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Abstract

Although they both place an object to the left of a sentential adverbial, Scandinavian Object Shift (OS) and continental West Germanic Scrambling (SCR) are normally treated as two different phenomena since they do not take place under exactly the same circumstances. In this introductory hand-out, I merely want to illustrate their properties and thus show that they are quite similar in what moves and which position movement can target, provided one considers the entire range of OS and SCR languages. The main difference between OS and SCR is that the former presupposes movement of the main verb whereas the latter does not. This property might be related to the contrast in basic verb placement, VO in Scandinavian vs. OV in the continental West Germanic languages.
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1 Movement and Holmberg's Generalisation

1.1 Object Shift

1.1.1 Verb Movement

OS is dependent on movement of the main verb: OS may only take place if the main verb does not occupy its base position. In MSc, a finite verb moves to the V2 position in main clauses (Cº) whereas it stays in situ in embedded clauses; consequently, OS is only possible in main clauses but not in embedded clauses. Moreover, note that in MSc, OS may apply to pronouns but not to full DPs, compare (1) vs. (2); see also section 2.1.1 below.

(1) Da a. Hvorfor læste Peter aldrig ___ bogen?
   why read Peter never book-the
   b. *Hvorfor læste Peter bogen aldrig ___ _____?

(2) Da a. *Hvorfor læste Peter aldrig ___ den?
   why read Peter never it
   b. Hvorfor læste Peter den aldrig ___ ___?

(3) Da a. Jeg spurgte hvorfor Peter aldrig læste den.
   I asked why Peter never read it
   b. *Jeg spurgte hvorfor Peter den aldrig læste ___.
(4) Da
CP
   XP
     Hvorfor
       C°
          IP
            C'
              ṭaste
                DP
                  I'
                    I°
                      VP
                        DP
                          VP
                            DP
                              AdvP
                                VP
                                  Spec
                                    V°
                                      DP
                                        læste
                                          den

Object shift, (2)b, main clause

(5) Da
CP
   XP
     ...
       Hvorfor
          C°
             IP
               C'
                 DP
                   I'
                     I°
                       VP
                         AdvP
                           VP
                             Spec
                               V°
                                 DP
                                   læste
                                     den

No object shift, (3)a, embedded clause

(Potential wh-movement of Hvorfor 'why' and subject movement from Spec,VP to Spec,IP is left out.)
In contrast to MSc, finite verb movement in Icelandic takes place in both main clauses and embedded clauses. Furthermore, OS does not only apply to pronouns, (7) and (9), but may also optionally affect full DPs in Icelandic, see (6) and (8).

(6) 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: 394)

(7) Ic a. *Af hverju las Pétur aldrei ___ hana?
      why read Pétur never it
b. Af hverju las Pétur hana aldrei ___ ___?
   (Vikner 2005: 394)

(8) Ic a. Ég spurði af hverju Pétur læsi aldrei ___ bessa bók.
      I asked why Pétur read never this book
b. Ég spurði af hverju Pétur læsi bessa bók aldrei ___ ________.
   (Vikner 2005: 396)

(9) Ic a. *Ég spurði af hverju Pétur læsi aldrei ___ hana.
      I asked why Pétur read never it
b. Ég spurði af hverju Pétur læsi hana aldrei ___ ___.
   (Vikner 2005: 396)
(10) Ic
  CP
  XP  C'
  Af hverju  IP
  Cº  las  DP  I'
  Iº  Pétur  VP  DP  VP  AdvP  aldrei  Spec  Vº  DP
  þessa bók

Object shift, (6)b, main clause

(11) Ic
  CP
  XP  C'
  ... af hverju  IP
  Cº  DP  I'
  Iº  Pétur  VP  DP  VP  AdvP  aldrei  Spec  Vº  DP
  þessa bók

Object shift, (8)b, embedded clause
In contrast to finite verbs, non-finite verbs usually do not move. OS is impossible across a non-finite main verb in any of the Scandinavian languages.

(12) a. Hvorfor havde Peter aldrig læst den?  
why had Peter never read it
b. *Hvorfor havde Peter den aldrig læst ___?

(13) a. Jeg spurgte hvorfor Peter aldrig havde læst den.  
I asked why Peter never had read it
b. *Jeg spurgte hvorfor Peter den aldrig havde læst ___.

(14) a. Af hverju hafði Pétur aldrei lesið bessa bók?  
why had Pétur never read this book
b. *Af hverju hafði Pétur þessa bók aldrei lesið ______?

(Vikner 2005: 395)

(15) a. Af hverju hafði Pétur aldrei lesið hana?  
why had Pétur never read it
b. *Af hverju hafði Pétur hana aldrei lesið ___?

(Vikner 2005: 395)

(16) a. Ég spurði af hverju Pétur hefði aldrei lesið bessa bók?  
I asked why Pétur had never read this book
b. *Ég spurði af hverju Pétur hefði þessa bók aldrei lesið ______?

(17) a. Ég spurði af hverju Pétur hefði aldrei lesið hana?  
I asked why Pétur had never read it
b. *Ég spurði af hverju Pétur hefði hana aldrei lesið ___?

There are cases, however, where a non-finite verb moves.

First, infinitival verbs in Icelandic control structures undergo Vº-to-Iº movement (or maybe Vº-to-Iº-Cº), as illustrated by their position relative to an adverbial. As would be expected, these have OS too.

(18) a. *María lofaði að lesa bókina.  
Maria promised to not read book-the
b. María lofaði að lesa ekki ___ bókina.
c. María lofaði að lesa bókina ekki ___ _____.  
(Jónsson 1996: 164)
Second, OS may take place in clauses with a non-finite main verb if the verb occurs in clause-initial position.

(19) 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 haldið í höndina á henni).
   kissed have I her not only held in hand.the on her

   (Vikner 2005: 431)

The observation that the object only moves if the main verb has moved forms the basis of what is called Holmberg's generalisation (Holmberg 1986: 165, 1997: 208).

