

Pronouns and resistance to displacement: Double objects and particles

- in the previous sessions, we have seen that WEAK and CLITIC pronouns must as a rule be placed outside the verbal core, in a specifier or head position outside or on the edge of VP
 - in this session, we will discover that such displacement can be pre-empted by material that belongs to the verbal core
- (i) the DOUBLE OBJECT CONSTRUCTION
- in English double object constructions with a phrasal indirect object, the direct object cannot be a weak pronoun; when both objects are weak pronouns, the output is variable
- (1)
- a. I sent the students the handout
 - b. I sent *them* the handout
 - c. *I sent {the students *it* / *it* the students}
 - d. %I sent {*them it* / *it them*}
- (2)
- a. “I think it all seems fishy but that address is why I sent them it in the first place”
 - b. “I requested each student’s video clip from IT and sent it them individually”
- in Scandinavian double object constructions with a phrasal indirect object, the direct object cannot be a weak pronoun, regardless of whether it undergoes object shift past the indirect object or stays *in situ*; when both objects are weak pronouns, object shift of both weak object pronouns is possible and obligatory, preserving their relative ordering
- (3)
- a. jeg låner ikke Maria bøgerne (Danish)
I lend not Maria books.the
 - b. jeg låner *hende* ikke bøgerne
I lend her not books.the
 - c. *jeg låner {ikke Maria *dem* / *dem* ikke Maria}
I lend not Maria them / them not Maria
 - d. jeg låner {*hende dem* / **dem hende*} ikke
I lend her them not
- (ii) the VERB–PARTICLE CONSTRUCTION
- in English verb–particle constructions (and similarly in Norwegian and Icelandic; for the latter: (6)), the object can only be a weak pronoun if it is placed to the left of the particle
- (4)
- a. I sent out the handout
 - a'. I sent the handout out
 - b. *I sent out *it*
 - b'. I sent *it* out
- in Swedish, where verb–particle constructions have the strict order V–Prt–Object, the object can be a weak pronoun but it cannot shift around the particle or further up

- (5) a. Peter kastade inte bort mattan (Swedish)
 Peter threw not away carpet.the
 a'. *Peter kastade inte mattan bort
 Peter threw not carpet.the away
 a''. *Peter kastade mattan inte bort
 Peter threw carpet.the not away
 b. Peter kastade inte bort *den*
 Peter threw not away it
 b'. *Peter kastade inte *den* bort
 Peter threw not it away
 b''. *Peter kastade *den* inte bort
 Peter threw it not away

- English (4b~b') would at first glance seem to confirm that weak pronouns must shift out of the VP, hence must end up to the left of the particle
- but Swedish (5b~b'/b'') tells us that the presence of a particle prevents object shift but is compatible with *in-situ* placement of the weak pronominal object
- 'particle shift' of the type found in English (and also in Norwegian and Icelandic) should not be modelled as object shift
 - its distribution is in itself independent of the weak pronominality of the object (it can affect full DPs in both Norwegian and Icelandic, even though full DPs cannot undergo object shift in the former)
 - but when 'particle shift' is available (as in Norwegian and Icelandic), it provides an 'escape' for the weak pronoun, which is then forced to undergo object shift as well

- (6) a. Pétur henti ekki út motunni (Icelandic)
 Pétur threw not away carpet.the
 a'. Pétur henti ekki mottuni út
 Pétur threw not carpet.the away
 a''. Pétur henti mottuni ekki út
 Pétur threw carpet.the not away
 b. *Pétur henti ekki út *henni*
 Pétur threw not away it
 b'. *Pétur henti ekki *henni* út
 Pétur threw not it away
 b''. Pétur henti *henni* ekki út
 Pétur threw it not away

- the empirical generalisation is that in the presence of a particle, object shift of a weak pronoun is impossible *unless*, independently of object shift, the particle can follow the object ('particle shift'), in which case object shift of the weak pronoun is obligatory

- (7) a. V ADV PRT
 ↑ × ↓
- b. V ADV PRT
 ↑ ↓

Q why do indirect objects and particles obstruct object shift?

