2014

Movement and Silence in the English have yet to Construction

Neil Myler
New York University

Stephanie Harves
New York University

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl

Recommended Citation
Available at: https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol20/iss1/27

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol20/iss1/27
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.
Movement and Silence in the English have yet to Construction

Abstract
This paper discusses the syntax of the have yet to construction in English, as in John has yet to eat dinner. As pointed out by Kelly (2008), this construction raises a number of questions. How is the NPI yet licensed? Why is have interpreted as a perfect auxiliary verb, in spite of the fact that it appears to take an infinitival complement, rather than a perfect participle? We argue that have in the have yet to construction is, for many speakers, perfect have, which selects for a silent raising predicate that has negative implicative semantics. This predicate, which we identify as a silent counterpart of fail, is responsible for licensing the NPI yet. We propose that FAILED is made silent as a result of yet moving into its specifier (invoking Koopman's (1996) Generalized Doubly-filled COMP filter). This same movement accounts for yet's unusual word-order behavior in the have yet to construction.
Movement and Silence in the English *have yet to* Construction

Neil Myler and Stephanie Harves*

1 Introduction: The Puzzles

Kelly (2008) points out several syntactic and semantic puzzles in regard to the construction in (1), compared with its paraphrase in (2).

(1) John has yet to eat dinner.
(2) John hasn’t eaten dinner yet.

The first puzzle regards the presence of *yet* in (1). How is *yet*, a Negative Polarity Item (NPI), licensed? The paraphrase in (2) contains negation, so could it be that (1) contains an instance of silent sentential negation? Second, we appear to have a clash between the syntax and the semantic interpretation of *have* here. That is, why do we see *have to* plus an infinitival complement in (1) as opposed to *have plus a perfect participle as in (2)? *Have to* appears in English when the interpretation of *have* is modal, rather than the aspectual perfect, as in (3). Could it be that the *have* in this construction is, in fact, modal *have*?

(3) John has to leave by 5:00.

Third, in light of the grammaticality of (1), and its interpretation in (2), why is the sentence in (4) ungrammatical?

(4) *John has yet eaten dinner.

Kelly (2008) suggests that *yet* conveys negative perfective aspect in the construction in (1) (henceforth the *have yet to* construction) although it is not clear how exactly it comes to take on this meaning on its own. We will argue that *yet* does not, in fact, convey negative perfective aspect on its own. Rather, we will adhere to the standard assumption that *yet* is an NPI and argue that this NPI is licensed by a silent perfect participle FAILED, which has negative implicative semantics. Specifically, we will argue that the sentence in (1) has the derivation shown in (5).

(5) John has yet FAILED [TP <John> to eat dinner <yet>].

The linear placement of *yet* (which is atypical, as we will show) arises via movement. We suggest that *yet* raises into the specifier of its licensor, FAILED, which is in turn rendered silent by the presence of the NPI *yet* in its specifier. Our proposal is thus that the *have yet to* construction arises from a process that, while highly restricted in English, is robustly attested in other languages. In particular, this relationship between the movement of an NPI and the silence of its licensor is a well-known feature of Ibero-Romance languages, as we discuss extensively below. Further, the proposal has the following consequences: (i) the *have yet to* construction is biclausal and involves raising; (ii) the construction is both downward-entailing and anti-additive, licensing the NPI *yet* in the embedded clause; (iii) there is no sentential negation present in the syntactic derivation of this construction. Below we present empirical arguments in favor of each of these consequences.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we discuss the negative force of the *have yet to* construction and how this interacts with the licensing of *yet* as an NPI. In

---

*Many thanks to the audiences at PLC and the NYU Syntax/Semantics Brown Bag Forum for comments and suggestions on the work presented here.

†The talk we presented at the 37th Penn Linguistics Colloquium also discussed the *be yet to* construction. For reasons of space, we do not include that discussion here, but see Harves and Myler (submitted).
Section 3, we consider the hypothesis that sentences with *have yet to* contain an occurrence of silent sentential negation, in light of the paraphrase in (2) above. In Section 4 we move on to the specifics of the syntax of *have yet to*. We conclude in Section 5.

