WORKING PAPERS
IN
SCANDINAVIAN SYNTAX

LUND UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITEIT GENT

Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax is an electronic publication for current articles relating to the study of Scandinavian syntax. The articles appearing herein are previously unpublished reports of ongoing research activities and may subsequently appear, revised or unrevised, in other publications.

The WPSS homepage:
http://project.sol.lu.se/grimm/working-papers-in-scandinavian-syntax/

The 95th volume of WPSS will be published in December 2015. Papers intended for publication should be submitted no later than November 1st, 2015.

June 2015,

Johan Brandtler, editor

Contact:
Johan Brandtler
Ghent University
Department of Linguistics
Rozier 44
9000 Gent, Belgium

E-mail: johan.brandtler@ugent.be

Contents

Microvariation in Norwegian long distance binding[*]

Marit Julien

Lund university

Abstract

It is well known that (some speakers of) Norwegian allow long distance binding, defined here as binding across a finite clause boundary. A number of factors that facilitate long distance binding have also been identified. In the study reported on here, 93 native speakers of Norwegian judged 30 sentences in a web-based questionnaire. The results show that V2 order in the embedded clause reduces the acceptability of long distance binding considerably, and the presence of a fronted topic in the embedded clause further adds to this effect. V2 order involves a relatively complex C-domain, and the presence of an initial topic increases the complexity even more. It appears that even without long distance binding, an embedded complex C-domain reduces the acceptability for some speakers, but adding long distance binding increases the rejection rate considerably. There are also other factors that influence the acceptance of long distance binding, and in addition, there is individual variation in the weighting of the factors. Moreover, for some speakers each factor in isolation does not make long distance binding unacceptable – only the interaction of two or more factors leads to ungrammaticality. Hence, long distance binding is a more complex phenomenon than has hitherto been assumed.

1 Introduction

The binding domain of an anaphor, that is, the domain where the anaphor must find its antecedent, is normally the clause. Nevertheless, it is well known that anaphors sometimes find their binder outside their containing clause, thereby forming so-called long distance binding dependencies.

In a Scandinavian context, long distance binding in Icelandic has been widely discussed in the linguistic literature since Thráinsson (1976). Less widely discussed, but nevertheless generally acknowledged, is the fact that long distance binding is also found in Norwegian. The semantic conditions that make long distance binding possible have attracted a fair amount of attention, and so has the geographic distribution of the pattern.

The purpose of this paper is to add to our understanding of Norwegian long distance binding. I will show that long distance binding, defined here as binding across a finite clause boundary (Reuland & Koster 1991), is a complex phenomenon. We will see that for many speakers of Norwegian, the acceptability of a given binding relation does not only depend on whether that binding relation crosses a finite clause boundary or not. Individual speakers are more or less restrictive with respect to long distance binding, and they are also sensitive to different factors that influence its acceptance.

Some of these factors have already been identified by other researchers, such as the prominence of intervening potential binders and the semantic properties of the matrix verb and of the embedded verb. To this list the present paper adds the complexity of the left periphery of the clause hosting the anaphor. More specifically, I show that the word order of the embedded clause – V2 or non-V2 – as well as the presence of topicalised constituents in the embedded clause reduce the acceptance of long distance binding in Norwegian.

The paper is organised as follows. In section 2 I give an overview of what is already known about long distance binding in Norwegian – what characterises it in terms of syntactic and semantic contexts and choice of reflexive, and what does its geographic distribution look like. In section 3 I briefly present data on Norwegian non-local binding found in the Nordic Syntax Database, a recently developed tool for research on the syntax of Scandinavian. Sections 2 and 3 thus provide the background for the survey that will be presented in sections 4 and 5. In my survey, I needed informants who would accept at least some cases of long distance binding, in order to investigate the factors that make this binding pattern more or less acceptable for them. Hence, only in light of the information found in sections 2 and 3 can my survey be interpreted in the right perspective. The survey method as well as the informants are described in section 4, whereas the results of the survey are presented in section 5. Section 6 concludes the paper.

2 Long distance binding in Norwegian

In this section I summarise the main results of previous investigations of Norwegian long distance binding. In 2.1, I show that two types of long distance binding is found in Norwegian. I address the choice of reflexive in local and long distance binding in 2.2, while the geographic distribution of Norwegian long distance binding is the topic of 2.3. The section is summarised in 2.4.

2.1 Two types of long distance binding in Norwegian

To my knowledge, the earliest report of long distance binding in Modern Norwegian is found in Aasen (1864). Aasen notes that although reflexive pronouns in Norwegian are normally related to the subject of their containing clause, there are cases where a reflexive pronoun in a

subordinate clause is related instead to the subject of the superordinate clause. He gives the following examples (Aasen 1864:292):

(1) *Han trudde, at dei vilde narra seg.*
     he   thought that they would cheat   REFL
     'He thought that they would cheat him.'

(2) *Ho trur alltid, at dei tala um   seg.*
     she thinks always that they talk about   REFL
     'She always thinks that they talk about her.'

(3) *Han sagde, at hesten   sin   var større.*
     he   said   that horse.DEF REFL.POSS was bigger
     'He said that his horse was bigger.'

We see here that a non-subject reflexive pronoun contained in a complement clause, as in (1) and (2), as well as a reflexive possessive pronoun inside the subject of a complement clause, as in (3), can be bound by the matrix subject.[1]

Concerning constructions like (3), Moshagen & Trosterud (1990:48, fn. 2) suggested that having a reflexive possessor in the subject of a subordinate clause might be more or less acceptable in all Norwegian dialects. Moreover, as Lødrup (2009:113) points out, the binding relation between a possessor inside a subject and a higher subject can be seen as local binding, since the higher subject is the closest available binder for the possessor in question.

Lødrup (2009) also observes that if the complement clause has an indefinite subject, as in (4) (cf. Lødrup 2009:128), or an expletive subject, as in (5) (cf. Lødrup 2009:116), binding into it is quite acceptable:[2]

(4) *De venter på at andre skal gjøre jobben   for seg.*
     they wait   on that others shall do   job.DEF for REFL
     'They are waiting for others to do the job for them.'

---

[1] Hellan (1988), perhaps the most widely known work on Norwegian anaphors, describes a variety of Norwegian that does not allow binding into finite clauses, as explicitly expressed by the tensed S-condition (Hellan 1988:84). Hellan notes, though, that binding into complement clauses sometimes occurs in casual speech (Hellan 1988:85).

Faarlund, Lie & Vannebo (1997:1161) also point out that reflexive possessors often appear in subjects of embedded clauses in the spoken language, although they are not common in writing. In addition, they note that binding of non-subjects in complement clauses and binding into relative clauses is attested.

[2] The effect of expletives was also noted in Aass (1979:315).

(5) *Plutselig fikk han høre at det kom en mann bak seg.*
suddenly got he hear that it came a man behind REFL
'Suddenly he heard that there came a man behind him.'

To account for the relatively high acceptability of constructions like these, Lødrup (2009) proposes a slight revision of principle A of binding theory. His formulation of principle A is as follows (Lødrup 2009:126):

(6) *Principle A of binding theory*
An anaphor is bound in a local domain that contains a (prominent) subject that is relationally superior.

Here, "prominent" means definite, or animate and having a thematic role that is high on the thematic hierarchy. A consequence of principle A, formulated as in (6), is that the subordinate subjects can be ignored as potential binders if they are lacking in prominence, so that the binding domain for the anaphor is in fact extended beyond the minimal clause.[3]

In addition, Lødrup (2009) notes that when the intervening potential binder is low in prominence, binding into relative clauses is also quite frequent in present-day Norwegian. An example is given in (7) (from Lødrup 2009:112):

(7) *Hun fortjener jo å ha noen som er glad i seg.*
she deserves you.know to have somebody that is fond of REFL
'She deserves to have somebody who loves her, you know.'

In cases like these, the correlate of the relative clause is usually an indefinite quantifier, which is often non-specific Lødrup (2009:115).

If we now go back to the examples in (1) and (2), we see that the intervening subject in both cases is the definite *dei* 'they', which also has a human referent. This means that the intervener is highly prominent, and consequently, it cannot be argued that the binding domain of the anaphor is expanded so that it contains the actual binder, the subject of the matrix clause. What we have here is real long distance binding of what could be referred to as the

---

[3] Sverre Stausland Johnsen, in unpublished work, notes that plural number on the intervener also facilitates long distance binding. He gives examples like the following pair:

(i) a. ?? Lærer-en$_i$ så elev-en stå bak seg$_i$.
teacher-DEF saw student-DEF stand behind REFL
'The teacher saw the student stand behind him/her.'

   b. Lærer-en$_i$ så elev-ene stå bak seg$_i$.
teacher.DEF saw student-DEF.PL stand behind REFL
'The teacher saw the students stand behind him/her.'

"Icelandic" type. As we will see, this kind of long distance binding is less widely accepted in Norway than the type that Lødrup (2009) describes, and it is also subject to other restrictions.

Long distance binding in general has been connected to logophoricity (see e.g. Maling 1984, Hellan 1988 and Sigurðsson 1990), and it has been argued that long distance binding of the "Icelandic" type depends on logophoricity also in Norwegian. More specifically, the claim is that long distance binding is possible when the content of the embedded clause corresponds to the point of view or perspective of the antecedent, which in most cases is the matrix subject (see e.g. Moshagen & Trosterud 1990). Hence, the relevant concept appears to be perspective, a view also taken by Strahan (2003).[4] According to Strahan, all reflexives have the reference point of the domain containing them as antecedent. This domain can be constrained e.g. by the presence of a perspective-holder or a first person pronoun (for details, see Strahan 2003:113).[5]

However, Lødrup (2009) demonstrates that in Norwegian, long distance binding across interveners of low prominence is not dependent on a logophoric matrix verb. The following example, from Lødrup (2009:117), shows this:

(8) *Kristne   er   forskjellige,   noen velger   irrasjonelle   slutninger*
     Christians are   different   some choose   irrational   conclusions
     som skader seg sjøl og   andre.
     that hurt   REFL self and   others
     'Christians are different, some choose irrational conclusions that hurt them and others.'

The matrix verb in the constructions that Lødrup discusses is often *ha* 'have', *få* 'get', *trenge* 'need', or some other verb indicating possession or lack of it, while the lower verb, as in long distance binding constructions more generally, is often non-agentive.[6]

2.2   Simple, complex and possessive reflexives

The majority of examples of long distance binding given above involve the simple reflexive *seg*. An exception is (8), where we see the complex reflexive *seg sjøl* (also written *seg selv*). The simple reflexive is known to be more acceptable in non-local binding than the complex

---

[4] Stausland Johnsen (2009) argues that at least in the variety of Norwegian that he has studied, a dialect from the county Østfold, long distance binding is possible if the matrix verb is a perception verb, or the semantically closely related *drømme* 'dream'. In his analysis, Stausland Johnsen connects the possibility of long distance binding to the absence of tense in the embedded clause.

[5] Culy (1994) points out that logophoricity proper is distinct from point of view, but he also notes that morphologically distinct logophoric pronouns as well as reflexive pronouns have a secondary use in contexts representing point of view.

[6] Teleman, Hellberg & Andersson (1999, vol. 2:343) report similar observations concerning Swedish, saying that some speakers allow a reflexive pronoun in a relative clause to be bound by the subject of the matrix clause if the correlate of the relative clause is an indefinite non-specific object of a verb with 'have' as a meaning component.

reflexive (Hellan 1988). Strahan (2003:73ff) showed, though, that *seg sjøl* is not completely excluded from non-local binding – as confirmed here by (8).

It is of relevance here that the simple reflexive in many cases is excluded from local binding. For example, the simple reflexive is ungrammatical in (9) – the complex reflexive is required instead.

(9)a. * *Ella elsker   seg*.
    Ella loves   REFL

  b. *Ella elsker   seg sjøl.*
    Ella loves   REFL self
    'Ella loves herself.'

Nevertheless, simple reflexives do sometimes appear in local binding dependencies. As Lødrup (2007) showed, the simple reflexive *seg* allows local binding in physical contexts, i.e. context where physical body of the referent is involved in the situation. This contrast is illustrated in (10). The simple reflexive *seg* is fine in (10a), which exemplifies a physical context, but not in (10b), where there is no physical context (examples from Lødrup 2007:193). Also note here that defining local binding as binding by a co-argument, as in Hellan (1998), would not enable us to distinguish between (10a) and (10b).

(10) a. *Vi   ba   ham kikke bak   seg*.
    we   asked   him look behind REFL
    'We asked him to look behind him.'

    b. *Vi   gjorde ham stolt   av   seg *(sjøl).*
    we   made   him proud   of   REFL self
    'We made him proud of himself.'

The situation is different for the possessive reflexive, since its simple version appears in the same positions as its complex version. This is shown in (11).

(11) a. *Ella hater   faren   sin.*
    Ella hates   father.DEF REFL.POSS
    'Ella hates her father.'

b. *Ella hater sin   egen far.*
Ella   hates REFL.POSS own   father
'Ella hates her own father.'

The difference between the simple possessive reflexive *sin* in (11a) and the complex poss-essive reflexive *sin egen* in (11b) is primarily one of emphasis: *egen* gives a contrastive interpretation, just like its English counterpart *own*. This is the reason why *sin egen* is obligatorily prenominal, thus appearing in a position where many varieties of Norwegian only allow possessors that receive a contrastive interpretation. Reflexive possessors without any emphasis, on the other hand, are normally postnominal in Norwegian. Apart from this, the syntactic contexts for nominal phrases containing *sin* are the same as the syntactic contexts for nominal phrases containing *sin egen*.

When Strahan (2003:89) concluded that the non-possessive reflexive *seg* is more acceptable in long distance binding than the possessive reflexive *sin*, this appears to be a consequence of the way the examples in her survey were constructed. She used near-minimal pairs of sentences, as in (12) (Strahan's examples 13 and 28). In pairs like this, with finite embedded clauses, her informants more readily accepted long distance binding of *seg* than of *sin*.

(12) a. *Jon tror   at   Maria elsker jobben sin.*
Jon thinks that Maria loves   job.DEF REFL.POSS
'Jon thinks that Maria loves ?his/her job.'

b. *Jon tror   at   Maria elsker seg.*
Jon thinks that Maria loves   REFL
'Jon thinks that Maria loves him.'

A closer look at the sentences reveals why. In (12a), *sin* allows local binding – that is, it can be bound by the local subject *Maria*. It follows that long distance binding, i.e. binding by the higher subject *Jon*, is dispreferred. In (12b), by contrast, *seg* does not allow local binding, as demonstrated in (9a). Hence, (12b) is either ungrammatical, or an instance of long distance binding. Thus, while it is true that binding of *sin* by the higher subject in (12a) is less acceptable than binding of *seg* by the higher subject in (12b), this has nothing to do with the possessive feature of *sin* as such, but follows from the fact that *sin* can be locally bound here whereas *seg* cannot.

If we look instead at examples where local binding of the reflexive is out, so that non-local binding is forced, there is in fact little difference in acceptability between possessive and non-possessive reflexives. Strahan gives the pair shown in (13) (her examples 20 and 14),

where PRO is controlled by the first person matrix object, so that the binder of *seg* and *sin*, which are third person, must be the matrix subject *Trond*.

(13) a. *Trond   ba   oss* PRO *hjelpe   seg.*
     Trond   asked   us   help   REFL
     'Trond asked us to help him.'

    b. *Trond   ba   oss* PRO *hjelpe   moren   sin.*
     Trond   asked   us   help   mother.DEF   REFL.POSS
     'Trond asked us to help his mother.'

Strahan (2003:89) reports that 71 % of her informants accepted (13a), whereas 76 % accepted (13b). Hence, in constructions where *sin* cannot be locally bound, non-local binding of *sin* and *seg* appear to be more or less equally acceptable.

2.3   The geographic distribution of long distance binding

Concerning the geographical distribution of long distance binding in Norwegian, Aasen (1864) stated that the phenomenon is particularly common in "Trondhjems Stift", which corresponds to the present-day counties of Nord-Trøndelag and Sør-Trøndelag plus most of Møre og Romsdal county, i.e. the central parts of Norway around the city of Trondheim. Half a century later, Iversen (1918) noted that long distance binding was also found in the dialect of Tromsø, in the north of Norway, while Tilset (1924) observed long distance binding in Strinda, which is now a part of Trondheim. Later on, Knudsen (1949) and Sandøy (1992), both referring to the Norwegian language as a whole, noted that long distance binding is more common in Trøndelag, and also in the western and northern parts of the country.

