

## Exceptional wide scope of bare nominals\*

Bert Le Bruyn  
*Utrecht University*

Henriëtte de Swart  
*Utrecht University*

Submitted 2020-06-17 / First decision 2020-12-28 / Revision received 2021-09-05 /  
Second decision 2021-12-06 / Revision received 2022-03-11 / Accepted 2022-03-20 /  
Final version received 2022-05-11 / Published 2022-08-10 / Final typesetting 2025-10-06

**Abstract** One of the strongest arguments in favor of the kinds approach to bare nominals is that they always take narrow scope with respect to other scope bearing operators in the sentence (Carlson 1977; Chierchia 1998; Dayal 2011). The publications supporting the obligatory narrow scope of bare nominals in a wide range of typologically different languages vastly outnumber the ones that claim the opposite. In this paper, we survey the facts from the literature, work out how the kinds approach deals with them, and identify scrambled bare plurals as the ultimate challenge for the kinds approach. Dutch examples illustrate that scrambled bare plurals unambiguously take wide scope with respect to quantifiers and negation, while maintaining kind reference. The kinds approach proves unable to derive the wide scope reading of bare plurals under a surface-oriented composition of scrambled objects. Once we abandon the default kind shift, following Krifka (2004), and allow bare plurals to directly shift to an existential interpretation, we can easily derive the wide scope reading with a local type repair. We conclude that a flexible type shifting approach to bare nominals is preferred over a default kind shift for empirical reasons.

**Keywords:** bare nominals, scope, kinds approach

---

\* We would like to thank the S&P reviewers and editor for their kind and constructive support. Throughout the years, we have discussed the issues that gave rise to this paper with a number of colleagues. In particular, we would like to mention Min Que, Hanna de Vries and Joost Zwarts. We also gratefully acknowledge support from the Dutch Research Council NWO (grants #360-70-340, #275-80-006, #360-80-070). A special thanks to Abodi Abd and the S&P editorial team for their help with the LaTeX conversion and final type-setting.

## 1 Introduction

Since Carlson’s seminal work, the most influential analysis of bare nominals has been to assume that they refer to kinds, either directly—as in Carlson 1977—or at least at some point in the derivation, as in Chierchia’s updated and cross-linguistically extended version (Chierchia 1998). None of the competitors of the kinds approach (Krifka 2004; Farkas & de Swart 2003; Magri 2012) have achieved anything close to the same popularity. The central claim of the kinds approach is that the kind reading of *dogs* underlies the generic as well as the indefinite interpretation of the bare plural. (1a) illustrates the kind reading and (1b) the indefinite reading:

- (1) a. I like dogs.  
b. I saw dogs in the park this morning.

In (1a), *dogs* are presented as a species the speaker likes, so the bare plural directly refers to the kind. Kinds are abstract entities that are not subject to visual perception, so the seeing in (1b) concerns instantiations of the species.<sup>1</sup> One of the strongest arguments in favor of the kinds approach is the preference bare nominals display for narrow scope with respect to other scope bearing operators in the sentence (Carlson 1977; Chierchia 1998; Dayal 2011). In Section 2, we will see that narrow scope is the general rule across languages, and we spell out how Chierchia (1998) derives narrow scope through a default kind shift followed by derived kind predication. Here and there, the literature brings up exceptional wide scope cases, as we will see in Section 3. Many reported cases of exceptional wide scope turn out not to be fully convincing, but modified bare plurals constitute a clear instance of wide scope. However, they are thought of as not involving kind reference, and as such, they are truly the exception to the rule. Section 4 brings up scrambled bare plurals as a novel challenge. Scrambled objects in languages like Dutch appear to the left of adverbials and negation and take unambiguous wide scope with respect to the operators they scramble over (de Hoop 1996, de Hoop 2003; Krämer 2000; Ruys 1992, Ruys 2001). Crucially, the

<sup>1</sup> We illustrate with bare nominals in object position because the interpretation of subjects is more involved. Indefinite readings of bare nominal subjects are cross-linguistically harder to get (see, e.g., Delfitto & Schrotten 1991 and Laca 1996 on Italian and Spanish) and this is independent of the availability of kind readings for bare nominals (see Cheng & Sybesma 1999 on Mandarin, Vogels & Lamers 2008 on Dutch). Special interpretive effects such as the functional readings of bare plurals in subject position (Condoravdi 1992) fall outside the scope of the kinds approach. Given the complications subjects bring along, we focus on bare nominals in non-subject positions, such as (1).

phenomenon extends to bare plurals. Even unambiguously kind-referring bare plurals can scramble, so the escape hatch formulated for modified bare plurals is not available. A bottom-up composition assigns wide scope to scrambled singular indefinites, yet application of the same compositional analysis to scrambled bare plurals stubbornly leads to a narrow scope interpretation under the kinds approach. Given that we are unable to derive the empirical facts with the toolkit in Chierchia 1998, we switch to Krifka’s (2004) flexible type shifting framework in Section 5. Krifka (2004) abandons the default kind shift, and derives the narrow scope reading of bare plurals by means of a local type repair and a direct existential shift. Application of the compositional analysis of scrambling to bare plurals that undergo a direct existential shift leads to the desired wide scope interpretation for scrambled bare plurals. Section 6 concludes that, other things being equal, a direct existential shift is preferred over an intermediate step through a default kind shift to handle the exceptional wide scope of bare nominals.

## 2 The standard case: Narrow scope of bare nominals

We follow the literature in focusing the scope discussion on count nouns (or nouns on their count interpretation).<sup>2</sup> Section 2.1 presents the cross-linguistic generalization that bare plurals take narrow scope with respect to other scope bearing operators in the sentence. Section 2.2 shows how Carlson (1977) and Chierchia (1998) derive narrow scope as a side effect of kind reference.

### 2.1 The cross-linguistic generalization: Narrow scope

Examples (2)-(4) illustrate the interactions of singular indefinites and bare plurals with a scope bearing operator. The generalization is that singular indefinites ((2a), (3a), (4a)) have variable scope—they can scope above and below quantifiers and negation—whereas bare plurals ((2b), (3b), (4b)) take obligatory narrow scope.

- |     |                             |                                       |
|-----|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| (2) | a. Every critic saw a movie | $\forall \exists / \exists \forall$   |
|     | b. Every critic saw movies  | $\forall \exists^* / \exists \forall$ |

<sup>2</sup> Motivation for the restriction to count nouns comes from French. French has developed an indefinite article for plurals (*des*) and for mass nouns (*du*), and lacks bare nominals in argument position. Crucially, *des N* can take wide scope whereas *du N* cannot (Bosveld-de Smet 1998). This suggests that wide scope is unavailable for mass nouns, independently of bareness.

- (3) a. I didn't see a spot on the floor  $\neg\exists/\exists\neg$   
 b. I didn't see spots on the floor  $\neg\exists/*\exists\neg$
- (4) a. John wants to meet a movie star  $\text{want} > \exists/\exists > \text{want}$   
 b. John wants to meet movie stars  $\text{want} > \exists/*\exists > \text{want}$

The pattern extends to more complex sentences involving two scope bearing operators, so singular indefinites can have an intermediate scope interpretation in (5a) (cf. Farkas 1981, Ruys 1992, Abusch 1994 and others). In contrast, bare plurals do not admit intermediate scope readings, and are restricted to the narrow scope interpretation in (5b):

- (5) a. Every professor rewarded every student who read a book he had recommended.  $\forall\forall\exists/\forall\exists\forall$   
 b. Every professor rewarded every student who read books he had recommended.  $\forall\forall\exists/*\exists\forall\forall$

(5a) has a reading where every professor picked some book out of all the books he had recommended and rewarded every student who read that book. Different books might have been recommended by different professors. This intermediate scope interpretation is missing for the bare plural in (5b).

English is not alone or unusual in displaying the pattern illustrated in (2)-(5). The examples in (6)-(9) are the Dutch counterparts of (2)-(5):<sup>3</sup>

- (6) a. Elke recensent keek een film. [Dutch]  
 every critic saw a movie  
 'Every critic saw a movie.'  $\forall\exists/\exists\forall$
- b. Elke recensent keek films.  
 every critic saw movies  
 'Every critic saw movies.'  $\forall\exists/*\exists\forall$
- (7) a. Helen praat niet met een geest op zolder.  
 Helen talks not with a ghost on attic  
 'Helen doesn't talk to a ghost in the attic.'  $\neg\exists/\exists\neg$
- b. Helen praat niet met geesten op zolder.  
 Helen talks not with ghosts on attic  
 'Helen doesn't talk to ghosts in the attic.'  $\neg\exists/*\exists\neg$

<sup>3</sup> Example (7) uses a construction with a prepositional complement in order to avoid incorporation of negation into the indefinite (de Swart 2000).

