(Un)interpretable Neg in Comp

Idan Landau

This article explores the possibility that the distinction between interpretable (valued) and uninterpretable (unvalued) features has grammatical manifestations beyond its role in feature checking. I argue that both *selection* and *lexical insertion* are sensitive to this distinction; thus, a head may determine not only which features its complement must bear but also whether they should be interpretable or not. Empirical consequences are explored in Hebrew, where infinitival complements to negative verbs ('refrain', 'prevent') display a number of surprising syntax-semanticscorrelations. Those are traced to the operation of negative features in the Comp position. The analysis also provides insight into the recalcitrant *prevent DP from V-ing* construction in English.

Keywords: negative complementizer, uninterpretable features, infinitives, selection, lexical insertion, negation

1 Introduction

The second phase of the Minimalist Program, starting with Chomsky 1995:chap. 4, introduced a novel distinction into the traditional inventory of grammatical oppositions: the distinction between interpretable and uninterpretable features. Although the idea itself, that some grammatical features are purely formal while others contribute meaning, is quite old (e.g., grammatical vs. semantic gender), the distinction between the two kinds of features was usually treated as a secondary, almost accidental property of language.

A radical shift in perspective was brought about by the minimalist hypothesis that the interpretable/uninterpretable distinction is not only central to language, but in fact constitutive of some aspects of syntactic computation. This view, expanded in Chomsky 2000, 2001, attempts to link two irreducible facts about human language: first, the existence of displacement, that is, the discrepancy between the position where a phrase is pronounced and the position where it is interpreted (e.g., in passive); second, the existence of uninterpretable features (e.g., nominative Case). The first fact embodies an ''interface condition'' imposed by the systems of interpretation that take linguistic expressions as input. The second fact is taken to be a mechanism to meet that condition. In particular, output representations must be cleansed of any uninterpretable features that cannot be ''read'' by the systems of interpretation. Since, however, lexical items do bear

This article has benefited from the comments and suggestions of Irena Botwinik-Rotem, Noam Chomsky, Danny Fox, Richard Kayne, Paul Postal, Ljiljana Progovac, Tali Siloni, and the audiences in the IATL 16 conference, Tel Aviv University, June 2000, and the ''Motivating Movement'' conference, University of Ulster, January 2001. All remaining errors are my own.

Linguistic Inquiry, Volume 33, Number 3, Summer 2002
465–492

those features when selected from the lexicon, it is the task of syntactic computation to get rid of them. Within minimalism, this is the rationale of *agreement* and *movement*—two syntactic processes that are driven (and triggered) by the need to eliminate uninterpretable features, yielding legible representations at the interface.

Conceptual arguments (avoidance of ''second-order'' features) as well as empirical ones (''defective'' intervention effects) led Chomsky (2000, 2001) to propose that uninterpretable features are nothing but unvalued features. On this view, for example, the ϕ-features on T enter the derivation without any values. Agreement with the subject DP values those features, an operation that affects only PF, not LF: at the level of the superordinate phase, those features are sent off to Spell-Out (yielding inflectional morphology) and then erased. Thus, there is no binary [±interpretable] opposition at the level of featural values; rather, the distinction reduces to the presence versus absence of a value. It will turn out that this conception provides a natural account of some of the phenomena addressed in this article.[1]

Once the valued/unvalued distinction is available in the grammar, one may wonder whether it has further repercussions, beyond feature checking. Consider selection and lexical insertion. Suppose a head A selects a complement headed by B, requiring B to bear some feature F.

(1) $[\ldots A \ldots [_{BP} \ldots B_F \ldots]]$

Assuming that F may be valued or not, we may raise two questions: (a) Can A select for a particular choice (vF or uF)? (b) If A *can* select for a choice of F on B (say, uF), can B be lexicalized by a lexical head specified for the other choice (namely, vF)? Those two questions concern the visibility of the interpretability distinction. We know it is visible to checking; is it similarly visible to selection and lexical insertion?

The issue, I believe, is empirical, even though so far research has not been directed toward those questions. Consider (a), the question of selection. Prima facie, it seems that selection, insofar as it is s-selection, does care about the interpretability of features. For example, the verb *thrill* selects for an object that is [+human], which is clearly an interpretable feature. That, however, does not teach us much: presumably, there is no uninterpretable counterpart of [+human], so that *thrill* does not choose between valued and unvalued [human]; it merely selects the only choice available.[2] What about verbs like *kick,* which do not impose any value of [human] on their complement? In these cases, I think, we want to say that they do not even select the relevant feature. This is quite different from the possibility presently explored, where the feature *is* selected, but its value is not.

Even if we find a case where A in (1) selects for a particular choice of F on B (say, uF), the issue of lexical insertion ((b) above) arises. For if B can be lexicalized by a head with vF, that would mask the (weaker) selectional restriction imposed by A.

[1] In what follows I will use the terms *(un)valued*/*(un)interpretable* interchangeably, particular choices depending on expository purposes.

[2] Notice that [−human] is not the uninterpretable counterpart, but rather the opposite value of the interpretable feature.

In this article I argue that these scenarios are not just abstract possibilities, but in fact are instantiated within a particular empirical domain. I will show that negative complementizers in Hebrew shed interesting light on questions (a) and (b). Specifically, we will see that when A = negative verb (e.g., 'refrain'), B = C(omp), and F = [neg], the following picture emerges: selection *does* see the valued/unvalued distinction, and different verbs select for complementizers with an interpretable or uninterpretable [neg] feature. By contrast, I will argue that lexical insertion, although sensitive to this distinction as well, obeys a weaker nondistinctness condition. This allows a valued [neg] morpheme to satisfy a requirement for an unvalued [neg], but crucially, the reverse situation is excluded. Whether that picture extends to other features is an open question.

This article is organized as follows. In section 2 I introduce the class of negative verbs (N-verbs) in Hebrew that take infinitival complements (N-complements). I present three independent arguments to the effect that the prepositional element that introduces N-complements—*me-* 'from'—is a complementizer rather than a preposition. The arguments draw on the behavior of N-complements under extraction, the properties of the verb *mana* 'prevent', and contrasts between PP-selecting verbs and CP-selecting verbs. In section 3 I show that the class of N-verbs is composed of two subclasses with distinct properties. N1-verbs display optional complementizer deletion, trigger a negative entailment, and are incompatible with finite complements or infinitival ones headed by *še-lo* 'that-not'; N2-verbs display an alternation between the complementizer *me-* and the negation *lo,* trigger a positive entailment, and are compatible with both finite complements and *še-lo* infinitival complements.

In section 4 I propose to reduce those contrasts to one distinction: N1-verbs select for a complementizer with a valued [neg] feature, N2-verbs for a complementizer with an unvalued [neg] feature. Drawing on evidence from licensing of affective polarity items in complements of adversative predicates, I also suggest that the Hebrew finite complementizer *še-* 'that' cannot bear a valued [neg]. In section 5 I turn to N-verbs in English and examine their (dis)similarities to their Hebrew counterparts. Interesting properties of the English construction (e.g., *John prevented there from being a riot*), hitherto unanalyzed, are derived from the proposal that *from* is a complementizer with an EPP feature (requiring a filled specifier). Finally, in section 6 I briefly compare nonfinite negative complementizers with finite ones, paying particular attention to the interaction of negation with higher intensional operators. Some broader issues and consequences of the present study are discussed in the conclusion.

2 The Complementizer *Me-*

In colloquial Hebrew, infinitives can follow what appears to be a preposition selected by the matrix verb. This is illustrated in (2) with the prepositions *be-* 'in', *al* 'on', and *me-* 'of, from'.

(2) a. Gil hit'anyen/hevin [*be*-le'harkiv pazelim].
Gil was-interested/understood in-to-assemble jigsaw-puzzles
'Gil was interested in/knowledgeable about assembling jigsaw puzzles.'

b. Gil hit'akeš/viter [*al* le'havin et Rina].
Gil insisted/gave-up on to-understand ACC Rina
'Gil insisted/gave up on understanding Rina.'

c. Gil hufta/hitragez [*me*-lišmo'a et axiv ba-xadašot].
Gil was-surprised/became-angry from-to-hear ACC his-brother in-the-news
'Gil was surprised/became angry at hearing his brother on the news.'

(3) a. Gil nimna/xadal [*me*-ledaber im Rina].
Gil refrained/stopped from-to-talk with Rina
'Gil refrained from/stopped talking to Rina.'

b. Gil nizhar/hit'apek [*me*-le'ha'aliv et ha-me'araxat].
Gil was-careful/restrained-himself from-to-insult ACC the-hostess
'Gil was careful not to insult the hostess.'/
'Gil restrained himself from insulting the hostess.'

