

**Eiríkur Rögnvaldsson,
University of Iceland**

ON SUBORDINATE TOPICALIZATION, STYLISTIC INVERSION AND V/3 IN ICELANDIC

0. Introduction

This paper is a preliminary version of a part of a survey of Icelandic word order, which Höskuldur Thráinsson and myself are currently working on (Rögnvaldsson & Thráinsson, in preparation). This part centers around the discussion of **XP** and its role and position in the basic structure of Icelandic sentences. I try to bring forth some new arguments supporting the analysis first proposed in Rögnvaldsson (1984), and considerably elaborated and developed in Thráinsson (1984, 1986). I argue against Sigurðsson's (1985b) claim that an analysis which does not make a syntactic distinction between main and subordinate clauses is incapable of explaining the different possibilities of Topicalization and Narrative Inversion (NI) in these two types of clauses.

But my main arguments concern the status of a specific fronting process in Icelandic (and Faroese) known as **Stylistic Inversion** (cf. Maling 1980, Platzack 1985). I argue that it is impossible to draw any **syntactic** boarder-line between Stylistic Inversion and Topicalization.

In the final section of the paper, I argue that Sigurðsson's (1986a) analysis of V/3 word order is not convincing; at least it can not be taken as a counterargument to the analysis proposed here.

1. XP

1.1 The role of XP

I assume here, as Platzack (1985, 1986 etc.), Holmberg (1983 etc.), Sigurðsson (1985a,b, 1986a,b) etc. have done, that the V/2 order of most Germanic languages is in fact derived in main clauses, by moving some phrase from its base-generated position to an initial slot usually labelled **XP** (or **X^{max}**). It is well known that the initial position is often used for "themes", and since subjects are usually themes, the unmarked option is to move the subject to XP. However, movement to initial position is not limited to themes. It is not always obvious that fronted adverbial phrases or PPs, for instance, should be counted as themes. On the other hand do they make a "point of departure" for the sentence, so to speak. Diderichsen's (1946) term **Fundament** would presumably be the most suitable description of the role of XP.

This slot can also be used to show that the clause has no real theme. This is either done by base-generating in it a completely non-thematic element, the dummy *það* (cf. Sigurðsson 1985b), or by deleting it. Deletion is possible since XP is not required by any independent principles, such as the theta-theory, the Binding theory etc.

If a certain clause has no theme at all, XP is left free for other phrases to move into. In such cases we can get particles, past participles etc. in initial position; this is what often has been called **Stylistic Inversion**. It has sometimes been claimed (cf. Platzack 1985) that XP is not the landing site of elements moved by Stylistic Inversion; but in section 4, I argue that no such distinction can be made.

1.2 Two analyses

The difference between the two analyses of the basic structure of Icelandic clauses that have been proposed in the last few years actually centers around XP. Both analyses essentially agree on the role of XP; that it is a sort of focus position, i.e. a landing site for topicalized elements; and that it is the place where the dummy *það* is generated. On the other hand, they disagree both on

its position in the structure and on its distribution. We claim that XP is to the **right** of Comp, and present in the D-structure of **all** clauses, embedded as well as main, cf. (1); whereas Platzack (1985, 1986) and Sigurðsson (1985a,b, 1986a,b, henceforth P/S) claim that XP is to the **left** of Comp, and (for the most part) only present in **main** clauses, cf. (2) (node labels changed to facilitate the comparison).

- (1) a S' --> Comp S
 b S --> XP Infl NP VP
- (2) a S' --> XP S
 b S --> Comp NP Infl'

Neither solution is free of all problems. The problem with the P/S analysis is that it predicts that some sentences which actually occur should be ungrammatical. In its strongest version, it predicts for instance that Topicalization in subordinate clauses should be impossible, since no XP is present for a topicalized phrase to move into. But Topicalization is often perfectly good in subordinate clauses in Icelandic; and Platzack (1986) recognizes this, of course. He suggests that in these cases, we may assume that the subordinate clauses actually have main clause structure, and hence can have the XP. He also observes that in many languages (perhaps not Icelandic, however) such clauses appear to form a uniform class; they are all **assertions**, and thus semantically similar to main clauses.

