

# Using TerraLing to investigate the semantic typology of conjunction

Nina Haslinger (University of Göttingen) & Viola Schmitt (University of Graz)

TerraLing workshop  
September 18-19, 2020

## Point of this talk

## Point of this talk

- Sketch one of the research questions from our former project

### 'Conjunction and disjunction from a typological perspective' (2016-19, FWF)

- Project website: <https://www.univie.ac.at/konjunktion/>
- TerraLing group: <https://www.terraling.com/groups/8>
- Other members: Enrico Flor, Valentin Panzirsch, Eva Rosina, Magdalena Roszkowski, Valerie Wurm
- First semantic project using TerraLing

## Point of this talk

- Sketch one of the research questions from our former project

### 'Conjunction and disjunction from a typological perspective' (2016-19, FWF)

- Project website: <https://www.univie.ac.at/konjunktion/>
  - TerraLing group: <https://www.terraling.com/groups/8>
  - Other members: Enrico Flor, Valentin Panzirsch, Eva Rosina, Magdalena Roszkowski, Valerie Wurm
  - First semantic project using TerraLing
- Focus on how we targeted the questions via TerraLing (some good features of our methodology, some things we could have done better)

## Point of this talk

- Sketch one of the research questions from our former project

### 'Conjunction and disjunction from a typological perspective' (2016-19, FWF)

- Project website: <https://www.univie.ac.at/konjunktion/>
  - TerraLing group: <https://www.terraling.com/groups/8>
  - Other members: Enrico Flor, Valentin Panzirsch, Eva Rosina, Magdalena Roszkowski, Valerie Wurm
  - First semantic project using TerraLing
- Focus on how we targeted the questions via TerraLing (some good features of our methodology, some things we could have done better)
  - Sketch one of the results

## Point of this talk

- Sketch one of the research questions from our former project

### 'Conjunction and disjunction from a typological perspective' (2016-19, FWF)

- Project website: <https://www.univie.ac.at/konjunktion/>
  - TerraLing group: <https://www.terraling.com/groups/8>
  - Other members: Enrico Flor, Valentin Panzirsch, Eva Rosina, Magdalena Roszkowski, Valerie Wurm
  - First semantic project using TerraLing
- Focus on how we targeted the questions via TerraLing (some good features of our methodology, some things we could have done better)
  - Sketch one of the results
  - Relate it to our ongoing work

- 1 Research questions: Example
- 2 Why we decided to use TerraLing – advantages and pitfalls
- 3 Structure of our questions and definitions
- 4 Some generalizations from our data set

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

- (1) *Ada and Bea received exactly 100 euros.*

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

(1) *Ada and Bea received exactly 100 euros.*

### DISTRIBUTIVE interpretation

‘DISTRIBUTIVE’ SCENARIO: Ada and Bea spent the afternoon working at a store.  
Ada received 100 euros. Bea received 100 euros.

⇒ *[[received exactly 100 euros]]* holds of **each individual** picked out by a conjunct.

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

(1) *Ada and Bea received exactly 100 euros.*

### DISTRIBUTIVE interpretation

‘DISTRIBUTIVE’ SCENARIO: Ada and Bea spent the afternoon working at a store. Ada received 100 euros. Bea received 100 euros.

⇒ *[[received exactly 100 euros]]* holds of **each individual** picked out by a conjunct.

### Non-distributive interpretations

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

(1) *Ada and Bea received exactly 100 euros.*

### DISTRIBUTIVE interpretation

‘**DISTRIBUTIVE**’ SCENARIO: Ada and Bea spent the afternoon working at a store. Ada received 100 euros. Bea received 100 euros.

⇒  $\llbracket$ *received exactly 100 euros* $\rrbracket$  holds of **each individual** picked out by a conjunct.

### Non-distributive interpretations

‘**COLLECTIVE**’ SCENARIO: Ada and Bea translated an article together. As a team, they received 100 euros for the translation.

Individuals picked out by conjuncts have the property  $\llbracket$ *received exactly 100 euros* $\rrbracket$  **as a group**.

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

(1) *Ada and Bea received exactly 100 euros.*

### DISTRIBUTIVE interpretation

‘**DISTRIBUTIVE**’ SCENARIO: Ada and Bea spent the afternoon working at a store. Ada received 100 euros. Bea received 100 euros.

⇒ *[[received exactly 100 euros]]* holds of **each individual** picked out by a conjunct.

### Non-distributive interpretations

‘**COLLECTIVE**’ SCENARIO: Ada and Bea translated an article together. As a team, they received 100 euros for the translation.

Individuals picked out by conjuncts have the property *[[received exactly 100 euros]]* **as a group**.

‘**CUMULATIVE**’ SCENARIO: Ada and Bea spent the afternoon working at a store. Ada received 60 euros. Bea received 40 euros.

Individuals picked out by conjuncts have properties that **‘add up’ to receiving exactly 100 euros**.

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

Two distinct readings?

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

### Two distinct readings?

- In many cases not clear if there are two distinct readings or a single weak reading.

(2) *Ada and Bea read the books.*

The **DISTRIBUTIVE** interpretation entails the **CUMULATIVE** one.

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

### Two distinct readings?

- In many cases not clear if there are two distinct readings or a single weak reading.

(2) *Ada and Bea read the books.*

The **DISTRIBUTIVE** interpretation entails the **CUMULATIVE** one.

- But the readings can be distinguished if we use predicates with **measure phrases** (*100 euros, 10 meters*) or **numeral-modified plurals** (*five bananas, ten books*).

(3) *Ada and Bea earned 100 euros.*

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

### Two distinct readings?

- In many cases not clear if there are two distinct readings or a single weak reading.

(2) *Ada and Bea read the books.*

The **DISTRIBUTIVE** interpretation entails the **CUMULATIVE** one.

- But the readings can be distinguished if we use predicates with **measure phrases** (*100 euros, 10 meters*) or **numeral-modified plurals** (*five bananas, ten books*).

(3) *Ada and Bea earned 100 euros.*

- With modifiers that impose both upper and lower bounds (*exactly 100 euros, exactly five bananas*), the two readings become logically independent.

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

### Two distinct readings?

- In many cases not clear if there are two distinct readings or a single weak reading.

(2) *Ada and Bea read the books.*

The **DISTRIBUTIVE** interpretation entails the **CUMULATIVE** one.

- But the readings can be distinguished if we use predicates with **measure phrases** (*100 euros, 10 meters*) or **numeral-modified plurals** (*five bananas, ten books*).

(3) *Ada and Bea earned 100 euros.*

- With modifiers that impose both upper and lower bounds (*exactly 100 euros, exactly five bananas*), the two readings become logically independent.

### Lexical ambiguity of *and*?

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

### Two distinct readings?

- In many cases not clear if there are two distinct readings or a single weak reading.

(2) *Ada and Bea read the books.*

The **DISTRIBUTIVE** interpretation entails the **CUMULATIVE** one.

- But the readings can be distinguished if we use predicates with **measure phrases** (*100 euros, 10 meters*) or **numeral-modified plurals** (*five bananas, ten books*).

(3) *Ada and Bea earned 100 euros.*

- With modifiers that impose both upper and lower bounds (*exactly 100 euros, exactly five bananas*), the two readings become logically independent.

### Lexical ambiguity of *and*?

Counterargument for English (Dowty 1987)

(4) *Ada and Bea met at the bar and had exactly two beers.*

*Met at the bar* requires non-distributive reading, but *had exactly two beers* still permits both readings.

