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Abstract

This paper discusses several aspects of Hungarian sentential negation. On the premises that the NEG-criterion applies at S-structure in Hungarian, I show that the NEG-criterion does represent a coherent and adequate explanatory tool to understand Hungarian negation. After establishing the motivation for a functional projection FP outside the predicational part of the sentence, as a component of CP, I show that instances of the Affect criterion, like the Focus criterion and the WH-criterion also apply at S-structure in Hungarian and account very adequately for the behaviour of non-negative quantificational elements. I propose a structure which integrates the functional projection NegP and I show that the structure I adopt has the advantage of taking into account, in addition to Hungarian adult data, acquisition data. I also show that the NEG-criterion applies at S-structure in Hungarian. The paper also discusses negative phrases. I argue that they are not negative polarity items, but intrinsically negative elements, and that the NEG-criterion applies fully at S-structure in these cases as well.
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Introduction

Since Pollock (1989), much attention has been paid in the literature to the position and behaviour of negative elements (see Zanuttini 1989, Laka 1990, Progovac 1993, Acquaviva 1993, Haegeman 1995 among others). A fairly general consensus arose about the fact that negation involves a functional projection and is subject to structural constraints, although there is some controversy as to its position, as discussed in e.g. Ouhalla (1990), Acquaviva (1995), Zanuttini (to appear). In this paper, I examine the properties of Hungarian negation in the framework proposed in Haegeman (1995). Haegeman (1995) argues that negative elements are constrained by the NEG-criterion, a well-formedness condition on the occurrence of negative elements, which is an instantiation of the more general Affect criterion. On the premises that the NEG-criterion applies at S-structure in Hungarian, I will discuss several aspects of Hungarian sentential negation which seem to challenge this assertion. I will show that although the behaviour of negative elements does not, at first sight, support the above given premise, the NEG-criterion does represent a coherent and adequate explanatory tool to understand Hungarian negation.

In the first section, I give a proposal for the structure of Hungarian non-neutral sentences. I discuss the motivation for a functional projection FP outside the predicational part of the sentence, as a component of CP, in fact. I show that instances of the Affect criterion, like the Focus criterion and the WH-criterion also apply at S-structure in Hungarian and account very adequately for the behaviour of non-negative quantificational elements.

The second section examines recent proposals as to the position and behaviour of negative elements in Hungarian, namely in the works of Piñon (1992) and Toth (1995). I propose a structure which integrates the functional projection NegP and I show that the structure I adopt has the advantage of taking into account, in addition to Hungarian adult data, acquisition data. I also show that the NEG-criterion applies at S-structure in Hungarian.

Section 3 discusses the case of negative phrases. I argue that they are not negative polarity items, but intrinsically negative elements, and that although their behaviour seems to challenge the point made in section 2, the NEG-criterion applies fully at S-structure in these cases as well.

Section 4 discusses the various occurrences of sem. I will argue that what Brody presented as being equivalent sets of data, in which nem and sem alternate, belongs in fact to two different phenomena, both being accounted for within the framework I adopt.
Finally, section 6 gives a summary of the discussions.

1. The structure of the Hungarian sentence.

Most authors agree on the fact that Hungarian sentences can be divided into two types, the neutral order sentences and the sentences involving some focus/operator position. Neutral order sentences have been assigned various forms by linguists, but the basic assumption is that they are encompassed in IP, where the constituents ordered in an SVO pattern will be accounted for\(^1\). Therefore, a sentence like

\[
(1) \quad \text{Balázs fel fedezte az olasz filmeket.}
\]

Balázs-nom part discover-pas-3s the Italian films-acc

'Balázs discovered the Italian films.'

is assigned a structure where the subject moves to an IP-initial position, and the order particle-verb is accounted for by the adjacency of the particle and the verb in a V’ node, where they are base-generated (see e.g. Brody 1990, E-Kiss 1992), or by the presence of the particle in spec TP, the verb moving into T\(^0\) (see Puskás 1996b)\(^2\).

A rather general assumption is that when the sentence does not display the word order corresponding to this SVO pattern, it is a non-neutral sentence, which contains a focus-type operator (Kenesei 1986). Again, the proposals vary as to what this entails in terms of structure:

\[
(2) \quad \text{AZ OLASZ FILMEKET fedezte fel Balázs.}
\]

the Italian films-acc discover-pas-3s part Balázs-nom

'It is the Italian films that Balázs discovered.'

Whereas E-Kiss (1992) proposes that focused phrases occupy spec VP, where they are assigned /checked against the [+f] feature present on the verb (3a), Brody (1990, 1995a) and Puskás (1992), based on Choe (1989), argue that focused phrases occur in the specifier of a functional projection FP, whose head F\(^0\) hosts the verb. In this case, the verb moves to F\(^0\) where it exhibits the feature [+f] (3b):
Crucially, the difference between these two approaches lies in the fact that the projection FP entails that non-neutral sentences have a (set of) functional projection(s) above IP, and that as soon as a sentence does not exhibit a neutral word-order, the IP-external projections are activated, and the verb occurs outside IP, in a non-predicative position. The movement of the verb to an IP-external position results in particle-verb inversion, as in (2) above.

In this paper, I will continue assuming that non-neutral sentences, including negative sentences, involve a functional projection FP, which is a component of CP in the sense of Rizzi (1995) and belongs to the set of non-predicative functional projections. The fact that FP is a component of CP, in the same sense as AgrP is a component of IP has consequences on the extraction of elements from this position as well as on selection particularities.

It is a well know fact that focus-in-situ is ungrammatical in Hungarian:

\[(4) \quad * \text{Imádja Balázs AZ OLASZ FILMEKET.} \]

\[\text{adore-pres-3s Balázs-nom the Italian films-acc} \]

Sentence (4) above can be adequately accounted for by the Focus criterion, originally formulated in Brody (1990). I give here a revised version of the criterion (5), based on Rizzi ‘s (1991) \text{WH-criterion} (6):

\[(5) \quad \text{Focus criterion} \]
\[a. \text{A } +f \text{ head must be in a spec-head configuration with a } +f \text{ XP} \]
\[b. \text{A } +f \text{ XP must be in a spec-head configuration with a } +f \text{ head.} \]

\[(6) \quad \text{WH-criterion} \]
\[a. \text{A } +w h \text{ X}^0 \text{ must be in a spec-head configuration with a } +w h \text{ operator} \]
\[b. \text{A } +w h \text{ operator must be in a spec-head configuration with a } +w h \text{ X}^0 \]

Let us now examine how the Focus criterion can account for the ungrammaticality of (4) above. The verb \text{imádja} (‘adores’) occurs in F0. I assume that F0 contains a feature [+f] which needs to be lexically realised, and hence forces the verb to move. Therefore, the focused phrase \text{az olasz filmeket} (‘the Italian films’) violates the Focus criterion: although it carries a feature [+f] , it is not in the required spec-head configuration with the relevant head, namely
F^0. Example (2) above, on the other hand, exhibits a focused phrase which has moved to the preverbal position, that is to spec FP, satisfying the Focus criterion overtly. Therefore, clause b of the Focus criterion applies at S-structure. As for clause a, I argue that it also applies at S-structure:

(7) *AZ OLASZ FILMEKET Balázs imádja.
the Italian films-acc Balázs-nom adore-pres-3s

In (7), the focused phrase az olasz filmeket occurs sentence-initially, in spec FP. However, the sentence is ruled out: as the verb imádja has not moved to F^0 (it follows the subject Balázs), it does not occur in the required spec-head configuration with the focused phrase. The sentence is thus ruled out by clause a of the Focus criterion. The criterion applies fully at S-structure in Hungarian.

It is also well known that wh-phrases occur in a verb-adjacent position. Consider the following:

(8)a. Melyik filmet láttta Balázs Rékával?
which film-acc see-pas-3s Balázs-nom Réka-instr
'Which film did Balázs see with Réka?'

b. RÉKÁVAL láttta Balázs az olasz filmet.
Réka-instr see-pas-3s Balázs-nom the Italian film-acc
'Balázs saw the Italian film with Réka.'

c. *Melyik filmet RÉKÁVAL láttta Balázs?
which film-acc Réka-instr see-pas-3s Balázs-nom

In (8a), the wh-phrase melyik filmet ('which film') occurs sentence-initially, immediately to the left of the verb. The subject Balázs follows the verb: therefore, the verb has moved to an IP-external position. This looks very much like focusing. Indeed, in (8b), the focused phrase Rékával ('with Réka') occurs in the preverbal position and the subject Balázs follows the verb. (8c), which combines wh-phrase and focused phrase is ungrammatical. Therefore, it is argued in the literature (see e.g. Horváth 1981, 1986, E-Kiss 1987) that wh-phrases occur in the same position as focused phrases. In the framework adopted here, this position is spec FP. Wh-phrases are strongly constrained in Hungarian:

(9)a. *Balázs láttta melyik filmet?
Balázs-nom see-pas-3s which film-acc

b. *Melyik filmet Balázs láttta?
In (9a), the verb occurs in its IP-internal position, and the wh-phrase *melyik filmet* ('which film') occupies its canonical object position. The ungrammaticality of the sentence can be accounted for by the wh-criterion (see 6 above). Indeed, the verb (or rather the inflectional head under which the verb sits) carries a feature [+wh]. In (9a), the wh-phrase does not sit in the spec position of the head which hosts the verb. Therefore, clause b of the wh-criterion is violated. In (9b), the wh-phrase has moved to the sentence-initial position, namely to spec FP. However, the verb does not occupy the head in which it can satisfy the spec-head requirement of the wh-criterion. (9b) violates clause a of the criterion. The conclusion is again that the wh-criterion applies fully at S-structure in Hungarian.

In this section, I have adopted the view that Hungarian non-neutral sentences contain a functional projection *F₀*, which belongs to the CP-type projections. Its head *F₀* contains a feature [+f] which signals focus and which attracts the verb. I have argued that focused phrases move to spec FP to satisfy the spec-head requirement of the Focus criterion. It was shown that the latter applies at S-structure in Hungarian. Similarly, wh-phrases move to spec FP. I have argued that they are constrained by the wh-criterion. The behaviour of wh-phrases in Hungarian shows again that the wh-criterion applies at S-structure.

2. Sentential negation

Recent proposals assign Hungarian negative sentences a structure which includes a functional projection. This projection is claimed by Piñon (1992) to be identical to the one involved in focusing. On the other hand, Toth (1995) adopts Pollock's (1989) proposal of an IP-internal NegP.

