

Werner Abraham (Vienna and Munich)

Modal particles in German and illocutive force in peripheral embedded clauses.

Abstract: The paper is on a fundamental division of subordinate clauses and the search for a unified explanation of this division. The division cuts through all three types of dependent clauses:

- 1 (factive-nonfactive) complement clauses;
- 2 (temporal-locative vs. logical) adverbial clauses; and
- 3 ((non-)restrictive) adnominal dependent clauses.

Central observations are due to Haegeman (2006). The shibboleth category are modal particles in German. As soon as a(n) German (in)dependent clause licenses a modal particle (MP) it carries autonomous speech act potential. MP signals speaker activity at assessing a proposition in relation to the addressee's knowledge assessment by the speaker. Such speaker status relates to ForceP, the highest clausal category in the syntactic representation of a sentence. Given its specific task we call the function of this category Speaker deixis. This article deals with the question which types of dependent clauses carry autonomous Speaker deixis and whether, and on which pragmatic-semantic grounds, MP encodes such Speaker deixis. Furthermore, it is discussed whether adverbials of modality are on a par with MP in terms of such Speaker deixis and how the respective speaker-hearer-deictic differences project syntactically. It will be argued that the crucial operation active for modal particles is Foreign Conscience Alignment (more generally "Theory of mind"): MP trigger reactions from the addressee on statements uttered by the speaker with respect to consensuability toward the utterance standing uniquely for shared beliefs of both speaker and addressee. In a way this discussion addresses central points of Sperber-Wilson's Theory of Relevance, and it solves pertinent questions in purely grammatical terms and operations.

As for the uniting characteristics for all three types of dependent clauses, several options will be considered: discourse vs. event descriptions; contextual foregrounding vs. backgrounding; presupposition vs. assertivity (relative to the matrix clause). It will be seen that the class of dependent complement clauses provide the hardest type for a common characteristic.

Literature:

Haegeman, Liliane 2006. Conditionals, factives, and the left periphery. *Lingua* 116: 1651-69.
Sperber, Dan & Deirdre Wilson 1986. *Relevance. Communication and cognition*. London: Blackwell.

The status of the embedded V-Neg word order

Kristine Bentzen
University of Tromsø

In this talk I will discuss the nature of the word order Verb-Negation (i.e. verb movement across negation) in embedded clauses. In contrast to Icelandic embedded V-Neg, this word order in Mainland Scandinavian is generally taken to be an instance of embedded V2 alongside non-subject initial V2 (XPVS). I will show that although this is indeed in many respects a correct analysis of embedded V-Neg in Norwegian, there are some puzzling facts from both Norwegian and Faroese, and from Norwegian child language, suggesting that embedded V-Neg still might have a slightly different status from embedded XPVS. I will look at the distribution of V-Neg and XPVS in various embedded contexts, and at interpretative and syntactic effects of these word orders. I will focus on Norwegian but also touch upon other Scandinavian languages, as well as parallel contexts in English.

First of all, I will show that the distribution of embedded V-Neg in Norwegian overlaps with the distribution of embedded XPVS concerning which clause types allow this word order, suggesting that the two word orders belong to the same phenomenon.

Secondly, as we have argued in Wiklund et al. (2009), the claimed link between *assertion* and embedded V2 in complement clauses is not crucial. I will here show further tests supporting this argument, as well as extending the argument to include other types of embedded clauses. Moreover, based on data from various Norwegian and English embedded contexts, I will argue (along with Wiklund et al. 2009) that there is an overlap of contexts displaying a *potential* for a Main Point of Utterance reading (MPU) and those displaying a *potential* for embedded V2 and other embedded root phenomena. Notably though, MPU and V2 do not go hand in hand. However here too, embedded V-Neg and embedded XPVS seem to behave the same way.