Now this may very well be the correct account for the "Mainland" Scandinavian languages. Note, however, that this classification is **semantic**, not **syntactic**; and moreover, **assertion** is not a very well defined term, in this respect at least. But most importantly, this account entails a considerable weakening of the theory. It is a recognition of the fact that word order rules and constraints cannot be explained solely by syntactic configurations; sometimes one must resort to semantic classification. I hasten to say that in my opinion, this is no drawback in general; it is a direct consequence of the role that language plays in human communication. But it **is** a drawback for a theory which crucially relies on syntactic structures to explain which sentences are good and which are not. Proponents of the P/S analysis, especially Sigurðsson (1985a), have sometimes claimed that their analysis is superior to ours, since the former is built on a firm syntactic ground, whereas we often must resort to vague semantic or functional explanations. In reality, I think the analyses do not differ greatly in this respect. According to P/S, some sentences which we might expect to be syntactically deviant are good because of some semantic reasons; under our analysis, however, many constructions which are syntactically well-formed give sentences which are ungrammatical for semantic and/or functional reasons.

It is of course possible that some people will prefer one analysis above the other because of this difference. However, I do not see any reason to do so; I think that the analyses must be evaluated according to their success in describing correctly the facts of Icelandic word order. Let us therefore turn to some problems which have been pointed out for each theory.

2. Subordinate Topicalization and Narrative Inversion

2.1 The vacuousness of subordinate Topicalization

The main problem our analysis encounters is that it overgenerates; it predicts that many sentences which are bad should be OK. The main types are these:

- (3) a Topicalization (i.e., topicalization of other phrases than the subject NP) should be possible in all subordinate clauses since XP is always present, at least optionally

- b Narrative Inversion should also be possible in subordinate clauses since XP can always be left out

Unfortunately, these predictions are not borne out. In many types of subordinate clauses, topicalization of other phrases than the subject is either heavily constrained or quite impossible; and NI is also almost nonexistent in subordinate clauses, even though acceptable examples can be constructed (cf. Thráinsson 1986).

Thráinsson (1986) has argued that the semantics (or rather the functional role) of NI is for the most part incompatible with subordination. Sigurðsson (1985b) has essentially accepted this, but he claims that this does not save our analysis. The reason is, he says, that this explanation is only compatible with an analysis where there is a difference in structure between main and subordinate clauses - and that is the P/S-theory. Sigurðsson's arguments are too complicated to go into them in detail here, but they rely on his analysis of NI as **non-topicalization**. He claims that there must be a connection between syntactic and semantic topicalization, and that such a connection is not present under our analysis, since all clauses are assumed to be topicalized under that analysis - not just main clauses.

I believe that Sigurðsson is indeed right in claiming that NI is a sign of non-topicalization; and that "the non-topicalization of NI is semantically vacuous in subordinate clauses and thus pointless and not to be expected". But note that Sigurðsson also claims that subordinate clauses usually have no independent micro-topic (to use his term). This entails that not only non-topicalization, i.e. NI, but also ordinary **Topicalization** "is semantically vacuous in subordinate clauses and thus pointless and not to be expected". Under our analysis, XP is present in both main and subordinate clauses, but only in the former does it play a role in establishing a topic.

2.2 Topics and themes

In the following discussion I will stick to Sigurðsson's terminology to make the comparison easier. I will make the (rather traditional) assumption that syntactic topicalization is not only a sign of microtopicality, as Sigurðsson claims, but also of themehood. Since subjects are usually inherent themes (as Sigurðsson says), it is the least marked option to move them to the XP, both in main and subordinate clauses. However, if the subject of a main clause is not micro-topical, the micro-topic of the clause overrides it and is moved to XP instead. But subordinate clauses have no independent micro-topic, as Sigurðsson points out, so that there the subject is usually the only candidate, still being the theme of its clause, of course. In this way, I think that it is possible to get a unified account of the possibilities of Topicalization and NI in both main and subordinate clauses.

