Uses of Tibetan *yin.n'ang* ཡིན་ནའང་

Michael Yoshitaka Erlewine (mitcho), NUS

Singapore Summer Meeting, July 2019[1]

1 Introducing Tibetan *yin.n'ang*

Tibetan *yin.n'ang* ཡིན་ནའང་ appears to have three distinct uses:

(1) **Counterexpectational 'but/however':**
ཁོང་གཟུགས་པོ་རིང་པོ་འདུག **ཡིན་ནའང་** སྤྱང་པོ་མི་འདུག

Khong gzugs.po ring.po 'dug. **Yin.n'ang** spyang.po mi-'dug.
he body long AUX YIN.N'ANG clever NEG-AUX

'He's tall. **However**, he isn't smart.'

(2) ***Wh* free choice item (FCI):**
Context: Pema is very friendly.
མོ་རང་**སུ་ཡིན་ནའང་**ལ་སྐད་ཆ་བཤད་གི་རེད།

Mo.rang [**su yin.n'ang**]=la skad.cha bshad-gi-red.
she who YIN.N'ANG=DAT speech talk-IMPF-AUX

'She talks to **anyone**.'

(3) **Concessive scalar particle (see e.g. Lahiri 2010; Crnič 2011a,b):**
Context: Don't worry, the test is easy.
དེབ་གཅིག་**ཡིན་ནའང་**བློག་ན་ཡིག་ཚད་མཐར་འཁྱོལ་གི་རེད།

[Dep [gcig]$_F$ **yin.n'ang** klog-na] yig.tshad mthar.'khyol-gi-red.
book one YIN.N'ANG read-COND exam succeed-IMPF-AUX

≈ '[You] will pass the exam [if [you] read **just at least** one book].'

Yin.n'ang is also variably *yin.na.yang* ཡིན་ན་ཡང་ or *yin.n'i* ཡིན་ནའི་[2] and is morphologically clearly:

(4)

ཡིན་	ན་	ཡང་		ཡིན་ན་ཡང་		ཡིན་ནའང་		ཡིན་ནའི
yin	+ na	+ yang	>	yin.na.yang	>	yin.n'ang	>	yin.n'i /yine/
COPULA	CONDITIONAL	EVEN						

- Today, I document these uses of *yin.n'ang* from original fieldwork and propose a **compositional semantics** which derives these uses from the components in (4).
- I also extend this analysis to **Japanese *demo***, which has the exact same range of uses and also historically derives from the ingredients in (4).

[1]I thank Kunga Choedun, Pema Yudron, and Tenzin Kunsang for many hours of consultations, as well as Chris Davis, Hadas Kotek, and Elin McCready for comments and discussion.

[2]This reflects the general reduction of ཡང་ <yang> EVEN to ཡའི་ <y'i> /ye/, common in speech (Tournadre and Sangda Dorje 2003: 409).

2 Counterexpectational 'but/however'

There are roughly three uses of English *but*:[3]

(5) **Uses of English *but* (Toosarvandani 2014: 3):**

a. Counterexpectational *but*: "p but q" $\rightsquigarrow p \Rightarrow \neg q$
The player is tall, **but** agile.
$\rightsquigarrow$ (we expect that) if the player is tall, she is not agile.

b. Semantic opposition *but*:
John is tall, **but** Bill is short.
$\rightsquigarrow$ (we expect that) if John is tall, Bill is not short.

c. Corrective *but*:
Liz doesn't dance, **but** sing.
$\not\rightsquigarrow$ (we expect that) if Liz doesn't dance, she does not sing.

---

(6) **Counterexpectation (or contrast) is required:**
ཁོ་ཁ་ལག་མང་པོ་ཟ་གི་རེད།

Kho kha.lag mang.po za-gi-red.
he food a.lot eat-IMPF-AUX
'He eats a lot of food.'

a. **ཡིན་ནའང་** རྒྱགས་པ་ཆགས་གི་མ་རེད།
Yin.n'ang rgyags.pa chags-gi-ma-red.
YIN.N'ANG fat become-IMPF-NEG-AUX
'But he doesn't gain weight.'

b. # **ཡིན་ནའང་** རྒྱགས་པ་ཆགས་གི་རེད།
Yin.n'ang rgyags.pa chags-gi-red.
YIN.N'ANG fat become-IMPF-AUX
'But he gains weight.'

