Sentential negation in Hungarian

Genoveva Puskás

The expression of sentential negation has been the object of a number of recent studies (Moritz 1989, Pollock 1989, Laka 1990, Ouhalla 1990, Haegeman & Zanuttini 1991, Zanuttini 1991). According to Haegeman & Zanuttini (1991), the distribution and interpretation of negative constituents is subject to the NEG criterion, a well-formedness condition which applies universally at LF, but may apply at S-Structure in some languages. The present paper starts from the observation that the distribution of negative elements in Hungarian is highly constrained, in contrast with non-negative constituents. I will argue that the movement of negative elements is accounted for by the NEG criterion and that in Hungarian too, the NEG criterion applies at S-Structure.

The paper is organised as follows: Section 1 gives an overall description of sentential negation in Hungarian. In section 2, I give a short description of the functional projection NegP and of its position within the structure of the negative sentences (2.1); it is followed by a discussion of the NEG criterion (2.2) and the levels at which it applies (2.3). Section 3 briefly discusses the structure of the sentence in Hungarian. This structure contains a projection FP whose head F hosts the verb and carries the feature + focus. Section 4 looks at sentential negation in Hungarian. Hungarian has an obligatory negative marker which is the head of NegP and can combine with optional negative operators which may sit in two different positions, either spec NegP or spec FP (4.1). The movement of the operators exclusively to these positions is due to the NEG criterion (4.2). Section 5 discusses the phenomenon of Negative Concord (5.1) and its manifestations in Hungarian (5.2). We shall see that the movement of negative operators is also strictly linked to Negative Concord. In contrast, section 6 deals with cases of double negation. It is shown that DN readings can only be obtained under the assumption that there is no movement of the negative constituents. Section 7 summarises the paper.
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1. Hungarian.

1.1. Bare sentential negation.

It is generally assumed that Hungarian has relatively free word order. The distribution of the NPs in examples (1) and (2) show that the arguments can freely precede or follow the verb:

(1) a. János Pétert látt
    John-NOM Peter-ACC see-PAS-3s
    'John saw Peter'
b. Pétert látt János
    'Péter was seen by János'
c. János látt Pétert
    'János saw Pétert'

(2) a. János Péterrel beszél a könyvéről
    John-NOM Peter-INSTR speak-PAS-3s his-book-DELAT
    'John spoke to Peter about his book'
b. a könyvéről János Péterrel beszél
    'about the book János spoke to Peter'
c. Péterrel beszél János a könyvéről

In (1), the subject János and the object Péter can appear on both sides of the verb látt. Similarly in (2), the arguments János, Péterrel and a könyvéről appear freely to the right or to the left of the inflected verb beszél. The different orders yield different interpretations, but they are all perfectly grammatical.¹ On the other hand, there are important constraints on the distribution of negative constituents in Hungarian:

(3) a. nem láttam Jánost
    NEG see-PAS-1s John-ACC
    'I didn’t see John'
b. Jánost nem láttam
    'János wasn’t seen'
c. *nem Jánost láttam

(4) a. Péter nem beszél Jánossal
    Peter-NOM NEG speak-PAS-3s John-INSTR
    'Peter didn’t speak with John'
b. Péter Jánossal nem beszél
    'Péter didn’t talk to János'
c. *nem beszél Péter Jánossal
    'János didn’t talk to Péter'
d. *Péter nem Jánossal beszél

¹ In (1b,c) the constituent which precedes the verb can be interpreted as either focus or topic. In the first case, it carries a stress and can be glossed as "it is XP who...". In the second case, that is, if the constituent occupies the position identified as topic, it is not stressed and is interpreted more or less as "as for XP,".² Both positions, which precede the verb, are optional. However, whereas the topic position can contain an unlimited number of constituents, the focus position can contain at most one constituent. Thus, in (1a), both János and Péter can occupy the topic position, in which case focus is empty. In this case, the gloss would be "John saw Peter" (i.e. we know who John is, we have already talked about him, and about Peter as well). Or János can occupy the topic position and Péter the focus position. In this case, the gloss would rather be "it is Peter that John saw."

The data in (3) and (4) show that Hungarian sentential negation is expressed by means of a negative marker nem, which always occupies the position to the immediate left of the finite verb.² No lexical element can separate them: in (3c) and (4d) nem cannot express sentential negation.³ So in negative sentences, the order is always nem+V.

1.2. Negative constituents.

The data in (5) and (6) below suggest that negative constituents behave like non-negative ones and can occur on either side of the verb:

(5) a. nem evett semmit
    NEG eat-PAS-3s nothing-ACC
    'he/she didn’t eat anything'
b. semmit nem evett

(6) a. nem jött senki
    NEG come-PAS-3s nobody-NOM
    'nobody came'
b. senki nem jött

(7) a. nem evett János semmit
    NEG eat-PAS-3s John-NOM nothing-ACC
    'John didn’t eat anything'
b. János semmit nem evett

(8) a. nem beszél Péterrel senki
    NEG speak-PAS-3s Peter-INSTR nobody-NOM
    'nobody spoke with Peter'
b. Péterrel senki nem beszél

The negative phrases occupy a position either to the right of the verb as in (5a, 6a, 7a and 8a) or to its left (5b, 6b, 7b, 8b). However, despite this apparent freedom, they are subject to certain constraints: as shown in (9) below, negative constituents in the preverbal position must be left-adjacent to nem:

(9) a. *semmit János nem evett
    b. *senki Péterrel nem beszél

² In sentences with auxiliary + infinitive verb, the negative marker is adjacent to the auxiliary:
(1) nem fog emi
    neg auxs-3s eat-infinit
    'he/she will not eat'

³ In sentence, we will only consider clauses with finite verbs.

