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(1) Who did everyone say that Bill saw?
(2) "... notice that in [(1)], the wh-quantifier takes wider scope than 'every', (since this
question is an inquiry into the identity of a specific person, of whom everyone said that
Bill saw him)." May (1977, p.141)
(3) What did each senator say
(4) Where did everyone go
(5) According to May (and I concur), these examples, unlike (1), are ambiguous. May
proposes that wh-phrases, optionally can undergo QR. This results in two possible LFs
for (3). [I have corrected an obvious typo in [(6)]
(6) \[ S \% [COMP What] \[S [each senator]x \[S did α say t ]]\]
(7) \[ S \% [COMP t ] \[S [each senator]x [what \[S did α say t ]]\]
(8) "[(6)] represents the reading in which the wh-phrase has wider scope; an appropriate
reply to [(6)] under this reading would be "That he would vote for the Canal treaty".
[(7)], on the other hand, represents a reading in which the wh-phrase has narrower scope.
An appropriate reply here would be "Proxmire said that he would vote for the treaty,
Goldwater said he wouldn't..."" [This latter is standardly called a “family of questions”
reading.]
(9) The family of questions reading arises when \( \forall \) c-commands WH (and the two are close
to each other), subject to an additional constraint that I will not be concerned with here
distinguishing (10) from (11). [See May (1985), Lasnik and Saito (1992), Chierchia
(1993), among others.]
(10) Who did everyone see \[Family of questions reading possible\]
(11) Who saw everyone \[Family of questions reading not possible\]
(12) Who do you think [everyone saw t at the rally]
(13) As May (1985) says, this one does allow a family of questions reading; he captures this
roughly as before, with a couple of technical differences:
(14) WH does not undergo QR.
(15) Rather, if \( \forall \) and WH are close together, either can scope over the other. [In this model,
unlike the 1977 model, LFs are not disambiguated.]
(16) This new analysis also immediately carries over to the original simple examples (3) and
(4).
(17) There are two apparent problems with this account of (12):
(18) It fails to distinguish (12) from (1).
As observed by Williams (1986), on May's account, *everyone* must scope out of the embedded finite clause, but this is normally not possible, as illustrated in (20), which only allows embedded scope for ∀.

Someone thinks everyone saw you at the rally

“The scope of *every* as a quantifier seems to be limited to the S that immediately dominates it.”

May (1988) responds to this argument sharply disagreeing with Williams, calling the claimed lack of broad scope for everyone in (20) a “spurious datum”, and reporting as a “standard observation” that a universal quantifier in this position can be understood as having broad scope. He goes on to state that “there does not seem to be any grammatical principle that can limit extraction from the complement subject position...”

I don’t believe that this is a standard observation. Rather, Williams’ claim reflects a pretty broad consensus, one that, interestingly enough, very quickly included May himself:

Larson and May (1990): “whereas quantified subjects can be given scope out of infinitives, this is not generally possible with tensed complements.”

“...whereas [(26)a] permits a wide-scope reading for *everyone* vis-à-vis *someone* and *believe*, according to which for each person x there is someone who believes x is a genius, [(26)b] permits only a narrow-scope reading for *everyone*, according to which there is some person who believes genius to be a universal characteristic”.

a  Someone believes everyone to be a genius
   b  Someone believes (that) everyone is a genius

Sloan and Uriagereka (1988) and Sloan (1991) also raise the challenge to the May (1985) analysis of WH-Q interactions based on the over prediction of ambiguity, observing, contra May’s prediction, that (28) does not have a family of questions reading.

Who does everyone think you saw?

Agüero-Bautista (2007) presents a somewhat similar structural account of the possibility of family of questions readings:

“... the pair-list interpretation of a question with a universal quantifier requires syntactic reconstruction of the wh-phrase below the quantifier... such readings arise when the quantifier binds a null variable in one of the copies left behind by wh-movement ...”

This allows family of question readings in (at least) all the circumstances that May’s account does.

Agüero-Bautista acknowledges that the possibility of a family of questions reading for (33), which I will argue is the crucial kind of case, was questioned by a reviewer (who apparently even questioned the possibility for cases like (12)).

Which book did every professor say that Pete read?

