

# Advising Meeting

Mykel Loren Brinkerhoff

## 1 Outline

- Discussing Engels (2012) and Fox & Pesetsky (2005)
- Next Steps

## 2 Engels 2012 and Fox & Pesetsky 2005

- (1) According to Engels (2012) NegS is able to be accounted for through Fox & Pesetsky's (2005) cyclic linearization.
- (2) Cyclic linearization has as its basic premise the idea that linearization occurs in each *spell-out domain* which Fox & Pesetsky (2005) equate with phases.
  - a. Fox & Pesetsky, following standard conventions, claim that the spell-out domains are at DP, VP, and CP.
- (3) At each of these spell-out domains, the order that the syntactic elements are found in is fixed through the use of order preservation rules.
  - a. These rules are assumed to always be in force and are added to at each spell-out domain.
- (4) As to how this relates to OS and NegS it is claimed that they are subject to two different effects and how the order preservation rules are formulated.
  - a. In the case of OS, they are subject to Holmberg's Generalization which states: Object Shift cannot apply across a phonologically visible category, which asymmetrically c-commands the object position except adjuncts.
  - b. NegS is claimed to adhere to something that is the mirror image of Holmberg's Generalization called the "Inverse Holmberg Effect" (Engels 2012) in those situations where NegS occurs across a verb *in-situ*.
- (5) The "Inverse Holmberg Effect" states:  
Movement of a VP-internal element is permitted only when V-raising does not take place (Fox & Pesetsky 2005: 30).
- (6) When OS and *string-vacuous* NegS occur they both adhere to the same ordering relations:
  - a. 
$$[_{CP} S \overset{\uparrow}{Y} \dots [_{NegP} \overset{\downarrow}{O} \text{adv} [_{VP} \overset{\downarrow}{t_v} t_o ] ] ]$$
  - b. VP Ordering: **V>O**  
CP Ordering: **S>V V>O O>adv adv>VP**
- (7) Because the ordering relations are maintained across the derivation there is no violation,
- (8) However when the verb or something else remains in-situ OS is blocked from occurring because there is a rule contradiction

- a.  $*[_{CP} S \overset{\uparrow}{V} \dots [_{NegP} \overset{\downarrow}{O} \text{adv} [_{VP} \overset{\downarrow}{t_o} XP_v \overset{\downarrow}{t_o} ]]]$
- b. VP Ordering:  $V > XP, XP > O$   
 CP Ordering:  $S > V, V > O, O > \text{adv}, \text{adv} > VP \rightarrow O > XP$
- (9) There two effects are associated with two different preservation rules at VP.
- a. OS and string-vacuous NegS:  $V > O$ .
- b. Verb *in-situ* NegS:  $O > V$
- (10) These two orders are arrived at by whether or not the object has moved before the spell-out domain is closed.
- (11) We can see these differences here:
- a.  $[_{CP} S \text{aux} \dots [_{NegP} \overset{\downarrow}{O} \text{adv} [_{VP} \overset{\downarrow}{t_o} V \overset{\downarrow}{t_o} ]]]$
- b. VP Ordering:  $O > V$   
 CP Ordering:  $S > V, \text{aux} > O, O > \text{adv}, \text{adv} > VP \rightarrow O > V$
- (12) However, this seems very ad-hoc and would suggest that there must be some sort of feature that motivates the movement of the Object to spec,VP. This is not explained in Engels (2012).
- (13) If Engels (2012) is correct then there must be some sort of motivation for the movement to spec,VP besides as a requirement for explaining why NegS is allowed to occur across verbs *in-situ*.
- (14) I think this is a flaw in the analysis and needs to be spelled out if this analysis is to succeed.

### 3 Next steps

- (15) Moving forward I think trying to provide the motivation for why NegS first moves to spec,VP would be a good first step
- (16) I think that at this point moving forward with designing an experiment to test which NegS is allowed and if there is a preference for pronominals over full DPs in the different varieties of Scandinavian should be my top priority

## 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. 1999. Remarks on Holmberg's Generalization. *Studia Linguistica* 53(1). 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9582.00038>.