OBJ-shift, NEG-shift & Double Objects

1 NEG-shift

1.1 Sentential Negation and Negative Objects

In all the Scandinavian languages, i.e. Danish, Faroese, Finland Swedish, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Swedish, negation can be expressed with (some version of) the sentence medial adverb *ikke* ‘not’.

The following Danish example is representative of all the Scandinavian languages.

(1) Da: Anders har ikke [VP modtaget nogen breve ]
   Anders has not    received any    letters

As the gloss shows, the same is the case for English. In all the languages, the same meaning (more or less) can be expressed with a NEGQP object consisting of the negative quantifier *ingen* ‘no’ and an NP. This NEGQP must be outside VP to license sentential negation (see Christensen 2003 and references cited there. In this paper, I leave out discussion of PP objects). The languages differ in the licensing conditions for this construction where the negative object has undergone NEG-shift.

All the examples with negative objects here share the same basic meaning which is also part of the input along with the numeration:

(2) *Ikke nogen*: NOT[some y (x=subject, y=object), P (x, y)]
(3) *Ingen*: NO y (x=subject, y=object), P (x, y)

The languages fall into four groups.
First, in Danish, Faroese, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Swedish, NEG-shift is obligatory. It takes place across the main verb in situ in sentences with auxiliary verbs, and is therefore not subject to Holmberg’s Generalisation HG (Holmberg 1986: 165, 1999: 2). Again, I only give examples in Danish but they are representative:

(4) Da:  a. *Anders modtog, \[vp_t \text{ ingen breve}\] 
       \[\text{Anders received no letters}\] 
   b. Anders modtog, \[vp_t \text{ ingen breve}_1\] \[vp_t \text{ t1}\] 

(5) Da:  a. *Anders har \[vp \text{ modtaget ingen breve}\] 
       b. Anders har \[vp \text{ ingen breve}_1\] \[vp \text{ modtaget t1}\] 

Second, in colloquial Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish, grouped together as Scan2, NEG-shift is subject to HG. NEG-shift can only apply in clauses without auxiliary verbs:

(6) Scan2:  a. *Anders modtog, \[vp_t \text{ ingen breve}\] 
        \[\text{Anders received no letters}\] 
   b. Anders modtog, \[vp_t \text{ ingen breve}_1\] \[vp_t \text{ t1}\] 

(7) Scan2:  a. *Anders har \[vp \text{ modtaget ingen breve}\] 
        \[\text{Anders has no letters received}\] 
   b. *Anders har \[vp \text{ ingen breve}_1\] \[vp \text{ modtaget t1}\] 

Third, in Finland Swedish, NEG-shift is subject to HG as in Scan2, but unlike all the other Scandinavian languages, Finland Swedish allows the NEGQP to license sentential negation in situ.

(8) FS:  a. Jag hade \[vp_t \text{ ingenting} \text{ att skaffa med den saken}\] 
       b. Jag hade \[vp_t \text{ t1} \text{ att skaffa med den saken}\] 

(9) FS:  a. Jag har \[vp \text{ haft ingenting} \text{ att skaffa med den saken}\] 
       *b. Jag har \[vp \text{ haft t1} \text{ att skaffa med den saken}\] 

Fourth, English never allows the object to undergo NEG-shift, regardless of the presence of auxiliaries. In fact, it can be claimed that NEG-shift is subject to HG and never occurs as the verb never moves out of VP (or at least not out of vP):

---

1 I concentrate on main clauses and leave out examples with embedded clauses as the examples would be completely parallel.

2 The source does not provide the examples in (8)a and b and (9)b but the text makes it very clear that only (9)a, and not (9)b, is grammatical.

3 Possessive have may be an exception. In certain dialects of English, it doesn’t take do-insertion as in Standard English but moves to a position preceding negation: I haven’t any money vs. I don’t have any money.
(10) En: a. Jack [vp received no letters]
    b. *Jack no letters; [vp received t₁]

(11) En: a. Jack has [vp received no letters]
    b. *Jack has no letters; [vp received t₁]

Alternatively, under Kayne’s (1998) analysis, English has NEG-shift and OBJ-shift followed by VP-preposing (remnant movement). Danish, Faroese, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Swedish lack VP-preposing, and the difference is still one of movement versus not movement. Only, the tables have turned and English has more movement than the V2 languages. Here is a simplified example:

(12) a. Base: He has probably [vp seen nothing]
    b. NEG-shift: He has probably nothing; [vp seen t₁]
    c. VP-preposing: He has probably [vp seen t₁]; nothing; t₂

In this paper I do not adopt Kayne’s approach and I shall not pursue this any further.

NEG-shift is motivated by the NEG-criterion (Haegeman & Zanuttini 1991: 244):

(13) NEGCRIT
    Each Xº[NEG] must be in spec-head relation with a negative operator XP[NEG] and vice versa⁴.

In other words, the target of NEG-shift is spec-NEGP. Unlike Haegeman & Zanuttini, I take NEGCRIT to be a violable constraint in an optimality-theoretic approach.

Below are the structures corresponding to the examples in (4) and (5) above of NEG-shift in Danish, Faroese, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Swedish. The first with an auxiliary verb and the second without:

---

⁴ As Hans-Martin Gärtner (p.c.) has pointed out to me, the “vice versa” part of the definition may be problematic. What about double negations? The object is not in a spec-head relation with a negative head. I think it holds after all. Consider the following two examples:

i. Du kan da ikke spise ingenting (“you can’t eat the amount of zero”)
ii. Du kan da ikke ingenting spise (“you can’t eat nothing” → “you must eat something”).

The former example is peculiar because of the unshifted negative object, which receives a ‘trifle’ interpretation. The latter is a true double negation which contains two (sentence medial) NEGP and the negative object has undergone NEG-shift. It may also be that ‘trifle’ negation objects also have a NEGP and that ingen moves to spec of this projection. (In fact, this is parallel to the classic problem with multiple wh-questions, cf. Vikner (2001b: 239-239) and the references cited there.)
(14) Da:      CP
   ┌───┴───┐
   Anders  TP
   ┌───┴───┐
   har     NEGP
   ┌───┴───┐
   t       ASPP
   ┌───┴───┐
   ingen  VP
   ┌───┴───┐
   breve  t
   ┌───┴───┐
   ASPº   Vº
   ┌───┴───┐
   t       Vº
   ┌───┴───┐
   Vº      t
   ┌───┴───┐
   Vº      modtaget
   ┌───┴───┐
   ASPº   Vº
   ┌───┴───┐
   t       Vº
   ┌───┴───┐
   Vº      t
   ┌───┴───┐
   Vº      t

(15) Da:      CP
   ┌───┴───┐
   Anders  TP
   ┌───┴───┐
   modtog NEGP
   ┌───┴───┐
   t       ASPP
   ┌───┴───┐
   ingen  VP
   ┌───┴───┐
   breve  t
   ┌───┴───┐
   ASPº   Vº
   ┌───┴───┐
   t       Vº
   ┌───┴───┐
   Vº      t
   ┌───┴───┐
   Vº      t

(The labels of the functional projections in the split IP are not crucial and instead of TP-NEGP-ASPP it could have been AGRSP-NEGP-TP. However, as none of the examples involve agreement, I use the notation without agreement projections. Sentential adverbs are adjoined to NEGP and VP-adverbials are clause final.)