The first major claim of this article is that there is a fundamental difference between the cases in (2) and those in (3): whereas the preposition in the former heads a PP, it is effectively a complementizer in the latter, heading a CP. The matrix verbs in (3) all involve some ''negative'' meaning (to be made precise below); call them *N-verbs,* taking *N-complements.* The claim is then that N-verbs in Hebrew select infinitives headed by the complementizer *me-* (or *mi-*, an equivalent allomorph). Notice that this complementizer is to be distinguished from the homophonous *me-* in (2c), a genuine preposition introducing a Cause argument. *Me-* can be thought of as the infinitival counterpart of the finite negative complementizer selected by 'doubt' and 'deny' (Progovac 1994, Laka 1994), although I will point out some interpretive differences below. For now I will assume that *me-* is interpreted as a propositional negation in the semantics.

An exhaustive list of N-verbs in Hebrew follows:

(4) *Hebrew N-verbs*
nimna 'refrain', mana 'prevent', manua 'prevented' (adj.), hitxamek 'avoid', nirta 'flinch', acar 'stop', heni 'dissuade', xadal 'stop, cease', hitnazer 'abstain', hištamet 'shirk', nizhar 'careful', nišmar 'watchful', hit'apek 'restrain oneself'

2.1 Extraction Asymmetries

The infinitival complements in (2), like PPs in general in Hebrew, behave like islands, while those in (3) do not. Thus, extraction of non-NPs is possible from the latter but not from the former.

(5) a. *Al ma Gil hit'anyen be-ledaber?
about what Gil was-interested in-to-talk
'About what was Gil interested in talking?'

b. *Im mi Gil viter al ledaber?
with whom Gil gave-up on to-talk
'To whom did Gil give up talking?'

c. *Im mi Gil hitragez me-ledaber?
with whom Gil became-angry from-to-talk
'To whom did Gil become angry from talking?'

(6) a. Al ma Gil nimna me-ledaber?
about what Gil refrained from-to-talk
'About what did Gil refrain from talking?'
b. Im mi Gil nizhar me-ledaber?
with whom Gil was-careful from-to-talk
'To whom was Gil careful not to talk?'

The contrast is sharp and is readily explained by the presence of a PP barrier in (5), blocking extraction, versus its absence in (6).[3]

2.2 *The Complement of* Mana

Independent evidence for the complementizer status of *me-* is provided by another ''negative'' context in which it is found, namely, after the verb *mana* 'prevent'. This verb appears in three subcategorization frames:

(7) *Subcategorization frames of* mana
a. DP_1 *mana me-*DP_2 Infinitive
b. DP_1 *mana be'ad* DP_2 *me-*Infinitive [*be'ad* = lit. 'through']
c. DP_1 *mana et* DP_2 *me-*Infinitive [*et* = accusative marker]

The three variants are quite similar in meaning, although there is an important difference between (7a) on the one hand and (7b–c) on the other, to which I return below. (7c) is stylistically marked. The discussion to follow concentrates on (7a).

Consider the following examples:

(8) a. Ha-bikuš ha-acum mana me-ha-mexirim laredet.
the-demand the-huge prevented from-the-prices to-fall
'The huge demand prevented the prices from falling.'
b. Ha-kaba'im man'u me-ha-eš le'hitpašet.
the-firemen prevented from-the-fire to-spread
'The firemen prevented the fire from spreading.'

That *me-* in these examples must be a complementizer can be shown by its failure to form a constituent with the DP to its right, explaining the immovability of the *me-*DP sequence.[4]

[3] As an anonymous reviewer observes, being a negative element, the complementizer *me-* creates a weak island, blocking adjunct extraction.

(i) *Be-eyze ton Gil nizhar me-ledaber im Rina?
in-which tone Gil was-careful from-to-talk with Rina
'In what tone was Gil careful not to talk to Rina?'

(ii) Be-eyze ton Gil hištadel ledaber im Rina?
in-which tone Gil tried to-talk with Rina
'In what tone did Gil try to talk to Rina?'

[4] Notice that *me-,* being a phonological clitic, attaches to the DP that follows it at some point in the derivation. The facts in (9) indicate that that point must be postsyntactic. The analysis proposed for Hebrew sheds interesting light on the English construction *John prevented Mary from leaving.* I address the English facts in section 5.2.

(9) a. *Mi-ma ha-bikuš ha-acum mana laredet?
from-what the-demand the-huge prevent to-fall
'What did the huge demand prevent from falling?'
b. *Mi-ma ha-kaba'im man'u le'hitpašet?
from-what the-firemen prevent to-spread
'What did the firemen prevent from spreading?'

Thus, the structure of (8) is as in (10a). This is entirely parallel to the English construction with the complementizer *for,* followed by a lexical DP (10b); indeed, the *for*-DP sequence is immovable (10c) just like its Hebrew counterpart.

(10) a. DP_1 *mana* [$_{CP}$ *me-* [$_{IP}$ DP_2 to-VP]]
b. It is unlikely [$_{CP}$ for [$_{IP}$ John to win the game]].
c. *For whom is it unlikely to win the game?

Since DP_2 in (10a) is not an argument of *mana,* this analysis further predicts that it should be possible to find nonthematic DPs in that position. Although Hebrew lacks *there*-type expletives, the prediction can be tested with idiom chunks.

(11) a. Ha-va'ada man'a [$_{CP}$ me- [$_{IP}$ ha-kvisa ha-meluxlexet lacet
the-committee prevented from- the-laundry the-dirty to-get-out
ha-xuca]].
out
'The committee prevented the dirty laundry from being washed in public.'
b. Ha-xašdanut ha-amuka beyn šney ha-cdadim man'a [$_{CP}$ me-
the-suspiciousness the-deep between two-of the-sides prevented from-
[$_{IP}$ ha-kerax le-hišaver ba-mifgašim ha-rišonim]].
the-ice to-be-broken in-the-meetings the-first
'The deep suspiciousness between the two parties prevented the ice from being broken in the first meetings.'

The idiom chunks in (11) occupy the embedded subject position and are licensed by the embedded predicates. If we minimally change the matrix verb in these examples to control verbs that select a *me*-PP, the result is ungrammatical. This is precisely what we expect, given that the idiom chunk is not licensed by the matrix predicate.[5]

(12) a. *Ha-va'ada darša [$_{PP}$ me-ha-kvisa ha-meluxlexet] [PRO lacet
the-committee demanded from-the-laundry the-dirty PRO to-get-out
ha-xuca].
out
'The committee demanded the dirty laundry to be washed in public.'

[5] The verbs *demand* and *expect* do take exceptional-Case-marking (ECM) complements in English, explaining the grammaticality of the translations in (12).

b. *Ha-paršanim ha-polityim mecapim [$_{PP}$ me-ha-kerax] [PRO le-hišaver
the-commentators the-political expect from-the-ice PRO to-be-broken
ba-mifgašim ha-rišonim].
in-the-meetings the-first
'The political commentators expect the ice to be broken in the first meetings.'
[cf. . . . mecapim še-ha-kerax yišaver . . .]
(. . . expect that-the-ice will-be-broken . . .)

The reasoning is quite simple. The facts in (8)–(12) provide compelling evidence for the existence of a negative infinitival complementizer in Hebrew, homophonous with the preposition *me-* 'from'. Therefore, analyzing *me-* in (3) as the same complementizer adds no complexity to the grammar of Hebrew and indeed accounts for the fact that in both (3) and (8) the infinitival complement is associated with a negative entailment.[6]

It is worth mentioning that *mana* can also take control complements, in which case *me-* heads a matrix PP argument. This structure is not available for inanimate DPs as in (8), but *is* available for animate object controllers.

(13) a. Gil mana me-Rina [PRO laredet ba-taxana ha-sofit].
Gil prevented from-Rina PRO to-get-off in-the-stop the-final
'Gil prevented Rina from getting off at the final stop.'
b. Gil mana me-Rina [PRO le'hitpašet].
Gil prevented from-Rina PRO to-undress
'Gil prevented Rina from undressing.'

In these examples the *me-*DP sequence is a constituent; indeed, it can be moved (contrast with (9)).

(14) a. Me-mi Gil mana [PRO laredet ba-taxana ha-sofit]?
from-whom Gil prevented PRO to-get-off in-the-stop the-final
'Who did Gil prevent from getting off at the final stop?'
b. Me-mi Gil mana [PRO le'hitpašet]?
from-whom Gil prevented PRO to-undress
'Who did Gil prevent from undressing?'

Returning to the options in (7), notice that unlike frame (7a), frames (7b–c) can only realize control structures. Consequently, they are unacceptable with inanimate objects.

(15) a. Gil mana et/be'ad Rina me-laredet ba-taxana ha-sofit.
Gil prevented ACC/through Rina from-to-get-off in-the-stop the-final
'Gil prevented Rina from getting off at the final stop.'

[6] Presumably, the prepositional complementizer *me-* assigns Case to the embedded subject in (10a). Yet Hebrew has neither accusative infinitival ECM constructions nor preposition stranding. This suggests that Kayne's (1981) thesis, which reduces the three types of constructions to a single parameter, must be reconsidered, perhaps weakened.

b. *Ha-bikuš ha-acum mana et/be'ad ha-mexirim me-laredet.
the-demand the-huge prevented ACC/through the-prices from-to-fall
'The huge demand prevented the prices from falling.'

