

Review Article

Lars Hellan & Kirsti Koch Christensen (eds.): *Topics in Scandinavian Syntax*. Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory. Reidel: Dordrecht. 1986. Pp. vii + 273, £40.50/Dfl. 147.00. ISBN 90-277-2166-1.

Sten Vikner, *Département d'Anglais, Université de Genève, CH-1211 Genève 4, Switzerland.*

When the proceedings of a conference or any other anthology of papers are to be published, the choice of printing method (typeset vs. offset from authors' camera-ready manuscripts) seems to have a great many consequences. At least this is the impression one might get from *Topics in Scandinavian Syntax (TSS)*: It is a very pleasant volume to deal with, both for its high aesthetic qualities (typeface, layout) and for its "editorial" ones (e.g. the introduction, the two indices), but it is also a very expensive volume and one that took a long time to appear.

One can only hope that these factors do not have to inter-relate in the way described above, i.e. that the price and the publishing time do not necessarily follow from the choice of typesetting over offset printing: while no one could reasonably expect a publishing time of 4 months and a publishing price of £4 for a volume with such indisputable qualities as *TSS*, 4 years and £40 seem almost excessive.

It is a shame that Reidel (as well as other publishers, e.g. C.U.P.) does not have the paperback policy that for example Foris has, but continues to publish a large number of its titles either in hardback versions only (like *TSS*) or in hardback first, only making a paperback version available much later (as was the case with Burzio (1986)).

All this does not mean that one should not buy this book. On the contrary (which only makes the price all the more deplorable), *TSS* is a "must" to anyone interested in Scandinavian syntax: As should be apparent from the more detailed comments below on the individual contributions, *TSS* contains very interesting papers of high quality. It is true that the papers address very different problems, and, not having much in common, do not make up a whole. On the other hand, *TSS* may serve as a good introduction to the field of Scandinavian generative syntax, because of the variety of problems treated, because most of the "great names" of the field are represented, and, of course, because of the excellent introduction.

1. INTRODUCTION

In their introduction (pp. 1–29), Lars Hellan and Kirsti Koch Christensen both summarize the individual contributions to *TSS* and give an introduction to the field of Scandinavian generative syntax. Their summaries in many cases also extend the analyses of the contributions, supporting these analyses with additional arguments (cf. e.g. the summary of Thránsson's paper, pp. 25–27).

The introduction to what they call "the Scandinavian paradigm" is reminiscent

of the volume as a whole in that it is not so much a coherent introduction to the field as it is a guided tour during which the reader is presented with many interesting sets of facts from Scandinavian: verb second and placement of negation, wh-extractions, binding facts, quirky case subjects, presentational constructions, short object movement, and *let*-causatives.

These are mainly areas in which the Scandinavian languages differ from non-Scandinavian languages, but it should not be forgotten that this is not the only kind of Scandinavian data that may be of interest to an international public. In fact, one might argue that, given the proximity of these languages to each other and their consequent suitability as a testing ground for theories wishing to reduce several surface differences to much fewer underlying ones, the areas in which variation inside Scandinavian is similar to variation outside Scandinavian are at least as interesting (if not more so) as the above-mentioned differences between Scandinavian and non-Scandinavian. As examples of variations found both in and outside Scandinavian, let me mention only null subject phenomena (cf. Platzack 1987), *have/be*-variation (cf. Taraldsen 1986, Vikner & Sprouse 1988), and past participle agreement (cf. Christensen & Taraldsen 1987).

2. ROBIN COOPER

In “Swedish and the Head Feature Convention” (pp. 31–52), Robin Cooper discusses three phenomena in Swedish: NPs with attributive adjectives, cf. (1)–(3), predicative adjectives in their standard form, and predicative adjectives with so-called “bare indefinite” NPs, cf. (4). He convincingly argues that the Head Feature Convention (which requires a head to share some or all features with its maximal projection) should not be seen as an absolute condition, as the three phenomena discussed all violate it. He therefore suggests considering the HFC as a “markedness principle”, i.e. the HFC may be violated, but the structures that do so are more marked than the structures that do not.