The languages differ in whether they allow both (14) and (15) (Danish, Faroese, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Swedish), only (15) (Scan2 and Finland Swedish), or none of them (English). Furthermore, one group allows *ingen*/*no* in situ (English and Finland Swedish), whereas the other doesn’t (all the other languages).
This variation can be derived from different rankings of NegCrit, cf. (13) above, and the following three constrains:

(16) **STAY**
Economy of derivation / *TRACE. (Only traces of XP movement are indicated.)

(17) **V-LICENSE (V-LIC)**
An object must be licensed by being c-commanded either by its selecting Vº or the trace of this Vº (Vikner’s 2001a: 328, LICENSING).

(18) **FAITHLEX**
The lexical material of the input must surface in the output.

In the tableaux below, “S Vaux [NEGP ...]” and “S V [NEGP ...]” means that the verb is in V2 position in Cº preceded by the subject in spec-CP. For the English examples, it means that spec-TP and Tº are filled by the subject and the finite auxiliary, respectively. I thus leave out information about irrelevant structure between Cº and NEGP and between NEGP and VP.

**Danish, Icelandic, Faroese, Norwegian, and Swedish**

(19) NEG-shift from VP
a. Across verb: Yes
   (The (a) competition in the tableau.)
b. Across tº: Yes
   (The (b) competition.)

(20) \{NEGCRIT, FAITHLEX\} » \{V-LICENSE, STAY\}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tableau 1: Danish, Faroese, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Swedish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEG-shift applies across both verb and tº (the answer is Yes in both a and b). V-LICENSE and STAY are violated in order to satisfy NegCRIT and FAITHLEX, cf. candidates (a3) and (b3), and the constraints are ranked as in (20).
Scan2

(21) NEG-shift from VP
   a. Across verb: No
      i. Lexical Substitution: Yes  (The (a) competition.)
   b. Across tv: Yes  (The (b) competition.)

(22) \{NEGCRIT, V-LICENSE\} » FAITHLEX » STAY

Tableau 2: Scan2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP Input: ingen</th>
<th>Neg Crit</th>
<th>V-LIC</th>
<th>Faith Lex</th>
<th>Stay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a1 S Vaux [NEGP ikke [VP V nogen NP]]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a2 *S Vaux [NEGP ingen NP [VP V t ]]</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a3 *S Vaux [NEGP ingen NP [VP V t ]]</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b1 S V [NEGP ikke [VP t v nogen NP]]</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b2 *S V [NEGP ingen NP [VP t v ingen NP]]</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b3 *S V [NEGP ingen NP [VP t v t ]]</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared with the parameters for Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish in (19) above, Scan2 differs by one setting: the answer in (21)a is No. NEG-shift cannot cross the verb and the optimal candidate (a1) has lexical substitution. V-LICENSE outranks FAITHLEX, which in turn is ranked above STAY to ensure that NEG-shift can cross the trace of the verb instead of allowing lexical substitution, compare (b1) and (b3).

Finland Swedish

(23) NEG-shift from VP
   a. Across verb: No  (The (a) competition.)
      ii. Lexical Substitution: No
   b. Across tv: Yes  (The (b) competition.)

(24) \{FAITHLEX, V-LICENSE\} » NEGCRIT » STAY

Tableau 3: Finland Swedish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP Input: ingen</th>
<th>V-LIC</th>
<th>Faith Lex</th>
<th>Neg Crit</th>
<th>Stay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a1 S Vaux [NEGP inte [VP V någon NP]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a2 *S Vaux [NEGP ingen NP [VP V t ]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a3 *S Vaux [NEGP ingen NP [VP V t ]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b1 S V [NEGP inte [VP t v någon NP]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b2 *S V [NEGP ingen NP [VP t v ingen NP]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b3 *S V [NEGP ingen NP [VP t v t ]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in Scan2, NEG-shift is blocked by the verb in (a3) but lexical substitution is not allowed. Violations of FAITHLEX and V-LICENSE are equally worse than violating NEGCRIT and (a2) is optimal. Because NEGCRIT outranks STAY, NEG-shift takes place across the verb trace in (b3).
English

(25) NEG-shift from VP

a. Across verb: No
   iii. Lexical Substitution: No

b. Across t;, (No)
   iv. Lexical Substitution: (No)

(26) \{FAITHLEX, V-LICENSE, STAY\} » NEGCRIT

Tableau 4: English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input: no</th>
<th>VP</th>
<th>V-</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>NEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LIC</td>
<td>LEX</td>
<td>AY</td>
<td>CRIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a1</td>
<td>S V aux [NEGP not [VP V any NP]]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≠ a2</td>
<td>S V aux [NEGP [VP V no NP]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a3</td>
<td>*S V aux [NEGP no NP [VP V t ]]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b1</td>
<td>S V [NEGP not [VP t, any NP]]</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b2</td>
<td>S V [NEGP [VP t, no NP]]</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b3</td>
<td>S V [NEGP no NP [VP t, t ]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In English, NEG-shift is never allowed and the no-phrase is always in situ.

Unlike in Finland Swedish, the (b) competition is not relevant in English because the main verb never leaves Vº and because English has do-insertion.

Therefore, the difference between English and Finland Swedish regarding NEG-shift, i.e. STAY » NEGCRIT versus NEGCRIT » STAY (with everything else outranking NEGCRIT in either case), has no empirical reflex. In fact, the relevant difference between (b2) and (b3) is string vacuous in any of the languages; cf. the structure in (15).

