

# **Expressive negation in proper nouns?**

## **The case of Rita in Catalan**

**Núria Bosch**

University of Cambridge

✉ nb611@cam.ac.uk | 🌐 [nuria-bosch.github.io](https://nuria-bosch.github.io)

*GLOW 47 – Workshop II Negation*  
Goethe-Universität Frankfurt

28 March 2025

# **Introduction**

# Overview

---



A proper noun, Rita, appears to function similarly to *negative indefinites* ( $\approx$  nobody)

- (1) a. Això s'ho creurà Rita.  
this CL.REFL=CL.DO= believe.FUT.3SG EPI

[Catalan]

'Nobody is going to believe this / There's no way I'm going to believe this' (lit. 'Rita is going to believe this').

- b. Esto se lo va a creer Rita.  
this CL.REFL= CL.DO= go.3SG to believe.INF EPI

[Spanish]

'Nobody is going to believe this / There's no way I'm going to believe this' (lit. 'Rita is going to believe this').

- c. Si segueixen així, (no) aprovarà Rita.  
if continue.3PL like.this not pass.FUT.3SG EPI

[Catalan]

'If they continue like this, nobody will pass (the exam) / they won't pass the exam.'

- Undescribed case of apparent **expressive negative indefinites** (Catalan and Spanish), henceforth **Expressive Pseudo (Negative) Indefinites**, or EPis.

# Overview

---

## Today

- **Descriptive/empirical effort:** syntactic distribution of the proper noun *RITA* as (apparent) EPI and its inter-speaker variation, with particular focus on Catalan.

# Overview

---

## Today

- **Descriptive/empirical effort:** syntactic distribution of the proper noun *RITA* as (apparent) EPI and its inter-speaker variation, with particular focus on Catalan.
- ↪ Impressionistic observations suggest *RITA* may interact with negation/antiveridicality in *some* speakers.

# Overview

---

## Today

- **Descriptive/empirical effort:** syntactic distribution of the proper noun *RITA* as (apparent) EPI and its inter-speaker variation, with particular focus on Catalan.
- Impressionistic observations suggest *RITA* may interact with negation/antiveridicality in *some* speakers.
- Native speaker consultation (Catalan and Spanish), supplemented by a **grammaticality judgement survey** among 1,344 Catalan speakers, of which 460 use the expression.
  1. Sentential negation
  2. Negative spread
  3. *Absolutely*-modification
  4. Neg-raising predicates
  5. Negative fragments
  6. *Without*-clauses
  7. Other restrictions: focalisation, argument structure.

## Today

- **Descriptive/empirical effort:** syntactic distribution of the proper noun *RITA* as (apparent) EPI and its inter-speaker variation, with particular focus on Catalan.
- Native speaker consultation (Catalan and Spanish), supplemented by a **grammaticality judgement survey** among 1,344 Catalan speakers, of which 460 use the expression.
- The upshot: A change-in-progress?
  - **RITA** patterns as a *syntactic class of its own*, sharing only some of the traits of existing categories, such as Negative Concord Items, Polarity Items and squatitives.
  - Significant, but *constrained inter-speaker variation*: (minimally) 3 consequential groups of speakers.
  - **Comparison** of *RITA* to other **EPIs** in these languages.
  - **Implications** for a syntactic typology of polarity/negative items and diachronic sources of related elements.

# The plan today

---

## 1. Introduction

## 2. Describing RITA: The Data

- 2.1 The phenomenon: general observations
- 2.2 *RITA* vs other negative and polarity items
  - RITA* and NCIs
  - RITA* and (weak) PIs
  - RITA* and squatitives

## 3. EPIs beyond *RITA*

## 4. Implications and Conclusions

## **Describing RITA: The Data**

## The phenomenon: general observations

---



**A proper noun**, Rita (originally 19th c. singer), appears to function similarly to *negative indefinites* (≈ nobody)

- (2) a. Això s'ho creurà **Rita.** [Catalan]  
this CL.REFL=CL.DO= believe.FUT.3SG EPI

'Nobody is going to believe this / There's no way I'm going to believe this' (lit. 'Rita is going to believe this').

- b. Esto se lo va a creer **Rita.** [Spanish]  
this CL.REFL= CL.DO= go.3SG to believe.INF EPI

'Nobody is going to believe this / There's no way I'm going to believe this' (lit. 'Rita is going to believe this').

- c. Si segueixen així, (no) aprovarà **Rita.** [Catalan]  
if continue.3PL like.this not pass.FUT.3SG EPI

'If they continue like this, nobody will pass (the exam) / they won't pass the exam.' (lit. 'Rita is going to pass the exam')

- **Expressive** and **epistemic**, encoding **speaker attitude**: negative attitude towards the likelihood of what is conveyed in the proposition or towards past events.
- **Flexible person indexing**.

# The phenomenon: general observations

---

- Part of a possibly broader phenomenon: limited set of proper nouns and person-referring DPs can behave (at least superficially) similarly.  
→ Focus primarily on RITA

(3) a. *Pues vendrá el Papa de Roma a arreglar las cosas.* [Spanish]  
well come.FUT.3SG the Pope of Rome to fix.INF  
the things

'Well, nobody is going to come to fix this / 'I'm not coming to fix this.'<sup>1</sup>

b. *Això (no) ho farà (ni) Déu.* [Catalan]  
this not CL.DO= do.FUT.3SG not.even God

'No one is going to do this.'

c. *Perdona'm, però les redaccions te les farà ta mare.*  
forgive.IMP=CL.DO but the essays CL.IO= CL.DO= do.FUT.3SG your mother

'Sorry, but I'm not doing these essays / no one is doing these essays.'<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup><https://x.com/LauritaRMadrid/status/185108997504909313?s=20>.

<sup>2</sup><https://x.com/AnaFerrerS/status/521411305102929920?s=20>.

