

46 Object Shift

STEN VIKNER

1 Introduction

2 Differences between object shift and scrambling

2.1 When does object shift apply?

2.1.1 Verb movement required (Holmberg's generalization)

2.1.2 Prepositions, particles, and indirect objects block object shift

2.2 Parasitic gaps

2.3 Which elements may undergo object shift?

2.4 What is the landing site of object shift?

2.4.1 Object shift is clausebound

2.4.2 Is object shift movement to an adjoined position?

2.4.3 Is object shift movement to a specifier position?

2.4.4 Landing site between two adverbials

2.5 Summary: object shift vs. scrambling

3 Case as the key to object shift

3.1 Traces of case assigners are optional case assigners

3.2 The role of morphological case

3.3 Case assignment from I°

3.4 Pronominal-object shift as cliticization

4 Equidistance as the key to object shift

5 Focus and interpretation as the key to object shift

5.1 The interpretation of object shift

5.2 Objects marked [–Focus] must be licensed by categories marked [+Focus]

6 Conclusion: a few recent accounts

NOTES

REFERENCES

1 Introduction

[2 Differences between object shift and scrambling](#) [3 Case as the key to object shift](#) [4 Equidistance as the key to object shift](#) [5 Focus and interpretation as the key to object shift](#) [6 Conclusion: a few recent accounts](#) [NOTES](#) [REFERENCES](#)

The definition of ‘object shift’ to be used here is a narrow one, covering only the kind of object shift typically found in the Scandinavian languages, following the original use of the term in [Holmberg \(1986 : 165\)](#). Sometimes object shift has been taken to include also at least some instances of scrambling as found in the Continental West Germanic languages (Afrikaans, Dutch, Frisian, German, and Yiddish); see among others [Vanden Wijngaert \(1989\)](#), [Neeleman \(1994b : 408\)](#), and [Bobaljik \(1995 : 85\)](#). For a thorough discussion of scrambling, please refer to [chapter 43](#).

Scrambling (as in the German examples (1b, c) below) and object shift (as in Icelandic (2b, c) and Danish (3c)) have in common that both move a DP leftward, from a position inside VP to a position outside VP but inside the same clause:

(1) Scrambling (German)

a.	Peter	hat _v			ohne	Zweifel	nie	[_{VP}	Bücher	gelesen] _{t_v}
	Peter	has			without	doubt	never		books	read
b.	Peter	las _v	die	Bücher _i	ohne	Zweifel	nie	[_{VP}	t _i	t _v].
	Peter	read	the	books	without	doubt	never			
c.	Peter	las _v	sie _i		ohne	Zweifel	nie	[_{VP}	t _i	t _v].
	Peter	read	them		without	doubt	never			

(2) Object shift (Icelandic)

a.	Pétur	hefur _v		eflaust	aldrei	t _v	[_{VP}	lesið	bækur	].
	Peter	has		doubtlessly	never			read	books	
b.	Pétur	las _v	bækurnar _i	eflaust	aldrei		[_{VP}	t _v	t _i	].
	Peter	read	books-the	doubtlessly	never					
c.	Pétur	las _v	þær _i	eflaust	aldrei		[_{VP}	t _v	t _i	].
	Peter	read	them	doubtlessly	never					

(3) Object shift (Danish)

a.	Peter	har _v		uden	tvivl	aldrig	t _v	[_{VP}	læst	bøger].
	Peter	has		without	doubt	never			read	books
b.	*Peter	læste _v	bøgerne _i	uden	tvivl	aldrig		[_{VP}	t _v	t _i].
	Peter	read	books-the	without	doubt	never				
c.	Peter	læste _v	dem _i	uden	tvivl	aldrig		[_{VP}	t _v	t _i].
	Peter	read	them	without	doubt	never				

All the above examples are verb second (V2), i.e., the finite verb has been moved from the position marked _{t_v} to its present position as the second constituent of the main clause. In addition, in all examples the base

position of the object is inside the VP, i.e., to the right of the adverbials *no doubt* and *never*, cf. (1a), (2a), and (3a). When scrambling (1b, c) or object shift ((2b, c) and (3c)) takes place, the object moves to a position to the left of these adverbials. From these examples, which focus on the similarities between object shift and scrambling, it might appear that there are no differences. This is not so; there are many differences between the two types of movement, as object shift is much more restricted than scrambling. Only object shift requires verb movement, and only object shift is restricted to DPs (though see (82b) and (84b) below). In I will review in detail a number of restrictions that apply to object shift but not to scrambling.

There is also a difference between Icelandic object shift and object shift as found in the other Scandinavian languages, namely, the difference between (2b) and (3b). Either both full DPs and pronouns (Icelandic) or only pronouns (the other Scandinavian languages) may undergo object shift. This will be discussed further in .

After the various empirical characteristics of object shift have been discussed and compared to those of scrambling, the discussion will turn to an analysis of the movement and its motivation (case in , equidistance in , and interpretational considerations in).

2 Differences between object shift and scrambling

[1 Introduction](#) [3 Case as the key to object shift](#) [4 Equidistance as the key to object shift](#) [5 Focus and interpretation as the key to object shift](#) [6 Conclusion: a few recent accounts](#) [NOTES](#) [REFERENCES](#)

2.1 When does object shift apply?

2.1.1 Verb movement required (Holmberg's generalization)

Object shift is blocked if the main verb which selects the object does not move out of its base position in V^0 . Because the Scandinavian languages (like all other Germanic languages except English) are V2, one context in which the main verb moves out of V^0 is a main clause where the main verb is also the finite verb; see (4) and (5).

(4) Icelandic: full DPs

	Af hverju	las _v	Pétur			aldrei	[_{VP} t _v þessa bók	]	?
a.	why	read	Peter			never		this	book
	Af hverju	las _v	Pétur	þessa	bók _i	aldrei	[_{VP} t _v t _i		]
b.	why	read	Peter	this	book	never			

(5) Icelandic: pronouns

	*Af hverju	las _v	Pétur		aldrei	[_{VP} t _v hana	]	?
a.	why	read	Peter		never		it	
	Af hverju	las _v	Pétur	hana _i	aldrei	[_{VP} t _v t _i	]	?
b.	why	read	Peter	it	never			

(6)

Danish: full DPs (impossible)

a.	Hvorfor	læste _v	Peter			aldrig	[_{VP}	t _v	den her	bog	]?
	why	read	Peter			never			this	book	
b.	*Hvorfor	læste _v	Peter	den her	bog _i	aldrig	[_{VP}	t _v	t _i		]?
	why	read	Peter	this	book	never					

(7) Danish: pronouns

a.	*Hvorfor	læste _v	Peter		aldrig	[_{VP}	t _v	den	]?
	why	read	Peter		never			it	
b.	Hvorfor	læste _v	Peter	den _i	aldrig	[_{VP}	t _v	t _i	]?
	why	read	Peter	it	never				

This observation, that the object may move only if verb movement has taken place, goes back at least to [Holmberg \(1986 : 165\)](#) and has been known as Holmberg's generalization, at least since [Collins and Thráinsson \(1993 : 135\)](#). Furthermore, (5a) and (7a) illustrate the obligatory nature of pronominal-object shift (see also): If a(n unstressed) pronoun can undergo object shift, it must. This is definitely true for Icelandic and Danish, but as shown by [Josefsson \(2003 : 200–202\)](#), e.g., object shift of pronouns in Swedish is optional rather than obligatory.

In those main clauses where the finite verb is an auxiliary verb, the main verb, *read*, occurs in a non-finite form and does not leave the VP. Consequently object shift may not take place:

(8) Icelandic

a.	Af hverju	hefur _v	Pétur			aldrei	t _v	[_{VP}	lesið	þessa	bók	]?
	why	has	Peter			never			read	this	book	
b.	*Af hverju	hefur _v	Pétur	þessa	bók _i	aldrei	t _v	[_{VP}	lesið	t _i		]?
	why	has	Peter	this	book	never			read			

(9) Icelandic

a.	Af hverju	hefur _v	Pétur		aldrei	t _v	[_{VP}	lesip	hana	]?
	why	has	Peter		never			read	it	
b.	*Af hverju	hefur _v	Pétur	hana _i	aldrei	t _v	[_{VP}	lesip	t _i	]?
	why	has	Peter	it	never			read		

(10) Danish

a.	Hvorfor	har _v	Peter			aldrig	t _v	[_{VP}	læst	den her	bog	]?
	why	has	Peter			never			read	this	book	
b.	*Hvorfor	har _v	Peter	den her	bog _i	aldrig	t _v	[_{VP}	læst	t _i		]?
	why	has	Peter	this	book	never			read			

(11)

Danish

	Hvorfor	har _v	Peter		aldrig	t _v	[_{VP}	læst	den	]?
a.	why	has	Peter		never			read	it	
	*Hvorfor	har _v	Peter	den _i	aldrig	t _v	[_{VP}	læst	t _i	]?
b.	why	has	Peter	it	never			read		

In embedded clauses the Scandinavian languages differ. In Icelandic the finite verb moves to I°, whereas in the other languages it seems to stay in V°; see, e.g., [Holmberg and Platzack \(1995 : 76–77\)](#); [Vikner \(1995 : 139, 1997b\)](#); [Rohrbacher \(1999 : 56–80\)](#). Consequently, object shift is found in embedded clauses only in Icelandic (and only if the main verb moves out of VP, i.e., only if the main verb is finite), (12b) and (13b), and not in the other Scandinavian languages (15b):¹

(12) Icelandic

	Ég	spurði	af hverju	Pétur	læsi _v			aldrei	[_{VP}	t _v	þessa	bók	].
a.	I	asked	why	Peter	read			never			this	book	
	Ég	spurði	af hverju	Pétur	læsi _v	þessa	bók _i	aldrei	[_{VP}	t _v	t _i		].
b.	I	asked	why	Peter	read	this	book	never					

(13) Icelandic

	*Ég	spurði	af hverju	Pétur	læsi _v		aldrei	[_{VP}	t _v	hana	].
a.	I	asked	why	Peter	read		never			it	
	Ég	spurði	af hverju	Pétur	læsi _v	hana _i	aldrei	[_{VP}	t _v	t _i	].
b.	I	asked	why	Peter	read	it	never				

(14) Danish

	Jeg	spurgte	hverfor	Peter			aldrig	[_{VP}	læste	den her	bog	].
a.	I	asked	why	Peter			never		read	this	book	
	*Jeg	spurgte	hverfor	Peter	den her	bog _i	aldrig	[_{VP}	læste	t _i		].
b.	I	asked	why	Peter	this	book	never		read			

(15) Danish

	Jeg	spurgte	hverfor	Peter		aldrig	[_{VP}	læste	den	].
a.	I	asked	why	Peter		never		read	it	
	*Jeg	spurgte	hverfor	Peter	den _i	aldrig	[_{VP}	læste	t _i	].
b.	I	asked	why	Peter	it	never		read		

Scrambling, on the other hand, does not require the verb to be moved as it may take place regardless of whether the main verb has left its VP (16a) or not (16b):

(16)

German

	Warum	liest _v	Peter	dieses	Buch _i	oft	[_{VP}	t _i	t _v	]	?
a.	why	reads	Peter	this	book	often					
	Warum	hat _v	Peter	dieses	Buch _i	oft	[_{VP}	t _i	gelesen	t _v	?
b.	why	has	Peter	this	book	often			read		

The fact that (16b) is grammatical thus shows that scrambling does not fall under Holmberg's generalization, at least not as formulated here ('the object may only move if verb movement has taken place'), assuming that neither German nor, e.g., Dutch have finite-verb movement in embedded clauses (see [chapter 43](#) of this volume and also, e.g., [Vikner 2005](#)). If the generalization is formulated as in [Déprez \(1994 : 111\)](#), 'Object movement never crosses a thematic verb', scrambling does not go against the generalization, since the object does not scramble across the verb as it is base-generated in a position left of the verb (assuming that the base order of German is SOV). There are still many types of object movement that do not fall under the generalization, however, e.g., object cliticization in Romance (see and chapters 13 and 14 in this volume), or another case of Germanic object movement, namely, scrambling in Yiddish. Yiddish is normally taken to be an SVO language, which means that when scrambling takes place in a sentence where the main verb is not finite, the object moves across the main verb:²

(17) Yiddish

	Far	vos	hot _v	Moyshe	nit	t _v	[_{VP}	geleyent	dos	dozike	bukh] _i ?	
a.	why		has	Moses	not			read	this		book	
	Far	vos	hot _v	Moyshe	dos	dozike	bukh _i	nit	t _v	[_{VP}	geleyent	t _i] _i ?
b.	why		has	Moses	this		book	not			read	

In and the following sections below, various suggestions as to why object shift (but not scrambling) requires the verb to have left its VP will be discussed.

