Nor Jnl Ling 33.3, 299–309 © Nordic Association of Linguists 2010 doi:10.1017/S0332586510000223

Hrafnbjargarson Gunnar Hrafn, Kristine Bentzen & Anna-Lena Wiklund. 2010.
Observations on extraction from V2 clauses
in Scandinavian. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 33(3), 299–309.

SHORT COMMUNICATION

Observations on extraction from V2 clauses in Scandinavian

Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, Kristine Bentzen & Anna-Lena Wiklund

This short communication presents a general overview of facts concerning *wh*-extraction from V2 clauses in the Scandinavian languages. While extraction from V2 clauses with a fronted non-subject is impossible in all of these languages, three classes can be distinguished with regard to extraction from subject-initial V2 clauses.

Keywords extraction, Scandinavian, verb second

Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson and Anna-Lena Wiklund, Centre for Languages and Literature, Lund University, Box 201, 221 00 Lund, Sweden. Gunnar.Hrafnbjargarson@nordlund.lu.se, Anna-Lena.Wiklund@nordlund.lu.se
Kristine Bentzen, CASTL, Department of Languages and Linguistics, University of Tromsø, 9037 Tromsø, Norway. kristine.bentzen@uit.no

1. INTRODUCTION

In the Scandinavian languages, extraction from embedded clauses without the verb second word order (henceforth V2) is generally possible, whereas embedded V2 clauses have been observed to display restrictions on extraction to varying degrees; see Holmberg (1986), Vikner (1995), and more recently Holmberg (to appear) and references therein. The contrast is exemplified by Swedish in (1).[1]

(1) a. Vad$_i$ sa han att han alltid åt t_i till frukost? (Sw.)
what said he that he always ate for breakfast
b. *Vad$_i$ sa han att han åt alltid t_i till frukost?
what said he that he ate always for breakfast
'What did he say that he always had for breakfast?'

This short communication presents a broad overview of *wh*-extraction from V2 clauses in Danish, Faroese, Icelandic, Norwegian and Swedish. We will show that V2 clauses with a fronted non-subject are islands for extraction in all of these

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000223 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Scandinavian varieties, whereas subject-initial V2 clauses differ with regard to the possibility of extraction, also within the Mainland Scandinavian languages (i.e. Danish, Norwegian and Swedish). From a theoretical perspective the extraction facts presented here favor an elaborate structure of the left periphery (Rizzi 1997) and suggest that there is no single verb second position in the clause (see Hróarsdóttir et al. 2007; Hrafnbjargarson & Wiklund 2010; Migdalski 2010). Moreover, they suggest that the verb second phenomenon *per se is* not responsible for island effects unless we distinguish between different types of verb second (see Bentzen to appear). Before we turn to the empirical facts, a couple of issues that are crucial to the interpretation of the data need to be mentioned. These concern subject-initial V2 in Insular Scandinavian and the *that*-trace effect.

2. SUBJECT-INITIAL V2 IN INSULAR SCANDINAVIAN

The Icelandic example in (2) illustrates extraction from an embedded clause that may be analyzed either as a subject-initial V2 clause with the subject and the verb in Spec-CP and C, respectively, or as involving V-to-I movement of the verb.

(2) **Hverjum**$_i$ heldur þú að María gefi ekki t_i svona bækur? (Ic.)
who think you that María gives not such books
'Who do you think that Maria doesn't give such books to?'

For theory-internal reasons, Vikner (1995:108ff.) assumes that extraction is impossible from V2 clauses and therefore that an analysis involving verb movement to the inflectional domain of the clause is the only one available for the embedded clause in (2). However, there is no *a priori* reason to assume that all V2 clauses are islands for extraction. As we will see, subject-initial V2 clauses allow argument extraction also in Norwegian varieties that do not display independent verb movement to the inflectional domain of the clause and where a V-to-I analysis of these clauses is therefore unavailable. Moreover, we will show that under certain circumstances subject-initial V2 clauses disallow extraction also in Icelandic. For these reasons, extraction facts do not easily lend themselves as arguments in favor of a V-to-I over a V-to-C analysis of Icelandic verb movement.

In what follows, we assume that all verb movement out of vP in Icelandic targets the CP domain of the clause and that embedded clauses like that in (2) above involve subject-initial V2 with both the subject and the verb in the left peripheral domain of the clause (CP). For detailed arguments in favor of this analysis and against the traditional V-to-I movement analysis, see Wiklund et al. (2007) and more recently Hrafnbjargarson & Wiklund (2010). For an attempt to rescue a V-to-I analysis of Icelandic verb movement, see Thráinsson (2010).[2]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000223 Published online by Cambridge University Press

3. THE *THAT*-TRACE EFFECT

Danish, Faroese, Swedish and some varieties of Norwegian display the *that*-trace effect, whereas Icelandic and other varieties of Norwegian (including Northern Norwegian) do not; see Taraldsen (1980), Thráinsson et al. (2004), and more recently Lohndal (2009) for discussion of the *that*-trace effect in the Scandinavian languages and English. In brief, the *that*-trace effect means that it is impossible to extract a subject across the complementizer. For this reason, the Danish, Faroese and Swedish examples in (3) cannot tell us anything about the possibility of extraction from V2 clauses. They would be ungrammatical in any case.

(3) a. *Hvem$_i$ sagde han **at** t_i kunne ikke synge denne sang? (Da.)
who said he that could not sing this song

b. *Hvør$_i$ segði hann **at** t_i dugdi ikki at syngja henda sangin? (Fa.)
who said he that could not to sing this.here song.the

c. *Vem$_i$ sa han **att** t_i kunde inte sjunga den här sången? (Sw.)
who said he that could not sing this here song.the

The ungrammaticality of the sentences in (3) disappears if the complementizer is omitted but with different results in the three languages:

(4) a. Hvem, sagde han, kunne ikke synge denne sang? (Da.)
who said he could not sing this song

b. Hvør$_i$ segði hann t_i dugdi ikki at syngja henda sangin? (Fa.)
who said he could not to sing this.here song.the

c. Vem, sa han, kunde inte sjunga den här sången? (Sw.)
who said he could not sing this here song.the
'Who, did he say, couldn't sing this song?'

Whereas (4b) involves subject extraction from a V2 clause, the only available reading for (4a and c) is a parenthetical reading (for the same proposal for German, see Reis 1996). The first piece of evidence for this difference concerns object extraction. As we will see, object extraction is possible from a subject-initial V2 clause in Faroese but not in Danish and Swedish. This difference already gives us a hint that subject extraction from subject-initial V2 clauses may be available in varieties of Faroese but unavailable in Danish and Swedish.[3]

Another piece of evidence comes from binding. The examples in (5) show that a quantifier in the matrix clause can bind a pronoun in the embedded V2 clause in Danish, Faroese and Swedish; the reading where the possessive pronoun covaries with the matrix quantifier is available in both varieties. This property sets Scandinavian embedded V2 clauses apart from their counterparts in e.g. West Frisian (see de Haan 2001), in that the V2 clause is really embedded under the matrix clause in Scandinavian.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000223 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(5) a. Hver mand$_i$ sagde at hans$_{i/j}$ mor havde ikke læst bogen. (Da.)
each man said that his mother had not read book.the

b. Hvør ein maður$_i$ segði at mamma hansara$_{i/j}$ hevði ikki lisið bókina. (Fa.)
each one man said that mother his had not read book.the

c. Varje man$_i$ sa att hans$_{i/j}$ mamma hade inte läst boken. (Sw.)
each man said that his mother had not read book.the
'Every man said that his mother hadn't read the book.'

In contexts like (4) above, however, the possibility of binding is restricted to Faroese. Neither Swedish nor Danish permits binding in this context, see (6).[4]

(6) a. Hans$_{*i/j}$ mor, sagde hver mand$_i$, havde ikke læst bogen. (Da.)
his mother said each man had not read book.the

b. Mamma hansara$_{i/j}$ segði hvør ein maður$_i$ hevði ikki lisið bókina. (Fa.)
mother his said each one man had not read book.the

c. Hans$_{*i/j}$ mamma sa varje man$_i$ hade inte läst boken. (Sw.)
his mother said each man had not read book.the
'Every man said that his mother hadn't read the book.'

We take these data to show that Faroese allows subject extraction from subject-initial V2 clauses, whereas Danish and Swedish do not. Rather, what looks like subject extraction from a V2 clause involves a parenthetical construction in the latter languages, corresponding to *His mother, said every man, hadn't read the book*. Our investigation of Norwegian is confined to varieties that do not display the *that*-trace effect.

