1 Introduction

Some big questions:

- What is the role of quantity in language and cognition and how does it interact with individuation?

- What does the domain of individuals look like? How is it structured?

The more modest goals:

- Convince you that objects matter to the interpretation of states.

- Argue that, as in events, object quantization makes the right distinction in states.

- Suggest a part-structure account of (some) existential interpretation and link it to aspect.

1.1 The Phenomenon

Existential Interpretation A distinguishing property of stage-level/individual-level predicates: the availability of existential interpretation of subjects (EIS) which effects the interpretation of bare plurals (Carlson 1977; Kratzer 1988/1995).¹

* Many thanks to Marcin Morzycki, Alan Munn, and Cristina Schmitt for their helpful comments and discussion of the topics of this talk. Thanks also to audiences at the Midwest Workshop on Semantics and University of Maryland’s Syntax Lunch group. A majority of this research was conducted at Michigan State University and forms a core of my forthcoming dissertation.

¹ Intuitions concerning the interpretation of bare plurals are often not clear cut. However, for a majority of these sentences, the bare plural can be replaced by the singular indefinite which, ignoring the kind reading, display a contrast in acceptability.

(i) a. A fireman is available.
    b. *A fireman is altruistic.
- Stage-level states like (1b) license EIS.
- Individual-level states like (1a) do not license EIS.\(^2,3\)

(1)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{Firemen are altruistic.} & (*\text{EIS}) \\
b. & \text{Firemen are available.} & (\text{EIS}) \\
\end{align*}

**Status of Objects** For those predicates which have arguments other than a subject (transitive stative verbs), the type of the argument conditions the availability of EIS (Fernald 1994).\(^4\)

(2)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{Monkeys live in trees.} & (*\text{EIS}) \\
b. & \text{Tycoons own banks.} & (*\text{EIS}) \\
\end{align*}

(3)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{Monkeys live in these trees.} & (\text{EIS}) \\
b. & \text{Tycoons own this bank.} & (\text{EIS}) \\
\end{align*}

- How to account for the alternation of the availability of EIS?
- What does this account tell us about states?

1.2 **Roadmap**

i. Briefly discuss previous accounts of the phenomenon.

ii. Present new evidence concerning the range of the phenomenon.

iii. Propose an analysis and note some of its properties.

iv. Raise some unresolved issues and conclude.

2 **Previous Accounts**

Starting with Glasbey (1997), previous approaches have focused on discourse constraints.

---

2 The use of ‘license’ here reflects my approach to this phenomenon as an issue concerning the addition of an interpretation. Certainly one could also think of this as a filtering of the available range of interpretations.

3 My primary concern in this talk is the availability of EIS. As such, I will ignore the equally interesting issue of whether a generic interpretation of bare plural subjects is available in these sentences. Judgments will thus only be given concerning the EIS with a * indicating that EIS is unavailable.

4 While not directly relevant to this talk, I take this as strong evidence for the phrasal nature of stage-level/individual-level predicates, à la Verkuyl (1972).
Jäger (2001) proposes that the distinction is linked to a topic requirement. “Discourse linking principle: Every atomic clause has a topic.”

Kratzer & Selkirk’s (2007) refinement of Jäger (2001): “The source of the syntactic differences is the requirement that there must be a syntactically represented topic.”

(4) a. Ich vermute, dass Quäcksalber spínnen. (*EIS)
I suspect that quacks are crazy

b. Ich glaube, dass in diesem Baum Áffen leben. (EIS)
I think that in this tree monkeys live

c. Ich weiss, dass dieses Haus Maffíosi besitzen. (EIS)
I know that this house mafia members own

• In (4a), the topic can only be the subject Quacksalber ‘quacks’.
  – The subject Quacksalber ‘quacks’ must raise to topic position, becoming a topic, and the predicate is accented.

• In (4b), the topic is the object PP in diesem Baum ‘in these trees’.
  – The subject Affen ‘monkeys’ may remain low, be non-topicial, and the predicate can be deaccented.