It seems to me that appeals to markedness ought to be the last resort, as the predictions made are very unclear (and such appeals also seem to be less and less frequent as linguistic theory develops). Take for example Cooper’s claim that

(1) Sw. *denna gamla häst*/**hästen* ‘this old horse (indef)

is more marked than

(2) Sw. *den gamla hästen*/**häst* ‘the old horse (def)

because the former shows a discrepancy in that the N is indefinite but the NP definite, whereas both N and NP are definite in the latter. Does the fact that Danish only exhibits the marked pattern.

(3) Da. a. *denne gamle hest*/**hesten*
 ‘this old horse (indef)

b. *den gamle hest*/**hesten*
 ‘the old horse (indef)

make Danish a counterexample to Cooper’s analysis, or does it merely mean that Danish is more “marked” than Swedish? If the former were the case, we would at least have a clear prediction, but it is not clear at all what follows from the latter.

Thus one would very much prefer alternative analyses of these three phenomena. Such alternatives (where the HFC is not necessarily seen as violated) might exist: cf. Holmberg (1988), where the “doubling” definite determiner — definite N is explained as a way of getting the adjective within the scope of the determiner.

Cf. also the introduction to *TSS* (pp. 19–20) and Hellan (1986), where predicative adjective agreement is seen as non-syntactic in nature: the adjectives are seen as governed rather than agreeing, and the “bare indefinites”, e.g. *bilar* in

- (4) Sw. *bilar* är dyrt
 ‘cars(pl) is/are (sg or pl) expensive (sg)’
 i.e. ‘it is expensive to have a car’

are seen as non-heads of the maximal projection that the adjective agrees with.

Cf. finally also Vikner & Sprouse (1988), where the predicative adjective agreement is seen as resulting from Raising and specifier-head agreement.

3. JOAN MALING (& EIRÍKUR RÖGNVALDSSON)

In “Clause-Bounded Reflexives in Modern Icelandic” (pp. 53–63), Joan Maling discusses objects as antecedents for reflexives. Eiríkur Rögnvaldsson’s “Some Comments on Reflexivization in Icelandic” (pp. 89–102) offers comments both on the paper by Maling and on the following one by Anderson.

Reflexives are possible (though not to all speakers) when the antecedent is uncontroversially an object, whereas in the cases where the antecedent may be interpreted as the subject of a small clause, e.g.

- (5) Ic. *Sálfræðingurinn gerði* [Harald stoltan af sjálfum sér]
 ‘The psychiatrist made Harold proud of himself’

reflexives are not only possible but obligatory to all speakers. Maling rejects a (small) clausal analysis of [*Harald stoltan af sjálfum sér*] as it cannot move as one constituent or be substituted by a pronoun, even though this inability to move may be caused by other factors (e.g. movement could be ruled out by *Harald* not getting case in any other position than following the matrix verb).

Maling also rejects a clausal analysis of subject-controlled *as*-complements

- (6) Ic. *Vigdís heiðraði þá* [sem forseti þeirra/*sinn]
 ‘Vigdís honoured them as their president’

(where only the non-reflexive option for *their* is possible), as no verb can be inserted in the complement. However, Rögnvaldsson claims that this is possible, as in

- (7) Ic. *Vigdís heiðraði þá* [sem hún væri forseti þeirra]
 ‘Vigdís honoured them as if she were their president’

and argues that this kind of complement is clausal. According to Rögnvaldsson, there may also be independent reason why reflexives are not possible with the matrix object *þá* as the antecedent in (6), e.g. lack of c-command.

Maling’s conclusion rests entirely on the assumption that the complements

inside which reflexives are obligatory even when the antecedent is an (alleged) object cannot be analysed as clauses. It is thus not completely convincing, as the facts discussed are not problematic if the complements are clausal, and as the reasons to exclude the clausal analysis are not entirely convincing themselves. Even so, taken together the papers by Maling and Rögnvaldsson offer a very wide selection of data on (potential) object antecedents, and a thorough and interesting discussion of these data.

