

The most widespread method to gather linguistic data in Generative Syntax, namely, the *grammaticality judgment task* (“acceptability judgment”) (GJT, henceforth) has been considered the great (methodological) contribution of Noam Chomsky to Linguistic Theory (Pires de Oliveira 2010). The so-called Cartographic version of the Principles and Parameters Theory (Rizzi 1997; Cinque 1999; Cinque & Rizzi 2010; Rizzi & Cinque 2016) usually combines GJT with a special technique, namely the use of *precedence-and-transitivity* tests either to determine the order of the elements in a (more) abstract functional sequence (*f-seq*) or to give the order of elements after different types of movements (“derived orders”) (Cinque 2013). Since adverbials are traditionally taken to be pivots around which the thematic V and its arguments move (Pollock, 1989), the acknowledgment that the structure of the clause is even more complex than previously thought (Cinque 1999, 2006; Rizzi 1997, 2004; Cinque & Rizzi 2010; *a.o.*) would pose at least four interesting questions for any (cartographic) attempt to account for V raising: (1) which adverb classes are diagnostics for V raising; (2) what are the different heights where different lexical V forms go in a given language and in different languages; (3) what explains the variation found; and (4) how to collect *bona fide* data on V raising yet by turning to GJT? My presentation aims to discuss some “methodological tips” to guarantee more accurate (cartographic) data-collection by means of GJT. These “tips” will be illustrated on the basis of an experiment made to determine the position that different thematic V forms (finite V, past participles, infinitives, gerunds) would reach in the *f-seq* of Cinque’s adverbs in Mozambican Portuguese (MP). A total of 60 university students (from Maputo; aged between 18-25 years; L1 MP) took part in the study. Volunteers were organized in three groups of 20 students each. Each group was asked to determine the position of a distinct V form—past participles, gerunds, finite Vs—*w.r.t.* each adverb class of the Cinque hierarchy. Sentences testing the position of infinitives were dissolved in the *gerund* and *finite* V groups. A total of almost 160 sentences were judged in each group. Volunteers individually had 3-4 seconds after hearing twice a given sentence to judge it according to a *likert* scale, ranging from 1 (very ill-formed) to 5 (very well-formed), before hearing (and judging) the next sentence and so on. Sentences were recorded by a native speaker of MP, from Maputo, and acoustically treated. These (almost) 160 sentences of each group were distributed in (almost) 50 sections, having 3-5 sentences each, depending on the V type (transitive, intransitive) and on the AdvP class. Thus, the placement of V *w.r.t.* to a (very) low adverb like *com frequência* ‘often’—the lowest low AdvP of the Cinque hierarchy—would give rise to four combinations of the lexical verb, the Direct Object, and the AdvP (if we take the V to be the most embedded constituent within its extended projection (V arguments being Merged in dedicated Specifier positions above it) (Cinque 2006, 2013)). These logically potential orders are illustrated in (1). The importance of such a methodology which gives the volunteer the acoustic *input* for each sentence they judge is to guarantee that the “pivot” adverb, which is taken to be the diagnostic for V raising, has not raised itself to the left periphery. Providing the acoustic input means to guarantee that each sentence in a group of sentences (like (1)) is given the same intonation. This methodological expedient guarantees that the adverb is in its position of Merge, thus fully qualifying as a reliable diagnostic test for V movement. On the basis of this methodology, more accurate GJT-data can be gathered. This is a very welcome methodological

step not only for the Cartographic approach—on its attempt to draw maps of syntactic structures—but also for any formal approach which makes use of the GJT methodology.

- (1) a. O Eduardo de novo a casa limpou.
- b. O Eduardo de novo limpou a casa.
- c. O Eduardo limpou de novo a casa.
- d. O Eduardo limpou a casa de novo.

References:

Cinque, G. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads: a Cross-linguistic Perspective*. NY/Oxford, OUP.

Cinque, G. 2006. *Restructuring and Functional Heads: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol. 4*. NY/Oxford, OUP.

Cinque, G. 2013. *Typological Studies: Word Order and Relative Clauses*. NY/London, Routledge.

Cinque, G.; Rizzi, L. 2010. “The Cartography of Syntactic Structures”. In: Heine, B.; Narrog, H. (Eds.) *Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*. Oxford, OUP, pp. 51-65.

Pires de Oliveira, R. 2010. “A Linguística sem Chomsky e o método negativo”. *ReVEL*, 8 (14), pp. 1-19.

Pollock, J-Y. 1989. “Verb Movement, Universal Grammar, and the Structure of IP”. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 20 (3), pp. 365-424.

Rizzi, L. 1997. “The Fine Structure of Left Periphery”. In: Haegman, L. (Ed.). *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publisher, p p. 282-337.

Rizzi, L. 2004. “Locality and Left Periphery”. In: Belletti, A. (Ed.) *Structures and Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol.3*. NY/Oxford, OUP, pp. 223-251.

Rizzi, L.; Cinque, G. 2016. “Functional Categories and Syntactic Theory”. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 2, pp. 139-163.