Universität Konstanz

Embedded V2 revisited: dependent vs. subordinate clauses

Constantin Freitag   Nathalie Scherf

Universität Konstanz, AThEME Project   Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

constantin.freitag@uni-konstanz.de   nathalie.scherf.1@hu-berlin.de

Contents

1 Introduction

It has been repeatedly claimed that (Germanic) V2 languages divide into different classes typically labeled as *general embedded V2* (Icelandic, Yiddish), *limited embedded V2* (Danish, Faroese, Frisian, Norwegian, and Swedish), and *"well behaved" V2* (e.g. Vikner, 1995, pp. 65–69 and Holmberg, 2015, pp. 356–362). We argue that such a division is based on deficient evidence and that Germanic languages pattern much more uniform than previously reported.

We advocate for a simplistic syntactic analysis for the derivation of V2 in embedded clauses, and argue that the pragmatic status of sentences, i.e. assertion, cannot be the driving force behind V2.

Main points:

- *V2 languages do not fall into implicational classes* regarding the application of verb movement to C⁰ in subordinated clauses.

- Optional embedded V2 clauses in (most) Germanic languages are not truly subordinated clauses, as evidenced by (syntactic) diagnostics.

- Truly subordinated V2 clauses exist.

- Verb movement (V-to-C) in subordinated clauses is conditioned by the complex complementizer in accordance with the original observations by den Besten (1983).

- Many pragmatic aspects, e.g. assertion and index shift, follow from the non-subordination.

2 Typology of embedded V2

We argue that V2 languages are justifiably categorized as such. They do not fall into different subclasses, regarding the application of V2 in subordinate clauses.

Reasons for this inadequate classification: Evidence in support are mostly

- subject initial clauses of SVO languages
- declarative object complement clauses
- sentence final embedded clauses
- identified by the adverb-finite verb-order only
- uncontrolled for the linguistic registers (divergence between (written) standard and colloquial variety)

Furthermore, German is much less strict than widely reported. It exhibits complement headed complement clauses and causal adverbial clauses.

Most if not all Germanic languages show a "well behaved" pattern for conditional clauses. Hence we argue that Germanic languages pattern more similar than previously claimed.

2.1 Optional embedded V2

Most V2 languages exhibit optional embedded V2 clause variants to verb-final embedded clauses. Some languages allow also complement clauses with or without complementizer (such as Afrikaans, Danish, Frisian, German, Icelandic, Swedish).

(1) GERMAN

a. Ich weiß, dass Herr Laack ⟨hat⟩ eine Stiftung gegründet ⟨hat⟩.
   I know that Mr. Laack has a foundation founded has
   'I know that Mr. Laack has founded a foundation.' (see Freywald, 2008, p. 246)

b. Ich weiß, Herr Laack ⟨hat⟩ eine Stiftung gegründet ⟨*hat⟩.
   I know that Mr. Laack has a foundation founded has
   'I know that Mr. Laack has founded a foundation.'

The SVO fallacy

In case of SVO languages such as the Scandinavian languages and Yiddish it is more difficult to tear apart the base order (SVO) from a subject initial V2 order. As Thráinsson (2010) shows that there is considerable variation of adverb placement in Scandinavian. According to Thráinsson (2010) only the order V-FIN≺ADV can be taken as indication for V-to-I movement, whereas the order ADV≺V-FIN cannot be taken as conclusive evidence that the verb has not moved out the VP. Most important, the order V-FIN≺ADV does not accurately identify V2 order as inaccurately assumed in many papers.

Two Diagnostics may help:

- placing only a non-subject (object or adverbial) in preverbal position ⟹ √V2, *SVO
- placing more than one element in preverbal position ⟹ *V2, √SVO

It is frequently claimed that Icelandic generally exhibits V2 in embedded clauses, as the finite verb always precedes the adverb in embedded clauses.

However, considering Icelandic temporal adverbial clauses, we can show that these are SVO sentences and not V2. The finite verb has to precede the sentence adverbial, as in (2-a). However placing the adverbial in the preverbal position leads to ungrammaticality (2-b) although this is perfectly fine in matrix clauses (2-c).

(2) ICELANDIC

a. Hans hringdi í Martin, [eftir að garðyrkjumaðurinn ⟨var⟩ sennilega ⟨*var⟩ farinn].
   Hans called to Martin after that gardener.DEF was probably gone.
   'Hans called Martin, after the gardener probably had left.'

b. *Hans hringdi í Martin, [eftir að sennilega var garðyrkjumaðurinn farinn].
   Hans called to Martin after that probably was gardener.DEF gone.
   'Hans called Martin, after the gardener probably had left.'

c. Sennilega var garðyrkjumaðurinn farinn.
   probably was gardener.DEF gone.
   'The gardener probably had left.'

It is crucial to accurately identify V2 clauses, as their occurrence is severally restricted (e.g. interaction with certain matrix verbs, see section 4.3).

Occurrence of optional V2 across clause types and languages

Across V2 languages you frequently find optional embedded V2 clauses in (complementizer headed object) complement clauses, as 6, , and in causal clauses.

German exhibits *weil* 'because' causal clauses with V-final and V2 order, as in (3) (see Freywald, 2010).

(3)   GERMAN

Die Elefanten werden mir nichts tun,   weil   die Tiere   ⟨kennen⟩
The elephants will   me not   harm because the animals know
meinen Geruch schon ⟨kennen⟩.
my   smell   already know

'The elephants will not harm me because the animals are already familiar with my smell.'

Optional V2 is less frequent for *wh*-interrogative clauses, polar interrogative and concessive clauses:

(4)   GERMAN

Das Auto startet nicht, obwohl   der Mechaniker ⟨hat⟩ den Motor
the car   starts not   although the mechanic   has the engine
ausgetauscht ⟨hat⟩.
replaced   has

'The car doesn't start, although the mechanic replaced the engine.'

Optional embedded V2 is generally not found in temporal adverbial clauses, conditional clauses and relative clauses (cf. Gärtner, 2001, for German V2 relative clauses).