2.1 Piñon (1992)

Piñon argues that the negative marker *nem* is of the category *Σ⁰*. *Σ* is the head of *ΣP*, "a functional projection whose head may contain (at least) tense and negation and whose specifier is an A'-position. This will contrast with Brody's (1990) F(ocus)P, which I believe is simply too narrow a construct." (Piñon 1992:106, fn5). Piñon also hypothesises that *ΣP* is a projection for tense. He argues that it is equivalent to TP, but that it is optional. Therefore, it is the projection whose head can host the verb and whose specifier can be involved in focusing. In short, Piñon argues that when a constituent is focused, it occurs in spec *ΣP*, and the verb moves to *Σ⁰*, to have its tense features checked in that position (the reader is referred to Piñon (1992) for a detailed discussion). When the sentence contains a negative marker, it occurs as one of the heads of a bi-cephalic functional projection on top of VP. Piñon argues that *ΣP* is in
fact an extended projection, which might have several heads with one specifier position. Therefore, the negative sentence in (10a) will have the representation in (10b):

(10)a. MARI nem jöt el tegnap.
    Mary NEG came PV yesterday
    'It is Mary who didn't come yesterday.'

(10)b. 

\[
\text{spec} \quad \Sigma' \quad \Sigma P
\]
\[
\text{spec} \quad \Sigma' \quad \Sigma P
\]
\[
\Sigma P
\]
\[
\Sigma 0 \quad \Sigma P
\]
\[
\Sigma 0 \quad \Sigma P
\]
\[
\text{Nem} \quad \Sigma 0 \quad \text{VP}
\]
\[
\text{Nem} \quad \Sigma 0 \quad \text{VP}
\]
\[
\text{Jött} \quad \text{V0}
\]
\[
\text{Jött} \quad \text{V0}
\]
\[
\text{XP} \quad \text{XP}
\]
\[
\text{XP} \quad \text{XP}
\]
\[
\text{t} \quad \text{t}
\]
\[
\text{el} \quad \text{t}
\]

The specifier of \( \Sigma P \) can host a focused phrase, but as \( \Sigma P \) is not inherently a focus projection, the structure accommodates also sentences containing a negative marker without focused phrase, as in (11a,b) below:

(11)a. Holnap nem utazom el
    tomorrow NEG depart-1SG PV
    'Tomorrow I'm not leaving.'
Although Piñon's structure seems to account quite easily for the above given facts, I will argue that the analysis does not reflect the exact nature of sentence negation. As discussed in Puskás (1994), *wh*-movement type extraction is blocked by the presence of an intervening negation:

\[(12)\]

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Miért gondolod hogy sírt Réka?
   \begin{itemize}
   \item why think-pres-2s that cry-pas-3s Réka-nom
   \end{itemize}
   'Why do you think that Réka cried?'
\item b. Miért nem gondolod hogy sírt Réka?
   \begin{itemize}
   \item why neg think-pres-2s that cry-pas-3s Réka-nom
   \end{itemize}
   'Why don't you think that Réka cried?'
\end{enumerate}

In (12a), *miért* ('why') can be construed with the matrix or with the embedded clause. In (12b), on the other hand, only the matrix clause reading is available. Following Rizzi (1990), this is due to the fact that an intervening position blocks the long construal. This intervening position is an A'-position, which blocks the antecedent-government relation between the *wh*-adjunct and its trace. Anticipating the discussion in section 2.4, I assume that this A'-position is the specifier of NegP.

In the structure given in Piñon (1992), the negative marker *nem* is one of the heads of ΣP, and *wh*-phrases are moved to the specifier of ΣP. If we adopt this structure, the *wh*-phrase *miért* ('why') in (12) above occupies spec ΣP, and *nem* occurs in Σ\(^0\). However, the contrast between (12a) and (12b) cannot be accounted for: indeed, there is no blocking A'-position which intervenes in either of the cases. (12b) should be just as good as (12a)\(^8\). Therefore, I will conclude that NegP is an independent functional projection, lower than spec FP, and whose head carries the feature [+neg], realised in Hungarian as *nem*. 
Toth (1995) discusses the licensing of negative polarity items in Hungarian. She argues that negative polarity items can be divided into two classes: the *se*-NPIs which start with the prefix *se*, as *senki* ('nobody'), *semmi* ('nothing'), etc., and the *vala*-NPIs which start with *vala*, as in *valaki* ('somebody'), *valami* ('something'). She observes that *se*-NPIs occur only with clausemate negation. I will come back to these in section 2.4 below. As for the structure of negative sentences, Toth argues that the clause contains a NegP. Indeed, she observes that negation blocks long *wh*-movement and long focusing:

(13)a. Mikor gondolod hogy megérkezik?
    [when think-pres-2s that part arrive-pres-3s]
    'When do you think he comes?'
  b. *Mikor nem gondolod hogy megérkezik?
    [when neg think-pres-3s that part arrive-pres-3s]
    'When don't you think he comes?'

(14)a. KÉTHETENTE szeretném, ha jönnél.
    [by two weeks like-cond-1s if come-subj-2s]
    'It is every two weeks that I would like you to come.'
  b. *KÉTHETENTE nem szeretném, ha jönnél.
    [by two weeks neg like-cond-1s if come-subj-2s]
    'It is every two weeks that I would not like you to come'
    [Toth 1995]

In (13a) and (14a), the *wh*-phrase *mikor* ('when') and the focused phrase *kéthetente* ('every two weeks') have been extracted from the lower clause. (13b) and (14b) differ from their *a* counterparts in that the main clause contains a negative marker *nem*. Toth concludes that given Relativized Minimality, the antecedent government relation between the moved *wh*-focused phrase and its trace is blocked as negative clauses contain a NegP whose specifier is filled at LF at the latest.

Therefore, Toth assigns the negative sentence in (15a) the structure given in (15b):

(15)a. János nem látott senkit.
    [János neg see-pas-3s nobody-acc]
    'John didn't see anyone.'
  b. [AgrP János [Agr nem látott [NegP Op t₁ [TP [VP t₁ senkit ]]]]
Toth proposes a functional projection NegP inside IP, and she assumes that the verb (with the negative head *nem*) moves to Agr⁰. The negative phrase *senkit* sits in its base position, i.e. inside VP. The Op in spec NegP is a null negative operator which is licensed by the overt negative element *nem*. The operator binds the negative phrase *senkit* (*nobody*), and assigns it sentential scope.

It is difficult to discuss Toth's proposal in detail as the set of data is not complete. However, I will argue against the representation given in (15b) in which the sentence containing a negative element corresponds to the structure of neutral order sentences. Consider the following pair:

(16)a. Réka nem jött el.
   Réka-nom neg come-pas-3s part
   'Réka did not come.'

b. *Réka nem el jött.

In (16a), the subject occurs sentence-initially. However, the sentence does not have a neutral word-order, as the particle follows the verb. Recall (see section 1) that particle-verb inversion occurs when the verb is raised to an IP-external position, that is in non-neutral sentences. Therefore, I will conclude that negative sentences are non-neutral, and involve the IP-external functional projections.

2.3 V-movement from NegP to FP

In Puskás (1994), I argued that the structure of Hungarian negative sentences contains a projection NegP, located inside IP, between AgrP and TP. I would like to maintain the basic claim put forth in that paper, namely that negative sentences contain a NegP inside IP. I will continue assuming that NegP occurs above TP, inside IP. Indeed, I will argue, against Piñon (1992), that the functional projection responsible for negation is inside IP and that further movement to a higher position is motivated by other factors, like the [+f] feature on F⁰ and the Focus criterion. Like in other non-neutral sentences, the CP level is triggered and FP is projected. As F⁰ contains a feature [+f] which needs to be lexicalized (see section 1), the verb moves to F⁰. On its way, its passes through Neg⁰ and takes the negative marker *nem* along. The latter being a clitic, it attaches to the verb and moves along with it¹⁰.

The representation of (16a) repeated here, will then be (17)¹¹:

(16)a. Réka nem jött el.
   Réka-nom neg come-pas-3s part
'Réka did not come.'

(17).

The subject Réka occupies the Topic position, above FP. The verb moves through the heads of IP up to F0. On its way, it takes nem along. Thus the complex nem+verb appears under F0. I assume that in the cases where spec FP is lexically empty, the Focus criterion is satisfied by a null operator in spec FP.

The movement of nem+verb to F0 is also attested by the following examples:

(18)a. Melyik filmet nem láttá Balázs?
   which film-acc neg see-pas-3s Balázs-nom
   'Which film did Balázs not see?'

   b. *Melyik filmet Balázs nem láttá?

It was shown in section 1 that wh-phrases occur in the same position as focused phrases, that is in spec FP. In (18a) above, the wh-phrase melyik filmet ('which film') occurs sentence initially, left adjacent to the negative marker. (18b) in which no verb movement takes place, violates the wh-criterion: as the wh-criterion requires that the head carrying [+wh] be in a spec-head configuration with the wh-phrase, the verbal complex nem+V which carries this feature, should occur in the head whose specifier hosts the wh-phrase. Therefore, in (18a), it is the unit formed by the negative marker nem and the verb which sits in F0.

In this section, I have shown that an analysis in which NegP (or any negative projection) appears outside IP cannot account for some of the observed facts, namely the asymmetries in extraction across a negative sentence. On the other hand, negative sentences
were shown not to be neutral order sentences. Therefore, I have proposed that the functional projection where negation is generated, that is NegP, does occur inside IP, but that the negative marker nem occurs in an IP-external position because it is a clitic which attaches onto the verb. The movement of the verb to F₀, due to the constraints related to FP, forces the negative marker to appear in F₀ as well, yielding the non-neutral surface order.

2.4 The NEG-criterion

Haegeman (1995) notes that negative elements trigger subject-auxiliary inversion and inner-island effects, among others. This means that in many respects, they behave like wh-operators or other affective operators (in Klima's 1964 sense). On the basis of Rizzi's wh-criterion, Haegeman and Zanuttini (1991) formulate the licensing condition on negative elements in the NEG-criterion:

(19)a. a NEG-operator must be in a spec-head configuration with an X₀ [+neg]
    b. an X₀ [+neg] must be in a spec-head configuration with a NEG-operator.

where the following definitions apply:

(19)c. a. NEG-operator: a negative phrase in a scope position.
    b. scope position: left peripheral A'-position (an XP-adjoined position or a specifier position).

Haegeman (1995) gives the following West Flemish examples:

(20)a. da Valère dies boeken nie an zen voader getoogd (en)-oat.
      that Valère those books not to his father shown en-had
      'that Valère had not shown these books to his father.'
    b. Valère en-eet nie s'oavends.
      'Valère does not eat in the evenings.'

For clarity's sake, I give in (21a,b) below a simplified bracketed representation of (20a,b):

(21)a. [CPda [AgrP Valère dies boeken [NegP nie t_i an zen voader getoogd [Agr (en)-oat.]]]
    b. [CP Valère [C en_i-eet [IP [NegP nie t_i s'oavends.]]]
Haegeman (1995) argues that the negative marker en cliticizes onto the verb and moves along with it to Agr\(^0\) in (21a), and to C\(^0\) in (21b). She assumes that the negative operator nie is base-generated in spec NegP. Therefore, it will enter the required spec-head relation with the trace of the negative head en, which cliticizes onto the moved verb. So the NEG-criterion can be satisfied on the trace of the negative head: although the lexical element has moved, the feature [+neg] is still available on Neg\(^0\).

