

Polarity Sensitivity and Fragments in Irish*

JAMES McCLOSKEY

University of California Santa Cruz

1. BACKGROUND AND GOALS. The English question-answer pair in (1) is ill-formed:¹

- (1) A: What did the priest say? B: *Anything.

Its apparent Irish counterpart in (2), however, is routine and well-formed:

- (2) A: Cad a dúirt an sagart? B: Aon rud,
what C say.PAST the priest any thing
A: ‘What did the priest say?’ B: ‘Anything’. CHD 57

To express the meaning of Irish (2), English must use (3), exploiting the presence in its lexicon of the negative indefinite *nobody*, used here as a fragment answer:

- (3) A: What did the priest say? B: Nothing.

This paper is concerned with the theoretical implications of the contrasts in (1)-(3). The issues raised by such contrasts are important in part because the Irish possibility shown in (2) seems to represent a theoretical and typological anomaly. Negative polarity items are not supposed to be able to function, in isolation, as fragment answers.

The first goal of the paper is to establish that this interesting and unexpected possibility does in fact exist – the answer in (2) really is a fragment negative polarity item. Its second goal is to develop a way of understanding that possibility which resolves the apparent anomaly. Its third goal is to consider some larger implications which flow from that account for the general theory of subsentential fragments and for the theory of ellipsis.

A by-product of the discussion will be a more complete map of the landscape of polarity-sensitive items in Irish than has so far been available. Most discussions of polarity sensitivity currently available deal with languages which have among their lexical resources expressions which are inherently negative, such as English *nobody*, *nothing* or *never*. I will argue here, though, that Paolo Acquaviva (1996) was right to claim that Irish has no such expressions. We are thus presented with an opportunity to explore what patterns emerge in their absence.

*This paper has its origins in conversations with Jason Merchant some twenty years ago. In bringing it to completion finally I owe an even larger debt of gratitude than usual to the friends and colleagues who have acted as my linguistic guides – Caitlín Nic Niallais, Lillis Ó Laoire, Máire Ní Neachtain, Pádhraic Ó Ciardha, Róise Ní Bhaoill and Seosaimhín Ní Bheaglaoich. I am also grateful – for advice, discussion and suggestions – to Paolo Acquaviva, Pranav Anand, Liam Breatnach, Lisa Cheng, Sandy Chung, Nicola D’Antuono, Vera Gribanova, Bill Ladusaw, Anikó Liptak, Gillian Ramchand, Ivy Sichel and Gary Thoms. Presentations at UC Santa Cruz in November 2019 and at Leiden University in January of 2020 were very helpful in pushing the project along. This research was supported by funding from the National Science Foundation via Award Number 1451819: *The Implicit Content of Sluicing* (principal investigators Pranav Anand, Daniel Hardt and James McCloskey) to the University of California Santa Cruz.

¹The star on (1) is well-deserved, but there are conditions under which nPI’s may appear as fragment answers in English. This issue is taken up in section 6 below.

Two sources of data form the basis for that exploration here – work with six native speaker consultants over a period of several years, along with a collection of 1800 naturally occurring examples of polarity sensitive items of various kinds and in various contexts of use.

A terminological preliminary – I will use the term ‘polarity-sensitive expression’ (PSE) for the class of elements, like *duine ar bith* in (2), whose interpretation and distribution depends on the polarity of the environment in which they find themselves. This is the superset which includes both negative polarity items (NPI’s) and what I will call ‘inherently negative expressions’ (INE’s) as subsets. What I will call INE’s are the elements called in different discussions ‘*n*-words’ or ‘negative indefinites’ or ‘negative quantifiers’ – elements like English *nothing* or *nobody*, which in some languages and varieties stand alone to express negation and in others must or may enter into negative concord dependencies to express negation.

2. THE LANDSCAPE OF POLARITY-SENSITIVE ELEMENTS. In presenting the contrast between Irish (2) and English (1), I glossed the Irish *aon rud* as English ‘any thing’. If I had instead chosen to use ‘no thing’ as the gloss, I could have created the impression that there was no theoretical or typological anomaly to be addressed, since many languages allow negative indefinites to function as fragment answers. The glossing decision, then, in this case mirrors an important theoretical issue. Consider the pair of Irish examples in (4):

- (4) a. Ní-or iarr duine ar bith orm é.
 C.NEG-PAST ask.PAST person any on.me it
 ‘Nobody asked me for it.’
 b. *D’ iarr duine ar bith orm é.
 PAST ask.PAST person any on.me it

From (4b) we know that *duine ar bith* cannot express negation (and is in fact ill-formed) outside an appropriate licensing context. In (4a), however, it appears in such a context – that determined by the clause-initial negation; (4a) is therefore well-formed, and the meaning it expresses is that given in the English translation. It appears then that *duine ar bith* in (4) must be either a negative polarity item or an inherently negative expression participating in a system of negative concord (see Labov (1972), Laka (1990), Haegeman & Zanuttini (1991), Ladusaw (1992), Zanuttini (1997), Zeijlstra (2004, 2008, 2016), Penka & Zeijlstra (2010), Giannakidou & Zeijlstra (2017), Deal (2022) among many others). Given the possibility of (2), only the second interpretation is consistent with the received wisdom concerning fragment answers. To maintain consistency with received wisdom, one must apparently assume that *duine ar bith* (and many similar expressions which we will encounter shortly) are not NPI’s but are rather negative concord items. But Paolo Acquaviva (1996) has argued that Irish (like, for instance, Māori²) has no INE’s. If he is right, it follows *a fortiori* that Irish cannot be a negative concord language. And it follows in turn that *duine ar bith* in (4) and *aon rud* in the fragment answer of (2) must be NPI’s like English ‘anyone’ or ‘anything’ and the apparent conflict with typological and theoretical expectation is real.

It is important, then, to determine whether the pattern in (4) reflects a negative concord system or an NPI-centered system, and the first business of the present paper will be to address that question. Making such a distinction, though, is not as straightforward as it once seemed to be – the empirical and theoretical landscapes seem more intricate than they once did (see, for instance,

²See (Bauer, 1997: p. 298-9, §19.5): ‘Negative quantifiers do not exist in Maori. Sentence negation or other lexical means are used.’ Mandarin, Korean and Bengali are also reported to lack such expressions (see Zeijlstra (2008: 15)).

Laka (1993) and especially Herburger (2001)). My contention in this paper, though, is that all of the polarity-sensitive expressions of Irish are NPI's. That is, Acquaviva was correct about the absence of inherently negative expressions in the language and the theoretical questions raised by (2) are real.

Two convictions drive the discussion throughout. The first is that the distribution of NPI's is determined by fundamentally semantic and pragmatic relations (Fauconnier (1975, 1979), Ladusaw (1979), Heim (1984), Kadmon & Landman (1993), Krifka (1995), Zwarts (1996), van der Wouden (1994, 1997), Giannakidou (1998), Lahiri (1998), von Stechow (1999), Hoeksema (2000), Gajewski (2005, 2011), Guerzoni & Sharvit (2007), Homer (2011: Chap. 2), Chierchia (2013), Crnič (2014), Gajewski & Hsieh (2014), Barker (2018), Crnič (2019), Homer (2021), Jeong & Roelefsen (2023)). The second is that, while negative concord items may well be strong NPI's in their semantics, the subsystem which licenses them has an uneliminable syntactic component, which includes requirements of relative prominence, locality and featural interaction computed over syntactic representations. This is why analyses in terms of the operation AGREE have been so influential and seemed so persuasive in recent years (see Zeijlstra (2008) and recent exchanges among Zeijlstra (2012), Preminger & Polinsky (2015), Bjorkman & Zeijlstra (2019) and Deal (2022)).

2.1. THE INVENTORY OF POLARITY-SENSITIVE EXPRESSIONS. We can begin by trying to establish what the inventory of polarity-sensitive expressions in Irish is. The element *tada*, as illustrated in (5), is one such.

- (5) a. Ní-or ith mé tada ar maidin.
 C.NEG-PAST eat.PAST I anything/nothing on morning
 'I didn't eat anything this morning.' 'I ate nothing this morning.'
 b. *D' ith mé tada ar maidin.
 PAST eat.PAST I anything/nothing on morning

Tada (and its dialectal variants *dada* and *dadaidh*) is one of a large class of elements united by shared distributional properties and a shared interpretive profile. Like *tada* in (5), they express existential quantification in the scope of sentential negation. I will call these 'polarity-sensitive expressions' for now, but the intention is to establish that they are negative polarity items, as they must be if Acquaviva's (1996) hypothesis is correct. I will present examples below in which the candidate elements are in the scope of sentential negation. Readers should assume that the corresponding example without negation is ungrammatical. This is true for almost every case considered. Elements for which it is not true will be discussed in section 2.3 below.

The class of PSE's of this type includes nominals and adverbs of temporal perspective. The nominal group in turn includes two subtypes – a class of monomorphemic lexical items which stand alone and a set of functional elements which appear as subparts of complex nominals. One element of the latter type is the prepositional phrase *ar bith* (diachronically or literally 'in the world' or 'in existence') which we have already encountered in (2) and (4). This is a post-nominal modifier which may attach to an indefinite in the scope of sentential negation. Note that since negation is high in Irish (marked on *c* in finite clauses), elements in subject position will always be in the semantic scope and in the syntactic domain of negation when it is present (Acquaviva

(1996), Duffield (1995), McCloskey (1996, 2001, 2017)).^{3 4}

- (6) a. Ní-or thóg bean ar bith de na mná seo riamh an fiabhras.
C.NEG-PAST take.PAST woman any of the women DEMON ever the fever
‘None of these women ever contracted fever.’ GOG 132
- b. Níl taibhsí ar bith ann agus ní raibh ariamh.
is-not ghosts any in-it and C.NEG be.PAST (n)ever
‘There are no ghosts and there never were.’ COC 156

The numeral *aon* (‘one’), in addition, can be used to determine polarity-sensitive nominals and in this use (and only in this use) it may compose with mass nouns.

- (7) a. Ní-or dúradh aon chuid de seo riamh go hoscailte
C.NEG-PAST say.PAST.IMPERS one part of this (n)ever openly
‘No part of this was ever said openly’ PNG 187
- b. Ní-or thugais aon ghrá ceart riamh dom
C.NEG-PAST give.PAST.S2 one love proper (n)ever to-me
‘You never gave me any proper love.’ ANNF 59
- c. Ní bhfuair tú aon scéala ó na gasúir go fóill?
C.NEG get.PAST you one news from the boys yet
‘You didn’t get any news from the boys yet?’ MABAT 31
- d. Ní-or theastaigh aon achrann ón athair
C.NEG-PAST want.PAST one quarrel from-the father
‘The father didn’t want any trouble.’ CPCC 36

Éinne (in western and southern varieties) is a fusion of *aon* with the noun *duine* ‘person’:

- (8) Ní-or labhair éinne ariamh liom.
C.NEG-PAST speak.PAST anyone (n)ever with-me
‘Nobody ever spoke to me.’

Among the elements which seem to lack any internal structure are *tada/dada*, *faic*, and *a dhath*,

³All of the items to be discussed in this section also (and unsurprisingly) appear in the scope of the emphatic or ‘demonic’ negation studied by Ó Siadhail (1989: 326-331) and especially by D’Antuono (2023). In this construction a phrase is fronted to a position immediately to the right of the emphatic negators *diabhal* (‘devil’) or *dheamhan* (‘demon’) and the clause out of which the phrase is extracted is headed by the WH-complementizer. PSE’s may be fronted (as in (i)) or appear in a clause-internal position (as in (ii)):

- (i) Dheamhan freagra ar bith a thug sí orm.
demon answer any C.WH give.PAST she on.me
‘Not an answer did she give me.’ AA 240
- (ii) Diabhal duine a thug aon aird orm.
devil person C.WH give.PAST any attention on.me
‘Not a person paid any attention to me.’ DGD 79

⁴Corpus examples are indicated by a tag consisting of an abbreviation of the title (in the case of published texts) followed by a number indicating the page from which the example was extracted. The abbreviations used in these tags are explained in Appendix Two.

all of which correspond to English ‘anything’ or ‘nothing’.⁵

- (9) a. ní dúrt faic
C.NEG say.PAST.S1 anything
‘I didn’t say anything.’ AGFC 181
- b. ní léann siad tada.
C.NEG read.PRES they anything
‘they don’t read anything’ ACED 267
- c. ní ba léir dó a dhath ariamh
C.NEG COP.PAST clear to-him anything (n)ever
‘Nothing was ever clear to him.’ GFH 102

In Munster dialects, the element *puinn* is also available. It can appear pre-nominally as in (10a), or alone, as in (10b), in the meaning ‘at all’ or ‘much’:

- (10) a. Ní-or fhág puinn bád riamh an t-oileán seo.
C.NEG-PAST leave.PAST any boat ever the island DEMON
‘No boat ever left this island’ CFC 129
- b. ní fhaca puinn ina dhiaidh sin é
C.NEG see.PAST.S1 after that him
‘I didn’t see him much at all after that.’ LGL 421

The polarity-sensitive adverbs are adverbs of temporal perspective like *(a)riamh* (‘ever, still’), *choíche*, *go brách*, *go deo* (‘ever, forever’). We have already encountered *ariamh* (see (6a), (6b), (7a), (7b), (9c) and (10a)). The others are exemplified in (11).

