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1. The Event: GURT 2004
This volume in the 2004 Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics (GURT) series comes from the conference that took place March 26–29, 2004, with the theme Comparative and Crosslinguistic Research in Syntax, Semantics, and Computational Linguistics. While the conference was open to any research within this broad theme, the conference announcement noted that presentations focusing on the following issues were especially welcome: the syntax and semantics of clause types; syntactic variation across varieties of English; the internal structure of the noun phrase; negation, negative polarity, and negative concord; tense and aspect in formal and/or computational semantics; microvariation in the left periphery of the clause; and linguistic typology for machine translation.

The main session in the conference had space for thirty-two presentations chosen from 126 submitted abstracts, in addition to seven presentations by the following invited speakers: Paola Benincà, Marcel den Dikken, Liliane Haegeman, James McCloskey, Toshiyuki Ogihara, Colin Phillips, and Henriëtte de Swart. The presentations were evenly chosen from the abstracts submitted in the areas of syntax and semantics, with a small number in computational linguistics (reflecting the small number of abstract submissions in this area). In addition to the talks in the regular sessions, other conference events included two well-attended poster sessions, where twenty-four posters were displayed; a lively panel discussion on methodological issues in the study of English dialects, led by Judy Bernstein (William Paterson University), Ralph Fasold (Georgetown University), Simanique Moody (New York University), and Christina Tortora (College of Staten Island, CUNY); a tutorial on computational tools for linguists, organized and conducted by Inderjeet Mani (Georgetown University); and a postconference workshop on clause typing and the left periphery, which included the presentation of six papers and ample time for discussion.

In preparing this volume for publication in the Georgetown University Press’s longstanding GURT conference series, we took upon ourselves the difficult task of selecting only a few contributions from the many high-quality presentations. We envisioned a volume that would reflect the balance of syntax and semantics seen at the conference and that would touch on at least some of the topics that were highlighted during that engaging weekend. To achieve this goal, we solicited the submission of contributions from all the invited speakers and from a handful of other presenters. Needless to say, there were numerous other excellent papers that would have allowed
us to reach our goal equally well and that we regretfully could not accommodate in the volume.

2. The Contributions
In what follows, we will provide a brief overview of the issues discussed in the contributions to this volume. The chapters can be placed into three groups: clausal architecture, negation, and tense and aspect, with one, that by Colin Phillips, falling outside of these groups.

Colin Phillips’s chapter, “Three Benchmarks for Distributional Approaches to Natural Language Syntax,” addresses the role of linguistic theory in computational models of language learning, in particular questioning the optimism (widespread in certain computational circles) that the discovery of the right statistical learning procedure will ultimately provide an adequate account of human linguistic abilities. Is it really possible to do away with the richly articulated structures widely assumed by linguistic theory and to account for human linguistic abilities simply on the basis of a statistical learning procedure? In other words, would an “ideal” statistical learner capture human knowledge of language? With impeccable coherence and clarity, the chapter summarizes a series of findings (from language acquisition, crosslinguistic typology, and language processing) that illustrate the challenges that any serious model of natural language syntax must meet. Phillips’s goal is not to argue that statistics plays no role in models of language learning but rather to show that speakers’ knowledge of constraints on language involves much more than just surface co-occurrence patterns, and that computational models of language learning can only succeed if they incorporate the richer representations provided by linguistic theory.

2.1 Clausal Architecture
Among the chapters on syntax, three address issues concerning the left periphery of the clause. Liliane Haegeman’s “Argument Fronting in English, Romance CLLD, and the Left Periphery” builds on Rizzi’s (1997) seminal work and focuses on arguments interpreted as topics. The chapter addresses the question of whether topics in English and topics resumed by a pronominal clitic in so-called clitic left-dislocation (CLLD) constructions in Romance and modern Greek share the same properties and thus should receive the same analysis, as is sometimes assumed. Haegeman starts out from the observation due to Hooper and Thompson (1973) that topicalization in English is restricted to root clauses and does not occur in clauses with uninflected verbs. She combines this with observations from her own recent work on adverbial clauses. In this recent work, she shows that adverbial clauses fall into two classes, “peripheral” and “central” adverbial clauses, distinguished because they make different interpretive contributions and also because they have different structural representations, the former exhibiting a full and the latter a reduced CP structure. Given these distinctions, the paper is then positioned to make its empirical and theoretical contributions. On the empirical side, Haegeman provides a more refined statement of the distribution of topicalization in English, pointing out that the clauses allowing topicalization are the same as those that may also contain expressions of epistemic
modality, speaker-oriented adverbs, and tag questions. In contrast, CLLD topics in Romance and Greek are not restricted to occurring in root clauses or in sentences that exhibit this cluster of properties. Based on this evidence, she makes two theoretical claims. First, she argues that English topicalization occurs in clauses that encode in the syntax the notion of speaker. Second, working on the assumption that the notion of speaker is encoded in a high projection in the left periphery, she proposes that English topicalization targets a high projection and, therefore, like the other properties that involve reference to the speaker, is restricted to clauses that have a full CP structure. In contrast, CLLD topics target a lower structural position, one that is present even in reduced clauses. This leads to the conclusion that clauses contain a higher and a lower structural position for topics, and this point corroborates the results independently obtained in other recent work in the literature.

