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1. Introduction
In den Dikken (2002), I present what is to my knowledge the first detailed discussion in the literature of the peculiar properties of a Dutch polarity item (PI), the word heel, a cognate of English whole, illustrated in (1a).

(1) a. ik ken die hele vent *(niet)
   I know that whole bloke not
   ‘I don’t know that bloke at all.’

b. die (*hele) vent kent me niet
   that whole bloke knows me not

I argue there that “polar heel” is dependent for its direct licensing on a sentential negation that does not have scope over it, as becomes evident from a comparison of the triplets in (2) and (3). In this respect, polar heel fits in the same slot in the typology of polarity-sensitive expressions that is also occupied by a particular subspecies of “n-words”—specifically, those that, as Giannakidou (2000) has shown in detail, behave “as polarity sensitive universal quantifiers which need negation in order to be licensed, but must raise above negation in order to yield the scoping \( \forall \neg \)” (Giannakidou 2000, 457).

(2) a. ik wil met die hele vent nie praten
   I want with that whole bloke not talk

b. *ik wil niet met die hele vent praten
   I want not with that whole bloke talk

c. ?ik wil niet praten met die hele vent
   I want not talk with that whole bloke
   ‘I don’t want to talk to that bloke at all.’

(3) a. ik wil met al die mensen niet praten  \( \forall \neg \)
   I want with all those people not talk

b. ik wil niet met al die mensen praten  \( \neg \forall \)
   I want not with all those people talk
Den Dikken (2002) shows furthermore that polar *heel* must not be separated from its licensing negation by a clause boundary and that it cannot be inserted in noun phrases which are prevented from undergoing A’-movement. Arguing that these restrictions follow from an analysis of the direct licensing of polar *heel* that involves A’-movement of the noun phrase containing polar *heel* into Spec, NegP in overt syntax, I provide a straightforward explanation for the fact that polar *heel* cannot be directly licensed in the subject of the negated clause (1b), for the clausal restriction on the direct licensing of polar *heel* (4), and for the ban on embedding polar *heel* in the indirect object (5b).

(4) a. *ik geloof niet dat ik die hele vent ken*  
   I believe not that I that whole bloke know  
   ‘I don’t believe I know that bloke at all.’  
   b. *ik geloof niet dat die hele vent me kent*  
   I believe not that that whole bloke me knows  

(5) a. hij wil die student die (hele) constructie niet uitleggen  
   he wants that student that whole construction not explain  
   ‘He doesn’t want to explain that construction to that student at all.’  
   b. hij wil die (?*hele*) student die constructie niet uitleggen  
   he wants that whole student that construction not explain

The ill-formedness of (1b) is a reflex of the illegitimacy of downgrading movement from Spec, TP into Spec, NegP (with NegP being below TP in Dutch; see Haegeman and Zanuttini 1991 and subsequent work).1 The ungrammaticality of (4) follows from the fact that both conceivable derivations of these sentences fail: fell-swoop movement of polar *heel*’s container across CP into the matrix Spec, NegP violates subjacency, and successive-cyclic movement through the embedded Spec, CP, while in accordance with subjacency, violates Müller and Sternefeld’s (1993) Principle of Unambiguous Binding, constituting an improper-movement effect of sorts.2 And the fact that polar *heel* cannot be embedded in the indirect object (5b) is a consequence of the general ban on A’-movement of indirect objects.3

Interestingly, however, the ungrammaticality of sentences that violate the conditions on direct licensing of polar *heel* can often be lifted if an additional polarity item is included in the structure, with the otherwise offending token of polar *heel* piggybacking on that additional polarity item. Thus, while (5b) is ungrammatical, (5c) is perfectly well formed. The difference between (5b) and (5c) is precisely the fact that (5c) contains an additional token of polar *heel* (underscored in the example) inside the direct object, where, as we know from (5a), polar *heel* is legitimately licensed. Apparently the presence of this additional polar *heel* helps out the otherwise illegitimate polar *heel* in the indirect object. This effect is part and parcel of a more general
phenomenon which, in den Dikken (2002), I dubbed parasitic licensing of polar heel. Some more examples of this are provided in (6), where systematically the result is grammatical only if the additional polarity item (once again underscored) is included in the sentence. Parasitic polar heel can be embedded in an indirect object, as in (5c), or in a subject, as in (6b), and it does not depend on a clausemate negation: in (6a, b), polar heel is separated from the negation in the matrix clause by a CP boundary, but it does not seem to care. In fact, parasitically licensed polar heel does not even depend on a negative morpheme: though conditionals and downward-entailing verbs like betwijfelen ‘doubt’ do not license polar heel directly, (6c, d) are grammatical if they include an additional PI (ooit ‘ever’) that is legitimately licensed in these contexts.

(5) c. hij wil die hele student die hele constructie niet uitleggen
   ‘He doesn’t want to explain that construction to that student at all.’

(6) a. ik geloof niet dat ik die hele vent *(ooit) gezien heb
   I believe not that I that whole bloke ever seen have
b. ik geloof niet dat die hele vent *(ook maar iets) tegen me
   I believe not that that whole bloke also but anything to me
   gezegd heeft
   said has

Parasitic licensing of polar heel is severely restricted, in ways that mimic the restrictions on the more familiar instance of parasitism in syntax, the licensing of parasitic gaps: both obey an anti-c-command condition (the parasite must not be c-commanded by what it aims to piggyback on) and an S-structure licensing condition. 4

The preceding paragraphs summarize the key ingredients of the analysis of direct and parasitic polarity item licensing laid out in den Dikken (2002). In the present chapter, I will take a closer look at the restrictions on parasitic licensing of polar heel. On the basis of an investigation of novel data that show that depth of embedding is an important restrictor of parasitic licensing, I will argue for a distinction between parasitic licensing and secondary triggering (see Horn 1996). In the course of that discussion, I will invoke and support a key ingredient of Postal’s (2000) recent perspective on the syntax of polarity: the idea that negation can originate within the projection of the PI.

2. Two Depth-of-Embedding Restrictions on Parasitism
The analysis of polar heel licensing outlined in den Dikken (2002) predicts that as long as there is some other PI that is licensed and to which polar heel can legitimately link up (in conformity with the anti-c-command condition and the S-structure licensing condition), parasitic licensing should make all restrictions on the licensing of polar
heel disappear. But there are at least two contexts in which parasitic licensing of polar heel is unsuccessful: (i) it is impossible for polar heel to be parasitically licensed by another PI if the two are in a clause that is more than one clause boundary removed from the licensing negation, and (ii) it is also impossible for polar heel and the additional PI themselves to be separated by a clause boundary: that is, polar heel can only piggyback on a clausemate “helper,” even if that helper is further down the tree than heel (so that anti-c-command is ensured) and is itself perfectly legitimate in this deeply embedded position. These are two contexts in which depth of embedding plays a key role in the licensing of polar heel—unexpectedly, on the analysis presented in den Dikken (2002).

2.1 Restriction I: The Licensing Negation Must Not Be More Than One Clause Boundary Away

Let me start by addressing the first problem: the fact that it is impossible for polar heel to piggyback on another PI if the two are in a clause that is more than one clause boundary removed from the licensing negation.

2.1.1 The Facts

That this is the case is shown by a comparison of the examples in (7), (8), and (9). In the monoclausal examples in (7), we find the familiar split between polar heel in the direct object, on the one hand, and polar heel embedded in the indirect object or the subject on the other: while (7a) is perfect, (7b, c) are degraded.

(7) a. ik heb [die (hele) vent]DO nooit gemogen
   ‘I have never liked that bloke at all.’
   [MONOCLAUSAL]
   I have that whole bloke never liked

b. ik zal [die (?*hele) vent]IO die constructie niet uitleggen
   ‘I won’t explain that construction to that bloke at all.’

