STiL – Studies in Linguistics Vol. 2, 2008
CISCL Working Papers

V1, V2 and criterial movement in Icelandic*

Irene Franco
University of Siena - CISCL
franco12@unisi.it

In this paper I argue that V1 and V2 orders are the outcome of criterial movement to the CP layer of, respectively, a null OP and an XP. Under the assumption that discourse-related properties are encoded in the CP, I propose a cartographic analysis of the mechanisms determining V1 and V2 orders in Icelandic. I show that the labels V2 and V1 are too generic and misleading because they cover constructions with different interpretive properties. On the one hand there are V2 orders found in declarative clauses, which can be distinguished into topic- or subject-initial. On the other hand, V1 orders are marked constructions, where the verb moves to a high position in CP and is preceded by a null OP with a scope-discourse related function. As a consequence, "pure" verb-initial constructions are not found in Icelandic, and, more generally, in Scandinavian. Nonetheless, it is syntactically visible that topic-initial declarative V2 and subject-initial V2 have different pragmatics with respect to what is commonly labelled as V1.

1. Introduction

A unitary account of the verb second (V2) phenomena must explain what is its underlying mechanism and how this is related to the imposition of interface conditions on syntax. Whether V2 is the result of V-to-I (specifically to the higher agreement projection in IP) in the so-called symmetric V2 languages (i.e. Insular Scandinavian and Yiddish) or the result of V-to-C movement both in main and subordinate clauses is still under debate.[1] Against the first of these two possibilities, proposed by Holmberg and Platzack (1995) a. o., Hróarsdóttir et al. (2007) provide an argument based on evidence from ECM clauses: "Since ECM infinitives lack the CP domain […] but contain the IP domain of the clause […], verb movement in these infinitives should be impossible in Icelandic […]. This prediction is indeed borne out:[…]

* This paper is the outcome of research carried out within the graduate program in Cognitive Science at the Interdepartmental Centre of Cognitive Studies on Language (CISCL) of the University of Siena. I want to thank my advisor Luigi Rizzi for his insights and the fruitful discussions; Cecilia Poletto, my coadvisor, for her sharp comments and useful indications; Ian Roberts for his willingness to discuss the issues raised here many times, Liliane Haegeman, Christer Platzack and Anders Holmberg for their precious feed-backs; Hoski Thráinsson, Jóhannes Gísli Jónsson, Tolli Eyþórsson, Sigga Sigurjónsdóttir and the faculty and students at the Institute of Linguistics of Háskóli Íslands for the opportunity to work with them, for their interest towards my research, comments and useful advice.
[1] In the present work I do not address the recent account of V2 as remnant movement, developed by a group of researchers from the University of Tromsø.

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

(1) Hann taldi hana (*hafa) alltaf (hafa) sungið í sturtunni
he believed her have always have sung in shower.the[…]" (p. 49).

Cecilia Poletto (p.c.) points out that the analysis of control vs. raising and ECM infinitives based on a rough distinction between CP and IP levels is out of date and needs refinements. Indeed, Thráinsson (2007) presents some sets of data whose interpretation is controversial, specifically because what are generally analysed as ECM or raising complements are "rather resistant to modification by sentence adverbs" (see Thráinsson (2007), examples (8.111) and (8.119), pp. 439; 443). According to Thráinsson's data[2], the presence of a "higher adverb" (following Cinque's (1995) hierarchy) degrades this type of clauses regardless the linear order of Adv and V, therefore judging the presence of verb movement becomes difficult in this context.
For the present purposes the exact target position of V in embedded V2 clauses of languages with symmetric V2 is not strictly relevant: either identification with Fin or AgrS allows for a distinction from the target of verb movement in V1 orders.
I present an alternative to Holmberg and Platzack's (1995) proposal, but I leave the determination of such target position to future research. For ease of exposition, I don't address the debate throughout the paper, but assume that symmetric V2 can still be considered V-to-C, and focus on the configurational properties of V2 (whose order is XP-V) at a more abstract level. I address what is commonly considered a basic condition for the realization of V2, namely the requirement that one XP is fronted to the first position.
Roberts and Roussou (2002) identify this condition as follows: "… the head containing T must have a filled specifier", where "the head containing T" is a C-head in the specific V2 case. I will call it "Filled-Spec requirement":

(2) Filled-Spec requirement
The Specifier of the position occupied by V in V2 configurations must be filled.

The condition expressed in (2) is purely descriptive, and presupposes that the verb, wherever it ends up, creates a local configuration with the XP in first position. Without a deeper understanding of the syntactic device generating V2, the reasons to have a locality relation at this point of the derivation remain mysterious. Along the lines of Rizzi's most recent development of the concept of locality, such as criterial movement and freezing effects[3], discourse-related properties require the satisfaction of certain criteria. The standard way to meet a criterion consists of a head bearing the relevant criterial feature and probing a phrase with a matching feature. The goal is then moved to the specifier position of the criterial projection, where the relevant feature can be interpreted.
The main empirical problem that (2) must face is the presence of productive V1 orders in most Germanic languages. If (2) is a condition applying pervasively to verb movement in Germanic, then the possibility of V1 is unexpected. Otherwise we can assume (2) to hold only in V2 constructions, not in V1. However, (2) does not provide an adequate explanation, but only a description of V2. Following Rizzi's idea that movement to CP is criterial, I propose to replace the requirement in (2) with that in (3) below:

[2] Whose judgment contrasts with that of (1) in the quotation above…
[3] See Rizzi (2004); (2007) and Rizzi and Shlonsky (2006) a. o.

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

(3) The Criterial-Movement requirement
In a construction of form XP…V, XP moves to the first position to meet a criterion and ends up in local configuration with the verb.

The assumptions underlying this perspective are that V1 and V2 are distinct phenomena, and that V1 is a spurious set, nonetheless they are both generated by movement to a criterial position.
My argument is based on evidence from Icelandic in comparison with Mainland Scandinavian languages and is developed as follows. Section 2. illustrates the syntactically different distribution of V1 and V2 orders, and disambiguates between V1 orders and constructions that are V2 in disguise, despite looking as V1 orders on the surface. Section 3. gives an interpretation of the data considered, analysing different types of V1 as null OP- V orders. Section 4 is the conclusion.
Two technical remarks are in order: first, in the paper I often use the terms "Topic" and "topicalization". Although the model assumed is the one proposed by Rizzi (1997)b., it is out of the scope of the paper to distinguish between Topic and Focus in V2 constructions, as further research is needed on this point. I do not exclude that what is called Topic here is indeed a Focus, with the exception of Expletive-V constructions.
Secondly, in order to represent the different configuration of V1 and V2 constructions, I had to face the issue of the reduction of the periphery. A still open question is whether the periphery is always fully projected but some nodes cannot be target of internal/external merge or only necessary nodes are projected[4]. Because I cannot enter this discussion here, I use the terms "active" or "activation" instead of the less neutral "projected" or "present", with regard to the syntactic structure.

2. Different distribution of V1 and V2

In this section I show how the presence of productive V1 in Icelandic is still compatible with the requirement that verb movement to the CP domain is associated to movement of an XP to the first position. In the previous section, I have argued that the XP movement to the first position is imposed for the satisfaction of a criterion. In order to prove this hypothesis, I present some facts concerning the distribution of V1 and V2 orders. First, I describe the syntactic environment where V1 orders occur. Secondly, I compare it with other clauses where V1 is not possible, but V2 is, distinguishing between real V1 and disguised V2.

2.1. V1 orders

Verb first orders are quite common in Insular Scandinavian among other languages (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:

(4) Far Þú/ Farðu heim! (Icelandic)
Go you/go-you home
'Go home!'

