

Advising Meeting

Mykel Loren Brinkerhoff

Outline of Handout

- Discussion of Broekhuis 2020 in §1
- Discussion of Scandinavian Pronoun structure in §2
- Discussion of Valentine Bordal 2017
- Discussion of Zeijlstra 2011
- Next steps in §5

1 Broekhuis 2020

- (1) Broekhuis 2020 explores the possibility that object shift and object scrambling are the same phenomenon and concludes that this is in fact the case.
- (2) However, Broekhuis: 417f does point out that weak pronominal object shift behaves differently than full DP objects in what loci there are allowed to inhabit. In the case of weak pronominals they are required to appear outside of the ν P if there is no intervening phonological material (i.e., Holmberg's Generalization Holmberg 1986, 1999).
- (3) Broekhuis does have some interesting discussion about the interaction of NegShift and pronominal OS.
- (4) Citing examples from Christensen (2005: 163ff), Broekhuis shows this pair of examples:
 - a. Jeg har <ingen bøger> lånt hende <*ingen bøger>.
 I have no books lent her
 'I haven't lent her any books
 - b. Jeg lånte henda fraktisch ingen bøger.
 I lent her actually no books
 'I didn't actually lend her any books.'
- (5) In (4a), we see that when we have a negative object that it shifts to a position higher than the ν P if it were to remain in-situ as it would be ungrammatical and would require the use of *ikke* 'not' and the NPI *nogen*.
 - a. Jeg har ikke lånt hende nogen bøger.
 I have not lent her any books.
 'I haven't lent her any books.'
- (6) However, when the main verb has raised to C^0 as in (4b) then the weak pronominal moves to a position higher than the adverb *fraktisch* 'actually'. The negative object is not able to move to the similar position that is higher than the adverb. Additionally, this results in OS > NegShift and according to Broekhuis this is a universal fact.

- (7) This does help us see that that even though these two phenomena appear to be similar they are in fact slightly different, due to the differences in the where the different movement operations' target is.

2 Scandinavian pronouns

- (8) There two different approaches that we can take when accounting for the syntactic structure of the negative indefinite pronouns in Swedish. The two positions are: (a) the pronoun is the head of a DP on its own; or (b) the pronoun resides in D⁰ and takes a null NP complete.¹

- a. DP with no complement

DP
pronoun


- b. DP with null NP complement

DP
 / \
 D NP
 pronoun ∅

- (9) The reason this question is
- (10) Evidence for one structure over the other comes from whether or not modification of the pronoun is allowed.
- a. I take modification to mean any addition to the syntactic structure beyond a bare head regardless of whether it is an adjunct or a compliment.
- (11) We know that cross linguistically that determiners, when given the opportunity, will always select an NP complement and does not seem to select anything other than NPs and are resistant to any type of modification, with the exception of genitive constructions.
- (12) However, this is not the case with NPs which are able to be modified by a wide variety of syntactic elements including adjectives, prepositional phrases, relative clauses, and subordinate clauses.
- (13) Because of this difference in behavior between determiners and nouns, we will be able to determine which of the two syntactic structures is the correct one for the Swedish negative indefinite pronouns if modification of these pronouns is present.
- (14) If pronouns are modified in any way through the addition of one these syntactic elements that are commonly associated with NPs, then it bares to reason that these syntactic elements are attaching to something that is an NP.
- (15) Data will be drawn from across all of the Scandinavian languages because of the close similarity between the mainland Scandinavian languages syntactically.

¹This second option could also assume that the pronoun originated in NP and moved to D⁰ prior to spell-out of the DP phase.

- (16) We observe in Danish that their negative indefinite pronouns are able to be modified with PPs and CPs as shown in Allan, Holmes & Lundskær-Nielsen (1995: 218ff).
- a. Prepositional phrases
 - i. Det er *intet* [PP i vej-an].
It is nothing in way-DET
'There is nothing wrong'
 - ii. Jeg kender *ingen* [PP her i byen].
I know no-one here in town
'I know no one in this town.'
 - b. Complimentizer phrases
 - i. Der er *ingen*, [CP der har set ham].
there is no-one, who has seen him
'Nobody has seen him'
 - ii. Der er *intet* [CP at være bange for].
There is nothing to be afraid of
'There is nothing to be afraid of'
- (17) This same behavior is also observed in Swedish (Holmes & Hinchliffe 2013: 197ff).
- a. Prepositional phrases
 - i. Han äger *inget* [PP av värde].
He owns nothing of value
'He owns nothing of value.'
 - b. Complimentizer phrases
 - i. Jag såg *ingen* [CP jag kände igen].
I saw no-one I recognize
'I saw no one that I recognize.'
 - ii. Jag har *ingenting* [CP att säga].
I have nothing to say
'I have nothing to say.'
- (18) Example (17a-i) shows the use of *inget* instead of *ingenting* which according to Holmes & Hinchliffe (2013) are fully interchangeable with each other.
- (19) Christensen (2005: 65f) describes some interesting cases involving the weight of the NI which is quoted by Penka (2011).
- (20) Christensen shows that when a negative indefinite is sufficiently large movement is band from occurring in Danish.
- a. Jeg har *intet* hørt.
I have nothing heard
'I haven't heard anything.'
 - b. Jeg har [*intet nyt*] hørt.
I have nothing new heard
'I haven't heard anything new'

