

Harmonic Grammar in phrasal movement: an account of probe competition and blocking*

Brian Hsu

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

1. Introduction

This paper discusses a commonly observed pattern in phrasal movement, in which a specifier position can be filled by more than one type of phrase, but not more than one phrase in a single derivation. I refer to this pattern as *probe competition*, in the sense that multiple probes on one head compete to fill the specifier of its projection.¹ I focus on an informative case in German verb-second (V2) clauses, in which the clause-initial position preceding the tensed verb or auxiliary can be filled by four types of phrases: a (i) topic, (ii) contrast, (iii) frame-setting adverbial, or (iv) grammatical subject (Frey 2006; Speyer 2008; Bader 2020, a.o.).² While frame-setting adverbials and subjects can in some contexts also be information-structure topics or contrasts, they do not need to be. Each of these are illustrated below with examples from Bader (2020).

(1) a. *Topic first*

Diesen Posten hatte er bis zum Ende von Cheney's Amtszeit
This post had he until to.the end of Cheney's tenure
'He had this post until the end of Cheney's tenure ...'

b. *Contrast first*

Den Roman Anayurt Oteli veröffentlichte er 1973 nach ...
The novel Anayurt Oteli published he 1973 after ...
'He published the novel Anayurt Oteli in 1973 after ...'

*For their comments and suggestions, I am grateful to Canaan Breiss, Elliott Moreton, Andrew Murphy, Katya Pertsova, Mariia Privizentseva, Jennifer L. Smith, and Michal Starke. I also thank audiences at a UNC linguistics Friday colloquium, NELS 51, and the 2021 LSA meeting.

¹ This differs from the use of this term in Oxford (2015), which refers to patterns where one item is the goal of more than one probe, and the effects of such configurations on agreement morphology.

² *Topics* here refer specifically to *aboutness-shift topics* (Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl 2007), topics that are distinct from the topic of the previous clause. Items classified as *contrast* need not be contrastive foci; they need only refer to a subset of a set of entities previously evoked (in (1b), 'the novel Anayurt Oteli' is a subset of a previously evoked set of works). See Bader (2020) for further discussion of the literature.

c. *Frame-setter first*

Bis 1750 besuchte er fünf Jahre lang die Volksschule ...
 Until 1750 attended he five years long the elementary school ...
 ‘Ending in 1750, he went for five years to the elementary school ...’

d. *Subject first*

Peter Albright wächst in einem Waisenhaus auf.
 Peter Albright grows in an orphanage up
 Peter Albright grows up in an orphanage.’

I will show that key properties of probe competition, as exemplified in German V2, pose significant challenges for standard Minimalist theories of phrasal movement. First, in sentences that contain multiple eligible first-position items, speakers admit more than one acceptable order. In terms of a derivational syntactic theory, this presents a clear case in which multiple grammatical outputs exist for a single set of items in the numeration. Second, while speakers show principled preferences in the choice of item that fills Spec, CP, the preferences are probabilistic, not categorical (Speyer 2008, 2010). Current Minimalist approaches do not account for such patterns, in which two or more features make conflicting demands at a step of the derivation, nor the probabilistic means by which the choice among them is made. Finally, I will discuss further challenges presented by related *probe blocking* patterns, in which a feature that typically triggers phrasal movement fails to do so if it would create an illicit structure by a separate criterion.

I propose that these patterns lend new support to a constraint-based Minimalist theory of syntax, in which the outcomes of derivational steps are determined by the interaction of violable constraints (Heck and Müller 2003, 2013; Murphy 2017, *to appear*). I further argue that the probabilistic aspects of choice are successfully accounted for in a Maximum Entropy Harmonic Grammar (Goldwater and Johnson 2003; Hayes and Wilson 2008), in which constraints are weighted (Harmonic Grammar: Legendre et al. 1990), and the probabilities of output candidates are determined by their relative harmony values. In addition to capturing the probe competition and probe blocking patterns in German V2, the proposal makes general, testable predictions about cumulative effects in the triggering of phrasal movements.

In sum, I argue that the adoption of a constraint-based grammar with numerical weights resolves a longstanding formal problem in Minimalist theories of movement, while expanding their empirical reach to principled types of optionality and variability.


2. Probe competition and blocking

Probe competition patterns are not novel in the generative literature. For instance, they frequently feature in arguments that heads and their features are parametrically split or bundled (Giorgi and Pianesi 1997, Bobaljik and Thráinsson 1998, Hsu 2017, among others). In addition to the information-structure properties relevant to German V2, probe competition patterns can involve a range of structural positions and probing features: Spec, TP in Finnish is filled by a referential adverb, or a DP of any case or thematic role (Vilkuna 1995; Holmberg and Nikanne 2002); Spec, AspP in the Gungbe “object-verb construction” (Aboh 2009) is filled by an object argument, reduplicated adverb, or gerund;

The highest DP projection in Mandarin Chinese can be filled by either a possessor, or an adnominal name and/or pronoun (Hsu and Syed 2020).

