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3 The System of Negation in Standard English

3.1 Introduction

The present chapter is devoted to describing and analysing how negation works in Standard English. For this purpose, in sections 3.2 and 3.3, some terminology is introduced, and a number of theoretical considerations that are relevant to the syntactic account that is put forward in section 3.5 are discussed.

As stated in section 3.2, two types of negation have traditionally been distinguished in English: these have been labelled *sentential* and *constituent* negation (Klima 1964) and can be, in principle, told apart by means of a number of tests. It is shown, however, that these tests are problematic to a certain extent, which calls for a redefinition of the sentential versus constituent negation distinction in terms of the scope of negation with respect to the matrix predicate of the clause.

In section 3.3, it is established that English negation involves the projection of a Neg(ative) P(hrase). This conclusion is part of a more general discussion on whether negative markers can be granted functional status.

Further assumptions are made on the internal structure of NegP in Standard English which depart from the conventional view of this language as having negative quantifiers and, thus, disallowing the phenomenon of NC (see chapter 1). In addition, *not* and the contracted form *-n’t*, which are two possible phonological realisations of the sentential negative marker are assumed to be contextual allomorphs of the same syntactic head.

This view also departs from recent analyses of *not* and *-n’t* as Specifier of NegP and Negº respectively (Haegeman 1995; Zeijlstra 2004), but is in line with Distributed Morphology (DM) accounts of negation (Frampton 2001; Flagg 2002 and Parrott 2007). In line with Laka (1990), it is also assumed that NegP is just one possible value of a broader syntactic category, labelled here as PolP.

Section 3.4 contains an overview of the diachronic evolution of the system of negation from Old English to Present Day (Standard) English. The several steps in the history of English negation are commented on by making reference to Jespersen’s Cycle (1917), a cyclic process in the expression of negation first described by (and hence named after) the linguist Otto Jespersen to account for the cross-linguistic similarities in the development of negation through time.

---

38 The original term is Klima (1964) is *sentence* negation, but the label *sentential* has also been used in the literature.
The aim of section 3.4 is to show that English was clearly an overt NC language until the Early Modern English period, when the co-occurrence of a negator and a negative adverbial reinforcer can no longer express just one semantic negation. It is entertained that the co-occurrence of an overt negative marker and any other element bearing negative features is disallowed in modern Standard English because this is built upon a variety of English that has, as part of its grammatical system, some morphological operations that prevent negative features from co-occurring in the derivation.

The main claim in this chapter is that modern Standard English ultimately has the syntactic structure of an NC language. This idea, which is not uncontroversial, has already been defended by Weiss (2002) and has been anticipated by Penka (2007), who claims that negative quantifiers do not exist in natural languages. In addition, it fits Zeijlstra’s (2004) predictions that (i) all languages that exhibit a negative head marker also exhibit NegP in negative expressions and that (ii) if a language has a functional projection NegP it is necessarily an NC language39.

To support the chapter’s central thesis, evidence is discussed in section 3.5 in favour of treating English negative constituents such as nobody, nothing, and the like as indefinites that are not inherently negative. This claim challenges the more traditional analysis of these words as negative quantifiers, but allows us to put forward a uniform account of NC across a number of languages.

In section 3.5 it is also argued that what masks the NC character of Standard English are two post-syntactic PF operations that either eliminate the negative feature of an n-indefinite, or obliterate the syntactic negative node. Each operation results in a particular Spell-Out of the negative marker and the indefinite(s) participating in the derivation.

These operations, known as Obliteration and Impoverishment (see chapter 2) are implemented within the DM model. Both operations are triggered when the Filter that prevents the co-occurrence of accidentally repeated negative features is

---

39 Zeijlstra (2004: 145) considers Standard English as ‘a DN language that shows NC-like behaviour and can be considered as a pseudo-NC language.’ Zeijlstra predicts that languages with a pre-verbal negative marker are NC languages, that only a subset of NC languages ban true negative imperatives, and that inverse scope readings are available in NC languages with universal quantifier subjects preceding negation. Since English can express sentential negation with a negative head (n’t), bans true negative imperatives and allows for inverse scope readings with universal quantifier subjects preceding negation, he is forced to conclude that ‘English seems to be a transit language between Jespersen Phase V, exhibiting DN, and Jespersen Phase I, exhibiting NC’ (Zeijlstra 2004: 146).
violated\footnote{Such a Filter may ultimately be related to the fact that some languages do not seem to tolerate the overload of marked material in certain contexts. Negation is assumed to be marked (Parrott 2007; Nevins and Parrott 2007).}, these two operations are mandatory (i.e. they must apply) in Standard English, but mutually exclusive (i.e. only one or the other can apply).

Both Impoverishment and Obliteration are claimed to be sensitive to syntactic domains of computation, i.e. phases, as these define cyclic points of Spell-Out. Morphology is thus connected to Phase Theory in this chapter and in the rest of the dissertation.

\section*{3.2 Sentential negation and constituent negation}

According to Klima’s (1964) groundbreaking work, negation can be defined as \textit{sentential} or \textit{constituent}. The former kind negates the sentence as a whole, while the latter negates just a constituent. The pair in (1) exemplifies the two types of negation.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[1] a. George didn’t attend Professor Lee’s lecture.
\item[1] b. George decided not to attend Professor Lee’s lecture.
\end{enumerate}

According to Klima (1964), whether an English sentence is construed with one type of negation or the other can be diagnosed by using three tests, which have been listed in (2). The examples in (3) and (4) show that sentential and constituent negation contrast in grammaticality when the tests in (2a-c) are applied.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[2] If a sentence is construed with sentential negation
\item[2] a. it takes a positive rather than a negative tag question.
\item[2] b. it takes a tag with \textit{neither} rather than \textit{so}.
\item[2] c. it can be continued with a phrase that begins with \textit{not even}.
\item[3] a. George didn’t attend Professor Lee’s lecture, \textit{did he}?
\item[3] b. John hardly called Mary last month and \textit{neither did Paul}.
\item[3] c. Nobody likes the new law, \textit{not even the Tories}.
\item[4] a. George decided not to attend Professor Lee’s lecture, *\textit{did he}?*
\item[4] b. Peter visited his mother not long ago and *\textit{neither did Paul}.*
\item[4] c. George thinks that Peter doesn’t visit his mother, *\textit{not even in Christmas}.*
\end{enumerate}
Klima’s tests, nonetheless, have been reported to run into some problems. The most important one is that it is the case that what these tests are sensitive to is whether negation takes widest scope or not (Jackendoff 1972; Stockwell, Schachter and Partee 1973; Payne 1985; Penka 2007). For instance, Penka (2007) illustrates widest-scope effects by discussing a pair of examples from Payne (1985: 200). While (5a) is a clear case of sentential negation, (5b), where negation does not take widest scope, is not.

(5)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
& a. \quad {\text{John doesn’t often pay taxes,}} & \begin{cases} 
\text{does he?} \\
\text{and neither did I.} \\
\text{not even to Malta.}
\end{cases} \\
& b. \quad {\text{??John often doesn’t pay taxes,}} & \begin{cases} 
\text{does he?} \\
\text{and neither did I.} \\
\text{not even to Malta.}
\end{cases}
\end{align*} \]

Penka (2007) further observes that sensitivity to widest scope is also the reason why negated quantifiers such as *not many* and *not every* qualify as expressers of sentential negation, despite being traditionally considered cases of constituent negation. She argues that treating these expressions as instances of constituent negation raises two main problems.

On the one hand, active sentences that contain a negated quantified subject are semantically equivalent to their passive counterparts, which are clearly classified as cases of sentential negation; on the other hand, Penka refers to Jacobs (1982) to argue that if negated quantifiers qualified as constituent negation, which implies that negation is assumed to be part of the quantified DP, they should have the distribution of a DP, contrary to fact.

Further evidence for the fact that negation and the quantifier do not form a constituent comes from the observation that modals, which are scope bearing, can take scope between the negation and the quantifier. These three arguments are illustrated in (6), (7) and (8) in turn with examples from Penka (2007: 9).

(6)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
& a. \quad {\text{Not many people attended the meeting.}} \\
& b. \quad {\text{The meeting wasn’t attended by many people.}}
\end{align*} \]

(7)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
& a. \quad {\text{Not everyone attended the meeting.}} \\
& b. \quad *{\text{I met not everyone.}} \\
& c. \quad *{\text{I talked to not everyone.}}
\end{align*} \]
(8) Not every boy can be above average height.
   ‘It is not possible that every boy is above average height.’

   (Sternefeld 2006, quoted in Penka 2007: 9)

The conclusion to be extracted from these examples is that it is only when negation takes scope above the matrix predicate that it qualifies as sentential. In the light of the facts, then, it seems more convenient to refer to sentential versus non-sentential negation instead of using the term constituent negation.

Sentential negation is not only construed by means of not or contracted -n’t, but also by using negative constituents such as nobody, nothing or never, as well as other expressions such as seldom, hardly or few. This means that Klima’s concept of sentential negation is actually a cover term for a number of different syntactic forms, though the most prototypical one is the use of not / -n’t.

Payne (1985: 198) refers to this prototypical way of negation as standard negation, which is defined as ‘that type of negation that can apply to the most minimal and basic sentences’, which are, in turn, main clauses consisting of ‘a single predicate with as few noun phrases and adverbial modifiers as possible’ (Payne 1985: 198). For English, Payne argues that the most minimal sentences are weather predicates of zero valency that require a dummy subject it, as illustrated in (9). These are negated as in (10) by means of not / -n’t and an auxiliary or, if no auxiliary is present, dummy do. Other ways of negating a clause are not considered cases of standard negation.

(9) a. It is raining.
    b. It snows.

(10) a. It isn’t raining.
    b. It doesn’t snow.

The expressions seldom, hardly, few and little also question the validity of Klima’s tests: although these expressions convey a weaker negative meaning, the tests classify them as expressers of sentential negation. Co-ordination of these expressions with a phrase introduced by neither, however, distinguishes them from stronger expressers of negation, as illustrated in (11).

(11) a. Bill will [not/never] drive a car and neither will John.
    b. *Bill will [seldom/rarely] drive a car and neither will John.

   (Zeijlstra 2004: 48)
As discussed in Zeijlstra (2004: 49), other scholars have proposed new tests to evaluate whether an instance of negation is sentential. For instance, Ross (1973) and Culicover (1981) argue that negative parentheticals are only possible with sentential negation.

(12)  
\begin{align*} 
a. & \text{It isn’t possible, I don’t think, to solve this problem.} 
\end{align*} 
\begin{align*} 
b. & \text{*It is impossible, I don’t think, to solve this problem.} 
\end{align*}

Whether NPIs can be licensed or not is also taken as a test for sentential negation (Zeijlstra 2004: 49). However, certain conditions hold for this test to be effective. First, constituent negation also licenses NPIs, so if the NPI is not licensed because it belongs to the constituent that does not contain the negation, it is not a case of sentential negation.

(13)  
\begin{align*} 
a. & \text{Bill didn’t drive any car.} 
\end{align*} 
\begin{align*} 
b. & \text{*Not long ago Bill drove any car.} 
\end{align*}

Second, the NPI must be licensed by negation, and not by any other non-negative operator that can also license NPIs. This condition can be validated by removing negation from the sentence: if negation is the NPI licenser, the sentence should then be ungrammatical. Third, the NPI-licensing test only gives a valid result if the NPI is c-commanded by negation at surface structure.

Another test to distinguish sentential from non-sentential negation consists in construing the sentence with a universal quantifier. In cases of sentential negation, negation scopes over universal quantifiers when negation precedes the universal. In cases of constituent negation, by contrast, negation does not have scope over the universal if this is not part of the negative constituent. This is exemplified in (14).

(14)  
\begin{align*} 
a. & \text{Last year Bill didn’t always drive a car.} \quad \text{negation > universal} 
\end{align*} 
\begin{align*} 
b. & \text{Not long ago Bill always drove a car.} \quad \text{*negation > universal} 
\end{align*}

(Zeijlstra 2004: 49)

To summarise, it has been shown that it is not always straightforward to distinguish between sentential and non-sentential negation by using Klima’s (1964) tests, as these are problematic in a number of ways. Supplementary tests have been discussed that should make it easier to classify negation as sentential or as non-sentential. Finally, it has been argued that what really makes negation an instance of sentential negation is that it takes scope over the matrix predicate.
The next section addresses the functional status of the negative marker in English. The most relevant literature on this issue is reviewed, and various views on the internal structure of NegP are presented. Finally, the DM analysis of the negative projection that has been assumed in this dissertation is outlined, as well as an account of do-support that relies on post-syntactic PF operations such as Lowering and Fission.

### 3.3 On NegP as a functional projection

One of the contributions of the generative syntactic theory of the 1980s is the assumption that the sentential negative marker can be analysed as a functional category. Such a claim is discussed in section 3.3.1, where the seminal work by Pollock (1989) and Chomsky (1991) is outlined, as well as further developments and revisions (Ouhalla 1990; Belletti 1990; Zanuttini 1991; Haegeman 1995 among others). Opposing views to the functional status of the negative marker such as Baker’s (1991) and Ernst’s (1992), whose proposals mainly focus on English, are also presented.

In fact, whether NegP exists cross-linguistically or not is also a controversial issue. Pollock (1989) assumes it to be present across languages, but Baker (1991) and Ernst (1992) defend the view that English not is an adverb that occupies adverb positions in English. Although Baker’s (1991) and Ernst’s (1992) point of view is compatible with more recent analyses of negation such as Zeijlstra (2004), where NegP is assumed to be present only in some languages, but not in all, I will argue that English does indeed have a NegP projection that is headed by Negº, which is specified with a semantically negative feature.

Inspired in Zanuttini’s (1996) proposal that non-sentential negation not is an adverbial element that can be adjoined to any maximal projection, I assume that the syntactic terminal Negation can adjoin to any XP in the clause, but that it only projects as NegP if a syntactic relation with TP is established. This assumption is based on Zanuttini’s (1996) claim that NegP is parasitic on TP both in Romance and in English. This proposal is here implemented in a slightly different way, however.

Assuming that the terminal Negation can adjoin to any XP, including TP, it is the scope of negation that will determine whether negation can be classified as sentential or not: for negation to be sentential, it must take scope over the event that the verb expresses (Acquaviva 1997; Zeijlstra 2004; Penka 2007). This allows us to reconcile the functional versus non-functional analyses of not to a certain extent.

Concerning the internal structure of NegP, I have adhered to a view that capitalises on two main assumptions: (i) the syntactic terminal Negation is a head with two
contextually restricted possible phonological realisations (Flagg 2002; Parrott 2007) and (ii) head movement of auxiliaries and copular be takes place in the PF branch (Chomsky 2001; Flagg 2002). This analysis, which is put forward within the DM model, takes Negation to be a syntactic head that can adjoin to T(ense) via head movement. In this case, Negation is realised by means of the contracted form -n’t. Elsewhere, Negation is realised as not.

It has been argued in the literature that the contracted form -n’t is a head due to the fact that it seems to block head movement of the verb to T. Such a violation is repaired by the introduction of do-support\(^41\). The phrasal status of not, on the other hand, is more controversial. In line with the argument that is used as evidence for the head status of the contracted form -n’t, it has been noted that not does not prevent auxiliaries and copular be from raising to the left of the negative marker. If head movement is understood as a narrow syntax phenomenon that obeys the Head Movement Constraint, which is a principle that prevents heads from crossing other heads in the syntax, the conclusion is that not cannot be a head. Hence, it must be a Specifier.

However, if head movement is assumed to take place at PF (Chomsky 2001), the view that not is a head stops being problematic. Alternatively, it can also be argued, following Williams (1994), that not is a head specified with the feature [-Tense]. This would prevent Negº from head-adjoining to T, and would account for the fact that not can only combine with non-finite verbal forms, for instance.

As discussed in further sections, the analyses that assume the sentential negative marker to be a head (Pollock 1989; Ouhalla 1990; Chomsky 1991) have had to introduce some extra machinery to circumvent the ban that the HMC imposed on auxiliaries and copular be crossing over negation. Likewise, this circumstance has also motivated approaches where -n’t is a Neg head that can move along with auxiliaries and copular be, but not sits in the Specifier of NegP, Negº being an empty operator that can be freely crossed (Belletti 1990; Zanuttini 1991; Haegeman 1995; Zeijlstra 2004).

In the present dissertation I have assumed, in line with Flagg (2002) and Parrott (2007), that Standard English not and -n’t are two contextual allomorphs of a single head Negº. This idea is combined with the assumption that, as proposed within the model of DM, the syntactic terminal that expresses sentential negation must be Adjacent (where Adjacency is a locality condition for structurally dependent elements) to a local syntactic head (Embick and Noyer 2001; Flagg 2002). More details of this analysis of negation in English are given in section 3.3.2, together with an analysis of do-support as structural repair: do is inserted so that T can satisfy its requirement of being Adjacent to v.

