Campos, Héctor. 1991. Preposition stranding in Spanish? *Linguistic Inquiry* 22:741–750.
Corver, Norbert. 1992. On deriving left branch extraction asymmetries: A case study in parametric syntax. In *NELS 22*, ed. by Kimberley Broderick, 67–84. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, Graduate Linguistic Student Association.
Craenenbroeck, Jeroen van. 2010. Invisible Last Resort: A note on clefts as the underlying source for sluicing. *Lingua* 120: 1714–1726.
Grohmann, Kleanthes. 2003. *Prolific domains*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Ishii, Toru. 1997. An asymmetry in the composition of phrase structure and its consequences. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Irvine.
Ishii, Toru. 1999. Cyclic Spell-Out and the *that-t* effects. In *WCCFL 18*, ed. by Sonya Bird, Andrew Carnie, Jason D. Haugen, and Peter Norquest, 220–231. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Nykiel, Joanna, and Ivan A. Sag. 2009. Sluicing and stranding. Paper presented at the 83rd annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America. San Francisco, CA, 8–11 January.
Rodrigues, Cilene, Andrew Nevins, and Luis Vicente. 2009. Cleaving the interactions between sluicing and preposition stranding. In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2006*, ed. by Danièle Torck and W. Leo Wetzels, 175–198. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Uriagereka, Juan. 1988. On government. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

CP-Negation and the Domain of Quantifier Raising

Eric Potsdam
University of Florida

It is widely stated that the scope of quantifiers is clause-bound (Chomsky 1977, May 1977, Farkas 1981, 1997, Fodor and Sag 1982, Aoun and Hornstein 1985, Beghelli 1993, Abusch 1994, Hornstein 1995, Fox and Sauerland 1997, and numerous others). This claim is based on the observation that (1a) has no reading in which reviewers covary with plays, while (2a) does.

(1) a. A reviewer thinks every play will fail this season.
b. *[$_{TP}$ every play$_i$ [$_{TP}$ a reviewer thinks [$_{CP}$ e$_i$ will fail this season]]]

(2) a. A reviewer attended every play this season.
b. [$_{TP}$ every play$_i$ [$_{TP}$ a reviewer attended e$_i$ this season]]

Current theories capture the contrast by making Quantifier Raising (QR), the covert syntactic operation that assigns scope to quantified noun phrases (QPs), clause-bound. Only in (2a), in which the universally quantified QP *every play* and the indefinite *a reviewer* are

Linguistic Inquiry, Volume 44, Number 4, Fall 2013
674–684
© 2013 by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology
doi: 10.1162/ling_a_00144

clausemates, can the universal QP raise to scope over the indefinite, yielding the Logical Form representation (LF) in (2b). This operation is prohibited for (1a) because the two NPs are not clausemates; hence, the LF in (1b) is illicit.

While this observation seems empirically well-grounded, its theoretical basis is less secure. Such clause-boundedness makes QR rather more restricted than one would expect a representative Ā-movement to be (see Reinhart 1997, Cecchetto 2004 for discussion). In what follows, I recap Fox's (1995, 2000) theory of Scope Economy, which provides an explanation for QR's clause-boundedness. I then introduce new data involving the interaction between QPs and certain instances of negation that are problematic for this approach. I conclude by sketching an alternative.

1 An Economy-Based Account of Quantifier Raising

Like many who research QR, Fox (1995, 2000) implicitly adopts what Beghelli and Stowell (1997) call Scope Uniformity: QR applies uniformly to all QPs and is not landing-site-selective. Any QP can be adjoined to any (nonargument) XP where it is interpretable. Further restricting this quite general assumption, economy considerations dictate that QR can apply only if it has an effect on semantic interpretation.[1] QR cannot apply if the derivation without it would yield the same meaning.

(3) *Scope Economy* (Fox 2000:23)
QR must have a semantic effect.

Fox (2000:62–66) proposes that the clause-boundedness of QR follows from Scope Economy. By (3), every application of QR must induce a change in semantic interpretation. At the same time, given that QR is an instance of Ā-movement, each application is subject to locality constraints on movement, which Fox formulates as Shortest Move.[2]

(4) *Shortest Move* (Fox 2000:23)
QR moves a QP to the closest position in which it is interpretable.