Let us now examine how the NEG-criterion applies in Hungarian. Consider the data below:

(22) Nem láttá Balázs ezt a filmet.
    neg see-pas-3s Balázs-nom this film-acc
    'Balázs didn't see this film.'

As discussed above, the functional projection which hosts sentence negation, NegP, appears inside IP. On the other hand, it was shown that nem does not occur inside IP, but in F\(^0\), cliticized onto the verb. As opposed to the West Flemish examples given above, Hungarian does not have a bi-partite bare negation: there is no overt negative operator.

I will propose that the NEG-criterion is satisfied by a null negative operator. Following Rizzi (1990a) and Haegeman (1995), I will adopt the idea that negative operators occur in contexts where negation induces inner island effects (examples from Haegeman 1995):

(23)a. Perche hai detto che Gianni e partito?
    why have you said that Gianni is left
    'Why did you say that Gianni has left?'
    = 1. 'What is the reason which made you say that Gianni left'
    = 2. 'You said that Gianni left for which reason'

b. Perche non hai detto che Gianni e partito?
    why non have you said that Gianni is left
    'Why did you not say that Gianni has left?'
    = 'What is the reason which made you not say that Gianni has left'

In (23a), the adjunct perché can be construed either with the higher clause or with the lower one. In (23b), on the other hand, the construed with the lower clause is lost. Haegeman argues that "in terms of a Relativized Minimality account, the intervening null operator in [spec,NegP] blocks the antecedent-government relation between perché and its trace in the lower clause" (Haegeman 1995:201). Note that it is not the negative marker non as such which blocks the relation, as non is a head which cliticizes onto the verb. The blocking
element is indeed the null operator present in spec NegP. Hungarian negative sentences present the same contrasts:

(24)a. Miért mondtad hogy sírt Réka?
    why say-pas-2s that cry-pas-3s Réka-nom
    'Why did you say that Réka cried?'
    = 1. 'Which reason made you say that Réka cried'
    = 2. 'You said that Réka cried for which reason'

b. Miért nem mondtad hogy sírt Réka?
    why neg say-pas-2s that cry-pas-3s Réka-nom
    'Why didn't you say that Réka cried?'
    = 'Which reason made you not say that Réka cried'

In (24a) the wh-phrase miért ('why') can be construed either with the higher or with the lower clause. However, in (24b) only the main clause reading is available. I will conclude that the presence of a negative operator in spec NegP blocks the antecedent-government relation. In Hungarian bare sentence negation, NegP contains a null operator. I will propose that the NEG-criterion is satisfied at the level of NegP. Indeed, the example below confirms that the surface position of nem is not involved in the NEG-criterion:

(25)a. AZ ANGOL FILMEKET nem láttá Balázs.
    the English films-acc neg see-pas-3s Balázs-nom
    'It is the English films that Balázs didn't see.'

In (25a) above, the specifier position of FP whose head hosts nem + láttá ('neg+saw') is occupied by the focused phrase az angol filmeket ('the English films'), a non-negative element. If the NEG-criterion applied at this level, (25a) would typically violate it. Therefore, the representation for (25a) is the following:
As the null operator in spec NegP is present at S-structure, the conclusion is that the NEG-criterion applies at S-structure in Hungarian. Evidence for this claim will be provided by the behaviour of negative phrases, examined in section 3 below.

2.5 Negation and acquisition

The IP-internal position of NegP is, in my view, reinforced by acquisition data. Papp (1996) examines a corpus of data of Hungarian children between 1;8 and 2;9. She observes that after a first period when the children move optionally the verb (26), (27), (28), they acquire an independent functional projection FP (29):

(26)a. Zoli 1;8 itt be tudu here pref can-we 'Here we can...in'
     b. Zoli 1;8 ide mászom be here-to climb-I pref 'I'm climbing in here'
     c. Zoli 1;8 nem el-vitte not perf-took-3sg 'He didn't take it away'

(27)a. Zoli 2;0 csak senki jött...Barna bácsi only nobody came Barna uncle 'Nobody came, uncle Barna'
     b. Gyuri 2;3 miér(t) be-mennek? why pref-go-they 'Why are they going in?'
The examples in (26) show that the first stage has optional verb movement: the prefix precedes the verb in (26a), it follows the verb in (26b) and in the negative sentence (26c), the negative marker occurs sentence initially, but the prefix precedes the verb. Papp (1996) argues that functional projections might not be present at all at this stage. The examples in (27) show that typically the various instances of the Affect-criterion are violated: (27a) is a violation of the NEG-criterion: the negative marker is not present. Note that in this case, the presence of verb movement cannot be determined, as the negative element senki ('nobody') is a subject. (27b,c) are violations of the WH-criterion: although the wh-phrase occurs sentence-initially, the verb does not move, as attested by the order particle-verb. (28) shows verb movement with wh-phrases. Papp argues that this shows that the children have implemented the functional projection which hosts the verb and satisfies the spec-head requirement of the WH-criterion. She argues that as wh-phrases and focused phrases are in complementary distribution, this functional projection is FP. Indeed, (29) shows that with raising verbs like kell (must), szokik ('habitually (do)'), the particle occurs in the pre-verbal focus position. Her prediction is then that the acquisition of the feature [+f] (present on F0) should result in the simultaneous acquisition of verb raising in wh, focus and negation contexts (note that Papp assumes Piñon's
structure for negative sentences). However, the data seems to contradict this. Consider examples of negative sentences of the same period:

(30)a. Gyuri 2;3 nem el-veszi
not pref take-3sg
'He won't take it away.'
b. Moni 2;5 én nem be-takartam
I not pref covered-it
'I didn't cover it.'
c. Eva 2;7 ne nem le-ül sz ide
don't not pref sit-you here
'No, you won't sit here.'
d. Eva 2;9 nem meg-harapta a kutya a cicát.
not pref bit-3sg the dog-nom the kitten-acc
'The dog didn't bite the kitten.'
e. Eva 2;9 nem el-veszem
not pref-take-I
'I won't take it away.'

At the same age, and even later, the children who produce adult wh-questions with verb-particle inversion still produce negative sentences without inversion: in the examples above, the particle systematically precedes the verb. Papp (1996) argues that in negative sentences, children project IP, to which they adjoin the negative marker. She adds that the IP-adjunction analysis is reinforced by utterances in which the child assigns scope over the whole sentence, rather than the VP:

(31)a. Zoli 2;2 nem meg-eszi csak
not pref-eat-3sg just
'it won't eat it just...' 
b. én nem össze-rontom csak a
I not pref-ruin-I just the
'I won't ruin it just...'

Papp argues that the structures in (31) suggest that children might overgeneralize from contrastive negation to sentential negation. However, she notes that "analysis of the children's' sentential negation in this way would of course need phonological information from the original files" (Papp 1996:12).
On the other hand, the assumption that NegP is lower in the structure makes interesting predictions with respect to the acquisition data above as well. As the head of NegP is realised as *nem*, verb movement as such is not necessary: indeed, I showed in section 2.4 above that the constraint on negation formulated as the NEG-criterion is satisfied independently of the presence of the verb itself. So by the time children have acquired the Focus- and the WH-criterion, they have also acquired the NEG-criterion. The movement of the verb to F0 in the case of negative sentences is driven by other constraints: I argued that the feature [+f] present on F0 needs to be lexically realised. In adult language, the verb (or rather the content of the functional projection T0) qualifies as the lexical element. On the other hand, example (30d) seems to indicate that for children negative sentences are not neutral sentences either: the subject occurs post-verbally. I will propose that in child sentence negation, it is the head of NegP, *nem*, which moves to F0. This amounts to saying that children have not acquired the fact that *nem* is a clitic. They move it as a full lexical element, generating the sentences in (30).

2.6 Summary

I have argued that the structure of a negative sentence contains a NegP, whose head, Neg0, is realised as *nem*. This functional projection was argued to be inside IP: indeed, it was shown that argument-adjunct asymmetries observed in extractions across negation could only be accounted for under the above assumption. Besides, child language data, in which the acquisition of the various instances of the Affect-criterion were shown to appear simultaneously also speaks in favour of a functional projection specialised in negation which is located inside IP.

On the other hand, I have discussed that negative sentences are not neutral-order sentences. I have argued that the negative marker *nem* surfaces outside IP, as a consequence of its being a clitic which attaches onto the verb, the latter moving to F0, an IP-external position. However, the NEG-criterion was shown to apply at S-structure, at the level of NegP. The trace of the negative marker enters into a spec-head relation with a null negative operator. The presence of the operator seems to be confirmed precisely by the asymmetries in wh- and focus extraction across a negation: under the assumption that there is an A’-position which blocks the antecedent-government relation between a moved adjunct and its trace, it is proposed that this A’-position is precisely spec NegP, and that it is occupied by a null operator which prevents a trace from appearing in this position. Therefore, the NEG-criterion is satisfied at this level. Evidence for this was given by examples in which the specifier of FP, whose head hosts the negative marker, contains a non-negative phrase. As no violation arises, I concluded that the NEG-criterion does not look at this position at all.
3. The negative phrases

Sentential negation in Hungarian is always expressed by the negative marker *nem*. In addition, negative sentences can contain various negative phrases. These elements have the property of always occurring with the negative marker:

    Balázs-nom neg see-pas-3s nothing-acc
    'Balázs didn't see anything.'

b. *Balázs látott semmit.

(33)a. Semmit nem látott Balázs.
    nothing-acc neg see-pas-3s Balázs-nom
    'Balázs didn't see anything.'

b. *Semmit látott Balázs

Although these negative phrases are referred to in Toth (1995) as SE-Negative Polarity Items, their properties differ from that of polarity items: they occur only in negative contexts and they are intrinsically negative\(^{13}\). Indeed, Toth (1995) gives the following contrasts:

(34)a. *Pál látott *senkit
    Paul saw nobody-acc

    Mary not said that Paul saw nobody-acc
    'Mary didn't say that Paul saw anybody.'

c. *Olvasott Mária *semmit?
    read-past Mary nothing-acc
    'Did Mary read anything?'

(35)a. *Pál nem mondott *valamit *is
    Paul not said anything-acc
    'Paul didn't say anything.'

b. Pál nem mondta, hogy Mária látott *valakit is.
    Paul not said that Mary saw anybody-acc
    'Paul did not say that Mary saw anybody.'

c. Tanultál valaha is oroszul?
    studied-2sg ever Russian
    'Have you ever studied Russian?'
Whereas the se-type negative elements can occur only in negative contexts, as attested by the examples in (34), the vala polarity items can occur in non-negative contexts as well (35b,c). Besides, they cannot co-occur with the negative marker nem (35a) \(^{14}\). I will conclude that the se-phrases (or negative phrases) are intrinsically negative and carry a feature [+neg], in the same way as wh-phrases are endowed with a feature [+wh].