2.1.2 Prepositions, particles, and indirect objects block object shift

Object shift is blocked if it has to cross a c-commanding preposition:

(18) Icelandic

	Af	las _v	Pétur			aldrei	t _v	[_{PP}	í	þessari	bók	] _i ?
a.	why	read	Peter			never			in	this	book	
	*Af	las _v	Pétur	þessari	bók _i	aldrei	t _v	[_{PP}	í	t _i		] _i ?
b.	why	read	Peter	this	book	never			in			

(19) Icelandic

	Af	las _v	Pétur			aldrei	t _v	[_{PP}	í	henni	] _i ?
a.	why	read	Peter			never			in	it	
	*Af	las _v	Pétur	henni _i	aldrei	t _v	[_{PP}	í	t _i		] _i ?
b.	why	read	Peter	it		never			in		

(20) Danish

a.	Hvorfor	læste _v	Peter			aldrig	t _v	[_{PP}	i	den her	bog	]?
	why	read	Peter			never			in	this	book	
b.	*Hvorfor	læste _v	Peter	den her	bog _i	aldrig	t _v	[_{PP}	i	t _i		]?
	why	read	Peter	this	book	never			in			

(21) Danish

a.	Hvorfor	læste _v	Peter		aldrig	t _v	[_{PP}	i	den	]?
	why	read	Peter		never			in	it	
b.	*Hvorfor	læste _v	Peter	den _i	aldrig	t _v	[_{PP}	i	t _i	]?
	why	read	Peter	it	never			in		

Object shift is also blocked if it has to cross a c-commanding verb particle, like *out* in *Peter threw out the old carpet*. For independent reasons (see, e.g., [Taraldsen 1984](#) ; [Åfarli 1985](#) ; [Vikner 1987](#) : 266; [Johnson 1991](#) ; [Collins and Thráinsson 1993](#) : 163), the particle always c-commands its complement in Swedish, (22), whereas this never happens in Danish, (24). In Icelandic, (27), and also in Norwegian, the situation is parallel to the one in English in that the particle may either precede (and c-command) a full DP complement or follow it, but a pronominal complement must precede the particle. It is therefore only in Swedish that we can observe how a particle blocks object shift, (23c):

(22) Swedish

a.	Peter	har _v	inte	t _v	kastat		bort	mattan.
	Peter	has	not		thrown		away	carpet-the
b.	*Peter	har _v	inte	t _v	kastat	mattan _i	bort	t _i .
	Peter	has	not		thrown	carpet-the	away	

(23) Swedish

a.	Peter	kastade _v		inte	t _v		bort	den.
	Peter	threw		not			away	it
b.	*Peter	kastade _v		inte	t _v	den _i	bort	t _i .
	Peter	threw		not		it	away	
c.	*Peter	kastade _v	den _i	inte	t _v		bort	t _i .
	Peter	threw	it	not			away	

In Danish, the particle has to follow its complement whether or not object shift has taken place, (24), and therefore the particle does not have any blocking effect (25c). In fact, the pronoun may not follow the particle, (25a), and has to undergo object shift, (25b, c). If the complement of the particle is a full DP, it still precedes the particle, (26a, b), but it cannot undergo object shift, (26c):

(24)

Danish

	*Peter	har _v	ikke	t _v	smidt		ud	tæppet.
a.	Peter	has	not		thrown		away	carpet-the
	Peter	har _v	ikke	t _v	smidt	tæppet _i	ud	t _i .
b.	Peter	has	not		thrown	carpet-the	away	

(25) Danish

	*Peter	smed _v		ikke	t _v		ud	det.
a.	Peter	threw		not			away	it
	*Peter	smed _v		ikke	t _v	det _i	ud	t _i .
b.	Peter	threw		not		it	away	
	Peter	smed _v	det _i	ikke	t _v		ud	t _i .
c.	Peter	threw	it	not			away	

(26) Danish

	*Peter	smed _v		ikke	t _v		ud	tæppet.
a.	Peter	threw		not			away	carpet-the
	Peter	smed _v		ikke	t _v	tæppet _i	ud	t _i .
b.	Peter	threw		not		carpet-the	away	
	*Peter	smed _v	tæppet _i	ikke	t _v		ud	t _i .
c.	Peter	threw	carpet-the	not			away	

In Icelandic, the particle may or may not precede its complement whether or not object shift has taken place, (27), and therefore the particle does not have any blocking effect, (28c) and (29c). Though a full DP may occur in any of the three positions, (28), a pronoun may not follow the particle, nor may it fail to undergo object shift (29a, b):

(27) Icelandic

	Pétur	hefur _v	ekki	t _v	hent		út	mottunni.
a.	Peter	has	not		thrown		away	carpet-the
	Pétur	hefur _v	ekki	t _v	hent	mottunni _i	út	t _i .
b.	Peter	has	not		thrown	carpet-the	away	

(28)

Icelandic

	Pétur	henti _v		ekki	t _v		út	mottunni.
a.	Peter	threw		not			away	carpet-the
	Pétur	henti _v		ekki	t _v	mottunni _i	út	t _i .
b.	Peter	threw		not		carpet-the	away	
	Pétur	henti _v	mottunni _i	ekki	t _v		út	t _i .
c.	Peter	threw	carpet-the	not			away	

(29) Icelandic

	*Pétur	henti _v		ekki	t _v		út	henni.
a.	Peter	threw		not			away	it
	*Pétur	henti _v		ekki	t _v	henni _i	út	t _i .
b.	Peter	threw		not		it	away	
	Pétur	henti _v	henni _i	ekki	t _v		út	t _i .
c.	Peter	threw	it	not			away	

In Norwegian, the situation is the same as in Icelandic as far as the particle is concerned (the particle may or may not precede its complement independently of whether object shift has taken place), but the object-shift situation is not the same in the two languages as only pronouns undergo object shift in Norwegian. Norwegian versions of the Icelandic (27), (28), and (29) would therefore basically have the same judgments as in Icelandic, with at least one major exception, namely, that (28c) would be ungrammatical in Norwegian because full DPs cannot undergo object shift (though see [Nilsen 1997](#)).

The fact that prepositions and (Swedish) particles block object shift might be related to the blocking of object shift by verbs inside VP. The generalization (first formulated in [Holmberg 1986](#) : 176, 199) could be that object shift is impossible if the object is governed (or assigned case) by an overt governor (or case-assigner) as opposed to object shift of objects which are governed (or assigned case) by the trace of a governor/case-assigner. The crucial difference would thus be that when object shift is blocked by a non-finite verb, a finite main verb in embedded clauses (except in Icelandic), a preposition, or a particle (only in Swedish), the governor/case-assigner is not a trace, but when object shift is not blocked, the governor/case-assigner is a trace (e.g., when the main verb has undergone V2 in main clauses, or in Icelandic when the main verb has moved to I° in embedded clauses). For further discussion of this, see .

The next set of data to be considered is not covered by this generalization. Object shift of a direct object is blocked by an indirect object, (30b) and (31b), even though object shift of both objects, (30c) and (31c), or object shift of the indirect object alone, (30d) and (31d), are not blocked:³

(30)

	Ég	lána _v			ekki	t _v	Maríu	bækurnar.
a.	I	lend			not		Maria. _{DAT}	books-the. _{ACC}
	*Ég	lána _v		bækurnar _i	ekki	t _v	Maríu	t _i .
b.	I	lend		books-the. _{ACC}	not		Maria. _{DAT}	
	Ég	lána _v	Maríu _j	bækurnar _i	ekki	t _v	t _j	t _i .
c.	I	lend	Maria. _{DAT}	books-the. _{ACC}	not			
	Ég	lána _v	Maríu _j		ekki	t _v	t _j	bækurnar.
d.	I	lend	Maria. _{DAT}		not			books-the. _{ACC}
				(Collins and Thráinsson 1993 : 149, 154, 143, 154)				

(31) Danish

	Jeg	låner _v			ikke	t _v	Maria	bøgerne.
a.	I	lend			not		Maria	books-the
	*Jeg	låner _v		dem _i	ikke	t _v	Maria	t _i .
b.	I	lend		them	not		Maria	
	Jeg	låner _v	hende _j	dem _i	ikke	t _v	t _j	t _i .
c.	I	lend	her	them	not			
	Jeg	låner _v	hende _j		ikke	t _v	t _j	bøgerne.
d.	I	lend	her		not			books-the

The reason why the generalization is formulated in terms of the direct object being unable to undergo object shift across the indirect object, rather than the accusative object being unable to undergo object shift across the dative object, is that, as shown by Thráinsson (2001 : 153), e.g., the generalization also holds for examples where both the direct and the indirect object are dative (for more Icelandic data with unexpected morphological cases, see (62), (63), and (64)):⁴

(32)

	Mannræninginn	skilaði _v . . .	
	Kidnapper-the. _{NOM}	returned	
a.	...	aldrei _{t_v}	foreldrunum börnunum.
		never	parents- children-
			the. _{DAT} the. _{DAT}
b.	*...	börnunum _i aldrei _{t_v}	foreldrunum t _i .
		children- never	parents-
		the. _{DAT}	the. _{DAT}
c.	...	foreldrunum _j börnunum _i aldrei _{t_v} t _j	t _i .
		parents- children- never	
		the. _{DAT} the. _{DAT}	
d.	...	foreldrunum _j aldrei _{t_v} t _j	börnunum.
		parents- never	children-
		the. _{DAT}	the. _{DAT}
	‘The kidnapper never returned the children to the parents.’		
	(Thráinsson 2001 : 153, his (14))		

As mentioned earlier, and as discussed in , [Holmberg \(1986 : 176\)](#) suggests that object shift is possible only if the object is governed (or assigned case) by a trace of a governor/case-assigner. The reason is taken to be that traces (of case-assigners) do not necessarily (but only optionally) assign case. As for the double-object data in (30–32), [Holmberg \(1986 : 206\)](#) proposes an account for them in terms of case visibility of an empty preposition which assigns case to the indirect object: If the empty preposition assigns case to the indirect object, it does so only because it is embedded under the verb, and then the verb trace must assign case to the direct object, and none of the objects may undergo object shift; see (30a, b), (31a, b), and (32a, b). If the empty preposition does not assign case to the indirect object, then the verb trace does not have to assign case to the direct object. This allows two situations, either one in which the verb trace does not assign case either, and then both objects undergo object shift; see (30c), (31c), and (32c), or one in which the verb trace does assign case, and then the indirect object undergoes object shift on its own, which is shown in (30d), (31d), and (32d). One problem here is that this empty preposition is taken to move along with the indirect object under object shift, something which overt prepositions never do, see .

In [Vikner \(1989 : 142\)](#), the blocking effect of an indirect object in situ, (30b), (31b), and (32b), is taken to be a relativized minimality effect, assuming that the indirect object is an A-position and object shift is A-movement. [Collins and Thráinsson \(1993 : 158\)](#) suggest an explanation within the Minimalist framework. The features of the head (AgrIO°) attracting the indirect object must be at least as strong as the features attracting the direct object (AgrO°), which means that if AgrO° has strong features (as is necessary to make the direct object move), AgrIO° must have strong features too, which will force the indirect object to move as well. Finally, [Müller \(2001 : 288–294\)](#) suggests an account for this effect (which he refers to as an order preservation effect, cf. shape preservation in [Williams 2003](#)) by means of an optimality-theory constraint called PARALLEL MOVEMENT, which is violated every time a c-command relationship between any two arguments is not the same at all levels (i.e., before and after the various movements).

2.2 Parasitic gaps

A number of differences between object shift and scrambling have often been taken to illustrate that object shift is A-movement and scrambling is A-bar-movement, e.g., in [Holmberg \(1986 : 175\)](#) and [Vikner \(1989: 142, 1994b : 490\)](#). More recently, the assumption that object shift is A-movement has been questioned by, e.g., [Holmberg and Platzack \(1995 : 147\)](#) and [Holmberg \(1999\)](#) .

Following the analysis of [Chomsky \(1982 : 40\)](#) and (1986 a: 56), a parasitic gap may occur only in a construction where A-bar-movement has taken place. Consider the following *wh*-movement constructions

in German and Danish, where parasitic gaps are possible ('t' is the trace, 'e' is the parasitic gap):

(33) German

Welches	Buch _i	haben	alle	[ohne	e _i	zu	lesen]	t _i	ins	Regal	gestellt?
which	book	have	all	without		to	read		into-the	bookcase	put
'Which book did everyone put on the shelf without reading first?'											
										(Müller 1995 : 172)	

(34) Danish

Hvad for en	bog _i	stillede	alle	t _i	hen på	reolen		[uden	at	læse	e _i	først]?
which	book	put	all		onto	bookcase-the		without	to	read		first
'Which book did everyone put on the shelf without reading first?'												

The fact that parasitic gaps may occur in scrambling constructions like (35), but not if scrambling does not take place as in (36), is often considered an indication that scrambling is an instantiation of A-bar-movement (cf., among others, [Bennis and Hoekstra 1984](#) : 65; [Felix 1985](#) : 190; [Müller 1995](#) : 172; [chapter 43](#) in this volume):

(35) German

...	daß	alle	dieses	Buch _i	[ohne	e _i	zu	lesen]	t _i	ins	Regal	gestellt	haben.
	that	all	this	book	without		to	read		into-the	bookcase	put	have
											(Müller 1995 : 173, his (74a))		

(36) German

*...	daß	alle	[ohne	e _i	zu	lesen]	dieses	Buch _i	ins	Regal	gestellt	haben.
	that	all	without		to	read	this	book	into-the	bookcase	put	have
'... that everyone put this book on the shelf without reading (it) first'												
										(Müller 1995 : 173, his (86))		

Object shift, on the other hand, does not trigger parasitic gaps, indicating that it is not an A-bar-movement (as first noted by [Holmberg 1986](#) : 225):

(37) Danish

*Alle	stillede _v	den _i	straks	t _v	t _i	hen på	reolen		[uden	at	læse	e _i	først]
All	put	it	at once			onto	bookcase-the		without	to	read		first

The absence of object shift does not improve (37), see (38), whereas both (37) and (38) are well-formed without the bracketed clause introduced by *without*:

(38) Danish

*... at alle straks stillede den hen på reolen [uden at læse e _i først]
that all at once put it onto bookcase-the without to read first

2.3 Which elements may undergo object shift?

From the standard instantiations of A-movement (passive, raising) and A-bar-movement (*wh*-movement), we know that A-movement is movement into, but A-bar-movement out of, a case-marked position. This distinction forms the basis for some of the arguments in favor of object shift being A-movement and scrambling being A-bar-movement.

