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6 The Syntax of Sentential Negation and Negative Markers

In this chapter I discuss the syntactic properties and behaviour of negative markers and I account for them in a (minimalist) syntactic framework. As was shown in chapter 4 and 5 the syntactic status is related to the other three phenomena that are under investigation in this study: (i) the position of the negative marker in the sentence is uni-directionally related to the occurrence of Negative Concord (NC); (ii) the ban on true negative imperatives only holds in a subset of the set languages that exhibit a preverbal negative marker; and (iii) the availability of inverse readings of clauses with an $\forall$-subject followed by a negative marker is related to the occurrence of NC and therefore also to the status of the negative marker.

In this chapter I will first address three different questions with respect to the syntax of negative markers in this chapter:

- What is the syntactic status of preverbal negative markers?
- What is the syntactic status of postverbal negative markers?
- What is the locus of negation in the syntactic structure of the clause?

After having answered these questions I rephrase the generalisations from chapter 5 in syntactic terms. The relation between the syntactic status of negative marker and the occurrence of NC will be discussed extensively in chapter 8. Other issues such as the ban on true negative imperatives and the availability of inverse readings in $\forall$-subject – negation clauses, will be discussed in the rest of this chapter.

In section 6.1 I address the first question, and I will argue that preverbal negative particles and negative affixes are both related to a syntactic head position $X^0$ and I show that negative adverbs are syntactic phrases (XP).

In section 6.2 I argue that negative head markers project a negative feature yielding a functional projection NegP. Languages may vary with respect to the position where preverbal negative markers are base-generated: either in a position attached to $V_{\text{fin}}$, in a position that is part of the verbal inflectional system or in Neg$^0$. Furthermore I show that negative adverbs are base-generated in an adjunct position of vP, and in some languages move to Spec,NegP. Finally I will show that the functional projection NegP is not available universally, i.e. negation is not a syntactic category in every language.

---

205 The terminology is confusing, despite its general usage. Postverbal negative markers refer to negative adverbial markers, which may in fact occur both preverbally and postverbally. Dutch niet is a postverbal negative marker in main clauses, but a preverbal negative marker in subordinate clauses. Hence the distinction should be read as ‘always occurring in preverbal position’ vs. ‘also possible to occupy a postverbal position.’ As the objective of this chapter is to explain this distinction in syntactic terms, the confusing terminology will be replaced by syntactic terms.
In section 6.3 I argue that the locus of negation is subject to cross-linguistic and language-internal variation. I will argue that the position of NegP in the clause is determined by the semantic properties of the negative operator and not fixed by UG. I follow Ramchand (2001) in her assumption that these properties may vary cross-linguistically.

Section 6.4 contains an account for the ban on true negative imperatives, and explains why this ban holds in several languages only.

In section 6.5 I propose an answer to the question why in NC languages clauses with an V-subject followed by a negative marker always allow for an inverse reading.

### 6.1 The syntactic status of negative markers

This section addresses the question regarding the exact syntactic status of negative markers. As we saw in chapter 5 (and in 3.2.2) preverbal negative markers are either particles (which are separate words), negative affixes or clitic-like elements (which are part of the verbal morphology). All three types of preverbal negative markers share several syntactic properties. Not only is it the case that the two types of preverbal negative markers invoke the occurrence of NC, they also pass several tests that indicate that these markers are negative heads. Given that these elements prove to be negative heads, they are associated with a head position in the syntactic clause: either they are base-generated in a head position, where the verb might pick them up in order to become part of its inflectional morphology, or these negative markers are base-generated on the (finite) verb that stands in an Agree (or Chain) relation with such a head, or the finite verb (c)overly moves to this head position in order to fulfil some of its syntactic requirements.

Negative adverbial markers behave differently from preverbal markers, and I will show that this difference is related to their phrasal status, i.e. negative adverbs, such as Dutch niet, should be considered as XP's rather than as X°.

In 6.1.1 I describe the behaviour of preverbal negative particles. In 6.1.2 I discuss the behaviour of negative affixes and clitic-like elements. In section 6.1.3 I discuss the syntactic status of negative adverbial markers.

#### 6.1.1 Preverbal negative particles as syntactic heads

In this paragraph I first discuss a number of tests that have been developed to determine whether a particular element is a syntactic head (X°) or a syntactic phrase (XP). Zanuttini (2001) takes blocking of head movement (a form of Relativised Minimality tracing back to Travis’ (1984) Head Movement Constraint) as crucial diagnostics for a head status of a negative marker and discusses a few tests such as blocking of clitic climbing or blocking of V-to-C movement by negative head markers.
In (1)b it can be seen that the presence of a negative marker *ne blocks movement of the clitic from a position in an infinitival clause to a position adjoining the matrix auxiliary. The example in (1)c makes clear that this blocking effect is due to the intervening preverbal negative marker *ne, as clitic movement over *pas is not illicit. Kayne (1989) argues that the intervening head blocks antecedent government of the trace, but in other frameworks intervening heads are argued to interfere with clitic movement as well.

(1) a. Jean l’a fait manger t1 à Paul
   Jean it makes eat to Paul
   ‘Jean makes Paul eat it’

b. *Jean l’a fait *ne pas manger t1 à l’enfant
   Jean it has made neg neg eat to
   ‘Jean has made the child not eat it’

c. Jean *ne l’a pas fait manger t1 à Paul
   Jean neg it has neg made Paul eat it
   ‘Jean hasn’t made Paul eat it’

Another test, introduced by Zanuttini, is provided by the phenomenon of long clitic-climbing. Italian allows long clitic climbing, i.e. an object clitic moving from the complement position of an infinitive to a position in front of the finite verb. It has been shown (Rizzi 1982, Burzio 1986) that long clitic climbing is not allowed when a negative marker intervenes (2).

(2) a. Gianni li vuole vedere
   Gianni them wants see
   ‘Gianni wants to see them’

b. *Gianni li vuole non vedere
   Gianni them wants neg see
   ‘Gianni doesn’t want to see them’

The facts in (1) and (2) can be explained by the assumption that Romance preverbal negative markers are heads that block long clitic climbing, and therefore form a firm indication that these preverbal negative markers are syntactic heads.

A third test is the blocking of verb movement. Paduan, an Italian dialect from Veneto, requires the C° head to be overtly filled in yes/no interrogatives. In positive interrogatives, the verb moves from a lower position (V°) to C°. As a result of the Head Movement Constraint, this movement would be illicit if another head intervened. Hence, if the preverbal negative marker is a syntactic head, V-to-C movement is predicted to be excluded in Paduan yes/no interrogatives. This prediction is borne out, as shown in (3).

206 Examples (1)a-b are from Kayne 1989, cited in Zanuttini 2001: 524.
(3)  
   a. Vien-lo?  
      Comes-he?  
      ‘Is he coming’  
   b. *Vien-lo no?  
      Comes-he neg?  
      ‘Isn’t he coming?’

A final test is the why not test developed by Merchant (2001). Given that the why not construction is analysed as a form of phrasal adjunction, it is predicted that this construction is only allowed in those languages in which the negative marker is not a syntactic head (4).

(4)  
   \[YP [XP why] [YP not]]

This prediction is born out for many of the languages with a preverbal negative marker, illustrated by examples from Italian and Greek (5):

(5)  
   a. *Perche non?  
      Italian  
   b. *Giati dhen?  
      Greek  
      Why neg  
      ‘Why not’

This observation holds for all languages that I have studied in this research, except for languages in which the negative marker is phonologically identical to the word for ‘no’ (as in yes/no). Those languages, e.g. Spanish and Catalan, allow the why not construction.

(6)  
   a. ¿Porque no?  
      Spanish  
   b. Per qué no?  
      Catalan  
      Why neg/no

Merchant shows that all languages in which the why not construction is ruled out, the meaning of this sentence is expressed by the construction why no.

(7)  
   a. Perche no?  
      Italian  
   b. Giati oxi?  
      Greek  
      Why no

Since the only languages with a preverbal negative marker that allow the why not construction have a phonological identical word for no, and since why no is proven to be the alternative way to express why not in languages where the latter is forbidden, I assume that in languages like Spanish or Catalan, the expression why not is ill-formed.
and replaced by the phonological similar form why no. Hence I adopt Merchant’s conclusion that preverbal negative markers are syntactic heads.\textsuperscript{208}

Possible arguments against a treatment of preverbal negative markers as syntactic heads have been discussed in Rowlett (1998). He provides two arguments from French that form a problem for this analysis, but he shows that these problems can be dispensed with: (i) the substandardly accepted pour ne pas que construction; and (ii) multiple occurrences of ne in a single clause.

The first problem concerns purpose clauses introduced by pour ‘in order to’ like (8), which have been analysed as a P taking a CP as its immediate complement. In those cases there is no head position available to project the preverbal negative marker ne in between P and its complement.

(8)  Habillez-vous bien [PP pour (ne) pas
     [CP que vous preniez froid]]\textsuperscript{209}
     Dress-yourself well for neg neg that you take.SUBJ cold
     ‘Dress yourself properly so you don’t catch cold’

Rowlett proposes a solution for this problem by arguing that the pour ne pas que construction is analogous to the more familiar pour ne pas \textit{V}_{inf} construction (following Muller 1991) in which the PP projected by pour selects an infinitival clause, which can be denied by an intervening projection hosting ne.

(9)  Il y a dix raisons [PP pour [IP ne; [XP pas t; [vP légaliser
     la prostitution]]]
     It there has ten reasons for neg neg legalise the prostitution
     ‘There are ten reasons not to legalise prostitution’

In such an analysis the P in the pour ne pas que construction does not select a CP, but it selects an infinitival clause IP consisting of an abstract infinitival light verb \textit{v}^0, which takes CP as its complement (10). The abstract infinitival head then attaches to the negative marker ne.

(10)  Habillez-vous bien [PP pour [IP ne-\textit{Ø}i pas \textit{v}^0 t; [CP que vous preniez froid]]]

\textsuperscript{208} Note that this observation is not restricted to languages with one negative marker. The preverbal negative marker ne in French cannot participate in the why not construction, whereas French pas can.

(i) *Pourquoi ne?
(ii) Pourquoi pas?
    Why neg

\textsuperscript{209} Taken from Rowlett (1998): 21.
Another possible argument against an analysis of the French negative marker *ne* as a syntactic head is the occurrence of multiple *ne* in a single clause, yielding Double Negation readings.

(11) Je t'ordonne de *ne plus jamais* *ne rien faire*\textsuperscript{210} \hfill French
\begin{quote}
I you advise of neg n-more n-ever neg n-thing do 'I advise you to never again not do anything'
\end{quote}

Rowlett argues that examples such as (11) are problematic since more than one negative phrase has to be projected in the clause if these negative markers were syntactic heads. This would not be in line with a theory that argues that functional projections are subject to hierarchy (Rizzi 1997, Cinque 1999). However, this does not a priori exclude the presence of multiple similar functional projections in a clause. Zanuttini (1998) proposes a series of functional heads hosting a negative head. In my own analysis of negation (presented in section 6.2 and chapter 8) projections of negative heads may contain negative operators and the Double Negation reading as in (11) is the result of two negative operators in different negative projections. But even if one maintains the assumption that functional projections cannot occur twice in a single clause, one may reason along the same lines as in the analysis of the *pour ne pas que* construction and propose an analysis of these sentences as clauses in which a light verb in the higher clause (which contains the first *ne*) selects an infinitival clause (with lower *ne*). This yields a Double Negation reading as well.