The examples above show that the negative phrases can occur either post-verbally, as in (32a) or in a preverbal position, as in (33a). West Flemish negative operators also occur in different positions in the sentence:

\[ \text{(36)a. \{CP Z' \text{en} \text{-was} [\text{IP NegP me niets t_i [VP ketent ]}]]} \]

'she en was with nothing pleased'

'She was not pleased with anything.'

b. \[ \text{[CP Me niets_k \text{en} \text{-was} [\text{IP ze [NegP t_k t_i [VP ketent ]}]}}} \]

'with nothing en was she pleased'

'She was not pleased with anything.'

[examples from Haegeman 1995; brackets mine.]

In the examples above, the negative phrase me niets ('with nothing') occurs either in a position inside IP, to the left of the adjective ketent ('happy') (36a), or sentence-initially, as in (36b). Haegeman (1995) argues that in (36a), the negative operator has scrambled out of its base position to spec NegP, where it satisfies the NEG-criterion with the trace of the negative marker en. Indeed, the latter has cliticized onto the verb which occupies C\(^{0}\). In (36b), the negative phrase occurs in sentence-initial position: Haegeman (1995) argues that this position is spec CP. The negative phrase enters into a spec-head relation with C, where it satisfies the NEG-criterion with the negative marker en. Therefore, Haegeman argues that in West Flemish, the NEG-criterion has the property of being able to apply at different points in the structure.

We saw above that Hungarian negative phrases can also appear in two positions: either inside IP or in a sentence-initial pre-verbal position. The question is whether the two levels indeed rely on the NEG-criterion. In the following sections, I argue that it is not the case. Section 3.1 deals with post-verbal negative phrases and section 3.2 examines preverbal negatives.

3.1 NegP and the NEG-criterion

Consider the following data:

\[ \text{(37)a. Rékával nem beszélt meg Balázs semmit.} \]

'Réka-instr neg speak-pas-3s part Balázs-nom nothing-acc'

'Balázs didn't talk over (=arrange) anything with Réka.'
b. Rékával nem beszélt meg semmit Balázs.
'He didn't talk over (=arrange) anything with his friends.'

In (37a), the subject Balázs occurs post-verbally, lower than the particle, and it is followed by
the negative phrase semmit. In (37b), the negative phrase precedes the subject. I assume that
the subject appears in spec AgrS, in the canonical subject position. Negative phrases of the
type semmit are intrinsically negative and carry a feature [+neg] (see section 3 above). Given
the NEG-criterion, one expects semmit in (37) to occupy spec NegP in order to enter a spec-
head relation with a negative head. However, if semmit occupies spec NegP, we have to
postulate two distinct spec NegP positions. I would like to rule this option out. I will propose
that in (37a), both arguments appear in their canonical positions, respectively in spec AgrSP
and spec AgrOP. In (37b), on the other hand, the subject is either in VP, or maybe extraposed,
yielding a slightly less natural, almost afterthought flavour to the subject. What comes out,
under this assumption, is that the negative phrase semmit does not sit in spec NegP.

The surface position of negative phrases might at a first sight challenge the conclusions given in section 2, in which I argue that the NEG-criterion applies at S-structure. One direction to pursue is to look at the nature of negative phrases. Recall that the NEG-criterion is expressed in terms of negative operators, where the notion of operator crucially relies on the scope position (that is a "left-peripheral A'-position) of the negative elements. In this view, Hungarian negative phrases may rely on the functional definition of operator, and when they are not in a left-peripheral A'-position, they do not count as operators. Therefore, the NEG-criterion has nothing to say about them. Then the NEG-criterion applies at LF.

Consider now the pair in (38). The contrast between (38a) and (38b) dwells in the
position of the negative phrase semmit. Whereas in (38a), it occupies a position lower than the
particle, that is TP, in (38b), it occurs between the verb and the particle. This position can only
be spec NegP, as it occurs between the verb in F₀ and the particle in spec TP. In this position,
the negative phrase clearly enters into a spec-head relation with the trace of nem. Therefore, it
does satisfy the NEG-criterion. It seems then that negative phrases are allowed to move out of
an argument position at S-structure. However, if they do, they can only move to a position
where they do not violate the NEG-criterion. However, the conclusion that the NEG-criterion
applies optionally at S-structure is not the best solution, and I would like to explore another
possibility.
Haegeman (1995), proposes that the \textit{NEG}-criterion can dispense with the functional definition of operators as discussed above. The distinction can be captured by the notion of (overt) chain, created by movement and which accounts for negative phrases in a scope position, and that of (representational) \textit{CHAIN}, created by indexation. The notion of representational \textit{CHAIN}, headed by a (non-overt) scope marker, is adopted from Brody (1995b). Brody (1995) proposes that overt movement and covert movement can be accounted for representationally in terms of chains. Chains which represent overt movement have a contentive at the head of the chain, the foot of the chain being the trace. Covert - or LF - movement involves chains whose head is an expletive, a scope marker which occurs in a relevant position, coindexed with the contentive at the foot of the chain.

I will adopt Brody's (1995) idea of expletive chain, in the spirit the discussion of Italian negation in Haegeman (1995)\textsuperscript{17}. The reader should bear in mind that in a derivational framework, expletive \textit{CHAINS} do not obtain through LF-movement. Rather, they are formed at S-structure, similarly to overt expletive chains.

Using this distinction, I will propose that the \textit{NEG}-criterion must in fact be satisfied by an (overt) chain, that is with an element which has moved to a scope position. Similarly to the Focus- and the \textit{WH}-criterion, the \textit{NEG}-criterion is satisfied at S-structure. However, as opposed to \textit{WH}-questions and to focused sentences, negative sentences have an overt negative marker which realises the head of the relevant functional projection; but the element which appears in the scope position is in fact non-overt. One could argue that whereas \textit{WH}-phrases are obligatory in \textit{WH}-questions, negative phrases are never required as such in a negative sentence: they do not function like the negative element \textit{pas} in French or \textit{nie} in West Flemish. I will propose that the \textit{NEG}-criterion is always satisfied by a null negative operator. In terms of chains, we could call it a "trivial" chain, whose only element occupies an A' scope position.

In this approach, negative phrases do not function as elements which satisfy the \textit{NEG}-criterion \textit{per se}. Indeed, in the sense that negative phrases are not obligatory (contrary to \textit{WH}-phrases in a \textit{WH}-question), they do not participate in the mechanism which checks the \textit{NEG}-criterion as such. In sentences with a negative phrase, as in the case of bare sentential negation (see section 2.4), the \textit{NEG}-criterion itself is satisfied by a null operator in spec NegP. On the other hand, as shown by the glosses, negative phrases do contribute to the negative meaning of the whole sentence (note that following Haegeman (1995), I consider the relation between the negative head and a negative phrase not as an instance of Negative Concord, but as an expression of sentential negation). A negative phrase which participates in sentential negation is assumed to have sentential scope. I will propose that negative phrases which have sentential scope belong to a negative \textit{CHAIN} whose foot is the overt negative phrase. The latter is an A-position\textsuperscript{18}. The head of the \textit{CHAIN} is an empty expletive element, which occupies a scope-position at S-structure. I will assume that this position is spec NegP, an A'-position. Therefore, although the negative element as such does not occupy a scope position, the \textit{CHAIN} it forms
with the (coindexed) expletive enables it to get sentential scope: it is the \textit{chain} as such which counts as occupying the relevant scope position, even if the contentive does not. By the mechanism of \textit{chain}-formation, negative phrases which exhibit no overt A'-movement will be able to acquire sentential scope. In other words, negative phrases in Hungarian get sentential scope because they belong to a negative \textit{chain}, and because the head - or a member - of this \textit{chain} appears in NegP, the locus of sentential negation. I will propose that the difference between (38a) and (38b) above is not a matter of level of application of the \textit{neg}-criterion. The latter always applies at S-Structure, and is satisfied by the null operator in spec NegP. Rather, in (38a), \textit{semmit} appears in a \textit{chain} whose head, a non-overt scope marker adjoins to spec NegP. In (38b), it is the negative phrase itself which occurs in this position. Thus the (simplified) representation for (38a,b) will be the following:

\begin{equation}
(39)\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & [\text{FP } \text{nem}_i \text{ beszélt } [\text{NegP } \text{SM}_k \text{ OP } t_i [\text{TP } \text{meg } \text{semmit}_k \text{ a barátaival } ]]] \\
\text{b. } & [\text{FP } \text{nem}_i \text{ beszélt } [\text{NegP } \text{semmit}_k \text{ OP } t_i [\text{TP } \text{meg } t_k \text{ a barátaival } ]]]
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

where OP is the null negative operator and SM corresponds to the expletive scope marker. Negative phrases are [+neg]. Therefore, the \textit{chain} is [+neg]. The expletive which adjoins to spec NegP is thus able to undergo neg-absorption. Although it is not the expletive as such which satisfies the \textit{neg}-criterion, it does not violate it. Besides, the fact that it undergoes neg-absorption enables the negative phrase (via the \textit{chain}) to get sentential scope, as it forms a negative operator with the null operator in spec NegP.

The optionality of such an alternation remains to be explained. In fact, (38b) is fine only if the negative phrase is heavily stressed\(^{19}\). The relation between stress and the position of negative phrases is examined in more details in the section discussing Negative Concord. It will be shown that the notion of \textit{chain} can account for interesting contrasts in these cases.

3.2 Pre-verbal negative phrases

The negative phrases can also occur in a preverbal position, adjacent to \textit{nem}+verb. Consider the following examples:

\begin{equation}
(40)\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Semmit } \text{nem láttott } \text{Balázs.} & \text{nothing-acc neg see-pas-3s Balázs-nom} & \text{‘Balázs didn't see ANYTHING.’} \\
\text{b. } & *\text{Semmit } \text{BALÁZS } \text{nem láttott.} & \text{nothing-acc Balázs-nom neg see-pas-3s}
\end{align*}
\end{equation}
As shown by (40a), *semmit ('nothing') can occur in a preverbal position. In Puskás (1994), it is claimed that this position is spec FP and that negative phrases satisfy the NEG-criterion with the head of FP which carries the cliticized *nem*, and hence negative features.

Observe that (40b), where the negative phrase is not adjacent to the verb (the focused constituent *Balázs intervenes), is ungrammatical. The reverse order (40c) is also ungrammatical. Finally, in (40d), the insertion of a non-focused constituent between the negative phrase *semmit* and the complex *nem+verb* is also impossible. Given the ungrammaticality of (40b,c), the conclusion is that preposed negative phrases land indeed in spec FP.

This seems also to be attested by the ungrammaticality of the examples (41a,b): it was shown (see section 1) that *wh*-phrases land in spec FP, where they satisfy the *WH*-criterion. Therefore, the co-occurrence of a negative phrase and of a *wh*-phrase is ungrammatical, in any order: whereas (41b) is excluded by the *WH*-criterion (the negative phrase intervenes between the *wh*-phrase and the verb carrying [+wh]), (41b), where the negative phrase precedes the *wh*-phrase is also ruled out\(^20\).

The only possible combination of a negative- and a *wh*-phrase is (41c), where the *wh*-phrase sits in spec FP and the negative phrase in its IP-internal position. Indeed, the *WH*-criterion can only be satisfied in FP, where the verb carrying the feature [+wh] occurs. On the other hand, the NEG-criterion was shown (section 3.1 above) to apply in NegP, between the head Neg\(^0\) which hosts the trace of *nem* and the null negative operator. I will argue that in fact, it is satisfied solely at the level of the Neg P. Haegeman (1995) argues that the NEG-criterion cannot be satisfied by the trace of a negative phrase. Therefore, she concludes that in West Flemish, the NEG-criterion is satisfied in two different positions, where the actual negative phrases occur (see section 3 above). But, as discussed above, the NEG-criterion is in fact satisfied by the null operator in spec NegP. There is no need for it to be satisfied elsewhere. In fact, such a requirement would even be redundant. The position of negative phrases in independent from the satisfaction of the NEG-criterion itself.
Therefore, I would like to argue that in the case of (41c), the movement of semmit to an IP-external position is motivated not by the NEG-criterion, but by the Focus criterion, independently of its negative component. I will assume that in this case, as it is a focused negative phrase, it carries [+f] which must satisfy the Focus criterion: when the negative phrase occurs in spec FP, it carries a strong emphatic stress. That a non-negative focused phrase and a negative focused phrase cannot co-occur in spec FP (40b,c) can be accounted for as they both have a focus feature: as there can be only one (type of) focus operator, one of them will be excluded in the preverbal position. Indeed, there can be no absorption between a negative and a non-negative operator, hence no possibility of being interpreted as one operator. A negative phrase moves optionally to spec FP, and if it does, it is because it requires a focus interpretation.

The sentential scope of the negative phrase was argued to obtain through the presence of a scope marker, an expletive element member of the negative chain in spec NegP. Negative phrases which occur on spec FP belong to a chain/CHAIN which enables them to get sentential scope. In the case of a movement to spec FP, the head of the chain, that is the element which occurs at the top of the chain is the negative phrase in spec FP: it occupies a scope position. But I will assume that the chain must contain a member (i.e. a trace in this case) in spec NegP in order for the phrase to attain sentential scope as a negative element: the negative chain is licensed in spec NegP. Therefore, the representation of (40a) will be the following:

\[(42) \quad \text{[} \text{FP semmit}_i \quad \text{nem}_j \text{látott} \text{]}_i \text{OP [} \text{Neg}_j \text{t}_j \text{[} \text{Balázs t}_j \text{]}}\]

3.3 Negative concord

Consider the following examples:

(43)a. Balázs nem beszélt senkivel semmiröl.
   Balázs-nom neg speak-pas-3s nobody-instr nothing-delat.
   'Balázs didn't speak about anything with anybody.'
   b. Balázs nem beszélt semmiröl senkivel.
   'id.'
(44)a. Nem beszélt Balázs senkivel semmiröl.
   neg speak-pas-3s Balázs-nom nobody-instr nothing-delat.
   'Balázs didn't speak about anything with anybody.'
   b. Nem beszélt senkivel Balázs semmiröl.
   'id.'
The examples in (43), (44) above contain two negative phrases, *senkivel* ('with nobody') and *semmiröl* ('about nothing'). As shown by the glosses, these examples all exhibit Negative Concord (NC). This means that the various negative elements all contribute to a unique negative force in the sentence (see Zanuttini 1989). Haegeman and Zanuttini (1991) observe that NC applies to West Flemish under given constraints. Indeed, in order to enter NC, negative phrases must be scrambled out of the VP. If they do not, the result is a double negation (DN) reading:

(45)a. da Valère niemand nie (en-)kent
    that Valère nobody not en-knows
    'that Valère does not know anybody.'
b. da Valère nie niemand (en-)kent
    'that Valère doesn't know nobody' (DN)

In (45a), *niemand* ('nobody') precedes *nie*, which sits in spec NegP. In (45b), the same negative phrase follows the *nie*, and the reading is that of a double negation. Haegeman and Zanuttini (1991) conclude that in (45a), the negative phrase has scrambled out of the VP and adjoins to NegP, whereas in (45b), it stays inside VP.

Haegeman (1995) argues that the scrambling of the negative phrases follows from the fact that the NEG-criterion applies at S-structure in West Flemish. Therefore, all negative phrases which occur in spec NegP enter a NC relation with the negative element *nie*, as in (45a). On the other hand, when negative phrases are not scrambled out of the VP, they cannot have sentential scope and fail to enter into the NC relation.

As shown by examples (43) and (44) above, Hungarian negative phrases also enter into a NC relation. However, the following contrast is interesting:

(46)a. SENKIVEL nem beszét STEMMIRÖL.
    nobody-instr neg speak-pas-3s nothing-delat.
    'He didn't speak with anybody about anything.'
b. SENKIVEL nem beszél semmiröl.
    'He did not speak with anybody about nothing' (DN)

In the pair above, E-Kiss (p.c) notes that the NC reading obtains when the lower negative phrase receives stress, as in (46a). Whereas in (46b), the interpretation is that of a double negation (DN). This is due to the fact that the negative phrase *semmiröl* is not stressed. Although the DN reading does not seem to be available to all speakers, as pointed out by a reviewer, it seems that at least a subgroup of the native speakers does accept the contrast in
Objections to DN readings seem to be raised by the observation that Hungarian is an NC language (see e.g. Newson 1994, Toth 1995). However, as discussed in section 3.1. above, I take NC to apply only to the cases where several negative phrases contribute to the negative meaning of the sentence, the relation between one negative phrase and the negative marker being of a different type. Given this, the contrast in (45), to the extent that it is accepted by some speakers, is indeed a contrast with respect to NC versus DN interpretations. In fact, all examples containing negative phrases and which yield a NC reading require a stress, although the latter in not always prominent:

(47) Nem beszélt SENKIVEL Balázs SEMMIRŐL.

neg speak-pas-3s nobody-instr Balázs-nom nothing-delat

'Balázs didn't speak about anything with anybody.'

The examples above show that the presence of a stress is a condition on the NC reading of the negative phrases. In other words, stress enables the negative phrases to reach sentential scope. Brody (1990) also notes that "neg-phrases are always stressed in post verbal position: we have taken this throughout as indicating LF movement." (Brody 1990:224). In this approach, one will conclude that whereas negative phrases which enter into a NC move at LF, those who do not will stay in-situ. I would like to argue that it is not the case.

As discussed in section 3.1. above, negative elements which have sentential scope, and hence are able to enter into NC stay in a position which is not a scope position: as opposed to West Flemish negative phrases, they do not scramble out to spec NegP. On the other hand, they show some kind of contrast with negative phrases which do not carry stress and yield DN readings. One way out would be to say that at LF, the stressed phrases move, as opposed to the unstressed ones. However, this raises again the problem that negative phrases can move at S-structure, a fact which basically amounts to entering into a NC with the negative head. But they can also wait until LF. This is an undesirable result, as it leaves the question of the level of application of the NEG-criterion and that of scope assignment open.

I will argue that the difference between NC sentences like (45a) and DN sentences as in (45b) lies in the fact that negative phrases which result in a DN reading do not belong to a negative chain/CHAIN as discussed in section (3.1): they are in no way related to the position in NegP. Therefore, they cannot reach sentential scope: indeed, the lack of NC reading shows that their scope is not that of the negative marker and/or other negative phrases. Typically, they occupy an A-position which cannot allow them to qualify as operators. Thus, the representation of (45a) and (45b) will be, respectively, (47a) and (47b), as far as the lower negative phrase is concerned:
In (47a), *semmiről* belongs to a CHAIN <SM; semmiről>; the same negative phrase in (47b) does not appear in a CHAIN. The fact that in (47a), the negative phrase belongs to a negative CHAIN whose head is adjoined to spec NegP enables it, or more precisely the CHAIN, to reach sentential scope. Such a possibility is not available in (47b), where the negative phrase occupies an A-position and does not belong to a CHAIN/chain which has access to spec NegP.

Consider now the following:

(48) Nem beszélt SEMMIT meg SENKIVEL neg speak-pas-3s nothing-acc part nobody-instr

'He didn't discuss anything with anybody.'

In (48) above, the contentive *semmit* ('nothing') precedes the particle. It occupies spec NegP. As noted in section 3.1 above, it is heavily stressed. It forms a negative chain with its trace. In this case, the contentive occurs at the head of the chain <*semmit*; t>. On the other hand, *senkivel* does not appear in spec NegP. However, it contributes to the NC reading in the same way as the other negative phrase. As discussed above, it is part of a CHAIN <SM; *senkivel*>. I will propose that the NC reading obtains because the two chains "intersect" in spec NegP, where they get sentential scope and can undergo absorption. As discussed above, negative elements adjoined to spec NegP are able to undergo neg-absorption, forming a unique negative operator which is interpreted as a unique sentential negation reading. As negative phrases carry a feature [+neg]. I will assume that in the case of NC, the feature [+neg] is transmitted to the expletive head of the chain: thus the whole chain is [+neg]. It enables the assignment of sentential scope to the negative phrase, via the element in spec NegP.

I will conclude that in a negative chain/CHAIN, if the contentive is at the head, it is stressed. On the other hand, if it is at the foot, the stress is passed on to it: I assume that the reason is that expletives do not realise stress. Note, however, that this stress cannot be assimilated with the stress assigned in spec FP, which has a strong emphatic or identificational reading. Therefore, it cannot be argued that these negative phrases carry [+f].

Consider now the following:

(49)a. SENKIVEL SEMMIRÖL nem beszélt Balázs.
nobody-instr nothing-delat neg speak-pas-3s Balázs-nom

'Balázs didn't speak with anybody about anything.'
b. Balázs SENKIVEL SEMMIRÖL nem beszélt.
' id'  
c. *SENKIVEL Balázs SEMMIRÖL nem beszélt.

The examples above show that more than one negative phrase can occur pre-verbally. In this case, they all enter into a NC relation. They might be preceded by a constituent (49b), which occurs in the topic position, but they cannot be separated by a constituent (49c). The negative phrases must be adjacent. So, as opposed to a focused phrase, negative phrases can be stacked in the focus slot. The reason is that as they enter NC, they undergo absorption: indeed, the negative phrases are interpreted as contributing to one and only one sentential negation. I will assume that the first negative phrase sits in spec FP, and the other one(s) adjoin to spec FP:

(50)a. FP
    spec
      spec
        spec senkivel
          F'
            F0 IP

As in the case of a single preverbal negative phrase, the negative phrases occur as elements of negative chains. I have argued that the NC reading obtains when negative chains are able to be assigned sentential scope in spec NegP. I propose that negative phrases in spec FP head jointly a negative chain, whose trace occurs in spec NegP. The full representation for (50a) will then be:

(50)b. [FP Senkivel semmiröl in/k [nem beszélt [NegP t½k OP [Neg t [Balázs t½ t½ ]]]]

3.4 Pre-verbal and post-verbal negative phrases

We have seen that negative phrases can either occur inside IP, in which case they enter into an expletive chain whose head occurs in the relevant scope position, or in spec FP, in which case sentential scope is also assigned to a negative chain, whose head is the contentive negative phrase. Consider now a third possibility, which combines the two others:

(51)a. SENKIVEL nem beszélt Balázs SEMMIRÖL.
    nobody-instr neg speak-pas-3s Balázs-nom nothing-delat
'Balázs didn't speak with anybody about anything.'

b. SEHOL nem beszélt SENKIVEL Balázs SEMMIRÖL.

nowhere neg speak-pas-3s nobody-instr Balázs-nom nothing-delat.