Exceptional wide scope of bare nominals

- (8) a. Jurriaan wil met een Spaans meisje trouwen.  
 Jurriaan wants with a Spanish girl marry  
 ‘Jurriaan wants to marry a Spanish girl.’ want >  $\exists/\exists$  > want
- b. Jurriaan wil met Spaanse kinderen spelen.  
 Jurriaan wants with Spanish children play  
 ‘Jurriaan wants to play with Spanish children.’ want >  $\exists/*\exists$  > want
- (9) a. Iedere professor beloonde iedere student die een boek had gelezen  
 every professor rewarded every student that a book had read  
 van de leeslijst.  
 of the reading list  
 ‘Every professor rewarded every student who had read a book from  
 the reading list.’  $\forall\forall\forall/\forall\forall\forall/\exists\forall\forall$
- b. Iedere professor beloonde iedere student die boeken had gelezen  
 every professor rewarded every student that books had read  
 van de leeslijst.  
 of the reading list  
 ‘Every professor rewarded every student who had read books from  
 the reading list.’  $\forall\forall\forall/*\forall\forall\forall/*\exists\forall\forall$

As a Germanic language, Dutch is closely related to English, but the obligatory narrow scope of bare nominals has been established for many typologically diverse languages, including Spanish (Espinal & McNally 2010 and references therein), Hungarian (Farkas & de Swart 2003), Russian (Geist 2010), Albanian (Kallulli 1999), Hebrew (Doron 2003), Hindi (Dayal 2003, Dayal 2004), Mandarin Chinese (Yang 2001, Rullmann & You 2006), Indonesian (Chung 2000; Sato 2008), Javanese (Sato 2008), Turkish (Bliss 2004), etc. Some examples are in (10) (from Espinal & McNally 2010), (11) (from Dayal 2003), (12) (from Rullmann & You 2006), and (13a) (from Chung 2000), vs. (13b) (from Sato 2008):

- (10) a. No busco piso. [Spanish]  
 not look.for.1SG flat  
 ‘I’m not looking for a(ny) flat.’  $\neg\exists/*\exists\neg$
- b. No busco pisos. [Spanish]  
 not look.for.1SG flats  
 ‘I’m not looking for (any) flats.’  $\neg\exists/*\exists\neg$
- c. No busco un piso. [Spanish]  
 not look.for.1SG a flat  
 ‘I’m not looking for a flat.’  $\neg\exists/\exists\neg$

- (11) a. anu kitaab nahiiN paRhegii [Hindi]  
 Anu book not read.FUT  
 ‘Anu won’t read a book.’  $\neg\exists/*\exists\neg$   
 b. anu ek kitaab nahiiN paRhegii [Hindi]  
 Anu one book not read.FUT  
 ‘Anu won’t read any book.’  $\neg\exists/\exists\neg$
- (12) a. Meige ren dou du guo [Mandarin Chinese]  
 every.CLF person all read ASP  
 guanyu youchong de shu  
 on caterpillar MOD book  
 ‘Everyone read books on caterpillars.’  $\neg\exists/*\exists\neg$   
 b. Meige ren dou du guo yiben [Mandarin Chinese]  
 every.CLF person all read ASP one.CLF  
 guanyu youchong de shu  
 on caterpillar MOD book  
 ‘Everyone read a book on caterpillars.’  $\neg\exists/\exists\neg$
- (13) a. Ali tidak jadi membeli buku. [Indonesian]  
 Ali not finished buy book  
 ‘Ali didn’t finish any book(s).’  $\neg\exists/*\exists\neg$   
 b. Ada sebuah buku yang Ali tidak jadi beli. [Indonesian]  
 exist one book that Ali NEG finish buy  
 ‘There is a book that Ali didn’t buy.’  $\neg\exists/\exists\neg$

Some of the languages illustrated have bare nominals with general number ((12), (13)), while others have bare singulars as well as bare plurals ((9), (10), (11)).<sup>4</sup> The restriction of the bare nominal to a narrow scope interpretation with respect to other scope bearing operators in the sentence is independent of the differences in number morphology. In contrast to the bare form, expressions with an overt indefinite article or a numeral construction built on ‘one’ take wide or variable scope ((10c), (11b), (12b), (13b)).

## 2.2 Deriving narrow scope from kind reference

Carlson (1977) derives the narrow scope of bare plurals from kind reference. Carlson grounds the close link between bare nominals and kind-referring expressions in the analogy between (14) and (15).

<sup>4</sup> Languages with general number are those where bare nouns are neither singular nor plural but neutral or unspecified for number (Corbett 2000).

(14) John didn't see this kind of animal.

(15) John didn't see dogs.

*This kind of animal* in (14) is unambiguously kind-referring. In Carlson's enriched ontology, kinds are abstract entities that are realized by concrete individuals. The object position of verbs like *see* targets concrete individuals, so the interpretation of (14) appeals to the realization relation, along with existential quantification over instantiations. This outcome is a narrow scope interpretation of (14) under which John hasn't seen any instantiations of the relevant kind of animal. Taking *dogs* to be kind-referring in the same way as *this kind of animal* provides a similar explanation for (15). We skip Carlson's formalization of the kinds approach and focus on Chierchia's (1998) neo-Carlsonian framework, because it is the standard in the current literature.

Chierchia (1998) takes a broader typological perspective than Carlson. He assumes languages come in one of three varieties: (i) those in which all bare nouns start out as kinds (e.g., Mandarin), (ii) those in which all bare nouns start out as properties (e.g., French), and (iii) those in which count nouns start out as properties and mass nouns as kinds (e.g., Russian, English).

In Chierchia's (1998) type-shifting perspective, kinds are individual concepts (type  $\langle s, e \rangle$ ), construed as the individual counterpart of properties. The 'up' ( $\cup$ ) and 'down' ( $\cap$ ) operators from Chierchia (1984) mediate between kinds and properties. For instance, if  $\lambda x. \text{dog}(x)$  is the property of being a dog, then  $\cap \text{DOG}$  is the corresponding kind *dog* (16a). Conversely, if *d* is the dog-kind,  $\cup d$  is the property of being a dog (16b):

- (16) a.  $\cap \text{DOG} = d$   
 b.  $\cup d = \text{DOG}$

Chierchia models kinds as functions from worlds or situations into pluralities, the sum of all instances of the kind. Formally, the down operator  $\cap$  is defined as the nominalization operator in (17a), and the up operator  $\cup$  as the predication operator in (17b).<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Unless otherwise specified, the variables used are unsorted variables of type  $e$ , which range over singular objects as well as pluralities and kinds. Chierchia relies on a generalized use of the  $\iota$  operator that interprets the definite article as picking out the only or the largest member of the set. The domain  $U$  has the structure of a join atomic semilattice with  $AT$  the set of atoms in  $U$ ,  $K$  the set of kinds in  $U$ , and  $K \subseteq AT$ . We refer to Chierchia 1998 for further details.

- (17) a. For any property  $P$  and any world/situation  $s$   
 $\cap P = \begin{cases} \lambda s.\iota P_s, & \text{if } \lambda s.\iota P_s \text{ is in the set of kinds } K, \\ \text{undefined otherwise.} \end{cases}$   
 Where  $P_s$  is the extension of  $P$  in  $s$ .
- b. Let  $k$  be a kind. Then for any world/situation  $s$ ,  
 $\cup k = \begin{cases} \lambda x[x \leq k_s], & \text{if } k_s \text{ is defined,} \\ \lambda x[\text{FALSE}] & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$   
 where  $k_s$  is the plural individual that comprises all of the atomic members of the kind in  $s$ .

The up operator comes into play when a bare plural appears in the object position of verbs like *see*. The sortal mismatch between the kind-denoting bare plural, and the concrete individual targeted by the verb is resolved by a shift from kinds to existential quantification over instantiations of the kind. Chierchia (1998) names this shift *Derived Kind Predication* (DKP), and provides the definition in (18) (minor details modified).

- (18) *Derived Kind Predication*  
 $(\text{DKP}(P))(k) \leftrightarrow \exists x[\cup k(x) \ \& \ P(x)]$   
 for  $P$  a predicate that targets concrete individuals and  $k$  a kind denoting expression

DKP applies locally, inside the body of the abstract, because this is where the sortal incompatibility between the kind argument and the predicate becomes apparent (Chierchia 1998). We spell out the full derivation of ‘John didn’t see dogs’ in (19).