Probe competition patterns raise several challenges in Minimalism, given one of its key guiding principles that movement is driven by features. On the one hand, the flexibility in the types of items that compete for a position makes it difficult to attribute all movements to a single probing feature; on the other hand, restrictions on the items that can move make it difficult to fully reduce the pattern to non-feature-driven, purely formal movement (for discussion in the context of German V2, see Frey 2006, Fanselow and Lenertová 2010, Wierzba and Fanselow 2020). Here, I will pursue the view that these patterns arise from the presence of distinct probes on a single head, and address the question of how their conflicting preferences are resolved.

I make several assumptions about the structure of V2 patterns and mechanics of phrasal movement based on Hsu (2017, 2021). First, German V2 clauses contain one C head with a bundle of four distinct probes, whose goals correspond to the four types of eligible first-position items. Abstracting away from the representation of the moved verb or auxiliary, the state of the derivation immediately after T-to-C movement is shown in (2). Second, I assume that probe-goal agreement occurs independently of movement; phrasal movement occurs after agreement only if the probe occurs on a head with the EPP property (Chomsky 2000).³ Specifically, I assume that at this point in the derivation, all probes that agree with matching goals lower in the clause compete to associate with [EPP] on C. In the next and final step, the goal of the winning probe moves to Spec, CP. For illustrative purposes, the figure assumes that all four eligible goals are separate XPs lower in the tree (which need not be the case in a given sentence). My analysis makes no crucial assumptions about the relative positions of different goals within InflP.



I will show that this bundled representation of probes makes the choice mechanism easy to formalize, as compared to a cartographic analysis of V2 (discussed in Section 4).

2.1 Probabilistic preferences in probe competition

There is a key property of the German V2 pattern, not shared with all probe competition patterns, that is instructive about how the grammar picks a winning probe in the presence

³ Probe competition patterns are challenging to view that the ability to trigger movement is an inherent property of probes, i.e. *strength* (Chomsky 1993). Accounting for these patterns requires an ad hoc stipulation that a probe's strength can depend on whether competing probes are present on the same head.

of competing options. Specifically, each type of phrase can occur lower in the clause when another item is in Spec, CP. In other words, one can find sentences in which several potential first-position items are present, and observe which item moves. This makes it possible to quantify the relative priorities of competing probes.

This property is exploited in the corpus studies of Speyer (2008; 2010), which identify sentences with various combinations of potential first-position items, and note which item is clause-initial.⁴ While most conditions show probabilistic variation in the types of items that appear in first position, all patterns are consistent with one transitive hierarchy in the relative preference accorded to different types of first-position candidates: *frame-setter* > *contrast* > *topic* > *subject*. The main quantitative results from Speyer (2008) are shown in the tables below.⁵

(3) **Table 1:** Contrast + Topic (from Speyer 2008; Table 1)

	Contrast first	Topic first	Subject first	Total
Number	20	9	3	32
Percent	63%	28%	9%	100%

(4) **Table 2:** Frame-setter + Topic (from Speyer 2008; Table 2)

	Frame-setter first	Topic first	Subject first	Total
Number	25	4	0	29
Percent	86%	14%	0%	100%

(5) **Table 3:** Frame-setter + Contrast (from Speyer 2008; Table 3)

	Frame-setter first	Contrast first	Subject first	Total
Number	12	3	1	16
Percent	75%	19%	6%	100%

(6) **Table 4:** Frame-setter + Contrast + Topic (from Speyer 2008; Table 4)

	Frame-setter first	Contrast first	Topic first	Subject first	Total
Number	6	1	0	0	7
Percent	86%	14%	0%	0%	100%

In terms of the derivational analysis of German V2 outlined so far, the patterns in each table show that the grammar permits variable outputs (in terms of the choice of moved item) for a unique input structure (a particular combination of XPs that agree with probes on C). Importantly, this obviates a key objection to the consideration of frequency

⁴ Speyer's corpus only includes sentences in which each potential first-position filler can be labeled exclusively as either a frame-setter, contrast, or topic. Section 3.1 will discuss predictions of my proposal for the patterning of phrases that are goals for multiple probes (ex. contrasted grammatical subjects).

