Licensing Negative Constituents and Negative Concord[*]

Željko Bošković

University of Connecticut

The goal of this paper is to propose a new approach to negative concord licensing, meant to hold crosslinguistically,[1] and resolve a puzzle concerning the distribution of negative constituents (NCIs) in Serbo-Croatian (SC).I will start the discussion with the latter issue.

1.   Binding or Movement to SpecNegP?

Progovac (1994) shows that there are two types of NCIs in SC. Examples (1)-(3) show that *ni*-NCIs require clause-mate negation, while *i*-NCIs do not tolerate it. *I*-NCIs co-occur with long-distance negation and can occur in some non-negative contexts, illustrated in (4)-(5), where *ni*-NCIs cannot occur. (Subjects and objects behave in the same way. The translations are a bit misleading; they are given for ease of exposition.)

(1)   Niko/*iko   nije   zaspao.
       nobody/anyone   neg.is   fallen.asleep
       'Nobody fell asleep.'

(2)   Milena   nije   rekla   da   je   iko/*niko   zaspao.
       Milena   neg.is   said   that is   anyone/nobody fallen.asleep
       'Milena did not say that anyone fell asleep.'

(3)   *Niko/*iko je zaspao.

(4)   Da li   je iko/*niko   zaspao?
       Q   is anyone/nobody fallen.asleep
       'Did anyone fall asleep?'

(5) Milena će biti otpuštena ako iko/*niko ode kući.
Milena will be fired if anyone/nobody goes home

Progovac gives a binding account of these data, based on A'-binding. She argues *ni*-NCIs are anaphoric elements subject to Condition A: they must be A'-bound by their licensor in their governing category (GC). *I*-NCIs are anaphoric pronominals, subject to Condition B: they must be A'-free in their GC, but bound within the sentence. To illustrate, consider (6) (Progovac assumes Op is the licensor in non-negative contexts). The GC is the embedded IP. Being anaphoric, the *ni*-NCI can only be bound by Neg2. Since the *i*-NCI must be free within its GC, it can be licensed by Op or Neg1, but not clause-mate Neg2.

(6) $[_{IP}$ Neg1 $[_{VP}$ $[_{CP}$ Op $[_{IP}$ Neg2 $[_{VP}$ *ni*-item/*i*-item$]]]]]$

Below, I observe a reconstruction paradigm which cannot be accounted for under the binding approach (for additional problems for this approach, see Bošković 2008). Before doing that I will outline the analysis of SC NCIs to be argued for in this paper (the main component of the analysis was actually proposed in Uribe-Echevarria 1994).

I argue that rather then being subject to different binding conditions, *ni/i*-NCIs differ regarding whether or not they move to NegP overtly. There are two ways to implement the analysis: (a) There is one lexical item for *ni-/i*-series counterparts. They differ in that *ni*-items move to SpecNegP, while *i*-items do not undergo this movement; (b) *Ni/i*-elements are different lexical items, *ni*-items move to NegP, while *i*-items cannot move to NegP. In both analyses, *ni*-NCIs are licensed in a Spec-Head configuration with negation, as in (7a). Under option 1, we can actually adopt (7b), where *iko* is spelled out as *niko* as a reflex of Spec-Head agreement (SHA) with negation. (*Ni-i* alternation is then treated on a par with Kayne's 1998 analysis of Norwegian *ingen-noen* alternation, where it is argued that *noen* 'any' is spelled out as *ingen* if it moves to the Spec of the negation *ikke*.)[2]

(7) a. $[_{NegP}$ niko $[_{Neg'}$ neg
     b. $[_{NegP}$ iko $[_{Neg'}$ ne = niko

Focusing on *ni*-items, subject NCIs can be easily handled under this analysis, with *niko* in (1) either staying in SpecNegP or moving from there to a higher position. What about object NCIs? (8a) can be handled in the same way as (1). (8b) is trickier.

(8) a. Nikoga ne voli.
         nobody.acc neg loves
         'He/she does not love anyone.'
     b. ?Ne voli nikoga.

---

[2]We would not necessarily expect to find this type of morphological reflex of SHA in all languages, i.e., a lack of such morphological transparency would not necessarily prevent extension of the above analysis of the *ni/i* alternation to other languages. I simply follow the standard practice here: transparent morphology, as in SC, provides evidence for the SHA analysis; the lack of such morphology would not provide evidence against it−it would merely fail to provide an argument for it.

(8a) is preferred to (8b). There are then two options: the contrast can be taken to be significant, confirming the above account (word order violations are typically rather weak in free word order languages like SC), or we can assume there is fronting of the NCI to NegP in both cases, with something happening to (8b) after the fronting that may be related to the rather extreme freedom of word order in SC. Bošković (2008) considers two options for (8).[3] One is a remnant movement analysis along the lines of Kayne (1998).

