

Only Nothing New

Paul Dekker, ILLC/University of Amsterdam
Position Statement for “One Day ‘Only’”
Friday, May 10, 2002

dekker@hum.uva.nl

Some Basic Observations

1. the semantics of “only” cannot be very complicated*
 2. “only” with bare plurals amounts to \supseteq
 3. “only” with conditionals amounts to \leftarrow
 4. “only” with (singular) terms amounts to the exclusion of alternatives
 5. basics can be accounted for along the lines of Rooth, Krifka, Hendriks**,
with a dynamic / discourse representation theoretic conception of terms
- *does anybody has any natural intuitions about the really involved examples?
**Rooth advocates a structured meanings approach (if compositional).

Some Basic Definitions

1. $M, g, e \models \phi$: as in predicate logic with anaphora (Dekker 02)
 - e : sequences of witnesses for (surface) indefinites and pronouns
 - $\exists x(Bx \wedge \exists y(Gy \wedge Lxy)); T\mathbf{p}_1\mathbf{p}_2 \Leftrightarrow \exists x(Bx \wedge \exists y((Gy \wedge Lxy) \wedge Txy))$
2. $M, g, e \models_{\alpha} \phi$: contextually restricted quantification (Gawron 96, ABC 00)
 - $(\alpha = ?xCx); \neg\exists_1 xGx \Leftrightarrow \neg\exists y(Cy \wedge Gy)$
 - $(\alpha = ?uvwGuvw); \exists 3((x_1 = j) \wedge Bx_2 \wedge Sx_3) \Leftrightarrow \exists x((x = j) \wedge \exists y(By \wedge \exists z(Sz \wedge Gxyz)))$
3. $M, g, ce \models_{\alpha} \text{ONLY}_{\phi}\psi$
PRE: $M, g, ce \models_{\alpha} \phi$ and $M, g, ce \models_{\alpha} \psi$
ASS: $\forall c'$: if $M, g, c'e \models_{\alpha} \phi$ then $c' \sqsubseteq c$

Some Basic Results

1 Topic and focus sensitive quantification

- $M, g, e \models_{?n\alpha} \text{ONLY}_{\exists n\gamma}\delta$ iff $M, g, e \models_{?n(\alpha\wedge\gamma)} \text{ONLY}_{\exists n\top}\delta$ iff
 $M, g, e \models \text{ONLY}_{\exists n(\alpha\wedge\gamma)}\delta$

They are closely related indeed.

2 Association with singular terms

- (1) Only John comes. $\exists x((x = j) \wedge \forall y(Cy \leftrightarrow (x = y)))$
- (2) Only a student protested. $\exists x(Sx \wedge \forall y(Py \leftrightarrow (x = y)))$
- (3) Only the vice-president phoned. $\exists x(VPx \wedge \forall y(PHy \leftrightarrow (x = y)))$

Benefit of DS/DRT: terms are assumed to satisfy the presuppositions. E.g. example (2): some student is such that only (s)he protested.

3 Association with plural terms

- (4) Only John and Harry come. $\exists X((X = \{j, h\}) \wedge \forall y(Cy \leftrightarrow Xy))$
 (5) Only some vegetarians protested. $\exists X((\emptyset \neq X \subseteq V) \wedge \forall y(Py \leftrightarrow Xy))$
 (6) Only five students gathered. $\exists X((X = 5S) \wedge G(X) \wedge \forall Y(G(Y) \rightarrow (Y \subseteq X)))$

Simply generalizing witnesses to the plural case.

4 Association with disjunctions

- (7) Only John or Harry comes. \Leftrightarrow
 Only John comes or only Harry comes.
 (8) Only a linguist or a logician voted against. \Leftrightarrow
 Only a linguist voted against or only a logician voted against.
 (9) Only John or Harry or both come. \Leftrightarrow
 Only John comes or only Harry comes or only both.

That's all pretty straightforward, but neat, right?

5 Association with bare plurals

- (10) Only Dutchmen ask for a receipt. $DM \supseteq AfaR$

Along the lines of (5), but without a presupposed witness.

6 Association with multiple terms

- (11) Penelope only met 42 heroes in 9 darkrooms.
 $\exists x((x = p) \wedge \exists Y((Y = 42H) \wedge \exists Z((Z = 9DR) \wedge M(p, Y, Z)))) \wedge$
 $\forall U \forall V(M(p_1, U, V) \rightarrow (\langle U, V \rangle \sqsubseteq \langle p_2, p_3 \rangle))$

Pretty straightforward again.

7 Association with generalized quantifiers

- (12) Mary only met most students.

Doesn't make sense, really. What does make sense is:

- (13) Mary met most students, and nobody else.

For a compositional analysis cf. Dekker, 2002, *Only Something Else*, manuscript.

8 Association with antecedents

- *only if* $[p]_F$ then $q \Leftrightarrow (\forall p' (\text{if } p' \text{ then } q): p' \sqsubseteq p) \Leftrightarrow p \leftarrow q$
- (14) You will qualify for the program only if you got your PhD. $QftPy \rightarrow PhDy$
 (15) Only if a farmer OWNS a donkey does he beat it. $\forall f, d: Ofd \leftarrow Bfd$
- *only* $[q]_F$ if $p \Leftrightarrow (\forall q' (q' \text{ if } p): q' \sqsubseteq q) \Leftrightarrow q \equiv \top$

Some Basic Conclusions

1. it's all there in the literature
2. what does \sqsubseteq really mean?
 - Mats?
 - Herman?
 - Richard?
 - Alastair?