---

\(^{41}\) See section 3.3.2 for an account of do-support within the DM model.
3.3.1 Seminal work on NegP

The first pieces of research where the sentential negative marker is assumed to head its own functional projection are Pollock (1989) and Chomsky (1991). Building on the work by Emonds (1976, 1978), both scholars address the systematic contrast that exists in English and French in terms of the syntax of questions and negatives in the two aforementioned languages.

Pollock (1989) and Chomsky (1991) argue that the well-known word order difference between the (a) and the (b) sentences in the pairs in (15) and (16) can be captured by assuming that I(nflection) lowers to V in English, while V raises to I in French. The differences in the syntactic behaviour of I are claimed to be dependent on the functional category AGR (ement): AGR is weak in English and cannot attract V, while it is strong in French and, thus, capable of attracting V. The strong/weak nature of AGR is assumed to be parametric and, therefore, extends to other languages, which group either with English or with French.

(15)

a. John often kisses Mary.
   b. *John kisses often Mary.

(16)

a. *Jean souvent embrasse Marie.
   b. Jean embrasse souvent Marie.

Word order indicates that in (15b) and (16b) V has raised to I (or AGR), moving across the adverb, which is assumed to be adjoined to the VP. While such a movement results in a grammatical structure in French, it yields ungrammaticality in English. On the contrary, in the examples (15a) and (16a), I has lowered to V. While such a lowering movement generates a grammatical structure in English, it results in ungrammaticality in French, since, as assumed by Pollock, raising of V to AGR is compulsory whenever possible. This idea is also captured by Chomsky’s ‘Principle of Least Effort’, which establishes that those derivations that involve the least number of steps are preferred.

The fact that English AGR is unable to attract V follows from Theta-theory, according to Pollock (1989). If V raised to a weak AGR, it would head-adjoin to I, resulting in an opaque structure ([I AGR [V]]) that would not allow the verb to assign theta-roles to its arguments. This is the case in (15b). Conversely, if I lowers to V, a complex V structure obtains ([V V [I]]) and there is no blockage for theta-role assignment, as shown by the grammaticality of (15a). As observed by Chomsky (1991), in I-to-V lowering, the trace of I fails to be antecedent-governed, since there is lack of m-command. In order to overcome this possible violation of the ECP, which is a well-formedness condition on chains at LF, he further assumes that the [V+I] complex raises to I at LF, thus no longer violating the ECP.
The sentences in (17) and (18) are also considered in Pollock (1989). Like in (15) and (16), French and English negative sentences also display divergent word orders.

(17)  a. *John likes not Mary.
     b. *John not likes Mary.
     c. John does not like Mary

(18)  a. Jean (n’) aime pas Marie.
     b. *Jean ne pas aime Marie.

The ungrammaticality of (17a) can be attributed to the fact that V has undergone overt raising to I across not, which, as explained above, is not a possible movement in English. The example in (17b), on the contrary, is puzzling under the analysis above: while the obtained word order is the result of I-lowering to V, the sentence is not grammatical, as subsequent raising of the [V+I] complex at LF seems to be blocked by the presence of the negator.

These kind of examples motivate Pollock’s claim that sentential negation should be considered a functional projection, NegP, with not as its head. The paradigm in (17) also lies at the heart of Chomsky’s account of do-support as a Last Resort mechanism that permits the derivation of negative constructions that cannot be salvaged by any other means (i.e. [V+I]-raising to I, in this case).

To explain how it is possible that French, as shown by the examples in (18a) and (18b), allows V-raising to I across Neg, which is headed by pas, Pollock (1989) and Chomsky (1991) argue that there is an AGR category between NegP and VP. This means that V raises to AGR, and the complex they constitute ([[V]+AGR]) then moves to I across Negº. While the first step in the derivation is legitimate, movement of the [[V]+AGR] complex across the head Neg is not, as it leaves the trace of AGR ungoverned, thus resulting in an ECP violation. This forces Chomsky to assume that the trace of AGR is deleted before or at LF. Alternatively, Pollock (1989: 397) stipulates that Negº is intrinsically inert for government, hence not preventing the trace of AGR to be properly governed.

English auxiliaries are also addressed in Pollock’s (1989) and Chomsky’s (1991) work. On the basis of examples like the ones in (17) and (18) it can be observed that auxiliary verbs do not behave like main verbs. The examples in (19) show that auxiliaries precede VP adverbs; the sentences in (20a-c) illustrate the fact that they precede the Neg head.

(19) a. John is completely losing his mind.
     b. John has very much objected to that.
     c. *John completely is losing his mind.
     d. *John very much has objected to that.
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(20) a. John is not losing his mind.
    b. John has not objected to that.
    c. John should/can/might not go.

On the basis of the data in (19) and (20), it is assumed that English auxiliaries move to I in the overt syntax, thus displaying structural differences with respect to main verbs. Unlike the latter, auxiliaries do not assign theta-roles, which allows them to raise to I without violating the Theta-criterion. The fact that English auxiliaries cross over the Neg head, however, would result in the violation of the ECP, since a trace in AGR is left ungoverned. As was assumed for French main verbs, the offending trace in AGR is deleted before or at LF for English auxiliaries, or else, it has to be assumed that Negº is inert for government, as Pollock does.

Ouhalla (1990) proposes an alternative to Pollock’s (1989) and Chomsky’s (1991) analyses by assuming a strict version of Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990). Unlike Pollock and Chomsky, Ouhalla puts forward an account which does not rely on the possibility of heads moving across other m-commanding head categories42, nor on lowering movements.

Ouhalla’s (1990) main points consist in claiming that the differences that can be observed in the distribution of negative elements in English and French are due to these two languages belonging to different typological groups. While he assumes that sentential negation is expressed by means of NegP in both English and French, he argues that they differ with respect to whether both the head and theSpecifier of NegP are realised lexically or, conversely, only one of the two is. In other words, there are languages in which both the head and the Specifier are overt (e.g. French ne / pas), others in which only the head is overt, while the Specifier is occupied by an empty operator (e.g. Turkish, Berber, English and Catalan), and, finally, others in which the Specifier is lexically realised and the head is an abstract morpheme (e.g. Colloquial French, where ne is dropped and only pas is overtly realised).

According to Ouhalla (1990), English and French also differ as far as the position of NegP in the clause is concerned, which is considered to be another dimension along which languages may diverge. This contrast is referred to as the NEG parameter and is related to whether Negº selects VP or TP, thus yielding different underlying syntactic structures.

The last central point in Ouhalla’s (1990) analysis is related to the treatment of auxiliaries as aspectual elements which project an ASP(ect)P rather than a VP.

---

42 Recall that in Chomsky’s (1991) analysis, the complex [[V] + AGR], which has been formed through raising of V to AGR, can move across Negº without resulting in a violation of the ECP thanks to the assumption that the offending trace of AGR deletes at LF.
Auxiliaries, in addition, are argued to be base-generated above NegP, which allows them to raise to T and AGR without having to cross Negº or any other head category.

Not all scholars agree on the fact that not is a functional category with a projection on its own. Ernst (1992), for instance, claims that an analysis of not à la Pollock violates several principles of Phrase Structure Theory, which have been listed in (21) to (23) below. He proposes, instead, to treat not as an adverb that can occasionally occupy the position of Spec, VP.

(21)  Locality of selection
Heads may select only complements, not (e.g.) complements within their complements.

(22)  Government by heads
All heads are potential governors.

(23)  Lexicality
Maximal projections have the same categorical identity as their heads.

Ernst (1992) argues that if not is assumed to be the head of NegP, two nots have to be postulated to preserve the distinction between sentential negation and constituent negation. In order not to violate the principle in (21), the not in constituent negation structures such as (24) has to be kept separate from the not in sentential negation constructions.

(24)  a.  a [NegP\(^{43}\) not unapproachable figure]
b.  [NegP Not always] has she seasoned the meat.

While it is the case that the not in constituent negation structures can take various types of complement, as shown by (24a) and (24b), where it takes an AP and an AdvP respectively, this is not the same for the not in sentential negation constructions, where the selection of an AP or an AdvP yields an ungrammatical result, as illustrated in (25).

(25)  a.  *Sam not unapproachable.
b.  *Sam not always.

(Ernest 1992: 120)

---

\(^{43}\) According to the assumptions made later on with respect to sentential and non-sentential negation, NegP would not be available in (24a), as [Neg] only projects as NegP if it is associated to T. Whenever this is not the case, [Neg] adjoins to an XP.
According to Ernst, if *not* were the same lexical item for both types of negation, it should be able to select all sorts of complements in both cases. The principle in (21) is allegedly violated, as the data seem to show that it is the category AGR, and not the Neg head, that is in fact deciding which type of complement Neg* can select in (25).

While it is true that *not* is a head, it can select various kinds of complement, it is not necessarily the case that two different *not* have to be postulated to capture the differences between sentential and constituent negation as Ernst argues. In the model that is adopted here, *not* is one of the possible phonological realisations of the syntactic terminal [Neg]. This terminal can select all sorts of complements, but it only projects as NegP if it is itself selected by T^44, which is merged in the structure to value the uninterpretable Tense features of *v*.

Assuming the derivation to proceed phase by phase (Chomsky 2001, 2005), v^P merges with the Neg head, which is in turn selected by T, a head dependent on the phase head C. The C-phase is accessible only to elements that have been extracted to the edge of the v^P-phase, that is, the subject in Spec, v^P and the negative head in NegP, which is merged on top of v^P. In that case, negation can take scope over the event expressed by the main predicate, thus being considered a case of sentential negation.

The examples in (25) contain what seems to be a subject, *Sam*. In the MP model, subjects are base-generated in the Specifier position of v^P. However, no v^ has been merged into the structure, so no v^P can possibly project. The ungrammaticality of Ernst’s examples, thus, does not follow from [Neg] not being able to select an AP or an AdvP, but from the fact that a verbal projection is missing altogether.

In addition, the example in (24b), which Ernst classifies as an instance of constituent negation, would be classed as an example of sentential negation according to Klima’s (1964) tests, as shown in (26). This is due to the fact that negation takes widest scope, which is what Klima’s tests really reveal. Notice, in addition, that fronting the negated universal has triggered Subject-Auxiliary Inversion. This is not the case for true cases of non-sentential negation, as in (27).

(26)  a. Not always has she seasoned the meat, has she? /*hasn’t she?
       b. Not always has she seasoned the meat and neither have I /*and so have I.
       c. Not always has she seasoned the meat, not even in winter.

^44 In that sense, NegP is parasitic on TP, as proposed by Zanuttini (1996). However, she claims that NegP is on top of TP, thus selecting the T head. While I will argue in chapter 5 that this is indeed the case for Romance languages, for English, NegP has been assumed to be at the edge of the v^P, right under TP. Negation can then head-adjoin to the T head, or remain where it has been first merged, with consequences for its Spell-Out.
(27)  a. Not long ago he visited his mother in Kansas.
    b. *Not long ago did he visit his mother in Kansas.

In that sense, Ernst’s (1992) examples are very similar to the examples in (6) to (8), which contained negated quantifiers such as *not everyone and not many, and should be analysed as cases of sentential negation according to the definition adopted here: since negation takes scope over the event expressed by the main predicate, (24b) is a case of sentential negation. This shows that it is not the case that Neg° takes a particular kind of complement depending on whether sentential or non-sentential negation is expressed; rather, the facts above are evidence in favour of the assumption that the negative syntactic terminal can select various types of complement, whereas it is scope with respect to the matrix predicate that is responsible for the sentential versus non-sentential negation classification.

As far as the principle in (22) is concerned, Ernst (1992) discusses the fact that not, if assumed to be a head, should not allow verbs like have and be to cross over it. The grammaticality of the examples (28) is thus a violation of the HMC, which prevents heads from moving across another head.

(28)  a. Paul has not left.
    b. Paul is not leaving.

The HMC ultimately follows from the ECP, which requires traces of moved elements to be properly governed. The traces of have and be in (28) cannot be properly governed because Neg° intervenes. As Pollock (1989) acknowledges, not is a potential antecedent-governor for the traces of the moved elements, thus causing a problem for his analysis. Pollock overcomes this situation by stipulating that Neg° is intrinsically inert for government, hence not preventing the traces of the moved verbs to be properly governed. This solution is, according to Ernst (1992), a violation of the principle in (22), which establishes that all heads are potential governors.

The principle in (22) is irrelevant in the MP, as government is no longer a required configuration for syntactic dependencies to obtain. In addition, it has been proposed in the literature (Chomsky 2001) that head movement can occur at PF. If this is the case, it could be argued that the HMC is a principle of the narrow syntax, but not of PF. Auxiliaries and the copula could then move across a negative head without resulting in ungrammaticality. Flagg (2002) argues that this is indeed what happens in English: first, the [Neg] syntactic terminal merges with vP in the syntax; then, in the PF branch, after the Adjacency condition that requires [Neg] to be in a local configuration with its complement has been assessed, v adjoins to T. After that, Vocabulary Insertion takes place.
Finally, Ernst discusses that Pollock’s assumption that *do* is an AGR head and that a modal is a T head constitutes a violation of Lexicality. According to Ernst, *do* is not an AGR head and, therefore, Lexicality forbids it to head AGRP. Likewise, if T is a head on its own that can project its category features into TP, then having a T headed by a modal would violate the principle in (23). In the present dissertation, Flagg’s (2002) proposal of do-support as structural repair is assumed. Like in Ernst (1992), *do* is not analysed as an AGR head; rather, *do*-insertion is a consequence of T’s [u\textsuperscript{v}] feature undergoing Fission (see chapter 2) to preserve the condition that T and v be Adjacent. Such an analysis is presented in depth in section 3.3.2. With respect to the syntactic characterisation of modals, it has been assumed that they belong to the category v\textsubscript{AUX} and raise to T in the same fashion as other auxiliaries do. Ernst (1992) proposes that *not* is an adverb that can occasionally occupy the Specifier position of VP. This is based on the assumption that sentential adverbs can be freely adjoined to TP, T’ and VP, as shown in (29).

(29)  (Occasionally) Ruth (occasionally) will (occasionally) go dancing.

(Ernst 1992: 126)

In the case of tensed clauses, the first auxiliary obligatorily moves to T. In addition, if T is specified as [+Tense], it can select either for a main verb, or for an auxiliary verb that optionally takes *not* as its Specifier. In being an adverb in the Specifier of VP, auxiliary verbs can raise over *not* without violating the HMC. *Do* is considered to be like other modals and, as such, it can take *not* in its Specifier and then move to T. Unlike modals and other auxiliaries, main verbs cannot take *not* in their Specifier, thus resulting in the impossibility of having sentences like (30). In the present account, by contrast, (30) is ungrammatical because of the impossibility of T to lower to v across Neg.

(30)  *Peter not came to class.

With respect to *not* in constituent (i.e. non-sentential) negation constructions as, for instance, non-finite clauses, *not* is assumed to be an ordinary adverb which never occupies the position of Specifier. Ernst claims that the VP head \textit{to}\textsuperscript{45}, however, does not raise to T, thus being able to surface to the right of *not*. This is shown in (31a).

(31)  a. Mary tried [not to cry].

\textsuperscript{45} Ernst (1992) takes \textit{to} to be a VP head, but \textit{to} is considered to be the head of IP in the generative grammar tradition.
b. *Mary tried [to not cry].

Following current syntactic theory, the contrast in (31) can be recast as follows: let us assume that control verbs like try select for a CP headed by a null complementiser which, in turn, selects for a TP headed by to. Negation adjoins to the CP complement, resulting in the structure in (32). Given an analysis of (33) as (34), and of (35) as (36), the stranding facts reported in Ernst are predicted if the vP is elided without having to analyse not as occupying a VP-adverb position.

