

No lack of determination

Greg Carlson
University of Rochester

1. Introduction

What are traditionally called Noun Phrases seem to come in two varieties--those that begin with a determiner (or a quantifier-like expression), and those that don't. So, at first glance, while phrases like *those desks* and *most new cars* show both a determiner-type element and a nominal, phrases like *Fred*, *her*, *linguistics papers*, and *wheat*, do not. The question of whether to analyze these latter types of noun phrases as being similar in structure to the former--and if so, how--has often boiled down to the question of the exact identity of the missing determiner element. It has been suggested, for instance, that proper names have a covert definite article associated with them, so that *Fred* should be analyzed syntactically and semantically along the lines of

- (1) a. Curious people crowded around the site of the accident. (i.e. Some curious people)
b. Curious people like to travel a lot. (All, or nearly all, curious people; curious people in general)

They also typically have just one of these interpretations available in any given sentence (on a constant interpretation of the sentence less the BP). So, for instance, (1a) has no universal or general reading, nor does (1b) have an existential reading. This observation is by no means hard and fast, however. In a sentence like (2), from Longobardi (1994), both readings appear accessible:

- (2) I only excluded old ladies (=Longobardi's (41a)).

Such a sentence can be understood as excluding only some older women (and admitting others), or as excluding all who are older.

Facts such as these have spurred a great deal of work, and controversy. It is possible to separate out two closely-related issues concerning the syntax and semantics of BP's:

- (A) What do BP noun phrases mean? Do they have a single, unified meaning which appears to be different in different contexts, or are there two or more meanings?
(B) How do the syntactic and semantic (and pragmatic) contexts determine which interpretation(s) of the BP is/are appropriate?

While these two questions are intertwined, we are going to focus on the former question.

2. An early unified analysis

Traditional grammars of English assume that BP's have covert determiners associated with them. One of these is the plural form of the indefinite singular *a(n)* and accounts for the existential interpretation; the other is a universal sort of determiner or quantifier, having something like the force of *all* or *any*. This analysis presents two quite different problems. First, it would appear to predict systematic ambiguity of BP's, when one finds more generally lack of it. Second, it is no trivial matter to specify the exact identity of the "universal" null determiner, as it is clearly not universal, nor quite like any of the other non-null determiners.

ers/quantifiers. These problems were discussed in Carlson (1977, 1980), the work inspired by that of Milsark (1974). The reason, I argued there, that bare plurals are not generally ambiguous in a given sentence, is that they are not ambiguous in and of themselves. Rather, it is the syntactic/semantic context in which they appear that makes them appear to have different interpretations, not any difference in the determiner or any other element in the noun phrase.

(4) Cats think very highly of themselves

A sentence like (4) has two readings, one where each individual cat thinks it is wonderful, and another reading in which cats hold no attitude towards themselves directly, but think highly that species in general. Similarly, there is one reading for examples such as (5):

(5) John polished apples, and Mary ate them.

which allows John to polish some apples and Mary to eat some other apples (that he never polished); on the other reading the apples are, of course, identical. In Carlson (1980) this difference was attributed to whether the pronoun was interpreted coreferentially or as an E-type pronoun.

Further, NP's of the form "that kind of x" also, it is claimed, exhibit "generic" and "existential" readings as well:

- (6) a. That kind of animal eats wood. ("generic")
b. I saw that type of animal at the pet store yesterday ("existential")

Additional arguments can be found in Carlson (1977, 1980) and elsewhere. This was, I believe, the first attempt to deal with the phenomena systematically within a formal semantics framework (though see especially Lawler 1973), and it didn't take long for researchers to work on improvements.

3. Critiques and criticisms

The unified "kinds" view was certainly not beyond criticism. DeMey (1980, 1982) was among the first to question the necessity of "stages" for an analysis. More detailed presentations of alternative views are found in ter Meulen (1979), on mass terms, and more specifically in Wilkinson (1991), on bare plurals, who offers perhaps the most comprehensive critique to date. Kratzer (1980) presents a very interesting criticism of the "kinds" analysis that has had some reply (Carlson 1996; É. Kiss 1998). Lasersohn (1997) likewise critiques some of the semantic claims associated with a "kinds" analysis from examining the detailed semantics of donkey sentences. Schubert & Pelletier (1987) have a detailed critical discussion of the framework. Condoravdi (1994) and É. Kiss (1998) argue that a notion of specificity (though characterized differently in each case) distinguishes apparently universal from i

indefinite appearances of bare plurals; Condoravdi (1994), like Wilkinson, presents criticisms fairly comprehensively. Even on a unitary “kinds” analysis, there remain several alternative points of view (e.g., see Ojeda, 1993), and while a unified analysis would seem a priori desirable it is by no means taken for granted.

