Re: CycLin and the role of PF in Object Shift[*]

Jonathan David Bobaljik
University of Connecticut
June 2004

This volume's two target articles explore novel approaches to word order alternations, especially Scandinavian Object Shift. They share the common perspective that aspects of linear order long considered the exclusive purview of syntax may be better understood if the burden of explanation is split between phonological and syntactic modules. The two articles differ substantially, however, in how this general hunch plays out, in particular in the amount of the explanation that is attributed to extra-syntactic factors. Fox and Pesetsky's "Cyclic Linearization" model (hereafter F&P, *CycLin*) is compatible with familiar syntactic models, and can be seen as a filter running (cyclically) on the output of syntactic derivations. F&P suggest that their proposal can explain various heretofore stipulated conditions on syntactic operations as consequences of the architecture of their system and a single axiom about linearization. Erteschik-Shir's proposal in "Sound Patterns of Syntax" (hereafter E-S) is more radical, in the sense that far less of the familiar syntax is retained; where for CycLin movement is still a syntactic process, on E-S's view a good deal of traditionally syntactic movement must be rethought in linear, rather than hierarchical terms. Both articles are largely exploratory and leave many of the details still to be spelled-out. To engage the ideas on specifics, then, will involve to some degree making some educated guesses about what ancillary assumptions the relevant authors might condone. I will therefore restrict myself to a few comments at a general level, though it will be impossible to do justice to these authors' ideas in the allotted space.

1. PHONOLOGY, FUNCTIONAL MOTIVATIONS, PARSING AND GRAMMAR

One of the central hypotheses put forward by E-S is that "the motivation for [phonological displacements] is limited to easing pronunciation … and parsing" (p.8). While stated in functional terms, the elaboration of this idea as E-S presents it has a variety of components. On the one hand, E-S spells out this hypothesis as meaning that cross-linguistic variation in word order should be attributable to independently justifiable differences in "general phonological properties" (such as intonational phrasing), and on the other, that issues of ambiguity resolution should constrain the possibilities for word-order variation.

In practice, the former idea seems to be a promising strategy for investigation of the fine micro-variation in OS possibilities among varies Scandinavian languages and dialects, sometimes glossed over in the literature. For example, it is well-known that speakers of Swedish disagree as to the obligatoriness of OS (in those environments where it is possible); for some it is obligatory, for others, apparently optional (Hellan and Platzack 1995). E-S suggests that this correlates with the possibility of realizing primary word-stress on negation; where that element may receive primary stress, it is a legitimate host for a weak (clitic-like) pronoun, and the order neg-pronoun is thus admissible, but

where negation itself is weak and cannot bear word-stress, it cannot serve as a host and the pronoun must be supported by the verb or the subject. Descriptions in the literature imply that the obligatory/optional variation in Swedish (at least) is among individuals, rather than identifiable dialects; it will thus be interesting to see whether E-S's general proposal will work out at the level of individual variation in the stress patterns available to negation. Note, though, that the promise here lies in tying one point of cross-linguistic (or cross-speaker) variation to another, in this case word-order possibilities and stress, along with a theory of cliticization / prosodic incorporation that relates the two. In principle, this is independent of whether a functional motivation for the theory can (or should) be inferred.

Where E-S's proposal adopts an explicitly functional motivation is in the role of disambiguation in the account, centred around (1), her ID (16):

(1)   In a string, X…Y, where X and Y are arguments, [identify] X as subject and Y as object if neither is marked otherwise.

