ON NEGP AND THE STRUCTURE OF THE POLISH CLAUSE

JACEK WITKOŚ
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

1. *Introduction*

For nearly a decade now linguists have been discussing the issue of functional clausal structure focussing on such problems as for example the existence and function of the syntactic projection of negation (NegP). Recently two studies concerned, among other things, with this aspect of Polish syntax have appeared: Borsley and Rivero's (1994) and Śpiewak and Szymańska's (1995). This study is concerned with the question of NegP manifestation in Polish and both agrees and disagrees in this respect with the two papers mentioned above.

We follow Borsley and Rivero (1994) in their assumptions concerning location of NegP in the Polish clause. First, we agree that it exists and that it does not split Infl but is governed by its lower functional head (Tense). We propose further justification for it based on the phenomenon of the Genitive of Negation by tying it to 'low' placement of NegP in the phrase marker. We shall differ from the view (implicitly) advocated in that paper in terms of the number of NegPs that can be generated within the Polish clause by claiming that more than one can be licensed. More fundamentally, we assume that there is no overt (syntactic) verb raising to Infl ($Agr_{Subject}/T^{o}P$) in Polish which is evident from adverb placement facts[1].

On this issue we side with Śpiewak and Szymańska (1995) with whom, sadly, we cannot however share the conviction that there is no NegP projected in the Polish clause.

The analysis below aims at the spirit of the minimalist/reductionist enterprise whose (basic) assumptions are too intricate and elaborate to be presented in any introductory section. We shall then proceed and clarify some outstanding issues in an *on line* manner. We shall begin with an overview of pertinent issues.

---

[1] Apart from declaring our view on verbal composition as proceeding in covert syntax rather than in overt syntax, we shall not present justification for this view. Witkoś (in progress) treats the problem of clausal structure of Polish in a more detailed and comprehensive manner.

2. *General syntactic aspects of Neg placement*

Syntactic analyses of the so called Neg placement and its contribution to the clause structure usually concentrate on three issues relevant for the theories of head movement:

A. placement of NegP in the hierarchy of functional projections;

B. the X bar theoretical status of the negative lexical element itself, e.g. English *not*, German *nicht* or Polish *nie*;

C. the blocking status of Neg^{o} and head movement chains.

There have been various proposals concerning the criteria that should be used for reliable determination of the NegP position within the structure of the clause. The most typical ones concern basic word order facts such as the precedence relation holding between the negative marker and the (inflected) main verb and modals. Thus for example on the basis of such criteria Pollock (1989), Chomsky (1991) and Belletti (1990 and 1994) proposed that NegP in Romance is placed between the two major functional projections resulting from splitting the former category of Infl. For the reasons connected to the manifestation of the Mirror Principle we shall adopt Belletti's template rather than Pollock's:

(1) $[_{AgrP}...Agr^{o}\ [_{NegP}...Neg^{o}\ [_{TP}...T^{o}...]]]$

Thus on these standard assumptions NegP in both Romance and English is relatively high in the clausal structure. We shall call this position medial, for it centrally 'splits' the traditional Infl node. In relevant cases, verb movement proceeds past NegP; in Romance modals and tensed main verbs move past NegP to Agr^{o} while in English main verbs are apparently unable to bypass NegP (with the sole exception of *be* and *have*).

If we choose to follow one of the rather radical recent proposals advocating universal outlay of functional heads in human language; the Universal Base Hypothesis, such as Sportiche's (1993) or Chomsky's (1994), this medial position of NegP should show for example in Polish and German too. However abstracting from such radical proposals and treating them rather as well motivated and ambitious research postulates and heavily relying on empirical data instead, we might ask if there are good reasons to doubt the universal placement of NegP. It seems that NegP can appear at different levels of structure in various languages. For example on the basis of distributional facts, Rivero (1994) claims that NegP is placed rather high in the languages of the Balkans and proposes the following clause structure for Romanian, Bulgarian, Albanian and Modern Greek:

(2) $[_{NegP}\ Neg^{o}\ [_{ModP}\ Mod^{o}\ [_{AgrP/TP}\ Agr^{o}/T^{o}\ [_{AuxP}\ Aux^{o}\ [_{VP}\ V^{o}...]]]]]$

Also on distributional grounds, Laka (1990) proposes a similar high positioning of NegP (SigmaP) for Basque. Rivero (1991) postulates a different positioning of NegP for Western Slavonic languages: Slovak, Czech and Polish[2]. We shall adopt this proposal and attempt to provide additional support for this placement of NegP in terms of the Genitive of Negation. The NegP placement facts pointing to its 'low' position are presented in the following section.

3. nie/not *placement and modal and auxiliary verbs*

Notice that negation in Polish, expressed by means of a proclitic particle *nie/not*[3], precedes the finite verb, the modal auxiliaries and the future tense copula but it follows the conditional copula and the perfective auxiliary of the dialect.

(3) Ja nie pływałem w jeziorze.
'I not swam in lake'

(4) Ja nie będę pływać w jeziorze.
'I not will swim in lake'

(5) Maria nie może pływać w jeziorze.
'Maria not can swim in lake'

(6) Książka nie została wydana.
'book not was published'

(7) Ja bym nie pływał w jeziorze, gdyby...
'I would not swam in lake if'

---

[2] Russian seems to belong to the same group: it shows the Genitive of Negation and the negative particle *ne/not* follows the conditional auxiliary:

Ja by czital knigu.

'I would read book/ACC'

Ja by *ne* czital knigi.

'I would not read book/GEN'

[3] That the negative particle in Polish is a proclitic on the verb is evident from the impossibility of their separation. Such separation imposes a different scope on negation, that of constituent negation (b):

a. Jan nie pije teraz wody.
'Jan not drinks now water'

b. ?Jan nie teraz pije wodę.
'Jan not now drinks water'= It is not now that Jan drinks water

c. Jan nie bije Marii.
'Jan not beats Maria'

d. *Jan nie Marii bije.

e. Jan Marii nie bije.

Scrambling across a negated verb is possible but the scrambled argument may not separate the verb from the negative particle (d).

(8) *Ja nie bym pływał w jeziorze, gdyby...

(9) Ja żem nie pływał w jeziorze.
'I have/aux not swam in lake'

(10) *Ja nie żem pływał w jeziorze.

The relevant fact at this point is that for some reason (8) and (10) are ungrammatical. The natural conclusion which can be drawn from the examples above is that the conditional auxiliary and the perfective auxiliary of the dialect are placed higher in the clause structure than main verb and other auxiliaries (passive and future and modals). If the former two are placed in the head of $Agr_{Subject}P$, the latter do not reach this position overtly. Schematically, this situation can be represented as follows:

(11) ...$Agr_{Subject}$...[*nie/not*+modal/verb]...

Thus the conditional auxiliary and the perfective auxiliary shall from now on be referred to as 'high' auxiliaries whereas the modal verbs, the future tense copula and the passive copula shall be called 'low' auxiliaries.

Without committing ourselves yet to saying whether *nie/not* in Polish is a head or specifier of NegP and where exactly its position is, we can still capitalize on the fact that it cannot precede $Agr_{Subject}$[4].

It can then be used as a landmark in delimiting the clausal structure. Thus the emerging picture with the negative particle as a clitic is that it can appear in $Agr_{Subject}$ only when it is able 'to get a piggy back ride' on the cliticization host which apparently picks it up on its cyclic head to head climb up the structure. If the auxiliaries in (9) and (7) are base generated in $Agr_{Subject}$, already too high up for the negative particle to cliticize onto, it can never find itself on their left. Instead, it cliticizes onto the following participle. Thus the other auxiliaries, and the main verb, in (3-6) originate lower than the canonical position of *nie/not* and pick it up on their way to higher head positions. We would like to propose that both the main verbs and the modal auxiliaries are generated similarly to lexical main verbs and share many properties with them.

The X-bar theory status of lexical negation has received considerable attention in the literature. The lexical negative elements are classified either as adverbial elements occupying the [Spec,Neg'] position (negative adverbs in Belletti's terminology) or as heads, Neg^0. Thus Italian *non* and French *ne* have been classified as heads while French *pas* and German *nicht* have been widely held to be negative adverbs. The status of English *not* is ambiguous, it has received treatment as both a head and a negative adverb[5].

On the basis of certain Case theory related phenomena, which we take to crucially rely on head to head relations, we shall assume that the lexical element in Polish (*nie/not*) is a head placed in Neg^0.

[4] To be precise, as we hope we are in further parts of this study, the negative particle cannot find itself in the position of the head of AgrP unless it has been moved into it together with the element it has previously cliticized onto.

[5] Chomsky (1991) and Williams (1994) treat *not* as the head of NegP, Pollock (1989) does not clearly commit himself to saying whether it is a head or a negative adverb, Rizzi (1990) and Haegeman (1995) claim that *not* is a negative adverb but the latter regards the *n't* clitic as the head of NegP.

The head of NegP usually shows twofold behaviour with respect to head movement and the Head Movement Constraint (Travis 1984); it either blocks verb movement from lower positions (the case of English in Chomsky's 1991 analysis[6]) or cliticizes onto the highest verbal projection head (Agr) as French *ne* and Italian *non*. As it has been mentioned in an earlier section, Polish *nie/not* is a proclitic thus it cannot be separated from its host. This fact coupled with the claim that it is a head means that it is more akin to the Italian and French negative markers than the English *not*.

