

## Residual Object Shift in Romance

Much recent literature has concentrated on the so-called “Object Shift” operation (e.g., *Peter købte den<sub>OBJECT</sub> ikke*, ‘Peter bought it not’) with no general consensus as to what restrictions it obeys: some authors highlight the role of  $v^*$ -to-T movement ([2],[3]), others phonological factors ([4,6,9]). In this paper we explore a Romance paradigm which presents what we call “Residual Object Shift”, arguing that the phenomenon is parasitic on verb movement. The proposal clearly revamps the (long abandoned) idea that verb movement ‘expands’ syntactic domains ([2,3]), and provides additional evidence in favour of [2]’s thesis that languages displaying Object Shift license an extra (third) subject position.

Let us start by considering the basic observation about Object Shift: it is blocked unless the verb leaves the  $v^*$ P. This can be seen in (1), taken from [8]; notice that when auxiliaries (1b) and complementizers (1c) appear, forcing the verb to remain within the  $v^*$ P, the object *henne* cannot shift.

Consider next Romance languages; these manifest VOS configurations, where objects also escape from their base (first-Merge) position. It is important to note that two analyses have been put forward to derive Romance VOS: VP topicalization (see [1]), and *bona fide* Object Shift (i.e., object movement to a position c-commanding the subject; see [6,9,10]). Interestingly (and somewhat puzzlingly), empirical evidence from variable binding appears to support both accounts. Catalan and Italian data support a VP topicalization approach, whereas European Portuguese, Galician, and Spanish do Object Shift (see 2).

Now, notice that if  $v^*$ -to-T movement does not occur (due to, say, the presence of an auxiliary such as progressive *be* on T), the VOS pattern is barred in Romance too. This is shown in (3).

There is more: going back to the Scandinavian case (1c), ungrammaticality disappears if the verb moves to the CP, as noted by [8] (see 4a), and, yet again, the same is true in Romance: if the verb leaves the  $v^*$ P (moving to, say, some Focus position in the CP), (3b), repeated as (4b), is ‘repaired’.

Scandinavian and Romance differ, however, when it comes to whether other elements create intervention effects. As [8] observes, apart from lack of  $v^*$ -to-T, arguments also bar Object Shift in Scandinavian, and, just like before, ungrammaticality disappears if they move to the CP layer (see 5b).

As (6) shows, arguments stranded within the  $v^*$ P do not block Object Shift in Romance, a fact we take to indicate that  $v^*$ -to-T movement is all that matters for VOS to emerge.

At this point we want to go back to the contrast in (2) and (3). Though irrelevant at first glance, the asymmetry becomes intriguing the minute one realizes that it patterns with another word order *datum*: E. Portuguese, Galician, and Spanish –but not Catalan nor Italian (see [1,5,10,11])– allow VSO sequences (see 7). Variation, it would appear, does not operate at random.

Following [2,10], we want to connect Object Shift and the availability of a ‘third subject position’ (the one occupied by subjects in VSO sequences, according to [10]). In particular, we argue that there is a micro-parameter targeting Romance  $v^*$  which distinguishes languages that license both Object Shift and VSO (E. Portuguese, Galician, and Spanish) from those which do not (Catalan and Italian). Accordingly, for us, both shifted objects and subjects in VSO target the same position: the *edge* of  $v^*$ . This follows – we claim – from  $v^*$  being richer in the relevant languages, having a more powerful EPP endowment.

As can easily be seen, for (8) to go through, we must assume subjects are base-generated in a position lower than generally assumed: in a VP-adjoined position, in accord with [7].

Synthesizing, in the preceding lines it has been argued that there is a “residual” version of Object Shift active in Romance languages which obeys *Holmberg’s Generalization* (i.e., object shifts if there is  $v^*$ -to-T movement; see [8]). We have claimed that, contrary to what happens in Scandinavian languages, the phenomenon is not ruled by phonological factors (adjacency or linearization; see [4,6,8]), but rather by syntactic intervention (*sensu* [5]): unless the verb moves (redefining locality domains), shifted objects block Agree (T, Subject). Our analysis is not only reinforced by (3), (4), and (6) above, but also by (9), where even though the verb remains within the  $v^*$ P, the shifted object moves to the CP, eliminating the intervention configuration (there is, of course, an A-trace left behind, but these do not create intervention effects; see [4]).

Finally, we have further linked the facts concerning Object Shift with the availability of an additional subject position ([2]’s original insight). Following [10]’s proposal, we think this is indeed feasible under the assumption that VSO sequences involve subject raising to an outer-Spec- $v^*$ . If so, the conclusion is that both (VSO) subjects and (shifted) objects can target the same  $v^*$ P peripheral position (an outer-Spec- $v^*$ ) in the relevant languages, suggesting that the microparameter to be explored is not restricted to any functional head, but actually to a phase head: the light verb  $v^*$ .