(5)   GERMAN

Der Doktor hat angerufen, nachdem der Vater ⟨*hat⟩ einen Unfall
the doctor has called   after   the father has   an.ACC accident ACC
gehabt ⟨hat⟩.
had   has

'The doctor called after the father has had an accident.'

5

Conditional clauses do not only show strict verb-base order but also show a complementary distribution of either complementizer headed V-base order or complementizerless V-initial order.

(6)   ICELANDIC

a.   Ef hann er   ekki heima kemur þú   bara aftur.
     if he   is.IND not home come you just back
     'If he isn't at home, you just come back.'

b.   Sé   hann ekki heima kemur þú   bara aftur.
     be.SBJ he   not home come you just back
     'If he isn't at home, you just come back.'

(Thráinsson, 2007, p. 406)

2.2 Obligatory embedded V2

Unlike embedded V2 clauses in European languages, in Kashmiri the embedded V2 clauses are not optional, but the only option for clauses introduced by *ki/zi* 'that' and *kyaazyki/tik'azi* 'because,' i.e. complement clauses (7-a), (7-c), and (7-e), interrogative clauses (7-d) and (7-e), resultative constructions (*so … that*) (7-f), and causal clauses (7-g).

(7)   KASHMIRI

a.   sa:ras   əːs pata   (ki/zi) aslam ⟨pari⟩   yi   kita:b ⟨*pari⟩.
     Sara.DAT was knowledge that Aslam read.FUT this book read.FUT
     'Sara knew that Aslam will read this book' (based on Koul and Wali, 2015, p. 201)

b.   me   chu ba:saːn (ki/zi) sali:m ⟨gatshi⟩ amri:ka: ⟨*gatshi⟩.
     I.DAT is appear.PR that   Salim go.FUT America.ABL go.FUT
     'It seems/appears to me that Salim will go to America.' (based on Koul and Wali, 2015, p. 201)

c.   me   buːz [yi khabar *(ki/zi) mohnas   ⟨miːj⟩ noːkri: ⟨*miːj⟩]
     I.ERG heard this news   that   Mohan.DAT got job   got
     'I heard the news that Mohan got a job.' (based on Koul and Wali, 2006, p. 151)

6

d. təmis chu pata: (ki/zi) aslamas kəm' ⟨dits⟩ ra:th ⟨dits⟩ ra:th yesterday
   he.DAT is knowledge that Aslam.DAT who.ERG gave yesterday
   kita:b ⟨*dits⟩.
   book gave

   'He knows who gave the book to Aslam yesterday' (based on Koul and Wali, 2015, p. 245)

e. me chu ni pata: (ki/ki) salmi ru:za gari ru:za
   I.DAT is NEG knowledge that Salma stayed.Q home.ABL stayed.Q
   (kini nə)?
   or not

   'I don't know whether Salma stayed home (or not)?'

f. khen ous evot asl ki/zi assi ⟨khev⟩ soroui ⟨*khev⟩.
   food was so good that we ate all of it ate

   'The food was so good that we have eaten all of it.'

g. su heki ni pərith [kyaazyki/tik'a:zi su ⟨chu⟩ on ⟨*chu⟩].
   he can.MOD.FUT NEG read.CP because he is blind is

   'He cannot read because he is blind.' (based on Koul and Wali, 2015, p. 227)

Additionally Kashmiri exhibits embedded clause types that are obligatory V-final, as shown by the temporal adverbial clause in (8-a), the conditional clause in (8-b), and the relative clause in (8-c).

(8) KASHMIRI
a. su chu bema:r yani su ⟨*a:v⟩ dilli pethi ⟨a:v⟩
   he is sick since he came Delhi.ABL from came

   'He has been sick since his arrival from Delhi.' (based on Koul and Wali, 2015, p. 223)

b. agar tas ⟨*me:li⟩ vi:za: ⟨me:li⟩ teli gatshi su amri:ka::.
   if he.DAT get.FUT visa get.FUT then go.FUT he America

   'If he gets the visa (then) he will go to America.' (based on Koul and Wali, 2015, p. 227)

c. sɔ kita:b [yɔs tɔhi ⟨*chav⟩ pasand ⟨chav⟩] cha me ti pasand.
   REL book COR you.PL is.2.PL like is.2.PL is me.DAT also like

   'The book which you like, I also like.' (based on Koul and Wali, 2015, p. 213)

Furthermore, all non finite clauses exhibit V-final order as in (9), what is predicted by an account that assumes that only finite verbs move to C.

(9) KASHMIRI
təm' kor va:di pə̃si ⟨*dinuk⟩ mohnas paga:h ⟨dinuk⟩.
he.ERG did promise money give.GEN Mohan.DAT tomorrow give.GEN

'He promised to give the money to Mohan tomorrow.'

2.3 Diagnostics for subordination

It is a longstanding observation that embedded V2 are syntactically rather inflexible as described in detail e. g. in Reis (1997) and de Haan (2001). We apply the diagnostics that are reported to evaluate if the embedded V2 clauses presented above behave like subordinated clauses.

2.3.1 Fixed position

We observe a strong contrast for embedded V2 clauses to appear in a position other than sentence final:

While V-final embedded object complement clauses may appear sentence medial or sentence final, as in (10-a) the V2 variant may only appear sentence final but not sentence medial as shown in (10-b).

(10) GERMAN
a. Peter hat seinen Eltern ⟨schon erzählt⟩ [dass wir nach Hamburg fahren] ⟨schon erzählt⟩.
   Peter has his parents already told that we to Hamburg drive already told

   'Peter already told his parents that we'll go to Hamburg.'

b. Peter hat seinen Eltern ⟨schon erzählt⟩ [(dass) wir fahren nach Hamburg] ⟨*schon erzählt⟩.
   Peter has his parents already told that we drive to Hamburg already told

   'Peter already told his parents that we'll go to Hamburg.'

Similarly V-final object complement clauses may appear sentence initial in the pre-verbal position, as in (11-a), whereas the V2 variant does not, as shown in (11-b).