The following box-diagram sums up the variations in constraint ranking that account for observed differences in NEG-shift:
(27) Danish, Faroese, Icelandic, Norwegian, Swedish

(28) Scan2

(29) Finland Swedish

(30) English
1.2 A Note on Negative Objects in Situ

Svenonius (2002) describes a number of Norwegian exceptions to the general rule that *ingen* is always in spec-NEG sentence medially. The same pattern is found in the other Scandinavian languages as well. I will just focus on one of the types of exception, namely what Svenonius calls *trifling negation*.

Consider the following scenario. A number of people participate in a contest and are rewarded with a number of points on a scale, say, from 0 to 5 which means that everybody gets a number of points even if the number is zero. In this context, *ingen* can occur VP-internally, but with a different reading than sentence negation:

(31) Da: a. Hun har [VP fået ingen point] _She has_ received _no_ points
≈ “She scored zero points”

b. Hun har ingen point, [VP fået t1] _She has no points received_ 
≈ “She hasn’t got any points yet/she hasn’t been judged yet”

The difference can be emphasised by inserting the NPIs *heller* ‘neither’ and *overhovedet* ‘at all’:

(32) a. *Hun har heller [VP fået ingen point] overhovedet _She has neither_ received _no_ points at.all
≈ “She hasn’t got any points at all either”

b. Hun har heller ingen point, [VP fået t1] overhovedet _She has neither no points received_ at.all
≈ “She hasn’t got any points at all either”

The same effect is found with positive/negative tags: (31)a takes a positive tag (*and so have I*) but not a negative one (*and neither have I*), whereas the pattern is the other way around in (31)b.

Another difference is that trifling negation is very limited. It can only be used with scalar quantities, such as points or salary:

(33) Da: a. *Hun har [VP fået ingen ideer] _She has_ got _no_ ideas
≈ “She has got some ideas and the number of ideas she’s got is zero”

b. Hun har ingen ideer, [VP fået t1] _She has no ideas got_
≈ “She hasn’t got any ideas”

This means that English and Finland Swedish clauses corresponding to (33)a are (potentially) ambiguous because of the lack of NEG-shift in both languages.
In Scan2, clauses with auxiliary verbs never have *ingen* with sentential negation but use *ikke* instead, and therefore they are not ambiguous.

In all the Scandinavian languages, however, clauses with the main verb in V2 position are (potentially) ambiguous because NEG-shift is string-vacuous.

### 1.3 A Note on Negative Subjects

The question is whether the subject moves through spec-NEGP on the way to spec-TP when the subject is negative, e.g.:

(34) Da: Ingen har set filmen (ikke engang os)

*No one has seen the movie (not even us)*

The sentence is negative as can be seen from the negative tag.

I assume that the movement of the subject to spec-TP is motivated by a high ranking or possibly inviolable constraint such as CASE (the case filter).

The question can be answered by considering the relative ranking of NEGCRIT and STAY. In all the Scandinavian languages, the ranking is NEGCRIT » STAY which means that movement of the subject through spec-NEG leaving a trace will satisfy NEGCRIT but violate STAY. This violation is licensed as the higher ranking NEGCRIT is satisfied. So, filling spec-NEGP is optimal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tableau 5: Scandinavian</th>
<th></th>
<th>NEG CRIT</th>
<th>STAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In English, the ranking is the other way around and therefore skipping spec-NEGP is optimal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tableau 6: English</th>
<th></th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>NEG CRIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>**!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The exact same pattern emerges with negative topics. I assume that topicalisation is motivated by a high ranking Topic Criterion:

(35) **TOPCRIT**

The topic of the clause must be in spec-head relation with a $C^0_{[TOP]}$.  


Only English prohibits movement through spec-NEG because of the ranking \( \text{TopCrit} \rightarrow \text{Stay} \rightarrow \text{NegCrit} \) (spec-NEG of is never filled by movement), whereas the opposite is the case for Scandinavian with \( \text{TopCrit} \rightarrow \text{NegCrit} \rightarrow \text{Stay} \). This difference, however, is of a purely theoretical nature as it has no empirical realisation.

2 Pronominal OBJ-shift

The Scandinavian languages have OBJ-shift of weak unstressed pronominal objects (e.g. Vikner 1989: 146; 1994), which is subject to Holmberg’s Generalisation (Holmberg 1986, 1999), i.e. OBJ-shift is only possible when the main verb has left VP (i.e. V2 or Icelandic Vº-to-Iº).

In Danish, Faroese, and Icelandic, this movement is obligatory.

(36) Da: a. *Hun så\(v\) ikke [\(VP \ t_v \ \text{ham}\)]  
    b. Hun så\(v\) ham\(i\) ikke [\(VP \ t_v \ t_i\)]  
    \(\text{She saw him not}\)  
    (“She didn’t see him.”)

(37) Ic: a. *Ég las\(v\) ekki [\(VP \ t_v \ \text{þær}\)]  
    b. Ég las\(v\) þær\(i\) ekki [\(VP \ t_v \ t_i\)]  
    \(\text{I read them not}\)  
    (“I didn’t read them.”)

In colloquial Swedish and Norwegian, pronominal OBJ-shift is optional:

(38) Sw: a. Jag vet\(v\) inte [\(VP \ t_v \ \text{det}\)]  
    b. *Jag vet\(v\) det inte [\(VP \ t_v \ t_i\)]  
    \(\text{I know it not}\)  
    (“I don’t know.”)

In the languages mentioned so far, except Icelandic, a pronoun with emphatic focus stress can remain inside VP. In fact OBJ-shift of stressed pronouns is ungrammatical (uppercase letters indicate emphasis):

(39) Da: a. Jeg mødte\(v\) ikke [\(VP \ t_v \ \text{HAM}\)]  
    b. *Jeg mødte\(v\) \text{HAM}\(i\) ikke [\(VP \ t_v \ t_i\)]  
    \(\text{I met HIM not}\)  
    (“I didn’t meet HIM.”)

(40) Ic: a. ?Ég hitti\(v\) ekki [\(VP \ t_v \ \text{HANN}\)]  
    b. Ég hitti\(v\) \text{HANN}\(i\) ekki [\(VP \ t_v \ t_i\)]  
    \(\text{I met HIM not}\)  
    (“I didn’t meet HIM.”)

