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0 Introduction

The phenomenon of polarity sensitivity is not, in general, very well understood. Why is it that certain words and idioms have the peculiar property of occurring only in negative, interrogative or conditional contexts? It is intuitively clear that negative polarity items (NPIs) are not arbitrarily distributed over the lexicon. A field-worker analyzing an unknown language would probably not ask if the word for knife is limited only to negative statements. On the other hand, indefinite pronouns, or certain modal verbs, are generally good candidates for NPIs. On the basis of these limited observations, one might venture the guess that negative polarity is a reflection of word meaning. More precisely, certain expressions are predestined to become polarity sensitive due to their semantic properties.

In the case of English any, this idea has been put forth by Kadmon and Landman (1993), who argue that all its uses can be explained by reference to its lexical-semantic properties. Fauconnier’s (1975, 1978) work on minimal-quantity NPIs like badge an inch or hurt a fly suggests that their occurrence in negative contexts is directly related to their pragmatic force. They have an intensifying character and are used to make universal statements. Given the indefinite meaning of the minimal-quantity NP, this goal can only be achieved in implication-reversing contexts (e.g. negation, cf. Ladasaw 1980).

However, the rhetorical force of these expressions is idiomatic because it cannot in general be predicted from their literal meaning. Compare e.g. one bit, an NPI with a bit, which is not an NPI (cf. I am (not) a bit worried), but may be used to strengthen negation, and a little bit, which is also not an NPI, but differs from a bit in negative clauses. Thus I am a little bit worried is roughly equivalent to I am a bit worried. The negative counterpart of the first sentence, I am not a bit worried, indicates a fairly strong degree of worry, while the negation of the second sentence, I am not a bit worried, expresses the absence of any worry. Arguably, these items have the same basic interpretation, but have developed special uses which have to be learned separately. If this is so, then a bit, one bit and a little bit are all possible candidates for NPI-status, but only one bit has been grammaticalized as such.

In using the term ‘grammaticalization’, I assume that the creation of NPIs shares some important features with other changes whereby lexical items acquire a special place in the grammar of a language. Traugott and Heine, in their introduction to the book Approaches to grammaticalization (Traugott and Heine 1991) mention the fact that only certain lexical classes are likely to become grammaticalized:

"What we find in language after language is that for any given gram-matical domain, there is only a restrictive set of lexical fields, and within them only a restricted set of lexical items, that are likely to be sources. For example, case markers, including prepositions and postpositions, typically derive from terms for body parts or verbs of motion; tense and aspect markers typically derive from specific spatial configurations; modals from terms for possession, or desire; middles from reflexives, etc." (1991: 8)
Rather similar things could be said about negative polarity items. They cluster in certain semantic domains, and undergo processes of semantic bleaching, typical of grammaticalization phenomena in general. E.g., the phrase *lift a finger* as used in *The police didn't lift a finger to stop him* means something like *do anything*; all other aspects of its etymological meaning have become irrelevant.

Another aspect of grammaticalization is a shift from objective reference-based meanings to subjective meanings which involve aspects of speaker attitude. Again, this can be illustrated for NPIs. Compare for instance the sentence *John didn't move his left index finger*, which is simply descriptive, with *John didn't lift a finger*, in its idiomatic reading, which has the added property of emotional intensity.

A final relevant property of grammaticalization is "layering": next to the grammaticalized use, older, nogrammaticalized uses often stay around. For example, the polarity item *need*, used as a modal auxiliary, has a main verb counterpart which is not polarity-sensitive (cf. *You need not worry* and *I need you*). Layering is in fact so rampant that there are hardly any "pure" NPIs that have no other uses as well. This makes it virtually impossible to automatically detect NPIs in a corpus: first the different uses have to be distinguished. A number of examples of this phenomenon will be discussed below.

In this paper, I investigate the grammaticalization of NPIs in the largely unexplored area of verbs and verbal idioms, basing my conclusions on a comparison of English and Dutch data. These data, I should add, for the most part are not diachronic in nature, but present tendencies in current usage, as reflected in various text corpora. I show that some verbs have a strong tendency to occur in negative contexts, although they are not, strictly speaking, NPIs. For these, I will introduce the term "semi-NPI".

1 Verbs of indifference

The first set of verbs to be considered here I call "verbs of indifference". These verbs are psychological verbs which assess the affective aspects of the relation between a human subject, the "experiencer", and a "stimulus".

The basic verbs in this domain are *care, matter, mind* and *bother*. They can be classified as in Table 1, using two binary oppositions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>positive</th>
<th>negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>personal</td>
<td>care</td>
<td>mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impersonal</td>
<td>matter</td>
<td>bother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The personal verbs in this table assign the experiencer role to the subject and the impersonal ones assign the stimulus role to the subject. Compare *I don't care about it* with *It doesn't matter to me* and *I don't mind it* with *It doesn't bother me*. The positive verbs entail a positive evaluation, the negative ones a negative evaluation.

The intimate relationship between *matter* and *mind* is suggested by some obsolete uses, listed in the OED: *mind* with the meaning of *matter*, as in the OED example *Bullets don't mind much* and *matter* with the meaning of *mind*, as in the following example cited from Fielding's "Tom Jones":

...
If it had been out of doors I had not mattered it so much.

Note that these verbs are polysemous. Both care and mind can be used in a nonpsychological sense, meaning "look after" (cf. One nurse had to care for 70 patients, Who is minding the store?). In the psychological use, there is a strong tendency to use these verbs in a negative, interrogative or conditional context. I have checked this in an 11-million word corpus of English texts posted on the Internet. My findings are presented in Table 2:

Table 2: Four verbs of indifference: distribution¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environments</th>
<th>CARE N=792</th>
<th>MATTER N=406</th>
<th>MIND N=341</th>
<th>BOTHER N=377</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other neg</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interrogative</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affirmative</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note in particular that the scores for care and matter are very close. Among the affirmative uses of these two verbs, quite a few are emphatic in character, either by displaying emphatic DO, as in But I do care, my dearest!, or by occurring in a cleft or pseudo-cleft construction. The verb mind is more nearly a negative polarity item than the others, as is evidenced by the paltry 1% of affirmative contexts. It is sometimes cited as a negative polarity item in the literature, but this is not entirely correct, since it is, after all, grammatical to say that you mind being left out.

Within the modern English period, the negation system shifted rather radically from postverbal negation (as in the jocular I kid you not) to preverbal negation with do-support. While the change was going on, some verbs resisted the new form of negation more than others. In the 18th century, the verbs that maintained the old form the longest were semi-polarity items, such as care and matter (cf. Tieken-Boon van Oostade 1987). In fact, Jespersen (1917) already suggested that the verbs which resisted the change the longest had a special affinity with negation. This, then, illustrates one of the ways in which semi-polarity status may become grammatically relevant.

In the case of bother, the association with nonaffirmative contexts is by far the weakest. I have no explanation as to why this might be. Interestingly, this verb is ambiguous, and also has another sense, which is easily distinguished and can be paraphrased roughly as "to take the trouble", as in Fred did not bother to call or You need not have bothered. With this meaning, the verb is actually a true negative polarity item², as you can see in Table 3, where the two uses are compared:

Table 3: Two types of BOTHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>contexts</th>
<th>=to annoy N=377</th>
<th>=to take the trouble N=253</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negation</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other neg</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interrogative</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affirmative</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As you can see, all nonaffirmative contexts have roughly doubled their frequency, while the affirmative contexts have disappeared. In the second use, *bother* seems to belong to the class of minimal-extent verbs, indicating, in a nonaffirmative context, a minimal degree of effort or involvement. This is underscored by the frequent use of *even* with this particular sense. All 30 examples in my corpus of *even* modifying *bother* involve the sense 'take the trouble'. Given that the other use is more common overall, this is no doubt a highly significant finding. Some examples from the corpus are given in (2):

(2) a. I won't even bother to answer that narrow-minded question.
   b. She becomes concerned when he doesn't even bother to give her a hard time about it.