2 The Negative Force of *Have Yet to* and the Licensing of Yet

Since the influential work of Ladusaw (1979), it has been argued that NPIs are licensed only in the scope of a Downward Entailing (DE) operator. However, not all NPIs are licensed in the same downward entailing environments. As discussed by Zwarts (1998) and van der Wouden (1997), strong NPIs additionally require anti-additivity as a strong licensing requirement.\(^2\) Zwarts (1998:222) provides the following definition for anti-additivity.

\[
\text{(6) Let } B \text{ and } B^* \text{ be two Boolean algebras. A function } f \text{ from } B \text{ to } B^* \text{ is said to be anti-additive if for each two elements } X \text{ and } Y \text{ of the algebra } B:} \\
f(X \cup Y) = f(X) \cap f(Y).
\]

It appears that the *have yet to* construction creates an anti-additive context in the sense of (6). This is shown by the validity of the following entailments.

(7) a. John has yet to visit Paris or Berlin.  
    b. John has yet to visit Paris and John has yet to visit Berlin.

(8) a. John has yet to visit Paris and John has yet to visit Berlin.  
    b. John has yet to visit Paris or Berlin.

It is therefore expected that *have yet to* will license NPIs identified as strong in Zwarts’ (1998) typology, such as *lift a finger* or *utter a sound*. This expectation is correct, as shown in (9).

(9) a. John has yet to *lift a finger* around here.  
    b. John has yet to *utter a sound*.

Any analysis of the *have yet to* construction must explain where this anti-additivity comes from. Uncovering the source of this anti-additivity will not only explain the data in (7–9), but also immediately account for the licensing of *yet* in the construction. While the set of environments that license *yet* is too complex to discuss in detail here (see Levinson 2008 for a comprehensive list), it suffices to note that *yet* is licensed both in anti-additive (10a&b) and in merely downward entailing contexts (10c).

\[
\text{(10) a. John hasn’t visited Paris } \textit{yet}.  
\text{ b. No student has visited Paris } \textit{yet}.  
\text{ c. Not everyone has visited Paris } \textit{yet}.}
\]

It follows that whatever accounts for (7–9) will also account for the fact that *yet* is licensed in (1) but not in (4). Perhaps the most obvious way of accounting for the anti-additivity of this construction is to postulate that it contains a silent instance of sentential negation. We examine this hypothesis in the next section.

3 Testing for Silent Negation

Recall the examples we started with in (1) and (2), repeated here as (11) and (12).

\[\text{2 See Giannakidou (1997) for arguments that nonveridicality is the key to NPI-licensing. See Gajewski (2005, 2011) for arguments that the presuppositions of strong NPI licensors must also be taken into account. Since *yet* passes diagnostics for weak NPIs, rather than strong NPIs, we will not throw our hat into the ring around the debate concerning strong NPI-licensing here.}\]
(11) John has yet to eat dinner.
(12) John hasn’t eaten dinner yet.

Since the paraphrase in (12) naturally contains sentential negation, it is appealing to consider the hypothesis that silent sentential negation is indeed responsible for licensing yet in (11). We will argue, however, that adopting this hypothesis would be a mistake.

A number of diagnostics have been used since Klima (1964) for determining the presence or absence of sentential negation in a clause.

(13) Klima (1964) Tests
   Sentential negation exists in a clause if:
   a. It takes a positive rather than a negative tag question.
   b. It can be continued with a phrase headed by neither rather than so.
   c. It can be continued with a phrase that begins with not even.

   A simple illustration of how these tests are used in negated versus non-negated sentences is given in (14) and (15).

(14) a. John didn’t attend Mary’s lecture last week, did he/*didn’t he?
   b. John didn’t attend Mary’s lecture last week, and neither did Bill/*so did Bill.
   c. John didn’t attend Mary’s lecture last week, not even for a minute.
(15) a. John attended Mary’s lecture last week, *did he/didn’t he?
   b. John attended Mary’s lecture last week, and *neither did Bill/so did Bill.
   c. John attended Mary’s lecture last week, *not even for a minute.

