Two Types of NPIs: Universal vs. Existential*

YoungSik Choi

(Soonchunhyang University)

Choi, YoungSik. 2011. Two Types of NPIs: Universal vs. Existential. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal. 19*(1). 137-157. A negative polarity item, according to the standard view in the literature (Ladusaw 1979, among many others), is an existential quantifier that should be under the syntactic scope of its licensor for a proper interpretation. I argue, however, that negative polarity items in Korean vary in quantificational force, that is, universal vs. existential. An interesting contrast emerges between *amwuto* 'anyone' NPIs and bare wh-word NPIs with respect to their distribution and locality in that the latter show a far broader distribution than the former and are not subject to locality in contrast to the former. I will show that the contrast in distribution and locality essentially reduces to the different quantificational force of the two NPIs: *Amwuto* is universal in quantificational force, whereas the bare wh-word NPI is existential in nature.

Key Words: quantificational, existential, universal, negation, polarity, locality

1. Introduction

The linguistic phenomenon of negative polarity items has been a topic of great interest since Klima (1964), leading to various proposals both syntactic and semantic in nature. (See Baker 1970, Ladusaw 1979, Linebarger 1980, Hoeksema 1983, Laka 1990, Progovac 1988, 1994, Zwarts 1995, 1998, among others) The standard view in the literature is that a negative polarity item (NPI, henceforth) is an existential quantifier, and should be under the syntactic scope of its

licensor for a proper interpretation.(Ladusaw 1979, among others) However, as I claim, negative polarity items in Korean vary in quantificational force, namely, existential vs. universal with an interesting pattern of contrast in distribution and locality between *amwuto* 'anyone' NPIs and bare wh-word NPIs emerging: The latter show a far broader distribution than the former. The latter are not subject to locality in contrast to the former. I suggest that the contrast essentially reduces to the different quantificational force of the two NPIs with the *amwuto* 'anyone' NPI a universal quantifier and the bare wh-word NPI an existential quantifier.

2. Negative Polarity Items

It is a standard observation in the literature that NPIs must occur under the syntactic scope of their licensors that are downward entailing.(See Fauconier 1979, Ladusaw 1979, among others)[1] Ladusaw (1979) claims that NPI *any* in English should be existential to properly assign meaning to the sentence containing it. Ladusaw makes his point with the following example in (1) including *any* and a negative adverb *rarely*:

(1) The IRS rarely audits anyone.
   a. It is usually not the case that there is someone whom the IRS audits.(=The IRS almost always audits no one)
   b.#Everyone is such that it is usually the case that the IRS doesn't audit him. (Ladusaw 1979: 102)

Assuming *rarely* means 'usually not,' he further goes on to say that the

---

1) According to Ladusaw (1979), negation is just one of the triggers, which are downward entailing. The notion of downward entailment shows property of reversing the direction of the entailment in their argument positions.
   (i) a. Syntacticians came to the party. (P)
      b. Linguists came to the party. (Q)
   P entails Q: Whenever P is true, Q is also true. This entailment is reversed when P and Q are negated by the negation.

universal construal of *any* over *rarely,* as given in (1b), cannot give the right truth condition for the sentence above in (1), whereas the existential construal of the former under the scope of the latter yields the right truth condition for it. He thus concludes that English *any* should be construed as an existential that should be under the syntactic scope of its licensor. Hence, the following example in (2) including *any* will have the informal logical representation for a proper interpretation below in (3a) out of the two formula in (3) that are truth conditionally equivalent.

(2) John did not invite anyone.

(3) a. ¬ ∃x[man(x) ∧ invited (j, x)]
    b. ∀x[man (x) → ¬ invited (j, x)]

That *any* as an NPI should be construed as an existential quantifier is further supported in constructions involving existential *there,* *almost* modification, and donkey anaphora, among others. Consider existential *there* construction as discussed in Carlson (1980) below in (4-5).

(4) a. Bob thinks there is someone from Greece in his basement.
    b. *Bob thinks there is everyone from Greece in his basement.

