

Session 2A Abstracts

According to (4), the CG that the attitude verb introduces generates a particular IC when applied to John. But what could this IC be? Given Mary's disjunctive desire, it cannot be $[\lambda w . ix(x \text{ is the best semanticist in } w)]$ or $[\lambda w . ix(x \text{ is the best syntactician in } w)]$, because it is not the case that the best syntactician is hired in each of her desire alternatives, and neither is it the best semanticist. The IC $[\lambda w . ix(x \text{ is the best semanticist in } w \text{ and } x \text{ is the best syntactician in } w)]$ will not do either because it will be undefined in those of her desire alternatives where the best syntactician and the best semanticist are two different people. Finally, the IC $[\lambda w . ix(x \text{ is the best semanticist in } w \text{ or } x \text{ is the best syntactician in } w)]$ is also not suitable. Again, in those of Mary's desire-alternatives where the best semanticist and the best syntactician are two different people, this concept will be undefined because it will not be able to pick out a unique individual. There does not seem to be any other options. From this, we conclude that the system of P&S requires a modification.

Proposal. We'll get the TCs right if we can make sure that the IC $[\lambda w . ix(x \text{ is the best semanticist in } w)]$ is used in those alternatives where the best semanticist is hired and the IC $[\lambda w . ix(x \text{ is the best syntactician in } w)]$ is used in those alternatives where the best syntactician is hired. We thus need a system that will generate weaker TCs for (2) by giving us a (possibly different) John-concept in each of Mary's desire alternatives.

- (5) Key idea: *Step 1.* Separate the following two components that are collapsed into one notion of a CG in P&S: (i) the component that generates the full set of John-concepts for Mary in w ; (ii) a mechanism that chooses a concept from the generated set. *Step 2.* Let the choice of a concept from the set of concepts be new for each desire-alternative.

We substitute variables over CGs by variables over generators of concept sets (GCS), as defined in (6). Such functions will take an individual and return the full set of concepts of this individual for the attitude holder. We introduce variables over choice functions (CFs) of type $\langle\langle se, t \rangle, se \rangle$. A CF applies to a set of concepts and outputs one of them.

We need only one generator of sets of concepts for an attitude holder. Building on (Heim, 1982), we propose an existential closure over CF-variables that can freely apply at any clausal level. The semantics proposed for *want* is given in (7). The LF for (2) is given in (8). The resulting TCs are given in (9).

- (6) Q is the generator of a concept set (GCS) for x in w iff Q is of type $\langle e, \langle se, t \rangle \rangle$ and, for all entities y , $Q(y)$ is the set of y -concepts for x in w .

- (7) $\|want\|^g = [\lambda w . \lambda P_{\langle\langle e, \langle se, t \rangle \rangle, st \rangle} . \lambda x . \forall w' \in \text{Desire-Alt}(x)(w):$

$$P([\iota Q: Q \text{ is the GCS for } x \text{ in } w])(w')=1]$$

- (8) $[_S \lambda w \text{ Mary } [_{VP} \text{ wants } w \text{ } [_{CP} \lambda G_{\langle e, \langle se, t \rangle \rangle} [\lambda w' . [_S \exists f : [_S \text{ PRO } [_{VP} \text{ to hire in } w' \text{ } [[[_G \text{ you}] f] w']]]]]]]]]]$

- (9) $\|(8)\|^g = [\lambda w . \forall w' \in \text{Desire-Alt}(\text{Mary})(w): \exists f: \text{Mary hires in } w'$

$$[f([\iota Q: Q \text{ is the GCS for Mary in } w](\text{you}_{John}))](w')]$$

In this system, an existential closure over CF-variables is allowed either at the level of the embedded TP or at the matrix level. In (8), f is a variable over CFs that is existentially closed at the lower level. Thus, in each desire-world, a different CF might pick out a different concept for one and the same individual John. Consequently, the interpretation in (9) is weaker than the one in (4) and correctly captures the meaning of (2).