   As (14) shows, sentences with sentential negation pass all three of the Klima tests, while the sentences in (15) show that sentences which lack sentential negation fail all three tests. With this in mind, let us now return to the construction under consideration here and apply these diagnostics to sentences with have yet to.

(16) a. *John has yet to eat dinner, has he?
   b. John has yet to eat dinner, hasn’t he/doesn’t he?
   c. *John has yet to eat dinner, and neither has Mary.
   d. John has yet to eat dinner, and so has/does Mary.
   e. *John has yet to eat dinner, not even once.

   Application of the Klima tests in (13) suggests that there is no sentential negation present in the have yet to construction. Hence, the source of the anti-additivity of this construction must be sought elsewhere. In order to set up the background for our own proposal, we turn in the next section to a more detailed discussion of the syntax of have yet to.

4 The Syntax of Have Yet to

One of the first questions that arises in examining the have yet to construction is, what kind of have are we dealing with here? Is this Perfect auxiliary have? Modal have? Possessive or light verb have?

4.1 Syntactic Diagnostics: The NICE Properties of Have Yet to

3 Note that this sentence is grammatical under a particular interpretation in some dialects of English, but with a reading that is different from a standard tag question interpretation. It means something like, “Aha! John has yet to eat dinner. Intriguing!” It does not have the interpretation, “John has yet to eat dinner, right?”

4 One might wonder whether Klima’s tests apply only to overt instances of sentential negation, rather than SILENT instances of it (we thank Salvador Mascarenhas, personal communication, for bringing this issue to our attention). In Harves and Myler (submitted) we show that uncontroversial instances of silent negation in French and Spanish do indeed pass Klima tests in those languages.
One way of probing the syntax of *have* here is to consider its so-called NICE properties (Huddleston 1976). As is by now well known, Perfect AUX *have* differs from both modal *have* and possessive *have* with respect to Negation, Inversion, Contraction, and Ellipsis. The sentences in (17–19) show the following: (i) only AUX *have* precedes negation and rejects *do*-support (a-b examples); (ii) only AUX *have* undergoes Inversion in questions (c-d examples); (iii) only AUX *have* Contracts with subjects (e examples); and (iv) only AUX *have* allows for Ellipsis of all lexical material following *have*, i.e., VP-ellipsis (f examples).

(17)  
\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{ I haven’t eaten lunch. (AUX *have*)} \\
b. & \text{*I don’t have eaten lunch.} \\
c. & \text{Have I eaten lunch?} \\
d. & \text{*Do I have eaten lunch?} \\
e. & \text{I’ve eaten lunch.} \\
f. & \text{I have eaten lunch, and Mary has/*does, too.}
\end{align*}
\]

(18)  
\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{*I haven’t to eat lunch. (Modal *have*)} \\
b. & \text{I don’t have to eat lunch.} \\
c. & \text{*Have I to eat lunch?} \\
d. & \text{Do I have to eat lunch?} \\
e. & \text{*I’ve to eat lunch.} \\
f. & \text{I have to eat lunch, and Mary *has/does, too.}
\end{align*}
\]

(19)  
\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{*I haven’t a new car. (Poss *have*)} \\
b. & \text{I don’t have a new car} \\
c. & \text{*Have I a new car?} \\
d. & \text{Do I have a new car?} \\
e. & \text{*I’ve a new car.} \\
f. & \text{I have a new car, and Mary *has/does, too.}
\end{align*}
\]

Having laid out a number of syntactic diagnostics for distinguishing between three variants of *have*, we now return to the *have yet to* construction. As the data in (20) show, the facts are not crystal clear. A survey of 11 native speakers of English yields the following results (we return presently to what is meant by the notation “%/*” next to the negation cases).

