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In the Scandinavian languages, sentential negation must be licensed outside VP, necessitating leftward movement of negative objects, Negative Shift (NegS). While string-vacuous NegS is possible in all Scandinavian varieties, there is a fair amount of cross-linguistic variation as to non-string-vacuous NegS. In particular, the varieties contrast in which constituents can be crossed by NegS and whether or not crossing of a certain constituent requires the presence of an intervening verb.

The paper discusses which difficulties for syntactic analysis arise from the variation as to the applicability of NegS and why other movement operations do not display such a range of variation.

1 Introduction

In the Scandinavian languages, there are two ways of formulating the negative sentence in (1), either with a negation marker and an indefinite quantifier, (1)a, or with a negative object, (1)b. The example in (1) illustrates this for Danish; the same alternation is found in the other Scandinavian languages.

(1)  a. Per læste måske ikke nogen bøger.  
     Per read maybe not any books

     b. Per læste måske ingen bøger.  
     Per read maybe no books

The paper focuses on the latter construction and investigates the variation across the Scandinavian languages as to the distribution of negative objects.

Negative objects are peculiar as they do not occur in the canonical object position under a sentential negation reading in Scandinavian. As shown in (2)b, a negative object cannot follow a non-finite main verb.¹

¹ Occurrence of a negative object in VP-internal position is possible if a narrow scope reading can be constructed; see Svenonius (2002).
The above data suggest that a negative object must undergo leftward movement out of VP, henceforth Negative Shift (NegS); cf. K. K. Christensen (1986, 1987), Rögnvaldsson (1987), Jónsson (1996), Svenonius (2000, 2002), and K. R. Christensen (2005). The present analysis takes NegS to be triggered by the need to license sentential negation outside VP. In the generative literature, the target position of NegS has been considered to be the specifier position of NegP (XP=NegP) or a position adjoined to VP (XP=VP); cf. (3). The exact structural position of negative objects will be left open as it does not matter here.

(3)

```
CP
  Spec  C'
    C°  IP
      Spec  I'
        I°  XP (= NegP or VP)
          Neg  VP
            Spec  V'
              V°  DP
                a. Per læste ikke [VP læst nogen bøger] Per has not read any books
                b. *Per læste ingen bøger Per has read no books
```
While string-vacuous NegS as in (1)b/(3)b is possible in all Scandinavian varieties, there is a considerable amount of cross-linguistic variation as to non-string-vacuous NegS. In particular, the varieties contrast in (a) which constituents may be crossed by NegS and (b) whether crossing of a certain constituent requires the presence of a main verb in situ. NegS across a verb, indirect object, preposition, and infinitive is discussed in section 2.1-2.4, respectively. The paper concentrates on the data, touching only briefly on the source of this variation and the difficulties for syntactic analysis that arise from this variation.

2 Non-string-vacuous Negative Shift
2.1 NegS across a verb in situ
As shown in (4), NegS of a direct object is permitted in all Scandinavian varieties (Ic=Icelandic, Fa=Faroese, Da=Danish, Sw=Swedish, No=Norwegian) if the verb has undergone V°-to-I°-to-C° movement.

(4)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>NegS</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Ég sagði</td>
<td>ekkert</td>
<td>_____v _____o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Eg segði</td>
<td>einki</td>
<td>_____v _____o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Jeg sagde</td>
<td>ingenting</td>
<td>_____v _____o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Jag sa</td>
<td>ingenting</td>
<td>_____v _____o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Jeg sa</td>
<td>ingenting</td>
<td>_____v _____o.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I said nothing

However, NegS across a verb in situ is subject to cross-linguistic variation. In the Insular Scandinavian languages (ISc), a negative object may occur to the left of a non-finite verb in situ; cf. (5).²