The impossibility of cross-clausal QR follows from a tension between Scope Economy and Shortest Move. QR that does not obey Shortest Move is illicit, but QR that targets a clausal node, obeying Shortest

[1] An exception is that QR is obligatory for semantic type considerations. QR must apply to move a QP from within VP to a position where it can be interpreted, sister to a clause-denoting expression of type *t* (Fox 2000:23). Thus, the first possible, and required, adjunction site for QR is VP.

[2] Cecchetto (2004) uses the more current Phase Impenetrability Condition (Chomsky 2001) as the relevant movement locality constraint.

Move, will not normally yield a new semantic interpretation, violating Scope Economy.

Returning to (1a), the two constraints derive the unavailability of the non-clause-bound reading of the universal QP in this example, repeated below as (5a). Two potential LFs for the wide scope reading of the QP *every play* are given in (5b–c). In (5b), *every play* raises directly to a position above the matrix subject; however, this violates Shortest Move since adjunction to the embedded clause is a closer interpretable position. In (5c), the QP *every play* targets the embedded clausal node to satisfy Shortest Move; however, Scope Economy is now violated because the move has no semantic consequence. As a result, the embedded QP has no extra, wide scope interpretation, as desired.

(5) a. A reviewer thinks every play will fail this season.
b. *[$_{TP}$ every play$_i$ [$_{TP}$ a reviewer thinks [$_{CP}$[$_{TP}$ e$_i$ will fail this season]]]]
c. *[$_{TP}$ every play$_i$ [$_{TP}$ a reviewer thinks [$_{CP}$ e$_i$ [$_{CP}$[$_{TP}$ e$_i$ will fail this season]]]]]

2 Overriding Clause-Boundedness

Fox (2000:63) points out that the Scope Economy account makes a surprising prediction: QR's clause-boundedness could be overridden if adjunction to CP (as in (5c)) had semantic motivation. Specifically, if the CP projection contained an element that the QP could scopally interact with, then Scope Economy would license cross-clausal movement.

(6) [QP$_i$ [. . . [$_{CP}$ e$_i$ [$_{CP}$ scope-inducing-element [$_{TP}$ . . . e$_i$ . . .]]]]]

Fox (2000:64) offers one set of data, from Moltmann and Szabolcsi 1994, that instantiates the configuration in (6) and seems to confirm the prediction. In (7), the needed scopal element is a *wh*-phrase in Spec,CP.

(7) a. A reviewer knows when every play will fail.
b. [$_{TP}$ every play$_i$ [$_{TP}$ a reviewer knows [$_{CP}$ e$_i$ [$_{CP}$ when$_j$ [$_{TP}$ e$_i$ will fail e$_j$]]]]]

(7a), unlike (5a), is ambiguous and has a reading in which the embedded QP *every play* takes scope over the matrix subject: every play is such that some reviewer or other knows when it will fail. The corresponding LF in (7b) is permitted because the intermediate adjunction to CP forced by Shortest Move has the semantic effect of causing the universal QP to take scope over the *wh*-phrase in Spec,CP. At the same time, Moltmann and Szabolcsi (1994) and Szabolcsi (1997a) argue that cross-clausal QR is not the correct mechanism to derive the wide scope reading in (7). These authors propose an alternative ''layered quantifier'' analysis that respects clause-boundedness. The goal of this squib is to test Fox's prediction in a domain that is not open to Moltmann and Szabolcsi's objections.

An alternative instantiation of (6) that would be suitable for testing the prediction places a negative head in C^0, what I will call *CP-Negation*. As is well-known, negation introduces scope ambiguities and should thus be a prime candidate for licensing an application of QR adjunction to CP under Scope Economy.[3] As above, in such a situation QR would obey Shortest Move *and* yield a semantically distinct interpretation, the wide scope reading of the QP with respect to CP-negation. Both of the LFs in (8) should be licensed—that is, whether QR applies or not. (The notation $X > Y$ indicates that X takes scope over Y.)