Note also the following passage, taken from Sigurðsson (1985b:42-43):

Although subordinate subjects are usually not 'independently' topical, they are normally thematic, just as well as main clause subjects (subjects in general being inherent themes). Suppose however that this is not the case in a particular subordinate clause and a particular main clause. Clearly then the dethematization of Heavy Subject Shift is usually meaningful in both.

Now it is quite clear that it is usually much easier to topicalize other phrases than the subject in those subordinate clauses that have a "heavy" subject. This appears to indicate that there is in fact not only a connection between themehood and topicalization. If the XP is not needed for the theme, it is available for any other phrase.

It has usually not been made very clear that topicalization in subordinate clauses in Icelandic is usually only possible in complement clauses (að-clauses). I do not think that the P/S--theory has proposed any explanation of this fact except that topicalization is possible in asserted

clauses. Although it is claimed that these clauses can have a special structure with an extra level (S"), it is clear that the explanation is **semantic** in nature. And, as mentioned above, this does not explain why topicalization should be easier in sentences with a heavy subject. It might be proposed that the reason is that in such sentences we are not dealing with **Topicalization**, but rather with **Stylistic Inversion**; but as argued in section 4, a **syntactic** distinction between these two processes is unfounded.

3. Predictions of P/S

I have elsewhere (Rögnavaldsson 1984) summarized the main points where the P/S analysis appears to make wrong predictions:

- (4)a Topicalization in relative clauses should be impossible, as the X^{\max} -position, which is the landing site of topicalized phrases, is occupied by a wh-element. Even if it wasn't, topicalization would still be impossible, as the topicalized element would end up to the left of sem.
- b Extractions out of topicalized clauses should be excluded. The reason is that subordinate topicalized clauses must have a special S"-level, and S" is considered an absolute barrier to extractions.
- c Extractions out of subordinate clauses with það should be excluded for the same reason; these clauses must have the S"-level.
- d það-insertion should be impossible in relative clauses, for the same reasons as topicalization should be excluded (cf. (4)a).

To each of these predictions, I have (Rögnavaldsson 1984) given two or more counterexamples. I will repeat here for convenience one counterexample to each of the predictions above:

- (5) Kennari [sem slíkan þvætting ber ___ á borð fyrir nemendur] er til alls vís
A teacher who such nonsense tells his students can do anything
'A teacher who tells his students such nonsense can do anything'
- (6) Þessar bækur_i hélt ég [að þér_j myndi ekki nokkur maður lána ____j ____i]
These books thought I that you would not any man lend
'I thought that noone would lend you these books'
- (7) Hvenær heldur þú [að það geti allir keypt sér íbúð ___]?
When think you that there can everyone by himself a flat?
'When do you think that everyone can buy himself a flat?'
- (8) Þetta er maðurinn [sem það var talað við ___ í sjónvarpinu í gær]
This is the man that there was talked to on the TV yesterday
'This is the man who was interviewed on TV yesterday'

True enough, such examples are not easily found, as I have admitted (Rögnavaldsson 1984); but Thráinsson (1986) agrees that such sentences are grammatical. Platzack (1986:232) has this to say on examples like (6): "A possible way to handle exceptional cases like this would be to assume that Icelandic can have a Wh-position outside of the higher COMP-position." As for examples like (8),

he also points out (1985:58) "that none of these examples are fully accepted by Thráinsson".

To my knowledge, proponents of the P/S analysis have never given a systematic account of their explanation of these apparent exceptions. It is conceivable, however, that they would choose to ignore them, on the ground that they are not accepted by all speakers, they are hard to find, etc. If these were the only examples, such a move might perhaps be justified. But there are also similar sentences which sound perfectly normal and acceptable to everyone. Such sentences are illustrated in (9)-(10):

- (9) Bókin [sem lesin var] þótti leiðinleg
The book that read was was considered boring
'The book that was read was considered boring'
- (10) Þessi maður veit ég [að komið hefur hingað oft]
This man know I that come has here often
'I know that this man has often come here'

However, most people would presumably not take these sentences into account, since they would claim that the movement is not due to **Topicalization**, but to another rule which has been called **Stylistic Inversion** (cf. Maling 1980, Platzack 1985); and hence no counterexamples to P/S, since the landing sites of these two rules are claimed to be different. On the other hand, I believe that a **syntactic** distinction between those two rules is unmotivated (cf. also Rögnvaldsson 1982), so that the examples above are genuine counterexamples to the P/S analysis. Since so much hinges upon this assumption, I will now bring forth some evidence for this opinion.

4. Stylistic Inversion

4.1 Maling's criteria

Maling (1980) was the first to claim that there are two different fronting processes at work in Icelandic; **Topicalization** and **Stylistic Inversion** (or **Stylistic Fronting**, cf. Maling 1982). These processes are exemplified by (12) and (13), respectively:

- (11) a Jón barði Guðmund
'John hit Guðmundur'
- b Guðmund barði Jón
Guðmundur hit John
'John hit Guðmundur'
- (12) a Allt sem hefur verið sagt er satt
'Everything that has been said is true'
- b Allt sem sagt hefur verið er satt
Everything that said has been is true
'Everything that has been said is true'

Maling (1980) claims that the differences between these processes is **syntactic**, and gives a list of six items where the processes differ. I will, however, argue that no syntactic boarder-line can be drawn between the two processes. I will look at Maling's criteria in turn, and show that none of them holds as an absolute criterium. I will argue that the reason why some words or phrases cannot be fronted if there is no "subject gap" is that they cannot be interpreted as the theme of the clause.

Let us first look at Maling's criteria:

(13) TOPICALIZATION	STYLISTIC INVERSION
Applies to object NPs, PPs, Adjs, some Advs, particles, etc.	Applies to past participles, etc.
Emphasis or focus on fronted constituent	No such emphasis or focus necessarily present
Uncommon in embedded Ss	Common in embedded Ss
Judgments vary on fronting in relatives, questions etc.	Accepted by all speakers
Unbounded	Clause-bounded
No Subject Gap required	Requires a Subject Gap

4.2 Nonsyntactic criteria

It is of course possible to make it a defining feature for a rule that it only applies to certain types of phrases. But since each of Maling's rules applies to more than one sort of categories, I can't see the point in making such a distinction. Note also that "The distinction between the two fronting processes is sometimes a fuzzy one, particularly when it comes to the fronting of adverbials ..." (Maling 1980:180). If both rules can apply to adverbials, it seems clear that the first criterium can never be conclusive by itself.

The claim that Topicalization necessarily implies emphasis or focus on the fronted element is simply not true. When objects are fronted, the "purpose" is usually to create a contrast, so that there Maling's claim holds; but it certainly does not hold when we come to the fronting of many kinds of PPs. The fronting of many time- or place-oriented PPs serves the function of creating a "stage" for the rest of the sentence; it does not require any emphasis or focus (cf. Thráinsson 1979:65). And even if it did, it is not clear that this should be counted as a syntactic criterium.

It is equally clear that Maling's third and fourth criteria can never be conclusive. Topicalization does occur in embedded sentences, as Zaenen (1980:21-22) notes: "This embedded topicalization is subject to pragmatic constraints, but it is more common than the equivalent in English or Swedish." Many examples of embedded Topicalization are such that everybody will accept them, such as the following.

- (14) Ég veit að þennan mann hefur hún aldrei hitt
I know that this man has she never met
'I know that she has never met this man'

It is true, however, that some examples of Topicalization in embedded Ss will not be accepted; I will come to that later in connection with the "Subject Gap" condition.

Maling's second, third, and fourth criteria are thus all a matter of degree. We could, of course, set up a scale with something we call "typical Topicalization" at one end and "typical Stylistic Inversion" at the other:

- (15) X Y Z

Then we can say something like this: "Let us call everything to the left of the point Y Stylistic Inversion, and everything to the right of that point Topicalization." But the obvious question is: Why drawing the line at point Y, rather than at X or Z? And even if we could bring forth some arguments for choosing Y, the distinction could hardly be called syntactic.