(20) NICE Properties with *have yet to*  
\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{%/* John hasn’t yet to win the hearts of his classmates. (Negation)} \\
b. & \text{%/* John doesn’t have yet to win the hearts of his classmates.} \\
c. & \text{% Has John yet to win the hearts of his classmates?} \\
d. & \text{% Does John have yet to win the hearts of his classmates?} \\
e. & \text{I’ve yet to win the hearts of my classmates. (Contraction)} \\
f. & \text{% John has yet to win the hearts of his classmates, and Bill has, too. (Ellipsis)} \\
g. & \text{% John has yet to win the hearts of his classmates, and Bill does, too.}
\end{align*}
\]

The % sign here conceals the nature of the variation in play, which is worth breaking down in more detail. Broadly speaking, there are four types of speaker. For one group, *have* in this construction patterns consistently with auxiliary *have*. For another group, *have* consistently patterns with lexical *have* (with the exception of allowing contraction, which is available for everyone). A

---

5 We note that the original NICE properties were defined as “Negation, Inversion, Code, and Emphatic Affirmation.” Instead, we use the properties “Negation, Inversion, Contraction, and Ellipsis.” “Code” for Huddleston (1976) is equivalent to what we today call VP-ellipsis.  
6 The judgments given in (18) and (19) reflect those of our American informants. We set aside here those (mainly British) dialects in which main verb *have* retains some auxiliary-like properties.  
7 The fact that contraction is the “easiest” auxiliary-like property for this *have* to have has intriguing implications, since it suggests that a more fine-grained approach to the nature of the NICE properties than the traditional distinction between auxiliary and lexical verb is necessary. In the same connection, it is interesting to note that Thoms (2012), looking at British dialects in which possessive *have* has auxiliary-like properties,
third group of speakers, which includes both of the present authors, consists of speakers who seem to permit both types of have. Finally, there are speakers that accept simple declarative cases with or without contraction, but find more complex cases involving T-to-C movement or VP-ellipsis ungrammatical. We suspect that these speakers do not have this construction as a productive part of their I-language, instead having only a passive knowledge of the construction from hearing other speakers use it. Their passive knowledge of the construction thus allows them to rate the simple declarative cases as fully acceptable, but their intuitions collapse when presented with more complex cases.

We now address the issue of the judgments on negation. The notation %/* in (20) reflects the fact that speakers reject an occurrence of overt negation in this construction out of the blue, regardless of whether these speakers tend to treat have in this construction as AUX have or modal/possessive have (i.e., whether they allow do-support or not). It seems that in order for sentential negation to be grammatical in the have yet to construction, it must be interpreted as the negation of denial, and not standard sentential negation. When provided with a context like (21), speakers accept sentential negation in accordance with whether they treat have as auxiliary, lexical, or both.

(21) Speaker A: John has yet to win the hearts of his classmates.
    Speaker B: What do you mean? John hasn’t yet to win the hearts of his classmates.
    He already has!
    Speaker B’: What do you mean? John doesn’t have yet to win the hearts of his classmates. He already did!

In Harves and Myler (submitted), we show that this effect is a subcase of yet’s behavior when forced to take scope under both a sentential negation and a negative implicative verb simultaneously. We cannot develop this point further here for reasons of space.

In the following subsections, we will concentrate on how to derive the version of this construction in which have is treated as an auxiliary, although we will make a brief suggestion as to how to extend the analysis to the structure with lexical have.

4.2 FAILED as the Silent Licensor of Yet

Thus far, we have concluded that have in the have yet to construction is AUX have for a number of speakers, and that silent sentential negation is not responsible for licensing yet. We propose that the licensor of yet is in fact (a silent version of) the past participle of the negative implicative verb fail.

In support of this suggestion, first note that fail appears to be both syntactically and semantically appropriate as a paraphrase for this construction (22b).

(22) a. John has yet to visit Paris.
    b. John has failed to visit Paris yet.

We know that fail is downward entailing and that it licenses NPIs in its infinitival complement. For instance, if John has failed to ever visit France (23a), then it follows that he has failed to ever visit Paris (23b).

