

Željko Bošković

On two types of negative constituents and negative concord*

Progovac's (1994) seminal work discusses two types of negative constituents (NCIs) in Serbo-Croatian (SC), *ni*- and *i*-NCIs. (1) shows 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 (2), where *ni*-NCIs cannot occur. (Subjects and objects behave in the same way in all these respects. The translations are a bit misleading; they are given for ease of exposition.)

- (1) a. *Niko/*iko nije zaspao.*
nobody/anyone neg+is fallen-asleep
“Nobody fell asleep.”
b. **Niko/*iko je zaspao.*
c. *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.”
- (2) a. *Da li je iko/*niko zaspao?*
Q is anyone/nobody fallen-asleep
“Did anyone fall asleep?”
b. *Milena će biti otpuštena ako iko/*niko ode kući.*
Milena will be fired if anyone/nobody goes home

Progovac proposes a binding account of these data, based on the concept of A'-binding.¹ She proposes *ni*-NCIs are anaphoric elements subject to Principle A: they have to be A'-bound by negation in their governing category. *I*-NCIs are anaphoric pronominals, subject to Principle B: they have to be A'-free in their governing category, but bound within the sentence. To see how the account works consider (3), where neg and Op are the relevant A'-licensors (Progovac assumes Op is the licensor in non-negative contexts). The binding domain in (3) is the embedded IP. Being anaphoric, the *ni*-item can only be bound by the embedded Neg. An *i*-item has to be free within its binding domain. It can then be licensed by a non-negative licensor or a higher clause negation, but not clause-mate negation.

- (3) [IP Neg [VP [CP Op [IP Neg [VP *ni*-item/*i*-item]]]]]

The analysis captures the above facts in an elegant manner. However, it also faces some problems. I refer the reader to Beck (1998) for relevant discussion, merely pointing out that the extension of the analysis to other languages is crucially based

*For insightful comments, I thank Ljiljana Progovac, Lanko Marušič, and the FDSL audience.

¹The following simplifies Progovac's analysis, which does not affect the points made below.

on stipulations regarding which NCIs subject to Condition A are allowed to move in LF (to get close to its licenser) and how they do it, and leaves SC *i*-NCIs as exceptional in being the only NCIs subject to Condition B. Furthermore, a number of recent works have argued that Conditions A and B should be eliminated (e.g. Hornstein 2001 and Kayne 2005), a line of research which, if successful, would deprive Progovac's analysis of the mechanism it crucially needs.² These problems would not necessarily condemn the analysis, especially in the absence of a viable alternative. However, in section 2, I will present a reconstruction paradigm that raises a serious empirical problem for the binding account, and develop an alternative analysis that can handle the data in question. (The paradigm will be shown to raise an equally serious problem for Progovac's 2005 analysis, which does not appeal to binding conditions). Based on this, I will conclude the binding account (as well as Progovac's 2005 account) should be abandoned. Before presenting the paradigm in question, I will first outline the analysis to be argued for in this paper (the main component of the analysis was actually proposed in Uribe-Echevarria 1994, though it was not really worked out in that work).

1. Movement to SpecNegP

In this section, I will argue that rather than being subject to different binding conditions, *ni*- and *i*-items differ with respect to whether or not they move to NegP overtly. There are two ways to implement the analysis:

1. There is one lexical item for *ni*-/*i*-series counterparts. They differ in that *ni*-items undergo overt movement to SpecNegP, while *i*-items either undergo covert movement or do not move to SpecNegP (for *ni*-movement, see also Abels 2005, Brown 2005, and Progovac 2005).
2. *Ni/i*-elements are different lexical items, *ni*-items move to NegP, while *i*-items cannot move to NegP.

In both analyses, *ni*-items are licensed in a Spec-Head configuration with negation, as shown in (4a). Under option 1, we can actually adopt (4b), where *iko* is spelled out as *niko* as a reflex of Spec-Head agreement (SHA) with negation.³

- (4) a. [_{NegP} *niko* [_{Neg'} neg
 b. [_{NegP} *iko* [_{Neg'} ne =*niko*

Consider first *ni*-items. Subject NCIs can be easily handled under the above analysis, with *niko* in (1a) either staying in SpecNegP or moving from there to a higher position. What about object NCIs? (5a) can be handled in the same way as (1a). (5b), where the object does not seem to be located in SpecNegP, is trickier.

²The mechanisms used to capture anaphor/pronoun binding effects in this line of research do not seem to be extendable to NCIs.

³We 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.

- (5) a. *Nikoga ne voli.*
 nobody-acc neg loves-3p
 “He/she does not love anyone.”
 b. *?Ne voli nikoga.*

Note that (5a) is preferred to (5b). 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 (5b) after the fronting that may be related to the rather extreme freedom of word order in SC. One option is remnant movement along the lines of Kayne (1998).

- (6) a. $[_{NegP} \text{ nikoga}_i [_{Neg'} \text{ ne voli } t_i]$
 b. $[_{XP} \text{ nikoga}_i [_{NegP} t_i [_{Neg'} \text{ ne voli } t_i]$ (object shift/focus movement/scrambling)
 c. $[_{NegP} t_i [_{Neg'} \text{ ne voli } t_i]_j [_{XP} \text{ nikoga}_i t_j]$

Nikoga in (6) moves to SpecNegP, proceeding to a higher position, after which we get remnant movement of NegP. The second step of *nikoga* movement can involve object shift, focus movement, or scrambling (I will come back to this later). If *nikoga* must stay in SpecNegP (which is not easy to ensure given the free word order of SC), we have several options. We can assume the head of NegP is null, with *ne* being lexically added to the verb. (5b) can then involve VP fronting even with *nikoga* located in SpecNegP (7a). If *nikoga* is in SpecNegP and *ne* in Neg⁰, we can assume (5b) involves Neg' movement, or if we adopt a multiple Spec analysis where NegP has two Specs, *nikoga* and a null Op (whose presence can be motivated by inner island effects, which involve an intervening A'-Spec), (5b) can involve NegP movement with the lower SpecNegP filled by the Op.