For both senses of *bother*, the incidence of negative contexts is higher than one would expect for an arbitrary verb. For instance, compare the psychological sense of *bother* with the distribution of two other psychological verbs, *like* and *amuse*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>contexts</th>
<th>bother N=377</th>
<th>like N=128</th>
<th>amuse N=126</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negation</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rest neg</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interrogative</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affirmative</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a semantic domain such as the verbs of indifference, with lots of semi-NPIs, one may expect the emergence of true NPIs. In these NPIs the strong tendency to appear in a negative context has become grammaticalized, that is to say, categorical. Examples are the various strengthenings of *care*, among which the OED lists:

(3) *Strengthenings of CARE (Source: OED on CD-ROM)*

| care     | a pin | a fig  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a button</td>
<td>a farthing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a straw</td>
<td>a rap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a rush</td>
<td>a damn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and also the idioms of the pattern *give an X; give a damn/shit/fuck/flying fuck/hoot/tinker's damn*. There seems to be a much greater variety in the ways you can say that you just don't care than there is in the more polite domain of saying that you don't mind.

An investigation of Dutch verbal polarity idioms also revealed a substantial number of idioms expressing indifference, such as

(4) *kunnent schelen*  
*kunnent bommen*  
*kunnent verdammen*  
*(kunnent) donderen*  

*uitmaken*  
*malen om*  
*talen naar*  
*zich bekreunen om*
all of which express various shades of indifference, and all of which have a strong, sometimes absolute tendency to occur in negative contexts. They correspond mostly to the English pair care-matter and not to the pair mind-bother. For the latter, only the counterparts deren and hinderen come to mind. The Dutch, like the English, appear to be more preoccupied with the rude than with the polite uses of the verbs of indifference. It would be interesting to say more about the etymological meanings of the various expressions listed in (4), but a full discussion would take far too long. Let me just point out that kunnen schelen contains the verb schelen which is related to the noun verschil "difference". So kunnen schelen literally means something like "to be able to make a difference (to somebody)". There is also a related adjective, onverschillig "indifferent", which like its English counterpart cannot drop the negative suffix, and therefore constitutes a NPI at the morphological level.

Another expression of indifference is geven om "give about = care about", which is clearly related to the English pattern give a damn etc. It has an impersonal variant, cf. the examples in (5):

(5)  
(a) Ik geef niet om boontjessoep  
I give not for bean soup
   "I don't care for bean soup"
(b) Dat geeft niet.  
that gives not  
"That doesn't matter"

The impersonal expressions often optionally take two nonsubject arguments as well as a subject argument. One of these indicates a measure, e.g. the extent to which something matters, or rather, doesn't matter, the other indicates the experiencer:

(6)  
Dat kan me niets/niet veel/weinig/*niet alles/geen bal schelen  
that can me nothing/not much/little/*not all/no ball differ
   "It makes no/no big etc difference to me"

The measure expressions must be indefinite, which is why negated universals, which are otherwise possible triggers for negative polarity items (Ladusaw 1980), are ruled out here. In this regard they are much like measure NPs elsewhere, which also frequently exhibit a definiteness effect, compare:

(7)  
It took no/little/some/*the/*all time to build it

Due to the optionality of the measure phrase, niet "not" and niets "nothing" can be used interchangeably with these verbs:

(8)  
Dat kan me niet(s) schelen.  
That can me not(hing) differ "I don't care about that"

All Dutch verbs and verbal idioms reviewed here can be used affirmatively with the affirmative adverb wel, which plays the same role in Dutch as emphatic DO in English. This adverb is typically used to deny an earlier negative statement or a negative presupposition. In Table 5, the distribution of some of these verbs is laid out.3
Table 5: Some Dutch verbs of indifference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context</th>
<th>kunnen schelen N=140</th>
<th>uitmaken n N=39</th>
<th>malen om N=34</th>
<th>deren N=110</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negation</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other neg</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interrogative</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affirmative</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Verbs of intolerance

Another set of semi-NPIs consists of what I will call verbs of intolerance. This category includes such items as *can stand*, *can take*, *can bear*. Unlike the previous category, this class tends to consist of verbal combinations, with a modal element (usually *can*) and a verbal element. However, the modal element is not lexically fixed, as is evident from pairs such as:

(9) a. I could not stand it any longer.
    b. I was unable to stand it any longer.