4. *The Genitive of Negation*

Apart from the distributional facts presented earlier, the main empirical evidence for Neg placement in Polish comes from the phenomenon of Genitive of Negation; Neg placement affects the structural case marking of the direct object.

4.1. *The facts*

Most transitive verbs usually assign (check) the ACCUSATIVE Case, however if sentential negation[7] is present, the ACCUSATIVE
Case of the object obligatorily changes to GENITIVE:

(12) Chłopcy kopią piłkę.
'boys kick ball/ACC'

(13) Chłopcy nie kopią piłki.
'boys not kick ball/GEN'

(14) Maria pisze listy.
'Maria writes letters/ACC'

(15) Maria nie pisze listów.
'Maria not write letters/GEN'

The Genitive of Negation occurs only with direct objects otherwise marked

[6] The presence of *not* as a potential head movement intervener lead Chomsky to propose the problematic lowering and raising account.

[7] Only sentential and verbal negations are able to affect the direct object case form. Constituent negation has no influence on the Case of the object which remains ACCUSATIVE:

a. Chłopcy kopali nie piłkę ale tornister.
'boys kicked not ball/ACC but satchel/ACC'

b. Maria pisała nie list ale donos.
'Maria wrote not letter/ACC but confidential report/ACC'

Apparently constituent negation is 'too deep' in the structure, within the projection of the nominal, to affect the relevant Case assigner which must be higher.

ACCUSATIVE by the verb. This fact seems to have direct bearing upon the theory of clausal structure in Polish: NegP should be base generated in the vicinity of the ACCUSATIVE Case assigner, so that its presence could alter the assigned (checked) Case from ACCUSATIVE to GENITIVE.

Before any explicit formulation of the NegP placement hypothesis is ventured, it must be stressed that the Case of the indirect object remains unaffected by the presence of lexical negation, nor the case of a prepositional object. These facts are expected if ACCUSATIVE Case is regarded as a structural Case and if only this type of Case were sensitive to Neg placement[8]. The same reasoning extends to prepositional objects, not only lexical assignment but also some Minimality effects are involved, notice that the preposition assigns ACCUSATIVE Case:

(16) Maria pomogła Piotrowi.
'Maria helped Peter/DAT'

(17) Maria nie pomogła Piotrowi.
'Maria not helped Peter/DAT'

(18) *Maria nie pomogła Piotra.
'Maria not helped Peter/GEN'

(19) Tomek odpowiedział na pytanie.
'T. answered on question/ACC'

(20) Tomek nie odpowiedział na pytanie.
'T. not answered on question/ACC'

There is a clear locality constraint on the phenomenon of the Genitive of Negation: it is clause bound in (21) but not strictly local, for the presence of the modal verb does not interfere with it. The clause boundedness condition is relaxed only in the case of infinitival clausal complements (23-26). Neg placement in the superordinate clause forces no change in the Case on the direct object of subjunctive complements (27-28) nor plain indicative complements (29-30):

(21) Tomek musi przeczytał tę książkę.
'Tomek must read this book/ACC'

(22) Tomek nie musi przeczytał tej książki.
'Tomek not must read this book/GEN'

(23) Nauczyciel chce wypić piwo.
'Teacher wants drink beer/ACC'

(24) Nauczyciel nie chce wypić piwa.
'Teacher not wants drink beer/GEN'

[8] This fact seems overlooked in the treatment of Neg placement proposed in Śpiewak and Szymańska (1995).

(25) Jan pozwolił chłopcom kopać piłkę.
'Jan let boys kick ball/ACC'

(26) Jan nie pozwolił chłopcom kopać piłki.
'Jan not let boys kick ball/GEN'

(27) Iwona chce, żeby Tomek zjadł zupę.
'Iwona wants that-cond Tomek ate soup/ACC'

(28) Iwona nie chce, żeby Tomek zjadł zupę/*zupy.
'Iwona not wants that-cond Tomek ate soup/ACC/*GEN'

(29) Jan uważa, że Tomek je zupę.
'Jan thinks that Tomek eats soup/ACC'

(30) Jan nie uważa, że Tomek je zupę/*zupy.
'Jan not thinks that Tomek eats soup/ACC/*GEN'

It is interesting that the syntactic environments allowing for non-local Genitive of Negation (23-26) are parallel to causative constructions in French and Italian and Restructuring constructions of Italian (complements of *volere/want*) which also show some characteristic features of clause merger (e.g., clitic climbing) extensively analyzed in the literature (e.g., Rizzi 1982, diSciullo and Williams 1987)[9].

Possibly some type of clause merger involving infinitival complements is also available in Polish for not only is the Genitive of Negation present in them but clitic climbing too[10]. Additionally, infinitival complements are the only clausal complements without a lexical complementizer in the initial position. Otherwise lexical complementizers are obligatory with noninterrogative clauses. To complete the picture, Wh extraction gives best results from infinitival clausal complements.

We shall return to this issue in a later section on negation. At first, the clause bound Genitive of Negation shall be examined.

[9] Recent analyses of this problem have focussed on the issue of abstract (Baker 1988) or overt incorporation of the causative and *volere* complement into the matrix clause. In Guasti (1993) it was proposed that the overt incorporation is then followed by excorporation of the relative functional projection.

[10] Notice the following examples of clitic climbing in Polish infinitival complements:

a. Jan chce go pochwalić
'Jan wants him praise'

b. Jan go chce pochwalić.
'Jan him wants praise'

c. Jan kazał jej to zjeść.
'Jan told her it eat'

d. Jan jej to kazał zjeść.
'Jan her it told eat'

As these examples show, clitic climbing is not obligatory in Polish.

4.2. *The regular case and low verb raising*

Ever since modular theory of Case was developed, basically since Chomsky (1981), it has been assumed that DATIVE is an inherent Case assigned directly within the m-command domain of the theta role assigning predicate at a rather deep level of grammatical representation (presumably D-structure). Several properties of inherent Case assignment follow, such as insensitivity to syntactic operations functioning at higher levels of representation, for example passivization[11]. If Genitive of Negation affects only the structural Case, its locus must be identified and NegP placed in its vicinity.

We shall assume that the structural Case is assigned (checked) in the spec/head relation with a relevant Agr^{o} head, essentially following Chomsky (1991, 1993 and 1994). Thus both NOMINATIVE and ACCUSATIVE in Polish are checked in [Spec,AgrP]; the subject within the $Agr_{Subject}P$ and the direct object within the $Agr_{Object}P$. Practically then we propose that there is $Agr_{Object}P$ in Polish where the case of the direct object (ACCUSATIVE) is checked.

Is there evidence for Agr_{Object} projection in Polish? There is no overt morphological evidence as in Romance (Kayne 1989, Sportiche 1992). We would like to claim that the Genitive of Negation implies the presence of $Agr_{Object}P$ in the structure. For example consider the observation that *nie/not* does not affect the Case of the underlying object in the Passive, where the ACCUSATIVE Case checker is deficient:

(31) Chłopiec nie kopnął piłki (*piłkę).
'boy not kicked ball/GEN (*ball/ACC)'

(32) Piłka (*piłki) nie została kopnięta.
'ball/NOM (*ball/GEN) not was kicked'

Thus it seems that the Genitive of Negation is tied to the ACCUSATIVE Case checker rather than to the object itself.

As to the position of NegP, it must be placed in the left adjacent slot with the head of NegP selecting $Agr_{Object}P$ as its complement. In view of the effect that Neg placement has on the structural Case, any reductionist/minimalist program (Sportiche 1993 or Chomsky 1993 and 1994) narrows the distribution options to extremely local relations of spec/head and head/head. The former relation can be dismissed as the position of [Spec,$Agr_{Object}P$] is reserved for object DPs which check their structural Case in it. The latter option manifests the relevant properties. Thus we propose that the lower verbal domain of the Polish clause can be represented in the following manner:

[11] The standard case concerns dative passives in German where the subject is still marked for DATIVE although it occupies the position typical of NOMINATIVE:

Mir wurde geholfen.

'me/DAT was helped'

I was helped.

(33) $...[_{NegP}...Neg^{o}...[_{AgrOP}...Agr^{o}...[_{VP}...V^{o}...]]]$

This structure represents the configuration in which locality conditions mentioned above are satisfied. These locality condtions are also necessary for *nie/not* cliticization onto the verb.

(33) seems to capture the facts characteristic of:

- Neg placement influence on the structural Case assigned to the direct object;
- closeness of Neg and verb positioning manifested in the form of *nie/not* cliticization on the verb;
- prevailing word order facts involving negative adverbs, lexical negation and other VP material.

The fact that only ACCUSATIVE Case is affected by the presence of lexical negation points to its special status captured by the $Agr_{Object}P$ hypothesis. If Case relations involve some form of government, the negative element affecting the ACCUSATIVE assignment should remain in the government relation with the direct object Case assigner. Such a relation is best captured if NegP dominates $Agr^{o}_{Object}P$ as its complement. If selection is always a relation involving heads, *nie/not* can be treated the head of NegP.

Some additional evidence can be brought up to adduce the claim that *nie/not* is the head of NegP. Williams (1994) proposes some tests to identify the head/adverbial status of Neg markers. Usually they can behave in both ways, the former typical of clausal negation and the latter typical of constituent negation. Canonical head/complement direction is one of them and in Polish nie/not never appears on the noncanonical side of the VP material: negative marker precedes the verb. Another test is based on the so called complement deletion: if a given lexical element can appear as the rightmost term in a representation of a structure involving deletion and the deleted phrase is recovered as the complement of this rightmost term, the term in question is a head. On such grounds, among others, Williams (1994) classified English *not* as the head of NegP:

(34) Peter didn't lend us money but Martina will [$_{VP}$ lend us money].

