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Claims

• Semantics of gendered nouns in Greek
  1. Gender in presupposition and assertion
  2. Gender via competition with the other gender (‘anti-presupposition’)

• Nominal Ellipsis with gender mismatch
  – The behavior of 2. is theoretically puzzling.
  – We claim competition doesn’t happen under ellipsis!
Outline

1. **DATA**: Nominal Ellipsis and three types of masc.-fem. noun pairs in Greek

2. **ANALYSIS + DATA**: Denotations of gendered noun + independent empirical support
   ➞ Partial account of the Nom. Ellipsis data

3. **ANALYSIS** of the remaining puzzle:
   No competition under ellipsis

(4. **Extra**: Grammatical vs. Natural Gender)
1. NOMINAL ELLIPSIS IN GREEK
• Merchant (2014): Three types of masc.-fem. pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sibling:</th>
<th>adherfós (m) – adherfi (f)</th>
<th>CLASS I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctor:</td>
<td>jatros</td>
<td>CLASS II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>dhaskalos (m) – dhaskala (f)</td>
<td>CLASS III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• **Class II nouns** have only one form (‘epicene nouns’), but gender is visible on D and Adj.

• The three classes differ in their behavior under Nominal Ellipsis with gender mismatch. (see Bobalijk & Zocca for other languages)
Nominal Ellipsis with Gender Mismatch

- **Class I**: NEGM impossible in both directions
- **Class II**: NEGM possible in both directions
- **Class III**: NEGM only possible if the antecedent is masc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M $\rightarrow$ F</th>
<th>F $\rightarrow$ M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class I</strong></td>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class II</strong></td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class III</strong></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1a) *M → F

O Petros episkefthike enan aderfo tu sti Veria, the P. visited one.m brother his in.the V. ke mia *(aderfi) stin Katerini and one.f *(sister) in.the K.

‘P. visited a brother of his in V., and one*(sister) in K.’

(1b) *F → M

O Petros episkefthike mia aderfi tu sti Veria, the P. visited one.f sister his in.the V. ke enan *(aderfo) stin Katerini and one.m *(brother) in.the K.

‘P. visited a sister of his in V., and one *(brother) in K.’
(2a) \( \text{M} \rightarrow \text{F} \)

O Petros episkeftheike enan jatro sti Veria, the P. visited one.m doctor in.the V. ke mia (jatro) stin Katerini and one.f (doctor) in.the K.

‘P. visited one doctor.m in V., and one (doctor.f) in K.’

(2b) \( \text{F} \rightarrow \text{M} \)

O Petros episkeftheike mia jatro sti Veria, the P. visited one.f doctor in.the V. ke enan (jatro) stin Katerini and one.m (doctor) in.the K.

‘P. visited a doctor.f in V., and a (doctor.m) in K.’
(3a) $^0kM \rightarrow F$

O Petros episkefthike enan dhaskalo sti Veria, the P. visited one.m teacher.m in.the V. ke mia (dhaskala) stin Katerini and one.f (teacher.f) in.the K.

‘P. visited a teacher.m in V., and a (teacher.f) in K.’

(3b) $^*F \rightarrow M$

O Petros episkefthike mia dhaskala sti Veria, the P. visited one.f teacher.f in.the V. ke enan *(dhaskalo) stin Katerini and one.m *(teacher.m) in.the K.