This system has an additional technical advantage. In order to account for cases like “John thinks that Clark Kent is not Superman”, P&S require two CGs. So, attitude verbs must be able to potentially introduce infinitely many CGs and take complements of unlimited complexity (known as the *type flexibility* of attitude verbs (Charlow & Sharvit, 2014; Cresswell & Stechow, 1982)). This shortcoming is avoided in our system.

On Dimensional Property Concepts in Palestinian Arabic: Evidence for Uniformitarianism

sentences and DNPC sentences lies in the incapability of the indefinite pivot in both types of structure to appear in the preverbal position as in (5.a, b) and their incompatibility with full agreement in the post copular PP-DP structure (6.a, b). The data suggest that the pivot comprising of the DNPC and its degree operator denotes a relation so that it can neither raise nor agree. We suggest that the DNPC sentence has the same underlying structure as relational have-sentence in English that triggers a definiteness effect (Hornstein et al. 1995; Landman and Partee, 1987; Partee 1999).

- (5) a. *tlat Tawabe? kaan-u la-əl-šamaara b. *tlat-a miter Tuul (kaan) rajul l-talʒ
 three stories WERE-3PL to the building three meter tallness (WAS) the snowman
 “ The building has three stories” “ The snowman (was) three meters tall”
- (6) a. *kaan-u xams řru? la- əš-šajara b. (*kaan-u) tlat-a miter Tuul la-rajul l-talʒ
 WERE.3PL.M five branches to-the-tree WERE.3PL.M three meter tallness to-the snowman
 “ The tree had five branches” “ The snowman was 3 meters tall”

On the transparent analysis, the problem is crystal-clear. The non-vagueness of the structure cannot be explained without adopting the option of assigning an individual-characterizing denotation to DNPCs. While a quality-characterizing semantics for the scale denoting DNPC necessarily involves a vague predicate, an individual-characterizing semantics is compatible with both vague and non-vague predicates, meaning that a DNPC is necessarily individual-characterizing given the non-vagueness of structure. If so, then DNPCs should compose via canonical predication. This is problematic since it would assume no possessive semantics despite the fact that the non-possessive canonical composition would give rise to the incorrect truth conditions (e.g. #Ali is 2 meters height) and the strict parallelism between possessive *la*-structures and DNPCs sentences. A uniformitarian analysis, on the other hand, does not encounter this problem. It has the theoretical merit of reconciling the two facts of non-vagueness and the possessive semantics. This analysis has the following assumptions: (i) The DNPC has a derived scale-denoting root with an underlyingly relational possessive structure (i.e., $[[[Ali]_j [be + IN [[2 miter Tuul]_i t_{IN} [t_j t_i]]]]]$). (ii) The root denotes a property of portions with an inherently degree function (from portions to degrees) (i.e., $[[\sqrt{TwI}]] =: \lambda p \lambda d. p \in \text{tallness} \ \& \ \mu(p) \leq d$). (iii) It composes with the semantically inert nominalizer (CaCC) that denotes an identity function. (iv) The resulting object saturates a covert possessive operator $[[IN]]$ represented as *la* in possessive *la*- sentences. As an existential relational structure with definiteness effects, it is standardly expected to be sensitive to the strong-weak DP distinction (Barwise and Cooper 1981). On the assumption that the POS degree operator is a universal quantifier over the contextually determined neutral set of degrees (i.e., $[\lambda Q: \forall d \in g(N) (S_A) Q(d)]$ (von Stechow, 2009)), it makes a strong DP when it composes with the relational DNPC. This results into a tautologous statement (See Partee 1999). That a DNPC sentence with a POS operator yields a tautology explains the oddness of the vague DNPC sentence in (2). Other degree operators, when applied to relational DNPCs, (e.g., measure phrases, comparative, equative) make weak DPs. This results into contingent statements that are felicitous. This explains the fact that DNPC modified by operators with lexically-specified standards are acceptable as exemplified in (3,4).