'Balázs didn't speak about anything anywhere with anybody.'

The examples above show that several negative phrases can occur in the sentence in several surface positions: in (51a), senkivel ('with nobody') occupies spec FP and semmiröl ('about nothing') occurs inside IP, either in its VP-internal base-position or in another "canonical" indirect object position\(^{24}\). In (51b), sehol ('nowhere') sits in spec FP, and senkivel ('with nobody') and semmiröl ('about nothing') occupy IP-internal positions (senkivel might be adjoined to spec NegP). In both cases, the various negative phrases enter into a NC relation with one another. The fact that these phrases occur in different positions and still enter into NC speaks in favour of an analysis in terms of chains. I will argue that the chains/CHAINS in which the various negative phrases occur all contain a member which occupies spec NegP; it is in this position that absorption can take place, enabling the negative phrases to enter a NC relation. The representation of (51a), details aside, will be the following:

\[
(52) \quad [\text{FP}_i \text{SENKIVEL}_t \text{[} \text{nem}_k \text{beszélt} \text{]} \text{IP}_j \text{[} \text{NegP}_i \text{t}_i \text{SM}_m \text{OP}_j \text{[} \text{Neg}_0 \text{t}_k \text{[}\text{Balázs SEMMIRÖL}_m \text{t}_l\text{]}}]
\]

The chains which contain the different negative phrases "cross" in spec NegP. Indeed, if we want to account for the NC reading in the above configuration, it is not possible to say that sentential scope is assigned at the level of FP for senkivel and at the level of NegP for semmiröl. The two negative phrases occur in negative chains which have an element in the same specifier, namely spec NegP, where absorption can take place. This is where sentential scope can be assigned and NC obtains.

3.4 Summary

Hungarian negative sentences optionally contain negative phrases. I have argued that given the optionality of the negative phrases, they could not be assimilated to the elements which, in other languages, form a bi-partite negation. I have proposed that in sentences with negative phrases, as in bare sentential negation, the NEG-criterion is satisfied by a null negative operator in spec NegP.

Negative phrases were observed to have sentential scope, in the same way as the negative marker nem. It was also observed that as opposed to West Flemish, the negative phrases do not always appear in a scope position: they can either occupy spec FP or "low", IP-internal A-positions. I have proposed that in the latter case, negative phrases form a
representational chain whose head is an expletive scope marker. This scope marker adjoins to spec NegP and enables the chain, and hence the negative phrase, to get sentential scope. I have argued that negative elements which appear in spec FP do not move for negative scope reasons, but because they are focused: the movement is constrained by the Focus-criterion. As negative elements, they are interpreted as sentential negation because they belong to a chain some element of which is adjoined to spec NegP. This is where neg-absorption can take place.

I have also examined the cases where several negative phrases occur in a negative sentence. It was shown that these negative phrases can enter into Negative concord, but that they do not do so obligatorily. In fact, the NC reading is linked to stress. I have argued that the difference between the cases where the NC reading obtains and the instances of double negation cannot be a matter of LF-movement versus no movement. Rather, I proposed that the negative phrases which enter into NC, that is have identical, sentential scope, enter into a negative chain whose head appears in spec NegP, the locus of negative sentential scope assignment. Negative phrases which exhibit no NC are not part of a negative chain.

The occurrence of negative phrases with identical scope in different positions in the sentence reinforces the proposal that negative elements are assigned sentential scope in one unique position, that is spec NegP. Thus, an analysis in terms of chains/CHAINS accounts for the different positions of negative phrases.

4 The case of sem

4.1 sem and nem

Brody (1990) discusses negative phrases on the basis of examples in which there is a systematic alternation between the negative marker nem and the negative particle sem. He notes that "phrases containing negative polarity items like senki (nobody), soha (never),(...) must precede c-focus, uq-phrases and is" (Brody 1990:222). He gives the following examples:

(53)a. SENKIT nem/sem szeretek.
    NOBODY(ACC) not/also not like-I
    'I don't like anybody.'

b. SENKIT nem/sem PETER szeret
    NOBODY(ACC) not/also not P likes
    'PETER doesn't like anybody.'

Brody argues that sem is a contracted form of is and nem, ('also' and 'not') and that when the negative items are not followed by the contracted form sem, it is "due to a minor rule optionally deleting is in the context '[neg-phrase--]'" (Brody 1990:222).
Although Brody (1990) gives the two examples as illustrating the same phenomenon, I will consider the two cases separately.

Let us look at (53a) first (53b will be discussed in section 4.3). The two variants in (53a) are both grammatical. However, I will argue that they might belong in fact to two different phenomena. The behaviour of *senki sem* and *senki (nem)* are different and the two forms belong to two different constructions, involving different structural positions. Indeed, in a context like (53a), *sem* cannot be a variant of *nem*:

(54)a. *Sem ismeri Balázs az olasz filmeket.*
   \[\text{sem know-pres-3s Balázs-nom the Italian films-acc}\]
   
   b. *Sem ismer Balázs semmit.*
   \[\text{sem know-pres-3s Balázs-nom nothing-acc}\]

The examples above show that *sem* does not function like the negative marker *nem* discussed in the previous sections. It cannot occur on its own (54a); it cannot occur separated from the negative phrase (54b). Consider now the following:

(55)a. *Semmit BALÁZS nem ismer.*
   \[\text{nothing-acc Balázs-nom neg know-pres-3s}\]
   
   b. Semmit sem BALÁZS nem ismer.
   \[\text{nothing not-also Balázs-nom neg know-pres-3s}\]
   \[\text{It is Balázs who knows nothing at all.}\]
   \[\text{= There is no x, such that it is Balázs who does not know x.}\]

As shown by (55), the sequence *semmit sem* -focused phrase is grammatical (55b), whereas the sequence *semmit* - focused phrase is not (55a). The gloss in (55b) shows that the sentence contains a focus negation as well as a sentence negation. The sentence negation is precisely expressed by the negative marker *nem* which is distinct from *sem*. The latter is related to a negative expression which is focalised. Obviously, *senki + sem* can be focused, despite the presence of a non-negative focused phrase. As discussed in the previous sections, this is not possible when negative phrases of the type *senki* occur on their own. Another argument to distinguish the two types of negation is illustrated by (56) below:

(56)a. Senkivel semmiről nem beszélt Balázs.
   \[\text{nobody-instr nothing-delat neg speak-pas-3s Balázs-nom}\]
   \[\text{'Balázs didn't speak about anything to anybody.'}\]
   
   b. *Senkivel sem semmiről sem beszélt Balázs.*
   \[\text{nobody-instr. not-also nothing-delat not-also speak-pas-3s Balázs-nom}\]
(56a) shows that several *senki*-type negative phrases can occur in a sequence. This is not possible with *senki sem*-type phrases (56b). The fact that in similar contexts, the sequences *senki nem* and *senki sem* behave differently leads us to the conclusion that whereas the former is composed of a negative phrase which precedes the sentential negative marker *nem*, the latter is a negative phrase on its own, which is formed of a *senki* type negative phrase and a negative element *sem*. This negative element *sem* is not a sentential negative marker (see 54), but some kind of constituent negative marker.

Brody (1990) proposes that *sem* is a contracted form of *is* ('also') and negation. I will rather consider it as a negative equivalent if *is*, that is distinct from the negative marker *nem*:

(57)a. Az olasz filmet is látta Balázs.
    the Italian film also see-pas-3s Balázs-nom
    'Balázs saw also the Italian film.'

b. Az olasz filmet sem látta Balázs.
    the Italian film-acc also-not see-pas-3s Balázs-nom
    'Balázs didn't see the Italian film either.'

(57) shows that *is*-phrases and *sem*-phrases are parallel, *sem* (57b) being the negative counterpart of *is* (57a). Consider also the following:

(58)a. SEMMIT nem ismer Balázs.
    nothing-acc neg know-pres-3s Balázs-nom
    'Balázs doesn't know anything.'

b. SEMMIT *sem* ismer Balázs.
    'Balázs doesn't know anything (at all).' 

c. %SEMMIT SEM nem ismer Balázs.
    'id.'

Example (58a) shows that the bare negative phrase *semmit* occurs in the position which precedes [*nem*+verb]. Indeed, I have argued that it occupies spec FP (see section 3.2). In (58b), the constituent *semmit sem* also occurs preceding the verb. In this case, the negative marker *nem* is not present. I would like to propose that the sequence *sem-nem* undergoes a phonological reduction and the output is *sem*. Indeed, Katalin E-Kiss (p.c.) observes that some dialects of Hungarian allow for the co-occurrence of *semmit sem* and *nem*, as in (58c). I will assume that in these cases, the phonological rule does not apply.
Therefore, I consider *sem* as the negative counterpart of *is* and *senki sem* type phrases (as in (56b)) as one negative constituent of the *is/sem* type, which is different from the negative phrase *senkit*.

Let us now examine the position of the *is/sem* phrase. Brody (1990) gives the following examples:

(59)a. *Senkit sem mindenki szeret.*
    nobody-acc also not everybody likes
    'EVERYBODY doesn't like anybody.'

b. *Senkit sem Peter is szeret.*
    nobody-acc also not Peter also likes

In (59a), *senkit sem* precedes a universal quantifier, and the sentence is fine. On the other hand, when it precedes an *is*-phrase, as in (59b), the result is ungrammatical. Brody argues that universal quantifiers occur in a projection higher than FP and that *is* also projects a functional projection on top of the quantifiers. The "focus field" is thus optionally composed of (recursive) FP-projections, the highest one headed by *is*, and the lowest one hosting the focused phrases. Brody (1990) argues that *is* is the head of a functional focus projection, and that the XP sits in the specifier.  

In Puskás (1996b), *is* is analysed as forming one constituent with the adjacent XP and occupying the spec position of a functional projection. I will retain this analysis for *sem*-phrases: *sem* forms a negative phrase with the constituent it occurs with. I will therefore assume that the head of the *semP* in phonetically null. A sentence like (55b) will then have the following representation:

(60)  
\[
\text{SemP} \\
\text{spec} \quad \text{Sem'} \\
\quad \text{semmit sem} \\
\quad \text{Sem'}^0 \quad \text{FP} \\
\quad \text{spec} \quad \text{Balázs} \\
\quad \text{F'}^0 \quad \text{IP} \\
\]  

\[
\text{nem ismer}
\]
If we assume, as discussed above, that *sem*-phrases are the negative counterparts of *is*-phrases, the pair in (59) follows: *sem*-phrases occur in the functional projection which dominates the position of universal quantifiers. The contrast between (55a) and (55b) above can thus be accounted for: bare negative phrases occur in spec FP, position to which they move to satisfy the Focus-criterion. On the other hand, *sem*-phrases move to spec *is/sem*P.