One observation that E-S invokes (1) to account for is the following partial paradigm. Examples (2a) and (2c) show that objects may be fronted yielding a word order consistent with the V2 constraint, but (2b), which should have a parallel object-fronting structure available to it, can, according to E-S, only be understood as 'Peter met Sara.'[1]

(2)   a.   Ham   mødte Sara.
                him   met   Sara
                'Sara met him'(ES (17a))

        b.   Peter   mødte Sara.
                Peter   met   Sara
                * as 'Sara met Peter' (ES (14a))

        c.   Peter   mødte Sara   ikke.
                Peter   met   Sara   not
                'Sara didn't meet Peter' (ES (14b))

Since case is only marked on pronouns, and agreement and word order do not disambiguate (2b), (1) applies to exclude the object-topicalization reading. In (2a), the pronoun bears accusative case so (1) does not apply, and in (2c) word order disambiguates—the position between the finite verb and negation is only available to non-pronominal NPs that are subjects. Note that in order to block (1) from applying, that position must count as 'marking' the subject.

The proposal in (1) is a venerable idea, dating at least to Jakobson (1936 [1971], p. 28).[2] While Jakobson apparently intended (1) as an absolute constraint, it has

---

[1] Line Mikkelsen and Sten Vikner (personal communication 6/04) find (2b) acceptable as object topicaliztation, with suitable context and intonation, required also for (2c) where word order does disambiguate. (Line Mikkelsen has also drawn my attention to Ørsnes 2002, which discusses the effects of case-marking as facilitating ambiguity resolution in certain finite subject extraction contexts in Danish—particularly relevant is his fn. 8). E-S does not comment on whether intonation may count as 'marking' for the purposes of (1), although the discussion of her (14)-(15) implies that it doesn't. In any event, this will not affect the point to be made below.

[2] "Wenn aber in einem derartigen Wortgefüge die Endungen der beiden Nomina ihre Kasus nicht anzeigen, darf die normale Wortfolge nicht verletzt werden." = "If, however, in such a construction, the endings of the two nominals do not indicate their cases, the normal word order [SVO] may not be violated." Russian

subsequently been argued that this represents instead a parsing *preference*, and that in suitable contexts, the object topicalization reading re-emerges (for Russian, see King 1995:2; see also fn. 1 for Danish). There seems to be ample evidence for (1) or something like it as a parsing strategy, in particular in German where there is a demonstrable preference for initially parsing a case-ambiguous initial NP as a subject (see Schlesewsky et al. 2000, 2003 and references therein).[3] Note, though, that the parsing preference is not a categorical judgment of acceptability, and is readily overcome by a variety of means, including pragmatic considerations and intonation. Thus, although feminine and neuter NPs and pronouns, including the inanimate *wh*-word *was* 'what', lack distinct nominative and accusative forms, speakers seem to have no trouble interpreting a question like (3) with Maria as the subject (presumably for reasons of pragmatic plausibility).

(3)   Was   hat   (die)   Maria   gegessen?
        What.ACC=NOM   has   the.ACC=NOM   Maria   eaten?
        'What did Maria eat?' (or 'What ate Maria?')

This appears to hold for Danish as well: *Den her bog læste Peter* 'this here book read Peter' is acceptable as a object-topicalization ('Peter read this book.') although case is not marked, and a question like *Hvad læser Peter?* 'What reads Peter' is unremarkable, despite case or word order cues to disambiguate the NPs, in violation of (1). Sten Vikner (personal communication) offers the question *Hvad spiste hesten?* 'What ate the.horse?' as an example that is truly potentially ambiguous between and object and a subject question, the latter reading salient in the context of a story with monsters, for example.

That factors such as intonation and pragmatics should play a role in affecting parsing preferences should come as no surprise, of course. However, E-S proposes that (1) is responsible for a wider range of phenomena than the obvious cases of preferences in ambiguity resolution. Thus, if I have read the account correctly, (1)—and only (1)—is also responsible for excluding a variety of unwanted derivations in OS constructions, including those that yield the examples in (4).

