

# QP Advising

Mykel Loren Brinkerhoff

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Negative indefinite shifting</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Engels 2012</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	String-vacuous NegShift . . . . .	3
2.2	NegShift across verbs . . . . .	4
2.3	NegShift across IO . . . . .	4
2.4	NegShift across preposition . . . . .	5
2.5	NegShift out of infinitival clauses . . . . .	6
<b>3</b>	<b>Scandinavian pronouns</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Broekhuis 2020</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Valentine Bordial 2017</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Zeijlstra 2011</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Interaction of NegShift and OS</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Adverbial orders</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Summary of where we are</b>	<b>14</b>
9.1	The problem . . . . .	14
9.2	Distributional properties of NegShift versus OS . . . . .	14
9.2.1	Similarities . . . . .	14
9.2.2	Differences . . . . .	14
9.3	Cyclic Linearization . . . . .	15
<b>10</b>	<b>Syntactic Analysis of NegS</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Next steps</b>	<b>17</b>
	<b>References</b>	<b>17</b>

## 1 Negative indefinite shifting

- (1) Negative Shifting (NegShift) is a process in the Scandinavian languages where a negative indefinite (NI) obligatorily shifts to a position outside of the VP.

- a. Manden havde måske *ingenting* [<sub>VP</sub> sagt  $t_o$  ].  
man-the had probably nothing said  
'The man hadn't said anything.'
  - b. Jeg har *ingen* *bøger* [<sub>VP</sub> lånt børnene  $t_o$ ].  
I have no books lent children-the  
'I haven't lent the children any books.'
- (2) This process occurs to all NIs and is permissible from a large number of different contexts, depending on the variety and register, see Table 1.

Table 1: Distribution of NegShift across Scandinavian languages. WJ = West Jutlandic, Ic = Icelandic, Fa = Faroese, DaL = Danish Linguists, SwL = Swedish Linguists, Scan1 = literary/formal Mainland Scandinavian, Scan2 = colloquial Mainland Scandinavian and Norwegian

NegShift across		WJ1	WJ2	Ic	Fa	DaL1	DaL2	SwL	Scan1	Scan2
String-vacuous		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Verb		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	*
IO	verb in situ	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	*
	verb moved	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Preposition	verb in situ	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	?	*	*	*
	verb moved	✓	✓	?	*	*	*	*	*	*
Infinitive	verb in situ	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	?	*	*
	verb moved	✓	*	*	✓	*	*	*	*	*

- (3) However, not all NegShift is treated equal. Christensen (2005: 65f), speaking on Danish, claims that the "weight" of the NI plays a factor in whether or not NegShift occurs.
- a. Jeg har *intet*<sub>o</sub> hørt  $t_o$ .  
I have nothing heard  
'I haven't heard anything.'
  - b. Jeg har [*intet nyt*]<sub>o</sub> hørt  $t_o$ .  
I have nothing new heard  
'I haven't heard anything new'
  - c. \*Jeg har [*intet nyt i sagen*]<sub>o</sub> hørt  $t_o$ .  
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*]<sub>o</sub> hørt  $t_o$ .  
I have nothing new in case-DET about the stolen paintings heard  
'I haven't heard anything new in the case about the stolen paintings.'
- (4) In those instances where the NI is too large one potential repair is to strand the PP while moving just the pronoun or using the negative particle *ikke* and a NPI.
- a. Jeg har *intet*<sub>i</sub> hørt  $t_i$  [<sub>PP</sub> i sagen om de stjålne malerier ].
  - b. Jeg har ikke hørt [ *noget* i sagen om de stjålne malerier ].
- (5) This same behavior has also been remarked upon by Penka (2011) for Swedish.

- a. Men mänskligheten har *ingenting*<sub>o</sub> lärt sig *t*<sub>o</sub>.  
but mankind-the have nothing taught themselves  
'But mankind haven't taught themselves anything.'
  - b. ? Vi hade *inga grottor*<sub>o</sub> undersökt *t*<sub>o</sub>.  
we have no caves explored  
'We haven't explored any caves.'
- (6) My QP explores whether or not there is indeed this preference for NegShift of pronouns by conducting a study on the Swedish Culturomics Gigaword Corpus (Eide, Tahmasebi & Borin 2016) and how this phenomenon might relate to prosodic analyses of pronominal object shift.
  - (7) One of the issues for this analysis is that one of the NI pronouns (*ingen/inget/inga*) is identical to the NI determiner (*ingen/inget/inga*).

