N-words and the Wide Scope Illusion

Jovana Gajić

1. Introduction

A strict Negative Concord (NC) language, such as Serbo-Croatian (S-C), is, by definition, contrasted with a double negation (DN) language, such as Standard English. This is reflected through the interaction of sentential negation with other negatively marked elements.

In S-C, n-words form a wh-based class of items, identifiable by the prefix/particle *ni-*.[1] As shown in (1a) and (1b), n-words in a strict NC language require the presence of an overt verbal marker of sentential negation (*ne*), regardless of their position in the sentence (subject and preverbal in (1a) or object and postverbal in (1b)), in contrast to the negative expressions in Standard English. The example in (1c) shows that double negation readings are not possible in S-C when one or more n-words are present in the clause (compare with Standard English 'Nobody sees nobody'). In general, S-C sentences involving both n-words and sentential negation only get interpreted with one logical negation. Finally, S-C n-words are grammatical in fragment answers to wh-questions (1d), which traditionally distinguishes them from Negative Polarity Items (NPIs), such as S-C *iko* ('*i*-who') or English *anybody*.

(1) a. Niko   ne čita.
         n-person_NOM not reads

         Nobody reads.

     b. Stevan ne vidi nikoga.
         Stevan not sees n-person_ACC

         Stevan sees nobody./Stevan doesn't see anybody.

     c. Niko   ne vidi nikoga.
         n-person_NOM not sees n-person_ACC

         Nobody sees anybody.

     d. A: Koga   si   video? B: Nikoga./*Ikoga.
         who_ACC AUX2Sg see   n-person_ACC/NPI_ACC

         A: Who did you see? B: Nobody./*Anybody.

On the other hand, S-C n-words are unacceptable in contexts in which NPIs are attested, as shown in (2). Normally, n-words in strict NC don't occur with extraclausal sentential negation[2] (2a), nor in other Downward Entailing (DE) contexts, such as the scope of the quantifier 'few' (2b). NPIs of the *i*-wh class are grammatical in these contexts.

(2) a. Josip ne vidi da je   *niko/iko   došao.
         Josip not sees that AUX3Sg n-person/NPI_NOM come

         Josip doesn't see that anyone came.

In this paper, I will use the historical name 'Serbo-Croatian' for the language that is nowadays often referred to as 'Bosnian/Croatian/Montenegrin/Serbian'.

[1] This paper features only the human-denoting n-word *niko* ('*ni*-who'), however, the paradigm extends further, with *ništa* ('*ni*-what'), *nigde* ('*ni*-where'), *nikad* ('*ni*-when'), *nikako* ('*ni*-how'), etc.

[2] This is valid for the majority of predicates, at least.

b. Malo studenata je   pročitalo *ništa/išta.
   few   students_{GEN} _{AUX3Sg} read   n-thing/NPI_{ACC}
   Few students read anything.

What is the interpretation that n-words get in strict NC languages and is it possible to relate it to the interpretation that negative expressions have in Double Negation languages? Two parameters seem to be semantically relevant here: whether n-words are inherently negative and whether they are existential or universal quantifiers. Reflecting the split in the first parameter, there are two groups of approaches to n-words in strict NC:

1. N-words are negative quantifiers (Zanuttini (1991), Haegeman & Zanuttini (1991), deSwart & Sag (2002)).

2. N-words are (non-negative) NPIs/indefinites (Ladusaw (1992), Laka (1990)).

Within the latter stand (that n-words in NC are not inherently negative), there are two approaches to the second parameter. These offer different accounts for the scopal relation between the n-word and the operator that is in charge of introducing sentential negation:

- N-words are indefinites in the scope of the negative operator (Zeijlstra (2004)).

- N-words are NPIs, but they outscope the negative operator, after Quantifier Raising (Giannakidou (2000)).

From a semantic point of view, distinguishing between these two possibilities is not an easy task. The reason for this is that an environment consisting of sentential negation and one or more n-words is characterized as anti-additive - it satisfies the De Morgan's equivalence in (3).

