Weak and strong NPIs: *nobody* **and** *anybody* **in Albanian and Modern Greek**[*]

Orest Xherija

The University of Chicago

orest.xherija@uchicago.edu

Abstract

In this paper, I present the typology, semantic distribution and interpretation of the emphatic and non-emphatic negative polarity items like **asnjë** 'nobody' and **ndonjë**, whose meaning is close to 'anybody' (albeit with a more indefinite import), in Albanian and compare it to that of another language in the *Balkan Sprachbund*, Modern Greek (Giannakidou (1993a) & Giannakidou (1993b)). Albanian differs from Modern Greek in that it differentiates between the two classes lexically (it has a distinct word for each paradigm), whereas Modern Greek uses the same word for both (**kanénas**) but distinguishes the cases intonationally, by means of emphatic stress. As in the case of Modern Greek, the distribution of the emphatic and non-emphatic NPIs is regulated by nonveridicality; the emphatic class only appears in the scope of antiveridical operators thus having a narrower distribution, while the non-emphatic class appears in a large repertoire of environments which are all, however, nonveridical. Morphology plays an important role in the distribution of the emphatic items since their first morpheme *as* 'even' has always the strict NPI reading (Giannakidou (2007)) which forces *as* to be licensed only in the scope of antiveridical operators, a property that is inherited by the tokens of the emphatic class as well. I conclude with examples from Albanian that seem inexplicable within the existing nonveridicality theory of polarity and might suggest the need for an extension of the current framework.

1 Introduction

In numerous languages, the dividing line between *n*-words[1](nobody, nothing, nowhere, never etc.) and indefinites (anybody, somebody, something etc.) is not well defined, and indefinite negative polarity items (NPIs) serve usually as the bridge between the two domains. Albanian has, to my knowledge, received no attention with regard to the study of NPIs. Motivated by the analysis in Giannakidou (1993a) and subsequent work on the distinction between **KANÉNAS/KANÍS**[2] 'nobody' and **kanénas/kanís** 'anybody' in Modern

---

[1]The term was first introduced in Laka (1990).

[2]Throughout this paper, the NPIs appear in bold font and the emphatic NPIs in Greek appear capitalized to indicate the associated prosodic focus

Greek, this paper aims to provide a typology and an interpretation of the corresponding Albanian NPIs (a more transparent case than Modern Greek, as it will be demonstrated) and study licensing conditions for each of them.

1.1 *Nobody* and *anybody* in Modern Greek

The case of Modern Greek has been analyzed in detail in Giannakidou (1993a) and subsequent work. I discuss and summarize the main findings in this section. In Modern Greek the distinction between the *n*-word and the indefinite existential use of **kanénas/kanís** is achieved intonationally, by employing emphatic stress. **KANÉNAS/KANÍS** 'nobody' and **kanénas/kanís** 'anybody' in addition to **TIPOTA** 'nothing' and **típota** 'anything' correspond to these two distinct uses, the indefinite existential use to the latter and the *n*-word use to the former.

Considering the quantificational nature of the two classes of polarity items (PIs), we observe that only **KANÉNAS** or **KANÉNAS N** are modifiable by adverbs such as *shedón* 'almost' and *apolítos* 'absolutely'. The non-emphatic paradigm is consistently ruled out, as exemplified in [1]:

(1) Me tétio skotádhi *dhen* vlépo   shedón/apolítos **KANÉNAN/*kanénan**.
    with such darkness not   see.1SG almost/absolutely nobody
    'It is so dark that I see almost/absolutely nobody.'

This diagnostic has been successfully employed in Horn (1972), Hoeksema (1983) and Zanuttini (1991) for the tracing of universal quantifiers and establishes that the tokens of the emphatic class are, indeed, universal quantifiers. The tokens of the non-emphatic class are consistently ruled out in such sentences, therefore making them existential quantifiers.

Turning to the study of the licensing environments, it becomes clear that the items of the emphatic paradigm are only licensed within the scope of sentential negation[3], that is, only in the scope of *dhe(n)* – for clauses whose verb is in indicative mood – and *mi(n)* – for clauses whose verb is not in indicative mood, with the exception of *prin* 'before' and *horís* 'without' clauses[4] where the presence of the negative marker is not required. Examples [2] - [7] illustrate these facts:

(2) *Dhen* írthe   **KANÉNAS/kanénas**.
    NEG came.3SG nobody
    'Nobody came.'

(3) ***KANÉNAS/*kanénas** írthe   na   me heretísi.
    nobody   came.3SG SUBJ me greet.SUBJ.3SG
    'Nobody came to greet me.'

(4) *Min* pis   se **KANÉNAN/kanénan** tin alíthia.
    NEG tell.SUBJ.2SG to nobody   the truth
    'Tell nobody the truth.'

---

[3]Hereafter, *negation* will mean *sentential negation* unless otherwise specified.

[4]*Horís* 'without' is considered to be an antiveridical operator. For a proof of this fact, the reader may consult Zwarts (1995), Zwarts (1998) and Giannakidou (1993b).

(5) *Pes* se ***KANÉNAN/kanénan** tin alíthia.
tell.IMP.2SG to nobody the truth
'Tell nobody the truth.'

(6) Éfige *horís* na milísi se **KANÉNAN/kanénan**.
left.3SG without SUBJ talk.SUBJ.3SG to nobody
'She left without talking to anybody.'

(7) Éfige *horís* **KANÉNAN/kanénan** distagmó.
left.3SG without any hesitation
'She left without any hesitation.'

The elements of the non-emphatic paradigm, on the other hand, are freely licensed in a wide variety of environments, including questions [8], modals [9] and imperative [10].

