1 Introduction

Some big questions:

• What is the role of quantity (i.e. quantization) 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 distinguishes between types of states.

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

1.1 The Phenomenon

1.1.1 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).\(^1\)

• Stage-level states like (1a) license EIS.

---

* 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, University of Maryland’s Syntax Lunch group, and GLOW 33. 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, as given in (i).
Individual-level states like (1b) do not license EIS.²,³

(1)  a. Firemen are available. (EIS)
    b. Firemen are altruistic. (*EIS)

1.1.2 Object Effects

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

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

• QUESTIONS:
  – 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 object effects.

ii. Present new evidence concerning the range of object effects.

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

(i)  a. A fireman is available.
    b. *A fireman is altruistic.

2 The use of ‘license’ here reflects my approach to this phenomenon as one 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 judged to be 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).
iv. Extend the analysis to other related phenomena.

v. Raise some unresolved issues and conclude.

2 Previous Accounts

Starting with Glasbey (1997), previous approaches have focused on the role of discourse in licensing EIS.

- 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 spinnen. (*EIS)
   I suspect that quacks are crazy

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

   c. Ich weiss, dass dieses Haus Mafia 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 (5a).
- 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 (5b).
- In (4c), the topic is a scrambled discourse-given object dieses Haus ‘this house’.
  – The subject Maffiosis ‘mafia members’ may remain low, be non-topicial, and the predicate can be deaccented (5c).
2.1 Predictions

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></th>
<th>Mass Noun</th>
<th>Bare Plural</th>
<th>Weak Numeral, 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>
<td>EIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantization</td>
<td>*EIS</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>
<td>EIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

3 The Observation

3.1 Objects Effects Revisited

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

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

⁵The role context plays in these examples may have broader implications which, given time, I will return to. See 7.3.2 for more discussion.
Mass noun objects do not license EIS.

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

Bare plural objects do not license EIS.

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

Singular indefinites can license EIS, though only marginally.6

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

Bare plural numerals can license EIS, also marginally.

(10) a. Monkeys live in three trees. (?EIS)  
b. Tycoons own two banks. (?EIS)

Weak quantifiers can license EIS.

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

Definites can license EIS.

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

---

6 When these sentences are presented in a list, their acceptability improves (Schmitt 1996).

(i) Monkeys live in a tree, bats live in a cave, and weasels live in a burrow.
Demonstratives can license EIS.

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

Strong quantifiers can license EIS.

(15) a. Monkeys live in every tree.  (EIS)
    b. Tycoons own every bank.  (EIS)
(16) 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/ ≥2</th>
<th>Weak Detenniners/ Numerals</th>
<th>Weak-Strong Quantifiers/ Strong Detenniners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bare Plural</td>
<td>*EIS</td>
<td>?EIS</td>
<td>EIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Bare plurals, although count, cannot license EIS.
  \[→\text{Evidence against count/mass.}\]
- Weak quantifiers, which cannot be topics, do license EIS.
  \[→\text{Evidence against weak/strong.}\]
- Weak determiners and numerals can license EIS (although with more difficulty).
  \[→\text{Evidence for quantization.}\]

3.2 Quantization in Eventualities

- The availability of EIS is linked to the quantization of the object.  

7 The following definitions should serve as a guide post for whether a nominal is quantized or not, taking Borer’s (2005) notion of quantity to stand in for quantized.

(i) c. Quantity

\[P \text{ is quantity iff } P \text{ is not homogeneous}\]

d. Homogeneous

\[P \text{ is homogeneous iff } P \text{ is cumulative and divisive}\]

i. \[P \text{ is cumulative iff } \forall x, y [P(x) \land P(y) \rightarrow P(x \cup y)]\]

ii. \[P \text{ is divisive iff } \forall x [P(x) \rightarrow \exists y [P(y) \land y < x] \land \forall x, y [P(x) \land P(y) \land y < x \rightarrow P(x - y)]]\]
Quantization of objects is also the characterization of objects which lead to an alternation in telicity as given in (17) (Verkuyl 1972).

