2.1 Extended Projections

Extended Projections

One of the most influential proposals that have been developed in Optimality Theory is the notion of Extended Projection (Grimshaw 1993, 1994, 1997, 2000). The core idea is that even though nominal and sentential expressions can occupy positions that are different from the Specifier of Extended Projection (EPP), they can still be blocked by the EPP. The purpose of extending these domains of blocking to higher layers of the Extended Projection is to reflect a number of phenomena including the fact that in Spanish, and I propose, the EPP is satisfied in Spec-IP, not Spec-VP. I develop a number of phenomena that illustrate that the EPP does not need to be extended to Spec-VP. In this chapter, I introduce the notion of the Pole and its relation to the EPP.

2.1.1 Extended Projections

With Grimshaw's proposal, one would expect to find an EPP in Spec-IP. However, I provide evidence from ellipsis that Support is not satisfied in Spec-IP and propose that the EPP is satisfied in Spec-IP, not Spec-VP. In this section, I introduce the notion of the Pole and provide evidence from ellipsis and from the distribution of negative-XPs that the Pole of the clause is not the subject. I then discuss the notion of the Pole and its relation to the EPP.

In section 2.1.1, I introduce the notion of the Pole and its relation to the EPP. In section 2.1.2, I discuss the characterization of clausal Extended Projections that my analysis assumes. I then provide evidence from the syntax of Spanish which supports a relational definition of the EPP. I then provide evidence from the syntax of Spanish which supports a relational definition of the EPP. In section 2.1.3, I discuss the distribution of clausal Extended Projections in Spanish. The reader familiar with Grimshaw's proposal can proceed directly to §2.1.3.
contain more than one projection (say \[CP [IP [VP V]]\]) for a clause) all these projections together can constitute a single extended projection, unified by the fact that all its layers share the same categorial feature as the head of the lexical projection that is subjacent to all the other projections. In other words, CP, IP and VP form an extended projection by sharing the categorial feature \[verbal\]. What distinguishes the lexical projection from the functional projections that dominate it is what Grimshaw (2000) refers to as the functional status of each projection. The functional status of a projection is encoded as a value for the functional feature \{F\}, which is part of the feature content of every head. In this system, lexical categories are \{F0\}, the functional projection that immediately dominates the lexical projection is \{F1\}, the next functional projection is \{F2\} and so on. A category label can now be characterized as a pair that consists of a categorial specification and a functional specification.

A central idea is that the head of the lexical XP in an extended projection so the structure

\[
\text{EXTENDED PROJECTION} \]

is a head of YP, and YP is a projection of X iff:

1. YP dominates X.
2. YP and X share all categorial features.
3. All nodes intervening between X and Y share all categorial features, (where a node N intervene between X and YP if YP dominates X and N, N dominates X, and N does not dominate YP).
4. No node intervening between X and YP is lexical.

(1) E

As an example, consider the following sentence from Grimshaw (2000):

\[
(2) E
\]

\[
\text{EXTENDED PROJECTION}
\]

X is a head of YP, and YP is a projection of X

(c) C \{verbal\} \{F2\}

I \{verbal\} \{F2\} \{F1\}

V DP \{verbal\} \{F1\} \{nominal\} \{F1\}

In (3), IP is an extended projection of V. This is because, given the definition in (2), IP dominates V, IP and V share the same categorial features, in this case the feature \[verbal\], and the only node that intervenes between IP and V is the lexical item under V, which is the head of the extended projection.
Grimshaw's proposal does not distinguish between lexical nodes that are distinct from the head of the extended projection in the definition in (2) and those that are not. However, I believe that this distinction is necessary. Otherwise V could not be the extended head of IP because there is a lexical node (i.e. an {F0} node) that intervenes between IP and V, namely VP.

Grimshaw also notes that this system can be readily expanded to more complex analyses of clause structure such as those that include a Polarity or Negation Phrase (Laka 1990, Zanuttini 1997a, 1997b) and exploded versions of IP (Pollock 1989) which would include TP, PP, etc.

In Grimshaw's proposal it is still possible to distinguish between the extended projection of V and its immediate projection, which can be expanded to include VPs, also has the feature [verbal] and it is not a lexical node distinct from V.

Similarly, CP is an expanded projection of V dominated by V, and it is not a lexical node distinct from V.

The core of Grimshaw's proposal is that while a number of syntactic conditions clearly need the notion of perfect projection to define locality requirements, others are better understood if locality is defined with respect to the Extended Projection. The notion of extended projection is always a DP (or an expanded CP) which in turn dominates a number of lexical and functional layers. This is always a DP (or an expanded CP), which in turn dominates a number of lexical and functional layers.

\[
\text{Perfect Projection} \quad (4)
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
X \text{ is a head of } Y & \iff X \text{ is a proceed head of } Y \\
X \text{ is a perfect head of } Y & \iff X \text{ is a proceed head of } Y \text{ and } Y \text{ is an extended projection of } X
\end{align*}
\]

Grimshaw's proposal is that while a number of syntactic conditions clearly need the notion of perfect projection to define locality requirements, others are better understood if locality is defined with respect to the Extended Projection. The notion of extended projection is always a DP (or an expanded CP), which in turn dominates a number of lexical and functional layers.

The core of Grimshaw's proposal is that while a number of syntactic conditions clearly need the notion of perfect projection to define locality requirements, others are better understood if locality is defined with respect to the Extended Projection. The notion of extended projection is always a DP (or an expanded CP), which in turn dominates a number of lexical and functional layers.
subcategorization and syntactic requirements independent of the lexical properties of these heads. Accordingly, Grimshaw (1997) suggests that a matrix clause with no auxiliary or modal involves only a VP, as in (5a), and a matrix clause with a modal or an auxiliary is just an IP, as in (5b). CP in matrix clauses is only projected when the presence of this projection is required to meet some extra well-formedness condition, such as fronting of a \textit{wh}-operator to a left-peripheral specifier position.

$$(5)$$

- \text{[VP ] John bought the newspaper].
- \text{[IP John will [VP buy the newspaper]]].
- \text{[CP What will [IP John [VP buy]]]?}

2.1.2 Minimal Extended Projections

Throughout this dissertation I adopt the Extended Projection analysis and with it the proposal that phrases are only projected when their presence is necessary to satisfy lexical or syntactic requirements. Still, Grimshaw’s proposal raises two separate questions which are independent of the issue of Economy of Structure, and which, to the best of my knowledge, have not received any significant attention in the OT literature.

The first issue has to do with the possibility of having a sentential projection without an inflectional layer. As seen in (5a), where the matrix sentence is just a VP, this is indeed a possibility in Grimshaw’s proposal, and Bakovic (1998) has developed an analysis of Spanish along these lines. Yet, I believe that there is considerable cross-linguistic evidence that this analysis of matrix clauses is not adequate. First of all, a representation like (5a) as a matrix clause would never be attested in languages where the verb always moves out of VP, such as Spanish and other Romance languages. Spanish, clearly enough, has surface strings identical to English (5a). However, following a classic argument made in Pollock (1989) for French, the position of adverbial elements indicates that even in these cases the verb has moved out of VP. Consider the following examples:

$$(6)$$

- Juan envolvió los chocolates.
  - Juan wrapped up the chocolates.
- Juan envolvió cuidadosamente los chocolates.
  - Juan wrapped up the chocolates carefully.

The position of the adverb between the verb and its DP complement is the unmarked position of a whole class of adverbial elements. This can be seen in the fact that in French, where the complement of the verb is always a DP, this is the position of the adverb in French as well:

$$(7)$$

- Jean envolva les chocolats.
  - Jean wrapped up the chocolates.
- Jean envolva les chocolats soigneusement.
  - Jean wrapped up the chocolates carefully.

The purpose of the discussion that follows is to provide some independent support for the assumptions that a) clauses with a tense specification always have an inflectional functional layer, and b) that the inflectional layer is fundamentally distinct from the “complementizer layer” or C-layer. These are standard assumptions in transformational frameworks, but not in OT syntax, hence the need to address them in more detail.
To the extent that we wish to maintain that the verb and the direct object are in a sisterhood relation at some level of representation, an analysis where the verb moves to a head position outside the VP is called for. In such an analysis, accounting for the word order facts in (6b) is unproblematic, since the position of the adverbial element can be taken to be a position in the left edge of VP.