⁵ The "subject" label in these tables is an approximation, as Speyer codes items that are not frame-setters, contrasts, or topics as "something else." However, he notes that these are typically subjects or expletive *es* (p. 273; fn.7). Non-topic, non-contrast objects can appear in Spec, CP in restricted circumstances; for example, Meinunger (2007; 557-9) notes that the object pronoun *es* can occur in Spec, CP in clauses that have a weakly quantified or existential subject, and do not contain a frame-setting adverbial. In essence, object *es* moves only if "better" first-position fillers are unavailable.

in syntactic analyses. Newmeyer (2003, p. 697) claims that comparisons of frequency between syntactic structures are uninformative because individual structures typically differ in the meanings that they convey, and the frequency of a structure thus cannot be isolated from the grammar-independent probability of having to convey its corresponding meaning. While this is a valid methodological concern in general, the objection does not apply to the German case because the variability in how a given set of phrases is ordered is observed while holding constant their grammatical roles (subject, object, adjunct, etc.) and information structure properties. This optionality and variation for a single input structure is seen in both speaker intuitions and corpus patterns.

2.2 Probe blocking

The German V2 pattern also exhibits a pattern that I will refer to as *probe blocking*, where the propensity of a particular feature to trigger movement is affected by features that are not involved in probe-goal agreement. I focus on one case that involves the pronominal form of candidate first-position items: the likelihood of movement of an object argument depends on whether it is a *demonstrative pronoun* or *personal pronoun*. The two options are shown in example (7) from Bader and Portele (2019): Both demonstrative pronoun *den* and personal pronoun *ihn* can refer to ‘a former colleague’ from the previous sentence.

- (7) a. Ich habe gestern einen ehemaligen Kollegen getroffen
I have yesterday a.ACC former colleague met
‘I met a former colleague yesterday.’
b. Ihn / Den habe ich sofort wiedererkannt
Him / DEM.ACC have I immediately recognized
‘Him, I recognized immediately.’

Patel-Grosz and Grosz (2017; 275) report a weak preference for contrast to occur on demonstrative pronouns, rather than a personal pronouns, but not a strong difference in ungrammaticality. The same weak preference is found in Bader and Portele’s larger-scale acceptability judgment study. However, the two pronoun types differ markedly in their relative frequency in first position. This is shown in the table from Bader (2020), which examines sentences that contain both a subject topic pronoun *er* and an object pronoun.

- (8) **Table 5:** Effect of pronoun type on position (from Bader 2020; Table 2.2)

	Demonstrative pronoun	Personal pronoun
Object pron. in first position	76%	2%
Object pron. not in first position	24%	98%

While this data is not directly controlled for information structure properties of the object pronouns, Bader (2020; 31) notes that they were not found to have a statistically significant effect. The crucial observation is that while it is not ungrammatical to place contrast on an object personal pronoun, nor to move contrasted items to Spec, CP, there is

a strong dispreference (in frequency, rather than acceptability) against the movement of object personal pronouns to this position. In other words, typically observed movement of contrasted items is blocked when it would move a personal pronoun to the first position.

Probe blocking patterns are not easily accounted for in a Minimalist grammar where the main prerequisite for phrasal movement is probe-goal agreement. Specifically, movement that follows agreement between [*u*Contrast] on C and a goal DP with interpretable [Contrast] is not predicted to depend on person or case features of the goal. In my proposal, probe blocking is analyzed as a “do something except when” effect that is easily generated in a constraint-based grammar (Prince and Smolensky 1993).

3. Harmonic Grammar analysis

I propose that probe competition and probe blocking patterns support a theory that integrates the key representations and principles of derivational Minimalism with a constraint-based theory of grammatical computation (Prince and Smolensky 1993). Specifically, I adopt the framework of Harmonic Minimalism (Murphy 2017, to appear), first developed by Heck and Müller (2003, 2013). In brief, syntactic structures are built derivationally from the bottom up (Chomsky 1993, et seq.). At each derivational step, the grammar examines the workspace and numeration, and then generates and compares output candidates that apply possible syntactic operations. The selected, optimal output then becomes the input of the next step. The candidate space is restricted by the set of possible operations, and the featural content of the numeration in a particular derivation.

In order to account for a key property of probe competition, the existence of multiple grammatical outputs for a single input structure, I further propose that constraint evaluation occurs in a Maximum Entropy Harmonic Grammar (MaxEnt HG: Goldwater and Johnson 2000; Hayes and Wilson 2008). In this system, individual constraints have numerical weights (Legendre et al. 1990), rather than strict rankings relative to other constraints (Prince and Smolensky 1993). The relative probabilities of output candidates are computed from their harmony scores, such that less well-formed candidates are less likely to surface, but not categorically banned. MaxEnt HG has been shown to successfully account for key qualitative and quantitative properties of variation in phonology (Coetzee and Pater 2011; Hayes 2020; among many others), and I argue that it can be successfully applied to probabilistic probe competition patterns.

