Structure-Building via *Merging Economy:* The Scope of Indefinites
Norio Suzuki   *Kobe Shinwa Women's University*

This paper aims to propose a narrow-syntactic (NS) reanalysis of the two *interpretational* phenomena concerning indefinite NPs: (i) *wide scope* (WS) interpretation (violating an island constraint; (1a)); & (ii) *scope diminishment* (SD) reading in negative NPs (*negative-split*, A-reconstruction; Iatridou & Sichel 2011; (2a)). I derive these interpretational nuances from some *NS structure-building* operations (phase-based; Chomsky 2000, etc.; 'amount of TRANSFER' subject to economy) across all the three prolific domains of Grohmann 2003, including the notion of *invasive* interface (López 2003) along with that of *bi-directional 'on-line' passage* between NS and interfaces (Suzuki 2007), and the principle of *Merging Economy* (ME) that states that "An n/N cannot have a larger amount of its uninterpretable features checked/deleted than is needed for the purposes of the current operation of Merge" (Suzuki 2012: 328; Georgi & Müller 2010), along with the concept of *economy* (Fox 2000). My architectural case is based on Hinzen's (2012: 311) observation that "… *grammar* constrains the organization of meaning in language."

The WS (*de re*) interpretation of an indefinite NP (*a philosopher),* as in (1a), has attracted much attention:

(1)   a.   If Bert invites a philosopher, Lud will be angry.   (López 2012)

   b.   *Choice-function:* $\exists$f (CH(f) $\wedge$ (Bert invites f(philosopher) $\rightarrow$ Lud will be
      angry))   (based on Reinhart 2006; *a philosopher = one of the philosophers)*

   c.   *Existential-closure:* If …$\exists$y [$_{NC/vP}$ Bert invites a philosopher (y)] …
      (based on Diesing 1992; domain of EC being nuclear scope (NC), taken here to be
      vP; *a philosopher = any philosopher)*

A philosopher takes scope outside the conditional (a strong island for extraction), on the interpretation where there is a certain philosopher such that if Bert invites him, Lud will be angry (1b; *de re* interpretation in terms of a *choice function* (CH(f))). The *existential-closure* (EC) interpretation of the indefinite is given in (1c). Let us see then an SD example (Iatridou & Sichel 2011: 605-606), as in (2a):

(2)   a.   No student may leave. (a *Neg>Mod* modal)

   b.   *Split interpretation: Neg > Modal > $\exists$*
      It is not allowed that a student leaves.

   c.   *De re interpretation: Neg > $\exists$ > Modal*
      There is no specific student x such that x is allowed to leave.

We focus on the *split interpretation* in (2b; *negative-split),* where the "negative" and "indefinite" components of the negative NP (*no student)* are interpretationally separated from each other by the intervening modal. It looks as though the indefinite component of the

negative NP A-reconstructs and scopes under the modal.

Let us see the NS-derivation of (1a) with the interpretation (1b). I follow the nP/NP approach to nominal phrases (Georgi & Müller 2010, Chomsky 2007). ME (Suzuki 2012) constrains each step of NS-derivation. Restricting ourselves to the *if*-conditional, the VP *invites a philosopher* is TRANSFERred at vP to the pragmatics-interface (P-interface; López 2003) to be assigned a [+specific]-feature, assumed to be licensed in the C-/discourse-domain. The indefinite with the [+specific]-feature (*a philosopher)* ends up *covertly* raising to C as a result of Internal Merge via the P-interface (via a *bi-directional 'on-line' passage;* Suzuki 2007). The final WS/*de re* interpretation of *a philosopher* may depend on some CH(f) application. As for the derivation of (1a) with the EC interpretation (1c), the P-interface 'invades' NS to assign a [–specific]-feature to the indefinite in the VP (*invites a philosopher)* at vP.

As for the NS-derivations of (2a), let us see its *split interpretation* (2b). Details about the modal aside, I take the first merger to be between *leave* and the nP *a student* (given '[no [a [student]]]' as the complex structure of *no student,* based on Zeijlstra 2007). At vP, the P-interface invades NS to assign a [–specific]-feature to the indefinite in the vP (*a student leave).* The indefinite then raises to [Spec, T], projecting up to the nP-structure '[no [a student]]' (pronounced as 'no student'). As for the interpretation of the negative *no,* I assume that it depends on discourse factors/the speaker/hearer's 'conversational' circumstances. The *no* portion of the subject negative covertly raises up to the C-domain and a negative operator of some sort (Zeijilstra 2007) identifies *no* by 'binding' it. Overall, we obtain the [–specific] interpretation for the *a student* portion of *no student* under the modal *may,* while above *may* we get the negative interpretation of its *no* portion in the C-domain (*split interpretation: Neg > Modal > Ǝ).* Let us see the *de re interpretation* (2c) of (2a). The first merger applies between *leave* and the n *student.* Then, the n *student* raises to [Spec, T], projecting up to '[no [a [student]]].' Both the negative *no* and the indefinite *a* covertly raise to the C-domain to be licensed, *no* ending up as 'bound' by a negative operator, and the indefinite receiving a [+specific]-feature from the P-interface (*de re interpretation: Neg > Ǝ > Modal).*

SelectedReferences

Chomsky 2000 MI./ 2001 DbP./ 2004 BEA./ 2005 OP./ 2007 AUGfB.// **Diesing** 1992 *Indefinites.*// **Fox** 2000 *Economy & Semantic Interpretation.*// **Georgi & Müller** 2010 Noun-phrase Structure by Reprojection *Syntax.*// **Grohmann** 2003 Successive Cyclicity under (Anti-)local Considerations *Syntax.*// **Hinzen** 2012 Phases & Semantics In *Phases.*// **Iatridou & Sichel** 2011 Negative DPs, A-movement, & ScopeDiminishment *LI.*// **López** 2003 Steps For a Well-adjusted Dislocation *Stud Ling.*/ 2012 *Indefinite Objects.*// **Reinhart** 2006 *Interface Strategies.*// **Suzuki** 2007 *Reflections On Chomsky's SMT.*/ 2012 Modification as Reprojection *JELS.*// **Zeijlstra** 2007 On the Lexical Status of Negative Iindefinites in Dutch and German.