Assuming that PPs may not receive case – e.g., they are at best marginal in the subject position of tensed sentences (for English, see, e.g., [Quirk et al. 1985](#) : 736 and [Stowell 1981](#) : 268) – it is possible to account for why PPs may undergo scrambling (39b), (40b), but not object shift (41b), (42b); (43b), (44b). Object shift is movement into a case-marked position, but scrambling is not:

(39) German

	Ich	habe				nicht	für	das	Buch	bezahlt.
a.	I	have				not	for	the	book	paid
	Ich	habe	für	das	Buch _i	nicht	t _i			bezahlt.
b.	I	have	for	the	book	not				paid

(40) German

	Ich	habe		nicht	dafür	bezahlt.
a.	I	have		not	there-for	paid
	Ich	habe	dafür _i	nicht	t _i	bezahlt.
b.	I	have	there-for	not		paid

(41) Icelandic

	Ég	borgaði _v			ekki	t _v	fyrir	bókina.
a.	I	paid			not		for	book-the
	*Ég	borgaði _v	fyrir	bókina _i	ekki	t _v	t _i	
b.	I	paid	for	book-the	not			

(42) Icelandic

	Ég	borgaði _v			ekki	t _v	fyrir	hana.
a.	I	paid			not		for	it
	*Ég	borgaði _v	fyrir	hana _i	ekki	t _v	t _i	
b.	I	paid	for	it	not			

(43)

Danish

	Jeg	betalte _v			ikke	t _v	for	bogen.
a.	I	paid			not		for	book-the
	*Jeg	betalte _v	for	bogen _i	ikke	t _v	t _i	
b.	I	paid	for	book-the	not			

(44) Danish

	Jeg	betalte _v			ikke	t _v	for	den.
a.	I	paid			not		for	it
	*Jeg	betalte _v	for	den _i	ikke	t _v	t _i	
	I	paid	for	it	not			
b.	((39–40) and (43–44) are from Vikner 1994b : 492, his (11–14))							

There are many other types of constituent which fit into the same picture in so far as they are not normally taken to be assigned case and they may not undergo object shift. One such type of constituent is the predicative adjectival, as shown in (45–47), others are, e.g., VPs. However, unlike the situation with PPs, there is no difference between scrambling and object shift here, e.g., predicative adjectivals undergo neither scrambling (45b), nor object shift (46b), (47b):

(45) German

	Peter	ist		nie	krank.
a.	Peter	is		never	ill
	*Peter	ist	krank _i	nie	t _i
b.	Peter	is	ill	never	

(46) Icelandic

	Pétur	er		aldrei	veikur.
a.	Peter	is		never	ill
	*Pétur	er	veikur _i	aldrei	t _i
b.	Peter	is	ill	never	

(47) Danish

	Peter	er		aldrig	syg.
a.	Peter	is		never	ill
	*Peter	er	syg _i	aldrig	t _i
b.	Peter	is	ill	never	

2.4 What is the landing site of object shift?

2.4.1 Object shift is clausebound

At the outset, we said that object shift was a leftward movement of a DP from a position inside VP to a

position outside VP but inside the same clause. The following examples illustrate that, as opposed to scrambling in Russian, e.g., object shift may not move a DP out of a clause (49a):⁵

(48) Russian

Vy	posylku _i	videli	[kak	zapakovali	t _i].	
you	parcel	saw	how (they)	wrapped		
'You saw how they wrapped the parcel.'						(Müller 1995 : 128, his (71b))

(49) Icelandic

	*Ég	veit	bókina _i	[af hverju	þau	seldu		ekki	t _i	].
a.	I	know	book-the	why	they	sold		not		
	Ég	veit		[af hverju	þau	seldu	bókina _i	ekki	t _i	].
b.	I	know		why	they	sold	book-the	not		
	Ég	veit		[af hverju	þau	seldu		ekki	bókina	].
	I	know		why	they	sold		not	book-the	
c.	'I know why they did not sell the book.'									

As was illustrated in , object shift moves a DP to a position which follows the subject and which in main clauses also follows the finite verb (in Icelandic it follows the finite verb also in embedded clauses). The position targeted by object shift furthermore precedes the negation and any (medial) sentential adverbial, both of which again precede all non-finite verbs (in Danish, Faroese, Norwegian, and Swedish embedded clauses, the negation and sentential adverbials also precede the finite verb).

2.4.2 Is object shift movement to an adjoined position?

In the earliest treatment of object shift, [Holmberg \(1986 : 218, 170\)](#), the shifted object is taken to be adjoined to VP in Icelandic and to I-bar in Mainland Scandinavian (i.e., Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish). [Holmberg \(1986 : 170, 93\)](#) is forced to assume adjunction to I-bar in Mainland Scandinavian because of his assumption that the finite verb in embedded clauses occurs in I° in all of the Scandinavian languages. Following [Pollock's \(1989\)](#) suggestions that finite French verbs move to I° whereas finite English verbs remain in V°, [Holmberg and Platzack \(1988\)](#), among others, suggested that the same difference obtains between Icelandic and Mainland Scandinavian. One of the advantages of this view was that the landing site of object shift in Icelandic could now be taken to be the same as the landing site of object shift in Mainland Scandinavian, a view followed by almost all subsequent analyses (cf. also). Consequently [Vikner \(1989, 1994 b\)](#) takes object shift to be adjunction to (the highest) VP in all of the Scandinavian languages (as opposed to scrambling in, e.g., German, which is taken also to allow adjunction to IP). [Holmberg and Platzack \(1995 : 142, 20\)](#) follow a very similar approach in that they take object shift to be adjunction to ActiveP, a functional projection immediately above (the highest) VP.

2.4.3 Is object shift movement to a specifier position?

Whereas most early analyses of object shift thus assume that the shifted object occurs in an adjoined position, almost all later analyses take the shifted object to occur in a specifier position, namely, the specifier position of some functional projection immediately above VP. Two of the earliest suggestions along these lines are [Déprez \(1989 : 226\)](#) and [Johnson \(1991\)](#), who consider object shift movement to [AgrOP, Spec] ([Johnson 1991](#) first refers to the landing site of object shift as μ P-Spec, 1991: 606–608, but

later identifies [μ P, Spec] with [AgrOP, Spec], 1991: 628). This analysis is also found in, e.g., [Chomsky \(1993 : 12–16\)](#), [Bobaljik \(1995 : 80\)](#) and [Collins and Thráinsson \(1996 \)](#).

As [Holmberg \(1999 a: 6–7, 14–15\)](#) points out, the exact position of [AgrOP, Spec] with respect to, e.g., auxiliary verbs is crucial. Compare [Déprez's \(1989 : 113\)](#) analysis in (50a) with [Bobaljik's \(1995 : 83\)](#) in (50b):

(50)	a.	...	[AgrOP	spec	AgrO°	[_{V(aux)}		V°	[_V		V°
	b.	...	[_{V(aux)}		V°				[_V		V°
			P	spec	(aux)			(aux)	(main)P	spec	(main)]]]
			P	spec	(aux)	[AgrOP	spec	AgrO°	(main)P	spec	(main)]]]

[Déprez \(1989 : 113\)](#) situates AgrOP above all VPs in the same clause, whereas [Bobaljik \(1995 : 83\)](#) explicitly situates AgrOP immediately above the VP of the main verb and below the VP of the auxiliary (or the VPs of the auxiliaries). Given that a shifted object always precedes negation and (medial) sentential adverbs, these two analyses then make different predictions as to whether the auxiliary V° follows or precedes negation and (medial) sentential adverbs. The fact that all non-finite auxiliaries in Scandinavian as well as all finite auxiliaries in Mainland Scandinavian embedded clauses follow rather than precede the negation and (medial) sentential adverbs is only compatible with an analysis such as (50a), where the potential landing site of object shift precedes all VPs.

In a reaction to this criticism, [Bobaljik \(2002 : 225\)](#) explicitly assumes both that negation (and presumably also sentential adverbials) always adjoin to the highest VP of the clause and that object shift is to the specifier position of an AgrOP, which is right above the VP of the verb that selects the shifting object. In other words, only when the highest VP is also the VP of the main verb (i.e., the verb that selects the shifting object), does the [AgrOP, Spec] position targeted by object shift precede the negation (and sentential adverbials). This makes the prediction that if it should be possible to have object shift in a clause where the finite verb and the object-selecting main verb are not the same verb (something which is normally excluded, cf. (8b), (9b), and (11b) above), the shifted object (which is in [AgrOP, Spec] right above the VP of the main verb) should follow, not precede, the negation (which is adjoined to the VP of the finite auxiliary verb). As [Bobaljik \(2002 : 235\)](#) himself notes (“it might leave as problematic the respective order of the pronoun and negation”), this is precisely the wrong prediction for the central example of [Holmberg \(1999 : 7\)](#), here given as (51c). The (shifted) object has to precede the negation, even though the sentence contains both a finite auxiliary and a non-finite main verb (which has been topicalized) (Example (51c) is a Danish version of [Holmberg's Swedish 1999 : 7, \(11a\)](#)):⁶

(51) Danish

a.	*Kysset _x	har _v	jeg		ikke	[_{VP}	t _v		[_{VP}	t _x	hende	]],	...
	Kissed	has	I		not						her		
b.	*Kysset _x	har _v	jeg		ikke	[_{VP}	t _v	hende _i	[_{VP}	t _x	t _i	]],	...
	Kissed	has	I		not			her					
c.	Kysset _x	har _v	jeg	hende _i	ikke	[_{VP}	t _v		[_{VP}	t _x	t _i	]],	...
	Kissed	has	I	her	not								

...	bare	holdt	hende	i	hånden.
	only	held	her	in	hand-the
'Kissed her, I haven't, only held her hand.'					

It would thus seem that [Holmberg's \(1999 : 6–7, 14–15\)](#) criticism of at least some [AgrOP, Spec] analyses is still highly relevant.

Even though [Johnson \(1991 \)](#) and [Chomsky \(1993 : 12–16\)](#), e.g., do not explicitly say where an auxiliary VP would be placed in the structure, the above criticism applies to these analyses as well because both require that all main verbs (even non-finite ones) move to AgrO°; for [Johnson \(1991 \)](#) because non-finite

main verbs, too, exhibit the positional effects he accounts for by assuming V° -to- AgrO° movement, and for [Chomsky \(1993 : 12–16\)](#) because all main verbs must move to AgrO° to make it possible for the object in all types of clauses to undergo overt or covert object shift to $[\text{AgrOP}, \text{Spec}]$ to have its object case checked (see also below on ‘equidistance’). The point is that the main verb could not possibly move to AgrO° if an auxiliary V° would intervene between AgrO° and the main V° . On the other hand, as outlined above, the auxiliary V° must intervene between AgrO° and the main V° to produce the correct predictions for (51b, c).

Similar to the $[\text{AgrOP}, \text{Spec}]$ analyses are the analyses of object shift as movement to (or through) $[\text{TenseP}, \text{Spec}]$, as in [Bobaljik and Jonas \(1996\)](#) or [Bošković \(2004\)](#), or as movement to the specifier position of an IP-internal TopicP, as in [Jayaseelan \(2001 : 71\)](#) or [Josefsson \(2001\)](#). However, as long as the position targeted by object shift is a position above even the highest VP of the clause, these analyses are not subject to [Holmberg's \(1999 : 6–7, 14–15\)](#) criticism discussed above. [Nilsen \(1997\)](#) and [Cinque \(1999 : 115\)](#), who assume the existence of a large number of functional projections inside IP but above VP, suggest that object shift may end in the specifier position of most if not all of these functional projections. These analyses are not subject to the criticisms voiced above as they assume that auxiliary verbs may be inserted in a large number of different functional heads, depending on the meaning of the auxiliary.

In some recent discussions of object shift, the landing site of object shift is left open, e.g., in [Holmberg \(1999\)](#). Similarly, whereas [Chomsky \(1995c : 360\)](#) suggests that object shift is movement to the outer of two specifier positions of vP, [Chomsky \(2001b : 33\)](#) makes it clear that although object shift moves through this position, it does not end there (in [Chomsky 2001b : 33](#), two different movements, namely, Object Shift and Disl, correspond to what is normally called object shift, as also pointed out by [Svenonius 2001](#)).

2.4.4 Landing site between two adverbials

One of the reasons given by [Holmberg and Platzack \(1995 : 152\)](#) for analyzing object shift as movement to an adjoined position rather than movement to $[\text{AgrOP}, \text{Spec}]$ are the adjacency effects discussed by [Vikner \(1994b : 493–497\)](#). Here the data will first be discussed from the point of view of the adjunction analysis, and only afterwards will the specifier analysis be considered.

According to [Stowell \(1981 : 113\)](#), case-assignment under government requires the case assigner and the case assignee to be adjacent. If object shift is movement to a case-assigned position, its landing site would have to be adjacent to a case assigner. If this case assigner is I° (or rather the verb or verb trace inside I°), the landing site of object shift would have to be adjacent to the verb or verb trace in I° . Although adjacency to a trace (including adjacency to a verb trace in I°) is impossible to see, the fact that I° itself is adjacent to the subject in $[\text{IP}, \text{Spec}]$ (assuming that adverbials or other elements cannot adjoin to intermediate projections like $I\text{-bar}$) means that when I° only contains a trace, adjacency to I° results in surface adjacency to the subject in $[\text{IP}, \text{Spec}]$. In other words, under these assumptions an account can be made for why object-shifted objects (and also floating quantifiers referring to object-shifted objects) may not occur separated from the subject in $[\text{IP}, \text{Spec}]$ or from the verb in I° by an adverbial (as [Holmberg and Platzack 1995 : 182](#) note, this argumentation may be seen as support of the assumption that Mainland Scandinavian has an I° -position, even though it is never overtly filled by a verb). In scrambling, on the other hand, nothing prevents the scrambled element (or a floated quantifier referring to a scrambled element) from occurring between two adverbials.

In (52c), (53c), (54c), and (55c), the scrambled or object-shifted object has been adjoined to the left of two adverbials; in (52b), (53b),⁷ (54b), and (55b), the object has been adjoined between two adverbials (which prevents it from being adjacent to $[\text{IP}, \text{Spec}]$ or I°); and in (52a), (53a), (54a), and (55a), no movement has taken place at all:

(52)

	Gestern				hat _v		Peter		...			
	yesterday				has		Peter					
a.	...			ohne	Zweifel			nicht	das	Buch	gelesen	t _v
				without	doubt			not	the	book	read	
b.	...			ohne	Zweifel	das	Buch _i	nicht	t _i		gelesen	t _v
				without	doubt	the	book	not			read	
c.	...	das	Buch _i	ohne	Zweifel			nicht	t _i		gelesen	t _v
		the	book	without	doubt			not			read	
'Yesterday Peter undoubtedly did not read this book'												

(53) Icelandic

a.	Í gær	las _v	Pétur		eflaust		ekki	t _v	bókina.
	yesterday	read	Peter		doubtlessly		not		book-the
b.	*Í gær	las _v	Pétur		eflaust	bókina _i	ekki	t _v	t _i
	yesterday	read	Peter		doubtlessly	book-the	not		
c.	Í gær	las _v	Pétur	bókina _i	eflaust		ekki	t _v	t _i
	yesterday	read	Peter	book-the	doubtlessly		not		
‘Yesterday Peter undoubtedly did not read this book’									
(Examples (52) and (53) are from Vikner 1994 : 493–494, his (15–16))									

Neither scrambling nor object shift (of a full DP) is obligatory, cf. (52a) and (53a), though see on focus. The crucial difference is that whereas a scrambled object may land anywhere, (52b, c), an object-shifted object may only land in a position adjacent to I°, (53b, c). ([Jónsson 1996](#) : 66 finds an example of the same type as (53b) to be only marginal rather than completely ungrammatical.)