4. EXTRACTING FROM V2

We have confined our survey to the tests below, all involving extraction of *wh*-elements corresponding to English *who*, *what* and *why*. We leave for future research the possibility that the type and complexity of the extracted element may affect extraction possibilities, see Szabolcsi (2006) for an overview.

(7) *Extraction tests*
(i) *wh*-subject extraction from non-subject-initial V2 clauses
(ii) *wh*-object extraction from non-subject-initial V2 clauses
(iii) *wh*-subject extraction from subject-initial V2 clauses
(iv) *wh*-object extraction from subject-initial V2 clauses
(v) *wh*-adjunct extraction from subject-initial V2 clauses

Furthermore, all examples in what follows involve counterparts of the English verb *say*, an ASSERTIVE predicate which has been observed to allow root phenomena cross-linguistically (see Hooper & Thompson 1973 for an early discussion) and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000223 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which may embed both subject-initial and non-subject-initial V2 clauses in all of the Scandinavian languages; see Julien (2007) and Wiklund et al. (2009).[5]

4.1 Argument extraction from non-subject-initial V2 clauses

The following tests identify the possibility of argument extraction from V2 clauses involving a fronted non-subject:

(8) a. ***wh*-subject**$_{EMB}$ said he that [non-subject V_{FIN}_NEG]
b. ***wh*-object**$_{EMB}$ said he that [non-subject V_{FIN} subject NEG_]

As the examples in (9)–(13) illustrate, none of the five Scandinavian varieties allow extraction from clauses involving non-subject topicalization (see Holmberg 1986 on Swedish). Judgments do not change if the negation is left out. The target meanings of the (a) and (b) examples below are, respectively, 'Who did he say that had not given these books to Trine?' and 'Whom did he say that he had not given these books to?'

(9) a. *Hvem$_i$ sagde han, at disse bøger havde t_i ikke givet Trine? (Da.)
who said he that these books had not given Trine
b. *Hvem$_i$ sagde han, at disse bøger havde han ikke givet t_i?
who said he that these books had he not given

(10) a. *Hvør$_i$ segði hann at hesar bøkur hevði t_i ikki givið Káru? (Fa.)
who said he that these books had not given Kára
b. *Hvørjum$_i$ segði hann at hesar bøkur hevði hann ikki givið t_i?
who said he that these books had he not given

(11) a. *Hver$_i$ sagði hann að þessar bækur hefði t_i ekki gefið Kára? (Ic.)
who said he that these books had not given Kári
b. *Hverjum$_i$ sagði hann að þessar bækur hefði hann ekki gefið t_i?
who said he that these books had he not given

(12) a. *Hvem$_i$ sa han at denne boka hadde t_i ikke gitt Kari? (No.)
who said he that this book.the had not given Kari
b. *Hvem$_i$ sa han at denne boka hadde han ikke gitt t_i?
whom said he that this book.the had he not given

(13) a. *Vem$_i$ sa han att den här boken hade t_i inte gett Karin? (Sw.)
who said he that this here book.the had not given Karin
b. *Vem$_i$ sa han att den här boken hade han inte gett t_i?
whom said he that this here book.the had he not given

4.2 Argument extraction from subject-initial V2 clauses

The possibility of argument extraction from subject-initial V2 clauses is identified by the following tests:

(14) a. ***wh*-subject**$_{EMB}$ said he (that) [_ V_{FIN} NEG]
b. ***wh*-object**$_{EMB}$ said he that [subject VFIN NEG_]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000223 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The intended (or idiomatic) translations of the (a) and (b) examples below are, respectively, 'Who did he say could not sing this song?' and 'What did he say that he could not sing?'.

(15) a. *Hvem$_i$ sagde han t$_i$ kunne ikke synge denne sang? (Da.)
who said he could not sing this song
b. *Hvad$_i$ sagde han at han kunde ikke synge t$_i$?
what said he that he can not sing

(16) a. Hvør$_i$ segði hann (*at) t$_i$ dugdi ikki at syngja henda sangin? (Fa.)
who said he that could not to sing this.here song.the
'Who did he say couldn't sing this song?'
b. Hva$_i$ segði hann at hann dugdi ikki at syngja t$_i$?
what said he that he could not to sing
'What did he say that he couldn't sing?'