Likewise, (35) is taken by Ernst as evidence that not has the same distribution as any other adverb in non-finite clauses. However, I take the parallel to be coincidental: the negative marker must precede to, a T head, because it is adjoined to the CP complement in control structures; the adverb quietly cannot be stranded after to because it is adjoined to the vP that the infinitival to selects and ellipsis (indicated with a vertical discontinuous line) applies to whole constituents.

\[(32) \quad \text{Mary tried} \ [\text{CP} \ [\text{Neg}] \ [\text{CP} \ [\text{C} \ \text{Ø} \ [\text{TP PROi} \ [\text{T to} \ [\text{vP t_i cry}]])])]]]\\
\]

\[(33) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. Carol told Dan to leave, but Jim told him not to } & \quad \underline{______}. \\
\text{b. *Carol told Dan to leave, but Jim told him to not } & \quad \underline{______}. \\
\end{align*} \\
(\text{Ernst 1992: 128})
\]

\[(34) \quad \text{Jim told} \ [\text{VP him} \ [\text{V'} tv \ [\text{CP} \ [\text{Neg}] \ [\text{CP} \ [\text{C} \ \text{Ø} \ [\text{TP PROi} \ [\text{T to} \ [\text{vP t_i leave}]})])])]]]\\
\]

\[(35) \quad \text{Bill wanted to quietly eat his Cheerios, and George} \\
\quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. wanted to } & \quad \underline{______}, \text{ too.} \\
\text{b. wanted to quietly } & \quad \underline{______}, \text{ too.} \\
\end{align*} \\
(\text{Ernst 1992: 128})
\]

\[(36) \quad \text{George wanted} \ [\text{CP[C} \ \text{Ø} \ [\text{TP PROi} \ [\text{T to} \ [\text{vP quietly t_i eat [his Cheerios]})])])]]\\
\]

Baker (1991) also analyses not as a pre-verbal adverb. Unlike Pollock (1989) and Chomsky (1991), however, he claims that the derivation of negative clauses in English cannot be accounted for by resorting to the core mechanisms of grammar (i.e. it is not a parameterised phenomenon). Rather, Baker claims that the position of
not with respect to finite verbs in English follows from a number of language-specific rules which constitute a peripheral component of grammar.

Baker’s analysis is based on the assumption that not, as a pre-verbal adverb, can attach to V-bar as a left sister. The result is a larger V-bar that can in turn attach to another pre-verbal adverb. The surface order of these kind of adverbs yields differences in scope. Following Ross (1969), Baker also assumes that auxiliaries are heads of VPs.

Unlike Pollock and Chomsky, it is claimed in Baker’s proposal that English has a language-specific transformational rule by which the finite verb moves to the left of not. In addition, another English-specific rule is responsible for the movement of unstressed finite verbs to the left periphery of their phrases. Both rules are obligatory, and in both rules not is seen as the trigger for the application of the rule. This makes Baker’s proposal very different from Pollock’s, Chomsky’s and Ouhalla’s regarding the movement of finite verbs. While in the former proposals not ends up at the right of the finite verb because the verb undergoes movement across the negative element for independent reasons (feature-checking), in Baker’s account, verbs only move if not is present.

As follows from the discussion in next section, the main insight of Pollock’s (1989) and Chomsky’s (1991) proposals – the claim that a functional projection is involved in the expression of negation – is defended in the present account. In addition, negation is assumed to be a syntactic head with two different phonological realisations that are contextually restricted. If this idea is combined with the assumption that head movement is a PF phenomenon, it is possible to treat not as a head: auxiliaries and copular be are merged below negation but can be Spelled-Out in a higher position without violating the HMC, which applies to movement in the narrow syntax.

The position taken here can be reconciled with Ernst’s (1992) and Baker’s (1991) accounts by assuming that negation can select various kinds of complement, including v and C heads. This analysis is based on Zanuttini’s (1996) claim that non-sentential not is an adverbial element that can adjoin to any maximal projection. The explanation for why Negation is always not, but not -n’t in those cases is to be found in the Vocabulary of English: only when Negation is head-joined to T is it assigned the phonological exponent /nt/. Elsewhere, it is Spelled-Out as not. As for why Negation does not have sentential scope in cases like (31) to (36), it has been assumed that it is a consequence of Negation not being able to take scope over the event quantifier of the proposition, which is introduced by the little v in the matrix predicate.

With respect to Baker’s (1991) proposal, it will suffice to say that to the extent that the analysis outlined in subsections 3.5.1.5 and 3.5.1.6 results in a successful account of the data, it will not be necessary to argue in favour of several language-
specific transformational rules to account for the linguistic facts in Standard English. Actually, the purpose of the present dissertation is to account for the expression of NC and negation by resorting to a few universal constraints and mechanisms that can explain the observed cross-linguistic differences and similarities in a uniform way.

To conclude this section, let us summarise the main points that have been covered. First, the history of NegP as a functional projection has been briefly reviewed by commenting on the seminal work by Pollock (1989), Chomsky (1991) and Ouhalla (1990), who develop the hypothesis that not is a functional head which projects into a maximal category. A number of refinements of this account have been presented too: it is widely assumed in the current literature that while the contracted form -n’t is clearly a head, not is best analysed as sitting in Spec, NegP, with the Negº position being filled by an empty operator (Haegeman 1995; Zeijlstra 2004)46. Finally, other proposals that argue against English not having functional status have been presented and discussed.

After reviewing the relevant literature on the functional versus non-functional nature of the negative projection, it has been suggested that the negative marker can be analysed as a functional head (i.e. with no a priori positional differences between not and -n’t, which are related to morphology) when it is the complement of TP. This view is possible if it is assumed that head movement is a PF phenomenon, so that raising of auxiliary and copular be is not blocked by the negative head.

However, Negation does not project into a NegP if it is syntactically unrelated to T. Rather, it adjoins to any maximal projection. It is the scope of negation with respect to the matrix predicate that determines whether an instance of negation is sentential or not. In addition, whether sentential negation is realised as not or as the contracted form -n’t depends on whether it adjoins to T or not. In the absence of adjunction to T, all instances of negation are Spelled-Out as not. A detailed account of this analysis of negation, as well as a compatible account of do-support are offered in the following section.

### 3.3.2 The inner structure of NegP

Let us assume, in line with Embick and Noyer (2001) and Flagg (2002), that the syntactic terminal [Neg] is a dependent element at PF. In other words, the morpheme [Neg] bears what Flagg (2002: 95) refers to as ‘a requirement for Adjacency under structural locality’ with respect to the head of its complement.

46 This view is already suggested in Pollock (1989: 405, footnote 36).
Two possible configurations for [Neg] exist when it is embedded under TP and, thus, projects into the functional projection NegP. These are (37) and (38) respectively.

(37)

```
TP
  T   NegP
    [Neg]  vP
```

(38)

```
TP
  T   NegP
    T   tseg  vP
        [Neg]
```

Both trees represent a structure where [Neg] is a functional element that selects $v$ as its complement and projects into NegP in being selected by TP. In (37), [Neg] remains in situ, whereas in (38), [Neg] has undergone head-movement to T, with which it forms a complex head.

Evidence for the Adjacency requirement of [Neg] comes from the parallel behaviour of imperatives and pseudogapping clauses. Flagg (2002) shows that, given a structure like (37), if an argument intervenes between [Neg] and the head of its complement, $v$, Adjacency is disrupted and the derivation crashes. This is illustrated with the examples in (39) and (40), which contain imperatives.

(39)  *Do not you trust Junior!

(40)  Don’t you trust Junior!

(Flagg 2002: 96)
As can be observed in the tree representations in (41)\(^{47}\) and (42) below, the argument you, which sits in Spec, vP, does not allow [Neg] to be structurally Adjacent to v. By contrast, in (40), as represented in (42), [Neg] is structurally local to T by virtue of having head-joined to it (Flagg 2002: 95). The fact that a Specifier argument intervenes between [Neg] and v is irrelevant, as the Adjacency requirement of [Neg] is satisfied by being structurally local to T. As can be observed in the examples in (39) and (40), [Neg] is assigned the phonological exponent /nt/ when it occurs in a complex head with T.

\[(41)\]
\[
\text{TP} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{do} \\
\text{NegP} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{[Neg]} \\
\text{you} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{trust} \\
\text{Junior}
\]

\[(42)\]
\[
\text{TP} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{do} \\
\text{NegP} \\
\text{[Neg]} \\
\text{you} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{trust} \\
\text{Junior}
\]

This view of NegP as headed by a Neg\(^*\) whose pronunciation is determined by the position it occupies in the structure has to be combined with the assumption that head movement is a PF phenomenon. Otherwise, the analysis runs into problems, as, judging from the data in (43), [Neg] certainly does not block head-movement of v\(_{aux}\) (have and be) to T.

\[(43)\]
\[a. \quad \text{Mary is not a good actress.}\]

\(^{47}\) Later in the section, this projection is shown to be somehow special: in line with Zanuttini (1996), it will be assumed to be a C\(^*\) head containing Tense features. This is why it will be labelled as C/T\(^*\).
b. Mary has not read Tom Sharpe’s books.

If head-movement is assumed to take place in the PF branch, Adjacency obtains between [Neg] and \( v_{aux} \), its complement. A reasonable question to ask is what happens with the subject that sits in Spec, \( vP \) in these cases: as was shown for imperatives, an argument intervening between [Neg] and its \( v \)-complement should cause the derivation to crash. However, it does not. Flagg argues that this is due to the fact that a difference exists between true syntactic movement and head-movement at PF. It seems to be the case that the copies of the former are absent at PF, thus not blocking the possibility of Adjacency to be assessed in a structure like (44). PF head-movement is assumed to take place after Adjacency has been assessed, and is understood as ‘a late adjunction operation that displaces the position in which a morpheme is realized phonologically to the position of the head with which an Agree relation was established in the Syntax’ (Flagg 2002: 102).

(44) Mary has not read Tom Sharpe’s books.

Like [Neg], T also bears an Adjacency requirement with respect to the head \( v \). According to Flagg (2002), Merge of \( vP \) to T allows the operation of Tense Lowering\(^48\), as shown in (45).

\[^{48}\text{Lasnik (1999) also claims that tense marking in English is a PF phenomenon. He calls it Affix Hopping: the } v^* \text{-complex is assumed to raise to T ([}\{V-v^*\}]_T \text{-to-T}) \text{ at PF in English, while this movement is syntactic in Romance. Whether [Neg] is blocking Tense Lowering or, rather, Affix Hopping is not going to be discussed here, as one analysis can be easily recast as the other with no significant changes in my proposal.}^{48}\]
(45) Mary reads Tom Sharpe’s books.

In clauses containing an auxiliary or a copula, it is assumed that these PF raise to T, with which they form a complex head. Auxiliaries and copular be are analysed as $v_{\text{AUX}}$ and project as $v_{\text{AUX}}P$. They are, therefore, different from lexical verbs, $vPs$. This distinction is crucial to account for the different syntactic behaviour of these verbs: while Lowering of T is only possible onto a $vP$ complement, PF raising is restricted to $v_{\text{AUX}}$. Auxiliary raising is illustrated in (46).

(46) Mary has read Tom Sharpe’s books.

Let us now consider how these two processes are affected by the presence of Negation. In a structure like (47), T and $\nu$ are not Adjacent because [Neg] is
intervening. Tense Lowering cannot take place, as the ungrammaticality of (48) shows.

(47)

\[ TP \]
\[ T \]
\[ NegP \]
\[ [Neg] \]
\[ vP \]
\[ v \]
\[ \ldots \]

(48) *Mary not reads Tom Sharpe’s books.

In order to ensure that T can establish an Adjacency structural relationship with v, onto which it is to be realised, do-support is required. As such, it is a Last Resort structural repair operation that occurs in the morphology in the form of Fission (Flagg 2002: 104).

Let us assume that T carries an uninterpretable [uv] feature which needs to be checked by Lowering onto v. When the complement of T is not vP but NegP, Fission (see chapter 2) applies to the [uv] feature of T, resulting in a dissociated v-feature that can establish a local relationship with the T head, thus satisfying the Adjacency requirement. The relevant tree representations are (49) and (50) for [Neg] to be Spelled-Out as not or -n’t respectively. The [uv] dissociated feature is, as indicated by the strikethrough and in line with Pesetsky and Torrego’s (2001) proposal, marked for deletion but still not erased.
Zanuttini (1996) claims that NegP is parasitic on TP both in Romance and in English. This amounts to saying that NegP can only occur in the sentence if TP is present. She frames this idea as a requirement of the head Negº to select TP, which determines the order NegP>TP.

I agree with Zanuttini in that the projection NegP is ultimately dependent on TP, but I will argue that this is because NegP is merged at the edge of the vºP phase and, thus, ultimately realised in the CP phase. When selected by Tº—a derivative phase head which inherits phi-features from Cº—Negº projects into NegP.

According to Fortuny (2007: 68), negation is C-related. Particularly, he argues that negation is a value of a broader feature, which he identifies as affectiveness, which
is active on C in English. By means of feature-inheritance, negation spreads to the I domain, where it is realised and can project into NegP. As part of the C domain, NegP can select vP; in addition, NegP can also offer a Specifier position when necessary. In short, I assume NegP to be dominated by TP in English, though I align with Zanuttini (1996) in that TP is below NegP in Romance, as discussed in chapter 5.

In English, if v is an auxiliary or a copular be, PF raising to T occurs. However, if v is a lexical verb, Tense Lowering is blocked by the presence of negation. Morphology repairs this situation by means of Fission of the uninterpretable v feature of T\textsuperscript{49}, which is Spelled-Out as do-support.

Zanuttini’s (1996) arguments in favour of NegP c-commanding TP in Romance come from the impossibility of negating true imperatives, which are argued to lack the TP projection. Since NegP obligatorily selects a TP in Zanuttini’s account, the absence of TP predictably results in the absence of the NegP projection, too.

For English, on the other hand, imperatives can be negated by means of not or -n’t and do-support. This is unexpected if, like in Romance, TP is lacking and leads Zanuttini to propose, in line with other scholars such as Stockwell, Schachter and Partee (1973) and Beukema and Coopmans (1989), that English imperatives are construed by using the present subjunctive. The difference between imperatives and subjunctives in English is argued to reduce to a contrast between matrix and embedded contexts: while imperatives occur in root sentences without an overt complementiser, the latter is always overt in embedded subjunctives. Concerning negation, it is expressed by not and without do-support in embedded subjunctives, contrary to what happens in imperatives. This is illustrated in (51) and (52).

(51)  
\begin{enumerate}  
\item a. I insist that she not stay.  
\item b. *I insist that she don’t stay.  
\end{enumerate}  

(52)  
\begin{enumerate}  
\item a. Don’t you say that!  
\item b. *You don’t say that!  
\item c. *You not say that!  
\item d. *Not you say that!  
\end{enumerate}  

(Zanuttini 1996: 196-197)

Zanuttini proposes for embedded subjunctives that the complementiser that carries the modality and tense features of the matrix verb, which are transmitted to the embedded clause. The structure of subjunctives is thus impoverished in lacking the functional categories that regularly contain T and modals in finite clauses.

\textsuperscript{49} The feature [u\textsubscript{v}] determines that T select a vP-complement.
Subjunctive *that*, which is different from the *that*-complementiser that introduces embedded indicative clauses, is assumed to function as a modal, sparing the need for T to be present in the clause. This accounts for the lack of inflectional morphology observed in subjunctives, and explains why the contracted form `-n't`, which is dependent on T to be phonologically realised, cannot occur.

For imperatives it is also assumed that modality and tense are expressed by a Cº head, though this is not overt because the clause is a root one. That is, as Zanuttini (1996: 198) puts it ‘the CP of imperatives is similar to the CP of subjunctives, but with one crucial difference: what in subjunctives is expressed via features of the lexical item *that*, in imperatives is expressed via features on the abstract functional head Cº.

As in the case of embedded subjunctives, the lack of a regular TP accounts for the absence of inflectional morphology. With respect to the availability of NegP, by contrast, the two kinds of constructions diverge in that NegP cannot possibly occur in embedded subjunctives because TP is not present at all. In the case of imperatives, however, NegP is assumed to be generated to the left of CP, which is the element that carries Tense features. *Do* is inserted in Cº, which then raises to NegP to attach to `-n't`, serving as its host.

I agree with Zanuttini that imperative clauses can be analysed as containing a head Cº/Tº, i.e. a Cº with Tense features. However, as for regular finite clauses, I will take [Neg] to be merged on top of vP and to project into NegP. *Do*-support is, again, an operation of structural repair that allows Cº/Tº to be locally adjacent to its v-complement. That Cº/Tº is defective is seen in the ungrammaticality of (53b), which shows that *do* is the only possible form in imperatives.

\[(53)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>Don’t anybody speak!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>*Doesn’t anybody speak!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of embedded subjunctives as lacking a TP altogether is consistent with the view that [Neg] is only pronounced as a contracted form if it head-joins to T. If no T category (not even a special one like Cº/Tº) is present, [Neg] does not project into NegP, and the only possible phonological realisation is *not*.

### 3.3.3 NegP as part of a broader syntactic category

Laka (1990) proposes that in natural languages, negation is one of the values of a broader syntactic category, identified as ΣP, which is also responsible for emphatic affirmation. She reaches such a conclusion by observing that negation and
affirmation are in complementary distribution both in English and in Basque. In (54), I present the relevant examples for English.

(54)  
   a. I didn’t, as Bill had thought, go to the store.  
   b. I did, as Bill had thought, go to the store.  
   c. *I did not, as Bill had thought, go to the store.  

   (Laka 1990: 93)

Laka further shows that emphatic so is also generated in ΣP, as shown in (55).

(55)  
   a. The writers could so believe the boy.  
   b. *The writers so believed the boy.  
   c. The writers did so believe the boy.  