(5) Bob does not think there is anyone from Greece in his basement.
    (Carlson 1980: 801)

The semantics of existential *there* construction admits the existential quantifier, but not universal quantifier reading. (See Milsark 1974, among others) If *any* is universal, then the appearance of *any* in existential *there* construction is quite unexpected. Also, *almost* and *nearly* in English cannot modify an existential quantifier as illustrated below in (6).[2] (See Dahl 1970, Horn 1972, Carlson 1980, Progovac 1994, among others for the observation)

---

2) Note that *almost* can modify *any* when it is construed as a free choice *any,* which is universal in quantificational force.
    (i) Almost anyone can do it.

(6) a. John was willing to buy {almost/nearly} everything.
    b. *John was willing to buy {almost/nearly} something.

(7) *John did not invite {almost/nearly} anyone.

Hence, the ungrammaticality of the sentence above in (7) clearly indicates that negative polarity item *any* is existential. Also it is well-known that universal quantifier cannot license donkey anaphora, whereas existential quantifier can, as below in (8). The acceptability of the sentence below in (9) thus shows that the negative polarity item *any* is existential.

(8) a. Every student who read a paper$_i$ on semantics likes it$_i$
    b.*Every student who read every paper$_i$ on semantics likes it$_i$ (de Swart 1998: 127)

(9) Students that have anything$_i$ to say should say it$_i$ now.
    (Giannakidou 2006: 374)

As shown thus far, the facts about the negative polarity item *any* in constructions involving scope interaction of *any* and negative adverbial, existential *there,* and donkey anaphora further support the view that negative polarity item *any* is indeed an existential quantifier. (cf. Quine 1960)

3. *Amwuto* NPIs and Bare Wh−word NPIs

With the negative polarity item *any* in English as an existential quantifier in mind, let us turn to *amwuto* 'anyone' NPIs and bare wh-word NPIs in Korean. *Amwuto* 'anyone' consists of *amwu* 'any,' and *to* 'even,' with the latter contributing to the negative polarity reading. When *amwu* 'any' combines with *lato* 'even,' it conveys a free choice reading. (Choe 1988, Suh 1990, Lee 1999 among others), which is not the present concern.

Turning to wh-word NPIs, as shown below in (10-11), it is quite a well-known fact that wh-words in Korean are indefinites, given that their

interpretation depends on the context where they appear, exhibiting quantificational variability and immunity to locality. (Lewis 1975, Heim 1982, Nishigauchi 1990, and Choi 2002, among others)

(10) a. **Nwu**-ka   owass-ni?
       who-NOM   came-QM
     'Who came?'
   b. **Nwu**-ka   owass-ta.
       who-NOM   came-IM
     'Someone came.'

(11) John-un **nwu**-ka   ssun   chayk-ul   ilkess-ni?
     J-TOP   who-NOM wrote   book-ACC   read
     'What is the book such that John read it?'

The wh-word above in (10) can be construed either as a wh-interrogative or as an existential quantifier *someone*, depending on the context where they are in. Also the same expression in (11) is construed as a wh-interrogative long distance bound by the question morpheme, *ni,* the binder in the matrix clause, exhibiting immunity to the syntactic island of a relative clause.

Thus it is not a surprise when a wh-word combines with the morpheme *to* 'even,' it behaves as an NPI, with its quantificational force determined by the morpheme *to* 'even.'

(12) John-un **nwukwu-**to mannaci an   hayssta.
     J-TOP   who-even   meet   NOT did
     'John did not meet anyone.'

Moreover, as observed by Choi (2002) among others, wh-words without *to* 'even' can also serve as NPIs as below in (13). This state of affairs is not a surprise, either, given that, being indefinites, wh-words do not have inherent quantificational force.[3]

---

(13) John-un   **nwukwu**-lul   mannaci   an   hayssta.
     J-TOP   who-ACC   meet   NOT   did
     'John did not meet anyone.'

(13) is construed as 'there is no one such that John met him' but not 'there is someone such that John did not meet him,' with the scope of *nwukwu* 'who' below negation. This scope pattern with respect to negation is characteristic of the NPI *any* as distinct from the positive polarity item *some*, which should scope over negation as below in (14).

(14) John did not meet someone.

(14) is construed as 'there is someone such that John did not meet him.' At this point, note that *nwukwu* 'who' can also appear in the positive context below in (15), where the wh-word is construed as an existential quantifier *someone*.

(15) John-i   **nwukwu**-lul   mannassta.
     J-NOM   who-ACC   met
     'John met someone.'

