Liliane Haegeman, *The syntax of negation.* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 75.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. Pp. xv+335.

Reviewed by PAUL ROWLETT, University of Salford

In this volume, Haegeman brings us up to date on a number of strands of her work on sentential negation – both alone and in collaboration with Raffaella Zanuttini – published since 1991. (See p. 323 for references.) After an introductory first chapter, in Chapter 2 Haegeman reviews and interprets within current GB theory the literature on the parallels (in English) between negatives and interrogatives. Haegeman then develops her own analysis of sentential negation, first in West Flemish (WF) (Chapter 3), then in a number of other languages (Chapter 4). In Chapter 5, Haegeman addresses the A/A′ distinction. Finally, in a brief sixth chapter, Haegeman points out some residual problems and addresses non-sentential negation.

Chapter 1 'Introduction' (1–69) is a straightforward presentation of (in the main) fairly uncontroversial aspects of GB theory which are relevant for later discussion, for example, VP-internal subjects, substitution vs. adjunction, Minimalist morphology-driven movement, Grimshaw's (1991) extended projections (on which, see below), the A/A′ distinction, the disjunctive ECP, identification via binding and/or antecedent-government, Relativized Minimality and (derivational) chains vs. (representational) CHAINS. In discussion of the syntax of WF, a West Germanic SOV V2 language, Haegeman also discusses Kayne's (1994) Universal Base Hypothesis whereby superficial SOV is derived from underlying SVO by clause-internal leftward A-movement to [Spec, AgrOP], i.e., scrambling. However, as Haegeman recognizes, the appealingly elegant features of her subsequent analysis of negation (at least for languages like WF) are largely voided by the Universal Base Hypothesis.

In Chapter 2 'The WH-criterion and the NEG-criterion' (70–111), Haegeman contextualizes her own work linking negatives with interrogatives by reviewing Klima (1964) and Lasnik (1972). Sentence-initial WH-/NEG-operators with sentential scope in English run parallel in that they both trigger subject-auxiliary inversion and license negative polarity items. In addition, NEG- and WH-operators both create inner islands by blocking antecedent-government. Further, both NEG- and WH-operators demonstrate connectedness effects, whereby one WH-/NEG-operator is licensed parasitically on the back of another. Finally, (some) languages demonstrate negative concord, a phenomenon arguably parallel to WH-absorption. Haegeman follows Klima in attributing these parallels to a common feature [AFFECTIVE] associated with negative and interrogative contexts alike which Haegeman assumes is generated both on phrasal constituents and functional heads, either of which being possibly non-overt. The distribution of [AFFECTIVE] elements is attributed to a general wellformedness

condition: the AFFECT-CRITERION in (1) which, Haegeman suggests, is motivated independently of the Minimalist Program's Checking Theory. (See below for discussion.)

(1) *AFFECT-criterion* (p. 93)
   (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.

(1) is most straightforwardly satisfied in the environment of a functional projection whose head is inherently specified for an [AFFECTIVE] feature, for example, NegP or a selected interrogative CP, whereby a suitable [AFFECTIVE] operator moves into specifier position to create the necessary configuration. Note, however, that (1) does not REQUIRE such an inherently [AFFECTIVE] functional head; rather, Rizzi's (forthcoming) Dynamic Agreement allows for (1) to be satisfied in configurations where an [AFFECTIVE] operator can transmit its feature to a head. Subject-auxiliary inversion is derived from (1), as are WH-absorption/negative concord: in the first case, where an [AFFECTIVE] operator occupies [Spec, CP], movement into C^0 of the inflected verb bearing the feature [NEG/WH] satisfies (1) at that level; in the second case, the multiple WH-/NEG-XPs in a Spec-head configuration with a unique WH-/NEG-head have their operator feature factored out and are amalgamated into a single specifier by (non-referential) co-indexation (without necessarily forming a unique constituent). The relationship between heads and specifiers is therefore biunique.

It is generally assumed that (1) applies universally at LF but that, in some languages, for example, English and WF, it is satisfied at S-structure. Haegeman departs from standard assumptions here and, based on a theory which does not recognize LF (Brody 1993), argues that (1) applies universally at S-structure, either straightforwardly by overt operator movement, or via a representational CHAIN linking an in situ overt operator with a non-overt one: Op. In the latter case, (1) is satisfied indirectly: the required relationship between the functional head and the overt operator is mediated by Op which is in the required configuration with the head and co-indexed with the overt operator. Haegeman's approach is thus similar to work by Watanabe (1991) on WH in situ and Acquaviva (1994) on negation, and it allows Haegeman to avoid the need to resort to Rizzi's (forthcoming) functional definition of operators in (2) which, it was assumed, made it possible for (1) apparently not to be satisfied at S-structure:

(2) (a) (WH-/NEG-)operator: an WH-/NEG-phrase in a scope position.
   (b) Scope position: a left-peripheral A′-position (XP-adjoined or Spec).

