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Abstract. In this article subject omission and verb initial declaratives in modern and early modern Swedish are investigated. It is illustrated that post verbal subject omission was possible only in early modern Swedish, and that verb initial declaratives from this period differ from modern verb initial declaratives in so far as only the modern ones seem to contain unpronounced material in preverbal position. Both these differences, it is argued, follow from one single difference: modern, but not early modern, Swedish has strong EPP in the sense presented in Platzack (1998b).

1. Introduction

Although Swedish is considered to be a V2-language, we nevertheless find declarative clauses with the finite verb in first position. This is true of both modern and 17th century Swedish, as shown in (1).1

1. a. Uthi siefwfe Staden boor een Visier Bassa, huvetke hûller sig mûcðata
   'In the city there lives a Visier Bassa who is very magnificent'
   prîchtig. Och kan man inttet gierna allena gå sîcker in utthi Staden [...] and can one not willingly alone go safe in city-the
   (Kitîping 1667)

1. b. De va en, nja en fullgubbe ba, ungarna hade ba, ungarna hade ba cykla
   'There was a drunk, the kids had just rode their bikes around him'
   runtan, kom hans brorsa å lappa tillan. (Kotsinas 1994:73)
   came his brother and punched to him

1I wish to thank Elisabet Engdahl for extensive and useful comments on this article. Thanks also to Christer Platzack and Benjamin Lyngfelt for valuable criticism and comments.
2 The finite verb of the relevant clause is in italics. Only the relevant part of the example is glossed; the rest is translated.
In 17th century but not in modern Swedish it is possible to omit a post verbal subject in the second conjunct of a coordinate structure. This is illustrated in (2). The omitted subjects are given in parenthesis indicating that they are phonetically unrealised.²

(2) a. Twemme af dessa Munckar fölgde oss till Wägs och
   Twome of these monks accompanied us
   and
   under Wägen wiste (de)² oss många namnkunniga Platser […]
   under way-the showed they us many famous places
   (Klöpping 1667)

   'N finished the meatballs' and then put he in a pinch snuff

The aim of this article is

(i) to investigate whether the verb initial clauses in (1a) and
(ii) to explain the fact that post verbal subjects once could, but
no longer can, be omitted in Swedish.

In section 2. subject omission is discussed, and in section 3, verb initial declarative main clauses. In section 4, an approach to the C-domain is presented that is relevant to both verb initial clauses and subject omission. In 5., finally, further implications for yes/no-questions and subordinate clauses that follow from the previous analysis are discussed.

2. Subject omission

In this section we will investigate when subjects may be omitted in Swedish main clauses. We start off looking at some analyses of verb second.

² An alternative could be to assume that the subject is a small pro (cf. e.g. Platzyck 1998a:105). Such an approach, however, makes it harder to account for omission of non-nominal constituents (cf. 3.1–3.2.).

³ In the examples from early modern Swedish the omitted subjects are given in their modern form.

2.1. The asymmetrical and the symmetrical V2-hypothesis

In the generative literature there are two basic approaches to verb second: the symmetrical analysis first formulated by den Besten (1977) and the asymmetrical one going back to Travis (1984). The essential difference between the two approaches is illustrated in (3)–(4) below.

(3) The asymmetrical V2-hypothesis

a. Han såg bordet.
   he saw table

b. Bordet såg han.
   table-the saw he

a'. [Tp Han, [c-o såg,] [vp t, t, bordet]]

b'. [c-o Bordet, [c-o såg,] [vp han, [c-o t,] [vp t, t, t]]]

(4) The symmetrical V2-hypothesis

a. [c-o Han, [c-o såg,] [vp t, t, bordet]]

b. [c-o Bordet, [c-o såg,] [vp han, [c-o t,] [vp t, t, t]]]

In the asymmetrical analysis the subject position is assumed to be the same in subject first main clauses as well as in inverted clauses, spec-IP above. The main reason for this assumption is that weak subject pronouns in Dutch and German may be clause initial, but weak object pronouns may not as we can see in the Dutch examples from Zwart (1994:5) in (5a) and (5b).⁴

(5) a. Ze/Zij komen.
   they-weak/strong come

b. *Ze/Hen ken ik niet.
   they-weak/strong know I not

⁴ There is no such difference between object and subject pronouns in Swedish, cf.
(i) Dom/DOM kommer.
   they-weak/strong come
(ii) Dom/DOM kan jag inte.
   they-weak/strong know I not
On the assumption that the subject always is in spec-IP the finite verb must be assumed to occupy I° in subject first main clauses and C° only in inverted clauses; hence the label asymmetrical.

In the symmetrical analysis, on the other hand, the position of the finite verb in V2-classes is assumed always to be C° (symmetrical), as a result of the strong finite feature in C°. The subject position therefore varies depending on whether the clause is subject initial or not.

2.2. Structural identity

Zwart (1993) adopts the asymmetrical analysis given in (3) above. He makes the following assumption about omission of constituents in coordination.

(6) [...] an element in the second clause of a coordinate structure can only delete under identity with an element in the first clause if the two elements are in the same structural position. (p. 252)

Platzack (1996) argues for the symmetrical analysis presented in (4) above. Following Zwart’s assumption in (6) Platzack compares the asymmetrical and the symmetrical analysis as to whether which of them makes the right predictions about subject omission in coordination (1996:115-117). A similar comparison based on the Swedish examples in (7) is presented below. After each example the coordination pattern is given in brackets with S for subject, V for finite verb and X for whatever constituent occupying spec-CP. The position of the omitted subject is marked _.

(7a) Han åkte till sta’n igår och (han) dr där
He went to town-the yesterday and he ate there
en stor middag.
a big dinner

(7b) Han åkte till sta’n igår och där *(han)
He went to town-the yesterday and there ate he
en stor middag.
a big dinner

(7c) Igår åkte han till sta’n och (han) dr där
yesterday went he to town-the and he ate there
en stor middag.
a big dinner

(7d) Igår åkte han till sta’n och där *(han)
yesterday went he to town-the and there ate he
en stor middag.
a big dinner

(7a) and (7d) should be grammatical according to both analyses since the subject is in the same structural position in both conjuncts — be it spec-IP or spec-CP — no matter which analysis we choose. But as we can see only (7a) is grammatical, not (7d). (7b) is correctly predicted to be ungrammatical by the symmetrical, but not the asymmetrical analysis, whilst (7c), on the other hand, is correctly predicted to be grammatical by the asymmetrical but not by the symmetrical analysis.

Platzack claims however (1996:116) that it is unclear whether the omitted subject is in spec-CP in structures like (7c). The symmetrical analysis permits different subject positions and the omitted subject could in principle be in spec-IP. In that case (7c) is correctly predicted to be grammatical. It would, however, be difficult to explain why there should be a structural difference between the omitted subjects in the two identical second conjuncts in (7a) and (7c): spec-CP and spec-IP respectively, if we do not postulate that the first conjunct somehow can determine the structure of the following conjunct. Nothing seems to indicate that this is the fact. If we try to insert a subject into the second conjunct in (7c) it must be clause initial as shown in (8).

