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Preface

Sentential negation has been of interest to linguists and philosophers for centuries. In this book, I propose an analysis of the principal phenomena in Modern French within the Principles-and-Parameters framework of generative syntax. (See Chomsky and Lasnik 1993 and Haegeman 1994a. For more recent versions of generative syntax, see Chomsky 1995b and Radford 1997. For introductions in French, see Pollock 1997a and Tellier 1995.) In so doing, I reconsider a number of the core issues that have been discussed in the literature: What items are truly negative in Modern French? Is Modern French a negative concord language? What is the status of ne and pas? What structural positions are they associated with? How is ne licensed? Why is ne excluded from nonsentential negation contexts? What is the theoretical significance of the controversial pour ne pas que construction? How are pseudopartitives licensed? Why does the distribution of rien typically follow that of tout rather than personne? Why can jamais readily follow a lexical infinitive while pas cannot? Why can items such as jamais and rien co-occur with each other without leading to logical double negation but not, generally, with pas? And why does the variety of French spoken in Quebec differ from Standard French in this respect? These and other questions are addressed in this book. In some cases, I come to the same conclusions as other researchers; in a number of cases, however, my conclusions differ.

Throughout the book, I follow a tradition initiated by Edward Klima more than thirty years ago and represented in current work by such linguists as Paolo Acquaviva, Adriana Belletti, Michel DeGraff, Viviane Déprez, Maria-Teresa Espinal, Liliane Haegeman, Paul Hirschbühler, Marie Labelle, Itziar Laka, Luc Moritz, Jamal Ouhalla, Elizabeth Pearce, Jean-Yves Pollock, Ljiljana Progovac, María-Luisa Rivero, Daniel Valois, and Raffaella Zanuttini. The work of these linguists will be referred to as the discussion progresses.

The fundamental assumption underlying the book is that clausal polarity is feature based. In particular, I assume, with Haegeman (1995: 107), that negative clauses are characterized by the presence of a feature, which I shall call [+\text{NEG}], on a functional head of the extended projection of V—that is, in the clausal domain. Consequently, most of my concern about sentential negation in Modern French revolves around how this feature specification is achieved. The data suggest that ne, which I assume, following work by Pollock (1989), is associated underlyingly with a functional head in the clausal domain, Neg\textsuperscript{+}, is not in fact
inhomogeneously negative; that is, it does not bear the abstract feature [+NEG] as a lexical property. Rather, it seems that the head Neg host is endowed with the relevant [+NEG] feature by some dynamic agreement mechanism that transmits [+NEG] from a negative operator in specifier position. It seems further that this takes place at S-structure and not, as some have argued, at LF. This has far-reaching consequences for the analysis of the other “negative” elements—adverbs and arguments—associated with ne, some of which, I conclude, are not inherently negative.

In successive chapters, I consider various aspects of the empirical domain starting, in chapter 1, with an overview of the assumptions I shall be making, in particular concerning the extent of Verb Movement. I then give a syntactic characterization of the pre-verbal particle ne. Crucial to the analysis will be the idea that clausal polarity features are located within a functional projection NegP (Pollock 1989) and that negative markers such as French ne underlyingly head NegP. In the French case, I suggest that ne is never underlyingly negative in the modern language; rather, ne inherits negative features from a suitable operator in SpecNegP. As a prelude to later discussion, I introduce the notion of “affective” item (Klima 1964). I conclude that the distribution and interpretation of such items are determined by a wellformedness condition known as the AFFECT criterion.

In chapter 2, I concentrate on the most salient aspect of negation in French, the adverbial negative marker pas, which I take to be the core overt lexical item in the modern language encoding negation. The discussion culminates in a syntactic analysis of this element that, following Pollock (1989), suggests that pas occupies SpecNegP (at S-structure). In contrast to Pollock’s analysis, however, I argue that the S-structure position of pas in SpecNegP is the result of an application of Move-a that raises pas from a lower base position. Several empirical and theoretical arguments are given to motivate this revision of Pollock’s original analysis. On the empirical front, such an analysis is argued to provide an elegant account of the contrast between the morphosyntactic properties of indefinite direct objects in positive clauses on the one hand and in negative clauses on the other, as well as otherwise problematic properties of imperative structures and the diachronic development of infinitival verb placement patterns. On the theoretical front, the approach follows naturally from the proposed analysis, inspired by Haegeman (1995), of sentential negation marking.

In many respects, chapter 3 is an excursion from the restricted domain of sentential negation in French. Predominantly cross-linguistic in outlook, the discussion addresses the distinction between negative concord (henceforth, NC) languages (e.g., Italian and Serbian/Croatian) and non-NC languages (e.g., Standard Modern English and Modern German). In very broad terms, NC languages are languages that allow multiple inherently negative constituents to co-occur within a single domain without their negative features being canceled out; non-NC languages do not. An account of the distinction between the two types of language is offered based on a reinterpretation of an observation made by Jespersen (1924), whereby the issue of whether or not a language is NC is determined by the nature of its regular negative marker. Languages whose regular
negative marker is realized on \( \text{Neg}^+ \) are NC languages; those whose negative marker is associated with SpecNegP are not. I provide an explanation for this generalization that I term Jespersen’s Generalization. The (un)availability of NC is attributed to the distinctive scope properties of \( \text{Neg}^+ \) and SpecNegP. Negative markers in SpecNegP take scope over negative XPs lower in the clause (via Generalized A'-binding); negative markers in \( \text{Neg}^+ \) do not. A negative marker in SpecNegP therefore cancels out the negative feature of a lower negative element (= Double Negation). Assuming that dynamic spec-head agreement is unidirectional (from SpecXP to X’) and does not therefore transfer [\(+\text{NEG}\)] from \( \text{Neg}^+ \) to SpecNegP, a negative marker in \( \text{Neg}^+ \) will not pass on its negative feature to its specifier and, further, will not cancel out the negative feature of a lower negative element (= NC).

Returning now to French, given that the regular negative marker in the modern language, \( \text{pas} \), is syntactically aligned with English \emph{not} and German \emph{nicht} (in SpecNegP), rather than Italian \emph{non} or Serbian/Croatian \emph{ne} (generated under \( \text{Neg}^+ \)), Jespersen’s Generalization predicts that Modern French is a non-NC language. At the end of chapter 3, I discuss why I believe that—despite appearances—this is in fact a reasonable conclusion to draw about Modern French.

Following the conclusions about negative concord in French made in chapters 2 and 3, I turn, in chapters 4 and 5, to more peripheral issues. In chapter 4, I consider “negative adverbs” other than \( \text{pas} \), namely \emph{plus} ‘any/no more/longer’, \emph{jamais} ‘(n)ever’, and \emph{guère} ‘hardly’. On the basis of the null hypothesis that these elements are in essence syntactically (if not semantically) identical to \( \text{pas} \), I explore the ways in which their distribution departs from that of \( \text{pas} \). A syntactic analysis is then proposed, taking into account the conclusion reached at the end of chapter 3—namely that Modern French is not an NC language.

In chapter 5, attention is turned to what might be termed “negative arguments”, namely \emph{rien} ‘anything/nothing’ and \emph{personne} ‘anyone/no-one’. My purpose here is to provide a syntactic analysis of the internal structure of these two nominal items that accounts for not only the similarities but also the differences between their respective distributions. Further, I relate the syntax of these items to the proposals for the “negative adverbs” in chapter 4. Given my contention that Modern French is a non-NC language, the “negative” items discussed in chapters 4 and 5 are not deemed to be inherently negative; rather than being the rough equivalents of Standard English \emph{nothing}, \emph{never}, and so on, these items are assumed to be more like \emph{anything}, \emph{ever}, and so on.

Some of the material in this book—a revised version of my doctoral dissertation (Rowlett 1996c)—has been presented to various audiences and/or has already appeared in print. Aspects of the analysis of \( \text{pas} \) detailed in chapter 2 have been presented to audiences in the United Kingdom in Cambridge, Edinburgh, Manchester, and York, as well as in Barcelona (Spain), Ferrara (Italy), and Girona (Spain) (Rowlett 1992a, b, 1993a–d). Jespersen’s Generalization, discussed in chapter 3, has been presented to British audiences in Durham, Manchester, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Salford, and York, as well as in Geneva (Switzerland) and Ottawa (Canada) (Rowlett 1994c, 1995a, b, 1997). The material in chapter 4
on negative adverbs formed the basis of talks in Cambridge and York (Rowlett 1994a, b). Parts of the discussion of the negative arguments rien and personne in chapter 5 have been presented in Cambridge (Rowlett 1996a, b, e). My approach to non-overt operators has been presented in Utrecht (the Netherlands) (Rowlett 1996f, 1998b). Finally, an overview of a number of aspects of my analysis of sentential negation in French has been presented in Oxford (Rowlett 1996b) and Toulouse (France) (Rowlett 1998a). I am of course grateful to the members of all these audiences for their helpful comments and suggestions, as well as for the comments of anonymous reviewers of my published work. Thanks therefore go to Jacques Durand, Chris Lyons, and Leo Hickey for acting as editors of the University of Salford series of Working Papers in Language and Linguistics, to which articles containing some of this material have been submitted. Finally, the anonymous reviewers of the Journal of French Language Studies, the Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics, the Journal of Linguistics, Linguistic Inquiry, and Probus provided me with very detailed and helpful comments on a number of articles written on the basis of this material. The final version of my dissertation benefited from the comments of the examiners, Liliane Haegeman and Georges T souls. The book manuscript was subjected to the careful eyes of two anonymous reviewers. Robert Brown and Odile Cyrille read through the final draft.

Writing this book—and the dissertation on which it is based—has been made possible by a number of people and bodies, all of whom deserve my thanks. John Green was my first linguistics teacher back in 1984 and gently encouraged me to consider linguistics at the postgraduate level. Later on, John was one of the first to consider offering me a job. Thanks for the confidence. Upon my arrival in York in 1989 as an M. A. student, Adrian Battye gave me initial guidance and support. He supervised my early work on French, as well as my dissertation. In autumn 1991, he began to supervise my doctorate. Adrian became a good friend and one I greatly miss. He died in March 1993. In September 1993, Bernadette Plunkett took over as my supervisor. Over the following two and a half years, she provided me with everything I could have needed as a research student. She offered the flexibility I required, given that I was living in Manchester—a ninety-minute train journey away—and given that I had to fit appointments in York around a full teaching and administration load at Salford. She provided discipline at times when I would rather have been doing other things and was an extremely valuable intellectual opponent to some of the conclusions I had drawn. I doubt I ever changed her mind, but it did me good having to try. My dissertation and this book are undoubtedly much the better for her critical eye.

I owe a lot to other linguists working specifically on negation. Paolo Acquaviva, Anastasia Giannakidou, Liliane Haegeman, Paul Hirschbühler, Marie Labelle, France Martineau, Claude Muller, Jamal Ouhalla, Hugues Péters, Ljiljana Progovac, Josep Quer, and Raffaella Zanuttini were particularly helpful in that they either provided comments on early versions of my ideas or discussed them in their own work. Others, such as David Adger, Bill Ashby, Adriana Belletti, Bob Borsley, Odile Cyrille, Viviane Déprez, Jacques Durand, John Green, Marie-Anne Hintze, Aafke Hulk, Ans van Kemenade, Bill Ladusaw, Richard
Larson, Chris Lyons, Jean-Pierre Mailhac, John Payne, Liz Pearce, Carme Piccallo, Jean-Yves Pollock, Ellen Prince, Ian Roberts, John-Charles Smith, Tim Stowell, and Nigel Vincent, were willing to discuss my work with me. For the information they provided about individual languages, thanks to Myriam Carr, Joe Cunningham, Odile Cyrille, Jacques Durand, Liliane Haegeman, Susan Hill, Sylvain Larose, Janet Lloyd, Jean-Pierre Mailhac, Jamal Ouhalla, Jean-Marc Pennetier, Ljiljana Progovac, Joëlle Riley, Ian Roberts, Philip Tomlinson, and Juliet Wigmore.

So much for individuals. As for the organizations whose help I have benefited from along the way, I should first of all acknowledge the British Academy, whose Post-graduate Studentship allowed me to go to York as a full-time M. A. student in the first place. Without them, I’d probably still be a (very unhappy) translator in Paris. They also offered me a further three years’ Ph.D. funding (which I turned down) and provided part of the financial support—in the shape of an Overseas Conference Grant—that allowed me to accept an invitation to participate in the Negation: Syntax and Semantics conference in Ottawa (Canada) in 1995. I would like to extend my particular thanks to the Department of Modern Languages and the European Studies Research Institute, both at the University of Salford, for providing both the environment and the financial support that were essential in allowing me to carry out this work. The Department of Modern Languages funded my Ph.D. for four years, while the European Studies Research Institute financed most of my research travel. Both showed confidence in me early on, and I’m extremely grateful. The Department of Language and Linguistic Science at York—in particular Connie Cullen, Steve Harlow, and Anthony Warner—deserves my thanks for introducing me to the delights of theoretical syntax and for giving me the opportunity to prove myself as a teacher following Adrian Battye’s death. Friends both within and without the UFR des Études du Monde Anglophone and the Équipe de Recherche en Syntaxe et Sémantique at the Université de Toulouse-Le Mirail made my 1998 stay in the South of France and completion of this book a most enjoyable experience.

On a personal note, thanks to Bev, Dr. Rob, Iain, Mad Maria, Marc, and Marietta for providing quality of life. Thanks finally to my mother and sister, whose love and respect were unconditional.
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### Abbreviations and Symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>first, second, third person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/A'</td>
<td>argument/nonargument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative (case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc(P)</td>
<td>Accusative (Voice) (Phrase) (Sportiche 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv(P)</td>
<td>Adverb (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgrO(P)</td>
<td>Object Agreement (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr(P)</td>
<td>Agreement (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgrS(P)</td>
<td>Subject Agreement (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asp(P)</td>
<td>Aspect (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>Binding Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17Fr</td>
<td>Seventeenth-century French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C(P)</td>
<td>Complementizer (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Dynamic Agreement (Rizzi 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat(P)</td>
<td>Dative (Voice) (Phrase) (Sportiche 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>(logical) Double Negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D(P)</td>
<td>Determiner (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ec</td>
<td>empty category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM</td>
<td>Exceptional Case Marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECP</td>
<td>Empty Category Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPH</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fn</td>
<td>footnote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(P)</td>
<td>Functional (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;L</td>
<td>Hirschbühler and Labelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMC</td>
<td>Head Movement Constraint (Travis 1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;Z</td>
<td>Haegeman and Zanuttini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperfect/imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfI/INFL</td>
<td>inflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infn(P)</td>
<td>Infinitive (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I(P)</td>
<td>Inflection (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>Logical Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>lexical infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-marking</td>
<td>lexical marking (Chomsky 1986b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-tous</td>
<td>leftward tous movement (Kayne 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>modal infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood(P)</td>
<td>Mood (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;V</td>
<td>Moritz and Valois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>negative concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg(P)</td>
<td>Negative (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom(P)</td>
<td>Nominative (Voice) (Phrase) (Sportiche 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(P)</td>
<td>Noun (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPI</td>
<td>negative polarity item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSE</td>
<td>Nonstandard English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num(P)</td>
<td>Number (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-word</td>
<td>negative word (Laka 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op</td>
<td>non-overt operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op_cont</td>
<td>non-overt contentive operator (Haegeman 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op_exp</td>
<td>non-overt expletive operator (Haegeman 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol(P)</td>
<td>Polarity (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos(P)</td>
<td>Positive (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp.</td>
<td>pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(P)</td>
<td>Preposition (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro</td>
<td>non-overt pronominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>non-overt pronominal anaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROS</td>
<td>prospective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QàD</td>
<td>quantification at a distance (Obenauer 1983, 1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q(P)</td>
<td>Quantifier (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR</td>
<td>Quantifier Raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFL</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Serbian/Croatian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Standard English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>subject-object-verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec</td>
<td>specifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subj</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>trace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T(P)</td>
<td>Tense (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>Universal Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>verb second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinf</td>
<td>infinitival verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V(P)</td>
<td>Verb (Phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V&amp;W</td>
<td>Verrips and Weissenborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF</td>
<td>West Flemish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wH/WH</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>variable over entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xₘₐₓ</td>
<td>XP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XP, YP, ZP</td>
<td>any maximal projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ϕ</td>
<td>person, number, gender, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ</td>
<td>thematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>non-overt negative operator (Rowlett 1994a, b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(=Op[+neg])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ(P)</td>
<td>Sigma (Phrase) (Laka 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¬</td>
<td>logical operator of negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>empty category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>ungrammatical string</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[*]</td>
<td>grammatical with a logical DN reading only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>???</td>
<td>strings of increasingly questionable grammaticality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>rejected by prescriptivists but acceptable to many speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∃</td>
<td>existential operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∀</td>
<td>universal operator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Foundations

This is a study of the syntax of (sentential) negation, with particular reference to Modern French, and of the insight into Universal Grammar (henceforth, UG) it offers. The purpose of this first chapter is to set out my basic assumptions, which will be essential to the development of the study. Section 1.1 starts with my assumptions about the extent of Verb Movement, introducing the Split-Infl hypothesis. Section 1.2 turns to fundamental issues concerning the syntactic representation of sentential negation. In particular, I introduce and motivate NegP, a functional projection housing clausal polarity features. Section 1.3 introduces the notion of affective element; my conclusions are drawn together in section 1.4.

Verbal inflection and Verb Movement

1.1

1.1.1 Verb Movement versus Affix-Hopping

Since Emonds (1978: 163–8), it has generally been assumed that the mechanism linking French finite verb forms with inflectional morphology is (obligatorily) Verb Movement (see Koopman 1984). Within models of syntactic theory assumed in much work since the 1980s (Government and Binding, Principles-and-Parameters), this has meant that verbal roots are deemed to move out of their containing VP and incorporate into one or more successive c-commanding functional heads encoding verbal morphology. In English, in contrast, Affix-Hopping is deemed to lower the inflection onto the root of main verbs, which, consequently, do not need to raise out of VP. Only finite auxiliaries and modals are outside VP at S-structure in English, à la française.

The distinction between Verb Movement and Affix-Hopping is recast by Chomsky (1993) within Checking Theory as a distinction between pre-spell-out and post-spell-out checking. Within Checking Theory, morphologically complex words enter the derivation fully inflected, while functional heads are generated as bundles of formal features. Morphologically complex words are then “checked” by being matched with the features following cyclic head-to-head adjunction to the relevant c-commanding inflectional heads. The parametric difference between the “French” system and the “English” system centers around whether head-movement-cum-checking takes place before or after spell-out, that is, the
input to the phonological component. This corresponds to the distinction between movement in the syntax as opposed to movement at LF in more traditional models. In French, movement/checking is pre-spell-out/overt; in English, movement/checking is post-spell-out/covert.

The difference between English and French is attributed by Pollock (1989) to the nature of agreement in the two languages. In French, it is strong, or transparent, and may be said to “attract” the verb; in English, in contrast, it is weak, or opaque. This parametric difference in the morphology of the two languages is claimed to be able to account for the following contrast:

(1) a. Jean embrasse, souvent _t_ Marie. (French)
    b. *Jean _souvent_ embrasse Marie
       J. (kisses) often (kisses) M.
       ‘J. often kisses M.’

(2) a. *John kisses, often _t_ Mary.
    b. John _é_ often kisses Mary

(3) Under the assumption that adverbs of the same type—for example, _often_ and _souvent_ ‘often’—are generated in the same position cross-linguistically, Pollock (1989) argues that contrasts such as the one illustrated in (1) and (2) (his (4), p. 367) strongly suggest that finite verbs in French move out of VP to the left of

1. This assumption, shared by Belletti (1994a: 38fn13), is supported by Sportiche’s (1988: 429) Adjunct Projection Principle that governs modification relations and Chomsky’s (1986b: 16) general theory of adjunction. Taken together, these theories oblige “modifiers” such as adverbs to appear adjacent to their nonargument XP “modifiee” (or the head of their “modifiee”). Note that this assumption is challenged by Williams (1994a: 189), who rejects “the idea that there are universal ‘slots’ in which adverbs of various kinds can appear, one slot for each type of adverb”; neither does he think “that adverbs are distributed in the same way in different languages”. In (3), I assume that _souvent_ _often_ are VP-adjoined. I modify this assumption in sections 1.1.6 and 1.1.7.3.
adverbs to an inflectional head such as $I^\circ$ to be associated with finiteness and $\varphi$-features, while finite verbs in English do not.

### 1.1.2 The Split-Infl hypothesis

Subsequent to Chomsky (1986b), Pollock (1989) has argued that the IP model fails to account for Verb Movement patterns in French. In short, a model of clause structure with a single inflectional head, such as $I^\circ$, does not provide enough positions to allow an elegant account of word order. To resolve the problem, Pollock argues that the $\varphi$-feature and finiteness specification of $I^\circ$ should be associated with separate and independent heads which he labels $T$(ense) and Agr(eement), both of which project full phrasal categories within the X'-model.\^2 Pollock motivates this “Split-Infl” model of clausal architecture on the basis of structures in French in which verbs undergo what he calls “short” Verb Movement as opposed to “long” Verb Movement. A model of clause structure in which there is just one inflectional head into which a verb either does or does not move is clearly not going to be able to account for such a fine-tuned distinction. In contrast, if IP is split into TP and AgrSP, with TP above AgrSP, the distinction between short and long movement can be represented as the distinction between movement from $V^\circ$ to AgrS\^2 and movement from $V^\circ$ through AgrS\^2 to $I^\circ$.

Pollock’s data involves the interplay of negative $pas$, adverbs such as $souvent$, and finite and nonfinite verbs. The data in (1) show that a finite verb in French moves to an inflectional head between the adverb and the subject. The data in (4) show that the distribution of negative $pas$ resembles that of $souvent$. As a working hypothesis, one could assume that $souvent$ and $pas$ are both VP-adjoined.\^3

---

\^2. The separate treatment of tense and agreement, that is, in terms of distinct functional heads, is supported by the fact that some languages, such as the Mainland Scandinavian languages Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish, distinguish between finite and nonfinite but do not demonstrate subject-verb agreement (Platzack and Holmberg 1989). In a number of other languages, such as Arabic (Plunkett 1993), finite verbs appear with or without (subject) agreement morphology, depending on whether the subject is overt or not. In both cases, the verb is marked finite. This clearly suggests that agreement and tense are independent of each other. Pollock’s Split-Infl hypothesis is one possible way of articulating that independence. Chomsky (1991) suggests that the Split-Infl hypothesis follows from an X'-theoretic condition on single-headedness proposed by Emonds (1976: 5). Anticipating later discussion, I relabel Pollock’s AgrP AgrSP; that is, subject agreement phrase, to distinguish it from AgrOP, the object agreement phrase. For recent discussion of Agreement projections, see Chomsky (1995b).

\^3. This is only a provisional characterization of $pas$ and adverbs like $souvent$. See section 1.2.1 and chapter 2 in particular for a detailed analysis of the syntactic properties of $pas$. For $souvent$, see section 1.1.6.

In most spoken varieties of Modern French, the pre-verbal negative marker $ne$ is optional. See section 1.2.4 for discussion. This optionality is not explicitly indicated in the examples here. For discussion of “ne-drop”, see Ashby (1976, 1981, 1991), Coovney (1989, 1990, 1996), Escure (1974), Pohl (1968, 1975), and Sankoff and Vincent (1977).
SENTENTIAL NEGATION IN FRENCH

(4) a. Jean n’ embrasse pas Marie.
b. Jean ne pas embrasse Marie.
   ‘J. doesn’t kiss M.’

(5) a. Jean n’ embrasse pas souvent Marie.
b. Jean n’ embrasse souvent pas Marie.
   ‘J. doesn’t often kiss M.’

The data reviewed so far are perfectly compatible with the IP model of clause structure: in both (1) and (4), the finite verb can be argued to have raised out of VP into the IP domain, to the left of the adverb and negative pas. Note, though, that the examples in (5) show that the order of the adverb and the negation is fixed—the negation must precede the adverb. This would need to be stipulated if both elements were deemed to have the same status as VP-adverbs. (See footnote 4.)

However, the paradigms in (6) and (7), containing strings with infinitival auxiliaries rather than finite forms, are not compatible with this model of clause structure:

(6) a. J-P avoue n’ être pas souvent à l’ heure.
b. J-P avoue ne pas être souvent à l’ heure.
c. J-P avoue ne pas souvent être à l’ heure.
   ‘J-P admits ne (be) pas (be) souvent (be) at the hour
   ‘J-P admits he isn’t often on time.’

(7) a. Lucille prétend n’ avoir pas souvent le temps.
b. Lucille prétend ne pas avoir souvent le temps.
c. Lucille prétend ne pas souvent avoir le temps.
   ‘L. claims ne (have) pas (have) souvent (have) the time
   ‘L. claims she doesn’t often have the time.’

To account for (6a) and (7a), in which the adverb and negation are post-verbal, one could assume, as with the verbs in (1) and (4), that the infinitival auxiliaries move from V° over souvent and pas to a nonfinite I°. To account for (6b) and (7c), in which the adverb and negation are pre-verbal, one could assume, with Pollock (1989), that infinitivals (in contrast to finite forms) do not need to move out of VP and that, in these cases, the verb appears in situ in V°. In both cases, the IP model of clause structure can deal with the data. In contrast, (6b) and (7b) are a problem. Here, the verb appears between the negation and the adverb. Given that both these elements appear between I° and V°, the problem is that, within the IP model, there is no head position between the negation and the adverb for the verb to occupy:

(8) \[ ip [I° [vp pas ??? [vp souvent [vp t ]]]] \]
To account for these examples, Pollock (1989) uses his more articulated model of clause structure and suggests that the verbs in (6b) and (7b) have undergone short movement to AgrS$^\ominus$. In (6a) and (7a), in contrast, he claims that the verbs have undergone long movement through AgrS$^\ominus$ to T$^\ominus$. In (6c) and (7c), the verbs are assumed to remain in situ in V$^\ominus$. Given the structure in (9), an infinitival auxiliary can occupy any one of the positions marked AUX, that is, V$^\ominus$, AgrS$^\ominus$, or T$^\ominus$:

\[ (9) \quad \text{Possible S-structure positions for infinitival auxiliaries in French (version 1):} \]
\[ \text{TP [T$_{\text{AUX}}$] [ pas [AgrSP [AgrS$^\ominus$ AUX] [ souvent [VP [V$_{\text{AUX}}$]]]]]} \]

I therefore conclude that clause structure (in French, if not universally) is more intricate than the IP model would suggest; CP-IP-VP is to be translated into CP-TP-Agr$^\ominus$-VP. Assuming the VP-internal subject hypothesis, such as that of Kitagawa (1986), a subject moves from its base position to SpecTP at S-structure, where it can be assigned nominative Case. In finite clauses in French (in contrast to English), the verb moves from its base position by a process of head-to-head movement through AgrS$^\ominus$ to T$^\ominus$, whose [+FINITE] property allows nominative Case assignment to the subject in SpecTP.

### 1.1.3 Support for the Split-Infl hypothesis from acquisition studies

The claim that there are two separate and independent syntactic heads associated with verbal inflection is supported not only by the word order patterns discussed in the previous section and the evidence referred to in footnote 1 but also by results from acquisition studies. Work reported in Verrips and Weissenborn (1992) (henceforth, V&W), on which the discussion in this section is based, suggests that L1 acquirers of French go through a stage during which morphologically finite verbs undergo short movement (rather than the long movement that finite verbs undergo in adult French grammars) and, consequently, appear to the right of the negation in the sequence: *pas + finite verb.* Further, even after chil...
dren appear to have acquired long Verb Movement of finite forms, they nevertheless persist in making errors (albeit rarely) that could be argued to be the result of failing to raise the verb as far as the adult grammar would require. Examples are given in (10) and (11):

(10) Fabienne:
   a. pas joue le chat (2-0-13)  b. pas compte (2-0-23)
      pas play the cat            pas count

(11) Benjamin:
   a. pas chante moi (2-2-18)  c. pas saute (2-3-1)
      pas sing me                pas jump
   b. pas met (2-2-18; 2-3-8)  d. non, pas mange (2-3-8)
      pas put                   no pas eat

While the rarity of these errors (two instances from Fabienne, five from Benjamin, none from Philippe during their respective periods of observation; see also the discussion in Déprez and Pierce 1993: 40; Pierce 1992: 65–7; Wexler 1994: 310) could be taken to indicate that these are examples of performance errors, V&W (pp. 308–9) venture that there are a number of aspects of the data that suggest, rather, that they reflect a principled process.7

The first aspect that V&W mention is the fact that two of the three children studied go through an initial stage in which finite main verbs are consistently placed after the negation (rather than in front of it, as in the adult grammar). The interesting hypothesis that this observation might lead one to consider is that initial use of *pas + finite verb* may constitute a genuine milestone in the acquisition of Verb Movement in French prior to acquisition of the adult sequence *finite verb + pas*.8 V&W refer to evidence that supports this hypothesis given by Choi (1988) and Boysson-Bardies (1976). Choi reports errors similar to the ones noted by V&W prior to the acquisition of the adult sequence. Furthermore, the transition from *pas + finite verb* to the adult *finite verb + pas* sequence took place at about the same point in the child considered by Choi as the two in V&W’s study. While Boysson-Bardies does not note any errors of the type under discussion here, she does comment that at first only auxiliaries and modals appear with post-verbal negation. This implies that, like V&W’s two subjects,
Boysson-Bardies’s subject also went through a stage characterized by an absence of finite lexical verbs appearing to the left of negation.9

The second point made by V&W with respect to these errors is that they do not involve the verbs avoir ‘to have’, être ‘to be’, or aller ‘to go’ despite the high frequency with which these particular verbs appear in the corpus. Fabienne used a finite main verb together with negation twice (between the ages of 1-5-11 and 2-0-23) and wrongly ordered the two elements on both occasions. (See (10).) During the same period of observation, she used finite forms of être, avoir, and aller together with negation on fifty-one occasions and got the order right every time. Meanwhile, Benjamin used a finite main verb together with negation five times (between the ages of 1-9-19 and 2-3-8) and wrongly ordered the two elements on all five occasions. (See (11).) During the same period of observation, he used finite forms of être, avoir, and aller together with negation on 140 occasions and got the order right every time. Clearly, then, there is something principled going on here.

The final aspect of V&W’s data that, the authors suspect, suggests that the errors are the result of a principled process is the absence of pre-verbal subjects in the sequence pas + finite verb, on either side of the negation (cf. (10a)–(11a)).

These considerations taken together lead V&W to suggest that the erroneous pas + finite verb orderings might represent an initial stage in the acquisition of Verb Movement in French children, which they term Partial Verb Raising. In this respect, it may be the case that language development reflects the steps in the derivations posited in adult structures (V&W, p. 303).10 In derivational terms, V&W (p. 312) analyze these sequences in terms of short Verb Movement to allow the verb to be marked for finiteness. Since, in Pollock’s model in (9), the landing site for short Verb Movement is under the negation, the relative order of the two elements is accounted for. V&W (p. 311) suggest that these finite main verbs do not raise into the higher inflectional head because of a failure on the part of children to recognize that they have (subject) agreement features, a plausible claim when one considers that these main verbs mark agreement by a null inflection and do not appear with an overt pre-verbal subject and if, as believed by many (e.g., Hyams 1986), it is indeed the case that UG favors minimal derivations.11 In contrast, the verbs avoir, être, and aller, which characteristically do not fail to raise to the left of the negation, morphologically mark person and number agreement by suppletion.

Of crucial importance to this analysis are (a) the morphological independence of finiteness and agreement on the one hand and (b) Pollock’s (1989) Split-Infl hypothesis on the other. I therefore take these data to be further evidence in support of the hypothesis. However, what is odd about the details of Pollock’s for-

11. See also Chomsky (1986b): “The language learner assumes that there is syntactic movement only where there is overt evidence for it” (p. 50).
mulation of the Split-Infl hypothesis is the respective order of the two inflectional heads $T^\circ$ and $AgrS^\circ$: Pollock suggests $TP$ is above $AgrSP$. Accordingly, in adult grammars, French finite verbs move from $V^\circ$ to $AgrS^\circ$ to $T^\circ$. This analysis seems difficult to square with the discussion in the previous paragraph in which it was suggested that verbs move to the lower inflectional head ($AgrS^\circ$) to be marked for finiteness and to the higher inflectional head ($T^\circ$) where agreement features are identified. Why should a verb move to $AgrS^\circ$ to be marked for finiteness and to $T^\circ$ for agreement features? Would not the reverse be expected? This issue is discussed in the next section, where additional arguments are presented in favor of reversing the order of $TP$ and $AgrSP$ proposed by Pollock.

**Relative order of $T^\circ$ and $AgrS^\circ$**

1.1.4

While accepting that $I^\circ$ needs to be split into component categories, a number of authors, including Belletti (1990), Chomsky (1991), and Ohalla (1991), have suggested that Pollock’s (1989) ordering of $TP$ with respect to $AgrSP$ should be reversed. In addition, in section 1.1.3, we saw that the data from acquisition studies discussed by V&W suggest that $T^\circ$ is closer to the verbal root than $AgrS^\circ$.

Belletti’s (1990) reason for wishing to reverse Pollock’s (1989) order is morphological in nature. Observing the internal structure of finite verb forms in Italian, Belletti notes that the suffix corresponding to tense is closer to the verbal root than the suffix corresponding to agreement:

(12) **Italian:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>read-IMP-3PL</td>
<td>speak-FUT-1SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘They read (imperfect).’</td>
<td>‘I will speak.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although overt verbal morphology is not as rich in French as it is in Italian, it is also the case in French that, where tense and agreement suffixes can be distinguished, tense is closer to the root than agreement:

(13) **French:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arrive-IMP-3PL</td>
<td>speak-IMP:SUBJ-2SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘arrived’</td>
<td>‘might speak’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of Baker’s (1985: 375 (4), 1988: 13 (25)) Mirror Principle of morphology given in (14), Belletti (1990) argues that a model of clause structure in which $AgrSP$ is higher than $TP$ more readily accounts for the internal morphological structure of these verb forms.\(^{12}\)

\(^{12}\) But see Speas (1991a, b) for arguments that the Mirror Principle does not necessarily follow from Baker’s incorporation theory. Belletti’s (1990) argument with respect to Baker’s Mirror Principle is accepted by Pollock (1997b). However, Pollock maintains that Belletti’s proposed ordering of $TP$
Given that the tense suffix is closer to the root than the agreement suffix, it is argued that S-structure incorporation (see section 1.1.1) of the verbal root into the features encoded under $T^e$ takes place before the resulting $[T \cdot [V \cdot V ] + T ]$ complex incorporates into the features under $\text{AgrS}^e$ to form a $[\text{AgrS}^e \cdot [T \cdot [V \cdot V ] + T ] + \text{AgrS} ]$ complex. This is most straightforwardly captured if $\text{AgrSP}$ is positioned higher in clause structure than TP.

Working under standard incorporation assumptions, Chomsky (1991) also recognizes the morphological argument in favor of reversing Pollock’s (1989) ordering of $\text{AgrSP}$ and TP. In addition, Chomsky (1991) suggests that having $\text{AgrSP}$ as the higher projection has welcome consequences within Case theory. With $\text{AgrSP}$ in this position, the subject of a tensed clause in French appears in Spec$\text{AgrSP}$, the position in which it is assigned nominative Case. This result is welcomed by Chomsky since it fits in with his analysis in which structural Case assignment always takes place under spec-head agreement within an Agr projection (cf. objective Case assigned via spec-head agreement with $\text{AgrO}^e$).\textsuperscript{13}

Given the data from acquisition studies discussed in section 1.1.3, the morphological argument presented by Belletti (1990) and the theory-internal considerations discussed by Chomsky, I shall assume in what follows that $\text{AgrSP}$ is in fact higher than TP. Consequently, (9) is modified as in (15):

(15) Possible S-structure positions for infinitival auxiliaries in French
(version 2):

$[\text{AgrSP}[\text{AgrS} \cdot \text{AUX}] \cdot \text{pas}[\text{TP}[T \cdot \text{AUX}] \cdot \text{souvent}[\text{VP}[V \cdot \text{AUX}]]])]

An objection

1.1.5

To complicate matters further, if Checking Theory is to be adopted (see section 1.1.1), it could be argued that Pollock’s (1989) original order of the inflectional projections TP and $\text{AgrSP}$ might be required after all. Given that, within Checking Theory, Verb Movement checks the morphological features of fully inflected words, one might expect the word to pass through successive heads corresponding to the morphemes successively furthest away from the lexical root, rather than those successively closest to the root. So, in the case of the Romance verb forms discussed in the text, Pollock (1997b) argues that the verb moves first to $\text{AgrS}^e$ to check the outermost agreement feature(s) and then to $T^e$ to check the tense feature. While dealing with Belletti’s morphological argument, this logic would, of course, singularly fail to deal with the acquisition evidence discussed with respect to $\text{AgrSP}$ fails to link the \textit{opaque} finite inflection parameter to any overt, that is, learnable, morphological property of the lower head, namely $T^e$ in Belletti’s (1990) model.

\textsuperscript{13} But see Chomsky (1995b) for an alternative view of abstract Case.
in section 1.1.3 and would deprive the framework of a uniform AgrP-based Case theory.

One way of solving the problem is to consider the extent to which Checking Theory as proposed by Chomsky (1993) needs to be adopted universally. The crucial issue, I suggest, is whether Checking Theory is adopted for languages with (relatively) rich verbal inflectional morphology like French and Italian. While Checking Theory seems attractive for languages such as English (with impoverished verbal morphology and no [lexical] Verb Movement), since it avoids the need to take recourse to a lowering operation like Affix-Hopping, it is not clear what is to be gained by generalizing the Checking Theory account of Verb Movement to languages like French and Italian. Instead of assuming (a) that all morphologically complex lexical items in all languages enter derivations fully inflected and (b) that parametric variation determines whether morphological features are checked pre- or post-spell-out, one could envisage the parametric variation being expressed in terms of whether or not lexical items enter derivations fully inflected. If this line of thinking were pursued, one could conclude that, in languages with (relatively) impoverished inflectional morphology, like English, lexical items enter derivations fully inflected and therefore do not need to check their features until after spell-out, that is, covertly at LF. Given principles of economy such as Procrastinate (Chomsky 1995b), movement will then necessarily be postponed until LF. In contrast, in languages like French and Italian, with (relatively) rich inflectional morphology, lexical roots could be argued to enter derivations uninfl ected, in which case movement would need to take place pre-spell-out, that is, overtly at S-structure, not to check morphological features but rather to ensure the lexical root is associated with its morphology in the conventional sense and to ensure that no stranded affixes remain. Consequently, overt Verb Movement in the traditional sense would be necessary in languages like French and Italian, and the relative order of AgrSP and TP proposed by Belletti (1990) and others would be required. This is the approach to the morphosyntax of French verbs I shall adopt in what follows.\footnote{See also Pierce’s (1992: 13) distinction between languages such as Italian with morphologically rich verbal inflection, which, she suggests, is part of the core grammar, and languages such as English with morphologically impoverished verbal inflection that is peripheral to the grammar.}

A third inflectional head?

1.1.6

In addition to the categories AgrS(P) and T(P), there is reason to believe that a third functional category (whose head encodes verbal inflectional morphology) is projected in French clausal architecture. Evidence in support of this claim has been presented in a number of articles by Kayne (e.g., 1990, 1991).\footnote{See also Pollock (1997b) and Pearce (1993).} Consider the verb forms in (16):
16. Kayne (1990, 1991) and Guasti (1991) use the terms Infn*/InfnP (Infinitive Phrase). In section 2.1.1, in the discussion of imperatives in French, I argue that Mood is also the locus of (true) imperative morphology.

17. I reject an analysis of the French infinitival ending along the lines of the one proposed by Rottet (1992: 281–83) for the final [-e] segment that appears on verb forms in the French-based Louisiana Creole for which no evidence of Verb Movement exists. Following a suggestion from Johan Rooryck, Rottet analyses [-e] as a verb marker along similar lines to Harris’s (1991) analysis of [-o] and [-a] as noun markers in Spanish.
Given that the infinitive in (18) follows the adverb, we would, on the basis of (15), assume that it appears in situ in \( V^\circ \). How, then, does one account for the fact that an object clitic appears between the adverb and the infinitive? Without going into detailed discussion, current thinking suggests that clitics are realizations of functional heads. One possible candidate host functional head for \( la \) in (18) is \( \text{AgrO}^\circ \), proposed in Chomsky (1991). Now, how can the clitic, as the realization of object agreement features, appear on the verb in (18) if the verb is in \( V^\circ \) and if the clitic is to the right of an apparently VP-adjoined adverb? Is it necessary to posit some lowering transformation such as Affix-Hopping to lower the clitic over the adverb onto the verb? Such a solution is undesirable for a number of reasons. Not only would it have all the unattractive features of any lowering movement; it would also be out of place in a language like French in which nothing like lowering transformations seems to be necessary elsewhere in verb syntax. I therefore reject such an analysis and conclude, rather, that, even where infinitives appear to the right of adverbs like \( \text{souvent} \), Verb Movement—albeit very short—to Mood\(^+\) has taken place.

Assuming, with Pollock (1997b), that MoodP is present in clause structure even when Mood\(^+\) is not overtly realized, the canonical clause structure I will therefore be assuming is (19):

\[
(19) \quad \text{Canonical French clause structure:}^{19} \\
[CP C^\circ [\text{AgrSP} \text{AgrS}^\circ [\text{pas} \text{T}^\circ [\text{souvent} \text{Mood}^\circ [\text{VP} V^\circ ]]]]]
\]

Note that this assumption entails analyzing some VP-adverbs such as \( \text{souvent} \) as MoodP-adverbs. I do not claim that VP-adverbs do not exist as such; rather, I am suggesting that not all adverbs traditionally labeled VP-adverbs are in fact adjoined to VP. Indeed, the contrast in (20) can be captured if it is assumed that the interpretation of an adverb such as \( \text{bien} \) ‘well/indeed’ is determined by its position:

\[
(20) \quad a. \quad \text{Le fait d’ avoir bien parlé ne suffit pas.} \quad \text{The fact that you spoke well isn’t enough.} \\
\text{the fact of have bien spoken ne suffices pas}
\]

\[
b. \quad \text{Le fait de bien avoir parlé ne suffit pas.} \quad \text{The fact that you did indeed speak isn’t enough.} \\
\text{the fact of bien have spoken ne suffices pas}
\]

Here, the position of the adverb with respect to the infinitive determines its (most natural) interpretation. In (20a), the adverb \( \text{bien} \) is post-infinitival and is most naturally interpreted as ‘well’; in (20b), it is pre-infinitival and means ‘indeed’. Assuming that the position of the infinitive is constant in both examples, that is, no lower than Mood\(^+\), the adverb in (20a) is deemed to be VP-adjoined.

---

18. See Sportiche (1992) for one possible implementation of this idea.
19. For the purposes of exposition, I abstract away from the issue of whether Chomsky’s (1991) AgrOP is projected. It may be that Chomsky’s AgrOP and our MoodP are in fact one and the same thing. I do not address this issue here.
while the adverb in (20b) is MoodP-adjoined (if not higher). This analysis is attractive for at least two reasons. First, it attributes adverb interpretation to adverb position (rather than to verb position). Second, it associates strict manner adverbs, as in (20a), with the VP-adjoined position, thus maintaining a traditional insight.  

**Verb Movement patterns**

1.1.7

Having determined a canonical clause structure for French within which Verb Movement can operate, it is useful now to bring together my assumptions about the way in which Verb Movement patterns are determined by such factors as the lexical (full, modal, auxiliary) and morphosyntactic (finite, nonfinite) properties of the verb in question.

**Finite verbs**

1.1.7.1

On the basis of (1) and (4), I conclude that finite lexical verbs move to the highest functional head encoding verbal inflection, that is, AgrS°. Given the data in (21)–(24) (and, of course, the provisional assumption that pas is TP-adjoined), this conclusion can be extended to cover finite auxiliaries and modal verbs, too.

(21) a. Jean a souven t embrassé Marie.
    b. *Jean souven t a embrassé Marie.
       J. (has) *souvent (has) kissed M.
          ‘J. often kissed M.’

(22) a. Jean n’ a pas embrassé Marie.
    b. *Jean ne pas a embrassé Marie.
       J. ne (has) pas (has) kissed M.
          ‘J. didn’t kiss M.’

(23) a. Jean doit souven t embrasser Marie.
    b. *Jean souven t doit embrasser Marie.
       J. (must) *souvent (must) kiss M.
          ‘J. often has to kiss M.’

(24) a. Jean ne doit pas embrasser Marie.
    b. *Jean ne pas doit embrasser Marie.
       J. ne (must) pas (must) kiss M.
          ‘J. doesn’t have to kiss M.’

(25) Overt finite Verb Movement in French:
    All finite verbs move to AgrS°.

---

20. My thanks to my colleagues Jean-Pierre Mailhac and Joëlle Riley for confirming the relevance of these data.
A D-structure such as the one in (26) therefore underlies the fully inflected S-structure representation in (27):

(26) D-structure:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
C^* \quad \text{AgrSP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{AgrS}^* \quad \text{TP} \\
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \\
\text{ent} \quad T^* \quad \text{MoodP} \\
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \\
\text{ai-} \quad \text{Mood}^* \quad \text{VP} \\
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \\
\text{er} \quad V^* \\
\downarrow \\
\text{frapp-} \\
\end{array}
\]

(27) S-structure:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
C^* \quad \text{AgrSP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{AgrS}^* \quad \text{TP} \\
\downarrow \\
[\text{AgrS}^* [T^* [\text{Mood} [V^* \text{frapp- } \text{er-ai-ent}] ] ] ] \quad \text{MoodP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{t} \quad \text{Mood}^* \quad \text{VP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{t} \quad V^* \\
\downarrow \\
\text{frapp-} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{Infinitival auxiliaries}\]

1.1.7.2

With nonfinite verbs, the picture is less clear. The general situation seems to be that infinitival lexical verbs do not move as far as, for example, infinitival auxiliaries or modals. The mobility of infinitival auxiliaries was illustrated in (6), and schematized in (19). These data, together with the assumption—made at the end of section 1.1.6—that even infinitivals have to move out of VP to be associated with their infinitival morphology, lead me to the conclusion that an infinitival
auxiliary can occupy any one of the three inflectional heads identified in (19), namely AgrS*, T*, and Mood*.

(28) *Overt movement of French infinitival auxiliaries:
Infinitival auxiliaries (*être* ‘to be’, *avoir* ‘to have’) freely move to Mood* (short movement), T* (medium movement), or AgrS* (long movement).

**Infinitival lexical verbs**

1.1.7.3

If adverb placement can be taken as an indication of (the extent of) Verb Movement, as we have been assuming here, lexical infinitives seem to be the least mobile.

(29) a. Souvent partir en vacances est un luxe réservé à . . .
   b. Partir souvent en vacances est un luxe réservé à . . .
   (leave) souvent (leave) on holidays is a luxury reserved to
   ‘Often going on holiday is a luxury reserved for . . .’

(30) a. Ne pas partir en France l’ été, c’est normal si . . .
   b. *Ne partir pas en France l’ été, c’est normal si . . .
   ne (leave) pas (leave) on France the summer it is normal if
   ‘Not going to France in summer is normal if . . .’

Still assuming that infinitives minimally move to Mood*, as in (29a), the example in (29b) shows that a lexical infinitive can move from Mood* (over the top of the MoodP-joined adverb souvent) to T*. However, (30b) shows that it cannot move from T* over pas to AgrS*.

(31) *Overt movement of French infinitival lexical verbs:
Infinitival lexical verbs move to Mood* (short movement) or T* (medium movement), but not as far as AgrS* (long movement).

**Infinitival modal verbs**

1.1.7.4

I turn finally to the movement of infinitival modals. This class of verb seems to be something of a halfway house between lexical infinitives (which cannot move to AgrS*) and infinitival auxiliaries (which freely move to AgrS*). Under the assumption that adverbs like souvent are adjoined to MoodP and that infinitives minimally move to Mood*, the string in (32a) shows that infinitival modals need move no further than Mood*. The string in (32b)—which is potentially synonymous with (32a)—shows nevertheless that infinitival modals can move beyond Mood*, that is, to T* and maybe even to AgrS*:

21. Hirschbühler and Labelle (1994b) suggest that the possible orderings of infinitival *être/avoir* and elements such as negative *pas* and VP-/MoodP-adverbs depend on whether the verb is used as an auxiliary or a copula.
Hirschbühler and Labelle (1994b) report that speakers tend to reject orderings in which the modal infinitive is followed by *pas*, as in (33b).

(32) a. Souvent devoir partir à l’étranger, c’est . . .
   b. Devoir souvent partir à l’étranger, c’est . . .
   (must) souvent (must) leave to the abroad it is
   ‘Often having to travel abroad is . . .’

The data in (33) can be used to test whether infinitival modals can indeed reach AgrS°. Here, the modal is negated with *pas*. Recall that I have so far been assuming that *pas* is adjoined to TP. In (33a), the infinitival modal verb appears after the negation; I therefore assume the verb has not been raised into AgrS°. In (33b), the modal verb appears before the negation; I therefore assume the verb occupies AgrS°. The question mark against (33b) indicates that this ordering is only marginally acceptable. While the order in (33a) is the preferred order, the order in (33b) is not regarded as ungrammatical. Pollock (1989: 375, 1997b) judges strings similar to (33b) (Pollock’s 1989: 375 (20)) to be “somewhat marginal” and “more exceptional”, suggesting that they have “a very literary ring to them”.

(33) a. Ne pas devoir partir à l’étranger, c’est . . .
   b. ?Ne devoir pas partir à l’étranger, c’est . . .
   ne (must) pas (must) leave to the abroad it is . . .
   ‘Not having to travel abroad is . . .’

I conclude therefore that, in the modern language, infinitival modal verbs move minimally from V° to Mood°, optionally from Mood° to T°, but only marginally from T° to AgrS°.

(34) Overt movement of French infinitival modal verbs:
   Infinitival modal verbs move to Mood° (short movement) or T° (medium movement), and only exceptionally to AgrS° (long movement).

**Summary**

1.1.7.5

Summarizing, I conclude that Verb Movement patterns in French are as in (35):

(35) Overt Verb Movement patterns in French:
   a. All finite verbs move to AgrS°.
   b’. Infinitival auxiliaries (*être, avoir*) freely move to Mood°, T°, or AgrS°.
   b''. Infinitival modal verbs (e.g., *pouvoir, devoir*) move to Mood° or T°, and only exceptionally to AgrS°.
   b’’. Infinitival lexical verbs move to Mood° or T°, but not as far as AgrS°.

The three classes of infinitive can therefore be distinguished on the basis of their movement patterns to AgrS°. Infinitival auxiliaries move to AgrS° freely, modal

---

22. Hirschbühler and Labelle (1994b) report that speakers tend to reject orderings in which the modal infinitive is followed by *pas*, as in (33b).
infinitives move to AgrS* only exceptionally, while lexical infinitives cannot raise to AgrS* at all. These patterns are crucial in distinguishing between pas and the other “negative adverbs” in sections 4.2.2 and 4.4.1.

The syntax of sentential negation

1.2

Here, I set out my assumptions about sentential negation, which will be crucial in future chapters. Section 1.2.1 motivates a further functional projection, NegP, as the locus of clausal polarity features (Pollock 1989). I adopt the common assumption that SpecNegP is a suitable position for pas to occupy (rather than the TP-joined position we have assumed thus far). Section 1.2.2 discusses two problems for the general assumption that ne heads NegP. Section 1.2.3 discusses the position of NegP with respect to the other functional projections in clause structure. Sections 1.2.4 and 1.2.5 concentrate on the semantics and licensing conditions of ne in Modern French.

The locus of clausal polarity: NegP

1.2.1

In addition to the inflectional heads already discussed, the presence of a further functional head, encoding polarity features, has been posited.23 It is assumed that negative markers such as those in italics in (36) are associated with this functional head.

(36) a. Giovanni *non è venuto. (Italian)
   G. *non is come
   ‘G. didn’t come.’

   b. Milan ne poznaje Marij-a. (Serbian/Croatian)
   Mi. ne knows Ma.-ACC
   ‘Mi. doesn’t know Ma.’

   c. Ur zrigh Idir. (Berber)
   ur saw-1SG I.
   ‘I didn’t see I.’

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

The claim that these negative markers are heads (rather than phrasal constituents) is supported by the fact that they have cliticized onto the finite verb in AgrS*, with which they form a syntactic unit. In the case of French, for example, ne moves with the verb in inversion contexts such as the interrogative:

23. See Haegeman (1995: 107), who assumes that negative clauses are clauses “which minimally have a neg-feature associated with a functional head of the extended projection of V”.

In those varieties of French in which Neg* is phonologically null, I assume that it is nevertheless syntactically active and that, like its phonologically overt counterpart, it raises to AgrS*.

This is clearly the null hypothesis given that I would not like to introduce any more differences between overt and non-overt Neg* than necessary. Haegeman (1995: 206, 226) assumes that, in Italian, the non-overt Neg* (which occurs with pre-verbal negative phrases) raises to AgrS* in the same way as its overt counterpart, non. In addition, Acquaviva (1994) discusses a possible semantic motivation for generalized Neg* → AgrS* raising:

(i) [S]uppose that a negative operator (corresponding to the classic Boolean connective ¬) is generated in NegP, and from there it merges with the existential closure, located under the topmost inflectional node. The merger of Boolean negation and existential closure is brought about in the syntax by the raising of the head Neg* to the topmost inflectional head, which I take to be Agr[S]* . . . . Neg* raises from its base position within NegP and is adjoined to the dominating inflectional head, giving rise to a complex operator analyzable as a negated existential.

This approach has the great advantage over previous analyses to provide an interpretive (as opposed to purely morphosyntactic) reason for the crosslinguistic generalization that negative markers tend to be incorporated into the topmost inflectional node, unless they can be analyzed as filling the specifier of NegP. (Acquaviva 1994: 113–14)

See also the discussion of negative imperatives in section 2.1.1 for empirical support for the claim that Neg* raises to AgrS* irrespective of whether Neg* is phonologically null or overt. For discussion of the semantics of ne, see section 1.2.4. For references to “ne-drop”, see footnote 3.
First, the data in (39) show a nonstandard construction—familière according to Muller (1991: 125)—in which *ne* appears to be located, optionally, in the CP domain. The examples are taken from Muller (1991: 125, 149). (The construction is also discussed by Daoust-Blais and Kemp 1979, as well as Acquaviva 1995.)

(39) a. Il faut que Luc rentre pour *(ne)* pas que ses parents s’inquiètent.

‘L. should go home in order to prevent his parents from worrying.’

b. Habillez-vous bien, pour *(ne)* pas que vous preniez froid.

‘Wrap up so you don’t catch cold.’

Assuming that the purpose clauses in (39) are PPs headed by *pour* and, for the time being, that *que* heads a CP that is the complement of *pour*, as in (40), it is unclear how to account for the presence of *ne*:

(40) PP

\[ PP \]

\[ P' \]

\[ P^* \]

\[ \text{pour} \]

\[ ?? \]

\[ CP \]

\[ C^* \]

\[ (ne) \text{pas} \]

\[ C' \]

\[ \ldots \]

\[ \text{que} \]

In cross-linguistic terms, this construction is extremely odd. Zanuttini (1996: 201 fn7) notes the possibility but suggests that French *ne* is unique within its class of negative markers in appearing in the CP domain (inversion contexts such as (37) notwithstanding). The relevance of the construction is, however, unclear.25 Rickard (1989: 147) claims that it is “incorrect” (sic) but common in “uneducated speech”. In a review of Rickard’s book, Gallagher (1993: 121) disagrees, claiming that *ne* is always omitted. In contrast, Muller (1991: 149) not only recognizes this construction as an exception to the generalization that *ne* is restricted to verbal contexts but says that it is a frequent one no less.26 It seems

25. See Rowlett (1994d) for brief discussion. Rizzi (1997) proposes a much more intricately articulated CP structure involving Focus Phrases and Topic Phrases. Such a structure might be able to accommodate the data discussed here.

26. Prescriptive sources are far from unanimous on this point. The *Le Petit Robert* 1 dictionary (1984, Paris: Le Robert, p. 1409) labels the *pour ne pas que* construction “fam” (familiar) and the *pour pas que* construction “pop” (popular). Grevisse (1986: 1489 §981) has the following to say: “La
to me that the very fact that there is controversy surrounding the phenomenon suggests quite clearly that it exists and that some sort of explanation is required. Further, my own informants unanimously agree that *pour pas que* and *pour ne pas que* both exist in the modern language.

Hirschbühl er and Labelle (1992/93: 34–7, section 1.1) envisage two syntactic approaches to the phenomenon. Either (a) the sequence *ne pas* is generated directly in CP or (b) it is generated lower (within the clause) and subsequently raised into CP. However, these authors arrive at no firm conclusions.

