

Some Remarks on Object Shift Constructions

Norihiko Kondo
University of Tokyo

ll67075@ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

1. Introduction

In this paper, I discuss Object Shift (henceforth, OS) constructions such as (1b) below:

- (1) a. Nemandinn las ekki þrjár bækur. (Icelandic)
Student-the read not three books
'It is not the case that the student read three books.'
- b. Nemandinn las þrjár bækur_i ekki t_i.
Student-the read three books not
'There are three books that the student didn't read.'

Generally it is assumed that (1b) is derived from (1a) by OS, which has applied to the object *þrjár bækur* and has moved it across the negation marker *ekki*. As a result of this movement, certain semantic differences arise between (1a) and (1b): the shifted object in (1b) necessarily receives a "specific" interpretation, which is not the case in (1a).

In this way, optional movements like OS or Scrambling can be applied only if certain surface semantic effects are derived by these operations (cf. Chomsky (2001a)). In this paper, then, I will investigate (i) what is the parameter for OS, (ii) why V-movement is required in OS, (iii) what interpretations are involved in OS and (iv) how a well-known contrast in Scandinavian¹ can be captured in the current Minimalist framework.

2. Previous Analyses

2.1. Holmberg (1999)

Holmberg (1986) proposes the following generalization called "Holmberg's Generalization" (henceforth, HG), which describes the circumstance where OS can be

¹ Note that "Scandinavian" includes both Icelandic and Mainland Scandinavian.

applied:

(2) OS is applied only if V moves out of VP. (Holmberg (1986))

According to this generalization, the contrast in grammaticality of the following sentences can be accounted for:

- (3) a. Jag kysste **henne_i** inte [VP *t_v* *t_i*] (Swedish)
I kissed her not
b. *Jag har **henne_i** inte [VP kysst *t_i*] (Swedish)
I have her not kissed

(Holmberg (1999: 1))

In (3a) the verb has moved out of VP and has raised to the V-2 position, namely the C position. By contrast, the verb in (3b) remains in the in-situ position within VP, so OS cannot be applied to the object.

However, Holmberg (1999) points out that the following sentences are ungrammatical despite the fact that the verb has moved out of VP, which is clear from the position of the negation marker *inte*:

- (4) a. *Dom kastade **mej_i** inte ut *t_i*. (Swedish)
They threw me not out
'They didn't throw me out'
b. *Jag gav **den_i** inte Elsa *t_i*. (Swedish)
I gave it not Elsa
'I didn't give it to Elsa'
c. *Jag talade **henne_i** inte med *t_i*. (Swedish)
I spoke her not with
'I didn't speak with her'

In all of these examples, the verb has moved out of VP, yet OS is illicit: in (4a), Holmberg suggests, because it has shifted across a preposition, in (4b) because it has shifted across an indirect object, and in (4c) because it has shifted across a verb particle.

To account for this fact, Holmberg (1999) proposes that OS is a phonological rule, which is applied in the stylistic component, and then he revises HG to capture the facts in (4):

- (5) Any phonologically visible category, be it a verb, a preposition, a verb particle, or another argument, which governs the object in VP, blocks OS.

(Holmberg (1999: 35))

According to this revised version of HG, the application of OS is blocked by not only verbs but also any material within VP (except adjuncts) asymmetrically c-commanding the object position.

On this point, however, Chomsky responds as follows:²

Leftward Th/Ex is distinct from OS, a phenomenon whose status and scope are open to many questions. One distinction, already noted, has to do with semantic consequences: the semantic neutrality of Th/Ex is one of the reasons to believe that it falls within the phonological component; but as is well known, that is not true of OS, which we therefore expect to fall (at least in part) within narrow syntax, given the simplifications that led to

(13).

(Chomsky (2001a: 26))

According to this remark, Chomsky does not regard OS as a phonological rule, but instead as a syntactic operation. So, this is an important difference between Holmberg (1999) and Chomsky (2001a).

Bearing this point in mind, in the next section I focus on the analysis by Chomsky (2001a) to understand in detail how Chomsky takes OS constructions.