(8a) Igår åkte han till sta’na och (han) dr där en stor middag.
yesterday went he to town-the and he ate there a big dinner

(8b) Igår åkte han till sta’na och där *(han) där en stor middag.
yesterday went he to town-the and there a big dinner

Since Zwart’s assumption in (6) clearly does not make the right predictions for Swedish I will replace it with the following assumption about subject omission, assuming the symmetrical analysis.
(9) Subjects may be omitted if they are in spec-CP. Only post verbal subjects are in spec-IP and these are not possible to omit. Given an asymmetrical view the restriction of subject omission expressed in (9) would instead have to focus the position of the finite verb, i.e. subjects may be omitted if the verb is in I°. Even if it seems intuitively more appropriate to consider the position of the subject, rather than the verb, when we are dealing with subject omission, this is not the main reason why I prefer the symmetrical analysis. On the assumption that subjects are always in spec-IP the strong finite feature in C° can only be active in inverted clauses. We must then explain why a strong finite feature is strong only in certain contexts. It seems harder to explain this than it is to account for why e.g. weak subject pronouns can be topocalized in Dutch and German, whereas weak object pronouns can not. As Platzack (1996:112–113) shows it is in fact possible to account for this later asymmetry without giving up the symmetrical analysis.

2.3. Subject omission in simple clauses

Given the assumption in (9) it is easier to link the pattern of subject omission illustrated in (7) to subject omission in simple clauses which occurs for instance in diaries and on postcards. Two clauses of the latter type are given in (10).

(10) a. (jag) Satte på stranden igår. I sat on beach-the yesterday [V]

b. Igår satte jag på stranden. yesterday sat I on beach-the *[XV, ]

In simple clauses like these it is not possible, of course, to find any structural identity between two conjuncts. If we were to hold on to Zwart’s assumption in (6), we would have to explain the pattern in (10) in some other way. If we, as suggested, adopt the assumption in (9) the ungrammaticality of (10b) can be accounted for in the same way as (7b) and (7d).

2.4. Subject omission in early modern Swedish

We will now look at some coordinated main clauses with subject omission in early modern Swedish. Two different texts have been used: Nils Matson Kiöping’s resa, ‘The Journey of Nils Matson Kiöping’, from 1667 and a description of a journey with the Swedish East Indian Company by Hinric Christopher Braad from 1752–53. The same coordination patterns as the ones presented in (7) above have been excerpted. This is illustrated in (11) and (12); in (11) we have examples from Kiöping, in (12) from Braad.

(11) a. The äro mycket fasta, och ligger på twenne "They are very firm" and lie on two uddar, så att Mogel in that can twinge them [...] [SV och _V_]
capes so that Mogol MOD.PART. it can force them [...] [XV, ]

b. Twenne af thesee Munckar förgde oss till "Two of these monks accompanied us’ Wägs och under Wägen wiste (de) oss många and under way-the showed they us many nammmkunniga Platser [...] famous places [...] [SV och XV, ]

c. [...] sedan bleff han slagen, och begaff sig uppå ‘[...] then he was beaten’ and went REFL on een Öö, benemdh Aionam. an island called Aionam [XVS och _V_]

d. Ty såsom Landszöffingen sågh att all förhoppaning ‘Since the county governor saw that all hope of life till Ljifwet war borto, förecet han migh ther qvar, was gone, he let me stay’ och uti sitt Affresande befalde (han) migf medh och in his departure commanded he me with grätande Tårar uti Gudz händer [...] crying tears in God’s hands [...] [XVS och XV, ]

(12) a. De Gamla inbegrepo detta Landet under den delen ‘The old included this land in the part they som de kallade allmänt IndoSkythia, och hade Sig generally called IndoSkythia’ and had REFL bekante åtskillige af dess Städer [...] bekante many of its cities [...] [SV och _V_]
contain an explicit subject in a position after the finite verb. Therefore they will be referred to as VS-clauses.

(13) a. Uthi siefwe Staden boor een Visier Bassa, hwilken håller sig månchta
   ’In the city there lives a Visier Bassa who is very magnificient’
   prächtig. Och kan man inhet gierna allena gå söcker in uthi Staden [...] and can one not willingly alone go safe in city-the
   (Kiöping 1667)

b. De va en, nja en fullgubbe ba, ungarna hade ba, ungarna hade ba cykla
   ’There was a drunk, the kids had just rode their bikes around him’
   runtan, kom hans broraa å lappa tillan. (Kotsinas 1994:73)
   came his brother and punched to-him

In subsections 3.1.–3.2. below VS-clauses from modern Swedish are discussed and in subsection 3.3. VS-clauses from Kiöping. A comparison between modern and early modern VS-clauses follow in 3.4.

3. Modern VS-clauses

Investigations of VS-clauses in modern Swedish have been conducted by e.g. Dahlbäck & Vamling (1983) and Mörnsjö (2002). The phenomenon seems to be particularly common in narrative sequences; all examples from Dahlbäck & Vamling occur in such a context, as we can see in example (14a) below. Although narrative VS-clauses are common among Mörnsjö’s examples, she illustrates non-narrative use as well, as we can see in (14b).

(14) a. Så ligger hon där i sjängen. Så låg han bara där. Kom
   So lies she there in bed-the so lay he only there came
   han in där, kände han igen henne, började han dara
   he in there recognized he PART. he started he shake
   he i hela kroppen så liksom. (Dahlbäck & Vamling:1983:10)
   in entire body-the so kind of

   in whole body the so kind of

b. A: Vill ni ha publik, eller? ’Do you want an audience, maybe?’
   B: Nej, ’No’
   may Ylva and Erika come later

3 Consequently the term 'narrative inversion' is used to refer to this clause-type by e.g. Plattzack (1987, 1996, 1998a).
Neither Mörsjö nor Dahlbäck & Vamling interpret their VS-clauses as clauses with the finite verb as the first constituent, but rather as clauses with unpronounced material in spec-CP, i.e. clauses with the constituent pattern (X)VXS. In (14a) the unpronounced element would, according to Dahlbäck & Vamling (1983:8), be såd, 'so', possibly as a consequence of earlier explicit såd:s. Mörsjö’s VS-clauses are, as she puts it, "V1 on the surface although V2 in nature" (2002:130–131). In (14b) it follows from the first question put to B and B’s reply in the negative that the unpronounced first constituent should be då, 'then' (cf. Mörsjö 2002:109).

(15) a. [...] (så) Kom han in där, (så) kände han igen henne, so came he in there so recognized he her 
(så) började han drå i hela kroppen så liksom. so started he shake in entire body the so kind of 

b. [...] (då) Får Ylva och Erika komma sen. then may Ylva and Erika come later

Other scholars who have analysed modern Swedish VS-clauses have assumed, instead, that the position preceding the finite verb is empty (e.g. Platzaq 1987), lacking (e.g. Platzaq 1996, 1998a, 1998b) or contains some kind of invisible operator (e.g. Stroh-Wollin 2002). However, these approaches do not consider the context in which the VS-clauses occur. The significance of context and text cohesion in the analysis of modern Swedish VS-clauses can be adequately illustrated if we look at the similarities between VS-clauses and so-called topic-drop clauses.