    The results presented in Strahan (2003), based on a survey of 180 speakers from all parts of Norway, suggest a similar picture. Strahan investigated long distance binding into subjects of complement clauses as well as long distance binding of non-subjects contained in complement clauses, in many cases across definite and animate subjects. An example of the latter type is shown in (14) (Strahan's example 45):

(14) *Jon$_i$ hørte   at   Tordis var   klar til å snakke   med seg$_i$.*
    Jon   heard   that Tordis was   ready to to speak   with REFL
    'Jon heard that Tordis was ready to speak with him.'

Strahan (2003:84) reports that 21 % of her informants accepted this example, with the indicated binding relation. Hence, the example is clearly not generally accepted by all speakers of Norwegian. However, Strahan does not specify the geographic distribution of the speakers

that accepted (14) and similar constructions. In the tables showing the geographic distribution, long distance binding of objects is lumped together with examples where the reflexive is contained in the subject of the complement clause. Still, Strahan shows that speakers in the Trøndelag region accept binding out of finite clauses to a higher degree than other speakers of Norwegian. It is unlikely that their scores could be very high if they had rejected long distance binding of objects, and we can therefore tentatively conclude that both kinds of long distance binding investigated by Strahan is more frequently accepted in Trøndelag than in other parts of Norway. In addition, the lowest acceptance of long distance binding is found in the southernmost parts of Norway, but informants from the northern regions are not particularly tolerant of long distance binding either.

Long distance binding has been seen as an archaic feature in Norwegian (Moshagen & Trosterud 1990, Strahan 2003:174). Interestingly, Rögnvaldsson (2007) showed that long distance binding was found in Old Norse, although it was less frequent than in Modern Icelandic. The acceptance of long distance binding found with some speakers of Norwegian might therefore represent the continuation of the reflexive syntax of Old Norse. It should be noted, though, that binding into relative clauses, which is accepted by many speakers of Norwegian, is not possible in Icelandic. This split between the two languages must have arisen after the Old Norse period. Those speakers of Norwegian who do not accept long distance binding at all, represent a newer development.

2.4   Summary

We have seen in this section that long distance binding across indefinite, inanimate and expletive subjects has been claimed to be generally acceptable in Norwegian, and so has binding into the subject of a complement clause. Long distance binding across animate and definite subjects appears to be different; it is connected to perspective, and it is more frequent in the Trøndelag region than elsewhere. Other factors, such as the choice of reflexive and the agentivity of the lower verb might also influence the acceptability of long distance binding.

3   The Nordic Syntax Database

Recent data on long distance binding in Norwegian can be found in the Nordic Syntax Database, described in Lindstad et al. (2009). The database contains judgement data collected from 924 speakers of Scandinavian, representing all the main varieties and many different dialects. The informants were presented with recordings of a number of sentences read by speakers of the respective local dialects, and asked to judge them using a scale from 1 (totally unacceptable) to 5 (fully acceptable). In each location, four informants were recruited: a younger woman, a younger man, an older woman and an older man – where "younger" means under 30 and "older" means above 50 years of age.

The data collection for the Norwegian part of the Nordic Syntax Database took place in the years 2006–2010 and covered 111 locations. Three sentences were tested that are of particular interest here: sentences 103, 116 and 156.

In sentence 116, shown in (15), a reflexive pronoun in a relative clause is bound by the matrix subject, across an inanimate (but definite) correlate:

(15) Sentence 116 in the Nordic Syntax Database
Folk   les   vel   berre   dei   breva   som er   til seg   sjølv.
people read presumably only   those letters.DEF that are   to REFL self
'People presumably read only those letters that are meant for themselves.'

As noted by Lundquist (2013b), this example was accepted by nearly all informants. A closer look at the judgements reveals that only a few speakers, scattered all over Norway, gave it a score lower than 5.

In example 156, shown below as (16), the reflexive possessor *sitt* is contained in the subject of a complement clause and bound by the subject of the matrix clause:

(16) Sentence 156 in the Nordic Syntax Database
Regjeringa   reknar ikkje med at   forslaget   sitt   vil   få
government.DEF counts   not   with that proposal.DEF REFL.POSS will get
fleirtal.
majority.
'The government does not expect that its proposal will get a majority vote.'

Lundquist (2013a) notes that relatively few informants gave this example a medium score. In most cases, it was either rejected or fully accepted. But strikingly, informants from the same location often gave opposite judgements, which means that the variation is individual rather than dialectal. Lundquist further reports that there was a concentration of high scores in Sør-Trøndelag, Møre og Romsdal, northern Oppland and northern Hedmark, that is, in the area known to have more long distance binding than the rest of Norway. Hence, Moshagen & Trosterud (1990) and Lødrup (2009) appear to be right in claiming that binding into an embedded subject by a higher subject is generally quite acceptable in Norwegian, although it is not fully accepted by everyone. We can also note that on the whole younger speakers are more positive than older ones, which suggests that this binding pattern might be on the rise in present-day Norwegian.

Long distance binding of the object of a complement clause was unfortunately not tested in the Norwegian subproject. We will therefore instead take a closer look at sentence 103, shown in (17):

(17) Sentence 103 in the Nordic Syntax Database

Ho   bad   meg PRO *hjelpe   seg.*
she   asked   me   help   REFL
'She asked me to help her.'

As we see, this example represents medium distance binding in the sense of Reuland & Koster (1991), as the binding relation between the reflexive pronoun *seg* and its binder *ho* 'she' crosses a non-finite clause boundary, thus extending beyond the local domain defined by the nearest subject – the PRO subject of the infinitival verb. One can also note that the intervening subject is animate, and that it is not a potential binder since its first person feature clashes with the third person feature of the reflexive. Hence, if the sentence is accepted, the higher subject is the binder.

Lundquist (2013c) reports that sentence 103 was rejected along the southern coast of Norway, whereas there was a concentration of high scores in the Trøndelag area. In addition, it got higher scores from the older informants than from the younger ones.[7] In some locations, the results are particularly striking, such as Røros, where the sentence got the score 1 from both of the younger informants, but a 5 from both of the older informants, and Meråker, where it got 1 and 2 from the younger informants but again 5 from the older ones. And in Rauma, Stranda and Volda, three locations situated in the southern part of the Møre og Romsdal county, all of the younger informants gave the score 2 whereas all the older informants gave the score 5.

These scores seem to indicate that medium distance binding, and probably binding across animate subjects more generally, is losing ground all over Norway. However, the relatively low scores given to sentence 103 are not necessarily only due to the binding relation. It has been suggested to me that the infinitival construction found here also plays a role. Younger speakers do not readily accept this construction with the verb *be* 'ask, request', I am told. Hence, the scores given to sentence 103 might not be due to the binding relation.[8]

---

[7] Sentences 103, 116 and 156 were also tested in Sweden and among speakers of Swedish in Finland. The acceptance of sentence 116 was high also among Swedish speakers, while there was much variation in the scores given to sentences 103 and 156 (see Lundquist 2013a, 2013b and 2013 c for details).

[8] The example of medium distance binding discussed here involves a simple reflexive. Lødrup (2009:129) notes however that complex reflexives can take part in medium distance binding in Norwegian. One of his examples is the following:

(i) *Det   ER   jo*   *faktisk litt   slik   psykopatene   klarer   å   snu*
    it   is   you.know   actually a.bit like.this psychopaths.DEF   manage   to   turn
    en hel   verden   til å   omhandle   seg   selv.
    a   whole world   to to deal.with   REFL SELF
    'It is actually somewhat like this that the psychopaths manage to turn a whole world to be about them.'

4 A new survey of binding in Norwegian

The preceding sections provide the background for the investigation of binding patterns in Norwegian that will be described in the following. What we know so far is that some speakers of Norwegian accept non-local binding more easily than others, and that liberal speakers are more often found in the Central Norway region. Consequently, I did my best to recruit informants from that region. My ambition was not to have a representative selection of Norwegian speakers, nor was attracting a high number of responses a primary goal. Instead, I wanted my informants to have long distance binding as a part of their linguistic repertoire, so that their acceptance of various cases of binding could be investigated in more detail.

In this section, I first present the survey in 4.1. Some information on the informants follows in 4.2, while 4.3 is a description of the questionnaire.

4.1 The survey

The survey reported on here was carried out by means of a web questionnaire created in SurveyMesh[9] and consisting of 30 sentences written in Bokmål, one of the two written standards of Norwegian. The reasons for choosing Bokmål were, firstly, that it would not be possible in any case to present the examples in the dialect of each informant, and, secondly, that Bokmål is more widely used in writing than Nynorsk, the other written standard, and therefore more likely to be readily accepted and processed by the informants. To minimise the risk of examples being rejected for lexical reasons, I also chose words that to my knowledge are commonly used in all parts of Norway.

The informants were however asked to judge the sentences as if spoken in their own dialect. They were told not to change the word order in any way, which was important because some of the examples involved embedded V2 sentences, which informants some-times tend to switch to non-V2. In order to prevent them from replacing reflexive pronouns with non-reflexives, they were also instructed not to replace any of the words by other words. Hence, what was required of them was to, in their heads, translate the word forms into their own dialect and then judge the sentence according to a three-point scale: "perfectly okay", "a bit odd", or "completely wrong".[10]

This might seem a bit risky, since there was no way of ensuring that the informants actually judged the dialect counterparts of the sentences. However, most speakers of Norwegian are well aware of their own dialect as a linguistic variety in its own right and

---

In addition, this example has a non-prominent intervener, while the example discussed in the text has a prominent intervener. As Lødrup points out, both the non-prominent intervener and the complex reflexive suggest that the local domain in (i) has been extended to comprise the higher clause.

[9] The survey is found here: http://www.surveymesh.se/s/survey/anon?id=4116b5ff-eea7-4263-bd40-b216ef7a1ead

[10] More specifically, the alternatives were "Denne setningen er helt grei" (This sentence is perfectly okay), "Denne setningen er litt rar" (This sentence is a bit odd), and "Denne setningen høres helt feil ut for meg" (This sentence sounds completely wrong to me).

different from the two standard varieties, and finding the dialectal counterpart of an expression in a standard variety is an exercise that should not be too unfamiliar. The responses also strongly indicate that the informants have indeed judged the examples according to their own dialect. If they had been judged according to the written standard, most of the sentences involving long distance binding should have been rejected.[11] On the other hand, none of the informants accepted all the examples in the survey. Instead, their judgements indicate that they have in fact responded to the syntactic properties of the examples. What we see is a coherent pattern where individual judgements align according to a hierarchy defined by the complexity of the left periphery.

The link to the survey was spread through various channels. I concentrated my efforts to the Central Norway region, where long distance binding is known to be more frequent. Hence, friends and colleagues in that region were asked to share the link, and I also succeeded in recruiting some informants by sending emails to a couple of municipality administrations.

4.2   The informants

The data collection started in September 2013, and the responses that will be reported on here were given between September 2013 and December 2013. During this period 95 speakers responded to the questionnaire, but since two of them forgot to save their markings, the judgements of 93 speakers of Norwegian were recorded.

In addition to the linguistic examples, the questionnaire contained questions related to the linguistic background of the informants: if they considered Norwegian their first language, if they had grown up in Norway, and if so, in which municipality. They were also asked about their present place of residence as well as their age: up to 24, 24–49, or above 50 years.

All informants stated that Norwegian was their first language and that they had grown up in Norway. Two informants answered that they live outside Norway at present, while the remaining 91 still live there.

In Table 1 I have grouped the informants according to age and region.[12] Only two informants (both from the Southern Norway region) were under 25 years of age, and conse-

---

[11] Although it is rarely formulated explicitly, it seems clear to me that an operative norm banning long distance binding applies to written Norwegian. Speakers with extensive exposure to the written language often react strongly negatively to violations of this norm, as can be witnessed in various online discussion fora dedicated to language. Moreover, Strahan (2003) found a strong negative correlation between level of education and acceptance of long distance binding, a fact which also suggests that familiarity with norms applying to the written language plays a role.

[12] The regions are defined by me as follows: Troms & Finnmark = Troms and Finnmark counties, Nordland = Nordland county, Central Norway = the counties Nord-Trøndelag, Sør-Trøndelag, and Møre og Romsdal, Western Norway = the counties Sogn og Fjordane, Hordaland, and Rogaland north of Boknafjorden, Eastern North = the northern, mountainous areas of the counties Hedmark, Oppland, and Buskerud, Eastern South = Eastern Norway south of region 5 and east of region 7, Southern Norway = The counties Telemark, Aust-Agder, Vest-Agder, and Rogaland south of Boknafjorden.

quently, I have collapsed the two lower age brackets in the questionnaire into one age group here.

Table 1: Informants in the survey, by region and age

Region	Under 50	50 or older	Total
1 Troms & Finnmark	1	1	2
2 Nordland	7	0	7
3 Central Norway	25	35	60
4 Western Norway	5	3	8
5 Eastern North	0	0	0
6 Eastern South	6	4	10
7 Southern Norway	6	0	6
Total	50	43	93

We see here that a total of 60 informants, or 65 % of the whole sample, are from the Central Norway region. Other regions are only sparsely represented. Accordingly, there ought to be a fair number of speakers in this sample who can accept long distance binding.

4.3   The questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of 30 sentences, which can all be found in the appendix. An overview of all binding patterns that were tested is given in (18), with the number of sentences in brackets.

(18) *Binding patterns tested in the questionnaire*

a. No anaphor (7)
b. Local binding (3)
c. Medium distance binding (2)
d. Binding into the subject of a finite complement clause (1)
e. Binding into relative clause, indefinite animate correlate (2)
f. Binding into relative clause, definite inanimate correlate (1)
g. Binding into complement clause, non-V2, inanimate subject (1)
h. Binding into complement clause, non-V2, indefinite subject (1)
i. Binding into complement clause, non-V2, definite animate subject (4)
j. Binding into complement clause, subject-initial V2, indefinite subject (2)
k. Binding into complement clause, subject-initial V2, definite subject (1)
l. Binding into complement clause, V2 with topicalised subject (1)
m. Binding into complement clause, V2 with topicalised object (1)
n. Binding into complement clause, non-V2, second person subject (2)
o. Binding into adverbial clause (1)

We see that 7 sentences contained no anaphor, but instead non-reflexive pronouns, but were otherwise parallel to sentences involving long distance binding of reflexives. In addition, there were 3 sentences with local binding and 2 with medium distance binding. The remaining 18 sentences involved long distance binding, see (18d)-(18o).

In most of the examples that tested binding, the simple reflexive *seg* was used. The three cases of local binding were all contexts for *seg*, and in addition, the possessive reflexive *sin* appears in one of them. The simple reflexive *seg* was also chosen for the majority of examples involving non-local binding. Since *seg* is less readily acceptable in local binding than the complex reflexive *seg sjøl*, as shown in 2.2, the presence of *seg* often forces long distance binding. Hence, an informant who accepts an example with *seg* most likely accepts it with long distance binding. Since I would not have the opportunity to talk to any of my informants to check their interpretation, I considered *seg* to be the safer alternative. In one example of long distance binding the possessive reflexive *sin* was used, and in another, the complex possessive reflexive *sin egen*.

5   Results from the survey

The most striking result from the survey is that there is much individual variation in the acceptance of long distance binding in Norwegian. While almost all my informants accepted the examples of local and medium distance binding that were presented to them, the sentences involving long distance binding got distinctly lower scores, with the acceptance rate ranging from approximately two thirds of my informants to ten or fewer. Interestingly, it also turns out that the examples that were lower in acceptance were not all accepted by the same subset of informants. Instead, we see that informants differ as to which syntactic properties make long distance binding possible for them. Hence, there are different individual grammars among those speakers of Norwegian who can accept long distance binding at all.

In the following, the informants' judgements of sentences with local or medium distance binding are presented in 5.1. In 5.2 I turn to their judgement of long distance binding, starting with binding across non-prominent interveners. In 5.3 I look more specifically at long distance binding into V2 clauses, which, as we shall see, is accepted by fewer informants than long distance binding into non-V2 clauses. Moreover, it turns out that the presence of a topic in initial position in the embedded V2 clause further reduces the acceptability of long distance binding. The topic of 5.4 is long distance binding across definite subjects, which is accepted by some of the informants in my survey, while 5.5 deals with binding across second person pronouns. Finally, in 5.6 I take a closer look at the judgements of eight individual speakers who were particularly tolerant of long distance binding. Taken together, their judgements give us an indication of the variation that can be found in individual Norwegian grammars.