(20) Holmberg's Generalisation (Holmberg 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.

   E.E. & S.V.]

HG does not only refer to main verbs but to any intervening non-adverbal element. The following sections show how HG affects object positions in particle verb constructions and double object constructions.
1.1.2 Particle Verbs

In languages in which the object precedes a verb particle, OS is possible in particle verb constructions, compare (23) and (26). In Danish, the object always precedes the verb particle, (21) and (22), and in Norwegian, Icelandic, and Faroese, the object has to precede the particle if it is a pronoun and it may do so if it is a full DP, (24) and (25).

(21) Da a. *Jeg har ikke skrevet op nummeret.
I have not written up number-the
b. Jeg har ikke skrevet nummeret op.

(22) Da a. *Jeg har ikke skrevet op det.
I have not written up it
b. Jeg har ikke skrevet det op.

(23) Da a. *Jeg skrev ikke det op.
I wrote not it up
b. Jeg skrev det ikke ___ op.

I have not written up number-the
b. Jeg har ikkje skrevet nummeret opp.

I have not written up it
b. Jeg har ikkje skrevet det opp.

(26) No a. *Jeg skrev ikkje det opp.
I wrote not it up
b. Jeg skrev det ikkje ___ opp.

By contrast, in languages in which the object follows the particle as in Swedish, see (27) and (28), OS may not take place across a particle, (29). 1

1 According to Vinka (1998, 1999), there are two classes of verbal particles in some Swedish varieties, transparent and non-transparent ones. Non-transparent particles do not permit the order object < particle whereas transparent ones do. Note that this order is only possible with pronominal objects.
   I have not written up number-the
b. *Jag har inte skrivit numret upp.

   I have not written up it
b. *Jag har inte skrivit det upp.

   I wrote not up it
b. *Jag skrev det inte upp ___.

However, as with participles in (19) above, also particles in Swedish (and other languages) may move to Spec,CP in which case OS may take place after all.

(i) %Sw a. *Kalle smutsade den ner.
   Kalle dirtied it down
b. Kalle tog dem av.
   Kalle took them off
c. Kalle satte den på.
   Kalle switched it on
d. *Kalle satte TVn på.
   Kalle switched TV on
   (Sells 2001: 69)

The possibility of particle shift order is independent of OS: it may occur in embedded clauses.

(ii) %Sw Jag vet [att Kalle inte tog dem av].
   I know that Kalle not took them off

Particle shift in this dialect feeds OS. OS is impossible across non-transparent particles (compare (29)b above), but acceptable in constructions with transparent particles.

(iii) %Sw Kalle tog dem inte ___ av.
   Kalle took them not ___ off
   (Bobaljik 2002: 239)

Furthermore, an object may be placed in front of a particle in Swedish if the particle is complex, and it may not follow the entire particle phrase. OS is possible in this case, (v).

(iv) Sw a. Vi kastade den ut genom fönstret.
   we threw it out through window-the
b. Vi kastade ut den genom fönstret.
   we threw it out window-the
   (Holmberg 1986: 201)
c. *Vi kastade ut genom fönstret den.
   we threw it out window-the
   (Holmberg 1986: 201)

(v) Sw Vi kastade den genast ___ ut genom fönstret.
   we threw it at-once out through window-the
   (Holmberg 1986: 201)
1.1.3 Double Objects

In double object constructions, an indirect object pronoun (IO) may undergo OS independent of the direct object (DO).

(31) Da a. *Jeg gave ikke hende bogen.
   I gave not her book-the
b. Jeg gave hende ikke _____ bogen.

By contrast, whether or not a DO pronoun may undergo OS depends on the position of the IO. A DO pronoun cannot shift across an in situ IO, (32); yet, the DO may undergo OS if the IO is moved out of the way – by wh-movement, (33)a, topicalisation, (33)b, or OS, (33)c:

   I gave not Elsa it
b. *Jag gave den inte Elsa ___. (Holmberg 1997: 203)

(33) Sw a. Vem gave du den inte ____ ____?
   who gave you it not
b. Henne visar jag den helst inte ____ ____.
   her show I it rather not
  c. Jag visar henne den inte ____ ___. (Holmberg 1997: 209/209)
  I show her it not

Just as a DO cannot shift across an in situ IO, multiple OS cannot change the order of objects in Danish and Icelandic:

\[\text{Vikner & Engels: Germanic SOV/SVO, part VII, p. 11}\]
1.2 Scrambling

1.2.1 Verb Movement

Object positions in the SCR languages do not depend on the position of the main verb: SCR is possible in both main clauses with a finite main verb where the verb moves to V2 position, (36) and (37), and in embedded clauses or clauses with a non-finite main verb where no movement of the main verb takes place, (38)-(43). Similar to Icelandic, a non-pronominal object may optionally undergo SCR, cf. that it may either precede or follow the adverbial nie 'never', e.g. (36), whereas a pronominal object must precede the adverbial nie 'never', e.g. (37).

(i) Sw a. Han visade henne inte den.

b. Han gave it not her.

(Hellan & Platzack 1999: 131/132)

(ii) Sw a. Jag gav henne den inte ___ ___.

b. Jag gave it not her.

(Holmberg 1986: 207)

In Norwegian, multiple OS may reverse the order of objects, (iii)d, although a DO pronoun cannot be moved across an in situ IO, (iii): 

(iii) No a. Eg ga ikkje ho den.

b. Eg gave not her it.

c. Eg ga ho den ikkje ___ ___.

b. *Eg gave it not her it.

(d) Eg ga ho den ikkje ___ ___.

e. *Eg ga den ikkje ho ___.

(Christensen 2005: 160)
(36) Ge a. Warum liest Peter nie das Buch _____?
     why reads Peter never the book
b. Warum liest Peter das Buch nie ________ _____?

