

Don't front! A minimality account of embedded topicalization and V2 in Scandinavian.

Irene Franco

LUCL – Universiteit Leiden

i.franco@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Root properties are generally attributed to main clauses, but there is a vast literature analyzing also embedded Germanic V2 and embedded topicalization as root, hence main-clause phenomena. In order to investigate the syntactic realization of root properties in embedded V2 clauses of Scandinavian languages, the paper focuses on the syntactic and interpretive differences of subordinate clauses in Mainland Scandinavian and Icelandic.

The distribution and interpretive properties of V2 in Scandinavian embedded clauses has been largely discussed (Vikner 1995; Holmberg and Platzack 1995 and references therein; Rögnvaldsson and Thráinsson 1990; Brandtler 2008; Hróarsdóttir et al. 2007; Wiklund et al. 2009; Julien 2007 and 2009; a.o.). Scandinavian embedded V2 differs from the West Germanic one in one significant respect, i.e. verb movement is not in complementary distribution with overt complementizers. Basically, Scandinavian embedded V2 may surface with either of the two linear orders given in (1) below¹:

- (1) a. C X P V S ... b. C S V̄ (Adv/Neg)...

The two options illustrated in (1) above have a different frequency rate in embedded contexts. Capitalizing on facts discussed by previous literature (see Wiklund et al. 2009, a.o.), the distinction between the two orders in (1) becomes evident when looking at the structure of embedded clauses in Mainland Scandinavian vs. Icelandic. In recent work, Hrafnbjargarson & Wiklund (2009) challenge the claim that Icelandic has symmetric V2. In line with the facts thereby presented, the difference regarding embedded V2 in Mainland Scandinavian and Icelandic can be summed up as follows:

- (2) a. Mainland Scandinavian has a more restricted embedded V2. When V2 is not possible, the clause can neither have the order in (1)a. nor the one in (1)b.

- b. Icelandic has a less restricted embedded V2. Some clauses can only have the order in (1)b., but not the one in (1)a.; i.e. in some clauses no topicalization is possible but subject-initial V2 is instead attested.

In my proposal, I assume a cartographic CP structure (Rizzi 1997; Benincà and Poletto 2004; Haegeman 2006, a.o.), where (embedded) topicalization and the V-to-Fin movement resulting in linear V2 are determined by structural and interpretive properties of the complementizer domain. Along the lines of Haegeman's (2010) intervention account of main clause phenomena in English and Romance, I provide a syntactic account for (i) the cooccurrence of embedded V2 and complementizers; and (ii) the distribution of embedded V2 and topicalization, in Scandinavian. I assume a split-CP structure, in which the verb moves to Fin, the declarative complementizer is in Force, and subordinating elements are in Sub. Under the assumption that V2 topicalization is an A'-OP-movement, I propose that non-subject initial V2, cf. (1)b., is blocked as a result of minimality effects whenever an additional OP-movement to the left periphery takes place (cf. Haegeman 2010). The type of the latter OP depends on the clause-type (e.g. Relative; Wh-; Factive; etc.) and is selected by interpretational requirements, for instance (3)a. shows the structure of indirect questions (similar structures are proposed in detail for other clause-types). By contrast, (3)b. shows the structure of an embedded V2 declarative clause where topicalization takes place.

- (3) a. [_{SubP} Wh-OP_{Sub[+int]} Force_[def] Ø (*_{TopP} XP)_{WhP} < Wh-OP>_{FinP} < Wh-OP>_{Fin} Ø_{[IP...}
 b. [_{SubP} [+decl]_{ForceP} OP_{ass} Force_[+ass] at/att/að_{TopP} XP<-OP_{ass}>_{FinP} <XP-OP_{ass}>_{Fin} V_{[IP...}

Embedded topicalization is explained as movement of an operator associated to the A'-fronted constituent, whose function is to check interpretative features related to

¹ A further refinement on the type of fronted XPs may be desirable, following Hrafnbjargarson and Wiklund's (2009) proposal. In the present paper I consider specifically fronting of arguments.

assertivity/main point of utterance/speaker's commitment². The presentation is organized as follows: section 1 briefly illustrates the distribution of V2 in different types of embedded clauses; section 2 explains the background assumptions and the approach adopted; section 3 illustrates the proposal and accounts for the ungrammaticality of embedded V2 in contexts where minimality effects are triggered; section 4 provides an account for the grammaticality of embedded subject-initial V2 in Icelandic by contrast to its ungrammaticality in Mainland Scandinavian. In this respect, it is argued that the scope of verb movement in embedded V2 clauses is related to its ability to check finiteness, tense and mood features in a grammar, among other factors (cf. Eide 2008a and b; Sigurðsson 2009). The last section summarizes the proposal and illustrates the avenues for future research.

