

Stylistic Fronting and Discourse

SF is also attested in Romance languages and is especially common in some Old Romance varieties. The Old Italian examples below illustrate past participle fronting in embedded clauses (3) and fronting of a nominal predicate in main clauses (4):

- (3) Per una grande pioggia che **venuta** era _____
for a big rain that come was
'because of a lot of rain that had come' (Franco 2009, N, 31, 11)

- (4) **Bisogno** fa___ che noi lo ritroviamo.
need makes that we 3s.CL.ACC find
'It is necessary that we find him.' (Franco 2009, FR, 47, 13)

As documented in linguistic research, SF is highly productive at earlier stages of Scandinavian and Romance languages (in Old-Danish, Middle-Danish, Old-Swedish, Old-Italian, Old-French, and Old-Catalan), whereas it is less frequent in modern “Insular Scandinavian” (e.g. Modern Icelandic, Faroese), and no longer (or less) productive in modern Romance varieties. Following Maling’s work, SF in Scandinavian and Romance has been studied in a large number of syntactic approaches from both a diachronic and a synchronic perspective, and in some recent works also by comparing Scandinavian and Romance languages and their varieties (Fischer and Alexiadou 2001, Franco 2009).

The key questions in SF-research have been the following:

- i. Is SF a distinct, different type of movement, i.e. is it possible to distinguish SF from other types of A-bar-movements – Topicalization and Focus movement – on structural and/or functional grounds?
- ii. Can SF be regarded as a uniform movement in Romance and Scandinavian?
- iii. Is SF a discourse-semantically relevant movement contributing to information structure in Romance and Icelandic, or is it a movement satisfying some condition which purely concerns form (satisfying the EPP-requirement or triggered by the Edge Feature)?

This paper aims to provide an answer to the above questions by investigating SF at the Interface of Narrow Syntax and Information Structure from a contrastive perspective – by comparing SF with Topicalization and Focusing and discussing its peculiarities in different Scandinavian and Romance languages. The clarification of the role of discourse seems to be an utterly important condition also for the proper syntactic analysis of this phenomenon. Despite a large amount of work, however, a satisfactory discussion of SF at the Syntax-Pragmatics Interface is still missing in linguistic research. As will be shown below in more detail, the claims concerning the discourse relevance of SF are contradictory, w.r.t. both Scandinavian and Romance. Regarding SF in the Romance languages (mainly in Old Romance varieties), SF is most often related to either Focus or Topic interpretation, although a less categorical position is taken in a recent study by

Franco (2009). In the analysis of the discourse properties of SF in Scandinavian (concentrating on Icelandic) the dominant view is that SF is a purely EPP- or Edge Feature-related movement (Holmberg 2000, 2005, Ott 2009, Platzack 2009), even though Hrafnbjargarson's (2003, 2004) works also suggest the analysis of SF as Focus movement.

The terminology used for the leftward movement targeting the empty subject position in Scandinavian is somewhat confusing since “stylistic” could be interpreted as having relevance for information structure. In order to avoid misunderstanding, Holmberg (2005:1-2) pointed out that “SF is stylistic in a different sense than for example topicalization or HNPS [= Heavy NP Shift], since unlike these operations SF does not even seem to have any discourse semantic effects.” The term “stylistic” refers instead to the “archaic character” of this movement and to the fact that it belongs to a higher/learned register (Holmberg 2005:34). Also, according to Angantýsson (2009), “SF is [...] more common in written language and in a formal style of speech [...] The data from the interviews actually confirms that people consider these constructions formal and ‘sophisticated.’”

Further, the term “stylistic” is motivated by the fact that Stylistic fronting is optional, in the sense that it is only one of more options for filling an empty “subject”-related position. According to most analyses there is a free alternation between (5) with SF and (6) with a subject gap: Fronting of *stolið* in (5) with subject extraction is optional and, importantly, (5) and (6) have the same discourse effect:

- (5) Hver heldur þú að **stolið** hafi ____ hjólinu?
 who think you that stolen has the-bike
‘Who do you think has stolen the bike?’
- (6) Hver heldur þú að ____ hafi **stolið** hjólinu?
 who think you that has stolen the-bike
‘Who do you think has stolen the bike?’ (Holmberg 2005)

Similarly, in impersonal sentences there is a free alternation between the clause with SF in (7) and the clause with the expletive *það* in (8):

- (7) Ef **gengið** er ____ eftir Laugaveginum ...
 if gone is along Laugavegur
‘If one walks along Laugavegur ...’
- (8) Ef **það** er gengið eftir Laugaveginum ...
 if EXPL is gone along Laugavegur
‘If one walks along Laugavegur ...’ (Holmberg 2005)

Another relevant terminological issue concerns the choice between the terms “Fronting” or “Inversion.” Maling’s (1980) original label “Stylistic Inversion” was replaced by the term “Stylistic Fronting.” As I will argue later in this paper, neither of the terms alone can reflect the syntactic and functional variation within the field of this special movement. Both a terminological and notional distinction seems relevant for the adequate account of the phenomenon generally called Stylistic Fronting in the literature. The main claim of this work is that there are two types of stylistic movements in Icelandic: Fronting and Inversion. These two types have different discourse effects which can be regarded as a consequence of different syntactic configurations or derivational histories. Whereas Stylistic Fronting is a contrast-related movement with obligatory accent, Stylistic Inversion often appears in unmarked cases with a maximal focus domain even though optional focusing or backgrounding is also possible in these cases.

The split of stylistic movement into a type with obligatory emphasis and a type with optional emphasis and interpretive variation also has interesting consequences for the comparison of languages. The proposed distinction of two SF-types makes it possible to analyse stylistic movement in Scandinavian and Romance in a more similar manner and call the non-uniform treatment of SF suggested by Fischer and Alexiadou (2001) in question. As argued below, SF in Scandinavian and Romance is thus not different in the sense that it lacks discourse relevance in Scandinavian and has discourse effects in Romance but both language groups seem to have (at least) two structurally and functionally distinct varieties.

The paper is structured as follows. After the presentation of some relevant diagnostics of SF in section 2 the functional and syntactic diversity of Stylistic fronting in Scandinavian and Romance will be demonstrated in section 3. After section 4 concentrating on the problems regarding the discourse effects of SF a novel analysis of the discourse behavior of SF will be suggested in section 5 where data mainly from Icelandic will be taken into consideration. Section 5 discusses the functional and syntactic differences between SF and other types of Fronting – like Topicalization and Focusing – arguing for the separation of these three movements. Section 7 shows that Scandinavian and Romance seem similar as to the variation w.r.t. the stylistic movement despite certain parametric differences between these languages. Section 8 concludes the paper.

2. Stylistic Fronting – Selected Diagnostics

As Maling pointed out in her article from 1980, SF in Icelandic is different from Topicalization in several respects. The most important syntactic asymmetries are related to the type of the fronted elements, the target position, and the (ir-) relevance of locality restrictions.¹ In the following the presentation will concentrate on these selected diagnostics.

¹ Further differences arise regarding clause boundedness (SF is strictly clause-bound in contrast to Topicalization) and with extraction (extraction across an element that has undergone SF is possible in contrast to embedded Topicalization which creates topic islands, cf. Maling 1990, Jónsson 1991, Thráinsson 2007, Holmberg 2005, Ott 2009.)

The prototypical elements that undergo SF are heads or head-like elements (participles, infinitives, but also particles, adverbs, negation, predicative adjectives, predicative nominals), in contrast to phrases which are typical for Topicalization.

The target position of SF is – according to Maling (1980), Platzack (1987), (2009), Rögnvaldsson and Thráinsson (1990), Holmberg (2000, 2005) – the position immediately preceding the finite verb (Spec,TP or Spec,IP), as opposed to Topicalization which targets Spec,CP (an A-bar-position). Since Spec,TP is the canonical subject position, SF can only apply if no overt subject is present. The so-called “subject gap condition” also has consequences for typical SF-contexts. In Scandinavian, SF often appears in subject extraction contexts and is thus dominant in embedded clauses (in subject relative clauses, see 9, and in wh-subject extraction clauses, see 5 repeated here in 10):

- (9) Hann er maður [sem hægt er ____ að treysta t]
 he is (a) man who possible is to trust
‘He is a man who can be trusted.’ (Sigurðsson 1997)
- (10) Hver heldur þú að stolið hafi ____ hjólinu?
 who think you that stolen has the-bike
‘Who do you think has stolen the bike?’ (Holmberg 2005)

However, SF is also possible in different types of impersonal (main or embedded) clauses either with no visible subject at all (like with impersonal passives, see example 11) or with subjects realized in postverbal positions (like with extrapositions, see example 12):

- (11) Hún spurði hvort rætt hefði verið ____ við Helgu.
 she asked whether talked had.SJV been with Helga
‘She asked if anybody had talked to Helga.’ (Sigurðsson 2010b)
- (12) Greinilegt er ____ að okkur vantar meiri peninga.
 obvious is that we need more money
‘It’s obvious that we need more money.’ (Rögnvaldsson 1996)

In addition to the subject gap condition, locality restrictions are of decisive relevance for SF since SF is regarded as a movement of the closest element to T following the “Accessibility hierarchy.” This hierarchy was first observed by Maling (1980) and is partly corresponding to Attract Closest suggested by Chomsky (1995:311). The order “negation/adverbs > past participle/verb particle > predicative adjective” regulates the possible movements of elements if there are several candidates for SF and predicts that negation and sentence adverbs will always block

SF. The “accessibility hierarchy” is, however, only operative in case of SF, in contrast to Topicalization where locality restrictions are not at stake.