(11) GERMAN

a. [Dass wir nach Hamburg fahren], hat Peter seinen Eltern schon
    that we to Hamburg drive has Peter his parents already
    erzählt.
    told
    'That we go to Hamburg Peter has already told his parents.'

b. *[(Dass) wir fahren nach Hamburg], hat Peter seinen Eltern schon
    that we drive to Hamburg has Peter is parents already
    erzählt.
    told
    'That we go to Hamburg Peter has already told his parents.'

The contrast in sentence initial position is also apparent for causal adverbial clauses as shown in (12-b).

(12) GERMAN

a. Sie wird mir sicher die Tür öffnen, [weil sie ⟨kennt⟩ mich
    she will me certainly the door open because she knows me
    bereits ⟨kennt⟩].
    already knows
    'She will certainly open the door for me because she already knows me.'

b. [Weil sie ⟨*kennt⟩ mich bereits ⟨kennt⟩], wird sie mir sicher
    because she knows me already knows will she me certainly
    die Tür öffnen.
    the door open
    'Because she knows me she will certainly open the door for me.'

The same contrast can be illustrated with Swedish. The sentence final complement clause shows both V-NEG orderings in (13-a). In sentence medial position only the non-V2 variant in (13-b) is grammatical. Example (13-c) with an adverbial in preverbal position shows unambiguously that the V2 variant is only possible in sentence final position.

(13) SWEDISH

a. Peter har sagt till sina föräldrar [att vi ⟨flyttar⟩ inte ⟨flyttar⟩ till
    Peter has said to his parents that we move not move to
    Hamburg].
    Hamburg
    'Peter told his parents that we are not moving to Hamburg.'

b. Peter har sagt [att vi ⟨*flyttar⟩ inte ⟨flyttar⟩ till Hamburg] till sina
    Peter has said that we move not move to Hamburg to his
    föräldrar.
    parents.
    'Peter told his parents that we are not moving to Hamburg.'

c. Peter har sagt ⟨till sina föräldrar⟩ [att i år ⟨flyttar vi⟩ inte till
    Peter has said to his parents that in year move we not to
    Hamburg] ⟨*till sina föräldrar⟩.
    Hamburg to his parents
    'Peter told his parents that we do not move to Hamburg this year.'

d. *[att i år flyttar vi inte till Hamburg] har Peter sagt till sina
    that in year move we not to Hamburg has Peter said to his
    föräldrar.
    parents
    'Peter told his parents that we do not move to Hamburg this year.'

e. [att vi ⟨*flyttar⟩ inte ⟨flyttar⟩ till Hamburg] har Peter sagt till sina
    that we move not move to Hamburg has Peter said to his
    föräldrar.
    parents
    'Peter told his parents that we do not move to Hamburg this year.'

Fronting of the complement clause is possible but rather not preferred in Kashmiri, as shown in (14-b) and (14-c). All examples in (14) indicate that V-final order is not possible.[1]

(14) KASHMIRI

a. saːras əːs pata (kiːzi) salaam ⟨pari⟩ yi kitaːb ⟨*pari⟩
    Sara.DAT was knowledge that Aslam read.FUT this book read.FUT
    'Sara knew that Aslam will read this book' (based on Koul and Wali, 2015, p. 201)

b. ?(kiːzi) salaam ⟨pari⟩ yi kitaːb ⟨*pari⟩ saːras əːs pata
    that Aslam read.FUT this book read.FUT Sara.DAT was knowledge
    'That Aslam will read this book Sara knew.'

c. ?(kiːzi) salaam ⟨pari⟩ yi kitaːb ⟨*pari⟩ əːs saːras pata
    that Aslam read.FUT this book read.FUT was Sara.DAT knowledge
    'That Aslam will read this book Sara knew.'

---

[1] My informants differed in their preference whether the subsequent matrix clause should follow the main clause order XP-V_fin, as in (14-b) or be verb initial, as in (14-c). I suspect that this is due (dialectal) variation.

Sentence medial object complement clauses are not possible in Kashmiri as shown in (15).

(15) KASHMIRI

ra:th cha sɔ ⟨para:n⟩ [(ki/zi) mohnas mi:j no:kri:] ⟨*para:n⟩
yesterday is she read that Mohan.DAT got job read

'Yesterday she read that Mohan got a job.'

We assume that this test shows if the dependent clause is really subordinated constituent that may be moved in other sentence position, such as the preverbal position. Failing this diagnostic, indicates that the dependent clause is only superficially connected with the matrix clause.

2.3.2 Embedding host

If the host clause of an embedded clause is itself a subordinate clause, the embedded clause is necessarily a subordinate clause with respect to the matrix clause. As expected we observe a sharp contrast between optional V2 clauses and their V-final counterparts.

Examples (16-a) and (16-b) shows that the optional V2 variants are not licit when embedded under relative clauses in contrast to their direct association with the matrix clause in 6 and (1-b).

(16) GERMAN

a. Ich kenne die Kollegen, [die wissen, [dass Herr Laack ⟨*hat⟩ eine
I know the colleagues who know that Mr. Laack has a
Stiftung gegründet ⟨hat⟩]].
foundation founded has

'I know the colleagues who know that Mr. Laack has founded a foundation.'

b. Ich kenne die Kollegen, [die wissen, Herr Laack ⟨*hat⟩ eine
I know the colleagues who know Mr. Laack has a
Stiftung gegründet ⟨*hat⟩]].
foundation founded has

'I know the colleagues who know that Mr. Laack has founded a foundation.'

Kashmiri obligatory embedded V2 clauses can be embedded under relative clauses, as shown in (17-a) in for declarative complement clauses, in (17-b) for *wh*-interrogatives, in (17-c) for polar interrogatives, and in (17-d) causal adverbial clauses.

