

Session 5B Abstracts

On Phrasal and Clausal Comparatives in Thai
Cheng-shiun Wu
National Tsing Hua University

Basic Data & Previous Studies. There are two types of comparative sentences in Thai, both of which employ the morpheme *kwàa* to signal the standard of comparison. On the surface, the constituent that follows *kwàa* appears as a DP in the so called ‘phrasal comparative’ in (1) and as a clause in the so called ‘clausal’ comparative in (2).

- (1) sǒmsàk sǔuŋ kwàa [DP sǒmsrǐi] [phrasal]
 Sǒmsàk tall KWAA Sǒmsrǐi ‘Sǒmsàk is taller than Sǒmsrǐi.’
- (2) sǒmsàk sǔuŋ kwàa [CP thǐi sǒmsrǐi sǔuŋ] [clausal]
 Sǒmsàk tall KWAA THII Sǒmsrǐi tall ‘Sǒmsàk is taller than Sǒmsrǐi is.’

While *kwàa* is taken to mean ‘exceed’ in Stassen (1985), Hofstetter (2013) argues against Stassen’s analysis and proposes that *kwàa* is the Thai counterpart of English *than* and combines with a degree description (e.g., in (1), λd . Somsrǐi is *d*-tall]) at LF.

In this paper, I argue that the phrasal comparative in Thai (1) in fact involves a clause-like structure in the post-*kwàa* constituent; on the other hand, in the clausal comparative (2), the standard is expressed by a nominal description which is a free relative.

A clausal-analysis of (1). Along with Pancheva (2006) and others, I suggest that the Thai phrasal comparative (1) involve a small clause in the post-*kwàa* constituent; at the surface, the occurrence of the gradable predicate in the post-*kwàa* constituent is elided (see (3)).

- (3) [TP [DP Somsak] [T’ [T] [VP [VP OP₁ [VP [DP Somsak] [VP [AP t₁ tall]]]] [PP [P kwaa] [VP OP₂ [VP [DP Somsrǐi] [VP [AP t₂ tall]]]]]]]

There are two pieces of evidence that suggest that the so-called phrasal comparative in Thai involves reduction operation and the post-*kwàa* constituent is a clausal-like structure.

Evidence 1. The Binding Condition C effect may be observed in the Thai phrasal-comparative, as shown in (4).

- (4) khon nénam khǎw_i kàp mɛɛrǐi mâak kwàa kàp nonsǎw
 people introduce 3.SG with Mary MAAK KWAA with sister
 khǒŋ sǒmsàk_{*i/j}.
 of Sǒmsàk

*More people introduce him to Mary than to Sǒmsàk’s younger sister.

This may be easily accounted for if it is assumed that the post-*kwàa* constituent in (4) involves a clausal-like structure. As indicated by Bhatt and Takahashi (2011), the standard (in (4), *Sǒmsàk’s younger sister*) is commanded by everything that c-commands the associate (in (4), *Mary*) if the standard constituent involves a clausal-like structure. Therefore, Binding condition C violation is expected in (4).

Evidence 2. As shown in (5), scope ambiguity is not observed with the quantifier in the post-*kwàa* constituent. (5) only carries a reading in which the universal-quantifier is interpreted within the standard constituent (cf. Bhatt and Takahashi 2011). This lack of scope ambiguity is expected if the universal quantifier *every kind of hat* cannot scope out of the post-*kwàa* constituent, which simply follows from the clausal-analysis in (3).

- (5) khon súuu sǔa túuk bèɛp mâak kwàa mùak túuk bèɛp.
 people buy shirt every kind MAAK KWAA hat every kind
 -er > every: ‘The number of people who buy every kind of shirt exceeds the number of

people who buy every kind of hat.

every > *-er*: ??? ‘Every kind of shirt was bought by more people than every kind of hat’

Evidence 3. The phrasal comparative in Thai shows island effects (see (6)); this is predicted by the analysis in (3). Along with the analysis, the post-*kwàa* constituent in (6) involves a clausal-like structure and the movement of the degree operator out of a complex NP (see (6)); therefore, ungrammaticality is expected.

