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Holmberg's Generalisation: V°-Topicalisation vs. Remnant VP-Topicalisation

1.1 Holmberg's (1997, 1999) V°-Topicalisation approach

In the Scandinavian languages, a (pronominal) object may move from its base position behind the main verb to a position to the left of a sentential adverbial. This movement operation is called Object Shift (OS).

(1) Da a. *Jeg kyssete ikke _____ hende.
    I    kissed not    her
b.  Jeg kyssete hende ikke _____ _____.

OS presupposes movement of the main verb; as shown in (2), it cannot cross a verb in situ.

(2) Da a. Jeg har ikke kysset hende.
    I    have not    kissed    her
b.  *Jeg har hende ikke kysset _____.

However, the main verb does not have to undergo head movement (V°-to-I°-to-C° movement) as in (1). OS is also possible in clauses with a non-finite main verb if the verb occurs in clause-initial position, (3). In fact, OS has to take place in this case, (4).

(3) Sw a. Kysst har jag henne inte ___ ___ (bara hållit henne i handen).
    kissed have I    her    not    only held her by    hand-the
    (Holmberg 1997: 205)
Da b.  Kysset har jeg hende ikke ___ ___ (bare holdt hende i hånden).
    kissed have I    her    not    only held her in    hand.the
    (Vikner 2005: 407)
Ic c. Kysst hef ég hana ekki ___ ___ (bara halðið í höndina á henni).
    kissed have I    her    not    only held in    hand.the    on    her
    (Vikner 2005: 431)

(4) Sw a. *Kysst har jag inte ___ henne.
    kissed have I    not    her
    (Erteschik-Shir 2001: 59)
Da b. *Kysset har jeg ikke ___ hende.
    kissed have I    not    her

The observation that the object only moves if the main verb has moved forms the basis of Holmberg's generalisation (Holmberg 1986: 165, 1997: 208).
Object Shift is blocked by any phonologically visible category preceding/c-commanding the object position within VP.

[Here "within VP" has to mean that only elements "properly inside" VP (i.e. not adverbials or other elements adjoined to VP) may block object shift.]

The definition in (5) is vague with respect to whether precedence and/or c-command of a phonologically visible category blocks movement. In the 1999 version of the paper, Holmberg formulates HG in terms of asymmetric c-command. For reasons to become clear in section 2.1 below, we pursue the first option, taking HG to be the consequence of a violable condition on order preservation (cf. Déprez 1994, Müller 2001b, Sells 2001, Williams 2003, and Fox & Pesetsky 2005).

Holmberg (1997, 1999) supposes that HG is a derivational condition, not a representational one. OS of an infinitival clause subject is possible as long as there is no intervening non-adverbial material, (6)a. A violation of HG as in (6)c cannot be repaired by subsequent operations as in (6)d that place the blocking element to the left of the shifted object; in other words, HG may not be violated at any point in the course of derivation.

(6)  
Sw  
a. Jag såg henne inte ___ [IP _____ arbeta].
   I saw her not work
b. Jag har inte sett [IP henne arbeta].
   I have not seen her work
c. *Jag har henne inte sett [IP _____ arbeta].
   *Sett _____ arbeta har jag henne inte
   *Sett _____ arbeta har jag henne inte

Holmberg concludes that the grammatical sentences in (3) cannot involve OS prior to remnant VP-topicalisation since that would violate HG, cf. (7). Rather, they must be derived by V°-topicalisation, with subsequent OS, cf. (8).1

1 Note that OS in the V°-topicalisation analysis is countercyclical: It targets a lower position than the previous movement of V°, violating Chomsky's (1993) Extension Principle (unless OS is adjunction and the Extension Condition is restricted to specifier positions / substitution).

