Indirect Object Scrambling and Double Object Scrambling: Are They as Similar as Black and White?

This study draws on theoretical assumptions borrowed from sources in the area of the movement approach to Scrambling (and Object Shift) phenomena (e.g. Haugan 2001; Thráinsson 2001; Richards 2004; Wallenberg 2009). I hold that Scrambling applies optionally to raise internal Arguments and Adjuncts into left-phrasally-adjoined targets whereby the T-head serves as barrier to movement. While it is prohibited by Conservation of C-Command (Wallenberg 2009: 132) from moving constituents across c-commanding functional heads, Scrambling is conditioned by a variety of factors, semantic/information-structural/prosodic.

If Scrambling is internal adjunction it is the syntactic status of this operation that defines its optional character, Scrambling is optional in narrow syntax. At the same time Scrambling is a constrained operation that applies locally to a certain c-command domain.

Data have been collected from two corpora: The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (Taylor, Warner, Pintzuk, Beths 2003) and the corpus of Íslendinga Sögur (Kristjánsdóttir, Rögnvaldsson, Ingólfsdóttir, Thorsson 1998). The proposed analysis has its focus on $V_{\text{fin}}$-IO(Dat)-$V_{\text{non-fin}}$-DO(Acc) and $V_{\text{fin}}$-IO(Dat)-DO(Acc)-$V_{\text{non-fin}}$ orders in O(ld) E(nglish) and O(ld) Icel(landic) and invokes semantic and information-structural factors in an attempt to determine to what extent the general linearization principles (weight, definiteness, pronominality) can be affected by such factors. The ultimate aim of the project is to describe and evaluate the ways the core properties of Scrambling in OE and OIce interface with semantic, discourse/informational and prosodic properties (based on Lambrecht 1994; Barðdal & Chelliah 2009; Hinterhölzl & Petrova 2009; Meurman-Solin, López-Couso & Los 2012; Nevalainen & Traugott 2012; Bech & Eide 2014; Bowern & Evans 2014).

The present account stands as an alternative to case-feature-driven analyses under which movement is triggered by the need for the internal Arguments to have their case-features checked. It also diverges from the weak version of semantic/discourse/informational analyses which assume that Topic and Focus are purely semantic features accessible at the interface, as well as from their strong version where Topic and Focus attract movement of constituents to dedicated functional projections.

Scrambled orders in OE and OIce canonical $V_{\text{fin}}$-IO(Dat)-$V_{\text{non-fin}}$-DO(Acc) and $V_{\text{fin}}$-IO(Dat)-DO(Acc)-$V_{\text{non-fin}}$ constructions are straightforwardly accounted for. More intriguing and pertinent to the analysis prove to be non-canonical examples like the following:

OE Se cyng nolde him agifan þæt þe he on Normandige uppon him genumen hæfde; (http://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/mec/hypidx?type=id&id=hyp.832.19981211T105002)
‘The king would not restore to him that which he had taken away from him in Normandy;’
OE Nyle se Waldend ēngum ānum ealle gesyllan gǣstes snyttru. (Cri 683)
‘The Almighty Ruler will not give to anyone alone all wisdom of the spirit.’
OE ... ic bidde eow þæt ge geþyldelice hlystan þæs ðe ic eow nu secgan wille ... Nu wille ic þeah be suman dæle scortlice hit eow sum asecgan. (VercB 50)
‘... I ask you that you patiently listen to what I will say to you ... Now I will though in part and in short tell you some of it.’
OLc Sá hefir mörgum manní veitt bana og marga hrædda gert. (Kjaln 632)
‘He has put to death many people and has caused many to dread him.’
OLc ... að hann skuli engum manní gefa hana, nema einverjam þessum tölfrkóngavitringi. (IngArn 3692)
‘... that to no one should he give her except to some very wise man.’
OLc Nú skal veita svör þínu máli, að eg vil óllum yður grið gefa skipverjum. En um frændsemi þá er þú telur við oss ... (Laxdæla 1564)
‘Now I shall give answers to your request that I will give mercy to all of you, shipmen. And regarding that kinship which you plead with us ...’
This study has resulted in drawing conclusions about the referential types of the ex-situ constituents, the type of the source and target positions, the barriers to movement, and most importantly about the set of factors that can trigger indirect object Scrambling and double object Scrambling. Among the conclusions are the following:

1. Scrambling in OE and Olce targets XPs (indefinite, covertly and overtly case-marked DPs and caseless PPs included). There are cases as well when non-constituents are affected by Scrambling.

2. Under OE and Olce Scrambling, the source position is case-marked with DP Arguments, whereas the target position is non-case marked with DP Arguments, PPs (Adjuncts) and non-constituents.

3. OE and Olce Scrambling mediates the way discourse roles correlate with constituent order either by invoking old, specific, topical, defocalized readings (unmarked interpretation) or by evoking non-presupposed, contrastive, focused, accentuated readings (marked interpretation).

4. Scrambling is a highly functional feature of OE and Olce word order and it is difficult to identify a single feature that can be said to trigger it. A powerful trigger of Scrambling can be a possible inconsistency between the placement of the default sentence accent and the position of the focus expression, viz. Scrambling applies either to make accent by default obtainable or to make explicit that accent by default is undesirable.

5. The studied type of word order variation can be best described as the end result of a complex interaction between syntactic, information structural and prosodic factors.
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