Parametric Variation in NPI-Licensing and the Role of LF X'-Movement

Overview: Cross-linguistic differences in licensing conditions on Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) have been observed. **Difference A** Long-distance licensing of NPIs is possible in English unless an island intervenes ([11]: (1)), while Korean/Japanese (K/J) NPIs require a clause-mate Neg ([2]: (2)). **Difference B** K/J allow subject NPIs, while English does not ([3]). Although previous studies of Korean NPIs ([3], [4]) attribute these differences to the properties of chains formed by LF movement to [Spec NegP/AgrP], we argue that the Japanese NPI –sika is licensed by covert head-movement. We thus suggest that there is head-movement that does not feed PF (contra [5]).

Previous analyses: [3] accounts for the two differences between English and K/J by proposing that [Spec, NegP] is an A'-position in English while it is an A-position in K/J. She argues that NPIs covertly move to [Spec, NegP]. **Diff. A** is derived because when a K/J NPI moves long-distance through the embedded [Spec, CP] ((4)a), it forms an improper chain A-A'-A (4)b, while movement of English NPIs ((5)a) forms a legitimate A-A'-A' chain ((5)b). **Diff. B** is derived because overt movement of the subject bypassing [Spec, NegP] makes an improper A-A'-A chain in English ((6)) while forming a legitimate A-A-A chain in Korean ((7)). [4] also employs the argument based on improper chains, but rejects the idea that Neg projects NegP. Under [4]'s account, NPIs are licensed in [Spec, AgrP] (A-position) in Korean, and Neg is adjoined to the V head ((8)).

New observations: Although the Japanese NPI -sika behaves in the same way as Korean NPIs with respect to **Diff. A/B**, we show that [3] and [4]'s analyses of Korean cannot be extended to the analysis of –sika. (–Sika attaches to a constituent and is licensed by Neg, interpreted as ‘not ... except ...’ See (9).) First, –sika can attach to adjuncts ((10)), which is unpredicted in the previous analyses. If the adjunct-sika phrase were licensed in an A-position ([Spec, NegP/AgrP]), it should form an improper chain consisting of A'-A (explicable given a ban on "comp" to non-"comp" movement originally in [6]: cf. [7]). Second, -sika can attach to heads. In (11)a, the scope of –sika is only the V-head, because it only means ‘John only licked the juice (as opposed to drink the juice),’ while in (11)b, the implication is ‘John didn’t do any activities other than to lick cough drops (as opposed to see the doctor, etc.).’ The contrast shows that –sika is ambiguous between V- or VP-attachment depending on the context. Under previous analyses, it would be hard to account for how a head can move to a Spec position. Third, ambiguity arises when double negation occurs ((12)). The ambiguity is well-accommodated under a system where NPIs are associated with a Neg-related position; it reflects which Neg the NPI is associated with. The ambiguity is hard to account for if NPIs uniformly occupy [Spec, AgrP] as [4] proposes.

Analysis: Given the above discussion (especially (11)a), we propose that covert head-movement of -sika to Neg is relevant to the licensing of –sika as in (13)a. (The movement skips V/V-heads. We follow [8] and [9] and assume that the Head Movement Constraint does not always hold.) If this movement crosses a CP, the head-movement of –sika onto the matrix Neg is blocked ((13)b) because the embedded C is filled by the C morpheme to. As a result, –sika cannot be attracted to the matrix clause, due to the Phase Impenetrability Condition. On the other hand, English NPIs undergo covert phrasal movement to [Spec, NegP]. When an English NPI moves long-distance, the embedded [Spec, CP] is available as an escape hatch ((14)). **Diff A** is thus derived. This system enables us to assume that [Spec, NegP] is uniformly an A'-position, contra [3]'s stipulation. **Diff. B** is derived because English NPI subjects undergo movement to [Spec, TP] via [Spec,NegP], forming an improper chain ((6)). On the other hand, –sika in (9)c is licensed by head-movement and subject movement to [Spec, TP] is irrelevant in forming the chain of -sika. In this way, both differences between Japanese and English NPIs are attributed to the parameter of head vs. phrasal movement.

