

Exhaustivity in anaphoric simple demonstratives in Portuguese

Fr 12.00 – 12.30

Portuguese has a complex demonstrative (*aquele* + NP), as well as two varieties of simple demonstratives: a bare demonstrative that inflects for number and gender (*aquele*) and an uninflected bare demonstrative (*aquilo*). Both the complex demonstrative and the uninflected simple demonstrative can be used anaphorically, provided that there is a viable antecedent enabling the whole demonstrative expression to denote a unique referent (e.g., see Wolter (2006), Robinson (2005) for different implementations). However, this is not true of the inflected simple demonstrative, which seems to require more than just an antecedent (2).

(1) O João viu uma peça...

The John saw a play ...

(2) ... Aquela peça / Aquilo / #Aquela foi interessante

That-fem-(sg) play / that / that-fem-(sg) was interesting

The inflected simple demonstrative in (2) becomes felicitous in a situation where there is a set of plays already present in the common ground and none of those plays (other than the one seen by John) was interesting. Thus, *aquela* requires an exhaustive interpretation of the nominal complement of its antecedent, similarly to what occurs when the complex demonstrative is focused (3) (cf. Rooth (1992)):

(3) O João viu uma peça. AQUELA peça foi interessante.

The John saw a play. That-fem-(sg) play was interesting.

Arguing against analysing exhaustivity as being lexically encoded in the demonstrative, I propose that exhaustivity is due to a silent complement of the apparently bare inflected demonstrative. As support for this proposal, I will suggest that the inflected simple demonstrative in Portuguese (*aquela*) is a counterpart of English complex demonstratives formed with *one* as a complement (as in *that one*), rather than being a counterpart of the simple demonstrative *that*.

I then propose that the simple English demonstrative *that* corresponds to the uninflected (obligatorily simple) Portuguese demonstrative *aquilo*, showing that both simple *that* and *aquilo* are best used with inanimate antecedents and that they share a preference for factual or propositional antecedents.

This is followed a brief comment on the relationship between the exhaustivity conditions discussed here and the anti-uniqueness or non-maximality condition on demonstratives proposed in Wolter (2006) and Robinson (2005).

Robinson, Heather Merle. 2005. *Unexpected (in)definiteness: Plural generic expressions in Romance*. Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers.

Rooth, M., 1992. A Theory of Focus Interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1:75-116.

Wolter, Lindsey. 2006. *That's That: The semantics and pragmatics of demonstrative noun phrases*. Doctoral dissertation, UCSC.