5.1   Local and medium distance binding

As shown in (18) above, the survey contained some examples of local and medium distance binding. The informants' judgements of these constructions can serve as a standard of comparison for their judgement of long distance binding. I will therefore start by presenting the survey results for the examples that involved local and medium distance binding.

Of all the 30 examples in the survey, the example in (19) got the highest score. Here and in the following, the judgement "perfectly okay" is represented as ok, while the judgement "a bit odd" is represented as ? and "completely wrong" as *. As we see, 91 informants regarded (19) as perfectly okay, whereas only one informant, from the Central Norway region, found it a bit odd. As is also the case for some other examples, one informant left a blank here, so that the total number of responses is only 92.

(19) *Jeg   ba   dem   om   å* PRO *vaske   seg.*
      I   asked   them   about   to   wash   REFL
      'I asked them to wash (themselves).'

ok	?	*
91	1	0

The second highest score was given to example (20). 91 informants accepted it completely, while one, from the Central Norway region, found it a bit odd, and another, from the Eastern South region, rejected it.

(20) *De   lurte   på   hva de   skulle   ta   med seg.*
      they wondered on   what they should   take   with REFL
      'They wondered what they should take along.'

ok	?	*
91	1	1

The high acceptance of these examples is not surprising, since in both cases, the reflexive is locally bound, and in addition, it is part of a fixed expression. The appearance of the simple reflexive in (19) is traditionally explained as a consequence of *vaske seg* 'wash (oneself)' being a reflexive verb, which means that the reflexive is non-thematic, and because of this, it can only be realised as a simple reflexive (see e.g. Hellan 1988:12). Lødrup (2007), however, argues that the simple reflexive here is connected to the physical context. In any case, the reflexive in (19) is coindexed with the PRO subject of the control infinitive. The expression *ta med seg* 'take along' in example (20) is idiomatic, and as Lødrup (2007:192) observes, idiomatic expressions often take simple reflexives. This means that both examples should be unambiguous and converge with the indicated interpretation. I will not speculate on possible reasons for rejecting (20) or finding (19) or (20) less than perfect, and I will assume that in principle, both examples are fully grammatical in Norwegian.

A third example of local binding, example (21), was marked as "a bit odd" by 7 informants, as we see. Of these informants one was from Nordland and two were from each of the regions Western, Eastern South, and Central Norway.

(21) *Det er koselig å* PRO_{arb} *ha med seg hunden sin*
it is nice to have with REFL dog.DEF POSS.REFL

ok	?	*
86	7	0

på skitur.
on ski-trip
'It's nice to have your dog with you when you go skiing.'

The fact that the binder in example (21) is arbitrary PRO might play a role here, in addition to the presence of two reflexives – although the expression *ha med seg* 'bring along' is very similar to *ta med seg* 'take along' shown in (20).

Next, we can note that the two examples of medium distance binding, examples (22) and (23), got higher scores than (21) and almost as high scores as (19) and (20). Example (22) was rejected by one informant, from the Eastern South region, and (22) as well as (23) was judged as being a bit odd by three informants, but an overwhelming majority of my informants fully accepted both examples.

(22) *De trenger noen til å hjelpe seg.*
they need somebody to to help REFL
'They need somebody to help them.'

ok	?	*
88	3	1

(23) *De vil alltid ha andre til å gjøre jobben for seg.*
they want always have others to to do job.DEF for REFL
'They always want others to do the job for them.'

ok	?	*
89	3	0

We now recall that the example of medium distance binding that was included in the Norwegian part of the Nordic Syntax Database, given in (17) above, was rejected by many younger speakers, except in the Central Norway region, where most younger speakers gave it a medium score. For example, in Southern Norway it was rejected by 28 out of 34 younger informants (see Appendix 1), as well as by 22 out of 34 older informants. In my survey, on the other hand, medium distance binding was accepted by all the informants from the Southern Norway region, who all happened to be in the younger group. Thus, although the absolute numbers are small, my examples seem to be more acceptable than the example in the Nordic Syntax Database. In addition to the possible problems with the infinitival construction in the Nordic Syntax Database, the judgements might also be influenced by the fact that the intervener in that example is definite, while the interveners in my examples are indefinite. As

noted by Lødrup (2009:129), the prominence of the intervener is not only relevant to long distance binding – it also influences the acceptability of medium distance binding.

5.2   Long distance binding

We will now look at how sentences involving long distance binding were judged in my survey. The first point to be noted is that only 10 informants, from a total of 93, did not fully accept long distance binding, but judged all examples as "a bit odd" or "completely wrong". The low number is partly a consequence of the geographic bias of the informant group, with considerable overrepresentation of the Central Norway region. However, the informants in question were from the regions Western Norway (2), Southern Norway (1), Eastern South (2), Nordland (1), and Central Norway (4), which shows that speakers with a restrictive reflexive syntax can be found all over the country, even in the Central Norway region. Still, the majority of my informants, regardless of age and region, accepted at least one example of long distance binding.

Two examples of long distance binding got higher scores than the others, namely examples (24) and (25). These examples were fully accepted by two thirds of the informants. Note that although example (24) involves a complement clause and example (25) a relative clause, the interveners are in both cases low in prominence, in the sense of Lødrup (2009). Consequently, it is not surprising that many informants accept the examples. Also note that local binding is not an option in any of these cases. In example (24), *noe* 'something' is ruled out as a binder for pragmatic reasons, and in example (25), local binding would require the complex reflexive *seg sjøl*. Thus, speakers who accept these examples, necessarily accept them with long distance binding.

(24) *Hun føler at   noe   mangler   i   livet   sitt.*
      she   feels that something misses   in life.DEF REFL.POSS
      'She feels that something is missing in her life.'

ok	?	*
63	18	10

(25) *De   trenger noen   som   kan   hjelpe   seg.*
      they need   somebody that can   help   REFL
      'They need somebody who can help them.'

ok	?	*
63	17	13

The informants who accepted these examples represent all regions. Long distance binding of this type can therefore not be claimed to be a characteristic of particular dialects, although it is not accepted by all individual speakers in any region. Variation on this point appears to be individual rather than geographic.

We can also observe that example (24) contains the possessive reflexive *sitt* while example (25) contains the non-possessive reflexive *seg*. Thus, there is no indication here that

long distance binding of possessive reflexives is less acceptable than long distance binding of the non-possessive *seg*.

Examples (26) and (27) got somewhat lower scores. The relatively low acceptance of (26) might be due to the agentive verb in the embedded clause (cf. Lødrup 2009). It is however unexpected that (27) gets lower scores than (25). Example (27) is accepted by fewer of the informants and completely rejected by more of them, even though factors such as perspective and the prominence of the intervener are the same, and the non-agentivity of the embedded verb should favour (27) over (25).

(26) *De   venter   på   at   noen   skal gjøre   jobben*
    they wait   on   that somebody shall do   job.DEF
    for   seg.
    for   REFL
    'They are waiting for somebody to do the job for them.'

ok	?	*
51	21	19

(27) *Hun fortjener   å ha   noen   som er glad i seg.*
    she   deserves   to have somebody that is fond of REFL
    'She deserves to have somebody who loves her.'

ok	?	*
45	24	24

We must conclude that the acceptance of long distance binding in Norwegian is dependent on several factors, some of which are not yet fully understood. There also appears to be individual variation as to which factors are decisive. Three informants accepted example (24) but no other example of binding across a finite clause boundary. Three others only accepted example (25), while there were two who only accepted example (26). Since long distance binding is clearly marginal for these speakers, it is also possible that some feature not directly connected to the binding pattern has made one example more acceptable than the others.

One example in the questionnaire, example (28), involved binding into a subordinate subject. The acceptance of this example was lower than the acceptance of examples with an indefinite intervener. As we see here, only 40 of the 93 informants fully accepted the construction:[13]

---

[13] I claimed in 2.2 that the complex possessive reflexive *sin egen* has the same syntax as the simple possessive reflexive *sin*. While this is generally true, it also appears that these two variants are not always equally good (or bad) inside an embedded subject. An informal investigation suggests that for the majority of those who can accept a reflexive inside an embedded subject at all, *sin egen* is preferred over *sin*, but there are also speakers who prefer *sin* as well as speakers who report no difference in acceptability.

(28) *Hun mente at sin egen plan var best.*
     she thought that REFL.POSS own plan was best
     'She thought that her own plan was the best.'

ok	?	*
40	25	28

It also seems clear that the acceptance of this binding pattern does not go hand in hand with acceptance of other cases of binding across finite clause boundaries. Two informants, both in the younger age group, accepted (28) but no other examples of long distance binding. On the other hand, there were also informants who rejected (28) although they accepted examples like (26) and (27).

5.3 Long distance binding across definite interveners

My survey also tested binding across definite interveners, that is, across potential binders that are relatively prominent in the sense of Lødrup (2009), and which therefore should block long distance binding dependencies to a higher degree than less prominent subjects. We will first look at example (29) below, which involves binding into a relative clause, across the definite but inanimate and non-specific correlate *det* 'it, that'.

(29) *De gjør bare det som passer for seg.*
     they do only it   that suits   for   REFL
     'They only do what suits them.'

ok	?	*
39	27	27

As we see, this example was rejected by more informants and accepted by fewer than similar examples with indefinite correlates, such as (25) and (27), shown in section 5.2. Still, it is completely rejected by less than one-third of the informants, and accepted by more than one-third.

     Examples that involved long distance binding across an animate personal pronoun were judged strikingly differently from example (29) and examples with indefinite interveners. In examples (30)–(33) a non-subject in a finite complement clause is bound by the matrix subject, across a personal pronoun that is the subject of the complement clause. Thus, this is what one might call long distance binding of the Icelandic type.

(30) *Hun ville at de skulle bli med seg inn.*
     she wanted that they should come with REFL in
     'She wanted them to come inside with her.'

ok	?	*
13	22	58

(31) *Hun trodde at han var sint på seg.*
     she thought that he   was angry   on   REFL
     'She thought that he was angry with her.'

ok	?	*
13	17	63

(32) *Hun   lurte   på   om   han   var   sint   på   seg.*
she   wondered   on   if   he   was   angry   on   REFL
'She wondered if he was angry with her.'

ok	?	*
11	19	62

(33) *Hun   trodde   at   han   ikke   var   sint   på   seg*
she   thought that   he   not   was   angry   on   REFL
lenger.
longer
'She thought that he was not angry with her any more.'

ok	?	*
10	28	54

The total acceptance for each example is quite low. Moreover, although a majority of my informants came from the Central Norway region, where acceptance of long distance binding is known to be relatively high, only 22 informants indicated that they fully accepted at least one of the four examples just mentioned. 19 of these were from the Central Norway region, whereas two were from Western Norway and one from the Eastern South region. This means that 41 of the 60 informants from Central Norway did not accept any of the examples in (30)–(33). Thus, while speakers who are relatively liberal with respect to long distance binding can be found also outside of this region, many speakers in the region are relatively restrictive. At the same time, the five informants who fully accepted all four examples were all from the Central Norway region.

My survey also included one example of binding into an adverbial clause, across a definite animate subject. As we see below, even this example was accepted by a few speakers.

(34) *Hun   ble   sur   fordi   ungene   erta   seg.*
she   got   cross because children.DEF   teased   REFL
'She got cross because the children teased her.'

ok	?	*
4	19	70

Of the four informants who accepted example (34), three were among those that were particularly tolerant of long distance binding. The fourth informant who accepted this example is a more puzzling case. This informant accepted no other example of long distance binding. Only medium distance binding was judged perfectly ok, alongside example (34). At present, I do not see how the judgements given by this informant should be interpreted.

5.4   Binding into embedded V2 clauses

The acceptance of long distance binding across a definite subject, which is low in all cases, drops further if the embedded clause has V2 order, as in example (35):

(35) *Hun trodde at han var ikke sint på seg lenger.*
    she thought that he was not angry on REFL longer
    'She thought that he was not angry with her any more.'

ok	?	*
10	15	68

Except for the word order in the embedded clause, example (35) is identical to example (33) above. We see that although the number of informants who fully accept the example is the same in both cases, example (35) is rejected by more informants than example (33).

A look at individual judgements of examples (33) and (35) reveals that 6 informants accepted both, 48 informants rejected both, while 8 informants found both a bit odd. In other words, 62 out of 93 informants judged the two examples in the same way. However, 17 of those who rejected example (35) (the V2 version) found example (33) (the non-V2 version) only "a bit odd". I take this to mean that the combination of embedded V2 and a prominent intervening subject leads to doubtless ungrammaticality for these speakers.

It also turns out that V2 order in the embedded clause has consequences for the acceptability of long distance binding across an indefinite and non-specific subject. Recall that long distance binding of this type is possible for many speakers of Norwegian. Examples (24)–(27) were judged as fully acceptable by half or more of the informants in my survey. On this background, it is striking that example (36), shown below, was rejected by 46 out of 92 informants, i.e., by exactly 50 %, and only a minority of 18 informants found it fully acceptable. The reason for the relatively low acceptance of example (36) is the combination of long distance binding with V2 order in the embedded clause.

(36) *De forstår at andre kan ikke gjøre jobben*
    they understand that others can not do job.DEF
    for seg.
    for REFL
    'They understand that others cannot do the job for them.'

ok	?	*
18	28	46

It is well known that embedded clauses in Norwegian and other Scandinavian varieties can have V2 order under certain conditions, and that *tro* 'think' and *forstå* 'understand' are verbs that allow their complement to have this order – see e.g. Julien (2007) and Wiklund et al. (2009). Still, embedded V2 is not necessarily accepted by all speakers. In my survey, this is reflected in the judgements given to example (37), which is identical to (36) except that the embedded reflexive in (36) is replaced by the non-reflexive pronoun *dem* 'them' in (37). In other words, (37) involves embedded V2 but no long distance binding.

	ok	?	*
	73	14	6

(37) *De forstår at andre kan ikke gjøre jobben*
they understand that others can not do job.DEF
for dem.
for them
'They understand that others cannot do the job for them.'

As we see, example (37) is fully accepted by 73 out of 93 informants, while 6 reject it and 14 find it a bit odd. In other words, although the overall acceptance is higher for (37) than for examples with long distance binding, the word order in the embedded clause makes (37) less than perfect for some informants. Hence, embedded V2 reduces the acceptability somewhat, but not as much as embedded V2 and long distance binding in combination.

The effect of embedded V2 is probably a consequence of the complex C-domain of V2 clauses. That the C-domain of V2 clauses is more complex than the C-domain of non-V2 clauses is generally assumed, regardless of whether embedded V2 is understood as CP-recursion, as in den Besten (1983) and Platzack (1983), or as the presence of an articulated C-domain in the embedded clause, as in Julien (2007) and Eide (2011). The effect of embedded V2 on the acceptance of long distance binding may nevertheless seem a bit surprising. If embedded V2 signals that the contents of the embedded clause is asserted, either by the speaker or by the matrix subject, as claimed e.g. by Andersson (1975), Holmberg & Platzack (1995) and Julien (2007), then one might expect embedded V2 to enhance the effect of perspective and facilitate long distance binding. But as we see, it does not. Instead, the complexity of the left periphery of the embedded V2 clause interferes with the long distance binding dependency, leading to reduced acceptability.

If the embedded clause has an initial doubled topic, the complexity of the C-domain increases further (see Eide 2011 for more details on doubled topics). And as the judgements of examples (38) and (39) suggest, having the subject as an initial doubled topic in an embedded clause leads to lower acceptability, even without long distance binding. Although very few informants completely reject these examples, many find them a bit odd.

	ok	?	*
	58	30	4

(38) *Jeg mener at andre, de får gjøre hva de vil.*
I think that others they may do what they want
'I think that others can do what they want.'

	ok	?	*
	65	19	9

(39) *De forstår at andre folk, de kan ikke gjøre*
they understand that other people they can not do
jobben for dem.
job.DEF for them
'They understand that other people cannot do the job for them.'

If we add long distance binding to a construction with an embedded subject topic, as in example (40), the rejection rate raises considerably.

(40) *De forstår at andre folk, de kan ikke gjøre*
they understand that other people they can not do
jobben for seg.
job.DEF for REFL
'They understand that other people cannot do the job for them.'

ok	?	*
12	26	55

The survey also included an example, shown in (41), where the object of the embedded clause is topicalised inside that clause. Moreover, the object is definite. The fronting of the object gives rise to an operator dependency between the fronted object and the base position of the object, a dependency which crosses the dependency between the reflexive and the binder. We might expect this to further reduce the acceptability of long distance binding. This is also what we find.