(17) KASHMIRI

a. su ḍa:ktar [yus pata ə:s [(ki/zi) aslam ⟨pari⟩ yi kita:b
that doctor REL knowledge was that Aslam read.FUT this book
⟨*pari⟩]] gav haspata:l
read.FUT went hospital

'The doctor who knew that Aslam will read this book, went to hospital'

b. su ḍa:ktar [yus pata: ə:s [(ki/zi) kəm' ⟨pari⟩ yi kita:b
that doctor REL knowledge was that who.ERG read.FUT this book
⟨*pari⟩]] gav haspata:l
read.FUT went hospital

'The doctor who knew who read this book, went to hospital'

c. su ḍa:ktar [yus pata: chu ni [ʔ(ki/zi) su ⟨ceya:⟩ dɔd
that doctor REL knowledge is NEG that he drink.FUT.Q milk
⟨*ceya:⟩]] gav haspata:l
drink.FUT.Q went hospital

'That doctor who doesn't know whether he will take milk went to hospital.'

d. su ḍa:ktar [yus heki ni pərith [tik'a:zi su ⟨chu⟩ on
that doctor REL read.CP NEG can.MOD.FUT because he is blind
⟨*chu⟩]] gav haspata:l
is went hospital

'The doctor who cannot read because he is blind went to hospital.'

We assume that this test shows if a clause can be really subordinated which should be possible at any depth of embedding. Failing this diagnostic indicates that the clause is may only superficially connected to the matrix clause.

2.3.3 Host clause ellipsis

If the answer to a questions consists of a matrix clause and an subordinate clause, the subordinate clause can function as an answer to the question. The host clause can be elided. Dependent main clauses cannot function as an answer.

Example (18-b) shows that only the V-final variant is a possible answer.

(18) GERMAN

a. Was hat Peter seinen Eltern erzählt?
   What has Peter his parents told
   'What did Peter tell his parents?'

b. Dass wir ⟨*fahren⟩ nach Hamburg ⟨fahren⟩
   that we go   to   Hamburg go
   'That we'll go to Hamburg.'

c. #Wir fahren nach Hamburg
   we go to Hamburg
   intended 'That we'll go to Hamburg.'

(19) GERMAN

a. Warum kommst du nicht mit?
   Why come you not with
   'Why are you not coming with us?'

b. Weil ich ⟨*muss⟩ noch Hausaufgaben machen ⟨muss⟩.
   because I must still homework make must
   'Because I have to do homework.'

c. da ich ⟨*muss⟩ noch Hausaufgaben machen ⟨muss⟩.
   because I must still homework make must
   'Because I have to do homework.'

d. denn ich ⟨*muss⟩ noch Hausaufgaben machen ⟨*muss⟩.
   because I must still homework make must
   'Because I have to do homework.'

In Kashmiri

(20) KASHMIRI

a. What have you heard?

b. (ki/zi) mohnas mi:j no:kri:
   that Mohan.DAT got job
   'Mohan got a job'

c. (ki/zi) kəmis mi:j no:kri:
   that who.DAT got job
   'Who got a job.'

d. salmi ru:za gari.
   Salma stayed.Q home.ABL
   'Whether Salma stayed home.'

2.4 Embedded vs. dependent clauses

We conclude that optional embedded *V2* clauses fail the diagnostics for subordinated clauses whereas the obligatory embedded clauses *V2* in Kashmiri pass the tests. We suggest that Kashmiri embedded *V2* clause are subordinated clauses whereas optional *V2* clauses are rather dependent main clauses that are connected to the highest node of the hosting matrix clauses.

As the cross-linguistic comparison shows, the possibility of exhibiting optional/obligatory embedded *V2* clauses seems rather language specific and does not

• generally apply in a given language which excludes that it is tied to a general syntactic structure of the language

• generally apply to only a specific set of clause types involved which rules out that it is tied to semantics of the clause types involved.

2.5 Summary

We have argued that

• Truly subordinated V2 clauses exist (Kashmiri).

• Optional embedded *V2* clauses are dependent main clauses and lack syntactic flexibility that is observable for subordinated clauses.

• Languages do not divide into separate classes that allow embedded *V2* as consequence of their (functional) structure.

• Despite their variability in allowing optional embedded *V2*, Germanic languages behave very alike regarding the restrictions of embedded V2.

3 The COMP story

Subordinating elements (complementizer) are frequently morphosyntactically complex elements or diachronically developed from more elaborate structures, e. g. German *weil* 'because' from Old High German *dia wîla* (*unz*) 'so long as'.

COMPlicated?

Further evidence in support that verb movement is dependent on lexical items in the left periphery and target the same position as COMPs (the den Besten, 1983 story):

- COMP doubling suppresses verb movement
- Inflected COMP suppresses verb movement
- only certain lexical items allow apparent EV2 (e.g. German *weil* vs. *da* vs. *denn*)
- loaned lexical complementizer seem to enter the left periphery from the top thereby not blocking verb movement

3.1 Split it up

Different function are fulfilled by left peripheral elements, eventually in a (universal) hierarchy

(discourse linker) ≺ Subordination ≺ Force ≺ Finiteness

(see Bhatt, 1999, pp. 151-168; Bidese, Padovan, and Tomaselli, 2014, pp. 493; 502-505)

3.2 Multiple COMPs

The compositional nature of the left periphery is indicated by multiply filled complementizers:

(21) a. GERMAN
 ... wann dass ...
 when that

 b. DUTCH
 ... wie of dat ...
 who whether that

 c. DANISH
 ... hvordan at ...
 how that

 d. SWEDISH
 ... vem som ...
 who REL

(22) KOREAN
a. Bill-un John-i wa-ss-ta-ko sayngkakhanta.
Bill-TOP John come-PST-DECL-SUB thinks
'Bill thinks that John came.'
b. Bill-un John-i wa-ss-nya-ko mwulessta.
Bill-TOP John come-PST-INTER-SUB asked
'Bill asked whether John came.'
(Bhatt, 1999, pp. 152-153)

COMP doubling blocks V2

In the embedded *wh*-interrogative in (23-a) both word orders, V2 and V-final are possible. If the interrogative pronoun is followed by the declarative complementizer *dass* 'that' only V-final order is possible.

(23) GERMAN

Nur der Neid sitzt gekränkt und allein in seiner Ecke und überlegt sich
Only the envy sits hurt and alone in his corner and thinks self
gespannt,
exitedly

a. wen ⟨könnte⟩ er anschreien ⟨könnte⟩.
who could he scream at could

b. wen dass ⟨*könnte⟩ er anschreien ⟨könnte⟩.
who that could he scream at could

'Only the envy sits in coner hurt and alone and thinks exitedly about who he could scream at.' (deWaC corpus)

3.3 Inflected COMPs

Inflected COMP blocks V2

Inflection at complementizers indicates that these target the same position as fronted finite verbs.