(37) Ge a. *Warum liest Peter nie es _____?
     why reads Peter never it
b. Warum liest Peter es nie ___ _____?

(38) Ge a. Ich frage mich warum Peter nie das Buch liest.
     I ask myself why Peter never the book reads
b. Ich frage mich warum Peter das Buch nie ______ liest.

(39) Ge a. *Ich frage mich warum Peter nie es liest.
     I ask myself why Peter never it reads
b. Ich frage mich warum Peter es nie __ liest.

(40) Ge a. Warum hat Peter nie das Buch gelesen?
     why has Peter never the book read
b. Warum hat Peter das Buch nie ______ gelesen?

(41) Ge a. *Warum hat Peter nie es gelesen?
     why has Peter never it read
b. Warum hat Peter es nie __ gelesen?

(42) Ge a. Ich frage mich warum Peter nie das Buch gelesen hat.
     I ask myself why Peter never the book read has
b. Ich frage mich warum Peter das Buch nie ______ gelesen hat.

(43) Ge a. *Ich frage mich warum Peter nie es gelesen hat.
     I ask myself why Peter never it read has
b. Ich frage mich warum Peter es nie __ gelesen hat.
(44) Ge

CP

XP

Warum

C°

C'

IP

liest

DP

Peter

I'

VP

DP

VP

das Buch

AdvP

nie

Spec

V°

DP

Vº

lies

Scrambling, (36)b, main clause

(45) Ge

CP

XP

...warum

C°

e

C'

IP

DP

Peter

I'

VP

DP

VP

das Buch

AdvP

nie

Spec

V°

DP

Vº

lies

Scrambling, (38)b, embedded clause

Vikner & Engels: Germanic SOV/SVO, part VII, p. 14
The dependence of OS on verb movement was captured by HG in section 1.1.1 above. Consequently, at first glance, the fact that SCR does not depend on verb movement suggests that SCR is not subject to HG. However, whether or not SCR may be affected by HG relies on the exact definition of HG. The definition in (20) above, repeated in (46), is vague with respect to whether precedence or c-command of a phonologically visible category blocks movement.

(46) **Holmberg's Generalisation**

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.

E.E. & S.V.]

In case c-command is the decisive factor, SCR cannot be subject to HG: The main verb in final position c-commands its object which may move nevertheless. However, if precedence is the decisive factor, the question of whether or not SCR is subject to HG cannot be determined by its independence of verb movement: SCR languages are OV; i.e. the verb never intervenes linearly between the base position of an object and its scrambled position and, consequently, could never have a blocking effect on SCR (see also a similar suggestion in Déprez 1994:111).

The next sections focus on the question of whether or not a linear version of HG also affects SCR. For that, we will look at constructions in which an effect of HG was found in the OS languages, particle verbs and double object constructions.

### 1.2.2 Particle verbs

In contrast to OS, SCR is never blocked by particles. Particles occupy a verb-adjacent position in German; consequently, they do not intervene between a scrambled argument and its trace (at least not linearly, but they might do so structurally). Hence, it cannot be determined whether or not SCR is subject to a linear HG on the basis of particle verbs.

(47) Ge a. Er wirft nie seinen Müll weg.  

*he throws never his garbage away*

b. Er wirft seinen Müll nie ________ weg.

(48) Ge a. ... weil er nie seinen Müll weg wirft.  

*because he never his garbage away-throws*

b. ... weil er seinen Müll nie ________ weg wirft.
1.2.3 Double Objects

There is cross-linguistic variation within the SCR languages as to whether or not SCR may change the order of arguments.

In German, SCR may reverse the order of arguments: A DO can move across an IO, irrespective of whether the IO occurs in situ, (49)d, or in a scrambled position itself, (49)e. The pronouns in (50) preferably occur in the order DO<IO, i.e. the reverse of the basic order.

(49) Ge a. ... weil er nie der Frau den Roman gegeben hat.
   because he never the woman the novel given has
b. ... weil er der Frau nie ________ den Roman gegeben hat.
c. ... weil er der Frau den Roman nie ________ _______ gegeben hat.
d. ... weil er den Roman nie der Frau ________ gegeben hat.
e. ... weil er den Roman der Frau nie ________ _______ gegeben hat.

(50) Ge a. ?... dass Fritz ihr ihn wahrscheinlich ___ ___ gegeben hat.
   that Fritz her him probably ____ given has
b. ... dass Fritz ihn ihr wahrscheinlich ___ ___ gegeben hat.

Similarly, movement of a pronoun does not have to maintain the base order of arguments in Dutch: A clitic DO pronoun is able to move across a full DP IO, and the order of two object pronouns is variable.

(51) Du a. ??...dat Jan Marie 't gegeven heeft.
    that Jan Mary it given has
b. ... dat Jan 't Marie ___ gegeven heeft. (Zwart 1993: 129)

(52) Du a. ?... dat Jan 'r 't gegeven heeft.
    that Jan her it given has
b. ... dat Jan 't 'r ___ gegeven heeft. (Zwart 1993: 129)

However, by contrast, the order of (non-focused) full DP objects cannot be reversed in Dutch: A full DP DO cannot move across an IO, irrespective of whether the IO occurs in situ or in scrambled position itself.3

---

3 Reversal of the basic order of (non-focused) DP arguments is only possible if it results in the order nominative < non-nominative.
The prohibition against reversal of the order of arguments in the OS languages was traced back to HG: Object movement cannot cross an intervening non-adverbial element, compare section 1.1.3 above. The same restriction on full DP SCR in Dutch could be accounted for by a linear conception of HG: While a verb in situ, a particle as well as an IO all c-command a DO, only the latter also precedes the DO and would thus intervene between the scrambled position of the DO and its trace; verb and particle do not intervene and are thus expected not to block SCR.