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

### Null hypothesis

Conjunctive coordinators that syntactically behave like *and* have a **unified meaning cross-linguistically**  $\Rightarrow$  no lexical distributive/non-distributive ambiguity

Matthewson 2001, Bochnak 2013: strongest possible null hypothesis = no variation

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

### Null hypothesis

Conjunctive coordinators that syntactically behave like *and* have a **unified meaning cross-linguistically**  $\Rightarrow$  no lexical distributive/non-distributive ambiguity

Matthewson 2001, Bochnak 2013: strongest possible null hypothesis = no variation

**Note:** Does not mean all languages have coordinators that behave like *and*

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

### Null hypothesis

Conjunctive coordinators that syntactically behave like *and* have a **unified meaning cross-linguistically**  $\Rightarrow$  no lexical distributive/non-distributive ambiguity

Matthewson 2001, Bochnak 2013: strongest possible null hypothesis = no variation

**Note:** Does not mean all languages have coordinators that behave like *and*

**If so, what should the unified meaning look like?**

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

### Null hypothesis

Conjunctive coordinators that syntactically behave like *and* have a **unified meaning cross-linguistically**  $\Rightarrow$  no lexical distributive/non-distributive ambiguity

Matthewson 2001, Bochnak 2013: strongest possible null hypothesis = no variation

**Note:** Does not mean all languages have coordinators that behave like *and*

**If so, what should the unified meaning look like?**

Distributive-quantifier hypothesis

Winter (2001), Champollion (2015) a.o.

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

### Null hypothesis

Conjunctive coordinators that syntactically behave like *and* have a **unified meaning cross-linguistically** ⇒ no lexical distributive/non-distributive ambiguity

Matthewson 2001, Bochnak 2013: strongest possible null hypothesis = no variation

**Note:** Does not mean all languages have coordinators that behave like *and*

### If so, what should the unified meaning look like?

#### Distributive-quantifier hypothesis

Winter (2001), Champollion (2015) a.o.

Conjunctive coordinators lexically form **distributive generalized quantifiers**.

⇒ **DISTRIBUTIVE** reading derived directly; **NON-DISTRIBUTIVE** reading requires **additional operators**.

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

### Null hypothesis

Conjunctive coordinators that syntactically behave like *and* have a **unified meaning cross-linguistically** ⇒ no lexical distributive/non-distributive ambiguity

Matthewson 2001, Bochnak 2013: strongest possible null hypothesis = no variation

**Note:** Does not mean all languages have coordinators that behave like *and*

### If so, what should the unified meaning look like?

**Distributive-quantifier hypothesis** Winter (2001), Champollion (2015) a.o.

Conjunctive coordinators lexically form **distributive generalized quantifiers**.

⇒ **DISTRIBUTIVE** reading derived directly; **NON-DISTRIBUTIVE** reading requires **additional operators**.

**Plural-based hypothesis**

Link (1983, 1987) a.o.

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

### Null hypothesis

Conjunctive coordinators that syntactically behave like *and* have a **unified meaning cross-linguistically** ⇒ no lexical distributive/non-distributive ambiguity

Matthewson 2001, Bochnak 2013: strongest possible null hypothesis = no variation

**Note:** Does not mean all languages have coordinators that behave like *and*

### If so, what should the unified meaning look like?

**Distributive-quantifier hypothesis** Winter (2001), Champollion (2015) a.o.

Conjunctive coordinators lexically form **distributive generalized quantifiers**.

⇒ **DISTRIBUTIVE** reading derived directly; **NON-DISTRIBUTIVE** reading requires **additional operators**.

**Plural-based hypothesis** Link (1983, 1987) a.o.

Conjunctive coordinators lexically form **pluralities** ('group'/'sum' individuals)

⇒ **NON-DISTRIBUTIVE** readings derived directly; **DISTRIBUTIVE** reading is either due to predicate or requires **additional operators**.

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

English data won't help us decide between the **distributive-quantifier** and the **plural-based hypothesis**.

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

English data won't help us decide between the **distributive-quantifier** and the **plural-based hypothesis**.

**How can cross-linguistic data help?**

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

English data won't help us decide between the **distributive-quantifier** and the **plural-based hypothesis**.

### **How can cross-linguistic data help?**

If one reading universally requires additional operators, it corresponds to 'bigger' LF structures cross-linguistically.

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

English data won't help us decide between the **distributive-quantifier** and the **plural-based hypothesis**.

### **How can cross-linguistic data help?**

If one reading universally requires additional operators, it corresponds to 'bigger' LF structures cross-linguistically.

Assumption: Morphosyntactic containment reflects LF 'complexity'

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

English data won't help us decide between the **distributive-quantifier** and the **plural-based hypothesis**.

### **How can cross-linguistic data help?**

If one reading universally requires additional operators, it corresponds to 'bigger' LF structures cross-linguistically.

**Assumption: Morphosyntactic containment reflects LF 'complexity'**

If one reading corresponds to a more complex LF that 'contains' the LF for the other reading, this containment relation should be **morphosyntactically transparent in at least some languages**.

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

English data won't help us decide between the **distributive-quantifier** and the **plural-based hypothesis**.

### **How can cross-linguistic data help?**

If one reading universally requires additional operators, it corresponds to 'bigger' LF structures cross-linguistically.

**Assumption: Morphosyntactic containment reflects LF 'complexity'**

If one reading corresponds to a more complex LF that 'contains' the LF for the other reading, this containment relation should be **morphosyntactically transparent in at least some languages**.

The **reverse containment pattern should not be found**.

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

English data won't help us decide between the **distributive-quantifier** and the **plural-based hypothesis**.

### **How can cross-linguistic data help?**

If one reading universally requires additional operators, it corresponds to 'bigger' LF structures cross-linguistically.

#### Assumption: Morphosyntactic containment reflects LF 'complexity'

If one reading corresponds to a more complex LF that 'contains' the LF for the other reading, this containment relation should be **morphosyntactically transparent in at least some languages**.

The **reverse containment pattern should not be found**.

**Note:** Doesn't mean we find transparent containment in every language

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

English data won't help us decide between the **distributive-quantifier** and the **plural-based hypothesis**.

### How can cross-linguistic data help?

If one reading universally requires additional operators, it corresponds to 'bigger' LF structures cross-linguistically.

**Assumption: Morphosyntactic containment reflects LF 'complexity'**

If one reading corresponds to a more complex LF that 'contains' the LF for the other reading, this containment relation should be **morphosyntactically transparent in at least some languages**.

The **reverse containment pattern should not be found**.

**Note:** Doesn't mean we find transparent containment in every language

**A previous detailed application: Bobaljik (2012)**

Superlative forms may **contain the comparative form**, but not *vice versa*.  
⇒ Underlying syntax + LF for superlatives 'more complex' than for comparatives.

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

Testing for 'containment': More specific research questions

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

Testing for 'containment': More specific research questions

- Are there conjunctions that **permit both readings**, but **become purely distributive** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

Testing for 'containment': More specific research questions

- Are there conjunctions that **permit both readings**, but **become purely distributive** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- Are there conjunctions that **permit both readings**, but **become purely non-distributive** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

Testing for 'containment': More specific research questions

- Are there conjunctions that **permit both readings**, but **become purely distributive** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- Are there conjunctions that **permit both readings**, but **become purely non-distributive** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- Are there conjunctions that are **purely distributive**, but **can get a non-distributive reading** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

Testing for 'containment': More specific research questions

- Are there conjunctions that **permit both readings**, but **become purely distributive** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- Are there conjunctions that **permit both readings**, but **become purely non-distributive** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- Are there conjunctions that are **purely distributive**, but **can get a non-distributive reading** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- Are there conjunctions that are **purely non-distributive**, but **can get a distributive reading** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- ...

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

Testing for 'containment': More specific research questions

- Are there conjunctions that **permit both readings**, but **become purely distributive** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- Are there conjunctions that **permit both readings**, but **become purely non-distributive** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- Are there conjunctions that are **purely distributive**, but **can get a non-distributive reading** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- Are there conjunctions that are **purely non-distributive**, but **can get a distributive reading** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- ...

