

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

1 Introduction

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 Wijngaerd (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 section 2 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 section 3.4.

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 section 3, equidistance in section 4, and interpretational considerations in sections 5 and 6).

2 Differences between object shift and scrambling

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

- a. Af hverju las_v Pétur aldrei [_{VP} t_v þessa bók]?
 why read Peter never this book
 b. Af hverju las_v Pétur þessa bók_i aldrei [_{VP} t_v t_i]?
 why read Peter this book never

(5) Icelandic: pronouns

- a. *Af hverju las_v Pétur aldrei [_{VP} t_v hana]?
 why read Peter never it
 b. Af hverju las_v Pétur hana_i aldrei [_{VP} t_v t_i]?
 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 sections 3.4 and 5.1): 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} | lesið | hana |]? | |
| | why | has | Peter | never | | | read | it | | |
| b. | *Af hverju | hefur _v | Pétur | hana _i | aldrei | t _v | [_{VP} | lesið | 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
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----------|------------------|-------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------|----------------|----|
| a. | Hvorfor | har _v | Peter | aldrig | t _v | [_{VP} | læst | den |]? | |
| | why | has | Peter | never | | | read | it | | |
| b. | *Hvorfor | har _v | Peter | den _i | aldrig | t _v | [_{VP} | læst | t _i |]? |
| | why | has | Peter | it | never | | | read | | |

In embedded clauses the Scandinavian languages differ. In Icelandic the finite verb moves to I^o, whereas in the other languages it seems to stay in V^o; 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
- | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|--------|-----|--------|-------|-------------------|--------|-----------------|----------------|-------|------|----|
| a. | Ég | spurði | af | hverju | Pétur | læsi _v | aldrei | [_{VP} | t _v | þessa | bók |]. |
| | I | asked | why | | Peter | read | never | | | this | book | |

- b. Ég spurði af hverju Pétur læsi_v þessa bók_i aldrei [_{VP} t_v t_i].
 I asked why Peter read this book never

(13) Icelandic

- a. *Ég spurði af hverju Pétur læsi_v aldrei [_{VP} t_v hana].
 I asked why Peter read never it
 b. Ég spurði af hverju Pétur læsi_v hana_i aldrei [_{VP} t_v t_i].
 I asked why Peter read it never

(14) Danish

- a. Jeg spurgte hvorfor Peter aldrig [_{VP} læste den her bog].
 I asked why Peter never read this book
 b. *Jeg spurgte hvorfor Peter den her bog_i aldrig [_{VP} læste t_i].
 I asked why Peter this book never read

(15) Danish

- a. Jeg spurgte hvorfor Peter aldrig [_{VP} læste den].
 I asked why Peter never read it
 b. *Jeg spurgte hvorfor Peter den_i aldrig [_{VP} læste t_i].
 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

- a. Warum liest_v Peter dieses Buch_i oft [_{VP} t_i t_v] ?
 why reads Peter this book often
 b. Warum hat_v Peter dieses Buch_i oft [_{VP} t_i gelesen] t_v?
 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 section 3.4 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

- a. Far vos hot_v Moyshe nit t_v [_{VP} geleyent dos dozike bukh]?
 why has Moses not read this book
- b. Far vos hot_v Moyshe dos dozike bukh_i nit t_v [_{VP} geleyent t_i]?
 why has Moses this book not read

In section 3 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

- a. Af hverju las_v Pétur aldrei t_v [_{PP} í þessari bók]?
 why read Peter never in this book
- b. *Af hverju las_v Pétur þessari bók_i aldrei t_v [_{PP} í t_i]?
 why read Peter this book never in

(19) Icelandic

- a. Af hverju las_v Pétur aldrei t_v [_{PP} í henni]?
 why read Peter never in it
- b. *Af hverju las_v Pétur henni_i aldrei t_v [_{PP} í t_i]?
 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

- a. *Peter har_v ikke t_v smidt ud tæppet.
 Peter has not thrown away carpet-the
 b. Peter har_v ikke t_v smidt tæppet_i ud t_i.
 Peter has not thrown carpet-the away

