

A Case for Categorical Indeterminates in English

Tomoko YASUTAKE

(Department of Teaching Japanese as a Foreign Language)

(Received September 12, 1991)

0. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to discuss the meaning and function of *some* and *any* in order to assist with the teaching of these two troublesome items to non-native speakers of English. It is not a full-scale investigation into the syntax and semantics of *some* and *any*, nor a complete review of the history of linguistic research and pronouncements on these words. Recognizing full well the value of scholastic investigation, here I choose to attend to the gap between research and language teaching.

I propose a learner-oriented rule of instruction of *some* and *any*. It relies on the observation that it is sometimes the case that precise scientific descriptions are not easily accessible nor of much help to ordinary learners. *Some* and *any*, which have long held a fascination for grammarians, constitute one such area. The intertwining factors such as polarity, stress, count/mass distinction, syntactic number and sentence types, have been a constant source of confusion for learners of English as a Foreign Language. What learners want is a simple working hypothesis. I argue that all we need for this purpose is two features, [\pm determinate] and [\pm assertive].

The paper will proceed as follows. First I will analyze the performance of some Japanese college students concerning *some* and *any* and examine grammatical knowledge, which they have or are presumed to have. Secondly, I will briefly sketch previous treatments of the two items in linguistic research and point out their inadequacies or uselessness in teaching grammar. I will then argue for a new, simple analysis. Finally I will point out some advantages and the effectiveness of my unitary analysis as a guiding rule for EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learners.

1. Learners' problems

In this section I would like to point out some misconceptions concerning *some* and *any* in Japan. Many Japanese students, after six years or so of study at school, seem to hold a belief that *some* and *any* translate into *ikutsuka* (a certain number of), *ikuninka* (a certain number of people) or *ikuraka* (a certain amount of). (The choice among the three Japanese expressions is controlled by features [\pm Human] and [\pm

Count]). What those students invariably do in translating the following sentences into Japanese is to mechanically apply their rule of thumb.

- (1) a. I have *some* books.
- b. There is *some* water in the bowl.
- c. John is dating *some* woman.
- d. Will you have *some* breakfast?
- e. Do you have *any* brothers?
- f. I don't have *any* money.
- g. He didn't buy *any* book.
- h. *Any* plan will do.

The output is a list of clumsy expressions some of which are hardly recognizable as normal Japanese sentences. Even the seemingly agreeable ones like (1a), (1b) and (1d) turn out awkward. (All of them are, in fact, better off with zero form for *some* and *any*).

What is the cause of such a misconception? It is easy to say that the students have not been taught the correct rule. The fact of the matter is that a lot of conventional attempts have been made in school but have fallen short of their goals in many cases.

Looking over some textbooks, dictionaries and reference grammars, I noted several policies and methodologies which can be confusing or misleading to students. The following six factors are identified as potential troublemakers in EFL instruction of *some* and *any*.

- (2) a. Belief in the *some-any* rule
- b. Emphasis on sentence conversion drills
- c. Obscurity of syntactic category [part of speech]
- d. Order of introduction
- e. Persistence of transliteration
- f. Intertwining factors (stress, countability, syntactic number, sentence type)

There is no doubt about the authenticity of what is presently known as the *some-any* rule [suppletion]. It appears in ordinary dictionary definitions in some form or another and has always been the primary topic of instruction concerning *some/any*¹, although the terminology itself originates in generative linguistics of 1960's. According to this rule, *any* is the negative, interrogative and conditional counterpart of *some*. The problem arises when learners are faced with sentences like (1d) and (1h). A mindful learner would remember the proviso, which he learned later in his high school days, that the rule sometimes gets suspended by the speaker's epistemic attitude. Quite a few learners, however, fail to do so.

Emphasis on sentence conversion drills at the early stage of learning is a plausible cause of a trouble. Students are made to convert a declarative sentence into a question, and vice versa, or an affirmative sentence into a negative sentence, and vice versa thousands of times in class or in quizzes. The result is the accumulation of reflex

answers and no room for any flexibility in coping with various situations.