Moreover, the V°-topicalisation analysis involves movement of an X° to an XP-position.
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Sw a. \([CP \text{ har } [IP \text{ jag } [VP1 \text{ inte } [VP2 \text{ kysst } \text{ henne}]])]\)

b. \([CP \text{ har } [IP \text{ jag } \text{ henne } [VP1 \text{ inte } [VP2 \text{ kysst } ____]])]\)

\[\text{X X X violation of HG!!!}\]

c. \([CP [VP2 \text{ Kysst ____}] \text{ har } [IP \text{ jag } \text{ henne } [VP1 \text{ inte } _______________]])\)


Sw a. \([CP \text{ har } [IP \text{ jag } [VP1 \text{ inte } [VP2 \text{ kysst } \text{ henne}]])]\)

b. \([CP [Vº \text{ Kysst}] \text{ har } [IP \text{ jag } [VP1 \text{ inte } [VP2 ____ \text{ henne}]])]\)

c. \([CP [Vº \text{ Kysst}] \text{ har } [IP \text{ jag } \text{ henne } [VP1 \text{ inte } [VP2 ____ ____]])]\)

However, if Vº-topicalisation would be possible, we would expect the sentences in (9)b/(10)b to be acceptable, contrary to fact.

(9) Da a. Jeg \(\text{ har } \text{ ikke smidt } \text{ den ud.}\)

\(I \text{ have not thrown it out}\)

b. *Smidt \(\text{ har } \text{ jeg } \text{ den } \text{ ikke } ____ \text{ ud.}\)

(10) Daa. Jeg \(\text{ har } \text{ ikke stillet } \text{ det } \text{ på bordet.}\)

\(I \text{ have not put it on table-the}\)

b. *Stillet \(\text{ har } \text{ jeg } \text{ det } \text{ ikke } ____ \text{ på bordet.}\)

Against Holmberg (1997, 1999), we would like to suggest that remnant VP-topicalisation is possible, though it is subject to certain restrictions.
1.2 Fox & Pesetsky's (2005) remnant VP-Topicalisation approach

As Fox & Pesetsky (2005) mentions, remnant VP-topicalisation is possible in Swedish under certain conditions: In double object constructions, topicalisation of a non-finite main verb may take along the IO, stranding the DO in shifted position, (11)a. By contrast, stranding of an IO pronoun alone is not possible, (11)b.

(11) Sw a. ?[VP \text{Gett} \underline{henne} ___] \text{har} \text{jag} \underline{den} \text{inte.} \\
\text{given} \text{her} \text{have} I \text{it} \text{not} \\
b. *[VP \text{Gett} ___ \underline{den}] \text{har} \text{jag} \underline{henne} \text{inte.} \quad \text{(Fox & Pesetsky 2005: 25)}

Fox & Pesetsky (2005) accounts for this asymmetry as well as for HG in general in terms of order preservation: OS may only take place if the order among (non-adverbial) elements is maintained.

Fox & Pesetsky (2005) suggests that the mapping between syntax and phonology, i.e. Spell-out, takes place at various points in the course of derivation (including at VP and at CP), whereby the material in the Spell-out domain D is linearized; see also Chomsky (2000, 2001). The crucial property of Spell-out is that it may only add information about the linearization of a newly constructed Spell-out domain D' to the information cumulatively produced by previous applications of Spell-out. Established information cannot be deleted in the course of derivation. Consequently, HG derives from ordering contradictions. OS may only take place if it results in ordering statements at CP that match those established at Spell-out of VP. As illustrated in (12), OS is thus only possible if the main verb itself moves too.

(12) a. Spell-out VP: \[[VP V O] \quad \text{ordering statement: } V<O \]

b. Spell-out CP: \[[CP S V O [VP ___]] \quad \text{ordering statement: } V<O \]
c. Spell-out CP: \[[CP V \text{Aux} S O [VP ___]] \quad \text{ordering statement: } V<O \]

b. Spell-out CP: \[[CP S \text{Aux} O [VP V ___]] \quad \text{ordering statement: } O<V \]

Correspondingly, the asymmetry between stranding of an IO and stranding of a DO by remnant VP-topicalisation illustrated in (11) above is expected by order preservation. Stranding of an IO, but not stranding of a DO gives rise to contradictory ordering statements at the various Spell-out domains: At VP, "IO<DO" is established, which is maintained at the Spell-out of CP in (11)a but not in (11)b.

