

Exhaustivity in anaphoric simple demonstratives in Portuguese*

Ananda Lima, UCLA

AG13: Workshop on Anaphoric Uses of Demonstrative Expressions
29th Annual meeting of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Sprachwissenschaft
Siegen, 28 February - 2 March, 2007.

1 Introduction

Brazilian Portuguese (BP) has three types of demonstrative phrases: a complex demonstrative (*aquele* + NP ??), as well as two varieties of simple demonstratives: a bare demonstrative that inflects for number and gender (*aquele* ??) and an uninflected bare demonstrative (*aquilo* ??).¹

- (1) O João viu uma peça. Aquela peça foi interessante.
The John saw a play. That-fem-(sg) play was interesting
'John saw a play. That play was interesting.'
- (2) O João viu uma peça. Aquela foi interessante.
The John saw a play. That-fem-(sg) was interesting.

*I am very grateful to Philippe Schlenker and Daniel Büring for extensive discussion and great suggestions. I also thank Tim Stowell, Hilda Koopman and Martin Prinzhorn (for discussion); Dan Shiber, Tereza Lima, Yatta Fernandes, Juliana Takaki, Elisa Pigeron, Vincent Homer and Jéssica Róldan (for judgments); and Chad Vicenik (for help with recordings and labeling spectrograms). There are some minor reviews in presentation from the original hand-out. I thank the workshop participants, especially Carla Umbach, for questions and comments. All mistakes are my own. This material is based in part upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 0617316 (PI: P. Schlenker). Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

¹Spoken BP has a two-way distinction between proximal *esse* (close to either the speaker or hearer) and distal *aquele* (distant from both the speaker or the hearer) (prescriptively, there is a three-way distinction, similar to Spanish). I mostly use the distal demonstrative throughout this talk for ease of exposition. The same effects carry over to the proximal demonstrative.

- (3) O João viu uma peça. Aquilo foi interessante.
 The John saw a play. That was interesting
 'John saw a play. That was interesting.'

	Complex Demonstrative	Simple Demonstrative	
(4) English	<i>that</i> +NP	<i>that</i>	
Portuguese	<i>Aquele</i> +NP	<i>Aquele</i>	<i>Aquilo</i>

The three types of phrases can be used anaphorically. However, as I will show in this talk, the bare inflected demonstrative in ?? is unlike the demonstratives in ?? and ??, in that it is odd out-of-the-blue.

Exhaustivity: Sentence ?? seems to be felicitous in a situation where there is a set of plays already present in the common ground and it is implied that none of those plays (other than the one seen by John) was interesting.²(To be derived via implicature)

Overview of the talk:

- BP uninflected demonstrative leads to an exhaustive reading.
- The exhaustive reading in ?? only occurs with bare inflected demonstratives (i.e., it should not be viewed as something intrinsic to demonstratives in general). (section 2)
- Exhaustivity arises from an interaction between the demonstrative and a silent complement, similar to English *one* (while BP uninflected bare demonstratives behave like the English bare demonstrative) (see ??). (section 3)
- I suggest a mechanism to derive association between *that one* and exhaustivity through an implicature, rather than lexically encoding exhaustivity directly in either the demonstrative or (silent) (*one*). (section 4)

²Here is a slightly more detailed description of contrastive reading. In ??, assume that *uma secretária* is the antecedent of the whole demonstrative phrase *aquela*, a referential element *e*. *Secretária* is the kind antecedent, a set *E*, which in combination with the demonstrative is understood to contain *e* as one of its elements (i.e., the particular secretary that John hired is in the set of secretaries).

- (5) O João contratou uma secretária. Aquela sabe falar Inglês.
 The John hired a secretary. That knows how to speak English.

In a sentence *S*, containing DEM + ONE, the sentence is felicitous and true if *S* is true, but no other sentence obtained by replacing *e* by another individual from *E* is true.

That is, the use of bare inflected *that* can be described in the same way as contrastive focus, as proposed in Rooth (1992)[?].