However, under the assumption that this restriction on SCR of full DPs in Dutch is in fact an effect of HG, i.e. that HG affects SCR in Dutch, HG must be violable or subject to parametric variation: While OS is subject to HG irrespective of the complexity of the shifted constituent, SCR of pronominal and non-pronominal phrases in German as well as SCR of pronouns in Dutch differ from Dutch full DP SCR in that they may move an object across a higher argument. Moreover, the contrast between full DPs and pronouns in Dutch as to the ability to scramble across a higher argument points to the conclusion that pronoun SCR and full DP SCR have to be differentiated, i.e. they are two different movement devices. (Note that in addition to this, Dutch also allows a full DP to move across a higher argument if it is focused, indicating that there is a further movement device for focused phrases which is not subject to HG and which has to be distinguished from SCR of defocused constituents; see (91) below.)

Moreover, a PP-complement may be moved in front of a DP one, see (104).

Vikner & Engels: Germanic SOV/SVO, part VII, p. 17
1.3 Summary

The previous sections have argued that OS and SCR differ from each other only to a certain extent. Although there is variation between OS and SCR as to which elements move and when they move, this variation is actually expected under a linear conception of HG:

a. OS requires movement of the main verb, whereas SCR does not. However, the base position of the verb linearly intervenes between a moved object and its trace in the Scandinavian languages, whereas it does not in the continental West Germanic languages. Hence, under a linear conception of HG, this contrast would be expected even if both OS and SCR were subject to HG.

b. There is variation within the OS languages as to whether OS can move an object in a particle verb construction. However, also this variation follows from independent differences: The object of a particle verb cannot move across the particle. All cases where the object of a particle verb does move turn out to be cases where OS or SCR begins in a position to the left of the particle, and therefore does not have to cross a particle linearly. This is so in some OS languages and in all the SCR languages, cf. that as we saw in hand-out II, all particles in the SCR languages are to the right of the object.

c. Only in double object constructions are the conditions for the application of HG the same for all the Germanic languages under consideration, because the IO precedes the DO in the base order in all the languages, and, consequently, movement of the DO would have to cross a linearly intervening element if the IO stays in situ. Nevertheless, we also find cross-linguistic variation as to whether or not object movement is possible in this case: While OS across the IO in Danish and Icelandic is ruled out, the availability of SCR across the IO depends on the complexity of the moved element in Dutch (pronouns vs. complex phrases); and finally in German, both SCR of pronouns and SCR of complex phrases across the IO is possible. These last facts would seem to point to the conclusion that HG is subject to parametric variation, applying to Scandinavian OS and Dutch SCR of complex phrases, but not to SCR in German nor to pronominal SCR in Dutch.
2 Restrictions on the syntactic category of the moved constituent

2.1 Object Shift

2.1.1 Complexity

As mentioned in section 1.1.1, movement of a full DP in front of a sentential adverbial may optionally take place in Icelandic, whereas it is unacceptable in MSc, compare (1) vs. (6), repeated as (54) and (55).

(54) Ic a. Af hverju las Pétur aldrei þessa bók?
   why read Pétur never this book
   b. Af hverju las Pétur þessa bók aldrei ________?

(55) Da a. Hvorfor læste Peter aldrig bogen?
   why read Peter never book-the
   b. *Hvorfor læste Peter bogen aldrig ______?

Likewise, syntactically complex pronouns, i.e. modified and conjoined ones, may undergo OS in Icelandic, see (56) and (57), while they cannot do so in MSc, see (58) and (59).

(56) Ic a. Af hverju las Pétur aldrei þessa hérna?
   why read Pétur never this here
   b. Af hverju las Pétur þessa hérna aldrei ________?     (Vikner 2005: 417)

(57) Ic a. Ég þekki ekki hann og hana.
   I know not him and her
   b. Ég þekki hann og hana ekki __________.        (Diesing & Jelinek 1993: 27)

(58) Da a. Hvorfor læste Peter aldrig den her?
   why read Peter never this here
   b. *Hvorfor læste Peter den her aldrig ______?       (Vikner 2005: 417)

(59) Da a. Han så ikke dig og hende sammen.
   he saw not you and her together
   b. *Han så dig og hende ikke __________ sammen.     (Diesing & Jelinek 1993: 27)
Moreover, focused pronouns cannot undergo OS: Focused pronouns have to stay in situ; they must follow a medial adverb.\(^4\)

(60) Da a. Hvorfor læste Peter aldrig DEN?
why read Peter never it
b. *Hvorfor læste Peter DEN aldrig ____?

(Vikner 2005: 417)

(61) Ic a. Af hverju las Pétur aldreri HANA?
why read Pétur never it
b. *Af hverju las Pétur HANA aldreri _____?

(Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, p.c.)

\(^4\) OS of a focused full DP is, however, more or less acceptable in Icelandic.

(i) Ic a. Pétur las PESSA BÓK
Pétur read never this book
b. Pétur las PESSA BÓK

(ii) Ic a. Sennilega las Pétur ekki PESSA BÓK HÉRNA,
probably read Pétur not this book here
b. ?Sennilega las Pétur PESSA BÓK HÉRNA ekki __________,
but this there

(iii) Ic a. Sennilega las Pétur ekki BÆKURNAR,
probably read Pétur not books-the
b. ??Sennilega las Pétur BÆKURNAR ekki __________,
but newspaper-the

Vikner & Engels: Germanic SOV/SVO, part VII, p. 20
Whether or not movement of a "weak" pronoun, i.e. a non-modified, non-conjoined, non-focused one, takes place is subject to cross-linguistic variation. While in Icelandic and Danish, pronominal OS has to take place if possible, see (62) and (63), OS is optional in Swedish, (64), as well as in the south-eastern dialects of Danish, (65), and ungrammatical in Finland Swedish, (66), and in the Swedish dialect Älvdalsmålet, (67); see Levander (1909) and Hellan & Platzack (1999).