- (19)  $\llbracket \text{see} \rrbracket = \lambda y_e \lambda x_e. \text{see}(y)(x)$   
 $\llbracket \text{dogs} \rrbracket = \lambda z_e. \text{dogs}(z)$   
 $\llbracket \text{not} \rrbracket = \lambda P \lambda z. \neg P(z)$   
 $\llbracket \text{John} \rrbracket = j$
- a.  $\llbracket \text{see dogs} \rrbracket =$
- |  |                             |                              |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| $\lambda y \lambda x. \text{see}(y)(x)$                              | $\lambda z. \text{dogs}(z)$ | <i>application</i>           |
| $\lambda y \lambda x. \text{see}(y)(x)$                              | $\text{DOGS}_k$             | <b>TYPE MISMATCH</b>         |
| $\lambda x \exists y[\cup \text{DOGS}_k(y) \ \& \ \text{see}(y)(x)]$ |                             | <i>kind shift</i> ( $\cap$ ) |
|  |                             | <b>CONVERSION</b>            |
|  |                             | <b>AFTER DKP</b>             |

- b.  $\llbracket \text{not see dogs} \rrbracket =$   
 $\lambda P \lambda z. \neg P(z) \lambda x \exists y [\cup \text{dogs}_k(y) \& \text{see}(y)(x)]$       *application*  
 $\lambda z \neg \exists y [\cup \text{DOGS}_k(y) \& \text{see}(y)(z)]$       *conversion*
- c.  $\llbracket \text{John not see dogs} \rrbracket =$   
 $[\lambda z \exists y [\cup \text{DOGS}_k(y) \& \text{see}(y)(z)]]$       j      *application*  
 $\neg \exists y [\cup \text{DOGS}_k(y) \& \text{see}(j, y)]$       *conversion*

The bare plural *dogs* starts out as a property denoting expression, but the verb *see* applies to entities, not properties. The bare plural shifts to the individual counterpart of the property, a kind denoting expression of type  $\langle s, e \rangle$ , to resolve the type mismatch. Given that the object position of *see* targets concrete individuals, rather than kinds, the combination with a kind denoting expression leads to a sortal mismatch, which gets resolved by DKP. The local application of DKP ensures narrow scope of the existential quantifier over instantiations of the kind with respect to negation, so in the final interpretation of (19), John did not see any instantiations of the dog kind. Just like Carlson then, Chierchia derives the obligatory narrow scope of bare plurals from their underlying kind interpretation.

### 3 The exception: Wide scope of bare plurals

#### 3.1 Reported cases of wide scope

The examples in Section 2.1 provide strong cross-linguistic support for the claim that bare nominals are restricted to narrow scope. However, the literature also discusses cases suggesting the possibility of a wide scope interpretation of bare nominals. Carlson (1977) acknowledges that both narrow and wide scope interpretations are available for sentences like (20):

- (20) John didn't see parts of that machine.  $\neg \exists / \exists \neg$

Geurts (2010) submits that the modified bare plurals in (22) allow for wide scope:

- (21) Several students reported that they had been harassed by professors.  
 (22) Several students reported that they had been harassed by professors wearing false beards and pink gowns.

Geurts prefers a narrow scope interpretation of the bare plural with respect to the scope island created by the clause embedded under *report* in (21) but

accepts a wide scope interpretation in (22). Following up on Geurts (2010), Le Bruyn, Que & de Swart (2012) pursue an experimental approach to modified bare plurals. They compare the felicity of items like (23) (with NPI *any*) to that of items like (24) (with a bare plural):

- (23) Aidan and Brenda discuss the homework they are about to hand in, which consists of five assignments. The professor has announced that handing in at least four of them is the minimum requirement for a passing grade.  
 Aidan: Did you manage to finish all five assignments?  
 Brenda: No, I didn't have time to look at **any of them**.  
 Aidan: Sounds like you have a problem...  
 Brenda: Nah, I'll be fine. I finished four of them, so I should get a passing grade.
- (24) Eve and Flynn work for the same company. One of their colleagues has recently been fired.  
 Eve: Do you know why they sent Geoffrey packing?  
 Flynn: Well, he has not cooperated with **colleagues on his team** since last Christmas.  
 Eve: His team, that's Judy, Vikash and Alexander, right?  
 Flynn: That's right. He did work with Alexander, but he flat out refused to even talk to Vikash and Judy.

Brenda in (23) and Flynn in (24) would contradict themselves between their first and second turn unless *any of them* in (23) and *colleagues on his team* in (24) were to take wide scope. Le Bruyn, Que & de Swart (2012) find that items like (24) are considered significantly more acceptable than items like (23). This outcome suggests that NPIs are stubbornly taking scope below negation, but that bare plurals can escape the restriction to narrow scope.

The possibility of a wide scope interpretation of bare nouns has been discussed for other languages as well. Kratzer (1980) notes that in contexts like (25), the German bare plural *Tollkirschen* can take scope over the modal verb *wollte*:

- (25) Otto wollte Tollkirschen in den Obstsalat tun, [German]  
 Otto wanted belladonna\_berries in the fruit\_salad do  
 weil er sie mit richtigen Kirschen verwechselte.  
 because he them with real cherries confused  
 'Otto wanted to put belladonna berries in the fruit salad, because he mistook them for real cherries'.

Exceptional wide scope of bare nominals

We do not take (25) to convey that Otto wanted to poison the fruit salad, but rather that there was a case of mistaken identity.

Moving beyond Western European languages, Paul (2016) argues that Malagasy bare nouns allow for wide scope:

- (26) Tsy nahasitrana zaza ny dokotera.  
Not PST.CAUSE.cure child DET doctor  
'The doctor was not able to cure a child.'  $\neg\exists/\exists\neg$

According to Paul, (26) allows for the bare noun *child* to take scope over negation, such that there was a child that the doctor was not able to cure.

Nakanishi & Tomioka (2004) argue that Japanese determinerless plurals can and even have to take wide scope:

- (27) Sono byooin-wa kanguhu-tati-o sagasi-teiru  
That hospital-TOP nurse-TATI-ACC look.for-PROG  
'There is a group of nurses that hospital is looking for.'  
\*look.for > nurse, nurse > look-for

In (27), *kanguhu-tati-o* is a plural noun without overt determiner that takes scope over the modal verb *sagasi*.

The data in (20)-(27) call for a more nuanced view on the scopal possibilities of bare nominals. In Section 3.2, we work out how the kinds approach handles the exceptional wide scope cases.

### 3.2 Exceptional wide scope under the kinds approach

Given that narrow scope of bare nominals constitutes a core ingredient of the (neo)-Carlsonian approach, a proper account of the problematic wide scope cases is crucial to uphold the kinds analysis. To maintain the discussion as clean as possible, we will first discard those cases from Section 3.1 in which the nominals are not really bare or where the data are inconclusive. We then move on to the cases that clearly go against the narrow scope generalization.

**1. Apparent bareness** The Japanese example in (27) can be argued not to involve a bare nominal. If so, it does not go against the narrow scope generalization. Studies of optional plural markers in various languages support the view that they often get specific or definite interpretations (Kester & Schmitt 2007 for Papiamentu and Brazilian Portuguese, Dalrymple & Mofu 2012 for Indonesian,

Iljic 1994 for Mandarin Chinese). These facts have led to analyses in which plural markers function as *portmanteau* morphemes, filling both the number and determiner projections, and Nakanishi & Tomioka (2004) follow this line. If *tati*-nominals do not qualify as bare nominals, they do not threaten the narrow scope generalization.

**2. Apparent wide scope with modal verbs** According to Van Geenhoven (1998), *Tollkirschen* in Kratzer's example (25), repeated here, does not take genuine wide scope. Rather, the mistaken identity reading points to a distinction between the *de re/de dicto* interpretation of the descriptive content and wide/narrow scope of the existential quantifier.

- (25) Otto wollte Tollkirschen in den Obstsalat tun, [German]  
 Otto wanted belladonna\_berries in the fruit\_salad do  
 weil er sie mit richtigen Kirschen verwechselte.  
 because he them with real cherries confused  
 'Otto wanted to put belladonna berries in the fruit salad, because he  
 mistook them for real cherries'.

Given that the sentence does not mean that there was a set of belladonna berries that Otto had the wish to put into the salad, there is no support for a wide scope existential quantifier. Van Geenhoven resorts to the framework of structured propositions to export the descriptive content of the bare plural *Tollkirschen* as *de re*, while the existential quantifier over instantiations of the berries remains inside the scope of the modal verb. In order to avoid interactions with modality, we restrict ourselves to quantifiers and negation as the relevant scope bearing operators.

**3. Malagasy bare nouns** The behavior of Malagasy bare nouns in (26) clearly calls into question the narrow scope generalization. If narrow scope is the result of an underlying kind interpretation, the first step in the account of Malagasy bare nominals would be to check whether they are kind-referring. A preliminary discussion in Paul 2016 shows that the data are inconclusive. We leave it to future research to clarify the position of Malagasy in the overall debate on kind reference across languages.

**4. Kinds and modification** Geurts' (2010) example in (22), repeated here, can be argued not to involve genuine wide scope.

- (22) Several students reported that they had been harassed by professors wearing false beards and pink gowns.

If *professors* takes wide scope, (22) states that the report of the students involved specific professors. There being specific professors mentioned in the report is however not excluded by the narrow scope reading that simply states that there was a report of professors harassing students. Configurations with weak quantifiers like (22), in which the wide scope reading entails the narrow scope reading, do not invalidate the claim that bare plurals take narrow scope. In order to avoid the entailment problem, Le Bruyn, Que & de Swart (2012) use negation as the embedding operator. Experimental items like (23) confirm that a wide scope reading is accessible, at least with a modified bare plural.

