Relative inversion and non-verb-initial imperatives in Early modern Swedish

Erik Magnusson Petzell

This article deals with two syntactic differences between Present-day Swedish (PdSw.) and Early modern Swedish (EmSw.): first, only EmSw. allows for VS and XVS word order to occur in relative clauses; second, only EmSw. permits non-verb-initial imperatives. One structural difference between the varieties is assumed to be a prerequisite for all these word order differences: the subject position was spec-TP in EmSw. but is spec-FinP in PdSw. Only the lower position (spec-TP) is compatible with inversion (VS) and fronting of non-subjects (XVS) in relative clauses as well as with imperative clauses being initiated by other elements than the imperative verb. To be able to account for the latter phenomenon, however, an additional assumption is needed: the imperative type-feature ([imp]) always accompanies the verb in PdSw. but is tied to an operator in EmSw. The first assumption about differing subject positions is independently motivated by findings in the previous literature. The second assumption about differing [imp]-behaviour in the two varieties is supported by the distribution of imperative verbs over a wider range of syntactic contexts in EmSw. than in PdSw.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In the Germanic V2-languages, inverted order between the finite verb and the subject, i.e. VS order rather than SV order, is a typical main clause phenomenon. Still, subordinate inversion does exist, in some V2-varieties to a higher extent than in others (see e.g. Rohrbacher 1999:14–20, Wiklund & Hrafnbjargarson 2008). This paper investigates a sub-type of subordinate inversion, namely inversion in relative clauses (relative inversion), in the history of Swedish. Whereas Present-day Swedish (PdSw.) does not permit VS word order in relative clauses, Early modern Swedish (EmSw.) does, at least in certain contexts; see (1a) below (cf. the PdSw. counterpart in (1b) where the order is SV). We take Early modern Swedish to refer to texts by authors born prior to 1700 but after 1500.

(1) a. 
Hwilketj skall Mahomet 2: secundus

which shall second

hafwa gjort (Rålamb 1657-58:125)

have done

‘which Mahomet the second is supposed to have done

b. 
vilketj Muhammed den andre skall ha gjort

which the second shall have done

‘which Muhammed the second is supposed to have done
Now, consider also the relative clauses in (2a–b) below, where the relative pronouns are followed by a fronted adverbial clause. These examples show the same word order difference in the relative matrix between the two varieties as was illustrated in (1a–b). However, there is another difference as well: in the EmSw. a-example, the gap corresponding to the relative pronoun is found in the intervening adverbial clause, whereas the gap in the PdSw. b-example is within the relative matrix.

(2) 

a. spånorna […] hwilckaj enär han besåg __j
   threads-DEF which when he saw
   befunnnes de och wara aff gull (Rålamb 1657-58:43)
   find-PST-PASS they also be-INF of gold
   ‘when he saw the threads, they too were found to be of gold’

b. vilka:j, när han granskade dem, __j visade sig
   which when he scrutinized-PST them show-PST REFL
   vara av guld
   be-INF of gold
   ‘when he scrutinized them, they turned out to be of gold’

This combination of word order difference and difference regarding the distribution of gaps can be accounted for structurally by assuming that the subject position is spec-FinP in PdSw. (following e.g. Platzack 2001, Stroh-Wollin 2002) but spec-TP in EmSw. (following Magnusson 2007a, b and Petzell 2010).
Such an account also felicitously predicts another, rarely discussed, difference regarding the use of imperatives in the two varieties. In PdSw., imperatives are obligatorily introduced by the imperative verb form; compare the verb-initial example in (3a) below to the ungrammatical (3a’), where the verb is preceded by an object (of a preposition). Non-verb-initial imperatives were, however, commonplace in EmSw., which is shown in (3b).

(3) a. Gör med örterna som du vill
   
   do with herbs-DEF as you want-PRS

   ‘Do as you want with the herbs.’

   a’. *Örterna gör med som du vill
   
   herbs-DEF do with as you want-PRS

b. Örterna gör med som du vill (Kockebook 1650:64)
   
   herbs-DEF do with as you want-PRS

   ‘Do as you want with the herbs.’

Rather than assuming ad hoc that older imperative utterances could involve topicalisation of the same kind as in indicative clauses today, we will relate the presence of non-verb-initial imperatives in EmSw. (cf. (3b)) but not PdSw. (cf. (3a’)) to the same structural difference regarding subject positions between the varieties that needs to be assumed anyway to account for the distribution of relative inversion (cf. (1a), (2a) above).

This paper is outlined as follows. In section 2, the relevant phenomena – relative inversion and non-verb-initial imperatives – are presented in more detail. Section 3 contains a theoretical discussion of the syntax of the C-domain and the upper part of the I-domain. It is argued that subjects always compete with other categories to satisfy locality constraints in A-
bar movement. Since the subject is higher than anything else, it must always win in such a competition, blocking movement of other categories into the left periphery. Assuming (with Richards 1998) a Principle of Minimal Compliance, this blocking effect can, however, be eliminated if T or Fin – as the case may be – first raises past (‘inverts with’) the subject to the next head up. In section 4, we return to the data presenting a detailed analysis of the differences between EmSw. and PdSw. under investigation. The paper is summarized in section 5.

2. EMPIRICAL BACKGROUND

This section contains the descriptive bulk of the paper: relative inversion is treated in 2.1, non-verb-initial imperatives in 2.2.

2.1 Relative inversion

In order to categorize relative inversion of the type illustrated in (1a) and (2a) above into relevant sub-types, we require some sort of descriptive labels to refer to the clauses involved: there is the VS-initiated clause that is present in both (1a) and (2a), and the adverbial clause located between the relative pronoun and the VS-initiated clause in (2a). We will refer to the former as the VS-clause, to the latter as the X-clause, and to the combination of these as the XVS-clause.

As shown in (1a) above, there is always a gap in a VS-clause that is not preceded by an X-clause. If there is an X-clause intervening between the relative pronoun and the VS-clause, EmSw. cannot have VS-gaps. Still, there may be a gap in the X-clause, henceforth: an X-gap, as shown in (2a). Interestingly, there are also examples with no gap at all, henceforth: 0-gap-
examples, in which case one or two resumptive pronouns mark(s) the relevant slot(s). Minimally, there is a resumptive pronoun in the X-clause, maximally in both X-clause and VS-clause. No examples contain a resumptive pronoun in the VS-clause alone. (4a–b) below give additional EmSw. examples of VS- and X-gaps. (5a–c) show some examples with 0-gaps.

(4) a. [âff hwilcken Summa] haffuer Oloff VS-gap
   of which sum has O
   Andersson bekâmidt halfftridie hundret
   A got-PTC two-and-a half hundred
   pund __j (EmSw. example from Falk 1993:223)

   pounds
   ‘Of this sum, Olof Andersson has received 250 pounds.’

   b. Engelske Ambassadeuren sände till denne X-gap
      English Ambassador-DEF sent-PST to this
      nya Caimacam sin Tâlck, hwilckenj
      new Kaymakam REFL.POSS interpreter which
      när han hälsade ___j på Engelske
      when he greeted-PST on English
      Ambassadeurens wägnar swarade
      Ambassador-DEF.POSS behalf answered-PST
      Caimacam […] (Rålamb 1657-58: 155)
      Kaymakam
‘The English Ambassador sent his interpreter to this new Kaymakam [an Ottoman sub-governor]. When he [i.e. the interpreter] greeted the Kaymakam on behalf of the English Ambassador, the Kaymakam answered […]’

(5) a. [...] dråpo een eller twå i theras åsyn, hwilcketi 0-gap

*killed-PST one or two in their sight which*

när the sågo thet, gäfwo the oss strax Penningar för them,

*when they saw it gave they us soon money for them*

‘[we] killed one or two in front of them. When they saw that, they soon gave us money in exchange for them.’

b. [...] hwilcketi, ehuru wäll det är något bittert 0-gap

*which although well it is somewhat bitter*

till Smaken, så är det lijkawist ene Menniskio mycket helsosampt […]

*to taste-DEF so is it all-the-same a human very healthy*

‘Although it tastes somewhat bitter, it is still very healthy for a human.’

c. then fierde flydde, hwilkeni när han kom till 0-gap

*the fourth fled-PST who when he came to*

the andra sina Stallbröder, berättandes them theras

*the other REFL-POSS comrades telling them their*

Affärd, dråpå the homi strax.

