

## 1 The Immediate Scope Constraint

Linebarger (1987) proposed the Immediate Scope Constraint (ISC) according to which an NPI could be licensed only if it was in the immediate scope of a negation.

Even though Linebarger (1987) restricted her attention to negation, for our purposes we can state the ISC as follows:

- (1) \*DE-Op ... NDE-Op ... NPI  
(NPIs are licensed in the configuration: DE-Op ... NPI)

Some instances of the ISC:

- (2) a. \*I didn't budge because I'm courageous, but because I felt like it.  
(intervener: **because** clause, LF: – (because(I felt like it, I budged)))
- b. \*I didn't drink a cocktail and any soda.  
(intervener: **and**)
- c. \*I didn't meet the man who gave me any present.  
(intervener: **the**)
- d. Mary didn't wear any earrings at every party.
- i. Reading 1: There is no particular earring Mary wore at every party.  
Scopal Relations: NOT > NPI > every
- ii. Reading 2: At every party Mary wore no earrings.  
Scopal Relations: every > NOT > NPI
- iii. Reading 3: It is not the case that Mary wore earrings to every party. (**\*unavailable\***)  
Scopal Relations: NOT > every > NPI, **every** intervenes.

Two ways to avoid the ISC:

- (3) \*DE-Op ... NDE-Op ... NPI  
(= the unavailable Reading 3 of (2d))
- a. Move the intervener out of the way:  
NDE-Op<sub>i</sub> ... DE-Op ... t<sub>i</sub> ... NPI  
(= Reading 2 of (2d))
- b. Move the NPI above the intervener, but below the DE-Op:  
DE-Op ... NPI<sub>i</sub> ... NDE-Op ... t<sub>i</sub>  
(= Reading 1 of (2d))

## 2 Trying to derive the ISC

One could take the ISC to suggest that the NPI must undergo covert p(hrasal)-movement to the immediate scope of its licenser.

This would allow us to derive the fact that NPI-licensing seems to be sensitive to at least certain kinds of islands.

- (4) a. Mary didn't say that you are dating anyone.  
b. \*Mary didn't meet [the man who gave her any present]. (Complex NP Island)  
c. \*Mary didn't eat any apple and a slice of my cake. (Coordinate Structure Constraint)

However, NPIs seem to sometimes be licensed in environments that are islands for p-movement.

- (5) a. Mary didn't meet [a professor who gave Bill any book].  
b. I didn't do anything [because anybody asked me].

Guerzoni also takes the subjects of embedded finite clauses to be positions from where p-movement to the immediate scope of negation is not possible. Yet NPIs can be licensed in this position.

- (6) I didn't say [that anyone came to my party].

She bases her claim on the failure of ACD resolution in cases like the following.

- (7) (from Larson and May (1990) via Fox (2002))
- a. \*I expect that [everyone [you do]] will visit Mary.  
b. \*I said that [everyone [you did]] arrived.

I am not convinced by this diagnostic. As noted in Tiedeman (1995) and further analyzed in Fox (2002), extraposition of the relative clause restores (7) to grammaticality.

- (8) a. I expect that [everyone] will visit Mary [that you do].  
 b. I said that [everyone] arrived [that you did].

A proper analysis of (8) involves p-movement of the subject of the embedded finite clause.

Interim Conclusion: p-movement is inadequate for the purposes of capturing all cases of NPI-licensing.

### 3 Two Kinds of Movement

Guerzoni assumes that NPI-licensing can be done by either p-movement or by **f-movement**.

#### 3.1 What is f-movement?

F(ature)-movement was invoked by Pesetsky (2000) as a kind of covert movement that is distinct from the more usual covert p(hrasal)-movement.

A diagnostic for f-movement:

F-movement, but not P-movement, is sensitive to Beck effects i.e. intervention effects triggered by a class of quantificational and negative operators.

F-movement has no effect on scopal relations, while p-movement effects scope.

Pesetsky (2000) uses f-movement to explain apparent violations of superiority and the sensitivity of such superiority violations to intervening quantifiers.

- (9) a. Which book<sub>i</sub> did [which student] read t<sub>i</sub>?

Pesetsky's analysis: [which student] has already undergone f-movement to the [+wh]C<sup>0</sup>, and so [which book] doesn't actually cross over it when it undergoes overt p-movement. Hence, no superiority violation.

- b. [Which book]<sub>i</sub> didn't John give t<sub>i</sub> to which student?

Pesetsky's analysis: [which book] undergoes p-movement, which can cross negation and other quantificational elements.

- c. \*[Which book]<sub>i</sub> didn't [which student] read t<sub>i</sub>?

Pesetsky's analysis: f-movement cannot cross negation and so f-movement of [which student] to [+wh]C<sup>0</sup> is blocked. We have a real violation of superiority and hence ungrammaticality follows.

#### 3.2 The logic of Guerzoni's Proposal

- (10) Two kinds of NPI-licensing:  
 a. Via p-movement: cannot be across an island, but not subject to intervention.  
 b. Via f-movement: can cross islands, but subject to intervention.

**Question:** Do we really need to invoke a distinction between p-movement and f-movement? In particular, do we need to assume anything more than the ISC?

The basic f-movement cases:

- (11) a. Mary didn't meet a professor who gave Bill any book.  
 (licensing across a Relative Clause island)  
 b. \*Mary didn't meet a professor who gave every student any book.  
 (bad due to intervention by 'every student')  
 c. \*Mary didn't tell everybody that she met a student who gave Bill any book.  
 (bad due to intervention by 'everybody')

Important for the explanation of the ungrammaticality of (11b) is a particular property of Double Object constructions: scope freezing i.e. they only permit surface scope between the IO and the DO.