(8) Írthe **kanénas/*KANÉNAS** mathitís?
came.3SG any student
'Did any student come?'

(9) Tha féro **kanénan/*KANÉNAN** fílo sto párti.
FUT bring.FUT.1SG any friend to.the party
'I will bring any friend to the party.'

(10) Fére **kanénan/*KANÉNAN** krasí mazí sou.
bring.IMP.2SG any wine with you
'Bring any wine with you.'

The regulating force of the distribution of the Modern Greek NPIs is nonveridicality. Moreover, the fact that the emphatic NPI is only licensed in environments in which there is negative marking suggests that the particular NPI requires antiveridical operators in order to be licensed. As for *horís* 'without', Giannakidou (1993b) proves that it is an antiadditive operator[5] in the structure *horís* S and it can consequently be regarded as an antiveridical environment, as proven by Zwarts (1995). The tokens of the non-emphatic class exhibit a wide distribution that can only be sufficiently explained by nonveridicality. Indeed, the wide repertoire of environments in which the non-emphatic items appear makes it impossible for the classical theory of DM operators[6] to sufficiently capture the entirety of the varying distribution of these NPIs. In the following section, I provide a licensing condition for NPIs (coming from Giannakidou (2002)) which is responsible for the regulation of the emphatic and non-emphatic Modern Greek NPIs, as well.

2 The nonveridicality theory of polarity

Up to this point I have employed the terms *veridical, nonveridical* and *antiveridical* without formally defining them. Before embarking on the discussion of the importance of the nonveridicality theory of polarity in the prediction and interpretation of NPI distributions, I deem it important to provide formal definitions of the aforementioned terms.

---

[5]An antiadditivephic operator should be thought of as a logical negation. It does not manifest itself as morphosyntactic negation but it has the logical properties of negative operators. A formal definition will be provided in Section [3.4].

[6]Given Boolean algebras $\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B}$, a function $f : \mathscr{A} \to \mathscr{B}$ is termed a *downward monotonic* (DM) operator if and only if $\forall x, y \in \mathscr{A}, x \leq y \implies f(x) \geq f(x)$ (Ladusaw (1979)).

Definition 2.1. A propositional operator $\mathscr{F}$ is termed:

1. veridical if and only if for any proposition p, $\mathscr{F}(p) \implies p$
2. nonveridical, otherwise
3. antiveridical if and only if for any proposition p, $\mathscr{F}(p) \implies (\neg p)$

Essentially, $\mathscr{F}$ is veridical if and only if whenever $\mathscr{F}(p)$ is true, p is also true; if this does not hold, $\mathscr{F}$ is nonveridical. A nonveridical $\mathscr{F}$ is antiveridical if and only if whenever $\mathscr{F}(p)$ is true, p is not true. Note, importantly, that antiveridical operators are a proper subset of the nonveridical ones. Modals, intensional operators and questions are typical nonveridical environments while the prototypical antiveridical environments are sentential negation and *without*.

(11) Yesterday, Orest bought an apple. $\implies$ Orest bought an apple.

(12) Did Orest buy an apple? $\not\implies$ Orest bought an apple.

(13) Orest may have bought an apple. $\not\implies$ Orest bought an apple.

(14) Orest didn't buy an apple. $\implies$ $\neg$ (Orest bought an apple.)

(15) Without Orest buying an apple. $\implies$ $\neg$ (Orest bought an apple.)

An adjustment is necessary when we consider temporal or aspectual operators, hence we modify the previous Definition [2.1] to [2.2]:

Definition 2.2. Let $\mathscr{F}$ be a temporal/aspectual operator, $\mathscr{M}$ a model, $\mathscr{I}$ a (contextually relevant) time interval and $t \in \mathscr{I}$ a fixed time instant. Then:

1. $\mathscr{F}$ is **veridical** if and only if $[\![\mathscr{F}(p)]\!]_t^{\mathscr{M}} = 1 \implies [\![p]\!]_{t'}^{\mathscr{M}} = 1$ for some $t' \leq t$. Otherwise, $\mathscr{F}$ is **nonveridical**.
2. $\mathscr{F}$ is **antiveridical** if and only if $[\![\mathscr{F}(p)]\!]_t^{\mathscr{M}} = 1 \implies [\![(\neg p)]\!]_{t'}^{\mathscr{M}} = 1$ for some $t' \leq t$.
3. given that $[\![\mathscr{F}(p)]\!]_t^{\mathscr{M}} = 1, \forall t \in \mathscr{I}$, $\mathscr{F}$ is **veridical** if and only if $\forall t \in \mathscr{I}$, $[\![p]\!]_t^{\mathscr{M}} = 1$. Else, $\mathscr{F}$ is **nonveridical**. If, instead, $\forall t \in \mathscr{I}$, $[\![(\neg p)]\!]_t^{\mathscr{M}} = 1$, then $\mathscr{F}$ is termed **antiveridical**.

A natural question that arises at this point is "Why is nonveridicality necessary?". Simply because the frameworks that preceded it were insufficient to describe the varying distributions of NPIs crosslinguistically. Indeed, the claim of Ladusaw (1979) that DM operators fully describe the environments in which NPIs occur was inadequate. The condition of Ladusaw (1979) predicts correctly that NPIs will be licensed in the scope of negation, DM quantifiers like *few N, at most n N, no N*, and the restriction of *every*:

(16) No students saw anything.

(17) John didn't see anything.

(18)   Few children saw anything.