In this paper, I will only consider clauses with finite verbs.

The scope of nem does not bear on the whole sentence, but only on the constituent it precedes, Jánost.
Moreover, the negative constituents never occur without the negative marker *nem:

(10) a. *evett semmit
cat-PAS-3s nothing-ACC
b. *semmit evett
c. *jött senki
come-PAS-3s nobody-NOM
d. *senki jött

In order to give an account of these facts, I will first look at the existing analyses of negation within the generative framework.

2. NegP.


There is no clear agreement as to the position of NegP and various proposals have been put forward. Possibly, its position in the structure may vary cross-linguistically.⁴

2.1 The position of NegP.

In seminal work on the internal structure of IP and the position of adverbials with respect to the verb, Pollock (1989) argues that negative sentences include an independent projection NegP headed by Neg⁰. Thus, the structure of IP in a negative sentence is as follows:

(11)

Pollock claims that in French, ne is the head of NegP and pas sits in the specifier position of this projection:

(12) Jean n'aime pas Marie
'John doesn't like Mary'

In (12), ne is a clitic and "must, like other clitics, move to (some) Tense (position)" (Pollock 1989:414); and pas, in the specifier position of NegP, appears to the right of the verb which has moved to T⁰. Hence the order ne V pas.⁵

Belletti (1990) observes that "it must be the case that words which result from a syntactic movement are morphologically well-formed words. V-movement can be no exception to this general requirement" (Belletti 1990:27). So, as affixation of the tense and agreement morphemes is the result of a head-to-head movement constrained by the ECP, she argues that "the affix which is closer to the root must be the one which has attached first and so on" (1990:27).

Negative sentences in Italian contain a negative marker non and various optional negative adverbs (Belletti 1990:29):

(13) Gianni non parla (più)
'John does not speak (anymore)'

Belletti argues that non is the head of NegP and that negative adverbs are specifiers of NegP. Negative sentences have the underlying structure in (14) below, with NegP between the two inflectional heads, as suggested by Pollock:

Observe that English patterns differently:

(i) *John left not
(ii) John has not left

Pollock (1989) offers two analyses: not can either be the head of NegP or it can sit in spec NegP. If not is in Neg⁰ T⁰, not does not block the movement of has to T⁰. In (ii), the alternative is that not occupies spec NegP, and Neg⁰ is lexically void. This argument is also developed in Moritz (1989).
To obtain the order non+V in (13) above, Belletti argues that non cliticises onto the verb which has moved to Agr^0. Belletti shows that the same derivation holds for French: *ne cliticises onto the verb which has moved to Agr^0. However, in French, spec NegP is obligatorily filled by pas:

(15) Jean n’aime *pas Marie
   'John doesn’t like Mary'

I will assume that negative sentences contain a NegP and I will adopt Belletti’s proposal on the relative order of the projections within IP.

2.2. The NEG criterion.

It has for long been observed that the behaviour of negative elements may be related to that of WH elements (cf Klima 1964, Lasnik 1972). As noted in Haegeman (to appear), these two types of elements have the property of licensing polarity items, triggering subject-auxiliary inversion and triggering inner-island effects. Rizzi (1991) interprets these phenomena as effects of the LF property of these operators: their scope position is an A’ specifier position.

Typically, the WH quantifiers’ scope position is spec CP. Rizzi (1991), based on May (1985), proposes that WH constituents are subject to a well-formedness condition, the WH criterion. This condition applies universally at LF, but may apply as early as S-Structure:

(16) WH criterion:
   a. Each WH operator must be in a Spec-Head relation with a +WH X^0
   b. Each +WH X^0 must be in a Spec-Head relation with a WH operator

The criterion is based on a functional definition of ’operator’: an operator is an XP in a scope position, where scope position is a “left peripheral A’ position (either a spec or an adjoined position). This excludes right peripheral positions and the base-generated position of VP adverbials” (Rizzi 1991:111). Interrogative sentences are endowed with a +WH feature which, Rizzi argues, is located on I^0 in main clauses and on C^0 in subordinate clauses. WH phrases also carry a +WH feature; and the matching of the two features is expressed through the WH criterion in (16). The criterion applies at S-Structure in languages which have overt WH movement (English, French). In languages which show no overt WH movement, such as Chinese, Japanese, etc., the criterion is assumed to apply at LF.