2.2. *Chomsky (2001a)*

Chomsky (2001a) proposes the following principles in (6a-b) and the parameter in (6c), to account for the data in (4):

- (6)
- a. v^* is assigned an EPP-feature only if that has an effect on outcome.
 - b. The EPP position of v^* is assigned Int.³
 - c. At the phonological border of v^*P , XP is assigned Int'.

(Chomsky (2001a: 35))

Chomsky suggests that (6a-b) are the principles which are involved in the application of

² The principle (13) in Chomsky (2001a: 15) is as follows: "Surface semantic effects are restricted to narrow syntactic operations".

³ As we will see later in the text, "Int" is the interpretive complex which consists of new/old information, specificity-definiteness, focus or topic, etc..

OS. Further, he proposes that (6c) is the parameter which distinguishes OS- from non OS-languages. This parameter, however, seems problematic, because it directly relates the semantic and phonological interfaces.

Moreover, as I mentioned above, Chomsky (2001a) considers, contrary to Holmberg (1999), that OS is a syntactic operation. If so, it is also problematic that OS can be applied only after it is ascertained whether an object is situated at the phonological border or not, as the parameter in (6c) suggests.

Then, we are now in a dilemma: if we consider (6c) to be the parameter for the application of OS, we are forced to regard OS as a phonological operation, to the extent that it refers to the phonological information. On the other hand, Chomsky himself suggests that OS is a narrow syntactic operation. The only way to get out of this dilemma will be to revise the parameter in (6c) so that it refers not to any phonological information, but instead to syntactic one (e.g. structural relations in syntax, etc.). For this purpose, however, we must first investigate what is the real cause for the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (4). In the next section, then, I take up and review the work by Bobaljik (2002).

2.3. *Bobaljik (2002)*

According to Bobaljik, the ungrammaticality of (4a-b) can be accounted for independently by the locality condition on A-movement. And he proposes that Holmberg's Generalization need not be revised so as to account for these cases.

First, he shows that passive in a particle construction in standard Swedish (7a) is as bad as its OS counterpart in (4a), and further that passivization of direct objects in double object constructions in (7b) is also as bad as its OS counterpart in (4b) (cf. Bobaljik (2002: 236)):

- (7) a. *Skräpet måste bli kastat ut. (Swedish)
 scrap-the must AUX thrown out
 'The scrap had to be thrown out.'
- b. *Bogen blev givet Jens. (Swedish)
 book-the AUX given Jens
 'Jens was given the book.'

Though he does not deal with the case of prepositional objects, passivization is also impossible in this case, according to the data in Maling & Zaenen (1990a: 162):

- (8) *Handelsen talades om. (Swedish)
 event-the talked-was about
 'The event was talked about.'

Note that A'-movement of the theme is possible from post-particle and post-indirect object positions, as shown below (cf. Bobaljik (2002: 236)):

- (9) a. Vad smutsade Kalle ner? (Swedish)
 what dirtied Kalle down
 'What did Kalle (make) dirty?'
 b. Vad gav Kalle Elsa? (Swedish)
 what gave Kalle Elsa
 'What did Kalle give Elsa?'

Moreover, A'-movement is also possible from post-preposition positions (this example is taken from Maling & Zaenen (1990a: 162)):⁴

- (10) Handelsen talades det om. (Swedish)
 event-the talked-was it about
 'People talked about the event.'

These facts suggest that the problem with (4a-c) is one of A'-movement from the post-particle, post-indirect object or post-preposition positions. Neither object shift nor passive is possible. This conclusion is strengthened by deeper consideration of variation in the verb-particle construction in Scandinavian.

The first relevant observation is that standard Swedish is alone among the Scandinavian languages in requiring the object to follow the particle (cf. Bobaljik (2002: 236)):

- (11) a. Vi slap {*ud} hunden {ud} (Danish)
 b. Við hentum {út} hundinum {út} (Icelandic)
 c. Vi slapp {ut} hunden {ut} (Norwegian)
 d. Vi släpte {ut} hunden {*ut} (Swedish)
 we let out the.dog out
 'We let the dog out.'