(25) Danish

- a. *Peter smed_v ikke t_v ud det.
 Peter threw not away it
 b. *Peter smed_v ikke t_v det_i ud t_i.
 Peter threw not it away
 c. Peter smed_v det_i ikke t_v ud t_i.
 Peter threw it not away

(26) Danish

- a. *Peter smed_v ikke t_v ud tæppet.
 Peter threw not away carpet-the
 b. Peter smed_v ikke t_v tæppet_i ud t_i.
 Peter threw not carpet-the away
 c. *Peter smed_v tæppet_i ikke t_v ud t_i.
 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

- a. Pétur hefur_v ekki t_v hent út mottunni.
 Peter has not thrown away carpet-the
 b. Pétur hefur_v ekki t_v hent mottunni_i út t_i.
 Peter has not thrown carpet-the away

(28) Icelandic

- a. Pétur henti_v ekki t_v út mottunni.
 Peter threw not away carpet-the
 b. Pétur henti_v ekki t_v mottunni_i út t_i.
 Peter threw not carpet-the away
 c. Pétur henti_v mottunni_i ekki t_v út t_i.
 Peter threw carpet-the not away

(29) Icelandic

- a. *Pétur henti_v ekki t_v út henni.
 Peter threw not away it
 b. *Pétur henti_v ekki t_v henni_i út t_i.
 Peter threw not it away
 c. Pétur henti_v henni_i ekki t_v út t_i.
 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 sections 3.1 and 5.2.

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) Icelandic

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

(31) Danish

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

- | | | | |
|----|-------------------|---|------------------|
| | 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_i börnunum_i aldre_i t_v t_i t_i.
 parents- children- never
 the.DAT the.DAT
- d. ... foreldrunum_i aldre_i t_v t_i 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 section 3.1, 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 section 2.3.

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 (1986a: 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
 which book have all without to read
 ins Regal gestellt?
 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
 which book put all onto bookcase-the
 [uden at læse e_i først]?
 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
 that all this book without to read
 ins Regal gestellt haben.
 into-the bookcase put have
 (Müller 1995: 173, his (74a))

- (36) German
 *. . . , daß alle [ohne e_i zu lesen] dieses Buch_i
 that all without to read this book
 ins Regal gestellt haben.
 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
 All put it at once onto bookcase-the
 [uden at læse e_i først]
 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
 that all at once put it onto bookcase-the
 [uden at læse e_i først]
 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
 a. Ich habe nicht für das Buch bezahlt.
 I have not for the book paid
 b. Ich habe für das Buch_i nicht t_i bezahlt.
 I have for the book not paid

- (40) German
 a. Ich habe nicht dafür bezahlt.
 I have not there-for paid
 b. Ich habe dafür_i nicht t_i bezahlt.
 I have there-for not paid

- (41) Icelandic
 a. Ég borgaði_v ekki t_v fyrir bókina.
 I paid not for book-the
 b. *Ég borgaði_v fyrir bókina_i ekki t_v t_i.
 I paid for book-the not

(42) Icelandic

- a. Ég borgaði_v ekki t_v fyrir hana.
 I paid not for it
- b. *Ég borgaði_v fyrir hana_i ekki t_v t_i.
 I paid for it not

(43) Danish

- a. Jeg betalte_v ikke t_v for bogen.
 I paid not for book-the
- b. *Jeg betalte_v for bogen_i ikke t_v t_i.
 I paid for book-the not

(44) Danish

- a. Jeg betalte_v ikke t_v for den.
 I paid not for it
- b. *Jeg betalte_v for den_i ikke t_v t_i.
 I paid for it not

((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

- a. Peter ist nie krank.
 Peter is never ill
- b. *Peter ist krank_i nie t_i.
 Peter is ill never

(46) Icelandic

- a. Pétur er aldrei veikur.
 Peter is never ill
- b. *Pétur er veikur_i aldrei t_i.
 Peter is ill never

(47) Danish

- a. Peter er aldrig syg.
 Peter is never ill
- b. *Peter er syg_i aldrig t_i.
 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
 a. *Ég veit bókina_i [af hverju þau seldu ekki t_i].
 I know book-the why they sold not
 b. Ég veit [af hverju þau seldu bókina_i ekki t_i].
 I know why they sold book-the not
 c. Ég veit [af hverju þau seldu ekki bókina].
 I know why they sold not book-the
 'I know why they did not sell the book.'