Such containment relations could provide ...

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

Testing for 'containment': More specific research questions

- Are there conjunctions that **permit both readings**, but **become purely distributive** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- Are there conjunctions that **permit both readings**, but **become purely non-distributive** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- Are there conjunctions that are **purely distributive**, but **can get a non-distributive reading** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- Are there conjunctions that are **purely non-distributive**, but **can get a distributive reading** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- ...

Such containment relations could provide ...

- evidence against **'no variation' null hypothesis** (no unified containment pattern)

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

Testing for 'containment': More specific research questions

- Are there conjunctions that **permit both readings**, but **become purely distributive** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- Are there conjunctions that **permit both readings**, but **become purely non-distributive** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- Are there conjunctions that are **purely distributive**, but **can get a non-distributive reading** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- Are there conjunctions that are **purely non-distributive**, but **can get a distributive reading** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- ...

Such containment relations could provide ...

- evidence against '**no variation**' **null hypothesis** (no unified containment pattern)
- if the null hypothesis holds up: a way of deciding between the **plural-based** and the **distributive-quantifier hypothesis** (which reading is formally 'less marked')?

## Q: Distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction

Testing for ‘containment’: More specific research questions

- Are there conjunctions that **permit both readings**, but **become purely distributive** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- Are there conjunctions that **permit both readings**, but **become purely non-distributive** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- Are there conjunctions that are **purely distributive**, but **can get a non-distributive reading** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- Are there conjunctions that are **purely non-distributive**, but **can get a distributive reading** once a certain marker is added within the coordination?
- ...

Such containment relations could provide ...

- evidence against ‘**no variation**’ **null hypothesis** (no unified containment pattern)
- if the null hypothesis holds up: a way of deciding between the **plural-based** and the **distributive-quantifier hypothesis** (which reading is formally ‘less marked’)?

Underlying assumption: **Morphosyntactic containment reflects LF ‘complexity’**.

- 1 Research questions: Example
- 2 Why we decided to use TerraLing – advantages and pitfalls
- 3 Structure of our questions and definitions
- 4 Some generalizations from our data set

## Problems with existing databases/typological surveys

## Problems with existing databases/typological surveys

None of the existing databases (e.g., WALS) or existing works based on grammars (e.g. Drellishak (2004), Payne (1985)) provide the data we needed.

## Problems with existing databases/typological surveys

None of the existing databases (e.g., WALIS) or existing works based on grammars (e.g. Drellishak (2004), Payne (1985)) provide the data we needed.

### Problems

## Problems with existing databases/typological surveys

None of the existing databases (e.g., WALS) or existing works based on grammars (e.g. Drellishak (2004), Payne (1985)) provide the data we needed.

### Problems

- Such works often do not control for the type of **syntactic structure** we are after (e.g., symmetric coordinate structures vs. comitatives)

## Problems with existing databases/typological surveys

None of the existing databases (e.g., WALS) or existing works based on grammars (e.g. Drellishak (2004), Payne (1985)) provide the data we needed.

### Problems

- Such works often do not control for the type of **syntactic structure** we are after (e.g., symmetric coordinate structures vs. comitatives)
- Such works do not control for the **semantic type** of the expression (e.g., WALS considers VP and NP conjunction, which might be of the same type; we would require the distinction between type  $e$  and type  $\langle e, t \rangle$  or  $\langle \langle e, t \rangle, t \rangle$ )

## Problems with existing databases/typological surveys

None of the existing databases (e.g., WALs) or existing works based on grammars (e.g. Drellishak (2004), Payne (1985)) provide the data we needed.

### Problems

- Such works often do not control for the type of **syntactic structure** we are after (e.g., symmetric coordinate structures vs. comitatives)
- Such works do not control for the **semantic type** of the expression (e.g., WALs considers VP and NP conjunction, which might be of the same type; we would require the distinction between type  $e$  and type  $\langle e, t \rangle$  or  $\langle \langle e, t \rangle, t \rangle$ )
- If a certain type of example is missing from a grammar, we cannot conclude that it is ungrammatical.

## Problems with existing databases/typological surveys

None of the existing databases (e.g., WALs) or existing works based on grammars (e.g. Drellishak (2004), Payne (1985)) provide the data we needed.

### Problems

- Such works often do not control for the type of **syntactic structure** we are after (e.g., symmetric coordinate structures vs. comitatives)
- Such works do not control for the **semantic type** of the expression (e.g., WALs considers VP and NP conjunction, which might be of the same type; we would require the distinction between type  $e$  and type  $\langle e, t \rangle$  or  $\langle \langle e, t \rangle, t \rangle$ )
- If a certain type of example is missing from a grammar, we cannot conclude that it is ungrammatical.
- Some of these works have (vague) semantic descriptions (e.g. Haspelmath (2004)), but often lack **semantically relevant minimal pairs** with explicit scenarios

## Problems with existing databases/typological surveys

None of the existing databases (e.g., WALs) or existing works based on grammars (e.g. Drellishak (2004), Payne (1985)) provide the data we needed.

### Problems

- Such works often do not control for the type of **syntactic structure** we are after (e.g., symmetric coordinate structures vs. comitatives)
- Such works do not control for the **semantic type** of the expression (e.g., WALs considers VP and NP conjunction, which might be of the same type; we would require the distinction between type  $e$  and type  $\langle e, t \rangle$  or  $\langle \langle e, t \rangle, t \rangle$ )
- If a certain type of example is missing from a grammar, we cannot conclude that it is ungrammatical.
- Some of these works have (vague) semantic descriptions (e.g. Haspelmath (2004)), but often lack **semantically relevant minimal pairs** with explicit scenarios
- Ideally, we want examples that make the two readings logically independent

## How we proceeded

## How we proceeded

- We didn't only have to target our semantic questions, but also **delimit the classes of expressions** we were interested in  
⇒ syntactic coordination (vs. comitatives), coordination of proper names, ...

## How we proceeded

- We didn't only have to target our semantic questions, but also **delimit the classes of expressions** we were interested in  
⇒ syntactic coordination (vs. comitatives), coordination of proper names, ...
- We defined **frequently used terms** in an external **glossary** (e.g. 'basic conjunctive interpretation'). Much work, as we were the first semantic project on TerraLing.

## How we proceeded

- We didn't only have to target our semantic questions, but also **delimit the classes of expressions** we were interested in  
⇒ syntactic coordination (vs. comitatives), coordination of proper names, ...
- We defined **frequently used terms** in an external **glossary** (e.g. 'basic conjunctive interpretation'). Much work, as we were the first semantic project on TerraLing.
- We defined the queries by drawing on properties of contexts, examples etc. that are known from work on English or German.

### Example: Contrast with third predicate improves CUMULATIVE VP conjunction

- (5) *The ten children were dancing and smoking, **but none of them were singing.***

## How we proceeded

- We didn't only have to target our semantic questions, but also **delimit the classes of expressions** we were interested in  
⇒ syntactic coordination (vs. comitatives), coordination of proper names, ...
- We defined **frequently used terms** in an external **glossary** (e.g. 'basic conjunctive interpretation'). Much work, as we were the first semantic project on TerraLing.
- We defined the queries by drawing on properties of contexts, examples etc. that are known from work on English or German.

### Example: Contrast with third predicate improves CUMULATIVE VP conjunction

(5) *The ten children were dancing and smoking, **but none of them were singing.***

- We provided concrete examples in property definitions (often English, also other languages + fictional languages based on English).  
Consultants could change predicates etc. if their language lacked lexical counterparts.

## How we proceeded

- We didn't only have to target our semantic questions, but also **delimit the classes of expressions** we were interested in  
⇒ syntactic coordination (vs. comitatives), coordination of proper names, ...
- We defined **frequently used terms** in an external **glossary** (e.g. 'basic conjunctive interpretation'). Much work, as we were the first semantic project on TerraLing.
- We defined the queries by drawing on properties of contexts, examples etc. that are known from work on English or German.