(6) **khon aasăi-yùu nay prà-thêet thîi Trump pòk-khron mâak kwàa Putin.*
people live in country THII Trump govern MAAK KWAA Putin
‘More people live in the country that Trump governs than live in the country that Putin governs.’

(7) **people live in country thîi Trump govern mâak kwàa Putin* [~~live-in~~ [_{NP} ~~country~~] [_{RC} ~~thîi-Putin govern~~]]

A phrasal-analysis of (2). I suggest that a Thai clausal comparative (2) involves in the post-*kwàa* constituent a degree-denoting free relative, as shown in (8).

(8) *Sömsàk tall* [_{PP} [_P *kwàa*] [_{RC} *thîi Sömsrîi tall*]]]

Evidence 1. Just like *thîi* in an ordinary relative clause, the optionality of *thîi* is observed in clausal comparatives (9) and (10). In Thai relative clauses, *thîi* is obligatory except subject relatives. This is expected by the analysis in (8).

(9) *sömsàk àan năjsũuu-kaatuun mâak kwàa (thîi) àan nîttàyasăan.*
Sömsàk read comic.book MAAK KWAA THII read magazines
‘Sömsàk read more comic books than [he] read magazines.’

(10) *sömsàk àan năjsũuu-kaatuun mâak kwàa thîi sömsrîi àan.*
Sömsàk read comic.book MAAK KWAA THII Sömsrîi read
‘Sömsàk read more comic books than Sömsrîi did.’

Arguing for the lack of subcomparatives. In (12), the Thai counterpart of an English subcomparative (11) is simply ungrammatical, no matter whether *thîi* is overt or not.

(11) The table is higher than the door is wide.

(12) **tó? sũuŋ kwàa (thîi) pràtuu kwâaŋ.*
table tall KWAA THII door wide

Intended reading: ‘The table is higher than the door is wide.’

In contrast to a full-clause analysis of (1), the small clause analysis can account for (12) (cf. Hsieh 2017). The lack of subcomparatives in Thai results from the failure to delete the unvalued feature on the adjective inside the *kwàa*-constituent which lacks all the functional clausal heads.

Conclusion. I have argued that in a Thai phrasal comparative post-*kwàa* constituent involves a clause-like structure and in Thai clausal comparatives involve a nominal structure. The complement of *kwàa* is a small clause or a free relative. Thus, the lack of subcomparatives in Thai can be attributed to the failure to eliminate the unvalued features at PF.

References. Beck, Sigrid, Oda, Toshiko, and Sugisaki, Koji. 2004. Parametric Variation in the Semantics of Comparison: Japanese vs. English. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 13:289–344; Bhatt, Rajesh, and Shoichi Takahashi. 2011. Reduced and unreduced phrasal comparatives. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29(3): 581-620; Hofstetter, Stefan. 2013. Comparison in Thai: European Patterns in a Language from Southeast Asia. *PhiN (Philologie im Netz)* 66: 1-20; Hsieh, I-Ta Chris. 2017. On Arguments against Comparative Deletion in Mandarin. *Tsing-Hua Journal of Chinese Studies, New Series Vol. 47 No. 2*: 255-287. Pancheva, Roumyana. 2006. Phrasal and clausal comparatives in Slavic. In *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics 14: The Princeton meeting*.

and not of VVPE. However, this analysis cannot account for the fact in (5)-(7). In (5), the element corresponding to the nominative argument *Mary-no koto-ga* in (2a) above is marked with *-sika* ‘only’. This is a negative polarity item (NPI), which has an ‘only’ meaning in the scope of negation (e.g., Takita 2011). Ellipsis of the *-sika* NPI does not alter its ‘only’ meaning, if it elides the NPI along with the locative, as shown in (6). However, if the NPI is the only target of ellipsis, the ‘only’ meaning becomes unavailable, as shown in (7). The contrast in meaning between (6) and (7) cannot be expected if AE is the only available option in JNACs. AE targets an argument, regardless of its position; it should be able to target the NPI under the scope of negation, both in (6) and (7).