As the semantic theory of indefinites developed during the 1980’s (Lewis 1975; Kamp 1981; Heim 1982), another analysis of BP’s appeared that made quite different assumptions about their character. The most detailed proposals are to be found in Krifka and Gernert-Link (1986), Wilkinson (1991), Kratzer (1995, initially written in 1989) and Diesing (1992). On this type of analysis, BP’s are always indefinite noun phrases (and not like names) whose contribution to the meaning of the whole is a predicate condition with a free variable in it. Thus, roughly, a BP like *stars* in any context would be interpreted as $star(x)$, much like the indefinite singular noun phrase *a star* would if one set aside the plurality--or the definite *the star(s)*, for that matter. In this theory, the quantificational force associated with a BP in a given sentence is, as before, provided by syntactic/semantic elements outside the noun phrase itself. The mechanisms providing for this differ from the earlier analysis, some attributable directly to the DRT framework itself.

One very fertile version is Diesing (1992) and related work. In this theory, there is a simple algorithm for determining how the free variable introduced by the noun phrase gets bound: if (at LF) an NP is found within the VP of the sentence, it gets bound by an existential quantifier (“existential closure”) and mapped to a nuclear scope; and if it appears in the IP of the sentence, it gets bound by something else and appears in a restrictor. That “something else,” in the case of quantified noun phrases that have undergone QR, would be the quantifier expression (e.g., the universal *all* in the noun phrase *all men*), but there are other possible binders as well. For instance, adverbs of quantification, as found in (7) below, can bind the free variable in the (interpretation of the) subject noun phrase *linguists*

The stage-level/individual-level contrast in this framework gets indirectly reflected in whether the subject and other arguments of the predicate require the argument to appear outside the VP at the level of LF, or within it. This analysis has both been supported (e.g., Longobardi 2000) and questioned (e.g., de Hoop 1996; Bobaljik and Jonas 1996) on empirical grounds.

There is something of an obvious smallish cost associated with accommodating BP's to indefinites within a DRT-type framework: you give up a unified analysis. In these treatments a distinction is fairly systematically drawn between BP's that can be treated as indefinites (as predicates) in the DRT framework, from those that are subjects of kind-level predicates (e.g., in (3)), in which case the BP's are kind-denoting and cannot convincingly be treated as predicates of individuals (or groups of individuals). Wilkinson (1991) in particular wishes to argue that this is an acceptable outcome. Further, one does not give up on the idea that many instances of BP's in generic sentences with universal-like readings are syntactically and semantically identical to BP's interpreted existentially. In the extensive summary paper of Krifka *et al* (1995), the point of view espoused by Krifka & Gerstner-Link, Kratzer, Wilkinson, Diesing, and others was presented and treated as the "center-of-opinion" and prevailing view (even if there may have been some very minor split of opinion among the numerous co-authors).

However, looking at things in this way also has some distinct advantages. For instance, in the Carlson (1977) analysis, the fact that indefinite singulars in English and other languages may also have generic readings along with their usual existential readings, as in (9), takes a bit of extra work. But within the DRT framework coupled with some of the principles mentioned above (along with a few others), this appears to fall out naturally and, in fact, would be a bit hard to prevent given assumptions.

- (9) a. A curious person knocked on the door. (existential)
b. A curious person likes to travel. (all curious people, curious people in general)

So this approach certainly has its advantages, though other alternatives are clearly possible (e.g., Cohen 2000). However, the DRT approach exemplified in Diesing and elsewhere does not, to this point, take account of certain features of bare plurals that other analyses have focused attention on.

4. Some additional facts about English BP's

For example, the similarities noted earlier about the relationship between bare plurals and proper names—the other side of the coin—haven't been dealt with. And long-noted scoping facts about existential readings of bare plurals have also tended to get set aside. It has been observed, and generally agreed, that bare plurals exhibit only narrowest-scope readings, in contrast to overt indefinites, which exhibit variable scope. For instance, a sentence like (10 a) does not mean there are specific shoes that are being sought; nor does (10 b) have a meaning equivalent to “There are some cows that are not in the garden”, thereby allowing some (other) cows to be there:

- (10) a. Mary is looking for shoes.
b. Cows are not in the garden.

These and other unexpected properties of BP's on their existential readings are missed on any analysis such as this which equates BP empty determiners with the indefinite plural. One particular issue that has received only minor attention in the literature (see for instance Longobardi 1994) is whether BP's are real contrasting plurals in the sense of excluding singular objects from their denotations. It appears to make some sense, at least, to claim that a question like “Are there holes in the wall?” is truly answerable with “Yes” under the circumstance where just one hole is in the wall and no more. If this is so, it argues that BP's are not indefinite plurals that stand in contrast to the indefinite singular, but rather forms whose interpretation encompasses both.

There are several other aspects of the interpretation of BP's that remain more near the periphery of research, but which have arisen in the course of this research, and which have motivated more detailed examination of BP's. For instance, Condoravdi (1994) has successfully focused attention on examples where bare plurals appear interpreted existentially, yet appear as subjects of individual-level predicates.

- (11) (There was a ghost haunting campus) *Students* were aware of this danger.

As Condoravdi points out, this is not a simple existential statement, as (11) above does not mean the same as (12):

- (12) (There was a ghost haunting campus). There were students who were aware of this danger.

But this is interpreted much more like a sentence with a definite article:

(13) ...The students were aware of this danger.