[4] A position in this debate is offered by Starke (2004) a. o.

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

(5) *Hann sagði [að farðu heim]
He said that go-you home

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

Imperatives cannot be found in embedded clauses in Icelandic. Platzack (to app.) analyzes Old Icelandic and Old Scandinavian, where embedded imperatives are indeed possible. He observes that the imperative verb cannot raise all the way up to CP, because the projection encoding [Force] is [+ declarative] and realized as a complementizer head, which mismatches with the imperative force of the verb. Embedded imperatives are then possible because the obligatory subject is the rescuing strategy: the overt subject checks the relevant phi-features on T.

(6) Jak manar thik…At thu sigh mik sannindh (Old Swedish)
I advise you that you say-IMP me truth-the
'I advise you to tell me the truth'

[Platzack to app., 64: (28)a.]

Platzack maintains that there is no EPP feature associated with T in this case: in fact imperatives are bare stem and don't need to pick up any morphology in T (thus they cannot check the phi-feature on T, despite being equidistant goal with subjects in Spec,vP). Platzack's hypothesis, then, is that embedded imperatives stay lower[5]. Lack of EPP is proved by the presence of pseudo-OV word order in Old Icelandic and Old Scandinavian, where the finite verb precedes the object both in main clauses and in embedded clauses, but the non-finite verb follows the object as in (7) below:

(7) Skalt Þú jafnan Þessu sæti halda (Old Icelandic)
Shall you always this seat keep
'You will always keep this seat'

[Platzack to app., 66: (31)b.]

Once the option of OV orders is lost, embedded imperatives are no longer possible.
Doing away with the difficulty posed by Old Icelandic and Old Swedish, we can see that 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, Germanic (among other languages) requires subject-verb inversion in that context, whereas inversion is not triggered when the question is indirect:

(8) a. **Hefur** Jón ekki [lesið bókina]? (Icelandic)
Has John not read the book

[5] I report Platzack's explanation: "there are two possible ways to delete this EPP-feature: either by the pronoun *thu* or by the imperative verb. Since the structure we are deriving is embedded under a declarative complementiser, we know from the discussion above that it will crash if the imperative verb with its feature [+κIMP] is placed in T_{Ev}. Hence, the only way to delete [¬φ] in T_{Ev} is to raise the pronoun to $SpecTP_{Ev}$. This account predicts both that the subject pronoun must be overt in embedded imperatives, and that it must precede the imperative verb." (See p. 65 of Platzack's paper for further details).

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

b. **Las** Jón ekki [___ bókina]?
Read John not the book

[Thráinsson 2007, 28: (2.21)]

(9) **Heldur** tú, at Zakaris seldi Eivindi tann gamla bilin? (Faroese)
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.]

(10) Hann spyr hvort Jón **taki** bækurnar (Icelandic)
He asks if John take(pres.subj.) books-the

[Thráinsson 2007, 397: (8.7)a.]

In the subordinate clause in (10) the verb does not raise to the first position: when a polar question is embedded, V1 order is no longer grammatical. Notice that "inversion" regards the verb and the element occupying the subject position, regardless case-marking. This is shown by Icelandic, where the dative experiencer is the subject of raising predicates:

(11) a. **Virtist** *henni* hesturinn hafa týnt knapanum? (Icelandic)
Seemed her(D) horse-the(N) have lost jockey-the
'Did it seem to her that the horse had lost its jockey?'

b. ***Virtist** hesturinn *henni* hafa týnt knapanum?
Seemed horse-the to-her have lost jockey-the

[Thráinsson 2007, 440: (8.114)a.; b.]

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, see Thráinsson et alia (2004), p. 239):

(12) **Koma** Þeir nú að stórum helli og… (Icelandic)
Come they now to big cave and
'Then they get to a big cave and…'

[Thráinsson 2007, 29: (2.22)b.]

(13) […] **Hitti** hann har nakrar studentar úr Íslandi og **sótu** teir har leingi (Faroese)
met he there some student from Iceland and sat they there long

[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). However, Thráinsson's judgement on (14) is not accepted uncontroversially by other speakers who do not really like the sentence:

(14) (?) Hann sagði [að **hefðu** Þeir Þá komið að stórum helli og...] (Icelandic)
He said that had(subj.) they then come to big cave and..

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

(15) 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)]

A refinement comes from the comparison between (14) and (15). Thráinsson (2007) observes that the option in (15)c. is fine and sounds like narrative V1, whereas the one in b. is just bad. The reason of this split may reside in the fact that two different phenomena are at play in (15). The first conjunct in the subordinate clause in (15) is clearly an instance of V2 (cf. with (14) above, not accepted), and the second conjunct is expected to display the same structure. However, a V2 order is not possible in (15)b. because the first position of a V2 structure is left empty, contrary to (15)a., where the subject moves[6] to CP. The structure of the second conjunct in (15)c. is thus different from that of (15)a. and b.
The crucial difference in (15)c. is that 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. More specifically, the impossibility to embed V1 clauses is motivated syntactically with the complementary distribution of complementizers and verbs in first position. Maling (1990) describes the distribution of V1 as follows:
"First position for the finite verb (V1) is typically reserved for main clauses, namely for direct questions, imperatives and the so-called narrative style characteristic of Icelandic. In embedded clauses, the finite verb comes first in conditional sentences without the conjunction *ef*" (Maling (1990), p. 72).
The fact that V1 is common in the subordinate clauses of conditional sentences appears as a counterexample to the claim that V1 clauses cannot be embedded. 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 in complementizerless subordinate clauses: the restrictions at this point depend on the criterial properties of the clause.
Conditional V1 is indeed spread crosslinguistically, and allowed only in absence of the subordinating particle. Luigi Rizzi (p.c.) observes that English (example (20)) allows conditional V1 only in counterfactual contexts. This seems to be a semantic restriction operating at the interface level.

(16) a. Jón verður góður [*ef* hann **æfir** sig]. (Icelandic)
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' [Thráinsson 2007, 30: (2.24)]

[6] On the possibility of a criterial position in CP for subjects triggering V movement further research is needed. Specifically, it is not clear, at this point of the investigation, whether pronominal subjects in Insular Scandinavian pattern like expletives or like lexical subjects.

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

(17) a. Bókin kemur út til jóla, *um* það **gongst** eftir ætlan (Faroese)
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.'
[Thráinsson et alia 2004, 293: (181)c.]

(18) a. Sie schaute ihn an, als *ob* er ein großes Verbrechen begangen **hätte** (German)
b. Sie schaute ihn an, als **hätte** er ein großes Verbrechen begangen
She looked him at as if/had he a big crime committed

(19) 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
[Vikner 1995, 44: (20); (22)]

(20) a. **Had** you studied more, you would have passed the test (English)
b. **If* **had** you studied more, you would have passed the test

Two further remarks are in order. First, 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 a revision, because what is called "residual V2" may indeed be a case of V1 and the two notions are distinct, as becomes evident in the following sections.
The second remark consists of the fact that the Icelandic sentences in (16)a. and b. are not only different as for the verb position in the subordinate clause, but also for the mood expressed in it. Notice that verb raising to first position in (16)b. is associated with subjunctive morphology, while the verb in a lower position comes in the indicative ((16)a.). Discussing the role played by subjunctive mood in the interpretation of a clause would take much longer than a paragraph in a paper, thus I do not address the issue here. However, it is worth pointing out that the distribution of subjunctive, the "irrealis" mood, is generally more frequent in dependent clauses and related to their criterial properties[7]. From a syntactic perspective, a concrete hypothesis for explaining the facts in (16) is that the presence of subjunctive may obviate the lack of a complementizer typing the clause as conditional. However, the presence of subjunctive and that of certain clause-type features cannot be accounted for as a one-to-one correspondence. I leave this issue for future research, while in the next subsection I concentrate on the differences between V1 and V2 orders.