*departure killed-PST they him directly*

‘The fourth fled. When he came to his other comrades and told them that they had left, they instantly killed him.’

(Kiéping 1674: 92, 51, 90)
The resumptive pronoun in 0-gap examples can be either a subject or a non-subject in either the X-clause or the VS-clause: in (5a), *thet* is an object in the X-clause; in (5b), the first *det* is a subject in the X-clause, the second *det* a subject in the VS-clause; in (5c), finally, *han* is a subject in the X-clause and *honom* an object in the VS-clause.

In examples with a gap, the distribution is different. In VS-clauses, the gap can never – naturally – be a subject, since an overt subject is a prerequisite for VS order in the first place. In the X-clause, on the other hand, it would be feasible with a gap in the subject position. Still, no such examples have been retrieved. We take this absence to be due to some sort of comp-trace filter (however this restriction is best formulated). Whatever prohibits examples such as (6a) below (where there is a trace after the extracted subject in the subordinate clause – cf. the grammatical (6a’) where the trace instead corresponds to an extracted object) in PdSw, it also prohibits – presumably – the occurrence of subject-gaps in X-clauses in EmSw. (see the construed example in (6b)).

(6)  

a.  *Kalle frågade vi [hur t\(_i\) hade lagat maten]  

\[K \text{ asked-PST we how had-PST prepared-PTC } \text{food-DEF}\]

a’.  *Maten frågade vi Kalle [hur han hade lagat \(t_j\)]  

\[\text{food-DEF asked-PST we K how he had-PST prepared-PTC}\]

‘We asked Kalle how he had prepared the food.’

b.  *vilken [när \(t_i\) såg oss] gick vi iväg  

\[\text{which when saw us went we away}\]
In both (6a) and (6b) there is an illicit trace directly after the wh-element initiating the embedded clause.

2.2 Non-verb-initial imperatives

In the introduction, it was shown that EmSw. permits non-verb-initial imperatives (cf. (3b) above); two more examples are given in (7). This word order is ungrammatical in PdSw. (cf. (3a’) above).

(7) a. till ett fierdingpund tag ett halft skålpund Socker
to a fourth-pound take IMP a half bowl-pound sugar
‘Take half a pound of sugar to a fourth-pound.’

b. Socker och Canel lägg ofwan där till
sugar and cinnamon put IMP above there to
‘In addition, put sugar and cinnamon on top.’

(Ny och fullkomlig koke-bok 1737:116/76, 121/81)

At first, it appears as if these imperative clauses in EmSw. involve topicalisation, i.e. fronting of a phrase to the highest spec-position in the clause. This is how the phenomenon is characterized by Delsing (1999). However, there is no need to assume any difference regarding topicalisation between the varieties; it explains nothing but the observed patterns (i.e. is ad hoc).

In addition, an analysis of the examples in (7) in terms of topicalisation does not help us understand how imperatives can also be embedded in EmSw.; cf. (8) below where the imperative verb form (skrif) occurs inside a relative clause.
Clearly, to understand how an imperative verb can be embedded, we need to understand more about the nature of imperative force.

3. SUBJECT POSITIONS, INVERSION AND THE NATURE OF IMPERATIVE FORCE

3.1 A broad outline of clause structure

Following Chomsky (2001) and Pesetsky & Torrego (2001), we can assume that the syntactic system is driven by the elimination of uninterpretable features. An uninterpretable feature ([uF]) is always eliminated by an interpretable counterpart ([F]); either [F] moves to a position structurally local to [uF] – this is the case if [uF] is marked with an EPP-feature – or a link is established from a distance between [uF] and a lower position containing [F]. Here, we will be concerned with local elimination only.

Both relative inversion and non-verb-initial imperatives involve placement of elements in the initial part of the clause that differs from the possible placement of the corresponding elements in PdSw. In EmSw., S and V invert in contexts where they cannot invert today, and imperative verbs need not, unlike today, be clause-initial. In order to understand these
differences we must consider the structural properties of the topmost area of the clause, in particular the C-domain but also the upper part of the I-domain.

The analysis argued for in the following is more or less identical to the one in Petzell (2010), which is to a large extent inspired by the analysis argued for by Stroh-Wollin (2002); she has in turn developed the ideas presented in Branigan (1996), Rizzi (1997) and Platzack (1998), but unlike the latter she maintains that main clauses and subordinate clauses are structurally different, i.e. represent different phrase-types. In the present analysis, the difference between independent utterances and subordinate clauses is reduced to a question of feature distribution.²

All finite clauses are treated as structurally identical maximal projections labeled TypePs. Type° hosts uninterpretable features associated with clausal type ([utype]EPP) and structural status ([ustatus]EPP). The interpretable features that are capable of eliminating [utype]EPP are of several kinds ([dec] gives a declarative reading, [rel] a relative reading, [wh] an interrogative meaning, [excl] an exclamative reading etc.), but the ones that are capable of eliminating [ustatus]EPP are but two: [comp], which makes the clause subordinate, and [force], which makes it independent. [comp] is connected to a visible or invisible complementizer, [force] often, but not always, to a finite verb. In exclamatives, [force] is apparently tied to the same element that hosts the type-feature, in (9a) below to the interjection Jävlar, ‘damnit’ (cf. Magnusson 2007a:212, Stroh-Wollin 2011; see also section 3.3 below). The type-feature [dec] is tied to all phrases that can be fronted in a declarative utterance, e.g. PPs, AdvPs and DPs (see 9b–d).³ [rel] is associated with relative pronouns as well as relative operators (cf. 9e–f). Relative pronouns are often homonymous with interrogative pronouns (i.e. pronouns marked with the feature [wh]). There are, however, some distinct forms in the two paradigms respectively indicating that it is indeed called for to keep rel-marking and wh-marking
separate in Swedish. The possessive *vars*, ‘whose’, in (9e) is uniquely relative. Likewise, *vem*, ‘who’, can only initiate a question (see (9g)).

\[(9)\]

a. \[\text{[InfP [exc] [force] Jävlar]} \vad \ du \ är \ bra! \]

\textit{damnit  what you are good}

’damnit, you’re good!’

b. \[\text{[PP [dec] På morgonen]} \äter \ han \ numera \ en \ stor \ tallrik \ gröt. \]

\textit{on morning-DEF eats he nowadays a big bowl porridge}

‘In the morning he eats a big bowl of porridge nowadays.’

c. \[\text{[AdvP [dec] Numera]} \äter \ han \ en \ stor \ tallrik \ gröt \ på \ morgonen. \]

\textit{nowadays eats he a big bowl porridge on morning-DEF}

‘Nowadays he eats a big bowl of porridge in the morning.

d. \[\text{[DP [dec] En stor tallrik gröt]} \äter \ han \ numera \ på \ morgonen. \]

\textit{a big bowl porridge eats he nowadays on morning-DEF}

‘A big bowl of porridge he eats in the morning nowadays.’

e. \[\text{manner [DP [rel] vars bro] \ bor \ här} \]

\textit{man-DEF whose brother lives here}

‘the man whose brother lives here’

f. \[\text{manner [DP [rel] Op] som \ bor \ här} \]

\textit{man-DEF that lives here}

‘the man that lives here’

\[\text{we wondered-PST who his brother was}\]

‘We wondered who his brother was.’