### Example: Contrast with third predicate improves CUMULATIVE VP conjunction

(5) *The ten children were dancing and smoking, **but none of them were singing.***

- We provided concrete examples in property definitions (often English, also other languages + fictional languages based on English).  
Consultants could change predicates etc. if their language lacked lexical counterparts.
- Survey draws on consultants' linguistic expertise (e.g. identifying collective predicates, measure phrases etc. in their language).

## What we should have done differently

## What we should have done differently

Pre-study

## What we should have done differently

### Pre-study

- Problem: **Workload and complexity of the queries.**  
A small **pre-study** would have helped identify less relevant factors

## What we should have done differently

### Pre-study

- **Problem:** **Workload and complexity of the queries.**  
A small **pre-study** would have helped identify less relevant factors
- **Example:** We tested proper-name conjunctions with two classes of predicates:
  - predicates with measure phrases (*100 euros, 2 meters*)
  - predicates with numeral-modified plural DPs (*5 bananas*)

These behave slightly differently in some languages, but **no systematic pattern.**

## What we should have done differently

### Pre-study

- Problem: **Workload and complexity of the queries.**  
A small **pre-study** would have helped identify less relevant factors
- **Example:** We tested proper-name conjunctions with two classes of predicates:
  - predicates with measure phrases (*100 euros, 2 meters*)
  - predicates with numeral-modified plural DPs (*5 bananas*)

These behave slightly differently in some languages, but **no systematic pattern.**

- Testing roughly 10 languages via a questionnaire before formulating TerraLing queries would have given us a grasp of the **expected range of variation.**

## What we should have done differently

### Pre-study

- **Problem:** **Workload and complexity of the queries.**  
A small **pre-study** would have helped identify less relevant factors
- **Example:** We tested proper-name conjunctions with two classes of predicates:
  - predicates with measure phrases (*100 euros, 2 meters*)
  - predicates with numeral-modified plural DPs (*5 bananas*)These behave slightly differently in some languages, but **no systematic pattern.**
- Testing roughly 10 languages via a questionnaire before formulating TerraLing queries would have given us a grasp of the **expected range of variation.**

### Two-level structure (languages vs. forms/expressions)

Was not available yet, would have reduced the number of queries significantly:

## What we should have done differently

### Pre-study

- **Problem:** **Workload and complexity of the queries.**  
A small **pre-study** would have helped identify less relevant factors
- **Example:** We tested proper-name conjunctions with two classes of predicates:
  - predicates with measure phrases (*100 euros, 2 meters*)
  - predicates with numeral-modified plural DPs (*5 bananas*)These behave slightly differently in some languages, but **no systematic pattern.**
- Testing roughly 10 languages via a questionnaire before formulating TerraLing queries would have given us a grasp of the **expected range of variation.**

### Two-level structure (languages vs. forms/expressions)

Was not available yet, would have reduced the number of queries significantly:

- **Does this language have a form with property A?**
- **Does this language have a form with property B?**
- **Does this language have a form with properties A and B?**
- **Does this language have a form that does not have property A? ...**

## What we should have done differently

### Pre-study

- Problem: **Workload and complexity of the queries.**  
A small **pre-study** would have helped identify less relevant factors
- **Example:** We tested proper-name conjunctions with two classes of predicates:
  - predicates with measure phrases (*100 euros, 2 meters*)
  - predicates with numeral-modified plural DPs (*5 bananas*)These behave slightly differently in some languages, but **no systematic pattern.**
- Testing roughly 10 languages via a questionnaire before formulating TerraLing queries would have given us a grasp of the **expected range of variation.**

### Two-level structure (languages vs. forms/expressions)

Was not available yet, would have reduced the number of queries significantly:

- Does this language have a form with property A?
- Does this language have a form with property B?
- Does this language have a form with properties A and B?
- Does this language have a form that does not have property A? ...
- Does this form of coordinate structures have property A?
- Does this form of coordinate structures have property B?

- 1 Research questions: Example
- 2 Why we decided to use TerraLing – advantages and pitfalls
- 3 Structure of our questions and definitions**
- 4 Some generalizations from our data set

## Glossary entries

## Glossary entries

Property definitions linked to external glossary wiki (will be integrated on the site)

## Glossary entries

Property definitions linked to external glossary wiki (will be integrated on the site)

Why was this necessary? Examples:

## Glossary entries

Property definitions linked to external glossary wiki (will be integrated on the site)

### Why was this necessary? Examples:

- **No consensus on how to identify coordinate structures**  
e.g. Gil 1991: Maricopa ‘has no coordination’ because there is no overt counterpart of English *and*

## Glossary entries

Property definitions linked to external glossary wiki (will be integrated on the site)

### Why was this necessary? Examples:

- No consensus on how to identify coordinate structures  
e.g. Gil 1991: Maricopa ‘has no coordination’ because there is no overt counterpart of English *and*
- Coordination strategies often grammaticalized from/formally similar to comitative structures (cf. Mithun 1988, Stassen 2000)  
⇒ consultants need syntactic criteria for distinguishing the two

## Glossary entries

Property definitions linked to external glossary wiki (will be integrated on the site)

### Why was this necessary? Examples:

- No consensus on how to identify coordinate structures  
e.g. Gil 1991: Maricopa ‘has no coordination’ because there is no overt counterpart of English *and*
- Coordination strategies often grammaticalized from/formally similar to comitative structures (cf. Mithun 1988, Stassen 2000)  
⇒ consultants need syntactic criteria for distinguishing the two
- Consultants are linguists, but might be unfamiliar with relevant semantic notions

## Glossary example: '(Iterative) Coordination'

## Glossary example: '(Iterative) Coordination'

Defining 'coordination'

## Glossary example: '(Iterative) Coordination'

### Defining 'coordination'

- All conjuncts + any coordinators must form a **constituent** (if testable)

## Glossary example: '(Iterative) Coordination'

### Defining 'coordination'

- All conjuncts + any coordinators must form a **constituent** (if testable)
- Conjuncts must have **same grammatical function** ('**grammatical function**' **undefined!**)

## Glossary example: '(Iterative) Coordination'

### Defining 'coordination'

- All conjuncts + any coordinators must form a **constituent** (if testable)
- Conjuncts must have **same grammatical function** ('**grammatical function**' **undefined!**)
- **Symmetric semantics** (possible exception: scope and binding asymmetries)

## Glossary example: '(Iterative) Coordination'

### Defining 'coordination'

- All conjuncts + any coordinators must form a **constituent** (if testable)
- Conjuncts must have **same grammatical function** ('**grammatical function**' **undefined!**)
- **Symmetric semantics** (possible exception: scope and binding asymmetries)
- **Island status (Coordinate Structure Constraint)**, if it can be tested with e.g. question movement or relativization

## Glossary example: '(Iterative) Coordination'

### Defining 'coordination'

- All conjuncts + any coordinators must form a **constituent** (if testable)
  - Conjuncts must have **same grammatical function** ('**grammatical function**' **undefined!**)
  - **Symmetric semantics** (possible exception: scope and binding asymmetries)
  - **Island status (Coordinate Structure Constraint)**, if it can be tested with e.g. question movement or relativization
- + Definition explicitly states what is **not** relevant: **plural agreement, presence/absence of coordinators.**

## Glossary example: '(Iterative) Coordination'

### Defining 'coordination'

- All conjuncts + any coordinators must form a **constituent** (if testable)
  - Conjuncts must have **same grammatical function** ('**grammatical function**' **undefined!**)
  - **Symmetric semantics** (possible exception: scope and binding asymmetries)
  - **Island status (Coordinate Structure Constraint)**, if it can be tested with e.g. question movement or relativization
- + Definition explicitly states what is **not** relevant: **plural agreement, presence/absence of coordinators**.