[7] Thráinsson (2007) himself argues that "if- clauses standardly take the indicative […] the subjunctive is standardly used in (preposed) conditional clauses if the subordinating conjunction is omitted […] this indicates further that the semantics of the conditional clauses is related to that of the subjunctive" (pp. 405-406).

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

2.2. Genuine V1 and disguised V2 in Icelandic

With respect to the theoretical framework proposed in section 1., not all cases of V1 orders are so uncontroversial as those just illustrated. In this section I show that some cases of embedded V1 are not problematic, because they are reanalyzed as disguised V2 orders, for which (3) is still satisfied.

Haeberli (2002) presents the facts in (21) below as related to the possibility of having productive V1 in Icelandic[8] embedded clauses, in contrast to Yiddish, which allows V1 only in main clauses, as (22) shows:

(21) a. Því er sennilegt að **rigni** meira á morgun (Icelandic)
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'

(22) a. * Er hot gefregt, tsi **iz** varem in shtub (Yiddish)
He has asked if is warm in room

b. * Ikh hob nit gevust, az **geyn** keyn Grinland azoy fil shifn
I have not known that go to Greenland so many ships
[Haeberli 2002, 342-343: (58); (59)]

Examples a. are impersonal constructions, examples b. are cases of postponed subjects.

Haeberli explains the difference between (21) and (22) under the assumption that in Icelandic a null expletive is optionally licensed in Spec, CP. If (21) is considered as an instance of embedded V1, then it is not clear why, in this case, the verb and the complementizer *að* are licensed in the same clause. My answer is that (21) is not a case of embedded V1, but of V2, with a null expletive in first position, as proposed by Haeberli. Notice that the embedded clauses in (21)a. and b. are declaratives. Maling (1990) observes that surface V1 in embedded clauses is possible only in presence of a subject gap:

(23)a. Þetta er handritið sem *hann* **skrifaði** eftir (Icelandic)
this is the-manuscript that he copied from
b. *Þetta er handritið sem **skrifaði** *hann* eftir
[Maling 1990, 84: (42)]

The argument against embedded V1[9] can be summarized as follows:

a. embedded V1 is possible only when a subject gap is present (no V1 with subject NPs)

b. main V1 is possible regardless the presence of a subject

→ main V1 and embedded V1 must be different phenomena.

Maling describes subject gaps as a characteristic of one of the following constructions:

[8] Declarative V1 is found in Swedish as well, but has a completely different distribution from Icelandic. Specifically, V1 declaratives cannot be embedded (see Mörnsjö (2002)). I discuss Swedish in the next subsection.

[9] With the exception of the conditional clauses previously discussed.

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

(i) extraction of the subject NP
(ii) impersonal passives or lexically impersonal predicates
(iii) indefinite NP-postposing
The contexts in which subordinate V1 is found in Icelandic are given in the following examples:
Declaratives ((21) is repeated below as (24)):

(24) a. Því er sennilegt *að* **rigni** meira á morgun (impersonal construction)
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 (postponed subject)
I knew not that went to Greenland so many ships
'I didn't know that so many ships went to Greenland'

(25) Þá gæti enginn sagt með vissu, *að* svo **hefði** verið (with Stylistic Fronting)
then could no-one say with certainty, that so had been
["Tilhugalíf", Ch. 5, in Maling 1990, 75: (7)d.]

Indirect questions:
(26) a. Hann spurði *hvar* __ væri ennþá ekið vinstra megin (impersonal construction)
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)]

(25) and (26)b. are a case of Stylistic Fronting (SF): the first position, otherwise empty, is occupied by a fronted element. Overt expletives are generally licensed when non-selected and clause-initial, otherwise the preverbal position can be occupied by a null expletive, as the contrast between (26)a. and c. shows. (27) below shows that SF and null expletives have the same distribution.

Relative clauses:
(27) Maðurinn *sem* **farinn** var/ __ var farinn heim heitir Pétur
The-man that gone had/ __ had gone home is-named Peter
[Maling 1990, 73: (4)c.]

Notice that in the cases just presented a complementizer or a subordinating particle (in italics) is present despite the initial position of the verb, in contrast to the cases of main clause V1 illustrated in section 2.1. above.
The explanation of this difference is that Icelandic embedded V1 is indeed a case of disguised V2. In fact, in *declarative clauses* the subject gaps "must be filled in order to satisfy V2, either by stylistic fronting or by *Það*-insertion […]."(Maling (1990), p. 85). This accounts for the following facts, contrasting with (24) above:

(28) a. ?Þeir segja [að __ verði dansað í brúðkaupinu]

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

They say that will-be danced in wedding-the
b. Þeir segja [að **Það** verði dansað í brúðkaupinu]
They say that there will-be danced in wedding-the
[Thráinsson 2007, 335: (7.35)]

The answer to the dilemma raised by the contrast between (24) and (28)a. comes from Sigurðsson (1990). He provides a different description of subject gaps and argues that the presence of *það* in embedded declaratives with non-topical subjects is not necessary. The fact that *það*-insertion is not required in some embedded declaratives is compatible with the facts in (24) above. Embedded declarative clauses with an unfilled subject gap can be considered a marginal option, strictly related to the presence of a non-topical subject as a syntactic constraint and to discourse related properties (cf. Sigurðsson (1990)).
Let's assume that null expletives in embedded declaratives with non-topical subjects are just an option, whereas *það*-insertion is preferred in certain binding contexts (cf. Sigurðsson (1990)). Furthermore, subject gaps cannot host overt expletives in clauses inherently containing gaps (Maling (1990); Sigurðsson (1990)). Then the two possible embedded structures codifying the first position in the examples (24); (25)-(27) above are:

(29) a. [decl]: [Matrix **[XP/ Það /(^{ok}/?__) V (t_{XP})]**]
b. [rel/Wh-/compar./etc.]: [Matrix **[XP/__ /(*Það) V (t_{XP})]**]

In (29) XP- t_{XP} is the chain created by stylistic fronting; __ represents a subject gap, and *það* is the expletive.
Further research is also needed on the distribution of *það* and null expletives, as the judgments seem to vary a lot, especially among speakers of different ages. One possible explanation for the distribution of *það* and null expletives has to do with the way in which Icelandic satisfies the Subject Criterion[10]. Because of the availability of null expletives, in Icelandic it is possible to have certain kinds of subject extraction, in a similar way to null subject languages, where merger of *pro* in the criterial position allows for subject extraction. On the other hand, Icelandic has only non-referential null expletives, thus it may as well adopt a different strategy of subject extraction, similar to the one found in non-null subject languages as French (see Rizzi and Roberts (1989) on the *que/qui* alternation in French). In sum, Icelandic displays a certain optionality in the way to satisfy the Subject Criterion and extract the subject: either non-referential *pro* or *það* is merged, or the relevant features on Fin are valued by movement. In the second case, there is reason to believe[11] that, in default contexts

[10] The Subject Criterion is a reformulation of ECP and EPP principles: the unmovability of subjects and their obligatoriness are in support of the idea that subjects must satisfy a criterion and undergo criterial freezing (cf. Rizzi (2004) and Rizzi and Shlonsky (2006)).
[11] Evidence for the point I am making here comes from the typological differences between Icelandic and other Scandinavian complementizer systems, specifically from the selectional properties of the different complementizer heads as I found them in the data sets in Thráinsson (2007). For instance, in subject indirect questions a subject relative pronoun follows the Wh- pronoun, whereas this is impossible in Icelandic (which admits only Wh- pronouns):
(i) Jeg ved ikke, hvem der/**e* __ har boet I det hus. (Danish)
I know not who that has lived in that house
(ii) ég veit ekki hver *sem/*e* __ kemur (Icelandic)
I know not who that came

