

## CHAPTER 5

### CONCLUDING REMARKS

#### 5.1. Summary of the Dissertation:

##### Chapter 1:

This chapter first makes a short presentation of Generalized Quantifier Theory and then introduces some logical as well as some linguistic properties that help us differentiate strong from weak quantifiers in natural languages.

Once we consider all these properties, the division we get between Basque strong and weak quantifiers is the following (cf. Etxeberria (2002b)):

- (1a) **Strong Quantifiers:** *guzti* (all), *den* (all), *gehien* (most), *bakoitz* (each).
- (1b) **Weak Quantifiers:** *batzu(e)k* (some), *zenbait* (some), *hainbat* (some), *asko* (many), *gutxi* (few), *ugari* (many), numerals, *numeral baino gehiago* (more than numeral), *numeral baino gutxiago* (less than numeral), etc.

## Chapter 2:

(i) Natural language quantification is contextually restricted by overt or covert domain variables (von Stechow (1994, 1998), S&S (2000a), Stanley (2002), Martí (2003)); crosslinguistically we must allow for both nominal restriction (St'át'imcets language) as well as for Q-det restriction, and languages differ with respect to whether they overtly or covertly restrict their quantificational domain (Giannakidou (2004)).

(ii) Basque generalized quantifiers provide clear evidence for the need of both nominal (Stanley (2002), S&S (2000a)) as well as Q-det domain restriction (Westerståhl (1985), von Stechow (1994), Martí (2003)) depending on whether the quantifiers are lexically strong or strongly interpreted weak quantifiers. Lexically strong quantifiers (*guzti* (all), *den* (all), *bakoitz* (each)) show clear evidence for Q-dets composing with D. Strongly interpreted weak quantifiers on the other hand, either incorporate partitive forms, or introduce a restriction by pragmatic means à la Büring (1996).

(iii) Assuming that Q-detP internal definite D is a nominal domain restrictor (Giannakidou (2004)), there is no need to reanalyze the standard generalized quantifier theory, since it gets things right crosslinguistically. Basque data provides further support in favour of this conclusion.

(iv) It has been shown that *most NPs* (maybe not *most of the NP* --see fn. 64--) and its crosslinguistic counterparts in languages like Spanish, Greek, Catalan and Dutch

do not behave as a Q-det, but rather have the status of a referential expression and behave as a superlative. A closer look at Basque *gehien* has shown that this conclusion is on the right track.

(v) *Guzti*, *den* and *oro* (not *bakoitz* that always behaves as a quantifier) have been treated as ambiguous between a real quantificational interpretation and a reading where they function as a DP exhaustive modifier (à la Brisson (1998, 2003)). *Oro*, in its quantificational interpretation seems to be behaving just like English *every* and Spanish *todo* in that it can not form a partitive construction and does not accept a definite determiner. This would show that Basque also possesses strong quantifiers that restrict their quantificational domain covertly, and as expected, the restriction will have to be done on the nominal (recall that the partitive *ikasleetatik oro* is completely out).

### Chapter 3:

(i) Weak quantifiers are not ambiguous between a cardinal and a proportional interpretation. When no overt partitive is used to create proportional strong quantifiers weak quantifiers are not quantificational, but rather, they behave as cardinality predicates of type  $\langle e, t \rangle$  that are base-generated in NumP (specifier or head, normally not both).

(ii) The propositional partitive interpretation of weak-cardinal quantifiers when there is no overt partitive ‘of the’, is not due to the presence of a covert partitive

construction as claimed by Partee (1988) and others; rather, this interpretation is explained in pragmatics terms (by means of the TFBS when in out of the blue sentences (Büring (1996)). With overt partitives, the weak quantifier will not be cardinal anymore and is claimed to be base-generated in Q-detP, together with the rest of strong quantifiers and will be of quantificational type.

(iii) In opposition to what has been claimed in the literature about the Basque definite determiner (-A/-AK), where it is assumed that both the -A and the plural marker -K are base generated together in the same syntactic position, in the DP head (or in “some kind of Number Phrase” --see Artiagoitia (2003)--); this chapter has suggested that the definite determiner -A and plural marker -K are base generated in different syntactic positions: The base position of the plural marker -K is NumP, while the base generating position of the Basque definite determiner -A (as standardly assumed for definite determiners crosslinguistically) is head of DP.