	Complex Demonstrative		Simple Demonstrative
(6) English	<i>that</i> +NP	<i>that one</i>	<i>that</i>
Portuguese	<i>Aquele</i> +NP	<i>Aquele</i>	<i>Aquilo</i>

2 Exhaustivity in bare inflected demonstratives

2.1 The distribution of exhaustivity and non-lexical encoding

2.1.1 Restriction to bare inflected demonstratives

Non-contrastive:

Person A:

- (7) Ontem eu fui andar de bicicleta. Voce e o João fizeram
 Yesterday I went walk of bike You and the John did
 alguma coisa?
 some thing
 ‘Yesterday I went on a bike ride. Did you and John do anything?’

Person B:

- (8) Eu estudei. O João viu uma peça. Aquela peça/ #Aquele
 I studied the John saw a play that-fem(sg) play that-fem(sg)
 foi interessante.
 was interesting.
 ‘I studied. John saw a play. That play was interesting.’

The # disappears if there is some sort of accommodation that puts a contrastive/exhaustive interpretation on the play that John saw (comparing it to other plays).³

Contrastive:

Person A:

- (9) As peças hoje em dia sao tão chatas!
 the plays today in day are so boring

³For example, if the same speakers had a conversation a couple of days ago about boring plays and they were implicitly making a comparison between the boring plays talked about then and the interesting play in ??.

‘The plays these days are so boring!’

Person B:

- (10) O João viu uma peça. Aquela peça/ Aquela foi
The John saw a play. that-fem(sg) play/ that-fem(sg) was
interessante
interesting
‘John saw a play. That play was interesting.’

Contrastive 2:

Person A:

- (11) Eu vi uma peça muito interessante ontem.
I saw a play much interesting yesterday
‘I saw a very interesting play yesterday’

Person B:

- (12) O João viu uma peça. Aquela peça/ Aquela foi
The John saw a play that-fem(sg) play/ that-fem(sg) was
interessante.
interesting
‘John saw a play. That play was interesting.’

The use of bare *Aquela* in ?? is ok, though it seems to indicate that person B is contradicting person A (as if saying: ‘the play you saw is not really interesting, compared to the play John saw’).

Based on this, a weak argument against lexical encoding of exhaustivity on the demonstrative:

- As not all uses of the demonstrative lead to exhaustivity, an approach that encodes it directly on the demonstrative should be dispreferred (if a unified account of demonstratives is to be maintained).
- Stipulating that exhaustivity is lexically encoded only on the bare inflected demonstrative seems to be simply a way to describe its distribution (no explanatory adequacy).

2.1.2 Cancelable

A strong argument against lexical encoding of exhaustivity on the demonstrative: exhaustivity is cancelable.

- (13) Eu gosto dessa foto... Eu gosto d-aquela, eu gosto d-essa tambem...
I like this picture I like of-that I like of-this too...
Eu gosto de todas.
I like of all.

This should not be possible if exhaustivity is lexically encoded in the demonstrative. Cf. examples with *only*, where exhaustivity is lexically encoded:

- (14) #Eu gosto d-essa foto... eu só gosto d-aquela, eu só gosto d-essa
I like of-this picture I only like of-that I only like of-this
tambem... Eu gosto de todas.
too I like of all
That is, an analysis involving lexical encoding of exhaustivity in the demonstrative would lack on both explanatory and descriptive adequacy.

2.2 Preview

So if the demonstrative isn't responsible for exhaustivity, what is it?

I will propose that exhaustivity derives from interaction between the demonstrative and a silent complement similar to English *one*.

- Arguments for the *that one* - *aquela* correspondence in section 3.
- Deriving exhaustivity from that in section 4.

3 BP *aquela* and English *that one*

3.1 Exhaustivity

Non-contrastive:

- (15) a. Yesterday I went on a bike ride. Did you and John do anything?
b. I studied. John saw a play. ?#that one was interesting.

