

(Changing) polarity in additive connectors

Polaritate aldakorra emendiozko lokailuetan

Polaridad (cambiante) en conectivos aditivos

Polarité (variable) dans les conjonctions d'addition

ODRIOZOLA PEREIRA, Juan Carlos

ONDARRA ARTIEDA, Ainara

Department of Basque Philology (Euskal Filologia Departamendua)

University of the Basque Country (Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea)

Faculty of Science and Technology. Leioa (Bizkaia). 48940. Spain

juancarlos.odrizola@ehu.es

ainara.ondarra@ehu.es

Noiz jaso: 2012-12-30

Noiz onartua: 2013-07-09

Euskera. 2012, 57, 3. 681-703. Bilbo

ISSN 0210-1564

Additive connectors are closely related to polarity, although the fields that explore the text level connection between clauses and the ones that explore polarity inside clauses belong to very different points of view in today's linguistics. The aim of this paper is to develop a unified approach to these phenomena by providing a set of truth presuppositions to bring together additive connection, and both negative and positive polarity. The paper is based on data concerning Basque *ere*, which appears attached to several clausal elements and gives rise to units that are similar to English *also*, *any* and *even*. *Ere*-bearing polar elements may be negative, positive or even alternating. *Ere* only attaches to a closed list of items within the set of Basque polarity items. The main aim of this paper is to explore the features shared by all these units, which are only related by means of the particle *ere*.

Key words: additive connectors, truth presuppositions, polarity.

Emendiozko lokailuak harreman estuetan daude polaritatearekin. Hala izanik ere, testu-antolakuntza eta polaritatea, oso ikuspegi desberdinetatik aztertu dira maiz. Izan ere, lokailuak bete-betean sartuta daude pragmatika esparruan aztergai hartzen diren kontuen artean, baina beste alde batetik, ohikoa da polaritatea pragmatikaren ikuspegitik urrun arakatzea. Euskal Bibliografian, *ere* osagaia lokailu gisa azaltzen da eta batzuetan anafora gisa ere. Lan honetan, zorrotz aztertu eta zedarriztatuko ditugu euskal osagai honen lokailu-ezauzgarriak, eta anafora direlako zereginetatik urrun islatuko dugu *ere*. Horretaz gain, osagai honek esparru polarretan egiten duen lana aztertuko dugu. Euskal tradizioan oso jorratuak ez dauden egiazko presuposizioak aztertzeari eutsiko diogu, kontu hauek guztiak eredu formal batean biltzeko asmotan. Lehenik, emendiozko egia-presuposizioa formalizatuko dugu. Bigarrenik, ikusi beharko dugu bestelako hizkuntzetan foku-presuposizioa deitu izan denak gurean zer-nolako isla duen. Hirugarrenik, emendiozko egia-presuposizioak eta egia-presuposizio eskalarrak alderatuko ditugu. Laugarrenik, euskarara zein bestelako hizkuntzetara jota, egiaztatuko dugu polaritateak hiru alderdi dituela giza hizkuntzetan zehar: alderdi semantikoa, alderdi sintaktikoa eta alderdi lexikoa. Fenomeno unibertsal gisa aurkeztuko ditugu beraz emendiozko harremana eta polaritatea, baina aipatu presuposizio motak, era desberdinetara gauzatu eta elkartuko dira giza hizkuntzetan zehar eta giza hizkuntza bakoitzeko hiztegi-sarretan zehar.

Hitz-gakoak: Emendiozko lokailuak, egia-presuposizioak, polaritatea.

Los conectores aditivos están directamente relacionados con la polaridad, aunque los trabajos sobre la conexión textual muestran a menudo unos puntos de vista muy distintos a los de los trabajos que exploran la polaridad en el entorno estrictamente clausal. Por medio de una nueva formalización de diversos tipos de presuposición de veracidad, este trabajo pretende analizar bajo un solo punto de vista la conexión aditiva y los diversos tipos de po-

laridad. El trabajo se basa en el constituyente *ere* de la lengua vasca, que se une a diversos elementos clausales dando lugar a complejos similares a los españoles *también /tampoco* o *incluso /ni siquiera*. Los elementos polares que contienen *ere* pueden mostrar una polaridad negativa, positiva o incluso alternantes. En el ámbito de la polaridad, *ere* se une a una lista cerrada de elementos clausales, cuyas características comunes son otro de los principales objetos de estudio de este trabajo.

Palabras clave: conectores aditivos, presuposiciones de veracidad, polaridad.