I shall focus on the unstressed pronouns.
Finally, in Finland Swedish this movement is not licensed even with the main verb in V2 position (cf. Bergroth 1917: 172, §255):

(41) **FS:**
   a. Jag vet\(_v\) inte [VP \(t\_v\) det]
   b. *Jag vet\(_v\) det inte [VP \(t\_v\) t\(_i\) ]

   (*I don’t know.*)

The same goes for English with the difference that the verb never moves out of VP (or at least never high enough to precede any of the sentence medial adverbs or negation; there may be movement to precede manner adverbs such as *slowly*):

(42) **En:**
   a. I do not [VP like her]
   b. *I do her not [VP like t\(_i\) ]

Müller (2001) argues that the target of pronominal OBJ-shift (and scrambling of pronouns) is a position in the domain of a functional head \(\pi^o\) (\(\pi/pi\) for ‘pronoun’) and that it is motivated by the Pronoun Criterion\(^5\):

(43) **PRONCRIT**
   Weak pronouns must be in the domain of \(\pi\) at S-Structure (Müller 2001: 289).

The \(\pi\)-projection is located between TP and NEGP:

---

\(^5\) See Vogel (2003) for an interesting alternative account of pronominal OBJ-shift based on phonology.
The variation in Scandinavian pronominal OBJ-shift can thus be derived by ranking PRONCRIT differently in the languages. Holmberg’s Generalisation states that OBJ-shift cannot cross the licensing verb (among other things), which means that V-LICENSE is ranked above PRONCRIT:\(^6\):

\[(45) \textbf{Holmberg’s generalisation}^7
\]
\[V\text{-LICENSE} \gg PRONCRIT\]

In order to take into account the optionality of colloquial Norwegian and Swedish OBJ-shift, an additional constraint is needed:

\[(46) \textbf{SCOPE}^8\]

An element has the surface position in the clause that corresponds to its relative scope.  
(Diesing’s 1997: 373, (5): Mapping Hypothesis; Vikner’s 2001a: 328, (22b): SCOPING)

Vikner (2001a) uses Scope to account for German scrambling and Icelandic full-DP OBJ-shift.

Tableau 7: Norwegian and Swedish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Scope”: pron &gt; inte</th>
<th>V-LIC</th>
<th>PRONCRIT</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a1</td>
<td>S V [\textit{ap} [NEGP \textit{inte} [VP \textit{t}, pron]]]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a2</td>
<td>S V [\textit{ap pron} [NEGP \textit{inte} [VP \textit{t}, t_1]]]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Scope”: inte &gt; pron</td>
<td>V-LIC</td>
<td>PRONCRIT</td>
<td>STAY</td>
<td>SCOPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b1</td>
<td>S V [\textit{ap} [NEGP \textit{inte} [VP \textit{t}, pron]]]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b2</td>
<td>S V [\textit{ap pron} [NEGP \textit{inte} [VP \textit{t}, t_1]]]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tied ranking between PRONCRIT and STAY is crucial in order to make violations of the lower ranked SCOPE important. STAY must outrank SCOPE because Norwegian and Swedish don’t have full-DP OBJ-shift like Icelandic.

---

\(^6\) The same blocking effect is found with licensing prepositions and therefore the ranking is P-LICENSE, V-LICENSE \(\gg\) PRONCRIT.

\(^7\) This only accounts for the blocking effect of verbs. P-LICENSE accounts for the effect of prepositions and PARMOVE for intervening indirect objects.

\(^8\) This is perhaps not the best label for the constraint (at least as it is used here), as pronouns being variables don’t actually take scope (thanks to Peter Sells (p.c.) for pointing this out). The constraint should rather be something like MAPPING, which in turn perhaps consists of two sub-constraints: FOCUS stating that focal elements (new information) must be within VP which maps onto the “nuclear scope of an operator”, and PRESUP stating that elements that map onto the “restriction of an operator” (i.e. the presupposition or given information) must be outside VP. (Focus would then be considered an operator along the same line as topic.) This is supported by the contrast in (39) and (40) on the one hand and between pronominal and full-DP OBJ-shift on the other. However, as I restrict myself to unstressed pronouns and pronominal OBJ-shift, I will continue to use Vikner’s label for the constraint.
Icelandic is the only Scandinavian language that has full-DP OBJ-shift as well as obligatory pronominal OBJ-shift, both dependent on verb movement. This means that both PRONCRIT and SCOPE outranks STAY:\(^9\):

**Tableau 8: Icelandic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V-LIC</th>
<th>PRON</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>STAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a1</td>
<td>*S V [\text{π} \ P \ \text{[NEGP e}kki \ [\text{VP t}, \text{t}, \text{t}1]]]</td>
<td><em>! (</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{a2}</td>
<td>S V [\text{π} \ P \ \text{[NEGP e}kki \ [\text{VP t}, \text{t}1]]]</td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full-DP OBJ-shift**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V-LIC</th>
<th>PRON</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>STAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\text{b1}</td>
<td>S V [\text{[NEGP e}kki \ [\text{VP t}, \text{DP}]]]</td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{b2}</td>
<td>S V [\text{[DP}1 \ [\text{NEGP e}kki \ [\text{VP t}, \text{t}1]]]]</td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRONCRIT outranks SCOPE and STAY to ensure that pronominal OBJ-shift always takes place when possible (i.e. when V-LICENSE is obeyed). In turn, SCOPE outranks STAY to make full-DP possible.

In Danish, Faroese, and Norwegian, pronominal OBJ-shift is obligatory, regardless of scope, and therefore PRONCRIT outranks STAY and SCOPE. Here STAY outranks SCOPE to prevent full-DP OBJ-shift:

**Tableau 9: Danish, Faroese, and Norwegian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V-LIC</th>
<th>PRON</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>*S V [\text{π} \ P \ \text{[NEGP i}kke \ [\text{VP t}, \text{t}, \text{t}]]]</td>
<td><em>! (</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{2}</td>
<td>S V [\text{π} \ P \ \text{[NEGP i}kke \ [\text{VP t}, \text{t}1]]]</td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td>* (*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Finland Swedish and English, STAY outranks PRONCRIT and there is no OBJ-shift. In this respect, the two languages differ syntactically only on the movement of the main verb: Finland Swedish is a V2 language and English has \textit{do}-insertion.

**Tableau 10: Finland Swedish**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V-LIC</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>PRON</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\text{1}</td>
<td>S V [\text{π} \ P \ \text{[NEGP i}nte \ [\text{VP t}, \text{t}, \text{t}]]]</td>
<td>* (*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*S V [\text{π} \ P \ \text{[NEGP i}nte \ [\text{VP t}, \text{t}1]]]</td>
<td><em>! (</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^9\) The parentheses indicate that the constraint is not necessarily violated. Depending on the input scope relation between the negation and the pronominal object, SCOPE is either violated in (a1) or in (a2) but never in both. For example, if the input is pron > NEG, (a1) violates SCOPE, whereas (a2) doesn’t.
### Tableau 11: English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V-LIC</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>PRON</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>*S do [sp</td>
<td>[NEGP not [VP V pron ]]</td>
<td></td>
<td>(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*S do [sp pron</td>
<td>[NEGP not [VP t1 ]]</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>(*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(On the difference in the ranking of V-LICENSE and STAY, recall from above that Finland Swedish has V-LICENSE » NEGCRIT » STAY, whereas English has {V-LICENSE, STAY} » NEGCRIT. As already noted, this difference has no empirical reflex.)