- (7) a. $[_{NegP} \text{ nikoga}_i \text{ null neg } [_{VP} \text{ nevoli } t_i]$
 b. $[_{NegP} \text{ nikoga}_i ([_{NegP} \text{ Op}) \text{ ne } [_{VP} \text{ voli } t_i]$

There are two alternatives to the remnant movement account. Browne (2005) proposes that (5b) involves movement to SpecNegP followed by rightward movement of *nikoga*. Another possibility is that NegP may have a rightward Spec, in which case *nikoga* in (5b) can be located in SpecNegP.⁴ One way or another, (5b) is handable.⁵ If it is considered acceptable, under the current analysis it is

⁴See also Progovac (2005:171), who suggests that (5b) involves lower copy pronunciation of *nikoga*, which moves overtly to SpecNegP.

⁵As far as I can tell, with appropriate adjustments all the options suggested above can handle examples like (ia), which would have multiple SpecNegP at some point of the derivation. (As usual, (ib) is preferred to (ia).)

- (i) a. *?Nikome ne daje ništa.*
 nobody-dat neg gives nothing-acc
 “He is not giving anything to anyone.”
 b. *Nikome ništa ne daje./Ništa nikome ne daje.*

crucial that the NCI in (5b) is not located in situ. There is also independent evidence for this. Consider (8).

- (8) a. ?*Ivan ne smatra nikoga budalom.*
Ivan neg considers nobody fool
“Ivan does not consider anyone a fool.”
b. *Ivan nikoga ne smatra budalom.*

(8b) is preferred to (8a). To make things more interesting, suppose that we do not consider the contrast to be significant and treat both (8a) and (8b) as acceptable, (8a) being derived in one of the ways sketched above, e.g. remnant movement. Here is how the derivation would proceed. We first have predicate movement to a position below the final position of *nikoga* ((9a); Kayne (1998) gives independent evidence for such predicate movement). We then have *nikoga* fronting discussed above (9b), followed by remnant movement (9c).

- (9) a. *Budalom ne smatra nikoga.*
fool neg consider nobody
b. *Nikoga budalom ne smatra.*
c. *Ne smatra nikoga budalom.*

Consider now (10). (10a) is clearly degraded. The contrast in (10) can now be easily captured if we assume the pronoun *nju* cannot undergo the movement from (9a). On the other hand, the contrast is surprising under the *ni*-in-situ analysis.

- (10) a. ??*Marija nije predala nikome nju.*
Marija neg+is given up nobody-dat her-acc
“Marija did not give her up to anyone.”
b. *Marija nikome nije predala nju.*

Consider also (11). In multiple *ni*-item examples, there is a clear contrast between fronted and in-situ examples, which is surprising under the in-situ analysis. The contrast was originally noted with respect to Russian by Browne (2005), who adopts the rightward-movement-from-SpecNegP analysis, and suggests that this rightward movement cannot apply multiply (sort of like English topicalization).

- (11) a. ?**On nije dao ništa nikome nikad.*
he neg+is given nothing-acc nobody-dat never
“He did not ever give anything to anyone.”
b. *On ništa nikome nikad nije dao.*

What is important for us are the differences between fronted and non-fronted

Note also that if under the remnant fronting account, all *ni*-items must take step (6b) (see sec. 4), we can handle (1a) by assuming that *ništa* undergoes movement above XP (the NCIs in (1b) do not have to be adjacent), which is followed by remnant XP fronting (*nikome* would be located in SpecXP). Alternatively, *ništa* can stay in SpecXP, with XP fronting affecting only one SpecXP.

examples in (10) and (11), which are difficult to account for if *ni*-items are freely allowed to stay in situ. I will therefore proceed with the assumption that they are indeed not allowed to stay in situ, with (5b) handled in one of the ways explored above. Although the above derivations appear unnecessarily complicated, we will see below that the movement to SpecNegP analysis has strong independent support (see the reconstruction data in section 2 and the restructuring data in section 3 (regarding the latter, compare (24) with (25)/(36)). Before showing that, let me point out that the above analysis receives support from the behavior of NCIs in other languages. Consider, e.g., negative concord items in West Flemish (WF). (SC *ni*-items are negative concord elements, see Watanabe 2004). Haegeman (1992) shows that fronted *n*-items like *niemand* in (12a) are located in SpecNegP (the account is updated with multiple Specs). (12a-d) then clearly show that negative concord requires movement to SpecNegP in WF. My suggestion is that the same holds for SC, though the extreme freedom of word order in SC sometimes masks the parallelism with WF. (Note the fact that SC *ni*-items 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”
 c. *da Valère an niemand niets nie gezeid eet.* (negative concord)
 that Valère to nobody nothing not said has
 “that Valère did not say anything to anyone”
 d. *da Valère an niemand nie niets gezeid eet.* (double negation)
 “that Valère did not say nothing to anyone” (Haegeman & Zanuttini 1991)

Also relevant is Norwegian (13). Kayne (1998) argues *noen* is spelled out as *ingen* if it moves to SpecNegP, undergoing SHA with *ikke* (i.e. we are dealing here with a morphological reflex of SHA, *ingen* being a combination of *ikke*+*noen*). Since, as is well-known, participles in aux+participle structures in Norwegian stay in situ, the object in (13a-b) could not have moved to SpecNegP. As a result, *ingen* is disallowed. The derivation in question cannot be blocked in (13c), a V-2 case where the verb moves to C. Hence, we get *ingen*. Interestingly, in colloquial speech, the object can be fronted even in aux+participle structures, as in (13d). As expected, *ingen* is allowed in (13d), which contrasts in this respect with (13a-b).

- (13) a. *Jon har ikke lest noen romaner/*ingen romaner.*
 Jon has not read any novels
 b. **Jon har lest ingen romaner.*
 c. *Jon leser ingen romaner.*
 Jon reads no novels
 d. *Jon har ingen romaner lest.*

To sum up, the current account on which *ni*-items must move overtly to Spec

NegP, while *i*-items either do not do it or do it covertly, does not need to appeal to Conditions A and B, hence is in line with recent attempts to eliminate them. The account also explains why *ni*-items cannot occur in non-negative contexts. It may also explain why only *ni*-items can be used in elliptical answers like (14).