(19)   Every student who heard anything should report to the police

But there are numerous environments[7]which are not DM but are acceptable as NPI licensors. This is precisely where the nonveridicality theory of polarity proves its superiority, as it accounts for the distribution of NPIs in both DM[8]and non-DM environments. Giannakidou (2002) proposes the following licensing condition for NPIs which is then derived form the lexical semantic content of the NPIs:

Criterion 2.1. *A NPI α is grammatical in a sentence $\mathscr{S}$ if and only if α is in the scope of a nonveridical operator β in $\mathscr{S}$.*

This licensing condition accounts for the case of Modern Greek. The English *any* has a weaker licensing condition than Criterion [2.1]. As this is out ofs the scope of this paper, I refer the reader to Giannakidou (2001) and Giannakidou (2002) for a complete discussion of the peculiarities of *any*.

3   The case of Albanian

As it will turn out, the semantic distribution of polarity items in Albanian is not very different from that of Modern Greek (possibly a consequence of the two being members of the *Balkan Sprachbund*), albeit it is different enough to be interesting and deserve a separate analysis.

3.1   Negation in Albanian

Before embarking on the study of the distribution of Albanian NPIs, an overview of the distribution of the Albanian negative operators is in order. A thorough analysis of the latter has been provided in Turano (2000); in this section I summarize her findings. Albanian has three overt negative makers: *nuk*, *s'* and *mos*[9]. I examine them separately, beginning with the first two. *Nuk* and *s'* are identically distributed; in fact, they can always replace each other. They are associated with indicative [20], conditional [21] and admirative[10][22] clauses. The following examples from Turano (2000) illustrate these distributional properties:

(20)   *Nuk/S'/*Mos* vajta   (më)   në bibliotekë.
       NEG   went.1SG (anymore) in library
       'I didn't go to the library (anymore).'

---

[7]Non-monotone quantifiers like *three students, neither student, nobody but John*; *hardly/barely*; questions; the future; the habitual, generic statements; modals; imperatives; protasis of conditionals; directive intensional verbs etc. A detailed account of these environments can be found in (Giannakidou (2002)).

[8]Zwarts (1995) proves that DM operators are a proper subset of the nonveridical ones.

[9]Turano (2000) mentions *jo* 'no' as a negative element but since I am only concerned with negative elements that actually assume the role of negative operators, I disregard *jo* in my analysis.

[10]Admiratives are used to express surprise or amazement.

(21) Po të   mos e   kishit lajmëruar, ai *nuk/s'/*mos* do   të   vinte.
     if SUBJ NEG CLT had   called.2PL he NEG   COND SUBJ come.SUBJ.3SG
     'If you hadn't called him, he wouldn't have come.'

(22) *Nuk/S'/*Mos* qenka   këtu Maria?
     NEG   has.been.ADM.3SG here Maria
     'Hasn't Maria been here?'

Mos is ungrammatical in these structures. *Nuk* and *s'* appear to the left of the finite verb. They precede the auxiliary in compound tenses [23] and the future [24] and conditional [25] marker *do*.

(23) a. *Nuk/S'* kam   ngrënë.
        NEG   have.1SG eaten
        'I haven't eaten.'

     b. *Kam {nuk/s'} ngrënë.

(24) a. *Nuk/S'* do   vijë.
        NEG   FUT come.FUT.1SG
        'He won't come'

     b. *Do *nuk/s'* vijë.

(25) a. *Nuk/S'* do   të   vinte.
        NEG   COND SUBJ come.COND.1SG
        'He wouldn't come'

     b. *Do *nuk/s'* të vinte.

Nuk and *s'* must be immediately adjacent to the verb; no lexical items [26], no adverbs [27] and no parentheticals [28] may appear between *nuk/s'* and the verb; clitics however can, as in [29]:

(26) **Nuk/S'* Maria flet.
     NEG   Maria talk.3SG
     'Maria doesn't talk.'

(27) **Nuk/S'* akoma flet.
     NEG   still   talk.3SG
     'She/It doesn't talk.'

(28) **Nuk/S'*, sipas   meje, iku.
     NEG   according.to me   left.3SG
     'She, according to to me, did not leave.'

(29) *Nuk/S'* i   flas.
     NEG   CLT talk.1SG
     'I don't talk to him/her/it.'

Now consider the negative element *mos*. It combines with the subjunctive [30], the imperative [31], the optative [32], the gerund [33] and the infinitive [34].

(30) Merr   çadrën që   të   *mos* lagesh.
     take.IMP.2SG umbrella so.that SUBJ NEG wet.SUBJ.2SG
     'Take the umbrella, so that that you don't get wet.'

(31) *Mos* lexo   këtë libër.
NEG read.IMP.2SG this book
'Don't read this book.'

(32) *Mos* vdeksh   kurrë.
NEG die.OPT.2SG never
'May you never die.'

(33) Duke *mos* ditur   çfarë të   bënte,   doli   në oborr.
GER NEG knowing what SUBJ do.SUBJ.3SG came.out.3SG in yard
'Not knowing what to do, She came out in the yard.'

(34) Për të   *mos* u   vonuar, mori   një taksi.
INF SUBJ NEG REFL been.late took.3SG one taxi
'For not to be late, he took a taxi.'

Mos cannot be replaced by *nuk* or by *s'*; their distributions are complementary. One of the most notable characteristics of the paradigm is the presence of a mood marker overtly realized by the particle *të* in the subjunctive, by the particle *duke* in the gerund and by the particles *për të* in the infinitive. The negative element *mos* follows the mood marker. So, in [30], *mos* appears between *të* and the verb; in [33] *mos* appears between *duke* and the verb; in [34] *mos* appears between *për të*t and the verb. Like *nuk* and *s'*, *mos* must be immediately adjacent to the verb. Clitics are the only lexical material which may intervene between negation and the verb as seen below:

(35) Të   *mos* e   harrojnë.
SUBJ NEG CLT forget.SUBJ.3PL
'They don't forget him/her/it.'

(36) *Të   *mos* Maria niset   herët.
SUBJ NEG Maria leave.SUBJ.3SG early
'Maria doesn't leave early!'

(37) *Të   *mos* herët niset.
SUBJ NEG early leave.3SG.SUBJ
'She doesn't leave early!'

This distribution of the Albanian negative elements *nuk/s'* and *mos* is not unique; indeed, Modern Greek exhibits the exact same distributional properties with its negative elements *dhen* and *mi(n)* (Giannakidou (1998)). *Dhe(n)* is identically distributed to *nuk/s'* and *mi(n)* shares an identical distribution with *mos*.

3.2   Emphatic versus non-emphatic items in Albanian

Contrary to the Modern Greek case which marks the difference between the emphatic and non-emphatic items by means of intonation, Albanian marks the difference by means of its morphology[11]. Although Albanian has a number of words for each class of polarity items (see Table [1]), the ones that are more frequently encountered[12]are **asnjë**, **asnjeri** and

---

[11]Although Albanian does not differentiate between the two classes of NPIs by means of prosody, I will keep using the terms *emphatic* and *non-emphatic* to refer to the NPIs that match the distribution of the Modern Greek emphatic and non-emphatic NPIs, respectively. This is only for convenience of exposition and to avoid terminological confusion.

[12]The older forms in Table [1] are rarely used, or used only in marginally spoken dialects of the Albanian language. I state them, here, for the benefit of the interested reader.

askush for the emphatic case and **ndonjë** and **ndonjeri** for the non-emphatic one. All the items of the emphatic case are equivalent to 'nobody' while the ones of the non-emphatic have a meaning which is closer to 'someone' but conveying a more arbitrary indefinite import than *dikush* 'someone' or *kushdo* 'anybody'.

Paradigms	Translation	Emphatic	Determiner	Infrequent
asnjë	nobody	✓	✓	
asnjeri	nobody	✓		
mosnjeri	nobody	✓		✓
askush	nobody	✓		
kurr(ë)kush	nobody	✓		✓
moskush	nobody	✓		✓
kurrnja	nobody	✓		✓
kurrfarë	nobody	✓	✓	✓
ndonjë	anybody		✓	
ndonjeri	anybody			
asgjë	nothing	✓		
mosgjë	nothing	✓		✓
kurrgjë	nothing	✓		✓
(ndonjë) gjë	anything			

Table 1: Emphatic and non-emphatic polarity items

Table [1] requires a clarification. As for the translation of the items of the non-emphatic class, the reader should not be led to consider them free choice items (FCIs). This complication in translation arises only due to the lexical asymmetry between Albanian and English. These are not FCI for FCIs do not surface in negative clauses with episodic predicates (Giannakidou (2001)), even though they surface in most of the other test environments that I use. I will show that, indeed, this is the case for these Albanian polarity items; they do appear in negative contexts (for a preview, consider [38] in Section [3.3]).

A morphological analysis of the above items reveals further information about their nature. Table [2] resulted from data taken from Demiraj (1973):

Items	Morpheme 1	Morpheme 2	Mopheme 3	Morpheme 4
asnjë	as 'even'	një 'one'	∅	∅
asnjeri	as 'even'	njeri 'human'	∅	∅
mosnjeri	mos (NEG)	njeri 'human'	∅	∅
askush	as 'even'	kush 'who'	∅	∅
kurrkush	kurr 'never'	kush 'who'	∅	∅
moskush	mos (NEG)	kush 'who'	∅	∅
kurrnja	kurr 'never'	nja 'one'	∅	∅
kurrfarë	kurr 'never'	farë 'sort'	∅	∅
ndonjë	kurr 'never'	do 'want'	një 'one'	∅
ndonjeri	kurr 'never'	do 'want'	njeri 'human'	∅
asgjë	as 'even'	gjë 'thing'	∅	∅
mosgjë	mos (NEG)	gjë 'thing'	∅	∅
kurrgjë	kurr 'never'	gjë 'thing'	∅	∅
(ndonjë) gjë	kurr 'never'	do 'want'	një 'one'	gjë 'thing'

Table 2: Morphological Analysis of the Paradigms

The first observation is that the items of the emphatic class all have a negative marker. Indeed, *as* 'even' is treated as a negative element. An explanation of the importance of this observation is provided in Section [3.4], after I have presented the data on the distribution of each item. The morphology of the non-emphatic class is also quite interesting. The analysis in Demiraj (1973) suggests that it comes from the concatenation of three morphemes and the fusion of the first two: *në*, a subordinate conditional conjunction whose meaning is very close to that of 'if', *do* (third person singular of *dua* 'want') and *një* 'one'. It seems, therefore, that the first morpheme endows the non-emphatic class of polarity items. Whether this is indeed the case, or whether the particular items exhibit word-internal compositionality is beyond the scope of this paper.

3.3 Distribution of emphatic and non-emphatic items

The following examples demonstrate licensing environments for each paradigm. It is evident right away that the emphatic paradigm can only be present in sentences where an overt negative operator is present. The distribution of the non-emphatic paradigm, however, varies to a much greater extent. Interestingly, the distribution of the non-emphatic class completely matches that of **kanís**, the non-emphatic NPI in Modern Greek[13].

Negative clauses

(38) Kërkova   shumë por *(*nuk*) gjeta   **asgjë/ndonjë gjë**.
       searched.1SG very   but NEG   found.1SG anything
       'I searched a lot but I didn't find anything.' *or* 'I searched a lot but I found nothing.'