Paola Benincà’s chapter, “A Detailed Map of the Left Periphery of Medieval Romance,” uses the hypothesis of a highly articulated structure of CP as a magnifying glass with which to examine certain aspects of the syntax of Romance languages from the twelfth to the early fourteenth century. The languages under analysis are Old French, Old Spanish, Old Portuguese, Old Provençal, and several varieties spoken in what is now Italy (Old Florentine, Old Milanese, Old Piedmontese, Old Sicilian, Old Tuscan, Old Umbrian, and Old Venetian). Because these languages show common properties, Benincà proposes to view them as variants of an abstract “Medieval Romance,” which differs from most contemporary Romance languages in exhibiting more movement to CP, both of the verb and of other constituents. The chapter offers many novel and insightful generalizations that are certain to form a solid and useful basis for further investigations and analyses. We will mention only two here. One concerns verb movement: in Medieval Romance, the verb always raises to CP in main clauses; it may or may not raise in embedded clauses, depending on the content of CP; and the only context where it cannot raise is that of embedded interrogatives. Having formulated this generalization, Benincà can then offer an account of the complex word order patterns exhibited by the varieties under investigation, as well as the distribution of null subjects (always possible in main clauses, but more restricted in embedded clauses); the possibility of a null subject is argued to correlate with the possibility of having the verb in C. Another generalization concerns the distribution of enclisis, that is, the word order verb-clitic: enclisis is never found when the verb is in C° and the XP that precedes it is in a specifier of the Focus Field; rather, it is found when the verb is in C° and the XP that precedes it is in a higher projection, within the Topic or Frame Fields. Noting also that enclisis is impossible in embedded clauses with overt complementizers, Benincà then speculates that it might result from the movement of the verb to a position past the Focus Field, possibly the one that hosts the topic in its specifier. The chapter is a beautiful example of how theoretical tools can take our understanding of language farther than pretheoretical descriptions can, especially when combined with the skills of a linguist who can analyze difficult and complex data.

In “Questions and Questioning in a Local English,” James McCloskey compares so-called standard English with those Irish varieties of English where inversion of
subject and auxiliary is found not only in matrix but also in embedded questions, as exemplified in (1):

(1) a. I wondered would I be offered the same plate for the whole holiday.

b. The baritone was asked what did he think of Mrs. Kearney’s conduct.

What makes standard English, where sentences of this type are ungrammatical, different from Irish English? And why are sentences like the ones in (2) ungrammatical in both standard and Irish English?

(2) a. *I found out how did they get into the building.

b. *The police discovered who had they beaten up.

First, a correlation is uncovered: predicates like wonder, ask, and inquire allow not only inversion in embedded clauses (1), but also adjunction of an adverbial phrase to their CP complement, as in (3):

(3) a. ?He asked me when I got home if I would cook dinner.

b. ?I wonder when we get home what we should do.

In contrast, predicates like discover, find out, and establish disallow both inversion (2) and adjunction of an adverbial to their CP complement, as shown in (4):

(4) a. *It was amazing while they were out who had got in to their house.

b. *The police established while we were out who had broken in to our apartment.