² Certain non-negative quantified objects may optionally move to the left of VP in Ic as well; cf. Rögnvaldsson (1987), Jónsson (1996), and Svenonius (2000).
(5)  a. Ég hef engan séð _____.  
    I have nobody seen  
    (Rögnvaldsson 1987: 37)  

   b. Petur hevur einki sagt _____.  
    Peter has nothing said

For the Mainland Scandinavian languages (MSc), in contrast, NegS across a verb is usually claimed in the literature to be stylistically marked (see K. K. Christensen 1986, Faarlund et al. 1997, Svenonius 2000 on No, Holmes & Hinchliffe 2003 on Sw, and K. R. Christensen 2005 on Da). It is found in literary or formal styles, referred to as Scan1, (6)a, but is ungrammatical in colloquial speech (Scan2), (6)b. Since NegS cannot not take place, (2)b, the ikke...nogen-variant, which is always acceptable, must be used in case NegS is blocked, (7).

(6)  a. Manden havde ingenting sagt _____.  
    man-the had nothing said  
    Scan1  

   b. *Manden havde ingenting sagt _____.  
    man-the had nothing said  
    Scan2  

(7)  Manden havde ikke sagt noget.  
    man-the had not said anything  
    Scan1/Scan2

However, NegS across a verb in situ is not only a matter of style but also subject to dialectal and inter-speaker variation. Thelander (1980) observes differences between Northern (Västerbotten, Umeå) and Southern Swedish (Eskilstuna, Örebro) in the distribution of negative objects. Moreover, in a dialect study on Western Jutlandic (WJ), 15 out of my 16 informants judged NegS across a verb in situ as unmarked. In contrast, the vast majority of my Norwegian informants did not accept it at all, not even in formal style.

In addition, in the BySoc Corpus of spoken Da 7% (= 8 out of 114) of the matches on the lexical items ingenting/intet 'nothing' are clause-medial objects preceding a verb in situ, indicating that the construction in (6) is in fact used in spoken language. Furthermore, a Google blog search (Google web for Fa) on

---

3 The study was carried out within the NORMS Dialect Workshop in Western Jutland January 2008.
certain clauses, negated by *ingen*/*inent* to the left of a VP-internal main verb or by *ikke...nogen*, produced the results in Figure 1: While clause-medial negative objects preceding a main verb *in situ* were quite frequent in ISc and possible in Da and Sw, there was no hit for this construction in No (Bokmål).

**Figure 1: Percentage of negative object < main verb orders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ic</th>
<th>Fa</th>
<th>Da</th>
<th>Sw</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*segja/siga/sige/*säga/si ('say')</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>63,6%</td>
<td>7,7%</td>
<td>17,4%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1/1)</td>
<td>(14/22)</td>
<td>(1/13)</td>
<td>(8/46)</td>
<td>(0/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>heyr</em>a/hoyra/høre/*höra/høre ('hear')</td>
<td>88,9%</td>
<td>90,0%</td>
<td>55,6%</td>
<td>11,3%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16/18)</td>
<td>(63/70)</td>
<td>(35/63)</td>
<td>(6/53)</td>
<td>(0/7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sjá/síggja/se/*se ('see')</td>
<td>83,3%</td>
<td>13,6%</td>
<td>22,2%</td>
<td>13,2%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10/12)</td>
<td>(8/59)</td>
<td>(4/18)</td>
<td>(5/38)</td>
<td>(0/7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*fá/fáa/fá/*få ('receive')</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
<td>43,5%</td>
<td>19,2%</td>
<td>14,3%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1/2)</td>
<td>(10/23)</td>
<td>(5/26)</td>
<td>(5/35)</td>
<td>(0/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*gera/gera/gøre/*göra/gjøre ('do')</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
<td>48,1%</td>
<td>15,2%</td>
<td>18,4%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1/5)</td>
<td>(13/27)</td>
<td>(5/33)</td>
<td>(9/49)</td>
<td>(0/7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>76,3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>53,7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0,0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(29/38)</td>
<td>(108/201)</td>
<td>(50/153)</td>
<td>(33/221)</td>
<td>(0/26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(including sentences of the format

(auxiliary) subject*1SG* (auxiliary) negative object verb*present/past/participle* and

