Quantifier Float and the Driving Force for Movement: Evidence from Janitzio P'urhepecha

Introduction. The *quantifier-float* (Q-float) alternation ((1)) has two main analyses.

(1) a. <u>All the walruses</u> are painting. b. <u>The walruses</u> are <u>all</u> painting.

On the **stranding** analysis (Sportiche 1988), (1b) underlyingly contains [*all the walruses*], but the ASSOCIATE *the walruses* moves away from *all*. On the **adverbial** analysis (Brisson 1998), a FLOATED QUANTIFIER (FQ) like *all* in (1b) is not a remnant [*all ~~the walruses~~*], but an adverbial:

(2) **Stranding:** [The walruses]$_1$ are [$_{vP}$ [$_{DP}$ all __$_1$] painting].
     Adverbial: [The walruses]$_1$ are [$_{vP}$ all [$_{vP}$ __$_1$ painting]].

   I provide novel data from Janitzio P'urhepecha (JP; Mexico) showing that <u>JP FQs are **stranded** by movement of their associates</u>, suggesting FQs are *not* universally adverbials.
   I then ask what *drives* DP-movement in JP: a featural requirement of the movement target (**altruistic** movement) or a requirement of the moving element (**greedy** movement). <u>DP-movement in JP is **altruistic**</u>, challenging "Greed-only" views of movement.

Q-float as stranding. On the **stranding** analysis, FQs occupy DP-positions: an FQ is a remnant DP. On the **adverbial** analysis, FQs are adverbials, and do <u>not</u> occupy ordinary DP-positions. In JP, the subject can occupy any □-position in (3). (The adverbials shown are rigidly ordered.)

(3) □ *sesimindu uandantani ia* □ *jimamberi* … *isku jauembarini* □ *sesi* [$_{VoiceP}$ □ …]
        'frankly'   'then'   'suddenly'   'well'

The **stranding** but not the **adverbial** analysis predicts FQs to occur in every □-position. This is correct; I illustrate using the second-lowest □-position:

(4) <u>Iurhitskiri-cha</u>   unta-sɨ-∅-ti=sɨ   **isku jauembarini**   <u>iamindu-eecha</u>   **kanekua**   **sesi**
     young.woman-PL   fix-PFV-PRS-IND+3=3pS   suddenly   all-PL   very   well

    ts'im-eri   kojtsɨtarakue-echa-ni.   'The young women suddenly all fixed their tables very well.'
    they-GEN   table-PL-ACC

This result was replicated for <u>every</u> subject-position; object-positions; and [Spec,FocP]. FQ distribution tracks ordinary DP distribution <u>extremely</u> faithfully—as the **stranding**, but not the **adverbial**, analysis predicts.
   Moreover, JP FQs match their associates in case. I show that this too supports the **stranding** over the **adverbial** analysis.

DP-movement as altruistic. If JP Q-float is associate-DP movement, what in JP <u>motivates</u> DP-movement? JP's rich syntax of subjecthood ((3)) points to an answer. If DP-movement is **altruistic**, optional subject-movement ((3)) is due to optional [EPP:D]-features on functional heads (which I argue are Aspect, Mood, and Polarity). If DP-movement is **greedy** (Bošković 2007), capturing the facts in (3) will require positing that D in JP can <u>optionally</u> bear [*u*Asp] <u>or</u> [*u*Mood] <u>or</u> [*u*Pol], a considerable stipulation.
   Furthermore, **altruistic** movement predicts intervention-effects: a probing F$^0_{[EPP:D]}$ finds the <u>highest</u> DP, so "subject-positions" should never attract nonsubjects. **Greedy** movement predicts <u>no</u> intervention-effects: a nonsubject bearing [*u*Mood] should move over the subject into [Spec,MoodP] to satisfy [*u*Mood]. The former prediction is correct; a JP nonsubject cannot move to a (non-information-structure-related) subject-position when there is an external argument:

(5) ['What happened yesterday?']
    ?I-ni   parikutarakua-ni   exeku-sɨ-∅-ti   Tate.
    this-ACC   car-ACC   fix-PFV-PRS-IND+3   dad
    '#This car, Dad fixed.'   **?OVS**   [**SVO** is perfect; OVS is licit elsewhere]

Conclusion. First, FQs in JP are **stranded** by their associate DPs, challenging analyses on which FQs are universally adverbials. Second, (some) DP-movement in JP is **altruistic**, challenging "Greed-only" analyses of movement.