

# **Movement and Clitics: Adult and Child Grammar**



Movement and Clitics:  
Adult and Child Grammar

Edited by

Vicenç Torrens, Linda Escobar,  
Anna Gavarró and Juncal Gutiérrez

**CAMBRIDGE  
SCHOLARS**

---

P U B L I S H I N G

Movement and Clitics: Adult and Child Grammar,  
Edited by Vicenç Torrens, Linda Escobar,  
Anna Gavarró and Juncal Gutiérrez

This book first published 2010

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2010 by Vicenç Torrens, Linda Escobar, Anna Gavarró, Juncal Gutiérrez  
and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system,  
or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or  
otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-1847-X, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-1847-6

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements .....	vii
Introduction .....	ix

## **Part 1: Movement**

### **Part 1.1. Adult Grammar**

Typology of Verb Movement in Scandinavian.....	5
Irene Franco	
Reconstruction Asymmetry in the Parasitic Gap Constructions and the Nature of Islands .....	28
Masayuki Komachi	
On the (Un)availability of Long-distance Movement.....	39
Ankelien Schippers	
Subextraction from Subjects and Objects: Cyclicity and Freezing.....	63
Balazs Suranyi	
Wh-in-situ: The Case of Greek.....	84
Christos Vlachos	

### **Part 1.2. Language Acquisition**

Intervention Effects in Russian Speakers' L2 Chinese Grammars .....	115
Esuna Dugarova	
The Left Periphery in L2 Serbo-Croatian: On the Acquisition of Multiple wh-Fronting by Speakers of French and English.....	133
Nadezda Novaković and Teresa Parodi	
The Acquisition of German V2 in Bilingual Italian-German Children residing in Germany and Italy: A Case of Acceleration? .....	154
Valentina Repetto and Natascha Müller	

Syntactic Movement in the Production of French Wh-questions: The Role of Computational Complexity versus L1 Transfer in Adult L2 Acquisition.....	185
Maureen Scheidnes and Laurice Tuller	

## Part 2: Clitics

### 2.1. Adult Grammar

On Clausal Architecture: Evidence from Complement Clitic Placement in Romance.....	219
Paola Benincà and Christina Tortora	

Morphologically Complex Clitic Pronouns and Spurious <i>se</i> Once Again.....	238
Anna Cardinaletti	

Italian Clitics: Variables and Disjoint Reflexivity.....	260
Diego Pescarini	

Restrictions on Enclitics and the Imperative in Iberian Spanish .....	281
Luis Sáez	

Syntax-Phonology Interface and Clitic Placement in Mayan Languages...	306
Stavros Skopeteas	

### Part 2.2. Language Acquisition

Experimental and Empirical Evidence for the Status and Acquisition of Subject Clitics and Agreement Marking in Adult and Child Spoken French.....	333
Géraldine Legendre, Jenny Culbertson, Isabelle Barrière, Thierry Nazzi and Louise Goyet	

Asymmetries in the acquisition of different types of clitics in European Portuguese .....	361
Carolina Silva	

L2 Acquisition of Clitics: Old French as an Interlanguage .....	389
Petra Sleeman	

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The editors wish to thank the following members of the Organizing Committee of the *Linguistic Institute* in Barcelona: Aoife Ahern, Lisa Brunetti and Cristóbal Lozano. We would also like to thank for their participation all students, and the instructors during the event: Adriana Belletti, Harald Clahsen, João Costa, Edward Gibson, Kleanthes Grohmann, Theo Marinis, Natascha Müller, Teresa Parodi, Christer Platzack, Luigi Rizzi and Ian Roberts. An acknowledgement is due to GLOW, the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, the Universitat Pompeu Fabra, the Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, the Generalitat de Catalunya and the European Union for their support to the organization of this event. Special thanks to Enric Vallduví, Lisa Brunetti, Isabel Pérez and the anonymous reviewers for their help during the organization of the event and the publication of this volume.





# INTRODUCTION

This volume presents a collection of papers on movement and clitics from a theoretical perspective drawing on adult and child grammar. It is the result of the contributions of the workshops *Facing Movement* and *Meeting Clitics* that took place during the *Linguistic Institute* in Barcelona in August 2008. This collection tries to cover several aspects of adult grammar and language acquisition by concentrating in the grammars of Dutch, English, Faroese, French, German, Greek, Icelandic, Italian, Japanese, Mayan, Norwegian, Portuguese, Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Swedish and Spanish.

The first set of papers relates to movement phenomena. Thus, by examining verb movement in V1 and V2 word orders in Germanic languages, Irene Franco shows that declarative V2 clauses do not have the pragmatic function found in V1. Furthermore, Franco suggests that the structure of V2 clauses is different from V1 marked word orders, where the displaced verb is in complementary distribution with declarative complementizers. In V2 word orders, on the other hand, the moved verb targets a position which is compatible with Scandinavian declarative complementizers. Franco concludes that V1 and V2 satisfy different interface requirements, V1 being a strategy to express a pragmatic value other than (unmarked) declarative.