Finally, I will discuss how embedded V-Neg word order interacts with other syntactic operations, such as extraction. A recent online experiment (Bentzen and Heycock 2010) confirms that embedded V-Neg blocks extraction in a way similar to embedded XPVS in Norwegian. However, as shown in Bentzen (2010) and Hrafnbjargason et al. (2010), extraction of arguments across word order V-Neg is not completely rejected by Norwegian speakers. This is surprising on the assumption that embedded V-Neg and embedded XPVS belong to the same phenomenon. Data from a parallel experiment from Faroese (Heycock, Sorace & Hansen), as well as relevant data from Norwegian child language (Westergaard & Bentzen 2007, Bentzen et al. 2011) will also be discussed in this connection. As we will see, these data suggest that there might be subtle differences between embedded V-Neg and XPVS in Norwegian (as well as in Faroese) after all, where speakers might have some sort of residual access to V-Neg as an instance of (traditional) V-to-I movement (Heycock et al. 2010).

References

- Bentzen, K, I. Franco & M. Westergaard. In progress. The acquisition of subject and object relatives in Norwegian.
- Bentzen, K. & C. Heycock. 2010. Embedded V2 and extraction in Faroese and Norwegian: Results from parallel experiments. Paper presented at the workshop *Verb movement: Its nature, triggers and effects*, December 2010, Amsterdam. (In collaboration with A. Sorace, Z. S. Hansen & F. Wilson)
- Bentzen, K. 2010. Exploring embedded main clause phenomena: The irrelevance of factivity and some challenges from V2 languages. *Theoretical Linguistics* 36. 163-172.
- Heycock, C., A. Sorace, Z. S. Hansen, S. Vikner, & F. Wilson. 2010. Residual V-to-I in Faroese and its lack in Danish: Detecting the final stages of a syntactic change. Submitted to *WPSS*.
- Hrafnbjargarson, G. H., K. Bentzen & A-L. Wiklund. 2010. Observations on extraction from V2-clauses in Scandinavian. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 33. 299-309.
- Westergaard, M. & K. Bentzen 2007. The (non-)effect of input frequency on the acquisition of word order in Norwegian embedded clauses. In *Frequency Effects in Language Acquisition. Defining the Limits of Frequency as an Explanatory Concept*. Mouton de Gruyter. 271-306.
- Wiklund, A-L., K. Bentzen, G. H. Hrafnbjargarson & Thorbjörg Hróarsdóttir. 2009. On the distribution and illocution of V2 in Scandinavian *that*-clauses. *Lingua* 119. 1914-1938.

V2 word order in subordinate clauses in spoken Danish

Torben Juel Jensen & Tanya Karoli Christensen, LANCHART, University of Copenhagen

Danish grammatical tradition has it that V2 and V3 word order are signals of the syntactic difference between main and subordinate clauses. However, several studies have shown that both word orders appear in both clause types (Heltoft 2005, Christensen 2007, Jensen forthc.). Though V2 and V3 are asymmetrically distributed, we argue that the word order difference should rather be seen as a signal of (subtle) semantic differences. In main clauses, V3 is highly marked in comparison to V2, and occurs in what may be called emotives. In subordinate clauses, V2 is marked and signals what has been called "assertiveness", but is rather a question of foregrounding (cf. Simons 2007: *Main Point of Utterance*).

The paper presents the results of a study of word order in subordinate clauses in contemporary spoken Danish and focuses on how to include the proposed semantic difference as a factor influencing the choice of one variant over another in a (socio)linguistic variable. This is a crucial methodological issue in the study of syntactic variation since variants are hardly ever semantically equivalent in all respects. The study, which is a part of the LANCHART project (www.lanchart.hum.ku.dk), is based on panel studies of two age cohorts of speakers in Copenhagen, recorded in the 1980s and again in 2005-07, and on recent recordings with two age cohorts of speakers from the western part of Jutland. This makes it possible to study variation and change with respect to word order in subordinate clauses in both real and apparent time, as well as geographical variation.

The results show that V2 word order in subordinate clauses is much more frequent than commonly assumed. Furthermore, they indicate that the most decisive factors predicting word order in subordinate clauses are the syntactic function of the clause and the type of subordinating conjunction, although social and geographical factors also have an impact. The results are consistent with the hypothesis that V2 word order is associated with foreground or main point of utterance, if we accept it as a statistical tendency in language use rather than as an invariant coding.