The fact that *ne* heads its own functional projection also proves that this projection of the negative head contains a negative operator, since infinitival clauses consisting of other negative elements are open for NC relations in most languages (including French). This follows from the NC readings of sentences in which the second *ne* is left out (12).

(12) Je t'ordonne de *ne plus jamais rien faire*\textsuperscript{211} \hfill French
\begin{quote}
I you advise of neg n-more n-ever n-thing do 'I advise you never do anything again'
\end{quote}

Only the fact that *ne* is the head of a separate functional projection prevents the lower negative elements from taking part in an NC relation with higher negative elements. However, *ne* cannot be taken to be the realisation of the negative operator itself, since it is allowed to occur in non-negative sentences as well (cf. Rowlett 1998: chapter 1).

On the basis of the examples above that show that preverbal negative particles are syntactic heads, and on the basis of the fact that the presented counterarguments do not raise problems for such an analysis, I conclude that preverbal negative particles are syntactic heads.

\textsuperscript{210} Taken from Rowlett (1998): 23.
6.1.2 Other preverbal negative markers as syntactic heads

In the previous subsection, I concluded that preverbal negative markers that are syntactic words are syntactic heads. The question now rises, whether this analysis can be extended to other types of preverbal negative markers, i.e. should negative affixes or negative clitics also be considered as negative heads?

Zanuttini (1998, 2001) distinguishes between four different kinds of negative markers: (i) negative adverbs, (ii) strong preverbal negative markers, (iii) weak preverbal negative markers, and (iv) negative markers that are part of the verbal morphology. Negative adverbs will be dealt with in the following subsection and strong preverbal negative markers refer to the kind of negative markers that were proven to be syntactic heads in the previous subsection. The question whether a negative marker belongs to the third or fourth class is much harder to answer. Zanuttini does not analyse the status of inflectional negation in detail and only discusses negative markers that she takes to be weak preverbal negative markers.

Zanuttini defines weak negative markers as those negative markers that cannot express negation by themselves and need to be accompanied by another negative marker, as in the Northern Italian variety of Cairese. These elements are considered to be weak since they attach to V\textsubscript{fin} or to a clitic that on its turn is attached to the verb.

(13) \begin{align*}
\text{U ni va *(nent)} \\
\text{SU-CL neg,LOC-CL goes neg}
\end{align*}

\begin{quote}
\text{Cairese}
\text{‘He doesn’t go there’}
\end{quote}

However, this definition faces empirical and theoretical problems. Slavic languages are known to express negation by means of a negative marker that is attached to V\textsubscript{fin} in a similar fashion to weak preverbal negative markers. Moreover, from a theoretical point of view there is no reason to ban covert realisations of the higher negative marker. In 7.2 and in chapter 8, I show that most Slavic languages express sentential negation by means of a weak preverbal negative marker that is dominated by an abstract negative operator higher in the clause.

The main difference between weak and strong negative markers seems that with respect to the occurrence of clitics and other functional markers that are attached to the verb, so-called weak markers occupy a lower position in the clause than strong negative markers.

Zanuttini takes weak preverbal negative markers to be syntactic heads adjoined to V\textsuperscript{o}. This analysis is supported by the fact that clitics may occur both to the left and to the right of a weak preverbal negative marker. In many Romance varieties, weak preverbal negative markers occur to the right of first and second person clitics and reflexive clitics, and occur to the left of third person, locative and partitive clitics. Assuming that multiple head adjunction is allowed, this leads to the following syntactic structure for the verbal cluster.
(14) \[ V [ CL-2 [ \text{Neg} \ CL-1 \text{neg}] CL-2] V \]

whereby CL-1: 1\textsuperscript{st} person, 2\textsuperscript{nd} person and reflexive clitics
CL-2: 3\textsuperscript{rd} person, locative and partitive clitics

Under Zanuttini’s analysis, which takes both clitics and weak preverbal negative markers to be base-generated in head-adjointed position, it follows immediately that these preverbal negative markers are syntactic heads, as phrase-adjunction to heads is ruled out.

Zanuttini distinguishes between weak preverbal negative markers and (inflectional) morphemes. However, weak negative markers only differ from negative affixes with respect to the position they occupy with respect to the verb. The question is legitimate whether negative markers that are instances of the verbal morphology, such as the Turkish negative marker *me*, which precedes tense, mood and person affixes and follows reflexive, causative or passive affixes, are fundamentally different from heads that attach to V\text{fin}. Only if it is assumed that Lexical Items (LI’s) enter the derivation fully inflected and that the formal features that the LI consists of are spelled out as inflectional morphemes (cf. Chomsky 1995) these negative affixes differ from weak negative markers. If inflected verbs are considered to be the result of a process in which the verb ‘picks up’ its affixes, the underlying structure for both types of negative markers is identical: they are both syntactic heads that attach to the verb.

The question arises how to interpret the syntactic status of inflectional material. Formal features, i.e. those features that trigger syntactic operations (see section 2.1), are taken to be either interpretable or uninterpretable. During the derivation, every uninterpretable feature has to be eliminated. Feature deletion is the result of feature checking of an uninterpretable feature against an interpretable feature. (Note that uninterpretability is a property of features that only applies at LF.) For example, tense is said to be interpretable on (finite) verbs at LF, but not on nouns. Hence the subject checks its uninterpretable tense feature ([uT]) (according to Pesetsky & Torrego (2001) realised as nominative case) against the interpretable tense feature of the verb. Sentential negation is a property of the entire predicate or proposition as has been shown in 3.2.1. This means that negation is not interpretable on the verb itself, but is interpretable as a negative operator that scopes over the entire predicate/proposition\textsuperscript{213}. The negative feature that is part of the inflection of the verb is uninterpretable at LF and should be deleted through feature checking.

Feature checking can take place through the operation Agree, or through Move, which is a superfunction of Agree. Agree implies that an uninterpretable feature [uF] can be checked against an [iF] feature located in a higher position than VP. In minimalist

\textsuperscript{212} In a framework that permits multiple adjunction (like Kayne’s (1995) anti-symmetry approach) this structure should be replaced by a more complex structure in which each class of clitics attaches to an empty functional head.

\textsuperscript{213} The conclusion that negation is not interpretable on the verb is supported by a series of empirical arguments presented in section 2 of this chapter and in chapter 8.
terms, it is said that [iF] probes for a goal [uF]. The question is then: what determines the nature of this functional projection which hosts [iF]? The only possible candidate is a functional projection that is projected by the same feature as the feature [uF] on the verb. In the case of the tense feature this is a T(ense)P, and for mood this is a MoodP. Hence the projection that is needed to eliminate the [uNEG] feature on the verb is a category hosted by a negative feature itself. However, this analysis suffers from the problem of feature redundancy. Suppose that a feature is realised on the verb and it projects a functional projection of its own, it would be realised twice.

(15) \[ [FP \ F[iF] \ [VP \ V[uF] ]] \]

In order to discard the problem of feature redundancy I adopt a proposal by Koeneman (2000), who combines two earlier proposals by Kerstens (1993) and by Ackema, Neeleman & Weerman (1993). Kerstens (1993) argues that functional structure is projected from the functional features of a lexical item (LI). A problem with Kerstens’ proposal is that there are still two identifiable elements, namely the feature F, and a distinct functional head F°. Ackema, et. al. argue that functional projections are reprojections of the verb, i.e. a verb is allowed to project more than once, yielding a new functional projection VP. This position has been argued against by Chomsky (1995), who argues that this would lead to ambiguous phrase markers: it would be unclear for the computational system to decide whether the top VP node is a projection of the original verb, or of the reprojected verb. In order to solve this problem, Koeneman (2001) adopts Giorgi & Pianesi’s Feature Scattering Principle (16):

(16) Feature Scattering Principle
Every feature can head a projection

This principle allows a feature, which is part of an LI that has been inserted in the derivation, to project itself if that is needed to satisfy output requirements. This means that if there is no position available to host an element carrying [iF] and an LI consists of a feature [uF] itself, this feature may project itself in order to create new structure to host the element carrying [iF] to have its [uF] feature checked. Thus, if a verb consists of an uninterpretable feature [uF] this feature may merge with VP to project itself and create a functional projection FP that forms the domain in which feature checking can take place, as in (17).

(17) \[ [FP [F[V \ V[iF]>]] \]

For the case of negation this simply means that every uninterpretable [uNEG] feature present on \( V_{\text{fin}} \) may project itself creating a functional projection NegP. This assumption immediately answers the question that has been raised in this subsection: what is the syntactic status of weak preverbal negative markers or negative affixes?
The answer is straightforward: both are syntactic heads. Either a negative marker is head-adjoined to V and its syntactic status is $X^\circ$ or it is the realisation of a negative feature on the verb and is allowed to head its own functional projection. Hence in both situations the negative marker is a syntactic head. From a theoretical point of view it is shown that both kinds of negative markers under discussion are syntactic heads. Despite the fact that there are only few diagnostics to test this conclusion empirically (weak negative markers and negative affixes are attached to the finite verb, and therefore they cannot block any head movement themselves), the *why not test should still be applicable for languages with a weak negative marker, or a negative affix, since conjunction of a negative head to the XP why remains forbidden. This prediction is born out (18).

(18) a. *Pochemune  
    b. *Waarom en
    Why neg
    ‘Why not’

The question whether negative markers are affixes or weak preverbal markers, can be dispensed with, as it is no longer necessary to answer this question in order to determine the status of the negative marker. I conclude that all non-adverbal negative markers are negative heads.

### 6.1.3 Negative adverbs as maximal projections

The conclusion so far is that all preverbal negative markers, being strong, weak or affixal, are syntactic heads $X^\circ$ that are either base-generated or moved to a projection that is headed by a negative feature. In this subsection I show that the final class of negative markers, negative adverbs, does not consist of syntactic heads, but of maximal projections XP.

The instruments in this subsection are equivalent to the diagnostics that have been used in the previous subsections: blocking of head movement and the *why not test. If negative adverbs are XP’s they should not block head movement and the why not construction should be acceptable. I show that both predictions are correct.

V2 languages such as Standard Dutch or Swedish only exhibit V2 in main clauses. This implies that the verb has to move over the negative adverb to $C^\circ$ in a negative sentence. This movement is allowed in both Swedish and Dutch.

