

## The constellation of polarity sensitive items

Workshop proposal for the 51st Annual Meeting of the *Societas Linguistica Europaea* (SLE 2018, Tallinn, 29-Aug - 01-Sep-2018)

Workshop organizers: Chiara Gianollo & Pierre Larrivé

Abstracts of max. 300 words (excluding references) should be sent to Pierre.Larrivee@Unicaen.fr before November 7 2017.

The constellation of polarity sensitive items has been an object of theoretical debates for the last fifty years (at least since Klima 1964). These debates have centered around the nature of the polarity sensitive items, their interpretations, their diachronic relations and their relation to other grammatical paradigms (cf., among book-length treatments, Ladusaw 1979, Giannakidou 1998, Zeijlstra 2004, Penka 2011, Chierchia 2013). Especially in the last decade, the discussion has been substantially enriched and deepened thanks to the contribution of cross-linguistic data (*i.a.* Progovac 1994, Vallduví 1994, Déprez 1997, 2000, Haspelmath 1997, Lahiri 1998, Herburger 2001, Kratzer & Shimoyama 2002, Pereltsvaig 2004, Fălăuş 2010, Szabolcsi 2013) and diachronic studies (*i.a.* Hoeksema 1994, 1998, 2010, Ramat 1998, Jäger 2010, various contributions in Larrivé & Ingham 2012, Willis et al. (eds.) 2013, Hansen & Visconti 2014, Gianollo 2016).

The aim of this workshop is to bring together experts from different areas of study (theoretical, typological and diachronic linguistics) in order to take stock of the progress made and to address new issues that emerge, as well as foundational issues that turn out to be unresolved, against the background of novel empirical dataset.

One central debate is the extent to which, as opposed to Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) like *anyone*, n-words that can be glossed by English *no-one* have a negative meaning in and of themselves, or whether they inherit that value from a clausal operator. Subcategories have been introduced in the degree of strength for NPIs (weak, strong and superstrong), and for concurring relations that characterize ordinary n-words in Italian and French as opposed to Negative Indefinites / Quantifiers in English and German. The underlying line of reasoning is generally that degrees of lexical or featural negativity should relate to the ability of an item to communicate negation on its own, and to be used with other overt clause-mate negatives. The assessment of this supposes the availability of reliable diagnostic to define membership of each category. While locality, modification by *almost* and fragment answer have all been alleged, counterexamples have been adduced.

Relation between n-words and NPIs, and their various sub-types, is also expressed in interpretative terms. Continuing a line of analysis going back to Fauconnier (1975), Kadmon & Landman (1993), Lee & Horn (1994) and Krifka (1995), the approach developed by Chierchia (2004, 2013 *i.a.*) accounts for the existence of polarity phenomena on the basis of their semantic and pragmatic contribution. It insists on the degree and type of exhaustification compatible with different classes of negative polarity items, that is, on the interpretive effects emerging through the interaction of negative polarity items with overt or covert clausal operators. The approach predicts syntactic reflexes such as locality constraints, unlike the productive line of research that separates pragmatic licensing of NPIs and syntactic licensing of n-words (Zeijlstra 2004, Penka 2011). An exhaustification-based approach has the potential

to apply to Free-Choice items, but whether it equally does to n-words, and beyond to positive polarity items, remains to be articulated.

Several of these issues can be illuminated by diachronic research. A stable pathway of variation and change characterizes polarity sensitive items. How and why are negative polarity items and n-words synchronically and diachronically connected? Why do some polarity contexts subsist to the evolution of a NPI into a n-word? The critical role of strong polarity contexts and super-strong negative polarity items has been recently emphasized as a transitional point between polarity and n-word.

Polarity sensitive items thus present a set of subcases and related categories that raise the question of whether grammatical paradigms relating to veridicality are similarly structured. Cases in point are *wh*-items, polarity and quantification. The extent to which these have referential force or are dependent on external operators arise, and whether these operators make syntactic, semantic and pragmatic predictions. This may illuminate parallels with distinctions among polarity sensitive items, as well as clarify the relation between negative and positive polarity items (Szabolcsi 2004, Larrivé 2012).

Novel contributions furthering the understanding on the topic of polarity sensitive items are invited, whether from a synchronic, diachronic or typological perspective. Analyses from all theoretical persuasion are welcome, and are expected to rely on a substantial basis of empirical data. A comparative dimension is deemed essential to apportion the current debates on the issue raised by polarity sensitive items.