4. STEPHEN ANDERSON (& EIRÍKUR RÖGNVALDSSON)

Stephen Anderson's paper, "The Typology of Anaphoric Dependencies: Icelandic (and Other) Reflexives" (pp. 65–88), considers the entire spectrum of Icelandic reflexives, i.e. with both subjects and objects as antecedents, and with the antecedents situated both inside and outside the clause of the reflexive. As was Maling's paper, Anderson's paper is discussed by Eiríkur Rögnvaldsson in "Some Comments on Reflexivization in Icelandic" (pp. 89–102).

Anderson considers the analysis of Kayne (1981a: footnote 20), "the minimal governing category of a reflexive can be projected from a governing V upward through a string of subjunctive Ss", which he rejects for two reasons: (a) It cannot account for reflexives that are subjects (i.e. quirky case ones) or embedded in subjects (i.e. possessive ones). (b) It cannot account for the difference between, on the one hand, reflexivization within one and the same clause or from a higher clause into an infinitival (obligatory if antecedent is a subject, optional if it is an object), and on the other hand, from a higher clause into a subjunctive clause (optional if the antecedent is a subject, impossible if it is an object).

The ingenious innovation of Anderson's paper is the suggestion that the defining property for a domain in which reflexivization takes place is that it has independent tense. This means that an indicative clause (including any number of embedded infinitivals) always counts as a domain, and that subjunctive clauses may either count as domains or not count, as they may be argued not to have independent tense (their tenses are entirely predictable from traditional rules of sequence-of-tense phenomena). So in a reading where a subjunctive clause has an independent tense, it is itself a reflexivization domain, hence reflexivization is impossible from a higher clause. On the other hand, for the same clause there is also the reading where the tense is not independent, and then the subjunctive clause is not a reflexivization domain, hence reflexivization is possible from a higher clause. This neatly accounts for cases where a subjunctive clause violates the sequence-of-tense rules and also behaves like an indicative clause w.r.t. reflexivization.

This approach is not completely unproblematic, however. One problem is that in Danish (as well as Norwegian and Swedish), infinitivals have the same properties as Ic. subjunctive clauses, even though infinitivals can hardly be said to have (a reading where they have) an independent tense, as they have no tense at all (as Anderson says for Ic. infinitivals (p. 77)). Danish infinitivals also show the logical opacity effects that Ic. subjunctive clauses show (p. 79, cf. Vikner 1985:51).

Additional problems are pointed out by Rögnvaldsson: (a) reflexivization may occur out of subjunctive clauses that violate sequence-of-tense. (b) A subjunctive clause may contain both a reflexive and a pronoun where the antecedent of the former may be in a higher clause than the antecedent of the latter. This would necessitate an analysis where the clauses that contain the two antecedents will have to both be part of the reflexivization domain (to allow the reflexive) and

not be part of it (to allow the pronoun). (This last observation is ascribed to Maling (1984)).

Anderson's paper ends with a discussion of languages with reflexivization systems similar to Icelandic: Georgian, Latin, and (classical) Greek.

As is apparent from the above, it may be argued that comparisons with more closely related languages would have been more appropriate (and Anderson briefly discusses Faroese), but this should not obscure the fact that the paper is a very important contribution both to *TSS* and to the ongoing discussion of reflexives in Scandinavian.

5. LARS HELLAN

In "On Anaphora and Predication in Norwegian" (pp. 103–124), Lars Hellan discusses reflexives and reciprocals in Norwegian. He distinguishes between closeness anaphors (those containing *selv* 'self' and the reciprocal) and anaphors subject to a predication condition (those containing *seg*, including the possessive *sin*).

Closeness anaphors are essentially anaphors in terms of principle A of the binding theory in Chomsky (1981). In Hellan's view, they may not be separated from their antecedent by more than one "intervening nexal head", i.e. a V, or an Adj or an N with verbal or adjectival stem.

The paper claims to show that c-command "plays a much less central role" than currently assumed, but this is not shown very convincingly, given that the central notion of the paper rests on c-command: How can "intervene" be defined, if not in terms of c-command: Z intervenes between X and Y iff Z c-commands one of them but not the other.