One might envisage dealing with this cross-linguistically highly marked and apparently hotly debated and controversial construction by exploiting the idea that it is analogous to the *pour ne pas* *Vinf* construction. (See Grevisse’s 1986: 1489 §981 comment in footnote 26 and the comment in a footnote [p. 149] in Muller 1991. Muller suggests that *ne* might be adjoined at a late stage in the derivation by analogy with the infinitival construction *pour ne pas* *Vinf*.) One could entertain the possibility that the *pour (ne) pas que* construction (and possibly the *pour que* construction, too) contains a non-overt infinitival causative verb that can be negated by *(ne) pas* just like any other infinitive. While I know of no other proposal along these lines for this particular construction, it has marked similarities to recent proposals within the Minimalist Program of Chomsky (1995b) to posit phonologically null light verbs, labeled *v* and heading *vP*, to offer attractive accounts of a number of syntactic phenomena, for example, double-object constructions and causative/inchoative alternations. Within the terms of such a proposal, one might conclude that *v* appears within its own clausal domain between *pour* and CP in (40). It can then be negated by *ne pas* in the usual way. The negative head *ne* raises to *AgrS*; *v* takes the CP headed by *que* as its complement:

\[
\text{(41) a. . . . pour [ ne pas v [}_CP \text{ que ses parents s’inquiètent ]]}
\]
\[
\text{b. . . . pour [ ne pas v [}_CP \text{ que vous preniez froid ]]}
\]

Note that, although not particularly idiomatic, the examples in (42), in which the lexical causative verb *faire* is inserted between *pas* and *que*, are essentially synonymous with those in (39) and (41):

\[
\text{(42) a. . . . pour ne pas faire (en sorte) que ses parents s’inquiètent.}
\]
\[
\text{b. . . . pour ne pas faire (en sorte) que vous preniez froid.}
\]
Such an approach seems intuitively more attractive than proposals such as Acquaviva’s (1995), for example. Acquaviva suggests that ne is a Q taking the adverb pas as its complement. It seems to me that Acquaviva’s proposal is untenable since it provides no structural position for the CP, [que S], which follows pas in this construction.27

A second problem for the assumption that ne is generated under Neg° comes in the form of data such as the examples in (43) from Muller (1991: 325):

(43) a. Je t’ordonne de ne plus jamais ne rien faire.
   I you order of ne plus jamais ne rien do
   ‘I order you never again not to do anything.’
   (= ‘I order you always to do something in future.’)

b. - Il serait criminel de ne pas partir.
   It be-COND criminal of ne pas leave
   ‘It would be a crime not to leave.’

- Au contraire, il serait criminel de ne pas ne pas partir.
   To-the contrary it be-COND criminal of ne pas ne pas leave
   ‘On the contrary, it would be a crime not to not leave.’
   (= ‘On the contrary, it would be a crime not to stay.’)

Here, within (what might appear to be?) a single infinitival clause, there are multiple instances of ne. These data are a problem for the current analysis in which ne heads NegP and each clause is assumed to contain maximally one instance of NegP. If these are indeed monoclausal structures, one would expect a single NegP to be projected and a single ne at most to be licensed. Yet the constituency of the examples as well as their interpretation suggest two fully fledged, fully negative NegPs, one canceling out the other. Maybe, then, one should admit two instances of NegP in these clauses. In that case, there is still the issue of the surface position of ne to deal with; in section 1.2.1, it was assumed that ne is a clitic that raises to AgrS°. Clearly, this is not a possible analysis for both instances of ne in the examples in (43) (assuming a single AgrSP projection per clause). In the second part of (43b), the first pas, which, as I show later and in chapter 2, is a phrasal constituent, intervenes between the two instances of ne, casting serious doubt on any suggestion that both cases of ne have cliticized onto the same AgrS°. The same applies to the sequence plus jamais in (43a), which also intervenes between two instances of ne.

27. The approach proposed here for the pour (ne) pas que construction means that the contrast, noted by DeGraff (1993a: 74 (11)), illustrated here between French and Haitian Creole, remains a mystery.

(i) Bouki fait le clown pour pas qu’ils s’ennuient.
   B. does the clown for pas that they get-bored
   ‘Bouki’s messing around so they don’t get bored.’

(ii) Bouki ap fè komik pou (●pa) yo anmiye.
    B. PROG does comic for pa 3pl. get-bored
    (= (i))
How, then, to account for the presence of two instances of ne in each case? Note that the second ne is crucial for the correct interpretation of (43a), which is reversed if the second ne is omitted.

(44) Je t’ordonne de ne plus jamais rien faire.  
I you order of ne plus jamais rien do  
‘I order you never to do anything again.’  
(= the opposite of (43a))

Is one wrong to assume monoclausal structures for the infinitival clauses in (43)? Could each ne be generated under Neg* within its own clause and raised to its own AgrS?28 Such an analysis has a number of attractions in that it allows one to maintain these central assumptions: (a) that a single NegP is available per clause; (b) that ne is generated as Neg*; and (c) that ne cliticizes onto AgrS.29

Furthermore, a biclausal approach is consistent with the approach adopted for the pour ne pas que construction discussed earlier. One might assume, for example, that the relevant part of (43a) actually has the structure in (45):

(45) . . . de [IP PRO ne plus jamais v [IP PRO ne rien faire ]]

The double negation interpretation of example (43a) is then attributed to the presence of negation (and NegP) in two successive clauses, whereby one has scope over the other. The negative concord interpretation of (44) is due to the monoclausal nature of the example: a single clause having a single NegP (see chapters 4 and 5).

The proposal that the two problematic sets of data should be analyzed in terms of a null verb, v, is attractive in that v can, in terms of its selection properties, be aligned with a number of other French verbs. With the unified analysis in terms of v, the two problematic contexts are reduced to two c-selection frames. In (41), v selects a finite subjunctive clausal CP complement introduced by que; in (45), in contrast, v selects an infinitival IP complement without an overt complementizer. In this respect, v is analogous to a number of other semi-auxiliary verbs in French, for example, vouloir ‘to want’, as illustrated in (46).

(46) a. Nous voulons que vous restiez.  
we want that you stay-SUBJ  
‘We want you to stay.’

28. Hirschbühler and Labelle (1992/93: 40 (18)) suggest an analysis in terms of NegP-recursion within the same clause. This proposal has the weakness of failing to account for the fact that the phenomenon in text examples (43) is restricted to infinitival contexts. If NegP-recursion is to be admitted by UG, a principled reason needs to be found to explain why similar effects are not attested in finite clauses.

29. DeGraff (1993b: 65fn4 (ii), 71fn12) suggests that the Haitian Creole example in (i) can be analyzed in terms of two NegP projections:

(i) Jan pa-pa vini.  
J. NEG IRREAL NEG come  
‘J. wouldn’t (won’t) come.’
b. Nous voulons rester.
we want stay-INF
‘We want to stay.’

The biclausal analysis opens the way, finally, to an explanation for the
perhaps unexpected grammaticality of (47):

(47) Je te conseille de ne plus jamais ne pas être à l’heure.
you advise of ne plus jamais ne pas be to the hour
‘I advise you never again not to be on time.’

My assumption of a biclausal structure for this example accounts for the
double negation interpretation. Consider now what happens when the second ne is re-
moved. When this operation was performed in (43a), the double negation turned
into negative concord, as in (44). In the case of (47), though, the result is
ungrammaticality, as in (48):

(48) *Je te conseille de ne plus jamais pas être à l’heure.

A straightforward account for the ungrammaticality of (48) can be given on the
basis of the presence, within a single clause, of plus/jamais and pas. This is
known independently not to be possible in French (see chapters 4 and 5 for an
account). The problem, then, becomes (47): why is this example fine? If I had
maintained a monoclausal analysis of (47), I would not have had an answer. Yet,
if the relevant part of (47) is deemed to be biclausal, as illustrated in (49), the
acceptability and interpretation of the example are expected: the co-occurrence
of pas and plus/jamais is acceptable because they are not clausemates; the
double negation interpretation is predicted because each nonfinite clause contains a
fully negative NegP.

(49) Je te conseille de [ip ne plus jamais v [ip ne pas être à l’heure]]

I therefore conclude that the data reviewed in this section do not pose a prob-
lem for the assumption that ne is uniquely generated as the head of NegP
and that clauses contain maximally one NegP.

The position of NegP

1.2.3

I now turn to the location of NegP within clause structure. Ouhalla (1990) sug-
gests that there is no universally applicable ordering (see also Zanutti 1991
and Pollock 1997b). Rather, hierarchical ordering of NegP in relation to other
functional projections is argued by Ouhalla to be subject to parametric variation,
determined by what he terms the Neg Parameter. With respect to French, for
example, in which the negative marker generated under Neg’, ne, is a clitic, its
surface position does not reflect the underlying position of NegP since the mark-

30. For discussion of this example and the others in this section, I am grateful to my colleague
Joëlle Riley.
er cliticizes onto AgrS° (see section 1.2.1). Consequently, it is the position of pas, which, following Pollock (1989), I assume occupies SpecNegP (at S-structure), that indicates the location of NegP in clause structure. Given that pas immediately follows tensed verbs, I conclude that NegP is the complement of AgrS°. The clause structure given in (19), and repeated here for convenience as (50) is therefore revised as in (51).

(50) Canonical French clause structure:

\[ \text{CP} \rightarrow \text{AgrSP} \rightarrow \text{T} \rightarrow \text{MoodP} \rightarrow \text{VP} \]

(51) Canonical French clause structure (revised):

\[ \text{CP} \rightarrow \text{AgrSP} \rightarrow \text{NegP} \rightarrow \text{Spec, pas} \rightarrow \text{T} \rightarrow \text{MoodP} \rightarrow \text{VP} \]

Within the framework of (51), ne is generated under Neg° and subsequently cliticizes onto AgrS°. The semantics and licensing conditions of ne in the modern language are discussed in the next two sections. As for the other negative markers in French, pas is dealt with in chapter 2. Consideration of the “negative adverbs” (plus ‘no/any more/longer’, jamais ‘(n)ever’, and guère ‘hardly’) and the “negative” arguments (rien ‘anything/nothing’ and personne ‘anyone/no-one’) is postponed until chapters 4 and 5, respectively.

French ne as inherently negative?

1.2.4

In this section and the next, I turn to the properties of the lexical item that, in some varieties of Modern French, is the realization of Neg°, that is, ne. A number of facts relating to ne point to the conclusion that this element is not inherently negative in the modern language. First, pre-verbal ne is insufficient to mark negation, as in (52), except with a very restricted set of pseudomodal verbs such as savoir ‘to know’, oser ‘to dare’, and pouvoir ‘to be able’, as in (53), frozen archaic expressions or proverbs, as in (54), or, as pointed out by a reviewer, certain restricted embedded contexts such as (55):

(52) *Je ne fais mon travail.
I ne do my work

31. Of course, this has not always been the case. See sections 3.1.1, 3.1.2, and 3.5.2 and the references in chapter 3, footnote 3, for discussion of the history of negation in French. In a recent study, Acquaviva (1995) addresses the issue of whether Modern French ne is or is not inherently negative but does not come to a firm conclusion one way or the other.

32. Note that these verbs can be negated by ne alone only if they take an infinitival complement. The examples in (i)–(iii), in which this condition is not met, are ungrammatical:

(i) *Pierre ne sait la réponse.
P. ne knows the answer

(ii) *On ne le peut.
one ne it can

(iii) *Je n’ osais.
I ne dared
(53) a. Pierre ne savait que faire.
   P. ne knew what do
   ‘P. didn’t know what to do.’

b. Je n’ osais venir.
   I ne dared come
   ‘I didn’t dare come.’

c. On ne peut vous aider.
   one ne can you help
   ‘We cannot help you.’

(54) a. Ne vous en déplaise.
   ne you of-it displease
   ‘If you will.’

b. Il n’est pire eau que l’ eau qui dort.
   it ne is worse water than the water which sleeps
   ‘Still waters run deep.’

c. N’ayez crainte!
   ne have fear
   ‘Fear not!’

(55) Cela fait dix ans qu’elle n’a chanté Carmen.
   It does ten years that she ne has sung Carmen
   ‘It’s ten years since she last sang Carmen.’

   Second, as pointed out in footnote 3, ne can be omitted from negative utter-
ances in most spoken varieties of French. Indeed, in Québécois, ne is almost
never overt (Sankoff and Vincent 1977). The pre-verbal element ne is therefor
not essential to the expression of negation. Alongside (56a), (56b) is also accep-
able in the spoken language.

(56) a. Je n’ai pas faim.
   I (ne) have pas hunger
   ‘I’m not hungry.’

   Third, ne has an “expletive” use. Here, ne appears in the complement of ad-
versative predicates and comparatives, for example, in which it does not have
negative force, as in (57a, b). In (58), note that the object of the fear expressed
in the complement clause in (58a) is the opposite of the object of the fear
expressed in (58b), even though both contain ne. The significant expression of
negation is clearly pas, absent from (58a) but present in (58b), rather than ne,
which can freely be omitted in both and seems only to indicate register. Further,
as pointed out by a reviewer, expletive ne can be used for rhetorical effect in
some interrogative contexts, as in (57c).
(57) a. Je doute qu’il ne soit là.
   I doubt that he be-SUBJ there
   ‘I doubt he’s there.’

b. Marie est plus grande que n’est son frère.
   M. is more tall than ne is her brother
   ‘M. is taller than her brother is.’

c. Qui ne souhaite partir en vacances?
   Who ne wishes leave on holidays
   ‘Who (on earth) doesn’t want to go on holiday?’

(58) a. Elle a peur que tu ne sois là.
   She has fear that you be-SUBJ there
   ‘She’s worried you might be there.’

b. Elle a peur que tu ne sois pas là.
   She has fear that you be-SUBJ pas there
   ‘She’s worried you might not be there.’

The contrast between (56a) and (57) could be taken as evidence to suggest that there are in fact two homophonous lexical items *ne* in the modern language: one negative, one nonnegative. I reject this possibility. Instead, I suggest that there is a single *ne* in Modern French and that it is not inherently negative. Where *ne* is overt and is interpreted negatively, as, for example, in (56a), it does so by virtue of its relationship with a negative operator, for example, *pas* in SpecNegP. I assume that Rizzi’s (1996: 76) mechanism of Dynamic Agreement (henceforth, DA) is responsible for endowing the negative head—and, hence, the whole clause (Haegeman 1995: 107)—with the [+NEG] feature of the specifier.

DA is used by Rizzi (1996) within the context of *wh*-movement. Rizzi assumes that, where *wh*-expressions are fronted, as in typical *wh*-questions, the *wh*-XP in SpecCP and C° itself agree with respect to the feature [+ Whitney].

(59)

Of course, fronting of a *wh*-XP is often accompanied by movement of the finite verb from AgrS° to C°, as in (59). Indeed, subject-auxiliary inversion can be
motivated if it is assumed that (the finite verb in) AgrS° bears the feature [+WH] and moves into C° in order for C° and SpecCP to agree.

AgrS°-to-C° movement cannot be motivated on the basis of the distribution of wh-features alone. One might imagine, for example, that the verb bearing wh-features could happily remain in AgrS°, while the wh-XP occupies SpecCP. To motivate the movement of the verb to the C° position, Rizzi further assumes a wellformedness condition on wh-constituents with wide scope, known as the wh-criterion (cf. May 1985: 17):

\[(60)\text{The wh-criterion:}\]
\[\text{a. Each wh-}X^\circ\text{ must be in a spec-head relationship with a wh-operator.}\]
\[\text{b. Each wh-operator must be in a spec-head relationship with a wh-}X^\circ\text{.}\]

\[(61)\]
\[\text{a. When are you coming?}\]
\[\text{b. \textbf{\#When you are coming?}}\]

Indeed, the obligatory nature of subject-auxiliary inversion in matrix wh-questions in English, as illustrated in (61), is attributed to (60): the verb, marked [+WH], moves to C° to produce the required configuration. I return to the wh-criterion in section 1.3.

In some languages, however, subject-auxiliary inversion is not required in wh-questions. One such language is French. In French, subject-auxiliary inversion is possible—but not necessary—in matrix wh-questions, as shown in (62), in which the wh-XP has fronted (to SpecCP, I assume), but the verb has not inverted to C°.

\[(62)\text{Où tu vas?}\]
\[\text{‘Where you go}\]
\[\text{‘Where are you going?’}\]

\[(63)\text{[CP Où [C: C° [AgrSP tu vas ]]]}\]

Rather than assuming that, in such cases, the wh-criterion fails to apply, Rizzi suggests that DA allows the [+WH] feature to be transmitted from the wh-expression in SpecCP to the non-overt C°. He schematizes DA as in (64):

\[(64)\text{Dynamic Agreement:}\]
\[\text{Op } X \rightarrow \text{ Op } X\]
\[\text{WH WH WH WH}\]

DA is therefore a mechanism for endowing a syntactic head with the relevant feature(s) of its specifier.\(^{33}\) The availability of DA is deemed to be subject to parametric variation. Thus, it is available in French but not in English; hence the contrast between (62) and (61b).

\(^{33}\text{Note that DA is unidirectional, passing features from specifier to head but not vice versa. This will be important in section 3.3.2.}\)
I propose that the same mechanism that endows the C′ head with the feature [+WH] in (62) is also responsible for endowing the Neg′ head with the feature [+NEG] in a negative clause such as (56a):

(65)  
```
  NegP
     Spec  Neg′
          |  |  
         pas  Neg′
               |  |  
               [+NEG]     ne
                  
Dynamic Agreement
```

Turning now to the cases in (53), in which ne is the sole overt marker of sentential negation, one might wonder where the [+NEG] feature comes from, given that ne itself is not inherently negative. To account for these data, I propose the existence of a non-overt operator, Op, which bears the feature [+NEG], occupies SpecNegP in these examples, and, by virtue of DA, can transmit its negative feature to ne in Neg′:34

(66)  
```
  NegP
     Spec  Neg′
          |  |  
         Op   Neg′
          |  |  
          [+NEG]     ne
             
Dynamic Agreement
```

Op in (66) can be regarded as the negative equivalent of the non-overt wh-operator (Haegeman 1995: 98–100), Op[+WH], assumed to occupy SpecCP in yes-no questions such as (67) and whose presence triggers subject-auxiliary inversion.35

34. Op[+NEG] is what Haegeman (1995) labels Op+, that is, the non-overt contentive negative operator. In Rowlett (1994a, b), I used the label  . I assume that Op[+NEG] also provides a key to the interpretation of the French ne . . . que construction:

(i)  
```
  Jean ne voit que Marie.
  'J. can see only M.'
```

I assume that Op[+NEG] raises to SpecNegP and is responsible for the (absolute) negation to which [que . . . ] provides the exception. Such an approach avoids the need to assume that ne is inherently negative (Acquaviva 1995). Op[+NEG] is central to my analysis of the “negative” adverbs and arguments in chapters 4 and 5. See also Rowlett (1996f; 1998b) for discussion of the ne . . . que construction.

35. See the discussion of (86) later in this chapter.
(67) a. Have you finished?
   b. \([_{C} OP[\text{+WH}] \ [_{C} \ \text{have,}[+\text{WH}] \ [_{\text{AgSp you t, finished }}]]\]

The full array of overt and non-overt negative (French) and interrogative (English) operators that such an approach posits is illustrated in the table in (68):

(68) Operators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>overt</th>
<th>non-overt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+WH]</td>
<td>whether</td>
<td>OP[+WH] (English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+NEG]</td>
<td>pas</td>
<td>Op[+NEG] (French)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence to support the claim that SpecNegP is occupied by a non-overt operator in the examples in (53) comes from inner island opacity effects. These effects are illustrated in (69) and are commonly attributed to Relativized Minimality violations (Rizzi 1990). Consider the contrast between (69a) and (69b). In (69a), the fronted wh-expression can be associated with either the matrix or the embedded predicate; in (69b), it cannot. In (69b), it can be associated only with the matrix predicate. Assuming that a wh-XP such as pourquoi 'why' is generated AgrSp-adjoined, the unavailability of the second interpretation in the case of (69b) can be explained in the following way: the operator pas in the matrix SpecNegP counts as a potential antecedent A'-governor for the trace of the wh-expression extracted from the embedded clause. The second reading is therefore unavailable because of Relativized Minimality.

(69) a. Pourquoi avez-vous dit que Jean était absent?
   Why have you said that J. was absent
   ‘Why did you say J. was absent?’

   b. Pourquoi n'avez-vous pas dit que Jean était absent?
   Why ne have you pas said that J. was absent
   ‘Why didn’t you say that J. was absent?’

Now, consider (70a). Once again, this wh-question is ambiguous. The fronted wh-expression can be associated with either the matrix or the embedded predicate.

(70) a. Pour quelle raison osais-tu lui téléphoner?
   For what reason dared you to him call
   Either: ‘What was it that made you dare phone him?’
   Or: ‘What was the reason for the phone call you dared to make to him?’

   b. Pour quelle raison n'osais-tu lui téléphoner?
   For what reason ne dared you to him call
   ‘Why didn’t you dare call him?’
   *‘What was the reason for the phone call to him you didn’t dare make?’
In contrast, the second reading is unavailable in (70b). Given the absence of *pas*, we assume that the Relativized Minimality effects are to be attributed to the presence of a non-overt operator in SpecNegP. In our terms, this non-overt operator is negative Op, the source of the [+NEG] feature transmitted to Neg⁺ by DA.₃₆

Inner island effects—or, rather, the lack of them—can also be used as evidence to support the claim that expletive *ne* in (57) and (58a) does not co-occur with a non-overt negative operator, a welcome outcome since, as its name suggests, expletive *ne* is not interpreted negatively. Generally, I have been assuming that, where *ne* in interpreted negatively at all, this can be attributed to its relationship with an operator, *pas* or Op[+NEG], in SpecNegP. In addition, this operator has been argued to be responsible for the inner island effects discussed earlier. What is significant about expletive *ne* is that inner island effects are not in fact attested, as shown by the example in (71). It would, of course, be nice to be able to attribute both the lack of inner island effects and the expletive interpretation of *ne* to one and the same fact, and this is indeed what I would like to do. In (71), the *wh*-expression can be associated with any of the predicates in the clause. Most significant for my purposes, it can be associated with the most deeply embedded verb, despite the presence of *ne* in the immediately superior clause. The fact that extraction of *pourquoi* from the most embedded clause to the matrix SpecCP does not lead to a Relativized Minimality violation suggests that there is no intervening A’-operator in SpecNegP in the middle clause to count as a closer potential antecedent for the trace of *pourquoi* in the embedded clause. The nonnegative expletive interpretation of *ne* and the absence of inner island effects are then reduced to the absence of any (negative) operator in SpecNegP.

(71) Pourquoi crains-tu qu’ elle *ne* dise qu’ elle t’aime?
   Why fear you that she *ne* say-SUBJ that she you loves
   ‘Why are you afraid she might say she loves you?’

The same point is made by the example in (72), taken from Haegeman (1995: 161 (5b)):

(72) Comment crains-tu qu’ il *ne* se comporte?
   How fear you that he *ne* REFL behaves
   ‘How do you fear he will behave?’

Here, *comment* ‘how’ is a manner adverb that can be construed with the predicate in the embedded clause; expletive *ne* does not give rise to a blocking effect.

₃₆ Of course, and as one of the reviewers of this book pointed out, the next question to be addressed is why it is that, when used in this way (see footnote 32), these verbs allow *ne* to be licensed by a non-overt operator while, in the absence of elements such as *jamais* or *rien*, “normal” verbs require *ne* to be licensed by overt *pas*. It seems to me that this phenomenon must be related to the modal properties of this use of the verbs concerned.
Given the assumptions I am making here, I therefore conclude that no non-overt operator occupies SpecNegP in the embedded clause.

One final piece of evidence I shall use to support my claim that expletive ne is not accompanied by a non-overt operator in SpecNegP concerns the licensing of partitive and pseudopartitive indefinite direct objects.37 I postpone detailed discussion of the licensing of these structures until section 2.2.1, and content myself here with pointing out the empirical contrast. The indefinite direct object in (73a) has what I term a partitive structure; the pseudopartitive direct object in (73b) is ungrammatical:

(73) a. J’ai acheté des livres.
   I have bought of-the books
   ‘I bought some books.’

   b. *J’ai acheté de livres.
   I have bought of books

Pseudopartitive direct objects can be licensed in a number of ways, such as by a quantifier like beaucoup ‘lots’ in (74a), negative pas in (74b), or the non-overt negative operator assumed to be present (in SpecNegP) in (74c, d).

(74) a. J’ai beaucoup acheté de livres.
   I have lots bought of books
   ‘I bought lots of books.’

   b. Je n’ai pas acheté de livres.
   I ne have pas bought of books
   ‘I didn’t buy any books.’

   c. Je ne peux Op acheter de livres.
   I ne can buy of books
   ‘I can’t buy any books.’

   d. Cela fait dix ans qu’elle n’a Op eu d’amant(s).
   It does ten years that she ne has had of lover(s)
   ‘It’s ten years since she last had a lover.’

The generalization (which is explored in more detail in section 2.2.1) seems to be that pseudopartitive direct objects are licensed in the presence of a c-commanding operator. Crucially, though, pseudopartitive direct objects are not licensed by expletive ne:

(75) a. *Je crains qu’il n’ait acheté de livres.
I fear that he ne have-SUBJ bought of books

   b. Je crains qu’il n’ait acheté des livres.
I fear that he ne have-SUBJ bought of-the books
   ‘I’m worried he might have bought some books.’

37. The terms partitive and pseudopartitive come from Selkirk (1977: 302ff).
(76) a. Qui ne souhaite gagner *de* prix?
   Who *ne* wishes win of prices

   b. Qui ne souhaite gagner *des* prix?
   Who *ne* wishes win of the prizes

‘Who (on earth) doesn’t want to win prizes?’

I take this as further evidence to suggest that expletive *ne* is not accompanied by a non-overt operator in SpecNegP. Of course, such a conclusion allows a unified account of a number of phenomena and is therefore welcome. While *ne* is assumed to be nonnegative underlyingly, it can be endowed with the negative feature of a negative operator in SpecNegP (pas or Op[+NEG]), which leads to inner island effects and licenses pseudopartitives. The absence of such an operator therefore has a number of consequences: first, *ne* will not be interpreted negatively; second, inner island effects will not be produced; third, pseudopartitive objects will not be licensed. Having considered the semantics of *ne* and concluded that this element is not inherently negative, I now turn to consider its licensing conditions.

**Licensing ne**

1.2.5

In the modern language, pre-verbal *ne* cannot freely occur in a clause. I attribute this to licensing conditions.

(77) *Marie n’aime Paul.
   M. *ne* likes P.

I suggest that *ne* can be licensed in either (or both) of the two following ways. On the one hand, it is licensed by (indirect) selection (i.e., government); on the other, it can be licensed by spec-head agreement. The first possibility is exemplified by expletive *ne*, already discussed. What is particular about expletive *ne* is that its availability is determined by the immediately superior predicate. (In (57c), expletive *ne* seems to be licensed by the contents of the CP level.) Thus, in (78) (= (58a)), expletive *ne* is licensed in the embedded clause because of the presence of the adverasive predicate *avoir peur* ‘to fear’ in the matrix clause.

(78) Elle a peur que tu *ne* sois là.
   She has fear that you *ne* be SUBJ there
   ‘She’s worried you might be there.’

I assume that there is some indirect selection relationship between the matrix predicate and the embedded Neg*+* (mediated by C*+* at the very least) and that it is this relationship that licenses expletive *ne* in the embedded clause. The ma-

38. The same extended selection relationship can also be seen to license the subjunctive morphology on the verb. For discussion of the relationship between negation and subjunctive mood in French, see Kampers-Manhe (1992).
trix predicate selects a CP whose head C° bears a specific feature that ensures that a specific kind of AgrSP is selected, and so on down to Neg°, at which point expletive ne is licensed.

The second way in which ne can be licensed, namely by S-structure spec-head agreement, can be exemplified by straightforward examples of clauses negated by pas, as in (79) (= (56a)).

(79) Je n’ai pas faim.
I ne have pas hunger
‘I’m not hungry.’

Assuming, as in section 1.2.3, and following standard assumptions since Pollock (1989), that pas occupies SpecNegP at S-structure, I conclude that DA is responsible for transmitting the feature [+NEG] to Neg°, as in (65), thereby licensing ne. Note that, where pas occupies a position below SpecNegP, ne is not licensed. See, for example, the data in chapter 2, footnote 36.

In (80) (= (58b)), I assume that ne is in fact “doubly” licensed, that is, by selection (by the matrix predicate avoir peur ‘to fear’) and by spec-head agreement (with pas):

(80) Elle a peur que tu ne sois pas là.
She has fear that you ne be-SUBJ pas there
‘She’s worried you might not be there.’

Crucially, licensing is required one way or another. This assumption is necessary to explain the ungrammaticality of (77) and is an important consideration in the discussion of “negative” adverbs and arguments in chapters 4 and 5.

The important difference between the licensing mechanisms proposed for expletive ne in (78) and negative ne in (79) is that expletive ne does not require the presence of an operator in SpecNegP in order to be licensed. In fact, in the previous section, I offered a number of reasons to conclude that no non-overt operator occupies SpecNegP in the context of expletive ne. Under the generally accepted assumption that the type of inner island effect that excludes one of the feasible interpretations of (69b) and (70b) is due to a Relativized Minimality violation, that is, the fact that the A’-operator in SpecNegP prevents proper government of the trace of the extracted A’-operator by its antecedent by counting as a closer potential A’-governor, I assume that the availability in (71) of all feasible interpretations means that no such A’-operator occupies SpecNegP. Were such an operator to occupy this position, one would expect the same inner island effects, contrary to fact. So, expletive ne cannot in fact be deemed to be licensed by spec-head agreement with an operator in SpecNegP, because no such operator is present in that position. Such a conclusion supports my analysis of the licensing mechanism of expletive ne, that is, by extended selection.

Having presented my assumptions about the syntactic representation of sentential negation and my conclusions regarding the semantics and licensing conditions of ne in Modern French, I now turn to the AFFECT criterion, a wellformed-
ness condition deemed to determine the distribution and interpretation, not only of \textit{wh-}expressions but of negative expressions, too.

**The AFFECT criterion**

1.3

In section 1.2.4, I showed that the \textit{wh-}criterion in (60) can account for the type of subject-auxiliary inversion attested in matrix \textit{wh-}questions in English and to explain the contrast between (61a) and (61b). In fact, interrogative structures are not the only ones that, in English, for example, trigger subject-auxiliary inversion. Compare (81) with (82):

(81) a. \textit{Not for a million dollars} would Adam be unfaithful.
    b. \textit{Not for a million dollars} Adam would be unfaithful.

(82) a. \textit{Not long afterwards} did Susan die.
    b. \textit{Not long afterwards} Susan died.

In (81), the italicized proposed negative constituent triggers inversion, what Rizzi (1996) refers to as residual V2; in (82), in contrast, it does not. The essential difference between the two grammatical sentences is that (81a) is a negative sentence (marked, we assume, by an abstract feature [+NEG] on the verb), while (82b) is not. This can be verified by means of a simple test, namely tag question formation (see Lakoff 1969). English statements can be continued with a tag question when the speaker is looking for confirmation, for example, from the hearer. Examples are given in (83):

(83) a. Susan’s pregnant, isn’t she?
    b. Bob can’t come, can he?

Tag questions with this function are formed by repeating the auxiliary verb from the antecedent, reversing its polarity and pronominalizing the subject. The crucial aspect of these tag questions is the necessary polarity reversal. In (83a), the antecedent is positive, so the tag is negative, and vice versa in (83b). If the polarity is not reversed, the tag question fails to fulfill the same function.\textsuperscript{39} Now, consider (81a) and (82b) again, repeated complete with (confirmation-seeking) tag questions:

(84) a. \textit{Not for a million dollars} would Adam be unfaithful, \textit{WOULD} he?
    b. \textit{Not long afterwards} Susan died, \textit{DIDN’T} she?

The fact that (81a) is a negative sentence is shown by the positive polarity of the tag in (84a); the fact that the tag in (84b) is negative indicates that (82b) is positive. In (81a), then, the proposed negative constituent is a negative operator that

\textsuperscript{39} Consider (i), in which the polarity of the tag matches that of the statement. Here, the function of the tag is to express doubt or disbelief.

(i) Susan’s pregnant, is she?
For some reason, such tags are not possible in negative clauses:

(ii) \textit{Bob can’t come, can’t he?}
40. The operator/nonoperator distinction between the two preposed constituents in (81) and (82) is probably why, in the first case, preposing is obligatory while, in the second case, it is not:

41. With respect to the level of representation at which the affect criterion must be met, there is some debate in the literature. In his adoption of the wh-criterion, of which the affect criterion is deemed to be a more general formulation, Rizzi (1990, 1996) assumes that it applies at LF universally but that it may, in some languages, be met as early as S-structure. The possibility that the criterion could be met in the base, that is, at D-structure, is not explicitly considered. Haegeman (1995), following suggestions made by Brody (1995), argues that the Neg Criterion applies universally at S-structure.

\begin{equation}
(85) \text{The affect criterion:}
\begin{align*}
\text{a. Each affective } & X^e \text{ must be in a spec-head relationship with an affective operator.} \\
\text{b. Each affective operator must be in a spec-head relationship with an affective } & X^e.
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

Rizzi (1996) defines an operator as an XP (bearing the relevant feature[s]) occupying a left-peripheral A'-position, that is, an adjoined position or a specifier position.

The affect criterion in (85) obliges an XP of a certain type to be in a spec-head configuration with an X^e of a certain type and provides an explanation for the inversion witnessed in sentences with initial negative operators, such as (81a). Suppose that the sentence-initial negative constituent in (81a) bears the

\[ [+\text{NEG}] \] feature and producing a negative sentence. In (82b), in contrast, the scope of negation is restricted to the sentence-initial constituent; negation does not take scope over the entire clause.40

I am not interested here in determining how it is that the negative constituent in (81) counts as an operator while the one in (82) does not (see Haegeman 1996a for discussion). I assume, for the sake of concreteness, that the [+NEG] feature manages to percolate up to the highest node of the preposed constituent in (81) but fails to do so in (82) and that the constituent not long afterwards in (82b) is not negative in any relevant sense.

Under the assumption that negative operators such as the one in (81a) move to SpecCP in the syntax as a reflex of the LF property that A'-specifier positions are canonical scope positions (Rizzi 1990: 20), what I am interested in here is why the presence in sentence-initial position of a negative operator in (81a) triggers subject-auxiliary inversion (i.e., AgrS^e-to-C^e movement). In the earliest generative work in this area (Klima 1964: 313), an “attraction” transformation for “affective” (but not factive) operators was posited, pulling the verb to the operator over the subject. More recently, Rizzi (1996) has suggested that affective operators are subject to a licensing requirement expressed in terms of spec-head agreement: “affective operators must be in a spec-head configuration with a head marked with the relevant affective feature”. This wellformedness condition was formulated in Haegeman (1992b) as the affect criterion:41

\[ \text{The affect criterion:} \]

\begin{align*}
\text{a. Each affective } & X^e \text{ must be in a spec-head relationship with an affective operator.} \\
\text{b. Each affective operator must be in a spec-head relationship with an affective } & X^e.
\end{align*}

\[ \text{Rizzi (1996) defines an operator as an XP (bearing the relevant feature[s]) occupying a left-peripheral A'-position, that is, an adjoined position or a specifier position.} \]

\[ \text{The affect criterion in (85) obliges an XP of a certain type to be in a spec-head configuration with an X^e of a certain type and provides an explanation for the inversion witnessed in sentences with initial negative operators, such as (81a). Suppose that the sentence-initial negative constituent in (81a) bears the} \]
Acquaviva (1993: 11) suggests this null operator is probably responsible for the opacity effects triggered by \textit{if} in (i):

(i)  \textit{How do you wonder if John behaved?}

AFFECTIVE feature \([+\text{NEG}]\). Given that (81a)—in contrast to (82b)—is in fact a negative sentence, suppose, further, following Haegeman (1995: 107), that the AFFECTIVE feature \([+\text{NEG}]\) is also borne by AgrS*, realized on the verb. What the AFFECT criterion in (85) does given such assumptions is to oblige the finite verb and negative operator to be in a spec-head configuration. The domain in which this can be achieved is above the traditional AgrSP domain, and I assume it to be within CP (see Rizzi 1997). The operator occupies SpecCP by virtue of the scope properties of this A*'-specifier position, as discussed earlier, and the finite verb raises to C* in order to satisfy the AFFECT criterion, resulting in the attested inversion.

I assume that the same reason underlies inversion in root non-wh-interrogatives in languages like English:

(86) a. Have you done your homework?

Here, I assume a phonologically null but syntactically active \textit{wh}-operator that has moved into SpecCP for the reasons already outlined (see (67)). Once in that position, the AFFECT criterion will oblige the finite \([+\text{WH}]\) verb to raise into C*. I therefore assume that (86a) can be represented as (86b):

(86) b. \[\text{CP} \begin{array}{c} \text{OP} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{have[+WH]} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{you t done your homework } \end{array} \]

Thus, the AFFECT criterion can be seen to be doing the work, that is, be a more general version, of the \textit{wh}-criterion and the Neg Criterion.

(87) \textit{The Neg Criterion:}

a. Each Neg X* must be in a spec-head relationship with a Neg operator.

b. Each Neg operator must be in a spec-head relationship with a Neg X*.

(88) \textit{The wh-criterion:}

a. Each \textit{wh}-X* must be in a spec-head relationship with a \textit{wh}-operator.

b. Each \textit{wh}-operator must be in a spec-head relationship with a \textit{wh}-X*.

Despite the fact that the two criteria in (87) and (88) are nothing more than construction-specific versions of the same principle, in subsequent chapters, I often refer to the individual criteria rather than to the more general AFFECT criterion. The Neg Criterion in particular is mentioned at various points.

\textbf{Summary}

1.4

In this chapter, I have set out my assumptions about Verb Movement and sentential negation in Modern French. Having argued in favor of an “exploded” Inf, a model of clause structure recognizing a number of functional categories associated with verbal inflectional morphology ((CP-)AgrSP-TP-MoodP(-VP)),
I concluded that Verb Movement patterns are determined (a) by the finiteness of the verb (all finite verbs in French raise to Agr$S^*$; not all infinitives do) and (b) by the nature of the verb (auxiliary, modal, and lexical infinitives have divergent Verb Movement patterns in French). The conclusions set out in (35) are repeated as (89) here:

(89) **Overt Verb Movement patterns in French:**

a. All finite verbs move to Agr$S^*$. 

b’. Infinitival auxiliaries (être, avoir) freely move to Mood$^*$, T$^*$, or Agr$S^*$. 

b”. Infinitival modal verbs (e.g., pouvoir, devoir) move to Mood$^*$ or T$^*$, and only exceptionally to Agr$S^*$. 

b”’. Infinitival lexical verbs move to Mood$^*$ or T$^*$, but not as far as Agr$S^*$. 

I then argued for a further functional projection in clause structure, namely NegP, whose head is the locus of features determining clausal polarity. In French, it was concluded that NegP is located between AgrSP and TP. Following Pollock (1989), I assume that SpecNegP can be occupied at S-structure by pas. Further, it was argued that Neg$^*$ is the base position of pre-verbal ne (in those varieties in which this element is overt). The element ne itself was not concluded to be inherently negative. As for the licensing mechanisms of ne, I concluded that this element can be licensed in one (or both) of two ways. First, negative ne is licensed by spec-head agreement with an inherently negative operator, overt pas or non-overt Op, in SpecNegP. Rizzi’s DA then ensures that the feature [+NEG] is transmitted to ne in Neg$^*$, guaranteeing a negative interpretation for the clause. Second, expletive ne—which can appear only in embedded contexts—is licensed by extended selection from the superordinate predicate or an interrogative C$^*$. In this case, there is no operator in SpecNegP (a conclusion supported by the lack of inner island effects and the unavailability of pseudopartitive objects), no DA, and no negative interpretation for ne or for the clause. 

Finally, I addressed the syntax of affective elements in general, not just negative elements. Here, I concluded that the distribution and interpretation of affective elements such as negatives and interrogatives is governed by a universal principle, the AFFECT criterion, which, following Haegeman (1995), I assume to apply at S-structure.

(90) **The AFFECT criterion:**

a. Each AFFECTIVE X$^*$ must be in a spec-head relationship with an AFFECTIVE operator.

b. Each AFFECTIVE operator must be in a spec-head relationship with an AFFECTIVE X$^*$. 

These conclusions form the basis of the rest of this book.
2

The Negative Marker

In this chapter, I consider the element *pas*, which, in contrast to *ne*, is inherently negative. Indeed, I have already observed that *pas* is one of the elements that can occupy SpecNegP and license *ne* by transmitting its [+NEG] feature to Neg∗. The central idea behind the analysis proposed here is that, in the context of sentential negation, SpecNegP is in fact the derived position of *pas*, which does not occupy the same position at both D-structure and S-structure. It is argued that, underlyingly, the position of *pas* is determined by its scope as a lexical negator: typically, *pas* is adjoined to VP, which, given the VP-internal subject hypothesis of, for example, Kitagawa (1986), is the minimal domain containing the verb and all its arguments; a VP-adjoined adverb therefore takes scope over all verbal arguments. This is explored in section 2.1. Alternatively, *pas* can function as a quantifier similar to *beaucoup* 'lots' and can, consequently, be generated within an indefinite nominal expression. This is explored in section 2.2.

In both cases, the superficial position occupied by *pas* is determined by those properties of the grammar that govern the syntax of sentential negation, that is, the need for a functional head in clausal hierarchy to bear the feature [+NEG] at S-structure (Haegeman 1995: 107). Given that French [Neg *ne*] is not inherently negative, the only way for this feature specification to be achieved is by DA with a negative operator in a functional specifier position or, in the more general case, with a negative operator chain that involves a functional specifier. In other words, either *pas* itself raises at S-structure or, alternatively, *pas* is bound, in situ, by an expletive negative operator (in the sense of Haegeman 1995) occupying a suitable position. In either scenario, the scope of the negation is widened to the clause. The evidence considered in section 1.2.5 clearly suggests that, in order to mark sentential negation, *pas* needs to raise overtly to a position that I identified as SpecNegP. I interpret this empirical fact as indicating, in theoretical terms, that no expletive negative operator is available in French. Given the unavailability of such an operator, overt raising (followed by DA) is the only way *pas* is able to mark sentential negation. Following Pollock (1989), I assume that the landing site of raising is SpecNegP. Once *pas* occupies SpecNegP, DA and the spec-head configuration created between *pas* and (the trace of) *ne* ensures that Neg∗ bears the feature [+NEG]; *ne* is consequently licensed, and the clause is interpreted negatively. The relevant configuration is illustrated in (1):
1. Note further that the principle of Greed prevents one constituent from moving in order to satisfy the licensing requirements of another.
Consider, then, clause (b), which states that negative operators need to be in a spec-head configuration with negative heads. On the surface, this approach seems more promising, given that pas is indeed underlyingly negative. Yet, this is not entirely unproblematic, either. The discussion of “true” imperatives in section 2.1.1, in which pas does not raise to SpecNegP, as well as other, nonsentential uses of pas (e.g., the examples in (3)) suggest that pas does not, in fact, have to occupy SpecNegP in order to be licensed. The discussion seems, therefore, to have come to a dead end. The head ne can be licensed without an operator, suggesting that clause (a) of the Neg Criterion does not apply to it; further, the negative adverb pas can appear in positions other than SpecNegP, suggesting that clause (b) does not apply to it. How, then, can one motivate pas-raising to SpecNegP? An important feature of the context in which pas has to raise to SpecNegP is the nature and/or the scope of the negation: sentential rather than constituent. Pas raises to SpecNegP to endow the clause with the negative feature, rather than to license ne. Ne is licensed as a consequence of the presence of the feature [+NEG] on Neg’. It seems, then, that pas-raising to SpecNegP occurs for scope reasons.

Alternatively, pas-raising to SpecNegP could be motivated within some version of Checking Theory on the assumption that ne is “weak” in some intuitive sense and needs to be “identified” or “supported” by virtue of its relationship with its specifier. I do not deal with this issue any further here since it would take me too far afield. However, I return to the Neg Criterion in section 3.3.1 and chapter 3, footnote 39, where I ultimately conclude that the Neg Criterion, as least inasmuch as it is seen as a configurational constraint, is in fact warranted by the data. I shall, therefore, continue to assume an approach to the empirical domain based on the Neg Criterion, although I recognize that there are some important questions to be answered. (The issue of the necessity of the Neg Criterion is briefly discussed in my review, Rowlett 1996d, of Haegeman 1995.)

**Configuration 1: pas as an adverb**

2.1

This section pursues a syntactic analysis of pas that sheds light on the fact that this element is used in contexts of both sentential and constituent negation. Negative pas is an adverb, that is, it serves to modify something. In fact, Pollock (1989), in the context of his analysis of pas in sentential negation, notices the distributional parallels between pas and adverbs. He notes (1989: 370, 377) that there is “a significant correlation in French between the placement of negation and that of adverbs” in both tensed and infinitival clauses. Cardinaletti and Gua-

---

2. But see Kampers-Manhe (1992), who follows Rizzi (1990) in assuming that pas occupies a specifier position even when it is used as a constituent negator. Under such an approach, pas might be deemed to satisfy clause (b) of the Neg Criterion in situ.

3. Plunkett (1996) in fact argues that clause (b) of the wh-criterion could be abandoned. See footnote 2.

4. Note, though, that Haegeman (1996b: 9) argues that scope properties are insufficient in explaining the distribution of negative words such as Modern French pas.
sti (1992) also observe that pas may function as an adverbial projection. Furthermore, as the examples in (3) illustrate, the adverbial/modifier function of pas is not restricted to sentential contexts:

(3) a. A: Ça va?  
    B: Pas mal.  
        How are you?  
        Not bad.

b. A: Qui est-ce qui veut un café?  
    B: Pas moi.  
        Who’s for coffee?  
        Not me.

c. Pas vrai!  
        Never!

d. Pas possible!  
        Impossible!

e. A: T’as du fric?  
    B: Pas un sou!  
        Got any money?  
        Not a penny.

Zanuttini (1996: 184) notes further that the distribution of the equivalent of pas in other Romance varieties (e.g., Piedmontese nen and Milanese minga) also overlaps with some adverbs. She concludes that all these items are lexical adverbial elements generated in an adjoined position lower than NegP. (See footnote 2.) (See Zanuttini 1997a for a more recent and articulated analysis.)

In the context of a sentence (negated with pas) that contains either an intransitive verb or a transitive verb governing a definite direct object,\(^5\) I suggest that negative pas is generated adjoined to the lexical projection it modifies, that is, VP, as in (4).\(^6\) This reflects the fundamental relationship between pas and the predicate; pas is a negative predicate adverb. (Sportiche’s Adjunct Projection Principle and Chomsky’s general theory of adjunction, together, oblige “modifiers” to appear adjacent to their nonargument XP “modifiee” or the head of their “modifiee”.)

(4) \([\text{VP} \backslash \text{pas} [\text{VP}]]\)

While this analysis of pas is conceptually attractive, it has one major problem that is avoided within Pollock’s model, namely the fairly convincing evidence discussed in sections 1.1.2, 1.1.6, and 1.2.1, that, superficially, pas occupies SpecNegP, that is, above the VP-adjoined position. I take this to suggest that pas raises from its VP-adjoined base position to SpecNegP in order to convert constituent negation into sentential negation; by raising to SpecNegP, pas endows Neg\(^a\) with the feature [+NEG]. (See the discussion in the previous section.)

---

5. For contexts in which pas negates a sentence containing a transitive verb governing an indefinite direct object, see section 2.2.

6. In her discussion of bipartite sentential negation in Navajo, Speas (1991b: 394–95) suggests that the post-verbal da marker is the overt realisation of Neg\(^a\) while dou, which canonically appears immediately before the direct object, occupies either SpecNegP or an adverbial position.
2.1.1 Synchronic evidence: negative imperatives

In this section, I present synchronic data that, I argue, are incompatible with a syntactic analysis of *pas* such as the one proposed by Pollock (1989), in which the element is assumed to be generated in SpecNegP. It is argued that, in cross-linguistic terms, the morphologically truncated structures of so-called true imperatives suggest that such paradigms project truncated syntactic structures in which no functional structure above and including NegP is projected. The fact that such imperatives in French are nevertheless compatible with *pas* but not *ne* (as well as the fact that such true imperatives in numerous other languages are compatible with adverbial negative markers but not head negative markers) undermines the claim that *pas* is uniquely associated with SpecNegP in verbal contexts.

The analysis hinges on the assumption that there are two kinds of (negative) imperative in French and is based on the data in the next section and on recent work by Maria-Luisa Rivero (1994) and Raffaella Zanuttini (1990, 1991, 1994a, 1996). Following these authors, I assume that the difference between the two kinds of imperative is position: one kind of imperative occupies one position, while the other kind occupies another. In the two subsequent sections, I discuss theoretical approaches to the distinction proposed by Rivero and Zanuttini, respectively. While I ultimately reject Rivero’s analysis, I show that Zanuttini’s offers interesting insights into the morphological and syntactic properties of imperatives. Finally, I show how the syntax of negative imperatives suggests that *pas* in French is not uniquely associated with SpecNegP.

The data

2.1.1.1

Negative imperatives in French appear with *either* tonic *or* atonic complement pronouns: tonic forms are post-verbal, as in (5); atonic ones are pre-verbal, as in (6). I assume that the nature of complement pronouns (tonic/post-verbal versus atonic/pre-verbal) is determined by the syntactic properties of the imperative verb, more specifically the position of the verb. This approach is supported by the fact that pre-verbal complement pronouns cannot co-occur with post-verbal ones. If the pre-verbal atonic pronouns are licensed by virtue of the imperative occupying one position, while the post-verbal tonic ones are licensed by virtue of the imperative occupying a different position, then I expect pre- and post-verbal pronouns to be mutually incompatible; the imperative cannot occupy both positions simultaneously. I conclude, then, that the choice of pronoun is determined by the position of the verb.

Another feature associated with negative imperatives that seems to be determined by the position of the verb (and therefore co-varies with pronoun posi-

---

7. In some cases, corresponding tonic and atonic pronouns are homophones. I assume that this is a matter of coincidence and does not detract from the conclusion that there are two independent sets of pronouns, with their own distinct properties.
tion) is the (un)availability of “negative” *ne*. French imperatives can always be negated by *pas* alone, but they cannot always be negated by bipartite *ne* . . . *pas*. Significantly, the (un)availability of bipartite *ne* . . . *pas* patterns identically with the choice of complement pronouns: imperatives that license post-verbal tonic pronouns are incompatible with *ne*, as in (5c), while no such incompatibility prevents imperatives that license pre-verbal atonic pronouns from co-occurring with *ne*, as in (6c). Given that the pre-/post-verbal position of the pronouns is deemed to be determined by verb position, this suggests that the (un)availability of *ne* is also determined by verb position. (The patterns in (5) and (6) are based on Muller 1991: 142):

watch-IMP me / give-IMP it to-him
‘Look at me.’ / ‘Give it to him.’

b. Regarde- moi pas. / Donne- le lui pas.
watch-IMP me *pas* / give-IMP it to-him *pas*
‘Don’t look at me.’ / ‘Don’t give it to him.’

c. *Ne regarde- moi pas. / *Ne donne- le lui pas.
ne watch-IMP me *pas* / ne give-IMP it to-him *pas*

(= (5b))

me watch-IMP / it to-him give-IMP

(= (5a))

b. Me regarde *pas. / Le lui donne pas.
me watch-IMP *pas* / it to-him give-IMP *pas*

(= (5b))

c. Ne me regarde *pas. / Ne le lui donne *pas.
ne me watch-IMP *pas* / ne it to-him give-IMP *pas*

(= (5c))

Observe that the pre-verbal pronouns are incompatible with positive imperatives: compare the grammatical (5a) with the ungrammatical (6a). I assume that this restriction is purely syntactic: the position necessarily occupied by a positive imperative is not the one that licenses pre-verbal pronouns. The inability of the verb to occupy the necessary position to license pre-verbal pronouns could be attributed to economy if the derivation of (5a) is less costly than (6a), for example, if (6a) involves (gratuitously) generating more functional structure than (5a) and if Hyams (1986) is right that UG favors minimal derivations. (See section 2.1.1.3 for details.) In contrast, the examples in (6b) could be argued to be fine for the simple reason that, as examples of sentential negation, NegP is non-empty; generating the required structure is not therefore deemed to be gratuitous.

Consider now negative imperatives. Where the verb is negated by *pas* alone (without *ne*), it can be accompanied by either tonic or atonic pronouns (but not both—see my earlier discussion): (5b) and (6b) are both grammatical. I assume
that the same position is occupied by the verbs in (5a, b) and that this is reflected in the position of the pronouns. In (6b), I assume that the atonic pre-verbal pronouns are licensed because the verb occupies a different position from the verb in (5a, b). Where the imperative is negated by bipartite ne...pas, the accompanying pronouns must be atonic and pre-verbal: compare the ungrammatical (5c) with the grammatical (6c). I assume that the unavailability of the tonic post-verbal pronouns together with ne in (5c) can be explained in terms of incompatible requirements on the imperative: the verb needs to be in one position to license the post-verbal pronoun(s) and in another to license ne. Given that the two constraints cannot be met simultaneously, the string is ungrammatical. In summary, then, the imperatives in (5) are compatible with neither ne nor pre-verbal complement pronouns, while the imperatives in (6) are compatible with both.

I assume that the absence of pre-verbal ne in (6b) is due to optional "ne-drop", discussed in chapter 1, footnote 3. The acceptability of (6c) shows that ne is possible in such a structure. In (5b), in contrast, I assume that the absence of ne is the result of some deeper grammatical incompatibility; hence the ungrammaticality of (5c).

These and similar data from other Romance languages have been considered by Zanuttini (1990, 1991, 1994a, b, 1996, 1997a, b) and Rivero (1994). Both authors exploit the distinction drawn by Joseph and Philippaki-Warburton (1987) between “true” imperatives (e.g., (5)) and “surrogate” imperatives (e.g., (6)). Informally speaking, true imperatives represent a distinct verbal paradigm, while surrogate imperatives are verb forms taken from another morphological paradigm, for example, the subjunctive or the infinitive, used with imperative force. True imperatives have distinctive structural properties; surrogate imperatives adopt the structural properties of their source morphological paradigms. In the next two sections, I consider first Rivero’s then Zanuttini’s analyses of the distinction between true and surrogate imperatives.

Rivero’s analysis

Rivero (1994) pursues an analysis of the distinction between true and surrogate imperatives in terms of verb position (see also Rivero and Terzi 1995). For Rivero, true imperatives occupy a higher position than surrogate imperatives. To be precise, while surrogate imperatives occupy whatever position one would expect their source forms to occupy, typically AgrS\* in the case of surrogate imperatives borrowed from finite paradigms, true imperatives occupy C*. Rivero suggests that raising into C* is triggered by the presence of some non-overt im-

8. Where infinitives are used with imperative force, as in (i), we assume they share the syntax of infinitives used in other contexts. Note that ne is present and that pas is pre-verbal.

(i) Ne pas marcher sur la pelouse.
ne pas walk-inf on the lawn
"Keep off the grass!"
The incompatibility between the pre-verbal negative marker ne and true imperatives (but not between the post-verbal negative marker pas and true imperatives) is common among Romance languages. In Piedmontese and Milanese, for example, pre-verbal no/ninga are compatible with true imperatives. Rivero does, however, address this issue. Assuming a CP-NegP-IP-VP model of clause structure, Rivero accounts for the cross-linguistic tendency by suggesting that a nonincorporating NegE blocks movement of the imperative verb from I* to C*. The absence of true negative imperatives is thus reduced to the HMC (Travis 1984), that is, Relativized Minimality. This account is problematic for a number of reasons. First, contrast the NegE negative markers in Spanish (explicitly mentioned by Rivero) and French. Rivero assumes that Spanish no does not incorporate and that this fact accounts for the absence of true negative imperatives. Given the incompatibility of French ne with true imperatives, one would naturally want to assume that ne does not incorporate, either. This seems, however, an unwelcome conclusion to have to draw, given the discussion in chapter 9. The incompatibility between the pre-verbal negative marker ne and true imperatives (but not between the post-verbal negative marker pas and true imperatives) is common among Romance languages. In Spanish and Italian, for example, pre-verbal no/non are incompatible with true imperatives. In Piedmontese and Milanese, in contrast, post-verbal nen/ninga are compatible with true imperatives. (See the work of Zanutini, especially 1991, 1997b, for discussion of negation in a number of Romance varieties. See also Parry 1996 for discussion of sentential negation in the dialects of Italy.) Rivero (1994) points out, though, that while Zanutini’s generalization holds also for Modern Greek, it does not appear to hold for Bulgarian, Slovak, Serbian/Croatian, and Breton, in which true imperatives can be negated by a pre-verbal NegE negative marker. It may well be desirable to deal with this contrast in terms of Ouhalla’s (1990) Neg Parameter, his assumed parametric variation with respect to the position in clausal architecture of NegP. In those languages in which NegP is generated relatively low in clausal hierarchy, NegP may be oblivious to the truncated structures of true imperatives.
10. A possible solution to this problem with an analysis along the lines of the one proposed by Rivero might be envisaged by distinguishing between incorporation and cliticisation. I do not pursue this here.

right lines, an immediate explanation suggests itself for the unavailability of pre-verbal atonic pronouns: if no structure above MoodP is projected, then no suitable head is available for the pronouns to cliticize onto, for example, AgrS° or an infinitival Mood°. The post-verbal tonic pronouns that are licensed by true imperatives are then presumably clitic on the verb in Mood° or proclitic on some lower null functional head, possibly AgrO°. Note that the true imperative and the post-verbal pronouns are inseparable.

\[
\text{(8)} \quad \text{Mood}°/\text{AgrO}° \\
\text{Spec} \quad \text{Mood}°/\text{AgrO}° \\
\text{Regarde-moi} \\
\text{Donne-le lui}
\]

Zanuttini’s analysis has certain explanatory potential:

a. It explains the root nature of true imperatives. Given that these verb forms do not project to CP and given that certain embedded contexts are characterized by their dependence on CP, the absence of embedded true imperatives can be attributed to the fact that CP is not projected.

b. It explains the morphological poverty of true imperatives cross-linguistically when contrasted with surrogate imperatives and other verbal paradigms more generally. (On this issue, see Rivero’s analysis discussed in section 2.1.1.2.)

c. It explains why the complement pronouns in (5a) are post-verbal, that is, tonic. Pre-verbal atonic pronouns are pro-clitic on some suitable inflectional head. Since inflectional categories above MoodP fail to project in positive imperatives, and assuming that an imperative Mood° is not a

12. Admittedly, a weakness of any analysis of the distinction between the French imperatives in (5) and those in (6) based on movement to AgrS° versus no movement to AgrS° is the fact that the verb morphology is identical in both cases. This is all the more surprising since, in a number of the languages described by Zanuttini (1991) and numerous others, there are clear morphological differences between true and surrogate imperatives. The French imperatives in (5) and (6) are morphologically reduced, the verb arguably comprising nothing more than a stem. This fact could be taken to indicate the lack of movement to T° or AgrS°. This conclusion could be challenged by the second person plural imperatives in (i):

\[
\text{(i) a. Regardez-moi pas. / Donnez-le lui pas.} \\
\text{b. Me regardez pas. / Le lui donnez pas.} \\
(= \text{(5b) and (6b) but second person plural rather than singular})
\]

However, in the context of parallel number marking distinctions on Spanish imperatives, Zanuttini (1996) suggests that it is in fact debatable whether the plural marking should be considered an agreement morpheme. The distinction between the examples in (i) and text examples (5b) and (6b) might not therefore imply movement to AgrS°.
suitable host for clitics, there is no pre-verbal position for the pronouns to pro-cliticize onto; hence the ungrammaticality of (6a) and the obligatory post-verbal position of the complement pronouns with positive imperatives.

d. It explains why, in (6), the properties of the pronouns and ne correspond to their properties in finite clauses. In structural terms, at least, the strings in (6) are AgrSPs, just like finite clauses. Pronouns are therefore pre-verbal, and ne is available but not compulsory.

e. It explains why bipartite sentential negation using ne...pas cannot occur in (5c): since ne and, according to Pollock (1989), pas are generated as head and specifier of NegP, respectively, and if we accept Zanuttini’s suggestion that NegP is not projected in the context of true imperatives, the unavailability of bipartite negation in (5c) is predicted.