Rizzi (1991) postulates that all affective elements are subject to a licensing condition expressed in terms of spec-head agreement between a head carrying the relevant feature and a constituent (operator) marked with the corresponding feature. Thus, at LF, the negative operator should appear as in (17):

(17) NegOP X^0 X^0 +neg

Haegeman & Zanuttini (1991) formulate this requirement as in the NEG Criterion:

(18) NEG Criterion
   a. a NEG operator must be in a Spec-Head relation with an X^0 +NEG.
   b. an X^0 +NEG must be in a Spec-Head relation with a NEG operator.

where the following definitions hold:

(19) a. NEG operator: a negative phrase in a scope position;
   b. Scope position: left peripheral A’ position (spec XP) or (XP, YP).
   [from Haegeman to appear]

In fact, Haegeman (1991b) reformulates (16) and (18) above as the AFFECT criterion:

(20) AFFECT criterion
   a. an (AFFECTIVE ) operator must be in a spec-head configuration with an (AFFECTIVE ) X^0
   b. an (AFFECTIVE ) X^0 must be in a spec-head configuration with an (AFFECTIVE ) operator.

A +WH C^0 is the result of the selection of a +WH subordinate clause by the main verb. Thus a verb like wonder selects a +WH C^0 whereas think selects a -WH C^0.
The level of application of the AFFECT criterion is again assumed to be LF, but some languages may require application at S-Structure already. In this approach, the NEG criterion itself is an instantiation of the generalised AFFECT criterion. Haegeman (to appear) proposes that the NEG criterion applies at S-Structure in West Flemish.

2.3. The level of application of the NEG criterion.

2.3.1. West Flemish.

In West Flemish, sentential negation in finite clauses can be expressed in different ways:

(21) da Valère waarschijnlijk nie nor us (en-)goat
    'that Valère probably does not go home'
    [Haegeman (to appear:ch.2,13)]

The negative marker nie may optionally be reinforced by en. Haegeman (to appear) argues that en- is the head of NegP and cliticises onto the finite verb, with which it forms a complex head, and is carried along when the verb moves to C. Nie does not move. Haegeman assumes that it occupies the specifier of NegP, like French pas. Thus, West Flemish negative sentences have the following structure (from Haegeman to appear:ch.2,14):

Given that en- is the head of NegP, Haegeman argues that nie cannot be a head, as such a claim would lead her to adopt a structure with two NegPs. In sentences where en does not reinforce nie, Haegeman assumes that Neg⁰ is non-overt.

In the case of bare sentential negation, expressed by nie, the criterion is met at S-Structure: nie appears in a spec-head relation with Neg⁰. Haegeman shows that indeed, the NEG criterion must be satisfied at S-Structure. Consider the following examples (from Haegeman to appear:chapter 2):

(23) a. da ze nie (ketent van eur werk) en-was
    that she not contented of her work en-was
    'that she was not pleased with her work'

b. da ze (me nieks) ketent en-was
    that she with nothing contented en-was
    'that she was not pleased with anything'

c. *da ze (ketent me nieks) en-was
    that she pleased with nothing en-was

d. *da ze ketent en-was (me nieks)
    that she pleased en-was with nothing
2.3.2. Italian and French.

Consider the following pair of sentences:

(26) a. nessuno crede che abbia telefonato
to nobody I think that he has phoned

b. à aucun étudiant je crois qu'il n'aie dit cela
to no student I think that he said that

These examples illustrate long movement of negative constituents. Two analyses come to mind. Following Rizzi’s (1991) discussion of the WH criterion, one might propose that the level of application of the NEG criterion is subject to parametric variation and that it applies as late as LF in Italian and French (see Moritz & Valois 1992). Alternatively (Haegeman to appear: chapter 4), the NEG criterion (and in fact the WH criterion) universally applies at S-structure. The latter analysis would imply that the NEG criterion is satisfied by an operator chain in (26).

Italian bare sentential negation contrasts with West Flemish as described in section 2.3.2 above:

(27) Giammi non telefona a sua madre
'John doesn't telephone to his mother'

In Italian, non is a head (see section 2.1). In (27), it satisfies the criterion if we assume that spec NegP contains a zero operator which is in the required spec-head relation with the trace of non in Neg0. Evidence for postulating a zero operator is given by the data in (28) from Rizzi (1990a):

(28) a. perché crede che Gianni sia partito?
'why do you think that Gianni has left?'

b. perché non crede che Gianni sia partito?
'why don't you think that Gianni has left?'

(28a) is ambiguous. Perché can question either the matrix clause or the subordinate clause. This is not the case for (28b): perché can only be related to the matrix clause. Rizzi argues that the null operator which is the specifier of non blocks the antecedent government relation between perché and its possible trace in the subordinate clause.

3. The Structure of the Clause in Hungarian.

It is now widely accepted that Hungarian, which used to be considered a non-configurational language, has - at least - a partially
configurational structure. The literature on Hungarian discusses at length various characteristics of the language which are symptomatic of structurally fixed positions.