As in Portuguese *aquela*, *that one* in (b) is ok if there is some sort of accommodation that puts a contrastive/exhaustive interpretation on the play that John

saw (comparing it to other plays).

Contrastive:

- (16) a. The plays that are on these days are so boring!
b. John saw a play. That one was interesting.’

Contrastive 2:

- (17) a. I saw a very interesting play yesterday
b. John saw a play. That one was interesting.

Cancelable

- (18) I like this picture... I like that one... I like this one too (... in fact I like them all).
Unlike *only*:
- (19) #I like this picture... I only like that one... I only like that picture too (... in fact I like them all).

That one seems to be behaving just like *aquela* in terms of exhaustivity.⁴

3.2 Agreement

Weak Argument of simplicity:

- *Aquele* behaves like the complex demonstrative, rather than the simple demonstrative *aquilo* in that *aquele* shows agreement.
- The demonstrative is what seems to be the undergoer (rather than the trigger) of agreement (the features of the demonstrative are determined by the intrinsic properties of the noun).
- If *aquele* has a silent complement, we can say that all demonstratives would then lack values of their own for gender and number features, obtaining them only through agreement with a descriptive nominal.⁵

⁴For some mention of an association between one-anahora and contrast, see Webber (1979) [?], Halliday and Hasan (1976) [?], Dale (1995) [?] and Dahl (1985) (for a pragmatic approach) [?].

⁵The descriptive noun is also known as the complement noun. Although the descriptive noun is often analyzed as the complement of the demonstrative (parallel to nouns complementing the definite determiner), there seems to be evidence that demonstratives are actually

- (20) O João viu duas peças. Aquel-a-s/*a/*e/*e-s peças
 The John saw two plays that-f-pl/f(sg)/m(sg)/f-pl plays
 foram interessantes.
 were interesting
 ‘John saw two plays. Those play were interesting.’
- (21) O João viu um filme. Aquel-e/*a/*a-s/*e-s filme foi
 The John saw a movie. that-m(sg)/f(sg)/f-pl/m-pl movie was
 interessante.
 interesting
 ‘John saw a movie. That movie was interesting.’

- The simple inflected demonstrative agrees with its logical antecedent:

- (22) O João viu duas peças. Aquelas/*a/*e/*e-s foram
 The John saw two plays. that-f-pl/f(sg)/m(sg)/f-pl were
 interessante.
 interesting
 ‘John saw two plays. Those play were interesting.’
- (23) O João viu um filme. Aquel-e/*a/*as/*e-s foi
 The John saw a movie. that-m(sg)/f(sg)/f-pl/m-pl was
 interessante.
 interesting
 ‘John saw a movie. That movie was interesting.’

3.3 English *one* - BP silence

Additional examples (independent from demonstratives):⁶

(Which book would you like?)

- (24) O fininho.
 The thin-dim
 ‘The thin one.’

modifiers of the descriptive noun, unlike determiners that are heads that select it (e.g., Brugé (2002) [?]). For the moment, I take no stance on this question (both determiner heads and adjectival modifiers agree with the noun in BP), just focusing on the fact that there is agreement between the demonstrative and the noun.

⁶I postpone addressing the interesting question pertaining the distribution of pronounced *one* versus NP-elipsis in English.

- (25) *O.
The
'The one'
- (26) A Juliana comprou um vestido vermelho e a Yatta comprou
The Juliana bought a dress red and the Yatta bought
um verde.
one green
'Juliana bought a red dress and Yatta bought a green one.'
- (27) 'Cê tá vendo aqueles dois caras? O que tá falando no
you are seeing those two guys? The that is talking on-the
telefone é bonitinho.
telephone is handsome-dim
'See those guys, the one that is talking on the phone is cute.'
- (28) *'Cê tá vendo o menino e a menina ali? O é bonitinho.
you be seeing the boy and the girl there the is handsome-dim
'See those two guys? The (boy) is cute.'