(4)   a.   *Peter ham   mødte ikke.
               Peter him   met   not
               'Peter didn't meet him.' (E-S (6))

        b.   *I går   mødte   ham   Peter ikke.
               Yesterday met   him   Peter not
               * as 'Sara met Peter' (ES (12))

As reported in the literature, including E-S's paper, examples such as those in (4) are apparently sharply ungrammatical despite the absence of any ambiguity.[4] Compare (4a)

---

has a rich case system, but certain nouns, among them 'soft' feminine nouns such as *mat'* 'mother' and *doč'* 'daughter' do not distinguish nominative from accusative; Jakobson claims that alongside the word order freedom seen in *syn ljubit otca* 'son-N loves father-A' versus *syna ljubit otec* 'son-A loves father-N', is unavailable when *both* nouns fail to mark case and thus that *mat' ljubit doč'* 'mother loves daughter' is unambiguously SVO. Although Jakobson discussed only Russian, the proposal was intended to be universal, see Jakobson 1963 [1971].

[3] The experimental effects are not equally strong for all constructions—see Schlesewsky et al. 2003 for a brief overview. If I have read Schlesewsky et al. correctly, the subject preference is mild, if present at all, in simple V2 constructions with the structure of (3), even when pragmatically unbiased predicates like 'meet' and 'visit' are used.

[4] Note that (4a) does not violate the V2 constraint within E-S's system, as the sequence *Peter-ham* is a single (prosodic) constituent derived by prosodic incorporation, prior to topicalization.

with (2a). In the account of (2a), the accusative form of the pronoun serves to resolve any potential ambiguity and thus prevents (1) from applying, but in (4a), although the pronoun is the same unambiguous accusative form, the ungrammaticality is attributed to (1).[5]

To my reading then, just as it strikes me as plausible to attribute certain dispreferences to parsing strategies, it looks implausible that a pressure to resolve ambiguity between subject and object in parsing can be behind (4). Put more generally, if parsing preferences are truly responsible for the exclusion of (4)—whatever those strategies are—one might expect marked improvement in acceptability as additional factors such as intonation, case and pragmatics come into play. (Alternatively, if parsing constraints are held to be inviolable, we would expect the absence of amelioration in the well-discussed cases of ambiguity resolution.) Apparently, though, this is not what we find.[6] In sum, my hunch is that phonology does have a role to play in the explanation of word order variation, and I feel that E-S's article has provided some intriguing new directions to explore as to how that might play out, but at this point, I remain unconvinced that the particular implementation of a functional (parsing) motivation avoids lumping together two qualitatively different classes of phenomena: those in which judgments of acceptability are readily influenced by pragmatics and other factors, and those where judgments appear to be of a more categorical nature.

2. CYCLIN

While E-S looks at variation within and among the Scandinavian languages, F&P present a theory which links Holmberg's Generalization (and an inverse HG effect) to the same considerations that force movement to be successive cyclic cross-linguistically, in particular in English. The goals that F&P set are quite ambitious, and include the elimination of special stipulations from the theory, arguing on the one hand that

---

[5] The crux of the account is a requirement that no element with Φ-features intervene between the verb and the subject; I take it from E-S's discussion below her (17) that this is intended to be derivable from (1). Even if not, my scepticism regards treating (4) as displaying the effects of a parsing constraint in the same manner as the interpretive preferences in (2b), independent of the particular parsing constraint held responsible. Note incidentally that in Icelandic, it is possible to have elements with Φ-features between the verb and the subject (and between the verb and the agreeing nominative, when the nominative is not a subject). Debates about the possibility of OS across a subject aside, indefinite subjects may extrapose to the right of the VP, as argued by Bresnan & Thráinsson 1990; yet Icelandic shares the Danish judgments on examples like (4).