Such “functional” readings, as Condoravdi calls them, can be teased apart from truly generic readings; she ultimately argues that there is an extensional generic reading--the functional reading-- that stands alongside the generic and existential readings.

É.Kiss (1998) also points out some facts about bare plurals when focused, in that they can take on purely existential readings, unlike their unfocused counterparts. So, for instance, in (14):

(14) GIRLS know mathematics the best in my school.

it can mean that those students who know it best, are among the girls in the school; it may also be read generically as about "all" girls, as well. É.Kiss argues that this possibility of interpretation results from the fact that something must be interpreted specifically in order to be topicalized (or, contrastively focused).

A further fact about bare plurals, noted in Longobardi (1994, 2000) though also recognized (but not accounted for) in Carlson (1980), is that when a relative clause or other post verbal modifier (in English) is appended, an existential interpretation may arise where none was possible before. So, for instance, with:

If we change the type of relative clause in the examples above, the existential reading seems to disappear:

- (18) a. Neighbors that eat lots of vegetables are tall.
b. Neighbors from Scotland are tall.

This stands in contrast to what occurs with the indefinite singular, where the existential reading appears to remain a possibility:

- (19) a. A neighbor that eats a lot of vegetables is tall.
b. A neighbor from Scotland is tall.

The types of postnominal modifiers that allow for existential readings are, intuitively, those that locate the corresponding individuals in time and/or space. Under most circumstances, a BP will, as noted above, exhibit most clearly only a narrow scope reading. However, with an appropriate postnominal modifier, not only is an existential reading possible, but the NP also can exhibit scopal properties just like an indefinite singular. Compare, for instance:

- (20) a. John is looking for old books (narrow scope only)
b. John is looking for old books that he forgot to return to the library
(narrow or wide scope)

In the second sentence, but not in the first, the object of John's search can be a specific set of books; both sentences have a clear narrow-scope reading. Again, these facts are different from what we observe with indefinite singulars in corresponding cases. These facts are discussed in more depth by Chierchia (1998b). One further lingering fact, noted by Barbara Partee (1985), is that when bare plurals (though not mass terms, in this instance) function as "dependent plurals", they show scoping effects as well.

Exactly what the facts are, and how all these relate to each other, remains not very widely examined at the moment, but there is getting to be a rich enough set of data and sufficient theoretical development to support growing work in this somewhat obscure area.

5. BP's in Romance (and Germanic)

Somewhat ironically, some of the most interesting work on BP's comes from consideration of languages which don't have lots of them. The most highly developed body of liter

ature is on Romance, especially Spanish and Italian, which have fewer BP's than English, and French (which has virtually none). To foreshadow some, the problem raised by the "kinds" analysis as well as by the more commonly assumed indefinites analysis is that one would expect any language with BP's to exhibit them fairly freely, as in Germanic, and for BP's to have both generic and existential readings. However, consideration of other languages shows this is not always the case. What has resulted thus far from this line of research has been a return to a more sophisticated "kinds" analysis, which nonetheless makes critical use of the insights of the theory of indefiniteness. One such analysis is found in de Swart (1993), who bases her analysis on facts from English and French, and others I discuss below. (Here, as above, I can really only point to but cannot do full justice to the scope of the individual works, which contain a great deal more than the few facts presented here.)

It has been known for some time that in Spanish, the distribution and interpretation of BP's is limited. Contreras (1986) notes such facts as these:

- (21) a. *Quiero cafe*
 want-1sg coffee
 'I want coffee'
- b. *El cafe me gusta*
 Def. coffee me pleases
 'I like coffee'
- c. **Me gusta cafe*
 Me pleases coffee (subj)
- d. **Cafe me gusta*
 Coffee me pleases
- e. *Hablamos con amigos*
 Speak-1pl with friends
 'We spoke with some friends'

BP's may not occur as subjects of non-ergative verbs, whether post- or pre-verbal, and in general cannot be interpreted generically, only existentially; further, when contrastively stressed, BP's may appear. The type of account offered by Contreras centers on the notion of proper government as applied to an NP with an empty determiner position; Torrego (1989) give

s an account very similar in spirit. That is, BP's are claimed to have a determiner position represented in the syntax that, like other empty categories, requires proper government, and the N within the NP (or DP) itself cannot govern that position. The account of the data above, and much more, centers around defining government and the syntactic structures of Spanish in such a way as to account for patterns such as those found in (21). Governing items include verbs and prepositions, but subjects (as in (21 c,d)) have no governor, and the empty determiner position remains unlicensed, resulting in ungrammaticality. Note that it is necessary, on this account, to have an actual empty D position in the DP; the data from English on any of the accounts reviewed above do not motivate such an analysis as the appearance of BP's in English is basically unrestricted.

On the semantic side, Laca (1990) presents a number of keen observations about how one expresses generic objects in such a language, which has restricted occurrences of BP's. Spanish generally uses the definite article to express what we are calling the generic reading (though Laca argues the informational notion of "inclusive" presents a better understanding), and the bare plural form is generally reserved for existential (= "non-inclusive") readings. Consider, for instance, the ambiguity inherent in the English:

(22) The Gwamba-Mamba worship bears.