(8) a. $[_{CP}\ QP_i\ [_{CP}[_{C'}\ Neg\ [_{TP}\ \ldots\ e_i\ \ldots\ ]]]]$
$QP > NEG$ (QR applies)

b. $[_{CP}[_{C'}\ Neg\ [_{TP}\ \ldots\ QP\ \ldots\ ]]]$
$NEG > QP$ (no QR)

The data to come show that QPs cannot take scope over CP-negation. The clause-boundedness of QR is in fact not overridden. This is problematic for the Scope Economy–based explanation.

3 Scope Interactions with Negation

It has become increasingly clear that not all QPs have the same scope options (Kroch 1979, Beghelli 1993, 1995, Liu 1997, Szabolcsi 1997b). Beghelli (1995) and Szabolcsi (1997b) identify four non-*wh* quantifier types:

(9) a. Negative quantifiers: *no*
b. Distributive universal quantifiers: *each*, *every*
c. Group-denoting quantifiers: indefinites (*a*, *some*), bare numerals, partitives
d. Counting quantifiers: *few*, *fewer than*, *more than*, *at most*, *at least*, etc.

As Beghelli (1995:136–166) discusses, not all of these quantifiers interact equally with negation.[4] In the crucial data to follow, I will use Beghelli's counting quantifiers, which include complex numerical

[3] I follow Ladusaw (1988) in assuming that the scope of negation is fixed by its surface position in C^0. There is no Neg-Raising or Neg-Lowering at LF. In particular, negation in C^0 does not reconstruct to T^0. If CP-negation could reconstruct, it would only increase the likelihood of the grammar allowing the unavailable scope readings in (12c), (14c), (16c), and (19c) in which negation has narrow scope with respect to a QP.

[4] The negative quantifier *no* and the distributive universal quantifier *each* are degraded to varying degrees with negation.

(i) a. *Jerry didn't like nobody.
(Postal 1974:235)
b. ?John didn't read each book.
(Beghelli 1995:142)

expressions such as *at least three* and *at most two*. They interact scopally with negation, as illustrated by the ambiguity in (10).

(10) a. She did**n't** answer **at least two** questions.
b. It is not the case that she answered at least two questions. NEG > AT LEAST 2
(i.e., One is required to answer at least two questions, but she did not do that.)
c. There are at least two questions that she didn't answer. AT LEAST 2 > NEG

4 The Scope Data

There are a number of constructions in English in which negation, in the form of a contracted auxiliary like *don't*, occurs in C^0. I consider three: imperatives, declaratives with negative constituent preposing, and interrogatives. In all cases, we will see that a potential scope ambiguity between CP-negation and a QP is resolved in favor of a lone NEG > Q interpretation.

Beukema and Coopmans (1989) and I (Potsdam 1998) argue that negative inverted imperatives such as (11a–c) have the desired structure with *don't* in C^0 and the imperative subject in Spec,TP, as shown in (11d).

(11) a. Don't you eat the last piece of cake!
b. Don't everyone go!
c. Don't anyone tease him!
d. $[_{CP}[_{C'}$ don't$_i$ $[_{TP}$ everyone t_i $[_{VP}$ expect a raise]]]]

Negative inverted imperatives containing a QP are unambiguous, regardless of the position of the QP (see Schmerling 1982, Potsdam

---

Every-QPs are grammatical with negation, but for many speakers they cannot take inverse scope over c-commanding negation: (iia) is unambiguous for these speakers and does not have the inverse scope reading in (iic). Other speakers allow both readings. *Every* is standardly taken as the prototypical quantifier, but I will not use it for this reason. See Horn 1989, Hornstein 1995, and Mayr and Spector 2010 for some discussion of *every* and negation.

(ii) a. The voters didn't like every candidate.
b. The voters liked not all the candidates. NEG > EVERY
c. The voters liked no candidate. EVERY > NEG

Group QPs such as indefinites and bare numerals do interact scopally with negation; however, such QPs also allow a specific reading that has unlimited upward scope (e.g., Fodor and Sag 1982, Heim 1982, Ruys 1992, 2006, Abusch 1994, Beghelli 1995, Farkas 1997, Liu 1997). Fodor and Sag (1982) point out that the specific reading of group QPs can escape scope islands, such as conditional clauses. This specific reading is not equivalent to the inverse wide scope reading and arguably results from a different mechanism than QR (Reinhart 1997, Kratzer 1998). Group QPs thus also need to be avoided in the crucial data to follow because an apparent wide scope reading may appear that is in fact the difficult-to-distinguish specific reading.