[6] As E-S notes, the construction in (4b), called Long Object Shift, is of varying acceptability in Swedish, and with more limited distribution in Icelandic. E-S treats its acceptability as a problem, and suggests an alternative direction, though one in which (1) nevertheless plays a role, as evidenced by the observation that "only object pronouns with unambiguous overt case marking are licensed in this" construction (p.33), (but see Jónsson 1996, 53 for an Icelandic example where case is not distinguished). The important point here is that (1) alone, and the ameliorating effects of overt case-marking, cannot be the entire account of the Swedish-Danish contrast here; if Long Object Shift violates (1), it should do so in all the languages; if case-marking avoids the violation, then (4b) should be acceptable in Danish, as in Swedish. As a final note on this point, if we were to grant that the account of the Swedish-Danish difference lies elsewhere, but maintain that (1) is responsible for restrictions on Long OS in Swedish, a novel prediction emerges. Specifically, the restriction should not be precisely that the object pronoun bear overt case-marking, but only that either the object or the subject bear such case marking (this is explicitly claimed for V2 ambiguity resolution, see her (17b)); thus pronouns like *dom* 'they/them' which cannot undergo Long OS, should be able to do so when the subject is pronominal and marks case. It would be an interesting feather in this approach's cap if that prediction could be shown to be correct.

Holmberg's Generalization effects—and their distribution—fall out from the basic architecture of the theory, and on the other, that the theory need not stipulate designated escape hatches for successive cyclic movement. While the paper covers an impressive range of ground, there are some relatively tacit assumptions which bear further scrutiny.

Consider first the key parts of the analysis that are left to be filled in by more or less familiar syntactic assumptions. At the core of the CycLin proposal is the establishment of inviolable ordering statements at intermediate stages of the derivation. The two relevant phases are CP and VP. While syntactic operations beyond the phase may affect elements within the first phase, the relative order among the members of the first phase is immutable. Thus in a VO language, simple *wh*-fronting of the direct object places it in a position preceding the main verb in the CP phase; the only way for this to happen under CycLin is for the object to move through an intermediate position where it comes to precede the verb within the VP phase, indicated as t' in (5).

(5) a.   John   has   [$_{VP}$ read   a book].
     b.   What   has   John   [$_{VP}$ t' read   t   ]?

Without the intermediate trace, the VP in (5b) would determine the ordering statement V < [precedes] OBJ at the VP phase level. Subsequent *wh*-movement of the object would yield OBJ < VP, which by transitivity gives OBJ < V, a contradiction. The intermediate step avoids this, by establishing OBJ < V in the first phase, an ordering which is respected by all further movements. The intermediate trace is key to allowing the long movement, but as F&P point out, "[their] proposals say nothing in themselves … about the circumstances under which movement to these left-edge positions is allowed or prohibited" (p. 38). One must look to familiar syntax to fill in the relevant assumptions here.

This raises the concern that their claim to avoid syntactically designated escape hatches (p. 3) may be undermined by the admission of precisely such stipulations through the back door of an as-yet-to-be-specified syntax. I illustrate the concern here with two domains in which the concern arises, one for which the *CycLin* model might in fact suggest a fresh approach, and one in which the tacit stipulation looks (to me) less likely to fall soon to a principled analysis.

2.1 Escape Hatch Asymmetries

One aspect of the *Barriers* model (Chomsky 1986), was an asymmetry between CP and VP domains. By means of relatively unconstrained adjunction possibilities, the VP was relatively porous and allowed for multiple elements to be extracted. By contrast, the assumption that CP tolerates maximally a single specifier, along with the Adjunction Prohibition (no adjunction to CP in complement position), effectively limits extraction from a given CP to a single, designated escape hatch, namely Spec,CP. The types of facts that motivated this distinction remain to be accounted for. To start, if extraction from VP must move through the edge, then the left periphery of the VP appears to tolerate multiple landing sites for intermediate traces (positions that are not accessible as final landing sites). This is illustrated in (6); if the corresponding active clause is a reliable guide to base positions, then the adverb *derfor* 'therefore' and the NP have reversed their order with respect to each other and with respect to the main verb/participle; thus, both must thus have undergone intermediate movements to the left periphery of the VP.[7]

