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5.1 Introduction

The present chapter addresses the phenomenon of NC in a variety of Romance languages such as Catalan, Spanish, Italian and French, among others. The purpose of this cross-linguistic comparison is to show that the account that was presented in chapter 3 for Standard English negation and then extended to NC in Non-Standard varieties of English in chapter 4 can also capture the linguistic evidence on NC in Romance.

Italian and Spanish, which are Non-Strict NC languages, display the well-known asymmetry between pre- and post-verbal n-words (or n-indefinites, as they have been referred to in previous chapters) with respect to the absence / presence of the sentential negative marker. While post-verbal n-words must co-occur with the negative marker, pre-verbal n-words cannot. This is comparable to what was observed for Non-Standard English varieties with a system of Non-Strict NC.

The purpose of this chapter is to show that, as was discussed for Non-Standard English in chapter 4, Non-Strict NC Romance languages are constrained by the Filter against the accidental repetition of negative features in Spell-Out domains. This triggers the application of Obliteration of the negative syntactic terminal whenever n-words are in a pre-verbal position. In the case of post-verbal n-words, it will be shown that, as was the case for varieties of Non-Standard English, they remain VP-internal, thus not being in the same Spell-Out domain as the sentential negative marker and not triggering Obliteration of the latter. As was discussed for AAE, Impoverishment is not attested in the Non-Strict NC languages considered in this chapter.

As discussed in section 5.2.3.3, n-indefinites are characterised as containing a polarity morpheme that carries a valued uninterpretable polarity feature. For Strict NC languages like Romanian, it has been assumed that these tolerate more than one negative feature in the same Spell-Out domain. PF repair operations are, thus, unmotivated.

Catalan and French are more complex than the other Romance languages mentioned so far. The former is very difficult to classify as displaying either Strict or Non-Strict NC. Actually, for a number of speakers, it is indistinctively both. Cases of intra-speaker variability are thus found in Catalan. With respect to French, significant differences have been reported between Standard French and other varieties of French such as Québécois in the field of the expression of negation, on
the one hand. On the other hand, Standard French shows a number of striking similarities with Standard English.

Both facts about French can be accommodated under the account that has been defended in earlier chapters. However, it will be necessary to explore the claim, made in Gallego (2005, 2007), that, despite being a Romance language, Standard French is not a null subject language (NSL). Rather, it is comparable to Standard English in that (i) T° bears an EPP-feature that disallows post-verbal subjects and in that (ii) v-to-T movement does not take place in the syntax, while this is assumed to be the case in the rest of Romance languages. After considering these two facts about Standard French, it will be shown that it is not surprising that it does not behave like most Romance languages concerning the phenomenon of NC.

Chapter 5 is organised as follows: in section 5.2 data on Spanish, a Non-Strict NC language, are introduced and discussed. However, a number of other issues are addressed before developing our own analysis of NC examples. In section 5.2.1, the phenomenon of Phase Sliding in NSLs is presented, as well as its implications for the positioning of PolP / NegP in the clause. In section 5.2.2, the work by Espinal (2000 and in press) on the semantic characterisation of n-words in Catalan (and other Romance languages) is discussed, and the role of Focus for the quantificational reading of pre-verbal n-words (Isac 2002) is highlighted. In section 5.2.3 some prototypical data on NC in Spanish are considered. These illustrate a well-known word order pattern also observed in other Romance Non-Strict NC languages. Section 5.2.3.2 addresses the no...N + alguno/a construction; section 5.2.3.3 is devoted to showing that n-words can co-occur with the sentential negative marker in dialectal and diachronic Spanish.

Section 5.3.1 addresses some data in Romanian, a Strict NC Romance language. Section 5.4 is devoted to the discussion of Standard French and Québécois French, while section 5.5 is dedicated to Catalan, with special emphasis on (i) the intra-speaker variability that is observed with respect to the co-occurrence of the negative marker with pre-verbal n-words and (ii) the status of pas. Finally, section 5.6 summarises the main conclusions.

5.2 Non-Strict NC in Romance: Spanish

5.2.1 Phase Sliding and the position of NegP in NSLs

As was already introduced in chapter 2, Gallego (2005, 2007) discusses the process of Phase Sliding, which follows from the syntactic movement of v*-to-T in NSLs. Gallego claims that when v* moves to T in the syntax (and not in the phonological
component, as seems to happen in English), this ‘pushes up’ the \( v^\# P \) phase: technically, Merge of \( v^\# \) to \( T \) causes a Reprojection\(^{102}\) that creates a hybrid label \( v^\#/ T \) that triggers all operations. All phase phenomena that occur in the \( v^\# P \) phase take place in the \( v^\#/ TP \) domain after Phase Sliding. In having its head removed, \( v^\# P \) is no longer a phase. Phase Sliding, therefore, induces an extra process of Transfer, which sends \( v^\# P \) and C-\( v^\#/ T \) to the interfaces at different times.

In addition, Gallego’s proposal gives an explanation for the well-documented observation that Spec, TP in Spanish displays both A- and A-bar properties. As noted in Gallego (2005: 49), under a Phase Sliding analysis, the A-bar properties of Spec, TP come from \( v^\# \), while \( T \) contributes the A-properties.

While the examples in (1) show that the subject in Spec, TP can bind and control, hence illustrating the A-properties of Spec, TP, Gallego (2005) discusses evidence that confirms the prediction that if \( T \) is a phase head, DPs should be able to land in its outer Spec(s) to allow successive cyclic movement, or to yield some particular semantic interpretation. As shown in (2), pre-verbal subjects are assigned a topic or categorical-like interpretation, whereas they are interpreted as Focus if they are post-verbal (Gallego 2004). This is expected if \( T \) is a phase-head.

(1) a. Juan, quiere PRO sali con Lucía. (Spanish)
‘Juan wants to go out with Lucía’

b. Juan, se afeita a sí mismo.
‘Juan shaves himself’

(Gallego 2005: 49)

(2) a. María canta. (=María is a singer) (Spanish)
‘María sings’

b. Canta María.
‘María sings’ (=María is singing/It is María who sings… and not Ana)

(Gallego 2005: 52)

\(^{102}\) Reprojection (Hornstein and Uriagereka 2002) consists in the projection, for a second time, in the same geometrical object. Reprojection transforms the phrase marker \( \{Y, \{Y, X\}\} \) into a phrase marker \( \{X, \{Y, X\}\} \).
Gallego (2005) also reports Uribe-Etxebarria’s (1992: 462-465) observation that, unlike in English, pre-verbal quantified subjects do not allow wh-objects to have inverse scope. This is illustrated in (3), for which a pair-list answer is not possible, and in (4), where both the rigid scope and the pair-list readings are possible. Finally, (5) shows that Spanish post-verbal distributive subjects do not show the restriction observed in (3).

(3) A: ¿A quién dices [CP que [TP cada senador, amabai [v*P ti tz]]? to who say-2SG that each senator loved-3SG
‘Who do you say that each senator loved?’ (Spanish)

B: Cada senador amaba a María.
each senator loved-3SG to María
‘Each senator loved María’

xB’: El senador Smith amaba a Inés, el senador Brown amaba a Inés, etc.
the senator Smith loved-3SG to María, the senator Brown loved-3SG to Inés, etc.
Brown loved Inés, etc.’

(Uribe-Etxebarria 1992, in Gallego 2006: 53)

(4) a. A: Who do you think everyone saw at the rally?
b. √B: It is John that everyone saw at the rally.
c. √B’: Susan saw Peter, Mary saw Eddie, Julia saw John, etc.

(Gallego 2006: 53)

(5) A: ¿A quién dices [CP que [TP cada senador, amabai [v*P cada senador, ti tz]]? to who say-2SG that loved-3SG each senator
‘Who do you say that each senator loved?’ (Spanish)

B: Cada senador amaba a María.
each senator loved-3SG to María
‘Each senator loved María’
\(B\): El senador Smith amaba a María, el senador Brown amaba a Inés, etc.

‘Senator Smith loved María, senator Brown loved Inés, etc.’

(Gallego 1992, in Gallego 2006: 53)

Gallego (2005) contributes evidence from subextraction and intervention effects that show that, in NSLs, \(\nu^*\) does not behave as a phase. With respect to the first phenomenon, Gallego claims that since Spec, \(\nu^*\) is not a phase edge in NSLs, subextraction from subjects is possible if these are post-verbal. This contrasts with English, where subextraction from subjects is impossible. Subextraction from subjects in Spec, \(\nu^*T\) is not totally impossible in NSLs, but it is highly degraded and worse than subextraction from Spec, \(\nu^*P\). This is shown in (6) and (7).

(6) a. \(?_c[\text{CP De qué artistas i han herido } \text{TP t_

\(\nu^*\) [las obras t_]

\(\text{tu sensibilidad}_]_实践中\)]? (Spanish)

‘Which artists have the works by hurt your sensitivity?’

b. \(n_c[\text{CP De qué artistas i han herido } \text{TP [las obras t_] t_} \nu^*\text{t_} t_

\(\text{tu sensibilidad}_]_实践中\)]? (Gallego 2005: 84)

(7) a. \(\text{De qué conferenciantes i te parece } \text{[CP que [TP me van of what speakers CL-to-you seems-3SG that me go}

\(\text{a impresionar } \nu^*\text{[las propuestas t_]}_实践中\)]? (Spanish)

to impress the proposals by will impress me?’
b. ¿De qué conferenciantes te parece que
of what speakers CL-to-you seems-3SG that
‘Which speakers does it seem to you that

[TP [las propuestas t nós] me van a impresionar [v*P]]?
the proposals me go to impress
the proposals by will impress me?’

(Uriagereka 2004: 10, in Gallego 2005: 84)

Concerning intervention effects, Gallego shows that VOS is a possible word order in transitive sentences in Spanish. He assumes Ordóñez’s (1998) account of VOS as a result of object movement to a position that c-commands the subject, which Gallego identifies as outer Spec, v*P. The examples in (8) are thus analysed as in (9).

(8) a. Compró el coche María.                  (Spanish)
     bought-3SG the car María
     ‘María bought the car’

b. Rompió el vaso Pablo.
     broke-3SG the glass Pablo
     ‘Pablo broke the glass’

(9) a. [CP C [TP Compró, [v*P el coche, [v*P María [VP t t]]]]]   (Spanish)

b. [CP C [TP Rompió, [v*P el vaso, [v*P Pablo [VP t t]]]]]

(Gallego 2005: 61)

Given the analysis of VOS in (9), if v*P is assumed to be a phase, intervention effects should be attested: when the phi-Probe of T looks for a Goal in its c-command domain, the first DP it finds is not the subject, but the object. However, no intervention effects are attested in (8), and T succeeds in Agreeing with the post-verbal subject despite the VOS word order. This is not unexpected if, as Gallego (2005, 2007) claims, v*-to-T movement can extend a phase domain, i.e. slide a phase. That v*-to-T is what permits Object Shift (OS) is confirmed in the examples in (10): OS is ungrammatical if the verb does not raise out from the v*P.