3.1. FP.

The structural Focus position has been extensively discussed and analysed (see Kiss 1987, Horváth 1986,1991, Brody 1990, Marácz 1989 for detailed analyses). I will adopt the approach developed in a previous paper (Puskás 1992) in which it is argued that the finite verb moves to \( F^0 \), the head of a functional projection FP, which has the feature \(+FOCUS\).\(^7\) The verb in \( F^0 \) gets the feature \(+FOCUS\). If no lexical element fills the specifier of FP, the feature \(+FOCUS\) is realised as a stress on the verb. If spec FP hosts a lexical element, the verb assigns the feature \(+FOCUS\) to it through spec-head agreement; the feature is then realised as a primary stress on the lexical element in spec FP, i.e. the constituent which immediately precedes the verb.\(^8\) So a sentence containing a focused element has a structure as in (29) below (see also Brody 1990 for a similar analysis):

\[ \text{(29)} \]

3.2. IP.

It has sometimes been argued that Hungarian sentences lack functional projections of the type IP (Kiss 1987), and that inflectional morphemes might be base-generated on the verb (Brody 1990). Following current developments in the generative tradition, I assume that Hungarian has a full IP node. The very rich agreement morphology on the verb suggests that there are several distinct heads within IP, namely at least Agr and T.\(^9\) Following Belletti (1990), I will rely on the morphological structure of the verb to determine the order of the different projections within IP:

\[ \text{(30)} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{a. beszél \(-\text{t} \)-em} \\
\text{\quad speak \(-\text{past} \)-1s} \\
\text{\quad 'I spoke'}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{b. beszél \(-\text{t} \)} \\
\text{\quad 'he/she spoke'}
\end{align*} \]

The root beszél is subcategorised for by the tense morpheme \(-\text{t}\). This complex form beszél-t is in turn subcategorised for by the agreement morpheme \(-\text{em}\) in (30a).

In (30b), although the agreement morpheme does not show overtly, I will assume that the 0 form of the 3rd person singular morpheme also subcategorises for V+T. So the structure of Hungarian sentences will take the following form:\(^{10}\)

\[ \text{(31)} \]

I will also assume that negative sentences contain a NegP, which is lower than AgrP. The exact position of NegP within IP being irrelevant.

---

\(^7\) In fact, Hungarian verbs also carry a morpheme for definite/indefinite direct objects.

\(^8\) In fact, Hungarian verbs also carry a morpheme for definite/indefinite direct objects.

\(^9\) The question whether all Hungarian sentences contain an FP is open. It has been proposed by Kálmán et al. (1989) that there are also 'neutral' sentences, as opposed to focused ones.

\(^{10}\) Two possibilities arise when the sentence contains no preposed constituent: either spec FP is not projected at all, or spec FP contains a zero operator which, in a by now familiar way, sits in a spec-head relation with the head carrying the \(+FOCUS\) feature. On would then be tempted to extend the AFFECT criterion mentioned above to a focus criterion. See Brody (1990) for a partial proposal along these lines. See also Ouhalla (this volume).
for the discussion, I will assume that a negative sentence has the structure as in (32) below.

(32)

Although word order is relatively free in Hungarian (in (33a), (33b)) the NP Jánost can appear on either side of the verb), the negative marker nem is always left-adjacent to the verb (33c). Nem can be the only negative element in the sentence (33), or it can be part of a bi-partite negation, co-occurring with a negative constituent like semmit ('nothing') as in (34). But it can never be omitted, even when the second element of the bi-partite negation is present (35).

4.1. The position of nem.

At first sight, the adjacency between nem and the verb could suggest that this negative marker is a negative XP like nie in West Flemish or pas in French, and that it occupies spec FP. However, the distribution of nem with respect to the other elements which do occur in spec FP suggests that this is not the adequate analysis.

In Puskás (1992), it has been shown that WH phrases typically occupy spec FP at S-Structure, where they receive focus and satisfy the WH criterion. Thus (36) has the structure in (37):

(36) mit látott János?
what-ACC see-PAS-3s John
"what did John see?"

(37)

As a sentential negation marker, nem can co-occur with lexical phrases in spec FP (the diacritic " signals the focus position):

(38) a. *mit nem mondta?
what-ACC NEG say-PRES-2s
"what don't you say?"
b. "kivel nem beszéllek?  
who-INSTR NEG speak-PAS-2s  
'who didn't you speak to?"

(39)  
Pétert nem láttam  
Peter-ACC NEG see-PAS-1s  
'it is Peter I didn't see'  

In (38), the WH phrases mit and kivel occupy spec FP, to the left of the verb, and they receive the stress associated with the feature +FOCUS (see section 3.1). In (39), Péter occupies spec FP and receives focus, or primary stress. As nem co-occurs with lexical elements which fill spec FP, I will conclude that nem itself does not occupy this position.

The sentences above also show that nem appears between the constituents in spec FP and the verb in F0.

When it expresses sentential negation, nem cannot be separated from the verb by any lexical element (see 33c). I will propose that nem is a head which cliticsizes onto the verb.

I will also propose that it is the head of NegP and carries the feature +NEG, which it transmits to the complex head it forms with the verb at S-Structure:

(40)

As for (33a), the complex nem+verb occupies F0, and spec FP is empty. As the feature +FOCUS is not assigned to spec FP, it is carried by nem+V and is realized at PF as a stress. The position of János is not clear; it can either be inside VP, in its base position, or somewhere higher, as in spec AgrP (see note 10).