(35) Peter swam in this dirty lake but Martina did not [$_{VP}$ swim in this dirty lake].

Notice, that *not* in (35) behaves exactly like *will* in (34), they both allow for deletion and recovery of the bracketed constituents which can be said to be their complements in both cases. Thus the head of NegP shows similar features to the head of some AuxP.

A corresponding regularity shows up in the case of the Polish negative head, where a similar process of its complement deletion can take place:

(36) Maria odpowiedziała na moje pytanie, a Piotr nie [odpowiedział na moje pytanie].
'Maria answered on my question but Peter not [answered on my question]'

(37) Jan kupuje dzieciom słodycze, a Tomek nie [kupuje dzieciom słodyczy].
'Jan buys children/DAT sweets but Tom not [buys children sweets]'

The bracketed constituents are fully recoverable and if deletion affects complements, the rightmost undeleted elements must be heads. On such terms *nie/not* would be the head of NegP[12].

The structure proposed in (33) can rather naturally account for the prevailing unmarked word order involving negative adverbs, negative quantifiers, the negative marker and the remaining part of VP:

(38) Jan nigdy nie pije wina.
'Jan never not drinks wine'

(39) Maria wcale nie gotuje zupy grzybowej.
'Maria at all not cooks soup mushroom'

(40) Piotr nikogo nie spotkał w parku.
'Peter noone not met in park'

Assuming that the negative adverbs and negative quantifiers occupy the position of [Spec,NegP] in these examples, the expected word order shows:

(41) ...Neg Adv...*nie*...verb...object...

However, assuming that [Spec,NegP] and Neg^{o} are occupied by some lexical elements in these examples is only a trivial consequence of distributional properties. A more demanding task is to commit oneself to saying where the verb and the object are in (41). The possible positioning of the object can involve two positions provided for by (33): [V',NP], the VP internal object position and [Spec,Agr^{o}P], the direct object Case position. The verb can occupy three available head positions: V^{o}, Agr^{o} or a Neg^{o} adjoined position.

In line with the reductionist/minimalist feature checking hypothesis, overt movement should not be posited unless there are strong empirical grounds to assume it does take place. Having said that, there appears to be at least one strong reason to assume verb movement out of VP at the pre spell-out (S-structure) stage of the derivation: *nie/not* cliticization on the verb. The cliticization of the negative head onto the verb is not a purely Polish (Slavic) feature. For instance it has been extensively analyzed for French *ne* (Pollock 1989 and 1993) and Italian *non* (Belletti 1994). As clitics, the negative clitics were said to move via head movement. In these analyses the negative clitic attaches to the left of the highest functional head which also hosts main verbs. Thus in principle these analyses involve two independent movement processes targeting the highest functional head (Agr^{o}), the movement of the negative clitic and the verb and ran into some problems with (the strict version) of the HMC[13].

We shall pursue a slightly different line of reasoning and say that the cliticization of the negative head on the verb comes about as the result of verb raising and right adjunction to Neg^{o} (a syntactic proclitic) which remains motionless in its base derived position. Rivero (1994) makes a similar claim: for her NegP in Balkan languages is high and for example even inflectional auxiliaries attach to it:

(42) Ja *ne*bih to uradio da sam na tvoim mestu[14].
'I wouldn't do it if I were you'

Thus the word order manifested in (41-42) involves a movement of the verb from within VP, through Agr$_{Object}$ into Neg^{o}. This movement is not fully vacuous despite generating an apparently identical word order; it gives an account of *nie/not*

[12] It is however striking that sometimes the so called negative adverbs can appear at the right periphery of a structure involving deletion, although negative adverbs are said to canonically occupy the [Spec,NegP] position (e.g., Belletti 1994), never a head position:

a.% Maria kupuje piwo, a Piotr nigdy [nie kupuje piwa].
'Maria buys beer but Peter never [not buys beer]'

b. Maria zawsze kupuje piwo, a Piotr nigdy [nie kupuje piwa].
'Maria always buys beer but Peter never [not buys beer]'

The less acceptable status of (a) can be credited to the fact that deletion must involve some notion of identity/parallelism of the constituents involved. The status of this example improves as the negative adverb is focally stressed. Note, that in (b) there are both a Positive Phrase (*zawsze/always...*) and a Negative Phrase (*nigdy/never...*) in either conjunct. Its fully acceptable status seems to corroborate some equivalence of PosP and NegP proposed in the literature (e.g., Progovac 1994, Laka 1990).

Still the possibility of deletion in these cases could mean that the respective adverbs are not in [Spec,NegP] but have their own independent projections (as proposed in Sportiche 1993). Having acknowledged a possible problem, we shall not pursue this matter further in this study.

[13] Pollock (1989) assumed that as defective head governor, Neg^{o} does not induce any Minimality (HMC) effects and based his analysis of its blocking potential on the lack of L-marking of the following AgrP and VP. The problem with this account is that when Agr-inserted dummy *do* moves over NegP to TP, one barrier is still crossed:

a. [TP...T...[NegP...Neg...[AgrP...[VP...V...]]]]

AgrP is said to be a defective BC (blocking category) just like IP in the original 'Barriers' system (Chomsky 1986), thus it need not be L-marked by Neg^{o}. However a direct movement of *do* from the position of Agr^{o} into T^{o} crosses over two maximal projections: NegP and AgrP. Consequently the chain of this head movement spans over a BC (AgrP) and NegP which although L-marked by *do* in T^{o} itself, becomes a barrier by inheritance from AgrP.

Belletti (1994) avoids HMC violations by assuming that it is a condition operating on representations rather than derivations and proposes that the target of both movements, the highest Agr$^{o}_{Subject}$ can head two independent chains if their indices are compatible. The compatibility of indexing remains a rather arbitrary issue.

[14] One of the effects of tying the low (post Infl) placement of negation to the Genitive of Negation is the interesting prediction that we would expect to find the Genitive of Negation in the Slavic languages which allow the order (a) in synthetic constructions with the conditional auxiliary but disallow (b):

(a) cond aux - neg

(b) neg - cond auxiliary

This expectation is at least partly confirmed: (a) is typical of Polish, Czech, Slovak and Russian. The latter two show the Genitive of Negation (Russian less prominently and probably it is being lost, at least in colloquial registers). Czech and Slovak had the Genitive of Negation until 15th century (it was still present in the addresses of Jan Hus). Bulgarian and Serbian/Croat favoring (b) do not display the Genitive of Negation.

cliticization onto finite verbs[15]. Once head adjunction takes place the two heads involved cannot be separated and any further movement of the complex head cannot show excorporation.

By assuming such a scenario for movement we can avoid the problem of the blocking effect that the head of the NegP should have on verb movement: in Polish the verb moves through Neg°, the locus of the negative clitic. Consequently, the strict version of the HMC is satisfied.

The case of the object in (41) is more complicated and involves more speculation. Apparently nothing is at stake whether we decide to propose that it leaves VP or not. For the unaffected word orders, movement of the object need not be posited as long as the verb precedes the object at spell-out (S-structure). The analysis assuming verb raising to Neg° presented above is able to account only for constructions involving sentential negation. How does the verb behave in its absence? To be more precise, is there any reason to claim that the verb moves in these constructions too?

We believe that two possible analyses can be sketched: one based on the assumption that a scrambled or topicalized object must have passed through [Spec,Agr_{Object}P] for Case checking and the other relying on ditransitive VPs. We shall advocate the latter option for the reasons given below.

Overt movements out of VP of both the object and the verb can be motivated in the following manner: topicalization and scrambling involve some sort of upward movement of the object. Having said that the verb overtly raises to Neg° in negative clauses, we must commit ourselves to the proposal that at least direct object scrambling moves the object higher than the [Spec,Agr_{Object}P] position. Otherwise, assuming (33), the relative word order: verb - object (see 41) should not change. If topicalization and scrambling involve movement past the direct object Case position, we should face a paradox concerning Principle Procrastinate; in scrambled structures the object should check its structural Case in overt syntax (passing through [Spec,Agr_{Object}P] en route its landing site) while in unaffected word orders it could check its Case in covert syntax. Alternatively, the scrambled direct object should move up at spell-out, then lower at LF and raise again to satisfy the ECP. Either way it is hard to imagine such a wide choice of Case checking options available within the same language.

Thus the distributional facts presented in (41) and their corresponding structural template in (33), repeated below for convenience:

(33) ...[$_{NegP}$...Neg°...[$_{AgrOP}$...Agr°...[$_{VP}$...V°...]]]

[15] The fact that the negative particle and the verb move as a unit is clear in archaic Yes/No questions involving *li/whether* clitic complementizer. Assume *li/whether* to be a head (Q°) placed in Comp° as in other Slavic languages. Consider:

nie znasz*li* tego człowieka?

'not know-2psing-whether this man?'

Do you know this man?

Here the neg-V°-Q° complex seems to be in Comp° with the verb and negation raising toghether as one head.