‘P. visited a teacher.f in V., and a *(teacher.m) in K.’
**Data Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>M → F</th>
<th>F → M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More masc.-fem. pairs:

- **Class I**: *antras* (m)–*jineka* (f) ‘spouse’; *vasilias* (m)–*vasilissa* (f) ‘king/queen’
- **Class II**: *dhimosiografos* ‘journalist’; *glossologos* ‘linguist’; *musikos* ‘musician’
- **Class III**: *mathitis* (m)–*mathitria* (f) ‘pupil’; *nosokomos* (m)–*nosokoma* ‘nurse’

(see Merchant 2014 for a longer list)

There doesn’t seem to be an obvious correlation with the morphology.
Remarks

- Merchant (2014) claims that Nominal Ellipsis with gender mismatch is available with predicative NPs, but not with argument NPs.
- (2)-(3) demonstrate that this is not the case. But Merchant’s theory is tailored to derive it.
- (See our ms. for details)
2. DENOTATIONS OF GENDERED NOUNS
Proposal

- Two types of gender inferences:
  a) Both asserted and presupposed
  b) Due to competition with the other gender (‘anti-presupposition’)

- Denotations of gendered nouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Sibling</th>
<th>Doctor</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masc.</td>
<td>a) asser &amp; presuppp</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fem.</td>
<td>a) asser &amp; presuppp</td>
<td>No Gender</td>
<td>a) asser &amp; presuppp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Denotations

⟦adherfos⟧ = \lambda x: \textcolor{red}{\text{male}(x)}. \textcolor{red}{\text{male}(x)} \land \text{ sibling}(x)

⟦adherfi⟧ = \lambda x: \textcolor{blue}{\text{female}(x)}. \textcolor{blue}{\text{female}(x)} \land \text{ sibling}(x)

⟦jatros⟧ = \lambda x. \text{doctor}(x)

⟦dhaskalos⟧ = \lambda x. \text{teacher}(x)

⟦dhaskala⟧ = \lambda x: \textcolor{blue}{\text{female}(x)}. \textcolor{blue}{\text{female}(x)} \land \text{ teacher}(x)

• \textcolor{red}{\text{jatros}} (doctor) and \textcolor{blue}{\text{dhaskalos}} (teacher.m) have no gender inference, while the rest all assert and presuppose gender.

• There is independent support for the gender neutrality of \textcolor{red}{\text{jatros}} and \textcolor{blue}{\text{dhaskalos}}.
Support 1: Unmarkedness

- **Jatros** with [masc.] and **dhaskalos** are actually gender neutral.
- They can describe mixed gendered groups. The rest cannot.

(4)

a. O Petros ke i Maria ine kali jiatri.
   the P. and the M. are good.m doctors
   ‘P. and M. are good doctors.

b. * O Petros ke i Maria ine kales jiatri.
   the P. and the M. are good.f doctors
Support 1: Unmarkedness (cont.)

- Similarly, in negative sentences *jatros* with [masc.] and *dhaskalos* include female individuals.

\[(5)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the P. not has no.m doctor</td>
<td>the P. not has no.f doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘P. has no doctor.’</td>
<td>‘P. has no female doctor.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ P. has no female doctor.</td>
<td>⇒ P. has no male doctor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unmarkedness of [masc.]

• The above data suggest:
  – jatros and dhaskalos are gender-neutral
  – [masc.] is actually gender-neutral.
• But jatros + [masc.] and dhaskalos usually mean masc.
• We’ll claim this is due to competition with [fem.]

(6)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>* I Maria ine kalos jatros.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the M. is good.m doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>* I Maria ine dhakalos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the M. is teacher.m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support 2: Focus

• In certain focus constructions, the gender presupposition is ignored for alternatives (Spathas 2010, Jacobson 2012).

(7) Only Mary did her homework.

• (7) means all alternatives to Mary did NOT do their homework.

• [fem.] on “her” only applies to Mary.

• So the alternatives can be male.
Support 2: Focus Test

**TEST:** “Only John is an NP[masc.]”

- If NP doesn’t assert [masc.],
  \[ \Rightarrow \text{female alternatives are not NP[fem.]} \]

- If NP asserts [masc.],
  \[ \Rightarrow \text{female alternatives are not NP[fem.]} \]
Support 2: Only + CLASS I

Class I nouns assert the gender

(8a)

Mono o Petros ine aderfōs tu Jani.
only the P. is brother the.gen J.gen
‘Only P. is a brother of J.’ ⇒ Maria is not a sister of J.