3.4 Bare *that* seems to pair with *aquilo* (not *aquele*)

Both simple *that* and *aquilo* tend to best used with inanimate or factual/propositional antecedents.⁷ (This is not true for *aquele* and *the one*)

3.4.1 Propositional antecedents

?? and ?? pattern together, favoring an interpretation where it is the fact that little John sees ghosts that may be dangerous (e.g., he might be crazy).

- (29) O Joãozinho viu um fantasma. Aquilo pode ser perigoso.
The John-dim saw a ghost. That can be dangerous.
'Little John saw a ghost. That can be dangerous.'
- (30) Little John saw a ghost. That can be dangerous.

Compare with the inflected simple BP demonstrative ??, which patterns with the complex demonstrative in Portuguese ?? and English ?? (favored interpretation: the ghost is dangerous)

⁷Philippe Schlenker (p.c.) suggests the possibility that this may be derivable via implicature, assuming 'maximize presuppositions' (Sauerland (2005) [?]) and underspecification of *aquilo* in phi features versus the presence of presuppositions for gender in number in the inflected demonstratives.

- (31) O Joãozinho viu um fantasma. Aquele pode ser perigoso.
 The John-dim saw a ghost that-masc-(sg) can be dangerous.
 ‘Little John saw a ghost. That can be dangerous.’ (as opposed to other non-dangerous ghosts)
- (32) O Joãozinho viu um fantasma. Aquele fantasma pode ser perigoso.
 The John-dim saw a ghost that-masc-(sg) ghost can be dangerous.
 dangerous.
 ‘Little John saw a ghost. That ghost can be dangerous.’
- (33) Little John saw a ghost. That ghost can be dangerous.

3.4.2 Inanimate antecedents

- (34) I’ve heard you are bringing a book to the wedding. Why are you bringing that?
- (35) Eu ouvi dizer que você vai trazer um livro para o casamento.
 I heard say-inf that you go bring-inf a book to the wedding.
 Porque você vai trazer aquilo?
 Why you go bring-inf that?
 ‘I’ve heard you are bringing a book to the wedding. Why are you bringing that?’
- (36) I’ve heard that you are bringing John/ a boy to the wedding. #Why are you bringing that?
- (37) Eu ouvi dizer que você vai trazer o João/ um menino para o casamento. #Porque você vai trazer aquilo?
 I heard say-inf that you go bring-inf the John a boy to the wedding. Why you go bring-inf that?
 ‘I’ve heard that you are bringing John/ the neighbour to the wedding. #Why are you bringing that?’
- (38) #That is really tall. [pointing to a person]⁸
- (39) #Aquilo é muito alto.
 That is very tall

⁸For some speakers, it seems possible to make this ok in a degree reading, where *that* stands for something like ‘John’s tallness’. The same seems to apply for some speakers of BP.

‘That is really tall.’ [pointing at a person]

(40) That is really tall. [pointing to a building]

(41) Aquilo é muito alto.
That is very tall
‘That is really tall.’ [pointing at a building]

→ The bare uninflected demonstrative *aquilo* in BP seems to be behaving like English *that*. The inflected *aquela* doesn’t.

3.5 Section Summary

(42)	<i>that</i> +NP	→	Ok out-of the blue
	<i>that</i>	→	Ok out-of the blue (propositional/inanimate antecedents)
	<i>that one</i>	→	contrastive

(43)	<i>aquele</i> +NP	→	Ok out-of the blue
	<i>aquilo</i>	→	Ok out-of the blue (propositional/inanimate antecedents)
	<i>aquele</i>	→	contrastive

4 Deriving exhaustivity

4.1 Implicature

- As we have just seen, not all uses of demonstratives lead to exhaustivity (cf. demonstratives without *one*)
- Similarly *One* does not seem to be obligatorily contrastive (cf. one, everyone, someone + next point)⁹
- Exhaustivity seems to be cancelable:

(44) I like this one, that one and that one... I fact, I like them all.