This does not necessarily constitute an argument against the proposal that wh-words can behave as NPIs, since wh-words in Korean are indefinites, with their interpretation determined in the context where they appear. I will call wh-words that can serve as NPIs without *to* 'even' as bare wh-word NPIs and will use *nwukwu* 'who' as a representative throughout.

4. Distribution of *amwuto* and Bare wh-word NPIs

As shown below in (16-17), *amwuto* 'anyone' NPIs are far more limited in distribution than bare wh-word NPIs in that they can appear in negation and *before*-clause only, a fact already observed by several researchers including Lee (1993), Lee (1999), Choi (2000), and Choi (2010), among others. By contrast, bare

---

and Arnaiz (1996) among others.

wh-word NPIs can not only appear in negation and *before*-clause, but other contexts as well including yes-no question, conditional, adversative predicate construction, emotive factive construction, relative clause headed by a generic noun, and comparative construction as observed by Choi (2010:201-202).

(16) a. John-i   **amwuto**   mannaci   an   hayssta.
        J-NOM   anyone   meet   NOT   did
        'John did not meet anyone.'
   b. Mary-ka **amwuto**   mannaki ceney John-un   ttenassta.
        M-NOM anyone   meet   before J-TOP   left
        'Before Mary met anyone, John left.'
   c. *John-i   **amwuto**   mannass-ni?
        J-NOM   anyone   met-QM
        'Did John meet anyone?'
   d. ***Amwuto** o-myen   wuli-lul   pangmwunhanta.
        anyone   come-if   us-ACC   visit
        'For any x, x an individual, if x comes, x visits us.'
   e.*Na-nun John-i   **amwuto**   mannassnun-ci uysimsulepta.
        I-TOP J-NOM   anyone   met-COMP   doubt
        'I doubt that John met anyone.'
   f. ***Amwuto**   wassta-ni   tahayngita.
        anyone   came   lucky
        'It is lucky that anyone came.'
   g.***Amwuto** cheum mannanun salamtul-un   oymo-ey
        anyone   first   meet   men-TOP   appearance-to
        sinkyengssunta.
        pay attention
        'People who meet anyone for the first time pay attention to appearance.'
   h.*Mary-nun **amwuto**   sayngkakhanun-kes   pota
        M-TOP   anyone   think   than
        hwelssin te   ttokttokhata.
        far   more   smart
        'Mary is far smarter than anyone thinks she is.'

(17) a. John-i   **nwukwu**-lul   mannaci   an   hayssta.
     J-NOM   who-ACC   meet   NOT did
     'John did not meet anyone.'

   b. Mary-ka **nwukwu**-lul mannaki ceney John-un ttenassta.
      M-NOM who-ACC   meet before   J-TOP   left
      'Before Mary met anyone, John left.'

   c. John-i   **nwukwu**-lul   mannass-ni?
      J-NOM   who-ACC   met-QM
      'Did John meet anyone?'

   d. **Nwu**-ka   o-myen   wuli-lul   pangmwunhanta.
      who-NOM come-if   us-ACC   visit
      'For any x, x an individual, if x comes, x visits us.'

   e. Na-nun John-i **nwukwu**-lul mannassnun-ci uysimsulepta.
      I-TOP J-NOM who-ACC met-COMP   doubt
      'I doubt that John met anyone.'

   f. **Nwu**-ka   wassta-ni   tahayngita.
     who-NOM   came   lucky
     'It is lucky that anyone came.'

   g. **Nwuku**-lul   cheum   mannanun   salamtul-un
      who-ACC   first   meet   men-TOP
      oymo-ey   sinkyengssunta.
      appearance-to pay attention
      'People who meet anyone for the first time pay attention to
      appearance.'

   h. Mary-nun   **nwu**-ka   sayngkakhanun-kes   pota
      M-TOP   who-NOM   think   than
      hwelssin   te   ttokttokhata.
      far   more   smart
      'Mary is far smarter than anyone thinks she is.' 4) 5)

---

4) It has been observed that *ku* 'he' can have bound variable reading although it does not yield
   the reading as easily as English *he*. See Kang (1988) among others for the related discussion.
5) Note that the wh-word can also have the reading of *some* in (17). This is well expected since
   these contexts allow the negative polarity item *any* as well as the positive polarity item *some*
   in English as well. (see the related discussion in Progovac 1994: 65)

