What do embedded scalars reveal about pragmatic inference-making? (Abstract)

Ira Noveck, Emmanuel Trouche, Hugo Mercier

Laboratoire L2C2, Institut des Sciences Cognitives Marc Jeannerod

The scalar inference literature, which has focused mostly on the way the word *Some* gets enriched to mean *Some but not all* in context, has evolved considerably over the last 15 years or so. The standard explanation among pragmatists has been that such enrichments are refinements that render speakers' meanings more informative, but at a cost (see Noveck & Reboul, 2008). On the other hand, semanticists (e.g. Cherchia et al., 2012) defend a compositional analysis by arguing that scalar terms such as *Some* are simply ambiguous and can be readily construed to mean *only some* at a lexical level. The crux of the matter is what accounts for the phenomenon: is the emergence of a *Some but not all* (i.e. *only some*) reading a linguistic-semantic, or an pragmatic-intentional, phenomenon?

Potts et al. (2015), in investigating the lexical approach, have presented the most intriguing data that lend support to compositional claims by presenting embedded cases, where an enrichment does not have informative import but appears to emerge nonetheless. For example, they present a scene depicting three basketball players – one who has visibly sunk all 12 out of 12 foul shots, another who has sunk half and a third who has sunk none – along with a sentence such as *Exactly one player hit some of his shots*; roughly half of their participants say "true," which is impressive because an *only some* reading here has no entailment relation to the sentence's literal reading (i.e. an *only some* reading does not represent a gain in information).

This short paper will describe our efforts to analyze Potts et al.'s claims (and assumptions) through MTurk surveys in order to determine the extent to which the emergence of *not all* readings can be considered a lexical phenomenon.