It is very important to note that [38] is strong evidence against the potential claim that **asgjë** may be an *n*-word and not a NPI. *N*-words do not require negation to be sanctioned in

---

[13]In the following examples, I have italicized the relevant environments.

a sentence, on the contrary, they provide the negation for the licensing of other negation dependent elements (e.g. NPIs). **Asgjë**, however, requires overt sentential negation in [38].

Restrictive adverbs and adjectives

(39) *Pak* burra marrin **ndonjë/*asnjë** grua   të   shëmtuar.
few men take   any   woman CLT ugly
'Few men take (as their wife) any ugly woman.'

(40) *Vetëm* pak professorë kan shoqëri   me **ndonjë/*asnjë** nga   studentët e   tyre.
only   few professors have friendship with any   among students CLT their
'Only a few professors make friends with any of their students.'

(41) *Shumica* e   professorëve kanë shoqëri   me **ndonjë/*asnjë** nga   studentët e   tyre.
majority of professors   have friendship with any   among students CLT their
'Most professors make friends with any of their students.'

Adversative predicates

(42) *Dushoj*   nëse   tha   **ndonjëri/*asnjëri** të   vërtetën.
doubt.1SG whether said.3SG anybody   the truth
'I doubt whether anyone said the truth.'

Yes-no questions

(43) Erdhi   **ndonjë/*asnjë** student të   puesi   për resultatet*?*
came.3SG any   student. SUBJ ask.SUBJ.3SG for results
'Did any student come by to ask about the results?'

(44) Supa është gati.   Do   **ndonjëri/*asnjëri***?*
soup is   ready want.3SG anybody
'Soup is ready. Does anybody want some?'

Wh-questions

(45) *Kur* do   lexosh   **ndonjë/*asnjë** libër*?*
when FUT read.FUT any   book
'When are you going to read any book?'

Sentential comparative

(46) E   tregoj   veten *më   të   mënçur se   sa* do   priste
CLT proved.3SG self   more CLT clever   than CLT FUT expect.PAST.3SG
ndonjëri/*asnjëri.
anybody
'She proved herself to be more intelligent than anyone would expect.'

(47) *Më   mirë* të   iki   *se   sa* të   shikoj **ndonjë/*asnjë** nga   ato
more good SUBJ go.SUBJ.1SG than CLT SUBJ see.SUBJ anyone   among them
edhe të   nevrikosem.
and   SUBJ get.angry.SUBJ.1SG
'It is better for me to leave than to see anyone of them and get angry.'

In the first argument of the universal quantifier

(48) *Kushdo* që ka   arritur **ndonjë gjë/*asgjë** të vështirë, e   ka arritur   me
    whoever that has.3SG achieved anything   CLT difficult CLT has achieved with
    shumë punë.
    lot   work
    'Everyone who has achieved anything difficult, has achieved it with a lot of work.'

Conditional

(49) *Po* të   më kërkojë   **ndonjëri/*asnjëri**, më lajmëro.
    if të.SUBJ me search.SUBJ.3SG anybody   me inform.IMP
    'If anyone asks for me, inform me.'

(50) *Po* të   gjeja   **ndonjë/*asnjë** grua   të mirë, do   martohesha.
    if SUBJ find.SUBJ any   woman CLT good do.SUBJ get.married.SUBJ
    'If I would find a good woman, I would get married.'

(51) *Le* të   sjelli   **ndonjë/*asnjë** notë të   keqe dhe do   shikoj   çfarë do
    let SUBJ bring.3SG any   grade CLT bad   and FUT see.3SG what FUT
    pesoj.
    happen.FUT
    'If she brings a bad grade, she will see what will happen to her.'

(52) *Po mos* gjejë   **ndonjë/asnjë** të   njohur, do kthehem   herët.
    if NEG find.SUBJ.1SG anybody   CLT familiar FUT return.FUT.1SG early
    'If I don't find anyone that I know, I shall be back early. '

We observe that in [52] the emphatic NPI **asnjë** is sanctioned. This is so because of the intervening negation *mos*. If we omit the negation and have an affirmative protasis instead, then **asnjë** is not be sanctioned.

Modals

(53) {*Mundet të*}   / {*ndoshta do*} kaloj   **ndonjëri/*asnjëri** të   më
    maybe   SUBJ / possibly   SUBJ come.SUBJ.3SG anybody   SUBJ me
    kërkoj.
    search.SUBJ.3SG
    'Someone may come and look for me.'

(54) Në këtë lojë   shahu *mundet* **ndonjëri/*asnjëri** të   fitoi.
    in this game chess can.3SG anybody   to.SUBJ win.SUBJ.3SG
    'In this chess game anyone can win.'

(55) Me kaq dhimbje koke *duhet* të   merje   **ndonjë/*asnjë** aspirin.
    with such pain   head must të.SUBJ take.SUBJ.2SG any   aspirin
    'With such a headache, you should have taken an aspirin.'

(56) *Duhet* sezbën   të shikoj   **ndonjë/*asnjë** doktorr.
    must   definitely to see.SUBJ.3SG any   doctor
    'A doctor must definitely see you.'
    [Notice: In English a sentence like *Any doctor must see him is marked as ungramamtical]

(57) *Nuk duhet* të më shikoj   **ndonjë/asnjë**.
    NEG must to me see.SUBJ.3SG anybody
    "No one must see me."

Similarly to [52], the emphatic NPI in [57] is sanctioned because of the negation *nuk* that precedes the modal. If we remove the negative marker, the sentence becomes ungrammatical.