(3) a. $\neg(P \lor Q) \Leftrightarrow \neg P \land \neg Q$
     b. John didn't meet the students or the professors $\Leftrightarrow$ John didn't meet the students and John didn't meet the professors.

If a semantic function allows for the equivalence between a disjunction in the scope of negation and a conjunction that outscopes negation, then the same function will also host the equivalence between an existential in the scope of negation and a universal scoping above negation (4a). Thus, in a simple negative context, an n-word can be interpreted both as a narrow-scope existential and as a wide-scope universal (4b, 4c).

(4) a. $\neg\exists x.P(x) \Leftrightarrow \forall x.\neg P(x)$
     b. Josip ne čuje nikoga.
         Josip not hears n-person_{ACC}
         Josip doesn't hear anyone.
     c.   i. For every x, it is not the case that Josip hears x. $[\forall > \neg]$
          ii. It is not the case that Josip hears some (or other) x. $[\neg > \exists]$

Recall that local sentential negation is the only context available for n-words in S-C. Is this a real impasse or is there a way to tease apart the narrow-scope existential from the wide-scope universal interpretation? A diagnostic employed to disentangle the two interpretations of n-words, featured in this paper following Shimoyama (2011), relies on intervention with an additional scope-taking element in the LF configuration. This scope intervention is performed in two guises: intervention with necessity modals and intervention with quantificational adverbs. If scopal configurations where the intervening element appears between the n-word and the sentential negation at LF are available among the readings of test sentences, then the narrow-scope existential interpretation of the n-word can be distinguished from the wide-scope universal one. The following two sections show how this works for S-C n-words.

2. Scope Intervention with modals

As observed in German and other double negation varieties of languages (Jacobs (1980), Penka (2010), Zeijlstra (2011)), a necessity modal (such as *müssen* or *have to*) can yield a 'split-scope' reading of the negative determiner (such as *kein* or *no*), where the latter is decomposed into a negative and an indefinite component at LF. An example from German is given in (5).

(5) Du musst keine Krawatte anziehen.
    you must no   tie   wear

    a. 'It is not required that you wear a tie'
    b. 'There is no tie that you are required to wear'
    c. 'It is required that you don't wear a tie'

With the scope relations as in (5a), the n-word can only be interpreted as a narrow-scope existential, since it is not possible to transform this configuration into one where the negative determiner would outscope the sentential negation. However, this is possible in the case of the other two interpretations ((5b) and (5c)) that are available in German - the negative determiner can be represented both as an indefinite in the scope of negation and as a universal outscoping negation. Why is this so? Because the modal has the lowest scope in (5b) and the highest scope in (5c). The corresponding LF scopal configurations are given in (6b) and (6c).

(6) a. $\neg > \Box > \exists$
     b. $\neg\exists > \Box = \forall\neg > \Box$
     c. $\Box > \neg\exists = \Box > \forall\neg$

For this reason, unambiguous availability of an interpretation that corresponds to (5a), i.e. (6a), would provide evidence for the claim that negative determiners and n-words remain in the scope of sentential negation. The goal is thus to check whether this reading (6a) is attested in S-C. Note that the term 'split scope' isn't appropriate for describing the situation in strict NC, since the sentential negation and the n-word seem to be overt syntactic and semantic elements whose relation is to be determined, at least along the lines of the (2.) group of approaches (cf. previous section).

S-C data features the necessity modal *morati*, which only scopes under sentential negation, and n-words in subject (preverbal) and object (postverbal) position. Let's look at the example with the subject n-word in (7). If 33 students are present in a classroom, but the safety regulations require that the maximum number of people in a classroom be 30, then (7a) cannot be felicitously uttered in S-C. I.e. (7a) cannot convey that there is no particular student that is obliged to leave (7c), although there is a general requirement for (any) 3 students (whatsoever) to leave. (7a) can only mean that there is no requirement at all for anyone to leave (7b).

(7) a. Niko   ne mora   da ode.
          n-person$_{NOM}$ not have-to$_{3Sg}$ that leave$_{3Sg}$

     b. 'It is not required that someone (or other) leaves' [$\neg > \Box > \exists$]
     c. i. *'There is no person x such that it is required for x to leave' [$\neg\exists > \Box$]
         ii. *'For every person x, it is not required that x leaves' [$\forall\neg > \Box$]

(8) a. Ne moraš   nikoga   da podmitiš.
          not have-to$_{2Sg}$ n-person$_{ACC}$ that bribe$_{2Sg}$

     b. 'It is not required that you bribe someone (or other)' [$\neg > \Box > \exists$]
     c. i. *'There is no x, such that it is required that you bribe x' [$\neg\exists > \Box$]
         ii. *'For every x, it is not required that you bribe x' [$\forall\neg > \Box$]

The example with the object n-word (8a) is not ambiguous either - it can only mean that there is no need for bribing anyone at all (8b). Only the (b) readings are available both for subject and object n-words

and it is impossible to transform these readings into logically equivalent ones where the n-word would take wide scope over sentential negation. This is because the necessity modal takes intermediate scope - it is below negation (the only possible scope relation for this modal), but it outscopes the n-word. Thus, when modals are used in the diagnostic, the results show that n-words in S-C unambiguously behave like existentials in the scope of sentential negation.

3. Scope intervention with adverbs

Shimoyama (2011) proposed a test that consists in eliminating the anti-additive environment by combining quantificational adverbs (Q-adverbs) such as *usually*, *mostly* and *often* with sentential negation and examining the scope relations that such constructs have with indeterminate NPIs, which are the Japanese equivalents of n-words.

Constructs that yield interpretations such as 'not often' are used to test whether n-words are unambiguously narrow-scope existentials, where the presence of the reading in (9a) would be taken as positive evidence. However, Shimoyama claims that this interpretation for the Japanese sentence in (9)is unavailable.

(9) Taro-wa hinpanni-wa doko-e-mo dekake-nakat-ta.
   Taro-wa often-wa   where-to-mo go.out-not-past

   a. *'It is not the case that often, Taro went out to some place or other'

   b. 'There was no place that Taro went out to often'

Unlike the other possible reading with a low-scope Q-adverb (9b), it is impossible to reinterpret (9a) in such a way that the n-word takes wide scope over negation.[3] (9a) is represented at LF as (10a) and this reading is targeted as the one that allows to tease apart the narrow scope existential from the wide scope universal interpretation of n-words in strict NC. The configurations in (10b) both correspond to the reading in (9b), which makes this reading non-transparent regarding the scope relations between n-words and sentential negation.

(10)   a. $\neg Q > \exists$
    b.   i. $\neg \exists > Q$
        ii. $\forall \neg > Q$

Conversely, availability of the reading in (11b), according to Shimoyama, speaks in favor of a wide-scope universal analysis of Japanese indeterminate NPIs, since it is not logically equivalent to any other interpretation where they could be represented as narrow-scope existentials.

(11) Nihonzin gakusei-no dare-mo hudan-wa   sankasi-nakat-ta
    Japanese student-gen who-*mo* usually-*wa* participate-not-past

       a. 'It was usually the case that no Japanese student participated'

       b. 'For every Japanese student, it was usually the case that he or she did not participate'

The interpretation in (11b) corresponds to the LF configuration in (12a) and it is targeted in the diagnostic for S-C n-words, as it could possibly identify them as unambiguous wide scope universals. However, the configurations represented in (12b), which correspond to the reading in (11a) for Japanese, do not permit disambiguation between the two possible scopal relations - an n-word scoping over sentential negation and one being in its scope.

(12)   a. $\forall > Q \neg$
       b.   i. $Q > \forall \neg$
            ii. $Q > \neg \exists$

---

[3] This part of the diagnostic with Q-adverbs is very similar to scope intervention with modals.

Such tests indicated that Japanese n-words have wide scope over sentential negation and behave like universals, since the configuration in (12a) was attested, whereas the one in (10a) wasn't confirmed. Before examining the S-C data and the findings of scope intervention with Q-adverbs, a few more words need to be said about the latter and their scope relations with sentential negation.