(41) *De må forstå at denne jobben kan ikke andre*
they must understand that this job.DEF can not others
gjøre for seg.
do for REFL
'They must understand that others cannot do this job for them.'

ok	?	*
9	21	63

As we see, example (41) was even less acceptable than example (40) – in particular, it was rejected by more informants than example (40), whereas the number of informants who fully accepted it was only marginally lower. Inspection of individual judgements reveals that 6 informants fully accepted both examples. 6 others found (40) fully acceptable, but either rejected (41) or found it a bit odd, while 3 informants gave opposite judgements, preferring (41) over (40). Although the absolute numbers are small, we have here another indication that many factors can be relevant for the acceptance of long distance binding in Norwegian, and that individual speakers weigh the factors differently.

5.5   Long distance binding across second person subjects

Strahan (2011:170) reports that in Faroese, long distance binding is not allowed across second person pronouns. She also states that the presence of an intervening second person pronoun does not affect long distance binding in Norwegian. Two examples with binding across second persons pronouns were included in my survey, and the judgements that were given of these examples indicate that also for some speakers of Norwegian, person features in the

intervener is a factor that affects the acceptance of long distance binding.[14] Below, I present the judgements of the two examples involving second person pronouns, alongside the judgements of corresponding examples with third person pronouns (repeated from the preceding section).

(42) *Hun trodde at han var sint på seg.*
she thought that he was angry on REFL
'She thought that he was angry with her.'

ok	?	*
13	17	63

(43) *Hun trodde at du var sint på seg.*
she thought that you were angry on REFL
'She thought that you were angry with her.'

ok	?	*
8	16	69

(44) *Hun lurte på om han var sint på seg.*
she wondered on if he was angry on REFL
'She wondered if he was angry with her.'

ok	?	*
11	19	62

(45) *Hun lurte på om du var sint på seg.*
she wondered on if you were angry on REFL
'She wondered if you were angry with her.'

ok	?	*
3	17	73

We see that as long as aggregated judgements are considered, binding across a second person subject is in both cases less acceptable than binding across a third person subject. But as we will see in the next section, this does not hold for all individual speakers.

We can also note that binding into an embedded interrogative clause, as in (44) and (45), gets lower overall scores than binding into an embedded declarative clause, as in (42) and (43). An embedded interrogative clause arguably has a more complex C-domain than an embedded declarative clause introduced by *at* 'that', if not in terms of structure, so at least in terms of features, since it is generally assumed that an overt or covert question operator is present in all interrogative clauses (see e.g. Rizzi 2001). However, as long as the intervening subject is third person, the effect of clause type is only marginal. When the intervening subject is second person, on the other hand, the combined effect of the person feature in the intervener and the embedded interrogative clause leads to the least acceptable example in the whole survey. Still, it is accepted by a few speakers.

Thus, in my survey I did not find one single property that makes long distance binding unavailable for all speakers. Instead, there are several factors that influence the acceptability

---

[14] Binding across a first person pronoun was not tested. The expectation is that first person pronouns would be no better than second person pronouns, although this remains to be investigated.

of long distance binding, and for those speakers who have the highest tolerance of long distance binding, only a combination of several factors that affect the acceptance negatively leads to rejection. This will be even more evident in the next subsection, where we look at the judgements of a few individual informants.

5.6   Eight liberal speakers

In this section, I will present and comment on the judgements of eight of the informants from my survey. After all, my survey was designed to uncover individual grammars rather than to obtain quantifiable results. The eight informants that we will look at more closely here were more tolerant of long distance binding than the others, and it is therefore of some interest to see which factors restrict the possibility of long distance binding for each of them.

All eight informants come from the Central Norway region. Two of them, referred to here as D and G, are in the younger age group, while the others are in the 50+ group. They all accepted medium distance binding as well as the examples with long distance binding across a non-prominent intervener and into a non-V2 clause. Their judgements of the more marked examples of long distance binding are shown in table 2. Note that informants C, D, E, F and H did not mark any example as "completely wrong", but used only the judgements "perfectly okay" and "a bit odd". Hence, it is possible that the judgement "a bit odd", represented by ? in table 4, actually means "ungrammatical" for these informants.

Table 2: The judgements of eight liberal informants

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
(30) Hun ville at de skulle bli med seg inn.	ok	ok	ok	ok	ok	ok	ok	ok
(31) Hun trodde at han var sint på seg.	ok	ok	ok	ok	ok	ok	ok	ok
(32) Hun lurte på om han var sint på seg.	ok	*	ok	ok	ok	ok	ok	ok
(33) Hun trodde at han ikke var sint på seg lenger.	?	ok	?	ok	ok	ok	ok	ok
(34) Hun ble sur fordi ungene erta seg.	?	*	?	?	ok	ok	*	ok
(35) Hun trodde at han var ikke sint på seg lenger.	ok	*	?	ok	?	ok	ok	ok
(36) De forstår at andre kan ikke gjøre jobben for seg.	?	ok	ok	ok	?	ok	ok	ok
(40) De forstår at andre folk, de kan ikke gjøre jobben for seg.	*	ok	ok	?	ok	ok	ok	ok
(41) De må forstå at denne jobben kan ikke andre gjøre for seg.	*	ok	ok	?	ok	?	ok	?
(43) Hun trodde at du var sint på seg.	ok	*	ok	?	ok	ok	ok	ok
(45) Hun lurte på om du var sint på seg.	ok	*	?	ok	?	?	*	ok
(28) Hun mente at sin egen plan var best.	?	ok	?	ok	ok	ok	ok	ok

Examples (30) and (31), with long distance binding across a definite and animate subject into a non-V2 embedded clause, were fully acceptable for all eight informants, as we see. It is also worth noting that in these cases, the matrix predicates are *ville* 'want' and *tro* 'think', two verbs of cognition that invite an interpretation of the embedded clause corres–ponding to the perspective of the matrix subject.

If we now consider the judgements given by informant A, we see that this informant rejected the two examples of binding across topics, (40) and (41), and disliked example (34), with binding into an adverbial clause, as well as example (28), with binding into an embedded subject. In addition, this informant found examples (33) and (36) degraded. The fact that example (36) involves an embedded V2 clause does not seem to be decisive, since example (35), which also has embedded V2, was found fully acceptable by this informant. Examples (33) and (36) both contain a negation in the embedded clause, but again, the same holds of (35), which was accepted. Thus, the reasons for A's judgements of examples (33) and (36) are not clear.

For informant B the factors that make long distance binding unacceptable appear to be having the reflexive pronoun in an adverbial clause, as in example (34), an embedded interrogative clause, as in examples (32) and (45), a second person embedded subject, as in examples (43) and (45), and finally, V2 order in the embedded clause in combination with a prominent intervening subject, as in example (35). Binding into a V2 clause with a less prominent subject, as in (36), across a topic, as in (40) and (41), and into an embedded sub-ject, as in (28), was perfectly fine for this informant.

Informant C, on the other hand, found example (28), with binding into an embedded subject, degraded, possibly ungrammatical. C also disliked example (34), with binding into an adverbial clause, as well as examples (33), (35) and (45). For (33) and (35), the presence of a personal pronoun as embedded subject in combination with a negation in the embedded clause is apparently what reduces the acceptability. Note that (36) and (40), which were both accepted, also involve an embedded negation but have indefinite embedded subjects. Moreover, C accepts example (43), with a second person embedded subject, but not example (45), which has a second person embedded subject in combination with an embedded interrogative clause. Hence, for C long distance binding becomes less acceptable when two negative factors co-occur.

Informant D is like informant C in finding example (34) degraded, perhaps ungram-matical. In addition, D disliked examples (40) and (41), with long distance binding across a topic. One of the examples of binding across a second person pronoun, example (43), was also marked as less acceptable, while the other example involving a second person pronoun, example (45), is marked as fully acceptable. There is no obvious reason for this, other than the fact that (43) was presented much earlier in the survey than (45), so that the acceptance of (45) might be due to a priming effect.

Informant E found three examples less acceptable: examples (35), (36) and (45). In examples (35) and (36) the embedded clause is negated and has V2-order, and in (45), binding across a second person pronoun combines with an embedded interrogative clause. Hence, in all the sentences that E found degraded, two factors co-occur that have a negative effect on long distance binding.

Informant F and G are both very tolerant of long distance binding, each of them finding only two examples degraded. F does not accept example (41), with a topicalised object in initial position in the embedded clause, while G rejects example (34), with binding into an adverbial clause. In addition, neither of them accept example (45), where an embedded interrogative clause has a second person subject.

Informant H is more tolerant of long distance binding than any of the others. H does not like example (41), with binding across a fronted object, but accepts all other examples of long distance binding included in the survey.

Taken together, the judgements given by these eight informants demonstrate that for speakers of Norwegian, the acceptability of long distance binding can be related to a number of factors, and, importantly, although each factor in isolation does not necessarily make long distance binding unacceptable, interaction of two or more factors can have that effect.

6 Conclusion

The main purpose of this paper was to show that long distance binding in Norwegian is a complex phenomenon. Some speakers do not accept binding across finite clause boundaries at all, and for these speakers, it is correct to say that long distance binding is not part of their grammar. However, many speakers can accept at least some cases of long distance binding. As Lødrup (2009) pointed out, constructions with long distance binding across a low prominence intervener are quite common in Norwegian – a claim which is confirmed by my survey as well as by the results in the Nordic Syntax Database discussed in Lundquist (2013b).[15]

Some speakers of Norwegian even accept long distance binding across high prominence interveners, such as definite nouns and personal pronouns. A detailed investigation of the preferences of these speakers reveals some very interesting patterns. It turns out that the complexity of the left periphery of the embedded clause has consequences for the acceptability of long distance binding. An embedded clause with V2 word order, which is possible in Norwegian under certain conditions, has a more complex left periphery than a non-V2 clause. The complexity increases further if there is a doubled topic in initial position. And if the topic is the object, which then necessarily has moved across the subject to reach its final position, an operator dependency arises which crosses the dependency between the reflexive and the binder, so that the construction gets even more complex. A comparable effect can be seen if

---

[15] In Strahan (2003) all examples involve prominent interveners, and the properties of the interveners are not addressed.

the embedded clause is negated or if it is interrogative. All these factors lead to decreased acceptability of long distance binding. That is, the more syntactic structure and the more dependencies a binding dependency has to cross, the less acceptable it gets.

In addition, some of my informants rejected binding across second person subjects, although they accepted similar examples with embedded third person subjects. In other words, incompatible intervening person features make long distance binding less acceptable for them.

Apart from the properties of the embedded subject, any connection between the syntax of the embedded clause and the acceptability of long distance binding has hitherto not been mentioned in the discussion of Norwegian long distance binding. Hence, most of the observations that I have presented in this paper are entirely new.

It is also striking that there is individual variation in the weighting of the factors that influence the acceptability of long distance binding. Moreover, for some speakers each factor in isolation does not make long distance binding unacceptable – only the interaction of two or more negative factors leads to ungrammaticality. This means that there are far more intricacies connected to long distance binding in Norwegian than earlier investigators have realised. My goal was to bring these intricacies to light in this paper. It would be desirable to follow up the investigation reported on here with an investigation where the informants are interviewed face to face, so that their interpretations of the examples as well as their judgements can be discussed. A formal syntactic analysis of the observed patterns is another obvious next step. Still, until these further investigations have been done, I think that I have demonstrated beyond doubt that Norwegian long distance binding is a much more multifaceted phenomenon than has been previously assumed.

References

Aasen, Ivar. 1864. *Norsk Grammatik.* Christiania.

Aass, Kristin Hauge. 1979. Refleksivitet i moderne norsk: Bruken av *seg* og *sin*. Cand. philol. thesis, University of Oslo.

Andersson, Lars-Gunnar. 1975. Form and function of subordinate clauses. Doctoral dissertation, Göteborg University.

Culy, Christopher. 1994. Aspects of logophoric marking. *Linguistics* 32, 1055–1094.

den Besten, Hans. 1983. On the interaction of root transformations and lexical deletive rules. In Werner Abraham (ed.) *On the formal syntax of Westgermania*, 47–131. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Eide, Kristin Melum. 2011. Norwegian (non-V2) declaratives, resumptive elements, and the Wackernagel position. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 34, 179–213.

Faarlund, Jan Terje, Svein Lie & Kjell Ivar Vannebo. 1997. *Norsk referansegrammatikk.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Hellan, Lars. 1988. *Anaphora in Norwegian and the Theory of Grammar.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Holmberg, Anders, & Christer Platzack. 1995. *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Iversen, Ragnvald. 1918. *Syntaksen i Tromsø bymaal: En kort oversigt.* Kristiania: Bymaals-laget.

Julien, Marit. 2007. Embedded V2 in Norwegian and Swedish. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 80, 103–161.

Knudsen, Trygve. 1949. *Pronomener.* Oslo: Universitetets studentkontor.

Lindstad, Arne Martinus, Anders Nøklestad, Janne Bondi Johannessen & Øystein Alexander Vangsnes. 2009. The Nordic Dialect Database: Mapping Microsyntactic Variation in the Scandinavian Languages. In Jokinen, Kristiina & Eckhard Bick (eds.) *NEALT Proceedings Series, Volume 4.* Northern European Association for Language Technology. http://dspace.utlib.ee/dspace/handle/10062/9206

Lundquist, Bjørn. 2013a. Long distance binding 1: Complement clauses. In Janne Bondi Johannessen & Øystein Alexander Vangsnes (eds.) *The Nordic Atlas of Language Structures Online (NALS).* http://www.tekstlab.uio.no/nals.

Lundquist, Bjørn. 2013b. Long distance binding 2: Relative clauses. In Janne Bondi Johannessen & Øystein Alexander Vangsnes (eds.) *The Nordic Atlas of Language Structures Online (NALS).* http://www.tekstlab.uio.no/nals.

Lundquist, Bjørn. 2013c. Mid-distance binding: Binding into infinitival clauses. In Janne Bondi Johannessen & Øystein Alexander Vangsnes (eds.) *The Nordic Atlas of Language Structures Online (NALS).* http://www.tekstlab.uio.no/nals.

Lødrup, Helge. 2007. A new account of simple and complex reflexives in Norwegian. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 10:183-201.

Lødrup, Helge. 2009. Animacy and long distance binding in Norwegian. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 32, 111–136.

Maling, Joan. 1984. Non-clause-bounded re flexives in Modern Icelandic. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 7, 211–241.

Moshagen, Sjur Nørstebø & Trond Trosterud. 1990. Non-clause-bounded reflexives in Mainland Scandinavian. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 46, 47–52.

Platzack, Christer. 1983. Germanic word order and the COMP/INFL parameter. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 2.

Reuland, Eric & Jan Koster. 1991. Long-distance anaphora: An overview. In Jan Koster & Eric Reuland (eds.) *Long-distance Anaphora*, 1–25. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. On the position Int(errogative) in the left periphery of the clause. In Guglielmo Cinque & Giampaolo Salvi (eds.) *Current Studies in Italian Syntax: Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, 287–296. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Rögnvaldsson, Eirikur. 2007. Reflexives in Older Icelandic. Ms., University of Iceland.

Sandøy, Helge. 1992. *Norsk dialektkunnskap*. Oslo: Novus.

Sigurðsson, Halldór A. 1990. Long distance reflexives and moods in Icelandic. In Joan Maling & Annie Zaenen (eds.) *Modern Icelandic Syntax*, 309–346. New York: Academic Press.

Strahan, Tania E. 2003. *Long-distance Reflexives in Norwegian: a Quantitative Study*. München: Lincom Europa.

Strahan, Tania E. 2011. A typology of non-local reflexives in the Scandinavian languages. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 34, 157–178.

Stausland Johnsen, Sverre. 2009. Non-local binding in tenseless clauses. *Proceedings of Chicago Linguistic Society* 45:2, 103–116.

Teleman, Ulf, Staffan Hellberg & Erik Andersson. 1999. *Svenska Akademiens grammatik*. Stockholm: Svenska Akademien.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1976. Some arguments against the interpretive theory of pronouns and reflexives. *Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics* 2, 573–624.

Tilset, Arne. 1924. *Målet i Strinda i Sør-Trøndelag*. Oslo: Studentmållaget.

Wiklund, Anna-Lena, Kristine Bentzen, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson & Þorbjörg Hróars-dóttir. 2009. On the distribution and illocution of V2 in Scandinavian *that*-clauses. *Lingua* 119:1914–1938.