The other departure from standard assumptions, the definition in terms of "nexal heads" rather than SUBJECTS (Chomsky 1981:209 ff.), is not very well motivated either, given that Hellan has to state specifically (a) that tensed S-boundaries always block binding (p. 108), and (b) that an NP must intervene in addition to two nexal heads (p. 107) for a construction to be ungrammatical (provided the second of the two nexal heads is an N, compare his (12a) with his (11b, d)). In terms of SUBJECTS these two extra provisos would follow automatically, w.r.t. (a) above because the presence of a SUBJECT is the difference between tensed and untensed clauses, and w.r.t. (b) above because the extra NP (required if the second nexal head is an N) is a subject (of the NP of which the second nexal head is the head), and hence a SUBJECT (clauses may not, but NPs may lack subjects, according to the extended projection principle (Chomsky 1981:40 ff.)).

Under the heading "Internal Binding", Hellan discusses a very puzzling problem, viz. the question of how the anaphor is bound in a construction like

- (8) No. en av sine venner meget beundret mann
 'a by his friends greatly admired man',
 i.e. 'a man greatly admired by his friends'

A binder is normally an NP which c-commands the anaphor, but here it is either (a) the entire NP (in which case there is no c-command, as the NP dominates the anaphor), or (b) the N or the determiner (in which case it is not an NP), or (c) a PRO somewhere inside the NP (but in that case this PRO is controlled by the entire NP, and again, lack of c-command by the entire NP, which is the controller, would be a problem).

This problem receives an elegant solution in Hellan's analysis, as it is seen as "internal predication", predicting correctly that it is only possible in the cases where the AdjP may be assumed to be predicated of the entire NP.

The predication condition that *seg* and *sin*-anaphors are subject to requires the antecedent to be the "predication-subject" of an expression which contains the anaphor. As in the other cases, this is not compared to a more standard analysis (e.g. Chomsky 1981), under which it might correspond to a claim that these anaphors must be bound by a subject. On p. 115 it is claimed that "what in common terminology is called a subject" will not cover all the relevant cases, but in fact it might: a subject may be a subject of an NP or of a small clause as well as of a clause (cf. Stowell 1981, and, w.r.t. Scandinavian reflexives, Vikner 1985:32, 54).

In conclusion, though this paper only deals with more standard analyses in a rather inaccurate manner (or not at all), it proposes an interesting analysis, applied not only to well-known facts, but also to less well-known ones, the "internal binding" cases, which may prove problematic for other analyses.

6. MICHAEL HERSLUND

The topic of Michael Herslund's contribution "The Double Object Construction in Danish" (pp. 125–147) is the difference between the two manifestations that this construction may have, $V\ NP_{IO}\ NP_O$ vs. $V\ NP_O\ PP_{IO}$.

His analysis is that these two manifestations emphasize different aspects of the secondary predication of the double object construction. $NP_O\ PP_{IO}$ emphasizes the (concrete) locative aspect, where the IO is a place, whereas $NP_{IO}\ NP_O$ emphasizes the "abstract locative" aspect, where the IO is a receiver. In the former the object is the subject of the secondary predication, whereas in the latter "the locative predication is reversed, whereby the IO becomes the subject" (p. 140). Herslund here clearly both exposes and overcomes the lack of precision that is present in most treatments of this topic, which use the term "goal" to cover both "place" and "receiver".

The following observations from his section 2 are thus accounted for: the object in the $NP_O\ PP_{IO}$ must be concrete, i.e. it must be something that may change position, ruling out abstract NPs as well as clauses (2.3). On the other hand, verbs that may only "be considered locative in a metaphorical sense" (p. 134), e.g. *tilgive* 'forgive', *bebrejde* 'reproach', do not occur in the concrete locative construction $NP_O\ PP_{IO}$ (2.4). It also follows that locative verb particles are possibly only in the $NP_O\ PP_{IO}$ construction (2.2).

