p-set 1

Patrick D. Elliott[1] *& Martin Hackl*[2]

February 07, 2020

[1] pdell@mit.edu

[2] hackl@mit.edu

Deadline: 02.13 (i.e., before next class)

1 Warming up

(1) A philosopher has criticized most linguists. ∃ > most

(2) Most professors gave every student a paper. most > ∀ > ∃

Give a derivation of the indicated readings of the examples above using:

- Quantifier raising and predicate abstraction.[3]
- Continuation semantics with *flat lambda expressions*.[4]
- Continuation semantics with *towers*.

[3] I.e., in-line with Heim & Kratzer (1998) – you should have covered this in semantics 101. Don't worry about trace conversion, just treat traces of movement as variables.

[4] No towers allowed! Make sure to be explicit about types, as well as any β-reductions and α-conversions necessary.

> Bonus round
>
> Can you come up with a general *translation procedure* for going from a derivation using continuations to a derivation which makes use of quantifier raising? It might help to think about the role of LOWER in continuation semantics.

> Bonus round
>
> We haven't had a chance to cover inverse scope yet, but read chapter 4 of Barker & Shan 2014, and the relevant section of my handout, and try deriving the following readings of the first example:
>
> (3) most > ∃

2 *Split scope*

Non upward-monotonic quantifiers give rise to so-called *split scope* readings across intensional verbs (Heim 2001).

(4) The company need fire no employees.
It is not the case that the company is obligated to fire employees (Potts 2000)

The split scope reading – the one we're interested in – entails a lack of obligation for the company. It seems to involve a noun-phrase *no employees* scoping in two different places at once.

- Analyze this phenomenon using continuation semantics.[5]

[5] Hint: think the possibility of a meaning of type $\mathsf{K}_\mathsf{t}\ (\mathsf{K}_\mathsf{t}\ \mathsf{a})$. Read chapter 4 of Barker & Shan 2014.