_____

[7] Vikner claims that this example is ambiguous and in particular allows a reading in which 'therefore' is extracted from a low position below negation; this contrasts with *wh*-extraction of 'why', which, in a

(6)   Derfor   blev   Marie   ikke   [$_{VP}$ t'_{ADV} t'_{NP} fyret t_{DP} t_{ADV}].
              therefore   was   Marie   not   fired
              'Marie was not fired for this reason.'   (Danish, Vikner 1995:24)

By contrast, there is evidence that only a single extraction is possible from CP. For example, V2 induces an island for extraction of anything other than the fronted topic (see Vikner 1995, 108-119).[8] The German examples in (7) illustrate.

(7)   a.   Ich   glaube   [$_{CP}$ nur Bananen   hat   der Hans   dem Peter   t   gegeben.]
               I   believe   only bananas   has   Hans.N   Peter.D   given
               'I believe that Hans gave Peter only bananas.'

       b.   Wem   glaubst   du   [$_{CP}$ t' hat   der Hans   t   Bananen   gegeben?]
               Who.D believe   you   has   Hans.N   bananas   given
               'Who do you believe Hans gave bananas to?'

       c.   *Wem   glaubst   du   [$_{CP}$ nur Bananen   hat   der Hans t_{wh} t_{NP} gegeben?]
               Who.D believe   you   only bananas   has   Hans.N   given
               'Who do you believe Hans gave only bananas to?'

Example (7a) shows embedded V2 topicalization (with a bridge verb), and (7b) shows the possibility of extraction from the fronted topic position; (7c) shows that extraction across a topic is impossible. Facts like this are traditionally attributed to the status of Spec,CP as the unique escape hatch at the CP phase. At first blush, then, it would seem that the kinds of assumptions (uniqueness of specifiers—or equivalently, the features that license them—and the ban on adjunction to complement CP) that effectively designate specific positions as escape hatches continue to be necessary.

In thinking more carefully about this, it has struck me that, at least for the specific case of V2 islands, *CycLin* may in fact provide a different way of looking at the puzzle. If the verb-second constraint may be stated as a restriction on ordering *at the CP phase*, this would effectively exclude all but a single position to the left of the verb (whether as an adjunct or multiple specifier). In (7c), for example, the framework requires that there be an intermediate trace within CP to the left of the fronted topic; without such a trace, extraction into the matrix clause (via the edge of the matrix VP) would necessarily derive an ordering contradiction.[9] However, if the V2 requirement holds as an ordering statement at the CP phase, the structure required for subsequent extraction will necessarily violate the V2 constraint—the intermediate position does not become a trace until a subsequent cycle. These considerations will draw the right distinctions in (7), in particular admitting (7b) as V2 is satisfied at the CP phase and subsequent extraction takes the leftmost element from that phase. For the specific case of V2 islands, then, the concern about the syntactic designation of escape hatches may be avoided; the larger question will be whether there is indeed a general asymmetry between CP and VP phase, one which will require the same kinds of stipulations made in previous frameworks.[10]

---

parallel sentence is unambiguous and lacks the 'low' reading of 'why'.

[8] In languages in which embedded V2 occurs under a complementizer, extraction of the fronted topic is also prohibited as (arguably) a special case of the that-*t* filter. In languages like German, embedded V2 occurs without CP recursion and only the topic is accessible for further extraction.

[9] Keeping in mind that most intermediate trace positions cannot be occupied by overt elements, the fact that multiple overt positions preceding the verb are disallowed tells us nothing directly about the availability of intermediate trace positions there.

[10] Susi Wurmbrand draws my attention to Zaenen 1985, where it is shown that extraction from embedded

2.2 Is OS special?

A second area where syntax is left unspecified lies in the account of Holmberg's Generalization, and here a way out is less readily discernable. Key to F&P's analysis is the assumption that the left-peripheral position in the VP (e.g., in (5b)) is not available for OS. This is illustrated schematically in (8) (compare F&P's (21) and (22)); (8a) shows that OS out of the VP when the verb has not raised (as in embedded clauses and compound tenses) will reverse the linear order of the object and the (main) verb, leading to an ordering contradiction.