- (14) a. *Šta si kupio? Ništa/*Išta.*
 “What did you buy? Nothing.”
 b. *Ništa_i [_{NegP} t_i ~~nisam~~ — *kupio* t_i]*
 nothing neg+am buy

Suppose (14a) is derived as in (14b), where the NCI moves above NegP, its movement through SpecNegP being forced by locality (see section 2, where it is argued that an element undergoing movement must pass through every projection on its way), which is followed by NegP ellipsis. Since the NCI passes through SpecNegP, only a *ni*-item is possible here. (I return to the details of ellipsis later; see also Watanabe 2004 and Ilc & Milojević Sheppard in press, who note that we get genitive of negation with ellipsis in Slovene, which argues for NegP deletion.)

2. Reconstruction effects

I now turn to what I believe is a rather strong argument for the current analysis, which is based on reconstruction effects. Consider (15).

- (15) a. *Nikoga nije poljubio.*
 nobody-acc neg+is kissed
 “He did not kiss anyone.”
 b. *Nikoga Marko nije poljubio.*
 nobody-acc Marko-nom neg+is kissed
 c. **Ikoga (Marko) nije poljubio.*

Nikoga in (15) is fronted above negation, to a position which can be higher than SpecNegP, given (15b). Interestingly, *i*-items are not allowed in such examples (15c). (15) raises a problem for the binding analysis. We could try to handle it by assuming NCI reconstruction. This, however, will not work. Consider (16)-(17).

- (16) *Nikoga nisi tvrdio da je poljubio.*
 nobody-acc neg+are claimed that is kissed
 “You did not claim that he kissed anyone.”

- (17) **Ikoga nisi tvrdio da je poljubio.*

Suppose the reconstruction is obligatory. If (*n*)*ikoga* must reconstruct, we incorrectly predict (17) to be acceptable and (16) unacceptable. Such examples thus argue against obligatory reconstruction. ((17) is in fact incompatible with reconstruction even as an option.) On the other hand, (18)-(21) indicate that we need to assume it. (Nothing changes if *ti* ‘you’ follows the NCIs in (16)-(21).)

- (18) ??*Nikoga tvrdiš da nije poljubio.*
 nobody claim that neg+is kissed
 “You claim that he did not kiss anyone.”
- (19) **Ikoga tvrdiš da nije poljubio.*
- (20) ?*Ničija kola tvrdiš da nije ukrao.*
 nobody’s car claim that neg+is stolen
 “You claim that he did not steal anyone’s car.”
- (21) **Ičija kola tvrdiš da nije ukrao.*

While a bit degraded (18) is clearly better than (19). (18) improves if the NCI is embedded a bit (20). We seem to be dealing here with a similar effect as in (22).

- (22) a. **Anyone, he didn’t see.*
 b. ??*Pictures of anyone, he didn’t see.*

Crucially, this kind of embedding cannot save (19) (cf. (21)). There is then another contrast between *ni/i*-NCIs. However, this contrast needs NCI reconstruction. We then seem to have a contradiction at our hands, with (18)-(21) requiring reconstruction and (16)-(17) 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).

It is clear that Progovac’s binding analysis cannot handle the above data no matter what assumptions we make regarding the possibility of satisfying binding requirements under reconstruction. E.g., if we allow it even as an option, which is necessary to account for (20), (17) cannot be accounted for. The fact is that NCIs behave differently from anaphors/pronouns under reconstruction, which provides evidence against the binding account. Note, however, that the data still confirm Progovac’s claim that *ni/i*-items are in complementary distribution.

The data also raise a problem for Progovac (2005). This work assumes a particular specification for NCIs for the [pos, neg] features, which forces NCIs to undergo feature checking with a Polarity Phrase (PolP) with the corresponding specification. Progovac assumes that *ni*-items are specified as [+neg] and *i*-items as [-neg, -pos]. She assumes that negative clauses (i.e. their PolP) like (23b) are specified as [+neg, -pos], non-negative clauses like (23a) as [-neg, +pos], and yes-no questions and conditionals like (2b) as [-neg, -pos], which also holds for the embedded CP in (23c). While the account captures the basic *ni/i* paradigm, a problem with it is that it is based on several stipulations concerning the feature specification of the elements in question. It appears that there is no deep reason for some of these stipulations. E.g., a question arises why the embedded clause in (23d) could not be specified as [-neg, -pos] (as in (23c)), which would incorrectly license the *i*-item.

- (23) a. **Jovan voli nikoga/ikoga.*
 Jovan loves nobody/anyone
 b. *Jovan ne voli ?nikoga/*ikoga.*
 Jovan neg loves nobody/anyone
 c. *Jovan ne tvrdi da Marija voli ?ikoga/*nikoga.*
 Jovan neg claims that Marija loves anyone/nobody
 d. **Jovan tvrdi da Marija voli ikoga/nikoga.*
 Jovan claims that Marija loves anyone/nobody

However, the most serious problem for the account is raised by the reconstruction examples discussed above. Given (16) and (20), it must be possible to check the relevant features during movement; otherwise the *ni*-item could not be licensed in these examples. But then we would also expect (17) to be acceptable, with *ikoga* checking the relevant feature during the movement (or under reconstruction).

Progovac (1994, 2005) thus fails to account for NCI reconstruction. So, what is going on here? How can we handle the apparently contradictory reconstruction data? I will now show they can be captured under the account from sec. 1, which provides strong evidence for it. Recall that under that account, we get *ni*-items if NCIs move to SpecNegP overtly; otherwise we get *i*-items (so, *ni*-items require overt movement to SpecNegP, and *i*-items are incompatible with it).

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 and Chomsky in press), a position I also adopt here. 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. I therefore conclude that the reconstruction data can be explained under the current analysis.

3. Complementary distribution breakdown

There is a context where the complementary distribution between *ni*- and *i*-NCIs breaks down. Progovac (1994) notes that both *ni*- and *i*-items are possible in the complement of *željeti* ‘want’ with long-distance negation, as (24) shows. Interestingly, this only holds for objects. Subject position allows only *i*-items (25).

