

Sentence-internal *different* as a lexical reciprocal

This talk focuses on sentences such as the following:

- (1) Mark and Raymond read different books.

[Interpretation: The book Mark read is different from the book Raymond read]

I call this the **plural-dependent reading**, and argue that it's an instance of the collective unary form of the adjective, which is not derived from the binary form (Winter 2018):

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| (2) X and Y are different. | (collective) |
| (3) a. X is different from Y. | } (binary) |
| b. X and Y are different from each other. | |

Road-map:

1. Introduce the plural-dependent reading
2. Argue that plural-dependent readings are generally available for (and limited to) lexically reciprocal adjectives
3. Argue that plural-dependent readings behave like collective unary uses of lexically reciprocal predicates (in contrast to periphrastic reciprocal constructions)
4. Conclude that plural-dependent readings are collective unary uses (and arise pragmatically)
5. Raise two as-of-yet unsolved issues

1. The different faces of *different*

different contributes a relation between individuals.¹ These individuals may be introduced in various ways (Carlson 1987, Beck 2000):

¹ *different* also has a use as a one-place predicate, which can be paraphrased as *strange* or *special*, and is often marked e.g. with special intonation:

(i) The book Mark read is quite... different.

- (4) a. Mark is different from Raymond. (overt)
b. Mark read a different book than Raymond. (comparative)
c. Raymond read The Hobbit. Mark read a different book. (anaphoric)
d. [pointing at The Hobbit] Mark read a different book. (deictic)
e. Raymond read several different books. (reciprocal)
f. Mark and Raymond read different books. (plural-dependent)
g. Every boy read a different book. (Q-bound)

(4f) and (4g) have **sentence-internal** readings: the relation contributed by *different* is determined with respect to another phrase within the same sentence (Carlson 1987).

In other words: *different* doesn't relate ANY books – it relates books read by Mark and Raymond, respectively; or by each of the boys, respectively.

Beck (2000) distinguishes between (4f) and (4g) in light of German data:

- (4) f'. Mark und Raymond lesen verschiedene/#andere Bücher. (plural-dependent)
g'. Jeder Junge las ein anderes/*verschiedenes Buch. (Q-bound)

The same difference in distribution also holds in Hebrew (*šone* vs. *axer*) and in Romanian (*diferite* vs. *alt*) (Brasoveanu 2011), and also extends to adjectives other than *different* (see next section).

2. Beyond *different*

Plural-dependent readings aren't unique to *different* (Carlson 1987, Barker 2007):

- (5) a. *Edinburgh and Glasgow Airports saw identical increases* in passenger numbers in April. [g]
[Interpretation: the increase Edinburgh Airport saw is identical to the increase Glasgow Airport saw]

b. “*You and I use similar phrasing* in the opening line,” he wrote, “because it is a common, economical way to state the facts.” [g]

[Interpretation: the phrasing the (quoted) speaker uses is similar to the phrasing the addressee uses]

c. For example, my daughter knows that *Mom and Dad live in separate houses*. [g]

[Interpretation: the house Mom lives in is separate from the house dad lives in]

Q: What “qualifies” these adjectives for having plural-dependent readings?

A: Lexical reciprocity

A predicate is **lexically reciprocal** if it has a collective unary use which “means the same” as a binary construction with a reciprocal pronoun (Gleitman et al. 1996):

- (6) a. Ecuador and the United States are different (= from each other).
- b. The copy and the painting are identical (= to each other).
- c. North Korea and China are similar (= to each other).
- d. The wheel and the car are separate (= from each other).

Lexical reciprocity isn’t predictable from semantics, not even from logical symmetry:

(7) X is far from Y \Leftrightarrow Y is far from X, but:
X and Y are far (\neq from each other).

(8) X and Y hugged (= each other), but:
X hugged Y \nrightarrow Y hugged X.

Claim: An adjective has plural-dependent readings only if it is lexically reciprocal²

² Lexical reciprocity is a necessary but not sufficient condition. For example, *alike* is lexically reciprocal, but cannot be used attributively and hence cannot have a plural-dependent reading:

- (i) Mark and Raymond are quite alike (= to each other).
- (ii) *Mark and Raymond read alike books.