• In (4c), the topic is a scrambled discourse-given object dieses Haus ‘this house’.
  – The subject Maffíosi ‘mafia members’ may remain low, be non-topicial, and the predicate can be deaccented.

These approaches predict that the availability of EIS is conditioned by the ability of the object to function as a topic.

• To be a topic, the object must be strong. Weak objects cannot be topics (Jäger 2001).
• But: The available data has only examined bare plural (weak) and demonstrative objects (strong).
There is a much wider range of possibilities that have not been pursued.

**QUESTION:** What types of object DPs license EIS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Noun</th>
<th>Bare Plural</th>
<th>Weak Numeral, Determiner, or Quantifier</th>
<th>Strong Determiner or Quantifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>count/mass</td>
<td>*EIS</td>
<td>EIS</td>
<td>*EIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantization</td>
<td>*EIS</td>
<td>EIS</td>
<td>*EIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak/strong</td>
<td>*EIS</td>
<td>*EIS</td>
<td>EIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Topic accounts depend on the distinction being made around weak/strong objects.

3 **The Observation**

For the following examples, a context is often helpful to make sense of the object.\(^5\)

(5)  
- a. Monkey Context: “Behind my house is mangrove forest.”
- b. Tycoon Context: “In this city there are over 50 privately owned banks.”

Mass noun objects do not license EIS.

(6)  
- a. Monkeys live on land. (*EIS)
- b. Tycoons own silverware. (*EIS)

Bare plural objects do not license EIS.

(7)  
- a. Monkeys live in trees. (*EIS)
- b. Tycoons own banks. (*EIS)

Singular indefinites can license EIS, though only marginally.\(^6\)

(8)  
- a. Monkeys live in a tree. (??EIS)
- b. Tycoons own a bank. (??EIS)

Bare plural numerals can license EIS, also marginally.

---

\(5\) I will return to the role of context in these examples later.

\(6\) When these sentences are presented in a list, their acceptability improves (Schmitt 1996).
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(9)  a. Monkeys live in three trees.  (?EIS)
    b. Tycoons own two banks.  (?EIS)

Weak quantifiers can license EIS.

(10) a. Monkeys live in several trees.  (EIS)
     b. Tycoons own several banks.  (EIS)
(11) a. Monkeys live in many trees.  (EIS)
     b. Tycoons own many banks.  (EIS)

Definites can license EIS.

(12) a. Monkeys live in the trees.  (EIS)
     b. Tycoons own the bank.  (EIS)

Demonstratives can license EIS.

(13) a. Monkeys live in these trees.  (EIS)
     b. Tycoons own this bank.  (EIS)

Strong quantifiers can license EIS.

(14) a. Monkeys live in every tree.  (EIS)
     b. Tycoons own every bank.  (EIS)
(15) a. Monkeys live in each tree.  (EIS)
     b. Tycoons own each bank.  (EIS)

The following table groups and summarizes the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mass Noun/</th>
<th>Weak Determiners/</th>
<th>Weak-Strong Quantifiers/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bare Plural</td>
<td>Bare Plural</td>
<td>Numerals</td>
<td>Strong Determiners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*EIS</td>
<td>?EIS</td>
<td>EIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Bare plurals, although count, cannot license EIS. → Evidence against count/mass.
- Weak quantifiers, which cannot be topics, do license EIS. → Evidence against weak/strong.
- Weak determiners and numerals can license EIS although with more difficulty (a point I return to at the end). → Evidence for quantization.
3.1 Interim Conclusion 1

- The availability of EIS is linked to the quantization of the object.
- Quantization of objects is also the characterization of objects which lead to an alternation in telicity (Verkuyl 1972).

