The 18th Amsterdam Colloquium

The 2011 edition of the Amsterdam Colloquium is the eighteenth in a series which started in 1976. Originally an initiative of the Department of Philosophy, the colloquium is now organised by the Institute for Logic, Language and Computation (ILLC). This booklet provides information about the Colloquium, locations, programme, and short summaries of the presentations.

Programme

The programme of the 18th AC includes four invited lectures by renowned experts in the field:

- Irene Heim (MIT)
- Seth Yalcin (University of California, Berkeley)
- Chung-chieh Shan (Cornell University)
- Donka Farkas (University of California, Santa Cruz)

The colloquium also hosts three thematic workshops:

Inquisitiveness
- Invited speaker: Manfred Krifka (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin)
- Organisers: J. Groenendijk, F. Roelofsen and M. Westera

Formal semantic evidence
- Invited speakers: Richard Breheny (University College London) and Bart Geurts (Radboud University Nijmegen)
- Organisers: Katrin Schulz and Galit Weidman Sassoon

Formal semantics and pragmatics of sign languages
- Invited speaker: Philippe Schlenker (Institut Nicod, Paris and NYU)
- Organisers: Vadim Kimmelman, Roland Pfau and Anne Baker

In addition, on Monday 19 December the E.W. Beth Foundation organises an evening lecture given by

- Kevin Kelly (Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh)

The Beth lecture will take place in the Doelenzaal of the UvA (see map).

Programme committee

Abstracts submitted for the general programme have been selected by a programme committee consisting of internal members: Frank Veltman (Chair), Hedde Zeijlstra and Paul Dekker, and external members: Adrian Brasoveanu (University of California Santa Cruz), Angelika Kratzer (University of Massachusetts Amherst), Anna Szabolcsi (New York University), Ariel Cohen (Ben Gurion University), Bart Geurts (Radboud University Nijmegen), Chris Kennedy (University of Chicago), Chris Potts (Stanford University), Chung-chieh Shan (Cornell University), Cleo Condoravdi (Palo Alto Research Center), David Beaver (University of Texas Austin), Donka Farkas (University of California Santa Cruz), Dorit
Abusch (Cornell), Ede Zimmermann (Frankfurt University), Emmanuel Chemla (Ecole Normale Superieure Paris), Elena Tribushinina (Utrecht University), Fred Landman (Tel Aviv University), Fritz Hamm (Tuebingen University), Gennaro Chierchia (Harvard), Gerhard Jäger (Tuebingen University), Henriette de Swart (Utrecht University), Irene Heim (MIT), Ivano Caponigro (University of California San Diego), Jakub Dotlaciš (University of California Santa Cruz), Jon Gajewski (University of Connecticut), Kjell-Johan Saebo (University of Oslo), Klaus von Heusinger (Stuttgart University), Louise McNally (Pompeu Fabra University Barcelona), Luis Alonso-Ovalle (McGill University), Martin Hackl (MIT), Martin Stokhof (University of Amsterdam), Paul Portner (Georgetown University), Pauline Jacobson (Brown University), Philippe Schlenker (Institut Jean-Nicod, Paris and NYU), Raquel Fernández Rovira (UvA), Regine Eckardt (Goettingen University), Rick Nouwen (Utrecht University), Robert van Rooij (University of Amsterdam), Roger Schwarzschild (Rutgers University), Sabine Iatridou (MIT), Seth Cable (University of Massachusetts Amherst), Seth Yalcin (Berkeley), Stefan Kaufmann (Northwestern University), Susan Rothstein (Bar-Ilan University), Tim Fernando (Trinity College Dublin), Uli Sauerland (ZAS, Berlin), Yael Sharvit (University of California Los Angeles), Yaron McNabb (University of Chicago), Yoad Winter (Utrecht University).

We thank the members of the programme committee for the very substantial work they did.

Venue

The Colloquium takes place in the Euclides-building of the Faculty of Science of the University of Amsterdam:

Euclides-building
Plantage Muidergracht 24
1018 TV
Amsterdam

In view of traffic jams, parking problems and parking police, we strongly advice not to get there by car. The easiest way to reach the conference site is by means of public transport, bicycle, or ‘shanks’ mare’ (walking).

Directions To reach the Euclides building by public transport proceed as follows. Take tramline 9 (coming from the Central Station) or line 14 and get off at stop ‘Plantage Badlaan’ (you can ask the driver to announce that stop). Next turn right and walk through the ‘Plantage Lepellaan’ (100 meters). The white building at the end of the street is the Euclides building.

Coming from the city center, you can also take tramline 10, and get off at stop Alexanderplein (near the Muiderpoort). Turn left (over the water), and then the first street left is the Plantage Muidergracht. Euclides is the third building on your left.
Social Program
On Monday 19 December after the Beth lecture there will be a welcome reception in Café Kapitein Zeppos (see map). A ticket for a one hour boat trip departing from the city center is included in the conference package.

Registration and Information
All participants are requested to register on Monday morning at the registration desk in room P015B. In order to speed up processing, those who have registered beforehand on the website will be handled first.

During breaks in the academic programme, an AC information desk will be open in room P015B.

Lunches and Dinner
Lunch on Tuesday will be served freely at the EUCLIDES building while other lunches are provided in the nearby student’s restaurant ‘Agora’ (see map). Lunch tickets for Monday and Wednesday are included in the conference package. The following website has dinner suggestions and reviews:

http://www.iens.nl/english/restaurantsIn/Amsterdam/

Dinner in the Netherlands is usually served around 6:00 pm - 8:00 pm; many restaurants might not serve meals after 9:00 pm; also keep in mind that eating out in Amsterdam is relatively expensive. In the following, we give a number of recommendations. The restaurants are roughly ordered by distance from the conference location: the restaurants from (1) to (7) are within 5 minutes walking distance; those from (8) to (10) within 15 minutes, the others within half an hour.

(1). Plancius
Plantage Kerklaan 61
Nice place to sit down opposite the Artis zoo.

(2). Café Koosje
Plantage Middenlaan 37
From sandwiches to more complete meals. Open for lunch and dinner. Reasonably priced.

(3). Meneer Nilsson
Plantage Kerklaan 41
Mediterranean café open for lunch and dinner.

(4). Mediacafé Plantage
Plantage Kerklaan 36
This Large café offers sandwiches and full meals. Open for lunch and dinner.

(5). De Groene Olifant
Sarphatistraat 510
Quite a nice pub. Serves pub meals.
(6). **Kerklaan** (Indian / Surinamese), Plantage Muidergracht 69, Phone (020) 421 49 39
Mostly a take-out and delivery place, but has a number of tables and decent food.

(7). **Taman Sari** (Indonesian), Plantage Kerklaan 32, Phone (020) 623 71 30
Small and very unpretentious Indonesian restaurant.

(8). **Koffiehuis van de Volksbond** (International)
Kadijksplein 4, Phone (020) 622 12 09, kitchen open 18.00-22.00
Simple and good restaurant without pretence. Warm atmosphere. Reasonably priced.

(9). **Asmara** (African), Jonas Daniël Meijerplein 8, Phone (020) 627 10 02
East African cuisine without cutlery.

(10). **Bird** (Thai), Zeedijk 77, Amsterdam, Phone (020) 420 62 89, kitchen open 3.00pm-10.00pm
Good Thai food on the street parallel to the Red Light District.