- (11) a. cuirimse de gheasa ort gan aon fhear a choíche a phósadh
put.PRES.S1 of injunctions on-YOU NEG.NONFIN any man ever marry.NON-FIN
‘I put you under an injunction not to ever marry any man.’ SRNF 49
- b. ní-or mhaith leis a bheith go deo ag caint air féin
C.NEG-PAST good with.him be.NON-FIN ever PROG talk on.him REFL.LOG
‘He didn’t like to ever be talking about himself’ LG 109

Within this group there is also an extensive catalog of expressions conventionally taken to denote the lowest possible point on some scale – so-called ‘minimizers’. *Smid* (‘breath’) refers to the tiniest sound audible, *deor* (‘drop’) to the smallest imaginable quantity of a liquid, *ceo* (‘mist’) to the most insubstantial thing, while *pioc* (‘a pick’) refers to the smallest measure imaginable.

- (12) a. ach ní-or labhair sé smid leofa
but C.NEG-PAST speak.PAST he breath with-them
‘But he didn’t breathe a word to them.’ SIF 33

⁵Such elements, while themselves monomorphemic, can be ‘strengthened’ by addition of *ar bith* or minimizers of the type to be considered in the subsection which follows:

- (i) Ní-or ghá dóibh tada ar bith beo eile a dhéanamh aríst go deo.
C.NEG-PAST need to-them nothing any alive other do.NON-FIN again ever
‘They never had to do a single solitary thing ever again.’ AFAP 33

- b. Ní-or chaoin sé deoir ariamh ina shaol.
C.NEG-PAST cry.PAST he drop ever in-his life
'He never shed a tear in his life.' GDDR 166
- c. Ach ní-or fhéad sé ceo a dhéanamh.
but C.NEG-PAST can.PAST he mist do.NON-FIN
'But he couldn't do a thing.' CC 79
- d. Níl pioc fírinne i n-a cheann.
is-not pick truth.GEN in his head
'He is incapable of telling the truth.' BTFS 124

An Irish idiosyncrasy is that many such elements are conventionalized disjunctions:

- (13) a. ní-or ghéill sí ionga ná orlach don chiúnas
C.NEG-PAST yield.PAST she finger-nail or inch to-the silence
'She didn't yield an inch to the silence.'
- b. ní thabharfadh duine ná deoraí freagra air.
C.NEG give.COND person or exile/stranger answer on-him
'Not a soul would answer him.'
- c. ní raibh tásc ná tuairisc ar an chainteoir
C.NEG-PAST be.PAST sign or report on the speaker
'There wasn't a sign or a trace of the speaker.'
- d. ní-or chorrúigheadar lámh ná cos ariamh ar a son
C.NEG-PAST move.PASTP3 hand or foot ever on-their-behalf
'They didn't ever lift a finger on their behalf.'
- e. ní-or fhág sé bonn bán ná pingin rua ag a clann sise
C.NEG-PAST leave.PAST he coin white or penny red at her family she
'But he didn't leave a penny to her family.' CTP 4

There are certain other minimizers which should be mentioned as well. The prepositional phrase *dá laghad* ('of the least') acting as a post-nominal modifier may create one such:

- (14) níl aird dá laghad aici ar an mbeirt
is-not attention of-the least at-her on the two-people
'She doesn't pay the slightest attention to the two of them.'

And in a slightly more colorful turn of phrase, we have the phrase *faic na fríde*. *Faic* is the monomorphemic element already discussed in this section, meaning 'nothing' or 'anything'. When modified by the possessor *na fríde* ('of the mite') it signifies 'the slightest/tiniest thing':

- (15) Níl faic na fríde le déanamh acu.
is-not to do.VN at.them
'They have nothing whatever to do.'

Some minimizers, finally, are based on inexplicable metaphors. In the Irish of Conamara, for example, the expression *mac an éin bheo* ('the son of the living bird') refers to the smallest possible set of people:

- (16) ní raibh mac an éin bheo le feiceáil an tráth sin de mhaidin
 C.NEG be.PAST son the bird.GEN living.GEN ASP see.VN the time DEMON of morning
 ‘There wasn’t a single solitary person to be seen at that time of the morning.’

There will be little or nothing in this inventory to surprise those who have closely studied negative polarity systems in other languages.

2.2. BEYOND NEGATION – THE LICENSING ENVIRONMENTS. We have so far considered just one environment in which the PSE’s described in the previous section may appear – in the scope of sentential negation. But their distribution is in fact much broader. All of them, for instance, also appear in the scope of semi-negative expressions such as ‘rarely’ or ‘hardly’ – which in Irish are predicates that select clausal complements (nonfinite as in (17), or finite as in (18)):

- (17) Is rí-annamh anois éinne acu a theacht abhaile.
 COP.PRES very-rare now anyone of.them come.NON-FIN home
 ‘It’s very rare now for any of them to come home.’
- (18) a. Ar éigean a bheas tada le déanamh agat
 hardly C be.FUT anything PTC do.NON-FIN at.you
 ‘You’ll have hardly anything to do.’ AA 215
- b. Is beag a shíl éinne don mbeirt againn gu- rb é an slán
 COP.PRES little C think.PAST anyone of.the two of.us C COP.COND it the farewell
 deireanach againn é
 final at.us it
 ‘Little did either of us think that it would be our last farewell.’ TUAIR 10-05-22

The PSE’s we are concerned with appear in fact in a broad range of environments, all of them characteristic of those in which NPI’s in other languages appear. Documenting this pattern and its breadth is important work, but it makes for tedious reading. I have therefore gathered the relevant data in Appendix One. What is shown there is that the relevant items, with their characteristic existential interpretations, are licensed in the following range of environments:

- In polar questions
- In WH-questions (when rhetorical or when demanding exhaustive, as opposed to partial, answers)
- In conditional clauses (realis and irrealis)
- In equative clauses
- In comparative and superlative clauses
- In phrases and clauses introduced by the degree particle *ró*- (‘too’)
- In certain temporal clauses (introduced by *sul* (‘before’) or *nuair* (‘when’))
- In the complement of adversative (and some implicative) predicates
- In the restrictive clauses of universal quantification structures

This is a list which is familiar from decades of research on NPI’s. Appendix One documents this distribution and also considers some particularities of the Irish patterns, having to do especially with the licensing potential of adversative and negative implicative predicates.

Irish PSE’s may in fact appear in an additional environment which has not so far been identified (as far as I have been able to tell) for NPI’s in other languages – in clauses introduced by (the

equivalent of) *to the extent that*. This is illustrated in (19):

- (19) a. To the extent that anyone ever believed this ...
 b. sa mhéid is gu-r chuir mé aithne ar bith air
 in-the extent as C-PAST put.PAST I acquaintance any on.him
 ‘to the extent that I got to know him at all’ LSC 130

The licensing-potential of such a context presumably arises from the implication of doubt or of disbelief that it conveys concerning the content of the complement clause.

In sum: there is a strikingly complete and exact parallel between the distribution of PSE’s in Irish and the distributional patterns characteristic of NPI’s in other languages.

And although real progress has been made in recent years on the question of what this broad range of environments might have in common in terms of their semantics (for overviews, see Giannakidou (2011), Chierchia (2013), or Homer (2020)), the task of identifying any plausible syntactic commonality, one that might provide the basis for an agreement or concord relation, seems very challenging.

2.3. AVAILABLE READINGS. It is a well-known, if not well-understood, property of NPI-systems that a subset of the NPI’s of a language may appear outside the licensing environments just listed – but with quasi-universal (or perhaps generic) rather than existential force. These are the so-called ‘free choice’ readings of certain NPI’s (Bolinger (1972), Horn (1989: 400 ff), Horn (2000), Chierchia (2013: Chap. 6)). Roughly half of the 115 languages in Haspelmath’s (1997) sample allow this option for some of their negative polarity items. Irish can be added to that sample. The ill-formed (5b) above, for example, is well-formed if the main verb is in conditional mood:

- (20) D’ íosfadh sé tada.
 PAST eat.COND he anything
 ‘He’d eat anything.’

Among the PSE’s, all but the minimizers allow such readings. The facilitating environments are the familiar ones – modal contexts (as in (20)) or the presence of a restrictive modifier such as a relative clause modifying the PSE (‘subtriggering’ in the sense of LeGrand (1975)). This possibility is exemplified for the nominal PSE’s in (21) and in (22). (21) illustrates the modal environment (generic in (21b)); those in (22) illustrate the ‘subtriggering’ effect.

- (21) a. Ceann de na hoícheanta sin go dtarlódh faic
 one of the nights DEMON C happen.COND anything
 ‘one of those nights when anything could happen’ LG 250
 b. maidir le daoine bochta, tá rud ar bith sách maith dóibh
 as-for people poor be.PRES thing any enough good for-them
 ‘As for poor people – anything is good enough for them.’ CG 59
 c. Dhéanfainn rud ar bith ach tusa a fháil domh féin
 do.COND.S1 thing any but you VCE get.VN to.me REFL.LOG
 ‘I’d do anything to get you for myself.’ SSOTC 222
- (22) a. Rud ar bith a tugadh ar iasacht domsa ariamh thug mé ar ais é.
 thing any C give.PAST.IMPERS on loan to-me ever give.PAST I back it
 ‘Anything that I was ever lent, I gave it back.’ AA 90

- b. Aon áit a chuais, ní raibh aon ní á labhairt ach Gaolainn.
 one/any place C GO.PAST.S2 C.NEG-PAST be.PAST any thing PROG.PASS speak but Irish
 ‘Any place you went, there wasn’t anything being spoken but Irish.’ TMGB 39

The temporal adverbials (*a)riamh*, *go brách*, *go deo* and *choíche* (‘ever’) may, in addition, appear outside the licensing environments just discussed and in that context they have universal rather than existential force and translate English ‘always’ or ‘forever’:

- (23) a. Bhí sé ariamh ann.
 be.PAST it ever in.it
 ‘It has always existed.’ FF 167
- b. An sileann tú go bhfuil tú ag imeacht go brách uainn?
 C.Q think.PRES you C be.PRES you PROG leave.VN forever from.us
 ‘Do you think you are leaving us for ever?’ ATFS 207
- c. Bhíodh clocha i nGleann Easa riamh agus beidh go deo.
 be.PAST.HABIT stones in ever and be.FUT always
 ‘There have always been stones in Gleann Easa and there always will be.’ DEAD 96
- d. Beidh cuimhne choíche agam air.
 be.FUT memory ever at.me on.it
 ‘I will always remember it.’ OMGS 290

The two meanings expressed by these adverbs are at least close to those expressed by NPI’s and their ‘free choice’ counterparts. In addition, both interpretations (existential in NPI-licensing contexts, universal otherwise) are available across the class, suggesting that something more systematic than lexical polysemy is at work. It may be, then, that the possibilities seen in (23) reflect a ‘free choice’ option for certain NPI’s. These universal readings, however, are not subject to the licensing restrictions observed for the determiner NPI’s such as English *any* (LeGrand (1975), Kadmon & Landman (1993), Dayal (1998, 2013), Giannakidou (2001), Chierchia (2013: Chap. 6)), for which modality or genericity seems to be crucial, neither of which is relevant for (23).

It might, alternatively, be more profitable to think about cases such as (23) in the context of work on *until* in English (and related items in other European languages), an item which, with its complement, forms a strong NPI in its punctual use:

- (24) a. He didn’t finish the paper until July.
 b. *He finished the paper until July.

but which in the context of atelic predications is a positive polarity item expressing extension over relatively long intervals (Karttunen (1974), Mittwoch (1977), Giannakidou (1992), Declerck (1995), de Swart (1996), and especially Condoravdi (2008)):

- (25) We remained in Cambridge until the end of the year.

The connection here is that the non-NPI readings of the temporal adverbs in (23) also appear only in the context of atelic predications.⁶ Needless to say, this discussion is little more than a marker laid down for a future research-project.

⁶The same restriction seems to hold for the more or less archaic use of English *ever* when universal in its force (on which see Israel (1998), Horn (2000: 181-3)).

2.4. NON-LOCAL LICENSING. One of the principal themes of research on negative concord systems has been that of locality. To a first approximation, the concord relation may not cross a finite clause boundary unless it is subjunctive (Haegeman & Zanuttini (1991), Zeijlstra (2008: 43-45), Deal (2022)).⁷ This is why analyses of the concord relation in terms of agreement or movement, with their associated locality requirements, have been persuasive and influential. The licensing of PSE's in Irish, however, is subject to no such restriction, as shown by examples like those in (26)-(28), which are commonplace and frequent (304 in our data-set).

- (26) a. Ní-or chualas gu-r mharaigh na tramanna duine ar bith ariamh.
C.NEG-PAST hear.PAST.S1 C.PAST kill.PAST the trams person any ever
'I haven't heard that the trams ever killed anyone.' CTP 49
- b. má cheapann sibh go bhfuil mise ag déanamh aon fhocal bréige
if think.PRES you.PL C be.PRES I PROG make.VN any word lie.GEN
'if you think that I am telling any lies' MABAT 56
- c. An sileann tú go dtiocfadh le cailín ar bith grá mar sin a thabhairt uaithe?
C.Q think.PRES you C could girl any love like that VCE give.VN from.her
'Do you think that any girl could give such love?' ATFS 343

In each of the cases in (26), the licensing element (negation, the conditional complementizer in (26b) or the polar interrogative particle in (26c)) is separated from the licensed PSE by at least one finite CP-boundary. Longer dependencies are also possible, as in (27). In (27a), the licensed PSE is separated from its licensing negation by two finite clause boundaries, one of them the complement to the experiencer noun *súil* (hope); in (27b) the licensing environment is established by the noun *eagla* (fear), which is adversative and licenses PSE's in its complement.

