# *Same*, parallelism, and presuppositions

Daniel Hardt & Line Mikkelsen
Copenhagen Business School & UC Berkeley

LSA Annual Meeting, 1/8/21

# 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 [$_{\text{CP}}$Jayden ate ]

- **Reduced phrasal** comparative:

(11) Imani ate more apples than [$_{\text{CP}}$Jayden ~~ate~~]

- **Unreduced phrasal** comparatives:

(12) Imani ate more apples than [$_{\text{DP}}$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 [$_{\mathrm{DP}}$this one].

# Comparatives and eventualities

- a reduced phrasal comparative makes an eventuality available via its clausal source: *than* [$_{\mathrm{CP}}$ *Jayden* ~~*ate*~~]
- an unreduced phrasal comparative does not make any eventuality available, just an individual: *than* [$_{\mathrm{DP}}$ *Jayden*]

# Solving the puzzle

- Why is (16) infelicitous?

(16) #Ornette Coleman played the **same** tune as [$_{\mathrm{DP}}$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 [$_{\text{CP}}$Don Cherry ~~played~~].

1. (17) is a reduced phrasal comparative
2. reduced phrasal comparatives make an eventuality available

- *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 [$_{\mathrm{CP}}$ Don Cherry ~~played~~].

(20) Ornette Coleman played a different tune than [$_{\mathrm{DP}}$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)

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

"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 $< e, t >$

# 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

# References


Carlson, Greg (1987) "Same and different: Some consequences for syntax and semantics." *Linguistics & Philosophy* 10: 531–565.

Hardt, Daniel & Line Mikkelsen (2020) Same and different: A presuppositional account. *Proceedings of NELS 50*

Heim, Irene (1985) Notes on Comparatives and Related Matters. Ms.

Krifka (1998) Additive particles under stress. *Proceedings of SALT 8*.

Van der Sandt, Rob A. (1992). Presupposition projection as anaphora resolution. *Journal of Semantics* 9:333–377.