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This paper investigates the morphosyntax and semantics of the Sakha particle daqani (дакани) [da'qani] and its reduced form da (дак), based on elicited data. Da(qani) appears in varied yet heavily constrained environments, which include negative polarity item (NPI) uses (licensed by negation and comparatives) and an additive/conjunctive use.

1. NPI: Sakha NPIs are constructed with WH-words+da(qani) (1) and the numeral biir ‘one’: biir+da(qani) (2).

(1) a. Kim {da/daqani} iti it-i (sirsi-ba-t-a / *siris-t-a)
   who da
   that dog-ACC chase-NEG-PST-3SG / chase-PST-3SG
   literally: ‘anybody didn’t chase that dog’, equivalent to English ‘Nobody chased that dog’

b. Tugu {da/daqani} (aax-pa-taq-im / *aax-pit)
   what.ACC da
   read-NEG-PST.1SG / read-PST
   ‘I didn’t read anything’

c. Djulus kim-neeqer *(da/daqani) uahun
   D. who-CMPR da
   tall
   ‘Djulus is taller than anyone’

(2) a. Miin biir da kinige-(ni) (aax-pa-t-im / *aax-t-im)
   1SG one da book-(ACC) read-NEG-PST-1SG / read-PST-1SG
   ‘I didn’t read any book’

b. biir {da/daqani} kinige-(ni) aax-pakka ererei yören-n-im
   one da
   book-ACC read-NEG.CVB even.though study-PST-1SG
   ‘I studied without reading any book(s)’

Da(qani) NPIs are licensed by direct negation (1-a)-(1-b), (2), but not indirect negation (3) ([1,2] for similar judgments).

(3) *Djulus mügün tugu {da/daqani} aax-pit dii sanaas-ba-tax
   D. 1SG.ACC what.ACC da
   read-PST.3SG CMP think-NEG-PST
   ‘Djulus didn’t think I read anything’

It is cross-linguistically irregular for an item to be licensed in direct negation and comparatives to the exclusion of indirect negation [3]. Still, it is known that in languages lacking an overt determiner (i.e. the) indirect negation often anti-licenses NPIs [4]. This paper argues that the semantics of the comparatives case marker -TaQAri includes a covert negative.

In biir da(qani) (2), note that accusative marking on the object is optional and results in no difference in meaning. Sakha is a differential object marking (DOM), with accusative appearing on specific objects. This specificity is neutralized in biir da(qani) NPs. This cannot be caused by negation alone, as without da(qani), DOM still results in a unmarked non-specific (4), marked specific (5) distinction:

(4) kini biir kulaxi sje-be-t-e
   3SG one bedbug eat-NEG-PST-3SG
   ‘He didn’t eat (even) one bedbug’

(5) kini biir kulaxi-ni sje-be-t-e
   3SG one bedbug-ACC eat-NEG-PST-3SG
   ‘There is one bedbug which he didn’t eat’

It will be argued that da(qani) NPIs neutralize this specificity requirement because they are obligatorily exhaustified by an O(nly) operator [5]. Why it is that this results accusative case marking on biir da(qani) being optional is an open question, but one option is that it is assigned by a functional head in in cases like (5), but assigned by structural configuration in biir da(qani) NPs (2) [1].

2. Additive: The second use of da(qani) has an additive, conjunction sense (6), hence the tendency of many grammars to translate it as and, also, even [6,7]. This is similar its Turkish cognate -de.

(6) Djulus [djaabiliika itir-aat] {da/daqani} kofje ih-cet {da/daqani} suur-e tur-d-a
   D. apple bite-CVB da coffee drink-CVB da
   run-CVB stand-PST-3SG
   ‘Djulus ran off after eating an apple and drinking coffee’

Aside from the meaning, additive da(qani) is distinguishable from the NPI uses in that it can modify a larger set of types of phrases, such as VPs (6), common nouns (7-a) and proper names (7-b).
(7) a. Djulus kofje-(ni) {da/daqani} čaj-(i) {da/daqani} is-t-e
   D. coffee-ACC da tea-ACC da drink-PST-3SG
b. Tujara-liin {da/daqani} Erkin-niin {da/daqani} kepset-t-e
   Tujara-COM da Erkin-COM da speak-PST-3SG
   ‘He talked with both Tujara and Erkin’

One thing to note is that in these non-NPI environments, da(qani) is pragmatically marked. For example, (7-a) is most natural as an answer to an alternative question (e.g. Did Djulus drink coffee or (did he drink tea?)? but odd without context. This is consistent with analyzing it as a focus-sensitive particle.