1998, Moon 1999). (12a), for example, has only the interpretation in (12b), the wide scope reading of negation, and not the interpretation in (12c), the reading where the QP takes inverse scope.

(12) a. Do**n't more than four** people go on vacation!
b. It shouldn't be the case that more than four people go on vacation. NEG > MORE THAN 4
(i.e., Fewer than four people go on vacation!)
c. *There should be more than four people who don't go on vacation. *MORE THAN 4 > NEG
(i.e., *More than four people don't go on vacation!)

We can sharpen the judgment by placing the example in a context that favors the inverse scope reading. In such a case, the example is infelicitous.

(13) All the student employees want to go away for spring break, but the library has to stay open for the week and at least five students are needed to staff the circulation desk—one for each day. More than four people have to not go on vacation so that the library can remain open. #So, don't more than four people go on vacation!

The example in (14a) makes the same point in a different way. We can make sense of its infelicity because the only available meaning, the narrow scope interpretation of the QP with respect to negation in (14b), is pragmatically odd. One doesn't normally place a lower bound on how many test questions someone shouldn't skip. The inverse scope reading in (14c) is sensible but seemingly unavailable.

(14) a. #Do**n't** anybody skip **at least three questions**!
b. #It mustn't be the case that anybody skips at least three questions. NEG > AT LEAST 3
(#Nobody skip at least three questions!)
c. *It must be that there are at least three questions that nobody skips. *AT LEAST 3 > NEG

The same pattern appears with CP-negation in negative constituent preposing, illustrated in (15). This construction is widely analyzed using T^0-to-C^0 movement (see Koster 1975, Emonds 1976, Progovac 1994, Haegeman 1995, Rizzi 1996).

(15) a. Never have we seen such a mess.
b. Only under duress will Joey share his chewing gum.
c. $[_{CP}$ never $[_{C'}$ have$_i$ $[_{TP}$ we t_i $[_{VP}$ seen such a mess]]]]

An inverted negative auxiliary in this construction also obligatorily takes wide scope with respect to clause-internal QPs.

(16) a. Only this semester did**n't** John fail **at least one** student.
b. It's not the case that John failed at least one student. NEG > AT LEAST 1
(i.e., John failed no students.)
c. *There is at least one student that John didn't fail. *AT LEAST 1 > NEG

(17) provides a context that favors the inverse scope reading, but the example is infelicitous.

(17) John is an incredibly difficult professor. Usually, everyone who takes his class fails. This semester, miraculously, Albert took his class and passed it. Everyone else still failed. #Thus, only this semester didn't John fail at least one student.

Paraphrases with clause-internal negation are acceptable in this context, (18), because the QP can scope over internal negation.

(18) a. John didn't fail at least one student this semester.
b. Only this semester did John not fail at least one student.

Finally, subject-auxiliary inversion in English interrogatives is standardly analyzed in terms of T^0-to-C^0 movement (e.g., Koster 1975, Koopman 1984, Chomsky 1986). As above, a QP obligatorily takes narrow scope with respect to CP-negation (Rupp 1998:154, citing Andrew Radford, pers. comm.).

(19) a. Don't at least two women candidates realize they are being used to split the vote?
b. Is it not the case that at least two women candidates realize that they are being used to split the vote?
NEG > AT LEAST 2
c. *Are there at least two women candidates who don't realize that they are being used to split the vote?
*AT LEAST 2 > NEG

The Scope Economy–based approach to QR clause-boundedness wrongly predicts the above examples to be ambiguous. To illustrate, (20b) is the available LF corresponding to the unavailable interpretation of (12), repeated as (20a).

(20) a. Don't more than four people go on vacation!
b. $[_{CP}$ more than four people$_j$ $[_{CP}[_{C'}$ don't$_i$ $[_{IP}$ t_j t_i $[_{VP}$ go on vacation]]]]]

Raising *more than four people* from the subject position to an adjunction position above negation satisfies Shortest Move and Scope Economy since it yields an interpretation distinct from the derivation in which it does not apply; nevertheless, the MORE THAN 4 > NEG interpretation is not possible.[5]

[5] An anonymous reviewer offers an example in which a clause-internal QP does scope over CP-negation.