3.2. Topic-drop and VS in modern Swedish

So far nothing has been said here about the relationship between topic-drop clauses and VS-clauses. Topic-drop-clauses are usually characterized as clauses lacking (on a phonetic level) a valency-bound, and thus easily recoverable, argument of the verb. This argument is typically the subject as in our example (10a) above, here repeated as (16a), or the direct object as in (16b) below. The surface word order between subject

\[\text{and verb is VS in (16b), as was of course the case in (14). Example (14b) is here repeated as (16c).}\]

(16) a. (jag) Satt på stranden igår. I sat on beach-the yesterday
   b. A: Har du sett flaskan? 'Have you seen the bottle?'
      B: (den) Såg jag i köket. it saw I in kitchen-the
   c. A: Vill ni ha publik, eller? 'Do you want an audience, maybe?'
      B: Nej. 'No'
      A: (då) Får Ylva och Erika komma sen. (Mörsjö:2002:109) then may Ylva and Erika come later

Since (16b) lacks the valency-bound direct object, but (16c) does not lack any valency-bound elements, Mörsjö labels the former OEA (Obligatory Element Absent) and the latter OEP (all Obligatory Elements Present) (2002:1–2). Such a distinction implies, however, that the difference between examples like (16b) and (16c) is greater than it, according to my view, really is. Even if an element is not obligatory on a lexical level it can be more or less obligatory on a pragmatic level.

In both (16b) and (16c) the VS-clauses are interpreted as declaratives. Since the expected word order in declaratives is XVS or SV, i.e. XV, spec-CP is interpreted as holding some unpronounced constituent. In (16b) it follows from the context (A asks about the bottle) and the lexical valency of se, 'see' (the verb must have a direct object) that the lacking constituent is den, 'it'. In (16c) the argument structure is intact, but the condition that B does not want any audience nevertheless seems to be important to express. If the initial word order in (16b) and (16c) is changed into SV, the syntactic incentive (as VS is) for interpreting unpronounced material is eliminated. The result in (16b) is ungrammatical and in (16c) it seems to be what we could call infelicitous in the conversational setting (marked #). This is shown in (17).

\[\text{6 Topic-drop involves continuous topics and alternate in Swedish with clauses with fronted explicit unstressed pronouns (cf. Engdahl 1997).}\]

\[\text{7 Even though some language users seem to be able to accept (17b) with SV-word order, VS is preferred.}\]
3.3. Early modern Swedish VS-clauses

All VS-clauses from the aforementioned text Nils Matson Kiöpings resa (1667) have been excerpted and investigated, a total of 79 VS-clauses.8 The greater part of Kiöping’s VS-clauses are initiated by the conjunctive och, ‘and’, as illustrated in (18a–c) below. The VS-clauses without an initial och all contain some kind of connective adverb, either after the initial verb, as in (18d) or directly after the subject as in (18e). These connective adverbs are here given in bold.

3.4. Modern and early modern VS

We have just mentioned that it is difficult to identify any lacking material before the verb in Kiöping’s VS-clauses. Mörnsjö (2002), whose study on modern Swedish VS-clauses must be considered to be the most thorough in recent years, can, on the other hand, always identify the lacking element and insert it without affecting the outcome materially. In her narrative examples, which in many cases are similar to the example from Dahlbäck & Väming given above (cf. (14a)), it is also common that the speaker alternates between VS-clauses and XV-clauses with explicit så:s, sen:s, då:s etc., a pattern supporting the (X)VS-analysis of the VS-clauses. A narrative sequence from Mörnsjö (2002:89) is given in (19).

8 The text also contains VS-clauses equivalent to modern Swedish presentation clauses initiated by det. These clauses will not be discussed in this article (cf. Magnusson 2001).

ther handla ey heller wistas [...] there trade not either stay [...] e. The bruka och Mandelötter för Penningar och gißla 6, they use also almonds for money and is-equivalent 6 ett Pejjas, Kan man allsa för twenne Mandelötter köpö Olia [...] one Pejjas can one consequently for two almonds buy oil [...] None of Kiöping’s VS-clauses lack any valency-bound elements, i.e. none of them could be said to represent topic-drop clauses in the sense presented in 3.2. It is in fact difficult to point out any dropped material at all, which means that an (X)VS-analysis as proposed earlier for modern VS, does not seem motivated here.
Since it is not obvious from the context that Kiöping’s VS-clauses lack any elements, it is only anachronistic, as I see it, to try and force them into some (X)VS-pattern that we have established for modern Swedish. A support for this view is that no VS-clauses alternate with explicit XVS-clauses in the way they often do in modern Swedish, as illustrated in (19) above. It is also peculiar that no clear cases of topic drop occur in Kiöping’s text. If his VS-clauses really were initiated by an elliptic element only interpretable from the context, it is indeed strange that we do not find any VS-clauses lacking more easily identifiable elements, as valency-bound constituents, e.g. direct objects, surely are.

Another characteristic feature ascribed to modern VS-clauses by Mörsjö is that they express “temporal succession” (2002:95). This is typically illustrated in the narrative use where each VS-clause expresses a transition in the chronological process. In Kiöping’s text only 3 out of 79 VS-clauses express a similar transition. Instead they normally express a static condition, often with the modal auxiliaries måste, ‘have to’ and kunna, ‘be able to’ as illustrated in (18) above.

A closer study of Kiöping’s text reveals an interesting pattern regarding the type of subjects that the author typically combines with VS-word order. When we compare the VS-clauses initiated by och with all the SV-clauses initiated by och in the text a distributional tendency emerges, see Table 1.

Table 1. Subjects in VS- and SV-clauses (Kiöping 1667)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>subject-type</th>
<th>man</th>
<th>ind. subj.</th>
<th>def. subj. 1</th>
<th>def. subj. 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>och-VS</td>
<td>13(18.9%)</td>
<td>7(9.7%)</td>
<td>50 (69.4%)</td>
<td>2 (2.8%)</td>
<td>72(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>och-SV</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>6 (31.6%)</td>
<td>6 (31.6%)</td>
<td>7 (36.8%)</td>
<td>19 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The indefinite pronoun man, ‘one’, only occurs in post verbal position, and it is also the most commonly used word-form among the subjects within the VS-category. This is why it has been granted its own column. Other indefinite subjects are, on the other hand, relatively more common in SV-clauses than in VS-clauses.

The definite subjects have been divided into two groups: definite subject 1 and definite subject 2. The subjects in the first group are often identical with something that has already been mentioned and therefore usually pronominalized as in (18a), here repeated as (20) with the relevant subject in bold.

(20) Thenna Konungen aff Wielapur medch heela sitt Landafolck äre Soldater, ‘This king of Wielapur and all his people are soldiers’ och föda the sig. alt medch Ofwerij [...].

and feed they RELP-all with robbery [...].

Subjects belonging to this group can also be what we could call referentially given, if they for instance constitute a part of a whole occurring in the preceding context as in (18c) above, here repeated as (21) (the cock is a part of the musket). As we can see in Table 1 all but 2 of the definite subjects in the VS-category belong to this group.

(21) ...hafwa mycket svärhn Mussqueretter, och slär theras Hane ofwer ått [...]. have very heavy musquets and strikes their cock over to

Mynnigen och icke till Anslaget [...] muzzle-the and not to impact-the

This tendency is more obvious in the diary of Agneta Horn, a text contemporary to Kiöping’s (Horn probably wrote her text around 1657, cf. Holm 1959). An equivalent number of VS and SV-clauses initiated by och was excerpted from her text and the subjects were categorized in the same way. In VS-clauses 4.2% of the subjects were indefinite and 95.8% definite. In SV-clauses 31.6% were indefinite and 68.4% definite.
Mörnsjö finds a similar tendency regarding types of subjects. She shows for instance that pronouns are much more common than indefinite DPs in modern VS-clauses (2002:108). Whether this indicates that certain subjects combine with VS also in modern Swedish is, however, uncertain. Mörnsjö does not present any corresponding numbers for SV, and it is not possible, therefore, to claim that the VS-pattern is unique for VS.