Appendix: The sentences in the web questionnaire

1 *Jeg ba   dem om   å vaske   seg.*
I   asked   them about   to wash   REFL
'I asked them to wash (themselves).'

2 *Det er koselig å ha   med seg hunden   sin   på   skitur.*
it   is nice   to have with REFL dog.DEF   POSS.REFL on   ski-trip
'It's nice to have your dog with you when you go skiing.'

3 *Hun   ville   at   de   skulle bli   med henne   inn.*
she   wanted that they should come with her   in
'She wanted them to come inside with her.'

4 *De trenger noen   til å hjelpe   seg.*
they need   somebody to to help   REFL
'They need somebody to help them.'

5 *Hun   ble   sur   fordi   de   erta   henne.*
she   got   cross because they teased   her
'She got cross because they teased her.'

6 *Hun   trodde   at   du   var   sint   på   seg.*
she   thought that you   were   angry   on   REFL
'She thought that you were angry with her.'

7 *De   vil   alltid   ha   andre   til å gjøre   jobben for   seg.*
they   want always   have others   to to do   job.DEF for   REFL
'They always want others to do the job for them.'

8 *Jeg mener   at   andre, de   får   gjøre hva   de   vil.*
I   think   that others   they may do   what they want
'I think that others can do what they want.'

9 *De   må forstå   at   denne jobben kan ikke andre   gjøre   for   seg.*
they   must understand that this   job.DEF can not   others   do   for   REFL
'They must understand that others cannot do this job for them.'

10 *Hun trodde at han var ikke sint på seg lenger.*
she thought that he was not angry on REFL longer
'She thought that he was not angry with her any more.'

11 *De trenger noen som kan hjelpe seg.*
they need somebody that can help REFL
'They need somebody who can help them.'

12 *De forstår at andre kan ikke gjøre jobben for dem.*
they understand that others can not do job.DEF for them
'They understand that others cannot do the job for them.'

13 *Hun ville at de skulle bli med seg inn.*
she wanted that they should come with REFL in
'She wanted them to come inside with her.'

14 *De venter på at noen skal gjøre jobben for seg.*
they wait on that somebody shall do job.DEF for REFL
'They are waiting for somebody to do the job for them.'

15 *Hun trodde at han var ikke sint på henne lenger.*
she thought that he was not angry on her longer
'She thought that he was not angry with her any more.'

16 *Hun ble sur fordi ungene erta seg.*
she got cross because children.DEF teased REFL
'She got cross because the children teased her.'

17 *De forstår at andre kan ikke gjøre jobben for seg.*
they understand that others can not do job.DEF for REFL
'They understand that others cannot do the job for them.'

18 *Hun fortjener å ha noen som er glad i seg.*
she deserves to have somebody that is fond of REFL
'She deserves to have somebody who loves her.'

19 *De   gjør bare det   som passer for   seg.*
they   do   only it   that suits   for   REFL
'They only do what suits them.'

20 *Hun   føler at   noe   mangler i livet   sitt.*
she   feels that something misses   in life.DEF REFL.POSS
'She feels that something is missing in her life.'

21 *Hun   trodde at   han var sint   på   seg.*
she   thought that he   was angry   on   REFL
'She thought that he was angry with her.'

22 *De   forstår   at   andre   kan ikke gjøre   jobben for   seg.*
they   understand that others   can not do   job.DEF for   REFL
'They understand that others cannot do the job for them.'

23 *Hun   lurte   på   om   du   var   sint   på   seg.*
she   wondered on   if   you were   angry   on   REFL
'She wondered if you were angry with her.'

24 *De   forstår   at   andre folk, de   kan ikke gjøre   jobben for   seg.*
they   understand that other people they can not do   job.DEF for   REFL
'They understand that other people cannot do the job for them.'

25 *Hun   syntes   at   opplegget   passet godt for   henne.*
she   thought that arrangement.DEF suited well for   her
'She thought that the arrangement suited her well.'

26 *Hun   lurte   på   om   han var sint   på   seg.*
she   wondered on   if   he   was angry   on   REFL
'She wondered if he was angry with her.'

27 *Hun   mente   at   sin   egen plan var best.*
she   thought that REFL.POSS own plan was best
'She thought that her own plan was the best.'

28 *De forstår   at   andre   folk,   de   kan ikke gjøre jobben for   dem.*
they understand that other   people they can not do   job.DEF for   them
'They understand that other people cannot do the job for them.'

29 *De   lurte   på   hva de   skulle ta   med seg.*
they   wondered on   what they should take with REFL
'They wondered what they should bring along.'

30 *Hun   trodde at   han ikke var   sint   på   seg lenger.*
she   thought that he   not was   angry   on   REFL longer
'She thought that he was not angry with her any more.'

Scandinavian Relative Clause Extractions
Apparent restrictions *

Fredrik Heinat & Anna-Lena Wiklund

Linnaeus University & Lund University

Abstract

This brief article investigates the restrictions on Mainland Scandinavian relative clause extraction that have figured in the literature on island constraints. The conclusion is that none of these restrictions can be regarded as constraints on relative clause extraction per se and therefore that the peripheral status standardly assigned to Mainland Scandinavian relative clause extraction cannot be maintained.

1 Introduction

It has long been recognized that the Mainland Scandinavian languages Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish are peculiar from a cross-linguistic perspective in that they fail to show the constraints on extraction usually observed for complex DPs. These languages allow relative clause extraction (RCE), traditionally described as a violation of the Complex NP Constraint or a strong island violation (Ross 1967 and Chomsky 1977, respectively), cf. (1-a) and (1-b) (from Engdahl 1997:54).[1] Early references include Erteschik-Shir (1973), Allwood (1975), Engdahl & Ejerhed (1982); Taraldsen (1981); Maling & Zaenen, (1982); Andersson (1982).[2]

---

[1]Replacing *who* in (1-b) by *that* does not change the unacceptable status of the extraction.

[2]Only a handful of other languages have been reported to show the same exceptionality as the Scandinavian languages: Japanese and Korean (Kuno 1973b: 239-240); Akan (Saah & Goodluck 1995). However, the status of these as true RCE is debated, see e.g. Han & Kim (2004) and Cinque (2010).

(1) a. [Såna blommor]$_i$ känner jag [en man [som säljer _$_i$]]. (Swe.)
          such flowers   know I   a man that sells
     b.*?[Those flowers]$_i$ I know [someone [who sells _$_i$]].

Whereas the English example can be improved by a resumption strategy (which makes it indistinguishable from a left dislocation), resumption decreases acceptability in Swedish and the other Mainland Scandinavian languages (MSc):[3]

(2) a. Såna blommor känner jag en man som säljer (*dem). (Swe.)
          such flowers   know I   a man that sells (them)
     b. ?Those flowers I know someone who sells them.

The relative contribution of structural and non-structural constraints on the processing and acceptability of long-distance dependencies of this kind has been a central issue in ongoing debates that span the research fields of both theoretical syntax (see Boeckx 2012 for an overview) and sentence processing (see e.g. Sprouse & Hornstein 2013). Although the MSc data have been regularly cited in the syntax- and processing-oriented literature, there is to date no account of RCE in Mainland Scandinavian that holds up under closer scrutiny, see Engdahl (1997) and more recently Christensen & Nyvad (2014) and Müller (2015) for discussion. Naturally, much of previous research on RCE in Mainland Scandinavian has focused on identifying the right conditions for RCE from the perspective that syntactic islands are universal. The guiding hypothesis has been that RCE in Mainland Scandinavian is severely constrained, as expected from theoretical considerations, but that the acceptability of the hard-to-explain cases may be derived from either of the following: (i) discourse-organizational factors (as in Ertechik-Shir & Lappin 1979), (ii) island obviation by way of covert resumption (as in Cinque 1990), or (iii) structural reanalysis during parsing (as in Kush et al. 2013). For arguments against a discourse-based approach, see Boeckx (2012) and §8 below. (2-a) above seems incompatible with an approach to Swedish RCE in terms of island obviation, since overt resumption is possible in other contexts (cf. Engdahl 1997). Finally, compelling arguments against structural reanalysis during parsing are presented in Christensen & Nyvad (2014) and Müller (2015). In other words, the problems posed by the Scandinavian data for theories about island constraints, whether cast in terms

---

[3]Examples are borrowed from Engdahl (1997:54).

of processing or syntax, are far from solved. We concur with Hofmeister & Sag (2010) and Boeckx (2012) in not being satisfied with how counterexamples to island constraints have been dealt with in the literature, both empirically and theoretically. What follows is an attempt to clean up the empirical part of the Scandinavian data to deepen our understanding of the unexpected void of island effects in RCEs in these languages. We show that beyond the more general factors, like the Subject Condition and factors pertaining to discourse and processing, which are known to play a role in perceptions of acceptability of RCE also in other languages, none of the restrictions proposed to condition RCE in Mainland Scandinavian actually hold. This observation tells us two things. First, assigning a peripheral status to the exceptions is not an option. Second, there seems to be a real (although perhaps a fuzzy) difference between Mainland Scandinavian and other languages with regard to perceived acceptability of RCE, in line with the early observations. Analytical options for further exploring the exceptionality of Mainland Scandinavian in this respect are outlined in the concluding section.

2 Relative clause extractions

It has consistently been claimed that only a subset of restrictive relative clauses allow extractions in Mainland Scandinavian and that a number of conditions have to be met for the extractions to be acceptable.[4] Restrictions on Mainland Scandinavian RCEs that have been reported relate to the head noun, the extracted element, the extraction gap (the gap linked to the extracted XP), the matrix predicate, the matrix subject, the position of the relative clause, as well as information-structural factors. The relevant string is schematized in (4) with the verb second word order, characteristic of Scandinavian matrix clauses.[5]

(4) XP_i V_{matrix} DP_{subj} ... $[DP_{head\ noun}$ $[_{RC}$ som ... V_{emb} $_{\_i}$ $]]$
      those flowers know   I   ... a man   that ... sells

---

[4]Appositive relative clauses do not allow RCE (Engdahl 1997:58) and will therefore not be discussed here:

(3)   *[Den teorin]$_i$ känner jag en man som för övrigt   tror   på $_{\_i}$.   (Swe.)
        that theory-the know   I   a   man that by the way believes in

[5]The matrix V2 word order excludes a dislocation structure of RCE (cf. Engdahl 1997), since that structure does not yield surface V2 word order.

Because clefts and presentational constructions seem to be liberal with regard to extraction possibilities also in other languages, like English (cf. Kush et al. 2013), we limit our discussion to cases where we seem to find the largest difference in acceptability between Mainland Scandinavian and other languages, as in (1). We thus exclude examples like (5) below (from Engdahl 1997:57), cf. the English example in (6) (from Chung & McCloskey 1983:708).

(5)   Vilket ord var det ingen som kunde stava rätt till.   (Swe.)
        Which word was there nobody that could spell rightly to

(6)   This is a paper that we really need to find someone who understands.

3 The head noun

3.1 Definiteness, specificity, and abstractness

Definiteness and specificity of the head noun are factors that have been noted to influence the acceptability of RCEs (Erteschik-Shir & Lappin 1979; Andersson 1982; Taraldsen 1981; Engdahl & Ejerhed 1982; Huber 2002; van Valin 2005; Cinque 2010) and NP-extraction in general (Chomsky 1973; Fiengo & Higginbotham 1981; Davies & Dubinsky 2003). Contrasts like the one in (7) below have been used to claim that RCE is restricted to relative clauses following indefinite head nouns (b-example from Engdahl 1997:69).

(7)   a. [Den teorin]$_i$ känner jag en man som tror   på $\_i$.   (Swe.)
            that theory-the know I a man that believes in

        b. ??[Den teorin]$_i$ känner jag mannen som tror   på $\_i$.
             that theory-the know I man-the that believes in

As noted by Engdahl, the examples provided to show these effects are, however, disfavored for pragmatic reasons. (7-b) is odd even without the extraction because of a uniqueness requirement on the object referent, cf. (8-a).[6] Once this factor is controlled for, e.g. by changing the embedded predicate, the sentence is fine, (8-b), and sub-extraction from the definite head noun is impeccable in Swedish, cf. (8-c) (from Engdahl 1997:70). This is also true for Norwegian

---

[6]The sentence in (7-b) is fine in a (somewhat far-fetched) context where only one person is relevant as a believer of the theory under discussion, cf. Engdahl (1997).

(Kristine Bentzen, p.c.) and Danish (Ken Ramshøj Christensen, p.c.), cf. (9).
The head noun in the examples is not only definite but also has specific ref-
erence, showing that the head noun in RCEs need not be non-specific, contra
Taraldsen (1981).

(8)   a.   #Jag känner mannen som tror   på den teorin.   (Swe.)
             I   know   man-the that believes in that theory-the

      b.   Jag känner mannen som kom på den här   teorin.
             I   know   man-the that made up this here theory-the

      c.   [Den här   teorin]$_i$ känner jag mannen som kom på _$_i$.
             this here theory-the know   I   man-the that made up.

(9)   [Den her   teori]$_i$ kender jeg kvinden   der fandt på _$_i$.   (Da.)
        this here theory-the know   I   woman-the that made up

Note that processing studies have identified a sensitivity to the referential prop-
erties of intervening nominals; there is a difference in cost between intervening
indefinite nouns (less costly) and definite nouns (more costly) along a filler-gap
path (Warren & Gibson 2002; Hofmeister & Sag 2010). The point that we wish
to make here is that if we remove definiteness as a factor interfering with judg-
ments, we seem to find a difference between Mainland Scandinavian on the one
hand and other languages on the other with regard to perceived acceptability of
RCE. That is, even though the English counterpart of (8-c) (definite head noun)
may be perceived as worse than the English counterpart of (7-a) (indefinite head
noun) (cf. Kluender 1992), the counterpart of (7-a) is not acceptable in English,
in contrast to Swedish. Note finally that the data cannot be explained in terms
of a 'metaphysical' concept denotation of the head noun (which enables ex-
traction in English, too) in contrast to a physical token denotation (Davies &
Dubinsky 2003). The examples above all involve concrete head nouns, which
are claimed to ban extraction in English (ibid.). Despite this, extraction is pos-
sible in Swedish (see also section 6).

3.2   The relativization gap

A number of studies have made the observation that there seems to be a subject
restriction on the head noun in the sense that the relativization gap has to be the

subject position of the relative clause, see Allwood (1976), Andersson (1982), Kluender (1992), Engdahl (1997), Cinque (2010), Kush et al. (2013). This restriction has been crucial in some attempts to account for RCE and other island violations, see Chung & McCloskey (1983), Chomsky (1986), Platzack (1999), Cinque (2010), Kush et al. (2013). For example, the contrast between (10) and (11) below is used by Kush et al. (2013:242) to argue in favor of a small clause analysis of RCE in Scandinavian and English.

(10)   a.   [Den teorin]$_i$ finns det ingen lingvist som tror   på $\_i$. (Swe.)
            that theory-the exists it   no   linguist that believes in

       b. *[Den här   lingvisten]$_i$ finns det ingen teori   som $\_i$ tror   på.
            this here linguist-the exists it   no   theory that   believes in

As noted by Engdahl (1997), however, Swedish is subject to a *that*-trace restriction (cf. Lohndahl 2009) and (10-b) is therefor ruled out for independent reasons. If we control for the *that*-trace restriction, it is evident that there is no subject restriction on the relativization gap in Mainland Scandinavian RCE. Examples showing this can be construed by using a ditransitive verb, (11-a), or by using adjunct instead of argument extraction, (12-b). In these cases, the relativization gap is in the object position, yet RCE is unproblematic, cf. (12-a). The possibility of adjunct extraction in (12-b) also illustrates that Mainland Scandinavian RCE is not amenable to an account in terms of a weak rather than a strong island violation, as there is no perceived difference between argument and adjunct extraction.

(11)   a.   Jag vet   tre   saker som han vill   ge   Lisa.   (Swe.)
            I   know three things that he   wants give Lisa

       b.   Jag vet   två grejer som man bör   göra i Paris.
            I   know two things that you should do   in Paris

(12)   a.   Lisa$_i$ vet   jag tre   saker   som han vill   ge $\_i$.
            Lisa know I   three things that he   wants give

       b.   [I Paris]$_i$ vet jag   två grejer som man bör   göra $\_i$.
             in Paris   I   know two things that you should do

3.3 Clause function

Erteschik-Shir & Lappin (1979) observe that the head noun must be a direct object of the matrix verb in cases of RCE. This is correct but, as well known, extraction from a (displaced) subject is constrained for independent reasons, regardless of whether it involves a relative clause or not: this is the so-called *Subject Condition* (Chomsky 1973; Huang 1982); see Kluender (2004), Boeckx (2012), and Haegeman et al. (2014) for recent discussion.