(23) a. John has failed to ever visit France.
    b. John has failed to ever visit Paris.

If silent FAILED is indeed syntactically present in the have yet to construction, then we expect such sentences to be downward entailing as well, which is indeed the case, as shown in (24).

also finds that contraction is the most widely accepted such property, with fewer speakers also allowing inversion, negation and VP-ellipsis without do-support. Presumably, then, there is a deeper reason for the relative ease of contraction in the have yet to construction, the elucidation of which we must leave for future research.
(24) a. John has yet to visit France. =>
    b. John has yet to visit Paris.

Furthermore, recall the discussion of anti-additivity above. We showed in (7) and (8) that sentences with *have to* are anti-additive (repeated here as (25) and (26)).

(25) a. John has yet to visit Paris or Berlin. =>
    b. John has yet to visit Paris and John has yet to visit Berlin.

(26) a. John has yet to visit Paris and John has yet to visit Berlin. =>
    b. John has yet to visit Paris or Berlin.

We would therefore expect that sentences with overt *fail* should yield anti-additive contexts as well. Indeed, as shown in (27) and (28), this prediction is borne out.

(27) a. John has failed to visit Paris or Berlin. =>
    b. John has failed to visit Paris and John has failed to visit Berlin.

(28) a. John has failed to visit Paris and John has failed to visit Berlin. =>
    b. John has failed to visit Paris or Berlin.

An additional prediction made by our proposal is that sentences with *have yet to* will pass diagnostics for raising predicates, since *fail* behaves as a raising predicate. The sentences below show that *fail* allows for idiomatic readings with discontinuous idioms (29a) and also allows for expletive subjects (29b&c), two properties shared by raising predicates but not control predicates.

(29) a. The shit has failed to hit the fan.
    b. There has failed to be a comprehensive discussion of this topic in the literature.
    c. It has failed to snow all weekend.

As the examples in (30) show, sentences with *have yet to* pass these same diagnostic tests, which suggests that the silent predicate is indeed a raising verb, not a control verb.

(30) a. The shit has yet to hit the fan.
    b. There has yet to be a comprehensive discussion of this topic in the literature.
    c. It has yet to snow all weekend.

Another piece of independent evidence in favor of a silent predicate FAILED in the *have yet to* construction, as opposed to silent sentential negation or some other NPI licensor, comes from *quite*-modification of *yet*. Certain NPI-licensing environments allow for the existence of either *yet* or *quite yet*. Several of these contexts are shown in (31).

(31) a. John hasn’t arrived *(quite) yet*.
    b. He is too young to understand this *(quite) yet*.
    c. I doubt the lamp is fixed *(quite) yet*.
    d. Mary has crossed the border without realizing it *(quite) yet*.

However, not all contexts that license *yet* license *quite yet*. While yes-no questions such as (32a) and superlatives as in (32b) license *yet*, *quite yet* is disallowed. And as (33) shows, *quite yet* is disallowed from occurring in the *have yet to* construction.

(32) a. Has John arrived *(quite) yet?*
    b. This is the best film that has been shown *(quite) yet.*

(33) a. John has yet to arrive *(quite) yet.*
    b. John has yet to snow *(quite) yet.*

---

8 We thank Chris Collins for bringing *quite*-modification to our attention.
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(33)  a. John has (*quite) yet to eat his dinner.
     b. John has (*quite) yet to visit Paris.

If one of the NPI licensors in (31) were the silent element responsible for licensing yet in (32), then the ungrammaticality of *quite yet would be mysterious. As the examples in (34) show, *quite yet is not licensed in the presence of overt fail. Hence, we do not expect it to be licensed when FAIL is silent, as in (33).

(34)  a. John has failed to visit Paris (*quite) yet.
     b. Mary has failed to write her grandmother (*quite) yet.