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

in Icelandic, the features specified on Fin, driving intermediate movement to a Criterial position, may be purely formal in the sense of Rizzi (2004, p.10). That means that *any category* can potentially satisfy the subject criterion, which is what happens with stylistic fronting.[12]

Diachronic studies on Old Norse shed some light on the availability of null expletives in Icelandic. Among the characteristics of Old Norse there is a massive presence of V1 which covers a wider range of pragmatic contexts than that of Narrative Inversion, a marked word order. Old Norse V1 is found in sentences with a subject in low position (as there are more positions available for subjects in this language, see Faarlund (2008), p. 230) or in subjectless sentences. Faarlund (2008) divides subjectless sentences into 2 kinds:

a) Sentences without an external argument (containing impersonal verbs; psych-verbs; double accusative verbs; mental process verbs; *like*-type verbs; passives; gerunds). For instance:

(30) súrnar í augunum (Old Norse)
becomes-sour in eyes.D-the
'one's eyes are smarting'
[Faarlund, 2008, 217: (57)c.]

b) Sentences with unexpressed external arguments (impersonal use of otherwise regular verbs; ergative constructions; comparatives; non-specific subjects). For instance:

(31) má Þar ekki stórskipum fara (Old Norse)
can there not big-ships.D travel
[Faarlund, 2008, 221: (69)c.]

Notice that both sentence kinds can be rendered with an expletive construction in Icelandic. Furthermore, in Old Norse clausal subjects are usually either extraposed, resulting in V1 constructions, or they are resumed by the demonstrative *þat* of which they are complement:

(32) satt er **Þat**, at mj□k er niðr fallit ríki Haralds konungs ins hárfagra
true.N is that.N,that much is down fallen kingdom.N Harald.G king the hair-fine.DEF
'It is true that King Harald the Fine-haired's kingdom has suffered a great decline'
[Faarlund, 2008, 224: (75)a.]

Old Norse lacks the expletive *það*, thus the hypothesis is that the latter is the diachronic evolution of the demonstrative *þat*, which has a very similar distribution, although it may alternate with a null element. Once the lexical entry for the expletive is available in the language, the presence of V1 order decreases dramatically and the form Expl-V is preferred. [13]

(see Thráinsson (2007), pp. 448-9 for further details). Such properties are allegedly related to the amount of feature specification on the head, which I assume to be Fin.

[12] An accurate description of subject extraction strategies and the characteristic of Icelandic Fin is currently under investigation.

[13] Þórhallur Eyþórsson (p.c.) confirms that hypothesis.

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

The fact that, in contemporary Icelandic, unfilled subject gaps in embedded declarative clauses are not always licensed or can alternatively be filled by the overt expletive *það* or by stylistic fronting, proves that embedded V1 is indeed V2 in disguise. We can see that the (purely descriptive) Filled-spec requirement on V2 does not admit a gap "*e"* in first position. With regard to embedded relative, Wh- or comparative clauses the Criterial Movement Requirement in (3) is expressed with the Subject Criterion, along the lines of Rizzi (2004).[14] In this framework, in order to have a well-formed V2 structure, what is really needed is meeting a criterion, not necessarily the presence of an XP in the Spec, CP position.

2.3. A comparison with Mainland Scandinavian: the case of Swedish declarative V1.
In her doctoral dissertation, Mörnsjö (2002) illustrates different cases of V1 declaratives in spoken Swedish. This kind of V1 orders are referred to in the literature as cases of "Topic drop", although the label "Topic" is quite generic and prone to the attribution of different discourse-related properties such as "aboutness" (i.e. argumental topics), rather than pertinence to the "frame" (e.g. adverbial topics). Mörnsjö (2002) identifies the conditions licensing topic drop with the presence of a presupposition that the speaker estimates as belonging to the communicative common ground he shares with her interlocutor and, as such, he can drop. This pragmatic characterization of Swedish V1 declaratives is substantially different from the syntactic properties licensing embedded V1 in Icelandic. As a matter of fact, Swedish topic drop is impossible in embedded clauses:

(33) Här är pajen. $Ø_i$ kan du sätta in t_i 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'

(34) *Han pekade på pajen och sa [att Ø kan du satta 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)]

In (33) V1 is the result of topic drop: the object is topicalized to a specifier position in the high left periphery: the V2 configuration is thus created. Then the object is "dropped" at the interface and becomes silent because it is presupposed from previous discourse. This is possible with a full-blown peripheral structure, as is found in root clauses, whereas topic drop is ungrammatical in embedded clauses, as (34) shows. The reason for this ungrammaticality resides in the structural (and interpretive) properties of selected clauses in Mainland Scandinavian. Notice that Swedish does not allow null expletives:

(35) *På lördag ska åka till Paris (Swedish)
on Saturday shall go to Paris
[Mörnsjö, 2002, 12: (2:3)]

[14] This is still work in progress. The idea that the feature on Icelandic Fin is purely formal was first expressed by Rizzi and Shlonsky in a brief manuscript on quirky subjecthood: this option is not available for Mainland Scandinavian, as will be clarified later on. Another reason in support of it is the fact that stylistic fronting, despite being identified as head movement to Fin, meets all the interface conditions and rescues the structure.

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

In (35) the first position is occupied by a topicalised adverbial, and no topic-drop takes place. Whatever the interpretation of the omitted subject could be, the result is still ungrammatical, contrary to Icelandic where a non-referential subject can be a null expletive:

(36) Svo byriaði Ø að rigni og rigni (Icelandic)
then began to rain and rain

[Example from the web]

Swedish declarative V1 is thus an interface phenomenon which can be still considered V2 syntactically, with a first, empty position.
I suspect that the difference between Icelandic and other Mainland Scandinavian languages depends on the parametric variations regarding the subject criterion. This hypothesis gets visible support from the crosslinguistic variations in V2 structures. The properties that are characteristic of Fin in Icelandic are not equally available in other Scandinavian languages. Consider the contrast between Icelandic and Danish in the following examples:

(37) **Hvernig** sagði hún **t** að börnin hefðu t alltaf lært sögu **t**? (Icelandic)
How said she that children-the have(COND) always learned history

(38) ***Hvordan** sagde hun **t** at børnene havde t altid lært historie **t**? (Danish)
How said she that children-the have always learned history

[Vikner 1995; 112: (118)b.]

The ungrammaticality of (38) is produced by the fact that the topicalised phrase *børnene* intervenes in the A' movement of the Wh- adverbial. This is not the case in (37) and the explanation is that the Icelandic lexical subject *börnin* is not A'-moved, but A-moved to a subject position in CP which doesn't seem equally available in Mainland Scandinavian.[15] The availability of an A-position in the Icelandic CP gets further support from the following pair:

(39) a. **Hvenær** heldur þú [að það verði ball í skólanum ___]? (Icelandic)
When think you that it will-be dance in school-the

b. ?***Hvenær** heldur þú [að í skólanum verði ball ___ ___]?
When think you that in school-the will-be dance

[Thráinsson 2007, 329: (6.44)b.; (6.45)b.]