5. Quantificational force of *amwuto* and bare wh-word NPIs

The contrast in the distribution of the two types of NPIs in the previous section as observed by Choi (2010) is notable and thus merits consideration for linguistic theorizing. Although he assumes that both types of NPIs are existential in quantificational force, following the standard assumption in the literature (Ladusaw 1979), as we will see below, the two types of NPIs differ in their quantificational force. At this point, recall our discussion in section 2 of the constructions involving negative adverbial, existential *there*, *almost* modification, and donkey anaphora to determine the quantificational force of the negative polarity item *any* in English. Although we cannot straightforwardly apply them to Korean due to inherent difference in the linguistic property of the two languages, some of them can still serve as valid tests to determine the quantificational force of the two types of NPIs in Korean. One has to do with modification of *almost* and *nearly* type adverb as below in (18).[6)]

(18) a. John-i   keuy   **amwuto**   chotayhaci   an   hayssta.
      J-NOM   almost   anyone   invite   NOT   did
     *'John did not invite almost anyone.'
   b. *John-i   keuy   **nwukwu**-lul   chotayhaci   an   hayssta.
      J-NOM   almost   who-ACC   invite   NOT   did
      *'John did not invite almost anyone.'

Recall that *almost* type adverb cannot modify an existential quantifier as illustrated above in (6) repeated below as (19). [7)]

---

6) An anonymous reviewer notes that when *nwukwu* 'who' in (18b) combines with *to* 'even,' the example sounds natural. The reviewer further goes on to say that this may suggest that the present proposal for *nwukwu* 'who' as distinct from *amwuto* 'anyone' may not be convincing. Note, however, that the status of a wh-word as an indefinite in Korean type languages has been well observed in the literature. (Nishigauchi 1990, Li 1992, Choi 2002, among others) Thus it is quite well expected that a wh-word and a wh-word + *to* 'even' will have different quantificational force, hence behaving differently with respect to *keuy* 'almost' modification.

7) An anonymous reviewer notes that the *keuy* 'almost' modification test may not necessarily support the proposal for *nwukwu* 'who' as an existential quantifier. In this regard, note that

(19) a. John was willing to buy {almost/nearly} everything.

     b. *John was willing to buy {almost/nearly} something.

The paradigm above in (18) thus shows that *nwukwu* 'who' as a negative polarity item is existential whereas *amwuto* 'anyone' is universal such that the former does not allow modification of *keuy* 'almost,' whereas the latter does. As a matter of fact, several researchers including Chung and Park (1998), and Kim (1999) also made the observation that *amwuto* 'anyone' is a universal quantifier based on similar examples as above in (18a).

More, I claim Donkey anaphora construction provides further evidence for this. The following examples in (20) show a sharp contrast in grammaticality in that *nwukwu* 'who' but not *amwuto* 'anyone' licenses donkey anaphora:

(20) a. **Nwukwu**$_i$-lul cacwu   mannaci an nun salamtul-un

    who-ACC   often   meet   NOT   men-TOP

    ku$_i$-uy   ches   insang-ul   swipkey   icepelinta.

    his-POSS first   impression-ACC easily   forget

    (Lit)'People who do not meet anyone often forget his first impression easily.'

    b. ***Amwuto**$_i$ cacwu   mannaci an nun   salamtul-un

     anyone   often   meet   NOT   men-TOP

     ku$_i$-uy   ches insang-ul   swipkey icepelinta.

     his-POSS first impression-ACC easily   forget

     (Lit)'People who do not meet anyone often forget his first impression easily.'

Recall that universal quantifiers are well-known for not being able to license the donkey anaphora, as shown in (8) repeated below as (21), since the scope of the universal quantifier is clause bound.

Penka (2006) also suggests that the original observation by Dahl (1970), Horn (1972), Carlson (1980) and others is not accurate, since *almost* can modify an indefinite as below.

  (i) John waited almost an hour.

However, it does not necessarily falsify the validity of the test, since the indefinite *an hour* in the above example admits the scalar denotation compatible with *almost.*

(21) a. Every student who read a paper$_i$ on semantics likes it$_i$

    b.*Every student who read every paper$_i$ on semantics likes it$_i$ (de
       Swart 1998: 127)

The contrast in acceptability above in (20) thus strongly suggests that *amwuto* 'anyone' is universal whereas *nwukwu* 'who' is existential. Thus the constructions involving modification of *keuy* 'almost' and donkey anaphora in (18) and (20) lead to the conclusion that *amwuto* 'anyone' NPI is universal whereas the bare wh-word NPI is existential.

