1. **GNeg and ellipsis:** The Genitive of Negation (GNeg) is exhibited, a.o., in Polish: objects which are accusative in positive-polarity contexts switch to genitive under sentential negation (see (1)).

(1)  
   a. Anna kupiła truskawki/*truskawek.
      Anna bought strawberries-ACC strawberries-GEN
      ‘Anna bought strawberries.’
   b. Anna nie kupiła truskawki/*truskawki.
      Anna not bought strawberries-GEN strawberries-ACC
      ‘Anna didn’t buy (any) strawberries.’

However, negation does not affect the case marking of the object in certain elliptical structures. Despite the presence of negation in (2a), the object has to be accusative. This is not acceptable in the non-elliptical counterpart in (2b).

(2)  
   a. Anna często kupuje truskawki, ale nigdy nie jagody/*jagód.
      Anna often buys strawberries-ACC but never not blueberries-ACC blueberries-GEN
      ‘Anna often buys strawberries, but (she) never (buys) blueberries.’
   b. Anna często kupuje truskawki, ale nigdy nie kupuje jagód/*jagody.
      Anna often buys strawberries-ACC but never not buys blueberries-GEN blueberries-ACC
      ‘Anna often buys strawberries, but (she) never (buys) blueberries.’

As the adverb *nigdy* ‘never’ is a negative polarity item, licensed by sentential negation, but not by constituent or lexical negation (e.g. (3); see Willim 1990), its availability in (2a) shows that the structure involves sentential negation (rather than constituent negation of *jagody* ‘blueberries’).

(3)  
   a. Anna zawsze przychodzi [nie za późno, ale za wcześnie].
      ‘Anna always comes [not too late, but too early].’
   b. Anna nigdy *(nie) przychodzi [nie za późno, ale za wcześnie].
      Anna never not comes not too late but too early
      ‘Anna never comes [not too late, but too early].’

Assuming that sentential negation is introduced by Σ (Laka 1990), the elliptical structure is at least a ΣP. Since (2a) features sentential negation, which obligatorily triggers GNeg on the object in non-elliptical structures (see (1b) and (2b)), the accusative marking of *jagody* is unexpected in this context.

2. **Analysis:** I suggest here that the unavailability of GNeg in cases such as (2a) is a result of the deletion of V, i.e. the deletion of its formal features (FFs) on Baltin’s (2012) approach.

Some verbs in Polish assign inherent case values to their objects (e.g. the verb *kierować* ‘direct/manage’ is specified for valuing the case feature of the object as instrumental (e.g. *kierować firmą* ‘manage firm-instr’)). Other verbs lack case-related specification and their objects surface as accusative in positive-polarity clauses (e.g. (1a)). Following Willim (1990), I take accusative to be realised on an object NP by a redundancy rule in the absence of specification for a particular case value. Within the system proposed by Pesetsky & Torrego (2004), the redundancy rule can be triggered when the [Case] feature on NP is valued as [v]. More specifically, on the merge of the verb and the object NP, the two are linked by Agree (Chomsky 2000), which is registered by assigning value [v] to the [Case] feature on NP. Vs assigning inherent case add information about case value to the [Case] feature on the NP (e.g. [Case:v,instr] for the object of *kierować* ‘direct/manage’). The example in (2a) indicates that the presence of sentential negation is not, in and of itself, sufficient for GNeg to arise. I suggest that GNeg is assigned to NPs by negation (Σ[NEG]) indirectly via V (which can be taken to stand for the root and v/v*/Voice, depending on one’s approach).