4.2. The NEG criterion.

Let us look at examples (34a,b), repeated here as (42a,b):

Moritz (1989) looks at the problem of the order of negative elements in French and English. In order to get the sequence ne V par in French, he suggests that Neg0, which carries a feature +neg, incorporates into Agr0. Although the derivation itself violates the head-movement constraint, since the verb, on its way to Agr, passes the intervening head Neg0, the result is nevertheless representationally well-formed. Bellettii (1990) develops this idea and argues that as non (or French ne) cliticsizes onto the verb, the chains <non, ti> and the chain <v, j> share the same head, namely Agr. As Agr carries both indices i and j, the relation of antecedent government holds non-distinctly for both empty categories ti and tj. Thus, all empty categories are properly governed and there is no ECP violation.
In this case, post-verbal negative constituents occupy their base position, that is, an A position and do not qualify as operators (see 19); hence, they are not subject to the NEG criterion.

The negative head nem can satisfy the NEG criterion in a spec-head relation with a non-overt operator. This strategy will be independently adopted for sentences with bare negation (see discussion below).

However, the distribution of post-verbal negative constituents suggests that the elements do not stay in their base position. This will provide evidence for the fact that the Neg Criterion applies at S-Structure already. Consider the following examples:

(45) a. nem beszélt János Péterrel a könyvéről
   NEG speak-PAS-3s John-NOM Peter-INSTR book-POSS-DELAT
   'John didn't speak with Peter about his book'
   b. *nem beszélt János Péterrel semmirol
   NEG speak-PAS-3s John-NOM Peter-INSTR nothing-DELAT
   *John didn't speak with Peter about nothing*
   c. nem beszélt János senkivel a könyvéről
   NEG speak-PAS-3s John-NOM nobody-INSTR book-POSS-DELAT
   'John didn't speak with anybody about his book'

Regardless of the structure of VP, negative constituents are subject to constraints which do not hold for non-negative constituents. (45c) and (46c) show that only one constituent can separate the negative constituent and the inflected verb: I assume that this constituent occupies spec AgrP and that the adjacent negative constituent has scrambled out of VP. Following Haegeman's discussion of the obligatory scrambling of negative constituents in West Flemish, I propose that in (45c) and (46c), senkivel and semmirol have moved to spec NegP. Analogously, I propose that in (42) semmit has left its base position and occupies spec NegP. In these examples, the NEG criterion is met within the projection of Neg⁰, between the phrase which occupies spec NegP and the trace of nem in Neg⁰. The obligatory movement of negative phrases into spec NegP argues for the fact that the NEG criterion applies at S-Structure.

Let us come back to (34b), repeated as (47), and compare it with the ungrammatical (9a), repeated here as (48).
(47) semmit nem emet
    nothing-ACC NEG eat-PAS-3s
    'he/she didn't eat anything'

(48) *semmit János nem emet
    nothing-ACC John-NOM NEG eat-PAS-3s

In the light of the above discussion, one would be tempted to say that in (47), the NEG criterion is satisfied at the level of NegP, i.e. between the trace of nem and the trace of semmit. However, this strategy would not explain why examples like (48) are ruled out: once the NEG criterion is satisfied, one would expect negative elements to be able to appear in, say, the topic position, like non-negative constituents. As (48) is ungrammatical, I will conclude that the NEG criterion cannot be satisfied by the trace of the operator; it is only met if the head - or trace of the head- is in the required spec-head relation with the operator itself. Observe that this conclusion supports the one reached by Haegeman (to appear) for West Flemish.

With respect to the satisfaction of the NEG criterion at S-Structure, Hungarian has a double strategy, which allows the NEG criterion to apply either at the head of the chain formed by nem and its trace, or at the foot of this chain, i.e. either in FP or in NegP. Thus, in (42a), the NEG criterion is met in FP. The S-Structure representations for (42a) and (42b) will then be as in (49a) and (49b) below:

---

12 We will have to say that on its way up to spec FP, the operator obligatorily moves through spec NegP. Otherwise, the latter will block the antecedent-government relation in terms of Relativised Minimality. See also the discussion below on negative concord.
Let us return to the examples in (3), in which sentential negation is expressed by the bare nem. The examples are repeated here as (50):

(50) a. nem látam Jánost
    NEG see-PAS1 John-ACC
    'I didn't see John'

b. Jánost nem látam

c. *nem Jánost látam

If the NEG criterion applies at S-Structure, we are led to postulating a non-overt operator in (50a) and (50b). Arguments for postulating a non-overt negative operator can be derived from the inner-island effects exhibited in (51) below:

(51) a. miért gondolod hogy sirt Réka?
    why think-PRES-2s that cry-PAS-3s Réka-NOM
    'why do you think that Réka cried?'

b. miért nem gondolod hogy sirt Réka?
    why NEG think-PRES-2s that cry-PAS-3s Réka-NOM
    'why don't you think that Réka cried?'