Yet there is a problem:

f. If Pollock’s analysis of ne and pas as head and specifier of NegP underly-ingly is adopted, Zanuttini’s model fails to account for the grammaticality of the negated true imperative in (5b). I assume that (5b) is a true imperative on the basis of the position of the pronouns: they are post-verbal, as in (5a); the unavailability of ne also suggests the verbs in (5) are true imperatives. Zanuttini’s model therefore predicts that NegP is not projected in (5b). Nevertheless, the verb is negated with pas. If pas is generated in SpecNegP, how can pas occur in (5b) where NegP is not projected? Do we reject Zanuttini’s characterization of the difference between true and surrogate imperatives? Or do we reconsider Pollock’s analysis of pas base-generated in SpecNegP?

I suggest that the latter option is better motivated, given (a) the otherwise attractive explanatory power of Zanuttini’s model of (negative) true imperatives, (b) the reasons already given for suspecting that pas is generated lower than SpecNegP and, in the specific context of sentential negation, subsequently raised into SpecNegP, and (c) the discussion in section 2.1.2. If we abandon Pollock’s (1989) claim that pas originates in SpecNegP, the presence of pas in the negative imperatives in (5)–in which we have reason to believe no NegP is in fact generated–ceases to be a problem. I suggest, rather, that, in (5b), pas occupies its base position, namely adjoined to VP. Crucially, the VP-adjoined position is lower than MoodP and therefore indifferent to the presence or absence of (TP and) NegP. The absence of these two functional projections is then not expected to prevent the appearance of pas.

In fact, the problem outlined in (f) was recognized by Zanuttini herself. To solve it, she too assumes that the position occupied by pas in (5b) is lower than TP/NegP. To be precise, she suggests that post-verbal negative markers such as

13. Why imperative Mood should be an unsuitable host for pre-verbal clitic pronouns should be investigated.
pas in French should be analyzed as specifiers of a second NegP projection, NegP-2, which is distinct from NegP(-1) in that it is below TP (and, presumably, MoodP) and therefore insensitive to the presence or absence of TP. (In Zanuttini 1994b: 430, NegP-1 and NegP-2 are renamed PolP and NegP, respectively; in Zanuttini 1997a, there are four NegPs.) In French, then, according to Zanuttini (1991), ne occupies Neg*-1, while pas occupies Spec NegP-2. In true (negative) imperatives, NegP-1 fails to be projected (due, according to Zanuttini 1991 and the conception of clausal hierarchy in terms of strict selection, to the absence of TP); hence the unavailability of ne in (5c). In contrast, NegP-2 can be projected in true imperatives (since it is independent of TP); hence the availability of pas in (5b).

I suggest this proposal has at least two weaknesses. First, on an empirical footing, the hypothesis that there are two NegP projections implies that overt negative markers occupying Neg*-2 and Spec NegP-1 should be attested, that is, head negative markers located in the lower NegP and phrasal negative markers in the higher NegP, both in isolation and in combination. However, the predicted multiplicity of negative markers (and combinations of negative markers) seems not to be a characteristic of natural language. In other words, while Zanuttini’s model leads one to expect to find the familiar pre-verbal X* and post-verbal XP negative markers co-occurring with post-verbal X* and pre-verbal XP negative markers, in fact one does not, a fact that casts doubt on Zanuttini’s suggestion that NegP-1 and NegP-2 are both available to UG in the first place (see also Robbers 1992).14

Second, and more conceptually, in a model admitting co-occurring NegP-1 and NegP-2, one might wonder what the respective contributions of each NegP projection are. Quite apart from the strangeness of an analysis in which a unique semantico-syntactic feature is encoded in two distinct functional projections within clausal structure, if each were independently to be headed by a negative feature, one would expect the two to cancel each other out (as in the Modern French examples discussed in section 1.2.2). However, co-occurring ne and pas do not and never have resulted in logical Double Negation in French. Yet if the two NegPs do not each contribute a polarity feature to the clause, it is difficult to see how one could motivate them both in the first place, at least in conceptual terms.

The alternative proposed here, namely that post-verbal negative markers such as pas are base-generated neither as the specifier of NegP-1 nor as the specifier of NegP-2 (the very existence of which I reject anyway) but rather as adjoined adverbs, is better motivated in that it avoids both problems raised in the previous paragraphs. First, it explains why the full range of (four) overt negative markers do not co-occur cross-linguistically. Zanuttini’s SpecNegP-2 is in fact analyzed as an adverb in an adjoined position. The absence of Neg*-2, which Zanuttini’s model fails to predict, is a direct consequence of my proposal, because NegP-2

14. Note that, even in Navajo (see footnote 6) and Fàn (see chapter 3, footnote 10), in which a pre-verbal XP negative marker co-occurs with a post-verbal X* negative marker, the predicted pattern of co-occurrence is not attested.
is not posited. Second, the absence of logical Double Negation in varieties with bipartite negation (analyzed by Zanuttini in terms of NegP-1 co-occurring with NegP-2) also follows from my model, since bipartite negation is not accounted for in terms of two distinct NegP projections. In conclusion, then, if I assume that pas is generated as an adverb, I may be able to hang on to Zanuttini’s analysis of the distinction between true and surrogate imperatives in Romance, including French, even though there are no morphological differences between the two sets of imperative. (See footnote 12.)

Note that this analysis also goes some way to explaining why the imperative in (9) is interpreted as being negative, even though it contains no overt negative marker. The imperative verb appears with a pre-verbal pronoun, which, as already discussed, is incompatible with a positive imperative. The negative interpretation is therefore imposed on the utterance as a consequence of word order, and the overt negative marker(s) (ne) . . . pas are redundant.

(9) T’ inquiète!
You worry
‘Don’t worry!’

To reiterate the conclusions of these sections, I have adopted a syntactic analysis of true imperatives in which these verb forms occupy a functional head very low in clause structure. Crucially, true imperatives are characterized by a truncated tree structure; in my model, CP, AgrSP, NegP, and TP fail to project. This analysis, while attractive for a number of reasons, is problematic when confronted with the assumption that pas is generated in SpecNegP, since the failure of NegP to project should entail the incompatibility of true imperatives and pas, contrary to fact. I have interpreted this state of affairs as evidence to support my claim that pas is not in fact generated in SpecNegP and that, rather, this element is generated in an adjoined position reflecting its fundamental modifying function.

A few comments are in order about the contribution of pas in the true imperatives discussed earlier. I have previously assumed that pas raises into SpecNegP to mark sentential negation (and license ne). In the case of the true negative imperative in (5b), pas does not raise to SpecNegP; indeed, NegP is not projected. The absence of ne is therefore expected. The issue remains whether or not (5b) is an instance of sentential negation. Recall that I have been assuming Hagegman’s (1995) characterization of negative clauses in terms of the appearance of the feature [+NEG] on a functional head in the extended domain of V. In the discussion of (5b), I suggested that pas remains VP-joined, a position from which it has not so far been able to mark sentential negation. One might therefore want to conclude that (6b) contrasts with (5b) in that, while (6b) is an instance of sentential negation, (5b) is not.

2.1.2 Diachronic evidence: pas-placement relative to lexical infinitives
In this section, I argue that the analysis of the syntax of *pas* proposed in section 2.1 immediately lends itself to an account of the historical development of the distribution of *pas* with respect to lexical infinitives.\(^{15}\) The data in this section come largely from recent work by such authors as Paul Hirschbühler and Marie Labelle (henceforth, H&L) (1992a, b, 1993, 1994a, b), France Martineau (1990, 1994), and Elizabeth Pearce (1990, 1991, 1993), who have looked at the diachronic development of the syntax of *pas*, in particular its position with respect to infinitives, especially lexical infinitives. (See also Pollock 1997a: chapter 13.)

From a diachronic perspective, there are two clear pieces of evidence that suggest that *pas* has not always occupied SpecNegP at S-structure and that consequently cast some doubt on the claim that this element originates in SpecNegP in the modern language. Prior to its advent as main sentential negator, the position of *pas* relative to infinitival verbs and the fact that *pas* could be fronted for emphatic purposes both suggest this element is best analyzed in the same way as a number of other adverbs, rather than as an element uniquely associated with (Spec)NegP. I suggest that an analysis of the syntax of *pas* in terms of adjunction in the base followed from about the seventeenth century by increasingly compulsory raising into SpecNegP is well placed to account for not only the synchronic facts but also the diachronic development.

The first piece of evidence concerns the relative order of *pas* and lexical infinitives. While, in the modern language, *pas* obligatorily precedes a lexical infinitive (see section 1.1.7.3), this has not always been the case. Prior to the seventeenth century (when *ne* was capable of marking sentential negation on its own, that is, when the appearance of *pas* in negative clauses was optional\(^{16}\)), the two orderings illustrated in (10) (H&L’s 1993: 1 (1)) were attested (Pearce 1993: 3–4), although the *ne V pas* order illustrated in (10a) was more common than the *ne pas V* order—obligatory in the modern language—illustrated in (10b) (H&L 1993: 3). During the seventeenth century, there was a clear shift from the *ne V pas* order in (10a) to the *ne pas V* order in (10b).

\(^{15}\) During the periods in the history of French that are relevant to the discussion in this section, *pas* competed with *point* as an “intensifier” for negative *ne* in the absence of “negative” pronouns and adverbs such as the ones discussed in chapters 4 and 5. Consequently, the observations made here about word order apply to both *pas* and *point*, even where explicit reference is only made to *pas*. (See Price 1984: 252–57, chapter 19, for discussion of an initial difference between *pas* and *point*.) Note that, contrary to the comments in Yaeger-Dror (1997: 27fn3), *pas* is not a reduced form of *point*. See footnote 25.

\(^{16}\) See sections 3.1.1, 3.1.2, and 3.5.2, as well as section 4.3.2, for discussion of the diachronic development of the system of sentential negation in French.

(10) a. . . . c’est de NE S’ ABANDONNER PAS au plaisir de les suivre. 
   it is of *ne* REF Fl abandon *pas* to-the pleasure of them follow
   ‘. . . is not giving in to the pleasure of following them.’

   b. Nous fûmes bien malheureux de NE PAS T’ EM M ENER . . .
   we were well unhappy of *ne pas* you take
   ‘We were very unhappy not taking you (with us) . . .’
H&L’s (1993: 4, 1994a, b) statistical data suggest that the “modern” construction, that is, the ne pas V order in (10b), was used just 30 to 40 percent of the time at the beginning of the seventeenth century, but 80 to 90 percent of the time by the end of the seventeenth century.\footnote{17}

Under the assumption (on which see my later discussion) that Verb Movement patterns remained constant during this time, that is, that lexical infinitives occupy a position below NegP throughout (as argued for the modern language in section 1.1.7.3), the earlier order clearly suggests that pas does not occupy SpecNegP in (10a). The shift from (10a) to (10b) can therefore be attributed to a progressive development whereby pas is increasingly obliged to raise to SpecNegP (at S-structure). Given that I have so far motivated pas-raising to SpecNegP by the need to mark sentential negation, namely to endow Neg with the feature [+NEG], the shift from the order in (10a) to the one in (10b) can be interpreted in association with the progressive weakening or “denegativization” of ne and the concomitant “negativization” of pas. This conclusion, as well as the association of ne “denegativization” with pas “negativization”, is supported by the coincidence of two developments with the shift from (10a) to (10b), namely (a) the loss of the ability of ne to function as the sole overt marker of sentential negation and (b) the shift in the interpretation of pas from an emphatic item to a negative item, according to Price (1993) and Posner (1985).\footnote{18}

The second piece of evidence relevant to the base position of pas comes from a third possible—albeit marked—order alongside (10a, b), illustrated in (11) ((11a) is taken from Martineau 1994: 59 (14), and H&L 1993: 15 (9a); (11b) is from H&L 1993: 16 (9c)), in which pas/poincjt actually precede the main negative marker ne:\footnote{19}

\begin{verbatim}
(11) a. . . . affin de . . . , PAS NE TRAVAILLER, POINCT NE ME SOUCIER.
       in-order of pas ne work-INF point ne me worry-INF
       ‘. . . so as to . . . , not to work, not to worry.’
\end{verbatim}

17. Given that the data on which these statistics are based are literary in nature, they are of course unlikely to be an accurate reflection (in terms of absolute percentages) of vernacular usage. However, the clear shift in literary usage represented by these figures is likely to reflect a parallel (possibly earlier) shift, in relative terms, in vernacular usage. Given the conservatism of written language, these shifts in absolute terms undoubtedly predated the seventeenth century. See footnote 20.

18. The issue arises as to the cause-and-effect relationship between the “denegativization” of ne and the “negativization” of pas. It seems to me that further study is needed on this issue, and I hope to be able to address it in future work. What seems clear is that the relationship between X\textsuperscript{§} and XP negative markers is often mediated by non-overt operators. I suspect, therefore, that any causality as might exist between the “denegativization” of ne and the “negativization” of pas is likely to be indirect, that is, mediated by such a non-overt operator.

19. Yvon (1948: 22) gives the following Old French examples from finite clauses:

\begin{verbatim}
(i) Pas ne vus esmaiez!  (Vie de Saint Alexis, v 681)
   pas ne you dismay
   ‘Don’t fret!’
(ii) Ço est Climborins qui pas ne fut produme. (Chanson de Roland, v 1528)
    It is C. who pas ne was worthy
    ‘He is C. and he was not a man of worth.’
\end{verbatim}
b. Il nous faut . . . partir, et nous attendre ici nos enemies.

‘It is necessary for us . . . to leave, and not wait here for our enemies.’

Once again, assuming constant Verb Movement patterns and elicitization of *ne* to AgrS’, these data suggest that *pas/poin(c)ter* do not occupy SpecNegP.

Recent accounts of these historical facts with a view to relating them to the situation in the modern language by H&L (1992a, b), Martineau (1990), Pearce (1990, 1991), and Pollock (1997a) have argued that the contrast between (10a) and (10b) can be attributed to differences in infinitival Verb Movement patterns. However, the fact that *pas* was the only negative adverb affected by the shift from (10a) to (10b) during the seventeenth century (H&L 1993: 2fn3, 13) suggests that Verb Movement is unlikely to have been responsible for the change. Note also that differing infinitival Verb Movement patterns alone are insufficient to account for the possibility of the examples in (11) or the finite examples in footnote 19.

In contrast, I suggest, following H&L (1993, 1994a, b) and Pearce (1993), that, instead of being the result of differing Verb Movement patterns, the contrast is due, rather, to a change in the (surface) position of the negative *pas*. As H&L (1993: 5) put it: “We now favor the idea that the change from *ne V pas* to *ne pas V* in the case of lexical verbs reflects a change in the position of the p-negative adverbs [i.e., *pas/poin(c)ter*] and not in the extent of [infinitival, PR] Verb Movement.” In the “old” system, illustrated in (10a), Neg can be endowed with the feature [+NEG] without the negative operator *pas* raising to SpecNegP. Consequently, *pas* was able to appear in situ in the VP-adjoined position. Given V-raising out of VP, minimally to Mood, *pas* then follows the verb. In contrast, in the “new” system, illustrated in (10b), Neg cannot be endowed with the feature [+NEG] without a negative operator raising to SpecNegP. For the reasons detailed at the start of this chapter, this has the consequence that, in (10b), *pas* raises to SpecNegP and precedes the infinitive.

The discussion in the previous paragraph does not in fact follow H&L’s (1993, 1994a, b) analysis fully. For me, the contrast between (10a) and (10b) revolves around the superficial position of *pas*; it is generated adjoined to VP in both cases and either does or doesn’t raise to SpecNegP. In contrast, H&L suggest that it is the base position of *pas* that changes; although generated in an adjoined position in (10a), *pas* is generated directly in SpecNegP in (10b), as in Pollock’s (1989) analysis of Modern French. In section 2.1, raising of *pas* into SpecNegP in the modern language was motivated by the need to mark sentential negation: given that, in Modern French, *pas* is inherently negative, it bears the feature [+NEG] and can endow Neg with that feature via DA after raising into the specifier position. The fact that this movement seems once to have been unnecessary/unavailable/optional can be explained if *ne* is deemed formerly to have been inherently negative, an approach supported by the facts that *ne* could mark sentential negation on its own and *pas* was interpreted as an emphatic item.
Within the terms of an analysis along these lines, obligatory raising of *pas* from its base position to SpecNegP and, hence, the shift from *ne V pas* to *ne pas V* in the context of lexical infinitives is seen as a consequence of the process by which *pas* increasingly took over the role of primary sentence negator from *ne*. This approach is supported by the following related facts (H&L 1993: 15): first, the loss of (10a) and (11) coincides with the loss of the ability of *ne* to mark negation on its own; second, the loss of (10a) and (11) coincides with the shift in the interpretation of *pas* from an emphatic/polarity item to a strictly negative element. According to H&L’s (1993: 15) interpretation of the statistical data, the critical period is the beginning of the seventeenth century.20

In summary, H&L’s idea that the change from *ne V pas* to *ne pas V* in the context of lexical infinitives is the consequence of a change in the base position of the negative requires assumptions in addition to those required by the analysis proposed here in which the change in relative position of the two items is seen as a consequence of increasingly obligatory raising to SpecNegP, that is, a change in surface position only. H&L’s analysis requires reanalysis of *pas/point* from an adverb to a SpecNegP-associated element. In addition, given that the shift from (10a) to (10b) is progressive, that is, given that two orders exist simultaneously during an intermediate period, H&L’s analysis assumes a period of dual classification. In contrast, my proposed analysis assumes nothing more than the increasing “negativization” of *pas* (and *point*) and “denegativization” of *ne*. The need for a functional head in clausal structure to bear the feature [+NEG] to mark sentential negation (Haegeman 1995) does the rest, in that, in the absence of an inherently negative marker in Neg* and a suitable non-overt operator, an overt [+NEG] XP will be obliged to raise into specifier position. The shift from (10a) to (10b) then falls out directly. The period during which *pas/point* appear to have had a dual classification can then be viewed as an ambivalence with respect to the status of *ne* ([+NEG] or not) and *pas* (negative quantifier or emphatic NPI) (H&L 1993: 17; Price 1993), rather than ambivalence with respect to the position in which *pas* is generated. I therefore conclude that the diachronic developments discussed in this section are best analyzed in terms of increasingly compulsory *pas*-raising to SpecNegP and that, as claimed in section 2.1, *pas* is generated in an adjoined adverbial position throughout.

### 2.2 Configuration 2: *pas* and indefinite direct objects

Here I consider a syntactic context representing an exception to the analysis of *pas* proposed and supported so far. Where the clause (negated by *pas*) contains a transitive verb that governs an indefinite direct object, it is argued that, exceptionally, *pas* is not generated in an adjoined position. Rather, in this context, *pas* functions as what Adrian Battye termed a “nominal quantifier”.

---

20. Posner (1985: 184) agrees that the changes coincide but suggests a critical period two centuries earlier: “The obligatory intercalation of the ‘forclusif’ between the auxiliary or modal and the non-finite lexical verb dates from the late fourteenth century: before then its position was freer and it had emphatic import.” See footnote 17.
Preliminaries: partitive and pseudopartitive direct objects

Indefinite nominal expressions can take on one of three forms: either they contain a singular indefinite article, or they exhibit a partitive or pseudopartitive structure, as illustrated in small capitals in (12a–c), respectively:

(12) a. Marie achète UN LIVRE. (singular indefinite)
M. buys a book
‘M. is buying a book.’

b. Marie achète DES LIVRES. (partitive)
M. buys of-the books
‘M. is buying (some) books.’

c. Marie a beaucoup acheté DE LIVRES. (pseudopartitive)
M. has lots bought of books
‘M. has bought lots of books.’

Ignoring the irrelevant (12a), I concentrate on the contrast between the partitive in (12b) and the pseudopartitive in (12c). The partitive structure in (12b) is fairly unanimously analyzed as being (at least) the syntactic combination of the preposition de ‘of’ and a definite nominal expression. In contrast, the pseudopartitive structure illustrated in (12c) has generated considerable debate within the literature.\(^{21}\)

Battye (1991: 38) assumes that partitives have the structure in (13). These indefinites are introduced by a non-overt D\(^+\) and N\(^-\);\(^{22}\) the complement of the latter is a PP headed by de ‘of’ which, in turn, selects a definite DP. I assume that a partitive structure does not have particular licensing conditions since its distribution is generally unrestricted. A partitive structure can appear in subject position (14a), direct (12b) and indirect (14b) object positions, and as the complement of a preposition (14c).

\(^{21}\) See Englebert (1993) for review and discussion.

\(^{22}\) In section 2.2.3 and footnote 28, I consider the possibility, following Lyons (1994a), that, as indefinites, partitives lack a DP shell altogether. The exact nature of the non-overt N\(^-\) is not relevant for my purposes, but see Battye (1991) for a proposal and Rowlett (1993a) for discussion. See also Kornfilt (1990) for discussion of partitives with non-overt heads in Turkish.
In contrast, pseudopartitive structures have a restricted distribution. They can appear only when licensed by another element. In (12c), for example, the pseudopartitive structure is licensed by beaucoup ‘lots’. Witness the ungrammaticality of (15), which is identical to (12c) modulo beaucoup.

(15) *Marie a acheté DE LIVRES.
M. has bought of books

I leave discussion of the internal structure of pseudopartitives until section 2.2.3. In the next section, I consider in some detail their licensing conditions and their relevance to negation.

Obenauer’s quantification at a distance

2.2.2

and Battye’s nominal quantification

Work by Obenauer (1983, 1984) and Battye (1987, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1995) suggests that pas and a number of other quantificational items, such as peu ‘a little’, trop ‘too much’, beaucoup ‘lots’, and assez ‘enough’, have a dual function in Modern French. In addition to being adverbs, as in (16), these items can appear as quantifiers within indefinite nominal expressions, as in (17).
23. Obenauer (1983: 68, 1984: 156) suggests that QàD structures are regarded as somewhat *relâché* ‘loose’ by purists.
What Battye (1991: 23) actually says with respect to QàD structures is that the quantifiers "seemingly 'float' backwards off the noun phrase in direct object position". I have interpreted this as a movement approach to QàD, although Battye himself does not propose any structural analysis of the mechanics involved.

24. What Battye (1991: 23) actually says with respect to QàD structures is that the quantifiers "seemingly ‘float’ backwards off the noun phrase in direct object position". I have interpreted this as a movement approach to QàD, although Battye himself does not propose any structural analysis of the mechanics involved.

25. In section 2.2.4, I suggest that pas should be included in the list of nominal quantifiers. A necessary corollary of Battye’s (movement) analysis (according to Battye 1995) is that the quantifier that appears, on the surface, either attached to or detached from the nominal it intuitively quantifies over must also be able to function independently as an adverbial. Informally speaking, nominal quantification and QàD are parasitic on VP-adjunction: an element cannot function as a nominal quantifier unless it can also function as a VP-adverb. The possibility of (16) is a necessary (although not sufficient) prerequisite for the possibility of (17) and (18). This is not to say that the implicature/corollary is bidirectional. As Milner (1978: 690–92) illustrates, it is not the case that all adverbial elements that can function as in (16) can also function in association with the indefinite direct object of a transitive verb as in (17) and (18). In the modern language, although both énormément and abondamment ‘a lot’ can appear as VP-adverbs, as in (20), the former can appear in association with an indefinite direct object (both...
QåD and non-QåD), as in (21), while the latter cannot, as in (22), (taken from Milner 1978: 691 (53)):

(20) a. J’ai énormément lu.
    I have a-lot read
    ‘I have read a lot.’

(21) a. J’ai lu énormément de livres. (non-QåD)
    I have (a-lot) read (a-lot) of books
    ‘I have read lots of books.’

b. J’ai énormément lu de livres. (QåD)

(22) a. *J’ai lu abondamment de livres. (non-QåD)
    *I have (a-lot) read (a-lot) of books
    ‘I have read lots of books.’

b. *J’ai abondamment lu de livres. (QåD)

Indeed, Milner uses these distributions to argue, contra Kayne (1975), that QåD structures are derived from non-QåD structures. His argument centers on the ungrammaticality of (22b), which contrasts with the acceptability of (20b). Kayne (1975) argues that elements like énormément and abondamment are base-generated in VP-initial position not only in (20) but also in (21b) and in (the ungrammatical) (22b). If this is indeed the case, we have no way of accounting for why (20a), (20b), and (21b) are grammatical while (22b) alone is not. If, alternatively, and as Milner proposes, the QåD strings in (21b) and (22b) are derived from the non-QåD strings in (21a) and (22a), then the unacceptability of the QåD example in (22b) containing abondamment can be accounted for in straightforward fashion. This particular element cannot appear in a (derived) QåD structure for the simple reason that it cannot appear in the (almost) equivalent (base-generated) non-QåD structure. So, in Kayne’s analysis, (22a) and (22b) have to be explained independent of each other; in an analysis in which (22b) is derived from (22a), only one explanation is required. I take this as strong evidence to suggest that QåD is a derived word order in French.

Analysis

2.2.3

With respect to the syntactic category of quantifiers such as beaucoeurp, Battye (1991) claims that, unlike other quantifiers in French (whereby the term “quantifier” represents an intuitively functional rather than a strictly syntactic characterization), beaucoeurp and so on are neither adjectives (cf. quelques ‘some’) nor determiners (cf. plusieurs ‘several’). Rather, Battye (1991) exploits Abney’s (1987) DP hypothesis to argue that these elements are in fact nominals, generated as the head N° within an indefinite DP, as in (23):

(23) [DP {D' Ø [NP {N° [N beaucoeurp ] [ (de) NP ]]}]}]
As nominals, beaucoup and the other terms absorb the Case assigned to the indefinite DP. Consequently, while they take an NP complement, the Case-marking preposition de ‘of’ must be inserted to avoid a Case filter violation. The structure in (23) seems not to pose any problems for the non-QàD configurations in (17). How, then, can the QàD configurations in (18) be derived from a structure such as (23)? While Battye assumes (or, rather, implies—see footnote 24) that examples such as those in (18) are derived from those in (17), he offers no concrete analysis of how the derivation might proceed. In Rowlett (1993a: 58–63), I address the issue, and I present the essential points of that analysis here.

There is a major difference between the underlying structure assumed by Battye, that is, (23), and the one assumed by Obenauer. Obenauer assumes the structure in (24):

(24) [NP [QP beaucoup, etc. | [ de N’]]]

The major difference concerns the status, in X’-theoretic terms, of the quantifier. In (23), it is a head; in (24), it is a maximal projection. The difference is significant if one is to pursue an analysis in which (18) is derived from (17), that is, if QàD is to be derived from non-QàD in terms of Move-α, the versatility of which is determined in part by principles of X’-syntax: head movement is more restricted than XP movement. Crucially, head movement is subject to the HMC (Travis 1984), while XP movement is not.26

In Rowlett (1993a), I followed Battye in assuming an underlying structure such as (23) in which the quantifier is the head of the construction. This left me with the problem of deriving QàD from non-QàD. In concrete terms, the quantifier, under N’, cannot be extracted directly from its containing maximal projection to its final left-peripheral position. To solve this problem, I suggested that the complement of the nominal quantifier, that is, the adnominal NP preceded by de ‘of’, should first be extraposed, or right-adjoined to VP, as in (25) (after Rowlett 1993a: 60 (31)). Once the adnominal NP has been extraposed, I suggested that the indefinite DP containing the quantifier itself is free to move independently. I assumed that the DP moves to the left-peripheral A’ scope position, as in (26), (after Rowlett 1993a: 61 (32)). I further assumed that the extraposed NP (NP) can properly bind its trace (t) by reconstruction of DP.

The obvious weakness in this structural analysis is the (rather inelegant) need to extrapose the NP complement of beaucoup prior to raising the nominal quantifier itself. In addition to its lack of elegance, though, it could be argued that the proposed analysis makes an incorrect prediction. More precisely, one might expect the extraposed constituent, NP, in (25) and (26), to be an island for extraction. Yet this is not the case, as witnessed by the grammaticality of the QàD example in (27), derived from (28), in which the topic has been extracted from what, in my analysis, would be an extraposed constituent, NP, as illustrated in

---

26. A second significant difference between (23) and (24) concerns the nature of the lexical head of the nominal construction. In (23), it is the quantifier; in (24), it is the quantified noun.
the simplified structure in (29). Hence, there are good reasons to doubt the validity of this analysis of QâD.

(25)

(26)

(27) C’est de Zola Op que Jean a beaucoup lu de livres.
It is of Z. that J. have lots read of books
‘Z.’s the one J. has read lots of books by.’

(28) . . . Jean a beaucoup lu [ de livres Op ]
As an alternative to the underlying structure assumed by Battye, one might maintain Obenauer’s assumption that the nominal quantifier is a full XP constituent, even where it quantifies over an indefinite direct object, i.e., even in (17). To capture this, one could assume that—rather than being generated as the head N in an indefinite DP—beaucoup is generated in a specifier position within the indefinite nominal. This analysis is, in fact, more in line with Battye’s own original (1987, 1995) work on nominal quantification. Working prior to the widespread awareness of Abney’s DP hypothesis, Battye suggests that nominal quantifiers appear in SpecNP. It was only later that he modified his analysis by placing these elements in N°. Given the profusion of functional projections currently being proposed in the literature and not just in the context of clauses, it may well be the case that nominal quantifiers occupy an extended specifier position of NP (in the sense of Grimshaw 1993), rather than SpecNP itself. An immediately obvious candidate would be the specifier of a number phrase: SpecNumP. With nominal quantifiers such as beaucoup in SpecNumP, the obligatory indefinite nature of such nominal expressions might be attributed to the spec-head relationship between the quantifier and the non-overt head Num° (see Lyons 1994a). SpecDP would not be a possible position for these nominal quantifiers in a model such as the one proposed by Lyons, since he assumes that DP is not projected in indefinite nominal expressions.

27. I am grateful to David Adger for discussing these issues with me.
The Case-theoretic features of pseudopartitives, that is, the obligatory insertion of the prepositional Case-marker *de* ‘of’ before the adnominal NP, could receive an explanation almost identical to the previous analysis. With *beaucoup* in specifier position (such as SpecNumP) absorbing the Case assigned by the transitive verb under government,\(^{28}\) *de* ‘of’ is still required to see that the (otherwise Case-less) adnominal NP does not violate the Case filter.

The attraction of such an analysis in which the nominal quantifier is an XP in SpecNumP is that initial extraposition of the adnominal NP is not required to allow extraction of the nominal quantifier from within the direct object to the left-peripheral A’ scope position. Instead, extraction can proceed as in (30):

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{(30)} \\
&\text{VP} \\
&\quad\text{XP}_1 \quad \text{VP} \\
&\quad\text{beaucoup} \quad V' \\
&\quad\quad V^0 \quad \text{NumP} \\
&\quad\quad \quad \text{Spec} \quad \text{Num'} \\
&\quad\quad\quad\quad t_i \quad \text{Num}^o \quad \text{NP} \\
&\quad\quad\quad\quad \text{de NP}
\end{align*}
\]

The analysis of *beaucoup* and similar terms as syntactic specifiers rather than heads has the added advantage of tying their syntax to their semantics.

---

28. It is interesting to compare this proposal with traditional analyses of Exceptional Case Marking (ECM), illustrated in (i):

(i) The villagers believed John to be a liar.

Examples of ECM such as (i) are often assumed to have a number of properties. The complement of the ECM verb *believe* is a nonfinite clause; the subject of that clause, *John*, is (consequently) not assigned nominative Case by the embedded AgrS\(^o\). Rather, it is “exceptionally” assigned accusative Case by the ECM verb under government. Government is deemed to be possible because, first, CP is not assumed to be projected by the embedded nonfinite clause and, second, the embedded AgrSP fails to count as a barrier against outside government due to the defective status of (nonfinite) AgrS\(^o\).

Compare this with the proposed analysis of nominal quantification. The nominal quantifier to be Case-marked is in SpecNumP, yet Case-marked by an external governor. This could be argued to be possible given, first, that DP is not assumed to be projected by the indefinite nominal expression and, second, that NumP fails to count as a barrier given the defective status of the indefinite NumP.

This proposal is supported by work by Lyons (1994a), who suggests that indefinites are characterized by their failure to project to the DP level. Further, the parallel between (non)finiteness/nomina- tive Case assignment and (in)definiteness/genitive Case assignment is attested in English nominals. In English, only definite D’ can assign genitive Case to its “subject”, arguably in the same way that only finite AgrS’ can assign nominative Case to its “subject”. Pushed to its logical conclusion, one would also have to conclude that, like nominative Case, genitive Case is structural rather than inherent.
Semantically, *beaucoup* and other quantifiers fulfill a specific function with respect to the indefinite direct object: specifier positions are typically occupied by constituents that fulfill a particular function with respect to the relevant maximal projection. By associating these nominal quantifiers with SpecNumP, semantics and syntax meet.

Further evidence suggesting nominal quantifiers are maximal projections like specifiers rather than heads comes from the fact that they can be modified, as in (31), which is crucially not synonymous with (32). In (31), the intensifier *bien* modifies *beaucoup*; in (32), it is emphatic. (See also chapter 1, example (20).)

(31) Jean a acheté [bien beaucoup] de livres.
   J. has bought well *beaucoup* of books
   ‘J. bought a hell of a lot of books.’
(32) Jean a bien acheté beaucoup de livres.
   J. has well bought *beaucoup* of books
   ‘J. has indeed bought lots of books.’

Concluding, then, I adopt this second analysis of nominal quantifiers. I assume that, in the nominal structure:

1. Nominal quantifiers bear the categorial features of nouns, i.e., [¬V, +N].
2. They bear the functional syntacticosemantic feature [+QUANTIFICATION].
3. They appear as the syntactic specifier of Num”; DP is not projected.
4. They are compatible with QâD.
5. They can function, independent of an indefinite nominal, as left-peripheral adverbs.

### Pas as a nominal quantifier

2.2.4

In this section, I argue—following Battye (1995) himself—that *pas* belongs to Battye’s class of nominal quantifier along with *beaucoup* and similar items and that, consequently, the syntax of *pas* should be modeled on the analysis proposed in the previous section. In other words, we argue that, where *pas* ne-
Winters (1987), within a cognitive account of the development of negation in French, suggests that the pseudopartitive structures, that is, [Ø de N], discussed in section 2.2.3, and licensed by negative markers such as pas (and the older point and goutte) are themselves indication that the negative markers were (and continue to be) nouns. As Winters points out (1987: 36), noun-noun expressions have, from the earliest evidence to the present day, been constructed with de ‘of’.

---

(33) Quoiqu’ ils eussent
However they have-IMP:SUBJ

une liberté plus absolue et plus dangereuse que P. et V.,
point de famille,
pas même un chien pour les avertir du danger,

a freedom more absolute and more dangerous than P. and V.,
point de mères vigilantes et tendres pour les former à la vertu,
point of mothers vigilant and tender for them train to the virtue
ils ne firent aucun genre de chute.

point de serviteur dévoué pour les chercher le soir et les
return to-the cradle
pas même un chien pour les avertir du danger,

pas même un chien pour les avertir du danger,

ils ne firent aucun genre de chute.

‘Although they had a more absolute and dangerous freedom than P. and V.,
no family, no vigilant and tender mothers to guide them toward virtue, no
devoted servants to collect them every evening and return them to the cradle, not even a dog to ward them from danger, they came to no harm.’

In other words, as Yvon (1948: 21) puts it:

Il ne serait pas déraisonnable de considérer comme complément d’objet les
groupes point de famille, etc., dans lesquels point ayant valeur de nom
aurait pour complément famille, etc., et se rattacherait moins étroitement au
verbe.
It would not be unreasonable to treat the phrases *point de famille*, etc., as the objects, whereby the nominal *point* would take *famille*, etc., as its complement and would be less intimately associated with the verb.

While I have decided to reject an account whereby nominal quantifiers are analyzed as the lexical head of the construction, I argue later that the negative markers, such as *pas*, are generated within the nominal expression (NumP) in direct object position. First, I note the syntactic similarities between *pas* and the other nominal quantifiers (section 2.2.4.1); then I show that extraction facts suggest a derivational account of *pas* (section 2.2.4.2).

### 2.2.4.1 Evidence: *pas* behaves like *beaucoup*, etc.

First, like *beaucoup* and other quantifiers and as predicted by Battye (1995) and discussed in section 2.2.2, *pas* can be used, not only in association with indefinite direct objects, but also independently, as an adverb, in clauses that do not contain indefinite direct objects. As the data in (34) and (35) show, *pas* not only fills the same slot, in linear terms, at least, as *beaucoup*; it also fulfills the same adverbial function.

(34) a. Pierrette voyage en France.
    b. Pierrette voyage beaucoup en France.
    c. Pierrette (ne) voyage pas en France.
    P. ne travels Ø/lots/pas in France
      ‘P. travels/travels a lot/doesn’t travel in France.’

(35) a. Pierrette a voyagé en France.
    b. Pierrette a beaucoup voyagé en France.
    c. Pierrette (n’) a pas voyagé en France.
    P. ne has Ø/lots/pas traveled in France
      ‘P. has traveled/has traveled a lot/hasn’t traveled in France.’

Second, in the same way that the distribution of *beaucoup* and the other terms in QaD structures is restricted, so the distribution of *pas* seems to be subject to a similar restriction. To be precise, among the class of transitive verbs in French, Obenauer distinguishes between those that are compatible with QaD and those that are not. The first group is illustrated in (36) (Obenauer’s 1983: 68 (6)), the second in (37) (Obenauer’s 1983: 70 (12)):

(36) a. Antoine a trop lu de romans policiers.
    A. has too-much read of novels detective
      ‘A. has done too much detective novel reading.’
    b. Max a (très) peu composé de sonates.
    M. has very little composed of sonatas
      ‘M. has done (very) little sonata composing.’
THE NEGATIVE MARKER

(37) a. Le critique a peu apprécié de films.
   the critic has little appreciated of films
b. Son regard a beaucoup impressionné de minettes.
   his look has lots impressed of young-girls
c. La réorganisation a beaucoup accéléré de procédures.
   the reorganization has lots speeded-up of procedures
d. La nouvelle a beaucoup inquiété d’experts.
   the news has lots worried of experts
e. Loin de la ville, il a beaucoup regretté d’amis.
   far from the town he has lots missed of friends

Note that the unacceptability of the strings in (37) is not of the same nature as the unacceptability of (22). In (22), the problem is the quantifier, which is incompatible with both QÀD and non-QÀD. In (37), the problem is the fact that the verbs are incompatible with QÀD. The non-QÀD equivalents are perfectly fine, as in (38):

(38) a. Le critique a apprécié peu de films.
   b. Son regard a impressionné beaucoup de minettes.
   c. La réorganisation a accéléré beaucoup de procédures.
   d. La nouvelle a inquiété beaucoup d’experts.
   e. Loin de la ville, il a regretté beaucoup d’amis.

Obenauer accounts for the distinction between the verbs in the examples in (36) and those in the strings in (37) and (38) in terms of types of what he calls “VP-quantification”. What Obenauer means by this is simply that, in QÀD structures, where beaucoup and other quantifiers are separated from the nominal they quantify over and appear in some left-peripheral position, that is, where they are extracted from SpecNumP in the direct object, as illustrated in (30), the quantification relationship is upheld by virtue of beaucoup or the other term quantifying in a certain way over the entire predicate and, hence, the direct object. The “in a certain way” is important here because Obenauer uses this condition to explain the contrast between (36) and (37). Consider the two examples in (39).

(39) a. Jean aimait beaucoup sa femme. (intensity)
   J. loved lots his wife
   ‘J. used to love his wife a lot.’

b. Jean faisait beaucoup l’amour à sa femme. (frequency)
   J. made lots the love to his wife
   ‘J. used to make love to his wife often.’

In these two examples, the predicates are quantified by beaucoup. However, the nature of the quantification relationship is different in the two cases. In (39a), beaucoup indicates the intensity of the sentiment expressed by the predicate aimer ‘to love’ and is synonymous with intensément. In (39b), in contrast, beau-
coup indicates the frequency of the activity expressed by the predicate faire l'amour 'to make love' and is synonymous with souvent. Importantly, the interpretation of beaucoup is determined by the predicate. Obenauer observes that the (un)availability of Q à D in (36) and (37) depends crucially on the reading of the quantifier. Where the quantifier has a frequency reading, Q à D is fine; where the quantifier has an intensity reading, Q à D is impossible. Obenauer goes on to suggest that this is a consequence of the underlying quantificational relationship with the direct object. The logic goes something like this: in order to maintain the quantificational force over the direct object in a Q à D structure, the predicate must be quantified with a frequency reading, since it is only by having multiple or frequent occurrences of the activity expressed by the predicate that it is possible to have multiple, or quantified, occurrences of the direct object. The problem with the examples in (36), then, is that two incompatible requirements are placed on the moved quantifier. The predicate wants the quantifier to take an intensity reading, while its binding relationship with its trace can be maintained only with a frequency reading. The clash cannot be resolved; the result is ungrammaticality.

Working on the assumption that the (underlying) quantification relationship with the direct object can be maintained only if, in the Q à D structure, the quantifier is interpreted as a frequency rather than an intensity adverb, the ungrammaticality of the strings in (37) can be explained. The verbs in the strings in (37) are incompatible with Q à D because the nominal quantifiers are interpreted as intensity adverbs rather than frequency adverbs, as in the grammatical strings in (40), in which all the direct objects are definite. Hence, in (37), the quantifier relationship with the direct object cannot be maintained.

(40) a. Le critique a peu apprécié ce film.
   the critic has little appreciated this film
   'The critic appreciated this film little.'

   b. Son regard a beaucoup impressionné cette minette.
      his look has lots impressed this young-girl
      'His look impressed this young girl a lot.'

   c. La réorganisation a beaucoup accéléré cette procédure.
      the reorganization has lots speeded-up this procedure
      'The reorganization speeded up this procedure immensely.'

   d. La nouvelle a beaucoup inquiété cet expert.
      the news has lots worried this expert
      'The news worried this expert a lot.'

   e. Loin de la ville, il a beaucoup regretté cet ami.
      far from the town he has lots missed this friend
      'Once settled far from town, he missed this friend a lot.'
What is important for our purposes is not the explanation for the contrast between (36) and (37) per se but the fact that, where the nominal quantifiers in (36) and (37) are replaced by *pas* similar effects are produced:

1. Antoine n’ a pas lu de romans policiers.
   A. *ne* has *pas* read of novels detective
      ‘A. hasn’t read any detective novels.’
2. Max n’ a pas composé de sonates.
   M. *ne* has *pas* composed of sonatas
      ‘M. hasn’t written any sonatas.’

(41) a. ??Le critique n’ a pas apprécié de films.
    the critic *ne* has *pas* appreciated of films
    ‘The critic didn’t appreciate any films.’
   b. ??Son regard n’ a pas impressionné de minettes.
      his look *ne* has *pas* impressed of young-girls
      ‘His look didn’t impress any young girls.’

c. ■La réorganisation n’ a pas accéléré de procédures.
   the reorganization *ne* has *pas* speeded-up of procedures
   ‘The reorganization didn’t speed up any procedures.’

d. ■La nouvelle n’ a pas inquiété d’ experts.
   the news *ne* has *pas* worried of experts
   ‘The news didn’t worry any experts.’

e. ■Loin de la ville, il n’ a pas regretté d’ amis.
   far from the town he *ne* has *pas* missed of friends
   ‘Once settled far from town, he didn’t miss any friends.’

The native speakers I have consulted do not, in general, find the examples in (42) as unacceptable as the strings in (37), but rather see them as somewhat odd, especially examples (42c–e). One might reason that, although (the necessary) frequency adverbs are in theory incompatible with these verbs, where that frequency is reduced to zero, that is, with negative *pas*, the incompatibility is not so marked. The fact that the strings in (42) are not considered totally unacceptable

30. I have no explanation for why (42a, b) are judged more acceptable than (42c–e).
31. Hugues Péters (personal communication) has drawn attention to the contrast between the ungrammatical text examples and these grammatical ones:

(i) Le critique n’ a apprécié aucun film.
   the critic *ne* has appreciated no film
   ‘The critic didn’t appreciate a single film.’

(ii) Il n’ a regretté aucun ami.
    *ne* has missed no friend
    ‘He didn’t miss a single friend.’

He notes further that the text examples can be rescued with a suitable continuation:
like those in (37) deserves closer scrutiny. Nevertheless, the contrast between (41) and (42) is significant in that it is parallel to the contrast between (36) and (37). I therefore conclude that pas belongs to the same class of quantifier as beaucoup.

I now consider what Obenauer (1984) refers to as pseudo-opacity effects, which, once again, suggest that pas should be treated on a par with Battye’s other nominal quantifiers, such as beaucoup. Obenauer notes the impossibility of associating one quantifier with a pseudopartitive direct object when another quantifier intervenes. Consider (43), in which beaucoup is interpreted as an intensity adverb (and therefore cannot be associated with the direct object by QaD):

(43) a. *Combien a-t-il beaucoup aimé de films?
   how-many has-he lots liked of films

Rather, in (43a), it is combien that is associated with the direct object by QaD. I assume that the ungrammatical (43a) is derived from the grammatical (43b):

(43) b. Il a beaucoup aimé combien de films?
   he has lots liked how-many of films
   ‘How many films did he like a lot?’

Given the acceptability of (43b), I would argue that the problem with (43a) cannot be semantic in nature and must therefore be syntactic. Given, further, that (43a) is derived from (43b) and that, therefore, the structure of (43a) can be represented as in (43a’), I appeal to Relativized Minimality to account for its ungrammaticality.32

(43) a’. *Combien, a-t-il beaucoup aimé [ t₁ de films ] ?
   (= (43a))

In (43a’), combien has been extracted from the direct object; let us assume that it has been moved to SpecCP and that the attested inversion takes place at the CP level and is triggered by the wh-criterion—see section 1.4. To avoid an ECP violation, the trace of combien needs to be antecedent-governed by its A’-antecedent, a relationship arguably interrupted by the A’-element beaucoup, which counts as an intervening potential antecedent-governor.

Now consider (44):

(iii) Il n’a pas regretté d’amis parce qu’il n’en avait aucun.
32 That Relativized Minimality is at stake here is supported by the acceptability of (i):
(i) [ Combien de films ], a-t-il beaucoup aimé t₁
   how-many of films has he lots liked
   ‘How many films did he like a lot?’

In (i), the Θ-marked internal argument of aimer ‘to like’ has been moved to SpecCP. The result is grammatical despite the intervening beaucoup. This is arguably attributable to the fact that, as an argument trace, t₁ does not need to be antecedent-governed in order to be properly governed. Rather, proper government can be achieved on the basis of Θ-government by the verb.
It should be stressed that the ungrammaticality of (43a) and (44) is due to their A\-binding configurations; it is not a consequence of any semantic incompatibility between the quantifiers in the examples. Sentence (43b) shows that \textit{combien} and \textit{beaucoup} can co-occur while (the admittedly rather archaic) exclamation in (i) shows that \textit{pas} and \textit{combien} are compatible:

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Combien} il n’ a-t-il \textit{pas} aimé [\textit{t} de films]?
\item \textit{beaucoup} and \textit{combien} can co-occur while (the admittedly rather archaic) exclamation in (i) shows that \textit{pas} and \textit{combien} are compatible:
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Combien il n’ a-t-il \textit{pas} aimé [\textit{t} de films]}!
\item \textit{beaucoup} and \textit{combien} can co-occur while (the admittedly rather archaic) exclamation in (i) shows that \textit{pas} and \textit{combien} are compatible:
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{beaucoup} is replaced by \textit{pas} and the same pseudo-opacity effect is created, suggesting that \textit{pas} should be analyzed syntactically in parallel fashion to \textit{beaucoup}.
\item So, in this section, I have demonstrated that \textit{pas} parallels \textit{beaucoup} and the other quantifiers in a number of interesting ways that suggest that one should analyze \textit{pas} syntactically in essentially the same way as the other nominal quantifiers.
\end{enumerate}

Before concluding this section, I address the important issue of the difference between \textit{pas} and the other nominal quantifiers, which is a consequence of the former’s [+\textit{NEG}] specification and its (not surprising) use as a marker of sentential negation. For, while nonnegative nominal quantifiers can remain adjoined to VP at S-structure, the need to endow a functional head with the feature [+\textit{NEG}], I have been assuming, obliges \textit{pas} to raise to SpecNegP. Furthermore, the conclusions drawn in section 1.2.7.3 about the movement patterns of lexical infinitives back up this assumption. In section 1.2.7.3, I concluded that lexical infinitives can raise up to Mood$^\circ$ or T$^\circ$ but not to AgrS$^\circ$. Assuming a CP-AgrSP-NegP-TP-MoodP-VP clausal hierarchy, I predict that the order LI-\textit{beaucoup} is grammatical (where LI stands for lexical infinitive and \textit{beaucoup} represents all nonnegative nominal quantifiers), while the order LI-\textit{pas} is not. This is so since the only way for a lexical infinitive to precede \textit{pas} (in SpecNegP) would be for it to raise into AgrS$^\circ$, which it cannot do. In contrast, a lexical infinitive can precede \textit{beaucoup} (VP-adjointed) simply by raising to Mood$^\circ$ or T$^\circ$, which it can do. As the following examples illustrate, these predications are borne out by the data:

\begin{enumerate}
\item It is useless of \textit{ne} speak \textit{pas}
\item ‘It’s pointless not talking.’
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{It is useless of \textit{ne} speak \textit{pas}}
\end{enumerate}
(\textit{LI-pas})

33. It should be stressed that the ungrammaticality of (43a) and (44) is due to their A$^\prime$-binding configurations; it is not a consequence of any semantic incompatibility between the quantifiers in the examples. Sentence (43b) shows that \textit{combien} and \textit{beaucoup} can co-occur while (the admittedly rather archaic) exclamation in (i) shows that \textit{pas} and \textit{combien} are compatible:

(i) \textit{Combien il n’ a \textit{pas} voulu avoir [\textit{t} d’ \textit{enfants}]}!

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{How much he \textit{ne} has \textit{pas} wanted have \textit{of} children}
\item \textit{’How he didn’t want children!’}
\end{enumerate}

In (i), \textit{pas} has been extracted from the pseudopartitive. If the exclamative quantifier \textit{combien} is generated AgrS-adjointed or in SpecCP, the lack of Relativized Minimality effects and grammatical status of (i) are predicted: no potential antecedent-governor interrupts an A$^\prime$-binding relationship. For discussion of exclamatives in French, see Radford (1989).

An analysis of (43b) involving LF raising of the direct object, that is, QR, is not a problem. Assuming that the entire direct object would undergo QR (rather than just \textit{combien}) as in the example of overt movement in (i) in footnote 32, the absence of Relativized Minimality effects can be attributed to the fact that, as a θ-marked complement, the ECP is satisfied by virtue of the direct object being head and θ-governed by the verb.
I therefore conclude that *pas* raises to a position higher than *beaucoup*, namely SpecNegP, and motivate this movement on the basis of the need to mark sentential negation, as discussed in section 1.3.5. More generally, though, I have shown that the distribution of *beaucoup* and *pas* show similarities that lend themselves to a parallel analysis of all these items. In the next section, I demonstrate that extraction facts also support a derivational analysis of *pas*.

**Evidence: extraction facts**

### 2.2.4.2

Support for a derivational analysis of *pas* comes from extraction facts. Following work on “islands” in the tradition of Ross (1967), there is a body of literature suggesting that PPs are islands in French but not in English. According to Pollock (1991: 87–88), for example, “le français est, lui, rebelle à toute extraction à partir d’un PP” (French does not allow any extraction from a PP-embedded position). This constraint has been used to account for the fact that preposition-stranding is, under certain conditions, possible in English but not in French.\(^{34}\) as illustrated in (46):

\[(46)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{There’s [ the guy ]}, O_p, \text{John used to go out with } t_c. \\
\text{b. } & \text{Voilà [ le type ]}, O_p, \text{que Jean sortait avec } t_c. \\
& \text{there the guy that J. went-out with} \tag{= (46a)}
\end{align*}
\]

Assuming that the contrast illustrated by the data in (46) can indeed be accounted for in terms of the respective island status of PPs in English and French, and given that the analysis of *pas* proposed in this chapter is based on movement, I predict that *pas* raising is impossible from an extraction site within a PP to a landing site outside PP. I can use this prediction to evaluate my proposed syntactic analysis of *pas*: to do so, I need structures in which—according to my analysis—*pas* is base-generated within a PP while the nearest SpecNegP (to which *pas* must raise in order to mark sentential negation) is outside PP.

Assuming, further, that *pas* is one of Battyce’s nominal quantifiers and is therefore generated either within an indefinite NumP or as a VP-adverb, the relevant structures contain either a PP-embedded indefinite NumP (containing *pas*) or a PP-embedded verbal predicate (to which *pas* is adjoined). However, given

---

\(^{34}\) The reader is referred to Pollock (1991) for a recent discussion and account of PP-islands. Pollock compares and contrasts French, English, and the Scandinavian languages. A precise explanation of PP-islandhood is not central to my discussion here. The judgment for (46b) applies to metropolitan French; Posner (1996: 342) gives Prince Edward Island French as an exception to the general pattern. Uriagereka (1995) also addresses this contrast between English and the Romance languages.
the status of the null pronominal anaphor PRO—the assumed subject of embedded infinitives—and the proliferation of functional heads currently being proposed in the literature (e.g., AgrSP, AgrOP, TP, AspP, NegP), it is debatable whether a bare VP could be generated within a PP without being dominated by one or more functional projections including, where relevant, NegP. It is therefore unclear whether pas adjoined to a VP and embedded in a PP ever needs to cross the PP node to reach the nearest SpecNegP to mark sentential negation. For this reason, I restrict my attention to PP-embedded indefinite NumPs containing pas in SpecNumP.

Thus, I can test the prediction with respect to clauses containing a PP whose head P* takes an indefinite NumP as its complement. For, although my model allows the nominal quantifier pas to be generated in SpecNumP, the island status of the dominating PP does not allow pas to be extracted for promotion to SpecNegP to mark sentential negation. Consider (47):

(47) a. J’aime tartiner mon pain [pp avec [Ø du beurre]].
   I like spread my bread with of-the butter
   ‘I like to spread butter on my bread.’

b. *J’aime pas tartiner mon pain [pp avec [t de beurre]].
   I like pas spread my bread with of butter
   ‘I don’t like to spread butter on my bread.’

c. J’aime pas tartiner mon pain avec du beurre.
   (= (47b))

The string in (47a) contains a PP whose head P* avec ‘with’ takes an indefinite nominal complement. As in (13), the non-overt noun Ø subcategorizes for a PP headed by de ‘of’. This partitive structure, discussed in section 2.2.1 and illustrated in (48), is licensed in my model.

(48)

A similar structure, in which pas is generated in SpecNumP, is also licensed in my model. (See (30).) In this case, given that pas will absorb the oblique Case assigned by the preposition to its complement, the NP will be Case-marked by the prepositional Case-marker de, forming the basis of a pseudopartitive structure. If movement of pas from within the indefinite NumP to SpecNegP were
then possible, that is, if the intervening PP node were not an island, one would expect the negative of (47a) to be (47b), with just such a pseudopartitive structure. Yet, the string in (47b) is not the negative of the one in (47a) and is, in fact, ungrammatical. Instead, the negative of (47a) is (47c), in which the indefinite nominal retains its partitive structure, as in (48). A consequence of this analysis is that, in (47c), pas cannot be generated within the PP-embedded indefinite. Rather, pas must be VP-adjoined. Thus, one can contrast (47b) with (47c). In the ungrammatical (47b), an attempt is made to move pas across a PP node, as illustrated schematically in (49), which is impossible given the island status of the PP; hence, the ungrammaticality of (47b).