   I will that whole bloke that construction not explain

   [MONOCLAUSAL]

   c. [die (*hele) vent]SU heeft nooit met me gesproken
   ‘That bloke has never spoken to me at all.’

   [MONOCLAUSAL]
   That whole bloke has never with me spoken

This follows straightforwardly from the fact that in (7), only direct licensing is possible, where direct licensing, on den Dikken’s (2002) analysis, means overt syntactic A’-movement of the container of polar heel to Spec, NegP. The ungrammaticality of (7b) follows from the general ban on A’-movement of indirect objects (recall note 3), and (7c) is bad because movement to Spec, NegP starting from the subject position would involve downgrading movement.

The well-formedness of all three examples in (8) shows, once again, that these restrictions on the licensing of polar heel are lifted in parasitic licensing contexts: in all examples, polar heel can link up to the licensing dependency of the other PI, ooit, which is legitimately licensed by a nonclausemate negation.

(8) ik denk niet dat . . .
   ‘I don’t think that . . .’

   [BICLAUSAL]
When we now look at (9), we see that, in triclausal constructions where both polarity items are two clause boundaries removed from the licensing negation, we get back the single-clause asymmetry between direct objects on the one hand and indirect objects and subjects on the other.\(^5\)

(9) ik denk niet dat ze zullen geloven dat . . .

\[ \text{I think not that they will believe that} \]

\[ \text{‘I don’t think that they will believe that . . .’} \]

The facts in (9) pose two immediate questions:

- Why does parasitic licensing of polar \textit{heel} fail here while it succeeded perfectly well in (8)?
- How does the polar \textit{heel} inside the direct object of the most deeply embedded clause in (9a) still manage to get licensed, while (9b) and (9c) are ungrammatical?

The most deeply embedded clause in (9) gives us precisely the same asymmetry that we see in monoclausal (7)—the most deeply embedded clause in (9) behaves as though it were the only clause in the structure, and, moreover, as though it were negative.

\[ \text{2.1.2 Two Types of Negative Polarity Items: Negative NPIs and Nonnegative NPIs} \]

I would like to argue that the constellation of facts seen in (7) through (9) can be made to follow if we make a distinction between two types of negative polarity items (NPIs), following the essence of Postal’s (2000) work on the syntax of polarity.\(^6\) Postal’s work is motivated by the desire to uphold “[t]he maximum and boldest generalization,” namely, “that negative polarity items are licensed \textit{only} by negations as tradition, the terminology and a few previous researchers including Linebarger (1980, 1987) would have it, but that this is obscured by the invisibility of many negations of relevance” (Postal 2000, 15). He accomplishes this by assuming, contrary to Klima (1964), that “all so-called negative polarity any forms underlyingly occur with Determiner-internal negations.
Any forms occur when the negation in closest combination with the non-negative part of the determiner raises out of it” (p. 17). Specifically, he proposes that any-NPIs come in two varieties, represented as (10a) and (10b). Of the two structures, (10a) is formally negative, downward entailing, and antiadditive; (10b), on the other hand, is nonnegative (the two negations on D cancel each other out in the semantics) and upward entailing.8

(10) a. [DP [D NEG1 [D some]] [NP ... N . . .]]
   b. [DP [D NEG2 [D NEG1 [D some]]] [NP ... N . . .]]

This two-way typology of NPIs is motivated by contrasts of the type seen in (11a’, b’), presented in Postal (2000, 22). NPIs of type (10a) are licensed only in antiadditive contexts, and, in virtue of being formally negative, can trigger negative inversion in embedded contexts; nonnegative, upward-entailing NPIs of type (10b), on the other hand, cannot bring about negative inversion. The fact that not every juror, the licenser of any in (11b, b’), is not antiadditive, unlike no juror in (11a, a’), ensures that in the (b) examples only the nonnegative, upward-entailing NPI can be chosen, which in turn guarantees that negative inversion is unsuccessful.

(11) a. No jurors believed that she had described any detail correctly.
   a’. No jurors believed that any detail had she described correctly.
   b. Not every juror believed that she had described any detail correctly.
   b’. *Not every juror believed that any detail had she described correctly.

In this chapter, I adopt Postal’s insight that some NPIs are formally negative. But I deviate from Postal’s assumptions reflected in (10) in a number of ways, bringing them more in line with a minimalist syntax and allowing them to transparently accommodate the polar heel facts. My most significant departure from Postal (2000) is that I do not assume that any is the suppletive lexicalization of an indefinite D that has lost a negative morpheme (i.e., the Spell Out of the “leftover” of not (not some); instead, I take any, in its negative incarnation, to be a D specified for the abstract feature [NEG]—an uninterpretable formal feature that needs to be checked by a matching [NEG] feature in some DP-external Neg° in the course of the syntactic derivation.9

With (10a) recast in terms of an abstract [NEG] feature, as in (12a), and with the negation originating DP-externally, there is no place in the analysis for a representation of the type in (10b): viewed as abstract, uninterpretable [NEG] features, the two negations in D in Postal’s (10b) would check against each other and delete within DP; as a result, this would be indistinguishable from a representation that has zero negations in D. I therefore analyze nonnegative, upward-entailing NPIs as simple indefinites that depend on a local licenser (a downward-entailing [Ladusaw 1979] or nonveridical [Giannakidou 1998] element; the choice between these two will be immaterial here), with no negation raising out of them, as in (12b). This chapter thus adopts what could be characterized as a blend of the classic Klima (1964) approach to NPIs, appropriately updated and instantiated here by (12b), and Postal’s (2000) alternative analysis represented by (12a).
(12) a. Formally negative PIs, with a [NEG] feature in D launched to a higher [NEG] head
   b. Indefinite PIs, dependent on a clausemate, downward-entailing/nonveridical licenser

The typology in (12) predicts that PIs of the type in (12b) can be embedded no deeper than a CP directly embedded under a negative. For the C-head of a CP immediately embedded below a negative, Laka (1990) and Progovac (1988) have argued that it possesses a [NEG] feature (a licenser in the sense of [12b]) assigned under selection from the matrix negation. They base this claim on the contrast between examples such as (13a) and (13b) (the former ill formed on a polarity reading of anything, though not on a free-choice interpretation, irrelevant here): for Laka and Progovac, the [NEG] feature on the C-head of the clause embedded under doubt (imposed on that C-head by the matrix verb) licenses the any-NPI in (13b). But the C-head of a more deeply embedded CP cannot be assigned a [NEG] feature because it is not itself selected by a negation. Since a CP that is twice removed from a negation does not have its C-head specified for the feature [NEG], it follows that any PI that is successfully licensed within such a CP (as in [13c], or Uribe-Etxebarria’s 1994 Spanish examples of the same type, featuring n-words) must itself be a negative constituent, of type (12a). That is to say, such PIs must themselves possess a [NEG]-specified head and launch that head up the tree (in line with the analysis that Postal gives for [NEG]-specified PIs), into the clause that harbors the negation.

(13) a. *I doubt anything/any claims.
   b. I doubt that anything will happen.
   c. I doubt that he thinks that anything will happen.

2.1.3 The Triclausal Cases With this as background, let me return to the Dutch facts in (8) and (9), on which the typology in (12) affords us an interesting perspective. If we assume that Dutch PIs like ooit ‘ever’ are themselves lexically ambiguous between PIs of types (12a) and (12b), this means that ooit has the option but not the obligation to be marked for the feature [NEG]. Its [NEG]-specified incarnation is perfectly allowed to be embedded two clauses down from the negation that will license its abstract [NEG] feature: the [NEG] feature can make its way up to its licenser (the Neg head in the matrix clause) via successive-cyclic head movement (see below for more details, and also Troseth 2004), thereby circumventing any phase boundaries in between. And given that an ooit that is two clauses removed from the negation must be a negative constituent of type (12a), since local licensing in keeping with (12b) would fail in such a context, it comes to play an instrumental role in helping out polar heel in the most deeply embedded clause of the triclausal examples in (9). The polar heel in the direct object in (9a) will in fact end up being legitimate as a result of direct licensing by a secondary Neg head—whence the label secondary triggering (borrowed from Horn 1996). Let me spell this out in more detail.