The ungrammaticality of (15b) (to be contrasted with (8a)) is expected: Hebrew has no infinitival (accusative) ECM constructions, and the preposition *be'ad,* unlike *me-,* is not a complementizer. Hence, there is no way to license 'the prices' as the embedded subject in (15b). Nor can it be an argument of the matrix predicate, which requires an animate object, so the sentence is ruled out.

One issue that is potentially problematic is the occurrence of the complementizer *me-* with both lexical subjects and PRO. In classical Government-Binding Theory this state of affairs was contradictory, implying that the prepositional complementizer is both a governor and a nongovernor. Within a minimalist framework one would have to attribute to the prepositional complementizer two distinct sets of ϕ-features, one suitable to check lexical subjects and the other (with ''null Case'') suitable for PRO. This comes close to admitting a lexical ambiguity.

The first thing to note is that the case of Hebrew *me-* is not unprecedented. The complementizers *for* in Belfast English and *i* 'to' in Welsh are similar: both can introduce either control or ECM infinitives.

(16) *Welsh* (Borsley 1986:(2), (3))
a. Mae Gwyn yn awyddus *i* weld Megan.
is Gwyn in eager to see Megan
'Gwyn is eager to see Megan.'
b. Hoffai Gwyn *i* Emrys fynd adref.
would-like Gwyn to Emrys go home
'Gwyn would like Emrys to go home.'

(17) *Belfast English* (Henry 1992:(11), (17a))
a. I tried *for* to get them.
b. It was stupid *for* them to do that.

The case of Belfast English is particularly telling, as Henry shows (by a variety of tests) that *for-to* in this dialect results from cliticization of *for* to the infinitival *to.* Cliticization is crucial in removing *for* from the C position, leaving PRO ungoverned. This description is no doubt correct for Hebrew, where the clitic status of *me-* is even more transparent. It remains to be worked out how cliticization of the complementizer licenses control in a minimalist theory of PRO's distribution, a task I will not take up here. In any event, it should be clear that no theoretical contradiction is entailed by the control/ECM duality of *me-,* once we recognize that it occupies different positions (I and C, respectively) in the two structures.

2.3 Selection for PP/CP

The main argument against the complementizer analysis of *me-* in N-complements is one from simplicity. We already have a preposition *me-* in Hebrew grammar, the argument goes; other things being equal, a theory that does not posit lexical ambiguity should be favored over one that does.

However, other things are not equal. In particular, it turns out that the uniform analysis of *me-* faces some empirical problems that the dual analysis does not, rendering simplicity considerations irrelevant.

To see this, let us look at the two alternatives more closely.

(18) a. Uniform *me-:* a preposition that selects either a DP or an IP/CP.
b. Dual *me-:* (i) a preposition that selects a DP; (ii) a complementizer that selects an IP (N-complement).

Some N-verbs occur in both environments, hence are neutral between the two options.

(19) a. Gil nimna/hitnazer/nizhar me-le'ašen sigaryot.
Gil refrained/abstained/was careful from-to-smoke cigarettes
'Gil refrained/abstained from smoking cigarettes.'
'Gil was careful not to smoke cigarettes.'
b. Gil nimna/hitnazer/nizhar me-išun sigaryot.
Gil refrained/abstained/was careful from-smoking (N) cigarettes
(Translation as in (a))

However, other N-verbs can only appear with a clausal complement.

(20) a. Gil mana/acar be'ad Rina me- la'azov/*aziva.
Gil prevented/stopped through Rina from- to-leave/*departure
'Gil prevented/stopped Rina from leaving/*departure.'
b. Gil hit'apek me- le'har'iš ba-koncert/*har'aša
Gil restrained-himself from- to-make-noise at-the concert/*making-noise (N)
ba-koncert.
at-the concert
'Gil restrained himself from *(making) noise at the concert.'

Moreover, degree infinitives (which are associated with a negative entailment) are uniformly introduced by *me-,* but have no nominal counterparts.[7]

(21) a. Gil haya ge'e miday me- le'hitnacel/*hitnaclut bifney Rina.
Gil was proud too from- to-apologize/*apology in-front-of Rina
'Gil was too proud to apologize to Rina.'
b. Rina ce'ira miday mi- le'havin/*havanat dvarim ka'ele.
Rina young too from- to-understand/*understanding-of (N) things such
'Rina is too young to understand such things.'

The proposal in (18a) would be hard pressed to account for the contrasts in (20)–(21). If *me-* is uniformly a preposition, there is no reason for it to prohibit DP complements in contexts where

[7] The measure modifier *miday* 'too' can be dropped, in which case the following *me-* is obligatory. Otherwise, it is optional, as in some N1-complements (see section 3.1). This alternation seems to be governed by recoverability; but at any rate it is orthogonal to the point at hand.

IP complements are allowed. If anything, the reverse situation is more likely with run-of-the-mill prepositions. Indeed, no other preposition in Hebrew displays this behavior. Unless one is willing to adopt the ad hoc stipulation that *me-* (and no other preposition) may never take a DP complement in certain contexts, the alternative proposal (18b) is to be preferred. On that analysis the difference between the N-verbs in (19) and those in (20) reduces to selection for PP/CP versus selection for CP alone, respectively, a difference that does no violence to standard conceptions of selection.[8]

To conclude this section, let us state the proposed lexical entry for *me-*.

(22) *Lexical entry for the complementizer* me-
Phonology: /me/, /mi/
Morphology: bound morpheme
Syntax: C^0
Semantics: propositional negation (λp. ⌜ p)

3 Two Types of N-Verbs

The second major claim of this article is that the verbs in (3a) and (3b) represent two subclasses with distinct properties, call them *N1-verbs* (taking N1-complements) and *N2-verbs* (taking N2-complements), respectively. Accordingly, the list in (4) can be broken into two subclasses:

(23) a. *N1-verbs*
nimna 'refrain', mana 'prevent', manua 'prevented' (adj.), hitxamek 'avoid', nirta 'flinch', acar 'stop', heni 'dissuade', xadal 'stop, cease', hitnazer 'abstain', hištamet 'shirk'
b. *N2-verbs*
nizhar 'careful', nišmar 'watchful', hit'apek 'restrain oneself'

In this section I discuss four empirical differences between the two classes of N-verbs. The differences will be illustrated with the verbs *nimna* 'refrain' and *nizhar* 'careful'; they extend to the other members of their respective classes, unless otherwise mentioned. In section 4 I will propose an analysis that reduces those differences to a single syntactic distinction.

3.1 Alternation of Me-/Lo/Ø

The first contrast is stated in (24) and illustrated in (25).

(24) *Me-* is optional in some N1-complements, but cannot be omitted in N2-complements unless it is ''replaced'' by an overt clausal negation.[9]

[8] See Rizzi 1982 for similar arguments motivating the complementizer analysis of *di* in Italian. An anonymous reviewer suggests that the two uses of *me-* can be unified under an analysis such as Kayne's (1999), where prepositional complementizers are generated as sisters to the matrix VP, and subsequent movements yield the observed word order. The preposition *me-* and the complementizer *me-* would differ only in the derivational stage at which they are merged.

[9] See Glinert 1989:205 for related observations. There is some cross-speaker variability concerning which N1-verbs may delete *me-,* and to what degree of acceptability. It seems that among the intransitive ones, *nimna* 'refrain', *manua* 'prevented' (adj.), *nirta* 'flinch', and *xadal* 'stop' tolerate *me-*deletion to various degrees, while *hitxamek* 'avoid', *hitnazer*

(25) a. Gil nimna me-/Ø leha'aliv et Rina.
Gil refrained from/Ø to-insult ACC Rina
'Gil refrained from insulting Rina.'
b. Gil nizhar me-/lo/*Ø leha'aliv et Rina.
Gil was-careful from/not/*Ø to-insult ACC Rina
'Gil was careful not to insult Rina.'

In section 3.2 I return to an interpretive contrast between N1-verbs and N2-verbs. For now it is sufficient to note that the *me-*/Ø alternants of (25a) are synonymous, and so are the *me-*/*lo* alternants of (25b). The peculiar property of the latter is that a ''bare'' infinitive, which is introduced neither by the complementizer *me-* nor by the clausal negation *lo,* is strictly ungrammatical.

It can be shown that this restriction is morphological, rather than semantic.

(26) a. Gil nizhar lo lihyot xacuf la-bos šelo.
Gil was-careful not to-be impolite to-the-boss his
'Gil was careful not to be impolite to his boss.'
b. *Gil nizhar lihyot menumas la-bos šelo.
Gil was-careful to-be polite to-the-boss his
'Gil was careful to be polite to his boss.'

The infinitives in (26a–b) are nearly identical in meaning, yet the one that lacks an overt negation cannot occur as a complement of an N2-verb.[10] That the negation at stake must be clausal is shown by (27).

'abstain', and *hištamet* 'shirk' do not. Crucially, though, *me-*deletion is sharply ungrammatical in N2-complements (without negation) for all speakers. Transitive N1-verbs forbid *me-*deletion, but their alternants with oblique arguments allow it.