Before moving on to the syntactic derivation of sentences with have yet to, let us briefly summarize the results of this subsection. We have argued that yet in the have yet to construction is licensed by the silent negative implicative verb FAIL. We saw a number of arguments in favor of such an analysis, based on the shared behavior of sentences with overt fail vs. silent FAIL (i.e., have yet to). We summarize the shared properties of these constructions in (35).

(35) Shared properties of sentences with have yet to and sentences with overt fail
     a. Both constructions are downward entailing and anti-additive.
     b. Both constructions pass diagnostics for raising predicates.
     c. Neither construction allows yet to be modified by quite.

One issue that we have yet to address in full is the position of yet in sentences with have yet to compared to sentences where fail is overt. We turn to this issue now and use the differences in placement/pronunciation of yet as the key to understanding the licensing of silent FAIL.

4.3 The Syntactic Derivation of Have Yet to

Thus far, we have only briefly alluded to the position of yet in the sentences under investigation here. Since we are arguing that sentences with have yet to vs. those with overt fail share an underlying structure, it is perhaps surprising that yet is pronounced in two different places, depending on the pronunciation or silence of fail. Consider the position of yet in the examples in (36).

(36)  a. John has yet to eat dinner.
     b. John has yet to visit Paris.
     c. John has failed to eat dinner yet.
     d. John has failed to visit Paris yet.

When failed is overt, yet is obligatorily pronounced sentence-finally. That is, yet cannot be pronounced adjacent to have when failed is overt, as shown in (37).

(37)  a. *John has yet failed to eat dinner.
     b. *John has yet failed to visit Paris.

For those speakers who allow a version of have yet to involving lexical/possessive have, we might suggest that the silent predicate involved is the derived nominal form of a negative implicative verb, with have acting in its light verb use. The overt counterpart of the relevant derived nominal might, in fact, be failure, since some speakers accept overt failure in a light verb construction along the lines of (i).

(i)  %John has had a failure to do his homework yet this year.

More investigation is needed to discover to what extent the availability of (i) in a given I-language correlates with the availability of the lexical/possessive have version of have yet to. If the correlation does not go through for all speakers, we will have to conclude a different derived nominal than failure is involved. All that our thesis requires is that the derived nominal in question be negative implicative in nature.
One crucial fact about *fail as an NPI licensor is that this predicate only licenses NPIs within its infinitival complement. It does not license NPIs in its own clause.

(38) a. *John has *ever failed to visit France.
b. John has failed to *ever visit France.
c. *John has failed *any exam.
d. John hasn’t failed *any exam.
e. John has failed to pass *any exam.

In (38a&b) we see that *fail cannot license the NPI *ever in the matrix clause, although it can license it within its infinitival complement. Similarly, if *fail occurs in its transitive guise, as in (38c), it cannot license an NPI in the direct object position unless sentential negation occurs as well (38d). That *fail is incapable of licensing NPIs within its own clause suggests that *yet in the *have *yet to construction Externally Merges in the infinitival clause and then Moves to / Internally Merges in the matrix clause. We propose that *yet raises to the Specifier of *FAIL in the *have *yet to construction, and that this raising is precisely what accounts for the silence of *FAIL. The derivation we propose is given in (39).

If *yet raises to the Specifier of *FAIL, then *yet is pronounced in the Specifier position, and the head *FAIL is silent. If *yet remains in situ, then *failed is pronounced in the matrix clause. This dependency between movement into a Specifier position and the silence of the head associated with that specifier is reminiscent of other “generalized doubly-filled COMP” effects, including analyses proposed for constructions involving n-word movement and Neg-deletion in Ibero-Romance. In both Spanish and Catalan, when an NPI/n-word raises past sentential negation, the Neg-head is silent, obligatorily so in Spanish and optionally in Catalan.

(40) Spanish (Zagona 2002: 197-200)
a. * (No) vino nadie.
   NEG came nobody
   ‘Nobody came.’
b. Nadie vino.
   ‘Nobody came.’

c. *Nadie no vino.
   ‘Nobody came.’