(8) a. *… O Adv [$_{VP}$ V t$_O$]

  b. … O Adv [$_{VP}$ t$'_O$ V t$_O$]

However, as F&P note in discussing their (18), if the left-peripheral position in VP were available (as in (8b)), movement to that position would reverse the order inside the VP phase (parallel to A'-extractions), leaving the object readily accessible to further leftwards movement, including OS, and no HG effects would be expected. Since OS is blocked in these environments, the intermediate position must be unavailable.

So why is this position unavailable for OS? The account will lie in the syntax, but what assumptions there might achieve this result? The only hint given is on p.16, where it is implied (perhaps unintentionally) that the intermediate trace position is only available to A'-movements. At face value, though, this doesn't seem adequate. Other A-movements of underlying objects in Scandinavian, such as passive and unaccusative, do reverse the linear order of the verb and its complement. This was shown for passive in (6). Note importantly that (6) has all the ingredients for cross-phasal movement of the NP *Marie*, specifically, the movement crosses and negation, which F&P explicitly take to lie outside the VP phase.

Note moreover that an appeal to a distinction between active and passive VPs, treating the latter, for example, as non-phases, seems unlikely to help.[11] Consider in particular double-object passives, and quirky subject constructions with a nominative object (the latter are arguably unaccusative in lacking an underlyingly external argument). In double-object passives, the dative moves across the verb, becoming a "quirky" subject, as shown in (9) (see Zaenen et al 1985 among others).

(9) Um veturinn voru konunginum [$_{VP}$ t$'_{PP}$t$'_{NP}$ gefnar t$_{DP}$ ambáttir t$_{NP}$].
  In the.winter were.PL the.king.D given slaves.N
  'In the winter, the king was given (female) slaves.' (Zaenen et al 1985 [1990]: 112)

Nevertheless, other order-preservation effects, including HG, are reported in DAT-NOM constructions, just as for active, transitive clauses (see Harley 1995, Jónsson 1996, 118, 147). In other words, passive and unaccusative contexts allow A-movement of the

---

questions is freely available in Icelandic, unlike extraction from embedded topicalization structures. Zaenen relates (p. 194) the extraction asymmetry to another difference, namely that embedded *wh*-questions also fail to evidence subject-verb inversion (V2). At first blush, the account sketched in the text in which islandhood is attributed to the V2 constraint would seem to predict this difference. I do not know at this time if the account generalizes.

[11] Since F&P explicitly argue that VP not *v*P constitutes the relevant domain in the Scandinavian languages, this would also look less promising than, for example, Chomsky's appeal to differences at the *v*P level.

(derived) subject to cross the verb, but appear to retain the other order-preserving properties attributed to VP phase-hood in F&P. It seems, then, that passive and unaccusative A-movement, and all kinds of A'-movement, have available to them an intermediate landing site in the left periphery of the VP.[12] Thus there is no general A/A' asymmetry here. Rather, it is only OS for which this position is unavailable, and it is this unavailability on which the account of HG crucially depends. While the account is quite elegant, a key component rests on an assumption that, for the moment at least, seems unfortunately *ad hoc*.

2.3 Generalizations and trade-offs

Scandinavian passives bring me to a final point regarding the scope of Holmberg's generalization and of order-preservation effects. As just mentioned, F&P use the same mechanisms to account for order-preservation restrictions holding between the verb and its internal arguments (standard HG effects) and those that obtain among direct and indirect objects, and particles (the classic HG effects). Thus, following Holmberg, F&P relate the impossibility of OS of the DO across an IO (as in (10a))to the same mechanism that prohibits OS of the DO across the verb (ultimately, the unavailability of the left-peripheral landing site in VP). F&P's system also accounts nicely for order-preservation effects when both objects shift, as shown for Danish in (10b-c) from Müller 2001 (see also Collins & Thráinsson 1996 for Icelandic).