An adjective which expresses a similar meaning is *insufferable*. The suffix -*able* represents the modal element, and *suffer* the verbal element. Its polarity sensitivity is obvious from the fact that the negative prefix *in-* is obligatory.

All expressions in this class appear to be firmly semi-NPIs. That is to say, they have a robust tendency to occur in nonaffirmative clauses, while at the same time being genuinely acceptable in purely affirmative use (cf. also the discussion in Linebarger 1980 and Von Bergen and Von Bergen 1993). For *can stand*, this is shown by the following examples from my Internet corpus:

(10) a. Now, patriarchism can stand some criticism, but I think Tepper goes way too far in saying that having a father is a bad experience for men.
    b. "Are you tired, Sufi?" "I could stand a nap, M'lord."
    c. Looks like he could stand to do some heavy labor out at the farm to burn away some of those extra calories....
    d. This is a "Gotterdammerung" that can stand the test of time.

Some relevant numbers are presented in the following table:

Table 6: Some English verbal expressions of intolerance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context</th>
<th>can stand N=137</th>
<th>can bear N=60</th>
<th>can take N=36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negation</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rest neg</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interrogative</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affirmative</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a plenitude of meaning-related NPIs in Dutch, such as

\begin{align*}
\text{(11)} & \quad \textit{kunnen uitstaan} \\
& \textit{kunnen verkroppen} \\
& \textit{kunnen zetten} \\
& \textit{kunnen velen} \\
& \textit{kunnen luchten of zien}
\end{align*}

The adjective \textit{onuitstaanbaar} is a direct counterpart to English \textit{insufferable}, and the negative prefix \textit{on-} is the (likewise obligatory) marker of negation. Table 7 presents usage data from our Dutch database.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context</th>
<th>kunnen uitstaan N=27</th>
<th>kunnen velen N=36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negation</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rest neg</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interrogative</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affirmative</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Modal verbs

Next, I want to briefly mention the case of NPIs which are auxiliary verbs\(^4\), such as English \textit{need} (\textit{Engineers need *not apply}), Dutch \textit{hoeven}, German \textit{brauchen} and Mandarin \textit{yòng}. Although not historically related, these modals have all developed into NPIs in the course of history and express the same meaning, which suggests strongly that NPI-status is not an arbitrary feature of these verbs. They also have largely the same sets of triggering contexts.

4 Verbs of minimal degree

A very large class of verbal expressions with NPI-status are the expressions of minimal degree or extent. These include well-known items such as \textit{budge (an inch)}, \textit{lift a finger}, \textit{bat an eyelid}, \textit{move a muscle} and the like. Usually, these contain an indefinite NP, often a measure expression, such as \textit{inch} or \textit{second}\. Less easily identifiable are solitary verbs whose negative affinity derives from the fact that they express some minimal action or relation. We have already seen the case of \textit{bother} in the sense of \textit{take the trouble}. Other verbs which may express minimality are \textit{begin} or \textit{touch} in sentences such as the following:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[a.] He did not even begin to answer the problem.
\item[b.] You have not touched your meal yet.
\end{enumerate}

Note that it is usually idiomatic to add \textit{even} to these verbs, as in (12a), which fits the fact that they point to some endpoint of a scale.