- in the case of double object constructions, we may be inclined to implicate **relativised minimality** (Vikner): movement of the direct object to an A-position across the indirect object (another nominal category in an intervening A-position) is illicit
- the feasibility of an appeal to relativised minimality depends a great deal on the question of whether the indirect object occupies a θ -position or not:
 - NP-movement across an intervening non-thematic A-position is illicit (‘super-raising’: **John seems that [it is likely t to win]*)
 - NP-movement across a thematic A-position is licit (passive: *Mary was [pro kissed t]*)
- relativised minimality does not apply in the case of verb–particle constructions: by general consensus, the particle is not a phrase occupying an intervening A-position on the movement path
- but **rigid minimality** can apply in the case of verb–particle constructions, on the assumption that the particle *governs* the object when it precedes the object, but fails to *license* its trace
- if we assume that the indirect object occupies a *derived* (non- θ) A-position and that the particle *governs* the object when it precedes the object, **minimality** can account for both the ban on object shift around indirect objects and the ban on object shift around particles — with relativised minimality in charge of the former and rigid minimality regulating the latter

BUT if rigid minimality is invoked in the analysis of the ban on object shift in V–Prt–Object constructions, the word-order alternation in the verb–particle construction (seen in English, Norwegian and Icelandic, independently of object shift) cannot be analysed in terms of NP-movement around the particle

- since an NP-movement account of the word-order alternation in the verb–particle construction is desirable (see Den Dikken 1995), and since there is no way to (a) have the particle govern the object in the ‘inner particle’ order (which means the particle has to be a head) and then (b) manoeuvre the particle around the object to obtain the ‘outer particle’ order (the particle *qua* head cannot be moved rightward), we will rethink the minimality-based analysis
- an **alternative** account: ORDER PRESERVATION (see Müller’s work; cf. also Fox & Pesetsky)
 - Swedish V–Prt constructions:
 - at the VP phase: \checkmark V–Prt–NP, *V–NP–Prt
 - at the next phase: *V–PRON–ADV–Prt [order of PRONOUN and Prt not preserved]
 - Icelandic/Norwegian V–Prt constructions:
 - at the VP phase: \checkmark V–Prt–NP, \checkmark V–NP–Prt
 - at the next phase: \checkmark V–PRON–ADV–Prt [order of PRONOUN and Prt preserved]
 - Scandinavian double object constructions:
 - at the VP phase: \checkmark V–IO–DO, *V–DO–IO
 - at the next phase: *V–PRON_{DO}–ADV–IO [order of IO and DO not preserved]
 - *V–PRON_{DO}–PRON_{IO}–ADV [order of IO and DO not preserved]
 - \checkmark V–PRON_{IO}–PRON_{DO}–ADV [order of IO and DO preserved]

- English introduces two quirks:
 - (a) the weak pronominal object in verb–particle constructions can neither be to the right of the particle (**send out it*; cf. Swedish (5b)) nor undergo object shift (**send it soon out*)
 - (b) the two weak pronominal objects of the double object construction can change places (subject to speaker variation: *%send them it ~ %send it them*; contrast with Danish (3d))
- re: (a) a separate constraint on weak pronoun distribution (language-specific; inactive in Swedish): within the VP, weak pronouns cannot be preceded by non-verbal phrasal material
- re: (b) language-internal variation with respect to V–DO–IO order with case-bearing objects
 - (i) in some English varieties, the case form of object pronouns is ‘robust’ enough to license a silent dative P (‘alternative realisation’; Emonds) without dative shift being required
 - (ii) *in-situ* licensing of IO pronouns is possible only if the DO is also a weak pronoun, with which the IO pronoun can cluster at PF to avert a violation of the constraint active in (a)
- NB** there are no morphophonological indications that (animate) object pronouns vary across dialects with regard to how ‘rich’ or ‘robust’ their case forms are, so the account for (b) is a self-fulfilling prophecy
 [in all fairness, it should be said that the literature features no satisfactory account of variation regarding the relative ordering of two weak pronominal objects in English double object constructions]
- for simplicity, the account sketched above is presented in the language of a constraint-based model (see Müller’s work, in particular)
- recasting it in a principles-based model is possible with the aid of Fox & Pesetsky’s cyclic linearisation approach (see the allusion to phases above)