For the purpose of this discussion, I adopt the feature-sharing approach to valuation (Frampton & Gutman 2000) and I take the object to be realised as genitive when the [Polarity] feature on V is valued as [NEG] by the [Polarity:NEG] feature on Σ[NEG]. To be precise, an object NP surfaces as
genitive when the value \([\text{NEG}]\) is added to its \([\text{Case}]\) feature \(([\text{Case}:v,\text{NEG}])\) as a result of \(V\) and \(NP\) having been linked by Agree before the valuation of the \([\text{Polarity}]\) feature on \(V\). I submit that morphology interprets \(([\text{Case}:v,\text{POS}])\) on \(NP\) as accusative, \([\text{Case}:v,\text{NEG}]\) as genitive, and \([\text{Case}:v,\text{INSTR}]\) as instrumental (and similarly for other inherent cases). Once specified, the value of inherent case is not affected by the value of the \([\text{Polarity}]\) feature (e.g. \(\text{nie kierować firmą ‘not manage firm-INSTR’}\)). The same holds under ellipsis, where the remnant \(NP\) is marked for inherent case, as expected (see (4)).

(4) Anna kierowała w przeszłości małymi firmami, ale nigdy nie tak dużym przedsiębiorstwem.
‘Anna managed in past small firms-INST but never so large company-INST
Anna managed small firms in the past, but she has never managed such a large company.’

The derivation of the negative clauses in (2) can now be taken to proceed as follows: on the merge of the object, \(\text{Agree}(V,\text{NP})\) links the two and assigns value \([v]\) to the \([\text{Case}]\) feature on \(NP\). In the non-elliptical variant in (2b), when \(\Sigma_{\text{NEG}}\) is merged (following the merge of \(\text{Asp(ect)}\) situated between \(VP\) and \(\Sigma P\)), the \([\text{Polarity}]\) feature on \(V\) is valued as \([\text{NEG}]\) and this value is also added to the \([\text{Case}]\) feature on \(NP\), resulting in \([\text{Case}:v,\text{NEG}]\), realised as genitive. In the elliptical variant in (2a), \([\text{NEG}]\) is not added to the \([\text{Case}]\) feature on \(NP\), which remains valued only as \([v]\) and is thus realised as accusative. In particular, following Baltin (2012), ellipsis is deletion of FFs in the syntax, applying at the point of merge of the elliptical \(XP\) with a higher head. Further syntactic operations involving these features are thus bled by deletion. For (2a) this means that \(VP\), including all FFs on \(V\), deletes when it is merged with \(\text{Asp}\) (as voice mismatches are not possible here, this means the deletion of \(\text{VoiceP}\) on approaches employing the \(\text{Voice head}; see\ Merchant 2008). To escape deletion, the object moves to \(\text{Spec,Asp}\). When \(\Sigma_{\text{NEG}}\) is merged, the \([\text{Polarity}]\) feature on \(V\) has already been deleted, together with all other \(VP\)-internal FFs:

(5) ...ale nigdy \([\Sigma P \text{-nie [AspP [NP jagody]}\] Asp \([\text{V-kupuje [NP jagody}]])\]

but never not blueberries-ACC buys blueberries-ACC
As there is no direct relation between \(\Sigma_{\text{NEG}}\) and the object \(NP\) and the \([\text{NEG}]\) value can only be added to the value of \([\text{Case}]\) on \(NP\) via \(V\), the \([\text{Case}]\) feature of the \(NP\) is not affected by negation here. The \(NP\) thus bears the \([\text{Case}:v]\) feature, rather than \([\text{Case}:v,\text{NEG}]\), despite the presence of sentential negation.

3. Conclusions: Structures such as (2a) are problematic for the analysis taking the accusative and genitive structural case to be assigned by a split Polarity-\(v\) probe (Witkoś 2003), which predicts that the object \(NP\) in the elliptical structure in (2a) should either not be able to be assigned case at all or should be genitive, depending on the approach to ellipsis which is adopted.

A broader conclusion from the present discussion is that acceptable elliptical structures need not have acceptable overt counterparts (cf. (2a) and (2b)), an important point in the light of the fact that a plausible analysis of an elliptical structure is likely to be rejected from theoretical discussions if an acceptable overt source is unavailable for the structure on a given analysis (see, a.o., Lasnik 1999).
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