(17) 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)

3.3 Interim Conclusion 1

Mass Noun/ Weak Determiners/ Weak-Strong Quantifiers/
Bare Plural  Numerals  Strong Determiners
Bare Plural  *EIS  ?EIS  EIS
Telicity  *in X time  in X time  in X time

4 The Analysis

GOALS

• Capture the similarity between the conditions which license EIS and those which license telicity.

• Explain how quantization originating with the object may license EIS.

In two parts:

i. First, I will argue that the VPs of state predicates are composed together using the same mechanisms which compose event predicate VPs.

ii. Second, I will suggest that EIS arises from the part structure enforced on the subject.

4.1 The Composition of Stative VPs

4.1.1 The Proposal for Events

Observation: There are two types of eventive VPs: homogeneous (atelic) and quantized (telic).
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- **Kratzer (2004)** derives the two types of eventive VPs through the meaning of the accusative case.

- Accusative case enforces an Object-to-Event mapping (Krifka 1998) through the denotation given in (18) (simplifying Kratzer’s (2004) proposal for clarity of exposition).  

  - 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.

\[(18) \quad \text{Object-to-Event Mapping} \quad \boxed{\text{ACC}} = \lambda R_{(e,(s,t))} \lambda e \lambda [R(x)(e) \& \forall x' [x' \leq x \rightarrow \exists e' [e' \leq e \& R(x')(e')]]} \]

- Accusative case enters into the composition of the VP as shown in (19).

\[(19) \quad \text{Variables: over individuals, } x \text{ and } y; \text{ over eventualities, } e \text{ for events and } s \text{ for states.} \]

8 Semantic types: individuals, \(e\); eventualities, \(s\); and propositions, \(t\).

9 Kratzer’s (2004) final proposal for the meaning of ACC takes non-trivial part structures of objects into account which are often at stake when determining telicity. She supplies a measure function \(f\) and suggests that “general cognitive mechanisms” determine the proper measuring function of the object referent.

\[(i) \quad \boxed{\text{ACC}} = \lambda R_{(e,(s,t))} \lambda e \lambda [R(x)(e) \& \exists f \text{ measure}(f) \& \forall x' [x' \leq f(x) \rightarrow \exists e' [e' \leq e \& R(x')(e')]]} \]
4.1.2 The Proposal for States

- **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 (19).

– This captures the similarity between eventive and stative VPs.

Example of a homogeneous stative VP (20) and a quantized stative VP (21).

(20) \[own \text{banks} = \lambda_s[own(s)(\text{banks}) \& \forall x'[x' \leq \text{banks} \rightarrow \exists s'[s' \leq s \& own(s')(x')]]] \]

(21) \[own \text{this bank} = \lambda_s[own(s)(\text{this-bank}) \& \forall x'[x' \leq \text{this-bank} \rightarrow \exists s'[s' \leq s \& own(s')(x')]]] \]

4.2 The Interpretation of Subjects

4.2.1 Making Sense of Part-Structure and EIS

**Goals**: Link the availability of EIS to the part-structure of states.\(^\text{10}\)

- Ladusaw (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” a stage of an individual.

\(^{10}\)This approach is somewhat akin to suggestions from Chierchia (1998) about using parts of individuals across worlds to understand genericity.
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.
  - 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.
  - This quantized stage, as a particular spatiotemporal slice of the individual, guarantees existence.

Under this conception, EIS is about the aspectual makeup of the individual.

### 4.2.2 The Mechanics

**QUESTION:** How do we relate VP part-structure to the subject’s part-structure?

- *(Kratzer 1996)* introduce the external argument through a Voice head using Event Identification, given in (22).

- 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).
  - Note: This distinguishes eventive and stative sentences.

