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1. Indeterminate-mo NPIs

(1) a. Yoko-wa dare-mo shootaishi-nakat-ta.
   Yoko-Top who-MO invite-not-Past
   'Yoko didn't invite anyone.'

   b. dare-mo Yoko-o shootaishi-nakat-ta.
      who-MO Yoko-Acc invite-not-Past
      'Nobody invited Yoko.' (Lit. *Anybody didn't invite Yoko.) [Like Hindi]

(2) A partial list of indeterminate pronouns:              [x: low tone]
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dare (person)</th>
<th>nani (thing)</th>
<th>doko (place)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dare...Q</td>
<td>nani...Q</td>
<td>doko...Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'who'</td>
<td>'what'</td>
<td>'where'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dare-ka</td>
<td>nani-ka</td>
<td>doko-ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'someone'</td>
<td>'something'</td>
<td>'somewhere'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dare-mo</td>
<td>nani-mo</td>
<td>doko-mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'everyone'</td>
<td>'everything'</td>
<td>'everywhere'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dare-mo</td>
<td>nani-mo</td>
<td>doko-mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'anyoneNPI'</td>
<td>'anythingNPI'</td>
<td>'anywhereNPI'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dare-de-mo</td>
<td>nani-mo</td>
<td>doko-de-mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'anyoneFC'</td>
<td>'anythingFC'</td>
<td>'anywhereFC'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Mo as 'also/even' [Like Hindi bhii]

(3) Yoko-wa Saburo-mo shootaishi-ta.
   Yoko-Top Saburo-MO invite-Past
   'Yoko also/even invited Saburo.'

• Can we extend Lahiri’s (1998) analysis of Hindi NPIs to indeterminate-mo NPIs?
  Indeterminate-mo NPIs have more limited distribution.¹

¹ Minimal value NPIs (e.g., hito-ri-mo = one-Cl person-MO, 'even a single person') and exceptive NPIs (e.g., Taro-sika 'anyoneNPI but Taro') require sentential negation, too. There are other, less studied types of items (NPIs?) that seem to have wider distribution: e.g., sonnani 'so much/that much' (Y.-S. Lee 1993, Nam 1996, Yoshida 1997).
(4) Descriptive generalizations for indeterminate-*mo* NPI licensing
   a. Sentential negation requirement
   b. Clausemate requirement (But see Yamashita 2003.)
   -----
   c. Immediate scope requirement —not absolute (Linebarger 1987)
   d. Scope rigidity —general property of LF in Jpn.

• Scope of *fewer than five students*

(5) *[go-nin ika-no gakusei]-ga nani-mo yon-da.
   five-Cl person fewer.than-Gen student-Nom what-MO read-Past.
   'Fewer than five students read anything.'

• Restriction of *every*

   what-MO read-Past every student pass-Past
   'Every student who read anything passed.'

(7) Three types of NPIs [See Bernhard's handout on 8/27/03]
   a. Weak *any, ever, ...* mere monotone decreasing context
   b. Strong *lift a finger, ...* anti-additive context
   c. Superstongone *bit, ...* sentential negation

(8) a. Taro didn't say [that Yoko invited anyone].
      Taro-Top Yoko-Nom who-mo invited that say-not-Past
      'Taro didn't say that Yoko invited anyone.'

2. Existential vs. universal analyses of NPIs

(9) a. Yoko didn't invite *anyone*.
   b. Yoko-wa dare-mo shootaishi-nakat-ta.
      Yoko-Top who-MO invite-not-Past
      'Yoko didn't invite anyone.'