Note that Fox & Pesetsky (2005) predicts that movement operations that do not obey HG have to proceed successive cyclically: The underlined constituents in (13) have to move through the edge of VP prior to linearisation of the VP domain to prevent ordering contradictions at the Spell-out of CP; cf. (14). These movement operations comprise various instances of A-movement and A-bar-movement operations, such as Scandinavian Negative Shift (see Christensen 2005), wh-movement, topicalisation, and subject raising.
(13) Da a. Måske har han ingen bøger læst _______.
   probably has he no books read
b. Hvad har du læst _______?
   what have you read
c. Bøgerne har jeg læst _______.
   books-the have I read
d. Måske blev bøgerne læst _______.
   perhaps were books-the read

(14) a. VP: [VP V O]
b. Spell-out VP: [VP O [VP V __]] ordering statement: O>V
   c. Spell-out CP: [CP O Aux S [VP __ [VP V __]]] ordering statement: O>V

Hence, the crucial difference between the various movement operations in (13) and OS is that the former may - and indeed must – go through the edge of VP, whereas, as Fox & Pesetsky (2003) states, in their analysis OS cannot involve movement through the edge of VP.

2 An OT approach to Object Shift and remnant VP-Topicalisation

2.1 Asymmetry I: Stranding of a DO vs. Stranding of an IO

Following Fox & Pesetsky (2005), we assume that HG results from a condition on order preservation, as stated by the constraint in (15).

(15) ORDER PRESERVATION ( OrdPRes):
   If the foot of the chain of some non-adverbial element α precedes the foot of the chain of some element β, the head of the chain of α also precedes the head of the chain of β.

OS is motivated by the constraint SHIFTPRON which outranks the constraint STAY that prohibits movement.²

² In Icelandic, not only weak pronouns but also full DPs may undergo OS.

(i) Ic a. Af hverju las Pétur aldrei bessa bók?
   why read Pétur never this book
b. Af hverju las Pétur bessa bók aldrei ________? (Vikner 2005: 417)

Full DP Shift is motivated by a more general version of SHIFTPRON, called SHIFT.

(ii) SHIFT:
   A [-foc] element precedes and c-commands the lowest VP (of the same clause) that contains all other VPs and all VP-adjoined adverbials.
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(16) **SHIFTPRONOUN (SHIFTPRON):**
A weak pronoun precedes and c-commands the lowest VP (of the same clause) that contains all other VPs and all VP-adjoined adverbials.

(17) **STAY:**
Trace is not allowed. (Grimshaw 1997: 374)

**SHIFTPRON** is satisfied if the pronoun is adjoined to the top VP, as illustrated in (18) below. The ranking **ORDPRES >> SHIFTPRON** predicts that OS is only possible if it maintains the base order of elements. The main verb does not necessarily have to undergo V°-to-I°(-to-C°) movement for OS to be possible. What is crucial is that the main verb moves to a position to the left of the target position of OS, such that the relative order between verb and object is preserved. This can also be achieved by placing a non-finite verb in topic position as in (3); cf. Tableau 1.

(18) Da

```
CP
  C'
  V°  IP
    har  DP
    jeg I'
    t    VP
  DP    VP
  hende AdvP
       VP
       Spec
       V'
       V°
       t
       Spec
       V'
       V°
       Spec
       VP
       Spec
       V°
       DP
       kysset
```
We propose that when a non-finite main verb occurs in topic position, then the pronominal object undergoes OS prior to remnant VP-topicalisation. In Holmberg's (1997, 1999) approach such remnant VP-topicalisation is ruled out by the assumption that HG is derivational, i.e. that it cannot be violated at any point in the derivation, compare (7) above. The OT constraint $\text{ORDPRES}$, by contrast, is representational: Constraint violations are computed based on the final structure of the candidates. Hence, although the individual steps of OS might violate $\text{ORDPRES}$, this is of no consequence as long as the verb is subsequently placed in front of the shifted object such that their precedence relation is re-established.