(16) a. Robby ate food *in an hour. (Mass Noun)
b. Robby ate sandwiches *in an hour. (Bare Plural)
c. Robby ate a sandwich in an hour. (Singular Indefinite)
d. Robby ate two sandwiches in an hour. (Bare Numeral)
e. Robby ate many sandwiches in an hour. (Weak Quantifier)
f. Robby ate the sandwich in an hour. (Definite)
g. Robby ate these sandwiches in an hour. (Demonstrative)
h. Robby ate every sandwich in an hour. (Strong Quantifier)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Mass Noun/ Weak Determiners/} & \text{Weak-Strong Quantifiers/} \\
\text{Bare Plural} & \text{Weak Determiners/} & \text{Strong Determiners} \\
\text{Bare Plural} & *\text{EIS} & ?\text{EIS} & \text{EIS} \\
\text{Telicity} & *\text{in X time} & \text{in X time} & \text{in X time} \\
\end{array}
\]

4 The Analysis

GOALS

- Capture the similarity between the conditions which license EIS and telicity.
- Explain how part-structure may license EIS.

In two parts:

i. First, I will argue that the VPs of state predicates are composed together through the same mechanisms used for event predicate composition.

ii. Second, I will suggest how EIS arises from the part structure enforced on the subject.
4.1 The Composition of Stative VPs

**Observation:** For events, arguments have been made for two types of VPs: homogeneous (atelic) and quantized (telic).

- **Kratzer (2004)** derives the two types of event VPs through the meaning of the accusative case.
  - The Object-to-Event mapping makes the event homogeneous whenever the part-structure of the object is homogeneous.
  - The Object-to-Event mapping makes the event quantized whenever the part-structure of the object is quantized.

(17) \[ [\text{ACC}] = \lambda R_{(e, (s, t))} \lambda x \lambda e [R(x)(e) \& \forall x'[x' \leq x \rightarrow \exists e'[e' \leq e \& R(x')(e')]] \]

- Accusative case enters into the composition of the VP as shown in (18).

(18) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\langle s, t \rangle \\
\downarrow \\
\langle e, \langle s, t \rangle \rangle \\
\downarrow \\
\text{DP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{ACC}_{\langle (e, (s, t)), \langle e, (s, t) \rangle \rangle} \\
\downarrow \\
\lambda_1 \\
\downarrow \\
V_{\langle e, (s, t) \rangle} \\
\end{array}
\]

- **Observation:** Telicity and EIS are both sensitive to the quantization of their objects.
- **Proposal:** Eventive VPs and stative VPs both compose in the manner of (18).

---

7 Semantic types: individuals, e; eventualities, s; and propositions, t.
Variables: over individuals, x and y; over eventualities, e for events and s for states.
This captures the similarity between eventive and stative VPs.

Example of a homogeneous stative VP (19) and a quantized stative VP (20).

(19) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{[own banks]} &= \\
\lambda s[\text{own}(s)(\text{banks}) & \land \forall x'[x' \leq \text{banks} \rightarrow \exists s'[s' \leq s & \land \text{own}(s')(x')]]
\end{align*}
\]

(20) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{[own this bank]} &= \\
\lambda s[\text{own}(s)(\text{this-bank}) & \land \forall x'[x' \leq \text{this-bank} \rightarrow \exists s'[s' \leq s & \land \text{own}(s')(x')]]
\end{align*}
\]

**QUESTION:** How are eventive and stative sentences different?

- *(Kratzer 1996)* introduce the external argument though a Voice head using Event Identification, given in (21).

- The aktionsart of the eventuality variable selects for the thematic role of the external argument as a constraint on Event Identification.
  
  - Eventive eventualities select for an eventive Voice head (bearing the Agent relation).
  
  - Stative eventualities select for a stative Voice head (bearing the Holder relation).

- **SUGGESTION:** In addition to specifying the external argument’s relation to the stative eventuality, the stative Voice head also enforces an Event-to-Object mapping as given in (22).²
  
  - The Event-to-Object mapping makes the individual homogeneous whenever the part-structure of the state is homogeneous.
  
  - The Event-to-Object mapping makes the individual quantized whenever the part-structure of the state is quantized.

² A similar mapping is also needed in events, although it is an Object-to-Event mapping as the part-structure of the subject affects the part-structure of the event.