(10) a. Narrow scope existential:  ¬∃x[x is a person & Yoko invited x]
    b. Wide scope universal:   ∀x[x is a person → ¬Yoko invited x]
(11) a. \[[\text{anyone/dare-mo}]\] = \(\lambda P \exists x [\text{person}(x) \& P(x)]\)  
   b. \[[\text{anyone/dare-mo}]\] = \(\lambda P \forall x [\text{person}(x) \rightarrow P(x)]\)

- *Any* NPIs: Narrow scope existential (Ladusaw 1979, Carlson 1980)
- *ind-mo* NPIs: Assumed to be like English *any*. (e.g., Nam 1994)

Recent proposal
What we see in (9b) is a negative concord phenomenon (Kawamori & Ikeya 199x, Watanabe 2002a,b).

**Negative concord phenomenon**
    n-body has come  
    'Nobody came.'  
   b. *(No) ha venido nadie.  
    not has come n-body  
    'Nobody came.'

(13) *Nadie* 'n-body' is:
   (a) always a negative quantifier (NOBODY).
   (b) always an NPI (ANYBODY).  
      (i) narrow scope existential NPI\(^2\)  
      (ii) wide scope universal NPI\(^3\)  
   (c) ambiguous between (a) and (b).

(14) *Dare-mo* is always a negative quantifier.  
    Sentential negation has no semantic content.  
    \[[\text{dare-mo}]\] = \(\lambda P \neg \exists x [\text{person}(x) \& P(x)]\)  
    = \(\lambda P \forall x [\text{person}(x) \rightarrow \neg P(x)]\)  
    (Watanabe 2002a,b)

**Outline**
  i. I present evidence for (11b), the wide scope univ. analysis of *ind-mo* NPIs.
  ii. It turns out that the evidence also shows that (14) is not tenable.

\(^2\) See, for example, Ladusaw (1992), Kratzer (2003) and Alonso-Ovalle and Guerzoni (2003).
\(^3\) Giannakidou (2000) analyzes Greek emphatic n-words as wide scope universals.
3. Constructing cases where the two analyses make different predictions

(15) Downward monotone functions [See Bernhard's handout on 8/27/03]
    \[ f(A \lor B) \rightarrow f(A) \land f(B) \]  
    (Zwarts 1998)

(16) Anti-additive functions
    \[ f(A \lor B) = f(A) \land f(B) \]

(17) Anti-morphic functions (Sentential negation)
    a. \[ f(A \lor B) = f(A) \land f(B) \]  
    b. \[ f(A) \lor f(B) = f(A \land B) \]

(18) a. \[ \neg \exists = \forall \neg \] 
    b. \[ \exists \neg = \neg \forall \]

(19) a. (Alex danced) or (Christina danced) or (Tammy danced).
    b. Someone danced.

(20) a. (Alex danced) and (Christina danced) and (Tammy danced).
    b. Everyone danced.

What we should look for is:

(21) Non-anti-additive functions
    \[ f(A \lor B) \not\equiv f(A) \land f(B) \]

(22) Non-anti-additive function \(\neg Q\)  
    (23) Non-anti-additive function \(\neg \neg Q\)
    a. \[ \neg Q \exists \]  
       \[ \neg \neg Q \exists \]
    b. \[ \not\forall \neg Q \]  
       \[ \not\forall \neg \neg Q \]

(24) The IRS rarely audits anyone. (Ladusaw 1979)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>predicted reading</th>
<th>actual reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>(\exists)-analysis</td>
<td>(\neg Q \exists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>(\forall)-analysis</td>
<td>(\forall Q \neg)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i) \(Q \neg \exists\) It is usually not the case that there is someone whom the IRS audits.  
    (= The IRS almost always audits no one.)

ii) \(\forall Q \neg\) *Everyone is such that it is usually the case that the IRS doesn't audit him.
4. Indeterminate-*mo* NPIs as wide scope universals?

QAdv

(26) kopiishitsu-ni-wa taitei(-no baai)/hotondo(-no baai)/mettani
copy room-in-WA in most/almost all cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPI</th>
<th>Neg</th>
<th>dare-mo</th>
<th>i-nai</th>
<th>yo. (iru-to sureba, Peter-da.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dare-mo</td>
<td>i-nai</td>
<td>yo. (iru-to sureba, Peter-da.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'It is mostly/almost always the case that there isn't anyone in the copy room. (If anyone, it's Peter.)'