(5) Bill-ni-wa Mary-no koto-sika atama-ni nakat-ta.
 Bill-DAT-TOP Mary-GEN thing-SIKA head-LOC NEG-PST (Lit.) ‘For Bill, Mary was the only thing in mind.’

(6) (With 5 as the antecedent) John-ni-mo Δ nakat-ta. (Δ=*Mary-no koto-sika atama-ni*)
 John-DAT-also NEG-PST (Lit.) ‘For John, too, Mary was the only thing in mind.’

(7) (With 5 as the antecedent) John-ni-mo Δ atama-ni nakat-ta. (Δ=*Mary-no koto*)
 John-DAT-also head-LOC NEG-PST
 (Lit.) ‘For John, Mary was something not in mind.’ (Not: ‘...the only thing in mind.’)

Analysis: Based on the fact above, I propose a hybrid analysis of JNACs. On this analysis, (6) and (7) involve a different type of ellipsis; (6) involves VVPE and (7) involves AE. This analysis can account for the fact that the ‘only’ meaning of the *-sika* NPI is available only in (6). That is, in (6), the target of ellipsis is the VP, in which [*Mary-no koto*]-*sika* falls under the scope of negation. As an NPI, the argument yields the meaning of ‘only’. In (7), the target of ellipsis is the argument *Mary-no koto*, which has been raised out of the VP; having been raised out of the scope of negation, it does not have the ‘only’ meaning. Two questions arise here. First, why does each of (6) and (7) have a different target of ellipsis? Second, why does *Mary-no koto* need to be raised out of the VP? I propose that both the VP and the argument have an E(llipsis)-feature, and the E-feature on the argument cannot enter into an Agree relation with an ellipsis licensing head when the argument remains within the VP. This proposal is based on Aelbrecht’s (2010) idea that ellipsis is licensed by an Agree relation established between a licensing head and an E-feature. Aelbrecht assumes that an E-feature resides on the head whose complement will be elided, but I assume here that the phrase that will be elided bears an E-feature, based on the fact that an NP is not embedded under a determiner in Japanese, but still it can be a target of ellipsis. Under this assumption, *Mary-no koto* in (7), which bears an E-feature, has to move out of the VP, because otherwise it cannot establish a local relation with the licensing head. (This analysis is compatible with the data discussed in the literature (e.g., the presence or absence of the adverb-including reading discussed in Funakoshi 2016), although I do not present it here due to space constraints.)

Prediction: The current analysis predicts that in cases where VVPE is blocked, AE should become the only available option to elide the object. This prediction is borne out. In (8), verb-raising is blocked because *fuki-mo* ‘wipe-even’ is a negative sensitive item, and needs to remain within the VP to be licensed by the negation. Since VVPE consists of verb-raising and VP ellipsis, and since verb-raising is blocked here, AE should become the only available option to elide the object while stranding the main verb. We can use the (un)availability of the adverb-including reading as a test to see whether this is true. That is, if it is VVPE that occurs in the cases like (9), the adverb-including reading should be available, just like in the case of English VPE (e.g., *Bill wiped a car carefully. John didn’t*. See Funakoshi 2016). If it is AE, the reading should not be available. The unavailability of the adverb-including reading in (9) indicates that when VVPE is blocked, AE becomes the only available option to elide the object. The adverb-including reading becomes available when both the object and the main verb are elided along with the adverb, as in (10). What is involved in (10) should not be AE, since AE cannot elide a verb.

(8) Bill-wa teineini kuruma-o fuki-mo si-nakat-ta.
 Bill-TOP carefully car-ACC wipe-even do-NEG-PST ‘Bill didn’t even wipe a car carefully.’

(9) (With 8 as the antecedent) John-mo Δ fuki-mo si-nakat-ta. (Δ=*kuruma-o*) (Lit.) ‘John didn’t even wipe
 John-also wipe-even do-NEG-PST a car.’ (Not ‘...carefully, either.’)