- (12) a. Mary showed a student every book.  
 ( $\exists > \forall$ , \* $\forall > \exists$ , Scope Freezing)  
 b. Mary showed a book to every student.  
 ( $\exists > \forall$ ,  $\forall > \exists$ , No Scope Freezing)

For the ungrammaticality of (11c), it must be the case that the existential quantifier cannot scope over the negation. This seems correct.

- (13) Mary didn't tell every student the truth.  
 ( $\neg > \forall$ , \* $\forall > \neg$ )

If we assume that the definite determiner *the* contributes universal quantification, which function as an intervener, we can also explain the ungrammaticality of (14).

- (14) \*Mary didn't meet the man that gave Bill any present.

In the absence of an island, p-movement is possible and Guerzoni claims that then intervention effects do not lead to ungrammaticality.

- (15) Mary didn't give every student any book.
- LF1:  $\neg > \forall > \exists$   
(should be blocked by the ISC)  
(compare with: 'Mary didn't every student a book', which has this reading)
  - LF2:  $\neg > \exists > \forall$   
(should be blocked by Scope Freezing in the DOC)
  - LF3:  $\forall > \neg > \exists$   
(Available Reading(?): requires that 'every student' can scope over Negation)

But if (15c) is the LF for (15), p-movement doesn't actually violate the ISC. It's just that p-movement is not sensitive to intervening quantifiers and is able to create a configuration that does not violate the ISC.

### 3.2.1 Embedded Subjects vs. Objects

Guerzoni assumes that p-movement is not possible from the subject position of an embedded finite clause. It is, however, possible from the object of an embedded finite clause.

She derives the following contrast from the above assumption.

- (16)
- The secretary didn't tell me that anybody called.  
(f-movement involved in NPI-licensing)
  - \*The secretary didn't tell everybody that anybody called.  
(the f-movement involved in NPI-licensing is blocked by the intervening *everybody*)
  - The secretary didn't tell everybody that she called any student.  
(p-movement is allowed, so intervention does not lead to ungrammaticality)

What is the LF of (16c)?

### 3.2.2 Existential Constructions

Another instance where p-movement seems to be unavailable is the postcopular position in an existential construction.

- (17)
- John must be meeting some student at the department.  
( $\exists > \text{must}, \text{must} > \exists$ )
  - There must be some student in the department right now.  
(\* $\exists > \text{must}, \text{must} > \exists$ )

We find that long-distance NPI-licensing of NPIs in the postcopular position of an existential construction is subject to Definiteness Effects.

- (18)
- I didn't tell Mary that there was any food in the fridge.  
(f-movement involved in NPI-licensing, p-movement not possible)
  - \*I didn't tell everyone that there was any food in the fridge.  
(the f-movement involved in NPI-licensing is blocked by the intervening *everyone*)
  - I didn't tell everybody that you had any food in the fridge.  
(p-movement is allowed, so intervention does not lead to ungrammaticality)

What is the LF of (18c)?

## 4 Intervention by *because*-clauses

Combination of f-movement and p-movement:

- (19) I didn't do anything because anybody asked me.
- LF1:  $\neg \text{Cause}(\text{anybody asked me}, \text{I did anything})$   
Ruled out because **anything** is not in the immediate scope (IS) of negation.
  - LF2:  $\text{Cause}(\text{anybody asked me}, \neg(\text{I did anything}))$   
Ruled out because **anybody** is not in the scope of negation.
  - LF3:  $\neg \text{anything}, \text{Cause}(\text{anybody asked me}, \text{I did } t_i)$   
**anything** licensed by p-movement, **anybody** licensed by f-movement.  
(=  $\neg \exists x [\text{thing}(x) \wedge \text{Cause}(\exists x [\text{person}(x) \wedge x \text{ asked me}], \text{I did } x)]$ )

Interaction of VP-Ellipsis and NPI-licensing.

- (20)
- I didn't eat anything because you asked me to  $[_{VP} \dots]$ .  
(\* $\neg > \text{because} > \exists, \neg > \exists > \text{because}$ )
  - I ate something because you asked me to  $[_{VP} \dots]$ .  
( $\text{because} > \exists, \exists > \text{because}$ )
  - I ate everything because you asked me to  $[_{VP} \dots]$ .  
( $\text{because} > \forall, \forall > \text{because}$ )

In these cases, the licensing takes place entirely by p-movement.

## References

- Fox, D. (2002) "Antecedent Contained Deletion and The Copy Theory of Movement," *Linguistic Inquiry* 34.
- Guerzoni, E. (to appear) "Intervention Effects on NPIs and Feature Movement: Towards a unified account of intervention," *Natural Language Semantics*.
- Larson, R., and R. May (1990) "Antecedent Contained Deletion or Vacuous Movement," *Linguistic Inquiry* 21, 103–122.
- Linebarger, M. (1987) "Negative Polarity and Grammatical Representation," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 10:3, 325–387.
- Pesetsky, D. (2000) *Phrasal Movement and Its Kin*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Tiedeman, R. (1995) "Some remarks on antecedent contained deletion," in S. Haraguchi and M. Funaki, eds., *Minimalism and linguistic theory*, Hituzi Linguistics Workshop Series 4, Hituzi Syobo, Tokyo, Japan, 67–103.