Now, it therefore follows that (22a) and (22b) will have the logical form representation in (23a) and (23b), respectively.[8]

(22) a. John-i   **nwukwu**-lul   chotayhaci an hayssta.
       J-NOM   who-ACC   invite   NOT did
       'John did not invite anyone.'

    b. John-i   **amwuto**   chotayhaci an hayssta.
       J-NOM   anyone   invite   NOT did
       'John did not invite anyone.'

(23) a. ¬ ∃x[man(x) ∧ invited (j, x)]

    b. ∀x[man (x) → ¬ invited (j, x)]

In fact, the examples involving scope interaction of the two types of NPIs with certain adverbial expressions strongly suggest that *amwuto* 'anyone' scopes over negation whereas *nwukwu* 'who' below negation. As is well-known, adverbial expressions *kyelkho* 'absolutely' and *celtaylo* 'absolutely' below in (24) should always scope out of negation.

---

8) The examples where the order of the two polarity items is reversed are still grammatical. Note that the occurrence of the polarity item *amwuto* 'anyone' after the adverbial expression does not necessarily exclude the option of parsing it outside the scope of negation.

  (i) {Kyelkho/ Celtaylo} **amwuto**   Mary-lul mannaci an   hayssta.
     absolutely   anyone   M-ACC   meet   NOT did
     'It is absolutely the case that nobody met Mary.'

(24) John-un {kyelkho/ celtaylo} Mary-lul mannaci an hayssta.
  J-TOP absolutely   M-ACC meet NOT did
  a. 'It is absolutely the case that John did not meet Mary.'
  b. #'It is not absolutely the case that John met Mary.'

Given the informal logical form notation above in (24), the scope of the adverbial expressions is over the negation. With the scope fact regarding the adverbial expressions with respect to negation above in (24) in mind, consider the examples below in (25), whose contrast in acceptability, I claim, shows that *amwuto* 'anyone' and *nwukwu* 'who' behave differently in terms of scope: that is, the former should scope over negation, whereas the latter should scope below negation.[9] [10] [11]

(25) a. **Amwuto** {kyelkho/celtaylo} Mary-lul mannaci an hayssta.
   anyone absolutely   M-ACC meet NOT did
   'No one is such that it is absolutely the case that he met Mary.'
  b. ?***Nwu**-ka{kyelkho/celtaylo}Mary-lul mannaci an hayssta.
   who-NOM absolutely M-ACC meet NOT did
   'No one is such that it is absolutely the case that he met Mary.'

---

9) As shown below, both *kyelkho* and *celtaylo* meaning 'absolutely,' require negation to be properly licensed, confirming their status as a negative polarity item. (See Chung and Park 1998)
 (i) a. John-un {kyelkho/ celtaylo} Mary-lul mannaci an   hayssta.
   J-TOP absolutely   M-ACC meet NOT did
   'It is absolutely the case that John did not met Mary.'
  b.*John-un {kyelkho/ celtaylo} Mary-lul mannassta.
   J-TOP absolutely   M-ACC met
   'It is absolutely the case that John met Mary.'
10) Although subtle, the grammaticality of the example in (25b) improves considerably if the wh-word is construed as positive polarity item *someone* meaning 'there is someone such that it is absolutely the case that he did not meet Mary.'
11) Chung and Park (1998) takes scope interaction of *amwuto* 'anyone' with negation as evidence for the wide scope construal of *amwuto* 'anyone' over negation. However, the scope fact of negation itself is quite a controversy in Korean literature, casting doubt to the strength of the argument *per se*. (See Choi 1999, among others)

Now, given our discussion so far, when it comes to the distribution of *nwukwu* 'who' above in (17) repeated below in (26), it is no surprise that the distribution of overlaps with that of *any* in English, since both are existential.