As we have seen earlier in this section only modern VS-clauses seem to contain an unpronounced element in front of the verb. In both narrative and non-narrative VS-clauses this element is contextually given, even though it is not obligatory on a grammatical level like the lacking element in topic-drop-clauses. Nevertheless it can sometimes be preferred on a pragmatic level, as was shown in (17b). Kiöping’s VS-clauses, on the other hand, do not seem to be initiated by anything else than the finite verb. Nothing in the context indicates that some unrealised constituent is situated in spec-CP. This difference calls for different structural analyses. These are presented in (23). The examples from (14b) and (18a) have been used.

(22) a. Thör Sultan eller Ståthållaren boor, är ett öfvermätton skönt Huuss
       'Where the sultan or the governor lives is an extremely nice house'
Och then Rundelen han stadtig utli vistus, är uthan till all
       and the round he always in stays is out to completely
beslagan medh fijt Gul.
       beslagmed fine gold

b. ...) och sigh föda upph fölrand Maner: The ducka under watnet
       '... and feed themselves in the following way: They dive 18 fathoms deep'
upph 18 fannar diup, och the som gumble äro, bruca ingen Wicht
       and who they old are use no weight

This pattern suggests that VS was preferred if the subject was clearly connected with the preceding context, and SV was preferred if the subject was not connected in this way. This division between SV and VS based on the choice of subject is certainly not absolute. Still the tendency just illustrated seems to be too apparent to be ignored.11

This cohesive role played by the VS-clauses in Kiöping’s text is further strengthened by the fact that they never occur without some kind of connective marker, be it the conjunction ooch initially or a connective adverb inside the clause (typically altså or therföre) as was pointed out in the beginning of section 3.3.12

---

11 Alving (1916:24–26) shows that different subjects combine with different word order types in old Swedish texts as well. Since he only draws a distinction between pronominal and other subjects his numbers are not completely comparable with mine. 90.1% of the ooch-SV-clauses in the revelations of Saint Birgitta contain a pronominal subject, whereas only 4.8% of the ooch-SV-clauses have such subjects.
12 de Boor (1922) uses the label Fortsättingsstellung, 'position (i.e. word order) of continuation', for VS-clauses in old Swedish.

(23) a. [CB (då) I] [CP är] [I] Ylva och Maria ...

b. [CP I Öllo miaste] [C] the ...

As analysis like (23b) does not capture the fact that the use of VS in Kiöping’s text is restricted to contexts where there is an initial conjunction, ooch, or some connective adverb inside the clause. For our purposes here, however, it is sufficient to conclude that bare VS-clauses were possible in Kiöping’s writings. Henceforth Kiöping’s VS-clauses are labelled simply bare VS-clauses as opposed to modern Swedish (XVS)-clauses.

3.5. ooch

It should be noted that the conjunction ooch is not orthographically separable from the adverb ooch in Kiöping’s text (in modern Swedish the ad-
verb is spelt ock). It could therefore be suggested that the initial och followed by VS really is adverbia. In that case these clauses would have to be analysed as XVS-clauses. If och were an adverb, however, the VS-word order could not be seen as motivated by text cohesion, but we would instead have to conclude that the adverb och typically selects for certain types of subjects and the conjunction och for other types, which indeed would be a peculiar conclusion.

Moreover, the VS-initial och is surely not seen as an adverb by Lars Salvius when he reedits Klöping’s text in 1743. Salvius changes all the obvious VS-clauses, i.e. those without initial och, into XVS-clauses or SV-clauses. He does the same with all VS-clauses initiated by och. If he interpreted Klöping’s initial och as an adverb there would be no reason for him to alter the word order, if he – as seems to be the case – wanted to get rid of clauses introduced by the finite verb.

Neither Alving (1916:42) nor Wessén (1965:208) consider the och preceding VS-clauses to be an adverb. They both claim, however, that the VS-word order after och originated when the initial och was still an adverb. Neither of them presents any evidence to support this statement.

4. Why a difference between modern and early modern Swedish?

In this section I will try and account for why modern and early modern Swedish differ in the respects discussed in sections 2.–3.

4.1. A split C-domain and VCC

So far in this article we have assumed that the C-domain constitutes a single projection with but two nodes: a head and (in most cases) a specifier. Rizzi (1997) has suggested, however, that the C-domain must contain at least two parts, i.e. two functional projections, since the domain functions both as “the interface between a propositional content (expressed by the IP) and the superordinate structure (a higher clause or, possibly, the articulation of discourse, if we consider a root clause)” (1997:283). He calls the projection facing the outside ForceP (force as in illocutionary force) and the projection facing the inside FinP (fin as in finiteness). ForceP is where sentence-type is determined whereas FinP, as is evident from the name, expresses finiteness.

Following Rizzi’s suggestion about a split C-domain Platzack (1998b) assumes that the active projections within this domain must always be visible, i.e. contain phonological features, at PF. In addition to this, he assumes that there is a filter ruling out all structures containing phonological features in the spec-position and the head of a projection at the same time. This filter is usually labelled Doubly filled Comp Filter (DCF) and goes back to Chomsky & Lasnik (1977). These two restrictions are formulated by Platzack as a Visibility Condition on the C-domain (VCC), given in (24):

(24) VCC

In a single derivation, every projection within the C-domain must be visible at PF, i.e. it must hold phonological features, but it cannot have such features both in the specifier and the head (1998b:54).

In the symmetrical analysis presented above the finite verb in a V2-language like Swedish is always taken to move to C from its base position in VP as a result of the strong finite feature in CP. In the split C-domain this feature is situated in FinP.

Platzack assumes that the subject in modern Swedish also is attracted by the finite feature in FinP (1998b:59). This follows from the interpretation of EPP (Extended Projection Principle) in terms of finiteness, suggested by Branigan (1996:68). Overt movement of the subject to spec-FinP then means that EPP is strong. Given this approach the modern Swedish SV- and XVS-clauses in (25a-b) below, can be analysed as in (26a-b). Here and in the following only movement within the C-domain is represented by traces.

12 Platzack recognizes that it is difficult to find theoretical support for this kind of condition (1998b:95). He maintains, however, that VCC can still be seen as a fruitful explanatory tool, if it enables us to make generalizations that make correct empirical predictions (1998b:55–56, 95). Stroh-Wollin suggests that at least DCF, which is a part of VCC, actually could have theoretical relevance. If a phrase within the C-domain can have no more than one phonological feature, the decoding process could be facilitated (2002:155).
more important that fronting of constituents can be accounted for within syntax proper than it is to explain why fronting takes place in each case. Therefore he proposes that fronting to the C-domain in a V2-language like Swedish be accounted for in terms of feature repelling, Repel F, as opposed to feature attraction (1996:93–94). In our present approach subjects are not a concern; their movement to the C-domain is always due to strong EPP. Other constituents that have moved to the C-domain, however, are assumed to be marked [Repel A]. This means that they must move to the first available A’-position in front of the highest A-position: spec-ForceP in our analysis. Since repel-marking is taken to be optional it is not a problem that den has been marked [Repel A] in (26b) but not in (26a). Why den is marked in (26b) but not in (26a) is a question that lies outside syntax proper.15

In the next two subsections we will apply the approach to the C-domain outlined in this subsection to the modern and early modern data presented in 2–3.