Of special interest for the present analysis of SF are the differences between SF and Topicalization with respect to discourse effects. According to Maling (1980), Topicalization requires emphasis or focus on the fronted constituent, whereas emphasis or focus is not necessarily present on the fronted element in case of SF. In later analyses the difference between the discourse properties of SF and Topicalization is often sharpened, resulting in the claim that SF has no semantic and pragmatic implications at all (Rögnavaldsson and Thráinsson 1990, Jónsson 1991, Holmberg 2005, Thráinsson 2007, Ott 2009, Platzack 2009), which constitutes a contrast to the discourse function of Topicalization.

However, if one takes into consideration that Topicalization in Scandinavian is only typically but not necessarily connected to emphasis and also reads Maling’s description of the pragmatic role of SF carefully, then it becomes clear that Topicalization and SF are functionally not as different as generally claimed in literature. Crucially, emphasis or focus is not excluded in SF in e.g. Maling’s or Holmberg’s analyses. Both types of fronting operations can thus appear with and without emphasis and focus and the alleged “atypical” cases are quite common: (i) Even if not mentioned by Maling and other researchers emphasis is often absent in case of Topicalization of subjects or certain types of adverbials, and (ii) stylistically fronted elements with emphasis should not be regarded as unexplainable exceptions neither (contrary to Holmberg 2005). Consequently the question arises: Is it really justified to distinguish Topicalization and SF in Scandinavian on functional grounds? This question can, however, only be answered if SF is clearly defined and syntactically delimited from other types of frontings and its relation to the two most important functionally loaded A-bar-movements – Topicalization and Focus movement – is properly accounted for. This will be the aim of the following two sections.

3. The Problem: Diversity of Stylistic Fronting

A cross-linguistically valid uniform definition of SF entails three major problems:

- i. The structural and functional variation of SF – within language groups and also within individual languages,
- ii. the cross-linguistic diversity of SF – evident in the comparison of Scandinavian and Romance languages, and
- iii. the structural/functional overlap with other types of A-bar-movement: Topicalization and Focus movement.

In this section selected aspects of the structural and functional variation of SF will be discussed in more detail, starting with the presentation of relevant data within certain language groups in section 3.1 and turning to the comparison of SF in Scandinavian and Romance in section 3.2.

3.1. Structural Variation within Languages – SF of Heads and Phrases

In the original proposal of Maling (1980), only “small elements” were taken into consideration regarding SF. However, Holmberg’s (2005) argumentation seems convincing when he shows that not only “heads” but also phrasal elements may undergo SF in Icelandic. Like fronting of adverbs and predicative elements, fronting of DPs and PPs fulfils the structural requirements for SF or are restricted by constraints applying to SF (the subject gap condition, locality restrictions, extraction facts etc). Like fronting of head-like elements fronting of phrases is optional. Further, stylistic movement of different categories does “not differ in terms of focus or other discourse semantic properties” according to Holmberg (2005:16).² The observed syntactic and (and possibly also pragmatic) variation within the two language groups makes the uniform definition of SF difficult. As argued in most works, SF is not restricted to “small elements” (neither in Scandinavian nor in Romance) but is also possible with phrases, PPs and DPs.

The variation in Icelandic w.r.t. the moved elements is illustrated in the examples (13-16), with fronting of “heads” (13-14) on the one hand, and with movement of full PP, DP in (15-16) on the other:

- (13) Þeir sem **ekki** hafa ____ búið í Óslo
 those that not have lived in Oslo
‘those who did not live in Oslo’

- (14) Þeir sem **búið** hafa ____ í Óslo
 those that lived have in Oslo
‘those who live in Oslo’

- (15) Þeir sem **í Óslo** hafa búið ____ segja að ...
 those that in Oslo have lived say that
‘Those who lived in Oslo say that ...’ (Holmberg 2005)

- (16) Þeir sem **þá erfiðu** **ákvörðun** verði að taka ____
 those that that difficult decision has to take
‘those who have to take this difficult decision’ (Hrafnbjargarson 2003)

SF comes in two basic variants also in Romance languages. According to Cardinaletti both predicative elements (17) and DPs (18) can be stylistically fronted in Italian:

² As will be discussed later in section, this claim is problematic.

Stylistic Fronting and Discourse

- (17) Lo studente que **via** andò ____ senza dire niente a nessuno.
the student that away went without saying anything to anybody
'the student that went away without saying anything to anybody' (Cardinaletti 2003)
- (18) Merito di John Elderfield, que **questa esposizione** ha voluto e curato ____
merit of John Elderfield who this exhibition has wanted and edited
'John Elderfield's merit, who wanted and edited this exhibition' (Cardinaletti 2003)

Also, Old Romance data indicate both type of fronting possibilities, illustrated here by examples taken from Old Catalan (19) and Old French (20):

- (19) que **feta** aviets ____ la corona del Emperi
that made had the crown of-the emperor
'who had made the crown of the emperor' (Desclot, 297, Fischer and Alexiadou 2001)
- (20) Quant les dames ... qui [**avec le reine**]_i estoient assises t_i
when the ladies who with the queen be.PAST.3PL sat
'When the ladies and the young girls who sat with the queen.' (Mathieu 2006)

The variation with respect to the SF-moved category led to different syntactic analyses in both Scandinavian and Romance. In addition to the hybrid view represented by Hrafnbjargarson (2003, 2004), according to which SF is either a head or a phrasal movement depending on the fronted element, the uniform treatment of SF is dominant in the analysis of Icelandic data. SF was uniformly accounted for e.g. by Jónsson (1991), who regards SF as head movement whereas others (e.g. Ott 2009) argue for the analysis of all instances of SF as phrasal movement. The last-mentioned approach stipulates the remnant movement of the head-like categories, which means that in these cases “incomplete” categories containing traces are moved (cf. Ott 2009 and the reference to Webelhuth and den Besten 1987 therein).

The observed categorical variation w.r.t. the fronted element in SF – which is present in both language types – has, however, been interpreted in a quite different way by Fischer and Alexiadou (2001). Instead of accounting for both varieties in Romance and Scandinavian they argue for a parametric difference between the SF-syntax of Scandinavian and Romance, which in their view is the reason behind the different discourse behavior of SF in these language groups (2001:136f.): “Now the analysis we proposed in the previous section for Old Catalan and the one adopted here for Icelandic are straightforwardly unified under the XP vs. X^o parameter. If we are right in suggesting [that] SF in Old Catalan involves X^o (information structure related) movement, and we maintain Holmberg’s analysis that SF in Icelandic involves XP (EPP) topic-related

movement, then the relevant difference is again one of XP vs. X°. SF involves head raising in Old Catalan, but involves XP raising in Icelandic.”

3.2. The Cross-Linguistic Structural and Functional Diversity of SF

There are, however, “real” differences between Scandinavian and Romance with respect to the basic syntactic requirements of Stylistic Fronting and also concerning the discourse relevance of this movement.