(auxiliary) subject*1SG* (auxiliary) negation marker verb*present/past/participle* object)

The cross-linguistic variation as to NegS is illustrated in Figure 2. NegS may apply string-vacuously in all of the Scandinavian varieties under discussion. Moreover, NegS across a verb *in situ* is possible in WJ, Ic, Fa, and Scan1 whereas it is ungrammatical in Scan2 and No.⁵

---

⁴ Instances of the Swedish saying *Jag säger ingenting/inget så har jag ingenting/inget sagt* (‘I could say a lot about this but I won’t.’) are excluded.

⁵ On the basis of the fact that a negative object cannot follow a non-finite verb within VP, NegS is taken here to be obligatory. NegS must take place in the languages under discussion even if it is string-vacuous; see (3)b. See K. K. Christensen (1986, 1987) and Fox & Pesetsky (2005b: 240-242) for an alternative approach according to which an *ingen*-object is licensed under adjacency to sentential negation which may be established by movement in all varieties except No/Scan2.
Notice that object movement across a verb is not permitted/prohibited as such in these varieties. Rather, different types of movement contrast in whether or not they may cross a verb in VP-internal position. On one hand, Object Shift presupposes movement of the main verb, as captured by Holmberg's generalization (Holmberg 1986, 1999). It cannot apply across a verb in any of the Scandinavian languages; cf. the contrast between (8) and (9).

(8)  
   a. *Jeg læste ikke dem.
   b. Jeg læste dem ikke ___.
      I read them not

(9)  
   a. Jeg har ikke læst dem.
   b. *Jeg har dem ikke læst ___.
      I have them not read

On the other hand, wh-movement, topicalization, passivization, and subject raising can apply across a verb even in Scan2/No; cf. (10).

(10)  
   a. Hva har du solgt ____.
      what have you sold
   b. Bøkene har jeg solgt ______.
      books-the have I sold
   c. I går ble bøkene solgt ______.
      yesterday were books-the sold
   d. Etter min mening har Pål alltid sett ut til ___ å være intelligent.
      in my opinion has P always looked out to to be intelligent
Accordingly, occurrence of a negative phrase in topic or subject position is acceptable. (Since definite phrases are better topics, an *ingen*-phrase with definite NP is used in (11)a.)

(11) a. **Ingen av bøkene** har jeg **solgt**_____.  
    *none of books-the have I sold*

    b. I går ble **ingen bøker** **solgt**_____.  
    *yesterday were no books sold*

Figure 3 summarizes the acceptability of movement across a verb *in situ* in the various varieties. The contrast between NegS on one hand and *wh*-movement, topicalization, passivization, subject raising, and Object Shift on the other hand as regards the emergence of cross-linguistic variation as to the ability to cross an intervening verb might have to do with the fact that there is an alternative expression for sentential negation, namely the *ikke...nogen*-variant, whereas there are no equivalent alternative options for the latter constructions. Thus, the variation found with non-string-vacuous NegS might be considered to reflect contrasts as to which extent the *ingen*-variant may arise alongside the alternative *ikke...nogen*-variant, which is always acceptable.

**Figure 3: Movement across a verb *in situ***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WJ/Ic/Fa/Scan1</th>
<th>Scan2/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>wh</em>-movement</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topicalization</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passivization</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject raising</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Shift</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Shift</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally note that in other languages, NegS need not take place overtly. For instance, a negative object may appear in VP-internal position in English (En), following the main verb.
(12) a. Peter probably didn't [VP read any books] En
    b. Peter probably [VP read no books]

Similarly, in situ occurrence of a negative object was apparently possible in Finland Swedish (FS) around 1900 (see Bergroth 1917), but the sentences in (13) seem to be ungrammatical in present-day FS (Caroline Sandström, p.c.). Instead, like in Standard Sw, licensing of sentential negation must be carried out by overt NegS or usage of the ikke...nogen-variant; cf. (14).