We will assume that all finite verbs in (9) are associated with the feature [force]. At first, such an assumption appears problematic since not all finite clauses are independent; cf. the subordinate clauses in (9a) and (9e-g). In these cases, we could argue, however, that the force-feature is simply invisible to LF, given that it never reaches TypeP where features of this sort are relevant, but instead remains in VP.\(^4\) Still, there are non-independent clauses where the finite verb inverts with the subject, which indicates that it is indeed in Type\(^0\); cf. the comparative conditional in (10a) and the verb-initial conditional in (10b).

(10) a. Han betedde sig som vore han galen.

\[\text{he acted-PST REFL as were-SBVJ he mad}\]

‘He acted as if he was mad.’

b. Kommer du hit blir jag glad.

\[\text{come-PRS you here become-PRS I happy}\]

‘If you’ll come here, I’ll be happy.’

If [force] is assumed to be tied to all indicative verbs (rather than all finite verbs), comparative conditionals would not pose a problem for our analysis; like in (10a), the verb in comparative conditionals is in the subjunctive. Not even the presence of a force-feature on the (indicative) verb in (10b) needs to be problematic. In fact, it may shed some light on the
distributional difference between conditionals initiated by a complementizer (om, ‘if’) and
verb-initial conditionals as in (10b). Unlike om-initiated conditionals, verb-initial conditionals
must appear initially; see (11a–b) below. Yet, they are never independent – the conditional
interpretation can only be obtained when the verb-initial clause is tied to another matrix (as in
10b); otherwise, it is interpreted as a question (cf. 11c). This intermediate status of verb-initial
conditionals could be seen as an effect of [force] on the one hand being present on Kommer,
but on the other hand being subordinate to another head with a force-feature (blir).

(11) a. *Jag blir glad kommer du hit

   I become-PRS happy come-PRS you here

b. Jag blir glad om du kommer hit

   I become-PRS happy if you come-PRS here

   ‘I’ll be happy if you’ll come here.’

c. Kommer du hit?

   come-PRS you here

   'Will you come here?'

It should be noted that a Type-head containing [force] may certainly be embedded in other
contexts; this is shown in (12a) below where there is a TypeP headed by [force] in the
complement of a narrative complementizer (‘CP-recursion’). The effect of this embedding is
that the proposition is interpreted as asserted by the speaker, an interpretation that is hardly
made if there is a single TypeP headed by [comp] as in (12b) (for a discussion, see Andersson
1975). No comparable difference is demonstrable in the case of conditionals. Semantically,
verb-initial conditionals as in (10b) (where [force] is in Type") and *om*-initial conditionals as in (11b) (where TypeP is headed by [compl]) are equivalent.

(12) a. Han fick medge att Palme beundrade han väldigt mycket.

    *he* got-*PST* admit-*INF* that *P* admired-*PST* *he* very much

b. Han fick medge att han beundrade Palme väldigt mycket.

    *he* got-*PST* admit-*INF* that *he* admired-*PST* *P* very much

‘He had to admit that he admired Palme very much.’

The phrase below TypeP, FinP, also hosts two uninterpretable features, one attracting the finite head (the verb or the complementizer) ([ufin]EPP) (cf. Holmberg & Platzack 1989, 1995) and one attracting the subject (cf. Branigan 1996). In EmSw., on the other hand, spec-FinP was not a pure subject position. Instead, the canonical position for subjects was spec-TP. Exactly what type of feature attracts the subject is not crucial for the present analysis. Magnusson (2007a, b, 2010) suggests there to be a pure subject feature in FinP both in EmSw. and in PdSw., the difference between the varieties being that only in the latter one is this subject feature accompanied by an EPP-feature. Although such an account felicitously predicts the difference between the placement of subjects in the two varieties, it fails to predict the presence of non-subjects in spec-FinP in EmSw. Clearly, there must be some separate uninterpretable feature in FinP that is general enough to attract subjects as well as non-subjects.

The distribution of heads and phrases in the C-domain and the upper part of the I-domain in PdSw. is presented in (13); the EmSw. system is shown in (14).
Motivations for this subject difference are given in 3.2. Inversion is handled in 3.3, and imperative force in 3.4.

3.2 Subject positions

The subject in PdSw. has been assumed to reside in the lower part of the C-domain since the late 1990s (Platzack 1998, drawing on Branigan 1996, Platzack 2001, Stroh-Wollin 2002,
Josefsson et al. 2003, Magnusson 2003, 2007a, b, Petzell 2010. The most important empirical motivation to support such a claim is presented in Platzack (2001): since children acquiring the language produce V2-errors and subject-related errors (i.e. violations of the demand for an overt subject) during the same stage of acquisition, the two phenomena (V2/overt S) are assumed to belong to the same clausal domain (see Platzack 2001:369–70). If V2 is a C-phenomenon, so is the realization of S.

Magnusson (2003, 2007a, b) and Petzell (2010) suggest that subjects in EmSw., unlike subjects in PdSw., reside in the topmost spec-position in the I-domain; we will refer to it as spec-TP. Magnusson (2003) connects this positional difference between subjects in the two varieties to the weaker demand for an overt subject in EmSw. This weaker demand is seen by Magnusson (2007a, b) and Petzell (2010) as a consequence of a stricter coordinator in the modern variety, ruling out any instantiation of asymmetrical coordinate gaps.

In Magnusson (2007a, b) as well as in Petzell (2010), the empirical motivation for assuming the subject to reside in spec-TP (rather than spec-FinP) comprises two types of coordinate data. First, EmSw. permits second conjuncts with SAV-word order in main clause coordination; see the examples in (15a, 16a) below. The preverbal adverbial (AV) indicates that the verb remains in situ, i.e. in VP. Since definite subjects (as the subjects in the SAV-sequences in (15a, 16a)) are never realized inside VP, the SAV-subjects must be in a higher subject position: spec-TP or spec-FinP. If they are assumed to be in spec-FinP as in PdSw., we are unable to account for the absence of V2; the uninterpretable feature in Fin° ([u fin]_EPP) cannot be left uneliminated; see the structures in (15b, 16b). Overt verbal movement over A to Ti is, on the other hand, not expected to occur at this relatively late stage of Swedish (cf. Falk 1993). Consequently, only if the SAV-subjects are assumed to reside in spec-TP is it possible to predict the post-adverbial position of the finite verb; see (15b′,16b′).
(15) a. Och ehuruwälf Wattnet uthi Persiska Inloppet är

and although water-DEF in Persian entrance is

mycket salt, hafwa the lijkwlä een mycket frisk

very salty have-PRS they still a very healthy

Syn, och theras Ögon aldrig förderfwas […]

eyesight and their Eyes never ruin-PRS-PASS

(Kiöping *1621:79)

‘Although the water in the Persian entrance is very salty, they still have very good eyesight; their eyes are never ruined.’

b. [TypeP [ehuruwälf Wattnet uthi Persiska Inloppet är mycket salt] hafwa₆

[FinP the tv lijkwlä een mycket frisk Syn] och

*[FinP theras Ögon [Fin₁ [ufin]EPP] aldrig förderfwas]]

b’. [TypeP [ehuruwälf Wattnet uthi Persiska Inloppet är mycket salt] hafwa₆ [TP

the tv lijkwlä een mycket frisk Syn] och

[TP theras Ögon [To e] aldrig förderfwas]]

(16) a. dänne dagh hadhe iagh låthit uthskriffwa Häradz

this day had-PST I let-PTC summon-INF hundred’s

Tingh, män Laghläsaren emoth min wethskap

court but law-reader-DEF against my knowing

hadhe uppskutit till dän 16 […](Rosenhane *1611:37)

had-PST postponed-PTC-it to the 16

On this day, I had summoned the court of the hundred; but the judge had – without me knowing – postponed it until the 16th.’
Second, it was possible in EmSw. to use second conjuncts with VS word order not only in a main clause context (as in Old Swedish, Alving 1916:22–44), but also inside a subordinate clause; see (17a) below. With the subject in spec-FinP as in PdSw., the initial finite verb would have to reside in Type⁰, which would mean that we are dealing with coordination on a TypeP-level (cf. (17b)). If the subject resides in spec-TP, on the other hand, we can assume the example to involve FinP+FinP-coordination; cf. (17c).