(10) a. *[CP C [TP T [v*P el coche, [v*P María compró t]]]]   (Spanish)
To conclude, if the structure in (11) is assumed, which results from Phase Sliding after $v^*$-to-\(T\) movement, both nominative and accusative Case are assigned in parallel within the $v^*$/TP phase, and movement of $v^*$ to T forces the object to move to the outer Spec, $v^*$P.

$$(11) \quad [CP \ C \ [TP \ T \ [v^*P \ Subj \ t_1 \ [VP \ V \ Obj \ ] \ ]]] \]$$

To test the validity of such a claim, Gallego (2005, 2007) shows that in constructions where the verb does not move to T (e.g. auxiliary structures and causative structures in Spanish), Case assignment cannot proceed in parallel, and the object cannot precede the subject. These two cases are illustrated in (12) and (13) respectively.

$$(12) a. \quad *[CP \ C \ [TP \ T \ [v^*P \ Juan \ hizo \ [\ v^*P \ cada \ coche] \ [v^*P \ a \ su \ dueño \ [VP \ recoger \ t_1] \ ]]] \]
   \quad \text{Juan made each car to its owner to-pick-up}
   \quad \text{‘Juan made its owner pick up each car’} \quad \text{(Spanish)}$$

$$b. \quad [CP \ C \ [TP \ T \ [v^*P \ Juan \ hizo \ recoger, \ [v^*P \ cada \ coche] \ [v^*P \ a \ su \ dueño \ [VP \ t_1] \ ]]] \]
   \quad \text{Juan made pick-up each car to its owner}
   \quad \text{‘Juan made its owner pick up each car’}
   \quad \text{(adapted from Gallego 2005: 66)}$$

$$(13) a. \quad (Ayer) \ \text{Estaba Juan leyendo un libro.} \quad \text{(Spanish)}
   \quad \text{‘Yesterday, Juan was reading a book’}

b. \quad *(Ayer) \ \text{Estaba un libro Juan leyendo}
   \quad \text{‘Yesterday, Juan was reading a book’}
   \quad \text{(Gallego 2005: 65)}$$

In (12a), the matrix $v^*$ cannot assign accusative case to the subject $a \ su \ dueño$ (‘to its owner’), as the object $cada \ coche$ (‘each car’) is in the outer Spec, $v^*$P as a result
of scrambling (and not because of Phase Sliding); the grammaticality of (12b), on the other hand, shows that the object is no longer intervening if the verb moves to T. Reprojecting into v*/T, and thus allowing parallel assignment of accusative and nominative case. In (13), the gerund leyendo is assumed to remain within the v*P, hence not allowing the object to move to an outer Spec, v*P.

The purpose of this section has been to introduce Gallego’s (2005, 2007) concept of Phase Sliding as a process that extends the v*P phase to the T-domain in NSLs. I assume that this is crucial to define what is the position of sentential negation in Romance languages.

Ouhalla (1991) suggests that the position of NegP is parameterised: it can either select VP or TP. In chapter 3, I have assumed that PolP, which can be specified as semantically negative, was merged at the edge of the v*P phase in English (both in Standard and in Non-Standard varieties); I will assume that it is merged on top of v*/TP in those Romance languages that display Phase Sliding.

This can seem a way of re-stating Ouhalla’s NEG Parameter within a recent Minimalist framework, but it is certainly not without consequences: contrary to what has been assumed in the literature, in French, which is not a NSL and is thus not affected by Phase Sliding\(^\text{103}\), the position of NegP should be at the edge of the v*P instead of on top of TP. In this respect, Standard French is similar to Standard English and different from Romance languages: not surprisingly, therefore, the behaviour of post-verbal n-words in Standard French displays a number of similarities with n-indefinites in Standard English, as discussed in section 5.4.

\(^{103}\) The assumption that v*-to-T movement does not take place in the narrow syntax in French has far-reaching consequences apart from conditioning the position of PolP/NegP in the clause. Recall that the functional status of NegP was discussed by comparing French to English verb movement patterns. The classic argument was presented in chapter 3. Although I will not attempt to reformulate the whole argument within the Phase Sliding proposal, I would like to highlight a few issues that should be taken into account when evaluating Pollock’s (1989) account: (i) the contrast between English and French with respect to finite verbs is based on the assumption that adverbs such as ‘often/souvent’ occur in the same position. As acknowledged in Rowlett (1998: 4, fn. 1), this assumption has been challenged by Williams (1994: 189); (ii) pas is a vP-adjointed adverb that raises to Spec, NegP, while ne has often been assumed to occupy Neg*. A sentence like Jean n’aime pas Marie, thus, is comparable to ‘John does not like Mary’; these examples show that, as signalled by ne in French, NegP precedes the verb (unless, of course, ne is assumed to cliticise onto the verb), and pas could be argued to move covertly to Spec, NegP; (iii) in sentences containing an auxiliary like Jean n’a pas vu Marie / ‘John has not seen Mary’ it is standardly assumed that T* is occupied by the auxiliary, while the verb remains in situ. In both cases, the element that is argued to contribute the negative meaning to the clause precedes the verb. Notice that a review of Pollock’s arguments does not invalidate the claim that the negative marker has a functional status in both languages. Actually, do-support, understood as a repair operation (Flagg 2002), also shows that Neg* is intervening in the process of Affix Hopping or Tense Lowering. To conclude, let me stress that Gallego (2005, 2007) based the conclusion that French does not undergo Phase Sliding not only on the fact that it is not a NSL, but also on the fact that, unlike other Romance languages like European Portuguese and Galician, it lacks generalised left-peripheral affective constructions such as overt Focus heads, inflected infinitivals and complex clitic clusters.
The structure that is assumed for Romance languages with syntactic $v^\ast$-to-$T$ movement is the one in (14). For non-NSLs (Standard English and Standard French), it is (15).

(14) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NegP} \\
\text{Neg}' \\
\text{Neg}^\circ \\
v^\ast/\text{TP} \\
v^\ast/T' \\
v_{i^\ast}/T^\circ \\
v^\ast/P \\
v^\ast'/t_i \\
\text{VP}
\end{array}
\]

(15) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NegP} \\
\text{Neg}' \\
\text{Neg}^\circ \\
v^\ast/P \\
v^\ast'/v^\ast \\
v^\ast/P \\
\text{VP}
\end{array}
\]

5.2.2 Characterisation of n-words in Romance

There is an ongoing debate with respect to whether n-words in Romance are best classified as (i) negative or as non-negative, and as (ii) quantifiers, NPIs or
indefinites. Different approaches which combine distinct hypotheses for (i) and (ii) have been outlined in chapter 1.

In this section I will present the work by Espinal (2000 and in press), based on Spanish and Catalan n-words. This proposal makes use of the notion of feature-underspecification, which accounts for the fact that n-words display quantificational variability. I will point out some problematic areas in Espinal’s account and will suggest an alternative analysis.

Following Déprez (1997, 2000), Espinal (2000 and in press) argues that Spanish and Catalan n-words are indefinites which are incorporated into a numeral meaning \( \|0\| \). In this sense, they are considered to be negative\(^\text{104} \). In addition, n-words are assumed to be underspecified with respect to their quantificational force. The proposed feature specification for Catalan and Spanish n-words is thus the one in (16) according to Espinal.

\[(16) \quad [+\text{Neg}, \alpha \text{ QF}] \quad \text{ (Espinal, in press)} \]

In Espinal (in press), the two possible configurations for post-verbal and pre-verbal n-words are given in (17). Movement to Num\(^\text{e} \) gives the n-word a zero meaning, but does not suffice to endow the n-word with quantificational meaning. As indicated by the dotted arrow, the D\(^e \) head of post-verbal n-words requires an external licenser, which can be either a non-veridical or an anti-veridical (\( \text{no} \), ‘not’) operator.

\[(17) \quad \text{Post-verbal:} \quad \ldots \quad [\text{DP} \quad [\text{D}^e] \quad [\text{Num}_{\|0\|}] \quad [\text{NP} \quad \text{n-word}]]
\quad \text{Pre-verbal:} \quad [\text{DP} \quad [\text{D}^e] \quad [\text{Num}_{\|0\|}] \quad [\text{NP} \quad \text{n-word}]]
\quad \text{ (Espinal, in press)} \]

Movement to D\(^e \) is assumed to take place only in a pre-verbal position, as a Last Resort. From this position, the n-word moves to Foc\(^e \), in the left periphery.

---

\(^{104} \) I take this assumption to be different from the claim, present in the early literature on n-words (Zanuttini 1991, among others) that these were negative quantifiers bearing an interpretable negative feature that was absorbed at LF so it did not cancel out the interpretable negative feature of the negative marker.
To account for the impossibility of Spanish n-words to co-occur with the sentential negative marker in pre-verbal contexts, Espinal assumes that pre-verbal Spanish n-words must have a filled Dº, while this is just a possibility for Catalan n-words. That is, Spanish n-words must move to Dº, and then to Focº, thus eliminating the need for syntactic binding of the variable in Dº and, consequently, the presence of no. Movement of the n-word to Dº, unlike movement to Numº, renders the n-word quantificational in Espinal’s account.

In Catalan, unlike Spanish, pre-verbal n-words are argued to optionally move to Dº. The whole NumP can raise up to Spec, FocP, across Dº, which is then licensed by an overt negative marker. This is how Espinal accounts for the optionality of the negative marker with pre-verbal n-words in Catalan.

However, such an account predicts that in a sentence like (18), the n-word should be interpreted as a numeral (i.e. weakly) instead of as quantificationally. For speakers who accept both (18) and (19), the meaning of the two sentences is equivalent, nonetheless.

(18) Ningú no sap la solució (Catalan)
    n-person not know-3 SG the solution
    ‘Nobody knows the solution’

(19) Ningú sap la solució (Catalan)
    n-person know-3 SG the solution
    ‘Nobody knows the solution’

In addition, to account for the ambiguity of a Spanish sentence such as (20), Espinal (in press) also considers the possibility that Spanish pre-verbal n-words can move only as far as Numº and then NumP to Spec, FocP. This would result in Dº having NumP as its licenser (instead of the negative marker, as in the case of Catalan), which would correspond to the first of the two interpretations for the ambiguous example. The second reading would correspond to movement of the n-word to Numº, Dº and, finally, Spec, FocP.