As was illustrated in section 2.1.1, 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 section 2.1.1). Consequently

Vikner (1989, 1994b) 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 (1999a: 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)P} spec V°(aux) [_{V(main)P} spec V°(main)]]]
 b. ... [_{V(aux)P} spec V°(aux) [_{AgrOP} spec AgrO° [_{V(main)P} spec V°(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 [AgrOP, Spec] to have its object case checked (see also section 4 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 [AgrOP, Spec] analyses are the analyses of object shift as movement to (or through) [TenseP, 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 [AgrOP, 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 [IP, Spec] (assuming that adverbials or other elements cannot adjoin to intermediate projections like *I-bar*) means that when I° only contains a trace, adjacency to I° results in surface adjacency to the subject in [IP, 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 [IP, 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 [IP, Spec] or I°); and in (52a), (53a), (54a), and (55a), no movement has taken place at all:

(52) German

- | | | | | |
|----|-----------|------------------|--|--------------------------|
| | 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 section 5 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 section 3.4 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

- a. *Í gær las_v Pétur eflaust ekki t_v hana
 yesterday read Peter doubtlessly not it
 b. *Í gær las_v Pétur eflaust hana_i ekki t_v t_i
 yesterday read Peter doubtlessly it not
 c. 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'

(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

- a. Peter wird die_i Bücher_i ohne Zweifel nie alle_i t_i lesen.
Peter will the books without doubt never all read
- b. Peter wird die_i Bücher_i ohne Zweifel alle_i nie t_i lesen.
Peter will the books without doubt all never read
- c. Peter wird die_i Bücher_i alle_i ohne Zweifel nie t_i lesen.
Peter will the books all without doubt never read
'Peter will undoubtedly never read all the books'

(57) Icelandic

- a. Pétur las_v bækurnar_i eflaust ekki allar_i t_v t_i.
Peter read books-the doubtlessly not all
- b. *Pétur las_v bækurnar_i eflaust allar_i ekki t_v t_i.
Peter read books-the doubtlessly all not
- c. 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'

(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 (57). 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 adverbials 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 section 2, 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).

(58) 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
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 section 3.4.

Sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 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

3.1 *Traces of case assigners are optional case assigners*

As mentioned in section 2.1.2, 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

- a. Jógvan keypti_v ikki [_{VP} t_v bókina].
 Jógvan bought not book-the.ACC
 b. *Jógvan keypti_v bókina_i ikki [_{VP} t_v t_i].
 Jógvan bought book-the.ACC not

(Barnes 1992: 28)

(61) Faroese

- 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 þessi bók. | |
| | | probably | | not this book.DAT | |
| b. | *... | sennilega þessi bók _i | ekki t _v t _i . | | |
| | | probably this book.DAT | not | | |
| c. | ... þessi 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 | | |
| a. | ?... | sennilega | ekki t _v þessi bók | ... | |
| | | probably | not this book.NOM | | |
| b. | *... | sennilega þessi bók _i | ekki t _v t _i | ... | |
| | | probably this book.NOM | not | | |
| c. | ... þessi bók _i | sennilega | ekki t _v t _i | ... | |
| | this book.NOM | probably | not | | |
- ... skemmtileg.
amusing.NOM
- '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 in section 2.1.1 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) Icelandic

- 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/pá/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) Icelandic

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

(70) Danish

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

Summarizing sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3, 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

- a. Af hverju las_v Pétur aldrei [_{VP} t_v HANA]?
 why read Peter never it
- b. Af hverju las_v Pétur HANA_i aldrei [_{VP} t_v t_i]?
 why read Peter it never

(72) Icelandic: full DPs may undergo object shift

- a. Af hverju las_v Pétur aldrei [_{VP} t_v þessa hérna]?
 why read Peter never this here
- b. Af hverju las_v Pétur þessa hérna_i aldrei [_{VP} t_v t_i]?
 why read Peter this here never