(17) a. Hver$_i$ sagði hann að t$_i$ gæti ekki sungið þetta lag? (Ic.)
who said he that could not sing this song
b. Hvað$_i$ sagði hann að hann gæti ekki sungið t$_i$?
what said he that he could not sing

(18) a. Hvem$_i$ sa han at t$_i$ kunne ikke synge denne sangen? (No.)
who said he that could not sing this song.the
b. Hva$_i$ sa han at han kunne ikke synge t$_i$?
what said he that he can not sing

(19) a. *Vem$_i$ sa han (att) t$_i$ kunde inte sjunga den här sången? (Sw.)
who said he that could not sing this here song.the
b. *Vad$_i$ sa han att han kunde inte sjunga t$_i$?
what said he that he can not sing

Danish and Swedish are the only varieties investigated that completely disallow argument extraction from subject-initial V2 clauses (see Holmberg 1986), bearing in mind the facts presented in section 3 and the fact that we have restricted our study of Norwegian to the varieties that do not display the *that*-trace effect. Although Swedish and Norwegian pattern together regarding the availability of embedded V2 (Wiklund et al. (2009), they apparently differ with respect to extraction from V2 clauses. While Swedish does not allow *wh*-argument extraction from subject-initial V2 clauses, Norwegian does (see Lohndal 2009). In this sense, the relevant varieties of Norwegian pattern with Faroese and Icelandic with respect to argument extraction.

4.3 Adjunct extraction from subject-initial V2 clauses

The possibility of adjunct extraction is identified by the following test:

(20) ***wh*-adjunct$_{EMB}$** said he that [subject V$_{FIN}$ NEG object _]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000223 Published online by Cambridge University Press

By incorporating the test into question–answer pairs, the available readings appear clearer. The question is:

(21) Why did you say that you had not met the queen?

Two potential answers to the question are A_1 and A_2:

(22) a. A_1: I said it because I thought you should know it.
b. A_2: She did not have time to meet me.

The A_2 answer is possible only if the *wh*-adjunct (*why*) originates from within the embedded clause, thus identifying adjunct extraction from the embedded V2 clause (see also Haegeman 2003 and Bhatt & Pancheva 2006 for a discussion of adjunct movement of this type).

(23) Q: Hvorfor$_i$ sagde du t_i, at du havde ikke mødt dronningen $^*t_i$? (Da.)
why said you that you had not met queen.the

A_1: Jeg sagde det, fordi jeg syntes, du burde ha vidst det.
I said it because I thought you should have known it

A_2: #Hun havde ikke tid til at træffe mig.
she had not time to meet me

(24) Q: Hví$_i$ segði tú t_i, at tú hevði ikki hitt drotningina t_i? (Fa.)
why said you that you had not met queen.the

A_1: Eg segði tað, tí eg helt, tú átti at vita tað.
I said it because I thought you should to know it

A_2: Hon hevði ikki tíð at hitta meg.
she had not time to meet me

(25) Q: Af hverju$_i$ sagðirðu t_i að þú hefðir ekki hitt drottninguna t_i? (Ic.)
why said.you that you had not met queen.the

A_1: Ég sagði það af því að mér fannst þú ættir að vita það.
I said it because I found you should to know it

A_2: Hún hafði ekki tíma til að hitta mig.
she had not time to to meet me

(26) Q: Hvorfor$_i$ sa du t_i at du hadde ikke møtt dronninga $^*t_i$? (No.)
why said you that you had not met queen.the

A_1: Jeg sa det fordi jeg syntes du burde vite om det.
I said it because I thought you should know about it

A_2: #Hun hadde ikke tid til å møte meg.
she had not time to to meet me

(27) Q: Varför$_i$ sa du t_i att du hade inte träffat drottningen $^*t_i$? (Sw.)
why said you that you had not met queen.the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000223 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A_1: Jag sa det för att jag tyckte att du borde veta om det.
I said it because I thought that you should know about it

