Canonical intonation patterns

- **S↑:** Is *Ann-or-Bill*↑ coming over tonight?
- **M↓:** Is *Ann*↑ or *Bill*↓ coming over tonight?

**Relevant prosodic features:**
- Pitch accents
- Final pitch movement

**What is the semantic contribution of these features?**
A third pattern

- This cannot be determined just on the basis of the two canonical intonation patterns!
- We must consider at least one non-canonical pattern.

- S↑: Is Ann-or-Bill↑ coming over tonight? BLOCK
- M↓: Is Ann↑ or Bill↓ coming over tonight? CLOSED
- M↑: Is Ann↑ or Bill↑ coming over tonight? OPEN
### Puzzle 1: answerhood conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block: S↑</th>
<th>Open: S↑</th>
<th>Closed: M↓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Is Ann-or-Bill↑ coming?</td>
<td>- Is Ann↑ or Bill↑ coming?</td>
<td>- Is Ann↑ or Bill↓ coming?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No  &gt;neither</td>
<td>- No  &gt;neither</td>
<td>- # No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Yes &gt;at least one</td>
<td>- #Yes &gt;yes, what?!</td>
<td>- # Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Yes,) Ann is</td>
<td>(Yes,) Ann is</td>
<td>Ann is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Yes,) Bill is</td>
<td>(Yes,) Bill is</td>
<td>Bill is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Puzzle 2: ‘exactly one’ suggestion

- Is Ann↑ or Bill↓ coming over tonight?

  Suggests: exactly one of Ann and Bill is coming

Declarative
- Ann↑ or Bill↓ is coming tonight.
- No, neither of them are.

> at least one ‘asserted’

Interrogative
- Is Ann↑ or Bill↓ coming tonight?
- # No, neither of them are.
- Actually, neither of them are.

> at least one merely ‘suggested’
Syntax: focus and closure

- **Block:** Is Ann-or-Bill↑ coming?
  
  \[Q\text{-is [Ann or Bill] }_F \text{ coming}\]

- **Open:** Is Ann↑ or Bill↑ coming?
  
  \[Q\text{-is [Ann]}_F \text{ or [Bill]}_F \text{ coming}\]

- **Closed:** Is Ann↑ or Bill↓ coming?
  
  \[Q\text{-is [Ann]}_F \text{ or [Bill]}_F \text{ coming}\]
Semantics 1: proposing possibilities

- Ann is coming.
- Is Ann coming?
- Ann or Bill is coming.
- Is Ann or Bill coming?
Semantics 2: highlighting possibilities

Is the door open?

Yes >the door is open

Is the door closed?

Yes >the door is closed

confirms the highlighted possibility

confirms the highlighted possibility
Focus, highlighting, and yes/no resolution

Is Ann↑ or Bill↑ coming?
- No  >neither
- #Yes >yes, what?!

Is Ann-or-Bill↑ coming?
- No  >neither
- Yes >at least one

Yes  >presupposes exactly one highlighted possibility
      >confirms that possibility
No   >rejects all highlighted possibilities (to be refined)
Semantics 3: closure

Is Ann↑ or Bill↓ coming?

\[ \text{Q-is } [\text{Ann}]_F \text{ or } [\text{Bill}]_F \text{ coming} \]_C

Suggests: exactly one of Ann and Bill is coming
Semantics 3: closure

Generally: \([X]_C\) suggests that exactly one of the possibilities highlighted by X can be realized

So: \([Q\text{-is }[Ann]_F\text{ or }[Bill]_F\text{ coming}]_C\)

Proposes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlights:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suggestions: acceptance and cancellation

- Suggestions can either be accepted or cancelled
- Acceptance is the default  (Groenendijk, 2008; Balogh, 2009)

(1) Is Ann↑ or Bill↓ coming?
(2) Bill is.

> ‘exactly one’ suggestion accepted  > Ann is not coming

- Cancellation of a suggestion is not marked with ‘no’
  but with a weaker disagreement particle (‘actually’ or ‘in fact’)

(3) Is Ann↑ or Bill↓ coming?
(4) # No, neither of them is coming.
(5) Actually, neither of them is coming.
### Back to puzzle 1: answerhood conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is Ann-or-Bill↑ coming?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Is Ann↑ or Bill↑ coming?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Is Ann↑ or Bill↓ coming?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No → neither</td>
<td>No → neither</td>
<td>#No → cancel suggestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes → at least one</td>
<td>Yes → presup. failure</td>
<td>#Yes → presup. failure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>→ presupposes that the question highlighted exactly one possibility</td>
<td>→ confirms that possibility</td>
<td>→ rejects all highlighted possibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ not appropriate to cancel a suggestion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Back to puzzle 2: declaratives vs interrogatives

**Declarative**
- Ann↑ or Bill↓ is coming tonight.
- No, neither of them are.

**Interrogative**
- Is Ann↑ or Bill↓ coming tonight?
- # No, neither of them are.
- Actually, neither of them are.

**at least one ‘asserted’**

**at least one merely ‘suggested’**
Back to the experiment: canonical patterns

- **S↑:** Is Ann-or-Bill↑ coming over tonight?
  => YN interpretation

- **M↓:** Is Ann↑ or Bill↓ coming over tonight?
  => ALT interpretation

- As expected
Back to the experiment: final fall only

- $S\downarrow$: Is Ann-or-Bill$\downarrow$ coming over tonight?
  => predominantly ALT interpretation

- Proposed account:
  - Final fall triggers search for highlighted alternatives
  - Without such alternatives, closure is meaningless
  - Lack of alternatives triggers re-analysis of focal structure
Back to the experiment: $S\uparrow$ versus $M\uparrow$

- $S\uparrow$: Is Ann-or-Bill$\uparrow$ coming over tonight?
  => YN interpretation
- $M\uparrow$: Is Ann$\uparrow$ or Bill$\uparrow$ coming over tonight?
  => still predominantly YN interpretation

Explanation:
- Artefact of the experimental setup
- The offered YN paraphrase is compatible with the interpretation induced by $S\uparrow$ but also with that induced by $M\uparrow$
- Further experimentation is needed to establish the subtle interpretive difference between the two patterns
Repercussions

- Exclusivity effects in **declarative disjunctions**:

  (1) **Ann**↑ or **Bill**↓ is coming. >at most one
  (2) **Ann**↑ is coming, or **Bill**↑, or both ↓. >perhaps both

- **Might**:

  (3) Jim might talk to **Ann**↑ or **Bill**↓. >at most one
  (4) Jim might talk to **Ann-or-Bill**. >perhaps both

- **Ignorance implicatures**: follow from ‘inquisitive sincerity principle’

- **Cross-linguistic applicability**: Core mechanisms may apply cross-linguistically, though their ‘implementation’ will differ (e.g., closure may be marked by intonation/word order/morphology).