(i) Only on Monday didn't some representative from every city come to the workshop.

5 Conclusion

I suggest that the above data are representative of a larger pattern, the CP-Negation Scope Generalization.

(21) *The CP-Negation Scope Generalization*
CP-negation takes wide scope with respect to QPs in its clause.

Scope Economy derives the unexpected clause-boundedness of QR; however, it does not capture (21) and overgenerates readings in examples with CP-negation. It remains to be determined whether the theory can be modified to avoid these results.[6]

The inability of a QP to take scope over CP-negation suggests that CP is not a possible target adjunction site for QR, a stipulation made by a number of researchers (e.g., May 1985, Cecchetto 2004). If we assume this, then clause-boundedness may follow in combination with an independently needed theory of successive cyclicity. A core result of research in bounding theory within the Government-Binding tradition and phase theory within the Minimalist Program is that CPs are cyclic nodes for cross-clausal movement (but see Rackowski and Richards 2005 and Den Dikken 2009).[7] If CP is simply not a possible adjunction site for QR, then a QP will not be able to raise out of its clause without violating Subjacency or the Phase Impenetrability Condition. We have an alternative answer to the clause-boundedness independent of Scope Economy. If such an approach is on the right track, it nonetheless remains to be explained why adjunction to CP is not a possible landing site for QR.[8]

The inverse-linking example (i) has an interpretation in which only on Monday, for every city, there was some representative from it who didn't come to the workshop. In this interpretation, EVERY has scope over NEG; however, the derivation of the EVERY > NEG interpretation does not require QR of *every city* over CP-negation. May (1985) argues that the *every*-QP embedded in the subject moves by QR only as far as the edge of the subject noun phrase and no farther.

[6] If correct, the generalization would confirm Moltmann and Szabolcsi's (1994) assertion that Fox's (2000) account of (7) is not correct.

[7] Assuming that CP is not a cyclic node does not in and of itself derive QR's clause-boundedness, as both Rackowski and Richards (2005) and Den Dikken (2009) assume that successive-cyclic Ā-movement via Spec,vP does still occur.

[8] An anonymous reviewer suggests an analysis of (21) using Rizzi's (1997) exploded CP. Suppose that CP is deconstructed into the hierarchy ForceP > Pol(arity)P > FocusP > TP. If CP-negation moves to Pol^0 but QR targets FocusP, then negation will always take wide scope.

References

Abusch, Dorit. 1994. The scope of indefinites. *Natural Language Semantics* 2:83–115.

Aoun, Joseph, and Norbert Hornstein. 1985. Quantifier types. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16:623–637.

Beghelli, Filippo. 1993. A Minimalist approach to quantifier scope. In *NELS 23*, ed. by Amy Schafer, 65–80. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, Graduate Linguistic Student Association.

Beghelli, Filippo. 1995. The phrase structure of quantifier scope. Doctoral dissertation, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA.

Beghelli, Filippo, and Tim Stowell. 1997. Distributivity and negation: The syntax of *each* and *every*. In *Ways of scope taking*, ed. by Anna Szabolcsi, 71–108. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Beukema, Frits, and Peter Coopmans. 1989. A Government-Binding perspective on the imperative in English. *Journal of Linguistics* 25:417–436.

Cecchetto, Carlo. 2004. Explaining the locality conditions of QR: Consequences for the theory of phases. *Natural Language Semantics* 12:345–397.

Chomsky, Noam. 1977. *Essays on form and interpretation*. New York: North-Holland.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dikken, Marcel den. 2009. On the nature and distribution of successive cyclicity. Ms., CUNY Graduate Center. Available at http://www.gc.cuny.edu/CUNY_GC/media/CUNY-GraduateCenter/PDF/Programs/Linguistics/Dikken/distribution_successive_cyclicity.pdf. Accessed 18 February 2013.

Emonds, Joseph E. 1976. *A transformational approach to English syntax*. New York: Academic Press.