Consider the following contrast, amply documented in the literature on V2 languages, where the main verb occupies the second position in the absence of an auxiliary, but appears in the sentence initial position when an auxiliary is present.

Perhaps the strongest argument against an analysis where matrix clauses can be just VPs comes from verb-second phenomena in languages like Dutch and German. Perhaps the strongest argument against an analysis where matrix clauses can be just VPs comes from verb-second phenomena in languages like Dutch and German. Perhaps the strongest argument against an analysis where matrix clauses can be just VPs comes from verb-second phenomena in languages like Dutch and German.

Consider the following contrast, amply documented in the literature on V2 languages, where the main verb occupies the second position in the absence of an auxiliary, but appears in the sentence initial position when an auxiliary is present. Perhaps the strongest argument against an analysis where matrix clauses can be just VPs comes from verb-second phenomena in languages like Dutch and German.
Jan saw a bird. The same reasoning holds if we adopt the analysis in Zwart (1997), where Dutch is taken to be underlyingly SVO and where the OV order of (10b) is derived through object shift.

If object shift is a surface requirement in Dutch, then in order to derive the SVO order in (10a) we must conclude that verb and both its arguments have moved out of VP.

In conclusion, there is enough evidence to safely assume that in the most widely studied European languages a matrix clause consists minimally of a lexical projection and at least one functional projection above it. I will not take a stand on the issue of whether this can and should be characterized as a property of UG, or rather if it is the result of some specific property (or a specific constraint ranking, in an OT analysis) characteristic of these languages. For our purposes, based on the discussion above I assume that every matrix that dominates the lexical layer.

The second question raised by the Extended Projection analysis has to do with the nature of the functional shell itself. Turning back to the schema in (3), notice that Grimshaw’s proposal does not contemplate any specific distribution between the different kinds of projections that constitute the extended projection, a difference that does not arise in Dutch.

While the projection does provide evidence that DP and CP form an intensional layer of the functional shell, the more relevant distinction should be made and that C is fundamental. Indeed, from the intensional shell in this analysis of the left periphery, Rizzi (1991) argues that such a fundamental distinction between the different kinds of projections that constitute the extended projection is a different issue altogether, regardless of the language.

Whereas the Germanic and English languages have a cyclic projection, other languages, like some Romance languages, have a more complex structure. In some cases, the C system is fundamentally distinct from the inflectional layer of the functional shell. Rizzi (1997) argues that such a distinction should be made, and that C is fundamental. Indeed, from the intensional shell in this analysis of the left periphery, Rizzi (1991) argues that such a fundamental distinction between the different kinds of projections that constitute the extended projection is a different issue altogether, regardless of the language.

(12) West Flemish (1991:530)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEL FRENGAIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a... da Jan in Gent naa gheen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b... Dan Jan en Pol in Gent naa gheen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, Jan goes to Ghent.

I depart from the analysis of Spanish in Boves (1996).

While this phenomenon does provide evidence that VP, IP and CP form an intensional layer of the functional shell, the more relevant issue is whether or not there is a fundamental distinction between the different kinds of projections that constitute the extended projection. Rizzi (1997) argues that such a distinction should be made, and that the C system is fundamentally distinct from the inflectional layer of the functional shell. He notes that:

"Whatever "inflectional" properties C reflects, they are not encoded in the form of verbal morphology, in the general case: they are expressed on free functional morphemes (such as que, ceci), and not on the form of verbal inflection."
In Rizzi (1997) the C-system is composed of projections related to illocutionary force and discourse considerations (Topic Phrase, Focus Phrase), and the I-system is composed of projections that license agreement, Case, and the like. The proposal that I develop in this dissertation is considerably different, but I adopt from the start Rizzi's idea that there is a fundamental division between the projections that dominate VP. In this I depart from Grimshaw (1997, 2000). The reasons for adopting this assumption will become clearer as we proceed. For our immediate purposes, I propose the following distinction between the projections that constitute the functional shell.

(13)

a. $\Pi$-Projections: IP, PolP (a polarity phrase), or exploded versions of these projections (TP, AgrSP, etc.).

b. $\Kappa$-Projections: CP, and recursions of CP.

This proposal does not exclude the possibility of having exploded versions of CP, such as the Force and Finiteness Phrases of Rizzi (1997), or the Mood Phrase of Terzi (1999). However, this is an issue that will not be dealt with here since throughout I will argue, following Zubizarreta (1998), that the fronting operations that Rizzi (1997) associates with the C-system are related in Spanish to the inflectional layer instead. In the spirit of Grimshaw's original proposal, though, I do assume that CP is only projected when its presence is required to satisfy some specific well-formedness condition. I further assume throughout that matrix clauses in Spanish involve only $\Pi$-Projections, and that $\Kappa$-Projections are found only in subordinate clauses (I follow Rizzi's (1997) assumption that the C-system is composed of projections related to illocutionary force, and the I-system is composed of projections related to discourse considerations).
Establishing what exactly triggers fronting of the subject has been a more controversial issue. Two different hypotheses have been proposed. In one, fronting of the subject is the result of the need to satisfy syntactic requirements, such as the EPP, and/or Case and agreement licensing (see Fernández-Soriano 1999 and Goodall 2001 for recent developments). In the other, fronting of the subject is the result of information structure considerations; topics are fronted in Spanish, as in many other languages, and the subject in (15) undergoes fronting because it is the default topic of the sentence (Meyer 1972; see also Contreras 1976 and Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998).

Based on the evidence presented in §1 that the EPP is an active requirement in Spanish, I adopt the former hypothesis. I present evidence against the latter hypothesis in chapter 4.

Consider now sentences where the sentential negation no appears. As shown in (16), the word order is the same irrespective of the presence of sentential negation.

In fact there are analyses like Contreras (1991) and Ordóñez & Treviño (1999) where it is claimed that the subject does not move to [Spec, I] at all. I will discuss these analyses in chapter 4 and in §2.2.1, respectively.

Some analyses, like Zubizarreta (1998) involve a combination of these two hypotheses. The same is true of psych and unaccusative sentences, although, to the best of my knowledge, their word-order interaction with negation has not been as thoroughly discussed in the literature. Contreras (1976) does report, however, that predicates that show an unmarked VS order switch to an unmarked SV order in the presence of sentential negation. My judgments do not correspond to this, but it does seem that [S Neg V] unaccusative sentences have a freer distribution than, say, [S V] sentences where the subject is topicalized. It seems to me that in these cases there is an entirely different factor at play, namely, having the subject outside the scope of sentential negation. This is an important issue, since it would show that the interpretive properties of scope-taking elements may also play a role in determining word order in Spanish.
The crucial issue now is determining what exactly the structure of sentences like (16) is. The literature on Spanish and closely related languages like Italian basically considers two alternatives. In the first, no is the head of a Polarity Phrase (PolP) that is sandwiched between the projection whose head will be the ultimate landing site for verb movement and the rest of the inflectional layer (Haegeman 1995, Suñer 1995, Zubizarreta 1998). In these analyses, the verb is argued to adjoin to the negation as it moves through PolP on its way to its final landing site. This is illustrated in (17):

$$(17) \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{IP} \\ \text{PolP} \\ \text{Pol} \\ \text{VP} \\ \text{Pol} \\ \text{V} \end{array}$$

In the other alternative, PolP is the highest projection of the inflectional layer, but the final landing site of the verb is still I0, so there is no adjunction or incorporation between the negation and the verb (Laka 1990, Contreras 1991; see Zanuttini (1997a) for Italian). This is illustrated in (18).

Laka (1990) labels this Polarity Phrase 'Σ-Phrase'.

In this latter analysis, the fronted subject in (16) would correspond to [Spec, Pol], as opposed to the fronted subject in (15). The consequences of each of these two analyses, especially for Case, are discussed in detail in the following chapter.
In contrast, the word order facts represent a challenge for those analyses where PolP is argued to be the highest inflectional projection because the fronted subject is in a different specifier position in (15) and (16). Accordingly, whatever syntactic requirement triggers the fronting of the subject DP, it cannot be defined with respect to a unique structural position. On the basis of this alone, it would seem that the analysis of Spanish sentential structure in (17) should be preferred. However, data from phrasal ellipsis renders this head-adjunction analysis extremely problematic. It is a well-known fact about phrasal ellipsis in Spanish that it generally involves a polarity head preceded by the remnant of the ellided construction (Brucart 1987, 1999; López 1999; López & Winkler 2000). This is shown in the examples in (19), where the elided phrase is shown in strikethrough.