Masayuki Komachi addresses the question of the intriguing asymmetry of reconstruction in parasitic gap (PG) constructions. In general, PGs are generated within islands, which blocks reconstruction of the gap. However, it has been observed that PGs within a subject island can undergo Condition A reconstruction, while this is not possible with PGs in adjunct islands. Komachi proposes that PGs are wh-traces derived through sideward movement and that, given the different nature of adjuncts and subjects, reconstruction into PGs is sensitive only to adjunct but not to subject islands.

Ankelien Schippers presents historical evidence from German and Dutch suggesting that long-distance movement constructions have been replaced by partial wh-movement and resumptive prolepsis. Schippers argues that although these two constructions involve short-distance movement they are derivationally related to long-distance movement. Furthermore she explores the possibility that what triggers movement to the intermediate CP in all cases is the same feature checking requirement,

thus accounting for the replacement of the long-movement alternatives by the short-movement structures.

Balazs Suranyi provides an account of the (non)opacity of Subject DPs to subextraction cross-linguistically as well as across-constructions. He suggests that syntactic computation is governed by three distinct notions of cyclicity: (a) cyclicity of Merge, (b) cyclicity of feature checking and (c) cyclicity of Transfer. Thus, Suranyi is able to predict the circumstances under which internal and external argument (*wh*- as well as non-*wh*-) subjects fail to display Freezing Effects. He also extends his proposal to ECM subjects and object DPs.

Christos Vlachos' paper argues that Greek *wh*-in-situ questions provide indirect evidence that information of constituency in Greek may be expressed by either of the two functional domains: CP, which regulates *wh*-ex-situ, or *v*P, which derives *wh*-in-situ. Vlachos shows that, in Greek, the two derivations are not optional counterparts and proposes that while Greek *wh*-words/phrases are intrinsically interrogative, Greek *wh*-in-situ stays within *v*P where it is existentially bound at *v*P level.

The next four papers discuss different aspects of bilingual and L2 acquisition of movement structures. To start with, Valentina Repetto & Natascha Müller discuss verb placement in six Italian-German bilingual children. They show that the six bilingual children behave like the monolinguals reported in the literature. However, Repetto & Müller find that while bilingual children do not use *V*final patterns, monolingual children go through a stage where they produce target-deviant *V*final structures. The authors explore the possibility that language dominance, instead of causing negative cross-linguistic influence, may aid the child in avoiding making false syntactic deductions on the basis of beneficial processing.

Esuna Dugarova presents an empirical study of intervention effects, where L1 Russian speakers learning L2 Chinese are tested by means of a grammaticality judgement test. She shows that the learners can make native-like grammatical distinctions in L2 Chinese *wh*-questions involving different types of interveners. Although they showed some indeterminacy in their judgements, which Dugarova attributes to difficulties at the lexicon-syntax interface, the results suggest that their interlanguage grammars are constrained by Universal Grammar.

Nadezda Novaković & Teresa Parodi's paper discusses the acquisition of multiple *wh*-fronting in the L2 Serbo-Croatian interlanguage of L1 French and English learners. They evaluate the results obtained in the experimental task in the light of two different acquisitional hypotheses, the Interpretability Hypothesis and the Feature Reassembly Approach.

Novaković & Parodi propose that the learners have a representational deficit involving an uninterpretable feature but that this deficit can be overcome at more advanced levels of proficiency and conclude that the difficulty for these L2 Serbo-Croatian learners lies in the association of wh-words with the correct set of uninterpretable features.

Maureen Scheidnes & Laurice Tuller study the elicited production of L2 French wh-questions by a group of adult L1 speakers of English in order to compare the role of computational complexity and the role of L1 transfer in L2 acquisition, showing that the L2 learners are affected by computational complexity rather than L1 transfer. This finding is further supported by the data Scheidnes & Tuller obtained from a group of four year-olds L1 French Typically Developing children and a group of French children with SLI, which leads them to conclude that computational complexity considerations constrain L1, L2 as atypical language acquisition alike.

With respect to the adult grammar of clitics, Paola Benincà & Christina Tortora's paper considers the occurrence of the Paduan clitic *ghe* mainly in the *volerghè* 'to be necessary' construction; the clitic, when used with *voler* in simple tenses and participial clauses, is variable, suggesting an analysis whereby the participial clause has a lower clitic placement site than the simple tense clause. Thus, from the restrictions on the appearance of clitics they draw conclusions on the functional structure of the clause, in particular in relation to the projection of clitics in the V- and I-domain.

Anna Cardinaletti proposes that two morphological classes of clitic pronouns, namely morphologically simple and morphologically complex clitic pronouns, should be distinguished: the former class consists of only one morpheme, the latter of two (or more) morphemes. On the basis of Italian data, she shows that the two types not only differ in their morphological make-up, but also in their syntactic behaviour: while morphologically simple clitic pronouns can enter clitic clusters without any restrictions, morphologically complex ones cannot appear as the first element of true clitic clusters, but can occur in split clitic configurations.