Interestingly, when coordinated da(qani) phrases appear under the scope of negation, the NPI meaning re-emerges: They cannot scope over negation (8) and remain anti-licensed by indirect negation (9)

(8) Djulus kofje-(ni) {da/daqani} čaj-(ni) {da/daqani} is-pe-t-e
   D. coffee-ACC da tea-ACC da drink-NEG-PST-3SG
   ∨ narrow-scope: ¬(coffee ∨ tea) *wide-scope: ¬(coffee ∧ tea)
(9) *Djulus mīgin kofje-ni (da/daqani) čaj-i {da/daqani} is-pit dii sanaa-ba-tax
   D. 1SG.coffee-ACC da tea-ACC da drink-PST CMP think-NEG-PST
   ‘Djulus didn’t think I drank coffee or tea’ (∼(coffee ∨ tea))

If additive da(qani) were an entirely separate lexical item, we would expect that it would emerge in contexts like (9) and the sentence would mean ‘Djulus didn’t think I drank both coffee and tea’. Moreover the same alternation between full daqani and reduced da is present in both additive and NPI uses. It follows that additive and NPI da(qani) are the same word and have the same semantics.

**Proposal:** Most grammars of Sakha say that da and daqani are related in some sense [6,7], though they don’t elaborate on any differences between them. I propose that da is a phonologically reduced form of daqani, which is (optionally) able to be reduced in non-focused environments, with a covert focus operator E(ven) preventing daqani from being reduced.

Semantically, the distribution of da(qani) is surprising. It is standardly assumed that NPIs are existentials [5,8], so for it to appear in additive environments with a universal (and) meaning is difficult to account for. How can a word mean or in negative environments and mean and in positive environments? While Japanese -mo famously appears as an NPI under negation and a universal quantifier in upward entailing environments [9], Sakha da(qani) lacks the latter uses (nor does it have any obvious free choice uses), thus analyses -mo are not directly portable to the Sakha data.

This paper explores one proposal for the semantics, using Chierchia’s alternative semantics approach to NPIs [5]. I propose that, fundamentally da(qani) is an existential with a set of lexically specified alternatives. Unlike English any (10), da(qani) (11) lacks a scalar alternative (p ∧ q). Like any, the domain alternatives {p,q} come out of the lexicon “pre-exhaustified” by the operator O.

\[
\begin{align*}
(10) & \quad \text{a. } \lceil \text{any} \rceil = p \lor q \\
& \quad \text{b. } \text{ALT}(\text{any}) = \{O(p),O(q),p \land q\} \\
& \quad \text{= } \{p \land \neg q,q \land \neg p,p \land q\} \\
(11) & \quad \text{a. } \lceil \text{da(qani)} \rceil = p \lor q \\
& \quad \text{b. } \text{ALT}(\text{da(qani)}) = \{O(p),O(q)\} \\
& \quad \text{= } \{p \land \neg q,q \land \neg p\}
\end{align*}
\]

Words like any and daqani themselves must be exhausted, as they are alternative-sensitive. In positive environments, exhaustifying over the scalar alternative results in a contradiction (12-b). Because da(qani) lacks a scalar alternative, no contradiction emerges and the existential (or) meaning is strengthened to a universal (and). In essence, additive da(qani) stops at (12-a).

\[
\begin{align*}
(12) & \quad \text{a. } O_{\text{DA-ALTS}}(p \lor q) = (p \lor q) \land \neg(p \land \neg q) \land \neg(q \land \neg p) \\
& \quad \equiv (p \lor q) \land p \rightarrow q \land q \rightarrow p \equiv (p \lor q) \land p \leftrightarrow q \\
& \quad \text{b. } O_{\text{SCALAR-ALT}}(p \lor q) = (p \lor q) \land \neg(p \land q) \perp \text{ (contradicts (12-a))}
\end{align*}
\]

When da(qani) is used with WH-words or biir, the scalar alternative is added because these words themselves have a scalar alternative, as they are existentials. Like any, this results in an LF which is only interpretable under the scope of negation.
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