Les conjonctions d'addition sont en étroite relation avec la polarité. Pourtant elles ont souvent été étudiées selon des points de vue très différents. Les conjonctions entrent totalement dans le domaine d'étude de la pragmatique, mais par ailleurs la polarité en est très éloignée. Dans la Bibliographie basque, la particule *ere* a été étudiée comme conjonction et parfois comme anaphore. Ce travail analyse attentivement les caractéristiques conjonctionnelles de cette particule, laissant de côté les particularités qu'elle pourrait avoir en tant qu'anaphore. Puis nous étudierons la fonction que cette particule remplit dans les domaines de la polarité. Nous étudierons attentivement les présuppositions de vérité, peu analysées jusque là dans la tradition basque, dans le but ultime de regrouper tout cela dans un modèle formel unique. Nous formaliserons tout d'abord la présupposition véritable additionnelle. Puis nous verrons quelle influence a eu dans la langue basque ce qu'en d'autres langues on a appelé la présupposition focale. Nous comparerons ensuite les présuppositions de vérité d'addition avec les présuppositions véritables graduées. Enfin, analysant la langue basque comme les autres langues, nous constaterons que la polarité a trois points de vue dans les langues : le sémantique, le syntaxique et le lexical. Nous présenterons comme phénomène universel la relation entre les conjonctions et la polarité. Mais ces présuppositions vont se concrétiser et se regrouper de différentes façons selon les langues, et donc dans les entrées du dictionnaire de chaque langue.

Mots-clés : conjonctions d'addition, présuppositions de vérité, polarité.

Introduction

Roughly speaking, polarity is defined as ‘sensitivity’ to the affirmative or negative nature of the clause, a universal phenomenon that is cross-linguistically explored from several points of view. First, insofar as the overt negative nature of the clause is either needed or forbidden, the issue is clearly syntactic. Second, exploring just the meanings of polar contexts, without regard to the structural relationships between the clausal constituents involved, is a job undertaken by semantics. Third, the specific lexical features of some items that, for instance, trigger negative readings, without needing an overt negative mark in the clause, is an area covered by lexical research.

This paper is also concerned with three additional issues. First, polarity can accurately be described as a set of truth presuppositions triggered by a given clause. Second, polarity as a truth presupposition set is related to the informational organisation of the clause. Third, polarity items (PIs) often are related to connectors that are explored in the field of text pragmatics, beyond the clausal border.

In fact, from a synchronic point of view one can say that syntax and pragmatics share a large set of phenomena that can be separated one from another in linguistics research only for methodological reasons. In this paper both additive truth presuppositions and focal truth presuppositions will be explored. Furthermore, PIs often are elements that (must) have evolved from one grammatical nature to another, and exhibit two different behaviours in a given state of the language.

Recent bibliography shows that the Basque connector *ere* ‘also’ is involved in additive, focal and downward truth presuppositions triggered by negative polarity items (NPIs). Moreover, it is also noted that these presuppositions are crucial in the description of both the wide range of free-choice elements under the scope of *ere*-bearing PIs and the set of *ere*-bearing PIs themselves. Section 1 reviews what has already been said in the bibliography about the connector behaviour (and additive truth presuppositions) of *ere* when it attaches to free-choice elements. We will also provide a new view of the behaviour of *ere* as an optional or obligatory building block in NPIs.

Sections 2 and 3 will explore alternating and positive polarity items where *ere* is an optional/obligatory building block in contexts that are not (necessarily) negative.

1. Bibliography review and some remarks on *ere* as an NPI

This section reviews what has already been said about the Basque connector *ere* either optionally attached to free-choice elements or obligatorily included in NPIs. In addition, a brief description is provided of parametrical features of Basque that are pertinent to this area of study.

Subsection 1.1 reviews the issue of ‘focal’ truth presuppositions regarding the particular case of the Basque item *ere*, and provides a brief overview of Basque system focalizing processes. Subsection 1.2 explores the additive truth presuppositions that *ere* triggers as a connector. Subsection 1.3 revisits downward truth presuppositions in negative polar contexts.

1.1. Informational organisation and focal truth presuppositions

González (2009: §5.2.2.2.1) points out that Spanish *también* ‘also’ (1a) triggers a truth presupposition that she considers ‘focal’. Henceforth we will informally express any kind of truth presupposition as a (b) English metalinguistic counterpart of the real Basque/English/Hindi/Spanish clause expressed in (a). Moreover, we will express the specific informational, situational and prosodic characteristics of focus by means of boldfaces.

- (1) a También **Ainhoa** estuvo
 also Ainhoa was
 ‘Ainhoa was also there’
 b ‘Ainhoa was there’

That is, if (1a) is true, what is metalinguistically expressed in English in (1b) must be necessarily true by means of *también*. González argues that *también* focalizes the noun it attaches to.

