

The talk will be a work-in-progress presentation of a series of acceptability studies designed to provide new data to empirically distinguish accounts of cross-sentential polarity-sensitivity making reference to morphosyntactic negation from ones that make reference to the presence of antiveridical propositional discourse referents (drefs).

The question: The licensing of certain cross-clausal anaphora is contingent on the polarity of their antecedent clause. Among them are English polar additives, *not even*-tags (Klima (1964)) and information-seeking uses of *why not* (Hofmann (2018)).

- | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|---|
| (1) | Mary didn't sleep. | (2) | Mary slept. |
| a. | Me neither. 'I didn't sleep either.' | a. | #Me neither. |
| b. | Not even a little bit. 'Mary didn't even sleep a little bit.' | b. | #Not even a little bit. |
| c. | Why not? 'Why didn't Mary sleep?' | c. | #Why not? (in its information-seeking sense) |

This asymmetry raises the question why the Polarity-Sensitive Anaphora (PSAs) in (1) and (2) are only licensed in the context of a negative antecedent.

Previous approaches to cross-sentential polarity-sensitivity can broadly be characterized in three categories.

1. Morphosyntactic approaches (Holmberg (2013), Kramer and Rawlins (2009)) that analyze PSAs in terms of ellipsis and a syntactic dependency. Such accounts characterize polarity-sensitivity as a sensitivity to the presence of morphosyntactic negation. 2. Semantic approaches (Krifka (2013)), assuming that it is a sensitivity to multiple propositional discourse referents (drefs) being introduced by sentences with negation, one corresponding to the full clause, and another to the prejacent of negation. 3. Hybrid approaches (Farkas and Bruce (2010), Roelofsen and Farkas (2015)), assuming that a propositional dref will bear a feature [–] if negation is the highest scoping operator in the clause introducing it. Whereas the syntactic and hybrid approaches rely on the presence of negation within the antecedent clause for licensing, semantic approaches make reference to the presence of a propositional dref that is introduced anti-veridically, s.t. the speaker will be committed to it being false.

Acceptability studies To empirically distinguish between these analyses, I am preparing a study that will compare the availability of the three PSAs introduced in (1) with possible antecedent clauses with morphosyntactic negation; neg-raising complements, which don't involve negation, but introduce a propositional dref that is interpreted negatively; anti-veridical embeddings, which don't involve negation, but introduce a propositional dref s.t. the speaker will be committed to its falsity; and negative implicatives, which don't involve negation, but entail the falsity of their non-finite complement. The study involves three 7-point acceptability rating experiments, which manipulate the factors of ANTECEDENT TYPE and PSA.

- | | | | |
|-----|--|-----|---|
| (3) | ANTECEDENT TYPE | (4) | PSA |
| a. | NEGATION: Mary didn't sleep | a. | NOT EVEN: not even for a little bit. |
| b. | NEG-RAISING: I don't think that Mary slept | b. | NEITHER: and neither did Sue. |
| c. | ANTIVERIDICAL: It's a lie that Mary slept | c. | WHY NOT: but I don't know why not. |
| d. | NEGATIVE IMPLICATIVE: Mary refused to sleep | | |

If PSAs are sensitive to morphosyntactic negation, we might expect PSAs to receive high ratings in NEGATION conditions and lower ratings in ANTIVERIDICAL and NEGATIVE IMPLICATIVE conditions. Assuming a semantic analysis of neg-raising (Gajewski (2007)), we might expect NEG-RAISING conditions to receive lower ratings as well. If PSAs are sensitive to the presence of an antiveridical dref, we might expect PSAs to pattern similarly in NEGATION, NEG-RAISING, and ANTIVERIDICAL conditions. They might potentially be rated lower for the NEGATIVE IMPLICATIVE manipulation, because here, the items involve non-finite embedded clauses, which might not introduce the kind of propositional dref relevant for a possible semantic analysis.

Selected references Donka Farkas and Kim Bruce. On reacting to assertions and polar questions. *Journal of Semantics*, 27(1):81–118, 2010. ♦ Jon Robert Gajewski. Neg-Raising and Polarity. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 30(3):289–328, November 2007. ♦ Lisa Hofmann. Why not? – Polarity ellipsis in why-questions. *UCSC manuscript*. 2018. ♦ Anders Holmberg. The syntax of answers to polar questions in English and Swedish. *Lingua*, 128:31–50, 2013. ♦ Edward Klima. Negation in English. In J. Fodor and J. Katz, editors, *The structure of language*, pages 246–32. Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1964. ♦ Ruth Kramer and Kyle Rawlins. Polarity particles: an ellipsis account. In Anisa Schardl, Martin Walkow, and Muhammad Abdurrahman, editors, *Proceedings of NELS*, 2009. ♦ Manfred Krifka. Response particles as propositional anaphors. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT)*, 23:1–18, 2013. ♦ Floris Roelofsen and Donka F. Farkas. Polarity particle responses as a window onto the interpretation of questions and assertions. *Language*, 91(2):359–414, 2015.