(19) a. Juan consiguió las artesanías en Guadalajara, pero Luisa no [consiguió las artesanías en Guadalajara].
   Juan got the handcrafts in Guadalajara but Luisa didn't.

b. Juan no consiguió las artesanías en Guadalajara, pero Luisa sí [consiguió las artesanías en Guadalajara].
   Juan did not get the handcrafts in Guadalajara but Luisa did.

See Brucart (1999) for a list and description of the polarity elements that can appear in these constructions, and their relation to the polarity of the antecedent clause. As is also well-known, phrasal ellipsis in Spanish differs from English in that the highest inflectional head cannot appear with, or substitute for the polarity word. This is shown in the examples in (21), adapted from López (1999).

(20) a. Susan had read War and Peace, but Mary hadn't.

b. Susan had not read War and Peace, but Mary had.

(21) a. *Susana había leído La Guerra y la Paz, pero María no había.
   Susana had read The War and the Peace but María not had

b. *Susana no había leído La Guerra y la Paz, pero María había.
   Susana not had read The War and the Peace but María had

It has also been widely argued that the constructions in (19) are true examples of phrasal ellipsis, analogous in many respects to English VP ellipsis. They can appear in embedded contexts, as shown in (22):

(22) Susana leyó La Guerra y la Paz, pero creo que María no ___.
   Susana read The War and the Peace but I think that María didn't.

Furthermore, they exhibit the strict or sloppy identity pattern observed in English VP ellipsis. This is shown in the examples in (23).

(23) a. Susan read War and Peace. Then I think that María did not.

b. Susan read not War and Peace. Then María did.
The ellipsis facts do not pose a problem for the analysis of sentential structure in (18), where the negation heads a projection that dominates IP. As argued by Laka (1990), under this analysis constructions like (19) and (23-24) can be uniformly analyzed as cases of IP ellipsis.

From this perspective, the broader phenomenon under consideration can be characterized as phrasal ellipsis (VP ellipsis in English, IP ellipsis in Spanish). Accordingly, we expect to see some properties shared by these constructions, such as their possibility to appear in embedded contexts, even if their specific instantiation differs from one language to another.

In contrast, in the head-adoption analysis it is unclear why the polarity head, but not the verb or auxiliary to which it has adjoined, can appear in elliptical constructions. Furthermore, even if an analysis were developed to account for this fact, it would necessarily result in a loss of generalization: since V plus everything that follows it would not be an infinitive in the clause where the VP appears, it could not be accounted for in this construction. Furthermore, even if an analysis were developed to account for the fact that the polarity head can appear in elliptical constructions, such an approach would not consider the fact that the verb or auxiliary to which it has adjoined is also an infinitive in the clause where the VP appears.

In this perspective, the evidence provided by phrasal ellipsis would go unaccounted for. Furthermore, the hypothesis that PolP is sandwiched in the middle of the inflectional layer, which straightforwardly accounts for subject fronting in (39) and (40), is disconfirmed by the data from phrasal ellipsis. On the other hand, the hypothesis that PolP dominates all other inflectional projections provides a direct account for the data from phrasal ellipsis. However, in phrasal ellipsis the polarity head is not an independent head, but rather a projection of the IP that dominates all other inflectional projections. In this case, the polarity head is not an independent head, but rather a projection of the IP that dominates all other inflectional projections.
63

2.2 Pole vs. Subject

The definition of the EPP in (24) is conceptually related to the definition of the SUBJECT constraint of Grimshaw (1997). This constraint requires the highest A-specifier of the extended projection to be filled, which in Grimshaw's analysis is sometimes [Spec, V] and sometimes [Spec, I]. In other words, this is also a well-formedness condition that is not defined with respect to a unique structural position. However, the SUBJECT constraint and my definition of the EPP differ in a number of important respects, which I address in Chapter 3. For the time being, the issue to keep in mind is that the definition of the EPP in (24) is so far neutral to whether the specifier of the highest Π-projection corresponds to an A-position or to an A-Bar position. The EPP is defined in this way so that it is not committed to whether the specifier of the highest Π-projection in a particular language is an A-position or an A-Bar position. However, the SUBJECT constraint and the definition of the EPP differ in a number of important respects, which I address in Chapter 3.
The idea that constituents other than the subject can occupy what has been referred to traditionally as the canonical subject position has a fairly long tradition in Spanish. In essence, there are two versions of this proposal. In one version, whose origins can be traced back to Meyer (1972), there are two left-peripheral positions, one for fronted topics, and a lower position for wh-phrases. In some variants of this version the subject position corresponds to the higher topic position, and the lower position corresponds to \([\text{Spec, I}]\) (Vallduví 1992, Fontana 1994) or to the specifier of some other functional projection (Ordóñez & Treviño 1999). In another variant (Jiménez 1994), the position occupied by fronted subjects corresponds instead to the lower position (\(\text{Spec-IP}\)), and the higher position (\(\text{Spec-CP}\)) corresponds to the position occupied by fronted topics. In other words, one variant of this analysis claims that fronted subjects have the same distribution as topics (see also Zagona 2002), and the other one claims that they have the same distribution as wh-operators.

In the second proposal all fronted constituents compete for the "canonical" subject position, \([\text{Spec, I}]\) or \([\text{Spec, T}]\), depending on the analysis. This is either because these constituents must move through this position on their way to their ultimate landing site (as in the analysis of \(\text{wh}\)-movement in Goodall 1991a, 1991b) or because this position is in effect the ultimate landing site of all these constituents (the landing site in the analysis of \(\text{PCP}\)-movement in Goodall 1991a, 1991b).

This kind of analysis of fronted constituents was originally proposed by Diesing (1990) for Yiddish. Space considerations do not allow me to discuss the details and merits of each of these analyses. In what follows, I will simply follow Zubizarreta's (1998) proposal that all types of fronted constituents compete for the same landing site in Spanish. However, my analysis is different from Zubizarreta's in that this position does not necessarily correspond to \([\text{Spec, T}]\), as discussed in the previous section for fronted subjects. Also, some other functional projections correspond to the higher subject position, and the lower subject position is \([\text{Spec-CP}\]).

The crucial descriptive observations about ellipsis that lead us to the conclusion that a variety of fronted constituents have the same distribution are the following.

First, it is a well-known fact that the remnant of ellipsis in Spanish need not be the subject, as in the examples in §2.1, but rather it can be any argument or adjunct of the elided predicate (see Brucart 1999, López 1999). This is shown in the examples in (26). In (26a), the remnant of the elided construction is the subject, in (26b) it is the dative experiencer of a Psych predicate, and in (26c) it is the locative PP.

(26) a. Luis reprobó a Ernesto, pero \([\text{Juan no___}]\). 'Luis failed Ernesto, but Juan didn't.'
   b. A Luis le gusta el café, pero \([a Juan no___]\). 'Luis likes coffee, but Juan doesn't.'
   c. En ese café cobran carísimo, pero \([\text{en el otro no___}]\). 'In that coffee shop they charge a lot, but in the other one they don't.'

Second, I will show that the facts discussed in the previous section for fronted subjects also hold for certain kinds of evidential and temporal elements.
The fact that subjects and fronted topics show the same distribution with respect to ellipsis suggests that they occupy the same structural position.

This argument was first developed in Ordóñez & Treviño (1999) in relation to fronted subjects and left-dislocated DOs and IOs. These authors suggest that the relevant position is the specifier of a Topic Phrase, and the ellipsis facts are presented by them in support of their analysis of preverbal subjects in Spanish as left-dislocated topical XPs.

But consider now a second descriptive observation that may account very well for at least a portion of the observed phenomena. As pointed out to me by Judith Aissen (p.c.), the constructions in (26) and (27) below must be distinguished from one where the relevant XP follows the negation, as in (i.b):

(i) a. Invitó a Luis, pero [a Juan no ___].
   'He invited Luis, but Juan, he didn’t (invite).'

b. Invitó a Luis, (pero) [no a Juan].
   'He invited Luis, (but) not Juan.'

Constructions like (i.b) are better analyzed as instances of stripping, since they differ from those cases involving true phrasal ellipsis in that they cannot appear in embedded contexts, a well-known characteristic of stripping also attested in English (Jackendoff 1972; the English examples are from López & Winkler 2000: 648).

