

that is in complementary distribution with another type of head, DEG, whose presence is marked by the silent *for*-phrase: (8) $[[\text{DEG for a man}] \textit{big}]$
 (9) $[[\text{DEG}] = \lambda P_{\langle e,t \rangle} \cdot \lambda G_{\langle dt,et \rangle} \cdot \lambda D. \lambda x: P(x). \exists D' [G(D')(x) \wedge D' \subseteq D \wedge D \subseteq S_{(P,c)}(G)]]$
 $[[\textit{for a house}] = \lambda x. x \text{ is a house}]$ $[[\textit{big}] = \lambda D_{\langle d,t \rangle} \cdot \lambda x. x\text{'s size} \in D]$

Evidence for this constituent structure comes from the observation that, in addition to *for*-phrases, as in (10), modification by measure phrases, as in (11), is permissible. However, these two types of adjective modification cannot co-occur, (12):

(10) John is tall for a man. (11) John is six feet tall. (12) *John is six feet tall for a man.

Now, when looking at plural nouns such as those in (1) and (2), the *for*-phrase takes a noun which sets the comparison class and derives the effect seen with GAA. More specifically, we propose that the adjective merges underneath the plural phrase (#P, cf. Borer 2005), and so, the identity condition on ellipsis resolution dictates that the silent noun in the *for*-phrase is not structurally specified for number. Then, if a plural phrase merges higher, we can obtain the plural noun. The structure is as follows:

(13) $[_{\text{PluralP}} \text{Plural} [_{\text{NP}} [_{\text{AP}} [\text{DEG for a box}] \textit{heavy}] \text{box}]]$

We further observe that higher syntactic placement of the attributive adjective results in the return of the collective/distributive ambiguity (Ouwayda 2011).

(14) The heavy twelve boxes \checkmark *distributive*; \checkmark *collective*

On the collective reading, (13) does not meet the non-monotonicity requirement, which fits better the view that this requirement is a consequence of the specific syntax and semantics of attributive modification rather than a constraint that rules out an otherwise potentially available reading. To account for the return of collective readings with higher placement of the attributive adjective (cf. (3)), we propose that $[[\text{DEG } [\textit{for N}] \textit{heavy}]$ moves above the plural phrase, and the noun is elided under identity with either a type noun (not specified for number) or a noun specified for number. Ellipsis of the plural noun in the *for*-phrase is licensed based on the assumption that the antecedent should not contain the ellipsis site, and so $[\text{DEG } [\textit{for boxes heavy}]$ moves outside of the Plural head. Attachment outside of the Plural operator allows for the collective reading (see 14), and attachment inside of the Plural operator allows for the distributive reading (as in 13).

(15) $[[[_{\text{AP}} [\text{DEG for boxes}] \textit{heavy}] [_{\text{PluralP}} \text{Plural} [_{\text{NP}} \text{box}]]]$

Evaluative adjectives like *pretty* similarly do not fit the view that non-monotonicity derives the requisite distributivity. In (15), a collective reading of *pretty* would meet the non-monotonicity requirement and yet such a reading is not allowed:

(16) *Context: ugly pieces of gravel come together to form a beautiful mosaic*
 #The pretty rocks formed a mosaic.

We propose that the requisite distributive reading with attributive adjectives stems *independently* of non-monotonicity, derived from the presence/absence of a *for*-phrase, as above, and that non-monotonicity of is a consequence of distributivity.

References: Bale, A. 2008. Count Nouns, Mass Nouns, Plurality and Measure Phrases. U. of Pennsylvania. Kennedy, C. & L. McNally. 2005. Scale structure, degree modification, and the semantics of gradable predicates. Language. Kennedy, C. 2007. Vagueness and grammar: the semantics of relative and absolute gradable adjectives. L&P. Ouwayda, S. 2011. Cardinals, agreement and plurality in Lebanese Arabic. Sinn und Bedeutung 16. Schwarz, B. 2010. A Note on *for*-phrases and derived scales. Sinn und Bedeutung 15. Schwarzschild, R. 2009. Stubborn Distributivity, Multiparticipant Nouns and the Count/Mass Distinction. NELS 39.