Nonpsychological verbs which exhibit polarity sensitivity often can be placed in this category. Take for instance the Dutch verb \textit{reppen}. In one of its meanings, this verb means \textit{to mention}, \textit{to speak of}. Until recently, this item was a negative polarity item for many speakers. Etymologically, this verb meant something like "to hit, to touch", compare the English idiom \textit{to touch upon}
something. Perhaps it was this meaning of 'touching' which gave the verb its character of expressing some minimal extent, which is often enhanced by adding the phrase met (g)een woord "with a (no) word", a clear minimizer. The same sense of 'barely touching (with the tips of your fingers)' can be found in the expression kunnen tippen aan "to be able to match = hold a candle to", as in (13)

(13) Niemand kon aan haar tippen.  
nobody could to her touch  "Nobody could hold a candle to her"

Note that impersonal verbs, verbs which I loosely define here as taking a nonhuman, nonagent subject, and verbs with an auxiliary indicating ability, such as can in English, are rather overrepresented within the class of polarity sensitive verbs. In the case of can, there seems to be a semantic explanation: This item often sets up a pragmatic scale (cf. Fauconnier 1975). Usually, if I did not do something minimal, it does not follow that I did not do anything less minimal. However, if I could not do something minimal, it follows (pragmatically, not logically) that I could not do anything less minimal either.

5 Other verbs

The classes identified so far appear to be the most significant among verbal polarity items. However, I am aware of others that do not fit into these categories, such as the Dutch verb boteren, lit. "to butter", an impersonal verb:

(14) Het boterde niet tussen de Koningin en de premier.  
it buttered not between the Queen and the prime minister  "The Queen and the prime minister did not get along"

Another Dutch verb, with a similar meaning, is klikken. Here we see a much weaker affinity for nonaffirmative contexts, cf. Table 8.

Table 8: A comparison of two Dutch verbs for getting along

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>context</th>
<th>botere n N=50</th>
<th>klikke n N=34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negation</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rest neg.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interrogative</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affirmative</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A more detailed discussion of the remaining cases must be set aside for another paper, due to considerations of space.

6 Conclusions

I have identified the main lexical domains in English and Dutch in which verbal NPIs occur, in order to argue that NPIs and semi-NPIs do not arise out of thin air or spring up randomly in the lexicon, but cluster in certain semantic areas. For largely pragmatic reasons, some verbs tend to occur in nonaffirmative contexts more than other verbs. This may set the stage for further specialization, but the
main point here is, that there is no necessity for this at all. Grammaticalization is not an inevitable process. We do not need to appeal to pragmatics to explain the distributional properties of NPIs and semi-NPIs, as some authors appear to want to do (cf. e.g. the discussion in Von Bergen and Von Bergen 1993). Compare for instance the English verb bother in its psychological sense with Dutch deren. Whereas affirmative clauses make up 48% of the environments in which bother may occur, they make up only 1% of occurrences for its Dutch counterpart (cf. Tables 3 and 5). The same point is made in Table 8, where two verbs for getting along are compared. Pragmatics cannot and need not explain such differences, which are a matter of one verb being further along the way in the grammaticalization process than the other.

Another conclusion is that attraction to negative environments is semantically-induced, but independent of argument-structure (unlike what Linebarger 1980 suggests). This is what pairs such as care-matter or mind-bother have to tell us.

I have concentrated here on the lexicographical aspects of verbal polarity items. Much could be said about other important aspects, such as the fact that all of them may appear before their triggers, in spite of the leftness condition on polarity licensing (Jackendoff 1972, Ladusaw 1980), a condition which seems otherwise valid for English. Cf.:

(15)  
a. You need not worry.
b. I could stand it no more.
c. It matters less and less.

Notes
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1 By "negative", clausal contexts are meant where not, n't or a negative quantifier, such as nobody, nothing, never, no is present. By "other neg.", clausal contexts with other downward entailing operators are meant, such as at most three students.

2 Bother also occurs in the polarity-sensitive collocation can be bothered. This usage was not included in the data for Table 3.

3 Taken from a database of naturally-occurring examples compiled at the University of Groningen.

4 For discussion of polarity sensitive auxiliaries from a typological perspective, see Edmondson (1983).
A rare case of a (formally) definite NP in a verbal idiom of minimal extent is the first thing in Ned does not know the first thing about topology.
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