(49) ••• pas, ••• [PP ••• [NumP ••• t••• ] ]

In (47c), in contrast, where pas originates from a position adjoined to the matrix predicate headed by aimer ‘to like’ rather than a position within the PP, promotion to SpecNegP is unproblematic, as in (50), since no island node is crossed.

(50) ••• pas, ••• [VP ••• [PP • •• []]]

Of course, this account of the ungrammaticality of (47b) hinges crucially on a derivational approach to the syntax of pas, as proposed in this chapter.

The data in (51) point to the same conclusion:

(51) a. Le premier (•n’) est venu [VP avec [NSP pas d’ idées du tout ]].
    the first ne is come with pas of ideas of-the all
    ‘The first one came without a single idea.’

b. •Le premier n’ est pas venu [VP avec [NSP t, d’ idées du tout ]].
    the first ne is pas come with of ideas of-the all
    (= (51a))

Although (51a) would probably be frowned upon by prescriptive grammarians and is certainly not standard written French, it is judged by many native speakers to be an acceptable utterance.35 It would seem that, in (51a), pas appears in its base position, that is, within the complement of the preposition avec ‘with’.

---

35. Consider also the following examples from Gaatone (1971: 111), cited in H&L (1992/93: 45):

(i) Aux cérémonies du mois prochain, aucune délégation étrangère n’a été invitée.
    to-the ceremonies of-the month next no delegation foreign ne has been invited
    Non seulement pas d’AMERICAINS, bien sûr . . .
    not only pas of Americans well sure
    ‘To next month’s ceremonies, no foreign delegation has been invited. Not just no Americans, of course, . . .’

(ii) Entre nous, je préférerais une femme qui me fasse souffrir à PAS DE FEMME
    between us I prefer-cond a woman who me make-SUBJ suffer to pas of woman
    du tout.
    of-the all
    ‘Between you and me, I’d rather have a wife who made me suffer than no wife at all.’
THE NEGATIVE MARKER

Clearly, this is not a canonical instance of sentential negation: first, ne is excluded;\(^{36}\) second, pas has not raised to SpecNegP, which, given the other examples we have reviewed, seems to be a property of sentential negation in French.\(^ {37}\) Indeed, given the (S-structure) island status of PP in French, I predict that it would be impossible for pas to be promoted to SpecNegP at that level. This prediction is borne out by the ungrammaticality of (51b), in which an attempt has been made to move pas from within the PP headed by avec ‘with’ to SpecNegP, outside PP. The judgment is perfectly straightforward and indeed expected, given the island status of PP in French and, more important for my purposes, the movement approach to the syntax of pas proposed in this chapter.

The final empirical argument I invoke here and that hinges on the island status of PP in French and a derivational analysis of pas is illustrated by the paradigm in (52). The relevant issue here is the reading of pas un(e) seul(e) N ‘not a single N’. More specifically, the issue is whether this sequence can be interpreted idiomatically as ‘no N at all’ (cf. Vikner 1978: 88) or, rather, is to be interpreted as ‘not just one N, but (possibly) more Ns’. The data suggest that the idiomatic reading is restricted to certain syntactic configurations, namely those in which the sequence can be generated as a single constituent.

(52) a. Avec pas une seule idée, il est allé voir son professeur.
   with pas a single idea he is gone see his teacher
   ‘He went to see his teacher without a single idea.’

\(^{36}\) This is the view of Muller (1991: 151) with respect to these examples:

(i) Elle (•·) s’habille [•· pour pas cher].
   she ne refl dresses for pas expensive
   ‘She wears inexpensive clothes.’

(ii) Il (•·) arrivera [•· dans pas longtemps].
   he ne arrive-FUT in pas long
   ‘He’ll be here soon.’

(iii) Il (•·) sort [•· avec pas un sou en poche].
   he ne goes-out with pas a penny in pocket
   ‘He goes out without a penny on him.’

Muller’s judgments in (i)–(iii) suggest that the marker of the scope of sentential negation, ne, must be licensed in some strictly syntactic way, such as by virtue of a spec-head configuration with an operator in SpecNegP, as argued in section 1.3.5. To that extent, the data in (i)–(iii) provide additional support for the approach adopted. The idea pursued here is that the necessary spec-head configuration can be created only by movement. See also Moritz and Valois (1993: 319), who say “sentential negation is best accounted for in terms of licensing of the head of a Negation Phrase. This licensing results from movement of a negative XP into the specifier of a NegP.” I assume that pas in these examples is a constituent negator. Muller’s judgments then follow H&L (1992/93: 38–39) who show that ne is incompatible with constituent negation.

\(^{37}\) The failure of pas to raise, for example, to SpecNegP, at S-structure in the text examples is not necessarily problematic. The issue was addressed at the end of the discussion of true negative imperatives in section 2.1.1.3. It might be possible to invoke Rizzi’s (1996) functional definition of operators. This would allow one to claim that, at S-structure, pas fails to take sentential scope and, hence, fails to count as an operator at that level. What seems clear about the examples in (51a) and footnote 36, examples (i)–(iii), is that the negative takes strictly local, that is, non-sentential, scope.
b. Marie n’a pas reçu une seule lettre depuis des mois.
M. ne has pas received a single letter since of-the months
‘M. hasn’t received a single letter in months.’

c. Il est venu me voir [pp avec pas une seule idée en tête].
he is come me see with pas a single idea in head
‘He came to see me without a single idea in mind.’
(= idiomatic reading)

d. Il n’est pas venu [pp avec UNE SEULE IDÉE en tête] . . .

In (52a), where *pas un(e) seul(e) N* appears as a single constituent in the absolute construction, the idiomatic reading is available. In (52b), where *pas* is separated from *un(e) seul(e) N* and, presumably, occupies SpecNegP (marking sentential negation), the idiomatic reading is also still available. I attribute this availability to the fact that *pas un(e) seul(e) N* is generated as a single constituent and that *pas* is subsequently separated from *un(e) seul(e) N* as a consequence of raising to SpecNegP. In (52c), *pas un(e) seul(e) N* appears in a PP-embedded position, and the idiomatic reading is still available, as indicated by the translation and due, once again, to the fact that the string is generated as a single constituent. In (52d), in contrast, the idiomatic reading is unavailable. What is crucially different about (52d) is the presence of the PP node between *pas* and *un(e) seul(e) N*. The presence of this node, I argue, prevents *pas* from raising out of the PP. The fact, therefore, that *pas* appears outside the PP in (52d) indicates that *pas* was never inside the PP (given that the string is grammatical). This, in turn, means that *pas un(e) seul(e) N* could not have been generated as a constituent; hence, the lexicalized idiomatic reading is unavailable. The only reading available for (52d), ‘not just one N, but more Ns’, should be clear from (52d’):

(52) d’. Il n’est pas venu avec une seule idée, mais plusieurs!
he ne is pas come with a single idea but several
‘He didn’t come with just one idea, but several!’

In conclusion, then, PP-extraction facts suggest that a movement analysis of the syntax of sentential negation involving *pas* such as the one advanced in this chapter is along the right lines.

---

38. Note that, even in the idiomatic expression, for *pas* to license *ne*, it must raise to SpecNegP. The example in (i), in which *pas* has failed to raise to the left of the past participle, is ungrammatical, contra DeGraff (1993b: 74fn20).

(i) *Je n’ai vu pas une seule femme.*
I ne have seen pas a single woman
‘I didn’t see a single woman.’
The example in (i) becomes marginally possible if *ne* is omitted and the sequence *pas une seule femme* is emphasized.
Hirschbühler and Labelle (1992/93)

2.2.5

An early version of the analysis assimilating *pas* to *beaucoup* and other quantifiers is discussed by H&L\textsuperscript{39} (pp. 41–53, section 2) and has been taken up by numerous members of audiences to whom this work has been presented. After presenting the analysis in Rowlett (1992b) (a preliminary version of Rowlett 1993a and of the modified analysis presented earlier), H&L (pp. 44–45) suggest—uncontroversially enough—that the following are desirable if the relationship between *pas* and pseudopartitive direct objects is to be maintained in terms of movement of the former out of the latter:

1. QàD should always be analyzed in terms of movement.
2. The restrictions on QàD (with and without *pas*) should be similar and analyzable in terms of base-generation of the quantifier within the direct object.
3. There should be no pseudopartitive structures that cannot be analyzed in terms of extraction of an (overt?) quantifier.

H&L suggest (p. 46) that there are cases of pseudopartitive direct objects out of which it would not be plausible to suggest that an overt quantifier has been extracted, and that the parallels suggested here between QàD and negation are not as neat as the proposed parallel analysis would lead one to expect. In each of the cases discussed here, I suggest that the distinction to be drawn between *pas* and other nominal quantifiers is semantic in nature rather than syntactic and, therefore, that these cases do not present a problem for the parallel syntactic analysis proposed here.

First, H&L suggest that, while QàD involving *beaucoup* and other quantifiers is sensitive to subjacency, QàD involving *pas* is not, as illustrated in (53)–(55), H&L’s (p. 46, (29)–(31)):

(53) a. Je n’ai pas l’intention d’acheter de livres.
I ne have *pas* the intention of buy of books
‘I don’t intend to buy any books.’

b. •J’ai beaucoup l’intention d’acheter de livres.
I have lots the intention of buy of books

39. Unless otherwise explicitly specified, references in this section to work by these authors are to H&L (1992/93).
40. It is unclear to me why it should be necessary for the extracted quantifier to be overt. Note that, in the present analysis, the extracted quantifier can be Op.
(54) a. Je ne crois pas qu’il ait acheté de livres.
   I don’t think he has bought any books.

b. *J’ai beaucoup cru qu’il a acheté de livres.
   I have lots thought that he has bought of books

(55) a. Je n’ai pas vu Pierre acheter de livres.
   I didn’t see P. buy any books.

b. *J’ai beaucoup vu Pierre acheter de livres.
   I have lots seen P. buy of books

Within the terms of the analysis proposed earlier, in each of the (a) examples, 
*pas* is assumed to have been generated within the pseudopartitive in the embed-
ded clause. It is then assumed to have been extracted, ultimately raising to the 
matrix SpecNegP. This produces perfectly grammatical sentences, as indicated.
In each of the (b) examples, in which *beaucoup* has apparently undergone 
the same movement, the strings are ungrammatical. H&L suggest the ungrammati-
cality of these (b) examples is due to a subjacency violation. This result is, of 
course, a problem if *pas* and *beaucoup* are analyzed in identical fashion, since 
subjacency should apply equally to both *pas* and *beaucoup*.

In response to H&L’s discussion of the data, I suggest that the distinction be-
tween the (a) and (b) examples in (53)–(55) can be accounted for independent of 
the QâD issue (and subjacency) with reference to the ungrammaticality of (53c), 
(54c), and (55c):

(53) c. *J’ai beaucoup l’intention d’acheter ces livres.
   I have lots the intention of buy these books

(54) c. *J’ai beaucoup cru qu’il a acheté ces livres.
   I have lots thought that he has bought these books

(55) c. *J’ai beaucoup vu Pierre acheter ces livres.
   I have lots seen P. buy these books

The examples in (53c), (54c), and (55c) are identical to those in (53b), (54b),
and (55b) but for the fact that the direct objects are definite rather than indifi-
nite. Accordingly, I do not suggest that the quantifier *beaucoup* has been raised 
out of the direct object. Rather, I suggest that the quantifier is a regular adv erb
and generated adjoined to a VP. Nevertheless, the examples are ungrammatical.
Given that no movement is posited in these examples, their ungrammaticality
cannot be attributed to subjacency effects. Rather, the ungrammaticality of 
(53c), (54c), and (55c) is more likely to be due to some semantic incompatibility
between *beaucoup* as an adverb and the verbal predicate. This being so, it is 
quite plausible that the ungrammaticality of (53b), (54b), and (55b) is not due to
subjacency effects, either. Recall the observation by Battye (1995) that the pos-
sibility of nominal quantification is dependent upon the possibility of VP-
adjunction. Since, in (53c), (54c), and (55c), such adjunction is impossible, I
predict that Q&D will be impossible in (53b), (54b), and (55b), *without recourse to subadjacency*. If this line of reasoning is justified, the syntactic distinction H&L draw between *beaucoup* and *pas* is unfounded. Rather, I suggest, the problem with the (b) and (c) examples is a semantic incompatibility between *beaucoup* on the one hand and *avoir l’intention de* *Vinf*, *croire*, and *voir* *Vinf* on the other.\(^{41}\) That the (a) examples are grammatical comes as no surprise, since the following (d) sentences are also fine:

(53) d. Je n’ai pas l’intention d’acheter ces livres.
   I *ne* have *pas* the intention of buy these books
   ‘I don’t intend to buy these books.’

(54) d. Je ne crois pas qu’il ait acheté ces livres.
   I *ne* think *pas* that he have-*SUBJ* bought these books
   ‘I don’t think he has bought these books.’

(55) d. Je n’ai pas vu Pierre acheter ces livres.
   I *ne* have *pas* seen P. buy these books
   ‘I didn’t see P. buy these books.’

Second, H&L suggest that the contrast between (56a) (H&L, p. 56fn13 (i)) and (56b) (H&L, p. 46, (32b)) undermines the parallel analysis I have given to *pas* on the one hand and nominal quantifiers such as *beaucoup* on the other.

(56) a. un sujet sur lequel ne sont pas parus de livres intéressants
   a subject on which *ne* are *pas* appeared of books interesting
   ‘a subject on which no interesting books have appeared’

b. un sujet sur lequel sont beaucoup parus de livres intéressants.
   a subject on which are *lots* appeared of books interesting

Here again, though, the ungrammaticality of the example with the nominal quantifier, (56b), can be attributed to a (semantic) incompatibility between the quantifier and the particular predicate, rather than to any syntactic difference between the nominal quantifier and *pas*. Consider (57):

(57) Ces livres intéressants sont beaucoup parus.
   these books interesting are *lots* appeared

Here, there are no indefinite arguments, and no movement operations would be posited to account for the surface position of *beaucoup*. Nevertheless, the string is ungrammatical, presumably due to some semantic incompatibility between the quantifier *beaucoup* and the predicate *paraître* *‘to appear’*. If this is true, it would also account for the ungrammaticality of (56b), without the need to conclude any syntactic difference between *pas* and the nominal quantifiers.

---

\(^{41}\) Similar facts apply to *avoir envie de* *Vinf* ‘*to want to V*’. Thanks to Odile Cyrille for pointing this out.
Third, H&L (pp. 49-50, section 2.2.2.2) suggest that *pas* does not give rise to Relativized Minimality effects while other nominal quantifiers do. Consider (58) (H&L, p. 50, (43)), both of which are grammatical:

(58) a. Gérard ne mange pas souvent de dessert.
   G. *ne eats pas* often of dessert
   ‘G. doesn’t often eat dessert.’

   b. Gérard ne mange souvent pas de dessert.
   G. *ne eats* often *pas* of dessert
   ‘Often, G. doesn’t eat dessert.’

H&L note the scope difference between (58a) and (58b). In (58a), *pas* has scope over *souvent* ‘often’; in (58b), the reverse is true. Scope properties are therefore reflected in or determined by superficial order. Given the (pseudopartitive) form of the direct object, I suggest, in both cases, that *pas* (or some larger constituent containing *pas*) has raised out of the direct object. In (58a), one might expect this to give rise to Relativized Minimality effects, since *souvent* intervenes between *pas* and its trace, as in (58a’). However, such effects are not produced; (58a) is perfectly grammatical.

(58) a’. Gérard ne mange *pas, SOUVENT t*, de dessert.
   (= (58a))

H&L suggest that the ungrammaticality of (59) (in contrast with the grammaticality of (58a)) is a problem if *pas* is analyzed along the same lines as *beaucoup*.

(59) •Luc a beaucoup *souvent eu de chance.* (H&L, p. 50, (45b))
   L. has lots *often* had of luck

In (59), the ungrammaticality is attributed to the fact that *beaucoup* has been raised above *souvent* and that this movement violates Relativized Minimality, as expected:

(59’) •Luc a beaucoup, SOUVENT eu *t* de chance.
   (= (59))

I deal with these data by suggesting that H&L’s interpretation of the movement involved in (58a) is incorrect. Consider (60):

(60) A: Est-ce que tu vas au cinéma?
   ‘Do you go to the cinema?’

   B: Non, pas souvent.
   no *pas* *often*  ‘No, not often.’

In the reply to the question in (60), *pas* modifies/qualifies *souvent* ‘often’ and is, therefore, presumably adjoined to *souvent*, forming a constituent: \[a, pas [a, sou-

vent ]). 42 Now, assume that, in (58a), *pas* is also adjoined to *souvent* and that the entire constituent is generated in SpecNumP. I assume that, in order to take sentential scope, the negative feature of *pas* percolates up to the mother node of the entire constituent and that, consequently, the entire constituent will have to raise to SpecNegP to license ne. In this way, given that this constituent is raised as a unit, no potential intervening antecedent-governors are crossed, and no Relativized Minimality effects are expected. In (58a), *pas souvenir* occupies SpecNegP as a single constituent, rather than *pas* occupying this position alone having raised over *souvent*. The grammaticality of (58a) is thus unproblematic. Turning now to (59), the question arises as to why a similar approach is not possible. The answer, it seems to me, lies in the fact that *beaucoup* and *souvent* cannot be generated together as a constituent: *[beaucoup souvenir]*. Consequently, the only way to generate (59) is, as H&L suggest, for *beaucoup* to appear within the direct object at D-structure and for *souvent* to be MoodP-adjoined, as in (59'). The examples in (61) show that these are (separately, at least) perfectly possible:

(61) a. Luc a beaucoup eu de chance. (H&L, p. 50, (45a, f))
   L. has lots had of luck
   ‘L. has had lots of luck.’

   b. Luc a souvent eu de la chance.
   L. has often had of the luck
   ‘L. has often had (good) luck.’

The ungrammaticality produced in (59), where *beaucoup* and *souvent* co-occur and where *beaucoup* raises over *souvent*, can then rightly be attributed to Relativized Minimality, as illustrated in (59'). Notice that, where these two elements co-occur but where *beaucoup* fails to raise over *souvent*, there are no problems:

(62) a. Luc a SOUVEN T beaucoup, eu ti de chance. (H&L, p. 50, (45d))
   L. has often lots had of chance
   ‘L. has often had lots of luck.’

   b. Luc a SOUVEN T eu beaucoup de chance.
   L. has often had lots of chance
   (= (62a))

Once again, then, the contrast between *pas* and *beaucoup* can be accounted for on independent semantic grounds and does not undermine the syntactic parallels posited here.

42. Alternatively, *pas* could be the specifier of *souvent*. The two elements would still form a constituent [ [], [pas] [], [souvent]]. Recall that Sportiche’s (1988: 429) Adjunct Projection Principle and Chomsky’s (1966b: 16) general theory of adjunction, together, oblige “modifiers” to appear adjacent to their nonargument XP “modifiee” or the head of their “modifiee”. See also Kampsers-Manhe (1992).
Before leaving H&L’s criticism of the approach to the syntax of *pas* adopted here, I discuss the data in (63) and (64), brought to my attention by an anonymous *Journal of French Language Studies* reviewer of Rowlett (1993a) as a difference between *pas* and the nonnegative nominal quantifiers. It seems to me that these data are in fact as unproblematic for my analysis as those presented by H&L.

(63) a. Pierre (n’)a pas voulu de cadeau(x).
   b. *Pierre a beaucoup voulu de cadeaux.

   ‘P. didn’t want any presents’ / ‘P. wanted lots of presents.’

(64) a. Pierre (n’)a pas eu de peine.
   b. *Pierre a beaucoup eu de peine.

   ‘P. didn’t have any trouble’ / ‘P. had lots of trouble.’

I mentioned these data in a footnote in Rowlett (1993a: 58fn5), suggesting that it might be possible to resolve the apparent problem with reference to Pollock’s (1989: 389–91) observation that the past participles of French modals and *être/avoir* behave differently from lexical past participles. On reflection, it seems more likely that the ungrammaticality of the two (b) examples, the ones with *beaucoup*, should be handled in the same way as (65):

(65) a. *Pierre a beaucoup voulu ce cadeau.
   b. *Pierre a beaucoup eu de la peine à finir son repas.

   ‘P. has lots wanted this present
   ‘P. has lots had of the pain to finish his meal

In these examples, (65a) shows that the adverbial use of *beaucoup* is incompatible with *vouloir ‘to want’; (65b) shows that *beaucoup* is incompatible with *avoir de la peine à l’inf ‘to have difficulty doing something’. The distinction between the (a) and (b) examples in (63) and (64) is therefore independent of the syntax of *pas/beaucoup* and does not undermine the analysis proposed here.

In conclusion, then, it appears that the “problems” presented by H&L and the anonymous *JFLS* reviewer are not in fact problematic at all. Consequently, I shall continue to assume that the syntactic proposals presented here for *pas* are by and large correct.

**Summary**

2.3

In this chapter, I addressed issues surrounding the syntax of *pas*, the principal marker of sentential negation in Modern French. Following Pollock (1989), I assumed that, in the unmarked case, *pas* marks sentential negation and licenses *ne* by occupying SpecNegP at S-structure. Indeed, this assumption was, in part, the basis of my conclusions in chapter 1 about the extent of the movement of different types of infinitives in the language. However, unlike Pollock (1989), I
argued that, rather than being the base position of pas, SpecNegP is, instead, its derived position. Pas was argued to be generated in a lower position and to raise, in the syntax, to SpecNegP. To be precise, I argued that, typically, pas is base-generated in a left-VP-joined position that reflects the nature of the relationship between the negation and the predicate. Alternatively, pas can be generated within an indefinite nominal expression. In either case, raising to SpecNegP was motivated in order to mark sentential negation and license ne at S-structure.
In this chapter, I move away from predominantly French considerations and adopt a more cross-linguistic perspective. I consider the nature of the relationship between the way a given language marks sentential negation and the (un)-availability of a phenomenon known as negative concord (henceforth, NC), in which, roughly speaking, multiple negative items can co-occur without negation being canceled out. (See section 3.2 for illustration.) NC has provoked considerable interest among linguists over the years (e.g., in recent work by Newsom 1994 and Déprez 1995, forthcoming) but has so far failed to be given anything like a generally accepted explanation. Indeed, in her recent (1995) study of the syntax of negation, Haegeman acknowledges (p. 304fn2) that it is not clear what the distinctive property of NC languages is and decides (p. 166) to leave the precise characterization of NC on the research agenda.

Haegeman does, however, make reference to early discussion of the topic by Jespersen, and it is with him that I start. Jespersen (1924: 333) observes that languages “in which the ordinary negative element is comparatively small in phonetic bulk” are characterized by NC, while languages that use “fuller negatives” fail to allow NC. (For a structural approach to the distinction between these two types of negative marker, see section 3.1.2.)

Jespersen notes further that the way languages mark pure sentential negation is subject to a cyclic development diachronically: languages fluctuate, over time, between marking pure sentential negation with negative markers that are “comparatively small in phonetic bulk” and using “fuller negatives”. This diachronic pattern is referred to as the Negative Cycle. The (im)possibility of NC is thus determined by where a language stands in the Negative Cycle. The rather sturdy generalization that can be captured will be referred to as Jespersen’s Generalization. The aim of this chapter is to account for Jespersen’s Generalization.

The relevance of Jespersen’s Generalization to the syntax of sentential negation in Modern French is as follows: if we know where Modern French stands in the Negative Cycle, Jespersen’s Generalization allows us to predict whether or not Modern French is an NC language. As I demonstrate in subsequent sections and chapters, this makes crucial predictions about the properties of a certain class of “negative” element that, like pas, can appear in association with ne in contexts of sentential negation. These elements, and the import of Jespersen’s Generalization are discussed in section 3.5.2 and especially in chapters 4 and 5.
The present chapter is organized in the following way. Section 3.1 discusses the Negative Cycle; more generally, it introduces Jespersen's (1924) typology of systems of sentential negation. In particular, section 3.1.2 shows how the Negative Cycle can be viewed within the template of NegP, introduced in section 1.2.1 and exploited in the discussion of pas in chapter 2. Within the NegP hypothesis, the locus of clausal polarity features is an autonomous syntactic projection. The typological difference between the two types of negative marker distinguished by Jespersen is viewed in structural terms: negative markers "comparatively small in phonetic bulk" are analyzed as head elements generated under Neg"; "fuller negatives" are phrasal elements associated with SpecNegP.

Section 3.2 presents the NC phenomenon, whereby (the negative feature of) multiple negative items appearing in the same domain fail to cancel each other out, contrary to what one might expect if the behavior of negation in natural language could be assimilated in straightforward fashion to the behavior of the Boolean logical negative operator ¬. In Boolean logic, the intrinsic properties of negation are such that, where one occurrence of ¬ has scope over another, the former cancels out the latter. In NC languages, multiple negatives do not cancel each other out; if anything, they reinforce each other.¹ NC is a common but not universal feature of natural language. Thus, in the Standard English (henceforth, SE) example in (1a), the two negative constituents cancel each other out, leading to logical Double Negation (henceforth, DN). In contrast, in the Italian example in (1b), the two negative constituents do not cancel each other out; rather, they reinforce each other. Italian is an NC language, while SE is not.

(1) a. No-one did nothing. 
   (i.e., everyone did something)  
   (SE: DN)

   b. Nessuno ha fatto niente. 
   no-one has done nothing 
   ‘No-one did anything.’  
   (Italian: NC)

From section 3.2 on, I deal with Jespersen's observation that whether or not a language is an NC language depends on where it stands in the Negative Cycle, that is, on the nature of its regular negative marker. In other words, whether or not a language is an NC language depends on whether its regular negative marker is generated under Neg° or associated with SpecNegP. Jespersen's observation is formulated as the generalization in (2):

(2) Jespersen's Generalization:
   A language is an NC language iff the regular marker of pure sentential negation is not associated with SpecNegP.

¹. The distinction between the behavior of co-occurring negatives in NC and non-NC languages resembles the distinction between mathematical addition and multiplication of negatives. Where two negatives are added, the result is an even greater negative (cf. NC); where two negatives are multiplied, the result is positive (cf. non-NC). The apparent "disobedience" of NC probably explains why it is often vociferously condemned by prescriptivists, for example, in the anglophone world.
Section 3.2 is devoted to showing that (2) is a sturdy generalization. Clearly, (2) is nothing more than a descriptive generalization that needs to be accounted for on the basis of fundamental principles. Before turning to such an account, I reconsider, in section 3.3, the spec-head agreement mechanism in Haegeman and Zanuttini’s (henceforth, H&Z’s) (1991: 244) Neg Criterion, the wellformedness condition governing the distribution and interpretation of negative constituents with sentential scope that I characterized, in section 1.4, as a construction-specific version of the more general AFFECT criterion. According to the Neg Criterion, irrespective of where a given language stands in the Negative Cycle, that is, irrespective of whether the overt marker of sentential negation is a functional head or an XP operator, both a “negative” head and a “negative” XP are syntactically active and “agree” with each other in a spec-head configuration.

In section 3.3.2, I suggest that spec-head “agreement” should be reinterpreted as “nonincompatibility” in the light of Rizzi’s (1996) work on Dynamic Agreement (henceforth, DA). DA is crucially deemed to be unidirectional, transferring features from SpecXP to X\textsuperscript{E} but not from X\textsuperscript{E} to SpecXP. In a spec-head configuration, then, in which a feature such as [+\textit{NEG}] is borne by SpecXP but not X\textsuperscript{E}, DA will transfer the feature to X\textsuperscript{E} (as I showed, crucially, in my analysis of \textit{ne} and \textit{pas} in chapters 1 and 2); in contrast, if the feature is borne by X\textsuperscript{E} but not by SpecXP, DA will not transfer the feature to SpecXP.

Returning to the (Neg) Criterion, within the revised approach to spec-head “agreement” advocated here, the agreement requirement needs to be modified: provided SpecXP does not bear any feature that is incompatible with the one(s) borne by X\textsuperscript{E}, the (Neg) Criterion may be met even though the feature borne by X\textsuperscript{E} has not been passed on to SpecXP. It is in this sense that spec-head agreement is seen as compatibility rather than feature identity.

This revised approach to spec-head agreement allows the locus of the abstract feature [+\textit{NEG}] to be subject to cyclic fluctuation—not just underlyingly—in the same way as the overt realization of sentential negation. In turn, this amounts to the claim that there is an abstract semantico-syntactic Negative Cycle alongside Jespersen’s overt morphophonological Negative Cycle. In the same way that sentential negation does not have to be overtly associated with both Neg\textsuperscript{E} and SpecNegP, neither does the abstract feature [+\textit{NEG}] have to appear on both Neg\textsuperscript{E} and SpecNegP in order for the Neg Criterion to be satisfied. This weaker version of spec-head agreement is exploited in section 3.4.1.3 to account for Jespersen’s Generalization.

In section 3.4, I turn to the descriptive Jespersen’s Generalization in (2) and endeavor to offer an account in terms of underlying grammatical principles. That account centers on the licensing of negative quantifiers and NPIs and the relationship between these items and negative markers proper. Before offering my own analysis, I review approaches to negative polarity item (henceforth, NPI) licensing proposed by Zanuttini (1991), based on L-marking (section 3.4.1.1), and by Progovac (1994), based on A’-binding (section 3.4.1.2). I conclude that Zanuttini’s L-marking approach does not achieve empirical adequacy. At the same time, Progovac’s A’-binding proposal raises a number of theory-internal questions. More precisely, while Progovac identifies clear parallels between the
distribution of pronominals and anaphors on the one hand and negative quantifiers and NPIs on the other, her (A’-binding) analysis of negative quantifier and NPI licensing has a number of undesirable dissimilarities with the traditional (A-binding) analysis of the distribution of anaphors and pronouns. In addition, Progovac’s A’-binding model is incapable of dealing with the attested cross-linguistic and diachronic variation at the heart of the Negative Cycle. In short, Progovac’s proposal cannot, as it stands, account for the distinction between NC and non-NC languages.

In section 3.4.1.3, I propose an analysis of Jespersen’s Generalization, based on Progovac’s account of NPI licensing that resolves the problems mentioned with respect to Progovac’s original proposals. Specifically, the analysis exploits the flexibility of the “weak” version of the spec-head relationship argued for in section 3.3.2. Together with an A’-binding mechanism that is more strictly parallel to the A-binding mechanism invoked in anaphor/pronoun licensing, the approach can deal with the attested cross-linguistic and diachronic variation that Progovac’s analysis fails to capture. The proposed analysis is applied to concrete examples in section 3.4.2.

Section 3.5 deals with two apparent problems for Jespersen’s Generalization, namely West Flemish (section 3.5.1) and Modern French (section 3.5.2). As a prelude to the analysis of negative adverbs and arguments in chapters 4 and 5, it is argued that Modern French is not in fact even an apparent problem for Jespersen’s Generalization since the relevant and apparently “concordant” items are not in fact underlyingly negative; as for West Flemish, it is argued that, while the data do indeed represent counterexamples to Jespersen’s Generalization as formulated in (2), other factors about the grammar suggest that this language is not problematic for the underlying explanation of Jespersen’s Generalization proposed in section 3.4. It is argued that the properties of sentential negation in West Flemish actually provide empirical support for the approach proposed in section 3.4.1.3. In section 3.6.1, I speculate about another area of recent theoretical debate, namely the pro-drop or null subject parameter, which could possibly be illuminated by the suggestions made here. My conclusions are summarized in section 3.6.2.

The Negative Cycle

3.1

3.1.1 The data: Jespersen

Jespersen (1924) observes a cyclic pattern in the diachronic development of the overt marking of sentential negation. This cyclic pattern is known as the Negative Cycle and is illustrated in Germanic and Romance in (3) and (4) respectively, after Jespersen (1924: 335–36). The dates for the respective stages of the development in (3) are from Bennis et al. (1995b, 1997: 1010 (9)).
2. The stage represented here by (3d) was not included in Jespersen’s paradigm. It has been included here to take into account the work of Beukema (1994) and Bennis et al. (1995a, b, 1997). Beukema and his colleagues argue that the pattern in (3d) was rare and essentially served as a bridge between (3c) and (3e).


4. To the extent that the illustrations in the text show nothing more than how sentential negation is overtly marked, they are likely to be a simplification of the underlying facts. As has been argued earlier in this book (for example, section 1.2.4), and as I demonstrate later, the expression of sentential negation can involve non-overt operators. The importance of these elements, and of their changing nature, is, of course, masked in (3) and (4).

5. For cross-linguistic and typological work on negation, see Croft (1991), Dahl (1979), de Haan (1997), Payne (1985), Ramat et al. (1987), and the contributions to Kahrel and van den Berg (eds.) (1994).

6. The word “first” is in inverted commas since it would be wrong to give the impression that the relevant varieties have no history prior to the stages illustrated by (3a) and (4a). Posner (1985b: 265–67) suggests that the negative marker non was reanalyzed over time from being a sentence adverb in Latin to being a clitic-like element that forms part of the verbal complex, for example, ne in French in (4). (See also Posner 1996: 302–5.) According to Vennemann (1974: 366–68), this reanalysis was a natural consequence of the typological shift from OV to VO order.) Burridge (1993: chapter 5) critically discusses Vennemann’s typological approach to the syntax of negation in the history of Dutch. See also footnote 71.

The sequences in (3) and (4) reflect the diachronic development in the respective languages; however, contemporary languages are known to exemplify the various stages in the sequences. In the “first” instance, for example, sentential negation is marked by a pre-verbal, syntactically dependent, element alone, as in (4a). This is where Italian and Spanish currently stand in the Negative Cycle:

(5) a. Gianni non telefona a sua madre. (Italian, Haegeeman G. non telephones to his mother 1995: 195 (43a))
   ‘G. doesn’t phone his mother.’

(3) English:
   a. he ne secgeþ. (“classical” Old English)
   b. he ne self not. (Middle English)
   c. he says not. (late Middle English – late 17th century)
   d. he not says. (early 15th century – second half 18th century)
   e. he does not say. (15th century – present)
   f. he doesn’t say. (±1600 – present)

(4) French:
   a. jëo ne di. (~ 1600)
   b. je ne dis (pas). (1600 – 1700)
   c. je ne dis pas. (Standard written French)
   d. je (ne) dis pas. (Standard spoken French)
   e. je dis pas. (Colloquial French)
   ‘I don’t say.’
7. A number of researchers, including Schwegler (1988: 26), have pointed out that the post-verbal “reinforcer” is often a nominal element denoting a small amount. See chapter 2, footnote 29.

8. According to Hirschbühler and Labelle (1993: 3), in French “ne can be the sole lexical negative element in a clause, and it is used alone much more than in combination with pas or point” “until at least the end of the sixteenth century”.

9. This phraseology is taken from Posner (1985a: 184). Posner suggests that, prior to the late fourteenth century, French pas had “emphatic import”.

10. In the bipartite system of sentential negation used in some clause types in F̣ṇ, the pre-verbal marker, má, is associated with SpecNegP, while the post-verbal marker, a, is associated with Neg*(da Cruz 1992, reported in DeGraff 1993b: 87). See also Navajo (Speas 1991b: 394–95; and chapter 2, footnote 6).

b. La niña no está hablando por teléfono. (Spanish, Haegeman 1995: 227 (81a))

‘The girl isn’t talking on the phone.’

The next stage in the overt Negative Cycle comes when the pre-verbal element is “reinforced” by a syntactically independent post-verbal constituent, first only optionally,8 “with emphatic import”,9 as in (4b), then obligatorily, as in (4c). Once the post-verbal element becomes compulsory, I assume it is inherently negative. It would seem that the position in the Negative Cycle occupied by some dialects of Berber is the same as that occupied by French in (4b). In the (null-subject) Taqbaylit dialect, sentential negation is marked by an (obligatory) proclitic marker, ur, with optional emphatic reinforcement by an independent post-verbal negative marker, ara (Jamal Ouhalla, personal communication).

(6) Ur zrigI (ara) Idr.

ur saw-1SG ara I.

‘I didn’t see I.’

Further, the following Burmese data attributed to Denise Bernot by Lazard (1994) suggest that this language is at the same stage in the Negative Cycle as the variety of Modern French exemplified in (4c). In Burmese, sentential negation is marked by both a pre-verbal negative marker, mə, and a post-verbal one, Phū:10

(7) a. ʔloʔ θə mə caN  Phū. (Lazard 1994: 26 (3))

work him mə organize Phū

‘He doesn’t organize his work.’

b. ʔåco Ko mə cá Phū. (Lazard 1994: 26 (2))

profit REL mə happen Phū

‘There is no profit.’


you stomach mə be-happy Phū Q

‘Aren’t you satisfied?’

In the next stage of the Negative Cycle, the independent post-verbal negative marker suffices to mark sentential negation on its own, and the clitic marker be-
comes first optional, as in (4d), then disappears altogether, as in (4e). The data in (8) suggest that spoken Breton is at the same stage in the Negative Cycle as the variety of Modern French exemplified in (4d). In spoken Breton, sentential negation is marked by obligatory post-verbal *ket* and, optionally, by pre-verbal *ne*:\(^{11}\)

\[(8)\]

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. *Ne ziskenn ket ar vugale betek an hent.* (Standard Breton, *ne* go-down *ket* the children to the road Stephens 1993: 397)
  \hspace{1cm} ‘The children are not going down to the road.’
  
  \item b. ‘ziskenn ket ar vugale betek an hent. (Spoken Breton, Stephens (= (8a)) 1993: 398)
\end{itemize}

In the “final” stage, the independent post-verbal negative marker weakens and is susceptible to reanalysis, or grammaticalization, in the sense of Hopper and Traugott (1993). The Negative Cycle is discussed further in section 3.1.2, where I suggest a structural template with which to view the developments.

\textbf{The analysis: NegP}

\subsection*{3.1.2}

Pollock’s NegP hypothesis, discussed and exploited in section 1.2.1 and chapter 2, that is, the idea that the locus of polarity features is an independent functional projection, provides Jespersen’s Negative Cycle with a structural template within which to operate. NegP provides two positions, SpecNegP and Neg*, a phrasal position and a head position. This is particularly convenient for an account of Jespersen’s typology of sentential negation and the Negative Cycle. Negative markers “comparatively small in phonetic bulk” identified by Jespersen can quite naturally be analysed as Neg*, while “fuller negatives” can be associated with SpecNegP. The relevant configuration is exemplified for Modern French in (9).

\[(9)\]

\[
\text{NegP} \\
\underline{\text{Spec} \quad \text{Neg'}} \\
\quad \underline{\text{pas} \quad \text{Neg}^* \ldots} \\
\quad \quad \underline{\text{ne}}
\]

So, and simplifying grossly (see footnote 4), the (overt) Negative Cycle can be claimed to amount to cyclic to-ing and fro-ing of the overt realization of sentential negation between these two positions.

---

11. See also section 3.5.1 for discussion of West Flemish, which also seems to be at this stage in the Negative Cycle.
The stage reached by English and illustrated in (3f), in which the independent XP negative marker criticizes onto the verb, can be analyzed in interesting ways within the NegP hypothesis. In SE, the relationship between *not* and the verb in (3f) is likely to be purely phonological in nature. In other words, the negative marker is syntactically associated with SpecNegP, but subsequently criticizes onto the auxiliary verb in AgrS. In a number of nonstandard varieties of English, in contrast, it seems more likely that the negative marker is associated with a head position in underlying syntax. This distinction between SE and nonstandard varieties is exploited further in sections 3.2.1.2 and 3.2.2.1. (See Zanuttini 1991 and Pollock 1997b.)

Reanalysis of the SpecNegP-associated negative marker (*pas*) as a Neg*-associated element does not appear to have happened (yet) in metropolitan French, even in the most informal spoken registers. However, some researchers (e.g., Moritz and Valois 1994: 679fn12) have suggested that *pas* has been at least partially reanalyzed as a head in Québécois. Thus, in parallel to *not* in SE (see footnote 34), in Québécois, *pas* may have the dual status of head and maximal projection. Moritz and Valois venture that the status of *pas* in Québécois as a Neg*-associated element rather than a SpecNegP-associated element might form the basis of a principled explanation of the contrast between (10a) and (10b):

(10) a. J’ai pas vu personne. (Standard Modern French)
    I have *pas* seen *personne*
    ‘I haven’t seen no-one.’
    (= ‘I have seen someone.’)

    b. J’ai pas vu personne. (Québécois)
    I have *pas* seen *personne*
    ‘I haven’t seen anyone.’
    (= the opposite of (10a))

Thus, and without going into unnecessary detail at this point, the (apparent) NC interpretation of (10b) in Québécois is deemed to be possible because *pas* is generated as Neg*. The same interpretation is unavailable in Standard Modern French because *pas* is associated with SpecNegP. While Moritz and Valois’s approach ties in well with Jespersen’s Generalization in that it links the availability of NC with the syntactic nature of the negative marker, I reject the proposal that *pas* has grammaticalized as Neg* in the relevant varieties. The fact that *pas* and quantifiers like *personne* could co-occur in earlier stages in the development of the language (when Neg* was occupied by *ne*) and be interpreted as in the Québécois example in (10b) casts some doubt on the assumption that the interpretation of (10b) depends on the position of *pas* being Neg*. Quite apart from the implausible idea that Neg* could be occupied by both *ne* and *pas*

in older varieties of French, one would also have to conclude that *pas*, associated with Neg in the classical language, had degrammaticalized and been analyzed as an XP in the modern standard language, only to regrammaticalize as a head in Québécois. This strikes me as a highly implausible way to account for the data. (See Hopper and Traugott 1993.) Furthermore, the element *pas* in Québécois behaves in identical fashion to *pas* in Standard French, casting doubt on any claim that one is a syntactic head while the other is a syntactic specifier.

For example, *pas* in Québécois can be modified, for example, by *même* ‘even’, just like *pas* in Standard French. More important, *pas* in Québécois fails to interfere with Verb Movement, just like *pas* in Standard French (Déprez forthcoming). Finally, there has been no typological shift to motivate reanalysis of *pas* as a syntactic head. (See also section 4.4.2.1.) I therefore reject an account of interpretations such as (10b) that are based on the conclusion that, in Québécois, *pas* occupies Neg*. I return to the distinction between the standard language and varieties that behave like Québécois in section 4.5.2, where I offer an alternative proposal.

With regard to the idea of the grammaticalization of *pas* as a negative head, similar—and more plausible—claims have been made for the negative marker *pa* found in some French-based creoles.¹³ In all French-based creoles (apart from Réunionnais, according to Corne and Moorghen 1978, cited by Posner 1985a: 182, and according to Battey and Hintze 1992: 325; see also Louisiana French Creole), *pa* is pre-verbal (along with tense-mood-aspect markers), rather than post-verbal as in both metropolitan French and Québécois (Posner 1985a: 171, 180), suggesting perhaps that *pa* is a head rather than an XP.

(11) a. Li pa t av ap vin. (Haitian, D’Ans 1968, cited by Posner 1985a: 180)
   ‘He wouldn’t be coming.’

   b. Nu pa ti pu rātre. (Mauritian, Green 1988: 450)
   ‘We wouldn’t have gone back.’

As Chris Lyons has pointed out (personal communication), the issue arises as to whether its pre-verbal position is enough for one to conclude that creole *pa* is a head. An alternative would be to suggest that creole *pa*, like French *pas*, occupies the SpecNegP position and that the verb fails to raise to the left of it, as witnessed, for example, by infinitives in French (see sections 1.1.7.2–1.1.7.4). This theoretical possibility is supported by the fact that, in most creoles, *pa* comes directly between the subject and the tense-mood-aspect markers, as in (11). Indeed, Posner (1985a: 181–82 (18i) and (21ii)) cites just two examples of French-based creoles in which *pa* intervenes between a tense-mood-aspect mar-

---

¹³. See the comments by Posner (1985a: 172, 180–83). Note also that Bickerton (1981) claims that NC is a characteristic of all creoles.
ker and the verb, as in (12a), or between two tense-mood-aspect markers, as in (12b):

   I PST NEG know
   ‘I didn’t know.’

   b. Mwe te pa apre māze. (Réunionnais, Corne and Moorghen 1978)
   I PST NEG PROG eat
   ‘I wasn’t eating.’

Nevertheless, in the more familiar Romance varieties, reflexes of the Latin adverb non usually intervene between the subject pronoun and any other pronouns present. They do not intervene between object pronouns and the verb.15 As far as I know, no-one has used this fact to cast doubt on analyses of such elements as realizations of Neg*, that is, as heads. The particular matter of the syntactic status of Haitian Creole pa is taken up by DeGraff (1993b), who concludes that this element is the overt realization of Neg*

Returning now to the Negative Cycle, once the negative marker is a syntactically dependent element again, the development has, in some sense, turned full circle. Numerous suggestions have been made to explain the Negative Cycle, that is, why, in the specific case of French, pre-verbal ne came first to be supported by a post-verbal element and subsequently to disappear. Most explanations have been phonological in approach, for example, those of Ewert (1943: 260) and Posner (1996: 303). Posner (1985a) examines the factors that might have conditioned the change in French from pre-verbal to post-verbal negation by comparing French and a number of other cognate languages (which have post-verbal negation) on the one hand with the majority group of Romance languages (which have pre-verbal negation) on the other. She suggests (pp. 171, 177) that changes in stress patterns, namely the transition, possibly in the fourteenth century, from word stress to breath group stress, favored a shift in

14. Of relevance in (mesolectal) Louisiana Creole is the fact that, where Verb Movement can be motivated on the basis of (a) its morphological makeup and (b) its position with respect to VP-adverbs, the verb precedes negative pa. Where no Verb Movement can be motivated, the verb follows negative pa (Rottet 1992: 268 (16)). Under the null hypothesis that the position of pa is the same in both cases, these facts mitigate strongly against analyzing pa as a functional head such as Neg*, since such an analysis would entail at least one instance of long head movement of the verb on its way from V* to whatever functional head it occupies in its pre-pa position (T* in Rottet’s 1992: 278 (46) analysis). In addition, the fact that Verb Movement in mesolectal Louisiana Creole is incompatible with overt tense-mood-aspect markers but not with negative pa (Rottet 1992: 277) suggests that pa should not be treated in the same way as the overt tense-mood-aspect markers (functional heads). DeGraff 1992, 1993b actually analyzes the tense-mood-aspect markers of Haitian Creole as verbs.) Rottet (1992: 285) therefore concludes that pa in mesolectal Louisiana Creole is associated with SpecNegP, rather than being generated in Neg*. This is arguably due to decreolization under strong influence from the acrolectal Cajun French dialect. A similar analysis is plausible of the Réunionnais data, given the extent of decr?eolization there, too. (Thanks to John Green for discussing the creole data with me.) See also DeGraff (1997).

emphatic stress toward the end of the breath group. Consequently, pre-verbal unstressed elements—including ne—were slurred, while post-verbal elements like *pas* often received emphatic stress.

It is also possible that more strictly syntactic issues are involved. Harris (1978: 118) suggests that the fate of *ne* could have been sealed by the fact that its position between subject clitics and object clitics hindered incorporation of the former with the latter (and the verb). Parry (1996) also links the loss of the pre-verbal negative marker with the accumulation of argument clitics in pre-verbal position. (Note, though, that this factor is likely to be sensitive to the null subject parameter.) Finally, as was noted in footnote 6, an underlying typological shift from XV to VX might explain the reanalysis of the pre-verbal negative marker in Romance from an XP adverbal element to a functional head. (See also Posner 1996: 304.)

Whatever the ultimate cause(s) of the (transitions between the different phases of the) Negative Cycle, the label “cycle” is clearly not a misnomer: once the syntactically independent negative marker has been grammaticalized as a functional head, the language is back where it started, and the cycle can be repeated.16 Jespersen’s overt Negative Cycle can therefore be reduced to fluctuation between marking sentential negation as a syntactically dependent constituent and as a syntactically independent constituent, with one intermediate stage in which sentential negation is bipartite and another in which the negative marker has an ambivalent status:

(13) *The Negative Cycle:*
  a.  Neg
  b.  Neg° (+ XP)
  c.  Neg° + XP
  d.  (Neg°) + XP
  e.  XP
  f.  [Neg° XP ]

3.1.3

Extensions: a prelude to an abstract Negative Cycle?

Given the availability within NegP of two positions of clearly different syntactic types, one head and one specifier, and mechanisms such as H&Z’s (1991) Neg Criterion (section 1.3) and DA (section 1.2.4) to regulate the behavior of affective features such as [+NEG], there are, in principle at least, two potential

16. Meillet (1912b: 140), cited in McMahon (1994: 165), comments as follows: “Les langues suivent ainsi une sorte de développement en spirale: elles ajoutent des mots accessoires pour obtenir une expression intense; ces mots s’affaiblissent, se dégradent et tombent au niveau de simples outils grammaticaux; on ajoute de nouveaux mots ou des mots différents en vue de l’expression; l’affaissement recommence, et ainsi sans fin.” (So languages follow a kind of spiral development: extra words are added to heighten expressive power; these words then weaken, are eroded, and reduced to mere grammatical devices; new or different words are added for the sake of expressivity; the weakening begins again, and so on, and so on.)
positions within NegP with which $[+\text{NEG}]$ can be associated (underlyingly, at least), as well as the possibility that $[+\text{NEG}]$ is associated with both positions underlyingly. The empirical basis of Jespersen’s Negative Cycle certainly suggests that the overt morphophonological locus of sentential negation can shift cyclically between SpecNegP and Neg $^\circ$, with intermediate stages at which both positions are associated with phonological material or the overt negative marker has an ambivalent status. Under the assumption that sentential negation is always marked by an abstract syntactic-semantic feature $[+\text{NEG}]$, there is, I suggest, no a priori reason to assume that the underlying locus of this abstract feature cannot fluctuate cyclically in (something like) the same way as the overt marker. This possibility has been implicitly recognized in the earlier discussion of non-overt negative operators. It is pursued and elaborated upon in section 3.3 and proves to be central to the proposed account of NC, to which I now turn.

**NC and Jespersen’s Generalization**

### 3.2

Languages vary with respect to whether they allow multiple apparently inherently negative constituents to appear, say, within the same clause, without canceling each other out. Van der Wouden (1994: 95) distinguishes between two phenomena that he labels “negative spread” and “negative doubling”. Negative doubling is illustrated in (14a) and (15a) in the NC languages Spanish and Italian respectively. Here, a negative XP, *nadie/nessuno* ‘no-one’, appears

---

17. The term “negative doubling” is also used in this way by Rizzi (e.g., 1982: 121). In early work, Labov (1972b) analyzes NC in nonstandard varieties of English as a process whereby the feature $[\text{NEG}]$ is copied from the verb onto an indefinite.

18. It is only partially the case that Italian and Spanish show negative doubling. This is only generally so in the absence of pre-verbal negative XPs, as in text examples (14a) and (15a). In contrast, with a negative (subject) XP in pre-verbal position, negative doubling is excluded:

(i) a. *Nessuno* (*non*) ha telefonato. (Italian)
   no-one *non* has phoned
   ‘No-one phoned.’

b. *Nadie* (*no*) hará eso. (Spanish, Suñer 1993: 3)
   no-one *no* do-FUT that
   ‘No-one will do that.’

This contrasts with, for example, Serbian/Croatian, text example (23b), and a number of other Romance varieties, including Romanian and Ladin (a Rhaeto-Romansch variety spoken in Engadine, Switzerland):

(ii) *Nimeni nu îmi spune niciodată nimic.* (Romanian, Baciu 1978: 74, cited in Muller 1991: 305fn2)
   no-one *nu* to-me says never nothing
   ‘No-one ever tells me anything.’

(iii) *Alura үngүn nu so nouvas d’ ünguotta.* (Ladin, Scheitlin 1962/72: 74, 97, cited in Muller 1991: 301)
   so no-one *nu* knows news of no-one
   ‘So, no-one has any news about anyone.’

In the case of Ladin, Posner (1984: 13) tentatively attributes co-occurrence of the pre-verbal negative XP and the negative marker to Slavonic influence.

Where a nonsubject appears pre-verbally in Italian, the possibility of negative doubling appears to be subject to speaker and register variation (Acquaviva 1994; Haegeman 1995: 196):
together with—“doubled” by—the regular pre-verbal negative marker, namely no/ non. Examples (14b) and (15b) illustrate negative spread, whereby multiple negative XPs co-occur. Examples (14c) and (15c) show negative spread and negative doubling occurring simultaneously.

(14) a. No conozco a nadie.
   ‘I don’t know anyone.’
   
   b. Nadie me ha dado nada.
   ‘No-one has given me anything.’
   
   c. No doy nada a nadie.
   ‘I’m not giving anything to anyone.’

(15) a. Mario non ha visto nessuno.
   ‘M. hasn’t seen anyone.’
   
   b. Nessuno ha fatto niente.
   ‘No-one did anything.’
   
   c. Gianni non dice niente a nessuno.
   ‘G. doesn’t say anything to anyone.’

The crucial property of all the examples in (14) and (15) is that, although all the italicized constituents (the regular negative marker and the negative XPs) are arguably morphologically negative, each sentence is interpreted as a single instance of sentential negation. They are not interpreted as containing multiple instances of logical negation. Spanish and Italian are NC languages.

Languages that do not allow multiple occurrences of negative constituents to be interpreted as a single instance of sentential negation are termed non-NC.

(iv) A nessuno Gianni (•?non) telefona.
   ‘G. doesn’t call anyone.’

In similar configurations in Spanish, negative doubling is not attested:

(v) A ninguna de ellos (•no) llamaría yo.
   ‘I wouldn’t call any of them.’


19. Etymologically, Spanish n-words are not negative (Laka 1993a). For contemporary speakers, however, one could plausibly assume that these elements are analyzed as being inherently (morphologically) negative. The situation in Italian is different; for Acquaviva (1995: 14fn3), nessuno, for example, is derived from the Vulgar Latin ne-ipos-unu ‘not-even-one’, in other words etymologically negative.
languages. In these languages, where two negatives co-occur, the first negation takes scope over, and cancels, the second. Examples are SE and German:

(16) a. I’ve (not) seen no-one. (SE)
   b. I’ve %(%not) given nothing to no-one.

(17) a. Hans sieht niemanden (%nicht). (German)
   H. sees no-one not
   ‘H. can’t see anyone.’
   b. Ich bin mit niemandem nirgendwohin %(%nicht) gefahren.
   I am with no-one nowhere not travelled
   ‘I didn’t drive anywhere with anyone.’

The SE examples in (16) show that one or more negative XPs cannot co-occur with the verbal marker of negation not (and receive the relevant NC interpretation). SE does not, therefore, demonstrate negative doubling. With respect to negative spread, the issue of whether multiple negative XPs can co-occur is unclear. Some speakers as well as prescriptivists reject (16b) without not; others do not. Dialectal variation seems to be at play. Clearly, though, negative spread needs to be distinguished from negative doubling. The judgments in (17) suggest that German patterns essentially with SE in this respect.

Ascertaining whether the Negative Cycle is relevant to NC amounts to establishing whether there is a correlation between (a) whether a language is an NC language and (b) where it stands in the Negative Cycle. Such a correlation would suggest that one was determined by the other. Given considerations of learnability, this would presumably mean that where a language stands in the Negative Cycle determines whether or not it is an NC language. Jespersen (1924: 333) suggests that there is such a correlation:

There is one very important observation to be made, without which I do not think that we shall be able to understand the matter, namely that repeated negation [i.e., NC] becomes an habitual phenomenon in those languages only in which the ordinary negative element is comparatively small in phonetic bulk . . . . If this repetition is rarer in modern English and German than it was formerly, one of the reasons probably is that the fuller negative not and nicht have taken the place of the smaller ne and en.

Following my analysis of the Negative Cycle within the framework of the NegP hypothesis in section 3.1.2, I shall assume that Jespersen’s observation amounts
to what I referred to as Jespersen’s Generalization in (2), repeated here for convenience:

(18) Jespersen’s Generalization:
A language is an NC language iff the regular marker of pure sentential negation is not associated with SpecNegP.\footnote{Note the following observation made by Acquaviva (1993: 60–61): “We can now formally characterize the difference between the English and the Romance (and nonstandard English) operators: only in the latter are specifiers of heads endowed with the morphological negative feature.” My analysis of Jespersen’s Generalization differs in crucial ways from Acquaviva’s; this is discussed in section 3.4.}

NC and nonnegative SpecNegP

3.2.1

In this section, I provide cross-linguistic data to show that NC is a characteristic of languages for which there is no reason to believe that SpecNegP bears the feature [+\textsc{neg}],\footnote{Note that my interpretation of Jespersen’s observation is slightly different from the one tentatively proposed by Haegeman (1995: 165). In the context of Jespersen’s observation, Haegeman suggests that NC may be determined by the availability of an overt negative head. See also Haegeman (1991: 16): “We might propose that in languages with NC readings the head of NegP is “strong”; it is autonomously licensed; it has its \textsc{neg} feature in the base. The Neg Criterion is met by a “strong” static agreement configuration. In non-NC languages, on the other hand, Neg is “weak” and would be assigned the \textsc{neg} feature by its specifier by virtue of spec-head agreement. . . . What is crucial for NC . . . is that the \textsc{neg} feature on Neg” is independently licensed, i.e., that Neg is a strong head. In languages where the \textsc{neg} feature on Neg” can only be achieved via dynamic agreement the negative head is not strong and NC is not possible. For me, in contrast, NC correlates with the absence of a negative operator in SpecNegP. Assuming that the characterization of the data in sections 3.1 and 3.1.2 is correct and that languages can indeed mark sentential negation by overt material associated with both SpecNegP and Neg, the difference between Haegeman’s and my own (re-)interpretation of Jespersen’s observation is not a trivial one. Note also that Haegeman’s approach predicts that Modern French is a non-NC language. See section 3.5.2.} that is, languages in which sentential negation is marked essentially in association with a syntactic head. The languages that follow this pattern include Serbian/Croatian, certain nonstandard varieties of English, and, as indicated in the previous section, Italian and Spanish. In addition to those languages already discussed here, Zanuttni (1991: 149, 161) gives data that show that Middle High German, Middle Dutch, Portuguese, and Catalan all fit into this category; Jamal Ouhalla informs me that Berber and Turkish belong here, too. Parry (1996) says that all modern dialects of Italy whose negative marker would be analyzed as a realization of Neg” are NC languages. DeGraff (1993b) argues that Haitian Creole, in which the negative marker pa is analyzed as Neg’, is also an NC language and, therefore, belongs in this group.

