

## Homework 7: Monotonicity and NPIs

### Question 1: Monotonicity.

Test for monotonicity, and tell me if the following generalised quantifiers are upward-, downward-, or non-monotonic:

- Every N \_\_\_\_\_
- Every \_\_\_\_\_ runs
- Few girls and certainly not John \_\_\_\_\_
- Seven N \_\_\_\_\_
- All girls but Mary \_\_\_\_\_
- Some linguists and no philosophers \_\_\_\_\_
- Both N's \_\_\_\_\_
- Some N's \_\_\_\_\_

### Question 2: NPIs.

Previously, we showed that ‘weak’ NPIs like *any* are ok in downward-entailing contexts:

- (1) No student saw any professor
- (2) I didn’t like anything in the show
- (3) Every student who read any papers got a good grade
- (4) Few students ate any pizza

Daniel Rothschild (2006) points out the following examples of non-monotonic contexts where NPIs are ok (a.k.a. “licensed”). (He also argues that other non-monotonic contexts where NPIs are bad, could be explained away). This seems to show that our previous conclusion, that NPIs are licensed by **precisely** downward-entailing contexts, is incorrect.

• Antecedents of conditionals (from Kratzer’s paper it should become clearer why these are actually not downward-entailing):

- (5) If John had walked on any weeds he would have tracked dirt into the house.

• Restrictor of quantifiers such as “most”:

- (6) Most men with any revolutionary commitments were executed.

• Unfocused contexts with “only”

- (7) Only John did any work.

• Exactly *n* (judgments here are much less consistent than with the previous cases)

- (8) Exactly three people with any money showed up
- (9) Exactly three people did any work at all

Without looking up what he says (and assuming we can really explain away the bad examples using some other principles), propose another conclusion, which would explain the acceptability of both our old data and Rothschild’s data. Your conclusion has to refer to monotonicity/entailingness in some way.