

Comments on
"Sufficiency with
modals and imperatives"
by Cleo Condoravdi

SARO Workshop
ZAS, Berlin

Luka Crnić
29/6/2024

SMCS with "only"

To get good cheese, you only have to go to the North End.

Prejacent Puzzle

$\nRightarrow \square NE$

Sufficiency & Means

$\Rightarrow \diamond NE \wedge \neg \square (NYC \vee Norm)$

$\Rightarrow NE \rightarrow \text{good cheese}$

Scalarity/Minimality

$\Rightarrow NE$ is the least effortful action that leads to getting good cheese

Splitting

vF & 1 05, 07, A0 & H 21

Split LF: $\boxed{OP_2} [\square [\boxed{OP_1} \text{ you go to the NE}]]$

$\square (\underline{NE \vee NYC \vee Norm})$

$\wedge \rightarrow \square (\underline{NYC \vee Norm})$

$\Rightarrow \diamond NE$
sufficiency

$\rightsquigarrow NE \rightarrow \text{good cheese}$
means

$\nRightarrow \square NE$
no prejacent

\Rightarrow scalarity / minimality
(inference of OP_2 , possibly)

Overgeneration issues?

cf. vF & 1 OS, OZ

Non-split LF: $[OP_2 [OP_1 [\Box \text{you go to the NE}]]]$

$\Box NE \vee \Box NYC \vee \Box Norm$
 $\wedge \neg(\Box NYC \vee \Box Norm)$

$\Rightarrow \Box NE \wedge \neg \Box NYC \wedge \neg \Box Norm$

very limited/impossible(?)
non-split parses w/
goal-oriented modality

* Reimbursement Ex.
 has other flavor?

limited/impossible(?)
split parses w/
other modalities

According to the law, you only have to report_F the crime.

$\Rightarrow \Box \text{report}$ # merely $\Rightarrow \Diamond \text{report}$

Gali is only planning to go to the NE_F during her visit.

$\Rightarrow \Box NE$ # merely $\Rightarrow \Diamond NE$

the error

re-diagnosing the pre-jacent problem

Cendoravi: & Francez argue we evaluate the models in the premise and the conclusion wrt different ordering sources (equivocation fallacy).

Premise

... only have to ...
fig

$$\exists \lambda w. \text{effort}_w^{\text{fig}}(\text{getting } g_c) \leq d \mid d \in q(w)$$

effort minimization
features in the ordering
source of the premise only

Conclusion

... have to ...
fig*

$$\exists \lambda w. \text{effort}_w^{\text{fig}^*}(\text{getting } g_c) \leq d \mid d \in q^*(w) = \emptyset$$

towards a theory of the error

"only" triggers
a scalar inference

note that in these contexts
the presence of "only"
contextually entails the
negation of the alternatives...

→ this cues/triggers
effort minimization

(vs. more flexibility
in imperatives)

↙ absent "only",
effort minimization
is not easily accessible

→ operative only
with goal-oriented
modality

"Only" and exceptives

h72, vF93, vF&1 05,07

strong inferences

Only the NE has good cheese.

No place except the NE has good cheese.
other than
but

} ⇒ the NE has good cheese

According to the law, you are not required to do anything except report the crime.

⇒ you are required to report the crime

smcs with exceptives

vF 8 | 05, 07

weak inferences

To get good cheese, you do not have to
go to any place other than the NE.
except
but

$\nRightarrow \Box NE$

$\Rightarrow \Diamond NE \wedge \rightarrow \Box (Nyc \vee Norm)$

Updating Splitting

qaj 08, cr22, cf. vF 93, qaj 13, 16, cr18

you went nowhere except to the North End.

LF: [max place except NE] [λD you went to no D]

$\text{Max}_{\mathcal{P}(E)} (D) (\Delta)$ presupposes $\forall D' \in \mathcal{P}(E): D' \neq D \rightarrow \neg \Delta(D')$
asserts $\Delta(D)$

$\text{Max}_{\mathcal{P}(E)} (\{NYC, Norm\}) (\lambda D. \neg (\exists x \in D: \text{you go to } x))$

pres: $(NYC \vee NE \vee Norm) \wedge (NE \vee Norm) \wedge (NE \vee NYC) \wedge NE$

ast: $\neg(NYC \vee Norm)$

obvious extension to "only" (cr22)

Updating splitting

LF: [max place except NE] [λD [\neg [\Box [you go to a D]]]]

$\text{Max}_{P(E)} (\xi_{NYC}, \text{Norm}) (\lambda D. \neg \Box (\exists x \in D : \text{you go to } x))$

pres: $\Box (NYC \vee \text{Norm} \vee NE) \wedge \Box (NE \vee NYC) \wedge \Box (NE \vee \text{Norm}) \wedge \Box NE$

ast: $\neg \Box (NYC \vee \text{Norm})$

contextually entails
due to effort + minimization

a weakening backdoor

$$\text{Max}_{\mathcal{P}(E)}(D)(\Delta) \rightsquigarrow \text{Max}_C(D)(\Delta)$$

ranges over $\mathcal{P}(E)$ ranges over $C \subseteq \mathcal{P}(E)$

Pruning of domains/alternatives (partial & sketchy):

- ① only if this leads to N-weakening (cf. ccf 15 fl 15)
 - ② (only) if this is necessary for assertability (cf. St 7°)
- (+ no symmetry breaking, etc.)

deriving weaker inferences

$$\text{Max}_c (\exists \text{NYC}, \text{Norm}) (\lambda D. \neg \Box (\exists x \in D : \text{you go to } x))$$

pres: $\Box (\text{NYC} \vee \text{Norm} \vee \text{NE}) \wedge \Box (\text{NE} \vee \text{NYC}) \wedge \Box (\text{NE} \vee \text{Norm}) \wedge \Box \text{NE}$

ast: $\neg \Box (\text{NYC} \vee \text{Norm})$

\Rightarrow $\Diamond \text{NE}$
sufficiency

\rightsquigarrow $\text{NE} \rightarrow$ good cheese
means

\nRightarrow $\Box \text{NE}$
no prejaquent

but scalarity/minimality
is not derived. While one
could write it into Max perhaps,
one really shouldn't...

but note
Kai's comment:
"Jay is nothing
but a poor
student."

weaker inferences more broadly

recall that pruning is licensed if it is required for assertability. this is the case in smc examples since the prejacent entails the negation of the alternatives.

Prediction:

According to the law,

you are only required to do exactly one thing when witnessing a crime.

imperatives and their force

h&r 12, oik 16, cf. p10, c & 12, vF & 12

you've asked me to paint these tables, but I'm tired and don't feel like doing something really useful.

→ "◇" > only ("acquiescence")
(or $\exists_m \square_m > \text{only}$, or...) (cf. kl 05
rm 00)

Only paint the round_F table.

only > "◇"
(or $\square > \text{only}$)



Oh, I feel like doing something really useful today. I think I'll paint the tables over there.

Only paint the round_F table.

Smcs with imperatives

suggestive paraphrase & exclusive distribution

to get good cheese, just go to the North End
only

to get good cheese, you can just go to the NE
only

expectation: if "∩" construal is impossible, so is the smc reading

Partial references

Alonso-Ovalle & Hirschl. 2021. SemPrag.

Condoravdi & Francez. 2022. AC.

van Fintel & Intridon. 2007. LI.

Fleisher. 2015. JoS.

Gajewski. 2008. NALS.

Haida & Repp. 2012. SuB16.

Horn. 1972. Diss.

Oikarinenon. 2016. Diss.