FREE CHOICE NINGUN IN EARLY NAVARRO-ARAGONESE[*]

GEOFFREY POOLE
(Newcastle University)

Abstract

The indefinite adjective *ningún* (in its various forms), while often translated in isolation as 'no', is standardly assumed to be a polarity item in early medieval Spanish (Martins 2008, Poole 2011). However, in the *Fueros de la Novenera*, a 12th century charter written in a very early variety of Navarro-Aragonese, *ningún* has a broader distribution which includes both polarity and free choice contexts, similar to the distribution of English *any*. I suggest that *ningún* in the *Fueros de la Novenera* can be accounted for in terms of Giannakidou & Quer's (2012) analysis of *any*, in which *any* is a single lexical item and an existential, rather than universal, quantifier. Under their analysis, the dual behavior seen with *any* (free choice vs. negative polarity item) arises because *any* conversationally implicates exhaustive variation, which creates a universal-like interpretation. However, where the implicature is cancelled (for example under negation and in questions), it behaves as a negative polarity item. *Ningún* in Navarro-Aragonese does however eventually develop into a 'standard' Old Spanish polarity item, and I suggest that this is consistent with other diachronic and acquisition hypotheses regarding polarity items.

1. *Ningún* in the *Fueros de la Novenera*: Descriptive Remarks

The *Fueros de la Novenera* is a charter from the 12th century granted to a group of four towns which lie 30-50 kilometres to the south of Pamplona, the capital of the former Kingdom of Navarra, in the north-east of the Iberian peninsula. The name of the charter derives from the fact that these towns were exempted from the *novena*, a one-ninth tax on income.

In his edition of the *Fueros de la Novenera*, Tilander (1951: 13) notes that the *Fueros* 'are very archaic in character, just as much with respect to language as to legal underpinnings'.[1] With respect to archaic legal practices, the *Fueros* allow for the use of 'the candle ordeal' as a legally binding method for settling certain disputes, as well as holding animals and even inanimate objects liable for homicide.[2] As for the language of the *Fueros*, they are written in a very early form of Navarro-Aragonese, a variety of Old Romance spoken in the kingdom of Navarra and the neighbouring kingdom of Aragón. *Ningún* in this variety, while exhibiting the NPI behaviour seen in other early Medieval Spanish varieties, has a broader distribution, more akin to English free choice *any* than a 'mere' NPI.[3]

---

[*] Thanks to Noel Burton-Roberts, Maria Maza, an anonymous reviewer and especially Ian Mackenzie for much helpful discussion. Any remaining errors are of course my own.

[1] 'Los *Fueros de la Novenera* son de índole muy arcaica tanto por lo que se refiere a la lengua como al fondo jurídico.'

[2] In the candle ritual, common in many cultures worldwide, the two parties gather with witnesses in a sacred place to call upon the adjudication of a supernatural entity. Two identical candles are lit at exactly the same moment, and the supernatural entity in question is deemed to have sided with the party whose candle stays lit for longer.

[3] I concentrate here on the NPI behaviour of *ningún* and put aside the question of whether it could also function as a modal polarity item during the early Medieval period, as, in fact, it has no impact on the discussion. (The modal contexts to be discussed in Section 1.2 below are ones in which *ningún* could not take on a positive, indefinite value in other early Medieval Spanish varieties (but see footnote 6 for some additional discussion).)

1.1. *Ningún* as a negative polarity item

Following various authors, including Martins (2000, 2008) and Poole (2011), I assume that *ningún* was in general a negative polarity item during the early Medieval Spanish period. It is licensed within both the direct scope of negation and other negative expressions such as the preposition *sin* 'without', as illustrated in (1)-(3).[4]

(1)   &   entraron   dentro &   no   hallaron   ningun hombre
         and entered.IND inside and NEG found.IND n-one   man
         'And they went inside and found nobody.'

                                                            (*Gran Conquista de Ultramar*, 13th c.)

(2)   Don aluar hannez non   erraria   en ninguna manera en las   conosçer
         D. A. H.   NEG err.COND in n-one   manner in them know.INF
         'Don Alvar Hannez would not err in any way by knowing them.'

                                                            (*Conde Lucanor*, 14th c.)

(3)   E   asi   estouieron toda la   noche sin   comer &   sin   ninguna consolacion
         And thus were.IND   all   the night without eat.INF and without n-one   consolation
         'And they were like that the whole night, without eating and with no consolation'

                                                            (*Meditations of Pseudo-Augustine*, 15th c.)

Crucially, however, *ningún* is also commonly found as a *subject* when the verb is negated.

(4)   …un mes   qual   el escogiesse que   ningun omne non vendiesse vino…
           a month which he chose.SBJV that n-one   man   NEG sold.SBJV wine
         '…a month which he chose in which no one could sell wine…'

                                                            (*Fuero Real*, 13th c.)

Cases such (4) are taken to fall together with the cases in (1) and (2) under the assumption that sentential negation raises covertly from T to C, with the result that *ningún* as a subject is within the scope of negation at LF.

This 'classic' NPI behavior illustrated in (1)-(3) above is also seen in the *Fueros de la Novenera*.