- **SUGGESTION:** In addition to specifying the external argument’s relation to the stative eventuality, the stative Voice head also enforces an Event-to-Object
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mapping as given in (23).\(^{11,12}\)

- 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.

\[\text{(22) Event Identification:} \quad f(e, (s, t)) \quad g(s) \quad \rightarrow \quad h(e, (s, t)) \quad \lambda x \lambda e[e(f(x)(e))] \quad \lambda e[g(e)] \quad \rightarrow \quad \lambda x \lambda e[e(f(x) \& g(e))]\]

\[\text{(23) } [\text{Voice}_S]\ = \lambda x \lambda s[\text{Holder}(s)(x) \& \forall s' [s' \leq s \rightarrow \exists x' [x' \leq x \& \tau(x') = \tau(s')]]]\]

The external argument is introduced by Event Identification as in (24).

\[\text{(24) } \langle s, t \rangle\]
\[\langle e, (s, t) \rangle \quad \text{(by Event Identification)}\]
\[\text{DP} \quad \text{Voice}_{e, (s, t)} \quad \langle s, t \rangle\]

11 Evidence given in (i) suggests that a similar mapping appears to also be needed in events, although it is another Object-to-Event mapping as the part-structure of the subject affects the part-structure of the event, given in (ii).

(i) a. Settlers crossed the desert for years.
   b. #The settlers crossed the desert for years.

(ii) \[\text{[Voice}_E\] = \lambda x \lambda s[\text{Agent}(e)(x) \& \forall s' [e' \leq x \rightarrow \exists x' [x' \leq x \& \text{Agent}(e')(x')]]\]

12 The stative voice head as proposed in (23) enforced the temporal intervals of the state and the stage of the individual to be the same. Alternatively, the stative voice head could enforce a different relation between the subpart of the state and the substage of the individual, for instance, the Holder relation as in (i).

(i) \[\text{[Voice}_S\] = \lambda x \lambda s[\text{Holder}(s)(x) \& \forall s' [s' \leq s \rightarrow \exists x' [x' \leq x \& \text{Holder}(s')(x')]]\]
The following denotations including the external argument are given for a homogeneous state (25) and a quantized state (26).

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

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

4.2.3 Evidence for Voice in States

Kratzer (1996) proposes that Voice preforms two functions.

- Voice introduces the external argument, and...
- Voice assigns accusative case to the object.

She suggests that the presence of Voice can be detected in different types of nominalizations.

- In of-ing gerunds, -ing attaches to the verb, preventing assignment of accusative case to the object and thus also blocking Voice as in (27).
  - The genitive DP may express “a general notion of relatedness of which the agent relation is but a special case” to the event, given in (29).

- In poss-ing gerunds, -ing attaches to the VP. Accusative case is assigned to the object and Voice must project as in (28).\(^{13}\)
  - The genitive DP must express the agent relation to the event, given in (30).

(27) \[ \text{[DP Maria’s [NP [N -ing read ] [PP of Pride and Prejudice ] ] ]} \]

(28) \[ \text{[DP Maria’s [NP -ing [VoiceP Voice [VP read [DP Pride and Prejudice ] ] ] ] ]} \]

\(^{13}\) More needs to be said on how the relationship between the genitive and Voice is structurally established as -ing appears to intervene in (28).
(29) 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.

(30) 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 statives?

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!

(31) 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.

(32) 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.

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

(34) a. News anchors’ hating of these politicians was contagious. (*EIS)
    b. News anchors’ hating of politicians was contagious. (*EIS)
### 4.3 Interim Conclusion 2

- EIS is a matter of aspect, i.e. the internal temporal make up of an individual; that is, the stages of an individual.

- Predicates are always predicating 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 (36a)
  
  - and Grice’s Maximum of Quantity as in (36b).

\[(35)\quad \text{Gregory was from America.}\]

\[(36)\quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{[be from America]}_c = \text{the function } f : D_i \rightarrow D_{(e,t)}, \text{ such that, for any } t \in D_i, f(t) = \text{the partial function } g : D \rightarrow 0, 1, \text{ such that, for any } x \in D, x \text{ is the domain of } g \text{ iff } x \text{ is alive at } t, \text{ and for any } x \in \text{the domain of } g, g(x) = 1 \text{ iff } x \text{ is from America at } t. \\
\text{b. } & \text{Since being from America is a property that, if it holds of an individual at all, holds of that individual over its entire lifetime, and since the speaker has implicated that Gregory’s beings from America is over, the speaker has implicated furthermore that Gregory is dead.}\end{align*}\]

- **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.
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 (37b) compared to (37a).