(17) a. Blef han för den skul så ondh på henne och sade,  
became he for that sake so mad on her and said-PST  
at hon nu har någ råt om migh och skule hon nu that she now has enough cared.PTC about me and should she now  
inte längre inbila sig något herewäle öfwer mig.  
not longer imagine-INF REFL any dominance over me  
(Horn *1629:80)

b. [TypeP [dänne dagh] hadhev [FinP iagh tₐ låthit uthskriFFwa Häradz Tingh]  
män  
* [FinP Laghläsaren [Fin⁰ [ufin]EPP] emoth min wethskap hadhe uppskutit till  
dän 16]]

b’. [TypeP [dänne dagh] hadhev [TP iagh tₐ låthit uthskriFFwa Häradz Tingh]  
män  
[TP Laghläsaren [To e] emoth min wethskap hadhe uppskutit  
till dän 16]]
‘Therefore, I was very angry with her, and he said that she has now cared for me enough and she shouldn’t imagine that she could dominate me any longer.’

b. \[TypeP \text{at} \text{hon nu har någ råt om migh\]} o\text{ch}\]
\[TypeP \text{skule hon nu inte längre inbila sig något herewäle öfwer mig}]\]

c. \[TypeP \text{ät}s \text{[FinP t\text{s hon nu har någ råt om migh\]} o\text{ch}}\]
\[\text{[FinP skule hon nu inte längre inbila sig något herewäle öfwer mig}]\]

The most critical problem with the TypeP-analysis in (17b) is that it involves coordination of two TypePs with different structural status. The status of conjunct 1 is subordinate, since it is headed by the feature [comp] (associated with the complementizer), but the status of conjunct 2 is independent, since it is headed by [force] (associated with the finite verb). Apart from the fact that the VS-sequence in this particular context must be interpreted as being part of the complement of the verb säga, ‘say’, i.e. embedded under at, we lack independent support that EmSw., unlike its modern counterpart, in fact allowed for TypePs with different structural status (main clauses and subordinate clauses) to be coordinated. None of these difficulties arise if the conjuncts in (17a) are treated as FinPs as in (17c), which is only possible if the subject in EmSw. is assumed to be in spec-TP.

If the subject does not need to move into FinP in EmSw., spec-FinP should be able to hold non-subjects. In other words, our analysis predicts there to be something of an A-bar-position just below Type\( ^{0}\) in EmSw. but not in PdSw. (i.e. spec-FinP). Presumably, this is where the adverbial clause, i.e. X, in XVS-clauses and clause-initial phrases in non-verb-initial imperatives reside.
Håkansson (2008) argues that subjects were even lower in Old Swedish (OS) than in EmSw., namely spec-vP, and that spec-TP was an A-bar-position at this earlier stage. If we combine Håkansson’s account with the present analysis we get two A-bar-positions above the subject but still below Type\(^0\) in OS: spec-FinP and spec-TP. Given such a structure we would in fact expect OS to permit one pattern that we do not find in EmSw.: relative clauses with XVS word order containing a trace after a relativized phrase in the VS-clause rather than a resumptive pronoun as in EmSw (cf. the 0-gap-examples discussed in section 2.1 above). In EmSw., the X blocks relativization (movement), since there is no A-bar-position above X but below [comp]: the subject is in spec-TP and X in spec-FinP. In OS, on the other hand, there is such a position available: the subject is in spec-vP, X in spec-TP leaving spec-FinP free for a relativised phrase to pass through.\(^6\) There are OS examples that seem to indicate that this prediction is correct; see (18), where the relativized object of æta has moved past both the subject (men) and the X (ey).

(18) aff them dyurom som ey magho men æta (Penta 1330s:130, 19)

\textit{of the-DAT animals-DAT that not may-3PL men eat-INF}

‘of the animals that men cannot eat’

First, we should note that the OS X is non-clausal unlike X in EmSw. Second, the relative clause is initiated by the relative complementizer (som) and not a pronoun as the majority of examples in EmSw. To investigate relative inversion in OS more thoroughly and to relate it to relative inversion in EmSw. is, unfortunately, beyond the scope of the present article.
3.3 Inversion

We will assume that spec-TypeP-movement has nothing to do with information structure. It is certainly evident that the clause-initial position has relevance for what is perceived as the topic of an utterance (cf. the label topicalisation), but it is not at all clear why this should be a matter of syntax (cf. Engdahl’s 1999 critique of Rizzi 1997, who assumes focus- and topic-features to syntactically motivate phrasal movement to the C-domain; cf. also Platzack 2008). In our view, it is syntactically relevant only that \([\text{utype}]_{\text{EPP}}\) needs to be eliminated, i.e. \(\text{THAT}\) something with a relevant interpretable feature moves into TypeP.\(^7\) Syntax does not, however, specify why this or that constituent is raised to first position in a certain case. This latter concern lies outside the domain of syntax proper. All phrases that are compatible with placement in spec-TypeP are assumed to have the status of possible spec-TypeP-candidates in every derivation. This means that syntax does not care what phrase eventually ends up in spec-TypeP, as long as some phrase does.\(^8\)

Yet, it is well known that syntactic operations seem to be restricted by some sort of economy principle, stating that feature matching always needs to be as local as possible. This principle is usually labelled Shortest Move (SM) and appears in the literature in several versions (cf. e.g. Rizzi 1990, Chomsky 1995). Here, we will assume the SM-formulation of Richards (1998), which is quoted in (19); minimal domain means maximal phrase.

(19) **Shortest Move (SM)**
A feature \(F\) must attract another feature \(G\), such that \(G\)’s minimal domain is not separated from \(F\) by any other feature that could participate in this attraction relation. (Richards 1998:614)
Since subjects in PdSw. have always raised to a higher spec-position than other spec-TypeP-candidates prior to the merging of Type⁰ (i.e. to spec-FinP), the type-feature associated with the subject ([dec], [rel] or [wh]) will always be structurally closer to [utype]ₑᵖᵖ than any other type-feature in the clause. Still, only some clauses are subject-initial, i.e. comply with SM by moving the subject to spec-TypeP; cf. (20a) below. In (20b), a phrase within VP marked with the type-feature [dec] (the object [DP en björn]) has moved across FinP to spec-TypeP in violation of SM, since VP (the minimal domain of [DP en björn]) is separated from [utype]ₑᵖᵖ by the dec-feature of [DP jag] in spec-FinP.⁹

(20)  
  a.  Jag såg en björn.  
      I saw a bear  
      ‘I saw a bear.’

     a’.  [TypeP [utype]ₑᵖᵖ jag, såg, [FinP ti, tv... [vp ti, tv [en björn]]]]  
          [dec]                     [dec]

  b.  En björn såg jag.  
      a bear saw I  
      ‘A bear, I saw.’

     b’.  [TypeP [utype]ₑᵖᵖ [en björn] j såg, [FinP jag tv... [vp ti, tv tj]]]  
          [dec]                     [dec]

elimination of [utype] with the dec-feature in VP rather than the dec-feature in FinP violates SM
Apparently, the SM-violation in (20b’) is not crucial; clauses with fronted non-subjects are indeed perfectly grammatical. As illustrated by Richards (1998:614–627), there are several other constructions in other languages that seem to violate SM, e.g. object shift in Icelandic and certain participle constructions in French. Characteristic of the SM-violations discussed by Richards is that they are all preceded by operations that do not violate SM.10

The fact that a licit operation with respect to SM appears to be able to ‘save’ an otherwise illicit operation leads Richards to the assumption that there must be some kind of loophole in the grammar of human languages. He formulates this loophole as a universal principle, Principle of Minimal Compliance (PMC), stating that a given restriction may be circumvented if it is previously obeyed. PMC is quoted in (21) below and commented upon in the following.

\[(21)\] **Principle of Minimal Compliance (PMC)**
For any dependency D that obeys constraint C, any elements that are relevant for determining whether D obeys C can be ignored for the rest of the derivation for purposes of determining whether any other dependency D’ obeys C.