Another problem lies in the order of introduction of different usages [senses] of *some/any*. Many college students, even some English majors, show difficulty in accepting sentences like (1c), (1d), (1g) and (1h). They insist that *some/any* are not to be used with singular count nouns. This is because at the beginning stage students were taught but one usage, viz. the one with plural count nouns, indicating "a certain number (three or more)"². The usage with material or abstract nouns, indicating "a certain amount or degree" is taught later in their second year of learning. They are not given a chance to learn the other principal usage of *some/any* with a singular count noun, indicating "a certain one, not specified or known" until much later³.

There is, however, no ground for teaching only one usage to beginners at the expense of the others. According to a brief survey that I made of examples of *some/any* in natural discourse, the ratio of instances of the two usages, though it varied with genre, turned out to be the same in first person narratives, a representative of everyday conversational style language. The survey excluded instances of *something*, *anyone*, *some day*, etc. Since these compounds (combined forms) exclusively have the meaning of "a certain one, not specified or known"⁴, if we take them into account, we have all the more reason not to give an inferior status to this meaning.

Still another source of confusion for learners concerns the obscurity of the syntactic category of *some/any*. What they learn at the beginning stage are pronominal usages, which are traditionally identified as adjectival in dictionaries and traditional grammar. Yet some reference books treat *some/any* primarily as pronouns. For example, in Miyakawa et al. (1988) the learners are referred to the chapter titled "Pronoun" to look up the usages of *some/any*. In Otsuka ed. (1970, 530-1) *some/any* are listed under the entry "Indefinite pronoun", where pronominal usage, adjectival usage, etc. are given separate treatments.

Students are supposedly taught from the very beginning that *some/any* are normally left out from Japanese translation⁵. Still, as noted at the beginning of this section, many automatically respond with *ikutsuka* when they come across either of these two words in the text. This may be due to the deeply-seated tradition of automatic transliteration without recourse to the meaning of the text and naturalness of the output⁶.

Finally, there are many intertwining factors in the descriptions of various instances of *some/any*, such as sentence type, countability, syntactic number, and stress. The fact that there are so many is itself discouraging for learners. A typical case is as follows: After spending much time mastering the *some-any* rule and the opposition of countable noun vs. mass noun, learners are made to cope with such examples as (1c), (1d), (1g) and (1h). Then they are told, for the first time, about the presence/absence of stress on *some/any* and its relationship to the singular vs. plural opposition of the accompanying noun. To make matters worse the poor students are

also exposed to the fact that the good old *some-any* rule would fail them sometimes.

The entry *some* in *OALD (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English)* is a specimen of all this information packed in a minimum space. It starts with the following comment on its phonetics and stress assignment:

- (3) /sʌm/ weak form /sm/ used only in the adjectival sense consisting of an undefined amount or number of

As to the senses, it might be enough, for our purpose, to cite only the adjectival parts of *some* here.

- (4) 1. (used in affirm sentences; usually replaced by *any* in inter and neg sentences, in conditional clauses, and in sentences where doubt or negation is implied. *Some* and *any* are used with material nn to indicate an amount or quantity that is either unknown or not given, with abstract nn to indicate a certain degree, and with pl common nn to indicate a certain number (three or more). *Some* and *any* are pl equivalents of the numeral article *a(n)*, of numeral *one*, and the indef pron 'one':...

6. (always /sʌm/) is used before sing common nn to indicate that the person, place, object, etc is unknown, or when the speaker does not wish to be specific.

There is no doubt that the above is an informative description aimed at non-native learners. It is evident that EFL instruction in Japan essentially follows this line. However, we would rather have easier to grasp working hypothesis which is encouraging to the learners. We need to look elsewhere for a unitary treatment.

2. Traditional Treatments and Categorization

Having identified the central problems in the teaching of *some any* in Japan, I will now review notable accounts of their syntactic status, where the difference is the greatest. Various views will be grouped below according to the categorical nomenclature given to *some/any*⁷.

Lexicographers and school grammar writers have little choice but to stick to the traditional parts of speech names. They classify words according to their surface structure position. Thus, *some/any* in prenominal position and nominal position are adjectives and pronouns, respectively. One problem with this method is that it often groups heterogeneous types under one heading, while ignoring some common features among separately classified items. Thus, it offers no explanation for the lack of declension, a characteristic of the adjective and the pronoun, from *some/any*, ignoring at the same time their similarity to the articles *a/the*.