Simple future

(58) *Do* gjejë **ndonjë/*asnjë** shok të   më ndifmoj, mos ki   hall.
     FUT find.1SG any   friend SUBJ me help.3SG NEG have.IMP.2SG worry
     'I will find some friend or other to help me, don't worry.'

Imperative

(59) *Shko*   gjejë   **ndonjë/*asnjë** ndim.
     go.IMP.2SG find.IMP.2SG any   help
     'Go find some help or other.'

(60) Nuk kam   ide, *pyet*   **ndonjë/*asnjë** specialist.
     NEG have.1SG idea ask.IMP.2SG any   specialist
     'I have no idea, ask some specialist or other.'

(61) *Hajde*,   por *mos sill*   prap **ndonjërin** nga   shokët e tu.
     Come.IMP.2SG but NEG bring.IMP.2SG again any   among friends of your
     'Come, but don't bring again anyone of you friends.'

(62) *Hajde*,   por *mos sill*   **asnjërin** nga   shokët e tu.
     Come.IMP.2SG but NEG bring.IMP.2SG nobody   among friends of your
     'Come, but bring none of your friends.'

Indicative (without negation)

(63) *Kalon*   ndonjëherë **ndonjëri/*asnjëri** edhe pyet.
     pass.3SG sometime   anybody   and ask.3SG
     'Some person or other passes by and inquires occasionally.'

(64) *Kalonte*   ndonjëherë **ndonjëri/*asnjëri** edhe pyeste.
     was-passing.3SG sometime   anybody   and ask.PAST.PROG.3SG
     'Some person or other used to pass by and inquire occasionally.'

(65) **Kaloj*   **asnjëri** edhe pyeti.
     passed.3SG nobody and   asked.3SG
     'Nobody passed by and asked.'

Superlative

(66) Është gënjeshtra *më   e   madhe që* ka   thënë **ndonjëri/*asnjëri**.
     is   lie   more CLT big   that has.3SG told   anyone
     'It's the biggest lie that anyone has told.'

The following environments are used to test the quantificational nature of the NPIs. They have not been claimed to be licensors of NPIs in the literature.

Co-indexation with clitics

(67) Nuk i$_i$ pëlqen   keqtrajtimi   i ***ndonjërit$_i$/asnjërit$_i$**.
     NEG CLT like.3SG maltreatment of nobody
     'He does not like anyone's maltreatment.'

Topicalization and fronting

(68) Me   këtë sjellje ***ndonjërin/asnjërin** nuk do   gjejë   ta ndifmoj.
     with this attitude nobody   NEG FUT find.FUT.3SG her help.FUT.1SG
     'With such bad attitude she will find noone to help her.'

Metalinguistic negation

(69) *Nuk* i   thash   **ndonjërit/*asnjërit** që ike   por që ndejte   deri në fund.
     NEG CLT told.1SG anybody   that left.2SG but that stayed.2SG until the end
     'I didn't tell anyone that you left but that you stayed till the end.'

Modification by *absolutisht* 'absolutely' and *po thuaj se* 'approximately'

(70) Me   kaq errësirrë, nuk shikoj *absolutisht* / *po thuaj se*   ***ndonjë gjë/asnjë gjë**.
     with such darkness NEG see.1SG absolutely / approximately nothing
     'It is so dark that I can see absolutely nothing.'

(71) *Po thuaj se* ***ndonjë/asnjë** çift   nuk është i   lumtur.
     almost   nobody   couple NEG is   CLT happy
     'Almost no couple is happy.'

3.4 Data Interpretation

One easily observes the different distribution of the items of the non-emphatic paradigm with respect to those of the emphatic one. In fact, sentential negation is the sole trigger for the licensing of the emphatic class of NPIs while the set of triggers for the licensing of the non-emphatic NPIs is remarkably rich, consisting of modal (subjunctives, imperatives, questions, modal verbs, conditionals, future, superlatives) aspectual (imperfective verbs in indicative) and DM (sentential negation, restrictive adverbs, S-comparatives and conditionals) operators. Clearly, not all of the environments that license NPIs in Albanian are DM (e.g. questions, imperatives). Considering Table [3], the reader can immediately verify that all of the environments that license the two paradigms are nonveridical[14]. Furthermore, the only environment regulating the emphatic element is clausal negation, a prototypical antiveridical operator, which agrees perfectly with the corresponding analysis that Giannakidou has provided for Modern Greek (Giannakidou (2002)). Albanian therefore conforms to the current framework of the nonveridicality theory of polarity.

A cautionary remark is in order at this point. There are examples of sentences which do not contain one of the overt negative markers discussed in Section [3.1] but do, nevertheless, license the presence of the emphatic NPI. Consider the following sentence:

(72) Ishte   i   sëmurë edhe i   paaftë   për **asnjë/ndonjë** punë fizike.
     was.3SG CLT sick   and CLT incapable for any   work manual
     'He was sick and incapable of any manual work.'

The reader will notice that there is no overt negative operator in this sentence, yet it allows for the presence of the emphatic item **asnjë**. The same will be true even if we change the

---

[14]Co-indexation by clitics, restriction on metalinguistic negation and modification by **absolutisht/po thuaj se** are not nonveridical but are included in the table to illustrate other properties of the NPIs in question, namely quantificational force, and in particular tracing of universal quantifiers.

