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(1), inspired by an example from Schwarzchild (To appear), can be true even if there are no actual boxcars (e.g. no freight train planned for the region). This rules out a de-re construal (even if one is creative about counter-part relations or concept-generators; Percus and Sauerland 2003, Sauerland 2014).

(1) {Jack and Jill, both train enthusiasts, discuss a high-speed freight train that they think will be built in their region. They agree that there will be four different boxcars painted red, blue, yellow, and green. Jack is hoping to ride on the red, blue, and yellow boxcars. Jill is hoping to ride the red and blue boxcars.}

Jack is hoping to ride on every boxcar that Jill is.

Given the de-dicto interpretation, we might think that the quantifier phrase every boxcar is interpreted within the scope of the attitude verb hope. But then Antecedent Contained Deletion (ACD) would not be resolved, contrary to fact.

Should we revisit our assumptions about ACD? The risk is to leave well-known observations about scope unaccounted for (Sag 1976, Williams 1977, Larson and May 1990). To see the challenge, consider a minimal variation on (1) below, modelled on an example from Sag.

(2) {Jill is a train enthusiast. Jack has no interest in trains and has never thought about the properties of boxcars in a train that Jill hopes will be built in the region. However, he’s very much interested in impressing Jill. If asked which boxcars he hopes to ride, he’d answer: “Every boxcar that Jill is hoping to ride.”}

Jack is hoping to ride on every boxcar that Jill is. [false]

(Cf. Jack is hoping to ride on every boxcar that Jill is hoping to ride on.)

(2) is false, and this teaches us that every boxcar must take scope outside of the intensional verb hope for ACD to be resolved, which in turn means that in (1) this scopal relation still allows the noun boxcar to receive a de-dicto interpretation. The conclusion is further supported by the inverse scope de-dicto interpretation in (3); see Geach (1967) for related observations and proposals.

(3) {A group of children discuss a high-speed freight train that they hope will be built in their region. They agree that there will be four different boxcars painted red, blue, yellow, and green. One boy and one girl hope to ride on the red boxcar, another boy and girl hope to ride on the blue boxcar. The other two imagined boxcars do not interest any of the girls (though one of them might interest a third boy).}

A boy is hoping to ride on every boxcar that a girl is.
Based on (1) and (3), we must reject the assumption that a de-dicto interpretation for a noun requires narrow scope for the quantifier that the noun restricts (see Szabó 2010, Keshet and Schwarz 2019). But how are the wide scope de-dicto interpretations in (1) and (3) represented? I would like to suggest a version of every that quantifies over individual concepts with the lexical entries in (4) and (5), and a logical form for (1) as indicated in (6), with C a covert domain restrictor.

(Considerations brought up in Aloni 2001 will have to wait for another occasion.)

(4) \[ every \[ (C_{se,t})(A_{se,t})(B_{se,t}) \iff C \cap A \subseteq B \]
(5) \[ [\text{boxcar}] = \lambda x_{se}. \forall w \in \text{domain}(x)[x(w) \text{ is a boxcar in } w] \]
(6) every C boxcar \[ \lambda x_{se}[[\text{hoping}(\lambda w. \text{Jill ride}_w x(w))]\]
\[ \lambda x_{se}[[\text{hoping}(\lambda w. \text{Jack ride}_w x(w))]\]

Where the denotation of C will have the four salient individual concepts as members:
\[ \lambda w. \text{the red boxcar in } w, \lambda w. \text{the blue boxcar in } w, \ldots. \]
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