(ii) * Invitó a Luis, pero creo que [no a Juan].
   'He invited Luis, but I think that Juan, he didn’t (invite).'

In contrast, as noted in López & Winkler (2000), the fact that constructions like (i.a) can appear in embedded contexts, as in (iv), argues against their analysis as instances of stripping and in favor of their analysis as true instances of phrasal ellipsis.

Furthermore, with an overt affirmative polarity head, the construction where the XP precedes the head is perfect, but the one where it follows it is not.

(v) a. No invitó a Luis, pero [a Juan sí ___].
   'He didn’t invite Luis but Juan, he did (invite).'

b. ??No invitó a Luis, pero [sí a Juan].
   'He didn’t invite Luis but yes, Juan.'

All the examples below are from Mexican Spanish. See Sánchez-López (1999) for other examples.
d. No sé a quiénes no les pidieron identificación.

'I don't know to whom they didn't ask for ID and to whom they did.'

(=I don't know who wasn't asked for ID and who was.)

e. En ese café cobran carísimo, pero [en dónde no]?‘In that coffee shop they charge a lot, but where don't they?'

(=That coffee shop is very expensive, but (then again) which one isn't?)

These constructions behave just like other instances of phrasal ellipsis. For example, they can also appear in embedded contexts as shown in (28).

(28)a. Sé que muchos colegas apoyan al candidato, pero Juan todavía no me ha dicho [ quiénes no ___ ] .

'I know that many colleagues support the candidate, but Juan still hasn't told me which (of them) don't.'

b. Sé que Juan quería comprar algunos de estos libros, pero no sé [ cuáles no ___ ].

'I know that Juan wanted to buy some of these books, but I don't know which ones he didn't.'

c. Aquí, en casi todos los bares te piden identificación, pero Juan ya me dijo [ en cuáles no ___ ].

'Here, in almost every bar they ask you for ID, but Juan has already told me in which ones they don’t.'

Furthermore, just like other phrasal ellipsis constructions, they display both a strict and a sloppy reading, as shown in (29).

(29)a. Luis apoya a sus estudiantes, pero [ quién no ___ ]?

'Luis supports his students, but who doesn't [support his students]?'

SLOPPY: 'Luis supports his students, but who doesn't [support his own students]?'

We have seen that the examples in (26) have been used in Ordóñez & Treviño (1999) as evidence for an analysis where subjects and fronted topics occupy the same position. Once we consider (27-29), parity of reasoning suggests that this position is also occupied by fronted wh-operators. Crucially though, this also shows that the relevant position is not the specifier of a Topic Phrase, since it is not usually assumed that wh-phrases can occupy such a position. These examples also show that the highest inflectional specifier in Spanish is not necessarily an A-position, and so defining it in terms of the A/A-bar distinction is not adequate either.

Summarizing the discussion so far, the data from ellipsis points to the conclusion that subjects, topics, and wh-operators all occupy the same position and that this position is [Spec, Pol]. Clearly, the simplest analysis is one where all these constituents correspond to the specifier of the polarity head. Recall now that Spec-Pol further is the position where the EPP is satisfied, since PolP is again the highest projection in the inflectional layer in (26-29). What we need to do now is reconcile these facts with the definition of the EPP in (24).
The definition of the EPP in (24) targets the specifier of the highest Π-projection. With respect to this, notice now that the specifier of the highest Π-projection is not just any specifier. All else being equal, in matrix sentences the constituent functioning as the specifier of this projection c-commands the whole of the extended projection. In other words, the XP in this specifier position is more prominent than any other constituent in the extended projection. In my view, this is why the specifier of the highest Π-projection has a special structural status, and why there exist well-formedness constraints and conditions on representation that specifically target it. I further propose that the specifier of the highest Π-projection has this special structural status regardless of whether it corresponds to an A-position or to an A-bar position.

Now, one of the core ideas that I pursue here is that the specifier of the highest Π-projection does not correspond to what is referred to as the canonical subject position in the literature on word order. I discuss this in detail in the following chapter, where we will see that Spanish provides strong evidence that there needs to be a crucial distinction between this specifier position and what Grimshaw (1997) and throughout this dissertation, I adopt the (first) definition of c-command in Reinhart (1981: 612): (i) Node A c( onstituent)-commands node B iff the branching node most immediately dominating A also dominates B. See also Barker & Pullum (1990) for a more precise definition of this command relation.

As will be argued in the following chapter, my proposal crucially departs in this respect from related considerations developed in Grimshaw (1997). This contemporary conception of the EPP is of course very different from Chomsky’s (1981,1982) original definition of this principle, which made crucial reference to the subject of the clause. See McCloskey (1997, 2001) for discussion.

In claiming that the EPP can be satisfied by constituents other than the subject I follow recent proposals developed both in transformational frameworks and in Optimality-theoretic syntax which argue that the EPP is a purely structural condition that requires some specifier position to be filled, independently of the category or grammatical relation of the constituent that fills it. However, the central claim of Optimality-theoretic frameworks is that the EPP is a properly structural constraint that follows from principles developed in unification-theoretic frameworks and in follow recent proposals developed in unification-theoretic frameworks.

In claiming that the EPP can be satisfied by constituents other than the subject I propose that clauses must have a Pole:

(30) EPP

Clauses must have a Pole

specifier

My plural version of the EPP is thus derived with respect to the Pole of the clause. Why plural version of the EPP is thus derived with respect to the Pole and not the specifier of the higher Π-projection without making any reference to superficial word order properties? I refer to the specifier as the Pole in order to deviate the specifier of the higher Π-projection without making any reference to the canonical specifier position, even though they overlap in many other respects. The definition of the EPP in (24) targets the specifier of the higher Π-projection.
As we have seen in our discussion of sentential structure in Spanish, the crucial characteristic of the Pole is that it corresponds to a specifier position that is defined relationally. When the highest inflectional projection of a sentence is IP, then [Spec, I] will be the Pole of the clause. When the highest inflectional projection of a sentence is PolP, then [Spec, Pol] will be the Pole of the clause.

(31) a. IP
b. PolP

XP I' XP Pol'

POLE
I VP

POLE
Pol IP

There are two crucial cases where I assume that a specifier position in the functional shell above VP does not correspond to the Pole of the sentence, though. The first one is Spec-CP, the other one is the specifier of an inflectional projection that has the same features as the inflectional projection that it immediately dominates (roughly, IP recursion). These two cases are schematized in (32) where, for exposition, IP stands as the highest projection of the inflectional layer.

(32) a. CP
b. VP

XP C' XP Y'

C IP Y IP

ø I VP

[Spec, C] in (32a) is not the Pole of the clause, since CP is not part of the inflectional layer. Notice, though, that [Spec, C] still is the highest specifier of the extended projection, even when it is not the highest specifier of the inflectional layer.

As will become clear in the chapters that follow, there is in fact a need for both notions. For there are properties related to the highest inflectional specifier (the Pole) and properties related instead to the highest specifier of the extended projection.

Case (32b) is somewhat different. Here, I take VP to be indeed part of the inflectional layer, but it is a phrase that is not distinct in its feature content from IP. In a number of Optimality-theoretic analyses (see for example Grimshaw 1997), structures like (32b) are generated by GEN and can emerge as winners when, for example, it is necessary to move an operator to a specifier position above IP.

There are two crucial cases where I assume that a specifier position in the extended projection stands as the highest projection of the inflectional layer.

(33) a. IP
b. PolP

XP I' XP Pol'

POLE
I VP

POLE
Pol IP

By inherent features I mean the features that are specified as part of the lexical entry of a head. The functional specification of each head (discussed in relation to (1)), i.e. its \{F\} value, will indeed be different for I and the head of YP in (32b), but \{F\} is not an inherent feature. Rather, as discussed in §2.1.1, its value is defined relationally, depending on the position that each head occupies in the Extended Projection.
projection is never the Pole of the clause. In other words, whatever syntactic constraints target the Pole position (such as the EPP), will target \[Spec, I\] in (32b), and not the specifier of YP. Nor does an XP adjoined to the highest inflectional projection correspond to the Pole, since the Pole is defined exclusively in terms of a Spec-head relation between an XP and the highest inflectional head.

