

Response to third reviewer's comments

this is the review starting *this is a well written paper...*

December 2016

The reviewer's insightful and helpful comments have allowed us to clarify a number of issues in the paper and have led to several modifications both major and minor in the presentation and argument. We thus would like to begin by thanking the reviewer for the time and effort that (s)he put in commenting on the paper. We are pleased that we have been able to incorporate the vast majority of the comments.

More specifically, We have followed the reviewer's suggestions and incorporated earlier discussions of the idea of differential spell-out, although we have limited ourselves to the areas where this was most relevant to the concerns of the paper.

More importantly, we would like to address here two issues of substance that the reviewer raises and offer some clarification.

First the reviewer raises an issue concerning the connection that we make between the analysis of wh-scope and the Beghelli and Stowell's (1997) feature-based system for scope. The reviewer suggests that it may be problematic, in the framework of the paper, that choice function indefinites (which we take to be wide-scope indefinites) and Q-particles do not behave alike. The reviewer recognises that this is not in itself a problem but goes on to point out that Q-particles do not behave exactly like existential quantifiers. This is seen as problematic in the context of our suggestion (modelled on Kratzer, 2005, 's work) that there may be an existential position in the set of scope-related positions in the clausal spine, corresponding to the position where \exists -closure applies. Strictly speaking, this is a correct observation as in the semantic literature it is claimed that choice-function indefinites can also take lower scope. However, the comparison with Q-particles in this respect is not really warranted because Q-particles are not taken to be existential quantifiers. Although we have not taken an explicit stance on this question (but we have also not challenged it, so implicitly we are going with it), the analysis of Q-particles due to Hagstrom (1998) and later Cable (2007) takes

them to be variables over choice functions which can be bound either by existential closure or an interrogative C resulting in their different interpretations in the languages that have wh-indefinites. Given that semantic analyses of closure specifically take it to be an unrestricted operation that can take place at different points (see most importantly, Reinhart, 1997; Winter, 1997, and subsequent work) It is to be expected that, if this is so, \exists Ps may be found at different points. This is in fact to be expected on a variety of grounds, theoretically, the suggestion that phasal nodes are accompanied by a functional shell with significant similarities across phase heads becomes increasingly commonplace. Empirically, there have been suggestions that elements like a DistP are indeed found within DPs (e.g. Etxepare, 2014; Tsoulas and Woods, 2015). It then follows that, if anything, this behaviour supports our proposal since it underlines a parallel between choice function indefinites which can be “bound” at wide or narrow scope levels by closure operations (this is because the closure operation is not restricted) and SSO as applied to QR.

The reviewer also asks why, under this account QR would be clause bound unlike Wh movement. This is, of course, a very good question and as we have pointed out there is really no good explicit account in the literature that assumes the classic version of the rule for this behaviour of QR. We have not incorporated an explicit discussion of this point in the paper for reasons of space and to keep things more coherent. The reason why we opted for this is that we believe there is a good answer to this question that derives directly from the system. Our approach here is that the locality of QR issue is solved immediately under Beghelli and Stowell’s (1997) system and our reinterpretation of its mechanisms in the following way: given that the effects of QR are subsumed under AGREE (and subsequent movement if needed) between a functional head and a DP it follows that QR will be restricted by the same locality constraints as AGREE. A problem would arise in a situation where there are no scopal functional structure in a subordinate clause and there is in the matrix. We know of no such cases and the reason why they would be ruled out anyway is the independent principle of *Phase Impenetrability Condition*. In other words, by the time the higher scope heads have been merged the lower DPs would have been subject to TRANSFER, fixing embedded scope.

Norman,
can you
check the
sentence
from Al-
though...?
do we
need to
mention
anyone
else and
should
Cable be
mentioned
there?

References

- Beghelli, F. and T. Stowell (1997). Distributivity and negation: The syntax of *each* and *every*. In A. Szabolcsi (Ed.), *Ways of Scope Taking*, pp. 71–107. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publisher.
- Cable, S. (2007). *The grammar of Q: Q-particles and the nature of wh-fronting, as revealed by the wh-questions of Tlingit*. Ph. D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Etxepare, R. (2014). Functional dependencies in basque. Ms IKER.
- Hagstrom, P. A. (1998). *Decomposing Questions*. Ph. D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Kratzer, A. (2005). Indefinites and the operators they depend on: From Japanese to Salish. In G. N. Carlson and F. Pelletier (Eds.), *Reference and Quantification: The Partee effect*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Reinhart, T. (1997). Quantifier scope: How labor is divided between QR and choice functions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20, 335–397.
- Tsoulas, G. and R. Woods (2015). Predicative possessives, relational nouns and floating quantifiers. ms. University of York.
- Winter, Y. (1997). Choice functions and the scopal semantics of indefinites. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20(4), 399–467.