Section 3 lists four sets of facts which supposedly show the subject-like properties of NP_{IO} in the $NP_{IO}\ NP_O$ construction, as it is shown to behave like subjects and unlike direct objects and prepositional complements: NP_{IO} may be the antecedent for the reflexive possessive *sin* (3.1) and for the clause-bound reflexive *sig selv* (3.2); it is possible for *hver*, 'each', to move (quantifier-float) out of NP_{IO} (3.3); and it is not possible to wh-extract anything out of NP_{IO} (3.4). This section would have been improved by some discussion of whether these facts actually indicate the "subjecthood" of NP_{IO} or merely that NP_{IO} has certain structural properties in common with subjects only.

Parallels are drawn in section 4.2 to the object predicate construction,

- (9) Da. De udnævnte Ronald til præsident
'They appointed Ronald (to) president'

as also here the NP_O, *Ronald*, is the subject and *til præsident* the predicate of the secondary predication. Any sequence with the NP_O in final position is ruled out, as this object “of course” (p. 142) must be the subject of the secondary predication. However, as the object predicate construction is “a special manifestation of the IO relation” (p. 142), and as the IO relation is reversible (section 4.1), it is perhaps not so obvious why the object predicate relation is not reversible as well.

Herslund deliberately refrains from offering a syntactic analysis of the relationship between the NP_{IO} NP_O and the NP_O PP_{IO} constructions: “syntactic analysis . . . cannot, indeed should not, be reduced to formally defined movement operations” (p. 144). This move is legitimate enough (though not that interesting from the point of view of this reviewer), as the burden of proof must lie with those who think that the two constructions should be related through movements of some sort. However, the article loses considerably in interest as the author does not even discuss an explicit syntactic analysis of either of the two constructions (cf. e.g. Kayne 1981b).

In short, Herslund’s contribution to this volume contains many very interesting observations, but the conclusions drawn are unfortunately rather vague.

7. TARALD TARALDSEN

The basic facts discussed by Tarald Taraldsen in “*Som* and the Binding Theory” (pp. 149–184) are that Norwegian *som* (which corresponds to the English relative *that*) is obligatory in subject extractions from embedded interrogatives but impossible in non-subject extractions:

(10) No. Vi vet hvem *(som) [_s e snakker med Marit]
 ‘We know who that talks to Marit’

(11) No. Vi vet hvem *som [_s Marit snakker med e]
 ‘We know who that Marit talks to’

(the facts concerning Danish *der* are exactly parallel). The obligatoriness of *som* in (10) is ascribed to the ECP (p. 149) whereas the impossibility of *som* in (11), which cannot be due to the ECP as the trace is properly governed (by the preposition), is argued to require two revisions of binding theory:

- (12) a. The distinction non-argument/argument (A’/A) is replaced by a distinction operator/non-operator.
- b. AGR is excluded from counting as a SUBJECT in the definition of governing category.

The latter has the effect that the governing category for a subject (the constituent inside which the subject must be bound if it is an anaphor) cannot be its own S, but must be a larger constituent (e.g. if COMP is nominal, which excludes verb second structures, it is the S’).

Som must be a non-operator, as otherwise there would be two operators (*hvem*, *som*) and only one variable (the trace) in (11), and there is a general prohibition against vacuous quantification in natural languages (section 2.1). The trace in (11) is minimally bound by an element in an A’-position, which does not explain the ungrammaticality of (11), as the trace is not bound inside its governing category, the S, and thus does not violate any binding principles.

However, given (12a), (11) is ruled out by the binding principles as the trace is locally bound by a non-operator, and therefore it should be bound in its governing category (the S), which it is not (2.2, 2.4). (12a) also accounts for the impossibility of long topicalizations of expletives and generics, (2.3), as discussed in more detail below. (12b) is necessary to allow *som* in (10), because also here the trace will be minimally bound by a non-operator, and as *som* is possible (in fact, obligatory) here, *som* will have to be inside the governing category of the subject, which it is if governing category is redefined as in (12b) (2.5, 2.6).