Ultimately, my suggestion is that the Pole is not a construct specific to Spanish, since facts similar to those that I will analyze in the following chapters have been reported in the literature for other languages. For instance, the unmarked word orders of different kinds of predicates in Spanish (to be analyzed in §3) are also attested in Italian (Pinto 1994; Arnaiz 1998; see also Belletti & Rizzi 1988). Topicalization facts similar to the ones discussed for Spanish in §4 are observed in Tz'utujil (Mayan: Aissen 1999b; Aissen, p.c.). Word order facts similar to those discussed in §5 for Spanish \(wh\)-interrogatives are reported for Greek in Costa (2001). However, it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to address this issue, which requires detailed and careful investigation for each relevant case. Instead I concentrate on providing a detailed analysis of a number of facts from the syntax of Spanish that support the adoption of the Pole as a relevant grammatical construct.

Now that we have defined the concept of the Pole, it is necessary to discuss its relation to the concept of grammatical subject. One of the central proposals of this dissertation is that the notion of the Pole is not equivalent to, and needs to be kept separate from, the notion of subject. Even though the Pole and the subject overlap in a great many cases, the syntactic conditions that each satisfy are different. The DP \[some students\] is the Pole since it is the specifier of the highest \(\Pi\)-phrase (IP or TP, depending on the analysis). Under the assumption that agreement with the highest inflectional head and/or nominative Case is a diagnostic for subjecthood (in the traditional sense), this DP is also the subject of the sentence. Yet, even in a language like English, where the correlation subject-highest inflectional specifier is very strong, there are cases where it can be argued that the two notions are clearly differentiated. Existential-there constructions are perhaps the most common case.

In (34) the NP \[the students\] is the DP that regulates agreement (i.e., the subject in the traditional sense), but it is also the subject of the highest inflectional head and thus the Pole of the clause. In this case (pre-theoretically, at least) the DP that agrees with the verb is not the subject. Yet even in a language like English, where the correlation subject-highest inflectional specifier is very strong, there are cases where it can be argued that the two notions are clearly differentiated. Existential-there constructions are perhaps the most common case.
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In (34) the NP \[the students\] is the DP that regulates agreement (i.e., the subject in the traditional sense), but it is also the subject of the highest inflectional head and thus the Pole of the clause. In this case (pre-theoretically, at least) the DP that agrees with the verb is not the subject. Yet even in a language like English, where the correlation subject-highest inflectional specifier is very strong, there are cases where it can be argued that the two notions are clearly differentiated. Existential-there constructions are perhaps the most common case.
that regulates agreement by the highest inflectional head, while the expletive, following standard assumptions, is nothing more than a place-filler which satisfies the EPP.

In this respect, the notion of the Pole stems in part from the central assumption of both Government and Binding and the Minimalist Program that the subject grammatical relation should not be considered a primitive of the theory. Instead of postulating a unified notion of subject, these transformational frameworks have claimed that the properties traditionally associated with the subject DP are distributed in different positions in the clause (see McCloskey 1997). For English and other Germanic languages, a good number of the arguments in favor of this idea have been provided by the study of expletive-associate constructions like the one above (see for example Chomsky 1995, 2000).

Existential-there constructions are also illustrative in that they show that the distinction between subject and Pole does not correspond to the traditional distinction between subject and Brentano and Marty’s logical subject (see Kuroda 1972 for a contemporary approach). Under this distinction, thetic judgements correspond to sentences that have no logical subject, and existential-there sentences are typical instances of thetic constructions in English. Yet these constructions still require a place-filler in the highest inflectional specifier. In our terms, they still require a Pole to satisfy the EPP, even when they lack a logical subject altogether. In terms of their function, the Pole and the logical subject are also clearly distinct. As I will argue throughout this dissertation, the prima facie function of the Pole is to satisfy the EPP, which is nothing more than a structural requirement on sentential structure. In contrast, the logical subject identifies an entity of which some property will be later ascribed, i.e., it is the target of predication. Furthermore, recall that the evidence from ellipsis indicates that wh-operators can correspond to the Pole, and in §5 I will present more evidence to this effect. Clearly enough, the Pole and the logical subject can still overlap in many cases. Example (33) is arguably a case where the three relevant notions, grammatical subject, logical subject, and Pole, all overlap. The precise characterization of the relation between the Pole and the logical subject in these cases is an issue that I leave open for future research.

The notion of the Pole is therefore independent from the subject grammatical relation and the logical subject. Clearly enough, the Pole and the logical subject can still overlap in many cases. Example (33) is arguably a case where the three relevant notions, grammatical subject, logical subject, and Pole, all overlap. The precise characterization of the relation between the Pole and the logical subject in these cases is an issue that I leave open for future research.

The need for a notion of the Pole independent from the subject grammatical relation is most evident when we consider a number of syntactic phenomena in Spanish, though. The bulk of the evidence is presented in the next chapter, but in § 3.3 I will present more evidence to this effect. Clearly enough, the Pole and the logical subject are not mutually exclusive. Since their notions are not mutually exclusive, the distinction between Pole and logical subject is most overt when we consider a number of syntactic phenomena in Spanish. The Pole is often licenced by stranded quantifiers, word order of the subject DP with respect to the main verb in periphrastic aspects, and other facts. McCloskey argues convincingly that the evidence from Spanish indicates that two properties previously associated with the grammatical subject (nominative Case and satisfaction of the EPP) must be kept distinct. In terms of my proposal, Spanish is a language where clauses do not have a Pole. However, I follow McCloskey’s analysis in that this does not entail that there will not be other positions in the inflectional layer which license properties typically associated with subjects, such as nominative Case.
The situation with selected topics is a bit more complex. Perhaps of interest in Spanish in general, and in Mexican Spanish in particular. In the remainder of this chapter, I present some preliminary evidence from ellipsis and the distribution of negative XPs in Spanish which indicate that these phenomena crucially implicate the Pole, and that the Pole cannot be identified with the grammatical subject.

2.3 Preliminary evidence for the Pole in Spanish

2.3.1 The Pole as the remnant of ellipsis

We have seen that there is evidence from English that suggests that subjects and wh-operators all occupy the same position in Spanish. However, clauses that display ellipsis differ from clauses that do not in one important respect. As is well-known, topics in Spanish can freely stack over either another topic or a wh-operator. This is attested both in the absence and in the presence of an overt polarity head, as shown in the examples in (35) and (36).

(35) a. Las artesanías, Juan las consiguió en Guadalajara.
   'The handcrafts, Juan got them in Guadalajara.'

b. Las artesanías, Juan no las consiguió en Guadalajara.
   'The handcrafts, Juan didn't get them in Guadalajara.'

I assume that both topics and wh-operators are in a dependency relation with a null category in the VP (see §1.2.2 and §1.3.1). For the cases of ellipsis that follow, this means that remnant is to be understood as a displaced XP that is either an argument or an adjunct of the predicate elided along with the IP.

(36) a. La tarea, quién ya la hizo?
   'Who already did the homework?'

b. La tarea, quién no la hizo?
   'Who did not do the homework?'

The detailed analysis of this stacking pattern will be the subject of chapters 4 and 5. For present purposes it is enough to note that in the analysis I will develop I analyze the leftmost fronted XP in (35-36) as adjoined to the highest Π-projection and the one that follows it to be the Pole of the clause ([Spec, I] in the (a) examples, [Spec, Pol] in the (b) examples).

This stacking pattern, however, is not possible in phrasal ellipsis constructions. As noted in López (1999: fn 15), stacking of a fronted topic over a remnant wh-operator results in robust ungrammaticality. The examples in (37) are my own.

(37) a. *Ya sé quién hizo los ejercicios, pero [la tarea quién no]?
   'Who already did the exercises, but the homework who not?'

b. *A Juan no le gusta Oslo, pero [Noruega a quién sí]?
   'To Juan not like Oslo, but Norway to whom yes?'

The situation with stacked topics is a bit more complex. Speakers of Mexican Spanish mostly reject elliptical constructions with stacked topics. Similar judgments show up in the examples in (35) and (36).
Some examples are included below.

(38) a. *Juan consiguió las artesanías en Guadalajara, pero los dulces Luisa no.
   a. Juan found the handcrafts in Guadalajara but the sweets Luisa not

b. *Juan consiguió las artesanías en Guadalajara, pero en Mérida Luisa no.
   a. Juan found the handcrafts in Guadalajara but in Mérida Luisa not

c. ??Juan consiguió las artesanías en Guadalajara, pero Luisa en Mérida no.
   a. Juan found the handcrafts in Guadalajara but Luisa in Mérida not

Brucart (1999) and López (1999), however, report examples like (39a-b), where apparently two topical remnants are allowed, presumably from a different variety of Peninsular Spanish than the one reported in Ordóñez & Treviño (1999). In an informant survey of six speakers of Mexican Spanish, all found (39b) robustly ungrammatical. Half of these six speakers further consider (39a) either ungrammatical or strongly deviant.