(8b)

Mono i Maria ine aderfē tu Jani.
only the M. is sister the.gen J.gen
‘Only M. is a sister of J.’ ⇒ Petros is not a brother of J.
Support 2: Only + CLASS II

Class II nouns don’t assert the gender

(9a)

Mono o Petros ine kalos jatros.
only the P. is good.m doctor
‘Only P. is a good doctor.’  ⇒ Maria is not a good doctor.

(9b)

Mono i Maria ine kali jatros.
only the M. is good.f doctor
‘Only M. is a good doctor.’  ⇒ Petros is not a good doctor.
Support 2: Only + CLASS III

Class III nouns are mixed!!

(10a)

Mono o Petros ine dhaskalos.
only the P. is teacher.m
‘Only P. is a teacher.’ ⇒ Maria is not a teacher.

(10b)

Mono i Maria ine dhaskala.
only the M. is teacher.f
‘Only M. is a teacher.’ ⇒ Petros is not a teacher.
Note: Superlatives

Superlatives show the same thing.

(11a)

O Petros ine o kaliteros dhaskalos.
The P. is the best.m teacher.m
‘P. is the best teacher.’ ⇒ Maria is a worse teacher.

(11b)

I Maria ine i kaliteri dhaskala.
The M. is the best.f teacher.f
‘M. is the best teacher.’ ⇒ Petros is a worse teacher.
Support 2: Data Summary

• Not all gendered nouns assert the gender.
  – Those that don’t can be used to refer to mixed gendered groups.
  – Their gender specifications are ignored by focus alternatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I Sibling</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Teacher</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Denotations again

\[
\begin{align*}
\llbracket \text{adherfos} \rrbracket &= \lambda x: \text{male}(x). \text{male}(x) \land \text{sibling}(x) \\
\llbracket \text{adherfi} \rrbracket &= \lambda x: \text{female}(x). \text{female}(x) \land \text{sibling}(x) \\
\llbracket \text{jatros} \rrbracket &= \lambda x. \text{doctor}(x) \\
\llbracket \text{dhaskalos} \rrbracket &= \lambda x. \text{teacher}(x) \\
\llbracket \text{dhaskala} \rrbracket &= \lambda x: \text{female}(x). \text{female}(x) \land \text{teacher}(x)
\end{align*}
\]

- The observations above are in line with our denotations.
Partial Resolution of the Puzzle

• **Claim**: The denotations explain the behavior of **Class I** and **Class II** nouns under nominal ellipsis with gender mismatch with independently motivated assumptions.

• **Assumption 1** (cf. Fiengo & May 1994): \( \varphi \)-presuppositions, but not assertions, are ignored under ellipsis.

(12)

| a. John did **his** homework. Mary didn’t (do **her** homework). |
| b. John is a **male** doctor. Mary isn’t *(a **female** doctor). |
Partial Resolution of the Puzzle (cont.)

- Assumption 2 (cf. Sauerland 2003): the gender specifications on Det, Adj, etc. are presuppositional.

- **Class I nouns** assert the gender, so mismatches under ellipsis are not allowed in either direction.
- **Class II nouns** only specify gender on Det, Adj, etc., which are presuppositional, so mismatches are tolerated.
(1a) *M → F

O Petros episkefthike enan aderfo tu sti Veria, the P. visited one.m brother his in.the V.
ke mia *(aderfi) stin Katerini
and one.f *(sister) in.the K.

‘P. visited a brother of his in V., and one *(sister) in K.’

(1b) *F → M

O Petros episkefthike mia aderfi tu sti Veria, the P. visited one.f sister his in.the V.
ke enan *(aderfo) stin Katerini
and one.m *(brother) in.the K.

‘P. visited a sister of his in V., and one *(brother) in K.’
(2a) $^{ok}M \rightarrow F$

O Petros episkefthike enan jatro sti Veria, the P. visited one.m doctor in.the V. ke mia (jatro) stin Katerini and one.f (doctor) in.the K.