This leaves us with the modified bare plural in (24) and *parts of that machine* in (20), repeated below, as clearcut examples where a wide scope reading is not only accessible, but also truth-conditionally distinct from the narrow scope reading.

- (20) John didn't see parts of that machine.  $\sqrt{\neg\exists}/\sqrt{\exists\neg}$

Rather than considering (20) a challenge for his analysis, Chierchia argues that it constitutes evidence in its favour:

NPs can be modified, and not every modified NP is going to be associated with a kind. This will depend on whether it picks a class of objects that display a sufficiently regular behavior. What counts as sufficiently regular is determined by the shared knowledge and beliefs in the community of speakers (and is thus subject to a certain degree of variation). Our theory makes a prediction in this connection. Imagine having a bare plural  $\alpha$  whose nominalization does not denote a kind. This means that  $\hat{\alpha}$  will be undefined. The English category-type assignment leaves us free to turn an NP into an argument. But if  $\hat{\alpha}$  is undefined, some other type shifting device will have to be used. Now, English has a plural definite article; hence the blocking principle prevents us from using  $\iota$  as a shifter. It lacks, however, a plural indefinite article. This makes  $\exists$  an available option. So non-kind denoting NPs should behave like regular existentially quantified NPs (and should therefore also have 'strong' interpretations). This is, in essence, the prediction.

(Chierchia 1998: 372)

If we accept Chierchia's argumentation for *parts of that machine*, the data in (20) and—by extension—those in (24) can be handled by the kinds approach.

### 3.3 The kinds approach to scope: Taking stock

In Chierchia's (1998) neo-Carlsonian framework, narrow scope readings of bare nouns are derived from their underlying kind interpretation. A critical review of exceptional wide scope readings of bare nouns reported in the literature shows that most cases are not real counterexamples. Malagasy deserves further investigation, and modified bare plurals truly display wide scope, but Chierchia (1998) suspends scope restrictions for bare nominals that lack kind reference. So far then, we have not encountered fully convincing wide scope readings of kind-referring bare nouns. This picture will change in Section 4, which shows that scrambled bare plurals are kind-referring yet take unambiguous wide scope. The scrambling data raise a novel challenge for the kinds approach.

## 4 Dutch scrambling and scope

Scrambling in the *Mittelfeld* is a widespread phenomenon in Germanic languages, but it also occurs in Japanese (Kuroda 1970), Korean (Choi 1996), Turkish (Kornfilt 2003), Persian (Ghameshi 2008), and elsewhere. We illustrate with Dutch data, because the patterns with Dutch bare plurals otherwise run closely parallel to the English ones (see de Hoop 1996 and Section 2.1). There is a rich literature on scrambling in Dutch, ranging from the seminal work of de Hoop (1996) and Ruys (1992) to the more recent work by van Bergen & de Swart (2010), and we squarely ground our analysis in mainstream views. We start with a brief review of the basic facts on scrambling, and then move on to wide scope readings of bare plurals in scrambling environments.

### 4.1 Scrambling as syntactic word order variation with possible semantic effects

In Dutch, the position of a direct object relative to an adverb may vary: the object may either follow or precede it. If the object follows the adverb, the object is said to be in 'unscrambled' position (28a). If the object precedes the adverb, the object is said to be in 'scrambled' position (28b).

- (28) a. ... dat Julia gisteren **de taart** heeft gebakken.  
 that Julia yesterday the cake has baked  
 unscrambled position
- b. ... dat Julia **de taart** gisteren heeft gebakken.  
 that Julia the cake yesterday has baked  
 scrambled position

The phenomenon of scrambling has received a considerable amount of attention in the literature on comparative Germanic syntax. We will not address the syntactic operations underlying scrambling in this paper, but for possible analyses of Dutch scrambling in terms of tree structures, we refer to Bennis & Hoekstra 1985, Van den Wyngaerd 1989 and Neeleman 1994. van Bergen & de Swart (2010) pursue a processing account, and Bobaljik & Wurmbrand (2012) settle on a mixture of grammatical and functional motivations driving scrambling at the syntax-semantics interface.

In the literature on scrambling, we find stronger and weaker views on the relation between word order variation and meaning. Diesing (1992: 108) and Diesing & Jelinek (1995: 172) analyse German scrambling as a semantically driven phenomenon. Under Diesing's Mapping Hypothesis, unscrambled objects are VP internal and interpreted in the nuclear scope of the adverbial (29a). Scrambled bare plurals have moved out of the VP and are interpreted in the restrictor of the adverbial quantifier in (29b). The bare plural is a predicate over a free variable, which is bound by an unselective quantifier (like *always*) when it occurs in the restrictor (29b) and by existential closure when it appears in the nuclear scope (29a).

- (29) a. ... dass Otto immer Bücher über Wombats liest. [German]  
 ... that Otto always books about wombats reads  
 [<sub>CP</sub> dass [<sub>IP</sub> Otto immer [<sub>VP</sub> Bücher über Wombats liest]]]  
 Always<sub>t</sub>[*t* a time in Otto's current life]  
 [∃*x*.*x* a book about wombats & Otto is reading *x* at *t*]
- b. ... dass Otto Bücher über Wombats immer liest.  
 ... that Otto books about wombats always reads.  
 [<sub>CP</sub> dass [<sub>IP</sub> Otto Bücher über Wombats immer [<sub>VP</sub> liest]]]  
 Always<sub>*x*</sub>[*x* a book about wombats]  
 [∃*t*.*t* a time in Otto's current life & Otto is reading *x* at *t*]

The German data in (29) are reproduced in Dutch (30) with the same interpretive effects.

- (30) a. ... dat Otto altijd boeken over wombats leest. [Dutch]  
 ... that Otto always books about wombats reads  
 b. ... dat Otto boeken over wombats altijd leest.  
 ... that Otto books about wombats always reads

Despite the similarities between (29) and (30), the Dutch literature generally supports a weaker relation between scrambling and meaning. Note that the word order variation in (28) is related to information structure (Neeleman 1994), but there are no truth-conditional meaning effects. Moreover, different categories of NPs (indefinites, definites, pronouns) display differences in scrambling behavior (van der Does & de Hoop 1998). The corpus study carried out by van Bergen & de Swart (2010) reveals that pronouns scramble almost categorically, without any meaning effect. Indefinites rarely scramble, and definites and proper names are somewhere in the middle. In sum, every category of NP has a default word order, word order variations are not always meaningful, and when they are, the meaning effect can be semantic or pragmatic. Based on the literature, we think that scrambling of bare plurals should not receive a separate treatment, but it should be analyzed as an instance of the more general phenomenon of word order variation in the *Mittelfeld*. Following de Hoop (1996, 2000, 2003) and van der Does & de Hoop (1998), we take scrambling to be a syntactic process of word order variation. If there is any semantic effect, it has to do with a change in scope relations between quantifiers brought about by the change in word order (Krämer 2000; Ruys 2001; Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2012). Given that we are interested in scope, we leave the information structural differences in (28) aside, but we maintain the view that scrambling is a syntactically driven phenomenon.

The semantic interaction of a singular indefinite object with the adverbial quantifier it scrambles over is illustrated in (31).

- (31) a. Je mag twee keer **een potje** omdraaien. (Krämer 2000)  
 You may two times a pot around.turn  
 'You can turn a pot twice.'  
 b. Je mag **een potje** twee keer omdraaien. (Krämer 2000)  
 You may a pot two times around.turn  
 'You can turn a pot twice.'

The examples in (31) are experimental items in a setting in which the participant is invited to carry out particular actions. The unscrambled order in (31a) is compatible with the turning around of two different pots, whereas the scrambled order in (31b) invites the interlocutor to turn around the same pot

twice. Thus, in scrambled position, the indefinite takes obligatory scope over the adverb, reflecting surface scope. Such interpretive facts may be analysed in terms of referentiality (de Hoop 1996), but Ruys (1992, 2001) maintains a scopal analysis, because scrambled indefinites can still take scope below other operators, as illustrated in (32).

- (32) ... dat elke premier **een journalist** meermalen heeft weggestuurd.  
... that each PM a journalist multiple\_times has sent\_away  
'That for each PM there is a journalist that s/he has sent away several times.'

*Een journalist* takes scope over *meermalen* but it falls itself in the scope of *elke premier*, so (32) illustrates the intermediate scope reading of a scrambled indefinite. We follow the scopal analysis.