(7) **Semantic opposition (not obviously counterexpectational) *yin.n'ang*:**
བསྟན་འཛིན་གཟུགས་པོ་རིང་པོ་འདུག། **ཡིན་ནའང་** བཀྲ་ཤིས་ཆུང་ཆུང་འདུག

bsTan.dzin gzugs.po ring.po 'dug. **Yin.n'ang** bKra.shis chung-chung 'dug.
Tenzin body long AUX YIN.N'ANG Tashi small-RED AUX
'Tenzin is tall. But Tashi is short.'

(8) **But no corrective *yin.n'ang*:**
#ཁོང་གཟུགས་པོ་རིང་པོ་མི་འདུག **ཡིན་ནའང་** ཆུང་ཆུང་འདུག

Khong gzugs.po ring.po mi-'dug **Yin.n'ang** chung-chung 'dug.
he body long NEG-AUX YIN.N'ANG small-RED AUX
Intended: 'He's not tall, but short.'

[3] There's also exceptive *but*, which we leave aside.

Analysis

Suppose counterexpectational *yin.n'ang* takes an unpronounced propositional anaphor:

(9) [[$pro_{=p}$]$_F$ yin-na] =yang q
COP-COND EVEN

Literal LF: EVEN (if it's $[p]_F$, q)

(10) **Deriving counterexpectation:**

a. The proposition p was asserted prior. $\boxed{\Rightarrow p}$

b. Let P be a set of relevant alternatives to p — propositions p' where the conditional "if p', q" is relevant to consider.

c. EVEN requires that the conditional "if p, q" be less likely than "if p', q" for all $p' \in P$. This scalar condition requires very low credence in "if p, q," which is supported by an expectation that "if p, not q." $\boxed{\rightsquigarrow \text{we expect (if } p\text{, not } q)}$

(In other words, EVEN is used to build a *concessive* ('although/even though') relation from a *causal* one, as is cross-linguistically common (König 1991: 82–83).)

d. Assuming that P exhausts all relevant possibilities — i.e. this is an "introduced" *even if* conditional, in Bennett's (1982) terms — the assertion of "EVEN if $[p]_F$, q" will implicate the truth of the consequent q (von Fintel 1994: §5.3.3). $\boxed{\rightsquigarrow q}$

e. Therefore, "p. *Yin.n'ang* q." $\rightsquigarrow$ p, q, we expect (if p, not q)

(I hope that we can reduce the scalar opposition use (7) to this same counterexpectational use.)

But a puzzle:

(11) **The propositional anaphor for *yin.n'ang* can't be overt:** cf (1)
*ཁོང་གཟུགས་པོ་རིང་པོ་འདུག **དེ་**ཡིན་ན་འང་སྤྱང་པོ་མི་འདུག

Khong gzugs.po ring.po 'dug. **De** yin.n'ang spyang.po mi-'dug.
he body long AUX that YIN.N'ANG clever NEG-AUX

(12) ***De* is used as a propositional anaphor:**
ཁོང་གཟུག་པོ་རིང་པོ་རེད་ད་བསམ་གི་འདུག བསྟན་རྫིན་ཡང་**དེ་**བསམ་གི་འདུག་

[Khong gzug.po ring.po red] nga bsam-gi-'dug. bsTan.dzin=yang[5] **de** bsam-gi-'dug.
he body long AUX 1sg think-IMPF-AUX Tenzin=ALSO that think-IMPF-AUX

'I think he's tall. Tenzin also thinks so.'

[5] *yang* is also 'also,' in addition to scalar 'even' (Erlewine and Kotek 2016).