(13) a. Jag har haft ingenting att skaffa med den saken. FS
    I have had nothing to do with this affair

    b. Han hade haft ingen aning om hela saken.
       he had had no knowledge about the whole case

       (Bergroth 1917: 173)

(14) a. Jag har ingenting haft att skaffa med den saken. FS
    I have nothing had to do with this affair

    b. Jag har inte haft någonting att skaffa med den saken.
       I have not had anything to do with this affair

However, as pointed out to me by Caroline Sandström (p.c.), an ingen-object may appear in situ in the presence of a VP-external negation marker in the Sibbo dialect of FS (Eastern Nyland). The sentence in (15) gives rise to a negative concord reading ('I haven't had anything to do with this affair.').

(15) Jag har inte haft ingenting att skaffa med den saken. Si
    I have not had nothing to do with this affair

    (Caroline Sandström, p.c.)

---

6 Thereby, an additional negation marker to the immediate left of the ingen-phrase sometimes emerges, emphasizing negation (Caroline Sandström, p.c.).

(i) Han vill inte se inte ingenting. Si
    he will not see not nothing
    (Caroline Sandström, p.c.)
Likewise, VP-internal occurrence of an *ingen*-object is possible in Övdalian (Öv) if the negation marker *it* is present, (16). In addition, the object may undergo NegS. In this case, co-occurrence of *it* is optional, as shown by the example in (17); see Garbacz (2008).

(16) a. *Ig ar si'tt inggan. Öv
     b. Ig ar *it si'tt inggan.
       I have not seen no one (Garbacz 2008: 198)

(17) a. Ig ar inggan si'tt ______. Öv
     b. Ig ar *it inggan si'tt ______.
       I have not no one seen (Garbacz 2008: 198)

Given that sentential negation is expressed by VP-external *it*, which licenses *in situ* occurrence of the *ingen*-object in (16)b, the question arises why the object may optionally undergo NegS in the presence of *it* at all, (17)b. In other words, the acceptability of *in situ* occurrence and the negative concord reading seem to indicate that the *ingen*-object itself does not have any negative impact in the presence of a VP-external negation marker. This in turn gives rise to doubts regarding the trigger for optional NegS. These issues are connected to the question of how negative concord is to be analyzed, which cannot be discussed here (see Haegeman 1995, Haegeman & Zanuttini 1991, 1996, Zeijlstra 2004, and Giannakidou 2005 on this issue).

Summing up, this section showed that there is cross-linguistic and diachronic variation as to the distribution of negative objects. While a negative object can occur in VP-internal position in En and former stages of FS, sentential negation must be expressed outside VP in present-day Scandinavian, necessitating NegS. While an intervening verb blocks NegS in No and Scan2, NegS across a verb *in situ* is possible in the other Scandinavian varieties under consideration. As discussed in the following section, NegS across an indirect object even requires the presence of a main verb *in situ.*
2.2 NegS across an indirect object

NegS of a direct object (DO) across an indirect object (IO) is possible in those and only those varieties which permit NegS across a verb in situ. In Scan2 and No, where a verb in situ blocks NegS, NegS across an IO is not acceptable either, (18). In Ic, Fa, WJ, and Scan1, in contrast, it is possible, (19).

(18) *Jeg har ingen bøker lånt barna _______. Scan2/No
  I have no books lent children-the

(19) a. Jón hefur ekkert sagt Sveini _____. Ic
  Jón has nothing said Sveinn (Rögnvaldsson 1987: 46)

  b. Petur hevur einki givið Mariu _____. Fa
  Peter has nothing given Mariu

  c. Jeg har ingen bøger lånt børnene_____. WJ/Scan1
  I have no books lent children-the

However, NegS of the DO across the IO gives rise to a so-called Inverse Holmberg Effect (Fox & Pesetsky 2005a): It is acceptable if the main verb stays in situ, (19), but it is ungrammatical if the main verb undergoes leftward movement as well, (20).\(^7\) (Holmberg's generalization, in contrast, states that movement of the main verb must take place for Object Shift to be possible, cf. examples (8) and (9) above.)