Diego Pescarini's article considers the so called Fancy Constraint, a restriction on the cooccurrence of certain clitics when a caused subject appears in a causative construction; he argues that this restriction correlates with some morphological asymmetries that seem to distinguish two subclasses of pronouns, and also with the syncretic morphology of reflexive clitics displayed by some Italian dialects. He argues for the distinction between 'true' argument and 'variable' argument to account for the restriction and the related empirical phenomena.

Luis Sáez's paper considers the restrictions on enclisis/proclisis in

Iberian Spanish and provides a set of related new data: namely, those of universal concessive conditionals and quotative inversion constructions; all of the cases manifest second person morphological gaps. Sáez observes that all these gaps derive from a common phenomenon: the incompatibility between person exponents and enclitics. In order to generalize over them, Sáez proposes to replace Harris' 1998 analysis by a Distributed Morphology analysis whereby enclitics become affixes post-syntactically.

Stavros Skopeteas' paper considers data from various Mayan languages that present a series of clitics whose placement has so far defied a general explanation. Demarcative clitics do not have semantic content and delimit the right boundary of nonfinal intonational phrases; interpretable clitics spell out interpretable features of the numeration, and are also associated with particular prosodic properties and aligned with the right boundary of an intonational phrase. These two classes of clitics are shown to display different interactions with morphology and indirectly with syntax.

Géraldine Legendre, Jenny Cuberston, Isabelle Barrière, Thierry Nazzi and Louise Goyet draw on new empirical findings from monolingual two-year-olds acquiring French, focussing on one long standing issue in the literature: the affixal status of subject clitics. Children are shown to treat subject clitics and full subject pronouns differently. This can only be adequately explained if subject clitics are considered affixal agreement markers in child French. The proposal is that subject clitics are acquired on a par with other agreement phenomena on the French verb.

Carolina Silva investigates the acquisition of accusative, dative, reflexive and non-argumental clitics by Portuguese children through a set of tasks of elicited production, in an attempt to understand the reasons why children omit clitics in European Portuguese. There is a high rate of clitic omission by young and older children in contexts in which clitics can alternate with null objects. The asymmetries detected between the different clitic types favour an account in terms of post-syntactic choices, since this assumption predicts a higher rate of omission only in contexts in which the clitic alternates with a null object.

The volume ends with a paper on second language acquisition of clitics by Petra Sleeman. The paper discusses clitic placement and shows some striking similarities between the data found in the interlanguage of Dutch learners acquiring French as L2 and the grammar of older stages of French in the 13<sup>th</sup> century. L2 learners apply the Tobler-Mussafia law, exhibit the same type of clitic climbing found in old French, and allow interpolation of an adverb or negation between an infinitive and the preceding clitic.

**PART 1:**  
**MOVEMENT**



## PART 1.1. ADULT GRAMMAR





# TYPOLGY OF VERB MOVEMENT IN SCANDINAVIAN

IRENE FRANCO  
UNIVERSITY OF SIENA - CISCL

## 1. Introduction

The most significant work for a classification of V2 phenomena in the Germanic languages remains Vikner (1995). In the scale of pervasiveness of V2 constructions in these languages, we find English on one side, having only “residual V2”, and Yiddish and Icelandic on the other, with full V2. The West Germanic languages permit V2 only in complementizerless clauses, whereas the Mainland Scandinavian languages together with Frisian and Faroese<sup>1</sup> allow V2 also in specific embedded contexts. Vikner calls the latter class “limited embedded V2 languages”, but the criteria for this identification are under discussion (cf. Biberauer 2002; Julien 2007, a. o.). Different approaches try to account for the syntax of verb position in Scandinavian: on the one hand, it is claimed that verb movement is confined to the IP system in embedded clauses both in V2 and non-V2 contexts (Holmberg and Platzack 1995, a.o.). On the other hand, an alternative approach proposes that verb movement in V2 contexts targets some position in the CP domain also in subordinate clauses (Hróarsdóttir et al. 2007).

As a matter of fact, the understanding of V2 in Scandinavian is strictly related to the syntactic and semantic properties encoded in the complementizer system. So far, V2 is commonly accounted for with a purely descriptive generalization, of the kind of (1) below (cf. Roberts and Roussou 2002):

(1) **Filled-Spec requirement**

In V2 configurations, the verb must occupy the second position in the clause and the Specifier of the position occupied by V must be filled.

The main empirical problem encountered by the requirement in (1) is the presence of productive V1 orders in V2 languages. If (1) is a condition applying to verb movement *tout court* in Germanic, then the possibility of V1 is unexpected, otherwise we must assume that (1) holds only in V2, not in V1 constructions. The main goal of the paper is to explore the nature of verb movement in Scandinavian, focusing on (i) the different distribution of V1 and V2 orders, and (ii) their different interpretive properties. Evidence is provided that the probe of V movement in specific V1 contexts is different from that of ordinary V2, is related to the pragmatics of the sentence, and contributes to overcome the *impasse* generated by (1). The argument is developed as follows: section (2) illustrates the syntactic distribution of V1, and disambiguates between pragmatically marked V1 orders and constructions that are V2 in disguise, despite looking as V1 orders on the surface; section (3) shows the distribution of V2, focusing on the crosslinguistic variations with regard to the licensing conditions of embedded V2 in Scandinavian; sections (4) and (5) provide an interpretation of facts concerning V2 and V1 orders respectively, and section (6) is the conclusion.