‘P. visited one doctor.m in V., and one (doctor.f) in K.’

(2b) $^{ok}F \rightarrow M$

O Petros episkefthike mia jatro sti Veria, the P. visited one.f doctor in.the V. ke enan (jatro) stin Katerini and one.m (doctor) in.the K.

‘P. visited a doctor.f in V., and a (doctor.m) in K.’
Remaining Puzzle

• So the remaining puzzle is the asymmetric nature of Class III nouns.

• Recall that with Class III nouns, Nominal Ellipsis with gender mismatch is possible only when the antecedent is masc.
(3a) \( O \overset{\text{ok}}{\rightarrow} F \)

O Petros episkefthike enan dhaskalo sti Veria, the P. visited one.m teacher.m in.the V. ke mia (dhaskala) stin Katerini and one.f (teacher.f) in.the K. ‘P. visited a teacher.m in V., and a (teacher.f) in K.’

(3b) \( F \overset{*}{\rightarrow} M \)

O Petros episkefthike mia dhaskala sti Veria, the P. visited one.f teacher.f in.the V. ke enan *(dhaskalo) stin Katerini and one.m *(teacher.m) in.the K. ‘P. visited a teacher.f in V., and a *(teacher.m) in K.’
Remaining Puzzle (cont.)

\[
\begin{align*}
\llbracket \text{dhaskalos} \rrbracket &= \lambda x. \text{teacher}(x) \\
\llbracket \text{dhaskala} \rrbracket &= \lambda x: \text{female}(x). \text{female}(x) \land \text{teacher}(x)
\end{align*}
\]

• Given this semantics, it is strange that Nominal Ellipsis with gender mismatch is possible at all.
• Ellipsis is usually not licensed by asymmetric entailment.

(13)

a. J. invited two **phonologists**. M. invited four *(linguists).

b. J. invited two **linguists**. M. invited four *(phonologists).
3. NO COMPETITION UNDER ELLIPSIS
Proposal

• Nominal Ellipsis in Greek requires total identity.
• So what’s hidden in (3a) is actually dhaskalos.
• Because dhaskalos is gender-neutral, this is semantically coherent.

\[(3a')\quad \text{okM} \rightarrow \text{F}\]

O Petros episkeptthike enan dhaskalo sti Veria, the P. visited one.m teacher.m in.the V. ke mia (dhaskalo) stin Katerini and one.f (teacher.m) in.the K.
‘P. visited a teacher.m in V., and a (teacher.m) in K.’
Interaction with Focus

• That the elided noun in (3a’) is actually [masc.] is supported by (14) with ‘only’.
• It entails that Maria has a female teacher and nobody else has a teacher, male or female!
  – [fem.] on mia is ignored in the alternatives.
  – dhaskalos is gender-less (unlike dhaskala).

(14)

I perisoteri apo emas den ehun dhaskalo stin Katerini.
‘Most of us don’t have a teacher in K.’

Mono i Maria exi mia (*dhaskalo).
‘Only Maria has one.’ ⇒ Nobody else has a teacher (in K.).
• So (3a’) involves a gender mismatch within DP, but **gender mismatches are not tolerated without Nominal Ellipsis**, (6).

• Note that according to our semantics, (6b) should be semantically coherent!

• We adopt a competition-based explanation.

(6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a. * I Maria ine kalos jatros.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the M. is good.m doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>* I Maria ine dhakalos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the M. is teacher.m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Competition between genders

\[
\text{⟦dhaskalos⟧} = \lambda x. \text{teacher}(x)
\]
\[
\text{⟦dhaskala⟧} = \lambda x: \text{female}(x). \text{female}(x) \land \text{teacher}(x)
\]

• **The idea**: When the feminine form can be used, it needs to be used.