The preferred reading for this is that the species represents the object of worship; however, there is also a reading where there are some specific bears they keep caged up, which they worship to the exclusion of other bears. This is the reading most favored for:

(23) The Gwamba-Mamba worship idols.

That is, the object of worship is some specific group of idols, not idols in general (though this is still a possible reading). The following Spanish sentences express these preferred readings:

(24) *Los G-M adoran a los osos*
Def G-M worship (to) Def bears
'The G-M worship bears (in general)'

(25) *Los G-M adoran idolos*
Def G-M worship idols
'The GM worship (some) idols'

But this distinction between definites and bare plurals is not limited to intensionalizing verbs such as "worship". So, for example, both are possible after an extensional verb like "chase", with differential effects:

(26) *Mi perro persigue a los gatos*

My dog chases (to) Def cats

'My dog chases cats' = 'What my dog does with cats is chase them'

(27) *Mi perro persigue gatos*

My dog chases cats

'My dog chases cats' = 'My dog has a habit of cat-chasing'

In this case, the use of the definite form is correlated with focus on the verb.

the article or a singular indefinite article in some cases, as in French and Spanish. Longobardi's main thesis is that in the case of proper names (and pronouns) there is movement within the DP from the N position into the empty D position, resulting in a structure which does not have an empty D that must be governed externally. This means that proper names, like (nearly) any noun phrase with an overt determiner, will appear in any position a DP may also occupy.

(29) [DP [D e] [N' N]]

Evidence comes largely from facts about Italian word-order. In the case of empty D's in Italian, one gets about the right results by assuming that common nouns, lacking reference of their own, do not move into the D position like proper names can, leaving only those positions where the D is governed, giving rise to a narrow-scope existential reading. But then, what of English (Germanic) BP's? In these languages there is little word-order evidence of the type to be found in Italian regarding movement of names and pronouns into D, and BP's may appear in any DP position at all; further, BP's can have generic interpretations. Longobardi's proposal here is that in Germanic, determinerless common nouns can move into the empty D position at the level of LF, which gives rise to a referential, generic reading for BP's; failure to move into the D position will result in a "default" instance of existential interpretation. In this case, the presumption would need to be that the existential interpretation is available only for those positions which in Germanic would count as governed positions, generic readings being the only available in ungoverned positions. Thus, to speculate for a moment, the IP position that Diesing has suggested for generic subjects would probably count as an ungoverned position, allowing only the generic reading; the VP-internal position Diesing assumes for stage-level subjects would be governed, and thus would allow for existential readings, and generic readings as well, unless otherwise restricted.

The notion of an expletive determiner is also developed in Brugger (1993), who focuses on German as well as Italian, comparing them both with English. Brugger argues that the definite article in German, but not in English (at least for the constructions considered), can be expletive. One basic fact pointed out is that while English plural definites cannot be interpreted generically (or if so, only marginally), in German this is an entirely natural way of expressing genericity. Thus, (30) has a generic reading, while its English counterpart does not, referring instead only to some contextually determined set of elephants, which is also a possibility for the German.

(30) ...*die Elephanten wertvolle Zähne haben*
the elephants precious teeth have
'Elephants have precious teeth'

German does have bare plurals, like English, but these cannot occur with true kind-level predicates (31), though they occur fairly freely in generic sentences (32):

(31) *...*Dinosaurier dabei sind auszusterben* (OK with *die Dinosaurier*)
Dinosaurs PRT become extinct

(32)
...*Elephanten wertvolle Zähne haben*
Elephants precious teeth have
'Elephants have precious teeth'

Brugger concludes that German (and Dutch) BP's cannot be kind-denoting; the definite plu

One main point of Chierchia's analysis is to account for the scopelessness of the existential reading of BP's, and to answer some questions raised by the prevailing view that generics should be analyzed as indefinites: (a) why would languages consistently use the same device (BP's or, in many languages, determinerless singulars) to express both kind-reference and existential indefiniteness? (b) why in the indefinites view would there be an ambiguity

Less work has focused on singular count common nouns lacking determiners, as in the Romance and Germanic languages these do not appear systematically in argument positions (though may in vocative and predicative constructions). However, this does not mean they are totally lacking. English has them sporadically ("I saw it on *television*" or, as Richard Oehrle pointed out to me, "The special relation between *doctor and patient* deserves special legal protection."). In Scandinavian languages, they appear quite a bit more systematically. Borthen (1998) discusses these in Norwegian. Here we find, for instance:

- (35) a. *Jeg kjører bil.*
 I drive car
 'I drive a car'
- b. *Petter spiser helst med skje.*
 Petter eats rather with spoon
 'Petter would rather eat with a spoon'
- c. *Jeg har bestilt billett.*
 I have ordered ticket
 'I ordered a ticket'

However, bare singulars may not appear in many other instances:

- (36) a. **Jeg odela datamaskin.*
 I destroyed computer
- b. **Bil kjører bortover veien*
 Car drives along road-the

Borthen considers the semantics of these bare singulars where they may occur, detailing how, on almost anyone's analysis, they must be regarded as non-specific (i.e. the observations are similar to those made in Enç 1991 for determinerless bare singulars in Turkish); further, they exhibit the same sort of scopelessness as (most instances of) BP's. Borthen does not find a specific syntactic mechanism to account for the distribution and interpretation of bare singulars in Norwegian, in the end settling on a semantic account which limits their appearance to argument positions exhibiting only certain semantic roles which are enumerated and motivated in the account.