(5)   Nuylla muyller…no ha   poder de…fer   feyto   ninguno

      N-one woman   NEG has.IND power of do.INF business n-one
      amenos de su marido
      without   her husband
      'No woman has the authority to conduct any business without her husband'

                                              (FdN, § 197)

(6)   non deue   ser peynndrado por deuda ninguna
      NEG must.IND be pledged   for debt n-one
      '[An ill person] may not have security taken for any debt'

                                              (FdN, § 135)

(7)   …et deuen   lo   prender los mayorales sines   armas ningunas et
       and must.IND him seize.INF the officials   without arms n-ones   and
      sines fuerça ninguna…
      without force n-one
      'And the officials must arrest him without any weapons or any force….'

                                              (FdN, § 99)

The *Fueros de la Novenera* also contains examples parallel with (4) above, in which *ningún* (or a variant n-word *nuill/nuyll*[5]) can serve as a subject of a negated verb.

(8)   Et otrosi uezino   ninguno non deue   cuyllir mancebo ninguno de su uezino
      And further neighbor n-one   NEG must.IND trap   boy   n-one of his neighbor
      'And furthermore no neighbor may hire away a servant from his neighbor'

                                              (FdN, § 145)

1.2. 'Free choice' *ningún*

However, the behaviour of *ningún* (or *nuill/nuyll*) in the *Fueros de la Novenera* differs from other varieties of early medieval Spanish in a number of (related) respects. It is licensed in all the contexts discussed in the previous section, but can additionally be used more broadly in certain (non-negative) free choice contexts. In particular, it can take on a positive indefinite value when it is the subject of a *non-negated* generic or deontic modal verb, and, as indicated by the translations, appears to have a free-choice interpretation.

(9)   Ninguna muiller que sea   uidua &   que se case   antes de
      n-one   woman that is.SBJV widow and that SE marries.SBJV before of
      un aynno complido   deue   .v. sueldos de calonia.
      a   year   completed owes.IND   5 sueldos of penalty
      'Any woman who is widowed and who (re)marries before one year has passed owes a fine of 5 sueldos.'

                                              (FdN, § 13)

(10)   Nuill ombre qui furta   aradro aylleno   a su uezino   peyte .lx. sueldos.
      n-one man who steals.IND plow   another's to his neighbour pays 60 sueldos
      'Any man who steals his neighbor's plow pays 60 sueldos.'

                                              (FdN, § 19)

---

[5] Though etymologically related to a different Latin word from *ningún* (NULLUS 'none', rather than NEC ŪNUS 'not (even) one') *nuill/nuyll* appears to have an identical distribution to *ningún* in the *Fueros de la Novenera*. See Tilander (1951: 26-27) for discussion and see also footnote 16.

(11)   Ningun hombre qui peynndra   carnero coyllundo deue   dar
        n-one   man   who takes.IND ram   uncastrated must.IND give.INF
        de calonia V sueldos
        of penalty 5 sueldos
        'Any man who takes an uncastrated ram must pay a fine of 5 sueldos.'

<div align="right">(FdN, § 17)</div>

In (9)-(11), the subject NP is interpreted as 'any', but, unlike (4) above, the verb of which it is a subject, is crucially *not* negated. As mentioned above in footnote 3, although there have been some claims that *ningún* in 'standard' early medieval Spanish is a weak NPI, and therefore can appear in *some* contexts with a positive indefinite value without being in the direct scope of negation, contexts like (9)-(11) are not one of them.[6] In these varieties, negation would be *required* in (9)-(11) in order to license the 'any' reading for *ningún* (in which case it would be 'any…not', and the examples would be assimilated to (4) above).

The free choice interpretation of *ningún/nuill* in (9)-(11) is confirmed by a second, incomplete copy of the *Fueros de la Novenera* which exists as part of manuscript 13331 in the Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid. It contains only the first 79 articles of *Fueros* as an untitled appendix to the charters of Viguera and Val de Funes, and Hergueta (1900) dates this manuscript to the 15th century. Tilander (1951: 27) observes that, with only one exception (which, he notes, probably reflects the original), all of the instances of *ningún/nuill hombre* in contexts such as (9)-(11) have been replaced by *todo hombre*. *Todo hombre* is in fact found in a number of places in the A manuscript of the *Fueros de la Novenera* and is also, in the context of a law code or set of regulations, the expression that would be used in Modern Spanish. Leonetti (2009) notes, this 'bare' form of the universal quantifier is predominantly non-specific, and in distribution resembles a Free Choice Item.

---

[6] I know of only one counterexample to this claim in the literature. Camus (2006: (40a)) notes the example in (i).

    (i)   Ninguno qui este nuestro fecho quisier   crebrantar, aya   la hira de Dios.
            n-one   who this our   deed wants.SBJV break.INF   has.SBJV the anger of God
            'Anyone who wants to break our law earns God's wrath.'

Camus (2006: 1181) refers to the context in (i) as 'imperative modality', and claims that this is a non-negative context in which *ningún* is licensed, but I have been able to find only one other example in the *Corpus del Español* (which from 1200-1400 contains 20 million words) outside the cases discussed here. Martins (2000: (52)) notes the superficially similar Old Galician-Leonese example in (ii).

    (ii)   Que ningun omne que en suas heridades nin en seus omnes metir mano…que peyte mil
            that n-one man that in his properties nor in his men   puts hand   that pays thousand
            mors. e   perda quanto   ouuer
            mors. and loses as-much-as might-have
            'that any person who causes damange to his properties or his men…pay a thousand *moravedis* (unit of money) and lose everything he might have'

In this example *ningún* is in a topic phrase (as evidenced by the reduplicated complementizer preceding the finite verb *peyte*), and in at least one other variety (the later Navarro-Aragonese language of the *Fuero General de Navarra* discussed in Section 3) a *ningún* phrase can very occasionally be a topic even after it has ceased being licensed in the contexts in (9)-(11).