4.3 Clause-boundedness

The two criteria left could, on the other hand, be taken as syntactic. Let us first look at the clause-boundedness of Stylistic Inversion. We must keep in mind that the elements that Stylistic Inversion moves, adjectives, past participles and verbal particles, are all parts of the verbal complex; they are therefore closely tied to the verb both structurally and semantically. It could be claimed that this semantic closeness is the reason why these elements are usually not moved far away from the verb.

It must also be noted that fronted NPs or PPs are usually **themes**, as mentioned above (cf. Kuno 1980). It seems in many cases to be a necessary condition for fronting that the fronted element can be interpreted as the theme of the sentence; but the semantics of the elements moved by Stylistic Inversion is such that they can hardly be themes. But if we add to an adjective a word with a demonstrative meaning, which makes a proper "Fundament" for the sentence, fronting becomes perfectly normal:

- (16) Svona leiðinlegur vissi enginn [að Jón væri ____]
That boring knew noone that John was
'Noone knew that John was that boring'

It is clear that there are severe constraints on such movement, but in certain cases it is possible, which shows that clause-boundedness cannot be used as a defining feature.

We could of course claim that in (16) we are in fact dealing with Topicalization, not Stylistic Inversion; in other words, we could claim that every instance of non-clause-bounded movement is an instance of Topicalization. But then we would be dealing with an ad hoc defining feature, which would also make Maling's first criterium meaningless.

4.4 The Subject Gap condition

Now the Subject Gap condition. Let us first make it clear what is meant by the term "Subject Gap". In Maling's paper (1980), it refers to clauses which either have no overt subject, or where it is possible to argue that the subject has been moved away from its usual position by some "independent" process. The former class includes relative clauses, impersonal passives, etc., cf. (17); whereas most sentences in the latter class have a postposed indefinite (or "heavy") subject, cf. (18).

- (17) Fundurinn sem fram fór í Osló var skemmtilegur
The meeting that on went in Oslo was amusing
'The meeting that was held in Oslo was amusing'
- (18) Ég veit að komið hafa hingað margir málfræðingar
I know that come have here many linguists
'I know that many linguists have come here'

It is certainly true that Stylistic Inversion is most often impossible in subordinate sentences with a

definite subject, as (19)-(20) show (taken from Maling 1980:182-183):

- (19) a Honum mætti standa á sama hvað sagt væri um hann
He might care nothing what said was about him
'He should not care what people say about him'
- b *Honum mætti standa á sama hvað sagt hefði Hjördís um hann
He might care nothing what Hjördís said has about him
'He should not care what Hjördís says about him'
- (20) a Verðbólgan varð verri en búist hafði verið við
The inflation became worse than expected had been
'The inflation grew worse than had been expected'
- b *Verðbólgan varð verri en búist hafði ríkisstjórnin við
The inflation became worse than expected had the government
'The inflation grew worse than the government had expected'

However, this is not conclusive either; Topicalization is also bad in these clauses, although it does not need a Subject Gap, according to Maling's criteria quoted above. Now this is perhaps not surprising, given Maling's third and fourth criteria; but note that Topicalization is generally much better in those embedded clauses that have a "Subject Gap" than in those which don't. This is shown in (21)-(22):

- (21) a ??Honum mætti standa á sama hvað um hann hefði Hjördís sagt
He might care nothing what about him had Hjördís said
'He should not care what Hjördís has said about him'
- b Honum mætti standa á sama hvað um hann hefði verið sagt
He might care nothing what about him had been said
'He should not care what people has said about him'
- (22) a *Verðbólgan varð verri en nokkurn tíma hafði ríkisstjórnin búist við
The inflation became worse than anytime had the government expected
'The inflation grew worse than the government could anytime have expected'
- b Verðbólgan varð verri en nokkurn tíma hafði verið búist við
The inflation became worse than anytime had been expected
'The inflation grew worse than anyone could anytime have expected'

This appears to make the distinction between Topicalization and Stylistic Inversion rather suspect; both rules are clearly subject to some pragmatic constraints. It should be evident by now that it is impossible to apply more than one argument at a time to make a distinction between the rules; no two of Maling's criteria can be made to fit together completely.

