

# Scalar Implicature, Hurford's Constraint, Contrastiveness and How They All Come Together

In this talk, I discuss the ordering asymmetry noted by Singh (2008) in connection with Hurford's Constraint (Hurford 1974) on disjunction.

- (1) Bob finished some or all of the homework. vs. Bob finished all or ??(only) some of the homework.

With the 'some–all' order, *some* is understood to be 'some but not all' without any overt exhaustifier (e.g., *only*), the reversed order strongly prefers the presence of such an expression. I demonstrate (i) that the same distributional pattern holds not only in disjunction but in contrastive environments in general, and (ii) that the constraint should be imposed on the preceding expression in contrast (i.e., the first of the contrasted expressions), rather than on the silent exhaustification process. Specifically, I argue that the antecedent expression of contrast must generate a strengthened set of alternatives; a mutually exclusive set of alternatives that includes the denotation of the subsequent expression of contrast (cf. Menéndez-Benito 2006, Wagner 2006). When a semantically weaker expression such as *some* is the antecedent, the set can be strengthened via exhaustification (or any comparable process) to include {some but not all, all, no}, which satisfies the requirement. When a stronger expression comes first, on the other hand, the exhaustification is undefined, and the set remains as {all, not all}, which does not include the denotation of the subsequent expression of contrast (= *some*). Therefore, the non-optimal status of the 'all–some' order is attributed to the inadequacy of the set generated by *all*.

The proposed analysis turns out to be incompatible with the popular belief among the localism advocates for implicatures that the exhaustive operator is a silent version of *only*. I suggest that this is a welcome result, as the overt *only*, when combined with a scalar item, is not exhaustive/exclusive, and its main semantic contribution is a mirative-like meaning (cf. Zeevat 2009) of 'less than the contextually salient standard'.

## References

- Hurford, James (1974), "Exclusive or inclusive disjunction." *Foundations of Language* 11(3): 409–411.
- Menéndez-Benito, Paula (2006), "Exclusive choices." In *Proceedings of NELS* 36, 2.
- Singh, Raj (2008), "On the interpretation of disjunction: Asymmetric, incremental, and eager for inconsistency." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31(2): 245–260.

Wagner, Michael (2006), “Association by movement: evidence from NPI-licensing.” *Natural Language Semantics* 14(4): 297–324.

Zeevat, Henk (2009), ““Only” as a Mirative Particle.” In Arndt Riester & Edgar Onea, ed., *Focus at the Syntax-Semantics Interface: Working Papers of the SFB 732*, Stuttgart University, vol. 3, pp. 121–141.