In (51a), miért ("why") can be construed either with the matrix clause or with the subordinate clause. (51b), on the other hand, is unambiguous: only the interpretation with the higher clause is available. Following Rizzi (1990a), this is due to the fact that there is a null operator which blocks the antecedent-government relation between miért and a trace in the lower clause (see section 2.3.2).

In terms of the Relativized Minimality framework (Rizzi 1990a), the absence of long construal in (51b) is due to the effect of an intervening A’ specifier which prevents antecedent government between the adjunct and its trace: here, the A’ specifier is the null negative operator in spec NegP.

Therefore, I propose that sentences with a bare negative marker contain a non-overt negative operator. Since spec FP can either be empty (50a) or filled with lexical material (50b) it is difficult to say whether the criterion is met at the head of the negative chain, i.e. in FP or at the foot, i.e. in NegP.

For economy reasons, one might assume that the zero operator is base generated in spec NegP and that since it has no reason to move, it doesn’t. The structure given in (41) can thus be extended as follows:

(52)

Let us look at the examples in (10), repeated as (53) for the reader’s convenience:

(53) a. *evett semmit
    eat-PAS-3s nothing-ACC

b. *semmit evett

c. *jött senki
    come-PAS-3s nobody-NOM

d. *senki jött

The ungrammaticality of the examples in (53) can be explained if we assume that the NEG criterion applies at S-Structure in Hungarian. In these examples, it is not the position of semmit as such which causes the ungrammaticality: it has been shown above (examples 42a,b) that negative constituents appear either in spec NegP, i.e. in a position to the right of the verb, or in spec FP, that is, to the immediate left of the finite verb. The conclusion is that what rules these sentences out is the fact that they violate the NEG criterion: the negative operator does not enter in a spec-head relation with a negative head.
Compare (53) with (54):

(54) a. It. nessuno (*non) è venuto
   'Nobody came'
b. WF: ...da Valère niemand (en)-kent
   'that Valère does not know anyone.'

(54a) above shows that in Italian, the negative head non cannot co-occur with nessuno in the subject position. Similarly, West Flemish has the option of omitting the negative head en (54b). Haegeman (to appear) argues that in these languages, a zero negative head satisfies the spec-head requirement stipulated by the NEG criterion. As shown by the ungrammaticality of (53), such an option is not available in Hungarian.

5. Negative Concord.

5.1. Multiple negation and Negative Concord.

Zanutti (1989) gives a detailed comparative study of negation in Romance languages. The author observes that Romance languages, as opposed to standard English, for example, display Negative Concord (NC): several negative constituents in the same clause enter into a relation of NC. This means that in these languages, the various negative elements which appear in a negative sentence are interpreted as contributing to a unique negative meaning in the sentence. These facts contrast with those of standard English, for example, where each negative element comes with its own negative force:

(55) John didn't see nothing

Haegeman & Zanutti (1990, 1991) observe that this phenomenon of NC is also present in a Germanic language, West Flemish. Here are the data (from Haegeman & Zanutti 1991:235):

(56) 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 (56a), the negative phrase niemand enters into a negative concord relation with nie. Haegeman & Zanutti argue that the NC reading is obtained via a process of absorption similar to WH absorption at LF: all the negative constituents which enter into a spec-head relation with the negative head are co-indexed with it, they share the same index. (56b), which contains the same negative phrases as (56a), cannot have a NC reading. Here, niemand appears to the right of nie. It has been said above (section 2.3.1) that nie occupies spec NegP.

So Haegeman & Zanutti propose that in (56b), niemand occupies its base position in VP.

The correlation between this fact and the double negation reading leads them to conclude that in order to enter into a NC relation with nie, a negative constituent must scramble out of its base position. In fact, all negative constituents which take sentential scope (hence their unique negative force) must be scrambled out of VP. Haegeman (to appear) proposes that the obligatory scrambling of negative constituents in West Flemish follows from the fact that the NEG criterion applies at S-Structure and that the functional definition of negative operators is not available.

All negative constituents move to reach a specifier-head relation with Neg. Haegeman also proposes that spec-head relations are one-to-one relations: thus Neg can only have one specifier. NC, that is, the absorption of multiple negative operators will allow for multiple constituents to reach the same spec-head relation with Neg. Haegeman & Zanutti (1991) assume, on the basis of the NEG criterion, that the negative constituents' landing site is spec NegP or an adjoined position.

5.2. Negative Concord in Hungarian.

Like the group of Romance languages studied in Zanutti (1989) and like West Flemish, Hungarian exhibits NC. I will adopt here the distinction made in Haegeman (to appear) between two types of relations involving negative constituents: on the one hand, the relation between the negative head (nem in Hungarian) and the other negative constituents is one of a head and a maximal projection.

On the other hand, the relation between several negative constituents is a relation between maximal projections which enter into a NC. Cases of sentential negation as described in section 4 above will not be considered as illustrations of NC, since they involve a relation between nem, the head of NegP, and a negative constituent.