⁴ In (10), *Handelsen* 'the event' is topicalized to the sentence initial position (i.e. [Spec,CP]), and the finite verb *talades* 'was talked' is raised to the C position. This is clear from the presence of the dummy subject *det* 'it' in [Spec,TP].

And in standard Swedish alone, the passivization of these particle-containing sentences results in ungrammaticality (compare the following sentences with (7a) in standard Swedish):

- (12) a. Hunden blev smedet ud. (Danish)
 dog-the AUX thrown out
 'The dog was thrown out.'
- b. Hundinum var hent út. (Icelandic)
 dog-the AUX thrown out
 'The dog was thrown out.'
- c. Hunden ble sluppet ut. (Norwegian)
 dog-the AUX let out
 'The dog was let out.'

In addition, in standard Swedish alone, OS is impossible in these particle-containing sentences (compare the following sentences with (4a) in standard Swedish):⁵

- (13) a. De kastet meg ikke ut. (Norwegian)
 they threw me not out
 'They didn't throw me out.'
- b. Jeg skrev det faktisk op. (Danish)
 I wrote it actually up
 'I actually wrote it up.'
- c. Petúr henti mottunni ekki út (Icelandic)
 Peter threw carpet-the not away
 'Peter didn't throw away the carpet.'

From these observations, then, the following generalization emerges across Scandinavian languages:

- (14) An object which can only appear in the post-particle position is blocked from further A-movement (i.e. object shift and passive).
 (Bobaljik (2002: 240))

As observed above, this generalization also holds of the cases involving indirect and

⁵ The examples in (13a-b) are taken from Bobaljik (2002: 237), while that in (13c) from Vikner (2006: 399).

prepositional objects. Therefore, we can say the ungrammaticality of (4a-c) is to be accounted for by the locality condition on A-movement.

This is the brief outline of the argument in Bobaljik (2002). Then, in the next section, I return to the work by Chomsky (2001a), and attempt to revise the parameter in (6c).

3. Proposal

3.1. *Why is V-movement required in OS constructions?*

As already mentioned in section 2, the OS of direct objects of a verb always requires verb movement out of VP (HG). For instance, Chomsky (1993) gives a syntactic account of this requirement, suggesting that it is required in order to extend the minimal domain of V (cf. Chomsky (1993)). Holmberg (1999), on the other hand, takes account of phonological aspects of OS constructions and then argues that it is required because OS cannot be applied across a phonologically visible category in VP (cf. Holmberg (1999: 35)). And Bobaljik (2002) gives an explanation for this question from the morphological perspective. He claims that it is required since if OS is applied with V remaining in VP, PF/morphological merger is blocked between a verb stem in V and an inflectional or participial affix(es) in Infl^0 or Part^0 . (cf. Bobaljik (2002)).

In this way, though the question of why V has to move out of VP in OS constructions has been approached from various angles, Chomsky (2001a) remarks as follows on this point:

In (56), the theta-role is determined by the configuration of Obj. If OS does not apply and Obj remains in situ in a trivial A-chain, then the same configuration is freely interpreted at LF, taking account of inherent properties of the lexical items and the theta-role: in particular, it may have the “surface” interpretation Int or its complement Int’.

(Chomsky (2001a: 33))

“The configuration of Obj” in the first line of this passage corresponds to the position of Obj in the following structure:

(15) $[_\beta C [\text{Spec } T \dots [_\alpha \text{ XP } [\text{Subj } v^* [_{\text{VP}} V \dots \text{Obj}]]]]]$

Chomsky (2001a: 33)

On the above remarks by Chomsky and the structure in (15), I call “the configuration of Obj with V” the base position of Obj, if both V and Obj remain in VP (cf. Hale & Keyser (1993)), and according to Chomsky, the object in this configuration is freely interpreted,

receiving Int or Int’.

Bearing these points in mind, first consider the following example where the finite verb *las* ‘read’ remains in VP due to the presence of Aux in C, as a result of which OS cannot be applied to the object *Þrjár bækur* ‘three books’:

- (16) Nemandinn hefur ekki lesið Þrjár bækur. (Icelandic)
Student-the has not read three books
‘It is not the case that the student has read three books.’
‘There are three books that the student didn’t read.’

