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1 Overview

- What is the difference between a regular constituent question, and an extreme ignorance question?
- “-ever”, “on earth”, “the hell”, “in the world”, “the devil”, etc.

Scenario 1: S is at the LSA, and sees Alfonso talking to someone they don’t recognize.

(i) S: Who is Alfonso talking to?

(ii) Extreme ignorance questions

a. S: Who on earth is Alfonso talking to?

b. S: Whoever is Alfonso talking to?

First pass: (extra) ignorance, low likelihood, surprise (Lee 1994; den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002).
- What is the right precise characterization of these differences?
- What is the right way of deriving these differences?
- What can we learn about free choice from extreme ignorance questions?

Proposal: “-ever”, “on earth” trigger domain widening (following den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002).
- Hamblin ‘indefinites’ approach (in the sense of Horn 2000).
- However, domain widening can’t be “extensional” as D&G propose (and as is often seen in the free choice literature).
  - Evidence: examples where extensional domain is fixed, and couldn’t be any different.
  - Must be intensional – widen the set of possible worlds/situations under consideration (cf. Dayal 1998).
  - Any widening of extensional domain is epiphenomenal.

Technically, widening takes the form of a widthness presupposition – presupposition that context set is as wide as possible, given the circumstances.
- Any actual widening (in a procedural sense) is the result of presupposition accommodation.
- Plan:
  - Background on questions.
  - Extensional domain widening analysis.
  - Fixed domain data, consequences.
  - Intensional domain widening proposal.

0.1 Background: on the semantics of interrogatives


  (i) An answer to a question is a sentence, or statement.
  (ii) The possible answers to a question form an exhaustive set of mutually exclusive possibilities.
  (iii) To know the meaning of a question is to know what counts as an answer to that question.

- Hamblin 1973 (see also Karttunen 1977; Hagstrom 1998; Kratzer and Shimoyama 2002; Lahiri 2002 among many others):
  - An interrogative denotes a set of alternative propositions, corresponding to possible answers.

  (i) Polar question

  \[ \text{Did Alfonso come to the party?} = \{ \lambda w. \text{Alfonso came to the party in } w, \lambda w. \text{Alfonso did not come to the party in } w \} \]

  (4) Constituent question

  \[ \text{Who came to the party?} = \{ \lambda w. (\text{Only} Alfonso came to the party in } w, \lambda w. (\text{Only} Joanna came to the party in } w, \lambda w. (\text{Only} Henry came to the party in } w, \} \]

- Groenendijk 1999: dynamic effect of alternative set is to partition the (set of possible world making up the) context.

1 The extensional domain widening account

- den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002, focusing on expletive questions with “the hell”: such questions trigger “domain extension” – similar to domain widening in the sense of Kadmon and Landman 1993.

  “When attached to a wh-word, the modifier the-hell, we argue, extends the domain of quantification to include familiar and novel values. This we call domain extension. As a result of domain extension, the domain of quantification for wh-the-hell is the entire domain D, and not just a presupposed subset of it, as with regular wh-words.” (den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002 p. 43)

- Conlin et al. 2003 also propose widening to account for a kind of question particle in ASL, conveying uncertainty.
  - “The effect of part:indef seems to be to extend the domain of reference to beyond the typical”
  - Simplest Hamblin-style analysis: denotation of “wh”-item is the set of individuals in the salient domain. (cf. Kratzer and Shimoyama 2002)

- Recall scenario 1: S is at the LSA, and sees Alfonso talking to someone they don’t recognize.

  (5) Who is Alfonso talking to?

- [who] might be the set of people at the conference, the set of people who Alfonso knows, etc.

  (6) Whoever / who on earth is Alfonso talking to?

- [Whoever] / [Who on earth]?
1. Negative attitude

• D&G also propose that “wh”-epithets introduce a presupposition of “negative attitude”.

(7) Who the hell talked to Ariadne?

presupposes: “If there is a person x in w, and x talked to Ariadne in w: x should not have talked to Ariadne in w.”

