

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 |

Unifying partitive and adjective-modifying *percent*

Robert Pasternak · Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7358/snip-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 percent \rrbracket , which A&S define as in (3):

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

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 percent \rrbracket combines with its arguments in succession, the result is as in (4).

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

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 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 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.

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

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