Consider the following data:

(57) a. senkivel semmiről nem beszélt János
   nobody-INST nothing-DELAT NEG speak-PAS-3s John-NOM
   'John didn't speak with anybody about anything'
b. János senkivel semmiről nem beszélt
c. *senkivel János semmiről nem beszélt
d. Péterrel János semmiről nem beszélt
   'John didn't speak about anything with Peter'
5.2.2. Post-verbal position.

As in negative sentences with one negative constituent, multiple negation can also occur post-verbally. Movement to spec FP is also optional in sentences with multiple negative constituents.

It was argued above (section 4) that a negative element in post-verbal position appears in spec NegP at S-Structure, satisfying the NEG criterion at this level. In (58a,b) the negative constituents *senkivel and semmiről are adjacent in this post-verbal position. It is a priori difficult to decide whether the second one, namely semmiről, sits in its base position or not.

However, (58c) shows that the adjacency requirement observed for the pre-verbal negative elements holds in these cases as well.

The fact that in (58d) a könyvről, a non-negative delative NP, can follow János attests that there is no constraint either on the number or on the order of constituents allowed to appear post-verbally. (58c) is ruled out because it violates the adjacency requirement between the negative constituents. We are led to the conclusion that the negative constituents move to spec NegP and to an adjoined position (see note 13). The S-Structure representation of (58a) is as in (60) below:

---

(i) Nem beszélte senkivel semmiről.
   neg speak-pas-3s never nobody-instr nothing-delat
   'He never spoke to anyone about anything.'

(ii) *Nem beszélte senkivel semmiről soha.

Here the negative adverb soha (never) can precede the negative constituents but not follow them. I assume that it has moved to adjoin to NegP in (i). The fact that (ii) is ruled out would then rather suggest that the negative constituents are both in spec NegP and not adjoined to NegP. This remains to be investigated further.

---

The question whether the second negative constituent adjoins to FP or to spec FP is open. In Puskar (1992), I had argued that multiple WH movement involves adjunction of the WH phrases to FP. If it is really the case, one would expect the negative operators to behave alike in multiple negation. Besides, adjunction to NegP would then probably follow the same pattern. On the other hand, examples like (i) and (ii) below point towards another possibility:

(i) Nem beszél soha senkivel semmiről.
   neg speak-pass-3s never nobody-instr nothing-delat
   'He never spoke to anyone about anything.'

(ii) *Nem beszél soha senkivel semmiről.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---
5.2.3. The double strategy.

We have seen that in Hungarian, the NEG criterion is satisfied at S-Structure either at the top or at the bottom of the chain formed by the negative head nem and its trace. We have also seen that multiple negation requires adjacency of the negative constituents and is also subject to the NEG criterion. Consider now the example given in (59) and repeated here as (61):

(61) semmiről nem beszélt János senkivel
    nothing DELAT NEG speak-PAS-3s John-NOM nobody-INSTR
    'John didn't speak about anything with anybody'

In section 5.2.2, I showed that negative elements which have sentential scope obligatorily move out of their base position.

I will then assume that in (61), semmiről occupies spec FP and senkivel spec NegP. The two negative operators satisfy the NEG criterion simultaneously at both ends of the chain < nem; t >.

The fact that the NEG criterion can be satisfied in two different positions is not surprising: in Hungarian, negative constituents can freely appear either in spec NegP or in Spec FP.

In this case, the two positions are cumulative: as long as the movement to spec FP is optional for negative constituents, the lower option (namely spec NegP) has to be always available. What is perhaps more surprising, though, is the resulting NC reading: in Hungarian, the process of LF absorption seems to work on an extended domain.

However, if we assume that LF absorption is a process of interpretation of indices, we can easily see how this works. Nem and its trace form a chain, in the sense that they are co-indexed and can be both the locus of application of the NEG criterion.

The process of indexation of negative constituents is maybe not so clear. Do the negative constituents get 'recognised' as part of a NC because they share the same position or because they enter somehow into a spec-head relation with the relevant head?

Let us assume that the fact that they move - at S-Structure or LF - to one position is what guarantees their recognition as belonging to the same negative unit, i.e. their co-indexation. I will then propose that when two negative phrases occur in different positions, the NC reading is possible because the movement of the highest one into spec FP - which is an optional move - transits by spec NegP.

Thus the negative unit, as one could say, is present at some point (in the form of a trace co-indexed with the actual element in spec FP) in an adjacent group. The co-indexation process can be done on this basis (it is difficult to decide whether it is one position or the chain which

In (60) above, senkivel and semmiről move to spec NegP and to an adjoined position: the negative operators satisfy the NEG criterion at the foot of the chain < nem; t >.

The negative operators in spec NegP share the same index at LF and enter in a NC relation. The ungrammaticality of (58c) shows that in order to be interpreted as sentential negation, i.e. to get sentential scope, all negative constituents must move out of VP.

And because of the NEG criterion, they have to move to the domain of NegP. So the correlation between scrambled negative phrases and NC reading observed by Haegeman & Zanuttini for West Flemish seems to hold for Hungarian. The scope domain of negative elements can be identical only if they are scrambled out of the VP.