A_2: #Hon hade inte tid att träffa mig.
she had not time to meet me

Because both A_1 and A_2 are possible answers to the question in Faroese and Icelandic (see (24) and (25)), the question is ambiguous in these languages. It can either ask for the reason why you said something, or the reason why you had not met the queen. The possibility of A_2 identifies adjunct extraction from subject-initial V2 clauses in these languages. In contrast, this does not hold for Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish, see (23), (26) and (27). In the presence of V2 in the embedded clause, the adjunct may only be read as originating from within the matrix clause. Thus, Norwegian patterns with Danish and Swedish rather than with Faroese and Icelandic regarding adjunct extraction.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Conforming to observations in the literature, our investigation has shown that none of the Scandinavian languages allow *wh*-extraction from V2 clauses where a non-subject has been fronted. With regard to subject-initial V2 clauses on the other hand, we see more variation. Based on our data, the Scandinavian languages can be divided into three classes. Faroese and Icelandic allow both *wh*-argument and *wh*-adjunct extraction from subject-initial V2 clauses, whereas Danish and Swedish allow neither, and Norwegian falls between these two classes in that it allows *wh*-argument extraction but not *wh*-adjunct extraction.

These facts are important for a deeper understanding of the V2 phenomena because they indicate that such phenomena are not likely to be attributable to a uniform syntactic trigger but may target different positions in the left peripheral domain of the clause, see Hróarsdóttir et al. (2007), Hrafnbjargarson & Wiklund (2010) and also Migdalski (2010). Moreover, the facts from Norwegian indicate that verb movement to the CP domain as such does not necessarily induce islands for extraction. Following the generally accepted assumption that Norwegian does not display independent V-to-I movement of the type traditionally attributed to Icelandic (save in Northern Norwegian, see Bentzen 2005), our data add an additional piece of evidence that the availability of extraction from subject-initial V2 clauses in Icelandic cannot be used as an argument for analyzing such clauses as involving V-to-I rather than V-to-C. Another piece of evidence comes from the observation in Hrafnbjargarson & Wiklund (2010) that argument extraction as in (17a) above is unacceptable even in Icelandic when discourse-oriented material is inserted into the clause (see Wiklund 2010), as is shown in (28) below. In other words, subject-initial V2 clauses are not always devoid of island effects in Icelandic. Whether they are

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000223 Published online by Cambridge University Press

or not arguably depends on the target of the V2 movement(s) involved, supposedly lower in (17a), higher in (28). In the absence of extraction, (28) is of course fine, see (29).

(28) *Hver$_i$ sagði hann að t_i gæti nú /fjandakornið sungið þetta lag? (Ic.)
who said he that could you.know swearword sing this song

(29) Hann sagði að hann gæti nú /fjandakornið sungið þetta lag. (Ic.)
he said that he could you.know swearword sing this song
'He said that he could very well sing this song.'

We leave the details of the 'cartography of V2' and potential intervention effects induced by a subset of the features that trigger V2 phenomena for future research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Kristine Bentzen is a native speaker of Norwegian, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson a native speaker of Icelandic, and Anna-Lena Wiklund a native speaker of Swedish. We are indebted to Victoria Absalonsen, Kirsti Hansen, and especially Zakaris Hansen for providing us with data from Faroese, to Björn Lundquist for additional judgments on the Swedish examples, to Christine Bjerkan Østbø, Øystein Alexander Vangsnes, and Merete Anderssen for additional judgments on the Norwegian examples, and to Robert Zola Christensen, Pernille Folkmann, and Kjeld Kristensen for judgments on Danish examples. For comments and discussion, we would like to thank Caroline Heycock, Terje Lohndal, Christer Platzack, Peter Svenonius, and the audience at the CASTL colloquium (Tromsø, March 2007). Last, but not least, we would like to thank Þorbjörg Hróarsdóttir for her collaboration on a previous version of this paper (Bentzen et al. 2007).

NOTES

1. The examples include the following abbreviations: Da. = Danish, Fa. = Faroese, Ic. = Icelandic, No. = Norwegian, Sw. = Swedish.
2. Concerning Faroese, the situation appears more complex as V-to-I movement may be a possibility at least in some varieties, see Heycock, Sorace & Svabo Hansen (2010). We assume without discussion that verb movement past negation targets the CP domain. There is increasing evidence that verb movement past negation is different from verb movement past other sentential adverbs; see Bentzen (2005) on Northern Norwegian and Garbacz (2010) on Övdalian.
3. In the Faroese variety investigated by Vikner (1995: 115, ex. (125b)), argument extraction from V2 clauses is reported to be impossible.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000223 Published online by Cambridge University Press

4. Judgements do not change if the bound element is contained in the object rather than the subject:

   (i) Kungen sa varje man$_i$ hade inte läst hans$_{j/*i}$ bok. (Sw.)
   king.the said each man had not read his book
   'The king said that each man had not read his book.'