3.1. Q-adverbs and negation

In order to yield the readings in (10), Q-adverbs that remain in the scope of negation are required. Conversely, Q-adverbs that outscope negation are employed in testing the possibility of having wide-scope universal n-words (12). These scope relations between Q-adverbs and negation are disambiguated via the 50-50% test.

(13)   a. Dušan nije   doručkovao često. [$\neg > Q_{often}$]
          Dušan didn't eat-breakfast often

          Dušan didn't eat breakfast often. (He actually ate breakfast every other morning.)

      b. Dušan obično nije   doručkovao. [$Q_{usually} > \neg$]
          Dušan usually didn't eat-breakfast

          Dušan usually didn't eat breakfast. (#Only half of the time.)

When a Q-adverb scopes under negation (13a)[4], the sentence should be compatible with a '50-50' scenario, because it excludes only the majority of cases (not true if the event occurred in more than 50% of the cases), but it can correspond to both the situation where the event occurred in exactly 50% of the cases and to the one where more than 50% of the time it didn't occur. However, when a Q-adverb scopes over negation (13b), it is incompatible with the scenario in which the event occurs in exactly one half of the cases. (13b) is only compatible with the state of affairs in which, for the majority of cases, there is no occurrence of the event. Crucially, the possible scenarios in which 'not often' and 'usually not' are true overlap almost entirely. The only situation in which one is true (13a) and the other one is false (13b) is the 50-50% of the cases scenario.

Regardless of the surface word order, *obično* cannot appear in the scope of sentential negation at LF. Moreover, it exhibits the behavior of a Positive Polarity Item (PPI), because it seems to lack interpretations in the scope of other DE operators (14), as well.

(14) Malo studenata   je obično išlo   na časove.
     few   students$_{GEN}$ has usually gone on classes$_{ACC}$

     a. *Few students were such that they usually went to classes.

     b. Usually few students went to classes.

Finally, in the next subsection we look at the findings of the test with a Q-adverb in the scope of negation, where the possibility that S-C n-words are unambiguously narrow-scope existentials can be tested, and in the following subsection the possibility of having wide-scope universal n-words is tested with Q-adverbs that scope over negation.

3.2. Narrow scope test

Testing whether n-words can be unambiguously diagnosed as narrow-scope existentials requires employing *često* ('often') as a Q-adverb that can be outscoped by sentential negation. The surface word order replicates this scope relation and the n-word is tested in subject (15) and object position (16).

---

[4]   Note that the verbal marker of sentential negation *ne* changes its form when combined with an auxiliary verb (*je*).

(15) Niko   nije   posetio doktora često.
     n-person_{NOM} didn't visit   doctor_{ACC} often

      a. 'It was not often the case that some (or other) patient visited the doctor'   [¬Q >∃]

      b.   i. 'There was no patient x, such that x visited the doctor often'   [¬∃ >Q]

           ii. 'For every patient x, it was not often the case that x visited the doctor'   [∀¬ >Q]

(16) Doktor   nije   često nikoga   pregledao.
     doctor_{NOM} didn't often n-person_{ACC} examine

      a. 'It was not often the case that the doctor examined someone (or other)'   [¬Q >∃]

      b.   i. 'There was no x, such that the doctor examined x often'   [¬∃ >Q]

           ii. 'For every x, it was not often the case that the doctor examined x'   [∀¬ >Q]

Regardless of the structural position of the n-word, both the (a) and the (b) readings seem available at first glance. The sentences are compatible with the distribution of medical examinations as depicted in the table in (17).