The counterpart of (11) is grammatical in Swedish, and it is therefore argued in section 3 that it is also possible for *som* to remain an operator, and for a trace bound by operator *som* to function as a resumptive pronoun (linking two differences between Swedish and Norwegian: only Swedish allows (11), and only Swedish allows resumptive pronouns). An alternative mentioned is that *som* in a grammatical (11) may not be co-indexed with the trace. Given that Danish actually also allows (11) (with *som*, not with *der*) and that Danish does not have resumptive pronouns, the latter alternative seems preferable. Unfortunately it is not discussed whether this (unlinked) *som* is an operator (then what about the prohibition on vacuous quantification?) or not (what then prohibits unlinked expletive *som* in all sorts of A'-positions in Swedish and Danish?).

In section 4, Taraldsen applies his analysis to non-Scandinavian languages, showing how it allows an elegant account of the predicative *qui*-relatives in French (4.1), and also how it applies to the French *que/qui* alternation (4.2) and to the similar West Flemish *da/die* alternation (4.3).

An interesting consequence of the analysis is the account of why long topicalization of expletives is not possible: Whereas referential NPs may, expletives may not be considered operators, and their traces will therefore be minimally bound by non-operators, without being bound in their governing category:

- (13) Da. a. Peter_i havde [_s jeg ikke hørt (e_i) [_s e_i boede her]]
 'Peter had I not heard lived here'
 b. *Der_i havde [_s jeg ikke hørt (e_i) [_s e_i boede nogen her]]
 'There had I not heard had lived someone here'

Even if there is an intermediate trace, the governing category of the leftmost trace will not be larger than the matrix S (if that large), and as it is not bound inside this S, it must be minimally operator-bound, which only is the case in (13a), as *der* (for semantic reasons) cannot be an operator.

This has further consequences, given the ungrammaticality of

- (14) Da. a. *Det havde jeg hørt regnede hele dagen
 'It had I heard rained all day'
 b. *Det havde jeg hørt var blevet sagt i radioen at Holland vandt
 'It had I heard had been said in the radio that Holland won'

(where the non-topicalized versions are fine). If *det* is an expletive, these data are accounted for, and they provide a counterexample to assumptions in Rizzi (1986:529) and in Bennis (1986), under whose analyses *det* would be taken to be an argument. An alternative is of course that Taraldsen is wrong, as his analyses still leave many aspects of long topicalization accounted for, compare (15) with (13):

- (15) Da. *Nogen_i havde [_s jeg ikke hørt (e_i) [_s e_i boede her]]
 'Someone had I not heard lived here'

It should appear from the above that the accounts and analyses allowed by the initial assumptions of this paper are both elegant and very interesting. The question is, however, whether the reader has the stomach necessary for these initial assumptions, viz. the idea that the trace in (10) is simultaneously bound by the operator *hvem* and by the non-operator *som*. It is not obvious for example how the thematic role assigned to the trace (that of “talker”, i.e. AGENT) knows that it is not supposed to follow the chain leading to the non-operator *som* but the one leading to the operator *hvem*.

The paper is both extremely complicated and extremely compact, but it is also one of the most interesting contributions to *TSS*.

8. CHRISTER PLATZACK

“COMP, INFL, and Germanic Word order” (pp. 185–234) deals with verb second and related phenomena. It is based on various suggestions made about Dutch in the late 1970s by among others den Besten, Evers, and Koster, which Platzack extends considerably and applies to Scandinavian. Thus we are here presented with analyses and comparisons of (almost) all the Germanic languages.

The claims concerning English are among the weakest of the paper: The absence of verb second in English is ascribed to S being a projection of INFL in English, but of COMP in the other Germanic languages. Such an analysis is much too powerful, compared to the null hypothesis that a maximal projection XP is headed by the same X in all languages, given that the latter suffices w.r.t. all other maximal projections (consider e.g. NPs or VPs). Platzack’s idea is that verb second is not only possible but obligatory in the other Germanic languages (where the subject is assigned case from COMP, which therefore must be lexically filled), but impossible in English, where the subject is assigned case by INFL. This, however, also fails to explain why verb second is not only possible but obligatory in English main clauses introduced by a *wh*- or negative element (it is not forced by case assignment to the subject as it is in the other Germanic languages). A more plausible approach to the headedness of S is taken by Chomsky (1986), where S universally is a projection of INFL and S’ a projection of COMP, as also advocated by Platzack himself in more recent work.

