Semantics 1

June 14, 2012

Gerhard Jäger







Syntax: (simplified)

- category: \overline{S}
- \bullet adjoined to N
- daughters of \overline{S} are
 - a relative pronoun (category NP), indexed with some index i
 - ${\ensuremath{\, \bullet }}$ an S which contains an NP trace also indexed with i



Semantics:

- lexicon: $\|that\| = \lambda P \lambda Q \lambda x \lambda s. Q(s, x) \wedge P(s, x)$ (and likewise for the other relative pronouns)
- trace:
 - If NP_i is a *wh*-trace:

$$\|NP_i\| = x_i$$

• rule:

• In a configuration $[_{\overline{S}}NP_i S]$:

$$\|\overline{S}\| = \|NP_i\|(\lambda x_i.\|S\|)$$

(1) John is a man who is famous.





This is equivalent to

 $\lambda s.\text{man'}(s, \mathbf{j'}) \wedge \text{famous'}(s, \mathbf{j'})$

which is the interpretation of

(2) John is a man and John is famous.

- (3) Semantics is no subject which a student likes.
 - object NP is a quantifier that
 - contains a relative clause that
 - containts a quantifier

(3) Semantics is no subject which a student likes.



- (3) Semantics is no subject which a student likes.
 - long QR: corresponds to specific reading: There is a particular student who doesn't like semantics.
 - short QR: No student likes semantics



Syntactic constraints on quantifier scope

- Quantifiers that are embedded inside a subordinate clause often cannot take scope at the level of the matrix clause.
- In derivational terms: QR across an \overline{S} -node is restricted.
- However, appropriate choice of context and lexical material frequently renders QR across \overline{S} possible.

(1) Some men from every city showed up.

- a. $\lambda s. \exists x(\text{man'}(s, x) \land \forall y(\text{city'}(s, y) \to \text{from'}(s, x, y)) \land \text{show_up'}(s, x)$
- b. $\lambda s. \forall y (\text{CITY}'(s, y) \rightarrow \exists x (\text{MAN}'(s, x) \land \text{FROM}'(s, x, y) \land \text{SHOW}_{UP}'(s, x)))$
- (2) Some men [\overline{S} who lives in every city] showed up.
 - a. $\lambda s. \exists x (\max'(s, x) \land \forall y (\operatorname{CITY}'(s, y) \rightarrow \operatorname{LIVE_{IN}}'(s, x, y)) \land \operatorname{SHOW_{UP}}'(s, x)$
 - b. $\lambda s. \forall y(\text{CITY}'(s, y) \rightarrow$

 $\exists x (\text{man'}(s, x) \land \text{live_in'}(s, x, y) \land \text{show_up'}(s, x)))$

(3) But: The man [\overline{s} who builds every television set] also repairs it.

- a. the > every: okay
- b. every > the: for many speakers also okay

(June 14, 2012)

Semantics 1

Syntactic constraints on quantifier scope

- (1) You will inherit a fortune $[\overline{S}]$ if every man dies].
 - a. if > every: okay
 - **b**. every > if: not possible
- (2) John hissed¹ [$_{\overline{S}}$ that Smith liked every painting] .
 - a. hiss > every: okay
 - b. every > hiss: not possible
- (3) **But:** John said $\left[\frac{1}{S}\right]$ that Smith liked every painting
 - a. say > every: okay
 - b. every > hiss: for many speakers also okay

¹zischeln

Syntactic constraints on quantifier scope

- Indefinites (such as a man, some woman) and cardinal quantifiers (such as *three clouds*) can take arbitrarily wide scope.
- Wide scope readings of these NPs are called **specific** readings.
- Specific readings can be facilitated by modifiers such as *certain*, *particular*, or *specific*
- (1) Most men [$_{\overline{S}}$ who read a particular book] showed up.
 - a. $\exists > most: okay$
 - b. most $> \exists$: also possible in appropriate contexts (e.g. if you continue *namely their dissertation.*)
- (2) You will inherit a fortune if three of your relatives die.
 - a. a fortune > three of your relatives: okay (pragmatically odd in this context though)
 - b. three of your relatives > a fortune: okay
- (3) John hissed that Smith abused a friend of mine.
 - a. hiss > a friend of mine: okay
 - b. a friend of mine > hiss: okay