84
counts).\textsuperscript{14} I will propose the analysis in (62) for the sentence in (61):

(62)

\[
\text{FP} \\
\text{AgrP} \\
\text{nem}_i \text{ beszélt}_j \\
\text{János} \\
\text{Agr'} \\
\text{NegP} \\
\text{senkivel}_k \\
\text{Neg'} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{i}_j (\text{tl}_m)
\]

(63) a. "senki nem evett "semmit nobody-NOM NEG cat-PAS-3s nothing-NEG
   'nobody ate anything'

b. "senki nem evett semmit
   'nobody ate nothing' (=DN)

Given the interpretations suggested to me by Katalin E. Kiss, (63a) is a case of NC similar to the ones described in the section above. It contrasts with (63b) only in the fact that in (63a), \text{semmit} seems to carry some kind of (secondary) stress. On the other hand, (63b), which lacks this stress on \text{semmit}, is interpreted as double negation.

In section 5 above, I discussed the fact that sentential negation and NC can only be obtained if the negative constituents are scrambled out of the VP. Under this assumption, (63a) can clearly be analysed as following this requirement: \text{semmit} does not sit in its base position, but has moved to spec NegP. In (63b), on the other hand, we do not get the NC reading. I will assume that in this case, the NC reading is not available precisely because \text{semmit} does not occupy spec NegP. If we take into account the fact that the NEG criterion applies at S-Structure in Hungarian, the conclusion is that \text{semmit} in (63b) has not moved at all, or occupies a non operator position. In (63b), \text{senki} satisfies the spec-head requirement in the domain of FP, as for \text{semmit}, it does not qualify as an operator. Thus, there is no violation of the NEG criterion. The double negation reading results from the fact that \text{semmit} does not move to spec NegP and cannot enter into a NC with \text{senki} in spec FP.

Consider the following pair of sentences:

(64) a. soha nem vet János semmit a fiának never NEG buy-PAS-3s John-NOM nothing-ACC the son-POSS-DAT
    John never bought anything for his son'

b. soha nem vet János a fiának semmit
    John never bought nothing for his son'

Recall that in section 4.2 above, I showed that negative constituents scramble out of their base position and move to spec NegP, leaving room for only one constituent between the inflected verb and their own position. In (64b) above, two constituents appear between the verb and \text{semmit}: this yields a sentence in which, provided that there is absolutely no stress on \text{semmit}, only the double negation interpretation is available. I will again conclude that in (64b), \text{semmit} sits in its base position, in contrast with (64a), where it has moved to spec NegP, yielding a NC reading with \text{soha}. So the relation between NC and scrambling out of VP already observed in section 5 above is confirmed here: in order to enter into a NC, negative constituents have to move to the domain of NegP.

Compare with West Flemish (from Haegeman p.c.). In (65), \text{nooit} has

\text{noot}
scrambled to satisfy the NEG criterion. However, *me nieks* has not moved to spec NegP: hence the double negation reading:

(65) da Valèrè nooit ketent me nieks en is
dhat Valèrè never contented with nothing en is

The sentences in (63) and (64) raise an interesting issue: the (secondary) stress on *semnit* in (63a) seems to be determinant in the disambiguation of the sentence. Although the focus position, filled by the constituent *senki*, is realised as a primary stress, it seems that a second stress can be assigned post-verbally. However, it cannot be assigned to any position, since it is very likely that *semnit* sits in spec NegP. Besides, the same stress does not seem to appear on post-verbal non-negative constituents. The possibility of a second stress has been signalled by Brody (1990).15 However, Brody suggests that the focus assigned freely inside VP is of contrastive nature. The secondary stress I am describing is by no means contrastive. Besides, it is not VP internal: it rather seems to be assigned in functional projections outside VP. This question remains to be investigated.

7. Conclusion.

In this paper, I argued that the NEG criterion applies at S-Structure in Hungarian. In order to take scope over a clausal domain, negative constituents must move to enter into a specifier-head relation with a head carrying the NEG feature. FOCUS and Neg⁰ are the relevant heads which host the feature NEG.

Negative Concord is a by-product of the NEG criterion. All negative constituents which take sentential scope must move to attain a spec-head relation with the negative head. Given the one-to-one requirement on spec-head relations, multiple A’s specifiers have to undergo absorption, a process whereby multiple specifiers are amalgamated into one. In Hungarian, the absorption process applies along the chain created by the movement of the negative head: negative constituents in spec FP amalgamate with those in spec NegP. On the other hand, negative constituents which have not undergone movement to either spec FP or spec NegP cannot undergo absorption.

15 Brody gives the following examples (Brody 1990:212):

(i) Nem JANOSSAL vitten le a SZEMETET (banem...)
   not JOHN-WITH took down the RUBBISH (but...)
   I didn’t take down the RUBBISH with JOHN (but...)
(ii) Nem JANOSSAL vittem le a szemézet (banem...)
    not JOHN-WITH took DOWN the rubbish (but...)
   I didn’t take DOWN the rubbish with JOHN (but...)

According to Brody, the second stress is due to "free +f assignment in VP" (p. 212).
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