(11). **Oriental City** (Chinese), Oudezijds Voorburgwal 177-179, Phone (020) 626 83 52, kitchen open 11.30am-10.30pm
Don’t let the ‘touristy’ exterior scare you away. Good for larger groups. If feeling adventurous, ask the waiter/waitress to recommend dishes from the Chinese menu.

(12). **Krua Thai Classic** (Thai), Staalstraat 22, Phone (020) 622 95 33

(13). **Koh-I-Noor** (Indian), Rokin 18, Phone (020) 627 21 18, kitchen open 5.00pm-11.30pm
Very good Indian food.

(14). **De Bolhoed** (Vegetarian), Prinsengracht 60, Phone (020) 626 18 03, kitchen open noon-10.00pm
Good vegetarian food in a beautiful neighborhood.

**Internet information**

*The short version* At the registration desk you have received a login with an SSID and a password. Use this to log on to the wireless network.

*The long version* Try to connect to the network with the SSID which was given to you using the default options and the password.

1. If you are using Vista you may get an error message saying that the connection failed. If you are connecting to the network for the first time, tick the box marked ‘save this network’. Close the error message and open a web browser; try to load a page. If this fails, wait 30 seconds and try again. The network should work now. The error mesage may persist each time you reboot and reconnect to the network; in that case, wait 30 seconds and the network should work.
(2). If you are using on your laptop and you are having trouble connecting, go to the registration desk for a more detailed manual.

(3). If you are using a Mac laptop, connecting using the default options should work; you may have wait 30 seconds after connecting before the network works. If not, try the ‘WEP 40/128 bit hex’ security option.

(4). On Linux, use the default WEP options or something resembling ‘WEP 40/128 bit key’.
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Organisation

The Amsterdam Colloquia are organised by the Institute for Logic, Language and Computation (iLLC) of the University of Amsterdam. The organising committee of the 18th Amsterdam Colloquium consists of Maria Aloni, Eric Flaten, Peter van Ormondt, Floris Roelofsen, Galit Weidman Sassoon and Matthijs Westera.
Programme
9.00 – 9.50  Registration & coffee (room P0.15B)

9.50 – 10.00  Opening by Frank Veltman (room 2.27)

10.00 – 11.00  Interpreting reconstruction in interrogative clauses
Chair: Frank Veltman (room 2.27)

Irene Heim

Chair: Frank Veltman (room 0.20)  Chair: Remko Scha (room 0.14)

11.15 – 11.45  Scales, Salience and Referential Safety: The Benefit of the Extreme
Michael Franke  Julie Hunter

Chair: Frank Veltman (room 2.27)

Julie Hunter

Now: A Discourse-Based Theory

11.45 – 12.15  Definite Theory of Superlatives
Sveta Krasikova  Reinhard Muskens

A Theory of Names and True Intensionality

11.45 – 12.15  On wh-exclamatives and noteworthiness
Anna Chernilovskaya and Rick Nouwen  Tim Fernando

Steedman’s Temporality Proposal and Finite Automata

13.45 – 14.15  Negative inquisitiveness and alternatives-based negation
Robin Cooper and Jonathan Ginzburg  Ka-fat Chow

Generalizing Monotonicity Inferences to Opposition Inferences

14.15 – 14.45  Free Choice in Deontic Inquisitive Semantics (DIS)
Martin Aher  Ryan Waldie

Nuu-chah-nulth Evidentials and the Origo

15.00 – 15.30  Where Question, Conditionals and Topics Converge
Markus Steinbach and Edgar Onea  Vincent Homer

As Simple as It Seems

15.30 – 16.00  Inquisitive knowledge attribution and the Gettier problem
Wataru Uegaki  Lucas Champollion

Each vs. jeweils: A cover-based view on distance-distributivity

16.15 – 17.15  Questions and question acts
Manfred Krifka

17.15 – 17.30  Launch of the Festschrift for Martin Stokhof

20.00 – 21.00  Beth/Vienna Circle Lecture (Doelenzaal)
Kevin Kelly

An Erotetic Theory of Empirical Simplicity and its Connection with Truth

21.15 – . . .  Welcome Reception at Kapitein Zeppos
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Title/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00 – 10.00</td>
<td>Seth Yalcin</td>
<td><strong>Context Probabilism</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chair:</strong> Henk Zeevat (room 0.20)</td>
<td><strong>Chair:</strong> Henriette de Swart (room 0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arno Bastenhof</td>
<td>Polarieties in logic and semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15 – 10.45</td>
<td><em>Chris Blom, Philippe de Groote, Yoad Winter and Joost Zwarts</em></td>
<td>On the Non-Licensing of NPIs in the Only-Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>I-Ta Chris Hsieh</em></td>
<td><strong>Chair:</strong> Henriette de Swart (room 0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Arno Bastenhof</em></td>
<td>Polarities in logic and semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45 – 11.15</td>
<td><em>Chris Blom, Philippe de Groote, Yoad Winter and Joost Zwarts</em></td>
<td>Implicit Arguments: Event Modification or Option Type Categories?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>I-Ta Chris Hsieh</em></td>
<td><strong>Chair:</strong> Henriette de Swart (room 0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Natalia Ivelieva</em></td>
<td>Obligatory implicatures and grammaticality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15 – 11.45</td>
<td>Udo Klein</td>
<td>Scope underspecification by expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chair:</strong> Galit W. Sassoon (room 2.27)</td>
<td><strong>Chair:</strong> Galit W. Sassoon (room 2.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 – 12.50</td>
<td>Poster talks</td>
<td><strong>Chair:</strong> Robert van Rooij (room 2.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chair:</strong> Robert van Rooij (room 2.27)</td>
<td>Superlative quantifiers: a dynamic approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop: <strong>Semantic evidence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chair:</strong> Katrin Schulz (room 0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30 – 16.00</td>
<td>Janina Radó and Oliver Bott</td>
<td>Underspecified representations of scope ambiguity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chair:</strong> Katrin Schulz (room 0.20)</td>
<td><strong>Chair:</strong> Katrin Schulz (room 0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Hardt, Line Mikkelsen and Bjarne Ørsnes</td>
<td>Sameness, Ellipsis and Anaphora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00 – 16.30</td>
<td>Sonja Tiemann and Florian Schwarz</td>
<td>Presupposition Processing – The Case of German wieder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chair:</strong> Katrin Schulz (room 0.20)</td>
<td><strong>Chair:</strong> Katrin Schulz (room 0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan Ginzburg, Raquel Fernández and David Schlangen</td>
<td>On the Semantics and Pragmatics of Dysfluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30 – 17.00</td>
<td>Agata Maria Renans</td>
<td>Projective behaviour of Nur – quantitative experimental research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chair:</strong> Katrin Schulz (room 0.20)</td>
<td><strong>Chair:</strong> Katrin Schulz (room 0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.15 – 18.15</td>
<td>Richard Breheny</td>
<td>Ask not (only) what experimental psychology can do for you. Ask what you can do for experimental psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chair: Vadim Kimmelman (room 2.27)

Philippe Schlenker

9.00 – 10.00
The Semantics of Pronouns: Insights and Problems from Sign Language
break

Workshop: Sign Language

Chair: A. Baker and R. Pfau (room 0.20)
Gemma Barberà Altimira
When wide scope is not enough: scope and topicality of discourse referents

Chair: Michael Franke (room 0.14)
Jacques Jayez and Bob van Tiel
Only 'only'. An experimental window on exclusiveness