   (Laka 1990: 100)

ΣP is assumed to be merged under IP in English, but above IP in Romance languages. It is, thus, subject to parametric variation.

Although I will not discuss here the rest of Laka’s proposal, which covers a broad range of data on NPI-licensing in English, Basque and Romance languages, I will borrow the core idea in her work: namely that NegP is just a possible value of a broader category, to which I will refer with the more transparent label Pol(arity)P (Ouhalla 1990; Belletti 1990; among others).

I assume PolP to be merged at the edge of the v*P phase in English, but on top of TP in Romance for reasons to be made clear in chapter 5. PolP is specified with an interpretable polarity feature that can, in certain circumstances, act as a Probe.

Adopting Pesetsky and Torrego’s (2004) proposal that syntax is concerned with whether a feature has a value or not, but not with whether it is interpretable or not, I claim that Polº is endowed with an interpretable polarity feature that is unvalued. Within the Minimalist Program (see chapter 2), this amounts to saying that it can act as a Probe that can scan its c-command domain for a Goal that can value any relevant features that are unvalued. If no element is found in the c-command domain

---

50 That is, (un)interpretability does not correlate with the valued/unvalued status of a feature as seems to be suggested in Chomsky (2005). While whether a feature is valued or unvalued is relevant to syntax, with the latter acting as Probes, interpretability is relevant to LF.
of Polº that carries valued polarity features, an Op¬ is merged in Spec, PolP that values the feature of Polº as negative under Spec-Head Agreement\textsuperscript{51}.

Let us discuss how the interpretable polarity feature of Polº is valued by a Goal. Consider, for instance, the sentence in (56).

(56) John saw nobody.

Assuming the syntactic representation of (56) to be the one in (57), the unvalued feature of Polº would scan its c-command domain seeking for a Goal with which it Agrees. The object DP is a suitable Goal, for it carries a valued polarity feature that can be copied onto Polº. The feature characterisation that is assumed for indefinites of the any-, no- and some-type is discussed in section 3.5.1.5; likewise, why Polº receives a silent phonological realisation is also accounted for in further sections. For the time being, it will suffice to keep in mind that Negº (and NegP) is equivalent to Polº (and PolP) when the interpretable polarity feature it carries has been valued as negative, either by finding a matching Goal, or thanks to an Op¬ in Spec, PolP.

(57) \[
\text{PolP} \\
\text{Polº} \\
\text{v*P} \\
\text{v*} \\
\text{\textsuperscript{\textvisiblespace}JOHN} \\
\text{\textsuperscript{\textvisiblespace}SEE} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{ [+human, -definite, uPol: Neg]} \\
\]

Probe, Agree and subsequent valuation of [iPol:] as [iPol:Neg].

\textsuperscript{51} As brought to my attention by Zeijlstra (personal communication), it is not unusual that an operator values an unvalued feature. In the case of pro-drop languages, for instance, the phi-features of an empty element, pro, value the uninterpretable phi-features of the verb.
3.4 Negation in Standard English: a diachronic view

In order to fully comprehend the surface differences between the system of negation of Standard English and that of Non-Standard varieties, it is necessary to provide an overview of a number of historic changes that have affected the syntactic behaviour of the sentential negative marker. Thus, the main goal of the present section is discussing Jespersen’s Cycle (Jespersen 1917) with special emphasis on how it can account for the evolution of negation from Old English to Present Day (Standard) English.

Jespersen’s Cycle is a cross-linguistic observation that stems from Jespersen’s thorough study of negation across a wide number of languages. It captures the fact that negation changes diachronically going through a number of stages that are common to most languages. Each of the six phases that constitute Jespersen’s Cycle of negation are described and illustrated in turn. The transition from Old English to Present Day (Standard) English comprises Stage 1 to 5, and, to a certain extent, an incomplete realisation of Stage 6.

In Stage 1, one single negative marker, which occurs pre-verbally, expresses negation. In Old English (OE) the negative marker is generally *ne* and, as can be seen in (58), it precedes the finite verb.

(58) þæt þa Deniscan him *ne* mehton þæs ripes forwiernan.
that the Danes them not coul d from the reaping keep back


As predicted by Stage 2, towards the end of the OE period and early Middle English (ME) period, the negative marker *ne* could be optionally reinforced by a second negative adverb (*na* ‘not a’, *nalles* ‘not at all’, *noht / noght* ‘no thing’), which occurred in post-verbal position and behaved as an NPI in that it depended on the presence of *ne*. This is illustrated in (59), where *na* is still optional.

(59) þæt þa Deniscan him *na* mehton þæs ripes forwiernan.
that the Danes them not coul d from the reaping keep back

---

52 Mazzon (1999) observes that *ná/no* is also an important negator during the OE period. However, it does not persist as a negative marker in later periods of the history of English. According to Mazzon, ‘this form originated as *ne* + á (≡ ‘never’), but soon lost its temporal meaning to become a simple negator, which, however, seems to possess some specialized functions. (…) *Ná* can appear as the sole clausal negator instead of *ne*, (…) it can occur before a phrase or a clause with contrastive and/or comparative functions, (…) or it can anticipate *noht/noght/not* as a post-verbal negator (…)’ (Mazzon 1999: 26).
(59) Ne bið he na geriht.
    not is he not / never set right [= forgiven]
    ‘He is not / never forgiven’

(example from Mazzon 1999: 27. OE sample, S. 16)

In Stage 3, the negative adverb which originally reinforced the pre-verbal negative marker *ne* becomes obligatory. The most typical expression of negation during the ME period is the sequence *ne*...*not*, the latter having evolved from the negative adverb *noht*. During this stage, the process of phonological weakening of *ne*, which had started in Stage 2, continues through Stage 4, where *ne* is no longer obligatory but optional. The situation is the reverse for *not*, which started out as optional in Stage 2 and becomes compulsory from Stage 3 onwards. As shown in (60), the weakening of pre-verbal *ne* culminates in its total disappearance in Stage 5, by the Early Modern English (EModE) period.

(60) But I thought *not ye* had marked it so plaine.

(example from Mazzon 1999: 66. Roister Doister, l. 375)

In Stage 6, the last phase in Jespersen’s Cycle, the reinforcing negative adverb becomes available as a negative marker which attaches to the finite verb. In that sense, Stage 6 is incomplete in Standard English: the use of a pre-verbal negative marker is dependent on the presence of an auxiliary (i.e. an auxiliary verb such as *have*, *be* or a modal or the dummy-*do*, which was introduced in the 15th century).

The adverbial negative marker *not* is pre-verbal with respect to the (uninflected) main verb in Standard English, but follows the elements that are inflected and actually carry the grammatical information. Therefore, the only change in the syntax of negation in Standard English with respect to Stage 5 has been the movement of the sentential negative marker to a pre-verbal position, probably obeying the Neg-first principle (Jespersen 1917; Horn 1989), according to which there is a strong tendency for languages to place the negative marker before the verb.

From Stage 2 to Stage 4, a period which extends from late OE to EModE, English allowed Negative Concord. That is, negation could be expressed by means of more than one negative element and the clause would not result in Double Negation.

A corpus study by Mazzon (1999) shows that NC is already attested in OE documents. NC seems to be an optional rule in OE, but Mazzon claims that it was a widely observed phenomenon. An example of NC in OE is given in (61).
NEGATIVE CONCORD IN ENGLISH AND ROMANCE:  
SYNTAX-MORPHOLOGY INTERFACE CONDITIONS ON THE EXPRESSION OF NEGATION

(61) Ne bæd se blinda naðor ne goldes ne seolfres: ne nane
not asked the blind neither nor for gold nor for silver nor for none
wuruldrice þing.
worldly thing

(example from Mazzon 1999: 38. OE sample, S. 05)

By the ME period, English had reached Stage 3 in Jespersen’s Cycle and the Neg + V + Neg pattern became common (Mazzon 1999: 55). Contrary to what is often claimed about negation in ME, NC was not obligatory, but highly systematic. That is, even though it was an extremely widespread phenomenon, there are instances of negative sentences which are construed with NPIs (see section 3.5), as in (62).

(62) Also, that no maner vitteler pay eny thynge.

(adapted from Mazzon 1999: 55)

In the 15th century NC starts being lost. At the end of the ME period and the beginning of EModE, English goes into Stage 4 of Jespersen’s cycle: pre-verbal ne is optional and negative constituents seem to be able to negate the clause themselves. Consider (63), from a play by Shakespeare.

(63) I thinke His father never was so true begot.

(example from Mazzon 1999: 61. Shakespear, King John, II, I, 129-30)

Although I will not explore this issue in depth, as it is beyond the scope of the present piece of research, it seems quite plausible to hypothesise that it is during Stage 3 and 4 that a variety of English develops which has, as part of its grammar, Impoverishment and Obliteration rules similar to the ones that are proposed in section 3.5. Such rules prevent the sentential negative marker from co-occurring with n-words, yielding constructions that are very similar to Present Day Standard English.

Optionality of NC in English, hence, might be due to the fact that this variety co-exists with others where Impoverishment or Obliteration do not apply in negative contexts at all. The concept of competing multiple grammars to account for linguistic change has been defended by a number of scholars (Kroch 1989; 1994, Pintzuk 1991, Santorini 1992 among others). However, the reason why a PF rule can
eventually become part of a given grammatical system is left unexplained here, though this is an extremely interesting issue for further research.

During the Modern English period, the process of standardisation of English began. It is often claimed that 18th century prescriptive grammarians are responsible for the disappearance of NC in English in their attempt to apply logic to language. Besides, the new prescriptive grammars that emerged during the Age of Reason were often based on the Latin model of grammar: Latin is a language that does not allow NC, which, together with the logic statement that \(-\neg p = p\) (i.e. two negatives make a positive) allegedly resulted in the stigmatisation of NC in English.

This has probably been the most traditional and widespread explanation for the decline of NC in English. However, as discussed by Anderwald (2005) (see chapter 4), a more recent view challenges the claim that prescriptivism was the cause for the disappearance of NC and argues that it had started declining well before prescriptivist grammars based on Latin became so popular. This is, for instance, the position taken by Mazzon (1999), who states that

‘What is certain is that multiple negation in written English appears to grow rarer and rarer much earlier than the time when it was attacked by prescriptive grammarians, and that only occasional, stray occurrences appear in the eighteenth century. As mentioned several times, therefore, the statement that is often found to the effect that multiple negation was excluded from the standard as a consequence of the grammarians’ attacks (…) is not correct, since the phenomenon had been on its way out of this variety for some time already.’

(Mazzon 1999: 92)

With respect to the influence that prescriptivist grammarians may have had on the decline and subsequent loss of NC in Standard English, she claims that ‘they probably only hastened the disappearance of these relics from the standard’ (Mazzon 1999: 17). In conclusion, it seems to be the case that prescriptivism is more directly related to the fact that the use of NC in English is nowadays still rather stigmatised than to its inability to surface in the system of negation of Present Day Standard English. I return to this issue in chapter 4, which is devoted to the study of negation in Non-Standard varieties of English.

---

53 I show in section 3.5.1.5 that the loss of NC in Standard English is just apparent, as it results from PF processes that affect either the sentential negative marker or n-indefinites, conditioning their phonological realisation.
3.5 Negation in Standard English: a synchronic view

Having presented and discussed the various stages in the system of negation of English through time, let us now concentrate on a synchronic description of how negation works in Standard English. The section has been divided into sentential negation and non-sentential negation, which are the two ways in which negation can be construed. Within each of these two sections, various strategies to express negation are considered and illustrated, and a formal syntactic analysis is provided in section 3.5.1.6 that treats the ban on the co-occurrence of negative markers and other negative constituents as a syntax-morphology interface phenomenon.

The main points of the proposed analysis are (i) that negative constituents such as nobody, nothing and the like are non-negative indefinites instead of negative quantifiers and (ii) that Standard English has the underlying structure of an NC language, although two PF operations triggered by a Filter on accidentally repeated syntactic features prevent NC from being expressed overtly. The assumption in (i) is supported by a similar analysis of German kein (Penka and von Stechow 2001; Penka 2007), which can be extended to English n-words; the claim in (ii), which builds upon Weiss’s (2002) proposal, allows us to provide a more uniform account of negation in English and is supported by the English acquisition data.

The phenomenon of Double Negation (i.e. cancellation of two negative meanings) is accommodated in the present account by assuming that a second negative syntactic terminal is merged in Focus, a functional category in the CP phase. Two interpretable negative features are present in the derivation in cases of DN, thus cancelling each other out at LF.

3.5.1 Sentential negation

3.5.1.1 The use of not / -n’t in finite clauses

Using the negative marker not / -n’t in finite clauses is the most frequent strategy for expressing sentential negation in Standard English. From a descriptive point of view, it must be said that the negative marker follows the first auxiliary present in the clause. If there is no auxiliary, do occurs (see section 3.3.2): the sentential negative marker follows do and the main verb is in the infinitive form. Other inflectional features such as [3rd person], [singular] or [+past] are also carried by do when there is no overt auxiliary in negative or interrogative clauses.

All English verbs are subject to do-insertion under the conditions described above, except for be, which even in its copular use (e.g. I am a Ph.D. student) is followed
by the negative marker in negative clauses. It has also been reported in the literature that, unlike in American English, have as a main verb can be negated without do-insertion in British English (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik 1973, 1985). A corpus study by Anderwald (2002) shows that while this has indeed been the tendency in the last thirty years, nowadays ‘DO-support is clearly the dominant strategy for negating the full verb HAVE in both British and American standard English’ (Anderwald 2002: 23).

### 3.5.1.2 Contracted -n’t

In English, sentential negation can also be expressed by means of the contracted form -n’t. While contraction is also possible with auxiliary verbs, Zwicky and Pullum (1983) give evidence in favour of treating the -n’t contraction as a process of affixation rather than cliticisation. In Zwicky and Pullum’s account, therefore, contracted negation is grouped with plural, past and superlative affixes rather than with clitics. This is in line with treating -n’t as a functional head. The relation of -n’t to not is far from being uncontroversial: while it might seem straightforward that the former is the contracted version of the latter, it has been claimed in the literature that while -n’t is a head, not is an adverb (i.e. a maximal projection) that occupies the Specifier position of NegP in cases of sentential negation (Zanuttini 1991; Haegeman 1995; Zeijlstra 2004).

A different position is taken here that assumes the two possible realisations of the negative marker to be contextual allomorphs. Later on it is argued that this assumption, implemented for English as in Parrott (2007), naturally derives the affixal character that Zwicky and Pullum (1983) defend for -n’t.

Returning to Zwicky and Pullum’s proposal, the evidence provided for treating contracted -n’t as an affix is based on a number of differences that can be observed between clitics and affixes. These are listed in (64), criteria E and F being two predictions which follow from A-D.

(64) A. Clitics can exhibit a low degree of selection with respect to their hosts, while affixes exhibit a high degree of selection with respect to their stems.

B. Arbitrary gaps in the set of combinations are more characteristic of affixed words than of clitic groups.

C. Morphophonological idiosyncrasies are more characteristic of affixed words than of clitic groups.
D. Semantic idiosyncrasies are more characteristic of affixed words than of clitic groups.

E. Syntactic rules can affect affixed words, but cannot affect clitic groups.

F. Clitics can attach to material already containing clitics, but affixes cannot.

(Zwicky and Pullum 1983: 503-4)

Criteria E and F straightforwardly show that the contracted negator behaves as an affix. Some of the examples given by Zwicky and Pullum to illustrate their point are reproduced in (65) and (66).

(65)  
  a. You haven’t been here.
  b. Haven’t you been there?
  c. *Could’ve you been there?

(66)  *I’dn’t be doing this unless I had to.

The examples in (65) show that -n’t does not behave as a clitic, but as an affix: while -n’t moves along with the auxiliary in questions, clitics like the contracted form of have do not. This conclusion is further supported by the example in (66), which shows that, as stated by criterion F, the contracted negative marker cannot attach to a lexical item that already contains a clitic.

The rest of the criteria contribute to strengthening Zwicky and Pullum’s hypothesis. As far as criterion A is concerned, -n’t is highly selective with respect to its host inasmuch it only attaches to finite auxiliary verbs. With respect to B, not all finite auxiliaries can bear a contracted -n’t form: the forms *mayn’t and *amn’t are not found in Standard English, though they are possible in certain Non-Standard varieties of English. In addition, the form ain’t has am, are, is, have and has as possible uncontracted counterparts. In short, -n’t displays arbitrary gaps in the set of combinations, thus indicating that it should be classified as an affix in terms of criterion B.

