

## *p-set 1*

Patrick D. Elliott<sup>1</sup> & Martin Hackl<sup>2</sup>

February 6, 2020

<sup>1</sup> pdell@mit.edu

<sup>2</sup> hackl@mit.edu

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

### 1 *Warming up*

- (1) A philosopher has criticized most linguists. most >  $\exists$
- (2) Most linguists have read a paper by every German semanticist.  $\forall$  >  $\exists$  > most

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

- Quantifier raising and predicate abstraction.<sup>3</sup>
- Continuation semantics with *flat lambda expressions*.<sup>4</sup>
- Continuation semantics with *towers*.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> No towers allowed! Make sure to be explicit about types, as well as any  $\beta$ -reductions and  $\alpha$ -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.

### 2 *Split scope*

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

- (3) 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.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Hint: think about towers with  $n > 2$  stories.