(i) a. Settlers crossed the desert for years.
   b. #The settlers crossed the desert for years.
(21) Event Identification:
\[ f_{(e,(s,t))} \quad g_{(s,t)} \rightarrow h_{(e,(s,t))} \]
\[ \lambda x \lambda e [f(x)(e)] \quad \lambda e [g(e)] \rightarrow \lambda x \lambda e [f(x)(e) & g(e)] \]

(22) \[ \text{Voice}_s = \lambda x \lambda s [\text{Holder}(s)(x) & \forall s' [s' \leq s \rightarrow \exists y'[y' \leq x & \tau(y') = \tau(s')]]] \]
where \( x \) ranges over stages of individuals and \( s \) over states

(23)
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\langle s, t \rangle \\
\text{DP} \\
\langle e, \langle s, t \rangle \rangle \text{ (by Event Identification)}
\end{array} \]
\[ \text{Voice}_{(e, \langle s, t \rangle)} \langle s, t \rangle \]

The following denotations are given for a homogeneous state (24) and a quantized state (25).

(24) \[ \text{[Tycoons own banks]} = \lambda s [\text{Holder}(s)(\text{tycoons}) & \forall s' [s' \leq s \rightarrow \exists y'[y' \leq \text{tycoons} & \tau(y') = \tau(s')]] & \text{own}(s)(\text{banks}) & \forall x'[x' \leq \text{banks} \rightarrow \exists s'[s' \leq s & \text{own}(s')(x')]]] \]

(25) \[ \text{[Tycoons own this bank]} = \lambda s [\text{Holder}(s)(\text{tycoons}) & \forall s' [s' \leq s \rightarrow \exists y'[y' \leq \text{tycoons} & \tau(y') = \tau(s')]] & \text{own}(s)(\text{this-bank}) & \forall x'[x' \leq \text{this-bank} \rightarrow \exists s'[s' \leq s & \text{own}(s')(x')]]] \]

Evidence for Voice in States Kratzer (1996) proposes that Voice both introduces the external argument and assigns accusative case to the object. She suggests that the presence of Voice can be detected in different types of nominalizations.

- In of-\text{ing} gerunds, -\text{ing} attaches to the verb, preventing assignment of accusative case to the object and thus also blocking Voice.
  - The genitive DP may express “a general notion of relatedness of which the agent relation is but a special case” to the event.

- In poss-\text{ing} gerunds, -\text{ing} attaches to the VP. Accusative case is assigned to the object and Voice must project.
  - The genitive DP must express the agent relation to the event.
(26) We remember Maria’s reading of *Pride and Prejudice*.
   a. Maria is the Agent of the reading *Pride and Prejudice* event.
   b. Maria is only related to the reading *Pride and Prejudice* event.

(27) We remember Maria’s reading *Pride and Prejudice*.
   a. Maria is the Agent of the reading *Pride and Prejudice* event.
   b. *Maria is only related to the reading *Pride and Prejudice* event.

QUESTION: Can we use the same test to detect the presence of Voice in stative verbs?

Yes we can.

*Context:* We all know that sometimes political pundits fake their personal feelings when speaking to their base. You know, anything for the rating!

(28) Glenn Beck’s hating of Obama was contagious.
   a. Glenn Beck is the Holder of the hating Obama state.
   b. Glenn Beck is only related to the hating Obama state.

(29) Glenn Beck’s hating Obama was contagious.
   a. Glenn Beck is the Holder of the hating Obama state.
   b. *Glenn Beck is only related to the hating Obama state.

Two further predictions arise from the hypothesis that Voice is the locus of EIS.

- By assigning accusative case to their objects, poss-ing gerunds should alternate in the availability of EIS given their object.
- By not assigning accusative case to their objects, of-ing gerunds should not alternate in the availability of EIS given their object.
  - Furthermore, the subjects of of-ing gerunds, lacking Voice, should be unable to license EIS.

To the extent these judgments are clear, all are born out.