(20) Dudo que nadie sepa la solución (Spanish)
    doubt.1 SG that n-person know-SUBJ the solution
    ‘I doubt that anyone knows the solution’
    ‘I doubt that nobody knows the solution’

The question at this point would be why it is possible for NumP to serve as a licenser for Dº in Spanish, while in Catalan, an empty Dº must be licensed by the antiveridical operator, no, as in (18). Espinal does not provide an answer to this issue.
Espinal further argues that the fact that the same Catalan sentence, reproduced in (21), is not ambiguous, confirms that movement of NumP to the left periphery is the correct analysis. She only attributes the first meaning to (21).

(21) Dubto que ningú sapiga la solució (Catalan)  
    doubt ISG that n-person knows-SUBJ the solution  
    ‘I doubt that anyone knows the solution’ (Espinal, in press)  
    ‘I doubt that nobody knows the solution’ (Laka 1009: 225, fn. 25)

Laka (1990: 225, fn. 25), however, reported that for Catalan speakers the sentence in italics was ambiguous, a judgement that I share, thus disagreeing with Espinal (in press). If (21) is in fact ambiguous between the strong and the weak construal of the n-word, as in Spanish, why can NumP license Dº in the first reading, precluding the presence of the negative marker, but this is not a possibility for (18)?

This is a flaw in Espinal’s analysis that shows that the licensing of the variable introduced by Dº cannot be held ultimately responsible for the impossibility of having pre-verbal n-words co-occurring with the sentential negative marker in Non-Strict NC languages. Actually, the ambiguous example in (20) can be given a different analysis that explains why none of the two readings allow the negative marker to be overt. I return to this issue in section 5.2.3.1.

Like Espinal, Martins (2000) also uses the notion of feature-underspecification to characterise n-words in Romance. However she considers that n-words are underspecified for negativity, rather than for quantificational force.

Martins distinguishes between strong and weak negative polarity items depending on whether these are specified or (variable-)underspecified for negative features. An n-word which is specified as [+neg] is a strong polarity item and can check the [+neg] feature of Polº in negative clauses (supposing it has been able to reach a suitable position in the checking domain of Polº before Spell-Out). Since strong polarity items are able to check the [+neg] feature of Polº when occurring pre-verbally, the negative marker is excluded.

By contrast, weak negative polarity items, which are assumed to be variable underspecified for negative features (α-underspecified), cannot possibly check the [+neg] feature of Polº. Hence, they always co-occur with the negative marker.

Martins argues that α-features are transparent in the sense that the weak negative polarity item will have its negative feature value ‘filled in’ when agreeing with the negative marker. Therefore, despite the fact that the negative marker is overt with weak negative polarity items, there is no cancellation of its negative meaning. Likewise, only negative polarity items specified with [α neg] features can be
licensed in modal contexts; strong negative polarity items cannot by virtue of being [+neg].

Unlike Martins, Isac (2002) defends the view that n-words are intrinsically negative; like Espinal, she endorses the view that n-words are indefinites and lack inherent quantificational force, which they acquire from Focus. Specifically, she proposes that

‘whenever N-words act as negative quantifiers, (i.e. pre-verbal N-words), this is not because of a [qu] feature intrinsic to the N-word, but is instead the result of the interaction of the N-word with Focus. More precisely, we propose that preverbal N-words are in a Focus position. Since Focus is quantificational, an N-word in Focus acquires quantificational features.’

(Isac 2002: 125)

For Strict NC languages, she argues that Focº and Polº are separate heads, while Focº syncretically hosts negative and focus features in Non-Strict NC. Hence, while in Strict NC an n-word can occupy Spec, FocP, and the negative marker can occur in Polº, n-words in Spec, FocP check both negative and Focus features in Non-Strict NC languages.

That pre-verbal n-words occur in Spec, FocP is also argued by Espinal (in press), who contributes evidence from a number of tests (some are adapted from Vallduví 1993) against the status of n-words as Topics. However, Espinal does not attribute strong quantificational readings to being in Focus; rather, she defends the view that the position of the n-word within the DP it is part of is also crucial for a strong or weak interpretation of the n-word.

5.2.3 Spanish n-words in negative contexts

5.2.3.1 Prototypical data

As has been traditionally reported in the literature, Spanish n-words in negative contexts display an asymmetric behaviour depending on whether they occur in a post-verbal or a pre-verbal position. While in the former case, the sentential negative marker must be overt, the opposite happens in the latter case, where the presence of
the negative marker results in a non-concordant, Double Negation reading. This is illustrated in the examples in (22), (23) and (24)

(22) *(No) ha comido nada
    not has eaten n-thing
    ‘(S)he didn’t eat anything’

(23) Nada (*no) les asusta                               (Spanish)
    n-thing not to them.CL frighten
    ‘Nothing frightens them’

(24) NADA (*no) comieron                                                   (Spanish)
    n-thing not ate-3PL
    ‘They ate NOTHING’

In this section I attempt a DM-style analysis of the distribution of n-indefinites in Spanish. The starting assumption is that, as was suggested for Standard English in Chapter 3, n-indefinites consist of an abstract polarity morpheme that merges with a Root. The polarity morpheme carries an uninterpretable polarity feature that can have different values. As established in the Vocabulary Items in (25)

...106, the

105 The same distribution is observed in Italian, as shown by the following examples:

(1) *(Non) ha mangiato niente
    not has eaten n-thing
    ‘(S)he didn’t eat anything’

(2) Nessuno (*non) ha telefonato
    n-person not has phoned
    ‘Nobody phoned’

(3) NESSUNO (*non) ha detto niente
    n-person not has said n-thing
    ‘NOBODY said anything’

106 Spanish n-indefinites are not restricted to negative contexts. They can also occur in some non-negative contexts such as conditionals, comparatives and complements of adversative predicates. As reported in Martins (2000: 200), the set of modal contexts where n-words are licensed varies across languages. In those contexts, however, n-forms compete with alg-forms. Very interestingly, she also states that ‘there is no contemporary Romance language or dialect which displays the obligatory co-occurrence of negative indefinites with the sentential negative marker on a par with the possibility of using negative indefinites in non-negative modal contexts’ (Martins 2000: 196). I return to this issue in section 5.3, devoted to Strict NC in Romance.

107 In order to account for the fact that in some modal contexts n-indefinites surface with negative morphology, one could explore the connection that seems to exist between some of the contexts and negation. In the case of comparatives, for example, a sentence like (1a) implies (1b), where the n-indefinite occurs in a negative context.
polarity morpheme is Spelled-Out as /n/ if the feature is valued as negative. If the value is other than negative, the Elsewhere form wins the competition for Vocabulary Insertion and the phonological exponent is /alg/. The Spell-Out of the Root is itself affected by allomorphy in that it is phonologically realised according to (i) the value of the polarity morpheme and (ii) the inherent features of the Root.

(25) Vocabulary for Spanish indefinites

a. [+polarity: negative] \( \leftrightarrow \) /n/ /____ \( \sqrt[4]{\text{Root}} 

b. Elsewhere \( \leftrightarrow \) /alg/ /____ \( \sqrt[4]{\text{Root}} 

The derivation of the sentence in (22) would proceed as follows. First, the object indefinite is merged with the verb in the \( v^*P \) phase, and VP is sent to Transfer\textsuperscript{108}. Movement from \( v^*-to-T \), as shown in (26) and (27), causes Phase Sliding to occur and, hence, Pol\( ^o \) is merged on top of TP, as shown in (28).

\[ (1) \]

a. Juan es más alto que nadie  
   Juan is more tall than n-person  
   ‘Juan is taller than anyone’

b. Nadie es más alto que Juan  
   N-person is more tall than Juan  
   ‘Nobody is taller than Juan’

Likewise, in the case of some verbs like \textit{dudar} ‘doubt’ and \textit{prohibir} ‘forbid’, their meaning is related to ‘believe not’ and ‘must not’, so it is plausible to assume that they select a C with polarity features, which is very close to Laka’s (1990) assumptions. In this section, I put forward an account for the occurrence of negative morphology in indefinites that are part of subjunctive dependents of \textit{dudar} ‘doubt’. For more complex cases (e.g. conditionals, questions, etc.) where the connection with negation is not obvious at first sight (these constructions only share with negation the fact that they contain non-veridical operators), it could be assumed that n-indefinites, as will be seen to be a possibility in subjunctive dependents, can enter the derivation unvalued. An Operator specified with non-assertive features is then merged in Spec, Pol\( ^* \), so that both Pol\( ^* \) and the n-indefinite can be valued as non-assertive. Of course, the Vocabulary for Spanish indefinites would have to include a Vocabulary Item of the kind [+polarity: non-assertive] \( \leftrightarrow /n/ \). N- and alg-forms, therefore, would be in competition (i) in the particular contexts where the [uPol] feature of an indefinite can be unvalued and (ii) to the extent that the possibility in (i) is exploited in the selected contexts. For instance, as reported in Vallduví (1994), younger generations of Catalan speakers tend to favour the use of alg-forms in non-negative contexts, which shows that the same feature valuation strategy is used by these speakers in all kinds of polarity contexts.

\[ ^{108} \] In Gallego (2005), it was assumed that Transfer of VP was delayed until \( v^*-to-T \) had taken place. However, in Gallego (2007), this is not the case. Rather, VP is Transferred and, after Phase Sliding, the \( v^*P \) (i.e. the complement of the hybrid head \( v^*T \)) is, as it is no longer a phase.
(26) TP

\[ \begin{array}{c}
T \\
\text{Edge domain} \\
\text{Subj} \\
v^*P \\
v^*V_j \\
\text{Obj} \\
\end{array} \]

(27) v^*/TP

\[ \begin{array}{c}
v^*/T \\
v^*P \\
\text{Subj} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{Obj} \\
\end{array} \]

(27) v^*/TP

\[ \begin{array}{c}
v^*/T \\
v^*P \\
\text{Subj} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{Obj} \\
\end{array} \]

(27) v^*/TP

\[ \begin{array}{c}
v^*/T \\
v^*P \\
\text{Subj} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{Obj} \\
\end{array} \]

(27) v^*/TP

\[ \begin{array}{c}
v^*/T \\
v^*P \\
\text{Subj} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{Obj} \\
\end{array} \]

(adapted from Gallego 2005: 15)
After Phase Sliding, the $v^*P$ is sent to Transfer. The extra Transfer process straightforwardly accounts for why post-verbal n-words (i.e. objects and post-verbal subjects) and the sentential negative marker can be phonologically realised in Non-Strict NC languages: they are not in the same Spell-Out domain. Post-verbal subjects are assumed to sit in Spec, $v^*P$, and so do objects, which have raised to the outer Spec of $v^*P$ to receive Case. The Filter in (29) is not violated and, thus, a repair PF operation like Obliteration is unmotivated.

\[(29) \quad */\text{negative marker}/ \quad /\text{polarity morpheme}/ \quad \text{if}
\]

\[(i) \quad */\text{negative marker}/ \quad \text{and} \quad /\text{polarity morpheme}/ \quad \text{are adjacent}, \]
\[(\text{and}) \quad \text{NEGATIVE MARKER and POLARITY MORPHEME agree.}
\]

Consider, by contrast, what happens in the case of (23). In this example, the n-word is pre-verbal and does not co-occur with an overt sentential negative marker. I argue that this is because the n-word, whose polarity feature is valued as negative, raises to Spec, FocP (Vallduví 1993, Isac 2002, Espinal, in press) and thus sits in the same Spell-Out domain as the negative marker upon Transfer.

