

A few thoughts on Angelika Kratzer's
"Covert quantifier restrictions in natural languages"

Sally McConnell-Ginet
Cornell University
smg9@cornell.edu

Context and Content Workshop
MIT/Harvard LSA Linguistic Institute
15 July, 2005

1. Quantificational domains are semantically restricted

Pedantry doesn't fly:

- (1) Everyone is frowning.

When the utterer is pointing to a photo an utterance of (1) expresses the same content as

- (2) Everyone in the photo is frowning.

To object to (1) on the grounds of someone smiling in Mindelheim or in Chapel Hill is not just pedantic: it is absurd because the sentence in the given context cannot be used to make claims about everyone in the universe.

2. How are domain restrictions introduced into the semantics?

Restriction cannot be global over a discourse or even over a sentence:

- (3) Sweden is a funny place. Every tennis player looks like Björn Borg, and more men than women watch tennis on TV. But most people really dislike foreign tennis players. Westerståhl, cited in von Stechow 1998

Nor does ellipsis offer a viable account:

- (4)
 - a. Everyone in this room is frowning.
 - b. Everyone in Jefferson 250 is frowning.
 - c. Everyone attending the final session of the context and content workshop is frowning.
 - d. Everyone now listening to my comments is frowning.

Appealing alternative: phonologically null variables present in the syntax introduce domain restrictions. . A variable account seems attractive also because of what look like binding effects:

- (5) I had great classes this past semester. Papers were good and every student answered every exam question correctly.

But if we posit syntactically realized variables to guide domain restriction there are

3. Questions:

- What sort of variables do we need? What kind of range?
 - a. Sets of individuals?
 - b. Properties?
 - c. Functions?
 - d. Space-time locations?
 - e. Situations?

- Where are the variables located?
 - a. Where the Det combines with its N-bar complement?
 - b. Further down inside the nominal projection?
 - c. In multiple positions?

Situations to the rescue: using situation variables can give us everything else we might need such as individuals in a situation, the spatio-temporal location of a situation, etc. And situation variables can plausibly be housed at different places in a tree, allowing for distinct variables to be associated with different domains.

4. Unifying (restrictions on) D-quantification with (restrictions on) A-quantification

- (6)
- a. Joan usually walks to school.
 - b. When the phone rings, I always light a cigarette.

But there are differences: as von Stechow (1994, 178, n 25) observes: "adverbial quantifiers [and generic sentences] resist being restricted by contextually supplied sets of entities [(7), cited from Krifka] while determiner-quantifiers resist being restricted by contextually supplied sets of situations [see (8), with a and b exceptions from lecture notes by Heim, c-e cited from Carlson]."

- (7)
- a. There are lions and tiger in the cage.
 - a. Every lion [in the cage] has a mane.
 - b. A lion [#in the cage] has a mane.
 - c. Lions [#in the cage] have a mane.
 - d. A lion [#in the cage] always has a mane.
- (8)
- a. Most letters are answered if they are shorter than 5 pages.
 - b. Few people like NY if they didn't grow up there.
 - c. #Bill hates any dog when/?if it is of a rare breed.
 - d. #All hotels are uneconomical when/if they have less than 200 rooms.
 - e. #Each wolf is intelligent when/if it has blue eyes.

If there is indeed such an asymmetry, can the present account shed any light on it?

5. Are salient individuals or properties irrelevant for domain restriction?
- (9) Sleep scientist enters lab where her assistants are bustling around taking readings from the research participants:
Great. Everyone is sleeping.
- (10) Host at dinner table in posh establishment around which many (hungry and unfed) staff are working to keep plates and glasses full for those seated at the table:
At last, everyone is eating.
- (11) Whenever I go to a dinner party, everybody comments on my haircut. [von Fintel]

But why can't making the property of being a phonologist highly salient allow us to consider only phonologists when quantifying over linguists?

- (12) A: Speech scientists are overly dependent on computers these days. Those speech pathologists in here the other day had no idea how to read IPA transcriptions and the psychologists had never even seen them.
B: Lisa knows the IPA. Every linguist knows the IPA.

If the final sentence can be understood as a claim restricted to linguists who also have the property of being speech scientists--to the phonologists and the phoneticians, say--then we might seem to have a domain restricted by a property that has been made not just salient but topical. We are talking about speech scientists. Or are we?

6. Topic situations and Austinian propositions

J.L. Austin's idea, formalized in Barwise & Etchemendy 1987, is that semantic context-dependence is pervasive: every sentence needs a contextually-supplied situation argument--the topic situation--to produce a truth-bearer.

- (13) a. It's raining.
b. Everyone has three of a kind.
c. The table is full of books.

The Butler and the Judge tale offers Austinian propositions as objects of attitude verbs and the South German data suggest that some languages actually pronounce situation variables.

7. Some further puzzles about how situations can restrict domains

Utterance situations are available as default topic situations but *everyone*, e.g., often/almost always excludes the speaker:

- (14) Everyone is looking at me.

On the other hand, in talk about the utterance situation *everyone* often goes beyond those present in the here and now:

- (15) a. Not everyone is here.
b. Everyone is here.

Although the topic situation may be the utterance situation, presumably another situation variable expands the domain relevant for the nominal to include, e.g., those expected to attend.

More generally, what can seem to be sentences saying something about the same topic situation can be used with apparently different domain restrictions.

- (16) Angelika is talking to Kai on the phone about the party Kai hosted last night:
A: Well, Kai, how did the party go?
K: Great. Everyone danced or played games for the first couple of hours and then we broke out the champagne. [includes all those in attendance during the first couple of hours of the party]
K': Great but not everyone was there when we cut the cake. [includes all those who did attend at some point in the evening, some of whom may have left before the cake-cutting and some of whom may have come after that event--the coincidence with those attending for first couple of hours may not be perfect]
K'': Great but not everyone could come. [includes not only those who attended some part of the event but others who did not appear at all]

Can appeal to situations help us account for (17)?

- (17) Noone goes to that club these days because the management lowered the cover charge and now everyone goes there.
[based on cartoon I once saw but can't now locate: something similar attributed to Yogi Bera]

- Barwise, Jon & John Etchemendy. 1987. *The Liar: An Essay in Truth and Circularity*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
von Fintel, Kai. 1994. Restrictions on Quantifier Domains. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
von Fintel, Kai. 1998. The semantics and pragmatics of quantifier domains. Vilem Mathesius Lectures, Prague.
Kratzer, Angelika. 2004. Covert quantifier domain restrictions. Milan Meeting (Palazzo Feltrinelli, Gargnano).
Percus, Orin. 2004. Context-dependence and quantifier domains. EGG 2004 Advanced Semantics Notes. Cluj, Romania
Westerståhl, Dag. 1984. Determiners and context sets. In Johan van Benthem & Alice ter Meulen, eds., *Generalized Quantifiers in Natural Language* (Dordrecht: Foris), 45-71.