

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 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

Disjuncts must be mutually excludable

Michael Wagner · McGill University

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

The following is odd, unless *American* can be contextually understood to imply ‘not Californian’:

- (1) #Jake is an American or a Californian.

Hurford (1974, 410) uses (1) to argue that “The joining of two sentences by *or* is unacceptable if one sentence entails the other [...]” (‘Hurford’s Constraint’ – HC). Stalnaker (1975, 278) equivalently hypothesized that “a disjunctive statement is appropriately made only in a context which allows either disjunct to be true without the other.” (‘Stalnaker’s Constraint’ – SC). This snippet raises novel issues with HC/SC looking at *n*-ary disjunction.

HC/SC, when stated as above, fail to explain (2):

- (2) a. #Jake is an American, (or) a Canadian, or a Californian.
b. #Jake is a Californian, (or) a Canadian, or an American.

At least the parse in which *Canadian or Californian* forms a constituent does not violate HC/SC, since it neither entails *American* nor is it entailed by it. To account for (2), we could apply HC/SC in pairwise fashion to the set of all disjuncts. If disjunctions introduce sets of alternatives (Aloni 2003; Alonso-Ovalle 2004; Simons 2005; Alonso-Ovalle 2006, 2008), then grammar should have access to this set. A pairwise HC/SC, however, fails to rule out (3):

- (3) a. #Sally left, (or) Sally didn’t leave, or Jake left.
b. #Sally left, (or) Jake left, or Sally didn’t leave.

The same effect arises with contextual entailment:

- (4) #Sally is left-handed, (or) right-handed, or from Montréal.

We can generalize HC/SC instead as follows:

- (5) Mutual excludability (‘ME’):

Stalnakerian formulation:

Each disjunct must be contextually compatible with the negation of all others

Equivalent Hurfordian formulation:

No disjunct may contextually entail the disjunction of all others

ME has some interesting properties: It requires that disjunctions be maximally ‘strengthenable’, such that each disjunct *could* be the only true one. Disjunctive expressions are usually assumed to be strengthened in competition with conjunctive alternatives (Sauerland 2004, and Alonso-Ovalle 2008 for *n*-ary disjunction). Fox (2007) argues that strengthening excludes all innocently excludable alternatives, i.e. those excludable without arbitrary choices. ME guarantees that the exclusion

of any conjunctive alternative will be innocent (the reverse is not true, as (1) shows—IE is not context sensitive). In (3), however, *J* is incompatible with excluding both *S&J* and *not(S)&J*, so neither is innocently excludable.

ME in fact permits to strengthen disjunctions by strengthening individual disjuncts with the negation of the others, without reference to conjunctive alternatives (see Singh 2008 for a related idea of exhaustifying individual disjuncts relative to a question under discussion.)

What could explain ME, especially in unstrengthened disjunctions? Stalnaker argues that SC follows from pragmatic constraints on assertability: "... the disjunction would be equivalent to the assertion of one of the disjuncts alone. So the disjunctive assertion would be pointless, hence misleading, and therefore inappropriate." Mayr and Romoli (2016) and Meyer (2015) develop related pragmatic accounts for HC/SC.

This rationale could explain (2). It is also compatible with the felicity of (6): the second conjunct is crucial to convey ignorance (Zimmermann 2000):

- (6) Sally left or Sally didn't leave.

However, it is not clear that it can explain (3) and (4), where dropping a disjunct should not lead to the same meaning. Consider:

- (7) a. Sally is left-handed or from Montréal.
b. Sally is left-handed or right-handed.

Unlike (4), (7a) entails that if Sally is right-handed, she is from Montréal; and (7b) fails to convey ignorance about whether Sally is from Montréal. (3) and (4) pose a new puzzle for pragmatic accounts for HC/SC, or at least they do for Stalnaker's. It should also be noted that Zimmermann (2000) and Singh (2008) argue for constraints even stronger than ME, which would cast a different light on what might explain ME.

References

- Aloni, Maria. 2003. Free choice in modal contexts. In *Proceedings of the Conference "SuB7 – Sinn und Bedeutung"*, ed. Matthias Weisgerber, 25–37. Konstanz, Germany: Universität Konstanz.
- Alonso-Ovalle, Luis. 2004. Simplification of disjunctive antecedents. In *Proceedings of the 34th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS 34)*, ed. Keir Moulton and Matthew Wolf, 73–88. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Alonso-Ovalle, Luis. 2006. Disjunction in Alternative Semantics. Doctoral Dissertation, UMass Amherst.
- Alonso-Ovalle, Luis. 2008. Innocent exclusion in an alternative semantics. *Natural Language Semantics* 16:115–128.
- Fox, Danny. 2007. Too many alternatives: density, symmetry and other predicaments. In *Proceedings of the 17th Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference (SALT 17)*, ed. Tova Friedman and Masayuki Gibson, 88–111.
- Hurford, James R. 1974. Exclusive or inclusive disjunction. *Foundations of Language* 410–411.
- Mayr, Clemens, and Jacopo Romoli. 2016. A puzzle for theories of redundancy: Exhaustification, incrementality, and the notion of local context. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 9:7–1.

- Meyer, Marie-Christine. 2015. Redundancy and embedded exhaustification. In *Proceedings of the 25th Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference (SALT 25)*, ed. Sarah D'Antonio, Mary Moroney, and Carol Rose Little, 491–511.
- Sauerland, U. 2004. Scalar implicatures in complex sentences. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27:367–391.
- Simons, Mandy. 2005. Dividing things up: The semantics of *or* and the modal/*or* interaction. *Natural Language Semantics* 13:271–316.
- Singh, R. 2008. On the interpretation of disjunction: asymmetric, incremental, and eager for inconsistency. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31:245–260.
- Stalnaker, Robert. 1975. Indicative conditionals. *Philosophia* 5:269–286.
- Zimmermann, Thomas Ede. 2000. Free Choice disjunction and epistemic possibility. *Natural Language Semantics* 8:255–290.

This research was supported by funding through the Canada Research Chair program of the Canadian Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.

Michael Wagner
chael@mcgill.ca
McGill University
Linguistics Department
1085 Dr. Penfield Avenue
Montréal, QC H3A 1A7
Canada