4 The matrix predicate

Along with the subject restriction on the relativization gap, shown to be wrong in the above section, Kush et al (2013) list choice of embedding verb as a key structural factor that influences acceptability of RCE, their so-called *predicate restriction*. The claim is that RCE is acceptable only with matrix verbs that also select small clauses, because in these cases the parser can reconstruct the complex noun phrase as a small clause (from which extraction is not blocked).[7] The predicate restriction has recently been investigated in detail in acceptability judgment experiments on both Swedish and Danish speakers, see Müller (2015) and Christensen & Nyvad (2014), respectively. Neither of these studies found any statistically significant differences between small-clause selecting vs. non-small clause selecting verbs. Müller (2015) provides a number of examples from the literature where RCE occurs with verbs that cannot select small clauses, all perceived as acceptable by native speakers of Swedish, cf. (13) (from Teleman et al. 1999[4]:423).

(13)   a.   Akupunktur$_i$ brukar det   delta   en läkare som kan $\_i$ vid våra
            acupuncture uses   there attend a   doctor that knows   at   our
            seminarier.
            seminars

            b.   [Piratdelar   till Volvo]$_i$ har   jag tagit   reda på   en   som säljer $\_i$.
            pirated-parts for Volvo   have I   found   out one that sells

---

[7]The contrast between Swedish and English is proposed to derive from differences with regard to the relative pronoun/complementizer. See Christensen & Nyvad (2014) and Müller (2015) for counterexamples to that proposal.

Even though acceptability arguably varies to a certain degree with properties of the intervening verb (Ertechik-Shir 1973; Kothari 2008; Hofmeister & Sag 2010), the examples in (13) refute the suggestion that the matrix verb in cases of RCE is semantically light by necessity, as has been claimed by Allwood (1976) and Ertechik-Shir & Lappin (1979:57). Matrix verbs in RCE clearly may have complex event structures and may also be rather specific with regard to the manner component of the event referred to.

5   The matrix subject

Erteschik-Shir & Lappin (1979:57) claim that RCE in Danish is subject to a person restriction such that extraction is only possible when the matrix subject is 1st person. This observation seems incorrect. As the examples from Danish in (14) show, RCE is also possible with 2nd and 3rd person matrix subjects (Ken Ramshøj, p.c.).[8]

(15)   a.   [Den slags musik]$_i$ kender du vist ingen   der kan lide $\_i$.
             that kind music   know you PRT nobody who can like

       b.   [Den slags musik]$_i$ kender hun vist ingen   der kan lide $\_i$.
             that kind music   know she PRT nobody who can like

       c.   [Den slags musik]$_i$ kender Mille vist ingen   der kan lide $\_i$.
             that kind music   know Mille PRT nobody who can like

6   The extracted element

Putative restrictions on the extracted element can be derived from well-known factors that influence the possibility to front constituents in general. That demonstratives extract more easily than indefinite noun phrases (Allwood 1976:11) is because the former front more easily than the latter, see Engdahl (1997) for discussion. Note that even non-referential constituents are extractable (a-example from Engdahl 1997:57):

---

[8]Norwegian (Marit Julien, p.c.) and Swedish are similar in this respect:

(14)   [Såna blommor]$_i$ känner du/hon/Lisa väl en man som säljer $\_i$.   (Swe.)
         such flowers   knows you/she/Lisa PRT a   man that sells

(16)　　a.　Så$_i$ känner jag ingen　som kan måla _$_i$.　　　　　　(Swe.)
　　　　　　so　know　I　nobody that can paint

　　　　b.　Snabbare$_i$ vet　jag ingen　som räknar　　_$_i$.
　　　　　　faster　　know I　nobody　that calculates

Davies & Dubinsky (2003) propose that extraction from NP in English is restricted to elements that count as participants in the lexical conceptual structure of the head noun, which is why extraction from NPs involving concrete nouns is never possible; these do not have an argument structure, nor do they imply participants. The possibility to extract from NPs involving concrete nouns (noted in §3 above) shows that the lexical conceptual approach to possibility of NP-extraction cannot be applied to Mainland Scandinavian NP-extractions and that no participant restriction holds for the extracted element in Mainland Scandinavian RCE.

7　The relative clause

According to Taraldsen (1981:486), the relative clause from which extraction has taken place must be clause-final (cf. Teleman et al. 1999[4]:423):

(17)　　a.　*[Såna böcker] tar　hon en kompis som läser _$_i$ med sig.
　　　　　　such books　takes she a　friend　that reads　with herself

　　　　b.　[Såna böcker] tar　hon med sig　en kompis som läser _$_i$.
　　　　　　such books　takes she with herself a　friend　that reads

The clause final restriction is not specific to RCE but seems to hold also for other extractions barring clefts and presentational constructions (Kuno 1973a). In view of example (13-a) above however, the restriction is not categorical. In that example, the sentence-final PP belongs to the matrix predicate *delta* 'attend', not to the relative clause. Despite this, extraction is possible.

8　Information-structural factors

Before concluding this excursion in reported restrictions on RCE, we wish to make a note on claims about information structural factors, reported to play a role for RCE and for extraction more generally (Erteschik-Shir 1973; 1982;

Erteschik-Shir & Lappin 1979; van Valin 2005; Goldberg 2013). The claim
is that back-grounded constituents are extraction islands. Back-grounded con-
stituents are those which are not interpreted as pragmatically dominant in dis-
course in the terminology of Erteschik-Shir (1973) and Erteschik-Shir & Lappin
(1979). The operational test adopted to determine the relevant dominance rela-
tions among constituents involves:

> "[...] placing the entire complex sentence in a context of direct dis-
> course and denying first the matrix sentence and then the embedded
> sentence. If it is not possible to deny the complement this indicates
> that the environment defined by the matrix excludes the possibility of
> interpreting the complement as dominant"
>
> (Erteschik-Shir & Lappin 1979:46)

The relative clause in (18-a) cannot be interpreted as pragmatically dominant,
according to this test, cf. (18-c). In this respect, Swedish is not different from
English.

(18) a. Jag känner dom som utvecklade den teorin.   (Swe.)
          I   know   them that developed this theory-the

      b. Nej, det gör du   inte.
          no, that do   you not
          'No, you don't.'

      c. #Nej, det gjorde dom inte.
          No, that did   they not
          'No, they didn't.'

Still RCE is possible in Mainland Scandinavian, but not in English, see (19).
An information-structural account of the difference between Mainland Scandi-
navian and English is therefor not likely to be on the right track. For discussion
and arguments against discourse-based accounts of islands more generally, see
Boeckx (2012:28-29).

(19) a. [Den teorin]$_i$ känner jag dom som utvecklade _$_i$.
              this theory-the know   I   them that developed.
      b. *[This theory]$_i$ I know the guys that developed _$_i$.

9   Conclusion

We have shown that the restrictions on Mainland Scandinavian RCE that have figured in the literature vanish under closer scrutiny. Some can be reformulated as preferences derivable from semantic, pragmatic, and processing factors, which influence the acceptability of complex structures more generally (cf. Kluender 1992; 2004; Hofmeister & Sag 2010; Sprouse & Schütze 2013) and thus cannot be regarded as constraints on RCE per se. When we remove these factors, the MSc languages stand out with regard to acceptability of RCE, in line with the early observations. That is, the difference between the Mainland Scandinavian languages and languages like English with regard to acceptability of relative clause extraction seems real although may appear fuzzy in the presence of the above-mentioned factors.

One possibility is that Swedish RCEs, although intuitively acceptable, pattern more like island structures in terms of processing. Tutunjian et al. (submitted) address this hypothesis in an eyetracking while reading study. They conclude that Swedish RCEs pattern closer to non-island structures (*that*-clause extraction) than to island structures (non-restrictive relative clause extraction), in terms of processing. This leaves us with two possibilities. The first is that Swedish RCEs do not involve island structures, in which case we need to look harder to find a tenable account of the phenomenon in terms of structure. The second possibility is that Swedish relative clauses are exempted from island constraints, in which case there is true variation in the island constraints themselves (see Phillips 2013, for discussion).

References

Allwood, Jens. 1976. The complex NP constraint as a non-universal rule and some semantic factors influencing the acceptability of Swedish sentences which violate the CNPC. In J. Stillings (ed.), *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics ii*, 1–20. Amherst, Ma.

Andersson, Lars-Gunnar. 1982. What is Swedish an exception to? Extractions and island constraints. In E. Engdahl & E. Ejerhed (eds.), *Readings on unbounded dependencies in Scandinavian languages*, 33–45. Umeå: Umeå University.

Boeckx, Cedric. 2012. *Syntactic islands*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1973. Conditions on transformations. In S. Anderson & P. Kiparsky (eds.), *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*, New York: Holt, Rhineheart and Wilson.

Chomsky, Noam. 1977. On *Wh*-Movement. In P. Culicover, T. Wasow, & A. Akmajian (eds), *Formal syntax*, 71–132. New York: Academic Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 13. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Christensen, Ken Ramshöj & Anne Mette Nyvad. 2014 On the nature of escapable relative islands. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 37:9–45.

Chung, Sandra & James McCloskey. 1983. On the interpretation of certain island facts in GPSG. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14:704–713.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A'-dependencies*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2010. On a selective "violation" of the complex NP constraint. In C. J. W. Zwart & M. de Vries (eds), *Structure preserved: Studies in syntax for Jan Koster*, 81–89. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Davies, William D. & Stanley Dubinsky. 2003. On Extraction from NPs. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 21:1–37.

Engdahl, Elisabet. 1997. Relative clause extractions in context. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 60:51–79.

Engdahl, Elisabet & Eva Ejerhed (eds.). 1982. *Readings on unbounded dependencies in Scandinavian languages* volume 43 of Acta Universitatis

Umensis. Umeå University, distibuted by Almqvist & Wiksell International, Stockholm.

Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 1973. On the nature of island constraints. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 1982. Extractability in Danish and the pragmatic principle of dominance. In E. Engdahl & E. Ejerhed (eds.),*Readings on unbounded dependencies in Scandinavian languages*, 175–191. Umeå: Umeå University.

Erteschik-Shir, Nomi & Shalom Lappin. 1979. Dominance and the functional explanation of island phenomena. *Theoretical linguistics* 6:41–86.

Fiengo, Robert & James Higginbotham. 1981. Opacity in NP. *Linguistic Analysis* 7:395–422.

Goldberg, Adele. 2013. Backgrounded constituents cannot be extracted. In J. Sprouse & N. Hornstein (eds.), *Experimental syntax and island effects*, 221–238. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haegeman, Liliane, Á. L. Jiménez-Fernández & A. Radford. 2014. Deconstructing the subject condition: Cumulative constraint violation and tolerance thresholds. *The Linguistic Review* 31:73–150

Han, Chung-hye & Jong-Bok Kim. 2004. Are there "double relative clauses" in Korean? *Linguistic Inquiry* 35:315–337.

Hofmeister, Philip & Ivan A. Sag. 2010. Cognitive constraints and island effects. *Language* 86:366–415.

Huang, James C-T. 1982. Logical relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

Huber, Stefan. 2002. Extractions from relative clauses in Swedish as self-answering questions. *The Department of English: Working Papers in English Linguistics* II.

Kluender, Robert. 1992. Deriving island constraints from principles of predication. In H. Goodluck & M. Rochemont (eds.), *Island constraints*, 223–258. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kluender, Robert. 2004. Are subject islands subject to a processing account. In *Proceedings of WCCFL*, volume 23, 475–499.

Kothari, Anubha. 2008. Frequency-based expectations and context influence bridge quality. In M. Grosvald & D. Soares (eds.), *Proceedings of WECOL 2008*, UC Davis, Department of Linguistics.

Kuno, Susumu. 1973. Constraints on internal clauses and sentential subjects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4:363–385.

Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.

Kush, Dave, Akira Omaki & Norbert Hornstein. 2013. Microvariation in islands? In J. Sprouse & N. Hornstein, *Experimental syntax and island effects*, 239–264. Cambridge: Cambidge University Press.

Lohndal, Terje. 2009. Comp-*t* effects: Variation in the position and features of C. *Studia Linguistica* 63:204–232.

Maling, Joan & Annie Zaenen. 1982. A phrase structure account of Scandinavian extraction phenomena. In P. Jacobsen & G. K. Pullum (eds.), *The nature of syntactic representation*, 229–282.

Müller, Christiane. 2015 Against the Small Clause Hypothesis: Evidence from Swedish relative clause extractions. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 38:67–92.

Phillips, Colin. 2013 On the nature of island constraints. II: Language learning and innateness. In J. Sprouse & N. Hornstein (eds.), *Experimental syntax and island effects*, 132–157. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Platzack, Christer. 1999. Satsfläta med relativsats [Extraction from relative clauses]. In I. Haskå & C. Sandqvist, *Alla tiders språk. en vänskrift till Gertrud Pettersson*, volume 55 of *Lundastudier i nordisk språkvetenskap*, 189–199. Lund: Department of Nordic Languages.

Ross, John Robert. 1967. Constraints on variables in syntax. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass. [published as 'Infinite syntax'. 1986].

Saah, Kofi K. & Helen Goodluck. 1995. Island effects in parsing and grammar: evidence from Akan. *The Linguistic Review*. 12:381–409.

Sprouse, Jon & Norbert Hornstein, (eds). 2013. *Experimental syntax and island effects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sprouse, Jon & Carson T. Schütze. 2013. Judgment data. In R. J. Podesva & D. Sharma (eds.), *Research methods in linguistics*, 27–50. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taraldsen, Knut Tarald. 1981. The theoretical interpretation of a class of "marked" extractions. In A. Belletti, L. Brandi & L. Rizzi (eds.), *The theory of markedness in generative grammar*, 475–516. Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore.

Teleman, Ulf, Staffan Hellberg & Erik Andersson. 1999. *Svenska akademiens grammatik* [Swedish Academy Grammar]. Stockholm: Norstedts Ordbok.

Tutunjian, Damon, Fredrik Heinat, Eva Klingvall & Anna-Lena Wiklund. Submitted. Processing Relative Clause Extraction in Swedish. Centre for Languages and Literature, Lund University.

Van Valin, Robert D. 2005. *Exploring the syntax-semantics interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Warren, Tessa & Edward Gibson. 2002. The influence of referential processing on sentence complexity. *Cognition* 85:79–112.

On Verb Movement

in the *Labeling Algorithm*-Based Derivation[*]

Mayumi Hosono, Leiden University

m.hosono@umail.leidenuniv.nl

Abstract

In this paper, I discuss verb movement in the *Labeling Algorithm*-based derivational system (Chomsky 2013, 2014). I point out that in this system, movement operations that do not produce a new semantic effect, including verb movement, freely occur in syntax, contra Chomsky (2001). I argue that since valuation (or *Agree*, Chomsky 2001) between the tense feature and a verbal head does not require any movement or any morphological support, verb movement, in the unmarked case, does not occur. Languages including, e.g. English, do not have verb movement and have a relatively poor inflectional system. Languages including, e.g. French and V2 languages, have verb movement either to T or to C and a relatively rich inflectional system. I suggest that the tense feature of the former languages is strong, whereas the latter languages have a weak tense feature and need verb movement and much morphological support to strengthen it. That is, the facts on verb movement are interpreted in the way opposite to the traditional claim represented by Chomsky (1995).[1]

1. Verb Movement in the *Phase-Cartographic* Framework

The finite verb appears in different positions in different languages. The finite verb *kisses* follows the adverb *always* in English (1a). *Embrasse* 'kisses' moves

---

[1] Throughout this paper, I assume that the reader is familiar with the theoretical development from Chomsky (2000) and onwards.

and precedes *toujours* 'always' in French (1b). *Kysser* 'kisses' moves not only across *alltid* 'always' but also across the subject *Jon* in Swedish (1c). These facts indicate that the finite verb is located in the v*P domain in languages such as English (referred to as type (1a) languages), in the TP domain in languages such as French (referred to as type (1b) languages), and in the CP domain in V2 languages such as Swedish (referred to as type (1c) languages).[2]

(1)   a.   [$_{TP}$ John (*kisses) always [$_{VP}$ (^{OK}kisses) Mary]].[3]   [Eng.]

      b.   [$_{TP}$ Jean (^{OK}embrasse) toujours [$_{VP}$ (*embrasse) Marie]].   [Fre.]
          Jean   kisses   always   kisses   Marie
          'Jean always kisses Marie.'

      c.   [$_{CP}$ Marit (^{OK}kysser) [$_{TP}$ Jon (*kysser) alltid[$_{VP}$ (*kysser) ~~Marit~~]]]. [Swe.]
          Marit   kisses   Jon   kisses always   kisses
          'Marit, Jon always kisses her.'