(41) ...Neg Adv...*nie*...verb...object...

should allow for the following positioning of the verb and the direct object in affirmative clauses: assume the direct object always raises to [Spec,Agr_{Object}P] overtly and thus the possibility of optional earlier or later Case checking is obliterated: ACCUSATIVE is always checked at the spell-out level. This would now cause an additional problem: in the affirmative clause the verb must still precede the direct object in unmarked cases. Thus the sequence present in (41) must involve both the object and the verb movement irrespective of the presence of negation. Raising of the verb to the head of the object agreement phrase is insufficient, for the object would still be only left adjacent rather than right adjacent to the verb. However if NegP and Positive Phrase (PosP) are both regarded as two different sides of the same coin (different realizations available for the head of some Polarity Phrase, PolP), the main verb in Polish would have to raise to Pol° in overt syntax. This solution has the advantage of proposing uniform treatment not only for affirmative clauses and negative clauses but also neutral word orders and scrambled word orders[16].

However one obvious flaw of this option is that the predicted word order within ditransitive VPs should be:

(43) ...verb...direct object...indirect object...

Although possible with focal stressed on the indirect object in the string final position, such a word order in Polish is not neutral and both DP object positioning and clitic pronoun positioning strongly point towards the opposite order between the objects:

(44) (*nie*)...verb...indirect object...direct object...

(45) Tomek kupił mamie kwiaty.
'Tomek bought mum/DAT flowers/ACC'

(46) Tomek nie kupił mamie kwiatów.
'Tomek not bought mum/DAT flowers/GEN'

(47) Tomek dał jej to.
'Tomek gave her it/ACC'

(48) Tomek nie dał jej tego.
Tomek not gave her it/GEN'

If we regard the word order in (44) as unaffected (neutral), the option positing

[16] Such a functional projection has been proposed in the literature (Laka's 1990) Affective Phrase or Belletti's (1994) Positive Phrase. The presence of these categories could be required by the presence of some equivalent structural licenser of both Negative and Positive Polarity Items (NPIs and PPIs). The Polarity Phrase postulate also suits the theory of functional and lexical heads presented in Grimshaw (1991) which we would like to rely on.

overt raising of the direct object to [Spec,Agr_{Object}] for structural Case checking cannot hold, for the object is in some VP final position[17]. The natural consequence of (44) is that the direct object cannot move to its structural Case position in overt syntax but instead its ACCUSATIVE Case feature is checked in the relative spec/head configuration at LF.

Our adoption of this proposal requires some comment on the unexpected situation with topicalized and scrambled direct objects[18]. The claim that by leaving VP they also leave $Agr_{Object}P$ is still in force. We tentatively propose that their movement must require some compromise on the principle of Procrastinate: if direct object scrambling involves movement to some A' position (as in Haegeman 1995 and Sportiche 1993 among others) the direct object passes through [Spec,$Agr_{Object}P$] on its way to the landing site showing 'early altruism'; the passing direct object checks off the Case feature of Agr_{Object} and its own Case feature at an earlier level of representation relying on the Economy principle that a (motivated) early checking is less costly than scrambling at spell-out followed by lowering at LF. This proposal resembles the LGB claim that A' movement of argument DPs can proceed only from A (Case) positions. Some other proposals can also be put forward in these cases[19].

Notice also, that if we assume that the direct object structural Case is checked at LF, we need not posit unnecessary movement of the verb out of its VP (into the head of some Positive Phrase)[20].

As far as the movement into Neg^{o} and cliticization onto *nie/not* is concerned, this process can be motivated by the presence of a strong syntactic proclitic nature of *nie/not*. It is the strength this feature that motivates verb movement within the low verbal domain.

[17] We dismiss the following option: all the lexical elements leave the VP; the objects raise to their respective [Spec,AgrP] positions for overt (pre spell-out) Case checking and the verb to some higher head position recreating the basic word order.

[18] This discussion is purely academic in view of repeated claims, expressed also in Chomsky (1994), that non morphologically driven movement such as scrambling is the domain of PF processes. We find it hard to accept this view.

[19] For example Kayne (1989) and Sportiche (1993) propose the following account of direct object clitic Case marking in participial constructions. When overt object agreement shows, the moved element has passed through [Spec,$Agro_{bject}P$]. When there is no overt agreement between the participle and the object clitic, it has 'skipped' [Spec,$Agro_{bject}P$] on its way to the surface clitic position. It is proposed the relevant ACCUSATIVE Case feature is then checked via an LF movement of **the trace** of the clitic into the specifier position of the object agreement phrase.

In our case, the trace of the scrambled object could check the structural Case, especially if the trace itself is treated rather as a copy of the moved DP (Chomsky 1993).

[20] This problem is not trivial if we follow the spirit of Grimshaw (1991) extended projections hypothesis; the number of functional phrases projected from a lexical head should be always equal, for each successive projection is in a sense 'numbered' by bearing an appropriate index: V^{o} [F0], $Agro_{bject}$ [F1], Neg/Pol^{o} [F2], T^{o} [F4], $Agrs_{ubject}$ [F5], etc. There can be no discontinuation in the number sequence of projected functional phrases. This fact would call for some Polarity Phrase whose head is either Neg^{o} or Pos^{o}. If this view is adopted the following claim can be put forward: Pos^{o} does not force overt verb movement the way Neg^{o} does, in line with the assumption that lexically empty heads do not force pre spell-out verb raising.

4.3. *Partial conclusions*

To sum up this part of our discussion of Neg placement in Polish we shall recapitulate its major points.

In view of two phenomena such as *nie/not* cliticization and the Genitive of Negation we have claimed that NegP in Polish is located in the vicinity of the locus of ACCUSATIVE Case assignment, which we take to be $Agr_{Object}P$, taking VP as its complement.

Due to the aforementioned cliticization which is syntactic, and not purely phonetic and in line with widely recognized claims that the movement of the clitic[21] involves head to head movement, we proposed that Polish negative marker *nie/not* is the head of NegP, not a negative adverb with which it can cooccur[22]. Additionally, we presented some arguments showing that Neg^{o} is able to license constituent deletion like other AuxP heads.

Because *nie/not* is a clitic we proposed that the process of cliticization can be viewed in terms of a local verb raising to the head position of NegP; the verb raising to Agr_{Object} is licensed by the ACCUSATIVE Case checking configuration and further raising to Neg^{o} is required by the syntactic proclitic nature of the head of NegP.

So far only an account of the most basic case of Neg placement has been proposed, involving a lexical transitive verb followed by an object. It remains to be seen how the suggested analysis can be extended onto the more intricate cases of local negation of the verb, nonlocal Genitive of Negation with modal verbs and Neg raising effects with infinitival complements, and finally how the presented account can account for the Genitive of Negation with locative subjects. We shall begin with the most local case.

5. *Neg extensions: local negation of the verb*

Polish grammar overtly allows for a manifestation of the difference in meaning between the two readings of:

(49) He may not sleep.
a. "I disallow him to sleep"
b. "I allow him not to sleep"

The corresponding Polish sentences are:

(50) On nie może spać.
'he not can sleep' = (49a)

[21] Note, that we use the term 'movement of the clitic' rather than 'clitic movement'. The difference is by no means trivial. In his analysis of clitics in Romance, Sportiche (1993) distinguishes between these two terms: the so called clitic (movement) constructions need not involve the movement of the clitic itself.

[22] Still having said that, we would like to follow the idea of Williams (1994) in this respect. Roughly speaking as clausal negation, *nie* is the head of NegP but as constituent negation marker it behaves like an adverbial modifier.

(51) On może nie spać.
'he can not sleep' = (49b)

with corresponding differences in meaning and different truth values[23].

The auxiliary negation (50) should be viewed as 'clausal negation' while the main verb negation (51) is expected to behave like 'local negation'. However this expectation is only partly corroborated and most importantly, from our point of view, the negative particle preceding the main verb triggers off the Genitive of Negation.

The differences between the two types of negation are as follows; although local negation on the verb also appears in the canonical order, it disallows its VP complement deletion:

(52) *Marek musi grać w piłkę ale Tomek może nie [grać w piłkę].
'M. must play in ball but T. can not [play in ball]

Clausal negation implies negation of each constituent (test from Guasti 1993):

(53) a. Maria nie może dziś pić piwa, ale Jan tak.
'M. not can today drink beer but Jan yes'
b. ----------, ale mleko tak.
'but milk yes'
c. ----------, ale jutro tak.
'but tomorrow yes.'

(54) a. ?*Maria może dziś nie pić piwa, ale Jan tak.
b. ?*----------, ale mleko tak.
c. ?*----------, ale jutro tak.

On the other hand, both types of negation seem to be able to license Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) in the object (57), adjunct (59) and subject (61) positions. Also, most importantly, the local negation on the main verb produces the Genitive of Negation (55):

(55) Tomek może dziś nie jeść zupy.
'T. may today not eat soup/GEN'

(56) Tomek nie może dziś niczego jeść.
'T. not may today nothing/GEN eat'-said the doctor

(57) Tomek może dziś niczego nie jeść.
'T. may today nothing/GEN not eat'-if he is not hungry

(58) Tomek nie może dziś wcale jeść.
'T. not may today at all eat'- because he is sick

[23] The placement of negation in these cases is different from the case of the synthetic conditional and the dialectal auxiliary: it does affect the meaning of the proposition but still it is able to trigger off NPIs.