(10) (With 8 as the antecedent) John-mo Δ si-nakat-ta. (Δ=*teineini kuruma-o fuki-mo*)
 (Lit.) ‘John didn’t even wipe a car carefully, either.’

Prepositional Infinitives in European Portuguese as Voice Alternations

Catarina Loureiro Soares and Jim Wood (Yale University)

In this talk, we discuss the syntax of European Portuguese (EP) Personal (PPI) and Impersonal (IPI) Prepositional Infinitive constructions like (1) and (2).

- (1) A roupa foi a lavar. (2) Pus a roupa a lavar.
 the clothes go.PST.3PS A wash.INF put.PST.1PS the clothes A wash.INF
 ‘The clothes were put to wash.’ ‘I put the clothes to wash this morning.’

We show that these constructions (i) involve an embedded passive VoiceP, despite being morphologically infinitive (cf. Pitteroff 2014), (ii) entail a change of location of the theme, and (iii) exhibit an existence presupposition on the theme, allowing them to serve as a novel diagnostic for the distinction between creation verbs and change-of-state verbs (Embick 2004; Marantz 2009). We argue that IPIs and PPIs are distinguished from ordinary causative constructions in that the matrix light verb has a locative meaning that is absent from ordinary causatives. The difference between PPIs and IPIs reduces to the choice of light verb, which is conditioned by the presence (for PPIs) or absence (for IPIs) of a matrix external argument.

Embedded VoiceP Instrument phrases have been argued to be diagnostics that pick out implicit agents introduced in a VoiceP (Bruening 2013). PPIs allow instrument phrases that modify the embedded event (‘with hot water’ in (3)) or the matrix event (‘with gloves’), while IPIs only allow instrument phrases that modify the embedded event (see (4)). This indicates that there is a VoiceP introducing an implicit agent in the embedded clause of both PPIs and IPIs.

- (3) O João pôs a roupa a lavar (com água quente / com luvas). (PPI)
 the João put.PST the clothes A wash.INF (with water hot / with gloves)
 ‘John put the clothes to wash (with gloves = wearing gloves).’
 (4) A roupa foi a lavar (com água quente / *com luvas). (IPI)
 the clothes go.PST A wash.INF (with water hot / *with gloves)
 ‘The clothes were put to wash (with hot water/with a soft detergent).’

The presence of an embedded Voice in IPIs is also suggested by the possibility of agentive by-phrases, as illustrated in (5). (These are subject to some constraints with IPIs and are not possible with PPIs, for reasons that will be discussed in the talk.)

- (5) A roupa foi a lavar (por alguém que sabia tirar aquelas nódoas).
 the clothes go.PST.3PS A wash.INF (by someone that knew take those stains)
 ‘The clothes were put to wash (by someone who knew how to get those stains out)’

Despite the presence of a Voice head, the implicit agent is not syntactically projected, as shown by the fact that the theme can A-move to the subject position in IPIs. This can also be shown for PPIs by passivizing the matrix verb.

- (6) A roupa foi posta a lavar <a-roupa> (por mim).
 the clothes were put.PPT A wash.INF <the clothes> (by me)
 ‘The clothes were put to wash (by me).’

These facts suggest that the embedded VoiceP is essentially passive, in that it has a semantic implicit agent but no syntactic argument (cf. Schäfer 2017). The structures of IPIs and PPIs like those in (3) and (4) are (7) and (8), where ‘-’ indicates the absence of a specifier. (We assume that *a* heads an AspP, but nothing hinges on this.)

- (7) [TP A roupa T [vP foi [AspP a [VoiceP – Voice [vP lavar <a roupa>]]]]
 (8) [TP O João T [VoiceP <O João> Voice [vP pôs [AspP a [VoiceP – Voice [vP lavar a roupa]]]]]

Thus, the alternation between IPIs and PPIs is a Voice alternation – the *v* on top of the PI on IPIs gets spelled out as *ir* ‘go’, a two-place predicate (Silva & Gomes de Farias 2011), and the *v* with Voice on PPIs gets spelled out as *pôr* ‘put’, a three-place predicate.