Consider now the following:

(61)a. Senkivel *sem*miröl nem beszélt Balázs.
    nobody-instr nothing-delat neg speak-pas-3s Balázs-nom
    'Balázs didn't speak about anything to anybody.'

b. *Senkivel sem semmiröl sem beszélt Balázs.
    nobody-instr not-also nothing-delat not-also speak-pas-3s Balázs-nom

(61a) follows from the analysis of negative phrases in section 3 above. On the other hand, the ungrammaticality of (61b) is straightforwardly accounted for: as *sem*-phrases occupy the spec of *is/sem*P, there can be no recursion of *sem*-phrases. As in the case of positive *is*-phrases, they cannot undergo LF absorption.

However, the following data seems to contradict predictions generated by the analysis given above:

(62)a. Soha senkivel semmiröl sem beszélt Balázs.
    never nobody-instr nothing-delat sem speak-pas-3s Balázs-nom
    'Balázs never spoke to anyone (at all) about anything (at all).'</n
b. *Senkivel sem semmiröl nem beszélt Balázs.
    nobody-instr sem nothing-delat neg speak-pas-3s Balázs-nom

(62a), in which several bare negative phrases precede the *sem*-phrase is fine. This seems to go against what one would expect under an analysis in which *sem*-phrases precede the focus position in which bare negative phrases occur. On the other hand, (62b), in which a *sem*-phrase precedes a bare negative phrase, is ruled out, again contrary to predictions.

A reviewer suggests that (62a) argues in favour of an analysis in the line of Brody (1990), namely that if we take *sem* to be a head, negative phrases then occur in the specifier position and undergo absorption. However, the following could be taken as a drawback to this alternative analysis:

(63)a. ?? Nem beszélt semmit sem meg a barátaival.
    neg speak-pas-3s nothing-acc sem part the friends-instr-poss
    'He didn't arrange anything (at all) with his friends.'
b. Nem beszélt meg semmit sem a barátaival.
   neg speak-pas-3s part nothing-acc also not the friends-poss-instr
   'He didn't discuss anything at all with his friends.'

As illustrated by (63a,b), the *sem*-phrase can occur in a position inside IP. Besides, although the status of (63a) is rather marginal, it is not ruled out completely. In this case, the *sem* phrase appears in spec NegP. In (63b), it occurs lower, as it follows the particle. If *sem* is to be analysed as a head, one has to postulate (at least) three different *sem* heads in three different functional projections. This seems to be rather a high cost. I will therefore go on assuming that *sem*-phrases are units which function as one negative constituent.

Coming back to (62a), I will propose that the negative phrases undergo absorption, but in NegP, as was discussed for multiple bare negative phrases as well (see section 3.2). Therefore, when they appear in spec *SemP*, they already form a unit, which heads one negative chain. They are licensed in this position as they form an amalgamated negative *sem* phrase:

(64) \[[\text{SemP Soha}_i \text{ senkivel}_j \text{ semmiröl}_k \text{ sem [Ppbeszélt [NegP tűj/k [... Balázs]]]}\]

How can we account for the ungrammaticality of (62b)? I will propose, as a corollary to the analysis of (62a), that when a *sem* negative chain occupies spec NegP, a bare negative chain (without the *sem* feature) cannot appear simultaneously. This could be accounted for as a problem due to restrictions in neg-absorption. If negative phrases undergo absorption in spec NegP with a *sem*-chain, they will appear in spec *SemP*, as is the case in (62a). On the other hand, if there is no neg-absorption between the two types of negative phrases, the coexistence of the two types of chains will be ruled out, as the coexistence of the two, non-absorbed, types of negative operators in spec NegP is ruled out. Therefore, in the preverbal positions, *sem* phrases can appear, or bare negative phrases, but not the two. On the other hand, a non-negative focused phrase will not be ruled out, as there is no absorption, focused phrases not entering into NC with negative phrases (see 55b).

4.2 *Sem*-phrases and the NEG-criterion

Consider now the following pair:

(65)a. *Balázs* semmit sem ismer.

Balázs nothing sem know-pres-3s

b. Semmit sem Balázs nem ismer.
   nothing-acc sem Balázs-nom neg know-pres-3s
   'Balázs knows nothing at all.'
The ungrammaticality of (65a) above can be accounted for as a violation of the Focus-criterion: the focused phrase Balázs does not occupy the required position in which it enters a spec-head relation with the head carrying [+f], namely F₀, which hosts the verb ismer ('knows'). However, the fact that (65b) is fine shows that, as opposed to bare senki-phrases, the sem phrase does not compete for the same position as the focused phrase. Recall that it was argued in section 3.2 that bare negative phrases move to spec FP to satisfy the Focus-criterion. As discussed above, senki sem-type phrases occur in a spec position higher than FP, where they get interpreted as focused, since they belong to the focus field. I will assume that as for (positive) is-phrases, they are assigned [+f] when they occur in the focus field, in the position in which they are licensed. Therefore, the negative phrase semmit sem in (65b) does not sit in a spec position in which it could satisfy the NEG-criterion. This reinforces the argument made above that the NEG-criterion is satisfied in NegP by a null negative operator, and that if negative phrases move to the preverbal position, it is for independent reasons. As mentioned above (section 4.1), the movement of sem-phrases to the preverbal position is not obligatory:

(66) Balázs nem látott semmit sem.

Balázs neg see-pas-3s nothing-acc sem
'Balázs didn't see anything at all.'

Although (66) is not the preferred word-order (the sem-phrase occurs low in the structure, maybe in spec AgrOP), it is acceptable, with a stress on the negative phrase. I have argued above (see section 3.2) that stressed negative phrases enter into a negative CHAIN whose head is a null expletive occupying a spec NegP adjoined position. I will say that in the case of sem-phrases, this is exactly what happens. Therefore, in (66), the head of the CHAIN <SM, semmit sem> adjoins to spec NegP, yielding the sentential scope reading.

4.3 Sentences without sentential negative marker

Let us now come back to (53b), repeated here:

(53)b. SENKIT nem/sem PETER szeret

NOBODY(ACC) not/also not P likes
'PETER doesn't like anybody.'

In both versions, that is the one with sem and the one with nem, the negative phrase precedes the focused phrase Péter. However, neither the negative phrase nem nor, to that matter, the
negative element *sem* are adjacent to the verb. This seems to speak against all previous assumptions concerning the status of *nem* as sentential negative marker and as a clitic appearing on the verb in F³. A closer look at the facts will enable us to distinguish these cases from the ones discussed in the sections above. Indeed, the exact gloss of (67a), an equivalent to the *sem* version of (53b), is given in (67b):

(67)a. Semmit *sem* BALÁZS ismer.
   
   nothing-acc *sem* Balázs-nom know-pres-3s
   'BALÁZS knows nothing (at all).'</b>
   
   b. There is no x, such that BALÁZS knows x.

It seems that in this case, instead of a negated verb, the sentence contains a declarative form. The fact that there is no real sentential negation is confirmed by the following:

(68) *Semmit *sem* BALÁZS mondott senkinek.
   
   nothing-acc *sem* Balázs-nom say-pas-3s nobody-dat

The fact that (68) is ungrammatical shows that *semmit sem* does not involve sentence negation: indeed, *senkinek* is not licensed in a non-negative context. The variant with *nem* can be taken here as alternating with the *sem* version, as an expression of constituent negation. Similarly, the examples given in Brody (1990) and involving universal quantifiers, as mentioned in section 4.1 above, do not contain a negative marker *nem*. Again, their reading will not be that of sentential negation. Compare with the following cases of constituent negation:

(69)a. NEM BALÁZST láttam.
   
   neg Balázs-acc see-pas-1s
   'It is not BALÁZS that I saw.'
   
   b. *NEM BALÁZST láttam senkivel.
   
   neg Balázs-acc see-pas-1s nobody-instr

In (69a), the focused constituent *Balázs* is negated. As in the cases above, there is no negative marker *nem* in the immediate pre-verbal position. The sentence is not interpreted as carrying a sentential negative force: the negative element *nem* only negates the element it precedes. The ungrammaticality of (69b) can be assimilated to that of (68) above: the negative phrase *senkivel* is not licensed, as there is no sentential negation marker, and hence no sentential negation.
Therefore, I will assume that the NEG-criterion has nothing to say about these cases: as they can appear independently from sentence negation, and hence without a sentence negation marker, they will be interpreted as not involving sentence negation at all. I will assume that these sentences do not have a NegP at all. Hence, scope relations will be different from that of negative phrases which do belong to sentential negation, as they will not be related to NegP.

4.4 Summary

In this section, I have examined the behaviour of the negative particle *sem*. I have proposed, contra Brody (1990), that *sem* does not alternate with *nem*, at least not as sentential negation marker. I have argued that *sem* is the negative counterpart of *is* and that *sem*-phrases form one negative unit which occurs in the specifier of a *SemP* whose head is phonetically null. This spec position is distinct from spec FP in which bare negative phrases appear. As in the cases of negative phrases, the NEG-criterion is satisfied by a null operator in spec NegP. The *sem*-phrases reach sentential scope as a negative chain which undergoes neg-absorption in spec NegP. The occurrence of *sem*-phrases in spec *SemP* is motivated by other independent factors.

Finally, I have discussed the cases where the *sem*-phrase occurs jointly with a focused phrase but without negative marker. I have argued that here, *sem* might alternate with *nem*, but that neither of the negative elements involves sentential negation. Rather, they express some kind of constituent negation, which can appear independently from sentential negation and which does not license other negative phrases.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I argue that negative sentences contain a NegP, a functional projection which is projected inside IP. I show that NegP is the projection where the NEG-criterion, an instance of the more general AFFECT-criterion, applies in Hungarian. I argue that bare sentential negation involves a null operator, which satisfies the spec-head configuration requirement of the NEG-criterion. The latter applies at S-structure in Hungarian.

I also examine the occurrence of negative phrases. They are allowed to surface in different positions, namely IP-internal A-positions as well as IP-external scope positions. I argue that the NEG-criterion is systematically satisfied at the level of NegP by a null negative operator. A corollary to this is that negative phrases do not play a role in the NEG-criterion per se. However, the negative phrases in different positions are interpreted as having identical scope. I propose that this is possible because negative phrases enter into a representational chain or a derivational chain, a member of which adjoins to spec NegP. Therefore sentential scope is assigned to negative chains/CHAINS and the contentive negative phrase is interpreted...
as having sentential scope. The presence of negative phrases in spec FP, a focus position, is
due to independent reasons.

The cases of Negative Concord which include negative phrases in different positions
in the sentence are also straightforwardly accounted for: whatever their surface position, a
member of the negative chain they belong to occurs in spec NegP, enabling identical scope
and neg-absorption.