References

- Christensen, T. K. 2007. Hyperparadigmer – en undersøgelse af paradigmatiske samspil i danske modussystemer. Institut for kultur og identitet. Roskilde, Roskilde Universitetscenter. PhD thesis.
- Heltoft, L. 2005. Ledsætning og letled i dansk. OV-sætningens rester. L. Heltoft, J. Nørgaard-Sørensen & L. Schøsler. *Grammatikalisering og struktur*. København, Museum Tusulanum.
- Jensen, Torben Juel forthc. Ordstilling i ledsætninger i moderne dansk talesprog. *Ny forskning i grammatik*.
- Simons, M. 2007. Observations on embedding verbs, evidentiality and presupposition. *Lingua* 117 (6), 1034-1056.
- Vikner, S. 1995. Verb movement and expletive subjects in the Germanic languages. Oxford University Press.

Sonia Cristofaro (University of Pavia)

Embedding, subordination, and grammatical categories

The basic intuition behind the notion of embedding is that a clause functions as a component of another clause, both in the sense that it encodes a state of affairs that is conceptually part of the state of affairs encoded by the other clause (Hale 1976, Cristofaro 2003, Mithun 2009), and in the sense that it functions as a syntactic constituent of this clause. This idea has been used to distinguish between two clause linkage types, subordination, which involves embedding, and non-subordination (coordination, cosubordination), which involves no embedding (Huddleston 1984, Foley and Van Valin 1984, Roberts 1988, Haspelmath 1995, among others). In various theoretical models, particularly (but not only) generatively oriented ones, it is further assumed that the distinction between embedded and nonembedded clauses is part of a speaker's knowledge of their language, to the extent that grammatical representation in a speaker's mind includes different clause classes characterized by syntactic embedding (or subordination) vs. lack thereof (Culicover and Jackendoff 1997, among others).

This paper investigates the notion of embedding in a functionally, cross-linguistically, and diachronically oriented perspective, and discusses various cases suggesting that this notion does not actually make it possible to consistently identify distinct clause types (for example, subordinate vs. coordinate clauses), both from one language to another and within individual languages (Cristofaro 2003, 2008). Not all of the traditional criteria for embedding give the same results for different clause types (complement, adverbial, and relative clauses), which means that individual clause types will count as embedded or nonembedded depending on the criterion taken into account. This challenges the view that embedding can be defined in terms of different criteria, and that all of the clauses that count as embedded under at least some of these criteria belong to a single class. Also, depending on the context, individual criteria for embedding may or may not distinguish between different clause types (for example, complement, adverbial, or relative clauses as opposed to coordinate clauses), which challenges the view that these clause types belong to different classes. Finally, in many languages, the same clause types display different semantic, pragmatic and syntactic properties in different contexts, which suggests that particular syntactic properties that are regarded as evidence for embedding may be related to contextual factors, rather than any specific syntactic configuration.

These problems, it will be argued, originate from a basic discrepancy between the intuitive understanding of the notion of embedding and the grammatical phenomena that are usually regarded as evidence for embedding. As different clause types involving conceptual embedding (traditional instances of 'subordinate' clauses, such as complement, adverbial, and relative clauses) may display various distinguishing properties, these are taken as evidence for syntactic embedding. However, the relevant properties are not obviously motivated by the fact that a clause functions as a syntactic constituent of another clause, nor by any unified grammatical phenomenon, for that matter. Rather, they can be related to various semantic and pragmatic properties of particular constructions, and the diachronic origin of these constructions (for example, positional restrictions for

particular types of ‘subordinate’ clauses may be related to whether they originate from nominalizations or serial verb constructions).

All this suggests that the notion of embedding, at least in the way it has been used in the literature, does not correspond to any specific grammatical category that is part of a speaker’s mental representation and is possibly relevant for different languages. As has been observed by Bybee (1986) with regard to grammatical categories in general, the differences or similarities between the various clause types attested cross-linguistically cannot be taken as evidence that these clause types are arranged in any specific grouping in a speaker’s mental grammar (see also Croft 2001). Rather, they only provide evidence about specific patterns of form-function correspondence, and diachronic processes that lead from one clause type to another.

