
One NPI, two forms: Spelling out the Bagel Problem

Iva Kovač

University of Vienna

iva.kovac@univie.ac.at

Croatian has two series of Negative Polarity Items (NPIs), which give rise to the so-called Bagel Problem (Pereltsvaig 2006): *ni*-NPIs (Negative Concord Items, e.g., *nitko* ‘nobody’) appear under *c*-command by local negation; *i*-NPIs (e.g., *itko* ‘anybody’) in other downward entailing (DE) contexts. In some cases, *ni*-NPIs are acceptable (to a degree) if not *c*-commanded by negation: they can be moved out of a negated CP (1) but not a negated infinitive (2). (Scrambling is in principle possible: embedding (2) into a DE context licenses an *i*-NPI in the higher position.)

- (1) {**Nikoga**} Marin tvrdi [_{CP} da Zrinka ni je {**nikoga**} vidjela].
nobody Marin claims that Zrinka NEG-AUX nobody seen
‘Marin claims that Zrinka didn’t see anybody.’
- (2) Marina je {***ništa**} uspjela [_{inf} ne razbiti {**ništa**}].
Marina AUX nothing managed NEG break nothing
‘Marina managed not to break anything.’

C-command by negation alone cannot capture the data: (1) shows that *c*-command is not a (global) representational requirement, as this would rule out the higher *ni*-NPI; (2) shows that it is not a derivational condition (as in Agree), since this would allow the higher *ni*-NPI. I propose an analysis in terms of a PF mismatch: *ni*- and *i*-NPIs are different surface forms of the same underlying NPI that is (semantically) restricted to DE contexts. The form of the NPI is governed by the *Ni*-Condition (3), a PF condition that applies at each spell-out domain (complement of *C*)—the *c*-command requirement is thus confined to spell-out domains. The *i*-NPI is an elsewhere form that arises if no spell-out domain licenses the *ni*- form.

- (3) The NPI is spelled out as *ni*- iff it is *c*-commanded by negation.

The NPI in (1) is *c*-commanded by negation in the embedded CP, yielding *ni*-. The infinitive in (2) is smaller than a CP (Wurmbrand 2001); the only spell-out domain is the matrix one. The lower position of the NPI is *c*-commanded by negation at spell-out, resulting in *ni*-, and the higher one is not, yielding *i*- (in a DE context).

I reach (at least) two general conclusions. First, Agree, if operative in Negative Concord (Zeijlstra 2004), must be fallible (Preminger 2014) and cannot be the sole factor involved. Second, the morphological form of an element and the position in which it is pronounced can be determined at different points in the derivation.

References: • Pereltsvaig, A. (2006). Negative polarity items in Russian and the ‘Bagel problem.’ In *Negation in Slavic*, Bloomington: Slavica, 153–178. • Preminger, O. (2014). *Agreement and its failures*. MIT Press. • Wurmbrand, S. (2001). *Infinitives*. De Gruyter. • Zeijlstra, H. (2004). *Sentential negation and Negative Concord*. PhD diss., UvA.