## Restricting QR I: Beghelli & Stowell (1997)

## 1. Comparison to May

May (1977–1985)	OR applies indiscriminately to all kinds of OPs
widy (1777, 1705).	QIX applies maiserinnately to an kinds of QI's

 $\rightarrow$  inverse readings should be freely available

É. Kiss (1991), Frey (1993), Saeboe (1995): Few or no inverse readings attested in Hungarian and German

Beghelli & Stowell (1997): The range of available inverse readings is restricted even in English

- (1)a. Every student solved more than/ at least three exercises.not: <>3 >> ∀
  b. Some student solved no exercise: not: no >> ∃
- i. QR as a free syntactic mechanisms does not exist;
- ii. the class of QPs is split up into several sub-classes, each with their own morpho-syntactic checking requirements
- iii.feature checking under SpecHead agreement with a functional head (Ref, Wh, Dist, Share, Neg + AgrSP and AgrOP)
- iv. only some object- QPs end up in a position high enough to give them inverse scope over a subject-QP:
  - *each/ every NP* move to SpecDistP and take scope over subject QP in SpecShareP:
- (2) Some man loves every woman
  - GQPs can move to SpecRefP and take scope over *each/every NP* in Spec,DistP:
- (3) Each student solved ONE exercise.
  - $\rightarrow$  system accounts for the absence of inverse readings

## 2. Some interesting features of the analysis

- The scope of a QP is derived by the grammatical system
- The scope of a QP depends on the structural position of the functional projection that it moves to for feature checking reasons:

A more radical position of this view is found in Kratzer & Shimoyama (2002). Indeterminate pronouns. The view from Japanese. Paper presented at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics. URL: http://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/WEwNjc4Z/Indeterminate%20Pronouns.pdf [2002-07-03] and in Butler (2004) *Phase Structure, Phrase Structure, and Quantification*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of York.

- → some or all QPs have no inherent quantificational force, but their presence ensures the licensing of (covert) propositional quantifiers higher up in the structure.
- $\rightarrow$  The position of the (covert) pr0positional quantifier is relevant for scope
- Beghelli & Stowell's system accounts for the curious restriction on DistP preceding Neg in many natural languages, see also Zeijlstra (2004). *Sentential Negation and Negative Concord*. Doctoral Dissertation, LOT Publications, Utrecht.
- (4)\*Each man didn't show up. (intended:  $\forall x [man'(x) \rightarrow \neg show_up'(x)]$

pragmatic: (4) is blocked by the availability of the simpler structure No man showed up.

Hintikka, J. (2002). Ngegation in Logic and Natural Language. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 25. 585-600.

syntactic: Distributive quantifiers may not raise across negative elements (Zeijlstra 2004)

- The analysis points out a fundamental difference between *each/every* and *all*, which is not captured by previous analyses of QPs, e.g. Montague (1973), Barwise & Cooper (1981) or Milsark (1977).

 $\rightarrow$  *distributivity* as an important semantic (and syntactic?) feature

## 3. Questions and Open Problems

- i. The analysis predicts sentences with two negative QPs to have a simple negated reading:
- (5) Nobody came home with nothing.
- ii. It is not quite clear how inverse readings with *everyQPs* are derived if *every* turns out not to be a strong distributive quantifier after all.
- iii. What about mostQPs?
- → Apart from *each/everyQPs* these are the only strong and [-def] and arguably [+dist] QPs in the system of Barwise & Cooper (1981):
- (6) a. ?Most knights surrounded the castle.
  - b. ?Most knights solved the exercises together.
- (7) a. Some representative of the company went to most tradefairs. ?INV
  - b. Representatives of the company went to most tradefairs INV OK
  - c. Every representative of the company went to most tradefairs. ?INV
- iv. Is the treatment of specific indefinite GQPs in terms of syntactic movement appropriate? For instance, why can indefinite GQPs take scope out of syntactic islands?
- (8)a. If SOME philosopher comes to the party, I'm off (namely Higginbotham)b. I admire the man who understands some/ a certain book (namely Syntactic Structures)
- v. Is the reconstruction of subject-GQPs to the Spec of ShareP a licit syntactic process? Normally, XPs can only reconstruct to a lower position if they have occupied this position at an earlier stage of the derivation.