(26) a. John-i   **nwukwu**-lul   mannaci   an   haysta.
        J-NOM   who-ACC   meet   NOT   did
        'John did not meet anyone.'
    b. Mary-ka **nwukwu**-lul mannaki ceney John-un ttenassta.
        M-NOM   who-ACC   meet before   J-TOP   left
        'Before Mary met anyone, John left.'
    c. John-i   **nwukwu**-lul   mannass-ni?
        J-NOM   who-ACC   met-QM
        'Did John meet anyone?'
    d. **Nwu**-ka   o-myen   wuli-lul   pangmwunhanta.
        who-NOM   come-if   us-ACC   visit
        'For any x, x an individual, if x comes, x visits us.'
    e. Na-nun John-i **nwukwu**-lul mannassnun-ci uysimsulepta.
        I-TOP   J-NOM   who-ACC met-COMP   doubt
        'I doubt that John met anyone.'
    f. **Nwu**-ka   wassta-ni   tahayngita.
        who-NOM   came   lucky
        'It is lucky that anyone came.'
    g. **Nwuku**-lul   cheum   mannanun   salamtul-un
        who-ACC   first   meet   men-TOP
        oymo-ey   sinkyengssunta.
        appearance-to   pay attention
        'People who meet anyone for the first time pay attention to appearance.'
    h. Mary-nun   **nwu**-ka   sayngkakhanun-kes   pota
        M-TOP   who-NOM   think   than
        hwelssin   te   ttokttokhata.
        far   more   smart
        'Mary is far smarter than anyone thinks she is.' 12) 13)

(27) a. John did not meet anyone.

　　b. Before anyone came, John left his office.

　　c. Did John meet anyone?

　　d. Everyone who knows anything on linguistics knows that English
　　　 is a SVO language.

　　e. I doubt anyone came to the party.

　　f. It is lucky that anyone came.

　　g. If anyone comes, I will introduce him to my instructor.

　　h. John runs faster than anyone does.

In the meantime, note that *amwuto* 'anyone' cannot appear in such environments as yes-no question, conditional, adversative predicate construction, emotive factive construction, relative clause headed by a generic noun, and comparative construction above in (16) repeated below as (28). This also follows since negative polarity items with universal quantificational force typically cannot appear in these contexts as observed in Giannakidou (2006).

(28) a. John-i　　**amwuto**　　mannaci　　an　　hayssta.

　　　J-NOM　　anyone　　meet　　NOT did

　　　'John did not meet anyone.'

　　b. Mary-ka **amwuto**　mannaki ceney John-un　ttenassta.

　　　M-NOM　anyone　meet　before　J-TOP　left

　　　'Before Mary met anyone, John left.'

　　c. *John-i　　**amwuto**　　mannass-ni?

　　　J-NOM　　anyone　　met-QM

　　　'Did John meet anyone?'

　　d. ***Amwuto**　o-myen　　wuli-lul　　pangmwunhanta.

　　　anyone　come-if　us-ACC　visit

　　　'For any x, x an individual, if x comes, x visits us.'

---

12) It has been observed that *ku* 'he' can have bound variable reading although it does not yield the reading as easily as English *he*. See Kang (1988) among others for the related discussion.

13) Note that the wh-word can also have the reading of *some* in those contexts. This is well expected since these contexts allow the negative polarity item *any* as well as the positive polarity item *some* in English as well. (See the related discussion in Progovac 1994: 65)

e.*Na-nun John-i **amwuto** mannassnun-ci uysimsulepta.
 I-TOP J-NOM anyone met-COMP doubt
  'I doubt that John met anyone.'

f. ***Amwuto** wassta-ni tahayngita.
 anyone came lucky
  'It is lucky that anyone came.'

g.***Amwuto** cheum mannanun salamtul-un oymo-ey
 anyone first meet men-TOP appearance-to
 sinkyengssunta.
 pay attention
 'People who meet anyone for the first time pay attention to
 appearance.'

h.*Mary-nun **amwuto** sayngkakhanun-kes pota
 M-TOP anyone think than
 hwelssin te ttokttokhata.
 far more smart
 'Mary is far smarter than anyone thinks she is.'

6. Locality vs. Long Distance Dependency

Another interesting contrast emerges with respect to locality between *amwuto* 'anyone' NPIs and bare wh-word NPIs. The *amwuto* 'anyone' NPI and its licensor form a strict local relation, that is, it should be clause bound. (Choe 1988, Sohn 1995, among others) By contrast, the bare wh-word NPI does not have to be clause bound as illustrated below in (29-32), which is from Choi (2010: 208-209).