Contrast *close* (=near) vs. *close* (=similar), *adjacent*, *karov* ‘near’:

- (9)a. Utrecht and Nijmegen are close (\neq to each other).
b. Mark and Raymond live in close cities. (#plural-dependent)
- (10)a. Anyway, this bar was really sweet, and tasted A LOT like an Almond Joy.
Not exactly, but *the tastes ARE close* (= to each other). [g]
b. Thanks a ton, this just solidifies that I need to pay attention to what you read
because *we have close tastes on lots of stuff*. [g] (\checkmark plural-dependent)
- (11)a. Observe that *these branches are adjacent* (= to each other), that is, they
have a terminal bus in common. [g]
b. *A cardinal and a squirrel sat on adjacent hickory branches*, both
complaining loudly at the disappearance of their favorite pine tree. [g]
(\checkmark plural-dependent)
- (12)a. Tel Aviv ve-Kfar Saba krovot (= axat la-šniya).
Tel Aviv and-Kfar Saba near (one to.the-second)
b. Leon ve-Ruti garim be-arim krovot. (\checkmark plural-dependent)
Leon and-Ruti live in-cities near

This is not the case for Q-bound readings. An adjective may have Q-bound readings
without being lexically reciprocal:

- (13)a. ?Tel Aviv ve-Kfar Saba axerot (\neq axat me-ha-šniya).
Tel Aviv and-Kfar Saba different (one from-the-second)
b. kol student gar be-ir axeret. (\checkmark Q-bound)
every student lives in-city different

Beck's (2000) account: <i>different</i> can take a covert reciprocal pronoun

- (14)a. Mark and Raymond are different ~~from each other~~
b. Mark and Raymond read different ~~from each other~~ books

3. Against covert reciprocals

There are established contrasts between **collective unary** (intransitive) uses of lexically reciprocal verbs and **periphrastic** reciprocal constructions (e.g. *each other*):

Reducibility to sub-events (Carlson 1998, Siloni 2002, Winter 2018)

(15) [Mark hugged Raymond. Later, Raymond hugged Mark]

a. Mark and Raymond hugged each other. (periphrastic)

b. #Mark and Raymond hugged. (collective)

Strict reading in comparative ellipsis (Siloni 2012)

(16) [|hugs between M&R| > |hugs between other kids and M&R|]

a. Mark and Raymond hugged each other more than the other kids did.
(periphrastic)

b. #Mark and Raymond hugged more than the other kids did. (collective)

Partial control (Landau 2016)

(17) Mark_i wants PRO_{i+} to hug (*each other).

Co-occurrence with lexical mass nouns

(18) a. *The weaponry combines* (*with each other) to form a sword, with Prowl's rump forming the hilt, Ironhide's clubs forming the shaft and Silverbolt's swords forming the blade. [g]

b. I like what you've done with the place. *The furniture all matches* (*each other) now. [g]

(19) [Carpets match carpets, and drapes match drapes] (Gillon 1992)

a. The carpets and the drapes match each other.

b. The carpeting and the drapery match each other. (periphrastic)

c. The carpeting and the drapery (both) match. (collective)

Claim: The contrasts extend (i) to adjectives and (ii) to plural-dependent readings

Reducibility to sub-states (Goodman 1951 apud Winter 2018)

❖ Adjectives:

(20) a. Mark, Raymond and Michelle are similar to each other in outlook, tastes and appearance, respectively. (periphrastic)

b. Mark, Raymond and Michelle are similar in outlook, tastes and appearance (*respectively). (collective)

❖ Plural-dependent readings:

(21) [Mark's book is in a similar style to Raymond's book, Raymond's book is in the same genre as Michelle's book, and Michelle's book promotes the same values as Mark's book]

#Mark, Raymond and Michelle read similar books.

Strict reading in comparative ellipsis

❖ Adjectives:

(22) [closeness (M,R) > closeness (other kids, M&R)]

a. Mark and Raymond are closer to each other than the other kids are. (periphrastic)

b. #Mark and Raymond are closer than the other kids are. (collective)

❖ Plural-dependent readings:

(23) [closeness (M's taste, R's taste) > closeness (other kids' tastes, M&R's tastes)]

#Mark and Raymond have closer tastes than the other kids do.

Partial control

(24) Murray stresses that she is only mentioning this possibility because *she wants to be equal* (*to each other). [g]

(25) I'm guessing he snores and *his wife wants to sleep in separate bedrooms*. [g]

Co-occurrence with lexical mass nouns

❖ Adjectives:

(26) a. *Modern loading equipment is identical* (*to each other) worldwide. [g]

b. *Their jewelry was all different* (*from each other) but blended so well together. [g]

(27) [weaponry is identical to weaponry, and equipment is identical to equipment]

The weaponry and the equipment are identical (#to each other).

❖ Plural-dependent readings:

(28) a. I mean, we're alike but we aren't. *We like different furniture*. [g]

b. I let *my bridesmaids wear different jewelry* to break the matchy-matchy up.
[g]

(29) [Carpets are different from carpets, and drapes are different from drapes]

Mark and Raymond bought different carpeting and drapery.

4. Conclusions

No explanatory power in positing covert reciprocal pronouns.