(24) WEST FLEMISH
a. ... da-t Marie goa-t
that-3SG Marie go-3SG

In other languages this cascade may be realized by affixes, such as in Korean in which we find separate affixes for declarative (*ta*) vs. interrogative (*nya*) affixes that precede the subordination affix (*ko*).

b. ...da-n Marie en Valere goa-n
   that-3PL Marie and Valere go-3PL
   (cf. Shlonsky, 1994)

The following clauses from Bavarian illustrate the complementary distribution. With an uninflected complementizer as in (25-a) both orders are possible. In cotrast, if the complementizer is inflected for 2nd person, as in (25-b), V2 order is impossible. Example (25-c) illustrates the incompatibility of inflected COMP and V2 order with an embedded clauses with a fronted adverbial.

(25) BAVARIAN
a. Des is schad, weil du ⟨bist⟩ gestern a scho nit
   That is disappointing because you are yesterday also SCHON not
   kimma ⟨bist⟩.
   come are
   'That is disappointing since you already didn't show up yesterday.'
b. Des is schad, weil-st du ⟨*bist⟩ gestern a scho
   That is disappointing because-2SG you are yesterday also SCHON
   nit kimma ⟨bist⟩.
   not come are
   'That is disappointing since you already didn't show up yesterday.'
c. Des is schad, weil(*-st) gestern bist du a scho nit
   That is disappointing because-2SG yesterday are you also SCHON not
   kimma.
   come are
   'That is disappointing since yesterday you already didn't show up.'

Moreover inflected COMPs are incompatible with COMP doubling. V-final conditional clause in Bavarian may exhibit an inflected complementizer, as in (26-a). This complementizer may be doubled by the declarative complementizer *dass* 'that'. However, as shown in (26-b), additional inflection on the complementizer is not possible.

(26) BAVARIAN
a. Wenn-st du zu uns kimmst, dann g'frei i mi.
   if-2SG you to us come then be happy I me
   'If you come to us, then I'll be happy.'
b. Wenn(*-st) dass du zu uns kimmst, dann g'frei i mi.
   if-2SG that you to us come then be happy I me
   'If you come to us, then I'll be happy.'

Prediction: Inflected complementizer do never cooccur with V2 but only with V-base order.

3.4 It's COMPlexical

Only certain lexical COMPs allow for optional V2

We observe contrast between lexical items in allowing V2. This is best exemplified with causal clauses.

German exhibits at least three elements that introduce causal clauses, *weil, da,* and *denn*. Adverbial clauses introduced by *weil* may exhibit V2 or V-final order as in (27-a). Clauses introduced by *da* may only exhibit V-final order, as in (27-b), and clauses introduced by *denn* may only show V2 order, as in (27-c).

(27) GERMAN
a. Das wird kein Problem sein, weil sie ⟨kennt⟩ mich bereits
   That will no problem be because she knows me already
   ⟨kennt⟩.
   knows
   'That won't be a problem because she knows me already.'
b. Das wird kein Problem sein, da sie ⟨*kennt⟩ mich bereits
   That will no problem be because she knows me already
   ⟨kennt⟩.
   knows
   'That won't be a problem because she knows me already.'
c. Das wird kein Problem sein, denn sie ⟨kennt⟩ mich bereits
   That will no problem be because she knows me already
   ⟨*kennt⟩.
   knows
   'That won't be a problem because she knows me already.'

Even though these causal connectors differ somewhat in their meaning. Usually *weil* express a causal relation whereas *da* and *denn* express an epistemic justification (see Frey, 2012). However *weil*-V2 (28-a), *da*-V2 (28-b), and *denn*-V2 (28-c) have all the epistemic reading. The fact that *da* still forces V-final order shows that the epistemic reading is not necessarily tied to verb movement. Scheffler (2013, pp. 89-90) argues that V2-*weil* clauses are desintegrated from main clauses and in this respect identical to *denn* clauses.[2]

---

[2]Same hold for phonologically desintegrated V-final *weil* clauses. We owe Yvonne Viesel for pointing this out to us.

(28) GERMAN

a. Petra wird noch in ihrem Büro sein, weil ihr Licht ⟨ist⟩ noch an ⟨#ist⟩.
   Petra will still in her office be because her light is still on is
   'Petra will still be in her office since the light is still on.'

b. Petra wird noch in ihrem Büro sein, da ihr Licht noch an ist.
   Petra will still in her office be because her light still on is
   'Petra will still be in her office since the light is still on.'

c. Petra wird noch in ihrem Büro sein, denn ihr Licht ist noch an.
   Petra will still in her office be because her light is still on
   'Petra will still be in her office since the light is still on.'

Similar contrast can be observed in other languages such as Dutch *omdat* V-final *vs. want* V2.

3.5 COMP borrowing

COMP borrowing gives evidence for high COMPs that do not block verb movement, as illustrated by Cimbrian data. With the genuine complementizer *az* 'that' in (29-b) we find a verb base order indicated by the negation obligatorily preceding the finite verb. With the italian loanword *ke* 'that' in (29-c) only a V2 compatible order of negation and finite verb is acceptable.

(29) CIMBRIAN

a. Du geast nèt ka Tria.
   you go not to Trento
   'You do not go to Trento'

b. I bill az-to ⟨*geast⟩ nèt ⟨geast⟩ ka Tria
   I want that-you.CL go not go to Trento
   'I do not want you to go to Trento'

c. I boaz ke du ⟨geast⟩ nèt ⟨*geast⟩ ka Tria
   I know that you go not go to Trento
   'I know you do not go to Trento'
   (see Bidese, Padovan, and Tomaselli, 2014, pp. 490-491)

Bidese, Padovan, and Tomaselli (2014) report similar contrast for *mixed complementizer compounds*, that consist of loanwords and genuine elements, in which the final

element (head) determines the verb position. So after the genuine head *azz* followes non-V2 indicated by the NEG≺V-FIN order in (30-a). In contrast the loanword *ke* allows for (apparent) V2 as suggested by the NEG≺V-FIN order in (30-b)[3].