3.1 Probe competition in MaxEnt HG

For the analysis of V2 probe competition, I assume that each type of phrasal movement satisfies a FEATURE CONDITION constraint (Heck and Müller 2003). To account for competition among different probes on C, I propose that there are multiple instantiations of this constraint, each indexed to a different probe, and associated with a unique constraint weight. As each constraint is defined, no violation occurs if there is no potential goal for that feature in the structure. For example, FEATURE CONDITION (TOPIC) is violated only if [*u*Top] is able to agree with an interpretable [Top].

- (9)
- a. FEATURE CONDITION (FRAME-SETTER)
For each [*uFrame*] and XP with matching [Frame], the XP occurs in the specifier of the head with [*uFrame*].
 - b. FEATURE CONDITION (CONTRAST)
For each [*uCon*] and XP with matching [Con], the XP occurs in the specifier of the head with [*uCon*].
 - c. FEATURE CONDITION (TOPIC)
For each [*uTop*] and XP with matching [Top], the XP occurs in the specifier of the head with [*uTop*].
 - d. FEATURE CONDITION (SUBJECT)
For each [*uD*] and XP with matching [D], the XP occurs in the specifier of the head with [*uD*].

We restrict attention to the derivational step that immediately follows verb movement to C, before movement to Spec, CP, shown earlier in (2). The input includes the C head with its probes, and the grammar compares output candidates with each eligible goal moved to Spec,CP. The tableau in (10) shows the violation profiles for an input that contains all four types of goals; I will discuss actual constraint weights shortly. Each output candidate violates FEATURE CONDITION constraints for each probe with a matching goal that has not moved to Spec, CP. For example, candidate (10a), which moves a frame-setter, does not violate FEATURE CONDITION (FRAME). However, the candidate violates each of the other FEATURE CONDITION constraints, since the matching goals of those probes on C do not occur in Spec, CP. For reasons of space, the tableau does not show the verbal item in C, and subsequent tableaux will omit the positions of non-moved XPs in output candidates.

(10) *Violation profiles of relevant output candidates*

[C' [IP ...XP _{sub} ...XP _{con} ...XP _{top} ...XP _{frame}	FC (FRAME)	FC (TOP)	FC (CON)	FC (SUB)
a. [CP XP _{frame} [C' [InflP ...XP _{sub} ...XP _{con} ...XP _{top} ...		-1	-1	-1
b. [CP XP _{con} [C' [InflP ...XP _{sub} ...XP _{top} ...XP _{frame} ...	-1	-1		-1
c. [CP XP _{top} [C' [InflP ...XP _{sub} ...XP _{con} ...XP _{frame} ...	-1		-1	-1
d. [CP XP _{subj} [C' [InflP ...XP _{con} ...XP _{top} ...XP _{frame} ...	-1	-1	-1	

Having established the violation profiles of each movement choice, given a combination of eligible goals, a set of constraint weights that accounts for the preference hierarchy and its probabilistic interpretation was identified using the MaxEnt Grammar Tool (Wilson and George 2009). Specifically, the learner was provided with (i) the data in Speyer's (2008) tables in (3)-(6), the attested frequency of each first-position item type, for each combination of items in competition; and (ii) the violation profile of each possible output, determined by the procedure outlined above. The learned constraint weights are shown in the tableaux below. Each tableau shows the competition pattern from one of Speyer's tables, with the harmony scores (*H*) and probabilities of output candidates (*P*) predicted by the weights acquired by the learner. As expected, these weights generate candidate probabilities that closely approximate the attested pattern.

(11) *Constraint weights and predicted probabilities corresponding to Table 1*

[C' [InflP ...XP _{con} ...XP _{top} ...XP _{sub} ...]	FC (CON) w=2.01	FC (TOP) w=1.28	FC (SUB) w=0	H	P
a. [CP XP _{con} [C' [InflP ... (contrast first)		-1	-1	-1.28	.62
b. [CP XP _{top} [C' [InflP ... (topic first)	-1		-1	-2.01	.30
c. [CP XP _{sub} [C' [InflP ... (subject first)	-1	-1		-3.29	.08

(12) *Constraint weights and predicted probabilities corresponding to Table 2*

[C' [InflP ...XP _{frame} ...XP _{top} ...XP _{sub} ...]	FC (FRME) w=3.45	FC (TOP) w=1.28	FC (SUB) w=0	H	P
a. [CP XP _{frame} [C' [InflP ... (frame-setter first)		-1	-1	-1.28	.87
b. [CP XP _{top} [C' [InflP ... (topic first)	-1		-1	-3.45	.10
c. [CP XP _{sub} [C' [InflP ... (subject first)	-1	-1		-4.73	.03