As the glosses in (16) show, this sentence has two possible readings: one is a non-specific (predicational) reading, and the other is a specific (quantificational) one. This sentence shows that if V remains in VP, the configuration of Obj is freely interpreted, receiving Int (here, ‘specific’ interpretation) or Int’ (here, ‘non-specific’ one), thus verifying the validity of the above suggestion by Chomsky.

Keeping this point in mind, then consider the following sentence which constitutes a minimal pair with (16):

- (17) Nemandinn las ekki Þrjár bækur. (Icelandic)
Student-the read not three books
‘It is not the case that the student read three books.’

In (17) the finite verb *las* ‘read’ has raised out of VP as a result of V-to-C raising, and the object *Þrjár bækur* ‘three books’ remains in VP. Notice here that as the gloss in (17) shows, this sentence has only a non-specific (predicational) reading (i.e. there is no presupposition of existence), and further that a specific interpretation is derived by applying OS to *Þrjár bækur* ‘three books’, as the following example shows,:

- (18) Nemandinn las Þrjár bækur_i ekki t_i. (Icelandic)
Student-the read three books not
‘There are three books that the student didn’t read.’

The sentences in (17) and (18) illustrate that if V moves out of VP, a specific interpretation is derived with the application of OS.

From the data in this section, then, we can say as follows on the question why V-movement is required in OS constructions, in the framework of Chomsky (2001a):

- (19) In OS constructions V must move out of VP, because if V remains in VP the configuration of Obj is freely interpreted, receiving Int or Int'. Thus, in accordance with the principles (6a-b) OS is blocked in this circumstance (i.e. where V remains in VP), since new surface semantic effects cannot be derived by its application

In this way, the V-movement requirement in OS constructions is explained on the assumptions that (i) the principles involved in OS are those in (6a-b) and that (ii) the configuration of Obj with V is freely interpreted, receiving Int or Int'.

Extending the discussions in this section, then, in the following section I will investigate the question of what is the parameter for OS constructions.

3.2 *The parameter for OS*

In section 3.1., I have shown that the V-movement requirement in OS constructions is captured on the following two assumptions:

- (i) The principles involved in OS are those in (6a-b).
- (ii) The configuration of Obj with V is freely interpreted, receiving Int or Int'.

And recall that “the configuration of Obj with V” in (ii) corresponds to the position of Obj in the following structure (I repeat (15) here):

- (15) $[_\beta C [Spec T \dots [_\alpha XP [Subj v^* [VP V \dots Obj]]]]]$

(Chomsky (2001a: 33))

The Obj in (15) is situated in its base position with V remaining in VP, and I have called the Obj in this configuration “the configuration of Obj with V”.

Assuming this much, then, in this section I will pay close attention to the question of what is the parameter in OS constructions. Recall that Chomsky (2001a) puts forward the following parameter for OS constructions (I repeat (6c) here):

- (6) c. At the phonological border of v^*P , XP is assigned Int'.

(Chomsky (2001a: 35))

Chomsky proposes this parameter on the assumption that the ungrammaticality exhibited by (4a-c) should be captured by HG. However, if the argument in section 2.3. is on the right track, the sentences in (4a-c) should be ruled out by the locality condition on A-movement, and then it will not be necessary to refer to the broader notion “the phonological border of”

as in (6c). Rather, it will be sufficient for the parameter on OS to refer only to the relation between a verb and Obj, to the exclusion of, say, particles, indirect objects or prepositions.

Thus, if we posit a parameter for OS, the data to be accounted for by it are just those in (3), excluding those in (4). Taking these points into account, then, I revise (6') as follows:

(6c') At the configuration of Obj without V (or with a trace of V), XP is assigned Int'.