(19) a. … om Jan inte köpte boken  
    … that Jan neg bought books
    ‘… that John didn’t by books’
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b. Jan köpte inte boken
   Jan bought neg books
   ‘Jan didn’t buy books’

(20) a. … dat Jan niet liep
       … that Jan neg walked
       … ‘that Jan didn’t walk’

b. Jan liep niet
   Jan walked neg
   ‘Jan didn’t walk’

From these results it follows that the negative adverbs in (19)-(20) behave as maximal projections. This is also the result of the why not test that is acceptable in all languages in which the negative marker is an adverb (given that the negative markers in (21) are phonologically distinct from the words for no (as in yes/no) in these languages).

(21) a. Why not?

b. Warum nicht?

c. Waarom niet?

d. Varför inte?
   Why neg?
   ‘Why not?’

A third argument in favour of an analysis of negative adverbs in terms of XP’s stems from topicalisation in V2 languages. In these constructions the only available position for a topic position is Spec,CP which can only be the landing site of an XP. In Swedish, topicalisation of negative marker is possible, as is shown in (22).

(22) Inte var det Selma
    Neg was it Selma
    ‘It was NOT Selma’

However, Dutch does not allow topicalisation of the negative adverb.

(23) *Niet ziet hij het
    Neg sees he it
    ‘He does not see it’

Barbiers (2002) takes this as an argument that Dutch niet is not always an XP, following Hoeksema (1997), who uses the same argument to show that Middle Dutch niet is not a specifier. Barbiers points out that topicalisation of Dutch niet is (marginally) accepted in some cases.
(24) Ik had wel gezien dat Jan aankwam, maar niet had ik gezien dat Ed vertrok.\(^{214}\)
I had PRT seen that Jan arrived, but neg had I seen that Ed left
‘I did see that Jan arrived, but I had not seen that Ed left’

Barbier argues that verbs can have their objects in two positions: in a DP that is to the left of VP, or in a complement CP.

(25) Ik heb <dat> gezien <dat hij kwam>
I have that seen that he came
‘I saw that (he came)’

On the basis of these examples Barbiers (2002) proposes that niet can be seen as an argument of the verb that is not allowed to receive a θ-role. Hence niet is comparable with expletives in the sense that it has a case feature (realised as [uT]) and lacks a θ-role. Therefore it can only occupy the VP-internal object position (to check its case features) in those constructions in which a verb assigns the θ-role to the complement CP. In those cases niet behaves like an XP (24) and the negative adverb is allowed to topicalise. In all other cases niet is base-generated in a head position.

Barbiers claims that the syntactic status of niet is lexically underdetermined and that it may vary between X° and XP, depending on independent conditions. Generally niet is inserted in a head position, but only under well-defined conditions the negative marker may appear in the specifier position, thus allowing sentences such as (24). According to Barbiers this approach is in line with Chomsky’s (1995) Bare Phrase Structures as a replacement of X-Bar theory.

This analysis faces several problems. First, the acceptance of sentences like (24) is marginal and the question is legitimate whether these examples provide a firm basis to build a new theory on. Moreover, it may be the case that the acceptability of (24) is related to wel (the counterpart of niet). For some speakers of Dutch the sentence becomes ill-formed if wel is left out.

(26) *Ik had gezien dat Jan aankwam,
maar niet had ik gezien dat Ed vertrok.\(^{215}\)
I had PRT seen that Jan arrived, but neg had I seen that Ed left
‘I had seen that Jan arrived, but I had not seen that Ed left’

Second, Barbiers’ explanation cannot account for the fact that niet, being a head, does not block verb movement to C°, but it is conceivable that this is accounted for in terms of remnant movement in which the entire vP moves to Spec,CP rather than V° to C° yielding a V2 order at surface structure (cf. Müller 2004). However this mechanism cannot account for the blocking effects in the Romance varieties in which negative elements block verb or clitic movement, without further stipulations.

A general and more conceptual argument comes from Bare Phrase Structures itself. Barbiers argues that the head status of the Dutch negative adverb accounts for the general ban on topicalisation. If the negative marker is a head, it cannot undergo head-spec movement to Spec,CP. Head to spec movement is ruled out by Chomsky's (1994) Chain Uniformity Condition.

(27)  
\textit{Chain Uniformity Condition (CUC)}

A Chain is uniform with respect to phrase structure status.

However, in Bare Phrase Structure, the distinction between specifiers and heads is replaced by the distinction between \textit{minimality} and \textit{maximality} of syntactic element. A head (in the traditional sense) is the first instance in the tree and therefore minimal (\(X^{\text{min}}\)). A maximal projection is the highest instance of such a head and therefore maximal (\(X^{\text{max}}\)). This means that CUC does not apply anymore to the traditional notions of heads and specifier, but to minimality vs. maximality. As a consequence there is no general ban on head to spec movement, but only on movement of a minimal element to a maximal position or vice versa. However, as a consequence not every instance of head-to-spec movement is ruled out by this system. Suppose for instance that an element \(H\) is adjoined to a higher projection of \(X\) (XP in the traditional sense) (28)a. In such a case \(H\), is the lowest and the highest instance of \(H\) in the structure, and therefore its phrasal status is \(X^{\min\max}\). As a consequence \(H\), being maximal, may rise to a position in which it can no longer project, e.g. Spec,CP (28)b. This position is a \(X^{\max}\) position as well and therefore such movement is not ruled by (27).

(28)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad [G \ G \ [X \ H \ X]] \\
b. & \quad [cH \ C[G \ [X <H> X]]]
\end{align*}

As a consequence, head to-spec-movement is not generally ruled out under Bare Phrase Structure. If the phrasal status of a certain element is both minimal and maximal, topicalisation of such an element is allowed. Hence the assumption of an underspecified lexical representation of Dutch \textit{niet} with respect to its phrasal status gives rise to other predictions that turn out to be incorrect.

I conclude on the basis of the results of the head movement blocking test and the \textit{why not} test that the negative adverbs under study are maximal projections. The question why Dutch \textit{niet} is not allowed to topicalise (in most cases) remains open and is subject to further study.

Although the analysis that negative adverbs are maximal projections is uncontroversial for many languages, the XP status of English \textit{not} is not. The syntactic status of the negative marker has been subject to thorough study (Pollock 1989,1993, Laka 1990, Haegeman 1995, Potsdam 1997, Merchant 2001). I adopt Haegeman's (1995) assumption that \textit{not} is a specifier.
An additional argument in favour of this assumption is that the analysis of English DO-support as a result of the head status of English not does not capture all data. It has been argued (cf. Laká 1990, Pollock 1993) that the negative marker blocks V-to-C movement in negative clauses, and therefore the negative auxiliary DO is inserted as a last resort option in a higher position (to fill T°).

\[(29) \quad [TP \downarrow do [NegP \emptyset [\text{Neg} \not \emptyset [VP V]]]] \]

However, English shows verbal movement across the negative marker:

\[(30) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{John has not been ill} \\
\text{b. } & \text{John is not ill}
\end{align*} \]

In (30) it is clear that both forms of the verb to be are base-generated in a position to the right of not, probably in VP. In (30)b however, the verb shows up in a position to the left of not, proving that not does not block verb movement. Hence DO-support is not an argument in favour of analyses that take not to be an X°. Recall furthermore that English not also passed the why not test.

The adverbial status of not does not hold for the weaker form of not, n’t. Haegeman adopts Zanuttini’s (1991) and Pollock’s (1993) analysis that n’t is a syntactic head and illustrates this by the fact that n’t has to move along with an inflected auxiliary (31), whereas its adverbial counterpart not cannot be attached on the auxiliary (32).

\[(31) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Hasn’t John left?} \\
\text{b. } & *\text{Has John n’t left?}
\end{align*} \]

\[(32) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Has John not left?} \\
\text{b. } & *\text{Has not John left?}^{216}
\end{align*} \]

I adopt Haegeman’s (1995) conclusion that English not is a specifier and English n’t is a syntactic head. Note that this widens the class of preverbal negative markers, as n’t is strictly speaking not preverbal, since it attaches to the right of V_{fin}. Nevertheless, this does not raise any terminological problems as the only distinction that is relevant between the different classes of negative markers now is the distinction between X° and XP. Negative adverbs are XP, all other negative markers are X°.

### 6.1.4 Concluding remarks

In this section the distinction between preverbal negative markers and negative adverbial markers has been replaced by a distinction in terms of negative head

---

216 Only acceptable as an archaic expression.
markers versus negative specifiers ($X^\circ$ vs. XP). This means that the generalisations that have been formulated at the end of chapter 5 should be replaced as well. In brief, this means that:

- All languages with a negative marker $X^\circ$ are NC languages, whereas only a subset of the set of languages that have a negative marker XP are NC languages.
- Only a subset of the set of languages with a negative marker $X^\circ$ bans true negative imperatives.
- Every language that has a negative marker $X^\circ$ allows for inverse readings for sentences in which $\forall$-subjects precede a negative marker.

In chapter 8, I explain the first generalisation in detail. In this chapter I will account for the second and the third generalisation (in 6.4 and 6.5 respectively).

### 6.2 The negative projection

As we saw in the previous section, negative markers are allowed to host a projection of their own or move, along with $V_{\text{fin}}$, to a head position that is projected by the negative feature. This projection has come to be known as NegP. These assumptions give rise to several questions that I will address in this section.

- What is the nature of this functional projection?
- Which negative markers are base-generated in Neg$^\circ$ and which negative markers are not?
- Do all negative markers obtain a position within NegP?
- Is NegP available in every language?

In 6.2.1, I first discuss what the nature is of a negative projection NegP. In 6.2.2, I argue that preverbal negative markers are either base-generated within this functional projection or that they are originated in a lower position attached to $V_{\text{fin}}$ and that these markers move to or agree with the negative projection. In 6.2.3, I argue that negative adverbs may be associated with a specifier position in NegP, but that this is not necessarily true for every language exhibiting only a negative adverb. In 6.2.4 finally, I conclude, arguing for a flexible treatment of the ontology of functional categories, that NegP is not available in every language. 6.2.5 contains some concluding remarks.

#### 6.2.1 NegP as a functional category

Ever since Pollock's (1989) seminal work on the structure of the middle field, it has been generally assumed that there is a separate functional category negation, which hosts its own projection. Pollock's argument for this is the fact that auxiliaries in
French and English occupy a different position at surface structure than lexical verbs do. In English, only auxiliaries are allowed to move across the negative marker *not.*

(33) a. Mary does *not* run  
    b. Mary is *not* running  
    c. *Mary runs not*

In (33) it is shown that the negative marker intervenes between the head of IP, presumably the base-position of the auxiliary and the head of the VP, the base-position of the lexical verb.

The fact that the negative marker may intervene between the two positions indicates that there is a different functional projection located between IP and VP. Pollock shows that the same holds for French. Although in French finite clauses both auxiliaries and lexical verbs occur to the left of the negative marker *pas*, auxiliaries and lexical verbs occupy different positions in negative infinitival clauses. Whereas the auxiliary *être* ‘to be’ is allowed to occur both to the right and to the left of *pas*, lexical verbs, as *sembler* ‘seem’ can only occupy a position to the right of *pas."

