

# The Scope of Indefinites

E.G. Ruys

Dissertatie, Universiteit Utrecht  
(Doctoral Dissertation, Utrecht University)

Supervisor: H.J. Verkuyl  
Co-supervisor: J.G. Kerstens

1992

CIP-GEGEVENS KONINKLIJKE BIBLIOTHEEK, DEN HAAG

Ruys, E.G.

The scope of indefinites / E.G. Ruys. - Utrecht : LEd. -  
(OTS dissertation series)

Ook verschenen als proefschrift Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht,  
1993. - Met index, lit. opg. - Met samenvatting in het  
Nederlands.

ISBN 90-5434-009-6

NUGI 941

Trefw.: generatieve grammatica.

Published by LEd, Hooghiemstraplein 97, 3514 AX Utrecht, The Netherlands.

ISBN 90-5434-009-6

Copyright © 1992 by E.G. Ruys. All rights reserved.

This book is dedicated  
to the memory  
of Lisan van Beurden

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	xi
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1. On the Necessity of Scope Assignment	2
1.1.1. On the Level of LF	2
1.1.2. Against S-Structure Interpretation	6
1.1.3. On Non-Syntactic Scope Assignment	16
1.2. Scope Assignment as a Movement Rule	20
1.2.1. Bridge Verbs	20
1.2.2. Finiteness	21
1.2.3. Subject - Object Asymmetries	23
1.2.4. Definite Noun Phrases	25
1.2.5. Complex Noun Phrases	27
1.2.6. Adjunct Islands	29
1.2.7. Coordinate Structures	31
1.2.8. Summary	39
1.3. Weak Noun Phrases	42
Chapter 2: On the Binding Scope of Indefinites	47
2.1. Introduction	47
2.2. E-Type Pronouns: Evans	53
2.3. Unselective Binding: Heim	63
2.4. Donkey anaphora: Evans, Cooper, Heim, Reinhart	74
2.4.1. Two Classes of Theories	75
2.4.2. Pro Unselective Binding	77
2.4.2.1. Weak Crossover	77
2.4.2.2. The Restrictive Clause	79
2.4.2.3. Definiteness	80
2.4.3. Contra Unselective Binding	81
2.4.3.1. VP Conjunction	81
2.4.3.2. Relative Scope	83
2.4.4. Contra E-type Pronouns	86
2.4.4.1. The Interpretation of Free Variables	87
2.4.4.2. The Antecedent-Anaphor Relation	90
2.5. Weak Crossover Attenuation	91
2.6. Conclusion	92

Chapter 3: On the Scope of Indefinites	95
3.1. Introduction	95
3.2. On Specificity	95
3.3. On the insufficiency of QR	102
3.4. On Relativized Specificity	108
3.4.1. On the insufficiency of a [ $\pm$ specific] ambiguity	108
3.4.2. Relativized Specificity	115
3.4.3. Indefinites and QR	129
3.5. On Scope Assignment	135
3.5.1. May (1985)	135
3.5.2. Scopal Reconstruction	140
3.5.2.1. Raising to Subject	140
3.5.2.2. Quantifier-Wh Interactions	147
3.5.3. Williams (1988)	152
3.5.4. Haik (1984)	155
3.6. Elaborations and conclusions	160
Chapter 4: Pronouns as Bound Variables	171
4.1. Bound Variable Pronouns	171
4.1.1. Chomsky (1977a)	171
4.1.2. Higginbotham (1980a), (1980b), (1983)	174
4.1.3. Reinhart (1983), (1987)	179
4.1.4. Haik (1984)	183
4.1.5. Koopman & Sportiche (1982)	186
4.1.6. Safir (1984)	188
4.1.7. May (1985)	190
4.1.8. A Scope Marking Analysis	194
4.2. Donkey Antecedents	202
4.2.1. Sigma-sequences	203
4.2.2. Open Sentences	206
4.2.3. Some Other Proposals	209
4.2.4. Scope Marking	213
4.2.5. The Proportion Problem	219
4.3. Donkey Anaphors	222
Chapter 5: Conclusions	231
References	235
Index	243

## Acknowledgments

It is a distinct pleasure for me to be able to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to a largeish number of people who over the past few years have contributed to the completion of this thesis.

The research reported here was conducted under the joint supervision of Johan Kerstens and Henk Verkuyl, who have generously granted me the freedom to pursue my own goals, but without whose support this thesis would in all probability have remained unwritten. It was Johan who first introduced me to the practice of linguistic research, and who impressed on me the necessity for keeping track of the wood behind the trees. Henk's confidence and optimism have acted as an indispensable stimulus; it was he who finally managed to convince me that in writing a dissertation, there comes a time when one should start to write a dissertation.

I have benefitted greatly from discussions with Tanya Reinhart who, when visiting OTS, awarded me generously of her time. Her encouragement and insight have been immensely valuable to me. Also, the influence of her work is apparent, I believe, throughout this study.

I am especially grateful to Peter Coopmans for his careful reading of the manuscript in various stages of completion. His comments, some of which caused me more loss of sleep than he perhaps suspected, have to my mind significantly improved the final result.

Finally, I want to thank the three remaining members of the reading committee: Ger de Haan, Jan Koster, and Eric Reuland, for their willingness to read the manuscript.

Many other people have in various ways contributed to the realization of this study. For stimulating discussions I am grateful to the members of what has come to be known as the 'Nederlandse Indefinieten Club': Hans Broekhuis, Helen de Hoop, Frans v.d. Putten, Henriëtte de Swart and Joost Zwarts. From Guido Vanden Wyngaerd I received detailed comments on parts of the manuscript. I owe thanks to Yaël Brenner, Charlotte Koster, Klara Lindhout-Lengyel, Glyn Morrill, Dominique Nouveau, and Maaïke Schoorlemmer for providing judgments on scores of intractable examples.

Less easily defined yet no less significant is my indebtedness to my colleagues, both present and past, at OTS and at the Dutch Department, for providing moral support and creating a most agreeable working environment. I am particularly grateful to Jan Don, who has been an unfailing source of encouragement and inspiration, linguistic and otherwise, over the past ten years. Furthermore, I want to specifically mention the members of the 'lunchclub' and various other 'kaffee-klatsch' societies,

including, besides some of the above: Peter Ackema, Lisan van Beurden, Martin Everaert, Jacqueline Frijn, Wim de Haas, Hans v.d. Koot, Ad Neeleman, Joleen Schipper, Mieke Trommelen, Ellis Visch, and Fred Weerman.

Finally, I thank Ludmila Menert, for putting up with me, generally, but in particular with those spells of glassy-eyed absent-mindedness, when a Quantifier would start to Raise in the middle of a conversation, or some ill-behaved donkey crossed our path.