The subject gap condition – one of the most crucial syntactic prerequisites of SF – seems only be obligatory in Scandinavian languages (e.g. in Old and Modern Icelandic, Old-Swedish) but not in Romance (Old Catalan, Italian etc.). As the grammaticality contrast of the following examples (21) and (22) indicate, preverbal subjects are completely ungrammatical in Icelandic sentences with SF:

- (21) hún sem **fyrst** var ____ til að lýsa stílfærslu
 she that first was PREP to investigate Stylistic-Fronting
‘she who was first to investigate Stylistic Fronting’

- (22) *afleiðslan sem hún **fyrst** var ____ til að lýsa
 the-construction that she first was PREP to investigate
‘the construction that she was first to investigate’ (Holmberg 2005)

On the other hand a subject gap seemed not to be obligatory in Old Catalan (23) and preverbal subjects are apparently acceptable:

- (23) e adonchs con amà Deu e serví Déu
 and so with love3.sg Godand serve3.sg God
 de que Déus **donat** li havia ____
 of that God given him had3sg. (Fischer and Alexiadou 2001)

Fischer and Alexiadou (2001:122) point out that “Old Catalan SF seems to have been an optional operation, applying independently of verb second requirements and the necessity of a subject gap, unlike Icelandic SF.” Also in Modern Italian, Stylistic Fronting can appear with preverbal subjects as shown in example (24) below:

- (24) La ragione per la quale si può dire che il problema **risoloto** non è ____
 the reason for the which SI can say that the problem solved not is
‘The reason for which one can say that the problem is not solved’ (Cardinaletti 2003)

Stylistic Fronting and Discourse

The cross-linguistic variation is also considerable w.r.t. the discourse effects of SF: whereas SF in Icelandic is generally claimed to be a semantically/pragmatically vacuous movement, SF in Romance languages is often related to different types of information-structural functions.

Sigurðsson, as late as in 2010, maintains the dominant view w.r.t. Icelandic: “SF often has (formal) stylistic flavor to it, but it does not correlate with propositional semantics, [...] it generally has vague or even non-detectable semantic effects” (Sigurðsson 2010b). The fact that there is “no focusing involved” in SF in Icelandic is illustrated by Thráinsson (2007) and Holmberg (2005) by the following examples:

(25) **Komið** höfðu ___ margir stúdentar á bókasafnið...
come (sup.) had many students to library
‘There had come many students to the library.’ Thráinsson (2007)

(26) **Fram** hefur komið ___ að **fiskað** hefur verið ___ í leyfisleysi...
forth has come that fished has been illegally
‘It has been revealed that illegal fishing has taken place ...’ (Holmberg 2005)

The claim of semantic/pragmatic vacuity of SF in Icelandic is also supported by the fact that impersonal Icelandic sentences (26’a) and (26’b) allow for an alternation with the expletive. According to Holmberg (2005:20) SF can be regarded as a kind of expletive movement: “The category fronted by SF is an expletive in its derived position:”

(26’) a. **Fram** hefur komið ___ að ...
forth has come that
b. **Það** hefur komið fram að ...
EX has come forth that
(Holmberg 2005)

On the other hand, concerning the discourse effects of SF in Modern and Old Romance languages and varieties, it is often claimed in the literature that SF expresses a kind of emphasis and is either bound to focus or to topic interpretation.

The Sardinian data in main and embedded sentences with obligatory focus on the fronted participle (27) and (28) indicate that SF has the same information-structural interpretation as Focus movement:

(27) **Arrivatu** est ___ a sa festa.
arrived is at the party
‘He has arrived to the party.’ (Jones 1993)

- (28) Appo natu ki **arrivatos** sun _____ ...
 have sg.1. s aid that arrived 3ps. are 3ps.
'I said that they have arrived...' (Jones 1993)

The overlap of SF with Focus movement in Sardinian is corroborated by the fact that the SF-fronted element must be a narrow focus and cannot be part of an “all-focus” sentence (29b) answering the question What happened in (29a):³

- (29) (Context:
 Ad una festa: improvvisamente tutti sono agitati.
 at a party: suddenly all are upset.
'At a party: Suddenly everybody are upset.')
- a. It' est sutzèriu?
 what is happened
'What happened?'
- b. ***Arribau** est Gianni
 arrived is John
'John has arrived.'

In a context (30a), where the past participle is supposed to provide the new information contained in (30b), SF-fronting of the “narrow focus” seems, however, quite unproblematic:

- (30) (Context:
 Ad una festa: molti sono arrivati ma non vedo Giovanni.
 at a party many are arrived but not see John
'At a party: Many people have arrived but I don't see John.')
- a. **Aundi** est Gianni?
 where is John
'Where is John?'
- b. **Arribau** est!
 arrived is
'He has arrived!'

Concerning SF in Old Catalan, Fischer and Alexiadou (2001:127) argue that “SF in Old Catalan contributes to information structure” and describe this contribution as “emphatic affirmation.” In their view SF is used “in order to express something which needs to be emphasised, which is un-

³ The Sardinian data in examples (29) and (30) were collected by Verner Egerland.

Stylistic Fronting and Discourse

expected/unforeseen or outstanding in the development of the text.” They illustrate their claim with the following example:

(31) Context:
 Longament consider lo hermit en la demanda que li hac feta Félix ...
 long considered the hermit in the question that him had.3sg made Félix
 ‘For a long time the hermit considered the question that Felix had asked him...’

(32) Continuation:
 Fèlix, se meravell à del hermità
 Fèlix ref. surprised of the hermit
 com no li responia a la demanda [que feta li havie _]
 how not him answered to the question that made him had.3.sg
 ‘Felix was surprised that the hermit did not answer him to the question he had asked him.’
 (Fischer and Alexiadou 2001)⁴

According to Fischer and Alexiadou (2001:127) the preposed element *feta* clearly indicates the emphasis of the unforeseen – in the given context the fact that *Fèlix* had not expected that the hermit would not be able to answer his question: “In our interpretation the inverse word-order here, clearly emphasizes the surprise *Fèlix* felt, and the reader feels” (ibid:127f.). However, the analysis of the information structure of this example – and thereby also the discourse interpretation of the SF moved constituent – is not convincing: The surprise is rather motivated by the polarity of the sentence (32) and consequently, the emphasis should be related to the negation adverb *no*.

Mathieu (2006) also claims that SF in Old-French has significance for discourse interpretation, its discourse effects are, however, related to the notion of Topic. The relevant examples are taken from different texts – verse (19) and prose (20). It is worth noting though that the SF moved constituents with topic status are phrases in these cases:

(33) S’ont trovee la sale overte qui [de tiules]_i estoit coverte t_i
 self-have.3PL found the room open that of tiles be.PAST.3SG covered
 ‘They found the room open whose roof was covered with tiles.’
 (Le Chevalie la Charrette 991–992, Mathieu 2006)

(34) Quant les dames et les damoiselles qui [avec le reine]_i estoient assises t_i
 when the ladies and the young-girls who with the queen be.PAST.3PL sat
 ‘When the ladies and the young girls who sat with the queen.’ (Mathieu 2006)

⁴ Examples (31) and (32) are taken from “Llibre de Meravelles” by Ramón Llull (1288).

Concerning the evaluation of the discourse effects of SF in Romance and Scandinavian, there is a considerable agreement in the literature: The dominant view in Scandinavian linguistics is that the trigger of SF is some version of EPP, requiring that the Spec,TP-position of finite clauses be filled – if not by the thematic subject or an expletive pronoun, then by a category fronted by SF. SF in Romance is generally claimed to have information-structural functions which are subject to cross-linguistic variation: as discussed above, the expression of “emphatic affirmation” in Old-Catalan, focusing in Sardinian and topicality in Old-French are suggested as possible functions. The difference w.r.t. the information-structural behavior of SF in Scandinavian and Romance is thus widely accepted in SF-research. Comparative studies analysing the parametric differences between the two language groups in detail also contribute to this picture by relating the different syntactic properties of SF to differences w.r.t. its discourse behavior (cf. Fischer and Alexiadou 2001, Franco 2009).

But are the discourse effects of SF in Romance and Scandinavian as different as claimed in the literature, i.e. is SF necessarily focus- or topic-related in Romance and semantically and pragmatically vacuous in Scandinavian? Or is it plausible to assume that SF can have different discourse properties within the same language (group) – and if the answer is positive, which types of interpretations can be identified? Last but not least, for a study looking at the Interface between Syntax and Information Structure, it is essential to ask whether different discourse effects of SF in the same language could be justified by different structural configurations.

In order to answer the above questions, the discourse effects of SF in Icelandic will be scrutinized and revisited in sections 4, 5 and 6, leading to a new proposal accounting for at least two syntactically distinct SF-types with different interpretive properties. In a later section (section 7) the parametric differences between Scandinavian and Romance will be discussed in order to show that SF in the two languages has considerable similarities concerning its discourse interpretation.

4. The Discourse Effects of SF – Solutions?

The main challenge in the analysis of the discourse relevance of SF in Icelandic is to explain the apparently contradictory SF-behavior:

- i. On the one hand, it is desirable to account for the information-structural “neutrality” of SF, i.e. the rather common cases with “reconstruction effects” which also provide the main motivation for Holmberg’s analysis of Stylistic fronting as a PF-phenomenon.⁵
- ii. On the other hand, it is necessary to explain the possibility or necessity of emphasis/focus in certain cases and thereby also to solve Holmberg’s problem/dilemma.