20. Note the following observation made by Acquaviva (1993: 60–61): “We can now formally characterize the difference between the English and the Romance (and nonstandard English) operators: only [in] the latter are specifiers of heads endowed with the morphological negative feature.” My analysis of Jespersen’s Generalization differs in crucial ways from Acquaviva’s; this is discussed in section 3.4.

21. Note that my interpretation of Jespersen’s observation is slightly different from the one tentatively proposed by Haegeman (1995: 165). In the context of Jespersen’s observation, Haegeman suggests that NC may be determined by the availability of an overt negative head. See also Haegeman (1991: 16): “We might propose that in languages with NC readings the head of NegP is “strong”; it is autonomously licensed; it has its \textsc{neg} feature in the base. The Neg Criterion is met by a “strong” static agreement configuration. In non-NC languages, on the other hand, Neg is “weak” and would be assigned the \textsc{neg} feature by its specifier by virtue of spec-head agreement. . . . What is crucial for NC . . . is that the \textsc{neg} feature on Neg” is independently licensed, i.e., that Neg is a strong head. In languages where the \textsc{neg} feature on Neg” can only be achieved via dynamic agreement the negative head is not strong and NC is not possible. For me, in contrast, NC correlates with the absence of a negative operator in SpecNegP. Assuming that the characterization of the data in sections 3.1 and 3.1.2 is correct and that languages can indeed mark sentential negation by overt material associated with both SpecNegP and Neg, the difference between Haegeman’s and my own (re-)interpretation of Jespersen’s observation is not a trivial one. Note also that Haegeman’s approach predicts that Modern French is a non-NC language. See section 3.5.2.

22. The consequences of the spec-head agreement mechanism inherent in the Neg Criterion notwithstanding, which is, in any case, discussed in section 3.3.2.
3.2.1.1 Serbian/Croatian

In Serbian/Croatian (henceforth, SC), pure sentential negation is realized as a negative particle, _ne_ (Neg’), proclitic on the first finite verb form (Progovac 1994: 34–35):

(19) Milan poznaje Mariju.
    Mi. knows Ma.-acc
    ‘Mi. knows Ma.’

(20) Milan _ne_ poznaje Mariju.
    ‘Mi. doesn’t know Ma.’

(21) *Milan poznaje _ne_ Mariju.

No other overt negative marker is required; _ne_ cannot be omitted from negative clauses (Progovac 1994: 36); _ne_ forms a syntactic unit with the finite verb. I conclude, therefore, that Neg’ bears the feature [+Neg] underlyingly, rather than SpecNegP. If the generalization in (2) is correct, I predict that SC is an NC language.

SC has two series of what Progovac (1994) terms NPIs, labeled _i_-NPIs and _ni_-NPIs to reflect the fact that members of one set begin with the prefix _i_– while members of the second begin with the prefix _ni_–. Progovac glosses the _i_-NPIs and _ni_-NPIs as _anyone_, _anything_, and so on, and _no-one_, _nothing_, and so on, respectively, but stresses (Progovac 1994: 40, 42) that the distribution of these elements is by no means identical to that of the two series of indefinites in SE. A couple of comments are in order at this point. First, the fact that the distribution of the _i_- and _ni_-NPIs in SC is different from the distribution of the _any_- and _no_-XPs respectively in SE does not necessarily mean that the _i_-NPIs differ from the _any_-XPs or that the _ni_-NPIs differ from the _no_-XPs in respect of any nontivial properties. It is entirely possible that the corresponding XPs in the two languages are essentially identical and that their divergent distributions are the result of differences elsewhere in the grammars of their respective languages. Indeed, this is what I conclude later in this chapter.23
Second, a word is perhaps in order on the issue of Progovac’s use of the term NPI for the ni-prefixeded series of XPs in SC. One might wonder whether the ni-XPs of SC (or, indeed, the no-XPs of SE or the n-words of various Romance varieties) are NPIs at all. These elements are more usually labeled negative indefinite universal quantifiers (with no particular licensing conditions) rather than polarity items (with specific—albeit complex—licensing conditions). However, there is some reason to suspect that even negative quantifiers (with sententential scope) have licensing conditions and that, consequently, the term NPI may not be misplaced. As Haegeman (1996b: 1) puts it, these elements “carry the semantic-syntactic feature NEG and . . . this feature is subject to a specific syntactic licensing condition”. (See also Rizzi 1982: 121–27, section 2, for relevant discussion.) There is, for example, evidence that the presence of negative quantifiers has necessary consequences—albeit sometimes non-overt—elsewhere in their clauses. In SC, for example, ni-NPIs necessarily co-occur with the pre-verbal negative marker ne. The presence of ne clearly satisfies some licensing condition of the ni-NPIs in much the same way that c-commanding negation is one way of licensing any-XPs in SE which are labeled NPIs without hesitation. Similar conditions can be argued to apply to negative quantifiers in other languages. Even in a language like SE, the presence of a negative quantifier can affect clausal polarity, even though this has no overt impact on verb morphology. For example, when familiar tests are performed on (22a) to determine the polarity of the sentence, they show it to be potentially negative:24

(22) a. John’s done nothing.
   b. John’s done nothing and neither/?so has Mary.
   c. John’s done nothing, has he/?hasn’t he?

I therefore conclude that negative quantifiers (with sententential scope) such as ni-NPIs (SC), no-XPs (SE), and n-words (Romance) are indeed polarity items in the sense that their occurrence is subject to licensing conditions.25 In this respect, I am therefore happy to retain the term ni-NPI used for SC by Progovac and to adopt the term no-NPI for SE for consistency.26 I now return to the discussion of SC negation.

footnote 30.

24. I assume with Haegeman (1995) that, where the negative tag is licit in (22c), that is, where the antecedent is positive, the negative quantifier has local scope, does not count as an operator, and is not associated with a NegP. The wide scope reading of the negative is therefore dependent on clausal negation being marked on the verb; it is in this sense that the negative quantifier (on this reading) is licensed by the polarity of the clause. On tags, see Lakoff (1969) and section 1.3.

25. See Quer (1993) for review and discussion of approaches to the licensing of negative quantifiers.

26. Within the terms of his analysis, Acquaviva (1993: 24) suggests that those elements often referred to as negative quantifiers “are closer to polarity items than to wh-operators”.
The most salient characteristic of the ni-NPIs in SC is that, irrespective of their position, they must, as already mentioned, be clause-mate with the pre-verbal negative marker ne (Progovac 1994: 37 (98)).

(23) a. Mario *\(\text{ne}\) vidi ni(t)ko-ga. (SC)
   \(\rightarrow\) M. ne sees no-one ACC
   ‘M. can’t see anyone.’

   b. Ni(t)ko *\(\text{ne}\) poznaje Marij-u.
      no-one ne knows M. ACC
   ‘No-one knows M.’

Furthermore, multiple ni-NPIs can co-occur in a given clause without leading to logical DN, provided, of course, that pre-verbal ne is also present in the same clause (Ljiljana Progovac, personal communication).

(24) Milan *\(\text{ne}\) daje ni(t)kom ništa. (SC)
   \(\rightarrow\) M. ne gives no-one nothing
   ‘M. isn’t giving anything to anyone.’

The examples in (23a, b) show negative doubling; the one in (24) shows both negative spread and negative doubling. SC is clearly an NC language, as predicted by the generalization in (2).

**Nonstandard English**

### 3.2.1.2

In this section, I use Cockney as a representative of a certain class of non-standard varieties of English. In Cockney, pure sentential negation is always realized as the contracted \(n’t\) rather than \(not\), even if the use of \(not\) allows contraction elsewhere:

(25) a. (*’E) ain’t comin’. (Cockney)
   \(\rightarrow \) E’s not comin’.

I take this contrast to be suggestive evidence that, in sentential negation in Cockney, the \([\text{NEG}]\) feature is associated with a head rather than SpecNegP. One might assume, for example, that the morpheme \(n’t\) is generated as \(\text{Neg}^*\) and that it raises to the finite verb in AgrS*. An alternative analysis would be to assume that the negative auxiliaries of Cockney, namely \(ain’t\), \(can’t\), \(won’t\), and \(don’t\), are drawn directly from the lexicon as inherently negative auxiliaries rather than as polarity-neutral auxiliaries, which are associated with a negative morpheme in the syntax. Such a view is supported by the fact that none of these negative auxiliaries...
auxiliaries shows overt person and number agreement (cf. SE isn’t versus aren’t and doesn’t versus don’t). The important point is that, in Cockney, the negative feature is associated underlingly with a syntactic head; in SE, in contrast, it is associated with an XP specifier position.

If I am right in concluding that, in Cockney, the feature [+NEG] is borne by a syntactic head, Cockney matches SC. The generalization in (2) then predicts that Cockney is an NC language.30 This prediction is borne out by the facts: Cockney has negative doubling with n’t (but not with not31), as in (26), as well as negative spread, as in (27):

(26)  a. I ain’t done nothin’.
    b. I’ve not done nothin’.

(27) No-one ain’t done nothin’.

It could be objected at this point that the data in (26) and (27) do not represent NC at all; rather, it could be concluded that, in varieties of NSE such as Cockney, nothin’, no-one, and so on, are negative polarity items à la SE anything or anyone, that is, not inherently negative. This is, however, unlikely. If NSE no-NPIs were equivalent to SE any-NPIs, one might expect the two series to have parallel distributions. However, the parallel between the behavior of NSE no-NPIs and SE any-NPIs is far from complete. Unlike the any-NPIs of SE, the concordant readings of no-NPIs in NSE are possible only in the presence of sentential negation, either in the same clause or in a higher clause.32 No-NPIs cannot appear in nonnegative polarity contexts in Cockney/NSE, whereas SE any-NPIs can (Ladusaw 1992):33

(28) NSE:
   a. If you see anyone/no-one, let me know. (Conditional)
   b. I doubt anyone/no-one will come. (Adversative predicate)
   c. Do you want anythin’/nothin’? (Interrogative)

30. Note that the approach adopted here to the distinction between the non-NC SE and nonstandard NC varieties such as Cockney and the variety of Belfast English described by Henry (1995) and referred to in footnote 31 assumes that the crucial difference lies at the level of the functional structure of the clause. This is in sharp contrast to the approach adopted by Acquaviva (1995) and Déprez (forthcoming), who assume that the crucial difference between NC and non-NC languages is to be found in the (operator-binding) properties of negative quantifiers. See footnote 23.

31. Henry (1995) describes another NSE, namely a variety of Belfast English, in which NC is possible with n’t but not not. Compare (i) with (ii) (Henry’s (35) and (36)):
   (i) We aren’t going nowhere.
   (ii) *We’re not going nowhere.

32. In this respect, Cockney differs from SC. In the former, the verbal negative marker is not obliged to appear in the same minimal clause as the no-NPIs. In the latter, it is. This may be related to the fact that, in Cockney, and in contrast to SC, for example, the verbal negative marker n’t is compatible only with finite verb forms.

33. Alison Henry (personal communication) informs me that the judgments in (28) also apply to the variety of Belfast English discussed in footnote 31.
34. The syntactic status of *not* is not entirely clear. See the discussion of the Negative Cycle in English in section 3.1 and in footnote 12. I have assumed that SE *n’t* is a phonologically elicitized form of *not*. It seems to be the case that *not* can sometimes cliticize without phonological reduction. Witness the grammaticality of (i), in part taken from Quirk et al. (1985: 809), cited by Haegeman (1995: 306fn17 (i)),

(i) a. Has not John been there too?
   b. Is not history a social science?
   c. Does not everything we see about us testify to the power of Divine Providence?

Here, both the auxiliary *and* the negation occupy a position to the left of the subject. Assuming an analysis in terms of *AgrS ‘-to-C’* movement to be along the right lines, the auxiliary and the negative must
(29) a. I do not like Vodka.
    b. I don’t like Vodka.

Most recent work on negation in SE, such as Haegeman (1995: 190), has concluded that not is generated in SpecNegP\(^{35}\) while n’t is generated as Neg\(^{-}\). (Like French pas, English not used to co-occur with a clitic ne—see (3b) and (18).) If this is true, it would be natural to claim that n’t is the grammaticalized (i.e., reanalyzed) equivalent of not. (See footnote 12.) While I accept the “standard” assumption that not is associated with SpecNegP at S-structure if not before, I doubt the validity of the claim that, in SE, n’t is associated with Neg\(^{-}\). It seems more likely that n’t is nothing more than a phonologically criticized version of not and that, in all relevant respects, n’t is associated with SpecNegP exactly like not. (See the suggestion by Jean-Yves Pollock reported by Zribi-Hertz 1994: 464fn17 that weakening of not to n’t preceded reanalysis of the item as a head. See also the discussion in section 3.2.1.2.) I conclude, therefore, that, in SE, SpecNegP bears the feature \([+\text{NEG}]\)\(^{36}\) Jespersen’s Generalization in (2) predicts that SE should not be an NC language.

With respect to NPIs in SE, the “equivalent”\(^37\) of the SC ni-NPIs, that is, the no-NPIs, cannot co-occur with not or n’t and receive an NC reading:

(30) a. \[*\]Michael can not see no-one. \hspace{1cm} (DN)
    b. \[*\]Michael can’t see nothing.

Not surprisingly, multiple instances of no-NPIs together with not/n’t are also illicit:

(31) a. \#I did not give nothing to no-one.
    b. \#I didn’t give nothing to no-one.

In conclusion, in SE negative sentences, the feature \([+\text{NEG}]\) is borne by SpecNegP, and SE is clearly a non-NC language, as predicted by (2).

**German**

3.2.2.2

As shown by the examples in (17), repeated here for convenience, German is a non-NC language.

\footnote{35. I do not address the issue of whether not should be deemed to be generated in an adverbial position and subsequently raised into SpecNegP in parallel to my proposals for pas in chapter 2.}

\footnote{36. Zwicky and Pullum (1983) claim that n’t is in fact a (morphological) inflectional affix, rather than a (syntactic) clitic.}

\footnote{37. With respect to the issue of whether no-NPIs in English and ni-NPIs in SC are equivalents, see Progovac (1994: 40, 42) and the discussion in section 3.2.1.1.}
38. See Déprez (forthcoming) for reservations about this conclusion.
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(35) The wh-criterion:
   a. Each wh-X° must be in a spec-head relationship with a wh-operator.
   b. Each wh-operator must be in a spec-head relationship with a wh-X°.

Indeed, the two criteria in (34) and (35) are seen as instantiations of a more general wellformedness condition on the distribution and interpretation of affective elements (with sentential scope), namely the affect criterion:39

(36) The affect criterion:
   a. Each affective X° must be in a spec-head relationship with an affective operator.
   b. Each affective operator must be in a spec-head relationship with an affective X°.

Each clause of these criteria arguably has two requirements:

(37) a. The first obliges a head and an operator of a specific type to be in a spec-head configuration.
   b. The second says that the head and operator must “agree” with each other with respect to the relevant affective features.

These two requirements are discussed in the following two sections.

The configuration

3.3.1

According to (37a), Jespersen’s Negative Cycle is nothing more than a superficial epiphenomenon: assuming that sentential negation is marked within a functional projection in clause structure, the Neg Criterion forces us to postulate the presence in negative clauses of a ([+NEG]) head and a ([+NEG]) operator (in abstract syntactic terms at least), irrespective of where the language stands in the Negative Cycle, that is, how a language overtly marks negation.

In languages with bipartite pure sentential negation, that is, languages that overtly realize both a negative head and a negative operator, such as Standard French (4c), Taqbaylit (6), Burmese (7), and Standard Breton (8a), as well as Pôa and Navajo (see footnote 10 and chapter 2, footnote 6), the configuration requirement in the Neg Criterion might be said to be trivially satisfied by the two overt constituents.

Where a variety overtly marks negation with a head element alone (e.g., Italian [Neg/non]), the Neg Criterion obliges one to posit the presence of an abstract negative operator that will appear in a spec-head configuration with that head (or its trace). In support of such a requirement, Rizzi (1990) provides

39. Haegeman (1995: 94) suggests that the affect criterion in its various manifestations can be subsumed under the more general Checking requirements of Chomsky’s (1993, 1995a, b) Minimalist Program. See sections 1.1.1 and 1.1.5, for example, for a discussion of Verb Movement in terms of Checking. Under a Checking approach, affective items are deemed to have morphological features that need to be checked against the features of functional heads within a spec-head configuration. See chapter 2.
evidence for postulating the presence of an operator in SpecNegP in Italian by showing that negative sentences exhibit inner island effects.\footnote{See also the discussion of a non-overt negative operator in French in section 1.2.4.} Consider the minimally contrasting pair in (38):

(38) a. Perché hai detto [t₁] che Gianni è partito [t₂]? (Italian)

\begin{quote}
\text{why have-2SG said that G. is left}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{‘Why did you say that G. left?’}
\end{quote}

b. Perché non hai detto [t₁] che Gianni è partito [t₂]?

\begin{quote}
\text{why non have-2SG said that G. is left}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{‘Why didn’t you say that G. left?’}
\end{quote}

In (38a), the adverb perché ‘why’ can be construed either with a trace adjoined to the matrix AgrSP, [t₁], or with one adjoined to the embedded AgrSP, [t₂]; the string can be interpreted as a question about saying or a question about leaving. In (38b), which differs from (38a) only with respect to the presence of sentential negation in the matrix clause, realized overtly as [Neg non], the second of these readings disappears; (38b) can be a question about saying only. In Rizzi’s analysis, the unavailability of the long-distance construal of perché is attributed to the presence of a non-overt operator in the matrix clause that counts as a potential A’-antecedent intervening between the surface position of perché and a trace adjoined to the embedded AgrSP. No such potential antecedent intervenes between perché and the higher trace [t₁]. Long construal of perché thus violates Relativized Minimality.\footnote{The following definitions are based on Rizzi (1990: 6-7): Relativized Minimality: A antecedent-governs B only if there is no C such that:

(i) C is a typical potential antecedent-governor for B.
(ii) C c-commands B and does not c-command A. Antecedent-government: A antecedent-governs B iff:

(i) A and B are co-indexed.
(ii) A c-commands B.
(iii) No barrier intervenes.
(iv) Relativized Minimality is respected.} Unless one were to postulate the presence of an abstract operator in SpecNegP in the matrix clause in (38b), the unavailability of long construal of perché would remain unexplained.\footnote{Den Besten (1989), among others, notes another empirical phenomenon that lends itself to an explanation on the basis of the requirement, expressed in the affect criterion, that affective heads be in a spec-head configuration with an operator. Den Besten notes that embedded V'-to-I'-to-C' movement creates islands for extraction in a way that embedded simple V'-to-I' movement does not. Under the assumptions (a) that extraction out of CP uses SpecCP as an intermediate landing site and (b) that I'-to-C' movement is triggered by the abstract properties of C', that is, the fact that C’ bears affective features, the island effects can be readily accounted for by assuming that the affect criterion obliges C’ to be in a spec-head configuration with an affective operator in SpecCP, preventing extraction from within CP from using SpecCP as an appropriate intermediate landing site.}

Conversely, where the overt negative marker is an XP (e.g., SE [SpecNegP not]), the Neg Criterion obliges one posit the presence of an abstract negative head. The following contrast provides evidence for the presence of an abstract Neg° in SE:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[40.] See also the discussion of a non-overt negative operator in French in section 1.2.4.
\item[41.] Den Besten notes that embedded V'-to-I'-to-C' movement creates islands for extraction in a way that embedded simple V'-to-I' movement does not. Under the assumptions (a) that extraction out of CP uses SpecCP as an intermediate landing site and (b) that I'-to-C' movement is triggered by the abstract properties of C’, that is, the fact that C’ bears affective features, the island effects can be readily accounted for by assuming that the affect criterion obliges C’ to be in a spec-head configuration with an affective operator in SpecCP, preventing extraction from within CP from using SpecCP as an appropriate intermediate landing site.
\end{enumerate}
43. DeGraff (1993b: 71) suggests that NC results from structural configurations involving agreement between a [+NEG] XP and a [+NEG] head, where necessary, with LF movement of the former into the specifier position of the latter.

44. Note, however, that Acquaviva (1993: 9–10) believes there is a “sharp difference” between the nature of spec-head agreement involved in sharing φ-features and the nature of spec-head agreement sharing operator features.
If the spec-head relationship is seen as feature identity, then the type of “abstract” Negative Cycle discussed in section 3.1.2, whereby the locus of the abstract feature [+NEG] fluctuates between Neg and SpecNegP in the same way as the overt marker of negation, becomes unacceptable. Under this strong interpretation, the Neg Criterion obliges both Neg and SpecNegP to bear the same feature: [+NEG]. Irrespective of where the feature is located underlyingly, a dynamic agreement mechanism will make sure head and specifier match in time for the Neg Criterion to come along and check that all is in order by LF at the latest, that is, at the level at which scopal relations are relevant. Consequently, no cross-linguistic or diachronic variation will be possible, and it will not be possible to relate NC to the Negative Cycle.

The strong interpretation of spec-head agreement in terms of feature identity is, however, not the only one available, and I now consider a weaker alternative that is attractive on both theory-internal and empirical grounds. Consider the possibility that spec-head agreement is in fact nothing more than spec-head anti-disagreement, guaranteeing feature compatibility rather than identity. Consider also the possibility that the only dynamic agreement mechanism available is Rizzi’s (1996: 76) DA, discussed in section 1.2.4, and schematized here for the specific affective context of interrogation but which might be generalized to other contexts.

(40) Dynamic Agreement (DA): (Rizzi 1996: 76)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Op} & \rightarrow \text{Op} \\
\text{X} & \rightarrow \text{X} \\
\text{WH} & \rightarrow \text{WH}
\end{align*}
\]

An important feature of DA is its unidirectionality. DA passes features from specifier to head but not vice versa. So, where a relevant feature is borne by both X* and SpecXP, DA has no effect. Where it is borne by SpecXP but not X*, DA passes on the feature to X* (as in the discussion of ne in chapter 1). In contrast, where it is borne by X* but not by SpecXP, DA crucially does not pass it on to SpecXP. Consider what this means for negation in a language such as Italian. Here, non in Neg is specified [+NEG] as a lexical feature, but DA does not transfer the feature [+NEG] to the non-overt operator in SpecNegP (whose presence there is guaranteed by (37a)), which is, consequently, what Haegeman (1995) terms an “expletive” operator. Under the strong interpretation of spec-head agreement, the Neg Criterion would not be satisfied, since there is no feature identity between Neg and SpecNegP. In contrast, with the weaker version of spec-head agreement, based on nonincompatibility, the Neg Criterion would be satisfied. Under such a view, the expletive operator in SpecNegP is not incompatible with Neg and the Neg Criterion is not violated.

By way of illustration, in a structure such as (41), if X* bears the set of affective features, α, while the operator in SpecXP bears the affective features, β, where β is a proper subset of α, the AFFECT Criterion will be satisfied, since SpecXP is not incompatible with X* even though there is not full agreement. In contrast, if α were a proper subset of β, DA would transmit the “extra” features from SpecXP to X*.
Note that this view of spec-head agreement is not at odds with Haegeman’s (1995: 107) characterization of negative clauses as clauses in which the feature [+NEG] is borne by a functional head in the extended domain of V. For, irrespective of where the feature [+NEG] originates, under the model proposed here, [+NEG] will always ultimately appear on a functional head. Indeed, if Haegeman is right in her characterization of negative clauses, the conception of DA in (40) could be argued to follow from economy considerations. If all that is needed to mark sentential negation is the presence of the feature [+NEG] on a functional head, then transferring the feature to an operator in specifier position serves no purpose and should arguably not be allowed. Certainly, as an interpretable feature, the presence of [+NEG] on a functional head at LF should not in itself be problematic. Consequently, the presence of a suitable operator in SpecNegP cannot be motivated for Checking reasons.

In contrast, transferring the feature from the operator to the head serves a clear purpose, since, in the absence of such a feature specification on the head, sentential negation will not be marked. Note also the motivation for pas-raising to SpecNegP given in chapters 1 and 2. Thus, there seem to be theory-internal reasons for adopting the concepts of spec-head agreement and DA proposed here.

On the empirical front, the “weak” conception of the spec-head relationship is strong enough to account for the ungrammaticality of the following strings from Italian discussed by Belletti (1990: 41 (29c, d)), arguably attributable to spec-head agreement:

(42) a. *Maria non parlera pur/ben di lui. (Italian)
    M. non spoke indeed of him

b. *Maria non ha pur/ben parlato di lui.
    M. non has indeed spoken of him

Belletti (1990: 39), following Lonzi (1991), describes adverbs such as pur/ben ‘indeed’ as having “the semantic function of reinforcing the assertive value of the sentence”. She concludes that they are the positive counterpart of negative (sentential) adverbs and that, accordingly, they fill the specifier of a polarity phrase, SpecPolP or SpecΣP (see section 1.2.1). This analysis is supported by the fact that the distribution of pur and ben is identical to the negative adverbs più ‘no more’ and mai ‘never’, which are assumed by Belletti (1990) to occupy SpecNegP at S-structure (but see Zanuttini 1997a): in (42b), the positive adverbs
This analysis is also in line with proposals made by Hulk and van Kemenade (1995: 231), who suggest that third person and singular number are both default \( \neg \) -features. It also ties in well with Benveniste’s (1966: 225–36) claim that first and second person differ in important respects from third person with respect to morphological marking. Note that, in a number of languages, if not universally, negative quantifiers like \textit{no-one}, which are semantically neither third person nor singular, are nevertheless syntactically third person singular. This also suggests that third person singular agreement morphology is a default setting. The agreement patterns in Spanish illustrated in (43) are also discussed in Torrego (1996: 114–16).

Recent work by Lyons (1994b) suggests further that the “weak” version of spec-head agreement is in fact empirically better motivated than the “strong” one. Lyons discusses data from Spanish in which subjects appear to disagree with the verb. In (43), for example, the subject is third person plural while the verb is first person plural.

(43) a. Los estudiantes trabajamos mucho. (Spanish)
    the students work-1PL much
    ‘We students work a lot.’

b. Algunos estudiantes trabajamos mucho.
    some students work-1PL much
    ‘Some students (including me) work a lot.’

The data in (43) are problematic if the spec-head relationship is formulated in terms of feature identity. If, rather, it is formulated in terms of compatibility, the problem does not arise. Assuming that third person is not a real person at all but is, rather, a default person, the data in (43) are straightforward.\(^{45}\) In each sentence, the feature specification of the morphologically strong Agr\(^{S}\) is [1PL] (Spanish is a null-subject language). The subject in SpecAgrSP bears only number features, that is, [PL]. Given that [PL] is a subset of [1PL], SpecAgrSP is compatible with Agr\(^{S}\). Of course, an analysis in terms of strict agreement or feature sharing would wrongly predict the ungrammaticality of the strings in (43). I conclude, therefore, that there are theoretical and empirical reasons for doubting that the spec-head relationship needs to be couched in terms of strict feature identity.\(^{46}\) Most significant for my purposes, a weaker interpretation of the spec-head relationship is also in line with proposals made by Hulk and van Kemenade (1995: 231), who suggest that third person and singular number are both default \( \neg \) -features. It also ties in well with Benveniste’s (1966: 225–36) claim that first and second person differ in important respects from third person with respect to morphological marking. Note that, in a number of languages, if not universally, negative quantifiers like \textit{no-one}, which are semantically neither third person nor singular, are nevertheless syntactically third person singular. This also suggests that third person singular agreement morphology is a default setting. The agreement patterns in Spanish illustrated in (43) are also discussed in Torrego (1996: 114–16).

\(^{45}\) This analysis is also in line with proposals made by Hulk and van Kemenade (1995: 231), who suggest that third person and singular number are both default \( \neg \) -features. It also ties in well with Benveniste’s (1966: 225–36) claim that first and second person differ in important respects from third person with respect to morphological marking. Note that, in a number of languages, if not universally, negative quantifiers like \textit{no-one}, which are semantically neither third person nor singular, are nevertheless syntactically third person singular. This also suggests that third person singular agreement morphology is a default setting. The agreement patterns in Spanish illustrated in (43) are also discussed in Torrego (1996: 114–16).

\(^{46}\) One of the anonymous reviewers of this book felt that the weaker version of the spec-head relationship proposed in the text effectively took the movement-inducing teeth out of, for example, the Neg Criterion. I feel that this concern is misplaced. Movement of a phrasal element into the relevant SpecXP is determined by the interplay of two factors, namely the feature marking on X\(^{\neg}\) and the availability of
head relationship in terms of compatibility rather than feature identity makes it possible to account for the link between the Negative Cycle and NC, and it is to this that I turn in the next section.

3.4 Jespersen’s Generalization: analysis

An analysis of Jespersen’s Generalization will depend on an analysis of how NPIs are licensed in negative contexts. Two proposals are evaluated in section 3.4.1, and a modified version of the latter is adopted. An analysis of Jespersen’s Generalization itself is given in section 3.4.2.

NPI licensing in negative contexts

3.4.1

In this section, I consider NPI licensing in negative contexts with a view to laying the foundations for an account of Jespersen’s Generalization. First, in section 3.4.1.1, I consider the approach adopted by Zanuttini (1991), which exploits Chomsky’s (1986b) idea of L-marking. I show that this approach, while theoretically interesting, is empirically inadequate. In section 3.4.1.2, I consider the more promising approach adopted by Progovac (1994) based on A’-binding. In section 3.4.1.3, I suggest modifications to Progovac’s A’-binding approach that, while exploiting her basic insight, have a number of empirical and theoretical advantages over her own execution of the idea: in the first instance, the revised analysis is truer to the nature of A-binding; second, it makes it possible to account for Jespersen’s Generalization. The modifications are explored in section 3.4.2.

Zanuttini (1991): L-marking

3.4.1.1

Jespersen’s Generalization is taken up by Zanuttini (1991: chapter 5) within the framework of her structural account of NC and NPI licensing in negative contexts. Zanuttini claims (1991: 151–52) that the co-occurrence of the pre-verbal negative marker (which she analyzes as the head of NegP-1, generated above TP) with post-verbal negative quantifiers (n-words) is linked to the need for the latter to raise, at LF, to SpecNegP-1 to satisfy the Neg Criterion, crossing TP as they go, which, when indicative, is a barrier to LF movement (Zanuttini

47. The reader is referred to Zanuttini’s own work for discussion of the distinction between NegP-1 and NegP-2. In section 2.1.1.3, I ultimately reject NegP-2. In Zanuttini (1997a), four NegPs are proposed.
1991: section 5.3). In this scenario, the function of an obligatorily overt pre-verbal negative marker is to L-mark—and hence to void the barrierhood of—the category it selects, TP, making LF movement of the negative quantifiers across TP into SpecNegP-1 licit, as illustrated in (44), adapted from Zanuttini (1991: 162). Negative quantifiers in pre-verbal position, such as negative subjects and topicalized negative constituents, do not co-occur with non because they do not need to cross TP and raise into SpecNegP at LF. In Zanuttini’s analysis, post-verbal markers of negation such as French pas are associated with the specifier position of what she terms NegP-2, generated below TP, as in (45) (adapted from Zanuttini 1991: 163), and do not therefore have the ability to L-mark TP, and NC is unavailable.

(44) NegP-1
   Spec  Neg'-1
      |       |
   -1   -1
    non   TP
         |
      L-marking
         . . n-word . .
         LF-raising

(45) TP
    T*  NegP-2
       Spec  Neg'-2
           |     |
          pas  Neg'-2  VP

Thus, Zanuttini seems to have accounted for Jespersen’s Generalization. This analysis is problematic for a number of reasons. (See also Robbers 1992: 229 for objections to Zanuttini’s analysis.) First, if, generally speaking, UG makes Zanuttini’s NegP-2 available below TP, why can this projection not be generated in, say, Italian? If NegP-2 were available in Italian, post-verbal n-words could raise into SpecNegP-2 to satisfy the Neg Criterion without having to cross TP. Pre-verbal non would then not be needed to L-mark TP in order to void its LF barrierhood. The ungrammaticality of post-verbal n-words in Italian in the absence of pre-verbal non suggests that there is no SpecNegP-2 position available, casting doubt on Zanuttini’s approach to NC, especially her NegP-2 hypothesis, and her approach to (45).#48

48. See also section 2.1.1.3 for additional reasons for rejecting Zanuttini’s NegP-2 hypothesis.
Second, if the presence of *non* in Neg\(^{\circ}\) is to L-mark TP to allow LF raising of n-words, why is *non* needed in the presence of *mai* ‘never’ and *più* ‘no more’, which, unlike argumental n-words, occupy SpecNegP-1 at S-structure? Given that any raising that takes place is in overt syntax, the LF-barrihood of TP should be irrelevant. Recall from the discussion of the examples in (42) that the class of Italian emphatic positive adverbs including *ben/pur* ‘indeed’ has the same distribution in positive clauses as *mai* and *più* in negative clauses. Exploiting the parallel, Belletti (1990, 1992, 1994a, b) argues that these positive adverbs have a matching distribution because they occupy Spec\(\Sigma\)P/SpecPolP, presumably to satisfy the *AFFECT* criterion.\(^{49}\) If these elements can occupy this position without TP being L-marked, why is *non* required in the corresponding negative contexts?

Third, why, in SC (see (23) and (24)) and a number of Romance varieties like Romanian and Ladin (see the examples in (ii)-(iii) in footnote 18) but not Italian (but note the stylistic and dialectal variation referred to in footnote 18), is it the case that the need for the verb to appear with an overt negative marker is not sensitive to whether or not the verb is preceded by a negative quantifier? Why should this be the case if, as Zanuttini argues, the overt nature of the negative marker is to L-mark TP? If Zanuttini’s analysis is along the right lines, SC, and so on would be expected to pattern with Italian, contrary to fact. The obverse of this objection to Zanuttini’s analysis can be made with respect to West Flemish. West Flemish has an (optional) pre-verbal negative marker, *en*, but obligatory raising of negative quantifiers (with sentential scope) at S-Structure. Why should morphologically negative quantifiers in West Flemish not be able to remain in situ at S-structure, safe in the knowledge that *en* will L-mark TP and allow LF-raising to SpecNegP, thus guaranteeing a concordant reading? Zanuttini’s analysis fails to answer these questions. (Negation in West Flemish is discussed in some detail in section 3.5.1.)

Finally, in a number of languages, for example Italian, an interesting scenario is provided by strings in which one negative quantifier appears pre-verbally while another appears post-verbally, as in (1b). In such a configuration, pre-verbal *non* does not appear. Under the assumption that the post-verbal negative quantifier has to raise at LF to SpecNegP to satisfy the Neg Criterion, one wonders why the presence of *non* is not necessary. It seems implausible to claim that the pre-verbal negative quantifier somehow manages to L-mark TP in the absence of an overt Neg\(^{\circ}\) marker.

On the basis of these considerations, I reject Zanuttini’s L-marking account of NC. An alternative analysis of the NPI licensing involved in NC has been proposed by Progovac (1994). This approach is evaluated in the next section.

---

\(^{49}\) Recall that the Neg Criterion and *wh*-criterion are construction-specific instantiations of the *AFFECT* criterion in (36). Raising of Italian *ben/pur* into the equivalent of SpecNegP could be motivated by the *AFFECT* criterion if emphatic elements are deemed to bear affective features.
Jespersen’s Generalization

3.4.1.2

Progovac (1994): A’-binding

On the basis of distributional parallels between anaphors and pronouns, on the one hand, and polarity items/negative quantifiers, on the other, Progovac (1994) suggests that (A’)-Binding Theory (henceforth, BT) should be called upon to account for NPI licensing. It is within this general framework that she analyzes the ni-NPIs of SC as A’-anaphors that, just like A-anaphors, need to be bound within a given domain (Principle A of BT). (See section 3.2.1.) In BT terms, the ni-NPIs need a local antecedent in the same way that (A-)anaphors do. In (46), for example, Principle A is satisfied by virtue of the fact that the ni-NPI nit(t)ko-ga ‘no-one’ is A’-bound by the c-commanding [Neg ne], a functional (A’)-head. The element ne functions as the A’-antecedent of the ni-NPI. This binding relationship is represented by co-indexation.

(46) Mario •(ne) vidi nit(t)ko-ga.
    M.    ne  sees no-one-ACC
    ‘M. can’t see anyone.’

This analysis is compatible with the standard assumption (e.g., in Haegeman 1995: 70–71 and references therein) that polarity items are licensed by a c-commanding negative or interrogative element. However, as Haegeman (1995: 294fn3) points out, this standard assumption says nothing in X’-theoretic terms about the nature of the c-commanding licenser of a polarity item: should it be a head or an XP? Haegeman herself (1995: 71) exploits both possibilities (arguably unnecessarily). Progovac clearly takes the former option with respect to the A’-binding of ni-NPIs in SC, which, she argues, are bound by Neg’, that is, ne. Here, Progovac essentially follows the line of Aoun (1986: 136), who was writing prior to the NegP hypothesis and the proposal of the Neg Criterion and who suggests for negation in Italian that post-verbal negative quantifiers are A’-bound by pre-verbal non, their antecedent in his terms. Nevertheless, this move by Progovac is surprising, given her more general objective, namely to subsume NPI licensing under a version of BT generalised to the A’-system. While Progo-

50. For example, in (i) (Haegeman’s 1995: 70 (1a)), Haegeman assumes that the interrogative feature on the inverted auxiliary, i.e., X*, licenses (by binding?) the NPI.

(i) Did you see anyone?
However, given that the wh-criterion obliges an operator to co-occur with a wh-head, Haegeman might alternatively have assumed that it is the operator that is responsible for licensing the NPI. NPI-licensing by heads would then no longer be needed at all, and the theory would be more constrained. (See also Haegeman 1995: 294fn3.) The AffecT criterion, that is, the requirement that affective heads co-occur with an affective operator, could also be used to avoid the need for Laka (1990) and Progovac (1991) to claim that, in (ii), the NPI is licensed by the affective feature on the embedded C*. (See Haegeman 1995: 90 (56c).)

(ii) He denies/doubts that anything happened.
Instead, one could argue that the NPI is licensed by the null operator required to occupy SpecCP in order to satisfy the AffecT criterion.
vac’s claim that the distribution of ni-NPIs and i-NPIs in SC patterns surprisingly closely with anaphors and pronominals seems convincing enough, it is odd that Progovac chooses to have ni-NPIs (phrasal constituents) obligatorily A’-bound by the head ne. This is not the way A-binding is generally assumed to function. On the contrary, A-binding—in its most familiar form—involves one XP binding another XP, for example, an overt antecedent binding an overt A-anaphor, as in (47a), or an overt NP binding its non-Case-marked trace (also assumed to be an A-anaphor) following NP-movement, as in (47b).

(47) a. Susan, loves herself,
    b. John, was killed t.

Progovac’s claim that ni-NPIs are A’-bound by Neg is even more surprising in view of her Relativized Principle A of BT, given in (48):

(48) Relativized Principle A:
    A reflexive R must be bound in the domain D containing R and an X-bar compatible SUBJECT.
    If R is an X¹ (morphologically simple) reflexive, then its SUBJECTS are X⁰ categories only, i.e., Agr (as the only salient (c-commanding) head with pronominal features).
    If R is an Xmax (morphologically complex) reflexive, its SUBJECTS are Xmax specifiers with pronominal features, thus SpecIP and SpecNP.
    (Progovac 1994: 12 (60); my emphasis)

Within the terms of (48), it is only another XP that should be able to A’-bind the XP ni-NPIs of SC. So what could that XP be? Although negative, NegP itself will not count as a suitable A’-binder, given that it actually contains the NPIs: co-indexation would violate the i-within-i filter. However, given the Neg Criterion, a potential A’-antecedent would be the operator in SpecNegP. In the following section, I propose that Progovac’s Relativized Principle A of BT should be respected and that one should assume that A’-anaphors that are maximal projections can be bound only by antecedents that are also maximal projections, for example, an operator in SpecNegP.

Modified version of NPI licensing in

3.4.1.3 negative contexts by A’-binding

In this section, I propose an account of NPI licensing in negative contexts that exploits the basic insight behind Progovac’s (1994) analysis, reviewed in the previous section. First, it exploits theoretical apparatus already available and well motivated, namely Generalized (A’)-BT. However, as is shown later, the A’-binding account put forward here is arguably more faithful to the principles of A-binding than Progovac’s original analysis. Second, and more important, it opens the door to an account of Jespersen’s Generalization. Third, it goes some way toward bringing natural language negation (back) into the sphere of the negation of (Boolean) logic. There is a tradition of observing that natural language
negation (at least in NC languages) cannot be subsumed under logical negation; however, no convincing alternative has been proposed, suggesting that the realm of logic was where natural language negation belonged all along. Finally, it allows me to claim, contra Acquaviva (1995) and Déprez (forthcoming), that inherently negative NPIs, that is, negative quantifiers, are identical in the relevant syntactic respects cross-linguistically—despite their diverging distributions, which can be attributed to a difference elsewhere in the grammar of the respective languages, namely their position in the Negative Cycle. This is a welcome result, since it serves to reduce the range of variation attested cross-linguistically, a consequence that has clear benefits for the explanation of language acquisition.

In order to make the A’-binding of NPIs parallel to the A-binding of anaphors, I suggest that Progovac’s Relativized Principle A of BT in (48) be respected. Consequently, if ni-NPIs in SC are indeed XP A’-anaphors (as Progovac argues and as I assume), then they will need to be locally A’-bound by an XP antecedent rather than by a head antecedent. So what XP could the A’-binder be? As suggested in the previous section, the answer to this question comes from the Neg Criterion. Under the assumption that the SC negative sentence in (46) contains a NegP with a head bearing the feature [+NEG] and realized phonetically as ne, the Neg Criterion obliges one to posit the presence of an affective operator, Op, in SpecNegP. I claim that it is this operator that A’-binds—and thus licenses—the ni-NPI in (46). In other words, the ni-NPI is A’-bound by the operator, Op, in SpecNegP, its antecedent, as in (46’):

\[
\text{(46')} \text{AgrSP AgrS NegP } \text{ni(t)ko-ga] } \\
\text{AgrSP AgrS NegP } \text{ni(t)ko-ga] } \\
\text{AgrSP AgrS NegP } \text{ni(t)ko-ga] }
\]

Following Progovac (1994), I assume that the fact that ni-NPIs are not licensed by superordinate negation or in nonnegative polarity contexts is due to the fact that, in such contexts, ni-NPIs are not A’-bound in the domain, D, referred to in (48). Progovac takes this domain to be NegP with possible extension to IP (=AgrSP) as a consequence of head-to-head movement of Neg to I’ (=AgrS*). Crucially, the domain never extends as far as CP. Given that SpecCP is arguably the position occupied by the polarity operator, Op, in the nonnegative polarity context in (49a) or in the clause embedded under matrix negation in (49b), this assumption is necessary to account for the ungrammatical status of the examples.

(49) a. Sumnja-m [CP Op [C da Milan voli niti ko-ga ]]
   ‘I doubt M. loves anyone.’
   (Progovac 1994: 64 (17))

b. Milan ne tvrdi [CP Op [C da Marija poznaje niti ko-ga ]]
   Mi. ne claims that Ma. knows no-one-Acc
   ‘Mi. isn’t claiming that Ma. knows anyone.’
   (Progovac 1994: 41 (111))
If the *ni*-NPIs are A’-bound at all in (49), they are A’-bound by Op in SpecCP. However, this binder is not close enough to satisfy (48).

The strings in (49) are grammatical if the *ni*-NPIs are replaced with *i*-NPIs. I follow Progovac in attributing this to the fact that, as “pronominals”, *i*-NPIs obey BT Principle B and must therefore be A’-free in the domain D. Nevertheless, *i*-NPIs also need to obey a requirement that they be A’-bound somewhere in the sentence outside the domain D. Unlike Progovac, though, I assume that an *i*-NPI, as a morphologically complex element, is also bound by a maximal projection, such as Op in SpecCP in (49), rather than by a head such as C^+.

### 3.4.2 Jespersen’s Generalization

By adopting a “weak” interpretation of spec-head agreement in terms of compatibility and an A’-binding approach to NPI licensing in which XP NPIs can be bound only by XP antecedents and not by heads, I am now in a position to account for Jespersen’s Generalization.

Assume that the negative quantifiers referred to in the context of NC, for example, *ni*-NPIs, *no*-NPIs, and *n*-words, are inherently negative, that is, they bear the feature [+NEG]. As polarity items (A’-anaphors), these will need to be licensed—by A’-binding, by hypothesis. Assume further that, in these languages, the feature [+NEG] is borne by the lexical item under Neg’ as a lexical characteristic.

*Why NC languages are NC languages . . .*

#### 3.4.2.1

In underlying representations, it was suggested earlier that, in NC languages, [+NEG] is to be seen as a feature of Neg’ but not SpecNegP. Given such an underlying configuration, the Neg Criterion in (34) obliges one to posit the presence of a non-overt operator in SpecNegP. Given the unidirectionality of DA, it is impossible for the [+NEG] feature to be passed from Neg’ to SpecNegP. Accordingly, I assume that the operator in SpecNegP is Haegeman’s (1995: 192–93) “expletive” polarity operator (Op_{exp}). Further, the weak spec-head relationship based on compatibility rather than on feature identity means that the Neg Criterion is satisfied. I further assume that the operator is the element responsible for A’-binding and licensing the inherently negative polarity items: Op_{exp} in SpecNegP (unselectively) A’-binds the [+NEG] polarity item in situ, creating a representational CHAIN.51

This can be illustrated using the Italian example in (50). The relevant features of the representation of (50) are given in the tree in (51). Neg’ bears the feature [+NEG] as a consequence of the lexical properties of non. In accordance with the

---

51. See Acquaviva (1993), who also exploits unselective binding in the licensing of negative quantifiers but in a slightly different way. See also Ladusaw (1992).
The notion of heads and maximal projections not interfering with each other is, of course, not new. Within the context of movement, the two are usually regarded as separate and independent.

Neg Criterion. SpecNegP must be filled by an operator, Op. Weak spec-head agreement checks that SpecNegP and Neg⁰ are compatible, but DA does not transmit the [+NEG] feature from Neg⁰ to SpecNegP. Op is therefore Op_exp. The inherently negative NPI nessuno ‘no-one’ is an A′-anaphor and needs to be A′-bound by forming a representational chain with an antecedent in order to be licensed. The antecedent is Op_exp; hence the coindexing.

(50) Mario non ha visto nessuno.
    M. non has seen no-one
    ‘M. hasn’t seen anyone.’

(51) NegP
    Spec
    |      Neg⁰
    Op_exp | Neg⁰
    non | [+NEG] 
    nessuno | [+NEG]

Crucially, this does not produce a configuration in which the two instances of [+NEG] interact syntactically. This is a welcome result, since it provides an explanation for why the two occurrences of [+NEG] in (51) do not interact with each other semantically, either, that is, do not cancel each other out. One of the [+NEG] elements is a syntactic head; the other is a maximal projection, and the two are independent of each other. Note that this analysis brings natural language negation closer to logical negation. The interpretation of (50) is not one of DN since, in (51), no negative constituent takes scope over any other negative constituent.

Note that, if I had maintained the strong interpretation of spec-head agreement, I would have had to assume that the polarity operator in SpecNegP in (51), Op, was what Haegeman (1995: 192–93) terms a “contentive” operator, that is, positively specified for the feature [+NEG] (as a consequence of being in a spec-head configuration with a [+NEG] head). Consequently, the inherently negative NPI would be in the scope of a negative operator, and the explanation for NC within logical negation would have been lost. Further, if I had maintained the Aoun/Progovac analysis of A′-binding of NPIs by Neg⁰, the cross-linguistic explanation for the (un)availability of NC would have been lost, too, since the [+NEG] negative quantifier would have been bound by the [+NEG] negative marker in Neg⁰. I take these results to provide substantial support for the approach adopted here.

52. The notion of heads and maximal projections not interfering with each other is, of course, not new. Within the context of movement, the two are usually regarded as separate and independent.
Before considering non-NC languages, I turn to the possibility, in NC languages, of multiple negative quantifiers co-occurring with a concordant reading, as in van der Wouden’s (1994: 95) “negative spread”. Here, I discuss two possible approaches to how it is that, in these languages, the [+NEG] features of multiple negative quantifiers do not cancel each other out in structures such as (24), repeated here for convenience:

(52) Milan ne daje ní(t)kome níšta. (SC)
    M. ne gives no-one nothing
    ‘M. isn’t giving anything to anyone.’

There are two issues to be resolved with respect to (52). First, given that the two ni-NPIs are XPs, how is it that one of them fails to take scope over and cancel out the negative feature of the other? I assume that the answer to this question needs to exploit the A/A’-distinction. Under the assumption that the mechanism by which a negative constituent takes scope over another is A’-binding, then the absence of such scope relations in (52) can be accounted for, since both negative quantifiers occupy A-positions.

The second issue to be addressed with respect to (52) concerns how multiple negative quantifiers are licensed in the first place. The first possibility is to assume that the structure of (52) is essentially identical to the one in (51), the only difference being that two ni-NPIs appear in the lower portion of the tree, unselectively bound by a unique Op in SpecNegP. Within this approach, I assume a single operator can license a potentially unlimited number of ni-NPIs within the same clause. This is the approach adopted by Suñer (1993) and Acquaviva (1993): a single operator is associated with all post-verbal negative quantifiers by unselective binding. (See also Haegeman 1995: 202 for discussion.) As an alternative, I could assume that each negative quantifier is bound by its own Op\textsubscript{exp}, as in (53).

(53) Milan [\text{AgrS} ne daje [\text{SpecP} \text{Op}\textsubscript{exp}, \text{Op}\textsubscript{exp}, \ldots ní(t)kome, níšta, ]]

An approach similar to this is adopted by Brody (1995) for the relationship between null wh-operators and multiple overt wh-phrases in situ. Haegeman applies the same approach, albeit tentatively, to negative structures (1995: 201–5), suggesting that it allows a more unified approach to the syntax of negation: given that, in languages with multiple overt movement of negative quantifiers, such as West Flemish (see section 3.5.1), multiple distinct chains are formed, it would be desirable for the same to be true of the representational chains assumed in languages such as SC. This is possible only if the in situ negative quantifiers are bound by distinct expletive operators. However, given that absorption is ultimately assumed to take place in both cases, the creation of multiple representational chains in the first place might be argued to be uneconomical and therefore ruled out by the grammar.

... and why non-NC languages are not
In non-NC languages like SE in which the feature [+NEG] is borne by the operator in SpecNegP, the situation is necessarily different. Here, the co-occurrence of the marker of pure sentential negation with a negative quantifier leads to logical DN, as in (54):

(54) I've not seen nothing. (DN)

Let us assume that no-NPIs in SE are to all intents and purposes identical to the ni-NPIs of SC. If this assumption is justified, nothing in (54) will be an anaphor and will have to be A'-bound within a local domain, presumably by an operator in SpecNegP, as was the case in SC. This configuration is illustrated in (55):

(55) NegP
    /\        \\          
Spec      Neg
    /\    +_______________
not  Neg  . . .
       \\       
[+NEG]          nothing
               \\       
               [+NEG]

The structure in (55) contrasts with the scenario sketched in the previous section and with the structure in (51) in that it produces a configuration in which the two instances of [+NEG] interact with each other syntactically. The [+NEG] operator in SpecNegP (the antecedent) binds and therefore takes scope over the [+NEG] no-NPI (the anaphor). The fact that such structures are impossible (with the relevant NC interpretation) is predicted by the analysis proposed here and supports the claim that natural language negation is closer to logical negation than is sometimes assumed. As predicted by Boolean logic, where one [+NEG] element takes scope over another [+NEG] element (e.g., by A'-binding), as in (54) and (55), the two instances of negation cancel each other out, producing DN.

This result also allows me to conclude, contra Acquaviva (1995) and Dépréz (forthcoming), that it was right to assume that there are no nontrivial differences between negative quantifiers cross-linguistically—a desirable result from the point of view of acquisition, as suggested earlier. SC ni-NPIs, English no-NPIs, and Romance n-words are all essentially identical. They are A'-anaphors and need to be A'-bound within a local domain. Their different distributions can be attributed, for the most part, to the fact that the languages in which they appear stand at different points in the Negative Cycle, that is, that these languages vary with respect to whether SpecNegP is marked [+NEG].
SE adopts one of two possible strategies to avoid DN in the context of
indefinite quantifiers. The first is to use NPIs that are not inherently negative
and that do not, therefore, cancel out the negative force of the [+NEG] operator in
SpecNegP when bound by it, namely the any-NPIs:

\[(\text{56}) \text{I've not seen anything.}\]
\[(\text{57}) \text{NegP} \]
\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{Spec} \\
\text{not} \\
\text{[+NEG]}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Neg'} \\
\ldots \\
\text{XP}_i
\end{array}
\]

In (57), anything (A'-bound by the operator in SpecNegP) is not inherently
negative. DN is thus avoided, since one negative element is not in the scope of
another.\(^{54}\)

So, what of multiple NPIs licensed by a single instance of sentential negation
in non-NC languages, as in (58)?

\[(\text{58}) \text{I've not seen anything anywhere.}\]

In section 3.4.2.1, I discussed multiple negative quantifiers in NC languages.
There, two possible analyses were envisaged. The first possibility was for all
post-verbal negative quantifiers to be licensed by unselective A'-binding from a
single OP\(_{\text{neg}}\) in SpecNegP. The second possibility was for each post-verbal
negative quantifier to be associated with its own OP\(_{\text{neg}}\) in SpecNegP. Similarly,
there are two possible approaches to the licensing of multiple NPIs by a single
instance of sentential negation as in (58). Either I can assume that each and
every NPI is licensed by association (via unselective A'-binding) with a single
contentive operator in SpecNegP, that is, not, or I can assume that each and
every NPI is licensed by association with its own OP\(_{\text{neg}}\). Note that, in the case of
SE, this second model involves one any-NPI being bound by the overt operator
not, while all other any-NPIs would be bound by a non-overt OP\(_{\text{neg}}\). This
discrepancy is arguably a weakness of the second model. In the first model, all
the any-NPIs are licensed by not.

---

53. I assume that choosing the unmarked alternative between (56) and (59) is a language-specific
issue. According to Ramat et al. (1987: 173), Icelandic adopts a strategy analogous to (59), while
Danish prefers (56).

54. Furthermore, I argue that the configuration in (57) is also the one found in Modern French.
Here, the [+NEG] operator is phonologically null and the personne, rien, jamais, and so on, series of
quantifiers are NPIs like the any-NPIs of English: they need to be A'-bound to be licensed but are not
themselves inherently negative. See section 3.5.2 and chapters 4 and 5 for detailed analysis.
The second (and more marked) strategy adopted by SE to avoid DN in the context of indefinite quantifiers is to avoid the negative operator,\(^{55}\) as in (59):

(59) I have seen nothing.

Two possible analyses come to mind for (59). In the first and most natural instance, and in order for nothing to take sentential scope, nothing is assumed to be bound by an expletive polarity operator in SpecNegP. This is the approach adopted by Haegeman (1995: 185–86, section 1.4.2.2.3). This allows the Neg Criterion to be satisfied by virtue of the relationship between Neg\(^{-}\) and the chain containing the non-overt expletive operator and the negative quantifier. The negative head is then, by DA, endowed with the feature \([+\text{NEG}]\) and the sentence is negative. Second, and less natural, the negative quantifier has local scope and an echoic reading. It does not then count as an operator and is not associated with a NegP. The sentence is then positive in all relevant senses.

Although such optionality is, in principle, undesirable, it is a possibility supported by the following observation. The two possibilities make predictions with respect to possible tag questions. In (60), the tag questions have to have the opposite polarity to the “antecedent”:

(60) a. You like squid, don’t you? / *do you?
   b. You don’t like squid, *don’t you? / do you?

Where the “antecedent” has a structure along the lines of (59), both polarities are (just about) possible in the tag:

(61) a. You’ve done nothing all day, have you?
   b. You’ve done nothing all day, haven’t you?

How can this choice be accounted for? On the basis of the tags, it looks like the antecedent clause in (61) can be seen as either negative or positive. This could be taken to be the consequence of the two possible ways of licensing nothing. If nothing takes sentential scope by being bound by Op\(_{\text{out}}\) in SpecNegP, the antecedent clause will end up being negative and the positive tag will be licensed: (61a). If, alternatively, the negative quantifier has local scope, there will be no binding and no NegP; the antecedent will be positive, and the negative tag will be licensed: (61b).

Before moving on to deal with two apparent counterexamples to Jespersen’s Generalization, I return briefly to the contrast with respect to NC discussed in sections 3.2.2.1 and 3.2.1.2 between SE and closely related nonstandard varieties such as Cockney.

(62) a. I ain’t done nothin’. (Cockney: NC)
   b. I haven’t done nothing. (SE: DN)

---

\(^{55}\) See (22), as well as sections 1.2.1 and 1.3, for evidence suggesting that, in (59), the clause and, presumably, therefore, the verb be negative in abstract terms.
In SE, NC is unavailable with n’t; in Cockney, in contrast, it is available. As suggested throughout, this contrast will not be dealt with by assuming some abstract distinction between Cockney nothin’ and SE nothing. Rather, I assume that the negative marker on the verb is significantly different in the two varieties. In Cockney, I assume that negative auxiliaries like ain’t are drawn from the lexicon as such. Consequently, the [+NEG] feature is borne underlyingly by a head. The non-overt operator licensing nothin’ in (62a) will therefore be Op⁻¹exp. To all intents and purposes, Cockney behaves like Italian. In (62b), n’t is deemed to be no more than a phonologically criticised version of not in SpecNegP. Thus, in (62b), nothing is bound by a contentive negative operator, hence DN.