The asymmetry between stranding of an IO and stranding of a DO in (11), repeated in (19), can be captured by the ranking $\text{ORDPRES} >> \text{SHIFTPRON}$.

\[(19)\] Sw a. \(\text{Gett} \quad \text{__ henne ___} \quad \text{har} \quad \text{jag} \quad \text{den} \quad \text{inte.} \)
\(\text{given} \quad \text{her} \quad \text{have} \quad \text{I} \quad \text{it} \quad \text{not} \)
\(\text{b.} \quad *\text{Gett} \quad \text{____ ____} \quad \text{har} \quad \text{jag} \quad \text{henne} \quad \text{inte.} \quad \text{(Fox \& Pesetsky 2005: 25)} \)

Note that also both objects of a double object construction may be taken along, (20)a, or both of them may be stranded by remnant VP-topicalisation, (20)b.

\[(20)\] Da a. \(\text{Givet \quad hende \quad den} \quad \text{har} \quad \text{jeg} \quad \text{ikke.} \)
\(\text{given} \quad \text{her} \quad \text{it} \quad \text{have} \quad \text{I} \quad \text{not} \)
\(\text{b.} \quad ?\text{Givet \quad ____ \quad ____} \quad \text{har} \quad \text{jeg} \quad \text{hende} \quad \text{den} \quad \text{ikke.} \)

Because of these alternatives, it is necessary to assume that it is specified in the input which constituents are to be placed in topic position (= bold in the tableaux below). Stranding of an element that should appear in topic position then violates $\text{TOPIC}$ whereas taking along too much material does not violate this constraint, see Tableau 2 and Tableau 3.

\[(21)\] $\text{TOPIC}$: Elements with a [+topic] feature occur in Spec,CP.
Tableau 2: VP-topicalisation that takes along both IO and DO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>[VP V Pron-IO Pron-DO] Aux Sub Adv tVP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td>(20)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>[VP V Pron-IO tDO] Aux Sub Pron-DO Adv tVP</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>(19)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>[VP V tIO Pron-DO] Aux Sub Pron-IO Adv tVP</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>(19)b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>[VP V tIO tDO] Aux Sub Pron-IO Pron-DO Adv tVP</td>
<td><em>!</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td>(20)b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tableau 3: Remnant VP-topicalisation that strands both IO and DO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Da/Sw</th>
<th>Topic: V</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>ORD PRES</th>
<th>SHIFT PRON</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>ex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>[VP V Pron-IO Pron-DO] Aux Sub Adv tVP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>!</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>[VP V Pron-IO tDO] Aux Sub Pron-DO Adv tVP</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>(19)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>[VP V tIO Pron-DO] Aux Sub Pron-IO Adv tVP</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>(19)b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>[VP V tIO tDO] Aux Sub Pron-IO Pron-DO Adv tVP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td>(20)b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Tableau 2 and Tableau 3 show, ShiftPRON favours stranding of a pronoun which is, however, only possible if the pronoun is not marked [+topic]. The asymmetry between stranding of a DO and stranding of an IO is expected by the ranking ORD PRES >> ShiftPRON. OS of a DO maintains the ordering relations in remnant VP-topicalisations, satisfying ORD PRES (see Tableau 4). Note that it is crucial for the remnant VP-topicalisation constructions that ORD PRES refers to precedence rather than c-command relations: While the precedence relations are maintained in (19)a, the c-command relations are not - neither the verb nor the IO c-commands the shifted DO. In contrast, remnant VP-topicalisation does not re-establish the base order relations if the IO is stranded. Consequently, the violation of ORD PRES rules out stranding of the IO in OS position, compare Tableau 5 below. Instead, the IO has to be taken along by VP-topicalisation, giving rise to neutralization: Despite the different input specifications with regard to topichood, the same candidate (namely, candidate a) arises as output in Tableau 2 and Tableau 5. (But stranding of the IO is possible if it does not result in a violation of ORD PRES, namely if both objects are stranded as in (20)b.)
Tableau 4: Remnant VP-topicalisation that strands DO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Da/Sw</th>
<th>Topic: V &amp; Pron-IO</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>ORD PRES</th>
<th>SHIFT PRON</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>ex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>[VP V Pron-IO Pron-DO] Aux Sub Adv tVP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**!</td>
<td>(20)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>[VP V Pron-IO tDO] Aux Sub Pron-DO Adv tVP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>(19)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>[VP V tIO Pron-DO] Aux Sub Pron-IO Adv tVP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>(19)b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>[VP V tIO tDO] Aux Sub Pron-IO Pron-DO Adv tVP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>(20)b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tableau 5: No remnant VP-topicalisation that strands IO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Da/Sw</th>
<th>Topic: V &amp; Pron-DO</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>ORD PRES</th>
<th>SHIFT PRON</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>ex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>[VP V Pron-IO Pron-DO] Aux Sub Adv tVP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>(20)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>[VP V Pron-IO tDO] Aux Sub Pron-DO Adv tVP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>(19)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>[VP V tIO Pron-DO] Aux Sub Pron-IO Adv tVP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>(19)b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>[VP V tIO tDO] Aux Sub Pron-IO Pron-DO Adv tVP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>(20)b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, the unacceptable sentence in (6)d, repeated here as (22)c, is ruled out by the ranking ORDPRES >> SHIFTPRON. These data led Holmberg (1997, 1999) to assume that remnant VP-topicalisation is not possible.