---

\(^7\) Note that NegS of the DO is compatible with movement of the main verb if the IO undergoes leftward movement as well. In this case, NegS of the DO is string-vacuous and, accordingly, it is possible even in Scan2 and No.
(20) a. *Jón sagði ekkert Sveini _____. Ic
   Jón said nothing Sveinn (Rögnvaldsson 1987: 46)

   b. *Petur gave einki Mariu _____. Fa
   Petur gave nothing Maria

   c. *Jeg lånte ingen bøger børnene ________. WJ/Scan1
   I lent no books children-the

As NegS across an IO presupposes the presence of a verb in situ, it is not surprising that it is only possible in varieties which permit NegS across a verb in the first place (see Figure 4).

**Figure 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NegS across</th>
<th>WJ/Ic/Fa/Scan1</th>
<th>Scan2/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>∅ (= string-vacuous)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb in situ</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb moved</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Inverse Holmberg Effect observed with NegS across an IO points to the conclusion that it is not the intervening constituent itself which blocks NegS, contrary to what e.g. K. R. Christensen (2005) suggests. A verb in situ may cancel out the blocking effect. The negative object may move across the IO if it also crosses the main verb. By the same reasoning, the base position of the object cannot be crucial for the availability of NegS either.

(21) **Inverse Holmberg Effect**

a. *S V O\text{NEG} [V_{\text{main}} \text{X} \text{X} \text{X} ]

b. S Aux O\text{NEG} [V_{\text{aux}} \text{Aux} [V_{\text{main}} \text{V} \text{X} \text{X} \text{X} \text{X} ] ]
At first glance, the fact that an intervening main verb cancels out the blocking effect would seem to indicate that the Inverse Holmberg Effect has to do with the target position of NegS to the left/right of the main verb (see Svenonius 2000 for an analysis along these lines). Apart from cross-linguistic variation, however, there is also variation across constructions as to the dependence of NegS on verb position, discussed in the following sections. This points out that the target position to the left/right of the main verb itself cannot be decisive for the acceptability of NegS either.

2.3 NegS across a preposition
According to K. R. Christensen (2005), NegS of the complement of a preposition is not permitted in MSc at all, neither in Scan1 nor in Scan2.

(22) a. *Jeg har ingen peget på ___. Scan1/Scan2
   I have nobody pointed at

   b. *Jeg pegede ingen på ___. (K. R. Christensen 2005: 131)
   I pointed nobody at

However, my Danish informants, linguists at the University of Aarhus from different regions of Denmark, referred to as DaL below, showed an Inverse Holmberg Effect with NegS of a prepositional complement: They marginally accepted NegS across a preposition if the main verb occurred in situ, (23)a, but rejected NegS just across the preposition, (23)b.  

(23) a. ?Jeg har ingen peget på ___. DaL
   I have nobody pointed at

   b. *Jeg pegede ingen på ___.
   I pointed nobody at

---

8 I found the same pattern with two of my six Swedish informants. In contrast, the other four informants rejected NegS across a preposition altogether, (22), although they accepted NegS across a verb, (6), reflecting the Scan1 pattern.
Likewise in Fa, NegS across a preposition was judged acceptable in the presence of a verb *in situ* whereas it was rejected by the majority of my informants if the main verb had undergone finite verb movement; cf. (24).\(^9\)

(24) a. Í dag hevur Petur ongan tosað við____. Fa
    today has Peter nobody spoken with

    b. *Í dag tosaði Petur ongan við____.
      today spoke Peter nobody with

Moreover, Svenonius (2000) claims that NegS of the complement of a preposition in Ic improves if the movement also crosses the verb, though this contrast is not that strong, (25)b is degraded but not ungrammatical.\(^10\)

(25) a. Ég hef engan talað við ____.
    I have nobody spoken with

    b. ?Ég talaði engan við ____.
      I spoke nobody with
      (Svenonius 2000: 272)

Finally in WJ, NegS just across the preposition is not even marked. NegS of the complement of the preposition is possible, independent of verb position.