4.5 The landing site of Stylistic Inversion

Note that Maling (1980) does not say anything about the landing sites of elements moved by Topicalization and Stylistic Inversion; but Platzack (1985) claims that they are different. Under his analysis, Topicalization moves phrases to the XP-position, whereas Stylistic Inversion moves

elements to an empty subject position. One would think that such movement should be impossible, since there would be a trace of the subject in that position; but Platzack has a story about that. He refers to Lasnik & Saito (1984), who maintain that move alpha leaves traces only optionally; general principles, such as the Projection Principle, the Case filter etc. will ensure that sentences with essential traces missing are filtered out. Platzack then shows that if Comp is marked [+Pronoun], a subject trace in the subject position would violate the Binding theory. Hence, the empty subject position can freely be used as a landing site for elements moved by Stylistic Inversion. But is this a desirable solution? And can it be upheld? Let us consider its predictions.

First, it is important to note that Stylistic Inversion is just as frequent and equally normal in adverbial clauses as in complement clauses. Consider the following examples:

- (23) Þegar komið var til Reykjavíkur ...
When arrived was to Reykjavík ...
'When one arrived to Reykjavík ...'
- (24) Ef gengið er eftir Laugaveginum ...
If walked is along the Laugavegur ...
'If one walks along the Laugavegur ...'
- (25) Ég fer, nema komið verði til móts við óskir mínar
I leave, unless fulfilled will be my wishes
'I will leave unless my wishes will be fulfilled'

Since Stylistic Inversion appears to behave in the same manner in all types of subordinate clauses, it seems clear that the same analysis should be applied. This would entail that Comp in adverbial clauses also be [+Pronoun], which does not seem feasible. Since Platzack claims that Comp is the head of S in the Scandinavian languages, it seems to be inevitable to assume that Comp in adverbial clauses is marked [-N,-V] - as adverbials are -if the feature system is to have any value. It seems to me to be quite strange if the feature [+Pronoun] can be joined to a node which isn't nominal at all. Platzack (1985:9) claims that "this feature can be specified [+N,-V]⁰"; he doesn't mention other possibilities.

4.6 Stylistic Inversion in main clauses

Second, the elements that Stylistic Inversion moves can not only be found in initial position in subordinate clauses; main clauses beginning with, e.g., a particle or a past participle are also very common:

- (26) Fram hefur komið að ...
Emerged has that ...
'It has emerged that ...'
- (27) Keypt hafa þessa bók margir stúdentar
Bought have this book many students
'Many students have bought this book'

Just as in subordinate clauses, such fronting of particles and past participles is only possible in clauses which have a subject gap. If that argument has any value, it is thus inevitable to conclude that the movement in (26) and (27) is due to Stylistic Inversion, not to Topicalization. But according to Platzack (1985), this could not be Stylistic Inversion. This is because Stylistic Inver-

sion moves elements to an empty subject position, as explained above. Since (26) and (27) are main clauses, the finite verbs hefur in (26) and hafa in (27) must be moved to Comp, according to Platzack's description; and Comp is to the **left** of the subject position, as (28) shows. This means that we must either assume that fram in (26) and keypt in (27) have been moved to XP (or to some other unspecified slot); or we must claim that the finite verbs have **not** been moved to Comp.