This suggests an implicature account.

4.1.1 Preview

- Exhaustivity is just contrastive focus!
- Non-contrastive reading of *that one* is ruled out by an implicature involving maximal pronominalization.

⁹I will not be able address all uses of *one* in detail here. I also set aside the (very interesting questions of the distribution of overt one-anaphora (with the word *one* versus NP anaphora without the word *one*. For a thorough description see Dahl (1982) [?].

4.2 Exhaustivity as contrastive Focus

Contrastive focus on the demonstrative in complex demonstratives (e.g. *THAT_F play* seems to behave just like demonstrative phrases with *one*

- Seems to imply exhaustivity (felicitous in contrastive environments)
- ... exhaustivity is cancelable.

4.2.1 Contrastive focus on the demonstrative in *that*+NP and *that one*

The examples below, with *AQUELA peça* behave exactly as the ones with *aquela* in section ?? (left for review on your own time).

We can assume a contrastive focus interpretation for *that one* (e.g. Rooth (1992) [?]). The only difference being that the contrastive set is determined through an anaphor.

Non-contrastive:

Person A:

- (45) Ontem eu fui andar de bicicleta. Voce e o João fizeram
Yesterday I went walk of bike You and John did some
alguma coisa?
thing
'Yesterday I went on a bike ride. Did you and John do anything?'

Person B:

- (46) Eu estudei. O João viu uma peça. #AQUELA peça foi
I studied the John saw a play THAT-fem(sg) play was
interessante.
interesting.
'I studied. John saw a play. THAT play was interesting.'

Again, the # disappears if there is some sort of accommodation that puts a contrastive/exhaustive interpretation on the play that John saw (comparing it to other plays).

Contrastive:

Person A:

- (47) As peças hoje em dia sao tão chatas!
the plays today in day are so boring

‘Plays these days are so boring!’

Person B:

- (48) O João viu uma peça. AQUELA peça foi interessante
The John saw a play. that-fem(sg) play/ that-fem(sg) was
interesting
‘John saw a play. THAT play was interesting.’

Contrastive 2:

Person A:

- (49) Eu vi uma peça muito interessante ontem.
I saw a play much interesting yesterday
‘I saw a very interesting play yesterday’

Person B:

- (50) O João viu uma peça. AQUELA peça foi
The John saw a play THAT-fem(sg) was interesting
interessante.
‘John saw a play. THAT play was interesting.’

Person B seems to be contradicting person A (as if saying: ‘the play you saw is not really interesting, compared to the play John saw’).

Cancelable Contrastive focus is also cancelable:

- (51) Eu gosto dessa foto... Eu gosto D-AQUELA foto, eu gosto
I like this picture I like of-THAT picture I like
D-ESSA foto também... Eu gosto de todas.
of-THIS picture too... I like of all.

4.2.2 Remaining Question: why does *that one* have to be contrastive?

- (52)

Neutral	<i>Aquela</i> +NP	# <i>that one</i> → Why #?
Contrastive	<i>Aquela_F</i> +NP	<i>Aquele_F</i>

4.3 Max-Pronoun

- (53) Max-Pronoun: if you are going use a pronoun at all, pronominalize as much as possible.¹⁰¹¹¹²

(cf. Max-Elide in the Sluicing/VP Elipsis)¹³

So, the speaker should choose *he* rather than *that one* as an anaphor for a referential antecedent (Pronominalize DP rather than Pronominalize NP).¹⁴

Identity between anaphor and antecedent

I assume that, as the interpretation of anaphors is derived from the interpretation of its antecedent (co-reference or co-variance), that the anaphor cannot contrast with (any part of) the antecedent.

Illustration from VP-elipsis: (just as an illustration)¹⁵

- (55) a. Mary won't buy apples at the store on Saturday, but Bob will.
(buy apples(/*tomatoes) at the store on Saturday/#Sunday).