(59) Tomek może dziś nigdzie nie jeść.
'T. may today nowhere not eat'- because he's fussy about restaurants

(60) Nikt nie może dziś jeść zupy.
'Nobody not may today eat soup/GEN'-said a food inspector

(61) Nikt może dziś nie jeść zupy.
'Nobody may today eat soup/GEN'

Also scopal ambiguities involving negation and quantifiers, supposedly typical of clausal negation, are marginally possible with local negation on the verb (again, a test used in Guasti 1993). The expectations are as follows: clausal negation, as c-commanding the object containing a quantifier phrase, can have a wide scope over it but if QR applies, the quantifier should also have a possibility of having a wide scope over negation. In the case of local verbal negation only one option should be possible, such in which the quantifier has wider scope than negation. It seems that both possibilities are marginally allowed with the local case:

(62) a. Profesor nie może oblać wielu studentów ale tylko kilku.
'Prof. not can fail many students but only few'
b. Profesor nie może oblać wielu studentów ale może ich odesłać.
'----------but can send them away'

(63) a. Profesor może nie oblać wielu studentów ale tylko kilku.
b. %----------ale ich odesłać[24].

Thus cases of local negation on the verb seem to behave differently from local negation on DPs which does not show any ambiguities: it has scope only over the DP constituent and does not trigger off the Genitive of Negation[25].

In our treatment of local negation of the verb, we should extend and modify the schemata proposed in (33) in line with the proposals expressed recently in Grimshaw (1991) and Koopman (1994). Assume that the lexical verb does not project only up to VP shell but forms an extended projection (in the sense of Grimshaw 1991) with two functional projections: Agr_{Object} and (optionally) Neg^{o}. Alternatively, the lexical verb can be said to have, minimally, two receptors corre-

[24] A considerable disambiguation of these cases is possible with a scrambling of the quantified argument into the preverbal position:

a) Profesor wielu studentów nie może oblać; QPneg

b) Profesor wielu studentów może nie oblać; QPneg

[25] Consider the following examples:

a. [Nie Maria] zbiła wazę.
'not Mary broke vase/ACC'

b. Maria zbiła [nie wazę] ale szklankę.
'Mary broke note vase/ACC but (a) glass/ACC'

Notice that the constituent negative *nie/not* does not affect the case of the object in (b). Without further analysis we shall assume that constituent negation is structurally represented in the form of DP adjunction.

sponding to the two aforementioned functional heads (Koopman 1994). The core assumption of this proposal is that rather than selecting lexical projections, the relevant functional projections should be viewed as projected of the lexical heads. This view borders on Minimalism: on minimalist terms, whenever the lexical verb enters the computation system, operation Merge combines it with the insulation layers of Agr_{Object} and Neg^{o} equipped with a particular set of features, otherwise the derivation crashes.

Additionally, assume that the modal verb also forms an extended projection involving Agr_{Object} and Neg^{o}[26]. This assumption is not 7 implausible, considering the fact that Polish modals have a repertoire of morphological forms almost as wide as that of lexical verbs: they have imperative forms, active participle forms and can form strings. Thus finally, the Polish clause involving a modal verb has the following form[27]:

(64) $[_{AgrS/T}\ [_{NegP}\ Neg^{o}\ [_{AgrP}\ Agr^{o}\ [_{ModP}\ Mod^{o}\ [_{NegP}\ Neg^{o}\ [_{AgrP}\ Agr^{o}\ [VP]]]]]]$

The structure above is only a partly reduplicated copy of (33). The reduplication of $Agr_{Object}P$ and NegP projections stems from the assumption concerning the lexical character of modal verbs. Before we consider some consequences of assuming (64) for head movement, we shall notice one unchallenged advantage of this structure over a 'single NegP' (Borsley and Rivero 1994) or 'no NegP' (Śpiewak and Szymańska 1995) accounts: (64) predicts that in principle both Neg^{o} positions could be lexically filled and affect only structural ACCUSATIVE. This is indeed the case as shown below.

Apart from the well known phenomenon of licensing multiple NPIs per clause preserving the negative value of the proposition, a phenomenon referred to as Negative Concord (NC) in Haegemann (1995), Polish shows also Double Negation (DN) with one *nie/not* cancelling the other and thus converting the negative value of the proposition to affirmative:

(65) Tomek nie może nie znać Marii.
'T. not may not know Maria/GEN'- he surely knows her

(65) seems to be the maximal lexicalization of the material in the frame proposed in frame (64).

Thus the head movement scenario in the case of (the so called) lexical negation of the main verb (example 51) is as follows: the lexical *nie/not* as a host of cliticization requires the verb to raise to it at S-structure. The Case checking requirement

[26] With the exception of the inflectional auxiliaries of the synthetic conditional and the dialectal perfective past which are indeed spell-outs of functional elements themselves.

[27] Viviane Deprez (personal communication) suggested that the modal and the main verb should be treated as two separate predicates projecting two independent clauses. This claim would practically equate modal/main verb relation with the main verb/infinitival complement relation. Although worth considering, we shall however put this proposition aside and leave it for future research. Thus we want to keep the distinction between the modal and infinitival constructions.

of Agr_{Object} is changed to GENITIVE. Thus all seems the same as in the basic lexical verb case.

On minimalist assumptions, the derivation of the phrase marker will proceed to the level of the main verb NegP where the head Neg has a strong feature [+v]. Its satisfaction must be immediate and must take place within the maximal projection of Neg^{o} or else the derivation crashes. Thus the verb is required to raise to Neg^{o} through an intermediate landing site in Agr_{Object}[28]. The presence of the lexical Neg head in the phrase structure will force the alteration in the Case checking requirements of the Agr_{Object} head in its government domain: instead of ACCUSATIVE, the GENITIVE Case is checked. The Case checking as such will take place after spell-out in the manner of the object Case feature raising to Agr_{Object} with a weak Case feature via head movement.

However, the obvious problem remains: what happens to the inert $Agr_{Object}P$ and NegP projections of the modal/auxiliary verbs? To make the discussion more concrete, let us present an example of such a construction and analyze it in view of the structure proposed in (64):

(66) Tomek może nie jeść zupy.
'T. may not eat soup'

As far as the inert NegP is concerned, we are not forced to assume that it is a NegP, paradoxically as it may sound. The head of NegP in Polish must always be lexicalized, unlike in English or Italian, where in standard varieties *nessuno/nobody* license nonlexical head of NegP:

(67) Nobody arrived.

(68) *Nobody didn't arrive.

(69) Nessuno telefona a Gianni.
'no one calls Gianni'

(70) *Nessuno non telefona a Gianni.

The Polish situation brings to mind such proposals as made in Laka (1990) and Belletti (1994), namely that there is a Polarity Phrase projected in the clausal structure. The interpretive value of this head can take at least two options remaining in complementary distribution: Positive and Negative. Assume that in Polish this value option selection is manifested overtly: whenever there is no *nie/not* in the phrase marker, the Polarity Phrase is a Positive Phrase. In the other case it is the Negative Phrase. Assume further that the head of the Positive Phrase

[28] This premature movement of the verbal head to Agr_{Object} is a violation of Procrastinate and Economy but it is in a sense parasitic on some other obligatory movement process (strong feature satisfaction of Neg^{o}). As suggested by Viviane Deprez (1995 Vienna seminar) parasitic violations of Procrastinate are licit and must be treated differently form straightforward violations of Procrastinate which cause ungrammaticality, as in an early verb raising in English:

*worry you not!

does not license overt verb raising at S-structure, for it is not a (lexical) clitic. On minimalist assumptions, Pos^{o} has a weak [+v] feature. Thus the NegP of the modal in (66) is a PosP requiring covert raising of the modal/auxiliary.

The discussion mentioned above certainly calls for a nontrivial alteration of the structural template proposed in (64): instead of a double NegP, we should have a double Pol(arity) Phrase, with a double head value each, Pos^{o} and Neg^{o}[29]:

(71) $[_{AgrS/T}\ [_{PolP}\ Pol^{o}\ [_{AgrP}\ Agr^{o}\ [_{ModP}\ Mod^{o}\ [_{PolP}\ Pol^{o}\ [_{AgrP}\ Agr^{o}\ [VP]]]]]]$

The case of the higher Agr_{Object} in (66) and similar cases is more problematic. Double checking of the same structural Case feature (ACCUSATIVE) is rather unorthodox and even prohibited under Minimalist assumptions: a presence of an Agr_{Object} with unchecked [+Case] feature at LF should cause the derivation to crash (The Minimalist version of the GB Case filter). Notice, however that the case of (66) and similar examples is not as straightforward as for example the case of an unchecked ACCUSATIVE Case. First, assume that Agr_{Object} has also other functions to fulfill, apart from checking Case; it has phi-features and a weak [+D] feature. The [+interpretable] phi-features and the categorial [+D] feature of the object DP can still be checked at the higher Agr_{Object}. The lack of checking of its Case feature is parasitic on an earlier checking of this feature on a lower $Agr_{Object}P$. We take this parasitic/conditional violation of the checking requirement to be allowed under LF incorporation and creation of a complex predicate whose outline shall be presented in the following section.