Work on bare singulars in other languages that likewise have articles and/or plurality has yielded a very similar pattern of syntactic and semantic observations. The work on AI

In Cantonese, however, bare nouns cannot be interpreted as definites. Definiteness is expressed by the use of a classifier (CL); as in Mandarin, bare nouns cannot be interpreted as definites preverbally (though they may be interpreted generically).

- (38) a. **Gau soeng gwo maalou*
 Dog want cross road
 (Not possible for 'The dog wants to cross the road')
- b. *Zek gau zung-ji sek juk*
 CL dog like eat meat
 'The dog (NOT dogs in general) likes to eat meat'
- c. *Gau zung-ji sek juk*
 Dog like eat meat
 'Dogs like to eat meat'

Mandarin, Cheng and Sybesma argue, also has CL+Noun phrases as well; however, there, the interpretation is always indefinite, and never definite as in Cantonese. The thrust of the work is to argue that classifiers in both Chinese languages function very much like D positions, in that any bare noun is a part of a classifier phrase, the basic structure being:

- (39) [CIPCl [NP

Before closing, it is worthwhile mentioning some other recent work. Brockett (1991) contains a detailed examination of Japanese; we also find Dayal (1992) on the situation in Hindi and Portersfield & Srivastav (1988) on the contrast between Hindi and Indonesian. Chung (2000), in a reply to Chierchia, also examines Indonesian in detail. Petronio (1995) discusses ASL (which has no plurality or articles; see also the other papers in the same volume). Greenberg (1994) comprehensively presents facts about Hebrew, and É. Kiss (1998), Hungarian. Bittner (1994) and Van Geenhoven (1998) discuss West Greenlandic incorporated nominals within this tradition, where one finds the most detailed semantic observations about these structures (along with the work on Hindi bare singulars--which are arguably incorporated forms--mentioned above). It appears that incorporated nominals (chiefly, objects of verbs) follow the general pattern of semantic interpretation characteristic of BP's and bare singulars as well--chiefly, in having nearly always weak indefinite existential and number-neutral interpretations. The same range of interpretations also appears to hold for "pseudo-incorporated" forms (Massam 2001). This suggests that incorporated nominals and BP's share a lot in common that deserves closer examination, as argued most pointedly by van Geenhoven (1995). In some languages, such as West Greenlandic, incorporated nominals can be modified or quantified from outside the word; this gives rise to a discontinuous syntactic form--a "split" construction--which likewise raises interesting questions about the semantics of determinerless nouns even in languages which do not have incorporation (Diesing 1992; Beerman 1997; also Geurts 1996).

Perhaps the most comprehensive survey of the range of nominal forms used to express genericity is to be found in Gerstner-Link (1998), who compares forty disparate languages and summarizes the results in a series of proposed universals. The patterns she finds are largely in keeping with the detailed work on a more limited set of languages (she uses Ger

ery similar types of entities into the model). However, a good number of researchers have found that stages themselves are useful constructs in their own right, as in Stump's (1981) analysis of constructions such as "an occasional sailor walked by". The literature making use of stages is more scattered than the literature reviewed above, but the issue occasionally surfaces when temporal restrictions are examined more closely. One recent comprehensive discussion is to be found in Musan (1995), who builds on the work of Enç (1981). Yoon (1998) considers the semantics of English indefinite NP's with a proper name modified by an adjective.

(40) ...*a handcuffed Jones* protested as two Columbus police officers pushed him into the Franklin County jail.

Yoon notes, first of all, that the adjectives appearing in this construction are stage-level and not individual-level adjectives ("a startled Kato Kaelin" vs. ?? "an intelligent Kato Kealin"); further, that despite their indefiniteness, they appear to make reference to individuals already introduced into the discourse. However, if the NP refers to a stage of an individual, then that stage itself constitutes a novel entity into the discourse, hence the indefinite. Dermidache (1997a, 1997b), in some provocative work, has also employed and defended stages in the analysis of St'at'imcets (Lillooet Salish) noun phrases in order to account for their temporal restrictedness. Lin (1999) has proposed that stages be countenanced in order to account for the semantics of *shenme* 'what' in donkey-type conditional sentences in Chinese (also examined in great detail by Huang and Cheng (1996) though they focus on the semantics of 'who', which turns out to have some different properties). The stage/individual contrast has also been invoked in unpublished work to form an account of the semantic distinction between the Japanese anaphoric expressions *sore* vs. *kare*. Carlson (1991) discusses the use of stages for the analysis of certain demonstratives in English--see Büring (1998) for an interesting and closely-related discussion.

