

Object Shift and Pseudogapping in the Scandinavian languages

Kirsten Gengel

University of Stuttgart

kirsten.gengel@ifla.uni-stuttgart.de

1. The Goal

In the literature, Pseudogapping (as in *Mary invited John more often than Emma did George*) has only been attested for English. In this paper I present novel data from Danish, Norwegian, and Icelandic which illustrate instances of Pseudogapping (henceforth PSG) in Scandinavian. On the basis of these data I show that the standard analysis of PSG, the object shift approach (Lasnik 1995, 1999, a.o.), cannot account for the Scandinavian PSG data. I propose an analysis in terms of focus instead, and assume that the PSG instances in English and Scandinavian follow one basic, most widely accepted type of PSG, with different degrees of possible variation.

2. The Data

The instance in which PSG is most widely accepted (as first noted by Levin (1978)) is in comparatives, as in -. illustrates the less natural coordinate version.

- (1) *Mary invited John more often than Emma did _ George.*
- (2) *Emma gave John more books than Mary did _ George.*
- (3) *Emma gave more books to John than Mary did _ to George.*
- (4) *Mary invited John and Emma will _ George.*

Moreover, PSG is rated best with prepositional remnants. This judgement is enforced by the Scandinavian data, where PSG only seems to occur with prepositional remnants (see the Norwegian judgements in to for comparatives and - for coordinate structures).

- (5) %*Mary vil gi Susan flere blader enn Paul vil bøker.* (No.)
Mary will give Susan more mag. than Paul will books.
'Mary will give Susan more magazines than Paul will books.'
- (6) ?**Mary vil gi Susan flere blader enn Paul vil Jane.*

Mary will give Susan more magazines than Paul will Jane.
 ‘Mary will give Susan more magazines than Paul will Jane.’

- (7) *Mary vil gi flere blader til Susan enn Paul vil bøker til Jane.*
 Mary will give more mag. to Susan than P. will books to Jane.
 ‘Mary will give more magazines to Susan than Paul will books to Jane.’
- (8) **Mary vil gi Susan mange penger og Paul vil en bok.*
 Mary will give Susan much money and Paul will a book.
 ‘Mary will give Susan much money and Paul will a book.’
- (9) **Mary vil give mange penge til Susan og Paul vil en bog.* (Da.)
 Mary will give much money to Susan and Paul will a book.
 ‘Mary will give much money to Susan and Paul will a book.’
- (10) **Mary vil gi Susan mange penger og Paul vil Jane.* (No.)
 Mary will give Susan much money and Paul will Jane.
 ‘Mary will give Susan much money and Paul will Jane.’
- (11) *Mary vil gi mange penger til Susan og Paul vil til Jane.* (No.)
 Mary will give much money to Susan and Paul will to Jane.
 ‘Mary will give much money to Susan and Paul will to Jane.’
- (12) *Mary vil give mange penge til Susan og Paul vil til Jane.* (Da.)
 Mary will give much money to Susan and Paul will to Jane.
 Mary will give much money to Susan and Paul will to Jane.
- (13) *Maria myndi skila fleiri bóku til Péturs en Páll myndi til Jóns.* (Ice.)
 Maria will return more books to Peter than Peter will to John.
 ‘Maria will return more books to Peter than Peter will to John.’

In Icelandic, only verbs of certain verb classes are allowed in PSG, namely verbs allowing the ‘til’(to)-construction. These are the verbs of the *skila/ræna*-class (‘return’/‘rob’; classification following Holmberg&Platzack 1995). The *gefa* verb class (‘give’) allows neither ‘til’(to)-construction nor PSG.

3. The Proposal

The Scandinavian data with their distributional differences suggest that object shift, as put forward in Lasnik’s (1995, 1999) analysis, is not exclusively responsible for the derivation of PSG since it (i) does not account for the lack of indirect objects in PSG (objects that otherwise shift easily), and (ii) does not explain the preference for

the remnant with 'til' in Scandinavian PSG. It is precisely the objects with 'til' that *cannot* undergo object shift in Scandinavian.

Hence I propose an analysis in terms of focus movement or Heavy Noun Phrase Shift (HNPS) (cf. also Jayaseelan 1990, 2001). The 'til' (*to*)-construction is heavier than the 'bare' indirect object, and thus is preferred in cases where the indirect object remains in PSG. Moreover, the indirect object with 'til' can undergo Heavy NP Shift, but HNPS seems to be impossible with direct objects (Ottósson 1991).

References

- Holmberg, A. and C. Platzack (1995). *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*. OUP, Oxford.
- Jayaseelan, K.A. (1990). Incomplete VP Deletion and Gapping. *Linguistic Analysis*, **20**: 64- 81.
- Jayaseelan, K.A. (2001). IP-Internal Topic and Focus Phrases. *Studia Linguistica*, **55(1)**: 39-75.
- Lasnik, H. (1995). A Note on Pseudogapping. In R. Pensalfini and H. Ura, eds., *Papers on Minimalist Syntax*. MITWPL, **27**: 143-163.
- Lasnik, H. (1999). Pseudogapping Puzzles. In E. Benmamoun and S. Lappin, eds., *Fragments: Studies in Ellipsis and Gapping*. OUP, Oxford, pp. 141-174.
- Ottósson, K. (1991). Icelandic double objects as small clauses. *Working papers in Scandinavian Syntax*, **48**: 77-97.