The scope effects in (29)-(32) fit the overall pattern of scope rigidity we find in free word order configurations. Bobaljik & Wurmbrand (2012) refer to Szabolcsi (1997) for the observation that there is an inverse correlation between rigid word order and scope rigidity. We tend to find surface scope in languages with free word order, while languages with limited possibilities for word order permutation, like English, have a high tolerance for scope ambiguities. With two possible scope configurations (A takes scope over B or B takes scope over A), and two possible word orders (A precedes B or B precedes A), languages with free word order often display a pattern in which not 2, but 3 out of the 4 logical pairings are acceptable. Bobaljik & Wurmbrand call this the 3/4 effect. The 3/4 effect is visible in the Dutch scrambling data in the restriction of the scrambled indefinite in (31b) to a wide scope reading, while the unscrambled word order in (31a) is scopally underspecified. We will not commit ourselves to any particular analysis of the scope ambiguity of (31a), or of the 3/4 effect, but we refer to Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2012 for further discussion and a possible analysis that is compatible with the semantics we propose. What matters to us is that the surface scope reading of the scrambled indefinite in (31b) is unambiguous, and in line with the literature as an instance of word order variation with possible semantic effects. In the remainder of this paper, we focus on the compositional analysis of the wide scope interpretation of the scrambled object.

We account for the wide scope reading of (31b) in a compositional way, formalized as function application in a bottom-up, right-to-left surface order. To illustrate, we work out the derivation of (31b) in (33). Here we analyze *twee keer* as an existential quantifier over events and add an event variable to the verb.

- (33)  $\llbracket \text{omdraaien} \rrbracket = \lambda e \lambda y_e \lambda x_e . \text{turn\_around}(e)(y)(x)$   
 $\llbracket \text{twee keer} \rrbracket = \lambda P_{\langle v, \langle e, \langle e, t \rangle \rangle} \lambda v_e \lambda u_e \exists e \exists e' [P(e)(v)(u) \& P(e')(v)(u) \& e \neq e']$   
 $\llbracket \text{een potje} \rrbracket = \lambda P_{\langle e, \langle e, t \rangle} \lambda w_e \exists z [\text{pot}(z) \& P(z)(w)]$   
 $\llbracket \text{je} \rrbracket = j$
- a.  $\llbracket \text{twee keer omdraaien} \rrbracket =$  *application*  
 $\lambda P \lambda v \lambda u \exists e \exists e' [P(e)(v)(u) \& P(e')(v)(u) \& e \neq e'] \quad \lambda e'' \lambda y \lambda x . \text{turn\_around}(e'')(y)(x)$   
 $\lambda y \lambda x \exists e \exists e' [\text{turn\_around}(e)(y)(x) \& \text{turn\_around}(e')(y)(x) \& e \neq e']$  *conversion*
- b.  $\llbracket \text{een potje twee keer omdraaien} \rrbracket =$  *application*  
 $\lambda P \lambda w \exists z [\text{pot}(z) \& P(z)(w)] \quad \lambda y \lambda x \exists e \exists e' [\text{turn\_around}(e)(y)(x) \& \text{turn\_around}(e')(y)(x) \& e \neq e']$   
 $\lambda w \exists z [\text{pot}(z) \& \exists e \exists e' [\text{turn\_around}(e)(z)(w) \& \text{turn\_around}(e')(z)(w) \& e \neq e']]$  *conversion*
- c.  $\llbracket \text{je (mag) een potje twee keer omdraaien} \rrbracket =$  *j*  
 $\lambda w \exists z [\text{pot}(z) \& \exists e \exists e' [\text{turn\_around}(e)(z)(w) \& \text{turn\_around}(e')(z)(w) \& e \neq e']]$  *application*  
 $\exists z [\text{pot}(z) \& \exists e \exists e' [\text{turn\_around}(e)(z)(j) \& \text{turn\_around}(e')(z)(j) \& e \neq e']]$  *conversion*

Through a straightforward process of function application and lambda conversion, the composition in (33) leads to the invitation to turn the same cup twice, in line with the wide scope interpretation of the singular indefinite over the adverbial quantifier.

So far, we established the basic facts about Dutch scrambling, and adopted the mainstream position that scrambling constitutes a syntactic option of word order variation with possible semantic effects. When an indefinite object interacts with an adverbial scope bearing operator, scrambling fixes the interpretation to surface scope. A bottom-up composition derives the desired wide scope reading. We now turn to the relevant data about bare plurals.

#### 4.2 Scrambled bare plurals as a challenge for the kinds approach

Just like singular indefinites, bare plurals take wide scope over other scope bearing operators in scrambled position. We already saw an example with an adverbial quantifier in (30), here we add examples with negation to avoid the

complications surrounding the interpretation of adverbs of quantification (see de Swart 1992 for discussion). Both (34) and (35) are naturally occurring examples:<sup>6</sup>

- (34) Als ik jou was zou ik eerder te veel dan te weinig mensen  
if I you was would I rather too many than too few people  
uitnodigen voor je huwelijk. Je zal eerder spijt hebben dat je  
invite for your wedding you will rather regret have that you  
**mensen** niet hebt uitgenodigd dan omgekeerd.  
people not have invited than the\_other\_way\_around  
'If I were you, I'd invite too many rather than too few people to your  
wedding. You're more likely to regret that there are people you didn't  
invite than the other way around.'
- (35) Het klopt dat ik **boeken** niet heb uitgelezen. Dan begon ik er aan  
it knocks that I books not have read then began I ER on  
maar kwam ik er achter dat ik het toch niet leuk vond.  
but came I ER after that I it after\_all not fun found  
'It's true that there are books that I didn't finish. I started reading them  
but then found out that I didn't like them.'

In (34), the speaker warns the addressee that he will regret not having invited enough people. This corresponds with a wide scope interpretation of *mensen*, where the addressee is predicted to regret that there are people he has not invited. The follow-up sentence in (35) confirms the wide scope interpretation under which the speaker did not finish some of the books she had started to read. A narrow scope reading of *mensen* and *boeken* is incongruous in the larger context of (34) and (35). Clearly, there is no implication in (34) that the addressee will not invite any guests to the wedding, and neither does (35) imply that the speaker did not read any books. The conclusion must be that existential bare plurals in scrambled position take genuine wide scope over negation. These data are uncontroversial for native speakers that we consulted, and replicate earlier examples in Ruys 2001.

The bare plurals in (34) and (35) are unmodified. Independently of which strategy the kinds approach adopts to deal with wide scope readings of modified bare plurals, it cannot be appealed to as an escape hatch here. Also, the nouns

---

<sup>6</sup> We made slight adaptations to condense the examples and to eliminate possible confounds. (34) is based on an example found at <https://www.ouders.nl/forum/off-topic-discussies/wat-ik-mij-afvraag-over-getrouwd-zijn?page=1> (consulted 22 May 2020). (35) is based on an example found at <http://nlfictiedossier.blogspot.com/2012/09/samenvatting-startdocument-fictie.html> (consulted May 22, 2020).

in question (*mensen* ‘people’ and *boeken* ‘books’) allow for a straightforward kind reading in scrambled position in (36) and (37).

- (36) a. ... dat ik **mensen** altijd gehaat heb  
 ... that I people always hated have  
 b. ... dat ik **boeken** altijd gehaat heb  
 ... that I books always hated have  
 ‘...that I’ve always hated people/books.’
- (37) a. ... dat ik **dit soort mensen** altijd gehaat heb  
 ... that I this type people always hated have  
 b. ... dat ik **dit soort boeken** altijd gehaat heb  
 ... that I this type books always hated have  
 ‘...that I’ve always hated this type of people/books’

Predicates like *hate*, which can take kind-referring objects, confirm that scrambling does not interact with kind formation in Dutch. This is crucial for the argumentation: if scrambling led to wide scope readings of bare plurals but blocked kind readings, it would fall in the same category as modified bare plurals (Section 3.2 above). Examples (36) and (37) show that kind-referring bare plurals and other kind-referring expressions can scramble.

If the wide scope reading of the scrambled bare plurals in (34) and (35) emerges as an instance of surface scope, we should be able to account for it by means of the compositional approach in (33), modulo the interpretation of the bare plural as a property denoting expression that shifts to a kind, and, through DKP, to instantiations of the kind. Unfortunately, the derivation of (35) in (38) shows that bare plurals stubbornly take narrow scope on the kinds approach, even in scrambled position.