8. Outcomes and Conclusions

Researchers now have on hand a large and sophisticated set of both data and analyses to draw from in considering the appropriate syntax and semantics of BP's. This presents us with an excellent base from which to work on this and related problems from a variety of perspectives, in a variety of the world's languages. On some matters, there is quite solid general agreement. One is that BP's on both existential and generic readings should try to be analyzed as having something basic in common. Another is that very close attention needs to

to be paid to issues of specificity and scoping for the indefinite readings. We have also seen a general trend towards taking elements of both the theory of indefinites and the kinds analysis, and trying to preserve something like a unitary analysis of BP's across languages: few if any of the researchers noted, in particular, defend an analysis in which there are multiple null D's. The success of assuming an empty D position that must be properly governed in some languages is also widely appealing, as is the idea that there is a connection between movement into D and definiteness/genericity.

An area that can use closer scrutiny, aside from extending research to a broader number of languages, is a more careful understanding of the relation between definite singular, definite plural, BP, singular indefinite generics, incorporated nominals, and the relation of these expressions to overtly expressive "kind" NP's in general, in languages which allow the

In some cases, they appear to make little difference. For instance, if one attributes V P-level existential quantification to existential closure, as Diesing suggests, or to an existential quantifier connected with the event structure, as Delfitto suggests, the effect on BP's is about the same. Type-shifting (Chierchia) quite clearly locates the source of the existential quantifier at the boundary between the NP and the predicate it is combining with, but then Carlson's existential quantification over stages can be looked upon in much the same way, though the ontologies differ. Longobardi's "default" existential quantifier is very much in the same vein. At the current state of research, there is no strong consensus about what source of existential quantification is correct or incorrect (nor does there seem to be one about the precise source of generic readings as well), so it is possible to focus on the correlated structures within the DP itself, and still make very productive contributions. As research continues and the theoretical issues become increasingly sharpened, however, I expect people are going to have to increasingly reason to choose among them.

Bibliography

- Abney, Steven 1987.
The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect. Massachusetts Institute of Technology Ph.D. dissertation.
- van der Auwera, Johan. 1980. *The semantics of determiners*. London: Croom Helm.
- Bach, Emmon., Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer, and Barbara Partee (eds.) 1995
Quantification in natural languages. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Barker, Chris & David Dowty (eds.) 1992.
Proceedings of SALT 2. Columbus, OH: *Working papers in linguistics 40*, Ohio State University.
- Basilico, David 1998
Object position and predication forms. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16: 541-95.
- Beerman, Dorothee 1997
Syntactic discontinuity and predicate formation: A study in German and comparative Germanic syntax

- Borthen, Katja 1998.
Bare singulars in Norwegian. Cand. philol. thesis. Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Department of Linguistics.
- Brockett, Chris 1991.
Wa-marking in Japanese and the syntax and semantics of generic sentences. Ph. D. dissertation, Cornell University.
- Brugger, Gerhard 1993. Generic interpretations and expletive determiners.
University of Venice working papers in linguistics 3, 1-30.
- Büring, Daniel 1998. Two types of identity statements. Ms, University of Cologne.
- Burton-Roberts, Noel 1976. On the generic indefinite article. *Language* 52, 427-448.
- Carlson, Gregory 1977
 A unified analysis of the English bare plural. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 413-457.
- Carlson, Gregory 1980. *Reference to kinds in English*. New York: Garland.
- Carlson, Gregory 1991.
 Ostension and perception: cases of really direct reference. Paper presented at SALT I, Cornell University.
- Carlson, Gregory 1996.
 A note on belldonnas. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, San Diego.
- Carlson, Gregory 2000
 Weak Indefinites. Paper presented at the NP to DP Conference at the University of Antwerp; University of Rochester ms.
- Carlson, Gregory & Francis Jeffrey Pelletier (eds.) 1995.
The generic book. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Cheng, Lisa, & C-T. James Huang 1996. Two types of donkey sentences. *Natural Language Semantics* 4: 21-163.
- Cheng, Lisa, and Rint Sybesma 1999. Bare and not-so-bare nouns and the structure of NP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 509-42.
- Chierchia, Gennaro 1988. *Topics in the syntax and semantics of infinitives and gerunds*. New York: Garland.
- Chierchia, Gennaro 1995. Individual level predicates as inherently generic. In Gregory Carlson & Francis Jeffrey Pelletier (eds.) 176-223.
- Chierchia, Gennaro 1998a. Partitives, reference to kinds, and semantic variation. In *Proceedings of Salt VII* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.
- Chierchia, Gennaro 1998b. Reference to kinds across languages. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6, 339-405.
- Chung, Sandra 2000 On reference to kinds in Indonesian. *Natural Language Semantics* 8: 157-71.