Verb movement does not affect the semantic interpretation as illustrated above. This fact has long been an argument against the claim that verb movement occurs in syntax. Since the *phase* framework was proposed (Chomsky 2000, 2001, 2004, 2008), it has been assumed that the computation of every human language proceeds in a uniform way in narrow syntax and the semantic component (the *Uniformity Principle*, Chomsky 2001). This assumption has been tied up with the claim made in the *cartographic* system (Rizzi 1997, Cinque 1999), where the position in which a category is located in narrow

---

[2] For traditional issues and discussions on verb movement, see, e.g. Emonds 1978, Travis 1984, Pollock 1989, Belletti 1990, Vikner 1990, Roberts 1993, Svenonius 1994, Chomsky 1995, Holmberg and Platzack 1995, Grimshaw 2000, Matushansky 2006, Truckenbrodt 2006, among others.

[3] In the current assumption since Chomsky (2001), all clauses universally have C, which I turn to in detail below.

syntax corresponds to, and must correspond to, the interpretation that the category receives in the semantic component in all languages. Thus, a category that is located, e.g. in [Spec,FocP], in narrow syntax is, and must be, interpreted as focus in the semantic component in all languages, and vice versa.

According to Chomsky (2001), syntactic movement occurs when a semantic difference is reflected on the interface. The *Extended Projection Principle* (EPP) – originally, the requirement that a category should be located in the Spec of a functional head (Chomsky 1981, 1986) – is, in the phase-cartographic system, referred to as a feature that is assigned to a functional head and triggers movement. Since C carries the EPP, the object *Marit* in (1c) moves to sentence-initial position and receives the focal (or topical) interpretation that it could not receive in its original position. The main verb *kysser* 'kisses' also moves to C in (1c). But the verb is not interpreted differently in C than in v* (1a) or in T (1b). Chomsky (2001:37-38) argues that movement operations that do not cause any semantic change, such as verb movement, occur in the phonological component.

2.   The Procedures of *Labeling Algorithm* and the Derivation of Verb Movement

Chomsky (2013, 2014) proposes the following procedures of *Labeling Algorithm* LA:[4]

(2)   a.   In the configuration [H, XP], with H being a phasal head, LA takes H as the label;
        b.   In the configuration [XP, YP], either procedure 1 or 2 is chosen:

---

[4] Throughout this paper, I use the term *Labeling Algorithm* LA for an abstract syntactic mechanism, and the term *labeling* for a specific syntactic operation.

1. Either XP or YP moves out; LA takes the head of the phrasal object that does not move out as the label;
2. XP and YP agree in some feature; LA takes that shared feature as the label;

c. In the configuration [H, XP] with H being a non-phasal head, i.e. V/R(oot) or T,

   i) The subject in [Spec,XP] moves to [Spec, H] and strengthens the non-phasal head;

   ii) That raised subject and the non-phasal head agree in some feature; LA takes that shared feature as the label.

Following Borer (2005a,b, 2013), Chomsky (2013, 2014) assumes that any category (noun, verb, etc.) is created by merge of a root and a functional head. For instance, V/R(oot) in (2c) merges to v* to be a verbal category. I follow this claim in this paper. Chomsky (2014:5-6) further argues that the non-phasal heads, V/R(oot) and T, are weak and cannot be labels by themselves; they must be strengthened by the movement of the subject in the Spec of their complement, as described in (2ci). This requirement of the subject movement is referred to as the EPP. The procedures of (2b2) and (2cii) describe the syntactic operation called *Agree*, i.e. valuation (Chomsky 2000, 2001, 2004, 2008): unvalued features of one are valued by the other so that the former can be interpreted at the interface with the other grammatical components. When a label is determined by Agree, LA seeks the feature shared by XP and YP in (2b2) and the feature shared by a non-phasal head and a subject raised to its Spec in (2cii). Conventionally, LA takes, as the label, the verbal/functional head, either X or Y, in (2b2) and the non-phasal head in (2cii).[5]

On the basis of the procedures above, the derivations of v*P and CP phases are described in (3i-viii). (3a) and (3b) illustrate the final representations

---

[5] In both configurations [H,XP] and [XP,YP], Agree occurs between two heads, H and X in the former and X and Y in the latter. See the series of Chomsky's papers referred to above.

of the derivations. I follow the procedure described in Chomsky (2014:11,(8)), which is carried out in more a successive-cyclic manner than the procedure described in Chomsky (2014:8,(5)).

(3) a. R+~~v*~~ [$_\alpha$ DP [R [$_\beta$ ~~DP~~ …]]]   (= v*P phase)

     b. ~~C~~ [$_\alpha$ DP [T [$_\beta$ ~~DP~~ …]]]   (= CP phase)

i)   DP in [Spec,β] moves to [Spec,R] in (3a) and to [Spec,T] in (3b) to strengthen those non-phasal heads;
ii) v* and C merge to its complement, α, in (3a) and (3b) respectively;
iii) Phasehood is inherited from v* to R in (3a) and from C to T in (3b);
iv) DP Obj(ect)-agrees with R in (3a); DP Subj(ect)-agrees with T in (3b);[6]
v)   α is labeled RP in (3a) and TP in (3b);
vi) R moves to v*, and v*, the verbal affix, is deleted in (3a); C is simply deleted in (3b);
vii) Phasehood is activated in the original position of R in (3a) and in that of T in (3b);
viii) β, the complement of R in (3a) and that of T in (3b), is transferred.[7]

A theoretical consequence of the LA-based derivational system is that movement operations that do not produce a new semantic effect can freely occur in syntax for any kind of categories, contra Chomsky (2001). As stated in

---

[6] In this Agree operation, unvalued φ-features of R/T are valued by DP. An unvalued Case feature of DP is also valued by the head and assigned the Accusative Case in (3a) and the Nominative Case in (3b).

[7] Christer Platzack (p.c.) addresses the question whether v*, a transitive head, should be distinguished from v, an intransitive/unaccusative head, in this new framework. The answer seems to be yes. By assumption, V/R(oot) needs some category in its Spec to strengthen it. An unaccusative verb takes, but an intransitive verb does not take, an internal argument (Burzio 1986). Though an unaccusative R can strengthen itself by raising its argument, an intransitive R cannot do so. The former can label itself after Agree with the raised argument, whereas the latter cannot label itself due to the absence of Agree with any argument. Thus, v as either intransitive or unaccusative can not always label itself, whereas v* as transitive can always do so, which enables the latter to be a phasal head.

the previous section, it has long been assumed that syntactic movement occurs when it causes a semantic change. However, in the configuration [XP,YP], either one of the categories moves regardless of whether it obtains a new semantic effect in the moved position; see (2b1). In the configuration [H, XP] with a non-phasal head, the subject in [Spec,XP] moves to [Spec,H]; see (2ci). This movement does not always produce a special semantic effect such as focus and topic for the raised subject. Hence, it is not necessary to assume in the LA-based derivational system that movement operations that do not cause a semantic change, including verb movement, occur in the phonological component.[8] See, e.g. Svenonius (1994), Matushansky (2006), Truckenbrodt (2006) and Biberauer and Roberts (2008), for the argument that verb movement should occur in syntax.[9]

According to Chomsky (2014:8), all functional features (such as φ-features, tense and an interrogative feature, if any) are located in C, not in T. It is plausible that such features are universally located in C, since C is a clausal head in all languages. In process (3iii), functional features are inherited from C to T. Let us assume that both φ-features and the tense feature are inherited from C to T in type (1a-b) languages as illustrated in (4a), whereas only φ-features are inherited from C to T and the tense feature stays in C in type (1c) languages as illustrated in (4b).[10] The claim here is in line with Holmberg and Platzack

---

[8] Johan Brandtler (p.c.) questions under what conditions movement that is not semantically motivated sometimes occurs in syntax and occurs in the phonological component in others. The claim here is in fact that as long as movement can occur in syntax, it should occur in it and should not be postponed to the phonological component. Thus, there should be no movement operations that occur in syntax in some cases but occur in the phonological component in others.

[9] In Chomsky (2014:11), it is claimed that R-to-v* occurs in narrow syntax, whereas T-to-C occurs in the phonological component.

[10] No problem arises in claiming that only some of the features of a phasal head are inherited to a lower head, leaving the others in the original head position. See Obata and Epstein (2012), who argue that features of a category can be splitted and appear in different syntactic

(1995), who propose that the finiteness feature is located in C in V2 languages, whereas it is located in T in non-V2 languages.

(4) a. $[C_{[\sout{T},\sout{\varphi}]}\ [T_{[T,\varphi]}\ [R+v^*[\sout{R}]]]]$[11]

  b. $[C_{[T,\sout{\varphi}]}\ [T_{[\varphi]}\ [R+v^*[\sout{R}]]]]$

The tense value of a verbal head is determined by T. Hence, it is plausible that v* has an unvalued tense feature, whereas T has a valued tense feature.[12] When the tense feature (as well as φ-features) is inherited to T in (4a), T and R+v* simply agree as in type (1a) languages; see (5a). In some languages such as type (1b) languages, T requires the R+v* amalgam to move to itself, which results in (5b).[13] In type (1c) languages in which the tense feature stays in C (see (4b)), T does not have any tense feature that agrees with v*. The valued tense feature in C then agrees with the unvalued counterpart of v*. As a phasal head, v* can access further syntactic operations that occur at the next higher phasal level. Following the claim made in recent literature, e.g. Holmberg and Hróarsdóttir (2003) and Chomsky (2008), let us assume that C directly raises the R+v* amalgam in the v* head to itself after Agree with v*, which results in (5c).

---

positions. Johan Brandtler (p.c.) addresses the question how to decide which functional features are inherited from C to T in a given language. This point concerns tightening the mechanism of feature inheritance, which I leave for future research.

[11] At the derivational point when functional features are inherited from C to T, v* would have been already deleted, since the derivation of CP follows that of v*P. Throughout this paper, I notate the verbal head amalgam as R+v* without a deletion line on v* for convenience' sake.

[12] Biberauer and Roberts (2008) assume valued/unvalued V-features in addition to valued/unvalued Tense features. I do not assume V-features for Agree between T and R+v*, since there is no reason to assume them. Traditionally, it has been assumed that a functional head has unvalued features and a category has valued features; the former is valued by the latter. But see, e.g. Pesetsky and Torrego (2001), who claim that the unvalued Case of a subject is valued by T. The point now is that in Agree, one has unvalued features and the other has valued features, as stated by Chomsky (2014:10,ft.16).

[13] The reason why T needs to raise the R+v* amalgam is mentioned later.

(5)   a.   C~~[T,φ]~~ [$_{TP}$ DP T$_{[T,φ]}$ [$_{v*P}$ ~~DP~~ R(kisses)+v* $\cdots$ [~~R(kisses)~~ …]]]]
(=1a)

b.   C~~[T,φ]~~ [$_{TP}$ DP [R(embrasse)+v*+T$_{[T,φ]}$ [$_{v*P}$ ~~DP R(embrasse)+v*~~
… [~~R(embrasse)~~ …]]]]   (=1b)

c.   … R(kysser)+v*+C$_{[T,φ]}$ [$_{TP}$ DP [T$_{[φ]}$ [$_{v*P}$ ~~DP R(kysser)+v*~~
… [~~R(kysser)~~ …]]]]   (=1c)

See Wiklund et al. (2007), who argue that verb movement in main clauses of Icelandic, a V2 language, directly targets the CP domain and does not display v*-to-T movement, which is in line with the proposal of the derivation illustrated in (5c).[14] Biberauer and Roberts (2008) assume the v*-to-T step for verb movement to C. They do not (or cannot) refer to that process in detail. With the direct movement analysis here, everything falls into place: there is no v*-to-T in type (1c) languages.[15]

Why is the raising of a verbal head amalgam either to T or to C obligatory in some languages? As has been claimed since Chomsky (2001), Agree occurs between a head and its goal, the latter staying in situ. Agree, i.e. valuation, does not require the movement of the goal. In the same way, R+v* should remain in situ after Agree with T in the unmarked case. Thus, it is type (1a) languages in which verb movement does not occur that represent the unmarked case. Type (1b-c) languages require verb movement in addition to valuation. Following Chomsky's argument concerning the weakness of

---

[14] Their analysis is based on *Remnant Movement* originated in Besten and Webelhuth (1987).
[15] v*-to-T is, but v*-to-C will not be, countercyclic, which details I leave aside here. See Richards (2001) for the 'tucking-in' operation, which has been widely assumed in the literature, including Chomsky (2013, 2014). See Epstein et al. (2012) for a theoretical discussion from the standpoint that the *Extension Condition* (Chomsky 1995) should be strictly obeyed.

non-phasal heads described in section 2, the tense feature in type (1a) languages is strong, since they do not require verb movement to strengthen it. The tense feature of type (1b-c) languages, on the other hand, is weak, since they require verb movement to strengthen it.

In the LA-based derivation, verb movement is a subclass of all kinds of movement operations. A phrase either simply moves out as in (2b1) or moves to strengthen a weak non-phasal head as in (2ci). In contrast, a verbal head moves to strengthen a weak tense feature in C/T only. The difference between phrasal movement and verb movement is that the former is, but the latter is not, involved in labeling. That is, when a phrase moves, LA takes the head of a remaining phrasal object as the label, as spelled out in (2b1). A phrase also moves so that it can agree with some feature of a non-phasal head; LA then takes that shared feature as the label, as spelled out in (2cii). Verb movement, however, is irrelevant to labeling operations, as illustrated in (5b-c).

Based on the claim that both φ-features and the tense feature are inherited to T in type (1b) languages, whereas only φ-features are inherited to T in type (1c) languages, it is predicted that the former languages have a morphologically richer inflectional system than the latter languages: both φ-features and the tense feature should be realized in the verbal head located in T in the former. This prediction is confirmed by many traditional observations, e.g. Vikner (1990), Roberts (1993), Holmberg and Platzack (1995): the Romance languages, which represent type (1b) languages, have a richer inflectional system than the Germanic languages, which represent type (1c) languages.[16]

Since the tense feature is in C but φ-features are in T, those features will be splitted and can be realized in difference syntactic positions in type (1c)

---

[16] See Biberauer and Roberts (2008), who argue that a rich tense inflectional system enables verb movement to occur (, whereas a rich agreement system allows an overt subject to be dropped). As Johan Brandtler (p.c.) points out, some V2 languages such as Icelandic and German have quite a rich tense inflectional system, which I turn to later.

languages. This is confirmed by Swedish participle constructions. Swedish has two perfect participial forms. One is a form called *supine* that does not inflect for any grammatical categories. The other is a form that inflects for gender and number. The participle *erbjudit* 'offered' in (6a) is a supine form and does not inflect. On the other hand, the participle *erbjuden* 'offered' agrees with the subject *hon* 'she' and inflects for common gender and singular in (6b). The participle *erbjudna* 'offered' agrees with the subject *de* 'they' and inflects for common gender and plural in (6c).[17] In (6b-c), Φ-features are realized on the participle in v*, whereas the finite auxiliary verb *blev* 'was' in C inflects only for the tense feature.[18] Compare with French, a type (1b) language, which is illustrated in (7). In this language type, both φ-features and the tense feature are inherited from C to T and realized in T, as illustrated by the form *sommes* 'are-PRES-1PL'.

(6) a.   Ingenting har Marit erbjudit Elsa.   [Swe.]
          nothing has Marit offered Elsa
          'Nothing, Marit (has) offered Elsa.'

     b.   Ingenting blev   hon erbjuden.
          nothing   was-PAST she offered-COM-SG
          'Nothing, she was offered.'

---

[17] Thanks to Johan Brandtler (p.c.) for the Swedish data of (6a,c).

[18] The participle agrees with the negative pronoun *ingenting* 'nothing' when the latter is passivized (Christer Platzack, p.c.). In i), a minimal pair of (6b), the Nominative form of the subject is changed to the Dative form. The participle *erbjudet* 'offered' agrees with the negative pronoun and inflects for neuter gender and singular.

i)   Ingenting blev   henne erbjudet.   [Swe.]
       nothing   was-PAST her   offered-NEUT-SG
       'Nothing was offered to her.'