(i) Gil mana/acar/heni et Rina *(me-)laxtom al ha-acuma.
Gil prevented/stopped/dissuaded ACC Rina *(from-)to-sign on the-petition
'Gil prevented/stopped/dissuaded Rina from signing the petition.'

(ii) Gil mana/acar be'ad Rina (me-)laxtom al ha-acuma.
Gil prevented/stopped through Rina (from-)to-sign on the-petition
'Gil prevented/stopped Rina from signing the petition.'

This contrast suggests that omissibility of *me-* is partly constrained by some requirement of the infinitive to be Case-licensed, independently of condition (24) (see Cinque 1990 for a similar restriction on the complementizer *di* in Italian). The verb *xadal* 'stop' is ambiguous between a raising and a control predicate (like all aspectual verbs; see Perlmutter 1970), the former being forced with inanimate subjects. Since raising complements are bare IPs, *me-* is predicted to be incompatible with them. This prediction is borne out, further supporting the complementizer analysis of *me-*.

(iii) Rina xadla (me-)le'acben et Gil.
Rina stopped (from-)to-irritate ACC Gil
'Rina stopped irritating Gil.'
(iv) Ha-muzika ha-ro'ešet xadla (*me-)le'acben et Gil.
the-music the-noisy stopped (*from-)to-irritate ACC Gil
'The loud music stopped irritating Gil.'

[10] This points to an unfortunate shortcoming in translating *nizhar* as 'careful', since the latter does not impose a similar restriction on its complement, as witnessed by the grammaticality of the English translation of (26b). In that respect it corresponds more closely to the Hebrew verb *hikpid.*

(27) a. *Gil nizhar lihyot lo xacuf la-bos šelo.
Gil was-careful to-be not impolite to-the-boss his
'Gil was careful not to be impolite to his boss.'
b. Gil hištadel lihyot lo xacuf la-bos šelo.
Gil tried to-be not impolite to-the-boss his
'Gil tried to be not impolite to his boss.'

(27a) minimally differs from (26a) in that it involves constituent negation rather than clausal negation. The contrast between those synonymous sentences points not only to the purely morphological nature of the condition in (24), but also to the fact that only clausal negation can satisfy this condition. As (27b) verifies, constituent negation is perfectly acceptable inside infinitival complements to other verbs.

3.2 Negative/Positive Entailments

The second contrast is a semantic one.

(28) N1-complements are negatively entailed, with or without *me-*; N2-complements are positively entailed without *me-,* and negatively with *me-*.[11]

In order to construct a uniform paradigm, we need to introduce clausal negation into the infinitives under consideration, given that (24) requires it for some members of the paradigm. This will give rise to double negation readings in certain cases, which are pragmatically awkward. However, the semantic patterns remain clear and unaffected by this minor complication.

Consider the following examples:

(29) a. Gil nimna (me-)lo le'exol kašer.
Gil refrained (from-)not to-eat kosher
'Gil refrained from not eating kosher.'
⇒ Gil ate kosher
b. Gil nizhar me-lo le'exol kašer.
Gil was-careful from-not to-eat kosher
'Gil was careful to eat kosher.'
⇒ Gil ate kosher
c. Gil nizhar lo le'exol kašer.
Gil was-careful not to-eat kosher
'Gil was careful not to eat kosher.'
⇒ Gil did not eat kosher

[11] There is some disagreement among native speakers about whether N2-verbs really trigger entailments or just strong implicatures. I will assume the former, although for present purposes all that is needed is a weaker opposition: without *me-* N1-verbs trigger a negative entailment, N2-verbs do not. The entailments of N-verbs are neither preserved nor reversed under matrix negation; thus, they are *weak implicatives* in the sense of Pesetsky 1991 (see Karttunen 1971 for a semantic characterization of implicative verbs).

The infinitive in all three examples is *lo le'exol kašer* 'not to eat kosher'. Notice that the N1-verb in (29a) triggers a negative entailment (which cancels the clausal negation)—whether *me-* is present or not. By contrast, the N2-verb triggers a negative entailment only in the presence of *me-* (29b); without it, a positive entailment (or at least, a strong positive implicature) is triggered, retaining the embedded clausal negation (29c). To put it differently, both (29a) and (29b) entail that Gil is an observant Jew, while (29c) entails that he is doing anything he can not to be one. This pattern of entailments is consistent across the two subclasses of N-verbs.

3.3 Selection for Finite Complements

The third contrast is stated in (30) and illustrated in (31).

(30) N2-verbs can take finite complements; N1-verbs cannot.

(31) a. Gil nizhar še-Rina lo tavxin bo.
Gil was-careful that-Rina not will-notice in-him
'Gil was careful that Rina would not notice him.'

b. *Gil nimna še-Rina (lo) tavxin bo.
Gil refrained that-Rina (not) will-notice in-him
'Gil refrained that Rina would (not) notice him.'

Again, this property consistently differentiates between all N1-verbs and all N2-verbs.[12] Of course, the (im)possibility of taking a finite complement is not limited to N-verbs, and it cuts across the whole range of control verbs. Still, it would be nice if the fact that N1-verbs and N2-verbs divide precisely along this line were not an accident, but instead followed from the proposed analysis. Notice, incidentally, that clausal negation is obligatory in (31a); thus, (24) holds for finite N2-complements as well.

3.4 Alternation of Lo/Še-lo

Before stating the fourth contrast between N1-verbs and N2-verbs, I need to make a few background observations about the Hebrew complementizer *še-* 'that'. *Še-* is the standard finite complementizer in the language (see (31a)) and is a phonological proclitic (Shlonsky 1988). Normally it is excluded from infinitives. However, there is one infinitival context in which it may (though need not) appear: before clausal negation.

(32) Gil hivtiax/nisa/hexlit še-*(lo) limšox tsumet-lev.
Gil promised/tried/decided that-*(not) to-draw attention
'Gil promised/tried/decided not to draw attention.'

[12] Finite complements to *hit'apek* 'restrain oneself' are not that common, but quite possible.

(i) Gil hit'apek še-lo yišme'u oto.
Gil restrained-himself that-not will-hear him
'Gil restrained himself not to be heard.'

The infinitival *še-lo* construction (more common in formal registers) is quite peculiar, and a full investigation of its properties lies beyond the scope of this article.[13] What is important for present purposes is the fact that a negated control infinitive may optionally be introduced by *še-*. This leads to the fourth contrast between N1-verbs and N2-verbs.

(33) A negated N2-complement can be introduced by the complementizer *še-,* but a negated N1-complement cannot.

This contrast is illustrated in (34) with *nimna* and *nizhar* alone, but it carries over to all other members of the two verb classes.

(34) a. Gil nimna (*še-)lo le'exol kašer.
Gil refrained (*that-)not to-eat kosher
'Gil refrained from not eating kosher.'
b. Gil nizhar (še-)lo le'exol kašer.
Gil was-careful (that-)not to-eat kosher
'Gil was careful not to eat kosher.'

This contrast is rather striking, since it is in fact a contrast between N1-verbs on the one hand and all other control predicates in the language on the other. At first sight one may attempt to relate it to the previous contrast, namely, the fact that N2-verbs but not N1-verbs can take finite complements. Since *še-* is the finite complementizer, perhaps the failure of N1-verbs to take *še-lo* infinitival complements simply reflects their failure to take finite complements. Regardless of how one would actually implement this alleged dependency, there is a serious problem with it. Many other verbs in Hebrew are like N1-verbs in taking only infinitival complements, but *unlike* them in allowing those complements to be introduced by *še-lo* (see Glinert 1989:543, fn. 9).

(35) a. Gil he'ez/hicliax/alul/asuy še-lo le'hagia ba-zman.
Gil dared/managed/might/might that-not to-arrive in-the-time
'Gil dared to/managed to/might not arrive on time.'
b. **Gil he'ez/hicliax/alul/asuy še-Rina lo tagia ba-zman.
Gil dared/managed/might/might that-Rina not will-arrive in-the-time
'Gil dared/managed/might that Rina will not arrive on time.'

Thus, the property at stake is specific to N1-verbs and is not reducible to property (30).

[13] The first and most interesting question that must be addressed is that of ''upward selection'': how can Neg govern the content of the higher head C? Surely *še-* itself does not select Neg; if it did, we would expect *še-* to always be followed by Neg in finite clauses as well (and it is not). Another puzzling fact (Irena Botwinik-Rotem, personal communication) is the existence of a few idioms in Hebrew where *še-lo* functions as a constituent negation, attaching to an adverbial phrase: *še-lo ka-din* 'illegally', *še-lo be-yod'in* 'unwittingly', *še-lo ke-derex ha-teva* 'not in the way of nature', and so on.

4 The Proposal

4.1 Selection, Insertion, and Checking

Ideally, the four contrasts between N1-verbs and N2-verbs—(24), (28), (30), and (33)—should follow from a single distinction, interacting with independent principles of the grammar. I propose that (36) is the relevant distinction.

(36) *Complement selection of N-verbs*
  a. N1-verbs select for a valued (interpretable) [neg] feature on the embedded C.
  b. N2-verbs select for an unvalued (uninterpretable) [neg] feature on the embedded C.