In the other Scandinavian languages, object shift may seem to be obligatory, but this is because, as mentioned above, only pronominal objects undergo object shift, and pronominal-object shift is obligatory (see below, and recall that [Josefsson 2003](#) : 200–202 shows object shift of pronouns in Swedish to be optional rather than obligatory). That this is a difference between pronouns and full DP objects is illustrated by pronominal data from Icelandic, compare (55) to (53):

(54) Danish

a.	*I går	læste _v	Peter		uden	tvivl		ikke	t _v	den
	yesterday	read	Peter		without	doubt		not		it
b.	*I går	læste _v	Peter		uden	tvivl	den _i	ikke	t _v	t _i
	yesterday	read	Peter		without	doubt	it	not		
c.	I går	læste _v	Peter	den _i	uden	tvivl		ikke	t _v	t _i
	yesterday	read	Peter	it	without	doubt		not		
‘Yesterday Peter undoubtedly did not read it’										

(55)

Icelandic

	*Í gær	las _v	Pétur		eflaust		ekki	t _v	hana
a.	yesterday	read	Peter		doubtlessly		not		it
	*Í gær	las _v	Pétur		eflaust	hana _i	ekki	t _v	t _i
b.	yesterday	read	Peter		doubtlessly	it	not		
	Í gær	las _v	Pétur	hana _i	eflaust		ekki	t _v	t _i
	yesterday	read	Peter	it	doubtlessly		not		
	‘Yesterday Peter undoubtedly did not read it’								
c.	(Examples (54) and (55) are from Vikner (1994b) : 493–494, his (17–18))								

The only two possible object positions in sentences where object shift is allowed are thus the base position of the object and a position preceding all (medial) sentential adverbs and negation. In other words, the object has to be adjacent either to V° or to I°, as expected if it receives case from either V° (if object shift does not apply) or I° (when object shift has applied).

Let us now turn to similar evidence involving so-called floating quantifiers. According to [Sportiche \(1988\)](#), a floated quantifier (see [chapter 71](#)) may occur only in positions in which the quantified NP may occur, or through which the quantified NP may have moved. [Giusti \(1990\)](#) applies this analysis to scrambling and object shift, arguing that both these movements are included in those that may leave floating quantifiers behind.

As shown by the following examples, the possible positions of floated quantifiers are the same as the possible positions of the object; that is to say that any position is possible in scrambling (56), but only the position preceding the adverbials and the base position are possible in object shift (57):

(56) German

	Peter	wird	die _i	Bücher _i		ohne	Zweifel		nie	alle _i	t _i	lesen.
a.	Peter	will	the	books		without	doubt		never	all		read
	Peter	wird	die _i	Bücher _i		ohne	Zweifel	alle _i	nie		t _i	lesen.
b.	Peter	will	the	books		without	doubt	all	never			read
	Peter	wird	die _i	Bücher _i	alle _i	ohne	Zweifel		nie		t _i	lesen.
	Peter	will	the	books	all	without	doubt		never			read
c.	‘Peter will undoubtedly never read all the books’											

(57) Icelandic

	Pétur	las _v		bækurnar _i	eflaust		ekki	allar _i	t _v	t _i
a.	Peter	read		books-the	doubtlessly		not	all		
	*Pétur	las _v		bækurnar _i	eflaust	allar _i	ekki		t _v	t _i
b.	Peter	read		books-the	doubtlessly	all	not			
	Pétur	las _v	allar	bækurnar _i	eflaust		ekki		t _v	t _i
	Peter	read	all	books-the	doubtlessly		not			
	‘Peter undoubtedly never read all the books’									
c.	(Examples (56) and (57) are from Vikner (1994b) : 496, his (20), (21))									

Admittedly, the ungrammaticality of (57b) is not directly explained by the adjacency requirement discussed

above, as case is assigned to the NP *bækurnar* or *allar bækurnar*, which is adjacent to I° in all three cases in (5). One possible account for (57b) would be that it shows that the object cannot have moved through a position between the adverbials on its way to its surface position, maybe because such a position would not be an A-position (making the movement an instance of ‘improper movement’, cf., e.g., [Chomsky 1981](#) : 195, 199), or because there would be no need for object shift to go via this position.

Summing up so far, if object shift is movement to an adjoined position, the data in (52–57) may be explained by assuming case may be assigned to an adjoined position, provided adjacency is respected.

If, on the other hand, object shift is movement to [AgrOP, Spec], then the requirements that the shifted object precede both negation and sentential adverbials must stem from [AgrOP, Spec] preceding the position of negation and medial sentential adverbials. This again would have to mean either (a) that scrambling (in Continental West Germanic) and object shift (in Scandinavian) have different landing sites (i.e., they cannot both be movement to [AgrOP, Spec]) or (b) that negation and the sentential adverbials have different positions in the two types of language. To be more precise, if object shift and scrambling target the same position (as assumed, e.g., by [Bobaljik 2002](#) : 230–233), negation and sentential adverbials in Continental West Germanic must be possible both to the left and to the right of this target [AgrOP, Spec], whereas negation and sentential adverbial in Scandinavian have to be restricted to the right of the target [AgrOP, Spec].

Notice finally that adjacency as discussed here is very different from what [Bobaljik \(2002 : 210–221\)](#) calls adjacency, e.g., in that two elements may be adjacent in Bobaljik's sense even though an adverbial occurs between them.

2.5 Summary: object shift vs. scrambling

Throughout, the properties of object shift in Scandinavian have been compared to the less restricted characteristics of scrambling in languages like Dutch and German (see (58)). Two additional differences between the Scandinavian languages were shown to follow from independent variation. First, only in Icelandic is object shift possible in embedded clauses, because only in Icelandic do all finite verbs move to I°, see examples (12) and (13b). Second, only in Swedish is object shift actually blocked by a particle, because only in Swedish does the object never precede the particle, see examples (22) and (23).

Section	Property	Object shift in Scandinavian	Scrambling in, e.g., German and Dutch
2.1.1	May take place independently of verb movement out of VP	No	Yes
(58) 2.1.2	May cross a preposition	No	Yes
	May cross a particle	No	Yes
	May cross an indirect object	No	Yes
2.2	Allows a parasitic gap	No	Yes
2.3	Moves (pronominal) DPs	Yes	Yes
	Moves PPs	No	Yes
	Moves predicative APs	No	No
2.4.1	May cross a clause boundary	No	No (Russian: yes)
2.4.4	May land between adverbials	No	Yes

One difference between the Scandinavian languages which does not follow from independent variation is that only in Icelandic do full DPs undergo object shift, see examples (4) and (5). In the other Scandinavian languages only pronominal DPs undergo object shift, see examples (6) and (7). This is further discussed in .

discussed which kind of position is targeted by object shift (and scrambling), and showed that although there is no general agreement in the literature, there is a growing trend to assume the landing site to be a specifier position rather than an adjoined position.

3 Case as the key to object shift

[1 Introduction](#) [2 Differences between object shift and scrambling](#) [4 Equidistance as the key to object shift](#) [5 Focus and interpretation as the key to object shift](#) [6 Conclusion: a few recent accounts](#) [NOTES](#) [REFERENCES](#)

3.1 Traces of case assigners are optional case assigners

As mentioned in , [Holmberg \(1986 : 176\)](#) was the first to suggest an analysis of object shift where case assignment by a trace is optional, as also assumed in [Vikner \(1994b : 500\)](#) and [Holmberg and Platzack \(1995 : 166\)](#). This means that in structures where we would expect a DP to be assigned case by a V° , such case assignment is only obligatory if V° contains a verb. If V° does not contain a verb but only its trace, this V° assigns case optionally. In other words, if a verb has moved out of VP, it is possible for its object not to be assigned case by the verb trace, and therefore to move into a different position and be assigned case there. If an object is assigned case not by the trace of a verb, but by the verb itself (i.e., if the verb has not left VP), this case assignment is not optional but obligatory, and therefore the object is not free to move into a different position and be assigned case there. How is the shifted object assigned case, then, if not by V° ? In [Holmberg \(1986 : 208, 217\)](#), the shifted objects are not assigned case at all: because shifted objects (in Swedish only pronouns, in Icelandic all DPs) have morphological case, they do not need to be assigned case syntactically. One problem for this hypothesis is that, as illustrated in the next section, full DP objects have morphological case in Faroese, and yet they may not undergo object shift.

3.2 The role of morphological case

Morphological case is realized on all DPs only in two of the Scandinavian languages – Faroese and Icelandic.

(59)

<i>the book</i>	Icelandic	Faroese	Danish	Swedish	Norwegian
Nominative	bókin	bókin	bogen	boken	boka/boken
Accusative	bókina	bókina	bogen	boken	boka/boken
Dative	bókinni	bókini	bogen	boken	boka/boken
					(Vikner 1994b : 502)

From the point of view of case morphology, Faroese thus patterns with Icelandic against the other Scandinavian languages, whereas as far as object shift is concerned, Faroese is more like the other Scandinavian languages, see (6) and (7), than like Icelandic, see (4) and (5):

(60) Faroese

	Jógvan	keypti _v		ikki	[_{VP}	t _v	bókina	].
a.	Jógvan	bought		not			book-the.ACC	
	*Jógvan	keypti _v	bókina _i	ikki	[_{VP}	t _v	t _i	].
	Jógvan	bought	book-the.ACC	not				
b.								(Barnes 1992 : 28)

(61)

a.	*Jógvan	keypti _v		ikki	[_{VP}	t _v	hana	].
	Jógvan	bought		not			it.ACC	
b.	Jógvan	keypti _v	hana _i	ikki	[_{VP}	t _v	t _i	].
	Jógvan	bought	it.ACC	not				
								(Vikner 1994b : 502)

According to [Sundquist \(2002\)](#), a similar situation obtained in Middle Norwegian, in that morphological case was also found outside the pronominal system, and yet object shift was restricted to pronouns. In early modern English, too, we find only pronominal-object shift and not object shift of full DPs ([Roberts 1995](#) : 274–276). From the point of view of case this is less surprising, as early modern English did not have morphological case outside the pronominal system. Object shift in early modern English is of course remarkable in the fact that it shows that object shift may also be found in a non-Scandinavian language, indeed in a non-V2 language. Another potential problem related to morphological case is that in Icelandic the direct object does not always have accusative case, but may have one of the other three cases: The object is genitive in (62), dative in (63), and even nominative in (64) (where the subject is dative; see [Sigurðsson 1989](#) : 198–241; [Taraldsen 1995](#)):

(62) Icelandic

	Í gær		leitaði _v		Pétur		. . .	
	yesterday		looked-for		Peter.NOM			
a.	. . .		sennilega		ekki	t _v	þessarar	bókar.
			probably		not		this	book.GEN
b.	*. . .		sennilega	þessarar	bókar _i	ekki	t _v	t _i .
			probably	this	book.GEN	not		
c.	. . .	þessarar	bókar _i	sennilega		ekki	t _v	t _i .
		this	book.GEN	probably		not		
	‘Yesterday Peter probably did not look for this book.’							
							(Vikner 1994b : 512)	

(63) Icelandic

	Í gær		lýsti _v		Pétur		. . .	
	yesterday		described		Peter.NOM			
a.	. . .		sennilega		ekki	t _v	þessari	bók.
			probably		not		this	book.DAT
b.	*. . .		sennilega	þessari	bók _i	ekki	t _v	t _i .
			probably	this	book.DAT	not		
c.	. . .	þessari	bók _i	sennilega		ekki	t _v	t _i .
		this	book.DAT	probably		not		
	‘Yesterday Peter probably did not describe this book.’							
							(Vikner 1994b : 512)	

(64)

Icelandic

	Í dag	þykir _v	þér	...
	today	thinks.3.SG	you.SG.DAT	

	?. . .		sennilega			ekki	t _v	þessi	bók . . .
a.			probably			not		this	book.NOM
	*. . .		sennilega	þessi	bók _i	ekki	t _v	t _i	. . .
b.			probably	this	book.NOM	not			
	. . .	þessi	bók _i	sennilega		ekki	t _v	t _i	. . .
		this	book.NOM	probably		not			
							. . .	skemmtileg.	
								amusing.NOM	
c.	'Today you probably do not find this book amusing.'								

The standard view on oblique case is that it is inherent or lexical case, which is assigned together with the thematic role (see [Marantz 1984](#) : 81 or [Andrews 1990](#) and references there). To analyze these facts in a way compatible both with this standard view and with the analysis that object shift is movement to a case-assigned position, inherent case (i.e., case which is assigned at D-structure) would have to be licensed at S-structure, and this licensing would have to take place under conditions identical to the ones under which structural case assignment takes place.

3.3 Case assignment from I°

[Holmberg's \(1986](#) : 208, 217) suggestion that shifted objects are not assigned case at all as they do not need case assignment because they have morphological case thus predicts that objects may shift if and only if they have morphological case. The ungrammaticality of full DP object shift in Faroese, (60b), was a direct counter-example to this analysis.

In [Vikner \(1994b](#) : 500) and in [Holmberg and Platzack \(1995](#) : 152), the shifted object is assigned case from I°. Vikner further suggests that a non-nominative case cannot be assigned by an X° which is already assigning nominative, e.g., C° in V2-languages and I° in non-V2-languages. Thus, object shift never occurs into a position preceding the verb, where C° is busy assigning nominative case (though see note 8 on long object shift in Swedish), and object shift never occurs at all in non-V2 languages, where I° is busy assigning nominative case, although object shift in early modern English, mentioned in the previous section, is a problem for this claim because early modern English is not a V2-language. The fact that early modern English is a VO-language and that it does not allow object shift of full DPs also excludes scrambling as a possible analysis.

The formulation of Holmberg's generalization is referred to the (obligatory) movement of the selecting verb, rather than to the (obligatory) movement of the case-assigning verb. The possibility of object shift in two particular contexts, perception verbs, and causative verbs, however, indicate that case-assignment is the relevant notion rather than selection, which again lends further, if rather indirect, support to the idea that case assignment is the key to object shift. For reasons of exposition, this will only be illustrated with perception verbs. A perception verb like *see* may either select a DP or an embedded clause as its object, and if it selects an embedded clause, this may either be finite or non-finite. When *see* selects a non-finite embedded clause, as in (65–70), the subject of the embedded clause is not selected by *see* but by the verb (or the VP) of the embedded clause, *beat*. There is nevertheless a particular relation between *see* and the embedded subject, as *see* is taken to assign case to the embedded subject, so this subject is accusative in spite of its being a subject, as witnessed by its form, which is *þá* 'them.MASC' rather than *þeir* 'they.MASC' in Icelandic (66b), and *dem* 'them' rather than *de* 'they' in Danish (68b).