According to the proposal made in this paper both tasks are possible by splitting SF in Icelandic into two types: Fronting and Inversion. First, I will argue that these two types have different discourse effects: For Stylistic Inversion focusing and emphasis are not necessary, yet possible (a

⁵ According to Holmberg (2005:34) “[t]he fronted constituent ... is presumably ‘reconstructed’ in the sense that it is interpreted in its pre-movement position.”

claim which is compatible with Mailing's and Holmberg's analyses), whereas Stylistic Fronting (in the sense defined here) bears obligatory contrastive accent. Second, I claim that the observed interpretational difference is due to syntactic differences. Third, it seems reasonable to assume semantic and/or discourse visibility and relevance in both cases.

The present proposal is based on earlier approaches distinguishing different fronting types in verb-second (V2) languages. Since all Scandinavian languages belong to this language type the distinction of fronting operations is highly relevant for the analysis of SF. Several works within the generative framework argue that "Fronting" in V2-languages (e.g. in case of German filling the so-called "prefield") is not a unitary phenomenon (cf. Frey 2006, also Fanselow 2002, Bhatt 1999). According to Frey's view the prefield in German can be filled in different ways and movement comes in two varieties: (i) In case of "Formal movement" the highest constituent of the middle field is moved into the prefield preserving whatever pragmatic property the constituent has "acquired" in the middle field." (ii) The other type of fronting – a "true" A-bar-movement – goes together with an obligatory contrastive interpretation of the moved item. In contrast to Formal Movement, this movement does not need to observe the locality restrictions. Formal movement requiring the highest constituent in the middle field can be applied both to base generated and scrambled phrases. According to Frey the unmarked case is when base generated items are moved by FM, which Frey illustrates with examples (35a) and (35b). Since the base position of the frame adverbial is the highest position of the middle field (shown in 35a), this sentence is unmarked. After applying FM to the frame adverbial the resulting sentence (35b) is also unmarked simply because (35a) is unmarked.

- (35) a. (dass) fast überall Jungen gerne Fußball spielen
that almost everywhere boys gladly soccer play
'that boys like to play soccer almost everywhere'
- b. Fast überall₁ spielen t₁ Jungen gerne Fußball.
almost everywhere play boys gladly soccer
'Almost everywhere, boys like to play soccer.'

As Frey points out, FM in German (a language with basic OV-order) can also be applied to a scrambled phrase if the scrambled phrase occupies the highest position in the middle field. However, a constituent which is scrambled to the highest position in the middle field (shown in 36b) induces pragmatic markedness, i.e. it cannot constitute a part of a maximal focus domain. It can either be interpreted as backgrounded or in special cases as contrastive focus. But if a scrambled phrase is moved to the prefield by FM – as is the case in (36c) – the markedness status of the construction will be preserved:

- (36) a. (dass) Otto mit der Axt den Baum gefällt hat
 that Otto with the ax the tree chopped has
'(that) Otto cut down the tree with the axe'
- b. (dass) mit der Axt_{t1} Otto t₁ den Baum gefällt hat
 that with the ax Otto the tree chopped has
'(that) Otto used the axe to cut down the tree'
- c. Mit der Axt_{t1} hat t₁ Otto t₁ den Baum gefällt
 with the ax has Otto the tree chopped
'Using the axe Otto cut down the tree'

On the other hand, the application of the true A-bar-movement has quite different interpretive consequences and is always bound to contrast. True A-bar movement is the only way for certain elements (like predicative phrases, modal adverbials) to target the prefield since these elements cannot be scrambled and thus cannot get to the highest position of the middle field (see the ungrammatical examples 37a and 38a). Movement of a predicative (in 37b) and a modal adverbial (in 38b) into the prefield always results in a marked (contrastive) reading of the fronted elements:

- (37) a.* dass Maria grün₁ die Tür t₁ streichen wird
 that Maria green the door paint will
'that Maria will paint the door green'
- b. Grün wird Maria die Tür streichen.
 green will Maria the door paint
'Maria will paint the door GREEN.'
- (38) a.*dass Otto unfreundlich₁ sehr oft t₁ gewirkt hat
 that Otto unfriendly very often seemed has
'that Otto often came across as unfriendly'
- b. Unfreundlich hat Otto sehr oft gewirkt.
 unfriendly has Otto very often seemed
'Otto often came across as unfriendly.'

The main syntactic difference between Formal Movement and true A-bar-movement is thus that in the former case the movement from IP to Spec,CP is EPP driven and is restricted by locality requirements (Minimal Link, cf. also Attract Closest) whereas the latter can move (cyclically) any constituent in the middle field to the prefield without locality restrictions. Crucially, the syntactic difference has interpretive consequences according to Frey's claim: Formal Movement has no semantic and pragmatic effect in contrast to true-A-bar movement which always induces a contrastive interpretation of the moved item (cf. Frey 2006:241).

5. Rethinking the Functional Load of SF in Icelandic – The Proposal in Detail

Inspired by Frey's analysis of Fronting in German it will be suggested in this work that Stylistic Fronting in Icelandic (and in Scandinavian languages) should be divided into two types, which are not primarily based on the types of the moved categories or on the different target positions (as argued for in previous "hybrid analyses") but on the derivation type of fronting. The most important claims of this article concerning the syntax and discourse behavior of Stylistic Fronting in Icelandic can be summarized as follows:

1. The target position of Stylistic Fronting is Spec,TP which is to be regarded as a mixed A- and A-bar position. Assuming like "Chomsky (2008) that A-chains (triggered by attraction by T) and A'-chains (triggered by attraction by C) are fronted simultaneously when both enter the derivation ... entails that C can raise A'-moved subjects directly from their base position (Spec,v) since the chain formed by T raising the subject to its specifier is invisible to C" (Ott 2009:168). Spec,TP can thus not only host the subject but in case C extracts subjects directly (T and C being "parallel probes"), Spec,TP can also attract different XPs.
2. Filling the Spec,TP position by Stylistic movement is, however, not a unitary phenomenon since this movement shows both syntactic and interpretive differences. This motivates the Stylistic Fronting split into (i) a movement called "true" Stylistic Fronting not restricted by locality requirements and obligatorily inducing emphasis and contrast, and (ii) a type called Stylistic Inversion locally strictly restricted and not necessarily bound to emphasis.
3. Concerning the syntactic differences between the two kinds of stylistic operations it is, however, relevant not to equate fronting of DPs and PPs with true Stylistic Fronting and the movement of head-like elements with Stylistic Inversion. In OV-languages represented by the Old-Scandinavian varieties, Stylistic inversion was namely not only available for predicative elements but also for phrases, although this option does not exist in Modern Scandinavian (due to its basic VO-order, see below). Thus crucially, it is not the category of the moved element but the type of derivation that decides the discourse properties of stylistic movement, even though this is not apparent in Modern Scandinavian. In languages with a basic VO-order only true Stylistic fronting can apply to phrases motivated by the invisibility of vP periphery in the derivation, whereas predicative elements can undergo Stylistic Inversion.
4. As to the interpretive properties of different kinds of stylistic movement the main claim is that this type of movement cannot be reduced to a movement fulfilling only the EPP requirement associated with the empty subject position applied and thereby applied at the Phonological Form as claimed by Holmberg (2000), (2005). This claim is supported by the following arguments:

- a. The distinction of true vs. formal movement – motivated by the different relevance of locality constraints in the two instances – contributes to an empirically adequate account of the functional load of SF:
 - i. The discourse effect of the stylistic movement operation is dependent on the movement type: Contrast/emphasis is obligatory in case of Stylistic Fronting.
 - ii. Emphasis – connected to Focusing and contrast is also possible in case of Stylistic Inversion.
- b. The target position of the stylistic movement is also subject to discourse constraints in the sense that it is “coherence-” (“C”)-related.
- c. Further, also semantic constraints are operative since only meaningful elements can be stylistically moved, and this movement is also related to scope differences or has specificity effect (connected to “C-relatedness”).

In the following discussion the above arguments will be taken up in more detail.