The distinction between these two classes of predicates corresponds to a distinction that is important in the work on the formal semantics of questions, where the literature has argued that the complement of predicates like wonder (question predicates, following Ginzburg and Sag 2000) is semantically of the same type as a root question, whereas the complement of predicates like discover (resolutive predicates) is a kind of proposition. McCloskey takes the differences uncovered by his work to be the syntactic correlate of the semantic differences between these two classes of predicates. He proposes that the syntax of the two classes differs as follows: question predicates, but not resolutive predicates, embed clauses with a double layer of CP structure. The additional layer of CP structure is where the difference between the denotation of the two classes of predicates is syntactically encoded. It is also what makes adjunction to CP possible in the complement of a question predicate, as in (3) above: the adverbial phrase is adjoined to the lower of the two CPs; since this is not an argument of the matrix verb, there is no violation of the well-known prohibition against adjunction to complements of lexical heads. This option is not available in the complement of resolutive predicates, which do not have two layers of CP structure. While the difference between the two classes of predicates is deep and affects both the syntax and the semantics, the microsyntactic variation observed between standard English and Irish English within the class of question predicates is argued to be rather superficial: in Irish English, but not in standard English, the head of the lower CP triggers verb movement, which results in subject-auxiliary inversion, as in
Lisa deMena Travis’s contribution, “VP-, D°-Movement Languages,” asks us to reflect on the nature of movement. Consider two familiar kinds of movement, verb (V) movement and DP movement, which can be seen as triggered by a V-feature and by a D-feature on T, respectively. V-movement proceeds from head to head, is confined to the extended project of the verb, and builds a bigger syntactic object by picking up inflectional material on the way (what Travis calls “the snowball effect”). DP movement, in contrast, proceeds from specifier to specifier (Spec-to-Spec), is not sensitive to the boundaries of an extended projection, and does not build a bigger object by picking up material as it moves. Are these asymmetries a reflection of a deep distinction within the grammatical system or simply an artifact of the languages that have been studied so far? Is the snowball effect exhibited by verb movement determined by the affixal nature of the elements to which the verb adjoins, or is it a property related to the categorical nature of the element that moves, namely the verb? Are there languages that exhibit the opposite combinations of movement possibilities, that is, head movement of D° and Spec-to-Spec movement of VP? The chapter provides compelling answers to these novel and challenging questions through a sophisticated analysis of certain word order properties of several languages. Malagasy, a Western Malayo-Polynesian (WMP) language, overtly exhibits the unexpected combination of movement possibilities: D° incorporates into T° and the VP fronts, moving from specifier to specifier. Malay, another WMP language, overtly exhibits D-to-T movement and is convincingly argued to have covert VP movement. In fact, Travis argues that a typology emerges, which contrasts V°-, DP-movement languages with D°-, VP-movement languages: whereas in the former class (which includes English and other widely studied languages) XP movement can target arguments, in the latter, XP movement targets only predicate projections. The latter class of languages (which includes Malagasy and Malay, Breton and Irish, and Yatee Zapotec and Quiavini Zapotec) is characterized by the following cluster of properties: fronting of the predicate, V-initial word order, D°-movement, and the use of a cleft to form wh-constructions. Interestingly, in languages of this class, fronting of the predicate exhibits the snowball effect, since the VP creates a bigger syntactic object as it moves from Spec to Spec. This suggests that the effect is not due to the affixal nature of the elements to which the verb adjoins in instances of V-movement. Rather, Travis suggests that it stems from the fact that movement targets the largest unit that contains the relevant categorical feature; since the elements along the extended projection of V contain a V-feature, they get picked up in the movement process.

2.2 Negation

Three of the chapters in this volume deal with some aspect of the syntax and semantics of negation. In “Parasitism, Secondary Triggering, and Depth of Embedding,” Marcel den Dikken furthers our understanding of the licensing conditions on polarity items (PIs) by continuing the in-depth investigation of the properties of the Dutch polarity item heel begun in den Dikken (2002). In particular, the chapter focuses on the notion of parasitic licensing, examining cases where heel occurs in an environment
where the conditions on its licensing are not met, and yet where it does not give rise to ungrammaticality because of the presence of another PI that is properly licensed. Based on the analysis of a novel set of data, the chapter makes two observations that show that depth of embedding plays an important role in parasitic licensing: (1) the negative marker cannot be more than one clause boundary removed from polar heel and the PI on which it is parasitic, and (2) polar heel and the PI on which it is parasitic must occur in the same clause. To account for the facts, den Dikken proposes a distinction between two kinds of PIs: those that are inherently negative and those that are indefinites licensed by a clausemate licenser. This distinction makes possible an account of the observed distributional restrictions by sharpening the notions of primary direct licensing, secondary direct licensing, and parasitic licensing. Primary direct licensing involves A'-movement of the noun phrase containing polar heel into the specifier of the NegP projection that contains the clausal negative marker. Secondary direct licensing, or “secondary triggering” (see Horn 1996), also involves A'-movement of the noun phrase containing polar heel into Spec, NegP, but this time it is a NegP projection whose head contains the negative component of the PI on which polar heel is parasitic, which adjoins to Neg° as it raises from head to head to the matrix NegP. Finally, parasitic licensing does not involve movement but rather holds when polar heel can link up to a relationship that has been established between another PI (of the nonnegative, indefinite type) and a clausemate licenser (Neg or C). These mechanisms all share the property that the relation between the licenser and the PI is syntactically local.