6. *Neg extensions: nonlocal Genitive of Negation*

Postponing our discussion of Agr_{Object} checking for a little while, let us take a closer look at the opposite case of negative marker preceding the modal element or the main verb taking an infinitival complement. We refer to cases of:

(72) Tomek nie może pić zimnej coli. (modal case)
'T. not may drink cold cola/GEN'

(73) Tomek nie chce jeść zupy. (infinitival case)
'T. not want eat soup/GEN'

Both modal constructions and infinitival constructions share some interesting properties: they allow for nonlocal Genitive of Negation as the examples show, they also allow for clitic climbing and license NPIs in their complements:

[29] In our analysis we do not refer to the issue of AspectP, included for example in the clause structure template proposed in Śpiewak and Szymańska (1995). Aspectual formatives have no bearing the Genitive of Negation and we leave the issue of their structural manifestation open:

(a) Maria nie obtłukła kubka.
'M. not chipped mug/GEN'

(b) Maria nie obtłukiwała kubka.
'M. not chipped/Asp/habitual mug/GEN'

(74) Maria go może pocałować.
'M. him can kiss'

(75) Maria go chce pocałować.
'M. him wants kiss'

(76) Piotr nie chce niczego czytać.
'P. not wants nothing/GEN read'

(77) Piotr nie może nic czytać.
'P. not may nothing read'

Another property they have in common is that they disallow for a lexical complementizer separating them from their complements. Thus, for example when taking subjunctive complements introduced by *żeby*, *kazać/order* or *chcieć/want* do not induce the relevant processes in their complements:

(78) Piotr nie kazał żeby Jan jadł zupę(ACC)(*GEN)
'P. not ordered that J. ate soup'

(79) Piotr nie kazał żeby Jan coś (*nic) jadł.
'P. not ordered that J. something (*nothing) ate'

(80) Maria (*go) chciała żeby go ukarać.
'M. (*him) wanted that him punish'

Returning to the relevant cases of modals and infinitives, we would like to propose a very unoriginal but plausible solution based on LF incorporation.

Assume that the lack of an intervening Complementizer and the fact that both the modal and the relevant verbs select infinitival complements in the appropriate configuration for incorporation to take place. At LF there is incorporation of the main verb into the modal one. Assume that the inactive functional nodes insulating the infinitive ($Agr_{Object}P$ and PolP) are truncated on the condition that their weak features are checked 'elsewhere', namely within the PolP and $Agr_{Object}P$. The condition on the truncation of functional nodes containing weak features can be identity: the weak feature must be checked in the domain of an identical functional projection or else the derivation would crash. The 'identity' of the relevant functional projections is defined in relation to the incorporation host; in essence the host, both the modal and the verb taking the infinitival complement must allow for their own functional heads to check the [+interpretable] and [-interpretable] features of the complement verbs[30].

Consider the concrete case of (81):

(81) Tomek nie może pić zimnej koli.
'T. not may drink cold coke/GEN'

[30] In practice, the truncation of the projections should be taken rather as erasure of the relevant weak features on the $Agro_{bject}$ and Neg^{o} heads in line with Chomsky (1994).

The lexical verb *pić/drink* does not project a negative Pol° (*nie/not*). As a result, it need not raise to Pol° overtly. Both Pol° and Agr_{Object} have weak features which must be checked at LF when the entire phrase marker has been constructed. With the lower part of the phrase marker produced by Merge (up to the level of PolP), the modal verb will project its own $Agr_{Object}P$ and PolP. The object agreement phrase of the modal will have to be able to check the Case of the verbal complement, assume it to be identical to the $Agr_{Object}P$ of the lexical verb. The PolP of the modal verb is in fact a NegP, so unlike the Pol° of the lexical verb, it has a strong [+v] feature and requires overt modal verb raising to form a clitic complex. Naturally, the higher Agr_{Object} checking capacity is affected by this fact and it is set to check GENITIVE. At LF the entire phrase marker has been projected and all the strong features of functional heads satisfied. Next the PolP and the $Agr_{Object}P$ of the main verb are truncated (their relevant features deleted) and abstract incorporation takes place. Immediately the question arises how this truncation affects the convergence of the derivation. It seems that it need not doom it to a crash: the structural Case feature of the direct object DP is checked at higher Agr_{Object}, the weak features of this functional head are also satisfied: the phi features, the D feature and the Case feature.

Further assume that a proposition has unambiguously only one positive/negative value: the topmost one (c-commanding the others) determines its value for the entire proposition. Consequently, the loss of the lower PolP is not relevant for the LF interface, for the higher PolP (NegP) will determine the value for the entire proposition. This immediately brings to mind the case of (66) which is definitely marked:

(66) Tomek może nie jeść zupy.
'T. may not eat soup/GEN'

Here both PolPs are projected and have conflicting values, however the higher one (PosP) prevails and marks the proposition as affirmative, although not unambiguously. The case of Double Negation (65) confirms this view.

In practice, we would like to claim that the truncation of the lower functional heads usually takes place in the modal and infinitival constructions. The only marked cases belong to the class of the 'local' negation of the verb discussed in the previous section (e.g. 66) where the lower functional heads are activated in checking. The problematic case of the inert higher Agr_{Object} can be now put on an equal footing with the cases of inert lower Agr_{Object}s; its deletion will not cause a crash as long as the Case, phi and D features of the object DP are checked by a corresponding (under our assumptions virtually identical) object agreement phrase[31].

[31] Alternatively, another line of argument can be proposed. The choice of items used in operations Select and Merge is purely arbitrary and there are a number of parallel derivations competing for convergence. Rather than saying that the modal phrase always projects the same type of $Agr_{Object}P$ as the main verb, we could assume that it always faces two options of merging either with a 'transitive' or 'intransitive' Agr°. The difference between the types being that the 'transitive' variety has the weak [+Case] feature while the 'intransitive' one has only the D and phi features to check. Thus the random selection of the 'transitive' Agr° would cause the derivation to crash, for its case feature would not be checked off at LF. A competing random merger with an intransitive Agr° would produce a converging derivation with no unchecked Case features. Notice, that phi and D features can be checked more than once but Case features cannot. This solution has a derivational and Minimalist flavour to it but notice also that it cannot apply to the lower $Agr_{Object}P$ and some form of truncation must still be proposed.

Notice, that our account of LF incorporation and functional node truncation can be extended to cover such cases as:

(82) Tomek *nie* może teraz zechcieć pić koli.
'T. not may now want drink coke/GEN'

(83) Tomek może teraz *nie* zechcieć pić koli.

(84) Tomek może teraz zechcieć *nie* pić koli.

For these cases we would like to posit the existence of three object agreement and polarity phrases.

At present we shall turn to the last and by far the most irregular case: the Genitive of Negation with subjects of locative predicates.

7. *Neg extensions: some speculation on Agr° and locative predicates*

Our hypothesis concerning NegP placement in Polish outlined above is able to account for Neg placement facts in simple cases of negated main transitive verbs. In the presence of negation the ACCUSATIVE Case on the direct object changes to GENITIVE. It was proposed that lexical head of NegP exerts influence on the head of $Agr_{Object}P$ and this fact is responsible for the Case alteration. This alteration was shown to occur only with direct objects, which points strongly to Agr_{Object} as the category involved in the process. Other types of objects are not affected.

There is however a set of constructions involving nonverbal locative predicates where the presence of clausal negation alternates the case of the subject of the clause; instead of the expected NOMINATIVE, the GENITIVE appears. Notice that once again a structural Case is affected.

7.1. *Preliminaries*

This alteration in Case form is accompanied by the presence of a suppletive form of the copula *być/ma*[32]:

[32] This suppletive form is based in the present tense on the third person singular and the third person plural forms of the verb *mieć/have*:

ja jestem/mnie nie ma my jesteśmy/ nas nie ma

ty jesteś/ciebie nie ma wy jesteście/was nie ma

on jest/ jego nie ma oni są/ich nie ma

In the past and nonpast (future) tenses, no suppletive form of the copula is used but the relevant Case alteration appears:

ja byłem/mnie nie było I was/ I was not

ona będzie/jej nie będzie she will be/ she will not be

(85) Książka jest na stole.
'book/NOM is on table'

(86) Książki nie ma na stole.
'book/GEN not is on table'

(87) Książka leży na stole.
'book/NOM lies on table'

(88) Książka nie leży na stole.
'book/NOM not lies on table'

(89) Chłopcy są tam.
'boys/NOM are there'

(90) Chłopców nie ma tam.
'boys/GEN not are there'

(91) Piłka jest zielona.
'ball/NOM is green'

(92) Piłka nie jest zielona.
'ball/NOM not is green'

The examples above are supposed to illustrate the use of the Genitive of Negation in the subject position. Examples (85-86) show the classic case of a locative prepositional predicate, examples (89-90) contain a locative predicate which is not a PP (*tam/there*). Examples (87-88) illustrate the fact that the Genitive of Negation affects the subject only if the predicate is nonverbal and examples (91-92) show that adjectival predicates are not affected.

7.2. *Types of Agr projections and negation*

Notice, that attributive predicates in (91-92) manifest a different behaviour with respect to Neg placement. The major difference between the attributive predicates, mostly APs but also nominal predicational constructions[33] and the locative predicates is that the presence of negation does not seem to affect the Case form of the external argument.

Assume as we have, following Chomsky (1993), that each lexical predicate phrase is dominated by a corresponding agreement phrase, some type of AgrP. Thus the abstract initial structure of (91-92) is as follows:

[33] Consider the following pair of examples where the presence of negation has no bearing on the Case form of the subject:

a. Maria jest nauczycielką.
'Maria/NOM is teacher'

b. Maria nie jest nauczycielką.
'Maria/NOM not is teacher'

(93) $[_{AuxP}$ *jest* $[_{PolP}$ Pol^{o} $[_{AgrP}$ Agr^{o} $[_{AP}$ *piłka* $[_{A'}$ *zielona*]]]]]

Notice, that once again we propose to place negation very low in the clausal structure, immediately dominating the lowest agreement phrase projection.