⇒ Not all criteria applicable in every language

## Glossary example: '(Iterative) Coordination'

### Defining 'coordination'

- All conjuncts + any coordinators must form a **constituent** (if testable)
  - Conjuncts must have **same grammatical function** ('**grammatical function**' **undefined!**)
  - **Symmetric semantics** (possible exception: scope and binding asymmetries)
  - **Island status (Coordinate Structure Constraint)**, if it can be tested with e.g. question movement or relativization
- + Definition explicitly states what is **not** relevant: **plural agreement, presence/absence of coordinators.**

⇒ Not all criteria applicable in every language

⇒ all criteria **rely on linguistic expertise on the consultant's part.**

## Glossary example: '(Iterative) Coordination'

### Defining 'coordination'

- All conjuncts + any coordinators must form a **constituent** (if testable)
  - Conjuncts must have **same grammatical function** ('**grammatical function**' **undefined!**)
  - **Symmetric semantics** (possible exception: scope and binding asymmetries)
  - **Island status (Coordinate Structure Constraint)**, if it can be tested with e.g. question movement or relativization
- + Definition explicitly states what is **not** relevant: **plural agreement, presence/absence of coordinators.**

⇒ Not all criteria applicable in every language

⇒ all criteria **rely on linguistic expertise on the consultant's part.**

### Defining 'iterative coordination'

Coordination in the above sense that permits more than two conjuncts.

# Glossary example: ‘(Iterative) Coordination’

## Coordination

Nina Haslinger edited this page on 9 Jul 2017 · 20 revisions

---

The terms **coordination** and **coordinate structure** refer to constructions in which two or more expressions of the same syntactic category or the same grammatical function, which we call **coordinates**, are combined to form a larger expression. The syntactic category or grammatical function of the larger expression matches that of the coordinates. Coordinate structures may be marked with one or more overt **coordinators**, but this is not required.

Four syntactic and semantic criteria for coordination are given below. For our purposes, a given construction counts as coordination if it satisfies *as many of these criteria as can be tested in the language*. It may be that one or more of the criteria cannot be tested. For instance, this is the case if there are no independently motivated tests that tell us whether the putative coordinate structure forms a [constituent]. Similarly, **Coordinate Structure Constraint** (CSC) effects cannot be tested if the language lacks the relevant kind of syntactic displacement. In such cases, we assume that criteria that cannot be tested do not provide any evidence for or against the presence of coordination.

With the exception of semantic symmetry, our criteria do **not** constrain the **meaning** of coordinate structures.

## 1 Criteria for coordination

---

### 1.1 Constituent status

---

All coordinates *can* form a constituent (see [Constituency Tests]) that includes the **coordinator(s)** (if any coordinators are present) but excludes any other material.

# Glossary example: ‘(Iterative) Coordination’

## Iterative coordination

Nina Haslinger edited this page on 9 Jul 2017 · 4 revisions

**Iterative coordination** refers to constructions satisfying the following two conditions:

1. They are coordinate structures (see [coordination](#) for a list of criteria).
2. There is no fixed upper bound on the number of coordinators. In particular, there may be more than two coordinators.

Note that the second criterion excludes several constructions that are usually discussed in the typological literature on coordination, such as some instances of adversative conjunction (cf. Haspelmath 2007).

In many languages, coordinate structures with more than two coordinators differ from those with exactly two coordinators in that it is not necessary to repeat the [coordinator](#) for each additional conjunct. This is illustrated in (1-a) and (2). In such cases, all the possibilities available for more than two conjuncts count as iterative coordination strategies, regardless of whether they are rare or formally marked. For instance, we assume that both of the examples in (1) count as iterative coordination. Even if the counterpart of (1-b) were ungrammatical, (1-a) would provide sufficient evidence that *and*-coordination is iterative.

(1)

- a. Peter, John, Jane and Mary met.
- b. Peter and John and Jane and Mary met.

(2)	Amharic		
čāw-anna	bārbāre	qəbe	amāṭṭaʷh
salt-COORD	pepper	butter	I.brought

‘I brought salt, pepper and butter’ (Haspelmath 2007:13)

## Properties for coordinations of proper names

## Properties for coordinations of proper names

- Is there iterative coordination of proper names at all?

## Properties for coordinations of proper names

- Is there iterative coordination of proper names at all?
- Is there iterative coordination of proper names with a **conjunctive** (vs. e.g. disjunctive) **interpretation**?    ⇒ glossary: **basic conjunctive interpretation**

## Properties for coordinations of proper names

- Is there iterative coordination of proper names at all?
- Is there iterative coordination of proper names with a **conjunctive** (vs. e.g. disjunctive) **interpretation**? ⇒ glossary: **basic conjunctive interpretation**
- Are there conjunctive, iterative coordination strategies for proper names with a **CUMULATIVE/COLLECTIVE/DISTRIBUTIVE** interpretation?

## Properties for coordinations of proper names

- Is there iterative coordination of proper names at all?
- Is there iterative coordination of proper names with a **conjunctive** (vs. e.g. disjunctive) **interpretation**? ⇒ glossary: **basic conjunctive interpretation**
- Are there conjunctive, iterative coordination strategies for proper names with a **CUMULATIVE/COLLECTIVE/DISTRIBUTIVE** interpretation?
  - **CUMULATIVE/DISTRIBUTIVE** tested with measure phrases and numeral-modified plurals (with modifiers like *exactly*, if available in the language)

## Properties for coordinations of proper names

- Is there iterative coordination of proper names at all?
- Is there iterative coordination of proper names with a **conjunctive** (vs. e.g. disjunctive) **interpretation**? ⇒ glossary: **basic conjunctive interpretation**
- Are there conjunctive, iterative coordination strategies for proper names with a **CUMULATIVE/COLLECTIVE/DISTRIBUTIVE** interpretation?
  - **CUMULATIVE/DISTRIBUTIVE** tested with measure phrases and numeral-modified plurals (with modifiers like *exactly*, if available in the language)
  - **COLLECTIVE** tested with collective predicates (which consultants had to identify for their language)

## Properties for coordinations of proper names

- Is there iterative coordination of proper names at all?
- Is there iterative coordination of proper names with a **conjunctive** (vs. e.g. disjunctive) **interpretation**? ⇒ glossary: **basic conjunctive interpretation**
- Are there conjunctive, iterative coordination strategies for proper names with a **CUMULATIVE/COLLECTIVE/DISTRIBUTIVE** interpretation?
  - **CUMULATIVE/DISTRIBUTIVE** tested with measure phrases and numeral-modified plurals (with modifiers like *exactly*, if available in the language)
  - **COLLECTIVE** tested with collective predicates (which consultants had to identify for their language)
- Are there sentences that are ambiguous between a **CUMULATIVE** and a **DISTRIBUTIVE** interpretation?

