

o 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.

(1) S: Who is Alfonso talking to?

(2) **Extreme ignorance questions**

- S: Who on earth is Alfonso talking to?
- 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 ‘indefinitist’ 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 wideness 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.

o.1 **Background: on the semantics of interrogatives**

- Groenendijk and Stokhof 1997 – **Hamblin's picture** (cf. Hamblin 1958, 1973; Groenendijk and Stokhof 1984)
 - An answer to a question is a sentence, or statement.
 - The possible answers to a question form an exhaustive set of mutually exclusive possibilities.
 - 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.

(3) Polar question

$$[[\text{Did Alfonso come to the party}]] = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \lambda w. \text{Alfonso came to the party in } w, \\ \lambda w. \text{Alfonso did not come to the party in } w \end{array} \right\}$$

(4) Constituent question

$$[[\text{Who came to the party?}]] = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \lambda w. (\text{Only}) \text{ Alfonso came to the party in } w, \\ \lambda w. (\text{Only}) \text{ Joanna came to the party in } w, \\ \lambda w. (\text{Only}) \text{ Henry came to the party in } w, \\ \lambda w. (\text{Only}) \text{ Alfonso and Joanna came to the party in } w, \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \end{array} \right\}$$

- Hamblin 1973; Kratzer and Shimoyama 2002: “wh”-pronoun denotes a set of alternative individuals.
- Groenendijk 1999: dynamic effect of alternative set is to partition the (set of possible world making up the) context.

I 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”
- Regular constituent question: “Wh”-item presupposes some salient domain. (cf. Westerstahl 1984; von Stechow 1994; Stanley and Szabó 2000 among others)
 - 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.
 - Who is Alfonso talking to?
- **[who]** might be the set of people at the conference, the set of people who Alfonso knows, etc.
 - Whoever / who on earth is Alfonso talking to?
- **[Whoever]/[Who on earth]?**

- Possibility 1: all people (D&G).
- Possibility 2: some set that is sufficiently wider than any salient domains.
- Ignorance follows from the inclusion of unlikely or non-prototypical examples in the domain set.

1.1 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 $\exists x [P(x)(w) \wedge Q(x)(w)] \rightarrow \text{SHOULD} \neg Q(x)(w)$, 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 (13), 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.

- a. Who will they pick?
- b. Which contestant will they pick?
- c. Whoever will they pick?
- d. Who on earth will they pick?

- Domain identical between all four examples.
- Extensional domain widening prediction: extreme ignorance questions should be infelicitous, or have the same interpretation as other constituent questions.
 - Wrong!
 - Domain is not just fixed, it is *necessarily fixed* – can’t even expand to include individuals who are only possible answers.
- Rather than having us consider unlikely individuals, such questions have us consider unlikely ways of differentiating them.
- Extensional domain widening can be neither the right characterization of the difference between the two kinds of questions, nor the right analysis of it.
 - See Arregui 2008 for a related observation about free choice items – plain indefinites often prefer extensional domains just as wide as free choice indefinites.
 - Side note: given fixed domain, no difference in informativity (at least w.r.t. quantity) between any of the questions above.

3 ANALYZING EXTREME IGNORANCE

- Proposal: “-ever” indicates that the domain of discourse is as wide as possible, relative to the issue the question raises.
- Domain of discourse? Context set (Stalnaker 1978).
 - Set of possible worlds(/situations) that could be actual, as far as discourse participants are (publicly) concerned.
- What does it mean to be wide? Domain includes worlds where propositions in question are very unlikely but still possible.
- Set of individuals under consideration may have to be wide as a consequence (but won’t necessarily widen).
- Cf. Chierchia 2006: “uncertainty about quantificational domains may also have qualitative aspects.” My claim: ‘qualitative’ aspects primary.
- Technical implementation:¹
 - (15) $c + [\text{whatever/on earth } [\alpha]] = c + [\text{what } [\alpha]]$
defined only if
 $\text{Dom}(c) \supseteq \{w \mid \exists p \in [[\text{what } [\alpha]]]^c : p \text{ is a slight possibility in } w \text{ relative to } f_c \text{ and } g_c\}$
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.

- “Slight possibility”: see Kratzer 1981, 1991.
- 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.²
- Lewis 1979: In normal circumstances we tend to ignore possibilities that we consider unlikely or not relevant by default.
 - E.g. implicit 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.
- Explanation 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

- Recap: “on earth”, “-ever”, etc. mark domain wideness, in the spirit of Kadmon and Landman 1993.
- 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.

²The idea I pursue here, while quite different, seems potentially related to Dayal’s 1998 contextual vagueness condition. As I am ignoring the licensing issues, I leave this connection for the future.

- The role of widening in other free choice constructions:
 - The form of widening I invoke here could be dropped in as part of the analysis of FC items. (Should it be?)
 - Wideness presupposition – similar to a modal “even” (cf. Lee and Horn 1994; Krifka 1995; Lahiri 1998).
 - Explains why FC items have a modal component (Dayal 1998).
 - Should wideness be derived via (Gricean) pragmatic principles, rather than stated as a property of lexical items? Seems to be conventional for extreme ignorance questions.
- Questions:
 - Differences among types of extreme ignorance questions? (“-ever” on its way out?)
 - Interaction with D&G’s licensing puzzles? (cf. Pesetsky’s 1987 description of such phrases as “aggressively non-D-linked”).
 - Marking extreme ignorance cross-linguistically?
 - Unified account of “-ever” across free relatives, questions?