In Chapter 3 'NEG-movement and the NEG-criterion' (112–162), Haegeman applies her analysis of sentential negation to WF. WF has (optional but productive) bipartite sentential negation in which the weak pre-verbal clitic (*en*) (compare French *ne*) obligatorily co-occurs with an inherently negative XP (NEG-XP) taking sentential scope, for example, *nie* 'not' which Haegeman suggests occupies a fixed position, namely [Spec, NegP] (compare French *pas*) and *niets* 'nothing'. WF demonstrates negative concord between multiple NEG-XPs (including *nie*) provided, according to Haegeman's analysis, the NEG-XPs scramble to a position above [Spec, NegP] (which entails that, if present, *nie* must be the last in any series of concordant NEG-XPs). Haegeman assumes that scrambling/NEG-movement allows the NEG-XPs to count as extended specifiers of Neg^0 and their individual [NEG] features to be factored out; the NEG-XPs are amalgamated into a unique specifier, thus satisfying the biuniqueness requirement on the Spec-head relation with the trace of *en* in Neg^0.

In Chapter 4 'The application of the NEG-criterion' (163–233), Haegeman considers West Germanic and Romance languages as well as Hungarian. The treatment of German includes lengthy discussion of the split-topic construction (on which, see below). As for English, in sentences like (3), Hageman assumes (1) is satisfied in NegP by a chain linking a non-overt Op in [Spec, NegP] with the negative quantifier ensuring that Op is interpretable and that Neg^0 can be identified.

(3) John said nothing.

The presentation of examples such as (3) is not entirely clear. Op in [Spec, NegP] is said to be 'expletive' yet it bears the feature [NEG]: it is an 'expletive negative operator'. The sense in which an operator can be both negative and expletive is unclear. This (possibly trivial) issue aside, the contrast between English (without NEG-movement) and, say, WF (with NEG-movement) is reduced to the (un)availability of the non-overt expletive negative operator. It is available in English, hence NEG-movement is not needed (therefore not possible given Procrastinate), but unavailable in WF, hence the need for overt NEG-movement in order to satisfy (1). I return to this distinction below. In Hungarian, and Romance languages like Italian, the negative head is assumed to be strong, given that it is sufficient to mark sentential negation. In a simple negative sentence such as (4a), Haegeman suggests (1) is satisfied by a non-overt 'contentive' negative operator; in (4b), in which Op is co-indexed with a NEG-XP, Op is expletive.

(4) (a) Gianni non telefona a sua madre.
(b) Gianni non telefona a nessuno.

In this context, it is unclear to me what motivates Haegeman's claim that the nature of the Op in [Spec, NegP] is different in (4a) and (4b). If Neg^0 is strong,

as Haegeman assumes, is it not the case that an 'expletive' Op would suffice in both cases?

In Chapter 5 'A-positions and A′-positions and the syntax of negation' (234–269), Haegeman concludes that A- and A′-specifiers are not mutually exclusive. Of relevance is (a) the observation that, in WF, non-negative XPs can interrupt a sequence of concordant NEG-XPs, and (b) the conclusion that, again in WF, the concordant NEG-XPs must be in [Spec, AgrOP] positions. This conclusion is a problem for the traditional strict distinction between A and A′: on the one hand, [Spec, AgrOP] is the locus of Case and/or phi-feature checking, i.e., an A-position; on the other, it is the position in which the operator feature(s) of concordant NEG-XPs are checked, i.e., an A′-position. The position is then deemed to have dual A/A′ status, and the traditional strict divide is abandoned.

In Chapter 6 'The syntax of negative operators' (270–289), Haegeman briefly discusses the distinction between sentential and constituent negation, concluding that NEG-XPs without sentential scope are referential and therefore not operators. This conclusion is supported by the lack of inner island effects with constituent negation.