## Properties for coordinations of proper names

- Is there iterative coordination of proper names at all?
- Is there iterative coordination of proper names with a **conjunctive** (vs. e.g. disjunctive) **interpretation**? ⇒ glossary: **basic conjunctive interpretation**
- Are there conjunctive, iterative coordination strategies for proper names with a **CUMULATIVE/COLLECTIVE/DISTRIBUTIVE** interpretation?
  - **CUMULATIVE/DISTRIBUTIVE** tested with measure phrases and numeral-modified plurals (with modifiers like *exactly*, if available in the language)
  - **COLLECTIVE** tested with collective predicates (which consultants had to identify for their language)
- Are there sentences that are ambiguous between a **CUMULATIVE** and a **DISTRIBUTIVE** interpretation?
- Are there forms of coordination where one interpretation **requires a special marker** within the predicate?  
cf. English *each/between them*: Disambiguate plural sentence, but not required to get a particular reading

## Properties for coordinations of proper names

- Is there iterative coordination of proper names at all?
- Is there iterative coordination of proper names with a **conjunctive** (vs. e.g. disjunctive) **interpretation**? ⇒ glossary: **basic conjunctive interpretation**
- Are there conjunctive, iterative coordination strategies for proper names with a **CUMULATIVE/COLLECTIVE/DISTRIBUTIVE** interpretation?
  - **CUMULATIVE/DISTRIBUTIVE** tested with measure phrases and numeral-modified plurals (with modifiers like *exactly*, if available in the language)
  - **COLLECTIVE** tested with collective predicates (which consultants had to identify for their language)
- Are there sentences that are ambiguous between a **CUMULATIVE** and a **DISTRIBUTIVE** interpretation?
- Are there forms of coordination where one interpretation **requires a special marker** within the predicate?  
cf. English *each/between them*: Disambiguate plural sentence, but not required to get a particular reading
- Are there forms of coordination where one interpretation **requires a special marker** within the coordination?

## Properties for coordinations of proper names

- Is there iterative coordination of proper names at all?
- Is there iterative coordination of proper names with a **conjunctive** (vs. e.g. disjunctive) **interpretation**? ⇒ glossary: **basic conjunctive interpretation**
- Are there conjunctive, iterative coordination strategies for proper names with a **CUMULATIVE/COLLECTIVE/DISTRIBUTIVE** interpretation?
  - **CUMULATIVE/DISTRIBUTIVE** tested with measure phrases and numeral-modified plurals (with modifiers like *exactly*, if available in the language)
  - **COLLECTIVE** tested with collective predicates (which consultants had to identify for their language)
- Are there sentences that are ambiguous between a **CUMULATIVE** and a **DISTRIBUTIVE** interpretation?
- Are there forms of coordination where one interpretation **requires a special marker** within the predicate?  
cf. English *each/between them*: Disambiguate plural sentence, but not required to get a particular reading
- Are there forms of coordination where one interpretation **requires a special marker** within the coordination?
- Are there forms of coordination where one interpretation **is blocked by a special marker** within the coordination?

# Properties for coordinations of proper names

## Listing Properties

Looking for a specific property

← Previous 1 2 3 4 Next →

Name	Completeness	?
01: Coordination of Proper Names	74%	
02: Iterative Coordination of Proper Names	63%	
0A01: Measure phrases	57%	
0A02: Iterative Coordination of Proper Names: Non-Distributive Interpretation, Measure Phrases	59%	
0A03: Iterative Coordination of Proper Names: Distributive Interpretation, Measure Phrases	57%	
0A04: Iterative Coordination of Proper Names: Cumulative Interpretation, Measure Phrases	51%	
0A05: Iterative Coordination of Proper Names: Same Strategy for Distributive and Non-Distributive Interpretation, Measure Phrases	53%	
0A06: Iterative Coordination of Proper Names: External Marker Needed for Distributive Interpretation, Measure Phrases	46%	
0A07: Iterative Coordination of Proper Names: External Marker Needed for Non-Distributive Interpretation, Measure Phrases	48%	

# Properties for coordinations of proper names: Example



## Property: 0A12: Iterative Coordination of Proper Names: Internal Marker Removes Non-Distributive Interpretation, Measure Phrases

Set by Nina Haslinger

### Quick Analysis

Add properties to compare with 0A12: Iterative Coordination of Proper Names: Internal Marker Removes Non-Distributive Interpretation, Measure Phrases values

Selected lngs (Remove all)

Q Cross Properties

Q Implication Antecedent

Q Implication Consequent

Overview

Description

Sureness Map

View on Map

A language has the value **NA** if the language is **no** for 02: Iterative Coordination of Proper Names, i.e. if the language lacks a form of *iterative coordination* that can be used to combine non-collective proper names such as *John and Mary*.

A language also has the value **NA** if, even though the language has *iterative coordination of proper names*, the relevant example types cannot be constructed in the language, e.g. if it is **no** for 0A01: Measure Phrases.

A language also has the value **NA** if it is **no** for 0A02: Iterative Coordination of Proper Names: Non-Distributive Interpretation, Measure Phrases. This means it has no form of *iterative coordination* of proper names with a *basic conjunctive interpretation* that allows for a non-distributive interpretation.

### Explanation of the property

The property has the value **yes** if the language has a form of *iterative coordination* of proper names with the following characteristics: It can have a non-distributive interpretation in sentences like (1) and a marker can be added *inside* the coordinate structure that removes this non-distributive reading. In other words, there can be non-distributive interpretation *without* the marker, but once the marker is added, this interpretation is not available anymore.

## Properties for coordinations of proper names: Example

This property concerns the interpretation of sentences like (1), in which a coordination of proper names occurs in **subject position** and the predicate contains a **measure phrase** (in non-subject position).

(1) John, Mary and Sue earned exactly 100 euros.

Contributors -

The English sentence in (1) has two interpretations. It has a **distributive**

Sign i

**interpretation w.r.t. the measure phrase** that makes it true in a scenario like (2-a). Here each conjunct individually satisfies the predicate, but all the conjuncts together/between them do **not** satisfy the predicate.

It also has a **non-distributive interpretation w.r.t. the measure phrase** that makes it true in a scenario like (2-b), where all conjuncts together/between them satisfy the predicate, but the conjuncts do **not** satisfy the predicate individually.

(2)

a. SCENARIO: John earned exactly 100 euros, Mary earned exactly 100 euros, Sue earned exactly 100 euros.

b. SCENARIO: John earned exactly 30 euros, Mary earned exactly 30 euros, Sue earned exactly 40 euros.

What we are interested in is whether your language has additional markers that can occur **within the coordinate structure** and that remove the non-distributive interpretation w.r.t. the measure phrase.

This means you will first have to check whether your language has a **form of iterative coordination** of proper names. Then you will have to check whether this form allows for a non-distributive interpretation w.r.t. the measure phrase in examples like (1). This means that a sentence like (1) in your language would be true in the scenario in (2-b). Note that your sentence can contain a non-distributivity marker on the predicate, as in the fictional example (3-b) below. Whether the distributive interpretation is also present is irrelevant.

You will then have to check whether there is some additional marker that can occur

# Properties for coordinations of proper names: Example

Dutch	No	Hilja Koopman
Conjunction and Disjunction + Search Languages Properties + Contributors +		Nikos Sign In
<a href="#">Serbo-Croatian</a>	Yes	Jovana Gajic
<a href="#">Cantonese (Guangzhou)</a>	No	Zixian Qiu
<a href="#">Korean</a>	No	SooHwan Jung
<a href="#">Chickasaw</a>	Na	Pam Munro
<a href="#">Turkish</a>	No	Sozen Ozkan
<a href="#">Nones</a>	No	Enrico Flor
<a href="#">Igbo</a>	No	Mary Amaechi
<a href="#">Wuhu Chinese</a>	No	Zhuo Chen
<a href="#">Basaa</a>	No	Paul Roger Bassong
<a href="#">Italian CG</a>	Yes	Terraling Admin
<a href="#">Dagara (Burkina)</a>	Na	Alain Hien
<a href="#">Sicilian</a>	Yes	Terraling Admin
<a href="#">Persian (Iran)</a>	No	Eva Rosina
<a href="#">Norwegian</a>	No	Marit Julien

## Why so many properties?

## Why so many properties?

- We tested (non-)distributivity marking **within the conjunction** and **within the predicate** separately.

## Why so many properties?

- We tested (non-)distributivity marking **within the conjunction** and **within the predicate** separately.
- We wanted to **distinguish between COLLECTIVE and CUMULATIVE predicates**, unlike much of the existing semantic literature.  
⇒ Turned out to be relevant!