(9)   a. $[_{NegP}$ nikoga$_i$ $[_{Neg'}$ ne voli t$_i$
        b. $[_{XP}$ nikoga$_i$ $[_{NegP}$ t$_i$ $[_{Neg'}$ ne voli t$_i$
        c. $[_{NegP}$ t$_i$ $[_{Neg'}$ ne voli t$_i$]$_j$ $[_{XP}$ nikoga$_i$ t$_j$

Nikoga moves to SpecNegP, proceeding to a higher position (see below for motivation for this movement), followed by remnant NegP fronting. Alternatively, following Browne (2005) (8b) involves movement to SpecNegP followed by rightward movement of *nikoga*. I refer the reader to Bošković (2008) for comparison of these analyses as well as evidence that the NCI in (8b) does not stay in situ. To mention two points here, the remnant fronting account captures (10) under the assumption that prior to the movements from (9), *fool* in (10a) undergoes predicate movement (Kayne 1998), which pronouns cannot undergo. On the other hand, the rightward movement analysis easily captures (11), assuming that the rightward movement in question cannot apply multiply, like English topicalization.

(10)   a.   ?Ivan   ne   smatra   nikoga   budalom.
                  Ivan   neg considers nobody fool
                  'Ivan does not consider anyone a fool.'
        b.   ???Marija   nije   predala   nikome   nju.
                  Marija   neg.is given up nobody.dat her.acc
                  'Marija did not give her up to anyone.'
        c.   cf. Nikome nije predala nju.

(11)   a.   ?*Nije   dao   ništa   nikome   nikad.
                  neg.is given nothing.acc nobody.dat never
                  'He never gave anything to anyone.'
        b.   Ništa nikome nikad nije dao.

What is important here are the differences between fronted and non-fronted examples in (10b-c)/(11), which are difficult to account for if *ni*-NCIs can stay in situ. I then proceed assuming they are indeed not allowed to stay in situ. The account is also supported by NCIs in other languages. Consider West Flemish (WF). Haegeman (1992) shows fronted *n*-items like *niemand* in (12a) are located in SpecNegP. (12) then shows negative concord requires movement to SpecNegP in WF. My suggestion is the same holds for SC (SC *ni*-items are negative concord elements, see Watanabe 2004), though the extreme freedom of word order in SC sometimes masks the parallelism with WF. (The fact that SC *ni*-items

---

[3]See also Progovac (2005), who argues (8b) involves lower copy pronunciation of *nikoga*, which moves overtly to SpecNegP. (A lower copy pronunciation analysis is particularly appropriate when an NCI is used to answer a question, see Stjepanović 1999.)

always participate in negative concord follows given that they must move to SpecNegP.)

(12) a.   da   Valère niemand nie   kent   (negative concord)
            that   Valère nobody   not   knows
            'that Valère does not know anybody'
      b.   da   Valère nie niemand kent   (double negation)
            'that Valère does not know nobody'

2.   Reconstruction Effects

I now turn to reconstruction effects with NCIs. Consider (13).

(13) a.   Nikoga   (Marko)   nije   poljubio.
            nobody.acc   Marko.nom   neg.is   kissed
            'Marko did not kiss anyone.'
      b.   *Ikoga (Marko) nije poljubio.

Nikoga in (13a) is fronted above negation, to a position which can be higher than SpecNegP, given intervening *Marko*. Interestingly, *i*-items are not allowed in such examples (13b). (13) raises a problem for the binding analysis. We could try to handle it by assuming NCI reconstruction. This, however, will not work. Consider (14)-(15).

(14) Nikoga   nisi   tvrdio   da   je   poljubio.
      nobody.acc neg.are   claimed   that   is   kissed
      'You did not claim that he kissed anyone.'

(15)   *Ikoga nisi tvrdio da je poljubio.

Suppose the reconstruction is obligatory. If *(n)ikoga* must reconstruct, (15) should be acceptable and (14) unacceptable. Such examples thus argue against obligatory reconstruction. ((15) is incompatible with reconstruction even as an option.) On the other hand, (16)-(17) indicate we do need it.(Nothing changes if 'you' follows the NCIs in (14)-(17).)

(16)   ?Ničija   kola   tvrdiš   da   nije   ukrao.
        nobody's   car   claim   that   neg.is   stolen
        'You claim that he did not steal anyone's car.'

(17)   *Ičija kola tvrdiš da nije ukrao.