The derivational history of the external argument of the adjectival predicate: the DP *piłka/ball* is as follows. As an external argument of the predicate it raises to [Spec,Agr^{34}P] to check the phi-agreement features[35]. As a lexical DP it must also satisfy the PF identification requirement of Case feature checking.

At this point some speculation on the content of the Agr^{o} head in (93) can be in place. This will allow some formalization of the account of Neg placement influence on Case checking. The agreement projections insulating lexical predicate projections are functional categories which have been given a convenient label of Agreement Phrases. However not all of these Agreement Phrases behave exactly in the same manner. Most notably the subject Agreement Phrase and the object Agreement Phrase are said to participate in two vital grammatical relations: agreement and Case checking. Their dual character is due to the character of the lexical predicate which they dominate: it licenses arguments but is only able to assign lexical Case while the structural Case must be assigned elsewhere: ACCUSATIVE by the verbs raised into the head of Agr_{Object}P and NOMINATIVE by Tense raised into the head of $Agr_{Subject}$P. Notice however that this dual character of AgrPs is not forced by any grammatical considerations other than the ones concerning the structural Case assignment; the principal role of agreement projections is to check agreement features. Assume then that the AgrP dominating the AP predicate (or any other attributive predicate) does nothing but check agreement features.

Regarding functional projection heads as bundles of features, we can represent the specification of Agr^{o} heads as:

(94) Agr^{o} [+/-agreement]
[+/-Case]

Assume that the option [-Case] means that a given type of agreement head

[34] This type of agreement phrase is usually referred to as Object Agreement irrespective of the fact that the predicate involved is not transitive and that the argument passing through it is not the object but the subject.

[35] The gender and number features surfacing on the adjective itself can be said to be checked in the spec/head configuration within the predicational AgrP:

a. piłka jest zielona
'ball/fem/sing is/sing green/fem/sing'

b. długopis jest zielony
'pen/masc/sing is/sing green/masc/sing'

c. piłki są zielone
'balls/fem/pl are/pl green/fem/pl'

The subject agreement with the copula verb can be treated as an overt reflex of 'subject ' agreement. This would preserve the notion of the uniformity of agreement patterns.

does not, in principle, participate in Case checking and is typical of intransitive predicates or predicates assigning lexical Case to their dependents. The [+Case] specification can be taken to mean that a given Agr head can participate in Case checking actively. When it is underspecified for [+/-Case feature], it can participate in Case checking only passively.

Active participation in Case checking is shown by AgrSubject and AgrObject whose specifier positions are both loci of structural Case checking. Participation in Case checking has a consequence for Agro heads contained in the government domain of Nego; whenever its lexical head nie/not is present, Agro Case checking feature is altered from ACCUSATIVE to GENITIVE. Consequently, the Case feature checked at a given Agro is affected only if this Agro has a non [-Case] specification; either [+Case] or the underspecified [+/-Case].

If Agro heads of predicative APs are specified for feature [-Case] and responsible only for agreement, the presence or absence of nie/not will not influence the Case of their external argument which shall have to raise from [Spec,AgrObjectP] to [Spec,AgrSubjectP] within an A chain in search of its Case checking head. The specification of a given agreement head as either [+Case] or [-Case] is dependent on the lexical predicate of a given functional projection is attached to. Hence in a sense, agreement projections are extended projections of their lexical predicates.

The formalization proposed in (94) allows us to capture the difference between the passive and the locatives; the passive participle is viewed as an unaccusative variant of its corresponding verb. Consider these examples and their structural representation:

(95) Maria została przyjęta do szkoły.
'Maria/NOM was admitted to school'

(96) Maria nie została przyjęta do szkoły.
'Maria/NOM not was admitted to school'

(97) [NegP nie [AgrP Agro [PrtP przyjęta Maria]]]

It is worth noticing that the participial agreement phrase engages in phi-feature checking exactly in the same manner as the agreement phrase of a predicative AP. In the syntactic tradition the passive participle has been often treated on a par with the adjective and semantically they are rather close. It is plausible to propose that the type of AgrP dominating the Participle Phrase is akin to the agreement phrase of the predicative AP in that its intrinsic specification is [-Case]. Thus it remains insensitive to the presence of lexical head of NegP.

As far as the placement of *nie/not* is concerned in that particular case, we cannot resort to the mechanism mentioned before, for there is no verb in the government domain of the proclitic to attract on the assumption that the participle is not a selected candidate. Having no incorporee to its right, the head of NegP moves

itself if no verb passes by and cliticizes on the left hand side of the Aux° head[36]. This operation has a Last Resort flavor[37] to it.

7.3. *Locative predicates and underspecified Agr°s*

Underspecification of the projected AgrP for the [+/-Case] feature is taken as an idiosyncratic property of locative predicates. Generally speaking, the consequence of showing this idiosyncrasy is as follows.

In Case theoretic terms, it means that an underspecified Agr° will be sensitive to Neg° placement and the following obligation to check GENITIVE Case; Neg° activates the [+Case] switch of AgrP: it checks Case in its spec position. This Case checking is a conspiracy of the underspecification of Agr° and negative value of PolP.

The positive value of PolP (Pos°), does not activate the potential [+Case] specification of Agr° and therefore only phi-features of the external argument are checked in [Spec,Agr_{Object}P]. The argument still has an unchecked Case feature and targets the next available Case position [Spec,$Agr_{Subject}$P].

Notice, that our analysis of negation assuming a rather 'low' placement of NegP can be saved on these assumptions. It was proposed in previous sections that NegP should be (recursively) placed within the 'low verbal domain of the Polish clause structure', immediately above Agr_{Object}P. In practical terms, this proposal states that the Genitive of Negation may occur only with DPs passing through [Spec,Agr_{Object}P]. However such Neg° placement should in principle be unable to affect the Case of the clausal subject which does not transit through this position in transitive constructions[38]. The underspecification of Agr° hypothesis helps to keep the Neg°/Agr° interaction within the lower verbal domain.

Turning to more detailed considerations, two outstanding issues must be acknowledged: the licensing of further movement of the subject DP of locatives to the clause initial position and the surface distribution of *nie/not*.

In case of the affirmative locative proposition, the DP moves to the subject position in an A chain, checks its Case feature and the strong Case feature of Tense raised to $Agr_{Subject}$. At the same time the [+strong] D feature of Tense (the Minimalist equivalent of the EPP) is also satisfied. The scenario cannot be the same for a negative locative proposition.

---

[36] It seems necessary to assume that inchoative verbs, which also behave like unaccusatives, generate an Agr° whose specification is [- Case], for Negation Placement does not affect the Case of the subject:

a. Szklanka rozbiła się.
'(a) glass/NOM broke'

b. Szklanka nie rozbiła się.
'(a) glass/NOM not broke'

[37] Notice that we assume that the passive copula is in a sense defective and does not project an independent PolP on its own. The same should apply to copula *być/be*.

[38] Even on the basis of the VP internal subject hypothesis (Koopman and Sportiche 1991), paraphrased as the predicate internal subject hypothesis, the subject in [Spec,VP/PP] should not find itself within the c-domain of the verb/locative head (and the Neg° cliticized on it at some early (lexical) stages of derivation even under such a proposal as Śpiewak and Szymańska's (1995).

One of the consequences of assuming that Neg^{o} forces Agr_{Object} to have the checking feature GENITIVE, is that the surface subject completes its A-chain having reached the [Spec,Agr_{Object}P] and loses any Case driven 'motivation' to reach the clause initial position of [Spec,$Agr_{Subject}$P]. Since Case theoretic reasons are only partially able to account for the presence of the subject in its usual position, some formulation of the Extended Projection Principle (EPP) is still necessary to capture all the other cases. Consider the structure:

(98) $Agr_{Subject}$ T^{o} Aux^{o} [$_{NegP}$ nie [$_{AgrP}$ Agr^{o} [$_{LocP}$ książka na stole]]]

As it stands after GENITIVE Case checking of *książki/book* in [Spec,Agr_{Object}P], (98) is problematic for two reasons: [+ strong] D feature of Tense and [+ strong] Case feature of Tense cannot be left unchecked, for the crash of the derivation would be unavoidable. UG, however, seems to provide an escape hatch in the form of expletive replacement: the D feature of Tense can be satisfied by an expletive (*pro*) and the argument associated with the expletive at an interpretive level. The [+ Case] feature of Tense seems a bigger problem, for it too must be checked by spell-out. Expletive replacement is a plausible way out if the expletive *pro* can function as both *it* and *there*, the difference between the two being that *there* has no case feature and cannot check any off either but *it* has a Case feature and is thus able to check off the [+ strong] Case feature of Tense[39]. The following structural consequences follow:

(99) pro jest książka na stole.
'(there) is book/NOM on table'

(100) pro nie ma książki na stole.
'(it) not is book/GEN on table'

(101) [$_{IP}$ książka [$_{I'}$ jest na stole.]]

(102) [$_{IP}$ książki$_{i}$ [$_{IP}$ pro$_{i}$ nie ma na stole.]]

Notice that (102) is a subject Left Dislocation Structure (LD) with *pro* in the subject position and double Case checking of *książki/book* is avoided. *Książka/book* of (101) is in [Spec,IP], the canonical subject position.