References

- Bybee, J. (1986). On the Nature of Grammatical Categories: a Diachronic Perspective. In S. Choi, D. Devitt, W. Janis, T. McCoy, and Z.-S. Zhang (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Second Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*, pp. 17–34. The Ohio State University.
- Cristofaro, S. (2003). *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cristofaro, S. (2008). Asymmetric events, subordination, and grammatical categories. In B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (Ed.), *Asymmetric events*, pp. 151–72. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Croft, W. (2001). *Radical Construction Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Culicover, P. W. and R. Jackendoff (1997). Semantic Subordination despite Syntactic Coordination. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28, 195–217.
- Foley, W. A. and R. D. Van Valin, Jr. (1984). *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hale, K. (1976). The adjoined relative clause in Australia. In R. M. W. Dixon (Ed.), *Grammatical categories of Australian languages*, pp. 78–105. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Languages.
- Haspelmath, M. (1995). The converb as a cross-linguistically valid category. In M. Haspelmath and E. König (Eds.), *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective*, pp. 1–56. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Huddleston, R. D. (1984). *Introduction to the Grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mithun, M. (2009). Re(e)volving complexity: Adding intonation. In T. Givón and M. Shibatani (Eds.), *Syntactic Complexity*, pp. 53–80. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Roberts, J. R. (1988). Amele switch-reference and the theory of grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 45–63.

Some Remarks on "Liberalizing Modals"

Hrafnbjargarson (2008) presents evidence that for some speakers of Icelandic, presence of a modal in the C-system widens the distribution of embedded V2-declaratives:

- (1) * a. *Hún efaðist um [að [þessar bækur hefðu [nemendurnir lesið fyrir prófið]]]*
she doubted that these books had students.the read before exam.the
b. *Hún efaðist um [að [þessar bækur myndu [nemendurnir lesa fyrir prófið]]]*
she doubted that these books would students.the read before exam.the

He goes on to hypothesize that "liberalizing" the left periphery for topicalization is due to semantic interaction between the matrix predicate and the modal. This presentation is meant to shed further light on this effect and to indicate directions of spelling it out semantically.

I. Similar effects have been observed for German (see Truckenbrodt 2006 for a recent source):

- (2) * a. *Maria verlangt [Hans geht / gehe heim]*
Mary demands Hans goes.IND go.SUBJ home
b. *Maria verlangt [Hans solle heimgehen]*
Mary demands Hans shall.SUBJ home.go
"Mary demands that Hans go home"

(2b) reports on an order by Mary the original utterance of which could have had the form of an imperative (*Hans, geh heim!*) or a V2-declarative involving a performative modal (*Hans, Du sollst heimgehen.*). It is well-known that in reported speech, modals have to be used to encode directives given that imperatives do not (normally) embed. On the assumption that one factor in licensing embedded V2-declaratives is speech and thought representation (cf. den Besten 1983, among others), the modal in (1) wouldn't be unexpected if it could be viewed in this light. Thus, one may speculate that the original situation of doubting reported on in (1b) involved a modalized interrogative (*Will/Would the students read these books? I'm not sure.*) Also, "modal concord" (Zeijlstra 2008) may play a role in (1b). On this view, *myndu* would (redundantly) encode the counterfactuality evoked by the matrix verb "to doubt."

II. To model the above effects semantically, one should try to follow recent work on "erlebte Rede" or "free-indirect discourse" (FID) (Schlenker 2004; Sharvit 2008). Embedded V2-declaratives are a category somewhere between FID and "standard indirect discourse" (SID). If what they preserve of direct discourse (DD) is the force operator, one has to assume that this operator can be shifted - i.e., its operation on commitment states can be relativized to the matrix attitude holder - the same way temporal adverbs like *today* can be shifted to the matrix attitude-holder's "now" in FID.