The ungrammaticality of (39)b. is due to the intervention of the topicalised phrase *í skólanum* with the A'-movement of the Wh- adverb. On the contrary, no minimality effects are triggered by the expletive subject *það* in first position in (39)a. This contrast does not uniquely emerge in extraction contexts but also depends on the selectional properties of matrix clauses on their complement clauses. Consider the contrast between (40) and (41) below:

[15] Platzack (forthcoming) suggests that in Scandinavian there is evidence for one of the two subject positions described in Cardinaletti (2004) in CP. However, there seems to be crucial differences between the availability of such position in Icelandic and Mainland Scandinavian. This issue deserves further investigations.

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

(40) a. Hann sagði að **hann** gæti ekki sungið í brúðkaupinu (Icelandic)
He said that he could not sung in wedding.the

b. Hann sá eftir að **hann** hafði ekki sungið
He regretted that he had not sung

(41) a. Hann sagði að **Þetta lag** gæti hann ekki sungið í brúðkaupinu
He said that this song could he not sung in wedding.the

b. *Hann sá eftir að **Þetta lag** hafði hann ekki sungið
He regretted that this song had he not sung

[Hróarsdóttir et alia 2007, 56: (18); (19)]

The ungrammaticality of (41)b. is related to the semantic and selectional properties of the matrix clause. Whether an analysis of the facts considers as the relevant criterion the interpretation of the matrix clause as a whole (see Hróarsdóttir et alia, 2007) rather than the classification of the matrix verb as "non-bridge" (cf. Vikner, 1995), the high left periphery of the selected clause cannot host a topic. A similar contrast is found in Mainland Scandinavian, with the difference that matrix clauses of the b-type (wrt the just mentioned examples) cannot select a V2 clause, and the verb stops in a lower position. With regard to subordinate clauses, the crosslinguistic difference thus concerns the structural properties of the high left periphery in the two classes of languages. In Mainland Scandinavian V2 is only possible with a full-blown CP displaying root properties. In Icelandic it suffices to have an available subject position in order to have a V2 structure, but this is not an option for Mainland Scandinavian[16], given the different agreement properties[17].

In this section I have tried to prove that the label V1 is way too generic and groups together different syntactic phenomena.

On the one hand, V1 is found in main clauses: it is in *complementary distribution with subordinating particles and complementizers*, and is generally understood as a pragmatically marked order associated to specific clause types (imperatives, polar questions, narrative style, a.o.). This markedness is also found in certain embedded contexts (conditional clauses), provided that the syntactic conditions for a correct clause-typing are respected, i.e. there is no complementizer introducing the "if-clause". Therefore the correct interpretation of V1 orders seems to be connected to some discourse-related function, clearly visible in the syntactic structure as linear V-S order.

On the other hand, it is possible to have declarative V1. This is a problem if we agree that [declarative] is the unmarked clause-type, because then it is not possible to find a specific discourse function that distinguishes a V1 from a non-V1 declarative clause.

In order to solve this problem, I have considered the case of Icelandic. By showing that declarative V1 orders, common in Icelandic, are *compatible with complementizers* and are found in embedded clauses, I have argued that they are indeed cases of disguised V2 (with which they have the same distribution).

Notice that in all Scandinavian languages embedded V2 cooccur with complementizers and subordinating particles. This fact proves that, with V2 orders, the target of V in CP must be lower than the projection hosting complementizers. The

[16] For a comparison between Icelandic and Mainland Scandinavian on this topic see tables and data in Hróarsdóttir et al. (2007).

[17] Cf. also Holmberg and Platzack (1995).

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

assumptions are that analogue Scandinavian complementizers (e.g. *að; at; att*) are merged in the same position, and that V targets a lower position in CP in some complement clauses[18]. Clause-type features are specified on ForceP, which attracts the Scandinavian complementizers[19]. As a consequence, the target of V-movement in V2 clauses will be a head position in the lower CP area.
A comparison with spoken Swedish V1 was brought about to illustrate that declarative verb-initial order in subordinate clauses is found only in Icelandic, among the Scandinavian languages, and that it is related to the particular agreement properties of this language. Notice that the requirement in (3) covers also cases of disguised V2 in Icelandic, as in that case movement is triggered to meet the Subject Criterion.

3. Interpretation

In this section I argue that the different syntactic behavior of V1 and V2 constructions depends on interface requirements imposed by discourse-related properties.
The comparative data presented in the last part of the previous section can be interpreted as follows. The Criterial-Movement Requirement determining (declarative) V2 is satisfied in different ways crosslinguistically. In Mainland Scandinavian it results in a Topic-criterion, whereas in Icelandic the Subject Criterion itself is sufficient to obtain a V2 configuration. That doesn't imply that Mainland Scandinavian doesn't have a Subject Criterion, but only that it is not (necessarily) associated with V2[20].
On the other hand, other criteria satisfied in CP are dissociated from V2 order, as has been described so far. Namely, there are criteria, such as Interr- (for "interrogative") or Imper- (for "imperative"), which are rather associated with a superficial V1 order. In this section it becomes clear that V1 and V2 are indeed two merely descriptive but misleading labels for syntactic phenomena that are instead produced by interpretive requirements.

3.1. Interpreting V1

In his (2006) paper, Allan analyzes the illocutionary force of a clause as dependent on the presence of specific clause-type operators. Allan considers English, but his proposal can be easily extended to other languages. The basic idea is that "each clause-type has a unique **primary illocution** (PI) which provides an initial clue to the pragmatically determined illocutionary point of the utterance containing the clause" (Allan (2006), p. 2). By primary illocution, Allan means the semantics of the clause type and postulates the presence of three main PI operators: declarative (T); interrogative (Q); imperative (I), and other three secondary PI operators: hypothetical (H); expressive (X) and exclamative (!). Main PI operators stand in complementary

[18] Depending on whether the language considered has symmetric or asymmetric V2 and on whether Icelandic V2 is analysed along the lines of Holmberg and Platzack (1995) or not.
[19] Western Germanic complementizers (e.g. *dass*), must merge in the lower C-head Fin°, and successively move to Force° for clause-typing requirements. This would explain why West Germanic allows embedded V2 only in complementizerless clauses: otherwise the periphery is "locked" by Fin°-to-Force° complementizer movement. Actually one doesn't need to exclude Fin°-to-Force° movement for Scandinavian complementizers. Following a proposal by Rizzi (to appear and p.c.), Scandinavian may optionally allow for Fin recursion, if Fin is selected by a Mood phrase. The complementizer would merge in the higher projection of Fin whereby it would be free to move to Force, whereas the lower Fin is an available target position for verb movement in V2 constructions. Further investigations are being made in order to verify the plausibility of such a hypothesis.
[20] The satisfaction of the Subject Criterion resulting in a V2 structure analogous to that found in Icelandic seems marginal in Mainland Scandinavian. However this possibility is under investigation.

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

distribution among each other, namely a Q-clause cannot also be an I-clause and so forth. (T) is the default, unmarked operator. Being declaratives, topic or subject-initial main V2 clauses and subordinate V2 clauses are thus unmarked for clause-type.
Another implication in Allan's (2006) proposal contributes to the present account of V1 orders. As mentioned above, Allan demonstrates that main clause-type operators are in complementary distribution, which is why imperatives and interrogatives cannot be embedded. In section 2. I have presented cases of V1 clauses, and shown that they cannot be found in embedded clauses. From a comparison with Allan's (2006) classification of clause-types, it turns out that marked main PI operators have their syntactic realization in V1 orders in all Germanic languages (included English), as the following paradigm, with Icelandic examples, show:

(42) a. "Farðu!" (Imperative)
Go-you

b. "Fór Jón til Íslands?" (Interrogative)
Went John to Iceland

If we assume that the declarative clause-type (T) has a default value on ForceP, no clause-type feature needs to be specified in those cases. Therefore the verb is not required to move to a higher positon and be in configuration checking [clause-type] features in declaratives.
The adoption of Allan's (2006) proposal for the identification of the interpretive properties of V1 orders results in a felicitous one-to-one relation with marked clause-type values. The question now is: how is the [clause-type] feature of a clause valued and checked in the syntactic configuration?
Following Allan (2006), a hypothesis is that clause-type features can be identified with different criteria. From a syntactic perspective, what happens is that the Force head selects a clause-type headed by a specific phrase. This phrase must be visible at the interface for full interpretation, therefore it must have phonological realization, and the relevant criterion identifying the clause type must be met. In order to do so, the projection selected by Force must have either an overtly realized head or criterial movement of an overt XP to its specifier position is triggered.
Let us now consider the different clause-types corresponding to V1 orders and how they satisfy the respective criteria.