Plural-dependent readings behave like collective unary uses. If we assume that is really what they are, there's nothing special structurally about these sentences:

(30) a. Mark and Raymond read different books.

b. Mark and Raymond read books, and the books they read are different.

(31) a. Mark and Raymond read interesting books.

b. Mark and Raymond read books, and the books they read are interesting.

Q: What gives rise to the dependency of the relations on the licensing phrase?

A: Pragmatics.

The relations contributed by the adjective can be determined with respect to a plurality that is conceptually but not grammatically accessible (Chierchia 1998):

- (32) a. *The furniture comes from different places.* Some pieces have been traveling with me for years. [g]
- b. This statue of Wilde is unique... *The statue is made from different stones of color* – for example, Wilde’s jacket is green stone which looks like jade with red stone cuffs. [g]

No qualitative difference between plural-dependent readings and “reciprocal” readings (certainly not vacuous, cf. Carlson 1987):

- (33) a. Mark read (very/somewhat/the most) different books.
- a’. Mark las verschiedene/#andere Bücher.

[Interpretation: a book Mark read was different from another book he read]

Support for the irreducibility of collective unary forms (Winter 2018):

If we assume (i) that collective unary forms of lexically reciprocal predicates are derived from their binary forms, and (ii) that the parts of a lexical mass noun’s denotation are not accessible during semantic derivation (Chierchia 1998, cf. Landman 2011), then we have no way of deriving (iii) the fact that the collective unary form can take a lexical mass noun as an argument.

5. Open issues

I. Plural-dependent readings also seem to be available for relational nouns and participle (stative) verbs:

- (34) a. Michelle and Bo are sisters (= each other’s sisters).
- b. Maroons speedsters Michael Morgan and Valentine Holmes — share a unique relationship: *they are dating sisters.* [g]
- [Interpretation: the person Michael Morgan is dating is the sister of the person Valentine Holmes is dating]

(35) a. The button and the shirt match (=each other).

b. *Meghan Markle and Prince Harry wore matching outfits* to the Queen's birthday. [g]

[Interpretation: the outfit Meghan Markle wore matches the outfit Prince Harry wore]

However, the latter are not necessarily lexically reciprocal:

(36) a. *Russia and China border/neighbor

b. State police are searching for a man, *suspected of attempted burglary and robbery in bordering towns* early Sunday morning. [g]

[Interpretation: the town the burglary was committed in borders the town the robbery was committed in]

II. One contrast between intransitive reciprocal verbs and periphrastic reciprocal constructions is not replicated with adjectives – co-occurrence with collective nouns:

(37) a. The couple kissed (*with each other).

b. The couple is different (\neq from each other).

c. Twenty percent of all married *couples are cousins* (= each other's cousins).
[g]

List of references

- Barker, C. (2007). Parasitic scope. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 30(4), 407-444.
- Beck, S. (2000). The semantics of different: Comparison operator and relational adjective. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 23(2), 101-139.
- Brasoveanu, A. (2011). Sentence-internal different as quantifier-internal anaphora. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 34(2), 93-168.
- Carlson, G. N. (1987). Same and different: Some consequences for syntax and semantics. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 10(4), 531-565.
- Carlson, G. (1998). Thematic roles and the individuation of events. In S. Rothstein (ed.), *Events and Grammar*, 35–51. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

- Chierchia, G. (1998). Plurality of mass nouns and the notion of ‘semantic parameter’.
In S. Rothstein (ed.), *Events and Grammar*, 53-103. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Gillon, B. S. (1992). Towards a common semantics for English count and mass nouns.
Linguistics and Philosophy, 15(6), 597-639.
- Gleitman, L. R., H. Gleitman, C. Miller and R. Ostrin. (1996). Similar, and similar
concepts. *Cognition*, 58(3), 321-376.
- Goodman, N. (1951). *The structure of appearance*. Cambridge: Harvard University
Press.
- Landau, I. (2016). Against the null comitative analysis of partial control. *Linguistic
Inquiry*, 47(3), 572-580.
- Landman, F. (2011). Count nouns-mass nouns, neat nouns-mess nouns. In M.
Glanzberg, B. H. Partee and J. Škilter (eds.), *Formal Semantics and
Pragmatics: Discourse, Context and Models. The Baltic International
Yearbook of Cognition, Logic and Communication*, 6, 1-67.
- Siloni, T. (2002). Active lexicon. *Theoretical Linguistics* 28(3), 383–400.
- Siloni, T. (2012). Reciprocal verbs and symmetry. *Natural Language & Linguistic
Theory*, 30(1), 261-320.
- Winter, Y. (2018). Symmetric predicates and the semantics of reciprocal alternations.
Semantics and Pragmatics, 11(1).