(29) a. John-i **amwuto** mannaci an hayssta.
 J-NOM anyone meet NOT did
 'John did not meet anyone.'

b.*John-un Mary-ka **amwuto** mannassta-ko malhaci
 J-TOP M-NOM anyone met-COMP say

an hayssta.

NOT did

'John did not say Mary met anyone.'

(30) a. Mary-ka **amwuto** mannaki ceney John-un ttenassta.

   M-NOM anyone meet before J-TOP left

   'Before Mary met anyone, John left.'

   b.*Mary-ka **amwuto** mannassta-ko malhaki ceney

   M-NOM anyone met-COMP say before

   John-un ttenassta.

   J-TOP left

   'Before Mary said she met anyone, John left.'

(31) a. John-un **nwukwu**-lul mannaci an hayssta.

   J-TOP who-ACC meet NOT did

   'John did not meet anyone.'

   b. John-un Mary-ka **nwukwu**-lul mannassta-ko

   J-TOP M-NOM who-ACC met-COMP

   malhaci an hayssta.

   say NOT did

   'John did not say Mary met anyone.'

(32) a. Mary-ka **nwukwu**-lul mannaki ceney John-un

   M-NOM who-ACC meet before J-TOP

   ttenassta.

   left

   'Before Mary met anyone, John left.'

   b. Mary-ka **nwukwu**-lul mannassta-ko malhaki ceney

   M-NOM who-ACC met-COMP say before

   John-un ttenassta.

   J-TOP left

   'Before Mary said she met anyone, John left.'

Now, the important question is: why is it that bare wh-word NPIs, unlike

amwuto 'anyone' NPIs, do not have to be local with their licensers? I suggest this important difference in locality can be again attributed to their quantificational nature, namely, universal vs. existential. Note that it is a well-known observation in the literature that universal quantifiers, unlike existentials or indefinites, are clause bound. (See Reinhart 1997, Farkas 1981, 1997, Farkas and Giannakidou1996, Abusch 1994)

(33) a. A high placed official claimed that John talked to every member of the committee.
    b. Every member of the committee claimed that John talked to a high placed official. (Farkas 1997: 205)

(33a) does not allow the reading where a high placed official covaries with each member of the committee, that is, wide scope of every member of the committee over a high placed official, whereas (33b) allows the reading where there is a particular high placed official such that every member of the committee claimed that John talked to him, namely, the wide scope reading of a high placed official over every member of the committee. (See Abusch 1994, Ludlow and Neale 1991, Reinhart 1997, and Farkas and Giannakidou 1996, among others) Now back to (29-32), the contrast in locality simply follows: *amwuto* 'anyone' NPIs, in contrast to bare wh-word NPIs, should take scope over their licensor in the matrix clause for proper interpretation, which is impossible since *amwuto* 'anyone' NPIs as universal quantifiers are clause bound. Before closing the section, note that it is not a mere coincidence that English NPI *any*, which is also existential, is not clause bound, either.

(34) a. John did not meet anyone.
    b. John does not think Mary met anyone.

(35) a. Before anyone came, John left.
    b. Before John thought anyone came, Mary left.

7. Conclusion

I argued that negative polarity items in Korean vary in quantificational force, that is, universal vs. existential. I showed that there emerges an interesting pattern of contrast between *amwuto* 'anyone,' NPIs and bare wh-word NPIs in that the latter show a far broader distribution than the former and are not subject to locality in contrast to the former. I tried to show that the contrast reduces to their different quantificational force: The *amwuto* 'anyone' NPI is universal, whereas the bare wh-word NPI is existential.

References

Arnaiz, Alfredo. 1996. *N-Words and Wh-in-situ: Nature and Interactions*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.

Baker, C. Lee. 1970. Double negatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 1, 169-186.

Carlson, Greg. 1980. Polarity *any* is Existential. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, 799-804

Cheng, Lisa. 1991. *On the Typology of Wh-Questions*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Choe, Hyun-Sook. 1988. *Restructuring Parameters and Complex Predicates; A Transformational Approach*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Choi, YoungSik. 2000. The Syntax and Semantics of NPI Licensing in Korean. WECOL 12, 164-175.

Choi, YoungSik. 2002. *Asymmetry of Scope Taking in Wh-Questions*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.

Choi, YoungSik. 2010. Argument Negative Polarity Items in Korean. *The Journal of Studies in Language. 26,* 195-212.