Most of the book is very clearly written and reader-friendly with frequent summaries and extensive cross-referencing. The discussion is divided into manageable (= small) sections and subsections with useful signposts. For me, the most opaque and long-winded sections were the discussion of the split-topic construction in German and the treatment given to the (admittedly complicated) system of negation in Italian. One topic which is presented quite confusingly is Grimshaw's (1991) work on extended projections. The fundamental idea is clear enough: functional projections generated above a lexical XP are extended projections of X^0. So, where YP dominates ZP (and a number of other conditions are satisfied), YP is an extended projection of Z^0 and Z^0 an extended head of YP. Haegeman gives Grimshaw's definition of extended head and projection and illustrates the idea on the basis of example trees. In (44a) on p. 36, TP dominates VP. Nevertheless, Haegeman claims that 'T is an extended head of VP'; five lines later, Haegeman states (correctly, but no less confusingly) that '(conversely), T is not an extended head of VP'. In (24b) on p. 250, NegP dominates VP. Despite this, Haegeman says that 'V is not the extended head of NegP'.

A number of issues – some of which are acknowledged by Haegeman – arise from the analysis of NEG-movement based, ultimately, on (1). First, WF is a scrambling language: NEG-movement (to [Spec, AgrOP]) is attested by non-negative (and non-affective) definite DPs and therefore unlikely to be due to (1). Some of the work attributed to (1) is clearly being done elsewhere. Within the Universal Base Hypothesis, scrambling is attributed to morphological strength: strong features need to be checked pre-spell-out, hence scrambling, weak features can be checked post-spell-out, hence the lack of scrambling. Meanwhile, Haegeman attributes the presence vs. absence of

NEG-movement to the (un)availability of a non-overt expletive negative operator. Given that NEG-movement is the same as scrambling, it is unclear why two parameters are needed. In languages with weak features and a non-overt expletive negative operator, the lack of NEG-movement/scrambling is doubly, i.e., redundantly, determined. Second, the structures produced by NEG-movement, i.e., adjunction to NegP or movement to [Spec, AgrOP], are unlike the structures created by WH-movement, i.e., movement by substitution of an initial WH-XP and movement by adjunction of subsequent WH-XPs into some specifier position. If both instances of operator movement are to be attributed to (1), there is no obvious explanation for this difference. Third, given that negative concord and WH-absorption are seen as parallel phenomena, it remains to be explained why languages do not uniformly admit both or neither.

In terms of presentation, finally, CUP's use of endnotes rather than footnotes will annoy some readers, as will the lack of care taken in preparing one or two of the trees and the inconsistency and errors in the references. Trees (14) on p. 16 and (40) on p. 34 are particularly dreadful. In (9c) on p. 7, the [+WH] complementizer should be *if* and not *that*. (76) on p. 62 implies that a head can move into a specifier position. The indices in (76a–c) and (77b) on pp. 62–65 should be subscripted. In the references, Lasnik's (1972) dissertation is dated (1974). Details for the reference on p. 82 to Ladusaw (1992) are missing. Klima, J. should be Klima, E. S. Ashby, S. should be Ashby, W. J. Elsewhere, on p. 89, [55a] should contain *X-Quant-Y* rather than *X-Quant-X*. (77a) on p. 222 should be starred. The gloss of (59a) fails to suggest multiple WH-movement. One or two glosses are on the page after the respective examples; some are missing altogether. 'LP' in (60) on p. 47 and (62) on p. 144 is unexplained.

These gripes aside, this is, in conclusion, a welcome survey of current work on a topic which has always had a central place in linguistics and which has generated a huge amount of activity and interest over the last decade. In addition, Haegeman offers a number of original insights into some new and some familiar problems. Readers wishing to familiarize themselves with the primary literature will find this book extremely useful and accessible.

REFERENCES

Acquaviva, P. (1994). The representation of operator-variable dependencies in sentential negation, *Studia Linguistica* **48**. 91–132.

Brody, M. (1993). Lexico-logical form: a radically minimalist theory. Ms., University College London.

Grimshaw, J. (1991). Extended projections. Ms., Brandeis University.

Kayne, R. S. (1994). *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Klima, E. S. (1964). Negation in English. In Fodor, J. A. & Katz, J. J. (eds.) *The structure of language*. London: Prentice Hall. 246–323.

Lasnik, H. (1972). *Analyses of negation in English*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

Rizzi, L. (forthcoming). Residual verb second and the *wh*-criterion. In Belletti, A. & Rizzi, L.

(eds.) *Parameters and functional heads: essays in comparative syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Watanabe, A. (1991). S-structure movement and WH in situ. Ms., MIT.

Author's address: European Studies Research Institute,
University of Salford,
Salford, M5 4WT.
E-mail: P.A.Rowlett@mod-lang.salford.ac.uk

(Received 6 September 1995)