This study investigates the Modern Greek floating quantifier *ola* 'all' to determine how and why floating constructions are generated. Based on some of the semantic and syntactic properties of *ola*, I argue that floating is a product of split PF and LF privileging of copies of the *ola*-phrase.

The central idea is the following: split privileging redefines the labor carried out by each component. Syntax is responsible for the movement of the QP, composed of *ola* and its DP restriction, and the interfaces are each tasked with activating either one or both QP copies. Consequently, LF-movement for scope assignment is dispensed with, and the PF rule 'pronounce higher copy' now co-exists with additional spellout options.

I present three arguments in favor of this analysis. The first concerns the role of syntax. Its role is to create a QP chain via movement. Using topicalization, long-distance A’-movement and the lack of intervention effects as diagnostics, I show that *ola* behaves and moves like a phrase, and therefore each chain link hosts a copy of the entire QP. The second argument is related to split privileging at PF. This process creates the floating effect; part of the QP copy is pronounced at its lower position, and part of it at its higher position (1). I suggest that this is often triggered by topicalization or focalization.

(1) a. *Ola* pigan *ta* pedia ekdromi. [Q … DP …] → [Q DP … Q DP …]
   All.3pl went the.3pl children.3pl field-trip

   b. *Ta* pedia pigan *ola* ekdromi. [DP … Q …] → [Q DP … Q DP …]
   The.3pl children.3pl went all.3pl field-trip

   'All the children went on a field trip.'

The third argument discusses split privileging at LF, which is used to derive scope construals. I present sentences where *ola* interacts with other operators to show that the overt position of the operator *ola* does not always coincide with its scope-taking point. The lower copy is active for θ-assignment, and either the higher position or the lower one is the locus of scope assignment. Constructions where *ola* interacts with the deontic modal *boro* substantiate the former, and those where it interacts with negation are evidence of the latter.

Having argued that the phonological outcome and the scope effects of floating quantifier constructions are attributable to overt-covert combinations of QP copy parts, I briefly discuss a potential problem. QP movement is predicted to overgenerate copies in a [DP Q … ] configuration (2). I propose that this permutation results from internal restructuring, where the DP raises to Spec.QP, rather than the generation of two string adjacent copies.

(2) *Ta* pedia *ola* pigan ekdromi. [DP Q … ] → [Q DP Q DP …]
   The.3pl children.3pl all.3pl went  field-trip

   'The children all went on a field trip.'

There is a considerable amount of research dedicated to determining how syntax interacts with the interfaces. Bobaljik (2002) and Tsoula and Yeo (2017) present arguments in favor of minimizing the labor of covert syntax, and Boskovic and Nunes (2007) argue for a computational mechanism where more than one chain link can be active at each interface. This study is aligned with these efforts, and extends this line of argument to capture the floating quantifier phenomenon involved in constructions with *ola*.