(22)   Sw a. Jag har inte sett henne arbeta.  
       I have not seen her work
       b. [VP Sett henne arbeta] har jag inte.
       c. *[VP Sett _____ arbeta] har jag henne inte.  (Holmberg 1997: 206)

Tableau 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sw:</th>
<th>Topic: V &amp; V</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>ORD PRES</th>
<th>SHIFT PRON</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>ex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>[VP V Pron V] Aux Sub Adv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>(22)b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>[VP V tPron V] Aux Sub Pron Adv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>(22)c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, the analysis predicts that stranding of the object is unacceptable in constructions in which the object is followed by other elements within VP, e.g. in constructions with a particle verb or a verb with an additional PP-complement, see (23)b/(24)b. In contrast, topicalisation of the full VP as in (23)a/(24)a is possible.
From the discussion in the previous sections, we might expect that all that matters is that the remnant object is at the edge of the the VP right before this VP is topicalised. However, not all objects on the right edge may be left behind during VP-topicalisation: The object of an infinitival clause cannot be stranded by remnant topicalisation of the main clause VP although it is the rightmost element within that VP.

Thus, besides the linear restriction, there would seem to also be a structural restriction, ruling out the leaving behind of an object which is too deeply embedded.

Also the object of a Swedish particle verb cannot be left behind during remnant VP-topicalisation even though the particle precedes the object in Swedish and therefore stranding of the object would not violate OrdPres.

We would like to suggest that the shifted object can only move out of the VP in (26)b in two steps, first by adjoining to the PrtP and then by adjoining to the VP. (The VP is what undergoes topicalisation to Spec,CP, and although the individual steps of the object shift violate OrdPres, this is of no consequence, as OrdPres violations are only computed on the final structure):
If we furthermore assume that adjunction to the PrtP is only necessary because PrtP and VP here do not have the „same“ head, then we have a difference between the above situation and double object constructions like the following (where remnant topicalisation is possible):

