

Scandinavian Object Shift reanalysed as TP-internal topicalization

Scandinavian Object Shift (OS) is a phenomenon that has intrigued linguists for more than twenty years since it was first discussed in Holmberg (1986). The phenomenon, in which pronominal objects are shifted across negation (and adverbs), is illustrated in (1).

Pronouns undergoing OS are typically destressed and defocused. These characteristics have led to analyses of OS related to prosody (cf. Erteschik-Shir 2005) and focus (Holmberg 1999, Mikkelsen to appear). Based on data from Mainland Scandinavian (specifically Norwegian) we will show that these analyses are problematic, and propose an alternative.

Some pronominal objects do not undergo OS, even though they are destressed and do not receive a focus interpretation. This applies to indefinite pronouns, (2). In addition, in certain contexts the pronominal object *det* 'it' is strongly dispreferred in a shifted position. As pointed out by Andréasson (2008) for Danish and Swedish, *det* cannot shift when it refers to a VP or a clause. The same holds for Norwegian, (3). Furthermore, as shown in Anderssen et al. (2011) (see also Lødrup 2010), when the pronominal object *det* refers back to a noun phrase with a generic interpretation it generally resists OS, (4). A characteristic property shared by the pronouns in (3)-(4) is that they refer to a non-individuated referent; a complete clause in (3) and fish in general in (4). Note that *det* referring to an individuated DP (the house), as in (1), obligatorily shifts.

Holmberg (1999) suggests that shifted pronominal objects are defocused, whereas non-shifted ones are focus elements. However, this generalization only captures part of the data, since non-focused pronominal objects can be found in both shifted and non-shifted position. Consequently, *defocusing* as such cannot be the trigger for OS. Rather, we here propose an account of OS in terms of topicalization to a TP-internal TopicP (cf. Jayaseelan 2001). However, this topic position is only available to pronominal objects with an individuated reference. This accounts for the distinction between (1) and (3)-(4). Notably, topical pronominal objects like that in (1) cannot be topicalized into a clause-initial position without receiving a contrastive interpretation, (5-B) vs. (5-B''). Thus, OS is the only way referential pronominal objects can be topicalized. In contrast, objects with a non-individuated reference can either remain in situ or be topicalized to the clause-initial position, (6). Finally, as illustrated in (7), indefinite pronominal objects cannot be topicalized to either of these positions. This is due to the fact that such elements cannot function as topics.

This yields an interesting pattern where there is a complimentary distribution between the available topicalization positions of pronominal objects with individuated and non-individuated reference. We will discuss this distribution in the light of the different topic positions proposed in Frascarelli (2007) and Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl (2007). Objects with an individuated reference function as familiar topics that are D-linked, i.e. have an accessible referent in the discourse. We suggest that this interpretation is licensed in a TP-internal TopicP in Scandinavian. Objects with a non-individuated reference are not D-linked in the sense that they do not have an accessible nominal referent in the discourse. Moreover, when topicalized into the clause-initial position, they function as Aboutness shifting topics. Referential (shifting) pronominal objects cannot have this function as they contain information already given in the context.

- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| (1) | a. Jeg fant {*huset} ikke {huset}. | b. Jeg fant {det} ikke {*det}. |
| | <i>I found house.the not house.the</i> | <i>I found it not it</i> |
| | 'I didn't find the house.' | 'I didn't find it.' |
| (2) | Jeg ville låne en sykkel, men han hadde {*en} ikke {en}. | |
| | <i>I wanted borrow a bicycle but he had one not one</i> | |
| | 'I wanted to borrow a bicycle but he didn't have one.' | |
| (3) | A: Har hun gått hjem? | B: Jeg tror {*det _{clause} } ikke {det _{clause} }. |
| | <i>has she gone home</i> | <i>I think it not it</i> |
| | 'Has she gone home?' | 'I don't think so.' |
| | | (<i>det</i> = 'that she has gone home') |
| (4) | A: Hva med fisk til middag? | B: Nei, Per spiser {#det _{Gen} } ikke {det _{Gen} }. |
| | <i>what with fish-MASC to dinner</i> | <i>no Per eats it not it</i> |
| | 'How about fish for dinner?' | 'No, Per doesn't eat that.' |
| | | (<i>det</i> = 'fish in general') |
| (5) | A: Har du spist bananen din? | B: #Nei, den likte jeg ikke. |
| | <i>have you eaten banana.the your</i> | <i>no it liked I not</i> |
| | | B': Nei, jeg likte den ikke. |
| | | <i>no I liked it not</i> |
| | | B'': Nei, DEN har jeg kastet. |
| | | <i>no THAT have I thrown</i> |
| (6) | A: Spiste du noe frukt? | B: Nei, jeg gjorde ikke det . |
| | <i>ate you any fruit</i> | <i>no I did not it</i> |
| | | B': *Jeg gjorde det ikke. |
| | | <i>I did it not</i> |
| | | B'': Nei, det gjorde jeg ikke. |
| | | <i>no it did I not</i> |
| (7) | A: Jeg vil ha en sjokolade! | B: Jeg har ikke en . |
| | <i>I want have a chocolate</i> | <i>I have not one</i> |
| | | B': *Jeg har en ikke. |
| | | <i>I have one not</i> |
| | | B'': * En har jeg ikke. |
| | | <i>one have I not</i> |

References:

- Anderssen et al. 2011. The acquisition of Norwegian Object Shift. Ms. University of Tromsø.
 Andréasson 2008. Not all objects are born alike - accessibility as a key to pronominal object shift in Swedish and Danish. In *Proceedings of the LFG08 Conference*. CSLI Publications.
 Erteschik-Shir 2005. Sound patterns of syntax: Object shift. *Theoretical Linguistics* 31.
 Frascarelli 2007. Subjects, topics and the interpretation of referential *pro*. *NLLT* 25.
 Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl 2007. Types of topics in German and Italian. In *On Information Structure, Meaning and Form*.
 Holmberg 1986. *Word order and syntactic features in the Scandinavian languages and English*. Doctoral diss., University of Stockholm.
 Holmberg 1999. Remarks on Holmberg's Generalization. *Studia Linguistica* 53.
 Jayaseelan 2001. IP-internal topic and focus phrases. *Studia Linguistica* 55.
 Lødrup 2010. Are Norwegian 'type anaphora' really surface anaphora? Ms. University of Oslo.
 Mikkelsen To appear. On prosody and focus in Object Shift. *Syntax* 14.