III. Hrafnbjargarson (2008:126) also assumes "that factive predicates and non-assertive predicates employ more structure than assertive (and semi-factive) predicates." This idea harmonizes well with the approach by Krifka (2001), who assumes that interrogatives start out as denoting question-acts. In this form they can combine directly with intensional predicates like *wonder*. For combination with extensional predicates like *know*, however, a type-shift via application of an additional operator TA ("true-answer") is required. For declaratives, the appropriate counterpart has to be postulated.

den Besten, Hans. 1983. "On the Interaction of Root Transformations and Lexical Deletive Rules." Pp. 47-138 in *On the Formal Syntax of the Westgermania*, edited by W. Abraham. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. • Hrafnbjargarson, Gunnar Hrafn. 2008. "Liberalizing Modals and Floating Clause Boundaries." *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 82:103-130. • Krifka, Manfred. 2001. "Quantifying into Question Acts." *Natural Language Semantics* 9:1-40. • Schlenker, Philippe. 2004. "Context of Thought and Context of Utterance: A Note on Free Indirect Discourse and the Historical Present." *Mind & Language* 19:279-304. • Sharvit, Yael. 2008. "The Puzzle of Free Indirect Discourse." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31:353-395. • Truckenbrodt, Hubert. 2006. "On the Semantic Motivation of Syntactic Verb Movement to C in German." *Theoretical Linguistics* 32:257-306. • Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2008. "Modal Concord is Syntactic Agreement." Unpublished manuscript. University of Amsterdam.

Classification of subordinate clauses in Danish

Abstract - Sune Sønderberg Mortensen

University of Copenhagen, Dep. of Scandinavian Languages and Linguistics

E: sunsm@hum.ku.dk / M: +45 5080 9740

Commonly, across Nordic and much international grammar, subordinate clauses are classified according to their syntactic function in the matrix clause, i.e. into categories such as **nominal**, **attributive** and **adverbial** subclauses (terminology varies) (e.g. Quirk *et al.* 1985; Faarlund *et al.* 1997; Van Valin & La Polla 1997; Teleman *et al.* 1999; Hansen & Heltoft *forthcoming*). By definition, this system does not reveal much about the subclauses **in isolation** from their matrix clauses – since only their syntactic function **in the actualised construction** is used as a criterion. Thus, e.g. Danish time clauses introduced by *da* (approx.: *when*) may be classified as either nominal (1), attributive (2) or adverbial (3), depending solely on the actual matrix clause construction:

- (1) Kan du huske **da vi var i Rom**? ('Do you remember when we were in Rome?')
- (2) Den uge **da vi var i Rom**, var fantastisk ('That week when we were in Rome was amazing')
- (3) Vi fik god mad **da vi var i Rom** ('We had great food when we were in Rome')

In other words, as the classification is done according to syntactic **function** only, a system is called for that allows classification at the level of **material** (a.k.a. **form**), i.e. of the subclauses in isolation, as it were. This is roughly the aim of my PhD project, in which I am currently investigating the **distributional potential** of various kinds of subclauses as a parameter for classification. I.e. some subclause types render different syntactic/topological opportunities than others, which are invariant properties according to which the clauses may be classified, more or less **independently** of the actual matrix clause construction. In my presentation I will show some of my preliminary findings based on this approach, arguing for a division of Danish subclauses into **Primary**, **Secondary**, **Tertiary**, **Quartary** and **Attributional** ones, as well as discuss some of my current challenges. My theoretical orientation is that of Danish Functional Linguistics (e.g. Engberg-Pedersen *et al.* 1996; Engberg-Pedersen *et al.* 2005), but I expect most of my points to remain relatively theory-neutral.

Engberg-Pedersen, E., M.D. Fortescue, P. Harder, L. Heltoft & L.F. Jakobsen (red.). (1996). *Content, expression and structure : Studies in Danish Functional Grammar*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Engberg-Pedersen, E., M.D. Fortescue, P. Harder, L. Heltoft & L.F. Jakobsen (2005). *Dansk funktionel lingvistik : En helhedsforståelse af forholdet mellem sprogstruktur, sprogbrug og kognition.*, København / Roskilde: Københavns Universitet / Handelshøjskolen i København / Roskilde Universitetscenter.