### 4.2. Modern Swedish and VCC

In section 2 it was illustrated that preverbal, but not post verbal, subjects could be omitted from modern Swedish main clauses. Following the approach to the C-domain in the previous subsection, this is in fact expected. Consider first the structure of an XVS-clause like the one in (1cb) above, here repeated as (27a) with the structural analysis in (27b).16

---

14 Instead of a trace in spec-μP in structures such as (26b) with a fronted object topic, Platzer assumes that there is an operator there (1998b:65–66).

15 Since a constituent marked [Repel A] must move above the highest A-position, it is also possible to account for why no other elements than those containing Wh-words raise to a spec-position within the C-domain above a subjunction. Such a position is simply not above the highest A-position, cf.

(i) Honom såg jag att du hade klippt.
   him saw I that you had cut

(ii) *Jag såg honom att du hade klippt.
    I saw him that you had cut

In a system with a C-projection for topics, nothing should prevent honom from being raised above att as in (ii). (cf. Platzer 1996:96)

16 Here and in the following, an omitted constituent is given in italics inside the derivation. The reason why this is preferred to an analysis with pro is, as was mentioned in footnote 2 above, that pro is not compatible with non-nominal constituents.
(27) a. Igår satt *(jag) på stranden.
yesterday sat I on beach-the

b. $[\text{FinP}]$ [igår $[\text{FinP}]$ e $[\text{Det}]$ lj $[\text{FinP}]$ satt I $[\text{FinP}]$ jag $[\text{FinP}]$ t] $[\text{FinP}]$ på stranden ...

When the verb satt is forced out of FinP to create the $\mu$P, the subject is left in FinP as the only phonological feature of the projection. Omission of the subject jag results in violation of VCC, i.e. we get an invisible phrase within the C-domain. This is why omission of a post verbal subject is ungrammatical.\(^7\)

Why then is preverbal subject omission permitted in modern Swedish? Given the analysis of SV-clauses presented above, subject omission would result in a ForceP without any phonological features violating VCC. The SV-clause in (10a) above is here repeated as (28a), but now with an explicit subject.

I sat on beach-the yesterday

b. $[\text{FinP}]$ [jag $[\text{FinP}]$ e $[\text{Det}]$ lj $[\text{FinP}]$ satt] $[\text{FinP}]$ på stranden igår ...

I suspect, however, that (28a) would have a different structure than the one represented in (28b) if the subject lacks phonological features. This is illustrated in (29).

(29) a. *(jag) Satt på stranden igår.

b. $[\text{FinP}]$ [jag $[\text{FinP}]$ e $[\text{Det}]$ lj $[\text{FinP}]$ satt] $[\text{FinP}]$ på stranden igår ...

\(^7\) It should be noted that an expletive subject in post verbal position sometimes can be omitted (example from Platzack, p.c.).

(i) I skogen kan (det) finnas många älgar.
in-fic-the-can there be many elks

Following a suggestion by Falk (1993:20ff.), the locative PP i skogen possibly checks the strong EPP in spec-FinP, which keeps the expletive subject det in IP where it can be omitted without violating VCC (cf. Platzack 1998b:81–82).

(ii) $[\text{FinP}]$ [i skogen $[\text{FinP}]$ e $[\text{Det}]$ lj $[\text{FinP}]$ kan $[\text{Det}]$] $[\text{Det}]$ det $[\text{Det}]$ kan finnas många älgar ...
given that det comes from the lexicon with the feature [+finite] to be checked in spec-FinP, it is perhaps even obligatory to omit it, if it, as in (ii), is prevented from ever reaching FinP. If this is so, the locative could not have moved through FinP if det is explicit.

As long as the subject is phonetically unrealised it is allowed in FinP together with the visible verb without violating VCC.\(^8\)

In fact subject omission can be seen as one of two strategies to avoid VCC-violation. When the subject, due to strong EPP, is attracted to spec-FinP it can either move on to spec-ForceP, in which case it must not be omitted, or remain in spec-FinP where it must be omitted. This is illustrated in (30).

(30) a. *(S)V

b. *(S)V

a'. $[\text{FinP}]$ [S $[\text{FinP}]$ e $[\text{Det}]$ lj $[\text{FinP}]$ V] $[\text{FinP}]$ ...

b'. $[\text{FinP}]$ [S $[\text{FinP}]$ V] $[\text{FinP}]$ ...

Coordinated declaratives with subject omission in the second conjunct should, on this account, contain one ForceP and one FinP. This is illustrated in (31) with example (7a) from above.\(^9\)

(31) a. Han åkte till sta’n igår och (han) dr där
He went to town-the yesterday and he ate there
en stor middag.
a big dinner

b. $[\text{Det}]$ [Det $[\text{Det}]$ Han $[\text{Det}]$ e $[\text{Det}]$ lj $[\text{Det}]$ åkte ...] $[\text{Det}]$ och $[\text{Det}]$ han $[\text{Det}]$ dr åt ...

Let us now turn our attention to the modern (X)VS-clauses. Example (15a) above is here repeated as (32a). The structure of the C-domain is given in (32b).

(32) a. *(...) då Får Ylva och Erika komma sen.
then may Ylva and Erika come later

b. $[\text{FinP}]$ [då $[\text{Det}]$ fär $[\text{Det}]$ Ylva och Erika $[\text{Det}]$ t] $[\text{FinP}]$ komma sen ...

\(^8\) Platzack suggests a similar analysis of what he calls diary-drop, i.e. clauses like the one in (29a). He assumes, however, that the omitted subject is represented by an invisible operator in spec-FinP (1998b:67–68).

\(^9\) I assume, in accordance with Kayne (1994), that the conjunction can be seen as the head of a Conjunction Phrase (CoP). The two conjuncts constitute the specifier and the head of this head.
Following the analysis in 4.1, the adverbial *då*, 'then', has been marked [Repel A], moved to ForceP and then been omitted. An explicit initial adverbial would of course demand the three-phrase structure presented in (26b) above to avoid VCC-violation. In (32b), on the other hand, *då* must not be explicit.

The tendency to interpret unpronounced material in front of the verb, i.e. spec-ForceP, in clauses such as (32a) is obviously strong in modern Swedish. All declaratives that surface as VS presented so far in this article were, as we have seen, interpreted in that way. Nothing in principle, however, suggests that a structure like the one in (33) below without something in spec-ForceP should be ungrammatical. The verb has moved out of FinP to ForceP to avoid violation of VCC.

(33)  
\[ \text{[ForceP [FinP V.] [FinP S [NP t.] ] [PrP ...]]} \]

Although it normally seems to be the case that it is the subject that moves out of FinP to avoid VCC-violation if only the verb and the subject are in the C-domain, structures like (33) actually occur in modern Swedish, at least in certain contexts. Especially in written language verbs such as *därstå*, 'remain', *tillkomma*, 'be added' etc. sometimes seem to reside all alone in ForceP with the subject in FinP. One example from SAG (Vol. 4:693) is given in (34).

(34) a.  
\[ \text{Tillkommer utgifterna för ommlånning, are-added expenses-the for repainting} \]

b.  
\[ \text{[ForceP [FinP t.] [FinP utgifterna för ommlånning [NP t.]] [PrP ...]]} \]

Some language users have the same pattern after the conjunction *eller*, 'or', which is shown in example (35), also from SAG (Vol. 4:694).