(62) Ic a. *Af hverju las Pétur aldrei ____ hana?
   why read Pétur never it
b. Af hverju las Pétur hana aldrei ____ ____?
   (Vikner 2005: 394)

(63) Da a. *Peter læste aldrig den.
   Peter read never it
b. Peter læste den aldrig ___.

(64) Sw a. Jag såg inte den.
   I saw not it
b. Jag såg den inte ___.
   (Erteschik-Shir 2001: 54)

(65) SD a. Du når såmænd 'nok odet.
   you will.make indeed likely it
   (from Ærø, Pedersen 1993: 205)
   b. Nej, jeg tror 'ikke odet.
      no I think not it
      (from Langeland, Pedersen 1993: 205)

(66) FS a. Ja, ser du, jag vet inte det själv.
   yes see you I know not it self
b. *Ja, ser du, jag vet det inte __ själv.
   (Bergroth 1917: 172)

(67) Äl a. An såg inte mig.
   he saw not me
b. *An såg mig inte __.
   (Levander 1909:124)

Hence, Icelandic and MSc differ in whether or not they allow OS of complex phrases: While both syntactically simple and complex phrases may undergo OS in Icelandic, only weak pronouns may be shifted in MSc. Moreover, full DP shift and pronominal OS in Icelandic differ in their obligatoriness: While OS of a weak pronoun is obligatory, (62), full DP shift is optional, see (54), (56), and (58).

Holmberg (1986) accounts for both this contrast in the applicability of OS to elements of different complexity and for HG in terms of case assignment (see also Vikner 1994 and Homberg & Platzack
An object is obligatorily assigned case by V° if V° contains a verb, ruling out OS if the main verb stays in situ. However in case V° contains a trace of a verb, V° only 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. According to Holmberg (1986: 208, 217), a shifted object is not assigned case at all: A shifted object has morphological case and, consequently, does not need to be assigned case syntactically. Permitting OS only for objects with morphological case, this hypothesis predicts the cross-linguistic contrast in its applicability to elements of different complexity: Icelandic differs from MSc in that morphological case is realised on all DPs in Icelandic whereas only pronouns are case-marked in MSc.

The necessity of morphological case for the availability of OS is apparently also supported by dialects that are able to use subject pronoun forms even as objects in certain contexts (e.g. Skellefteå in Sweden or Malax in Finland): Such "nominative" object pronouns may not undergo OS, whereas OS is possible in these dialects with pronouns that have the standard object pronoun form (accusative). In other words, a clearly case-marked form would seem to be a prerequisite for OS. 5

(68) Sw a. Maria ville kyssa jag / du / han / vi.  
 María wanted-to kiss I / you / he / we
 b. Maria kysste inte jag.  
 María kissed not I
 c. *MariaSUB kysste jagOBJ inte ___.
 d. Maria kysste mej inte ___.  
 (Holmberg 1986: 212)

5 Another potential problem for Holmberg's (1986) approach 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 (i), it is dative in (ii), and it is even nominative in (iii) (where the subject is dative, see Sigurðsson 1989: 198-241 and Taraldsen 1995), while in (68)c nominative case prevented OS.

(i) Ic a. Ígær leitaði Pétur sennilega ekki bessarar bókar.  
yesterday looked-for Peter.NOM probably not this book.GEN
 b. Ígær leitaði Pétur sennilega ekki ____________.
 c. Ígær leitaði Pétur bessarar bókar ekki ____________.
 (Vikner 1994: 512)

(ii) Ic a. Ígær lýsti Pétur sennilega ekki bessari bók.  
yesterday described Peter.NOM probably not this book.DAT
 b. Ígær lýsti Pétur sennilega ekki ________.
 c. Ígær lýsti Pétur bessari bók ekki ________.
 (Vikner 1994: 512)

(iii) Ic a. Ígær þótti þér sennilega ekki þessi bók skemmtileg.  
yesterday thought.3.SG you.SG.DAT probably not this book.DAT amusing.NOM
 b. Ígær þótti þér þessi bók ekki ________.
 c. Ígær þótti þér bessi bók ekki ________.
 (Vikner 2005: 414)
However, according to Jørgensen (2000), in the Swedish dialect from Umeå as well as in the Finland Swedish dialect from Västra Nyland, subject forms in object positions are only acceptable if they are contrastively stressed. The fact that these forms cannot undergo OS could then have to do with their prosodic properties (see (60) above).

(69) U a. Hab dom också frågat Du – dom har frågat mej? 
  
  have they also asked you they have asked me  

  b. *Har dom också frågat du? 

  (Jørgensen 2000: 206)

(70) U a. Elsa tycker om Du – int’ om jag. 
  
  Elsa cares for you – not for me  


  (Jørgensen 2000: 206)

Moreover, not all elements that have morphological case may also undergo OS: Full DP objects have morphological case in Faroese, and yet they may not undergo OS. 

(71) Fa a. Jógvan keypti ikki bókina. 
  
  Jógvan bought not book-the.ACC  

  b. *Jógvan keypti bókina ikki ____.  

  (Barnes 1992: 28)

(72) Fa a. *Jógvan keypti ikki hana. 
  
  Jógvan bought not it.ACC  

  b. Jógvan keypti hana ikki ____.  

  (Vikner 1994: 502)

---

6 According to Holmberg & Platzack (1995), morphological case in Faroese is of a weaker type such that DPs cannot OS: For example, a Faroese object does not retain oblique Case under passivization, in contrast to an Icelandic one.

(i) Fa a. Teir hjálpiti honum. 
  
  they helped him.DAT  

  b. *Honum bleiv hjálpin ____.  

  (Holmberg 1992: 28)

  c. Hann bleiv hjálpin ____.  

  (Holmberg & Platzack 1995: 173)

(ii) Ic a. Þeir hjálpuðu honum. 
  
  they helped him.DAT  

  b. Honum var hjálpað ____.  