(39) a. Yo podría regalarle los pendientes a mi madre, pero [el collar a mi padre no].
   a. I could give-to-her the ear-rings to my mother but the necklace to my father not
   'I could give the earrings to my mother, but I couldn't give my father the necklace.'

b. Luis no estaba haciendo crucigramas, pero [Pedro jeroglíficos sí].
   a. Luis not was making crosswords but Pedro hyeroglyphs yes
   'Luis was not making crossword puzzles, but Pedro was (making) hyeroglyphs.'

It is not immediately obvious that the examples in (39) truly constitute instances of topic stacking under ellipsis. Notice that the relative order of the two remnants in these examples is the same as the one in the antecedent clause, i.e. the canonical order of topics. Under ellipsis, the resulting construction is fine because the small clause is the single syntactic unit and so we have a single remnant:

(i) Juan tiene [amigos en Barcelona], pero [amigos en Madrid] no.
   a. Juan has friends in Barcelona but friends in Madrid not
   'Juan has friends in Barcelona, but friends in Madrid he doesn't.'
orders are possible in cases like (39), and they do not test these constructions with the diagnostics used to identify true cases of ellipsis (acceptability in embedded contexts, sloppy readings, etc.).

Another possibility is that ultimately this might just be an issue of dialectal variation. In support of this hypothesis, notice that Portuguese (Matos 1994:349; reported in Lopez 1999: 285) shows the same restriction as Mexican Spanish against stacking multiple topics in elliptical constructions.

(40) PORTUGUESE

a. Esse editor, à Maria pagou os direitos de autor.

that editor to Mary paid the copyright

b. *O João já pagou os direitos de autor ao Pedro e [esse editor, à Maria também].

John already paid the copyright to Peter and [that editor to Mary too]

English, on the other hand, does allow for more than one remnant in VP ellipsis constructions. As noted in Schuyler (2001), one of the remnants corresponds to the subject, and the other one can be an interrogative operator, a relative operator or a fronted topic (see also López & Winkler 2000).

(41) a. I don't know which puppy you SHOULDN'T ___

b. I discovered that my cat had scratched some of the furniture, and then I sold the furniture [that he HADN'T ___ ].

In contrast, in cases where there is no ellipsis, multiple topics can appear to the right of the head of a relatively clause.

Pending further investigation of this issue, I will assume that the difference in judgments on the examples in (39) is indeed due to dialectal variation. Consider now how the data from Mexican Spanish in (37-38) suggest that the remnant of phrasal ellipsis has to be the Pole. Assume that some languages like Mexican Spanish and Portuguese set a condition that requires the remnant of phrasal ellipsis to be a Head-Spec relation with the head of the highest phrase in the constituent from which it stems. This is true in the cases reported in (37-38), where the highest phrase is the subject or the experiencer of the Psych predicate. In contrast, in cases where there is no ellipsis multiple topics can be adjoined freely to the highest phrase when the Pole specifier is already occupied.

Given these considerations, it is natural to assume that the difference in judgments on the examples in (40) is indeed due to dialectal variation.
In contrast, it is not clear how a multi-phrasal left-periphery analysis could account for these facts. Consider a sketch of clausal structure in such an analysis, schematized in (42). Following Rizzi (1997), the multiple Topic Phrases would host multiple fronted topics in their specifiers, and [Spec, Foc] would correspond to the position occupied by fronted \textit{wh}-operators.

![Diagram of clausal structure](image)

Given the structure in (42), it is not clear why there can only be one fronted remnant in phrasal ellipsis, since the landing sites for subjects, \textit{wh}-operators and topics are still available after IP has been elided. It would not be clear how the condition licensing the single remnant should be stated either, since subjects, \textit{wh}-operators and topics all occupy distinct positions. In the analysis I propose, the remnant is always the Pole, which stands in a Spec-Head configuration with the head of the highest inflectional phrase. Even if we devised a mechanism where, for some reason, only one left-peripheral phrase could be projected when ellipsis takes place, if the remnant were a topic or a \textit{wh}-operator, it would still not be in a Spec-Head configuration with the highest inflectional head, and extra machinery would be required to define the condition licensing the single remnant.

2.3.2 Negation and the Pole in Spanish

The Pole is also relevant for determining some of the interpretive properties of a clause, independently of: a) the specific category of the highest inflectional phrase, and b) the grammatical relation of the constituent that functions as the Pole. The relevant data come from negation, the distribution of negative XPs, and double negation constructions in Spanish. Spanish is a negative concord language, as is well-known, and its properties in this respect have been widely studied (see for example Bedell-García 1993, Haegeman 1995, Suñer 1995, Sánchez-López 1999, to cite just a few references). Just as in many other negative concord languages, there are two ways of expressing sentential negation in Spanish: either by the negative head no, as in (43a), or by a preverbal negative XP, as in (43b).

3.8 There is considerable debate in the literature as to whether negative XPs in Romance languages are negative quantifiers or rather negative polarity items (see Haegeman 1995 for a brief overview of this debate). Settling this matter will not be crucial for our purposes, and so I will use the label negative XP throughout.
(43) a. No llegaron los muchachos.
'Not arrived the boys.'
b. Nadie llegó.
'No one arrived.'

In Spanish, the preverbal negative XP that expresses negation does not need to be the subject DP, as shown in (44). In (44a) the preverbal negative XP corresponds to the direct object of the verb, in (44b) to a temporal adjunct.

(44) a. A nadie vio Juan en su viaje a las montañas.
'Juan saw no one in his trip to the mountains.'
b. Nunca habíamos viajado a París.
'We had never traveled to Paris.'

As is also well-known, a negative XP cannot appear by itself in the post-verbal field. This is shown in the examples in (45).

(45)a. *Llegó nadie.
'b. *Juan vio a nadie en su viaje a las montañas.

Zubizarreta (1998) reports that fronted negative XPs in these cases must be intonationally prominent. This does not correspond to my judgements and is not reported in other works dealing with these facts either (Fontana 1994, Suñer 1995, Sánchez-López 1999).

Post-verbal negative XPs can be licensed by either of two mechanisms. They can be licensed by the negative head no, as in (46). Alternatively they can be licensed by a preverbal negative XP, as in (47).

(46)a. No llegó nadie.
'No one arrived.'
b. Juan no vio a nadie en su viaje a las montañas.
'Juan saw no one in his trip to the mountains.'
c. Juan no había viajado nunca a París.
'Juan had never traveled to Paris.'

(47) a. Nadie dijo nada.
'No one said anything.'
b. Aquí nunca viene nadie.
'No one ever comes here.'
c. A nadie le entregó nada.
'He handed in nothing to no one/He didn't hand in anything to anyone.'
Most sources in the literature agree that there are two crucial characteristics of the Spanish pattern (also seen in closely related languages, such as Italian and Portuguese; see for example Zanuttini 1997b for discussion) that need to be accounted for. The first is the fact that there is more than one way to license a post-verbal negative XP, as in (46) and (47). The second one relates to the interpretive properties of the negative concord pattern, namely, the fact that preverbal negative XPs contribute to the polarity value of the sentence (as in (43a) and (44)) but post-verbal negative XPs do not: in other words, there is more than one negative element, the post-verbal negative XP and the negative element that licenses it, but this does not result in a multiple negation interpretation.

In what follows I suggest an answer to the second issue based on the notion of the Pole, and this in turn provides an answer to the first issue of the licensing of negative XPs. The fundamental insight comes from Ladusaw (1992). Ladusaw argues that the interpretive properties observed in negative concord are best understood as the result of conditions which specify the structural positions where a feature \([\text{NEG}]\) is semantically potent. In negative concord languages (as opposed to, say, standard English) the presence of a feature \([\text{NEG}]\) in the sentence does not by itself guarantee that this feature will have an effect on the interpretive value of the sentence. There are some structural positions where a \([\text{NEG}]\) feature has an effect on the interpretation of the clause and others where it does not. In Ladusaw’s analysis, sentential negation is ultimately expressed by the head of a phrase in what would correspond to the Extended Projection in our terms. There are two different ways in which such a head can bear the \([\text{NEG}]\) feature. It can be part of its inherent feature content (as in the case of \textit{not} in English) or it can acquire it from a specifier or an adjoined sister. I will adopt Ladusaw’s analysis and insights as a starting point, but I will suggest a number of modifications as we go along.