Such a configuration would violate the Filter in (29). This triggers Obliteration of the sentential negative marker, which escapes lexical insertion. Impoverishment is generally not attested in Spanish.
As shown in (30), unlike Standard English, co-occurrence of negative uninterpretable features in the same Spell-Out domain is not offending. In that sense, Romance languages are similar to Non-Standard varieties of English.

(30)  \textit{Nadie nunca volvió a Cuba.}  \hfill (Spanish)
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{n-person n-ever returned to Cuba} \\
\end{tabular}

It is argued in Herburger (2001) that (30) is ambiguous between an NC and a DN reading. She attributes it to the lexical ambiguity of n-words, which are NPIs in certain occasions, but negative quantifiers in some others. However, the picture seems to be more complex than that. Actually, with a neutral intonation, the most accessible reading for (30) is the concordant one. By contrast, if \textit{nadie} is contrastively stressed, the DN reading is favoured. This shows that Focus is somehow involved in the expression of DN.

(31)  
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\text{a. Nobody ever returned to Cuba.} & [NC] \\
\text{b. Nobody never returned to Cuba.} & [DN] \\
\end{tabular}

(Herburger 2001: 306)

In line with what was said in section 3.5.1.7, I argue that the DN reading of (30) is obtained only if a second syntactic terminal that carries an interpretable negative feature is merged into the structure. Hence, even after Obliteration of the negative marker in Polº, its negative meaning is cancelled.

As was argued to be the case for Standard English, it is assumed that the second negative syntactic terminal is head-adjoined to Focº, from where it has scope over the quantifier event of the predicate. Unlike Standard English, this second negative marker does not receive any phonological content in this case.

Other ambiguous data were introduced in section 5.2.2 as part of the discussion of Espinal’s (in press) work. The relevant example has been repeated here for convenience.

(32)  \textit{Dudo que nadie sepa la solución}  \hfill (Spanish)
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{doubt.1SG that n-person knows-SUBJ the solution} \\
\end{tabular}

‘I doubt that anyone knows the solution’

‘I doubt that nobody knows the solution’

To account for the ambiguity of the example in (32), let us assume that, as is the case with the Tense features of embedded C and T in subjunctive dependents
(Gallego 2007), the polarity feature of Polº in the subordinated clause can get its polarity value from Polº in the main clause, as shown in (33b).

(33)  

a. Dudo [Polº [iPol:modal] [que Cº nadie[uPol: neg] sepa Polº [iPol: ...la respuesta]]]  


In addition, let us assume that the polarity feature of the n-indefinite has a negative value and itself values the uninterpretable polarity feature of Cº as negative. The Agree relation between these two elements allows these uninterpretable features to delete at LF. However, the negative value of the n-indefinite conditions its phonological realisation as *nadie*.

If, by contrast, it is possible for the polarity feature of the n-indefinite to enter the derivation unvalued when being part of a subjunctive dependent and be valued as [uPol: modal] by the Polº head in the matrix clause, then the Elsewhere form would be inserted, as shown in (34b).

109 Unlike in Romance, a negative Cº in Standard English must be followed by a default *any*-form instead of an element of the *no*-set (which would induce a DN reading). Within the present account, this restriction falls into place if the subject of the subordinate clause is actually an instance of Impoverished n-indefinite. In a model where derivations proceed phase by phase, the sentences in (1) would be assembled by first merging the n-indefinite, the lowest verb, the direct object and the adjunct into the v*-P phase. The negative marker would then be merged on top of v*-P.

a. The witnesses denied [that anybody left the room before dinner]

b. The professor doubts [that anybody understood her explanation]

(Laka 1990: 168)

The subject n-indefinite would raise to Spec, PolP, thus being in the same Spell-Out domain as the negative marker. This would trigger Obliteration of the latter in the morphological component. In not being a root clause, Phase Theory would predict the Transfer of TP, which would place the negative Cº and the subject n-indefinite in separate Spell-Out domains and allow the latter to surface with overt negative morphology, contrary to fact. Notice, however, that, as seen in this section, in other languages such as Spanish or Catalan, verbs like *deny* and *doubt* select embedded clauses in the subjunctive mood. Gallego (2007) provides evidence in favour of treating the C-T complex in subjunctive dependents as defective. The main implication of this analysis is that the Transfer operation of these clauses is delayed until the T feature of subjunctive C-T is valued by the matrix v*-T complex. Inspired in Gallego’s account, I would like to suggest that the negative feature of Cº is uninterpretable and needs to Agree with the negative feature of the verb *deny*. Transfer of the embedded CP is thus delayed until it merges with the subordinating phase head. The subject n-indefinite Impoverishes as a consequence of being in the same Spell-Out domain as the negative Cº and thus is realised as an *any*-form.
The second interpretation of (32), on the other hand, involves a syntactic structure where the modality value of Pol in the matrix clause is different from the value of the Pol head in the embedded clause. The n-indefinite carries an unintepretable polarity feature valued as negative, which values the [iPol:] feature of the embedded Pol as negative. Pol in the matrix clause has a modal value.

As shown in (35), when the n-indefinite is internal to the embedded v*P, no ambiguity arises, and the only possible interpretation is non-negative. This is due to the fact that the embedded Pol head is valued as modal by the matrix Pol. As illustrated in (36), if it had been valued as negative by the n-indefinite, the negative marker should be overt as the n-indefinite remains in its first-merge position, which is Transferred before the chunk containing the negative marker.

That the ambiguity in (32) is due to matrix and embedded Pol heads having either the same or different values for the interpretable polarity feature is seen in a language like Catalan, where Spelling-Out the negative marker yields the loss of the first reading, as shown in (37).

While in the absence of the sentential negative marker (37) could be equivalent to (38), this is not the case when the negative marker is overt.
In short, the ambiguity in (32) stems from the possibility of matrix Pol" to value the polarity feature of embedded Pol" in subjunctive clauses, which yields the non-negative reading. If, conversely, the embedded Pol" head is valued as negative by the n-indefinite, the interpretation of the sentence is negative, and the Pol" head is overt (or not) depending on the position of the n-indefinite in the clause.

The alternation between n- versus alg-forms has been attributed to the possibility of n-indefinites to enter the derivation with their polarity feature unvalued, which allows them to be specified as modal, thus surfacing as alg-forms thanks to the insertion of an Elsewhere phonological exponent. In subjunctive dependents embedded under a verb like dudo ‘doubt’, an n-phonological exponent is inserted for the n-indefinite if it is specified with a negative value (which values and Agrees with C"[uPol: ]); if the matrix and embedded Pol" heads are specified as modal, however, the overall interpretation is non-negative regardless of the presence of negative morphology.

5.2.3.2 Spanish: no... N + alguno / -a constructions

As reported in Bosque (1980: 63), Spanish allows the construction in (39), which consists of a noun followed by the indefinite alguno. The examples in (39) receive roughly the same interpretation as (40).

(39) a. No hay libro alguno que me guste (Spanish)
   not there-is book some that to-me like-3SG
   ‘There is no book that I like’ or
   ‘I don’t like any book(s)’

b. No vino turista alguno
   not came tourist some
   ‘No tourist came’

110 The glosses to Bosque’s examples are mine.
c. No me comí fresa alguna
   not myself ate strawberry some
   ‘I didn’t eat any strawberries’

   (Bosque 1980: 63)

(40) a. No hay ningún libro que me guste
   not there-is n- book that to-me like-3SG
   ‘There is no book that I like’ or
   ‘I don’t like any book(s)’

b. No vino ningún turista
   not came n- tourist
   ‘No tourist came’

c. No me comí ninguna fresa
   not myself ate n- strawberry
   ‘I didn’t eat any strawberries’

Notice that the difference between the examples in (39) and (40) is that while the former are construed with an extraposed indefinite with no overt negative morphology, the latter contain an n-word. As shown in (41), it is also possible to find extraposed n-words in the constructions under discussion. According to Bosque, these examples would be nowadays judged ungrammatical; however, for some speakers (Brucart 1994 and personal communication), these examples are acceptable.

111 As Bosque (1980: 64) puts it,

‘[e]n el caso de que tales secuencias sean aceptables, pertenecerían a un lenguaje exclusivamente literario. Debe observarse que sólo la gramática de la RAE recoge, incluso en su edición de 1973, este tipo de construcción que no figura seguid en la gramática de Bello. (…) Alcina y Blecua recogen (pág. 649) en Valle Inclán: Come sin mirar a parte ninguna y en Julio Camba No hay comodidades ningunas. Ambas oraciones nos parecen actualmente agramaticales, o, en todo caso, fuera del registro de la lengua estándar.’

[in case that such sequences are acceptable, they would belong to an exclusively literary language. It must be observed that only the RAE’s grammar mentions, even in its 1973 edition, this kind of construction that does not appear even in Bello’s grammar. (…) Alcina and Blecua note (p. 649) in Valle Inclán: Come sin mirar a parte ninguna (He eats without looking at place n-) and in Julio Camba No hay comodidades ningunas (There is comfort n-). Both sentences seem to us ungrammatical nowadays or, in any case, outside the standard language register].
(41) a. ?Manolo no me ha escrito carta ninguna (Spanish)
   ‘Manolo has written no letter(s) to me’

   b. ?No se ha visto en parte ninguna
      ‘It hasn’t been seen anywhere’

   c. ?Ramón no encuentra piso ninguno
      ‘Ramón doesn’t find any flat’

   (Bosque 1980: 64)

The no…N + alguno/-a construction has been addressed in Brucart (1994) and (1996), who proposes the syntactic structure in (42) to account for the set of examples in (43).