### 3 Double Objects and Parallel Movement

In double object construction with OBJ-shift (or scrambling), movement always has to preserve the base-generated or initial word order of the two objects (Scandinavian and English: IO-DO, German: DO-IO). Müller (2001) proposes that this is due to the Parallel Movement Constraint:

\[
(47) \text{PARMOVE} \quad \text{If } \alpha \text-commands } \beta \text{ at level } L_n, \text{ then } \alpha \text-commands } \beta \text{ at level } L_{n+1} \text{ (where } \alpha, \beta \text{ are arguments).} 
\]

(Müller 2001: 279, (1))

The direct object DO moves to spec-$\pi$P and the indirect object IO adjoins to $\pi$P and the base-generated word order is preserved\(^{10}\):

\[
(48) \qquad \text{IO} \quad \text{DO} \quad \text{...} \quad \text{...} 
\]

(There is, of course, also the logical possibility that there are two $\pi$P projections, one for the direct object $\pi$DOP and another for the indirect object $\pi$IOP. This is parallel to the two projections for object agreement, AGROP and AGRIOP. If so, the structural order of the two $\pi$P projections would have to be subject to parametric variation: $[\pi\text{DOP} [\pi\text{DOP}]]$ vs. $[\pi\text{DOP} [\pi\text{IOP}]]$.)

The following Danish examples are representative of the other Scandinavian languages. What (49) and (50) show is that PARMOVE must be obeyed. A comparison of (49)b and (49)c shows that OBJ-shift must apply to satisfy PRONCRIT. However, (50)b shows that PRONCRIT can be violated to satisfy PARMOVE:

\(^{10}\) This obligatory word order preservation in double object shift is also discussed by Vikner (1989), who suggests that what is moved is the entire lower VP-shell, i.e. $[_{\pi\text{IOP}} {\text{V}^n \text{ DO}}]$, which he labels $\delta$P (1989: 148, (36)).
Unlike the other Scandinavian languages, Icelandic has OBJ-shift of full DPs which can be seen from the fact that they may precede the negation ekki ‘not’. In double object constructions, only those that respect the underlying order are grammatical. This is true for any combination of DPs, pronouns, and clitics:

(51) Ic: a. Ég lána\textsubscript{v} Mariu\textsubscript{1} bækurnar\textsubscript{2} ekki [\text{VP} t\textsubscript{v} t\textsubscript{1} t\textsubscript{2} ]
   b. *Ég lána\textsubscript{v} bækurnar\textsubscript{2} Mariu\textsubscript{1} ekki [\text{VP} t\textsubscript{v} t\textsubscript{1} t\textsubscript{2} ]
   I lent the.books Maria not
   (“I didn’t lend Mary the books.”)

(52) Ic: a. Ég [lána+henni\textsubscript{i}]\textsubscript{v} bækurnar\textsubscript{2} ekki [\text{VP} t\textsubscript{v} t\textsubscript{1} t\textsubscript{2} ]
   b. *Ég lána\textsubscript{v} bækurnar\textsubscript{2} henni\textsubscript{i} ekki [\text{VP} t\textsubscript{v} t\textsubscript{1} t\textsubscript{2} ]
   I lent the.books her not
   (“I didn’t lend her the books.”)

(53) Ic: a. Ég lána\textsubscript{v} Mariu\textsubscript{1} þær\textsubscript{2} ekki [\text{VP} t\textsubscript{v} t\textsubscript{1} t\textsubscript{2} ]
   b. *Ég [lána+þær\textsubscript{2}]\textsubscript{v} Mariu\textsubscript{1} ekki [\text{VP} t\textsubscript{v} t\textsubscript{1} t\textsubscript{2} ]
   I lent+them Maria not
   (“I didn’t lend them to Mary.”)

(54) Ic: a. Ég [lána+henni\textsubscript{i}+þær\textsubscript{2}]\textsubscript{v} ekki [\text{VP} t\textsubscript{v} t\textsubscript{1} t\textsubscript{2} ]
   b. *Ég lána\textsubscript{v} þær\textsubscript{2} henni\textsubscript{i} ekki [\text{VP} t\textsubscript{v} t\textsubscript{1} t\textsubscript{2} ]
   I lent them her not
   (“I didn’t lend them to her.”)

Thus, in all the languages discussed, PARMOVE must be ranked above PRONCRIT and SCOPE\textsuperscript{11}.

\textsuperscript{11} According to Anagnostopoulou (2003: 123-127), some speakers of Swedish and Norwegian allow both (49)d and (50)d. As violating PARMOVE doesn’t necessarily result in ungrammaticality, the ranking in these dialects must be SCOPE » PARMOVE. Interestingly, Anagnostopoulou (2003) relates the possibility of non-parallel OBJ-shift to the Norwegian and Swedish symmetric passive. That is, both the direct and the indirect object can raise to subject under passivisation which is not possible in Danish and Icelandic (it is, however, not clear whether all speakers of Norwegian and Swedish accept both (i) and (ii) or whether it correlates completely with (un)acceptability of non-parallel OBJ-shift):

i. Jon\textsubscript{1} ble gitt t\textsubscript{1} en bok
   A book was given John
ii. En bok\textsubscript{2} ble gitt Jon t\textsubscript{2}
   A book was given John
The following tableau shows the relevant candidates for Danish, Faroese, and Icelandic, leaving out details of Icelandic clitisation:

### Tableau 12: Danish, Faroese, and Icelandic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input: pronIO, pronDO</th>
<th>PAR MOVE</th>
<th>V-LICENSE</th>
<th>PRON CRIT</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 *S V [<strong>NEGIP ikke [VP t, IO DO ]</strong>]</td>
<td>*! *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 *S V IO1 [<strong>NEGIP ikke [VP t, t1 DO ]</strong>]</td>
<td>*! *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 *S V DO2 [<strong>NEGIP ikke [VP t, IO t2 ]</strong>]</td>
<td>*! *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 *S V IO1 DO2 [<strong>NEGIP ikke [VP t, t1 t2 ]</strong>]</td>
<td>*! *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 *S V DO2 IO1 [<strong>NEGIP ikke [VP t, t1 t2 ]</strong>]</td>
<td>*! *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Norwegian and Swedish allow pronominal objects in situ. Satisfying the high ranking PARMOVE, three possible constructions survive, which have to be evaluated by SCOPE. Only the candidate with the proper word order is optimal ([VP [IO DO] vs. [IO [VP t DO] vs. [IO DO [VP t t]]):