Aboh, E. (2005) "Deriving relative and factive constructions in Kwa". In: Brugè L, Giusti G., Munaro N., Schweikert W., Turano G. (Eds.), *Contributions to the Thirtieth Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*. Libreria Editrice Cafoscarina, Venezia, pp. 265–285/ Benincà P; Poletto C. (2004) "Topic, Focus and V2: defining the CP sublayers", in Rizzi, L. (ed.) (2004) *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol.2, New York, Oxford University Press./ Brandtler J. (2008) "On the structure of Swedish subordinate clauses", *WPSS*, 81, 79-97./ Cardinaletti A., (2004) Toward a Cartography of Subject Positions. In *The Structure of CP and IP. The cartography of syntactic structures*, vol. 2, ed. by Luigi Rizzi, 115- 165. Oxford: Oxford University Press./ Duffield N. (2008) "Aspects of Vietnamese clausal structure: separating tense from assertion", *Linguistics* 45–4 (2007), 765–814./ Eide, K. M. (2008)a. "Finiteness. The haves and the have-nots". *Advances in Comparative Germanic Syntax*. Artemis Alexiadou, Jorge Hankamer, Thomas McFadden, Justin Nüger & Florian Schäfer (eds.). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins/ Eide, K. M. (2008)b. "Norwegian Mood" Chapter in B. Rothstein and R. Thieroff (eds.): *Mood in European Languages*, in Studies in language companion, Benjamins./ Franco I. (to app.) "Issues in the syntax of Scandinavian embedded clauses", to app. in *WPSS*/ Haegeman, L. (2006), "Argument fronting in English, Romance CLLD and the left Periphery". In: Zanuttini, R., Campos, H. Herburger, E., Portner, P. (Eds.), *Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture: Cross-linguistic Investigations*. Georgetown University Press, pp. 27-52./ Haegeman L. (2010) "The internal syntax of adverbial clauses", *Lingua* 120, 628-648./ Heycock, C. (2006) Embedded Root Phenomena. In: Everaert, Martin and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell companion to syntax*. Vol II: 174-209./ Holmberg A. and Platzack C. (1995) *The role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*, Oxford University Press. / Hooper J.; Thompson S. (1973) "On the applicability of root transformations". *Linguistic Inquiry* 4, 465-497./ Hrafnbjargarson G. H. (2008) "Liberalizing modals and floating clause boundaries", *WPSS*/ Hróarsdóttir Þ.; Bentzen K.; Wiklund A. L.; Hrafnbjargarson G. H. (2007) "The afterglow of verb movement" in *WPSS* 80, pp. 45-75, Lund University./ Julien M. (2007) "Embedded V2 in Norwegian and Swedish" in *WPSS* 80, pp. 103-161, Lund University. / Julien, M. (2009) "The Force of Embedded V2", ms. University of Lund./ Hrafnbjargarson G.H. & Wiklund A.L. (2009) "General embedded V2: Icelandic A, B, C, etc.", *WPSS* 84 (2009), 21–51./ Meinunger A. (2004) "Verb position, verbal mood and the anchoring (potential) of sentences", in Lohnstein H. and Trissler S. (eds.), *The syntax and semantics of the left periphery*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, 313-41./ Platzack C. (2009) "Backward Binding and the C-T Phase: A Case of Syntactic Haplology", ms. University of Lund./ Rizzi L. (1990) *Relativized Minimality*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass./ Rizzi L. (1997), "The fine structure of the left periphery" in L. Haegeman, ed, *Elements of Grammar*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 281-337. / Rögnvaldsson E.; Thráinsson H. (1990) "On Icelandic word order once more" in *Modern Icelandic Syntax, Syntax and Semantics* 24, pp. 3-39, Academic Press Inc./ Sigurðsson H. (2009) "Mood in Icelandic", ms. University of Lund./ Thráinsson H., (2007) *The syntax of Icelandic*. Cambridge University Press./ Vikner S., (1995) *Verb movement and expletive subjects in the Germanic languages*. New York: Oxford University Press./ Wiklund A.-L.; Hrafnbjargarson G. H; Bentzen K.; Hróarsdóttir Þ.; (2009) "On the distribution and illocution of V2 in Scandinavian *that*-clauses", to

2 There is a poignant debate on the interpretive properties of embedded topicalization, cf. Wiklund et al. 2009; Julien 2007 and 2009; and Meinunger 2004 for some accounts. The exact identification of the feature in question is out of the scope of the paper, and the specific interpretation of embedded topicalization (and V2) in Scandinavian is left to future research.

app. in *Lingua*./ Zanuttini, R., Portner, P., (2003). "Exclamative clauses: at the syntax-semantics interface". *Language* 79, 39-81.