Regarding Basque, the literature (Elordieta 2001, Laka 1990: §3.2.2, Etxepare & Ortiz de Urbina 2003) describes two types of elements with prominent informational, situational and prosodic features. The Basque standard informational focus forms a prosodic unit with the verb which is placed to the right. In affirmative clauses the analytical verb form is constituted by a lexical verb and an auxiliary to the right. We express the informational organisation task by means of a previous question in (2):

- (2) **Nor** egon zen?
 who been aux. 2
 ‘Who was there?’
- (3) **Ainhoa** egon zen
 Ainhoa been aux.
 ‘Ainhoa was there’

In negative clauses the particle *ez* ‘not’ follows the focus. The auxiliary follows *ez* and precedes the lexical verb form:

- (4) **Nor ez** zen egon?
 who not aux been
 ‘Who was not there?’
- (5) **Dorleta ez** zen egon
 Dorleta not aux. been
 ‘Dorleta was not there’

The bibliography (Euskaltzaindia 1990: §2.1, Osa 1990: §5.9.3, Ondarra 2006, 2007a, 2007b) shows that a Basque free-choice element such as *Ainhoa* or *Dorleta* cannot be focalized if the connector *ere* ‘also’ attaches to it. Odriozola & Ondarra (2010: §1.2.1.1) point out the fact that the specific characteristics of any kind of Basque focus are not available to an *ere*-bearing complex.

- (6) ***Ainhoa ere** egon zen
 Ainhoa also been aux
- (7) ***Dorleta ere ez** zen egon
 Dorleta also not aux. been

However, the prosodic unit constituted by the NP and *ere* may precede the verb when a pause (/ /) intervenes between the two. The informational context in (8-9) shows that both *Ainhoa (ere)* and *Dorleta (ere)* are not the focus of the clause.

- (8) Ainhoa ere // **egon zen**, ez pentsa bestela
Ainhoa also been aux. not think otherwise
'Ainhoa was also there, don't think otherwise'
- (9) Dorleta ere // **ez zen egon**, ez pentsa bestela
Dorleta also not aux. been not think otherwise
lit. 'Dorleta also wasn't there, don't think otherwise'

Odriozola & Ondarra provide further criteria for distinguishing a non-focus element preceding the verb. In fact, some synthetic verbal forms must take the particle *ba-* when the assertion of the verb is the focus. Compare (10) and (11).

- (10) **Ainhoa** dago
Ainhoa is
'Ainhoa is there'
- (11) Ainhoa **badago**, ez pentsa bestela
Ainhoa ba-is not think otherwise
'Ainhoa is there, don't think otherwise'

The focalisation of *Ainhoa ere* preceding a non-focalised synthetic form is ungrammatical, even if the stipulated pause appears; i.e., *ba-* in (11) shows that it is the verb that has been focalized.

- (12) ***Ainhoa ere** // dago
Ainhoa also is
Finally, wh-words can not have scope over *ere*-bearing items:
- (13) *Nor ere egon zen enparantzan
who also been aux. square-postp.

Therefore Odriozola & Ondarra show that *ere*-bearing free-choice elements match neither informational nor prosodic features of Basque focus. Nevertheless, for convenience, the authors assume that *ere* truth presuppositions in NON-focalized free-choice elements such as *Ainhoa ere* and

Dorleta ere can be called ‘focal’ insofar as the truth presupposition of both (14a) and (15a) triggers the truth presupposition of both (14b) and (15b), where the bare presupposition of predication about the NPs *Ainhoa* and *Dorleta* is made.

- (14) a Ainhoa ere egon zen
Ainhoa also been aux.3
‘Ainhoa was also there’
b ‘Ainhoa was there’
- (15) a Dorleta ere ez zen egon
Dorleta also not aux. been
‘Dorleta also wasn’t there’
b ‘Dorleta wasn’t there’

In any case, it should be remarked that the standard focal presupposition described in the literature has scope only over an NP like *Ainhoa* or *Dorleta*.

The second kind of prominent element in Basque described in the literature is a corrective focus (Ortiz de Urbina 2003). The literature describes this element for negative contexts, and in fact, it is in negative clauses where the difference between standard focus and corrective focus is transparent. The context is shown in (16), whereas (17) shows the corrective focus intervening between the auxiliary and the lexical verb in negative clauses.

- (16) Dorletak negar egingo zuen enparantzán
Dorleta cry aux. square- postp.
‘Dorleta probably cried in the square’
- (17) Ez zen **Dorleta** egon enparantzán. **Ainhoa** egon zen
not aux. Dorleta been Ainhoa been aux.
‘Dorleta wasn’t in the square. Ainhoa was’

Note that also the corrective focus is in boldface in our examples. In fact we are concerned with features of very different levels: word order, informational organisation and prosody. The corrective focus in (17) shares (some of) the prosodic features with the focus.

Furthermore, *ere* and its additive reading are not available for corrective focus. For a correct reading of (18) see section 1.2, where we explain that the meaning is more like ‘not even...’.