Environments	Emphatic	Non-Emphatic
clausal negation	✓	✓
restrictive adjectives/adverbs		✓
adversative predicates		✓
yes - *no* questions		✓
wh-questions		✓
S - comparatives		✓
conditionals		✓
modals		✓
simple future		✓
imperatives		✓
superlatives		✓
co - indexation with clitics	✓	
topicalization/fronting		✓
restrictions on metalinguistic negation	✓	
modification by *absolutisht*/*po thuaj se*	✓	

Table 3: Licensing environments for the two paradigms

tense to any other, so there is no relation between the licensing of the non-emphatic item and the imperfective nature of the tense in [72]. A potential solution to this apparent paradox might be in the morphology of the word *paaftë* (incapable).

pa 'without' + aftë 'capable'

At this point I need to introduce the concept of antiadditivity to explain the licensing of the strong[15] NPI in [72].

Definition 3.1. An operator $\mathscr{F}$ is termed antiadditive if and only if $\forall X, Y$

$$\mathscr{F}(X \vee Y) \iff \mathscr{F}(X) \wedge \mathscr{F}(Y)$$

If we replace the operator $\mathscr{F}$ with negation, then we obtain the first De Morgan Law. Indeed, in Albanian the following equivalencies are empirically acceptable[16]:

(73)   pa   (shtëpi ose familje) $\iff$ (pa shtëpi) dhe (pa familje)
       without house   or   family

(74)   pa   (shtëpi dhe familje) $\Longleftarrow$ (pa shtëpi) ose (pa familje)
       without house   and family

(75)   pa   (u   trëmbur ose u   friksuar) $\iff$ (pa u trëmbur) dhe (pa u friksuar)
       without REFL scared   or   REFL frightened

---

[15]The characterization "strong" is from Zwarts (1998) who uses it to classify the NPIs which need to appear in the scope of an antiadditive operator to be sanctioned. I will use the term "strong" as equivalent to "emphatic" in this paper, although in principle strong NPIs are (at best) a superset of emphatic NPIs.

[16]For a proof of the antiadditivity of *without* see Zwarts (1995) and Zwarts (1998).

(76) pa   (u   trëmbur dhe u   friksuar) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (pa u trëmbur) ose (pa u friksuar)
    without REFL scared   and REFL frightened

We note that the construction *pa* follows **Definition** [3.1] of antiadditive operators hence it forms an environment that licences the emphatic class of NPIs to appear without the companionship of sentential negation. But although Modern Greek and Albanian agree on the antiadditive nature of 'without' (the antiadditivity of Modern Greek 'without' has been established in Giannakidou (1998) and other work by the same author; it can also be observed in [7]), this still does not account for the discrepancy of [72] as, in this case, the negative marker *pa* has become the prefix of an adjective. My current research on this topic, which is still ongoing, revolves around one possible explanation namely that the prefix *pa* 'without' in the adjective *i paaftë* 'incapable' is a semantically active morpheme that allows the licensing of the NPI *asnjë*. Therefore, a covert antiveridical operator exists in the above clause and it may be the case that, although a prefix, it has licensing potential for the emphatic NPIs.

An important distinction between the two paradigms comes from their truth-conditions. This agrees with the analysis in Giannakidou (1993b) and is clearly illustrated by observing the behavior of the two classes of NPIs in imperative sentences such as those in [77] and [78].

(77) *Hajde*,   por mos sill   prap **ndonjërin** nga   shokët e tu.
    Come.IMP.2SG but NEG bring.IMP.2SG again any   among friends of yours
    'Come, but don't bring again anyone of you friends.'

(78) *Hajde*,   por mos sill   **asnjërin** nga   shokët e tu.
    Come.IMP.2SG but NEG bring.IMP.2SG nobody   among friends of yours
    'Come, but bring none of your friends.'

[77] implicates that the hearer did bring some colleagues the last time he visited the utterer, contrary to [78] which states clearly that last time the hearer came alone. As a consequence, [77] expresses the desire of the utterer that the hearer does not repeat what he did last time whereas by uttering [78] the speaker expects that the hearer will repeat exactly what he did the previous time. We therefore have two distinct scopal orders:

<div align="center">

NOT AGAIN SOMEONE [77]

AGAIN NOT SOMEONE[17] [78]

</div>

The aspectual marker *prap* (again) is non-trivially affecting the sentence as it reinforces the modal effect already activated by the imperative mood. We observe, also, that no specific reading of **ndonjë** is permissible in such constructions, contrary to what is the case for the negation of indicatives, as modality seems to dictate indefinite non-specific interpretations of the non-emphatic items.

When considering the items of the emphatic class, the reader should be particularly careful with the concatenative morphology that generates them. Indeed, all of the items of the emphatic paradigm have as their first morpheme the word *as* 'even'. Note that translation equivalents of the English *even* have polarity sensitive meanings crosslinguistically

---

[17]With the concordant reading because Albanian is a negative concord language.

(see Giannakidou (2007) for a detailed account). The Albanian *as* corresponds to the high-scalar negative polarity *even* meaning. This explains its restrictions of use to negative and antiveridical environments. The following examples illustrate this phenomenon:

(79) Oresti *(nuk) lexhoj   as   pak.
      Orest (NEG) read.3SG.PAST even a.little
      'Orest did not read even a little.'

(80) Oresti iku   pa   takuar   as   professorin.
      Orest left.3SG without greet.INF even professor.DEF
      'Orest left without greeting even the professor.'

(81) Oresti as   hëngri as   piu.
      Orest neither ate.3SG neither drank.3SG
      'Orest neither ate nor drank.'

Typically *as* occurs in post-verbal position but it may also occur in pre-verbally, leading to cases where *as* requires no overt negation for its licensing as in the following:

(82) As   e   vras   mëndjen.
      Even CLT bother.1SG mind
      'I don't even bother (my mind).'