- Cohen, Ariel 2000
On the generic use of bare indefinite singulars. To appear in Christopher Pinon and Paul Dekker (eds.) *Uses of indefinite expressions*. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Cohen, Ariel, and Nomi Erteschik-Shir 1997
Topic, focus, and the interpretation of bare plurals. In *Proceedings of the 11th Amsterdam Colloquium*, Amsterdam: Institute for Language, Logic, and Information. 31-6.
- Cohen, Ariel, and Nomi Erteschik-Shir 1999
Are bare plurals indefinite? In Francis Corblin, Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin, and J. Marandin (eds.). 99-109.
- Condoravdi, Cleo 1992.
Strong and weak novelty and familiarity. In Chris Barker & David Dowty eds. 17-37.
- Condoravdi, Cleo 1994. *Descriptions in context*. Ph. D. dissertation, Yale University.
- Contreras, Heles 1986.
Spanish bare NP's and the ECP. In Ivonne Bordelois, Heles Contreras, & Karen Zagana (eds.), 25-9.
- Corblin, Francis, Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin, and J. Marandin (eds.) 1999
Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics 2. The Hague: Theus Publishing.
- Dahl, Östen. 1975. On generics. In Edward L. Keenan ed., 99-111.
- Dayal, Veneeta 1992.
The singular-plural distinction in Hindi generics. In Chris Barker and David Dowty (eds.) 39-58.
- Dayal, Veneeta 1999.
Bare NP's, Reference to Kinds, and Incorporation", *Proceedings of SALT 9*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.
- Dekker, Paul & Martin Stokhof (eds.) 1993.
Proceedings of the ninth Amsterdam Colloquium. University of Amsterdam: ILLC/Department of Philosophy.
- Diesing, Molly 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Delfitto, Denis 1997. Aspect, genericity, and bare plurals. Ms, University of Utrecht.
- Delfitto, Denis and Jan Schrotten 1991. Bare plurals and the number affix in DP. *Probus* 3, 155-185
- Delsing, L. O. 1993.
The internal structure of noun phrases in the Scandinavian languages. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Lund.
- Demirdache, Hamide 1996.
The chief of the United States sentences in Lillooet Salish. *Papers for the 31st International conference on Salish and neighboring languages*. 79-100.

- Demirdache, Hamide 1997.
 Predication times in St'at'imcets Lillooet Salish. In *The Syntax and Semantics of Predication*, Texas Linguistic Forum, University of Texas/Austin.
- Dineen, F. ed. 1969.
Monograph series on language and linguistics 19. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. 1996.
 Types of predicates and the representation of existential readings. Ms, University of Paris 7.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen & Brenda Laca 1997.
 On the definiteness of generic bare NP's. Paper delivered at the Institute for Advanced Studies, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem.
- É. Kiss, Katalin 1994.
 On generic versus existential bare plurals. Ms, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest.
- É. Kiss, Katalin 1998.
 On generic and existential bare plurals and the classification of predicates. In Susan Rothstein ed. 15-162.
- Enç, Mürvet 1991. The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22:1, 1-26.
- Farkas, Donka., & Yoko Sugioka 1983.
 Restrictive if/when clauses. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 6, 225-258.
- Fernald, Theodore 1994.
On the nonuniformity of the individual- and stage-level effects. Ph. D. dissertation, University of California at Santa Cruz.
- Fernald, Theodore 2000
 Generalizations in Navajo. In Theodore Fernald and Paul Platero (eds.). 51-72.
- Fernald, Theodore, and Paul Platero (eds.) 2000
The Athabaskan Languages: Perspectives on a Native American language family. Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics 24. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Filip, Hana 1993.
 On genericity: a case study in Czech. In J. Guenther and B. Kaiser (eds.), *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*. University of California at Berkeley. 125-142.
- von Stechow, Kai 1994.
 Restrictions on quantifier domains. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts/Amherst.
- von Stechow, Kai 1997. Bare plurals, bare conditionals, and *only*. *Journal of Semantics* 14: 1-56.
- Fodor, Janet D., & Ivan Sag 1982.
 Referential and quantificational indefinites. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 5, 355-398.
- van Geenhoven, Veerle 1995
 Semantic incorporation: A uniform semantics of West Greenlandic noun incorporation and West Greenlandic bare plural configurations. In Audra Dainora et al (eds) *Papers from the 31st regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

- van Geenhoven, Veerle 1998.
Semantic incorporation and indefinite descriptions. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Gelman, Susan and Twila Tardif 1997.
Generic noun phrases in English and Mandarin: An examination of child-directed speech. Paper presented at the LSA Annual Meeting, Chicago.
- Gerstner-Link, Claudia 1998. A typological approach to generics. Ms, University of Munich.
- Geurts, Bart 1996 On *No*. *Journal of Semantics* 13, 67-86.
- Glasbey, Sheila 1993.
Event structure in natural language discourse. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh.
- Greenberg, Yael 1994.
Hebrew nominal sentences and the stage/individual level distinction. M. A. Thesis, Bar-Ilan University, Israel.
- Greenberg, Yael 1998.
An overt syntactic marker of genericity in Hebrew. In Susan Rothstein, (ed.) 125-143.
- Groenendijk, Jeroen, Theo Janssen, & Martin Stokhof (eds.) 1981.
Formal methods in the study of language. Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam: Mathematical Center Tracts, 135.
- Groenendijk, Jeroen & Martin Stockhof (eds.) 1987.
Studies in discourse representation theory and the theory of generalized quantifiers.