	Day	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
(17)	Patient 1	x	x	x	✓	✓	✓
	Patient 2	x	x	x	✓	✓	✓
	Patient 3	x	x	x	✓	✓	✓

The S-C sentences (15) and (16) are judged true in the scenario in (17) and as a response to an assertion about the doctor having a heavy workload and examining patients often. However, there is an entailment relation between these two scopal configurations: the (a) readings entail the (b) ones. This means that, for every scenario in which the doctor didn't receive visits from patients in one half (or more) of the occasions, it must also be the case that no particular patient visited the doctor in one half (or more) of the occasions. What needs to be verified because of this entailment relation, is whether the (b) readings are available independently from the (a) ones, i.e. whether they are true even when the (a) readings are false.[5] A disambiguating context for the existential test is given in the table in (18).

	Day	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
(18)	Patient 1	x	x	x	✓	✓	✓
	Patient 2	✓	x	x	✓	x	✓
	Patient 3	✓	x	x	x	✓	✓

With the situation in (18), none of the patients (neither patient 1, nor patient 2, nor patient 3) visited the doctor often - only half of the time, actually (so (15b) and (16b) correspond well to this context), but the doctor did examine patients often, since a patient (or other) would visit him four out of six days (so (15a) and (16a) are incompatible with this). The test sentences (15) and (16) are accepted in this context, although native speakers are less unanimous in the case of the sentence with the object n-word (16) - some of them reject it with (18).

     This shows that the reading in which the Q-adverb has the lowest scope in the sentence and the n-word can be interpreted both as an existential in the scope of sentential negation and as a universal that takes scope over sentential negation is indeed attested for S-C n-words in subject (15b) and, to a certain extent, in object (16b) position. Importantly, this is not in collision with a narrow-scope existential analysis of S-C n-words, because these findings show only that an existential interpretation of the n-word, with the lowest sentential scope ((15a), (16a)), is not the only possible. The conclusion of this low-scope test is that S-C n-words are existentials that can have either the lowest scope in the sentence, or the intermediate scope (where they outscope the Q-adverb). Nevertheless, they are in the scope of the sentential negation in both cases.

---

[5] Testing the opposite is impossible, since (b) readings will be true whenever (a) readings are.

3.3. Wide scope test

Let's turn to the data containing the PPI-adverb *obično* which takes scope over negation and is unacceptable in its scope. Examples with subject and object n-words are given below.

(19) Niko   obično nije   išao na seminar.
    n-person$_{NOM}$ usually didn't go   on seminar$_{ACC}$

    a. 'For every x, it was usually the case that x didn't go to the seminar'   [∀ >Q¬]

    b.   i. 'It was usually the case that, for every x, x didn't go to the seminar'   [Q >∀¬]

          ii. 'It was usually not the case that someone (or other) went to the seminar'   [Q >¬∃]

(20) Doktor   obično nije   nikoga   pregledao.
    doctor$_{NOM}$ usually didn't n-person$_{ACC}$ examine

    a. 'For every x, it was usually not the case that the doctor examined x'   [∀ >Q¬]

    b.   i. 'It was usually the case that, for every x, the doctor didn't examine x'   [Q >∀¬]

          ii. 'It was usually not the case that the doctor examined someone (or other)'   [Q >¬∃]

Again, both readings seem available at first glance and, indeed, there is an entailment relation between these two logical possibilities: the (b) readings entail the (a) ones. This means that, each scenario that makes (19b) or (20b) true, also makes (19a) or 20a) true, respectively. What is left to do is to check whether the readings where the n-word is unambiguously a wide scope universal ((19a) and 20a)) are available even when the other logical possibility ((19b) and (20b)) is not. For the example in (19), a disambiguating context is the following: there are three students in a seminar consisting of six classes, and the distribution of their presences and absences is given in

(21)

Class	Cl.1	Cl.2	Cl.3	Cl.4	Cl.5	Cl.6
Student 1	x	x	x	x	✓	✓
Student 2	✓	x	x	x	x	✓
Student 3	✓	✓	x	x	x	x

Now, the (19a) interpretation is compatible with the situation depicted in (21), since each student missed four out of six classes, i.e. didn't attend the majority of classes. On the other hand, the interpretation in (19b) doesn't correspond to (21) because only two classes weren't visited by a single student, whereas at least four classes without students are required for 'usually not'. For the example with the n-word in object position (20), the same scenario serves as a test, only this time it represents the distribution of patients' visits to the doctor.