(29) Sw \[\text{VP } \text{gett} \] [\text{VP } \text{henne } t)] = (11)a

where there is no intermediary trace adjoined to the lower VP. We now would like to suggest that the reason why the absence of the intermediary trace is important is that it is possible to topicalise the (higher) VP in (29) without bringing along any intermediary trace (i.e. what is topicalised is the inner segment of the higher VP). In contrast, even if what is topicalised in (28) is only the inner segment of the VP, an intermediary trace would still have to come along to Spec,CP, viz. the trace adjoined to PrtP. One possible reason why intermediary traces are not allowed to come along to Spec,CP could be that they have to be licensed by being c-commanded by the next higher link in the chain (which does not hold under VP-topicalisation), whereas a trace in its base position (which has to come along to Spec,CP in both (28) and (29)) may be licensed in a different way, e.g. simply by being in a thematic position. The difference between (27) and (26) is now that in (27), only the PrtP is topicalised (the verb is also moved, but by a different movement, V2) and so there does not have to be an intermediary trace inside Spec,CP.

2.2 **Asymmetry II: Subject vs. Object**

The ranking ORDRES >> SHIFTPRON thus predicts that remnant VP-topicalisation may strand an object in shifted position as long as the precedence relations are maintained (and its base position is not too deeply embedded). Consequently, only an object that is right-peripheral in VP may be left behind, giving rise to the asymmetry between stranding of an IO and stranding of a DO.

In addition, there is an asymmetry between stranding of an object and stranding of a subject by remnant VP-topicalisation, indicating that a non-peripheral trace in the topicalised VP is not a problem as such. The base order of elements does not have to be maintained by remnant VP-topicalisation if the remnant occurs in subject position (as in passives), see (30)a/(31)a vs. (30)b/(31)b.

(30) Da a. *[\text{VP } \text{Smidt } ___ \text{ud}] \quad \text{har jeg den ikke.} \\
    \text{thrown} \quad \text{out} \quad \text{have} \quad \text{I it not}

b. \[\text{VP } \text{Smidt } ___ \text{ud}] \quad \text{blev den ikke.} \\
    \text{thrown} \quad \text{out} \quad \text{was} \quad \text{it not}
This contrast is accounted for if the constraint that triggers subject movement to Spec,IP, SUBJECT, outranks ORDRES.³ (Note that the acceptability of subject raising out of a verb particle construction indicates that depth of embedding does not play a role for subject movement either.)

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Da: Topic: V &amp; Prt</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>ORD PRES</th>
<th>SHIFT PRON</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>ex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a [VP V Pron-Obj Prt] Aux Sub Adv</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(23)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b [VP V Obj Prt] Aux Sub Pron-Obj Adv</td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>(30)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a [VP V Pron-Sub Prt] Aux e Adv</td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>(30)b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b [VP V lSub Prt] Aux Pron-Sub Adv</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Asymmetry III: Remnant VP-Topicalisation out of a Main vs. an Embedded Clause

Moreover, there is an asymmetry between remnant VP-topicalisation out of a main clause and remnant VP-topicalisation out of an embedded clause.

While finite verb movement takes place in main clauses, (32), it does not in embedded clauses; consequently, OS is prohibited in embedded clauses, (33).

(32) Da a. *Hvorfor e Peter aldrig læste den?  
why Peter never read it  
b. Hvorfor læste Peter den aldrig ___ ___?  
(Vikner 2005: 394)

(33) Da a. Jeg spurgte hvorfor Peter e aldrig læste den.  
I asked why Peter never read it  
b. *Jeg spurgte hvorfor Peter læste den aldrig ___ ___.  
(Vikner 2005: 396)

A full VP may be topicalised from both main clauses and embedded clauses.