Faarlund, J.T., S. Lie & K.I. Vannebo (1997). *Norsk referansegrammatikk*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Hansen, E. & L. Heltoft (*forthcoming*). *Grammatik over det Danske Sprog*, Copenhagen: Det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab / Syddansk Universitetsforlag.

Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech & J. Svartvik (1985). *A Comprehensive grammar of the English language*, London: Longman.

Teleman, U., E. Andersson & S. Hellberg (1999). *Svenska Akademiens grammatik 4 : Satser och meningar*, Stockholm: Svenska Akademien.

Van Valin, R.D. & R.J. La Polla (1997). *Syntax - Structure, Meaning and Function*, Cambridge New York: Cambridge University Press.

(1) contains a so called embedded V2-clause (*att John äter inte sill*).

(1) Han sa att John äter inte sill.

He said that John eats not herring

'He said that John does not eat herring.'

"Embedded" V2-clauses, like the *att*-clause in (1), deviate from prototypical Swedish subordinate clauses by displaying two typical main clause properties: They have V2 word order and express speech acts (they are normally construed as assertions) (cf. Julien, 2007). "Embedded" V2-clauses are often analyzed as subordinate clauses containing a recursive CP. Following a recursive CP analysis, the "embedded" V2-clause has two CPs: a lower one, to which the finite verb moves and a higher one which is occupied by the complementizer *att* ('that') (cf. Holmberg & Platzack, 1995; Vikner, 1995).

If the recursive CP analysis is on the right track and the "embedded" V2-clause is a subordinate clause, extraction out of an "embedded" V2-clause ought to be grammatical since the highest spec-CP position would be a possible escape hatch. One would also expect topicalization of an "embedded" V2-clause to be grammatical. However, none of these operations yield grammatical results. Furthermore, unlike prototypical subordinate clauses, "embedded" V2-clauses do not have to be deictically adjusted to their "matrix clauses". On the basis of these observations, I argue that the "complementizer" *att* ('that') does not function as a regular complementizer in the sense that it anchors the "embedded" V2-clause in the speech act- or finiteness value of its "matrix" clause.

I define a main clause as a clause which expresses a speech act and a subordinate clause as a clause which does not express a speech act. Further, I argue that speech act value is directly connected to V-to-C movement in Swedish. Following these definitions, I conclude that "embedded" V2-clauses cannot be analyzed as subordinate clauses since they express speech acts and display V2 word order. Instead, I propose a paratactic analysis according to which both clauses in a sentence containing an "embedded" V2-clause are main clauses. I argue that the presumed complementizer *att* is not a complementizer but a pronominal element which functions as an argument in relation to the verb of the first clause. The pronominal element *att* refers to the second clause in an "embedded" V2 construction. This paratactic analysis can account for the facts concerning extraction, topicalization and deictic adjustment. The analysis is supported by historic and prosodic evidence and by the observation that the "embedded" clause can be an imperative clause (cf. Petersson, 2009).

Holmberg, Anders; Platzack, Christer (1995): *The role of inflection in Scandinavian syntax*. New York, Oxford: Oxford university press.

Julien, Marit (2007): Embedded V2 in Norwegian and Swedish. In *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax 80*. pp. 103 - 161. Lund: Center of language and literature

Petersson, David (2009): Embedded V2 does not exist in Swedish. In *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax 84*. pp. 101 - 149. Lund: Center of language and literature.

Vikner, Sten (1995): *Verb movement and expletive subjects in the Germanic languages*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University press.

Embedded topicalization – evidence from Övdalian

Henrik Rosenkvist

Since Holmberg & Platzack (1995), one of the most debated features of Scandinavian syntax has been word order in embedded clauses. During the last decade or so, the division in Insular and Mainland Scandinavian languages which claim that Insular Scandinavian languages have verb raising in embedded clauses (the finite verb raises above clause adverbials) while Mainland Scandinavian languages have not, has been called into question. Recent contributions to this debate are for instance a series of works by Kristine Bentzen, Gunnar Hrafnbjargarson, Þórbjörg Hróarsdóttir and Anna-Lena Wiklund (e.g. Bentzen et al 2007, Wiklund et al 2007, 2009, Hrafnbjargarson & Wiklund 2009, Wiklund 2010) as well as Julien (2007) and Þráinsson (2010). One of the most important aspects in the inquiry into possible word orders has been to establish which embedded clauses allow main clause word order and which do not; to ensure that one really is analyzing an embedded clause, clauses which display typical V2-constructions such as topicalization must not be included in the study. As for e.g. *that*-clauses, Hróarsdóttir et al (2007:59) claim that such clauses do not allow topicalization when they are embedded under non-assertive and factive verbs (such as *doubt* and *regret*, respectively), in any of the Scandinavian languages. Accordingly, such a *that*-clause will reveal the true word order in embedded clauses in the Scandinavian languages.