3.5 Counterexamples to Jespersen’s Generalization?

3.5.1 West Flemish

At first sight, the data presented here suggest that Jespersen’s Generalization falls down in the case of West Flemish (henceforth, WF). In section 3.5.1.1, I present the data; in section 3.5.1.2, I suggest an analysis, following Haegeman (1995), that somewhat weakens the status of WF as a counterexample.56

The data

3.5.1.1

In some respects, sentential negation in WF and French are similar: like French ne, the optional pre-verbal en is insufficient to mark sentential negation on its own, as in (63), and must co-occur with a negative phrasal constituent, either the negative adverb nie ‘not’, equivalent to French pas, as in (64), or some other negative element, as in (65):57

(63) *da Valère dienen boek en-eet (Zanuttini 1991: 170 (278))
    that V. that book en-has

(64) da Valère dienen boek nie (en-)eet (Zanuttini 1991: 171 (279a))
    that V. that book not en- has
    ‘. . . that V. doesn’t have that book’

(65) a. da Valère ier niemand (en-)kent (Haegeman 1995: 116 (5b))
    that V. here no-one en- knows
    ‘. . . that V. doesn’t know anyone here’

b. da Valère dienen boek nieverst (en-)vindt (Zanuttini 1991: 171 (280b))
    that V. that book nowhere en- finds
    ‘. . . that V. doesn’t find that book anywhere’

56. For detailed discussion and analysis of negation in WF, see Haegeman (1992b, 1995: chapter 3) and H&Z (1996).

57. The data from WF are given in the context of embedded clauses to compensate for V2 effects.
On the basis of these data, and given the discussion of French in chapters 1 and 2, I want to conclude that, in WF, like SE (and, indeed, Standard Dutch and Modern German), the abstract feature [+NEG] is borne by SpecNegP underly-

ingly, and I expect WF to pattern with the languages discussed in section 3.2.2. That is to say, I do not expect WF to be a non-NC language.

However, in contrast to Standard Modern Dutch and German, negative quantifiers can co-occur in WF, without canceling each other out, as in (66), taken from Haegeman (1995: 132–33 (39)):

(66) a. da Valère [an niemand] [niets] gezeid (en-)oat that V. to no-one nothing said en- had ‘. . . that V. hadn’t said anything to anyone’

b. da Valère [noot] [an geen mens] [niets] gezeid (en-)oat that V. never to no person nothing said en- had ‘. . . that V. had never said anything to anyone’

c. da Valère [noot] [van niemand] ketent (en-)was that V. never of no-one not contented en- was ‘. . . that V. was never pleased with anyone’

The XPs co-occurring with each other and, optionally, with en in (66) are clearly inherently negative: they are inherently negative quantifiers, rather than any-type NPIs.

Furthermore, the negative adverb nie can co-occur with negative quantifiers, again without the negation being canceled, as in (67), taken from Haegeman (1995: 133 (40)):

(67) a. da Valère [an niemand] [niets] [nie] gezeid (en-)oat that V. to no-one nothing not said en- had (= (66a))

b. da Valère [noot] [an geen mens] [niets] [nie] gezeid (en-)oat that V. never to no person nothing not said en- had (= (66b))

c. da Valère [noot] [van niemand] [nie] ketent (en-)was that V. never of no-one not contented en- was (= (66c))

So, WF appears to be a counterexample to Jespersen’s Generalization. The crucial negative marker nie occupies SpecNegP and, although en exists in WF as a pre-verbal negative marker associated with Neg”, its status seems comparable to that of ne in French (see section 3.1 as well as chapter 1, footnote 3) or Breton (see (8)). In WF, the feature [+NEG] seems to be associated with Spec-

NegP. Nevertheless, the data in (66), and especially (67), suggest that WF is an NC language, contra (2).
3.5.1.2

The data from WF in section 3.5.1.1 suggested this language might be a counterexample to Jespersen’s Generalization. On the basis of (63) and (64), I concluded that, in WF, the feature \([\text{+NEG}]\) is borne by SpecNegP. Accordingly, WF is predicted to be a non-NC language. The data in (66) and (67) show that this is not in fact the case. In (66) and (67), negative quantifiers, for example, niemand ‘no-one’, niets ‘nothing’, nooit ‘never’, and nieverst ‘nowhere’, co-occur with an NC reading, not only with each other but also with the negative adverb nie ‘not’. Is it possible to square these data from WF with Jespersen’s Generalization? In this section, I show that there are a number of restrictions on NC in WF that suggest that Jespersen’s Generalization (or, rather, the underlying principled account of the superficial descriptive generalization) can in fact be salvaged. In particular, the restrictions on NC suggest that the analysis of Jespersen’s Generalization in terms of A\(^{-}\)-binding from SpecNegP proposed in section 3.4.2 is along the right lines.

For the concordant readings in (66) and (67) to be available, the negative quantifiers must scramble leftward out of their base position. Following Haegeman (1995), I analyze this leftward scrambling as raising to (or above) SpecNegP and conclude that, for reasons independent of the Neg Criterion, for example, WF is able to exploit this mechanism in order to avoid DN. This overt operation on negative constituents produces “negative absorption” (along the lines of \(wh\)-absorption) and leads to the observed concordant readings. The negative constituents associated with SpecNegP at S-structure are thus treated, to all intents and purposes, as a single negative constituent. Consequently, while, on the surface of it, WF is indeed an exception to the generalization, the analysis presented in section 3.4.2 holds for this language, too.

In Haegeman’s account of negative absorption (1995: 117–20), she assumes that the WF negative adverb nie ‘not’ has a fixed (S-structure) position, namely SpecNegP (generated to the left of Neg’). It seems to me that this is a reasonable assumption to make, one that is supported both by Pollock’s (1989) and my own chapter 2 analyses of (the derivation of) French pas. Irrespective of whether the traditional SOV West Germanic languages such as WF are analyzed as being head-final or head-initial, the position of phrasal constituents within an embedded domain with respect to nie will provide a diagnostic for whether their
61. If the pre-verbal negative marker *en* is omitted, (69a) is not, in fact, ungrammatical as such. Rather, the negative constituent fails to achieve sentential scope as a consequence of not having scrambled out of its containing AP and has narrow scope. Haegeman (1995: 136–37) suggests that (69a) would then be interpreted in one of two ways. Either the negative constituent is echoic or Valère is very easy to please, that is, ‘he is happy (even) when he has very little (or even nothing at all)’. With pre-verbal *en* in place, (69a) is indeed ungrammatical, as indicated in the text, since failure of the negative constituent to raise (to SpecNegP) fails, in turn, to mark sentential negation and license *en*. See also the discussion of French *ne* and *pas* in chapters 1 and 2. Note that these facts are further evidence to suggest that WF *en* has parallel licensing conditions to French *ne*. 
In addition to licensing pre-verbal *en*, scrambling of negative quantifiers in WF is relevant to NC. Consider the interpretation of the strings in (70), taken from Haegeman (1995: 132 (38)):

(70) a. *da Valère [pp van niemand] nie [AP ketent t] en-was NC*  
that V. of no-one not contented *en-was*  
‘... that V. wasn’t pleased with anyone’

b. *da Valère nie [AP ketent [pp van niemand]] en-was DN*  
c. *da Valère nie [pp van niemand] [AP ketent t] en-was DN*

b and c: ‘... that V. was not pleased with no-one’

Given the presence of *nie* in SpecNegP in the strings in (70), the clauses are interpreted as negative, and pre-verbal *en* is licensed throughout. There is, however, a crucial difference between (70a) and (70b, c). In (70a), in which the negative PP has scrambled to the left of *nie* in SpecNegP, the two occurrences of negative XPs (*niemand* and *nie*) contribute to a single instance of sentential negation; (70a) is an example of NC. This is not the case in (70b, c). In (70b), the negative PP remains in situ while, in (70c), the negative PP scrambles locally but is still to the right of *nie* in SpecNegP. In both cases, NC is unavailable; the two negative XPs cancel each other out, leading to DN. The contrast is clear from the translations.

The different interpretations witnessed in (70) show that WF is not an NC language à l’italienne. Rather, it seems that there are clear configurational constraints on NC in this language. Given the interpretation of (70b, c), that is, the unavailability of NC, Haegeman (1995) concludes that these configurational constraints amount to the need for negative XPs to be associated with SpecNegP for a concordant reading to be available. The string in (70a) respects this constraint if the surface position of the negative PP is “associated with SpecNegP”, that is, if it occupies an (extended) SpecNegP position. Haegeman argues that this is indeed the case, suggesting that the scrambled negative constituent is adjoined either to NegP or to SpecNegP itself. In contrast, given that, in (70b, c), the negative PP has not raised to an (extended) SpecNegP position, the strings do not satisfy the configurational constraint on NC; hence the DN interpretations. (See also DeGraff 1993b: 73fn16.)

What, then, is one to make of WF? To what extent does it represent a problem for Jespersen’s Generalization? I suggest that, while the data reviewed here clearly show that Jespersen’s Generalization needs to be qualified, the configurational constraint on NC in WF in fact lends support to the analysis of NC proposed in section 3.4.2. A number of points need to be made. First, Jespersen’s Generalization predicts that WF is not an NC language. Indeed, the data in (70b, c) show that, at the very least, WF is not a generalized NC language. Jespersen’s Generalization does not therefore fail entirely in the case of WF.

Second, the nature of the configurational constraint on NC in WF suggests that, in order for NC to be available, negative XPs need to move to a position outside the scope of the negative marker *nie* in SpecNegP, whereby scope
relations are determined, at least in part, by A'-binding, itself defined in terms of c-command. In (70a), the negative PP is higher than nie and escapes its scope. The fact that, in its surface position, the negative PP is itself then associated with the same SpecNegP and Neg' positions by negative absorption, it could be argued, prevents the PP from taking scope over (and canceling out) the negative marker nie in SpecNegP. In (70b, c), the negative PP fails to move to a position outside the c-command domain of nie and, hence, remains in its scope, leading to logical DN. All these facts are, arguably, predicted by the analysis of NC and DN proposed in section 3.4.2. To that extent, the facts from WF back up the account of Jespersen’s Generalization suggested here.

Finally, given that Jespersen’s Generalization is, after all, nothing more than a label for an observed set of empirical facts, it is, I suggest, more important that WF be compatible with the explanation of the facts than that it be in accord with the generalization based on the facts. In the next section, I turn to Modern French, which might also be regarded as problematic for Jespersen’s Generalization.  

**Modern French**

3.5.2

Like Italian non and Spanish no, the French negative marker ne is proclitic on the first finite verb in a clause. In contrast to the Italian and Spanish markers, though, Modern French ne is generally neither sufficient nor necessary to mark sentential negation, although it was at earlier stages in the development of the language. In this respect, Modern French ne is like WF en, discussed in the previous section. As was seen in section 3.1, proclitic ne came to be reinforced by syntactically independent constituents, the most sturdy of which proved to be the element pas.

(71) Je (ne) vois pas ta mère. (Modern French)

I ne pas your mother

‘I can’t see your mother.’

In view (a) of the obligatory presence of pas, and the only optional presence of ne, to mark pure sentential negation in the modern language and (b) of the fact that ne can appear without contributing a negative feature to the clause, I
64. Given this conclusion, the generalization in (2) predicts that Modern French is a non-NC language. Evaluating this prediction, that is, determining whether negative concord exists in Modern French as in SC, Cockney, Italian, or Spanish, is not a straightforward issue, since, with the exception of the determiner *null*, no French “negative” can convincingly be argued to be morphologically negative (on a par with the *ni*-NPIs of SC or the *no*-NPIs of SE). 65. A set of morphologically negative indefinite quantifiers did not develop in French. 66. Consequently, it is unclear whether the “negatives” that do exist in the language, such as *rien* ‘nothing/anything’, *personne* ‘no-one/anyone’, and *jamais* ‘never/ever’, are inherently negative; that is, whether they are equivalent to the *no*-/*ni*-NPIs or the *any*-/*i*-NPIs of SE and SC, respectively.

On the basis of the generalization in (2), one would, of course, predict that these French “negatives” are equivalent to the *any*-/*i*-NPIs. The generalization in (2) predicts that Modern French is a non-NC language; if these “negatives” were in fact inherently negative, Modern French would be an NC language, contrary to prediction. Nevertheless, arguments have been advanced to support both analyses in the literature. For example, while Laka (1990) and Déprez (forthcoming) treat them as polarity items in the traditional sense of the term, that is, not as inherently negative, Zanuttini (1991) argues that they are negative quantifiers, that is, that they are inherently negative.

I do not review the arguments presented for and against the two positions here; instead, I refer the reader to the literature. (See also Quer 1993 for discussion.) However, given the otherwise robust nature of the generalization in (2), I adopt the analysis of these “negatives” as being equivalent to the *any*-/*i*-NPIs and conclude that Modern French is a non-NC language. This is, however, not merely a convenient move, given the general argument put forward in this chapter. Support for the conclusion can be drawn from a comparison of Modern French with earlier forms of the language. NC of a fashion was possible in seventeenth-century French (henceforth, C17Fr). Examples are given in (72), taken from Haase (1969: 256 §102A):

64. See section 1.3.4 for arguments that *ne* is not inherently negative, in examples such as (i):

(i) Jeanine craint que Pierre ne soit en retard.
J. fears that P. *ne be-*SUBJ in lateness
‘J. fears P. might be late.’
‘J. fears P. might *not* be late.’

65. But see Haase (1969: 110 §52B), who claims that even the negative value of *null* has been progressively lost. Posner (1985a: 170) also suggests that the few Latin negatives other than *non* that survived, such as *nullus*, from which French *null* is derived, “were treated more as negative polarity items than as inherently semantically negative”. Posner (1996: 302) comments on the considerable number of “negative items” within the Romance languages—and French in particular—that are derived from etymologically positive ones. For discussion of the etymology of Romance n-words, see Laka (1993a).

66. This is a fact that itself deserves investigation. The same can be said for Catalan. What is perhaps significant in this respect about these two varieties is the fact that they have phrasal negative markers, namely *pas* in both cases.
(72) a. Encore qu’ils n’ aient pas la mesure d’ aucune sorte de
yet that they ne have-SUBJ pas the measure of aucune kind of
verse.
‘Even though they don’t sound like verse of any kind.’

b. Ne faites pas semblant de rien.
ne do-IMP pas semblance of rien
‘Don’t pretend anything.’

c. Ce n’est pas que je pense à personne d’ici.
it ne is pas that I think of personne from here
‘It’s not that I’m thinking of anyone here.’

d. On ne veut pas rien faire ici qui vous déplaise.
we ne want pas rien do-INF here which you displease-SUBJ
‘We don’t want to do anything that might upset you.’

In these examples, post-verbal *pas* co-occurs with the “negatives” *aucun*, *rien*, and *personne* (as well as with *ne*). While the “negatives” can, with some exceptions, co-occur with each other in the modern language, they cannot co-occur with *pas* (in all clause-mate and most multicalausal contexts—see section 5.5.2) with a concordant interpretation in the way that they do in (72). Where they do co-occur, the interpretation is of logical DN.

The crucial difference between C17Fr as described by Haase (1969) and the modern language is that the former was still at the stage in the Negative Cycle illustrated by (4b), whereas the latter is at the stage in the Negative Cycle illustrated by (4c–e) (depending on the variety of Modern French under consideration). That is to say, in C17Fr, the pre-verbal negative marker *ne* was necessary and sufficient to mark sentential negation. While *ne* was compulsory, the appearance of post-verbal *pas* for reinforcement was optional. At this point, pre-verbal *ne* was clearly still inherently negative (like *no/non* in Modern Spanish/Italian). This is illustrated in (73), taken from Haase (1969: 251 §100B). In Modern French, in contrast, the appearance of post-verbal *pas* is an obligatory marker of pure sentential negation, as shown in (71).

(73) a. Il ne meurt de cette peine.
he ne dies of this pain
‘This pain isn’t killing him.’

67. See Muller (1991: 269) for details of possible combinations.

68. In fact, it was during the seventeenth century that the appearance of a post-verbal marker of pure negation began to be obligatory. The examples given in the text are still typical during the early part of the century but are rarer by the turn of the eighteenth century. Posner (1985a: 171) claims that, certainly by the seventeenth century, *pas*, *point*, *mi*, *rien*, and so on, had become “virtually obligatory disjunctive appendages of pre-verbal *ne*”. 
b. Je ne veux du tout vous voir.
   I ne want at all you see
   ‘I don’t want to see you at all.’

c. Aussi pour ne vous ennuyer, je vous les dirai.
   also for ne you annoy I you them say-FUT
   ‘Therefore, in order not to annoy you, I will tell you them.’

C17Fr thus belongs with those languages reviewed in section 3.2.1. Accordingly, the generalization in (2) predicts that C17Fr should be an NC language. Indeed, it seems clear that this is the case.

The question to be addressed, though, is this: in (72), which negative elements enter into NC with each other? I suggest that it is pre-verbal ne that enters into NC with the post-verbal pas.69 both pre-verbal ne and post-verbal pas are inherently negative, yet are interpreted together as a single instance of sentential negation, that is, in an NC reading. I assume this to be attributable to a structure like the one in (51). The inherently negative ne occupies Neg. SpecNegP is occupied by Haegeman’s (1995) non-overt expletive operator: Op. Op binds pas, which, consequently, does not have to raise into SpecNegP.70 In turn, negative pas, adjoined to VP, takes scope over the elements aucun(e), rien, and personne, which I assume are non-inherently negative NPIs like the any-NPIs of SE. (See Kayne 1984: 39fn4 for correspondences between French personne and SE anyone.)

What, then, of the difference between Modern French and, say, C17Fr? The generalization in (2) predicts that Modern French is a non-NC language. What has changed? I argue that the change underlying the shift from NC to non-NC status centers on the pre-verbal marker ne. Up to C17Fr, ne (= Neg+) was inherently negative; it bore the abstract feature [+NEG] underlingly and could serve as the unique marker of sentential negation. Subsequently, and for reasons discussed in section 3.1.2, ne lost this property. Given that one of the two original elements entering into NC is then no longer negative, the issue of NC is no longer relevant. On such a view, Modern French is a non-NC language.71

69. This interpretation of the data is also suggested by Hirschbühler and Labelle (1993: 18).

70. This was the conclusion drawn in section 2.1.2 on the basis of the relative position of pas and lexical infinitives.

71. With respect to the pre-French period, Vennemann (1974: 366–68) suggests that the Latin negative marker non is an adverb (like pas in Modern French). In a verb-final language like Latin, non is therefore expected to be pre-verbal. One would therefore want to associate non with SpecNegP rather than Neg+. Consequently, Jespersen’s Generalization predicts, correctly (Posner 1984: 1, Winters 1987: 28, 30), that Latin is a non-NC language: “With minor exceptions, if one of the negative words in view occurs in a negative clause as just defined, the effect is for the two negative features to cancel each other out and result in a non-negative, i.e., affirmative, predication” (Agard 1984: vol. 2, p. 151). The claim that Latin non, adopted in Old French, is a phrasal constituent rather than a head is supported by the fact that sentence-initial non, when used emphatically in sentence-initial position in Old French, triggered inversion, as in (i). (See Posner 1985a and references there.)

(i) Non fera-il. (Old French, Posner 1985a: 179 (12))
   non do-FUT he-EMPH
   ‘He certainly won’t do so.’
The issue that remains to be addressed, however, is why the NPIs (e.g., rien, personne, jamais), while compatible with each other, are no longer compatible with pas. This issue is addressed in section 4.4.2. 72

3.6 Discussion and summary

3.6.1 Discussion

The analysis of Jespersen’s Generalization proposed in this chapter has relied crucially on what I have termed a “weak” interpretation of the relationship between a head and its specifier in terms of compatibility rather than strict agreement. According to this interpretation, where a head bears relevant (agreement, affective) features underlyingly, its specifier is prevented from bearing incompatible features, but does not have to bear identical features. In other words, Rizzi’s DA is unidirectional, from specifier to head, but not from head to specifier. Such a modification to the spec-head relationship was arguably derived from considerations of economy and made it possible to account for Jespersen’s Generalization on the basis of cyclic fluctuation in the underlying position of the abstract feature [±NEG].

Of course, given that natural languages can be distinguished in terms of other cyclic parameters, too, the question arises as to whether the approach adopted here, if justified, can be used to explain distinctions between natural languages other than the “NC-versus-non-NC” distinction. One parameter that has received considerable attention over the last decade and a half is the pro-drop or null subject parameter. 73

Pro-drop is traditionally viewed as parametric variation in the (morphological) “strength” of AgrS°. Languages in which AgrS° is morphologically strong are pro-drop; languages in which AgrS° is morphologically weak are not. In the original terms of Rizzi (1982: 42), strong AgrS° and, hence, (referential) pro-drop amounted to [±PERSON] specification. 74 One conclusion that it might be possible to draw is that the “strong-versus-weak-AgrS°” distinction and, hence, the pro-drop parameter could be due to (cyclic) fluctuation of the underlying position of some abstract agreement feature, which one might label [AGR]. Thus, in pro-drop languages, it could be argued that AgrS° bears the feature [AGR] as

It seems plausible that, like Latin non, tonic non, which survives in Modern French, is also an XP (adverbia) element.

72 DeGraff (1993b: 73fn15) suggests that the incompatibility between pas and the other “negatives”–the unavailability of negative absorption, in his analysis–is that, while the other “negatives” are quantifiers, pas is not. Given that the analysis proposed for the other “negatives” in chapters 4 and 5 does not take recourse to negative absorption, such an approach will not work. It would also be difficult to square such an idea with the facts from Québécois, in which pas is perfectly compatible with the other “negatives” apart from plus. (See (10) and section 4.4.2.1 and section 5.5.2 for discussion of Québécois.) Note, though, that Haegeman (1996b) uses a similar approach to distinguish between two sets of negative elements in WF that cannot enter into NC with each other.

73 See the studies in Jaeggli and Safir (eds.) (1989).

74 See also Pollock (1997a: chapter 13, section 2.1). Dupuis et al. (1992) suggest the relevant feature is [±NUMBER]. See footnote 75.
an inherent or underlying property.\footnote{Rizzi (1982: 131) calls this feature [+PRONOUN] and suggests that it is optionally borne by INFL (my AgrS\(^*\)) in a pro-drop language such as Italian. As an alternative, however, Rizzi (1982: 176fn16) envisages the possibility that such a primitive feature may not be necessary and that, rather, the properties attributed to it could be a consequence of feature specifications as person and number, that is, [AGR].} This would correspond to “strong AgrS\(^{\circ}\)”.

Significantly, in such a language, AgrS\(^{\circ}\) is not reliant upon its specifier for the [AGR] feature; hence the null-subject nature of the language.\footnote{Plausibly, the fact that pro-drop languages tend to allow free inversion (analyzed as subjects in situ in SpecVP) could also be attributed to the fact that a strong AgrS\(^{\circ}\) would not need an overt specifier to raise from SpecVP to SpecAgrSP in order for AgrS\(^{\circ}\) to be associated with [AGR] features.} In contrast, in non-pro-drop languages, [AGR] would not be borne by AgrS\(^{\circ}\) underlyingly. In this second scenario, AgrS\(^{\circ}\) could be assigned the feature only by association with an overt specifier, by DA, which is perfectly in keeping with my “weak” version of the spec-head relation based on compatibility. This would correspond to “weak AgrS\(^{\circ}\)”. Consequently, subjects cannot be non-overt; overt subjects have to raise from SpecVP to SpecAgrSP; the language is non-pro-drop. Cyclic diachronic fluctuation between pro-drop and non-pro-drop could then be argued to be the result of an (abstract) “Agreement Cycle” running alongside the familiar Negative Cycle. It seems to me that this is a potentially fruitful line of inquiry that deserves attention. (See the comments in Déprez forthcoming.)

3.6.2 Summary

In the course of the preceding sections it was suggested that the pattern observed by Jespersen and referred to as the Negative Cycle amounts to cyclic to-ing and fro-ing of the overt realization of sentential negation between the head and specifier of NegP. It was further suggested that the abstract realization of sentential negation, that is, the locus of the feature [+NEG], could also fluctuate in a similar, if not the same, cyclic fashion.

This conclusion led me to reconsider the nature of the spec-head relationship. Instead of assuming an obligatory two-way dynamic process guaranteeing that the relevant features borne by specifier and head are identical, it was suggested that spec-head “agreement” should be interpreted as nothing more than a process that makes sure that feature incompatibility is excluded. While this interpretation of spec-head agreement did not exclude the possibility, within NegP, of both SpecNegP and Neg\(^{\circ}\) being positively specified for the feature [+NEG], it did make it possible to satisfy the Neg Criterion without specifier and head necessarily both bearing the feature [+NEG]. The importance of this move for my purposes was that it allowed the Neg Criterion to be satisfied without SpecNegP bearing the feature [+NEG].

The cross-linguistic variation that this allowed for paved the way to an account of the (im)possibility of NC. In some languages, SpecNegP is specified [+NEG]; in others, it is not. The empirical observation to be accounted for is that NC is unavailable in the first group of languages, yet available in the second.
The account provided for this generalization was a modified version of Progovac’s (1994) analysis of NPI licensing, itself based on A’-binding. In the implementation proposed, inherently negative polarity items are seen as A’-anaphors that need, following Principle A of BT, to be bound within a given domain. It is assumed, with Progovac, that the relevant domain is NegP, with possible extension to AgrSP. Capitalizing on Progovac’s Generalized Principle A of BT, which guarantees that binders are X’-compatible with bindees, it is concluded that the A’-binder of inherently negative NPIs is the polarity operator in SpecNegP, whose position there is guaranteed by the Neg Criterion. In non-NC languages, that is, languages in which SpecNegP is specified [+NEG], co-occurrence of a negative marker and a negative NPI leads to DN because the former has scope over the latter.
Other Negative Adverbs

Having dealt with ne (chapter 1) and the core negative marker pas (chapter 2) and having concluded that Modern French is a non-NC language (chapter 3), I turn, in chapters 4 and 5, to what might be termed the periphery, or the “negative” elements other than pas, which Muller (1991) labels semi-négations. After establishing an inventory of the relevant lexical items, I subdivide the group into two, considering here just the adverbs (plus ‘no/any more/longer’, jamais ‘(n)ever’, and guère ‘hardly (ever)’), leaving the arguments for chapter 5 (rien ‘anything/nothing’ and personne ‘anyone/no-one’).

In section 4.1, I distinguish between negative adverbs and arguments. After initial discussion of the distribution and interpretation of the adverbs, one feature of the data becomes clear, namely the far-reaching parallels between the distribution of these elements and that of pas. With this observation in mind, I consider some possible conclusions about the syntactic properties of negative adverbs, drawing heavily on those made in chapter 2 for pas. In particular, given that I analyzed [xp pas] in terms of Move-α, I assume, a priori, that it is probably best to approach the syntax of the negative adverbs in terms of XP movement as well. In section 4.2, I reconsider the data. Although it seemed, at first glance, warranted to throw negative adverbs into the same bag as pas, it becomes apparent that the distributional parallels are not total. First, the negative adverbs differ from pas in terms of their co-occurrence possibilities (section 4.2.1); negative adverbs can readily co-occur with each other but not—in the standard language, at least—with pas (with the relevant NC reading). Second, they differ in terms of the positions they can occupy with respect to infinitives (section 4.2.2); negative adverbs have a freer distribution than pas. These differences are taken into account when I come to my conclusions in section 4.3. These exploit the discussion in chapter 3, especially section 3.5.1.1, and the idea that Modern French is a non-NC language. I interpret this as indicating that the negative adverbs (and, as I shall show, the negative arguments, discussed in chapter 5) are not in fact themselves inherently negative. Rather, it is suggested that they appear canonically in the scope of the non-overt operator, Op, which, as has been discussed in earlier chapters, is inherently negative. It will be argued that an analysis of the negative adverbs in terms of Op allows a principled account of the differences between the negative adverbs and pas, as well as allowing one to maintain the conclusion that Modern French is a non-NC language. Section 4.4
As discussed in section 1.2.4, pre-verbal ne is optionally dropped in most varieties of spoken French. See chapter 1, footnote 3, for references.

My conclusions are summarized in section 4.5.

**Inventory: negative adverbs**

### 4.1 and arguments

The elements that will be considered in this chapter are *plus* ‘no/any more/longer’, *jamais* ‘(n)ever’, and *guère* ‘hardly (ever)’. I assume, on the basis of their distributions, illustrated in (1c–e), that these elements, like *pas*, are all adverbial in nature.¹

(1) a. Paul sera riche.
   P. be-FUT rich
   ‘P. will be rich.’

b. Paul ne sera PAS riche.
   P. ne be-FUT pas rich
   ‘P. won’t be rich.’

c. Paul ne sera PLUS riche.
   P. ne be-FUT plus rich
   ‘P. will no longer be rich.’

d. Paul ne sera JAM AIS riche.
   P. ne be-FUT jamais rich
   ‘P. won’t ever be rich.’

e. Paul ne sera GUÈR E riche.
   P. ne be-FUT guère rich
   ‘P. will hardly be rich.’

In association, optionally, with *ne*, these elements modify a positive utterance, for example (1a), just like *pas* in (1b). One might assume, therefore, that the negative adverbs share the properties attributed to *pas* in chapter 2, namely that they are [+NEG] XPs, base-generated in a relatively low position reflecting their scope over the predicate and subsequently raised into SpecNegP to mark sentential negation (and thereby license *ne*). These assumptions are explored in more detail and partially revised in sections 4.2 and 4.3. The data presented here further illustrate the parallel between these adverbs and *pas*.

(2) a. Marie ne va PAS être en retard.
   M. go-es pas-INF in lateness
   ‘M. won’t be late.’

b. Marie ne va JAM AIS être en retard.

1. As discussed in section 1.2.4, pre-verbal *ne* is optionally dropped in most varieties of spoken French. See chapter 1, footnote 3, for references.
SE NTE NTI AL  NEGA TION  IN F RE NCH

2. Gaatone (1971: 138) notes that, with compound tense forms, such as (3), the adverb jamais may exceptionally follow the past participle. He labels this “un effet de style recherché”.

(i) Celle-ci n’ avait ensuite conçu jamais qu’ Albertine pût me quitter
She ne had then conceived jamais that A. could-IMP:SUBJ me leave-INF

de’ elle-même . . .
of her self . . .
‘She had then never considered that A. might leave me on her own initiative . . . ’

(ii) Si bas que l’ eût trainé jamais l’ ingénieux ennemi, tout lien n’ était pas
So low that him had-IMP:SUBJ dragged jamais the ingenious enemy all link ne was pas
rompu ni tout écho du déhors étouffé . . .
broken nor all echo from-the outside deadened
‘As low as the ingenious enemy might ever have dragged him, no ties were ruptured and no sounds from outside blocked . . . ’

I assume this is a relic from some earlier stage in the development of the language.
of adverbial (function compositional) plus, jamais, and so on and argumental (0-role satisfying) rien and personne, dealing with the former here and postponing consideration of the latter until chapter 5.

The translations of the examples in (1) show a clear interpretative distinction between pas and the negative adverbs. Whereas pas corresponds to the Boolean negative connective $\neg$, the negative adverbs are interpreted as composite elements comprising $\neg$ plus something else. In other words, the negative adverbs are interpreted as containing pas. The negative adverb in (1c), plus, is interpreted as equivalent to an unmarked adverb of duration, encore ‘still/yet’, combined with pas. In (1d), jamais is a lexicalized version of something like toujours ‘always’ combined with pas. In (1e), guère is a lexicalized equivalent of an adverb of extent, intensity, or degree combined with pas.

This informal discussion suggests two things. First, given my characterization of the way pas is interpreted as $\neg$, it is not surprising that it plays a central role in negation in Modern French. In contrast to the negative adverbs, pas is atomic, an absolute negative. Pas is more central for the simple reason that it is more basic. This is relevant later. Second, one should not be surprised to note distributional similarities between the syntax of pas and the syntax of the negative adverbs, given that the latter are interpreted as if they contain the former. Recall that, in (1c–e), (2b), and (3b), the negative adverbs pattern with pas in (1b), (2a), and (3a), respectively. Tentatively, one might assume that the negative adverbs can be generated in either of the same two configurations discussed in chapter 2 in the context of pas, namely in an adjoined position or in SpecNumP within a pseudopartitive. However, a strictly parallel analysis would lead one to predict that the distribution of pas is identical to the distribution of the negative adverbs. Yet, this prediction is not borne out by the data, as shown in section 4.2. It is therefore not possible to claim that the negative adverbs and pas are syntactically identical. A precise syntactic characterization of the negative adverbs in question is proposed in section 4.3, based on the insight that these negatives are semantically complex, comprising $\neg$ and another element. The syntactic analysis exploits this complexity and suggests that the two elements enjoy a certain degree of autonomy with respect to each other.

Distribution of negative adverbs

4.2

In addition to the semantic properties distinguishing pas from plus, jamais, and guère discussed in the previous section, there are a number of distributional differences that show that the parallel suggested by the data in (1b–c), (2), and (3) is not complete. In section 4.2.1, I show that co-occurrence patterns distinguish pas from negative adverbs (and arguments) (in the standard language); in section 4.2.2, I show that negative adverbs have a freer distribution than pas with respect to infinitives.
3. The ungrammaticality of (5d) and (5f) indicates that *jamais* and *guère* are mutually incompatible. This could be due to the fact that both are adverbs of extent of one sort or another. (See Zanuttini 1997a and Cinque 1995, 1996, 1998 for an approach to adverbs as specifiers of functional projections. This approach accounts for ordering restrictions among adverbs and, under the assumption that *jamais* and *guère* occupy the specifier position of the same functional projection, may provide some insight into the fact that the two are mutually incompatible.) The ungrammaticality of (5e) does not indicate mutual incompatibility between *plus* and *guère* since (5b) is acceptable. See Muller (1991: 269) for a tabular representation of the co-occurrence possibilities of pairs of negative adverbs/arguments. Note that Muller considers only pairs of negative elements. He does not consider n-tuples where n > 2 such as my examples in (7).

In (i), whose grammaticality represents an apparent counterexample to the pattern illustrated in (5e), only *guère* is interpreted in association with *ne*. The element *plus* is a positive element, common in comparatives. I am grateful to Bernadette Plunkett for providing the example.

(i) Paul ne voit son père *guère plus qu’a* il ne voit sa mère.
   P. *ne* sees his father *guère plus* that he *ne* sees his mother.
   ‘P. doesn’t see his father much more than (he sees) his mother.’

3. The ungrammaticality of (5d) and (5f) indicates that *jamais* and *guère* are mutually incompatible. This could be due to the fact that both are adverbs of extent of one sort or another. (See Zanuttini 1997a and Cinque 1995, 1996, 1998 for an approach to adverbs as specifiers of functional projections. This approach accounts for ordering restrictions among adverbs and, under the assumption that *jamais* and *guère* occupy the specifier position of the same functional projection, may provide some insight into the fact that the two are mutually incompatible.) The ungrammaticality of (5e) does not indicate mutual incompatibility between *plus* and *guère*, since (5b) is acceptable. See Muller (1991: 269) for a tabular representation of the co-occurrence possibilities of pairs of negative adverbs/arguments. Note that Muller considers only pairs of negative elements. He does not consider n-tuples where n > 2 such as my examples in (7).

In (i), whose grammaticality represents an apparent counterexample to the pattern illustrated in (5e), only *guère* is interpreted in association with *ne*. The element *plus* is a positive element, common in comparatives. I am grateful to Bernadette Plunkett for providing the example.

(i) Paul ne voit son père *guère plus qu’a* il ne voit sa mère.
   P. *ne* sees his father *guère plus* that he *ne* sees his mother.
   ‘P. doesn’t see his father much more than (he sees) his mother.’
NEGATIVE ADVERBS

4. Of course, *pas* can co-occur with “negatives” to produce logical DN, as in (9). The only exceptions to the generalization given in the text for standard metropolitan Modern French are strings of the basic pattern *Pas un(e) (seul(e)) N ne VP*, as in (i) and (ii), in which a negative adverb may be associated with the verb:

(i) *Pas une seule proposition n’ a JAMAIS été acceptée.*

＞＞＞

３１６
＞＞＞

‘Not a single suggestion has ever been accepted.’

(ii) *Pas un seul étudiant ne désire PLUS venir me voir.*

＞＞＞

３１６
＞＞＞

‘Not a single student wants to come and see me any more.’

Nominal expressions with the structure *pas un(e)* cannot generally be treated in the same way as other uses of *pas*. Indeed, Vikner (1978: 88) lists *pas un(e)* as a negative item distinct from bare *pas*. Therefore, the acceptability of the examples in (i) and (ii) is not entirely unexpected. See also chapter 2, example (51).

5. [*] is the symbol used by Moritz and Valois (1994) to indicate that logical DN is the only possible interpretation.

This state of affairs leaves one with something of a problem. Given the parallels between *pas* and the negative adverbs already discussed, one could conclude that, like *pas*, the elements *plus, jamais, guère*, and so on are also inherently negative. The grammatical strings in (5)–(7) would then represent examples of NC, familiar from chapter 3. However, given the syntactic nature of the principal negative marker in (standard and nonstandard varieties of) Modern...
In this paragraph, \( \alpha \), \( \beta \), and \( \gamma \) represent the semantic content of each negative adverb minus the negation itself.

French, that is, \( \textit{pas} \), which is associated with SpecNegP rather than being generated under Neg", I concluded in the discussion of Jespersen’s Generalization in chapter 3 that French is a non-NC language. As such, one expects multiple occurrences of negative elements in the same minimal clause to lead to logical DN. Yet, in the text examples given here, the interpretation is clearly not DN. In order to maintain the conclusions from chapter 3 and my analysis of the diachronic development of sentential negation in French, I must assume that the negative adverbs discussed earlier (as well as the negative arguments to be discussed in chapter 5) are not in fact inherently negative. This conclusion is exploited in interesting ways in section 4.3.2.

What can one conclude about the syntactic nature of negative adverbs on the basis of their distributions? Exploiting the informal idea that the negative adverbs are interpreted “as if” they “contain” \( \textit{pas} \), it seems that, when used in isolation, a negative adverb is interpreted negatively, that is, as \( \neg [ \alpha ] \). However, when negative adverbs are combined, the negative, that is, polarity-reversing, content (\( \neg \)) is not repeated. Thus, when two co-occur, as in (5a), the interpretation is something along the lines of:

\[
\neg [ \alpha [ \beta ] ]
\]

When three co-occur, as in (7a), the interpretation is:

\[
\neg [ \alpha [ \beta [ \gamma ] ] ]
\]

Crucially, the interpretation of (5a) is not:

\[
\neg [ \alpha [ \neg [ \beta ] ] ]
\]

since this would result in the unattested logical DN. Similarly, the interpretation of (7a) would presumably not be:

\[
\neg [ \alpha [ \neg [ \beta [ \neg [ \gamma ] ] ] ] ]
\]

The fact, then, that these elements are semantically complex seems to be reflected in syntactic structure. Were this not the case, the interpretations discussed here could not be explained. If \( \textit{plus} \) or \( \textit{jamais} \) were syntactically atomic negatives, one would expect their co-occurrence in a non-NC language like French to result in polarity reversal, contrary to fact. The nonnegative semantic content of the adverbs therefore enjoys limited independence, which allows it to “combine” with another adverb. The single instance of negation then has scope over all the lexical adverbs present. I explore a formal mechanism that can be used to account for this in sections 4.3.3 and 4.3.4.

Of course, what this does not explain is why the adverbs cannot co-occur with the overt negative marker \( \textit{pas} \) (with the relevant interpretation), as indicated by the ungrammaticality of (8). I address this restriction in section 4.4.2 and return to it in chapter 5. Before I develop in detail a syntactic analysis of negative

---

6. In this paragraph, \( \alpha \), \( \beta \), and \( \gamma \) represent the semantic content of each negative adverb minus the negation itself.
adverbs, I consider a second distributional difference that distinguishes negative adverbs from *pas*. That difference concerns linear order.

**Linear order**

4.2.2

In addition to the co-occurrence restrictions illustrated in the previous section, which suggest that the distribution of *pas* is more restricted than that of the negative adverbs, there are differences in linear order that, once again, show the distribution of *pas* to be less flexible than that of the negative adverbs. The differences discussed here are in relation to the possible positions that negative adverbs can occupy with respect to infinitives. The data support the informal conclusion reached in the previous section, namely that negative adverbs are both semantically and syntactically complex and that the nonnegative content of these items enjoys a limited independence from the negation itself.

Reinforcing the examples in (1)–(3), the data in (14)–(19) show that, where a verb is finite, it must precede all negative adverbs, irrespective of the nature of the adverb or the verb:

(14) Marc n’est *pas* à la hauteur de la tâche. (copular *être* + *pas*)

M. *ne* is *pas* at the height of the task

‘M. isn’t up to the job.’

(15) Myriam ne serait *jamais* venue si . . . (auxiliary *être* + *jamais*)

M. *ne* be-COND *jamais* come if

‘M. would never have come if . . . ’

(16) Marie n’ aura *plus* vingt ans. (possessive *avoir* + *plus*)

M. *ne* have-FUT *plus* twenty years

‘M. will no longer be twenty years old.’

(17) Alain n’a *guère* eu de devoirs à faire depuis . . .

A. *ne* has *guère* had of homework to do-INF since

‘A. has hardly had any homework to do since . . . ’

(auxiliary *avoir* + *guère*)

(18) Élise ne pouvait *plus* marcher. (modal verb + *plus*)

E. *ne* could *plus* walk-INF

‘E. could no longer walk.’

(19) Jean ne passerait *jamais* pour un Français. (lexical verb + *jamais*)

J. *ne* pass-COND *jamais* for a Frenchman

‘J. would never pass for a Frenchman.’

In my discussion of Verb Movement in section 1.1, I followed Pollock (1989) and Belletti (1990) in assuming that finite verbs in French move in the syntax from their base position to the highest functional head encoding verbal inflectional morphology, which I identified as AgrS°. The data in (14)–(19) show, therefore, that the canonical position(s) occupied by *pas* and the negative adverbs is/are lower than AgrS°. In chapters 1 and 2, I followed Pollock (1989)
in assuming that the S-structure position of *pas* is SpecNegP, which is indeed below AgrS°.

Turning to negative adverbs, my null hypothesis is, of course, that these elements also occupy SpecNegP. On the basis of the data with respect to finite verb paradigms reviewed so far, I have no reason to assume otherwise. However, if I consider infinitives (which, following the discussion in sections 1.1.7.2–1.1.7.4, I assume do not necessarily occupy AgrS°), I find evidence to suggest that the null hypothesis is in fact wrong. In other words, the evidence suggests that negative adverbs do not necessarily occupy SpecNegP at S-structure. The evidence comes in the form of possible orderings of infinitives with respect to negative adverbs and *pas*, and the picture is quite complex. Before reviewing the data, I revisit the conclusions I drew about infinitival Verb Movement in Modern French. These were summarized in section 1.1.7.5, and are repeated here for convenience:

\[(20)\] **Overt Verb Movement patterns in French:**

a. All finite verbs move to AgrS°.

b'. Infinitival auxiliaries (*être, avoir*) freely move to Mood°, T°, or AgrS°.

b''. Infinitival modal verbs (e.g., *pouvoir, devoir*) move to Mood° or T°, and only exceptionally to AgrS°.

b'''. Infinitival lexical verbs move to Mood° or T°, but not as far as AgrS°.

Of relevance to my discussion are the movement patterns of infinitives in (20b')–(20b''').

In the case of the infinitival auxiliaries, *être* and *avoir*, all negative adverbs (*pas* and the negative adverbs) can either precede or follow the verb, as in (21) and (22), after Pollock (1989: 373 (15)).

\[(21)\]

a. Ne PAS/PLUS ÊTRE heureux est une condition pour . . .

b. N’ÊTRE PAS/PLUS heureux est une condition pour . . .

ne (be) pas/plus (be) happy is a condition for

‘Not/No longer being happy is a condition for . . .’

\[(22)\]

a. Ne PAS/GUÈRE AVOIR d’enfance heureuse est une condition . . .

b. N’AVOIR PAS/GUÈRE d’enfance heureuse est une condition . . .

ne (have) pas/guère (have) of childhood happy is a condition

‘Not/Hardly having a happy childhood is a condition . . .’

According to Grevisse (1986: 1488 §980), in “la langue ordinaire”, the norm is for the negative adverb to precede the infinitival auxiliary, as in (21a) and (22a), while, in “la langue soignée”, the negative adverb may follow the infinitival auxiliary, as in (21b) and (22b). Given my conclusion that *pas* occupies SpecNegP in (21) and (22), and my assumption in (20b') about the movement of infinitival auxiliaries, it seems that there are stylistic implications
7. In a similar vein to Grevisse’s comments, but in reference to infinitivals in general and not just infinitival auxiliaries, Gaatone (1971: 138) suggests that jamais usually precedes infinitivals and follows them only “dans le style littéraire”; he also claims (1971: 149) that post-infinitival plus is less common than pre-infinitival plus.

associated with movement of an infinitival auxiliary from $T^+$ (over $pas$) into AgrS$^+$. With regard to the issue at hand, namely the possible position(s) of negative adverbs such as plus and guère in (21) and (22), given the flexibility of the infinitival auxiliaries, that is, the fact that they can freely occupy Mood$^+$, $T^+$, or AgrS$^+$, no firm conclusions can be drawn on the basis of these data.

In the case of infinitival modals, the situation is more complex. Where an infinitival modal is negated by $pas$, the preferred order is for the adverb to precede the verb, as in (23a)–(25a). However, the reverse order is not regarded as ungrammatical. Pollock (1989: 375, 1997b) judges examples (23b)–(25b) (based on Pollock’s 1989: 375 (20)) to be “somewhat marginal” and “more exceptional”, suggesting that they have “a very literary ring to them”. (Grevisse 1986: 1487 §980 also mentions the possibility of $pas$ following an infinitive when the infinitive is itself followed by another infinitive, for example, a modal.) Indeed, the pattern in (23)–(25) formed the basis of my conclusion, given in (20b”), that modal infinitives only exceptionally raise from $T^+$ (over $pas$) to AgrS$^+$.

(23) a. Je pensais ne PAS POUVOIR dormir dans cette chambre.
b. ?Je pensais ne POUVOIR PAS dormir dans cette chambre.
   ‘I thought I couldn’t sleep in this bedroom.’

(24) a. Il estimait ne PAS DEVOIR donner suite à ma demande.
b. ?Il estimait ne DEVOIR PAS donner suite à ma demande.
   ‘He thought he wouldn’t have to answer my request.’

(25) a. Il avait dit ne PAS VOULOIR donner suite à ma demande.
b. ?Il avait dit ne VOULOIR PAS donner suite à ma demande.
   ‘He had said he didn’t want to answer my request.’

What is interesting and significant about negation and infinitival modals is that, if $pas$ is removed from the (b) examples in (23)–(25) and replaced with a negative adverb, the judgments change. While the ordering modal infinitive +
pas is judged “somewhat marginal”, “more exceptional”, or “very literary”, the ordering modal infinitive + plus/guère/jamais is not:

(26) a. Je pensais ne plus pouvoir dormir dans cette chambre.
    b. Je pensais ne pouvoir plus dormir dans cette chambre.
    ‘I thought I would no longer be able to sleep in this bedroom.’

(27) a. Il estimait ne guère devoir donner suite à ma demande.
    b. Il estimait devoir guère donner suite à ma demande.
    ‘He thought he would hardly have to answer my request.’

(28) a. Il disait ne jamais vouloir donner suite à ma demande.
    b. Il disait vouloir jamais donner suite à ma demande.
    ‘He said he never wanted to answer my request.’

The important contrast is shown in (29), in which devoir stands for modal infinitives in general and plus stands for negative adverbs in general:

(29) a. ?ne devoir pas
    b. ne devoir plus

In other words, a modal infinitive followed by pas is “somewhat marginal”, is “more exceptional”, and has a “very literary ring” to it, as indicated by the question mark in (29a). The same is not true of sequences of a modal infinitive followed by a negative adverb. What is to be made of this contrast? In chapter 2, I showed that pas obligatorily occupies SpecNegP where that position is available and sentential negation is to be marked. This obligatory raising was accounted for on the basis of Haegeman’s (1995: 107) characterization of negative clauses as clauses in which the feature [+NEG] is borne by a functional head. Failure of pas to raise to SpecNegP means that the necessary feature specification cannot be achieved and leads to fairly sharp ungrammaticality in the modern language. Given that the strings in (23b)–(25b) are merely somewhat marginal and not ungrammatical as such, I assume that, in these examples, pas occupies SpecNegP as required. The position of pas in the structure is not, therefore, the reason for the marginal status of these strings. Their marginality is then due to the position of the infinitival verb to the left of pas, that is, in AgrS⁺, as concluded in (20b’).

As for (26b)–(28b), these examples are not marginal, despite the fact that the infinitival modal precedes the negative adverb. Consequently, I assume that the infinitival modal has not raised to AgrS⁺. Assume, for concreteness, that the verb occupies the immediately lower inflectional head position, namely T⁺.

Where does this analysis leave one with respect to the negative adverbs? Clearly these cannot occupy SpecNegP. If they did, they would precede the verb in T⁺, which they do not. So where are they? There are two possibilities. First, they could occupy a lower position in the same clause, as illustrated in (30) (= (27b)), for example, a lower specifier position or an adjoined position. If this analysis is along the right lines (as I ultimately conclude), this shows a major difference
between *pas* and the negative adverbs. While *pas* needs to occupy SpecNegP at S-structure to mark sentential negation and license *ne*, negative adverbs do not.

\[
(30) \left[ \text{AgrSP} \; \text{ne} \; [\text{NegP} \left[ \text{TP} \left[ \text{gevoir} \; \text{guère} \; \text{MoodP} \; \text{VP} \left[ \text{AgrSP} \; \text{donner} \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] = (27b)
\]

The second possible position for the negative adverbs in (26b)–(28b) to occupy (assuming a biclausal structure) is SpecNegP in the lower clause. This would entail positing a clause boundary between the infinitival modal and the negative adverb in (26b)–(28b), as illustrated in (31), but would allow one to maintain the generalization that negative adverbs and *pas* occupy SpecNegP.

\[
(31) \left[ \text{AgrSP-1} \; \text{Ne} \; \text{do} \; \text{guère} \; \text{richten} \; \text{MoodP} \; \text{VP} \left[ \text{AgrSP-2} \; \text{donner} \right] \right] = (27b)
\]

An argument in support of this second scenario could be advanced if, in each pair of examples in (26b)–(28b), there were a difference in interpretation between the (a) string and the (b) string, that is, if the negative took scope over the infinitival modal verb in the (a) examples while taking scope over the (embedded) infinitival lexical verb *only* in the (b) examples (or were at least ambiguous with respect to scope). That is to say, for this second possibility to be taken seriously, it would have to be possible to interpret (26b)–(28b) (repeated here as (32a)–(34a) for convenience) as being synonymous with (32b)–(34b), in which the lower infinitival clause is negated:

\[
(32) \begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Je pensais NE POUVoir PLUS DORMIR dans cette chambre.} \\
& \quad \text{b. Je pensais POUVoir NE PLUS DORMIR dans cette chambre.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
(33) \begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Il avait estimé NE DEVOIR GUÈRE DONNER suite à ma demande.} \\
& \quad \text{b. Il avait estimé DEVOIR NE GUÈRE DONNER suite à ma demande.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
(34) \begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Il avait dit NE VOULOIR JAMeAS DONNER suite à ma demande.} \\
& \quad \text{b. Il avait dit VOULOIR NE JAMeAS DONNER suite à ma demande.}
\end{align*}
\]

However, the necessary interpretations are not available. The strings in (32a)–(34a) are not synonymous with those in (32b)–(34b), as illustrated, for example, by the glosses to (34a, b) given in (35a, b). This lack of synonymy is initial evidence undermining the plausibility of the second a priori possible scenario, illustrated in (31).

\[
(35) \begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{He said he had never wanted to answer my request.} \\
& \quad \text{b. He said he had wanted never to answer my request.}
\end{align*}
\]

Further evidence to undermine the plausibility of the second analysis of the examples in (26b)–(28b) comes from sentences such as the one in (36). This sentence contains the infinitival modal *vouloir* ‘to want’ with a *finite* CP complement. Crucially, the negative adverb *jamais* intervenes between *vouloir*
and the complementizer, _que_ ‘that’, presumably heading CP. It is therefore implausible to claim that the adverb appears in the lower clause.\(^8\)

\[ (36) \text{Il avait dit } ne \\
\text{vouloir jamais qu’ elle parte.} \]

\hspace{1cm} he had said _ne want jamais_ that she _leave-SUBJ_

\hspace{1cm} ‘He had said he never wanted her to leave.’

With respect to interpretation, the string in (36) is admittedly ambiguous. It can be interpreted synchronously with (37), as if _NEG-raising_ had taken place, that is, as if the negative adverb had been base-generated in the lower clause and raised into the higher clause.\(^9\)

\[ (37) \text{Il avait dit vouloir qu’ elle ne parte jamais.} \]

\hspace{1cm} he had said _want that she ne leave-SUBJ jamais_

\hspace{1cm} ‘He had said that he didn’t want her ever to leave.’

Alternatively, (36) can be interpreted as if _NEG-raising_ had not taken place, that is, as if the negative adverb were base-generated in the higher clause. This ambiguity is not a problem; the important point for my purposes here is that, in (36), the negative adverb occupies a surface position in the higher clause that is crucially not SpecNegP, since it is to the right of the infinitival modal in \( T^* \). I am therefore obliged to accept the first of the two analyses given earlier, namely the one illustrated in (30), and to conclude that, unlike _pas_, negative adverbs do not have to occupy SpecNegP at S-structure to mark sentential negation and license _ne_.

Before moving on from infinitival modals and turning to lexical infinitives, there are two final reasons to reject the second analysis, namely that, in (26b)–(28b), the negative adverbs occupy SpecNegP in the embedded clause, as in (31). First, if the adverbs in (26b)–(28b) are in a lower SpecNegP, there is no reason to assume that such a position cannot also be occupied by _pas_. Yet the judgments in (23b)–(25b) show that this is not possible. Consequently, it is unlikely to be the case in (26b)–(28b).

Second, in section 1.2.5, I discussed the licensing conditions of pre-verbal _ne_. I concluded that “negative” _ne_ can be licensed only by an S-structure spec-head configuration with a negative operator in SpecNegP. This too would undermine the plausibility of the type of structure in (31). If _plus/jamais/guère_ could

---

8. An alternative approach to the example in (36) would be to assume an analysis along the lines of the one sketched in section 1.2.2, for the _pour ne pas que_ construction, namely in terms of a null light verb. In other words, one might conclude that the CP headed by _que_ is not in fact the complement of _vouloir_. One might assume, instead, that the complement of _vouloir_ is an infinitival clause headed by a null light verb, _v_, which is negated by _jamais_ and which, in turn, takes the CP head by _que_ as its complement. This approach is unlikely to be along the right lines since, in contrast to the contexts discussed in section 1.2.2, the pre-verbal marker _ne_ cannot appear to the left of _jamais_, as shown in (i).

\[ (i) \text{Il avait dit vouloir ne jamais qu’ elle parte.} \]

\hspace{1cm} he had said _want ne jamais_ that she _leave-SUBJ_

occupy an *embedded* SpecNegP position, one would not expect *ne* to be licensed in the *matrix* clause, since no negative operator would occupy the matrix SpecNegP in order to satisfy the licensing conditions of the Neg*²*.

I now turn to infinitival full lexical verbs. In such structures, *pas* must precede the verb, as in the grammatical examples (38a) and (39a), taken from Pollock (1989: 374 (16)), the reverse order in (38b) and (39b) being ungrammatical (outside literary language with a distinct archaic flavor to it; see Grevissé 1986: 1487 §980):

(38) a. Ne PASSEMBLER heureux est une condition pour . . .  
b. *Ne SEMBLER PAS heureux est une condition pour . . .  
   *ne (seem) pas (seem) happy is a condition for
   ‘Not appearing happy is a condition for . . .’

(39) a. Ne PASPOSÉDER de voiture en banlieue rend la vie difficile.  
b. *Ne POSÉDER PAS de voiture en banlieue rend la vie  
   *ne (possess) pas (possess) of car in suburb makes the life  
   difficult.  
   ‘Not having a car (while living) in the suburbs makes life difficult.’

Maintaining my assumption that, in the grammatical (38a) and (39a), *pas* occupies SpecNegP, the lexical infinitive must occupy a lower functional head position in these examples, either Mood*²* or T*²*. The ungrammatical status of (38b) and (39b) could be explained in either of two ways. First, with the verb in T*²* or Mood*²*, it could be that *pas* has failed to raise to SpecNegP. Second, if *pas* is indeed in SpecNegP, the verb would need to have raised from T*²* to AgrS*²*, which I therefore assume to be impossible, as in (20b*²*).

But what about contexts in which a negative adverb is used to negate the lexical infinitive, instead of *pas*? Here, the distribution is freer, and both relative orderings are acceptable, although the adverb more commonly precedes the infinitive.

(40) a. Ne JAMAISSEMBLER heureux est une condition pour . . .  
b. Ne SEMBLER JAMAIS heureux est une condition pour . . .  
   *ne (seem) jamais (seem) happy is a condition for
   ‘Never appearing happy is a condition for . . .’