The contribution by Bernhard Schwarz and Rajesh Bhatt, “Light Negation and Polarity,” deals with light negation in German and the bearing it might have on the semantics of “rescuing” positive PIs under negation. Though light negation employs the same morpheme as regular sentential negation (nicht), its syntactic distribution is shown to be quite different. The sentential negative marker nicht in German does not normally precede definite descriptions, indefinites, or disjunctions: definite descriptions generally scramble across nicht, the combination of nicht and indefinites results in a form of kein plus noun, and the equivalent of disjunction under the scope of negation is expressed in terms of a negative disjunction (weder . . . noch ‘neither . . . nor’). However, under certain circumstances nicht can appear preceding definite descriptions, indefinites, and disjunctions, and this is what the authors call light negation. Its distribution is discussed in detail in the chapter. It can be found in negative polar questions, in the antecedent of conditionals, in the scope of negative quantifiers, and in the scope of the German equivalent of surprised. This distribution leads to the claim that light negation is a kind of negative polarity item (NPI). At the same time, the authors note that light negation can appear in a context that normally does not license NPIs, namely in the main clause of a subjunctive conditional if the antecedent is interpreted counterfactually, for example, in If Fritz were stupid, he wouldn’t have answered question 3, on the interpretation that Fritz answered question 3 and he is not stupid. Finally, the authors also show that light negation appears as an instance of expletive negation in combination with bevor ‘before.’

Regarding the semantic properties of light negation, the authors carefully show that it takes scope over the entire clause in which it surfaces but immediately under
its licenser (under the assumption that light negation is an NPI). Moreover, the licenser must be of the antiadditive kind. Since light negation appears both as a contentful negation and as an expletive negation, which seemingly makes no semantic contribution, no unified semantic characterization is said to be possible. It is further shown that, unlike regular negation, light negation is not an antilicenser for positive polarity items in its scope. This observation leads to another important concern of the paper, that of the analysis of rescuing. Instances of rescuing are cases like those in (5): here, the PPI *some* is interpreted in the scope of negation, and this is somehow made possible by the presence of the NPI licensers *no one* and *surprised*:

(5) a. There is no one here who didn’t find some typos.
   b. I am surprised they didn’t find some typos.

Two possible accounts of rescuing are considered. Both assume that rescuing involves the licensing of an NPI. Where they differ is with respect to what this NPI is. On one view, inspired by observations in Ladusaw (1979), the negation itself is the NPI. On the other view, recently advocated in work by Anna Szabolcsi, the NPI is a “derived” one, consisting of the combination of *n’t* and *some* in (5a), for instance. The authors argue that the distribution of light negation in German bears on this issue, favoring the first approach.

Henriëtte de Swart’s “Marking and Interpretation of Negation: A Bidirectional Optimality Theory Approach” analyzes negative indefinites, a term that includes, for instance, English *nobody*, French *personne*, Polish *nikt*, and Spanish *nadie*. Building on earlier work in collaboration with Ivan Sag (de Swart and Sag 2002), de Swart regards negative indefinites as inherently negative, that is, as negative quantifiers. In order to account for negative concord, she assumes that multiple occurrences of negative indefinites do not necessarily result in the same number of semantic negative indefinites or negative quantifiers; although this is a possibility (“iteration”), it is also possible to interpret multiple occurrences of negative indefinites by “resumptive” quantification. This amounts to saying that $\lnot x, \lnot y, \lnot z \ R(x, y, z)$ is interpreted as $\lnot x, y, z \ R(x, y, z)$. Building on de Swart and Sag (2002), this chapter aims to account for the crosslinguistic variation in the distribution and interpretation of negative indefinites by using the tools of Optimality Theory (OT). To this end, de Swart proposes a series of often functionally motivated constraints that are argued to be ordered differently in different languages. These constraints are used both to generate the relevant structures and to interpret them.