(16)-(17) illustrate another contrast between *ni/i*-NCIs. However, these data need NCI reconstruction. We then seem to have a contradiction at our hands, with (16)-(17) requiring reconstruction and (14)-(15) incompatible with it.If we consider the data more closely a generalization emerges: *ni*-NCIs are always acceptable in reconstruction contexts (regardless of whether we are dealing with clause-mate or long-distance negation) while *i*-NCIs are always unacceptable in reconstruction contexts (again regardless of whether we are dealing with clause-mate or long-distance negation).

The binding account (the same holds for Progovac's 2005 account, see Bošković 2008) cannot handle these data no matter what we assume regarding the possibility of satisfying binding conditions under reconstruction. E.g., if we allow it even as an option, which is necessary for (16), (15) cannot be accounted for. The fact is that NCIs behave differently from anaphors/pronouns under reconstruction, which provides evidence against the binding account. The above data, however, do confirm Progovac's claim that *ni/i*-items are in complementary distribution.[4] What is surprising here is that the long distance/clause-mate negation distinction, which is otherwise crucially involved in determining the distribution of *ni/i* NCIs, is irrelevant under reconstruction.

So, how can the apparently contradictory reconstruction data be handled? They can actually be easily captured under the account from sec. 1, where we get *ni*-items if NCIs move to SpecNegP; otherwise we get *i*-items. Many authors have argued that successive cyclic movement targets every phrase on its way (Bošković 2002a, Boeckx 2003, Müller 2004, Manzini 1994, Takahashi 1994; see also Fox and Lasnik 2003, Chomsky in press), a position I also adopt here.[5] This means NCIs moving above SpecNegP, such as those in the reconstruction examples, must pass through SpecNegP. We then have a principled explanation why *ni*-NCIs are always acceptable in reconstruction contexts, while *i*-NCIs are not. Such contexts always involve movement to SpecNegP, which *ni*-, but not *i*-NCIs are compatible with under the current analysis.

3.   Back to *I*-Items: Focus Movement

Consider now *i*-NCIs more closely. Since the NCI in (18a) does not move to SpecNegP, *ikoga* is possible. The same holds for (18c). In (18b), *ikoga* moves above NegP. Since it must move via SpecNegP, *ikoga* is disallowed here. (19) can also be explained. (19a) is derived as in (19b), where the NCI moves above NegP via SpecNegP, followed by NegP ellipsis (I return to ellipsis below; note that we get genitive of negation with ellipsis in Slovenian, Polish, and Russian, which quite conclusively argues for the NegP deletion analysis). Since the NCI passes through SpecNegP, only a *ni*-NCI is possible here.

(18)   a.   ?Ivan ne   tvrdi   da   voli   ikoga.
                 Ivan neg   claims that loves   anyone.acc
                'Ivan does not claim that he loves anyone.'
        b.   *Ikoga   Ivan   ne   voli.
                 anyone.acc Ivan   neg loves
                'Ivan does not love anyone.'
        c.   ?Da li Ivan   voli   ikoga?
                 Q   Ivan   loves   anyone.acc
                'Does Ivan love anyone?'

---

[4]See Bošković (2008) for discussion of one context (involving restructuring) where the complementary distribution appears to break down. I show that the break-down is only apparent. (It is also worth noting that the relevant data provide strong evidence that *ni*-NCIs cannot stay in situ.)

[5]Alternatively, within Chomsky's (2001) system we can simply assume that NegP is a phase.

(19) a. Šta si kupio? Ništa/*Išta.
          'What did you buy? Nothing.'
      b. Ništa$_i$ [$_{NegP}$ t$_i$ nisam kupio t$_i$]
          nothing   neg.am bought

So far so good. Consider, however, (20), another context where an *i*-NCI is disallowed.

(20) *Ivan ne voli   ikoga.
       Ivan neg loves   anyone

We have seen NCIs in this context may move to SpecNegP. To account for (20), we need the movement to be obligatory: If the NCI must move to SpecNegP, only *ni*-items will be allowed. I then suggest that *i*-NCIs must undergo movement. There is also independent evidence to this effect. Recall that fronted examples are preferred to "in-situ" examples with *ni*-NCIs. The same holds for *i*-NCIs. (18a) is actually somewhat degraded, *Ivan ne tvrdi da ikoga voli* being preferred.[6] As noted above, the contrast can be taken to be significant, indicating that *i*-NCIs must move. Alternatively, we can assume *ikoga* in (18a) moves leftward within the embedded CP, followed by remnant fronting of what is below *ikoga* (long-distance NCI movement+remnant fronting is quite generally disallowed in this context, see Bošković 2008) or rightward movement of *ikoga*. I then proceed assuming that, like *ni*-NCIs, *i*-NCIs must undergo movement. What is this movement? One option is that SC is an obligatory object shift language (see Bošković 1997 and Stjepanović 1999), with AgroP above NegP. Given the target-every-phrase account of successive cyclic movement, *ikoga* then must move to SpecNegP in (20), as desired. A potential problem concerns *i*-adjuncts like *ikad* 'ever', which also must be forced to move (they cannot co-occur with clause-mate negation).We can adopt here Oka (1993), where adjuncts have a licensing requirement similar to Case, which would force them to move. However, I would like to endorse an alternative which has independent morphological motivation (see Bošković 2008 for additional options). I suggest that *i*-NCIs (as well as *ni*-NCIs) must undergo focus movement to a FocP above NegP. The movement is forced to pass through SpecNegP, as discussed above. The account also has independent motivation. Consider the morphological make-up of SC NCIs. Both *ni*- and *i*-NCIs contain a wh-part and a focal marker (used independently as focal *even*). In addition, *ni*-NCIs contain *n*, which I argued above is a reflex of SHA with negation.[7]

