

Continuation semantics for expressives and epithets

Timothy Leffel / NYU / tim.leffel@nyu.edu

Potts' (2005, 2007) theory of expressive content holds that expressive and descriptive elements generate entailments which are logically independent of one another, and hence contribute to different *dimensions* of meaning. However, Potts' multi-dimensional logic \mathcal{L}_{CI} is not compositional and does not capture certain empirical facts about apparent interactions between different dimensions of meaning. For example, his system cannot predict *the bastard Schmidt is not a bastard* to be a contradiction (Geurts 2007). In this presentation, I use Kubota & Uegaki's (2009) framework for multi-dimensional meaning to give a compositional semantics for expressive adjectives (EA) and epithets. The analysis accounts for Geurts' observation and others.

Configurational approaches to expressive content (e.g. Schlenker 2007) are generally not multi-dimensional, while *contextual* approaches (e.g. Potts 2007) are generally not compositional. I follow Potts in assuming multi-dimensionality, but make crucial use of a configurational framework (KU09). KU09 is based on the formal system in e.g. Barker & Shan (2008), which was originally designed for scope manipulation. I show that well-motivated scope displacement mechanisms can be used to derive non-speaker-oriented interpretations of expressives (cf. Harris & Potts 2010). In short, orientation depends on the point in the derivation at which the expressive element is evaluated. This approach is thus configurational, but maintains multi-dimensionality and compositionality.

The flexibility of KU09's system allows us to encode the scope displacement properties of expressives and epithets directly into their lexical entries. Scoping EAs over the NPs in which they occur automatically predicts that EAs are not restrictive, as Potts (2005) notes.

The continuation-based approach also gives a unified account of expressive and descriptive uses of single lexical items; e.g., the entailments generated by epithetical *bastard* and predicative *bastard* are identical, but happen to lie on different semantic dimensions. This accounts for Geurts' observation above.

Because epithets are typically evaluated at the root node, it is straightforward to derive the intended reading of so-called *pseudo de re* reports (Kaplan 1989), such as *John said the bastard who stole his car is honest*. Potts (2005) claims that the correct interpretation of these sentences cannot be captured in a configurational approach without *ad hoc* stipulations.

References: Barker, C. & C-c Shan. 2008. Donkey anaphora is in-scope binding. *S&P* 1(1). Geurts, B. 2007. Really fucking brilliant. *Theoretical Linguistics* 33(2). Harris, J. & C. Potts. 2010. Perspective-shifting with expressives and appositives. To appear in *L&P*. Kaplan, D. 1989. Demonstratives. In *Themes from Kaplan*. OUP. Kubota, Y. & W. Uegaki. 2009. Continuation-based semantics for conventional implicatures: the case of Japanese benefactives. *SALT 19*, OSU. Potts, C. 2005. *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. OUP. Potts, C. 2007. The expressive dimension. *Theoretical Linguistics* 33(2). Schlenker, P. 2007. Expressive presuppositions. *Theoretical Linguistics* 33(2).