10.15 – 10.45
Josép Quer
Quantificational strategies across language modalities

David Beaver and Elizabeth Coppock
Exclusive Updates! Brought to you by your local QUD

break

Kathryn Davidson
When disjunction looks like conjunction: Pragmatic consequences in ASL

Noor van Leusen
The accommodation potential of implicative verbs

11.30 – 12.00
Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay
Degree modification and intensification in ASL adjectives

Ting Xu
You again: How is its ambiguity derived?

lunch

Chair: Paul Dekker (room 2.27)

Chung-chieh Shan
Shadows of meaning

break

Chair: Paul Dekker (room 0.20)
Friederike Moltmann
Tropes, intensional relative clauses and the notion of a variable object

Chair: Jeroen Groenendijk (room 0.14)
Marta Abrusan
Focus, evidentiality and soft triggers

15.15 – 15.45
Louise McNally and Henriette de Swart
Inflection and derivation: how adjectives and nouns refer to abstract objects

Andreas Walker
Focus, uniqueness and soft presupposition triggers

15.45 – 16.15
Gianluca Giorgolo and Stephanie Needham
Pragmatic constraints on gesture use: the effect of downward entailing contexts on gesture processing

Tohru Seraku
Multiple foci in Japanese clefts and the growth of semantic representation

break

Chair: Jeroen Groenendijk (room 2.27)

Donka Farkas
Polarity particles in English and beyond
Chair: Galit W. Sassoon (room 2.27)

12.00 – 12.05
Márta Abrusán and Kriszta Szendrői
Experimenting with the king of France

12.05 – 12.10
Emmanuel Chemla and Lewis Bott
Processing: Free choice at no cost

12.10 – 12.15
Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox
Variation of Presupposition Projection in Quantified Sentences

12.15 – 12.20
Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts
Corpus evidence for preference-driven interpretation

break

12.30 – 12.35
Adrian Brasoveanu and Jakub Dotlačil
Licensing Sentence-internal Readings in English: An Experimental Study

12.35 – 12.40
Lisa Bylinina and Stas Zadorozhny
Evaluative adjectives, scale structure, and ways of being polite

12.40 – 12.45
Francesca Panzeri and Francesca Foppolo
Can children tell us something about the semantics of adjectives?

12.45 – 12.50
Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally
Adjectives as saturators vs. modifiers: Statistical evidence
Abstracts
Invited Speakers

Polarity particles in English and beyond
Donka Farkas

This talk reports on work done in collaboration with Floris Roelofsen from ILLC, Amsterdam. It proposes an account of the distribution and interpretation of ‘polarity particles’, i.e., morphemes exemplified by yes and no in English. The goal is to explain why utterances of the type Yes, she is/No, she isn’t can only occur in responses to assertions (She is home) or polar questions (Is she home?/Is she not home?) but not in ‘out of the blue’ contexts or in reactions to constituent questions or certain type of alternative questions. We approach the issue from an inquisitive semantics perspective by first refining semantic distinctions so as to allow us to capture the similarities and differences between assertions and polar questions, as well as the differences between questions such as Is the door open?/Is the door closed? so as to be able to account for the different interpretations yes and no reactions to these questions receive. After giving a detailed analysis of the data in English and formulating predictions concerning cross linguistic patterns we turn to checking them by looking at the facts in Romanian, a language whose polarity particle system contrasts with that of English along several parameters.

Interpreting reconstruction in interrogative clauses
Irene Heim

Building on Rullmann & Beck (1998), I will explore some consequences of interpreting the restrictor of ‘which’ as a definite description inside the question nucleus. Issues discussed will include functional readings, de re/de dicto ambiguity, and question-answer congruence.

Shadows of meaning
Chung-chieh Shan

Context Probabilism
Seth Yalcin

I investigate the idea of equipping the common ground of a conversation with probabilistic and utility-theoretic structure, analogous to the kind of structure typically assumed in Bayesian decision theory. I offer some suggestions for how best to interpret such a model of the common ground, and I explore some options for giving a dynamic semantics for modals and conditionals which exploits the added structure. I close with some discussion of the question in virtue of what the semantics developed might be considered ‘essentially dynamic’.
An Erotetic Theory of Empirical Simplicity and its Connection with Truth

Kevin T. Kelly (joint work with Hanti Lin)

In keeping with the Vienna Circle theme, we revisit the problem of justifying induction, as described by Rudolf Carnap in his paper “On Inductive Logic”. According to Carnap, “the decisive justification of an inductive procedure does not consist in its plausibility... but must refer to its success in some sense.” Carnap approves of Hans Reichenbach’s appeal to convergence to the truth as a partial answer, but remarks that convergence allows for infinite variety among methods in the short run – something more is required to explain characteristic scientific biases such as Ockham’s razor. The nature of simplicity and its relationship to truth are persistent problems. First, we propose an axiomatic theory of empirical simplicity that recovers a unique simplicity order in typical empirical problems, which are assumed to consist of a theory choice question (modeled as a partition over possible worlds) and a specification of possible information states (modeled as a topological basis). Simplicity emerges from topological relations that arise at the boundaries of the theories in the information space, so simplicity essentially involves both the question and the information space. Next, we pursue Carnap’s challenge by considering methods that converge to the truth in the most deductive way possible, where deductiveness is characterized in terms of losses that measure departures from standard features of deductive inference. Charging for retractions of prior beliefs minimizes violations of monotonicity. Charging for impatience – ruling out possibilities that nature would have ruled out if your belief were true – approximates the fact that deduction never rules out possibilities until nature does. We discuss the extent to which convergent Ockham strategies coincide with strategies that converge to the truth in an optimally deductive way.

Workshop on Inquisitiveness

Questions and question acts

Manfred Krifka (invited speaker)

I will argue for a distinction between questions as semantic objects (to be modelled, e.g., as sets of propositions) and questions as pragmatic objects or speech acts (to be modelled, e.g., as transitions between obligations). I will consider both embedded questions (e.g., embedding under know vs. wonder) and root questions (e.g., the expression of bias in questions).
Free Choice in Deontic Inquisitive Semantics (DIS)
Martin Aher
We will propose a novel solution to the free choice puzzle that is driven by empirical data from legal discourse and does not suffer from the same problems as implicature-based accounts. We will argue against implicature based accounts and provide an entailment-based solution. Following Andersons violation-based deontic logic, we will demonstrate that a support based radical inquisitive semantics will correctly model both the free choice effect and the boolean standard entailment relations in downward entailing contexts. An inquisitive semantics is especially suited to model sluicing effects where the continuation “but I do not know which” coerces an ignorance reading. It also demonstrates that the counterarguments to Anderson failed to take into account the effects of inquisitiveness. Furthermore, we will argue that the problem of strengthening the antecedent that is used as a counterargument against entailment based accounts fails to capture the complexity of the data and will outline conditions for a solution to this issue.

Negative inquisitiveness and alternatives-based negation
Robin Cooper & Jonathan Ginzburg
We propose some fundamental requirements for the treatment of negative particles, positive/negative polar questions, and negative propositions, as they occur in dialogue with questions. We offer a view of negation that combines aspects of alternative semantics, intuitionist negation, and situation semantics. We formalize the account in TTR (a version of type theory with records). We develop an account of the coherence of negative utterances in the dialogue framework KoS.