Most importantly, however, as will be discussed below, seemingly no law charters contained in the *Corpus del Español* use *ningún* in this way in this context besides the *Fueros de la Novenera*, where it is extremely frequent. This suggests that this free choice use of *ningúno* was not more widely available.

This unusual use of subject *ningún/nuill* in the *Fueros de la Novenera* is further highlighted by comparing the *Fuero de la Novenera* to a 13th century manuscript version of the *Fuero General de Navarra* in the *Corpus del Español*. In this charter, written in a slightly later variety of Navarro-Aragonese from approximately the same area, contexts such as those in (9)-(11) are never realized with non-negative *ningún*.[7] (12), for example, contains *ningun ombre* as a subject, but the main verb is negated (and thus *ningun ombre* is within the scope of negation after T to C raising at LF).

(12)   Ningun omne non deue   ser   Rentado por traydor por que mate   omne
         n-one   man   NEG must.IND be.INF produced by criminal because kill.IND man
         que aya   de peychar homjçidio   o   callonya por fuerro de Nauarra
         that has.SBJV of pay.INF homicide fine or penalty by fuero of N
         'No man shall be considered a criminal because he kills a man; instead he has to pay
         the homicide fine or penalty according to the laws of Navarra.'
                                                                 (*Fuero General de Navarra*, 13th c.)

In (13), *todo ombre* is used, just as in the B manuscript of the *Fueros de la Novenera*.[8]

(13)   Otrossi   todo ombre que taiare   uit o vimne aylleno deue   pechar
         However all   man   who cut.SBJV vine or vinyard another's must.IND pay.INF
         .v. sueldos de calonia por cada uit
         5   sueldos of penalty for each vine
         'However, any man who damages another's vines must pay a fine of 5 sueldos for
         each vine.'
                                                            (*Fuero General de Navarra, Version B*, 13th c.)

More commonly, however, a conditional with *algún* 'some' is used to introduce an article of the charter:

(14)   Si algun villano   se quasare   con   alguna villana   el [sic] vno de eilos
         if some commoner.M SE marry.IND with   some commoner.F and   one of them
         muere sin   creaturas el que biuo finquare   non deue   tener la heredad
         dies.IND without children   he who alive remain.IND NEG must.IND have the property
         del   muerto
         of.the dead
         'If two commoners marry and one of them dies before there are any children, the
         survivor may not inherit the property of the deceased.'
                                                            (*Fuero General de Navarra, Version B*, 13th c.)

1.2.1. *Ningún* as a topic

Another reason to believe that *ningún* in the *Fueros de la Novenera* must be more than a 'mere' NPI is the fact that NPs introduced by *ningún* can serve as a topic, as in (15).

---

[7] Although the *Corpus del Español* does not explicitly indicate anything concerning the exact dates or locations of manuscripts which it contains, Version B, from the ADYMTE corpus, is indexed with the 13th century materials and is replete with characteristic Aragonisms (such as the third-person possessive pronoun *lur* (from Vulgar Latin *ILLŪRUM, which existed alongside *illorum* (Umphrey 1913))

[8] Interestingly, *qual quier* 'who-/whichever', a very common free choice item in the 13th century, is not found either in the *Fueros de la Novenera* or the *Fuero General de Navarra*.

(Note that contrary to superficial appearances, the verb *ha* in (15) is a variety of the impersonal verb *hay* 'there is', and therefore the NP is not the subject.)

(15)   Ningún hombre que plague   a   otro, si el   plagado non se clama,
         n-one   man   who injures.SBJV a other if the injured NEG SE clamors
         no ha   calonia.
         NEG there.is penalty
         'As for any man who injures another, if the injured party does not lodge a complaint, there is no penalty.'

(*FdN*, § 2)

In (16), the NP introduced by *nuill* introduces a large topic, which is then resumed by the indirect object pronoun *le*, suggesting very clearly that the NP is topical.

(16)   Nuill ombre que sea   ferme a otro por heredat et   niegue   que
         n-one man   that is.SBJV witness to other for property and denies.SBJV that
         no   es ferme, pueden   le   dar   candela.
         'NEG' is witness, can.3p.IND to.him give.INF candle
         'With respect to any man who serves as a witness for another for [the purchase of] a piece of property and who later denies that he did so, they can subject him to the candle ordeal.'

(*FdN*, § 31)

This behaviour is unexpected given that, as noted by Giannakidou (2011: 1695) among others, negative polarity items are referentially deficient in an important way. They cannot introduce a new discourse referent and cannot assert existence in a default context. For this reason, it is generally assumed that NPIs cannot serve as topics, and therefore *ningún/nuill* must be more than a 'mere' NPI in (15) and (16). We return to this issue in Section 2.3 below, but notice that free choice items in a deontic modal, legal context such as (15) and (16) seem intuitively akin to generically interpreted bare plurals or universal quantifiers, both of which *can* serve as topics (see Kuno 1972 and Reinhart 1981 respectively, and Endriss 2009 for an overview).

1.3. Summary

Despite the limited nature of the discourse contexts provided by a document such as a law charter, it seems clear that *ningún/nuill* has a broader distribution than it does in 'standard' early Medieval Spanish. Its positive, indefinite interpretation in the absence of any negative expression when the subject of a deontic modal or generic verb is not to be found even in later varieties of Navarro-Aragonese. The central challenge for a unified account of *ningún* in the language of the *Fueros de la Novenera* is then to explain how this element can function both in straightforward negative polarity and in free choice environments.