- (1) a. Jag kysste [VP henne inte [VP t<sub>Jag</sub> t<sub>kysste</sub> t<sub>henne</sub> ] ] ✓ *v\*-to-T Movement* (Swedish)  
 I kiss-PAST-1.SG her not  
 'I did not kiss her'
- b. ... \* [CP att jag henne inte [VP t<sub>Jag</sub> kysste t<sub>henne</sub> ] ] \* *v\*-to-T Movement* (Swedish)  
 that I her not kiss-PAST-1.SG  
 '... that I did not kiss her'
- c. \*Jag har [VP henne inte [VP t<sub>Jag</sub> kysst t<sub>henne</sub> ] ] \* *v\*-to-T Movement* (Swedish)  
 I have-1.SG her not kissed  
 'I have not kissed her'
- (2) a. ??Ahir va visitar cada estudiant<sub>i</sub> el seu<sub>i</sub> professor. (Catalan)  
 Yesterday AUX-3.SG visit-INF each student the his teacher  
 'His teacher visited each student'
- b. Ayer visitó a cada chico<sub>i</sub> su<sub>i</sub> mentor. (Spanish)  
 Yesterday visit-PAST-3.SG to each boy his mentor  
 'His mentor visited each boy yesterday'
- (3) a. [TP Vistió [VP a todo niño [VP su madre t<sub>vistió</sub> t<sub>a todo niño</sub>]]] ✓ *v\*-to-T Movement* (Spanish)  
 Dress-PAST-3SG to every child his mother  
 'His mother dressed every child'
- b. \* [TP Estaba [VP a todo niño [VP su madre vistiendo t<sub>a todo niño</sub>]]] \* *v\*-to-T Movement* (Spanish)  
 Be-PAST-3.SG to every child his mother dressing  
 'His mother was dressing every child'
- (4) a. Kisst har jav henne inte (...bara hållit henne i handen) (Swedish)  
 Kissed have-1.SG I her not (... only held her by hand)  
 'Kiss, I did not do that to her (...I just held her hand)'
- b. VISTIENDO estaba a todo niño su madre (...no riendo) (Spanish)  
 Dressing be-PAST-3.SG to every child his mother not scolding  
 'DRESSING (not scolding) his mother was every child'
- (5) a. \*Jag gav den inte [VP t<sub>Jag</sub> Elsa t<sub>gav</sub> t<sub>den</sub> ] (Swedish)  
 I give-PAST-1.SG it not Elsa  
 'I did not give it to Elsa'
- b. Vem gav du den inte [VP t<sub>du</sub> t<sub>gav</sub> t<sub>vem</sub> t<sub>den</sub> ] IO-wh-movement (Swedish)  
 Who give-PAST-3.SG you it not  
 'To whom didn't you give it?'
- (6) [TP Estaba dándoles [VP los regalos [VP María t<sub>dándoles</sub> a los niños t<sub>los regalos</sub>]]] (Spanish)  
 Be-PAST-3.SG giving-CL-to-them the presents María to the children  
 'His mother was dressing every child'
- (7) a. \*Ha comprato Maria il giornale. (Italian)  
 Have-3.SG bought Maria the newspaper  
 'Maria has bought the newspaper'
- b. Comeu o Paulo a sopa. (E. Portuguese)  
 Eat-PAST-3.SG the Paulo the soup  
 'Paulo ate the soup'
- (8) [ Shifted Object / Subject v\* [ t<sub>Subject</sub> [ V t<sub>Object</sub> ] ] ]
- (9) [CP A TODO NIÑO estaba [VP t<sub>a todo niño</sub> [VP su madre vistiendo t<sub>a todo niño</sub> ] ] ] (Spanish)  
 TO EVERY CHILD be-3SG his mother dressing  
 'EVERY CHILD his mother was dressing!'

**REFERENCES** [1] Belletti, A. (2004): "Aspects of the Low IP Area", in L. Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures (vol. 2)*, New York: OUP, 16-51. [2] Bobaljik, J. & D. Jonas (1996): "Subject Positions and the Roles of TP", *LJ*, 27:195-236. [3] Chomsky, N. (1993): "A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory", in K. Hale & S. Keyser (eds.), *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press, 1-52. [4] Chomsky, N. (2001): "Derivation by Phase", in M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press, 1-52. [5] Costa, J. (2002): "VOS in Portuguese: Arguments against an analysis in terms of remnant movement", in A. Alexiadou et al. (eds.), *Dimensions of Movement*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 69-89. [6] Fox, D. & D. Pesetsky (2005): "Cyclic Linearization of Syntactic Structure", *Theoretical Linguistics*, 31:1-45. [7] Hale, K. & S. Keyser (1993): "On the argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations", in K. Hale & S. Keyser (eds.), *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press, 53-109. [8] Holmberg, A. (1999): "Remarks on Holmberg's Generalization", *Studia Linguistica*, 53:11-39. [9] Ordóñez, F. (1998): "Post-verbal asymmetries in Spanish", *NLLT*, 16:313-346. [10] Ordóñez, F. (2005): "Two Specs for postverbal Subjects: Evidence from Spanish and Catalan", Ms., SUNY-Stony Brook. [11] Picallo, C. (1998): "On the Extended Projection Principle and null expletive subjects", *Probus*, 10:219-241.