The sentence with the object n-word (20) is rejected by all consulted native speakers, though the one with the subject n-word (19) is accepted by some speakers. This seems to indicate that S-C n-words can exhibit seemingly wide scope universal behavior in particular circumstances, since the sentence in (19) is sometimes judged true in a scenario (21) that is compatible only with a universal interpretation of the n-word (19a), which scopes over the Q-adverb that outscopes the negative operator of sentential negation. However, this reading (20a) is not confirmed for n-words in object position (20), when tested in a context that invalidates the other reading (20b). This represents an interesting asymmetry and the next section is an attempt at explaining why subject, but not object, n-words display this wide scope effect.

3.4. The wide scope illusion

What scope can S-C n-words have with respect to sentential negation? In general, the test based on scope intervention with modals provided more stable findings than the test based on scope intervention with adverbs. At the same time, speakers encounter difficulties in assigning interpretations to the test sentences with Q-adverbs, many of them even judging these examples as syntactically degraded, whereas no such problems occur in the examples with modals. To summarize, these are the scope possibilities with S-C n-words:

1. The tests based on scope intervention with modals unambiguously show that S-C n-words take narrow scope with respect to sentential negation and behave like existentials and/or indefinites.

2. The tests based on scope intervention with adverbs give less conclusive results:

   (a) The test that employs a Q-adverb that scopes under sentential negation shows that the existential interpretation of n-words, where they have the lowest scope in the sentence, is sometimes the only possible interpretation that n-words can get in this context;

   (b) The test that employs a PPI Q-adverb that takes wide scope over sentential negation shows that n-words sometimes have the possibility of outscoping sentential negation.

Importantly, in the case of both (a) and (b), it is the subject/preverbal position of the n-word that allows for this wide scope behaviour. The question is therefore, why this structural position of the n-word affects its interpretation.

In the case of the test with the narrow-scope adverb, contrastive focus was invoked to ensure that the sentential negation takes scope over the Q-adverb, since it is difficult to maintain this scopal relation without help from discourse. Since both scope relations are possible with *često* ('often'), and the Q-adverb over negation is the more salient one, the negation over Q-adverb is induced through a response to an assertion inside a dialogue. In the case of the test with the PPI adverb *obično* ('usually'), the Q-adverb over negation is not only the more salient scope relation, but the only one. However, studies of PPI-hood (Iatridou & Zeijlstra (2013) and references therein) have shown that PPIs in the indefinite domain, as well as modal auxiliaries, can be interpreted in the scope of sentential negation under particular circumstances, contrastive focus being one of them. Since sentences with Q-adverbs intervention turned out to be hard to process, and even degraded regarding their word order, triggering contrastive focus in order to give an interpretation to the sentence is a plausible effect, to which native speakers resort in order to give an interpretation to the test sentence (especially because negation is already involved). Now, when contrastive focus is invoked in the interpretation of sentences involving PPI-adverbs, then the scopal relation between the sentential negation and the Q-adverb is reversed. This means that the interpretation of the sentence that is actually obtained is not the one where the n-word has the highest scope in the sentence (22), but the one where the n-word can be both an existential in the scope of sentential negation and a universal outscoping it, since the Q-adverb takes the lowest scope (23).

(22) $\forall > Q \neg$

(23) $\forall \neg > Q = \neg \exists > Q$

Crucially, this scopal configuration (23) is compatible with the situation depicted in the table in (21). But, what is the role of the subject position of the n-word?

The preverbal subject n-word localizes the scope of the sentential negation in the sentence, since the preverbal n-word is the highest element in the clausal spine that participates in Negative Concord, the position of the negative head is expected to be at least as high as that of the highest n-word (Zeijlstra (2004)). This is compatible with the analysis of n-words as indefinites/existentials in the scope of negation. Thus, with a subject n-word, the Q-adverb appears in the scope of negation and this is in conflict with its Positive Polarity nature. An information-structural effect, such as focus, is a way to resolve the conflict!