The ooit in the most deeply embedded clause in (9) is a negatively specified PI of type (12a). Its abstract, uninterpretable [NEG] feature is in need of checking
against the [NEG] feature borne by the matrix Neg°, but a direct Agree relationship
between the matrix Neg° and the NPI in the embedded clause is unestablishable: at
least two strong phase boundaries (the embedded CP and the matrix vP) are in be-
tween. The bearer of the uninterpretable [NEG] feature of the polarity item (its
D-head) hence has to be launched up the tree, first to the C-head of the embedded
clause. But fell-swoop movement to the embedded C is prohibited: it would violate
the locality conditions on head movement. Movement therefore has to proceed via a
succession of smaller steps. First, the abstract [NEG]-specified head of the PI raises
to the Neg head of the most deeply embedded clause; 11 that Neg head will subse-
quently raise to the C-head of the most deeply embedded CP, and so forth. 12
The thing to note here is that in order to reach the root Neg head, the [NEG] feature of the
PI in the most deeply embedded clause must minimally be able to reach the Neg
head of its own clause. Once it is there, it will enable that secondary Neg head to di-
rectly license polar heel by attracting the container of polar heel to its specifier, as in
the single-clause examples in (7). 13 The relevant part of the structure of the sen-
tences in (9) is shown in (14).

The successful licensing of polar heel in (9a) now falls out as a case of secondary
triggering similar in its essentials to what we find in something like (15) (see Horn
1996; Postal 2000), where in weeks is licensed by the presence of a secondary nega-
tion—the [NEG] feature of (12a)-type anybody.

(15) I’m surprised {*John/✓anybody} has been here in weeks.

With (9a) being a case of secondary direct licensing of polar heel, we expect the
distribution of polar heel in this doubly embedded context to match that of a polar
heel licensed directly by a clausemate negation. And this is precisely what we find:
the sentences in (9b) and (9c) are ill formed, exactly on a par with those in (7b, c).
The deviance of these examples follows from the fact that direct licensing of polar
heel involves pied-piping A⁰-movement into the clausemate Spec, NegP, which is
impossible here. That parasitic licensing fails here as well will become clear after we
have analyzed the examples in (8), to which I now turn.

2.1.4 The Biclausal Cases

The single-embedding paradigm in (8) suspends the asymme-
tries found in (7) and (9) because, in that particular context but not in (7) and (9),
parasitic licensing is successful. That parasitic licensing is available in (8) follows
from the fact that the ooit ‘ever’ in the single-embedding, biclausal examples in
(8) does not have to be a negative constituent but can also be a PI of type (12b)—that
is, a nonnegative indefinite establishing a local dependency relationship with a
clausemate, downward-entailing/nonveridical element (here C Neg°), as shown in
(16). It is this dependency relationship between C Neg° and ooit that polar heel suc-
cessfully parasitizes on in all of the sentences in (8). Since parasitic licensing does
not involve A⁰-movement of the container of polar heel, and since polar heel can
legitimately link up to the dependency between the structurally higher $C_{\text{NEG}}$-head and ooit, we do not expect to find any asymmetries between direct objects on the one hand and indirect objects and subjects on the other—and indeed, no such asymmetries are found in (8).

\[(16)\]
\[
[\text{CP } C_{\text{NEG}} \left[ \text{IP } \text{die (*hele) vent} \ldots [\text{VP} \ldots \text{die (hele) vent}_{\text{DO}}] \ldots [\text{ooit}]_{(12b)} \ldots [\text{]]}]
\]

Parasitic licensing fails in (9). Even though the C-head in (14) above comes to harbor a $\text{[NEG]}$ feature in the course of successive-cyclic raising of $D_{\text{NEG}}$, the fact that this $\text{[NEG]}$ feature entertains a movement dependency with the D-head of ooit ‘ever’, not a licensing dependency of the type referred to in (12b), makes it impossible for polar heel to link up with this dependency and be licensed parasitically as a result. Parasitism is highly sensitive to the kind of dependency that the parasite is to piggyback on. From the domain of parasitic gaps, we are familiar with the fact that these link up with A’-movement dependencies, not A’-binding dependencies (cf. the contrast in this article, I filed it/*it, without reading pg). But parasitic polar heel is not a gap and does not move; as a consequence, it cannot parasitize on a movement dependency but instead requires, for its parasitic licensing to be successful, that there be a local head (Neg or C) with its own $\text{[NEG]}$ feature engaging in a licensing dependency with a (12b)-type PI in its c-command domain. Since there is no such head in (14), parasitic licensing of polar heel is not possible there.

To summarize the discussion of (7) through (9), what we have seen is that parasitic licensing of polar heel succeeds only in contexts in which the C-head of the clause containing polar heel and the additional PI that it seeks to piggyback on is specified for the feature $\text{[NEG]}$, thanks to being the head of the CP complement immediately embedded under a negated clause. In other contexts, polar heel can only survive if it can be licensed directly, via movement of its container to Spec, NegP. Such direct licensing itself comes in two types: primary direct licensing by the Neg head of a clause that is itself negated by a physical negation and secondary direct licensing by a Neg head (or $\Sigma$-head; see note 11) that has the $\text{[NEG]}$-specified head of a (12a)-type NPI raise through it and thus receives an abstract $\text{[NEG]}$ feature.

2.1.5 Licensing Polar Heel under Negative Verbs Before moving on to the second depth-of-embedding restriction on parasitic licensing of polar heel, let me briefly examine two further issues that come up under the rubric of secondary triggering versus parasitic licensing. Recall first of all that the fact that in (8) parasitic licensing is successful is thanks to the presence of a $\text{[NEG]}$ feature on the C-head of the clause embedded under the matrix negation. Recall also that Laka (1990) and Progovac (1988) motivated this $C_{\text{NEG}}$ on the basis of the distribution of PIs in the complement of verbs such as doubt, as shown in (13). A natural question to ask at this point, therefore, is what happens with polar heel in the complement of such verbs. What we predict is that it should not be licensed via primary direct licensing (since there is no NegP in the complement CP) and that it should be able to be licensed parasitically in the CP immediately embedded under the doubt-type verb but not in a CP embedded within doubt’s own
complement. We have already seen that the former prediction is correct: (6d) is ungrammatical without ooit. The fact that it becomes perfect with ooit inserted tells us that parasitic licensing does indeed work here. The examples in (17a, b) reproduce this effect. To probe what happens under further embedding, we need to compare biclausal (17b) and triclausal (17c). The contrast between these sentences confirms that parasitic licensing of polar heel under verbs like doubt is indeed restricted in the expected way.

(17) a. ik betwijfel of ik die (*hele) vent ken
   ‘I doubt that I know that bloke at all.’

b. ik betwijfel of die (hele) vent ook maar iemand zal groeten
   ‘I doubt that that bloke will greet anyone at all.’

c. ik betwijfel of ze zullen geloven dat die (*hele) vent ook maar
   ‘I doubt that they will believe that that bloke will greet anyone at all.’

d. ik betwijfel of ze zullen geloven dat ik die (hele) vent ooit
gemogen heb
   ‘I doubt that they will believe that I have ever liked that bloke at all.’