(42) 

(43) a. No tiene pudor alguno. (Spanish)
    ‘(S)he has no sense of shame’ (Lit.: “sense of shame some”)

   b. *No tiene algún pudor.
    ‘(S)he does not have some sense of shame’

   c. No tiene pudor ninguno.
    ‘(S)he does not have any sense of shame’ (Lit.: “sense of shame any”)
d. No tiene ningún pudor.
   ‘(S)he does not have any sense of shame’
   (Brucart 1994)

He argues that the derivation of (43a) is generated by raising of the noun to Dº via Numº, as indicated by the solid line. That the N raises to Dº is supported, according to Brucart, by the data in (44). These examples show that in spite of the possibility of inflecting the indefinite \textit{alguno} for plural, it must occur in the singular in the no… N + \textit{alguno} constructions. In addition, (44c) illustrates the fact such a restriction does not apply to bare nouns in negative constructions. (44d) does not receive a negative polarity interpretation.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(44)]
a. No leyó libro alguno.            (Spanish)
   ‘(S)he read no book’ (Lit.: “book some”)

b. *No leyó libros algunos.
   ‘(S)he did not read any books’ (Lit.: “book some-Pl”)

c. No leyó libros.
   ‘(S)he did not read books’

d. No leyó algunos libros.
   ‘(S)he did not read some books’
\end{enumerate}

(44d) does not receive a negative polarity interpretation.

(44) (Brucart 1996)\textsuperscript{112}  

Brucart further claims that raising of \textit{alguno} to the specifier of the DP it occurs in is obligatory whenever possible. If the landing position is already occupied by an abstract negative operator, as is the case in the structure in (42), \textit{alguno} necessarily remains where it has been base-generated and surfaces after the noun.

In the case of \textit{ninguno}, by contrast, Brucart argues that it can raise to Spec, DP, replacing the abstract negative operator, as it is specified with a negative feature. Such movement has been indicated in (42) with a dotted line.

The presence of an abstract negative operator prevents the structures in (45), where Spec, DP is filled in by another element.

\textsuperscript{112} The English readings for Brucart’s examples in (44) are mine.
Brucart’s analysis can be made to a certain extent compatible with what has been said in this dissertation. Let us assume that the indefinite is merged in Spec, NumP with its polarity feature valued as either assertive or negative: the indefinite will subsequently raise to Spec, DP (possibly the edge of a phase) to eventually value the polarity feature of matrix Pol and the indefinite will surface as algún in the first case and ningún in the second.

What would happen if the polarity feature of the indefinite entered the derivation unvalued? As in other cases that have been discussed, an operator should be merged. Brucart assumed the operator in Spec, DP to be negative, which would result in the indefinite being specified as [uPol: Neg] and surfacing with overt negative morphology.

Although it has been claimed, earlier in the chapter, that Impoverishment was not a possible PF repair operation in Spanish, let me entertain the possibility that it optionally applies in the context depicted above. If it did, the result of deleting the negative value of the indefinite would trigger the insertion of the Elsewhere form, i.e., the phonological exponent alguno.

5.2.3.3 Spanish: negative markers with pre-verbal n-words

Franco and Landa (2006) report that in Basque Spanish\(^\text{113}\) pre-verbal n-words can co-occur with an overt negative marker\(^\text{114}\). This is illustrated in the following examples, which are used by speakers of all ages in certain parts of the Basque Country.

\(^{113}\) ‘Spanish spoken by Basque bilinguals and monolinguals who have lived most of their lives in the Basque Country and whose main Spanish input has always come from persons with characteristics similar to those just mentioned’ (Franco and Landa 2006: 35).

\(^{114}\) The authors also mention Paraguayan Spanish as a variety that allows the overt negative marker to co-occur with pre-verbal n-words. Weiss (2002) also mentions that colloquial Madrid Spanish allows pre-verbal n-words to co-occur with the negative marker without resulting in DN.
While Franco and Landa (2006) defend the view that Spanish pre-verbal n-words cannot co-occur with the negative marker due to anti-agreement effects (i.e. the prohibition of clitic-doubling elements with quantificational force), they show that Basque Spanish operator-like elements can be interpreted either as referential or as quantificational. Unlike in Spanish, n-words (as well as other operator-like elements) in Basque Spanish can be clitic doubled, as shown in (49).

(49) No le he visto a nadie en el partido
not CL.3SG have seen to n-person in the game
‘I saw no one at the game’

(Franco and Landa 2006: 38)

Clitic-doubling favours a presuppositional reading of the n-word in (49) (i.e. something along the lines none of those people you and I know). Franco and Landa defend the idea that structures like the ones above are possible in Basque Spanish because of language contact with Basque.

Basque influence is not taken to be an instance of transfer, however. Rather, they assume that language contact has acted as a trigger for such a construction to occur.

These data are relevant to the present dissertation because they show that it is not totally impossible to encounter overt negative markers with pre-verbal n-words in languages that are typically classified as implementing Non-Strict NC. I take the existence of the Basque Spanish constructions above as evidence in favour of the analysis that has been developed so far: in Non-Strict NC languages, the negative marker is present in the syntactic structure, but Obliterated in the morphology when occurring in the same Spell-Out domain as another element with negative features.
Further support for the analysis that takes the negative marker to be part of the underlying structure of Non-Strict NC languages is found in diachronic data. As reported in Martins (2000: 194) and Camus (2006), Old Spanish, like many other Old Romance languages, implemented Strict NC. This is shown in (50).

(50) que a myo Cid Ruy Diaz, que nadi nol diessen posada
that to my Lord Ruy Diaz that nobody not-him give lodging
‘that nobody give lodging to Mio Cid Rui Diaz’

(Cantar de Mio Cid 25)
(Camus 2006: 1176)

As has been seen in previous sections, Modern Spanish does no longer allow pre-verbal n-words to co-occur with the negative marker. What are the exact mechanisms of this change is left as further research, as this issue is beyond the scope of the present dissertation. However, exploring whether and how haplology rules and diachronic change can be connected could give us some clues to the ultimate reasons that motivate the intriguing observations in the Jespersen’s Cycle.

5.3 Strict NC in Romance

5.3.1 Romanian

In Strict NC Romance languages, the negative marker co-occurs with n-words in all positions. This is illustrated in this section by using examples from Romanian. Other Strict NC languages are Czech and Greek, for instance. The distribution of Romanian n-words in negative contexts parallels that of these other languages.

As reported in Martins (2000), n-words in Strict NC languages cannot be used in non-negative contexts\(^\text{115}\), as illustrated in (51). This makes it possible to formalise

\(^{115}\) De Swart and Sag (2002: 389) state for French that

‘(...) occasionally, we still find existential interpretations of concord items in non-negative contexts, such as comparative and superlative constructions or the antecedent of a conditional, but the examples are rare, and they are generally considered to be marginal and archaic (...). With the exception of these remainders of older stages of the language, we claim that the occurrence of expressions like personne (‘no one’), rien (‘nothing’), etc. is restricted to strict negative concord contexts.’

In line with de Swart and Sag’s claim, I will assume that, as in Romanian, French indefinites can bear an uninterpretable polarity feature that is valued as negative. Why negative morphology is not visible in
the Vocabulary for Romanian indefinites as in (52). As was argued for Spanish, the Root that is selected by the polarity morpheme which is part of the indefinite shows allomorphy.

(51) a.  întreabă-l dacă a văzut pe *nimeni /cineva
    ask-him if has seen n-person /someone
    ‘Ask him whether he saw anyone’

b.  Dacă ați nevoie de *nimic /ceva, spune-mi
    if you-have necessity of n-thing /something tell-me
    ‘If you need anything, let me know’

    (Martins 2000: 217 and 218)

(52) Vocabulary for Romanian indefinites

    a.  [+polarity: negative]  /ni/ / __________√Root
    b.  Elsewhere  /Ø/ /________√Root

In Romanian, both pre-verbal and post-verbal n-words co-occur with the negative marker. This is shown in (53) and (54) for pre-verbal and post-verbal n-words respectively.

(53) a.  Ion nu suna pe nimeni.                  (Romanian)
    Ion not calls to n-person
    ‘Ion doesn’t call anybody’

b.  Nu suna nimeni.
    not calls n-person
    ‘Nobody calls’

(54) Nimeni nu suna.                     (Romanian)
    n-person not calls
    ‘Nobody calls’

    (Zeijlstra 2004: 126)

personne, rien, etc. can be attributed to the fact that the polarity morpheme that combines with a Root does not receive a phonological representation, although it triggers allomorphy in the Root.

116 While negative morphology is overt in Romanian n-words, the polarity morpheme that is assumed to be part of assertive indefinites is not phonologically realised. The particle -va seems to be expressing indefiniteness. I thank Andrei Filip for providing the relevant paradigms.
The paradigm in (53) and (54) has led some researchers (Zeijlstra 2004, Penka 2007) to argue in favour of the view that negative markers are semantically non-negative in Strict NC languages. In minimalist terms, this involves that they are specified with an uninterpretable negative feature. Negative meaning has been assumed to be contributed to the clause by means of an abstract negative operator, Op¬.

The assumption that the negative marker always triggers the presence of an Op¬ in Strict NC languages can be easily correlated to tolerance to accidentally repeated negative features in Spell-Out domains. In other words, the fact that certain languages are constrained, while others are not, by a condition that does not allow them to have too many negative features with a morphophonological realisation in the same domain, can be ultimately related to whether these languages have the possibility of having a negative marker with interpretable negative features in the first place.

The prediction would then be that only those languages that have a negative marker specified with an interpretable negative feature are subject to the Filter that prevents two negative features from being accidentally repeated in the same Spell-Out domain. This would explain why Standard English and Standard French also show the effects of Obliteration despite being significantly different from Non-Strict NC languages.

5.3.2 Double Negation in Strict NC languages

While it is the case that DN is not possible in n-word + n-word combinations in Non-Strict NC languages\(^{117}\), as shown in (55), Penka (2007: 85) reports that DN is possible with two n-words in the same clause in Romanian. The sentence in (56) can be assigned a DN-reading ‘provided the sentence occurs in a context where the DN-reading is prominent, e.g. in a denial context’.

