

This suggests the descriptive claim that indefinite DPs are only felicitous if this type of entailment does *not* hold. Taken literally, this is too strong since it would exclude all cases of entailment relations between the two arguments of the determiner (cf. *Some linguists are good linguists*). However, the following weaker formulation seems to make adequate predictions:

- (41) If there is no entailment relation between the restrictor P and the nuclear scope Q , then $\lambda w.\exists x.P(w)(x)$ and $\lambda w.\exists x.Q(w)(x)$ do not jointly entail $\lambda w.\exists x[P(w)(x) \wedge Q(w)(x)]$.

The idea is that if we interpret (40a) and (40b) with an upward-monotonic predicate meaning and no domain restriction, (41) is violated unless we apply a domain-restriction mechanism which then gives rise to the non-monotonicity effect. In contrast, cases like (42a) satisfy (41) regardless of how domain restriction works. A more interesting prediction involves predicates of abstract mass individuals that are ‘monotonic’ with respect to the part-of relation. For instance, if you have read a piece of text, it arguably follows that you have read its parts, to the extent that these are also text. One might therefore expect to find a counterpart of the non-monotonicity effect in (42b). (41) predicts – correctly, I suspect – that this is not the case, since two pieces of text do not necessarily have a common part while two propositions (and, if my assumption is correct, two pieces of information) always have a common entailment.

- (42) a. *Some linguists are asleep.*
 b. *John read some text that Mary had (also) read.*

It is therefore worth investigating whether the constraint in (41) makes plausible predictions in other situations – for instance in cases where the monotonicity properties of the restrictor and the nuclear scope are distinct – and if so, how it could be implemented. While (41) could be added to the cross-categorical determiner meaning as a presupposition, it should arguably follow from some deeper, possibly pragmatic principle that also applies to other determiners.¹⁵

7. Conclusion

This paper investigated the truth conditions of sentences with ‘higher-order DPs’ (hDPs) quantifying over propositions. The main focus was on the ‘non-monotonicity effect’: the observation that, given the monotonicity properties we standardly take attitude verbs to have, certain propositions are unexpectedly missing from the domains of hDPs selected by such verbs. According to the descriptive generalization I proposed, hDPs are sensitive to a contextually given question meaning, which provides the ‘structure’ needed to determine the domain of propositions that the hDP quantifies over. In particular, this domain depends on the Hamblin set of the question, rather than just the set of propositions that partially answer it or are relevant to it. If true, this is relevant for the choice between theories of question semantics, since e.g. partition semantics (Groenendijk and Stokhof, 1984) provides no way of deriving Hamblin sets.

While I did not provide an analysis of hDPs that explains the monotonicity effect, the generalization is compatible with various ways of building the effect into the DP meaning, which would remove the need for a non-monotonic verb semantics (cf. Zimmermann 2006). Further, I argued that the effect is not tied to higher-type quantification and proposed a tentative generalization about the class of predicates that give rise to it. If this generalization holds up, the lexical monotonicity properties of different predicates actually play a role in predicting when

¹⁵Note that the effect cannot be due to a Quantity implicature, even if $\lambda w.\exists x[P(w)(x)] \wedge \exists x[Q(w)(x)]$ is assumed to be an alternative of $\lambda w.\exists x[P(w)(x) \wedge Q(w)(x)]$: If (41) is violated, the two putative alternatives are equivalent.

the effect occurs. Needless to say, many empirical questions were left open here. The need for a cross-linguistic study of the non-monotonicity effect, which could decide between different implementations, was already discussed in Section 6. Another open question is whether the effect is found with asymmetric determiners like *every*. Finally, the effect should be related more explicitly to the work of Sutton and Filip (2019) on ‘individuation schemas’ – a contextual parameter that influences how we count abstract entities with propositional content.

References

- Beck, S. (2000). The semantics of *different*: Comparison operator and relational adjective. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 23, 101–139.
- Beck, S. and Y. Sharvit (2002). Pluralities of questions. *Journal of Semantics* 19, 105–157.
- Cremers, A. and E. Chemla (2016). A psycholinguistic study of the exhaustive readings of embedded questions. *Journal of Semantics* 33(1), 49–85.
- Elliott, P. D. (2017). Explaining DPs vs. CPs without syntax. In *Proceedings of CLS 52*, pp. 171–185. Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Geach, P. (1972). A medieval discussion of intentionality. In *Logic Matters*, pp. 129–138. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Groenendijk, J. and M. Stokhof (1984). *Studies on the semantics of questions and the pragmatics of answers*. Ph. D. thesis, Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- Hamblin, C. L. (1973). Questions in Montague English. *Foundations of Language* 10(1), 41–53.
- Haslinger, N. (2019). Quantificational DP arguments of opaque predicates in German. Master’s thesis, University of Vienna.
- Heim, I. and A. Kratzer (1998). *Semantics in Generative Grammar*. Blackwell.
- Hintikka, J. (1969). Semantics for propositional attitudes. In *Models for Modalities. Selected Essays*, pp. 87–111. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Link, G. (2002 [1983]). The logical analysis of plurals and mass terms: A lattice-theoretical approach. In P. Portner and B. Partee (Eds.), *Formal Semantics: The Essential Readings*, pp. 127–146. Blackwell.
- Moltmann, F. (2008). Intensional verbs and their intentional objects. *Natural Language Semantics* 16, 239–270.
- Moltmann, F. (2013). *Abstract Objects and the Semantics of Natural Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Montague, R. (1974). The proper treatment of quantification in ordinary English. In R. H. Thomason (Ed.), *Formal Philosophy. Selected Papers of Richard Montague*, pp. 247–270. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
- Quine, W. V. O. (1960). *Word and Object*. Cambridge, MA/London: MIT Press.
- Spector, B. (2007). Modalized questions and exhaustivity. In T. Friedman and M. Gibson (Eds.), *Proceedings of SALT XVII*, Ithaca, NY, pp. 283–299. Cornell University.
- Sutton, P. and H. Filip (2019). Singular/plural contrasts: The case of informational object nouns. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Amsterdam Colloquium*, pp. 367–376.
- Zimmermann, T. E. (1993). On the proper treatment of opacity in certain verbs. *Natural Language Semantics* 1, 149–179.
- Zimmermann, T. E. (2006). Monotonicity in opaque verbs. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 29, 715–761.