- (27) a. Ní hamhlaidh [_{CP} a tá súil agam [_{CP} go dtiocfadh éinne anois]].
COP.NEG SO C be.PRES hope at.me C come.FUT anyone now
'It is not the case that I really expect that anyone will come now.' LGL 60
- b. ar eagla [_{CP} go gceapadh sé [_{CP} go raibh duine ar bith díobh chomh díthcéillí]]
on fear C think.COND he C be.PAST person any of.them so foolish
'for fear that he would think that any of them were so foolish' ATIM 90

The licensing relation can also span at least some island-boundaries, as seen in (28) – a WH-island in (28a)⁸ and in (28b) a finite CP-argument of the noun *cuma* ('appearance'). Such structures are strong islands in Irish (McCloskey (1985, 2002), Maki & Ó Baoill (2011).)

- (28) a. cha-r fhoghlaim mé ariamh cén dóigh le rud ar bith a tharraingt.
C.NEG-PAST learn.PAST I ever what way with thing any VCE draw.VN
'I didn't ever learn how to draw anything.' APB 12
- b. ní raibh cuma uirthi go raibh eagla ar bith roimh an astar uirthi
C.NEG be.PAST appearance on.her C be.PAST fear any before the journey on.her
'It didn't look as if she had any fear of the journey.' NLAB 54

⁷For complications, exceptions and for approaches to those issues, see, for example, Robinson & Thoms (2021).

⁸For (28a) one might wonder whether the PSE is licensed in the interrogative clause itself rather than by the matrix negation. This is not a plausible interpretation, though, given that the WH-interrogative is neither rhetorical nor exhaustive. In addition, the example is ill-formed when the matrix negation is removed.

2.5. MODIFICATION BY ALMOST. Finally: all PSE's in Irish strongly resist modification by *almost*, a property which in many languages distinguishes NPI's from inherently negative expressions:

- (29) a. *Ní raibh comhair a bheith duine ar bith i láthair.
 C.NEG-PAST be.PAST almost person any present
 ‘There was almost nobody present.’
 b. *Ní dhéanainn freastal ar chomhair a bheith léacht ar bith.
 C.NEG-PAST do.PAST.HABIT.S1 attendance on almost lecture any
 ‘I attended almost no lectures.’

2.6. INTERIM CONCLUSION. The items surveyed in section 2.1, then, while being polarity-sensitive, (i) cannot express negation outside an appropriate licensing environment, (ii) appear in the broad range of environments characteristic of weak NPI's, (iii) support quasi-universal readings outside those environments, (iv) can be licensed non-locally, even across certain island boundaries, and (v) are incompatible with modification by *almost*. All of this suggests that – as Acquaviva (1996) already argued – Irish possesses a rich and familiar inventory of negative polarity items but no plausible candidate for the role of INE. It therefore also lacks the mechanisms of negative concord⁹ and our PSE's are negative polarity items.¹⁰ From this point on, then, I will abandon the neutral term PSE, and call all of the items discussed here negative polarity items (NPI's).

In light of that conclusion, though, the observations of the section which follows seem unpleasantly anomalous.

3. THE ANOMALY. Each of the polarity-sensitive elements described in section 2.1 may appear in apparent isolation as a subsentential fragment – often as a fragment answer to a WH-question (as in the examples of (30)) or to a polar question (as in the examples of (31)). See also example (2) above.¹¹

- (30) NPI'S AS FRAGMENT ANSWERS TO WH-QUESTIONS:
 a. ‘Céard a tá uait?’ ‘Tada, a Mháistir.’
 what C be.PRES from.you anything, VOC-PTC Master
 ‘What do you want?’ ‘Nothing, sir.’

LL 254

⁹In other work I have argued that Irish does in fact have a limited kind of ‘negative concord’, if by that pre-theoretical term we mean only agreement between the expression of sentential negation and another element. As noted already, negation is expressed on *c* in Irish finite clauses; McCloskey (2017) argues that the negative feature on *c* is semantically inert but enters into an agreement relation with a semantically potent polarity head lower in the extended clausal projection – an analysis that I remain committed to. In the absence of a set of negative indefinites and adverbs, of course, there is no conflict between this analysis and the claim that Irish lacks a system of ‘negative concord’ – as the term has been conventionally understood

¹⁰Elena Herburger (2001) develops an important analysis of the distribution of polarity-sensitive expressions in Spanish, another case in which the distinction between NPI's and INE's seems less than clear. She shows that that complex of data can be accounted for on the assumption that the relevant PSE's in Spanish are systematically ambiguous between being NPI's and items lexically specified as being ‘negative’. Her analysis is remarkably successful, but it cannot be applied to the problems we deal with in the following section. In Spanish, the class of elements Herburger examines can always express negation on their own, so to speak (because they are inherently negative expressions). But that is not possible for the class of Irish elements we are concerned with here, as we have seen with examples like (5b) above. Put differently, the set of contexts in which the ‘*n*-words’ of Spanish may appear is the union of the distributions of NPI's and what I have called here INE's – a distribution much broader than that of the Irish PSE's we are concerned with.

¹¹Gary Thoms reports that similar facts hold for Scots Gaelic.

- b. ‘Agus caidé a ghní tú leis na réaltógaí?’ ‘Rud ar bith. Is liomsa iad.’
and what C do you with the stars thing any COP.PRES with.me them
‘And what do you do with the stars?’ ‘Nothing. They belong to me.’ APB 47¹²
- c. ‘Cad a dúirt an sagart?’ ‘Aon rud,’ arsa mise.
what C say.PAST the priest any thing said I
‘What did the priest say?’ ‘Nothing,’ I said. CHD 57
- d. ach cé labhrann liom í? Éinne ach do leithéidse.
but who speak.PRES with-me it anyone but your like
‘but who speaks it to me? Nobody except the likes of you.’ TMGB 252
- (31) NPI’S AS FRAGMENT ANSWERS TO POLAR QUESTIONS:
- a. ‘An ndéanfaidh aon duine m’ áit-sa duit?’ ‘Go deo.’
C.Q make.FUT any person my place for.you ever
‘Will anyone ever take my place for you?’ ‘Never.’ ATFS 488
- b. ‘A’ bhfuil rud ar bith a ba mhaith leat a rá liom?’ ‘Faic na fríde.’
C.Q be.PRES thing any C you-would-like VCE say.VN with.me
‘Is there anything you’d like to say to me?’ ‘Nothing whatsoever.’ AM 170
- c. ‘An bhfaigheadh na scéalaithe aon díolaíocht?’ ‘Aon rud in aon chor.’
C.Q get.PAST.HABIT the storytellers any payment any thing at-all
‘Would the storytellers get any payment?’ ‘Nothing at all.’ AL 88

It is maybe worth emphasizing that the answers in (30) and (31) are in no way strained. They do not require heavy contextualization, nor do they demand accommodation. They are routine, and as far as I am aware there is no alternative way to express such answers (fully articulated clauses aside).

There are additional contexts in which such NPI fragments appear – contexts that do not, in an obvious way at least, involve question-answer pairings. We will return to those cases and their implications, but the apparent dilemmas are already clear. If the arguments developed so far in this paper are to be relied upon, bare NPI’s may function as fragment answers in Irish. But there is very strong evidence from a range of languages already studied that NPI’s cannot serve as fragment answers. In fact, this has come to be recognized as one of the most reliable diagnostics for distinguishing between NPI’s and inherently negative expressions. As Penka & Zeijlstra (2010: 778) put it:

The ability to contribute negation in fragmentary answers can thus be regarded as a defining property of negative indefinites, distinguishing them from NPIs (cf Bernini and Ramat 1996 and Haspelmath 1997).

We might, in the face of this dilemma, reject the arguments of the first half of this paper and conclude that all Irish polarity sensitive expressions are actually negative indefinites. My own assessment (unsurprisingly) is that this would not be a wise move and in the remainder of the paper, I propose an analysis which preserves those earlier results, while also preserving the basic integrity of the generalization articulated by Penka and Zeijlstra. The proposed resolution is, I think, well-supported by evidence internal to Irish and has some interesting implications. The questions which need to be addressed in such a resolution are these:

¹²Example (30b) is from a translation of *Le Petit Prince* by Antoine de Sainte-Exupéry. The French original has: *Et que fais-tu de ces étoiles? Rien. Je les possède.*

- How can the fragments in (30)–(31) be well-formed outside the licensing context that they otherwise require?
- How can such examples have the interpretations that they in fact do – in the absence of that crucial licensing environment?
- Why are the mechanisms that underlie the possibility in (30)–(31), whatever they may be, unavailable in the other languages so far examined?

The answer to all of these questions, I believe, is that Irish has a movement rule whose very particular properties are crucial in permitting the possibilities on display in (30)–(31).

4. THE RESOLUTION.

4.1. NARRATIVE FRONTING. Ó Siadhail (1989: §9.2.2) and McCloskey (1996) discuss a process, named *Narrative Fronting* by Ó Siadhail, by way of which a phrase is moved leftward in a finite clause to a position immediately to the left of the negative complementizer and therefore also to the left of the inflected verb. The process is productive and of high frequency.¹³

A variety of phrase-types may be fronted, but the most frequent pattern is one in which the moved phrase is an indefinite nominal within the scope of the triggering negation. The fronted phrase is nominal in (32), adverbial or prepositional in (33).

(32) NARRATIVE FRONTING IN NEGATIVE CLAUSES:

- | | | |
|----|--|----------------|
| a. | Duine níba réasúnaí ní raibh ann. person more reasonable.COMPR NEG was in-it 'A more reasonable person was there none.' | FF 107 |
| b. | Mo bhéal ní-or oscail mé ar feadh chúig lá. my mouth C.NEG-PAST open.PAST I during five day 'I didn't as much as open my mouth for five days.' | TUAIR 26-04-21 |
| c. | Leabhar gramadaí ní raibh ariamh agam. book grammar.GEN C.NEG-PAST be.PAST ever at.me 'I never had a grammar-book.' | ABHM 41 |

- | | | |
|---------|---|---------|
| (33) a. | Ach díreach ní-or bhreathnaigh sí air but straight C.NEG-PAST look.PAST she on-him 'But straight she didn't look at him.' | C 24 |
| b. | isteach san fháinne ní thiocfaidh sí into in-the ring C.NEG come.FUT she 'Into the ring she will not come.' | SGC 112 |

¹³There is a similar but much less productive process which applies in clauses headed by the complementizer *go* and in which the inflected verb is in subjunctive mood (a form now archaic for almost all speakers). Such clauses express curses (as in (ia)) or blessings (as in (ib)):

- | | | |
|--------|---|--------|
| (i) a. | Na seacht ndiabhal déag go dtuga – leo sibh the seven devil ten C take.SUBJ with.them you.PL 'May the seventeen devils take you!' | CNF 51 |
| b. | ádú agus sonas go raibh – ort luck and happiness C be.SUBJ on-you 'May you have good fortune and happiness.' | SK 104 |

Though superficially similar, it is not clear that the two processes have a common syntax. We will be concerned here only with the very productive negative case.

- c. Go deo ná go bráthach ní scarfamaoid ón a chéile arís
 ever or ever C.NEG separate.FUT.P1 from each-other again
 ‘Never again will we separate from one another.’ IAE 331

Narrative Fronting is optional and the examples of (32) and (33) are truth-conditionally equivalent to the corresponding examples in which it has not applied. (32) and (33), though, are felt to be ‘emphatic’ in a way that their counterparts in which fronting has not applied are not always. The general pattern, then, can be schematized as in (34):

- (34) NARRATIVE FRONTING:
 a. [XP_j _[NEG] C _[FIN] V ... – j ...]
 b. where XP can be any constituent-type but is frequently an indefinite nominal
 c. and the interpretive effect is to express ‘emphatic’ negation.

Narrative Fronting is relevant for us because all of the weak NPI’s and minimizers surveyed earlier appear freely and frequently in the XP-position of (34a). The examples in (35) illustrate this fact for the weak NPI’s; those in (36) for the minimizers.

- (35) WEAK NPI’S IN NARRATIVE FRONTING:
 a. Cearta ar bith ní raibh – ag gnáthdhaoine
 rights any C.NEG be.PAST at ordinary-people
 ‘Ordinary people had no rights.’ ABHM 53
 b. Aon mhoill ní-or dhein Cromail –
 any delay C.NEG-PAST make.PAST Cromwell
 ‘Cromwell made no delay.’/ ‘No delay did Cromwell make.’ OOGC 199
 c. Ach tada ní raibh sé in ann – a chloisteáil
 but anything NEG be.PAST he able hear.NON-FIN
 ‘But nothing was he able to hear.’ SJSJ 55
 d. Go deo arís ní dhéanfadh fear amadán – dom
 ever again C.NEG make.COND man fool of-me
 ‘Never again would a man make a fool of me.’ LG 158
 e. Éinne de na comharsain ní cheannódh é.
 anyone of the neighbors C.NEG buy.COND it
 ‘None of the neighbors would buy it.’ BM 197
- (36) MINIMIZERS IN NARRATIVE FRONTING:
 a. Faic na fríde ní bhfuair mé – mar fhreagra.
 the-tiniest-thing C.NEG get.PAST I as answer
 ‘I didn’t get the tiniest thing as an answer.’ PAA 24
 b. Smid ní -l – ann faoi Tone.
 breath C.NEG be.PRES in.it about
 ‘There’s absolutely nothing in it about Tone.’ TH 121
 c. pioc eagla ní raibh – ar an tiománaí
 pick fear C.NEG be.PAST on the driver
 ‘The driver wasn’t the tiniest bit afraid.’ DR 15

- d. deoir ní-or chaoín sé – .
 drop C.NEG-PAST weep.PAST he
 ‘He didn’t cry a single tear.’ LL 118
- e. Le mac an éin bheo níor sceith ceachtar againn ár rún.
 with son the bird.GEN living C.NEG-PAST expose.PAST either of.us our secret
 ‘Neither of us revealed our secret to a single living soul.’ LL 437

It is not just that weak NPI’s *may* undergo Narrative Fronting; they clearly have a particular affinity for the environment created in (34), as is shown by the fact that in 43% of the attested examples of Narrative Fronting in our database (196 of 486), the element fronted is an NPI. Among these, minimizers are particularly frequent – they represent 41% (80 of 196) of all the examples in which NPI’s are fronted under Narrative Fronting.