Jespersen (1933, sec. 16. 1) treats *some/any* as pronouns. According to his analysis, the two items are classed among "pronouns of indefinite indication" along with the indefinite article, interrogative pronouns, etc. The functions of *some* and *any* are identified as follows.

(5) *some* is a pronoun of unknown or unspecified quantity

(6) *any* is a pronoun of indifference.

(Incidentally, the definite article is treated as a “pronoun of definite indication” along with personal pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, etc.⁸.)

Jespersen’s categorization does not have many advocates now, but it is worth mentioning that he does note the similarity between *some/any* and the indefinite article.

There is another scholar who notes the resemblance of *some* and *any* to the indefinite article *a(n)*. Palmer (1939, section 116ff.) claims that they are like quantitatives (e. g. *a few*, *a little*) or numerals in one respect, but are like the indefinite article in the other. He claims that *some/any* are intermediate between these two categories and calls them “partitive articles”. Palmer, however, dictates rather bluntly that *some* changes into *any* in questions and negative sentences.

In Kingdon (1969, 75-6), which is a revised and rewritten edition of Palmer (1939), *some/any* are included under the heading of determiners together with personal and demonstrative pronouns, articles, numerals etc. Kingdon adopts the terms the affirmative partitive for *some*, and the indefinite partitive for *any*.

Saito (1936) adopts the term indefinite pronominal adjective to categorize *some/any* in his bilingual dictionary. The origin of this ingenious terminology is unknown. It may well have been the product of his determination to give a unitary treatment to all major functions of *some/any*.

Somewhat similar to Saito’s is Declerck’s (1991, 21-2) terminology. He treats *a*, *an*, *some*, *any* uniformly, as determiners (together with a host of others), and adopts the term “indefinite pronominal determiner” for *some/any*. According to Declerck, pronominal constituents can occur in one of seven positions in the NP: e. g.

(7) (i) nearly (ii) all (iii) these (iv) five (v) old (vi) silk (vii) man’s shirts
Position (i) is occupied by “focusing adverbs”, and position (ii) by “predeterminers”. Position (iii) is the “determiner” position, the most often occupied position. Positions (iv), (v), (vi) and (vii) are occupied by “postdeterminers”, “modifying adjective”, “nouns functioning as premodifiers” and “classifying genitives [adjectives]”, respectively.

The term “quantifier” as is currently used in generative linguistics to talk about *some/any* has its origin in Jespersen (1924, 85). There, it is used interchangeably with the term “quantifying adjunct”, in opposition to “qualifier [qualifying adjective]”. *Some* is comprised in quantifiers together with numerals, *many*, *much*, *few*, *little*, *no*, etc., to the exclusion of *any*.

Present-day use of the term “quantifier”, however, is of logical nature. It designates logical words sensitive to the scope of modal operators. Countless works have been written on English quantifiers in predicate logic and linguistics. A number of these works treat *some* as an existential quantifier and *any* as a part-time universal

quantifier. What is noteworthy, for our purpose, is that here *some* is treated contrastively with the so-called universal quantifiers *all*, *every*, and is given the name existential quantifier (together with *a/an*). I will return to the treatment of *some/any* as logical elements later in section 4.

3. Treatment of Senses and *Some-any* Rule

As we noted in section 1, the teaching of *some/any* in Japan overemphasizes the sense denoting “a certain indefinite [unspecified] number, quantity, degree”, and is biased against the sense that denotes “a certain one, not specified or known”. I suspect that it is mainly because the latter sense is not conformable to the *some-any* rule at all. I am of the opinion that these two “senses” are not to be treated as intrinsically different, but I will postpone the discussion until section 5.

Another possible cause may be the listing order of senses in dictionaries. In *OALD* cited in (4) above specific reference is made to *some-any* rule at the outset of definitions of *some*, and the indefinite number/quantity/degree sense is given the primary status, while the ‘unknown one’ reading is given the bare sixth place.

Let us look at two other dictionaries, *POD* (*Pocket Oxford Dictionary*) and *WNWD* (*Webster’s New World Dictionary of the American Language*).