5.1. The Discourse Effects of SF are Dependent on SF-Syntax

For the kind of SF defined here as a true A-bar movement and illustrated by examples (39) and (40) the claim of an obligatory contrast effect seems plausible:

(39) Peir sem í Óslo hafa búið ___ segja að
 those that in Oslo have lived say that
‘Those who lived in Oslo say that...’ (Holmberg 2005)

(40) Peir sem þá erfiðu ákvörðun verði að taka___
 those that that difficult decision have to take
‘those who have to take this difficult decision’ (Hrafnbjargarson 2003)

In the above examples, SF applies to phrases where the PP (in 39) and the DP (in 40) reaches the empty subject position in a much more complicated way than typical for predicative elements. According to the “phase theory” of Chomsky, phrases (complement XPs) which start out as sisters of V in VP must be moved first to the outer edge of vP in order to be available to further operations. This derivation is possible if one assumes that v can be optionally endowed with an EPP-property that triggers this movement to the vP-edge (cf. Ott 2009). Ott emphasizes that SF of complements, which he regards as parasitic on this edge-driven movement, still corresponds to the locality requirements of SF. This is because the moved XP and the vP are equidistant from T after the movement of XP to the outer edge of vP, being sisters and neither asymmetrically c-commanding the other. Importantly, movement of predicative elements is also analysed by Ott as an instance of phrase movement (“remnant movement”) “with evacuation movement of the object triggered by vP’s edge property” (2009:158). This explains why moving of XPs or predica-

- (44) ... sem **GERT** hafa ____ eitthvað, en ekki bara talað. (Holmberg 2005)

Last but not least it should be mentioned that the SF-moved predicative items can also remain unaccented – either in information-structurally unmarked cases (with a maximal focus domain) justified by the presence of a complement in the clause which bears the nuclear accent or in marked cases where the absence of accent is due to backgrounding of the SF-constituent in the given context. Example (45) where *drukkið* is unaccented is compatible with both readings: The neutral reading of the sentence in an unspecified context or the reading where the lack of accent with backgrounding effect is available if the sentence serves as an answer to the underlying or explicit question: What have those drunk that can understand what you feel? Cf.:

- (45) Peir sem **drukkið** hafa ____ bjór skilja hvernig mér liður núna
 those that drunk have ale understand how I feel now
'Those who have drunk ale understand how I feel now.'

An SF-moved participle can also remain unaccented after a superlative (like after *versta bók* in example 46) which normally bears the emphasis (and focus) of the sentence:

- (46) Þetta er versta bók sem **skrifuð** hefur verið.
 this is worst book that written has been
'This is an issue that has been discussed.' (Holmberg 2005)

All mentioned above discourse features of the stylistically moved predicative elements could be accounted for if we adopt Frey's analysis of EPP-driven fronting also for SF. Crucially, this stylistic movement could without any problem qualify as a kind of "Formal movement," since here the moved item in its basic position is adjacent to the finite verb and the locality restrictions are thus also operative in a visible way. This kind of stylistic operation represents a case which could be called Stylistic Inversion. In addition to satisfying the syntactic requirements for Formal Movement the typical discourse properties of this movement – i.e. the variation in the discourse interpretation (the potential, but not obligatory, accent and focus/contrast effect) – is also present. Holmberg's claim (2005:16), according to which stylistic fronting of e.g. participles and PPs "do not necessarily differ in terms of focus or other discourse semantic properties," thus seems to be only partly correct: Although both types of stylistic fronting can have emphasis (and this makes them similar), emphasis is only optional on SF-moved (formally moved, inverted) predicative elements since – as discussed above – true stylistic fronting obligatorily requires emphasis.

5.2. Discourse Constraints on the Target Position of SF

The target position of stylistic movement is also subject to discourse constraints in the sense that it is "coherence-" ("C-") related. Crucially, even though stylistic movement is EPP-related in

most cases it is functionally not unrestricted. According to the approach presented in (Molnár and Winkler 2009) preferably “C-marked” (coherence establishing) elements are moved to the left edge position of CP and TP (cf. the “C-Constraint” or “Coherence-Constraint”). As argued by Molnár and Winkler, “C-marking” is not only justified by contextual givenness (identity or similarity of entities), typical for themes and topics, but also by contrast where (despite the non-identity of entities) relatedness to an identical set or scale is required. Contrast – both in case of contrastive topics and contrastive foci – thus has a decisive role in establishing coherence in discourse, similarly to givenness (and often combined with it). The proposed “C-Constraint” also predicts the ungrammaticality and inappropriateness of the Stylistic movement of non-C-marked elements, which is typical for non-contrastive (narrow) focus. Focus constituents in SpecCP or SpecTP integrated into a larger (or maximal) focus domain typical in all-new utterances are, however, acceptable since default C-marking is assumed in these cases.

Evidence for the influence of the “C-Constraint” on SF is the fact that emphatic cases – not restricted to “true” Stylistic fronting – always require a contrast-inducing context. Hrafnbjargarson (2003) points out regarding Focusing of an SF-moved past participle *lesnar* in (47) that it is only adequate if the sentence is “contrasted with a situation where books have not been read” and *lesnar* is either a contrastive focus or verum focus. Example (48) without SF where *lesnar* is focused should, on the other hand, be acceptable without contrast, sentence (48) is regarded by Hrafnbjargarson (2003:161) only as “a description about books being read:”

(47) **Lesnar** hafa verið _____ bækur.
 read have been books
 ‘Books have been read.’

(48) Bækur hafa verið **lesnar**.
 books have been read
 ‘Books have been read.’

(Hrafnbjargarson 2003)

According to the judgment of three Icelandic informants the explicit marking of the contrastive context in the main clause renders a higher degree of acceptability of SF in the relative clause: Hrafnbjargarson’s (2003) original example *Hann syndi mér flöskurnar sem smyglað hafði verið inn* modified by the use of negation and the demonstrative pronomen *þær* (“those”) in example (49) and completed with the focus particle *bara* (“only”) in example (50) received one question mark, whereas example (51) with the focus particle *bara* and the demonstrative pronomen *þær* – guaranteeing the optimal delimitation of the relevant group from all others – was judged best:

(49) [?] Hann syndi mér bara flöskurnar sem **smyglað** hafði verið inn.
 he showed me onlybottles-the that smuggled had been in
 ‘He showed me only the bottles that had been smuggled.’

- (50) ? Hann syndi mér ekki þær flöskur sem **smyglað** hafði verið inn.
 he showed me not those bottles that smuggled had been in
'He did not show me those bottles that had been smuggled.'
- (51) Hann syndi mér bara þær flöskur sem **smyglað** hafði verið inn.
 he showed me only those bottles that smuggled had been in
'He showed me only those bottles that had been smuggled.'

The “C-Constraint” can be assumed to be operative even in cases of stylistic fronting of DP where the specificity requirement indicates the necessity of the contextual anchoring of the SF-moved phrase. This requirement for SF was pointed out by Holmberg (2005:24-25) “...there is some evidence that the fronted category, if it is an DP, cannot be nonspecific” and illustrated by example (52):

- (52) hundurinn sem **minkinn/*minka** drap ____
 the.dog.N that the.minkminks.A killed
'the dog who killed the mink' (Holmberg 2005)

The specificity requirement in (52) was, however, regarded by Holmberg as a problematic case and as “an exception to the generalization that SF has no semantic effect.”

5.3. The Semantic Effects of SF – Semantic Restrictions

If one adopts the view that both cases of Stylistic Fronting – both Stylistic Inversion and true Stylistic Fronting – have pragmatic and/or semantic effects and/or are restricted by semantic and pragmatic constraints, the above-mentioned case is predicted. Moreover, another problem in Holmberg’s analysis – the fact that SF is only possible with contentful verbal elements and auxiliaries cannot be SF-moved – can also be accounted for:

- (53) þetta er versta bók sem **skrifuð** hefur verið ____
 this is worst book that written has been
'This is the worst book that has been written.'
- (54) * þetta er versta bók sem **verið** hefur ____ skrifuð
 this is worst book that been has written
'This is the worst book that has been written.' (Holmberg 2005)

The claim made by Hrafnbjargarson that SF is relevant for scope interpretation is also consistent with the proposal of the present work to not regard SF as a pure PF-phenomenon. According to Hrafnbjargarson (2003) the negation in (55) without SF is not (necessarily) contrastive, in con-

sitions, a Spec- and a head-position in the Focus projection. But several questions are unsatisfactorily answered and problems remain unsolved in this approach:

- i. How to account for cases of SF without focusing? Hrafnbjargarson's proposal according to which the checking of the Focus feature is "open for either an expletive or a stylistically fronted XP" where the expletive is regarded as "a semantically empty focus element that is inserted into FocusF-Spec to check the focus feature on F^o" (Hrafnbjargarson 2003:164) seems rather ad hoc.
- ii. The fact that focusing is not obligatorily contrastive (as pointed out by Molnár 2006 among others), but in SF narrow focus is always bound to contrast is not taken into consideration.
- iii. There is no clear evidence for a split C-domain in V2-languages, even though recent works of Hrafnbjargarson and Wiklund seem on a promising path in this direction (cf. Hrafnbjargarson and Wiklund 2009).
- iv. The main syntactic requirements of SF – the locality constraints and the subject gap condition – are definitely not present in Focus movement, which strengthens the impression that the parallel syntactic analysis of these two movements is not convincing.