## 2. Distribution of V1

In this section I show how the presence of productive V1 in Insular Scandinavian languages is still compatible with the requirement that verb movement to the CP domain is associated to movement of an XP to the first position. I describe the syntactic environment where V1 orders occur and compare it with other clauses where V1 is not possible, but V2 is, also distinguishing between V1 and disguised V2.

Verb first orders are quite common in Insular Scandinavian among other languages<sup>2</sup> (cf. Maling 1990; Sigurðsson 1990; Thráinsson 2007; Thráinsson et alia 2004). The first type of V1 order to consider is that of imperative clauses. Imperative clauses are generally verb-initial in other languages as well, and have a specific syntactic behavior, related to their structural properties. Compare the following facts:

- (2) Icelandic  
**Far þú/ Farðu heim!**  
 Go you/go-you home  
 “Go home!”

- (3) \*Hann sagði [að **farðu** heim]  
 He said that go-you home  
 “He said that go you home”

[Thráinsson 2007, 28: (2.22)a.:(2.23)]

Imperatives cannot be found in embedded clauses in Icelandic<sup>3</sup>. The impossibility of being embedded seems a general property of V1 clauses, as Maling (1990) observes.

Another case of productive V1 is found in Y/N questions. In general, Standard Germanic requires subject-verb inversion in that context, whereas inversion is not triggered when the question is indirect as in (6) below:

- Icelandic  
 (4) a. **Hefur** Jón ekki [lesið bókina]?  
 Has John not read the book  
 “Hasn’t John read the book?”  
 b. **Las** Jón ekki [\_\_\_ bókina]?  
 Read John not the book  
 “Doesn’t John read the book?”

[Thráinsson 2007, 28: (2.21)]

- Faroese  
 (5) **Heldur** tú, at Zakaris seldi Eivindi tann gamla bilin?  
 Think you that Zakaris sold Eivind the old car-the  
 “Do you think that Zakaris sold Eivind the old car?”

[Thráinsson et alia 2004, 238: (34)c.]

- Icelandic  
 (6) Hann spyr hvort Jón **taki** bækurnar  
 He asks if John take(pres.subj.) books-the  
 “He is asking if John is taking the books”

[Thráinsson 2007, 397: (8.7)a.]

In the subordinate clause in (6) the verb does not raise to the first position: when a polar question is embedded, V1 order is no longer grammatical.

Another case of V1 is represented by the “narrative style”, mainly found in current written Icelandic and earlier written Faroese (it is rare in the modern variety, cf. Thráinsson et alia 2004, p. 239):

Icelandic

- (7) **Koma** Þeir nú að stórum helli og...  
 Come they now to big cave and  
 “Then they get to a big cave and...”  
 [Thráinsson 2007, 29: (2.22)b.]

Faroese

- (8) [...] **Hitti** hann har nakrar studentar úr Íslandi og **sótu** teir har leingi  
 Met he there some student from Iceland and sat they there long  
 “There he met some student from Iceland and they sat there for a  
 long time”  
 [Thráinsson et alia 2004, 240: (39)a.]

According to Thráinsson (2007) narrative V1 clauses can only marginally be embedded “except for the second conjunct of conjoined complement clauses if the complementizer is absent” (Thráinsson 2007, p. 29):

Icelandic

- (9) ? Hann sagði [að **hefðu** Þeir Þá komið að stórum helli og...]  
 He said that had(subj.) they then come to big cave and...  
 “He said that then they came to a big cave and...”
- (10) Hann sagði [[að Þeir hefðu haldið áfram]  
 He said that they had(subj) continued  
 a. ... og [að Þeir hefðu Þá komið...]]  
 and that they had then come  
 b. ?\* ... og [að **hefðu** Þeir Þá komið...]]  
 c. ... og [**hefðu** Þeir Þá komið...]]  
 “He said that they had continued and they had then come...”  
 [Thráinsson 2007, 29: (2.24 a.; b. 1,2,4)]

Thráinsson (2007) observes that the option in (10c) is fine and sounds like narrative V1, while the one in (10b) is just bad. The reason of this split may reside in the fact that two different phenomena are at play in (10). The first conjunct in the subordinate clause in (10) is an instance of V2, rather than V1 (cf. (9) above, not accepted), and the second conjunct is expected to display the same structure. However, V2 order is not possible in (10b), which is embedded under the complementizer *að* but for which the requirement in (1) is in fact not satisfied, contrary to (10a), where the subject may have moved<sup>4</sup> to CP. The structure of the second conjunct in (10c) is thus different from that of (10a) and (10b). Notice that in (10c) the

complementizer *að* is missing, and verb movement does not require overt XP-fronting. These syntactic facts reflect the different interpretation of the conjunct as a narrative-style clause: in other words, there is syntactic evidence of what characterizes narrative V1 semantically. At a first glance, the presence of the declarative complementizer *að* seems to interfere with different pragmatic requirements imposed on syntax. So far it may be observed that marked orders, such as the narrative inversion in (9) and (10) or the imperative in (2) (contrasting with (3)) among other cases, do not admit embedding because that would change their status from marked clauses into default declaratives, typically introduced by *að* in Icelandic (*at* in Faroese). More generally, the impossibility to embed V1 clauses is motivated syntactically with the complementary distribution of complementizers and verbs in first position.