(30) CIMBRIAN

a. Dar Gianni hat gezzt vil, ånka azz-ar nèt hat gehummart.
   the Gianni has eaten a lot although-he.CL not was hungry
   'G. ate a lot, although he was not hungry'

b. Dar hat gepaitet asó vil ke dar hat-z nèt dartånt zo soina
   he has waited so much that he has-it.CL not managed to be
   da pa zaiten.
   here on time
   'He waited so much that he did not manage to be here on time'

Kashmiri complementizer *ki* is reported to be a borrowing from Persian. This might explain why it occupies a high position in the CP structure thereby not blocking verb movement. Kashmiri also exhibits complementizer compounds such as *kyaazyki* 'because' that is made up of *kyaazyi* 'why' and *ki* 'that' (Bhatt, 1999, 100, fn. 15)[4]. As expected both clauses, introduced by *ki* and complex *kyaazyki*, exhibit obligatory V2 order shown in (7-a) and (8-a), here repeated as (31-a) and (31-b).

(31) KASHMIRI

a. sa:ras a:s pata (ki/zi) aslam ⟨pari⟩ yi kita:b ⟨*pari⟩.
   Sara.DAT was knowledge that Aslam read.FUT this book read.FUT
   'Sara knew that Aslam will read this book' (based on Koul and Wali, 2015, p. 201)

b. su heki ni pərith [kyaazyki/tik'a:zi su ⟨chu⟩ on ⟨*chu⟩].
   he can.MOD.FUT NEG read.CP because he is blind is
   'He cannot read because he is blind.' (based on Koul and Wali, 2015, p. 227)

3.6 Summary

The complementizer complex may fulfill at least three different function. The (supposed) lowest lowest position is related to finiteness and stands in complementary

---

[3] As stated in section 2.1 hypothesis that this is true V2 needs to be confirmed by structures that allow adverbs or objects in the preverbal position.

[4] At the moment we can only speculate that there may exist a similar relation between the other causal connector *tik'azi* and the declarative subordinator *zi*.

distribution with verb movement to the C-domain (V2-movement). This is evidenced by

- analogous stackings of verbal affixes in Korean
- COMP doubling that blocks verb movement to C⁰ and stands in complementary distribution with inflected COMPs
- inflected COMPs that block verb movement and stand in complementary distribution with comp doubling
- varying word order patterns of lexically different but semantically near identical COMPs
- higher positions that allow verb movement to C⁰ by loaned COMPs

4 The status of embedded clauses

4.1 Root phenomena in embedded clauses

The data in the previous section shows that some complementizers are compatible with verb movement, whereas others are not. Additionally, there are some complementizers that are flexible:

that-complement clauses and causal clauses in German, Swedish, Icelandic...

What does this flexibility depend on? It cannot be linked to the complementizer as such, but can we link it to the status of the embedded clause? There are two main approaches for such analyses:

- Syntactic account: peripheral vs.central Haegeman, 2006
- Pragmatic account: asserted vs. presupposed Hooper and Thompson, 1973

4.2 The syntactic account

Two types of clauses

Peripheral adverbials, non-factive complement clauses and appositive relatives have an extended left periphery and allow for main clause phenomena, especially speaker related phenomena. Central adverbials do not have the extenden periphery, and do not allow for main clause phenomena, Haegeman, 2006.

" I propose that clauses introduced by *that* and embedded under factive predicates be considered as reduced finite structures, characterised by the lack of speaker deixis" (Haegeman, 2006, p. 1665)

- Central adverbial clause: Sub Fin
- Peripheral adverbial clause: Sub Top Focus Force Fin
- Root clause: Top Focus Force Fin

Haegeman, 2006, p. 1662 Could these difference in the CP-layer be the reason for V2/V-base?

Central and peripheral adverbial clauses

Central:

(32) GERMAN
   a. Es gibt Pizza im Kühlschrank, falls Peter ⟨*hat⟩ nicht schon alles
      It gives Pizza in fridge   if   Peter has   not   already all
      aufgegessen ⟨hat⟩.
      eaten   has
      There is pizza in the fridge, if Peter has not eaten all of it already.

Peripheral conditionals:

(33) GERMAN
   a. Es gibt Pizza im Kühlschrank, falls du   ⟨*hast⟩ noch Hunger ⟨hast⟩.
      It gives Pizza in fridge   if   you have still hunger have
      There is pizza in the fridge, if you are still hungry.

Examples from German show that the status of the clause cannot account for the position of the verb. With the complementizer *falls* (=if), V2 is never possible. Even though (33) is a peripheral conditional, it cannot embed a V2 clause.

With the complementizer *weil* (=because), both positions of the verb are possible, and in both cases speaker related phenomena can occur, e.g. modal particles.

(34) GERMAN

a. Ich werde Lisa heute nicht mehr treffen, weil   sie ⟨geht⟩ ja
    I   will   Lisa today not more meet   because she goes MP
    Dienstags früher nach Hause ⟨geht⟩.
    Tuesdays earlier to   home goes.
    I will not meet Lisa again today, because she always leaves earlier on
    Thursdays as you know.

MPs are incensed in both cases ⇒ peripheral clause, and the verb can occur in both positions.

The status of the clause as peripheral, i.e. having an extended left periphery, does not effect the position of the verb. From example (32), (33) and (34) the position of the verb seems to be dependent on the complementizer, but how could this account for the flexible clauses, as in the case of *weil?*

4.3 Assertion vs presupposition

A pragmatic account

The pragmatic status of the embedded clause as asserted has been claimed to be the reason for root phenomena in embedded clauses, cf.Hooper and Thompson, 1973 . Does this also hold for V2?

Verbs of saying and semi-factive verbs, *say, believe, know,* can embed V2 and the complement clause is asserted. Factives cannot embed V2 and the complement clause is not asserted.