2. Giannakidou & Quer (2012) on English *any*

In this section, I outline Giannakidou & Quer's (2012) analysis of *any* in English, which seems to straddle the free choice and (negative) polarity divide in a similar way to *ningún* in the *Fueros de la Novenera*. Under Giannakidou & Quer's analysis, the free choice and negative polarity natures of *any* receive a unified analysis within the context of a

particular approach to polarity items and the free choice effect, and I argue that their approach to *any* can account for the behaviour of *ningún* in early Navarro-Aragonese.

2.1. The dual behaviour of English *any*

As is well known, English *any* exhibits a cross-linguistically peculiar dual behaviour. On the one hand, it can have a 'free choice' interpretation in certain contexts, as evidenced by the grammaticality of *almost*, a traditional diagnostic for free choice (see, e.g., Giannakidou 2001 and the references cited there).

(17) a. (Almost) anyone who wants to drive a truck must obtain a special license
     b. John will read his poetry to (almost) anyone

However, *any* cannot be a 'true' free choice item, as it can be also found in contexts which are impossible for these elements; for example, within the direct scope of negation or within the scope of other negative elements in an episodic context.

(18) a. John didn't see (*almost) any of the people.
     b. Mary quit her job without (*almost) any notice.

Since *almost* is impossible in (18a) and (b), we know that we are dealing with negative polarity *any*, as opposed to free choice *any*. Furthermore, as noted by Quer (1999) (cited in Giannakidou & Quer (2012)), a true Free Choice Item such as Spanish *cualquier* is ungrammatical in contexts like (17):

(19)   *Expulsaron   del   partido a cualquier disidente.
          Expelled.IND from.the party   A FC   dissident
          Intended: '*They expelled FC-any dissident from the party.'
                                                      (Modern Spanish; Quer 1999)

In other words, descriptively, the facts in (17) and (18) suggest that *any* in English is neither a 'true' free choice item nor a 'true' (negative) polarity item.

2.1.1. The quantificational status of *any*

Contrasts such as the one between (17) and (18) have engendered a debate concerning the quantificational status of *any*. [9] Since Ladusaw (1980) and Carlson (1980), polarity *any* has been generally taken to be an existential quantifier. For example, in addition to the argument from *almost*-modification noted in (18) above, Carlson (1980) also notes other environments in which NPI *any* patterns with existential rather than universal quantifiers:

(20) a. He has a little/some/*all/*every courage.
     b. He doesn't have any courage.

(21) a. We made a little/some/*all/*every headway.
     b. We didn't make any headway.

---

[9] Those who have taken the view that *any* is an existential quantifier include Kadmon & Landman (1993), Giannakidou (2001) and Horn (2005); while Davison (1980), Jayez & Tovena (2005) and Dayal (2005) among others claim that *any* is a universal quantifier.

By contrast, free choice *any* seems more like a universal quantifier, particularly as the subject of a generic verb. For example, (22) seems effectively synonymous with either (23a) or (23b).

(22)   Any owl hunts mice.

(23) a. Every owl hunts mice.
      b. Owls hunt mice.

One approach, the position dubbed 'ambiguist' by Horn (2000), would be to say that *any* in English is simply ambiguous between a universal quantifier, which appears in free choice contexts, and an existential quantifier, which is seen in the negative polarity contexts. However, even in addition to the general theoretical considerations which would favour a unified analysis of *any* over one that postulated ambiguity, Giannakidou & Quer note that free choice *any* is not limited to universal quantification. It can be interpreted as an existential quantifier under the influence of certain modal verbs.

(24) a. They may have hired any candidate on the list.
      b. The committee can give the job to any candidate.

This variation between universal and existential interpretations, even within the free choice uses of *any*, is in fact typical of indefinites. This is unsurprising, as they note, given that *any* is etymologically related to the indefinite article (both deriving from a reduced form of the adjective *one*). Therefore, Giannakidou & Quer (2012), following Giannakidou (2001) among others, argue that *any* most appropriately receives a unified analysis as an existential quantifier.[10]

2.2. Giannakidou & Quer on the Free Choice effect.

Given that Giannakidou & Quer claim that *any* should be analysed across the board as an existential quantifier and not a universal one, sentences such as those in (17) and (22) now require explanation. Specifically, such an analysis requires an account of the source of the universal-like interpretation that *any* receives in 'free choice' contexts.

According to Giannakidou & Quer, following Giannakidou (2001), the free choice effect seen with *any* (and with true free choice items more generally, which they claim are also existential quantifiers) is due to a lexical semantic effect of 'domain exhaustification'. Domain exhaustification is defined such that, for each member of a domain d, there is a world w where some predicate is true of d (and also that in that world w there is no other element d' which satisfies the predicate, though this addition is required for technical reasons that do not concern us here). In other words, one exhausts all possible values in a domain (say, the possible referents of 'any book') individually across a range of closely related worlds in a pairwise fashion.[11] This is a different interpretation from the one provided by universal quantification, which invites the hearer to compare every value with respect to a particular world. Free choice items and English *any* differ, however, in that true free choice items

---

[10] They are thus 'unitarians' in the sense of Horn (2000).

