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The puzzle

(1) Ornette Coleman played the same tune as Don Cherry.
(2) Ornette Coleman played a different tune than Don Cherry.

(3) #Ornette Coleman played the same tune as this one.
(4) Ornette Coleman played a different tune than this one.

(Heim 1985:21-22)

We argue that this is because same presupposes an eventuality and different does not (Hardt & Mikkelsen 2020).
The presuppositional nature of *same*

(5)  a. Ornette Coleman played *Street Woman* and 
    b. Don Cherry played the *same* tune.

- In (5-b), *same*’s eventuality presupposition is ‘someone played a tune’.
- This presupposition is satisfied by (5-a) *Ornette Coleman* played *Street Woman*. 
The presuppositional nature of *same*

Negation makes that eventuality inaccessible:

(6) #Ornette Coleman *didn’t* play *Street Woman* but Don Cherry played the same tune.

▶ *same*’s presupposition is ‘someone played a tune’.
▶ That presupposition is not satisfied by the negated clause
▶ hence *same* is infelicitous.

To see that this is a matter of eventualities and not individuals, compare (6) to (7):

(7) Ornette Coleman *didn’t* play *Street Woman*, but Don Cherry played it.
The presuppositional nature of *same*

This eventuality requirement survives in questions and conditionals, indicating that it is indeed a presupposition.

(8) Ornette Coleman didn’t play *Street Woman*. #Did Don Cherry play the same tune?

(9) Ornette Coleman didn’t play *Street Woman*. #If Don Cherry played the same tune, the audience would know it.

(see Hardt & Mikkelsen 2020 for further evidence that *same* is presuppositional)
Back to comparatives

- **Clausal** comparative:
  
  (10) Imani ate more apples than [\(_{CP}\) Jayden ate ]

- **Reduced phrasal** comparative:
  
  (11) Imani ate more apples than [\(_{CP}\) Jayden ate ]

- **Unreduced phrasal** comparatives:
  
  (12) Imani ate more apples than [\(_{DP}\) Jayden]

- *than Jayden* could be a reduced phrasal comparative (11) OR an unreduced phrasal comparative (12)
Unambiguous comparatives

- whereas (13) is ambiguous, some phrasal comparatives are unambiguous (14):

(13) Imani ate more apples than Jayden.
(14) Ornette Coleman played a different tune than this one.

- There is no possible clausal source in (14).
- *than this one* can only be an unreduced phrasal comparative:

(15) Ornette Coleman played a different tune than \([_{\text{DP}} \text{this one}]\).
Comparatives and eventualities

- a reduced phrasal comparative makes an eventuality available via its clausal source: \( \text{than } [_{\text{CP}} \text{Jayden ate}] \)

- an unreduced phrasal comparative does not make any eventuality available, just an individual: \( \text{than } [_{\text{DP}} \text{Jayden}] \)
Solving the puzzle

Why is (16) infelicitous?

(16) #Ornette Coleman played the same tune as [dp this one].

1. there is no clausal source available in (16)
2. (16) can only be an unreduced phrasal comparative
3. an unreduced phrasal comparative does not provide an eventuality
4. same presupposes an eventuality

(16) results from presupposition failure
Solving the puzzle

Why is (17) felicitous?

(17) Ornette Coleman played the same tune as \textit{cp Don Cherry played}.

1. (17) is a reduced phrasal comparative
2. reduced phrasal comparatives make an eventuality available
   - \textit{same}’s eventuality presupposition is satisfied
Different

- *different* does not presuppose an eventuality:

(18) Ornette Coleman didn’t play *Street Woman*, instead he played a different tune.

- This explain why *different* is licensed in both reduced and unreduced phrasal comparatives:

(19) Ornette Coleman played a different tune than \([cp \text{ Don Cherry played}]\).

(20) Ornette Coleman played a different tune than \([dp \text{this one}]\).
Presupposition for *too*

*too* also presupposes an eventuality (Krifka 1998):

(21) Ornette Coleman played *Street Woman*. Don Cherry played it too.

(22) Ornette Coleman didn’t play *Street Woman*. #Don Cherry played it too.
same and too

Indeed *same* and *too* exhibit parallel distribution:

(23) Don Cherry played *Street Woman*.
   a. Ornette Coleman played the *same* tune.
   b. Ornette Coleman played it *too*.

(24) Don Cherry didn’t play *Street Woman*.
   a. #But Ornette Coleman played the *same* tune.
   b. #But Ornette Coleman played it *too*. 
same and too

However, *same* and *too* come apart when we consider so-called ‘internal readings’ licensed by a quantifier (Carlson 1987):

(25) Every trumpeter played the same tune.

- (25) allows an internal reading: if a trumpeter played some tune $x$, then every other trumpeter played tune $x$.
- the internal reading does not require identification of $x$
- Because the internal reading is available, (25) is acceptable without an external antecedent.
same and too

(26) #Every trumpeter played the tune too.

- (26) is not acceptable without an external antecedent, indicating that it lacks an internal reading.
- (26) cannot mean that there is some tune $x$ that every trumpeter played, without prior identification of $x$.
- with prior identification of $x$, too becomes felicitous

(27) Charlie Haden played *Street Woman*. Every trumpeter played it/the tune too.
Generating an Internal Reading for same

(28) Every trumpeter [played the same tune]

Assertion:
[[u_0|trumpeter(u_0)] < every > [u_1|tune(u_1), play(u_0, u_1), u_1 = u_3]]

"For every trumpeter u_0, there's a tune u_1 that u_0 played, and u_1 is identical to some contextually-identified u_3"

Eventuality presupposition:
[u_2, u_3|trumpeter(u_2), tune(u_3), play(u_2, u_3)]

"Some trumpeter u_2 played some tune u_3"
Generating an Internal Reading for *same*

**Accommodate Presupposition:** (Van der Sandt 1992)

\[
[[u_0, u_2, u_3|{\text{trumpeter}(u_0), \text{trumpeter}(u_2), \text{tune}(u_3), \text{play}(u_2, u_3)}] \\
< \text{every} > \\
[u_1|{\text{tune}(u_1), \text{play}(u_0, u_1), u_1 = u_3}]\]
\]

"For every pair of trumpeters < u_0, u_2 > where u_2 played a tune u_3, there's a tune u_1 that u_0 played, and u_1 is equal to u_3"

*Simplified from Hardt & Mikkelsen (2020)*
Internal Readings: *same* vs. *too*

- Internal readings are generated by presupposition trigger being within nuclear scope of quantifier (Hardt & Mikkelsen 2020)
- *same* appears within nuclear scope and can therefore generate internal readings
- We suggest that *too* cannot appear within the nuclear scope and therefore cannot generate internal readings
  - Syntactically *too* must attach at clausal level
  - Semantically *too* applies to objects of type *t*; nuclear scope is type $\langle e, t \rangle$
Conclusion

- Heim’s puzzle dissolves once we recognize that
  - *same* carries an eventuality presupposition;
  - *different* doesn’t
- *same* and *too*:
  - Like *same*, *too* carries an eventuality presupposition
  - Unlike *same*, *too* cannot generate internal readings
  - We suggest this is because *too* attaches outside the nuclear scope
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