3 *Wh* free choice item

Free choice items are licensed in a range of modal/conditional and non-episodic (non-veridical; Giannakidou 2001) environments and lead to *free choice inferences*:

(13) $f(\text{FCI}_x) \Rightarrow$ for any choice of x, $f(x)$ is true

(Kratzer and Shimoyama 2002's "distribution requirement"; Giannakidou 2001's "quasi-universal effect")

(14) ཁོང་ཁ་ལག་**གཱ་རེ་ཡིན་ནམ་**ཟ་གི་རེད། ...ཟ་ཐུབ་གི་རེད།

Khong [kha.lag **ga.re yin.n'ang**] za-gi-red. / ...za-thub-gi-red.
he food what YIN.N'ANG eat-IMPF-AUX eat-ABLE-IMPF-AUX

'He {eats(habitual)/can eat} **any** food.'

(15) **Puzzle: FCIs can't be built with 'which'**

*ཁོང་ཁ་ལག་**གང་གི་ཡིན་ནམ་**ཟ་ཐུབ་གི་རེད།

Khong [kha.lag **gang.gi yin.n'ang**] za-thub-gi-red.
he food which YIN.N'ANG eat-can-IMPF-AUX

literally 'He can eat *yin.n'ang*(*which* food).'

Aside: On *yin.n'ang* in argument position

Taking the morphology of *yin.n'ang* at face value — COPULA + COND + EVEN (4) — *yin.n'ang* is a conditional clause (with EVEN).

- But in *yin.n'ang*'s FCI and focus particle uses, *X yin.n'ang is in an argument position*. This is especially problematic in (2), where *wh yin.n'ang* takes a dative case particle.[6]

(2) ***Wh* free choice item (FCI):**

མོ་རང་**སུ་ཡིན་ནམ་**ལ་སྐད་ཆ་བཤད་གི་རེད།

Mo.rang [**su yin.n'ang**]=la skad.cha bshad-gi-red.
she who YIN.N'ANG=DAT speech talk-IMPF-AUX

'She talks to **anyone**.'

- I propose to adopt the Shimoyama 1999 E-type anaphora approach for (Japanese) head-internal relatives. (Tibetan also generally has head-internal relatives.)

  The clause itself is interpreted at LF as adjoined to the main clause, with its surface argument position interpreted with an E-type pronoun.

(16) a. Literal (2): She talks to [even if it's who] $\Rightarrow$

b. LF: [even if it's who$_i$], she talks to *them*$_i$ $\Rightarrow$ EVEN(if it's who$_i$, she talks to *them*$_i$)

[6] It seems like ergative case goes inside *yin.n'ang*? But I only have one example and want to confirm this.

Analysis

Following the approach developed in my ongoing work...[7]

(17) **Computing the *wh* free choice item example (2):**

a. *Wh*-words have an alternative set ranging over its domain but no ordinary value (Ramchand 1997; Beck 2006; Kotek 2014):

$$[\![su/who]\!]^{o} \text{ undefined} \qquad [\![su/who]\!]^{alt} = \{x : x \text{ animate}\}$$

b. EVEN requires its complement to have a defined ordinary value (the prejacent). But the ordinary value of the sister of EVEN in (16b) — which contains 'who' — is undefined.

c. To fix this problem, I posit the following covert operator $\exists$:[8]

$$[\![\exists\ \alpha]\!]^{o} = \bigvee [\![\alpha]\!]^{alt} \qquad [\![\exists\ \alpha]\!]^{alt} = [\![\alpha]\!]^{alt}$$

d. Complete LF for (2): EVEN[$_{\alpha}$ if $\exists$[they$_i$'re *who*], she talks(HABITUAL) to them$_i$]
$[\![\alpha]\!]^{o} = {}^{\wedge}$if it's *someone*$_i$, she talks to them$_i$
$[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt} = \{{}^{\wedge}$if it's x_i, she talks to them$_i$: x human$\}$

e. EVEN(α) asserts $[\![\alpha]\!]^{o}$: she talks to everyone (as long as they exist).

f. Notice that the prejacent $[\![\alpha]\!]^{o}$ asymmetrically entails every proposition in $[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt}$. The presupposition of EVEN is thus satisfied: the prejacent is the least likely alternative.

g. In addition, I propose that the assertion of $[\![\alpha]\!]^{o}$ instead of a more specific alternative in $[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt}$ yields a conversational implicature that 'someone' in the conditional clause can be verified by multiple (all?) individuals. This derives the free choice inference.