(21) n(neg)+i(focus ('even'))+ko(who)

What is important is that NCIs have a focal marker. SC is an obligatory focus movement

---

[6]As with *ni*-NCIs, (ia-b) are unacceptable, which argues against the in-situ analysis (see sec. 1).

(i) a. *On ne tvrdi da Marija daje išta   ikome   ikad.
          he neg claims that Marija gives anything.acc anyone.dat ever
     b. ???On ne tvrdi da Marija predaje   ikome   nju.
             he neg claims that Marija is.giving.up anybody.dat her.acc
[7]The morphology does not have to be transparent in every language in which these mechanisms are at work (see fn. 2).

language, which moves all focalized phrases to FocP overtly (Bošković 2002b, Stjepano-vić 1999).The presence of a focal marker should then force NCIs to move to FocP. Since FocP is located above NegP (cf. (22), where contrastively focused *MARKO* must precede neg), the NCI in [$_{FocP}$[$_{NegP}$ NCI]] must pass through SpecNegP. We now have an account of the impossibility of *i*-NCIs ocurring with clause-mate negation.The obligatory move-ment to SpecFocP forces them to pass through SpecNegP, which then yields *ni*-NCIs. This is not the case with long-distance cases like [$_{NegP}$[$_{CP}$[$_{FocP}$ NCI]]], since here the NCI can move to FocP within the embedded CP, hence does not have to move to SpecNegP.

(22) MARKA   ne   voli.
      Marko.acc neg   loves
      'He does not love MARKO.'

What is appealing in this account, and argues in its favor, is that all movement is morpho-logically motivated: *i* motivates movement to FocP, and *n* to SpecNegP.[8] In Bošković (2008) I provide evidence for this analysis, showing that NCI fronting is possible only where focus movement is allowed, which follows if the former indeed involves focaliza-tion. Thus, both NCI movement and focus fronting are impossible within infinitives.

(23) *Asmir ne   želi   nikoga/ikoga   vidjeti.
       Asmir neg   wants nobody.acc/anyone.acc to.see
       'Asmir does not want to see anyone.'

(24) *Asmir (ne) želi   MILENU   vidjeti.
       Asmir neg   wants Milena.acc   to.see
       'Asmir does not want to see MILENA.'

To sum up, I have offered an account of *ni/i* NCIs where all movement they undergo is morphologically motivated. In addition to capturing the clause-mate/higher negation data, the analysis explains the behavior of NCIs under ellipsis and reconstruction (only *ni-NCIs* are possible there, and it is irrelevant whether reconstruction occurs into clause-mate or higher negation contexts) and non-negative contexts (only *i*-NCIs are allowed there).

4.   Back to Ellipsis: On the Interpretation of NCIs and Negation

I now return to ellipsis, where only *ni*-items occur. We have seen this can be explained if (25) involves movement of the NCI followed by NegP ellipsis (see also Watanabe 2004).

(25) Šta   si   kupio?'What did you buy?' Ništa   ~~nisam   kupio~~. 'Nothing.'
      what are   bought   nothing neg.am bought

Giannakidou (1998) argues that negative concord items are not inherently negative, which means there must be a negation in the elided part of (25). Under this analysis, non-negative sentences must be able to serve as ellipsis antecedents for negative sentences.

---

[8]I assume that the morphology does not have to reflect the order of feature checking.

This, however, raises a problem regarding recoverability of deletion. Watanabe (2004) notes another problem. Consider (26).

(26) a. Šta si vidio? 'What did you see?' b. Zmiju 'Snake.'
c. Zmiju ~~sam vidio~~. d. Zmiju ~~nisam vidio~~.
   snake am seen   snake neg.am seen

If non-negative sentences can be antecedents for negative sentences, we can have negation in the elided part of (26b); i.e. (26b) should be able to stand for (26c) or (26d). (26b) is then incorrectly predicted to allow interpretation 'I didn't see a snake'. The data indicate that negative interpretation comes from negative concord items (i.e. their neg feature is interpretable). There should then be no (semantically contentful) negation in the elided part of (25) and (26b). Only (25), with an NCI, can then have negative interpretation.

