

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

A tense question

Tue Trinh · Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft

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

Sauerland and Yatsushiro (2017), henceforth S&Y, take the *remind-me* reading of such questions as (1a) to arise from a presupposition triggered by the adverb *again*: (1a) can be read as simply asking for the addressee's name, with the inference that the name was made known earlier.

- (1) a. $[s [Q \text{ what is your name}] \text{ again}]$?
b. $\llbracket S \rrbracket = \llbracket Q \rrbracket$ if there was an event preceding the utterance at which the complete answer to Q was made common ground, undefined otherwise

S&Y point out that the *remind-me* reading can also come about by way of past tense. Thus, (2a) allows the same reading as (1a). This observation is given a straightforward account by S&Y in terms of reference time effects: (2a) picks out a salient time interval C in the past which includes the communication of the name and excludes the utterance. We will represent this reading by subscripting the tensed verb with C .

- (2) a. $[Q_C \text{ what was}_C \text{ your name}]$?
b. $\llbracket Q_C \rrbracket = \text{'for which } x: \text{ your name is } x \text{ at } C'$

Past tense and *again* can co-occur: (3a) is acceptable under the same reading as (1a) and (2a). S&Y take this to be unsurprising: past tense and *again*, they claim, are “two independent mechanisms that work congruently [...].” Applying their analysis, the meaning of (3a) would be (3b).

- (3) a. $[s_C [Q_C \text{ what was}_A \text{ your name}] \text{ again}]$?
b. $\llbracket S_C \rrbracket = \llbracket Q_C \rrbracket$ if there was an event preceding the utterance at which the complete answer to Q_C was made common ground, undefined otherwise

Now consider the question below, where the subscript L is mnemonic for ‘life.’

- (4) $Q_L = \text{'for which } x: \text{ your name is } x \text{ throughout your life'}$

Let us note two facts about Q_L . The first is specific to English. In this language, Q_L can be expressed by the present tense sentence in (5).

- (5) $\text{what is}_L \text{ your name?}$

The second fact is logical: the complete answer to Q_L is stronger than that to Q_C . Obviously, the name you have throughout your life is the name you have at C . These two facts, together with S&Y's analysis of *remind-me* questions, mean that the presupposition of (6a) is stronger than that of (6b).

- (6) a. $[S_L [Q_L \text{ what is}_L \text{ your name}] \text{ again}]$?
presupposition: there was an event preceding the utterance at which the complete answer to Q_L was made common ground
- b. $[S_C [Q_C \text{ what was}_C \text{ your name}] \text{ again}]$?
presupposition: there was an event preceding the utterance at which the complete answer to Q_C was made common ground

The two questions (6a) and (6b), therefore, stand in the same relation as (7a) and (7b).

- (7) a. who also_x went to Harvard?
presupposition: x went to Harvard
- b. who also_x went to Harvard or Yale?
presupposition: x went to Harvard or Yale

We can observe that in a context where the presupposition of (7a) is satisfied, the question with the weaker presupposition, i.e. (7b), is deviant, as evidenced by the contrast between (8b) and (9b) as follow-ups to the assertion *John went to Harvard* (cf. Spector and Sudo 2017).

- (8) a. John went to Harvard.
b. Who also_j went to Harvard?
- (9) a. John went to Harvard.
b. #Who also_j went to Harvard or Yale?

In the context of this conversation, the presupposition of Q_L is satisfied, but Q_C , to my ear, is not deviant. To the extent that my intuition is reliable, then, we have a question to ponder: what distinguishes the difference between (6a) and (6b) from that between (7a) and (7b)?

References

- Sauerland, Uli, and Kazuko Yatsushiro. 2017. Remind-me presuppositions and speech-act decomposition: Evidence from particles in questions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 48:651–677.
- Spector, Benjamin, and Yasutada Sudo. 2017. Presupposed ignorance and exhaustification: how scalar implicatures and presuppositions interact. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 40:473–517.

This work is funded by the ERC Advanced Grant “Speech Acts in Grammar and Discourse” (SPA-GAD), ERC-2017-ADG 787929.

Tue Trinh
tuetrinh@alum.mit.edu
Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft
Schützenstr. 18
10117 Berlin
Germany