As stated in criterion C, affixes are prone to morphophonological idiosyncrasies. In the case of -n’t, the pronunciation of the forms ain’t, can’t, don’t, musn’t, shan’t and won’t does not result from the application of regular phonological rules to the combination of a finite auxiliary and -n’t.
Finally, the interaction of negation with modal auxiliaries yields a number of ‘irregular’ semantic interpretations, as expected from criterion D if -n’t is an affix. Zwicky and Pullum (1983: 509) discuss the following examples.

(67) a. You must not go home.
   b. You mustn’t go home.

(68) a. You can nót go home.
   b. You can simply not go home.
   c. You cánnot go home.
   d. You can’t go home.

As Zwicky and Pullum point out, the sentences in (68) are semantically equivalent. Conversely, (68a) –the accents indicate stress– and (68d) are not equivalent in the sense that the former has an extra meaning (with the modal scoping over not) which the latter does not have. The extra meaning of (68a) is clearly seen in (68b), where the modal and negation are not adjacent. (68c) and (68d), on the other hand, receive the same interpretation.

Having established that -n’t satisfies all the criteria to be considered an affix, the authors give evidence for treating it as an inflectional, rather than a derivational, affix. They point out the fact that -n’t is not category-changing, which indicates that inflection, and not derivation, is involved. Besides, in auxiliaries which have been inflected for [3rd person] such as doesn’t and hasn’t and for [+past], hadn’t, -n’t occurs after an inflectional affix, which is consistent with Bloomfield’s (1933) generalisation that derivation does not apply after inflection.

To end up with this section, let us establish that the evidence that Zwicky and Pullum (1983) discuss, clearly indicates that -n’t is an affix. If this assumption is translated into the DM model, the Vocabulary for negation can be stated to be the one in (69), as suggested in Parrott (2007: 217).

(69) Vocabulary for the sentential negative marker in English

a. [+Neg] $\rightarrow$ /n/ $\rightarrow$ /M [T[^past] __ ]

b. Elsewhere $\rightarrow$ /n/ $\rightarrow$

The statement in (69) reads as follows: the negative marker is Spelled-Out as the affix /n/ when it undergoes head to head movement to T, with which it forms an M-word, i.e. T and Neg are sisters. In all other contexts (i.e. elsewhere) /n/ is inserted. Further in the chapter, it is shown that the English sentential negative marker can also result in a phonologically null realisation as a consequence of Obliteration, a post-syntactic PF operation that can delete a syntactic terminal (see chapter 2).
As pointed out earlier in the chapter, Zwicky and Pullum’s treatment of -n’t as an affix is very much compatible with an analysis of -n’t and not as contextual variants, rather than as elements having different syntactic status. The differences in the distribution of these two phonological realisations of negation follow from the fact that the process of affixation is optional: only when Neg forms a complex with T can it move along with the finite auxiliary in questions, for example. Notice that cliticisation (e.g. could have as could’ve) is only possible in declarative sentences. In the case of negation, on the other hand, if affixation takes place, the resulting configuration serves as input for other movement operations such as SAI in question formation.

3.5.1.3 Negative constituents and NPIs

Negative constituents such as nobody and nothing seem to be able to express negation on their own in English, as shown in (70). Notice that the sentential negative marker does not occur in the sentence.

(70) a. Nobody saw Paul yesterday.
    b. George phoned nobody yesterday.

Actually, the co-occurrence of the negative marker and one (or more) negative constituents results in ungrammaticality in Standard English, as shown in (71). Alternatively, under special circumstances such as contrastive stress, which is conventionally indicated with capitals, DN arises and the two negative meanings cancel each other out as in (71b), which can receive an affirmative interpretation.

(71) a. *Mary didn’t say nothing to nobody.
    b. George DIDn’t phone NOBODY yesterday.
    = George phoned someone yesterday

Lexical items such as nobody, nothing and the like have a correspondence with assertive and non-assertive elements in English. The whole inventory is displayed in (72). As can be seen in the first column, the items in the table are heterogeneous with respect to their syntactic class: some are determiners, others are pronouns and some others are adverbs. Their semantics in terms of [+/- /0 assertiveness] seems to be the criterion according to which they can be grouped into a paradigm. In section 3.5.1.5, such an intuitive featural characterisation is replaced by one based on the MP and DM theoretical assumptions that have been presented in chapter 2.
(72) **Assertive, non-assertive and negative indefinites** in Standard English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic class</th>
<th>Assertive</th>
<th>Non-assertive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>determiner</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determiner</td>
<td>(one or the other)</td>
<td>either</td>
<td>neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>(one or the other)</td>
<td>either</td>
<td>neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>somebody</td>
<td>anybody</td>
<td>nobody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>someone</td>
<td>anyone</td>
<td>no one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process adverb</td>
<td>somehow</td>
<td>(in any way)</td>
<td>(in no way)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place adverb</td>
<td>somewhere</td>
<td>anywhere</td>
<td>nowhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time adverb</td>
<td>sometime(s)</td>
<td>ever</td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time adverb</td>
<td>already</td>
<td>yet</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time adverb</td>
<td>still</td>
<td>any more / longer</td>
<td>no more / longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extent adverb</td>
<td>(to some extent)</td>
<td>at all</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intensifier</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>any (the)</td>
<td>no, none the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additive adverb</td>
<td>as well, too</td>
<td>either</td>
<td>neither, not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik 1973: 376)

Assertive indefinites are generally used in affirmative sentences\(^{56}\), whereas non-assertive indefinites can be used in interrogative and negative clauses. When occurring in the latter, non-assertive indefinites have been traditionally referred to in the literature as negative polarity items (NPIs). NPIs are necessarily dependent on negation, which can be expressed by means of the sentential negative marker, a negative constituent from the third column of the table, or by an adversative predicate. This is illustrated in (73) and (74).

(73) a. There is someone in the garden. (affirmative)
    b. Have you talked to anybody today? (interrogative)

\(^{54}\) Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik’s (1973) use of the term *indefinite* is different from the one in chapter 1. Quirk et al. (1973) try to capture the semantic vagueness of the words in the table.

\(^{55}\) In initial position with negative inversion of subject and auxiliary.

\(^{56}\) Assertive indefinites can also be used in interrogative clauses that are offers and requests rather than inquiries aimed at obtaining information, as shown in (1). This issue, however, is not explored in the present dissertation.

(1) a. ?Would you like any sugar? (offer)
    b. Would you like some sugar?
    c. ?Can anyone open the door? (request)
    d. Can someone open the door?
c. She doesn’t talk to anybody. (negative marker)
d. Mary has never talked to anybody in the office. (negative constituent)
e. I doubt that she talks to anybody in the office. (adversative)

(74)  a. *She talks to anybody.
b. *Mary has talked to anybody in the office.

The negative elements in the third column are often referred to as negative quantifiers. This terminology is based on the assumption that they have quantificational force and can express sentential negation themselves. As shown in section 3.5.1.5, nonetheless, this view has been recently challenged (Penka and von Stechow 2001 and Penka 2007 for German; Weiss 2002 for English).

As illustrated in (75a), only one negative constituent can occur per sentence, all other indefinites within its scope having to be non-assertive. Like in the examples in (71), if two (or more) negative constituents co-occur, the sentence is judged ungrammatical, as shown in (75b).

(75)  a. Nobody talked to anybody about anything.
b. *Nobody talked to nobody about nothing.

The so-called negative quantifiers are equivalent to the combination of the sentential negative marker and an any-form in all syntactic positions except for the subject one, where negative constituents are obligatory. Labov (1972a, b) argues that this asymmetry in the distribution of negative constituents follows from the mandatory character of the negative attraction rule (Negattrac) for subjects. Negattrac results in the negative being obligatorily attracted to the subject indeterminate in the clause,

57 Under a free-choice interpretation the any-indefinite refers to an undetermined antecedent within a group of possible referents. In other words, the example in (74a) is ungrammatical if the intended overall meaning of the clause is negative (i.e. She doesn’t talk to anybody), but it can be grammatical if the intended reading is a free-choice one (i.e. She talks to every person, regardless of his/her identity). In some negative sentences, there is ambiguity between the negative and the free-choice reading of the non-assertive indefinite. Such an ambiguity is resolved by the context.

I don’t lend my books to anyone.

Negative reading: I lend my books to no-one.
Free-choice reading: I don’t lend my books to everyone (but only to certain people who qualify).
thus preventing examples like (76) from occurring in Standard English and in most Non-Standard varieties.\footnote{As is discussed in the next chapter, (76) is marginally possible in Hiberno-English, a variety of English spoken in the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland, and in Tyneside English. In my analysis, however, the \textit{any}-subjects are claimed to be Free-Choice Items instead of NPIs (non-assertive indefinites in the sense of Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik 1973).}

(76) *Anybody doesn’t like to be insulted.

Attraction of object indefinites, on the other hand, is optional. The choice between an element from the \textit{no}-set and a non-assertive indefinite bound by the sentential negative marker seems to be driven by formality: the so-called negative quantifiers are more formal than analytic forms (Anderwald 2002: 32). In section 3.5.1.5, a syntactic account is offered of how these two possible ways of expressing negation (i.e. \textit{I saw nobody} versus \textit{I didn’t see anybody}) are derived.

### 3.5.1.4 Negative conjunctions

\textit{Neither} and \textit{nor} are negative conjunctions that can be used to co-ordinate constituents, phrases or lexical items occurring as part of phrases. Each of these cases is exemplified in the sentences in (77), which contain the combinations \textit{neither...nor} and \textit{not...nor}.

(77) a. \textit{Neither} Professor Lee \textit{nor} his students went to the meeting.
    b. His article has been \textit{neither} published \textit{nor} presented to conferences.
    c. His article is \textit{not} good \textit{nor} interesting.

As shown in (78), the sentences in (77) go through Klima’s tests, which means that the clause is negated as a whole. As discussed earlier in the chapter, this is an effect of the tests being sensitive to negation taking widest-scope. In further sections, negative conjunctions are analysed on a par with negative constituents like \textit{nobody} and \textit{nothing}.

(78) a. \textit{Neither} Professor Lee \textit{nor} his students went to the meeting, \textit{did} they?
    b. His article has been \textit{neither} published \textit{nor} presented to conferences. And \textit{neither} has his thesis.
    c. His article is \textit{not} good \textit{nor} interesting, not even for first-year students.
3.5.1.5 Syntactic analysis of sentential negation

Applying the terminology that was introduced in chapter 2, the English negative marker can be analysed as an abstract morpheme that bears an interpretable polarity feature that can be valued as negative, hence being responsible for the negative interpretation of the clause. Throughout this section, I will use the simplified labels Negº and NegP to refer to instances of Polº containing an [iPol:Neg] feature.

As stated in earlier sections, the syntactic head Negº has at least two possible phonological exponents in Standard English, represented in writing as not and -n’t. These are contextually restricted in that the latter is a specialised form that is inserted when negation has head-adjoined to T. The representational structure for the sentential negative marker that is assumed for English is the one in (79) and (80), which correspond to non-affixal and affixal negation respectively. As anticipated in earlier sections, [Neg] is assumed to be a (negative Pol) head in both cases. A Specifier can be projected in both cases when necessary.

Concerning the expression of negation by means of post-verbal negative constituents of the no-series (i.e. the elements in column three in the table in (72)) Haegeman (1995) assumes that NegP is projected with a non-overt Negº and that an expletive non-overt operator in Spec, NegP is co-indexed with the post-verbal negative constituent. This structure yields a Spec-Head relationship between Negº and the chain formed by the expletive operator and the post-verbal negative constituent it is co-indexed with. Such a configuration is necessary to meet the NEG Criterion (see
chapter 1), which requires negative constituents to be in a Spec-Head relationship with a negative operator. This is represented in (81).

\[(81) \quad \text{I saw nobody}\]

In Haegeman’s analysis, n-word subjects (or fronted n-word objects), which occur pre-verbally, are assumed to occupy the Spec, NegP position, replacing the expletive operator \( \text{Op}_{\text{exp}} \). Again, the negative constituent and the empty negative head are in a Spec-Head relation and the NEG Criterion is met.

As discussed in this chapter, I present an analysis which ultimately yields a configuration that is very similar to the one Haegeman (1995) proposes. However, since the analysis that will be developed is framed within the DM model, the \([\text{Neg}]\) projection is assumed to be a matrix of formal features that is assigned phonological content at the PF interface.

The implication of such an assumption is that, apart from the two already mentioned phonological exponents /nat/ and /nt/, it is also possible for the negative marker not to be Spelled-Out at all. This is what happens after the application of a post-syntactic operation known as Obliteration. This means that a non-overt Negº à la Haegeman (1995) does not need to be stipulated, for it is a consequence of a morphological operation.

With respect to words such as nobody, nothing and the like, a featural composition for these syntactic terminals will be presented shortly that relates them to other indefinites such as anybody or somebody. However, in line with the proposals of Weiss (2002) for English, and also of Penka and von Stechow (2001) and Penka (2007) for German kein, the no-series of indefinites, which have traditionally been analysed as negative quantifiers, are argued to be non-negative. This amounts to assuming that the polarity feature they bear is uninterpretable, but valued as negative.

As argued by Weiss (2002), the analysis of English n-words such as nobody or nothing as non-negative indefinites would make this language (and Standard German) less typologically odd with respect to the languages of Europe. In addition,
this proposal permits a uniform treatment of both Standard and Non-Standard varieties of English, which would diverge, as explained in the next section, along three dimensions: (i) whether n-indefinites move to Spec, NegP or some other position outside the VP-domain, (ii) whether this movement is optional or mandatory and, (iii) whether a given variety allows two negative features to co-occur in Spell-Out domains or not. If it does not, PF operations like Impoverishment and Obliteration repair the violation in the morphological component.

According to Weiss (2002: 136), the claim that Standard English negative constituents of the no-series (e.g. nobody, nothing, no, never, etc.) are weak determiners is supported by the fact that, unlike real quantifiers, they are intersective. This means that the truth of the proposition that an n-indefinite introduces does not depend on the order of the arguments. The data on the behaviour of n-indefinites with respect to intersectivity that Weiss reports is taken from Hornstein and Uriagerea’s (2000) work and presented in (82) to (84).

(82)  
a. Some scientists are women.  
b. Some women are scientists.

(83)  
a. All scientists are women.  
b. All women are scientists.

(84)  
a. No scientists are women.  
b. No women are scientists.

For some, which is clearly a weak determiner, (82a) entails (82b). In other words, whenever (82a) is true, (82b) is necessarily true as well. On the contrary, for all, which is a strong determiner, (83a) does not entail (83b). In the case of the negative constituent no, it aligns with some, as (84a) entails (84b).

According to Weiss (2002), the presuppositional behaviour of n-indefinites strengthens the conclusion that they are weak determiners. The author considers the data in (85) and (86).

(85)  
a. All women stopped crying.  
b. All women cried.

(86)  
a. No woman stops crying.  
b. *No women cried.  
c. Some women cried.  

(Weiss 2002: 136)
The examples in (85) and (86) contain a predicate that is made up of two verbs which denote different events. One of these two events is presupposed to have taken place before the other. In the case of strong determiners (i.e. all), (85a) presupposes that (85b) is also true. However, for n-indefinites (i.e. no) this is not the case: (86a) presupposes (86c), but not (86b).

That n-indefinites lack quantificational force is seen, according to Weiss (2002: 137) in structures that contain VP-ellipsis. The fragment of a crime story that he uses to illustrate the point has been reproduced in (87).

(87) There was no one else around apart from the brothers. There seldom is around ten, which was why I’d chosen it for our meeting.

(McDermid 1996: 179 quoted in Weiss 2002: 137)

In the second sentence of (87) there is VP-ellipsis. Weiss argues that if the assumption is made that VP-ellipsis is an LF copy procedure, as claimed by scholars such as Hornstein (1995) and Oku (2000), copying the same exact deleted material (i.e. no one else around) would yield a DN reading. This is clearly not the intended meaning, as the context of the novel makes it clear that the place has been chosen because there is seldom anyone around. This motivates the assumption that no one and anyone share the same meaning at LF, the quantificational force of the former being actually attributable to a covert negative particle located in the Neg° head of the first part of the sentence (There seldom is). Crucially, Weiss (2002: 138) is assuming that Standard English is an NC language whose negative marker is never overt in the presence of n-indefinites.

Penka and von Stechow (2001) and Penka (2007) put forward an analysis of kein as a non-negative indefinite which needs to be licensed by an abstract negation operator. Such a claim follows from the observation of Split Scope readings in German and in Scandinavian (Penka 2007). In addition, as for English, ellipsis phenomena also show that n-indefinites are not always semantically negative. Both types of evidence are illustrated in (88) for German.