An crucial point here is that (6c') does not refer to any phonological information, as (6c) does. So, the problem with (6c) that I mentioned above does not arise here: that is, the direct connection between the phonological and semantic interfaces. Thus, (6c') is more appropriate than (6c), if we follow Chomsky in assuming that OS is a syntactic operation and further that surface semantic effects are restricted to narrow syntax (cf. Chomsky (2001a)). On the parameter in (6c'), we can distinguish Romance (non-OS languages) from Scandinavian (OS-languages) as follows:

TABLE 1: DISTINGUISHING ROMANCE FROM SCANDINAVIAN IN TERMS OF THE PARAMETER (6c')

	OBSERVE THE PARAMETER IN (6c')?
ROMANCE LANGUAGES	NO
SCANDINAVIAN LANGUAGES	YES

As this table shows, Romance has a negative value with respect to the parameter in (6') while Scandinavian a positive one. This means that in Romance interpretations are freely assigned at the configuration of Obj without V (i.e. both Int or Int' are available there), so OS cannot be applied in compliance with the principles in (6a-b).⁶

(20) [CP [TP V_i [vP [vP t_i Obj(Int or Int')]]]] (Romance)

On the other hand, in Scandinavian where the parameter is set on, only Int' is assigned to the configuration of Obj without V, so that OS can be applied insofar as new surface semantic effects (Int) are induced with its application:⁷

(21) [CP V_i [TP [vP (Int) [vP t_i Obj(Int')]]]] (Scandinavian)

⁶ I assume here that finite verbs in Romance are overtly raised to T.

⁷ In (21), V is raised to C to satisfy the V2 requirement.

On these premises, then, in the next section I will analyze the well-known contrast within Scandinavian languages in the types of shifted objects: in Mainland Scandinavian⁸ only pronouns are subject to OS, whereas in Icelandic not only pronouns but full DPs undergo OS.

3.3. *A well-known contrast within Scandinavian languages in the types of shifted objects*

First consider the cases of pronominal OS in Scandinavian languages:

- (22) a. *Nemandinn las ekki hana. (Icelandic)
 b. *Studenten læste ikke den. (Danish)
 c. *Studenten läste inte den. (Swedish)
 student-the read not it

- (23) a. Nemandinn las **hana_i** ekki *t_i*. (Icelandic)
 b. Studenten læste **den_i** ikke *t_i*. (Danish)
 c. Studenten läste **den_i** inte *t_i*. (Swedish)
 student-the read it not

'The student didn't read it.'

As illustrated in (22) and (23), pronominal OS is obligatory in Scandinavian, and the object is restricted to a simple, unstressed definite pronouns. The following examples, for instance, show that indefinite pronouns do not readily shift, either in Mainland Scandinavian or in Icelandic:

- (24) Nei, jeg har ingen paraply, (Norwegian)
 No I have no umbrella
 a. men jeg k per muligens en i morgen.
 but I buy possibly one tomorrow
 b. *... men jeg k per **en_i** muligens *t_i* i morgen.

- (25)  g   ekkert eftir Chomsky. (Icelandic)
 I have nothing by Chomsky
 a.  tt þ  ekki eitthva ?
 Have you not something

⁸ "Mainland Scandinavian" here includes Danish, Norwegian and Swedish.

- b. *Átt þú eitthvað_i ekki *t_i*?
 ‘I don’t have anything by Chomsky. Don’t you have something?’

On these observations, then, Chomsky (2001a) concludes that the interpretation of “specificity-definiteness” is involved in the OS of pronominal objects in Mainland Scandinavian and Icelandic:⁹

TABLE 2: INTERPRETATIONS INVOLVED IN THE PRONOMINAL OS IN MAINLAND SCANDINAVIAN AND ICELANDIC

	TYPES OF OBJ	RELEVANT INT
MAINLAND SCANDINAVIAN	Pronouns	Specificity-definiteness
ICELANDIC	Pronouns	Specificity-definiteness

As mentioned above, if we follow Chomsky (2001a) in assuming the interpretations assigned to the EPP position of *v** are universal, and that parameters should be posited in the configuration of Obj, then this means, in the present framework, that in Mainland Scandinavian and Icelandic, the interpretation of “specificity-definiteness” is consistently unavailable to pronominal objects in the configuration of Obj without V. As a result, they shift to the EPP position of *v**, where a new semantic effect is obtained (i.e. in this case, “specificity-definiteness”). In this way, Mainland Scandinavian and Icelandic are parallel in the behavior of pronominal objects.