Where Question, Conditionals and Topics Converge
Edgar Onea & Markus Steinbach
In this paper we show that using traditional partition semantics for questions and the idea of highlighted alternatives from inquisitive semantics opens the way to a predictive and comprehensive account for the fairly complicated and puzzling distribution of V1-conditionals and irrelevance conditionals in German. Our analysis does not only correctly predict a number of puzzling distributional facts about V1 and wh-conditionals in German, it also clarifies the relation between conditionals and questions in general. If yes/no questions highlight exactly one alternative and are topical, they can be interpreted as conditionals.

Inquisitive knowledge attribution and the Gettier problem
Wataru Uegaki
This paper addresses one of the unresolved questions in Inquisitive Semantics. Namely, given that the inquisitive-semantic denotation of the clausal complement is a set of possibilities, how an attitude verb, such as believe and know,
semantically operates on its complement. The conclusion will be that \textit{know} operates on the set of possibilities denoted by the complement ‘as a whole’, in contrast to \textit{believe}, which operates on the union of the possibilities. The argument is twofold. First, Inquisitive Semantics combined with the claim that \textit{know} operates on the inquisitive denotation of the complement provides a new solution to (the linguistic counterpart of) the Gettier problem (Gettier 1963). Second, the proposed treatment provides an elegant account of the entailments of attitude verbs combining with certain ‘propositional’ DPs (e.g., \textit{the rumor that p}).

\textbf{Workshop on Formal Semantic Evidence}

\textbf{Ask not (only) what experimental psychology can do for you. Ask what you can do for experimental psychology}

\textit{Richard Breheny (invited speaker)}

I take the goal of contemporary semantics-pragmatics to be to provide at least a framework for a theory of cognition that explains how meaning is ascribed in the production and comprehension of utterances. It follows then that engagement with the methods of the experimental psychologist should be a two-way street. In this talk, I consider some notable examples of how the use of experimental methods has contributed to purely theoretical debates in a way introspective methods could not; but I also highlight some clear limitations for the use of experiments to settle theoretical issues. I argue that the best way to use experiments to progress theory is to show how a theory can illuminate research in psychology generally. Here I present some work on negation and on the use speaker perspective from our lab as well as some developmental work that are examples of this direction of fit.

\textbf{Superlative quantifiers: a dynamic approach}

\textit{Bart Geurts (invited speaker)}

Although, prima facie, “at least \(n\)” and “at most \(n\)” would appear to be synonymous with “more than \(n - 1\)” and “fewer than \(n + 1\)”, respectively, Geurts and Nouwen (2007) show that there is ample evidence to suggest that they are quite different. Geurts and Nouwen propose to capture the differences between superlative (“at least/most \(n\)”) and comparative (“more/fewer than \(n\)”) quantifiers by assuming that, whereas the standard semantics of the latter is correct, the former have modal meanings: “At least \(n\) \(A\) are \(B\)” means that the speaker is certain that there are \(n\) \(A\) that are \(B\) and considers it possible that more than \(n\) \(A\) are \(B\) (the meaning of “at most” is similar). This account makes predictions about the relative complexity of comparative and superlative quantifiers, which have been confirmed experimentally (Geurts et al. 2010). Unfortunately, the modal account of superlative quantifiers has its problems, too. In particular, it has a hard time explaining some embedded occurrences of superlative quantifiers. In this talk, I
show how the differences between superlative and comparative quantifiers can be captured by supposing that they change the context in quite different ways. In truth-conditional terms, this means that I revert to the standard view, but I can still account for the fact that superlative quantifiers are more complex than comparative ones, as shown by Geurts et al.’s data (2010) on acquisition and online processing. Furthermore, the various quantity implicatures associated with superlative quantifiers follow straightforwardly from the proposed analysis.


**Relating ERP-Effects to Theories of Belief Update and Combining Systems**

*Ralf Naumann (cancelled)*

The significance of empirical neurophysiological data, like ERPs, for formal semantic theory has increasingly been acknowledged in recent years. Despite this rapprochement, there still remain important unsolved foundational questions like ‘How can ERP-effects be related to particular semantic phenomena?’ or ‘How can these assignments be empirically tested?’ Using the results of well-designed ERP-studies, Baggio et al. (2008, 2010) have shown how a correlation between two known ERP-effects, the N400 and the SAN, and semantic phenomena like the progressive can be established. In this talk we will present an alternative to the formal theory used by Baggio et al. which is based on the technique of combining systems and in which the dynamics of information change is separated from the more static aspects of knowledge representation. Using this two-layered architecture, we hypothesize that the SAN is related to the process of updating a discourse model in the light of new information about changes in the world and therefore with the relation between the two layers, whereas the N400 concerns the more static aspects of discourse models, e.g. the relation between events and persistent objects (swimming is more expected for ducks than for humans). Finally, we will present some test cases for our hypothesis.

**Underspecified representations of scope ambiguity?**

*Janina Radó & Oliver Bott*

The paper presents an online experiment investigating when readers start to compute quantifier scope. In the critical trials participants first had to read a doubly quantified sentence and then incrementally uncover a picture that disambiguated the reading. The reading times show indication of scope conflict well before participants encountered the disambiguation. We discuss implications for semantic underspecification accounts.
Projective behaviour of Nur – quantitative experimental research
Agata Maria Renans

The talk presents the fieldwork manual on formal semantics QUISsem (Renans et al. 2011) and the results of an experiment obtained with the use of QUIS-sem. The exemplary experiment concerns the projective meaning of only. The data from German shows that the prejacent of nur (‘only’) projects easily out of counterfactual if-clauses, whereas its projective behaviour changes while embedding under indicative if-clauses. The obtained results classify projection out of counterfactuals as a reliable test for projective meanings in the cross linguistic perspective, on the one hand, while shedding more light on the semantics of nur and conditionals, on the other.

Presupposition Processing - The Case of German wieder
Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann

Presuppositions are vital for language comprehension, but little remains known about their processing. Using eye tracking in reading, we investigated two issues based on wieder (‘again’). First, we looked at the time course of presupposition processing by testing for processing costs of unsupported presuppositions. Secondly, we tested whether embedding wieder under negation affected this mismatch effect. Presupposition-induced effects showed up immediately after wieder, but only in the unembedded context, suggesting that embedding interferes (at least) with the immediate detection of the mismatch. A follow-up rating study confirmed that there indeed is a mismatch for the embedded context. Detection of the mis-match under embedding thus seems to be delayed in processing.

Poster session

Experimenting with the king of France
Mártta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendrői

Existential presuppositions seem not to appear equally strongly in every sentence (cf. Strawson 1969, Reinhart 1981, von Fintel 2004, etc.). Strawson (1969) (cf. also Reinhart 1981) proposed that definite descriptions trigger an existential presupposition only in topic position. Lasersohn (1993) and von Fintel (2004) dismissed the importance of topichood and argued instead that what is important is verifiability: If a sentence contains an independent NP such that the sentence could be verified based on the properties of this NP, speakers might have enough grounds to accept or reject the sentence whether or not the presupposition of the definite description is satisfied. All the data in the above papers are based on the intuitions of the authors. We designed an experiment to verify the alleged differences between the various (local) linguistic contexts and to test the predictions of the theories. We found that the situation is more complex than appears from
any of the above papers. Both topicality and verifiability is a factor in its own right.

**Adjectives as saturators vs. modifiers: Statistical evidence**  
*Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally*

The paper employs a large-scale, statistical corpus data analysis to support the analysis of ethnic adjectives (EAs, e.g. ‘French’) as modifiers (Arsenijević et al., to appear) over the standard analysis in the syntax literature, on which they can saturate the arguments of nominals (e.g. in ‘French agreement’; Kayne, 1981, among others). We exploited the fact that the two accounts make different predictions about the distribution of EAs vs. the corresponding PPs (e.g. ‘agreement by France’) and constructed a linear regression model to test these predictions using the British National Corpus without doing any semantic tagging. The results support the modifier analysis and illustrate the usefulness of statistical analysis for testing theoretical hypotheses in semantics.

**Licensing Sentence-internal Readings in English: An Experimental Study**  
*Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil*

Adjectives of comparison (AOCs) like *same*, *different* and *similar* can compare two elements sentence-internally, i.e., without referring to any previously introduced element. This reading can only be licensed if some semantically plural NP is present. In contrast to almost all previous literature, we argue in this paper that it is incorrect to describe a particular NP as either licensing or not licensing the sentence-internal reading of a specific AOC. Licensing is more fine-grained. We use experimental methods to establish which NPs license which AOCs and to what extent. Furthermore, we show the advantage of using Bayesian statistics for analyzing data over the traditional, frequentist approach.

**Evaluative adjectives, scale structure, and ways of being polite**  
*Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny*

We investigate gradable properties of evaluative adjectives (EAs), both negative (‘lazy’, ‘ugly’ etc.) and positive (‘charming’, ‘industrious’ etc.). This is a pilot quantitative study limited to several degree modifiers: low-degree modifiers ‘a bit’, ‘a little bit’, ‘slightly’, ‘somewhat’, and a standard-boosting modifier ‘very’. We take distribution of degree modifiers as a diagnostics for scale structure of EAs: low-degree modification is applicable to lower-bound scales, while ‘very’ is commonly taken to be characteristic of totally open scales with relative standards. Our study reveals that negative EAs show properties of both lower-bound and totally open scales at the same time, while positive EAs are canonically open-scale. We try to make sense of this assuming that for negative EAs a ‘polite lower-bound interpretation is systematically available along with the default relative one. This systematic ambiguity is unavailable for positive EAs.
Processing: Free choice at no cost
Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott

A disjunctive sentence such as (1) standardly carries the conjunctive inference that (2)a and (2)b are true. (1) John is allowed to eat an apple or a banana. (2) a. John is allowed to eat an apple. b. John is allowed to eat a banana. This phenomenon is known as Free Choice (FC) permission (Kamp 1973). Current formal models tend to treat FC inferences as a special type of scalar implicature (mostly building on Kratzer & Shimoyama’s 2002 insights, see, e.g., Schulz 2005, Klinedinst 2006, Fox 2007, Chemla 2008, Franke 2011). We present the first processing study of FC. Our results go against the expectations of recent formal analyses, and show that, unlike scalar implicatures, FC inferences come at no processing cost.

Corpus evidence for preference-driven interpretation
Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts

We present a novel corpus of 799 task-oriented dialogues and use it to explore models of discourse in which production and interpretation are driven by the goals and preferences of the discourse participants. We look in particular at the interpretation of question–answer pairs, showing how the corpus’s extensive metadata can be used to pinpoint the effects of domain restriction and to elucidate the forces driving the mention-some/mention-all distinction.

Can children tell us something about the semantics of adjectives?
Francesca Panzeri & Francesca Foppolo

We present two experiments in which Relative Gradable Adjectives were tested with objects that did not evoke any normative class, and were presented in isolation. In Exp. 1, we found that children overwhelmingly accepted “This is Rel-Adj”, while most of the adults opted for the answer-option “I don’t know”. In Exp.2, we tested adults with a similar material but we trained them to be “charitable” and only give them a binary choice (yes/no). Surprisingly, adults turned into children, overwhelmingly accepting a Rel-GA even in the absence of contextual/normative/perceptual cues. We claim that children’s behaviour cannot be easily integrated under a degree-based semantics for GAs (a.o. Kennedy, 2007) in which Rel-GAs are irreducibly comparative. One possibility is that children start by interpreting Rel-GAs as total functions and only later refine their analysis of GAs as partial functions, as assumed under Klein’s analysis.

Variation of Presupposition Projection in Quantified Sentences
Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox

Presupposition projection in quantified sentences is at the center of debates in the presupposition literature. This paper reports on a survey revealing inter-speaker variation regarding which quantifier yields universal inferences. In particular, we
observe an implication that if ‘some’ yields a universal inference for a speaker, ‘no’, and a polar question with ‘any’ do too for the same speaker. We propose an account of this implication based on trivalent theories of presupposition projection together with auxiliary assumptions.

Workshop on Sign Language

The Semantics of Pronouns: Insights and Problems from Sign Language
Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)

It is often thought that sign language indexes are sometimes the overt realization of formal indices (Lillo-Martin and Klima 1990). Some studies of Binding Theory confirm this point, as versions of Condition A, Condition B, as well as Strong and possibly Weak Crossover constraints appear to hold in ASL, among others. The Overtness hypothesis has made it possible to use sign language to bring new insights into some classic questions in semantics, pertaining for instance to donkey anaphora and to temporal and modal anaphora. Still, in other cases there are modality-determined *differences* between sign and spoken language pronouns, involving in particular iconicity. We will attempt to provide a framework that does justice both to the similarities and to some of the differences.

When wide scope is not enough: scope and topicality of discourse referents
Gemma Barberà

This paper aims at determining the semantic properties that discourse referents may have, which lead to the establishment of a location in sign space. It is argued that prominence of the discourse referent interacts with the actual establishment of the spatial location: both wide and narrow scope variables correlate with a location as long as the narrow scope variable denotes the d-topic. Narrow scope variables are introduced with an eyegaze which functions as an operator denoting a de dicto mode. In such contexts, the link with the discourse topic is required. A representational semantic level which integrates a theory of discourse structure with special focus on the d-topic is offered. Data taken from a small-scale Catalan Sign Language corpus is used to argue for the proposed integrated theory.

When Disjunction looks like Conjunction: Pragmatic Consequences in ASL
Kathryn Davidson

In this paper I present the first discussion of disjunction (English “or”) in American Sign Language (ASL) by describing the various devices ASL makes use of for disjunction, including two that look identical to conjunction (“and”) (terminology
used here is from Haspelmath 2006). I also present experimental evidence highlighting a different rate of scalar implicature calculation in ASL based on these disjunctions/conjunction scales compared to other scales in ASL and compared to the disjunction/conjunction scale in English. Results support the view that separate lexical instantiation of contrasting scalar items is a crucial component of scalar implicature calculation.

Quantificational strategies across language modalities
Josep Quer

In this paper I discuss the three varieties of quantificational strategies attested in two signed languages (ASL and LSC (Catalan SL)) and argue that even the apparent instances of pure D-quantification in those languages actually make use of the more “constructional” way of encoding quantificational meanings, i.e. A-quantification. Further, lexical quantification is addressed from the domain of quantifier binding structures.

Degree modification and intensification in ASL adjectives
Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay

The Event Visibility Hypothesis (EVH) was formulated for SLs based on the observation that telic verb signs are distinguished from atelics by end-marking reflecting the final state of telic events. Given the mapping of event structure to scalar structure in adjectives (McNally/Kennedy), and the EVH, it is predicted that closed scalar structure adjectives are end-marked. It will be shown that some categories take modification by SO/VERY whereas others permit only intensification by [+delayed release]; that lower-closed scalar adjectives lacking closed upper boundaries (like ‘far’) can be coerced to have a closed upper boundary reading when combined with a measure phrase providing the limit in ‘too far to walk’; and that the adjective receives a similar nonmanual to telic verbs, indicating that, like the visibility of event structure in verbs, scalar structure is also visible in ASL.

General Programme

Focus, Evidentiality and Soft triggers
Márta Abrusán

Soft triggers are fairly easily suspendable in context (cf. Karttunen 1971, Stalnaker 1974, Simons 2001, Abbott 2006, Abusch 2010, Romoli 2011, Tonhauser 2011, etc.). Two main environments in which this happens have been identified: (1) The presupposition of soft triggers can be suspended by focus (cf. Beaver 2004). In some languages even verbs such as know are sensitive to focus: (2) Simons (2007) has observed that many soft triggers such as hear, see, believe,
*discover, know,* etc. have semantically parenthetical uses which are not presuppositional. This paper offers a way of predicting these facts.

**Polarities in logic and semantics**  
*Arno Bastenhof*

We ask to what extent a satisfactory analysis of non-local scope construal can already be realized without compromising on context-freeness, nor on the association of a unique reading to each syntactic derivation. We show that a variety of data on the topic can be dealt with through an adaptation of classical non-associative Lambek calculus (CNL), taking into account Girard’s concept of polarity. The latter has found application in the constructivization of classical logic, recognizable by computer scientists as the definition of continuation-passing style (CPS) translations. Crucially, we make no appeal to non-context-free mechanisms, nor on the relaxation of compositionality to a mapping of derivations into non-singleton sets of readings.

**Implicit Arguments: Event Modification or Option Type Categories?**  
*Chris Blom, Philippe de Groote, Yoad Winter and Joost Zwarts*

We propose a unified syntactic-semantic account of passive sentences and sentences with an unspecified object (‘John read’). For both constructions, we employ option types for introducing implicit arguments into the syntactic-semantic categorial mechanism. We show the advantages of this approach over previous proposals in the domains of scope and unaccusatives. Unlike pure syntactic treatments, option types immediately derive the obligatory narrow scope of existential quantification over an implicit arguments slot. Unlike purely semantic, event-based treatments, our proposal naturally accounts for syntactic contrasts between passives and unaccusatives, as in ‘the door *(was) opened by John*. After the main system is introduced, some of its further predictions in the domain of optional arguments and event modification are analyzed.

**Each vs. jeweils: A cover-based view on distance-distributivity**  
*Lucas Champollion*

Zimmermann (2002) identifies two classes of distance-distributive items (DD) across languages. The first class is restricted to distribution over individuals; the second class can also be interpreted as distributing over occasions/events. I explain this behavior by formally relating this split to the two distributivity operators proposed in the work of Link (atomic D operator) and Schwarzschild (cover-based operator).

**Cross-categorial donkeys**  
*Simon Charlow*

Ellipsis constructions with unexpected sloppy interpretations are used to argue against situation-based analyses of donkey anaphora. Situation-based accounts
founder because the descriptive content of E-type pronouns causes trouble for both syntactic and semantic ways of ensuring identity between antecedent and ellipsis VPs/clauses. An account of the phenomena is advocated on which the surprising sloppy items are dynamically-bound donkey pronouns. The analysis integrates de Groote’s (2006) variable-free dynamic semantics with Rooth’s (1993) two-stage process for ellipsis resolution. The cross-categorial nature of the relevant phenomena (explored in greater detail in the paper) provide an important argument that donkey anaphora is itself a cross-categorial phenomenon.

On wh-exclamatives and noteworthiness

Anna Chernilovskaya & Rick Nouwen

There are two dominating approaches to the semantics of wh-exclamatives. One approach claims that wh-exclamatives are degree constructions involving degree intensification of a possibly implicit degree property (see, especially, Rett (2011)). The opposing account, mainly due to Zanuttini and Portner (2003), has it that wh-exclamatives involve a mechanism of domain widening. In this paper we show that the mechanisms behind the two competing approaches are basically indistinguishable. Moreover, we point out that there is a kind of wh-exclamatives for which these approaches do not provide the expected semantics. Finally, we put forward a distinctive and crucially much simpler proposal: exclamatives directly express a noteworthiness evaluation, either of the referent associated to the wh-phrase or of the open proposition underlying the exclamative. Crucially, this means we do not consider exclamatives to be a degree phenomenon, nor do we need to assume a widening mechanism.

Generalizing Monotonicity Inferences to Opposition Inferences

Ka-fat Chow

This paper generalizes the definitions of monotonicities to opposition properties (OPs) of determiners and focuses on 4 OPs that are related to the classical contrary, subcontrary and contradictory relations. These OPs are analogous to the monotonicity properties that are related to the superordinate and subordinate relations. Some theorems that will enable us to determine the OPs of determiners will be proposed. Moreover, we will formulate the concept of OP-chain and propose a principle that will enable us to determine the OPs of an iterated quantifier in its arguments based on the OPs of its constituent determiners. By virtue of these results, we can then derive valid opposition inferences of both monadic determiners and iterated quantifiers involving the contrary, subcontrary and contradictory relations.

Exclusive Updates! Brought to you by your local QUD

Elizabeth Coppock & David Beaver

We propose a dynamic semantics within a variant of standard type theory (Ty3; Beaver 2001) in which contexts include not only a common set of beliefs, but also a
question under discussion (QUĐ) whose answers are information states consisting of world-assignment pairs, along with a strength ranking over such answers. The proposed framework satisfies several desiderata arising from the behavior of exclusives (e.g. only, just, mere and sole), including: (i) the possibility of presupposing a question; (ii) quantificational binding into such presupposed questions; (iii) the expressibility of presuppositional constraints regarding the strength ranking over the answers to the question under discussion; (iv) compositional derivation of logical forms for sentences. Along with a grammar fragment and a new, dynamic notion of Strawson Downward Entailment, we use this framework to capture similarities and differences between exclusives manifest in data from paraphrasability, entailments, and NPI licensing.

**Steedman’s Temporality Proposal and Finite Automata**
*Tim Fernando*

In a wide-ranging study, Steedman (2005) proposes that “the so-called temporal semantics of natural language is not primarily to do with time at all” (as given say, by the real line) but that “the formal devices we need are those related to representation of causality and goal-directed action.” The present paper explains why Steedman’s proposal is interesting, and what is added to the proposal by finite automata, implicit in which are notions of causality (labelled transitions) and goal-directed action (final/accepting states). Three strands in theories of aspect isolated in Binnick 2006 are examined: temporal relations, phases, and boundedness. The commonly recognized dichotomy between states and events is linked to that between programs and their runs, as strings representing events are extended to automata.

**Scales, Salience and Referential Safety: The Benefit of the Extreme**
*MICHAEL FRANKE*

This paper argues that signaling games fail to account plausibly for a general preference to use gradable adjectives to communicate extreme values. The reason is that these models focus too narrowly on descriptive language use. Numerical simulations show that the choice of extreme values is pragmatically beneficial in situations of referential language use under possible noise. A preference for extreme values also offers an explanation for Kennedy’s (2007) observation that the topology of the scale a gradable adjective is associated with influences its contextual use conditions. Yet, unlike previous explanations of this observation in terms of psychological salience (Kennedy, 2007; Potts, 2008), this paper contributes a truly functional explanation for this association.