  (Holmberg & Platzack 1995: 173)

  c. *Hann var hjálpað ____.  

However, if m-case needs to be strong for OS, then pronouns should only shift in Icelandic.
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Furthermore, "strong", i.e. focused, modified, or conjoined, pronouns have morphological case in MSc, but cannot undergo OS, compare examples (58)-(60).

As will be shown in the next section, even the generalisation that morphological case is a necessary (though obviously not sufficient) condition for OS does not hold: pronominal adverbials which do not bear case can shift as well.

2.1.2 Adverbials

Not only arguments but also pronominal adverbials may undergo OS:

(73) Da a. ??Bor Peter ikke længere der?
   lives Peter not longer there
   b. Bor Peter der ikke længere ___? (Vikner 2005: 422)

(74) Da a. *Peter sov alligevel ikke der.
   Peter slept after.all not there
   b. Peter sov der alligevel ikke ___. (Haider, Olsen, & Vikner 1995: 20)

(75) Ic a. Býr Pétur ekki lengur þar?
   lives Peter not longer there
   b. Býr Pétur þar ekki lengur ____? (Vikner 2005: 422)

However, note that not all pronominal adverbials may undergo OS, e.g. nu ‘now’ or sådan ‘in this way, thus’. In German, by contrast, SCR of these adverbials is possible, see also section 2.2.2 below.

(i) Da a. Jeg arbejder ikke nu.
   work not now
   b. *Jeg arbejder nu ikke __.

(ii) Da a. Jeg arbejder ikke sådan.
    work not in-this-way
    b. *Jeg arbejder sådan ikke __.

(iii) Ge a. ?Ich arbeite nicht jetzt.
    work not now
    b. Ich arbeite jetzt nicht __.

(iv) Ge a. Ich kann nicht so arbeiten.
    can not in-this-way work
    b. Ich kann so nicht ___ arbeiten
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Under the assumption that a clause-final free adverbial is adjoined to the right of VP, as illustrated in (76), HG has to refer to the linear precedence rather than c-command: An object may undergo OS in the presence of a clause-final adverbial, see (77)b, while OS of an adverbial is only possible if there is no intervening object, (77)c. In (76), the object precedes the adverbial, but does not c-command it, while the adverbial c-commands the object but does not precede it.

(76) Da   CP
     XP   C'
     I går   IP
 Cº   mødte  DP
     IP   l'
Peter lº   VP
     VP   ikke
             t
     Spec  V'
der  AdvP   PP
      t    der  i byen
     Vº    DP
      t    Elsa

(77) Da a. I går mødte Peter ikke Elsa i byen.
yesterday met Peter not Elsa in town-the
b. I går mødte Peter hende ikke ___ i byen.
yesterday met Peter her not ___ in town-the
c. *I går mødte Peter der ikke Elsa ___.
yesterday met Peter there not Elsa

Similarly, *der 'there' in (78) may undergo OS in the presence of the c-commanding, but following adverbial i går 'yesterday', but not in the presence of the non-c-commanding, but preceding adverbial godt 'well'.
(78) Da 

| a. Jeg sov ikke godt der i går. |
| I slept not well there yesterday |
| b. Jeg sov der ikke ___ i går. |
| c. *Jeg sov der ikke godt ___. |

Like multiple OS of two pronominal arguments is possible and must maintain the order of arguments in Danish and Icelandics, OS of a pronominal adverbial may target a position to the left right of a shifted pronominal argument.

(79) Da Peter havde troet at Sofie ville komme til receptionen, men

| a. han så hende der nu ikke ___ ___.
| he saw her there just not |
| b. *han så der hende nu ikke ___ ___.

Likewise, the example in (80) with a shifted pronominal argument and a subcategorized adverbial is acceptable.

(80) Da 

| a. Peter stiller ikke bøgerne op på hylden. |
| Peter puts not books-the up on shelf-the |
| b. *Peter stiller ikke dem op på hylden. |
| c. Peter stiller dem ikke ___ op på hylden. |
| d. Peter stiller ikke bøgerne der. |
| e. *Peter stiller der ikke bøgerne ___. |
| f. Peter stiller dem der ikke ___ ___. |

Note that in case a pronominal argument co-occurs with der 'there' in shifted position, as e.g. hende der 'her there' in (79), this sequence only allows for an interpretation as two constituents, argument + local adverbial [hende] [der], not as one constituent, i.e. not as adverbially modified pronoun [hende der]. This fact is not directly compatible with the assumption made by Vikner (1994), Christensen (2005) and many others that multiple OS is the result of movement of a more complex constituent: The complex constituent [hende der] comprising two pronominal elements cannot undergo OS, compare (58) above.

Though the pronominal adverbial der 'there' may undergo OS, a PP cannot shift, not even in Icelandic:

(81) Ic 

| a. Býr Pétur ekki lengur í Kaupmannahöfn? |
| lives Petur not longer in Copenhagen |
| b. *Býr Pétur í Kaupmannahöfn ekki lengur ____________? (Vikner 2005: 424) |
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Likewise, a modified pronominal adverbial cannot shift in Icelandic.

(82) Ic a. Býr Pétur ekki lengur barna vinstra megin?

\[ \text{lives} \text{ Pétur} \text{ not longer there left side} \]

b. *Býr Pétur barna vinstra megin ekki lengur ________________?

Furthermore, although a full DP argument may undergo OS in Icelandic, a DP adverbial cannot shift in Icelandic either - independent of whether it is free (83) or selected for (84).

(83) Ic a. Pétur las hana örugglega allan daginn.

\[ \text{Pétur read} \text{ it certainly every day} \]

b. *Pétur las hana allan daginn örugglega __________.

(84) Ic a. Ökuferðin tók tvær stundir örugglega.

\[ \text{drive-the took certainly two hours} \]

b. *Ökuferðin tók tvær stundir örugglega __________.