Change of location The theme of IPIs/PPIs is entailed to undergo a change of location. Compare (9), in which the object is *o carro* ‘the car’, with (10), in which the object is *a casa* ‘the house’:

- (9) O carro foi a pintar. (10) *A casa foi a pintar.
 the car go.PST.3PS A paint.INF the house go.PST.3PS A paint.INF
 ‘The car was put to paint.’ INTENDED: ‘The house was put to paint.’

(12) and (13) both have the same embedded verb, *pintar* ‘paint’, so the ungrammaticality of (13) must be due to the object. The only way for (13) to be acceptable is if the house is somehow movable (like a mobile home, for example), otherwise the sentence is degraded. We propose that this property derives from the locative meaning contained in the light verb, which distinguishes it from ordinary causatives which do not have an inherent change-of-location meaning (cf. Folli & Harley 2013, to appear). This ultimately underlies the fact that theme is subject to an **existence presupposition**: it must already exist in some form prior to the event. A comparison between creation verbs such as *construir* ‘build’ (11) and the similar verb *montar* ‘assemble’ (12) shows that this is quite a fine-grained distinction: (12) is acceptable because assembling furniture implies that there already exist discrete parts of the furniture, whereas building furniture really means ‘making it from scratch’ (in other words, the parts are less furniture-like than with ‘assemble’).

- (11) *A mobília foi a construir. (12) A mobília foi a montar.
 the furniture go.PST.3PS A build.INF the furniture go.PST.3PS A assemble.INF
 INTENDED: ‘The furniture was put to build’ ‘The furniture was put to assemble.’

A parallel can be drawn here with English *re-* prefixation (Marantz 2009): *rebuilding* a house, for example, can be accomplished using new materials, but *reassembling* a house would necessarily imply using the same materials or parts that made up the house to begin with. This construction can therefore be used as a novel diagnostic to distinguish between creation verbs and change-of-state verbs (cf. Embick 2004). We propose that the existence presupposition follows from the change-of-location entailment: a theme cannot be both created and undergo a change-of-location as part of the same event, so it must therefore exist prior to the event. Ordinary causatives show no such restrictions – there is no change of location entailment, as (13) shows (compare with (10)), and consequently no existence presupposition, hence the grammaticality of (14) (compare with (11)).

- (13) Fi-los pintar a casa. (14) Fi-los construir a mobília.
 made.1PS-them paint.INF the house made.1PS-them build.INF the furniture
 ‘I made them paint the house.’ ‘I made them build the furniture.’

Conclusion This paper provides insight into the Voice system of Portuguese by showing that IPIs and PPIs embed a passive VoiceP despite having infinitival morphology, as well as a novel diagnostic for the distinction between creation verbs and change-of-state verbs based on an existence presupposition associated with the theme. The latter is triggered by a change of location entailment, which distinguishes these constructions from ordinary causatives. We argue that this entailment originates from the locative meaning contained in the matrix light verb, the choice of which is conditioned by the presence (in PPIs) or absence (in IPIs) of a matrix external argument.

Selected References: Embick D. 2004. On the Structure of Resultative Participles in English. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 35:3. Pitteroff, M. 2014. Non-canonical ‘sich lassen’ middles. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Stuttgart. Schäfer, F. 2017. Romance and Greek Medio-Passives and the Typology of Voice. In *The Verbal Domain*, ed. Roberta D’Alessandro, Irene Franco, and Ángel J. Gallego. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

On the syntax of variable negative concord in English varieties

Mary Robinson and Gary Thoms, New York University

mkr361@nyu.edu

gst1@nyu.edu

In this talk we propose a new theory of negative concord (NC) which combines components of the movement-based theory of Blanchette (2015, B15) with certain features of the Agree-based theory of Zeijlstra (2004). The proposal is motivated by data from English variable NC.