- (18) #Ez zen Dorleta ere egon enparantzán
not aux. Dorleta also been square-postp.

Moreover, standard focus (19) and corrective focus (20) are not compatible (21):

- (19) **Dorleta** ez zen egon enparantzán
Dorleta not aux. been square-postp
‘Dorleta wasn’t in the square’
- (20) Dorleta ez zen **enparantzán** egon, etxean egon zen
Dorleta not aux. square-postp been home-postp. been aux.
‘Dorleta wasn’t in the square. She was home’
- (21) ***Dorleta** ez zen **enparantzán** egon, etxean egon zen
Dorleta not aux. square-postp been home-postp. been aux.

In short, *ere* attached to free-choice elements triggers a focal presupposition, in the sense described in the literature. Nevertheless, *ere*-bearing units cannot take the prosodic and informational features of the focus. Informational, prosodic and positional features of the corrective focus are not available for *ere*-bearing units either.

1.2. (Scalar) additive presuppositions

Following Cuartero (2002), Krifka (1999) and Ondarra (2006, 2007a), Odriozola & Ondarra (2010) show that *ere* attached to free-choice elements involves an additive truth presupposition, which Etxeberria and Irurtzun (2011) and Lahiri (2008) call ‘existential presupposition’:

- (22) a Ainhoa ere enparantzán egon zen
Ainhoa also square-post. been aux.
‘Ainhoa was also in the square’
- b X (≠Ainhoa) was in the square
This is so in negative contexts too:

- (23) a Dorleta ere ez zen enparantzan egon
 Dorleta also not aux. square-postp. been
 ‘Dorleta wasn’t in the square either’
 b X (≠Dorleta) wasn’t in the square

We follow Odriozola & Ondarra (2010) in that we assume that *ere* is not involved in polar contexts when it is attached to free-choice elements and triggers standard additive/existential truth presuppositions. That is, *ere*-bearing free-choice elements are not sensitive to the affirmative/negative nature of the clause.

Etxeberria & Irurtzun (2011) provide intonation data (in italics) in order to show that another kind of truth presupposition can emerge in the behaviour of *ere* attached to free-choice elements. The stress in *ere* (24a) is related to a standard additive/existential presupposition (24b), whereas the stress in the free-choice NP (25a) shows a reading that we could call ‘scalar additive presupposition’ (25b).

- (24) a *Ainhua ere* enparantzan egon zen
 Ainhua also square-post. been aux.
 ‘Ainhua was also in the square’
 b X (≠Ainhua) was in the square
- (25) a *Ainhua* ere enparantzan egon zen
 Ainhua also square-post. been aux.
 ‘Ainhua was also in the square’
 b ‘Likelihood (X≠Ainhua was in the square) >
 likelihood (Ainhua was in the square)’

We would like to add that the stressed element in (25a) is not compatible with a standard focus:

- (26) **Ainhua* ere **enparantzan** egon zen
 Ainhua also square-post. been aux.
 ‘Ainhua was also in the square’

Both additive and scalar readings are outside polar contexts in that they are licensed in both affirmative (24-25) and negative (27-28) clauses in Basque.

- (27) *Ainhoa ere ez zen egon enparantzan*
 Ainhoa also not aux. been square-post.
 ‘Dorleta also wasn’t in the square’
- (28) *Ainhoa ere ez zen egon enparantzan*
 Ainhoa also not aux. been square-post.
 ‘Even Ainhoa wasn’t in the square’

We leave open the question of whether the *ere*-bearing stressed elements in both (25) and (28) match all the prosodic and informational features of a standard focus. However it should be noted that it is the scalar reading that emerges when an element intervenes between the auxiliary and the verb, in the position of the corrective focus:

- (29) *Ez zen Ainhoa ere egon enparantzan*
 Ainhoa also not aux. square-post. been
 ‘Even Ainhoa wasn’t in the square’

In any case, we would like to focus on the relation between additive and scalar readings that are instantiated by *ere* in different informational and syntactic contexts. Spanish has the additive elements *también* and *tampoco*, which are licensed only in affirmative clauses, although their reading is *also* and *neither* respectively. Moreover, this language has the scalar elements *hasta* and *ni* that are licensed in affirmative clauses as well, although their reading is respectively affirmative and negative. English also has *too* or *also* for additive readings, and *even* for scalar readings. However, Lahiri (2008) shows the borderline problems between the pure additive existential readings and the scalar readings, which could be thought not to be existential. So, does the additive reading in (b) really apply when the overt intention of the speaker lies on the scalar reading of (b’)?

- (30) a *Ainhoa ere enparantzan egon zen*
 Ainhoa also square-post. been aux.
 ‘Ainhoa was also in the square’
- b ‘X (≠Ainhoa) was in the square’
- b’ ‘Likelihood (X≠Ainhoa was in the square) >
 likelihood (Ainhoa was in the square)’

We assume that scalar readings may entail an additive reading in Basque too. Henceforth therefore, we will be speaking about scalar (additive) readings.

