

distribution of the latter implicature is constrained in a complicated way (beyond the scope of this paper). And this is the source of the complicated distribution of BP's readings. Thus, (5) says that there is no need for a dedicated theory of the distribution of BP's readings; we need instead a theory of the availability of the not-all implicature for overt indefinites, and that's all we need.

(5) An occurrence of the BP [\emptyset NP] has a generic (existential) reading iff the corresponding overt indefinite [*some* NP] triggers (doesn't trigger) the not-all implicature out of the blue. The talk shows that (5) is indeed borne out on a number of classical cases, such as the following.

■ **Case #1.** Readings of BP subjects correlate with predicate type (Carlson 1972): *dogs* has generic reading with the ILP *carnivorous* in (6a) and existential reading with the SLP *play* in (6b).

- (6) a. *Dogs* are carnivorous. a'. *Some dogs* are carnivorous.
 b. *Dogs* were playing in the backyard. b'. *Some dogs* were playing in the backyard.

This pattern (6a)/(6b) conforms to (5): out of the blue, *some dogs* triggers the not-all implicature in (6a') but not in (6b'). This pattern (6a)/(6b) thus follows straightforwardly from (4).

■ **Case #2.** BP objects can be existential independently of predicate type, as in (7a)-(7b). This conforms to (5): out of the blue, *some dogs/lawyers* trigger no not-all implicature in (7a')-(7b').

- (7) a. John bought *books*. a'. John bought *some books*.
 b. John knows *good lawyers*. b'. John knows *some good lawyers*.
 c. John hates/loves *lawyers*. c'. John hates some/loves *some lawyers*.

The intensional BP object *lawyers* in (7c) is instead construed generically. This pattern again conforms to (5), as *some lawyers* does trigger the not-all implicature in (7c').

■ **Case #3.** Existential BPs only have narrow scope, as in (8a), thus lacking scope ambiguities.

- (8) a. Every boy read *books*. ($\forall\exists, *∃\forall$) b. Every boy read *some books*. ($\forall\exists, \exists\forall$)

Again, this pattern conforms to (5). I argue that when *some books* has wide scope wrt to *every boy* in (8b), it triggers the not-all implicature, as in "Some books are such that every boy read them." That is not necessarily the case when *some books* has narrow scope in (8b), as in "For every boy there are some books he read." When wide scoped, the BP *books* in (8a) thus only gets the generic reading, while the existential reading is only available when the BP is narrow scoped.

■ **Case #4.** Surprisingly, BP subjects of ILPs get the existential reading if embedded under another universal operator: (9a) can mean that for every man *there are* women related to him (Fox 1995).

- (9) a. *Jewish women* are related to every jewish man.
 b. *Some jewish women* are related to every jewish man.

In conformity with (5), *some women* in (9b) triggers no implicature when scoped below *every man*.

■ **Case #5.** The BP *typhoons* in (10a) can be construed as existential or generic (Wilkinson 1991).

- (10) a. *Typhoons* arise in this part of the pacific. b. *Some typhoons* arise in this part of . . .

In conformity with (5), *some typhoons* in (10b) does or does not trigger the not-all implicature, depending on whether the sentence is construed as about typhoons or about this part of the pacific.

■ **Other readings.** (a) The BP *students* in (11a) is neither generic nor existential, rather equivalent to the definite *the students* (Condoravdi 1997). By (4), the reading predicted for this BP is existential plus the negation of the implicature triggered by *some students* in (11b). The latter implicature is that it is false that the students on campus were aware, not that all students in general were. The predicted meaning of (11a) is thus that the students on campus were aware, as desired.

- (11) a. In 1985 there was a ghost haunting the campus. *Students* were aware of this fact.
 b. In 1985 there was a ghost haunting the campus. *Some students* were aware of this fact.

(b) For the kind-reading, I assume (as Diesing 1992 and Chierchia 1995) that BPs are ambiguous between kind-denoting terms and predicates with the null determiner \emptyset ; my proposal only applies to the latter. (c) To account for extreme narrow scope *existential* BPs (Carlson 1972), I assume that \emptyset can take narrower scope than overt indefinites. My proposal crucially predicts that extreme narrow scope *generic* BPs cannot exist (as the alternative with the overt indefinite is unavailable).