³ Accordingly, constraints triggering other movement operations such as wh-movement or topicalization that are not subject to HG, (13), outrank ORDRES (e.g. WHSPEC, TOPIC >> ORDRES). The contrast between different movement devices as to whether or not they are subject to HG is thus accounted for by differences in the ranking of their constraints relative to ORDRES.
Topicalisation of a remnant VP, by contrast, is only possible out of a main clause, (35)a, not out of an embedded clause in Danish: The stranded object may neither follow the finite auxiliary (in its base position), (35)b, nor may it precede it, (35)c:

This asymmetry shows that stranding must involve OS, because OS requires the (stranded) object to occur in a position to the left of the base position of a finite verb (SHIFTPRON), but it can only do so if this verb has itself left its base position (ORDPRES).
Tableau 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Da: Topic: V</th>
<th>ORD PRES</th>
<th>SHIFT PRON</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>ex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a [VP V Pron-Obj] Aux Sub Adv tVP</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(34)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b [VP V tObj] Aux Sub Adv Pron-Obj tVP</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c [VP V tObj] Aux Sub Pron-Obj Adv tVP</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>(35)a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tableau 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Da: Topic: V</th>
<th>ORD PRES</th>
<th>SHIFT PRON</th>
<th>STAY</th>
<th>ex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>(34)b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>(35)b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>(35)c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The hypothesis that (a) a stranded object has to undergo movement to some position to the left of the finite verb and (b) that this movement is only possible if the finite verb itself has left its base position (i.e. that OS has to take place) seems to be supported by the fact that Icelandic which has V°-to-I° movement and thus also OS in embedded clauses marginally permits a remnant object in VP-topicalisation out of an embedded clause (as opposed to the Danish (35)b,c which are completely ungrammatical).

(38)  
Icelandic

a. *Ég spurði af hverju Pétur e aldrei læsi hana.
   I asked why Pétur never read it

b. Ég spurði af hverju Pétur læsi hana aldrei ___ ___.
   (Vikner 2005: 396)

(39)  
Icelandic

??[VP Kysst ____] hélt ég ekki að þú [I° hefðir] hana oft, ...
   kissed think I not that you have her often
   bara haldið í höndina á henni.
   only held in hand.the on her
   (Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, p.c.)

Note that remnant VP-topicalisation from embedded clauses is possible in passives, i.e. if the element left behind occurs in subject position. This follows from SUBJECT being ranked higher than HG, as in Tableau 7 above.

(40)  
Danish

a. [VP Set ____] blev han ikke, ...
   seen was he not

b. [VP Set ____] tror jeg ikke at han blev, ...
   seen think I not that he was
   ... men der var nok mange der hørte ham.
   but there were probably many who heard him
3 Conclusion

Holmberg (1997, 1999) considers occurrences of a non-finite verb in topic position such as (3) to result from $V^o$-topicalisation. He assumes that HG is a matter of derivation rather than of representation, i.e. a violation of HG cannot be rescued by some subsequent operation, and hence the non-finite verb has to move before OS can take place, ruling out remnant VP-topicalisations altogether.

However, Fox & Pesetsky (2005) have presented data from double object constructions that clearly show that remnant VP-topicalisation is possible, as long as it does not involve a reversal of the base order of elements, which suggests that HG is representational. We have collected more data that corroborate Fox & Pesetsky's observation and we agree with them in the assumption that HG is to be accounted for in terms of order preservation. Their approach builds on the assumption that Spell-out applies at various points in the derivation (in particular, at VP and at CP) and that the information about the linearisation of the material of a newly constructed Spell-out domain must not contradict the cumulated information of previous applications of Spell-out. In this way, Fox & Pesetsky (2005) predict that OS differs radically from other types of (A- and A-bar-) movement that can result in a reversal of the order of elements, such as e.g. wh-movement or subject raising, in that the latter have to proceed successive cyclically through the left edge of VP while this is impossible for OS.

In contrast, in our OT approach, order preservation is required by a violable constraint. This means that it is the ranking of the ORDERPRESERVATION constraint relative to the constraints that motivate the various types of movement which accounts for the contrast as to whether or not a certain movement operation has to be order preserving. Hence, OS does not receive a special treatment in our approach; the properties distinguishing it from other movement types result from constraint interaction.

