

Ezra Keshet
University of Michigan

LOCAL IMPLICATURES AND THE STRUCTURE OF DISCOURSE

25.02.2011, 12:00-12:30

Geach (1962) proposed that anaphora across two sentences such as those in (1a) could be modeled with bound variables, suggesting a unified Logical Form like (1b). Evans (1980) points out a flaw in this proposal: although (1b) should be compatible with a scenario in which Harry vaccinates a proper subset of John's sheep, the discourse in (1a) asserts that Harry vaccinates all of them.

- (1) a. John owns some sheep. Harry vaccinates them in the spring. (Evans 1980)
b. $[[\text{some sheep}]_i \text{ } [[\text{John owns } t_i] \text{ } [\text{Harry vaccinates them}_i]]]$

My solution to this counterexample starts with (2) – another of Evans's examples. When *only* appears in a clause A, it takes scope over A and ensures that no stronger alternative to A is true (Rooth 1985, von Stechow 1994). If the two sentences formed a syntactic unit, the DP could scope in a position high enough to bind the pronoun in the second clause, as shown in (3a). This structure yields the correct meaning in (3b), even as Geach's analysis is maintained.

- (2) Only one man drank champagne. He got sick. (after Evans 1980)
(3) a. $[[\text{one man}]_i \text{ } [[\text{only } t_i \text{ drank champagne}] \text{ } [\text{he}_i \text{ got sick}]]]$
b. There's one man x such that only x drank champagne and x got sick.

Fox (2004) and Chierchia et al. (2008) have argued that local implicatures arise due to an exhaustive operator whose meaning is almost identical to that of *only*. Assuming this new operator appears in (1a) allows us to analyze this sentence analogously to (2).