Sensitivity and Exhaustivity in *Dou*-Quantification

Jianhua Hu
Institute of Linguistics, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences
ctjhu@yahoo.com

It has been observed that the English universal A-quantifiers *always* and *only* exhibit different properties in terms of sensitivity and exhaustivity in focus interpretation. While *always* allows for a non-exhaustive interpretation, *only* can only have an exhaustive interpretation when associated with focus. Under Beaver and Clark's (2003) analysis, the difference between *always* and *only* is accounted for by the former one's dependency on the context and the latter one's lexical encoding of a dependency on focus. This paper shows that besides these two kinds of A-quantifiers, Chinese has another type of A-quantifiers that can be grouped into neither the *always*-type nor the *only*-type in distribution and interpretation. These A-quantifiers may be termed as the intermediate type of A-quantifiers when compared with those at the two opposite sides represented by *zong(shi)* and *zhi* respectively. The intermediate type of A-quantifiers, represented by *dou*, bears the universal quantificational force as do *zong(shi)* and *zhi*, the Chinese counterparts to the English *always* and *only*. For instance, in the following sentence, *dou* may occur either with or without being associated with a focus.

(1) Ta dou shuo English. "He only speaks English/He always speaks English."

If the object NP *English* bears focus, (1) means that *he only speaks English*. In addition to this reading, (1) has another interpretation where *English* is not in focus. In the latter reading, *dou* can be interpreted as *always*, which, as an adverb of quantification, may have the following representation (Pan 2006).

(2) DOU[s∈ set of situations][he speaks English in s]

$\forall$s [s∈ set of situations→he speaks English in s]

It is shown that while *zong(shi)* and *zhi* are clearly distinguished with respect to focus sensitivity and exhaustivity, the intermediate type of A-quantifiers often blurs such a distinction. Although *dou* sometime behaves like *zong(shi)* and sometimes behaves like *zhi*, it may not be treated as a counterpart to either of them. (3) shows that the replacement of *zong(shi)* by *dou* would result in contradiction in interpretation of the two clauses linked by *ye* 'also', and (4) shows that *dou* cannot be used as *zhi* when there is an aspect marker such as *guo* or *le* in the sentence.

(3) a. ta zong(shi) qu [Beida]^F ting baogao, ta ye zong(shi) qu [Tsinghua]^F ting baogao. "He always goes to Peking University to attend lectures, and he also always goes to Tsinghua University to attend lectures."

b. ??ta dou qu [Beida]^F ting baogao, ta ye dou qu [Tsinghua]^F ting baogao.

(4) a. ta zhi qu guo/le [Beida]^F ting baogao. "He only went to Peking University to attend lectures"

b. *ta dou qu guo/le [Beida]^F ting baogao.

In this paper, we argue that *dou* and *zong(shi)* occupy different syntactic positions and are thus operators that bind different kinds of variables: *dou* is an event variable binder whereas *zong(shi)* is a situation variable binder. Under our analysis, the focus sensitivity of *zong(shi)* and *dou* are parasitic on their respective binding of situation variables and event variables. An important point to notice is that their occurrence in the sentence may not require focus association. In this respect, *zhi* differs from *zong(shi)* and *dou* fundamentally. *Zhi* may occur without binding a situation variable or an event variable, but it must be associated with the focus, given that its occurrence must be licensed by the placement of focus.

References

Beaver, David and Brady Clark. 2003. *Always* and *only*: why not all focus-sensitive operators are alike. *Natural Language Semantics* 11: 323-362.