(35) a.  
\[ \text{Vi upptäcks av spanare på den irakiska sidan och we will tas kanske för trupprörelser. Eller tas vi för ett pressuppbåd, perhaps be mistaken for troop movements' or are-taken we for a press rally} \]

b.  
\[ \text{[FinP [FinP vi] [FinP S [NP t.]]] [PrP för ett pressuppbåd ...]} \]

Of course, our analysis can not account for why a single verb in ForceP is less common in modern Swedish than a single subject, i.e. why movement to ForceP in order to avoid VCC-violation almost always is handled by the subject. It is not intended to either. We are solely concerned with what is a possible modern Swedish structure.

4.3. Early modern Swedish and VCC

If we assume that there is no structural difference between clauses in modern and early modern Swedish respectively, it is difficult to explain why a post verbal subject can be omitted in Kiöping’s and Braad’s texts. Example (11b) from above is here repeated as (36a). In (36b) a structural analysis of the second conjunct in (36a) assuming that Kiöping’s language does not differ structurally from modern Swedish is given.

(36) a.  
\[ \text{Twenne af these Munckar föllde oss till ‘Two of these monks accompanied us’} \]

b.  
\[ \text{[ForceP [FinP t.] [FinP Wägen wiste (de) oss många l]-under way-they showed they us many namukkunnia Plattar [...] famous places [...]} \]

To omit the subject here, i.e. to let the only constituent in FinP be unpronounced, apparently violates VCC. But (36a) is still grammatical.

Rather than assuming that VCC did not apply in Kiöping’s language I suggest that the difference between his language and modern Swedish is the value of EPP. I will assume that EPP was weak in Kiöping’s language whereas it is strong today. Nothing in his text, however, suggests that the finite feature in FinP attracting the finite verb was weak; in this respect modern and early modern Swedish are alike. On this account the structure in (36b) above should instead look like the one in (37).

\[ \text{Such a suggestion would obviously clash with Platzack’s original idea about VCC as a universal condition (cf. Platzack 1998b:55)} \]
(37) [frmø under Wägen [frmø e] [ifrø [mø wiste] [fr do [vr oss många ...]

When the phonetically unrealised subject, due to weak EPP, is outside the C-domain there is no VCC to be violated.

Let us now consider subject omission in Kjölping’s text that was earlier considered to be ambiguous as to whether the subject was in pre- or post verbal position. Example (11a) from above is here repeated as (38) with the ambiguity symbolized in the brackets.

(38) The åro mycket fasta, och liggpa på twenne
"They are very firm’ and lie on two
uddar, så att Mogol in thet kan twinga them [...] [sv och V] canes so that Mogol MOD.PART. it can force them [...]"

On our assumption that Kjölping’s language had weak EPP the position of the omitted subject in the second conjunct in (38) is still structurally ambiguous. If the subject is in preverbal position we must first of all assume that it has moved to the C-domain. Since EPP is weak it must have been marked [Repel A], moved to spec-FinP and then been omitted. A phonetically empty subject alone in ForceP would of course be unacceptable just as in modern Swedish (cf. 4.2. above).

(39) a. *(de) liggpa på twenne ...

b. (*de) liggpa på twenne ...

a’. [frmø de, [frmø e] [ifrø t [ifrø liggpa] [ifrø på twanne ...

b’. [ifrø de [mø liggpa] [ifrø på twanne ...

Alternatively we could assume that nothing has been marked [Repel A] and that the phonetically unrealised subject resides in IP, just as the subject in (37) above did.

(40) [ifrø [mø liggpa] [ifr do [vr på twanne ...

This latter alternative seems to be the most likely. If we consider the subject pattern in Kjölping’s text presented in Table 1 above, spec-IP typically holds subjects belonging to the group definite 1. Preverbal subjects, on the other hand, i.e. subjects that have been marked [Repel

A], most often belong to the group definite 2. From a semantic point of view subjects from definite 1 are presumably more easily recoverable than subjects from definite 2 and therefore more likely to be omitted. On these grounds it seems reasonable to assume that the majority of omitted subjects in Kjölping’s text are situated in spec-IP. The ambiguous pattern in (38) can then be eliminated.21

(41) The åro mycket fasta, och liggpa (de) på twenne
'They are very firm’ and lie they on two
uddar, så att Mogol in thet kan twinga them [...] [sv och V] canes so that Mogol MOD.PART. it can force them [...]"

Let us now move on to Kjölping’s VS-clauses. Given that EPP is weak, but that the verb moves to Finº in overt syntax the structure of his VS-clauses should look like the one in (42).

(42) [ifrø [ifrø V] [ifr S [vr ...

In section 3. we concluded that Kjölping’s VS-clauses were bare, which means that they did not contain any unrealised element in front of the verb. Given the structure in (42) this is to be expected. The only available position in front of the verb for such an element would be spec-FinP and only subjects can be situated there.

Still an (X)VS-clause could not be considered to be an impossible structure. We might imagine that the verb in such a case moves to Force in order to make ForceP visible. This in turn forces the subject out of IP to spec-FinP in order to avoid VCC-violation. EPP is then checked in overt syntax, contrary to what normally is the case.

(43) [ifrø [ifrø X [ifrø V] [ifr S [ifrø t] [ifrø ...

No such structure has been found in Kjölping’s text however.

---

21 The omission position for e.g. subjects in old Icelandic seems to have been post verbal as well (cf. Sigurðsson 1993:277)
4.4. From weak to strong EPP

In this section it has been illustrated that the differences between modern and early modern Swedish, as represented by Köping, presented in sections 2.–3. can be accounted for by assuming that EPP was weak in Köping's language but strong today. It should be noted that Braad's text, from which some of the examples of post verbal subject omission were excerpted, contains the same kind of bare VS-clauses as Köping. This suggests that Braad's language had weak EPP as well.

(44) a. De som hafwa råd till, använda på dem stora penningar, sökande
"Those who can afford to spend much money on them looking
synerligen efter sådana, som äro stora och hwita, och har jag sedt dem
especially for the white ones' and have I seen them
som med knölen på ryggen, varit 13 quarter höga,
who with bump-the on back-the been 13 quarters high
b. Den tyckes därföre försigtigast handla, som minst blandar sig därmed,
'The one interfering the least, therefore seems to be most careful'
och lämnar jag således hällöre samme sak åt dem [...]. (Braud 1752-53)
and leave I thus rather same thing for them

Interestingly, Salvius, who, as we saw in section 3., removes all the bare VS-clauses in his edition of Köping's text, removes all instances of post verbal subject omission at the same time. This indicates that EPP was strong in Salvius' language.

An important question to ask is how a shift from weak to strong EPP could have come about. One possibility is that repel-marking of subjects for some reason at some point increased in frequency. If subjects then came to constitute the majority of fronted elements, the repel-marking could eventually have been reanalysed as strong EPP. An SV-clause with a repelled subject and one caused by strong EPP would both have the structure given in (45).

(45) [front Q] [front: Q] S, [rep: T] [front: V] [FinP: ...]

Further research in this area is certainly needed before we can claim that an increasing frequency of fronted subject was the trigger for strong EPP. Still it should be noted that Wieselgren shows that subjects con-
stitute between 56% and 72% of all fronted elements in some Swedish texts from the 18th century that she investigates (1971:101). In texts from the time before 1500 investigated by Platzack (1980:29) the corresponding numbers vary between 34% and 55%.

5. Further implications

In this section we will discuss what implications the analysis in section 4. have for yes/no-questions (subsections 5.1.–5.2.) and subordinate clauses (subsection 5.3.).