Chomsky’s approach also makes impossible another claim of Platzack’s, viz. that English topicalized NPs (which cannot co-occur with verb second) are in COMP, as only zero-level projections (heads) may be in COMP, as COMP is a head itself. Therefore the topicalized NPs must either be in Specifier of COMP (as are topicalized NPs in the other Germanic languages and *wh*-elements in English) or adjoined to S. In either case the impossibility of verb second (INFL moving to COMP) cannot be explained by COMP being filled by the topicalized NP.

Platzack further suggests that the English *do*-support and the absence of similar facts in the other Germanic languages is due to the base-generation of *have/be/do*/modals in INFL, and of all other verbs in VP in English (if *do* is in INFL at PF, it is replaced by a tensed V) whereas in the other Germanic languages all verbs are base-generated inside VP. Again this is a much too powerful analysis; the null hypothesis would be that corresponding verbs are base-generated in the same place, at least in related languages. Pollock (1988) has shown that an account of *do*-support compatible with base-generation of all verbs inside VP is feasible.

Even though the analyses mentioned above have been superseded, there are

also many ideas in this paper which remain valid, and most of the analyses concerning the Germanic languages (apart from English) belong to this latter group. It is for instance very convincingly argued that verb second is a movement of INFL to COMP, based on (a) the fact that sentences with *as if* in all the languages have parallel versions with *as* followed by the finite verb, (b) the fact that Dutch clitic subjects immediately follow either a finite verb in the verb second position or a complementizer, and (c) facts concerning the position of *kanske* ('maybe') and deletion of auxiliary *ha* ('have') in Swedish. Also the facts concerning indirect questions are shown to receive a natural explanation under this approach.

Also the discussion of the position of the infinitival marker in different Scandinavian languages is both interesting and convincing: it is in COMP in Sw. and Ic., but in INFL in No. and Da.

As for the analysis of the position of the object relative to the sentence adverbial in Swedish and Icelandic, it is not as satisfying as the one proposed by Holmberg (1986). Where Platzack merely states that the object that may precede these adverbials includes all objects in Icelandic but only "light" ones in Swedish, Holmberg (1986:207–217) ties this in with case (as all NPs in Ic. but only pronouns in Sw. display morphological case). Also Platzack's analysis necessitates the pruning of VP once V has moved to INFL, a move not motivated otherwise, whereas this is not necessary to Holmberg's analysis. As pruning is deletion of structure, it should be avoided where possible.

Summing up, one could say that though the implementation of some of the analyses has later turned out to be inexpedient (note though, that the paper was originally presented in 1982), the leading idea is still valid. This paper was the first to suggest such a general analysis of verb second in Scandinavian and in Dutch and German, and I find it one of the most important contributions not only to TSS, but to comparative Scandinavian and Germanic syntax in general.

9. HÖSKULDUR THRÁINSSON

Höskuldur Thráinsson's paper, "On Auxiliaries, AUX and VPs in Icelandic" (pp. 235–265), discusses the status of auxiliaries and their complements in Icelandic: AUX-like verbs (i.e. auxiliaries and epistemic modals) take VP-complements and do not assign θ -roles to their subjects, whereas root modals and subject control verbs ("Equi-verbs") both assign θ -roles to their subjects, though only the complements of the latter show clausal properties.

The argumentation that INFL ("AUX") is a constituent separate from VP is unfortunately not very clear, as verb second is not taken into account: It is based on the occurrence of various elements between INFL (i.e. the finite verb) and the (rest of the) VP. As all the examples are main clauses, where (following Platzack's suggestion discussed above) the finite verb has moved to COMP, the intervening elements may in fact be occurring anywhere between COMP and VP, and thus not necessarily between INFL and VP.

Like Platzack, Thráinsson discusses the occurrence of objects before the sentence adverbial (under the term "disintegration of the VP") in such a way that pruning of the VP is necessary. As stated above, the analysis of Holmberg (1986), which avoids this, seems much more appealing.

