

Quantification and Anaphora in Conditionals: Getting RESULTS

Classical theories of quantification and anaphora predict that the pronouns in (1) and (2) (with the narrow scope of the indefinite in (2)) should not be able to have *every cat* or *a donkey* as antecedents since the scope of *every* is limited to its minimal clause.

- (1) *If every cat purrs, it is happy (Poesio and Zucchi, 1992)
- (2) *If every farmer kicks a donkey, it brays (adapted from Barker and Shan (2007))

In this talk I argue that in conditionals: (i) *Every* is not a barrier to anaphoric dependence of a pronoun to elements within the universal's scope, and (ii) felicity conditions on anaphora differ in interesting ways from anaphora in the conditional's component clauses when they are expressed as two sequential assertions. While the data I discuss on conditionals further highlights the important role of context in the possibility of singular anaphora to universals, the observed pattern is not straightforwardly predicted by DRT style accounts of coherence relations on telescoping and quantificational subordination (QS).

It is usually assumed that the infelicity of (1) and (2) is due to a syntactic property of *every* that also shows up in non-conditional contexts, such as #*Every altar boy believed*. #*He was religious*. However, there are well known exceptions to this pattern, where the universal does not block intersentential anaphora, such as telescoping (3) and QS (4).

- (3) Every degree candidate approached the stage. He took his diploma and went to his seat. (B. Partee, in Roberts 1987)
- (4) Every chess set comes with a spare pawn. It is taped to the top of the box. (Sells 1985)

(5) - (6) are counterexamples (previously absent in the literature) to (1) - (2) and are akin to (3) - (4):

- (5) As for Diouf, if every club had a Dioufy it would be a livelier and better place.
- (6) If every student has a laptop, and if it is a required part of school (as it is in many colleges and law schools), there will no longer be a stigma of bringing it to class.

Discourse subordination phenomena appear to be sensitive to both discourse coherence and particular discourse relations. Only recently has empirical work attempted to sort out which types of DRT-style textual relations support telescoping and QS. (7) and (8), from Wang et al (to appear), demonstrate the effect of different DRT type relations on intersentential anaphora:

- (7) Every hunter that saw a deer shot it. a. It died immediately/b. #It was female.
- (8) Every student in the syntax class was accused of cheating.
a. He was reprimanded by the Dean./b. #He had a Ph.D. in astrophysics.

The (a) sentences in (7) and (8) involve a RESULT relation (Wang et al. to appear), while the (b) continuations clearly do not. But even though RESULT is the most natural way of linking the clauses in (1), it does not yield felicity. Similarly, (3) and (4) above are no longer acceptable as conditionals (*If every chess set....*). If we take conditionals in English to be a grammaticized expression of a single relation, e.g. CONDITION in a DRT-style analysis, we would not expect such variability in acceptability, particularly when the cohesion relation of the embedded clauses is held constant and licenses QS in other types of sentences.

Sorting out pragmatic effects on discourse subordination in conditionals is an important step in understanding exceptional anaphora in the construction. In this talk I argue that examples of QS in *if...then* utterances are rare due to the difficulty of construing situations which obtain only when a set of individuals is *universally* quantified over. However, supporting context improves many conditional QS examples greatly: in light of a highly communicable livestock disease and a scarcity of vaccine "*If every farmer in a village owns a donkey, the government will inoculate it for free*" receives no star or hash mark. Establishing this fact allows us to interpret sentences such as (1) as illustrating a pragmatic violation instead of a syntactico-semantic phenomenon.

References

- Barker, Chris and Chung-Chieh Shan. Donkey Anaphora is Simply Binding.
[semanticsarchive.net/Archive/ 2Y2ODI4Z/barker-shan-donkeys.pdf](http://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/2Y2ODI4Z/barker-shan-donkeys.pdf)
- Poesio, M. and Zucchi, A.: 1992, On Telescoping, *Proceedings of SALT 2*, 347–366.
- Wang, Linton, Eric McCready, and Nicholas Asher. Information Dependency in Quantificational Subordination, Where Semantics Meets Pragmatics, K. Turner & Klaus von Heusinger, (eds.), Elsevier. (forthcoming)