[11] More specifically, worlds which are identical save for the different value chosen from the domain d.

presuppose domain exhaustification, while English *any* merely conversationally implicates it.[12]

2.3. A unified analysis of free choice and polarity *ningún*

Applying Giannakidou & Quer's analysis to *ningún* in early Medieval Spanish, consider again example (11) (repeated below):

(11)   Ningun hombre qui peynndra carnero coyllundo   deue   dar
        n-one   man   who takes.IND ram   uncastrated must.IND give.INF
        de calonia V sueldos
        of penalty 5 sueldos
        'Any man who takes an uncastrated ram must pay a fine of 5 sueldos.'

                                                                                          (FdN, § 17)

Under the assumption that *ningún/nuill* in the *Fueros de la Novenera* functions like English *any*, it will be defined as follows (adapting and amalgamating Giannakidou & Quer's (2012: (41) and (42)) definitions for *any*):

(25) a. *Ningún P* is an extensional indefinite of the form P(x), where x is an individual variable.
    b. The x variable is dependent: it cannot be bound by a default existential, unless there is another nonveridical operator above the existential. If the nonveridical operator is a Q-operator, then the Q-operator binds the x variable, as is standardly the case with indefinites.

(26)   Domain exhaustification (conversationally implicated):
        If *ningún* is in the scope of an operator contributing a set of worlds W:
        $\forall d \in D_{ningun}. \exists w. Q(d)(w)$ and no other member of the domain d' is such that Q(d')(w); where D is the domain the FCI [*sic*], and Q is the main VP predicate.

Furthermore, I assume the definition of *must* in (27), adapting von Fintel & Gillies (2007: (6)) as per their remarks:

(27)   *must (B) (ϕ)*
        must (B) (ϕ) is true in w iff ϕ is true in all worlds that are B-accessible from w
        B: the conversational background (in the sense of Kratzer), effectively a function from worlds to sets of worlds
        ϕ: the prejacent proposition

Putting together the formal definitions in (25)-(27), we see that a deontic modal context such as that provided by *deber* 'must' is one in which an element such as *ningún* can be licensed. First, deontic modality provides the requisite non-veridical environment. (The claim 'it is required or ought to be the case that *p*' does not entail (or presuppose) the truth of *p*.) Deontic modality also provides a set of worlds over which *ningún*'s domain

---

[12] This is because English *any*, like *ningún* in Navarro-Aragonese and unlike true Free Choice Items, is also licensed within the direct scope of negation, an environment in which conversational implicatures, but not presuppositions, are cancelled.

exhaustification can be evaluated, and this set of worlds is universally quantified over.[13] I therefore take the Logical Form of the sentence in (11) to be (28) (putting aside the precise question of how the relative clause is represented):

(28) $\forall w' \in$ W-deo(w), x: [uncastrated-ram thief (x in w')] [pay (x, 5 sueldos, in w')]

The universal quantifier provided by the deontic modal binds the dependent variable introduced by the *ningún*-phrase, and (28) therefore is interpreted as meaning that, for every world w' which is a member of the set of deontically accessible worlds from our world w (that is, worlds where the laws are the same as this world) and where x is an uncastrated ram thief in w', x pays a fine of 5 sueldos in w'. (11) further conversationally implicates that the domain of uncastrated ram thieves is exhausted pairwise with the deontic alternative worlds that we consider.

This approach to *ningún* also explains other examples in the *Fueros de la Novenera* which have a free choice interpretation, but where, unlike (11) above, universal quantification is not a plausible alternative analysis. Consider (29)-(31):

(29)   Dos uandos que se mesclen   nuyt nin dia   et   maten ombre ninguno.
        Two groups that refl mix.SBJV night nor day and kill.SBJV man n-one
        saquen omiziero et peyten homizidio al rey
        get.SBJV homicide and pay.SBJV homicide fine to.the king
        'Two groups of people who come to blows at any time and kill a man are guilty of homicide and pay the homicide fine to the king.'
                                                                        (FdN, § 157)

(30)   Todo ombre que aya   baraylla   un uezino   con otro   et
        all   man that has.SBJV altercation a neighbor with another and
        uienen   parientes en ualimiento con armas   et muere   hi
        come.IND relatives in aid   with weapons and dies.IND there
        nuill ombre, todos   deuen   el homizidio….
        n-one man   everyone owes.IND the homicide fine
        'As for any man that has an altercation with his neighbour and relatives come in aid with weapons and a man is killed there, everyone owes the fine for homicide.'
                                                                        (FdN, § 149)

(31)   De hombre que furta   ninguna bestia
        Of man   that steals.IND n-one   animal
        'Regarding a man who steals an animal' (statue title)
                                                                        (FdN, § 14)

As indicated by the translations, *ningún* in these contexts is clearly an indefinite, and under the proposed analysis the free choice effect comes about through the conversational implication of domain exhaustification. Notice that *ningún* is not plausibly interpreted as a universal quantifier in these cases. (29) does not restrict itself to a situation in which two groups of people fight and *every* man is killed. Rather, it intends to claim that, in every world which is deontically accessible from our own in which a man is killed as a result of an altercation between two groups of people, those people are collectively guilty of homicide

---

[13] All of these statements are also true of generic contexts, and thus I assume that the analysis of (11) will carry over straightforwardly to examples such as (10) above.

and pay the homicide fine. Similarly, (31) does not require that a man steal *every* animal in order to fall within the scope of the statute. Instead, the statute applies across pairs of deontically accessible worlds and stolen animals, and is relevant in every one of them.