## References

- Chierchia, Gennaro. 2004. Scalar implicatures, polarity phenomena and the syntax/pragmatics interface. In Adriana Belletti (ed.), *Structures and Beyond*, 39–103. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 2013. *Logic in grammar: Polarity, Free Choice, and intervention*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Déprez, Viviane. 1997. Two types of Negative Concord. *Probus* 9. 103–142.
- Déprez, Viviane. 2000. Parallel (a)symmetries and the structure of negative expressions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18. 253–342.
- Fălăuș, Anamaria. 2010. Alternatives as sources of semantic dependency. In *Proceedings of SALT 20*, 406–427.
- Fauconnier, Gilles. 1975. Pragmatic scales and logical structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 6(3). 353–375.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 1998. *Polarity sensitivity as (non)veridical dependency*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2000. Negative...concord? *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18. 457–523.
- Gianollo, Chiara. 2016. *Indefinites between Latin and Romance*. Habilitationsschrift, Universität zu Köln.
- Hansen, Maj-Britt Mosegaard & Jacqueline Visconti. 2014. *The Diachrony of negation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Herburger, Elena. 2001. The Negative Concord puzzle revisited. *Natural Language Semantics* 9. 289–333.
- Hoeksema, Jack. 1994. On the grammaticalization of negative polarity items. In Susanne Gahl, Andy Dolbey & Christopher Johnson (eds.), *Proceedings of the 20th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 273–282. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Hoeksema, Jack. 1998. On the (non)loss of polarity sensitivity. In Richard Hogg & Linda van Bergen (eds.), *Historical linguistics 1995. Selected papers from the 12th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, vol. Volume 2: Germanic linguistics, 101–114. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Hoeksema, Jack. 2010. Dutch *enig*: from nonveridicality to downward entailment. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28. 837–859.
- Jäger, Agnes. 2010. *Anything is nothing is something*. On the diachrony of polarity types of indefinites. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28(4). 787–822.
- Kadmon, Nirit & Fred Landman. 1993. Any. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16(4). 353–422.
- Klima, Edward S. 1964. Negation in English. In Jerry A. Fodor & Jerrold J. Katz (eds.), *The structure of language*, 246–323. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Kratzer, Angelika & Junko Shimoyama. 2002. Indeterminate pronouns: The view from Japanese. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics*, 1–25.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1995. The semantics and pragmatics of polarity items. *Linguistic Analysis* 35. 209–257.
- Ladusaw, William. 1979. *Polarity sensitivity as inherent scope relations*: University of Texas, Austin dissertation.
- Lahiri, Utpal. 1998. Focus and negative polarity in Hindi. *Natural Language Semantics* 6. 57–123.
- Larrivé, Pierre and Richard Ingham. 2012. *The Evolution of negation. Beyond the Jespersen Cycle*. Berlin: DeGruyter.
- Larrivé, Pierre. 2012. Positive polarity, negation, activated propositions. *Linguistics* 504. 869–900.
- Lee, Young-Suk & Laurence R. Horn. 1994. *Any as indefinite + even*. ms, Yale University.
- Penka, Doris. 2011. *Negative indefinites*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pereltsvaig, Asya. 2004. Negative polarity items in Russian and the ‘bagel problem’. In A. Przepiorkowski & S. Brown (eds.), *Negation in Slavic*, Bloomington: Slavica Publishers.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 1994. *Positive and negative polarity: a binding approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ramat, Paolo. 1998. Perché *veruno* significa *nessuno*? In Paolo Ramat & Elisa Roma (eds.), *Sintassi storica. Atti del XXX Congresso Internazionale della Società di Linguistica Italiana*, 397–409.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 2004. Positive polarity - Negative polarity. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22. 409–452.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 2013. Quantifier particles and compositionality. In Maria Aloni, Michael Franke & Floris Roelofsen (eds.), *Proceedings of the 19th Amsterdam Colloquium*, 27–34. University of Amsterdam.
- Vallduví, Enric. 1994. Polarity items, n-words, and minimizers in Catalan and Spanish. *Probus* 6. 263–294.
- Willis, David, Christopher Lucas & Anne Breitbarth (eds.). 2013. *The history of negation in the languages of Europe and the Mediterranean*, vol. 1: Case studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2004. *Sentential negation and Negative Concord*: Universiteit van Amsterdam dissertation.
- Zwarts, Frans. 1996. A hierarchy of negative expressions. In Heinrich Wansing (ed.), *Negation. A notion in focus*, 169–193. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.