(88) a. Bei der Prüfung muss kein Professor anwesend sein
   At the exam must n-DET professor present be
Possible readings:
(i) ?? musst > ¬ existential: ‘It is required that there be no professor present’
(ii) ¬ existential > musst: ‘There is no professor who is required to be present’
(iii) ¬ > musst > existential: ‘It is not required that there be a professor present’

(Penka 2007: 87)

b. …weil Peter kein Auto hat und Maria auch nicht …because Peter n-DET car has and Maria neither ‘Peter doesn’t have a car and neither does Maria’

c. [[ Peter [VP kein Auto hat]] und [Maria auch nicht [vp Kein Auto hat]]]

(Penka 2007: 101)

The sentence in (88a) could possibly have two readings if kein is assumed to be a negative quantifier. The reading in (i) corresponds to kein having narrow scope over the modal, and would be equivalent to the deontic modal dürfen plus negation (i.e. a similar reading to the deontic English must not). As shown by the question marks, this interpretation does not correspond to the speakers’ intuitions.

In the interpretation in (ii), by contrast, the negated existential scopes over the modal, which is compatible with the analysis of kein as a quantifier. However, the interpretation in (iii) is unexpected if kein is a negative quantifier that undergoes Quantifier Raising: it is an instance of Split Scope (Penka and von Stechow 2001; Penka 2007), where negation scopes over the modal and the existential, as if the former were dissociated from the latter.

Penka (2007) shows with an extensive number of examples that Split Scope readings also arise with the modal verbs dürfen (may), kann (can) and brauchen (need), as well as in contexts where n-words serve as objects of a transitive intensional verb such as seek or transitive need. She also discusses data where negative indefinites are used as predicate nominals, which is a problematic issue for the quantifier analysis of German negative indefinites.

In line with the English example in (87), the examples in (88b-c) show that if ellipsis is understood as a mechanism of copy and deletion at LF (Hornstein 1995; Oku 2000), the assumption must be made that kein in kein Auto is actually non-negative. This would explain why its co-occurrence at LF with the negative marker nicht does not result in DN.
The possibility of obtaining Split Scope readings is also observed in English, as pointed out by Penka (2007: 171-172). She proposes the following readings for the examples in (89).

(89) a. There can be no doubt.
   ‘It is not possible that there is a doubt’ ¬ > can > existential

b. Yet here it was, a letter, addressed so plainly that there could be no mistake.
   ‘It was not possible that there was a mistake’ ¬ > can > existential


(Penka 2007: 172)

Penka also refers to Potts’s (2000) observation that Split Scope readings arise when negative indefinites occur in the verbal complement of the modal need. This is shown in (90) and (91).

(90) The company need fire no employees.
   a. ‘It is not the case that the company is obligated to fire employees.’
   b. ‘There are no employees x such that the company is obliged to fire x.’
   c. *The company is obligated to fire no employees.’

(from Potts 2000, quoted in Penka 2007: 172)

(91) [This country is very rich indeed and has enormous resources. If this House and this Government wanted to, resources could be found to provide a house for everybody in this country.]

There need be nobody sleeping on the streets; there need be no homelessness and no evictions because people cannot meet the kind of rents being demanded.

(Penka 2007: 172)

The existence of Split Scope readings in English sentences involving an n-word is thus taken as evidence that the latter are not intrinsically negative. Rather, it is assumed herein that n-words are non-negative indefinites that need to be licensed by negation. Contra Penka (2007), though, it will be shown that it is not (always) necessary to assume that n-indefinites are licensed by abstract negation: rather, they
will be claimed to be licensed by the negative marker, which is rendered phonologically silent in the morphological structure. This issue is discussed in the next section.

To end up this section, let us briefly comment on the characterisation, in terms of formal features, of the syntactic terminal where indefinites are inserted in Standard English. In (92), building on a proposal by Cain and O’Brien (1997) I put forward a DM-style description of the different Vocabulary Items that are in competition for the realisation of the polarity morpheme that attaches to different roots specified with features such as [-definite] [±human], [±place], etc., corresponding to \BODY, \THING and \WHERE among others.59

(92) Vocabulary for Standard English indefinites

a. [+polarity: negative] \rightarrow /n\ /\ Root 60
b. [+polarity: assertive] \rightarrow /s\ /\ Root
c. Elsewhere: [+polar] \rightarrow /n\ /\ Root

As stated in (92c), the phonological exponents for the any-set of indefinites are inserted under Elsewhere conditions. That is, when a value other than ‘negative’ or ‘assertive’ is assigned in the syntax to the polarity feature of the polarity abstract morpheme, an any-form is inserted. Notice that the Elsewhere character of any and its derivatives is very consistent with the observation that any-forms occur in a wide number of contexts such as questions, conditionals, comparatives, and so on. They also occur in negative clauses when the sentential negative marker has an overt phonological realisation but, as will be discussed later on, this is a product of Impoverishment.

In the next section, it will be shown that the particular Spell-Out of the sentential negative marker and the insertion of either (92a) or (92c) follows from two morphological processes, Obliteration and Impoverishment. The former is responsible for the suppression of the [Neg] node, thus resulting in the negative marker escaping lexical insertion of any kind. The latter affects the morpheme that encodes polarity and results in the insertion of an unmarked form, i.e. the Elsewhere form. The application of these two rules results in the two possibilities in (93). This is discussed in the next section.

59 The complete paradigm of English indefinites, which has been reported in (72), contains some idiosyncrasies with respect to the phonological exponents that are inserted when the polarity morpheme combines with certain Roots. Consider, for instance, indefinites such as sometime, never and ever. I will not go into discussing the mechanisms that are at work in every case. Rather, I present a general proposal to account for the most general cases of allomorphy (some-, no-, any-), leaving particular cases for further research.

60 In the case of nothing, the phonological exponent for the negative feature is /n\/. 
3.5.1.6 The Spell-Out of the negative marker and indefinites

3.5.1.6.1 Introduction

The analysis developed in this section is greatly inspired by two concepts: first, it is assumed that post-syntactic operations that can alter the feature composition of a syntactic terminal can rearrange the syntactic output conditioning the phonology of the derivation if triggered by language-particular constraints; second, the notion of contextual allomorphs is adopted. Both concepts follow from the tenets of DM and are very useful to account for a number of syntactic phenomena where syntax interfaces with morphology.

The post-syntactic operations assumed to be responsible for the expression of negation in Standard English are Obliteration and Impoverishment. They are language-specific operations that readjust the output of syntax at the PF interface. They allow the alteration or deletion of the content of syntactic terminals under certain conditions, which has consequences for the syntax-morphology and syntax-phonology mappings.

In DM, the conditions under which Obliteration and Impoverishment apply are merely syntactico-grammatical. This is in line with Neeleman and van de Koot (2006), who discuss a number of ways in which languages repair the accidental repetition of morphemes.

Their view departs from Ackema and Neeleman (2004), who argue that for a remarkable number of syntactic phenomena across languages adjacency seems to be playing a role in the phonological realisation of functional elements. Ackema and Neeleman propose that allomorphy rules (a concept inspired in DM’s post-syntactic PF operations) are sensitive to prosodic phrasing.

While I will not deny the possibility that prosody plays a role in some of these post-syntactic readjustments, I will follow Neeleman and van de Koot and argue that what conditions the expression of negation and NC in a number of languages and varieties is whether certain language-specific Filter is violated in a particular context. I assume such context to be the Spell-Out domain imposed by the derivation by phase.

(93) a. I don’t know anybody.
     b. I know nobody.
The concept of Impoverishment in DM implies not only that a feature is erased from a syntactic terminal (thus affecting Vocabulary Insertion), but also that an unmarked form be introduced. Let us illustrate that with an example from Parrott (2007), who analysed weren’t levelling in the variety of English spoken in Smith Island (East coast of the United States) as Impoverishment of a marked person feature.

As described by Parrott (2007), variable levelling of weren’t is widespread with first and third person singular pronominal subjects, and with third person singular DP subjects. Levelling always occurs with contracted -n’t, but never with not. This is shown in (94).

(94)

a. I weren’t able to answer.
  b. I weren’t very old.
  c. She weren’t that close to you.
  d. He weren’t expecting a boat.
  e. The man weren’t there every day.
  f. Ma weren’t doing no laughing.

(examples from Mittelstaedt 2006 and p.c., quoted in Parrott 2007: 201)

In addition, the form were is the Elsewhere phonological exponent for past-tense be in the variety of English spoken in Smith Island. If the syntactic terminal is specified with the feature [-pl], the form was is inserted.

To account for the facts in (94), Parrott proposes that a variable Impoverishment rule applies in Smith Island English whenever the complex \([be \ T_{[\pm Past, \phi\text{-features}]}]\) occurs in the same morphosyntactic terminal complex as the feature \([+Neg]\). The rule, which has been reproduced in (95), deletes the \([\pm pl]\) feature of the phi-feature complex that \(T\) contains. This triggers the insertion of the Elsewhere form were.

(95) \(\text{Variable} \ [\pm \text{pl}] \text{ Impoverishment rule, Smith Island}\)

\[
T_{[\pm \text{Past}, \pm \text{pl}]} \% \rightarrow T_{[\pm \text{Past}, 0]/ [M \text{____+Neg}]
\]

(Nevins and Parrott 2007)

Having presented an example of Impoverishment, let us now consider Ackema and Neeleman’s (2004) proposal. Their account, which is very close to the assumptions of DM, takes prosodic domains to be relevant for the application of certain post-syntactic rules that, like (95), have an effect on the Spell-Out of the syntactic terminals that participate in the derivation. The case of Old French Pro Drop has been chosen to illustrate Ackema and Neeleman’s (2004) rules of deletion. The
output of such rules is very close to the output of the Obliteration operation that is argued to be part of the grammar of Standard English.

In Old French, which was a verb-second language, the subject of a finite clause had to be phonologically null when it was adjacent to the inflected verb. That is, pro-drop occurred in clauses in which subject-verb inversion would have taken place if the subject were overt. Consider the following examples.

(96)  
a. Einsi corurent __ par mer tant que il vindrent à Cademelée  
    Thus ran.3PL by sea until they came.3PL to Cadmée  
    ‘Thus they ran by the sea until they came to Cadmée’

b. Oserai __ le vous demander?  
    dare.1SG it you ask  
    ‘Do I dare ask it of you?’

c. *Einsi corurent il Grieu par mer tant que __ vindrent  
    Thus ran.3PL the Greeks by sea until came.3PL  
    à Cademelée  
    to Cadmée

d. *__ corurent einsi par mer tant que il vindrent  
    ran.3PL thus by sea until they came.3PL  
    à Cademelée  
    to Cadmée

(Ackema and Neeleman 2004: 223)

The sentences in (96) show that only subjects that were adjacent to the inflected verb could be dropped. Ackema and Neeleman (2004) argue that the data can be accounted for by means of the allomorphy rule that is sensitive to prosodic phrasing.

Prosodic phrases, which are indicated by curly brackets, are defined with respect to the edges of syntactic XPs: in head-initial languages, the right edge of an XP corresponds to the right edge of a prosodic phrase. It is further assumed that traces introduce prosodic phrase-closure, and that boundaries are erased between a modifier and the material it modifies. That said, let us discuss the rule in (97), which applies when the subject and the inflected verb are in the same prosodic phrase.
The rule in (97) reads as follows: if an element X with the features plural, participant (in the speech act) and addressee, which the authors take to be unitary features (Ackema and Neeleman 2004: 194), sits in the same prosodic phrase as a pronoun that bears the same features, the latter are deleted. Without features, there is no lexical insertion (i.e. the phonological realisation is null).

The example in (96) is also discussed in Neeleman and van de Koot (2006) as part of an account of how haplology rules can repair the violation of a constraint that forbids the repetition of morphemes. One of the possible strategies they propose is deletion of one of the offending morphemes when these are functional and adjacent.

In the case of Old French Pro Drop, Neeleman and van de Koot argue that whenever the Filter in (98) is violated, deletion, formalised in (99), applies. This means that haplology does not only repair accidental repetition of phonological material, but also of accidentally repeated syntactic features.

(98) */affix/ /pronom/ if
    (i) /affix/ and /pronom/ are adjacent, and
    (ii) AFFIX and PRONOUN agree.

(99) /pronom/ → Ø (triggered by [(98)])
   (Neeleman and van de Koot 2006: 703)

3.5.1.6.2 Obliteration and Impoverishment in Standard English

With respect to the expression of negation in Standard English, I claim that the fact that the negative marker cannot possibly co-occur with negative constituents such as nobody and under no circumstances can be attributed to the existence of two post-syntactic operations that operate either on the sentential negative marker terminal or
on the abstract morpheme encoding polarity to avoid the violation of the Filter in (100).\(^{61}\)

(100) */negative marker/polarity morpheme/* if

(i) /negative marker/ and /polarity morpheme/ are adjacent, and

(ii) NEGATIVE MARKER and POLARITY MORPHEME agree.

One of the rules that prevent the violation of (100) is the following:

(101) \([\text{Neg}]\text{ Obliteration rule, Standard English}\)

\[ [+\text{Neg}] \rightarrow \emptyset \quad / \quad [____\text{[+polarity: negative]}]_{\text{Spell-Out}} \]

The Obliteration rule deletes the negative feature that the negative marker bears, so that it cannot be morphologically realised. The polarity morpheme, on the other hand, surfaces with overt negative morphology (i.e. an element of the *no*-set).

A second strategy is available in Standard English to avoid violation of the Filter. Instead of voiding the negative marker of featural (and consequently phonological) content, the rule in (102) deletes the negative value of the polarity feature of the polarity morpheme that is part of the n-indefinite. Notice that such an operation results in the feature configuration that determines that the Elsewhere form be inserted (i.e. an element of the *any*-set).

(102) \([\text{Neg}]\text{ Impoverishment rule, Standard English}\)

\[ [+\text{polarity: negative}] \rightarrow [+\text{polarity}] \quad / \quad [+\text{Neg} \quad ____\]_{\text{Spell-Out}} \]

When more than one n-indefinite is present in the structure, the violation of the Filter can be repaired in two different ways: one the one hand, Impoverishment can apply simultaneously to every indefinite, resulting in (103c). On the other hand, a combination of Obliteration and Impoverishment is possible, as well. The negative marker terminal can be Obliterated in co-occurring with the closest polarity morpheme with a negative value; however, the result still contains a sequence of

\(^{61}\)Rowlett (1998: 123-124) also refers to the use of *any*- versus *no*-indefinites as two strategies that repair a problematic situation. In his account, however, *no*-indefinites are assumed to be intrinsically negative, so the configuration that Standard English tries to avoid is one that would yield Double Negation.
identical syntactic features which calls for a repair. Impoverishment eliminates the negative value of the polarity feature of the second indefinite, which surfaces as any. This is shown in (103d). (103a) and (103b) are the product of Obliteration and Impoverishment respectively.

(103)

a. I saw nobody.
b. I didn’t see anybody.
c. I didn’t say anything to anyone.
d. I said nothing to anyone.

The Filter in (100) is violated whenever n-indefinites raise out from their VP-internal base-generated position to Spec, NegP via the outer Specifier of v*P. It is assumed that the [iPol: ] feature of Polº is endowed with the EPP-property in Standard English, which forces the closest n-indefinite to move to Spec, NegP. Assuming NegP to be at the edge of v*, the negative marker and the n-indefinite are in the same Spell-Out domain after movement.

When more than one n-indefinite occurs in the derivation, the closest one raises to Spec, NegP to satisfy the EPP-feature, and the other do so only as far as Spec, v*P so that they Agree with Polº and their polarity feature can be marked for deletion upon Transfer.

That movement to Spec, NegP obeys the principle of Attract Closest is shown in the examples in (104), which contain two object n-indefinites, one functioning as a direct object (DO), and another one as an indirect object (IO). English allows two different orderings in double object constructions: IO-DO, as in (104a), and DO-IO, as in (104b), where the IO surfaces as a PP-complement. Notice that only the n-indefinite that occurs highest in the structure can trigger Obliteration of the negative marker and thus surface as an element of the no-series, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (104c-f).

(104)

a. I gave nobody anything.
b. I gave nothing to anybody.
c. *I gave anybody nothing.
d. *I gave anything to nobody.
e. *I gave noone nothing.
f. *I gave nothing to noone.

62 It is assumed that phase heads can have multiple Specifiers. While the outer Spec, v*P position is an escape hatch for elements that participate in later phases, the external argument of the verb is base-generated in a lower Spec, v*P, from where it raises to Spec, TP.
The facts above fall into place if a VP-shell analysis for double object constructions is assumed. This is represented in (105) for the IO-DO order, and in (106) for the DO-IO.