(55) *Nessuno ha mangiato niente* (Italian)
    n-person has eaten n-thing
    ‘Nobody ate anything’ [NC]
    ‘*Nobody ate nothing*’ [*DN]

---

\(^{117}\) In chapter 3 and section 5.2.3.1 in the present chapter it has been argued that DN only obtains if a second syntactic terminal with interpretable negative features is merged into the structure. It has been claimed that it head-adjoins to Focus.
CHAPTER 5 – NEGATIVE CONCORD IN ROMANCE

(56)  \textit{Nimeni nu iubește pe nimeni.}  \hspace{1cm} \text{(Romanian)}
\begin{align*}
\text{n-person not loves OBJ-M n-person} \\
\text{‘Nobody loves anybody’} & \quad \text{[NC]} \\
\text{‘Nobody loves nobody’ (= ‘Everybody loves somebody.’)} & \quad \text{[DN]} \\
\end{align*}
(from Iordâchioaia 2006, in Penka 2007: 85)

However, a DN-reading is not possible when an n-word co-occurs with the negative marker, as shown in (57). Penka (2007) argues that this is because only n-indefinites, but not the negative marker, can be licensed by a separate \textit{Op$\neg$} in the presence of another licenser.

(57)  \textit{Nimeni nu-i place pe Ion.}  \hspace{1cm} \text{(Romanian)}
\begin{align*}
\text{n-person not likes OBJ-M Ion.} \\
\text{‘Nobody likes John’} & \quad \text{[NC]} \\
\text{‘*Nobody doesn’t like John’ (= ‘Everybody likes John.’)} & \quad \text{[DN]} \\
\end{align*}
(from Iordâchioaia 2006, in Penka 2007: 85)

The data in (56) are also considered in Isac (2002), who reports that several scholars (Puskás 1998, Vinet 1998 and Isac 1998) observe that the DN-reading is only obtained if both n-words are under stress. In Isac’s account, Focus is quantificational, so two n-words under Focus should both behave quantificationally, i.e. should both receive a strong construal, with the two negative features cancelling each other out.

In the present account, DN would be obtained by merging a second negative syntactic terminal in Focus. This proposal is very close to Penka’s: this second abstract morpheme with an interpretable negative feature does not receive any phonological content (i.e. it is comparable to Penka’s abstract negative operator) and can cancel the negative meaning of matrix Pol$\neg$.

5.4 The case of French

French, as was anticipated in section 5.1, is not a NSL. Following Gallego’s (2005, 2007) claim that Phase Sliding is only attested in NSLs, French is assumed to have the clausal structure in (15), repeated here as (58) for convenience. \textit{v}-to-$T$ movement is claimed to happen in the PF branch and, thus, does not extend the \textit{v}$^*P$ phase, which is Transferred after the CP phase has been completed.
In this section I aim to show that the analysis that was put forward in chapter 3 for Standard English n-indefinites can be extended to French with some slight modifications. Section 5.4.1 is devoted to Standard French, while in section 5.4.2 data from the variety of French that is spoken in Québec are addressed.

The data that have been included in these sections show that Standard French behaves very differently from other varieties of French. In addition, the striking similarities that are observed between Standard French and Standard English, which set the former language apart from other Romance languages with respect to the expression of negation, are accommodated in the present analysis quite straightforwardly.

### 5.4.1 Standard French

In Standard French, negation is expressed by means of *ne* and *pas*, as shown in (59). The former, however, is unable to negate a clause in isolation, as shown in (60), which is the reason why it has often been assumed that it is *pas*, and not *ne*, the element that is specified with interpretable negative features\(^{118}\).

\[ (58) \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NegP} \\
\text{Neg'} \\
\text{Neg} \quad \nu^*P \\
\nu^* \quad \nu^* \\
\end{array}
\]

\[ (59) \]

Jean *ne* mange *pas* de chocolat                                       (French)
Jean *ne* eats not of chocolate
‘Jean doesn’t eat chocolate’

\[ (Rowlett 1998: 19) \]

---

\(^{118}\) Rooryck (in preparation) argues that Standard French *ne* is a ‘minifier’. That is, *ne* is claimed to be an NPI-licensing operator that expresses contrary negation and that, given a set of possible alternatives, selects the smallest possible value.
When combined with n-words, ne is obligatory, while pas must not be present in the clause. Otherwise, DN follows. This is illustrated in (61) and (62).

(61) Jean *(n’) a (*pas) vu personne
    ‘Jean hasn’t seen anybody’
    (Rowlett 1998: 178)

(62) Personne *(n’) est (*pas) venu
    ‘Noone came’
    (Rowlett 1998: 182)

The distribution of pas in (62) is quite familiar: all Non-Strict NC languages and varieties that have been considered so far do not allow the negative marker to co-occur with pre-verbal n-words. The example in (61), by contrast, suspiciously resembles the data that have been discussed in chapter 3 for Standard English. In addition, (61) is problematic for an account of NC that treats French on a par with other Romance NC languages, as no such languages prevent the negative marker from co-occurring with post-verbal n-words.

In chapter 3, Standard English was analysed as being constrained by the language-particular condition in (63). Whenever this constraint is violated, PF repair operations –known as Obliteration and Impoverishment– are triggered.

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

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

(ii) NEGATIVE MARKER and POLARITY MORPHEME agree.

For Standard English, I proposed that n-indefinites raise to Spec, NegP to satisfy the EPP-property of the interpretable (yet unvalued) feature of Polº. The result of such movement is that n-indefinites, regardless of their position in the clause, are always in the same Spell-Out domain as the sentential negative marker. This configuration triggers the application of either the Obliteration rule in (64) or the Impoverishment
rule in (64b) if the n-indefinite is post-verbal. For pre-verbal n-indefinites, only Obliteration is an option.

(64)  

a. [Neg] Obliteration rule, Standard English

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

b. [Neg] Impoverishment rule, Standard English

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

As in the case of Standard English, the interpretable polarity feature of Polº is also unvalued and endowed with the EPP-property in Standard French. Consequently, n-indefinites raise to Spec, NegP. Unlike Standard English, however, French does not have a threefold system of indefinites and does not display the effects of Impoverishment.

The immediate consequence of French n-words raising to Spec, NegP is the Obliteration of the negative marker \textit{pas} whenever it co-occurs with one or more n-words, as they are always in the same Spell-Out domain. The same pattern is attested in Colloquial French which, like Standard French, does not allow \textit{pas} to co-occur with n-words. Colloquial French diverges from Standard French in that \textit{ne} is no longer obligatory.

As shown in the word order contrast in (65) and (66), for some Standard French n-words, movement to Spec, NegP is overt.

(65)  
a. Jean \textit{n’} a vu \textit{personne}. \hfill (French)

b. *Jean \textit{n’} a vu \textit{rien}.
   \textit{Jean ne} has \textit{seen} \textit{personne/rien}
   ‘Jean hasn’t seen anyone/anything’

(66)  
a. *Jean \textit{n’} a \textit{personne} vu. \hfill (French)

b. Jean \textit{n’} a \textit{rien} vu.
   \textit{Jean ne} has \textit{seen} \textit{personne/rien} seen
   ‘Jean hasn’t seen anyone/anything’

(Rowlett 1998: 187)

119 Haegeman (1995: 231) claims that in Genevan French, \textit{personne} can precede the verb as \textit{rien} does.
For pre-verbal n-words, the analysis is the same as the one that has been proposed for Standard English and those varieties of Non-Standard English that implement Non-Strict NC. Subject n-words raise to Spec, TP. Since they are in the same Spell-Out domain as the negative marker, Obliteration occurs in the morphological component.

Like Standard English, Standard French also seems to allow verbs like *douter* ‘doubt’ to select for a C° with an uninterpretable negative polarity feature which can license n-words in embedded clauses. Consider, for instance, the example in (67).

(67) *Je doute que personne y réussisse* (French)
    ‘I doubt that anybody will succeed in it’

(Haspelmath 1997: 261, in Penka 2007: 83)

Notice that the only possible reading for the n-word in (67) is as an existential. However, the presence of *ne*, which is only possible if the matrix Polº head has been valued as negative, results in the n-word being interpreted as a universal. *Pas* is not phonologically realised because it is Obliterated in occurring in the same Spell-Out domain as the n-word.

(68) *Je doute que personne n’y réussisse* (French)
    ‘I doubt that nobody succeeds in it’

As was discussed in section 5.2.3, the contrast between (67) and (68) follows from whether Polº in the matrix clause values Polº in the subordinate clause or else it is the negatively specified polarity feature of the indefinite that does so. In the case of (68), the polarity feature of the indefinite, which is valued as negative, is probed by Polº, which is specified as negative, as well. Obliteration will take place in the morphological component. By contrast, in (67), the polarity feature of the indefinite is also specified as negative, but rather than valuing the interpretable feature of embedded Polº, which is valued by matrix Polº, it enters in an Agree relation with subordinating Cº, which has polarity features. This results in the insertion of an apparently negative indefinite in a non-negative context.

To close this section, let us point at the fact that, as has been argued earlier for other NC languages, DN readings are also possible in French. As reported in Corblin and Tovena (1999: 99), a sentence like (69) can display cancellation of negative meaning. Significantly, they explicitly state that if the sentence under study ‘is
pronounced without any special stress or pause, the interpretation suggested at first by almost all speakers is the NC one’.

By contrast, ‘a marked intonation paired with a break which results in the processing of the sentence being split “in two parts”’ (Corblin and Tovena 1999: 100) favours the DN reading. The intonational pattern they suggest for DN is reproduced in (70) and (71).

(69) \textit{Personne ne dit rien à personne} \hspace{1cm} \text{(French)}
\small
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\text{n-person} & \text{neg says}  \\
\text{n-thing} & \text{to n-person} \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{‘Nobody tells anything to anyone’}  \\
\text{‘Nobody tells nothing to nobody’}\hspace{1cm} \text{[NC]}^{120}  \\
\text{‘Everybody tells something to someone’} \hspace{1cm} \text{[DN]} \\
\end{tabular}

(70) \textit{PERSONNE/ ne dit rien à personne} \hspace{1cm} \text{(French)}
\small
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\text{n-person} & \text{neg says}  \\
\text{n-thing} & \text{to n-person} \\
\end{tabular}

(71) \textit{Personne ne dit rien // à PERSONNE} \hspace{1cm} \text{(French)}
\small
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\text{n-person} & \text{neg says}  \\
\text{n-thing} & \text{to n-person} \\
\end{tabular}

These data are comparable to the examples that have been considered for other languages such as Spanish, Romanian and Standard English, and clearly show that Focus is intimately linked with the expression of DN. The example in (72), for instance, could be analysed along the same lines as the Standard English example in (73).

