

2.2.4.2 Chaining law

- (63) a. Max stopped smoking. He was thus reasonable.
 b. * Max began smoking. He was thus reasonable.
- (64) *Marie went out with her children. As a matter of fact, she has always wanted to be a mother.

2.2.4.3 Discourse break

- (65) — Tu connais ma sœur ?
 — # Non, tu n'as pas de sœur !
- (66) a. A:— John has bought a German Shepherd.
 b. B:— # Hey wait a minute! I didn't know John had a dog!
- (67) a. A:— John's dog doesn't like to play.
 b. B:— Hey wait a minute! I didn't know John had a dog!
- (68) a. A:— Le Roi de France a assisté à la conférence
 b. B:— ?? Parce qu'il a assisté à la conférence ?
 c. B:— Parce que la France est une monarchie ? C'est nouveau, ça !

2.3 Negative properties

2.3.1 Weakness

2.3.1.1 Suspension

- (69) a. If baldness is hereditary, then Jack's children are bald.
 b. If he has children, then Jack's children are bald.
- (70) a. If Sam went to the movies, she is no longer there now.
 b. If the film is from Woody Allen, she is no longer there [at the movies] now.
- (71) a. *general pattern* : If P, then Q
 b. *with* : $P \rightarrow pp(Q)$
- (72) a. Either Jack has no children, or his children are bald.
 b. Either Jack is sick, or his children are bald.
- (73) This house has no bathroom or the bathroom is in a funny place
- (74) a. *general pattern* : Either P, or Q
 b. *with* : $P \rightarrow \neg pp(Q)$
- (75) a. Either this wine has stopped fermenting, or it hasn't started to ferment.
 b. If this wine hasn't started to ferment, then it has stopped.
- (76) a. *general pattern* : Either P or Q or If P, then Q
 b. *with* : $pp(P) \rightarrow \neg pp(Q)$
- (77) a. Joe believes that Jack's children are bald.
 b. Léa pretends that she regret having left her fiancé.
 c. Sam says that Paul is the only one that can solve this problem
- (78) a. *general pattern* : N_0 says/believes/pretends that P
- (79) a. If Paul realises that he made a mistake, he will feel bad.

- b. If I realise that I made a mistake, I'll make a public statement
 (80) a. *general pattern* : Factive verb + First person subject

2.3.1.2 Meta-cancellation

- (81) The king of France is not bald, for there is no King of France!
 (82) a. The king of France is not bald, since France is a republic!
 b. It is not Lea who got an A. Nobody had an A.
 c. Joe didn't come TOO. He came alone.
 d. The head of department will not be fire, because there is no head of department.
 e. Marie has no children, so she certainly hasn't gone fetch her children at school.
 (83) a. #The king of France is bald, but there is no king of France.

<p>meta-linguistic negation Horn (1989); Carston (1998); Geurts (1998) (<i>négation polémique</i> Ducrot (1972); Muller (1991))</p> <p>(84) a. Pierre is not tall, he is immense. b. Pierre is not tall, he is short.</p> <p>(85) Properties —marked prosody —<i>garden path effect</i>^a —echoicity dimension —rectifying clause necessary —non metalinguistic interpretation contradictory</p> <p>(86) a. Joe never eats: he pigs out. b. Don't call the POlice: call the poLlce c. He hasn't eaten some cookies, he ate them all</p> <p><small>a. Par exemple, <i>Number of Lothian patients made ill by drinking rockets</i>, Language Log, Pullum, mars 2010.</small></p>
--

2.3.2 Accommodation

- (87) a. I have to go pick up my daughter at school.
 b. I've just met Marcel, he regrets having travelled alone in China.
 c. # Joe broke his middle arm.
 (88) a. We regret that children cannot accompany their parents to commencement exercises
 b. Me too, when I quit smoking, I took some weight.

2.4 Antipresuppositions

2.4.1 Heim's motto

- (89) a. #A wife of John's is intelligent
 b. The wife of John's is intelligent
 c. #A father of the victim arrived at the scene
 d. The father of the victim arrived at the scene (Heim, 1991; Sauerland, 2003)
 (90) "Scalar alternatives"

- a. ⟨ some, all ⟩ assertion
 b. ⟨ a, the ⟩ presupposition (Hawkins, 1978)

— *make your contribution presuppose as much as possible*

2.4.2 Sauerland's proposal (implicated presuppositions)

— Sauerland's proposal: an implicated presupposition is derived exactly like a (scalar) implicature, but in the presuppositional domain.

— Implicated Presuppositions :

— non factivity of *believe*

- (91) John believes that 313 is prime.

— non singularity of the plural

- (92) Tom's children must be well-behaved.

- (93) All parents are requested to check that their children have put their life jacket.

— non uniqueness and non duality of universal quantifier

- (94) a. #Every nose of Kai's is runny.
 b. #Every cheek of Lina's is rosy.

- (95) a. The nose of Kai's is runny.
 b. Both cheeks of Lina's are rosy. (Sauerland, 2006, ex(36))

— non imperative presupposition of French subjunctive

- (96) a. #Que tu sois prudent!
 That you be_{SBJ} cautious
 b. Sois prudent!
 Be cautious
 '*Be cautious!*'

- (97) Que votre Altesse soit prudente!
 That your highness be_{SBJ} cautious
 '*Let your highness be cautious!*'

— Tense and other features (person, number, gender)

2.4.3 Percus' (and Chemla's) notion of antipresupposition

- (98) Mary knows that Jane is pregnant.
 presupposes that Jane is pregnant
- (99) John is repairing the chair in Mary's living room.
 presupposes that Mary has exactly one chair in her living room
- (100) John assigned the same exercise to both of Mary's students.
 presupposes that Mary has exactly two students
- (101) Mary believes that Jane is pregnant.
 antipresupposes that Jane is pregnant