The conversational implicature of domain exhaustification also explains the ability of *ningún/nuill* to be used as a topic (discussed at the end of section 1.2.1 and also relevant for some of the examples directly above). According to Giannakidou & Quer's definition of *ningún* in (25) above, in which the phrase *ningún P* introduces a dependent individual variable, it seems as though it is the sort of element which should not be able to be topical. This is made explicit by Giannakidou's (2011: 1695) definition of 'dependent existential' (cf. the definition of 'dependent variable' (25b) above)):

(32)   An existential quantifier $\exists x_d$ is dependent iff the variable x_d it contributes
         does not introduce a discourse referent in the main context.

However, I assume that the conversational implicature of domain exhaustification allows the *ningún* phrase to be interpreted as a kind or class, and therefore to have a referent which can be licensed as a topic. A *ningún*-phase in this sense becomes similar to a generic bare plural NP which, as noted by Kuno (1972) and Kuroda (1972) among others, can also be interpreted as a topic for this reason (again see Endriss 2009 for an overview).

Having discussed the various 'free choice' uses of *ningún*, recall that *ningún*, like English *any*, can also be used in NPI environments, for example within the direct scope of negation, as in (5), repeated below.

(5)   Nuylla muyller…no ha   poder de…fer   feyto   ninguno
        N-one woman   NEG has.IND power of   do.INF business n-one
        amenos de su marido
        without   her husband
        'No woman has the authority to conduct any business without her husband'
                                                                            (FdN, § 197)

(5) differs crucially from the previous cases discussed above because negation provides a non-quantificational non-veridical operator. As per the definition in (25b) above, this allows the dependent variable(s) introduced by the *ningún* phrase(s) to undergo existential closure. There is no domain exhaustification, since, following Gazdar (1979) and Horn (1991), conversational implicatures are cancelled in negative contexts. As such then, (5) merely claims that it is not the case that there exists a woman x and a business transaction y such that x has the power to conduct y without her husband's approval.

3. *Ningún* in later Navarro-Aragonese

The development of *ningún* in western varieties of Navarro-Aragonese can be traced through the next centuries by examining two other early charters, the Pamplona manuscript of the *Fuero de Jaca* (manuscript D of Molho 1964) and Version B of the *Fuero General de Navarra* found in the *Corpus del Español*.[14] Jaca was the early administrative center of the kingdom of Aragón, and its charter dates from the end of the 11th century. Although originally promulgated in Latin, Manuscript D of Molho's (1964) critical edition of the *Fuero de Jaca* is a translation into Navarro-Aragonese done in Navarra around 1340. By contrast, the *Fuero General de Navarra* was originally composed in Navarro-Aragonese, and

---

[14] All examples in this section from the *Fuero de Jaca* are taken from Molho (1964), cited by article.

promulgated initially in 1247. As noted in footnote 6 above, Version B from the *Corpus del Español* seems to originate from an approximately contemporaneous period and region.

Consideration of these two charters suggests that, by the early 14th century at the latest, Navarro-Aragonese had developed into a 'standard' old Romance variety. *Ningún* is, as expected, licensed within the scope of negation (again requiring main clause negation when in subject position)

(33)   Ningun omne non deue   ser   Rentado por traydor por que mate   omne
        n-one   man   eng must.IND be.INF produced by criminal because kill.IND man
        que aya   de peychar homjçidio   o   callonya por fuerro de Nauarra
        that has.SBJV of pay.INF homicide fine or penalty   by fuero of N
        'No man shall be tried as a criminal because he kills a man; instead he has to pay the
        homicide fine or penalty according to the laws of Navarra.'
                                                                  (*Fuero General de Navarra*, 13th c.)

(34)   Mas si por auentura lo   troba   muerto, d'ailli   adelant non lo   puede   cobrar
        but if by chance   him finds.IND dead   from.there forward NEG him can.IND charge
        por njnguna razon.
        by n-one   reason
        'But if by chance he finds him dead, from then on he cannot charge him for any
        reason.'
                                                                  (*Fuero de Jaca ms. D*, §134)

Also, as expected from the general discussion in Section 1, *ningún* in later Navarro-Aragonese is also licensed when in the scope of other negative elements, such as the preposition *sin* 'without'

(35)   De omne que todo se dona   a religion o a glesia a todo quanto   que a /
        of man that all   SE gives.IND to religion or to church to all how.much that has.IND
        sen   nengun retenimiento & d[e]spues muere,
        without n-one   withholding and later   dies.IND
        'As for a man that gives everything he has to a religious group or church without any
        withholding and later dies….'
                                                                  (*Fuero de Jaca ms. D*, §148)

(36)   & puede pacer en el prado.   o enla defesa   sin   calonia ninguna
        and can.IND graze in the meadow or in.the pasturage without penalty n-one
        'And it can graze in the meadow or in the pasturage without any fine.'
                                                                  (*Fuero General de Navarra*, 13th c.)

However, no examples with *ningún* as a subject in a deontic modal or generic non-negative context, corresponding to (9)-(11) above, are to be found in either document.[15] This can be accounted for under the assumption that in later Navarro-Aragonese the implicature of domain exhaustification is lost. Essentially, *ningún* is reanalysed as a 'mere' NPI, a

---

[15] While this is true, it should be noted that a handful of examples can be found in the *Fuero General de Navarra* in which a *ningún* phrase is a topic, similar to examples (15) and (16) above. This could be because *ningún* has not entirely completed the transition to a simple polarity item. An alternative possibility is that the explanation for *ningún*'s use as a topic both in the *Fueros de la Novenera* and in the *Fuero General de Navarra* lies in the fact that a *ningún*-phrase can refer to the set that the phrase picks out, in which case, following Reinhart 1981, it can be interpreted as a topic.