   Consider now (27).

(27) Context: There was a party yesterday. A knows that John, Mary, and Jane were at the party, but does not know whether Bill, Joan, and Peter were there:
   A: Ko nije došao? 'Who didn't come?'
      who neg.is come
   B: ?*Niko ~~nije došao~~.   B': Niko nije došao.
      nobody neg.is come

It seems something must have gone wrong with the ellipsis here, since B' is acceptable. The data lead to a rather strange conclusion under Giannakidou's analysis: a non-negative sentence can be an antecedent for a negative sentence (25),but a negative sentence cannot be an antecedent for a negative sentence (27). On the other hand, if there is no negation in the elided part of B (i.e. if only NCIs are negative), (27) can be easily handled if a negative sentence cannot be an antecedent for an affirmative sentence, which seems natural.[9]

   However, we are still facing a problem. If negative interpretation comes from NCIs their neg feature must be interpretable. This also must be the case for the neg feature of negation, otherwise (28) would not have negative interpretation. But if both negation and an NCI have negative interpretation, a combination of the two in the same clause should lead to the unattested double negation reading, not the negative concord reading.

(28) Marko ne radi.
   Marko neg works

(29) negation (*i*Neg) … negative concord item (*i*Neg) = double negation!

(8) is then incorrectly predicted to mean 'He loves someone'. To deal with the problem, Watanabe (2004) proposes a feature-copying mechanism, which introduces a complica-

---

[9]This raises a question of how *ni*-NCIs can be licensed in ellipsis contexts if there is no negation in the elided part. The issue will be addressed below.

tion into the feature-checking system. He assumes both NCIs and negation have *i*Neg. He suggests *i*Neg of the NCI is copied into the negation, which then has two *i*Neg features. They cancel each other out and we end up with only one *i*Neg feature, in the NCI itself.[10]

Bošković (2008) offers an alternative which doesn't need additional mechanisms. Given the ellipsis data, NCIs must have *i*Neg (their Neg feature must be interpretable). To avoid the double negation problem, negation in NCI contexts then must have *u*Neg. What about (28)? Negation here must have *i*Neg, otherwise we would incorrectly allow non-negative interpretation. There is then an easy solution to the negation interpretation problem: There are two negative heads, Neg A and Neg B, one having *i*Neg, and the other *u*Neg. (The lack of Neg B in a language will lead to the lack of negative concord.)

(30)   Negation A: *i*Neg   Negation B: *u*Neg

We need to ensure the right distribution for the Neg heads: Neg B should not occur in (28) (or (28) would allow non-negative interpretation), and Neg A should not occur with NCIs (or NCI examples would allow double negation readings). To achieve this I adopt the standard assumption that X cannot probe unless it has an uninterpretable feature (*u*K) (without it, last resort would prevent it from probing). I also adopt Chomsky's (2001) Activation Condition, which says Y must have a *u*K to be visible for movement/agreement. NCIs (from now on, I use the term for *ni*-items (but see the discussion below)) then must have the specification in (31) (see Bošković in press and Watanabe 2004 for evidence for a *u*K in negative elements). I assume that just like the Case of NPs is checked as a reflex of feature checking with Tense/*v* (see Chomsky 2001), the *u*K of NCIs is checked as a reflex of neg feature checking with negation. (I am adopting here Chomsky's 2001 system; see fn. 13 for an alternative.)

(31)   NCI: *i*Neg, *u*K

Recall we must prevent Neg A from occurring with NCIs to disallow double negation readings with NCIs. This is easily achieved: Neg A can't occur with an NCI since it can't serve as a probe because it doesn't have an uninterpretable feature. Since Neg A wouldn't probe the NCI, the NCI's *u*K can't be checked.The issue doesn't arise with Neg B, which has a *u*K hence can be a probe. Only Neg B can then co-occur with NCIs. The other half of our job is also done. Recall that since Neg B has *u*Neg we should not be able to use it in (28), or (28) could mean *Marko works*. But Neg B can't be used in (28) since its *u*Neg would remain unchecked. Because of this, Neg B can only be used with an NCI, which will check its *u*Neg. This will also result in the checking of the NCI's *u*K (so NCIs can be used only with Neg B). We have thus ensured the right distribution of negative heads.

Returning to ellipsis, it should be obvious now that we need negation in the elided part of (25), and that it must be Neg B (without it the NCI's *u*K could not be checked).

