Comments on Dalrymple and Haug's paper

Yoad Winter, Utrecht University

Workshop on the cross-linguistic semantics of reciprocals

Utrecht University, 7-8 October 2019

Dalrymple and Haug (2019):

"the relational approach to reciprocals provides a better solution to a range of puzzles of reciprocals than the competing approaches"

- *operator-based, distributivity-based approaches*

General aim: hedge the claim about "better solutions" in this context, especially in relation to cross-linguistic studies.

Semantics of English reciprocals

Operator approach: *each other* denotes an operator from binary predicates to (collective) unary predicates.

Sue and Dan like each other.

like = { <sue,dan>, <dan,sue>, <a,b>, <b,a>, <c,d> }

like each other = {sue+dan,a+b} (not c+d)

Distributivity approach: before being interpreted, *each other/one another* is decomposed into a floating distributor ("each") and an anaphor ("other").

Sue and Dan like each other :

Sue and Dan **each** *like* ~~**each**~~ [*the*] *other.*

= *Sue and Dan each like the other.*

Semantics of English reciprocals (cont.)

Relational approach: *each other* restricts information states by imposing <u>collective identity</u> and <u>individual variation</u>.

Sue, Dan and Ann like each other

Collective identity:
Between them, Sue, Dan and Ann collectively like Sue, Dan and Ann

Individual variation:
For each of Sue, Dan and Ann, there is someone in the group other than herself that she likes

```
S ↘ ↗ S        S ↘ ↗ S        S ↘ ↗ S
D ↗↘ D        D ✕ D        D ↗ D
A ✕ A        A → A        A ↗ A
```

+CI+IV   **+CI-IV**   **-CI+IV**

English *each other*: **+CI+IV**

Romance *SE*: **+CI-IV**

Scope phenomena

(1) *Sue and Dan thought that they like each other.*

    (i) Sue thought: "I like Dan"/"he likes me", and Dan had a similar thought

    (ii) Sue and Dan thought "we like each other"

Levels of representation:

Operator approach: None – direct interpretation

Distributivity approach: Logical Form – movement, binding

Relational approach: DRT – translation to logical language

Tradeoff between flexibility and predictiveness:

Flexibility: Operator < Distributivity < Relational

Predictiveness: Operator > Distributivity > Relational

Other phenomena?

Key factor for evaluation – predictiveness:

To what extent does the phenomenon's description follow **naturally** from **basic assumptions?**

Common reciprocity phenomena (1)

Lexical vs. grammatical reciprocity (Kemmer 1993)

(1) a. Sue and Dan kissed each other – *possibly unrelated events*

     b. Sue and Dan kissed – *simultaneous/related events*

(2) a. **Birbiri**-ni   gör-dü-ler   (Turkish)

     RCP-ACC   see-PAST-3PL   "they saw **each other**"

    b. Gör-**üş**-tü-ler

     see-**RCP**-PAST-3PL   "they **met**"

No advantage in predictiveness to any theory:

  (1a)/(2a) – quantification

  (1b)/(2b) – a lexical collective intransitive entry

Common reciprocity phenomena (2)

Reciprocal/Reflexive underspecification:

(1) *Les ètudiants se   sont frappes* (French, Cable 2014)

    the students **RFL/RCP** AUX   slap

    "the students slapped themselves/each other"

Vagueness ➜ advantage to relational approach

  English *each other*: **+**collective identity, **+**individual variation

  French *se*:   **+**collective identity, **–**individual variation

Ambiguity ➜ advantage to operator/distributivity approaches

Decision is a tricky matter (Palmieri, this workshop):

  - per language

  - lexical properties of different verbs

Common reciprocity phenomena (3)

Multiple reciprocals

Japanese (Haug & Dalrymple, from Kosuge 2014):

(1) *John-to   Bill-ga   (otagai-o) naguri-au-ta*

    John-and Bill-NOM (**RCP**-NOM) HIT-**RCP**-PST   "J&B hit e.o."

French:

(2) *Ils   se   sont battus (l'un   l'autre)*

    They RCP/RFL AUX beat   (the-one the-other)

    "they beat each other (in turns)"

Need for licensing mechanism of reciprocity.

No advantage in predictiveness to any theory.

Common reciprocity phenomena (4)

Different reciprocal interpretations:

(1) The men know each other.

(2) The trays are stacked on top of each other.

*"**The challenge … is to find a natural locus of variation that can yield the different readings**"* (Haug & Dalrymple 2019)

Operator-based approaches:

1. Reciprocal ambiguity + context-based selection of strongest meaning (Dalrymple et al. 1998).

2. One general meaning + sensitivity to logical or conceptual restrictions (Sabato & Winter 2012, Poortman et al. 2018).

Distribution-based approach – Beck 2001

Relational approach – Haug & Dalrymple 2019

Summary

	Operator	Distributivity	Relational
Scope	- tradeoff Flexibility/Predictiveness -		
Lexical/Grammatical	√	√	√
Reciprocal/Reflexive	- depends on ambiguity/vagueness -		
Multiple reciprocity	- need for licensing mechanism -		
Different interpretations	√	√̸	√̸

Suggestions:

1- concentrate on basic assumptions and predictive
      power of theories

2- try to figure if, and to what extent, "reciprocity" is a
      unitary cross-linguistic notion (Palmieri)