Maybe this approach can derive FCI distribution?

(18) **Deriving the ungrammaticality (?) of *wh yin.n'ang* FCI in episodic contexts:**

a. Hypothetical structure: He's eating [even if it's what] right now. *Missing this data!*

b. Intended: *'Mary's eating anything right now.'

c. LF: EVEN[$_{\alpha}$ if $\exists$[it's what$_i$], he's eating *it*$_i$ right now]

d. The intuition: In this episodic situation, either the speaker knows what specifically is being eaten right now (maybe multiple things) — and therefore should be able to say a more specific alternative in $[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt}$, contra (17g) — or they can't be certain (and therefore shouldn't say, by Quality) that everything is being eaten right now ($[\![\alpha]\!]^{o}$).[9]

[7] In the work I'm developing, the obligatory use of EVEN here is also explained. But see (20) below.

[8] Although the effect of the ordinary value here is that of the existential closure/disjunction operator as in Kratzer and Shimoyama 2002 and Alonso-Ovalle 2006, these previous works work in a one-dimensional Hamblin semantics. The $\exists$ operator here defines an ordinary value but does not touch the focus semantic value.

[9] This might also help explain "subtrigging" — the exceptional licensing of FCI when their domain is further restricted, for example with a relative clause. Making the domain of alternatives much smaller could help avoid

There is also a *wh* conditional with "unconditional" semantics, which shows that a logic like (17) must be generally productive:

(19) **སུ་སླེབས་ན་ཡང་**འགྲིག་གི་རེད།

[**Su** slebs-na]=**yang** 'grig-gi-red.
who come-COND=EVEN alright-IMPF-AUX

Translated from: 'Anyone can come.' literally 'It's alright even if who comes.'

But here, apparently the *yang* EVEN is optional...

(20) **སུ་**སླེབས་ན་འགྲིག་གི་རེད།

[**Su** slebs-na] 'grig-gi-red.
who come-COND alright-IMPF-AUX

'Anyone can come.'

4 Concessive scalar particle

Crnič 2011b: 5:

> "[Concessive scalar particles are] licensed in two types of environments: DE and modal environments. It is glossed with *even* in DE environments and under existential modals; it is glossed with *at least* in imperatives, under universal modals and under attitude predicates. The associate of [a CSP] is the lowest element on the pragmatic scale."

(21) ***Yin.n'ang* licensed by negation:**[10]

a. བཀྲ་ཤིས་ཨང་གསུམ་པ་**ཡིན་ནའེ་**ལེན་**མི་**འདུག

bKra.shis ang [gsum]$_F$-pa **yin.n'i** len-**mi**-'dug.
Tashi # three-rd YIN.N'ANG receive-NEG-AUX

'He didn't **even** get [third]$_F$ place.'

b. *བཀྲ་ཤིས་ཨང་གསུམ་པ་**ཡིན་ནའེ་**ལེན་འདུག

bKra.shis ang [gsum]$_F$-pa **yin.n'i** len-'dug.
Tashi # three-rd YIN.N'ANG receive-AUX

literally 'He got YIN.N'ANG [third]$_F$ place.'

these issues which block the use of a FCI.

[10] It is known that the licensing of CSPs with clause-mate negation is subject to cross-linguistic variation. Spanish *siquiera* allows it (Alonso-Ovalle 2016: 186) but Slovenian *magari* does not, although it can be licensed by non-clause-mate negation (Crnič 2011b: 4). (I think Japanese *demo* cannot.)

