Split Quantifiers and Countercyclic Adjunction
Marc Authier & Lisa Reed
The Pennsylvania State University

There is, in French, a case of split quantification, which has gone virtually unnoticed in the literature. It consists of a quantifier semantically linked to a complex constituent that denotes its restrictor set. The latter is made up of the element *comme* 'as' + a bare common noun. These two components are often split in the syntax (1b) (discontinuous variant), but can appear together as a phrase (continuous variant) (1a). This construct will be referred to as QCN (= Quantifier + *comme* + Noun).

(1) a. Si **rien**　　**comme solution** n'est　proposée/ne　　nous　est apportée ...
　　　　　if nothing as　　　　solution NEG-is proposed/ NEG to-us is　brought
　　b. Si **rien** n'est proposé/ne nous est apporté **comme solution** ...
　　　　'If no solution is proposed/is given to us …'

It will be first established that the properties of QCN markedly differ from those of the more well-known case of quantification at a distance involving *de*-phrases in French (QAD) discussed by Kayne (1975), Obenauer (1976, 1994) and Doetjes (1995). For example, while the restriction in QCN may be spelled out following a temporal adjunct (2a), this option remains unavailable in cases of QAD (2b).

(2) a. J'ai　　**rien**　　lu　[cet été]　　**comme articles**.
　　　　　I-have nothing read this summer as　　　articles
　　b. *J'ai　　**beaucoup** lu　[cet été]　　**d'articles**.
　　　　　'I read a lot of articles this summer.'

Next, it will be shown that QCN restrictor phrases exhibit the exact distributional characteristics of restrictive relatives. For example, extraposed relatives show a nested linear order (Rochemont & Culicover 1997 and Bianchi 1999), and so do extraposed QCN restrictor phrases (3).

(3) a. ?**Personne** n'a　　**rien**　　reçu　hier　　[**comme salaire**] [**comme travailleur**].
　　　　　 no one　NEG-has nothing　received yesterday as　　　salary　　 as　　　　worker
　　b. ***Personne** n'a **rien** reçu hier [**comme travailleur**] [**comme salaire**].
　　　　'No worker received any compensation yesterday.'

A treatment of QCN along the lines of Kayne's (1994) promotion analysis of relatives will be considered, but will be shown to be unable to account (*inter alia*) for the existence of QCN "hydras" (cf. Link (1984) for restrictive relatives) such as that in (4).

(4) Ce tireur　d'élite ne　rate jamais [**rien**　　ni　**personne** [**comme cible**]].
　　　this shooter of-elite NEG miss never　nothing nor no one　　　as　　　target
　　　'This sharpshooter misses no one and nothing.'

Instead, an account of QCN will be explored that takes the restrictor phrase to be a QP-modifying adjunct whose distribution can be made to fall out of the theory of extraposition developed by Hunter and Frank (2011). In this theory, every XP counts as a phase and an XP modifying adjunct (labeled [*XP] because it is the kind of object that "looks for" an XP to combine with) can either be introduced during a phase where XP is being constructed (early option), or be introduced during a phase where XP is present as the complement or specifier of another head (late option). On these assumptions, we expect object-modifying QCN restrictor phrases to be introduced at the object QP phase (early option) or the VP phase (late option). As the examples in (5) suggest, this is, in fact, what we find.

(5) a. Ils ont　accepté [$_{QP}$ n'importe qui] [$_{*QP}$ comme bénévoles] hier. (early option)
　　　　they have accepted　anybody　　　　　as　　　volunteers yesterday
　　b. Ils ont [$_{VP}$ accepté [$_{QP}$ n'importe qui]] hier [$_{*QP}$ comme bénévoles]. (late option)
　　　　'They accepted anyone who volunteered yesterday.'

In those cases involving two instances of QCN in the same clause, we expect that each restrictor phrase should be able to avail itself of the early option and be linearized to the right of its host during the QP phase. For the object, this should occur in situ, for the subject, this should occur at the right edge of the higher copy. That this is in fact a legitimate option is illustrated in (6).

(6) On s'est aperçu　que [$_{QP}$ rien]　[comme uniforme] ne　plaisait à [$_{QP}$ personne] [comme joueur].
　　　we SE-is realized that　　nothing as　　　uniform　NEG pleased to　nobody　　as　　　player
　　　'We realized that no uniform pleased any player.'

Thus, our goal will be to demonstrate that the locality restrictions observed for QCN can be captured if one assumes that QCN restrictor phrases are QP-modifying adjuncts that can be introduced in the syntactic workspace when their host is acting as the complement or specifier of some other projection.