(72) a. \textit{Jean n’a rien dit à personne.} \hspace{1cm} \text{(French)}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\text{Jean} & \text{n’a}  \\
\text{rien} & \text{dit à personne.} \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{‘John did not say anything to anybody / No, on the contrary it is not the}  \\
\text{case that he did not say anything to anybody’} \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{(Corblin and Tovena 1999: 101)} \\
\end{tabular}

\hspace{1cm} \text{(73) I DIDn’t talk to NOBODY} \hspace{1cm} \text{(English)}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\text{I} & \text{DIDn’t}  \\
\text{talk to NOBODY} & \text{NOBODY} \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{= “I talked to someone”} \\
\end{tabular}

\footnote{\textit{Corblin and Tovena (1999: 99) only include the reading ‘Nobody tells nothing to nobody’ for this example, but it becomes clear in their discussion that it has two possible interpretations: a concordant one and a DN one.}}
In (72), I analyse *pas* as the phonological realisation of the second negative marker that was head-adjoined to Focus. The *pas* that was hosted in Spec, PolP is assumed to have been Obliterated in co-occurring with n-words. The two negative syntactic terminals, which bear an interpretable negative feature, cancel each other out.

### 5.4.2 Québécois French

Québécois French, unlike Standard French, allows n-words to co-occur with the overt negative marker *pas* regardless of the position where they occur. This is shown in (74).

(74)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Je juge <em>pas personne</em>.</th>
<th>(Québécois)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I judge neg n-person</td>
<td>‘I don’t judge anybody’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. Il y a <em>pas personne</em> en ville.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he is neg n-person in town</td>
<td>‘There is nobody in town’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. <em>Personne</em> est <em>pas</em> capable de parler français à Montréal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n-person is neg capable of speak French in Montréal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Is nobody able to speak French in Montréal?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Zeijlstra 2004: 142)

The distribution of n-words with respect to the negative marker *pas* in Québécois French suggests that it is a Strict NC language. This means that Québécois is not constrained by the condition in (63) and does not resort to PF repair operations such as Obliteration.

As was already discussed for Basque Spanish in relation to Standard Spanish, I take the data in Québécois French to indicate that an analysis that reduces the incompatibility of the negative marker to co-occur with n-words in Standard French to Obliteration in the morphological component might be in the right track.
5.5 The case of Catalan

5.5.1 Intra-speaker variability in Catalan

Catalan is difficult to classify as displaying either Strict or Non-Strict NC. This is why the negative marker is often described as ‘optional’ in Catalan, as shown in (75), where the sentential negative marker has been placed between brackets.

(75) \[ \text{Ningú (no) ha telefonat} \quad \text{(Catalan)} \]

\[ \text{n-person not has called} \]

‘Nobody called’

The optionality of the negative marker is analysed in section 5.5.1 as an instance of intra-speaker variability. This concept was already introduced in chapter 4 to refer to the speakers’ switches from one variety to another. In the particular case of Catalan, the switch seems to be between a grammar with Strict NC and a grammar with Non-Strict NC.

Accounting for variability in language as resulting from the co-existence of various competing grammars that are available to a speaker (Kroch 1989, 1994, 2001; Pintzuk 1991 and Roeper 1999, among others) could possibly explain why for some speakers it is possible to produce (76a) and (76b) interchangeably. The claim would be that the two grammatical systems that compete diverge as far as the type of NC is concerned.

(76) a. \[ \text{Ningú no ha telefonat} \quad \text{(Catalan)} \]

\[ \text{n-person not has called} \]

‘Nobody called’

b. \[ \text{Ningú ha telefonat} \quad \text{(Catalan)} \]

\[ \text{n-person has called} \]

‘Nobody called’

However, there is a more Minimalist alternative to the multiple grammars account. Adger and Smith (2005), argue that within the MP it is possible to find variable phonological outputs with the same semantic interpretation. That is, the choice of lexical item is what determines variation. If two lexical items exist (or abstract morphemes in the DM model) that diverge in their feature-specification, but can be used in the same context yielding the same meaning, morphosyntactic variation is expected to occur.
In an account like Zeijlstra’s (2004), the semantic status of the negative marker correlates with the type of NC. That is, while the negative marker is semantically non-negative in Strict NC, it is assumed to carry an interpretable negative feature in Non-Strict NC. If this theory of NC is to be maintained, therefore, it should be assumed that the negative marker (or a polarity head that can be specified as negative) is underspecified for the interpretability of its negative (polarity) feature. Intra-speaker variability in Catalan, therefore, would reduce to a different lexical choice which concerns the negative marker.\textsuperscript{121}

Given the connection that has been observed between obedience to the Filter that disallows the accidental co-occurrence of negative features in the same Spell-Out domain and the interpretability of the negative feature of the sentential negative marker, the switch between Strict and Non-Strict NC is expected in a transitional language like Catalan. Selecting a negative marker with interpretable features involves activating the Filter which results in the pre- / post-verbal asymmetries that have been discussed so far. I endorse the view that such a correlation must derive from the principle of Economy and the mechanism of derivation by phase.

According to Chomsky, phases reduce the computational burden by allowing the computational system to forget about a particular subarray of elements that participate in the derivation once a cycle has been completed. Phases also define points of Transfer to the interfaces and, consequently, Spell-Out domains. If redundant information co-occurs in the same Spell-Out domain, as has been discussed to be the case for the phenomenon of NC in a number of languages, the principle of Economy can be expected to ‘activate’ or ‘sanction’ certain mechanisms that may limit the amount of redundant linguistic information that will be ultimately phonologically realised.

Given that uninterpretable features are deleted at LF, the Obliteration after Spell-Out of a terminal specified as interpretable for the semantics (e.g. the negative marker) is, to a certain extent, expected: it will be interpreted by the semantic component and, crucially, it is recoverable from other redundant elements in the derivation (i.e. n-words). The requirement that the n-word and the negative marker are in the same

\textsuperscript{121} De Swart (2004), who puts forward an account of NC within Optimality Theory, claims that the optionality of the negative marker in Catalan follows from the interaction of the constraints NegFirst and MaxSN. The first constraint establishes that negation be pre-verbal; the second requires negative clauses to contain a marker of sentential negation. She suggests the following ranking of constraints for Catalan: MaxNeg > NegFirst > MaxSN << >> Neg, with MaxSN and *Neg (i.e. ‘avoid negation in the output’) being ranked equally high. MaxNeg determines that variables that are interpreted in the scope of negation be marked as negative. Post-verbal n-words must co-occur with the negative marker because NegFirst, which requires negation to be pre-verbal, is ranked higher than MaxSN and *Neg. This results in the generation of a pre-verbal negative marker with post-verbal n-words. For pre-verbal n-words, by contrast, the equal ranking of MaxSN and *Neg yields two possible optimal outputs, one with an overt negative marker and one without it.
Spell-Out domain for the latter to be Obliterated, therefore, is a way of guaranteeing the recoverability of the node that is deleted.

5.5.2 On the status of *pas*

*Pas* has been analysed as a vP-adjunct that raises to Spec, NegP (Rowlett 1998; Zeijlstra 2004). In French, it has been claimed to be the element that contributes the negative meaning to the clause. In Catalan, however, *pas* is optional and relatively free in its word order\(^{122}\). Consider the examples in (77) and (78).

\[(77)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{No he } \text{pas } \text{vist } \text{a } \text{ningú.} & \text{(Catalan)} \\
& \text{not have.1SG neg seen to n-person} & \text{‘I haven’t seen anyone’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{No he } \text{vist } \text{pas } \text{a } \text{ningú.} & \text{(Catalan)} \\
& \text{not have.1SG seen neg to n-person} & \text{‘I haven’t seen anyone’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[(78)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{No he } \text{pas } \text{rigut.} & \text{(Catalan)} \\
& \text{not have.1SG neg laughed} & \text{‘I didn’t laugh’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{No he } \text{rigut } \text{pas.} & \text{(Catalan)} \\
& \text{not have.1SG laughed neg} & \text{‘I didn’t laugh’}
\end{align*}
\]

Such an assumption allows us to account for the example in (79), which was attested in the variety of Catalan spoken in Sant Ramon (Lleida), in the Eastern part of Catalonia. While it is the case that *pas* can occur in questions when a negatively specified polarity head is present, as in (80), it is normally ruled out when Negº is absent, as in (81), and even in the presence of an n-word, as in (82).

\[(79)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Que he } & \text{dit } \text{pas } \text{algo}^{123}? & \text{(Dialectal Catalan}\(^{124}\)) \\
& \text{that have.1SG said pas something} & \text{‘Have I said anything?’}
\end{align*}
\]

---

\(^{122}\) This is so at least in my dialect.

\(^{123}\) The proper form would be *alguna cosa*, but *algo* is commonly used in Catalan.

\(^{124}\) Pujalt and Sant Ramon, Lleida.
(80) No ha trucat pas ningú? (Catalan)
not has.3SG called neg n-person
‘Hasn’t anyone called?’

(81) Ha trucat (*pas)? (Catalan)
has.3SG called neg
‘Has (s)he called?’

(82) Ha trucat (*pas) ningú? (Catalan)
has.3SG called neg n-person
‘Has anyone called?’

More examples that show that *pas can be treated as a polar item in certain varieties of Catalan are presented in (83) and (84).125

(83) Que ho volia fer ella pas? (Dialectal Catalan)
that it wanted to-do she pas
‘Do you think she wanted to do it?’

(84) Que el vaig fer enfadar pas? (Dialectal Catalan)
that him AUX.PAST to-do upset pas
‘Did I make him upset, by any chance?’

To account for an example like (79), let us assume that Polº contains an unvalued interpretable polarity feature and that *pas bears an unvalued uninterpretable polarity feature. This gives us the following configuration, where [iPol:] is F$, and the [uPol:] feature in *pas is F$.

(85) … F$[ ] … F$[ ] …

Pesetsky and Torrego (2004), contra Chomsky (2000, 2001), assume that Agree is possible between an unvalued Goal F$ and an unvalued Probe F$ (see chapter 2), which yields a structure containing only one occurrence of F with two instances, as in (86).