(65)

a.	Pétur	sá _v		áreiðanlega	[_{VP}	t _v	[_{IP}	FH	vinna	Hauka	]].
	Pétur	saw		presumably				FH	beat	Haukar	
b.	Pétur	sá _v	FH _i	áreiðanlega	[_{VP}	t _v	[_{IP}	t _i	vinna	Hauka	]].
	Pétur	saw	FH	presumably					beat	Haukar	

(66) Icelandic

a.	*Pétur	sá _v		áreiðanlega	[_{VP}	t _v	[_{IP}	þá	vinna	Hauka	]].
	Pétur	saw		presumably				them	beat	Haukar	
b.	Pétur	sá _v	þá _i	áreiðanlega	[_{VP}	t _v	[_{IP}	t _i	vinna	Hauka	]].
	Pétur	saw	them	presumably					beat	Haukar	

(67) Danish

a.	Peter	så _v		formentlig	[_{VP}	t _v	[_{IP}	AGF	slå	FC København	]].
	Peter	saw		presumably				AGF	beat	FC Copenhagen	
b.	*Peter	så _v	AGF _i	formentlig	[_{VP}	t _v	[_{IP}	t _i	slå	FC København	]].
	Peter	saw	AGF	presumably					beat	FC Copenhagen	

(68) Danish

a.	*Peter	så _v		formentlig	[_{VP}	t _v	[_{IP}	dem	slå	FC København	]].
	Peter	saw		presumably				them	beat	FC Copenhagen	
b.	Peter	så _v	dem _i	formentlig	[_{VP}	t _v	[_{IP}	t _i	slå	FC København	]].
	Peter	saw	them	presumably					beat	FC Copenhagen	

In spite of the relation between *see* and the embedded subject, *FH/þá/ AGF/dem*, being one of case-assignment and not one of selection, the verb movement of *see* allows the embedded subject to undergo object shift in the usual fashion, i.e., obligatorily if it is a pronoun (66) and (68), optionally if it is an Icelandic full DP (65), and not at all if it is a Danish full DP (67).

That (65–68) are cases of object shift, i.e., that the embedded subject is moving around an adverbial of the main clause in (65b), (66b), and (68b), is supported by the fact that the adverbial in question, *presumably*, is a speaker-oriented adverbial which only occurs as a sentential adverbial in main clauses; it is ill-formed to the right of the main clause participle, *seen*:

(69)

	Pétur	hefur _v	áreiðanlega	[_{VP}	t _v	[_{VP}	séð	[_{IP}	FH	vinna	Hauka	]]].
a.	Pétur	has	presumably				seen		FH	beat	Haukar	
	*Pétur	hefur	séð	áreiðanlega				FH	vinna	Hauka.		
b.	Pétur	has	seen	presumably				FH	beat	Haukar		
	*Pétur	hefur	séð	FH	áreiðanlega			vinna	Hauka.			
c.	Pétur	has	seen	FH	presumably			beat	Haukar			

(70) Danish

	Peter	har _v	formentlig	[_{VP}	t _v	[_{VP}	set	[_{IP}	AGF	slå	FC København	]]].
a.	Peter	has	presumably				seen		AGF	beat	FC Copenhagen	
	*Peter	har	set	formentlig				AGF	slå	FC København.		
b.	Peter	has	seen	presumably				AGF	beat	FC Copenhagen		
	*Peter	har	set	AGF	formentlig			slå	FC København.			
c.	Peter	has	seen	AGF	presumably			beat	FC Copenhagen			

Summarizing, it was shown how assuming case assignment by a verb trace to be optional was an attempt to account for Holmberg's generalization. Object shift is possible only if the case-assigning verb leaves VP because only then is the case-assigned DP assigned case by a trace, which again means that only then is it possible for this DP not to be assigned case and therefore to move into a case position higher up in the clause.

3.4 Pronominal-object shift as cliticization

If case were crucial for object shift in the manner described in the previous section, we might expect that one of two situations would obtain in a given language: either all objects may undergo object shift (provided all other conditions on object shift were fulfilled), or no objects may undergo object shift at all. There would be no reason to expect pronouns (i.e., pronominal DPs) to behave any differently from full DPs, given that all DPs are alike in requiring case. However, the two types of object do behave differently with respect to object shift cross-linguistically.

In Icelandic, both pronominal objects and full DP objects may undergo object shift, see (4) and (5) above, whereas in the other Scandinavian languages (Danish, Faroese, Norwegian, and Swedish), only pronominal objects may undergo object shift, full DP objects may not, see (6), (7), (60), and (61).

Before discussing potential accounts of this difference, I shall give some further examples. ‘Strong’ pronouns (i.e., pronouns which are stressed, modified, or coordinated, cf. [Holmberg 1986](#) : 209) differ from pronominals which are not stressed, modified, or coordinated. As seen in (5) and (7) above, normally, pronouns obligatorily undergo object shift (though only optionally in Swedish, as mentioned in connection with (7)). Strong pronouns, however, behave like full DPs in this respect, i.e., they may optionally undergo object shift in Icelandic, see (4), and they may not undergo object shift in Danish, see (6).

The strong pronouns in (71) and (73) are stressed versions of the unstressed pronouns in (5) and (7), i.e., Icelandic *hana* and Danish *den* ‘it’. The strong pronouns in (72) and (74) are Icelandic *þessa hérna* and Danish *den her*, ‘this here’. The result would have been the same with expressions such as Icelandic *þessa með rauðu kápuna* or Danish *den med det røde omslag* ‘the one with the red cover’.

(71)

Icelandic: strong pronouns may undergo object shift

	Af hverju	las _v	Pétur		aldrei	[_{VP}	t _v	HANA	]?
a.	why	read	Peter		never			it	
	Af hverju	las _v	Pétur	HANA _i	aldrei	[_{VP}	t _v	t _i	]?
b.	why	read	Peter	it	never				

(72) Icelandic: full DPs may undergo object shift

	Af hverju	las _v	Pétur			aldrei	[_{VP}	t _v	þessa	hérna	]?
a.	why	read	Peter			never			this	here	
	Af hverju	las _v	Pétur	þessa	hérna _i	aldrei	[_{VP}	t _v	t _i		]?
b.	why	read	Peter	this	here	never					

(73) Danish: strong pronouns do not undergo object shift

	Hvorfor	læste _v	Peter		aldrig	[_{VP}	t _v	DEN	]?
a.	why	read	Peter		never			it	
	*Hvorfor	læste _v	Peter	DEN _i	aldrig	[_{VP}	t _v	t _i	]?
b.	why	read	Peter	it	never				

(74) Danish: full DPs do not undergo object shift

	Hvorfor	læste _v	Peter			aldrig	[_{VP}	t _v	den	her	]?
a.	why	read	Peter			never			this	here	
	*Hvorfor	læste _v	Peter	den	her _i	aldrig	[_{VP}	t _v	t _i		]?
b.	why	read	Peter	this	here	never					

Let us now turn to some proposed accounts of the difference between pronominal-object shift and full DP object shift. A number of analyses take pronominal-object shift to be X^o-movement along the lines of, e.g., cliticization in the Romance languages (Holmberg 1991a : 167; Josefsson 1992, 1993 ; Déprez 1994 : 122; Bobaljik and Jonas 1996 : 207; Diesing 1996 : 77, 1997 : 415). The main advantage of such an approach is that the question of whether or not a language has object shift can now be turned into the question of whether or not a language has full DP object shift, and this can then plausibly be tied to whether or not I^o (or T^o) has strong features. I^o (or T^o) can be argued to have strong features in Icelandic (as reflected in the presence of V^o-to-I^o movement), but weak features in the other Scandinavian languages (which lack V^o-to-I^o movement). The main drawback, to be further discussed below, is that although it may become easier to account for whether or not a language has object shift of full DPs, it becomes much more difficult to account for whether or not a language has pronominal-object shift, as the differences between pronominal-object shift in Scandinavian and cliticization in Romance become unexpected (e.g., why do the former but not the latter observe Holmberg's generalization?).

As pointed out in Vikner (1994b : 504–506) and Holmberg and Platzack (1995 : 154–156), assuming pronominal-object shift to be X^o-movement is problematic for at least two reasons. One is that the object-shifted pronoun behaves differently from a Romance clitic pronoun, in that object-shifted pronouns do not occur in C^o together with the finite verb, whereas Romance clitic pronouns do. If the object-shifted pronoun has incorporated into the verb, it should not only move along with the verb when the verb moves from V^o to I^o (which it arguably does; shifted objects occur adjacent to I^o, see), but it should also move along with the verb when the verb moves from I^o to C^o. The latter is quite clearly not the case, (75a):

(75)

Danish

a.	*Hvorfor	[C°	læste-	den _v	]	Peter	[I°	t _v		]	aldrig	[VP	t _v	t _i]	?
	why		read	it		Peter					never				
b.	Hvorfor	[C°	læste _v		]	Peter	[I°	t _v -	den _i	]	aldrig	[VP	t _v	t _i]	?
	why		read			Peter			it		never				
‘Why did Peter never read it?’															

Not only would (75a) incorrectly be expected to be grammatical, but (75b) would also, again incorrectly, be expected to be ungrammatical. Although it should not be possible for the pronoun to be left behind in I° when the verb moves on to C° (see [Kayne 1991](#) : 649, who says a trace cannot be “a proper subpart of a X° constituent,” referring to [Baker 1988a](#) : 73), this is exactly how (75b) would have to be analyzed if pronominal-object shift were X°-movement: the trace of the verb which has moved to C° is a proper subpart of I°.

It is of course possible to revise the analyses of [Kayne \(1991](#) : 649) and [Baker \(1988a](#) : 73), and to allow some form of excorporation, as in [Roberts \(1991a](#) : 214–216). However, it is far from clear that this could be done in such a way as to rule out (75a) and rule in (75b) without doing the same to the Romance data. In French, for instance, ruling out (76a) and allowing (76b) would be problematic, as the French judgments are the exact mirror image of the Scandinavian ones; compare (76) and (75):⁸

(76) French

a.	Où	[C°	I _i '	avait _v]-	il	[I°	t _v		]	[VP	t _v	[VP	acheté	t _i	]]?
	where		it-	had	he								bought		
b.	*Où	[C°		avait _v]-	il	[I°	le _i	t _v	]	[VP	t _v	[VP	acheté	t _i	]]?
	where			had	he		it						bought		
‘Where had he bought it?’															

[Josefsson \(1993](#) : 21–22) says about the above difference that Scandinavian has weak pronouns, i.e., what she calls independent heads, whereas Romance has clitics, i.e., dependent heads. The crucial difference is that only independent heads are able to excorporate. However, the ability to excorporate is exactly the property that we are trying to account for, and so we arrive at a restatement of the problem above; if pronominal-object shift is X°-movement along the lines of cliticization in Romance, why do the two not behave alike? The other problem with the assumption that pronominal-object shift is X°-movement is connected with the fact that Scandinavian pronouns (if they should turn out to be clitics) would be clitics on the right side of their incorporating heads, as opposed to Romance clitics, which are on the left; see (76a).

If the Scandinavian pronoun were to incorporate into the verb already in the V°-position, we would expect a situation (e.g., right before verb movement to C°) in which finite tense endings would follow the compound head consisting of the verb and the incorporated pronominal object, which clearly is not the case; cf. (3c) with (77).

(77) Danish

*	...	[I°	[T°	[V°	[V°	læs-	]	dem	]	-te	]]	...
						read-		them		PAST		

(I am assuming here, along with [Roberts 2001](#) : 122, that [Baker's 1988a](#) : 13–15 mirror principle is relevant for the sequence of morphemes in complex words, even in a framework where such elements are checked in the relevant functional heads rather than base-generated there, as originally assumed by [Baker 1988a](#) .)

If on the other hand the Scandinavian pronoun were to incorporate into the verb at some point higher than V° (e.g., in T° or in I°), then it would have to be able to move at least one step as an XP since it would have

to be able to move out of VP without incorporating into V° . If this were possible, however, then we would no longer have an account for Holmberg's generalization, i.e., for why it is necessary for the verb to move out of VP even for pronominal-object shift to be possible. There would in effect be no difference in this respect between an incorporation analysis of Scandinavian object shift and cliticization in Romance, where the object clearly does not incorporate into V° ; the object is not incorporated into the main verb *acheté* 'bought' in (76a).

It would thus seem that there are good reasons not to take pronominal-object shift to be X° -movement along the lines of cliticization in Romance. But then, what is it? And if pronominal-object shift is no different from object shift of full DPs, we have no account of why four out of five Scandinavian languages have the former but not the latter. Recent accounts (including the ones to be discussed in the rest of this chapter) have very little to add to this discussion; although [Holmberg \(1999 : 22\)](#) and [Chomsky \(2001b : 33\)](#) both assume that pronominal-object shift is XP-movement as well, they do not attempt to account for why pronominal-object shift is also found in at least four languages that do not have object shift of full DPs.

4 Equidistance as the key to object shift

[1 Introduction](#) [2 Differences between object shift and scrambling](#) [3 Case as the key to object shift](#)
[5 Focus and interpretation as the key to object shift](#) [6 Conclusion: a few recent accounts](#) [NOTES](#)
[REFERENCES](#)

The so-called equidistance account ([Chomsky 1993 : 15–19](#)) is an alternative to Holmberg's generalization. The idea is that the reason why object shift is possible only if the main verb leaves VP is that this verb movement is necessary to allow the object to move across [VP, Spec], which is where the subject is base-generated.

[Chomsky \(1993 : 15–19\)](#) thus solves two problems at the same time. One problem is to find a reason for Holmberg's generalization, the other, to explain how object shift (as A-movement) may move across the base position of the subject in [VP, Spec] (which is an A-position), in violation of relativized minimality and/or the shortest movement condition. In other words, how can the object move from its base position, as in (78a) across [VP, Spec] into a higher specifier position, here [AgrOP, Spec], as in (78b)?

(78)

a.				[_{VP}	Subject	V°	Object	]
b.	[_{AgrOP}	Object	$AgrO^\circ$	[_{VP}	Subject	V°	t_{obj}	]]

[Chomsky's \(1993 : 18\)](#) suggestion is that if and only if the verb moves from V° to $AgrO^\circ$ do [VP, Spec] and [AgrOP, Spec] count as belonging to the same minimal domain. If [VP, Spec] and [AgrOP, Spec] belong to the same minimal domain, they are equidistant from the object position, which means that from the point of view of the shortest movement condition, the object is free to move into either [VP, Spec] or [AgrOP, Spec]. In other words, the object is free to move into [AgrOP, Spec] even though this means moving across the base position of the subject in [VP, Spec], as in the derivational step from (79b) to (79c), as long as the verb has just moved from V° to $AgrO^\circ$, as in the step from (79a) to (79b):

(79)

a.					[_{VP}	Subject	[V°	Verb	]	Object	]
b.	[_{AgrOP}		[$AgrO^\circ$	Verb]	[_{VP}	Subject	[V°	t_{verb}	]	Object	]]
c.	[_{AgrOP}	Object	[$AgrO^\circ$	Verb]	[_{VP}	Subject	[V°	t_{verb}	]	t_{obj}	]]

If the verb would not move, [VP, Spec] and [AgrOP, Spec] would not belong to the same minimal domain and they would therefore not be equidistant, and so the object could not leave its base position (at least not by means of A-movement).