(34) a. *Ne pas* être heureux est une condition pour écrire des romans  
    b. *N*’être *pas* heureux est une condition pour écrire des romans

(35) a. *Ne pas* sembler heureux est une condition pour écrire des romans  
    b. *Ne sembler pas* heureux est une condition pour écrire des romans

On the basis of these observations, Pollock introduces the so-called *Split IP hypothesis,* arguing that IP should be split up in a TP, an AgrP and, if required, a NegP. This NegP consists of a negative head Neg°, hosting preverbal negative markers and a specifier (Spec,NegP) that is occupied by the negative adverb. 

---

This line of analysis has been adopted by many scholars (cf. Laka 1990, Zanuttini 1991, Ernst 1992, Chomsky 1995, Lasnik 1995, Haegeman 1995, Potsdam 1997, Rowlett 1998). However, various proposals for changing the original analysis have been brought forward, e.g. with respect to the internal structure of NegP, the origin of negative elements within NegP, the clause-internal position of NegP, or the question whether there is more than one NegP position available in the clause.

A problem with the functional projection NegP is the fact that although Pollock (1989) shows the presence of NegP in English and French, he assumes that languages cross-linguistically have a NegP at their disposal, without further motivation of this assumption. In 6.2.4, I argue that the availability of a negative projection NegP should in fact be subject to cross-linguistic variation.

6.2.2 Negative head markers being associated with Neg°

In this subsection, I elaborate on a question that has also been put forward in 6.1.2: the origin of (preverbal) negative markers. As was shown by Zanuttini (1998, 2001), four different kinds of negative markers can be distinguished: strong negative markers, weak negative markers, negative affixes and negative adverbs. The conclusion from section 6.1 is that the distinction between weak negative markers and negative affixes is not always straightforward, but that the first three kinds of negative markers can be seen as negative heads, whereas the negative adverbial cannot.

According to Haegeman (1995) languages differ with respect to the place of origin of the negative marker in the clause. Negative markers that negate a clause by themselves are base-generated in Neg°, whereas negative markers that require a second negative marker (like the Cairese variety of Northern-Italian, or West Flemish) have their negative marker base-generated in a lower position, as a V-adjoined clitic or as verbal inflection.

I adopt Haegeman’s (1995) suggestion that the origin of the negative head marker may vary across languages, but I argue that this cross-linguistic variation is not related to the independent occurrence of the negative marker, but to the question whether the preverbal negative marker occurs to the right of certain clitics or interact with other inflectional material. This leads to a reduction of the number of preverbal negative markers. The crucial distinction is between preverbal negative markers that are base-
generated in \( \text{Neg}^o \) and those that are base-generated on \( V_{\text{fin}} \). The question then is what the exact relation is between the lower base-generated negative marker and the higher negative projection.

In the previous section I argued that negative markers that are base-generated on \( V_{\text{fin}} \) carry an uninterpretable negative feature \([u\text{NEG}] \) that needs to be eliminated. This feature has to move out of the verbal domain in order to project a higher functional projection \( \text{NegP} \). Then the negative feature \([u\text{NEG}] \) becomes located in \( \text{Neg}^o \), and it may merge with an abstract negative operator \( \text{Op}^\ast \) that carries \([i\text{NEG}] \). Under spec-head agreement \([u\text{NEG}] \) gets deleted.

\[
(37) \quad [\text{NegP} \; \text{Op}^\ast [u\text{NEG}] \; \text{Neg}^o [u\text{NEG}] \; [\text{VP} \; V^\circ [u\text{NEG}] \; [\text{VP} \; V^{-1}[u\text{NEG}]]] ]
\]

Languages differ with respect to the verb movement along with \([u\text{NEG}] \). In SOV languages, \( V_{\text{fin}} \) probably remains in situ, and the abstract feature \([u\text{NEG}] \) moves on its own to \( v^o \) before moving out of the \( v \) phase, whereas in SVO languages \([u\text{NEG}] \) moves along with \( V_{\text{fin}} \).

If the distinction between strong preverbal negative markers and weak preverbal negative markers/negative affixes is the result of the position where these elements are base-generated (\( \text{Neg}^o \) or on \( V_{\text{fin}} \)), this difference should also have semantic effects. This is indeed the case. First, in languages (like Czech) with the negative marker base-generated on \( V_{\text{fin}} \), other quantifiers, such as ‘much’, are able to precede the negative marker but remain under the scope of the negation. In Italian, which has a strong preverbal negative marker, the negative marker coincides with \( \text{Neg}^o \) and the quantifier that occurs to the left of non outscopes negation (38).

Second, in Slavic languages in which the negative marker is attached to \( V_{\text{fin}} \), it is also possible to have NPI objects licensed in a position to the left of the negative marker, whereas this is excluded in languages such as Spanish or Italian, in which the negative marker is base-generated in \( \text{Neg}^o \) (39).

\[
(38) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Milan moc nejedl} & \text{Czech} \\
& \quad \text{Milan much neg.est.perf.} \\
& \quad \text{‘Milan hasn’t eaten much’} \\
& \quad \text{neg > much} & \quad \ast \text{much > neg} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Gianni molto non ha mangiato} & \text{Italian} \\
& \quad \text{Gianni much neg has eaten} \\
& \quad \text{‘Gianni hasn’t eaten much’} \\
& \quad \ast \text{neg > much} & \quad \text{much > neg}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
(39) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Ani nohu jsem (tam) nevidel.} & \text{Czech} \\
& \quad \text{Neg-even a-leg-ACC.SG I-am (there) neg-seen} \\
& \quad \text{‘I haven’t been seeing anyone’}
\end{align*}
\]
b. "*Ni una sola alma no he visto
   Neg-even a single soul not I-have seen
   'I haven’t seen anyone’

In the a examples in (38)-(39), the objects (OB) are under the scope of the negative operator $Op\rightarrow$, and in the b examples they are not.

(40) a. $[\text{Neg} P \text{Op} \rightarrow [\text{vP OB neg-V}]]$  
    b. $[\text{XP OB} [\text{Neg} P \text{Op} \rightarrow]]$

On the basis of this observation I conclude that strong negative markers are base-generated in $\text{Neg}^0$. Weak preverbal negative markers/negative affixes are base-generated on $V_{\text{fin}}$, and the negative feature moves out of the $v$ phase, possibly along with $V_{\text{fin}}$, in order to project a position $\text{Neg}^0$, where $[u\text{NEG}]$ is deleted under spec-head agreement.

6.2.3 Negative adverbs as vP adjuncts

It is often assumed that negative heads are associated to $\text{Neg}^0$ and that negative adverbs originate in $\text{Spec, NegP}$. However, the latter assumption should be subject of reconsideration. Rowlett (1998) argues that the French negative adverb $\text{pas}$ is base-generated in a $vP$ adjunct position and it moves overtly to $\text{Spec, NegP}$. I demonstrate that Rowlett is essentially right in assuming that these negative adverbs are originally base-generated in a $vP$ adjunct position, but that the assumption that negative adverbs universally move to a higher $\text{Spec, NegP}$ position is false.

I show that such overt movement is restricted to French (and a few other languages), but that this does not hold for languages such as Standard Dutch or German, or the Scandinavian languages. Rather than stipulating that movement is covert in these languages, I demonstrate that there is no movement at all and that negative adverbs takes scope from a $vP$ adjunct position, scoping over the entire proposition.

Rowlett supports his claim that $\text{pas}$ is not base-generated in $\text{Spec, NegP}$ contrary to what Pollock (1989) and Zanuttini (1998) suggest. He provides three different kinds of evidence: conceptual arguments, synchronic arguments and diachronic arguments. Conceptually the idea that $\text{pas}$ is a $vP$ adjunct is attractive, since it is the smallest syntactic domain that includes the entire proposition.\(^{219}\)

Synchronic evidence comes from the ban on certain types of negative imperatives in French. As in almost every variety of French the preverbal negative marker is allowed

\(^{219}\) Rowlett does not adopt a framework in which the light verb $v$ is always present, and he formulates his assumption about $\text{pas}$ as VP adjunction. The only theoretical argument in favour of an analysis that includes the light verb $v$, is that it fits nicely in phase theory: negation does not only take a proposition as its complement, but it introduces syntactic islands as well, from which extraction is only possible under well-defined conditions.
to occur optionally, one can distinguish between two types of imperatives in French: those with *pas*, and those with *ne ... pas*.

(41)  (Ne) me regarde *pas*!  
      (Neg) me watch neg
      ‘Don’t look at me’

In (41) the pronoun *ne* is a clitic that occurs to the left of the V$_{fin}$. However, if the pronoun is replaced by a heavy pronoun *moi* ‘me’ in its canonical postverbal position, it becomes impossible to use the negative imperative with *ne*.

(42)  (*Ne) regard *e moi* pas!  
      (Neg) watch me neg
      ‘Don’t watch me’

Elaborating on Kayne’s (1992) conclusion that true imperatives lack TP and any functional structure that is higher than TP, Zanuttini (1994) argues that in (42) there is no NegP (which she takes to be higher than TP) available. Hence the negative head *ne* cannot be base-generated in Neg°. Rowlett argues that if Neg° is not realised then there is no possibility for *pas* to move out of its vP adjunct position. This accounts for the examples in (42).

If Zanuttini’s general account for the ban on true negative imperatives in several languages is correct, it is likely that Neg° is absent in (42). The only alternative, namely that Neg° is realised covertly, does not hold. Suppose that Neg° is realised covertly. In that case *pas* would be expected to move obligatorily to Spec,NegP, thus moving across the object pronoun *moi* which is in a position between NegP and vP, as in standard indicative constructions. However, this movement is ruled out.

(43)  a. *Regarde *pas* moi!  
      Watch neg me
      ‘Don’t look at me’

b.  *Il ne* regarde *pas* moi  
    He neg watches neg me
    ‘He doesn’t watch me’

Another piece of evidence comes from the observation that French underwent a diachronic change with respect to the position of *pas* (cf. Hirschbühl & Labelle (1993, 1994)). Whereas 20$^{th}$ Century French allows *pas* to occur at a position preceding an infinitival clause, in 17$^{th}$ Century French *pas* occurs to the right of V$_{inf}$.
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(44) a. ... c'est de ne s'abandonner pas au plaisir de les suivre\textsuperscript{220} ... it is neg abandon neg to the pleasure of them follow
   '... is not giving in to the pleasure of following them'

   b. Nous fûmes bien malheureux de ne pas t'emmener We are well unhappy of neg neg you take
   'We are very unhappy not taking you with us'

The fact that *pas* is allowed to occur at a lower position (with respect to $V_{\text{inf}}$) forms another strong indication that *pas* does not originate in Spec,NegP. This leads to the following syntactic representation of *pas* in French.

