

and their simple definite counterparts, since it is generally assumed that scopal relations are established by the syntactic engine. However, *all DPs* behave like quantified noun phrases with respect to their ability enter into scope relations with other operators, relations that are determined by syntactic operations like Quantifier Raising (QR). Firstly, although they are both (at least to some extent), universally quantified, definite subjects of distributive sentences and subjects headed by *every* have different scope properties. For example, while negation always scopes under the universal quantifier contributed by the distributive predicate (3a), subjects headed by *every* can take scope either above or below negation (3b).

(3) a. The girls are not late (Only $\forall > \neg$) b. Every girl is not late ($\neg > \forall$ & $\forall > \neg$)

However, as shown in (4), *all DPs* pattern like *every DPs* (and unlike definites): they can scope both above and below negation.

(4) All the girls are not late ($\neg > \forall$ & $\forall > \neg$)

Additionally, in configurations in which QR for an *every DP* is impossible (like in *how many* questions (5b)), *all DPs* (but not definites (5a)) are similarly limited in scope (6).

(5) a. How many books did the girls read? (*what* $n > \forall$ & $\forall > \textit{what } n$)

b. How many books did every girl read? (Only *what* $n > \forall$)

(6) How many books did all the girls read? (Only *what* $n > \forall$)

A final argument that *all DPs* play an important role in syntactic derivations comes from their role in NPI licensing. Firstly, unlike definites (7a), like *every DPs* (7b), *DPs* headed by *all* can license NPIs in their complement (8).

(7) a. *The girls who read anything passed the exam

b. Every girl who read anything passed the exam

(8) All the girls who read anything passed the exam

Secondly, while definites don't intervene in NPI licensing (9a), universally quantified *DPs* do.

(9) a. John doesn't think that the girls bought anything

b. *John doesn't think that every girl bought anything

Yet again, *all DPs* pattern like universally quantified *DPs* (10), not definites.

(10) *John doesn't think that all the girls bought anything

In summary, we argue that the *all's* grammatical contribution cannot be limited to influencing post-syntactic processes like variable assignment to indexical expressions. The status of *all DPs* as universal quantifiers must be established prior to the end of the derivation.

4. All in the Localist View. Similar to Brisson and other authors, we propose that the distributivity operator imposes a relation on the part-structure of the definite subject. This relation is contextually determined; therefore fixing it is a matter for pragmatics. However, unlike previous authors, we propose that supplying this relation can be local and sub-propositional: we propose *all* fixes it immediately after this lexical item is merged into the structure. Therefore, the syntactic engine applies to *all DPs* as if they were universal quantifiers, which is why they behave in the same way as *every DPs* with respect to scope interaction and NPI licensing. We therefore conclude (along with Récanati, Chierchia, Fox, and Spector) that (at least some) pragmatic computation mirrors syntactic computation and that the syntax-pragmatics interface is much more intricate than is traditionally thought.

5. References. 1. Brisson, C. (2003). "Plurals, All, and the Non-Uniformity of Collective Predication." *Linguistics & Philosophy*. 26. 2. Chierchia, G. D. Fox & B. Spector. (2008). "The Grammatical View of Scalar Implicatures and the Relationship between Semantics and Pragmatics". *Handbook of Semantics*. 3. Grice, P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. HUP. 4. Lasersohn, P. (1999). "Pragmatic Halos." *Language*. 75. 5. Morzyki, M. (2002). "Wholes and their Covers." *SALT XII*. 6. Récanati, F. (2004). *Literal Meaning*. CUP. 7. Schwarzschild, R. (1996). *Pluralities*. Springer.