(22) **Spanish *aunque sea* in a conditional (Lahiri 2010):**

Si lees **aunque sea** UN/*CINCO libro, vas a aprobar.
if you read AUNQUE SEA one/*five book, you're going to pass

Tibetan *yin.n'ang* in a similar conditional environment must associate with a weak element:

(23) ***Yin.n'ang* licensed by a conditional, with 'at least' interpretation:**

a. དེབ་གཅིག་**ཡིན་ནའང་**སློག་ན་ཡིག་ཚད་མཐར་འཁྱོལ་གི་རེད། =(3)
[Dep [gcig]$_F$ **yin.n'ang** klog-na] yig.tshad mthar.'khyol-gi-red.
book one YIN.N'ANG read-COND exam succeed-IMPF-AUX
≈ '[You] will pass the exam [if [you] read **at least** one book].'

b. #དེབ་གསུམ་**ཡིན་ནའང་**སློག་ན་ཡིག་ཚད་མཐར་འཁྱོལ་གི་རེད།
[Dep [gsum]$_F$ **yin.n'ang** klog-na] yig.tshad mthar.'khyol-gi-red.
book three YIN.N'ANG read-COND exam succeed-IMPF-AUX
Intended: ≈ '[You] will pass the exam [if [you] read **at least** three books].'

(24) ***Yin.n'ang* in an imperative, with 'at least' interpretation:**
ཁ་ལག་ཏིས་**ཡིན་ནའི་**ཟ་དང།
Kha.lag [tis]$_F$ **yin.n'i** za-(dang)!
food a little YIN.N'ANG eat-IMP
≈ 'Eat **at least** a little food!'

CSPs are also supposed to be licensed under bouletic embeddings like *want*, yielding 'at least' translations (25), but I wasn't able to reproduce this.

(25) **Slovenian *magari* licensed under 'want/wish that' (Crnič 2011b: 5):**

a. Janez si želi, da bi Peter osvojil **magari** BRONASTO medaljo.
John self want that AUX Peter win MAGARI bronze medal
'John wishes that Peter would win **at least** a bronze medal.'

b. *Janez je mislil, da je Peter osvojil **magari** BRONASTO medaljo.
John AUX think that AUX Peter won MAGARI bronze medal
Intended: 'John thought that Peter won at least a bronze medal.'

(26) ***Yin.n'ang* not licensed by 'hope' (N):**
*བཀྲ་ཤིས་ཨང་གསུམ་པ་**ཡིན་ནའི་**ལེན་པའི་རེ་བ་ཡོད།
[bKra.shis ang [gsum]$_F$-pa **yin.n'i** len-pa]-'i re.ba yod.
Tashi # three-rd YIN.N'ANG receive-NML-GEN hope have
'I hope that Tashi gets **at least** third place.' literally 'I have hope that...'

...but maybe (26) was a bad set up because *re.ba* 'hope' here is a noun.

Analysis[11]

(27) **Licensing by negation with 'even' reading (21):**

This follows the general logic of weak elements associating with EVEN to form NPIs (Lahiri 1998; see also Lee and Horn 1995). We consider only first, second, third places here.

a. LF for (21a): EVEN[$_\alpha$ if it's [third]$_F$ place$_i$, Tashi didn't get it$_i$]
$[\![\alpha]\!]^o$ = ^if it's third place$_i$, Tashi didn't get it$_i$
$[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt}$ = {^if it's n-th place$_i$, Tashi didn't get it$_i$: $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$}
Assuming getting first place is less likely — or more noteworthy (Herburger 2000) — than second, than third, *not* getting third place will be the least likely, satisfying EVEN.

b. LF for (21a): EVEN[$_\alpha$ if it's [third]$_F$ place$_i$, Tashi got it$_i$]
$[\![\alpha]\!]^o$ = ^if it's third place$_i$, Tashi got it$_i$
$[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt}$ = {^if it's n-th place$_i$, Tashi got it$_i$: $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$}
Here the prejacent is the most likely / least noteworthy, so EVEN is not satisfied.

(28) **Licensing in a conditional and associating with a weak element (3):**

a. LF for (3): EVEN[$_\alpha$ if it's [one]$_F$ book$_i$, [if you read it$_i$, you will pass the exam]]
$[\![\alpha]\!]^o$ = ^if it's one book$_i$, [if you read it$_i$, you will pass the exam]
$[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt}$ = {^if it's n books$_i$, [if you read them$_i$, you will pass the exam] : $n \geq 1$}
On the 'at least' interpretation of the numeral, $[\![\alpha]\!]^o$ asymmetrically entails all other alternatives in $[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt}$ and is thus the least likely, satisfying EVEN.