There is something, then, about the environment of Narrative Fronting that particularly favors NPI’s and there is something about NPI’s (minimizers especially) which makes them particularly susceptible to fronting in this context. This is one of a number of observations suggesting that the two phenomena are deeply entangled. What is the nature of that entanglement though?

The ‘emphatic’ character of Narrative Fronting seems to have its source, at least in part, in that the structure in (34) evokes scalar implicatures of a familiar kind. That is, they evoke alternatives to the proposition expressed – alternatives ranked on a scale of strength, which depends partly on the discourse context and on information shared among interlocutors, but also on the relative informational strength of alternatives, as measured by asymmetric entailment relations. Such ranked alternatives, implicitly evoked, have been central to theoretical work in pragmatics and semantics for many years. In that light consider the examples of (37)

- (37) a. Acht sagart amháin ní tháinig de chóir fhéasta an Rí
 but priest one C.NEG come.PAST near feast the king
 ‘But not a single priest came near the king’s feast.’ UMI 13
- b. míle fear ní bhainfeadh feacadh aisti as a háit
 thousand men C.NEG take.COND movement out-of.it from its place
 ‘A thousand men couldn’t budge it from its place’ (a large rock) ATT 34

In (37a) the alternatives evoked have to do with the number of priests who had attended the king’s feast – a set of propositions of the form: ‘*n* priests did not attend the king’s feast’ ordered by the value of *n*. The asserted proposition is that the lowest number possible (namely none at all) attended. That is also the strongest proposition among the evoked alternatives since it entails all of the others (if it is not the case that one priest attended, then it is not the case that two attended, or that three attended, or four or ...). The proposition expressed is therefore the logically strongest and the most informationally specific of the alternative-set. In (37b), the alternative propositions evoked are of the form: ‘*n* men could not move that rock’ and those propositions are ranked by the value of *n* from one thousand down as far as one. The strongest proposition on that scale (in the sense of entailing all of the others and of being, again, informationally more specific) is the one asserted to be true (if it is impossible for one thousand men to dislodge the rock, it is impossible for 900 to do so and also 800 and so on downwards). The meaning ultimately conveyed, then, is that the rock is likely impossible to dislodge. In both cases the proposition actually expressed is presented as being at the extreme high-point of a scale of salient alternatives. This is the standard logic of scalar implicatures. It seems reasonable, then, to assume that Narrative

Fronting is a syntactic operation which attracts to the XP-position of (34) constituents that evoke alternatives.¹⁴ (38) revises (34) accordingly:

- (38) NARRATIVE FRONTING:
- a. $[XP_j \quad C \quad V \quad \dots - j \dots]$
 $\quad \quad \quad [NEG] \quad [FIN]$
 - b. where XP is alternative-evoking.

If it is the case that the fronted phrase in (38) must be alternative-evoking, an additional property of Narrative Fronting falls into place. That phrase is very often modified by the focus-particle *féin*. *Féin* is a phrase-final focus-marker whose meaning is close to that of English ‘even’:

- (39) *bhí an madra féin fachtha mífhóighneach.*
 be.PAST the dog *féin* gotten impatient
 ‘Even the dog had become impatient.’ GSA 19

This particle appears very frequently with the fronted phrase in Narrative Fronting examples:

- (40) a. *An toirneach féin ní dhúiseodh Johnny.*
 the thunder *féin* C.NEG waken.COND
 ‘Even thunder wouldn’t waken Johnny.’ C 17
- b. *An fhuiseog féin ní raibh ina suí.*
 the lark *féin* C.NEG be.PAST awake
 ‘Even the lark wasn’t awake.’ AN 43

This is an expected possibility given (38) because the effect of suffixing *féin* to some phrase XP is exactly to turn XP into an alternative-evoking expression. In the case of (40b), for instance, the alternative propositions evoked have to do with what creatures were up and about that morning. Given conventional ideas about bird life-styles, the lark will always be the earliest creature awake and the proposition that the lark was not awake therefore entails all of the alternative propositions evoked (the fox was not awake; the hare was not awake; the curlew was not awake ...). What is ultimately conveyed, then, is that it was really unusually early in the morning.

All such example-types convey that the proposition expressed is at the upper limit (in being maximally informative) of some scale of relevant alternatives and is therefore outside the range of conventional norms and expectations. Such assertions then evoke in hearers a sense of surprise or unexpectedness. Appeal to such alternatives, then, may be enough to account for the ‘emphatic’ character of Narrative Fronting examples – they are scalar assertions in Krifka’s (1995) sense.

¹⁴I do not assume that expressions which are alternative-evoking are ‘F-marked’ in the sense familiar from work on the distribution of focal accents and contrastive focus. Rather I follow Krifka (1995), Jeong & Roelefsen (2023) and others in assuming that expressions in focus evoke alternatives but that that is just one of the contexts in which alternatives play a central role. This will be important when we return to the topic of NPI’s. See Krifka (1995) and Jeong & Roelefsen (2023) for thorough discussion of the issues that arise here. If we assume that the alternative-evoking character of NPI’s reflects a kind of inherent focus-marking, we are left in a poor position to understand the differences between emphatic and non-emphatic uses of NPI’s – the central concern of the discussion in Jeong & Roelefsen (2023). They assume, with Krifka (1995) and others that all NPI’s evoke alternatives, as a matter of lexical specification, but they also argue for a distinction between contingently-emphatic and inherently emphatic members of the class. The latter are the minimizers and they are inherently focused; the former may or may not be focused. These commitments are entirely consistent with our discussion here.

Negation plays a central role in these deductions. Its effect is to reverse the direction of entailment among the alternatives and therefore to reverse the ranking of those propositions on the scale of strength. Returning to example (37a), for instance: the proposition *One priest attended the king's feast* leaves open the possibility that two priests, or three, or four ... attended the feast, but it entails neither those propositions nor their negations. The presence of negation changes that calculation and 'converts' what would be in its absence a logically weak and low-ranked proposition into a logically strong and high-ranked proposition.

But this must be why the polarity-sensitive elements at the center of our discussion are so susceptible to Narrative Fronting.

If there were a class of expressions lexically specified to be alternative-evoking, we would now expect those expressions to appear naturally and frequently in the XP-position of (38). But that is exactly the claim that is at the heart of one of the most important strands of current research on the nature and licensing of NPI's – from the domain-widening of Kadmon & Landman (1993) to the explicit appeal to scalar implicatures in the work of Krifka (1995), Lee & Horn (1994), Israel (1998), Lahiri (1998), Horn (2000), Condoravdi (2008), Chierchia (2013) and Jeong & Roelefsen (2023). The core idea in this line of work is that the limited distribution of weak NPI's (that is, that they may appear only in downward-entailing environments) is to be attributed to the fact that they are required in their lexical semantics to be alternative-evoking and further that they are, or at least that many subtypes of NPI are, lexically specified as representing minimal elements on the quantity-scale defined by those alternatives. But by the logic we just reviewed those 'minimal' elements will be strengthened exactly when they appear within the scope of negation. Different theoreticians have different ways of working this reasoning into a formal theory of NPI-licensing, but the common thread, since Krifka (1995), has been that unless such items appear within the scope of negation (or an element with similar logical properties) they run afoul of a version of Grice's (1975) Quantity Maxim ('be as informative as possible') built into the compositional mechanisms.

But negation is, of course, also the syntactic driver of Narrative Fronting. Weak NPI's and minimizers will be ideal candidates for the role of XP in (38), then, since they are in their lexical definition alternative-evoking and minimal. In their interaction with negation, then, they will very naturally generate the logically strong propositions that are the hallmark of the construction.

Given this perspective, we understand why NPI's in Irish appear so frequently in the fronted position of Narrative Fronting structures. The two phenomena are 'entangled', as we put it above, because they exploit the same logical mechanism in evoking scalar implicatures – namely the strengthening effect of downward entailing contexts. The difference between the two is that Narrative Fronting is syntacticized and so limited to a single downward-entailing environment (the domain of sentential negation) while weak NPI's and minimizers can exploit that logic in any syntactic environment in which it emerges (those described in section 2.2). The descriptions given at earlier stages of our discussion now reduce to (41).

(41) NARRATIVE FRONTING:

The finite negation head may include a probe which attracts XP's which are alternative-evoking.

The description in (41), unlike the earlier formulations, makes no mention of 'emphasis'. The 'emphatic' character of the construction emerges organically from the scalar implicature that

arises from the interaction between the negative head and the alternatives evoked by the attracted constituent.

A property of this account of Narrative Fronting which is neither obviously correct nor obviously incorrect is that the fronting itself plays no role in establishing its emphatic character. That aspect of the construction, on this account, emerges from a semantic-pragmatic interaction between the attracting negation and the alternatives evoked by the fronted element – an interaction which would take place even if the alternative-evoking phrase were to remain in its base position. The pairs of examples in (42) and (43) should then be equally ‘emphatic’:¹⁵

- (42) a. ach ní-or labhair sé smid leofa
but C.NEG-PAST speak.PAST he breath with-them
‘But he didn’t breathe a word to them.’ SIF 33
b. Smid níor labhair sé – leofa.
- (43) a. Aon mhoill ní-or dhein Cromail –
any delay C.NEG-PAST make.PAST Cromwell
‘No delay did Cromwell make.’ OOGC 199
b. Níor dhein Cromail aon mhoill.

Assessing whether or not this prediction is correct is a matter of such subtlety and vagueness that it will be next to impossible to investigate responsibly, I suspect – especially if the subtleties of footnote 15 are in play. For whatever it may be worth (not much), my impression is that it is not obviously incorrect.

4.2. NARRATIVE FRONTING AND SCOPE. There is a final property of Narrative Fronting that we need to attend to, one that is implicit in the preceding discussion but which should be made explicit.

It was observed in McCloskey (1996: 76-86) that Narrative Fronting never expands the scope of the raised item, at least with respect to negation. In (44), for instance, the temporal indefinite *uair amháin* remains within the scope of negation despite apparently preceding it:

- (44) uair amháin fiú, ní-or cheistigh sé conas a bhí an t-ullmhúchán
one time even C.NEG-PAST question.PAST he how c be.PAST the preparation
faoi bhráid Mheiriceá ag dul.
for America PROG GO.VN
‘Not even once did he ask how the preparation for America was going.’ PI 67

(37a) above is similar, as are the examples in (45):

¹⁵It is a prominent theme of Chierchia’s (2013) discussion of polarity sensitivity that NPI’s are inherently emphatic (see in particular his Chapter 3). He draws distinctions, though: the minimizers, because they rely on an operator like *even* for the required exhaustification of their alternative-set, are always and strongly emphatic. For run of the mill weak NPI’s, like *any*, however, the activation of the relevant alternatives is often undetectable. Similarly, Krifka (1995: 232-233) argues that minimizers are inherently focussed and that they appear only in emphatic assertions, unlike weak NPI’s. Jeong & Roelefsen (2023) argue for a similar distinction. All of this might lead us to expect a difference between (42), which involves a minimizer and (43), which involves *any*. That is, we might expect that the two examples in (42) would be equally emphatic while there would be a detectable difference between the fronted and unfrosted versions in (43). See also footnote 14 above.

- (45) a. duine amháin as ocht nduine dhéag i seomra na nuachtóirí ní-or
 person one out-of eight person ten in room the journalists C.NEG-PAST
 labhair liom air
 speak.PAST with.me on.it
 ‘Not one person out of eighteen in the newsroom spoke to me about it. AAG 027
- b. Aon mhála amháin ní bhfaighidh tú.
 one bag one C.NEG get.FUT you
 ‘Not one bag will you get.’ OTA 194
- c. duine acu ní-or aithníos
 person of.them C.NEG-PAST recognize.PAST.S1
 ‘I recognized none of them.’ BTFS 14

(45c), for example, in its actual context of use, does not convey that there was one person that I did not recognize – a meaning naturally expressible in English by means of *One of them, I didn’t recognize*. Rather, the intended interpretation has the indefinite interpreted within the scope of negation. The examples of (46) show that fronted disjuncts also remain within the scope of the negation which triggers Narrative Fronting.

- (46) a. do chlann ná do chéile ní fheicfidh tú go deo
 your family or your spouse C.NEG see.FUT you ever
 ‘You will never see either your spouse or your family.’ CDC 230
- b. Agus mionnán ná bainne ní bheadh ... an bhliain sin aici.
 and kid-goat or milk C.NEG be.COND the year DEMON at.her
 ‘And she would have neither a goat nor (its) milk that year.’ CC 16

For detailed discussion see McCloskey (1996).¹⁶

The fact, then, that weak NPI’s and minimizers may appear in clause-initial position under Narrative Fronting (as in (35) and (36)) is but one aspect of this larger generalization. In cases like (35) and (36) the fronted NPI remains within the scope of sentential negation, just like the indefinites of (45) and the disjuncts of (46), and this is why such examples are fully well-formed.

It is an interesting question how this outcome is guaranteed. A partial answer is provided by the proposal (McCloskey (1996)) that complementizers in Irish attain their pronounced positions by way of a postsyntactic operation which lowers them, across intervening material if present, to the position of the inflected verb. c-lowering, on this view, is one of a set of postsyntactic operations which jointly create the morphological word known in the Irish linguistic tradition as the ‘verbal complex’. On that view, the final syntactic representation of a Narrative Fronting example would be as in (47):

- (47) [CP C XP V ... – ...]
 [NEG] [ALT] [FIN]

Given this proposal, the fronted XP is commanded by the expression of negation at every point in its derivational career – negation is in c and the relevant movement targets a position within the

¹⁶Note that the claim is not that wide-scope indefinites are never found in the fronted position of a Narrative Fronting structure. They are, though rarely. That is, they are found with the same degree of difficulty and at the same (low) level of frequency as is characteristic of indefinites in the base-position of the movement. That is, Narrative Fronting does not expand or change the scopal properties of fronted elements with respect to negation.