(30) a. News anchors’ hating these politicians was contagious. (EIS)
    b. News anchors’ hating politicians was contagious. (*EIS)

(31) a. News anchors’ hating of these politicians was contagious. (*EIS)
    b. News anchors’ hating of politicians was contagious. (*EIS)
4.2 The Interpretation of Subjects

GOALS: Link the availability of EIS to the temporal part-structure of states.\(^9\)

- Ladasaw (1994) and McNally (1998) both discuss stage-level/individual-level predicates in terms of thetic/categorical judgments.
  - Stage-level predicates are thetic statements, i.e. statements “about” events.
  - Individual-level predicates are categorical statements, i.e. statements “about” individuals.

However, states in general are taken to be “about” individuals.

- My suggestion: Think about stage-level/individual-level states in terms of stages of individuals.
  - Stage-level predicates are statements “about” some a stage of an individual.
  - Individual-level predicates are statements “about” all the stages of an individual.

QUESTION: How does the part-structure of the VP relate to the stages of the subject?

- When the VP is homogeneous (has a homogeneous object), the state applies to homogeneous stages of the subject (24).
  - As these stages compose the individual itself, no particular spatiotemporal stage of the individual is acquired and EIS is blocked.

- When the VP is quantized (has a quantized object), the state applies to only a quantized stage of the subject (25).
  - This quantized stage, as a particular spatiotemporal slice of the individual, guarantees existence.

\(^9\) This approach is somewhat akin to suggestions from Chierchia (1998) about using parts across worlds to understand genericity.
4.3 Interim Conclusions

- EIS (like telicity) is a matter of aspect, i.e. the internal temporal make up of an individual, i.e. the stages of an individual.

- Predicates are always predicated of stages of individuals.
  - Homogeneous predicates apply to homogeneous stages of the subject.
  - Quantized predicates apply to a quantized stage of the subject.

5 Extensions

5.1 Lifetime Effects

Musan (1995, 1997) and others (Percus 1997; Maienborn 2004; Magri 2006) have proposed that lifetime effects are pragmatic.

- Musan (1997), for instance, captures lifetime effects through...
  - a lifetime presupposition (given in bold) in (33a)
  - and Grice’s Maximum of Quantity as in (33b).

(32) Gregory was from America.

(33) a. \([\text{be from America}]^c = \text{the function } f : D_i \rightarrow D_{(e,t)}\), such that, for any \(t \in D_i\), \(f(t) = \text{the partial function } g : D \rightarrow 0, 1\), such that, for any \(x \in D\), \(x \text{ is the domain of } g \text{ iff } x \text{ is alive at } t\), and for any \(x\) in the domain of \(g\), \(g(x) = 1 \text{ iff } x\) is from America at \(t\).

b. Since being from America is a property that, if it holds of an individual at all, holds of that individual over its entire lifetime, and since the speaker has implicated that Gregory’s beings from America is over, the speaker has implicated furthermore that Gregory is dead.

- QUESTION: How does the lifetime presupposition come about in the first place?

- Suggestion: Lifetime effects are derived from the quantization of predicate.
  - Homogeneous predicates apply to homogeneous stages of the subject, i.e. the individual itself. Lifetime effects arise because all of the stages of the individual are put in the past.
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– Quantized predicates apply to a quantized stage of the subject, i.e. a stage of the individual. Lifetime effects do not arise because only some stage of the individual is put in the past.

Evidence: The lifetime implicature is much weaker in (34b) compared to (34a).

    b. John owned this bank. ̸⇝ John is dead.

5.2 Temporal Modification

Percus (1997) notes that not all temporal modification is ruled out for individual-level predicates.

(35)  a. #John was tall yesterday.
    b. John was tall in his adulthood.

He argues that out-of-the-blue utterances are evaluated with respect to our world knowledge, i.e. world knowledge forms the basic context.

• Properties which tend to not change from one situation to the next, i.e. those which tend to be stable over time (36), are not acceptable with temporal modifiers...