► This necessitates the 'at least' interpretation of the numeral and blocks the exact reading.

b. LF for (23b): EVEN[$_\alpha$ if it's [three]$_F$ books$_i$, [if you read it$_i$, you will pass the exam]]
$[\![\alpha]\!]^o$ = ^if it's three books$_i$, [if you read it$_i$, you will pass the exam]
$[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt}$ = {^if it's n books$_i$, [if you read them$_i$, you will pass the exam] : $n \geq 1$}
$[\![\alpha]\!]^o$ is *not* the strongest/least likely alternative in $[\![\alpha]\!]^{alt}$ and so EVEN is not satisfied.

(29) **Licensing *yin.n'ang* in an imperative (24):**

a. LF for (24): EVEN[$_\alpha$ IMP(if it's [a little]$_F$ food$_i$, you eat it$_i$)]
IMP represents the imperative speech act in (29).

b. As imperatives don't have truth conditions (*pace* Kaufmann 2012), we can't order them by likelihood or entailment. So here I adopt a *noteworthiness* scale (Herburger 2000).

c. In a context where a stronger request — e.g. IMP(if it's *a lot* of food$_i$, you eat it$_i$) — is also appropriate, the speaker's choice to make the weaker request with 'little' is noteworthy, satisfying EVEN.

[11] The analysis here is similar to that in Lahiri 2010. Notably, Lahiri 2010 notes that Spanish *aunque sea* appears to be EVEN + CONDITIONAL + COPULA, and the Greek CSP *esto ke* is also EVEN + CONDITIONAL.

d. This derives the 'at least' flavor: Alternative imperatives with higher values would also be appropriate.

And now for something completely different (?)...

5 Japanese *demo*

See if this looks familiar:

(30) **Counterexpectational 'but/however':** ≅ (1); cf (11)

Tashi-wa se-ga takai. (Sore) **demo** atama-wa yoku-nai.
Tashi-TOP height-NOM high that DEMO head-TOP good-NEG
'Tashi's tall. **But** [he] isn't smart.'

(31) ***Wh* free choice item:** ≅ (2)

Context: Pema is very friendly.

Kanojo-wa [**dare**-to **demo**] hana-su.
she-TOP who-DAT DEMO talk-NONPAST
'She talks to **anyone**.'

(32) **Concessive scalar particle:** ≅ (3)

Context: Don't worry, the test is easy.

[Hon-o [is-satsu / ?san-satsu]$_F$ **demo** yom-eba] shiken-ni gookaku su-ru
book-ACC one-CL three-CL DEMO read-COND exam-DAT pass do-NONPAST
(yo).
YO
≈ '[You] will pass the exam [if [you] read **just at least** one book].'

► Japanese *demo* is Tibetan *yin.n'ang*! I propose that the same analysis can apply for each of these uses.

Nakanishi 2006: 141:

> "*-Demo* can be morphologically decomposed into the copular verb *-de* followed by *-mo* [EVEN]. However, it is not clear whether this decomposition is necessary. Indeed, *-demo* is often treated as a single lexical item corresponding to *even*..."

- Onodera 2004 however argues that Japanese *demo* historically derives from the V-*te* (causal/asymmetric conjunction) + *mo* (EVEN) construction, described by Yamaguchi 1989 as a concessive conditional.

► The success of the decomposition for Tibetan *yin.n'ang* — as COPULA + CONDITIONAL + EVEN — in turn motivates a similar decompositional approach for Japanese *demo* as well.

---

(33) **Semantic opposition *demo*:** ≅ (7)

Tenjin-wa se-ga takai. **Demo** Tashi-wa se-ga hikui.
Tenzin-TOP height-NOM high DEMO Tashi-TOP height-NOM low
'Tenzin is tall. But Tashi is short.'

(34) **But no corrective *demo*:** ≅ (8)

#Kare-wa se-ga/wa takaku-nai. **Demo** hikui.
he-TOP height-NOM/TOP high DEMO low
'He's not tall, but short.'