# The phenomenon: general observations

---

- Some signs of grammaticalisation and pragmaticalisation:
  1. **Grammaticalisation**: apparent rise in negative/quantificational and more pronominal interpretations.
    - **Bleaching**: original function as proper nouns/DPs is lost, including reference to a specific individual.
    - **Decategorialisation**: loss of syntactic attributes associated with more lexical categories → loss of personal article *la* before *RITA* in Catalan (otherwise compulsory with proper nouns)<sup>3</sup>.
  2. **Pragmaticalisation** (Diewald, 2011): propositional meaning > metacommunicative, discourse interactional meaning.
    - **Novel encoding of negative speaker attitude** → (inter)subjectification (Traugott, 1989).
- Overall, **proper noun** seemingly undergoing *some change*. Its study may be **instructive** in at least three ways:
  - Placement of EPIs in a syntactic typology of negative/polarity items.
  - Development of expressive language (see relevant data in, i.a., Speas and Tenny, 2003; Gutzmann, 2015; Wiltschko and Heim, 2016; Trotzke, 2017; Wiltschko, 2014, 2021).
  - Possible sources of negation/polarity-related items.

---

<sup>3</sup>In most, but not all, speakers.

# The phenomenon: general observations

---

- Some signs of grammaticalisation and pragmaticalisation:
  1. **Grammaticalisation**: apparent rise in negative/quantificational and more pronominal interpretations.
    - **Bleaching**: original function as proper nouns/DPs is lost, including reference to a specific individual.
    - **Decategorialisation**: loss of syntactic attributes associated with more lexical categories → loss of personal article *la* before *RITA* in Catalan (otherwise compulsory with proper nouns)<sup>3</sup>.
  2. **Pragmaticalisation** (Diewald, 2011): propositional meaning > metacommunicative, discourse interactional meaning.
    - **Novel encoding of negative speaker attitude** → (inter)subjectification (Traugott, 1989).
- Overall, **proper noun** seemingly undergoing *some change*. Its study may be **instructive** in at least three ways:
  - Placement of EPIs in a syntactic typology of negative/polarity items.
  - Development of expressive language (see relevant data in, i.a., Speas and Tenny, 2003; Gutzmann, 2015; Wiltschko and Heim, 2016; Trotzke, 2017; Wiltschko, 2014, 2021).
  - Possible sources of negation/polarity-related items.

**Next up:** Comparing *RITA*'s distribution with existing syntactic categories

---

<sup>3</sup>In most, but not all, speakers.

### N-words (or Negative Concord Items)

(Giannakidou and Zeijlstra, 2017, 7)

N-words (or Negative Concord Items): an expression  $\alpha$  is an n-word iff:

- $\alpha$  can be used in structures that contain sentential negation or another  $\alpha$ -expression, yielding a reading equivalent to one logical negation; and
- $\alpha$  can provide a negative fragment answer (i.e., without the overt presence of negation).

### Veridicality and non-veridicality

- A propositional operator  $F$  is **veridical** iff  $Fp$  entails  $p$ :  $Fp \Rightarrow p$ ; otherwise,  $F$  is **nonveridical**.
- A nonveridical operator  $F$  is **antiveridical** iff  $Fp$  entails *not*  $p$ :  $Fp \Rightarrow \neg p$ .

- **Upcoming:** RITA's behaviour in *antiveridical* contexts, compared to NCIs in Catalan and Spanish.
- I identify (minimally) **five points of difference** between RITA and NCIs (**First set of survey data**), but also important **convergences**.

## RITA and NCIs: sentential negation

---

- Catalan and Spanish as Non-strict Negative Concord languages.

- (4) a. **\*(No)** *vino nadie.* [negative doubling; Spanish]  
not come.PST.3SG n-body  
  
'Nobody came.'
- b. **Nadie (\*no)** *vino.* [no negation with pre-verbal NCIs]  
n-body not come.PST.3SG  
  
'Nobody came.'
- c. **Ningú (no)** *menja.* [optional negation with pre-verbal NCIs; Catalan]  
n-body not eat.3SG  
  
'Nobody eats.'

## RITA and NCIs: sentential negation

---

👎 First point of divergence: RITA is most commonly used **without sentential negation**, even if postverbal, or negation + NCI *ni*.

- (5) a. *N'estic farta. El farà Rita aquest projecte.* [Catalan]  
CL.REFL=be.1SG fed.up CL.DO= do.FUT.3SG EPI this  
project  
project
- 'I'm fed up. I'm not doing this project / there's no way I'm finishing this project.'
- b. *Los perros de los vecinos solo hacían que ladrar esta noche. Evidentemente, (no) ha dormido (ni) Rita* [Spanish]  
the dogs of the neighbours only do.IMPF.3SG that  
talk. INF this night obviously not AUX.HAVE.3SG sleep.PTCP not.even EPI
- 'The neighbours' dogs were barking constantly last night. Obviously, we couldn't sleep at all.'

# RITA and NCIs: sentential negation

---

- ! It can nonetheless **co-occur with sentential negation for some speakers.**
  - RITA is gradually sanctioning sentential negation in some speakers.

(6) a. **No** s'aixecarà                            **Rita** demà.  
not CL.REFL=wake.up.FUT.3SG EPI tomorrow

[Catalan]

'There's no way we're waking up (on time) tomorrow.'

b. **No** vindrà                            **Rita** al        gimnàs!  
not come.FUT.3SG EPI to.the gym

'Nobody is going to come to the gym / I'm not coming to the gym!'

c. **Lo** de la multa **no** se        **lo**        **cree**  
the of the fine not CL.REFL= CL.DO= believe.INF

[Spanish]

**Rita la Cantaora.**

EPI


'As for the fine, nobody is believing this / I'm not going to believe this.'<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup><https://x.com/AgoneyCarmel/status/1326535312193937409?s=20>.