(26) a. Måske har hun ingen snakket med ____.
    maybe has she nobody spoken with

    b. I går snakkede hun ingen med ____.
      yesterday spoke she nobody with

Summing up, there is not only cross-linguistic variation as to which constituent can be crossed by NegS (verb, IO, preposition) but also variation as

---

\(^9\) The Faroese data was collected during the NORMS Dialect Workshop in the Faroe Islands August 2008.

Actually, in the absence of a verb *in situ*, NegS of a complement of a preposition seems to be subject to dialectal and inter-speaker variation as regards preposition stranding and pied-piping; see Engels (submitted-b).

\(^10\) Depending on the verb-preposition combination, the preposition is stranded or pied-piped in Icelandic; see Jönsson (1996) and Svenonius (2000).
to whether crossing of a certain constituent requires the presence of a main verb
\textit{in situ} (see Figure 5).

\textbf{Figure 5}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NegS</th>
<th>WJ/Ic</th>
<th>Fa/DaL</th>
<th>Scan1</th>
<th>Scan2/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\emptyset) (= string-vacuous)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\begin{tabular}{llll}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>across</th>
<th>verb in situ</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>verb moved</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>verb in situ</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>verb moved</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\end{tabular}

\textbf{2.4 NegS out of an infinitival clause}

NegS out of a control infinitive is only acceptable in Ic if it also crosses the
matrix main verb (cf. Svenonius 2000).\footnote{Though slightly more marked (possibly for pragmatic reasons), long NegS out of two
infinitival clauses is possible as well:}

(i) a. Jeg har \textit{ingen penge} \textbf{planlagt at opdrive} \textit{...} \textit{Da}
'I didn't plan to find any money ...'

b. Jeg har \textit{ingen penge} \textit{prøvet at opdrive} \textit{...}
'I didn't try to find any money ...'

c. ?Jeg har \textit{ingen penge} \textbf{planlagt at prøve at opdrive} \textit{...}
'I didn't plan to try to find any money ...'

\textit{... til at fortsætte projektet.}

\textit{... to continue project-the}

\textit{... to continue the project.'} \hspace{1cm} (Henrik Jørgensen, p.c.)

(ii) a. Pétur hefur \textit{engu bréfi} \textit{lofað að svara} \textit{...} \textit{Ic}
'Petur didn't promise to reply to any letter.'

b. Pétur hefur \textit{engu bréfi} \textit{reynt að svara} \textit{...}
'Petur didn't try to reply to any letter.'

c. Pétur hefur \textit{engu bréfi} \textit{lofað að reyna að svara} \textit{...}
'Petur didn't promise to try to reply to any letter.' \hspace{1cm} (Ásgrímur Angantýsson, p.c.)
Some of the DaL (DaL1) and WJ (WJ2) speakers show an Inverse Holmberg Effect with NegS out of an infinitival clause, too.

The other DaL speakers (DaL2) do not permit long NegS at all, (29). Similarly, NegS out of a control infinitive seems to be ruled out altogether in Scan1 and Scan2; cf. see Christensen & Taraldsen (1989: 72).

(30) a. *Han har ingen bøker prøvd å lese _______. Scan1/Scan2
he has no books tried to read

b. *Han prøvde ingen bøker å lese _______.
he tried no books to read
'He didn't try to read any books.'
In contrast, the other WJ speakers (WJ1) permit NegS out of the infinitival clause, irrespective of the position of the matrix main verb; cf. (31). Likewise, NegS out of an infinitival clause is possible in Fa, independent of verb position, (32).

(31) a. Han har _ingen kager lov__et at købe ___. WJ1
   he has _no cakes _promised _to buy

   b. Han _lovede _ingen kager at købe ___, vel?
   he _promised _no cakes _to buy _well
   'He didn't promise to buy any cakes (did he?)'