(8) POD definitions

some: An unspecified amount or number of, an unknown or unnamed, an appreciable or considerable amount of, any that may be chosen or available, conjecturally or approximately the specified number or amount.

any: (With Neg. Interrog. *if*, &c.) one, some; one or some taken at random, whichever you will, every.

As can be seen, POD does not mention the *some-any* rule in its entry for *some*, nor does it treat uses with singular count nouns separately from those with plural count and mass nouns.

In *WNWD*, the listing order is reversed. (It gives separate entries to pronominal and adjectival usages, but it might suffice, for our purpose, to cite only the adjectival parts here.)

(9) WNWD definitions

some 1. being a certain one, not specified or known.
3. being of a certain unspecified (but often considerable) number, quantity, degree, etc.

any 1. one (no matter which) of more than two:
2. some (no matter how much, how many, or what kind):
3. even one; the least amount or number of:
4. every:

English-Japanese Dictionaries are likewise divided on this point. *Kenkyusha’s*

New English-Japanese Dictionary 5th ed. places the usage with singular count nouns as the first option for both *some* and *any*. *Shogakukan's Progressive English-Japanese Dictionary* gives priority to the usage with singular count nouns in the entry for *some*. *Kodansha's New World English-Japanese Dictionary*, on the other hand, gives priority to the usage with plural count and mass in its entry for *some*. For *any*, however, both *Shogakukan's* and *Kodansha's* treatment is similar to *POD's*; they do not treat the two usages separately.

We have not checked every dictionary but the lexicographers are evidently divided into several camps on this point.

4. The line of Research in Generative Framework

We have seen in Section 2 above that in generative linguistics it is customary to treat *some/any* as quantifiers⁹. In this section, I pay tribute to the progress and advancement of the study in predicate logic and generative linguistics concerning *some/any*.

Let us start with the following pair of sentences, which have been the object of much attention in recent linguistics.

- (10) a. Anybody can win.
b. Everybody can win.

The difference between (10a) and (10b), which is hard to capture in everyday language, is explained in logical terms, as follows.

- (11) a. $\forall x$: person (can (x win))
b. can ($\forall x$: person (x win))

The ambiguity of the following type of sentences, too, has been a popular topic of semantics.

- (12) a. John can't do anything.

The two separate readings are given lucid forms on logical basis.

- (12) b. $\sim \exists x$ [can (John do x)]
c. $\exists x \sim$ [can (John do x)]

The logical analysis based upon the difference in quantifier scope demonstrates the ambiguity of the following (13a). Compare (13b) and (13c).

- (13) a. *Every* girl is fond of *some* boy.
b. every > some (Each girl has her own favorite boy.)
c. some > every (A certain boy is liked by every girl.)

In the reading of (13b), *every* has wider scope than *some*. In (13c) *some* has wider scope than *every*.

This is the mainstream of the progress and products of recent linguistic research. The scientific explanation is, unfortunately, not always of easy access to EFL learners. Moreover, some linguists have reservations about including *some/any* in the class of

quantifiers. For example, Carden (1973) deliberately excludes them from his discussion of English quantifiers, because of the problems involved with the putative *some-any* rule.

5. Inherent properties of *some/any*

The gap between the linguistic research and the teaching of grammar to non-native speakers is undeniable. In search of a bridge over it, let us turn our attention to inherent properties of *some/any*.

As to their syntactic status, it should follow from the previous discussions that the only tenable analysis in the present state of the art is along the lines of Declerck, i. e. to assume *some/any* as determiners.

Only a few scholars have paid attention to the semantic aspects of *some/any*. Klima (1964), who treated *some/any* as quantifiers, claimed that the *some-any* rule is an indefinite-incorporation rule, which is a transformational rule that changes an indeterminate constituent into an indefinite constituent. Thus, the following two sentences are transformationally related by this rule.

- (14) John has some money. → John doesn't have any money.

In terms of feature notation, *some/any* has the following features.

- (15) *some*: [−determinate]
any: [−definite]

To our disappointment, Klima provides no definition for indeterminacy or indefiniteness. It is worth pointing out, though, that Klima, unlike many of his colleagues at the time, noted a lexico-semantic difference between *some* and *any*. Attractive though his attempt is, he does not seem to have had many followers.