In (17b, c), I chose subjects as containers of polar heel to make sure that only parasitic licensing could ever help heel out. These examples, therefore, do not allow us to check whether secondary direct licensing could succeed two clauses down. To verify this, I added (17d), which predictably fails as an instance of parasitic licensing (because the local C-head in the most deeply embedded CP is not [NEG] specified) but which, in view of the fact that it is acceptable with polar heel included, does converge as an instance of secondary triggering: (12a)-type ooit ‘ever’ launches its [NEG] feature up to its ultimate licenser, via successive-cyclic movement, stopping by at the Neg head (or Σ-head) of its own clause, which can then take care of direct licensing of polar heel.14

2.1.6 Licensing Polar Heel in Conditional Clauses Finally, let us ask what happens in nonnegative environments such as conditional clauses. In (6c), we saw that parasitic licensing of polar heel is successful in a conditional. But it should break down once an additional clause is inserted between als ‘if’ and polar heel’s container. And indeed, it does: while (18a, b) are both fine with heel included, we find a contrast between (19a) and (19b), the latter being ungrammatical due to the fact that parasitic licensing fails in the context at hand because (12b)-type ooit cannot establish a local dependency with a clausemate, downward-entailing/nonveridical element in this context.
(18) (see [6c])

\[ \begin{align*} 
\text{a. als je die (hele) vent } & \text{ooit zou bezoeken, kijk ik je nooit meer aan} \\
& \quad \text{if you that whole bloke ever would visit} \\
& \quad \text{look I you never more} \\
& \quad \text{PR} \\
& \quad \text{‘If you ever were to visit that bloke at all, I would never look you in the eye again.’} \\
\text{b. als die (hele) vent } & \text{me ooit zou bezoeken, zou ik hem direct} \\
& \quad \text{if that whole bloke me ever would visit} \\
& \quad \text{would I him directly} \\
& \quad \text{deur uitgooien} \\
& \quad \text{the door out-throw} \\
& \quad \text{‘If that bloke were to ever visit me at all, I would throw him out the door immediately.’} 
\end{align*} \]

(19) a. als je denkt dat ik die (hele) vent ooit zou bezoeken, heb je het mis \\
\quad \text{if} \\
\quad \text{you think} \\
\quad \text{that I} \\
\quad \text{that whole bloke ever would visit} \\
\quad \text{have} \\
\quad \text{you it} \\
\quad \text{wrong} \\
\quad \text{‘If you think that I would ever visit that bloke at all, you’re wrong.’} \\

b. als je denkt dat die (*hele) vent me ooit zou bezoeken, heb je het mis \\
\quad \text{if} \\
\quad \text{you think} \\
\quad \text{that that whole bloke me ever would visit} \\
\quad \text{have} \\
\quad \text{you it} \\
\quad \text{wrong} \\
\quad \text{‘If you think that that bloke would ever visit me at all, you’re wrong.’} \\

Example (19a) is acceptable because direct-object contained polar *heel* can be licensed via secondary triggering here: the [NEG] feature launched successively cyclically from (12a)-type *ooit* enables polar *heel* to be licensed directly by a secondary NegP in its own clause.\(^{15}\) The analysis thus makes the right predictions in the context of negative matrix verbs and conditional clauses as well.

2.2 Restriction II: The Parasite and Its Helper Must Be Clausemates

The division of labor between primary direct licensing, secondary direct licensing, and parasitic licensing gives polarity items like polar *heel* an abundance of opportunities to survive in all sorts of syntactic contexts. But it is plain that there are plenty of contexts in which polar *heel* can be licensed neither through secondary triggering nor through parasitic licensing. We have already come across several such contexts. In this subsection, I would like to address another context, illustrated by the example in (20), first noted in Hoeksema (2003).\(^{16}\)

(20) ik denk niet dat die hele vent (*geloofde dat ze) hem ooit \\
\quad \text{I} \\
\quad \text{think not} \\
\quad \text{that that whole bloke} \\
\quad \text{believed that she him ever} \\
\quad \text{gemogen heeft} \\
\quad \text{liked} \\
\quad \text{has} \\
\quad \text{‘I don’t think that that bloke (believed that she) ever liked him at all.’}
Hoeksema’s example shows that in order for parasitic licensing of polar heel to be successful, the additional PI that polar heel is to piggyback on must be a clausemate of polar heel: (20) is well formed if the doubly underscored middle clause is absent, which tells us that it is apparently impossible for polar heel and the additional PI ooit ‘ever’ to be constituents of different clauses. The ungrammaticality of the triclausal version of (20) follows from the fact that polar heel in this example can be licensed neither through secondary triggering nor through parasitic licensing, as I will now show.

It should be immediately clear that, regardless of whether the doubly underscored portion is included or not, direct licensing of subject-contained polar heel in (20) will always fail. All direct licensing, whether primary or secondary, involves pied-piping movement of the container of polar heel into Spec, NegP, and such movement would of necessity be downgrading movement if launched from the clausemate Spec, TP. So there is no hope of direct licensing of polar heel in (20), no matter whether polar heel and ooit are clausemates or not. But now notice that the question of whether polar heel and its helper ooit are clausemates or not does become highly relevant when it comes to the alternative licensing strategy for polar heel: parasitic licensing. In successful cases of parasitic licensing, polar heel piggybacks on the licensing of another PI—an ooit of type (12b) in the case at hand. Now, ooit in (20) can only be legitimately of type (12b) in the biclausal version of the sentence, where it can locally depend on a [NEG]-specified C-head. In the triclausal variant, the lowest CP is not [NEG] specified since it neither contains an overt negation nor serves as a complement clause immediately embedded below a negation. As a result, (12b)-type ooit is not licensable in (20) if the doubly underscored part is included, and with (12b)-type ooit ruled out in triclausal (20), it follows (since secondary direct licensing had already been eliminated independently) that there is no chance of survival for polar heel in the version of (20) that has the doubly underscored part included.

3. The S-Structure Condition on Parasitism Revisited
Finally, I would like to return to something I noted in passing in the introduction (recall the text below [6]): the fact that parasitic licensing of polar heel has to be established at S-structure. This was demonstrated and discussed in den Dikken (2002) on the basis of the examples in (21).

(21) a. [dat ze die (*hele) vent ook maar een cent meer salaris zouden that they that whole bloke also but a cent more salary would geven] was tijdens de vergadering niet besproken give was during the meeting not discussed
‘That they would give that bloke a penny more in salary at all wasn’t discussed in the meeting.’

b. [een dokter die die (*hele) vent ook maar enigszins kon helpen] a doctor who that whole bloke also but in any way could help was niet te vinden was not to find
‘A doctor who could help that bloke in any way at all was nowhere to be found.’
In these sentences, licensing of the underlined *ook maar* NPIs inside the bracketed constituents is successful, under reconstruction at LF (à la Uribe-Etxebarria 1994; see also Linebarger 1980). But LF licensing of the *ook maar* NPIs apparently does not help out polar *heel* in these examples: it comes too late, parasitism being an S-structure affair (see the familiar ungrammaticality of [22b]).

(22) a. *which article* did you *file* *t* without reading *pg*?
    b. *who filed* *which article* without reading *pg*?

### 3.1 Raising to Subject Versus Topicalization and the Role of $C_{\text{NEG}}$

With this as background (and see den Dikken 2002 for more detailed discussion), consider the fact that the sentences in (23b, c) are perfectly grammatical and contrast markedly with the ungrammatical variant of (21a) with *heel* included. The example in (23c) is particularly instructive: the fact that polar *heel* here is subject contained tells us unequivocally that we are dealing with parasitic licensing, not secondary triggering.

(23) a. [dat we die (*heel*) *vent* toen hebben uitgenodigd] kan ik nu that we that whole bloke then have invited can I now niet meer begrijpen not more understand
    ‘That we invited that bloke at all back then, I can no longer understand.’

b. [dat we die (*heel*) *vent* ooit hebben uitgenodigd] kan ik nu niet that we that whole bloke ever have invited can I now not meer begrijpen more understand
    ‘That we ever invited that bloke at all, I can no longer understand.’

c. [dat die (*heel*) *vent* ons ooit heeft uitgenodigd] kan ik nu niet that that whole bloke us ever has invited can I now not meer begrijpen more understand
    ‘That that bloke ever invited us at all, I can no longer understand.’

