

Captain Nonnemo
travels to the Positive Pole, the Negative Pole, and Negative Concordia
 Sinn und Bedeutung VII (Kontanz, 2002)
 Anna Szabolcsi
 New York University

- **Refining the basic description “PPI cannot scope under negation (unless it is denial)”**

PPI cannot scope directly under clausemate antiadditive operator -- $f(a \vee b) = f a \wedge f b$:

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| (1) John didn't call someone. | * not > some |
| (2) No one called someone. | * no one > some |
| (3) John came to the party without someone important. | * without > some |

PPI can scope directly under clausemate downward entailing operator:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| (4) At most five boys called someone. | √ at most 5 > some |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|

PPI can scope under clausemate antiadditive operator if something intervenes:

- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| (5) John doesn't always call someone. | √ not > Adv > some |
| (6) John didn't show every boy something interesting. | √ not > QP > some |
| (7) John didn't call someone because p (but because q) | √ not > b/c p > some |

PPI can scope below non-clausemate negation:

- | | |
|---|------------------------------|
| (8) I don't think that John called someone. | √ not > [_{CP} some |
|---|------------------------------|

**In sum, PPI cannot be in the immediate scope of a clausemate antiadditive:
 *[anti-add > PP].**

- **Surprise, surprise: even *[anti-add > PPI] is rescued if...**

... its context is Strawson-decreasing,

- | | |
|--|-----------------------|
| (9) I don't think that John didn't call someone. | √ not > not > some |
| (10) At most five boys didn't call someone. | √ few > not > some |
| (11) Only John didn't call someone. | √ only > not > some |
| (12) I regret that John didn't call someone. | √ regret > not > some |
| (13) If we don't call someone, we are doomed. | √ if (not > some) |

and there is no scopal intervener:

- | |
|--|
| (14) *I don't think that every/most guest(s) thought that you didn't call someone. |
|--|

In sum, √ decreasing > [anti-add > PPI].

Wanted: (I) A semantics for the NPI-features and their licensing.
 (II) An account of the full distribution of the PPI.

Re: (I) and part of (II):

- Each NPI-feature is a negation. In (23), the two negations simply cancel out. In (9)-(13), each negation is individually active.

(23) I saw someone. $\lambda P \neg \neg \exists x [\text{human}(x) \ \& \ P(x)]$

(24) *non nemo* `some persons, a few’
non nullus `a certain amount of, not a little; a number of, not a few; some men’
non numquam `on various occasions, sometimes’

video de istis qui se popularis haberi volunt abesse **non neminem** [...] **is** et nudius tertius in custodiam civis Romanos dedit.

`I see that of those men who wish to be considered attached to the people **one man** is absent [...] **He** only three days ago gave Roman citizens into custody.’ (Cicero)

Extending de Swart—Sag’s 2002 proposal for negative concord, we interpret NPI-licensing as resumptive quantification.

(25) Exactly five boys read exactly five books.
 asymmetrical scope: 25 books read by boys
 resumptive quantification: exactly five $\langle x, y \rangle$ [boy(x) read book(y)]

(26) *Personne n’aime personne.*
 asymmetrical scope: everyone loves someone
 resumptive quantification: $\text{no} \langle x, y \rangle$ [person(x) love person(y)]

(27) At most five boys didn’t call someone
 $\text{no} \langle x, y \rangle \text{ no} \langle z, w \rangle$ [x(more than five) boys z-called w-y-one]

Intervention effects derived a la de Swart 1992, Honcoop 1998: scopal intervener separates operator from its restriction.

NPI-licensing and negative concord now share a basic semantics. Consequence: NPIs in general must contain invisible negations. Postal (in progress) argues exactly this.

Postal: both *any* and *no* are ambiguous between $\neg \exists$ and $\neg \neg \exists$, depending on whether they can be modified by *but*-exceptive. These underlying negations may stay in place or get deleted by appropriate operators in the sentence. If one negation stays in place, morphology spells *no*. If no negation stays in place, morphology spells *any*.

Szabolcsi: “deletion” = entering into resumptive quantification with what Postal calls the deleter.

Some fills gaps in Postal's system:

- (28) Spelling out underlying $\neg\neg\exists$:
- | | | | |
|----|--|-------------|---|
| a. | one \neg deleted DP-internally,
other \neg stays in place | <i>NO</i> | (<i>He didn't say NOthing</i>) |
| b. | one \neg deleted DP-internally,
other \neg externally | <i>any</i> | (<i>He didn't say anything</i>) |
| c. | both \neg 's stay in place | <i>some</i> | (<i>He/Few men said something</i>) |
| d. | both \neg 's deleted externally | <i>some</i> | (<i>Few men didn't say something</i>) |

Re remainder of (II):

Why is *Few men said something* acceptable?

Crossing: plain decreasing *few* cannot license the weak-NPI feature across the strong one.

How to exclude the remaining logical possibilities for generating **He didn't say something*?

***Antiadditive licenses one NPI-feature, other stays in place: Why not?**

(28a) spells this as *NO*, not as *some*.

***Both NPI-features of PPI are left in place under antiadditive: Why not?**

Ruled out by same generalization as **No one didn't laugh*, **No one said nothing but hello*.

***Single antiadditive licenses both NPI-features of PPI: Why not?**

Semantically indistinguishable from (28b); spelled out as *any*, not *some*.

Selected literature:

Baker (1970), Double negatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 1: 169-186.

von Stechow (1999), NPI-licensing, Strawson-entailment, and context dependency. *Journal of Semantics* 16/2:97-148.

Honcoop (1998), Dynamic Excursions on Weak Islands. PhD, Leiden. semanticsarchive.net

May (1989), Interpreting Logical Form. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12:387-435.

Oxford Latin Dictionary.

Postal (in progress), ms. New York University.

de Swart and Sag (2002), Negation and Negative Concord in Romance. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25:373-417.

Szabolcsi (2002), Positive polarity—negative polarity. semanticsarchive.net

van der Wouden (1997), *Negative Contexts: Collocation, Polarity, and Multiple Negation*, Routledge.