As illustrated in (3iv-vi), R(*erbjudet*) Obj-agrees with *ingenting* 'nothing', which has been raised to the Spec of R(*erbjudet*). The Φ-features of *ingenting* are realized in R(*erbjudet*), which further moves to v*. The same argument applies to the French participle *invités* 'invited' in (7c). See also footnote 6.

c. Ingenting blev   de   erbjudna.
    nothing   were-PAST they offered-COM-PL
    'Nothing, they were offered.

(7)   Nous sommes   invités   à dîner par Particia.   [Fre.]
      we   are-PRES-1PL invited-PL to diner by Patricia
      'We are invited to diner by Patricia.'

Some predictions are made for embedded clauses of type (1c) languages. First, when C is occupied by nothing, C will raise the R+v* amalgam of an embedded clause to strengthen it in the same way as in main clauses. As illustrated in (8a-b), when C is realized as Ø, the tense feature in C directly raises the embedded R+v* amalgam to strengthen itself (, with an element occupying the Spec of the embedded CP).

(8)   a. Maria glaubt, Peter geht nach Hause.
          Maria believes Peter goes to   house
          'Maria believes (that) Peter is going home.'

      b. ···, [$_{CP}$ Peter R(geht)+v*+C$_{[T,φ]}$ [$_{TP}$ T$_{[φ]}$ [$_{v*P}$ … ~~R(geht)+v*~~ …]]]

Secondly, when C is occupied by a complementizer that appears to be irrelevant to the tense feature, the latter (, in addition to φ-features) will be inherited to T; since the tense feature of type (1c) languages is weak as stated above, it raises the verbal head in v* to strengthen itself. As illustrated by Icelandic (9a-b), the inherited tense feature in T raises the verbal head amalgam; since both the tense feature and φ-features are located in the embedded T, the latter is realized with rich inflection. The inherited tense feature of type (1c) languages, though weak, appears to allow an option: it can simply agree with the embedded verbal amalgam without raising the latter, as illustrated by Swedish and German

(10a-b). The verbal amalgam in the embedded v* has poor inflection in Swedish (10a) but has rich morphologies in German (10b).[19]

(9) a. Ég veit að Jón keypti   ekki bókina.   [Ice.]
         I   know that Jón bought-PAST-3sg not   the-book
         'I know that Jón didn't buy the book.'

     b. …, [$_{CP}$ að$_{[T,φ]}$ … [$_{TP}$ R(keypti)+v*+T$_{[T,φ]}$ … [$_{v*P}$ … R(keypti)+v* …]

(10) a. Jag sa   att Johan inte [$_{v*P}$ talade med Maria].   [Swe.]
         I   said that Johan not   talked with Maria
         'I said that Johan didn't talk with Maria.'

     b. Maria glaubt, dass Peter [$_{v*P}$ nach Hause geht].   [Ger.]
         Maria believes that Peter   to   house goes-PRES-3sg
         'Maria believes that Peter is going home.'

---

[19] In Faroese, verb movement in embedded clauses is optional (Heycock et al. 2010). In Swedish, a finite verb can move in embedded clauses. In such cases, the embedded clause almost obligatorily requires an overt complementizer, as illustrated in i). In other words, when a complementizer appears and the tense feature in C is inherited to T, the tense feature of this language type, being weak, is likely to raise the verbal head in v* to strengthen itself.
i)   Hon sa $^{??}$(att) hon hade inte [$_{v*P}$ hade läst den].   [Swe.]
     she said   that she had   not   read it
     'She said (that) she had not read it.'
The tense feature seems to be inherited to T in embedded clauses of type (1c) languages, even when an overt complementizer does not appear. As illustrated in ii), the embedded clause with the in-situ finite verb *hade* can optionally drop the complementizer. In this case, it seems that the tense feature in the embedded C is inherited to the embedded T and agrees with the embedded finite verb.
ii) Hon sa   (att) hon inte [$_{v*P}$ hade läst den].   [Swe.]
     she said that she not   had read it
     'She said (that) she had not read it.'
I would like to thank Johan Brandtler (p.c.) for letting me know various patterns of embedded clauses of V2 languages. Importantly, when a complementizer is absent, a comma intonation is used, which in most cases indicates that the complement clause is a direct quotation (Anders Holmberg, p.c.). I leave the role that such intonational properties play in embedded clauses for future research.

3.   Conclusion

I have discussed verb movement in the LA-based derivational system. I have pointed out that in this derivational system, movement operations that do not produce a new semantic effect freely occur in syntax for any kind of categories, contra Chomsky (2001). It is thus not necessary to assume that such movement operations, including verb movement, occur in the phonological component. I have argued that since Agree/valuation between the tense feature and a verbal head does not require any movement or any morphological support, verb movement, in the unmarked case, does not occur. Languages including, e.g. English, do not have verb movement and have a relatively poor inflectional system, whereas languages including, e.g. French and V2 languages, have verb movement either to T or to C and a relatively rich inflectional system. I have suggested that the tense feature of the former language type is strong, whereas the latter language type has a weak tense feature and requires verb movement and much morphological support to strengthen it. This argument is confirmed by the traditional observation that the inflectional system, e.g. of English, is relatively poor, whereas the inflectional system, e.g. of French and V2 languages, has quite rich inflectional morphologies.

Following the LA-based derivational system, verb movement is interpreted in the way opposite to the traditional claim represented by Chomsky (1995), where a strong T with rich inflectional morphologies causes verb movement, contrary to a weak T with poor inflections. In the LA-based derivation, the tense feature of type (1a) languages is strong, since valuation between the tense feature and a verbal head does not require any movement or any morphological support. The tense feature of type (1b-c) languages, on the other hand, is weak: they require verb movement as well as relatively rich morphological inflections to strengthen the tense feature.

References

Belletti, Adriana. 1990. *Generalized Verb Movement: Aspects of Verb Syntax*. Turin: Rosenberg and Sellier.

Besten, Hans den, and Gert Webelhuth. 1987. Adjunction and Remnant Topicalization in the Germanic SOY-Languages. Paper presented at GLOW (Venice).

Biberauer, Theresa, and Ian Roberts. 2008. Subjects, Tense and Verb Movement in Germanic and Romance. ms., University of Cambridge.

Borer, Hagit. 2005a. *In Name Only. Structuring Sense, Volume I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Borer, Hagit. 2005b. *The Normal Course of Events. Structuring Sense, Volume II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Borer, Hagit. 2013. *Taking Form: Structuring Sense Volume III*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Knowledge of Language*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework. In *Step by Step*, ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 89-156. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by Phase. In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1-52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2004. Beyond explanatory adequacy. In *Structures and Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 3*, ed. by Adriana Belletti, 104-131. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On Phases. In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Inquiry: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, ed. by Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero, and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, 133-166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2013. Problems of projection. *Lingua* 130:33-49.

Chomsky, Noam. 2014. Problems of Projection: Extensions. ms., MIT.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Crosslinguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Emonds, Joseph. 1978. The verbal complex V'-V in French. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9:49-77.

Epstein, Samuel David, Hisatsugu Kitahara and T. Daniel Seely. 2012. Structure building that can't be. In *Ways of Structure Building*, ed. by Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria and Vidal Valmala, 253-270. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grimshaw, Jane. 2000. Locality and Extended Projection. In *Lexical Specification and Insertion*, ed. by Peter Coopmans, Martin Everaert, and Jane Grimshaw, 115-133. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Heycock, Caroline, Antonella Sorace and Zakaris Svabo Hansen. 2010. V-to-I and V2 in subordinate clauses: An investigation of Faroese in relation to Icelandic and Danish. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 13:61-97.

Holmberg, Anders, and Thorbjörg Hróarsdóttir. 2003. Agreement and movement in Icelandic raising constructions. *Lingua* 113:997-1019.

Holmberg, Anders and Christer Platzack. 1995. *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Matushansky, Ora. 2006. Head Movement in Linguistic Theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37:69-109.

Obata, Miki, and Samuel David Epstein. 2012. Feature-splitting internal merge:

The case of *tough*-constructions. In *Ways of Structure Building*, ed. by Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria and Vidal Valmala, 366-384. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pesetsky, David, and Esther Torrego. 2001. T-to-C movement: Causes and consequences. In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 355-426. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. Verb movement, Universal Grammar, and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20:365-424.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In *Elements of Grammar*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281-338. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Richards, Norvin. 2001. *Movement in Language: Interactions and Architectures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, Ian. 1993. *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Svenonius, Peter. 1994. C-selection as feature-checking. *Studia Linguistica* 48(2):133-155.

Travis, Lisa. 1984. Parameters and Effects of Word Order Variation. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.

Truckenbrodt, Hubert. 2006. On the semantic motivation of syntactic verb movement to C in German. *Theoretical Linguistics* 32-3:257-306.

Vikner, Sten. 1990. *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wiklund, Anna-Lena, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, Kristine Bentzen and Þorbjörg Hróarsdóttir. 2007. Rethinking Scandinavian verb movement. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 10:203-233.

PUBLISHED BY JUNE 2014
1. Tarald Taraldsen: Som (1983)
2. Christer Platzack: Germanic word order and the COMP/INFL parameter (1983)
3. Anders Holmberg: The finite sentence in Swedish and English (1983)
4. Kirsti Koch Christensen: The categorial status of Norwegian infinitival relatives (1983)
5. Lars Hellan: Anaphora in Norwegian and theory of binding (1983)
6. Elisabet Engdahl: Parasitic gaps, subject extractions, and the ECP (1983)
7. Elisabet Engdahl: Subject gaps (1984)
8. Eiríkur Rögnvaldsson: Icelandic word order and flað-insertion
   Höskuldur Thráinsson: Some points on Icelandic word order (1984)
9. Tarald Taraldsen: Some phrase structure dependent differences between Swedish and Norwegian (1984)
10. Jan Engh: On the development of the complex passive
    Lars Hellan: A GB-type analysis of complex passives and related constructions (1984)
11. Tor A. Åfarli: Norwegian verb particle constructions as causative constructions (1984)
12. Martin Everaert: Icelandic long reflexivization and tense-connectedness (1984)
13. Anders Holmberg: On raising in Icelandic and Swedish
    Anders Holmberg: On certain clitic-like elements in Swedish (1984)
14. Toril Fiva: NP-internal chains in Norwegian (1984)
15. Kirsti Koch Christensen: Subject clitics and A-bound traces (1984)
16. Annie Zaenen, Joan Maling, Höskuldur Thráinsson: Passive and oblique case
    Joan Maling, Annie Zaenen: Preposition-stranding and oblique case (1984)
17. Nomi Erteschik-Shir: Der (1985)
18. Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson: Subordinate V/I in Icelandic. How to explain a root phenomenon (1985)
19. Kirsti Koch Christensen: Complex passive and conditions on reanalysis (1985)
20. Christer Platzack: The Scandinavian languages and the null subject parameter (1985)
21. Anders Holmberg: Icelandic word order and binary branching (1985)
22. Tor A. Åfarli: Absence of V2 effects in a dialect of Norwegian (1985)
23. Sten Vikner: Parameters of binder and of binding category in Danish (1985)
24. Anne Vainikka: Icelandic case without primitive grammatical functions (1985)
25. Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson: Moods and (long distance) reflexives in Icelandic (1986)
26. Wim Kosmeijer: The status of the finite inflection in Icelandic and Swedish (1986)
27. Robin Cooper: Verb second - predication or unification? (1986)
28. Joan Maling: Existential sentences in Swedish and Icelandic: Reference to Thematic Roles (1987)
29. Tor A. Åfarli: Lexical structure and Norwegian passive and ergative constructions (1987)
30. Kjell-Åke Gunnarsson: Expressions of distance and raising (1987)
31. Squibs, Remarks and Replies (Klaus von Bremen, Christer Platzack) (1987)
32. Cecilia Falk: Subjectless clauses in Swedish (1987)
33. Anders Holmberg: The Structure of NP in Swedish (1987)
34. Halldor Ármann Sigurðsson: From OV to VO: Evidence from Old Icelandic (1988)
35. Lars Hellan: Containment and Connectedness Anaphors (1988)
36. Tomas Riad: Reflexivity and Predication (1988)
37. Squibs, Remarks and Replies (Elly van Gelderen, Arild Hestvik, Tomas Riad) (1988)
38. Sten Vikner & Rex A. Sprouse: Have/Be-Selection as an A-Chain Membership Requirement. (1988)
39. Sten Vikner: Modals in Danish and Event Expressions (1988)
40. Elisabet Engdahl: Implicational Universals: Parametric Variation in GB and GPSG. (1988)
41. Kjell-Åke Gunnarsson: Expressions of Distance, Prepositions and Theory of Theta-Roles (1988)

Beginning with no. 42, the papers are no longer published as separate issues. There are two issues each year, a June issue, and a December issue.

42.   [December 1988]
Lars Hellan: The Phrasal Nature of Double Object Clusters
Anders Holmberg & Christer Platzack: On the Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax
Barbro Lundin & Christer Platzack: The Acquisition of Verb Inflection, Verb Second and Subordinate
        Clauses in Swedish

Lars Olof Delsing: The Scandinavian Noun Phrase
Gunnel Källgren & Ellen F. Prince: Swedish VP-Topicalization and Yiddish Verb-Topicalization

Kristine Bentzen, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, Þorbjörg Hróarsdóttir and Anna-Lena Wiklund:
Extracting from V2

Irene Franco: Issues in the syntax of Scandinavian embedded clauses.
David Petersson & Gunlög Josefsson: ELLERHUR and other Yes/No-question operator candidates
in Swedish.
Mikko Kupula: Causers as derived Subject – An unaccusative view from Finnish

87   [June 2011]
Jim Wood: Icelandic *let*-causatives and Case.
Eva Klingvall: On past participles and their external arguments.
Ulla Stroh-Wollin: Embedded declaratives, assertion and swear words.
Verner Egerland: Fronting, Background, Focus: A comparative study of Sardinian and Icelandic.
Caroline Heycock, Antonella Sorace, Zakaris Svabo Hansen, Sten Vikner & Frances Wilson:
Residual V-to-I in Faroese and its lack in Danish: detecting the final stages of a syntactic change.

88   [December 2011]
Henrik Rosenkvist; Verb Raising and Referential Null Subjects in Övdalian
Kari Kinn: Overt non-referential subjects and subject-verb agreement in Middle Norwegian
Mayumi Hosono: Verb Movement as Tense Operator Movement
Jim Wood & Einar Freyr Sigurðsson: Icelandic Verbal Agreement and Pronoun Antecedent Relations
Eva Klingvall: On non-copula *Tough* Constructions in Swedish
David Petersson: Swedish exclamatives are subordinate

89   [June 2012]
Eva Engels: Wh-phrases and NEG-phrases in clauses and nominals.
Fredrik Heinat: Adjective and clausal complementation.
Mayumi Hosono: Information structure, syntax and information properties of multiple *Wh*-questions.

90   [December 2012]
Ermenegildo Bidese, Andrea Padovan, AlessandraTomaselli: A binary system of
complementizers in Cimbrian relative clauses
Camilla Thurén: The syntax of Swedish copular clauses
Eva Klingvall: Topics in pseudo passives
Fredrik Heinat: Finiteness in Swedish.
Gunlög Josefsson: "Disagreeing" doubling *det*

91   [December 2013]
Roland Hinterhölzl: Economy conditions and coreference: From minimal pronouns to referential acts
Dorian Roehrs: Possessives as Extended Projections
Björn Lundquist: On inter-individual variation and mid-distance binding in Swedish
Verner Egerland: The Apropos-Topic, the Concerning-Topic and the syntax-pragmatics interface

92   [June 2014]
Elisabet Engdahl & Filippa Lindahl: Preposed object pronouns in Mainland Scandinavian
Katarina Lundin: An unexpected gap with unexpected restrictions
Dennis Ott: Controlling for movement: Reply to Wood (2012)
Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson: About pronouns

93   [December 2014]
Filippa Lindahl: Relative Clauses are not always strong islands
Gunlög Josefsson: Pseudo-coordination with gå 'go' and the "surprise effect"
Jóhanna Barðdal, Thórhallur Eythórsson & Tonya Kim Dewey: Alternating Predicates in Icelandic and German
Mayumi Hosono: Scandinavian Verb Particle Constructions and the Intonational Principles

Issues 1 - 43, 45, 66, 67 are out of stock. It is still possible to get copies of 44, 46–65, 68–91 by sending an order to the editor. Beginning with June 2008, the articles published in WPSS are available online: http://projekt.ht.lu.se/grimm/working-papers-in-scandinavian-syntax/