Richards’ definition of relevance:
An element X is relevant for determining whether any dependency D with a head A and a tail B obeys constraint C if
a. X is along the path of D (that is, X=A, X=B or A c-commands X and X c-commands B) and
b. X is a member of the class of elements to which C makes reference.

(Richards 1998:601)
Let us now re-consider the structure in (20b’) above (repeated below as (22). As already noted, the movement of the non-subject (the object) to spec-TypeP violates SM, since the subject is a structurally closer candidate for fronting. However, the raising of the verb from Fin⁰ to Type⁰ – an operation that fully obeys SM – includes the subject in path D (spec-FinP is between the head of the verbal movement, Type⁰, and its tail, Fin⁰). Given PMC, the subject is not taken into consideration when the next movement is being evaluated with respect to SM. Long distance fronting of VP-elements can thus be permitted.¹¹

\[
\text{(22)} \quad \text{[TypeP [utype]EPP [en björn]j såg, [FinP jag t_j \ldots [VP t_i t_j]]]}
\]

\[
\text{[dec] [dec]}
\]

No SM-violation given PMC

This analysis of long distance fronting can straightforwardly be extended to subordinate clauses. In the relative clause in (23) below, the relativized object of såg (Op) has moved to spec-TypeP over the subject in spec-FinP. Just as in main clauses, such an operation must be preceded by head movement from Fin⁰ to Type⁰, since the dec-feature of the subject that is structurally closer to [utype]EPP than the rel-feature of the object needs to be hidden from the SM-mechanism; a raising of the complementizer som in (23a’) thus serves the same purpose as the raising of the finite verb såg in (20b’) (for independent evidence for complementizer movement, see e.g. Roussou 2000, Roberts 2004, Rizzi & Schlonsky 2007). Consequently, to invert with the subject cannot be viewed as a strictly verbal phenomenon, but a characteristic of all finite heads, i.e. both complementizers and finite verbs.

\[
\text{(23) a. björnen som jag såg}
\]

\[
\text{bear-DEF that I saw}
\]
‘the bear that I saw’

a’.  [TypeP Opj somÅFinP jag Åsågtj]]

[rel]                  [dec]
No SM-violation given PMC

The fact that [dec] can never co-occur with [comp] inside TypeP (cf. (24a–b) below) is irrelevant as far as the elimination of [utype]EPP is concerned. Both [dec] on the subject and [rel] on the relativized object are capable of eliminating [utype]EPP and are thereby competing for movement into TypeP; the fact that [dec] and [comp] are incompatible is a separate matter. We will simply conclude that some combinations of type- and status-features are illicit. Presumably, it is such a combinatorial restriction that is responsible for the absence of relative inversion in PdSw. (where inversion, unlike inversion in EmSw., always involves movement of the finite verb to Typeo); see (24c–d). Here [rel] associated with the pronoun and [force] on the finite verb are both contained within the same TypeP, a combination that is – apparently – not allowed. The ban on certain feature pairs in TypeP is clearly an LF-restriction (cf. Magnusson 2007a:281–282).

(24)  a.  *mannen Åigår som han sågt en björn

*man-DEF yesterday that he saw a bear

b.  mannen [TypeP Åigår som [FinP han sågt en björn]]

*[ [dec] [comp] ]

c.  *dokumentet vilket såg du alltså här

*document-DEF which saw you thus here
d. dokumentet \[\text{TypeP vilket såg [\text{FinP du alltså här}]\]}

\*([\text{rel} [\text{force}] \]}

In relative clauses that are initiated by a relative pronoun, we need to assume the presence of an invisible complementizer (\textit{Comp}); see (25a–a’) below. This complementizer has been base generated in Fin° and then moved to Type° concealing the subject from the SM-device and thereby allowing non-subject fronting, just as the overt \textit{som} in (22). Without a complementizer trace in Fin°, we expect verb movement to this head (to eliminate the feature \text{[ufin]EPP}), but such movement never occurs; cf. (25b) with the ungrammatical V-advl order which V-to-Fin movement would generate.

(25)
\begin{enumerate}
  \item \text{dokumentet vilket du alltså såg här}
  \begin{align*}
    \text{document-DEF which you thus saw here} \\
    \text{‘the document which you thus saw here’}
  \end{align*}

  \item \text{dokumentet vilket J Comp₅ [\text{FinP du t₅ alltså såg t₅ här}]}
  \begin{align*}
    \text{document-DEF which you saw thus here}
  \end{align*}
\end{enumerate}

For an alternative analysis of relative clauses lacking an overt complementizer, see Stroh-Wollin (2002, in particular pp. 294–297)).

\subsection*{3.4 Imperative force}
In the generative literature, imperative force has been linked to a feature \([\text{imp}]\) that is tied to the imperative verb form (identical to the verb stem in Swedish) residing in the highest phrase of the clause, i.e. TypeP in our model (see e.g. Platzack & Rosengren 1998). It is, however, not evident why \([\text{imp}]\) and the verb would always go together. We know that other type-features are not necessarily bound to overt (visible) lexical items, even though they may indeed be so. The polarity feature, for instance, comes with the invisible operator \(Q\) in yes/no-questions, but is associated with the complementizer in the corresponding subordinate clauses (see (26a–b) below; cf. Magnusson 2007a:214–215). Furthermore, an exclamative feature is sometimes associated with an interjection (as in (26c; cf. also 9a) above), but sometimes it is not. In the latter case, we may assume an invisible exclamative operator \((E)\) in TypeP; see (26d).

\[(26)\]

a. \([\text{TypeP} [\text{pol} \text{ } Q] [\text{force} \text{ } \text{Har}] \text{ } \text{du } \text{ätit}]\]

\(\text{have-PRS you eaten}\)

’Have you eaten?’

b. Jag undrar \([\text{TypeP} [\text{pol} \text{ } \text{comp} \text{ } \text{om}] \text{ } \text{du } \text{har } \text{ätit}]\]

\(I \text{ wonder-PRS whether you have-PRS eaten}\)

‘I wonder if you’ve eaten.’

c. \([\text{TypeP} [\text{excl}[\text{force} \text{ } \text{Fan}] \text{ } \text{att } \text{du } \text{aldrig kan lär } \text{dig } \text{detta}]\]

\(\text{damn that you never can learn-INF you this}\)

‘Damnit, why can’t you ever learn this!’

d. \([\text{TypeP} [\text{excl}[\text{force} \text{ } E] \text{ } \text{Att du inte går } \text{iväg}]\]

\(that you not go-PRS away\)
‘Why don’t you go away!’

This ambivalence in the associate behaviour of type-features should constitute a natural domain for parametric variation. The type feature [imp] would be no exception; it is expected to be either tied to an operator (\(I\)) or associated with a lexical item. Like [excl] (but unlike [pol]), [imp] is intrinsically paired with the feature [force]. Suppose that [imp] is associated with the imperative verb (i.e. Vstem) in PdSw. but tied to an operator (\(I\)) in EmSw. Adding the subject difference, both systems generate verb-initial imperatives with post-verbal subjects (when overt), as shown in (27) below; in (27a), Vstem must move to Type\(^o\) in order for the [imp]-[force] feature pair to get there; in (27b), these features (being tied to the operator \(I\)) are instead merged directly in Type\(^o\), whereas the verb remains in Fin\(^o\).\(^{12}\) In both cases, (S) ends up to the right of the verb.\(^{13}\)

\[(27)\]

\[\text{a. PdSw. } [\text{TypeP } [\text{[imp] [force] Vstem}]_V [\text{FinP (S) t}]] \]

\[\text{b. EmSw. } [\text{TypeP } [\text{[imp] [force] } I] [\text{FinP Vstem } [\text{TP (S)]]]] \]

The crucial effect of the combination of subject difference and difference regarding the associate status of [imp] is that there is room for a non-subject above the imperative verb (i.e. in spec-FinP) in EmSw but not in PdSw., offering us an account of the occurrence of non-verb-initial imperatives in the older variety but not the modern one.

