

Focal analysis of NPI connectivity and movement of negation

Higgins (1973) observes that English pseudo-clefts show connectivity effects. Anaphors in the clefted phrase can take antecedents within the *wh*-phrase, despite an apparent lack of any *c*-command relation (1a). Similarly, NPIs in the clefted phrase can have a trigger within the *wh*-phrase (1b). Many (Heycock and Kroch 1999 and others) have viewed binding and NPI connectivity as parallel, assuming a uniform analysis for both. However, English *it*-clefts with anaphors and NPIs cast doubt on this uniformity assumption. In (2a), the anaphor in the clefted phrase can have *Mary* as its antecedent, showing binding connectivity, whereas in (2b), the NPI is not licensed by the negation; NPI connectivity fails. In this paper, I argue that NPI connectivity is in fact a different phenomenon from binding connectivity. Specifically, I propose that NPIs in negated pseudo-clefts are licensed in a way parallel to NPIs in negated *because* and focus constructions.

Herburger (2000) observes that negated focus constructions are ambiguous between a reading in which negation is associated with focus (i.e. bound) (3a) and a reading in which negation is associated with the verb (i.e. free) (3b). Linebarger (1987) observes that negated *because*-clauses are also ambiguous between a reading in which negation is associated with the *because*-phrase (4a) and a reading in which negation is associated with the main verb (4b). Given Hooper and Thompson's (1973) observation that *because*-phrases express the main assertion in a sentence, as if inherently focused, these two seemingly independent cases of ambiguity can be assimilated under a single approach: the negated focal constructions have a bound reading and a free reading. Now note that NPIs within a focused phrase are licensed only under a bound reading (5)/(6). Observe that negated (specificational) pseudo-clefts are also ambiguous between a bound (7a) and a free reading (7b). The NPI in the clefted phrase is licensed only under a bound reading (8); i.e. it shows NPI connectivity. The negated *it*-clefts, on the other hand, are unambiguous; they do not have a bound reading (9). Because they lack a bound reading, NPIs in the clefted phrase cannot be licensed in *it*-clefts; i.e. they fail to show NPI connectivity (10).

While negation usually takes scope at its surface position (11), I argue that the negation can move covertly in focal structures. If it moves, we get the bound reading (A_i), if it does not, we get the free reading (A_{ii}).

(A) i. **not** [_{FocP} FOC/*because* phrase/clefted phrase [_{presupposition} ... **not** V ...]] (bound)

ii. [_{FocP} FOC/*because* phrase/clefted phrase [_{presupposition} ... **not** V ...]] (free)

In (A_i), negation takes scope over the focused phrase, so the NPIs in the focused phrase is licensed, whereas in (A_{ii}), the focused phrase is outside of the scope of negation, and hence, the NPI in the focused phrase is not licensed. Thus, NPI connectivity is found only when the sentence has a bound reading.

This analysis of NPI connectivity explains otherwise mysterious phenomena in Dutch as well. Dutch clefts usually show NPI connectivity (12a). However, when *heel* ('whole') is used as an NPI, NPI connectivity disappears (12b). den Dikken (2002) argues that *heel* is a wide scope universal NPI and is licensed when it takes scope over a clause-mate negation, whereas other NPIs are narrow scope existential NPIs, which are licensed in the scope of negation, just like English NPIs. Usually, NPIs in the focused phrase are licensed in the bound reading, where negation takes scope over the focused phrase. However, because it is a wide scope universal NPI, *heel* cannot be licensed under the bound reading. It cannot be licensed in the free reading either, due to the clause-mate condition. Since neither bound nor free readings satisfy the licensing requirement of *heel*, NPI connectivity is not found in clefts with *heel*.

I close by suggesting that negation movement is sensitive to some economy constraints on movement, which offers an account of why there is no bound reading in *it*-clefts.

- (1) a. [What **Mary** bought] was [a picture of **herself**]. [\checkmark binding connectivity]
 b. [What John didn't eat] was [**any vegetables**]. [\checkmark NPI connectivity]
- (2) a. It was [a picture of **herself**] [that **Mary** bought]. [\checkmark binding connectivity]
 b. * It was [**any vegetables**] [that John didn't eat]. [\checkmark NPI connectivity]
- (3) John didn't eat VEGETABLES.
 a. John ate something but it was **not** vegetables. (bound)
 b. John **not**-ate (avoided-eating) something and it was vegetables. (free)
- (4) Mary didn't leave [because John ate vegetables].
 a. Mary left. It was **not** because John ate vegetables. (bound)
 b. Mary didn't leave. It was because John ate vegetables. (free)
- (5) John didn't eat **ANY VEGETABLES**.
 a. John ate something but it was **not** vegetables. (bound, \checkmark NPI)
 b. # John **not**-ate (avoided eating) something and it was vegetables. (free, *NPI)
- (6) Mary didn't leave [because John ate **any vegetables**].
 a. Mary left. It was **not** because John ate vegetables. (bound, \checkmark NPI)
 b. # Mary didn't leave. It was because John ate vegetables. (free, *NPI)
- (7) a. What I didn't order was PIZZA, (but PASTA).
*interpretation: I ordered something. It was **not** pizza.* (bound)
 b. (I am on a low calorie diet. So,) what I didn't order was PIZZA.
*interpretation: I **not**-ordering (avoided ordering) something. It was pizza.* (free)
- (8) a. What I didn't order was **ANY PIZZA**, (but PASTA).
*interpretation: I ordered something. It was **not** pizza.* (bound, \checkmark NPI)
 b. # (I am on a low calorie diet. So,) what I didn't order was **ANY PIZZA**.
*interpretation: I **not**-ordering (avoided ordering) something. It was pizza.* (free, *NPI)
- (9) a. # It was PIZZA that I didn't order, (but PASTA).
*interpretation: I ordered something. It was **not** pizza.* (*bound)
 b. (I am on a low calorie diet. So,) it was PIZZA that I didn't order.
*interpretation: I **not**-ordering (avoided ordering) something. It was pizza.* (free)
- (10) * It was **ANY PIZZA** that I didn't order. (a. *bound, *NPI b. free, *NPI)
- (11) a. John doesn't want to visit Mary. (not > want, *want > not)
 b. John **wants not** to visit Mary. (want > not, *not > want)
- (12) a. [wat ik **nog nooit** opgemerkt heb] is [look maar **enig teken** van ontevredenheid].
 what I yet never noticed have is also but any sign of dissatisfaction
 (What I have never noticed is any sign of dissatisfaction.) (den Dikken 2001)
 b. * [wat ik **niet** begrijp] is [die **hele constructie**]. <heel NPI>
 what I not understand is that whole construction
 (What I don't understand is any constructions.) (p.c. Marcel den Dikken)

den Dikken, M. 2001. "Specificational copular sentences and pseudoclefts." In Everaert, M. & H. van Riemsdijk (eds.) *The Syntax companion*. Blackwell.

den Dikken, M. 2002. "Direct and parasitic polarity item licensing." *Journal of comparative Germanic linguistics*. 5: 35-66.

Herburger, E. 2000. *What counts: Focus and quantification*. MIT Press.

Heycock, C. and A. Kroch 1999. "Pseudocleft connectedness: Implications for the LF interface level." *LI* 30: 365-397.

Higgins, F. R. 1973. *The Pseudo-cleft construction in English*. Garland, New York.

Hooper, J. and S. Thompson 1973. "On the applicability of root transformations." *LI* 4:465-497.

Linebarger, M. C. 1987. "Negative polarity and grammatical representation." *Linguistic and Philosophy* 10: 325-387.