As argued above, the claim of discourse relevance and the possibility of Focusing in case of SF can be integrated into an approach where SF is regarded as a special type of syntactic operation in Icelandic. The claim of the present work is thus that not only should SF be distinguished from Focus movement but also from Topicalization, both on structural and functional grounds. This claim is partly consistent with Maling's original analysis where especially the distinction between SF and Topicalization was introduced and argued for even though the differences between SF and Topicalization w.r.t. their discourse interpretation were further elaborated on in the present work. Topicalization and SF are thus still regarded as two different syntactic movements, not distinguished primarily by the type of the moved category but rather by the difference w.r.t. the role of the empty subject position and the accessibility hierarchy (cf. section 2). Functionally, however, the two movement types seem to be more closely related, as recognized by Maling, even if they differ w.r.t. their "typical" function. The main discourse differences should thus not be located between Stylistic Fronting and Topicalization but along the line "formal" vs. "true" movement, both in the case of Topicalization and Stylistic movement. This analysis consequently subsuming contradicts a previous claim by Rögnvaldsson and Thráinsson (1990:28), according to which "[TOP and SF] are syntactically a unified process, even though they are certainly different functionally[...]," emphasizing the syntactic similarities between SF and Topicalization and also subsuming SF to Topicalization.

7. Comparing Scandinavian and Romance – Parametric Differences

Hitherto, the syntactic and functional analysis of SF concentrated on the Icelandic data and the proposal made above in section 5 can only be related to Scandinavian languages. From a cross-

linguistic perspective there are still two important issues which should be addressed in order to answer the key questions regarding SF presented in the introduction.

The main issues relating to language comparison are

- i. WHY SF or SI are needed at all, and whether it is possible to reach a cross-linguistically valid generalization w.r.t to the interpretive effects of these syntactic operations in different languages, and
- ii. HOW SF or SI are possible in different languages, i.e. whether there are common prerequisites of the stylistic movement in Romance and Scandinavian justifying its separation from Topicalization and Focusing in both language groups.

Concerning the issue of “WHY,” i.e. the effects of SF, it is an uncontroversial fact that it results in establishing an OV-configuration. This explains the fact that SF is more natural in languages or language varieties with a basic OV-order (like in the Old Scandinavian languages, e.g. Old Icelandic and Old Swedish), and in languages with “only” residual OV (Romance languages and Modern Icelandic) it is not only less frequent but also more “archaic.” Another function of SF is related to the Verb-second property: “[...] this kind of fronting can [...] be viewed as a generalization of V2 to clauses that would otherwise begin with the finite verb” (Maling 1980:71).

As to the issue of “HOW” the subject gap condition seems to have the highest priority and is regarded (together with the accessibility hierarchy) as the most important structural prerequisite of SF. The possibility and the frequency of the subject gap providing a target position for SF is related to certain parametric properties of languages: (i) To rich agreement and V^o-to-I^o-movement: The checking of the phi features in I^o is necessary and can only be satisfied by verbal morphology (subject-agreement suffixes) if there is no nominal element in the subject position; (ii) to the pro drop property which licences a subject in SpecIP without overt realization and makes a subject gap possible also in main clauses with any subject.

Interestingly, the discussion of the cross-linguistic differences and their significance for SF in linguistic research quite often takes not only the synchronic but also the diachronic perspective into consideration. This is understandable if one keeps in mind that SF has changed character in most cases after a parametric change (w.r.t. V2, OV, pro drop) in the development of many languages. As pointed out in the introductory chapter of this paper, SF is – in contrast to the massive use of SF in Old Scandinavian and Romance – productive to only a minor extent or no longer productive in the modern Scandinavian and Romance varieties. Among the Scandinavian languages today SF is only relevant in Icelandic although it is also present to a minor extent in Faroese (cf. Hrafnbjargarson 2003, Thráinsson 2007). Concerning Modern Romance, it is a controversial question whether SF is productive at all: Franco (2009) argues against Cardinaletti’s proposal that SF is still attested in Italian. Fronting participles to the left edge in Sardinian is, however, also regarded as an instance of SF by Jones (2003) as discussed above (see subsection 3.2.).

According to Franco, the loss of SF in Mainland Scandinavian and in Romance languages has different causes: In Romance the loss of V2, in Mainland Scandinavian the loss of null subjects. The specific diachronic variations and changes in Scandinavian and Romance on the one

hand and the differences between the two language groups on the other, are thus closely related to these properties. In addition to the above-mentioned structural properties Franco emphasizes also the importance of OV-order in a V2-grammar.

The following discussion will show how the parametric differences and similarities between the two language groups and different developmental stages affect SF. After summarizing the synchronic and diachronic variation in (57) the comparative analysis will focus on the relevant parameters in more detail.

(57)	Parametric differences			
	ROMANCE			SCANDINAVIAN
	Old	→ Modern		Old → Modern
	1. VO/OV	→ OV?		OV → residual OV
	2. relaxed V2	→ non V2		V2
	3. asymmetric pro drop	→ full pro drop		partial pro drop
	(main clauses)	(main + subord. clauses)		(drop of expletives)

7.1. Parametric Difference w.r.t. V2

The dominant claim regarding Scandinavian languages, including Old and Modern varieties, in research are that they all belong to the V2-language type and show a “strict” V2-order. A somewhat different proposal is made in recent work of Hrfanbjargarson and Wiklund (2009), who argue against this view on the basis of Modern Icelandic data. Examples from Early Runic and Old Norse (cf. Eythórsson 1996, Faarlund 2008 referred to in Franco 2009) also serve as evidence for a more relaxed V2 in Scandinavian. It is, however, uncontroversial that V2 has a greater significance in Scandinavian languages than in Romance: According to Franco’s claim, Old Romance languages have a “relaxed type” of V2 order since more than one element can precede the finite verb in the C-domain. V2 is asymmetric, though, since the verb moves to the CP only in main clauses, not in subordinate ones. (As Franco also points out, this explains why pro-drop is not licensed in subordinate clauses where overt subject pronouns are found instead.) V2 is, however, lost in Modern Romance languages, including Modern Italian which is thus a non V2-language.

In the generative framework the above mentioned differences w.r.t. the V2-property between languages and/or developmental stages are accounted for in the following way: V2 in (Old) Scandinavian means that after the V° -to- I° movement into the C-domain, movement of I° to C° is required. Concerning Old Catalan with the Romance-type of V2 (relaxed V2 or non-V2), Fischer and Alexiadou (2001) suggest an additional movement into the so-called Σ° -projection located between IP and CP, for hosting the SF-moved constituent with emphatic reading. According to their analysis, the operation of SF in Old Catalan is therefore to be regarded as a head movement I° -to- Σ° (in contrast to XP-movement in Scandinavian) differing from SF in Scandinavian both w.r.t. syntax and information structure (cf. subsection 3.1. above). For the analysis

of SF in Old Italian, Franco makes a different proposal following Rizzi's "Split-CP model" (Rizzi 1997): SF can target certain functional projections within the C-domain containing ForceP, TopicP, FocusP ModP, FinP (in this order) before the SubjP.

A very interesting aspect of Franco's analysis is that she shows on the basis of an extensive empirical investigation that different positions – and consequently also different interpretive options – are available for stylistically fronted elements in Old Italian. Although her analysis is restricted to the examination of SF in "unmarked" cases, her data and conclusions are novel. The restriction to fronting of predicative elements (e.g. participles, infinitives) seemed necessary, primarily in order to avoid the problem of apparent overlap between SF and Focus movement or Topic movement in case of fronting of phrases. Franco's examples taken from three Old Italian corpora show, based mainly on evidence from the placement of clitics, that there are two different target positions for stylistically fronted predicative elements in the CP-field of Old Italian: ModP and FinP (located in the following way: (FocP >) ModP > FinP (> SubjP)). Nominal predicates and adjectives target (parasitically) ModP in the CP domain, a non-quantificational position which according to Rizzi (2001) is dedicated to adverb preposing. Elements in this position bear emphatic stress and thus have a different interpretation than participles and infinitives, which are located in FinP after stylistic movement (and are more frequent in subordinate contexts). She argues that the distinction of (at least) two types of SF is required since they differ not only with respect to syntax (targeting different positions and showing different frequency in main and subordinate clauses) but also functionally. They check different features at different structural levels and this fact explains why they are differently available in main and subordinate clauses: SF to ModP is preferred in main clauses, to FinP in subordinated contexts. And importantly, they are also bound to different interpretations: she argues that emphatic stress is only required in case of movement to ModP). Although the details of her analysis w.r.t. information structure must be worked out in more detail her proposal of SF-split shows interesting similarities to the analysis of SF suggested for Icelandic in this paper.