First, I propose that the expression of negation in Spanish is regulated by two (and only two) separate conditions. One corresponds to Ladusaw’s case where an inherently negative head is part of the representation. I define this condition as in (48).

\[ \text{(48) NEGATIVE HEAD CONDITION} \]

In order for a \([\text{NEG}]\) feature to have an effect on the interpretive value of the sentence, it must be an inherent feature of the head of an XP, XP one of the phrases of a clausal Extended Projection. Simplifying somewhat, the reason for defining this condition as in (48) is related to the observation that a sentential negative polarity head (say \textit{no} in Spanish, \textit{not} in English) has an effect on the polarity value of the sentence irrespective of where its position in the Extended Projection happens to be (see Zanuttini 1997b). In other words, a feature \([\text{NEG}]\) is semantically potent if it is an inherent feature of the head of an XP, XP one of the phrases of a clausal Extended Projection. This means that conditions can occur on the head of a phrase that will affect the \([\text{NEG}]\) feature of the head of an XP, XP one of the phrases of a clausal Extended Projection. In particular, the head of a phrase can bear the \([\text{NEG}]\) feature of the head of another phrase, and this head can have an effect on the \([\text{NEG}]\) feature of the head of the first phrase. This is a violation of the Extended Projection property, and it is a violation of the Extended Projection property because it is a violation of the Extended Projection property. In particular, the head of a phrase can bear the \([\text{NEG}]\) feature of the head of another phrase, and this head can have an effect on the \([\text{NEG}]\) feature of the head of the first phrase.
A feature [NEG] is semantically potent if it is a feature of the Pole.

Conditions (48) and (49) express the fact that in Spanish these are the only two positions where a feature [NEG] is semantically potent. We can now informally state that a clause is negative iff it contains a feature [NEG] that is semantically potent.

Example (43b) corresponds to the case contemplated in (49). For this example I propose the analysis in (50) where there is no Polarity phrase (contra the analyses in Laka 1990, Haegemann 1995, Suñer 1995, and the GB analysis in Ladusaw 1992) and accordingly no polarity head anywhere in the representation. Also, in contrast with Ladusaw's (1992) analysis, I propose that ultimately it is the Pole that expresses sentential negation, and not the head that the Pole is the specifier of. In other words, the sentence has its negative polarity value because the negative XP is the Pole of the clause, [Spec, I] in this case. The reason for this will become clear in what follows.

(50)

IP

No

llegó

VP

nadie


no-one arrived

'No one arrived.'

Consider now a negative concord example (46a), repeated here as (51).

(51)

PolP

No

IP

llegó

VP

nadie

not arrived no-one

'No one arrived.'

In this case, the [NEG] feature of the post-verbal negative XP 'no-one', does not meet either the NEGATIVE HEAD CONDITION or the NEGATIVE POLE CONDITION. Nadie is not the head of a phrase of the [verbal] (i.e. the sentential) extended projection, nor does it correspond to the Pole of the sentence. Accordingly its [NEG] feature has no effect on the polarity value of the sentence.

Now the crucial observation that supports this analysis is that these two conditions can operate simultaneously in Spanish. In this language, when a negative XP in the Pole co-occurs with the sentential negation, the result is a double negation (DN) construal. Some examples are presented below. In all these examples, the negative concord reading is not possible.

(i) a. No m'ha telefonat ningú.

'Nobody has called me.'

b. Ningú ha vist en Joan.

'nobody has seen John'

c. Ningú no ha vist en Joan.

'nobody not has seen John'

Descriptively, we can say that Catalan is a language where the NEGATIVE HEAD CONDITION and the NEGATIVE POLE CONDITION cannot both be operational at the same time. Ultimately, in providing a full account of languages like Catalan, it would be necessary to determine which of the two negative conditions is neutralized in (i.c) and why, but dealing with this issue goes beyond the scope of this dissertation. Notice, though, that from an OT perspective the fact that one condition can be made inactive under certain circumstances is far from being a surprising state of affairs.
a. Nadie no lo hizo.

b. Hasta ahora, a nadie no le ha gustado esa película.

c. Hasta ahora, en ninguna de las secretarías no nos han apoyado.

This is a fact widely acknowledged in the literature on negation in Spanish (see for example Laka 1990, Suñer 1995, Sánchez-López 1999), but which, to the best of my knowledge, has not yet been analyzed in any detail.

Crucially, these examples constitute the fundamental piece of evidence that shows that the NEGATIVE POLE CONDITION has to be defined with respect to the Pole and not, say, with respect to [Spec, I] (which is where the [+NEG] feature is located in (50)). If we were to define the properties of negation with respect to [Spec, I], and not relationally (with respect to the Pole), then we would be hard pressed to explain the DN reading of the examples in (52). This is because the preposed negatives XP that add their [+NEG] feature to the interpretation are not in [Spec, I] but rather in the embedded clause with its own [Spec, I].

What provides a unified account of (50) and (52) is that the Pole is defined relationally: when IP is the highest phrase in the inflectional layer, [Spec, I] functions as the Pole, as in (50). But when a polarity phrase is present, as in (52), then [Spec, Pol] corresponds to the Pole. In both cases the Pole is the highest specifier of the embedded clause; this is where the highest specifier of the embedded clause is located in (52). In the examples in (50) and (52), there are two cases where the highest specifier of the embedded clause is found in the highest specifier of the inflectional layer, [Spec, I].

This data further provide evidence in favor of my proposed distinction between the Pole and the highest specifier of the extended projection. Although the [+NEG] feature is indeed found in the Pole both in (50) and (52), these are two cases where the Pole coincides with the highest specifier of the extended projection as well (i.e. the highest inflectional specifier also happens to be the highest specifier of the extended projection). This raises the question of whether the NEGATIVE POLE CONDITION should be specified in terms of the highest specifier of the extended projection instead. Embedded contexts show that this would not be the correct definition. In the embedded clause in (53), the highest phrase of the extended projection is CP, but C has no specifier in this case. The negative XP that provides the embedded clause with its polarity value is still found in the highest specifier of the embedded clause. If [Spec, I] was the highest specifier in this case, it would no longer be the correct specifier of the highest specifier of the embedded clause, and therefore the highest specifier of the embedded clause would not contribute to the overall polarity value of the clause.

This is a fact widely acknowledged in the literature on negation in Spanish (see for example Laka 1990, Suñer 1995, Sánchez-López 1999).
The double negation facts in (52) also highlight the advantages of my analysis over a potential alternative that relies on the Negative Criterion of Haegeman & Zanuttini (1991). In analyses based on the Negative Criterion, there is always a Negative Phrase (NegP) that is part of the representation of negative sentences. The examples in (43) would be recast as in (54) under such an analysis.

\[(54)\]  
\[a. \ (\text{NegP}) \quad \text{No llegaron los muchachos}. \]  
\[\text{not arrived the boys} \]  
\[\text{The boys didn't arrive.} \]  
\[b. \ (\text{NegP}) \quad \text{Nadie} \quad \text{Ø} \quad \text{llegó}. \]  
\[\text{no-one arrived} \]  
\[\text{No one arrived.} \]

In (54), it is the head Neg\(_0\), whether overt or not, that ultimately defines the polarity value of the sentence. The [NEG] feature of the preverbal negative XP in (54b) is cancelled out for interpretive purposes because it is in a Spec-Head configuration with the head of NegP (see Haegeman 1995 for details). This is why (54b) does not have a double negation reading. But this predicts that the [NEG] feature of the preverbal negative XPs in the double negation examples in (52) should also be cancelled out for interpretive purposes, contrary to fact. In contrast, the analysis I propose here is not only simpler (in that it does not need to stipulate the presence of a Polarity Phrase with a null head for cases like (54b)), but it can also account for the attested interpretive properties in a straightforward way.

