Krzysztof Migdalski, Wrocław University
Against a uniform treatment of second position effects as force markers

A common assumption about the V2 rule in the Germanic languages is that it is related to clause typing/illocutionary force specification. At first blush this approach seems well-motivated, given that the finite verb is assumed to raise to C in root contexts, whereas in embedded clauses the movement is blocked by the complementizer that directly specifies clause type. Moreover, in some Scandinavian dialects V2 is possible in embedded clauses depending on the illocution expressed by the verb in the matrix clause (cf. (1); see Andersson 1975; Wechsler 1991; Wiklund et al. 2009). Thus, in analyses such as Brandner (2004), languages like German or Dutch are claimed to mark clause types via V2 in all contexts, whereas in English, which has just "residual V2", the operation only encodes "deviation from a declarative clause". This talk will challenge this assumption and will argue that "generalized" V2 found in declarative clauses in all contemporary Germanic languages except English is entirely unrelated to the "clause-typing" V2. The motivation for this proposal will come from (i) the diachrony of V2 and (ii) properties of second position cliticization in Slavic. As for (i), it is well-established that the two types of V2 operations developed independently. In Old Germanic V2 was restricted to operator context; Old English had a more elaborate V2 system, but it was lost presumably due to the development of the EPP feature in T and/or the differentiation of the past and perfect tense (see Van Kemenade 1997, Fuss 2003, Axel 2007), so the change was independent of any modifications in the clause typing mechanism. As for (ii), second position cliticization (2P) has been presumed to be an instance of the same syntactic operation as V2 since Wackernagel (1892), see also Franks (2000) and Bošković (2001). Diachronically, on a par with V2 in Old Germanic, 2P was initially restricted to operator contexts: the only 2P clitics in Old Church Slavonic were operator clitics like the interrogation/focus particles *li* and *že*, ethical datives, and the complementizer *bo* (cf. (2); see Radanović-Kocić 1988). Pronominal clitics were at first verb-adjacent, switching to 2P in some Slavic languages (e.g., Czech, Serbo-Croatian, Slovene) at a later stage. However, operator clitics are still in 2P in both the languages that do not have pronominal clitics otherwise (e.g., Polish and Russian) as well as in the languages in which pronominal clitics are still verb-adjacent (Bulgarian and Macedonian). Crucially, in languages with generalized 2P cliticization, operator clitics exhibit different properties than all other 2P clitics. For example, in S-C *li* is unable to project a specifier (Bošković 2001: 31) and may be preceded only by heads, while other 2P clitics can be preceded by heads and XPs alike (cf. 3). Furthermore, ethical datives raise higher than argumental pronominal clitics in S-C, as only the former may precede sentential adverbs (cf. 4). In Czech *li* requires verb-adjacency, unlike all other 2P clitics that do not need to be adjacent to any specific category (cf. 5). Finally, in Macedonian *li*, which is the only 2P clitic in the language, is an enclitic, whereas other clitics procliticize onto finite verbs (cf. 6). Hence, although pronominal and operator clitics are both 2P in many Slavic languages, the latter show distinct requirements with respect to the categorial and syntactic nature of the preceding host. Concerning the diachronic extension of 2P cliticization onto the formerly verb-adjacent pronominal clitics, it does not seem to be related to any modification of clause typing strategies either, as in the case of the history of V2. Rather, it conspicuously coincides with the decline of simple past tenses (aorist and imperfect), which I interpret as a weakening of T, as a result of which T is no longer available as a potential adjunction site for pronominal clitics.

Consequently, if V2 and 2P are indeed related processes, and if the diachronic accounts of V2 in Germanic are correct, it is clear that only a subset of second position effects encodes illocution. Furthermore, given that Force-2P and "general" 2P cliticization have so different

properties, "general" V2 might also be an entirely different operation than Force-V2, although both produce the same surface word orders in Germanic.