(45) \[
\left[ \text{Neg} \right. \, \left[ \text{Neg}^e \, \text{ne} \right] \left[ \text{vP} < \text{pas} > \left[ \text{vP} \right] \right] \] French

A question that rises now is why *pas* has to move to Spec,NegP. As movement is the result of feature checking requirements *pas* has to move to have its uninterpretable [uNEG] feature checked against Neg$^o$, or *pas* has to move to Spec,NegP in order to check an [uNEG] uninterpretable feature of *ne*. Hence the question about the trigger of *pas* movement to Spec,NegP is reduced to the question which of the two negative markers is the bearer of the [iNEG] feature, and which marker carries [uNEG].

It is generally assumed that *pas* carries [iNEG] and *ne* [uNEG]. The reasons for this are: (i) *pas*, contrary to *ne*, is able to express not only sentential negation, but can also negate other phrases such as AP's, DP's, PP's, etc. (46); (ii) *ne* may occur by itself in French, but only in non-negative sentences, i.e. sentences without a negative operator carrying [iNEG]. As soon as *pas* is added, a negative operator is included in the semantics (47). Finally, the assumption that *pas* carries [iNEG] is in line with the observation that NegP does not always have to be realised in sentences that contain *pas*, such as in the imperative in (42), as movement of *pas* is only triggered to check [uNEG] features.

(46) a. *Pas* mal
   Neg bad
   'Not bad'

   b. *Pas* moi
   Neg me
   'Not me'

   c. *Pas* de Paris
   Neg of Paris
   'Not from Paris'

(47) a. Elle a peur que tu *ne* sois là
   She has fear that you neg be
   'She's afraid that you might be there'

\textsuperscript{220} Data from Hirschbüller & Labelle (1993).
b. Elle a peur que tu ne sois pas là
   She has fear that you neg be.SUBJ neg there
   ‘She’s afraid that you might not be there’

I conclude that movement of \( \text{pas} \) to Spec,\text{NegP} is triggered to check \( \text{ne} \)’s [u\text{NEG}] feature. In the case of the absence of \( \text{ne} \), I assume that the \( \text{Neg}^0 \) position is phonologically empty, but still contains a [u\text{NEG}] feature that heads this projection. In other words, \( \text{Neg}^0\text{[uNEG]} \) is optionally spelled-out in French.

\[
\text{(48) } \begin{array}{c}
\text{[NegP pas[NEG] [Neg}^0 \text{(ne)[uNEG]] [vP <pas> [vP]]]}
\end{array}
\text{French}
\]

The conclusion that French \( \text{pas} \) moves to Spec,\text{NegP} in order to check external uninterpretable features, implies that in languages in which there are no [u\text{NEG}] features, movement of the negative adverb is not required and therefore excluded. This leads to the following picture for Phase V languages: either there is a phonologically abstract [u\text{NEG}] feature present in \( \text{Neg}^o \), or there is no [u\text{NEG}] feature present, and consequently no \text{NegP}. For a language like Dutch, this means that there are two possible ways of analysing the structural position of \( \text{niet} \).

\[
\text{(49) } \begin{array}{ll}
a. & \text{[NegP niet[NEG] Neg}^0\text{[uNEG]} [vP t; [vP]]] \\
b. & \text{[vP niet[NEG] [vP]]}
\end{array}
\]

The problem how to determine which representation in (49) is correct for Dutch, is subject of theoretical considerations rather than empirical observations. Since in Phase V languages there is no overt realisation of [u\text{NEG}] the head \( \text{Neg}^o \) is always phonologically empty and it does not block verb movement. It follows that there is no empirical way to determine the existence of a head \( X^o \) if \( X^o \) is never expressed overtly. Therefore it appears to be impossible to choose between the two structures in (50).

\[
\text{(50) } \begin{array}{ll}
a. & \text{XP} \\
 & \text{YP} \\
 & \text{(Neg)} \\
 & \text{X'} \\
 & \text{X}^0 \\
 & \text{ZP} \\

b. & \text{YP} \\
 & \text{ZP} \\
 & \text{(Neg)} \\
 & \text{ZP} \\
 & \varnothing
\end{array}
\]

The problem is not restricted to negation, but to adverbs in general: are adverbs located in the specifier position of a special functional projection, or are they adjuncts of lexical or functional categories, such as CP, IP, \( vP \), etc? In the next subsection, I show that an adjunct approach is to be preferred from a theoretical point of view over the assumption of multiple functional projections. As a consequence, I will argue that Phase V languages only have a functional projection \text{NegP} if there is positive
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evidence for it: phonological realisations of [uNEG] features or overt movement of the negative adverb to a higher position.

6.2.4 The availability of NegP

Ever since Cinque’s (1999) seminal work on adverbial ordering, it is known that adverbs are subject to a functional sequence. Cinque demonstrates that the distributional properties of adverbs, free functional morphemes, verbal affixes and restructuring verbs share important distributional properties, and that for that reason all these phenomena should be given a similar treatment.

Cinque therefore argues that the distribution of adverbs is the result of syntactic selection in which lower adverbial phrases, containing for instance manner adverbs, are selected by higher adverbial phrases like mood or modality phrases. He proposes a fine-grained structure for adverbial phrases as in (51):

(51) \[
\text{[frankly \ Mood}_{\text{speech act}} \ [\text{fortunately \ Mood}_{\text{evaluative}} \ [\text{allegedly \ Mood}_{\text{evidential}} \ [\text{probably \ Mod}_{\text{epistemic}} \ [\text{once \ T(Past)} \ [\text{then \ T(Future)} \ [\text{perhaps \ Mod}_{\text{intensive}} \ [\text{necessarily \ Mod}_{\text{necessity}} \ [\text{Possibly \ Mod}_{\text{possibility}} \ [\text{usually \ Asp}_{\text{habitual}} \ [\text{again \ Asp}_{\text{repetitive(I)}} \ [\text{often \ Asp}_{\text{frequentative(I)}} \ [\text{intentionally \ Mod}_{\text{volitional}} \ [\text{quickly \ Asp}_{\text{celerative(I)}} \ [\text{already \ T(Anterior)} \ [\text{no \ longer \ Asp}_{\text{terminative}} \ [\text{still \ Asp}_{\text{continuative}} \ [\text{always \ Asp}_{\text{perfect(?)}} \ [\text{just \ Asp}_{\text{prospective}} \ [\text{soon \ Asp}_{\text{proximative}} \ [\text{briefly \ Asp}_{\text{durative}} \ [\text{Characteristically(?)} \ Asp_{\text{generic/progressive}} \ [\text{almost \ Asp}_{\text{prospective}} \ [\text{completely \ Asp}_{\text{SpCompletive(I)}} \ [\text{tutto \ Asp}_{\text{SpCompletive}} \ [\text{well \ Voice} \ [\text{fast/early Asp}_{\text{celerative(I)}} \ [\text{again \ Asp}_{\text{repetative(I)}} \ [\text{often \ Asp}_{\text{frequentative(I)}} \ [\text{completely \ Asp}_{\text{SpCompletive(I)}}]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]])]
\]

From this ordering, contrasts as in (52)-(53) follow immediately:

(52) a. Waarschijnlijk gaat Jan vaak naar huis
   Probably goes Jan often to house
   ‘Probably John often goes home’

b. *Vaak gaat Jan waarschijnlijk naar huis
   Often goes Jan probably to house

(53) a. Mogelijk heeft hij het werk bijna af
   Possibly has he the job almost done
   ‘Possibly, he has almost done the job’

b. *Bijna heeft hij mogelijk het werk af
   Almost has he possibly the work done

However, this ordering is not uncontroversial. First, it has been observed that there are counter-arguments against this ordering as in (54), arguing against a syntactic analysis

of the ordering in terms of selection and feature checking of adverbial heads (Nilsen 2003).

(54) This is a fun free game where you’re *always possibly* a click away from winning $1000!222

Nilsen (2003) argues that these readings show that the adverbial hierarchy is not the result of syntactic selection, but of semantic scope effects. In (54) *always* scopes over *possibly*, although generally *possibly* dominates *always*. Nilsen assumes that expressions with a scope ordering as in (54) are felicitous only in rare situations. Hence the relative order of adverbials should be accounted for in terms of semantics/pragmatics (cf. also Ernst 2001, Svenonius 2001b).

Nilsen shows that if one has a semantic mechanism that accounts for the standard order of adverbials the selection and checking mechanism Cinque proposes becomes theoretically redundant. The proposal that adverbials move to particular selected positions in order to check the corresponding uninterpretable features of the adverbial heads is no longer needed to account for the relative order of adverbs.223

Nilsen’s argument is also attractive from a conceptual point of view: it reduces the syntactic ontology. If the adverbial sequence no longer has to be accounted for in syntactic terms, syntax can discard with a series of functional features/projections, a desirable result under minimalist assumptions.

Note that adverbial heads are not ruled out. The distributional properties of adverbial heads and the position of adverbs are determined by pragmatic and semantic considerations. Only if there is positive evidence for uninterpretable adverbial features, such as adverbial morphology on the verb, or free adverbial morphemes that prove to be syntactic heads, the existence of an adverbial head position is required. However, there is no need to assume the presence of adverbial heads if there is no visible marking of the adverbial head at all, and adverbials can be taken to be adjuncts of other projections. As a consequence, not every adverbial corresponds to a distinct syntactic category.

Applying this theory to a theory of negative adverbs, negative adverbs only move to Spec,NegP if there is positive evidence for the existence of a [uNEG] feature. This can either be a negative affix, a preverbal negative marker, overt movement to a higher position than the position that the negative adverb is base-generated in, or overt agreement with an element carrying a phonologically present [uNEG] feature.

The latter possibility connects the syntactic status of the negative marker with the occurrence of Negative Concord (NC). Suppose that n-words (in NC languages) can be considered non-negative elements carrying a [uNEG] feature. Then NC can be seen as syntactic agreement and the negative marker (carrying [iNEG]) eliminates the n-word’s [uNEG] feature under Agree. Since in these languages, as in the languages

---

222 Example taken from Nilsen (2003).

223 Not every reverse order is ruled out by pragmatic considerations. Nilsen (2003) shows that modal adverbs such as *probably* are positive polarity items and therefore have to precede negation. Likewise, negation always has to scope over universal adverbs such as *always*, as a result of the semantic properties of universal adverbs (which are not allowed to scope over negation).
with a preverbal negative marker, \([u\text{NEG}]\) is visibly present, a functional projection NegP is required. In the next chapter, I show that \(n\)-words should be treated as non-negative indefinites carrying \([u\text{NEG}]\). That makes NC a trigger for the presence of NegP. Moreover, it is predicted that the relation that all languages with negative head markers are NC languages. NC languages have a NegP at their disposal, whereas non-NC languages do not. Therefore, only in NC languages negative head marker can be spelled out.

To conclude, NegP is only available in languages with a \([u\text{NEG}]\) feature, i.e. with a syntactic category \textit{negation}. I showed that NegP is available in all languages with a preverbal negative marker (Jespersen Phase I-IV, VI). In Phase V languages the availability of a NegP depends on the occurrence of \([u\text{NEG}]\) features. Hence negation as a syntactic category is subject to cross-linguistic variation.