Finally, I examine the case of negative phrases involving the particle sem. I argue that
negative sem phrases differ from bare negative phrases with respect to the position in which
they occur in the focus field. The fact that sem-phrases occur in the focus field in a position in
which they do not enter a spec-head relation with a negative head reinforces the claim that the
NEG-criterion involves solely NegP.

---

1 E-Kiss (1992) proposes in fact that SVO patterns involve a subject in Topic position, and that there are no
neutral order sentences.

2 Verbal particles usually give a perfective meaning to the verb they occur with. Marácz (1992) gives an
elaborate sentence structure which includes an Asp(ect)P headed by the particle. The S-part-V-O order results
from the lowering of the agreement and tense morphemes to Asp⁰ hosting the particle, position to which the verb
also adjoins.

3 Rizzi (1990b) proposes that functional heads belong to different types and can be characterized by features,
where [+I] designates predication and [+C] propositional content. Typically, components of IP are [+I], whereas
components of C are [+C] (and [+I +C] in case of V2 languages). On a full discussion of split CP and its
components, see Rizzi (1995).

4 The reader is referred to Puskás (1996a) for a discussion of the extraction of focused phrases from embedded
clauses, as well as for an account of the selection of a [+wh] embedded clause "at a distance" by a verb. Among
others, the paper discusses the contrast in grammaticality between (i) and (ii) below:

(i) Ez az a film amiröl pÉTERREL gondolom hogy beszéltünk.
   this that the film which-delat Peter-instr think-pres-1s that talk-pas-1pl
   'This is the film about which I think that we talked WITH PETER.'
(ii) *Hogy gondolod hogy EZT A FELADATOT oldotta meg?
  how think-pres-2s that this problem-acc resolve-pas-3s part
  'How do you think that he solved THIS PROBLEM?'

Indeed, (i) involves a relative extraction across a focused phrase, whereas (ii) is a wh-extraction, again across a
focus. Summarising, the paper argues that whereas focus and wh use the same CP (-type) slot, relativization
involves another CP-type projection. Horváth (1986) also discusses the difference between focussing and
relativization in the sense that wh-phrases land in the focus position, which is distinct from spec CP, the landing-
site of relative phrases. In her account, however, long focussing uses (the only) spec CP as an escape hatch, a
claim that does not seem to be supported by the following:

(iii) ..a lány akivel BALÁZST gondolom hogy látták
      the girl with-whom Balázs-acc think-pres-1s that see-pas-3pl
    'the girl with whom I think they saw BALÁZS.'

(iv) ..a lány akivel TEGNAP gondolom hogy látták.
      the girl with-whom yeszerday think-pres-1s that see-pas-3pl
    'the girl with whom I think that they saw (him) YESTERDAY.'

As shown by the examples above, a focused phrase and a relative phrase can be extracted simultaneously from an
embedded clause, both when the focused phrase is an argument (iii) and when it is an adjunct (iv).

On a different approach to long focusing, see also Liptál (1996).

5 In fact, it is not the verb which moves, but what occupies T0. Indeed, the carrier of the feature [+f] can also be a
predicative adjective:

(i) AZ OLASZ FILMEK érdekesek.
    the italian films-acc interesting-pl
    'It is the Italian films which are interesting.'

In this case, the focused phrase is adjacent to the predicative adjective. I will assume that the adjective moves to
T0, from where it reaches F0.

See Brody (1995a) for a similar proposal, on different grounds.

6 On the relevance of keeping the WH-criterion and the Focus-criterion separate, see Puskás (1996b).

7 As the extracted elements are adjuncts, their trace must be properly antecedent governed under the conditions
given in Rizzi (1990):

(i) X antecedent-governs Y iff
    (i) X and Y are non-distinct
    (ii) X c-commands Y
    (iii) no barrier intervenes
    (iv) Relativized Minimality is respected
where Relativized Minimality is defined as:
(ii) Relativized Minimality: X \( \alpha \)-governs Y only if there is no such Z that

(i) Z is a base-generated position

(ii) Z is \( \alpha \)-G(overment) T(hory) compatible with Y

(iii) Z c-commands Y and does not c-command X

Toth accounts for the ungrammaticality of the given examples in the following way: spec NegP counts as an intervening position, that is a position of the same type as spec FP, and thus blocks the government relation between the moved element and its trace.

8 Note that the contrast could not be accounted for by a ban on the cooccurrence of a negative \( \Sigma^0 \) and a wh-phrase, as the following are fine in Hungarian:

(i) Kit láttál?
   who-acc see-pas-2s
   'Who did you see?'

(ii) Kit nem láttál?
    who-acc neg see-pas-2s
    'Who didn't you see?'

9 A reviewer notes that negation does not always block long extraction:

(i) Mikor nem szeretnéd hogy érkezzem
    when neg like-cond-2s that arrive-subj-1s
    'When would you not like it if I arrived?'

(ii) MA ESTE nem szeretném, ha jönnél.
    tonight neg like-cond-1s if arrive-cond-2s
    'IT IS TONIGHT that I would not like it if you arrived.'

Case (i) illustrates extraction from a subjunctive clause. Case (ii) is extraction of a specific phrase across negation. It seems that subjunctive has properties which differ from indicative clauses with respect to extraction (Polish, for example, allows for wh-extraction only from a subjunctive clause). As for (ii), I have no straightforward answer to the problem. It might be that specific phrases parallel with arguments in the sense that they carry some kind of referential index. Their extraction could then be assimilated to that of arguments.

10 The clitic status of nem seems to be challenged by the following (due to a reviewer):

(i) János alszik, Péter viszont nem.
    John-nom sleep-pres-3s Peter-nom on the other hand neg
    'John is sleeping, but Peter is not.'

where in the second, elliptical clause, the negative marker can appear on its own. In fact, the structure of elliptical sentences should be examined in detail, among others with respect to focusing and other A’-left peripheral phenomena. The nature of the inflectional projections, for example, should also be taken into account, as well as
the exact properties of this negative element in elliptical contexts. I have, of course, no answer to these problems, but it is clear that the matter is worth pursuing.

11 On the motivations for a TP occurring above AgrSP, see Puskás (1996b), in which it is argued that SVO order sentences have the subject in a non-canonical position (spec DefP) which licenses only definite subjects, the canonical subject position being post-verbal.

12 A reviewer argues that in some cases, the lower construal is never available anyway. He/she suggests that the examples be compared with the following:

(i) Hogyan szeretnéd, hogy megfogalmazzam?
   'How would you want that I express (it)('?'

(ii) Hogyan nem szeretnéd, hogy megfogalmazzam?
   'How would you not want that I express (it)('?'

The reviewer suggests that in this case, the two sentences are ambiguous. However, if this really is the case, it might have to do again with properties of subjunctive clauses. I will leave this aside. Note that the judgements concerning the unambiguous reading of (24a) in the text is not shared by all speakers.

13 Toth (1995) notes that negative phrases of the type se-NPI's are intrinsically negative. Indeed, morphologically, they are composed of the negative part se and the wh-word ki ('who'), mi ('what'), mikor ('when'), etc.

14 In fact, Ildiko Toth (p.c) confirms that the se-phrases might not be polarity items as such.

15 West Flemish is a V2 language: in main clauses, the verb moves to C0.

16 Although E-Kiss (1987, 1992) claims that VP is flat and that constituents occur in any order, the order subject-object seems much more natural. I do not want to discuss this here. However, as pointed out to me by Nedzad Leko (p.c.), the VP-internal position of the subject might pose a problem for case checking.

17 Although Brody's (1995b) LLF theory excludes movement in general and adopts a purely representational approach, in this paper I will only adopt the notion of CHAIN headed by an expletive and not go into the main point of his argument, namely the suppression of any syntactic level involved in a derivation. For an analysis using LLF theory, see Puskás (1996b).
I will assume that the foot of the neg-CHAIN can be an element in an A-position, or an A-chain, that is a chain formed by an element in a (functional) A-position and its trace. This amounts to saying that in case \textit{semmit} occurs in spec AgrOP, it counts, with its trace in base-position, as one element of the neg-CHAIN.

Thanks to Szilvia Papp for pointing this out to me.

A reviewer notes that in (41b), the negation has scope over the \textit{wh}-phrase, which is semantically uninterpretable. Therefore this cannot be a strong proof that negative phrases occupy spec FP. However, the position of negative phrases follows "by elimination", as there is no semantic reason to exclude neg-focus sequences.

The interaction, e.g. scope relations, between negative phrases which enter into NC and those which do not remains to be explored. As this goes beyond the scope of the present paper, I will keep all the issues related to this problem, including interaction between negative elements and other quantified expressions for (near) future research. Thanks to the reviewer who suggested these extensions to me.

Indeed, there is a difference in reading between (i) and (ii) below:

(i) Balázs \textit{semmit} nem láttott.
   Balazs nothing-acc neg see-pas-3s
   'Balazs didn't see \textit{ANYTHING}.'

(ii) Balázs nem láttott \textit{semmit}.
   'Balazs didn't see anything.'

Whereas in (i), the negative phrase has a strong emphatic or even contrastive interpretation (and in that sense corresponds to the 'focus' of the sentence), (ii) would rather correspond to a non-contrastive, maybe somehow 'corrective' kind of stress. I will leave for further research the question of how this stress is assigned; it seems that a non-contrastive, non-'identificational' type of stress is available for other types of quantificational elements as well. Note that to some extent, this happens in other languages as well. L. Rizzi (p.c.) points out that in Italian, where contrastive focus occurs sentence-initially, a kind of corrective focus in assigned IP-internally.

The reason why focused phrases cannot adjoin to spec FP is that they do not undergo LF absorption. Indeed, if focused phrases are interpreted, following Kenesei (1984) as "exclusion by identification", the identificational property of focusing is in my view incompatible with absorption.

Brody (1995a) argues that IP could also contain an AgrIO P.

Thanks to the reviewer who pointed this out to me.
Semantically, *sem*-phrases have an interpretation of a strongly negated element: although it was argued that *sem* is the negative counterpart of *is* (‘also’), in the cases where it occurs with negative phrases, its meaning is not that of negative phrase+neither, as it is the case with non-negative phrases. Rather, the *sem* corroborates the negative strength of the phrase it attaches to.

Interestingly, the examples above do not contain a negative marker *nem* adjacent to the verb. In fact, the examples do not involve sentence negation. The gloss given for (56a) can only be interpreted as meaning “there is no person such that everybody likes him”. It seems that sentence negation cannot involve positive universal quantifiers. However, I will assume that this does not modify the behaviour of the *sem*-negative phrases. This is discussed in section 4.3 below.

Although this is given here as a mere observation, one can stipulate that the properties of *is*/*sem* phrases do not allow for absorption. Indeed, *also* can be analyzed as a focusing particle, along with *only* and *even* (see Bayer 1996). Focusing particles might thus have the property of not being able to undergo absorption, as opposed to quantificational elements.

Licensing in this case may be that they carry some *is* feature which forces them to move to spec *is*/*sem* P.
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