TP-domain. The proposal of c-lowering has been controversial (see for instance Maki & Ó Baoill (2017)), but I know of no competitor proposal which deals with the range of facts it accounts for. There is, in addition, no reason for embarrassment in a contemporary theoretical context about an appeal to postsyntactic (as opposed to syntactic) lowering.

When we integrate these proposals with those developed in McCloskey (2017), matters become a little more complicated in interesting ways. The core idea in that paper is that the expression of negation in finite clauses is distributed across two positions linked by an agreement relation – c (where the morphological exponence appears) and a lower polarity-head. In addition, the lower polarity head is taken to be the target for the head-movement which is responsible for determining v-initial order. In the context of those proposals, the final syntactic representation of a Narrative Fronting structure (before the application of any postsyntactic head-movements) is the schematic structure seen in (48).

$$(48) \quad \left[\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{CP} & \text{C} & \text{XP} & \text{POL} & \dots - \dots \\ & [\text{NEG}] & [\text{ALT}] & [\text{NEG}] & \end{array} \right]$$

Given (48), we can assume that it is the lower negative polarity head which hosts the probe which attracts the alternative-evoking expression into its specifier position. Following raising of the finite verb to the polarity position, the fronted XP ends up to the left of the inflected verb and niched between the two (linked) expressions of negative polarity.

We then account by way of standard mechanisms for the fact that Narrative Fronting applies only in negative clauses, while avoiding the assumption that the relevant probe is on c and risking the incorrect prediction that the operation would have the same locality-profile as the much-studied \bar{A} -movements of the language. Narrative Fronting is movement to a TP-internal position, not movement to the clause-edge.

This discussion is obviously too brief to do justice to the many issues that now arise. But in addressing the primary question posed here – how the language can tolerate NPI's as fragments (see (2) above), we need only to be able to assume (i) that Irish has a movement rule (Narrative Fronting) which targets negative polarity items (and similar expressions), raising them towards the left periphery (ii) that that rule applies in negative clauses and (iii) that, in raising its target expressions, it does not change or expand the scopal relations that they enter into with respect to negation. And that much seems close to incontrovertible.

4.3. NARRATIVE FRONTING AND ELLIPSIS. If the conclusions of the previous subsection are safe, the path is clear towards resolving the apparent anomaly we opened with – how can there be fragment answers (like (2)) which consist only of a negative polarity item, in apparent violation of an otherwise valid crosslinguistic generalization? Following a suggestion in Merchant (2004: 691), we can assume that fragment answers consisting of, or containing, NPI's are parasitic on a prior application of Narrative Fronting.¹⁷

Narrative Fronting lifts the NPI to the left periphery and the clausal remnant is elided by a sluicing-like operation which eliminates all but the fronted XP. The apparently isolated NPI's in (30) and (31), then, are well-formed because those NPI's are within the scope of negation in pre-ellipsis (that is, syntactic) representations and they have the interpretations they do because of the scope-preserving property of Narrative Fronting. Many languages disallow the equivalents

¹⁷The link between Narrative Fronting and the possibility of fragment NPI's is made independently in D'Antuono (2024).

of (30)–(31), because they lack a movement operation with the particular set of properties which we have demonstrated for Narrative Fronting in Irish (though see Laka (1993) and Giannakidou (2000) for additional cases of the same general type). In (49b), then, (involving a minimizer), L's response will be derived roughly as in (50), in which I use a greyed-out font to indicate elided material.

(49) a. J: Ná habair a dhath le n-ár gcairde.
 C.NEG say.IMPV anything with hour friends
 'Don't say anything to our friends.'

b. L: Smid.
 breath
 'Not a word.'

(50) a. Smid ní dhéarfadh mé le n-ár gcairde.
 breath C.NEG say.FUT I with our friends
 'I won't breathe a word to our friends.'

b. 1. ní dhéarfadh mé smid le n-ár gcairde.
 2. smid ní dhéarfadh mé – le n-ár gcairde.
 3. smid [[ní dhéarfadh mé – le n-ár gcairde]]

An additional set of observations shows that the link between movement possibilities and legal fragment-types is very tight. There are items in Irish which resemble NPI's in many respects but to which Narrative Fronting may not apply. One of these is a focus-exceptive construction which is one of the ways of expressing *only*. In these structures, which have much in common with the *ne-que* construction of French, the exceptive particle *ach* attaches to a focused phrase (or to a larger phrase which includes a focused phrase) within the domain of sentential negation:

(51) a. Ní-or labhair ach seisear.
 C.NEG-PAST speak.PAST but six-people
 'Only six people spoke.'

b. Ní ólaim ach tae.
 C.NEG drink.PRESS1 but tea
 'I drink only tea.'

c. Ní raibh gluaisteán ach aige daoine saibhre an uair sin
 C.NEG be.PAST car but at people rich the time DEMON
 'Only rich people had cars at that time.'

Ach-phrases like those in (51) with the 'only' interpretation are licensed either in the scope of sentential negation or in polar questions.

(52) a. nó an raibh ann acht rud a samhladh dó
 or C.Q was in-it but thing C imagine.PAST.IMPERS to-him
 'Or was it only something he imagined?'

LCS 110

b. An raibh ach an t-aon Naomh amháin ina measc go léir?
 C.Q was but the one saint one in-their-midst all
 'Or was there only one Saint among them all?'

AG 113

Despite their kinship with the NPI's we have mostly been concerned with here (discussed in McCloskey (2013)) these exceptives are absolutely banned from Narrative Fronting:

- (53) *Ach do dheartháir ní raibh ag an chruinniú aréir.
 but your brother C.NEG be.PAST at the meeting last-night
 'Only your brother was at the meeting last night.'

And they are correspondingly impossible as fragments, as shown in (54):

- (54) a. Cé a bhí ag an chruinniú aréir?
 who C be.PAST at the meeting last-night
 'Who was at the meeting last night?'
 b. *Ach do dheartháir.
 but your brother
 'Only your brother.'

Such close correlations are expected if the possibility of fragment NPI's is parasitic on a prior application of Narrative Fronting.¹⁸

There are various ways in which the ellipsis required might be formalized and the various options are closely linked with assumptions made about the internal structure of clauses and how negation is expressed. I will not address those questions here – for reasons of space and because the larger issues I want to address are not, as far as I can tell, affected by which choices are made.

5. ENGLISH AGAIN. This paper opened with a claimed contrast between English and Irish – that Irish does, but English does not, allow fragment NPI's. There is, though, a strand of research which questions the claim for English or suggests at least that the facts are more nuanced. At issue is what we should conclude about the example-type in (55) (den Dikken et al. (2000), Valmala (2007), Weir (2014, 2015)):

- (55) Q: What DIDN'T Owen buy? A: Any wine.

As all investigators have been careful to note, (55) is not accepted by all speakers and is, for many or most, of intermediate acceptability (I know of no quantitative study). The conditions which allow the fragment NPI in (55) seem also to be quite stringent – what is required, as noted by den Dikken et al. (2000: fn, 3, pp 44-45) Weir (2014: 167-171), is a negative WH-question with verum focus and a discourse context which includes, implicitly or explicitly, a set of propositions like that in (56):

- (56) Owen bought pizza.
 Owen bought bottled water.
 Owen bought beer.
 Owen bought chips.

The possibility in (55) also seems to be linked to the possibility of specificational pseudoclefts in English like those in (57), in which the appearance of the NPI within the pivot position is also puzzling on most accounts.

¹⁸Speakers very frequently use Narrative Fronting in paraphrases or expansions of fragment answers.

- (57) a. What we didn't make was (we didn't make) any progress.
 b. What Owen didn't buy was (he didn't buy) any wine.

It is exactly this connection that *den Dikken et al. (2000)* are centrally concerned with and in pursuing that connection they are brought to the conclusion that (55) is an elided form of (58):

- (58) Q: What DIDN'T Owen buy? A: [He didn't buy] any wine.

The connection with the pseudoclefts in (57) is then that the relation between the WH-clause and the pivot in such constructions is similar in essential respects to the question-answer relation in (55) and (58). In both cases, the polarity item is licensed within a full finite clause which is subject to optional elision. Important support for this proposal derives from the generalization, which they establish, that bare NPI pivots are possible in pseudoclefts just in case the full clausal option is also possible (as illustrated in (57)).

Andrew Weir (2014, 2015) builds on these insights to develop an analysis which is consistent with the idea that fragment answers at least typically involve movement followed by ellipsis of all but the moved element. It also accounts for the marked and variable character of (55) by assuming that the movement in question takes place in the derivation of phonological forms (and its effects are therefore invisible to semantic conditions such as those essential to the licensing of polarity items) and is a marked and 'last resort' operation – one that applies only to head off the possibility that a focus-marked expression might be elided and is specific to that context.

These issues are difficult and important, but they clearly do not challenge the empirical claim which was the starting point for the present paper: that Irish and English differ fundamentally with respect to the well-formedness of NPI-fragments. The Irish cases we have been concerned with are in no way marked or recondite; nor are they variably acceptable or restricted to very particular contexts, as is the English possibility in (55). They are simply routine aspects of the grammar of the language – productive and un-marked.

The proposals developed here account for that property of Irish and are in addition entirely compatible with the framework developed by Weir and his predecessors for English cases like (55). The difference between the two languages is still that the grammar of Irish includes a syntactic operation (routine and productive) which makes any appeal to marked or 'last resort' operations unnecessary. The grammar of English, by contrast, includes no such operation and in providing a structural description for (55) must rely on the logic of last resort.

6. IMPLICATIONS. The proposal outlined here (and anticipated in Merchant's paper) depends on a very central element of the so-called 'move and delete' approach advocated by Merchant (2004) for subsentential fragments of propositional type. That approach links the ellipsis possibilities found in a given language with the inventory of movement-types available in that language. That inventory in turn reflects the inventory of probes in the language; so we have yet another case in which variation among languages has its roots in combinatorial properties of elements of the functional vocabulary of those languages. In the absence of such an approach we would not be able to make the required connection between the possibility of fragment NPI's and the existence and properties of Narrative Fronting.

The analysis also preserves the essence of the generalization that NPI's may not function as fragment answers. The possibility of such fragments will exist productively only for a language in which there is a movement rule with the properties shown by Narrative Fronting in Irish, namely

that it does not raise the moved item out of the crucial licensing context. Irish does not show that the initial generalization is wrong, then, but rather suggests a refinement.¹⁹ This clarification too depends in a fundamental way on the move-and-delete approach to fragment responses.

Most important, perhaps, the arguments for an ellipsis-based analysis of at least this type of fragment response are quite powerful. There are not many elements that are as subtly dependent on context as are negative polarity items. Both their well-formedness and their interpretation depend on their being in compositional settings with very particular properties. And although we have focused here on the semantic aspect of this licensing-system, those who have pushed hardest to construct a fundamentally semantic and/or pragmatic understanding of the licensing problem have consistently recognized that there is a syntactic component at play as well (see, for example Ladusaw (1979: 206-207)). In recent work, Jon Gajewski (2005) and Vincent Homer (2011, 2021) have developed persuasive arguments that even the fundamental semantic constraint (that NPI's must appear in downward-entailing environments) must be stated in terms both syntactic and semantic, as in (59):

- (59) An NPI α is licensed in sentence S only if there is a (syntactic) constituent A of S containing α such that A is downward-entailing with respect to the position of α .

Homer (2021: 5)

That is, syntactic constituents (rather than 'operators') are downward or upward entailing (in virtue, of course, of their interpretive properties). What this means in turn is that the minimizer fragment *smid* in the exchange in (49b) above, if it is to be appropriately interpreted and licensed, must be within a syntactic constituent whose semantic properties are such that it is (Strawson) downward entailing with respect to *smid*. This is guaranteed in a straightforward way by the ellipsis analysis, since its principal commitment is exactly that the minimizer in (49b) is contained within an interpreted syntactic structure of the required kind – one, though, which happens not to be pronounced. It is difficult to imagine how the required compositional scaffolding (semantic and syntactic) might be supplied in an approach to fragments which eschewed such silent structure.

But if appeal to ellipsis is correct for this material, there are also implications for what the theory of ellipsis must look like. Consider again some examples of NPI fragment responses:

- (60) a. 'Beidh na girseachaí leat.' 'Ó go bráthach!'
 be.FUT the girls with.you ever
 'The girls will be with you.' 'Oh, never!' ATFS 505
- b. 'Cá mhéad a bhéas ar sin?' 'Pingin ar bith,' arsa bean a' tsiopa.
 what amount C be.PRES on that penny any said woman the shop.GEN
 'How much will that be?' 'Not a penny,' said the shop-woman. BRD 81
- c. Cé a d' inis duitse go bhfuil tú ag déanamh mar is ceart? Aon duine.
 who C PAST tell.PAST to.you C be.PRES you PROG do.VN as is right one person
 'Who told you that you were doing the right thing?' 'Nobody.' ISNB 139

¹⁹With the implication, obviously, that in diagnosing some constituent as either an NPI or a negative concord item, one should not use the fragment answer diagnostic in a simplistic way. Before concluding that an element is a negative concord item on the basis of this test, we should ask if the language under investigation has an independently available mechanism which could displace an NPI out of a potential ellipsis-site, yielding an Irish-like pattern of possible fragment answers.