According to [Bobaljik and Jonas \(1996 : 202\)](#), this scenario repeats itself when the subject moves out of its base position on its way to [AgrSP, Spec] (roughly equivalent to [IP, Spec]). The question is now how the subject may move across the object (or object trace) in [AgrOP, Spec] (which is an A-position). If we assume with [Bobaljik and Jonas \(1996 : 198\)](#) that AgrOP is the complement of T° , then if the verb moves from Agr° to T° , as in the step from (80c) to (80d), then [AgrOP, Spec] and [TP, Spec] count as

equidistant, and the subject may move across the object (or object trace) in [AgrOP, Spec], as in the step from (80d) to (80e):

(80)

a.										[_{VP}	Subject	[_{V°}	Verb	]	Object	]
b.					[AgrOP		[AgrO°	Verb	]	[_{VP}	Subject	[_{V°}	t _{verb}	]	Object	]]
c.					[AgrOP	Object	[AgrO°	Verb	]	[_{VP}	Subject	[_{V°}	t _{verb}	]	t _{obj}	]]
d.	[_{TP}		[_{T°}	Verb]	[AgrOP	Object	[AgrO°	t _{verb}	]	[_{VP}	Subject	[_{V°}	t _{verb}	]	t _{obj}	]]]
e.	[_{TP}	Subject	[_{T°}	Verb]	[AgrOP	Object	[AgrO°	t _{verb}	]	[_{VP}	t _{subj}	[_{V°}	t _{verb}	]	t _{obj}	]]]

Chomsky (1995c : 349–355) eliminates Agr categories altogether and introduces the concept of multiple specifiers, so that in effect what was described earlier as [VP, Spec] and [AgrOP, Spec] are now considered to be two different specifiers of the same VP (or of the same V°). Chomsky (1995c : 356–357) then goes on to revise the conditions on equidistance so that two specifiers of the same head are equidistant. This in turn means that equidistance no longer requires the verb to move from one head to the next higher one, and therefore the account of Holmberg's generalization is lost, as noted by Chomsky (1995c : 358) himself. The first step of object shift can now be a movement into the outer specifier of VP, and object shift is therefore able to cross the base position of the subject, which is the inner specifier of the same verb. As Chomsky (1995c : 358) said, Holmberg's generalization would have to be a property of the verb, so that it can have more than one specifier only if it is a trace. And Chomsky continues, “There is no obvious reason why this should be so.”

5 Focus and interpretation as the key to object shift

[1 Introduction](#) [2 Differences between object shift and scrambling](#) [3 Case as the key to object shift](#)
[4 Equidistance as the key to object shift](#) [6 Conclusion: a few recent accounts](#) [NOTES](#) [REFERENCES](#)

The two accounts discussed so far, the one linked to optional case assignment by a trace and the equidistance account, have at least three features in common:

- (i) They assume that full DP object shift is optional and they therefore have nothing to say about which full DPs undergo object shift and which ones do not.
- (ii) They also both assume that pronominal-object shift is obligatory.
- (iii) Finally, they both predict that non-DPs cannot possibly undergo object shift.

In we shall see that the first two assumptions do not hold, and in this section we will see that the prediction that only DPs undergo object shift is not quite borne out either.

When the adverb *there* is unstressed and defocused, it may undergo object shift in Icelandic, (82), and it must do so in Danish, (84) (as observed in Josefsson 1994 : 117; Haider et al. 1995 : 20; Thráinsson 2001 : 197, n.7):

(81) Icelandic

	Býr _v	Pétur			ekki	lengur	t _v	í	Kaupmannahöfn?
a.	lives	Peter			not	longer		in	Copenhagen.DAT
	*Býr _v	Pétur	í	Kaupmannahöfn _i	ekki	lengur	t _v	t _i ?	
b.	lives	Peter	in	Copenhagen.DAT	not	longer			

(82)

Icelandic

	Býr _v	Pétur		ekki	lengur	t _v	þar?
a.	lives	Peter		not	longer		there
	Býr _v	Pétur	þar _i	ekki	lengur	t _v	t _i ?
b.	lives	Peter	there	not	longer		

(83) Danish

	Bor _v	Peter			ikke	længere	t _v	i	København?
a.	lives	Peter			not	longer		in	Copenhagen
	*Bor _v	Peter	i	København _i	ikke	længere	t _v	t _i ?	
b.	lives	Peter	in	Copenhagen	not	longer			

(84) Danish

	??	Bor _v	Peter		ikke	længere	t _v	der?
a.		lives	Peter		not	longer		there
		Bor _v	Peter	der _i	ikke	længere	t _v	t _i ?
b.		lives	Peter	there	not	longer		

These data might seem to support the view discussed in , that pronominal-object shift is cliticization – cliticization in Romance also affects clitic adverbials, e.g. French *y* ‘there’. However, like any other kind of object shift, object shift of Icelandic *þar* and of Danish *der* ‘there’ underlie Holmberg’s generalization, as opposed to cliticization of their Romance counterparts:

(85) French

	Pierre	n'	y	a	jamais	vécu.	
a.	Pierre	not	there	has	never	lived	
Danish							
	*Peter		har	der	aldrig	boet.	
b.	Peter		has	there	never	lived	
	Peter		har		aldrig	boet	der.
c.	Peter		has		never	lived	there

As in , the conclusion therefore remains that pronominal-object shift is not a kind of cliticization but a kind of object shift. The fact that non-DPs undergo object shift as well suggests that the key property is not case or equidistance, but something entirely different. In the next sections we shall see that the key property may be focus and interpretation.

5.1 The interpretation of object shift

From what has been said so far about full DP object shift in Icelandic, it might seem as if it is completely optional. This is not the case, however. As observed in [Diesing and Jelinek \(1995 : 150\)](#) and in [Diesing \(1996: 79, 1997 : 418\)](#), the interpretation of an object-shifted object in Icelandic differs from that of a non-object-shifted one, and this difference parallels the difference in interpretation between scrambled and non-scrambled objects in e.g. German and Yiddish (cf. [Diesing 1992b : 129](#)). Consider first a German example:

(86)

German

	...	weil	ich				selten	die	kleinste	Katze	streichle
a.		because	I				rarely	the	smallest	cat	pet
	...	weil	ich	die	kleinste	Katze _i	selten	t _i			streichle
		because	I	the	smallest	cat	rarely				pet
b.	(from Diesing and Jelinek 1995 : 130, their (9a), Diesing 1996 : 73, her (17), and Diesing 1997 : 379, her (14a))										

Diesing and Jelinek (1995) and Diesing (1996, 1997) observe that the interpretation of (86a) is that whichever group of cats I meet, I rarely pet the one which is the smallest in that particular group. The interpretation of (86b) is that there is a cat which is smaller than all others, and that cat I rarely pet. In other words, the relative scope of *rarely* and *the smallest cat* correspond to their surface order, the one furthest left has wider scope. This is also the case in Icelandic:

(87) Icelandic

	Hann	les			sjaldan	lengstu	bókina.
a.	he	read			rarely	longest	book-the
	Hann	les	lengstu	bókina _i	sjaldan	t _i	
	he	read	longest	book-the	rarely		
b.	(from Diesing 1996 : 79, her (32), and Diesing 1997 : 418, her (82))						

According to Diesing (1996, 1997), the interpretation of (87a) is that whichever group of books he is put in front of, he rarely reads the one which is the longest in that particular group. The interpretation of (87b) is that there is a book which is longer than all others, and that book, he rarely reads. Thus also here, the relative scope of *rarely* and *the longest book* correspond to their surface order, the one furthest left has wider scope. Diesing's claim is that these interpretation differences can be derived from the Mapping Hypothesis of Diesing (1992: 10, 1997 : 373); see also Diesing and Jelinek (1995 : 124), i.e., the differences follow from whether the object is inside the VP and thereby part of the 'nuclear scope (the domain of existential closure)' or outside VP but inside IP and thereby part of the 'Restriction (of an operator)'. The difference in interpretation between (87a) and (87b) makes it clear that full DP object shift is not optional but that, depending on which interpretation is the target, object shift is either obligatory or impossible.⁹

Diesing and Diesing and Jelinek also point out that claiming pronominal-object shift to be obligatory is at best a gross oversimplification. The point is that there are pronouns which do not undergo object shift, namely, indefinite pronouns. They do not have wide scope, and therefore remain in their base position (both in languages with object shift, here Icelandic and Danish, and in languages with scrambling, here German):

(88) Icelandic

	Ég	á	ekki	regnhlíf,	áttu		ekki	eina?
a.	I	have	not	umbrella	have-you		not	one
	*Ég	á	ekki	regnhlíf,	áttu	eina _i	ekki	t _i ?
b.	I	have	not	umbrella	have-you	one	not	

(89)

Danish

	Jeg	har	ikke	nogen	paraply,	har	du		ikke	en?
a.	I	have	not	any	umbrella	have	you		not	one
	*Jeg	har	ikke	nogen	paraply,	har	du	en _i	ikke	t _i ?
b.	I	have	not	any	umbrella	have	you	one	not	

(90) German

	Ich	habe	immer	einen	Regenschirm,	warum	hast	Du		nie	einen?
a.	I	have	always	an	umbrella	why	have	you		never	one
	*Ich	habe	immer	einen	Regenschirm,	warum	hast	Du	einen _i	nie	t _i ?
	I	have	always	an	umbrella	why	have	you	one	never	
	(from Vikner 1997a : 11–12, his (34–36), based on										
b.	Diesing 1996 : 76, her (24–25))										

Actually, it can also be claimed that it is possible for definite pronouns not to undergo object shift. We have already discussed (71) and (73), where it was shown that stressed definite pronouns do not have to undergo object shift (and in languages where full DPs cannot undergo object shift, stressed definite pronouns cannot do it either). It is possible to reinterpret this kind of data to show that the interpretation depends on whether or not object shift takes place, and then the obligatory stress on definite pronouns that have not undergone object shift is a consequence of them being focused. The following is a further example from Danish:

(91) Danish

En	Dag	saa	hun	Niccolo	i	Gaden	. . .	Men	han	saa	ikke	hende
one	day	saw	she	Niccolo	in	street-the		but	he	saw	not	her
(from <i>Ekko</i> by Karen Blixen, with the original orthography, cited in Togeby 2003 : 169)												

As pointed out by [Togeby \(2003 : 169\)](#), (91) requires that both the subject *han* ‘he’ and the object *hende* ‘her’ are stressed. In other words, (91) corresponds to English *...but HE did not see HER*, where the focus is on *he* and *she* having switched roles, from ‘seer’ to ‘seen’ and vice versa. It would not have been ungrammatical for Karen Blixen to have written *...Men han saa hende ikke*, but this would not have the interpretation with focus on the role switching, it would simply correspond to English *...but he did not see her*, where the focus is on the entire VP.

This section has shown that depending on interpretation and focus, object shift of full DPs and object shift of pronouns may or may not take place.

5.2 Objects marked [–Focus] must be licensed by categories marked [+Focus]

Here we review the analysis proposed in [Holmberg \(1999 a\)](#), and although focus and interpretation (which were dealt with in the previous section) are central to [Holmberg's \(1999\)](#) analysis, this will only come in at the end of the discussion.

[Holmberg \(1999 : 6\)](#) points out that [Chomsky's \(1993 : 15–19\)](#) equidistance account (as presented in above) only accounts for those cases of Holmberg's generalization where the main verb leaves VP by moving into the next higher head position (i.e., the head which is the sister of the VP in question). The reason is that only by means of such a head movement do [VP, Spec] and [AgrOP, Spec] count as equidistant. If the verb were to leave VP in a different fashion, the equidistance account would predict object shift to be impossible, as [VP, Spec] and [AgrOP, Spec] would not be part of the same minimal domain and therefore not count as equidistant. [Holmberg \(1999\)](#) argues that this prediction is not borne out, and the example that shows this is the one already discussed earlier as (51c), repeated here as (92c) (see (ic) in n. 6 for an Icelandic version). The non-finite main verb *kysset* ‘kissed’ has left its VP by means

not of head movement but of topicalization, and yet object shift is well-formed:

(92) Danish

a.	*Kysset _x	har _v	jeg		ikke	[_{VP}	t _v		[_{VP}	t _x	hende	]], ...
	kissed	has	I		not						her	
b.	*Kysset _x	har _v	jeg		ikke	[_{VP}	t _v	hende _i	[_{VP}	t _x	t _i	]], ...
	kissed	has	I		not			her				
c.	Kysset _x	har _v	jeg	hende _i	ikke	[_{VP}	t _v		[_{VP}	t _x	t _i	]], ...
	kissed	has	I	her	not							

	...	bare	holdt	hende	i	hånden.	
		only	held	her	in	hand-the	
	'Kissed her, I haven't, only held her hand.'						

[Holmberg \(1999\)](#) then goes on to discuss other data where an element blocks object shift only if this element is not a trace. One such element is the particle in Swedish. Object shift is not possible across an unmoved particle, (93b) (see also (23c) above), but it is possible across the trace of a particle even in Swedish, (93d):

(93) Swedish

	Ja ja,	jag	ska	mata	din	katt,	men	...
	all right,	I	shall	feed	your	cat,	but	
	...	jag _k	släpper _v	t _k		inte	t _v	in den.
a.		I	let			not		in it
	*...	jag _k	släpper _v	t _k	den _i	inte	t _v	in t _i .
b.		I	let		it	not		in
	...	IN _j	släpper _v	jag		inte	t _v	t _j den.
c.		in	let	I		not		it
	...	IN _j	släpper _v	jag	den _i	inte	t _v	t _j t _i .
d.		in	let	I	it	not		
	'All right, I'll feed your cat, but I won't let it in.'							
	(Example (93d) is from Holmberg's 1999 : 17, his (44b))							

The assumption made in , that traces of case assigners are optional case assigners, partially accounts both for object shift being possible across the trace of a particle in Swedish even though overt particles block object shift and for object shift being possible across the trace of a non-finite main verb even though overt non-finite main verbs block object shift. The account is only partial in so far as what is predicted is that case does not have to be assigned to the base position of the object, because the (potential) case assigner is a trace, but what is not accounted for is how the shifted objects are assigned case, as the case assigners have not moved through I°, for instance. As for the equidistance account discussed in , it is also unclear whether it could account either for object shift being possible across the trace of a particle in Swedish or for object shift being possible across the trace of a non-finite main verb.