## RITA and NCIs: sentential negation

- Highly statistically significant difference between acceptability of clauses with sentential negation vs *ni*-accompanied RITA ( $W = 26386, p < .0001$ ). **However**, significant proportion of speakers judged the former as "Good" or "Very good".



## RITA and NCIs: positional restrictions and focalisation

---

- ~ Negation *can* (but need not) precede postverbal *RITA* for some speakers; for others, it is entirely ungrammatical. NCIs, in contrast, *require* negation when postverbal.
- 👎 **Second point of divergence: positional restrictions** on *RITA* which do not apply to Catalan/Spanish NCIs.
  - Preference for *RITA* as *subject*, specifically **postverbal subject**. If **preverbal**, it must be **focalised** and receive **emphatic prosody**.


- (7) a. \*?**Rita** trobarà feina aquí. [Catalan]  
EPI find.FUT.3SG work here  
(intended) 'Nobody will find a job here' (alternative reading: 'Rita will find a job here.'<sup>5</sup>)
- b. **RITA** trobarà feina aquí  
EPI find.FUT.3SG work here  
'NOBODY will find a job here / There's no way I'll find a job here' OR 'RITA will find job here (not someone else)'.

---

<sup>5</sup>Although odd and only marginally acceptable because of the lack of personal article.

## RITA and NCIs: sentential negation

- Significantly higher proportion of acceptability of *RITA* when focalised pre-verbally ( $\chi^2(1) = 5.8359, p < .016$ ).



- **Postverbal** subjects known to display **focal properties** in Cat./Sp. (i.a., Belletti, 2004; Ortega-Santos, 2008; Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria, 2008; Forcadell, 2013) → **preverbal RITA appears to have kept this requirement**, unlike canonical preverbal (topical) subjects in these languages.

## RITA and NCIs: argument structure and *ni*

---

⚠ **Third point of divergence:** argument structure preferences on RITA (dependent on the presence of NCI *ni*) which do not apply to Catalan/Spanish NCIs.


- Postverbally and without *ni/no*: transitive and unergative frames preferred, compared to unaccusatives. RITA dispreferred as *object*.
- With *ni*: differences disappear; all contexts rated as "Good" or "Very good".

- (8) a. *El farà Rita aquest examen.* [Catalan]  
CL.DO= do.3SG.FUT EPI this exam  
  
'There's no way we're/I'm doing this exam.'
- b. *L'aire condicionat no va. Treballarà Rita.*  
the-air coinditioning not work.3SG work.3SG.FUT EPI  
  
'The air-con isn't working. I'm not working today!/There's no way we can work today!'
- c. *Mira qué cola de coches. Llegarán Rita a tiempo!* [Spanish]  
look what queue of cars arrive.3SG.FUT EPI on time  
  
'Look at the car queue! No way we're arriving on time.'
- d. ?? *Llamaré (a) Rita, no estoy de humor!*  
call.1SG.FUT DOM EPI not be.1SG in mood  
  
'I'm not going to call anyone/them/him, I'm not in a good mood!'

## RITA and NCIs: argument structure and *ni*

- Statistically highly significant differences between argument structure frames, and differences between exclusion/inclusion of NCI *ni*.

Responses with verbs with different argument structure with/without NCI *ni*



## RITA and NCIs: *absolutely*-modification

---

👎 **Fourth point of divergence:** NCIs in various Romance languages permit ***absolutely/almost*** **modifiers** under negation (see Quer, 1993, Giannakidou, 2000). This does not carry over to RITA, with or without sentential negation.

- (9) a. *No he vist absolutament/quasi ningú.* [Catalan]  
not AUX.HAVE.1SG see.PTCP absolutely/almost no-one

'I have seen absolutely/almost no-one.'

- b. *No he visto absolutamente/casi nadie.* [Spanish]  
not AUX.HAVE.1SG see.PTCP absolutely/almost no-one

'I have seen absolutely/almost no-one.'

- (10) a. \* *(No) he vist absolutament/quasi Rita.* [Catalan]  
not AUX.HAVE.1SG see.PTCP absolutely/almost EPI

(intended) ≈ 'I have seen absolutely/almost no-one.'

- b. \* *(No) he visto absolutamente/casi Rita.* [Spanish]  
not AUX.HAVE.1SG see.PTCP absolutely/almost EPI

(intended) ≈ 'I have seen absolutely/almost no-one.'

## RITA and NCIs: expressivity and epistemicity

---

- ☛ **Fifth point of divergence:** RITA is **expressive** in nature, conveying **negative speaker attitude** towards an event or action. Canonical NCIs (and other types of negative indefinites more broadly, such as NPIs or negative quantifiers), can be uttered in discourse-neutral contexts.
- **Other restrictions:** possible **tense/aspectual restrictions** (pending further study)

- (11) a. ✓ A *aquest ritme, aprovarà Rita l'examen.* [Catalan]  
at this rate pass.FUT.3SG EPI the-exam  
  
'At this rate, no one is going to pass the exam.'
- b. ✓ A *aquest ritme, aprova Rita l'examen.* [Catalan]  
at this rate pass.3SG EPI the-exam  
  
'At this rate, no one is going to pass the exam.'
- c. ? Va *aprovar Rita l'examen!* [Catalan]  
go.AUX.3SG pass.INF EPI the-exam  
  
'(Of course) no one passed the exam!'

## RITA and NCIs: expressivity and epistemicity

---

- Overall:
  1. Behaviour with sentential negation (notwithstanding inter-speaker variation)
  2. Positional restrictions and focalisation
  3. Argument structure restrictions
  4. (Possibly) tense/aspectual restrictions
  5. *Absolutely*-modification
  6. Expressivity and epistemicity

→ In these respects, *RITA* ≠ NCIs.

- Next: points of convergence in antiveridical contexts, namely neg-raising predicates, negative spread, negative fragment answers and *without*-clauses.

**Second set of survey data**

## RITA and NCIs: neg-raising predicates

---

- NPI-licensing properties of neg-raising predicates (*think, believe, suppose*, etc.)