The linear conception of HG as expressed by the constraint ORDRES and its dominance over the constraint that triggers OS, SHIFTPRON, predicts that only pronominal objects that originate in a right-peripheral position within VP might be left behind in OS position during remnant VP-topicalisation, accounting for the asymmetry in stranding of an IO and stranding of a DO observed by Fox & Pesetsky (2005). However, depth of embedding also plays a role for whether or not an object may have undergone OS out of a topicalised VP: The remnant VP in Spec,CP may not include an intermediary trace of a shifted object. Moreover, we presented new data that showed that subject raising does not underly either of these restrictions, and this may be accounted for by a different ranking of SUBJECT and SHIFTPRON relative to the corresponding prohibitions (including ORDRES).

Finally, the asymmetry between main and embedded clauses as to the applicability of remnant VP-topicalisation in MSc illustrates that object stranding has to involve OS. Object stranding is only possible in sentences in which finite verb movement has taken place, something that would be expected if any object left behind during remnant VP-topicalisation would have to undergo OS (and that as always, OS has to respect order preservation).
Appendix: Structure Preservation

There are native speakers of Danish whose intuitions do not agree with the acceptability judgments given above. Rather than to subject remnant VP-topicalisation to a linear restriction, permitting stranding of an object in OS position as long as it does not change the base order of elements (cf. (19) and (20) above), these speakers do not allow for object stranding during remnant VP-topicalisation at all. Topicalisation of a full VP, in contrast, is judged acceptable.

(41) Da a. [VP Givet hende den] har jeg ikke.
   given her it have I not
b. *[VP Givet _____ ___] har jeg hende den ikke.
c. *[VP Givet hende ___] har jeg den ikke.
d. *[VP Givet ____ den] har jeg hende ikke.

The pattern in (41) can be accounted for if in addition to order preservation, a constraint on structure preservation is considered to restrict OS (cf. Déprez 1994, Müller 2001, Sells 2001, and Williams 2003).

(42) STRUCTURE PRESERVATION (STRUCPRES):
If the foot of the chain of some non-adverbial element α c-commands the foot of the chain of some element β, the head of the chain of α also c-commands the head of the chain of β.

In other words, where ORDRES says "preserve the sequence", STRUCPRES says "preserve the c-command relationships".

Like ORDRES, the constraint STRUCPRES and its dominance over SHIFTPRON predicts that OS cannot cross an intervening non-adverbial element: For example, OS across a verb in situ as in (43)b changes the c-command relation between the verb and the shifted object.

(43) Da a. Jeg spurgte hvorfor Peter aldrig læste den.
   I asked why Peter never read it
b. *Jeg spurgte hvorfor Peter den aldrig læste ___.

In contrast to ORDRES, however, STRUCPRES (>> SHIFTPRON) rules out stranding of an object during VP-topicalisation. While the linear relations between the verb and the objects are maintained in (41)b,c above, their structural relations are not: The verb (and IO) in Spec,CP is too deeply embedded to c-command the stranded (IO and) DO. Consequently, STRUCPRES >> SHIFTPRON rules out stranding of an object during remnant VP-topicalisation while permitting topicalisation of a full VP.
Tableau 10: No remnant VP-topicalisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Da</th>
<th>Topic: V</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>STRUC PRES</th>
<th>SHIFT PRON</th>
<th>ex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[VP V Pron-IO Pron-DO] Aux Sub Adv tvp</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>↑</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>(41)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>[VP V tIO tDO] Aux Sub Pron-IO Pron-DO Adv tvp</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>↑</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>(41)b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>[VP V Pron-IO tDO] Aux Sub Pron-DO Adv tvp</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>↑</em> <em>↑</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>(41)c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>[VP V tIO Pron-DO] Aux Sub Pron-IO Adv tvp</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>↑</em></td>
<td><em>↑</em></td>
<td>(41)d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence, variation between speakers as to the strandability of objects during VP-topicalisation may be accounted for by a contrast in the ranking of two very similar constraints, one requiring order preservation, the other structure preservation.
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