This admits a syntactic account which proposes the existence of a covert counterpart of negation, but which is beyond the scope of this paper. I refer the reader to (Giannakidou (2007)) for completeness. What one notices, then, is that the distribution of the items of the emphatic class perfectly matches (with the exception of the unresolved case mentioned previously) the distribution of *as*. Indeed, the emphatic paradigm inherits the properties of its first morpheme *as*, and this accounts perfectly for the strictness of the particular items with respect to their nature as NPIs requiring antiveridical environments for their licensing.

4 Conclusion

In this paper, the first treatment of negative polarity items in Albanian, I presented the typology, semantic distribution and interpretation of the emphatic and non-emphatic class of NPIS like **asnjë** 'nobody' and **ndonjë**, whose meaning is close to 'anybody' (albeit with a more indefinite import and having always an existential content), in Albanian and compare it to that of Modern Greek, both languages of the *Balkan Sprachbund*.

I showed that Albanian differs from Modern Greek in that it differentiates between the two classes lexically (it has a distinct lexical entry for each class), whereas Modern Greek uses the same entry for both (**kanénas**) but distinguishes the cases intonationally, by means of emphatic stress. As in the case of Modern Greek, the distribution of the Albanian emphatic and non-emphatic NPIs is regulated by nonveridicality; the emphatic class only appears in the scope of antiveridical operators, while the non-emphatic class appears in a large repertoire of environments which are all, however, nonveridical. Albanian conforms to the predictions of the nonveridicality theory of polarity and enriches the existing theory by adding a set of previously unexplored data to the class of languages in which NPI distribution is modeled successfully by the nonveridicality theory.

Morphology, in particular, plays an important role in the distribution of the emphatic items since their first morpheme *as* 'even' has always the strict NPI reading which forces *as* to be licensed only in the scope of antiveridical operators, a property that is inherited by the items of the emphatic class. Indeed, the licensing environments of *as* in Albanian are in a one-to-one correspondence with the licensing environments of the emphatic items.

Finally, I provided examples that seem to exhibit properties not predicted by the nonveridicality theory of NPI licensing by raising the question of whether negative import prefixes of nouns or adjectives and word-internal compositionality in general can serve as licensing environments of NPIs. To my knowledge, there has been no evidence of languages in which licensing of strong NPIs is possible from word-internal negative markers which makes the Albanian examples interesting. The licensing of strong NPIs is only possible if an antiadditive operator scopes above the strong NPI. There have been no arguments so far, that I am aware of, claiming that word-internal negative markers can be antiadditive operators. This is the line of research that I would like to pursue in future work, summarized by Hypothesis [4.1]:

Hypothesis 4.1. *A word-internal negative marker $\mathscr{M}$ licenses strong NPIs in the scope of its host if the following conditions are satisfied:*

1. *$\mathscr{M}$ can appear as a free morpheme (i.e. in non-word-internal position).*
2. *$\mathscr{M}$ is an antiadditive operator when not word-internal.*

In essence, this Hypothesis [4.1] proposes an extension of the class of licensors of NPis, which, according to the Albanian examples, is necessary. Note, crucially, that I do not an equivalence between sentential negation and lexical negation. The conjecture that I am proposing is that lexical negation satisfying the conditions in Hypthesis [4.1] is able to license strong NPIs. To my knowledge, this is the first semantic attempt to relate the licensing of strong NPIs to lexical negation.

References

Demiraj, Shaban. 1973. *Morfologija historike e gjuhës Shqipe*. Universiteti i Tiranës.

Giannakidou, Anastasia. 1993a. KANENAS and TIPOTA: talking about nothing or anything in Modern Greek. In *Language and Cognition*, ed. by Ale de Boer, Jelly de Jong, & Rita Landerweerd, volume 3 of *Yearbook of the Research Group for Theoretical and Experimental Linguistics of the University of Gröningen*, 49–58. Gröningen: Uitgeverij Passage.

——. 1993b. KANIS/kanis: a case of polarity sensitivity in Modern Greek. In *Proceedings of the 14th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics*, ed. by Anna Anastasiadi-Simeonidi, Mirto Koutitia-Kaimaki, & Melita Stavrou-Sifaki, volume 14 of *Studies in Greek Linguistics*, 130–144. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

——. 1998. *Polarity sensitivity as (non)veridical dependency*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

——. 2001. The meaning of free choice. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 24.659–735.

——. 2002. Licensing and sensitivity in polarity items: from downward entailment to nonveridicality. In *Proceedings of the 38th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by Maria Andronis, Anne Pycha, & Keiko Yoshimura, 29–53. Chicago Linguistic Society.

——. 2007. The landscape of even. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25.39–81.

Hoeksema, Jack. 1983. Negative polarity and the comparative. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1.403–434.

Horn, Laurence R., 1972. *On the semantic properties of logical operators in English*. University of California, Los Angeles dissertation.

Ladusaw, William, 1979. *Polarity sensitivity as inherent scope relations*. University of Texas at Austin dissertation.

Laka, Itziar, 1990. *Negation in syntax: on the nature of functional categories and projections*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.

Turano, Giuseppina. 2000. On clitics and negation in albanian. *Rivista di Gramatica Generativa* 25.81–117.

Zanuttini, Raffaella, 1991. *Negation and clausal structure: a comparative study of Romance Languages*. University of Pennsylvania dissertation.

Zwarts, Frans. 1995. Nonveridical contexts. *Linguistic Analysis* 25.286–312.

——. 1998. Three types of polarity. In *Plurality and Quantification*, ed. by Fritz Hamm & Erhard Hinrichs, volume 69 of *Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy*, 177–238. Kluwer Academic Publishers.