- (12) a. I **don't** think he lifted **a finger** to help. [neg-raising predicate]  
b. \*I **don't** mean that he lifted **a finger** to help. [non-neg-raising predicate]

👉 **First point of convergence:** grammaticality of RITA with **neg-raising predicates** (13a) vis-à-vis predicates that do not involve neg-raising (13b).

- (13) a. No crec que vingui **Rita.** [neg-raising; Catalan]  
not think.1SG that come.SUBJ.3SG EPI  
  
‘I don’t think (absolutely) anyone will come / I think (absolutely) no one will come.’
- b. \*No dic que vingui **Rita.**  
not say.1SG that come.SUBJ.IMPF.3SG EPI  
  
‘(intended) I am not saying that anyone/no-one came.’

## RITA and NCIs: neg-raising predicates

- Highly statistically significant difference between acceptability of RITA with neg-raising verbs vs non-neg-raising ones ( $W = 73484, p < .0001$ ).



## RITA and NCIs: negative spread

---

- In non-strict Negative Concord languages, a pre-verbal n-word can sanction a postverbal one, without requiring sentential negation, Sp. **Nadie** comió **nada** 'Nobody ate anything' (lit. 'nobody ate nothing').
- thumb up icon **Second point of convergence:** pre-verbal (focalised) RITA turns out, again, grammatical in **negative spread** contexts for varieties of Catalan (NB: Spanish judgements).

(14) a. A aquest ritme, **RITA** aprovarà [negative spread; Catalan]  
at this rate EPI pass.FUT.3SG

**cap** examen.  
no exam

'At this rate, nobody will pass any exams / there's no way anyone is passing any exams.'

b. ??*Esto huele fatal.* **RITA** se va a comer [Spanish]  
this smell.3SG terrible EPI CL.REFL= go.3SG to eat.INF


**nada.**  
nothing

'This smells terrible. There's no way we're eating any of this.'

## RITA and NCIs: negative spread

---

- Participants generally prefer focalisation (32%), 15.6% the non-focalised version. Rest like neither (34.9%) or both (12.9%).



## RITA and NCIs: negative spread

---

- How can we tell the previous examples involve genuine negative spread?  
→ Contrast between *RITA* and *other proper nouns* in Catalan (e.g., *Joan*).

- (15) A *aquest ritme, en Joan* \*(no) aprovarà *cap* examen. [Catalan]  
at this rate the John not pass.FUT.3SG no exam  
'At this rate, John won't pass any exams.'

- **Potential discrepancy** in the formal make-up of *RITA* vis-à-vis other proper nouns in Cat.  
→ Whatever formal properties *RITA* is acquiring (e.g., some inherent negative force or negation-related features), they are 'enough' to sanction structures with apparent negative spread.

## RITA and NCIs: negative fragment answers

---

- Catalan/Spanish NCIs, which can serve as **negative fragments**, e.g., Cat. *Qui s'ha menjat el pastís? Ningú* 'Who ate the cake? Nobody'. (Weak) NPIs, on the other hand, cannot, cf. English *Who did you talk to? \*Anybody.*

👉 **Third point of convergence:** RITA patterns like NCIs here.

- (16) a. A: *Qui vindrà a córrer?* [isolated answer; Catalan]  
who come.FUT.3SG to run.INF  
  
'Who is going running (with me)?'
- b. B: *Rita!* (*Amb aquesta calor...*).  
EPI with this heat  
  
'Nobody! / I'm not coming! (given this heat...)'

## RITA and NCIs: *without*-clauses

---

- **Without-clauses** as another antiveridical context that licenses NCIs:

- (17) a. *El partit es va acabar sense que els equips concedissin **cap** gol.* [Catalan]  
the match CL.REFL= AUX.PST.3SG finish.IMPF without that  
the teams concede.SUBJ.IMPF.3PL no goal  
'The match ended without the teams conceding any goal.'
- b. *Intenta levantarte sin despertar **a nadie**, por favor.* [Spanish]  
try.IMP get.up.INF=CL.REFL without wake.upINF  
DOM no-one please  
'Try to get up without waking up anyone, please.'

## RITA and NCIs: *without*-clauses

---

► **Fourth point of convergence (maybe):** Judgements hard to obtain, but **potentially grammatical given appropriate context.**

- (18) a. A: A en Joan el devia veure marxar [Catalan]  
DOM the John CL.DO= should.IMPF.3SG see.INF leave.INF

to *thom*, no?

everyone no

'Everyone must have seen John leave, right?'


- b. B: Què va! El tio va marxar sense que se  
INTJ the guy AUX.PST.3SG leave.INF without that CL.REFL=  
*n'adonés* **Rita!**  
CL.PART=notice.SUBJ.IMPF.3SG EPI

'Not at all! The guy (somehow) left without anyone/a single person noticing!'

## RITA and NCIs: *without*-clauses

---

- 169 and 98 participants rated the two examples as 4-5 across the two questions. Around 50% of the 460 did not accept them.



## A change-in-progress?

---

- K-means clustering: finding coherent participant profiles<sup>6</sup>.

Group	Affirmative	Negation	Ni	Neg-raising	Without-clauses	N
1	3.258065	1.956452	4.154839	1.693548	1.764516	155
2	4.065476	3.202381	4.328869	2.633929	2.681548	168
3	2.660000	3.395000	3.910000	3.740000	3.320000	50
4	4.402299	4.063218	4.678161	4.074713	3.959770	87

**Table 1:** Four clusterings of participants obtained based on their ratings

---

<sup>6</sup>Appropriate number of clusters determined with the aid of `fviz_nbclust()`. `set.seed()` of 123 adopted.

<sup>7</sup>Plausibly includes those speakers that only sanction RITA if it has the accompanying personal article. The survey did not address this variant of the expression (due to unawareness of its existence on my part).