### 6.2.5 Concluding remarks

In this section the categorical properties of negation have been introduced and it has been shown that negation may be implemented syntactically by a functional projection NegP. NegP may either host a (strong) preverbal negative marker, or establish an Agree relation with a lower negative marker (clitic-like or affixal). In those cases the negative projection is the result of feature projection of the negative feature of \(V_{\text{fin}}\).

Furthermore, following Rowlett (1998) I showed that the negative adverb \textit{pas} in French occupies Spec,NegP at surface structure, but that it originates at a \(vP\) adjunct position. Elaborating on this observation, and following a line of thinking introduced by Nilsen (2003), I argued that all negative adverbs are base-generated at a \(vP\) position, and that these elements may move to a derived position Spec,NegP if this projection is triggered. The trigger is the lexical realisation of a \([u\text{NEG}]\) feature. This leads to the following typology:

\[(55)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I languages</th>
<th>([\text{NegP} [\text{Neg}^+ \text{non}] [vP V_{\text{fin}}]])</th>
<th>Italian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>([\text{NegP} [\text{Neg}^+] [vP V_{\text{fin}}-me[u\text{NEG}]]))</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>([\text{NegP} [\text{Neg}^+] [vP ne-V_{\text{fin}}[u\text{NEG}]]))</td>
<td>Czech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>([\text{NegP} [\text{Neg}^+] [vP u-V_{\text{fin}}[u\text{NEG}]]))</td>
<td>Carcarese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II languages</td>
<td>([\text{NegP} (\text{pas}) [\text{Neg}^+ \text{no}]])</td>
<td>Catalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III languages</td>
<td>([\text{NegP pas} [\text{Neg}^+ \text{ne}] [vP t; [vP]])</td>
<td>St. French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>([\text{NegP niet} [vP en/\text{ne}-V_{\text{fin}}[u\text{NEG}]]))</td>
<td>Middle Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV languages</td>
<td>([\text{NegP pas} [\text{Neg}^+ (\text{ne})])</td>
<td>Coll. French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>([\text{NegP niet} [vP en-V_{\text{fin}}[u\text{NEG}]]))</td>
<td>West Flemish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase V languages</td>
<td>([\text{NegP niet} [vP t; [vP]])</td>
<td>Bavarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>([vP niet [vP]])</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase VI languages</td>
<td>([\text{NegP not} [\text{Neg}^+ n'c]])</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a syntactic category, negation is subject to cross-linguistic variation. Languages do not require a specific syntactic configuration to express sentential negation. The presence of NegP is only one option. Another option is to use a negative adverb that can be interpreted at LF as the negative operator $Op_-$. Without further syntactic marking. In that case, the lexical representation of the negative marker is not involved in syntactic operations (except for Merge) and is directly interpreted at LF.

As mentioned briefly in the previous subsection, the distribution of the syntactic category negation (or the functional projection NegP) reflects the distributional pattern of NC across languages. All languages that have a syntactic category negation (Neg$^o$, phonologically overt or abstract) also exhibit NC. This means that non-NC languages can only be found amongst Phase V languages. In other words: all languages in which NegP is present are NC languages, and all languages in which NegP is absent (like Dutch) cannot be NC languages. Hence I will hypothesise that NC corresponds one to one to the presence of NegP in negative sentences and that NC is a form of syntactic agreement with respect to negation. This hypothesis will be discussed extensively in chapter 8.

### 6.3 The locus of NegP

Another question that needs to be addressed with respect to NegP is its position in the clause. First, I will briefly evaluate Ouhalla’s (1991) proposal that there is a single position of NegP in the clause, of which the position is parameterised: either it dominates TP or VP. Then I discuss Zanuttini’s (1998) analysis that there are multiple NegP’s in the clausal domain which potentially could all host a negative marker (6.3.1). In 6.3.2, I show that the position of NegP is semantically derived, where sentential negation is considered to be a form of binding of event variables by a negative quantifier. I follow Ramchand (2001) in assuming that this form of negation is not universal, but that languages may vary with respect to the kind of variables that are bound by a negative quantifier under negation.

### 6.3.1 Fixed positions of NegP

On the basis of different positions of the negative affix in Turkish and Berber, Ouhalla (1991) argues that NegP can occupy two different positions in the clause. Ouhalla proposes that this variation is the result of a single parameter that either puts NegP on top of TP or on top of VP. He shows that in Turkish, negative affixes are in between the verb and tense affixes, whereas in Berber negation is in the outer layer of verbal morphology. This is shown in (56).
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(56) a. \( Ur\text{-ad-y-xdel Mohand dudsha}^{224} \) Berber  
\( \text{Neg.FUT.3MASC.arrive Mohand tomorrow} \)  
‘Mohan will not arrive tomorrow’

b. John elmalar-i ser-me-di Turkish  
John apples like.neg.PAST.3SG  
‘John doesn’t like apples’

Ouhalla formulates the NEG parameter as in (57) and he argues that the same parameter holds for languages like Dutch and French as well: in French NegP dominates TP, in Dutch NegP dominates VP.

(57) NEG Parameter  
a. NegP selects TP  
b. NegP selects VP

Although we will see that a fixed parameterised position for NegP leaves open many questions, this proposal provides more space for a flexible analysis of NegP than e.g. Pollock’s (1989) proposal, in which the position of NegP is fixed by UG. Ouhalla’s analysis that NegP selects VP in languages such as Dutch or German is in line with my analysis that negation in these languages can be expressed by means of an operator in vP adjunct position. There are some arguments against a (fixed) position of NegP on top of TP: (i) the argument from the morphological order does not hold: it remains unclear whether the negative markers are affixes or clitic-like elements that are attached to \( V_{\text{fin}} \); (ii) negation seems to have a distribution that is more free than would be expected from a fixed NegP>TP or TP>NegP order; and (iii) the assumption that NegP dominates TP would incorrectly predict that it is possible to license NPI subjects to the left of the negative marker.

The first argument Ouhalla presents to support his claim that NegP dominates TP or TP dominates NegP comes from the order of tense and negative morphemes in the examples in (56). However, the two examples do not form a strict minimal pair with respect to the order of verbal morphemes, since the Turkish negative affix occurs to the right of the verbal stem, whereas in Berber the inflectional material is located to the left of \( V_{\text{fin}} \). Consequently, one cannot distinguish between the following two representations for Berber negation:

(58) a. \( [[\text{NegP} \ ur] \ [V^o \text{-ad-y-xdel}]] \)

b. \( [[V^o \ ur\text{-ad-y-xdel}_{[\text{a NEG}]}}]] \)

In (58)a the negative marker is attached through head adjunction to \( V_{\text{fin}} \), whereas in (58)b ur is part of the verbal inflectional morphology. As the first analysis cannot be excluded for Berber, the argument from morphology does not hold, since ur in (58)a is not part of the verbal inflectional system.

A second argument against Ouhalla’s parameter comes from Zanuttini (1998, 2001) who argues that postverbal negative markers in Romance varieties are allowed to occupy different positions with respect to adverbials. In a framework as developed in Cinque (1999) this would imply that NegP should be assigned different positions within the adverbial hierarchy. That is exactly why Zanuttini proposes four different NegP position within the hierarchical ordering of functional projections, together with two positions for TP.225

\[
(59) \quad [\text{NegP}_1 [\text{TP}_1 [\text{NegP}_2 [\text{TP}_2 [\text{NegP}_3 \text{Asgp}pf [\text{Asgp}gen/prog [\text{NegP}_4 ]]]]])]
\]

Zanuttini is essentially right in arguing that more positions should be available for negative markers, but she does not make clear why these positions have to be the result of a syntactic selection mechanism. The fact that the distribution of negative markers seems much more free than a series of fixed NegP position suggests, does not form a strong argument in favour of an even more fine-grained structure, but rather for a free syntactic distribution, which is constrained by some independently motivated syntactic or semantic restrictions. Note that the arguments Nilsen (2003) put forward against a syntactic treatment of adverbial ordering also hold here: if the ordering of negative elements with respect to other elements in the sentences can be explained by a semantic analysis, there is no need to assume a syntactic selection mechanism as well.

The assumption that NegP dominates TP faces another problem: if the negative operator is higher than the canonical subject position, one would expect NPI subjects to be felicitous in a position to the left of the negative marker (since subjects are located in Spec,TP) if the negative marker is attached to V_fin. This prediction is not borne out.

The following example from Czech proves that the negative operator is in fact located between the subject and the object position, as the subject NPI cannot be licensed by the lower negative marker, whereas the object NPI can.

\[
(60) \quad \begin{align*}
&\text{a. *Petník by za to nebyl dan} \\
&A.\text{nickel would for it neg.be given} \\
&\text{‘A single cent wouldn’t be paid for it’} \\
&\text{b. Petník by za to nedal} \\
&A.\text{nickel.NPI would for it neg.pay.3SG} \\
&\text{‘He wouldn’t pay a single cent for it’}
\end{align*}
\]

225 Another argument Zanuttini provides stems from negative imperatives (see also the discussion earlier in this chapter), where she argues that NegP is parasitic on TP. She claims that if TP is absent any higher functional material should be absent as well. In the following section I show that Zanuttini’s analysis for Negative Imperatives cannot explain why NegP should be parasitic. Moreover, even if NegP were parasitic on TP, there is no reason to assume a priori that in such a case NegP should dominate TP.
On the basis of these examples I conclude that in these languages NegP is located below TP as well. Apparently, the position of NegP may vary cross-linguistically, but seems to be dominated in many languages that have been diagnosed as NegP>TP languages. Therefore I argue that in the languages that have been discussed so far, NegP (if present) is below TP.

This claim is not universally applicable. If a given language with a negative marker attached to Vfin licenses NPI subjects (with the negative marker occurring to the right of this NPI), one has to assume that in those languages NegP is higher than TP. One such language is Hindi.

(61)  Koi-bhii nahin aayaa226
      Anybody neg came
      ‘Nobody came’

Hence I take Hindi to be a language in which TP dominates NegP, whereas in most other languages we saw that NegP dominates TP. This may seem as a revival of Ouhalla’s NEG parameter (with a different distribution amongst languages), but there is one major difference between Ouhalla’s analysis and mine, namely that I do not take the position of NegP in the clause to be a result of some (parameterised) syntactic selection mechanism, but to be driven from its semantic properties.

6.3.2 Sentential Negation as binding free variables

In this subsection I account for the difference between Hindi and the other languages with respect to the position of TP and NegP. In the previous section, I argued, following Nilsen (2003), that an account of the functional sequence should be semantic/pragmatic and such an account replaces a syntactic selection mechanism. This means that the locus of negation in the clause follows from semantic properties of negation. However, the question what the exact semantic properties of negation in natural language are, is subject to a lot of controversy, and a proper discussion of this debate is beyond the scope of this study. I therefore assume, without any further discussion, that standard sentential negation is binding of event variables by existential closure that is introduced by the negative operator (following Acquaviva 1997, Giannakidou 1999). Negation, being the negative operator, introduces an existential quantifier that binds all free variables that have remained unbound during the derivation.

