

This paper also presents results we obtained in grammaticality judgement tasks with native speakers of Romanian. According to Szabolcsi (2004), PPIs, whose licensing implies the checking and activation of two negative features, together with the semantic operator that normally anti-licenses them - form a non-lexical NPI, subject to familiar constraints on NPI-licensing. Example 6(a) shows that lexical PPIs in Romanian are doubly marked NPIs.

- (6) a. *Puțini studenți nu au ajuns în sala de examen într-o clipită.*
 Few student-pl. not have-3rd.p.pl. arrive-past.perf. in room-the DE
 exam in a moment.
 ‘Few students didn’t get to the exam room in a jiffy.’
- b. *Puține secretare dactilografiază 100 de cuvinte într-o clipită.*
 Few secretary-pl. type 100 DE word-pl. in a moment.
 ‘Few secretaries type 100 words in a jiffy.’
- c. **Concurenții au așteptat în culise fără a se emoționa într-o clipită.*
 Contestant-pl.-the have-3rd.p.pl. waited in backstage without to get nervous
 in a moment.
- d. **Trimit scrisorile deloc într-o clipită.*
 Send-1st.p.sg. letter-pl.-the at all in a moment.
 ‘* I will send the letters in a jiffy at all.’
- e. **Ajung la serviciu nicidecum într-o clipită.*
 Get-1st.p.sg. at work not-at-all in a moment.
 ‘*I get to work in a jiffy not-at-all.’

Example (6a) shows that 86% of the participants considered the sentence grammatical and 14% judged it ungrammatical. Example (6b) shows that 96,6% of the participants considered this sentence grammatical and 3,3% judged it as ungrammatical. Example (6c) shows that 10% of the participants considered this example grammatical and 90% judged it as ungrammatical. Example (6d) shows that 1,1% of the participants considered the example grammatical and 98,8% judged it as ungrammatical. Example (6e) shows that 23,3% of the participants considered this example grammatical and 76,6% judged it as ungrammatical.

3. Conclusion: This paper shows that native speakers of Romanian are sensitive to the occurrence of lexical PPIs in different types of negative contexts and proposed that the adequate semantic mechanism in the interpretation of PPIs in Romanian is similar to the one proposed by Szabolcsi (2004), where the licensing of PPIs involves the checking and activation of two negative features. Example 6(a) which is grammatical because the doubly-marked PPIs occurs in the scope of two licensers, specifically: in the scope of *puțini* (‘few’) – the downward-entailing operators and in the scope of *nu* (‘not’) – the antimorphic operator – at the same time.

Selected References:

- Falaus. Anamaria. 2008. Positive and negative polarity: a matter of resumption. *Proceedings of ConSOLE XVI* 51-68
- Israel. Michael. 2001. Minimizers, Maximizers, and the Rhetoric of Scalar Reasoning. *Journal of Semantics* 18.4. 297-331
- Ladusaw. William. 1979. *Polarity Sensitivity as Inherent Scope Relations*. Dissertation. University of Texas at Austin: Austin
- Szabolcsi. Anna. 2004. Positive Polarity-Negative Polarity. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* (NLLT) 22. 409-425

Wouden. Ton van der. 1997. *Negative Contexts: Collocation, Polarity and Multiple Negation*. Routledge: London