• Technical implementation:

(8) Presupposition of negative attitude of “wh-the-hell” (den Dikken and Giannakidou 2002 ex. 38)

In the actual world w: If ∃x[P(x)(w) ∧ Q(x)(w)] → SHOULD¬Q(x)(w), for all possible values of x.

(where x is the variable of “wh-the-hell”, P is the property denoted by the “wh-the-hell” phrase, and Q is the property denoted by the VP.)

• This presupposition does not seem to be general to the whole class, only triggered for “the hell”, “the fuck”, etc.

(9) What the hell did Alfonso do to the coffee maker?
(10) What on earth did Alfonso do to the coffee maker?

• Deontic claim does not appear in all circumstances:

(11) Who the hell is Alfonso talking to?
(12) What the hell am I supposed to do with this form?
(13) Where the hell is Alfonso?

• Expressive content more like speaker frustration at lack of an answer.

• Modal negatives of various kinds may be inferrable from frustration, including those captured by negative attitude presup.

  – e.g. in (11), the modal component is that the speaker should be here, stronger than the claim that he shouldn’t be where he is.

• I will set the negative attitude issue aside – not general to all epithet questions, or to “ever” questions.

2. Fixed domains

• Extreme ignorance questions felicitous in contexts where extensional domain is completely fixed.

(14) Scenario 2: A reality show is nearing the end of its season. 5 candidates are left, and the competition is fierce. On the task for this episode, all of the competitors do extremely well. It is hard to tell who the judges will pick as the person to send home.

(15) c + [whatever/on earth [α]] = c + [what [α]]

defined only if

\[ \text{Dom}(c) \supseteq \{w | p \in [\text{what } [\alpha]]_c \} \]

where \( f_c \) is a speaker-oriented epistemic modal base and \( g_c \) a circumstantial ordering source.

• Paraphrase: the domain of the context (context set) includes worlds where alternative propositions are a slight possibility.

1See Rawlins 2008 for a more compositional version of this.

Not a widening presupposition, but a wideness presupposition.

- May of course be accommodated.
- Accommodating presupposition can affect what individuals might correspond to possible answers – end effect of question is to partition the context set.

Another way of putting it: extreme ignorance questions not compatible with implicit domain narrowing. What do I mean by domain narrowing?

- Discourse circumstances radically underspecify contexts: the context is subject to vagueness.
- Another way of putting it: extreme ignorance questions not compatible with implicit domain narrowing. What do I mean by domain narrowing?

- However, the boundary can be explicitly shifted outwards via accommodation.

Lewis 1979, p. 183, my emphasis: “Suppose I am talking with some elected official about the ways he might deal with an embarrassment. So far, we have been ignoring those possibilities that would be political suicide for him. He says: ‘You see, I must either destroy the evidence or else claim that I did it to stop Communism. What else can I do?’ I rudely reply: ‘There is one other possibility – you can put the public interest first for once!’ That would be false if the boundary between relevant and ignored possibilities remained stationary. But it is not false in its context, for hitherto ignored possibilities come into consideration and make it true. And the boundary, once shifted outward, stays shifted. If he protests ‘I can’t do that’, he is mistaken.”

- Wideness presupposition enforces attention to the unlikely possibilities in just this way.
- Ensures that worlds where an alternative is extremely unlikely are contained in the alternative.
- Recall from Hamblin: alternative here = possible answer.
- If an alternative would consist of worlds where the proposition in question is unlikely, it may spring into existence as a consequence of accommodating wideness.

Weakening of both free domain and fixed domain data.

- Scenario 1: context set will have to be wide enough to include unlikely possibilities for who Alfonso is talking to. Accommodating this may will expand number of alternatives (a la Lewis).
- Scenario 2: context set will have to be wide enough to include unlikely propositions about one of the candidates being eliminated in the alternative set. Number of alternatives fixed. Felicitous because possibilities do expand.

4 Conclusions

- Widening + wideness + accommodation.
- Domain wideness involves the inclusion of distant possibilities possibilities, not (necessarily) the inclusion of unlikely or non-typical individuals.
- Follows recent work by Kratzer (forthcoming) – quantifier domains are not sets of individuals.
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