(62)  \[Op\rightarrow \exists x [...(e)...(x)...]]

From such an analysis of sentential negation, the locus of negation as dominating vP seems very plausible. In many syntactic analyses \(v^o\) or a functional projection high in

226 Example taken from Vasishth (1999).
the \( v \) domain, is said to introduce a free event variable (cf. Chomsky 1995, Ernst 2001). A position above \( vP \) enables the negative operator to bind the event variable. The assumption that sentential negation is a form of event binding, explains why negation occupies a position in the clause, immediately dominating \( vP \).

The question that rises then is how to account for the facts about Hindi, in which negation seems to license NPI's at surface structure. Given that \( T^o \) introduces a time variable, this implies that in this case negation is not only a form of event negation, but that the existential quantifier that is introduced by the negative operator, binds temporal variables, leading to a different logical form for negative sentences. The idea that languages may vary with respect to the binding strategy for sentential negation has first been proposed by Ramchand (2001). She argues that languages may opt for a strategy in which the negative marker binds an event variable, or a time variable. Consequently, sentential negation can be the result of two different logical forms. However, Ramchand argues that in most cases the two strategies will yield subtle interpretational differences only.

As support for her analysis, Ramchand shows that Bengali has two different negative markers, \( ni \) and \( na \), one for each strategy. \( Na \) is said to bind event variables, and \( ni \) binds time variables. Ramchand shows that these negative markers are in most cases in complementary distribution (where \( na \) is the default negative marker), but that there are sentences that allow for both negative markers. In those sentences the interpretational differences become visible in the interaction with other temporal adverbials. Moreover, the interaction with NPI's follows immediately from this analysis. In Bengali, a temporal NPI adverb \( kokhono \) 'ever' can only be licensed by \( ni \) and not by \( na \).

\[
(63) \quad \begin{align*}
a. \text{Ami kokhono an khai } ni & \quad \text{Bengali} \\
\text{I ever mangoes ate neg} & \\
\text{‘I never ate mangoes’} \\
b. \text{*Ami kokhono an khai } na & \\
\text{I ever mangoes ate neg} & \\
\text{‘I never ate mangoes’} \\
\end{align*}
\]

### 6.3.3 Concluding remarks

In this section I argued that there is a series of arguments that languages vary with respect to the position of NegP. In most languages, NegP is located on top of \( vP \), in other languages it dominates TP. I showed furthermore that the position of negation is not syntactically predetermined, but that it should be the result of the semantic properties of the negative operator. Following a proposal by Ramchand (2001), I assume that in those languages in which NegP dominates TP, the negative operator binds temporal variables, hence yielding a logical form that is interpreted as sentential negation. In languages in which NegP is below TP the negative operator binds event variables, yielding a logical form, which is also interpreted as sentential negation.
A major advantage of this view on the syntactic distribution of NegP (or the negative operator) is that one does not need to presuppose multiple positions for NegP in order to account for variety of the position of the negative marker, but that every NegP in the syntactic clause introduces exactly one semantic negation.  

### 6.4 Negative Imperatives

As we saw in the conclusion of chapter 5, true negative imperatives are forbidden in all Non-Strict NC languages (64), and in some Strict NC languages (65). In other Strict languages true negative imperatives are allowed (66).

(64)  

a. *¡No lee!*  
   Neg read.2SG.IMP  
   ‘Don’t read’

b. *Non parla*  
   Neg talk.2SG.IMP  
   ‘Don’t talk’

(65)  
*Đhen diavase to!*  
Neg read.2SG.IMP it  
‘Don’t read it’

(66)  

a. *Ne čitaj ga!*  
   Neg read.2SG.IMP it.ACC.CL

b. *Ne go četi!*  
   Neg it.ACC.CL read.2SG.IMP  
   ‘Don’t read it’

The difference between the negative marker in Greek and the negative marker in the Slavic examples is that the Greek negative marker, similar to the Italian/ Spanish marker is a strong negative marker, not attached to V_{fin}, whereas the Slavic markers are weak. As I discussed in section 6.2, strong negative markers are base-generated in Neg° and weak negative markers are base-generated in a position attached to V_{fin}. The [uNEG] feature is projected in a higher Neg° position, which holds the negative operator [iNEG] in its spec position. Hence the generalisation from chapter 5 with respect to the ban on true negative imperatives can be rephrased as follows:

(67) Whenever a negative marker is base-generated in Neg°, true negative imperatives are not allowed.

---

227 This does not exclude the presence of multiple Neg heads in the clause: as these heads will be adjoined to V, these Neg heads do not project.

228 Examples taken from Tomic (1999).
Several analyses have been proposed to account for the ungrammaticality of (64)-(65). These analyses can be roughly divided into two groups: (i) analyses in terms of the negative marker blocking movement of V\textsubscript{fin} to a higher position (Rivero 1994, Rivero & Terzi 1995); and (ii) analyses that say that NegP is parasitic on TP, i.e. NegP does not exist without TP being present (and dominating NegP). In the latter analysis true imperatives are said not to trigger any TP, and the absence of TP excludes the presence of a (higher) NegP (Kayne 1992, Zanuttini 1994).

It is standardly assumed that imperatives move to a position in a functional projection that is hosted by a [Mood] feature. Rivero (1994) and Rivero & Terzi (1995) assume that languages vary cross-linguistically with respect to the position where [Mood] can be projected. In languages like Spanish, Italian or Greek, Mood is realised in C°, whereas in the Slavic type of languages Mood is realised in I° (or T°). If Neg° is located between C° and I°, it follows from the Head Movement Constraint that negative heads block movement to C° and hence rule out true negative imperatives. The Slavic languages can express true negative imperatives, since Neg° does not block V-to-I movement.

However, this account faces several problems. Tomic (1999) argues that the assumption that Mood is realised in I° in Slavic languages is not well founded and she provides examples in which she shows that the subject located in Spec,TP can precede and follow the imperative verb. Consequently, imperative verbs can move to a higher position than I°.

A second argument against Rivero’s analysis is that several negative markers, such as French ne, are able to incorporate into an (empty) head. Hence it remains unclear why French true negative imperatives cannot fuse with ne and move to C° together.

\[
\text{(68) } \begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{C°} \quad \text{NegP} \\
\text{Neg°} \\
\text{Ne} \quad \text{mange} \\
\text{TP} \quad \text{T°} \\
\text{t}_i 
\end{array}
\]

A third argument against Rivero’s analysis is that true imperatives are always morphologically poor which argues against an analysis in terms of movement to functional projections, as movement is generally taken to be morphologically driven. The morphological poorness of true negative imperative forms can then be taken as an argument to propose that imperatives clauses are structurally poorer than indicative clauses.

---

\[229\] This argument is not sufficient by itself, as it depends strongly on the alleged relationship between morphological richness and syntactic operations. However, it is another indication against Rivero’s approach.
Zanuttini (1994) suggests, following Kayne (1992), that imperatives only move to a separate Mood\(^\circ\) position, which is immediately dominating vP and that this MoodP is the highest position in the imperative clause. According to Zanuttini the absence of TP blocks the presence of any functional material higher than TP, including NegP. Since there is no TP, true negative imperatives cannot exist. Although it seems plausible to assume that TP is lacking in imperatives (since imperatives are considered to be tenseless) and that true imperatives are truncated syntactic structures, there is no reason to assume that NegP is absent as well. Only if the negative marker would carry a \([uT]\) feature that needs to be eliminated against TP, we may explain the absence of negative imperatives as a consequence of the absence of TP. It has been suggested that negative markers require such a feature, since they express sentential negation. This assumption holds in languages in which the negative marker is only allowed to express sentential negation. This is certainly not the case for Italian non, since it is also allowed to express constituent negation.

(69) \[
\text{Gianni ha arrivato non oggi} \\
\text{Gianni has arrived neg today} \\
\text{‘Not today Gianni arrived’}
\]

Moreover, Zanuttini’s solution cannot explain why true negative imperatives in languages with a lower negative marker are not forbidden. Since negative markers need to be in a feature checking relation with NegP, true negative imperatives in clauses without a NegP are ruled out.

Both Rivero’s and Zanuttini’s analyses face serious problems. However these problems can be solved if one adopts the conclusion from the previous section that NegP is below TP and immediately dominates vP. In this case MoodP also dominates NegP, and hence an overtly filled Neg\(^\circ\) blocks movement from v\(^\circ\) to Mood\(^\circ\) as a result of the HMC.

(70) \[
[\text{MoodP [NegP [vP]]}]
\]

It is explained why in languages in which the negative marker is base-generated in Neg\(^\circ\) (Italian, Spanish, Greek, a.o.) true imperatives are not allowed, whereas in languages in which the negative marker is base-generated in a position attached to \(V_{\text{fin}}\), Neg\(^\circ\) contains a phonologically empty feature \([u\text{NEG}]\). This feature does not block V-to-Mood movement and therefore true negative imperatives are allowed in these languages.

The only problem that remains open is the question why a negative marker that is base-generated in Neg\(^\circ\) cannot incorporate into \(V_{\text{imp}}\) and move to Mood\(^\circ\) together with \(V_{\text{imp}}\). I take phonologically strong negative markers such as Italian non to be (syntactic) words, and the phonologically weak forms, such as French ne, not. Furthermore, I adopt the standard hypothesis that syntactic words cannot be subject to
incorporation, but only to compounding. This explains why the negative marker in Italian cannot incorporate in a higher head.

As there is no rule that forbids such incorporation of the French negative marker *ne* the explanation for the absence of true negative imperative forms in French should come from somewhere else. I argue that French *ne*, contrary to the Spanish or Italian negative markers, has a [uT] feature. This explains also why *ne*, contrary to Italian *non*, may not be used as a marker of constituent negation. Adopting Kayne’s and Zanuttini’s proposal that true imperative forms lack a T° head, the ungrammaticality of true negative imperatives follows immediately: *ne* cannot incorporate into T°, hence its [uT] feature remains unchecked and the derivation crashes.

This analysis is also supported by the facts about French *ne* that have been discussed in 6.1.1. The claim that the French negative marker incorporates into T° also explains the surface order of negative infinitives in French (cf. Rowlett 1998).

\[(71) \quad [\text{Il veut} \, [T° \, \text{ne}, \, [\text{NegP pas} \, [\text{Neg}° \, t, \, [v \, \text{manger}]])]] \quad \text{French}\]

This analysis about true negative imperatives follows from the generalisation on these imperatives that has been formulated in chapter 5 and accounts for the distribution that has been found. Moreover this analysis can explain the ban on true negative imperatives by adopting (i) that imperatives verbs move obligatory to Mood°; (ii) the Head Movement Constraint; and (iii) the absence of T° in true negative imperatives. Note that these assumptions have been motivated independently.