## A change-in-progress?

---

- K-means clustering: finding coherent participant profiles<sup>6</sup>.

Group	Affirmative	Negation	Ni	Neg-raising	Without-clauses	N
1	3.258065	1.956452	4.154839	1.693548	1.764516	155
2	4.065476	3.202381	4.328869	2.633929	2.681548	168
3	2.660000	3.395000	3.910000	3.740000	3.320000	50
4	4.402299	4.063218	4.678161	4.074713	3.959770	87

**Table 1:** Four clusterings of participants obtained based on their ratings


- **Group 1** → RITA OK only with NCI *ni* (34%).
- **Group 2** → RITA OK in affirmative and with NCI *ni* only (37%).
- **Group 3** → RITA bad-ish everywhere (11%)<sup>7</sup>.
- ! **Group 4** → RITA OK everywhere (incl. some/all antiveridical contexts) (19%).

---

<sup>6</sup>Appropriate number of clusters determined with the aid of `fviz_nbclust()`. `set.seed()` of 123 adopted.

<sup>7</sup>Plausibly includes those speakers that only sanction RITA if it has the accompanying personal article. The survey did not address this variant of the expression (due to unawareness of its existence on my part).

## A change-in-progress?



- Significant proportion of speakers allowing either *RITA* with *all* antiveridical contexts explored (negation, neg-raising, negative spread, without-clauses); or with *some* of them.
  - Assuming *RITA* with negation is diachronically more recent → gradual grammaticalisation for *RITA* → **a change-in-progress?**

## RITA and NCIs: a recap

---

- RITA matches the distribution of NCIs to a significant extent, due to its compatibility with antiveridical contexts:
    1. Sentential negation (for some speakers)
    2. Neg-raising predicates
    3. Negative spread (in Catalan, at least)
    4. Negative fragments
    5. *Without*-clauses (maybe)
  - Only *partial* match.
    1. Inter-speaker variation w.r.t. antiveridicality.
    2. Pre-verbal focalisation requirement.
    3. Argument structure restrictions
    4. Incompatibility with *absolutely*-modification.
    5. Expressivity, speaker-attitude orientation.
- RITA is not an NCI, but may be undergoing some formal change in several speakers, gradually causing points of convergence with NCIs.

## RITA and (weak) PIs: non-veridical contexts

---

- A broad definition of Polarity Items (encompassing strong and weak) is given below (Giannakidou, 2001, 669).

### Polarity Items

A linguistic expression  $\alpha$  is a *polarity item* iff:

- The distribution of  $\alpha$  is limited by sensitivity to some semantic property  $\beta$  of the context of appearance; and
- $\beta$  is (non)veridicality, or a subproperty thereof:  $\beta \in \{\text{veridicality, nonveridicality, antiveridicality, modality, intensionality, extensionality, episodicity, downward entailingness}\}$ .

- **Next:** RITA also does not fit the typology of **weak PIs**.

## RITA and (weak) PIs: non-veridical contexts

---

- PIs licensed in non-veridical contexts: this includes questions, conditionals, imperatives, habituals, etc.

- (19) a. *Si tienes cualquier problema, por favor* [conditional; Catalan]  
if have.2SG any issue for favour  
*llámame.*  
call.IMP=CL.IO
- 'If you have any issues, please call me.'
- b. *Que vol res?* [interrogative]  
Q wants anything
- 'Does s/he want anything?'
- c. *Ho va veure abans que ningú ho veié.* [before]<sup>9</sup>  
it AUX saw before that anybody it see.SUBJ.3SG
- 'S/he saw it before anybody did.'

(Tubau et al., 2023, 12)

<sup>9</sup>NB: *before*-clauses have also been analysed as antiveridical, so the example above can be contested. I simply copy Tubau et al. (2023)'s exposition here.

## RITA and (weak) PIs: non-veridical contexts

---

⚠ Key point of divergence: RITA ungrammatical in non-veridical contexts.

- (20) a. \**Si truca Rita, avisa'm.* [conditional; Catalan]  
if call.3SG EPI warn.IMP=CL.DO  
  
(intended) 'If anyone/nobody calls, let me know.'
- b. \**Que vindrà Rita?* [interrogative]  
that.INT want.3SG EPI  
  
(intended) 'Is anyone/nobody coming?'
- c. \**Lo vio antes que se diera cuenta Rita.* [before; Spanish]  
CL.DO= see.PST.3SG before that CL.REFL= give.IMPF.SUBJ.3SG  
count EPI  
  
(intended) 'S/he saw it before anybody realised.'

→ The above then disqualifies RITA as a weak PI.

## RITA and squatitives: also not a match

---

- **Squatitives** (Horn, 2001): English expressions of scatological origin (*jack shit*, *(diddly) squat*, *fuck-all*, etc.).

- (21) a. I didn't sleep **squat** last night.  
b. There have been a couple of veterans who have done **squat** since they've been here.

(Horn, 2001, 186)

- Labelled '**quasi-NPIs**' in Horn (2001), behaving both like **NPIs** in (21a) (e.g., English *anything*), and like **negative quantifiers** (e.g., English *nothing*) in (21b), bringing their own negative force.

## RITA and squatitives: also not a match

---

- ✓ Licensed in **antiveridical** contexts (sentential negation, neg-raising, etc.).

- (22) a. He doesn't know **jackshit/fuck all.** [sentential negation]  
b. He knows **jackshit/fuck all.**

- (23) a. I don't think he brought **jackshit.** [neg-raising predicate]  
b. \*I didn't say he brought **jackshit.** [non-neg-raising predicate]

- (24) **Nobody** said **fuck all.** [negative spread]  
(Thoms et al., 2017)

- ✗ In **non-veridical** contexts, *only* the *negative quantifier reading* can be obtained, the NPI-reading is lost.

- (25) a. \*Did he say fuck all?  
b. \*The last person to say fuck all was John.

