

# Quantifiers, resumption and generic statements

**Introduction** The paper focuses on some apparent exceptions to the generalisation that quantifiers resist resumption in Greek CLLD, questions and relative clauses. The main body of exceptions involves generic statements. Following Fox and Sauerland (1996) I argue that the Generic Operator, by involving quantification over situations, allows a trivialisation of quantifiers like *kathe*(=each). Thus, in sentences with a generic operator the pronominal resumes the single individual involved in each situation the generic tense quantifies over, rather than the quantified phrase.

**The problem** Unlike referential DPs (1a), quantifiers are excluded from Greek CLLD (1b)&(1c).<sup>1</sup> This is also true of quantificational chains (in the sense of Lasnik and Stowell 1991) like Relative Clauses (RCs)—see (2). However, quantifiers are admitted to such chains when a generic operator is involved (3). According to standard views, examples like (1a) involve anaphoric binding of the pronoun by its antecedent (Rizzi 1997; Tsimpli 1999; Alexopoulou 2006). Such binding standardly requires a referential/specific antecedent (Sells 1984).<sup>2</sup> The question then is how this requirement is coerced in cases like (3).

**Analysis** A related contrast between episodic and generic sentences exists in English; the universal quantifier can apparently take wide scope in (4b) but not in (4a) (from Fox and Sauerland 1996). For (4b), Fox and Sauerland (1996) argue that the generic operator leads to a trivialisation of the universal so that each time a relevant portion of the world is considered, a single guide is involved in each situation of a tour to Louvre; it is quantification over situations that gives the illusion of co-varying tours and guides. I adopt this analysis for the examples in (3). Let us consider (3c). As in (4b), a generic operator is involved (triggered by the present tense and the adverbial *pada*); intuitively, generic sentences like (3c)

assert that whenever we look at certain relevant portions of the world, we see that they have a certain property. Crucially, for examples like (3c), we can assume that the relevant portion of the world is a situation involving the reading of a single dissertation. Since the Generic Operator involves quantification over situations, the sentence will be true (if it is true for all situations). This trivialisation of *kathe* can then explain the availability of the pronominal in (3c); the pronominal takes as its antecedent the single dissertation involved in each situation of dissertation-reading (rather than the quantifier); but this binding is no different from (1a), where the pronominal resumes a referential DP. Crucially, as in (1a), the pronominal in (3) is not only available, but obligatory. This analysis extends to (5), which involve episodic sentences, but where expressions like “as an individual case” give rise to quantification over situations and, in a way parallel to the generic operator, to the trivialisation of quantifiers. (6) will also be argued to involve trivialisation of the universal quantifier contained in the relative clause which allows resumption of the CLLD-ed RC by the the pronominal.

Further following Fox and Sauerland’s (1996) treatment of (7), I argue that in (8a)&(8b) the pronominals are dependent on the single individual involved in each situation the generic tense quantifies over. They are, thus, parallel with (8c), where the dislocated phrase is referential (and functions like a topic). In addition, such examples contrast with (8d), where the preposed phrase is focused and where the pronominal is unacceptable and the possessive pronoun cannot be bound by *to Yani*. In the absence of a generic operator in (8d), nothing can trivialise the quantificational force of the focused phrase, and, thus, (8d) is on a par with (1b)&(1c).

Finally, consider (9). Anaphoric binding leads to a wide scope reading for the CLLD-ed indefinite in (9a); but the universal can apparently take wide scope in (9b). In (9b) the possessive pronoun and the accusative clitic are bound respectively by the single student and the single dissertation involved in each situation the generic tense quantifies over. As in (4b) the illusion of wide scope for the universal is created by the generic operator quantifying over situations.

<sup>1</sup>In the examples given small caps indicate accent placement; interrogative pronouns and quantifiers like *kanenas* (noone) attract sentential accent irrespective of their discourse role (topic, focus); by contrast, referential DPs are always (part of) focus when accented.

<sup>2</sup>This assumption also accounts for the unavailability of a wide scope reading for the universal in (9a).

- (1) a. To Yani \*(ton) ida sto PARTY  
the Yani-acc him saw-1sg at-the party  
b. KANENA fititi den (\*ton) ida sto parti  
no-acc student-acc not him saw-1sg at-the party  
c. PION (\*ton) ides sto parti  
who-acc him saw-2sg at-the party
- (2) a. kathe fititria pu (\*tin) ida sto parti  
each student that (\*her) saw-1sg at-the party  
b. kamia apo tis fititries pu (\*tin/\*tis) ida sto parti  
none of the students that (\*her/\*them) saw-1sg at-the party
- (3) a. KANENA den ton apoliun ETSI  
noone-acc not him fire-3pl like-this  
b. KANENOS den tu aresi i ipokrisia  
noone-gen not him-gen like-3g the-nom hypocrisy  
Noone likes hypocrisy (from Giannakidou 1997)  
c. kathe diatrivi ti diavazume pada me MEGALI prosohi  
each dissertation it read-1pl always with big attention  
Each dissertation we always read (it) with great attention.  
d. kanenas anthropos pu ton kakopiun stin pediki tu ilikia  
no person that him abuse-3pl in-the child his age  
no person that is abused in his childhood
- (4) a. Yesterday, a guide ensured that every tour to Louvre was fun.  
b. In general, a guide ensures that every tour to Louvre is fun.
- (5) a. kathe etisi tin adimetopisame os mia horisti periptosi  
each application it treated-1pl as a separate/individual case  
Each student we treated (her) as an individual case.  
b. kamia fititria den tin adimetopisame os idieteri periptosi  
no student not her treated-1pl as particular case
- (6) tin kopela pu efere kathe fititis<sub>1</sub> ti valame na katsi dipla tu<sub>1</sub>  
the-acc girl that brought-3sg each student-nom her put-1pl subj sit-3sg next him  
The girl each student brought we put her to sit next to him.
- (7) Her<sub>1</sub> thesis year is the hardest for every student<sub>1</sub>.
- (8) a. KANENA<sub>1</sub> den ton<sub>1</sub> agapai i pethera tu<sub>1</sub>  
noone-acc not him love-3sg the-nom mother-in-law his  
b. PION<sub>1</sub> ton<sub>1</sub> agapai i pethera tu<sub>1</sub>  
who-acc him love-3sg the-nom mother-in-law his  
c. to Yani<sub>1</sub> ton<sub>1</sub> AGAPAI i pethera tu<sub>1</sub>  
the Yanis-acc him love-3sg the-nom mother-in-law his  
d. \*TO YANI<sub>1</sub> ton<sub>1</sub> agapai i pethera tu<sub>\*1</sub>  
the Yanis-acc him love-3sg the-nom mother-in-law his
- (9) a. ena arthro tu Chomsky to diavase KATHE fititis  
an article the-gen Chomsky it read-3sg each student-nom (wide scope for indefinite)  
b. ti diatrivi tis<sub>1</sub> tin prosehi KATHE fititria<sub>1</sub>  
the-acc dissertation her it takes-care-of each student-nom (wide scope for universal)  
Her dissertation every student takes care of (it).