4. ACCOUNTING FOR THE DIFFERENCES
In section 3, we introduced two structural differences between PdSw. and EmSw.: one difference regarding the position of subjects (spec-FinP in PdSw., spec-TP in EmSw.) and one difference concerning the imperative type-feature [imp] (which is assumed to be verbally associated only in PdSw.). In this section, the structural analysis is put to the test when we return to the data introduced in section 2.

4.1 Relative inversion

From the independently motivated difference with respect to the position of subjects between EmSw. and PdSw. (see 3.2 above) follows that inverted word order is possible in relative clauses in the older variety only. Relative VS must have S in spec-TP. If S is in spec-FinP as in PdSw., VS order can only be obtained via movement of the finite verb into TypeP, which prohibits the establishment of subordinate status since the verb carries the feature [force].

Furthermore, we need to make clear that although spec-FinP was something of an A-bar-position in EmSw., the subject in spec-TP would always be the structurally least complicated choice – the element in spec-TP is simply the closest candidate to fill spec-FinP. Consequently, the modern Comp+SV order (cf. (1b) above) is by far the most typical order in EmSw. as well; see (28).

(28)  a. med hwilcket han och underhåller the

      with which he also supports the

      andra Fäder (Kiöping 1674:82-83)

      other fathers

      'with which he also supports the other fathers'
b. \([\text{TypeP [med hwilcket]} Comp_s \omega_{\text{FinP han} t_e \omega_{\text{TP t}_i \omega_{\text{VP underhåller the andra Fäder t}_j}}}]\]

As in PdSw., the (invisible) complementizer\(^{14}\) moves from Fin to Type thereby (given PMC) concealing the subject (*han*) and making relativization of the non-subject (*med hwilcket*) licit.

In VS-examples like the one in (29), the subject remains in spec-TP and the non-subject relative pronoun is therefore first moved to spec-FinP before it advances to spec-TypeP. However, for a non-subject to be able to move to spec-FinP, the subject in spec-TP needs to be concealed, just as the subject in (28). Complementizer movement is not an option here, since complementizers are always base generated above TP (either in FinP, from where it moves to TypeP, or, as here, directly in TypeP). Instead, movement of the finite verb does the job, which leads to inverted word order in these cases.

(29) a. Hwilket\(_i\) ska[l Mahomet 2:secun\]dus VS-gap

\(\textit{which shall M second}\)

hafwa giort \(\_j\) (Rålamb 1657-58:125)

\(\textit{have-INF done}\)

‘which Mahomet the second is supposed to have done

b. \([\text{TypeP rel-pro}_{\text{j}} Comp_s \omega_{\text{FinP t}_j \omega_{\text{Vv \omega_{\text{TP S t}_v t}_j}}}]\]

XVS-examples share with the VS-examples the characteristic of having moved a non-subject to spec-FinP over the subject in spec-TP, a subject concealed from the SM-device by inversion. In the XVS-examples, the element fronted to spec-FinP is an entire adverbial clause, the X. The relative pronoun in spec-TypeP of an XVS-structure is linked to either a
resumptive pronoun or to a gap in the adverbial clause X, 0-gap-examples and X-gap-examples respectively; this is shown in (30) and (31).

(30)  a.  […] dråpo een eller twå i theras åsyn, hwilcketj 0-gap

  killed-PST one or two in their sight which

när the sågo that, gäfwo the oss strax Penningar för them,

  when they saw it gave they us soon money for them

(Kiöping 1674: 92)

‘[we] killed one or two in front of them. When they saw that, they
soon gave us money in exchange for them.’

b.  [TypeP rel-pro Comp [FinP [X-clause]k Vv [TP Sv tv tk]]]

(31)  a.  spånorna […] hwilckaj enär han besåg __j X-gap

  threads-DEF which when he saw

befunnes de och wara aff gull (Rålamb 1657-58:43)

  find-PST-PASS they also be of gold

‘when he saw the threads, they too were found to be of gold’

b.  [TypeP rel-proj Comp [FinP [X-clause tj]k Vv [TP Sv tv tk]]]

Presumably, 0-gap examples ((30a)) represent subordinate versions of left dislocation. In PdSw., left dislocated elements must correspond to a pronominal copy within the first clausal domain possible. Cf. the characterization in The Swedish Academy Grammar (SAG:4:446): ‘den pronominella kopian [står] normalt inte senare i satsen än som fundament eller del av fundamentet.’ ['the pronominal copy does not normally come later in the clause than in or
within spec-CP’]. If we assume the same restrictions to apply to EmSw. (the unmarked assumption), single resumptive copies in the VS-part of an XVS-clause are predicted to be avoided – X would be the preferred place for such a pronoun – a prediction that is borne out. As was pointed out above, resumptive pronouns in 0-gap examples never occur in the VS-clause alone.

Examples involving X-gaps (i.e. (31a)) are – in one respect – structurally equivalent to examples involving movement of relative pronouns from spec-FinP to spec-TypeP (i.e. VS-gap-examples as in (29)). In both cases, there is an instance of FinP-to-TypeP-movement. The filling of spec-TypeP by long distance relativization (which would generate gaps in the VS-part of an XVS-clause) is blocked by the fact that the only possible PMC-concealer of X is the finite verb, which cannot reside in TypeP together with [rel], as already noted. In other words, the PMC-analysis predicts there to be no VS-clauses with gaps if X intervenes. Precisely this type is unattested. On the other hand, when an X-clause is followed by SV word order as in the PdSw. example in (2b) above, X has no such blocking effect indicating that the X-clause is less integrated, i.e. parenthetical, in these cases. Apart from the lack of a blocking effect, the parenthetical nature is also reflected in the absence of gaps after the relative pronoun within an X-clause that is followed by SV.

Examples with a gap in both X-clause and VS-clause are also unattested. In such a structure, long-distance movement into spec-TypeP would, as it were, coincide with local movement. It is, however, blocked by the fact that the trace within the X-clause would not c-command its trace in the VS-clause being itself contained in the deeply embedded X-clause; cf. the construed example in (32).

(32) *[TypeP vilketj [FinP [TypeP när han såg t:j] plockade [Tp du upp t:j]]] which when he saw picked-PST you up
Why the relative pronoun in VS-examples ((29)) always moves to spec-TypeP, but an X-clause internal element only optionally so (cf. (30) and (31)) is an intriguing question. It is clearly related to another question. Why may some non-subjects stay in spec-FinP, others not? Evidently, there is some mechanism restricting what XPs may dwell in FinP after spell-out. For instance, the proposed analysis is unable to block by itself the generation of main clause strings of the type XPVXPS; if V moves to TypeP to conceal the XP in spec-FinP, any XP should be up for topicalisation. But for some reason, the non-subject in spec-FinP can seldom remain there. Even proper subjects, e.g. subjects that come in the form of an infinitival phrase, are banned from spec-FinP in PdSw. indicating that something is the matter independently of the analysis proposed here;\textsuperscript{16} compare the grammatical (33a) below, where the subject \textit{att simma} is clause-initial (i.e. has moved through spec-FinP), to the ungrammatical (33b), where it is postverbal (i.e. resides in spec-FinP).

\begin{equation}
(33) \quad \text{a. } [\text{TypeP} [\text{InfP Att simma}i \text{ kan [FinP t} \text{[TP vara roligt]]}]
\end{equation}

to swim-INF can be-INF fun

‘To swim can be fun.’

\begin{equation}
(33) \quad \text{b. } *[\text{TypeP Ibland kan [FinP [InfP att simma] [TP vara roligt]]}]
\end{equation}

sometimes can to swim-INF be-INF fun

In sum, the subject difference between PdSw. and EmSw. is the crucial structural difference one needs to explain why the different types of relative inversion no longer occur. Examples with a gap always involve movement of a relative pronoun to the spec-position of the highest phrase in the C-domain (TypeP) via spec-FinP. Examples without a gap, by contrast, contain
a directly merged pronoun in spec-TypeP and an adverbial clause (X-clause) in spec-FinP. Neither of these types are available in PdSw., since in the modern variety, spec-FinP can hold only subjects.