(37) a. John owned banks.  \(\rightsquigarrow\) John is dead.
    b. John owned this bank.  \(\not\Rightarrow\) John is dead.

5.2 Temporal Modification

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

(38) 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 (world knowledge forms the basic context), and that part of our world knowledge is whether a property tends to be stable from one time point to another.

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

• Properties which tend to not change from one situation to the next, i.e. those which tend to be stable over time (39), 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.

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

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

• Properties which tend to be stable (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 (40b) compared to (40a).

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

6 Conclusions

- States, like events, are sensitive to the types of their objects.
  - Some evidence against topic-based proposals for the alternation of EIS.
  - The distinction which makes the right cut is quantization.

- EIS is an aspectual issue.
  - Stative predicates apply to stages of individuals.
  - The part-structure of the subject is inherited from the quantization of the state.
  - EIS is 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.

7 Appendix: Unresolved Issues

7.1 Licensing EIS by Locatives

Another hallmark of stage-level/individual-level predicates is their compatibility with locative modifiers (Carlson 1977; Kratzer 1988/1995).
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.
  – When present they license EIS.
  – Even when the object does not!

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.

SUGGESTION: There is a second route to EIS.
• Silent/overt locatives may license EIS.
7.2 Licensing EIS through Discourse Context

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

- Glasbey (1997) argues that EIS is unlicensed in (45).
- But the addition of discourse context allows EIS in (46).\textsuperscript{14}

(45) Drinkers were under-age. (*EIS)

(46) 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.

\textbf{Observation:} (46) includes not only discourse context, but also an explicit locative, \textit{there} (Jäger 2001; Kratzer & Selkirk 2007).

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

(47) 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 (47), 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.

\textsuperscript{14} Glasbey (1997) does not provide judgments for the other predicates conjoined in (46). I find these acceptable with EIS, presumably due to past tense, the predicate type for \textit{on sale}, and the eventive predicate \textit{break out}.

(i) a. Drugs were on sale. \textit{(EIS)}
    b. Fights broke out. \textit{(EIS)}
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- These seem to be the same places where an overt locative can be used.

(48) 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, (7) and (8) (repeated in (50) and (51) below) seemed unable to license EIS.

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

(50) a. Monkeys live on land. (*EIS)
    b. Tycoons own silverware. (*EIS)
(51) a. Monkeys live in trees. (*EIS)
    b. Tycoons own banks. (*EIS)

- But, these might not be the right contexts to license silent locatives.

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

7.3 Generic Interpretation of Subjects and Objects

7.3.1 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.
  - (52) allows for pauses in the overall running event (for getting a drink of water, retying shoes, etc.)
  - And (52) has a certain grain size – it is only homogeneous down to atoms (Rothstein 2004).
(52) John ran for an hour.

7.3.2 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 as kinds.

(53) a. Monkeys live in many kinds of trees. (*EIS)  
    b. Tycoons own many types of banks. (*EIS)

(54) a. Monkeys live in these kinds of trees. (*EIS)  
    b. Tycoons own this 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?

7.4 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.

(55) 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 (55) to be present in (56).
  – But the contrast does not come out.

(56)
  a. John owned houses twice.
  b. John owned this house twice.

• Observation 1: Hinrichs’s (1985) judgment needs clarification.
  – (55a) is acceptable under an interpretation where John has participated in two sandwich-eating events.
  – And (55b) also seems to have this two event reading.

• Observation 2: There seems to be some contrast between (56a) and (56b).
  – Whatever accounts for the acceptable interpretation of (55a) may help clarify the interpretational difference between (56a) and (56b).
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