---

[10]The account holds for negative doubling. Watanabe notes that something like a semantic mechanism of neg-factorization (Haegeman and Zanuttini 1996) or de Swart and Sag's (2002) polyadic quantification is needed for negative spread (i.e. multiple NCIs). The same holds for the account adopted below.

However, given that the identity condition on ellipsis is semantic (see Merchant 2001), there is no problem with having a non-negative sentence as an antecedent for a negative sentence here since the relevant part is not semantically negative (the neg feature is uninterpretable). Recall that Watanabe (2004) argued that negation should not be allowed in the elided part of (25) or we would also allow it in (26b), incorrectly allowing interpretation 'I didn't see a snake'. The problem does not arise in the current system. (26) is quite different from (25), since in (26) we must use Neg A. (If we were to use Neg B, its uNeg would remain unchecked.) The neg feature of Neg A has semantic import (it is interpretable), hence a clause containing it cannot be deleted under identity with a non-negative clause (the parallelism requirement being semantic).We have thus succeeded in resolving Watanabe's problem without positing additional feature-checking mechanisms. Note also that in (27) a negative sentence (with iNeg) serves as an antecedent for a semantically non-negative sentence (with uNeg), which I assume is disallowed.[11] Finally, note that the two negations from (30) may have different PF manifestations in Standard French. (32) can be easily captured if *ne...pas* is Neg A (iNeg), and *ne* Neg B (uNeg).

(32) a. Jean ne mange pas. b. Jean ne mange (*pas) rien.
          Jean neg eats   neg   Jean neg eats   neg nothing
          'Jean does not eat.'   'Jean does not eat anything.'

I now turn to an issue that I left open before, namely the two vs one lexical item analysis for *ni/i* NCIs. Under the one item analysis (where (31) holds for both series), the iNeg of NCIs needs to be a more general feature (see Progovac 1994) which would yield negative interpretation when it undergoes checking with negation.[12] Under this analysis, the uK of NCIs would be in principle checkable by negation and the non-negative licensors Progovac (1994) discussed (regarding *i*-NCIs), the SpecNegP requirement on *ni*-NCIs being responsible for the incompatibility of *ni*-NCIs with the non-negative licensors. There is, however, an alternative to this analysis: *i*-NCIs licensed by negation and *i*-NCIs licensed by non-negative elements are different lexical items, with only the former being subject to the unified analysis with *ni*-NCIs (so (31) holds only for them). Under this analysis, SC *ni*-NCIs and negative *i*-NCIs are the counterpart of, e.g., Turkish (non-partitive) NCIs, which are licensed by negation (clause-mate or superordinate), but not non-negative licensors (see Progovac 1994).) (33) provides evidence for this analysis.

(33) a. *Nije rekao da ikoga   ne voli.
          neg.is said that anyone.acc neg loves
          'He didn't say that he doesn't love anyone.'

---

[11]If a negative item has iNeg but no uK, it would not require negation, and if negation is present a double negation reading would result. Such items could not co-occur with Neg B, which is a prerequisite for negative concord, since being inactive (lacking uK) they could not check Neg B's uNeg. *I saw nothing* may instantiate this type. Anticipating the discussion below, this treatment of English negative elements can be preserved under the one negation, Op-insertion analysis proposed in sec. 5, since an NCI without uK would trigger Op-insertion, not being able to feature-check negation given the Activation Condition. As discussed below, Op-insertion in this context would lead to a double negation reading.

[12]I assume that in (18a) *ne* would mark the scope of negation (more precisely, the iNeg feature), similar to the scope marker in partial *wh*-movement constructions.

b. ?Da li je rekao da ikoga ne voli?
   Q is said that anyone.acc neg loves
   'Did he say that he doesn't love anyone?'

c. ?Ako išta ne zna, neće ga biti stid.
   if anything.acc neg knows neg.will him be ashamed
   'If he doesn't know anything, he won't be ashamed.'

d. Da li iko nije sreo Milana?
   Q anyone.nom neg.is met Milan.acc
   'Is there anyone who didn't meet Milan.'

e. cf. *Iko nije sreo Milana.

The NCI in (33a) can only be licensed by negation, hence is subject to the unified analysis with *ni*-NCIs, where passing through SpecNegP yields a *ni*-NCI. The NCI in (33b-d) does not have to be licensed be negation (questions and conditionals are licensing environments) hence does not have to be subject to the unified analysis with *ni*-NCIs under the two *i*-NCIs analysis. What we see here is that negative *i*-NCIs (i.e. *i*-NCIs licensed by negation) and non-negative *i*-NCIs behave differently, in particular, only the former disallow clause-mate negation, which provides evidence for the two *i*-NCIs analysis.