Now, the surface distribution of *nie* may seem problematic; in the previous

[39] See Chomsky (1994), commonly referred to as *Chapter 4*, and consider the well known asymmetry between the two place holders:

(a) There arrived a man.

(b) *There was said that John is guilty.

(c) *It arrived a man.

(d) It was said that John is guilty.

(b) crashes as the strong Case feature of Tense is not checked off and (c) because *the man* has no Case checker.

section it was proposed that the negative clitic as the head of NegP does not lower onto the verb in the standard case but that the verb moves to Neg^{o} forming the clitic complex. In the cases at hand, the copula apparently precedes NegP but the negative clitic still appears in its usual preverbal position. To illustrate this point, consider the structure:

(103) ...Aux^{o}...Neg^{o}...Agr^{o}...[$_{LocP}$...DP...]

We treat the projections of Agr^{o} and Neg^{o} as extended projections of the locative predicate. Even a cursory look at (103) reveals the fact that the head of Negation Phrase and the head of the Aux Phrase are adjacent, hence subject to unconstrained head movement. Bear in mind that the lexical negative element *nie/not* is a syntactic proclitic and cannot surface separate from a verbal element. The basic guideline of Economy of syntactic operations requires that the clitic not move if possible; in the regular case the verb will move up to it.

However in the case of locative predicates the predicate does not raise from its base position and the negative clitic is left stranded unless it moves itself. This is exactly what we propose for the locative constructions: the head of NegP is forced to move and cliticize onto the auxiliary verb. According to its clitic/morphological frame, *nie/not* raises to the copula verb.

Before we conclude, a few final points must be made. First, notice that we assume that the locative predicate is idiosyncratic in the sense that it projects a Case underspecified AgrP. We preserve our main claim of the locality required for the Genitive of Negation only if *nie/not* is adjacent to the underspecified Agr^{o}. Thus we are forced to assume that the copula verb *być/be* is defective in the sense that it does not project its own PolP; Neg^{o} must always raise to the copula. This assumption, since the copula verb is in many ways defective, does not come at a high cost.

Interestingly, the locative construction on our assumptions forces the modal verb to copy the setting of Agr_{Object} type from its verbal complement. Consider[40]:

(104) Książki może nie być w lodówce[41].
'book/GEN may not be in fridge'

(105) Książki nie może być w lodówce.
'book/GEN not may be in fridge'

In (105) the subject DP checks only agreement features in [Spec,Agr_{Object}P] of the locative predicate and moves higher to pass through the corresponding

[40] Interestingly, it is easier to accept these structures with NOMINATIVE on the subject DP than the definitely bad local cases, probably because the distance between the subject and the locative predicate is bigger. This assumption would point to some parsing dependent rule. It may also be the case that as the Genitive of Negation and especially the Genitive of the Locative Subject, are marked constructions and they are being slowly eliminated as the grammar is getting simpler.

[41] As for the higher $Agro_{bject}$ weak Case feature, follow the case of (66) and assume that both $Agro_{bject}$s are copies of each other and jointly satisfy their features.

[Spec,Agr_{Object}P] of the modal verb where it is affected by Neg placement with the modal verb adjoining to *nie/not*. Negation thus activates the [+ Case] specification of Agr^{o} typical of locatives. In both cases, the lexical DP subject is IP adjoined.

To sum up our attempt at assimilating the phenomenon of Neg placement in locative predicates to simple cases of the Genitive of Negation, we can conclude that:

- locative predicates are idiosyncratic by projecting AgrP underspecified for [+/-Case] feature;
- the locative predicate AgrP has no structural case to check but is transparent to government from Neg^{o} with the usual consequence of checking GENITIVE;
- further movement of the subject to the clause initial position in negative locative constructions is not Case driven and targets an IP adjoined position. Expletive replacement suffices to satisfy the strong [+D] and [+Case] features of Tense;
- the copula verb is defective by not projecting an independent PolP[42];
- lexically unsupported proclitic *nie/not* has to raise to the copula verb to satisfy its own morphological properties.

8. *Conclusions*

In this paper a syntactic theory of Neg placement in Polish is attempted. The main claim of the analysis above is that there is NegP in Polish and that it can be licensed by each type of verbal lexical predicate with the exception of the copula verb. Practically, it means that Polish lexical auxiliaries and modals project their own functional projections and take VP complements insulated in their own functional projections. NegP is positioned 'low' in the structure of the clause and does not seem to split the Polish Infl.

The low positioning of negation has a consequence in the form of the Genitive of Negation typical of Polish and a subgroup of other Slavic languages. Both clausal and verbal negation can cause a change of the structural Case in a set of syntactic contexts which involve abstract incorporation and feature deletion. A similar operation was claimed to take place in locative complements which uniquely show the Genitive of Negation on the subject. It is worth noticing that the alteration of the affected Case to GENITIVE is not accidental. As claimed in Tajsner (1990), GENITIVE is the default Case in Polish used as a Last Resort option should other Case assignment/checking procedures fail. It is claimed in this paper that local government by Neg^{o} entails failure of regular Case assignment/checking.

[42] It is interesting that the copula seems to share this property with functional auxiliaries: *bym/(I)would* and the dialectal *żem/(I)have*. The latter can never be preceded by *nie/not* in periphrasis unlike the copula which cannot be followed by the negative particle in the clausal negation reading. The difference between the copula and the modal auxiliaries is that the negative particle can still surface cliticized to some verbal form following the functional auxiliaries (the participle) and does not have to move on its own. In the case of the *być/be*, the copula verb itself is the only available verbal host of the negative clitic and therefore the clitic moves by itself.

This study centered on the issue of the placement of *nie/not* and did not provide any account on other Neg placement related phenomena such as NPIs licensing in Polish or the functioning of the Neg Criterion, both topics of current Neg placement related debate (see Heageman 1995 and Progovac 1994) and certainly requiring much attention.

The framework of the presented analysis gravitates towards the Minimalist program outlined in early 1990's in a series of MIT publications and successfully developing ever since. Aware of shortcomings of the analysis presented above, the author would like to treat this work as an invitation to a discussion of the framework itself and its applications to the description of the grammar of Polish and other Slavic languages.

REFERENCES

Baker, M. 1988. *Incorporation: A theory of grammatical function changing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Belletti, A. 1990. *Generalized verb movement*. Turin: Rosenberg and Tellier.

Belletti, A. 1994. "Verb positions: Evidence from Italian". In Lightfoot, D. and Hornstein, N. (eds). 1994. 19-40.

Borsley, R. and Rivero, M. 1994. "Clitic auxiliaries and incorporation in Polish". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12. 373-422.

Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, N. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. 1991. "Some notes on the economy of derivation". In Freidin, R. (ed). 417-454.

Chomsky, N. 1993. "A minimalist program for linguistic theory". In Hale, K. and Keyser, S. (eds). 1-52.

Chomsky, N. 1994. *Chapter 4*. Unpublished MS.

Freidin, R. (ed.). 1991. *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Grimshaw, J. 1991. *Extended projections*. Unpublished MS.

Guasti, M.T. 1993. *Causative and perception verbs*. Turin: Rosenberg and Tellier.

Gussmann, E. (ed.). 1995. *Licensing in syntax and phonology*. Lublin: Folium.

Haegeman. L. 1995. *The syntax of negation*. Cambridge: CUP.

Hale, K. and Keyser, S. (eds). 1993. *The view from Building 20*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Jaeggli, O. and Safir, K. (eds). 1989. *The null subject parameter*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kayne, R. 1989. "Null subjects and clitic climbing". In Jaeggli, O. and Safir, K. (eds). 239-261.

Koopman, H. and Sportiche, D. 1991. "The position of subjects". *Lingua* 85. 211-258.

Koopman, H. 1994. "Licensing heads". In Lightfoot, D. and Hornstein N. (eds). 261-296.

Laka, I. 1990. *Negation in syntax: On the nature of functional categories and projections*. Cambridge: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Lightfoot, D. and Hornstein N. (eds). 1994. *Verb movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pollock, J.I. 1989. "Verb movement, Universal Grammar and the structure of IP". *Linguistic Inquiry* 20. 365-424.

Pollock, J.I. 1993. *Notes on clause structure*. Unpublished MS.

Progovac, L. 1994. *Negative and positive polarity*. Cambridge: CUP.

Rivero, M. 1991. "Long head movement and negation: Serbo- Croatian vs. Slovak and Czech". *Linguistic Review* 8. 319- 351.

Rivero, M. 1994. "The structure of IP and V-movement in the languages of the Balkans". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12. 63-120.

Rizzi, L. 1982. *Issues in Italian syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Rizzi, L. 1990. *Relativized minimality*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Sportiche, D. 1992. *Clitic constructions*. Unpublished MS.

Sportiche, D. 1993. *Sketch of a reductionist approach to syntactic variation and dependencies*. Unpublished MS.

Śpiewak, G. and Szymańska, I. 1995. "A poll on Pollock – functional categories in Polish". In Gussmann, E. (ed). 125-146.
Tajsner, P. 1990. *Case marking in English and Polish: A government and binding study*. Doctoral dissertation, Poznań University.
Travis, L. 1984. *Parameters and effects of word order*. Cambridge: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.
Williams, E. and DiSciullo, A.M. 1987. *On the definition of word*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Williams, E. 1994. *Thematic structure*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Witkoś, J. (in press). "On the syntactic status of że/that and its implications for the theory of Phrase Structure in Polish".
Witkoś, J. (in progress). "Verb movement and clausal structure in Polish".