(13) *Constraint weights and predicted probabilities corresponding to Table 3*

[C' [InflP ...XP _{frame} ...XP _{con} ...XP _{sub} ...]	FC (FRME) w=3.45	FC (CON) w=2.10	FC (SUB) w=0	H	P
a. [CP XP _{frame} [C' [InflP ... (frame-setter first)		-1	-1	-2.10	.79
b. [CP XP _{con} [C' [InflP ... (contrast first)	-1		-1	-3.45	.19
c. [CP XP _{sub} [C' [InflP ... (subject first)	-1	-1		-5.55	.02

(14) *Constraint weights and predicted probabilities corresponding to Table 4*

[C [InflP...XP _{sub} ...XP _{con} ...XP _{top} ...XP _{frame}]	FC (FRME) w=3.45	FC (TOP) w=1.28	FC (CON) w=2.1	FC (SUB) w=0.0	H	P
a. [CP XP _{frame} [C [InflP... (frame-setter first)		-1	-1	-1	-3.3	.72
b. [CP XP _{con} [C [InflP... (contrast first)	-1	-1		-1	-4.73	.17
c. [CP XP _{top} [C [InflP... (topic first)	-1		-1	-1	-5.55	.08
d. [CP XP _{sub} [C [InflP... (subject first)	-1	-1	-1		-6.83	.02

The constraint-based analysis also predicts attested cross-linguistic variation in the restrictions and/or preferences on first-position items in V2 structures. For instance, initial contrasts are not permitted in Swedish V2 (Holmberg 2015), and initial topics are dispreferred in Kashmiri V2 declaratives (Manetta 2011). This can be accounted for in terms of differences in the relative weights of each FEATURE CONDITION constraint.

While a full discussion is outside the scope of this paper, it is important to note that the MaxEnt HG proposal predicts the existence of (gradient) *ganging cumulativity* in probe competition. Concretely, for any XP that is the goal of more than one probe on C (ex. a subject DP that also has [topic]), the harmony of an output candidate where the XP does not move includes the summed penalty of all corresponding FEATURE CONDITION constraints. All else being equal, XPs that are goals of more probes are expected to be more likely to move. Although I leave this prediction unverified for now, it is promising that ganging cumulativity effects predicted by weighted constraint grammars are observed in both categorical restrictions (Murphy 2018) and gradient acceptability judgments (Ellsiepen and Bader 2018) related to phrasal movement patterns.⁶

3.2 Probe blocking in MaxEnt HG

Thus far, I have accounted for differences among probes in their propensity to trigger movement in terms of the weight of their respective FEATURE CONDITION constraints. Here, we turn to the probe blocking pattern, in which object personal pronouns are much less likely to to Spec, CP than demonstrative pronouns, in the same information structure conditions. A challenging aspect of the pattern is that it is difficult to posit a plausibly grounded constraint that is violated by object personal pronouns, but not demonstrative pronouns, in first position. I propose that the pattern is better understood as a difference between pronoun types in their *propensity to move*: all else being equal, it is easier to move an object demonstrative pronoun than to move an object personal pronoun.

Specifically, I adopt the proposal that structures in grammar can be represented with gradient levels of presence, a.k.a *activity*, as in Gradient Harmonic Grammar (Smolensky and Goldrick 2016). As further discussed in Hsu (2019), the theory is particularly well-suited to analyzing patterns that depend on both contextual factors (in this case, which probes compete), and lexical, item-specific properties (here, properties of goals). I refer the reader to Müller (2019) for similar applications of gradient symbols in syntax.

The key property of this approach is that changes to the activity values of otherwise identical structures can influence their relative harmony. Because constraints have numerical weights, the penalty of a constraint violation is proportional to the activity of the penalized structure. Concretely, suppose that pronoun types differ in activity, such that personal pronouns are represented with less activity than demonstrative pronouns.⁷

⁶ Speyer's corpus, built in anticipation of a Stochastic Optimality Theory analysis (Boersma and Hayes 2001), explicitly excludes sentences with items that satisfy more than one probe. It is relevant to note that while Stochastic OT can model limited patterns of gradient ganging cumulativity (but not categorical gang effects), MaxEnt HG generates a wider, attested range of gradient cumulative patterns (Jäger and Rosenbach 2006; Smith and Pater 2020).

⁷ This approach requires gradient activity to be possible in output representations (Zimmermann 2018), an assumption not shared with all Gradient Harmonic Grammar analyses.