Next consider the cases of the OS of full DPs. As illustrated in (26) below, full DPs in Mainland Scandinavian cannot undergo OS:

⁹ The idea that the D head, which bears the interpretation “definiteness”, is involved in OS is also suggested in Watanabe (2003). Thus, he adduces the following contrasts observed within Germanic languages:

- (i) a. Nemandinn las bókina ekki. (Icelandic)
 b. *Studenten laste boken inte. (Swedish)
 Student-the read book-the not

(Watanabe (2003: 51))

As we will see later in the text, this contrast shows that only in Icelandic, can full DPs undergo OS: the definite DP in (ia) in Icelandic has shifted across the negation marker *inte*, whereas this movement is impossible in Swedish as shown in (ib). To capture this contrast, Watanabe pays his attention to the following contrast observed within Germanic languages:

- (ii) a. nyja hus-is (Icelandic)
 b. det nya hus-et (Swedish)
 c. tas nya hus-is (Faroese)
 the new house-the

(iia-c) show the contrast observed within Germanic languages when an attributive adjective appears in DP: in Swedish and Faroese, not only suffixes but also definite articles appear on the head noun as shown in (iib-c), while as (iia) shows, only suffixes occur in Icelandic. On the basis of this fact, Watanabe proposes that the properties of D-head, (inter alia, the interpretation “definiteness”), are involved in the OS of full DPs observed in Icelandic.

- (26) a. *Studenten læste **bogen**_i ikke *t*_i. (Danish)
 b. *Studenten leste **boken**_i ikke *t*_i. (Norwegian)
 c. *Studenten läste **boken**_i inte *t*_i. (Swedish)
 student-the read book-the not

On the other hand, full DPs in Icelandic optionally undergo OS, as shown in (27) below:

- (27) a. Nemandinn las ekki **bókina**. (Icelandic)
 student-the read not book-the
 'The student didn't read the book.'
 b. Nemandinn las **bókina**_i ekki *t*_i.
 'The student didn't read the book.'

In (27b), the definite DP *bókina* 'the book' has undergone OS and shifted across the negation marker *ekki* 'not'.

As the following examples show, however, indefinite DPs cannot undergo OS:

- (28) a. Ég las ekki **bók**. (Icelandic)
 I read not book
 'I didn't read (a single) book.'
 b. *Ég las **bók**_i ekki *t*_i.
 I read book not

From the contrast in grammaticality between (27b) and (28b), we can say that the interpretation "definiteness" is involved in the application of OS (cf. Diesing (1997)).¹⁰

Note here that in certain contexts, quantificational DPs can also undergo OS in Icelandic:

- (29) a. Nemandinn las ekki **þrjár bækur**. (Icelandic)
 Student-the read not three books
 'It is not the case that the student read three books.'
 b. Nemandinn las **þrjár bækur**_i ekki *t*_i.
 Student-the read three books not
 'There are three books that the student didn't read.'

¹⁰ In the literature, it is considered that (28b) is ungrammatical since the shifted object *bók* '(a) book' is an indefinite one, unable to receive specific (or definite) interpretation.

As already mentioned in section 3.1., these two sentences have a different meaning. (29a), where the object is inside the VP, receives a predicational reading and there is no presupposition of existence. (29b), on the other hand, receives a specific interpretation (cf. Diesing & Jelinek (1993, 1995) and Thráinsson (2001)). In this way, quantificational DPs in Icelandic can undergo OS only if a specific interpretation is required in the context.¹¹

Summarizing the discussion so far on the OS of full DPs in Icelandic, we obtain the following two descriptions:

- (30) Unlike definite DPs, indefinite DPs in Icelandic cannot be shifted, because they are unable to receive the interpretation of “specificity-definiteness”.
- (31) Quantificational DPs in Icelandic can undergo OS only when they receive the interpretation of “specificity-definiteness”.