(1) a. Han sa at han **kunne ikke** synge i bryllupet (strong assertion, embedded V2 possible)
He said that he could not sing in wedding-the
"He said that he could not sing at the wedding."

b. *Han angret på at han **hadde ikke** sunget (weak assertion, no embedded V2)
he regretted on that he had not sung
"He regretted that he hadn't sung." (Norwegian, Wiklund et al. 2009)

(2) Elisaveti *že* isplъni *sę* vrĕmę roditi *ei*.
Elizabeth FOC fulfil$_{PAST}$ REFL time give-birth her$_{DAT}$
"When it was time for Elizabeth to have her baby." (OCS, Pancheva et al. 2007)

(3) a. Skupe (*li*) knjige (**li*) Ana čita?
expensive Q books Q Ana reads
"Does Ana read expensive books?"

b. Skupe (*je*) knjige (*je*) Ana čitala.
expensive be$_{AUX.3SG}$ books be$_{AUX.3SG}$ Ana read
"Ana read expensive books." (S-C, cf. Bošković 2001: 27)

(4) Oni *su* *ti* pravilno odgovorili Mileni.
they be$_{3PL}$ you$_{CL.DAT}$ correctly answer$_{PART.M.PL}$ Milena$_{DAT}$
"They did the right thing in answering M." (only possible when *ti* is an ethical dative)
/"They gave M. a correct answer."(possible in both cases) (S-C, Bošković 2001: 60)

(5) a. Máte-*li* pochyby, zatelefonujte na informace.
have$_{2PL}$+Q doubts call$_{2PL}$ at information
"If you have doubts, call the information."

b. *Pochyby/ *dnes- *li* máte...
doubts / today Q have$_{2PL}$ (Czech, Toman 1996: 508)

(6) a. (**Li*) *si* *mu* *gi* dal parite?
Q be$_{2SG}$ him$_{DAT}$ them$_{ACC}$ give$_{PART.M.SG}$ money-the

b. *Si* *mu* *gi* dal *li* parite?
be$_{2SG}$ him$_{DAT}$ them$_{ACC}$ give$_{PART.M.SG}$ Q money-the
'Did you give him the money?' (Macedonian, Rudin et al. 1999: 544)

References

Andersson, L.-G. 1975. Form and function of subordinate clauses. Doctoral dissertation, Gothenburg University. **Axel, K.** 2007. *Studies on Old High German Syntax. Left sentence periphery, verb placement and verb-second.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins. **Bošković, Ž.** 2001. *On the Nature of the Syntax-Phonology Interface. Cliticization and Related Phenomena.* Amsterdam: Elsevier. **Brandner, E.** 2004. Head-movement in Minimalism, and V2 as FORCE-marking. In *The Syntax and Semantics of the Left Periphery*, eds. H. Lohnstein and S. Trissler, 97-138. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. **Franks, S.** 2000. Clitics at the Interface: An Introduction to *Clitic Phenomena in European Languages*. In *Clitic Phenomena in European Languages*, eds. F. Beukema and M. Den Dikken, 1-46. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. **Fuss, E.** 2003. On the historical core of V2 in Germanic. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 26: 195-231. **Kemenade, A. van.** 1997. V2 and embedded topicalisation. In *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, eds. A. van Kemenade and N. Vincent, 326-352. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. **Pancheva R., A. Łazorczyk, J. Krivokapić, and Y. Minkova.** 2007. *Codex Marianus.* In *USC Parsed Corpus of Old South Slavic.* **Radanović-Kocić, V.** 1988. The Grammar of Serbo-Croatian Clitics: A Synchronic and Diachronic Perspective. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. **Rudin, C., C. Kramer, L. Billings, and M. Baerman.** 1999. Macedonian and Bulgarian *li* Questions: Beyond Syntax. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 17:541-586. **Toman, J.** 1996. A Note on Clitics and Prosody. In *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, eds. A. Halpern and A. Zwicky, 505-510. Stanford: CSLI Publications. **Wackernagel, J.** 1892. Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1: 333-435. **Wechsler, S.** 1991. Verb Second and Illocutionary Force. In *Views on Phrase Structure*, eds. K. Leffel and D. Bouchard, 177-191. Dordrecht: Kluwer. **Wiklund, A.-L.** 2009. In search of the force of dependent V2: A note on Swedish. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 83: 27-36. **Wiklund, A.-L., K. Bentzen, G. H. Hrafnbjargarson, Þ. Hróarsdóttir.** 2009. On the distribution and illocution of V2 in Scandinavian *that*-clauses. *Lingua* 119.12: 1914-1938.