## 2 Engels 2012

- (8) Engels (2012) provides a very nice table outlining the types of NegShift that is allowed in the different Scandinavian languages. I will first present this table and will have examples of the different types of shifting in subsections following the table.
- (9) For each of the subsections they are further subdivided into whether or not the verb remains in situ or has moved.
- (10) In the following table ✓ indicates that NegShift occurs, \* indicates that NegShift cannot occur, ? means that there was idiosyncratic variation

Table 2: Distribution of NegShift across the different Scandinavian languages. WJ = West Jutlandic, Ic = Icelandic, Fa = Faroese, DaL = Danish Linguists, SwL = Swedish Linguists, Scan1 = literary/formal Mainland Scandinavian varieties, Scan2 = colloquial Mainland Scandinavian varieties and Norwegian

NegShift across		WJ1	WJ2	Ic	Fa	DaL1	DaL2	SwL	Scan1	Scan2
String-vacuous		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Verb		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	*
IO	verb in situ	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	*
	verb moved	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Preposition	verb in situ	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	?	*	*	*
	verb moved	✓	✓	?	*	*	*	*	*	*
Infinitive	verb in situ	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	?	*	*
	verb moved	✓	*	*	✓	*	*	*	*	*

### 2.1 String-vacuous NegShift

- (11) According to Engels all varieties allow string-vacuous NegShift

- a. Ég sagði *ekkert* [VP  $t_v t_o$ ] Ic  
 Eg segði *einki* [VP  $t_v t_o$ ] Fa  
 Jeg sagde *ingenting* [VP  $t_v t_o$ ] Da  
 Jag sa *ingenting* [VP  $t_v t_o$ ] Sw  
 Jeg sa *ingenting* [VP  $t_v t_o$ ] No  
 I said nothing  
 ‘I said nothing’

## 2.2 NegShift across verbs

- (12) NegShift may cross a verb in situ in Insular Scandinavian languages

- a. Ég hef *engan séð*  $t_o$ . Ic  
 I have nobody seen  
 ‘I haven’t seen anybody.’  
 b. Í dag hefur Petur *einki sagt*  $t_o$ . Fa  
 today has Peter nothing said  
 ‘Peter hasn’t said anything today.’

- (13) It is claimed that NegShift across a verb in situ is found in literature to be stylistically marked. However, it is reported that there is dialectal variation (e.g., West Jutlandic). It was also deemed grammatical by Danish and Swedish linguists.

- a. Manden havde måske *ingenting sagt*  $t_o$ . Scan1  
 b. \*Manden havde måske *ingenting sagt*  $t_o$ . Scan2  
 man-the had probably nothing said  
 ‘The man hadn’t said anything’

## 2.3 NegShift across IO

- (14) NegShift across IO is permitted if the verb remains in situ for Icelandic, Faroese, West Jutlandic, and Scandinavian 1.

- a. Jón hefur *ekkert sagt Sveini*  $t_o$ . Ic  
 Jón has nothing said Sveinn  
 ‘John hasn’t told Sveinn anything’  
 b. Í dag hefur Petur *einki givið Mariu*  $t_o$ . Fa  
 today has Peter nothing given Mary  
 ‘Today, Peter hasn’t given Mary anything.’  
 c. Jeg har *ingen bøger lånt børnene*  $t_o$ . WJ/Scan1  
 I have no books lent children-the  
 ‘I haven’t lent the children any books.’  
 d. \*Jeg har *ingen bøger lånt børnene*  $t_o$ . Scan2

- (15) If the verb has undergone V-to-T-to-C movement, NegShift is deemed ungrammatical in all varieties.

- a. \*Jón sagði *ekkert Sveini*  $t_0$  Ic  
 Jón said nothing Sveinn  
 Intended: 'John didn't tell Sveinn anything.'
- b. \*Í gjár gv Petur *einki Mariu*  $t_0$  Fa  
 yesterday gave Peter nothing Maria  
 Intended: 'Yesterday, Peter didn't give Mary anything.'
- c. \*Jeg lante *ingen bøger børnene*  $t_0$  WJ/Scan1  
 I lent no books children-the  
 Intended: 'I didn't lend the children any books.'

## 2.4 NegShift across preposition

- (16) NegShift across a preposition is not permitted in Mainland Scandinavian.

- a. \*Jeg har *ingen peget på*  $t_0$  Scan1/Scan2  
 I have nobody pointed at  
 Intended: 'I haven't pointed at anybody.'
- b. \*Jeg pegede *ingen på*  $t_0$   
 I pointed nobody at  
 Intended: 'I didn't point at anybody.'

- (17) According to Engels's (2012) investigation there is considerable variation in this regard. It is permitted by the majority of Danish linguists at the University of Aarhus, but ungrammatical if the verb has moved.

- a. ?Jeg har *ingen peget på*  $t_0$ . DaL  
 b. ?Jeg har pegede *ingen på*  $t_0$

- (18) Permitted in Faroese if the the verb remains in situ.

- a. Í dag hevur Petur *ongan tosað við*  $t_0$ . Fa  
 today has Peter nobody spoken with  
 'Today Peter hasn't spoken with anybody.'
- b. \*Í dag tosaði Petur *ongan við*  $t_0$ .  
 today spoke Peter nobody with  
 Intended: 'Today Peter didn't speak with anybody.'

- (19) In Icelandic, NegShift is permitted if the verb remains in situ. If the verb has moved, it is still grammatical but degraded.

- a. Ég hef *engan talið við*  $t_0$ . Ic  
 I have nobody spoke with  
 'I have spoken to nobody'
- b. ?Ég talaði *engan við*  $t_0$ .  
 I spoke nobody with  
 'I spoke with nobody.'

- (20) In West Jutlandic, NegShift is always permitted across prepositions.

- a. Måske har hun *ingen* **snakket med**  $t_o$ . WJ  
 maybe has she nobody spoken with  
 ‘She maybe hasn’t spoken with anybody.’
- b. I går snakkede hun *ingen* **med**  $t_o$ .  
 yesterday spoke she nobody with  
 ‘Yesterday, she didn’t speak with anybody.’

## 2.5 NegShift out of infinitival clauses

(21) Icelandic allows NegShift out of infinitival clauses if the matrix verb has remained in situ.

- a. Hún hefur *engan* **lofað að kyssa**  $t_o$ . Ic  
 she has nobody promised to kiss  
 ‘She hasn’t promised to kiss anybody.’
- b. \*Hún lofaði *engan* **að kyssa**  $t_o$ , var það nokkuð?  
 she promised nobody to kiss was it rather  
 Intended: ‘She didn’t promise to kiss anybody, did she?’

(22) It is also reported that Icelandic allows NegShift out of multiple infinitival clauses if the verb remains in situ.

- a. Petúr hefur *engu bréfi* **lofað að reyna að svara**  $t_o$ . Ic  
 Peter has no letter promised to try to reply  
 ‘Peter hasn’t promised to try to reply to any letter.’

(23) NegShift out of a infinitival clause is also permitted by some of the Danish linguists and for some west Jutlandic speakers if the verb has remained in situ. This is also the case for some of the Swedish linguists.

- a. Han har *ingen* *kager* **lovet at købe**  $t_o$ . DaL1/WJ2  
 he has no cakes promised to buy  
 ‘He hasn’t promised to buy any cakes.’
- b. \*Han lovede *ingen* *kager* **at købe**  $t_o$ , vel?  
 he promised no cakes to buy well  
 Intended: ‘He didn’t promise to buy any cakes, did he?’
- c. ?Per har *inga tårta* **lovat att köpa**  $t_o$ . SwL  
 Per has no cake promised to buy  
 ‘Per hasn’t promised to buy any cake’
- d. \*Per lovade *ingen tårta* **att köpa**  $t_o$ .  
 Per promised no cake to buy  
 Intended: ‘Per didn’t promise to buy any cake.’

(24) Other Danish linguists do not permit NegShift out of infinitive clauses at all. This is also true for Scandinavian1 and Scandinavian2.

- a. \*Han har *ingen* *kager* **lovet at købe**  $t_o$ . DaL2  
 b. \*Han lovede *ingen* *kager* **at købe**  $t_o$ , vel?

- c. \* Han har *ingen bøker prød å lese* t<sub>0</sub>. No  
 he has no books tried to read  
 Intended: 'He hasn't tried to read any books.'
- d. \* Han prøvde *ingen bøker å lese* t<sub>0</sub>.  
 he tried no books to read  
 Intended: 'He didn't try to read any books.'
- (25) For other West Jutlandic speakers and Faroese NegShift is permitted regardless if the matrix verb has moved or not.
- a. Han har *ingen kager lovet at købe* t<sub>0</sub>. WJ1  
 b. Han lovede *ingen kager at købe* t<sub>0</sub>, vel?
- c. Allarhelst hevur Petur *einki roynt at eta* t<sub>0</sub>. Fa  
 probably has Peter nothing tried to eat  
 'Peter probably hasn't tried to eat anything.'
- d. Allarhelst royndi Petur heldur *einki at eta* t<sub>0</sub>.  
 probably tried Peter also nothing to eat  
 'Peter probably also didn't try to eat anything.'


### 3 Scandinavian pronouns

- (26) 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 D and takes a null NP complete.<sup>1</sup>

- a. DP with no complement

DP  
*pronoun*

- b. DP with null NP complement



- (27) The reason this question is interesting is the presence of two homophonous NIs.
- a. the first is the negative indefinite determiner which always appears with a nominal pivot. This is equivalent to our NI determiner *no*.
- i. Jag bakade honom [<sub>DP</sub> *inget* kaka ].  
 I baked him no cake  
 'I didn't bake him any cake.'
- ii. Hon såg *inga* barn.  
 she saw no children  
 'She didn't see any children.'

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

- b. The second is the negative indefinite pronoun which does not take a nominal pivot and stands independent or with an adjunct, similar to English's *no-one* or *none*.
    - i. Jag bakade honom *inget*.  
I baked him none  
'I didn't bake him anything.'
    - ii. Jag har *ingen* lånt barnen.  
I have none lent children-the  
'I haven't lent the children anything.'
- (28) Evidence for one structure over the other comes from whether or not modification of the pronoun is allowed.
  - a. Modification is taken to be additional material that changes what the set of things the NI refers too.
  - b. This is predominately done with PPs, relative clauses, or infinitival clauses (when the NI is an object of an existential clause).
- (29) Because of this difference in behavior between determiners and nouns, we can gather evidence that would suggest one of the two syntactic structures is the more likely one for the Swedish negative indefinite pronouns if modification of these pronouns is present.
- (30) Data will be drawn from across all of the Scandinavian languages because of the close similarity between the mainland Scandinavian languages syntactically.
- (31) 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. PPs
    - 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. CPs
    - 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'
- (32) This same behavior is also observed in Swedish (Holmes & Hinchliffe 2013: 197ff).
  - a. PPs
    - i. Han äger *inget* [PP av värde ].  
He owns nothing of value  
'He owns nothing of value.'



## b. CPs

- i. Jag såg
- ingen*
- [
- <sub>CP</sub>
- jag kände igen ].

I saw no-one I recognize

'I saw no one that I recognize.'

- ii. Jag har
- ingenting*
- [
- <sub>CP</sub>
- att säga ].

I have nothing to say

'I have nothing to say.'


(33) Example (32a-i) shows the use of *inget* instead of *ingenting* which according to Holmes & Hinchliffe (2013) are in free variation.

(34) Based on this data, we see adjunct extraposition, which is assumed to be the result of the adjunction site of these PPs and CPs being within NP.

- a. This is a working hypothesis and I am currently looking for further independent evidence that this is the correct analysis for pronominals in Swedish.

(35) Another reason that we can assume that (26b), repeated below with a adjunct, is the correct structure, is that if we assume that (26a) is the structure for pronouns then we are left wondering how exactly these pronominal modifiers attach to our structure.

a.



## 4 Broekhuis 2020

(36) Broekhuis 2020 explores the possibility that object shift and object scrambling are the same phenomenon and concludes that this is in fact the case.

(37) 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 vP if there is no intervening phonological material (i.e., Holmberg's Generalization Holmberg 1986, 1999).

(38) Broekhuis does have some interesting discussion about the interaction of NegShift and pronominal OS.

(39) 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*
- faktisk
- ingen bøger*
- .

I lent her actually no books

'I didn't actually lend her any books.'

- (40) In (39a), we see that when we have a negative object that it shifts to a position higher than the *vP* 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.’
- (41) However, when the main verb has raised to *C*<sup>0</sup> as in (39b) 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.
- (42) 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.

## 5 Valentine Bordal 2017

- (43) Valentine Bordal (2017) is a corpus study of *Språkbanken*<sup>2</sup> looking at how existential predicates are negated in Swedish.
- (44) According to Valentine Bordal declarative sentences are negated using the negative particle *inte* only.
- a. Anna är *inte* doktor.  
 Anna is not doctor  
 ‘Anna is not a doctor.’
- (45) 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.<sup>3</sup>
- a. Jag har *inte* några barn.  
 I have not any children  
 ‘I don’t have any children’
- b. Jag har *inga* barn.  
 I have no children  
 ‘I don’t have children.’
- (46) According to her results, NIs were the most frequent method for negating existential predicates.
- (47) Under her analysis of NIs, they are all treated as a pronominal which can or cannot appear with a nominal pivot.

---

<sup>2</sup><https://spraakbanken.gu.se/en>

<sup>3</sup>I disagree with her claim that NIs are only used with non-lexical verbs, because there are plenty of examples in the literature that show NIs negating sentences that contain lexical verbs (see Engels 2012 and Christensen 2005 for examples).

Table 3: Frequency of negation strategy

Negated existential	Raw count	Proportion
Existential predicates negated with an indefinite pronoun	212 918	89%
Existential predicates negated with inte	27 437	11%
Total	240 355	100%

- a. This means that her "modifier" is best treated as a NI determiner which appears with a nominal pivot and her "head" is best treated as a pronoun which doesn't appear with a nominal pivot.

Table 4: Frequency of NI property

Syntactic property of the NI	Frequency	Proportion
Modifier	687	78%
Head	198	22%
Total	885	100%

- (48) 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.

## 6 Zeijlstra 2011

- (49) Zeijlstra 2011 is interested in showing providing an analysis of the split-scope interpretation that exists for negative indefinites in Germanic languages.
- (50) 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.
- (51) Zeijlstra assumes that this behavior is the result of the compositional status of negative indefinites similar to the claims made by Iatridou & Sichel (2011). Unlike Iatridou & Sichel, who simply claim that negation takes scope higher than the modal's scope and the indefinite scopes low, he claims that NIs are composed of a negative operator and an indefinite component.
- (52) 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.

## 7 Interaction of NegShift and OS

- (53) Christensen (2005) provides a clear and detailed summary of the interactions of OS and NegShift. His summary is detailed below in Table 5.

- (54) In this table No<sup>+</sup>/Sw<sup>+</sup> represent some varieties of Norwegian and Swedish respectively in contrast to more standard Norwegian (No) and Swedish (Sw), FS represent the Swedish variety which is spoken by Swedes in Finland.

Table 5: Summary of OS and NegShift according to Christensen (2005).

IO-DO	Ic	Da/Fa	No/Sw	No <sup>+</sup> /Sw <sup>+</sup>	FS
Pron-Pron	++	++	% %	§ §	--
Pron-NegQP	++	++	++	++	--
NegQP-Pron	+-	+-	+-	+-	--
Pron-DP	+ %	+-	% -	% -	--
DP-Pron	% -	--	--	--	--
DP-DP	% %	--	--	--	--
DP-NegQP	% %	--	--	--	--
NegQP-DP	+-	+-	+-	+-	--

(KEY: + = obligatory, - = blocked, % = optional, § = optional and ‘non-parallel’)

- (55) The sections on this table that are most interesting are those involving what Christensen calls Negative Quantifier Phrases, which is equivalent to NIs. However, this does conflate NI determiners and NI pronouns into a single category.
- (56) According to Christensen, when the IO is a pronoun and the DO is a NegQP both obligatorily shift when the verb has been able to swift to C, (a), otherwise only the NegQP shifts, (b).
- a. Jeg lånte *hende(IO)* faktisk *ingen bøger(DO)*  
 I lent her actually no books  
 ‘I actually didn’t lend her any books’
- b. Jeg har *ingen bøger(DO)* lånt *hende(IO)*  
 I have no books lend her  
 ‘I didn’t lend her any books’
- (57) If, however, the IO is a NegQP and the DO is a pronoun then the pronoun is blocked from shifting. This produces a freezing effect on OS (Christensen 2005: p. 164).
- a. Jeg lånte faktisk *ingen(IO)* *den(DO)*  
 I lent actually no-one it  
 ‘I actually lent it to no-one.’
- b. \*Jeg lånte *den(DO)* faktisk *ingen(IO)*
- (58) This is actually a very important point for the question of the prosodic nature of the shifting. If we assume that these are moving to a position outside of the VP or are some sort of adjunct to VP<sup>4</sup> then we would assume that OS should be allowed according to Holmberg’s Generalization, (a).

<sup>4</sup>This is actually well argued by Thráinsson (2010) because if it was the head of a NegP that resided above the VP then we would assume that Neg, including NIs, should block head movement from occurring. Because we do not observe this and instead we see Neg and its reflexes acting more along the lines of actual adverbs. However, I am not entirely convinced as will be seen in (59)

- a. Object Shift cannot apply across a phonologically visible category asymmetrically c-commanding the object position except adjuncts (Holmberg 1999: p. 15).
- (59) However, this might not actually be the case if we follow the logic from Holmberg's Generalization. HG requires that OS occur if there is not a phonologically visible category that asymmetrically c-commands the object's base position. Because OS is blocked, then Neg is a phonologically visible category that asymmetrically c-commands the object and is not an adjunct. This then suggests that it is a head of a phrase, where the head asymmetrically c-commands the object. This leaves us with two possibilities: either, (i) the NI does not move in these contexts; or (ii) the NI does move but to the head of some phrase that is in the domain of HG.
- (60) Additionally, when the IO is a full DP and the DO is a NegQP the full DP IO induces a freezing effect on overt NegShift, which results in NegShift occurring covertly. This is also true when the IO is left in-situ, (b).
  - a. Ég gaf *manninum*(IO) *víst enga gjöf*(DO)  
 I gave man-the.DAT PRT no present  
 'But i di give the man the present'
  - b. Ég gaf *víst manninum*(IO) *enga gjöf*(DO)

## 8 Adverbial orders

- (61) There was some discussion about *faktisch* 'actually' being the wrong type of adverb to show movement of NIs and object pronouns.
- (62) However looking into the ordering of adverbs this actually seems to be the best type of adverb. This is because there is a strict ordering of adverbs in the middle field.
- (63) Holmes & Wilson (2017) stats that there are four distinct levels that these adverbs are allowed to appear in.
  - a. The first level contains short modal adverbs  
*då* 'then'
  - b. The second level contains short pronominal adverbs or conjunctive adverbs  
*därför* 'therefore'
  - c. The third level contains longer modal adverbs  
*faktiskt* 'actually'
  - d. The fourth and last level are adverbs of negation  
*aldrig* 'never', *inte* 'not'
- (64) Examples of multiple adverbs
  - a. De har ju<sub>1</sub>        *därför*<sub>2</sub> *faktiskt*<sub>3</sub> *aldrig*<sub>4</sub> rest        utomlands.  
 they have certainly therefore actually never traveled abroad  
 'They have therefore actually never traveled abroad'
  - b. Vi får väl<sub>1</sub>        *ändå*<sub>2</sub> trots allt<sub>3</sub> *inte*<sub>4</sub> ge upp.  
 we must nevertheless despite everything not give up  
 'We must nevertheless despite everything not give up'

## 9 Summary of where we are

### 9.1 The problem

- (65) The problem that I am focusing on is about whether or not there is a prosodic motivation for NegShift in the Scandinavian languages.
- (66) This question comes about from the fact that, on the surface, NegShift resembles Scandinavian OS which has been well-documented to be driven and determined by prosodic factors (Erteschik-Shir 2005, Erteschik-Shir & Josefsson 2017, Erteschik-Shir, Josefsson & Köhnlein 2019, Brinkerhoff & Tengesdal 2020).
- (67) However, it is clear that not all instances of NegShift directly correlate to the accounts of OS. One of the chief reasons for is due to the wider range of material that is allowed to undergo NegShift whereas only prosodically weak object pronouns are allowed to undergo OS. Further discussion is in §9.2 about the similarities and differences between OS and NegShift.
- (68) The one area that NegShift and OS are united in is the movement of pronouns. Additionally, there have been several claims that NegShift has a preference for shifting negative indefinite pronouns over the full DPs (Christensen 2005, Penka 2011).

### 9.2 Distributional properties of NegShift versus OS

- (69) As mentioned above there are certain patterns that NegShift and OS share and differ in.

#### 9.2.1 Similarities

- (70) Both OS and NegShift involve the movement of elements from their base position to a position that is to the left of the VP, as seen by the movement across negation/adverbials in the case of OS, (70a), and across the verb in the case of NegShift, (70b).
  - a. Jag kyssade<sub>v</sub> henne<sub>o</sub> inte [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>v</sub> t<sub>o</sub> ]  
     I   kiss.PST   her       NEG  
     ‘I didn’t kiss her.’
  - b. Jag har   ingen<sub>o</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> kyssat       t<sub>o</sub> ]  
     I   have no-one    kiss.PST.PTCP  
     ‘I haven’t kissed anyone.’
- (71) Additionally, they are similar in that they both operate on pronouns, weak object pronouns for OS and negative indefinite pronouns for NegShift.
- (72) As mentioned above NegShift has a preference for shifting pronouns (Christensen 2005, Penka 2011).

#### 9.2.2 Differences

- (73) There are two primary differences when it comes to OS and NegShift.

- a. NegShift applies to full negative DPs such as *inga böcker* ‘no books’ in addition to pronouns. There is however a restriction in the size of the moved NI (Christensen 2005, Penka 2011). OS can only apply to weak object pronouns.
- b. NegShift is *not* subject to Holmberg’s Generalization but is instead subject to an “Anti-Holmberg Effect” where it can shift across phonological material, whereas OS is subject to Holmberg’s Generalization.

### 9.3 Cyclic Linearization

- (74) Cyclic Linearization is a theory that was developed by Fox & Pesetsky 2005 as a way to account for OS and Holmberg’s Generalization.
- (75) This theory works by stipulating that spell-out of the morpho-syntax is cyclic and order preserving, which means that as you spell-out each successive phase you need to ensure that whatever orders existed when that phase was spelled-out persist at the next phase’s ordering restrictions. This theory also had the benefit of accounting for when OS was allowed or not allowed to occur.
- (76) This proposal was extended by Fox & Pesetsky (2005) and Engels (2011, 2012) to account for quantifier movement (QM), which NegShift is a subset of.
- (77) Under this proposal QM is subject to an “Anti-Holmberg Effect” or an “Inverse Holmberg Effect”, which are identical in principle
  - a. Under Holmberg’s Generalization, OS can only apply if the verb has undergone movement from V to T to C.
  - b. The Anti-Holmberg Effect explains that only when the verb remains in situ can we have QM, which is the result of the ordering operations between the different phases being in agreement.
- (78) In order to account for OS, Fox & Pesetsky propose that the during the spell-out of the VP phase the V is the leftmost element in its phase<sup>5</sup> and at which point the ordering restrictions are in place which state that the V must precede the O.
- (79) At this point the V moves to T and then to C at this point the object is free to move to a position higher because the order that existed at the VP phase continues to hold.
- (80) OS and string-vacuous ~~Neg-Shift~~
  - a.  $[_{CP} S \overset{\text{Neg-Shift}}{\underset{\text{VP Ordering}}{V}} \dots [_{NegP} O \text{ adv } [_{VP} t_v t_o ]]]$
  - b. VP Ordering:  $V > O$   
CP Ordering:  $S > V, V > O, O > \text{adv}, \text{adv} > VP$
- (81) If the DO were to move instead of the IO this would now result in the DO being ordered before the IO at the spell-out at the CP phase. By moving the DO, we now introduce a mismatch between the ordering restrictions at the VP phase and the CP phase explaining why such utterances are ungrammatical.


<sup>5</sup>The position of the V at the left-edge of the phase could be due to the movement of V to *v* in which case it is actually the *vP* that acts as the phase not the VP.

- (82) In the case of NegShift, where it is able to shift across various phonological material it is proposed that the NI first moves to the left edge of the VP before spell-out of that phase.
- a.  $[_{CP} S \text{ aux } \dots [_{NegP} \overset{\text{O}}{\text{O}} [_{VP} \overset{t_o}{t_o} V \overset{t_o}{t_o} ]]]$
- b. VP Ordering:  $O > V$   
 CP Ordering:  $S > V, \text{aux} > O, O > \text{adv}, \text{adv} > VP \rightarrow O > V$
- (83) The benefit of using Cyclic Linearization comes from being able to account for why certain orders are fixed throughout the entire derivation.

## 10 Syntactic Analysis of NegS


- (84) In Zeijlstra's (2011) account of split-scope of NIs, he claims that the origin of split scope comes from copy movement.
- (85) Copy-theory of Movement claims that when we move items we copy them entirely and remerge them into the syntactic structure [FIND REF]. This results in multiple copies of the item being in the syntactic structure. Only at a later stage, after the syntactic structure has been spell-out, parts of the copy are removed in PF or LF. This could result in either a partial or complete deletion of any of these copied-elements at any location that they are found.
- (86) For example, we see this in the following syntactic structure.

a.



- (87) At this point during PF, part of the higher copy is elided leaving only the NI determiner. This process is possibly due to the constraint \*HEAVYNPSHIFT. In the lower copy *intet* is deleted, resulting in the following structure.
- a.





## 11 Next steps

## References

- Allan, Robin, Philip Holmes & Tom Lundskær-Nielsen. 1995. *Danish: a comprehensive grammar* (Routledge grammars). London ; New York: Routledge. 628 pp.
- Brinkerhoff, Mykel Loren & Eirik Tengesdal. 2020. MATCHING phrases in Norwegian object shift.
- 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.
- Eide, Stian Rødven, Nina Tahmasebi & Lars Borin. 2016. The Swedish Culturomics Gigaword Corpus: A One Billion Word Swedish Reference Dataset for NLP. 5.
- Engels, Eva. 2011. Microvariation in object positions: Negative Shift in Scandinavian. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 34(2). 133–155. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S033258651100014X>.
- 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>.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 2005. Sound Patterns of Syntax: Object Shift. *Theoretical Linguistics* 31(1-2). 47–93. <https://doi.org/10.1515/thli.2005.31.1-2.47>.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi & Gunlög Josefsson. 2017. Scandinavian Object Shift Is Phonology. In Laura R. Bailey & Michelle Sheehan (eds.), *Order and structure in syntax I: Word order and syntactic structure* (Open Generative Syntax 1), 99–115. Berlin: Language Science Press. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.1117700>.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi, Gunlög Josefsson & Björn Köhnlein. 2019. Variation in Mainland Scandinavian Object Shift: A Prosodic Analysis. *lingbuzz/003688*.

- 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>.
- Holmes, Janet & Nick Wilson. 2017. *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Fifth Edition (Learning about Language). London ; New York, NY: Routledge. 538 pp.
- 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](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>.
- Thráninsson, Höskuldur. 2010. *The syntax of Icelandic*. 1. paperback ed (Cambridge syntax guides). Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. 563 pp.
- 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>.