

negates none of the alternatives, since the assertion (5a') entails both (5b') and (5c'), thus no contradiction arises (5d'). The exhaustification performed by O^S is strong, so presuppositions and implicatures must be taken into account (Gajewski 2011). For this reason (*ni...*)*ni* is ungrammatical in DE environments that are not AA (3): 'few children like spinach' bears an implicature that 'some children like spinach' and this disrupts the DE nature of the sentence.

The conjunction *i* is not subject to obligatory exhaustification and thus has a freer distribution.

III. *Ni* and *i* as focus particles A disjunction-based analysis for Serbian *ni* should be maintained for its use as an additive focus particle which only occurs in negative environments, as in (6).

(6) (Sofija ne jede španać.) Ni Lea (ne jede španać).

Sofija_{NOM} NEG eats spinach_{ACC} *ni* Lea_{NOM} NEG eats spinach_{ACC}

'(Sofija doesn't eat spinach) Lea doesn't eat spinach, either'

Namely, single *ni* is this time adjoined to a focalized constituent, bearing an anaphoric requirement. Following Ahn's (2014) analysis for English 'either', Serbian *ni* is understood as a disjunction that takes as its arguments the host proposition (p) and a silent anaphor (q) for which it is presupposed that it is a distinct focus alternative of the host proposition. A salient antecedent is needed in the context, and it must entail one of the alternatives from the focus value of the host. Analysing *ni* focus additive particle as a disjunction allows us to explain its polarity-sensitive behavior. This is due to the obligatory presence of an ONLY-operator and the active alternatives. Once the matching feature on *ni* is checked, the operator exhaustifies the alternatives, as in (5a'-d'), but this mechanism is vacuous, since the assertion is stronger than all its alternatives. The only difference is that, this time, p and q are not constituted from overt coordinated constituents, but from the host and the silent anaphor. Again, a contradiction arises (5d) if additive focus particle *ni* is attached to a constituent of a positive sentence. Importantly, the conjunction *i* can be employed as an additive particle, but the host is not negative, see (7).

(7) (Sofija jede španać.) I Lea (jede španać).

Sofija_{NOM} eats spinach_{ACC} also Lea_{NOM} eats spinach_{ACC}

'(Sofija eats spinach) Lea also eats spinach'

Like English 'too' (Ahn 2014), additive focus particle *i* conjoins p (host proposition) and q (silent anaphor in need of an antecedent that entails one of the alternatives from the focus value of the host). This time, exhaustification would be vacuous anyway, as the assertion is the strongest alternative. It is also not predicted, since *i* is not limited in its distribution, the way *ni* is.

Finally, both *ni* and *i* as focus particles can also express a scalar meaning, similar to that of English 'even' occurring in negative (8) or positive (9) contexts:

(8) Nije ni uradila domaći. $\neg(p \vee q \vee (p <_{\mu} q))$ (9) Uradila je *i* domaći. $p \wedge q \wedge (p <_{\mu} q)$

NEG has *ni* do_{PARTIF} homework_{ACC}

do_{PART} has even homework_{ACC}

'She didn't even do homework'

'She even did homework'

Once the alternatives are ordered on a likelihood scale that builds up a focus value (in contrast to non-ordered alternatives of the additive focus particle), a different kind of exhaustifier is required – an EVEN-operator. But this time, an E^S has to be invoked both with *ni* and with *i*, in order to yield the right scalar meaning. In the case of *ni*-disjunction, only when embedded in a negative context can it yield the right meaning (on the example in (8)): it is not the case that she did homework (p) and it is not the case that she cleaned her room (q), where p is less likely than q , by some contextually provided probability measure μ . The effect is reversed with *i* in (9).

IV. Conclusions In our approach, Serbian *ni* and *i* receive parallel analyses, based on the three different roles that they cover in grammar. This proposal further supports the alternatives and exhaustification framework which has mainly been established for indefinites, but also disjunction. A remaining issue is the relationship between coordination and focus additive and scalar effects, both synchronically and diachronically.

V. References Ahn, D. 2014. The semantics of additive *either*. Proceedings of SuB 19; Arsenijević, B. 2011. Serbo-Croatian coordinative conjunctions at the syntax-semantics interface, The Linguistic Review 28. 175-206; Chierchia, G. 2013. Logic in Grammar, Polarity, Free Choice and Intervention. Oxford studies in semantics and pragmatics 2, OUP; Dagnac, A. 2012. Gapping as vP-coordination: an argument from French strict NPI licensing. Ellipsis. U. Vigo (Spain); Doetjes, J. 2005. The chameleonic nature of French *ni*: negative coordination in a negative concord language. Proceedings of SuB 9; Gajewski, J. 2011. Licensing strong NPIs. Natural Language Semantics 19(2). 109-148; Gonzalez, A. & Demirdache, H. 2015. Negative Coordination: single vs. recursive *ni* in French. Proceedings of 44th ISRL; de Swart, H. 2001. Négation et coordination: la conjonction *ni*. In Adverbial modification. Bok-Bennema et al.; Wurmbrand, S. 2008. *Nor*: Neither disjunction nor paradox. Linguistic Inquiry 39, 511-522.