(41) Catalan (Espinal 2000: 559)

a. * (No) ha vist ningú.
   NEG has seen nobody
   ‘S/he has not seen anybody.’
b. Ningú (no) ha vist res.
   nobody (NEG) has seen anything
   ‘Nobody has seen anything.’
c. A NINGÚ (no) ha vist.
   P nobody (NEG) has seen
   ‘S/he has seen nobody.’

One can argue, following Haegeman and Zanuttini (1991) and Zagona (2002), that satisfaction of something akin to the Neg-Criterion results in silence of the Neg head.

(42) The Neg Criterion

   (Haegeman and Zanuttini 1991: 244)
   a. Each Neg X0 must be in a Spec-Head relation with a Negative operator;
   b. Each Negative operator must be in a Spec-Head relation with a Neg X0.

The silence of the Neg-head could be argued to derive from Koopman’s (1996) Generalized Doubly-Filled Comp Filter, defined in Koopman & Szabolics (2000) as follows.

(43) Generalized Doubly-Filled Comp Filter

   (Koopman & Szabolics 2000: 4)
   No projection has both an overt head and an overt specifier at the end of the derivation.

We argue here that the silence of FAILED in the have yet to construction is due to the same principle governing the silence of negation with fronted n-words in Spanish and Catalan. It is unlikely to be a mere coincidence that in both cases we are dealing with the silence or pronunciation of an NPI licensing head.

To conclude this section, we return to a puzzle raised at the outset of this paper, namely, why is the sentence in (44a) ungrammatical, given the paraphrases of sentences with have yet to?

(44) a. *John has yet eaten dinner.
   b. John has yet to eat dinner.
   c. John hasn’t eaten dinner yet.

At this point our answer should be clear. The sentence in (44a) is ungrammatical because there is no silent negative implicative verb FAILED available in this sentence. The perfect participle eaten is filling the verbal head where FAILED would occur. Moreover, there is no silent sentential negation here.10

---

10 Beatrice Santorini has proposed to us (personal communication) a very interesting counteranalysis of this construction which at first sight also seems able to capture the data here. She points out that yet’s status as an NPI emerged over time, and that historically yet had non-NPI uses. Furthermore, some such non-NPI uses remain in modern English in a restricted way, often (but not always) with an archaic flavor (cf. he might yet arrive). Santorini’s suggestion is thus that the have yet to construction involves two sorts of archaized syntax. First, she proposes that this version of yet is representative of the old er, pre-NPI stage; second, the unusual word-order arises because have (which she proposes is the modal have of John has to leave) undergoes V-to-T movement, just as it did in earlier English (and still does in some British varieties). The existence of speakers who reject instances of the construction in interrogatives, VP ellipsis cases etc. can then be explained as a case of their not having full control over this archaic syntax.
5 Conclusion

We began this paper by pointing out some seemingly idiosyncratic properties of the have yet to construction: the irregular replacement and NPI behavior of yet, and the apparent mismatch of the construction’s surface infinitival syntax with its semantic interpretation. Our proposal that the construction involves a negative implicative predicate which is rendered silent by the raising of yet into its specifier (with yet in turn licensed as an NPI by the negative implicative predicate) yields an instant solution to these puzzles, and moreover one that is motivated by the existence of dependencies between movement and silence in other languages. Hence, what seemed like a bizarre and idiosyncratic property of English turns out to be nothing more than a highly restricted reflection of a well-attested phenomenon permitted by UG.
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There are two reasons why we do not adopt this analysis. The first is that there are speakers who robustly allow do-support in this construction in interrogatives, under negation, and in VP-ellipsis. This is totally unexpected if the word order with have preceding yet is produced by V-to-T movement, for then we would expect do-support to be ruled out entirely. The second is that cases involving modals like he might yet arrive do not pattern with have yet to as regards negation. While it is possible to negate have yet to with an explicit denial interpretation, it seems to us that this is not possible at all in cases like he might yet arrive.

(i) *Wait a minute, he {mightn’t / couldn’t} yet arrive! (We already know he can’t make it.)