(41) a. Ne PLUSPOSÉDER de voiture en banlieue rend la vie difficile.  
b. Ne POSSÉDER PLUS de voiture en banlieue rend la vie  
   *ne (possess) plus (possess) of car in suburb makes the life  
   difficult.  
   ‘No longer having a car (while living) in the suburbs makes life  
   difficult.’
In (40a) and (41a), I assume that the adverb occupies SpecNegP and that the verb occupies T°. Given my earlier conclusion that lexical infinitives cannot raise from T° to AgrS°, I further assume that, in (40b) and (41b), the verb occupies a position no higher than T°. This being the case, the post-verbal negative adverb cannot occupy SpecNegP in these sentences. Rather, it must occupy a lower position. This is further evidence to suggest that the syntax of negative adverbs is less strict than the syntax of pas. While the latter must appear in SpecNegP at S-structure for reasons that are by now familiar, the former are not obliged to do so.

**The syntactic status of jamais, plus, guère**

### 4.3

#### 4.3.1 Preliminary remarks

In section 2.1, I concluded that, where the operator pas is used to negate a clause containing an intransitive verb, [\_ pas ] bears the feature [+NEG], is generated adjoined to VP, and then raises to SpecNegP in the syntax to mark sentential negation and license ne. Maintaining my assumption from section 1.2.4 that ne is not inherently negative, I assume that DA transmits the feature [+NEG] from the negative operator in SpecNegP to the Neg head, as illustrated in (42). This is in line with Haegeman’s (1995: 107) minimal assumption that negative clauses are characterized by the presence of the feature [+NEG] on a functional head in the extended domain of V.

\[(42)\]

\[
\text{NegP} \quad \text{Spec} \quad \text{Neg}^\circ \quad [+\text{NEG}] \quad \text{pas} \quad \text{Neg}^\circ \quad \ldots \\
\text{ne}
\]

Dynamic Agreement

So what about the negative adverbs? In what way does (42) have to be modified in order to account for their syntax? Before considering this, it’s necessary to decide what needs to remain constant. First, sentences containing a negative adverb can appear with ne, as I have already shown. Given that I have not had to posit more than one kind of ne so far, I shall assume that the ne that appears with negative adverbs is the same ne I considered in sections 1.2.2, 1.2.4, and 1.2.5, that is, the one that appears with pas. Recall that ne is not inherently negative. In the case of “expletive” ne, it is never associated with negative features and is licensed by indirect extended selection from above; in the case of the ne that co-occurs with pas, it is licensed and “acquires” its “negativity”, via DA, in association with the inherently negative pas in
SpecNegP at S-structure, as in (42). The null hypothesis therefore must be that, in (1c-e), ne is also licensed via DA by a negative operator in SpecNegP.

Further, there is no reason to suppose that sentences containing negative adverbs are any less “negative” than sentences containing pas. Under the assumptions I have made so far (Haegeman 1995: 107), this means that, one way or another, a functional head within the extended domain of V will bear the feature [+NEG] at S-structure. I assume that it is in fact Neg* that bears this feature, that is, ne (with possible raising to AgrS—see Acquaviva 1994). Since (a) ne is not itself negative, (b) SpecNegP is not occupied by pas, (c) as I showed in section 4.2.2, the negative adverbs are not obliged to raise into SpecNegP, and (d) I am assuming that ne needs to be licensed and sentential negation marked at S-structure in Modern French, I can conclude only that, in (26b)–(28b), (40b), and (41b), the non-overt operator, Op, occupies SpecNegP at S-structure and, given DA, transmits its [+NEG] feature to Neg*, thus ensuring that ne is licensed and that the sentence is interpreted as being negative. Finally, given the analysis of NPI licensing advocated in sections 3.4.2ff, Op unselectively A'-binds the negative adverb(s). In other words, I conclude that, in the examples in (40b) and (41b), sentential negation is marked in the same way as in (43) and (44), discussed in section 1.2.4:

(43) a. Je n’osais venir.
I ne dared come
‘I didn’t dare come.’

b. [{AgrSP Je n’osais [NegP Op [Neg’ . . . t . . . venir ]]}]

(44) a. Jean ne voit que Marie.
J. ne sees que M.
‘J. can only see M.’

b. [{AgrSP Jean ne voit [NegP Op [Neg’ . . . t . . . que Marie ]]}]

Before speculating further about possible syntactic characterisations of negative adverbs, it is insightful to consider how they relate to ne and pas diachronically.

The development of sentential negation in French

4.3.2

In order to understand the nature of the relationship among ne, pas, and the negative adverbs, one must appreciate something of the way the system of sentential negation in Modern French has evolved (see sections 3.1.1, 3.1.2, and especially 3.5.2). As discussed by Grevisse (1986: 1477 §973), Harris (1978: 23–29), Posner (1996: 302), Winters (1987: 28–30, 33–47), and, in more recent theoretical work, Pearce (1990, 1991, 1993), the canonically post-verbal markers of negation in the modern language, that is, the negative adverbs/arguments and pas, were not originally negative. Rather, they were nouns denoting small amounts that came to reinforce non/ine; they were essentially emphatic elements
This development took place during the Middle French period, from the twelfth century on (Harris 1978: 25).

The development has been accounted for on both phonological and syntactic grounds, and, in both accounts, the trigger can be seen as the initial grammaticalization/weakening of non/ne, that is, its (re)analysis as Neg∗. On a phonological level, it has been suggested that phonetic weakening of the pre-verbal marker left it incapable of marking sentential negation on its own. Since it had not been possible to use non with a finite lexical verb since the early Old French period (according to Grevisse 1986: 1477 §973), another strategy needed to be developed to mark/reinforce sentential negation. On a syntactic level, the immobility of the pre-verbal marker, the very fact that it was always pre-verbal, meant that it was interpretatively inflexible. Negation expressed by the pre-verbal marker alone was always interpreted as an instance of absolute negation. In other words, the entire propositional content of the clause was being denied. It could not be used for local constituent negation (Grevisse 1986: 1482 §977), that is, to negate a subclausal unit, such as a purpose clause. Since the post-verbal markers of negation were distributionally more flexible, their position could indicate the part of the proposition being negated.

French thus followed Jespersen’s Negative Cycle, with the erstwhile emphatic post-verbal elements, and pas in particular, losing their original (positive) value. They then came to carry clausal negation alone, with the pre-verbal negative marker ne subsequently and increasingly often being absent from spoken language, especially in interrogatives, by the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Harris 1978: 26) and, according to Price (1993: 191), at least, as early as the thirteenth century. In fact, the tendency for bipartite sentential negation to be replaced by single (post-verbal) sentential negation using pas is now so strong that, as I argued in chapter 1, in the modern language, the one-time exclusive bearer of sentential negation, pre-verbal ne, has lost whatever inherent negativity it had. Whatever negative interpretation can be assigned to this element is now due to its association with some other element marked [+NEG], such as pas. The link between ne and negation in Modern French is therefore indirect, to say the least. Of course, by virtue of (a) the licensing conditions assumed for ne in section 1.2.5, (b) the analysis of pas proposed in chapter 2, and (c) the nature of the spec-head relationship inherent in the Neg Criterion proposed in section 3.3, I have the means by which [+NEG] can be transmitted from pas to ne: movement of pas to SpecNegP followed by DA.

I claim that pas is the only overt post-verbal “negative” element in the standard modern language to be inherently marked [+NEG]. (See section 3.5.2, for my reasoning.) In contrast, the adverbs I have discussed in this chapter are not marked in this way; the elements plus, jamais, and guère are not inherently negative, and their co-occurrence does not therefore amount to NC. What I am claiming with respect to negative adverbs is supported by a number of facts, some of which have already been reviewed. First, “negative” adverbs still have some nonnegative uses. For example, jamais and plus (without ne, even in registers not characterized by “ne-drop”) are stylistic variants of un jour/en un temps quelconque ‘one day’/‘some time or other’ or encore ‘still’, respectively.
A deletion-based analysis is in fact proposed for Standard Modern French in Escure (1974).

For further discussion of the interaction between verb position and negative adverb position, see Belletti (1990, 1992, 1994a, b) and Zanuttini (1994b, 1995).

(Gaatone 1971: 139, 151). In contrast, no positive use remains for the element *pas*.

(45) a. Je ne crois pas que cet homme revienne jamais.
   *I don’t believe* pas *that this man return-SUBJ jamais*
   ‘I don’t think that man is ever coming back.’

b. À jamais
   *to jamais*
   ‘For ever.’

c. Si jamais tu reviens à Paris, . . .
   *if jamais* you return to P.
   ‘If you’re ever back in Paris, . . .’

Second, as illustrated earlier, “negatives” can co-occur without negation being canceled. Third, in the patterns of NC in earlier varieties of French discussed in section 3.5.2, there is reason to believe that the only items entering into NC are *ne* and *pas*, and not the negative adverbs discussed in this chapter or the negative arguments analyzed in chapter 5.

Instead of being lexically marked [+NEG], I claim that the negative interpretation of the adverbs is to be attributed to the fact that they appear in the scope of an inherently [+NEG] operator. Of course, in standard metropolitan Modern French, this inherently [+NEG] operator cannot normally be *pas*; otherwise, some deletion process would need to be invoked to make sure *pas* does not surface in the syntax together with the adverb. However, given the account of sentences such as (43) and (44) proposed in section 1.2.4, and the A’-binding approach to NPI licensing adopted and modified in section 3.4.2, the non-overt counterpart of *pas*, namely Op, is an immediately obvious source of the negative interpretation of these adverbs. To account for the data in (43) and (44) while maintaining the conclusion that *ne* is not inherently negative in the modern language, I attributed the negative interpretation to a non-overt inherently negative operator: Op. Pre-verbal *ne* then acquires the [+NEG] feature from Op as a consequence of the mechanism by which *ne* is formally licensed, namely DA. Op is, of course, identical to *pas*, apart from the fact that it is non-overt. In the next section, I exploit Op and flesh out an analysis of negative adverbs.

**Structural analysis**

4.3.3

Focusing attention on contexts without pseudopartitive direct objects (but see footnote 12), I assume that negative adverbs are generated in an adjoined position. This was the conclusion I came to in section 2.1, with respect to *pas,*

---


11. For further discussion of the interaction between verb position and negative adverb position, see Belletti (1990, 1992, 1994a, b) and Zanuttini (1994b, 1995).
and I see no reason why the same is not the case for the negative adverbs, especially in view of my characterization of the negative adverbs with respect to Di Sciullo and Williams’s (1986) distinction between different types of modification; if *pas* produces a composite function with the predicate by adjunction, it seems likely that the negative adverbs do too. (But see Cinque 1995, 1996, 1998 for an analysis of adverbs based on distinct functional projections rather than adjoined positions.)

As mentioned, however, this is not to claim that *pas* and the negative adverbs necessarily occupy identical *surface* positions. While the negative operator *pas* necessarily raises overtly to SpecNegP in order to license *ne* and to mark sentential negation, my claim is that this is crucially not the case for the negative adverbs. This is attributable to the fact that the negative adverbs are not in fact negative, that is, do not bear the feature [+NEG]. They cannot therefore license *ne* or mark sentential negation by raising to SpecNegP. Rather, the negative adverbs co-occur, in the relevant contexts, with Op, the non-overt negative operator. It is therefore *Op* that crucially needs to raise to SpecNegP at S-structure to mark sentential negation. Where the negative adverbs themselves raise to SpecNegP, it is in a sense parasitic on movement of the operator, rather than as a result of any of their own inherent features. For concreteness, I assume the base structure in (46), in which Op and the negative adverbs are adjoined to VP.\(^\text{12}\)

(46) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{Op} \\
\text{XP} \\
\text{XP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{guère} \\
\text{plus} \\
\text{jamais}
\end{array}
\]

To mark sentential negation, a negative operator has to be in a spec-head configuration with an appropriate functional head, such as Neg\(^*\), at S-structure.

\(^{12}\) This is something of a simplification. Following Cinque (1995, 1996, 1998), these elements may attach higher in clause structure. This has no implications for the analysis proposed here, which, incidentally, differs from Rowlett (1996c), section 4.4.3. I do not make strong claims about the order of the two VP-adjoined elements in (46). For example, given its interpretation (“always-not” as opposed to “not-always”), it may make sense to assume that *jamais* is base-generated above Op. As for the licensing of pseudopartitives, as in (i), I assume that Op is generated in SpecNumP and subsequently raised to SpecNegP, as suggested in section 2.2.4, for *pas*. This is illustrated in (ii).

(i) Julie n’ a jamais lu de romans.
   *J. has never read any novels.*

(ii) \[\ldots \text{ n’a } [\ldots \text{ Op } [\ldots \text{ jamais } \ldots \text{ lu } \ldots [\ldots [\ldots \text{ [ de romans } \ldots]]]]]]
Failure of *pas* to raise in the relevant contexts was shown in chapter 2 to have two consequences. First, *ne* becomes unavailable. Second, the negation has local scope. In contrast, in the sentences considered here, *ne* is available, and negation has wide scope. I therefore assume that Op has raised to SpecNegP. This is illustrated in (47):

(47)  
```
            NegP
               ↑
        Spec  |  Neg'  
        Op  |  Neg  
            ne
```

```
            VP
               ↑
        t  
            VP
```

```
            VP
               ↑
        XP*  
            jamais  
             guère  
            plus
```

A further possibility, suggested by the examples in (40a) and (41a), would be for Op to be accompanied by the negative adverb (or adverbs—see section 4.3.4.4) as it raises into SpecNegP. This is illustrated for (40a) very schematically in (48):

(48)  
```
            NegP
               ↑
        Spec  |  Neg'  
        Op jamais  |  Neg  
            ne
```

```
            VP
               ↑
        t  
            VP
```

In the second case, the overt adverb in (46) parasitically raises into SpecNegP while, in the first case, it remains in situ in its adjoined position. Given that TP and MoodP intervene between the base VP-adjoined position of the negative adverb and SpecNegP, this analysis has the attraction of predicting that negative adverbs can either precede or follow an infinitive in \( T^*/\text{Mood}^* \). In both scenarios, crucially, Op appears in SpecNegP (as required by the need to mark
sentential negation). DA then ensures that *ne* is licensed and endowed with the feature [\textit{+NEG}]; negation has wide scope and the sentence is negative.

**Examples**

4.3.4

Some exemplification is perhaps in order at this point, especially since, unlike in chapter 2, where I considered the syntax of *pas*, assumptions about the position of the negative adverbs interact in much more complex fashion with the syntax of infinitives. My assumptions about Verb Movement patterns in Standard French—motivated in chapter 1—were given in (20) and are repeated here:

(49) \textit{Overt Verb Movement patterns in French:}

\begin{enumerate}
\item All finite verbs move to \textit{AgrS}⁺.
\item Infinitival auxiliaries (*être, avoir*) freely move to \textit{Mood}⁺, \textit{T}⁺, or \textit{AgrS}⁺.
\item Infinitival modal verbs (e.g., *pouvoir, devoir*) move to \textit{Mood}⁺ or \textit{T}⁺, and only exceptionally to \textit{AgrS}⁺.
\item Infinitival lexical verbs move to \textit{Mood}⁺ or \textit{T}⁺, but not as far as \textit{AgrS}⁺.
\end{enumerate}

Thus, while tensed verbs always appear in \textit{AgrS}⁺ at S-structure, infinitivals can, depending on the nature of the verb, appear either in \textit{AgrS}⁺ (auxiliaries, exceptionally modals, but not lexical infinitives) or in \textit{T}⁺/\textit{MoodP}⁺ (auxiliaries, modals, and lexical verbs). In example 1, the clause is finite, and the verb must therefore move to \textit{AgrS}⁺. Examples 2 and 3 contain an auxiliary and a modal infinitive, respectively. The two possible surface orderings of \textit{verb + adverb} and \textit{adverb + verb} are discussed. Finally, in example 4, an infinitival lexical verb co-occurs with two negative adverbs.

**Example 1**

4.3.4.1

(50) Pierre *ne* boit plus.

\begin{itemize}
\item Pierre *ne* drinks \textit{plus}.
\end{itemize}

In this example, the clause contains a finite intransitive verb, *boit* ‘drinks’, which, in line with (49a), raises to \textit{AgrS}⁺. The pre-verbal particle *ne* will move along with the finite verb to \textit{AgrS}⁺. Op raises to SpecNegP to mark sentential negation. Depending on whether or not \textit{plus} follows Op into SpecNegP, the negative adverb will either remain in situ, VP-joined, as in (52), or occupy SpecNegP, as in (51). In either case, the adverb is in post-verbal position.

(51) [Pierre \textit{[AgrS}⁺ ne boit [\textit{NegP [Spec Op plus ] [\textit{T} \textit{[MoodP [VP ... ]]]]]]}]]

(52) [Pierre \textit{[AgrS}⁺ ne boit [\textit{NegP [Spec Op ] [\textit{T} \textit{plus [MoodP [VP ... ]]]]}]]]
4.3.4.2 Example 2

(53) . . . afin de ne jamais être sans argent
     in-order of ne jamais be without money
     ‘. . . in order never to be without money’

Here, an infinitival clause containing an auxiliary is introduced by a complex complementiser afin de ‘in order to’, whose structure will not be investigated here. Following (49b’), I assume that the verb moves at least as far as Mood
. Given its pre-verbal position, I assume that jamais occupies SpecNegP, that is, that it has raised with Op to SpecNegP (as in (48)), and that the verb has not raised above T
.

(54) . . . ne [NegP [Spec Op jamais ][Neg’ ][TPMoodP être [VP t [VP sans argent ]]]]

Example 3

4.3.4.3

(55) . . . faire preuve de ne vouloir guère que cela soit le cas
     do proof of ne want guère that that be-SUBJ the case
     ‘. . . prove that PRO hardly wants that to be the case’

In contrast to example 2, which contains a (nonmodal) auxiliary, the infinitival clause in example 3 contains the modal verb vouloir ‘to want’. Here, the negative adverb follows the verb, yet precedes the finite CP complement of the verb. Given the nature of the complement of the modal, that is, a finite CP, and the position of the negative adverb, it cannot be claimed that the negative is associated with the CP. (See footnote 8.) I conclude, then, that the “negative” is left-VP-joined and that the modal has raised either to Mood
 or to T
, as in (56). Sentential negation is marked and ne is licensed since Op has raised to SpecNegP.

(56) [AgrP ne [NegP Op [TPMoodP vouloir [VP t [VP guère [VP [CP . . . ]]]]]]

Example 4

4.3.4.4

(57) Dis-lui de ne plus jamais venir.
     say-him of ne plus jamais come
     ‘Tell him/her never to come again.’

In the infinitival clause in example 4, which is the complement of the imperative, the verb is preceded by two negative adverbs, as in (5a–c). However, although I have discussed the possibility of negative adverb concatenation, I have not yet proposed a syntactic analysis of this phenomenon. Given the approach to the examples discussed in section 4.3.3, it seems sensible to assume that multiple negative adverbs are successively adjoined to VP, as in (58), and can both subsequently parasitically raise with Op into SpecNegP, as has presumably happened in (57), given their pre-verbal position.
Recall that it was observed that these adverbs are not polarity-reversing elements, that is, not inherently specified [+NEG]. In the structure proposed in (46), which, it was suggested, underlies the use of a single negative adverb, the structure receives its negative interpretation by virtue of the presence of Op. What is characteristic, of course, about the interpretation of the structures in (5a–c) and example 4 here is that the apparent negativity of one adverb does not cancel out that of another. (Recall also the discussion in section 4.2.1 and the informal characterization in (10)–(13) of multiple “negatives” in French.) I interpret this fact as suggesting that, in structures containing two or more adverbs, there is only one Op, producing a single instance of negation, as in (58). Given that the relationship between Op and the lexical negative adverb is unselective binding, the ability of two adverbs to “share” a single operator becomes clear. Op can in principle bind any number of suitable items; in this example, it binds two negative adverbs. The surface structure in (57) is a result of short or medium Verb Movement (to Mood+/T+) and movement of both Op and the negative adverbs to SpecNegP, exactly as in previous examples.

The question then arises as to whether it is possible for just one of the two negative adverbs to follow Op into SpecNegP. The example in (59) suggests that this is not ruled out by the grammar.

(59) Elle était contente de ne plus avoir jamais à faire l’amour avec son mari.

‘She was glad she didn’t ever have to make love to her husband again.’

Here, while plus has raised with Op to SpecNegP, jamais can remain in situ, as shown by their position with respect to the infinitive. (Of course, it is also possible for jamais to raise with plus to give the order [ne plus jamais avoir].)

**Explanatory power**

**4.4**

In section 4.2, two distributional differences between pas and the negative adverbs were discussed. In this section, I demonstrate how the analysis proposed in section 4.3 allows an account of those differences to be given.

**Linear ordering of infinitival verbs**

**4.4.1**

The underlying structure in (46) can be used in a relatively straightforward way to explain why, in infinitival clauses, the distribution of the negative adverbs is more flexible than that of pas. The table in (60) shows how the analysis of negative adverbs and pas proposed or defended here together with the assumptions in (20), can account for the orderings exemplified in the text. What is
important to remember is that my analysis predicts that *pas* must appear in SpecNegP, since this is the only way in which *pas* can mark sentential negation, that is, the only way it can be in the required configuration with a suitable head and the only way *ne* can be licensed. With respect to the negative adverbs, in contrast, two possibilities are open. In the scenario illustrated in (47), lexical *guère, plus,* and *jamais* appear in their base position at S-structure; sentential negation is marked, and *ne* is licensed, by Op alone raising to SpecNegP. In the scenario illustrated in (48), lexical *guère, plus,* and *jamais* appear in SpecNegP, since they have raised with Op to SpecNegP. Hence, in the table in (60), *pas* must appear in the column headed SpecNegP, while the negative adverbs can appear either in the column headed SpecNegP or in the column headed VP-joined.

(60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT EX.</th>
<th>AGR$^+$</th>
<th>SPECNEG</th>
<th>T$^+$/MOOD</th>
<th>VP-ADJOINED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. (1b) sera</td>
<td>pas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. (1c-e) sera</td>
<td>plus/jamais/guère</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. (1c-e) sera</td>
<td>plus/jamais/guère</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. (21a) pas/plus/jamais/guère</td>
<td>être</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. (21b) être</td>
<td>pas/plus/jamais/guère</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. (21b) (être)</td>
<td>(être) plus/jamais/guère</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. (23a) pas</td>
<td>pouvoir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. (23b) ?pouvoir</td>
<td>pas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. (26a) plus/jamais/guère</td>
<td>pouvoir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. (26b) pouvoir</td>
<td>plus/jamais/guère</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. (38a) pas</td>
<td>sembler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. (38b) *sembler</td>
<td>pas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. (38b) sembler *pas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. (40a) plus/jamais/guère</td>
<td>sembler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. (40b) sembler plus/jamais/guère</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In (60a–c), in which the finite verb is in Agr$^+$, both pas and the negative adverbs follow the verb. Pas obligatorily occupies SpecNegP, (60a), while the negative adverbs can appear either in SpecNegP, (60b), or, if Op alone raises to SpecNegP, in situ, VP-adjoined, (60c).

In (60d–f), the infinitive is an auxiliary. Following (20b'), the verb can undergo either short, medium, or long Verb Movement and can therefore occupy either Mood$^+$, T$^+$, or Agr$^+$. Where the adverb is pre-verbal, as in (60d), it must be in SpecNegP, and the verb cannot have raised above T$^+$. Where the adverb is post-verbal, a number of possibilities exist. If the adverb is pas, it must be in SpecNegP, and the verb must have risen to Agr$^+$, as in (60e). However, if the negative is an adverb rather than pas, it can be in SpecNegP, in which case the verb must have risen into Agr$^+$, as in (60e), or in its base position, adjoined to VP, in which case the verb could be in Agr$^+$, T$^+$, or Mood$^+$, as in (60f).

In (60g–j), the infinitive is a modal. In (60g–h), the verb is negated by pas, which must occupy SpecNegP. The most natural order, according to Pollock (1989: 375, 1997b), is for pas to precede the infinitival modal. This is illustrated in (60g), where the modal has undergone short or medium Verb Movement to T$^+/$/Mood$^+$. The unnaturalness of the reverse ordering is a consequence of the fact that, for such a string to be generated, the infinitival modal would need to undergo long Verb Movement to Agr$^+$, which is exceptional in line with (20b'). The interesting contrast noted between (23b) and (26b) is illustrated in the table in (60h) and (60j). For, although infinitival modals cannot—without marked stylistic effects—precede pas, they can quite naturally precede negative adverbs, not because long Verb Movement becomes more natural when it co-occurs with these adverbs but rather because the adverbs (unlike pas) do not have to raise to SpecNegP. Rather, they can remain VP-adjoined, and the modal can precede them without having to raise from T$^+$ to Agr$^+$.

Finally, the situation with respect to full lexical verbs is illustrated in (60k–o). Where a lexical infinitive is negated by pas, the verb must follow the negative, as in (60k). This is because pas must occupy SpecNegP and the verb cannot raise higher than T$^+$. For the reverse order to be generated, either the verb would have to raise to Agr$^+$, as in (60l), or the negative would have to remain VP-adjoined, as in (60m). In each case, the string is ungrammatical. In contrast, where the lexical infinitive co-occurs with a negative adverb, both relative orders are equally possible. In each case, the verb appears no higher than T$^+$. Where the adverb is pre-verbal, it has raised with Op to SpecNegP, as in (60n); where it is post-verbal, it remains VP-adjoined, as in (60o).

With respect to (60n) (= (40a)) and (60o) (= (40b)), it was noted on page 151 that the most common order was for the adverb to precede the infinitive as in (60n) (= (40a)). This suggests that, for some reason, yet to be explored, the possibility of parasitic movement, with Op, to SpecNegP, on the part of the negative adverb, is a preferred option. I return to this in the next section.
4.4.2 Co-occurrence restrictions
Within the framework of the structures proposed in (46), the question of why *pas* cannot, in some varieties (including the standard), co-occur with the negative adverbs (without leading to logical DN) is reduced to a consideration of why, on the basis of an underlying configuration such as (61a), the operator bearing the feature [+NEG] cannot be overt, that is, *pas*. Why, instead, must it surface as Op, as in (61b)? And what is it about the grammar of certain nonstandard varieties that allows the operator, optionally, to surface as *pas*, as in (61c)?

(61) a. *Underspecified underlying configuration:*

\[
\text{VP} \\
\text{XP} \quad \text{VP} \\
[\text{+NEG}] \quad \text{XP} \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \text{plus} \\
\quad \text{jamais} \\
\quad \text{guère}
\]

b. *Standard:*

\[
\text{VP} \\
\text{Op} \quad \text{XP} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{XP} \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \text{plus} \\
\quad \text{jamais} \\
\quad \text{guère}
\]

c. *Nonstandard (e.g., Québécois):\textsuperscript{13}*

\[
\text{VP} \\
\text{XP} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{pas} \quad \text{XP} \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \text{jamais} \\
\quad \text{guère}
\]

It is possible to relate the phenomenon illustrated in (61b) to the empirical tendency noted with respect to (60n, o) in section 4.4.1, namely that, where a nega-

\textsuperscript{13} The absence of *plus* from (61c) follows as a consequence of judgments from native speakers (of Québécois, at least) that the co-occurrence of *pas plus* is not permitted. See (62b).
tive adverb such as jamais co-occurs with a lexical infinitive, the preferred order is for the adverb to precede the verb, that is, to raise to SpecNegP with Op (even though the opposite order, in which the adverb remains in situ, is perfectly grammatical). In other words, while negative adverbs do not have to raise to SpecNegP with Op, they have a tendency to do so anyway. I attribute the tendency of the negative adverbs to raise to SpecNegP, as well as the non-overt nature of the [+NEG] operator, to an intimate association between the operator and the adverb, an association that can, in turn, probably be attributed to extensive co-occurrence in structures such as those illustrated in section 3.5.2, example (72). (See McMahon 1994: 164.) This seems a plausible approach, given that, as I show in the next section and in section 5.5.2, it is precisely in those syntactic configurations in which the “negative” is increasingly distant from the negative operator that the latter is more likely to surface as pas rather than Op. In section 5.5.2, for example, I show that, in the standard language, there are constraints on the necessary intimacy between the “negatives” and the operator and that, where these constraints are not met, the negative operator is overt. In particular, when certain kinds of clause boundary intervene between the surface and underlying position of the negative operator, the operator surfaces as pas. In section 4.4.2.1, in which I consider Québécois and other nonstandard varieties of French, I show that negative arguments are generally more likely than negative adverbs to be accompanied by overt pas rather than by non-overt Op. This can perhaps be attributed to the fact that the negative arguments cannot raise to SpecNegP with Op. Further, negative arguments are more likely to be accompanied by overt pas than by non-overt Op when they are embedded within a PP, that is, syntactically more remote from the negative operator, which, as we saw in section 2.2.4.2, crucially cannot be extracted from within the PP and must therefore originate external to VP. Given that the phenomenon illustrated in (61b) affects both negative adverbs and arguments, I return to it in section 5.5.2. In the next section, I consider varieties of French in which (61b) does not apply.

Québécois

4.4.2.1

As suggested earlier with respect to (61c), the relationship between the negative operator and negative adverbs does not force the former to surface as Op in some nonstandard varieties of French, such as Québécois. The examples here (from Marie Claude personal communication [62] and Muller 1991: 262 [63]) show how, in monoclusal contexts, pas can co-occur with negative adverbs and, especially, argumental rien and personne, without inducing DN.

(62) a. Marie pleure pas jamais.
   M. cries pas jamais
   ‘M. never cries.’
b. J’ai pas plus faim.
   I have *pas plus* hunger
   ‘I am no longer hungry.’

c. Michel a pas rien fait.
   M. has *pas rien* done
   ‘M. hasn’t done anything.’

d. Je vois pas personne.
   I see *pas personne*
   ‘I can’t see anyone.’

(63) a. Le samedi soir . . . , y a pas personne en ville à Québec.
   the Saturday evening there has *pas personne* in town at Q.
   ‘Saturday evenings . . . , there’s no-one in the center of Quebec.’

b. J’ai pas parlé à personne.
   I have *pas* spoken to *personne*
   ‘I haven’t spoken to anyone.’

c. Tu travailles pas rien, tu risques pas grand-chose . . .
   you work *pas rien* you risk *pas* much
   ‘If you do no work, you don’t risk much . . .’

d. Y m’répond pas rien.
   he me answers *pas rien*
   ‘He doesn’t answer me.’

e. Personne a pas l’droit de rien faire pis de rien dire.
   *personne* has *pas* the right of *rien* do then of *rien* say
   ‘No-one has the right to do nothing and say nothing.’

f. Personne n’est pas venu.
   *personne* *ne* is *pas* come
   ‘No-one came.’

Muller’s observation about the co-occurrence of *pas* and negative arguments is confirmed by Moritz and Valois (1994). The following examples are taken from Daoust-Blais and Kemp (1979: 11–12):

(64) a. Je connais pas personne.
   I know *pas personne*
   ‘I don’t know anyone.’

b. J’ai pas vu personne.
   I have *pas* seen *personne*
   ‘I haven’t seen anyone.’

c. Je vois pas rien.
   I see *pas rien*
   ‘I can’t see anything.’
d. J’en ai pas vu aucun.
   I of-them have pas seen aucun
   ‘I haven’t seen any of them.’

e. Je sais pas jamais quand il va venir.
   I know pas jamais when he goes come
   ‘I never know when he’ll come.’

Outside Quebec, Muller (1991: 261) notes a construction in metropolitan French that he suggests is “populaire, dialectal, Moyen-Français, vieilli, rare” and in which pas can co-occur with negatives:

(65) a. Toute la rouscaillure n’y fera pas rien.
   all the moaning ne there do-FUT pas rien
   ‘All the moaning won’t make any difference.’

b. J’ai pas rien trouvé.
   I have pas rien found
   ‘I haven’t found anything.’

c. Je connais pas aucun homme.
   I know pas aucun man
   ‘I don’t know any men.’

d. Personne ne sait pas ce qu’il y a derrière.
   personne ne knows pas what that he there has behind
   ‘No-one knows what’s behind it.’

e. . . . un parfum qu’a aucun artifice ne parvient pas à donner
   a perfume that aucun trick ne manages pas to give
   ‘. . . a smell that no trick could manage to produce’

Muller notes further that this construction is even more frequent where the negative argument is embedded within a PP (hence the unavailability of negative adverbs, which cannot, for independent reasons, occur in such positions).

(66) a. Il fera pas d’ cadeau [pp à personne].
   he do-FUT pas of gift to personne
   ‘He won’t give anyone a present.’

b. Il ne fait pas de doute [pp pour personne] que . . .
   it ne does pas of doubt for personne that
   ‘No-one doubts that . . .’

c. Je n’ai pas besoin [pp d’ aucune preuve].
   I ne have pas need of aucune proof
   ‘I don’t need any proof.’

How is one to deal with these data? One possibility is that, unlike in Standard French, pas has not become inherently negative in Québécois (and the other
relevant varieties). If *pas* were still what Muller (1991) terms a *semi-négation*, that is, a noninherently negative NPI, its co-occurrence properties would be expected. However, this seems unlikely. Denise Daoust-Blais, for example, has argued that, in Québécois as in Standard French, *pas* and not *ne* must be considered the true negative marker (Daoust-Blais 1975; Daoust-Blais and Kemp 1979: 11). Indeed, *ne* is generally omitted in Québécois (Sankoff and Vincent 1977). Such an approach is therefore implausible and unlikely to be able to explain the contrast between the standard and nonstandard varieties. A different approach is therefore needed.

An alternative analysis, one that has been advocated by Moritz and Valois (1994: 679fn12), is to hold that, in Québécois, for example, *pas* has been reanalyzed as Neg�. (Recall, for example, from the discussion of the Negative Cycle in section 3.1.1, especially footnote 6, that the negative marker *non*, an adjective in Latin, has been reanalyzed as the realization of a functional head in the modern Romance languages.) However, as discussed in section 3.1.2, I find this idea implausible for a number of reasons. First, there are no syntactic respects in which *pas* in Québécois behaves like a head. In all respects, most importantly concerning Verb Movement patterns across it, *pas* in Québécois behaves like a maximal projection, a fact adequately reflected in the analysis of this element as the specifier of NegP. Second, there has been no major typological shift in Québécois that might explain why speakers would begin to analyze *pas* as a head rather than as a maximal projection. Third, Québécois is in fact more of a paradigm case of a negative concord language than is Standard French. Given the analysis of the negative adverbs and arguments as non-inherently negative NPIs of one sort or another, I actually expect them to co-occur with a negative XP operator. In such terms, it is the “weird” standard language that begs an explanation, rather than the nonstandard varieties. I therefore reject the claim that *pas* in Québécois has been reanalyzed as Neg�.

I return to the relationship between the negative operator and negative adverbs in section 5.5.2, where I develop the approach to (61b, c) sketched in section 4.4.2 for the standard and the nonstandard patterns.

### Summary

In this chapter, I have considered the syntax of the negative adverbs *plus*, *jamais*, and *guère*. In line with the conclusion drawn at the end of chapter 3, namely that Modern French is a non-NC language, I analyzed these elements as nonnegative. I treated them as NPIs, in that their negative interpretation is the result of their co-occurrence with an operator that is inherently negative and that takes scope over them. In the standard language, this operator is non-overt: Op; in some nonstandard varieties, such as Québécois, it can be overt: *pas*. By concluding that the “negative” adverbs of French are not inherently negative themselves, I was able to provide an elegant account for the freer distributions these elements witness in comparison with *pas*. Whereas *pas* must raise to SpecNegP
where this position is accessible, since this is the only way in which sentential negation can be marked, the “negative” adverbs do not since sentential negation can be marked if the non-overt Op raises (without taking the lexical adverb with it).
5

Negative Arguments

In this chapter, I move away from negative adverbs. My aim is to provide a syntactic analysis of negative arguments, which show a number of similarities with the adverbs discussed in chapter 4. They co-occur with each other (and the adverbs) without producing DN; they license ne; and they have sentential scope (see (1)). In contrast to the elements discussed in the previous chapter, though, the elements of interest here are argumental rather than adverbial and, consequently, are associated with θ-roles and, presumably, A-positions. The two elements I consider are personne ‘anyone/no-one’ and rien ‘anything/nothing’. Examples are given in (1): 1

1. While the presence of pre-verbal ne is generally optional (see section 1.2.4, and the references in chapter 1, footnote 3, for discussion of the sociolinguistics of “ne-drop”), Ashby (1976: 123, 1981: 679) notes in two studies that, where the grammatical subject is personne or rien, pre-verbal ne is never deleted. Prince (1976: 410) gives the same judgment. A couple of comments are in order at this point. First, Escure (1974: 403) disagrees with Ashby and Prince, giving the following data (her (3b) and (4b)):
   (i) Personne vient.
       personne comes
       ‘No-one is coming.’
   (ii) Personne veut rien.
       personne wants rien
       ‘No-one wants anything.’
   Escure’s judgments are in no way marginal; my informants also accept (i) and (ii). Second, the fact that personne and, in liaison contexts, rien both end in an [n] makes it difficult to tell whether or not ne has been dropped. The contrast could be reduced to the presence-versus-absence of gemination. Strong categorical claims that ne is never dropped in these contexts need therefore to be treated with care. Further, Prince’s judgment was based on accepted prescriptivist views rather than observation (personal communication). More reliable contexts in which to test the hypothesis, that is, avoiding phrase-final [n], are suggested in (iii) and (iv):
   (iii) Rien du tout (?n’)a été fait.
       rien of-the all  ne has been done
       ‘Nothing at all was done.’
   (iv) Personne d’ intéressant (?n’)a été invité à la fête.
       personne of interesting  ne has been invited to the party
       ‘No-one interesting was invited to the party.’
   Finally, in recent discussion, and following further fieldwork of the type presented in Ashby (1976, 1981), Bill Ashby (personal communication) reports that he has found instances of ne-drop in the presence of personne and rien in subject position.
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2. The symbol # is used in (2b) to indicate that the order is marked. The degree of markedness seems to vary between speakers. For my informants, postparticipial rien is emphatic; for Muller (1991: 282) and Viviane Déprez (personal communication), it is ungrammatical.

Muller (1991: 281) points out that, while impossible in the standard language, (3a) is possible in (1) a. Personne ne voit Marie.

*personne ne* sees M.

‘No-one can see M.’

b. Marie ne soupçonne rien.

*M. ne* suspects *rien*

‘M. suspects nothing.’

c. Personne ne fait rien.

*personne ne does rien*

‘No-one’s doing anything.’

Given my conclusion that the negative adverbs considered in chapter 4 are not inherently negative, and in view of the similarities between those items and the negative arguments considered here, I pursue an analysis in which the negative arguments are assumed not to be inherently negative either. Rather, I argue that the negative interpretation which rien and personne receive is a consequence of their being bound by Op, which is inherently negative. The presence of Op is also responsible for conferring sentential scope on the negative arguments and for licensing ne.

My approach is supported by the fact that personne and rien can co-occur with each other, as well as with the negative adverbs discussed earlier, without leading to DN. Given that Jespersen’s Generalization predicts that Modern French is a non-NC language, as discussed in section 3.5.2, I do not expect multiple negative XPs to co-occur in the language without leading to DN. Given that personne and rien can co-occur without leading to DN, they are deemed to be NPIs (nonnegative elements dependent on the presence of a negative operator), rather than negative quantifiers (inherently negative items).

Assuming, then, that rien and personne are NPIs, I first address the mechanisms responsible for licensing them in clauses. As one might expect, given the noted similarities, these are the same as those responsible for licensing the adverbs discussed in chapter 4, namely local A'-binding by a negative operator at S-structure.

A further aim of this chapter is to account for why, within the standard modern language, the distribution of rien does not match that of personne, a fact widely recognized in traditional grammars but that, to my knowledge, has been ignored by theoretical syntacticians. (In her recent study of sentential negation, which includes discussion of French, Haegeman 1995: 315–16 fn40 decides to leave the precise characterization of these two elements on the research agenda.) For example, in compound perfective verb paradigms, while personne must follow the participle, the more natural position for rien is between the auxiliary and the participle.2

---

2. The symbol # is used in (2b) to indicate that the order is marked. The degree of markedness seems to vary between speakers. For my informants, postparticipial rien is emphatic; for Muller (1991: 282) and Viviane Déprez (personal communication), it is ungrammatical.

Muller (1991: 281) points out that, while impossible in the standard language, (3a) is possible in
(2) a. Jean n’a vu personne.
   b. #Jean n’a vu rien.
      ‘J. ne has seen personne/rien
      ‘J. hasn’t seen anyone/anything.’

(3) a. *Jean n’a personne vu.
    b. Jean n’a rien vu.
       ‘J. ne has personne/rien seen
       (= (2a, b))

This and other parallel distributional mismatches between personne and rien are discussed in section 5.4.

**Early generative approaches to**

5.1 the syntax of personne and rien

Early transformational attempts to deal with the syntax of personne and rien were couched within the terms of LF raising: as quantifiers, these elements were assumed to QR at LF in order to acquire sentential scope. Such LF movement was argued by Kayne (1981, 1984: 24) to account for the contrast in (4):

(4) a. *Je n’ai exigé que personne soit arrêté.
    I ne have demanded that personne be-SUBJ arrested
    ‘I didn’t demand anyone be arrested.’

    b. ?Je n’ai exigé qu’ils arrêtent personne.
    I ne have demanded that they arrest-SUBJ personne
    ‘I didn’t demand they arrest anyone.’

Kayne argues that the ungrammaticality of (4a) is due to the ECP in (5):

(5) *The Empty Category Principle (ECP):*
    A (nonpronominal) empty category must be properly governed.

Following QR, Kayne argues that personne in (4a) leaves a subject trace that fails to be properly governed; hence the ungrammaticality. Raising of personne in (4b) fails to result in ungrammaticality because the trace left after LF movement of personne is in object position. Object traces—unlike subject

...
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traces—are properly head-governed.3 Identical facts hold for rien, as shown in (6):

(6)  a.  *Je n’ ai exigé que rien soit fait.
     I ne have demanded that rien be-SUBJ done
     ‘I didn’t demand anything be done.’

     b.  ?Je n’ ai exigé qu’ ils fassent rien.
     I ne have demanded that they do-SUBJ rien
     ‘I didn’t demand they do anything.’

A couple of comments are in order here. First, not all speakers of French
agree with Kayne’s judgments in (4). (See, for example, the comments by Zaring
1985: 160 and the reservations in von Bremen 1986: 230.) This fact could be
taken to cast doubt on an ECP approach, since ECP violations usually result in
sharp ungrammaticality. Second, it is surprising that the same effects are not
found in Spanish at all (see Longobardi 1987). Further, the grammaticality of (7)
is problematical for an LF-raising approach to the syntax of personne/rien.4

(7)  Je ne crois pas que personne soit arrivé. (Prince 1976: 410 (29d))
     I ne believe pas that personne be-SUBJ arrived
     ‘I don’t think anyone has arrived.’

In this example, personne appears in the same position as in Kayne’s (4a),
namely the subject position of the embedded subjunctive clause. The fact that
personne has matrix scope is clear from the translation of the example as well as
the representation in (8).

(8)  ¬∃x, person(x), believe(I, (arrived(x)))
     (= (7))

In (9), in contrast, the scope of personne is restricted to the embedded clause.
The meaning of (7) is the opposite of the meaning of (9):

3.  Rizzi (1982: 124 (22) and (26)) shows that the facts for personne can be replicated in Italian for
nessuno (and niente):

   (i)  Non pretendi che tu arresti nessuno.
       non require-LSG that nessuno you arrest-SUBJ
       ‘I don’t require you to arrest anyone.’

   (ii) *Non pretendi che nessuno ti arresti.

The example in (i) is somewhat better than the equivalent French string in (4b), since the pre-verbal
negative marker is sufficient in Italian to mark sentential negation, but not in French. (See section
1.2.4.) The only possible interpretation of the string in (ii)—assuming, anyway, a particular intonational
pattern (Rizzi 1982: 175fn12)—is an (irrelevant) DN reading. Hence, (ii) could be glossed as in (iii):

   (iii)  I don’t require that no-one arrest you.

   (DN)

4.  The structure illustrated with croire ‘to believe’ in (7) is also possible with other bridge verbs,
such as affirmer ‘to maintain’, prétendre ‘to claim’, penser ‘to think’, and estimer ‘to feel’, but not,
interestingly, with dire ‘to say’. Thanks to Odile Cyrille for this information.
section 5.2.2, the grammaticality of (7) is also problematic for Moritz and Valois’s
(1994) account of the syntax of personne.

5.2

The syntax of personne

Of the two negative arguments to be discussed here, personne is the most
straightforward, at least in terms of its distribution. The overt distribution of
teen is essentially that of any other argument DP (Moritz and Valois 1994:
669). It can be a subject, a direct or indirect object, or the complement of a
noun or preposition. Yet, in similar fashion to Kayne (1981), M & V suggest that
teen raises to SpecNegP at LF. In contrast to Kayne’s QR analysis, M & V
motivate raising on the basis of the Neg Criterion, repeated in (11): personne
is deemed to be inherently negative and raises at LF to SpecNegP in order to be in
a spec-head configuration with a negative head. In section 5.2.1, I discuss and
evaluate the analysis and logic put forward by M & V. General problems with
their analysis are raised in section 5.2.2. An alternative proposal—following the line of inquiry pursued in earlier chapters—is made in section 5.2.3.

5.2.1 Moritz and Valois: LF raising of \textit{personne} to SpecNegP

The syntax of \textit{personne} has been the topic of recent work by Luc Moritz and Daniel Valois (1993, 1994), who assume, following Kayne (1981), that, in contrast to “ordinary” arguments, \textit{personne} (or a larger constituent containing \textit{personne}) undergoes movement at LF. M\&V assume that \textit{personne} is inherently negative and suggest that LF raising is to SpecNegP to satisfy Haegeman and Zanuttini’s (henceforth, H\&Z) (1991: 244 (27)) Neg Criterion in (11):

(11) The Neg Criterion:
   a. Each Neg $X^\circ$ must be in a spec-head relationship with a Neg operator.
   b. Each Neg operator must be in a spec-head relationship with a Neg $X^\circ$.

If \textit{personne} raises to SpecNegP, the Neg Criterion can be satisfied by virtue of the spec-head configuration between (the constituent containing) \textit{personne} in SpecNegP and (the trace of) \textit{ne} in Neg $^\circ$. The reader is referred to M\&V for the mechanics of how \textit{personne} manages to reach SpecNegP at LF, the exact details of which are irrelevant for my purposes here. Briefly, where possible, \textit{personne} raises alone, directly or successive cyclically to SpecNegP at LF. Where this is not possible, for example, where \textit{personne} is contained within an island XP, M\&V suggest that \textit{personne} raises to the highest specifier position within the island. A sequence of Dynamic Agreement (henceforth, DA) between \textit{personne} (in SpecXP) and the head, $X^\circ$, of the island, followed by feature percolation from $X^\circ$ up to XP, guarantees that the [+\textit{NEG}] feature is borne by the entire XP island constituent, turning it into a negative operator,\(^8\) which then raises to SpecNegP to satisfy the Neg Criterion. M\&V call this “LF pied-piping”.\(^9\)

To support their LF pied-piping analysis, M\&V provide arguments suggesting that movement is involved in sentential negation in French in general, that is, not just in \textit{ne} . . . \textit{pas} constructions but also in structures containing \textit{ne} . . . \textit{personne}, and so on. First, albeit tentatively, they refer (p. 671) to Longobardi’s (1991) observation of a parallel between rules operating on wh-movement and those responsible for scope assignment of negative phrases in Italian, which Longobardi attributes to the fact that negative phrases undergo LF movement. M\&V (p. 673) point out that \textit{personne} exhibits some of the properties identified by Longobardi, for example sensitivity to strong islands, providing data that suggest that the distribution of \textit{personne} is sensitive to both

\(^8\) See Haegeman (1996a) for discussion of contexts in English in which an XP becomes a negative operator by virtue of a negative element contained within it.

\(^9\) A similar mechanism is used by Ortiz de Urbina (1993) to account for some cases of overt movement in Basque.
the Subject Condition and the Adjunct Condition. However, as M&V acknowledge (p. 674), sensitivity to strong islands is not an undisputed indication of movement. For example, they note that Cinque (1990) challenges this correlation in his (nonmovement) analysis of clitic left dislocation constructions in Italian. In Cinque’s analysis, sensitivity to strong islands is a condition on “chains” generally, whether created by movement or by base-generation, that is, a condition on chains and CHAINS. This reservation notwithstanding, M&V (section 4) provide data that, in their view, constitute direct empirical evidence that, where personne is not higher than SpecNegP at S-structure, it moves to SpecNegP at LF. The first set of data concerns the licensing of indefinite pseudopartitive direct objects, that is, with the structure [Ø de NP]. The second concerns the failure of NC between personne and pas.

The data are discussed and the argumentation evaluated in sections 5.2.1.1 and 5.2.1.2, respectively. General problems with M&V’s analysis are raised in section 5.2.2.

**Pseudopartitive direct objects: [Ø de NP]**

5.2.1.1

In section 2.2, I proposed a derivational A’-binding analysis of pseudopartitives, which I assumed, following Lyons (1994a), were NumPs: [NumP Ø de NP]. Pseudopartitives are licensed in negative sentences, as in (12a), or by what Battye (1989, 1995) terms nominal quantifiers in a QàD structure, as in (12b).

(12) a. Jean n’a pas mangé [Ø de pain].
   J. ne has pas eaten of bread
   ‘J. hasn’t eaten any bread.’

b. Jean a beaucoup mangé [Ø de pain].
   J. has lots eaten of bread
   ‘J. has eaten lots of bread.’

What seems to be required is a c-commanding operator (at S-structure) for local A’-binding of the empty category, Ø, contained within the pseudopartitive (cf. Kayne 1981). In section 2.2, I claimed that the c-command condition is a consequence of the fact that Ø is the trace of the operator pas or beaucoup; the operator is generated within the pseudopartitive NumP and subsequently extracted: Ø = t. Since the ECP guarantees that movement is always to a c-commanding position, the operator will always c-command Ø/t. This approach has the desirable consequence that Kayne’s c-command condition does not need

10. Subject Condition violations are illustrated in (i), Adjunct Condition violations in (ii) (from M&V, p. 673, (14a) and (16a)):

(i) •Engager personne n’est permis.
   hire-INF personne ne is allowed

(ii) •Pierre souhaite que Marc ne parte avant d’engager personne
   P. wishes that M. ne leave-SUBJ before of hire-INF personne

See M&V for discussion.
to be stated, since it follows from the ECP and the nature of the relationship between the operator and the empty category. The binding relations in (12) are indicated by co-indexation. In (12b), the operator is *beaucoup*; in (12a), it is *pas*.

In addition to the configurations discussed here, M&V (p. 677) point out that pseudopartitives are licensed when the subject is *personne*, as in (13):

(13) *Personne n’a avalé de poison.*

*personne ne* has swallowed of poison

‘No-one swallowed any poison.’

For M&V, who do not assume the derivational analysis of pseudopartitives proposed in chapter 2 (and who cannot therefore explain the unavailability of PP-embedded pseudopartitives discussed in section 2.2.4.2), the grammaticality of (13) does not pose a problem: the (S-structure) c-command condition on (the empty category contained within) the pseudopartitive is satisfied if *personne* is analyzed as a potential licenser, that is, if the pseudopartitive in (13) is licensed as in (14).

(14) *Personne, n’a avalé [Ø, de poison].*

Despite the fact that examples such as (13) are amenable to analysis within the terms of Kayne’s *S*-structure c-command condition on licensing pseudopartitives, M&V present data that, according to them, suggest the c-command condition on licensing pseudopartitives should in fact apply at LF. M&V show that pseudopartitives are licensed in the presence of *personne* even when *personne* does not itself c-command the pseudopartitive at S-structure, as in (15) (from M&V, pp. 677–78, (31)), where *personne* is embedded within an indirect object or adverbial PP.

(15) a. *Lucie n’a donné [Ø de livres] [pp à personne].*

L. *ne* has given of books to *personne*

‘L. hasn’t given any books to anyone.’

b. *Lucie ne donne [Ø de réceptions] [pp pour personne].*

L. *ne* gives of parties for *personne*

‘L. doesn’t throw parties for anyone.’

11. Note that in (14), the licenser of the empty category in the pseudopartitive [Ø de NP] is not its antecedent: Ø = *t*. For M&V, binding is a representational relationship, not a derivational one. Ø and its licenser form a chain rather than a chain. This, of course, has the weakness of making it necessary to stipulate that the two elements are related by binding at all and, consequently, c-command. In the analysis of pseudopartitives proposed in chapter 2, this stipulation is not necessary. There, pseudopartitives were seen as the result of operator extraction. Since there is independent evidence that antecedents and traces are related, binding (and c-command) do not have to be stipulated.

12. Although in each of the examples in (15), the PP can be argued to c-command the pseudopartitive direct objects, “negative” *personne*, embedded within the PP, clearly cannot. See footnote 14.
13. The shift from S-structure to LF must be stipulated. With respect to (16), personne is contained within an island, personne first moves to SpecPP and a sequence of DA and feature percolation turn the entire PP into a negative operator which then raises to SpecNegP.
14. Note further that raising as far as SpecNegP is not in fact necessary, even if the c-command condition is applied at LF. In fact, to account for the examples in (15), movement of personne to SpecPP followed by DA and feature percolation is arguably all that is needed. Since, with respect to the tree in (16), this would be enough to turn the PP into an operator, and since PP c-commands the empty category, Ø, in the direct object NumP, the licensing condition of Ø is already satisfied and the Neg Criterion need not be invoked.
not possible where personne, jamais, and similar terms co-occur with pas. This should be clear from the translations in (18).\(^{15}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
(18) \text{a. Jean n’ a jamais vu personne.} & \quad (\text{NC}) \\
& \quad \text{‘J. hasn’t ever seen anyone.’} \\
(18) \text{b. [*]Jean n’ a pas vu personne.} & \quad (\text{DN}) \\
& \quad \text{‘J has not seen no-one.’} \\
& \quad (= ‘J has seen someone.’)
\end{align*}
\]

M&V suggest that the unavailability of NC in strings like (18b) can be explained by assuming (a) that pas occupies SpecNegP (at D-structure—see below) and (b) that SpecNegP cannot then be an LF landing site for personne and similar terms. So, while in (18a), both jamais and personne can raise to SpecNegP at LF,\(^{17}\) and their respective \(+\text{NEG}\) features can be absorbed,\(^{18}\) this is not possible in (18b) since, for some unspecified reason, the D-structure presence of pas in SpecNegP prevents personne from raising to this position at LF.

At this point, one or two words need to be said with regard to M&V’s rather confusing stand on the issue of whether pas in generated directly in SpecNegP (as in Pollock 1989) or whether it is generated lower in clause structure and subsequently raised into SpecNegP (as I suggest in chapter 2). First, on page 667, M&V suggest movement is always involved in sentential negation. Later, on page 679, M&V claim that pas is base-generated in SpecNegP.\(^{19}\) And, to confuse matters further, in footnote 4 on page 669, M&V are uncommitted on the issue of the base position of pas, referring the reader to the discussion in Hirschbühler and Labelle (1992/93) of Rowlett (1992b), an early version of the proposals in chapter 2.

Throughout, M&V (p. 669fn4) claim that nothing in their analysis of personne hinges on this particular issue. Nevertheless, it seems to me that there is in fact something crucial in M&V’s analysis of personne that hinges on the issue of where pas is generated. It seems to me that their analysis of the unavailability of

\(^{15}\) As has already been seen in numerous places, this is the case in Standard French but not in some nonstandard varieties such as Québécois, as acknowledged by M&V (p. 679fn12), who offer examples such as (i):

(i) J’ai pas vu personne.

I have pas seen personne

‘I didn’t see anyone.’

Haegeman (1995: 302fn15) recognizes that the issue of why NC appears to be impossible between pas and personne in Standard French is a problem.

\(^{16}\) M&V use the [*] diacritic to indicate that strings such as (18b) containing both pas and personne are interpreted as instances of DN rather than NC.

\(^{17}\) The adverb jamais may well occupy SpecNegP as early as S-structure. See the discussion in section 4.4.1. Crucially, though, for M&V’s purposes, jamais and so on do not occupy SpecNegP at D-structure.

\(^{18}\) Recall that, in contrast to my own analysis, M&V assume these elements are inherently negative. For discussion of absorption, see Higginbotham and May (1981).

\(^{19}\) Moritz and Valois (1993) make the same claim.
NC between *personne* and *pas* hinges crucially on *pas* being in SpecNegP in (18b) *at D-structure*. Indeed, their analysis falls down if the *S-structure* presence of *pas* in SpecNegP could prevent LF raising of *personne* and the NC interpretation. If the presence of *pas* in SpecNegP at S-structure blocked LF raising of *personne*, we would expect the S-structure presence of negative adverbs, such as *jamais*, in SpecNegP to block LF raising of *personne*, too. However, this does not happen, as shown in (18a) as well as (19):

(19) Anne avait peur de ne jamais pouvoir souvent rien faire.
    A. had fear of *ne jamais* be-able often *rien* do
    ‘A. was afraid she would never be able to do anything often.’