References: Barwise, Jon, and Robin Cooper, 1981: Generalized quantifiers and natural language. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 4: 159–219. Benmamoun, Elabbas. (1999). Arabic morphology: The central role of the imperfective. *Lingua* 108: 175-201. Boneh, Nora and Ivy Sichel (2010) Deconstructing Possession. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 28:1-40 Grano, Thomas and Stuart Davis. 2017. Universal markedness in gradable adjectives revisited The morpho-semantics of the positive form in Arabic. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* Francez, Itamar and Andrew Koontz-Garboden. (2015). Semantic variation and the grammar of property concepts. *Language* 93:533–563. Hornstein, Norbert S., Sara Rosen, and Juan Uriagereka. 1995. *Integrals*. Landman, Fred & Barbara H. Partee (1987) Weak NPs in HAVE sentences (unpublished abstract, UMass Amherst) Menon, Mythili, and Roumyana Pancheva. (2014). *The grammatical life of property concept roots in Malayalam*. In Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 18, 289-302. Partee, Barbara H. (1999) Weak NPs in HAVE Sentences. (University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam).

Formal sources of cross-linguistic variation in additivity

Karoliina Lohiniva, University of Geneva/University of Delaware

In this paper, I discuss the availability of *double contrast* and *remind-me* readings of additives in Finnish, Hungarian, and Turkish. I propose that the availability of both of these readings is dependent on additive syntax, and that the latter also involves a difference in lexical semantics.

Data. Additives (ADD) signal that the context contains a salient previous answer to the current question under discussion (Beaver and Clark, 2008). In Turkish (Göksel and Özsoy, 2003; Kamali and Karvovskaya, 2013) (1a) and Finnish (Vilkuna, 1984) (1b), that previous answer may also relate to a superquestion. In this case, the previous answer and the host sentence of ADD show double contrast; they differ both in terms of contrastive topic (CT) and of focus (F). In (1), the superquestion is *[Where]_F are [L. and M.]_{CT} going?* and ADD appears adjacent to a CT.

- (1) a. *Leyla sinemaya gidiyor, Meltem de konsere (gidiyor)* [TUR]
Leyla cinema-DAT go-PRES Meltem ADD concert-DAT go-PRES
'Leyla is going to the movies and Meltem is going to a concert'
- b. *Laila on menossa elokuviin, ja Mattikin on menossa konserttiin* [FIN]
Laila is going cinema-ILL and Matti-ADD is going concert-ILL
'Laila is going to the movies, and Matti is going to a concert'

Hungarian does not allow double contrast additivity. However, in Hungarian and Finnish – but not in Turkish – ADDs may also convey a remind-me reading in single *wh*-questions, marking a repeated question (cf. Sauerland and Yatsushiro, 2017). In Hungarian, remind-me *-is* is adjacent to the *wh*-phrase (2a); in Finnish, remind-me *-kAAn* attaches to the finite verb (2b).

- (2) a. *Mi is (volt) a neved?* [HUN]
what ADD was the name-PX/2SG
'What is/was your name again?'
- b. *Mikä sinun nimesi olikaan?* [FIN]
what your name-PX/2SG was-ADD
'What is/was your name again?'

The question addressed in this paper is: What determines whether readings such as double contrast and remind-me are available for a given additive in a given language?

Previous work. Out of the two readings discussed in this paper, only double contrast has been studied previously. Zimmermann (2015) proposes that ADD is a propositional operator that attaches above *vP*, and existentially binds the traces of both CT and F. It then presupposes that the resulting proposition is in the context. On this account, cross-linguistic variation in the availability of double contrast should be related to the number of traces that may be bound by ADD, i.e. semantics.

Double contrast in Hungarian. Hungarian *is* cannot convey a double contrast reading. Instead of attributing this ban on the semantics of ADD, I propose that it follows from Hungarian syntax: *is* is interpreted in DistP, below TopP and above FocP (Szabolcsi, 1997). The unavailability of double contrast follows if the CT is interpreted in TopP; *is* cannot scope over it.