4.2 Non-verb-initial imperatives

Having consolidated the subject difference between PdSw. and EmSw., non-verb-initial imperatives fall neatly into place. There is no need for any additional assumption that EmSw. imperatives, contrary to PdSw., allowed for material which normally is consistent only with a declarative interpretation of the clause in spec-TypeP. Instead, the phrase heading a non-verb-initial imperative utterance would have its place in spec-FinP, since this position was not restricted to subjects in EmSw. And, given the assumption that [imp] comes with an invisible operator, I, and is not verbally associated in EmSw. (cf. section 3.3), the verb may stay in Fin0; see (34).

(34) a. Örterna gör med som du vill (Kockebook 1650:64)

   herbs-DEF do with as you want-PRS

   ‘Do as you want with the herbs.’

   b. [TypeP [[imp] [force] I][FinP XP Vstem [TP (S)]]

Furthermore, the lack of imperative force on the Vstem as such predicts that it be less restricted in its distribution than in PdSw.17 And this prediction is, as we have seen, borne out. Unlike today, the Vstem in EmSw. may be used in subordinate contexts; the example in (8) above is repeated as (35).
It might strike us as a bit odd with a relative clause lacking a tensed verb, but nothing in principle prohibits dependent clauses from being tenseless: the combination of (S) and V is not set in time, but it is, just as independent imperatives (although indirectly, via its matrix clause), anchored in the moment of speech.

4.3 A note on Latin influence

There are still remnants in PdSw. of the embedded construction illustrated in (35). In the short hand style of dictionaries the phrase *om vilket se* (lit. ‘of which see’) is used to direct the reader forward. Referring phrases of this exact sort occur in Latin: *quod vide*. Presumably, the Swedish *om vilket se* should be seen as an instance of adaptation to the Latin equivalent, an adaptation that has occurred in other European languages as well (e.g. English *which see*). The Latin phrase is not to be analysed as a subordinate clause containing an imperative verb form. Rather, it is an instance of so called relative connection, whereby a *wh*-phrase is used in a non-interrogative (i.e. relative) way in an independent utterance.

Suppose that the usage of embedded imperatives on the whole in older Swedish – including not only fixed phrases such as *om vilket se* but also the productive usage illustrated in (35) – is in fact imported from Latin. If so, it is not evident that they are embedded at all. In
the source language (i.e. Latin), this is clearly not the case. It might be, then, that the wh-phrases with a relative meaning in older Swedish had the same lexical status as their Latin equivalents (not marked for structural type), differing from relative wh-phrases in PdSw., which are restricted to subordinate clauses (i.e. must not be combined with [force]).

The non-interrogative use of wh-words is certainly to be derived from Latin influence (cf. Höder 2010:266, Lindblad 1943:132ff., Wollin 1983:139–142, Noreen 1904:411, Wessén 1941:79), but the question is how much of the original distribution was imported.\textsuperscript{18} To implement the Latin relative connection into the syntax of independent utterances would mean to combine non-interrogative, i.e. relative wh-words, with typical root clause characteristics such as inverted order between S and V and imperative mood, i.e. exactly those combinations that occur in EmSw. Consequently, there is – in principle at least – the possibility that what distinguishes EmSw. from PdSw. is the status of relative wh-phrases: if these are as free in their distribution as their Latin counterparts, it explains the combination of such phrases with inversion and with imperatives.

Such an account, however, fails to explain why EmSw. – but not PdSw. – permits non-verb-initial imperatives initiated by ordinary XPs. Such a difference is impossible to relate to a stipulated lexical difference between older and modern relative wh-words. Also, there are other structural differences between the varieties that remain unresolved, namely the coordinate differences discussed in 3.2 that would have to be related to the subject difference anyway.

Apparently, Latin influence is responsible for the introduction of relative wh-words, but the implementation of relative connection must have been handled within the domain of subordination. What is more, there are embedded imperatives in Old Swedish (OS) that can hardly be characterized as Latin transfer; see (36) below from Delsing (1999) (cf. Platzack 2007, who presents similar examples from Old Icelandic).
Even if the \textit{wh}-initiated imperatives from the Early modern era would be treated as independent utterances expressing relative connection of the Latin type, we still need an independent account of embedded imperatives in OS. Our analysis accounts for all relevant differences between older varieties of Swedish and the modern language, assuming only two structural differences between the varieties: the status of spec-FinP and the locus of \[\text{imp}\]. No stipulated difference regarding the status of relative \textit{wh}-phrases is needed.\textsuperscript{19}

5. SUMMARY

In this article, we have addressed two seemingly unrelated syntactic differences between PdSw. and EmSw. and presented a unified account of them. The first difference regards the use of inversion and non-subject fronting in relative clauses. The second difference regards the position of imperative verb forms. Unlike PdSw., EmSw. permits both VS word order (inversion) and XVS word order (where X is an adverbial clause) in relative clauses. In addition, it was commonplace in EmSw. (but is ungrammatical in PdSw.) to let imperative utterances be initiated by something else than the imperative verb form, e. g. objects, i.e. to use non-verb-initial imperatives.
Two underlying (and sometimes conspiring) structural discrepancies between PdSw. and EmSw. are assumed to be responsible for the syntactic differences at hand. First, there is the status of spec-FinP, a position that is restricted to subjects in PdSw. but not in EmSw. (where the canonical subject position is instead spec-TP). Second, there is the status of the imperative type-feature [imp], which is always tied to the imperative verb form (in practise, the verbal stem – Vstem) in PdSw. but tied to an operator in EmSw.

When the subject resides in spec-TP (as in EmSw.), subject-verb inversion can be obtained via verbal movement to Fin⁰, i.e. within the complement of the highest head in the C-domain, Type⁰, which contains a complementizer in relative clauses. With the subject in spec-FinP, however, the verb needs to move into Type⁰ itself to create inversion, thereby ruling out relative clauses as a possible context for VS order. In addition to making relative inversion possible, a lower subject position (spec-Tp) leaves the field clear for non-subjects in spec-FinP; hence, there is XVS word order in EmSw. but not PdSw. relative clauses. As for imperatives, the subject-difference alone cannot account for the possibility in EmSw. of initiating imperatives with e.g. objects. There is certainly room for an initial non-subject in spec-FinP, but this non-subject would only be clause-initial if the imperative verb had its place below spec-FinP. Given that [imp] is not tied to the Vstem in EmSw., such a low verbal position in imperatives is feasible.