Hence, there is a contrast between OS of weak pronominal elements and OS of more complex phrases in the applicability to elements with different grammatical functions: While pronominal OS may apply to any weak pronoun, irrespective of its grammatical function as argument or adverbial, OS of more complex phrases may only apply to arguments but not to adverbials in Icelandic and to none of them in MSc. In other words, Icelandic adverbials are apparently subject to the same restrictions as arguments in MSc: Only weak pronouns may shift.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ic</th>
<th>MSc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pronominal element argument</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronominal element adverbial</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex phrase argument</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex phrase adverbial</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As argued in section 1.2.3, the difference in the ability to reverse the order of arguments in Dutch points to the conclusion that presumably two movement operations have to be distinguished according to syntactic complexity of the moved element, pronoun vs. complex phrase, due to the difference in their ability to reverse the order of arguments in Dutch. In Icelandic, these two movement operations obviously differ in their applicability to adverbials. Movement of complex adverbials may be ruled out in Icelandic by a corresponding prohibition against adverbial movement. As shown in the next section, complex adverbials, however, can undergo SCR in German, indicating that such a prohibition against adverbial movement must be violable: Adverbials may move in German irrespective of their syntactic complexity, whereas only pronominal adverbials can undergo OS.
2.2 Scrambling

2.2.1 Complexity

As mentioned in section 1.2, full DPs may precede or follow a sentential adverbial in German and Dutch, see (85) and (87) whereas pronouns have to precede it, (86) and (88).

(85) Ge a. Warum liest Peter nie das Buch __? 
why reads Peter never the book
b. Warum liest Peter das Buch nie ________ ____?

(86) Ge a. *Warum liest Peter nie es ____?
why reads Peter never it
b. Warum liest Peter es nie ________ ____?

Jan has yesterday Marie kissed
b. Jan heeft Marie gisteren _____ gekust.

Jan has yesterday her kissed
b. Jan heeft 'r gisteren ___ gekust. (Haegeman 1991: 32)

In the SCR languages, movement of a focused item is possible, irrespective of its phrasal status, pronoun vs. full DP.

(89) Ge a. Gestern traf Peter nicht PAUL (aber HANS)
yesterday met Peter not PAUL but HANS
b. ?Gestern traf Peter PAUL nicht ____ (aber HANS).

yesterday met Peter not HIM but HER
b. ?Gestern traf Peter IHN nicht ___, (sondern SIE).

(91) Du a. ... dat ik gisteren de jongen HET BOEK gegeven heb.
that I yesterday the boys the book given have
b. ... dat ik HET BOEK gisteren de jongen _________ gegeven heb. 
(De Hoop & Kosmeijer 1995: 150)
(92) Du A: Heeft Jan\textsubscript{SUB} nog nooit zijn moeder\textsubscript{OBJ} gebeld?

\begin{tabular}{llll}
& has & Jan \ (yet never) & his mother \ (called) \\
B: Nee, zijn moeder\textsubscript{SUB} heeft HEM\textsubscript{OBJ} nog nooit ___ gebeld.
& no & his mother \ (has) & him \ (yet never) \ (called)
\end{tabular}

(Delfitto & Corver 1998: 321)

Note that in contrast to "neutral" SCR, movement of a focused object may reverse the order of arguments in Dutch.  

2.2.2 Adverbials

Similar to OS, SCR is not restricted to arguments. However in contrast to OS, SCR of adverbials may not only apply to pronominals in German, but also to (certain) complex adverbials and PPs.

(93) Ge a. ... weil Hans wahrscheinlich nicht dafür bezahlen will.

\begin{tabular}{llll}
& because Hans \ (probably) & not for.that \ (pay) & wants.to \\
\end{tabular}

b. ... weil Hans dafür wahrscheinlich nicht ___ bezahlen will.

Similarly, Italian focalization and clitic left dislocation differ in several respects: The former but not the latter gives rise to weak cross-over effects, (i), is restricted to place only one argument in clause-initial position, (ii), and is prohibited in infinitival and adjunct clauses, (iii) and (iv).

(i) a. *GIANNI suai madre ha sempre apprezzato (non Piero).

\begin{tabular}{llll}
Gianni \ (his mother) & ha sempre \ (has always) \ (appreciated) & not Piero \\
\end{tabular}

b. Giannii, suai madre loi ha sempre apprezzato. \quad (Rizzi 1997: 290)

(ii) a. *A GIANNI IL LIBRO darò (non a Piero, l'articolo).

\begin{tabular}{llll}
the book \ (to Gianni) \ (I.will.give) & not to Piero the article \\
\end{tabular}

b. Il libro, a Gianni, domani, glielo darò senz'altro. \quad (Rizzi 1997: 290)

(iii) a. *Ho deciso, IL TUO LIBRO di rileggere (non il suo).

\begin{tabular}{llll}
I.have decided \ (the your book) \ (to reread) & not the his \\
\end{tabular}

b. Ho deciso, il tuo libro, di rileggerlo. \quad (Haegeman 2003)

(iv) a. *Se IL MIO LIBRO riesci a leggere, supererai l'esame.

\begin{tabular}{llll}
if \ (my book) \ (you.manage) \ (to read) \ (you.will.pass) \ (the exam) \\
\end{tabular}

b. Se il mio libro riesci a leggerlo, supererai l'esame. \quad (Haegeman 2003)

if \ (my book) \ (you.manage) \ (to read.\ it) \ (you.will.pass) \ (the exam)
(94) Ge a. ... weil Hans wahrscheinlich nicht für das Buch bezahlt.  
   because Hans probably not for the book pays
b. ... weil Hans für das Buch wahrscheinlich nicht bezahlt.

(95) Ge a. ... weil wahrscheinlich an Weihnachten Hans hier
eine Rede hält.  
a talk gives
b. ... weil hier an Weihnachten wahrscheinlich ___ Hans ___
eine Rede hält.