He indicates, however, that his factual claim “is widely corroborated in the literature”, citing May (1985), Williams (1986), Williams (1988), Chierchia (1993), and Aoun and Li (1993).
But with the one exception of May (1985), none of these works give an example like (33), or make any claim about such an example. And while May (1985) did indeed call such an example ambiguous, this flatly contradicts May (1977), who called such an example unambiguous. [See (1) above.]

For Agüero-Bautista, the two situations are not distinguished. His theory treats them both the same, allowing the family of questions reading in both. And they fall under the same description: Long distance wh-movement from a position below the Q to a position above it. May’s 1985 analysis has the same consequence.

As noted, May’s analyses are based on structural interaction between the Q and the surface position of the WH.

Not long after May (1985) appeared, three alternatives appeared, all based on structural interaction between the Q and the trace of WH (in particular, the initial trace), and all in somewhat different ways:

Sloan (1991)

Lasnik and Saito (1992)

Chierchia (1993)

For Sloan (1991) and Lasnik and Saito (1992), what is crucial is that the WH originate in the same clause as the Q (and lower than the Q, a fact discussed in great detail by May (1985) and Chierchia (1993)).

Lasnik and Saito propose that (part of) the initial trace of wh-movement is actually an existential quantifier, a fairly ancient idea, found, for example, in Chomsky (1964).

Family of questions readings, then, are the result of a \( \forall \) scoping over this \( \exists \).

This kind of scope interaction is usually clause bound.

a. This obviously handles the simple cases like (4)
b. and long distance wh-movement cases like (12), where \( \forall \) and the \( \exists \) wh-trace are in the same clause.
c. On the other hand, cases like (1) will be excluded (correctly, I believe, and just as claimed by May (1977) and Sloan (1991)).

But there is a complication.

Sloan (1991) reports that in response to her claim that examples like her (49) lack the family of questions reading, Robert May gave her structurally similar examples like (50), which do have this reading.

a. Who does everyone think Mary saw t?
b. Who does everyone expect Mary to see t?

a. Who does everyone think he, saw t?
b. Who does everyone expect PRO, to see t?

(50)b is, on the face of it, not particularly surprising, since it has been known at least since Postal (1974) and Rizzi (1978) that subject control constructions behave in many respects as if they constitute a single clause ...
though it is not clear that 'expect' is actually of the restructuring class that he explored.

And 'claim' is not a restructuring verb by usual criteria, yet we still find the possibility of family of questions when 'claim' substitutes for 'expect':

Who does everyone claim PRO to have seen?

Regardless, (50)a, is quite surprising, since noone has ever proposed restructuring for finite complements yet, unlike (49)a, only the former allows a family of questions reading.

If clause-mateness is, indeed, relevant in licensing family of questions readings, sentences like (50)a are striking exceptions, and ones not evidently rescuable by restructuring under any circumstances.

The salient difference between (49)a, disallowing family of questions, and (50)a, allowing it, is that the latter, like a control construction, has a bound subject.

The 'bound' aspect is crucial. If 'he' is understood as independently referential in (50)a, the family of questions reading becomes just as inaccessible as it is in (49)a.

Significantly, a survey of the literature reveals that a number of other clause-mate phenomena fall into the same pattern: the possibly unsurprising exemption for control constructions, but the quite surprising exemption for finite complements with bound pronoun subjects.

→ Gapping

John read books and Mary read magazines
John wanted to read books and Mary wanted to read magazines
*John wanted Bill to read books and Mary wanted Bill to read magazines
?John thinks that he will see Susan and Mary thinks that he will see Mary
[Nishigauchi (1998), attributed to an anonymous reviewer]

"... the clausemate restriction on Gapping is alleviated by an intervening pronoun."

*John thinks that Bill will see Susan and Mary thinks that Bill will see Mary
John, thinks that he, will see Susan and Harry, thinks that he, will see Mary

In particular, the alleviation requires a bound pronoun.