5 types of matrix verbs

A: Verbs of saying:
  – say, report, claim,
  – embeds an assertion

B: Verbs of weak assertives:
  – suppose, believe, guess
  – embeds an assertion

C: Non-assertive verbs
  – doubt, deny, be likely, be (im)possible,

  – Embeds no assertion, nor presupposition

D: Factive verbs:
  – regret, be sorry
  – embeds a presupposition

E: Semi-factive verbs
  – realize, know, discover
  – embeds an assertion rather than presupposition

In Icelandic and Swedish, verbs of class A, B and E embed V2-clauses, (Wiklund et al, 2009)

An example

(35) SWEDISH

a. Johan sa   att han ⟨gav⟩ inte ⟨gav⟩ Maria boken.
    John said that he gave not gave Mary book.the
    John said that he did not give the book to Mary.

b. Johan ångrar att han (*gav) inte ⟨gav⟩ Maria boken.
    John said   that he gave not gave Mary book.the
    John regretted that he did not give the book to Mary.

Syntactic differences

The embedded clauses do not only differ with respect to their pragmatic status of the embedded clause, they display syntactic differences as well.

- In Swedish factive and non-assertive verbs (class C and D) must occur with a complementizer. Non-factive verbs (class A, B and E) can occur without.
- Topicalization of non-subjects is only possible under non-factive verbs (class A, B and E) (Wiklund et al., 2009)

verb	v2	v-base	without comp	top of non-subj	status of emb. C
A: say, report	yes	yes	yes	yes	asserted
B: suppose, believe, guess	yes	yes	yes	yes	asserted
C: doubt, deny	no	yes	no	no	-
D: regret	no	yes	no	no	presupposed
E: realize, know, discover	yes	yes	yes/no	yes	asserted

(36) SWEDISH

a. Johan sa (att) han ⟨gav⟩ inte Maria boken.
John said that he gave not Mary book.the
John said that he did not give the book to Mary.

b. Johan sa *(att) han inte ⟨gav⟩ Maria boken.
John said that he gave not gave Mary book.the
John said that he did not give the book to Mary.

c. *Johan ångrar (att) han ⟨gav⟩ inte Maria boken.
John regret that he gave not gave Mary book.the
John regretted that he did not give the book to Mary.

d. Johan ångrar *(att) han inte ⟨gav⟩ Maria boken.
John regret that he not gave Mary book.the
John regretted that he did not give the book to Mary.

How can we account for this?

In favour of a syntactic account

Hypothesis: Verbs of class C and D take other complements than A, B and E, i.e. that do not allow for movement of the verb in the embedded clause. One possible analysis for this is found in Haegeman, 2006, i.e. non-factive complement clauses have an extended CP-structure and can host main clause/root phenomena.

Above we saw that the peripheral status did not affect the verb position in the causal clause. So why should it be applied in these cases?

This approach is not enough to account for V2 in all cases.

Is the pragmatic account the right way? For the complement clauses it work, but what about other cases where the embedded clause is asserted?

Relative clauses: Assertion or presupposition?

Following Hooper and Thompson, 1973 the complement of relative clauses is either presupposed or asserted. This is claimed by related to the possibility to embedd V2 or V-fin by Wiklund et al., 2009.

Non-restrictive relative clauses are asserted and thus can host main clause phenomena, e.g. modal particles

(37)
a. Loppet, som (ju) startar kl tre, är 10 km långt.
race.def rel MP starts clock three is 10 km long.
The race, which, as you know, starts at three o'clock, is 10k.

(38)
a. Loppet, som Peter (ju) troligtvis springer, är 10 km långt.
race.def rel Peter MP probably runs is 10 km long.
The race, which, as you know, Peter probably will run, is 10k. # The one John runs is 5 k.

Restrictive relative clauses relating to a definite NP are presupposed and not asserted, and can not host main clause phenomena , i.e do not allow for MPs.

(39)
a. Loppet som (*ju) startar kl tre är 10 km långt.
race.def rel MP starts clock three is 10 km long.
The race that starts at three o'clock is 10k.

(40)
a. Loppet som Peter (*ju) troligtvis springer, är 10 km långt.
race.def rel Peter MP probably runs is 10 km long.
The race that, as you know, Peter probably will run, is 10k. The one John runs is 5 k.

Even though example (40) is asserted and allows for RTs, V2 is still not possible:

(41)
a. Loppet, som ju (*startar) troligtvis (startar) kl tre, är 10 km långt.
race.def rel MP starts probably starts clock three is 10 km long.
The race, which, as you know, probably starts at three o'clock, is 10k.

(42)
a. Loppet, som Peter (ju) ⟨*springer⟩ troligtvis ⟨springer⟩, är 10 km långt.
race.def rel Peter MP runs probably runs is 10 km long.
The race, which, as you know, Peter probably will run, is 10k. #The one John runs is 5 k.

If assertion-hood is what drives the movement of the finite verb into a V2 position, than V2 should be possible here.

Consequences

- The status of the embedded clause as asserted *vs.* presupposed is not reflected in the word order of the embedded clause.
- We can use an analysis as proposed by Haegeman, 2006 to account for main clause phenomena in verb-final embedded clauses.
- BUT: It is not enough to account for V2.

What to do with the V2 clauses?

Embedding of speech acts, cf Krifka, 2014.

If we analyse the embedded clauses as speech acts, it follows naturally that we find different speech acts embedded under the corresponding verb, with the 'default' word order of that clause, i.e. V2 in assertions, V-initial in polar questions, etc.

(43)   GERMAN

a. Ich würde gerne mit dir ins neue Fischrestaurant essen gehen,
   I   would like with you in neu Fishrestaurant eat   go,
   obwohl; magst du überhaupt Fisch?
   although like   you at all   fish?
   I would like to go to the new fishrestaurant with you, but do you like fish at all?

b. Ich staune, was du alles isst!
   I   wonder what you all   eat!
   I am amazed by the things you eat.

The complementizers with flexible patterns can embed speech acts! Not only assertions, but also questions and exclamations. Which speech act it is possible to embed depends on the matrix verb.