Auxiliaries and epistemic modals are shown not to assign θ -roles to their subjects, whereas root modals and subject control verbs do: Only with the former (a) are quirky case subjects possible, (b) are expletive subjects possible,

and (c) do active and passive versions of the embedded sentence have the same interpretation.

It is furthermore shown that movement of an embedded V to an embedded INFL (and the subsequent possibility for an object to precede the sentence adverbial) may only occur in complements of subject control verbs, and not of auxiliaries, which leads to the conclusion that only the former are clausal, whereas the complements of auxiliaries are VPs. This fits in well with the thematic facts (given the assumption that an external θ -role must be assigned outside the VP): If the highest verb assigns a θ -role to its subject, the embedded verb must assign its subject θ -role somewhere else, and for this to be possible there must be an embedded clause, not just an embedded VP.

It is therefore problematic that root modals, which are assumed to have clauses as complements, do not seem to: these complements do not allow the verb or the object to precede the sentence adverbial. One possible solution is that the complement is clausal but contains no INFL (as suggested by the author), but another is that the θ -role assigned to the subject by the root modal is of a kind that does not exclude this subject from also receiving a θ -role from the embedded verb (this is suggested in Vikner (1988) for Danish root modals for independent reasons).

For parallel reasons, it is tentatively concluded that Raising verbs have VP-complements: lack of V to INFL movement in their complement.

The conclusions are often rather tentative (as admitted in the paper), but the paper is nevertheless very interesting, not least due to the wealth of intriguing facts and analyses discussed.

Let me conclude this review by recommending *Topics in Scandinavian Syntax* to everybody interested in Scandinavian generative syntax, as the best and most comprehensive anthology in the field.¹

NOTE

1 I am grateful to Liliane Haegeman, Ian Roberts, Bonnie Schwartz, Görel Sandström, and Carl Vikner for helpful comments.

REFERENCES

- Bennis, H. 1986. *Gaps and Dummies*. Dordrecht: Foris.
 Burzio, L. 1986. *Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
 Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
 Chomsky, N. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
 Christensen, K. K. & Taraldsen, K. T. 1987. Expletive Chain Formation and Past Participle Agreement in Scandinavian Dialects. Forthcoming in Benincà, P. (ed.) 1988. *Dialect Variation and the Theory of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.
 Hellan, L. 1986. The Headedness of NP in Norwegian. In Riemsdijk, H.v. & Muyskens, P. (eds.), *Features and Projections*. Dordrecht: Foris.
 Holmberg, A. 1986. *Word Order and Syntactic Features in the Scandinavian Languages and English*. Stockholm: University of Stockholm.
 Holmberg, A. 1988. The Structure of NP in Swedish. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 33.
 Kayne, R. 1981a. ECP Extensions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12, 93–133. Reprinted in Kayne (1983).
 Kayne, R. 1981b. Unambiguous Paths. In Koster, J. & May, R. (eds.), *Levels of Syntactic Representation*. Dordrecht: Foris. Reprinted in Kayne (1983).

- Maling, J. 1984. Non-Clause-Bounded Reflexives in Modern Icelandic. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 7, 211–241.
- Platzack, C. 1987. The Scandinavian Languages and the Null-Subject Parameter. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5, 377–401.
- Pollock, J.-Y. 1988. Verb Movement, UG and the Structure of IP. Ms, University of Upper Brittany.
- Rizzi, L. 1986. Null Objects in Italian and the Theory of *pro*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, 501–557.
- Stowell, T. 1981. Origins of Phrase Structure. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, M.I.T.
- Taraldsen, K. T. 1986. A Directionality Parameter for Subject/Object Linking. Ms, University of Tromsø.
- Vikner, S. 1985. Parameters of Binder and of Binding Category in Danish. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 23.
- Vikner, S. 1988. Modals in Danish and Event Expressions. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 39.
- Vikner, S. & Sprouse, R. A. 1988. *Have/Be* Selection as an A-Chain Membership Requirement. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 38.