→ Reciprocal Binding

John and Mary visited each other
John and Mary want to visit each other

Each wants to visit the other' Higginbotham (1981)

*John and Mary want Bill to visit each other
John and Mary think they like each other

John and Mary think (that is, John and Mary) like each other.
John thinks that he likes Mary and Mary thinks that she likes John

*John and Mary think that I like each other (would = Each of John and Mary thinks that I like the other.)
Multiple Sluicing

(73) Someone talked about something
   but I don't know who about what
(74) Someone wanted to talk about something
   but I don't know who about what
(75) Someone wanted Mary to talk about something
   *but I don't know who about what
(76) A certain boy decided to talk to a certain girl
   I forget which boy to which girl Barrie (2005)
(77) *Each professor said he was working on a different one of these topics, but I can't
   remember which on which one [Lasnik (2013), from Jason Merchant, personal communication]
(78) *Each professor said Susan was working on a different one of these topics, but I can't
   remember which on which one
(79) A certain boy said he would talk to a certain girl
   I forget which boy to which girl Barrie (2005)

Quantifier Scope Interaction

(80) At least one student fooled each of the professors
(81) At least one student has tried to fool each of the professors Kayne (1998)
(82) At least one student saw each of these new books
(83) At least one student has asked to see each of these new books Kayne (1998)
(84) At least one man/some man thinks he’s in love with each of these women
   each > at least one possible Kayne (1998)
(85) At least one man/some man thinks Bill’s in love with each of these women.
   each > at least one not possible

Towards an Account

Based on joint work with Tom Grano: Grano and Lasnik (2014)

a. Phase-based locality: Gapping (and other similar clause-mate processes) are phase-bound.
b. Convergence-based phasehood: Phases are constituents with no unvalued features. (Cf. Felser (2004). A version of this is entertained also by Chomsky (2000, p.107) though ultimately not accepted by him.)
c. Valuation-based binding: Bound pronouns enter the derivation with features that are not valued until the antecedent is merged in.

Then we modify (86)c roughly following Kratzer (2009): Some bound pronouns are born as \( \phi \)-defective "minimal pronouns" that obtain their features via transmission from C or v. Kratzer identifies relative pronouns and PRO as two kinds of minimal pronouns whose features are transmitted from C; here we extend the idea to bound pronominal subjects of finite complement clauses.

How this might help with the Gapping contrast:

a. \( \text{Joe}_1 \) claims that \( \text{he}_1 \) reads books and \( \text{Tim}_2 \) <claims [\( \text{NON-PHASE} \) that he reads] articles]
b. *\( \text{Joe} \) claims that Bill reads books and \( \text{Tim}_2 \) <claims [\( \text{PHASE} \) that Bill reads] articles]
Now the Sloan/May family of questions contrast:

a. Who does everyone think \([_{\text{NON-PHASE}} \text{ that he}_i \text{ should see }]\)?

b. Who does everyone think \([_{\text{PHASE}} \text{ that Mary should see }]\)?

Cf.

Everyone thinks that he, should see someone

a. \(\forall x \ x \text{ thinks } \exists y \mid \text{he should see } y\)
b. \(\forall x \ \exists y \mid x \text{ thinks he should see } y\)

Everyone thinks Mary saw someone

a. \(\forall x \ x \text{ thinks } \exists y \mid \text{Mary should see } y\)
b. \(\forall x \ \exists y \mid x \text{ thinks Mary should see } y\)

So far so good. BUT

a. Joe, claims that he, reads books and Tim, \(<_{\text{NON-PHASE}} \text{ that he, reads}>\) articles

\[\text{\textbullet \bullet \bullet}\]
b. Joe, claims that Bill gave him, books and Tim, \(<_{\text{NON-PHASE}} \text{ that Bill gave him}>\) articles

What book does everyone claim that he read

Family of questions

What book does everyone claim that Bill gave him

Family of questions

Only a bound subject induces the transparency we have been finding.

Why can’t him in (94)b enter the derivation as a minimal pronoun, thereby (erroneously) allowing gapping?

Why can’t him in (95)b enter the derivation as a minimal pronoun, thereby (erroneously) allowing the family of questions reading?

Proposal: C and v intervene for each other.

Consequence: (100) cannot be derived from (101).

Joe, claims that Bill gave him, books

[Diagram]

And similarly for (95).

A remaining problem (possibly a big one):

Subject-internal bound possessors do not induce transparency (105), even though v does not intervene (106).

[Diagram]
And roughly parallel for family of questions:
What books does every father claim that his son reads

Summary:
The transparency effects induced by bound pronominal subjects of finite complement clauses provide novel evidence for (a) the convergence-based view of phasehood and (b) the view that some but not all bound pronouns enter the derivation unvalued.

Some questions for further investigation:
a. What is responsible for the ‘entire subject’ effect seen in (105)?
b. How do φ-features get onto C? (Cf. Landau (To appear))
c. How should the Phase Impenetrability Condition be formulated on a convergence-based view of phasehood?
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