(10) a.   *Peter   viste   den   jo   [$_{VP}$ t_V Marie t_{DO}]
               Peter   showed   it   indeed   Marie
               'Peter indeed showed it to her.'

      b.   Peter   viste   hende   den   jo   [$_{VP}$ t_V t_{IO} t_{DO}]
               Peter   showed   her   it   indeed

      c.   *Peter   viste   den   hende   jo   [$_{VP}$ t_V t_{IO} t_{DO}]
               Peter   showed   it   her   indeed

Since, by hypothesis, order-changing movement in the VP is impossible as there are no intermediate landing sites in OS, the only admissible derivation is the one which preserves the VP-internal order as indicated by the traces. Note, though, that in Danish (and Icelandic), passive shows the same order-preservation effect between the two internal arguments: just as the DO may not undergo OS across the IO (10a), the DO is also prohibited from undergoing passive movement across the IO (11) (Holmberg & Platzack 1995: 215).

(11) a.   Jens   blev   [$_{VP}$ t'_{NP} givet t_{IO} bogen]
           Jens   was   given   the.book
           'Jens was given the book.'

      b.   *Bogen blev   [$_{VP}$ t'_{NP} givet   Jens t_{DO}]

F&P cannot provide a unified account of (10) and (11). The pair in (11) shows that the relative order of NP and verb may be changed while in the same construction, the relative order of the two objects is immutable. The acceptability of (11a) necessitates a left-

---

[12] Since other A-movements appear to make use of this intermediate position, an appeal to improper movement to exclude adjunction to VP on the way to a higher A-position will not suffice.

peripheral intermediate trace for passive movement; it thus cannot be the unavailability of such a position per se that excludes the crossing movement in (11b).

Anagnostopoulou (2003) and Bobaljik (2002) use such contrasts to argue against Holmberg's (1999) formulation of Holmberg's Generalization (adopted by F&P) in which order preservation effects between the verb and the object have the same account as those among direct and indirect objects. The examples in (11) show that this is incorrect. F&P recognize this (fn. 21) and argue that the uniformity of their proposal across the constructions identified by Holmberg (including the V-topicalization construction, which neither Anagnostopoulou 2003 nor I account for) argues in favour of their proposal. Yet the cost is that they exclude the possibility of a unified account of (10) and (11). We are left with competing, overlapping, but ultimately incompatible empirical generalizations—on current understanding, one must be spurious.

I believe there is at least some reason to suspect that the order-preservation effects in (10b-c) should in fact be grouped together with (11) and not with the verb-movement asymmetries that form the core of (the extended) Holmberg's Generalization. This evidence comes from variation within Scandinavian. It is not the case that all Scandinavian languages show the strict order-preservation effects in double object shift and in double object passive. Norwegian in particular is a symmetric passive language, allowing both (11a) and (b) (Holmberg & Platzack 1995: chapter 7—they note that Swedish allows the (b) example "somewhat marginally", p. 215). Similarly, at least some speakers of Norwegian and Swedish allow (10c) alongside (10b) (Tarald Taraldsen, personal communication 06/04, see also Anagnostopoulou 2003: 125-127 and fnn. 40-41; and E-S, n.17). Anagnostopoulou notes moreover that at least some Swedish (and Norwegian) speakers allow constructions parallel to (10a), with OS across an unmoved IO, when both arguments are pronouns, as illustrated in (12) (judgments attributed to Holmberg, see also Hellan & Platzack 1995:58).

(12) Jag   gav   den   inte   [$_{VP}$ honom   t$_{DO}$].
      I   gave   it   not   him.
      'I didn't give it to him.'

Importantly, while there is variation reported for constructions like (10) and (11) (and for other domains in which order preservation appears to hold, including particle constructions and raising constructions), the variation appears to track (at least at a gross level) and moreover, there is no such variation reported for the canonical HG effects involving the verb. These facts have suggested to me, and to Anagnostopoulou, that there is a principled line to be drawn dividing the constructions, a line that is inconsistent with the formulation of the generalizations offered by Holmberg and by F&P. To be sure, neither Anagnostopoulou (2003) nor Bobaljik (2002) provide a complete account, nor is the empirical situation entirely clearly described.

At this stage in the research, then, the disagreements I have with E-S and F&P lie largely in educated guesses about what the proper descriptive generalizations might turn out to be. Having competing theories on the table draws attention clearly to the points of difference among perspectives, and should lead to yet another fruitful period for the development of the theory. As noted, I find the expanded role for PF in accounting for precedence relations (word order) to be an intriguing direction, and I look forward to the further elaboration of each of the theories sketched in the target articles.

REFERENCES

Anagnostopoulou, E. (2003). The syntax of ditransitives: evidence from clitics. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.

Bobaljik, J. D. (2002). "A-chains at the PF-interface: Copies and 'Covert' Movement." Natural Language and Linguistic Theory **20**(2): 197-267.

Bresnan, J. and H. Thráinsson (1990). A note on Icelandic coordination. Modern Icelandic Syntax. J. Maling and A. Zaenen. San Diego, Academic Press. **24:** 355-365.

Chomsky, N. (1986). Barriers. Cambridge, Mass, MIT Press.

Collins, C. and H. Thráinsson (1996). "VP-Internal Structure and Object Shift in Icelandic." Linguistic Inquiry **27**: 391-444.

Harley, H. (1995). Abstracting away from abstract case. Proceedings of NELS 25.

Hellan, L. and C. Platzack (1995). Pronouns in Scandinavian: an overview. Lund. **56:** 47-69.

Holmberg, A. (1999). "Remarks on Holmberg's Generalization." Studia Linguistica **53**(1): 1-39.

Jakobson, R. (1936 [1971]). Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre. Gesamtbedeutungen der russischen Kasus. Selected Writings. The Hague, Mouton. **2:** 23-71.

Jakobson, R. (1963 [1971]). Implications of language universals. Selected Writings. The Hague, Mouton. **2:** 580-592.

Jónsson, J. G. (1996). Clausal architecture and case in Icelandic. Amherst, MA, University of Massachusetts.

King, T. H. (1995). Configuring Topic and Focus in Russian. Stanford, CSLI.

Müller, G. (2001). Order Preservation, Parallel Movement, and the Emergence of the Unmarked. Optimality-Theoretic Syntax. G. Legendre, J. Grimshaw and S. Vikner. Cambridge, MIT Press**:** 279-313.

Ørsnes, B. (2002). Case marking and subject extraction in Danish. LFG02 Conference, National Technical University, Athens, Greece, CSLI.

Schlesewsky, M., G. Fanselow, and S. Frisch. (2003). Case as a trigger for reanalysis: Some arguments from the processing of double case ungrammaticalities in German. Experimental Studies in Linguistics 1. S. Fischer, R. van de Vijver and R. Vogel. Linguistics in Potsdam **21:** 31-60.

Schlesewsky, M., G. Fanselow, R. Kliegl and J. Krems. (2000). Subject preference in the processing of locally ambiguous questions in German. German Sentence Processing. B. Hemforth and L. Konieczny. Dordrecht, Kluwer**:** 65-93.

Vikner, S. (1989). Object shift and double objects in Danish. **44:** 141-155.

Vikner, S. (1995). Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Zaenen, A. (1985). Extraction rules in Icelandic. New York, Garland.

Zaenen, A., J. Maling and H. Thráinsson. (1985). "Case and grammatical functions: The Icelandic passive." Natural Language and Linguistic Theory **3**: 441-483.