We may think of [neg] in analogy to another operator feature—namely, [wh], which comes in two guises: interpretable [wh] is the feature of the *wh*-word, which is attracted by an uninterpretable counterpart on C. Thus, the term *unvalued* does not necessarily imply a potential multiplicity of values (as in ϕ-features), but merely a formal feature ''stripped'' of its semantic content.

Next, I assume that the lexicon of Hebrew provides two infinitival negative complementizers, given in (37).

(37) *Infinitival negative complementizers in Hebrew*
  a. me_{vneg}-: valued [neg]
  b. $\emptyset_{\text{uneg}}$: unvalued [neg]

In other words, the lexical complementizer is interpretable whereas the null one is not.

As far as lexical insertion is concerned, I adopt the standard ''nondistinct subset'' requirement: if A selects for some collection of features F on its complement B, then B can be lexicalized by any item whose feature collection F′ is a subset of F, nondistinct in values (Halle and Marantz 1993, 1994). The interesting question here is how to interpret *nondistinct* in the case where the valued/unvalued distinction is at stake. On a ''symmetric'' interpretation, all four combinations are possible: selection for uF or vF may be satisfied by a lexical item with uF or vF. On an ''asymmetric'' interpretation, the inserted item must be at least as specified as selection requires: hence, selection for uF may be satisfied by an item with either uF or vF, but selection for vF may only be satisfied by the latter. The asymmetric option is intuitively more appealing insofar as it captures a consequence of the Projection Principle: namely, no lexical requirement can be compromised in the course of the derivation. Yet the issue is empirical. As I argue below, the evidence indeed favors the asymmetric option.[14]

[14] Note that this result does not conflict with the principle of underspecification in Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993, 1994). The latter requires vocabulary items to be featurally underspecified with respect to the nodes under which they are inserted. In the present case the feature [neg] is always present on the inserted complementizer, even if unvalued. More importantly, morphological features are syntactically realized on the nodes they spell out, whereas selectional requirements are encoded only on a higher head; for example, the [+human] restriction on the object of *thrill* is not read off an empty complement position, later to be ''filled'' by an object DP. Thus, my (traditional) usage of ''lexical insertion'' is not to be confused with the ''late insertion'' sense of Distributed Morphology.

As a general framework, I will assume recent proposals within the theory of feature checking as developed in Chomsky 1995, 2000, 2001. The core idea of that theory is that feature checking is driven by the necessity to eliminate uninterpretable features before the interface. Typically, a probe P with an uninterpretable (unvalued) feature seeks a goal G with a matching interpretable (valued) feature. If G is in the syntactic domain of P, a relation is established, Agree (P,G) (possibly, though not necessarily, followed by Merge of some phrase containing G at the head/specifier of P, giving rise to Move). The features of P become valued, spelled out cyclically at the phase level, and then erased. The system is subject to Last Resort: no operation is allowed that is not necessary. Specifically, interpretable features, unlike uninterpretable ones, must not erase, and therefore cannot trigger any feature-checking operation.

Some immediate consequences ensue in the present context. Together with the proposals in (36) and (37), they derive the full range of facts associated with N-verbs.

4.2 Deriving the N1/N2 Asymmetries

Recall the four contrasts we have found between N1-verbs and N2-verbs.

(38) a. *Me-* is optional in some N1-complements, but cannot be omitted in N2-complements unless it is ''replaced'' by an overt clausal negation.
b. N1-complements are negatively entailed, with or without *me-*; N2-complements are positively entailed without *me-,* and negatively with *me-*.
c. N2-verbs can take finite complements, N1-verbs cannot.
d. A negated N2-complement can be introduced by the complementizer *še-,* but a negated N1-complement cannot.

Consider (38a) first. By assumption, N1-verbs select for the valued negative complementizer, namely, *me-*. Being interpretable, this head need not and cannot be checked. Furthermore, the null complementizer $\emptyset_{\text{uneg}}$ cannot be merged since it fails to satisfy the stronger selectional requirement of the N1-verb for a valued [neg]; as noted, inserted items must be at least as specified as required by selection. How, then, do we account for the appearance of a null complementizer in N1-complements, at least partially?

It has long been observed that complementizers may delete at PF, this (optional) process being subject to recoverability, among other factors (Pesetsky 1998). Suppose this is true here as well. Then we have the following two options:

(39) *Deriving N1-complements*
a. Merge (*me-,* TP) → $[_{\text{CP}}$ *me-* TP]
b. Merge (*me-,* TP) → $[_{\text{CP}}$ *me-* TP] → PF deletion of complementizer → $[_{\text{CP}}\ \emptyset_{\text{vneg}}$ TP]

Notice that *me*-deletion in (39b) is semantically recoverable: the interpretable negative feature on *me-* is matched by a selectional requirement of the matrix N1-verb. Thus, neither convergence nor recoverability is at stake in the event of *me*-deletion in an N1-complement. If we do find cases where deletion is unacceptable, this should be due to ''surfacy'' effects of a flexible phono-

logical spell-out; indeed, the cross-speaker variability in these cases (see footnote 9) suggests that they should not be treated within the core computational system but rather in its periphery.

Now consider N2-verbs. These select for an unvalued negative complementizer. There are two ways to satisfy this requirement, as illustrated in (40).

(40) *Deriving N2-complements*
a. Merge (*me-*,TP) → [$_{CP}$ *me-* TP]
b. Merge ($\emptyset_{uneg}$, TP) → [$_{CP}$ $\emptyset_{uneg}$ TP] → Agree ($\emptyset_{uneg}$, Neg^0)

Under scenario (40a) the N2-complement comes to be headed by *me-*. Notice that the nondistinct subset condition on lexical insertion is met: the N2-verb merely selects for a complementizer with a negative feature, valued or not. *Me-,* bearing such a feature, satisfies this requirement. As the [neg] feature of *me-* is interpretable, no further syntactic operation is needed, and by economy, none applies.

Under scenario (40b) the N2-complement comes to be headed by the null complementizer $\emptyset_{uneg}$. The selectional requirement for a [neg] feature is satisfied. However, this is not enough, since the unvalued feature of $\emptyset_{uneg}$ must not survive to the interface. Hence, $\emptyset_{uneg}$ establishes an Agree relation with an appropriate goal in its domain; naturally, that goal must be a negative element. In the absence of Neg the uninterpretable [neg] feature of $\emptyset_{uneg}$ remains unchecked, causing the derivation to crash.

Observe that it is not possible to insert *me-* and then delete it at PF, as in (39b). Crucially, the valued negative feature on *me-* is *not* recoverable from the selectional requirement of the matrix N2-verb, which only specifies an unvalued [neg] feature on its complement. Thus, in the absence of Neg an N2-complement without *me-* either fails to converge or violates recoverability. This is how we explain the obligatory presence of either *me-* or Neg in N2-complements.[15] The fact that the negation required by (38a) must be clausal—that is, the head of NegP—should follow from a general condition on possible goals. Constituent negation occupies an adjunct position, and those presumably are not ''attractable'' (possibly, a consequence of the Left Branch Condition or the invisibility of category segments).

The availability of option (40a) supports the idea that interpretability should not be seen as a binary feature that can take either a plus or a minus value. Rather, the notion reduces to valuation, with interpretable features being valued and uninterpretable ones unvalued (Chomsky 2000, 2001). Under this view an interpretable feature on a morpheme to be inserted can satisfy a selectional requirement for an uninterpretable feature, simply because the two are nondistinct. Moreover, the weak selection for a feature, with no value specification, can be satisfied by a valued token of this feature. By contrast, if one builds into the grammar a [± interpretable] opposition at the level

[15] In principle, one could posit overt Neg-to-C movement instead of (40b) (see Haegeman 1995, Zanuttini 1997). However, that would fail to extend to the finite counterpart (31a), where negation, equally obligatory, is separated from the complementizer by a lexical subject. Hence, I favor the Agree solution (covert head movement being a notational variant).

of featural values, it is hard to see how (40a) escapes a selectional violation (inserting $[neg]_{+\ INT}$ under a verb that selects $[neg]_{-\ INT}$). Since nondistinctness is independently known to govern lexical insertion, option (40a) comes for free under the valuation analysis.

To recapitulate the options of complementizer spell-out: Both N1-complements and N2-complements can be headed by *me-* or by what appears to be a null complementizer. *Me*-insertion in N1-complements satisfies both the requirement for the type of feature, [neg], and its value; *me*-insertion in N2-complements satisfies only the former (value of [neg] not being selected by N2-verbs). As for the null complementizer, it arises from very different sources in the two environments (as the differential judgments indeed suggest): in N1-complements it is the result of a PF deletion of *me-,* effectively leaving its semantic features intact; in N2-complements it is the result of $\emptyset_{uneg}$-insertion. Independent principles, such as constraints on lexical insertion, Last Resort, and recoverability of deletion, conspire to rule out any alternative options.

