracket$. Moreover, while a full demonstration must be left for future work, this analysis can be extended equally well to A&S's treatment of (1b), and the proposed structural relationship between (1a) and (1b) can be maintained.

References

- Ahn, Dorothy, and Uli Sauerland. 2015. The grammar of relative measurement. In *Proceedings of the 25th Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference (SALT 25)*, ed. Sarah D'Antonio, Mary Moroney, and Carol Rose Little, 125–142.
- Ahn, Dorothy, and Uli Sauerland. 2017. Measure constructions with relative measures: Towards a syntax of non-conservative construals. *The Linguistic Review* 34:215–248.
- Kennedy, Christopher, and Louise McNally. 2005. Scale structure, degree modification, and the semantics of gradable predicates. *Language* 81:345–381.
- Wellwood, Alexis. 2015. On the semantics of comparison across categories. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 38:67–101.

This research has been funded by the DFG project 'Relative measurement and the DP-border', which is gratefully acknowledged.

Robert Pasternak
pasternakrs@gmail.com
Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft
Schützenstr. 18
10117 Berlin
Germany