The key difference between (21a) on the one hand and (23b, c) on the other seems to be that (23b, c) are cases of topicalization while (21a) has the bracketed clause function as a subject. But while subject versus topic is indeed an important distinction, it cannot be the whole story, for (21b) cannot be similarly “rescued”: (24a) through (24c) are bad if *heel* is included.

(24) a. [dokters die die (*heel*) *vent* ook maar enigszins kunnen helpen] doctors who that whole bloke also but in.any.way can help vind je nergens find you nowhere
    ‘Doctors who can help that bloke in any way, you can’t find anywhere.’
Regardless of whether *die hele vent* ‘that bloke’ is the direct object, as in (24a), the indirect object (24b), or the subject (24c) within the relative clause, the output of topicalization of the relativized noun phrase crashes.\(^{19}\) The facts in (23) and (24) and their relationship with (21) raise important questions that need to be addressed. If (21a, b) are bad because licensing of the *ook maar* NPIs under reconstruction comes too late to rescue polar *heel*, then how can (23b, c) be grammatical while (24a) through (24c) continue to crash?

Let me start with the contrast between (21a) and (23b, c). These examples involve a CP embedded in a negative clause. For such CPs, the foregoing discussion had adopted (from Progovac 1988 and Laka 1990) the idea that its C-head is equipped with a [NEG] feature that can license clausemate NPIs of type (12b) under c-command. Let us assume, plausibly, that the [NEG] feature of a C-head embedded under a matrix negation is uninterpretable and needs to be checked against a matching [NEG] feature of Neg\(^{°}\), and let us further assume that in order for a dependency between a [NEG]-specified head and a (12b)-type PI to be able to parasitically license polar *heel*, that dependency itself must have been fully established, with all uninterpretable features erased. For a CP that serves as the complement of a transitive verb, which is separated from Neg by a vP phase boundary, this means that CP must minimally raise to a position on the edge of the vP phase within which it is embedded to allow parasitic licensing of polar *heel* to happen. Such licensing must, moreover, happen in overt syntax, since parasitic licensing in general never happens covertly.

Now, in (23) we are dealing with topicalization. As an instance of A/ A'-movement, this should be allowed to proceed via intermediate A'-positions, including an adjunction position to vP. With CP adjoined to vP, an Agree relationship between Neg\(^{°}\) and the [NEG] feature of the C-head is established, as a result of which C’s [NEG] feature is checked against the matching [NEG] feature in the matrix Neg\(^{°}\), and the dependency between (12b)-type *ooit* and the interpretable [NEG] feature of the matrix clause is fully established. On this dependency, polar *heel* then parasitizes in (23b, c). Notice, crucially, that the parasitic licensing of polar *heel* in this example is thus effectuated already at S-structure, thanks to overt raising of the CP to a vP adjoined position on its way up to the topic position.\(^{20}\)
In the example in (21a), a [NEG] feature on the C-head of the left-peripheral CP cannot be overtly checked, however. In line with Koster’s (1978) argument to the effect that subject sentences do not exist, I will take the “subject CP” in (21a) to be base generated in a position in the left periphery, linked to a pronoun (optionally spelled out in Dutch as a so-called d-word, as shown in [25]) originating in the θ-position and making its way up to Spec, TP. Since the CP’s overt syntactic position, high up in the left periphery, is not one from which an Agree relationship can be established with Neg, it follows that this CP’s head cannot be equipped with an uninterpretable [NEG] feature: if it had possessed such a feature, the failure of getting it checked would have resulted in a Full Interpretation violation. No NPIs of any kind can be licensed inside the physical CP in (21a), therefore. That (12b)-type NPIs nonetheless do survive in this context is due to the fact that the base copy of the (null) d-word to which the physical CP is associated gets replaced at LF by a full (though silent) copy of its associate CP. Unlike the physical CP in the left periphery, this VP-internal copy can be equipped with a [NEG] specification: this feature can be checked at LF as a result of feature movement to Neg. At LF, therefore, the [NEG] feature of the C-head of the silent VP-internal copy of the “subject CP” can license a (12b)-type PI, as desired: (21a) and (25) are grammatical so long as polar heel is not included. That polar heel cannot be included in these examples follows from the fact that the licensing of the (12b)-type NPIs in examples of the type in (21a) and (25) cannot be established prior to LF and as a result cannot facilitate parasitic licensing of polar heel, which (like all parasitism) has to be accomplished in overt syntax.

That the examples in (21b) and (24) are all ungrammatical with polar heel included can now be understood as well. Parasitic licensing in these examples is dependent on the establishment of a licensing relationship between a (12b)-type NPI and a local [NEG] feature. The [NEG] feature local to the ook maar NPIs inside the relative clauses in (21b) and (24) would have to be hosted by the C-head of the relative clause. Suppose, therefore, that this C° has a [NEG] specification—how would that uninterpretable [NEG] feature be checked? The fact that it is separated from the Neg head of the matrix clause by a DP node, combined with the fact that DP is arguably a phase, tells us that C’s [NEG] feature could only be checked if this feature first made its way up to the head of the relativized DP. In other words, the licensing of (12b)-type NPIs within a relativized noun phrase is dependent on LF feature movement. That is fine as far as these NPIs themselves are concerned, but of course it wreaks havoc for their chances of facilitating the parasitic licensing of polar heel in the examples in (21b) and (24): since they themselves are not licensed until LF, they cannot help polar heel out because parasitism must be established by spell out.

(25) [dat ze die (*hele) vent ook maar een cent meer salaris zouden geven], dat was tijdens de vergadering niet besproken

‘That they would give that bloke a penny more in salary at all wasn’t discussed in the meeting.’
Notice that the account of (21b) and (24) outlined in the previous paragraph predicts that even with the relativized noun phrase in object position, it should be impossible to get polar heel licensed parasitically by a (12b)-type NPI that depends for its licensing on the C\_\text{NEG} of the relative clause. This is correct: (26a) is ungrammatical with heel included.

(26) a. ik kon nergens [een dokter [die die (*hele) vent ook maar
   I could nowhere a doctor who that whole bloke also but
   enigszins kon helpen]] vinden
   in.any.way could help find

b. ik kon nergens een dokter vinden [die die (hele) vent ook maar
   I could nowhere a doctor find who that whole bloke also but
   enigszins kon helpen]
   in.any.way could help
   ‘Nowhere could I find a doctor who could help that bloke in any way
   at all.’

Interestingly, however, (26b) is well formed with polar heel. And this, too, is as predicted. What has happened here is that the relative clause has been extrapoosed from its containing noun phrase, which, basically regardless of one’s assumptions concerning the details of relative clause extraposition, means that CP is not dominated by a DP or vP phase boundary in this example.\textsuperscript{24} That, in turn, means that an uninterpretable [\text{NEG}] feature on the C-head of the relative clause, licensing the (12b)-type NPI ook maar enigszins, can in fact be checked in overt syntax under an Agree relationship with Neg\textsuperscript{o}. And with the licensing of ook maar enigszins fully established in overt syntax, parasitic licensing of polar heel is successful in (26b), as desired.