Consider next (38b). The source of the negative entailment in N1-complements is *me-* itself, that is, the negative operator associated with the [neg] feature on C. PF deletion of the complementizer, by definition, does not affect semantic features, the negative operator included. Therefore, that entailment obtains whether or not PF deletion applies, that is, whether or not the C position of an N1-complement is spelled out. By contrast, $\emptyset_{uneg}$, which is not interpreted, cannot trigger any negative entailment by itself. Therefore, in the absence of *me-* N2-verbs will not entail the negation of their complements. This will occur in scenario (40b), where C contains $\emptyset_{uneg}$ and Neg is filled. A negative entailment will only arise upon merging of *me-,* since that complementizer, by assumption, bears an interpretable [neg] feature (see (37a)). This will occur in scenario (40a).[16]

To explain (38c) and (38d), we need only assume the following:

(41) The finite complementizer *še-* cannot bear an interpretable [neg] feature.

(41) is a lexical property of the finite complementizer in Hebrew. There is nothing mysterious about this property: many other clause types cannot be headed by *še-,* such as questions, conditionals, and imperatives. Complementizers come from the lexicon with a fixed set of features and cannot be inserted in contexts that require other features. Given (41), insertion of *še-* as the head of an N1-complement will violate the selectional requirement of the matrix N1-verb. This accounts for the unavailability of both finite and infinitival *še-lo* complements to N1-verbs.

Is there independent evidence for (41)? Evidently, since it is a lexical property, we do not expect it to be a universal constraint on finite complementizers. In fact, there is straightforward evidence that Hebrew is different from other languages in this respect, languages in which the standard finite complementizer *can* bear an interpretable [neg] feature.

Finite negative complementizers have been at the focus of much research (see, e.g., Laka 1994, Progovac 1993, 1994, Suñer 1994). The primary source of evidence for their existence is

[16] The source of the *positive* entailment without *me-* is not syntactic; we do not posit any [pos] feature in C. Rather, it is given by the presupposition of the matrix verb (see Karttunen 1971). This is consistent with the fact that it is subject to more variation, surfacing only as a strong implicature for some speakers.

the licensing of affective polarity items (APIs) in the clausal complements of certain adversative predicates, like *deny* and *doubt*.[17] The crucial observation is that nominal complements to these verbs cannot be APIs; thus, the licensing negative feature is to be located not in the verb's meaning, but in the complementizer it selects, explaining the nominal/clausal asymmetry in (42) (see Laka 1994, Progovac 1992, 1993, 1994).

(42) a. John denied/forgot that Mary had heard anything.
b. *John denied/forgot anything.

In English (as well as Spanish and Serbo-Croatian) the negative finite complementizer is homophonous with the standard finite complementizer of the language. By contrast, in Basque a designated negative complementizer, *enik,* must head an N-complement in which an API occurs. It is conceivable that certain languages will have neither option, possessing no finite negative complementizer, standard or special. Hebrew, I suggest, is such a language.

The idiomatic API *nakaf ecba* 'lift a finger' must be in the scope of some affective operator—negation, question, and so on—in order to be licensed.

(43) a. Gil *(lo) he'emin še-Rina (ey-pa'am) nakfa ecba avuro.
Gil *(not) believed that-Rina (ever) lifted finger for-him
'Gil didn't believe that Rina (ever) lifted a finger for him.'
b. Mišehu nakaf ecba avurxa *(?)
somebody lifted finger for-you
'Did somebody lift a finger for you?'

Unlike in English/Spanish/Serbo-Croatian, however, that API is not licensed in the indicative complement of adversative predicates (44a). Notice that an interrogative complement to one of these predicates does license the API (44b).

(44) a. *Gil hikxiš/šaxax še-Rina (ey-pa'am) nakfa ecba avuro.
Gil denied/forgot that-Rina (ever) lifted finger for-him
'Gil denied/forgot that Rina (ever) lifted a finger for him.'
b. Gil šaxax matay Rina nakfa ecba avuro.
Gil forgot when Rina lifted finger for-him
'Gil forgot when Rina lifted a finger for him.'

Crucially, infinitival N-complements, headed by *me-,* also license this API.

(45) a. Gil nimna me-linkof ecba avur Rina.
Gil refrained from-to-lift finger for Rina
'Gil refrained from lifting a finger for Rina.'

[17] I keep to Giannakidou's (1998) terminological distinction between APIs, which are licensed in nonveridical contexts, and negative polarity items (NPIs), which require antiveridical (basically, negative) context. Hebrew N-words like *af-exad* 'nobody' and *šum-davar* 'nothing' are NPIs that further require negative concord, making them unavailable in all of the contexts examined in the text. For this reason, I use the idiomatic API below.

b. Gil heni et Rina me-linkof ecba avur axoto.
Gil dissuaded ACC Rina from-to-lift finger for his-sister
'Gil dissuaded Rina from lifting a finger for his sister.'

The contrast between (44a) and (44b)/(45) supports the hypothesis in (41): unlike the interrogative complementizer and *me-,* which possess affective features ([Q] and [neg], respectively), the indicative complementizer *še-* lacks either feature, hence cannot license APIs in its scope. In turn, the lack of a [neg] feature explains (38c) and (38d), namely, the incompatibility of N1-verbs with any complement headed by *še.*

5 N-Verbs in English

The analysis of N-verbs in Hebrew data can and should be examined against parallel data from other languages. Such examination will no doubt help to tease apart the universal aspects of the analysis from the language-particular ones. Although a systematic study of this sort is beyond the scope of this article, I will consider English N-verbs in this section. The English data are quite puzzling, perhaps explaining the little attention they have received in the literature. Apart from some comments in Rosenbaum 1967:89–91, the main source is Postal 1974:154–163, with some brief comments in Postal and Pullum 1988 and Baltin 1995. It turns out that the analysis of Hebrew can shed some interesting light on the English facts.

5.1 The Complementizer From

Consider the following examples ((47), (48c–d), and (49) are from Postal 1974; (48a–b) are from Rosenbaum 1967):

(46) a. John refrained from smoking in the office.
b. Mary abstained from eating junk food.
c. Mary avoided eating junk food.

(47) a. I dissuaded Jack from kissing the gorilla.
b. I deterred him from embarking.
c. We restrained her from jumping.
d. They discouraged me from taking that flight.

(48) a. I prevented the doctor from examining John.
b. I prevented John from being examined by the doctor.
c. They stopped him from embarking.
d. She kept us from winning.

(49) a. He prevented there from being a riot.
b. Nobody can stop it from snowing in the Himalayas.
c. Harry kept tabs from being kept on Joan's movements.

The first observation is that English N-verbs are all N1-verbs; that is, there are no parallels to the Hebrew *nizhar* 'careful', which require overt negation. The next obvious observation is that

N-complements in English are gerundive. This in itself may not mean much if one assumes (as Rosenbaum originally did) that gerunds are full clauses, namely, CP or S′ projections. In that case the analysis of *from,* at least in (46), can be entirely parallel to the analysis of *me-* in Hebrew: a negative prepositional complementizer.[18] In fact, Rosenbaum proposed precisely this, drawing an analogy to the other prepositional complementizer in English, *for.*

However, if one takes gerunds to be IP projections (e.g., Stowell 1982), then the question immediately arises, what is the syntactic status of *from*? Prima facie, the only available option is that it is some sort of inflectional element, located in the I(nfl) domain. This analysis not only would be dubious on English-internal grounds, but also would miss the possible insights to be gained from the Hebrew case, in which *me-* is clearly a complementizer. Furthermore, there are strong independent reasons to view gerunds as full CPs (see Reuland 1983), beyond simplicity considerations. I will therefore assume that *from* is a negative prepositional complementizer, just like *me-* in Hebrew.[19] This accounts with no further assumptions for the examples in (46)–(47).

5.2 *Solving the Puzzle of* Prevent

To return to the paradigm of English N-verbs: Postal (1974) observes that the N-verbs in (47) and those in (48) are quite different. While the latter allow nonthematic DPs (expletives or idiom chunks) to follow the N-verb, as in (49), the former do not. Furthermore, Rosenbaum (1967) observes that (48a–b) are equivalent (but would not be if *prevent* were replaced by *dissuade*). In current terms we would say that the N-verbs in (47) take (object) control complements and those in (48) take ECM complements.[20]

The intriguing cases are the ECM examples, where the expected order of the complementizer and the subject is reversed. Let us consider them more closely. Whereas Hebrew *mana* 'prevent' is well behaved as far as word order is concerned, its English counterpart seems ''scrambled.''

(50) a. Hebrew: DP_1 *mana* [$_{CP}$ *me-* [$_{IP}$ DP_2 to-VP]]
b. English: DP_1 *prevented* [$_{\beta}$ DP_2 [$_{\alpha}$ *from* VP-ing]]

Given the above assumptions, it must be the case that $\alpha = C'$ in (50b). Then what is β? Postal argues that DP_2 raises to the matrix object position in (50b). This proposal is intuitively appealing in two respects: first, it accounts for the ''scrambled'' word order of (50b); second, it accounts for the acceptability of expletives and idiom chunks in that position, at least insofar as DP_2 occupies a derived (hence, nonthematic) position. In current terms Postal's proposal amounts to the claim that DP_2 raises to the specifier of Agr_OP or vP (the maximal projection of small v).