However, it appears that in Övdalian (cf. Garbacz 2010) *that*-clauses embedded after these types of matrix verbs do allow some forms of topicalization.

1. An twivler å at idag kumb eð tä raingen.
he doubts on that today will it to rain
'He doubts that it will rain today.'
2. An aunggrer at niði bym brukeð an blät sig milmað.
he regrets that in village.DAT.DEF. used-to he drink REFL. sometimes
'He regrets that he used to get drunk down in the village sometimes.'
3. ?An aunggrer at å-dar buotje wann an aldri leså.
he regrets that she-there book.DEF. made-it he never read
'He regrets that he never had time to read that book.'

In this talk, I will present and discuss further examples of topicalization in embedded clauses in Övdalian, based on current field work, and I will also discuss the possibility to extract constituents from this type of *that*-clauses. The features of Övdalian will be related to the general discussion about embedded V2 in the Scandinavian languages.

References

- Bentzen, K, G. Hrafnbjargarson, Þ. Hróarsdóttir, & A-L Wiklund. 2007. Extracting from V2. *WPSS* 79:119–128.
- Garbacz, Piotr. 2010. *Word Order in Övdalian*. Doctoral Dissertation, Centre for Languages and Literature, Lund University.
- Julien, Marit. 2007. Embedded V2 in Norwegian and Swedish. *WPSS* 80:103–161.
- Þráinsson, H. 2010. Predictable and unpredictable sources of variable verb and adverb placement in Scandinavian *Lingua* 120:5:1062–1088.
- Wiklund, A-L, G.H. Hrafnbjargarson, K. Bentzen, & Þ. Hróarsdóttir. 2007. Rethinking Scandinavian verb movement. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 10:203–233.
- Wiklund, Anna-Lena. 2010. In search of the force of dependent Verb Second. *NJL* 33:81–91.
- Wiklund, A-L, G.H. Hrafnbjargarson, K. Bentzen, & Þ. Hróarsdóttir. 2009. On the distribution and illocution of V2 in Scandinavian *that*-clauses. *Lingua* 119:1914–1938.

Complementizer-headed clauses are embedded. Evidence from Swedish swearing

Some clauses, such as the ones in (1a–b), exhibit all formal criteria of being subclauses, but may, nevertheless, be used as independent speech acts.

- (1) a. Att han alltid ska vara så envis! ('How stubborn he always is.')
- b. Om jag bara kunde sticka iväg! ('If I could only go away.')

The capacity of expressing speech acts is normally assigned to main clauses, and I take it as a theoretical point of departure that this capacity is structurally defined and formally linked to a force feature. This feature is normally absent in subclauses, the only exception being *that*-clauses with main clause word order. (Cf. Stroh-Wollin 2002: ch. 6.) So, what about the clauses in (1a–b)?

In Stroh-Wollin 2003, I suggested that exclamative clauses by mere convention function as independent speech acts. This idea was, however, challenged in Magnusson 2007. Magnusson (p. 209 ff.) noted that exclamatives may be complements to emphatic interjections, such as swear words, and (some) imperatives, i.e. words that can be assumed to have a lexically inherent force feature. In case a visible matrix of this kind was lacking, Magnusson suggested a corresponding invisible operator to be present instead, see (2).