Jespersen (Ibid.), as we have seen in section 2, makes reference to semantic aspects of *some/any*, which is recapitulated as (16).

- (16) *some*: [−known] or [−specified]
any: [+indifferent]

Kingdon (Ibid.)'s definitions of *some/any* contain the following lexico-semantic features.

- (17) *some*: [+affirmative] [+partitive]
any: [−definite] [+partitive]

We note some similarities and differences among the three analyses. I will argue in Section 6 that the properties discussed in the above works merely skim over the essential meanings of *some* and *any*.

The most notable account of the problem of *some/any* is found in Bolinger (1977, 21-34). His analysis begins with the contention that a syntactic *some-any* rule would not work because the problem of *some/any* belongs to lexicon, and its relationship to such matters of syntax as negation and interrogation is incidental. For Bolinger, what

correlation there is between the two systems is a matter of semantic compatibility. Hence *some* and *any* do not have affirmation and negation built into their meanings.

His view on accent is equally straightforward. *Any* is accented as any other word is accented — to focus on its meaning, and where *any* is accented, *some* is accented. The accent is overlaid along with the rest of the speech melody, and does not affect the underlying difference.

Bolinger's following statements serve as his definitions of *some/any*.

- (18) [sɪ] is the plural and mass equivalent of the indefinite article, and [sʌm] with a singular countable is the emphatic equivalent of the indefinite article.
- (19) A *some* indicates a particularity, an assumed something (more often than not an existent something).
- (20) The meaning of *any* is defined as “counter-specification¹⁰.”

Based on this analysis, Bolinger draws up the following diagram. (Actually, he discusses other lexical items, such as *a little*, *no*, *both*, or etc. in conjunction with *some/any* and shows that the tertiary classification applies to them as well. Here, I concentrate on the *some/any* and *no* parts.)

(21) Bolinger's diagram

| UNITARY | | | DISTRIBUTIVE | NEGATIVE | |
|--------------------|------------------|-------------|--------------|----------|-------------|
| Unemphatic adjunct | Emphatic adjunct | Non-adjunct | | Adjunct | Non-adjunct |
| a, an | sʌm | one | any | no | none |
| sɪ | sʌm | sʌm | any | no | none |

The diagram (21) is a visual summary of the different uses [senses] of *some/any*, which are normally given separate treatments in dictionaries and grammar books.

I find the following points in this diagram that call for improvement.

- (22) a. No definition is given of the notions “unitary” and “distributive”.
- b. There are no indices of countable vs mass opposition, nor of singular vs. plural opposition
- c. The term *adjunct* is obsolescent because, as Declerck (Ibid.) points out, the term is now normally used to refer to a particular type of adverbials. The alternative term is *adnominal*.

It is not my intention to propose an alternative diagram. The defective details notwithstanding, I agree in many of the points that Bolinger makes and accept as relevant and correct his argument for the separation of lexicon and syntax in the analysis of *some/any*. However, as insightful as the notions of “particularity” and “counter-specification” may be for the analysis of *some/any*, they resist formalization and do not provide a handy tool for EFL instruction. In addition, I believe that Bolinger's factors are better reanalyzed as two features contributing to the similarity and difference between *some* and *any*. I will take up this point in the next section.

6. A New Unitary Analysis

I will argue below for a unitary analysis of *some/any* in terms of inherent semantic features. Assuming that the two words have a common feature as well as a distinctive feature, let us reexamine previous analyses.

We looked at four different analyses of inherent semantic properties of *some/any* in the previous section. Combining them with what dictionaries like *POD* and *WNWD* have to say about the semantic aspects of the two words, we now have the following lists of possible properties.

- (23) *some*: unknown, not given, a certain, unspecified, undefined, indefinite, affirmative, indeterminate, particular, unitary
any: indefinite, indifferent, counter-specification, distributive

Looking at (23), we may be inclined to conclude that the common property shared by *some* and *any* is indefiniteness. However, as noted in Jespersen (1933) and Yasui (1982), indefiniteness is better considered a higher order feature which is found in many other lexical items such as the article *a(n)*. Moreover, since “being indefinite” can sometimes mean “being unlimited”, there are cases where the notion “indefinite” is inappropriate, i. e. the usage with plural and mass nouns such as *some books*, *any rain*, etc. Clearly, these phrases do not mean an “unlimited number of books” or an “unlimited amount of rain”.