On the basis of these two descriptions, then, we reach the following result on the interpretations involved in the OS of full DPs in Icelandic:

TABLE 3: INTERPRETATIONS INVOLVED IN THE OS OF FULL DPs IN ICELANDIC

	TYPES OF OBJ	RELEVANT INT
ICELANDIC	Full DPs	Specificity-definiteness

Combining Table 2 and 3, then, we get the following result on the types of Obj and the relevant interpretations involved in the OS of Scandinavian languages:

¹¹ As a further argument on this point, look at the following examples in German, which involve “Scrambling” (in (i) below, scrambled objects are bold-faced):

- (i) a. daß die Polizei gestern **zwei Linguisten** festgenommen hat
that the Police yesterday two linguists arrested has
b. daß die Polizei **zwei Linguisten** gestern festgenommen hat
that the Police two linguists yesterday arrested has
c. *daß die Polizei **Linguisten** gestern festgenommen hat
that the Police linguists yesterday arrested has

Generally it is assumed that the structure in (ib) is derived from (ia) by Scrambling. This operation is similar to OS, in that both are optional operations. And if we follow Chomsky in assuming that optional operations must be driven by surface semantic effects, then the leftward scrambling observed in the example in (ib) must also be driven by surface semantic effects, just as in OS examples like (29b). On this point, note that (ib) is grammatical only if the NP *zwei Linguisten* ‘two linguists’ has a specific interpretation. This is confirmed by the ungrammaticality of (ic): the indefinite object NP in (ic) (i.e. *Linguisten* ‘linguists’) has an unambiguously existential interpretation, so it cannot receive a specific one (cf. Phillippi (1997)).

TABLE 4: *TYPES OF OBJ AND INTERPRETATIONS INVOLVED IN THE OS OF SCANDINAVIAN LANGUAGES*

	<i>TYPES OF OBJ</i>	<i>RELEVANT INT</i>
MAINLAND SCANDINAVIAN	Pronouns	Specificity-definiteness
ICELANDIC	Pronouns	Specificity-definiteness
	Full DPs	Specificity-definiteness

In the framework in this paper, then, the situation described in this table is captured in the following way:

- (32) Pronominal objects in both Mainland Scandinavian and Icelandic are consistently unable to receive the interpretation of “specificity-definiteness” at the configuration of Obj without V. As a result, they shift to the peripheral position of v^* , where the relevant interpretation is assigned to them.
- (33) In Mainland Scandinavian, the interpretation “specificity-definiteness” is consistently assigned to full DPs at the configuration of Obj without V. In Icelandic, on the other hand, it is optionally assigned to them at the same configuration. So, when it is not, v^* is assigned an EPP-feature in accordance with the principles (6a-b). Then, they undergo OS and move to the peripheral position of v^* , in which they are interpreted properly.

Thus, I suggest that the difference stated in (33) is responsible for the well-known contrast observed in Scandinavian languages in the types of shifted objects: namely, only in Icelandic, can full DPs undergo OS.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, I have made some remarks on OS constructions observed in Scandinavian languages. OS constructions have been discussed since the important work by Holmberg (1986), in which it is suggested that OS is possible only if V moves out of VP. Holmberg (1999), on the other hand, argues that not only V but any phonologically visible category blocks OS. Taking this point into account, Chomsky (2001a) puts forth the parameter for OS in (6c), which directly connects phonological information with semantic one. This parameter, however, is undesirable since such a connection between phonology and semantics is not permitted in the current Minimalist framework. To solve this problem, I have reconsidered the data in Holmberg (1999) from another perspective. Bobaljik (2002), for instance, shows that it is the locality condition on A-movement that is responsible for the ungrammaticality of the OS across particles and indirect objects. Though Bobaljik does