(28)	Comp ¹				
	Comp	NP	Infl ¹		
		e	Infl	VP	NP
			V	Prt/NP	Comp ¹
	hefur		komið	fram	að ...
	hafa		keypt	þessa bók	margir stúdentar

Consider first the the second possibility; that the finite verb actually stays in Infl in these cases. Recall that the reason for verb movement to Comp in main clauses, according to Platzack, is that Comp must be able to act as a proper governor for the subject, and so it must be lexically filled. The feature [+Pronoun] thus does not suffice as a Case assigner, since it has no lexical content. But it is quite clear that a Case assigner is needed in these sentences, at least in (27), where the main verb is transitive; hence it is impossible to argue that the logical subject originates in an "object" position inside VP. (27) must be analyzed as a case of "heavy" or indefinite subject postposing from the "real" subject position. According to Platzack, the subject then gets its Case and theta-role by virtue of being coindexed with the pronominal element in Comp; but of course, this pronominal element needs a Case assigner, which must be the finite verb. Note that we can not save this analysis by assuming that fram and keypt are moved to Comp in these cases; this would result in feature conflict, since Comp must be marked [+Tense], but fram and keypt are obviously [-Tense].

So let us turn to the first possibility. It would entail that no difference would be postulated between the landing sites of Stylistic Inversion and Topicalization. It is of course possible to claim that since we are dealing with movement to a place to the left of Comp, this is Topicalization but not Stylistic Inversion. But if this is done, two arguments for the distinction between the rules must be abandoned. We must admit that they can move the same types of elements; and we must admit that Topicalization can also need a subject gap sometimes.

5. V/3

5.1 Two types of adverbs in second position

Let us finally turn to a problem for both analyses: The fact that sometimes, certain adverbials occupy the second position instead of the finite verb. This word order occurs both in main and subordinate clauses, as the following examples show:

(29) Jón bara hlær að þessu
John just laughs at this

(30) Þegar ég loksins kom heim ...
When I finally came home ...

It is clear that both theories will have to say something special about such clauses. Thráinsson

(1986) claims that they are derived by permutation of two sister constituents, i.e. AdvP and Infl. But Sigurðsson (1986a) maintains that two different processes are at work here. He supports this by pointing out that the third position adverbs in main clauses on one hand and subordinate clauses on the other are not of the same type; the former he calls **ESASP** (Emotive Sentence Adverbials in Subordinate Clauses), whereas the latter he calls **PASC** (Preverbal Adverbials in Subordinate Clauses). Sigurðsson claims that ESASP stand in second position due to adverbial fronting in PF; on the other hand, the latter are claimed to be due to a special PS-rule.

5.2 Is a distinction well founded?

There are at least four reasons why Sigurðsson's analysis is not very convincing.

The first point is that the difference between the two classes is semantic, not syntactic. Sigurðsson does not say anything about different origins or the like. Thus, his analysis does not answer the question why PASC cannot be fronted in main clauses, just as the ESASP can.

The second point is that although PASC can only be fronted in subordinate clauses, the fronting of ESASP is not limited to main clauses, as the following examples show:

- (31) Ég held [að Jón bara hlæi að þessu]
I think that John just laughs at this
- (32) Ég vissi [að þú auðvitað gætir ekkert gert]
I knew that you of course could nothing do
'I knew that of course you could not do anything'

Remember that Sigurðsson has a different structure for subordinate clauses than for main clauses. The landing sites of ESASP are thus not the same in these two types. This is perhaps no big problem, but an explanation is called for, anyway. Under our analysis, however, the landing site will be the same for both main and subordinate clauses, i.e. between XP and Infl.

The third point is that PASC can also end up at various other places than between the subject NP and Infl:

- (33) a Þegar ég loksins kom heim ...
When I finally came home ...
- b Loksins þegar ég kom heim ...
Finally when I came home ...
- c Þegar loksins eitthvað fór að gerast ...
When finally something started to happen ...

Both (33)a and b are quite normal sentences, whereas the word order in (33)c is more subject to pragmatic constraints, and is only possible with an indefinite subject, I think. One could of course try to argue that (31)b and c are cases of adverbial attachment to Comp, although (31)c would have to be an unusual sort of such attachment since the adverbial loksins precedes the complementizer in this case. But (33)b appears to pose a more serious problem for this proposal; it is not obvious why adverbial attachment should be better with indefinite subjects than with definite.