(27) [...QAdv...NPI...Neg...]

| i) \text{∃-analysis} | Q \neg \exists | \text{possible reading} | Q \neg \exists |
| ii) \text{∀-analysis} | \forall Q \neg | \text{actual reading} | Q \forall \neg |

\begin{align*}
\text{i) } & Q \neg \exists \quad \text{mostly } \neg [\text{someone}_x \ [x \text{ is in the copy room}] \\
\text{ii) } & \forall Q \neg \quad \text{everyone}_x \ [\text{mostly } \neg [x \text{ is in the copy room}]
\end{align*}

\text<i>4d: SR (& 4c: ISR)>\text

\begin{align*}
\text{i') } & Q \forall \neg \quad \text{mostly } [\text{everyone}_x \neg [x \text{ is in the copy room}] \\
\end{align*}

\text<i>ISR not satisfied>\text

(28) dare-mo taitei(-no baai)/hotondo(-no baai)/mettani
who-MO in most/almost all cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPI</th>
<th>QAdv</th>
<th>kopiishitsu-ni-wa i-nai yo. (ok/#iru-to sureba, Peter-da.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kopiishitsu-ni-wa i-nai yo. (ok/#iru-to sureba, Peter-da.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\text{a. } \text{same as (26)}

\text{b. 'For everyone, it is mostly/almost always the case that he or she is not in the copy room. (#If anyone, it's Peter.)'}

(29) [...NPI...QAdv...Neg...]

| i) \text{∃-analysis} | Q \neg \exists | \text{possible reading} | Q \neg \exists |
| ii) \text{∀-analysis} | \forall Q \neg | \text{actual reading} | \forall Q \neg |

\begin{align*}
\text{ii) } & \forall Q \neg \quad \text{everyone}_x \ [\text{mostly } \neg [x \text{ is in the copy room]}
\end{align*}

\text<i>ISR not satisfied>\text
- What's the picture now?
i) Universal quantificational phrases that are not polarity sensitive and undergo normal QR:
   *dare-mo* 'everyone', *doko-mo* 'everywhere', ...

ii) Universal quantificational phrases that are specified to be polarity sensitive and undergo QR to Spec of NegP:
   *dare-mo* 'everyone$_{\text{NPI}}$', *doko-mo* 'everywhere$_{\text{NPI}}$', ...

iii) *Mo* in indeterminate-*mo* always contributes universal quantification.

5. Could they be negative quantifiers?

- (28) also shows that the meaning of *dare-mo* cannot contain negation as in (14).

$(14)$ \[
[[\text{dare-mo}]] = \lambda P \neg \exists x [\text{person}(x) \land P(x)] \\
= \lambda P \forall x [\text{person}(x) \rightarrow \neg P(x)] \quad \text{(Watanabe 2002a,b)}
\]

Puzzle for both negative and non-negative quantifier analyses:
—What's going on with negative fragment answers?
—What kind of ellipsis is involved?

$(30)$ Q: Ti idhes? \hspace{1cm} (32) Q: Nani-o mi-ta no?
what saw.2sg \hspace{1cm} what-Acc see-PastQ
'What did you see?' \hspace{1cm} 'What did you see?'
A: TIPOTA. \hspace{1cm} A: Nani-mo.  
n-thing \hspace{1cm} what-MO
'Nothing' (Giannakidou 2000) \hspace{1cm} 'Nothing' (Watanabe 2002a,b)

$(31)$ a. TIPOTA [dhen idha] \hspace{1cm} (33) a. Nani-mo [mi nakat-ta]
n-thing not saw.1sg \hspace{1cm} what-MO see-not-Past
'I didn't see anything.' \hspace{1cm} 'I didn't see anything.'

b.*TIPOTA [idha] \hspace{1cm} b.*Nani-mo [mi-ta]
n-thing saw.1sg \hspace{1cm} what-MO see-Past
'I saw anything.' \hspace{1cm} 'I saw anything.'