### Tableau 13: Norwegian and Swedish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input: pronIO, pronDO</th>
<th>PAR MOVE</th>
<th>V-LICENSE</th>
<th>PRON CRIT</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 S V [<strong>NEGIP ikke [VP t, IO DO ]</strong>]</td>
<td>** (*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 S V IO1 [<strong>NEGIP ikke [VP t, t1 DO ]</strong>]</td>
<td>* (*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 *S V DO2 [<strong>NEGIP ikke [VP t, IO t2 ]</strong>]</td>
<td>*! *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 S V IO1 DO2 [<strong>NEGIP ikke [VP t, t1 t2 ]</strong>]</td>
<td>** (*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 *S V DO2 IO1 [<strong>NEGIP ikke [VP t, t1 t2 ]</strong>]</td>
<td>*! *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>** (*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Finland Swedish and English, the high ranking of Stay makes the candidate without movement optimal (I only provide a tableau for Finland Swedish but English patterns completely the same just without V2):

### Tableau 14: Finland Swedish (and English)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input: pronIO, pronDO</th>
<th>PAR MOVE</th>
<th>V-LICENSE</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>PRON CRIT</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 S V [<strong>NEGIP ikke [VP t, IO DO ]</strong>]</td>
<td>** (*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 *S V IO1 [<strong>NEGIP ikke [VP t, t1 DO ]</strong>]</td>
<td>*! *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 *S V DO2 [<strong>NEGIP ikke [VP t, IO t2 ]</strong>]</td>
<td>*! *</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 *S V IO1 DO2 [<strong>NEGIP ikke [VP t, t1 t2 ]</strong>]</td>
<td>*! *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 *S V DO2 IO1 [<strong>NEGIP ikke [VP t, t1 t2 ]</strong>]</td>
<td>*! *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following box-diagram sums up the micro-variation in pronominal OBJ-shift:
(55) Icelandic

(56) Swedish

(57) Danish, Norwegian, Faroese

(58) Finland Swedish

(59) English
4 NEG-shift and Double Objects

4.1 A Note on Wh-Movement

In traditional terms, subject movement and OBJ-shift are both instances of A-movement, but they do not block each other. The same holds for NEG-shift and wh-movement which are both A-movement but do not block each other.

Curiously, both NEG-shift and OBJ-shift, but not wh-movement, are blocked by a VP-internal indirect object:

\[(60)\]
\[
\text{Da:} \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Jeg gav}_v \text{ ham}_l \text{ ingen gave}_2 \ [\text{VP } t_v t_1 t_2 ]  \quad \text{(OBJ- & NEG-shift)} \\
\text{b. } & *\text{Jeg gav}_v \text{ ingen gave}_2 \ [\text{VP } t_v \text{ manden } t_2 ]  \quad \text{(NEG-shift)} \\
\text{c. } & *\text{Jeg gav}_v \text{ manden ingen gave }_{12} \ [\text{VP } t_v t_2 ]  \quad \text{(no NEG-shift)} \\
& \text{I gave (him) (no present) the.man (no present)} \\
& ("I didn’t give him/the man any present.")
\]

\[(61)\]
\[
\text{Da:} \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Jeg gav}_v \text{ ham}_l \text{ den}_2 \text{ ikke } \ [\text{VP } t_v t_1 t_2 ]  \quad \text{(double OBJ-shift)} \\
\text{b. } & *\text{Jeg gav}_v \text{ den}_2 \text{ ikke } \ [\text{VP } t_v \text{ manden } t_2 ]  \quad \text{(OBJ-shift)} \\
\text{c. } & \text{Jeg gav}_v \text{ ikke } \text{ manden den }_l \ [\text{VP } t_v t_2 ]  \quad \text{(no OBJ-shift)} \\
& \text{I gave (him) (it) not the.man it} \\
& ("I didn’t give it to him/the man.")
\]

\[(62)\]
\[
\text{Da:} \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Hvad}_2 \text{ gav}_v \text{ jeg } \text{ ham}_l \ [\text{VP } t_v t_1 t_2 ]  \quad \text{(OBJ-shift & wh-move)} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Hvad}_2 \text{ gav}_v \text{ jeg ingen}_l \ [\text{VP } t_v t_1 t_2 ]  \quad \text{(NEG-shift & wh-move)} \\
\text{c. } & \text{Hvad}_2 \text{ gav}_v \text{ jeg } \text{ manden}_l \ [\text{VP } t_v \text{ manden } t_2 ]  \quad \text{(wh-move)} \\
& \text{What gave I (him/no-one) the.man} \\
& ("What did I give him/no-one/the man?")
\]

Wh-movement is motivated by the \textit{Wh}-Criterion (Rizzi 1996: 64) which must be ranked above \textit{PARMOVE} to make the sentences in (62) grammatical as the order of the objects is reversed.

\[(63)\] \textit{WHCRIT}
\[
\text{XP}_{[-?h]} \text{ is in the domain of } C_{[-?h]} \text{ at S-structure (Müller 2001: 29, (38)).}
\]

\[12\] As Icelandic has full-DP OBJ-shift, the string in (60)c is grammatical with a different structure, namely the one where the negative direct object has undergone NEG-shift and the indirect object has shifted across it:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{i. } & *\text{Ég gaf}_v \text{ [manninum] } \text{ enga gjöf }_{12} \ [\text{VP } t_v t_1 t_2 ]  \\
\text{ii. } & \text{Ég gaf}_v \text{ [manninum] } \text{ enga gjöf }_{12} \ [\text{VP } t_v t_1 t_2 ]  \\
& \text{I gave the.man no present}
\end{align*}
\]

\[13\] This is grammatical (but has a different meaning) in Icelandic if the indirect object DP (Ic. \textit{MADURINN}, Da. \textit{MANDEN}) is stressed.
Note that (61)c is grammatical despite the PRONCRIT violation. The pronominal direct object den is preceded by the full DP indirect object manden. As Danish does not have full-DP OBJ-shift, both objects must be inside VP. This is licensed because PARMOVE \( \gg \) PRONCRIT. Leaving the object in situ is not available for NEG-shift in (60)c. I return to this in section 4.3 below.