## Why so many properties?

- We tested (non-)distributivity marking **within the conjunction** and **within the predicate** separately.
- We wanted to **distinguish between COLLECTIVE and CUMULATIVE predicates**, unlike much of the existing semantic literature.  
⇒ Turned out to be relevant!
- We wanted to control for **potentially distinct behavior of measure phrases and ordinary plural DPs/NPs**.  
⇒ In hindsight, this wasn't worth the extra effort/workload for our consultants.

## Why so many properties?

- We tested (non-)distributivity marking **within the conjunction** and **within the predicate** separately.
- We wanted to **distinguish between COLLECTIVE and CUMULATIVE predicates**, unlike much of the existing semantic literature.  
⇒ Turned out to be relevant!
- We wanted to control for **potentially distinct behavior of measure phrases and ordinary plural DPs/NPs**.  
⇒ In hindsight, this wasn't worth the extra effort/workload for our consultants.
- All questions involved **existential statements about 'forms' or 'strategies' for coordination**.  
⇒ As expected, many languages had two or more strategies.  
With the new **two-level structure (languages vs. forms/expressions)**, this would have been much easier to control for

- 1 Research questions: Example
- 2 Why we decided to use TerraLing – advantages and pitfalls
- 3 Structure of our questions and definitions
- 4 Some generalizations from our data set**

## Q (distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction)

## Q (distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction)

Here is one of the typological gaps we found and what we took to follow from it

(Flor et al. 2017a,b, Haslinger et al. 2019)

## Q (distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction)

Here is one of the typological gaps we found and what we took to follow from it

(Flor et al. 2017a,b, Haslinger et al. 2019)

### Generalization (from our data set on individual conjunction, simplified)

For any pair of conjunction strategies for proper names, where one strategy can be obtained from the other by adding extra markers within the coordinate structure:

## Q (distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction)

Here is one of the typological gaps we found and what we took to follow from it

(Flor et al. 2017a,b, Haslinger et al. 2019)

### Generalization (from our data set on individual conjunction, simplified)

For any pair of conjunction strategies for proper names, where one strategy can be obtained from the other by adding extra markers within the coordinate structure:

- **extra markers within coordinate structure never add cumulative reading**

If the form with extra markers in permits a cumulative reading w.r.t. a certain predicate (of the afore-mentioned kind), so does the form without these markers

## Q (distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction)

Here is one of the typological gaps we found and what we took to follow from it

(Flor et al. 2017a,b, Haslinger et al. 2019)

### Generalization (from our data set on individual conjunction, simplified)

For any pair of conjunction strategies for proper names, where one strategy can be obtained from the other by adding extra markers within the coordinate structure:

- **extra markers within coordinate structure never add cumulative reading**

If the form with extra markers in permits a cumulative reading w.r.t. a certain predicate (of the afore-mentioned kind), so does the form without these markers

- **extra markers within coordinate structure never remove distributive reading**

If the form without the extra markers permits distributive reading w.r.t. a certain predicate (of the afore-mentioned kind), so does form with the extra markers.

## Q (distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction)

Here is one of the typological gaps we found and what we took to follow from it

(Flor et al. 2017a,b, Haslinger et al. 2019)

### Generalization (from our data set on individual conjunction, simplified)

For any pair of conjunction strategies for proper names, where one strategy can be obtained from the other by adding extra markers within the coordinate structure:

- **extra markers within coordinate structure never add cumulative reading**

If the form with extra markers in permits a cumulative reading w.r.t. a certain predicate (of the afore-mentioned kind), so does the form without these markers

- **extra markers within coordinate structure never remove distributive reading**

If the form without the extra markers permits distributive reading w.r.t. a certain predicate (of the afore-mentioned kind), so does form with the extra markers.

### Consequences (simplified)

Also linked to GEN 2: There are conjunction strategies where distributive reading requires markers in VP-predicate, none where cumulative reading requires such markers.

## Q (distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction)

Here is one of the typological gaps we found and what we took to follow from it

(Flor et al. 2017a,b, Haslinger et al. 2019)

### Generalization (from our data set on individual conjunction, simplified)

For any pair of conjunction strategies for proper names, where one strategy can be obtained from the other by adding extra markers within the coordinate structure:

- **extra markers within coordinate structure never add cumulative reading**

If the form with extra markers in permits a cumulative reading w.r.t. a certain predicate (of the afore-mentioned kind), so does the form without these markers

- **extra markers within coordinate structure never remove distributive reading**

If the form without the extra markers permits distributive reading w.r.t. a certain predicate (of the afore-mentioned kind), so does form with the extra markers.

### Consequences (simplified)

Also linked to GEN 2: There are conjunction strategies where distributive reading requires markers in VP-predicate, none where cumulative reading requires such markers.

- Unified containment pattern: **Compatible with 'no variation' null hypothesis**

## Q (distributive vs. non-distributive conjunction)

Here is one of the typological gaps we found and what we took to follow from it

(Flor et al. 2017a,b, Haslinger et al. 2019)

### Generalization (from our data set on individual conjunction, simplified)

For any pair of conjunction strategies for proper names, where one strategy can be obtained from the other by adding extra markers within the coordinate structure:

- **extra markers within coordinate structure never add cumulative reading**

If the form with extra markers in permits a cumulative reading w.r.t. a certain predicate (of the afore-mentioned kind), so does the form without these markers

- **extra markers within coordinate structure never remove distributive reading**

If the form without the extra markers permits distributive reading w.r.t. a certain predicate (of the afore-mentioned kind), so does form with the extra markers.

### Consequences (simplified)

Also linked to GEN 2: There are conjunction strategies where distributive reading requires markers in VP-predicate, none where cumulative reading requires such markers.

- Unified containment pattern: **Compatible with 'no variation' null hypothesis**
- Clear asymmetry: **Supports plural-based hypothesis for conjunction**

## How this connects to our ongoing work

## How this connects to our ongoing work

⇒ **plurality** might be a ‘deep’ (persistent, cross-categorical...) feature of NL

## How this connects to our ongoing work

⇒ **plurality might be a ‘deep’ (persistent, cross-categorical...) feature of NL**

New project: ‘The typology of cumulativity’ (2020-23, FWF)

<https://sites.google.com/view/the-typology-of-cumulativity/>  
members: Eva Rosina, Valerie Wurm, Viola Schmitt

## How this connects to our ongoing work

⇒ **plurality might be a ‘deep’ (persistent, cross-categorial...) feature of NL**

New project: ‘The typology of cumulativity’ (2020-23, FWF)

<https://sites.google.com/view/the-typology-of-cumulativity/>  
members: Eva Rosina, Valerie Wurm, Viola Schmitt

- Is there cross-linguistic evidence for **cross-categorial plurality**?

## How this connects to our ongoing work

⇒ **plurality might be a ‘deep’ (persistent, cross-categorical...) feature of NL**

New project: ‘The typology of cumulativity’ (2020-23, FWF)

<https://sites.google.com/view/the-typology-of-cumulativity/>  
members: Eva Rosina, Valerie Wurm, Viola Schmitt

- Is there cross-linguistic evidence for **cross-categorical plurality**?
- Is there cross-linguistic evidence that **quantification involves a plural component**? (Are quantifiers built up from more primitive parts?)

## How this connects to our ongoing work

⇒ **plurality might be a ‘deep’ (persistent, cross-categorical...) feature of NL**

New project: ‘The typology of cumulativity’ (2020-23, FWF)

<https://sites.google.com/view/the-typology-of-cumulativity/>  
members: Eva Rosina, Valerie Wurm, Viola Schmitt

- Is there cross-linguistic evidence for **cross-categorical plurality**?
- Is there cross-linguistic evidence that **quantification involves a plural component**? (Are quantifiers built up from more primitive parts?)