(All fine on NQ reading)

## RITA and squatitives: also not a match

---

- (26) a. He knows absolutely fuck all about this. [absolutely modification]  
b. He kens absolutely nihin aboot this.
- (Thoms et al., 2017)
- (27) I published this a year ago and **fuck all** has been done<sup>10</sup> [pre-verbal squatitives]

---

<sup>10</sup>[https://x.com/Vltra\\_MK/status/1653762970072272899?s=20](https://x.com/Vltra_MK/status/1653762970072272899?s=20).

## **RITA and squatitives: also not a match**

---

- **Partial overlap with RITA:**

1. They are also licensed in antiveridical contexts, like *RITA*.
2. Janus-nature of squatitives (with/without negation) only partly true for some Cat./Sp. speakers.
3. Squatitives can get NQ-reading in non-veridical contexts, but not NPI-reading. *RITA* cannot get either.
4. Squatitives are *not* person-referring, whilst *RITA* necessarily refer to a person/human collective.
5. *RITA* disallows *absolutely*-modification.
6. Little focalisation/positional constraints with squatitives (even if usually postverbal).

→ ***RITA does not behave like squatitives either.***

## RITA – a summary of the data

---

**Table 2:** Comparison of the behaviour of NCIs, Pls, squatitives and RITA

	NCIs	Pls	Squatitives	RITA
Licensing via antiveridical operators	✓	✓	✓	Some
Licensing via non-veridical operators	✗	✓	✗	✗
Pre-verbal focalisation requirement	✗	✗	✗	✓
Argument structural restrictions	✗	✗	✗	✓
Embeddability	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>Absolutely</i> -modification	✓	✓	✓	✗
Expressivity	✗	✗	✓	✓
Speaker-attitude orientation	✗	✗	✗	✓

- RITA – a **syntactic class of its own**, but whose patterning is nonetheless **constrained** and **systematic** (notwithstanding substantial inter-speaker variation).
- **Resulting challenge:** how should we incorporate RITA (especially in more ‘advanced’ speakers) in a syntactic typology of negation/polarity items?

## **EPIs beyond RITA**

- General behaviour of EPIs (negative indefinite-like with speaker attitude orientation)  
**observed in a wider range of DPs and proper nouns.**

EPI	Language(s)	Original denotation/translation
Rita (la Cantaora)	Cat./Sp.	19th century Spanish singer/artist
El Papa de Roma	Cat./Sp.	'The Pope of Rome', head of the worldwide Catholic Church
Déu, Dios	Cat./Sp.	'God'
La teva/te/ta mare, Tu madre	Cat./Sp.	'Your mother'
El teu pare, Tu padre	Cat./Sp.	'Your father'
El Tato	Cat./Sp.	19th century Spanish bullfighter (Antonio Sánchez 'el Tato')
Txapote	Spanish	Former member of the 'hard wing' of <i>Euskadi Ta Askatasuna</i> (ETA)
En Pere Vamba	Catalan	King of the Visigoths from 672 to 680
Josep el fuster	Catalan	Reference to St Joseph of Nazareth

**Table 3:** (Incomplete) list of EPIs in Catalan and Spanish

- I now show **RITA is at a more advanced grammaticalisation stage** (at least w.r.t. my variety/Group 4) than other EPIs.

- Like RITA, postverbal EPIs sanctioned, for many speakers, both in affirmative contexts and with *ni*.
- Sentential negation with nobody-type reading only available with NCI *ni* (like Group 1/2 with RITA).

(28) a. **No** lo va a comprar \*(*ni*) tu madre. [Spanish]  
not CL.DO= go.3SG to buy.INF not.even EPI

'No one is going to buy this / I'm definitely not buying this.' Literal readings: 'Not even your mother will buy this.'

b. **No** es saltarà classe \*(*ni*) Déu! [Catalan]  
not CL.REFL= jump.3SG class not.even EPI

'No one is skipping class / I'm definitely *not* skipping class.' Literal reading: 'Not even God is skipping class.'

- If sentential negation used without *ni*, we get **double negation readings**.

(29) a. A: *Tienes demasiados videojuegos, no te compres el nuevo FIFA. Guarda el dinero para otra cosa.* [Spanish]  
have.2SG too.many videogames not CL.IO=buy.SUBJ.2SG

the new FIFA save.IMP the money for other thing

'You have too many videogames, don't buy the new FIFA game. Save this money for something else.'

b. B: \**No lo va a comprar tu madre! Llevo tiempo esperándolo.*  
not CL.DO=go.3SG to buy.INF EPI bring.1SG time waiting=CL.DO

(intended) 'No one is going to buy this.' Alternative reading: 'I'm going to buy it anyway (regardless of what you are telling me)! I've been waiting for it for a long time' (double negation reading).

- If sentential negation used without *ni*, we get **double negation readings**.

(30) a. A: *Fes el favor d'anar a classe aquesta tarda, que tens examen divendres.* [Catalan]  
make.IMP the favour to-go.INF to class this afternoon, that.CONJ have.2SG exam Friday

'Please go to class this afternoon, you have an exam on Friday.'

b. B: *\*No es saltarà classe Déu! Jo ja no puc més.*  
not CL.REFL= jump.3SG class EPI I already not can.1SG more

(intended) 'I'm definitely *not* skipping class.' Alternative reading: 'I'm skipping class for sure (regardless of what you are telling me), I've had enough' (double negation reading).


- Single negation readings is a feature specific to **RITA** for some speakers.
- The same holds for other antiveridical contexts (neg-raising, neg spread), where other EPIs are ungrammatical.
- Non-veridical contexts (questions, conditionals...) sharply ungrammatical.
- Only pattern alike in negative fragments (for some speakers consulted).

- (31) a. A: *¿Quién piensa solucionar esto?* [fragment answer; Spanish]  
          who    think.3SG fix.INF    this  
          ‘Who is going to fix this?’
- b. B: *¡Tu madre / el Papa de Roma / Dios!...*  
          EPI  
          ‘No one! / I’m not going to do this’, etc.