– Unless a sufficient context is available which suspends their temporal stability.

– Or the temporal modifier itself establishes a period of time compatible with our world knowledge.

(36) \[ P \text{ is tendentially stable iff } \forall s_1, s_2 \in Wd, x [P(s_1)(x) = 1 \land s_2 \text{ follows } s_1 \text{ temporally } \land P(s_2)(x) \text{ is defined}] \rightarrow P(s_2)(x) = 1 \]

QUESTION: How do we know that a predicate is tendentially stable?

• Agree with Percus (1997), but suggest that stability rides on the part-structure of the state, i.e. is determined in part by the semantics.

• Tendentially stable properties (individual-level predicates) are homogeneous states.
– A homogeneous state has only one “part”, namely itself, which extends indefinitely.

• Properties which are do not tend to be stable (stage-level predicates) are quantized states.

– A quantized state can have multiple parts, which can come and go.

Modification by yesterday is improved in (37b) compared to (37a).

(37) a. #John owned banks yesterday.
    b. John owned this bank yesterday.

6 Unresolved Issues

6.1 Licensing EIS by Locatives

Another hallmark of stage-level/individual-level predicates is their compatibility with locative modifiers (Carlson 1977; Kratzer 1988/1995).

(38) a. John is available in the next room.
    b. #John is altruistic in the next room.

(39) . . . weil fast alle Schwäne in Australien schwarz sind.
    since almost all swans in Australia black are
    a. . . . since most all of the swans in Australia are black.
    b. *. . . since most all swans are black in Australia.

(40) . . . weil fast alle Flüchtlinge in dieser Stadt umgekommen sind.
    since almost all refugees in this city perished are
    a. . . . since almost all of the refugees in this city perished.
    b. . . . since all the refugees perished in this city.

The (a) readings: the locative modifies the restricting predicate of the quantifier.
The (b) readings: the locative modifies the main predicate of the sentence.

• We would expect a predicate’s compatibility with locative modifiers to be sensitive to the type of object . . .

• But, locative modifiers are acceptable with these predicates.
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- When present they license EIS.
- Even when the object does not!

(41) a. Monkeys live in these trees around here. (EIS)
   b. Tycoons own this house near here. (EIS)
(42) a. Monkeys live in trees around here. (EIS)
   b. Tycoons own houses near here. (EIS)

Jäger (2001) and Kratzer & Selkirk (2007), operating under a topic-based approach, propose that a silent locative or temporal pronoun could function as a topic.

- Stage-level predicates are compatible with locative modification.
- Individual-level predicates are incompatible with locative modification.

(43) a. Ich hab’ geträumt, dass (dann) der Rhéin ausgetrocknet ist. (EIS)
    I have dreamed that (then) the Rhine dried up is
   b. Ich vermute, dass (*dann) Quácksalber spínnen. (*EIS)
    I suspect that (then) quacks are crazy.

- SUGGESTION: There is a second route to EIS.
- Silent/overt locatives may license EIS.

6.2 Licensing EIS through Discourse Context

Glasbey (1997) argues that discourse context may license EIS.

- Glasbey (1997) argues that EIS is unlicensed in (44).
- But the addition of discourse context allows EIS in (45).

10 Glasbey (1997) does not provide judgments for the other predicates conjoined in (45). I find these acceptable with EIS, presumably due to past tense, the predicate type for on sale, and the eventive predicate break out.

(i) a. Drugs were on sale. (EIS)
    b. Fights broke out. (EIS)
(44) Drinkers were under-age. (**EIS)

(45) John was shocked by his visit to the Red Lion. Drinkers were under-age, drugs were on sale, and a number of fights broke out while he was there.

**Observation:** (45) includes not only discourse context, but also an explicit locative, there (Jäger 2001; Kratzer & Selkirk 2007).

• (46) corrects for the locative (and the tense), and EIS appears to still be available (though my judgments here are far more questionable).

(46) The inspector was impressed on his visit to the Green Door and indicated so to the owner. "You’re doing a good job enforcing the age-limit. Drinkers are over 21 years old.”