I argue that the denominator in the semantics of *any* and *some* is indeterminacy. I may owe this terminology to Klima (1964, 319), but his notion remains undefined and is obviously different from mine; Klima’s feature is found only in *some*¹¹, while mine is shared by both *some* and *any*. Indeterminacy is a notion comprising nonspecificity and lack of knowledge.

The feature [\pm determinate] is to be distinguished from [\pm definite]. Indefiniteness concerns the identifiability of the referent, while indeterminacy applies to the number, the quantity and the degree as well as to the identity of the referent.

Another important difference between [\pm definite] and [\pm determinate] is that while the definite/indefinite marking of a noun phrase is mandatory in English, the marking of indeterminacy is optional. It is up to the speaker to decide whether or not to add *some/any* to an indefinite noun phrase. Thus, he can choose between *There are flowers in the vase*, and *There are some flowers in the vase*, or between *Did you buy milk?* and *Did you buy any milk?*, etc. This idiosyncrasy of the feature [\pm determinate] derives from its speaker-oriented epistemic nature.

According to the survey which I referred to in Section 1, the number of instances of *some/any* as a whole varies with the genre; they are comparatively rare in journalistic and expository style writings but are rather common in narratives and colloquial style discourse. This is just as expected, given the speaker-oriented nature of the feature [$-$ indeterminate]. No such variation among different styles of English is

evident with instances of indefinite marking.

I maintain that it is the feature [\pm assertive] that separates *some* and *any*. *Some* is marked as [+assertive] and *any* [–assertive]. Consider the following examples, cited from Bolinger (1977).

- (24) a. You know something?—Joe got married.
 b. #You know anything?—Joe got married¹².
- (25) a. What's the big hurry—are you going somewhere?
 b. #What's the big hurry—are you going anywhere?

In the situation described in (24), where the speaker is bringing up a certain piece of information, he need to use *something* to assert the existence of such information. It would be nonsense with *anything*. In (25), the speaker asserts that he infers something from the speaker's behavior, hence the use of *something*. (25b) is thus an illogical sequence.

The feature [\pm assertive] has an independent motivation. It is used in Hooper (1975) to clarify a series of syntactic differences between classes of predicates that have full sentence (with tense) complements.

A clear advantage of the unitary analysis is that it captures the similarity and difference between *some* and *any* in terms of two features. The so-called different usages listed up in dictionaries are to be derived from the sum total of the sense of *some/any* and the syntactic features of the head noun. In the case of bilingual dictionaries, it should be noted that separate listings of word meanings are often a product of the lexicographers' effort to make up for subtle lexical discrepancies between the two languages. In such a case, separate translations are not to be taken as mirroring the ambiguity of the word.

The last point I should make is that in syntax it is not the determiner that carries the major features of a noun phrase as a whole; indeterminacy and assertiveness are treated as properties of noun phrases, and not just of determiners. It might be worth mentioning in this connection that the DP analysis proposed by Stowel (1981) and others, which treats a so-called NP as a DP with the determiner as its head, would go well with the unitary analysis developed here.

7. Summary

I have argued that *some* and *any* cannot be adequately characterized solely in terms of the *some-any* rule, stress, polarity, countability and syntactic number. Rather, the two words share the semantic feature [–determinate] and the crucial condition on the use of one over the other is set by the feature [\pm assertive], the embodiment of the speaker's epistemic attitude toward the entity. Indeterminacy and (non)assertiveness should be considered first semantic notions, and derivatively a property of the noun phrase. Now we are explicitly in an advantageous position over

the previous analyses, having access to two features, powerful tools for the description and instruction of *some* and *any*.

