Polarity driven quantification: On some parallelisms between definites, bare

arguments and donkey pronouns.

Gennaro Chierchia

Consider a slogan like "People are fed up; don't mess with them". The first sentence in it means roughly: All the people around are fed up. The second means: Do not mess with any of them. Even though the second sentence looks just like a negative counterpart of the first, it doesn't have the expected compositional meaning: it doesn't mean "do not mess with all the people". This phenomenon is extremely general. It takes place with Bare Plurals, like people in our slogan. It figures prominently in the behavior of Plural Definites, where it goes under the rubric of 'homogeneity' (I spoke to the students in trouble $\cong \forall / I$ didn't speak to the students in trouble \cong $\neg \exists$). It also takes place with to Donkey pronouns (*Every farmer who had a donkey sold it* $\cong \forall / No$ man who had a donkey sold it $\cong \neg \exists$). These switches of quantificational force under polarity reversals call to mind Free Choice phenomena. In particular, a determiner like any is interpreted as a narrow scope existential in a sentence like *I* didn't talk to any student in trouble $\cong \neg \exists$; however, in positive environments, the existential meaning of any emerges as strengthened to universal *I spoke to any student in trouble* $\cong \forall$. It is tempting to conjecture that the source of this uniform behavior is a uniform mechanism. While these constructions (Free Choice any, Bare Plurals, Plural Definites, and Donkey pronouns) have been studied extensively, and insightful analyses have been proposed in some cases (cf., in particular, Bar Lev (2018, 2019) on Plural Definites), a unitary analysis has not been attempted to the best of my knowledge. In spite of the many challenges that such a unified analysis faces, it is worth a try, for, if successful, it would considerably push forward our understanding of a wide range of very diverse constructions.