Another element that blocks object shift only if it is not a trace is the indirect object. Compare (30–32) above, which show that indirect objects block object shift of the direct object ((30b), (31b), (32b)) unless the two objects undergo object shift together, ((30c), (31c), (32c)). [Holmberg \(1999\)](#) : 17 gives two

Swedish examples where the indirect object has undergone A-bar-movement to [CP, Spec]: *Vem_j gav_v du den_i inte t_vt_i?*, ‘Who gave you it not?’, i.e., ‘Who did you not give it?’; and *Henne_j visar_v jag den_i helst inte t_vt_i*, ‘Her show I it rather not’, i.e., ‘To her, I would rather not show it’. However, because in both of these examples, both the indirect and the direct object are pronouns, the possibility cannot be excluded that the two objects could have undergone object shift together, and the indirect object, *hvem* ‘who’/ *henne* ‘her’, could then have undergone A-bar-movement to [CP, Spec] after the object shift had taken place. This does not mean, though, that Holmberg does not have a point; it merely means that the two examples cited above do not support this point in an optimal way. Better examples are (94b) and (95b), because the indirect object that has undergone *wh*-movement to [CP, Spec], *Maria/Maríu*, is a full DP which at least in Danish presumably could not have undergone object shift first, cf. (6) above:

(94) Danish

a.	Maria _j	fortalte _v	du	forhåbentlig	ikke	t _v	t _j	noget.
	Maria	told	you	hopefully	not			anything
‘I hope you did not tell MARIA anything.’								
b.	Maria _j	fortalte _v	du	det _i	forhåbentlig	ikke	t _v	t _j t _i .
	Maria	told	you	it	hopefully	not		
‘I hope you did not tell MARIA.’								

(95) Icelandic

a.	Maríu _j	sagðir _v - ðu		vonandi	ekki	t _v	t _j	leyndarmálið.
	Maria _{.DAT}	told- you		hopefully	not			secret-the
b.	Maríu _j	sagðir _v - ðu	leyndarmálið _i	vonandi	ekki	t _v	t _j	t _i .
	Maria _{.DAT}	told- you	secret-the	hopefully	not			
‘I hope you did not tell MARIA the secret.’								

It is clear that the pronominal direct object could not have moved across the full DP indirect object, *Maria/Maríu*, if the latter had not undergone *wh*-movement, (96b)/(97b):

(96) Danish

a.	??	Du	fortalte _v			forhåbentlig	ikke	t _v	Maria	det.
		you	told			hopefully	not		Maria	it
b.		*Du	fortalte _v		det _i	forhåbentlig	ikke	t _v	Maria	t _i .
		you	told		it	hopefully	not		Maria	
c.		*Du	fortalte _v	Maria _j	det _i	forhåbentlig	ikke	t _v	t _j	t _i .
		you	told	Maria	it	hopefully	not			
d.		*Du	fortalte _v	Maria _j		forhåbentlig	ikke	t _v	t _j	det.
		you	told	Maria		hopefully	not			it

(97)

Icelandic

	þú	sagðir _v		vonandi	ekki	t _v	Maríu	leyndarmálið.
a.	you	told		hopefully	not		Maria.DAT	secret-the
	*þú	sagðir _v	leyndarmálið _i	vonandi	ekki	t _v	Maríu	t _i .
b.	you	told	secret-the	hopefully	not		Maria.DAT	
	þú	sagðir _v	Maríu _j leyndarmálið _i	vonandi	ekki	t _v	t _j	t _i .
c.	you	told	Maria.DAT secret-the	hopefully	not			
	þú	sagðir _v	Maríu _j	vonandi	ekki	t _v	t _j	leyndarmálið.
	you	told	Maria.DAT	hopefully	not			secret-the
d.	'I hope you did not tell Maria the secret.'							

The same picture appears when A-movement of the indirect object occurs, e.g., when the finite main verb is passivized in Icelandic. In (98), the indirect object *þér* 'you.DAT' has moved out of VP, and the direct object *þvílíkt tækifæri* 'such a chance' can therefore undergo object shift, (98b):

(98) Icelandic

	þér _j	gafst _v			oft	t _v	t _j	þvílíkt	tækifæri.
a.	you.DAT	was-given			often			such	chance
	þér _j	gafst _v	þvílíkt	tækifæri _i	oft	t _v	t _j	t _i .	
	you.DAT	was-given	such	chance	often				
b.	'You were often given such a chance.'								

In (99), the indirect object *Maríu* 'Maria.DAT' has not moved out of VP, and therefore the direct object *þvílíkt tækifæri* 'such a chance' cannot undergo object shift, (99b):

(99) Icelandic

	Pétur	gaf _v			oft	t _v	Maríu	þvílíkt	tækifæri.
a.	Peter	gave			often		Maria.DAT	such	chance
	*Pétur	gaf _v	þvílíkt	tækifæri _i	oft	t _v	Maríu	t _i .	
	Peter	gave	such	chance	often		Maria.DAT		
b.	'Peter often gave Mary such a chance.'								

That object shift of a direct object is possible across the trace of an indirect object but not across an overt indirect object is not expected under any of the approaches discussed so far. Insofar as any of the above approaches would predict an (overt) indirect object to block object shift, the same would be expected of the trace of an indirect object.

In order to account both for the data captured by the accounts discussed earlier and for the additional data discussed here, [Holmberg \(1999 : 25–28\)](#) suggests that shifted objects are all marked [–Focus] and that they must be licensed by being c-commanded by a category (an X° or an XP) with the feature [+Focus]. For more discussion of the shifted objects not being in focus, see above, which showed that objects which are focused do not undergo object shift. The reason why objects never object shift across (overt) verbs, prepositions, and (Swedish) particles is that these are inherently marked [+Focus], and therefore they can license objects marked [–Focus], and there would be no reason and thus no justification for object shift to go any further.

Adverbials, on the other hand, are not marked [+Focus], and they can therefore not license objects marked [-Focus]. Furthermore, if an element not marked [+Focus] intervenes between the licensing [+Focus] element and the [-Focus] element that must be licensed, this licensing is blocked. These two assumptions, that an adverbial cannot itself license a [-Focus] object and that an adverbial blocks such licensing if it intervenes between a licensing category and a [-Focus] object, therefore force shifted objects to precede adverbials.¹⁰

6 Conclusion: a few recent accounts

[1 Introduction](#) [2 Differences between object shift and scrambling](#) [3 Case as the key to object shift](#)
[4 Equidistance as the key to object shift](#) [5 Focus and interpretation as the key to object shift](#) [NOTES](#)
[REFERENCES](#)

Needless to say, there have been a number of other discussions and analyses of object shift in the literature than the ones that have been mentioned here. In this final section, three recent accounts will be briefly mentioned to the almost certainly unjust exclusion of several others.

In his article about ‘phases’, [Chomsky \(2001b : 34\)](#) suggests that the crucial difference concerning Holmberg's generalization is whether or not the DP in question is properly inside the VP of the main verb, i.e., whether or not the DP is the leftmost overt element in the VP. If the DP is not the leftmost overt element in the VP, it may have either the interpretation *Int* or *Int'* (see, e.g., example (ic) in note 9, where object shift could not possibly have taken place). (*Int'* roughly corresponds to [Holmberg's \(1999\)](#) [+Focus], i.e., the interpretation assigned to a DP which remains in situ in an object shift context, cf. the discussion of (87a) above, whereas *Int* corresponds to [Holmberg's \(1999\)](#) [-Focus], i.e., the interpretation assigned to a DP which has undergone object shift; cf. the discussion of (87b) above.)

If the DP is the leftmost overt element in the VP, however, it may only have the interpretation *Int'* ([Chomsky 2001b : 34](#)). If a [-Focus] DP finds itself with *Int'*, an interpretation incompatible with its form, the sentence is deviant if the DP stays where it is, but a way out of the problem is for it to move to [*v**P, Spec], where it will obtain the right interpretation *Int*, due to to *v**'s EPP feature (the result of this is a structure with object shift, see (87b) above and (ib) in n. 9). On the other hand, if a [+Focus] object finds itself with *Int'*, there is no problem, as this is not incompatible with its form. It might move to, [*v**P, Spec], but then it will be deviant, as here it will get the wrong interpretation *Int*, due to to *v**'s EPP feature (the result of this is a structure without object shift even though there could have been object shift, e.g., (87a) above or (ia) in note 9). In other words, [Chomsky's \(2001b\)](#) phases account rests on distinguishing whether something is the leftmost overt element in VP or not.

[Svenonius \(2001\)](#) suggests a different account of Holmberg's generalization, also based on [Chomsky's \(2001b\)](#) phases. If a VP contains an overt verb, it is sent off to Spell Out and discourse-related movements (which include object shift and scrambling) are impossible. If, on the other hand, the verb has left the VP, then the VP is not sent off to Spell Out on its own, but has to wait until it can be sent to Spell Out as part of a larger XP. In this case, discourse-related movements are allowed within this XP, and so object shift is possible.

[Bobaljik \(2002\)](#) suggests a rather different account (already discussed in) which is based on his particular concept of adjacency, where two elements may be adjacent even though elements in adjoined positions occur between them ([Bobaljik 2002 : 210–221](#)). When the main verb is finite, *I*° has to be adjacent to the main verb, and this blocks object shift in those cases where a shifted object would intervene between the two ([Bobaljik 2002 : 221–224](#)), e.g., in those embedded clauses where the finite verb occurs in *V*° (i.e., in Danish, Faroese, Norwegian, and Swedish). When the main verb is a participle, it is *Pple*° that has to be adjacent to the main verb ([Bobaljik 2002 : 225](#)), and this blocks object shift in those cases where the overt shifted object would intervene between *Pple*° and the main verb. One problem with this is that the landing position of object shift in a clause where the main verb is a participle would have to be lower than *Pple*°, and because *Pple*° is below the *V*° of any auxiliary verb, which again is lower than negation or a sentential adverbial, the prediction would be that if object shift should be possible in a structure where the main verb is a participle, object shift would target a position lower than negation or a sentential adverbial. That this is not so, is shown in (51c)/(92c) and their discussion.

NOTES

[1 Introduction](#) [2 Differences between object shift and scrambling](#) [3 Case as the key to object shift](#)

	*Ich	weiß	dieses	Buch _i	[	warum	sie		nicht	t _i		verkaufen]
a.	I	know	this	book		why	they		not			sell
b.	Ich	weiß			[	warum	sie	dieses	Buch _i	nicht	t _i	verkaufen]
	I	know				why	they	this	book	not		sell
c.	Ich	weiß			[	warum	sie		nicht	dieses	Buch	verkaufen]
	I	know				why	they		not	this	book	sell
	'I know why they do not sell this book.'											

6 Many speakers of (at least) Danish and Icelandic do not find (51c)/(ic) completely acceptable, but it would seem that there is general agreement that (51c)/(ic) is considerably less unacceptable than (51a, b)/(ia, b):

(i) Icelandic

	*Kysst _x	hef _v	ég		ekki	[_{VP} t _v		[_{VP} t _x	hana	]], ...
a.	kissed	has	I		not				her	
	*Kysst _x	hef _v	ég		ekki	[_{VP} t _v	hana _i	[_{VP} t _x	t _i	]], ...
b.	kissed	has	I		not		her			
	?Kysst _x	hef _v	ég	hana _i	ekki	[_{VP} t _v		[_{VP} t _x	t _i	]], ...
c.	kissed	has	I	her	not					
	...	bara	haldið	í	höndina	á	henni.			
		only	held	in	hand-the	on	her			
	'Kissed her, I haven't, only held her hand.'									

7 It must be admitted that some Icelandic speakers find (53b) acceptable. Notice though that [Thránsson \(2001 : 162\)](#) gives the following judgment of a completely parallel example:

(i) Icelandic

*Jón	las _v	eflaust	bókina _i	aldrei	t _v	t _i .
John	read	doubtlessly	book-the	never		

It should perhaps be added that there seems to be general agreement among Icelandic speakers as to the unacceptability of the pronominal version of this kind of example in (55b).

8 To complicate matters even further, pronominal-object shift in Swedish is different both from pronominal-object shift in the other Scandinavian languages, (75), and from Romance clitic pronouns, (76), in that both options are possible. The shifted pronoun may occur either left of the subject, (ia) or right of the subject, (ib):

(i) Swedish

										[_{VP} t _v
a.	Därför	ger _v	mig _i	[_{IP}	Tutanchamons	hemsk	förbannelse	ingen	ro _j	t _i t _j]].
	therefore	gives	me		Tutanchamon's	terrible	curse	no	rest	
										[_{VP} t _v
	Därför	ger _v	[_{IP}	Tutanchamons	hemsk	förbannelse	mig _i	ingen	ro _j	t _i t _j]].
	therefore	gives		Tutanchamon's	terrible	curse	me	no	rest	
b.	(Example (ia) is from Josefsson 1992 : 65)									

Example (ia) is commonly referred to as long object shift, and compared to normal or 'short' object shift, as in (ib), long object shift is subject to some additional and rather elusive restrictions. According to [Holmberg \(1984 : 3\)](#), only weak reflexive pronouns or weak first or second person pronouns undergo long object shift; whereas [Josefsson \(1992 : 68\)](#) shows that all those pronouns that have different nominative and accusative forms undergo long object shift. [Josefsson \(1992 : 65–67\)](#) also discusses certain thematic restrictions on long object shift. Finally, [Thránsson \(2001 : 154\)](#) points out that long object shift was also

found in Danish and Norwegian in the nineteenth century.

9 If object shift is blocked (e.g., by the main verb being a participle), both the reading that is associated only with a shifted object in an object-shift construction and the reading associated only with a non-shifted object in an object shift construction are possible:

(i) Icelandic

a.	Í	prófunum	svarar	hann	sjaldan	[DP	erfiðustu	spurningunni].	
	in	exams-the	answers	he	rarely		most-difficult	question-the	
b.	Í	prófunum	svarar	hann	[DP	erfiðustu	spurningunni]	sjaldan.	
	in	exams-the	answers	he		most-difficult	question-the	rarely	
c.	Í	prófunum	hefur	hann	sjaldan	svarað	[DP	erfiðustu	spurningunni].
	in	exams-the	has	he	rarely	answered		most-difficult	question-the
							(Vikner 2001a : 325–326)		

The difference between (ia) and (ib) parallels the difference between (87a) and (87b) in the main text. The interpretation of (ia) is that regardless of which exam he is taking, he rarely answers whichever question happens to be the most difficult one in that particular exam. The interpretation of (ib) on the other hand, is that there is one particular question which is more difficult than all others (e.g., ‘list all the irregular verbs in Icelandic’) and which appears in most or all exams, and when he encounters this question, he rarely answers it.