---

125 I thank Gemma Rigau for contributing these data, which belong to the variety of Catalan that is spoken in el Baix Camp, in the south of Catalonia. I also thank Teresa Cabré for judgements on the acceptability of these kind of data.
If Agree later applies between one of the instances of an unvalued F and a distinct valued occurrence of F in some other location (γ), the valued feature F will be present at three locations. This is represented in (87).

\[(87) \quad \text{F} \text{[3]} \quad \text{F}_\text{ɪ}[3] \quad \text{F}_\text{ɪ}[3] \quad \text{F}_\text{ɪ}[3] \quad \text{F}_\text{ɪ}[3] \quad \text{F}_\text{ɪ}[3] \quad \text{F}_\text{ɪ}[3] \quad \text{F}_\text{ɪ}[3] \]

(Pesetsky and Torrego 2004: 5)

In an example like (79), I take \( Fγ \) to be the uninterpretable polarity feature valued as modal in the Dº algo. Polº and pas would then be valued as modal.

In the variety of Catalan where (79) is possible, pas is a possible phonological exponent when its polarity feature is valued as negative, as well as when it is valued as non-negative. In that sense, pas must be regarded as a polarity item with underspecified polarity features126. In other varieties, by contrast, pas is a vP adverb that can only be licensed by negation, i.e. whose polarity feature can only be specified as negative.

---

126 The characterisation of \( \text{pas} \) as a polar element ties up to a certain extent with the issue of expletive negation (EN), which is defined by Espinal (1992: 333) as ‘(…) a Neg syntactic constituent which appears in certain syntactic environments but makes no effective contribution to the interpretation of the whole string containing this constituent.’ In an example like (1), for instance, the lexical item \text{no} or the combination of \text{no pas} – brackets indicate optionality – do not contribute negative meaning to the clause.

\[(1) \quad \text{És millor} \quad \text{tener} \quad \text{un} \quad \text{cotxe} \quad \text{vell} \quad \text{que} \quad (\text{no} \quad (\text{pas})) \quad \text{no} \quad \text{tener-} \quad \text{ne} \quad \text{cap} \quad \text{is better to have a car old that not not not have CL none} \quad \text{It is better to have an old car than not to have a car at all} \]

(adapted from Espinal 1992: 338)

In that sense, the expression of EN could be related to the expression of negation in Strict NC languages. That is, it is plausible, to my view, to argue that \text{no} (or \text{no pas}) in EN bears an uninterpretable feature. Which kind of feature \text{no} in EN bears is what should be determined. The contexts that license EN are restricted to comparative quantifiers of inequality, certain prepositions such as ‘until’ and ‘before’, and some verbs like ‘to fear’ or ‘to prevent’. Although EN seems to be lexically determined to a great extent, Espinal (1992) showed that some structural conditions are necessary for an expletive reading to obtain. Particularity, she argues that some specific lexical item must select and govern the expletive \text{no} for its negative meaning to be absorbed. Acommodating EN into an account of negation as affected by haplology is left as further research.
5.6 Summary and conclusions

The present chapter has addressed the phenomenon of NC in a number of different Romance languages. For those that implement Strict NC, like Romanian, it was argued, as in earlier chapters, that they are not constrained by the morphological condition that prevents too many negative features to be morphophonologically realised in the Spell-Out domains defined by Phase Theory.

For those Romance languages that have a system of Non-Strict NC, conversely, the pre-verbal / post-verbal n-word asymmetry that was already discussed for some Non-Standard varieties of English in the last chapter was attributed to the fact that these languages are affected by the Filter against the accidental repetition of negative features in Spell-Out domains. Such a hypothesis has been combined with the claim that in NSLs verb movement to Tº is overt and, in occurring in the syntax, it extends the v*P phase (Gallego 2005, 2007). PolP / NegP has, thus, been assumed to occur on top of TP in those languages where Phase Sliding takes place, while it would be merged on top of v*P in those languages where verb movement does not occur in the syntax (i.e. English). This view is consistent with Ouhalla’s (1990) NEG parameter.

The work by Espinal (2000 and in press), according to which n-words are indefinites that are incorporated into a zero numeral meaning has been discussed, as well as the proposals by Martins (2000) and Isac (2002). In order to be interpreted strongly, n-words have to move to Spec, FocP (Isac 2002, Espinal, in press).

Espinal attempted to explain the (im)possibility of n-words to co-occur with the negative marker as a result of whether the D head that is part of the internal structure of n-words is filled or not. She argued that whenever Dº is filled, there is no need for a binder for Dº. This is what happens in Non-Strict NC languages; in Strict NC languages, n-words were assumed only to raise as far as NumP, but not to Dº, which is bound by the antiveridical operator no ‘not’. Espinal’s analysis, as discussed in the chapter, has, to my view, certain inconsistencies. The reason why n-words cannot co-occur with the negative marker in certain languages has been claimed, in the present dissertation, to be independent from the internal structure of n-words.

As claimed in previous chapters, whether n-words can co-occur with the sentential negative marker or not correlates with the presence or absence of a language-particular Filter that prevents two negative features from being accidentally repeated in the same Spell-Out domain. This idea, which is inspired in the work by Ackema and Neeleman (2004) and Neeleman and van de Koot (2006), reduces the expression of NC in Romance, Standard English and Non-Standard English to an instance of syntactic haplology.
Concerning the post-verbal / pre-verbal asymmetry that is observed in Non-Strict NC Romance languages, it has been claimed that due to Phase Sliding, which introduces an extra Transfer operation, n-words in the v*P are not in the same Spell-Out domain as the negative marker. Hence, Obliteration of the negative marker is not triggered. Pre-verbal n-words, conversely, are always in the same Spell-Out domain as the sentential negative marker.

The ambiguity of pre-verbal n-words that are embedded under an adversative predicate like *dudar ‘doubt’ were related to (i) the possibility that the uninterpretable polarity feature of the polarity morpheme enters the derivation unvalued and (ii) whether the embedded Pol^p is valued by the matrix Pol^p or, by contrast, by the polarity feature of the n-indefinite.

If the [uPol] feature of the indefinite is unvalued, the matrix Pol^p values both the embedded Pol^p and the indefinite as modal, and the result is the insertion of the Elsewhere form. If, by contrast, the indefinite carries a [uPol:neg] feature, it can value the Pol^p head in the embedded clause: the indefinite will surface with overt negative morphology, and the embedded clause will be assigned an overall negative interpretation.

To surface with negative morphology in a non-negative context, it has been assumed that the embedded Pol^p must be valued by matrix Pol^p, while the negatively specified polarity feature of the indefinite is probed by C^*[uPol: ], with which it Agrees. This results in the interpretation of the embedded clause as modal, but in the morphology of the indefinite as negative.

Bosque’s (1980) data on the no…N + alguno/-a construction in Spanish were also discussed in this chapter. Brucart’s (1994, 1996) analysis for this polarity construction was outlined. Broadly, he assumed that alguno and ninguno are both base-generated in the same position, to the left of the noun, which raises to D^p. As Spec, DP is assumed to be filled in by an abstract negative operator, both alguno and ninguno can be licensed in situ. However, only ninguno can raise to Spec, DP to replace the operator. I have argued that an analysis of the data in terms of Impoverishment can yield the desired results provided the polarity morpheme of indefinites is allowed to enter the syntactic derivation with an unvalued polarity feature, which will be valued as negative by an Op¬. Optionally, the negative value of the polarity feature of the indefinite can be affected by Impoverishment, thus surfacing as alguno /-a.

In this chapter, (Standard) French has been analysed in a totally novel way. Instead of equating it to other Romance languages, French has been set apart from the start, assuming, in line with Gallego (2005, 2007), that it does not display Phase Sliding. Rather, the clausal structure that has been assumed for French is the same as the one that was assumed for Standard English in chapter 3. The kind of NC that Standard French displays is also very much comparable to that of Standard English: in both
languages the negative marker cannot co-occur with n-indefinites in any position. The pre-verbal / post-verbal asymmetry that is observed in other Romance languages is thus not attested in French.

I have argued that this is due to the fact that, like in Standard English, n-words in French raise to Spec, NegP, as this functional head has a polarity feature that has the EPP-property. This movement is overt for certain n-words (e.g. *rien*) and covert for some others (e.g. *personne*). As was argued for Standard English, raising to Spec, NegP places them in the same Spell-Out domain as the negative marker regardless of whether they occur pre- or post-verbally. The negative marker *pas* is therefore totally incompatible with n-words and always subject to Obliteration.

Both for Spanish and French, evidence from dialectal syntax has been presented that seem to support the hypothesis that the negative marker is Obliterated when co-occurring with an n-word in the same Spell-Out domain. In the case of Basque Spanish, examples were found of pre-verbal n-words followed by an overt negative marker; in the case of Québécois French, the negative adverbial *pas* was allowed to occur in the company of n-words both in post-verbal and pre-verbal position. These kind of data seem to indicate that the negative marker is there, syntactically speaking, whenever n-words are present in these languages. The hypothesis that the syntax-phonology mismatch is a matter of morphology is thus a possibility that is worth considering.

At different points in the chapter some thought has been given to why there seems to be a correlation between the semantic negativity of the negative marker and the Filter against the accidental repetition of negative features in Spell-Out domains. I have suggested that such a relation might stem from the principle of Economy: there is a strong tendency to avoid Spell-Out domains containing redundant linguistic information if this can be recovered from other elements with which Agree was established in the syntax.

In the case of Non-Strict NC, the interpretable feature of the Obliterated negative marked is relevant for the semantics but is not given a phonological realisation in some specific contexts; for n-words it is the other way around: their uninterpretable polarity features are deleted at LF, but they are phonologically realised as negative morphology. In the case of Strict NC, an Op¬, and not the negative marker, carries the interpretable negative feature that renders the sentence negative: it would be uneconomical to have an operation such as Obliteration to prevent an element which is silent in nature from being phonologically realised. All the other material specified with an uninterpretable negative feature that deletes at LF is phonologically realised, though.

Intra-speaker variability in Catalan was argued to be ultimately related to whether a negative marker with interpretable or uninterpretable negative features is selected. If the former is used, the Filter that prevents the negative marker from co-occurring
with pre-verbal n-words will be active; by contrast, if the latter is selected, the Filter will be ignored. Continuing with Catalan, it was also shown that in some varieties, the adverb *pas* must be characterised as a polar element whose features can be valued as modal, as well.

In the light of these observations, it seems to me that what the Filter against the co-occurrence of negative features in Spell-Out domains that I have been defending might be ultimately doing is create symmetry in the expression of NC across languages. However, it does so at such a deep level that the different patterns of NC that can be observed in the data are just the most optimal way of satisfying a vast number of requirements in each language.