

Donnerstag  
09.03.2017  
12:15 – 12:45  
B3 1, 0.13

---

## Additives and accommodation

---

Mira Grubic  
Universität Potsdam  
[grubic@uni-potsdam.de](mailto:grubic@uni-potsdam.de)

The presupposition of additive particles like *too* is usually assumed to be especially hard to accommodate, due to its anaphoricity (Kripke 2009). There is however no consensus on what is responsible for this anaphoricity; whether it is the existence of a salient other individual which is required to be in the discourse context (Geurts & van der Sandt 2004), or whether the whole parallel proposition needs to be salient (e.g. Beaver & Zeevat 2007).

The former account predicts that the presupposition of the additive particle in (1) is similar to that of the possessive in (2): both presuppose the existence of a salient individual (i), and a possessor-possessed relation (ii).

- |      |                                     |      |                                      |
|------|-------------------------------------|------|--------------------------------------|
| (1)  | PETER has a sister, <b>too</b> .    | (2)  | <b>her sister</b>                    |
| (i)  | there is a salient other individual | (i)  | there is a salient female individual |
| (ii) | that individual has a sister        | (ii) | that individual has a sister         |

The prediction would be that (i) is hard to accommodate, whereas (ii) can be accommodated. Thus, in a context like (3), both should be fine.

- (3) Peter and Mary talked about how it was to grow up on the countryside.
- a. During the discussion, it was revealed that **he has a sister, too**.
  - b. During the discussion, it was revealed that **he knows her sister**.

We present the results of an experiment in which this is tested for the German additive *auch* and discuss the relevance of our findings for the taxonomy of projective meaning discussed in Tonhauser et al. (2013). One relevant issue is the question of what the different triggers grouped together in the same class have in common, whether there is any way to reduce one to the other. Additives, in particular, have been proposed to underlyingly involve pronoun resolution (cf. also Heim 1992), as have anaphoric definite descriptions (Schwarz 2009). In other work, the anaphoricity of additives has been related to their association with focus: the salient antecedent is independently required due to the Givenness of the backgrounded material (Ruys 2015). In this discussion whether the anaphoricity of additives is due to pronoun resolution or due to Givenness, our talk makes a contribution in favour of the former account.