5.1. Subject omission in yes/no-questions

Yes/no-questions are often assumed to have a question operator, usually labelled Q, in clause-initial position (cf. e.g. Platzack 1998a:103; cf. also Klima 1964:253 and Katz & Postal 1964:79). In the split C-domain suggested by Rizzi (1997) the position of Q is spec-ForceP, ForceP being the projection where sentence-type is determined. Following Platzack (1998b:69) I assume that the finite verb in interrogatives is always attracted to Force\(^\text{a}\) by a strong sentence-type feature [+Wh]. This means that the invisible operator Q is never left alone in spec-ForceP, which would have been a violation of VCC. In declaratives the presence of ForceP is not obligatory, since declarative is the default sentence-type.

Given this approach to yes/no-questions the subject is always alone in FinP, as illustrated in (46). Subjects should never be omitable in these cases without violating VCC.

(46) [front Q] [front: Q] V, [rep: S] [front: V] [FinP: ...]

This prediction seems to be correct if we consider the interrogative examples in (47a-c). Three corresponding declarative structures are given in (47d-f). In the declarative second conjuncts the omitted subject is assumed to be in FinP along with the verb (cf. 4.2. above). If ForceP
would have been obligatory in declaratives as well, subject omission would not have been possible. 22

(47) a. Kan man parkera bilen utanför och bör *(man) drag ticket-the into lobby-the ta med sig biljetten in i lobbyna? *(QVS och QV _) b. Provade du den där restaurangen på Kungsgatan igår och at *(du) föresten av deras härliga leverpastej? you that restaurant on Kungsgatan yesterday and at of their lovely liver pasté? *(QVS och QV _)

c. Satt *(du) på stranden igår? sat you on beach-the yesterday *(QV _)

d. Man kan parkera bilen utanför och (man) bör one can park-car-the outside and one should ta med sig biljetten in i lobbyna. drag ticket-the into lobby-the *(SV och V _)

e. Jag provade den där restaurangen på Kungsgatan igår och (jag) at föresten av deras härliga leverpastej. I tried that restaurant on Kungsgatan yesterday and I ate of their lovely liver pasté. *(SV och V _)

f. (jag) Satt på stranden igår. sat on beach-the yesterday [V _]

5.2. What does och coordinate?

Contrary to expectations a coordinated yes/no-question without an explicit subject in the second conjunct actually seems to be acceptable in some cases. This is illustrated in (48a) which can be compared with (47b) above, here repeated as (48b).

(48) a. Provade du den där restaurangen på Kungsgatan igår och at av deras härliga leverpastej? you that restaurant on Kungsgatan yesterday and at of their lovely liver pasté? *(QVS och QV _)

b. Provade du den där restaurangen på Kungsgatan igår och at *(du) föresten av deras härliga leverpastej? you that restaurant on Kungsgatan yesterday and at of their lovely lever pasté? *(QVS och QV _)

The example in (48b) contains, in addition to the finite verb, a sentential adverb, föresten, 'by the way', presumably situated somewhere in IP. Since the second conjunct in (48a) lacks the adverbial, we might suspect that the coordination in this example is in fact a coordination of VPs, or rather V's. The V' + V' analysis would, as I see it, be preferable to a VP + VP analysis since the verbs provade and at share the same subject in spec-VP. If this analysis is correct no subject omission has taken place in (48a) which is indicated by the single V inside the brackets. In (48b), or the other hand, the subject is alone in spec-FinP and is not omittable without violating VCC.

I do not consider it to be a problem that the second conjunct in (48a), given a V' + V'-analysis, must be assumed to share ForceP with the first conjunct. It is a problem, however, that only the finite verb in the first conjunct can check its finite feature in FinP, whereas the just as finite second verb remains in V, presumably with unchecked features. Therefore an analysis of (48a) like the one in (49) can not be accepted.

(49) [Force Q, [Voice provade,] [null du [E-visitor-t] ... [clitic [V [voice-t] ... ]] [null och]]
    [V [voice-at] ... ]
An alternative way of accounting for the coordination in (48a) is to assume that the second conjunct is a FinP sharing ForceP with the first FinP. This means that only the finite verb of the first conjunct needs to check the strong sentence-type feature in ForceP; the whole structure is interpreted as interrogative anyway. The finite verb of the second conjunct remains in FinP where its finite feature is checked. What och in fact coordinates is then FinPs. Since the verb of the second FinP has not moved to ForceP, both the subject and the verb are in FinP. The subject must therefore be omitted, just as the subject in declarative single FinPs (cf. 4.2 above). The structure as a whole is a ForceP taking a CoP as its complement. This is illustrated in (50).

(50) a. Provade du den där restaurangen på Kungsgatan 
    tried you that restaurant on Kungsgatan
    igår och *(du) dr av deras härliga leverpastej? 
    yesterday and you ate of their lovely liver pâté 

b. [c.0 p [c.0 provade,] [c.0 dom [c.0 och]] 
    [c.0 och] 
    [c.0 och] 
    [c.0 dom [c.0 åter]] 

Why this coordination pattern is possible only when förresten (and probably other sentence-adverbials) is absent seems to be hard to explain. Possibly the absence of förresten semantically links the two conjuncts closer to each other permitting them to share ForceP. If förresten is present the two conjuncts can obviously not share ForceP. If they could, subject omission in (48b) would not be ungrammatical. How insertion of adverbials affects the coordination pattern certainly needs to be further investigated. I will not pursue this matter here however.

It should be noted that it is possible to have an explicit subject in the second conjunct of (48a). The structure as a whole would in that case be a CoP, taking one ForceP as the specifier and one ForceP as the complement, presumably the same structure as (48b). This is illustrated in (51).

(51) a. Provade du den där restaurangen på Kungsgatan 
    tried you that restaurant on Kungsgatan

b. [c.0 p [c.0 provade,] [c.0 dom [c.0 och]] 
    [c.0 och] 
    [c.0 dom [c.0 åter]] 

I suspect that (52b) is preferred since one single event is being described. A ForceP, i.e. an explicit subject, in the second conjunct, as in (52d), implies that the eating and the drinking are to be interpreted as two separate events, which is hardly the case in this context. For the same reason, an explicit subject in the second conjunct of the declarative in (53) below is just as questionable.

(53) a. Nu dricker vi kaffe och *(vi) åter bulle. 
    now drink we coffee and eat bun

b. [c.0 p [c.0 dom [c.0 och]] 
    [c.0 och] 
    [c.0 dom [c.0 åter]] 

2) The * indicates that the subject is not omitable without violating VCC given the structure in (51b).
When the subject is explicit in the second conjunct it must be in ForceP, as illustrated in (53d). This makes it impossible for the second conjunct to share the temporal adverbial nu with the first conjunct, although that is the preferred interpretation. In (53b) nu has scope over both conjuncts.

There are also cases where ForceP-sharing, for semantic reasons, needs to be avoided. Consider the coordination in (54) below, with the same content as (47d) above but with the adverbial utanför fronted in the first conjunct.

(54) Utanför kan man parkera bilen och *(man) bör
outside can one park the car and one should
na med sig biljetten in the lobby.

*VXS och _V]

Omission of the subject man indicates that the second conjunct is a FinP. This FinP can be interpreted as the complement of a CoP which in turn is a part of the complement to the initial ForceP. This is illustrated in (55).

(55) [fronad Utanför] fronad e ljö ljö kan[,] lco fronad man [n0,0 t4] ...] lco och

[fronad man [n0,0 bör] ...