---

(35) ***Wh demo* FCI:** ≅ (14)

Kare-wa tabemono-o **nan-demo** tabe-ru. / ...tabe-rare-ru.
he-TOP food-ACC **what-demo** eat-NONPAST eat-ABLE-NONPAST
'He {eats(habitual) / can eat} **any** food.'

► There is a slight challenge to adopting the same Shimoyama-style analysis in (16) — assuming that the FCI/CSP is a conditional clause that adjoins to the embedding clause at LF — for Japanese data as in (31). Notice that the dative case particle comes *inside demo* in Japanese, unlike in Tibetan (2).

I propose that the copular clause inside *demo* is in fact a reduced cleft. Cleft pivots in Japanese can include case particles:

LF for (31): EVEN(if it's [who-DAT$_i$] ~~[that she talks to]~~, she talks [to] *them*$_i$)

Another fascinating FCI parallel:

(36) ***Dou* is manner 'how':**

Chibetto-ni **dou** ik-u-no?
Tibet-DAT how go-NONPAST-Q
'How will you go to Tibet?'

(37) ***Dou-demo* can't be used for 'any way':**

***Dou-demo** ik-u (yo).
how-DEMO go-NONPAST YO
Int.: ≈ 'I will go however/in any way.'

(38) **Instead, *dou-demo* expresses strong indifference:**

Dou-demo ii (yo).
how-DEMO good YO
'Anything is fine.' (I don't care / That doesn't matter)

(39) བོད་ལ་**གང་འདྲ**་འགྲོ་ཡ་ཡིན།

Bod-la **gang.'dra** 'gro-ya-yin?
Tibet-DAT how go-FUT-AUX
'How will you go to Tibet?'

(40) ***གང་འདྲ་ཡིན་ནའང**་འགྲོ་ཡ་ཡིན།

Gang.'dra yin.n'ang 'gro-ya-yin?
how go-FUT-AUX go-FUT-AUX
Int.: ≈ 'I will go however/in any way.'

(41) **གང་འདྲ་ཡིན་ནའང**་འགྲིག་གི་རེད།

Gang.'dra yin.n'ang 'grig-gi-red.
how go-FUT-AUX alright-IMPF-AUX
'Anything is fine.'
(speaker comment: 'I don't care.')

Japanese also has a *wh* conditional with "unconditional" semantics:

(42) [**Dare**-ga ki-te]=*(**mo**) ii. ≅ (19); cf (20)
who-NOM come-TE=EVEN good
'Anyone can come.' literally 'It's alright even if who comes.'

---

(43) ***Demo* in an imperative, with 'at least' interpretation:** ≅ (24)
[Sukoshi]$_F$ **demo** tabe-ro/nasai!
a little YIN.N'ANG eat-IMP
≈ 'Eat **at least** a little food!'

However! The use of Japanese *demo* as a concessive scalar particle appears to be slightly broader than Tibetan *yin.n'ang*:

(44) Teramura 1991 in Watanabe 2013: 207:
John-ni-**demo** kik-ou.
John-DAT-DEMO ask-let's
'Let's ask John, for example.'

(45) Watanabe 2013: 208:
Kaze-**demo** hii-ta-no?
cold-DEMO catch-PAST-Q
'Did you catch a cold, for example?'

(46) Ocha-**demo** nomi-masu-ka?
tea-DEMO drink-POLITE-Q
'Would you like to get tea, for example?'

(47) *བཀྲ་ཤིས་**ཡིན་ནང་**ལ་འདྲི་གོ
bKra.shis-**yin.n'ang**-la 'dri-go.
Tashi-YIN.N'ANG-DAT ask-let's
literally 'Let's ask *yin.n'ang* Tashi.'

(48) *ཁྱེད་རང་ཅམ་པ་**ཡིན་ནང་**བརྒྱབ་འདུག་གས།
Khyed.rang cham.pa **yin.n'ang** brgyab-'dug-gas?
you cold YIN.N'ANG build-AUX-Q
lit. 'Did you catch *yin.n'ang* a cold?'