In that sense Basque has two further instantiations of scalar (additive) readings that are closely related to *ere*-bearing free choice elements. Crucially, these elements are constituted by a kind of quantifier and by *ere*, which attaches to the right obligatorily.

The first-type element has a suffix similar to English *-est*, which attaches to NPs that usually have an adjective. In these cases the pure additive reading is possible (31b), although the attachment of *ere* drives us almost obligatorily to a scalar reading (31b'):

- (31) a Jonek soldata txikiena ere onartuko luke
 Jon salary small-est also accept aux.
 'Jon would accept even the smallest salary'
 b 'Jon would accept X (\neq the smallest salary)'
 b' 'Likelihood (Jon would accept X \neq the smallest salary) >
 likelihood (Jon would accept the smallest salary)'

Note, however, that the counterpart without *ere* would not have a non-referential scalar reading.

- (32) Jonek soldata txikiena onartuko luke
 Jon salary small-est accept aux.
 'Jon would accept the smallest salary'

Second, Basque universal quantifiers may optionally take *ere*.

- (33) Enparantzan zeuden denak (ere)
 square-postp. were all also
 '(Absolutely) everyone was in the square'

In short, the connector *ere* is not involved in polar contexts when it attaches to free-choice elements in both positive and negative clauses. This is so even when it gets a scalar reading in both type of clauses, related to quantifiers appearing in a given syntactic context.

1.3. Negative scalar presuppositions

It is well known that the bibliography relates downward entailing contexts to some NPIs, at least since Ladusaw (1979: §VI). Odriozola & Ondarra (2010) show that *ere* optionally appears attached to NPIs in these contexts. These authors lexically redefine this type of downward/negative polarity in terms of hyper-/hyponym truth presuppositions. The truth of (34a) presupposes the truth of (34c) so that hyponyms ('woman') are deduced in descending order based on hypernyms ('human'), over which the element *inongo* (*ere*) 'any' holds scope.

- (34) a Inongo gizakirik (*ere*) ez zen egon
any human also not aux. been
'No human was there '
b X (=human) wasn't there
c X (=woman) wasn't there

It is worth noting the differences between (34) and the optional non-polar scalar reading described in section 1.2 which is repeated here as (35):

- (35) a Dorleta *ere* ez zen egon
Dorleta also not aux. been
b X (\neq Dorleta) wasn't there
b' Likelihood (X \neq Dorleta wasn't there) > likelihood that
Dorleta wasn't there

As said before, we assume that (35) triggers a scalar (additive) reading, whereas (34) triggers a downward additive reading.

As Odriozola & Ondarra (2010) have pointed out, *ere* is sometimes the obligatory building block of the NPI. One of the elements preceding *ere* is the numeral *bat* 'one' that gives rise to the same type of truth presupposition.

- (36) a Gizakirik *bat ere* ez zen egon
human one also not aux. been
lit 'One human even wasn't there' ('Not a person was there')
b X (=human) wasn't there
c No woman was there

It is worth noting that Basque NPIs like *bat ere* pattern in both their structure and their semantics with Hindi NPIs like *ek bhii* ‘one even’ (‘any’) (37) in that they all bear both a numeral and a second element that Lahiri (1998) considers emphatic:

- (37) mainN-ne ek bhii aadmii-ko nahiiN dekhaa
 I one even man not saw
 ‘I didn’t see even one man’

Both languages show NPIs in overt negative contexts; i.e., a negative particle related to verbal inflection is needed in the clause, whereas English has both an inflectional *not* (38) and the particle *no* (39) having scope over the noun phrase:

- (38) I didn’t see even one man
 (39) I saw no man

In any case, it should be noted that Lahiri translates *ek bhii* as ‘even’, whereas the Basque particle *ere*, in its standard behaviour, is normally translated as ‘also’. On the other hand, the behaviour of both the whole units *bat ere* and *ek bhii* are equivalent to English NPI *not even one*. All of them attach to free-choice elements.

Moverover, Odriozola & Ondarra (2010) have shown that these Basque NPIs exhibit intonation and position features similar to both focus and corrective focus, although focal truth presuppositions are no longer pertinent here.

In short, *ere* is optionally or necessarily attached to non free-choice elements that are NPIs. The units trigger downward negative scalar readings, and focal presupposition is no longer pertinent. The downward negative readings may be taken as a kind of scalar (additive) reading.

2. Alternating polarity items

We know that polarity items are licensed by positive (or negative) syntactic contexts, but that these items may trigger negative (or positive) readings depending on their lexical features. At this point in our re-

search, we assume that polarity can also alternate. This section specifically shows that the semantic/lexical/syntactic nature of polarity makes it hard to classify this phenomenon into separate types such as «positive» or «negative».