3.2 Negatively Polar Hoeven, Verb Second, and S-Structure Parasitism

In the context of the S-structure licensing condition on parasitism, the behavior of the negatively polar verb hoeven ‘need’ (see van der Wouden 2001 and references cited there) is also of great interest. This verb, similar to English auxiliary need in key respects, is dependent on a negation (or a nonveridical context; note, though, that hoeven is legitimate only in a subset of nonveridical contexts and is more restrictive than English auxiliary need, as van der Wouden notes explicitly). The licensing negation can but does not have to be a clausemate of hoeven: in Neg-raising contexts such as (27a), niet ‘not’ can be placed either in the matrix or in the embedded clause. And surprisingly, the negation does not have to c-command hoeven at S-structure: in (27b, c), hoef(t) has raised to the highest functional head in the clause (to which I will refer as the C-head), producing a Verb-Second construction; despite the fact that hoeft has raised past both the negation niet and the abstract functional head Neg\textsuperscript{°}, (27b, c) come out perfectly grammatical.

(27) a. ik denk <niet> dat je dat <niet> hoeft te doen
   I think not that you that not need to do
   ‘I don’t think you need to do that.’
b. je hoeft dat niet te doen
   you need that not to do
   ‘You needn’t do that.’

c. dat hoef je niet te doen
   that need you not to do
   ‘That you needn’t do.’

One could conceivably argue that in Verb-Second constructions of the type in (27b, c), *hoeven* is licensed under reconstruction, at LF. But the facts of parasitic licensing of polar *heel* in sentences featuring negatively polar *hoeven* show that the dependency between *hoeven* in C and the negation further down is in fact syntactically real already at S-structure, despite its apparent “backwardness” at that point. The key fact here is that the examples in (28) are grammatical. These involve polar *heel* embedded in the indirect object and the subject, respectively—positions in which, for reasons laid out in den Dikken (2002) and briefly recapitulated above, direct licensing of polar *heel* is systematically impossible. That polar *heel* is not being licensed directly in these examples is evident also from the fact that its legitimacy is dependent on the presence of negatively polar *hoeven* ‘need.’ It thus appears that it is *hoeven* that helps out polar *heel* in these examples, the latter somehow parasitizing on the former’s dependency on the sentential negation.

(28) a. je hoeft die (hele) vent die constructie niet uit te leggen
   you need that whole bloke that construction not PRT to explain
   ‘You needn’t explain that bloke that construction at all.’

b. die constructie hoeft die (hele) vent me niet uit te leggen
   that construction need that whole bloke me not PRT to explain
   ‘That construction, that bloke needn’t explain to me at all.’

But that dependency seems to be backwards at S-structure, with the dependent higher up than the negation. It does not have to be backwards: in the Neg-raising examples in (29), the matrix negation c-commands *hoeft* perfectly straightforwardly, and parasitic licensing of polar *heel* is as expected. But interestingly, if the negation is a clausemate of *hoeven* and the negatively polar verb does not raise to C, as in (30), polar *heel* fails to be licensed parasitically: polar *heel* cannot parasitize on the licensing relationship between *niet* and the in situ verb *hoeven*.

(29) a. ik denk niet dat je die (hele) vent die constructie hoeft uit
    I think not that you that whole bloke that construction need PRT
    te leggen
    to explain

b. ik denk niet dat die (hele) vent me die constructie hoeft uit
    I think not that that whole bloke me that construction need PRT
    te leggen
    to explain
The grammaticality of (29) and the ill-formedness of (30) with heel included are both straightforward from the point of view of the analysis of parasitic licensing of polar heel outlined in den Dikken (2002) and summarized above. In (29), the licensing relationship between niet in the matrix clause and hoeven in the embedded clause is such that polar heel can legitimately “latch on” to it in keeping with connectedness—(31a) attempts to bring this out graphically, with the larger box indicating the structure covered by the licensing relationship between niet and hoeven and the smaller box identifying the parasite: the latter is contained in the former, and parasitism is successful. In (30), on the other hand, the two boxes do not connect, as (31b) tries to show.

(31) a. niet ... [CP ... die hele vent ... hoeft ... ]
   b. [CP ... die hele vent ... niet hoeft ... ]

When we now look back at (28) and graphically represent these examples as in (32), we see that it is in a real sense analogous to (31a), with the polar heel box once again fully contained in the box indicating the licensing dependency between hoeven and the negation. The fact that (28) patterns with (29) is thus unsurprising in that respect: these facts fit in perfectly with the connectedness account of parasitic licensing espoused in den Dikken (2002).

(32) [CP XP hoefti ... die hele vent ... niet i ... ]

What is surprising, however, is that the dependency marked by the large box in (32) is the reverse, both linearly and hierarchically, of the corresponding dependency in (31a). Polar heel really does not care whether the dependent, hoeven, is structurally lower or higher than the negation that licenses it: all that it cares about is that there be an S-structure dependency relationship involving polarity item licensing that it can structurally connect to.

For our purposes in this chapter, this conclusion is sufficient. It lends support to the connectedness approach to parasitism, and it shows that despite the fact that there is no S-structure c-command between hoeven and its licensing negation in Verb-Second constructions of the type in (28), the dependency between the two has already been established prior to verb fronting and is extended, as a result of V-to-C raising, all the way up to the CP.26 On this extended dependency, polar heel manages to parasitize in (28) at S-structure, as desired.
Much more could be said about hoeven ‘need,’ its role in the parasitic licensing of polar heel, and the structures sketched in (31) and (32). But for the purposes of this chapter, the remarks in the previous paragraphs will suffice. I will leave questions raised by these remarks for some future occasion.

4. Theoretical Results
Let me conclude by listing the main theoretical results of the foregoing discussion. I have argued that parasitic licensing and secondary triggering are independent and fundamentally different phenomena: the former is of the same type as the parasitic licensing of gaps, a finding which shows that parasitism in syntax is not confined to parasitic gap phenomena; the latter involves direct licensing by a secondary negation, which remains abstract. Confirming one of Postal’s (2000) central claims, the analysis of parasitic licensing and secondary triggering of polar heel outlined here has made a distinction within the class of PIs between formally negative (12a)-type PIs, dependent on a local Neg° (which itself may raise out of the clause, thus creating apparent long-distance dependencies), and (12b)-type PIs, dependent on a clausemate C[NEG] (and thus supporting the Laka/Progovac approach to polarity item licensing in CPs immediately embedded under negation). Both (12a)-type and (12b)-type PIs are licensed locally on my account. Thus, if the analysis of primary and secondary direct licensing and parasitic licensing of PIs presented in this paper stands up to scrutiny, it leads to the general (and desirable) conclusion that all PI licensing is syntactically local.
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NOTES
1. For those assuming an AgrSP/TP split (contra Chomsky 1995, ch. 4 et passim), NegP (the higher NegP of Haegeman 2002; van Craenenbroeck 2004) is between AgrS and TP, again below the licensing position of the subject. The problem posed by (1b) cannot be avoided by launching the subject to Spec, NegP from its vP/VP-internal base position. Though that would not be an instance of downgrading movement, it would ultimately lead to improper movement: after landing in Spec, NegP, the subject would still need to raise on to Spec, TP to satisfy the EPP (which I assume is in effect in Dutch; this is particularly evident if subject-initial root clauses in Dutch are TPs, as argued forcefully in Zwart 1997); but movement from an A-position to a higher A-position via a touchdown in an intermediate A’-position is illicit.

2. To be specific, raising the container of polar heel to a position in the C-domain (the embedded Spec, CP) will henceforth destine this phrase uniquely for positions in the C-domain; movement from a position in the C-domain into a position that is not in the C-domain is improper, regardless of whether the latter position is an A- or A’-position.

3. See Baker’s (1988) Non-Oblique Trace Filter for the ban on A’-movement of the indirect object; see also den Dikken (1995, ch. 4). While literal A’-extraction of the indirect object under overt-syntactic category movement is ungrammatical, construal of an indirect object in a surface A’-position with a pro in the corresponding 0-position (à la Cinque 1990) is possible. It is via this strategy, irrelevant
here, that apparent counterevidence to the ban on A’-extraction of indirect objects (such as Dutch
wie heb je dat boek gegeven? ‘who have you that book given’) can be accommodated. See den
Dikken (2002, sec. 1.6).