• Following the literature we assume that this is enforced by the principle of **Maximize Presupposition! (MP)** (Heim 1991, Percus 2006, 2010)
Competition between genders (cont.)

\[ [\text{dhaskalos}] = \lambda x. \text{teacher}(x) \]
\[ [\text{dhaskala}] = \lambda x: \text{female}(x). \text{female}(x) \land \text{teacher}(x) \]

- Roughly, MP says: “Given a set of alternatives, use the form that has the most presuppositions.”
- Since \text{dhaskala} has gender presupposition and \text{dhaskalos} doesn’t, \text{dhaskala} needs to be used whenever possible.
- Consequently, \text{dhaskalos} usually means masc. (‘anti-presupposition’).
Maximize Presupposition! (MP)

Maximize Presupposition!

φ is infelicitous in (local) context c if ψ exists such that
i) ψ is an alternative to φ;
ii) ψ has more presuppositions than φ; and
iii) the presuppositions of ψ are satisfied in c.

• We assume masc.-fem. pairs are alternatives.
• Assuming that MP applies to Det, Adj., etc. individually, DP-internal concord is forced (cf. Percus 2006, 2010, Singh 2011).
• Crucially, our version of MP doesn’t require φ and ψ to assert the same thing. (See Spector & Sudo (ms.) for independent motivation for this.)
(6) are made unusable due to the alternatives (6’).

(6)

a. * I Maria ine kalos jatros.
   the M. is good.m doctor

b. * I Maria ine dhakalos.
   the M. is teacher.m

(6’)

a. I Maria ine kali jatros.
   the M. is good.f doctor

b. I Maria ine dhakala.
   the M. is teacher.f
MP ignores elided material

• Proposal: **MP is not active under ellipsis.**
• Then (3a’) with ellipsis is perfectly coherent, although its overt counterpart is ruled out.

\[(3a’) \quad \text{Ok} \quad M \rightarrow F\]

O Petros episkefthike \textit{enan} dhaskalo sti Veria, the P. visited one.m teacher.m in.the V. ke mia (*dhaskalo) stin Katerini and one.f (*teacher.m) in.the K. ‘P. visited a teacher.m in V., and a (teacher.f) in K.’
Summary

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{⟦dhaskalos⟧} &= \lambda x. \text{teacher}(x) \\
\text{⟦dhaskala⟧} &= \lambda x: \text{female}(x). \text{female}(x) \land \text{teacher}(x)
\end{align*}
\]

- Without ellipsis, the use of \textit{dhaskala} is forced by MP whenever felicitous.
- With ellipsis, gender mismatch is tolerated, because MP is turned off.

\((3a')\) \text{okM} \rightarrow F

O Petros episkefthike \textit{enan dhaskalo} sti Veria, the P. visited one.m teacher.m in.the V. ke mia (*dhaskalo) stin Katerini and one.f (*teacher.m) in.the K.

‘P. visited a teacher.m in V., and a (teacher.f) in K.’
Summary (cont.)

\[ \text{[dhaskalos]} = \lambda x. \text{teacher}(x) \]
\[ \text{[dhaskala]} = \lambda x: \text{female}(x). \text{female}(x) \land \text{teacher}(x) \]

- On the other hand, F→M is bound to violate MP: Since dhaskala presupposes and asserts the gender, only mia is compatible.

(3b’) \(*F \rightarrow M*

\*O Petros episkefthike mia dhaskala sti Veria, the P. visited one.f teacher.f in.the V. ke enan (dhaskala) stin Katerini and one.m (teacher.f) in.the K.
‘P. visited a teacher.f in V., and a (teacher.f) in K.’
Predictions

• The assumption that MP is turned off under ellipsis makes predictions beyond gendered nouns.

• However, the facts are not as simple as one might expect.

• See Appendix.
4. NATURAL VS. GRAMMATICAL GENDER
Grammatical Gender under Ellipsis

• Our analysis relies on the assumption that agreement mismatches within DP are in principle permitted.