$^4$ Giannakidou (2000: 466) reports that there are recorded instances in southern Igbo where 'anyone/anything' and 'everyone/everything' are distinguished only by tone.
Appendix: Why teasing the two analyses apart is so difficult in Japanese

The properties (4c) and (4d) conspire to make it very difficult to construct cases that decide between the narrow scope existential and wide scope universal analyses. What follows is a chronicle of unsuccssful attempts to tease the two analyses apart, despite the potentially deciding configurations that contain non-anti-additive expressions.

A. [...Q...NPI...Neg...]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Q} & \text{NPI} & \text{Neg} \\
(1)\text{ ooku-no seijika-ga} & \text{dare-mo} & \text{yoba-nakat-ta.} & \text{(Sohn 1995)} \\
\text{many-Gen politician-Nom} & \text{who-MO} & \text{invite-not-Past} \\
\text{'Many politicians didn't invite anyone.'}
\end{array}
\]

(2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>possible reading</th>
<th>actual reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) (\exists)-analysis</td>
<td>(\neg Q) (\exists)</td>
<td>(Q \neg \exists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) (\forall)-analysis</td>
<td>(\forall Q \neg)</td>
<td>(Q \forall \neg)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i) \(Q \neg \exists\) many politicians\(x\) \(\neg\) \{someone\(y\) [x invited y \(\checkmark\)]

ii) \(\forall Q \neg\) everyone\(y\) \{many politicians\(x\) \(\neg\) [x invited y \(*<4d: SR (\& 4c: ISR)>\]

ii') \(Q \forall \neg\) many politicians\(x\) \{everyone\(y\) \(\neg\) [x invited y \(\checkmark\)]

(3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>possible reading</th>
<th>actual reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) (\exists)-analysis</td>
<td>(\neg Q) (\exists)</td>
<td>(Q \neg \exists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) (\forall)-analysis</td>
<td>(\forall \neg Q)</td>
<td>(Q \forall \neg)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i) \(\neg Q \exists\) \(\neg\) many politicians\(x\) \{someone\(y\) [x invited y \(*<4c: ISR>\]

ii) \(\forall \neg Q\) everyone\(y\) \{many politicians\(x\) [x invited y \(*<4d: SR>\]

B. [...NPI...Q...Neg...]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{NPI} & \text{Q} & \text{Neg} \\
(4)\text{ dare-mo} & \text{ooku-no seijika-o} & \text{yoba-nakat-ta.} & \text{(Sohn 1995)} \\
\text{who-MO} & \text{many-Gen politician-Acc} & \text{invite-not-Past} \\
\text{'No one invited many politicians.'}
\end{array}
\]
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>possible reading</th>
<th>actual reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>(\exists)-analysis</td>
<td>(Q \neg \exists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>(\forall)-analysis</td>
<td>(\forall Q \neg)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. \(Q \neg \exists\) many politicians, \(y \neg [\text{someone}_x [x \text{ invited } y]\) *<4d: SR>
2. \(\forall Q \neg\) everyone, \(x [\text{many politicians}, y \neg [x \text{ invited } y]\) *<4c: ISR>

\(\neg\exists\) \(\neg\) \(\neg\exists\) \(\neg\) \(\neg\exists\) \(\neg\exists\)

\(\forall\neg\) \(\forall\neg\) \(\forall\neg\) \(\forall\neg\)

\(\neg\) \(\neg\) \(\neg\) \(\neg\)

\(\neg\) \(\neg\) \(\neg\) \(\neg\)

\(\neg\) \(\neg\) \(\neg\) \(\neg\)

\(\neg\) \(\neg\) \(\neg\) \(\neg\)

\(\neg\) \(\neg\) \(\neg\) \(\neg\)
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