As a result, a demonstrative pronoun that fails to move incurs a greater penalty of each FEATURE CONDITION constraint that it violates than a non-moved personal pronoun that violates the same constraints.

The tableaux in (15) show one set of weights and activity levels that approximate the frequency patterns attested by Bader (2020), shown in (8). The subject topics and demonstrative pronouns are each represented with 1.0 activity, whereas personal pronouns have 0.55 activity. The penalty of each FEATURE CONDITION violation is equivalent to the weight of the constraint multiplied by the activity of the XP that fails to move. Compare candidate (a) in each tableaux below: the failure to move a demonstrative pronoun incurs a FEATURE CONDITION (CONTRAST) penalty of $11 \times 0.55 = 11$, while the failure to move a contrasted personal pronoun incurs a FEATURE CONDITION (CONTRAST) penalty of $11 \times 0.55 = 6.05$. This difference in the penalties incurred by each pronoun type results in a large difference in the predicted probability of contrast-driven movement.

(15) *Effects of gradient activity on candidate harmony and probabilities*

[C' [InflP ...XP _[1.0] , top... <i>dem-pron</i> _[1.0] , con...	FC (TOP) <i>w</i> =10	FC (CON) <i>w</i> =11	<i>H</i>	<i>P</i>
a. [CP XP _[1.0] , top [C' [InflP ... <i>dem-pron</i> _[1.0] , con... (<i>topic first</i>)		-1	-11	.27
b. [CP <i>dem-pron</i> _[1.0] , con [C' [InflP ...XP _[1.0] , top... (<i>contrast dem. pron. first</i>)	-1		-10	.73

[C' [InflP ...XP _[1.0] , top... <i>pers-pron</i> _[0.55] , con...	FC (TOP) <i>w</i> =10	FC (CON) <i>w</i> =11	<i>H</i>	<i>P</i>
a. [CP XP _[1.0] , top [C' [InflP ... <i>pers-pron</i> _[0.55] , con... (<i>topic first</i>)		-0.55	-6.05	.98
b. [CP <i>pers-pron</i> _[0.55] , con [C' [InflP ...XP _[1.0] , top... (<i>contrast pers. pron. first</i>)	-1		-10	.2

While the data considered here is limited, we can speculate that gradient activity differences are the representational reflection of the hierarchy of pronominal strength (Cardinaletti and Starke 1999), such that stronger pronouns have greater activity. Potentially, this allows a parsimonious account of the fact that strength distinctions involve multiple grammatical properties; gradient activity on an item affects the penalties of all constraint types that refer it. This proposal remains tentative, pending a systematic analysis that considers a holistic constraint set, and the full range of proposed pronominal strength distinctions.

The upshot of the discussion is that a weighted constraint grammar can account for variation among goal XPs in their propensity to move, even when the properties that condition variation are independent of the features involved in probe-goal agreement. A similar gradient symbol analysis can potentially be extended to account for differences in movement propensity that do not involve pronominal form. For instance, properties that influence the likelihood of movement of a topic XP (ex. animacy, recency of previous mention) could be implemented as influences on the gradient activity of [topic] features.


4. Alternative analyses of probe competition

Here, I discuss challenges faced by some alternative analyses of probe competition. I briefly note that none of them bear directly on the analysis of probe blocking.

First, consider an analysis in which C can contain at most one probe. The choice of which item moves to Spec, CP depends only on which probe occurs on C, as determined when the numeration is created. This removes the problem of optionality in a derivational analysis, as the outcome of the final step is fully predictable from the input. However, in the absence of a theory of how the content of a numeration is chosen, we are left with no clear way to model how probes are chosen or prioritized. There are other theory-internal reasons to propose multiple probes on C: if *interpretable* features like [contrast] and [top] require licensing by agreement (Sigurðsson 2011), the corresponding uninterpretable features must be on C at least when the interpretable features occur in a clause.

Supposing that multiple probes can co-occur on C, some aspects of how competition is resolved are predicted by the proposal that features on a head can be arranged in an ordered stack that determines the order in which they are checked (Lahne 2010; Manetta 2011). The preference hierarchy in German can be stated in terms of a checking order of probes on C: [uFrame]>[uContrast]>[uTopic]>[uD]. However, the approach does not account for the probabilistic nature of choice, nor differences in the likelihood of ordering reversals across feature pairs (for example, the *frame-setter* > *contrast* preference is more often maintained than *contrast* > *topic*). Furthermore, ordered feature checking does not predict the existence of cumulative effects in probe competition, since at each step the grammar attempts to check only the top-most feature in the stack.