The assumption that subjects reside in spec-TP in EmSw. is independently motivated by coordinate data in the previous literature, the assumption that the subject position is spec-FinP in PdSw. by findings in the previous literature on language acquisition. The [imp]-difference is certainly stipulated to begin with, but it correctly predicts the Vstem to be less restricted in its syntactic distribution in EmSw. than in PdSw. Indeed, only in the older variety may the Vstem occur in embedded contexts.
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1 Disregarding clause-initial arguments, there is variation within the modern Scandinavian languages with respect to what types of adverbial element may precede an imperative verb form. Swedish appears to be relatively restricted, permitting only bara 'just' to precede imperatives (Bara ta den, du!, lit. ‘just take it, you’), Norwegian/Danish less restricted, permitting pre-imperative negation (Ikke tenk/tænk mer/mere på det!, lit. ‘not think more on it’). In other Germanic varieties, however, object-initial imperatives are possible, e.g. in standard German (see Reis & Rosengren 1992). It is beyond the scope of this article to discuss these modern inter-Scandinavian and inter-Germanic differences. Still, it is worth noting that what we claim to be a structural prerequisite for object-initial imperatives in EmSw. (canonical subject position below the C-domain) has been argued to be a characteristic of German too. For instance, te Velde (2006:310) maintains that the nature of coordinate ellipsis in German indicates that subjects (inverted as well as non-inverted) are always in spec-TP unless they are emphatic.

2 In Magnusson (2007a) the analysis of the C-domain resembles that of Stroh-Wollin to a further extent. There, independent utterances are treated as ForcePs (a label originally suggested by Rizzi 1997), whereas subordinate clauses are labelled CompPs.

3 When such phrases contain the feature [wh], it is this feature, not [dec], that eliminates [utype]. Whether [wh] outranks [dec] on a phrasal level or is simply the more prominent of the two is not entirely clear. Still, we might think of the fact that [wh] is visible to LF below
Type⁰ (unlike [dec]; cf. endnote 17 in 4.2 below) as a piece of support for the latter alternative.

4 Alternatively, we could think of [force] as a feature that relates the clause to the context/discourse; when it is found in a dependent clause, it simply indicates the relation between the matrix and the embedded finiteness. However, we still need to assume that some features are invisible when they are below TypeP, e.g. [dec] in (9g). Here, the DP hans bror would be marked [dec], but this does not affect the status of the clause as interrogative since [dec] is in spec-FinP and not in spec-TypeP; cf. also 4.2 below, especially endnote 17.

5 Within the FinP-conjuncts in (17c), however, the status-feature of the highest head is presumably irrelevant (as noted in 3.1 above); what matters here is the fin-feature that is present in both conjuncts.

6 Seeing that OS thus displays XVS order below the C-domain, we would have ha case of V2-within-IP in the sense of Schwarz & Vikner (1996). Previously, such an analysis of V2 has been proposed for Icelandic (Rögnvaldsson & Thráinsson 1990) and Yiddisch V2 (Maling 1990). Cf. also Rohrbacher (1999:69–70, 80–81), who argues that Yiddisch V2 is always within IP, Icelandic V2, however, only within IP in embedded contexts.

7 In this context, relevant means ‘capable of eliminating [utype]EPP’ A further discussion of different type-features, their distribution and compatibility with the status-features [force] and [comp] is beyond the scope of this article; see Magnusson (2007a: 203–225).

8 This treatment of movement to the clause-initial position bears some resemblance to the analysis of A-bar-movement in Platzack (1996). However, the notion [repel], introduced by Platzack to account for movement that is not triggered by feature-attraction (i.e. feature-elimination in contemporary minimalism), still implies that syntax ‘knows’ what constituent raises above C⁰. More recently, A-bar-movement has been analysed as movement triggered by an edge-feature (Chomsky 2008, Platzack 2010). Such an account is clearly less minimal
than an account in terms of elimination of type-features: an edge-feature is purely syntactic whereas type-features are motivated by LF (and thereby syntax-external). What motivates movement to the clause-initial position is, however, of secondary interest for the proposed analysis, as long as there are several candidates for fronting in every clause.

9 We will disregard any possible violation of the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC) of Chomsky (2001), since it has no direct bearing on the point we are making. Whether or not the VP-internal candidate is inside VP or on its left side (which would have to be the case if derivation works in phases and VP is a phase) is of secondary concern here, since it is below the subject in spec-FinP and further from TypeP in either case.


11 To analyse inversion as a PMC-motivated phenomenon was first suggested by Platzack (2004) dealing with wh-questions. Note also that this analysis to some extent resembles the treatment of inversion within the asymmetrical analysis of verb-second (Travis 1984, Zwart 1993), where movement of the finite verb over S occurs only to create a landing site for fronted elements.

12 The imperative structures in (27) contain a FinP just as other finite clauses. Such an analysis is not entirely uncontroversial. According to Platzack & Rosengren (1998), imperatives lack tense and mood, and, since the authors assume the presence of tense and mood to be a prerequisite for finiteness (ibid. p. 181), they reach the conclusion that imperatives are non-finite (non-propositional) speech acts, i.e. TypePs without any FinP, TP or MoodP in its complement. As pointed out by Stroh-Wollin (2002:164), this is probably going too far; there is after all some propositional content in an imperative utterance: there is a verbal component and a nominal addressee (implicitly at least) that is anchored in the here and now of the speaker.
In fact, post-verbal placement of imperative subjects is mandatory only in PdSw. Before the modern system emerged, Swedish imperative subjects could precede the verb, occupying the same position as clause-initial non-subjects; see (i). Pre-imperative placement of a second person pronoun does occur today, but it is always followed by a pause, indicating that it is extra-clausal. Also, it is non-nominative, which is visible in those varieties that make a morphological distinction between vocative and nominative case; see (ii).

(i) Thu blif her qwar (OS example from Delsing 1999:51)

\[ \text{you-NOM remain-IMP here PART} \]

'Stay here, you!'

(ii) Dô, sätt dej ner! (Gothenburg dialect)

\[ \text{you-VOC sit-IMP you down} \]

'Hey you, sit down!'

That there is indeed an invisible complementizer present is indicated by the low placement of the finite verb (underhåller) below the sentence adverbial (och); without a complementizer being base generated in Fin (before moving into TypeP), the verb would have to move to Fin. Cf. the discussion around example (24) at the end of section 3.3 above.

Formally, we cannot determine whether the relative pronoun moves out of the X-clause, stranding it in spec-FinP, to spec-TypeP or whether it pied-pipes the entire X-clause, leaving nothing behind in spec-FinP. Examples with an overt complementizer would disambiguate between the two, but no such examples have been retrieved (cf. the construed example vilket som när han såg gick han hem, where the complementizer som is between the relative pronoun and the X-clause indicating that the pronoun has moved by itself, to vilket när han såg som gick han hem, where som is preceded by both pronoun and X-clause indicating that the X-clause accompanies the pronoun to TypeP). Intuitively, the pied-piping alternative appears unlikely.
For a discussion of similar restrictions on the subject position in English, see Haegeman & Guéron (1999:115ff.)

To be precise, a prerequisite for making this prediction is that [imp], like [wh] but unlike [dec], is interpretable below TypeP. When a wh-marked phrase is in spec-FinP in a declarative clause, the clause gets an interrogative dimension; see (i). On the other hand, when a dec-marked phrase occupies the corresponding position in an interrogative clause, the question status is unaffected, i.e. the dec-feature is invisible to LF; compare (ii), where [dec] is in FinP to (iii) where the initial wh-phrase has moved through FinP.

(i) Då gick vem på toa!?

*Then, who went to the toilet!*

(ii) Vem fick du se?

*Who did you get to see?*

(iii) Vem fick se dig?

*Who got to see you?*

If [imp] is like [wh], we can explain why the imperative verb is banned from a clause such as (35) in PdSw; even if [imp] is below TypeP, it conflicts with the type-feature on the relative pronoun.

To our knowledge, no one has suggested that relative connection was in fact imported into the Swedish system. Of the cited scholars dealing with relative pronouns and Latin influence, only Wollin (in part one of his series on Latin translations) mentions relative connection; he assumes the Swedish equivalent to the Latin construction always to be subordinate (1981:18).
In OS, it appears to have been obligatory to have an overt subject in embedded imperatives of the type exemplified in (36) (Delsing (1999:55). The *wh*-initiated embedded imperatives of the EmSw. type (cf. (35)) instead pattern with independent imperatives, where an explicit subject is used only occasionally. We have no explanation for this difference.
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