

Advising Meeting

Mykel Loren Brinkerhoff

1 Outline

- Discussing Engels (2012)
- Negation Scope
- Next Steps

2 Engels (2012)

- (1) According to Engels (2012), NegS is claimed to operate on the same principles of cyclic linearization as described for OS Fox & Pesetsky (2005).
- (2) This means that elements are able to shift if they are located in Spec,XP or if their string is vacuous.
- (3) Engels however does not describe any crucial differences between OS and NegS using cyclic linearization except that NegS does not seem to subject to Holmberg's Generalization (Holmberg 1986, 1999).
- (4) This is seen in the following examples where the NI is able to shift across intervening phonological material
- (5) This can be seen where the NI is allowed to shift across intervening phonological material in the VP.

- a. Jeg har *ingen bøger* [_{VP} lånt børnene t_{NI}]
 I have no books lent children-the
 'I haven't lent the children any books' WJ/Scan1
- b. Studentene lånte_V oss_{IO} ingen romaner_{IO} [_{VP} t_V t_{IO} t_{DO}]
 students-the lent us no novels
 'The students didn't lend us ' No/Scan1

- (6) This is in contrast with OS where movement is blocked by any phonological material in the VP.

- a. *Jeg har dem_{DO} [_{VP} lånt børnene t_{DO}]
 I have them lent children-the
 'I have lent the children them' WJ/Scan1
- b. Jeg har [_{VP} lånt børnene dem.]
 I have lent children-the them
 'I have lent the children them' WJ/Scan1

- (7) Besides this brief description there is no discussion about anything other than OS and NegS both involve the same types of cyclic movement and that OS is subject to Holmberg's Generalization.

- (8) This seems to be an area that could potentially be due for more detailed analysis especially if it is to be believed that OS and NegS both are produced by the same types of cyclic linearizations
- (9) If however OS is not governed by cyclic linearization and is instead governed by prosody then this is not an issue for the syntax and is explained away by some other factors completely.

3 Scope of negation

- (10) Engels (2012), following Svenonius (2002), states that there is an apparent difference in the scope of negation between shifted NIs and nonshifted NIs.
- (11) It is claimed that shifted NIs are allowed to take wide scope (i.e., sentential negation) whereas nonshifted NI take narrow scope.
- (12) This means that the sentence in (12-a) has the shifted NI taking wide scope which results in a negated sentence. This is in contrast with the sentence in (12-b) which has the nonshifted NI taking narrow scope and negating only the noun.
- a. Per har måske ingen bøger_{DO} [_{VP} læst _{t_{DO}}]
 Peter has probably no books read
 ‘Peter probably hasn’t read any books’
- b. Per har måske [_{VP} læst ingen bøger]
 Peter has probably read no books
 ‘It wasn’t books that Peter probably read (could have been magazines)’
- (13) This appears to be similar to the differences in scope that quantifiers take with both a wide and narrow scope possible. However, unlike quantifiers, NI only license sentential negation, (wide scope) when they are moved to a position outside of the VP and take narrow scope when in-situ.
- (14) Additionally, it seems that pronominal NI do not have the same distributions as the complex NI (Penka 2011)
- (15) According to Penka (2011), Swedish prefers shifting pronominal NIs instead of shifting full DP NIs.
- a. Men mänskligheten har ingenting lärt sig
 but mankind-the have nothing taught REFL
 ‘But mankind hasn’t learned anything’
- b. ?Vi hade inga grottor undersökt
 we have n-DET caves examined
 ‘We haven’t explored any caves.’
- (16) However, there does not seem to be much in the way of pronominal negative indefinites.
- (17) This seems to be a place to do more exploration.

4 Next steps

- (18) I have been approved as a mentor for the Summer Internship Program, which will be held remotely this year.
- (19) I plan on having my interns help me with conducting corpus research on NegS. I am planning on trying to get an outline/timeline put together for what me and my interns will be doing and what tasks we want to accomplish.
- (20) I am also currently working on a project with Eirik Tengesdal on a prosodic analysis for OS and verb particles for AMP 2020.
- (21) Thoughts about submitting something about the corpus research and some version of this QP to the LSA?



References

- Engels, Eva. 2012. Scandinavian Negative Indefinites and Cyclic Linearization: Scandinavian Negative Indefinites and Cyclic Linearization. *Syntax* 15(2). 109–141. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9612.2011.00161.x>.
- Fox, Danny & David Pesetsky. 2005. Cyclic Linearization of Syntactic Structure. *Theoretical Linguistics* 31(1-2). 1–45. <https://doi.org/10.1515/thli.2005.31.1-2.1>.
- 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>.
- 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>.
- Svenonius, Peter. 2002. Strains of negation in Norwegian. *Working papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 69. 121–146.