## How this connects to our ongoing work

⇒ **plurality might be a ‘deep’ (persistent, cross-categorical...) feature of NL**

New project: ‘The typology of cumulativity’ (2020-23, FWF)

<https://sites.google.com/view/the-typology-of-cumulativity/>  
members: Eva Rosina, Valerie Wurm, Viola Schmitt

- Is there cross-linguistic evidence for **cross-categorical plurality**?
  - Is there cross-linguistic evidence that **quantification involves a plural component**? (Are quantifiers built up from more primitive parts?)
- We are again using the TerraLing database, but we learned from our earlier work

## How this connects to our ongoing work

⇒ **plurality might be a ‘deep’ (persistent, cross-categorical...) feature of NL**

New project: ‘The typology of cumulativity’ (2020-23, FWF)

<https://sites.google.com/view/the-typology-of-cumulativity/>  
members: Eva Rosina, Valerie Wurm, Viola Schmitt

- Is there cross-linguistic evidence for **cross-categorical plurality**?
  - Is there cross-linguistic evidence that **quantification involves a plural component**? (Are quantifiers built up from more primitive parts?)
- We are again using the TerraLing database, but we learned from our earlier work
    - pre-studies via questionnaires to delimit range of variation

## How this connects to our ongoing work

⇒ **plurality might be a ‘deep’ (persistent, cross-categorical...) feature of NL**

New project: ‘The typology of cumulativity’ (2020-23, FWF)

<https://sites.google.com/view/the-typology-of-cumulativity/>  
members: Eva Rosina, Valerie Wurm, Viola Schmitt

- Is there cross-linguistic evidence for **cross-categorical plurality**?
  - Is there cross-linguistic evidence that **quantification involves a plural component**? (Are quantifiers built up from more primitive parts?)
- We are again using the TerraLing database, but we learned from our earlier work
    - pre-studies via questionnaires to delimit range of variation
    - We will use the new two-level structure to simplify definitions

## How this connects to our ongoing work

⇒ **plurality might be a ‘deep’ (persistent, cross-categorical...) feature of NL**

New project: ‘The typology of cumulativity’ (2020-23, FWF)

<https://sites.google.com/view/the-typology-of-cumulativity/>  
members: Eva Rosina, Valerie Wurm, Viola Schmitt

- Is there cross-linguistic evidence for **cross-categorical plurality**?
  - Is there cross-linguistic evidence that **quantification involves a plural component**? (Are quantifiers built up from more primitive parts?)
- We are again using the TerraLing database, but we learned from our earlier work
    - pre-studies via questionnaires to delimit range of variation
    - We will use the new two-level structure to simplify definitions
    - **Try to make use of Ryan’s suggestion (storyboards/pictures)!**

## How this connects to our ongoing work

⇒ **plurality might be a ‘deep’ (persistent, cross-categorical...) feature of NL**

New project: ‘The typology of cumulativity’ (2020-23, FWF)

<https://sites.google.com/view/the-typology-of-cumulativity/>  
members: Eva Rosina, Valerie Wurm, Viola Schmitt

- Is there cross-linguistic evidence for **cross-categorical plurality**?
  - Is there cross-linguistic evidence that **quantification involves a plural component**? (Are quantifiers built up from more primitive parts?)
- We are again using the TerraLing database, but we learned from our earlier work
    - pre-studies via questionnaires to delimit range of variation
    - We will use the new two-level structure to simplify definitions
    - **Try to make use of Ryan’s suggestion (storyboards/pictures)!**

**If you are interested in collaborating, let us know!**

## How this connects to our ongoing work

⇒ **plurality might be a ‘deep’ (persistent, cross-categorical...) feature of NL**

New project: ‘The typology of cumulativity’ (2020-23, FWF)

<https://sites.google.com/view/the-typology-of-cumulativity/>  
members: Eva Rosina, Valerie Wurm, Viola Schmitt

- Is there cross-linguistic evidence for **cross-categorical plurality**?
  - Is there cross-linguistic evidence that **quantification involves a plural component**? (Are quantifiers built up from more primitive parts?)
- We are again using the TerraLing database, but we learned from our earlier work
    - pre-studies via questionnaires to delimit range of variation
    - We will use the new two-level structure to simplify definitions
    - **Try to make use of Ryan’s suggestion (storyboards/pictures)!**

**If you are interested in collaborating, let us know!**

Follow-up PhD projects using other methods

- Magdalena Roszkowski: Non-distributivity in child language and cognition
- Nina Haslinger: Context-dependency in plural semantics – why does e.g. cumulative predicate conjunction require special contexts?

## References I

- Bobaljik, Jonathan D. 2012. *Universals in Comparative Morphology: Suppletion, superlatives and the structure of words*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Bochnak, Ryan. 2013. *Cross-linguistic variation in the semantics of comparatives*. Chicago: University of Chicago dissertation.
- Champollion, Lucas. 2015. Ten men and women got married today: noun coordination and the intersective theory of conjunction. *Journal of Semantics* 33(3). 561–622.
- Dowty, David. 1987. A note on Collective Predicates, Distributive Predicates and *All*. In *Proceedings of ESCOL 86*, 97–115.
- Drellishak, Scott. 2004. *A survey of coordination strategies in the world's languages*: University of Washington MA thesis.
- Flor, Enrico, Nina Haslinger, Hilda Koopman, Eva Rosina, Magdalena Roszkowski & Viola Schmitt. 2017a. Cross-linguistic evidence for a non-distributive lexical meaning of conjunction. In Alexandre Cremers, Thom van Gessel & Floris Roelofsen (eds.), *Proceedings of the 21st Amsterdam Colloquium*, 255–264.
- Flor, Enrico, Nina Haslinger, Eva Rosina, Magdalena Roszkowski & Viola Schmitt. 2017b. Distributive and non-distributive conjunction: Formal semantics meets typology. Accepted for publication in: Moreno Mitrović (ed.), *Logical vocabulary and logical change*, available via <https://www.univie.ac.at/konjunktion/texte.html>.
- Gil, David. 1991. Aristotle goes to Arizona, and finds a language without “and”. In Dietmar Zaefferer (ed.), *Semantic Universals and Universal Semantics* (Groningen-Amsterdam Studies in Semantics 12), 96–130. Berlin/New York: Foris.

## References II

- Haslinger, Nina, Valentin Panzirsch, Eva Rosina, Viola Schmitt & Valerie Wurm. 2019. A plural analysis of distributive conjunctions: Evidence from two cross-linguistic asymmetries. Ms., University of Göttingen, University of Vienna.  
<https://sites.google.com/view/the-typology-of-cumulativity>.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. Coordinating constructions: An overview. In Martin Haspelmath (ed.), *Coordinating Constructions* Typological Studies in Language, 3–40. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Link, Godehard. 1983. The Logical Analysis of Plurals and Mass Terms: A Lattice-Theoretical Approach. In R. Bäuerle, C. Schwarze & Arnim von Stechow (eds.), *Meaning, Use and Interpretation of Language*, 302–323. DeGruyter.
- Link, Godehard. 1987. Generalized Quantifiers and Plurals. In P. Gärdenfors (ed.), *Generalized Quantifiers: Linguistic and Logical Approaches*, 151–180. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Matthewson, Lisa. 2001. Quantification and the nature of crosslinguistic variation. *Natural Language Semantics* 9. 145–189.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1988. The grammaticization of coordination. In John Haiman & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*, 331–359. John Benjamins.
- Payne, John. 1985. Complex Phrases and Complex Sentences. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, vol. 2: Complex constructions, 3–41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1st edn.
- Stassen, Leon. 2000. AND-languages and WITH-languages. *Linguistic Typology* 4. 1–54.
- Winter, Yoad. 2001. *Flexibility Principles in Boolean Semantics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.