

Redundancy under Discussion

Supplementary material

September 8, 2024

1 The main contrast

- | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------------------|
| (1) | # Either Ido is at SuB , or he is at SuB or he is in Boston . | $p \vee (p \vee q)$ |
| (2) | # If Ido is not at SuB , then he is at SuB or he is in Boston . | $\neg p \rightarrow (p \vee q)$ |
| (3) | Either Ido is at SuB , or if he is not at SuB then he is in Boston . | $p \vee (\neg p \rightarrow q)$ |

2 What previous theories say about contrast

2.1 Local Contexts (Schlenker, 2009)

2.2 Local Redundancy Checking (Katzir & Singh, 2014)

3 A little bit more on simplex Qtrees

3.1 What if the alternatives are not exclusive?

3.2 Can simplex sentences give rise to layered Qtrees?

4 Evidence for the contrast between \vee and \rightarrow

4.1 Connectedness effects in conjunctions of conditionals

4.2 The *depending on* construction

4.3 Verum focus

4.4 Caveat: QuD-shifting in conditionals

5 Details of the derivation of a disjunctive Qtree

5.1 A successful derivation

5.2 An unsuccessful derivation

6 Details of the derivation of a conditional Qtree

7 One prediction of the last version of Q-Redundancy

if q is contextually equivalent to not p , then (3) should sound tautological and not odd because tree VI right is Q-redundant but after reduction tree VI left is just tautological