not deal with the case of prepositional objects, Maling & Zaenen (1990a) show that passivization of prepositional objects is also impossible in Scandinavian languages, especially in Swedish. Taking account of these points, I have excluded from consideration the cases involving particles, indirect objects or prepositions, and focused only on those which involves verbs. Then, in section 3.1. I have first concentrated on the question why V-movement is required in OS constructions, on the following two assumptions: (i) the principles involved in OS are those in (6a-b), and (ii) the configuration of Obj with V is freely interpreted, receiving Int or Int'. On these assumptions, we have recognized that V-movement is required in OS constructions, because if V remains in VP no surface semantic effects are induced by the operation. In this way, I have derived the V-movement requirement in OS from linking a syntactic configuration with semantic interpretations as suggested in Hale & Keyser (1993), thus not resorting to any phonological information. In section 3.2. I have turned my attention to the second question: what is the parameter for OS? To answer this question, I have again relied on the relation between a verb and its complement, and have proposed that the parameter involved in OS is the one in (6'), which also relates a syntactic position with semantic interpretations. To the extent that this parameter does not directly connect phonological aspects with semantic ones, it is more desirable than that proposed by Chomsky. Thus, if the argument in this paper is valid, we can derive both the V-movement requirement expressed in HG and the parameter in OS by linking a syntactic configuration (i.e. the configuration of Obj) and semantic interpretations available there. In the final section, then, I have shown, based on the parameter in (6'), how we can capture a well-known contrast in Scandinavian languages in the types of shifted objects.

References

- Bobaljik, Jonathan (2002) "A-chains at the PF-interface: Copies and 'Covert' Movement," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20, 197-267.
- Chomsky, Noam (1991) "Some Notes on Economy of Derivation and Representations," *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Syntax*, ed. by Robert Freidin, 417-454, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Chomsky, Noam (1993) "A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory," *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, ed. by Kenneth Hale & Samuel Jay Keyser, 1-52, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995a) "Introduction," *The Minimalist Program*, 1-11, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995b) "Categories and Transformations in a Minimalist Framework,"

- The Minimalist Program*, 219-394, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Chomsky, Noam (2000) "Minimalist inquiries: the framework," *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels & Juan Uriagereka, 89-155, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Chomsky, Noam (2001a) "Derivation by Phase," *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. by Michael Kentowicz, 1-52, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Chomsky, Noam (2001b) "Beyond Explanatory Adequacy," *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 20, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Diesing, Molly (1992) *Indefinites*, MIT press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Diesing, Molly (1997) "Yiddish VP Order and the Typology of Object Movement in Germanic," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15, 369-427.
- Diesing, Molly & Eloise Jelinek (1993) "The syntax and semantics of object shift," *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*, 51.
- Diesing, Molly & Eloise Jelinek (1995) "Distributing Arguments," *Natural Language Semantics* 3, 123-176.
- Hale, Kenneth and Samuel Jay Keyser (1993) "On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations," *The view from Building 20*, ed. by Kenneth Hale & Samuel Jay Keyser, MIT press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Holmberg, Anders (1986) *Word Order and Syntactic Features in the Scandinavian Languages and English*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Stockholm.
- Holmberg, Anders (1999) "Remarks on Holmberg's Generalization," *Studia Linguistica* 53, 1-39.
- Maling, Joan & Annie Zaenen (1990a) "Preposition-stranding and passive," *Syntax and semantics 24: Modern Icelandic Syntax*, ed. by Joan Maling & Annie Zaenen, 153-164, Academic Press, New York.
- Maling, Joan & Annie Zaenen (1990b) *Syntax and semantics 24: Modern Icelandic Syntax*, Academic Press, New York.
- Miyashita, Harumasa (2003) "The Qualitative Decline of Object-Verb Order in Late Middle English: A Minimalist Approach," *Linguistic Research* 19, 117-239, The University of Tokyo English Linguistics Association.
- Philippi, Julia (1997) "The Rise of the article in the Germanic languages," *Parameters of morphosyntactic change*, ed. by Ans van Kemenade & Nigel Vincent, 62-93, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Svenonius, Peter (1994) *Dependent Nexus: Subordinate Predication Structures in English and the Scandinavian Languages*, unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur (2001) "Object Shift and Scrambling," *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*, ed. by Mark Baltin & Chris Collins, 148-202,

Blackwell, Oxford.

Vikner, Sten (2006) "Object Shift," *The Blackwell companion to syntax (volume III)*, ed. by Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk, 392-436, Blackwell, Oxford.

Watanabe, Akira (2003) "Kansi no Toogoteki Yakuwari (Syntactic Roles of Articles)," *Gengo* 32.10, 50-56.