The fact that V1 is common in the subordinate clauses of conditional sentences appears as a counterexample to the claim that V1 clauses cannot embed. The condition for the realization of V1 is primarily identified by the lack of a complementizer, hence unselected clauses are the optimal environment. Nevertheless, from a syntactic point of view, nothing prevents V1 to occur also in *complementizerless subordinate* clauses: this is the case for conditional V1.

Conditional V1 is spread crosslinguistically, and allowed only in absence of the subordinating particle<sup>5</sup>:

Icelandic

- (11) a. Jón verður góður [ef hann **æfir** sig].  
           Jon becomes good if he practises self  
       b. Jón verður góður [**æfi** hann sig].  
           Jon becomes good practise(subj.) self  
           “Jon will be good if he practices”

[Thránsson 2007, 30: (2.24)]

Faroese

- (12) a. Bókin kemur út til jóla, *um* tað **gongst** eftir ætlan  
           book-the comes out to Christmas, if it goes after plan  
       b. **Gongst** \_\_\_ eftir ætlan, kemur bókin út til jóla  
           Goes after plan comes book-the out to Christmas  
           “If everything goes according to plan, the book will come out by Christmas.”

[Thránsson et alia 2004, 293: (181)c.]

German

- (13) a. Sie schaute ihn an, als *ob* er ein großes Verbrechen begangen  
**hätte**  
b. Sie schaute ihn an, als **hätte** er ein großes Verbrechen begangen
- (14) a. \*Sie schaute ihn an, als *ob* **hätte** er ein großes Verbrechen  
begangen  
b. \*Sie schaute ihn an, als **hätte** *ob* er ein großes Verbrechen  
begangen  
she looked him at as if/had he a big crime  
committed  
“She looked at him as if he had committed a big crime”  
[Vikner 1995, 44: (20); (22)]

English

- (15) a. **Had** you studied more, you would have passed the test  
b. \**If* **had** you studied more, you would have passed the test

The productivity of conditional V1 varies from language to language. Luigi Rizzi (p.c.) observes that English (example (15)) allows conditional V1 only in counterfactual contexts. This seems to be a semantic restriction operating at the interface level.

Notice that English is not a V2 language, but displays only "residual V2". Beside the inversion phenomena triggered by quantificational/negative elements (e.g. "Never would I do this again..."), the label "residual V2" has been used to identify other common instances of inversion, such as the one found in conditional clauses, narrative style, etc. I suppose that this classification needs revision, primarily because the distinction between V1 and V2 from a purely descriptive perspective is untenable. Different syntactic phenomena are grouped under these labels, and can be captured only with a sufficiently fine-grained analysis of the left peripheral structural properties.

In this section I have illustrated that specific clause-types have a V1 order. Such clause-types are characterized by their unselected status, namely, in these V1 orders the verb is in complementary distribution with any subordinating particle. From a first reading, these V1 orders have a pragmatically marked function that distinguish them from standard declarative clauses.

There are two apparent counterexamples to what has been claimed so far. The first consists of the fact that Icelandic has a kind of productive V1 in embedded clauses introduced by a complementizer:

Icelandic

- (16) a. Því er sennilegt að **rigni** meira á morgun  
 Thus is likely that rains more heavily tomorrow  
 “Thus it is likely that it will rain more heavily tomorrow”  
 b. Ég vissi ekki að **færu** til Grænlands svona mörg skip  
 I knew not that went to Greenland so many ships  
 “I didn’t know that so many ships went to Greenland”  
 [Haeberli 2002, 342: (58)]

This issue is discussed in detail in Franco (2008) (pp. 8 and ff.): basically, the order COMP-V is possible because Icelandic has an A-position hosting null subject expletives in CP (cf. also Haeberli 2002). The surface word order is then reanalyzed as COMP-pro-V and obtains only in specific contexts where a topical subject is not needed, but subject gaps are instead licensed<sup>6</sup>. Franco (2008) argues that the type of V1 shown in (16) “is not a case of embedded V1, but of V2, with a null expletive in first position” (p. 9).