Theoretical consequences: If our analysis is on the right track, it provides an instance of covert head-movement, which shows that not all head-movement is PF-movement. Our system also implies that only CP is a phase ([10]) in Japanese because morphemes on v (e.g. passives, causatives) do not block -sika movement as opposed to C morphemes. Finally, the proposed system suggests that NPIs need to move to NegP even under the probe-goal system. This enables us to account for the covert long-distance licensing of wh-phrases/NPIs ((1)b) without cumbersome assumptions such as long-distance Agree.
a. Mary did not meet anyone. b. Mary did not believe that John bought anything.
c. *Mary never met [the man who tried to kill anybody]. (Complex NP island)

(2) a. Mary-ka **amuto** ani manna-essta ‘Mary did not meet anybody.’ [Korean]
   *Mary-Nom anybody not met
   *Mary-Nom John-Nom anything bought-C believe not did
   ‘Mary did not believe that John bought anything.’

(3) a. *Anyone did not meet Mary.
b. **Amuto** Mary-lul ani mensensta. ‘Anybody did not meet Mary.’ [Korean]
   Anybody Mary-Acc not met

b. *[Spec, NegP] (A’) … [Spec, CP] (A’) … original theta-position (A) = (2b)

(5) a. Mary did [NegP anythingt not [VP believe [CP t1 [c: that John bought t1]]]] = (1b)
b. [Spec, NegP] (A’) … [Spec, CP] (A’) … original theta-position (A)

(6) a. *[AgrSP Anyone1 [TP did [NegP t1’ [Neg’ not [AgrP [VP t1 meet Mary]]]]]] = (3a)
b. *[Spec, AgrSP] (A) … [Spec, NegP] (A’) … original theta-position (A)

(7) a. [AgrP Amuto1 [TP [NegP t1’ [t1 Mary-lul] ani] mensensta]] = (3b)
b. [Spec, ArgSP] (A) … [Spec, NegP] (A) … original theta-position (A)

(8) … [AgrP amukesto1 [AgrO’ [VP (SUBJ) [t1 [v ani’v]]]]]

(9) a. Mary-wa ringo-sika tabe-nakat-ta. ‘Mary ate only apples.’ [Japanese]
   Mary-Top apple-sika eat-not-past (= lit. ‘Mary didn’t eat except for apples.’)
   Mary-Top John-Nom apple-sika eat-past C think-not-past
   ‘Mary did not think that John ate only apples.’
c. Mary-sika ringo-o tabe-nakat-ta. ‘Only Mary ate apples.’
   Mary-sika apple-Acc eat-not-past

(10) Mary-wa **yukkuri-sika** ringo-o tabe-nakat-ta. ‘Mary ate apples only slowly.’
   Mary-Top slowly-sika apple-Acc eat-not-past

(11) a. [context: John hates the vegetable juice. Juice is normally what you drink, but…]
   John-wa sonojusu-o name-sika si-nakat-ta.
   John-Top the juice-Acc lick-sika do-not-past
   ‘John only licked the juice. All John did was to lick the juice.’
b. [context: John has a terrible cold. He should take a proper care of himself, but…]
   John-wa nodoame-o name-sika si-nakat-ta.
   John-Top cough-drop-Acc lick-sika do-not-past
   ‘John only licked cough drops. All John did was to lick cough drops.’

(12) Mary-wa ringo-sika tabe-nakat-ta.
    Mary-Top apple-sika eat-not-past
   a. [[Mary-Top apple-sika eat-not] not-past]
      ‘It is not the case that Mary only ate apples. (=ate something else, too.’)
b. [Mary-Top apple-sika [eat-not not-past]
      ‘Mary did not eat (=avoided eating) only apples. (=ate everything other than apples.)

(13) a. [IP Mary-wa [NegP [VP ringo-t1 [t1] tabe] nakat-sika1] ta] = (9a)
    Mary-Top
    apple eat not-sika past
b. *[IP Mary-wa [NegP [VP [CP John-ga ringo-t1 tabe-ta to] omowa] nakat-sika1] ta] = (9b)
   Mary-Top
   John-Nom apple eat-past C think not-sika past

(14) [IP Mary did [Neg anythingt not [VP believe [CP t1’ [c: that [IP John bought t1]]]]] = (1b)