(105)  
\[\begin{array}{c}
\vdash \varepsilon^P \\
\downarrow \\
\varepsilon^{*} \\
\downarrow \\
\varepsilon^{*} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{VP} \\
\downarrow \\
D \\
\downarrow \\
D_1 \\
\downarrow \\
V \\
\downarrow \\
t_{D_1}
\end{array}\]

(106)  
\[\begin{array}{c}
\vdash \varepsilon^P \\
\downarrow \\
\varepsilon^{*} \\
\downarrow \\
\varepsilon^{*} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{VP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{VP} \\
\downarrow \\
D_{DO} \\
\downarrow \\
V \\
\downarrow \\
t_{D}
\end{array}\]

For the examples in (104a, b) to be derived, let us assume that only the closest n-indefinite moves to Spec, NegP through Spec, \(\varepsilon^P\) to satisfy the EPP-feature of Neg\(^*\). The indefinite ends up in the same Spell-Out domain as the negative marker, thus triggering Obliteration. The second n-indefinite raises as far as Spec, \(\varepsilon^P\) and Agrees with Neg\(^*\).

However, Obliteration has not totally repaired the violation of the Filter in (100), as there are still two negative features co-occurring in the same Spell-Out domain. This triggers Impoverishment, which results in the insertion of the default form in (107).

(107)  
Elsewhere: [+pol] \[\leftrightarrow /em/\]
Given a structure like (105), the n-indefinite that functions as the IO is the one that triggers Obliteration, while the one functioning as the DO Impoverishes. By contrast, given a structure like (106), the n-indefinite with the IO function is the one that Impoverishes. The derivation of (104a, b) is illustrated in (108) and (109) respectively.
The movement analysis of n-indefinites is supported by diachronic data. As discussed later in the section, movement of n-indefinites to Spec, NegP was overt in Late Middle English (LME) (Ingham 2000).

Examination of the Paston data, a database of private familial correspondence written in the 15th century, revealed that OV word order was productive when the object was an n-indefinite. This is shown in (110), where it can also be observed that the n-indefinite raised to a position higher than the lexical verb, but lower than an auxiliary. Ingham (2000) refers to this configuration as ‘embraciated position’.

(110) for I may no leysour haue PL 182, 48 (1465)
for I may no leisure have (Ingham 2000:21)
Such a construction co-occurred with VO word order for object n-indefinites, as illustrated in (111). Notice than neither in (110) nor in (111) is the negative marker present, although (112) shows that NC was quite common in the 15th century.

(111) I kowd have noo leysure
     I could have no leisure
 PL 402, 8 (1479)
(Ingham 2000: 21)

(112) I kowd not gette no grawnt of hym
     I could not get no grant of him
 PL 147, 7 (1453)
(Ingham 2000: 30)

Adjuncts and subjects occurring in clauses with a *there* expletive could also display OV, as shown in (113) and (114) respectively. Again, no negative marker is phonologically realised.

(113) He will no forther meddil in the werde
     He will no further meddle in the world
 PL 488, 5 (1449)
(Ingham 2000: 31)

(114) There shal no thyng hurte hym
     There shall nothing hurt him
 PL 643, 24 (1461)
(Ingham 2000: 23)

In fact, as pointed out by Ingham (2000:31),

‘a very striking restriction was in evidence when a negated XP, whether object or adjunct, was in embraced position (…). In such cases, *not* was categorically absent; strings such as **I cannot no letter write or **He would not for no man alive false his promise were never found.’

Ingham reports, nonetheless, examples where n-indefinites co-occur with *never*.

(115) She had neuer non avayle ther-of
     She had never none avail thereof
 PL 788, 15 (1471)
(Ingham 2000: 31)
Ingham (2000) accounts for the distribution of object / adjunct and associate NP n-indefinites by arguing that they raised to Spec, NegP, thus being able to surface to the left of a lexical verb in embraciated positions. The categorical absence of the negative marker in OV constructions with n-indefinites, which contrasts with NC constructions with an overt negative marker and a post-verbal n-indefinite of the no-set, could be attributed to the existence of the Obliteration operation that has been proposed to account for the facts in Standard English. This assumption is strengthened by the existence of examples of NC like (112), where the negative marker co-occurs with a post-verbal n-indefinite.

In all the languages / varieties considered in the present dissertation, the polarity feature of the polarity morpheme that combines with a Root specified as [-definite] is assumed to be uninterpretable and valued (contra Chomsky (2005), who assumes all uninterpretable features to enter the derivation unvalued). This means that despite not carrying any semantic content, it can serve as a Goal to a Probe with unvalued polarity features.

For Standard English, let us assume that n-indefinites bear a [uPol:Neg] feature that can value the interpretable polarity feature of Polº. This process takes place via Agree: the Probe (the interpretable but unvalued polarity feature of Polº) scans its c-command domain and establishes an Agree relation with one (or more) n-indefinites. This process allows Polº to be specified as negative (NegP, in the literature), and the n-indefinites to have their uninterpretable polarity feature marked for deletion, so that the derivation satisfies the Full Interpretation Principle when it reaches LF.

Let us see how the Vocabulary Items and the PF operations that have been proposed in this chapter yield the three examples in (116).

(116)  
(a) Peter loves nobody.  
(b) Peter doesn’t love anybody.  
(c) Peter does not love anybody.

In line with DM, the syntactic structure that is initially built up contains a number of syntactic terminals fully specified in terms of grammatical features. This is shown in (117).63

63 Trees are simplified for the sake of explanation. It is assumed that the verb bears an interpretable Tense feature that values T, the Probe, in the CP-phase. Raising of the subject to Spec, TP is not represented. Neither is Tense Lowering (or Affix Hopping). Subindices are used for expository purposes. In addition, Roots are categorised as nouns, verbs, etc. by virtue of being selected by categorising nodes such as n, v, etc.
To satisfy the EPP-feature of Polº, the n-indefinite raises to Spec, PolP, thus ending in the same Spell-Out domain as the sentential negative marker terminal. This triggers either Obliteration of the negative marker, which results in (116a), or Impoverishment of the n-indefinite, which results in (116b).

In (116a) the n-indefinite has raised to Spec, NegP and is thus in the same Spell-Out domain as the [Neg] syntactic terminal in the morphological structure. This configuration would violate the Filter in (100) and, thus, Obliteration applies. The negative marker node is removed\(^\text{64}\) and no phonological exponent is inserted. Besides, Tense Lowering or $v^*\text{-to-T}$ movement of the verb can take place in the PF component, as [Neg] is no longer an intervener in not having phonological content.

In (116b), on the other hand, Impoverishment applies and the negative value of the polarity feature carried by the polarity morpheme that is part of the n-indefinite is deleted. According to the Vocabulary Items in (92), the phonological exponent that will be inserted is $any$.

The difference between (116b-c) is to be found in whether negation head-joins to T, as in (118), or if, by contrast, it stays where it has been first merged. In the former case, the phonological exponent /ɪn/ will be inserted, while in the latter, as represented in (119), the full form $not$ will be used.

---

\(^{64}\) Obliteration consists in removing a syntactic node from the derivation in the Morphological Structure, a post-syntactic component. However, the claim that what is Obliterated is not the whole node but just the negative feature it contains would yield the same results: an empty feature matrix cannot be assigned any phonological content.
The complete process is shown in (120).

(120) a. \[
[\text{Pol}P [\text{Pol}º [\text{Neg}]_\text{[Pol.]}_\text{[EPP]}]_\text{[iPol:]}_\text{[EPP]}]_\text{[iPol:]}_\text{[EPP]} \text{ Peter } [\neg]_\text{[uT:pres]} [\text{VP} \text{ [uPol: Neg]} [V' [V \text{ tv} [tD]]]]
\]

b. \[
[\text{Neg}P \text{ [aPol: Neg]} [\text{Neg}] [\text{Neg}P _\text{[aPol: Neg]}] [\text{VP} \text{ tD} [\neg]_\text{[uT:pres]} \text{ Peter } [\neg]_\text{[uT:pres]} [\text{VP} \text{ tD} [V' [V \text{ tv} [tD]]]])]
\]
c. Spell-Out, v*P phase:
\[
\text{NegP} \ [\text{uPol:Neg}] \ \text{Neg}^* \ [\text{Neg}] \ [\text{EPP}] \ [\text{v}^* \ P] \ \text{tD} \ \text{I, Peter} \ [\text{uT:pres}] \ \text{love} \ [\text{uT:pres}] \ \text{VP} \ldots
\]

d. Spell-Out, CP phase:
\[
\text{CP} \ [\text{C}^\circ [\text{uT}]] \ [\text{CP}] \ [\text{TP} \ \text{Peter}] \ [\text{uT:pres}] \ \text{NegP} \ D \ [\text{uPol:Neg}] \ \text{Neg}^* \ [\text{Neg}] \ [\text{EPP}] \ [\text{v}^* \ P] \ldots
\]

e. Obliteration or Impoverishment:
Obliteration: [\text{+Neg}] \rightarrow / \text{_____} \ [\text{+polarity: negative}] \text{Spell-Out}
Impoverishment: [\text{+polarity: negative}] \rightarrow [\text{+polarity}] / \{[\text{+Neg}] \_\} \text{Spell-Out}

f. Vocabulary Insertion:
After Obliteration: [\text{Neg}] escapes lexical insertion
[\text{+polarity: negative}] \leftrightarrow /\text{not}/
After Impoverishment: [\text{Neg}] \leftrightarrow /\text{nat}/ or /\text{nt}/
[\text{+polarity}] \leftrightarrow /\text{ent}/

So far, only examples with post-verbal n-indefinites have been considered. It has been argued that these raise to Spec, NegP to satisfy the EPP-feature of Neg*. After syntax, therefore, the n-indefinite and the negative marker are in the same Spell-Out domain, thus violating the Filter that prevents the accidental repetition of identical features.

Two repair strategies, Obliteration and Impoverishment, are available in Standard English to undo this situation. They affect different syntactic terminals and result in different phonological exponents for the negative marker and the indefinite. Impoverishment, however, is not attested with pre-verbal n-indefinites.

In Cain and O’Brien (1997: 73), this restriction in the distribution of any- / no-items is attributed to the fact that when the indefinite is the uppermost feature-bundle in a negative domain, the [Neg] feature it bears has to be realised overtly. In the present account, I will assume that Impoverishment can only apply if the negative marker c-commands the n-indefinite in the surface.

For fronted n-indefinites, I assume that they are specified with a Focus feature that is probed by a Focus head in the left periphery of the clause. Therefore, they must be extracted to the outer Specifier of the v*P phase, as established by the PIC. Otherwise, they could not participate in the next phase.

Later in the chapter it will be shown that assuming that fronted n-indefinites carry a Focus feature, but that subject n-indefinites do not, accounts for the differences between the two with respect to SAI: since subject n-indefinites raise only as far as Spec, TP, SAI is not attested, while in the case of fronted n-indefinites, which are
assumed to occupy Spec, FocP, SAI ensures that the Focº be lexically realised whenever Spec, FocP is too.

A sentence containing a fronted negative constituent such as (121) is, according to Klima’s (1964) tests, an instance of sentential negation. This is shown in (122).

(121) Under no circumstances will she call.

(122) a. Under no circumstances will she call, will she?
    b. Under no circumstances will she call, and neither will I.
    c. Under no circumstances will she call, not even if you insist.

For cases like (121), Haegeman (1995) proposes that there is a NegP projection with a non-overt Negº. In the course of the derivation, the auxiliary, which is base-generated within vP, transits through Negº, where it acquires a [+Neg] feature. When the constituent under no circumstances later moves to a fronted position, the subject and the auxiliary invert so that the [+Neg] feature that the fronted negative constituent carries can be erased in a Spec-Head configuration.

In the present account, Negº is rendered null by the application of Obliteration to prevent the violation of the Filter in (100); in addition, SAI is triggered for Focº to be lexically realised. The derivation of (121) proceeds as shown in (123).65

65 Chomsky (2004) allows for the possibility that phases are transferred in full in the case of root clauses. However, another view of what constitutes a Spell-Out domain in Phase Theory is found in Svenonius (2004), who introduces the concept of the Mittelfeld. The functional heads (e.g. Negation) that are merged at the edge of phases and their Specifiers are also part of the edge domain of the phase head. Bearing this in mind, the following model could be assumed:

(1) a. $vP [vP V]
    b. $A [A [vP V]] $ is Transferred
    c. $T [A [vP opacity]]]
    d. $CT [T [A [opacity]]]
    e. $Top [T [A [opacity]]]
    f. $V [Top [opacity]]

Assuming NegP in English to be merged on top of AspP (and object n-indefinites to raise to Spec, AspP if another n-indefinite has already satisfied the EPP-feature of Negº) and FocP on top of TP (but under TopP), the data that have been discussed so far as well as the facts related to fronting of n-words and SAI can be accounted for as well.
If the negative constituent is fronted, it first agrees with Polº, which acquires a negative value, and then moves to Spec, FocP (supposing Focº carries an EPP-feature that forces overt movement) via Spec, NegP. The Focº head needs to be filled in. This can be done by the auxiliary that is already present in the derivation or by means of dummy do, which raises from the T complex to Focº if no auxiliary is present in the clause. As has been argued earlier, do is assumed to result from Fission of the [u\_v] feature of T (Flagg 2002). In the cases discussed so far, [u\_v] Fission of T was analysed as a way of repairing the lack of Adjacency between T and v when [Neg] intervened. In the case of sentences containing fronted negative constituents but no auxiliary, do would also result from Fission of the [u\_v] feature of T; however, this would be triggered by the need of the head Focº to be phonologically realised when its Spec is, too.
Fronting of a negative constituent triggers Impoverishment of another n-indefinite in the same Spell-Out domain. This is what happens, for instance, in (124).

(124) Under no circumstances can anybody leave the room.

The example in (124) shows that the constituent that will ultimately be realised as under no circumstances originates as a VP-adjunct; but, bearing an uninterpretable –albeit valued– Focus feature that is probed by the Focº head, it raises to Spec, vºP in its way to Spec, FocP. The subject n-indefinite, which undergoes Impoverishment, is Spelled-Out in Spec, TP. Obliteration of the negative syntactic terminal occurs to repair the violation of (100), the Filter against accidentally repeated syntactic material in the same Spell-Out domain. However, the application of Obliteration results in still too many negative features in the relevant context. Hence, Impoverishment rescues the derivation.

It is marginally possible for a sentence like (125) to have an NC reading. I assume that this is due to the fact that they involve a Negº with no EPP-feature, as is the case in Non-Standard English.

(125) ?Nobody loves nobody.

In not carrying an EPP-feature, the polarity feature of Negº can be valued at the distance via Agree with the n-indefinites. The post-verbal n-indefinite does not have to raise to the edge of the phase and remains VP-internal. In not being in the same Spell-Out domain as the subject n-indefinite or the negative marker, the object n-indefinite does not Impoverish, thus surfacing with overt negative morphology.

The sentence in (125) also has a DN reading, provided that the subject n-indefinite is focused and receives contrastive intonation. As discussed in the next section, the DN reading of (125) actually involves two negative markers. One is merged at the edge of the vºP phase and projects as NegP. The other one is adjoined to TP. Both undergo Obliteration in being in the same Spell-Out domain as a pre-verbal n-indefinite.

Before closing this section, let us address the case of negative conjunctions such as neither and nor. As was shown in section 3.5.1.4, they negate the clause as a whole despite having been traditionally classified as instances of constituent negation. Their behaviour should not be surprising under an analysis that treats n-indefinites as non-negative and defines sentential negation in terms of scope: like n-indefinites, negative conjunctions only display negative morphology in the absence of the negative marker. If this is phonologically realised, the conjunctions under study are realised as either and or. They are thus non-negative and subject to Obliteration and Impoverishment pretty much under the same conditions as n-indefinites. Negation is
defined as sentential in the context of the conjunctions *neither* and *nor* because the negative marker, which has been Obliterated, has scope over the matrix predicate.

As discussed in the following chapters, not all languages stick to the constraint in (100): in a number of languages and varieties the negative marker necessarily co-occurs with n-indefinites throughout the derivation. Obliteration is, thus, not operative in the morphological component in these languages / varieties.

Some languages / varieties that are constrained by the Filter (100), in addition, seem to diverge from Standard English in that they tolerate post-verbal n-indefinites with negative morphology in the presence of the sentential negative marker. It will be argued in the next chapter that this is due to Negº not having an EPP-feature.

In this section it has been shown that in Standard English, sentences where the sentential negative marker co-occurs with another lexical item bearing negative features are ill-formed. It has been argued that this situation follows from the existence of a Filter that forbids the accidental co-occurrence of identical syntactic features in the same Spell-Out domain.

It has been assumed that indefinites contain a polarity morpheme whose polarity feature can value the unvalued interpretable polarity feature of Polº. Polº (often referred to as Negº once valued as negative), carries an EPP-feature (or, more accurately, the [iPol: ] feature of Polº has the EPP-property), which forces its Specifier to be filled in by the closest n-indefinite. When the n-indefinite sits in Spec. NegP, either Obliteration or Impoverishment are triggered, supposing that the language in question is constrained by the Filter that does not allow two negative features to be morphophonologically realised in the same Spell-Out domain.