- (2) [Fan/Se/Ø_{force} [vad dum hon är]].
SWEAR WORD/Look/Ø how stupid she is

When studying swear words in a drama corpus (Stroh-Wollin 2008), I discovered even more complementizer-headed clause types that may or, in some cases, have to be preceded by a swear word (or an alternative interjection or an imperative), which may support Magnusson's hypothesis. In my contribution I will explore the idea that all complementizer-headed clauses are embedded in some force-expressing matrix, if not a finite one, a non-finite one and if not a visible one, an invisible one.

Magnusson, Erik, 2007: Gränsöverskridande koordination. Syntaktisk förändring I äldre svenska. Nordistica Gothoburgensia 28. Göteborg.

Stroh-Wollin, Ulla, 2002: Som-satser med och utan *som*. Skrifter utgivna av Institutionen för nordiska språk vid Uppsala universitet 58. Uppsala.

Stroh-Wollin, Ulla, 2003: Va' bra han va'! Något om exklamationer och deras illokutionära kraft. I: Grammatik och samtal. Red. av Bengt Nordberg m.fl. Skrifter utgivna av Institutionen för nordiska språk vid Uppsala universitet 63. Uppsala. S. 11–20.

Stroh-Wollin, Ulla, 2008: Dramernas svordomar – en lexikal och grammatisk studie i 300 års dramatik. Svensk dramadiolog 10 (= FUMS Rapport nr 224.) Institutionen för nordiska språk vid Uppsala universitet.

Filling in the Gaps: Examining Scandinavian Embedded V2 from a Diachronic Perspective

This paper explores some of the gaps in diachronic research on verb second (V2) word order in embedded clauses in the history of Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish. In light of recent findings on V2 in embedded clauses in contemporary varieties of these languages and in Icelandic and Faroese, including Bentzen *et al* (2007), Julien (2007, 2009), Wiklund *et al* (2009), and Hrafnbjargarson and Wiklund (2009) and Wiklund (2010), I focus on similar aspects of embedded clause data by examining historical antecedents to the synchronic data in a corpus of texts written between the 13th and 17th centuries.

The paper is divided into three parts that focus on new data from each of the Mainland Scandinavian languages. First, I conduct a reanalysis of embedded clause data from Old Swedish, examining five Old Swedish law texts for the distribution of embedded V2. Building on previous descriptive work on early Swedish by Wenning (1930), Larsson (1931) and Åkerlund (1944), and more recent scholarship from a generative perspective in Platzack (1988), Falk (1993), Sundquist (2002) and Håkansson (forthcoming), I provide evidence that manuscripts written as early as the 14th century begin to exhibit the newer embedded clause word order that lacks V2 in some contexts with sentential adverbs. In particular, I address the issue of the type of subject (non-pronominal vs. pronominal) in these clauses, examining various explanations for the fact that the new embedded order (Adv-V) only occurs with pronominal subjects.

In the second portion of the paper, I provide comparative data on embedded clause word order in the history of Norwegian. The results of a pilot study of an early Norwegian corpus of texts written between 1250 and 1450 will be presented and analyzed for comparison with the developments in the early Swedish texts. The data are analyzed for text type, date of composition, word order, type of subject, and type of clause. The preliminary results indicate that Adv-V order appears in the 15th century Middle Norwegian period, although it is again limited to contexts with pronominal subjects. Moreover, I discuss the data in light of Bobaljik's (2002) Rich Agreement Hypothesis and address the ramifications of these findings for a weak version of this hypothesis.

The final portion of the paper is an attempt to add a diachronic dimension to the discussion on the role that illocutionary force plays in embedded clause word order variation, along the lines of Bentzen *et al* (2007), Julien (2007), and Wiklund *et al* (2009). With a corpus of Early Modern Danish texts from the 16th and 17th centuries I examine *that*-clauses with sentential negation, using Hooper and Thompson's (1973) system of classification for matrix verbs that allow complement clauses with root transformations. Although the corpus does not yield enough examples with particular verbs for a full-scale statistical investigation of all of Hooper and Thompson's classes, it does provide evidence that the distribution and variation of embedded V2 can be explained by means of semantic pressure such as illocutionary force and assertion during the period under investigation. The implications of these findings for a theory of syntactic change and the impact of the data on future diachronic analyses are addressed in the final portion of the paper.