Section 2.1 is concerned with a type of polarity that is triggered only in some aspectual contexts. Let us call it lexical alternating polarity. Section 2.2 will be concerned with what we will call syntactic alternating polarity, which, as expected, is triggered only in some syntactic contexts.

2.1. Lexical alternating polarity

Bosque & Gutiérrez-Rexach (2009: §10.3.5) point out that some elements are involved in polarity only with certain predicates. For instance, they show that *todavía* 'still' functions as a NPI only with telic predicates like *pagar* 'to pay':

- (40) a No lo ha pagado todavía
not clitic aux. paid still
'He still has not paid'
b *Lo ha pagado todavía
clitic aux. paid still
lit. 'He still has paid'

On the other hand, non-telic predicates like *amar* 'to love' are available for *todavía* in both affirmative and negative clauses

- (41) a No lo ama todavía
not clitic love still
'He still doesn't love him'
b Lo ama todavía
clitic love still
'He still loves him'

According to this argument, the telic verb *pagar* 'pay' mentioned by these authors licenses the NPI reading of *todavía* (40a).

As usual, polarity items in this field have very different origins cross-linguistically, but in any case, polarity is a universal in human languages, from both a semantic and a syntactic point of view. In fact Basque *ere* is also optionally inserted in alternating polarity complexes: *oraindik (ere)* lit. 'still also' functions as an NPI with telic predicates like *ordaindu* 'to pay':

(42) Oraindik (ere) ez du ordaindu
still also not aux. paid
'He has still not paid'

(43) *Oraindik (ere) ordaindu du
still also paid aux.

As expected, *oraindik (ere)* is not sensitive to the affirmative/negative nature of non-telic predicates like *maite* 'to love':

(44) a Oraindik (ere) ez du maite
still also not aux. love
'He still does not love him'
b Oraindik (ere) maite du
still also love aux.
'He still loves him'

However, it is well known that the lexical aspect of a given verb changes considerably in syntax. In fact, languages may instantiate a non-telic (state) predicate by means of a given form of the morphological paradigm of a verb that is lexically telic. Crucially, the lexically telic verb *ordaindu* 'to pay' is involved in non-telic predicates that do license the PI *oraindik (ere)*. *Gabe* 'without' (Odriozola 2004) must be related to the context that licenses *oraindik (ere)*:

(45) Oraindik (ere) ordaindu gabe dauka
still also paid pospt. aux.
lit. 'He still has it not paid'

Items like *oraindik (ere)* trigger a truth presupposition similar to the focal one (46b):

(46) a Jonek oraindik (ere) ez du ordaindu
still also not aux. paid

- 'Jon still has not paid'
 b 'Jon hasn't paid'

Nevertheless, it should be remarked that the *ere*-bearing unit no longer has scope over the NP *Jon*. In fact, *oraindik (ere)* is a clause modifier, and we assume that the focal presupposition corresponds here to the negation/assertion of the whole clause. Compare the presupposition of (47b) to the presupposition set of (47b-c):

- (47) a Jonek ere ez du ordaindu
 Jon also not aux. paid
 'Jon also hasn't paid'
 b Jon hasn't paid
 c X (≠Jon) hasn't paid

Nevertheless, *oraindik (ere)* triggers another presupposition that is rather different from the additive one triggered by the *ere* attached to free-choice elements: in (47c) we presuppose 'X≠Jon has not paid' whereas *oraindik (ere)* presupposes something related to the whole clause: 'Jon has not paid during a whole period of time'. Needless to say, this kind of presupposition is closely related to the aspectual kind of predicates that license *oraindik (ere)*. In any case, it should be stressed that lexical and syntactic aspect is so complex that it can only with difficulty be completely described in particular languages or in human language itself. This means that, at least for Basque, alternating aspectual polarity items need to be explored in more detail, taking as a point of departure an accurate description of the different instantiations of all lexical, morphological and syntactic aspect in Basque.

2.2. Syntactic alternating polarity

Section 1.3 has shown that according to the bibliography, *inongo NP (ere)* is an NPI:

- (48) a Inongo gizakirik (ere) ez zen egon
 any human also not aux. been
 'No human was there'

- b X (=human) wasn't there
- c X (=woman) wasn't there

However it is not absolutely true that the so-called negative polarity items only appear in overt negative clauses. In fact, Lahiri (1998) points out that *bhii* is allowed in some syntactic contexts such as conditional embedded clauses. For convenience, we provide the English counterpart with *any* that is licensed in the same way:

- (49) If Ram sees anyone, he will inform you

This paper is not directly concerned with the description of standard NPIs. However, both Lahiri's work and traditional descriptions of some issues of Basque grammar seem to indicate that, in a way, there is not a clear border between negative polarity and other types of polarity that should be explored in more detail. Since this issue could be seen as an instantiation of changing/positive polarity, we make here a short tentative description of Basque data that could prove helpful for future research in the line of Odriozola & Ondarra (2011).