**On the Semantics and Pragmatics of Dysfluency**
*JONATHAN GINZBURG, RAQUEL FERNÁNDEZ AND DAVID SCHLANGEN*

Although dysfluent speech is pervasive in spoken conversation, dysfluencies have received little attention within formal theories of dialogue. The majority of work
on dysfluent language has come from psycholinguistic models of speech production and comprehension and from structural approaches designed to improve performance in speech applications. In this paper, we present a detailed formal account which: (a) unifies dysfluencies (self-repair) with Clarification Requests (CRs), without conflating them, (b) offers a precise explication of the roles of all key components of a dysfluency, including editing phrases and filled pauses, (c) accounts for the possibility of self-addressed questions in a dysfluency.

Pragmatic constraints on gesture use: the effect of downward entailing contexts on gesture processing
Gianluca Giorgolo & Stephanie Needham
Giorgolo (2010) introduces a theory of the joint interpretation of verbal language and co-verbal spontaneous gestures that assumes a tight connection between gesture meaning and the semantic structures of the co-occurring linguistic expression. In this abstract we extend this theory by considering additional pragmatic restrictions that we assume control the use of gestures and that effect the interpretability of a multimodal utterance. This leads to a number of predictions that we are in the process of testing experimentally. We report on some preliminary results obtained in a pilot study. Our goal is to provide support for the hypothesis that gesture and speech are part of a single communicative process which is constructed around the systematic constraints imposed by language. In particular, we believe that our analysis and our experimental results suggest that the interpretation of a gesture is dependent at a very precise level on the logical/semantical structure of the verbal expression it accompanies.

Sameness, Ellipsis and Anaphora
Daniel Hardt, Line Mikkelsen and Bjarne Ørsnes
It is a truism that elliptical and anaphoric expressions are in some sense interpreted the same as the antecedent – in this paper we examine expressions involving explicit assertions of sameness, and we find that they differ in surprising ways from analogous elliptical and anaphoric expressions. We examine “do the same” and compare it to the related forms, VP ellipsis and “do so/it/that”, and we also examine “same” in ordinary NP’s like “the same book”. We conclude that “same” quite generally functions as an additive particle, giving rise to a presupposition similar to “too”; we are not aware that this has been observed previously. Furthermore, we show that “same” must take scope over the minimal containing VP, by covert movement or some other mechanism.

As Simple as It Seems
Vincent Homer
English presents a well-known case of syntax-semantics mismatch known as the “can’t seem to construction” (Langendoen 1970, Jacobson 2006). It consists in
the reversal of the relative scope of “seem” and ability “can”. Only ability “can” lends itself to the scope reversal (SR); the two verbs have to be relatively close to each other; the reversal only occurs in the presence of an expression which denotes a downward-entailing function; “seem” achieves wide scope both over the trigger and can (in that order); contrary to what normally happens in (non-generic) present sentences, the predicate embedded under “seem” need not be stative. We show that SR is not illusive (contra Jacobson 2006) and is due to the covert movement of “seem”, a positive polarity item.

On the Non-Licensing of NPIs in the Only-Focus
I-Ta Chris Hsieh

While the grammaticality of NPIs in the scope of ‘only’ receives great attention (e.g., (1a); Klima 1964; Ladusaw 1979; von Fintel 1999; Giannakidou 2006; a.o.), the non-licensing of these items in the only-focus is rarely discussed (e.g., (1b); Wagner 2006; Horn 1996; a.o.).

(1) a. Only [John]F ate any vegetables
   b. *Only [any student]F ate vegetables.

This paper focuses on the non-licensing of NPIs in the only-focus; first I show that with the SDE condition of NPI licensing (von Fintel 1999), the non-licensing of NPIs in the only-focus is predicted by a Fox-style semantics of ‘only’ (Fox 2007), which appeals to innocent exclusion, but not a Horn-style one. The proposed analysis suggests that assuming a (Fauconnier-Ladusaw-von Fintel) DE-based approach, a revision of the SDE condition that is context-independent and refers to assignment functions is called for.

Now: A Discourse-Based Theory
Julie Hunter

This paper offers an account of examples in which “now” refers to a time in the past of the utterance event. Contrary to existing theories of “now”, e.g., Kamp & Reyle (1993) and Lee & Choi (2009), I argue that the interpretation of “now” in such examples is determined by the rhetorical structure of the discourse in which the example figures. A full theory of rhetorical structure is needed to account for these examples.

Obligatory implicatures and grammaticality
Natalia Ivlieva

In this paper we address the question whether scalar implicatures of a sentence could prevent it from being grammatical. In many theories of scalar implicatures it is predicted to be impossible. We argue, however, that the answer is yes, but that happens in a limited number of cases, namely when a scalar implicature of a given single sentence has to be calculated but potentially leads to a contradiction.
if conjoined with another scalar implicature of the sentence (is not innocently excludable, Fox 2006). This is illustrated by a puzzling data on agreement with disjunctions in Russian.

**Only ‘only’. An experimental window on exclusiveness**  
*Jacques Jayez & Bob van Tiel*

The ‘standard theory’ (Horn 1967) for ‘only’ claims that ‘only P’ presupposes that P (the so-called ‘prejacent’) and asserts that alternatives to P are false. This approach has been challenged in a number of ways. We focus here on Beaver and Clarke’s (2008) recent proposal (B&C), which entails in particular that ‘only P’ does NOT presuppose P, partly on the basis of experimental data. We review their experiment and show that it is not conclusive and that their theory is problematic. We present the results of a large-scale experiment on several triggers in English, Dutch and French. Whereas the English data support B&C’s claim on ‘only’, the Dutch (‘alleen’) and French (‘seulement’) counterparts are quite standard and seemingly presuppose their prejacent. Given the fact that (i) verbs like ‘manage’ behave like ‘only’, and (ii) the French ‘seulement’ behaves exactly like ‘only’ in every other respect, we conclude that the observed differences are not due to a special status of the prejacent but are better explained by postulating that presupposed propositions can be affected by truth-conditional operators like negation to various degrees, depending on the language and the lexical trigger under consideration.

**Scope underspecification by expansion**  
*Udo Klein*

In this paper I will propose a theory of quantification and scope underspecification, where contrary to the standard view (i) the denotation of the underspecified representation does indeed capture what the possible readings all have in common, and (ii) the specification of an underspecified denotation amounts to adding information, so that there is a clear sense in which the underspecified denotation is part of every specified reading.

**On the Grounding Status of Appositive Relative Clauses**  
*Todor Koev*

It is usually assumed in the literature that appositive relative clauses (ARCs) (i) project, i.e. are not affected by truth-conditional operators in the main clause and (ii) are backgrounded, i.e. are not part of the main point of the utterance (see Chierchia & McConnell-Ginet 1990, Potts 2005, Simons et al. 2010). In this paper I focus on the latter property and demonstrate that ARCs are not inherently backgrounded but rather their grounding status depends on their surface position. Roughly, clause-medial ARCs are backgrounded whereas clause-final ARCs are (or can be) foregrounded. I provide a uniform account of ARCs according to
which appositive content is backgrounded only if it updates the context before the main clause content is accepted. Building on AnderBois et al. (2010), I implement the proposal in Dynamic Predicate Logic with propositional variables. I also demonstrate that only clause-final ARCs can advance the reference time in narrative discourses and propose a structurally similar account.