Matrix verbs can take a speech act as complement if it is compatible with the meaning of the verb.

know can not embed a question: It is not possible to state that you have knowledge and then question it!

(44)   GERMAN

a. Ich weiß, ⟨Peter kommt morgen.⟩/ #⟨kommt Peter morgen?⟩
   I   know ⟨Peter comes tomorrow⟩ ⟨comes Peter tomorrow?⟩
   I know Peter is coming tomorrow # Is Peter coming tomorrow?

b. Ich frage, #⟨Peter kommt morgen.⟩/ ⟨kommt Peter morgen?⟩
   I   ask   ⟨Peter comes tomorrow⟩ ⟨comes Peter tomorrow?⟩
   I ask # Peter is coming tomorrow/ Is Peter coming tomorrow?

A speech act verb can be used to spell out a speech act, and take a subordinate clause (proposition) as a complement, or a speech act as complement and thus a clause with the default order for that speech act.

Verbs of Class B express attitudes towards a proposition and not speech acts, but can still have V2. Krifka, 2014 offers one account for this and ties it to the possibility of the embedded clause to be a speech act of the type assertion.

Summary

- Verbs can embed speech acts and they sub-categorize for which speech act they can take as a complement.
- Not only assertions can be embedded, but also questions and exclamatives.
- The status of the embedded clause cannot be linked to the dichotomy *asserted* vs. *presupposed* content: In case of V2, the content does not have the status of being asserted in the sence of Hooper and Thompson, 1973 but it IS an assertion
- Propositions can still be asserted in the sence of Hooper and Thompson, 1973 without being independent speech acts nor V2, cf. relative clauses.

4.4 Consequences for the assertion hypothesis

Consequences for the assertion hypothesis

- Does it hold that no V-base clauses are asserted, such as concessive clauses, relative clause, and temporal adverbial clauses?
- Under a universal application of the hypothesis it would follow that in Kashmiri complement clauses, causal clauses and embedded interrogative clauses are always asserted because they are obligatory V2.

• If the complementizer is compatible with verb movement, and it's absence doesn't drive how can you ensure that you not get complementizerless V-base orders?

5 Conclusion

• A plea: Don't give up the insight that low COMPs block verb movement.

• Optional embedded V2 clauses are not subordinate clauses.

• Specific lexical complementizer are the cause of the optional V2 order.

• Most (if not all) observation about optional embedded V2 follow from the main clause status.

• Assertion is rather the consequence then the cause of V2 order.

Acknowledgements

References

Bhatt, Rakesh Mohan (1999). *Verb Movement and the Syntax of Kashmiri*. Studies in Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 46. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Bidese, Ermenegildo, Andrea Padovan, and Alessandra Tomaselli (2014). "The syntax of subordination in Cimbrian and the rationale behind language contact". In: *STUF - Language Typology and Universals* 67.4, pp. 489–510.

De Haan, Germen J. (2001). "More is going on upstairs than downstairs: embedded root phenomena in West Frisian". English. In: *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 4.1, pp. 3–38.

Den Besten, Hans (1983). "On the interaction of root transformation and lexical deletive rules". In: *On the formal syntax of the Westgermania*. Ed. by Werner Abraham. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 47–131.

Frey, Werner (2012). "On two types of advrbial clauses allowing root-phenomena". In: *Main Clause Phenomena. New Horizons*. Ed. by Lobke Aelbrecht, Liliane Haegeman, and Rachel Nye. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 405–429.

Freywald, Ulrike (2008). "Zur Syntax und Funktion von dass-Sätzen mit Verbzweitstellung". In: *Deutsche Sprache* 36, pp. 246–285.

Freywald, Ulrike (2010). "Obwohl vielleicht war es ganz anders. Vorüberlegungen zum Alter der Verbzweitstellung nach subordinierenden Konjunktionen". In: *Historische Textgrammatik und Historische Syntax des Deutschen*. Ed. by Arne Ziegler. Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 55–84.

Gärtner, Hans-Martin (2001). "Are there V2 relative clauses in German?" In: *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 3.2, pp. 97–141.

Haegeman, Liliane (2006). "Conditionals, factives and the left periphery". In: *Lingua* 116, pp. 1651–1669.

Holmberg, Anders (2015). "Verb second". In: *Syntax – Theory and Analysis*. Ed. by Tibor Kiss and Artemis Alexiadou. Vol. 1. Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 42.1. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Hooper, Joan B. and Sandra A. Thompson (1973). "On the Applicability of root transformations". In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 4.4, pp. 465–497.

Koul, Omkar N. and Kashi Wali (2006). *Modern Kashmiri Grammar*. Springfield: Dunwoody Press.

— (2015). *Kashmiri*. München: LINCOM.

Krifka, Manfred (2014). "Embedding Illocutionary Acts". In: *Recursion, Complexity in Cognition (Studies in Theoretical Psycholinguistics 43)*. Ed. by Tom Roeper and Margaret Speas. Berlin: Springer, pp. 125–155.

Reis, Marga (1997). "Zum syntaktischen Status unselbständiger Verbzweit-Sätze". In: *Sprache im Fokus. Festschrift für Heinz Vater zum 65. Geburtstag*. Ed. by Christa Dürscheid, Karl Heinz Ramers, and Monika Schwarz. Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp. 121–144.

Scheffler, Tatjana (2013). *Two-dimensional Semantics. Clausal Adjuncts and Complements*. Linguistische Arbeiten 549. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Shlonsky, Ur (1994). "Agreement in Comp". In: *The Linguistic Review* 11.3-4, pp. 351–357.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur (2007). *The syntax of Icelandic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— (2010). "Predictable and unpredictable sources of variable verb and adverb placement in Scandinavian". In: *Lingua* 120.5. Formalising syntactic variability, pp. 1062–1088.

Vikner, Sten (1995). *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. Oxford studies in comparative syntax. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wiklund, Anna-Lena et al. (2009). "On the distribution and illocution of V2 in Scandinavian *that*-clauses". In: *Lingua* 119.12. Twists of Mood: The Distribution and Interpretation of indicative and subjunctive, pp. 1914–1938.