3.2. Imperative clauses
The default imperative form in Icelandic, as well as in Old Norse, consists of the verbal head plus the subject clitic form as in the second option in (4) repeated below as (43):

(43) Far þú/ Far**ðu** heim!
Go you/go-you home
'Go home!'

If we compare this subject enclitic form with the studies on Medieval Romance (Benincà (2006)) and Rhaeto-Romance (Poletto (2002)), we may hypothesize that Benincà's analysis applies to Icelandic and Old Norse as well. Benincà observes that enclitics are incompatible with FocP, but are triggered when a higher phrase is activated. From a comparison between Icelandic and Old Norse, the V1 order of

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

imperative clauses can be analyzed as verb movement to a quite high position in CP, surely higher than the Focus field, and perhaps endowed with the [+ addressee] feature. In this framework, Zanuttini (forthcoming) formulates the hypothesis of a Jussive Phrase characterizing the imperative clauses. Faarlund (2008) observes that in imperative sentences "the topic position is usually empty […] but it may also be filled by an adverbial". Dispensing with Faarlund's generic terminology for identifying the preverbal position, Old Norse facts prove that the first position could have overt realization:

(44) **þá** tak þú af tvá hluti (Old Norse)
Then take.IMP2s you.N off two parts.A
'Then withdraw two parts' [Faarlund 2008, 229: (88)]

Given the basic CP structure proposed by Rizzi (1997)b., I assume that the left periphery of some clauses is "defective". In the case of imperatives, the inflection is reduced to second person, but no Tense is specified. It seems plausible that FinP is equally not projected in this type of clauses, as suggested by Platzack and Rosengren (1998), and Belletti (1999).[21]
The preverbal adverbial *þá* in (44) is replaced by a null OP in contemporary Icelandic, which determines the scope of verb movement. The idea is that V moves to such a high position for scope-discourse related properties, namely as the overt realization of a criterial head.

3.3. Interrogative clauses
Another marked clause-type displaying V1 order is that of Y/N interrogatives, which can be analyzed in analogy with Wh-questions. There is vast literature on the target position of Wh-movement in questions, and recent cartographic approaches have identified the landing site of Wh-elements in the Focus field (see Rizzi (1997)a. and Benincà (2006) a.o.).
Rizzi (1997)a. argues that Wh-questions implement the Wh-criterion, where a spec-head configuration is created between the verb and a Wh- element. This idea can be extended to polar questions, by assuming that a null, interrogative operator (i.e. Allan's (2006) (Q) PI) replaces the Wh- element, thus satisfying an "Interr-Criterion". Straightforward evidence for the presence of an operator in Y/N questions comes from diachronic studies on Old Norse. Old Norse shows an alternation between V1 and V2 orders of the following kind:

(45) kantu n□kkut segja oss til Hákonar jarls? (Old Norse)
Can2s.-you some tell us to Hakon earl
"Can you tell us about Earl Hakon?"

(46) hvárt grært þú nú, Skarpherðinn?
Whether cry.2s you now Skarpherdin
"Are you crying now, Skarpherdin?" [Faarlund 2008; 226: (79)a.; (81)a.]

[21] Di Domenico (2004), p. 89, observes that:
"Following a suggestion of Valentina Bianchi (p.c.) I assume that the lack of FinP is connected to […] the fact that they [imperative clauses] cannot be embedded [...]. We can define imperative clauses 'non-placed expressions'. As such they are identified with (rather than related to) the speech event."

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

The question word *hvárt* can be translated with "whether" and is often accompanied by a second option introduced by *eða* (or), but "the second part of the disjunctive can be omitted. This word then comes to function as an introduction to a regular sentence question" (Faarlund (2008), p. 226). Therefore we can assume that when *hvárt* is absent there is a null OP in the specifier of the verb: the alternation thus concerns the overt/covert realization of the operator. In contemporary Icelandic, then, the overt form has been dropped in favor of a V1 order which can be understood as null OP-V.

As for the position targeted by the verb I refer to a recent debate in the cartographic approach. Benincà and Poletto (2004) argue, *contra* Rizzi, that the lower (criterial) position above FinP can be identified with a Focus, not with a Topic. Supposing Benincà and Poletto (2004) are right, the expectation is that a Focus lower than a [+interrogative] V in its criterial position is ruled out, because movement of the interrogative OP and the Focus-OP would trigger minimality effects. The expectation is borne out by facts:

(47) a. *Fór **til Íslands** Jón/hann? (Icelandic)
Went to Iceland J/he
b. Fór Jón/hann til Íslands?
Went J/he to Iceland
c. *Hefur **margar bækur** Jón/hann lesið?
Has many books J/he read
d. Hefur Jón/hann lesið margar bækur?
Has J/he read many books

Because the 2nd person subject pronoun optionally comes as enclitic on the verb, [+interr]V is incompatible with the activation of Focus (Benincà (2006), cf. above).

(48) a. Ertu búinn?
Are-you ready
b. Heitirðu Jón Jónsson?
Are-called-you J.J.
'Is your name J.J.?'

The target position of the verb must be located higher than the Focus position, presumably on the head of an Interr- projection, and is preceded by a null OP undergoing criterial movement.

3.4 Conditional clauses

In section 1. I have also considered another instance of V1 order which is also found in embedded context, namely conditional clauses without subordinating particles. The embeddability of conditionals is explained if we agree with Allan (2006). He argues that most hypotheticals (H) "do not contrast with T, Q, and I but fall within dependent clauses in the scope of one of these PI operators whose illocutions they modify to apply to hypothetical worlds […]" (p. 26). How come, then, that these clauses, which are not equivalent to Q and I (the marked values of main clause-types), may have V1 order? First of all notice that the same clause-typing function can be optionally carried out in a different way. Hypothetical clauses are marked as *irrealis* [-R]. It is worth pointing out that the distinction between the categories of *realis* and *irrealis* is not always clear cut, but there is a lot of crosslinguistic overlapping between the two. According to Allan (2006) a. o., at the opposite sides of the *realis/irrealis* split are

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

declaratives [+R], and hypotheticals, counterfactuals, intensionals, traditional subjunctives [-R], whereas interrogatives and imperatives are in between.
Clause-types are located in the scale of reality as follows (cfr. Allan (2006) a. o.):

+R _____- R
Declarative Imperative Interrogative Intensional/Hypothetical/Counterfactual

The characterization of a clause as *irrealis*, as in the case of hypotheticals, seems to have consequences on its syntactic behavior. In order to be marked as [-R], hypotheticals may use a specific verbal mood, i. e. subjunctive. The employ of subjunctive varies across languages.
Consider first the case of Icelandic in (14), repeated below as (49):

(49) a. Jón verður góður [ef hann **æfir** sig]. (Icelandic)
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"

In a conditional clause introduced by a complementizer ((49)a.) the verbal mood is the indicative, thus we must assume that the clause is marked [-R] configurationally (*ef* in ForceP; the verb in the low CP area), rather than with the verbal morphology. On the contrary, in complementizerless hypotheticals ((49)b.) the *irrealis* is marked both morphologically (subjunctive mood) and configurationally (V-to-Force).
Consider now the German example (18), repeated below as (50):

(50) a. Sie schaute ihn an, als *ob* er ein großes Verbrechen begangen **hätte** (German)
b. Sie schaute ihn an, als **hätte** er ein großes Verbrechen begangen
She looked him at as if/had he a big crime committed

Differently from Icelandic, German requires the use of *Konjunctiv II* in both the *ob*-clause and the V1 clause. Alternatively, other languages that do not have a specific morphology for subjunctive make obviative use of indicative forms, as in the case of English:

(51) a. If we **were** rich, we would buy a boat.
b. If I **were/*was** rich, I would buy a boat.
c. **Had** he invited me, I would have come.