With OBJ-shift and wh-movement out of the way, only NEG-shift needs an explanation.

### 4.2 NEG-shift and Pronominal Objects

Consider first NEG-shift of the direct object (DO) together with OBJ-shift of a pronominal indirect object (IO):

(64) Da: a. *Jeg gav faktisk hende ingen gave\textsuperscript{14}
   b. *Jeg gav faktisk ingen gave hende
   c. Jeg gav hende faktisk ingen gave
   
   ("I actually gave her no present.")

The examples correspond to the candidates in the following tableau. The string in (64)c has two possible structures: one with string-vacuous NEG-shift, the optimal candidate (a4), and one without, (a3):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tableau 15: Danish</th>
<th>Input: pron\textsubscript{IO} ingen\textsubscript{DO}</th>
<th>PAR MOVE</th>
<th>NEG CRIT</th>
<th>PRON CRIT</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>*S V [NEGP [vp t, pron ingen]]</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*S V [NEGP ingen\textsubscript{2} [vp t, pron t\textsubscript{2}]]</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>*S V pron\textsubscript{1} [NEGP [vp t, t\textsubscript{1} ingen]]</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S V pron\textsubscript{1} [NEGP ingen\textsubscript{2} [vp t, t\textsubscript{1} t\textsubscript{2}]]</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/1" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the candidates except the optimal one violate either NEGCRIT or PRONCRIT or both. The fact that candidate 2 violates PARMOVE is ‘secondary’ as it would be ungrammatical regardless.

Consider next NEG-shift of the indirect object together with OBJ-shift of a pronominal direct object\textsuperscript{15}:

\textsuperscript{14} This is grammatical (at least in Danish and Icelandic) if the pronoun hende is stressed, which is also to be expected as stressed pronouns remain in VP in Danish. Leaving the negative object in situ as well violates NEGCRIT but satisfies PARMOVE.

\textsuperscript{15} According to Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson (p.c.), even (65)b is grammatical in Icelandic with a certain ironic intonation with stress on the subject and stress on the subject of the tag:

i. ÉG gaf hana reyndar engum en það gerðir þú
   I gave it actually no one but that did YOU
The sentences in (65) both have two possible structures: sentence (65)a corresponds to candidates (a1) and (a2) in Tableau 16 below, and (65)b corresponds to candidates (a3) and (a4):

4.3 A Remaining Problem: the Blocking Indirect Object
The construction with a full DP indirect object in VP, as exemplified in (60)b and c above, provides empirical support for this ranking. Consider the data in (66):

(As far as I know, the blocking effect of a VP-internal DP\textsubscript{IO} on both OBJ-shift and NEG-shift is the same in all the Scandinavian languages, so I only provide examples in Danish. As stated in footnote 12 on page 19, (66)a is grammatical in Icelandic with a different structure than the other Scandinavian languages. Again, the point is that Icelandic has OBJ-shift of full DPs.)
Only the *ikke .. nogen* ‘not any’ construction is grammatical. In other words, it is better to change the lexical material and violate FAITHLEX than to violate NEGCRIT ((66)a) or PARMOVE ((66)b).

Interestingly, the presence of the verb in V° appears to be important, as can be seen from the fact that while only the construction with compound tense is possible in main clauses, both versions are grammatical in embedded clauses where the verb is always in situ:

(67) Da: a. Jeg har ingen gave, [VP t[v [VP givet manden t1]]]
     I have no present given the.man
     (Main clause)

   b. *Jeg gav,  ingen gave, [VP t[v manden t1]]
      I gave no present the.man
      (Main clause)

(68) Da: a. …at jeg ingen gave, [VP har [VP givet manden t1]]
     …that I no present have given the.man
     (Embedded clause)

   b. …at jeg ingen gave, [VP gav manden t1]
      …that I no present gave the.man
      (Embedded clause)

Some speakers find all the examples in (67) and (68) marked. However, (67)b is still significantly worse than the others. Examples (67)a and (68)b and c would then have a question mark, while (67)b would still have an asterisk. Sentence (67)b has a “garden path” effect: the immediate but absurd interpretation is that the man was given to no present.

It is also interesting to note that the problem is only related to indirect objects in situ. Constructions with a NEG-shifted negative indirect object and an in situ full DP direct object are not problematic, which is to be expected as there are no PARMOVE violations involved:

(69) Da: a. Jeg har ingen lingvist, [VP t[v [VP givet en bog]]]
     I have no linguist given a book
     (Main clause)

   b. Jeg gav ingen lingvist, [VP t[v en bog]]
      I gave no linguist a book
      (Main clause)

(70) Da: a. …at jeg ingen lingvist, [VP har [VP givet en bog]]
     …that I no linguist have given a book
     (Embedded)

   b. …at jeg ingen lingvist, [VP gav en bog]
      …that I no linguist gave a book
      (Embedded)

This gives rise to a problem for which I at present have no solution.

In Tableau 17 below, the (a) and (b) competitions correspond to (66) and (67)a respectively.

NEGCRIT has been promoted to dominate PARMOVE (as do WHCRIT and TOPCRIT) to make (b1) inherently worse than (b2). As there has been no crucial ranking between the two constraints so far, this minor change has no effect on the choice of optimality in the tableaux above.
Unfortunately, there is a candidate that wins over (a3), namely the one with OBJ-shift of the indirect object. This solution is available in Icelandic, but not in Danish, which is interesting because OBJ-shift of full DPs in Icelandic normally isn’t obligatory. This apparently constitutes an exception.

Considering the (b) competition corresponding to (67), once again the wrong candidate wins, i.e. the one with OBJ-shift of the indirect object. This operation, however, is not even licensed in Icelandic.