Both Impoverishment and Obliteration are PF rules that operate on the syntactic output; however, while the former deletes the negative feature of the n-indefinite and causes the insertion of a default form, the latter eliminates the [Neg] syntactic node altogether, which escapes lexical insertion.

### 3.5.1.7 Double Negation

Double Negation (DN) is the term that is used to refer to the phenomenon of negative meaning cancellation. That is, in certain contexts, the co-occurrence of two syntactic terminals with interpretable negative import can cancel each other out, the result being a sentence with affirmative meaning. This is illustrated in (126).

(126) I DIDn’t see NOBODY = I saw somebody
Given an analysis of n-indefinites as intrinsically non-negative, DN can only be argued to result from the presence of a second negative syntactic terminal that bears interpretable negative features. Notice that assuming that (126) is a product of Obliteration or Impoverishment just failing to apply with no other further motivation does not explain why the negative meaning of the negative marker is cancelled, for uninterpretable features do not contribute any semantic content. That is, if (101), Obliteration, fails to apply, the presence of a second interpretable negative feature is unexplained. Recall that the Obliteration rule in (101) only manipulates the output of syntax at PF (but not at LF), so even if the syntactic terminal is removed from the structure in the morphology thus failing to be assigned a phonological exponent, the negative feature is interpreted by the semantic component, which means that nothing is added or removed in semantic terms.

The conclusion is, therefore, that an extra negative projection with interpretable negative features must be part of the derivation in cases of DN. Such an extra syntactic terminal seems to be closely related to emphasis, as shown by the fact that the DN reading for (126) is not straightforward with a neutral intonation. Rather, some contrastive stress is needed for the affirmative reading to emerge. I take this fact to be an indication that Focus is involved in the expression of DN66.

The question is now: where is the second negative syntactic terminal merged in cases of DN if Negº already contains an instance of sentential negation? The answer I propose is that the second negative morpheme that causes DN is merged in the left periphery of the clause67.

The object n-indefinite in (126) is focused. This means that it needs to be extracted to the edge of the phase where it has been merged; otherwise, the PIC would prevent the n-indefinite from participating in the CP-phase.

The n-indefinite, which is specified with the [uPol:Neg] and [uFoc] features, raises from the position where it has been base-generated to Spec, VP. In order to be checked, [uFoc] and [uPol:Neg] further raise to the outer Spec, vP, the edge of the

---

66 This is similar to a proposal by Alonso Ovalle and Guerzoni (2004), who discuss cases of Double Negation in denial contexts as instances of metalinguistic negation. In their proposal, the negative features in Focus that cause Double Negation are phonologically null, while the negative marker in Negº is Spelled-Out. In my account, it is the other way around.

67 Cormack and Smith (1999) argue for a third negative position in English, called Echo[Neg], on the basis of scope interactions of modals and negation. Echo [Neg] is claimed to be merged above T and C, but below C[FORCE], as Rizzi’s (1997) well-articulated cartography of the left-periphery is adopted. This extra position allows the authors to account for the fact that certain modals are interpreted within the scope of negation in echoic contexts, which are defined as in Wilson and Sperber (1988) and Carston (1994). The examples that Cormack and Smith discuss as echoic contexts are questions, rhetorical questions and denial. In line with Cormack and Smith, I also assume that the extra negative abstract morpheme is merged in the CP-layer; however, I take English to allow Merge of negative features in Focus.
v*P phase. In Spec, v*P, [uFoc] can be marked for deletion via Agree with the Focº head; [uPol:Neg] further moves to Spec, NegP, triggering Obliteration of the lower negative head. Both Focº and the n-indefinite are pronounced with contrastive stress.

The n-indefinite, which carries [uFoc] features, raises from the position where it has been base-generated to Spec, VP. In order to have the [uFoc: ] and [uPol: ] features valued, the n-indefinite further raises to the outer Spec, v*P, the edge of the v*P phase. In Spec, v*P, [uFoc] can be valued via Agree with the Focº head; to satisfy the EPP-feature of Negº, the n-indefinite further moves to Spec, NegP, where [uPol: ] is valued as negative. This configuration triggers Obliteration of the lower negative head. Both Focº and the n-indefinite are pronounced with contrastive stress.

A second [Neg] syntactic terminal adjoins to T, under FocP. From this position, [Neg] has scope over the event quantifier of the main predicate, which is a necessary condition for DN to obtain: if two [Neg] terminals are present in the structure, but one of them does not have scope over the matrix predicate, DN does not possibly arise.

Fission of the [uv] feature of T regularly occurs to repair the lack of Adjacency between T and v. As discussed earlier, Fission results in the insertion of dummy-do. The subject in Spec, TP raises to Spec, FocP, and the complex Tº head raises to Focº, allowing [Neg] to head-adjoin to Focº, which contains Tense features. All these operations are illustrated in the tree representation in (127).
(127)

Movement of \([uPol:Neg]\) to Spec, NegP. Valuation of \([iPol: ]\) as Pol:Neg; satisfaction of EPP.

Movement of \([uFoc]\) and \([uPol:Neg]\) to the phase-edge.
3.5.1.8 The learnability problem: support from language acquisition

One of the potential problems of arguing in favour of the existence of an Obliteration rule in Standard English is explaining how it is possible for a child to ‘learn’ that the sentential negative marker is there in the syntax but fails to be Spelled-Out when n-indefinites are realised by elements of the no-set. That is, postulating that in Standard English the negative marker is merged into the structure but is not phonologically realised if n-indefinites occur in a particular syntactic position seems a theoretical construct, as, apparently, there is no input for the child to acquire the Obliteration operation.

The purpose of the present section is to show that far from posing a problem, child English data provide strong support for the analysis that has been put forward. The child English acquisition data available in the literature show that the child ‘knows’ that the negative marker is there from a very early age. This is nicely illustrated in a classic example from McNeill (1966).

(128) CHILD: Nobody don’t like me.  
MOTHER: No, say ‘nobody likes me.’  
CHILD: Nobody don’t like me.  
(eight repetitions of this dialogue)  
MOTHER: No, now listen carefully; say ‘nobody likes me.’  
CHILD: Oh! Nobody don’t like me.

(McNeill 1966: 69)

More examples have been collected from the CHILDES database (MacWhinney 1995). In the Gathercole-Burns corpus, Katie and George produced the following examples at around age four.

(129) Can’t get no scissors.  
(Katie)

(130) Nobody [[/][68] no one here’s not finished yet.  
(George)

(131) The rabbit wants [/] doesn’t want # none tail.  
(George)

In the Wells corpus, a child named George produced the example in (132) at around three years of age. The examples by Elspeth, collected at different ages, are also from the same corpus.

68 The slashes and the symbol # indicate slight pauses.
I don’t want no peas.  
(133) Haven’t got nothing  
(Elspeth, 3; 6. 05)  
(134) You haven’t got none left  
(Elspeth, 5; 0. 03)

The examples in (128) to (134) seem to indicate that NC structures are at the base for the acquisition of the system of negation of Standard English. The literature on the acquisition of English as a first language (Bellugi 1967; Kiparsky 1968) confirms the fact that NC is quite general in child language, disappearing around age five.

Actually, Bellugi (cited in Kiparsky 1968) revealed that the co-occurrence of the negative marker with n-indefinites like nobody, nothing or no + noun can be regarded as a stage in the process of acquisition of English. Kiparsky (1968: 193) points out that these kind of sentences, which have the form of non-standard English negative sentences, may have never been heard by the child. Within the generative grammar tradition, the production of strings of language that are not observed in the input is generally taken to be an argument for some a priori linguistic knowledge that allows the child to acquire a language when exposed to the input.

On the basis of the acquisition data that were illustrated in (128) to (134), and the observation that English children seem to go through a period of multiple negation (Kiparsky 1968: 193) it is plausible to assume that what children acquire is that a rule deletes the negative marker which, as seen in the data, is naturally merged into the structure during the process of acquisition.

Alternatively, the examples in (131) to (134) could result from Neg° not having an EPP-feature in the child’s grammar. In this case, neither Obliteration nor Impoverishment would be triggered.

3.5.2 Non-sentential negation not

Instances of non-sentential negation are always construed with not in English. Unlike sentential negation, not in non-sentential negation has scope over the constituent it is negating and not over the whole clause.

As shown in the examples in (4), repeated here as (135) non-sentential negation fails to go through Klima’s tests. In addition, the negated constituent not long ago in a sentence such as (135b) does not trigger SAI when fronted, as illustrated in (136). In addition, constituent negated phrases do not display inner island effects (Haegeman...
1995: 272), as shown in (137), where why can be construed either with say or with be fired thus showing that not long ago does not block movement as an operator would do.

(135) a. George decided not to attend Professor Lee’s lecture, *did he?
   b. Peter visited his mother not long ago and *neither did Paul.
   c. George thinks that Peter doesn’t visit his mother, *not even in Christmas.

(136) Not long ago Peter visited his mother.

(137) ?Why did they say not long ago that Bill would be fired?

The lack of SAI and the absence of inner island effects point at the fact that expressions that are constituent negated are not negative operators associated to a NegP projection. Inspired in Zanuttini (1996), I claim that non-sentential negation results from the adjunction of the syntactic terminal [Neg] to a maximal projection that is not associated with Tense. This amounts to assuming that there is no PolP/NegP projection in non-sentential negation constructions, as recall that [Neg] has been argued to project into NegP only if it is the complement of TP. Only when [Pol]/[Neg] is associated with T can it take scope over the event quantifier of the main predicate and be considered sentential negation. Whenever this is not the case, the scope of negation is confined to the constituent it is adjoined to. The Vocabulary for the English negative marker determines that the contracted -n’t form is a possible realisation of [Neg] only when this has head-adjointed to T. This is why in cases of non-sentential negation only not is possible.

3.5.3 Fragment answers

Haegeman (1995) points out that an analysis that does not treat n-indefinites as quantifiers cannot account for the fact that it is impossible to have sentences like (138) with a negative interpretation.

(138) A: Who called you?
   B: *Anybody.

In addition, the fact that n-words are interpreted as negative in fragment answers in the absence of the negative marker has been a very strong argument in the literature in favour of n-words being treated as negative quantifiers. However, in this dissertation, it has been assumed that negative meaning is supplied by the negative
Any-indefinites have been analysed as the default form of a three-way indefinite system. That is, whenever the polarity feature of an indefinite of the system has a value other than negative or assertive, or when it is not specified at all as a consequence of Impoverishment, the indefinite surfaces as an *any*-form.

In the present account, the example in (138) could only be obtained if Obliteration and Impoverishment both applied to the same syntactic output. It has been shown in the chapter that any of the two operations can repair the violation of the Filter that prevents two negative features from being phonologically realised in the same Spell-Out domain. Impoverishment only applies after Obliteration if the latter fails to fully repair the syntactic output with respect to the Filter.

Having an overt negative marker does not make the sentence in (138) grammatical, however. This is shown in (139).

(139) A: Who called?  
B: *Not anybody.

The impossibility of having *not anybody* instead of *nobody* as a fragment answer can be accounted for by assuming, in line with Merchant (2004), that short answers are focused constituents further affected by ellipsis. In other words, the non-sentential XP that serves as a fragment answer moves to a left-peripheral position before the rest of the clausal structure is elided. An example like (139) is ruled out, as the negative marker and the indefinite do not form a constituent that can be focused.

Merchant’s (2004) minimalist analysis of ellipsis is based on the assumption that a head that allows ellipsis of its complement is specified with an $E$-feature, which ‘instructs the post-PF phonological interpretative component not to parse its complement’ (Merchant 2004: 671). In the case of fragment answers, the head that bears the $E$-feature is Focº. After movement of the relevant XP to Spec, FocP, TP is not pronounced.

The derivation of an example like (140) is thus the one in (141).

(140) A: Who called?  
B: Nobody.
3.6 Summary and conclusions

In the present chapter, I have described the system of negation in Standard English by resorting to the concepts of sentential and non-sentential negation, which have been redefined as a mere difference in the scope of the negative marker with respect to the matrix predicate. After considering arguments in favour and against the existence of the NegP projection in English and, hence, the functional nature of sentential negation *not* and *-n’t*, it has been concluded, based on Laka (1990), that NegP is just one possible value for a broader functional category, PolP, which carries an interpretable polarity feature that needs to be valued. If valued as negative, PolP is realised as NegP.

It has also been argued that PolP/NegP is parasitic on the presence of TP. In other words, only when [Neg] is selected by C-T does it project into NegP. In other cases, [Neg] is adjoined to any maximal projection and displays an adverbial-like behaviour.

Whether the syntactic terminal [Neg] is realised as *not* or as the contracted *-n’t* form has been argued to follow from the fact that the Vocabulary for the negative marker in Standard English establishes that [Neg] be realised as the contracted form only
when it forms a complex head with T. Whenever this is not the case, and this necessarily includes non-sentential negation, the only possible realisation for the negative marker is not.

I have also argued in favour of treating words such as nobody, nothing and the like as indefinites with no inherent negative meaning. Although this is a controversial claim, it has been shown that there is evidence (both in English and in historically related languages, such as German) that motivates such an analysis.

Claiming that Standard English indefinites of the no-series are just one possible allomorph that is dependent on the context of insertion brings such a language closer to Non-Standard varieties. That is, the differences that can be observed in the expression of negation do not follow from the lexical differences of n-indefinites, but from some other mechanisms that I have located partly in the domain of narrow syntax, and partly in the domain of morphology.

After reviewing the different steps in the evolution of English negation (i.e. the six phases predicted by the Jespersen’s Cycle), it has become clear that NC was attested until the Early Modern English period, when it disappeared from the Standard. Since then, Standard English departs from the majority of the languages of Europe, which display NC.

I accounted for the apparent lack of NC in Standard English as the result of two independent post-syntactic mechanisms (Obliteration and Impoverishment), occurring in the PF branch, that readjust the syntactic output. Both operations are ultimately motivated by a general Filter that disallows the accidental occurrence of two negative features in the same Spell-Out domain. While Obliteration eliminates the [Neg] node altogether from the morphological representation, thus resulting in the syntactic negative terminal not being realised phonologically (i.e. escaping lexical insertion), Impoverishment deletes the negative value of an n-indefinite triggering the insertion of the Elsewhere form.

It has been claimed that in Standard English, Negº bears an EPP-feature that causes n-indefinites to raise to Spec, NegP. Such movement has phonetic effects in that it triggers Obliteration of the negative marker when the n-indefinite is pre-verbal, and either Obliteration or Impoverishment when it is post-verbal. It has been shown that overt movement of the n-indefinite to Spec, NegP was an option in Late Middle English negative embraciated contexts.

DN constructions, where the negative marker co-occurs with an n-indefinite or where two n-indefinites co-occur, have been analysed as involving adjunction of a second negative terminal to TP, below FocP. In addition, the n-indefinites in DN constructions have been claimed to bear a Focus feature that ensures their participation in the CP-phase. The first negative marker is rendered phonologically
null by Obliteration; the second is realised in Focº, which is occupied by the T head when Spec, FocP is overtly realised.

In the last part of the chapter, it has been shown that data from the field of first language acquisition lend support to the claim that the underlying structure for Standard English negative clauses is very similar to that in Non-Standard English. In Bellugi’s (1968) groundbreaking study of the acquisition of negation in English it is already observed that children go through a stage where they produce NC constructions which they may not have heard in their input. I have taken this fact to indicate that what the children acquire is that either Obliteration or Impoverishment operate in Standard English whenever negative features co-occur in the same Spell-Out domain. In other words, the fact that children produce NC constructions at a very early age shows that a negative marker is merged in all negative sentences, the final expression of n-indefinites being a product of morphology. For those children who are mostly exposed to Standard English input, not finding combinations of n-indefinite(s) of the no-set and the negative marker is a trigger for acquiring such rules.

As will be seen in chapters 4 and 5, committing to the assumption that Standard English is ultimately an NC language with PF mechanisms that always mask such a fact makes it possible to offer a uniform account of the expression of negation across varieties of English, including the Standard. Such an analysis, which will be extended to NC in Non-Standard English and Romance in further chapters, crucially relies on determining to what extent a given language or variety tolerates the co-occurrence of negative features, which are marked.

Languages that implement Strict NC, by contrast, will be shown to ignore the Filter against the accidental repetition of identical features: this is why the negative marker always co-occurs with n-indefinites. With respect to the low frequency of Impoverished n-indefinites in negative constructions, it will be argued that, unlike Standard English, the syntax of Non-Standard varieties of English allows n-indefinites to remain in situ, thus avoiding Obliteration and Impoverishment when occurring post-verbally.

In Non-Strict NC languages, neither Obliteration nor Impoverishment are generally attested when n-indefinites occur post-verbally. However, Obliteration occurs when these are pre-verbal. In the next two chapters, it is discussed where this well-known pre-verb / post-verb asymmetry follows from.