

What is quantification again?

Rafael Nonato (MIT)

Iatridou & Sichel (2008) show that English sentences containing a Neg-DP (DPs headed by 'no') behave semantically as if negation could be striped from the DP and applied to the sentence level. That is, the outcome of number of scopal tests is going to be equivalent whether they're applied to sentences containing Neg-DPs or sentences containing an indefinite DP plus sentential negation.

I note that similar outcomes arise when these tests are applied to sentences containing DPs headed by other quantifiers. Given a desire for a syntax that structurally mirrors these results, they point to the feasibility of a framework where the quantifier determiners in English and similar languages stand as a kind of focus marker related to the presence of a covert sentence-level operator.

That account parallels in some senses the account of negation concord in Zeijlstra (2008). Since the empirical starting point of my analysis is the parallelism between scopal phenomena in sentences with Neg-DPs and other quantifiers, that seems to be a welcome coincidence.

On the other hand, given the desire that the syntactic structure of quantification be homogeneous across languages, the fact that in many less-studied languages universal quantification is expressed only verbally, never on the NP (cf. Thomas 2007), though apparently the opposite pattern is unattested, constitute evidence to my proposal.

#### Cited References

\* Iatridou, Sabine, and Ivy Sichel. 2008. Negative DPs and scope diminishment: some basic patterns. To appear in Proceedings of NELS 38.

\* Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2008. Negative Concord is Syntactic Agreement. Ms.

\* Thomas, Guillaume. 2007. Quantification, completive aspect and degree modification in Mbyá. Proceedings of SULA 4: Semantics of Under-represented languages in the Americas. University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers 35.