

p-set 1

Patrick D. Elliott¹ & Martin Hackl²

February 6, 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 > \exists

(2) Most linguists have read a paper by every German semanticist.
 $\forall > \exists > \text{most}$

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.

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.⁵

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