Finally, the core problems of probe competition are not obviated by an analysis of V2 that assumes an articulated CP structure (Rizzi 1997). For concreteness, I illustrate with the bottleneck effect analysis (Haegeman 1996). In this account, the key property of V2 patterns is that all phrasal movement to the left periphery must first proceed through the lowest C-domain projection Fin(iteness)P. As shown schematically in (16), once this specifier position has been filled by an XP_i, it cannot be crossed by a distinct XP_j. Only the XP_i in Spec, FinP can move to a higher projection.



How does the grammar determine which XP moves in sentences with several candidate items? Under the assumptions that syntactic structure is built from the bottom up, and that each left-peripheral probe occurs on a separate head ([uCon] is in FocP, [uTop] in TopicP, etc.), a look-ahead problem emerges. The grammar must choose which XP is moved while building FinP, before potential probes have entered the derivation. While the issue is obviated if the grammar can examine competing probes in both the existing workspace and un-Merged parts of the numeration, the bundled structure I have proposed has the advantage of being able account for probe competition and its resolution without this complication to the grammatical computation. I refer the reader to Hsu (2017, 2021) for discussion of how bundling can be reconciled with the claims of cartographic theory.

5. Conclusion

I have argued that probe competition and probe blocking patterns support a particular application of Harmonic Grammar in Minimalist syntax. The proposed analysis provides a formal explanation for how derivational choices are made in the presence of competing, grammatical options. More broadly, it gives further support to the claim that constraint-based theories of grammatical computation provide a parsimonious way to model probabilistic variation, while maintaining the insights and content of generative theory (Coetzee and Pater 2011). As shown in the case at hand, candidate spaces are delimited by a limited set of syntactic operations, and the constraint inventory consists of grounded well-formedness principles on syntactic structures. The theoretical means of explaining categorical phenomena in (non-constraint-based) Minimalism can be extended to account for probabilistic variation involving similar patterns. In sum, probabilistic weighted constraint grammars can resolve a formal problem in theories of phrasal movement, while expanding the predictive power and explanatory reach of Minimalist theory.

References

- Aboh, Enoch Oladé. 2009. Clause structure and verb series. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40: 1–33.
- Bader, Markus. 2020. Objects in the German prefield. In *Rethinking verb second*, ed. Rebecca Woods and Sam Wolfe, 15–39. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David, and Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1998. Two heads aren't always better than one. *Syntax* 1: 37–71.
- Boersma, Paul, and Bruce Hayes. 2001. Empirical tests of the Gradual Learning Algorithm. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 45–86.
- Cardinaletti, Anna, and Michal Starke. 1999. The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns. In *Clitics in the languages of Europe*, ed. Henk van Riemsdijk, 145–233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In *The view from Building 20*, ed. Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In *Step by step: essays on Minimalist syntax in honour of Howard Lasnik*, ed. Roger Martin, David Michaels, Juan Uriagereka, and Samuel Jay Keyser, 89–115. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Coetzee, Andries, and Joe Pater. 2011. The place of variation in phonological theory. In *The handbook of phonological theory, 2nd edition*, ed. John A. Goldsmith, Jason Riggle, and Alan C. L. Yu, 401–434.
- Ellsiepen, Emilia, and Markus Bader. 2018. Constraints on argument linearization in German. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 3: 6. 1–36.
- Fanselow, Gisbert, and Denisa Lenertová. 2010. Left peripheral focus: mismatches between syntax and information structure. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 29: 169–209.
- Frascarelli, Mara, and Roland Hinterhölzl. 2007. Types of topics in German and Italian. In *On information structure, meaning and form: generalizations across languages*,