Further support for this comes from the observation that the wide scope effect is reinfroced when there is a restriction on the set of individuals denoted by the n-word, in the form of a partitive (24), such as 'of (the) patients/students'.

(24) a. Niko   od pacijenata nije   posetio doktora često.
          n-person_NOM of patients_GEN didn't visit   doctor_ACC often
          'No patient visited the doctor often.'

      b. Niko   od studenata obično nije   išao na seminar.
          n-person_NOM of students_GEN usually didn't go   on seminar_ACC
          'Usually no student went to the seminar.'

A genitive prepositional phrase attracts focus to the n-word and this facilitates the reversal of the scope relations between the Q-adverb and the sentential negation, so that the former is no longer anti-licensed as a PPI.

All this shows that the wide scope behavior of S-C n-words is not consistent and that very particular linguistic conditions are responsible for it.

4. Conclusion

The results obtained from two versions of the same diagnostic point towards a narrow scope existential analysis of S-C n-words. In certain cases, these expressions seem to exhibit a universal-like behavior, characterized by wide scope over sentential negation. Nevertheless, it has been shown that this is an effect of the combination of multiple factors: the Positive Polarity nature of the Q-adverb and information structure.

Scope intervention with modals doesn't cause sentence degradedness, whereas Q-adverbs as LF interveners can be problematic for syntactic grammaticality. The former kind of diagnostic thus provides more stable judgements.

The findings presented in this paper offer an insight into the quantificational status of Serbo-Croatian n-words. They do not, however, advance any claims about the cross-linguistic validity of a narrow scope existential analysis for n-words. It might be the case that further research, especially on strict Negative Concord languages that have been claimed to feature wide scope universal n-words (such as Japanese and Greek, but also Korean (Kim & Sells (2007))), will show that they actually behave like S-C n-words. Alternatively, it will be shown that the realm of strict NC exhibits significant cross-linguistic variation with respect to the status of negatively marked expressions.

References

deSwart, Henriette & Ivan Sag (2002). Negative concord in French. Linguistics and Philosophy 25, 373–417.

Giannakidou, Anastasia (2000). Negative...concord? Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 18, 457–523.

Haegeman, Liliane & Raffaella Zanuttini (1991). Negative heads and the neg-criterion. The Linguistic Review 8, 233–251.

Iatridou, Sabine & Hedde Zeijlstra (2013). Negation, polarity, and deontic modals. Linguistic Inquiry 44, 529–568.

Jacobs, Joachim (1980). Lexical decomposition in Montague grammar. Theoretical Linguistics 7, 121–136.

Kim, Shin-Sook & Peter Sells (2007). Generalizing the immediate scope constraint on npi licensing. Zeijlstra, Hedde & J-P Soehn (eds.), Proceedings of the Workshop on Negation and Polarity, Collaborative Research Center 441, University of Tübingen.

Ladusaw, William (1992). Expressing negation. Barker, Chris & David Dowty (eds.), Proceedings of 2nd Conference on Semantics and Linguistic Theory, The Ohio State University, Columbus.

Laka, Itziar (1990). Negation in Syntax: on the Nature of Functional Categories and Projections. PhD thesis, MIT.

Penka, Doris (2010). Negative Indefinites. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Shimoyama, Junko (2011). Japanese Indeterminate Negative Polarity items and thier scope. Journal of Semantics 28, 413–450.

Zanuttini, Raffaella (1991). Syntactic Properties of Sentential Negation. PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.

Zeijlstra, Hedde (2004). Sentential Negation and Negative Concord. LOT publications, Utrecht.

Zeijlstra, Hedde (2011). On the syntactically complex status of negative indefinites. Journal of Comparative German Linguistics 14, 111–138.

Proceedings of the 33rd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics

edited by
Kyeong-min Kim, Pocholo Umbal,
Trevor Block, Queenie Chan,
Tanie Cheng, Kelli Finney, Mara Katz,
Sophie Nickel-Thompson, and Lisa Shorten

Cascadilla Proceedings Project   Somerville, MA   2016