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

- 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

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

- a. Hvorfor læste_v Peter aldrig [_{VP} t_v den her]?
 why read Peter never this here
- b. *Hvorfor læste_v Peter den her_i aldrig [_{VP} t_v t_i]?
 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° (or T°) has strong features. I° (or T°) can be argued to have strong features in Icelandic (as reflected in the presence of V° -to- I° movement), but weak features in the other Scandinavian languages (which lack V° -to- I° 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° -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° 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° to I° (which it arguably does; shifted objects occur adjacent to I° , see section 2.4.4), but it should also move along with the verb when the verb moves from I° to C° . 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°} l_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°} 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

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° [VP Subject V° t_{obj}]]

Chomsky's (1993: 18) suggestion is that if and only if the verb moves from V° to AgrO° 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°, as in the step from (79a) to (79b):

- (79) 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}]]

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 $^\circ$ 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 $^\circ$} Verb] Object]
 b. [_{AgrOP} [_{AgrO $^\circ$} Verb] [_{VP} Subject [_{V $^\circ$} t_{verb}] Object]]
 c. [_{AgrOP} Object [_{AgrO $^\circ$} Verb] [_{VP} Subject [_{V $^\circ$} t_{verb}] t_{obj}]]
 d. [_{TP} [_{T $^\circ$} Verb] [_{AgrOP} Object [_{AgrO $^\circ$} t_{verb}] [_{VP} Subject [_{V $^\circ$} t_{verb}] t_{obj}]]]
 e. [_{TP} Subject [_{T $^\circ$} Verb] [_{AgrOP} Object [_{AgrO $^\circ$} t_{verb}] [_{VP} t_{subj} [_{V $^\circ$} 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 $^\circ$). 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

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 section 5.1 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
- a. Býr_v Pétur ekki lengur t_v í Kaupmannahöfn?
lives Peter not longer in Copenhagen.DAT
 - b. *Býr_v Pétur í Kaupmannahöfn_i ekki lengur t_v t_i?
lives Peter in Copenhagen.DAT not longer
- (82) Icelandic
- a. Býr_v Pétur ekki lengur t_v þar?
lives Peter not longer there
 - b. Býr_v Pétur þar_i ekki lengur t_v t_i?
lives Peter there not longer
- (83) Danish
- a. Bor_v Peter ikke længere t_v i København?
lives Peter not longer in Copenhagen
 - b. *Bor_v Peter i København_i ikke længere t_v t_i?
lives Peter in Copenhagen not longer
- (84) Danish
- a. ??Bor_v Peter ikke længere t_v der?
lives Peter not longer there
 - b. Bor_v Peter der_i ikke længere t_v t_i?
lives Peter there not longer

These data might seem to support the view discussed in section 3.4, 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
- a. Pierre n’ y a jamais vécu.
Pierre not there has never lived
- Danish
- b. *Peter har der aldrig boet.
Peter has there never lived
 - c. Peter har aldrig boet der.
Peter has never lived there

As in section 3.4, 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
- | | | | | | |
|----|----------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------|
| a. | ... weil | ich | | selten die kleinste Katze | streichle |
| | | because I | | rarely the smallest cat | pet |
| b. | ... weil | ich die kleinste Katze _i | selten t _i | | streichle |
| | | because I the smallest cat | rarely | | pet |
- (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
- | | | | |
|----|----------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. | Hann les | | sjaldan lengstu bókina. |
| | he read | | rarely longest book-the |
| b. | Hann les | lengstu bókina _i | sjaldan t _i . |
| | he read | longest book-the | rarely |
- (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

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

(89) Danish

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

(90) German

- a. Ich habe immer einen Regenschirm, warum hast Du nie einen?
I have always an umbrella why have you never one
b. *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 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 *Ekko* 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 (1999a), 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 section 4 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
- a. ... jag_k släpper_v t_k inte t_v in den.
 I let not in it
- b. *... jag_k släpper_v t_k den_i inte t_v in t_i.
 I let it not in
- c. ... IN_j släpper_v jag inte t_v t_j den.
 in let I not it
- d. ... IN_j släpper_v jag den_i inte t_v t_j t_i.
 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 section 3.1, 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 section 4, 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_i gav_v du den_i inte t_v t_j t_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_v t_j t_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

