Speaker: Hadas Kotek
Date: Monday, March 19, 5:30pm
Location: **32-D124** (note unusual location!)

I will present pilot results from two sentence processing studies that we ran in the department last month - one concerning multiple questions and the other concerning the quantificational nature of *any*. Both studies yield unexpected results that bear on the theories of questions and of free choice *any*, respectively. In particular, I will argue that covert *wh*-movement may not target the same position as overt *wh*-movement but rather a much lower position (if it occurs at all), and that *any* should be analyzed as an existential quantifier that QRs locally, targeting a lower position than the one targeted by the QR of *every*. More details on the two studies below.

Experiment 1: **multiple *wh*-questions**
Pesetsky (2000) shows a correlation between superiority violations and intervention effects in English D-linked questions: superiority-violating questions are sensitive to intervention effects induced by negation, quantifiers and focus-sensitive operators. Superiority-obeying questions are not sensitive to such effects.
(1) Which boy didn't ___ read which book? (cf. which boy read which book?)
(2) *Which book didn't which boy read ___? (cf. which book did which boy read?)

This correlation is explained by assuming different LFs for superiority obeying and superiority violating questions. In the superiority-obeying question, the lower wh-phrase covertly moves to C, above potential interveners. In the superiority-violating question, the higher wh-phrase must stay in-situ so that the lower phrase may be attracted to the highest specifier of C. Intervention effects occur when there is an intervener between C and a wh-phrase it agrees with (Beck 2006).
(3) [CP [which boy]1 [which book]2 [C [TP INTERVENER t1 read t2]]]
(4) [CP [which book]2 [C [TP INTERVENER [which boy]1 read t2]]]

Following the results of Hackl et al. (2011), we expect covert movement to facilitate the processing of Antecedent Contained Deletion (ACD) that occurs downstream from the target position of the movement. Hence, *every* should facilitate the processing of local ACD in (5). Since covert *wh*-movement is non-local, we predict that both local and non-local ACD should be facilitated in questions such as (6). Our results suggest, however, that these predictions are not confirmed. Rather, covert *wh*-movement does not facilitate the processing of non-local ACD. Hence, covert *wh*-movement, if it occurs at all, must target a position below the high ACD site. I will discuss the implications of this result for theories of multiple questions.
(5) The commentators predicted which college was hoping to recruit every player that the professional club did/was.
(6) The commentators predicted which college was hoping to recruit which player that the professional club did/was.

Experiment 2: **free choice *any***.
Some theories argue that *any* is an existential quantifier and receives a universal interpretation via mechanisms such as double exhaustification. As an existential, *any* should be commutative with the existential modal *allowed*. Compare *any* with *every: every* is a universal quantifier, and consequently not commutative with *allowed*. Hence, to get a sensible meaning in (7), we expect *every* to scopally interact with *allowed* in non-trivial ways. We expect *any* in (8) to be interpretable without QR. As a result, *every*, but not *any*, should facilitate ACD resolution downstream.
(7) For the main course, the visitor was allowed to choose every dish that the food critic did/was
(8) For the main course, the visitor was allowed to choose any dish that the food critic did/was

Our results show that *any* facilitates the processing local ACD, but it does not facilitate the processing of non-local ACD. This is consistent with an analysis of *any* as an existential quantifier that moves locally above the lowest VP. *Every*, on the other hand, facilitates the processing of both local and non-local ACD. Consequently, we must assume that *every* QRs above the position to which *any* moves. I will suggest two possible target positions for this movement and discuss the implications of both options for the theory.