When the system is applied to the sentences in (69) with a NEG-shifted IO and an in situ full DP DO, the preferred candidates are optimal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tableau 17: Danish</th>
<th>Input: DP\textsubscript{IO}, \textit{ingen}DO</th>
<th>NEG</th>
<th>PAR</th>
<th>FAITHL</th>
<th>V-LIC</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a1 | *S V \begin{tabular}{|c|}
\textsubscript{NEG} \\
\textsubscript{VP t, DP \textit{ingen}} \end{tabular} | *! | | | | | |
| a2 | *S V \begin{tabular}{|c|}
\textsubscript{NEG} \textit{ingen} \textsubscript{2} \\
\textsubscript{VP t, DP \textit{t2}} \end{tabular} | *! | | | | | |
| ⊗ a3 | S V \begin{tabular}{|c|}
\textsubscript{NEG} \textit{ikke} \\
\textsubscript{VP t, DP \textit{nogen}} \end{tabular} | *! | | | | | |
| ⊗ a4 | S V \begin{tabular}{|c|}
\textsubscript{DP} \textsubscript{1} \textsubscript{NEG} \textit{ingen} \textsubscript{2} \\
\textsubscript{VP t, \textit{t1} \textit{t2}} \end{tabular} | | | | | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input: DP\textsubscript{IO}, \textit{ingen}DO</th>
<th>NEG</th>
<th>PAR</th>
<th>FAITHL</th>
<th>V-LIC</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| b1 | *S V\textsubscript{aux} \begin{tabular}{|c|}
\textsubscript{NEG} \\
\textsubscript{VP V \textit{ingen}} \end{tabular} | *! | | | | | |
| ⊗ b2 | S V\textsubscript{aux} \begin{tabular}{|c|}
\textsubscript{NEG} \textit{ingen} \textsubscript{2} \\
\textsubscript{VP V \textit{t1} \textit{DP}} \end{tabular} | *! | * | * | | |
| ⊗ b3 | S V\textsubscript{aux} \begin{tabular}{|c|}
\textsubscript{NEG} \textit{ikke} \\
\textsubscript{VP V \textit{nogen}} \end{tabular} | *! | | | | | |
| ⊗ b4 | S V\textsubscript{aux} \begin{tabular}{|c|}
\textsubscript{DP} \textsubscript{2} \textsubscript{NEG} \textit{ingen} \textsubscript{2} \\
\textsubscript{VP V \textit{t1} \textit{t2}} \end{tabular} | | | | | | |

Tableau 18: Danish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input: \textit{ingen}DO, DP\textsubscript{DO}</th>
<th>NEG</th>
<th>PAR</th>
<th>FAITHL</th>
<th>V-LIC</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a1 | *S V \begin{tabular}{|c|}
\textsubscript{NEG} \\
\textsubscript{VP t, \textit{ingen} \text{\textit{DP}}} \end{tabular} | *! | | | | | |
| ⊗ a2 | S V \begin{tabular}{|c|}
\textsubscript{NEG} \textit{ingen} \textsubscript{1} \\
\textsubscript{VP t, \textit{t1} \text{\textit{DP}}} \end{tabular} | | | | | | |
| a3 | S V \begin{tabular}{|c|}
\textsubscript{NEG} \textit{ikke} \\
\textsubscript{VP t, \textit{nogen} \text{\textit{DP}}} \end{tabular} | *! | | | | | |
| a4 | S V \begin{tabular}{|c|}
\textsubscript{DP} \textsubscript{2} \textsubscript{NEG} \textit{ingen} \textsubscript{1} \\
\textsubscript{VP t, \textit{t1} \textit{t2}} \end{tabular} | | | | | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input: DP\textsubscript{IO}, \textit{ingen}DO</th>
<th>NEG</th>
<th>PAR</th>
<th>FAITHL</th>
<th>V-LIC</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| b1 | *S V\textsubscript{aux} \begin{tabular}{|c|}
\textsubscript{NEG} \\
\textsubscript{VP V \textit{ingen} \text{\textit{DP}}} \end{tabular} | *! | | | | | |
| ⊗ b2 | S V\textsubscript{aux} \begin{tabular}{|c|}
\textsubscript{NEG} \textit{ingen} \textsubscript{1} \\
\textsubscript{VP V \textit{t1} \text{\textit{DP}}} \end{tabular} | | * | | | |
| b3 | S V\textsubscript{aux} \begin{tabular}{|c|}
\textsubscript{NEG} \textit{ikke} \\
\textsubscript{VP V \textit{nogen} \text{\textit{DP}}} \end{tabular} | | | * | | |
| b4 | S V\textsubscript{aux} \begin{tabular}{|c|}
\textsubscript{DP} \textsubscript{2} \textsubscript{NEG} \textit{ingen} \textsubscript{1} \\
\textsubscript{VP V \textit{t1} \textit{t2}} \end{tabular} | | * | | | ** ** |
5 Summary
The languages differ with respect to the licensing of NEG-shift:
- Danish, Faroese, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Swedish all have NEG-shift, even across the licensing main verb in Vº.
- Scan2 only allows NEG-shift in clauses where the main verb has left VP.
- Finland Swedish has NEG-shift when the main verb is in V2 and ingen in situ when the main verb is in Vº.
- English never has NEG-shift.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>NEG-shift Across t.</th>
<th>NEG-shift Across Verb</th>
<th>Subject to HG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Da, Fa, Ic, No, and Sw</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scan2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗ Substitution</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗ NEG in situ</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En</td>
<td>✓?</td>
<td>✗ NEG in situ</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-shifted NEGQPs can be interpreted as trifling negation, which means that they are ambiguous:
- in main clauses with the main verb in V2 in all the Scandinavian languages
- in main clauses with the main verb in Vº in FS and En

The languages also differ in the licensing of OBJ-shift:
- Da, Fa, and Ic have obligatory OBJ-shift
- Sw and No have optional OBJ-shift
- FS and En have no OBJ-shift

As predicted, OBJ-shift is licensed in accordance with Holmberg’s Generalisation, except that Finland Swedish needs a stronger version as OBJ-shift cannot cross the verb trace when the main verb has moved.

Parallel Movement (PARMOVE) is respected in all the languages that have OBJ-shift (i.e. Da, Fa, Ic, No, Sw, and Scan2; see footnote 11 for exceptions) when both objects undergo OBJ-shift.

PARMOVE can be (and must be) violated in topicalisation (which I haven’t discussed) and wh-questions.

In double object constructions with one pronominal object and one negative object, PARMOVE is always respected:
- PronIO & NEGDO → PRONCRIT is violated as the pronominal IO cannot shift across the indirect object in spec-NEGP thus violating PARMOVE.
- NEGIO & pronDO → both objects shift, i.e. the former undergoes NEG-shift, the latter OBJ-shift, which re-establishes the basic word order.

When one of the objects is a NEGQP and the other is a full DP:
- With NEGIO & DPDO, PARMOVE is vacuously respected, as the IO undergoes NEG-shift while the full-DP DO stays in situ.
- With DPIO & NEGDO, the wrong candidate wins: Full-DP OBJ-shift is the optimal, which is fine for Icelandic, and Icelandic alone, clauses with the main verb in V2, but it’s ungrammatical in all the languages in clauses with the main verb in Vº.
As the diagram below shows, the differences between the languages can be accounted by minimal constraint re-ranking.
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