Evidence that this is the case comes from the fact that the same contexts allow stylistic fronting (SF) to the preverbal position<sup>7</sup>:

Icelandic

- (17) a. Hann spurði hvar \_\_ væri ennþá ekið vinstra megin  
 He asked where was still driven left side  
 b. Hann spurði hvar **ekið** væri ennþá vinstra megin  
 He asked where driven was still left side  
 c. \*Hann spurði hvar **það** væri ennþá ekið vinstra megin  
 He asked where it was still driven left side  
 “He asked where people still drove on the left side of the road”  
 [Maling 1990, 84: 85: (41), (46)]

Notice that both SF in (17b) and the declarative V1 order of (16) reanalysed as V2 “in disguise” are found only in Icelandic among the Scandinavian (and, more generally, the Germanic) languages<sup>8</sup>. These phenomena are indeed related to the particular agreement properties and the availability of expletive *pro* in this language<sup>9</sup>.

The second type of counterexample is exemplified by declarative V1 in Spoken Swedish: the association of V1 to an unmarked word order runs against the expectations following from the present analysis. Again, I refer to Franco’s (to app.) discussion of this issue. In her dissertation, Mörnshjös (2002) observes that Spoken Swedish V1 declaratives are instances of

Topic drop and reanalyzes them as special cases of V2. What is relevant to the present discussion is the fact that, contrary to Icelandic declarative V1, Spoken Swedish topic drop is impossible in embedded clauses:

Spoken Swedish

- (18) Här är pjen. Ø<sub>i</sub> **kan** du sätta in t<sub>i</sub> direkt i micron, om du vill. (Ø=den)  
 here is pie-the Ø can you put in directly in micro-the if you want (Ø=it)  
 “Here is the pie. You can put it directly in the micro if you want”
- (19) \*Han pekade på pjen och sa [att Ø **kan** du sätta in direct i micron]  
 He pointed on pie-the and said that Ø can you put it directly in micro-the  
 “He pointed at the pie and said that you can put it directly in the micro”

[Mörnsjö, 2002, 11: (2:1); (2:2)]

The ungrammaticality of (19) is related to the pragmatics of topic drop. According to Mörnsjö (2002) the licensing condition consists of a presupposition that the speaker estimates as belonging to the communicative common ground he shares with his interlocutor and, as such, he can drop. An embedded context generally depends on the pragmatics of the matrix clause, and cannot be directly related to the speaker’s presupposition. From a syntactic point of view, topic drop entails the presence of a topic (which becomes silent at the interface), thus of a fully-available periphery as that of main clauses, whereas the periphery of subordinate clauses is subject to more restrictions.

### 3. Distribution of V2

In this section I illustrate the distribution of V2 in Icelandic in contrast to Mainland Scandinavian languages, and focus on the syntactic conditions licensing V2 orders. The facts show that such conditions are different from those required for V1. Assuming that in Icelandic (and in Mainland Scandinavian V2 clauses) the inflected verb raises to Fin<sup>10</sup>, this movement would be blocked if the declarative complementizer *að* (or *at/att* in its crosslinguistic variants) were also merged in Fin, and the facts in (20a); (21a) below would be unexpected:



Icelandic

- (20) a. Ég veit um eina bók *sem* (*að*) Jón **hefur** ekki lesið.  
I know about a book SOM that Jón has not read
- b. Ég veit um eina bók *sem* (*\*að*) Jón ekki **hefur** lesið.  
I know about a book SOM that Jón not has read  
“I know about a book that John hasn’t read.”
- (21) a. Hann þurfti að fara snemma *fyrst* (*að*) bíllinn **var** ekki kominn úr viðgerð.  
He had-to to leave early since that car-DEF was not come from repair
- b. Hann þurfti að fara snemma *fyrst* (*\*að*) bíllinn ekki **var** kominn úr viðgerð.  
He had-to to leave early since that car-DEF not was come from repair  
“He had to leave early since the car hadn’t come from repair.”  
[Vangsnes 2006; 4: (12)-(13)]

As for the facts in (20b) and (21b), Vangsnes (2006) reports that: “According to Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson (p.c.) the presence of *að* after some other complementizer requires the finite verb to precede sentence adverbials [...] (in cases where verb movement is otherwise optional, cf. Angantýsson 2001)”. Doing away with the optionality of verb movement in Icelandic, which is tolerated<sup>11</sup> in restricted contexts, for the present purposes it is sufficient to notice that there seems to be a correlation between the presence of an overt Comp (*að*) and V2 orders: exactly the opposite correlation found for V1. Indeed, the declarative complementizer *að* and V-to-Fin are in complementary distribution in V1 orders, whereas the presence of *að* requires V-to-Fin in the V2 contexts in (20)-(21). Höskuldur Thráinsson (p.c.) argues that there is no correlation between the presence of *að* and the requirement of V2, and disagrees with Hrafnbjargarson. I leave this controversial issue aside, for the moment. Luigi Rizzi (p.c.) observes that V2 seems possible only if the first subordinating particle is a head selecting a “full-blown structure” introduced by *að*. I would prefer to avoid the notion of full-blown vs. reduced periphery, and adopt a view based on Liliane Haegeman’s suggestions (p.c. and Haegeman, to app.). Instead of assuming that a left-periphery where topics and foci are not licensed is reduced, she proposes that in some clauses the movement of an operator would trigger intervention effects with another XP fronted by A’-movement.<sup>12</sup>

