

Response to the second reviewer's comments

this is the review starting *For example...*

December 2016

We would like to begin by thanking the reviewer for his/her time and effort put into reading and commenting on the paper. Clearly the points raised have led to a number of modifications that have led to several improvements in clarity, presentation and content. The reviewer has raised a number of points of detail and presentation on specific places of the paper. We will not list them all here but we have taken them all into account and either have clarified the point/presentation or made the required change. In the following we will address two points that relate more to the content of the paper.

The first point where the reviewer sees a problem is the scope of indefinites. Including a full discussion of this would, of course, take us too far afield. We should note however that, as it seems to us, there is no real problem in this respect. The phenomenon of indefiniteness scoping out of islands has received a number of treatments in the literature. For example, one could follow Abusch's (1994) extension of the Kamp-Heim framework for the analysis of indefinites and analyse them accordingly. On the other hand, choice-function approaches to wide-scope for indefinites, as pioneered by Reinhart (1997), Winter (1997) will also provide not only an appropriate analysis but also, and more importantly for our concerns here, a parallel with the behaviour of Q-particles, the latter being potentially interpreted as indefinites of question words depending on the operator that binds them, and the former taking wide or narrow scope depending on the level where closure operations (including \exists -closure or choice function) applies.

The second point that the reviewer raises regards the status of LF movement. Specifically, the reviewer specifically suggests that the approach merely integrates LF into the syntax.... We respectfully disagree with this position for the following reasons: First, given current assumptions regarding phase based derivation, LF movement of the type that is assumed generally becomes unformulable. The difference between a theory based on the more traditional Y-model and a phase based one is that in the latter there can be

no syntactic operations on the “LF-branch”. The operation of TRANSFER entails that the transferred material is opaque and unavailable to syntactic operations. Under this assumption the only way there is to maintain what appears to be empirically well motivated analyses of a range of typologically very different languages is to work with the idea that the “overt” syntax (or rather, plainly the syntax) is richer than what the acceptance of the overt vs. covert distinction of syntactic operations may lead us to believe.

References

- Abusch, D. (1994). The scope of indefinites. *Natural Language Semantics* 2(2), 83–136.
- Reinhart, T. (1997). Quantifier scope: How labor is divided between qr and choice functions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20, 335–397.
- Winter, Y. (1997). Choice functions and the scopal semantics of indefinites. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20(4), 399–467.