¹⁰I greatly thank Daniel Buring for first suggesting an account along these lines to me.

¹¹I use the term 'pronominalization' loosely here, to mean use a pronominal form instead of a non-pronominal form.

¹²The main text is formulated taking the simple assumptions that *he* has a referent (syntactically a DP), whereas *one* has a kind (syntactically an NP) antecedent. The situation may be more complicated, considering proposals which treat *he* and *the+one* (e.g. Postal (1966) [?], Elbourne (2006) [?]). I skip the discussion of this point for reasons of time, but the proposals here could be rephrased (in a more cumbersome way) to be consistent with Elbourne's view if necessary. The ONE in *he* proposed by Elbourne seems to be distinct to the overt *one* in that it is not allowed to be modified or vary antecedents, including non-human, non-masculine objects. *He* and the one also seem to trigger different agreement patterns in some languages (e.g., Buckie English (David Adger, p.c.)).

¹³E.g.:

- (54) a. They interviewed someone from that department, but I don't know who they interviewed.
b. They interviewed someone from that department, but I don't know who.
c. ?*They interviewed someone from that department, but I don't know who they did.

See Merchant (to appear) [?] and Fox and Takahashi (2005) [?] for discussion.

¹⁴If the anaphoric relation is only between a kind antecedent (not a referential antecedent), then *he* is not a suitable competitor for the purposes for Max-Pronoun (i.e.: maximum pronominalization is one-pronominalization)

¹⁵For discussion on the identity condition for VP-elipsis, see Sag(1976) [?]. I am not proposing that VP elipsis is identical to the kind of pronominalization discussed here (though it is an interesting possibility to consider).

- b. Mary won't buy apples at the store on Saturday, but Bob will on Sunday. (buy apples at the store)

Assumption: Focal Structure matters (for identity between an anaphor and an antecedent) ??

(56) *that* ≠ *THAT_F*

- By Max-Pronoun, *he* should always be preferred to *that one* → Neutral *that one* is ruled out.
- However, the string *that one* is fine (not a competitor with *he*) if it has an F feature.
- *That one* correlates with contrastiveness because it correlates with the presence of an *F* feature in the DP.

4.3.1 Predictions for other determiners with one

- The implicature also correctly predicts a contrastive reading with modified *the one*:

(57) John saw a play. The play that he saw was nice. (... but the one I saw wasn't)

(58) John bought a two shirts. The blue one is nice.

- It also predicts that unmodified *the one* should not be good (except for a numerical reading), if we assume that *the* cannot be focused:

(59) The one was nice.

- Conversely, the *one* present in quantifiers like in *someone*, *everyone* etc. are correctly not predicted to lead to a contrastive implicature (as quantifiers are not referential and thus do not compete with *he* under Max-Pronoun).

4.4 Section Summary

- The hearer assumes that a cooperative speaker will say *he* rather than (neutral) *that one* (Max-Pronoun).
- That is not true for *THAT_F one*...
- Where *one* has anaphoric reading, *that one* correlates with contrastive focus because that is the situation in which that string is pragmatically appropriate (no competition by Max-Pronoun).

5 Conclusion

Main points:

- Exhaustivity is limited to bare inflected demonstratives in BP.
- The BP bare inflected demonstrative is similar to English *that one*, whereas the BP uninflected demonstrative is similar to the English bare demonstrative.
- There is a possible mechanism to derive Exhaustive interpretation through implicature by appealing to comparison between pronominalizing the NP (or whatever the domain of *one* is) versus pronominalizing the DP (or whatever the domain of *he* is).

THANK YOU!

6 Appendix

6.1 Brief note on anti-uniqueness and Contrastive interpretation

The exhaustivity discussed today has some points in common with the condition known as anti-uniqueness: they both seem require more than one element to be present in the set described by the nominal description associated with the demonstrative.