As argued in section 1.1.7.4, it seems that, in the unmarked case, infinitival modals, such as *pouvoir* ‘to be able’ do not have to move higher than Mood and that, if they do move any higher, they can freely move only as far as T’. The fact that *pouvoir* appears before the adverb *souvent*, which, following the discussion in chapter 1, I assume is MoodP-adjointed, suggests that, in (19), *pouvoir* has indeed raised into T’. Accordingly, given its pre-verbal position, I assume that *jamais* occupies SpecNegP, as in (20):

(20) [NegP [Spec *jamais* ] [TP pouvoir [MoodP *souvent* [MoodP *rien* faire VP ]]]]

If M&V’s analysis of the unavailability of NC with *pas* and *personne* in (18b) hinges on the *S-structure* presence of *pas* in SpecNegP blocking LF raising of *personne* to that position, then NC should also be unavailable between *personne/rien* and *jamais* in (18a) and (19), since *jamais* occupies SpecNegP at S-structure. As the gloss shows, however, this is not the case. The sentences in (18a) and (19) have what might be termed an NC interpretation. Consequently, if M&V’s account can be salvaged, it must be the *D-structure* presence of *pas* in SpecNegP that prevents LF raising of *personne*. M&V cannot therefore remain ambivalent and must assume that *pas* is base-generated in SpecNegP, contrary to my proposals in chapter 2. Consequently, they are unable to explain the facts reviewed in sections 2.2.4.2 and 2.1.1, concerning PP-embedded indefinite nominals and negative imperatives. I take this to be somewhat problematic for M&V’s proposed analysis of the syntax of *personne*.

This is not the only issue that, it seems to me, needs to be clarified in M&V’s proposals. First, if *personne* needs to raise to SpecNegP at LF and if, as M&V suggest, the presence of *pas* in SpecNegP blocks such movement, they would predict that (18b) is ungrammatical. This prediction is, however, not borne out by the data; (18b) is perfectly grammatical but simply does not receive an NC reading. How can *personne* ultimately be licensed without LF movement to SpecNegP? M&V do not answer this question. One might envisage that, in (18b), *personne* fails to qualify as an LF operator in some way, perhaps within the terms of Rizzi’s (1996) functional definition of operators. This seems unreasonable, however. Rizzi exploits the functional definition of operators to explain why some constituents appear not to have to raise at *S-structure*. His definition does not apply at LF, where all constituents bearing affective features—wh- or negative, for example—are assumed to be operators and, therefore, under-
go raising. Certainly, unless some other assumptions are made, Rizzi’s functional definition of operators is not going to help M&V explain why personne can avoid LF raising in (18b) and maintain grammaticality.

Second, M&V’s account of the unavailability of NC in (18b) leads implicitly to a discrepancy between the way the Neg Criterion and the wh-criterion work in Modern French.\(^{20}\) Consider (21), which contains two wh-constituents:

(21) Qui a fait quoi?
‘Who did what?’

With respect to multiple wh-structures such as (21), it is standardly assumed that the wh-phrase which remains in situ at S-structure raises at LF to adjoin to a higher wh-phrase (Huang 1982; Lasnik and Saito 1984) and that absorption of the wh-feature takes place at that level (Higginbotham and May 1981). This approach seems to be suitable for (21).\(^{21}\) The question that then needs to be answered is the following: Why should a wh-phrase in situ (quoi ‘what’ in (21)) be able to raise at LF and adjoin to another wh-phrase (qui ‘who’ in (21)) allowing wh-absorption, whereas, in the case of negative phrases, personne in (18b) cannot LF raise and adjoin to pas, allowing absorption of the [+NEG] feature? M&V do not really address this issue, either. They simply note that, while NC is generally available in French, it is unavailable with pas. This in no way provides an explanation for the observed facts.

This state of affairs becomes particularly striking when one considers Québécois, in which NC is available in the presence of pas, a possibility that M&V tentatively suggest might be dealt with by assuming that, in Québécois, the negative marker pas has been reanalyzed as a NegE*-associated element and therefore fails to interfere with LF raising to SpecNegP. (See section 4.4.2 for reasons why I reject such an analysis and for an alternative proposal to deal with this distinction between the standard language and Québécois. See also section 5.5.2 for further discussion, including contexts in the standard language in which NC is also possible with pas, as exemplified in (7).)

Third, M&V’s analysis of personne predicts—wrongly—that NC should be possible between personne in subject position and pas. M&V suggest that, where personne occupies a position within the subject, as in (13) and, presumably, (16), although M&V do not discuss such examples, it does not move to SpecNegP, since this would involve lowering.\(^{22}\) If personne in a subject does not need to move to SpecNegP, the presence of pas in SpecNegP should not pose a problem, and NC should be possible. The fact that pas and personne are in distinct specifier positions is not necessarily a problem for absorption of

---

\(^{20}\) The discrepancy mentioned here is quite independent from the issue of at what level the criteria apply. As is shown in the next section, it is clear that the wh-criterion applies at S-structure in French.

\(^{21}\) See Plunkett (1996) for an alternative view.

\(^{22}\) Acquaviva (1993: 17–21) discusses Quantifier Lowering, for example, LF lowering of “negatives” from the subject position to SpecNegP, and concludes that it is implausible. See also Rizzi (1990).
the [+NEG] feature either, given Haegeman’s (1995) analysis of NC in West Flemish. (See section 3.5.1 for discussion.) In West Flemish, negative XPs can move in the syntax to distinct specifier positions. Provided these specifiers are not lower than SpecNegP, NC is possible. In other words, absorption of the feature [+NEG] is possible even if the [+NEG]XPs are not in the same specifier position. In Haegeman’s analysis, recourse is taken to the notion of extended specifier, following work by Grimshaw (1993): each one of the distinct specifier positions to which concordant [+NEG]XPs move counts as an extended specifier of Neg’. Transferring this notion to French, M&V would predict that personne in subject position can co-occur with pas in SpecNegP with an NC reading, contrary to fact:

(22) Personne n’ est pas venu.

‘No-one didn’t come.’

(= ‘Everyone came.’)

Fourth, M&V’s account of NC in terms of multiple adjunction to SpecNegP followed by [+NEG] absorption makes erroneous predictions for (admittedly highly marked) strings such as (23):

(23) a. ??Personne n’a pas rien fait.

‘No-one didn’t do anything.’

b. ??Je n’ai pas rien donné à personne.

‘I didn’t give nothing to anyone.’

M&V predict that the presence of pas in SpecNegP in the examples in (23) prevents the other negatives from entering into NC (with pas and with each other). Given that both examples in (23) contain three negatives, this means that each should have net negative polarity. That is to say, the strings in (23) should be synonymous with (24), which they are not:

(24) a. Personne n’a rien fait.

‘No-one has done anything.’

b. Je n’ai rien donné à personne.

‘I haven’t given anyone anything.’

23. To counter my objection here, M&V might argue that personne needs to pass through SpecNegP in its way to SpecAgrSP and that the D-structure presence of pas in SpecNegP prevents it from doing so.
In other words, despite the “blocking” presence of *pas* in SpecNegP in (23), *personne* and *rien* are still able to enter into NC with each other (which is, of course, subsequently canceled by *pas*). The issue that M&V fail to address is how *personne* and *rien* manage to do this, given that they cannot converge on SpecNegP for [+NEG] absorption.

The same point can be made in the context of “true” negative imperatives. These were discussed in chapter 2, where it was argued that they are characterized by the absence of a number of functional projections in clausal architecture, including NegP. Given the absence of NegP in such structures, there is obviously no SpecNegP for multiple negative phrases to LF raise to for [+NEG] absorption. Assuming M&V’s analysis of *personne*, NC should not be possible in these configurations. Yet, as shown in (25), NC is indeed possible:

(25) Donné-lui jamais rien.

‘Never give him anything.’

Here, two negative phrases, *jamais* and *rien*, occur in a true imperative clause. That the clause contains a true imperative and, consequently, no NegP projection is clear from the post-verbal position of the indirect object clitic pronoun and the unavailability of pre-verbal *ne*. Yet, as is clear from the translation, NC is available, contrary to M&V’s prediction.

Finally, by arguing that the (D-structure) presence of *pas* in SpecNegP prevents LF raising of *personne* and similar elements, M&V are unable to account for the interpretation of (7), repeated here:

(26) Je ne crois pas que personne soit arrivé. (Prince 1976: 410 (29d))

I don’t think anyone has arrived.’

As is clear from the translation, the interpretation of (26) is one of NC. *Personne* therefore has wide/matrix scope. Given the assumptions that M&V make (cf. Kayne 1981), this means that *personne* raises at LF to the matrix SpecNegP. However, M&V’s analysis predicts that (26) should be interpreted as DN, since the presence of *pas* in the matrix clause should prevent LF raising of *personne* from the embedded clause into the matrix SpecNegP.

**Summary: what’s wrong with**

5.2.2

Moritz and Valois’s analysis?

Having discussed the logic that M&V use to support their proposed analysis, I now summarize what I see as the fundamental flaws. I differ from M&V (a) on the nature of the negative phrase that raises to SpecNegP and (b) on the level at which raising takes place. With respect to (a), M&V assume that it is either *personne* itself or some larger constituent containing *personne* that raises to SpecNegP. With respect to (b), they assume that movement to SpecNegP is delayed until LF. I disagree on both these points.
NEGATIVE ARGUMENTS

First, given that M&V motivate raising of personne to SpecNegP in terms of the Neg Criterion in (11), the fact that this movement does not take place until LF means that M&V are effectively concluding that, in Modern French, the Neg Criterion need not be satisfied until LF. This conclusion arouses immediate suspicion in the light of the evidence presented here, in chapters 1 and 2 in particular, which clearly suggests that sentential negation has to be marked at S-structure in Modern French. Furthermore, the conclusion that the Neg Criterion does not apply until LF in Modern French is problematic when one considers the wh-criterion. It has been argued (see Rizzi 1996; Haegeman 1995: 101–2 and references there) that the following data from embedded clauses show that the wh-criterion applies at S-structure in Modern French:

(27) a. Je me demande qui ils ont invité t. (Haegeman 1995: 101 (70c, d))
   ‘I wonder who they invited.’

b. *Je me demande (que) ils ont invité qui.

Movement of the wh-phrase is compulsory in selected embedded wh-clauses, arguably to satisfy the wh-criterion. If M&V’s analysis of personne is right, these data imply a divergence between the wh-criterion on the one hand and the Neg Criterion on the other. This is problematic if the wh-criterion and Neg Criterion are nothing more than construction-specific instantiations of the more general affect criterion, as discussed in section 1.3. In contrast, if both criteria are assumed to apply at S-structure, as I have been arguing throughout, there is no such divergence.

Before I leave the issue of the level at which raising to SpecNegP takes place, consider the contrast in (28):

(28) a. Jean n’est sorti avec personne.
   ‘J. didn’t go out with anyone.’

b. %Jean (n’)est sorti avec pas d’argent.
   ‘J. went out without any money.’

In (28a), ne is licensed. Within M&V’s account, ne is licensed by virtue of the fact that personne raises to SpecNegP (by pied-piping its containing PP) at LF. As for (28b), the string is grammatical (if frowned upon by prescriptivists) if ne is absent but universally rejected if ne is present. The issue of relevance to us here is the ungrammaticality of (28b) with ne. If, in (28a), raising of a negative XP to SpecNegP at LF is sufficient to license ne at S-structure, why is it not possible to assume that pas pied-pipes to SpecNegP at LF in order to license ne in (28b)? Given M&V’s analysis of personne, and given that the surface position

24. This is in fact in line with H&Z’s (1991: 244) suggestion that the level of application of the Neg Criterion could be parametrized and Haegeman’s (1992a) claim that the value for the parameter is indeed set to LF in French.
of *pas* in (28b) is licit, I see no reason why a parallel derivation should not be possible for (28b) with *pas*. The fact, therefore, that *ne* is not licensed in (28b) casts doubt on the validity of any analysis in which *ne* is licensed by the LF presence of an operator in SpecNegP in (28a). What seems to be the case, rather, is that “negative” *ne* is licensed by the S-structure presence of an operator in SpecNegP. Indeed, this is what I have assumed since chapter 1 and what, in the next section, I suggest is true in the case of *personne*. Before I go on to do that, I consider the second fundamental objection I have to M&V’s analysis of *pas*, namely the issue of whether *personne* is specified [⁺NEG].

M&V assume that *personne* is inherently negative. Although they claim (p. 669 fn5) that they do not wish to take a stand on the issue of whether *personne*-like elements are real (negative) quantifiers or NPIs, they go on (p. 690) to claim that *personne* “inherently bears the [⁺NEG] feature”, which does rather suggest that they have made their minds up on the issue. Further, their analysis in fact crucially depends on *personne* bearing the feature [⁺NEG]. First, movement of *personne* to SpecNegP (at any level of representation) cannot be motivated by the Neg Criterion in (11) unless *personne* is [⁺NEG]. Second, in the context of structures in which *personne* is embedded in an island constituent from which it cannot be extracted, M&V suggest that the island constituent as a whole pied-pipes to SpecNegP. The pied-piping mechanism that M&V posit depends upon a feature, namely [⁺NEG], associated with *personne* alone underlingly, being transferred to the entire island constituent as discussed briefly in section 5.2.1. It is clear that this mechanism relies on *personne* being marked [⁺NEG].

Given Jespersen’s Generalization and the discussion in chapter 3, this is not a conclusion I am happy to make about elements like *personne* in Modern French. Indeed, in chapter 4, I was able to provide an elegant account of the distributional differences between *plus*, *jamais*, and similar elements on the one hand and *pas* on the other on the basis of an analysis whereby the former are not inherently negative, while the latter is. For these reasons, I reject M&V’s assumption that *personne* and so on are inherently negative and that *personne* (or a larger XP constituent containing *personne*) raises to SpecNegP at LF.

**An alternative proposal**

5.2.3

As an alternative to the analysis proposed by M&V, I suggest that the conclusions reached in previous chapters about sentential negation in French lend themselves immediately to an account of the syntax of *personne*. In what follows, I will assume, in line with Jespersen’s Generalization, that *personne* is not inherently negative and does not therefore need to raise to SpecNegP in order to satisfy the Neg Criterion. Rather, I argue that *personne* is an NPI, licensed in situ by binding from the (non-overt) negative operator, Op, which, in contrast, *does* raise to SpecNegP. From this position, Op licenses *ne* and marks sentential negation, ensuring that *personne* has wide scope. I base my discussion on the example in (29), taken from M&V (p. 670, (5)): 

---
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Given Jespersen’s Generalization and the discussion in chapter 3, this is not a conclusion I am happy to make about elements like *personne* in Modern French. Indeed, in chapter 4, I was able to provide an elegant account of the distributional differences between *plus*, *jamais*, and similar elements on the one hand and *pas* on the other on the basis of an analysis whereby the former are not inherently negative, while the latter is. For these reasons, I reject M&V’s assumption that *personne* and so on are inherently negative and that *personne* (or a larger XP constituent containing *personne*) raises to SpecNegP at LF.

**An alternative proposal**

5.2.3

As an alternative to the analysis proposed by M&V, I suggest that the conclusions reached in previous chapters about sentential negation in French lend themselves immediately to an account of the syntax of *personne*. In what follows, I will assume, in line with Jespersen’s Generalization, that *personne* is not inherently negative and does not therefore need to raise to SpecNegP in order to satisfy the Neg Criterion. Rather, I argue that *personne* is an NPI, licensed in situ by binding from the (non-overt) negative operator, Op, which, in contrast, *does* raise to SpecNegP. From this position, Op licenses *ne* and marks sentential negation, ensuring that *personne* has wide scope. I base my discussion on the example in (29), taken from M&V (p. 670, (5)):
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I assume that \textit{personne} is interpreted negatively in (29) by virtue of being unselectively bound by Op. Further, I assume that the sentential scope of \textit{personne} is due to the position of Op (Acquaviva 1993: 25). Given that Op is seen as a non-overt counterpart to \textit{pas}, I assume it can be base-generated adjoined to the constituent over which it takes scope: VP (see section 2.1). The binding relationship in (30) is indicated by co-indexation.\footnote{Haegeman (1995: 193, 230) suggests that Op here is in fact nonnegative, that is, an expletive null polarity operator.}

(30) \[
\text{[VP Op,[VP voir personne,]]}
\]

Given that Op is marked [+NEG] and that sentential negation has to be marked at S-structure, I assume that Op raises overtly to SpecNegP. The relevant parts of the (S-)structure of (29) are given in (31):

(31) \[
\text{[AgrSP \ldots ne, \ldots [NegP \text{[Neg } t_1 \text{[TP } t_2 \text{[VP } t_3 \text{[VP } \ldots \text{personne}, \ldots ]}]]}
\]

The spec-head relationship between Op and (the trace of) \textit{ne} in Neg° serves to license \textit{ne} by transmitting the [+NEG] feature by DA. The clause is therefore negative: \(i = j\).

As for the way in which \textit{personne} seems able to license pseudopartitives without c-commanding them at S-structure, consider again the example from M&V given in (15a), repeated here.

(32) Lucie n’ a donné [Ø de livres] [\textit{à personne}].

L. \textit{ne} has given of books to \textit{personne}

‘L. hasn’t given any books to anyone.’

In section 2.2.3, I argued that, where pseudopartitive NumPs are licensed by \textit{pas} (the overt counterpart of Op), the empty category within the nominal is in fact the trace of \textit{pas}, which has been extracted and raised to SpecNegP. Given that Op in (31) fulfills the same function as overt \textit{pas} in the structures discussed in chapter 2, I argue that the parallel should be extended further and that Op should be generated in SpecNumP within the pseudopartitive in (32) and raised to SpecNegP whence (in addition to marking sentential negation and licensing \textit{ne}) it can bind \textit{personne}. The relevant difference between the structure of (32)—given in (33)—and the representation in (31) is therefore the extraction site of Op. Whereas, in (31) it is VP-adjoined, in (33) it is within NumP. In both cases, it unselectively A'-binds \textit{personne} at S-structure.
In (32) and (33), the pseudopartitive is therefore licensed in the usual way, by extraction of an operator from SpecNumP. (The trace of) ne in Neg” is licensed by its (DA) relationship with Op in SpecNegP.

That Op is extracted from within the pseudopartitive NumP in (32) is supported by the ungrammaticality of (34):

\[(34) \star \text{Je ne sortirais } [\text{avec } [\text{NumP } \emptyset \text{ de filles }]][\text{pour personne au monde }].
\]

‘I wouldn’t go out with girls for anyone in the world.’

In the same way that pas cannot license a PP-embedded pseudopartitive, as discussed in section 2.2.4.2, it seems that Op cannot do so, either. In the former case, the constraint was analyzed with respect to the island status of the PP in French. In order for pas to license a PP-embedded pseudopartitive, it would need to be generated within the PP and subsequently extracted, which it can’t do. The ungrammaticality of (34) suggests that a parallel analysis is required for Op. I conclude, therefore, that, in (32), Op originates within the pseudopartitive and is raised to SpecNegP at S-structure, just like pas. Of course, given that I am assuming that Op is the non-overt equivalent of pas, this is exactly what I would like to do, anyway.

**The distribution of rien**

### 5.3

Despite the semantic parallel between rien and personne— the fact that they are both NPIs of some sort— there are clear distributional differences between the two. While personne essentially has the distribution of a DP, rien behaves like the universal quantifier tout ‘everything’. The differences are illustrated in the following examples:

\[(35) \text{a. Jean n’a vu personne.}
\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \star \text{Jean n’a vu rien.} \\
& J. \text{ ne has seen personne/rien} \\
& \text{‘J. hasn’t seen anyone/anything.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{c. } & \star \text{Jean a vu tout.} \\
& J. \text{ has seen everything} \\
& \text{‘J. has seen everything.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[(36) \text{a. } \star \text{Jean n’a personne vu.}
\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{Jean n’a rien vu.} \\
& J. \text{ ne has personne/rien seen} \\
& (= (35a, b))
\end{align*}\]
c. Jean a tout vu.
J. has everything seen
(= (35c))

The examples in (35a) and (36a) show that, where personne is the direct object of a verb taken from a compound perfective paradigm, that is, one with an auxiliary and a past participle, personne must appear in post-verbal position (for most speakers—see footnote 2); it cannot intervene between auxiliary and past participle. In contrast, (35b) and (36b) show that, in the unmarked case, rien raises to such a position between the auxiliary and the past participle. (Given the argumental/thematic nature of rien in these examples, I assume that it is base-generated within an A-position and subsequently moved.) The word rien can appear in postparticipial position (for some speakers—see footnote 2), but only with a marked emphatic reading. Examples (35c) and (36c) show that, in this respect, the distribution of rien parallels that of tout.

It is not just in the context of compound perfective paradigms that the distributions of rien and tout coincide (and diverge from personne). Parallels can also be drawn in the case of infinitives, as shown in (37) and (38):

(37) a. N’ aimer personne, c’est un crime.
  ‘Not loving anyone/anything is a crime.’

b. #N’ aimer rien, c’est un crime.
  ‘Not loving anything is a crime.’

e. #Aimer tout, c’est un crime.
  ‘Loving everything is a crime.’

(38) a. Ne personne aimer, c’est un crime.

b. Ne rien aimer, c’est un crime.
  (= (37a, b))

e. Tout aimer, c’est un crime.
  (= (37c))

Within the topicalized infinitival clauses, personne must follow the verb. In contrast, in the unmarked case, rien precedes the infinitive and can follow the infinitive only with emphatic stress. Once again, tout parallels rien.

Finally, the examples in (39)–(41) show how, when the direct object of a lexical infinitive is embedded under a modal infinitive, rien/tout can—in the unmarked case—precede either the lexical infinitive or both the modal and the lexical infinitive, while personne must follow the lexical infinitive:
The possibilities are schematized in (42), where Mi stands for modal infinitive, Li for lexical infinitive:

(42) a. *personne Mi *personne Li personne
    b. tout/rien Mi tout/rien Li #tout/rien

So, in the unmarked case, rien occupies a position further to the left (= higher) than the position occupied by personne.

Of course, I have no reason to assume that the positional differences illustrated in these examples are not also manifested in structures in which the nature of verb syntax means that the differences cannot be seen. In other words, given that I can see from these examples that rien generally occupies a higher position than personne, the null hypothesis must be that these two elements also occupy different positions in (43), even though the difference does not lead to distinct word orders. This is represented schematically in (44).

(43) a. Marie ne voit personne.
    b. Marie ne voit rien.
       M. ne sees personne/rien
       ‘M. can’t see anyone/anything.’
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26. I remain agnostic over whether the non-overt category associated with the clitic is raised before or after L-tous takes place. But see footnote 27 for a constraint on L-tous that suggests it might take place after cliticization.

With respect to the mechanism involved in cliticization, while it has no relevance for the point at hand, I assume Sportiche’s (1992) analysis, in which a non-overt XP is generated in the canonical position and subsequently raised into the specifier of some functional projection, either a Voice Phrase or an Agr phrase, which is headed by the clitic itself.
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(46) a. Elle a lu tout le livre.
    she has read tout the book.
    ‘She has read all the book.’

    b. *Elle a tout lu t le livre.

    c. *Elle a [tout le livre ], lu t,

More recently, Cinque (1992) has suggested that the distribution of both French tout and Italian tutto is the result of movement to an A’ scope position (Kayne’s 1975 adverbial position). I accept this basic analysis and generalize it to French rien. Two questions arise from this. The first is considered by Cinque, who was concentrating on tout/tutto: What is the A’ scope position these elements occupy? The second is more relevant to my concerns about rien: Why is it that rien moves to such an A’ scope position, while personne does not? In other words, why is it that whatever triggers/allows movement of rien fails to trigger/allow movement of personne. I take these questions in turn in the next sections.

5.4.1 The position of tout/rien

First, I consider the position occupied by tout/rien in, for example, (36b, c). Following Rizzi (1996), I assume that an A’ scope position is an A’ left-peripheral specifier or adjoined position, that is, an XP position. That I am dealing with an XP position can be demonstrated quite straightforwardly. First, rien can be modified, even in pre-verbal position, as in (47a). Second, a very restricted kind of “non-bare” tout can move, as in (47b), to which I return later. 27 Both these facts suggest I am dealing with XP movement.

(47) a. Anne n’a [absolument [rien]] mangé.
    A. ne has absolutely rien eaten
    ‘A. ate absolutely nothing.’

    b. Il nous a [tous les deux] invité.
    he us has tous the two invited
    ‘He invited us both.’

    (Kayne 1975: 14 (24b))

So, under the further (uncontroversial, I think) assumption that tout/rien are generated in the 0-position with which they are associated (witness the marginal acceptability of (35c), (37c), and (39c)), I suggest that [ XP tout/rien ] moves from this A-position to the relevant A’-position. Consider (48), in which pas necessarily precedes tout:

27. The movement of non-bare tout illustrated in (b) is parasitic upon cliticization. Witness the ungrammaticality of (i):

(i) *Il a [tous les deux] invité.
    he has tous the two invited
(48) Jean n’a pas tout lu.
   J. ne has pas tout read
   ‘J. hasn’t read everything.’

Since chapter 1, I have been assuming that the canonical position of the negative marker *pas* is SpecNegP. Assuming further that examples such as (48) are in fact monoclausal, an assumption supported by the position to which the clitic moves in (49a) in contrast to the situation in the biclausal (49b), I conclude that *tout* occupies a position below SpecNegP in (48).

(49) a. Jean ne (LES) a pas (•LES) lu.
   J. ne them has pas them read
   ‘J. hasn’t read (them).’

   b. Jean ne (•LES) veut pas (LES) lire.
   J. ne them wants pas them read
   ‘J. doesn’t want to read (them).’

Given the parallel distributions of *tout* and *rien* illustrated in the previous section, an additional conclusion I draw at this point is that *rien* is also lower than SpecNegP in (50).

(50) Jean n’a rien mangé.
   J. ne has rien eaten
   ‘J. hasn’t eaten anything.’

The conclusion that *pas* and *rien* occupy different surface positions is supported by the distribution of the adverbs *encore* ‘yet/still’ and *souvent* ‘often’ in the examples in (52)–(53). While the distribution of *encore* is admittedly fairly free, a number of speakers have a preferred position for this element. It seems that this preferred position is between those occupied by *pas* and *rien*. Consider first (51). Here, *pas* and *rien* intervene between the auxiliary and the past participle.

(51) a. Jean n’a rien mangé.
   b. Jean n’a pas mangé.
   J. ne has rien/pas eaten
   ‘J. hasn’t eaten (anything).’

On the basis of these data alone, one might be tempted to conclude (contrary to my assumptions here) that *rien* and *pas* occupy the same position, that is, SpecNegP. Were this the correct conclusion, one would predict that any given adverb would occupy the same linear position with respect to both *rien* and *pas*. This prediction is, however, not borne out by the data in (52) and (53). In (52), the sentences from (51) have been modified by the adverb *encore*. While *encore* can either precede or follow both *rien* and *pas*, the unmarked order is for *encore* to
precede *rien* but follow *pas.* Under the assumption that *encore* occupies the same position in both (52a) and (52b), I conclude that *pas* and *rien* occupy different positions.

(52) *Unmarked position of encore in (51):*

a. Jean n’a encore rien mangé.

b. Jean n’a pas encore mangé.

‘J. has (pas) encore (rien) eaten’

Turning now to the less flexible *souvent*, the data in (53) show even more clearly that *pas* occupies a higher position than *rien*. In both examples, the embedded infinitival clause is modified by the adverb *souvent*. If *pas* and *rien* occupy the same position, one would expect *souvent* either to precede both or to follow both. However, as shown by (53a), *encore* must precede *rien*, while (53b) shows that *souvent* must follow *pas.*

(53) a. . . . afin de ne pas souvent manger.

b. . . . afin de ne souvent rien manger.

‘. . . in order to not often eat (anything).’

So, I conclude (a) that *encore* and *souvent* have a unique (unmarked) S-structure position and (b) that *pas* occupies a higher position than *rien*. While *pas* is in SpecNegP (see chapter 2), *rien* is not. The unmarked position of *encore/souvent* can then be assumed to be between the S-structure positions of *pas* and *rien*. As a working hypothesis, I assume that *rien/tout* raise and adjoin to MoodP, below *encore/souvent*, which I assume are adjoined to TP (i.e., below SpecNegP).

This state of affairs is significant, since it seriously weakens any argument that the overt movement that *rien* undergoes, in (36b) for example, has anything to do with negation. If negation were a factor in *rien*-raising, we would expect overt raising to be to SpecNegP, to satisfy the Neg Criterion/license ne/mark sentential negation, in much the same way that *pas* is obliged to raise to SpecNegP. Given that *rien* is very adept at raising out of its base position to A’ scope positions, I see no reason why it would not raise as far as SpecNegP if it had to. The fact that it does not raise that far, I argue, clearly shows that it does not have to, a consequence of the fact that it is not actually negative. What is clear from this discussion is that whatever motivates movement of *rien* out of its base position has nothing to do with negation.

If *rien*-raising is not then due to negation, it can only be related to the quantificational properties of *rien*. In other words *rien*-raising must be a consequence of the fact that *rien* is a universal quantifier, as in (54a), a welcome conclusion, given that the distribution of *rien* matches so closely that of *tout*, which is also a universal quantifier, as in (54b).

28. Thanks to Odile Cyrille for pointing out the relevance of these facts.

29. Thanks to Sylvain Larose for confirming the relevance of these data.
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(54) a. $X$ ne verb rien: $\forall x, \neg(\text{verb}'(X,x))$ (e.g., Jean ne mange rien)
   b. $X$ verb tout: $\forall x, \text{verb}'(X,x)$ (e.g., Jean mange tout)

So much for the S-structure position occupied by tout/rien. In the next section, I turn to a characterization of the formal differences between rien and personne.

Why doesn’t personne behave like rien?

5.4.2

In the previous section, I concluded that the XP elements rien and tout raise to an A’ scope position at S-structure, possibly adjoined to MoodP. The data discussed so far suggest that, in contrast, personne does not. I have not explained why this should be so. Haegeman (1995: 231) suggests that the (quasi-obligatory) movement of rien is triggered by a “strong intrinsic quantifier feature” that forces the operator to attain an A’ scope position at S-structure and that the same applies to tout. While this seems plausible, given that tout and rien are both universal quantifiers (more plausible certainly, given our conclusions about the surface position of rien in the previous section, than an analysis that motivates rien-raising on the basis of any negative feature it might bear), the questions that need to be answered are the following. First, why does personne (in most varieties) not have the same feature? (Alternatively, what additional feature does personne bear that prevents it from raising in similar fashion to rien/tout?) Second, what are the structural consequences of the feature mismatch between rien and personne? Third, how is the feature mismatch overridden when tout/rien are emphasized, as in (37b), for example, which is acceptable for some speakers?

In what follows, I adopt an analysis whereby the contrast between rien/tout and personne with respect to mobility is attributed to the structural configurations in which the items are generated. I argue that “mobile” rien and tout are generated as bare QPs in a specifier position within the argument nominal construction. To be precise, I argue that they appear in SpecNumP and function as cardinality markers for NumP. In contrast, “immobile” personne is generated as the head noun of the argument nominal construction. With respect to why rien and personne should function differently, I follow Haegeman (1995: 231) (to some extent) and Cinque (1992) and attribute this to feature specification: while rien is an absolute or universal quantifier in an intuitive sense, personne is not (in that, minimally, it also bears the feature [+HUMAN]). I therefore assume that this feature specification is sufficient to prevent personne from functioning as a cardinality marker and, consequently, being generated as a bare QP in SpecNumP. Emphatic tout/rien is assumed to bear an additional syntactic/pragmatic feature that overrides the “strong intrinsic quantifier feature” and prevents S-structure A’-movement (L-tous/rien-raising) from taking place in the sense that emphatic tout/rien is not deemed to be “bare” in the relevant way. Such an approach opens the door to an account of the possibility of L-tous in (47b). Here, the entire constituent [tous les deux] functions as a
cardinality marker in SpecNumP. It is thus deemed to be “bare” in the relevant sense and can raise. (But see the constraint discussed in footnote 27.)

I turn now to the analysis, where my discussion begins with the contrast between (55) and (56):

(55) a. Jeanne a déjà fait tout son travail.
    b. *Jeanne a déjà tout fait $t_j$ son travail.
       ‘J. has already (all) done (all) her work

(56) a. Jean a déjà fait tout de ce qu’on lui a donné.
    b. Jean a déjà tout fait $t_j$ de ce qu’on lui a donné.
       ‘J. has already (all) done (all) of what that one him has given

In (55a), the direct object of the verb is the constituent [tout son travail]. The ungrammaticality of (55b) indicates that tout cannot undergo L-tous from its base position. (See also (46b).) In (56a), in contrast, the direct object of the verb is [tout [de . . . ]] containing tout and a partitive structure headed by de ‘of’.

From such a base structure, raising of tout is possible, as shown in (56b). How can one account for the fact that raising of tout is possible in one case but not in the other?

I first consider the structure of the direct object in (55a). One might assume that these French examples have a parallel structure to the Italian structures discussed by Cinque (1992), who suggests (p. 4), following Giusti (1991) and Bianchi (1992), that Italian tutto (= French tout) is a head, Q$, whose complement in (57) is a DP:

(57) a. $[QP \text{ tutto } [DP \text{ il libro }]]$
    b. $[QP \text{ tutti } [INS \text{ i } \text{ libri }]]$
       all the book(s)

What is relevant if this analysis of Italian tutto is adopted for tout is that tout is a complement-taking head: Q$. If this is the correct analysis, the immobility of tout in (55b) is expected. Movement of tout out of its base position within the direct object (without taking its complement DP with it) over V to a position outside VP would require long head movement, which would violate Travis’s (1984) HMC. Further, even if Q$ could be extracted from VP, given the Structure Preservation Hypothesis, one would not expect it to be possible to move it to the type of XP position that, in the previous section, I suggested tout/rien occupies at S-structure, namely MoodP-adjoined. Finally, as was shown in (47), tout/rien movement has all the marks of XP movement, rather than head movement.

Consider now (56). Here, the direct object of the verb comprises tout and the partitive, as in (56a), a base configuration from which tout can be extracted, as in (56b). This suggests that tout does not have the same status within the direct object in (55) as it does in the direct object in (56). Given that the pre-verbal A’ scope position is an XP position, the grammaticality of (56b) suggests that tout
is an XP within the direct object rather than a head. So, while structures such as Cinque’s (57) may be suitable for (55) and may provide the basis of the unacceptability of (55b), Cinque’s structure in (57) will clearly not do for the direct object in (56). Rather than being a complement-taking Q, like tutto in (57), I assume instead that tout in (56) is a bare Q and that QP functions as a cardinality marker in SpecNumP (following the discussion in section 2.2), as in (58).

(58) \[ \text{NumP} \]
\[ QP \quad \text{Num}' \]
\[ Q' \quad \text{Num}' \quad PP \]
\[ Q^o \quad P^o \quad DP \]
\[ \text{tout de} \]

As was the case in my discussion of pseudopartitives licensed by pas in section 2.2.3, in which pas was deemed to be generated as a bare XP in SpecNumP, I assume that tout in SpecNumP is well placed to determine the cardinality of the entire NumP by virtue of its spec-head relationship with Num’. With such a structure underlying (56), the freedom of movement of tout, as in (56b), can be dealt with in the same way as quantifier movement in QàD structures, discussed in section 2.2.3. Crucially, tout can be extracted from (Spec)NumP in (58) as a maximal projection, QP; head movement is not required; the HMC does not apply.

Returning now to rien, note that the freedom illustrated in (56) with respect to tout also applies to rien:

(59) a. Jean n’a toujours fait rien de ce qu’on lui a donné.  
     J. has always (rien) done (rien) of what that one him has given  
     ‘J. still hasn’t done any of what he’s been given.’

b. Jean n’a toujours rien fait de ce qu’on lui a donné.  
     J. ne has always (rien) done (rien) of what that one him has given  
     ‘J. still hasn’t done any of what he’s been given.’

I assume that the same base structure underlies the movement possibilities in both (56) and (59):
In many ways, this structural analysis of *rien* as a specifier echoes the suggestion by Acquaviva (1995: 9) that *rien* is a determiner.

Like *tout* in (58) (= (56a)), *rien* in (60) (= (59a)) is a bare quantifier heading a QP in SpecNumP, which can be extracted in (59) because it is a maximal projection. In both cases, movement to an A’ scope position is triggered by the “strong intrinsic quantifier feature”.

Turning finally to *personne*, given that this element does not demonstrate the same mobility as *rien/tout* (see (36a), (38a), (40a), and (41a)), and given that I attributed this mobility to the fact that *rien/tout* occupy SpecNumP in (58) and (60), I must assume that *personne* cannot appear in SpecNumP. Instead, I assume that “negative” *personne* is analyzed by speakers as a noun and, consequently, generated as the ultimate head of the indefinite nominal expression, NumP, in which it appears.

The question that immediately poses itself is why *rien* and *personne* should be analyzed in such divergent ways by speakers of the language. I have suggested that *rien/tout* occupy SpecNumP in (58) and (60) because they function as cardinality markers for NumP. The real question to be answered therefore is why *personne* (in contrast to *tout*, *rien*, *tous les deux*, and so on) cannot function as a cardinality marker for NumP. It seems to me that there are two potential ways of explaining this. First, one might assume that the different categorial/structural analyses are determined by feature specification. The two contrasting elements being considered here (*personne* versus *rien*) are identical but for one feature. While *personne* bears the feature [+HUMAN], *rien* does not. *Rien* and *tout* are
both unrestricted universal quantifiers, as in (54a, b); in contrast, *personne* has an inherent restriction, namely the set of human beings, as in (62):

(62) \( \exists x \text{ verb } \) personne: \( \forall x, x([+\text{HUMAN}]), \neg \text{verb'}(X,x) \)

(c.e.g., Jean ne voit personne)

It could be that this is sufficient to prevent speakers from analyzing *personne* like *rien/tout*, namely as a bare cardinality marker, QP. Under such an approach, the elements *rien/tout* are readily susceptible to analysis by acquirers as quantifiers because of their impoverished feature matrix.

The second way one might envisage explaining the fact that speakers analyze *personne* differently from *rien/tout* derives from the fact that the lexical noun, *la personne*, from which the negative argument being discussed here was derived, is retained in the modern language. The existence of this lexical item may be enough to ensure that “negative” *personne* is treated as a noun. In fact, Cinque (1992) himself pursues a similar line in terms of categorial feature poverty. In his terms, *tutto/tout/rien* can move into an A’ scope position, which, as Kayne (1975) observes, is essentially an adverbial position, because they are unspecified for the features \([\pm N]\) and \([\pm V]\). Given that *personne* is clearly a lexical noun elsewhere in the grammar, its lack of mobility as a “negative” item can arguably be attributed to its categorial feature specification: \([+N, -V]\).

Finally, note that the analysis I have pursued here, in particular the grounds for the structural distinction between *rien* and *personne*, suggests that other negative arguments in the language are unlikely to be analyzed as quantifiers like *rien/tout* if they are restricted universal quantifiers like *personne* or if there exist parallel nonnegative lexical items. While there are only a few other negative arguments in Modern French, the ones that exist bear out this prediction, as shown in (63): ³¹

(63) a. Marie n’ a pipé mot.
   M. ne has piped word
   ‘M. didn’t say a word.’

   b. ♦Marie n’a mot pipé.

(64) a. n’ y voir goutte
   ne there see drop
   ‘to not see a thing’

   b. ♦n’y goutte voir

In summary, then, I conclude that the diverging distributions of *personne* and *rien* are best dealt with in terms of the underlying configurations in which these elements appear. The fundamental distinction to be captured is that *rien* can be

³¹. My thanks to John-Charles Smith for pointing this out.
generated as a bare quantifier (QP) that can function as a cardinality marker within an indefinite NumP. With such a function, [QP rien] appears in SpecNumP and is afforded the same movement possibilities as the nominal quantifiers discussed in chapter 2. In particular, and as a consequence of some strong intrinsic quantifier feature, rien can move out of SpecNumP and adjoin to MoodP. In contrast, personne is analyzed as a lexical noun, even in its “negative” use. As a lexical head, movement to an essentially adverbial position such as the MoodP-joined position is unavailable.

**Residual issues**

5.5

Here, I deal with one issue that has yet to be addressed and another that was discussed in section 4.4.2. First, in section 5.5.1, given that I have assumed that personne and rien are NPIs, I consider why their distribution differs from that of the any-NPIs in English. Then, in section 5.5.2, I consider once again contexts in which NC is possible with pas, and not just in nonstandard varieties.

**French versus English**

5.5.1

Why is it that personne and rien can occupy the subject position while the any-series of NPIs in SE cannot?

(65) a. Personne ne vient.
   personne ne comes
   ‘No-one is coming.’
   b. ★Anyone isn’t coming.’

Further, why is it that personne and rien can function as one-word answers to constituent questions while any-NPIs in English cannot?

(66) A: Qu’est-ce que tu fais?
    B: Rien.

(67) A: What are you doing?
    B: ★Anything.

While it is indeed the case that the any-NPIs cannot function as one-word answers or as the subject of matrix negative clauses in SE, the contrast with French can be attenuated if one recalls that the licenser of rien/personne is non-

32. But see Duffield (1993) on Hiberno-English, where any-NPIs are licensed in “subject” position. Duffield (1993: 222 (15b–e)) gives the following Hiberno-English examples that are ungrammatical in SE:

(i) a. %Any country couldn’t stand it.
    b. %Any fellow wouldn’t bother joining if he wasn’t interested enough to try.
    c. %Anything is no sin.
    d. %Anybody don’ seem to like to live in Russia.
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overt, that is, Op. One might assume that, in (65a) and (66), respectively, personne and rien are in the scope of Op. In (65a), this would mean that Op is adjoined either to personne in SpecAgrSP or to AgrSP itself. In such a position, Op would count as an extended specifier of AgrS° and, consequently, would license ne from that position, which, given the assumptions we have made throughout, will have raised to AgrS°. (Note that the Neg Criterion obliges a negative operator and head to be in a spec-head configuration at S-structure; it does not specify that this must take place at the NegP level. Note also that the fact that ne is licensed in a slightly less direct way in these examples than in the contexts considered so far might explain why a number of authors have claimed that ne-deletion is impossible in these cases—see footnote 1.) In (66), Op is adjoined directly to rien. In both cases, Op has scope over the negative argument, thus accounting for its interpretation. The suggestion being made here echoes an early analysis of no-XP s given in Klima (1964). If, as Klima argues, a no-XP is assumed to be the surface form of an underlying combination of not plus an any-XP, then the grammatical response to the constituent question in (67) (nothing) is, underlingly, [not [anything]], that is, exactly parallel to the [Op [rien]] sequence I am positing for the French (66). Whereas [Op [rien]] in French surfaces as rien, the sequence [not [anything]] in English is converted into nothing.

NC with pas

5.5.2

In section 4.4.2, I addressed the unavailability of NC between negative adverbs and pas, concluding that the empirical domain was best dealt with in the following way: after prolonged co-occurrence and structural proximity between the underlying position of the negative operator and the negative adverb(s), the former can be identified by the latter and is required to surface phonologically null. In other words, the association between the operator and adverb(s) is so intimate that the former is necessarily non-overt. Given that the unavailability of NC with pas applies to negative arguments in more or less the same way as it does to negative adverbs, one might assume that the same approach is appropriate in the case of negative arguments too.

In section 4.4.2, I argued that this approach is attractive given that, within nonstandard varieties of French, the tendency for the negative operator to surface as overt pas increases as the syntactic distance between the underlying positions of the operator and the negative increases. For example, in Québécois, the negative operator is more likely to appear as pas rather than as its null equivalent (Op) in contexts containing negative arguments like personne than in contexts containing negative adverbs like jamais (Muller 1991). Given that negative arguments contrast with negative adverbs in that the former are generated VP-internally whereas the latter are generated outside or adjoined to VP, the structural approach to the unavailability of NC with pas seems well placed to deal with the empirical facts. Indeed, as mentioned in section 4.4.2.1, Muller notes further that PP-embedded negative arguments are in turn more
likely to co-occur with *pas* than non-PP-embedded negative arguments. Once again, given that PP-embedded negative arguments are even more syntactically distant from the VP-adjointed negative operator, a structural approach to the ban on NC with *pas* seems appropriate. Within the varieties in question, then, the hierarchy in (68), in which *jamais* represents the class of negative adverb discussed in chapter 4 and *personne* represents the class of negative argument analyzed in this chapter, seems to be operative. The more deeply embedded the negative adverb/argument is, the more likely the negative operator is to surface as *pas* rather than Op.

(68) a. \[ \ldots [\text{vp} [+\text{NEG}] [\text{vp} \text{jamais} [\text{vp} \ldots \ldots]]] \]

b. \[ \ldots [\text{vp} [+\text{NEG}] [\text{vp} \ldots \text{personne} \ldots \ldots]] \]

c. \[ \ldots [\text{vp} [+\text{NEG}] [\text{vp} \ldots [\text{pp} \text{personne} \ldots \ldots]]] \]

This structural approach to the absence of NC with *pas* also finds support in the standard language. It is, for example, not the case that NC is *never* available with *pas* in Standard French.\(^{32}\) Indeed, an example of NC with *pas*, from Prince (1976: 410 (29d)), was given in (7), and is repeated here for convenience as (69a), along with a second example, which I came across in the writing of the linguist Gilbert Lazard (Lazard 1994: 41), in (69b), and a third, from von Bremen (1986: 238 (37)), in (69c); (69d) is from Kayne (1984: 40). In all these examples, *pas* occurs with a negative argument without leading to logical DN:

(69) a. Je ne crois pas que personne soit arrivé.
I *ne* believe *pas* that *personne* be-SUBJ arrived

‘I don’t think anyone has arrived.’

b. Elle n’indique pas que le chien ait rien fait pour voir l’évêque.
it *ne* says *pas* that the dog have-SUBJ rien done for see-INF

‘It doesn’t say that the dog did anything to see the bishop.’

c. Je ne crois pas que Pierre ait vu personne.
I *ne* believe *pas* that P. have-SUBJ seen *personne*

‘I don’t believe that P. has seen anyone.’

---

33. See also the discussion of the Haitian Creole contrast in (i) and (ii), discussed by Déprez (1992: 38) and DeGraff (1993b: 79 (20)).

(i) Mwen pa kwè pèsonn ap vini.
1sg *pas* believe no-one IRREAL come

‘I don’t think that anyone will come.’

(ii) Mwen pa kwè pèsonn pa ap vini.
1sg *pas* believe no-one *pas* IRREAL come

‘I don’t think that no-one will come.’

(i.e., the opposite of (i))
d. Je ne veux PAS que PERSONNE vienne.
   *I don’t want anyone to come.*

The same phenomenon is also attested with the negative adverbs discussed in chapter 4:

(70) Jean ne croit PAS qu’il ait JAMAIS fait d’erreur.
   J. *doesn’t think he has ever made a mistake.*

The problem is that, given what is known about the interaction between *pas* and, for example, the negative adverbs in Standard French, discussed in section 4.4.2, (69) and (70) are expected to mean the opposite of what they actually do mean. And this is also what is predicted by the approaches to the licensing of negative items such as *personne* proposed by Rizzi (1981, 1984) and Moritz and Valois (1993, 1994). Given that negative arguments pattern with negative adverbs, Rizzi and Moritz and Valois expect the *pas* that occurs in the matrix in (69) and (70) to be independent of the non-overt Op, which is assumed to bind *personne*. In other words, they expect *personne* to have local scope, which it does not.

In contrast, the data in (69) and (70) are not a problem for the analysis of these “negative” items proposed here. The claim that these items are NPIs rather than negative quantifiers deals with their co-occurrence possibilities in a non-NC language like French. The structural approach to the ban on NC with *pas* in turn arguably sheds light on the unexpected interpretations of the examples in (69) and (70). I suggest that what distinguishes the examples in (69) and (70) from the one in (18b) is the fact that, in (69) and (70), a (subjunctional) clause boundary intervenes between *pas* and the negative arguments. It is the nature of the embedded CP shell that lies at the heart of any solution to the problem, and the relationship between *pas* and the negative arguments/adverbs in (69) and (70). Intuitively, it seems that the relationship between *personne/rien/jamais* in the embedded clauses in (69) and (70) and the operator in the matrix SpecNegP (which determines the scope of the “negatives”) is not close or direct enough to allow the operator to be non-overt, which is why it must surface as *pas* rather than Op.

Consider first what is in fact being negated in (69a) (= (71)). Specifically, consider whether the verb *croire* ‘to think’ is within the scope of the negation. Arguably, it is not. The example is at the very least ambiguous, and the most natural reading is one of NEG-raising in which the negation originates within the embedded clause and has raised into the matrix. (See chapter 4, footnote 36, for references to discussion of NEG-raising.) The scope relations in (69a) are then as in (71a) rather than (71b), in which *x* represents the embedded clause:

(71) a. *croire(¬(x))*
   b. *¬(croire(x))*
If it is in fact reasonable to interpret strings like (69a) in this way, one might propose that the base position of pas is lower than the VP-adjoined position in the matrix clause. Two possibilities immediately come to mind. First, one could imagine that pas originates in the specifier position of the embedded CP and raises into SpecNegP from there. A second possibility is to follow the tack of numerous researchers, including Prince (1976), in assuming that pas is base-generated within the embedded IP domain (i.e., VP-adjoined in my analysis) and raised into the matrix domain. Here, too, one can assume that pas passes through the specifier position of the embedded CP. In both scenarios, then, one expects the embedded SpecCP position to be involved in mediating in the A'-binding relationship between pas in the matrix SpecNegP and personne in the embedded clause in (69a).

To be precise, where, in the examples discussed so far, the A'-binding relationship between the negative operator and the NPI is direct, that is, clause-bounded or across an infinitival clause boundary, in (69a) it is indirect in the sense that it crosses a subjunctive clause boundary and is mediated by SpecCP. In chapter 4, the non-overt nature of the operator in SpecNegP that licenses negative adverbs was attributed to the fact that the relationship between the operator and the adverb was local. In (69a), in contrast, the operator in the matrix SpecNegP binds its trace in SpecCP, while the trace in SpecCP unselectively binds the NPI. In other words, it is nonlocal. This, I argue, must be at the root of any explanation of why the operator in SpecNegP cannot itself be non-overt. The relationship between the operator in the matrix SpecNegP and the NPI in the embedded clause is “indirect”, and the operator cannot be identified. Consequently, it cannot be non-overt and must be spelled out as pas, the overt equivalent of Op. In a sense, then, the hierarchy in (72) mirrors the one in (68): the likelihood that the operator is overt is determined by the contiguity between it and the NPI it binds.

(72) a. \[
[\ldots [\text{Neg} \ Op, [\text{Neg} \ldots [\ldots \text{personne}, \ldots ]]]] \] \hspace{1cm} \text{(Direct A'-binding)}
\] b. \[
[\ldots [\text{Neg} \ pas, [\text{Neg} \ldots [\text{CP} \ t_i \ [\text{C} \ldots \text{personne}, \ldots ]]]]]^{34} \] \hspace{1cm} \text{(Indirect A'-binding)}
\]

In both scenarios, crucially, personne is an NPI, and the operator in SpecNegP is inherently negative irrespective of whether or not it is overt, as predicted by Jespersen’s Generalization in chapter 3. That the embedded SpecCP is involved in the binding relationship between the matrix operator and the embedded NPI is supported by the following contrast. In (73a), the [+WH] argument qui is extracted from the embedded domain. Given that the embedded clause contains personne with matrix scope, I assume, by hypothesis, that personne is bound indirectly by the negative operator, pas, in the matrix SpecNegP. Further, this relationship is assumed to be mediated by the embedded SpecCP position, which

34. The fact that the embedded C^*, que, is overt can be taken as evidence to support the argument that the embedded SpecCP is filled with no more than t. In null operator structures in Standard French, C^* is non-overt. Given that C^* here is in fact overt suggests strongly that the SpecCP position is not occupied by a null operator (at S-structure).
is, consequently, unavailable as an intermediate landing site for wh-movement; hence the ungrammaticality of the example. In (73b), in contrast, personne in the embedded clause has (relatively) local scope. No binding relationship is therefore posited with the matrix SpecNegP position, and the embedded SpecCP is not involved. Instead, personne is bound by the negative operator in the embedded SpecNegP (a relationship that allows the operator to be non-overt). Consequently, the embedded SpecCP is available as an intermediate landing site for wh-movement, and the example is grammatical:

(73) a. *Qui ne croyais-tu pas que personne ait invité t ?

who ne believed you pas that personne have-SUBJ invited

b. Quel livre croyais-tu que Jean n’avait prêté t à personne?

what book believed you that J. ne had lent to personne

‘Which book did you think J. hadn’t lent to anyone?’

Finally, I consider the obligatory subjunctive morphology in the embedded clauses in the examples dealt with in this section. One might assume that this is the consequence of the fact that a negative operator has transited through the embedded SpecCP. Assuming that some sort of abstract DA might occur at that level, the subjunctive morphology would amount to indirect selection from C°. Consider in this respect the contrast between (74a) and (74b):

(74) a. Nous pensons qu’il est là.

we think that he be-IND there

‘We think he’s there.’

b. Nous ne pensons pas qu’il soit là.

we ne think pas that he be-SUBJ there

‘We don’t think he’s there.’

In both examples, the matrix predicate is penser ‘to think’. Yet, in a number of varieties, as in (74a), the selected embedded clause must contain an indicative verb, while in (74b) it must be subjunctive. The difference must lie in the presence of the negation in the matrix clause in (74b). Note, though, that (74b) is a case of NEG-raising. In other words, what (74b) actually means is, ‘We think he isn’t there’. The negation has “raised” out of the embedded clause and is marked overtly in the matrix domain. Arguably, “raising” has taken place via the embedded SpecCP. Indeed, one might claim that the fact that a negative operator has transited through the embedded SpecCP is the reason that the embedded verb in (74b) is subjunctive (rather than the indicative as in (74a)). Further, if a suitable context could be found in which to interpret something like (74b) as if NEG-raising had not taken place, one would expect the selected embedded clause to contain an indicative verb. In fact, this is exactly what occurs:

(75) Nous ne pensons pas qu’il est là, nous le savons.

we ne think pas that he be-IND there we it know

‘We don’t think he’s there, we know he is.’
Summary

5.6

In this final chapter, I have focused on the negative arguments *rien* and *personne*. I have pursued the line of thinking discussed in chapters 3 and 4 and provided an analysis of the negative arguments as NPIs, rather than as inherently negative quantifiers. This parallel analysis is justified by the fact that negative arguments can freely co-occur with each other and negative adverbs. In this respect, they are identical to the negative adverbs discussed in chapter 4. Any divergent analysis I might propose would therefore be difficult to justify.

The analysis proposed here differs crucially from suggestions made, for example, by Kayne (1981, 1984) and Moritz and Valois (1993, 1994) in that I have not posited LF raising. While all these authors have assumed that *personne* and similar elements raise at LF for one reason or other (QR for Kayne, the Neg Criterion for Moritz and Valois), I have argued that S-structure is the level at which the scopal properties of negative arguments are determined and the Neg Criterion is satisfied. In this respect, I have followed suggestions by Brody (1995) with respect to in situ *wh*-constructions and work on negation by Haegeman (1995). Rather than posit LF raising, I have suggested that the scopal properties of *personne* and *rien* are determined by the S-structure position of Op, namely SpecNegP. Op in SpecNegP serves to license *ne* and mark sentential negation by DA; it confers a negative interpretation on *personne* and *rien* via A'-binding. In pursuing my analysis, I have two significant advantages over earlier proposals. First, I have avoided the mismatch between the level at which the *wh*-criterion and the Neg Criterion apply in French. There is clear empirical evidence to suggest that the former applies at S-structure. Yet Moritz and Valois’s (1994) analysis of *personne* depends on the latter not applying until LF. This divergence is undesirable if the two criteria are ultimately to be viewed as a single *AFFECT* criterion, as assumed in section 1.3. Second, my analysis of negative arguments allows me to maintain a unitary account of pseudopartitives. In section 2.2, I considered the syntax of these indefinites and concluded that their distribution was best dealt with in terms of S-structure operator extraction. While this was appropriate for the data discussed in chapter 2, it was questioned by Moritz and Valois’s (1994) analysis of *personne*. For Moritz and Valois, *personne* licenses the empty category contained within a pseudopartitive by A'-binding after LF raising to SpecNegP. LF raising was necessary since *personne* doesn’t necessarily c-command the empty category at S-structure. By assuming, as I have done, that it is a non-overt negative operator (rather than *personne*) that raises (at S-structure rather than LF) to SpecNegP, I am able to maintain my original analysis of pseudopartitives. In other words, rather than being licensed by *personne* itself, pseudopartitives are licensed by Op (in the same way that they are licensed by *pas, beaucoup*, and so on), namely by S-structure operator extraction out of (Spec)NumP.

The analysis fleshed out here unites a number of the conclusions drawn in earlier work by other researchers. For example, I follow Muller (1984, 1991) in
treat ing rien and personne (as well as adverbs such as plus, jamais, and guère, discussed in chapter 4) as NPIs (in the scope of a non-overt, underlyingly negative operator), rather than as inherently negative items. I also follow Kayne (1981), Rizzi (1982), Hornstein (1984), and Zaring (1985) in assuming that the adverbs/arguments (associated with the operator in SpecNegP) are quantifiers. Finally, along with Milner (1979) and Aoun (1986), I assume that the negative adverbs/arguments are “anaphoric” in the sense that they are licensed by virtue of being $\lambda$-bound by an “antecedent”, namely the negative operator, Op/pas.

Having concluded that personne and rien are both NPIs bound by a negative operator and licensed at S-structure, I went on to ask why these two elements do not have matching distributions. Here, the crucial observation, dating back at least to Kayne (1975), was that, rather than matching personne, rien matches the other universal quantifier, namely tout. On the basis of work by Cinque (1992) on Italian tutto, it was suggested that rien and tout (at least in its “mobile” version) are generated as bare quantifiers heading a QP in the specifier of an argument NumP. As a maximal projection, the QP containing bare rien/tout is afforded the syntactic mobility needed to allow it to raise to an A’ scope position, a movement triggered by a “strong intrinsic quantifier feature” common to them both. In contrast, it was argued that the lack of movement possibilities of personne suggest that this element does not occupy such a specifier position. Rather, I suggested that personne is a head noun and that this naturally accounted for its immobility.
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