

On the Syntactic Properties of English Floating Quantifiers

Hideki TANAKA

It has been observed that floating quantifiers (FQs) in English should precede predicates of the NPs the FQs modify (henceforth, host NPs). Consider the following contrast:

- (1) a. I consider [_{sc}the men all intelligent].
b. [The men]_f seem to be [_{APT} all honest].
c. *I consider the men intelligent all.
d. *The men seem to be honest all.

The FQs in (1a-b) precede the predicates of their host NPs (i.e., intelligent and honest), while the FQs in (1c-d) do not.

Preceding predicates of host NPs is, however, not a sufficient precondition for FQs. This is exemplified by the contrast in (2):

- (2) a. I believed the men all to be honest.
b. *I all believed the men to be honest.

This contrast in grammaticality arises even though the FQs both precede the predicate of their host NPs (honest). The only difference is that the FQ in (2a) follows its host NP, whereas the FQ in (2b) does not. Thus, this contrast indicates that FQs should follow their host NPs.

The above considerations lead us to claim that the necessary precondition for FQs is as follows:

- (3) FQs should follow their host NPs and precede predicates of their host NPs.

The validity of (3), however, appears to be disputed by the following grammatical examples:

- (4) a. John gave the toys all to the boy.
b. John gave the boys all some toys.

The FQs in (4) both follow their host NPs (the toys and the boys), satisfying the first clause of (3). Do these FQs fulfill the second clause of (3)? Let us explore whether the "post-FQ" elements (to the boy and some toys) in (4) serve as predicates of the indirect objects (the

toys and the boys).

Based on Larson's [1] VP-shell analysis, we assign the following S-structures to (4a-b), respectively:

- (5) a. John [_{VP1} gave [_{VP2} [the toys] all [_{V'} t_v to the boy]]].
 b. John [_{VP1} gave [_{VP2} [the boys]_i all [_{V'} [_{V'} t_v t_i] some toys]]].

The verb gave in (5a) forms a complex predicate (V') with the PP to the boy before moving to the higher head (V_1). According to Larson, the V' assigns a θ -role to the object the toys. It should be noted that the object in (5a) is an internal argument rather than an external argument of the predicate. Therefore, we cannot regard the relation between the object and the V' as a subject-predicate relation so long as we take the semantic view of predicates in which predicates are viewed as external θ -role assigners.

Larson derives the double object construction in (5b) from the dative construction in (5a) via a process similar to passivization: (i) the object in (5a) is adjoined to the V' ; (ii) the NP in the to-phrase in (5a) moves into [Spec, VP_2]. In the resulting structure in (5b), the upper V' does not even assign a θ -role to the indirect object in [Spec, VP_2]; hence, we cannot regard the relation between the indirect object and the V' as a subject-predicate relation. Consequently, we face the undesired situation: neither of the V' s in (5) is a predicate of the host NP in [Spec, VP_2].

To overcome this difficulty, we claim that the V' s in question are both predicates of the host NPs by introducing a syntactic notion of predicate which is independent of θ -role assignment (cf. Rothstein [2]). Whether or not an X' is an external θ -role assigner, we regard the relation between an NP and the X' as a "syntactic" predication relation when the NP and the X' are in a Spec- X' relation. Given this, the FQs in (5) adequately precede "syntactic" predicate (V') of their host NPs, satisfying (3). Thus, it is concluded that under the syntactic view of predicates, the FQs in (4) successfully satisfy the condition in (3) like the grammatical FQs in (1-2).

References: [1] Larson, R. "On the Double Object Construction," LI 19/ [2] Rothstein, S. "The Syntactic Forms of Predication," Ph.D diss., MIT.