- (60) Non-maximality [=anti-uniqueness]: The demonstrative may not be used when its referent is known to be the only entity which fits its descriptive content in the domain of reference. (Robinson, 2005: 50) [?]

The two conditions may well be related in some way, but they so not seem to be identical: their seem to have different domains and distributions.

Distribution: Anti-uniqueness, but not exhaustivity, applies to complex demonstratives with overt NP-complements.

- (61) #That center of the universe

- (62) #That smallest prime number

- (63) #That oldest man in the world.
(Lobner, 1985 [?])

Domain: For exhaustivity, the relevant domain seems to be the immediate context of conversation. For anti-uniqueness, the relevant domain seems to be the actual world (thus, there is no violation for items with unique descriptive content only in the context):

- (64) Eu tenho so um aluno e esse aluno e burro.
 I have only one student and this-masc-(sg) student is donkey.
 ‘I only have one student and that student is stupid.’
- (65) Só tem um chefe na empresa e aquele chefe e
 Only have a boss in-the company and that-masc-(sg) is nice
 legal.
 ‘There is only one boss in the company and that boss is nice.’

6.2 Where to from here

Work not discussed here, work-in-progress and plans for the future:

- Corpus examples
- Cross-linguistic comparison
- Thorough analysis of the intonation
- Continue to thoroughly test the implicature in complex demonstratives and other structures, considering factors such as:
 - The interaction between Max-Pronoun and other unrelated implicatures proposed for demonstratives (e.g., see Wolter (2006) [?])
 - The view of pronouns in Elbourne (2006) [?] and Postal (1966) [?].
- The distribution of English *one* versus NP-elipsis.
- The relationship between Max-Pronoun and Max-Elide
- The syntax of these structures.

References

- [1] Laura Brugè. The positions of demonstratives in the extended nominal projection. In Guglielmo Cingue, editor, *Functional Structure in DP and IP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, volume 1 of *Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax*, ch: 2, pages 15–53. Oxford University Press, New York, 2002.
- [2] Deborah Dahl. Structure and function of one-anaphora in English, 1985.
- [3] Robert Dale. Generating one-anaphoric expressions: Where does the decision lie?, 1995.
- [4] Paul D. Elbourne. *Situations and Individuals*. Current Studies in Linguistics. MIT Press, 2006.

- [5] M.A.K. Halliday and R. 1976. Hasan. *Cohesion in English*. London Group Limited, London, 1976.
- [6] Sebastian Lobner. Definites. *Journal of Semantics*, 4:279–326, 1985.
- [7] Jason Merchant. Variable island repair under ellipsis. In K. Johnson, editor, *Topics in Ellipsis*. Oxford University Press, to appear.
- [8] Paul Postal. On so-called pronouns in English. In F. Dineen, editor, *Report on the Seventeenth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies*, pages 177–206. Georgetown University Press, Washington, DC, 1966.
- [9] Heather Merle Robinson. *Unexpected (in)definiteness: Plural generic expressions in Romance*. PhD thesis, Rutgers, 2005.
- [10] M. Rooth. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics*, 1:75–116, 1992.
- [11] Ivan Sag. *Deletion and Logical Form*. PhD thesis, MIT, 1976.
- [12] U. Sauerland. On the semantic markedness of phi-features. In *Proceedings of the Phi- Workshop*. McGill University, Montreal, Canada, 2005.
- [13] Shoichi Takahashi and Danny Fox. MaxElide and the re-binding problem, 2005.
- [14] B.L. Webber. *A formal approach to discourse anaphora*. Garland, New York, 1979.
- [15] Lynsey Wolter. *That's That: The semantics and pragmatics of demonstrative noun phrases*. PhD thesis, UCSC, 2006.

-
 Ananda Lima
 University of California, Los Angeles
 Department of Linguistics
 3125 Campbell Hall
 Los Angeles, CA 9005-1543
 Ph: 310 889-4026
 lima@humnet.ucla.edu
<http://www.linguistics.ucla.edu/people/grads/lima/>