- c. *Jeg har [*intet nyt i sagen*] hørt. 
 I have nothing new in case-DET heard
 ‘I haven’t heard anything new about the case.’
- d. *Jeg har [*intet nyt i sagen om de stjålne malerier*] hørt.
 I have nothing new in case-DET about the stolen paintings heard
- (21) In those instances where the NI is too large one potential repair is to strand the prepositional phrase while moving just the pronoun.
 a. Jeg har *intet*_i hørt *t*_i [_{PP} i sagen om de stjålne malerier].
- (22) Based on this behavior of allowing modification of the pronoun, it is safe to assume that the syntactic structure is the one in (8b) instead of them being a bare determiner.
- (23) Another reason that we can assume that (8b) is the correct structure, is that if we assume that (8a) is the structure for pronouns then we are left wondering how exactly these pronominal modifiers attach to our structure.
- (24) If it was possible that a pronominal determiner, as in (8a), could select a PP or CP as a complement then we would expect other determiners such as the definite article or demonstratives to also select PPs or CPs, which is not what we observe. If we would propose that some determiners select PPs and CPs while others select NPs then we would no longer have a unified criteria for separating the behavior of determiners from NPs.

3 Valentine Bordal 2017

- (25) Valentine Bordal (2017) is a corpus study of Swedish looking at how existential predicates are negated.
- (26) According to Valentine Bordal declarative sentences are negated using the negative particle *inte* only.
- (27) If the verbal predicate has a non-lexical verb (i.e., modals and auxiliaries) then the sentence is negated with either the negative particle *inte* or with a negative indefinite.
- (28) According to her corpus study negative indefinites were used most frequently as a “modifier” with a nominal pivot.

Table 1: Results of Valentine Bordal’s (2017) corpus study

	Frequency	Proportion
Modifier	687	78%
Head	198	22%
Total	885	100%

- (29) She treats all negative indefinites as bare pronouns that could or could not take a nominal compliment.
- (30) She also claims that out of all the negative indefinites, *inga* only appears as a modifier, *ingen* and *inget* both appear equally as modifiers and pronominal heads, and *ingenting* only ever appear as a head.

4 Zeijlstra 2011

- (31) Zeijlstra 2011 is interested in showing providing an analysis of the split-scope interpretation that exists for negative indefinites in Germanic languages.
- (32) Split-scope is evident when modals and other auxiliaries are present and the negation scopes higher than the modal/auxiliary's scope where the indefinite resides.
- (33) Zeijlstra assumes that this behavior is the result of the compositional status of negative indefinites similar to the claims made by Iatridou & Sichel (2011). He claims that NIs are composed of a negative operator and an indefinite component.
- (34) He further claims that the split-scope interpretation is the result of a copy-theory of movement where the indefinite interpretation is interpreted in the lower copy while the negative operator is interpreted in the higher copy after quantifier rising.

5 Next steps

- Continue looking into the difference in between the different negative indefinites.
- Work on sorting the corpus data.
- Prepare for Pre-290 presentation on Thursday, 12. November.

References

- Allan, Robin, Philip Holmes & Tom Lundskær-Nielsen. 1995. *Danish: a comprehensive grammar* (Routledge grammars). London ; New York: Routledge. 628 pp.
- Broekhuis, Hans. 2020. The Unification of Object Shift and Object Scrambling. In Michael T. Putnam & B. Richard Page (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Germanic Linguistics*, 1st edn., 413–435. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108378291.019>.
- Christensen, Ken Ramshøj. 2005. *Interfaces: Negation - Syntax - Brain*. Aarhus: University of Aarhus Ph.D. dissertation.
- Holmberg, Anders. 1986. *Word order and syntactic features in the Scandinavian languages and English*. Stockholm, Sweden: University of Stockholm Doctoral dissertation.
- Holmberg, Anders. 1999. Remarks on Holmberg's Generalization. *Studia Linguistica* 53(1). 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9582.00038>.
- Holmes, Philip & Ian Hinchliffe. 2013. *Swedish: A comprehensive grammar*. 3rd edition (Routledge Comprehensive Grammars). New York: Routledge. 726 pp.
- Iatridou, Sabine & Ivy Sichel. 2011. Negative DPs, A-Movement, and Scope Diminishment. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42(4). 595–629. https://doi.org/10.1162/LING_a_00062.
- Penka, Doris. 2011. *Negative indefinites* (Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics no. 32). Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press. 264 pp. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199567263.001.0001>.
- Valentine Bordal, Heidi. 2017. *Negation of existential predications in Swedish: A corpus study*. Stockholm: Stockholm University SU MA thesis.

Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2011. On the syntactically complex status of negative indefinites. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 14(2). 111–138. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10828-011-9043-2>.