- a. Þú sagðir_v vonandi ekki t_v Maríu leyndarmálið.
 you told hopefully not Maria.DAT secret-the
- b. *Þú sagðir_v leyndarmálið_i vonandi ekki t_v Maríu t_i.
 you told secret-the hopefully not Maria.DAT
- c. Þú sagðir_v Maríu_j leyndarmálið_i vonandi ekki t_v t_j t_i.
 you told Maria.DAT secret-the hopefully not
- d. Þú sagðir_v Maríu_j vonandi ekki t_v t_j leyndarmálið.
 you told Maria.DAT hopefully not secret-the
 '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

- a. Þér_j gafst_v oft t_v t_j þvílíkt tækifæri.
 you.DAT was-given often such chance
- b. Þér_j gafst_v þvílíkt tækifæri_i oft t_v t_j t_i.
 you.DAT was-given such chance often
 '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

- a. Pétur gaf_v oft t_v Maríu þvílíkt tækifæri.
 Peter gave often Maria.DAT such chance
- b. *Pétur gaf_v þvílíkt tækifæri_i oft t_v Maríu t_i.
 Peter gave such chance often Maria.DAT
 '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 section 5.1 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

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 sections 2.4.3 and 2.4.4) 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

I am very grateful to my Syncom colleagues for their help, criticism, and, not least, incredible patience. Many thanks also go to Jonathan Bobaljik, Ken Ramshøj Christensen, Molly Diesing, Anders Holmberg, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, Kyle Johnson, Gunlög Josefsson, Carl Vikner, and an anonymous reviewer.

- 1 In Icelandic control infinitives (see Thráinsson 1986: 247; Holmberg 1986: 155–158; Sigurðsson 1989: 49–56; Johnson and Vikner 1994; Jónsson 1996: 159–166), the infinitival verb embedded under the control verb must leave VP as it must precede negation, (ia, b). Given that the verb must leave its VP, it is not surprising that object shift is possible, (ic):

(i) Icelandic

- a. *María lofaði_v [_{IP} að ekki lesa bókina].
 María promised to not read book-the
- b. María lofaði_v [_{IP} að lesa_v ekki t_v bókina].
 María promised to read not book-the
- c. María lofaði_v [_{IP} að lesa_v bókina_i ekki t_v t_i].
 María promised to read book-the not
 'María promised not to read the book.'

(Jónsson 1996: 164)

- 2 Den Besten and Moed-van Walraven (1986: 113), Diesing (1997: 388), and Sadock (1998) take Yiddish to be a VO language with remnants of OV, whereas Santorini (1993) classifies it as mixed OV/VO and Hall (1979), Geilfuss (1991), Haider and Rosengren (1998: 78–81), and Vikner (2001b) assume the basic order in modern Yiddish to be OV.
- 3 The form of an object in the Danish examples varies depending on whether or not the object in question has undergone object shift, given that only pronouns can undergo object shift and that they have to undergo it.
- 4 An example with the same word order as (32b) is acceptable, but with the opposite interpretation, namely, that the kidnapper never returned the parents to the children. In other words, it would have the structure of (32d) and (30d).
- 5 The reason why the example of non-clausebound scrambling is from Russian is that German (and Dutch) scrambling actually is clausebound, and therefore completely parallel to the object shift data in (49):

(i) German

- a. *Ich weiß dieses Buch_i [warum sie nicht t_i verkaufen].
 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

- a. *Kysst_x hef_v ég ekki [_{VP} t_v [_{VP} t_x hana]], ...
 kissed has I not her
 b. *Kysst_x hef_v ég ekki [_{VP} t_v hana_i [_{VP} t_x t_i]], ...
 kissed has I not her
 c. ?Kysst_x hef_v ég hana_i ekki [_{VP} t_v [_{VP} t_x t_i]], ...
 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 Thráinsson (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

- a. Därför ger_v mig_i [_{IP} Tutanchamons hemska förbannelse ingen
 therefore gives me Tutanchamon's terrible curse no
 ro_j [_{VP} t_v t_i t_j]].
 rest
 b. Därför ger_v [_{IP} Tutanchamons hemska förbannelse mig_i ingen
 therefore gives Tutanchamon's terrible curse me no
 ro_j [_{VP} t_v t_i t_j]].
 rest

(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, Thráinsson (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

- 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.