The use and interpretation of subjunctive, as well as the relation between verbal mood and clause-typing mechanisms, deserve further investigation, which I leave to future research.
At present I limit my observations to the fact that subjunctive seems to play a role in marking the clause as [-R]. In this sense, its function is consistent with that of V1 in conditionals (see the German example above), whereas other clause-types are characterized by a different verbal mood (e.g. imperative mood in imperative clauses). Faarlund ((2008), p. 246), on the other hand, attributes the possibility of using

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

subjunctive to the lack of factivity in a clause[22]. For instance, as imperative is not possible in embedded clauses, subjunctive is instead used with the semantic function of marking the clause as optative (see also Platzack, to app.).
Notice that the presence of a complementizer, in complementary distribution with the verb in first position, is crucial for typing a clause as (H). Therefore we can consider the if-comp in the examples above as the overt PI (H) operator indicated by Allan (2006). Given the interpretive properties of verb initial conditionals, we can postulate the presence of a null OP as for other V1 clauses (see imperatives and interrogatives above). Because of the optionality between the order (i) IF-Subj-V and the order (ii) OP-V, we can assume that the verb targets the high CP head (Force°), which can alternatively be specified by the conditional complementizer in order (i). The complementary distribution of V1 and conditional complementizers is then explained with the intervention effect between the A'-OP-movement of the overt subordinating conjunction (=if) and that of the conditional null OP which must end up in preverbal position (as for the other cases of V1 mentioned above).[23]
The presence of OP-movement in V1 conditional clauses, as well as in imperative and interrogative clauses is supported by the incompatibility with topicalization. Haegeman (forthcoming) argues that: "what is needed to licence argument fronting, then, is not simply the presence of Force, but rather […] 'declarative' force" (p.7). In her paper, Haegeman distinguishes between two types of conditional: peripheral conditional ('echoic', in the sense that they can "echo Q-propositions about a nonfactual world.." (Declerck and Reed 2001:83)) and central conditionals. She shows that only central conditional are incompatible with argument fronting because they involve OP movement:

(52) a.*If <u>water</u> you heat up to 100° C, it will boil.

b. If <u>some precautions</u> they have indeed taken, many other possible measures they have continued to neglect

[Ex. b. is from Haegeman (forthcoming), 22: (44)]

V1 counterfactuals, in Scandinavian as well as in English, belong to the central conditional class, and they do not allow argument fronting:

(53) *Had <u>some precautions</u> they taken, such consequences would have been avoided

As a consequence the presence of a null OP undergoing A'-movement to the preverbal position seems a correct postulation.

3.5 Narrative Inversion
As for conditional, interrogative and imperative clauses, the periphery of narrative style clauses does not allow topicalization. The presence of a topicalized argument or adjunct would make a V1 clause ungrammatical, as shown in the following configuration:

(54) *V1 Top (subj)…

[22] This correlation is not uncontroversial, see data on indicative/subjunctive alternation in Thráinsson (2007); chap. 8.
[23] I thank Liliane Haegeman (p.c.) for useful insights on this aspect. For a description of intervention effects triggered by null OP movement see her forthcoming paper (see References).

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

This is indeed borne out by facts:

(55) a. *Koma **að stórum helli** þeir og.. (Icelandic)
Come to big cave they and..
b. Koma þeir nú að stórum helli og…
Come they now to big cave and..
[(55)b. is from Thráinsson 2007, 29: (2.22)]

However narrative V1 is compatible with the possibility of an adverb like *þá (then)* or *síðan (since)* intervening between subject and verb in Old Norse:

(56) Lét *þá* Sigríðr senda eptir þóri hund til Bjarkeyjar (Old Norse)
Let then Sigrid send after Thori hound to Bjarkey
'Then Sigrid and Thori hound sent for from Bjarkey'

(57) Fóru *síðan* hvárir-tveggju leiðar sinnar
Went since each-two ways their
'Then both of them went their own way'
[Faarlund 2008; 231: (91)d.]

Icelandic Narrative V1 can be grouped together with those V1 declaratives where all the obligatory elements are present (OEP) accounted for by Mörnsjö (2002). She identifies that class of declaratives with clauses having a "temporal/spatial/logical relation to the preceding linguistic or situational discourse […] established by means of a connective adverb. […] OEP should be analysed as XVS sentences […] having a phonetically non-realized frame topic […] in Spec-CP" (p. 90). In a narrative inversion context like (58) below, the null frame topic would be the adverb *så* (so, then):

(58) Så gick han och jag la ner min snöboll så här. ∅ Tog jag upp en snöboll till..
So went he and I put down my snoball dm took I up one snowball more...
'So he went and I put down my snowball like this. Then I took up another snowball…'
[(Spoken Swedish), Mörnsjö (2002), 89: (7:2)]

Following Mörnsjö's (2002) proposal, also Icelandic Narrative inversion could be analysed as an XVS order, with a silent frame topic in first position. Along the lines of Benincà (2005) the "frame field" would be located in the higher part of the CP and host Scene Setting adverbs and Hanging Topics, as in (50) below:

(59) [$_{\text{Force}}$ C°]{$_{\text{Frame}}$ [ScSett][HT] C°}{$_{\text{Topic}}$ …}{$_{\text{Focus}}$…}[$_{\text{Fin}}$ C°]

In a structure of this kind, the frame-topic identified by Mörnsjö is located in a specific position at the edge of CP where it can remain phonologically silent. According to this perspective, however, sentences like (56) or (57) are problematic because the relevant adverbs (i.e. *þá (then)* or *síðan (since)*), which are expected to be in the preverbal, scene setting projection, indeed follow the verb.
My proposal is that, as for other marked V1 orders, Narrative V1 clauses have a silent OP in preverbal position, moving to the relevant specifier position in the frame field

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

for scope reasons. In cases as in (56) and (57) where the frame-topic follows the verb, an null OP is associated to the AdvP and moves to the frame field, with extraction from a lower position. According to this analysis, the OP carries [+scene setting] or [+HT] features, whereas the stranded adverb may just check his feature in ModP and be frozen there[24]. A possible derivation would be:

(60) [$_{ScSett/HTP}$ OP] V [$_{ModP}$ [$_{AdvP}$ t_{OP} Adv]] [$_{Subj2P}$ Subj]…

Notice that OP movement makes the periphery unavailable to further topicalizations, even in cases like (55)b. where the adverb *nú* follows the subject and OP-movement must take place from a lower position. The association of adverbs and operator is hypothesized along the lines of Haegeman (forthcoming). She argues, for instance, that French temporal clauses displaying Stylistic Inversion are derived by operator fronting.
As for the interpretation of this type of clauses, it is clear that they are much more context-dependent than standard V2 declaratives with a subject or a lower topic in first position.