In (60) we have NPI's of various types as fragment responses. For all of them, there is a very natural paraphrase of the fragment response in terms of Narrative Fronting:

- (61) a. Go bráthach [ní bheidh na girseachaí liom].
 'Never will the girls be with me.'
 b. Pingin ar bith [ní bheidh ar sin].
 'That won't cost a penny.'
 c. Aon duine [níor inis domh go raibh mé ag déanamh mar is ceart].
 'Not one person told me that I was doing the right thing.'

In each case the elided material must include a sentential negation – to license the stranded NPI and to guarantee the right interpretation. But there is no corresponding negation in the apparent antecedent. It must be the case, then, that whatever form the antecedence requirement on ellipsis takes, it cannot demand, across the board, that antecedent and ellipsis-site match with respect to polarity. Such cases add, then, to the steady accumulation of evidence in recent years for this conclusion (Yoshida (2010), Toosarvandani (2013), Kroll & Rudin (2018), Rudin (2019), Kroll (2019), Anand et al. (2021, 2022)).

The issues around antecedence do not end there though. In question-response pairs it is usually straightforward to identify an overt antecedent. But NPI-fragments occur easily in other contexts as well and, in many such cases, no overt antecedent can be discerned in the context. Consider the cases in (62), for example:

- (62) a. Bhain sé triail as an uimhir fóin. Freagra ar bith.
 took.PAST he try out-of the number phone.GEN answer any
 'He tried the phone number. No answer.' TAIR 114
 b. Chuaigh mé amach a dh'éisteacht le ceol na n-éan. Fuaim dá laghad.
 GO.PAST I out to-listen with music the.GEN birds.GEN sound of-the least
 'I went out to listen to the singing of the birds. Not a sound.' RNG 20-10-18
 c. Níl aon uaigh ann, a Dheaid. Chuartaigh muid an áit ó bhun go
 is-not one grave in.it VOC-PTC Dad search.PAST we the place from bottom to
 barr. Tada.
 top anything
 'There's no grave, Dad. We searched the place from top to bottom. Nothing.' A 98

These are all attested examples. (62a) was also checked with six native speaker consultants, all of whom accepted it without hesitation as natural, well-formed and clear. The crucial property of such cases is that, although the evidence for ellipsis is as clear and as strong as for the other instances of NPI-fragments, there is no overt antecedent in the discourse context. There is, in each case however, a strongly salient but implicit question (a QUD in the sense of Roberts (2012)) – *Would he get an answer?, What would he hear?, What did they find?* – in the local discourse context.

That is, given how strong the evidence for ellipsis is for these fragment answer cases, we are required to conclude (with Merchant (2004: Section 5)) that, for certain kinds of ellipsis at least, antecedents with the necessary syntactic and semantic properties may be found in discourse representations rather than in any overt linguistic signal.

REFERENCES.

- Acquaviva, Paolo. 1996. Negation in Irish and the representation of monotone decreasing quantifiers. In Robert Borsley & Ian Roberts (eds.), *The syntax of the Celtic languages: A comparative perspective*, 284–317. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Anand, Pranav, Daniel Hardt & James McCloskey. 2021. The Santa Cruz sluicing dataset. *Language* 97(1). e68–e88.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2021.0009>.
- Anand, Pranav, Daniel Hardt & James McCloskey. 2022. The domain of formal matching in sluicing. *Linguistic Inquiry* To appear.
- Barker, Chris. 2018. Negative polarity as scope marking. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 41. 483–510.
- Bauer, Winifred. 1997. *The Reed reference grammar of Māori*. Auckland, New Zealand: Reed Publishing.
- Bernini, Giuliano & Paolo Ramat. 1996. *Negative sentences in the languages of Europe: A typological approach*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.
- Bjorkman, Bronwyn M. & Hedde Zeijlstra. 2019. Checking up on ϕ -agree. *Linguistic Inquiry* 50. 527–569.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1972. *Degree words*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Bumford, Dylan & Yael Sharvit. 2022. Negative polarity items in definite superlatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 53. 255–293.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 2013. *Logic in grammar: Polarity: Free choice, and intervention*. Oxford Studies in Semantics and Pragmatics 2. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Condoravdi, Cleo. 2008. Punctual until as a scalar NPI. In Kristin Hanson & Sharon Inkels (eds.), *The nature of the word: Studies in honor of Paul Kiparsky*, 631–653. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Condoravdi, Cleo. 2010. NPI licensing in temporal clauses. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28. 877–910.
- Crnič, Luka. 2014. Against a dogma on NPI licensing. In Luka Crnič & Uli Sauerland (eds.), *The Art and Craft of Semantics: A Festschrift for Irene Heim*. MITWPL 70, Volume One, 117–145. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Department of Linguistics, MIT.
- Crnič, Luka. 2019. Any: Logic, likelihood, and context (pts. 1 and 2). *Language and Linguistic Compass* 13. e12350, e12351.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12354>.
- D’Antuono, Nicola. 2023. The syntax of emphatic negation in Modern Irish. Manuscript, DISLL, Università di Padova. To appear in *Glossa*.
- D’Antuono, Nicola. 2024. An emergent theory of negation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, DISLL, Università di Padova.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 1998. Any as inherent modal. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 21. 433–476.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 2013. A viability constraint on alternatives for free choice. In A. Falaus (ed.), *Alternatives in semantics*, 88–122. London, New York and Shanghai: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2022. Negative concord as downward agree. In Özge Bakay, Breanna Pratlley, Eva Neu & Peyton Deal (eds.), *NELS 52, Proceedings of the Fifty-Second Meeting of the Northeastern Linguistic Society*, 235–244. Amherst, Massachusetts: GLSA.
- Declerck, Renaat. 1995. The problem of *not ... until*. *Linguistics* 33. 51–98.
- den Dikken, Marcel, André Meinunger & Chris Wilder. 2000. Pseudoclefts and ellipsis. *Studia*

- Linguistica* 54. 41–89.
- Duffield, Nigel. 1995. *Particles and projections in Irish syntax*. Dordrecht and Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Fauconnier, Giles. 1975. Pragmatic scales and logical structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 6. 353–375.
- Fauconnier, Giles. 1979. Implication reversal in a natural language. In F. Guenther & S. J. Schmidt (eds.), *Formal semantics and pragmatics for natural languages*, 188–199. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Reidel Academic Publishing.
- von Fintel, Kai. 1999. NPI licensing, Strawson entailment, and context dependency. *Journal of Semantics* 16. 97–148.
- Gajewski, Jon. 2005. Neg-raising: Polarity and presupposition. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Gajewski, Jon. 2010. Superlatives, NPI's and most. Manuscript, University of Connecticut.
- Gajewski, Jon. 2011. Licensing strong NPI's. *Natural Language Semantics* 19. 109–148.
- Gajewski, Jon & I-ta Chris Hsieh. 2014. Comments on negative polarity items in definite descriptions. In Luka Crnić & Uli Sauerland (eds.), *The Art and Craft of Semantics: A Festschrift for Irene Heim*. MITWPL 70, Volume One, 181–198. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Department of Linguistics, MIT.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 1992. *Until*, aspect and negation: A novel argument for two *untils*. In Brendan Jackson (ed.), *SALT 12, Proceedings of the 12th Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference*, 84–103. Linguistic Society of America.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 1998. *Polarity sensitivity as (non)veridical dependency*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 1999. Affective dependencies. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 22. 367–421.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2000. Negative ... concord. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18. 457–523.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2001. The meaning of Free Choice. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 24. 659–735.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2011. Negative polarity and positive polarity: Licensing, variation, and compositionality. In Klaus von Heusinger, Claudia Maienborn & Paul Portner (eds.), *The handbook of natural language meaning*, 1660–1712. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter 2nd edn.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia & Hedde Zeijlstra. 2017. The landscape of negative dependencies: N-words and negative concord. In Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The blackwell companion to syntax, second edition*, John Wiley and Sons.
- Grice, H. Paul. 1975. The logic of conversation. In Peter Cole & Jerry Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech acts*, 43–58. New York: Academic Press.
- Guerzoni, Elena & Yael Sharvit. 2007. A question of strength: on NPI's in interrogative clauses. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 30. 361–391.
- Haegeman, Liliane & Rafaella Zanuttini. 1991. Negative heads and the Neg Criterion. *The Linguistic Review* 8. 233–251.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite pronouns*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heim, Irene. 1984. A note on negative polarity and downward entailingness. In Catherine Jones & Peter Sells (eds.), *NELS 14, Proceedings of the Fourteenth Meeting of the Northeastern Linguistic Society*, 98–107. Amherst, Massachusetts: GLSA.
- Herburger, Elena. 2001. The negative concord puzzle revisited. *Natural Language Semantics* 9(3). 289–333.
- Herdan, Simona & Yael Sharvit. 2006. Definite and nondefinite superlatives and NPI licensing.

- Syntax* 9. 1–31.
- Hoeksema, Jack. 1983. Negative polarity and the comparative. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1. 403–434.
- Hoeksema, Jack. 2000. Negative polarity items: Triggering, scope and c-command. In Laurence R. Horn & Yasuhiko Kato (eds.), *Negation and polarity: Syntactic and semantic perspectives*, 115–146. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Homer, Vicent. 2011. Polarity and modality. Doctoral dissertation, UCLA.
- Homer, Vincent. 2020. Negative polarity. In Lisa Matthewson, Cécile Meier, Hotze Rullman & Thomas Ede Zimmermann (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Semantics*, John Wiley and Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118788516.sem057>.
- Homer, Vincent. 2021. Domains of polarity items. *Natural Language Semantics* 38. 1–48.
- Horn, Laurence R. 1989. *A natural history of negation*. Chicago, Illinois: Chicago University Press.
- Horn, Laurence R. 2000. Pick a theory (not just *any* theory). In Laurence R. Horn & Yasuhiko Kato (eds.), *Negation and polarity: Syntactic and semantic perspectives*, 147–192. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Israel, Michael. 1998. *Ever*: Polysemy and polarity sensitivity. *Linguistic Notes from La Jolla* 19. 29–45.
- Jeong, Sunwoo & Floris Roelefsen. 2023. Focused NPI's in statements and questions. *Journal of Semantics* 40. 1–48.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffac014>.
- Kadmon, Nirit & Fred Landman. 1993. 'Any'. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16. 353–422.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1971. Implicative verbs. *Language* 47. 340–358.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1974. Until. In Michael W. La Galy, Robert A. Fox & Anthony Bruck (eds.), *CLS 10: Papers from the 10th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 284–297. Chicago, Illinois: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Klima, Edward. 1964. Negation in English. In J. Fodor & J. Katz (eds.), *The structure of language*, 246–323. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1995. The semantics and pragmatics of polarity items. *Linguistic Analysis* 25. 209–257.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2010. *Before* and *After* without coercion: comment on the paper by Cleo Condoravdi. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28. 911–929.
- Kroll, Margaret. 2019. Polarity reversals under sluicing. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 12.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3765/sp.12.18>.
- Kroll, Margaret & Deniz Rudin. 2018. Identity and interpretation: Syntactic and pragmatic constraints on the acceptability of sluicing. In Andrew Lamont & Katerina Tetzloff (eds.), *NELS 47: Proceedings of the Forty Seventh Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, vol. Volume Two, 177–190. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, Graduate Student Linguistic Association.
- Labov, William. 1972. Negative attraction and negative concord. *Language* 48. 773–818.
- Ladusaw, William A. 1979. Polarity sensitivity as inherent scope relations. Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.
- Ladusaw, William A. 1992. Expressing negation. In Chris Barker & David Dowty (eds.), *SALT 2, Proceedings of the 2nd Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference*, 237–259. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University. Published as Volume 40 of the Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics.

- Lahiri, Utpal. 1998. Focus and negative polarity in Hindi. *Natural Language Semantics* 6. 57–123.
- Laka, Itziar. 1990. Negation in syntax: On the nature of functional projections in syntax. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Laka, Itziar. 1993. Negative fronting in Romance: Movement to Sigma. In William J. Ashby, Marianne Mithun & Giorgio Perissinotto (eds.), *Linguistic perspectives on Romance Languages: Selected papers from the XXI Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, Santa Barbara, February 21–24, 1991*, 315–334. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lee, Chungmin. 1995. A unified account of polarity phenomena. In *Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*, <https://aclanthology.org/events/paclic-1995/>.
- Lee, Young-Suk & Laurence R. Horn. 1994. *Any* as indefinite + *even*. Manuscript, Yale University.
- LeGrand, Jean. 1975. *Or* and *any*: The semantics of two logical operators. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Maki, Hideki & Dónall P. Ó Baoill. 2011. *Essays on Irish syntax*. Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo: Kaitakusha Co. Ltd.
- Maki, Hideki & Dónall P. Ó Baoill. 2017. Embedded topicalization in Irish. In *Essays on Irish syntax II*, 139–157. Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo: Kaitakusha Co. Ltd.
- Mayr, Clemens. 2013. Downward monotonicity in questions. In Emmanuel Chemla, Vincent Homer & Grégoire Winterstein (eds.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 17*, 345–362. Paris.
- McCloskey, James. 1985. The Modern Irish double relative and syntactic binding. *Ériu* 36. 45–84.
- McCloskey, James. 1996. On the scope of verb raising in Irish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14. 47–104.
- McCloskey, James. 2001. The morphosyntax of WH-extraction in Irish. *Journal of Linguistics* 37. 67–100.
- McCloskey, James. 2002. Resumption, successive cyclicity, and the locality of operations. In Samuel Epstein & Daniel Seeley (eds.), *Derivation and explanation*, 184–226. London and New York: Blackwell Publishers.
- McCloskey, James. 2013. Focus and the grammar of exceptives in Irish. Paper presented at the 19th International Congress of Linguists, Geneva, July 22nd–27th 2013. Handout available at <https://gramadach.net/mccloskey/papers.html>.
- McCloskey, Jim. 2017. Ellipsis, polarity, and the cartography of verb-initial orders in Irish. In Enoch Aboh, Eric Haeberli, Genoveva Puskás & Manuela Schönenberger (eds.), *Elements of comparative syntax: Theory and description*, vol. 127 Studies in Generative Grammar, 99–151. Boston and Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27. 661–738.
- Mittwoch, Anita. 1977. Negative sentences with *until*. In Woodford A. Beach, Samuel E. Fox & Shulamith Philosoph (eds.), *CLS 13: Papers from the 13th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 410–417. Chicago, Illinois: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Ó Siadhail, Mícheál. 1989. *Modern Irish: Grammatical structure and dialectal variation*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Penka, Doris & Hedde Zeijlstra. 2010. Negation and polarity: an introduction. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28. 771–786.
- Preminger, Omer & Maria Polinsky. 2015. Agreement and semantic concord: A spurious unification. Manuscript, University of Maryland.

