Readings for next time:


Moritz, Luc, and Daniel Valois (1993). French sentential negation and LF pied-piping. *NELS 22*. NOTE: This one has been recently added to the schedule—you won’t already have a copy of it. Two copies are in the box outside my office.

Comments on Haegeman & Zanuttini (1991)

H&Z are trying to show that there is a parallel to *wh*-movement in the domain of negation—movement of negative words to some position related to Neg°.

“Scrambling” is the common term for an operation which takes an argument out of its base position and moves it left. The original connotation of the word has this as a “free, optional” movement, probably adjoining to IP, and allows for more or less free reordering. H&Z use it as a way to call the movement they’re talking about, since it isn’t really *wh*-movement or NP-movement (A-movement).

Note: The data is primarily from West Flemish, which has German-like word order. The verb comes second in matrix clauses and the verb is underlyingly final. Most of the examples in the paper are embedded clauses beginning with *that…* in order to keep the verb in its base position (no V2 in embedded clauses).

DN, NC, and absorption. There is a fairly influential proposal (in a paper by Higginbotham & May, I believe) that in multiple *wh*-questions, all of the *wh*-words join up at LF in or around SpecCP, and that semantically, the *wh*-phrases are “absorbed” into one another to form a single operator. The details, motivations, and issues are not important here. H&Z borrow this idea occasionally to talk about the NC reading—if the negative constituents can “absorb” one another, then they will only jointly express one negation—if they cannot, each expresses its own. The idea is that absorption is only allowed between things which are in a particular (close) structural relation.

There are no pages missing, but there is a mysterious jump between pages 243 and 244. I don’t know either.

Comments on Zanuttini (1994)

p. 428: “Following Chomsky (1993), we view syntactic movement as motivated by the need to check morphological or grammatical features, i.e. to combine these features with an appropriate morpheme or lexical item.” Just to be clear, this is *very* similar to the “criteria” that Rizzi uses. You move only when there’s a reason (like the *wh*-criterion).

p. 428: “In some languages, the process of feature checking must take place before Spell-out” means almost exactly “the criteria must be satisfied by s-structure.”

Zanuttini is arguing for two negation-related projections, one she calls NegP (lower in the clause, where the morphology enters the derivation) and one in the CP system she calls PolP (were the negation is actually interpreted).

Comments on Moritz & Valois (1993)

This paper concerns *personne* in French, and is trying to make a couple of points. One of them is that (contrary to a [once-]popular belief), LF movement is constrained by Subjacency just like overt movement is.

They walk through Pollock’s (1989) story and talk about restrictions on *personne* in French. They argue against a “binding” approach (whereby *ne* binds *personne* in a kind of antecedent-anaphor relation—such a relation would not involve movement and would therefore not be constrained by Subjacency). They conclude that it doesn’t *act* like binding.

They end up proposing that these constructions involve movement to SpecNegP.

Don’t work too hard to get all of the technical details about (22-26), which rule out certain *wh*-movements.

“LF pied piping”. Pied piping refers to the situation where more than the trigger for movement moves. So, *For whom did you buy that?* involves pied-piping (of *for*) because presumably the reason the phrase *for whom* was fronted was that it contains *wh*. LF
pied piping is a version of this same concept transferred to LF. This has been used by a few people around 1987 (Pesetsky 1987, Nishigauchi 1986, Choe 1984; some of this we’ll read) in relation to covert wh-movement. The idea is basically: Suppose you have a wh-word in an island, so that moving the wh-word to SpecCP would violate Subjacency. What if you move the whole island to SpecCP (e.g., The man that gave what to John)? No Subjacency violation. This is basically the situation referred to as LF pied piping. Notice that the existence of LF pied piping serves as a sort of evidence that Subjacency constrains LF movement too, since why else would islands (and only islands) get pied-piped?

Stuff for you to do:

- Do the readings.
- Write a short (1–2 page) summary of Haegeman & Zanuttini’s article.

Some points about the write-ups (this one and future one):
- Single-space them, so that you have more room to comment if you wish.
- Email is fine, just get them in by class (need not necessarily be earlier).
- (Text, PDF, Microsoft Word, or RTF files are the best options).
- Mention: major points, major arguments.
- Don’t mention: ways of dealing with isolated possible objections / potential counterexamples, picky technical revisions to the theory, (unless they significantly “advance the plot”)
- For one or more major point(s), try to outline at least one argument for it in somewhat more detail—no examples needed, something like:

  * In Icelandic, a shifted object can (under certain circumstances) be seen overtly preceding the subject, which indicates that the base position of the subject must be lower than the derived position of the object—hence, providing damaging evidence against the Split-VP hypothesis.

- If something occurs to you—questions, possible support or possible counterexamples from a language you know—mention those too.

Next time: