

# Advising Meeting

Mykel Loren Brinkerhoff

## 1 Outline

- Discussing NegShift

## 2 NegShift

- (1) Engels (2012) provides a very nice table outlining the types of NegS 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.
- (2) For each of the subsections they are further subdivided into whether or not the verb remains in situ or has moved.
- (3) In the following table ✓ indicates that NegS occurs, \* indicates that NegS cannot occur, ? means that there was idiosyncratic variation

Table 1: Distribution of NegS 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

NegS 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 NegS

- (4) According to Engels all varieties allow string-vacuous NegS

- |    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| a. | Ég sagði <i>ekkert</i> [ <sub>VP</sub> t <sub>v</sub> t <sub>o</sub> ]     | Ic |
| b. | Eg segði <i>einki</i> [ <sub>VP</sub> t <sub>v</sub> t <sub>o</sub> ]      | Fa |
| c. | Jeg sagde <i>ingenting</i> [ <sub>VP</sub> t <sub>v</sub> t <sub>o</sub> ] | Da |
| d. | Jag sa <i>ingenting</i> [ <sub>VP</sub> t <sub>v</sub> t <sub>o</sub> ]    | Sw |
| e. | Jeg sa <i>ingenting</i> [ <sub>VP</sub> t <sub>v</sub> t <sub>o</sub> ]    | No |
|    | I said nothing   |    |
|    | ‘I said nothing’   |    |

## 2.2 NegS across verbs

- (5) NegS 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.'

- (6) It is claimed that NegS 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 NegS across IO

- (7) NegS across IO is permitted if the verb remains in situ for Icelandic, Faroese, West Jutlandic, and Scandinavian1

- 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

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

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

## 2.4 NegS across preposition

(9) NegS across a preposition is not permitted in Mainland Scandinavian.

- a. \*Jeg har *ingen* **peget** på t<sub>0</sub>. Scan1/Scan2  
 I have nobody pointed at  
 Intended: 'I haven't pointed at anybody.'
- b. \*Jeg pegede *ingen* på t<sub>0</sub>.  
 I pointed nobody at  
 Intended: 'I didn't point at anybody.'

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

- a. ?Jeg har *ingen* **peget** på t<sub>0</sub>. DaL  
 b. ?Jeg har pegede *ingen* på t<sub>0</sub>.

(11) Permitted in Faroese if the the verb remains in situ.

- a. Í dag hevur Petur *ongan* **tosað** við t<sub>0</sub>. Fa  
 today has Peter nobody spoken with  
 'Today Peter hasn't spoken with anybody.'
- b. \*Í dag tosaði Petur *ongan* við t<sub>0</sub>.  
 today spoke Peter nobody with  
 Intended: 'Today Peter didn't speak with anybody.'

(12) In Icelandic, NegS 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<sub>0</sub>. Ic  
 I have nobody spoke with  
 'I have spoken to nobody'
- b. ?Ég talaði *engan* við t<sub>0</sub>.  
 I spoke nobody with  
 'I spoke with nobody.'

(13) In West Jutlandic, NegS is always permitted across prepositions.

- a. Måske har hun *ingen* **snakket med** t<sub>0</sub>. WJ  
 maybe has she nobody spoken with  
 'She maybe hasn't spoken with anybody.'
- b. I går snakkede hun *ingen* **med** t<sub>0</sub>.  
 yesterday spoke she nobody with  
 'Yesterday, she didn't speak with anybody.'

## 2.5 NegS out of infinitival clauses

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

- a. Hún hefur *engan* **lofað** að kyssa t<sub>0</sub>. Ic  
 she has nobody promised to kiss  
 'She hasn't promised to kiss anybody.'

- b. \*Hún lofaði *engan* að kyssa t<sub>0</sub>, var það nokkuð?  
 she promised nobody to kiss was it rather  
 Intended: ‘she didn’t promise to kiss anybody, did she?’
- (15) It is also reported that Icelandic allows NegS out of multiple infinitival clauses if the verb remains in situ.
- a. Petúr hefur *engu bréfi* lofað að reyna að svara t<sub>0</sub>. Ic  
 Peter has no letter promised to try to reply  
 ‘Peter hasn’t promised to try to reply to any letter.’
- (16) NegS 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<sub>0</sub>. 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<sub>0</sub>, 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<sub>0</sub>. SwL  
 Per has no cake promised to buy  
 ‘Per hasn’t promised to buy any cake’
- d. \*Per lovade *ingen tårta* att köpa t<sub>0</sub>.  
 Per promised no cake to buy  
 Intended: ‘Per didn’t promise to buy any cake.’
- (17) Other Danish linguists do not permit NegS out of infinitive clauses at all. This is also true for Scandinavian1 and Scandinavian2.
- a. \*Han har *ingen kager* lovet at købe t<sub>0</sub>. DaL2  
 b. \*Han lovede *ingen kager* at købe t<sub>0</sub>, 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.’
- (18) For other West Jutlandic speakers and Faroese NegS 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 Penka 2011

- (19) Penka (2011: 176) reports that “the possibility of shifting an NI also depends on the ‘heaviness’ of the NI”.
- (20) This is to occur in Swedish where shifting was deemed better than shifting full DPs.
- a. Men mänskligheten har **ingenting** lärt sig Sw  
 but mankind-the has nothing taught REFL  
 ‘But mankind hasn’t learned anything.’
  - b. ?Vi hade **inga grottor** undersökt.  
 we had no caves examined  
 ‘We didn’t explore any caves.’
- (21) In Danish, NegS becomes unacceptable the heavier the NI is.
- a. Jeg har **intet nyt** hørt. Da  
 I have nothing new heard  
 ‘I haven’t heard anything new.’
  - b. \*Jeg har **intet nyt i sagen** hørt.  
 I have nothing new in case-the heard  
 ‘I haven’t heard anything new in the case.’

### 4 Research question

- (22) Based on these data, I think my research question should be about the size/‘heaviness’ of the item that is allowed to move for NegS. Something like:
- a. “Given the wide acceptability of NegS in Scandinavian languages, is there a difference in the acceptability of NegS depending on the size of the shifted negative indefinite?”
- (23) This suggests that I should probably choose two contexts that have the widest acceptance among the different Scandinavian languages. I think these should be: (i) when the verb remains in situ, and (ii) across indirect objects that still has the verb in situ (lines 2 and 3 of Table 1).
- (24) I will also do this as part of my corpus study as part of SIP to see if I can observe anything before running an experiment.
- a. If I am going to be running an experiment than I should also start working on getting IRB approval before running participants in a study.

### 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>.
- 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>.