Remind-me in Turkish. Turkish *-dA* cannot convey a remind-me reading. I assume that remind-me ADDs must scope above *wh*-phrases (as in e.g. Hungarian, where *wh*-phrases are in FocP; Surányi, 2002). Given that *-dA* is able to scope over CTs, it is implausible that it cannot scope

above *wh*-phrases, which in Turkish appear either in situ or in the preverbal focus domain (Göksel and Özsoy, 2000). After all, CTs are standardly assumed to scope over foci (e.g. Büring, 2003). Hence, I propose that the lexical semantics of *-dA* precludes a remind-me reading.

Restrictions in Finnish. In Finnish, the bound ADDs *-kin* and *-kAAn* allow double contrast and remind-me readings, while the unbound *myös* and *myöskään* do not (Vilkuna, 1984). Moreover, only *-kAAn* has a remind-me reading. I propose that unbound ADDs disallow double contrast for syntactic reasons (they are *vP*-adverbs), and only *-kAAn* has the semantics required for remind-me.

Implementation. The gist of the proposal for double contrast is that the prejacent has a CT-F structure (Büring, 2003), and ADD and its associated squiggle operator \sim (Rooth, 1992) are *type-flexible*. I introduce this flexibility in a systematic way using unions (\cup), as shown in the table below (cf. Zimmermann, 2015). In the table, α stands for the prejacent, and Γ for the free variable that \sim restricts presuppositionally and that ADD refers to in its presupposition. ‘Baseline’ refers to simple contexts (e.g. *MARY jogs, too*); the presuppositional semantics of \sim is from Rooth 1992.

Under this approach, double contrast ADD searches for a previous answer β in a set that consists of the union of Γ . Remind-me ADD scopes over a question, and searches in the context for an antecedent that is also a question (types in the table as in e.g. Kotek, 2014). Formally, remind-me ADDs target the Table, which contains a stack of questions under discussion (Farkas and Bruce, 2010). Therefore, besides being type-flexible, ADDs may also be *antecedent-flexible*.

	Baseline	Double contrast	Single- <i>wh</i> _{remind-me}
Type of $[[\alpha]]^o$	$\langle st \rangle$	$\langle st \rangle$	$\langle st, t \rangle$
Type of $[[\alpha]]^f$	$\langle st, t \rangle$	$\langle \langle st, t \rangle, t \rangle$	$\langle \langle st, t \rangle, t \rangle$
Semantics of \sim	a. $\Gamma \subseteq [[\alpha]]^f$ b. $[[\alpha]]^o \in \Gamma$ c. $\exists \beta \in \Gamma [\beta \neq \alpha]$	a. $\cup \Gamma \subseteq \cup [[\alpha]]^f$ b. $[[\alpha]]^o \in \cup \Gamma$ c. $\exists \beta \in \cup \Gamma [\beta \neq \alpha]$	a. $\cup \Gamma \subseteq \cup [[\alpha]]^f$ b. – c. $\exists \beta \in \Gamma [\beta \neq \alpha]$
Semantics of ADD	$\exists \beta \in \Gamma [\beta \in cg]$	$\exists \beta \in \cup \Gamma [\beta \in cg]$	$\exists \beta \in \Gamma [\beta \in Table]$

Conclusion. I propose that some cross-linguistic variation in additivity is rooted in syntax, and some in the lexical semantics of ADD. The prediction is that if a language does not allow ADDs to scope over topics, it should not allow double contrast readings. The fact that some languages marginally accept double contrast (e.g. German and English; Krifka, 1998; Zimmermann, 2012) should then be related to the ease with which ADDs scope over topics in these languages. Moreover, while I do propose that remind-me readings require a specific lexical semantics for ADD, remind-me readings are only predicted to be possible if ADD is able to scope over questions. The syntactic properties of ADD or ADDs (cf. Finnish) therefore play an important role in determining which readings will be available in a given language. Finally, I propose that a type-flexible squiggle is required; the implications of this proposal for other focus-sensitive operators should be considered.