(iv) Weak-cardinal quantifiers cannot appear with the definite determiner (except numerals) due to the fact that they are unspecified for number. This unspecificity makes them unable to obtain a definite and referential interpretation. The only construction that allows the definite article to appear with these unspecified weak quantifiers is the partitive construction where the definite plays the role of the contextual domain restrictor. Numerals on the other hand, can appear with the definite determiner [Numeral+Noun+AK] and as a consequence are able to get definite as well as referential interpretations; of course, they can also form partitive constructions where as predicted they are interpreted as quantifiers.

(v) When the common noun that combines with weak-cardinal quantifiers is made silent, *batzu(e)k* and *zenbait* and their counterparts in English (*some*) and Spanish (*algunos*) can only obtain proportional, partitive-like interpretations. I claim that this interpretation (extending Büring's analysis to these cases) is the result of the Topic/Focus/Background Structure.

#### Chapter 4:

(i) In line with the so-called Neocarlsonian approach (see Chierchia (1998c), Dayal (2004), Zamparelli (2002a, 2002b) and references therein), which has been shown to be preferable to the Ambiguity approach (Wilkinson (1991), Diesing (1992), Gerstner & Krifka (1993) and Kratzer (1995)), this chapter has claimed that Basque -A is a definite article and as such is always base-generated in [Head, DP] (as standardly assumed for the definite determiner crosslinguistically). I claim that -A is a definite determiner everywhere (contra Artiagoitia (2002)), but very flexible in its ability to type-shift, the latter properly accounts its range of different interpretations.

(ii) Although mass terms share the property of triggering singular verb agreement with singular count terms this chapter postulates that they are number neutral (see Delfitto & Schroten (1991), Doetjes (1997), Dayal (2004), Krifka (2004), among many others). Semantically, mass terms share more properties with plurals than with real singulars; so despite agreement facts with verbs, masses are closer in behaviour to

plurals than to singulars. Thus, count terms will be referred as (morphologically) singular or plural and their syntactic structure will contain the NumP functional projection while mass terms will be claimed not to bear number morphology at all and as a consequence no NumP functional projection will be needed. The analysis proposed in this thesis goes against Artiagoitia (2002)'s proposal who claims that in the existential interpretation the definite determiner is not a real determiner but a number marker that is placed in [Head, NumP], -A when singular, -AK when plural. The problem with Artiagoitia's analysis is that it forces us to treat mass terms as singulars, an undesirable conclusion (see § 6.4.1).

(iii) The different interpretations that definites can get in Basque follow from the Neocarlsonian approach. The existential interpretation of definites (in object position) depends on the kind-level reading (see Chierchia (1998c)). Here, Basque is claimed to be in between English and French: the former makes use of bare plurals to get existential interpretation while the latter needs the definite plus the partitive preposition *de* (*du* for mass terms, *des* for plural count term) to express the same meaning; in Basque, the article is there while the preposition is not. Following Zamparelli (2001b), where it is argued that the definite determiner that combines with the partitive preposition in French and in Italian is a kind-denoting definite; Basque definite determiner in existential interpretations is also claimed to be a kind denoting definite; then, a covert version of the partitive preposition (similar to French *de*) gives us the predicative  $\langle e, t \rangle$  type back. The role of this covert partitive preposition will be halfway the Derived Kind Predication (DKP), that is to say, it gives as an  $\langle e, t \rangle$  type element but no existential closure. This local existential closure will be provided by the DKP which

introduces an existential quantification over instances of the kind in episodic sentences. The difference between strongly interpreted weak quantifiers that cannot make use of the covert partitive preposition (see Chapter 2) and the existential interpretation of definites that are formed by means of the covert version of the partitive is that the former means “being part of N” while the meaning of the latter is “being an instantiation of the kind”.

(iv) Common nouns have been assumed (Dayal (2004), Zamparelli (2002a)) to denote both in the object domain (yielding the normal specific reading) as well as in the taxonomic domain (yielding taxonomic readings). With this assumption, I have claimed that the singular definite generic (see § 6.5.2) is derived from the combination of the taxonomic common noun and the normal definite determiner, the normal *iota* operator.