The movement account. B15 develops a theory of NC which builds directly on the theory of neg-raising and NPIs in Collins & Postal (2014, CP14). This theory captures the dependency between the negative elements in NC configurations such as (1a) in terms of movement: a NEG that is base-generated in the DP in a structure is raised to adjoin to the clause, as (1b); *no* is the spellout of the in the DP in the lower copy of <NEG>, and *-n't* is a spellout of NEG in the raised position. As B15 notes, this is in effect a resumption analysis of NC.

(1) a. I didn't see nobody. b. I did NEG₁ say [<NEG₁> [body]]

As it is built on CP14, B15 predicts that NC will be possible across clause boundaries with neg-raising predicates, and she notes this is borne out with data from a corpus of Appalachian English, where NC into finite clauses embedded by *reckon* is attested.

(3) I don't reckon there was no federal men back then. (B15: 82)

That some accept (3) is a problem for Zeijlstra (2004), who takes the clause-boundedness of NC cross-linguistically to be a strong and correct prediction of his Agree-based approach. We provide judgment data which confirms examples like (3) are OK for some but not all speakers.

Problems. We identify two problems for the movement account which motivate an alternative. Problem 1: cross-clausal NC. While in some varieties cross-clausal NC may only be possible in neg-raising contexts, we show that NC is possible across non-neg-raising predicates such as *say* and *know* in African American Englishes (henceforth AAE). Weldon (1995, 386) provides (4a,b), attested in corpus data, while Martin & Wolfram (1998, 20) give (5).

(4) a. I ain't know he had no curl. b. I ain't say nobody said nothing 'bout no sick.

(5) He ain't say nobody was eating with no college president.

More problematic still, NC dependencies in AAE can sometimes cross relative clause (RC) boundaries, in particular if the head determiner of the modified nominal is also an NC item, as in Labov's (1972) famous (6a), and others such as (6b). We provide judgment data to confirm that (4)-(6) receive NC readings, and further corpus data to show that they're not mere outliers.

(6) a. It ain't no cat can't get in no coop. b. There's nothing that nobody can do about it.

B15 and Zeijlstra predict (4)-(6) to be impossible, and the fact that AAE NC can cross into a RC may seem to doom *all* syntactic accounts, since RCs are typically islands. However it has been known since McCawley (1981) that RCs modifying existential pivots are sometimes exceptionally transparent for extraction. In an analysis of such exceptions, Sichel (2019) shows that the islandhood of RCs depends on syntactic properties of the RC head. Once these nuances are taken into account, the opposite conclusion can be drawn: NC *must* be derived by movement if it shows such structural sensitivity and dialectal variability wrt RC boundaries.

Problem 2 concerns the analysis of NC where there are multiple NC items, such as (4b), (5), (6). Recall that B15 characterizes NC as resumption, where the lower *no*-words are in effect resumptive copies of the negation that raises to the highest clause. This account faces the problem that very typically resumption involves pronouncing some element like a pronoun at the launching site of movement and nowhere else; that is, multiple resumption of the kind that would be required for (4b) (*nobody... nothing ... no sick*) is virtually unattested. The problem is not alleviated if NC in B15's system is recast as multiple copy spellout of the kind invoked by Nunes (2004) for German wh-copy constructions, because unlike these constructions, the elements in the chain of negative dependents in NC clauses need not all be realized with the same form, as 'mixed' chains which involve both *no*-items and *any/ever*-items are possible, such as (7). (CP14/B15 need to analyse such cases in terms of movement out of all the polarity items, given the conditions of their system.) Moreover, even in cases of consistent NC the lower elements in the chain may be morphologically very distinct, such as in cases like (6) where two of the lower NEG_s are determiners and another is a verbal negation.