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For discussion of this and related work I am grateful to Donka Farkas, Sandy Chung, Bill Ladusaw, Pete Alrenga, Pranav Anand, Scott AnderBois, Jan Anderssen, Chris Barker, Adrian Brasoveanu, Daniel Büring, Greg Carlson, Ivano Caponigro, Cleo Condoravdi, Hans-Martin Gärtner, Christine Gunlogson, James Isaacs, Olga Kagan, Andrew Kehler, Ruth Kramer, Angelika Kratzer, Jim McCloskey, Paula Menéndez-Benito, Geoff Pullum, Alia Sperling, Zoltán Szabó, Dave Teeple, Michael Wagner, and Gigi Ying; as well as audiences in UCSC under numerous circumstances, at SALT 2008, and at Johns Hopkins University in May/Dec 2008.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arregui, Ana. 2008. Some remarks on domain widening. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 27*, ed. Natasha Abner and Jason Bishop, 45–53. Cascadilla Press.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 2006. Broaden your views: Implicatures of domain widening and the “logicality” of language. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37:535–590.
- Conlin, Frances, Paul Hagstrom, and Carol Neidle. 2003. A particle of indefiniteness in American Sign Language. *Linguistic Discovery* 2:1–21.
- Dayal, Veneta. 1998. *Any* as inherently modal. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 21:433–476.
- den Dikken, Marcel, and Anastasia Giannakidou. 2002. From *Hell* to polarity: “aggressively non-d-linked” *Wh*-phrases as polarity items. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:31–61.
- von Stechow, Kai. 1994. Restrictions on quantifier domains. PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Groenendijk, Jeroen. 1999. The logic of interrogation. In *Proceedings of SALT IX*, ed. T. Matthews and D. L. Strohlovitch. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.
- Groenendijk, Jeroen, and Martin Stokhof. 1984. Studies in the semantics of questions and the pragmatics of answers. PhD dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
- Groenendijk, Jeroen, and Martin Stokhof. 1997. Questions. In *Handbook of logic and language*, ed. J. van Benthem and A. ter Meulen, 1055–1124. Elsevier/MIT Press.
- Hagstrom, Paul. 1998. Decomposing questions. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

- Hamblin, C. L. 1958. Questions. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 36:159–168.
- Hamblin, C. L. 1973. Questions in montague english. *Foundations of Language* 10:41–53.
- Horn, Laurence. 2000. Pick a theory (not just any theory). In *Negation and polarity*, ed. Laurence Horn and Yasuhiko Kato, 147–192. Oxford University Press.
- Kadmon, Nirit, and Fred Landman. 1993. Any. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16:353–422.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1977. Syntax and semantics of questions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1:3–44.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1981. The notional category of modality. In *Words, worlds, and contexts: New approaches in world semantics*, ed. Hans-Jürgen Eikmeyer and Hannes Rieser, 38–74. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1991. Modality. In *Semantics: an international handbook of contemporary research*, ed. A. von Stechow and D. Wunderlich, 639–650. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kratzer, Angelika. Forthcoming. *The event argument and the semantics of voice*. MIT Press.
- Kratzer, Angelika, and Junko Shimoyama. 2002. Indeterminate pronouns: The view from Japanese. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Tokyo conference on psycholinguistics*, ed. Yukio Otsu, 1–25. Hituzi Syobo.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1995. The semantics and pragmatics of polarity items. *Linguistic Analysis* 25:1–49.
- Lahiri, Utpal. 1998. Focus and negative polarity in Hindi. *Natural Language Semantics* 6:57–123.
- Lahiri, Utpal. 2002. *Questions and answers in embedded contexts*. Oxford University Press.
- Lee, Felicia. 1994. Negative polarity licensing in “wh”-questions. M.A. thesis, UCLA.
- Lee, Young-Suk, and Laurence Horn. 1994. Any as indefinite+Even. Manuscript, Yale University.
- Lewis, David. 1979. Scorekeeping in a language game. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 8:339–359.
- Pesetsky, David. 1987. Wh-in-situ: Movement and unselective binding. In *The representation of (in)definites*, ed. Eric J. Reuland and Alice G. B. ter Meulen, 98–129. MIT Press.
- Rawlins, Kyle. 2008. (Un)conditionals: an investigation in the syntax and semantics of conditional structures. Ph.D. dissertation, UC Santa Cruz.
- Stalnaker, Robert. 1978. Assertion. In *Pragmatics*, ed. Peter Cole, 315–332. New York: Academic Press.
- Stanley, Jason, and Zoltá Gendler Szabó. 2000. On quantifier domain restriction. *Mind & Language* 15.
- Westerstahl, Dag. 1984. Determiners and context sets. In *Generalized quantifiers and natural language*, ed. Johan van Benthem and Alice G. B. ter Meulen, 45–71. Foris Publications.