

Additivity? A Matter of Superset-to-Subset Inferences

Madeleine Butschety (University of Graz) – madeleine.butschety@uni-graz.at

Poster Presentation at GLOW 42 (University of Oslo) – May 8, 2019

This paper discusses a phenomenon that appears when a phrase consisting of an additive particle and its argument associates with a QNP which occurs within the same sentence or in an antecedent sentence, as in (1). Such syntactic constructions give rise to two distinct readings. On the ‘exclusive’ reading (paraphrased in (1-a)), the additive particle’s argument is interpreted as being a member of the set of individuals that are in the nuclear scope (S) of the quantifier, but not in its restrictor (R). Given common analyses from the literature (cf. Beaver & Clark 2008, among others), this is the meaning we expect an additive particle to convey; although it might not be the common way to get to it. But on what I call the ‘inclusive’ reading (paraphrased in (1-b)), the argument of the additive particle is rather understood to be a member of the set $R \cap S$ – an interpretation which is neither predicted nor investigated in the literature yet.

- (1) Every assistant professor will have some questions concerning this theory. You too.
- You and every assistant professor will have questions concerning this theory.
 - Every ass. professor will have questions concerning this theory. This includes you.

Based on data from German, I argue that the distinction between ‘exclusive’ and ‘inclusive’ is not just due to pragmatic reasoning or rather inferences, as an *ad hoc* analysis of (1) and similar examples might suggest, but caused by syntactic as well as semantic factors. Specifically, on the basis of three different types of sentence constructions as shown in (2), I explain how ‘inclusion’ vs. ‘exclusion’ is related to syntactic structure and semantic derivation.

- (2)
- Jeder Student, auch Hans, hat geschlafen.
every student too Hans has slept (INCLUSIVE only, i.e. Hans = student)
 - Jeder Student hat geschlafen. Hans auch.
every student has slept Hans too (EXCLUSIVE favored, i.e. Hans \neq student)
 - Jeder Student hat geschlafen, auch Hans.
every student has slept too Hans (INCLUSIVE/EXCLUSIVE ambiguity)

The main claim of this account is that additive phrases can not only yield ‘exclusive’, but also ‘inclusive’ interpretations because their underlying mechanism is not one of (common sense) additivity, but providing a subset-relation to an antecedent superset. Hence, this theory treats the German additive particle *auch* (‘too, also’) as associating with either a QNP or VP, which’s denotation serves as superset for *auch*’s argument. To assure that association with a QNP gives us the correct superset – especially in case we are dealing with a negative quantifier –, I adopt assumptions from recent accounts on complement anaphora (in particular Schmitt, Onea & Buch 2017) and thereby also show how these two pieces of data strongly interact with each other. Applying the parts of this theory to non-quantified constructions involving *auch* – i.e. the association with VP case – as a final step in this analysis further highlights its crucial point: If we think additivity slightly different, namely as superset-to-subset inference, that will give us the advantage of correctly predicting ‘inclusive’ as well as ‘exclusive’ readings and overcoming the specific additive presupposition an additive particle is commonly assumed to give rise to.

References: Beaver, David and Brady Clark (2008): *Sense and Sensitivity. How Focus Determines Meaning*. Malden, MA/Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell – Schmitt, Viola; Edgar Onea and Friederike Buch (2017): Restrictions on complement anaphora. In D. Burgdorf, J. Collard, S. Maspong and S. Stefánsdóttir (eds.) *Proceedings of SALT 27*, p. 212-229