7.2. Parametric Difference w.r.t. the Basic Word Order (OV vs. VO)

Another significant parametric difference between Romance and Scandinavian and between different stages of these languages, can be traced back to the setting of the OV–VO-parameter. The relevance of OV for stylistic movement is connected to the "easier" frontability of different lexical elements from the lower phrasal domain which in the basic OV-configuration are locally closer to the SF-probe (cf. Franco 2010).

With respect to the basic word order the main differences are not between Romance and Scandinavian, but instead related to the availability of OV in the older and modern varieties of these languages. As pointed out in works on Old Romance, OV is a frequent configuration despite the VO-character of these languages. OV seems possible for any type of constituents (arguments, adverbials, verbal modifiers) with "lack of specialization" typical of left peripheral positions (Poletto 2006). According to Egerland (1996), OV results from direct object agreement,

i.e. object movement to AgrOP in Old Italian. In Modern Romance, OV is more restricted and residual OV is regarded as typical for the literary register (cf. Egerland 2010).

Scandinavian languages, which are originally all OV-languages have, however, lost the OV-property to a greater extent than Romance. As mentioned above in the introductory section, SF was quite frequent in e.g. Old Swedish, partly due to its OV-character. There is one relevant exception, though, as to the presence of OV in Modern Scandinavian, namely Icelandic. Icelandic preserved a basic OV much longer than other Scandinavian languages and turned to VO as late as 1800. As argued by Poletto (2006), the importance of OV order in a V2 grammar is related to the active status and visibility of the low vP periphery at the end of the main phrase, causing the locally restricted “formal” version of SF to be much more easily available in an OV language. The late change of OV to VO in Icelandic and Iceland’s influential literary tradition contribute to the “activity” of OV-order in Modern Icelandic. SF can be regarded as an excellent means in Icelandic for reconstructing the traditional OV-configuration and give an archaic flavour to sentences where the structural requirements of SF can be satisfied (cf. also Egerland 2010).

7.3. Parametric Difference w.r.t. to the Subject Gap

Last but not least the parametric differences with respect to the pro-drop property explain the contrast between Romance and Scandinavian w.r.t. the subject gap. As discussed above in section 3.2. SF in Scandinavian is only possible where no visible overt subject is present in the subject position whereas overt subjects are not necessarily obstacles to SF in Romance. The subject gap can be attested in these languages in main clauses with definite subjects preceding the empty subject position, leading to a completely unthinkable SF-configuration in Scandinavian.

The explanation of these empirical facts seems, however, quite simple if the combined effect of the different setting of the pro-drop parameter in combination with differences w.r.t. V2 is taken into consideration. As Franco (2010) points out, Old Italian shows an asymmetric pro-drop pattern where pro-drop can only be licensed in main clauses by the V-to-C-movement. However, in subordinate clauses without verb movement to C, SF licenses subject extraction (and pro-drop). Full pro-drop in Modern Italian makes the subject position without an overt subject possible in both main and subordinate clauses and as such creates optimal conditions (at least w.r.t. pro-drop) for SF.

In contrast to Italian, pro-drop is much more restricted in Icelandic and can apply only in case of expletive subjects (cf. Sigurðsson 2010a). The pro-drop property of Romance is thus essential for creating empty subject positions in more types of environments (both in main and subordinate clauses) than is the case in e.g. modern Scandinavian languages where SF typically appears in subordinated clauses (see section 1 above). The restriction on cooccurrence of a raised subject and an SF-constituent in Icelandic requires, however, that the setting of the V2 parameter also be taken into consideration. As argued in the literature, this restriction is due to constraints on V2 (cf. Cardinaletti 2003, Franco 2009, 2010). Since in non-V2 languages more subject projections are available, SF is possible with realized definite subjects in Italian.

7.4. Rethinking of the Interpretive Effects of SF in Romance and Scandinavian

The frequency of SF and its importance in Romance and Scandinavian is linked to the above-mentioned parametric differences in the literature. The positive setting of the pro-drop parameter contributes to a wider availability of vacant subjects positions required for SF, and the OV-property of languages creates symmetry between the high left periphery (CP) and the low one (vP), enabling the frontability of SF-moved elements (by observing the locality restrictions of movements). Finally, the differences w.r.t. the V2-parameter contribute to the difference in the significance of the subject gap condition in the sense that overt subjects can precede the SF-moved constituent in Romance, an option which is not available in Scandinavian since fronting is restricted to a single constituent.

Also the differences w.r.t. the interpretive properties of SF are generally attributed to this latter parameter. In most approaches, verb-second in Scandinavian serves as the main motivation for the analysis according to which SF in Scandinavian is only conditioned by EPP requirements (or by the Edge Feature) without any relevance for discourse. As argued earlier in this work (cf. section 4) this proposal seems unable to account for the complexity of information-structural possibilities in Icelandic. Instead, a distinction was suggested between two different subtypes of SF that show different discourse behavior due to the different derivation of the stylistic movement. Whereas Formal movement restricted by locality constraints (also called “Stylistic Inversion”) is not necessarily bound to emphasis and contrast, “true” Stylistic Fronting requires obligatorily emphatic (contrastive) interpretation. However, as emphasized in section 5.2., both types of stylistic movements must respect the “C-Constraint.”

Concerning Romance, the split of Stylistic Fronting also seems to be supported by the empirical facts. As Franco argues, SF is not uniform in Old Italian and can have different interpretations depending on the type of features which are checked at different structural levels. Fischer and Alexiadou’s (2001) claim of discourse relevance of SF in Old-Catalan, i.e. “emphatic affirmation” as a consequence of movement to Σ P located between CP and IP and triggered by a strong Topic feature on Σ P, cannot capture all relevant interpretive options of SF in Romance. Nor can Mathieu’s (2006) analysis of Old French data, which also claims discourse relevance of SF – in this case the Topic-interpretation – be the whole story. In addition to cases which are reminiscent of “true” Stylistic Fronting in Icelandic and require emphasis, there are also cases (documented by Franco), where the function of Stylistic fronting is quite different. In these cases SF is analysed by Franco (2010:22) as “an interface requirement to license subject extraction/drop, by checking the relevant features on the lower complementizer position (FinP); cf. Sigurðsson and Maling 2008.” Following (Rizzi 2004, Rizzi and Schlosky 2006), Franco relates these cases to the Subject Criterion by which the “classical EPP,” the requirement that clauses have subjects, is restated as a criterial requirement, the Subject Criterion, formally akin to the Topic Criterion, and the Focus Criterion (cf. Franco 2009, 2010). These latter instances of SF which are reminiscent of Stylistic Inversion, indicate, however, that the dominant view on the functional load of SF in Romance should be revisited and modified.

8. Conclusion

As the comparison of the Stylistic movement in Romance and Scandinavian presented above shows, the evaluation of the functional load of SF is quite problematic in linguistic research. Mainly cases related to emphasis (with Topic or Focus interpretation) were taken into consideration in works on Romance, while research in Icelandic focused on unmarked, functionally neutral instances of SF. The exaggeration of the dominant cases regarding both language groups – in combination with unmotivated or problematic judgments – could lead to the conclusion that the discourse behavior of SF in Scandinavian and Romance languages are quite different.

The main aim of this paper was to call the parametric difference between Romance and Scandinavian w.r.t. SF into doubt – at least in those versions which were suggested in the literature – and provide a modified account for the interpretive properties of Stylistic fronting. It was argued that SF in Romance and Scandinavian is more similar than hitherto suggested in the literature, and also claimed that Stylistic movement comes in (at least) two varieties in both language groups. Despite relevant parametric differences between Romance and Scandinavian with respect to the Verb-Second Parameter, basic word order and pro-drop property, SF can have different discourse effects within the language groups in both cases. It can appear as a Formal Movement (here called Stylistic Inversion) in unmarked cases, primarily satisfying the requirements of EPP, Edge feature or “Subject Criterion,” but also respecting the “C-constraint.” “True” Stylistic Fronting with marked information-structural effect is also possible in both language groups and not restricted to the Romance languages. This proposal, based on earlier ideas on the relevance of locality restrictions for Topicalization developed within the generative framework, is also compatible with a recent analysis of SF in Old Italian suggested by Franco (2009, 2010). Another important aspect of the presented comparative approach is that the differences in the discourse function of SF within and between languages and developmental stages are – similarly to previous proposals – attributed to syntactic differences. However, not primarily the type of the SF-moved category was regarded as the main reason for the different interpretation but the differences in the derivational history and the influence of the locality constraints.