- ed. Kerstin Schwabe and Susanne Winkler, 87–116. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Frey, Werner. 2006. Contrast and movement to the German prefield. In *The architecture of focus*, ed. Valéria Molnár and Susanne Winkler, 235–264. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Giorgi, Alessandra, and Fabio Pianesi. 1997. *Tense and aspect: from semantics to morphosyntax*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Goldwater, Sharon, and Mark Johnson. 2003. Learning OT constraint rankings using a Maximum Entropy Model. In *Proceedings of the Stockholm Workshop on Variation within Optimality Theory*, ed. Jennifer Spenader, Anders Erkişson, and Östen Dahl, 111–120. Stockholm: Department of Linguistics, Stockholm University.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 1996. Verb second, the split CP, and null subjects in early Dutch finite clauses. *Geneva Generative Papers* 4: 135–175.
- Hayes, Bruce. 2020. Deriving the Wug-shaped curve: a criterion for assessing formal theories of linguistic variation. Ms., University of California, Los Angeles.
- Hayes, Bruce, and Colin Wilson. 2008. A maximum entropy model of phonotactics and phonotactic learning. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39: 379–440.
- Heck, Fabian, and Gereon Müller. 2003. Derivational optimization of wh-movement. *Linguistic Analysis* 33: 97–148.
- Heck, Fabian, and Gereon Müller. 2013. Extremely local optimization. In *Linguistic derivations and filtering*, ed. Hans Broekhuys and Ralf Vogel, 135–166. Sheffield: Equinox.
- Holmberg, Anders, and Urpo Nikanne. 2002. Expletives, subjects and topics in Finnish. In *Subjects, expletives, and the EPP*, ed. Peter Svenonius, 1–45. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hsu, Brian. 2017. Verb second and its deviations: An argument for Feature Scattering in the left periphery. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 2:35. 1–33.
- Hsu, Brian. 2019. Exceptional prosodification effects revisited in Gradient Harmonic Grammar. *Phonology* 36: 225–263.
- Hsu, Brian. 2021. Coalescence: a unification of bundling operations in syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 52: 39–87.
- Hsu, Brian, and Saurov Syed. 2020. Cooccurrence of nonarticle determiners as evidence for split DPs and bundled projections. *Language* 96: e114–e134.
- Jäger, Gerhard, and Anette Rosenbach. 2006. The winner takes it all — almost: cumulativity in grammatical variation. *Linguistics* 44: 937–971.
- Lahne, Antje. 2010. A multiple specifier approach to left-peripheral architecture. *Linguistic Analysis* 35: 73–108.
- Legendre, Géraldine, Yoshiro Miyata, and Paul Smolensky. 1990. Can connectionism contribute to syntax?: Harmonic Grammar, with an application. In *Proceedings of the 26th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. M. Ziolkowski, M. Noske, and K. Deaton, 237–252. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Manetta, Emily. 2011. *Peripheries in Kashmiri and Hindi-Urdu: The syntax of discourse-driven movement*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Meinunger, André. 2007. About object *es* in the German vorfeld. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38: 553–563.
- Müller, Gereon. 2019. The third construction and strength of C: a gradient harmonic

- grammar approach. In *The sign of the V - Papers in honour of Sten Vikner*, ed. Ken Ramshøj Christensen, Henrik Jørgensen, and Johanna L. Wood, 419–448.
- Murphy, Andrew. 2017. Cumulativity in syntactic derivations. Ph.D dissertation, Universität Leipzig.
- Murphy, Andrew. 2018. Dative intervention is a gang effect. *The Linguistic Review* 35: 519–574.
- Murphy, Andrew. To appear. *Harmonic Minimalism: cumulativity and serialism in syntax*. Sheffield: Equinox.
- Newmeyer, Frederick J. 2003. Grammar is grammar and usage is usage. *Language* 79: 682–707.
- Patel-Grosz, Pritty, and Patrick G. Grosz. 2017. Revisiting pronominal typology. *Linguistic Inquiry* 48: 259–297.
- Prince, Alan, and Paul Smolensky. 1993. *Optimality Theory: constraint interaction in generative grammar*. Ms., Rutgers University & University of Colorado, Boulder. Published 2004, Malden, Mass. & Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2011. Conditions on argument drop. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42: 267–304.
- Smith, Brian W., and Joe Pater. 2020. French schwa and gradient cumulativity. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 5: 24. 1-33.
- Smolensky, Paul, and Matthew Goldrick. 2016. Gradient symbolic representations in grammar: the case of French Liaison. Ms., Johns Hopkins University & Northwestern University. Available as ROA-1286 in the Rutgers Optimality Archive.
- Speyer, Augustin. 2008. German vorfeld-filling as constraint interaction. In *Constraints in discourse*, ed. Anton Benz and Peter Kühnlein, 267–290. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Speyer, Augustin. 2010. Filling the German vorfeld in written and spoken discourse. In *Discourses in interaction*, ed. Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen, Marja-Liisa Helasvuo, Marjut Johansson, and Mia Raitaniemi, 263–290. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Vilkuna, Maria. 1995. Discourse configurationality in Finnish. In *Discourse configurational languages*, ed. Katalin É. Kiss, 244–268.
- Wierzba, Marta, and Gisbert Fanselow. 2020. Factors influencing the acceptability of object fronting in German. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 23: 77–124.
- Wilson, Colin, and Ben George. 2009. Maxent grammar tool. Software package. <https://linguistics.ucla.edu/people/hayes/MaxentGrammarTool/>.
- Zimmermann, Eva. 2018. Gradient symbolic representations in the output: a case study from Moses Columbian Salishan stress. In *NELS 48: Proceedings of the 48th Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, 275–288.