

# 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

# Plural anaphoric reference and non-conservativity

Giorgos Spathas · Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft

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

Quantificational structures of the form  $D(A)(B)$  like *most MPs attended the meeting* can provide three potential antecedents for subsequent plural pronouns: the restrictor set (MAXSET)  $A$ , the reference set (REFSET)  $A \cap B$ , and the complement set (COMPSET)  $A \cap \bar{B}$ . Whereas reference to MAXSET and REFSET, as in (1) and (2), is always available, reference to COMPSET is restricted to negative quantifiers and is only available under certain pragmatic conditions (Nouwen 2003).

- (1) They all attended the Tuesday meeting.
- (2) They even stayed till the end.

Given conservativity, the general availability of MAXSET and REFSET anaphora seems very natural; the sets needed to evaluate the truth-conditions of  $D(A)(B)$  are also the ones available for anaphoric reference. This raises interesting questions about non-conservative construals (NCC). Ahn and Sauerland (A&S, 2015, 2017) identify relative measures as NCCs; (3) specifies the ratio of women the company hired to all the people hired by the company, so that the men hired by the company are relevant in establishing its truth. Although anaphora to the women the company hired is possible, as in (4a), anaphora to the people the company hired is degraded, as in (4b), as is anaphora to the set of women in (4c).

- (3) The company hired 75%  $\text{WOMEN}_F$ .
- (4) a. They will be paid 10% more than the men.  
b. #They will all start working next month.  
c. #We rejected some of them for lack of experience.

A&S provide an analysis of (3) that structurally unifies relative and intersective measures, as in *the company hired two dozen women*, which exhibit the same anaphoric possibilities. A&S's analysis is built around the entry for *percent* in (5) (where  $\mu$  is a contextually determined measure function). Factoring in focus-sensitivity and QR of 75%, as in (6), the restrictor of the generalized quantifier  $75$  [ *percent c* ] ] is the variable  $c$  resolved to the set of all people hired by the company (MAXSET), whereas the scope is the sum of all women hired by the company (SCOPSET), which is identical to REFSET.

- (5)  $\llbracket \text{percent} \rrbracket = \lambda x. \lambda n. \lambda P. \mu(x \sqcap \sigma y [P(y)]) / \mu(x) = n/100$
- (6)  $\llbracket 75$  [ *percent c* ] ]  $\llbracket \sim c$  [  $\lambda z$  [ the company hired [the<sub>z</sub> women ] ] ] ]

In the case of NCCs of relative measures one cannot simply relate their dynamic properties to their truth-conditional requirements. Although anaphora to the set of women the company hired can be explained as a case of REFSET anaphora, the unavailability of MAXSET anaphora is puzzling.

Notice, moreover, that although anaphora to the set of women is correctly predicted to be unavailable in the A&S account, it is available in the case of other NCCs, like *the company hired many WOMEN*, in the relevant reading, indicating a limit in any attempt to unify the two. Similarly, any attempt to reduce (3) to partitive structures like *30% of the women the company hired live in NYC* is challenged by the fact that partitives do allow MAXSET anaphora (as pointed out to me by an anonymous reviewer). A successful account of (3), then, will not only have to correctly predict the pattern of anaphoric possibilities in (4), but also explain why this pattern is identical to that of intersective measures, and not identical to that of other NCCs or corresponding partitive structures.

## 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.
- Nouwen, Rick. 2003. Plural Pronominal Anaphora in Context. Doctoral Dissertation, Utrecht University.

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

Giorgos Spathas  
[spathas@leibniz-zas.de](mailto:spathas@leibniz-zas.de)  
Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft  
Schützenstr. 18  
10117 Berlin  
Germany