Concerning Icelandic it was argued that “true” stylistic Fronting is a contrast-related movement (with obligatory emphatic accent), whereas the discourse behavior of the locally strictly restricted Stylistic Inversion shows a greater diversity. Contrast is also optional in these cases and backgrounding (signalling “theme” status of the constituent by deaccenting) is possible, besides the unmarked cases (with a maximal focus domain) where different options for the accentuation of the fronted constituent are given (which depend on the syntactic structure, e.g. the presence of a complement, an adjunct, etc.).

The different options of SF claimed for Romance are according to this proposal also related to the syntactic differences between the SF-types. In this case the discourse interpretation is decided by the feature and its checking in different structural layers of the left periphery. SF can appear in Romance as a criterial operator movement to the higher CP-domain, which is focus related and bears obligatory accent (as is the case in Sardinian, presumably also in Italian), or as a

non-operator movement to lower projections at the left periphery, leading to different interpretational effects. The movement to ModP or FinP correlates with different prosody, and in the former case (moving predicatives, especially in V2-contexts) it is related to nuclear accent, whereas particles and infinitives typically lack an accent in the FinP-position.

The cross-linguistic analysis of SF at the interface of Narrow Syntax and Discourse Interpretation proposed in this paper leaves open many issues which should be investigated in more detail and on the basis of much more linguistic data, both from a synchronic and a diachronic perspective. However, by challenging the dominant view on the functional load of SF and claiming a more detailed distinction of functional types both in Romance and Scandinavian, the purpose of this new perspective on SF is to contribute to an empirically more adequate analysis of this phenomenon, which is necessary for further theoretical generalizations w.r.t. stylistic movement operations.

References

- Angantýsson, Ásgrímur. 2009. Stylistic Fronting and expletive insertion: Some empirical observations. Paper given at the “Maling Seminar. Ráðstefna til heiðurs Joan Maling 30” at the University Iceland. November/December 2009.
- Bhatt, Rakesh Mohan. 1999. *Verb movement and the syntax of Kashmiri*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Cardinaletti, Anna. 2003. Stylistic Fronting in Italian. In Delsing, Lars-Olof, Cecilia Falk, Gunlög Josefsson, and Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson (eds.), *Grammar in focus. Festschrift for Christer Platzack*. Lund: Wallin and Dalholm, 47-55.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On phases. In Freidin, Robert, Carlos P. Otero, and Maria-Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.), *Foundational issues in linguistic theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 133-166.
- Delsing, Lars-Olof. 2001. Stylistic Fronting. Evidence from Old Scandinavian. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 68:141-171.
- Egerland, Verner. 1996. The syntax of past participles. A generative study of nonfinite constructions in Ancient and Modern Italian. Ph.D. Dissertation. Lund University (Études Romanes de Lund 53).
- Egerland, Verner. 2010. The double basis for Stylistic Fronting. Paper given at the conference on “Focus, Contrast and Givenness in Interaction with Extraction and Deletion” at the Max-Planck Institute in Tübingen, March 2010.
- Eythórsson, Thórhallur. 1996. Functional categories, cliticization and word order in the early Germanic languages. In Thráinsson, Höskuldur, Samuel D. Epstein, and Steve Peter (eds.), *Studies in Germanic Syntax II*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 109-139.
- Faarlund, Jan Terje. 2008. *The syntax of Old Norse*. Oxford University Press.

- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2002. Quirky subjects and other specifiers. In Kaufmann, Ingrid, and Barbara Stiebels (eds.), *More Than Words*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 227-250.
- Fischer, Susann, and Artemis Alexiadou. 2001. On Stylistic Fronting: Germanic vs. Romance. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 68:117-145.
- Franco, Irene. 2009. Verbs, subjects and Stylistic Fronting. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Siena.
- Franco, Irene. 2010. Verbs, subjects and Stylistic Fronting. Talk given at the Centre for Languages and Literature in Lund, February 2010.
- Frey, Werner. 2006. The grammar-pragmatics interface and the German prefield. In Molnár, Valéria, and Susanne Winkler (eds.), *The architecture of focus*. Berlin: De Gruyter. (= Studies in Generative Syntax 82), 235-264.
- Holmberg, Anders. 2000. Scandinavian Stylistic Fronting. How any category can become an expletive. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31.3:445-483.
- Holmberg, Anders. 2005. Stylistic fronting. In Everaert, Martin, Henk van Riemsdijk, Rob Goedemans and Bart Hollebrandse (eds.), *The Blackwell companion to syntax*. Oxford: Blackwell, 530-563.
- Jones, Michael Allan. 1993. *Sardinian syntax*. New York: Routledge.
- Jónsson, Jóhannes Gísli. 1991. Stylistic Fronting in Icelandic. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 48:1-43.
- Hrafnbjargarson, Gunnar Hrafn. 2003. On Stylistic Fronting once more. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 72:153-205.
- Hrafnbjargarson, Gunnar Hrafn. 2004a. Stylistic Fronting. *Studia Linguistica* 58:88-134.
- Hrafnbjargarson, Gunnar Hrafn. 2004b. Stylistic Fronting. Paper given at SCL in Helsinki, January 2004.
- Hrafnbjargarsson, Gunnar Hrafn, and Anna-Lena Wiklund. 2009. General embedded V2: Icelandic A, B, C, etc. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 84:21-51.
- Maling, Joan. 1980. Inversion in embedded clauses in Modern Icelandic. *Íslenskt mál og almenn málfræði* 2:175-193.
- Maling, Joan. 1990. Inversion in embedded clauses in Modern Icelandic. In Maling, Joan and Annie Zaenen (eds.), *Modern Icelandic syntax*. San Diego: Academic Press, 71-91.
- Mathieu, Eric. 2006. Stylistic Fronting in Old French. *Probus* 18:219-266.
- Molnár, Valéria. 2006. On different kinds of contrast. In Molnár, Valéria, and Susanne Winkler (eds.), *The architecture of focus*. Berlin: De Gruyter. (= Studies in Generative Syntax 82), 197-233.
- Molnár, Valéria, and Susanne Winkler. 2006. Exploring the architecture of focus in grammar. In Molnár, Valéria, and Susanne Winkler (eds.), *The architecture of focus*. Berlin: De Gruyter. (= Studies in Generative Syntax 82), 1-29.
- Molnár, Valéria, and Susanne Winkler. 2009. Edges and gaps: Contrast at the interfaces. *Lingua* (Special Issue "Contrast as an Information-Structural Notion in Grammar").

Stylistic Fronting and Discourse

- Ott, Dennis. 2009. Stylistic Fronting as remnant movement. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 83:141-178.
- Platzack, Christer. 2009. Old wine in new barrels. The edge feature in C, topicalization and Stylistic Fronting. Paper given at the “Maling Seminar. Ráðstefna til heiðurs Joan Maling 30” at the University Iceland. November/December 2009.
- Poletto Cecilia 2006. Parallel phases: A study on the high and low left periphery of Old Italian. In Mara Frascarelli (ed.), *Phases of interpretation*, Vol. 91. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 261-295.
- Rizzi Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman, (ed.), *Elements of grammar*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, 281-337.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. On the position ‘Int(errogative)’ in the left periphery of the clause. In Cinque, Guglielmo, and Giampaolo Salvi (eds.), *Current studies in Italian linguistics*. Elsevier: Amsterdam, 287-296
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2004. On the form of chains: Criterial positions and ECP effects. In Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen, and Norbert Corver (eds.), *On movement*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 97-133.
- Rizzi, Luigi, and Ur Shlonsky. 2007. Strategies of subject extraction. In Gärtner, Hans-Martin, and Uli Sauerland (eds.), *Interfaces + Recursion = Language?* Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin, 115-160.
- Rögnvaldsson Eiríkur. 1996. Word order variation in the VP in Old Icelandic. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 58:55-86.
- Rögnvaldsson, Eiríkur, and Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1990. On Icelandic word order once more. In Maling, Joan, and Annie Zaenen (eds.) *Modern Icelandic syntax*. San Diego: Academic Press, 3-40.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1997. Stylistic Fronting. Ms. University of Iceland.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2010a. On EPP effects. *Studia Linguistica* 64:159-189.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2010b. On Stylistic Fronting. Paper given at the conference on “Focus, Contrast and Givenness in Interaction with Extraction and Deletion” at the Max-Planck Institute in Tübingen, March 2010.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2007. *The syntax of Icelandic*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Webelhuth, Gert, and Hans den Besten. 1987. Remnant topicalization and the constituent structure of VP in the Germanic SOV languages. Paper presented at GLOW, Venice.