4. I refer the reader to den Dikken (2002) for detailed illustration and discussion of these two
constraints on parasitic licensing. On the requirement that parasitic licensing of polar heel be established
at S-structure, see also section 3 below.

5. I should note that in (9), even the (a) example, featuring direct-object contained polar heel, is
less than perfect, whence the question mark on hele in (9a). There seems to be a general negative effect
of distance on the felicity of polar heel, which may be rooted in extrasyntactic restrictions on the
 parser. For some speakers this distance effect is so strong that none of the examples in (9) sound ac-
ceptable to them. I will be concentrating the discussion on those speakers for whom (9a) is relatively
acceptable, but who still reject (9b, c) for reasons discussed in the text.


7. A functor is antiadditive iff \( f(X \lor Y) \rightarrow f(X) \land f(Y) \).

8. It is important to realize that the semantic nonnegativity/upward-entailingness of NPIs of type (10b)
themselves leaves unaffected the well-known fact that their licensing is dependent on a nega-
tive/downward-entailing context. Just as in (10a), in (10b) the NEG-D raises out of the DP on Postal’s
analysis, and is realized DP-externally as the negation on which, on the standard dependency-based
approach to NPI licensing, the NPI depends.

9. Paul Postal (pers. comm.) asks how the language learner/user can recognize the abstract [NEG] fea-
ture of negative, downward-entailing NPIs. Since [NEG] is not morphophonologically instantiated,
the only way the language user can diagnose it is on the basis of the syntactic behavior of the NPI in
question—in particular, by its licensing environments. I will illustrate this for Dutch in the remain-
der of this chapter. While I realize that the learnability questions raised by my variant of the “two
anys” story are potentially more serious than those raised by Postal’s (2000), it should be said that
very similar questions arise for Szabolcsi’s (2004) extension of Postal’s analysis to positive PIs,
where there are multiple ways in which some can be represented: the two ways listed in Szabolcsi
(2004, 441), which both involve the structure in (10b), plus a simple indefinite structure in which
some is in D all by itself.

10. Horn (1996) points out that the discovery of secondary triggering dates back at least to unpublished
work by himself, John Lawler, and Paul Neubauer from the early 1970s.

11. If one should have reservations about the inclusion of a NegP in the structure of the most deeply em-
bedded clause in (9), one should feel free to read NegP here as Laka’s (1990) ΣP; the net result will be
identical: a Σ-head that receives a [NEG] feature will become syntactically equivalent to a Neg head.

12. The details of the derivation do not particularly concern me here, though they are not necessarily
trivial. I will assume that successive-cyclic head movement of the type circumscribed in the text is
legal, as it clearly must be if Postal’s (2000) analysis is on the right track. It may well be significant
that the matrix verbs in the Dutch examples are Neg-raising verbs; an analysis of Neg-raising along
the lines of the text discussion would be straightforward. Whether the [NEG]-specified head of a
(12a)-type NPI ultimately raises all the way up to the Neg head that checks its uninterpretable [NEG]
feature or stops in the head of the first phase below that Neg head (which will be sufficient when it
comes to establishment of an Agree relationship) is a question I cannot settle on the basis of the em-
pirical evidence available at this time; I will leave the matter open for now.

13. The fact that the [NEG] feature of the (12a)-type NPI is itself uninterpretable does not mean that it
cannot be multiply checked; on the lifespan of uninterpretable features marked for deletion, see in
particular Pesetsky and Torrego (2001).

14. The ultimate licenser of this [NEG] feature is either the C[NEG] of the clause embedded under
betwijfelen ‘doubt’ or, if negative verbs project a NegP in their own clause (see den Dikken 2002,
43–45), an (abstract) Neg head in the root clause.

15. The licenser of (12a)-type ooit’s [NEG] feature in the conditional matrix clause is the conditional
complementizer als ‘if’ itself, which is apparently endowed with a [NEG] feature of its own. I have no
insights to offer with respect to the question of why Dutch als apparently does, but English
conditional if evidently does not, possess a [NEG] feature. The latter can be deduced from Paul
Postal’s (pers. comm.) observation that when it comes to the behavior of polar heel and the ways in which it can be licensed, there are echoes in the domain of English taboo NPIs such as squat (see Postal 2000 for detailed discussion), but only to a certain extent. Thus, squat is like polar heel in being unable to appear as a finite subject or indirect object (ia, b) (these are ungrammatical on an NPI reading for squat), and it can also be licensed via secondary triggering, once again like polar heel (ic). But unlike polar heel, parasitic licensing in, for instance, a conditional if-clause fails completely: (id) is impossible, unlike (18).

(i) a. *I don’t think that squat happened at the meeting.
   b. *He never gives squat his undivided attention.
   c. I did not testify that he *(ever) said squat.
   d. *If you (ever) learn squat, I will never make fun of you anymore.

This is interesting in light of Postal’s (2000) conclusion that NPI squat is always of his type (10a), never of type (10b). This conclusion is based on the fact that in contexts in which any NPIs of type (10b) are impossible, and hence exceptions are blocked, NPI squat is impossible as well; see (ii). Updated from the point of view of (12), this means that NPI squat always has an uninterpretable [NEG] feature that must be checked against a matching [NEG] feature higher up in the structure. This is arguably responsible for the failure of (id): if lacks a [NEG] feature, it does manage to license (12b)-type NPIs (ever in [id]) thanks to being downward entailing/nonveridical, but it cannot license squat directly, nor can the dependency relationship between if and ever be piggybacked on by squat in the hopes of getting its [NEG] feature checked; as a result, (id) crashes as a Full Interpretation violation.

(ii) a. She never said anything (but nonsense)/squat.
   b. Nobody said anything (but nonsense)/squat at the meeting.
   c. Not every professor said anything (*but nonsense)/squat at the meeting.
   d. It is evil to say anything (*but nonsense)/squat about this during a cabinet meeting.
   e. Did she say anything (*but nonsense)/squat to?
   f. Who did she say anything (*but nonsense)/squat to?
   g. Who would say anything (*but nonsense)/squat to him?

16. Hoeksema in fact notes solely that triclausal (20) is ungrammatical. He does not explicitly contrast it with its biclausal counterpart, which is well formed as a garden variety case of parasitic licensing: polar heel in that case can piggyback effortlessly on the dependency relationship between ooit and the [NEG]-specified C-head of the clause embedded under the matrix negation.

17. Unfortunately, there does not appear to be a way of embedding a polar heel in the middle clause of a triclausal construction inside a container that could, on independent grounds, legitimately move into Spec, NegP, thereby effecting direct licensing of polar heel: in the middle clause, the only two positions available for polar heel’s container would be the subject and indirect object positions, and we know independently (recall section 1 above) that direct licensing of polar heel contained in subjects and indirect objects fails. The fact, then, that (i) below is ungrammatical is entirely on a par with the fact that (ii) is as well. Therefore, there does not seem to be a way of testing whether secondary direct licensing could ever take place in the middle clause of a triclausal construction facilitated by the presence of a (12a)-type PI in the most deeply embedded clause. [Of course, (i) contrasts minimally with (iii), which is perfectly well formed thanks to the fact that parasitic licensing of polar heel by the dependency relationship between the C[NEG] of the middle clause and the clausemate ooit of type (12b) is successful here, as it is in biclausal (20).]

(i) *ik denk niet [dat ik die hele vent verteld heb [dat ik hem ooit gemogen heb]]
   I think not that I that whole bloke told have that I him ever liked have
(ii) *ik heb die hele vent niet verteld dat ik hem verafgeschuw
   I have that whole bloke not told that I him despire
(iii) ik denk niet [dat ik die hele vent ooit verteld heb [dat ik hem verafgeschuw]]
   I think not that I that whole bloke ever told have that I him despire

18. A variant of (23b) was originally pointed out to me by Jack Hoeksema (pers. comm.), who started me thinking about the difference between subject sentences and topicalized clauses.
19. At the end of this subsection, I will turn to the question of what happens to (24) if one forgoes topicalization of the relativized noun phrase.