In her minimalist analysis of (87a) and (87b) (and, by extension, of (ia) and (ib)), [Diesing \(1996 : 70, 1997 : 375–376\)](#) assumes the existence of a ‘scoping constraint’, which says that DPs should move to the position in the surface order that corresponds to their scope, and which therefore forces object shift in (87b) and (ib) and prevents object shift in (87a) and (ia). Diesing takes these examples, (87a, b) and (ia, b), to show that the scoping constraint must be a ‘condition on convergence’, to explain why the scoping constraint overrides ‘procrastinate’, an ‘economy condition’, which says do not move unless absolutely necessary.

[Vikner \(2001a : 334\)](#) argues that while these assumptions give the correct predictions concerning (87a, b) and (ia, b), they make an incorrect prediction concerning (ic). The point is that in the reading of (ic) that corresponds to (ib), the scoping constraint is overridden, *the most difficult question* has scope over *rarely* and yet does not precede it. In other words, (ic) shows that Holmberg's generalization overrides the scoping constraint, and (ib) shows that the scoping constraint overrides procrastinate. The problem is that within minimalism, for the scoping constraint to override procrastinate, it would (as [Diesing 1997 : 422](#) says) have to be a condition on convergence, but that in turn would mean that it could not itself be overridden by anything; on the contrary, a violation of a condition on convergence must lead to a crash and this would incorrectly predict (ic) to be unambiguous. On the other hand, as [Vikner \(2001a\)](#) shows, an analysis within optimality theory would not run into this problem. In OT it would be perfectly possible to have a particular constraint both override one constraint and itself be overridden by another.

[Thráinsson \(2001 : 193\)](#) points to a basic problem common to the accounts of [Diesing \(1996, 1997\)](#), [Vikner \(2001a\)](#), and [Chomsky \(2001b\)](#). In structures where a DP is not prevented from object shift by Holmberg's generalization but nevertheless does not undergo object shift, e.g., (87a) and (ia), these accounts assume the DP to have only one interpretation, namely, the narrow scope/unfocused/weak reading. Although speakers agree that this reading is possible and preferred, it is not quite clear that the other one, the wide scope/focused/strong reading (i.e., the one that is the only reading in (87b) and (ib)), is completely excluded for all speakers; cf. De [Hoop \(1992 : 137–139\)](#).

10 As pointed out by [Holmberg \(1999 : 15\)](#) and [Josefsson \(2001 : 92, 2003 : 204\)](#), this account would incorrectly predict long object shift (i.e., object shift to a position left of the subject) to be impossible. See (ia) in n. 8 for a grammatical example of long object shift.

REFERENCES

[1 Introduction](#) [2 Differences between object shift and scrambling](#) [3 Case as the key to object shift](#)
[4 Equidistance as the key to object shift](#) [5 Focus and interpretation as the key to object shift](#) [6 Conclusion: a few recent accounts](#) [NOTES](#)

- Áfarli, Tor A. (1985). Norwegian Verb Particle Constructions as Causative Constructions. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 8: 75–98.
- Andrews, Avery (1990). Case Structures and Control in Modern Icelandic. In: *Modern Icelandic Syntax*. Joan Maling and Annie Zaenen (eds.), 187–234. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Baker, Mark (1988a). *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Barnes, Michael (1992). Faroese Syntax: Achievements, Goals, and Problems. In: *The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics* 7. Jonna Louis-Jensen and Jóhan Hendrik W. Poulsen (eds.), 17–37. Tórshavn: Føroya Fróðskaparfelag.
- Bennis, Hans and Teun Hoekstra (1984). Gaps and Parasitic Gaps. *Linguistic Review* 4: 29–87.
- Besten, Hans den and Corretje Moed-van Walraven (1986). The Syntax of Verbs in Yiddish. In: *Verb Second Phenomena in Germanic Languages*. Hubert Haider and Martin Prinzhorn (eds.), 111–135. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan (1995). Morphosyntax: The Syntax of Verbal Inflection. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan (2002). A-Chains at the PF-Interface: Copies and ‘Covert’ Movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20/2: 197–267.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan and Diane Jonas (1996). Subject Positions and the Role of TP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37: 195–236.
- Bošković, Željko (2004). PF Merger in Stylistic Fronting and Object Shift. In: *Minimality Effects in Syntax*. Arthur Stepanov, Gisbert Fanselow, and Ralf Vogel (eds.), 37–71. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chomsky, Noam (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam (1982). *Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (1986a). *Barriers*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (1993). A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory. In: *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*. Ken Hale and Samuel J. Keyser (eds.), 1–52. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995c). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (2001b). Derivation by Phase. In: *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. Michael Kenstowicz (Ed.), 1–52. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1999). *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Collins, Chris and Höskuldur Thráinsson (1993). Object Shift in Double Object Constructions and the Theory of Case. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 19: 131–147.
- Collins, Chris and Höskuldur Thráinsson (1996). VP-Internal Structure and Object Shift in Icelandic. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27: 391–444.
- Déprez, Viviane (1989). On the Typology of Syntactic Positions and the Nature of Chains: Move A to the Specifier of Functional Projections. PhD dissertation, MIT.

- Déprez, Viviane (1994). Parameters of Object Movement. In: *Studies on Scrambling*. Norbert Corver and Henk C. van Riemsdijk (eds.), 101–152. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Diesing, Molly (1992b). *Indefinites*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Diesing, Molly (1996). Semantic Variables and Object Shift. In: *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax II*. Höskuldur Thráinsson, Samuel Epstein, and Steve Peter (eds.), 66–84. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Diesing, Molly (1997). Yiddish VP Order and the Typology of Object Movement in Germanic. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **15**: 369–427.
- Diesing, Molly and Eloise Jelinek (1995). Distributing Argument. *Natural Language Semantics* **3/1**: 123–176.
- Felix, Sascha (1985). Parasitic Gaps in German. In: *Erklärende Syntax des Deutschen*. Werner Abraham (Ed.), 173–200. Tübingen: Narr.
- Geilfuss, Jochen (1991). Jiddisch als SOV-Sprache. (Yiddish as an SOV-Language.) *Working Papers of the Sonderforschungsbereich 340* **11**: 3–17.
- Giusti, Giuliana (1990). Floating Quantifiers, Scrambling and Configurationality. *Linguistic Inquiry* **21**: 633–641.
- Haider, Hubert and Inger Rosengren (1998). Scrambling. *Sprache und Pragmatik* **49**: 1–104.
- Haider, Hubert, Susan Olsen, and Sten Vikner (1995). Introduction. In: *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax*. Hubert Haider, Susan Olsen, and Sten Vikner (eds.), 1–4. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Hall, Beatrice (1979). Accounting for Yiddish Word Order or What's a Nice NP Like You Doing in a Place Like This. In: *Linear Order and Generative Theory*. Jürgen Meisel and Martin Pam (eds.), 253–287. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Holmberg, Anders (1984). On Certain Clitic-Like Elements in Swedish. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* **13**.
- Holmberg, Anders (1986). Word Order and Syntactic Features in the Scandinavian Languages and English. PhD dissertation, University of Stockholm.
- Holmberg, Anders (1991a). The Distribution of Scandinavian Weak Pronouns. In: *Clitics and their Hosts*. Henk C. van Riemsdijk and Luigi Rizzi (eds.), 155–173. Tilburg University.
- Holmberg, Anders (1999). Remarks on Holmberg's Generalization. *Studia Linguistica* **53/1**: 1–39.
- Holmberg, Anders and Christer Platzack (1988). On the Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* **42**: 25–42.
- Holmberg, Anders and Christer Platzack (1995). *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hoop, Helen de (1992). Case Configuration and Noun Phrase Interpretation. PhD dissertation, Groningen University.
- Jayaseelan, Karattuparambil (2001a). IP-Internal Topic and Focus Phrases. *Studia Linguistica* **55/1**: 39–75.
- Johnson, Kyle (1991). Objects Positions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **9**: 577–636.
- Johnson, Kyle and Sten Vikner (1994). The Position of the Verb in Scandinavian Infinitives: In V or C but not in I. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* **53**: 61–84. University of Lund.
- Jónsson, Jóhannes Gísli (1996). Clausal Architecture and Case in Icelandic. PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts.
- Josefsson, Gunlög (1992). Object Shift and Weak Pronominals in Swedish. *Working Papers in*

Scandinavian Syntax **49**: 59–94.

- Josefsson, Gunlög (1993). Scandinavian Pronouns and Object Shift. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* **52**: 1–28.
- Josefsson, Gunlög (1994). Scandinavian Pronouns and Object Shift. In: *Clitics: Their Origin, Status and Position*. Henk C. van Riemsdijk and Lars Hellan (eds.), 91–122. Tilburg: ESF-EUROTYP.
- Josefsson, Gunlög (2001). The True Nature of Holmberg's Generalization Revisited – Once Again. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* **67**: 85–102.
- Josefsson, Gunlög (2003). Four Myths about Object Shift in Swedish – and the Truth ...In: *Grammar in Focus: Festschrift for Christer Platzack 2*. Lars-Olof Delsing, Cecilia Falk, Gunlög Josefsson, and Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson (eds.), 199–207. University of Lund.
- Kayne, Richard (1991). Romance Clitics, Verb Movement, and PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* **22**: 647–686.
- Marantz, Alec (1984). *On the Nature of Grammatical Relations*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Müller, Gereon (1995). *A-Bar Syntax: A Study in Movement Types*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Müller, Gereon (2001). Order Preservation, Parallel Movement and the Emergence of the Unmarked. In: *Optimality-Theoretic Syntax*. Géraldine Legendre, Jane Grimshaw, and Sten Vikner (eds.), 297–313. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Neeleman, Ad (1994b). Scrambling as a D-Structure Phenomenon. In: *Studies on Scrambling*. Norbert Corver and Henk C. van Riemsdijk (eds.), 387–429. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nilsen, Øystein (1997). Adverbs and A-Shift. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* **59**: 1–31.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves (1989). Verb Movement, Universal Grammar and the Structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* **20**: 365–424.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London/New York: Longman.
- Roberts, Ian (1991a). Excorporation and Minimality. *Linguistic Inquiry* **22**: 209–218.
- Roberts, Ian (1995). Object Shift and Verb Movement in Early Modern English. In: *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax*. Hubert Haider, Susan Olsen, and Sten Vikner (eds.), 269–284. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Roberts, Ian (2001). Head Movement. In: *Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*. Mark Baltin and Chris Collins (eds.), 113–147. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Rohrbacher, Bernhard (1999). *Morphology-Driven Syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sadock, Jerrold (1998). A Vestige of Verb Final Syntax in Yiddish. *Monatshefte für Deutschsprachige Literatur und Kultur* **90**: 220–226.
- Santorini, Beatrice (1993). Jiddish als Gemischte OV/VO-Sprache (Yiddish as a Mixed OV/VO-Language). In: *Dialektsyntax*. Werner Abraham and Josef Bayer (eds.), 230–245. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann (1989). Verbal Syntax and Case in Icelandic. PhD dissertation, University of Lund.
- Sportiche, Dominique (1988). A Theory of Floating Quantifiers and its Corollaries for Constituent Structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* **19**: 425–449.
- Stowell, Tim (1981). Origins of Phrase Structure. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Sundquist, John (2002). Object Shift and Holmberg's Generalization in the History of Norwegian. In:

Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change. David Lightfoot (Ed.), 326–347. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Svenonius, Peter (2001). On Object Shift, Scrambling, and the PIC. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* **39**: 267–289.
- Taraldsen, Knut Tarald (1984). Some Phrase-Structure Dependent Differences Between Swedish and Norwegian. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* **9**: 1–45.
- Taraldsen, Knut Tarald (1995). On Agreement and Nominative Objects in Icelandic. In: *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax*. Hubert Haider, Susan Olsen, and Sten Vikner (eds.), 307–327. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur (1986). On Auxiliaries, AUX and VPs in Icelandic. In: *Topics in Scandinavian Syntax*. Lars Hellan and Kirsti Koch Christensen (eds.), 235–265. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur (2001). Object Shift and Scrambling. In: *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*. Mark Baltin and Chris Collins (eds.), 148–202. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Togeby, Ole (2003). *Fungerer denne Sætning? Funktionel Dansk Sproglære. (Does this Sentence Function? Functional Danish Linguistics.)* Copenhagen: Gads Forlag.
- Vanden Wyngaerd, Guido (1989). Object Shift as an A-Movement Rule. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* **11**: 256–271.
- Vikner, Sten (1987). Case Assignment Differences between Danish and Swedish. In: *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference of Scandinavian Studies in Great Britain*. Robin Allan and Michael Barnes (eds.), 262–281. London: University College London.
- Vikner, Sten (1989). Object Shift and Double Objects in Danish. In: *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 44. Lars Olof Delsing, Cecilia Falk, and Christer Platzack (eds.), 141–155. Lund: Department of Scandinavian Languages.
- Vikner, Sten (1994b). Scandinavian Object Shift and West Germanic Scrambling. In: *Studies on Scrambling*. Norbert Corver and Henk C. van Riemsdijk (eds.), 487–517. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Vikner, Sten (1995). *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vikner, Sten (1997a). The Interpretation of Object Shift, Optimality Theory, and Minimalism. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* **60**: 1–24.
- Vikner, Sten (1997b). V^o-to-I^o Movement and Inflection for Person in All Tenses. In: *The New Comparative Syntax*. Liliane Haegeman (Ed.), 189–213. London: Longman.
- Vikner, Sten (2001a). The Interpretation of Object Shift and Optimality Theory. In: *Competition in Syntax*. Gereon Müller and Wolfgang Sternefeld (eds.), 321–340. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Vikner, Sten (2001b). Verb Movement Variation in Germanic and Optimality Theory. Habilitation thesis, Tübingen University.
- Vikner, Sten (2005). Immobile Complex Verbs in Germanic. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* **8/1–2**: 83–115.
- Williams, Edwin (2003). *Representation Theory*. Cambridge: MIT Press.