Boban Arsenijević – ULCL, Leiden University Negative concord in Serbo-Croat APs

b.arsenijevic@let.leidenuniv.nl

Sproat and Shih (1990) and Larson (2000), among others, propose analyses in which Adjective phrases (AP's) are derived as relative clauses. I will present data from Serbo-Croat (S-C) supporting this view.

S-C is a negative concord language. I will borrow the term n-words for the items showing negative concord from Laka (1990), and take the definition for n-words from Giannakidou (in press), that an expression is an n-word iff it can be used in structures containing sentential negation or another n-word yielding a reading equivalent to one of logical negation and if it can provide a negative fragment answer.

As illustrated in (1), n-words which give universally quantified fragment negation can be used in S-C **only** if the finite verb in the clause is negated (a requirement of the negative concord).

| a. | Niko | nikoga | nikad | nigde | *(ne) | zove. | |
|----|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| | NEG.who | NEG.who.ACC | NEG.when | NEG.where | not | invite | |
| | No one invites anyone anywhere ever. | | | | | | |
| b. | A: Ko vidi Jovana? | | B: Niko. | | | | |
| | Who do | es see Jovan? | No one. | | | | |
| | A: Kad Jovan dolazi? | | B: Nikad. | | | | |
| | When do | oes Jovan come? | Never. | | | | |
| | | NEG.who No one invi b. A: Ko vidi Who do A: Kad Jov | NEG.who NEG.who.ACC No one invites anyone anywher b. A: Ko vidi Jovana? Who does see Jovan? | NEG.whoNEG.who.ACCNEG.whenNo one invites anyone anywhere ever.b.A: Ko vidi Jovana?B: Niko.Who does see Jovan?No one.A: Kad Jovan dolazi?B: Nikad. | NEG.who NEG.who.ACC NEG.when NEG.where No one invites anyone anywhere ever. No Neg.where Neg.where b. A: Ko vidi Jovana? B: Niko. Who does see Jovan? No one. A: Kad Jovan dolazi? B: Nikad. | NEG.who NEG.who.ACC NEG.when NEG.where not No one invites anyone anywhere ever. b. A: Ko vidi Jovana? B: Niko. b. A: Ko vidi Jovana? B: Niko. Who does see Jovan? No one. A: Kad Jovan dolazi? B: Nikad. | |

The n-word 'nimalo' *not at all* (lit. not-even-little) is another negative universal quantifier, and modifies mass nouns, (bare) plurals and adjectives.

| (2) | a. | Jovan Jovan | *(ne) not | pokazuje shows | nimalo not-at-all | | milosti. mercy.GEN | | | |
|-----|----|--|--------------|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | Jovan de | oesn't sho | t show any mercy. | | | | | | |
| | b. | Jovan | *(ne) | izgleda | eda nimalo | | naivan / naivno. | | | |
| | | Jovan | not | looks | not-at-all | 1 | naive.MASC / naive.NEUTR | | | |
| | | Jovan doesn't seem to be naive at all. | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | A: Koliko rakije ima Jovan? | | | | B: Nimalo. | | | | |
| | | How much brandy has Jovan? | | | | No (brandy) at all. | | | | |

Interestingly, however, 'nimalo' *can* appear in sentences that have no negated verb, on condition that it modifies an adjective. The same n-word yields ungrammaticality when it modifies a property realized by a mass or plural noun as shown in (3).

Snippets - Issue 10 - March 2005 http://www.ledonline/snippets/

1.

- (3) a. Jovan je dobio nimalo naivno pitanje o rekurziji. Jovan AUX gotten not-at-all naive question about recursion Jovan got the not-naive-at-all question about recursion.
 - b. Nimalo naivno pitanje o rekurziji je sasvim zbunilo Jovana. not-at-all naive question about recursion AUX completely confused Jovan The not-naive-at-all question about recursion totally confused Jovan.

This is expected if AP's are derived as relative clauses (potentially reduced and/or preposed, depending on one's favorite analysis) in which the n-word is in a proper environment with a negated verb. On this view, the facts involving noun modification in (2) are unsurprising: while the sentences with 'nimalo' in AP's in (3) can be rephrased as in (4), no such rephrasing is possible for the examples in (2).

- (4) a. Jovan je dobio pitanje o rekurziji, koje nije nimalo naivno. Jovan AUX gotten question_i about recursion which_i not is not-at-all naive Jovan got the question about recursion, which isn't naive at all.
 - b. Pitanje o rekurziji, koje nije nimalo naivno, question_i about recursion which_i not is not-at-all naive je sasvim zbunilo Jovana.
 AUX completely confused Jovan The question about recursion, which isn't naive at all, totally confused Jovan.

Notice that in participial reduced relatives as well, n-words can appear without the overt presence of negation:

- (5) a. To su bile ničim izazvane sankcije. that AUX been nothing.INST provoked sanctions. Those were fully unprovoked sanctions. (lit. by nothing provoked)
- cf. b. Sankcije *(ni-)su bile ničim izazvane. sanctions NEG-AUX been nothing.INST provoked. The sanctions were not provoked by anything.

References

Giannakidou, A. (in press) "N-words and negative concord", in H. van Riemsdijk et al. eds., *The Linguistics Companion*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Kayne, R. (1994) The Antisymmetry of Syntax, MIT Press, Cambridge MA.

- Laka, I. (1990) *Negation in Syntax: On the Nature of Functional Categories and Projections*, Ph. D. dissertation, MIT.
- Larson, Richard K.(2000) "Temporal modification in nominals", presentation given at the Paris Tense Workshop, Paris, November 16th 2000.
- Sproat, R. and Chilin Shih (1990) "The Cross-Linguistic Distribution of Adjective Ordering Restrictions", in C. Georgopoulos and R. Ishihara eds., *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Language: Essays in Honor of S.-Y. Kuroda*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 565-593.