- (38)  $\llbracket \text{uitlezen} \rrbracket = \lambda y_e \lambda x_e. \text{read}(y)(x)$   
 $\llbracket \text{not} \rrbracket = \lambda P_{\langle e, \langle e, t \rangle \rangle} \lambda v_e \lambda u_e. \neg P(v)(u)$   
 $\llbracket \text{boeken} \rrbracket = \lambda y_e. \text{books}(y)$   
 $\llbracket \text{ik} \rrbracket = i$
- a.  $\llbracket \text{niet uitlezen} \rrbracket =$   
 $\lambda P \lambda v \lambda u. \neg P(v)(u) \quad \lambda y \lambda x. \text{read}(y)(x) \quad \textit{application}$   
 $\lambda y \lambda x. \neg \text{read}(y)(x) \quad \textit{conversion}$

- b.  $\llbracket \text{boeken niet uitlezen} \rrbracket =$   
 $\lambda y \lambda x. \neg \text{read}(y)(x) \quad \lambda z. \text{books}(z)$  *application*  
**TYPE MISMATCH**  
 $\lambda y \lambda x. \neg \text{read}(y)(x) \quad \text{BOOKS}_k$  *type-shift to kind ( $\wedge$ )*  
 $\lambda x \neg \exists y [\cup \text{BOOKS}_k(y) \ \& \ \text{read}(y)(x)]$  **CONVERSION AFTER DKP**
- c.  $\llbracket \text{ik boeken niet uitlezen} \rrbracket =$   
 $\lambda x \neg \exists y [\cup \text{BOOKS}_k(y) \ \& \ \text{read}(y)(x)] \quad i$  *application*  
 $\neg \exists y [\cup \text{BOOKS}_k(y) \ \& \ \text{read}(i, y)]$  *conversion*

The derivation in (38) follows the same bottom-up composition as (33), so *uitlezen* first combines with the negation *niet*. Application of *niet uitlezen* to the bare plural *boeken* leads to a type mismatch that is resolved by a kind shift. Because *uitlezen* targets concrete objects, DKP applies to resolve the sortal mismatch. The outcome is a narrow scope reading in which the speaker didn't read any books. Clearly, this is not the wide scope reading of the scrambled bare plural we were after.

We could try to amend the kinds approach by reinterpreting the DKP mechanism and making it apply non-locally. In the light of examples like (39), this is an unattractive move, though:<sup>7</sup>

- (39) De docent beweert zelf dat hij **dit soort dingen** niet heeft gezegd.  
the teacher claims self that he this sort things not has said  
'The teacher himself claims that he didn't say this type of things.'

In the larger discourse context, *dit soort dingen* refers to denigrating things. The only reading we get for (39) is that the teacher claims not having said any denigrating things. So the locality built into DKP is on the right track for expressions that are unambiguously kind-referring. Removing the locality of DKP would undermine the parallelism between bare plurals and kinds that the (neo)-Carlsonian approach is based on.

We are unaware of other machinery in Chierchia's (1998) toolbox that we could exploit to solve the problem, so the Dutch scrambling data constitute a real challenge for the kinds approach. Section 5 explores the type-shifting framework by Krifka (2004) as an alternative strategy. We will show that it allows a straightforward derivation of wide scope taking scrambled bare plurals.

<sup>7</sup> This example is taken from <https://hvana.nl/lees/2540/hva-docent-intimideerde-studenten-jarenlang-ongestraft> (consulted May 22, 2020).

## 5 An account of wide scope scrambled bare plurals in a flexible type-shifting framework

Notwithstanding the success of the kinds approach, a few alternatives have been developed in the literature, e.g., Farkas & de Swart 2003, Krifka 2004, Magri 2012. These analyses also rely on type-shifting mechanisms, but typically don't take kind reference to be the default. We work out our analysis of the Dutch scrambling data in Krifka's (2004) framework.

### 5.1 Krifka's (2004) account of narrow and wide scope of bare plurals

According to Krifka (2004), bare plurals in languages like English start life as type  $\langle e, t \rangle$  expressions and can undergo a shift to a kind or an existential type shift to an expression of type  $\langle \langle e, t \rangle, t \rangle$  along the lines of Partee (1987). The crucial difference between Krifka and Chierchia is that the latter assumes the kind shift takes precedence over the existential shift, thus making the kind shift into the default. Krifka abandons this assumption and takes the existential and kind shift to be equally available. For the run-of-the mill example (15), this leads to the derivation in (40).

(15) John didn't see dogs.

- (40)  $\llbracket \text{see} \rrbracket = \lambda y_e \lambda x_e. \text{see}(y)(x)$   
 $\llbracket \text{not} \rrbracket = \lambda P \lambda x. \neg P(x)$   
 $\llbracket \text{dogs} \rrbracket = \lambda z_e. \text{dogs}(z)$   
 $\llbracket \text{John} \rrbracket = j$
- a.  $\llbracket \text{see dogs} \rrbracket =$   
 $\lambda y \lambda x. \text{see}(y)(x) \quad \lambda z. \text{dogs}(z)$  *application*  
**TYPE MISMATCH**  
 $\lambda P \exists z [\text{dogs}(z) \ \& \ P(z)] \quad \lambda y \lambda x. \text{see}(y)(x)$  *local type repair( $\exists$ )*  
 $\lambda x \exists z [\text{dogs}(z) \ \& \ \text{see}(z)(x)]$  *conversion*
- b.  $\llbracket \text{not see dogs} \rrbracket =$   
 $\lambda P \lambda y. \neg P(y) \quad \lambda x \exists z [\text{dogs}(z) \ \& \ \text{see}(z)(x)]$  *application*  
 $\lambda x \neg \exists z [\text{dogs}(z) \ \& \ \text{see}(z)(x)]$  *conversion*
- c.  $\llbracket \text{John not see dogs} \rrbracket =$   
 $\lambda x \neg \exists z [\text{dogs}(z) \ \& \ \text{see}(z)(x)] \quad j$  *application*  
 $\neg \exists z [\text{dogs}(z) \ \& \ \text{see}(j, z)]$  *conversion*

In Krifka's (2004) framework, just like in Chierchia 1998, bare plurals are property denoting expressions. Verbs like *see* don't take properties as their argument, so there is a type mismatch. In order to combine with the verb, the bare plural needs to undergo a type shift. As *see* targets concrete individuals, the existential shift is the preferred option. A locality constraint imposed on type repair suffices to derive the narrow scope reading of *dogs* in (40). Local repair implies that the incompatibility between two expressions leads to a shift of one of them and is immediately followed by a successful application of the one to the other.

Krifka (2004) is aware of the possibility of genuine wide scope for modified bare plurals and Carlson's example (20). Under the assumption that type repair happens locally, *parts of that machine* in (20) is not expected to behave differently from *dogs* in (15), and the only reading obtained is the narrow scope one. To derive the wide scope reading of *parts of that machine*, Krifka suggests that bare plurals can take on choice function readings, independently of the readings obtained through type shifting. He further assumes that these readings are generally blocked through the bare plural's competition with *some N* and formulates a specific proposal for the overruling of this blocking in modification contexts.

Summing up, we find that both Chierchia (1998) and Krifka (2004) derive the narrow scope of bare plurals as the default interpretation, but Krifka skips the intermediate step of shifting to kinds in existential contexts. In both frameworks, the wide scope readings of bare plurals that are not kind-referring require a special solution independent of the regular type shifting mechanisms. Theory-internal arguments aside, we see no empirical reason to prefer one framework over the other. This brings us back to scrambling. Scrambled bare plurals take genuine wide scope while maintaining kind reference. As we saw in Section 4.2, they constitute a real challenge for the kind-based approach, but Section 5.2 will show that we can easily handle the data in Krifka's (2004) framework.

## 5.2 Analysis of Dutch scrambled bare plurals in Krifka's (2004) framework

We want to extend the bottom-up composition of scrambling that correctly derived the wide scope reading of the singular indefinite with respect to the adverbial quantifier in (33) to the scrambled bare plural in (35), repeated here.

- (35) Het klopt dat ik **boeken** niet heb uitgelezen.  
 It knocks that I books not have UTT\_read  
 'It's true that there are books that I didn't finish.'

Under the kinds approach to bare plurals, the bottom-up composition led to an incorrect narrow scope interpretation of the scrambled bare plural in (35) (see derivation in (38)). In Krifka's flexible type-shifting framework, the default kind shift is abandoned, and the bare plural undergoes a local existential shift. For the scrambled bare plural in (35), this correctly results in wide scope with respect to negation, as the derivation in (41) shows.

- (41)  $\llbracket \text{uitlezen} \rrbracket = \lambda y_e \lambda x_e. \text{read}(y)(x)$   
 $\llbracket \text{not} \rrbracket = \lambda P \lambda z. \neg P(z)$   
 $\llbracket \text{boeken} \rrbracket = \lambda y_e. \text{books}(y)$   
 $\llbracket \text{ik} \rrbracket = i$
- a.  $\llbracket \text{niet uitlezen} \rrbracket =$   
 $\lambda P \lambda z. \neg P(z) \quad \lambda y \lambda x. \text{read}(y)(x) \quad \text{application}$   
 $\lambda y \lambda x. \neg \text{read}(y)(x) \quad \text{conversion}$
- b.  $\llbracket \text{boeken niet uitlezen} \rrbracket =$   
 $\lambda y \lambda x. \neg \text{read}(y)(x) \quad \lambda y. \text{books}(y) \quad \text{application}$   
**TYPE MISMATCH**  
 $\lambda P \lambda v \exists z [\text{books}(z) \& P(z)(v)] \quad \lambda y \lambda x. \neg \text{read}(y)(x)$   
*local type repair* ( $\exists$ )  
 $\lambda x \exists z [\text{books}(z) \& \neg \text{read}(z)(x)] \quad \text{conversion}$
- c.  $\llbracket \text{ik boeken niet uitlezen} \rrbracket =$   
 $\lambda x \exists z [\text{books}(z) \neg \text{read}(z)(x)] \quad i \quad \text{application}$   
 $\exists z (\text{books}(z) \& \neg \text{read}(i, z)) \quad \text{conversion}$

The surface-oriented composition leads to the application of negation to the verb as a first step. We face a type mismatch when the property denoting bare plural combines with *niet uitlezen*. Just like in (40), we opt for a direct existential shift in (41). This local type repair straightforwardly leads to *books* taking scope over the negated predicate. Interestingly, a local type repair with an existential shift forces *dogs* to scope under negation in (40), but will not push *books* to scope below negation in (41). The result is a straightforward wide scope interpretation of the scrambled bare plural in (35). No extra assumptions are needed to derive the obligatory wide scope interpretation of scrambled bare

plural objects in Krifka's (2004) framework, in contrast to the kinds approach (see Section 4.2).