(49) *ཁྱེད་རང་ཡིན་ནང་འཐུང་ཡ་ཡིན་པས།
Khyed.rang cha **yin.n'ang** 'thung-ya-yin-pas?
you tea YIN.N'ANG dring-FUT-AUX-Q
lit. 'Will you drink *yin.n'ang* tea?'

But notice that all of these examples involve focus associates that are not

- Tibetan *yin.n'ang*'s alternatives must be ordered only by likelihood/entailment in the CSP use, without contextual information. Therefore *yin.n'ang* CSP can only associate with weak elements on a scale such as 'one,' but not contextually ordered alternatives.

(How to get the current analysis based on EVEN to extend to these Japanese 'for example' cases is a puzzle for future work...)

References

Alonso-Ovalle, Luis. 2006. Disjunction in alternative semantics. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Alonso-Ovalle, Luis. 2016. Are all concessive scalar particles the same? probing into Spanish *siquiera*. In *Proceedings of SALT 26*, 185–204.

Beck, Sigrid. 2006. Intervention effects follow from focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 14:1–56.

Bennett, Jonathan. 1982. 'even if'. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 5:403–418.

Crnič, Luka. 2011a. Getting *even*. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Crnič, Luka. 2011b. On the meaning and distribution of concessive scalar particles. In *Proceedings of NELS 41*, ed. Nicholas LaCara, Lena Fainlib, and Yangsook Park, 1–14.

Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka, and Hadas Kotek. 2016. *Even*-NPIs in Dharamsala Tibetan. *Linguistic Analysis* 40:129–165.

von Fintel, Kai. 1994. Restrictions on quantifier domains. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts.

Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2001. The meaning of free choice. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 24:659–735.

Herburger, Elena. 2000. *What counts: focus and quantification*. Number 36 in Linguistic Inquiry Monographs. MIT Press.

Kaufmann, Magdalena. 2012. *Interpreting imperatives*. Springer.

Kotek, Hadas. 2014. Composing questions. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Kratzer, Angelika, and Junko Shimoyama. 2002. Indeterminate pronouns: the view from Japanese. In *The Proceedings of the Third Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics (TCP 2002)*, ed. Yuko Otsuka, 1–25. Tokyo: Hitsuji Syobo.

König, Ekkehard. 1991. *The meaning of focus particles*. Routledge.

Lahiri, Utpal. 1998. Focus and negative polarity in Hindi. *Natural Language Semantics* 6:57–123.

Lahiri, Utpal. 2010. Some *even*'s are *even (if) ... only*: The concessive "even" in Spanish. Manuscript.

Lee, Young-Suk, and Laurence Horn. 1995. *Any* as indefinite plus *even*. Manuscript, Yale University, May 1995.

Nakanishi, Kimiko. 2006. *Even*, *only*, and negative polarity in Japanese. In *Proceedings of SALT 16*, 138–155.

Onodera, Noriko O. 2004. *Japanese discourse markers: Synchronic and diachronic discourse analysis*. John Benjamins.

Ramchand, Gillian Catriona. 1997. Questions, polarity and alternative semantics. In *Proceedings of NELS 27*, 383–396. GLSA.

Shimoyama, Junko. 1999. Internally headed relative clauses in Japanese and E-type anaphora. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 8:147–182.

Toosarvandani, Maziar. 2014. Contrast and the structure of discourse. *Semantics & Pragmatics* 7:1–57.

Tournadre, Nicholas, and Sangda Dorje. 2003. *Manual of Standard Tibetan: Language and civilization*. Snow Lion Publications.

Watanabe, Akira. 2013. Ingredients of polarity sensitivity: Bipolar items in Japanese. In *Strategies of quantification*, ed. Kook-Hee Gil, Stephen Harlow, and George Tsoulas, 189–213. Oxford University Press.

Yamaguchi, Seiko Fujii. 1989. Concessive conditionals in Japanese: A pragmatic analysis of the S1-*temo* S2 construction. In *Proceedings of BLS 15*, 291–302.