(32) a. Allarhelst hevur Petur _einki roynt at eta ___. Fa
   probably has _Petur _nothing _tried _to eat

   b. Allarhelst _royndi Petur heldur einki at eta ___.
   probably _tried _Petur also _nothing _to eat
   'Petur probably didn't try to eat anything.'

Hence, as with NegS across a preposition, there is cross-linguistic variation as to whether or not NegS out of a control infinitive is possible at all and, if so, whether it depends on the position of the matrix main verb. In addition, Figure 6 shows that there is variation across constructions with regard to these parameters. For instance, both Fa and DaL display an Inverse Holmberg Effect with NegS across a preposition. In contrast, NegS out of an infinitival clause gives rise to an Inverse Holmberg Effect in DaL1 whereas it is permitted in Fa and prohibited in DaL2, irrespective of verb position. These facts point to the conclusion that the target position to the left/right of the matrix main verb cannot be decisive for the availability of NegS as such.\(^\text{12}\)

\(^{12}\) However, NegS just across the infinitive is not prohibited altogether; it is possible under a narrow scope reading of negation in Da.

(i) a. Han har lov__et _ingen kager at købe ___. WJ/DaL
   he has _promised _no cakes _to buy

   b. Han _lovede ___V _ingen kager at købe ___, ikke?
   he _promised _no cakes _to buy _not
   'He promised not to buy any cakes (didn't he?)'
### 3 Conclusion

The preceding sections showed that while string-vacuous NegS exists in all the Scandinavian varieties, there is a considerable amount of variation as to the availability of non-string-vacuous NegS. In particular, the varieties contrast in which constituent can be crossed by NegS and whether or not crossing depends on the presence of a main verb *in situ*.

The above data corroborate the hypothesis that it is not the intervening constituent itself which blocks NegS. Instead, it seems to depend on the target position/locality of movement whether NegS may cross just the infinitive.

(ii) a. Han **lovede** [______v [ingen kager **at købe** ____ o]]
                  √WJ1/√WJ2/√DaL1/√DaL2

   b. Han **lovede** [ingen kager [______v [**at købe** ____ o]]]
                  √WJ1/*WJ2/*DaL1/*DaL2
NegS across X

ungrammatical
irrespective of verb position

impossible possible
requires / does not require presence of main verb in situ

acceptable only if main verb stays in situ;
Inverse Holmberg Effect

acceptable irrespective of verb position

Contrary to the widely held belief, non-string-vacuous NegS in MSc is not only a matter of style but it is also subject to dialectal and inter-speaker variation. While Scan2/No only permits string-vacuous NegS, the presence of a main verb in situ does not block NegS in Scan1, DaL, Fa, Ic, and WJ, and is even required during NegS across an IO (Inverse Holmberg Effect). In contrast, NegS across a preposition and NegS out of an infinitive are not necessarily dependent on the presence of a verb in situ; they may be permitted or prohibited, irrespective of the position of the matrix main verb; cf. Figure 6 above.

Furthermore, it was laid out that neither the intervening elements (main verb/indirect object/preposition/infinitive) nor the base position of the negative phrase (as complement of transitive/ditransitive verb/preposition/infinitival verb) or its target position (to the left/right of the matrix main verb) may capture the observed variation by themselves. An intervening verb makes NegS possible in some cases but not in others. Engels (submitted-a) accounts for Scandinavian NegS within Fox & Pesetsky’s (2003, 2005a,b) cyclic linearization model. Under this approach, non-string-vacuous movement must proceed through the left edge of Spell-out domains. As a consequence, variation across languages and constructions as to the acceptability of non-string-vacuous NegS may be derived from differences in the availability of these intermediate positions.

Finally, the large range of variation as to the distribution of negative objects in Scandinavian was considered to be connected to the fact that there is an alternative expression for sentential negation, namely ikke...nogen. Thus, the variation found with non-string-vacuous NegS might be taken to mirror contrasts as to which extent the ingen-variant may arise alongside the alternative ikke...nogen-variant, which is always acceptable.
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