• But grammatical gender behaves differently from natural gender in this regard (cf. Merchant 2014).

• Greek grammatical neuter nouns: koritsi (girl), melos (member), pedhi (child), agori (boy), etc.
• The ungrammaticality of (15) doesn’t follow if [neut.] has no semantic contribution.

• **Tentative hypothesis:** syntax forces agreement of grammatical gender.

• If this is right, then syntax treats grammatical and natural gender differently (cf. Alexiadou 2004, Kramer 2014)

(15)

* O Petros episkefthike **ena** koritsi sti Veria,  
* the P. visited **one.n** girl.n in.the V.  
  ke mia (koritsi) stin Katerini  
  and **one.f** (girl.n) in.the K.  

‘P. visited one girl in V., and one (girl) in K.’
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Predictions

• Maximize Presupposition (MP) is used to explain various kinds of competitions:
  – a vs. the (Heim 1991)
  – all vs. both (Percus 2006)
  – think vs. know (Percus 2006)

• Our proposal that MP is inactive under ellipsis makes predictions.

• But it turns out that the facts are not so straightforward.
All vs. Both

• “All” is infelicitous if “Both” can be used. e.g. #‘all parents of mine’
• Prediction: “all” becomes OK with ellipsis.
• However, in sentences like (A1), “all” can be used even without ellipsis.

(A1)
[John has four sisters. Bill has two sisters.] John will invite all of his sisters. Bill will invite all of his sisters), too.
Think vs. Know

• “Think” vs. “know” seems to go against our prediction.
• But “know” might actually involve more than the factive presupposition (cf. ‘Gettier’s problem’).

(A2)

[Bill, but not John, has been admitted to MIT ]
John thinks he’s been admitted to MIT. #Bill does (think he’s been admitted to MIT), too.
Merchant’s example

• Merchant (2014) uses examples of the type in (i) to claim that NEGM is not possible in argument positions.

• The claim is refuted by the data in, e.g., (2) and (3).

• (i) is out due to violations of the obligatory contrastive topic contour.

(i)

* O Petros exi enan jatro sti Veria,
* the P. visited one.m doctor in.the V.
ala dhen exi kamia (jatro) stin Katerini
but not has no.f (doctor) in.the K.
‘P. has one doctor in V., but he has no (doctor.f) in K.’
Presupposed gender only

• Can we account for the contrast in, e.g., (10), keeping the assumption that gender is always presuppositional and never asserted?

• The idea would be that gender not figured in the alternatives implies the absence of gender at LF (Heim 2008, Kratzer 2009, a.m.o.).

(10a) Mono o Petros ine dhaskalos.
   only the P. is teacher.m
   ‘Only P. is a teacher.’
   ⇒ Maria is not a teacher.

(10b) Mono i Maria ine dhaskala.
   only the M. is teacher.f
   ‘Only M. is a teacher.’
   ⇒ Petros is not a teacher.
Presupposed gender only (cont.)

• The difference between, e.g., dhaskalos and dhaskala, then, is the presence/absence of gender information.

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle \text{dhaskalos} \rangle &= \lambda x. \text{teacher}(x) \\
\langle \text{dhaskala} \rangle &= \lambda x: \text{female}(x). \text{teacher}(x)
\end{align*}
\]

• Problem: Analysis is committed to the assumption that presuppositional gender is present in focus alternatives.

• Refuted by examples in which gender cannot be the result of syntactic/morphological mechanisms in any obvious way, as in, e.g., (14).

(14)

I perisoteri apo emas den ehun dhaskalo stin Katerini.
the more from us not have teacher.m in.the K.
‘Most of us don’t have a teacher in K.’

Mono i Maria exi mia (*dhaskalo).
only the M. has one.f (*teacher.m)
‘Only Maria has one.’ ⇒ Nobody else has a teacher (in K.).