## 6 Discussion and conclusion

The goal of this paper was to test the possibility of exceptional wide scope for bare plurals. We took our starting point in the neo-Carlsonian analysis developed by Chierchia (1998), because this is the most influential account of bare nominals in the current literature. We found that Chierchia can deal with all of the issues that have been raised in the literature so far. However, the kind-based analysis proves unable to account for the obligatory wide scope reading of scrambled bare plurals. In contrast, the closely related type-shifting analysis developed by Krifka (2004) derives the Dutch facts in a standard compositional analysis of scrambling. We can quibble over the theoretical reasons to prefer one approach over the other, but we cannot escape the conclusion that Krifka's framework is better suited to derive the obligatory wide scope of scrambled bare plurals than Chierchia's.

There are a number of choices we have made throughout the paper and these result in a series of follow-up questions. First, we focused on bare nominals in object position. We had good reasons to set subjects aside but the locality of type shifts that we rely on to get the scrambling facts right seems to predict wide scope to be equally available in (preverbal) subject position. Word order variation is not limited to the *Mittelfeld*, but also occurs in the Germanic *Vorfeld* (de Hoop 1996, Bouma 2008), so getting the facts straight and working out how type-shifting interacts with interpretive mechanisms in subject position is an important follow-up step. Given the complexity of the data, we leave this for further research.

Second, we have illustrated scrambling exclusively with Dutch examples, even though our claims extend beyond this language. Future empirical work should investigate the impact of word order variation on the scope of bare nominals in other scrambling languages. For German, Diesing (1992) drew attention to the wide scope interpretation of bare plurals over adverbials in contexts like (29). The attested examples (42), and (43) suggest that the German scrambling patterns with negation are similar to those in Dutch.

- (42) Ich wußte auch nicht, was ich da bauen sollte oder habe [German]  
 I knew also not what I there build should or have  
**Komponenten** nicht gefunden oder es war mit dem kleinen  
 components not found or it was with the small  
 Inventar so nervig.  
 inventory so annoying  
 ‘I didn’t know either what I should build or [if I did know], there were  
 components I couldn’t find, or [if I did find the components], the small  
 inventory made it an annoying experience.’<sup>8</sup>
- (43) Ich habe **Menschen** nicht wiedererkannt, ich konnte ihre Gesichter und  
 I have people not recognized, I could their faces and  
 ihre Namen nirgends einordnen.  
 their names nowhere classify.’<sup>9</sup>

Under the most natural interpretation of (42), *oder* is strengthened to exclusive *or*, such that every problem that the player managed to solve in the computer game led to a new one. This construal leads to a wide scope interpretation in which certain components were hard to find, once the speaker had decided what to build. The speaker of (43) suffered an aneurysm, and reports on his experiences recovering from and living with his brain injuries. From the pronouns in the follow-up sentence, it is clear that a wide scope reading is intended under which the speaker didn’t suffer from complete memory loss, but had difficulty recognizing certain people. Scrambled bare plurals also appear with predicates that can take kind-referring objects, as illustrated in (44).

- (44) Falls es schon immer so war, dass du **Bücher** nicht magst und  
 In\_case it already always so was, that you books not like and  
 dich zum lesen zwingen musst, dann rate ich dir mit anderen  
 yourself to read force must then advise I you with other  
 Methoden neues zu lernen.  
 methods something\_new to learn  
 ‘If it has always been the case that you don’t like books, and have to  
 force yourself to read, then I advise you to learn new things through  
 other methods.’

<sup>8</sup> Example (42) is taken from the discussion forum <https://www.gamestar.de/xenforo/threads/das-lohnenswerteste-weltraum-erkundungsspiel.469486/> (consulted August 27, 2021).

<sup>9</sup> The example is taken from a website about reintegration in the job market after brain injury, see: <https://derarbeitsmarkt.ch/de/print-artikel/Mein-Leben-wird-nie-mehr-so-sein-wie-frueher> (consulted August 22, 2021).

The addressee in (44) is hypothesized to dislike books in general and is advised to learn new things through other methods than reading. The fact that kind reference is possible in scrambled contexts blocks the escape hatch formulated for modified bare plurals and invites a compositional analysis of the wide scope interpretation of the bare plural in (42) and (43) through a compositional account of scrambling. A full cross-linguistic exploration of wide scope interpretations of scrambled bare plurals will hopefully provide further confirmation of the proposals made in this paper, but the observation that the central empirical facts about Dutch carry over to German is promising.

We conclude that the observations about Dutch scrambling constitute the strongest empirical case for exceptional wide scope of bare nominals in the literature so far. The unambiguous wide scope of bare plurals in scrambled position is problematic for Chierchia's (1998) kind approach. Following Krifka (2004), we abandoned the default kind shift, and derived the facts through a direct existential shift in a compositional analysis of scrambling.

## References

- Abusch, Dorit. 1994. The scope of indefinites. *Natural Languages Semantics* 2(2). 83-135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01250400>.
- Bennis, Hans & Teun Hoekstra. 1985. Gaps and parasitic gaps. *Linguistic Review* 4(1). 29-88. <https://doi.org/10.1515/tlir.1985.4.1.29>.
- van Bergen, Geertje & Peter de Swart. 2010. Scrambling in spoken Dutch: Definiteness versus weight as determinants of word order variation. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 6(2). 267-295. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cllt.2010.010>.
- Bliss, Heather. 2004. The semantics of the bare noun in Turkish. *Calgary Working Papers in Linguistics* 25(Spring). 1-65. <https://doi.org/1880/51464>.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan & Susi Wurmbrand. 2012. Word order and scope: Transparent interfaces and the  $\frac{3}{4}$  signature. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43(3). 371-421. [https://doi.org/10.1162/LING\\_a\\_00094](https://doi.org/10.1162/LING_a_00094).
- Bosveld-de Smet, Leonie. 1998. *On mass and plural quantification: The case of French des/du-NP's*. Groningen, Netherlands: University of Groningen dissertation. <https://research.rug.nl/en/publications/on-mass-and-plural-quantification-the-case-of-french-desdu-nps>.
- Bouma, Gerlof. 2008. *Starting a sentence in Dutch: A corpus study of subject- and object-fronting*. Groningen, Netherlands: University of Groningen. dis-

- sertation. <https://research.rug.nl/en/publications/starting-a-sentence-in-dutch-a-corpus-study-of-subject-and-object>.
- Carlson, Gregory Norman. 1977. *Reference to kinds in English*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts at Amherst dissertation. <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/reference-kinds-english/docview/302863258/se-2>.
- Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen & Rint Sybesma. 1999. Bare and not-so-bare nouns and the structure of NP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(4). 509–542. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4179080>.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1984. *Topics in the syntax and semantics of infinitives and gerunds*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts at Amherst dissertation. <https://www.proquest.com/docview/303307786>.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1998. Reference to kinds across languages. *Natural Language Semantics* 6(4). 339–405. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23748806>.
- Choi, Hye-Won. 1996. *Optimizing structure in context: Scrambling and information structure*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University dissertation. <https://doi.org/10.7282/T3WH2NX2>.
- Chung, Sandra. 2000. On reference to kinds in Indonesian. *Natural Language Semantics* 8(2). 157–171. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026527925514>.
- Condoravdi, Cleo. 1992. Strong and weak novelty and familiarity. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT)* 2. 17–38. <https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v2i0.3038>.
- Corbett, Greville G. 2000. *Number*. Cambridge, UK & New York: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139164344>.
- Dalrymple, Mary & Suriel Mofu. 2012. Plural semantics, reduplication, and numeral modification in Indonesian. *Journal of Semantics* 29(2). 229–260. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffr015>.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 2003. Bare nominals: Non-specific and contrastive readings under scrambling. In Simin Karimi (ed.), *Word order and scrambling*, 67–90. Oxford: Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470758403.ch4>.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 2004. Number marking and (in)definiteness in kind terms. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27(4). 393–450. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25001933>.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 2011. Bare noun phrases. In Klaus von Stechow, Claudia Maienborn & Paul Portner (eds.), *Semantics: An international handbook of natural language meaning*, vol. 2 (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft / Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science (HSK) 33.2), 1088–1109. Berlin & Boston: Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110255072.1088>.