Farkas, Donka. 1981. Quantifier scope and syntactic islands. In *Papers from the 17th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by Roberta Hendrick, Carrie Masek, and Mary Frances Miller, 59–66. Chicago: University of Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society.

Farkas, Donka. 1997. Evaluation indices and scope. In *Ways of scope taking*, ed. by Anna Szabolcsi, 183–216. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Fodor, Janet Dean, and Ivan Sag. 1982. Referential and quantificational indefinites. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 5:355–398.

Fox, Danny. 1995. Economy and scope. *Natural Language Semantics* 3:283–341.

Fox, Danny. 2000. *Economy and semantic interpretation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Fox, Danny, and Uli Sauerland. 1997. The illusive scope of universal quantifiers. In *NELS 26*, ed. by Jill Beckman, 71–85. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, Graduate Linguistic Student Association.

Haegeman, Liliane. 1995. *The syntax of negation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Heim, Irene. 1982. The semantics of definite and indefinite noun phrases. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
Horn, Laurence R. 1989. *A natural history of negation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Hornstein, Norbert. 1995. *Logical Form: From GB to Minimalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Koopman, Hilda. 1984. *The syntax of verbs: From verb-movement rules in the Kru languages to Universal Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.
Koster, Jan. 1975. Dutch as an SOV language. *Linguistic Analysis* 1: 111–136.
Kratzer, Angelika. 1998. Scope or pseudoscope? Are there wide scope indefinites? In *Events in grammar*, ed. by Susan Rothstein, 163–196. Dordrecht: Kluwer
Kroch, Anthony. 1979. *The semantics of scope in English*. New York: Garland.
Ladusaw, William. 1988. Adverbs, negation, and QR. In *Linguistics in the morning calm 2*, ed. by the Linguistic Society of Korea, 481–488. Seoul: Hanshin.
Liu, Feng-Hsi. 1997. *Scope and specificity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
May, Robert. 1977. The grammar of quantification. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
May, Robert. 1985. *Logical Form: Its syntax and derivation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Mayr, Clemens, and Benjamin Spector. 2010. Not too strong! Generalizing the Scope Economy Condition. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 14*, ed. by Martin Prinzhorn, Viola Schmitt, and Sarah Zobel, 305–321. Vienna: Department of Linguistics. Available at http://www.univie.ac.at.sub14/. Accessed 16 April 2013.
Moltmann, Friederike, and Anna Szabolcsi. 1994. Scope interaction with pair-list quantifiers. In *NELS 24*, ed. by Mercè Gonzàlez, 381–395. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, Graduate Linguistic Student Association.
Moon, Grace. 1999. *Don't* imperatives. In *Harvard working papers in linguistics 7*, ed. by Bert Vaux and Susumu Kuno, 93–107. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Department of Linguistics.
Postal, Paul M. 1974. *On raising*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Potsdam, Eric. 1998. *Syntactic issues in the English imperative*. New York: Garland.
Progovac, Ljiljana. 1994. *Negative and positive polarity: A binding approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rackowski, Andrea, and Norvin Richards. 2005. Phase edge and extraction: A Tagalog case study. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36:565–599.

Reinhart, Tanya. 1997. Quantifier scope: How labor is divided between QR and choice functions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20: 335–397.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1996. Residual verb second and the *Wh*-Criterion. In *Parameters and functional heads: Essays in comparative syntax*, ed. by Adriana Belletti and Luigi Rizzi, 63–90. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Rupp, Laura. 1998. Aspects of the syntax of English imperatives. Doctoral dissertation, University of Essex.

Ruys, Eddy. 1992. The scope of indefinites. Doctoral dissertation, Utrecht University.

Ruys, Eddy. 2006. Unexpected wide-scope phenomena. In *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, ed. by Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk, 5:175–228. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Schmerling, Susan. 1982. How imperatives are special and how they aren't. In *Papers from the Parasession on Nondeclaratives, Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by Robert Schneider, Kevin Tuite, and Robert Chametzky, 202–218. Chicago: University of Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society.

Szabolcsi, Anna. 1997a. Quantifiers in pair-list readings. In *Ways of scope taking*, ed. by Anna Szabolcsi, 311–348. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Szabolcsi, Anna, ed. 1997b. *Ways of scope taking*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.