NOTES

- (1) For example, *OALD* states as follows.
some....used in affirm sentences; usually replaced by *any* in interr and neg sentences, in conditional clauses, and in sentences where doubt or negation is implied.
- (2) As to the part that *some/any* indicates "a certain number (three or more)", the readers are referred to *OALD*.
- (3) Although there is no mention of *some/any* with a singular count noun, expressions like *some day*, *something* and *someone*, which indicate "a certain one, not specified or known", do appear in junior high school textbooks. They may be used to incite linguistically-minded students to infer this other meaning.
- (4) *Sometimes*, which is an adverb with inherent plurality, is an exception.
- (5) Ohta et al. (1990a, 102-3, 110) is explicit on this point.
- (6) The problem may be more serious with some junior high school students than we are apt to think. I have heard of a case where a student responded with *any* when he was expected to say *how many*. His mistake is not a farfetched one when we think of the morphological relations between the two Japanese words *ikutsuka* "any" and *ikutsu* "how many". It is just that he pays no attention to the meaning of the sentence that he is working at. This is a disastrous result of too much emphasis on transliteration in foreign language instruction.
- (7) I do not discuss adverbial usage, simply because it is derivative.
- (8) It is ironical that Jespersen himself argues against this grouping elsewhere. To cite his exact words (Jespersen, 1924. 85):
 ... to establish a separate "part of speech" for the two "articles" as is done in some grammars, is irrational.
- (9) cf. Otsuka et al. (1982. 990).
- (10) Bolinger attributes this definition to Michael Anthony (forthcoming). But I have not been able to get hold of the article in question entitled "Some remarks on *any*" *Forum linguisticum*.
- (11) Klima, in fact, includes other items in this category, such as *too*, *sometime*, *somewhere*, *once*, *a*, *many*.
- (12) A # is used to mark contextual incongruity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bolinger, D. 1977. *Meaning and form*. London: Longman.
- Carden, G. 1973. *English quantifiers: Logical structure and linguistic variation*. Tokyo: Taishukan.
- Declerck, R. (forthcoming) *A comprehensive descriptive grammar of English*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Hooper, J. 1975. On assertive predicates, in Kimball, J. ed. *Syntax and semantics*, Vol. 4. New York: Academic Press.
- Jespersen, O. 1924. *The philosophy of grammar*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- 1933. *Essentials of English grammar*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Kingdon, R. 1969. *Palmer's grammar of spoken English*. Cambridge: Heffer.
- Klima, E. S. 1964. Negation in English, in Fodor, J. and J. Katz eds. *The structure of language: Readings in the philosophy of language*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.
- labov, W. 1972. Negative attraction and negative concord in English grammar. *Language* 48. 773-818.
- Lakoff, R. 1969. Some reasons why there can't be any *some-any* rule. *Language* 45. 608-15.

- Miyakawa, Y. et al. 1988. *Royal English grammar with complete examples of usage*. Tokyo: Obunsha.
- Ohta, A. et al. 1990a. *New horizon English course 1*. Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki
- Ohta, A. et al. 1990b. *New horizon English course 2*. Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki
- Otsuka, T. ed. 1970. *Sanseido's dictionary of English grammar*, 2nd edition. Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Otsuka, T. et al. eds. 1982. *Kenkyusha's dictionary of English linguistics and philology*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Palmer, H. E. 1939. *A grammar of spoken English*. Cambridge: Heffer.
- Stowel, T. 1981. *Origins of phrase structure*. Unpublished MIT Ph. D. dissertation.
- Yasui, M. 1982. *Eibumpo soran*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Yasui, M. ed. 1987. *The Taishukan explanatory dictionary of contemporary English grammar*. Tokyo: Taishukan.

DICTIONARIES

- Hornby, A. S. 1974. *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha. (abbreviated OALD)
- Kenkyusha's new English-Japanese dictionary*, 5th ed. 1980. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Kodansha's new world English-Japanese dictionary*. 1969. Tokyo: Kodansha.
- The pocket Oxford dictionary*. 1946. (Abbreviated POD).
- Saito's idiomological English-Japanese dictionary*. 1936. Tokyo: Iwanami.
- Shogakukan's progressive English-Japanese dictionary*, 2nd Ed. 1987. Tokyo: Shogakukan.
- Webster's new world dictionary of the American language*, College Ed. 1986. Cleveland: World. (abbreviated WNWD)