A central constraint is FaithNeg, which requires that the nonaffirmative nature of the input is reflected in the output. This constraint is ranked the highest across languages. In particular, it is always ranked higher than *Neg, which demands avoiding negation in the output. A third important constraint is MaxNeg—mark the arguments of a negative chain. If *Neg is ranked higher than MaxNeg, the optimal way to express a meaning of the sort ‘it is not the case that somebody saw anything’ is in terms of indefinites under negation. The reverse order (MaxNeg higher than *Neg) results in the opposite: the optimal output to express the desired meaning being a series of negative indefinites. To account for the possibilities of interpretation of a series of
negative indefinites, a further constraint is introduced, namely IntNeg, according to which every negative expression in the input form is interpreted as contributing a semantic negation in the output. If *Neg, which also has a semantic application, is ranked higher than IntNeg, then a sequence of multiple negative expressions leads to a single negation in the semantics. The opposite order forces a double negation interpretation.

Since the constraints are ordered relative to individual languages, one would expect that in a given language, either negative indefinites are interpreted as giving rise to negative concord or they are interpreted as giving rise to multiple negations. As de Swart observes, however, the facts are more complex: as the relevant literature makes clear, there are various patterns across languages that would seem like “mixed” cases. One such mixed case arises when a preverbal negative indefinite gives rise to ambiguity. For instance, a sentence like personne n’est le fils de personne in French is ambiguous between ‘no one is the son of anyone’ or ‘everyone is the son of someone.’ Apart from ambiguities of negative indefinites, another mixed case that seems to pose a challenge to an OT perspective is given by languages where preverbal negative indefinites are said to differ from postverbal ones in that the preverbal ones do not give rise to negative concord, but the postverbal ones do (e.g., Italian, Spanish, or Portuguese; New Testament Greek; and older varieties of several Slavic languages). De Swart resolves the problems posed by mixed cases in two ways. The ambiguity of the preverbal negative indefinites is argued to stem from an overlap between the range of two constraints, meaning that in some contexts their order can be reversed. As for the asymmetric distribution of negative indefinites in languages like Italian, it is attributed to the workings of a highly ranked constraint that requires that some negative element (be it a negative indefinite or a sentential negation) appear preverbally. Why do these languages differ from languages that require preverbal negative indefinites to co-occur with a sentential negation (e.g., modern Slavic languages, Greek)? De Swart suggests that in strict negative-concord languages there is a constraint, MaxSN, that requires that a negative clause must contain an overt marker of sentential negation. This constraint is similar to but not identical with NegFirst, which requires that a marker of sentential negation occur in preverbal position; this is clearly shown by Afrikaans, which has an overt marker in sentential negation that occurs postverbally, thus satisfying MaxSN but not NegFirst. De Swart’s contribution raises the standard for approaches to negation and negative concord in that it aims to explain fine-grained variation that has not been accounted for in other theories.

2.3 Tense and Aspect

Alice ter Meulen’s chapter, “Cohesion in Temporal Context: Aspectual Adverbs as Dynamic Indexicals,” discusses the role of aspectual elements, in particular the adverbials not yet, still, already, and not anymore, in dynamic semantics. According to ter Meulen, the goal of dynamic semantics is to integrate a theory of sentence content with accounts of the complex structuring of information in discourse and in reasoning. This is a broad and sophisticated perspective on the role of dynamic interpretation, and she shows that aspectual information has a complex and subtle role to play.
The basic meanings of the adverbials can be captured in a simple static semantics. For example, as ter Meulen puts it, *John is already asleep* means that John has fallen asleep in the past and been asleep since. She then discusses two different ways in which this basic meaning can be made more complex as it is integrated into dynamic semantics. The first way is that it can be modified, in English through the use of prosody, to indicate “the speaker’s attitude regarding the flow of events or its perceived speed.” (Other languages may use different mechanisms, as ter Meulen points out.) For example, *John is already asleep* can indicate that the speaker didn’t expect John to be asleep yet. The second way in which the basic meanings of the aspectual adverbials can be modified as they are integrated into dynamic semantics concerns the partitioning of the information they convey into asserted and presupposed components. For example, *John is still asleep* presupposes that he was asleep and asserts that he is now asleep. This division into presupposed and asserted information allows an explanation of the patterns found in question-answer sequences like the following:

(6) a. A: Was John *still* asleep when Mary arrived?
   b. B: No, he was not asleep anymore.
   c. B: *No, he was already asleep.*
   d. B: No, he had not (even) fallen asleep yet.