**Definite Theory of Superlatives**  
_Sveta Krasikova_

We develop a new analysis of the superlative that successfully handles some longstanding problems in resolving the absolute/comparative ambiguity. The analysis follows the spirit of Stateva’s dissertation, in treating the superlative as an anaphoric expression depending on a measure function salient in the context. The main advantage of our proposal over existing analyses is that the definite article is not ignored but contributes to creating the superlative degree description.

**The accommodation potential of implicative verbs**  
_Noor van Leusen_

We present an analysis of implicative verbs, a class of complement-taking verbs known for their specific projection behaviour since Karttunen (1971). Implicative verbs induce polarity sensitive entailments (Nairn et al. 2006), but are also claimed to trigger presuppositions. What is presupposed, however, is much more diffuse and variable than with e.g. factive verbs. We provide a formal treatment in Logical Description Grammar (van Leusen and Muskens 2003) and consider the implications of handling this class of verbs for the theory of accommodation, cf. Beaver and Zeevat (2006). It is argued that what is accommodated need not be precisely the linguistically presupposed material but can be any background information that explains the presupposition or makes it more likely, in support of models of interpretation which integrate linguistic and pragmatic presupposition.

**Inflection and derivation: how adjectives and nouns refer to abstract objects**  
_Louise McNally & Henriette de Swart_

The study of nominalization raises foundational questions about the relation between adjectives and nouns in the way they refer to abstract objects. We analyze the three-way distinction in Dutch between expressions that refer to color/taste (e.g. ‘het rood/het rode/de roodheid van de aardbeien’ ‘the red/the red+e/the redness of the strawberries’). We assume that noun and adjective ‘rood’ derive from an uncategorized root. We treat ‘rood’ in ‘het rood’ as a noun, referring to a shade of color. Derivational ‘-heid’ turns adjective ‘rood’ into a noun; thus ‘roodheid’ denotes instantiations (bits) of redness in individual objects. We take ‘rode’ to be an adjective; the inflectional suffix ‘-e’ enriches the valence of the adjective, creating a relation such that ‘het rode van de aardbeien’ is interpreted
as ‘the red aspect of the strawberries’, where ‘het’ denotes Chierchia’s (1984) nominalizer cap, embedding the AP directly under DP.

Tropes, Intensional Relative Clauses and the Notion of a Variable Object  
Friederike Moltmann

It is a common view that NPs like ‘the originality of the book’ or ‘the length of the paper’ refer to tropes or particularized properties. This view faces a serious challenge from NPs of the sort ‘the originality of the book he plans to write’ or ‘the length of the paper he needs to write’. I propose an account of such NPs based on a notion of a variable object and argue that it is superior to an account that would make use of individual concepts, not only conceptually, but also empirically.

A Theory of Names and True Intensionality  
Reinhard Muskens

Standard approaches to proper names, such as Kripke’s, hold that (a) intensions of expressions are functions from possible worlds to extensions and (b) names are rigid designators, i.e. their intensions are constant functions from worlds to entities. The difficulties with these approaches are well-known and in this paper we develop an alternative. Based on earlier work on a higher order logic that is truly intensional in the sense that it does not validate the axiom schema of Extensionality, we develop a simple theory of names in which Kripke’s intuitions are accounted for, but the unpalatable consequences of the traditional theory are avoided.

Multiple Foci in Japanese Clefts and the Growth of Semantic Representation  
Tohru Seraku

Japanese clefts are divided into two types, depending on whether a focus item has a case particle: “clefts+P” (i.e. clefts with a particle) and “cleftsP” (i.e. clefts without a particle).

(2) [Tom-ga nagu-tta no]-wa Mary(-o) da.  
T.-NOM hit-PAST NO]-TOP M.(-ACC) COP  
‘It is Mary that Tom hit.’

It is well known that multiple foci are possible only in clefts+P (Koizumi 2000).

(3) [Tom-ga age-ta no]-wa  
T.-NOM give-PAST NO]-TOP  
Mary*(-ni) purezento*(-o) da.  
M.(-DAT) present(-ACC) COP  
Lit. ‘It is Mary, a present, that Tom gave φ_i φ_j.’
In the literature, the asymmetry concerning multiple foci in Japanese has been treated syntactically (Hiraiwa and Ishihara to appear). This paper proposes that such syntactic issues can be handled as an outcome of semantic-structure building: a parser builds up semantic structure of clefts incrementally, with the machinery of “structural underspecification and subsequent resolution”. More specifically, each node for a focus item is unfixed in semantic structure and needs to be fixed by a case particle before a next focus is parsed. Thus, multiple foci are licit only if each focus has a case particle to resolve underspecification; hence, multiple foci are possible only in clefts+P.

A Modal Analysis of the Perfective in Slavic
Sergei Tatevosov (cancelled)

The perfective has never been among those aspectual operators that are believed to deserve a modal analysis (e.g., Dowty 1979, Landman 1992, Portner 1998, a.o. for the perfective and Katz 2003, Portner 2003 for the perfect). However, I argue that properties of the perfective in Slavic languages are best accounted for if its semantics is endowed with a modal component, too. Evidence for the proposal comes from aspectual composition in Slavic. Specifically, I propose that the contribution of the Slavic perfective to the interpretation is two-fold. First, it introduces an operator in Klein’s (1994) style mapping predicates of events to predicates of times. Secondly and crucially, to say that the perfective sentence is true in our world we need to make sure that the event does not continue in accessible worlds as long as it falls under the same event description. This idea is implemented within Kratzer’s (1977, 1981 and elsewhere) double relative theory of modality.

Nuu-chah-nulth Evidentials and the Origo
Ryan Waldie

This paper investigates the nature of the origo— the person from whose perspective a proposition is evaluated— using data from Nuu-chah-nulth. The origo is also the receiver of information indicated by evidentials, and I look at the interactions between the two systems. I present three ways an origo can be assigned, and show how this results in the shifted indexical behaviour of evidentials in complement clauses. I also argue that the pragmatics of assertion and the origo argument together conspire to yield the effect of a direct evidential.

Focus, Uniqueness and Soft Presupposition Triggers
Andreas Walker

This paper investigates the behaviour of the definite article in the context of the sentence (1) ‘John only saw the [GERman]F professor’. As von Heusinger (2007) observed, its uniqueness presuppositions are not copied in the alternative set. Instead of assuming a special lexical entry for the definite article, we provide data
showing that it behaves as a soft presupposition trigger with respect to its uniqueness presupposition, and suggest that the presuppositions of soft presupposition triggers need not be copied in the context of a sentence like (1).

You again: How is its ambiguity derived?
Ting Xu

It is well-known that a sentence with a complex predicate modified by again displays a repetitive vs. restitutive ambiguity. The former presupposes that the subject has previously performed the action denoted by the VP. The latter presupposes that the result state has held before. It either held from the very beginning or came into being as a result of someone else performing the action. Like English again, Chinese you ‘again’ modifying a resultative verb compound also exhibits a repetitive vs. restitutive ambiguity. However, Chinese differs from English in that the position of you ‘again’ is relatively fixed: it can only occur preverbally but not postverbally. This study examines how the ambiguity of Chinese you is derived. Investigating the scope interaction between you ‘again’ and an indefinite object, I argue that the ambiguity of you ‘again’ is structural but not lexical. I further propose that you ‘again’ moves overtly as a last resort to satisfy a PF requirement specific to Chinese.
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