Ref. • Beaver and Clark (2008) *Sense and sensitivity: How focus determines meaning*. Wiley • Büring (2003) On D-trees, beans, and B-accents. *Ling and Phil* • Farkas and Bruce (2010) On Reacting to Assertions and Polar Questions. *Journal of Sem* • Göksel and Özsoy (2000) Is there a focus position in Turkish? *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics* • Göksel and Özsoy (2003) *dA*: a focus/topic associated clitic in Turkish. *Lingua* • Kamali and Karvovskaya (2013) ‘Also’ in Turkish and Ishkashimi. *Proceedings of WAFL 8* • Kotek (2014) *Composing Questions*. MIT dissertation • Rooth (1992) A theory of focus interpretation. *Nat Lang Sem* • Sauerland and Yatsushiro (2017) Remind-Me Presuppositions and Speech-Act Decomposition: Evidence from Particles in Questions. *Ling Inq* • Szabolcsi (1997) Strategies for scope taking. In *Ways of Scope Taking*. Kluwer • Vilkuna (1984) Voiko kin-partikkelia ymmärtää? *Virittäjä* • Zimmermann (2012) ‘Even’ gives even more information. 34. *Jahrestagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Sprachwissenschaft* • Zimmermann (2015) Scalar Particles and Contrastive Topics in English and Vietnamese. *Proceedings of IATL 31*

Depictive acceptability is conditioned by inner aspect and its correlates

Jake Farrell (Georgetown University)

Introduction: I show how variation in depictive acceptability reflects their sensitivity to inner aspect (telicity and durativity) and its correlates in other domains. I use this to account for the apparent restriction of Object-oriented depictives to telic, durative VPs.

Puzzle: Depictives are a subclass of secondary predicates. In English, Object-Oriented Depictives (OODs) show restrictions depending on the class of the verb in the matrix clause, but Subject-Oriented Depictives (SODs) do not:

- (1) a. John_i ate the meal_j cold_{i/j} [Accomplishment]
b. John_i carried Mary_j drunk_{i/*j} [Activity]
c. John_i recognised Mary_j drunk_{i/*j} [Achievement]

This has led to the claim that OODs can only be predicated of an object when the VP is both telic and durative (Rapoport 1999; Motut 2010). This is supported by the observation that manipulating the telicity of a VP can improve acceptability of an OOD:

- (2) a. John carried the cart { for a minute/*in a minute }
(i) John carried the cart on the stage { for a minute/*in a minute }
(ii) John carried the cart off the stage { *for a minute/ in a minute }
b. ??John carried the cart_i broken_i
(i) ??John carried the cart_i on the stage broken_i
(ii) John carried the cart_i off the stage broken_i

However, examples can be found of OODs with VPs that are not both telic and durative:

- (3) a. I recognised him_i dead_i better than I had recognised him_i alive_i
b. My sister played the guitar_i untuned_i {...for an hour/*in an hour}

Explanations for the particular restrictions on OODs have varied, with many revolving around restricting the type of thematic role that the depictive can be predicated of (e.g. Williams 1980, McNulty 1988, Rothstein 1983). As an alternative account, Motut (2014) has argued that secondary predicates must be mappable to every subpart of the situation. However, it is not clear how a thematic role account or Motut's proposal would explain the difference in acceptability of OODs with the adjectives *full* and *broken*:

- (4) John pushed the cart_i full_i/?broken_i

A new approach: I propose that OODs generally require a durative, telic VP for interpretation reasons, as depictives specify a property relevant to the entity it is predicated of at the time of the matrix event (similar to McNally's (1994) account for unacceptability of Individual-Level Predicate depictives). However, I argue that OODs inside nondurative and/or atelic VPs can be repaired by introducing the corresponding formal analogue in the adjectival domain of the verbal domain's 'missing component' (cf. the formal correspondence between Mass nouns and atelic verbs (Bach 1986), and the interaction of a Count direct object affecting the telicity of a VP).