The final point is this: As pointed out by Thráinsson (1986), PASC almost exclusively occur in adverbial clauses - not in complement clauses. If it is the case, as Sigurðsson claims, that the occurrence of PASC is to be explained by a change in the PS-rule of S, this change should presumably occur in all types of clauses - not just in adverbial clauses. It might of course be

proposed that we are at some intermediate stage where different PS-rules are used in different types of clauses; but then again, Sigurðsson's explanation is no real explanation.

6. Conclusion

In this paper I have argued that Rögnvaldsson's (1984) and Thráinsson's (1984, 1986) analysis of the basic structure of Icelandic sentences, where main and subordinate clauses have identical structures in all relevant respects, can be maintained, despite the arguments of Sigurðsson (1985a,b, 1986b). I have also shown that Stylistic Inversion cannot be discerned from Topicalization on syntactic grounds, so that all arguments based on this distinction must be abandoned. Furthermore, I think it is safe to say that Sigurðsson's (1986a) analysis of the V/3 sentences does not provide a strong argument against our analysis of Icelandic sentence structure.

However, let me remind you that this is only a preliminary report on a part of an ongoing study. I hope that we will be able to develop and extend the analysis and the arguments presented here in Rögnvaldsson & Thráinsson (in preparation).

References:

- Diderichsen, Paul. 1946. Elementær Dansk Grammatik. Gyldendal, København.
- Holmberg, Anders. 1983. The Finite Sentence in Swedish and English. Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax 3. Department of Linguistics, University of Trondheim.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1980. Functional Syntax. Edith A. Moravcsik & Jessica R. Wirth (eds.): Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 13, Current Approaches to Syntax, pp. 117-135. Academic Press, New York.
- Lasnik, Howard, & M. Saito. 1984. On the Nature of Proper Government. Linguistic Inquiry 15:235-289.
- Maling, Joan. 1980. Inversion in Embedded Clauses in Modern Icelandic. Ñslenskt mál 2:175-193.
- 1982. Non-Clause-Bounded Reflexives in Icelandic. Thorstein Fretheim & Lars Hellan (eds.): Papers from the Sixth Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics, pp. 90-106. Tapir, Trondheim.
- Platzack, Christer. 1985. The Scandinavian Languages and the Null Subject Parameter. Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax 20. Department of Linguistics, University of Trondheim.
- 1986. COMP, INFL and Germanic Word Order. Lars Hellan & Kirsti Koch Christensen (eds.): Topics in Scandinavian Syntax, pp. 185-234. Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Rögnvaldsson, Eiríkur. 1982. Um orðaröð og færslur í íslensku. Cand.mag.-thesis, University of Iceland.
- 1984. Icelandic Word Order and það-insertion. Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax 8. Department of Linguistics, University of Trondheim.
- Rögnvaldsson, Eiríkur, & Höskuldur Thráinsson. In preparation. On Icelandic Word Order Once More.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór ñirmann. 1985a. Subordinate V/1 in Icelandic: How to Explain a Root Phenomenon. Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax 18. Department of Linguistics, University of Trondheim.
- 1985b. The Root Behaviour of (Some) Verb-Initial Declaratives in Icelandic: A Syntactic or a Semantic Problem. Unpublished paper, University of Stockholm and Christian Albrechts Universität, Kiel.
- 1986a. Verb Post-Second in a V2 Language. Östen Dahl & Anders Holmberg (eds.): Scandinavian Syntax, pp. 138-149. Institute of Linguistics, University of Stockholm.
- 1986b. Verb-Initial Declaratives in Icelandic: Their Syntax and Their Semantics. Unpublished paper, Christian Albrechts Universität, Kiel.

- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1979. On Complementation in Icelandic. Garland, New York.
- . Some Points on Icelandic Word Order. Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax 8. Department of Linguistics, University of Trondheim.
- . 1986. V1, V2, V3 in Icelandic. Hubert Haider & Martin Prinzhorn (eds.): Verb-Second Phenomena in Germanic Languages, pp. 169-194. Foris, Dordrecht.
- Zaenen, Annie. 1980. Extraction Rules in Icelandic. Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University.