We can now return to the second issue to be addressed in relation to negative concord, namely, the question of how negative XPs are licensed. With the analysis of sentential negation developed up to here, it is possible to appeal to a fairly simple surface condition on representation for the licensing of negative XPs, such as the one proposed in Bedell-García (1993:8).

\[(55)\]  
\[A \text{ negative element must occur in a negative clause.} \]

In our terms, this would mean that a negative XP must occur in a negative clause.

\[(56)\]  
\[a. \ (\text{Pol P}) \quad \text{No} \quad \text{[IP llegó [VP nadie]]}. \]  
\[\text{not arrived no-one} \]  
\[\text{No one arrived} \]  
\[b. *\text{[IP llegó [VP nadie]].} \]  
\[\text{arrived no-one} \]  

Ultimately this condition would have to be expanded to include those cases where there is licensing of negative XPs across clause boundaries, but this is an issue I will not deal with here.
Since the clause is specified as \[\text{NEG}\], the post-verbal negative XP meets the condition in (55) and so the resulting construction is grammatical. In contrast, the sentence in (56b) is not specified as \[\text{NEG}\]. It lacks the negative head \text{no} and the negative XP does not correspond to the Pole, so its \[\text{NEG}\] feature has no effect on the interpretive properties of the clause. Since the clause is not a negative clause in this case, the post-verbal negative XP fails to meet the condition in (55) and is thus ungrammatical.

Consider now an example with a preverbal negative XP, such as (57). In this case the negative XP is the Pole of the sentence, and so its \[\text{NEG}\] feature defines the polarity value of the sentence. As a result, the clause as a whole is \[\text{NEG}\] and so the negative XP complies with the licensing condition in (55). This captures the insight in Ladusaw (1992) and Bedell-García (1993) that preverbal negative XPs are "self-licensing." (57)\[\text{IP}\] Nadie llegó \[\text{VP}\] t.\[\text{no-one arrived}\]'No one arrived.'

Finally, consider a case where there are two negative XPs, one in the Pole position and one in the post-verbal field, as in (58). In (58), the negative XP functioning as the Pole provides the \[\text{NEG}\] feature that makes the clause negative, just like in (57). Both the preverbal and the post-verbal negative XP now comply with the licensing condition in (55) and as a result the sentence is grammatical. My analysis thus captures the insight in Ladusaw (1992) that it is not strictly speaking the preverbal negative XP that licenses the post-verbal negative XP. Rather, the preverbal negative XP provides the conditions under which both negative XPs can be licensed, in a way in which the post-verbal negative XP cannot.

\[\text{IP}\] Nadie dijo \[\text{VP}\] n.\[\text{no-one said nothing}\]'No one said anything.'

My analysis further predicts that any negative XP (not just the subject) occupying the Pole should be able to license itself and a post-verbal negative XP in the same way that \text{nadie} does in (58). This is because the Pole in Spanish is not a position exclusively of subjects, so the \[\text{NEG}\] feature of preverbal non-subject negative XPs will be semantically potent irrespective of the grammatical relation borne by the XP. As shown in (59), this prediction is correct. In these examples the preverbal negative XP corresponds to the indirect object and a temporal adjunct, respectively.

(a) A nadie le hemos dicho nada.\[\text{to no-one DAT-CL we-have said nothing}\]'We haven't said anything to anyone.'

(b) Nunca vamos a ningún lado.\[\text{never we-go to no place}\]'We never go anywhere.'

In Ladusaw (1992) and Bedell-García (1993), the preverbal negative XPs are licensed with the licensing condition in (55), which expresses the requirement that the negative XP is the Pole of the sentence. However, since his [\text{NEG}] feature is not a property of the clause, the clause is not a negative clause in this case, the preverbal negative XP does not correspond to the Pole, so its [\text{NEG}] feature has no effect on the interpretive properties of the clause. Since the clause is specified as \[\text{NEG}\], the post-verbal negative XP means the sentence is grammatical. (55) is not satisfied in (55) so the negative XP is licensed by the negative Pole.
To conclude this section, I show how my analysis makes another correct prediction regarding the distribution of negative XPs in Spanish. My analysis predicts that it should not be possible to front a negative XP to a position other than the Pole. This is because the [-\textit{NEG}] feature of a fronted negative XP outside the Pole is not semantically potent, i.e., in our terms, the resulting clause would not satisfy the \textit{NEGATIVE POLE CONDITION}. Accordingly, the clause cannot be specified as a negative clause, and so, following the licensing condition in (55), the fronted negative XP would remain unlicensed. This prediction is also correct. As is well-known, fronting of a negative XP in Spanish does not block the fronting of other constituents (either subjects or non-subjects) functioning as topics. The negative XP, however, must appear in the immediate preverbal position, as in the (a) examples in (60-63). Otherwise, the resulting constructions are ungrammatical (Bedell-García 1993, Fontana 1994, Zubizarreta 1998, Ordóñez & Treviño 1999).

Notice that these examples are particularly telling in that they show that it is descriptively inadequate to simply state that negative XPs in Spanish are "self-licensing" as long as they are located in the preverbal field.

Recall our assumption from §2.3.1 that when there is more than one fronted XP in the preverbal field, the leftmost one is adjoined to the highest inflectional phrase. Accordingly, the examples in (60) would be analyzed as in (64).

\begin{align*}
\text{(60a)} & \quad [\text{no-one\_Juan\_wants\_to\_see}] \\
\text{(60b)} & \quad *[\text{no-one\_Juan\_wants\_to\_see}] 
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{(61a)} & \quad \text{the bad-ones\_nobody\_has\_bought} \\
\text{(61b)} & \quad *[\text{nobody\_the\_bad-ones\_has\_bought}]
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{(62a)} & \quad \text{Juan\_no-one\_saw\_in\_his\_trip\_to\_the\_mountains} \\
\text{(62b)} & \quad *[\text{no-one\_Juan\_saw\_in\_his\_trip\_to\_the\_mountains}]
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{(63a)} & \quad \text{Juan\_n\_ever\_had\_traveled\_to\_Paris} \\
\text{(63b)} & \quad *[\text{n\_Juan\_had\_ever\_traveled\_to\_Paris}]
\end{align*}

Recall our assumption from §2.3.1 that when there is more than one fronted XP in the preverbal field, the leftmost one is adjoined to the highest inflectional phrase. Accordingly, the examples in (60) would be analyzed as in (64).

\begin{align*}
\text{(64a)} & \quad [\text{IP\_Juan\_wants\_to\_see}] \\
\text{(64b)} & \quad *[\text{IP\_no-one\_wants\_to\_see}] 
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{(65a)} & \quad [\text{ACC\_Juan\_wants\_to\_see}] \\
\text{(65b)} & \quad *[\text{ACC\_no-one\_wants\_to\_see}]
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{(66a)} & \quad [\text{ACC\_Juan\_wants\_to\_see}] \\
\text{(66b)} & \quad *[\text{ACC\_no-one\_wants\_to\_see}] 
\end{align*}

Glosses are partially my own.
The crucial difference between (64a) and (64b) is that in the former the negative XP occupies the Pole specifier, whereas in the latter it is adjoined to IP. In (64a) the negative XP is the Pole of the sentence; its [+NEG] feature defines the polarity value of the clause as negative, which in turn licenses the presence of the negative XP, but in (64b), where the fronted negative XP is not the Pole, the relevant conditions are not met.

2.4 Conclusions

The central issue of this chapter has been the introduction and the definition of the Pole and its relation to the EPP. I have suggested, in accordance with most transformational conceptions of sentential structure and departing from Grimshaw (1993, 1997), that the notion of Extended Projection requires both a distinction between the lexical and the functional layer, and a further distinction between the phrases in the inflectional layer of the sentence (Π-Phrases) and those in the C-system (Κ-Phrases). Following this distinction, I have suggested that the specifier of the highest Π-Phrase has a special structural status that is independent of the category of the head that it is the specifier of, and of whether it corresponds to an specifier of the highest Π-Phrase. I have argued that this position is referenced by the EPP. Among other things, an EPP which references a relationally defined position explains why a negative XP is not the Pole if it is not the Pole, whereas the presence of the negative XP does not affect the clause as a negative, which in turn licenses the presence of the negative XP, but the nature of the clause as a negative: [+EPP] causes the presence of the negative XP, but not the presence of the clause as a negative: [+EPP] causes the presence of the negative XP, but not the presence of the clause as a negative. The example sentence: [+]EPP license the presence of the negative XP, but not the presence of the clause as a negative. The example sentence: [+]EPP license the presence of the negative XP, but not the presence of the clause as a negative.