Additive particles differ in their distribution across sentence types.

(1)   Declaratives/polar questions:
    a.   Kim **also** danced. / Kim danced, **too**.
    b.   Did Kim **also** dance? / Did Kim dance, **too**?

(2)   *wh*-questions:
    a.   #Who **also** danced? / #Who danced, **too**?
    b.   Who **else** danced?

Basic idea: with wh-questions, the INDEPENDENCE condition is impossible to satisfy—unless the wh-domain has been suitably restricted.

I take a *wh*-question to have the corresponding question without domain restriction as its CQ.

(8)   [CQ: **What** did John read?]
    Which science fiction books did John read?

Unrestricted wh-questions

For unrestricted *wh*-questions, this means the QUD is **identical to the question itself**.

(9)   [CQ: What did John read?]
    What did John **also** read?

It follows that INDEPENDENCE is **impossible to satisfy** for unrestricted *wh*-questions. This explains the degradedness of *also* in unrestricted *wh*-questions.

Showmaster questions

Umbach (2012): whenever German *auch* 'also' is used in a *wh*-question, this question receives a ***showmaster interpretation***.

(3)   [Little Lisa tells her mom about her visit to the zoo with Auntie.]
    Auntie to Lisa: Und was ist im Zoo **auch** passiert?
    Auntie to Lisa: And what also happened at the zoo?

Choosing additive particles in wh-questions

Nadine Theiler, ILLC, University of Amsterdam

I propose a generalized additivity presupposition that is applicable to both assertions and questions.

Following Beaver and Clark (2008), this presupposition is formulated in a Question under Discussion framework, where it is assumed that every utterance addresses a Current Question (CQ):

(5)   [CQ: **What** did John read?]
    John read **[Middlemarch]**$_F$.

If an additive particle occurs in a sentence *S*, this presupposes that:

– a positive partial resolution *p* of the CQ has saliently been established,   EXISTENCE

– there is no positive partial resolution *q* of *S* such that $q \subseteq p$.   INDEPENDENCE

The notion of positive partial resolution (PPR) used here is based on the notion of resolution from inquisitive semantics. In a nutshell, a PPR is any non-empty proposition entailing a *somebody/something* reply to a *wh*-question or a *yes*-reply to a polar question/assertion.

else-questions

else **removes the witness** of the additivity presupposition from the *wh*-domain (Romero, 1998; Schwarz, 2017):

(10)   A: Ann called.
    B: Who else called? = Who other than Ann called?

I therefore take an *else*-question to have the corresponding question without *else* as its CQ.

(11)   [CQ: Who called?]
    Who **else** called?

So, the witness is contained in the CQ domain, but not in the domain of the question itself. This makes it **possible to satisfy INDEPENDENCE**.

Summoning questions

What saves the day in *else*-questions is the **witness removal**. So, more generally, we'd expect *also* to be acceptable in any question whose domain doesn't contain the witness. And indeed:

(12)   John danced all night at Mary's birthday party.
    Who #(from your dorm) also danced?

Summoning questions

There's a class of questions that evades Umbach's generalization: what I will call **summoning questions** can host *also/auch* without showmaster interpretation.

A summoning question is a question **posed directly to a group of people** with the aim of finding out who of these people have a certain property:

(4)   a.   Who **also** wants an ice cream?
    b.   Who's **also** in favor of leaving?
    c.   Who of you is **also** on Snapchat?

Assertions: classical

To see what the generalized additivity presupposition amounts to for an assertion like (6), we first need to determine the CQ and the PPRs of (6):

(6)   [CQ: **What** did John read?]
    John also read **[Middlemarch]**$_F$.

PPRs of (6): $\{q \mid q \subseteq [\![\text{John read Middlemarch}]\!]\}$

Presupposition: there's a saliently established PPR *p* of *What did John read?* such that *p* is logically independent of $[\![\text{John read Middlemarch}]\!]$.

Polar questions: same

An assertion and its corresponding polar question have the **same set of PPRs**.

It is standardly assumed that the CQ associated with a polar question like (7) is *What did John read?*.

(7)   Did John also read **[Middlemarch]**$_F$?

So, an assertion and its corresponding polar question also have the **same CQ**. This means that for polar questions the generalized additivity presupposition amounts to exactly the **same** as for assertions.

In **summoning questions** a suitable restriction is supplied by the **context**:

(13)   I'm getting an ice cream. **Who (of you)** also wants one?

The speaker restricts the *wh*-domain to the group of addressees, and since that group doesn't contain the witness, INDEPENDENCE is satisfied.

Showmaster questions

Based on George 2011, I assume the *wh*-domain of showmaster questions is **restricted** to just those entities that the speaker has in mind as an answer.

E.g., suppose the answer Auntie has in mind is that a giraffe stole Lisa's hat:

(14) $[\![\text{What also happened at the zoo?}]\!]$
    $= \{ \textbf{giraffe-stole-lisa's-hat} \}^{\downarrow}$

The generalized additivity presupposition **boils down** to the same as for the corresponding assertion/polar question. Satisfying INDEPENDENCE is unproblematic.