The facts in (20)-(21) are limited to Icelandic, whereas Mainland Scandinavian languages have a more restricted embedded V2. Vikner (1995) a. o. distinguishes between languages with symmetric and asymmetric V2. Icelandic belongs to the first group, allowing V2 in both main and embedded clauses. The presence of V2 is restricted to subject/stylistically fronted XP-V orders in some type of subordinate clauses. Only clausal complements to "bridge verbs" <sup>13</sup> permit (non-subject) topicalization to the first position:

- Icelandic
- (22) a. Hann *sagði* að **hann** gæti ekki sungið í brúðkaupinu  
 He said that he could not sung in wedding.the  
 "He said that he couldn't sing at the wedding"
- b. Hann *sá eftir* að **hann** hafði ekki sungið  
 He regretted that he had not sung  
 "He regretted that he hadn't sung"
- (23) a. Hann *sagði* að **Þetta lag** gæti hann ekki sungið í brúðkaupinu  
 He said that this song could he not sung in wedding.the  
 "He said that he couldn't sing this song at the wedding"
- b. \*Hann *sá eftir* að **Þetta lag** hafði hann ekki sungið  
 He regretted that this song had he not sung  
 "He regretted that he hadn't sung this song"
- [Hróarsdóttir et alia 2007, 56: (18); (19)]

The contexts licensing only subject-initial V2 in Icelandic disallow V2 in Mainland Scandinavian, whereas those allowing non-subject initial V2 in Icelandic, license V2 in Mainland Scandinavian, regardless of what is fronted to the first position. Compare (22)-(23) above with the following facts from Swedish:

- Swedish
- (24) a. \*Han *ångrade* att **han** hade inte sjungit  
 He regretted that he had not sung  
 "He regretted that he hadn't sung"
- b. \*Han *ångrade* att **den här sången** hade han inte sjungit  
 He regretted that this here song.the had he not sung  
 "He regretted that he hadn't sung this song"

- (25) Han *sa* att **den här sången** kunde han sjunga på bröllopet  
 He said that this here song.the could he sing on wedding.the  
 “He said that he couldn’t sing this song at the wedding”  
 [Hróarsdóttir et alia 2007, 58, 59 : (23) ;(22)a.]

While (22a), (23a) and (25) are instances of embedding under bridge-verbs, the main verb in (22b), (23b) and (24) are non-bridge, according to Vikner’s classification. Because it is often difficult to assign a verb to a class rather than to another, Hróarsdóttir et alia (2007) propose an analysis of embedded V2 based on the typology of matrix verbs. They identify four categories, along the lines of Hooper and Thompson (1973): assertive (e.g. *say/believe*); semi-factive (e.g. *discover*); non-assertive (e.g. *doubt*) and factive (e.g. *regret*). From the data collected, they draw a correlation between the impossibility of embedded V2 in Mainland Scandinavian and the licensing of subject-initial embedded V2 in Insular Scandinavian. Namely, in the latter language group, embedded V2 with a non-subject in first position is excluded from the same contexts disallowing V2 in Mainland Scandinavian. Table 1<sup>14</sup> shows the correlation:

**Table 1. Embedded V2 in Scandinavian**

Verb Type	Structure	Swedish	Norwegian	Faroese	Icelandic
Assertive <i>say/believe</i>	V2	Ok	Ok	Ok	Ok
	Topic	Ok	Ok	Ok	Ok
Semi-factive <i>discover</i>	V2	Ok	Ok	Ok	Ok
	Topic	Ok	Ok	Ok	Ok
Non-assertive <i>Doubt</i>	V2	*	*	Ok	Ok
	Topic	*	*	*	*
Factive <i>regret</i>	V2	*	*	Ok	Ok
	Topic	*	*	*	*

The interesting facts concern non-assertive and factive predicates in the two language groups. In complements to these verbs, Insular Scandinavian allows V2 provided that the first position is not occupied by a non-subject topic. Compare the following facts on adjunct extraction from a subject-initial V2 clause in Icelandic and Danish:

- Icelandic
- (26) **Hvernig** sagði hún **t** að börnin hefðu *t* alltaf lært sögu **t**?  
 How said she that children-the have(COND) always learned history
- (27) \***Hvordan** sagde hun **t** at børnene havde *t* altid lært historie **t**? (Danish)  
 How said she that children-the have always learned history  
 “How did she say that the children have always learned history?”  
 [Vikner 1995; 112: (118)b.]

Mainland Scandinavian does not make any distinction between subject and non-subject initial V2 clauses: both display root and island properties, whereas subject-initial V2 clauses in Insular Scandinavian are not islands to extraction<sup>15</sup>. A viable hypothesis to explain the difference between (26) and (27) is that Icelandic has an available subject position in the CP system, where also DPs (*börnin* in (26)) can be A-moved without triggering minimality effects with A'-movement of other elements (*hvernig* in (26)).<sup>16</sup> On the contrary, the presence of subjects<sup>17</sup> (as well as of other topics) in extraction contexts as in (27) gives rise to minimality effects.