Adjectives can be gradable or non-gradable, with gradable adjectives further split up into absolute and relative adjectives. Similar to the correspondenc between Mass nouns and atelic verbs, gradability in adjectives corresponds with durativity (Beavers 2008), while absolute adjectives correspond to telicity (Kennedy and Levin 2008). Since the VP is

durative and atelic, the ‘missing component’ (in this case, the analogue of telicity) can only be supplied by the absolute adjective *full*, but not by the relative adjective *broken*. This account makes a number of predictions. First, we should see that gradable adjectives are more acceptable with achievement verbs than nongradable adjectives, as gradability supplies the ‘missing’ durativity. Second, while a relative adjective should improve acceptability with achievements, only absolute adjectives should improve acceptability with activity verbs, since only absolute adjectives have the formal analogue of telicity:

- (5) a. I found the casing_i {hot_i [gradable] / *brass_i [nongradable] }
 b. John carried the bag_i {empty_i/full_i} [absolute] / ??{heavy_i/light_i} [relative]

This also predicts that for ambiguous gradable adjectives, OODs should disambiguate them. E.g. *wet* has both an absolute interpretation (the amount of wetness an object has), and a relative interpretation (the climate). With an activity verb, telicity is missing, and so only the absolute interpretation of *wet* should be available:

- (6) John visited the countryside_i wet_i
 a. It had rained heavily for weeks
 b. ??It was a usual spring

Further, we should expect that if a non-gradable adjective can be coerced into giving a gradable reading through a degree modifier, then acceptability should improve in sentences with achievement verbs. Likewise, if an adjective can be coerced into an absolute reading, then acceptability should improve with activities, but not in the case where a degree modifier only coerces a relative adjective reading (even though both are gradable):

- (7) a. John met him_i ??drunk_i / ?/ok completely drunk_i / ?/ok very drunk_i
 b. John carried the cart ??broken_i / ?/ok completely broken_i / ??very broken_i

This captures the generalisation of OOD acceptability with durative, telic VPs and the variation in acceptability in (4), without incorrectly ruling out the sentences in (3). I argue that this restriction arises from the OOD being within the domain of computation of inner aspect (Travis 2010) – the property expressed by the OOD must hold at the beginning of the event expressed by the matrix clause. If the property is not interpreted as being relevant to the time expressed by the event, then this results in pragmatic infelicitiousness. Importantly, this change in adjective type does not lead to the entire VP becoming telic, unlike the addition of the directional adverbial in (2b), which suggests that the depictive it is not affecting the computation of inner aspect for the entire VP:

- (8) John carried the bag_i empty_i {for an hour/??in an hour_i}

References: ●Bach, E. (1986). The Algebra of Events. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 9.1, 5-16 ●Beavers, J. (2008). Scalar complexity and the structure of events. *Event structures in linguistic form and interpretation*, 245-265, ●Kennedy, C., & Levin, B. (2008). Measure of change: The adjectival core of degree achievements. *Adjectives and adverbs* 156-182. *Language*, 345-381, ●McNally, L. (1994). Adjunct predicates and the individual/stage distinction. *Proceedings of WCCFL*, 12, 561–576. ●Motut, A. (2010). A puzzle for the syntax-semantics of depictives. *Proceedings of the CLA*. ●Motut, A. (2014). A Semantics for Object-Oriented Depictives. *UPenn Working Papers in Linguistics*, 20(1), 26, ●Rothstein, S. (1983). *The syntactic forms of predication* (PhD Thesis, MIT), ●Travis, L. (2010). *Inner aspect*. Springer. ●Williams, E. (1980). Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 11(1), 203–238.