[18] Unlike *me-* in Hebrew N1-complements, *from* does not alternate with Ø in English. Nonetheless, English does seem to apply PF deletion (obligatorily) at least in one case: (46c).

[19] It is surely not an accident that in both languages a negative meaning is associated with the spatial relation denoted by *from* (and not other prepositions, such as *to* or *with*). Notice that the argument from selection (of CP vs. PP; see section 2.3) can be reproduced for English as well, undermining Postal and Pullum's (1988) claim that *prevent* takes NP-PP sequences (e.g., **John prevented Mary from examination of the documents*).

[20] I use the term *ECM* somewhat loosely, taking it to cover both *believe*-type complements and *for*-NP complements—essentially, any nonfinite clause with a lexical subject.

I will pursue an alternative line instead. The surface position of DP_2 in (50b), I maintain, is Spec,CP, to which it raises from Spec,VP via Spec,IP.

(51) DP_1 *prevented* [$_{CP}$ DP_2 [$_{C'}$ *from* [$_{IP}$ t_2 -ing [$_{VP}$ t_2 V′]]]]

In current terminology we can say that *from* has an EPP feature that must be checked by an overt DP.[21] Notice that the Minimal Link Condition ensures that the DP to be raised is the highest one, namely, the subject. Like the ''raising-to-object'' analysis, this proposal immediately accounts for both the word order DP_2-*from* and the acceptability of a nonthematic DP_2 in (50b). Is there any empirical evidence bearing on the choice between the two alternatives?

In fact, relevant evidence is provided by Postal himself, in a footnote (1974:159, fn. 55). He observes a curious puzzle: unlike standard ECM cases, nonthematic ''objects'' of the *prevent*-construction cannot be passivized (cf. (49a,c)).

(52) a. Harry was prevented from escaping.
b. *There was prevented from being a riot.
c. *Tabs were prevented from being kept on Lucy.

This sensitivity to the (non)thematic status of the object is not witnessed in standard passive ECM constructions.

(53) a. Harry was believed to have escaped.
b. There was believed to be a riot.
c. Tabs were believed to have been kept on Lucy.

Since both types of constructions involve ''raising to object'' in Postal's account, the contrast between (52b–c) on the one hand and (52a)/(53b–c) on the other is left unexplained. Postal simply remarks that such facts show that passivization cannot be stated independently of some (as yet unknown) semantic conditions. Postal and Pullum (1988), citing the same facts, offer no account either. As far as I know, these facts have remained unanalyzed to date.

The present proposal offers a solution to the puzzle. Given structure (51), passivization in (52b–c) involves movement from the embedded Spec,CP to the matrix Spec,IP, that is, from an Ā-position to an A-position. The ban on improper movement correctly rules this out, as shown in (54).[22]

[21] The filled Spec,CP of *from*-clauses does not block extraction (e.g., *Who$_1$ did you prevent the paychecks from being sent to t_1?*), indicating that *from* licenses a second specifier for intermediate traces. Baltin (1995), rejecting the idea that *from* can be a complementizer, proposes a structure parallel to (51), with PP/P′ replacing CP/C′. As noted in footnote 19, that leaves unexplained the fact that the complement of *from* must be gerundive.

[22] On this analysis the failure of passivization in (52b–c) is parallel to its failure in (ii).

(i) We want/prefer [(for) Mary to win].

(ii) *Mary$_1$ was wanted/preferred [t_1 to win].

As Chomsky (1981:69) notes, a ''bare-IP'' analysis of the infinitival complement in (ii) would fail to explain why passive is impossible here, as opposed to standard ECM structures. Rather, one should assume a CP complement, headed by *for,* which optionally deletes at PF. Implicit in this account is the assumption that passivization may not proceed through Spec,CP.

(54) *[$_{IP}$ There$_1$ was prevented [$_{CP}$ t_1 from [$_{IP}$ t_1 being a riot]]].

improper movement

The grammaticality of (52a) suggests that an alternative derivation is available just in case the passivized DP is thematic. The natural candidate for such a derivation is (55), in which *prevent* occurs as an object control verb.

(55) [$_{IP}$ Harry$_1$ was prevented t_1 [$_{CP}$ from [$_{IP}$ PRO$_1$ escaping]]].

The idea that *prevent* is ambiguous between a control verb and an ECM verb is quite plausible. First, the same ambiguity is overtly manifested in Hebrew (see section 2.2). Second, transitive N-verbs in English do participate in control (see (47)). Third, a few other verbs in English display the same ambiguity (e.g., *expect, allow, demand*).[23]

Plausibility aside, some independent evidence points to the same conclusion. Postal and Pullum (1988) observe that while all speakers accept pleonastic/weather *it* in the post-*prevent* position, as in (49b), some exclude the expletive *there* from that position, as in (49a). Furthermore, they note that the constraint on nonthematic passivization, observed by Postal (1974), does not apply to the former element.

(56) a. It can be prevented from raining.
b. It cannot be prevented from being obvious that he is lying.

Now, it is well known that pleonastic/weather *it,* but not expletive *there,* can control PRO.

(57) a. It sometimes rains after [PRO snowing]. (Chomsky 1981:324)
b. It can seem that someone is guilty without [PRO seeming that they actually committed the crime]. (Williams 1994:91)
c. There occurred three more accidents without [there/*PRO being any medical help available on the premises]. (Haegeman 1994:279)

Postal and Pullum leave their observations unexplained. Clearly, the natural account should utilize the control/ECM ambiguity together with the asymmetry exemplified in (57). Specifically, for the dialect lacking (49a), *prevent* is unambiguously a control verb. By contrast, those speakers

[23] As with Hebrew *me-,* the question arises how *from* can head both ECM and control clauses. Baltin (1995) accounts for this duality by assuming that PRO, unlike lexical subjects, does not raise to Spec,IP. I would like to suggest again, following Henry's (1992) analysis of *for-to,* that *from* cliticizes to I (V + *ing*). This would tie together three facts: (a) the ECM/control alternation; (b) the lack of violation of the Doubly Filled Comp Filter (since at PF only the specifier of CP is filled); (c) the obviation of complementizer-trace effects both in *from*-clauses in Standard English and in *for-to* clauses in Belfast English (on obviating the ECP by complementizer cliticization, see Shlonsky 1988).

(i) What did you prevent from happening?

(ii) Who do you want for to help you? (Henry 1992:(65))

Notice that Baltin's proposal has no obvious way to link fact (a) to facts (b) and (c). Alternatively, we might explain (i) in the spirit of Rizzi 1990, positing abstract ϕ-features on *from.* If Chomsky (2001) is correct in associating ϕ-completeness with EPP, this is consistent with the fact that *from* has an EPP feature, but none of the other lexical complementizers in English does.

who accept (49a) but still find a contrast between (52b–c) and (56) have two entries for *prevent:* control and ECM. Thus, they can analyze (56) as an instance of control, parallel to (52a). Since *there*-expletives and idiom chunks cannot serve as controllers, (52b–c) cannot avail themselves of this possibility. Moreover, applying passive to the ECM structure results in improper movement. Therefore, (52b–c) have no possible source and are ruled out—for all speakers.[24]

A final piece of evidence favoring the dual analysis of *prevent* comes from British English. Speakers of British English appear to distinguish the ECM complementizer from the control complementizer, in that only the former can be optionally omitted (Paul Elbourne, personal communication).

(58) a. John prevented/stopped Mary (from) leaving.
b. He prevented there (from) being a riot.
c. Harry prevented tabs (from) being kept on Joan's movements.

(59) a. John refrained *(from) smoking in the office.
b. Mary abstained *(from) eating junk food.
c. I dissuaded Jack *(from) kissing the gorilla.
d. They discouraged me *(from) taking that flight.

This contrast already indicates that two varieties of *from* are involved. Recall now the earlier claim that the passive version of *prevent* is exclusively derived from the control variant; this explained why this variant is incompatible with *there*-expletives and idiom chunks. We therefore predict that in British English the passive of *prevent* will pattern with other control N-verbs and *not* with the active *prevent,* which allows an ECM analysis. Strikingly, the prediction is confirmed: when (58a) is passivized, complementizer deletion becomes impossible.[25]

[24] Paul Postal (personal communication) notes that his earlier generalization from the idiom case (52c) was too strong, given the acceptability of the following examples:

(i) Birds of a feather cannot be prevented from flocking together.

(ii) The rug was prevented from being pulled out from under Mary.

(iii) Strings were prevented from being pulled.

However, native speakers who accept those sentences point out that they must assign some ''metaphorical'' interpretation to the fronted idiom chunk. This intuition is in line with the distinction Nunberg, Sag, and Wasow (1994) draw between ''idiomatic phrases'' and ''idiomatically combining phrases.'' The latter are quasi compositional in the sense that their meaning is distributed over their parts (even if it cannot be deduced from them). Nunberg, Sag, and Wasow show that the standard tests of idioms apply only to the first category; the second one fails them, and it is in fact much larger. Of particular interest here is their observation that many idioms *can* participate in control.