The Intuition: To the extent that EIS is licensed in (46), the discourse makes a location accessible.

• Suggestion: Discourse context may be used to license silent locatives.
• Even for those predicates whose subjects Kratzer & Selkirk (2007) argues must be topics, discourse context may license EIS.
  – These seem to be the same places where an overt locative can be used.

(47) Mark visited the mental health hospital today and he told me. . .
  a. “Mental health patients are crazy!”
  b. “Mental health patients are crazy there!”

However, even with the given contexts, (6) and (7) (repeated in (49) and (50) below) seemed unable to license EIS.

(48) a. Monkey Context: “Behind my house is mangrove forest.”
  b. Tycoon Context: “In this city there are over 50 privately owned banks.”
(49) a. Monkeys live on land. (*EIS)  
b. Tycoons own silverware. (*EIS)  
(50) a. Monkeys live in trees. (*EIS)  
b. Tycoons own banks. (*EIS)

Ultimately, we may need to use other related phenomena (such as Kratzer & Selkirk’s (2007) observations about phrasal stress) to determine the presence of a silent locative.

6.3 Generic Interpretation of Subjects and Objects

Subjects Homogeneous predication of stages of an individual may not give us the exceptionality of generic interpretation.

- *Tycoons own banks* does not mean that every stage of every tycoon is a holder of a bank-owning state.

- However, (eventive) homogeneous predicates are known to tolerate certain types of exceptions.
  - (51) allows for pauses in the overall running event (for getting a drink of water, retying shoes, etc.)
  - And (51) has a certain grain size – it is only homogeneous down to atoms (Rothstein 2004).

(51) John ran for an hour.

Objects One objection to the observation about quantization as the proper characterization of the objects licensing EIS is that the objects which fail to license EIS are themselves not interpreted existentially.

- This can be readily seen when objects are construed generically.

(52) a. Monkeys live in many kinds of trees. (*EIS)  
b. Tycoons own many types of banks. (*EIS)  
(53) a. Monkeys live in each kind of tree. (*EIS)  
b. Tycoons own every type of bank. (*EIS)
• The suggestion then is that mass noun and bare plural objects are impossible to construe as existential objects.
  – Even with strong existential-biasing contexts.

• The account may be more complicated.

• How do homogeneous/quantized objects interact with existential interpretation?

6.4 Evidence for Quantization in Stative VPs

**QUESTION:** Can we find evidence that stative VPs are homogeneous/quantized?

• Hinrichs (1985) argues that adverbs like *twice* are sensitive to the telicity of their predicate.

(54)  
  a. *John ate sandwiches twice.
  b. John ate a sandwich twice.

• Adverbs like *twice* may be sensitive to VP quantization, i.e. require an quantized eventuality.

• We would expect a contrast like that in (54) to be present in (55).
  – But the contrast does not come out.

(55)  
  a. John owned houses twice.
  b. John owned this house twice.

• Observation 1: Hinrichs’s (1985) judgment needs clarification.
  – (54a) is acceptable under an interpretation where John has participated in two sandwich-eating events.
  – And (54b) also seems to have this two event reading.

• Observation 2: There seems to be some contrast between (55a) and (55b).
  – Whatever accounts for the acceptable interpretation of (54a) may help clarify the interpretational difference between (55a) and (55b).
7 Conclusions

- States, like events, are sensitive to the types of their objects.
  - The distinction which makes the right cut is quantization.
  - Evidence against topic-based proposals to capture the alternation of EIS (due to objects).

- EIS is an aspectual issue.
  - Stative predicates apply to stages of individuals.
  - The part-structure of the subject inherits the quantization of the state.
  - EIS derived from the part-structure of the individual.
    * Homogeneous stative predicates apply to all the stages of the individual.
    * Quantized stative predicates apply to a stage of the individual, ensuring existence.

- Quantization derives some of the temporal behaviors of individuals in stage-level/individual-level predicates.
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