Chung, Daeho and Park, Hong-Keun. 1998. NPIs Outside of Negation Scope. Ho-Min Sohn and John Haig (eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 6, 415–435, CSLI Publications, Stanford.

Dahl, Östen. 1970. Some Notes on Indefinites. *Language* 46, 33-41.

Farkas, Donka. 1981. Quantifier scope and syntactic islands. Roberta Hendrik etal. (eds.), Chicago Linguistics Society 7, 59-66,

Farkas, Donka, and Anastasia Giannakidou. 1996. How Clause-bounded is the Scope of Universals? *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* (SALT) VI, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

Farkas, Donka. 1997. Evaluation Indices and Scope. Anna Szabolcsi (ed.), *Ways of Scope Taking*, 183-215, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.

Fauconnier, Gilles. 1979. Implication reversal in natural Language. Franz Guenthner and Siegfried J. Schmidts, (eds.), *Formal Semantics and Pragmatics for Natural Language*, Dordrecht, Reidel.

Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2006. N-Words and Negative Concord. Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*. Vol. 3, 327-391, Blackwell Publishing, Malden, MA.

Heim, Irene. 1982. *The Semantics of definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Hoeksema, Jack. 1983. Negative Polarity and the Comparative. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1, 403-434.

Horn, Laurence. 1972. *On the Semantic Properties of Logical Operators in English*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Kang, Myung-Yoon. 1988. *Topics in Korean Syntax: Phrase Structure, Variable and Movement*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Kim, Kwang-sup. 1999. A Paradox in Korean NPI licensing. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 9, 403-428.

Kim, Soo-Won. 1991. *Chain Scope and Quantification Structure*. Doctoral dissertation, Brandeis University, Waltham.

Klima, Edward. 1964. Negation in English. Jerry Foder and Jerrold Katz (eds.), *The Structure of Language*, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall.

Kuroda, S-Y. 1965. *Generative Grammatical Studies in the Japanese language*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Ladusaw, William. 1979. *Polarity Sensitivity as Inherent Scope Relations*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.

Laka, Itziar. 1990. *Negation in Syntax: On the Nature of Functional Categories and Projections*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Lee, Chungmin. 1999. Types of NPIs and Nonveridicality in Korean and other Languages. Gianluca Storto (ed.), UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics 3, 96-132,

Lee, Young-Suk. 1993. The semantics of *ANY* Revisited. Proceedings of NELS 23, 287-301.

Lewis, David. 1975. Adverbs of Quantification. Edward Keenan (ed.), *Formal Semantics of Natural language*, 3-15, Cambridge University Press.

Li, Audrey. 1992. Indefinite Wh in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 1,125-155.

Linebarger, Marcia. 1980. *The Grammar of Negative Polarity*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Ludlow, Peter, and Stephen, Neale. 1991. Indefinite descriptions: in defense of Russell. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 14, 171-202.

Milsark, Gary. 1974. *Existential Sentences in English*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Nishigauchi, Taisuke. 1990. *Quantification in the Theory of Grammar*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Penka, Doris. 2006. Almost there: The meaning of *almost*. Christian Ebert and Cornelia (eds.), Proceedings of Sinn and Bedeutung 10, 275-286, Berlin, ZAS.

Progovac, Ljiljana. 1988. *A Binding Approach to Polarity Sensitivity*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.

Progovac, Ljiljana. 1994. *Negative and Positive Polarity: A Binding Approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Quine, Willard. 1960. *Word and Object*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Reinhart, Tanya. 1997. Quantifier Scope: How Labor is Divided between QR and Choice Functions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20, 335-397.

Sohn, Keun-Won. 1995. *Negative Polarity Items, Scope, and Economy*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Suh, Jinhee. 1990. *Scope Phenomena and Aspects of Korean Syntax*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.

De Swart, Henriëtte. 1998. *Introduction to Natural Language Semantics*. CSLI Publications, Stanford.

Zwarts, Frans. 1995. Nonveridical Contexts. *Linguistic Analysis* 25, 286-312.

Zwarts, Frans. 1998. Three Types of Polarity. Fritz Hamm and Erhard Hinrichs (eds.), *Plurality and Quantification*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.

YoungSik Choi

Dept. of English Language and Literature

Soonchunhyang University, Asan, Chungnam, 336-745

Phone:+82-41-530-1124

Email: youngsic@sch.ac.kr