- Delfitto, Denis & Jan Schroten. 1991. Bare plurals and the number affix in DP. *Probus* 3(2). 155–185. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1515/prbs.1991.3.2.155>.
- Diesing, Molly. 1992. Bare plural subjects and the derivation of logical representations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23(3). 353–380. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4178777>.
- Diesing, Molly & Eloise Jelinek. 1995. Disturbing arguments. *Natural Language Semantics* 3(2). 123–176. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23748488>.
- van der Does, Jaap & Helen de Hoop. 1998. Type-shifting and scrambled definites. *Journal of Semantics* 15(4). 393–417. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/15.4.393>.
- Doron, Edit. 2003. Bare singular reference to kinds. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT)* 13. 73–90. <https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v0i0.2881>.
- Espinal, Maria Teresa & Louise McNally. 2010. Bare nominals and incorporating verbs in Spanish and Catalan. *Journal of Linguistics* 46(1). 87–129. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226710000228>.
- Farkas, Donka. 1981. Quantifier scope and syntactic islands. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 17(1). 59–66.
- Farkas, Donka & Henriëtte de Swart. 2003. *The semantics of incorporation: From argument structure to discourse transparency*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Geist, Ljudmila. 2010. Bare singular NPs in argument positions: Restrictions on indefiniteness. *International Review of Pragmatics* 2(2). 191–227. <https://doi.org/10.1163/187731010X528340>.
- Geurts, Bart. 2010. Specific indefinites, presupposition and scope. In Rainer Bauerle, Uwe Reyle & Thomas Zimmermann (eds.), *Presuppositions and discourse: Essays offered to Hans Kamp* (Current Research in the Semantics/Pragmatics Interface 21), 125–158. Brill. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004253162\\_006](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004253162_006).
- Ghomeshi, Jila. 2008. A minimalist approach to scrambling: Evidence from Persian (review). *Language* 84(3). 646–648. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0041>.
- de Hoop, Helen. 1996. *Case configuration and noun phrase interpretation*. New York, NY: Garland Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315051628>.
- de Hoop, Helen. 2000. Optional scrambling and interpretation. In Hans Bennis, Martin Everaert & Eric Reuland (eds.), *Interface strategies*, 153–168. Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts & Sciences (KNAW). <https://hdl.handle.net/2066/104540>.

- de Hoop, Helen. 2003. Scrambling in dutch: Optionality and optimality. In Simin Karimi (ed.), *Word order and scrambling*, 201–216. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470758403.ch9>.
- Iljic, Robert. 1994. Quantification in Mandarin Chinese: Two markers of plurality. *Linguistics: An Interdisciplinary Journal of the Language Sciences* 32(1). 91–116. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1994.32.1.91>.
- Kallulli, Dalina. 1999. *The comparative syntax of Albanian: On the contribution of syntactic types to propositional interpretation*. Durham, UK: Durham University dissertation. <https://etheses.dur.ac.uk/1466/>.
- Kester, Ellen-Petra & Cristina Schmitt. 2007. Papiamentu and brazilian portuguese: A multifaceted approach. In Marlyse Baptista & Jacqueline Guéron (eds.), *Noun phrases in creole languages: A comparative study of bare nominals* (Creole Language Library 31), 107–143. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cll.31.07kes>.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 2003. Scrambling, subscrambling and case in Turkish. In Simin Karimi (ed.), *Word order and scrambling*, 125–155. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470758403.ch6>.
- Krämer, Irene. 2000. *Interpreting indefinites*. Utrecht, Netherlands: Utrecht University dissertation. <https://doi.org/10.17617/2.2057626>.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1980. Die Analyse des bloßen Plurals bei Gregory Carlson. *Linguistische Berichte* 70. 47–50.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2003. Bare NPs: Kind-referring, indefinites, both, or neither? *Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT)* 13. 180–203. <https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v13i0.2880>.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2004. Bare NPs: Kind-referring, indefinites, both, or neither? In Olivier Bonami & Patricia Cabredo Hofherr (eds.), *Empirical issues in formal syntax and semantics: Papers from the Colloque de Syntaxe et de Sémantique de Paris 5 (CSSP 2003)*, 111–132. Also published in Krifka 2003. <http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss5/krifka/>.
- Kuroda, Sige-Yuki. 1970. Remarks on the notion of subject with reference to words like *also*, *even* and *only*, part II. *Annual Bulletin* 4. 127–152. Reprinted in Kuroda 1992.
- Kuroda, Sige-Yuki. 1992. *Japanese syntax and semantics: Collected papers*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-2789-9>.
- Laca, Brenda. 1996. Acerca de la semántica de los plurales escuetos del español. In Ignacio Bosque (ed.), *El sustantivo sin determinación: La ausencia del determinante en la lengua española*, 241–268. Madrid: Visor Libros.

- Le Bruyn, Bert, Min Que & Henriëtte de Swart. 2012. The scope of bare nominals. In Alda Mari, Claire Beyssade & Fabio Del Prete (eds.), *Genericity*, 116–139. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199691807.003.0003>.
- Magri, Giorgio. 2012. No need for a dedicated theory of the distribution of readings of English bare plurals. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT)* 22. 383–402. <https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v22i0.2644>.
- Nakanishi, Kimiko & Satoshi Tomioka. 2004. Japanese plurals are exceptional. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 13(2). 113–140. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JEAL.0000019058.46668.c1>.
- Neeleman, Ad. 1994. *Complex predicates*. Utrecht, Netherlands: Utrecht University dissertation.
- Partee, Barbara. 1987. Noun phrase interpretation and type-shifting principles. In Jeroen Groenendijk, Dick de Jongh & Martin Stokhof (eds.), *Studies in discourse intepretation and the theory of generalized quantifiers*, 115–143. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783112420027-006>.
- Paul, Ileana. 2016. When bare nouns scope wide. The case of Malagasy. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 34(1). 271–305. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43698473>.
- Rullmann, Hotze & Aili You. 2006. General number and the semantics and pragmatics of indefinite bare nouns in Mandarin Chinese. In Klaus von Heusinger & Ken Turner (eds.), *Where semantics meets pragmatics* (Current Research in the Semantics / Pragmatics Interface 16), 175–196. Brill. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9780080462608\\_012](https://doi.org/10.1163/9780080462608_012).
- Ruys, Eddy. 1992. *The scope of indefinites*. Utrecht, Netherlands: Utrecht University dissertation.
- Ruys, Eddy. 2001. Dutch scrambling and the strong-weak distinction. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 4(1). 39–67. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23741037>.
- Sato, Yosuke. 2008. *Radical underspecification, general number, and nominal denotation in Indonesian: An exo-skeletal approach*. *LingBuzz archive, CASTL, Tromsø*. Later published in Sato 2009. <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/000831>.
- Sato, Yosuke. 2009. Radical underspecification, general number, and nominal denotation in Indonesian. In Sandy Chung, Daniel Finer, Ileana Paul & Eric Potsdam (eds.), *Sixteenth meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA)*, 197–209.
- de Swart, Henriëtte. 1992. *Adverbs of quantification: A generalized quantifier approach*. New York, NY: Garland.

- de Swart, Henriëtte. 2000. Scope ambiguities with negative quantifiers. In Klaus van Heusinger & Urs Egli (eds.), *Reference and anaphoric relations* (Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy (SLAP) 72), 109–132. Dordrecht: Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-3947-2\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-3947-2_6).
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 1997. Strategies for scope taking. In Anna Szabolcsi (ed.), *Ways of scope taking* (Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy (SLAP) 65), 109–154. Dordrecht: Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5814-5\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5814-5_4).
- Van den Wyngaerd, Guido. 1989. Object shift as an a-movement rule. In Phil Branigan, Jill Gaulding, Miori Kubo & Kumiko Murasugi (eds.), *MIT working papers in linguistics 11: Proceedings of the 1st student conference in linguistics (SCIL 1)*, 256–271. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Van Geenhoven, Veerle. 1998. *Semantic incorporation and indefinite descriptions: Semantic and syntactic aspects of noun incorporation in West Greenlandic*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Vogels, Jorrig & Monique Lamers. 2008. The placement of bare plural subjects in Dutch. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 25(1). 169–180. <https://doi.org/10.1017/avt.25.18vog>.
- Yang, Rong. 2001. *Common nouns, classifiers, and quantification in Chinese*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University dissertation. <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/common-nouns-classifiers-quantification-chinese/docview/304727509/se-2>.

Bert Le Bruyn  
Utrecht University  
Institute for Language Sciences  
Trans 10  
3512 JK Utrecht  
The Netherlands  
B.S.W.LeBruyn@uu.nl

Henriëtte de Swart  
Utrecht University  
Institute for Language Sciences  
Trans 10  
3512 JK Utrecht  
The Netherlands  
h.deswart@uu.nl