5. According to our investigation, extraction possibilities are not affected by which class the matrix predicates that may embed V2 clauses belong to (in terms of Hooper & Thompson 1973) among the predicates that may embed V2 clauses in each of the languages that we have studied.

REFERENCES

Bentzen, Kristine. 2005. What's the better move? On verb placement in Standard and Northern Norwegian. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 28(2), 153–188.

Bentzen, Kristine. To appear. Exploring embedded main clause phenomena: The irrelevance of factivity and some challenges from V2 languages. *Theoretical Linguistics*.

Bentzen, Kristine, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, Þorbjörg Hróarsdóttir & Anna-Lena Wiklund. 2007. Extracting from V2. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 79, 119–128.

Bhatt, Rajesh & Roumyana Pancheva. 2006. Conditionals. In Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, vol. I, 638–687. Oxford: Blackwell.

Garbacz, Piotr. 2010. *Word Order in Övdalian: A Study in Variation and Change*. Fil.dr dissertation, Centre for Languages and Literature, Lund University.

de Haan, Germen. 2001. More is going on upstairs than downstairs: Embedded root phenomena in West Frisian. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 4(1), 3–38.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2003. Notes on long adverbial fronting in English and the left periphery. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34(4), 640–649.

Heycock, Caroline, Antonella Sorace & Zakaris Svabo Hansen. 2010. V-to-I and V2 in subordinate clauses: An investigation of Faroese in relation to Icelandic and Danish. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 13(1), 61–97.

Holmberg, Anders. 1986. *Word Order and Syntactic Features in the Scandinavian Languages and English*. Fil.dr dissertation, Stockholm University.

Holmberg, Anders. To appear. Verb second. In Artemis Alexiadou & Tibor Kiss (eds.), *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Research*, 2nd edn, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Hooper, Joan & Sandra Thompson. 1973. On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4, 465–497.

Hrafnbjargarson, Gunnar Hrafn & Anna-Lena Wiklund. 2010. AGR & V2. *Theoretical Linguistics* 36(1), 57–68.

Hróarsdóttir, Þorbjörg, Anna-Lena Wiklund, Kristine Bentzen & Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson. 2007. The afterglow of verb movement. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 80, 45–75.

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

Lohndal, Terje. 2009. *Comp-T* effects: Variation in the position and features of C. *Studia Linguistica* 63(2), 204–232.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000223 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2010. On the relation between V2 and the second position cliticization. *Lingua* 120(2), 329–353.
Reis, Marga. 1996. Extractions from verb-second clauses in German. In Ulli Lutz & Jürgen Pafel (eds.), *On Extraction and Extraposition in German*, 45–88. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Syntax*, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Szabolcsi, Anna. 2006. Strong vs. weak islands. In Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, vol. I, 479–531. Oxford: Blackwell.
Taraldsen, Knut Tarald. 1980. *On the Nominative Island Condition, Vacuous Application and the* That-*trace Filter*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2010. Predictable and unpredictable sources of variable verb and adverb placement in Scandinavian. *Lingua* 120(5), 1062–1088.
Thráinsson, Höskuldur, Hjalmar P. Petersen, Jógvan í Lon Jacobsen & Zakaris Svabo Hansen. 2004. *Faroese: An Overview and Reference Grammar*. Tórshavn & Reykjavík: Føroya Fróðskaparfelag & Háskólaútgáfan.
Vikner, Sten. 1995. *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Wiklund, Anna-Lena. 2010. In search of the force of dependent verb second. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 33(1), 81–91.
Wiklund, Anna-Lena, Kristine Bentzen, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson & Þorbjörg Hróarsdóttir. 2009. On the distribution and illocution of V2 in Scandinavian *that*-clauses. *Lingua* 119, 1914–1938.
Wiklund, Anna-Lena, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, Kristine Bentzen & Þorbjörg Hróarsdóttir. 2007. Rethinking Scandinavian verb movement. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 10, 203–233.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000223 Published online by Cambridge University Press