Because *not anymore* in (6b) asserts an answer to (6a), and otherwise presupposes the same things (6a) does, it is a simple coherent answer. The incoherence of (6c) is due to the fact that *already* fails to match the partitioning induced by *still*, because *still* is basically about the end point of an event while *already* is about its initiation. (6d) shows that marked constructions are able to bring presupposed information into the foreground in such a way that it can be denied. This reasoning is represented in an explicit and formal way in the chapter.

This chapter also discusses the contrast between the perfect and past in asserting presupposed information. It is typically possible to use a sentence in the perfect to assert what is presupposed, but this is not possible with the past:

(7) a. John was already asleep. He had fallen asleep.
   b. ??John was already asleep. He fell asleep (again).

Ter Meulen takes this contrast to be due to a difference in how the two tenses affect the reference time. This contrast presents another example of how important semantic contrasts only come to the fore when aspectual elements are viewed in a dynamic setting.

In “Tense, Adverbials, and Quantification,” Toshiyuki Ogihara studies the interaction of tense and quantified temporal PPs such as *during every meeting* and *on a Sunday*. Examples like (8) pose a problem for compositional semantics:

(8) John cried during every meeting.

In (8), the adverbial has scope over *John cried*, but the past tense of *John cried* seems to restrict the interpretation of *every meeting* in such a way that it only quantifies
over past meetings. Ogihara’s solution is to say that the temporal anteriority of a past tense sentence is not contributed by its tense; rather, tense reflects the presence of a (covert or overt) higher temporal adverbial. In the case of (8), *during every meeting* is actually represented at LF as *during every meeting in the past*, and the past tense has no direct effect on the interpretation. This idea is similar to that of Vlach (1993) and can be connected to other literature such as Carlson and Spejewski (1997).

Ogihara’s chapter lays out in a very clear way some of the important lessons of thirty years of work on temporal semantics. In particular, he reviews arguments that show that tensed sentences do involve existential quantification over times, but that this quantification does not come from the tense itself. The quantification can be seen as coming from a covert or overt adverbial (Bäuerle and von Stechow 1980) or existential closure (Stump 1985, improving on Dowty 1979). Ogihara adopts Bäuerle and von Stechow’s approach.

Ogihara argues against one intuitively appealing way of dissolving the problem posed by (8), namely the possibility that the set of meetings being quantified over is limited to past meetings by pragmatic contextual restriction such as that which occurs in every quantified sentence (the familiar fact that *everybody arrived on time* doesn’t quantify over everyone in the world). Such an approach incorrectly predicts that example (9) (Ogihara’s [19]) can describe a situation in which not every meeting was past. For example, (9) cannot be used to describe the situation in (10), because meeting 3 is still in the future.

(9) Mary kissed John before every meeting.

(10) kissing 1  kissing 2  kissing 3
    meeting 1  meeting 2  meeting 3  now

(Interestingly, one could utter the present perfect sentence *Now Mary has kissed John before every meeting* at the time indicated by *now.*)

Pratt and Francez (2001) have presented a successful analysis of the phenomenon in (8). They include a temporal context variable *during I* in the interpretation of every temporally dependent expression, including temporal adverbials and tensed clauses. The temporal context variable of the widest-scope temporal expression is linked to the reference time, and this allows the pastness of (8) to affect the wide-scope adverbial’s interpretation. Ogihara reviews their account and then criticizes it on conceptual grounds. He then goes on to present his own account; Ogihara’s analysis is based on the earlier insights of Bäuerle and von Stechow, as mentioned above, but adds to it by attributing not only the existential quantification of past tense sentences to a wide-scope adverbial, but also the temporal anteriority itself. This means that the anteriority will be introduced into the semantics in such a way that any expressions that need to be dependent on it can be. Ogihara’s analysis of tense and temporal adverbials, in particular his idea that tense itself plays an indirect role while the adverbials play a more major role, is likely to be extremely fruitful in future work on temporal semantics.
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