→ **RITA singled out**, in the present Cat./Sp. varieties, as an EPI potentially **further advanced** in the process of grammaticalisation and pragmaticalisation.

# Towards some syntactic conclusions on EPIs

- Plausible **cline of grammaticalisation** across EPIs.
- **EPIs and Group 1/2 only:** negative reading as **pragmatic result**, e.g. implicature. Least grammaticalised.
- **In Group 4:** interaction with **polarity/negation**, possibly via grammaticalisation of relevant [F]s.
- **In all cases:** interaction with **left-peripheral [F]s** (focalisation, expressivity).



**Figure 1:** Euler diagram of EPIs' distribution across items and speaker groups

## **Implications and Conclusions**

## Why Rita is Interesting: final comments

---

- Novel case-study of ***proper noun*** undergoing formal change and **acquiring negation/quantificational/pronominal characteristics**.
  - Survey data reveals minimally 3/4 groups of speaker profiles, plausibly at distinct 'grammaticalisation' stages.
  - Particular significance of Group 4.
  - Comparison with other EPIs indicates inter-item variation, esp. w.r.t. *RITA*.
- **Formal implications:**
  - In more 'advanced' speakers, how do we model *RITA*'s behaviour in antiveridical contexts (e.g., negative spread)?  
See Zeijlstra (2004), Deal (2022), Tubau et al. (2023) and many others for analyses that ascribe some negation-related features or inherent negative force to items behaving in this way.

## Why Rita is Interesting: final comments

---

- Novel case-study of ***proper noun*** undergoing formal change and **acquiring negation/quantificational/pronominal characteristics**.
  - Survey data reveals minimally 3/4 groups of speaker profiles, plausibly at distinct 'grammaticalisation' stages.
  - Particular significance of Group 4.
  - Comparison with other EPIs indicates inter-item variation, esp. w.r.t. *RITA*.
- **Formal implications:**
  - In more 'advanced' speakers, how do we model *RITA*'s behaviour in antiveridical contexts (e.g., negative spread)?  
See Zeijlstra (2004), Deal (2022), Tubau et al. (2023) and many others for analyses that ascribe some negation-related features or inherent negative force to items behaving in this way.
- **Diachronic implications:**
  - **Complexifies** the existing polarity/negation landscape.
  - **Taboo words** are **well-studied** as sources of expressive (grammaticalised) forms of negation (see, i.a., Postma, 2001; Hoeksema and Napoli, 2008; Napoli and Hoeksema, 2009; Gutzmann, 2015; Sailor, 2017, 2020; Sailor, 2018; Erschler, 2023).
  - Common nouns, '**minimisers**' and other sources of negative indefinites **also well-studied** (Haspelmath, 2001).
  - However, **little to no** literature on ***proper nouns*** and/or person-referring expressions (though cf. Collins and Postal, 2012; Song et al., 2023, on 'imposters' and non-canonical pronouns).

## Why Rita is Interesting: final comments

---

- Outstanding Qs:
    - Syntactic model of *RITA*'s distribution, across and within groups.
    - EPIs placement in a syntactic typology of negation/polarity.
    - How does the distribution of Catalan *RITA* compare to Spanish *RITA*?
    - More in-depth comparison with crosslinguistically similar phenomena.
- Overall:
- Linguistically peculiar phenomenon, worthy of further study.
  - Expands our grasp of grammaticalisation/pragmaticalisation pathways of expressive material and open new research avenues on diachronic sources of polarity/negation items.

# Thank you!

Gràcies, gracias!

*Acknowledgements:* Special thanks very much to Theresa Biberauer for supervising this project. Thanks also to reviewers and audience of ConSOLE32 and SyntaxLab and to attendees of the MPhil seminar on Syntactic Change in Greek, for useful comments. This work is generously supported by an Open-Oxford-Cambridge AHRC DTP – St John's Studentship (UKRI and St John's College).


Slides 



SCAN ME


## RITA – Group 4 in more depth

- Group 4 most permissive w.r.t. argument structural contexts




## RITA – Group 4 in more depth

- Group 4 most permissive w.r.t. argument structural contexts



# RITA – Group 4 in more depth


- Group 4 most permissive w.r.t. argument structural contexts



## RITA – Group 4 in more depth

- Group 4 most permissive w.r.t. argument structural contexts – compare ALL groups

Responses with verbs with different argument structure with/without NCI ni



## RITA – Group 4 in more depth

- Groups 2 and 4 most clearly exhibit focalisation restriction, compared to Group 1 ( $p < .001$ )

→ However, Group 4 presents higher acceptance of *non-focalised* pre-verbal RITA ( $p = .03$ ).





Figure 2: Focalisation with RITA across Groups 1, 2 and 4

## RITA – Group 4 in more depth

- Groups 2 and 4 most clearly exhibit focalisation restriction, compared to Group 1 ( $p < .001$ )
- However, Group 4 presents higher acceptance of *non-focalised* pre-verbal RITA ( $p = .03$ ).


Focalisation with pre-verbal Rita by Group



## Inter-speaker variation not age-conditioned

- **Sociolinguistic profile:** No significant differences in age across cluster groups.

Responses with verbs with different argument structure with/without NCI ni



# Geographical distribution of Group 4

- **Sociolinguistic profile:** Group 4 scattered around regions in Catalonia (apparent gap in northwestern Catalonia is due to sparcity of participants from that area).