However, leftward movement of a PP in Dutch is subject to certain restrictions.

PP movement is only possible with a restricted set of adverbial phrases: The PP *op mijn opmerking 'on my remarks' may move across an adverbial like *nauwelijks 'hardly', (96), but not across an adverbial like *gisteren 'yesterday', (97); in contrast, SCR of a DP across gisteren is possible, (98).

   Jan has hardly on my remarks reacted
b.   Jan heeft op mijn opmerking nauwelijks gereageerd.
   (Broekhuis 2006: 22)

   Jan has yesterday on my remarks reacted
b.   *Jan heeft op mijn opmerking gisteren gereageerd.  
   (Broekhuis 2006: 22)

(98) Du a.   Ik heb gisteren dat boek gelezen.  
   I have yesterday that book read
b.   Ik heb dat boek gisteren ___ gelezen.  
   (Broekhuis 2006: 22)
Furthermore, SCR of a PP complement across an adverbial PP is always blocked, (99), SCR of a DP across such an adverbial PP, (100), - as well as across an adverbial DP as in (101) - is always possible.

(99) Du a. ... dat Jan na de vergadering op Marie wachtte.

  that Jan after the meeting for Marie waited

b. *... dat Jan op Marie na de vergadering ______ wachtte. (Broekhuis 2006: 22)

(100) Du a. ... dat Jan na de vergadering het boek wegbracht.

  that Jan after the meeting the book brought-away

b. ... dat Jan het boek na de vergadering ______ wegbracht.

  (Broekhuis 2006: 22)

(101) Du a. ... dat Jan deze middag dat boek zal wegbrengen.

  that Jan this afternoon that book will bring-away

b. ... dat Jan dat boek deze middag ______ zal wegbrengen.

  (Broekhuis 2006: 22)

Moreover, PPs that contain a definite pronoun may move when the pronoun has its non-reduced form, (102), whereas usage of a weak pronoun is impossible in scrambled position, (103). In other words, the moved PP must be assigned stress, whereas SCR normally has the effect of destressing the moved element, leading Broekhuis (2006) to suggest that PP movement does not involve SCR but rather focus movement (see also DeHoop & Kosmeijer 1995). Like movement of focused DPs (compare (91) above), PP movement may cross an intervening argument, (104).

(102) Du a. ... dat Jan nauwelijks naar hem luisterde.

  that Jan hardly to him listened

b. ... dat Jan naar hem nauwelijks ______ luisterde. (Broekhuis 2006: 21)

(103) Du a. ... dat Jan nauwelijks naar 'm luisterde.

  that Jan hardly to him listened

b. *... dat Jan naar 'm nauwelijks ______ luisterde. (Broekhuis 2006: 21)

(104) Du a. ... dat ik gisteren het boek aan de jongen gegeven heb.

  that I yesterday the book to the boys given have

b. ... dat ik aan de jongen gisteren het boek ______ gegeven heb.

c. ... dat ik aan de jongen het boek gisteren ______ ______ gegeven heb.

  (De Hoop & Kosmeijer 1995: 150)
Under the assumption that PP movement in Dutch is an instance of focus movement, Dutch SCR is similar to Icelandic OS in that it cannot apply to complex adverbials.9

2.3 Summary

As shown in this chapter, there is cross-linguistic variation in which types of elements may undergo movement, weak pronouns vs. complex phrases, arguments vs. adverbials. All types of weak pronominal elements, i.e. arguments and adverbials, may undergo movement in all OS and SCR languages. Movement of complex phrases, by contrast, may only take place in certain languages: While it is prohibited in MSc, complex phrases may undergo movement in Icelandic and the SCR languages. However, while in German movement of a complex phrase is independent of its grammatical function, movement of complex phrases is restricted to DP arguments in Icelandic and Dutch.

Moreover, pronominal elements and complex phrases differ in the obligatoriness of movement. While movement of a weak pronoun is obligatory if possible (except for Swedish and some south-eastern dialects of Danish where pronoun movement is optional and the Swedish dialect Älvdalsmålet and Finland Swedish where pronoun movement is ungrammatical), movement of complex phrases seems to be optional in all languages that allow for this type of movement at all. Furthermore, it was shown in chapter 1 that pronominal elements and complex phrases in Dutch differ in their ability to move across an intervening argument.

---

9 The hypothesis that SCR of complex phrases is restricted to arguments in Dutch would seem to force us to assume that also movement of an adverbial like *gisteren* 'yesterday' to a position to the left of a sentential adverbial as in (i) represent instances of focus movement; but see also footnote *Fejl! Bogmærke er ikke defineret.*.

(i)  
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{Du} & \text{Jan} & \text{heeft} & \text{waarschijnlijk} & \text{gisteren} & \text{Marie} & \text{gekust.} \\
\text{Jan} & \text{has} & \text{probably} & \text{yesterday} & \text{Marie} & \text{kissed} \\
\text{b. Jan} & \text{heeft} & \text{gisteren} & \text{waarschijnlijk} & \text{Marie} & \text{gekust.}
\end{array}
\]
Under the assumption that the dependency of object movement on verb movement in the Scandinavian languages is due to a linear restriction, it may be treated on a par with the prohibition against movement across an intervening argument. In other words, there might be a more general prohibition against movement across a linearly intervening non-adverbal element. The fact that movement is independent of verb movement, but dependent on (the absence of) intervening arguments in Dutch (full DP SCR) while it is dependent on both in Icelandic and Danish would then just be a result of the contrast between VO and OV.

Hence, the data suggests that rather than differentiating movement devices according to language family (OS in the Scandinavian languages and SCR in the continental West Germanic languages), two movement devices should be distinguished according to the complexity of the moved element. The next chapter presents an OT approach to the cross-linguistic differences of these movement devices.
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