(iv) An old dog never wants to be taught new tricks.

(v) Every lion prefers to be bearded in his den.

(vi) Birds of a feather like to flock together.

To the extent that the idiom chunk can be assigned independent reference, it can be a controller (independent animacy restrictions aside). I take this to mean that the acceptability of (i)–(iii) does not undermine the control analysis of passive-*prevent* constructions; moreover, this analysis, unlike the ''raising to object'' one, makes sense of the nonuniform behavior of idioms in this construction.

[25] Ignoring the irrelevant adjunct reading of the gerund (i.e., *Mary was stopped while leaving*).

(60) Mary was prevented/stopped *(from) leaving.

Thus, the English data are not only compatible with the present proposal, but in fact furnish a strong argument in favor of its nontrivial aspects.

To conclude this section, I list in (61) the major differences between the nonfinite negative complementizers in Hebrew and in English.

(61) *Negative complementizers in Hebrew and English*

Properties of C	Hebrew	English
Type of complement	infinitive	gerund
EPP feature	no	yes
Lexical variants	valued (*me-*) or unvalued (Ø)	only valued (*from*)
PF deletion	partially available, varies with speakers	excluded, except with *avoid* (obligatory)

6 Finite Negative Complementizers

The existence of complementizers with a negative force has been recognized in the syntactic literature for many languages: *ne* and *quin* in Latin; *ilmale, (i)lule,* and *pen* in Hebrew; *unless* and *lest* in English; *nach, mur,* and *gan* in Irish; *enik* in Basque; *mipos* and *min* in Greek; *kei* in Maori; *hleze* in Xhosa; *na'a* in Tongan; *bara* in Tukang Besi.[26] However, to the best of my knowledge the vast majority of these examples involve finite complementizers, taking indicative or subjunctive complements. The existence of nonfinite negative complementizers, like *me-* in Hebrew and *from* in English, has received very little attention.

Progovac (1993, 1994) argues that as opposed to clausal negation, a negative element in C does not negate the clause. This claim is based on the observation that finite negative complementizers do not trigger negative entailments; typically, they head ''irrealis'' clauses, whose truth value is undetermined. Notice, however, that the notion that the meaning of negation depends on its position is problematic. Standard conceptions of the syntax-semantics mapping allow for the same element to have different scopes in different positions, but not different denotations. Moreover, the nonfinite complementizers we have examined *do* trigger negative entailments. Hence, Progovac's generalization cannot be maintained in toto.

What seems to be going on is the following. In finite clauses it is typically the case that the negation in C is construed under the scope of an intensional operator, associated either with C itself, a higher prepositional head (e.g., in adjunct clauses), or the matrix verb. This opaque context blocks the negative entailment, yielding the familiar irrealis interpretation. By contrast, nonfinite negative complements are typically implicative, hence extensional.[27] This context is transparent to the negative entailment, yielding the realis interpretation. No need arises to posit different

[26] Examples are taken from Asya Pereltsvaig's summary on Linguist, posted on September 25, 1998 (*http://linguistlist.org/issues/9/9-1331.html#1*).

[27] A rare exception is the intensional verb *discourage* (see (47d)); no analogue exists in Hebrew.

interpretations for negation itself, depending on its position. Since there are no finite implicative clauses, Progovac concludes that finite negative complementizers lack a true negative force. The considerations above suggest that this conclusion is unwarranted, its effects owing to the (non)interaction of negation with intensional operators.

7 Conclusion

In this article I showed that negative verbs in Hebrew take negative complements headed by *me-*. The claim that *me-* is a complementizer, itself novel, was defended at length, drawing on data from extraction, complement selection, and ECM properties. I further argued that N-verbs come in two types, one selecting for a valued (hence, interpretable) negative feature on the head of its complement, the other for an unvalued (hence, uninterpretable) feature. This distinction yields systematic contrasts between the two types of complements, both semantic and syntactic. The presence of [neg] in C interacts with the presence of the head Neg in interesting ways, recalling other Neg-C associations documented in the literature (Haegeman 1995, Zanuttini 1997). The analysis of the Hebrew data was subsequently extended to English, yielding a coherent explanation of the peculiar *prevent*-construction, which has so far resisted analysis.

The results obtained lend substantial support to the view that the interpretable/uninterpretable distinction plays a central role in the grammar. In particular, the correlation of certain semantic entailments with effects of feature checking and recoverability of deletion would be quite puzzling if that distinction were not available.

As noted in the introduction, the present study bears on the question to what extent valuation and interpretability interact with lexical insertion and selection. In the case under consideration—namely, the feature [neg]—we concluded that the valued/unvalued distinction is fully visible to selection (hence the contrasts between N1- and N2-complements) but only ''partially'' visible to lexical insertion (hence the fact that both types of complements can be headed by the valued *me-*). The conclusions are empirically supported, conceptual considerations being of little merit in this domain.

The issue of selection warrants further investigation. Are there any other cases where a head may select for either uF or vF on the head of its complement? Relevant examples may come from complementation patterns of verbs. Consider the fact that some verbs select either finite or nonfinite complements (*learn*), others select only finite (*assert*) or only nonfinite (*dare*) complements, and still others simply do not select clausal complements at all (*characterize*). With F = Finite, we could say that the first class selects for uF, the second and third classes select for vF (valued + or −, respectively), and the fourth class does not select F at all. These remarks are obviously rather sketchy, and they may well turn out to be untenable. Nevertheless, it appears that the general issues opened up by this study, although poorly investigated, are quite substantial and have some real empirical consequences.

References

Baltin, Mark R. 1995. Floating quantifiers, PRO, and predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26:199–248.

Borsley, Robert D. 1986. Prepositional complementizers in Welsh. *Journal of Linguistics* 22:67–84.
Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik,* ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 89–155. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A life in language,* ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1–52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. Ergative adjectives and the lexicalist hypothesis. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 8:1–39.
Giannakidou, Anastasia. 1998. *Polarity sensitivity as (non)veridical dependency*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Glinert, Lewis. 1989. *The grammar of Modern Hebrew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Haegeman, Liliane. 1994. *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
Haegeman, Liliane. 1995. *The syntax of negation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Halle, Morris, and Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed Morphology and the pieces of inflection. In *The view from Building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger,* ed. by Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, 111–175. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
Halle, Morris, and Alec Marantz. 1994. Some key features of Distributed Morphology. In *Papers in phonology and morphology,* ed. by Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley, and Tony Bures, 275–288. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 21. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MITWPL.
Henry, Alison. 1992. Infinitives in a *for-to* dialect. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 10:279–301.
Karttunen, Lauri. 1971. Implicative verbs. *Language* 47:340–358.
Kayne, Richard. 1981. On certain differences between French and English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12:349–371.
Kayne, Richard. 1999. Prepositional complementizers as attractors. *Probus* 11:39–73.
Laka, Itziar. 1994. *On the syntax of negation*. New York: Garland.
Nunberg, Geoffrey, Ivan Sag, and Thomas Wasow. 1994. Idioms. *Language* 70:491–538.
Perlmutter, David M. 1970. The two verbs *begin*. In *Readings in English transformational grammar,* ed. by Peter Rosenbaum and Roderick Jacobs, 107–119. Waltham, Mass.: Ginn-Blaisdell.
Pesetsky, David. 1991. Zero syntax II: An essay on infinitives. Ms., MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
Pesetsky, David. 1998. Some optimality principles of sentence pronunciation. In *Is the best good enough? Optimality and competition in syntax,* ed. by Pilar Barbosa, Danny Fox, Paul Hagstrom, Martha McGinnis, and David Pesetsky, 337–383. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
Postal, Paul M. 1974. *On raising*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
Postal, Paul M., and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 1988. Expletive noun phrases in subcategorized positions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19:635–670.
Progovac, Ljiljana. 1992. Nonnegative polarity licensing must involve Comp. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23:341–347.
Progovac, Ljiljana. 1993. Negation and Comp. *Rivista di Linguistica* 5:329–347.
Progovac, Ljiljana. 1994. *Negative and positive polarity: A binding approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Reuland, Eric J. 1983. Governing *-ing*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14:101–136.
Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. *Issues in Italian syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
Rosenbaum, Peter. 1967. *The grammar of English predicate complement constructions*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
Shlonsky, Ur. 1988. Complementizer-cliticization in Hebrew and the Empty Category Principle. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 6:191–205.

Stowell, Tim. 1982. The tense of infinitives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13:561–570.
Suñer, Margarita. 1994. Negation and the features of Comp. In *Papers on negation,* ed. by Howard Grabois, David Parkinson, and Deborah Yeager, 183–192. Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics 12. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, CLC Publications.
Williams, Edwin. 1994. *Thematic structure in syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
Zanuttini, Raffaella. 1997. *Negation and clausal structure*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Department of Foreign Literatures and Linguistics
Ben Gurion University
P. O. Box 653
Beer Sheva 84105
Israel

idanl@bgumail.bgu.acil