In this structure utanför has scope over both FinPs, which clashes with the content of (54); the event described in the second conjunct does not occur outside. To avoid this interpretation, man needs to be explicit in the second conjunct. When man is explicit, the second conjunct must be a ForceP, in which case utanför can not be shared with the first conjunct.

So far only conjuncts with identical subjects have been discussed. Let us finally look at one coordination with different subjects in the two conjuncts, but with an initial adverbial having scope over both conjuncts. Subject omission in the second conjunct is, of course, not possible in this case since the omitted subject is not recoverable from the context. In order to bring about an interpretation where the initial adverbial is shared without omitting the subject, some language users let the subject remain in IP, although EPP then is unchecked in overt syntax. This is illustrated in (56).

on Mondays plays Kalle football and dances Lisa ballet

b. [fronad På måndagar, fronad e ljö ljö spela[,] ljö fronad Kalle [n0,0 t4] ...]

[fronad och] fronad [n0,0 dansar] ljö Lisa ...

Other language users have a problem accepting that EPP is not checked in overt syntax and they therefore prefer to have the subject Lisa in preverbal position, i.e. in ForceP, which is shown in (57).

(57) a. På måndagar spela Kalle fotboll och Lisa dansar balett.
on Mondays plays Kalle football and Lisa dances ballet

b. [fronad På måndagar, fronad e ljö ljö spela[,] fronad Kalle [n0,0 t4] ...]

[fronad och] fronad Lisa, fronad e ljö t4 [n0,0 dansar] ...

In spite of Lisa’s position in ForceP, på måndagarne nevertheless seems to be associated with both conjuncts. It is unclear to me how this should be accounted for structurally.24

To sum up, we can conclude that only clauses that can be interpreted as single FinPs may contain phonetically unrealised subjects in modern Swedish. This accounts for why subjects may never be omitted in simple yes/no-questions, whereas it is sometimes possible in coordination. Second conjuncts in interrogative coordination can be FinPs sharing

24 One possibility could be to assume that the explicit second subject is in fact in FinP. This would mean that a structure with VCC-violation in this case is preferred to a structure where the adverbial is prevented from having scope over both conjuncts. I have not investigated whether such an approach is tenable however.
ForceP with the first conjunct. This is of course not possible in simple yes/no-question.

We have also seen that subject omission in declarative coordination is preferred when a fronted adverbial in the first ForceP has scope over the entire structure, and avoided when the adverbial has scope only over the first conjunct. Since only single FinPs – given VCC – hold phonetically unrealised subjects and since only FinPs can share ForceP with the first conjunct, this is expected.

Nothing has been said so far about yes/no-questions in early modern Swedish. Although EPP was presumably weak, a yes/no-question would nevertheless have the same structure as today.

\[(\text{ForceP Q [come V, I \text{Spec} S I \text{Adv} t,] I_{\text{NP}} ...} \]

(58)

On the assumption that the invisible operator Q is in spec-ForceP, the verb must be assumed to be in Force\(^2\); otherwise ForceP is invisible.\(^2\) To avoid VCC-violation in FinP the subject is then forced to move to spec-FinP in overt syntax. Subject omission should in that case be impossible. Nothing in Klöping’s and Braad’s texts has been found that clashes with this prediction, i.e., no subject omission in yes/no-questions has been observed.

5.3. Subordinate clauses

Assuming that the subjunction lexicalises the strong finite feature in FinP in subordinate clauses, a modern Swedish att-clause (that-clause) would have the following structure.

\[(\text{I do [come V, I \text{Spec} S I \text{Adv} t,] I_{\text{NP}} ...} \]

(59)

(60) a. Han sa att han var glad.
   he said that he was glad

b. Han frågade om *(han) skulle komma.
   he asked whether he should come

On the assumption that EPP was weak in early modern Swedish an att-clause like the one in (59a) would have the structure given in (61).

\[(\text{I do [come V, I \text{Spec} S I \text{Adv} t,] I_{\text{NP}} ...} \]

(61)

Since the subject is outside the C-domain, omission would not violate VCC and should therefore be possible. However, no subordinate clauses with an omitted subject have been found in Klöping’s and Braad’s texts. In other words, we lack empirical support for our prediction, at least at this point. Still it should be noted that subject omission in att-clauses seems to have been possible in old Swedish. This is illustrated in (62a) from the chronicle of the priest of Vedum from the 13th century. An att-clause with an explicit subject is given in (62b) (examples from Holm 1957:48–49).

(62) a. Annar konungær war Åemunder colbrenne. Oc hat other king was Åemunder coal burned and was-called be colbrenne, at (han) war riwar i restum sinum at therefore coal burn that he was eager inquisitions his to brannen hus manne, pridhi war Åemunder slærne burn houses men’s third was Åemunder slærne

\(^{25}\) It is perhaps questionable whether it really is to ForceP that att is raised. Strohl-Wolin assumes that ForceP is active only in independent utterances, and that att, in structures such as (59), is situated in the higher of two FinPs: FinP\(M\) for (Modal), a phrase where clause-type is determined (2002:169). Our main concern here, however, is that the subject is alone in a phrase within the C-domain.
6. Summary

The aim of this article was to investigate whether VS declaratives in modern and early modern Swedish should be analysed in the same way, and to explain why post verbal subject omission was possible in early modern but not in modern Swedish.

I have argued, following e.g. Mörmöl (2002) and Dahlbäck & Vamling (1983), that modern VS-clauses should be analysed as (X)VS-clauses, i.e. with unpronounced material in preverbal position. This means that they share many properties with so-called topic-drop-clauses. The essential difference between the two is that the unpronounced constituent in topic-drop-clauses is both contextually and lexically given, whereas it is only contextually given in VS-clauses. In early modern Swedish, on the other hand, no evidence was found to support an (X)VS-analysis of the VS-clauses. They were therefore labelled bare VS-clauses.

Following Rizzi’s (1997) suggestion about a split C-domain and Plat Zack’s (1998b) suggestion about a Visibility Condition on the C-domain (VCC), these differences between modern and early modern Swedish could be narrowed down to one single structural difference. Modern Swedish was assumed to have strong EPP and early modern Swedish to have weak EPP. Strong EPP was, in accordance with Plat Zack (1998b), taken to result in overt movement of the subject to the lower phrase of the C-domain: FinP.

Only when EPP is weak may post verbal subjects in declaratives be omitted. If EPP is strong this kind of subject omission violates VCC, since the post verbal subject then is inside the C-domain. The difference regarding EPP also accounts for why modern VS-clauses are interpreted as (X)VS, whereas the early modern ones from Köping seem to be bare VS. If EPP is strong, the verb in a VS-clause must move out of FinP to ForceP in order to avoid VCC-violation. Spec-ForceP is then available for unpronounced material, i.e. (X). If EPP is weak, the verb in a VS-clause remains in FinP and the only position in front of the verb is spec-FnP where no other constituent than the subject can reside.

It was illustrated that Köping’s VS-clauses always occurred together with some connective marker and typically with repeated subjects. It was also pointed out that this context dependence was difficult to account for structurally. One might suggest, however, that their status as FinPs alone makes them less independent than full ForcePs. We have seen that single FinPs in modern Swedish either share ForceP with another FinP or contain contextually given unpronounced material. Although there is no such structurally visible dependence in Köping’s VS-clauses, they are nevertheless single FinPs and obviously need to be explicitly connected with the previous context by means of the conjunction och or connective adverbs.
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