## Who is Rita?

---

- 19th century Spanish singer/artist
- Article in *La Razón* sheds some light on the origin behind the expression and the 'I'-centred nature of *Rita*

*The figure of Rita la Cantaora remained for posterity in Spanish popular culture, not so much for her work as a singer and dancer, but because of an expression that became a popular proverb. Apparently, **her passion for the work was such that she was willing to perform wherever she was asked**, regardless of the money she earned for performing, and even to perform additional shows, whether asked by the owner of a 'tablao' or the organizer of a private party. She was so famous that even her own colleagues recommended her services when they did not offer them enough money to perform themselves. In this way, **the expression que lo haga Rita la Cantaora 'let Rita la Cantaora do it'** was coined to refer to all those occasions in which one is not willing to perform an action<sup>11</sup>.*

---

<sup>11</sup>My own translation from: [https://www.larazon.es/cultura/historia/quien-fue-rita-cantaora-que-mencionamos-cuando-trabajo-nos-gusta\\_2024012865b5fca3c3cb30000108c092.html](https://www.larazon.es/cultura/historia/quien-fue-rita-cantaora-que-mencionamos-cuando-trabajo-nos-gusta_2024012865b5fca3c3cb30000108c092.html). Accessed 2 March 2024.

## Who is Rita?

---



## **References**

## References I

---

- Belletti, A. (2004). Aspects of the Low IP Area. In Rizzi, L., editor, *The Structure of IP and CP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, volume 2, pages 16–51. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Collins, C. and Postal, P. M. (2012). *Imposters: A Study of Pronominal Agreement*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Deal, A. R. (2022). Negative concord as downward Agree. In *Proceedings of the Northeast Linguistic Society (NELS) 52*. GLSA Publications.
- Diewald, G. (2011). Pragmaticalization (defined) as grammaticalization of discourse functions. *Linguistics*, 49(2):365–390.
- Erschler, D. (2023). Colloquial emphatic negation in Russian and morphology of negative concord. *lingbuzz/006969*.
- Etxepare, R. and Uribe-Etxebarria, M. (2008). On Negation and Focus in Spanish and Basque. In Artiagoitia, X. and Lakarra, J., editors, *Gramatika Jaietan: Patxi Goenaga Irakaslearen Omenaldiz*, pages 287–310. International Journal of Basque Linguistics and Philology. Special issue.
- Forcadell, M. (2013). Subject informational status and word order: Catalan as an SVO language. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 53:39–63.
- Giannakidou, A. (2000). Negative ... Concord? *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 18:457–523.
- Giannakidou, A. (2001). The Meaning of Free Choice. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 24:659–737.

## References II

---

- Giannakidou, A. and Zeijlstra, H. (2017). The Landscape of Negative Dependencies: Negative Concord and N-Words. In Everaert, M. and Riemsdijk, H., editors, *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, pages 1–38. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2nd edition.
- Gutzmann, D. (2015). *Use-Conditional Meaning: Studies in Multidimensional Semantics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Haspelmath, M. (2001). Negative Indefinite Pronouns. In Haspelmath, M., editor, *Indefinite Pronouns*, pages 193–234. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hoeksema, J. and Napoli, D. J. (2008). Just for the hell of it: A comparison of two taboo-term constructions. *Journal of Linguistics*, 44(2):347–378.
- Horn, L. R. (2001). Flaubert triggers, squatitive negation, and other quirks of grammar. In Hoeksema, J., Rullmann, H., Sánchez-Valencia, V., and van der Wouden, T., editors, *Perspectives on Negation and Polarity Items*, pages 173–200. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Napoli, D. J. and Hoeksema, J. (2009). The grammatical versatility of taboo terms. *Studies in Language. International Journal sponsored by the Foundation “Foundations of Language”*, 33(3):612–643.
- Ortega-Santos, I. (2008). *Projecting Subjects in English and Spanish*. PhD thesis, University of Maryland, College Park.

## References III

---

- Postma, G. (2001). Negative polarity and the syntax of taboo. In Hoeksema, J., Rullmann, H., Sánchez-Valencia, V., and van der Wouden, T., editors, *Perspectives on Negation and Polarity Items*, pages 283–330. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Quer, J. (1993). *The Licensing of Negative Items*. Master's thesis, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Sailer, M. (2018). ‘Doing the devil’: Deriving the PPI-hood of a negation-expressing multi-dimensional idiom. *Linguistics*, 56(2):401–433.
- Sailor, C. (2017). Negative inversion without negation: On fuck-inversion in British English. *Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics*, 10:88–110.
- Sailor, C. (2020). Rethinking ‘residual’ Verb Second. In Woods, R. and Wolfe, S., editors, *Rethinking Verb Second*, pages 126–149. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Song, C., Nguyen, L., and Biberauer, T. (2023). Alternative pronominal items: Noncanonical pronouns in Chinese, Vietnamese, and Afrikaans. In Paterson, L. L., editor, *The Routledge Handbook of Pronouns*, pages 148–164, New York. Routledge.
- Speas, P. and Tenny, C. (2003). Configurational properties of point of view roles. In Di Sciullo, A. M., editor, *Asymmetry in Grammar*, pages 315–344. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Thoms, G., Adger, D., Heycock, C., and Smith, J. (2017). Shades of negative concord in dialects of Scots. Talk presented at LAGB Annual Meeting, University of Kent.

## References IV

---

- Traugott, E. C. (1989). On the Rise of Epistemic Meanings in English: An Example of Subjectification in Semantic Change. *Language*, 65(1):31–55.
- Trotzke, A. (2017). *From Information Structure to the Expressive Dimension*. De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, Boston.
- Tubau, S., Exteberria, U., and Espinal, M. T. (2023). A new approach to Negative Concord: Catalan as a case in point. *Journal of Linguistics*, page 1–33.
- Wiltschko, M. (2014). *The Universal Structure of Categories: Towards a Formal Typology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Wiltschko, M. (2021). *The Grammar of Interactional Language*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Wiltschko, M. and Heim, J. (2016). The syntax of confirmationals: A neo-performative analysis. In Kaltenböck, G., Keizer, E., and Lohmann, A., editors, *Outside the Clause*, pages 305–340. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Zeijlstra, H. (2004). *Sentential Negation and Negative Concord*. PhD thesis, University of Amsterdam.