5. Alternative with Only One Negation

Above I presented and further developed the two Neg analysis of Bošković (2008). I will now investigate the possibility of an alternative where there is only one negative head, namely Neg B (*u*Neg). Under this analysis, a null operator (Op) with *i*Neg is merged with the negation to check its *u*Neg feature as a last resort, i.e. only when the *u*Neg feature of the negation would otherwise remain unchecked. This happens in (28), where nothing else can feature-check the negation. However, Op is not inserted in examples with NCIs (e.g. (8)) since in such examples the NCI feature-checks the negation. The ellipsis data can be accounted for as before (the elided clause is still semantically non-negative in (25) and (27), and negative in (26d), which means the earlier account of ellipsis can be preserved). The analysis in fact captures all the data discussed above. (Regarding (32), *pas* may be treatable as a PF manifestation of Op insertion (see also Zeijlstra 2004).)[13]

6. Failure of *Ni*-NCI Licensing

I now turn to a surprising failure of *ni*-licensing in Russian. Brown and Franks (1995) give several contexts where clause-mate negation fails to license a *ni*-NCI in Russian. They argue the contexts in question involve expletive negation, which according to them cannot license *ni*-NCIs. The analysis is incompatible with the current approach, where such negation does license *ni*-NCIs. However, Abels (2005) argues against the expletive negation analysis, and gives an account that is fully compatible with the current system.

---

[13]Note also that only the one negation analysis is compatible with Bošković's (2007) system, where the moving element, not the target, works as the probe. As a result, it is not possible to prevent Neg A from co-occurring with an NCI by preventing it from serving as a probe, which was done in sec. 4; in contrast to Chomsky's (2001) system, the probe would always be the NCI in my system. The issue, however, does not arise under the one negation analysis, which eliminates Neg A.

To illustrate the contexts in question, consider (34)-(35), where the *ni*-NCI can be licensed only if *fear,* which otherwise can take a subjunctive, takes an indicative complement.

(34) *Ja bojus' {kak by / čtoby} nikto   ne   opozdal.   (Subjunctive)
       I   fear   how MOD   that   nobody   neg   was.late

(35) Ja bojus' čto nikto   ne   opozdal.   (Indicative)
       I fear   that nobody neg was.late
       'I am afraid that nobody was late.'   (Abels 2005)

Abels (2005) notes Russian subjunctive has a positive evaluative component (the proposition in the subjunctive is seen as desirable—this is a case of Cinque's 1999 evaluative mood). He further observes that fearing *p* is incompatible with having a positive evaluation of *p*. As a result, negation embedded under *fear* has to negate the content of the evaluative mood embedded under *fear*, not the clause itself. In other words, negation has to negate the positive evaluation of *p* rather than *p* itself. (Negation is in fact obligatory in the subjunctive complement of *fear*, as expected under this analysis.) However, according to Abels, negating the content of evaluative mood has no truth-conditional effect because evaluative mood itself does not have a truth-conditional effect (see also Cinque 1999). Abels then suggests that negation in the context in question needs to raise in LF to the evaluative mood, which is very high in the structure (see Cinque 1999), to be able to take it in its scope. Under Abels's analysis this obviously has to be the *i*Neg negation (Neg A under the two negation analysis. Op (with *i*Neg) would be moving under the one negation analysis). As discussed above, this negation is incompatible with NCIs, hence the contrast in (34)-(35). Note also that, as expected, where the above problem does not arise, as with *want* (wanting *p* is not incompatible with having a positive evaluation of *p*), *ni*-NCIs can occur within a subjunctive (and negation is not otherwise obligatory).[14]

---

[14]Consider also (i), which shows *ni*-NCIs cannot occur in negative yes-no questions. (Abels treats the Russian counterpart of (i) in terms of a wide scope, hence semantically contentful negation; note that Russian patterns with SC regarding (i) and (iii), see Abels 2005 and Brown and Franks 1995).

(i)   Nije   li Ivana/*nikoga   srela?
       neg.is Q   Ivan.acc/nobody.acc   met
       'Didn't she see Ivan/anyone?'   (SC)

Milićević (2007) notes that SC questions under consideration have only Ladd's (1981) outer negation reading (see also Büring and Gunlogsen 2000), where the negation is generated above TP (see (ii)), which she argues is too high to license *ni*-NCIs.The account can be maintained within the current system, since, due to the height of this NegP, the NCI could not have passed through SpecNegP in (i).

(ii)   [CP Q [NegP [TP Subject

Notice also that *i*-NCIs are possible in this context, as expected under the current analysis. (We may actually be dealing here with non-negative *i*-NCIs, which are not subject to the unified analysis with *ni*-NCIs.)

(iii) ?Nije   li ikoga   srela?
        neg.is Q   anyone.acc   met
        'Didn't she see anyone?'

(36) Ja xotel by, čtoby nikto ne opozdal.   (Subjunctive)
      I wanted MOD that nobody neg was.late
      'I would like nobody to be late.'

7. Conclusion

I argued for an account of *ni/i* NCIs where all movement they undergo is morphologically motivated. The account captures the behavior of NCIs with respect to negation (*ni*-NCIs occur only with clause-mate and *i*-NCIs with long distance negation (unless they are licensed by another element), non-negative licensors (only *i*-NCIs are possible there), reconstruction (only *ni*-items are compatible with it, and it is irrelevant whether reconstruction takes place into clause-mate or higher negation contexts), and ellipsis (only *ni*-items are possible there). I have also proposed a new approach to negative concord which is meant to hold crosslinguistically: two alternative accounts have in fact been proposed, one based on the existence of two negative heads, and one based on last resort Op insertion which does not require two negations. Teasing them apart is left for future research.

References

Abels, Klaus. 2005. "Expletive negation" in Russian: A conspiracy theory. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 13:5-74.

Boeckx, Cedric. 2003. *Islands and chains*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bošković, Željko. 1997. *The syntax of nonfinite complementation: An economy approach*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Bošković, Željko. 2001. *On the nature of the syntax-phonology interface: Cliticization and related phenomena*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Bošković, Željko. 2002a. A-movement and the EPP. *Syntax* 5:167-218.

Bošković, Željko. 2002b. On multiple wh-fronting. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:351-383.

Bošković, Željko. 2007. On the locality and motivation of Move and Agree: An even more minimal theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38:589-644.

Bošković, Željko. 2008. On two types of negative constituents and negative concord. In *Proceedings of FDSL* 6.5, 9-35. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Bošković, Željko. in press. On the operator freezing effect. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.

Brown, Sue. 2005. Negative concord in Slavic and Attract all-F. In *Negation in Slavic*, ed. Sue Brown and Adam Przepiórkowski, 71-104. Bloomington: Slavica.

Brown, Sue, and Steven Franks. 1995. Asymmetries in the scope of Russian negation. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 3:239-287.

Büring, Daniel, and Christine Gunlogsen. 2000. Aren't positive and negative questions really the same? Ms., UCLA and University of California Santa Cruz.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. Michael Kenstowicz, 1-52. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. in press. On phases. In *Foundational issues in linguistic theory*, ed. Robert Freidin, Carlos Otero, and Maria L. Zubizarreta. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Željko Bošković

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads.*Oxford:Oxford University Press.

Fox, Danny, and Howard Lasnik. 2003. Successive-cyclic movement and island repair: The difference between sluicing and VP-ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34:143-154.

Giannakidou, Anastasia. 1998. *Polarity sensitivity as (non)veridical dependency.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Haegeman, Liliane. 1992. Negation in West Flemish and the Neg Criterion. In *Proceedings of NELS* 28, 195-208, GLSA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Haegeman, Liliane, and Rafaella Zanuttini. 1996. Negative concord in West Flemish. In *Parameters and functional heads*, ed. Adriana Belletti and Luigi Rizzi, 117-179. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ladd, Robert. 1981. A first look at the semantics and pragmatics of negative questions and tag questions. In *Proceedings of CLS* 17, 164-171. University of Chicago.

Kayne, Richard. 1998. Overt vs. covert movement. *Syntax* 1:128-191.

Manzini, Rita.1994. Locality, minimalism, and parasitic gaps. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25:481-508.

Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Milićević, Nataša. 2007. When negation is not negation.*Proceedings of FDSL* 6:297-308.

Müller, Gereon. 2004. Phase impenetrability and wh-intervention. In *Minimality effects in syntax*, ed. Arthur Stepanov, Gisbert Fanselow, and Ralf Vogel, 289-325. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Oka, Toshifusa. 1993. Shallowness. In *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 19, 255-320. Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

Progovac, Ljiljana. 1994. *Negative and positive polarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Progovac, Ljiljana. 2005. *A syntax of Serbian*. Bloomington: Slavica Publishers.

Stjepanović, Sandra.1999.What do second position cliticization, scrambling, and multiple wh-fronting have in common? Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Swart, Henriëtte de, and Ivan Sag. 2002. Negation and negative concord in Romance. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25:373-417.

Takahashi, Daiko. 1994. Minimality of movement. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Uribe-Echevarria, María. 1994. Interface licensing conditions on negative polarity items. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Watanabe, Akira. 2004. The genesis of negative concord: Syntax and morphology of negative doubling. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35:559-612.

Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2004. Sentential negation and negative concord. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Department of Linguistics, U-1145
University of Connecticut
Storrs, CT 06269

zeljko.boskovic@uconn.edu