- Roberts, Craige. 2012. Information structure: Towards an integrated formal theory of pragmatics. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 5. 1–69.
- Robinson, Mary & Gary Thoms. 2021. Long distance negative concord in English. In Alessa Farinella & Angelica Hill (eds.), *NELS 51, Proceedings of the Fifty First Meeting of the North East Linguistics Society, Volume Two*, 181–190. University of Massachusetts Amherst: GLSA.
- Rudin, Deniz. 2019. Head-based syntactic identity in sluicing. *Linguistic Inquiry* 50. 253–283.
- de Swart, Henriëtte. 1996. Meaning and use of *not ... until*. *Journal of Semantics* 13. 221–263.
- Toosarvandani, Maziar. 2013. Corrective *but* coordinates clauses not always but sometimes. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31. 827–863.
- Valmala, Vidal. 2007. The syntax of little things. In Yehuda N. Falk (ed.), *Proceedings of Israel Association for Theoretical Linguistics*, vol. 23, Tel Aviv University: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. <http://linguistics.huji.ac.il/IATL/23/Valmala.pdf>.
- Weir, Andrew. 2014. Fragments and clausal ellipsis. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Weir, Andrew. 2015. Fragment answers and ‘exceptional movement under ellipsis’: A PF-movement account. In Thuy Bui & Deniz Özyıldız (eds.), *NELS 45, Proceedings of the Forthty Fifth Meeting of the North East Linguistics Society*, 175–188. University of Massachusetts Amherst: GLSA.
- van der Wouden, Ton. 1994. Negative contexts. Doctoral dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.
- van der Wouden, Ton. 1997. *Negative contexts. Collocation, negative polarity, and multiple negation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Yoshida, Masaya. 2010. Antecedent-contained sluicing. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41. 348–356.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella. 1997. *Negation and clausal structure*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2004. Sentential negation and negative concord. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
- Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2008. Negative concord is syntactic agreement. Manuscript, University of Amsterdam.
- Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2012. There is only one way to Agree. *The Linguistic Review* 29. 491–539.
- Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2016. Negation and negative dependencies. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 2. 233–254.
- Zwarts, Frans. 1996. Three types of polarity. In Fritz Hamm & Edward W. Hinrichs (eds.), *Plural quantification*, 177–238. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

APPENDIX ONE – THE LICENSING ENVIRONMENTS

This appendix presents data concerning the range of licensing environments in which the polarity-sensitive expressions discussed in Section 2 may appear.

IN POLAR QUESTIONS. All of the PSE's discussed in Section Two may appear in polar questions, root and embedded:

- (63) a. féachaint an samhlódh faic dom
to-see-if c.q imagine.IMPERS anything/nothing to-me
'to see if anything would spring to mind for me' AGMTS 3
- b. go bhfeicfeadh muid an raibh tada beo tar éis na hóiche
C see.COND we c.q be.PAST anything alive after the night
'so that we could see if anything was alive after the night' IMSBRM 55
- (64) a. An féidir liom tada a fháil duit?
c.q possible with.me anything get.NON-FIN for.you
'Can I get anything for you?' DEAD 149
- b. Agus a-r ghnóthaigh sí aon rás eile i mbliana?
and c.q-.PAST win.PAST she one race other this-year
'And did she win any other race this year?' RNG 26-08-19

IN CERTAIN WH-QUESTIONS. The issue of under what conditions NPI's are licensed in WH-questions has been important in debates about the nature of NPI-licensing (Giannakidou (1999, 2011), Guerzoni & Sharvit (2007), Mayr (2013)). The PSE's we care about here appear in such questions, root and embedded:

- (65) a. cé eile a bhfuil fhios aige tada faoi seo?
who other c be.PRES knowledge at.him anything about this
'Who else knows anything about this?' CAB 89
- b. goidé mar a thiocfadh liom aon fhear a phósadh?
how c come.COND with.me any man vce marry.VN
'How could I marry any man?' AM 162
- c. Cad a dheineas féin ná Pádraig riamh a thuill TB a thabhairt domhsa
what c do.PASTS1 self or Patrick ever c merit.PAST give.NON-FIN to-me
'What did Patrick or myself ever do that I deserved to get TB?' DP 105
- d. cé a chreidfeadh go raibh sé ariamh bródúil?
who c believe.COND c be.PAST he ever proud
'Who could believe that he was ever proud?' ATFS 51

Many of these cases involve rhetorical questions – (65b-d), for example; others are information-seeking questions which require exhaustive answers, as in (65a), a pattern which is consistent in particular with the work of Guerzoni & Sharvit (2007) and Mayr (2013). Whether or not this pattern holds consistently is something which remains to be investigated.

IN CONDITIONAL CLAUSES. The PSE's of Section 2 may also appear, with existential interpretation, in conditional clauses, both realis (66a) and irrealis (66b,c):

- (66) a. má chaitheann tú choíchin tada a rá, abair go cuí é
 if must.PRES you ever anything say.NON-FIN say.IMPV appropriately it
 ‘if you ever have to say anything, say it appropriately’ AE 62
- b. dá mbeadh baint ar bith leis na gnóithe agam
 if be.COND connection any with the business at.me
 ‘if I had any say in the matter’ CLM 38
- c. dá dtarlaíodh tada dá hathair
 if happen.COND anything to-her father
 ‘if anything should happen to her father’ AA 177

IN EQUATIVE, COMPARATIVE AND SUPERLATIVE CLAUSES.

- (67) culaith éadaigh chomh deas agus a chuir aon fhear riamh ar a dhroim
 suit clothes.GEN as nice as C.WH put.PAST any man ever on his back
 ‘as nice a suit of clothes as any man ever put on his back’ EMPP 163
- (68) Tá níos mó chéill i gcuid cainte Dhomhnaill ná aidmhigheas aon duine.
 be.PRES more sense.GEN in share talk.GEN than admit.PRES.WH any person
 ‘There’s more sense in what Domhnall says than anyone admits.’ MO 135
- (69) a. gheobhaidh tú an úsáid is measa a fuair aon fhear ariamh
 get.FUT you the use worst C.WH get.PAST any man ever
 ‘you’ll get the worst treatment any man ever got’ UGV 108
- b. d’ airigh siad an screadach ba chráite dár chuala aon duine ariamh
 PAST hear.PAST they the scream most-tortured C.PAST hear.PAST any person ever
 ‘They heard the most agonized scream that anyone had ever heard.’ SJCCF 14

On the licensing potential of comparatives see Hoeksema (1983); on superlatives see von Fintel (1999), Gajewski (2010), Herdan & Sharvit (2006), Bumford & Sharvit (2022).

IN EXCESSIVE-DEGREE CLAUSES. Phrases in construction with the degree-word *ró-* (‘too’) also freely host PSE’s:

- (70) a. Tá sé ró- mhall anois tada a dhéanamh.
 be.PRES it too late now anything VCE do.VN
 ‘It’s too late to do anything now,’ AA 158
- b. bhí sé ró- the chun éinne bheith ag spaisteoireacht ar na failltreacha
 be.PAST it too hot for anyone be.NON-FIN PROG stroll.VN on the cliffs
 ‘It was too hot for anyone to be walking on the cliffs.’ DPB 102
- c. duí gainmhe a bhí ró- aimhréidh d’ aon ghalfchúrsa
 dune sand.GEN C be.PAST too uneven for any golf-course
 ‘a sand-dune that was too uneven for any golf-course’ LG 170

IN CERTAIN TEMPORAL CLAUSES. In languages which have been closely studied, NPI’s also appear within certain temporal clauses (see especially Condoravdi (2010), Krifka (2010)). The Irish PSE’s we are concerned with occur freely in such clauses:

- (71) a. sula a dtabharadh sé deor amháin do fhear ar bith
before c gie.COND he drop one to man any
'before he would give a single drop to anybody' SSOTC 242
- b. sul má bheidh a fhios aige tada
before c be.FUT knowledge at-him anything
'before he knows anything' CF 129
- c. sul má lonnaigh aon duine ariamh ann
before c settle.PAST any person ever there
'before anyone ever settled there' MABAT 74
- (72) a. Bhí siad go han-mhaith dó nuair a bhí a dhath acu.
be.PAST they PTC very-good to-him when c be.PAST anything at-them
'They were very good to him when they had anything.' GOG 266
- b. nuair a theastaíodh dada uaithi bhuaileadh sí cnag ar an urlár
when c need.PAST.HABIT anything from.her hit.PAST.HABIT she knock on the floor
'when she needed anything, she would bang on the floor' CG 20
- c. Ní tostach dóibh nuair a thagas aon bhac in a mbealach.
COP.NEG silent to.them when c come.PRES.WH any obstacle in their way
'They are not silent when any obstacle gets in their way.' CG 34

IN ARGUMENTS OF 'NEGATIVE' PREDICATES. The PSE's of Section 2 also appear in the complements of certain predicates whose meaning has a 'negative' component (in a sense which remains to be fully clarified). As shown in (73), for instance, they appear regularly in the clausal complements of so-called adversative attitude predicates – those which give rise to an implicature that the holder of the attitude has a negative view of the semantic content of the complement.

- (73) a. bhí inní orainn go dtarlódh aon cheo dhuit
be.PAST worry on-US c happen.COND any mist to-you
'We were worried that anything would happen to you.' CGC 68
- b. Is deacair tada a rá
COP hard anything say.NON-FIN
'It's hard to say anything.' FB 146
- c. ar eagla go dtarlódh a dhath dó
on fear c happen.COND anything to-him
'for fear that anything might happen to him' TAIR 182
- d. Is mór a' trua go gcaithfidh aon duine imeacht as.
COP.PRES great the pity c must any person leave.NON-FIN out-of.it
'It's a great pity that anyone has to leave it.' BRD 246

I include in this class some implicative predicates like *fail*:

- (74) a. chinn orm éinne a aimsiú.
fail.PAST on.me anyone VCE find.VN
'I failed to find anyone.' TUAIR 04-10-21
- b. chinn air tada in-ite a fháil.
fail.PAST on.him anything edible VCE find.VN
'He failed to find anything edible.' ATT 101

Here, though, there is an interesting contrast between Irish and English. In Irish (and also in Korean, judging by Lee (1995)), *pse*'s may appear as direct arguments of the relevant predicates (as opposed to being allowed only within their complements):

- (75) Chinn sé ar aon dochtúir thall ann é a bhaint amach.
 fail.PAST it on any doctor over there it *vce* take.VN out
 'No doctor over there succeeded in extracting it.' SJCCF 275
 (*lit.*: 'Any doctor over there failed to extract it.')

An interesting subclass of such predicates are those which express reluctance on the part of an experiencer. These are among Karttunen's (1971) negative implicatives – 'they seem to incorporate negation' (Karttunen (1971: 352)) and license the inference that in the preference-worlds of their experiencers the eventuality described in their complement is not instantiated.²⁰ *NPI*'s in English are licensed within the complements of such predicates, but not in the experiencer argument-position. In Irish they are in addition licensed in the experiencer argument-position. I emphasize the contrast between the two languages in this respect by offering for the examples in (76) literal English translations – which are ill-formed but, interestingly, understandable.²¹

- (76) a. bhí drogall ar aon imreoir suí leis ag clár na himeartha
 be.PAST reluctance on any player sit.NON-FIN with.him at board the.GEN playing.GEN
 'any player was reluctant to sit with him at the gaming-table' SJCCF 337
 b. Bhí leisce ar aon duine tada a rá.
 be.PAST reluctance on any person anything *vce* say.VN
 'Anyone was reluctant to say anything.' LGN 96

Similarly, the predicate *cuma* ('matterless, insignificant') allows *NPI*'s in its two argument-positions:

- (77) a. Ba chuma liom faoi thada.
 COP.PAST matterless with.me about anything
 'I didn't care about anything.' RNG 31-01-20
 b. is cuma le ceachtar agaibh fá'n duine eile
 COP.PRES matterless with either of.you about.the person other
 'Neither of you cares about the other.' ATFS 425
 (*lit.* 'Either of you doesn't care about the other.')

The English facts here may be complicated by a language-particular oddity – a requirement that the licensing element precede the licensed *NPI*, on which see, for instance, Ladusaw (1979: 206-7)). It is also possible that the English-Irish contrasts reflect an independent contrast – that the scope potential of subjects in Irish is more limited than the scope potential of subjects in English. On that view, (75)–(77) would be available in Irish because the relevant arguments are within the scope of the (negative component of the) licensing predicate. English subjects raise out of that scope domain and, for some mysterious reason, reconstruction is not available.

²⁰For a sophisticated and relevant discussion, see von Stechow (1999: 115-121).

