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I. Introduction

Goals:
- Account for the felicitousness of examples such as (1)a
- Motivate an information-structure based account of the adversative mais/but
- Give arguments for the non-sensitivity of mais/but to pragmatic enrichments
- Link information-structure based accounts of mais/but to argumentativity

(1) À combien de questions ont respectivement répondu Lemmy et Ozzie?
  How many questions did Lemmy and Ozzie answer each?

a. # [Lemmy]CT a répondu [à toutes les questions], mais [Ozzie]CT [à quelques-unes]r

II. Semantics for ‘mais/but’

Without an overt restriction quelques/some appears incompatible with mais/but in (1)a

(4) # Lemmy a répondu [à toutes les questions], mais Ozzie au moins à quelques-unes

Hypothesis: in (1)a mais/but takes into account the raw semantic meaning of quelques/some, i.e. some and possibly all
II.D. Application

- Applying the semantics to (1)a:
  (9) # [Lemmy]_{CT} a répondu [à toutes les questions], mais [Ozzie]_{RT} [à quelques-unes]_{RT}
  # Lemmy answered all the questions, but Ozzie some of them
  a. \(\neg (\text{Lemmy answered some of the questions}) \land \text{Lemmy answered no questions}\)

- Applying the semantics to (3):
  (10)[Lemmy]_{CT} a répondu [à toutes les questions], mais [Ozzie]_{CT} [seulement à quelques-unes]_{CT}
  Lemmy answered all the questions, but Ozzie only some of them
  a. \(\neg (\text{Lemmy answered only some of the questions})\)

- Applying the semantics to (7)a:
  (11)[Lemmy]_{CT} a répondu [à toutes les questions]_{CT}, mais [Ozzie]_{CT} [à quelques-unes]_{CT}
  Lemmy answered all the questions, but Ozzie some of them
  a. \(\neg (\text{Ozzie answered all the questions}) \land \text{Ozzie didn’t answer all the questions}\)

III. Non-restricted interpretation

- Quelques/some enters the semantics of mais/but as at least some

  Two options:
  a. mais/but takes pragmatic enrichments into account, but the second conjunct is not exhausted in the particular context of (1)a
  b. mais/but only takes semantic information into account, pragmatic effects are derived on a different level

III.A. Blocking of the non-exhaustive interpretation

- Hypothesis A: mais/but is sensitive to pragmatic content
  a. Consequence: the second conjunct of (1)a is not exhausted, the quantity implication is suspended (and localist theories of implication have to account for this)

- Supporting Argument:
  o Some examples show a sensitivity to pragmatic content:
    (12)Lemmy aime conduire et boire, mais pas boire et conduire
    Lemmy loves driving and drinking, but not drinking and driving

(13)Est-ce que Kevin s’est bien comporté chez grand-mère et a mangé ses horribles sables ?

\(\text{Did Kevin behave well at Granny’s and ate her terrible cookies ?}\)

a. Il en a mangé quelques-uns, mais en fait il les a tous mangés et elle l’a trouvé mal élevé

\(\text{He ate some of them, but in fact he ate all of them, and she said he has bad manners}\)

III.B. Purely Semantic Feeding of ‘mais/but’

- Hypothesis B: mais/but is not sensitive to pragmatic content
  a. Consequence: exhaustive of the second conjunct of (1)a can apply

- Supporting Arguments:
  o In many cases mais/but appears insensitive to exhaustification
    (14)Ronnie a chanté certaines chansons de Rainbow, mais il ne les a pas toutes chantées
    Ronnie sang some songs by Rainbow, but he didn’t sing them all
  o Even with a meaning equivalent to exhaustification some examples are still felicitous:
    (15)# Lemmy a chanté dix chansons mais Ozzie (exactement) trois
    Lemmy sang ten songs, but Ozzie (exactly) three
    (16)Lemmy a chanté dix chansons mais Ozzie seulement trois
    Lemmy sang ten songs, but Ozzie only three
  o Over restriction is mandatory in other contexts (example due to B. Geurts)
    (17)Hier, il y a eu un accident d’avion
    Yesterday, there was a plane crash
  a. Heureusement, #(seulement) certains passagers sont morts
    Fortunately, #(only) some passengers died

III.C. Conclusion

- We favor Hypothesis B: mais/but is insensitive to pragmatics

IV. Solutions and Openings

IV.A. Remaining puzzles

- In (12), the pragmatic content is an R-based implicature (Horn,1989), or an explication (Carlston, 2005), i.e. an enrichment of a logical form occurring before the computation of other conversational implicatures

- In (13)a some appears opposed to all, seemingly requiring its exhaustification
  o In this context « Kevin ate some of the cookies » is argumentatively opposed to « Kevin ate all the cookies » (Anscombe and Ducrot, 1983)
  o The description of mais/but given in II.C does not, but can, include argumentativity
IV.B. Nature of the inference

- Based on (Merin, 1999) Decision Theoretic Semantics
  - $r_s(p)$ stands for the relevance of $p$ to $H$
  - $a$ proposition $p$ argues for $H$ iff $r_s(p) > 0$

**Proposition:** The inference derived in II.C is an Argumentative Parallel (AP) to the left conjunct

- Given an utterance $p$ but $q$, the inference $s$ derived as in II.C is such that
- $\text{sign}(r_s(s)) = \text{sign}(r_s(p))$, i.e. $p$ and $s$ must both be arguments for the (contextually given) conversation goal $H$

**Consequence:** an AP can contradict any conjunct, cf. a proposition can argue for something it explicitly denies:

(18) Lemmy a bu presque toute la bière

- $\Rightarrow$ argues for Lemmy drank all the beer
- This is the case for all utterances without Contrastive Topics

IV.C. Application

- (1a): predicted AP = “Lemmy didn’t answer some of the questions”
  - In this context answering some of the questions and answering all the questions have parallel argumentative properties
  - negation reverses argumentativity
  - hence: the AP cannot be parallel to the left conjunct

- (13a): predicted AP = “Kevin didn’t eat all the cookies”

Argumentation might also explain example (17)a
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