### 6.5 Universal Subjects and Negation

In this section I address another generalisation that has been drawn in chapter 5: the relation between Negative Concord and the reading of ∀-subjects that are followed by a negative marker. At the end of section 6.2, I hypothesised that all NC languages express sentential negation by means of a NegP. Hence the generalisation that in all NC languages the reverse ∀-subject - negation reading is available, as well as in a strict subset of the set of Non-NC languages, can be rephrased as in (72).

\[(72) \quad \text{Every NC language (i.e. every language that has NegP) has an inverse reading of clauses in which an ∀-subject precedes the negative marker. Only in some non-NC language this reading is also available.}\]

As we saw before, in languages with a NegP present, the negative operator is located in a higher position than in languages without NegP. Recall that one of the arguments to locate NegP immediately above vP was that vP is the smallest projection that contains the entire proposition (73)a. This assumption is based on the widely accepted proposal that subjects are base-generated in Spec,vP and may move to a Spec,TP position later on (Koopman & Sportiche 1991, Chomsky 2001). In languages without
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a NegP, subjects and negative operators are both base-generated in a specifier position of vP (73)b.

(73) a. \([\text{Neg}P \, Op_\pi, \, [\text{Neg}^\circ \, [\text{vP} \, SU \, [\pi]]]]\]
   
   \ b. \([\text{vP} \, Op_\pi, \, [\text{vP} \, SU \, [\pi]]]\]

In the case of sentential negation in languages that have NegP, the presence of NegP (outside vP) is triggered by the presence of a negative head marker that carries [uNEG] or by the fact that the negative head marker is base-generated in Neg°. As a consequence, in all these languages sentential negation always takes scope from a position higher than vP outscoping the subject in Spec,vP.

In languages without NegP however, this consequence does not follow: as the negative adverb is not required to be hosted in a particular projection, the following structure is also allowed:

(74) \([\text{vP} \, SU \, [\text{vP} \, Op_\pi]]\]

Since in the structure in (74) the subject dominates the negative operator, this is no instance of propositional negation anymore, but an instance of predicate negation, which is strictly speaking (from a syntactic point of view) a form of constituent negation. Thus one difference between NC and non-NC languages is that in NC languages a negative operator cannot take scope from a position below the base-generated position of the subject.230

Let us look at the consequences of this fact for universal subjects. It is well known that universal quantifiers are generally not allowed to raise over negation (cf. Beghelli & Stowell 1997, Nilsen 2003) (75).

(75) John didn’t see every book
\[\forall x[\text{book}'(x) \rightarrow \text{saw}'(j, x)]\]
\[\forall x[\text{book}'(x) \rightarrow \neg \text{saw}'(j, x)]\]

However, in the logical form of (76), the subject scopes over the negative operator. Since universal quantifiers are not allowed to raise over the negative operators, the only way to establish such readings is by the \(\forall\)-subject already having scope over the negative operator in base-generated position.

(76) Iedereen loopt niet
Everyone walks neg
‘Nobody walks’

(77) \([\text{vP} \, iedereen \, [\text{vP} \, niet \, [\pi]]]\]

230 This is not entirely true. In chapter 7 and 8, I show instances where this is indeed the case. However, in those examples there is no negative marker present. The presence of NegP in a position above vP is merely the result if the presence of the negative marker in NC languages.
(78) \( \lambda P. \forall x.[\text{Human}'(x) \rightarrow P(x)](\lambda y. \neg \text{walk}'(y)) = \forall x.[\text{Human}'(x) \rightarrow \neg \text{walk}'(x)] \)

Only in those languages in which the subject has been base-generated in a higher position than the negative operator this interpretation is available. In all other languages, these sentences receive the reverse interpretation, i.e. the order \( \neg \rightarrow \forall \). Therefore this reading is expected to be available only in those languages that lack NegP, i.e. only in non-NC languages. This explains partly the generalisation in (72), namely why the only available reading in NC languages is reverse \( (\neg \rightarrow \forall) \).

Three questions still need to be answered: (i) how can the fact that languages allow surface structure orders in which the \( \forall \)-subject dominates the negative marker despite the ban on QR of universal quantifiers over the negative operator as in the example (76); (ii) why are these sentences, even in NC languages, only marginally acceptable; (iii) why do not all non-NC varieties have the \( \forall \rightarrow \neg \) readings at their disposal.

The first question to be addressed is why word orders of the form \( \forall \rightarrow \neg \) (with reading \( \neg \rightarrow \forall \)) are allowed in many languages. First, in many languages, e.g. the Slavic languages, the negative marker is attached to \( V_f \), and the negative operator is realised abstractly. In these cases, the location of the negative marker does not represent the location of the negative operator. The correct representation of these sentences is: \( OP_{\neg} > \forall > \neg \) negative marker.

Second, in other languages the negative marker is the phonological realisation of the negative operator, such as those many varieties of Dutch in which the reverse order is the preferred one (although it is only marginally acceptable).

(79) iedereen komt niet
Everybody comes neg
‘Not everybody comes’

Substandard Dutch

The question remains open why in this sentence the \( \forall \)-subject seems to be allowed to move over \( niet \), whereas the reading remains inverse. This phenomenon can be explained in terms of feature movement. Movement of \textit{iedereen} in cases such as (79) is required for grammatical reasons, since subjects obligatory move to Spec,TP in Dutch. However, movement of the universal quantifier is forbidden for semantic reasons. The only way to rescue this conflict between semantic and formal requirements is to assume feature movement of the relevant (formal and phonological) features to Spec,TP, whereas the relevant semantic features remain in situ. Hence all formal and semantic requirements are fulfilled and the semantic features remain in Spec,vP.

(80) \([TP SU_{[\text{Formal and Phonological Features}]} [\lambda P OP_{\neg} [\lambda P SU_{[\text{Semantic Features}]}]])\]

The second question, why are these sentences only marginally acceptable to speakers, can be answered in terms of blocking effects. Given that in NC languages the only
possible reading is the inverse reading ($\rightarrow \forall$), these sentences are hard to parse as surface structure suggests an interpretation in which the universal quantifier scopes over negation. Moreover, there is a much easier way to produce a clause with the same reading ($\rightarrow \forall$), namely by putting the negation in front of the universal quantifier at surface structure.

(81)  

Pas tous le monde mange  

Not everybody eats  

‘Not everybody eats’

In sum, I assume that clauses with an $\forall$-subject are generally blocked by the existences of sentences like (81), where the interpretation is identical, but which are more ease to parse.

Finally, the third question concerns the range of interpretations of these clauses in non-NC languages. Contrary to NC languages, clauses with an $\forall$-subject preceding negation in non-NC languages are in principle ambiguous, depending on the original position in the derivation. However, the set of non-NC languages exhibits variation with respect to the availability of the interpretation of these clauses. In some varieties these clauses are ambiguous, in some clauses only the $\forall \rightarrow$ reading is available, in other varieties only the reverse reading $\rightarrow \forall$ is available.

I account for the varieties that lack ambiguity in terms of pragmatic blocking of one of these readings. Since both interpretations of (76) can be paraphrased by one the sentences in (82), which are also easier to parse, it is conceivably that languages rule out at least one of these interpretations for pragmatic reasons. In conversation, language users try to reduce ambiguity, and by disallowing one of the possible interpretations, these sentences become unambiguous.

(82)  
a.  

Niemand kommt  

N-body comes  

‘Nobody comes’

b.  

Niet iedereen comes  

Not everybody comes  

‘Not everybody comes’

The underlying ambiguity of these clauses also explains why these sentences are almost ungrammatical in most languages. As these sentences can easily be paraphrased by unambiguous examples or examples that form less problems for parsing, clauses with an $\forall$-subject preceding negation are generally blocked (cf. Giannakidou (2001) for an analysis for Greek).  

231 Giannakidou’s (2001) analysis uses pragmatic blocking to account for the ban on universal quantifiers scoping over negation, as QR does not render constructions that cannot be expressed otherwise. This is opposed to universal quantifier NPI’s which are required to cross negation for their semantic requirements.
6.6 Conclusions

In this chapter I implemented most generalisations that have been drawn in chapter 4 and 5 in a syntactic (minimalist) framework.

The first question was how to analyse the difference status of preverbal and postverbal negative markers. I argued, using different diagnostics, that preverbal negative markers (particles, clitic-like elements attached to V\text{fin}, or negative affixes) should be considered as syntactic heads (X°). Negative adverbs are considered to be specifiers or adjuncts of some projection XP.

As preverbal negative markers are syntactic heads, they project their own feature and this gives rise to a functional projection NegP. The preverbal negative marker is associated with the head of this projection, Neg°. The negative adverb may be associated with the specifier position of the functional category NegP, but this is not necessary. It could also be that the negative adverb remains in a vP adjunct position. Therefore, I argue that languages that only exhibit a negative adverb (Phase V languages) exhibit variation with respect to the presence of a functional projection NegP in negative clauses. Recall that this pattern reflects the correspondence between NC and the syntactic status of negative markers. Since all languages that have a visible negative head Neg° are NC languages, and only some languages without an overt negative head are NC language, I proposed the following hypothesis:

\[(83)\] Every language that exhibits a functional projection NegP is a NC language.

In the rest of this chapter I argued that the position of NegP is in between TP and vP in most languages (on the basis of both syntactic and semantic reasons), but that some languages such as Hindi or Bengali also express sentential negation by means of a NegP dominating TP. I adopted Ramchand’s (2001) claim that sentential negation is a form of binding of time variables or event variables by means of negative existential closure.

The conclusions so far lead to an explanation of two other generalisations in chapter 5: first, the generalisation that a subset of the set NC languages forbids true negative imperatives. I argue that this observation follows from the question whether the negative head marker is base-generated in Neg° or not. I have shown in section 6.4 that a negative marker blocks movement of V\text{fin} from v° to Mood° if it is base-generated in Neg°, which is obligatory for true imperatives.

Furthermore, I explained a second generalisation from chapter 5, namely the fact that NC languages allow for inverse readings only in clauses in which an ∀-subject precedes negation. I argued that this follows from the ban on QR of universal quantifiers over negation, and that in NC languages, given the presence of a functional category NegP, which hosts the negative operator Op°, in its spec position, the ∀-subject can never scope over negation. In non-NC languages, a derivation where a
universal subject quantifier is base-generated in a higher position than $O_p$ is allowed, and hence the availability of the reading $\forall x > -$ is accounted for.

The main conclusion from this chapter is that many generalisations follow from the observation that negation is flexible cross-linguistically (or language-externally) with respect to its syntactic categorical status. I have argued that only in a subset of the set of languages negation is realised as a syntactic category, i.e. it triggers syntactic operations. In other languages, like Dutch and German, syntax is blind for negation, i.e. negation does not trigger syntactic operations. Negative lexical items do not contain formal information for the syntactic procedure, but consist of material that can be interpreted directly at the interface with the Conceptual-Intentional component of the language faculty.