- Keenan, Edward L. (ed.) 1975.
Formal semantics of natural language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krifka, Manfred 1987.
An outline of genericity, partly in collaboration with C. Gerstner. University of Tübingen: SNS-Bericht 87-23.
- Krifka, Manfred 1992. Definite NP's aren't quantifiers. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 156-163.
- Krifka, Manfred, F. Jeffrey Pelletier, Gregory Carlson, Alice ter Meulen, Gennaro Chierchia, & Godehard Link 1995. Genericity: an introduction. In Gregory Carlson and Frances Jeffrey Pelletier (eds.), 1-124.
- Kratzer, Angelika 1980.
 Die Analyse des bloßen Plural bei Gregory Carlson. *Linguistische Berichte* 70, 47-50.
- Kratzer, Angelika 1995.
 Stage-level and individual-level predicates. In Gregory Carlson and Frances Jeffrey Pelletier (eds.), 15-174.
- Kuroda, Sige-Yuki. 1972.
 The categorial judgement and thethetic judgement. *Foundations of Language* 9, 153-185.
- Laca, Brenda 1990. Generic objects: some more pieces of the puzzle. *Lingua* 81, 25-46.
- Laca, Brenda and Liliana Tasmowski 1994.
 Le pluriel indéfini de l'attribut métaphorique. *Linguisticae Investigationes* 18, 27-47.
- Ladusaw, William 1994. Thetic and categorial, stage and individual, weak and strong. In *Proceedings of Salt IV*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics. 220-229.
- van Langendonck, Willy 1980.
 Indefinites, exemplars, and kinds. In Johan van der Auwera ed., 211-231.
- Lasnik, Peter 1997. Bare plurals and donkey anaphora. *Natural Language Semantics* 5, 79-86.
- Lawler, John 1973.
Studies in English generics. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Papers in Linguistics 1:1, University of Michigan Press.
- Le Pore, Ernie (ed.) 1987. *New directions in semantics*. London: Academic Press.
- Lewis, David 1975. Adverbs of quantification. In Edward L. Keenan ed., 3-15.
- Lin, Jo-Wang 1999
 Double quantification and the meaning of *shenme* 'what' in Chinese bare conditionals. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 22: 573-93.
- Löbner, Sebastian 2000
 Polarity in natural language: Predication, quantification and negation in particular and characterizing sentences. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 23: 213-308.

- Longobardi, Giuseppe 1994.
Reference and proper names: a theory of N-movement in syntax and logical form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25, 609-669.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe 2000
"Postverbal" subjects and the mapping hypothesis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31: 691-702.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe 2001
How comparative is semantics? A unified parametric theory of bare nouns and proper names. To appear in *Natural Language Semantics*.
- Massam, Diane 2001
Pseudo noun incorporation in Niuean. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19: 153-97.
- McNally, Louise 1992.
An interpretation for the English existential construction. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California Santa Cruz
- McNally, Louise 1995.
Bare plurals in Spanish are interpreted as properties. In Glyn Morrill and Richard Oehrle (eds.), 19-212.
- McNally, Louise 1998.
Existential sentences without existential quantification. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 21, 353-392.
- ter Meulen, Alice 1980.
Substances, quantities, and individuals. Ph. D. dissertation, Stanford University.
- de Mey, Sjaak 1980

Musan, Renate 1999

Temporal Interpretation and information-status of noun phrases. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 22: 62-61.

Ojeda, Almerindo 1991.

Definite descriptions and definite generics. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 14, 367-397.

Ojeda, Almerindo 1993

Linguistic individuals. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Partee, Barbara H. 1985

- Stvan, Laurel 1998
The semantics and pragmatics of bare singular noun phrases. Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University.
- Svenonius, Peter 1996 Predication and functional heads.
In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information. 493-507.
- de Swart, Henriette. 1993.
Definite and indefinite generics. In Paul Dekker & Martin Stokhof (eds.). 625-644.
- de Swart, Henriette 1999
Indefinites between predication and reference. In *Proceedings of SALT 9*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University. 273-97.
- de Swart, Henriette 2001
Weak readings of indefinites: type-shifting and closure. *The Linguistic Review* 18: 69-96
- Torrego, Esther 1984.
On inversion in Spanish and some of its effects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15, 103-129.
- Torrego, Esther 1989.
Unergative-unaccusative alternations in Spanish. *MIT working papers in linguistics*. Department of Linguistics, MIT.
- Vergnaud, Jean-Roger, & Maria Luisa Zubizarreta 1992.
The definite determiner and the inalienable constructions in French and English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 595-652.
- Wilkinson, Karina 1991.
Studies in the semantics of generic noun phrases. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Yoon, J-H. 1998. Indefinite proper nouns and stages. *Korean Journal of Linguistics*.
- Zamparelli, Roberto 1995. Layers in the determiner phrase. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Rochester
- Zuber, Richard 1987. *To be, to be called* and generics. Ms., CRNS, University of Paris.