'referentially vague indefinite' in Giannakidou & Quer's terms, in which case it is analysed as per the discussion of example (5) in the previous section.

Proceeding in parallel with the loss of the free choice use of *ningún* is the increasing use of various alternatives for expressing free choice which existed alongside *ningún*. In particular, as mentioned in Section 1.2 above, the 'bare' quantifier *todo/toda* exists alongside free choice *ningún* in the A manuscript of the *Fueros de la Novenera*, as illustrated by (37), or by example (30) above.

(37)   Todo ombre que uenda   heredat que sea   de patrimonio, debe   lo fer
        all   man   that sells.SBJV property that is.SBJV of inheritence must.INF it make.INF
        saber   con dos ombres a sus hermanos, si los ha….
        know.INF with two men   to his brothers   if them has.IND
        'Any man who sells an inherited piece of property must make it known with two men
        to his siblings, if he has them….'

                                                                                                (FdN, § 39)

Ningún N as the subject of a statute occurs approximately twice as frequently as *todo N* in the *Fueros de la Novenera*. However, while the *Fuero General de Navarra* contains 68 instances of a punctuation mark (including & or a statute boundary) followed by *todo N*, there are no instances of *ningún N*.

3.1. A note on the diachronic trajectory of polarity items

Martins (2000; 2008) suggests that polarity items in Romance follow a general trend towards decreasing underspecification within a unary-valued system of features (Rooryck (1994)) located in the Polarity Phrase (PolP). The change, for example, from 'standard' Old Spanish n-words (which are negative polarity items) to Modern Spanish n-words (which are negative concord items) involves a change from a variably underspecified [α] negative feature to a specified negative feature [+]. In other words, these elements move from being anti-licensed in affirmative contexts to being positively licensed in negative contexts. Since, as discussed in footnote 3 above, I put aside the question of whether 'standard' Old Spanish *ningún* was a modal polarity item in addition to a negative polarity item, I do not take any position on the relationship between the technical details of her proposal and the development of *ningún* in early Navarro-Aragonese discussed here.

However, the change does seem to be consonant with the spirit of her proposal. In describing the proposed trend of polarity items in Romance, Martins, for example, uses the phrase 'becoming more restrictive in their licensing contexts' (2000: 206) as equivalent way of saying 'reducing the degree of underspecification'. The former certainly describes the development of *ningún*. The loss of its implicature of domain exhaustification means that it is licensed in a subset of the environments that it was licensed in previously (i.e., from free choice contexts and NPI contexts to simply NPI contexts).[16]

Furthermore, the development seen in early Navarro-Aragonese would seem to be entirely consistent with the acquisition findings of van der Wal (1996), which Martins (2008) cites as evidence for the general thrust of her proposal. In a study of the acquisition of Dutch weak polarity items by first-language learners, van der Wal observes that the first context which children acquire for these items is the negative one. It is only later in the acquisition

---

[16] I put aside here the question of how *ningún/nuill* itself became licensed in free choice contexts. It is a somewhat surprising development given that both elements are etymologically related to negative elements in Latin (NEC ŪNUS 'not (even) one' and NULLUS 'no/none', respectively). Unfortunately however, it may be that the lack of sufficiently early Old Spanish texts will make even speculation about this question impossible.

process that the non-negative modal contexts are acquired. If the negative polar environment is generally perceived by learners as most salient for elements which are licensed there, then the direction of the change seen with *ningún* in Navarro-Aragonese would be expected. This would also explain the cross-linguistic trend for indefinites to become 'more negative' (see, e.g, Haspelmath 1997 and Roberts & Roussou 2003 for discussion).

4. Conclusion

This paper has examined *ningún* in early Navarro-Aragonese, from both synchronic and diachronic perspectives. The archaic use of *ningún*, as exemplified by the manuscript version of the *Fueros de la Novenera* in Tilander (1951), straddles the free choice/polarity divide, in a manner similar to English *any* (which is well-known for being cross-linguistically unusual). It is particularly unusual in the context of the history of early Medieval Spanish polarity items, as *ningún* does not generally exhibit this behaviour in equivalent contexts in other early medieval Spanish varieties. I suggested that the behaviour of *ningún* in the *Fueros de la Novenera* provides indirect support for the analysis of English *any* in Giannakidou & Quer (2012), in that its properties seem amenable to a similar analysis. *Ningún* is an existential, rather than a universal, quantifier and the free choice effect is the result of a lexical semantic property of *ningún* by which it conversationally implicates domain exhaustification. Diachronically, *ningún* in later Navarro-Aragonese appears to develop into a 'standard' early Medieval Spanish (negative) polarity item, losing the ability to serve as the subject of a non-negated generic or deontic modal verb, and this change appears to be broadly consonant with the diachronic developments of other polarity items cross-linguistically.

References

Camus Bergareche, B. (2006) La expressión de la negación. In C. Company Company (ed.), *Sintaxis histórica de la lengua española. Parte I: La frase verbal*, 1165-1252. México: FCE, UNAM.

Carlson, G. (1980). Polarity *any* is existential. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, 779-804.