20. In an earlier version of this paper, I assumed that CP transits through Spec, NegP and has its [Neg] feature checked at that point, under Spec-head agreement. An Agree-based analysis makes movement through Spec, NegP superfluous, so in keeping with Occam’s Razor, I will assume here that it does not take place. It is ultimately an empirical question, of course, whether CP does or does not transit through Spec, NegP when it topicalizes. One thing that potentially bears on this question is the fact that CP topicalization does not result in direct licensing of polar heel: (23a) is bad with heel.

This is straightforwardly guaranteed by the text analysis. If, on the other hand, CP were to transit through Spec, NegP, the deviance of (23a) with heel would seem to be unexpected. It could be blamed, though, on the general fact (addressed in detail in den Dikken 2002, sec. 2.2) that polar heel must not be too deeply embedded within the container phrase that raises to Spec, NegP. This, combined with the fact that direct licensing fails within the bracketed clause as well (because this clause lacks a NegP into whose specifier position polar heel’s container could raise) and the fact that there is no additional PI on which polar heel might piggyback either, may ensure that (23a) bars heel even if CP does transit through Spec, NegP on its way up to the topic position. The ban on heel in (23a) thus does not appear to be fatal for the raising-through-Spec, NegP analysis. I cannot at this time think of any empirical evidence that would allow one to settle the question of whether a touchdown in Spec, NegP is made.

21. The same operation will take care of the binding facts catalogued in Grohmann (2003, 149–51) as well as the fact that the left-peripheral topic in d-word left dislocations can form an idiom together with material in the matrix clause (Grohmann 2003, 151–52), given that idiomatic fixing is an LF affair (see Chomsky 1995, ch. 3). See de Vries (2001), Grohmann (2003, ch. 4), Van Craenenbroeck (2004, ch. 3), and references cited there for detailed discussion of d-word and other topicalization and left-dislocation strategies in the West-Germanic languages. Van Craenenbroeck opts for a base-generation approach similar to the one adopted in the main text (though he does not address the NPI-connectivity effect and leaves open precisely how reconstruction would come about). De Vries has the left dislocate and the d-word form a constituent (an asyndetic coordination: [ap [XP] [ & (=Ø) dat/die]] that moves as a unit, from the 0-position to the topic position. Grohmann’s analysis takes the d-word to be a reduced copy of the left-dislocated constituent itself. For d-word left-dislocation constructions not involving a subject sentence, movement analyses à la de Vries or Grohmann are in principle available alongside the text base-generation approach (though see van Craenenbroeck 2004, 48–49 for an interesting nonsubject case for which movement accounts would be difficult to uphold). The fact that the examples in (23b, c) can be adorned with a d-word (i) while still allowing polar heel to be parasitically licensed indicates that in these examples, the (12b)-type NPI (ooit ‘ever’) can be licensed in overt syntax even in the presence of a d-word. A Grohmann- or de Vries-style movement analysis can ensure this; the text approach in terms of base generation will not extend to (i). For d-word left dislocations featuring a subject sentence in left-peripheral position, however, Grohmann’s analysis would conflict with the general ban on CPs in subject positions (Koster 1978), and though De Vries’s analysis does not strictly speaking violate that ban (because it postulates a coordination structure of which CP is merely the first conjunct), it, too, should be ruled out for the derivation of d-word left dislocations featuring a subject sentence—the failure of polar heel parasitism in (21a) shows clearly that there can be no point in the overt syntactic derivation at which the (12b)-type NPI could be licensed. For d-word left dislocations with a subject sentence in left-peripheral position, therefore, only a base-generation analysis (cum LF replacement of the d-word by its associate) of the type presented in the main text is available.

(i) a. [dat we die (hele) vent ooit hebben uitgenodigd] dat kan ik nu niet meer begrijpen that we that whole bloke ever have invited that can I now not more understand
   that we that whole bloke ever have invited that can I now not more understand
   b. [dat die (hele) vent ons ooit heeft uitgenodigd] dat kan ik nu niet meer begrijpen that that whole bloke us ever has invited that can I now not more understand

22. Even if one were to extend the local domain up to the relativized DP, this would not help out: it can independently be shown to be impossible to select for a [Neg] feature in D; see the ungrammaticality of *I doubt (the) claims about anything, alongside (13b): if the D-head of claims about anything
could host a [NEG] feature, it ought to be possible to license (12b)-type anything in this environment, which is not the case. That morphologically and semantically nonnegative D, unlike C, cannot host an uninterpretable [NEG] presumably has something to do with the fact that there exist morphologically and semantically negative Ds (e.g., English no) while morphologically and semantically negative Cs are much less common (English lest might be a candidate).

23. The question of whether DP is a phase is complex, but both general and specific considerations lead one to assume that DP, like CP, is indeed a strong phase. The general considerations that suggest that DP is a phase include the fact that DP is arguably propositional and the fact that there are systematic syntactic parallels between DP and CP, as shown by Abney (1987) and especially Szabolcsi (1994); more specific considerations supporting the status of DP as a phase are the fact that Spec, DP, like Spec, CP, is employed as an escape hatch for extraction (see for example Szabolcsi’s 1994 discussion of “runaway” possessors in Hungarian) and, concomitantly, the fact that a DP with a filled specifier is an island for extraction, on a par with a CP whose specifier is occupied. See Chomsky (2001, 14) for brief remarks that go in the same direction: “the general typology should include among phases nominal categories . . . Phases are then (close to) functionally headed XPs. Like TP, NP cannot be extracted, stranding its functional head.” Matushansky (2003) denies that DP is a phase, however, and does so precisely by attacking the above considerations. Several of her claims in this connection are open to debate (consider, for instance, the assertion that propositional in Chomsky’s 2000 sense should translate as ‘having the semantic type <t>;’ this seems straightforwardly false in view of the phasehood of vP), but this is not the place to enter into a discussion of the pros and cons of DP as a phase. The text discussion will simply assume that DP is a phase and will, if the account based on it is successful, lend support to this assumption.

24. That is, regardless of whether one assumes a movement or base-generation account, and if the former, whether movement is rightward or leftward. The only thing that has to be crucially assumed is that the extravposed CP is not dominated by DP or vP.

25. These sentences contrast with those in (i), which crash with heel included, though they may improve with heavy stress on probeert. The stressed variants of (i) then mimic the pattern in (28) in two ways: (a) in (28) as well, hoeft is typically heavily stressed, and (b) when stressed in this way, probeert in (i) becomes dependent on the presence of a negation: je probeert die vent die constructie *(niet eens) uit te leggen! ‘you’re *(not even) TRYING to explain that bloke that construction.’ Assuming that heavily stressed probeert does indeed pattern with negatively polar hoeven ‘need’ in its syntactic behavior, the text account of (26) will carry over to the stressed variants of (i).

(i) a. je probeert die (*hele) vent die constructie niet uit te leggen
   you try that whole bloke that construction not PRT to explain
   b. die constructie probeert die (*hele) vent me niet uit te leggen
   that construction tries that whole bloke me not PRT to explain

26. This will obviate the need for an analysis that seeks to undo the backwardness of the relationship between hoeven and niet in (28) by reconstructing hoeven into a position c-commanded by the negation at LF. Note also that it is only verbs that do actually depend on negation for their licensing that will create an extended dependency when raising to C; for verbs that do not need a licensing negation, V-to-C does not create a negation-based dependency on which polar heel can then piggyback. That this is as desired is shown by the ungrammaticality, with heel included, of the examples in (i) in note 25.
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