²¹One might avoid this puzzle by taking the examples in (75), (76) and (77) to involve 'free choice' readings. But this move is unlikely to be tenable given that the licensing conditions for such readings are not satisfied in such cases. In addition, the possibilities shown in (75)–(77) hold only for predicates whose meaning in some sense includes a negative component (Klima (1964), Karttunen (1971), Kadmon & Landman (1993), von Stechow (1999)).

IN THE RESTRICTIVE CLAUSE OF A UNIVERSAL QUANTIFICATION STRUCTURE. We can document a final licensing environment and it is once again a familiar one – the restrictive clause of a universal quantification structure.

The most frequent case of this type involves NPI's which have 'free choice' or quasi-universal readings. On this possibility (in English) see Horn (2000: 163). A relative clause attached to such an element acts as the restrictor for the universal quantification that it expresses and the PSE's discussed in Section 2 appear freely within such clauses.

- (78) a. éinne go bhfuil aon chiall aige
anyone C be.PRES any sense at.him
'anyone who has any sense' G 11
- b. Fear ar bith a bhfuil fhios aige tada
man any C be.PRES knowledge at.him anything
'any man who knows anything' CNF 25
- c. Am ar bith a mbeadh a dhath le rádh aige liom
time any C be.COND anything to say.VN at.him with.me
'any time he had anything to say to me' LCS 201

Relative clauses attached to head nouns modified by the ordinal *céad* ('first') are probably also best regarded as being of this class, and the PSE's of Section 2 appear freely in such clauses:

- (79) a. Siod é an chéad am a labhair mé air le aon duine
that it the first time C speak.PAST I on.it with any person
'That was the first time that I spoke about it with anyone.' SMC 287
- b. an chéad ál a bhí ariamh aici
the first litter C be.PAST ever at-her
'the first litter she ever had' CA 26

Unconditional clauses (which in Irish are marked by means of a distinctive WH-determiner *pé*, or *cibé*) similarly host the PSE's that are of interest:

- (80) pé pingin a bhí riamh acu
whatever penny C be.PAST ever at-them
'whatever pennies they ever had' AI 199

It is hardly a surprise, then, that relative clauses which restrict nouns headed by explicit universal quantifiers may also host the polarity sensitive expressions of Section 2:

- (81) a. timpeall ar chuile áit a gceapfaidís a mbeadh aon deis ag an ngail
around on every place C think.COND.P3 C be.COND any opportunity at the steam
a bheith ag éalú
be.NON-FIN PROG escape.VN
'around every place that they'd think there was any opportunity for the steam to escape' SJCCF 266
- b. Gach neach a thug cath éagórach riamh d' Fhionn
every being C give.PAST battle unjust ever to
'every being who ever joined battle unjustly with Fionn' SAF 226

APPENDIX TWO – SOURCES OF EXAMPLES.

- A: *Aileach*, Jackie Mac Donncha, Cló Iar-Chonnacht, 2010
- AA: *Athaoibhneas*, Pádraic Óg Ó Conaire, Sáirséal agus Dill, 1959
- AAG: *As an nGéibheann*, Máirtín Ó Cadhain, Sáirséal agus Dill, 1973
- ABHM: *Ábhar Machnaimh*, An tAthair Donncha Ó Corcora, Foilseacháin Náisiúnta Teoranta, 1985
- ACED: *An Chuid Eile Díom Féin – Aistí le Máirtín Ó Direáin*, ed. Síobhra Aiken, Cló Iar-Chonnacht, 2018
- AE: *An Eochair*, Máirtín Ó Cadhain, Dalkey Archive Press, 2015
- AFAP: *An Fear a Phléasc*, Mícheál Ó Conghaile, Cló Iar-Chonnachta, 1997
- AGFC: *An Grá Faoi Cheilt*, Pádraig Ó Cíobháin, Coiscéim, 1992
- AGMTS: *Ar Gach Maoilinn Tá Síocháin*, Pádraig Ó Cíobháin, Coiscéim, 1991
- AG: *An Gabhar Sa Teampall*, Mícheál Ua Ciarmhaic, Coiscéim, 1986
- AI: *Allagar na hInise*, Tomás Ó Criomhthain, Oifig an tSoláthair, 1977
- AL: *Abair Leat*, Joe Daly, ed. Pádraig Tyers, An Sagart, 1999
- AM: *An Mhiorbhailt*, C.B Kelland, trans. Niall Mac Suibhne, Oifig Díolta Foillseacháin Rialtais, 1936
- AN: *Athnuachan*, Máirtín Ó Cadhain, Coiscéim, 1995
- ANNF: *Ar Nós na bhFáinleog*, Siobhán Ní Shúilleabháin, Coiscéim, 2004
- APB: *An Prionsa Beag*, Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, trans. Eoghan Mac Giolla Bhríde, Éabhlóid, 2015
- ATFS: *Ag Teacht Frid an tSeagal*, Helen Mathers, trans. Seosamh Mac Grianna, An Gúm, 1932
- ATIM: *An tIolrach Mór, Díoghlaim Gearr-Sgéal*, Pádraic Ó Domhnalláin, Brún agus Ó Nualláin, 1941
- ATT: *An tSraith Tógtha*, Máirtín Ó Cadhain, Sáirséal agus Dill, 1977
- BM: *Bullaí Mhártain*, Síle Ní Chéileachair agus Donncha Ó Céilleachair, Sáirséal agus Dill, 1969
- BRD: *Bean Ruadh de Dhálach*, Séamus Ó Grianna, Oifig Díolta Foillseacháin Rialtais, 1966
- BTFS: *An Blascaod Trí Fhuinneog na Scoile*, Nóra Ní Shéaghdha, ed. Pádraig Ó hÉalaí, An Sagart, 2015
- C: *Clochmhóin*, Joe Steve Ó Neachtain, Cló Iar-Chonnachta, 1998
- CA: *Cnuasacht Airneáin*, Colm Ó Ceallaigh, Coiscéim, 2006
- CAB: *Carraig an Bháis*, Colm Ó Ceallaigh, Coiscéim, 2007
- CC: *Cruithneacht agus Ceannabháin*, Tomás Bairéad, Comhlucht Oideachais na hÉireann, 1940
- CDC: *Castar na Daoine ar a Chéile, Scríbhinní Mháire 1*, Séamus Ó Grianna, ed. Nollaig Mac Congail, Coiscéim, 2002
- CF: *Cois Fharraige Le Mo Linnse*, Seán Ó Conghaile, Clódhanna Teoranta, 1974
- CFC: *Céad Fáilte go Cléire*, ed. Marion Gunn, An Clóchomhar Tta, 1990
- CGC: *Caillte i gConamara, Scéalta Aniar*, ed. Brian Ó Conchubhair, Cló Iar-Chonnacht, 2014
- CG: *Ceol na nGiolcach*, Pádraic Óg Ó Conaire, Oifig an tSoláthair, 1968
- CHD: *Chicago Driver*, Maidhc Dainín Ó Sé, Coiscéim, 1992
- CLM: *Cúl le Muir agus Scéalta Eile*, Séamus Ó Grianna, Oifig an tSoláthair, 1961
- CNF: *Clann na Feannóige*, Colm Ó Ceallaigh, Coiscéim, 2004
- COC: *Cora Cinniúna*, Séamus Ó Grianna, ed. Niall Ó Domhnaill, An Gúm, 1993
- CPCC: *Cuimhní Pinn, Cuimhní Cinn*, Seán Ó Sé, Coiscéim, 2010
- CTP: *Cuimhne an tSeanpháiste*, Mícheál Breatnach, Oifig an tSoláthair, 1966
- DEAD: *Déirc an Díomhaointis*, Pádraic Óg Ó Conaire, Sáirséal agus Dill, 1972
- DGD: *Deoir Ghoirt an Deoraí*, Colm Ó Ceallaigh, Cló Iar-Chonnachta, 1993
- DP: *Dochtúir na bPiast*, Maidhc Dainín Ó Sé, Coiscéim, 1993
- DPB: *Dualgas Pheadair Bhig*, trans. Séamus Ó Maolchathaigh, Oifig an tSoláthair, 1953
- DR: *Dracula*, Bram Stoker, trans. Seán Ó Cuirrín, An Gúm, 1933/1997
- EMPP: *Eachtraí Mara Phaidí Pheadair as Toraigh*, Séamus Mac a' Bhaird, ed. Aingeal Nic a' Bhaird, Caoimhín Mac a' Bhaird, Nollaig Mac Congail, Arlen House, 2019

- FB: *Feamain Bhealtaine*, Máirtín Ó Direáin, An Clóchomhar Tta., 1961
- FF: *Fonn na Fola*, Beairtle Ó Conaire, Cló Iar-Chonnacht, 2005
- G: *Greenhorn*, Maidhc Dainín Ó Sé, Coiscéim, 1997
- GDDR: *Go dTaga do Ríocht, Boicíní Bhóthar Kilburn, Cripil Inis Meáin*, Mícheál Ó Conghaile, Cló Iarr-Chonnachta, 2009
- GFH: *An Ghlan-fhírinne*, Cóil Learaí Ó Finneadha, Cló Iarr-Chonnacht, 2014
- GOG: *Glórtha ón Ghorta: Béaloideas na Gaeilge agus an Gorta Mór*, Cathal Póirtéir, Coiscéim, 1996
- GSA: *An Giorria San Aer*, Ger Ó Cíobháin, Coiscéim, 1992
- IAE: *In Aimsir Emmet*, trans. Colm Ó Gaora, Oifig Díolta Foillseacháin Rialtais, Dublin, 1937
- IMSBRM: *Idir Mná: Scribhneoirí Ban Ros Muc*, ed. Máire Holmes, Pléaráca Chonamara, 1995
- ISNB: *Iad Seo Nach Bhfaca*, Beairtle Ó Conaire, Cló Iar-Chonnacht, 2010
- LCS: *Le Clap-Sholus*, Séamas Ó Grianna, Oifig an tSoláthair, 1967
- LGL: *Le Gealaigh*, Pádraig Ó Cíobháin, Coiscéim, 1991
- LGN: *Le Gean agus scéalta eile*, Mike P. Ó Ó Conaola, Sián, 2020
- LL: *Lámh Láidir*, Joe Steve Ó Neachtain, Cló Iar-Chonnachta, 2005
- LSC: *Lig Sinn i gCathú*, Breandán Ó hEithir, Sáirséal agus Dill, 1976
- MABAT: *Mar a Bhí Ar dTús: Cuimhne Seanghasúir*, Joe Steve Ó Neachtain, Cló Iarr-Chonnacht, 2018
- MO: *Muintir An Oileáin*, Peadar O'Donnell, trans. Seosamh Mac Grianna, 1952
- NLAB: *Na Laetha a Bhí*, Eoghan Ó Domhnaill, Oifig an tSoláthair, 1968
- OMGS: *Ó Mhuir go Sliabh*, Séamus Ó Grianna, Oifig an tSoláthair, 1961
- OOGC: *Ó Oileán go Cuilleán*, Muiris Ó Súilleabháin, ed. Nuala Uí Aimhírgín, Coiscéim, 2000
- OTA: *Ón tSeanam Anall, Scéalta Mhicí Bháin Uí Bheirn*, ed. Mícheál Mac Giolla Easbuic, Cló Iarr-Chonnachta, 2008
- PAA: *Peacaí Ár nAthaireacha*, Mícheál Ó Súilleabháin, Coiscéim, 1992
- PI: *Punt Isló*, Maidhc Dainín Ó Sé, Coiscéim, 2013
- PNG: *Pobal na Gaeltachta*, ed. Gearóid Ó Tuathaigh, Liam Lillis Ó Laoire, Seán Ua Súilleabháin, Cló Iarr-Chonnachta, 2000
- RNG: *Raidió na Gaeltachta* (numerical index refers to date of broadcast)
- SIF: *Seanchas Iascaireachta agus Farraige*, Seán Ó hEochaidh, *Béaloideas* 33, 1965
- SJCCF: *Seanchas Jimmí Chearra Chois Fharraige*, ed. Pádraic Ó Cearra, Coiscéim, 2010
- SJSJ: *Seachrán Jeaic Sheáin Johnny*, Mícheál Ó Conghaile, Cló Iarr-Chonnacht, 2002
- SK: *Sáile Chaomhánach*, C.J. Kickham, trans. Máirtín Ó Cadhain, An Gúm, 1932/1986
- SMC: *Stairsheanchas Mhicil Chonraí – Ón Máimín go Ráth Chairn*, ed. Conchúr Ó Giollagáin, Cló Iar-Chonnachta, 1999
- SNAF: *Seanchas na Féinne*, Niall Ó Dónaill, An Gúm, 1943/1996
- SRNF: *Seanchas Rann na Feirste*, Maelsheachlainn Mac Cionaoith, 2006
- SSOTC: *Síscéalta ó Thír Chonaill*, ed. Seán Ó Heochaidh, Máire Ní Néill and Séamas Ó Catháin, Comhairle Bhéaloideas Éireann, 1977.
- TAIR: *Tairngreacht*, Proinsias Mac a' Bhaird, Leabhair Comhar, 2018
- TII: *Tone Inné agus Inniu*, Máirtín Ó Cadhain, Coiscéim, 1992
- TMGB: *Thiar sa Mhainistir atá an Ghaolainn Bhreá*, Brighid Ní Mhóráin, An Sagart, 1997
- TUAIR: *Tuairisc*: online newspaper: <https://tuairisc.ie> (numerical index refers to date of publication)
- UMI: *Uaill-Mhian Iúdaigh*, Roy Bridges, trans. Tadhg Ó Rabhartaigh, Oifig Díolta Foillseacháin Rialtais, 1936
- UGV: *Ulster Gaelic Voices: Bailiúchán Wilhelm Doegen 1931*, Róise Ní Bhaoill, Iontaobhas Ultach, 2010