Davies, M. (2002-). Corpus del Español (100 million words, 1200s-1900s). Available online at http://www.corpusdelespanol.org

Davison, A. (1980). Any as universal or existential? In Van Der Auwera, J. (ed.), *The Semantics of Determiners*, 11-40. London: Croom Helm.

Dayal, V. (2005). The universal force of free choice *any*. In Rooryck, J & Van Craenenbroeck, J. (eds), *Linguistic Variation Yearbook 2004*, 5-40. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Endriss, C. (2009). *Quantificational topics. A scopal treatment of exceptional wide scope phenomena*. New York: Springer.

von Fintel, K. & Gillies, A. (2007). An opinionated guide to epistemic modality. In Gendler, T. & Hawthorne, J. (eds.), *Oxford studies in epistemology, vol. 2*, 32–62. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gazdar, G. (1979). *Pragmatics: implicature, presupposition, and logical form*. New York: Academic Press.

Giannakidou, A. (2001). The meaning of free choice. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 24, 659-735.

Giannakidou, A. (2011). Negative polarity and positive polarity: licensing, variation, and compostionality. In von Heusinger, K., Maienborn, C. & Portner, P. (ed.), *The*

Handbook of Natural Language Meaning (second edition), 1660-1712. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

Giannakidou, A. & Quer, J. (2012) Exhaustive and non-exhaustive variation with anti-specific indefinites: free choice versus referential vagueness in Greek, Catalan, and Spanish, ms., University of Chicago/ICREA and Universitat Pompeu Fabra.

Haspelmath, M. (1997). *Indefinite Pronouns.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hergueta, N. (1900). Fueros inéditos de Viguera y de Val de Funes, otorgados por D. Alfonso el Batallador. *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* 37, 368-430. [Digital edition (2006). Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes. Available at http://bib.cervantesvirtual.com/FichaObra.html?Ref=017765 [consulted 4/12/12]]

Horn, L. (1991). Duplex negatio affirmat...: the economy of double negation. In Dobrin, L. et al., eds., *CLS 27, Part Two: The Parasession on Negation*, 80-106. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Horn, L. (2000). Any and (-)ever: free choice and free relatives. In Wyner, A. (ed.), *Proceedings of the 15th Annual Conference of the Israeli Association for Theoretical Linguistics*, 71–111.

Horn, L. (2005). Airport '86 revisited: toward a unified indefinite *any*. In Carlson, G. and Pelletier, F. (eds.), *The Partee Effect*, 179-205. Stanford: CSLI.

Jacques J. & Tovena, L. (2005). Free choiceness and non-individuation. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 28, 1–71.

Kadmon, N. & Landman, F. (1993). 'Any'. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16, 353-422.

Keniston, H. (1937). *The syntax of Castillian prose: the sixteenth century*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Kuno, S. (1972). Functional sentence perspective: a case study from Japanese and English. *Linguistic Inquiry 3*, 269-320.

Kuroda, S.-Y. (1972). The categorical and the thetic judgement: evidence from Japanese syntax. *Foundations of Language* 9, 153–185.

Ladusaw, W. (1980). *Polarity sensitivity as inherent scope relations*. New York: Garland.

Leonetti, M. (2009). Remarks on focus and non-specificity. In Espinal, M. et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the IV Nereus International Workshop 'Definiteness and DP Structure in Romance Languages'*. Konstanz: Fachbereich Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Konstanz.

Martins, A. (2000). Polarity Items in Romance: Underspecification and Lexical Change. In Pintzuk, S. et al. (eds), *Diachronic Syntax: Models and Mechanisms*, 191-219. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martins, A. (2008). Investigating language change in a comparative setting. In Almeida, M., Sieberg, B. & Bernardo, A. (eds.), *Questions on Language Change.* Lisbon: Colibri/Centro de Estudos Alemães e Europeus. 99-116.

Molho, M. (1964). *El Fuero de Jaca. Edición critica*. Zaragoza: Escuela de Estudios Medievales/Instituto de Estudios Pirenaicos. [facsimile available online at http://www.derechoaragones.es/es/catalogo_imagenes/grupo.cmd?posicion=3&path=101595]

Poole, G. (2011). Focus and the development of n-words in Spanish. In Berns, J. et al. (eds.), *Romance Language and Linguistic Theory 2009*, 291-303. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Quer, J. (1999). The quantificational force of free choice items. Paper presented at *Colloque de Syntaxe et Semanique de Paris '99*.

Reinhart, T. (1981). Pragmatics and linguistics: an analysis of sentence topics. *Linguistica* 27, 53-94.

Roberts, I. & Roussou, A. (2003). *Syntactic change. A minimalist approach to grammaticalisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rooryck, J. (1994). On two types of underspecification: towards a theory shared by syntax and phonology. *Probus* 6, 207-233.

Tilander, G. (1951). *Los Fueros de la Novenera*. Stockholm : Leges Hispanicae Medii Aevi, II.   [facsimilie   available   online   at http://www.derechoaragones.es/i18n/catalogo_imagenes/grupo.cmd?path=101969]

Umphrey, G. W. (1913). *The aragonese dialect*. Bulletin of the University of Washington, University Studies 5.   Seattle: Washington. [facsimile available online at http://archive.org/details/aragonesedialect00umphuoft]

van der Wal, S. (1996). *Negative Polarity Items & Negation: Tandem Acquisition.* Groningen Dissertations in Linguistics 17.

Geoffrey Poole
School of English Literature, Language and Linguistics
Percy Building, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne
NE1 7RU, United Kingdom

geoffrey.poole@ncl.ac.uk