- (24) a. ?*Marko ne želi da vidi nikoga.*
 Marko neg wants that sees nobody
 “Marko does not want to see anyone.”
 b. ?*Marko ne želi da vidi ikoga.*
- (25) a. **Marko ne želi da niko dodje.*
 Marko neg wants that nobody comes
 “Marko does not want for anyone to come.”
 b. *Marko ne želi da iko dodje.*

Stjepanović (2004), Aljović (2005), and Progovac (1994) show we are dealing here with a restructuring context. One of Progovac's arguments concerns (26).

- (26) a. *Šta_i ne želiš da mi kažeš t_i?*
 what neg want that me tell
 "What don't you want to tell me?"
 b. *??Šta_i ne kažeš/misliš da voliš t_i?*
 what neg say/think that like
 "What don't you say/think that you like?"

While long-distance wh-movement is normally not possible across negation, it is possible with the verb *željeti* (26a). Notice first that without negation in the matrix clause, long-distance wh-movement is quite generally allowed, as shown in (27a). What we are dealing with here is an inner-island type effect, where negation induces a blocking effect for movement. As is well known, this type of effect is also present in English, but only with adjunct extraction ((27b), see also (30a)).

- (27) a. *Šta_i kažeš/misliš da voliš t_i?*
 b. **I wonder how John didn't fix the car.*

SC thus differs from English in that it exhibits inner island effects with argument extraction. The effect arises only in long-distance questions (with non-restructuring verbs). Short-distance wh-movement does not show it.

- (28) *Šta_i ne voliš t_i?*
 what neg love
 "What do you not love?"

The contrast can be captured if objects moving to SpecCP undergo object shift, as argued in Bošković (1997a) (see also Chomsky 2001). I show accusative NPs must move to SpecAgroP when moving to a higher position even when movement to SpecAgroP is not otherwise required based on (29). (29a) illustrates Superiority effects with Bulgarian multiple wh-fronting (MWF), the underlying assumption being that the wh-phrase that is first in the linear order is the one that moves first. Given this, (29b) indicates the object must be higher than the adjunct prior to wh-movement. This follows if the object must move first to SpecAgroP; it is then higher than the adjunct, which I assume is VP-adjoined, prior to wh-movement.

- (29) a. *Koj kogo e tselunal/*Kogo koj e tselunal?*
 who whom is kissed
 "Who kissed whom?"
 b. *Kogo kak e tselunal Ivan?/*Kak kogo e tselunal Ivan?*
 whom how is kissed Ivan
 "How did Ivan kiss whom?"

Returning to (26b) and (28), we can account for the contrast given wh-movement

via Spec AgroP and the assumption that AgroP is higher than negation, argued for in Takahashi (1994). *Šta* in (28) then crosses negation while undergoing A-movement, while *šta* in (26b) does it while undergoing wh-movement. Since inner island effects involve A'-spec intervention (see Rizzi 1990), the contrast in question is accounted for. Furthermore, given that in restructuring contexts the Case-position of the embedded object (SpecAgroP) is located in the higher clause, as argued in Wurmbrand (2001), long-distance extraction in (26a) is expected to pattern with (28) rather than (26b).

What about the SC/English contrast regarding inner island effects with argument wh-movement? It is standardly assumed English does not show such effects even with long-distance argument wh-movement (30a). Takahashi (1994) notes this is actually incorrect. First, note that (30b) is ambiguous: negation can be interpreted either in the matrix or the embedded clause (negative raising (NR)).

- (30) a. *Which problem don't you think that John solved?*
 b. *I don't think that John solved the problem.*

Takahashi notes (30a) only has the NR reading. He shows this can be captured under the wh-movement-via-AgroP analysis. Assuming negation is located in the lower clause on the NR reading and in the higher clause on the matrix reading, the wh-phrase in (30a) crosses negation on the NR reading while undergoing object shift (A-movement), and on the matrix negation reading while undergoing wh-movement. Since we are dealing here with an A'-movement intervention effect, it follows only matrix clause negation blocks wh-movement. Takahashi's analysis thus explains why (30a) has only the NR reading. It also makes a prediction: with non-NR verbs, instead of a missing reading we should get a degraded sentence. As Takahashi notes, the prediction is borne out, as (31), involving the non-NR verb *claim*, shows. Returning to SC, (26b) is degraded because *kazati/misliti* are non-NR verbs (see Bošković in press a, where it is shown that the relevant test involves strict clause-mate NPI licensing, not just lower clause interpretation).

- (31) ??*Which problem didn't you claim that John solved?*

More evidence for restructuring with *željeti* is provided by long-distance clitic climbing, which is allowed only with restructuring. Progovac notes it is allowed with *željeti*, which confirms the restructuring account of the *da* clause with *željeti*.

- (32) a. *Milan želi/kaže da ga vidi.*
 Milan wants/says that him sees
 "Milan wants to see him/Milan says that he sees him."
 b. ?*Milan ga želi da vidi.*
 c. **Milan ga kaže da vidi.*

Progovac notes that there are restrictions on such restructuring. Thus, the higher and the lower verb must agree in Φ -features (compare (33a) and (32b)). Interestingly, *nikoga* is possible in the lower clause only with restructuring (33b).

- (33) a. **Milan ga želi da vidiš.*
 Milan him wants that see(2.sg)
 “Milan does not want for you to see him.”
 b. **Milan ne želi da vidiš nikoga.*
 Milan neg wants that see(2.sg) nobody
 “Milan does not want for you to see anyone.”

Let us see why. First, as usual, fronting of *nikoga* is also possible (cf. (24a). Note that overt subjects can either precede or follow fronted NCIs like *nikoga* in (34)).

- (34) *Nikoga ne želi da vidi.*
 nobody-acc neg wants that sees

Recall that AgroP for the embedded object is located in the matrix clause with restructuring. Assuming SC has overt object shift (Bošković 1997b, Stjepanović 1999), *nikoga* in restructuring contexts moves to the matrix SpecAgroP (but see section 4 for alternative motivation for this movement). As discussed above, the movement passes through SpecNegP.⁶ This is what happens in (34). I assume that the *ni*-option in (24a) can be handled either via remnant or rightward movement, which would occur after the point in the derivation reached in (34).

Recall that *ni*-items are impossible in the subject position of the lower clause (25). This is reminiscent of the well-known subject-object asymmetry in (35), which is restricted to subjunctives. (Progovac in fact treats (26) as a subjunctive/indicative contrast.)

- (35) a. *Je nâi exigé qu'ils arrêtent personne.*
 I neg-have required that-they arrest nobody
 b. **Je nâi exigé que personne soit arête.*
 I neg-have required that nobody be arrested (French)

The account of the contrast in (24)-(25) in the current system is straightforward. As discussed above, the *ni*-item in (24a) moves to the matrix SpecAgroP, passing through SpecNegP, which is followed by either remnant movement of the material following *ni* or rightward movement of *ni*.⁷ Regardless of which of the two options is taken, this analysis obviously cannot be applied to (25), where *ni* remains in the embedded clause, never moving to SpecNegP. Since there is no movement to SpecNegP, *ni*-items cannot occur in the context in question (25a).

(36) can also be accounted for; in fact, it should be interpreted as additional evidence for the current analysis. Like the subject *ni*-item in (25), the NCI in (36) must be located in the embedded clause; it could not have moved to

⁶ I assume that in the case of successive cyclic movement, whether an intermediate Spec (such as SpecNegP) counts as an A- or an A'-position depends on whether the movement in question is A or A', an assumption that is necessary in the current framework (see Bošković in press b.)

⁷This derivation should not be available in indicatives (i.e. in non-restructuring contexts), or we would allow *ni* in (23c). Similar remnant movement derivations also need to be blocked for indicatives in Kayne's (1998) system.

SpecNegP. As a result, (36a) is unacceptable. Again, an *i*-item can occur here.

- (36) a. **Jovan ne želi da nikoga vidi.*
Jovan neg wants that nobody-acc sees
“Jovan does not want to see anyone.”
b. *Jovan ne želi da ikoga vidi.*

To sum up, restructuring contexts, where the complimentary distribution between *ni*- and *i*-items breaks down, can be accounted for in the current system. The optionality in (24) is a result of the optionality of restructuring, the restructuring option yielding *nikoga* and the non-restructuring option *ikoga* (see section 4 regarding the latter). We have seen that in all other positions only *i*-items are allowed in the complement of *željeti*. Since in the unacceptable examples with *ni*-items such as (25a) and (36a) the *ni*-items do not move to SpecNegP overtly, these data provide additional evidence for the current claim that *ni*-items must move to SpecNegP overtly.

4. Back to *i*-items: Focus movement

Although the above analysis captures quite a bit of data, there is a glitch in it that needs to be fixed. Consider *i*-items, focusing on *ikoga*. (37) can be easily accounted for. Since in (37a), the NCI does not (in fact, cannot (see fn. 7) move to the matrix SpecNegP, *ikoga* is possible here. In (37b), *ikoga* moves above NegP. Since, as discussed above, it must pass through SpecNegP, *ikoga* is not possible here (recall that SHA between negation and NCIs yields *ni*-NCIs). (37c) does not contain negation, hence there is no SHA between the NCI and negation. (37d) is also straightforward. As discussed above, the example involves movement of the NCI above NegP (see below for its landing site), followed by NegP ellipsis. Since the movement must proceed via SpecNegP (see sec. 2), *ikoga* is impossible here.

- (37) a. *Ivan ne tvrdi da voli ikoga.*
Ivan neg claims that loves anyone
“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?*
‘Does Ivan love anyone?’
d. *Koga voli?* ‘Who does he love?’ **Ikoga.* ‘Anyone.’

So far so good. Consider, however, (38).

- (38) **Ivan ne voli ikoga.*
Ivan neg loves anyone

I-items are not licensed here. We have seen NCIs in such examples may move to

SpecNegP. To account for (38), we need the movement to be obligatory: If the NCI must move to SpecNegP, only *ni*-items can be licensed here. I therefore suggest *i*-items must undergo movement. There is independent evidence to this effect. Recall fronted examples are preferred to what seem to be in-situ examples with *ni*-NCIs. The same holds for *i*-NCIs. Examples like (37a), repeated here, are actually somewhat degraded, (39b) being preferred (see also Progovac 2005).⁸

- (39) a. *?Ivan ne tvrdi da voli ikoga.*
 Ivan neg claims that loves anyone-acc
 b. *Ivan ne tvrdi da ikoga voli.*

As discussed above regarding *ni*-items, the contrast can be taken to be significant, indicating *i*-items must undergo movement. Alternatively, we can assume *ikoga* also undergoes leftward movement within the embedded CP in (39a), followed by remnant movement of the material below *ikoga*, or rightward movement of *ikoga*, the options being slightly marginal (they are responsible for the marginal status of (39a)). I will then proceed under the assumption that, like *ni*-items, *i*-items must undergo movement. What is the movement in question? The movement cannot involve scrambling, which is an optional operation, since it must be obligatory. (If *ikoga* in (38) could stay in situ we could not account for its ungrammaticality.) We also cannot maintain that *i*-items must move to SpecNegP given cases like (36b) and (39b) (recall that such examples are unacceptable with *ni* due to the lack of movement to SpecNegP). The following are, however, viable options:

1. We can assume SC is an obligatory object shift language (see Bošković 1997b and Stjepanović 1999 for relevant discussion), with AgroP located above NegP. Given the target-every-phrase approach to successive cyclic movement adopted above, *ikoga* then must move through SpecNegP, as desired. A potential problem under this approach concerns adjunct *i*-phrases like *ikad* ‘ever’, which also have to be forced to move (since they cannot co-occur with clause-mate negation). One possibility is to appeal to an analysis along the lines of Oka (1993), where adjuncts have a licensing requirement similar to Case, which forces them to move.
2. Another possibility is to adopt Progovac’s (2005) claim that there are two PolPs in a CP. The lower PolP would be headed by *ne* in (38) and *ikoga* would be forced to move to the higher PolP, passing through the Spec of the negation PolP.⁹
3. We can also adopt Citko’s (1998) claim that all indefinites must move to Spec OpP, located above NegP (she discusses Polish, but SC behaves like Polish in this respect). Given the traditional wh+indefinite account of wh-phrases, the fact that

⁸As with *ni*-NCIs (see section 1), multiple *i*-NCI examples and examples like (ic) are disallowed.

- (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 išta ikome ikad daje.*
 c. *??On ne tvrdi da je Marija predala ikome nju.*
 he neg claims that is Marija given-up anybody-dat her-acc
 ‘He does not claim that Marija gave her up to anyone.’
 d. *On ne tvrdi da je Marija ikome predala nju.*

⁹This would be followed by remnant movement in (38), but not in **Ikoga Ivan ne voli.*

SC is a MWF language provides an argument in favor of Citko's claim. In fact, even indefinites like the one in (40) are preferred in a fronted position in SC.

- (40) *Nešto je kupio.*
 something-acc is bought
 "He bought something."

While these options all work, forcing *i*-NCIs to move, I would like to endorse another option which has independent morphological motivation. 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 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 is a reflex of SHA with negation.¹⁰

- (41) *n(neg)+i(focus ('even'))+ko(who)*

What is important for us is that NCIs have a focal marker. It is well-known SC is an obligatory focus movement language, which moves all focalized phrases to a FocP overtly (Bošković 2002b, Stjepanović 1999). The presence of a focal marker should then force NCIs to move to FocP too. Since FocP is located above NegP (cf. (42a), where contrastively focused *Asmir* must precede negation), the NCI in (42b) must pass through SpecNegP. We now have an account of the impossibility of an *i*-NCI co-occurring with clause-mate negation. The obligatory movement to Spec FocP forces it to pass through SpecNegP, which then yields a *ni*-NCI. This is not the case with long-distance cases like (42c), since here an *i*-item can move to FocP within the embedded CP, hence it does not have to move to SpecNegP.

- (42) a. *ASMIRA ne voli.*
 Asmir-acc neg loves
 "He does not love ASMIR."
 b. [_{FocP} [_{NegP} NCI
 c. [_{NegP} [_{CP} [_{FocP} NCI

What is appealing in this account, and argues in its favor, is that all movement is morphologically motivated: *i* motivates movement to FocP, and *n* to SpecNegP.¹¹

Additional evidence for the above analysis is provided by the distribution of NCIs in infinitives. As shown by (43), only *ni*-items can occur in this context.

¹⁰Recall that the morphology does not have to be transparent in every language where the above mechanisms are at work (see fn. 3). A language where these mechanisms are not reflected in the morphology would not argue against the above analysis, it would merely fail to provide one argument for it. (It is in fact possible that (40) involves focus movement that is not reflected in the morphology. Alternatively, it may be possible to analyze *nešto* as *ne+i+što*, with *i*-deletion. Or the movement in question could be independent of focalization.)

¹¹I assume that the morphology does not have to reflect the order of checking, which is more or less the standard assumption in the feature-checking approach.

- (43) *Asmir ne želi vidjeti ?nikoga/*ikoga.*
 Asmir neg wants to-see nobody/anyone
 “Asmir does not want to see anyone.”

Stjepanović (2004) shows that SC infinitives must involve restructuring, which means that all functional structure that is normally located within a non-restructuring infinitive is located in the higher clause (following Wurmbrand 2001). I refer the reader to Stjepanović for relevant discussion, merely noting that negation also cannot occur in the infinitive, which is consistent with the above claim that functional structure must all be located in the higher clause due to obligatory restructuring with SC infinitives.

- (44) *Asmir ne želi vidjeti Milenu/*Asmir želi ne vidjeti Milenu.*
 Asmir neg wants to-see Milena
 “Asmir does not want to see Milena/Asmir wants not to see Milena.”

In fact, NCIs cannot front within the infinitive (45), which indicates the phrase hosting obligatory NCI movement cannot be located within the infinitive either.

- (45) **Asmir ne želi nikoga/ikoga vidjeti.*
 Asmir neg wants nobody/anyone to-see
 “Asmir does not want to see anyone.”

As expected, focus movement of other XPs also cannot land within the infinitive.

- (46) a. *?*Asmir (ne) želi MILENU vidjeti.*
 Asmir neg wants Milena-acc to-see
 “Asmir does not want to see MILENA.”
 b. *MILENU Asmir (ne) želi vidjeti/Asmir MILENU (ne) želi vidjeti.*

The obvious conclusion is that NCIs must move (i.e. undergo focus movement) outside of the infinitive. Since the movement must proceed via SpecNegP, only *ni*-items are possible in infinitives, as shown by (47). (In (43), this movement is followed by remnant NegP fronting or rightward movement, as discussed above).

- (47) *Asmir nikoga/*ikoga ne želi vidjeti.*
 Asmir nobody/anyone-acc not wants to-see

Recall that the *da*-complement of *željeti* can optionally undergo restructuring.¹² When the restructuring option is forced via clitic climbing (Stjepanović 2004 shows clitic climbing requires restructuring, though the failure of a clitic to climb does not prevent restructuring), neither an *i*-NCI nor an XP undergoing focus movement can occur in the complement of *željeti* (48a-b). Negation is also impossible (48c), and nothing changes regarding NCI licensing in (48d).

¹²*Da* with restructuring should not actually be treated as a complementizer (see Stjepanović 2004).

- (48) a. *Milan mu ne želi da predstavi ?nikoga/*ikoga.*
 Milan him-dat neg wants that introduces nobody-acc/anyone-acc
 “Milan does not want to introduce anyone to him.”
- b. *?*Milan mu želi da MILENU predstavi.*
 Milan him-dat wants that Milena-acc introduces
- c. **Milan mu želi da ne predstavi Milenu.*
 Milan him-dat wants that neg introduces Milena-acc
- d. *Milan mu nikoga/*ikoga ne želi da predstavi.*

These data can be accounted for in the same way as the corresponding data with infinitives. Note also that, as expected, *i*-NCIs, focus movement and negation can all occur in the complement of *željeti* on the non-restructuring option (lexical subjects in the complement of *željeti* are compatible only with this option).

- (49) a. *Milan ne želi da Marija ikoga predstavi.*
 Milan neg wants that Marija-nom anyone-acc introduces
 “Milan does not want for Mary to introduce anyone.”
- b. *Milan želi da Marija PETRA ne predstavi.*
 Milan wants that Milena-nom Petar-acc neg introduces

To sum up, I have offered a simple account of the *ni/i* alternation, where all movement NCIs undergo is morphologically motivated. In addition to accounting for Progovac’s clause-mate/higher negation data, the current analysis accounts for the curious behavior of NCIs under reconstruction (only *ni*-items are compatible with it, and it is irrelevant whether reconstruction takes place into a clause-mate or a higher negation context), the behavior of NCIs in non-negative contexts (only *i*-items are possible there) and ellipsis (only *ni*-items are possible there).

5. Implementation

I now turn to the implementation of the above analysis, which will involve discussing its technical details. In section 1, I discussed two options, where *ni*-items are located in SpecNegP or a higher position. The above considerations favor the latter. Consider the former option: To account for the fact that all *ni*-items move, we would need to assume that Neg has an EPP feature with Bošković’s (1999) Attract All property (see Brown 2005), which can be satisfied only if Neg attracts all NCIs (which are not already located in SpecNegP). Consider now how this would be implemented in Bošković’s (in press b) system, which deduces EPP effects from the assumption that an uninterpretable feature (uK) must be a probe (see also Epstein and Seely 2006); more precisely, a uK can be checked iff the element containing it c-commands the checker. (50a) is then ruled out because the uCase of *John* cannot be checked since *John* does not c-command *I*. The problem does not arise in (50b), where *John* moves to a position c-commanding *I*, hence can probe *I*, checking its uCase. Under this analysis, Case (in fact any uK) cannot be checked via Agree; the analysis requires movement to the Spec of the Case licenser (i.e. movement to the closest position c-

commanding it, which is its Spec). (50c) provides evidence for the analysis. As noted in Bošković (in press b), (50c) raises a serious problem for Chomsky's (2001) system, where Case can be checked by Agree. *What* cannot be Case-checked in the lower clause, *seem* not being a Case checker. But *know* (i.e. its *v*) can check Case. Why is then *know* apparently unable to Case-check *what*? (Appealing to some kind of a ban on verbs undergoing Agree with elements in A'-positions will not work here, since in a number of languages a verb undergoes object agreement with an NP in SpecCP; i.e., a verb can agree with an NP in SpecCP, it only cannot Case-mark it). In Bošković's (in press b) system this is straightforward. *What* in (50c) can only be Case-checked if it moves to the matrix SpecvP, c-commanding its Case licenser. This in itself is not a problem given that, as argued in Bošković (in press b) and references therein, English has object shift. However, the problem is that *what* would then be located outside of its scope (embedded CP), which, as is well-known (see Saito 1992), is disallowed.

- (50) a. **Was arrested John*.
 b. *John was arrested*.
 c. **I know what it seems clear*.

Returning to NCIs, positing a uK on NCIs that must be checked against Neg, which then forces movement to SpecNegP, easily handles *ni*-items. However, there is a problem with *i*-items if they are considered to be the same lexical items, since they would then always have to move to SpecNegP too. The same problem arises under the Attract All account, since if *ni/i*-items are the same lexical elements, they would all be attracted to SpecNegP. Under this analysis we then have to conclude that *i*-items do not have the relevant feature, i.e. the feature that is attracted by the Attract All property of Neg (so they are not candidates for movement under this account), or that they do not have the uK feature that forces the movement in question under the uK-as-a-probe analysis. In other words, this analysis is incompatible with the same lexical item approach to *ni/i*-NCIs. However, even with this assumption the analysis still does not work because of examples like (38) since under the analysis in question we cannot force movement of *ikoga* to SpecNegP.

Here is then an alternative that is also consistent with the single lexical item view: Neg does not drive anything. There is always movement (for other reasons, i.e. focus) to a phrase above NegP for both *ni*- and *i*-items. (Either the Attract-all EPP or the uK-must-be-a-probe option can be employed to drive this movement.) The movement must pass through NegP (due to locality), which gives us *n*.

We have thus teased apart options (6)-(7) from section 1, favoring the movement-above-NegP option. The movement in question is focus movement.

6. Back to ellipsis

I now return to ellipsis, where only *ni*-items occur. We have seen this can be accounted for if (51) involves movement of the NCI, followed by NegP ellipsis.

- (51) *Šta si kupio?* ‘What did you buy?’ *Ništa nisam—kupio.* ‘Nothing.’
 what are bought nothing neg+am bought

Consider the semantics of NCIs/negation. Giannakidou (1998) argues negative concord items are not inherently negative, which means there must be a negation in the elided part of (51). Non-negative sentences must then be able to serve as ellipsis antecedents for negative sentences, which raises a potential problem for recoverability of deletion. Watanabe (2004) notes another problem. Consider (52).

- (52) 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 a non-negative sentence can serve as an ellipsis antecedent for a negative sentence, we can have negation in the elided part of (52b); i.e. (52b) should be able to stand for either (52c) or (52d). (52b) is then incorrectly predicted to allow interpretation ‘I did not see a snake’. The data lead us to conclude that negative interpretation comes from negative concord items. There should then be no negation in the elided part of (51) and (52b). Only (51), which contains an NCI, can then have negative interpretation. However, we are still facing a problem. If negative interpretation comes from NCIs the neg feature of NCIs must be interpretable. This also must be the case for the neg feature of negation, otherwise (53) 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 negative concord reading.

- (53) *Marko ne radi.*
 Marko neg works

- (54) negation (iNeg) ... negative concord item (iNeg) = double negation!

(5) is then incorrectly predicted to mean ‘He loves someone’. To deal with the problem, Watanabe (2004) proposes a feature-copying mechanism, which introduces a complication into the feature-checking system. He assumes that both NCIs and negation have iNeg. He suggests the iNeg feature of the NCI is copied into the negation, which then has two interpretable neg features. They cancel each other out and we end up with only one interpretable neg feature, in the NCI itself.

- (55) Neg(iNeg) NCI(iNeg) → Neg(iNeg, iNeg) NCI(iNeg) → Neg NCI(iNeg)

I would like to propose an alternative which does not need any additional mechanisms.¹³

¹³The following is thus meant to replace Watanabe’s feature-copying mechanism, as well as Haegeman and Zanuttini’s (1996) neg-factorization, which Watanabe replaces with his feature-copying, in negative doubling. However, as Watanabe notes, a residue of neg-factorization (see de

feature. Since Neg A would not probe the NCI, the uK of the NCI remains unchecked. The problem does not arise with Neg B, which has an uninterpretable feature hence can function as a probe. We have thus ensured that only Neg B can co-occur with NCIs. The other half of our job is also done. Recall that since the neg feature of Neg B is uninterpretable we should not be able to use it in (53), or (53) could mean *Marko works*. But Neg B cannot be used in this context since its uNeg feature would remain unchecked. Because of this, Neg B can only be used with an NCI, which will check its uNeg feature. This checking relation will also result in the checking of the uK of the NCI. NCIs can then be used only with Neg B because of this. We have therefore ensured exactly the right distribution for the two negative heads.

Returning to ellipsis, it should be obvious now that we need negation in the elided part of (51) and that it must be Neg B (without it the uK of the NCI would not be checked). Note, however, that given that the identity condition on ellipsis is semantic (see Merchant 2001), there is no problem with taking a non-negative sentence to be an antecedent for a negative sentence here since the relevant part is not semantically negative (the neg feature in question is uninterpretable). Recall that Watanabe (2004) argued that negation should not be allowed in the elided part of (51) or we would allow negation in the elided part of (52b), incorrectly predicting (52b) to allow interpretation ‘I did not see a snake’. The problem does not arise in the current system. (52) is quite different from (51), since in (52) we have to use Neg A. (If we were to use Neg B, its uNeg feature 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 (recall that the parallelism requirement is semantic). We have therefore succeeded in resolving Watanabe’s problem without positing additional feature-checking mechanisms.

Let me finally note that if a negative element has iNeg but no uK, it would not require negation, and if negation is present we would get a double negation reading. Such elements could not co-occur with Neg B, which is a prerequisite for the negative concord reading, since being inactive (i.e. lacking uK) they could not check the uNeg of Neg B. English *I saw nothing* may instantiate this type.

7. Conclusion

To sum up, I have argued for a simple account of the *ni/i* alternation where we get *ni* when NCIs move to SpecNegP. I have provided a number of arguments that *ni*-NCIs must undergo this movement while *i*-NCIs are incompatible with it based on reconstruction, restructuring, and ellipsis. In addition, both *ni* and *i*-NCIs undergo focus movement, FocP being higher than clause-mate NegP. All movement NCIs undergo is morphologically motivated. The current analysis explains the behavior of NCIs with respect to negation (*i*-NCIs occur with long distance and *ni*-NCIs with clause-mate negation), non-negative licensors (only *i*-NCIs are possible there), ellipsis (only *ni*-NCIs are possible there), and reconstruction (only *ni*-NCIs are possible under reconstruction, a pattern which was shown to raise a serious problem for alternative accounts). I have also proposed a new account of negative

concord based on the existence of two negative heads.

References

- Abels, Klaus. 2005. "Expletive negation" in Russian: A conspiracy theory. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 13: 5-74.
- Aljović, Nadira. 2005. On clitic climbing in Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian. *Lingvistički Vidici* 34: 58-104.
- Beck, Sigrid. 1998. Review of Ljiljana Progovac: "Negative and Positive Polarity—A Binding Approach". *Linguistische Berichte* 175: 425-429.
- Boeckx, Cedric. 2003. *Islands and chains*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bošković, Željko. 1997a. On certain violations of the Superiority Condition, AgrO, and economy of derivation. *Journal of Linguistics* 33: 227-254.
- Bošković, Željko. 1997b. *The syntax of nonfinite complementation: An economy approach*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Bošković, Željko. 1999. On multiple feature-checking: Multiple wh-fronting and multiple head-movement. In *Working Minimalism*, ed. Samuel Epstein and Norbert Hornstein, 159-187. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- 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. 2005. On the operator freezing effect. Ms., University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Bošković, Željko. in press a. What will you have, DP or NP? *Proceeding of NELS* 37.
- Bošković, Željko. in press b. On the locality and motivation of Move and Agree: An even more minimal theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38.4.
- Brown, Sue. 2005. Negative concord in Slavic and Attract all-F. In *Negation in Slavic*, ed. Sue Brown and Adam Przepiórkowski. Bloomington: Slavica.
- 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.
- Citko, Barbara. 1998. On multiple wh-movement in Slavic. In *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics* 6, ed. Željko Bošković, Steven Franks, and William Snyder, 97-113. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Epstein, Samuel D. and T. Daniel Seely. 2006. *Derivations in Minimalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fox, Danny, and Howard Lasnik. 2003. Successive-cyclic movement and island repair. *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.

- Proceedings of NELS 28*, 195-208.
- Haegeman, Liliane, and Raffaella Zanuttini. 1996. Negative concord in West Flemish. In *Parameters and functional heads*, ed. Adriana Belletti and Luigi Rizzi, 117-179. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 2001. *Move! A minimalist theory of construal*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Ilc, Gašper, and Milena Milojević Sheppard. in press. Slovene negative pronouns as N-words. *Proceedings of FDSL 6*.
- Kayne, Richard. 1998. Overt vs. covert movement. *Syntax* 1: 128-191.
- Kayne, Richard. 2005. *Movement and silence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Manzini, Maria Rita. 1994. Locality, minimalism, and parasitic gaps. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25: 481-508.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 19: 255-320.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 1994. *Negative and positive polarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 2005. *A syntax of Serbian*. Bloomington: Slavica Publishers.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized minimality*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Saito, Mamoru. 1992. Long distance scrambling in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 1: 69-118.
- Stjepanović, Sandra. 1999. What do second position cliticization, scrambling, and multiple wh-fronting have in common? Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Stjepanović, Sandra. 2004. Clitic climbing and restructuring with “finite clauses” and infinitive complements. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 12: 177-212.
- 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, Storrs.
- Van der Wouden, Ton. 1997. *Negative contexts*. London: Routledge.
- Uribe-Echevarria, María. 1994. Interface licensing conditions on negative polarity items. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Watanabe, Akira. 2004. The genesis of negative concord: Syntax and morphology of negative doubling. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35: 559-612.
- Wurmbrand, Susanne. 2001. *Infinitives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Željko Bošković
Department of Linguistics, U-1145
University of Connecticut
Storrs, CT 06269
zeljko.boskovic@uconn.edu