(7) ...but we **never** had **any** luck there **neither**. (CBC podcast “Someone Knows Something”)
 It is clear, then, that the elements of an NC dependency are independent of each other morphologically. This is something that the Agree-based analysis of Zeijlstra captures well, since the dependency is simply a featural dependency between multiple independent elements. **Analysis.** We follow CP14 and B15 in deriving NC dependencies with movement, but we don’t tie this to neg-raising and don’t take it to be scopally vacuous; rather, the movement involved is much like *wh*-movement, in that it extends the mover’s scope and may potentially proceed long-distance via clause boundaries. On our analysis, the mover is a NegP which merges in the specifier of the lowest negative element (e.g. an NPI/NCI) and then raises to a higher scope position, typically in the spec of the Σ P just below T. This NegP conditions the form of the head whose specifier it occupies by agreement; that is, the head bears a uPol feature which is valued by the NegP by Agree, and this agreement results in the relevant NCI form of the head: *no* if it is D, *n’t* if it is Σ . Thus a simple example like (1a) is derived as in (8).

(8) [_{TP} subj T [_{Σ P} NegP_i [_{Σ} Σ [_{VP} V [_{DP} <NegP_i>] [_{D’} D_[Pol:NEG] [body]]]]]]

The derivation of cases with multiple NC DPs such as (4b) and (5) would involve ATB-movement of NegPs within both DPs, as in (9). This is similar to what is proposed by Collins et al. (2017), but for our account there is no radical reconstruction of the raised NegP, as there is for them. So, we do not need the additional technology of polyadic quantification (which risks massive overgeneration) to ensure only one of the negations is interpreted, as CP14 do, nor any other account based on indexation or “negative absorption” (as in B15). Rather, for our account to work we may adopt a syntax-semantics for interpreting the lower copies of the raised NegPs as bound variables, and we sketch an implementation in terms of Abels & Marti’s (2010) analysis of high-scoping negative quantifiers in German, where the raised quantifier binds choice-function variables in the lower DPs. As for the fact that our derivation involves ATB-extraction from non-coordinate structures, as partially schematized for (4b) in (9) (traces used for convenience), Vicente (2017) shows that restricting ATB to coordination structures leads to undergeneration. We follow Citko (2005) in assuming that such derivations (we adopt an implementation much like Citko’s in terms of parallel merge) are not to be ruled out entirely but rather they should be filtered by conditions which apply at the interfaces (which Vicente’s exceptions may help to elucidate).

(9) [_{TP} I [_{Σ P} NegP_i [_{Σ} Σ [_{VP} say [_{TP} [_{DP} t_i [_{D’} D_[NEG] [body]]] [_{VP} say [_{DP} t_i [_{D’} D_[NEG] [thing]]] ...
 As for ‘mixed’ cases like (7), these can also be derived by ATB-movement on our account, since the D which would be realized as *any* is syntactically independent from the NegP itself and thus able to be realized with a non-NC form. On this analysis, English variable NC is an instance of *variation in spellout*, where *any* and *no* are simply two outputs of a probabilistic variable rule which learners would acquire on the basis of input. In the talk we provide an outline of how differences between varieties wrt their ‘degrees’ of NC may be accounted for.

As for Problem 1, the task at hand is to improve on B15 and hone in on what the dialectal ingredients are which would allow for the different cross-clausal NC options. We suggest that cross-clausal NC may be conditioned by the availability of Pol features on the embedding C to drive NegP movement through its edge: if they are absent, NegP may not pass through and will thus be trapped in the lower clause. We propose that Pol features only appears on C in dialects with polarity-driven T-to-C movement, and we suggest that negative auxiliary inversion in AAE (“ain’t nobody say nothing”) is the sign that this dialect has such a feature. The absence of productive cross-clausal NC from British varieties is unsurprising as they lack NAI (Smith 2000). Relative clauses may also allow for movement through their spec when (i) the RC is a raising relative and thus not an island (Sichel 2019) and (ii) extraction from the raising relative involves moving through the spec of the raised head NP.

Selected references: Blanchette, F. 2015. *English Negative Concord, Negative Polarity, and Double Negation*. New York: CUNY Doctoral dissertation. Collins, C. & P. Postal. 2014. *Classical NEG raising*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. Zeijlstra, H. 2004. *Sentential negation and negative concord*. Utrecht: LOT.