#### 4. Interpretation of V2

The restrictions on embedded V2 in Mainland Scandinavian seem related to pragmatic factors. Julien (2007) argues that embedded V2 in Mainland Scandinavian does not strictly depend on the matrix verb type and rejects those analyses merely based on a lexical classification of verbs (e.g. factive; assertive; non-assertive; etc.; cf. Hooper and Thompson 1973). Instead, she claims that the verb type contributes to the semantics of the matrix clause, which may or may not license an assertive clausal complement. In some cases the presence of an assertive complement clause is optional, hence depending on interpretive, non-syntactic requirements. Below are some facts showing that embedded V2 “is at best only *indirectly* dependent on the matrix predicate. Other factors, like polarity and modality, also play a role [...]” (Julien 2007, p. 133, italics are mine).

Norwegian

- (28)a. \*Jeg *tviler* på at slike konserter **hjelper** faktisk mot vold-en  
I doubt on that such concerts help actually against violence-DEF
- b. Jeg *tviler ikke* på at slike konserter **hjelper** faktisk mot vold-en  
I doubt not on that such concerts help actually against violence-DEF  
“But I doubt/do not doubt that concerts like that actually have an effect on the violence”
- (29)a. Da *oppdaget* han at han **var** ikke alene  
Then discovered he that he was not alone  
“Then he discovered that he was not alone”
- b. Da *oppdaget* han *ikke* at han **var** ikke alene  
Then discovered he not that he was not alone  
“Then he didn’t discover that he was not alone”
- c. Han *kunne* ha *oppdaget* at han (\***var**) ikke (**var**) alene  
He could have discovered that he was not was alone  
“He could have discovered that he was not alone”  
[Julien 2007, 120-125: (18)b.; (19); (26)b.; (27); (28)]

Note that embedded V2 is present only when the embedded clause can be asserted, as in (28b) and (29a) or at least presupposed. It is generally assumed that a presupposition cannot be asserted, therefore Julien’s stand may result contradictory. However, she uses (29b) as evidence for the fact that what is presupposed (by the speaker) –“at han **var** ikke alene”- can be asserted (by the speaker). What she refers to, in fact, is the notion of *accommodated presupposition*, namely the idea that the speaker’s belief is accepted and included in the hearer’s common ground. By accommodated presupposition, Stalnaker (2002) refers to a tacit, pragmatic process, whereas Julien (2007) argues that some V2 clauses (i.e. (29b)) instantiate the speaker’s interpretive expectation on the hearer. By saying “...at han **var** ikke alene” (cf. (29b)), the speaker *asserts* what she already presupposes in order for the hearer to include it in her own belief system. By contrast, the modal operator in (29c) prevents the interpretation of the complement clause as an assertion (of the speaker addressed to the hearer).

My hypothesis for a syntactic analysis of the facts in (28) and (29) is based on the cartography of the left-periphery firstly proposed by Rizzi (1997) and further refined by subsequent studies<sup>18</sup>. I propose that the assertivity of Mainland Scandinavian embedded V2 results from selectional properties of the matrix clause. Crucially, I assume that in Scandinavian the declarative complementizers (*að*, *at*, *att*) are merged as

head of ForceP. Accordingly, Cecilia Poletto (p.c.) observes that such a higher merge of Scandinavian complementizers may be motivated by their morphological difference from other Germanic complementizers such as *dass*, which seems formed by a “ass”+ a “d” element. There is reason to believe that the latter type of complementizer is merged in Fin (and indeed it blocks V2) as it also displays agreement in many substandard varieties, whereas Scandinavian complementizers, compatible with V2, never do. Furthermore, *að/at/att* is not marked for finiteness as it introduces infinitival complements as well:

- Icelandic  
 (30) Ég ætla *að* **fara** heim  
       I am.going to go.INF home  
       “I am going home”

The structure of embedded assertive clauses in Mainland Scandinavian would then be:

- (31) ...ForceP **at** <sub>TopP</sub> **XP** <sub>FinP</sub> <XP> V...

If the selected clause is not asserted, a possibility is that the clause type is specified on Force by a modal operator expressing the pragmatic value required by the matrix clause. The nature of the operator is dependent on the sense conveyed by the interpretation of the matrix predicate. For instance, in the case of (28a) above an operator is connected to the predicate “doubt” and marks the *irrealis* status of the selected clause. Moving from a lower position, the OP interferes with the A'-movement of XP fronting and blocks the access of further elements to the CP field. The structure of an embedded non-V2 clause in Mainland Scandinavian would then be:

- (32) ...ForceP OP **at** <sub>FinP</sub> <OP> <sub>IP</sub> S...(adv)...V...

This analysis is also compatible with the facts of Icelandic, as the subject position which is available in CP in this language would be located right above Fin; and, being it an A-position, would not interfere with OP-movement. Assuming that Subj2P is the Icelandic subject position in CP<sup>19</sup>, the structure of a non-assertive subject-initial V2 clause would then be:

- (33) ...ForceP OP **at** <sub>Subj2P</sub> **S** <sub>FinP</sub> <S> V...