The unit *inongo* NP-partitive (*ere*) is licensed in adjunct embedded clauses of the *if*-type

- (50) a Inongo gizakirik (ere) ikusten badut,...
any human also see COMP.-AUX.
'If I see even one human'
- b Inongo gizakirik (ere) ikustekotan
any human also see-COMP.
lit. 'In seeing even one human' 'If I see even one human'

It is so also for adjunct embedded clauses of the *before*-type

- (51) Inongo gizakirik (ere) ikusi baino lehen
any human also seen COMP.
'Before I see even one human'

However, even exploring adjunct embedded clauses with semantics similar to both *if*-type and *before*-type clauses, the licensing for *inongo* NP-partitive (*ere*) is not always possible:

- (52) a *Inongo gizakirik (ere) ikusi arren
any human also seen COMP.
b Gizaki batzuk ikusi arren
human some see COMP
'Even if I see some humans'
- (53) a *Inongo gizakirik (ere) ikusi ostean
any human also seen COMP
b Gizaki batzuk ikusi ostean
human some seen after
'After I see some humans'

Some complement embedded clauses license this unit under negative main clauses:

- (54) a Ez dakit inongo gizakirik (ere) ikusiko dudan
not know any human also see-fut. -aux.-comp.
'I don't know if I will even see any humans'
b Ez dut esan inongo gizakirik (ere) ikusiko dudanik
not aux. say any human also see-fut. aux.-comp.
'I didn't say I saw any human'

This is not so for all types of embedded clauses, and this is another area (outside the scope of this paper) that should be studied in more detail.

In line with the bibliography, we assume that these polar items are negative because they are not licensed in any affirmative main clause, although a given syntactic context, i.e. the syntactic context of some embedded clauses, may license them.

In short, *ere* optionally attaches to non-free choice elements licensed by some specific aspectual features in the predicates. The *ere*-bearing unit triggers a kind of focal reading understood as an assertion/negation of the whole clause. Its additive reading turns out to be closely related to aspectual features of the whole clause.

3. Affirmative polarity items

The section provides instantiations of *ere* involved in affirmative polarity. Significantly, the building blocks of PPIs here are *ere* and quantifiers that are different from the ones described above.

González (2009: §5) describes the polarity of items like *como mucho* ‘at most’, only licensed in affirmative contexts.

- (55) Al bautizo (*no) asistieron como mucho veinte personas
to-the baptism not came at most twenty persons
‘At most, twenty people came to the baptism’

In this field, Basque again exhibits non free-choice elements to which *ere* is attached. These elements often are postpositional complexes in which a numeral is one of the building blocks (for Basque postpositional complexes see Zabala & Odriozola 2004). These units hardly ever appear without *ere*: *gehienez ere* lit. ‘most-the-at also’ (‘at (the) most’), *gutxienez ere* ‘least-the-at also’ (‘at (the) least’). They trigger a focal presupposition (56b) that could be taken as standard in that the PI has scope over an NP (*bi txori* ‘two birds’), although adjacency between two elements is not needed.

- (56) a Gutxienez/gehienez ere bi txori ager daitezke
at (the) least/at (the) most also two bird appear aux
‘At (the) least/At (the) most two birds might appear’
b Two birds might appear
c $N > 2 / N = 2$ birds might appear

It is obvious that the so-called existential presupposition related to additive particles in (56b) is not so standard. Nevertheless, we show in (56c) that it can be plausibly presupposed that a number different from two might appear. On the other hand, it should be noted that the NP under the scope of the API may be focalized.

The building blocks preceding *ere* can also be adjectival or adverbial elements to which the quantifying suffix *-ena* ‘-est’ is attached: *luzeenaz ere* lit. ‘long-est-the-at also’, *onenean ere* lit. ‘best-the-at also’ and *beranduenez ere* ‘late-est-the at also’. These are non free-choice elements and, furthermore,

they are licensed only by affirmative clauses. It should be recalled that free-choice elements that bear either *-ena* or a universal quantifier (see section 1.2) are not sensitive to the positive/negative nature of the clause.

Moreover, in *batez ere* lit. ‘one-at also’ (‘mostly’), the particle *ere* is obligatorily attached to a postpositional complex in which the numeral *bat* ‘one’ is one of the building blocks. The whole unit has been described as a pure connector that is not additive and that has the function of introducing remarks (Zabala 1996: §4.3). However, the complex *batez ere* triggers both a focal (57b) and an existential additive (57c) truth presupposition, in a very standard way:

- (57) a Batez ere txoriak ikusi ditugu
 one-postp. birds seen aux.
 ‘We mostly saw birds’
 b We saw birds
 c We saw X(≠birds).