4. Conclusion

I have argued that the labels V1 and V2 cover inappropriately heterogeneous phenomena. What is known as standard V2 is found mainly in declaratives and is possible in subordinate clauses, but V2 clauses have different pragmatic properties: topic-initial V2 seems to bear the pragmatic value of an assertion, whereas this is not necessarily the case for subject-initial V2, at least in Icelandic.[25]
V1 orders have a different distribution. It is worth remarking that "V1" is a highly generic term which tells little about the underlying structure. Indeed V1 orders can be distinguished as follows:
(a) Disguised V2: Ø Expl/SF – V (in Icelandic subordinate clauses)
(b) Ø OP-V orders: in imperatives, Y/N interrogatives, conditionals and narratives[26].
The order in (a) is analyzed syntactically as V2, whereas it cannot be unitarily identified semantically as it may lack the assertive character of V2 declarative clauses[27].
The orders in (b) can be distinguished from other cases of V2 because of their specific discourse related properties, as indicated by verb raising to a higher head in CP and the criterial movement of a null OP in first position. Since the OP has no phonological realization, verb movement is indispensable for satisfying the criterion.

[24] In case the adverb does precede the verb Criterial Freezing (see Rizzi (2004) and (2007)) is still respected. What happens in this case is that the adverb still checks its feature on Mod, but the larger phrase containing it is pied-piped to the frame field in order to check other features.
[25] For an interpretation of V2 clauses see Julien (2007) a.o.
[26] According to Mörnsjö (2002), narratives would only be a subset of (spoken Swedish OEP) V1 clauses. A better identification would be "context-dependent" V1.
[27] It is in fact related to morphological and syntactic properties found in Icelandic, but missing in Mainland Scandinavian. Because the ø Expl-V configuration is found in extraction contexts, and does not depend on the assertivity degree of the clause, I consider it from a purely syntactic perspective.

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

References

Allan K. (2006) “Clause-type, primary illocution, and mood-like operators in English”, *Language Sciences* 28, 1-50.

Belletti A. (1999) “Italian/Romance clitics: Structure and derivation”, in Van Riemsdijk H. (ed.) (1999) *Clitics in the languages of Europe*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

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.

Benincà P. (2006) “A Detailed Map of the Left Periphery of Medieval Romance”. In Zanuttini R.; Campos H.; Herburger H.; Portner P. (eds.) *Crosslinguistic Research in Syntax and Semantics. Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture*. Georgetown University Press, Washington 2006, pp. 53-86.

Bianchi V. (2006) “On the syntax of personal arguments”, *Lingua* 116: 2023–2067.

Cardinaletti, Anna (2004), Toward a Cartography of Subject Positions. In *The Structure of CPand IP. The cartography of syntactic structures*, vol. 2, ed. by Luigi Rizzi, 115-165. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cardinaletti A., Roberts I. (2002) “Clause structure and X-second” In Cinque G., *Functional Structure in DP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, volume I, OXFORD, Ed. Oxford University Press, pp. 123-166.

Cinque G. (1999) *Adverbs and Functional Heads*. A Crosslinguistic Perspective. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Di Domenico E. (2004) “Placed, non-placed and anaphorically placed expressions”, *Italian Journal of Linguistics*, 16.1, pp. 63-105.

Faarlund J. T. (2008) *The syntax of Old Norse*, Oxford University Press.

Haeberli E. (2002) *Features, Categories and the syntax of A-positions. Cross-Linguistic Variation in the Germanic Languages*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Haegeman L. (2004) “Topicalization, CLLD and the left periphery”, in Shaer, B., Frey, W. et C.

Haegeman L. (forthcoming) “The internal syntax of adverbial clauses”, Université de Lille 3, ms.

Maienborn (Réds.), *Proceedings of the Dislocated Elements Workshop, ZAS Berlin, November 2003, ZAS Papers in Linguistics,* 35, Vol 1, 157-192.

Holmberg A. (2000) “Scandinavian Stylistic Fronting: how any category can become an expletive”. Draft.

Holmberg A. and Platzack C. (1995) *The role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*, Oxford University Press.

Hooper J. B. (1975) “On assertive predicates”, J. P. Kimball (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. VI, Academic Press INC. Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Hróarsdóttir Þ.; Wiklund A. L.; Bentzen K.; Hrafnbjargarson G. H. (2007) “The afterglow of verb movement” in *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 80, pp. 45-75, Lund University.

Julien M. (2007) “Embedded V2 in Norwegian and Swedish” in *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 80, pp. 103-161, Lund University.

Maling J. (1990) “Inversion in embedded clauses in modern Icelandic”, in *Modern Icelandic Syntax, Syntax and Semantics* 24, pp. 71-91, Academic Press Inc.

Mörnsjö M. (2002) “V1 declaratives in Spoken Swedish”, PhD thesis, Lund University.

Platzack C. (to app.) “Embedded Imperatives”, ms., Lund University.

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)

Platzack C. (forthcoming) “Backward Binding and the C-T Phase: A Case of Syntactic Haplology”, ms. Univeristy of Lund.
Platzack C.; Rosengren I. (1998) “On the subject of imperatives: A minimalist account of the imperative clause”, *The journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 1:177-224.
Poletto C., (2002) "On V2 and V3 sequences in Rhaetoromance", in *Syntactic Microvariation*, Sjef Barbiers, Leonie Cornips e Susanne van der Kleij (eds).
Rizzi L. (1997a), “Residual Verb Second and the Wh-Criterion” in Belletti A.; Rizzi L. (eds.), *Parameters and Functional Heads*, Oxford University Press.
Rizzi L. (1997b), “The fine structure of the left periphery” in L. Haegeman, ed, *Elements of Grammar*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 281-337.
Rizzi L. (2004) “On the Form of Chains: Criterial Positions and ECP Effects” ms, University of Siena.
Rizzi L. (2005) “Grammatically-Based Target-Inconsistencies in Child Language” ms, University of Siena.
Rizzi L. (2007) “On Some Properties of Criterial Freezing”, *STiL - Studies in Linguistics*, Vol.1
Rizzi L., Roberts I. (1989) “Complex inversion in French”, ms., University of Siena.
Rizzi L., Shlonsky U. (2006) “Strategies of Subject Extraction”, ms. University of Siena.
Roberts I. (2004) “The C-System in Brythonic Celtic Languages, V2, and the EPP” in L. Rizzi (ed) *The Structure of IP and CP*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
Roberts I., Roussou A. (2002), “The extended projection principle as a condition on the Tense dependency” in P. Svenonius, ed., *Subjects, Expletives and the EPP*, p. 125-55, Oxford University Press.
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. A. (1990) “V1 declaratives and verb raising in Icelandic” in *Modern Icelandic Syntax, Syntax and Semantics* 24, pp. 41-69, Academic Press Inc.
Speas P.; Tenny C. (2003) “Configurational properties of point of view roles”, in Di Sciullo, (ed.), *Asymmetry in Grammar*, vol I, Benjamins 2003, 315-344.
Starke M., (2004) “On the inexistence of specifiers and the nature of heads”, in Belletti, A. (ed.) *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 3*. New York, Oxford University Press, pp. 252-268.
Thrainsson H., (2007) *The syntax of Icelandic*. Cambridge University Press.
Thráinsson H.; Petersen H. P.; Jacobsen J.; Hansen Z. S. (2004) *Faroese: an overview and reference grammar*, Tórshavn : Føroya Fróðskaparfelag.
Vikner S., (1995) *Verb movement and expletive subjects in the Germanic languages*. New York: Oxford University Press.

BDD-A22682 © 2008 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:51:22 UTC)