Note, however, that although the element *batez ere* has a connector-like placement in the clause, it can take scope over the focal nominal element.

4. Conclusion

Ere ‘also’ is a connector that has scope over non-polar elements and bears both additive and focal *also* presuppositions. Moreover, it may take an *even* scalar reading in these cases.

However *ere* may also attach to a wide range of elements in order to constitute polarity items of several types. In almost all such cases, *ere* is optional as a building block of the polarity item, but *ere* does not attach to any element of a given polarity. That is, it optionally attaches to non free-choice polarity items, although sometimes *ere* is obligatory. In polar contexts, additive and focal presuppositions must be reviewed in each case.

Ere-bearing NPIs give rise to a *not any* downward reading that could be related to a kind of scalar (additive) readings.

Some non free-choice elements take *ere* only with telic predicates in negative clauses, so they instantiate a *still not* reading. In these cases the focal presupposition has scope over the whole clause, not over a given NP.

Some non free-choice elements are licensed by an affirmative predicate, so an *all even* reading emerges.

Finally, the additive presupposition of *ere* is somehow never lost. The focal presupposition is not lost either. Furthermore, *ere* is involved in polarity of the three types, and is (obligatorily) attached to certain elements.

References

BOSQUE, I. & J. GUTIÉRREZ-REXACH, 2009, *Fundamentos de sintaxis formal*. Madrid: Akal.

CUARTERO, J.M., 2002, *Conectores y conexión aditiva*. Madrid: Gredos.

EUSKALTZAINDIA, 1990, *Euskal Gramatika. Lehen Urratsak III*. Bilbao.

ETXEBERRIA, U. & A. IRURTZUN, 2011, «The emergence of scalar meanings: association with focus of the additive particle *ere* in Basque». Available on: <http://filcat.uab.cat/clt/cgg22/Abstracts/Etxeberria%20&%20Iruztzun.pdf>.

ETXEPARE, R. & J. ORTIZ DE URBINA (2003). «Focalization» in José Ignacio Hualde & Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), *A Grammar of Basque*. Berlin-New Cork: Mouton de Gruyter.

GONZÁLEZ, R., 2009, «La polaridad positiva en español». Philosophical Dissertation. Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

KRIFKA, M., 1999, «Additive Particle Under Stress». *Proceedings of SALT 8*, 111-128. Ithaca, N.Y: CLC Publications.

LAKA, I., 1990, *On the nature of functional categories and projections*. Philosophical Dissertation. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

LAHIRI, U., 1998. «Focus and negative polarity in Hindi». *Natural Language Semantics* 6, 57-123. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in the Netherlands.

———, 2008, «The semantics and pragmatics of some scalar expressions in Spanish», *Anuario de Filología Vasca «Julio de Urquijo»* 42 (2), 359-389.

ODRIOZOLA, J.C. 2004. «Estructuras con *gabe* 'sin' en vasco» in Elixabete Pérez. Igone Zabala & Llúisa Gràcia (eds.), *Las fronteras de la composición en lenguas románicas y en vasco*, 355-393. Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto.

———, & A. ONDARRA, 2010. «Conectores, gramaticalización e polaridade: o caso de *ere* 'tamén' na lingua vasca», *Cadernos de Fraseoloxía Galega* 12, 175-194.

ONDARRA, A., 2006, «También del castellano y *ere* del vasco (I)», *Interlingüística* 17, 788-796.

———, 2007a, «También del castellano y *ere* del vasco (II)», *Interlingüística* 18, 846-855.

———, 2007b, «*Ere* eta aurreuposizioa (hizkuntzalaritzako) testu teknikoetan», *Espezialitateko Hizkerak eta Terminologia II. Euskara estandarra eta espezialitate hizkerak*, 199-20. EHU.

ORTIZ DE URBINA, J. (2003): «Word order», *A Grammar of Basque*. J.I. Hualde & J. Ortiz de Urbina (eds.). Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

OSA, E., 1990, *Euskararen hitzordena: komunikazio zereginaren arauera*. Doktorego-tesia. EHU, Bilbo.

ZABALA, I., 1996, «Testuan iruzkinak sartzeko funtzioa izan dezaketen antolatzailak: *hau da, hain zuzen ere, adibidez, batez ere*» in Igone Zabala (coord.), *Testu-loturarako baliabideak: Euskara teknikoa*, 113-130. EHU/UPV.

———, & J.C. ODRIOSOLA (2004). «Los compuestos posposicionales en vasco» in Elixabete Pérez-Gaztelu, Igone Zabala & LLÜISA GRÀCIA (eds.), *Las fronteras de la composición en lenguas románicas y en vasco*, 445-534. Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto.