Workshop description

The verb second (V2) property seen in most Germanic but also in some other Indo-European or even extra-Indoeuropean languages may be part of a wider variational scenario in which particular features (as encoded in the finite verb) must be represented in the left clausal periphery (cf. Anderson, 1993). Although the V2 property has received much attention in the syntactic literature, there is still dissent which functional projections/steps of movement are involved in the derivation of V2 order or if it is even base generated. Furthermore, it is still unclear if the V2 order is a purely structural linearization condition, or if it is tied to the semantic component in narrow syntax, as proposed for German (Truckenbrodt, 2006). Every generalization must also consider the variation among V2 languages concerning basic word order, clause types which exhibit V2 (main clause, embedded clause, relative clause), and co-occurrence of V2 order and complementizers.

L1-acquisition research suggests that children acquire the V2-property of German as a secondary step after having settled for head-final basic word order (Clahsen and Muysken, 1986). For L2-acquisition it is reported that the acquisition process runs through a fixed order of structural hypotheses which differ from L1-acquisition patterns. These findings suggest that the V2 is a derived order.

Despite the consideration of V2 in theoretical work, the consequences of V2 for sentence processing have not received much attention. For instance, German has been mostly studied with respect to its underlying verb-final order. But the early availability of the morphological
and lexical verb information in V1/V2 may have important consequences for the parsing process. For instance Knoeferle et al. (2005) showed that the verbal information is immediately used in anticipating upcoming event participants. Other aspects of verb related interpretation processes, however, such as covert reconstruction of quantifiers (Bott and Schlotterbeck, 2015), thematic prominence effects (Scheepers et al., 2000), and NPI licensing (Freitag and Bayer, 2015) seem to be delayed to the right clause boundary, i.e. the supposed base position of the finite verb.

The main questions we want to address are: What is the structural analysis of the V2 position in different clause types? Is V2 only a linearization phenomenon, or is it tied to semantics/pragmatics? What is the role of V2 verbal information in sentence processing? Which aspects of the interpretation are immediately triggered by the verb in V2 position and which are assigned at its base position.

We invite submissions that present theoretical or empirical contributions based on language-specific, cross-linguistic, diachronic, or language acquisition research on the empirical properties of phenomena that are caused by, or correlate with the V2 property. Theoretical proposals should make clear-cut predictions that allow for experimental falsification. Experimental approaches, on the other hand, should address the predictions of theoretical implementations. By bringing together the above mentioned lines of research, we hope to come one step closer to a deeper understanding of V2, and to find directions for future research.
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Modern German is usually regarded as a typical instance of a Germanic V2 language, with a strict V2 restriction for matrix declaratives that requires exactly one position to be filled in the ‘forefield’ in front of the finite verb. Deviations from V2 described in the literature are either separate constructions such as left dislocation or hanging topics (Frey 2005), specific exceptions such as sentences with irrelevance conditional and counterfactual adverbial clauses in the forefield (Axel 2004, d’Avis 2004), or patterns of only putative multiple frontings that might be subsumed under V2 (Müller 2005 on multiple VP constituents in the forefield). Accordingly, examples such as in (1) are usually constructed to illustrate ungrammatical linear orders, and starred accordingly:

(1) “[Sobald/Wenn/Weil es aufheitert], wir können spazieren gehen.” [Axel 2004:25]

However, findings from spoken language use outside formal standard German provide evidence for just such linearisations, cf. (2), including ones with non-clausal adverbials (3):

(2) WENN du mir nisch GLAUBST wir legen AUF [KiDKo, MuH3WT]
(3) HEUte ich werd meine zigaRETten mitbringen [KiDKo, MuH11MD]

This suggests that there might be systematic extensions of V2 in German, to a more liberal forefield that can also accomodate V3. Evidence for this was first reported from Kiezdeutsch, an urban dialect found in informal speech among multilingual peer groups (Wiese 2009, 2013), and has subsequently also been found in more monolingual contexts of German (Schalowski 2012, 2015), cf. (4) and (5) (utterances by speakers at a lecture series and an annual DGFs conference, respectively):

(4) wenn sie das GANze hören sie wissen genau ... [BSa-Sch 8]
(5) und dann (-) die partikeln verÄNdern sich nicht [BSa-Sch 24]

These findings point to a specific pattern which (a) is syntactically integrated into German as V3, rather than an allochthonous SVO construction (Wiese 2013, te Velde to appear; contra Auer 2013), indicated, e.g., by the preservation of the verbal bracket, and (b) at the level of information structure, allows both framesetters and topics to appear together in the left periphery.
Our paper presents results from a cross-linguistic study that further explored such an information-structural motive for this pattern. We investigated whether speakers of German and English were more likely to place verbs in a V3 position, after framesetter plus topic, if language-specific grammatical restrictions were removed. In order to test this, we presented speakers with a (non-verbal) comic sequence and asked them to describe the final picture, which included a frame-setter (a time indicated on a clock) and an animate or inanimate topic. Participants had to render the scene (a) verbally and (b) in a semi-verbal set-up, using little plastic figures, wooden clocks, and paper slips with written verbs.

Results indicate that verbal descriptions followed the typical standard language patterns, German speakers displaying V2 with either the topic/subject or the framesetter/adverbial in the forefield (i.e., Adv V_{fin} S or S V_{fin} Adv), and English speakers displaying SVO with the topic/subject always in front of the verb and sometimes preceded by the framesetter/adverbial (i.e., SV Adv or Adv SV). In contrast to this, in the semi-verbal condition, both German and English speakers also used an additional ordering option pointing to V3, with both topic and framesetter presented before the verb, and in both internal orders (i.e., framesetter > topic, and topic > framesetter). We analyse these findings from the point of view of the interface between syntax and information structure, and discuss their implications for a syntactic account of German V3.
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This talk will give an overview of the verb second (V2) phenomenon, as found in both main and embedded clauses in the Germanic languages, and it will also explore a particular derivation of (embedded) V2, in terms of a cP/CP-distinction.

All the Germanic languages except modern English (but including e.g. Old English) are V2, i.e. in all declarative main clauses and in all _wh_-questions, the finite verb is in the second position. regardless of whether the first position is occupied by the subject or by some other constituent. This can be extended to _yes/no_-questions, provided it is assumed that the first position in such questions is empty (and such an assumption is supported by the fact that it allows an account for Greenberg’s 1963:83 “Universal 11”, cf. Vikner 2007). English only requires V2 in some main clauses: questions and negative topicalisations.

As far as embedded clauses in the Germanic languages are concerned, V2 is never obligatory, and although it is optionally possible in many embedded clauses, this is not the case for all types of embedded clauses, as e.g. embedded questions never allow V2 (Julien 2007, Vikner 2001).

I will explore a particular derivation of (embedded) V2, in terms of a cP/CP-distinction, which may be seen as a version of the CP-recursion analysis (de Haan & Weerman 1986, Vikner 1995 and many others). This analysis will be compared to a fine-grained left periphery approach (Rizzi 1997 and many others).

The idea is that because embedded V2 clauses do not allow extraction, whereas other types of CP-recursion clauses do (Christensen et al. 2013a,b), CP-recursion in embedded V2 is assumed to be fundamentally different from other kinds of CP-recursion, in that main clause V2 and embedded V2 involve a CP (“big CP”), whereas other clausal projections above IP are instances of cP (“little cP”).

Part of the talk builds on joint work with Ken Ramshøj Christensen and Anne Mette Nyvad.

Relaxed V2 languages and their Left Periphery. Two cases from Northern Italy
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Introduction: The aim of this talk is to contribute to our understanding of the V2 phenomenon by comparing two varieties spoken in Northern Italy (Trentino-South Tyrol): the Rhaeto-Romance variety of Badia (henceforth: R) and Mòcheno (M), a German dialect. Both have been independently claimed to be relaxed V2 languages, in which i) the finite verb and one XP have to move to CP for EPP reasons (Roberts 2004, Holmberg 2015), and ii) this movement coexists with V3/V4 word orders (cf. Rowley 2003 for M; Poletto 2002 for R, a.o.). By discussing a series of novel data on the structure of the left periphery in R&M, we show that they pattern alike in most contexts, and exhibit two properties which are incompatible with previous accounts of R (cf. Poletto 2002) and of relaxed V2 languages in general (Benincà 2006).

Properties of R&M: In previous accounts, the possibility of V3/V4 word orders in relaxed V2 languages was ascribed to the presence of an articulated left periphery in these varieties, like in modern Italian (cf. Rizzi 1997, Benincà 2001). However, R&M exhibit properties which are absent from modern Romance and have mostly remained unnoticed so far. These are:

1. Relativized Minimality effects (RM, cf. Rizzi 2004) in fronted topics: Two fronted topics can precede the verb; however, a given subject and a given object cannot contemporary appear in the left periphery:

(1)   a. Lucaj ala mamak tik à=lj cumprè n liber (R)
     Luca to-the mum her has=he.cl bought a book
     a’. Der Luca en de mama hòt a puach kaft (M)
           the Luca to the mum has a book bought

(2)   a. *La mamaj liberk, (lk) a(=laj) cumprà inier (R)
     the mum the book (it) has= she.cl bought yesterday
     a’. *De mama s puach hòt gester kaft (M)
           the mum the book has yesterday bought

We propose that the V3 order in (1) is due to the fact that the EPP feature is not satisfied by one of the fronted arguments, but by a pro in Fin⁰. Topics move directly to TopicP and are not base-generated there. Subject and object cannot co-occur because they share the same featural marking (+topic, -focus, -case, where case is to be understood as morphological case. This means that the presence/absence of a case assigning P is distinctive for +/- case in both R&M).
2. **Restrictions on V3 with a fronted focalised argument:** When a focalised element is fronted, strict V2 order is mandatory in R. Following Poletto (2002), we propose that the focalised element moves to ForceP, the highest projection of the clause in R. The EPP feature is on Force⁰, and the verb also moves to Force⁰ to satisfy it (see 3).

In M, just one topic can precede a fronted focus. In our proposal, this is due to the fact that in M focalisation is an instance of (focalised) topicalisation: since M has only two TopicPs (3), the lower one is occupied by the focus and one TopicP is available for topics. Moreover, in these sentences there are superiority effects: the [+contrastive] topic moves first to FinP to satisfy the EPP feature, creating the typical “bottle-neck” effect, which can be circumvented only by a topic whose base-position is higher than the base-position of the [+contrastive] XP.

3. **Asymmetries between main declarative and interrogative clauses:** In wh-interrogatives, V3/V4 word orders are possible in both R&M, but with one difference: in M we observe the same RM-effects observed in declarative clauses (2), while in R there are no restrictions on the simultaneous fronting of subject and object. We claim that in this case the EPP-feature in Fin⁰ is satisfied by the wh-element, and that in M the fronted topics are moved from a lower position; in R, instead, topics are base-generated when there is a wh-element.

**To conclude:** The base structure of the left periphery in both R&M is the following:

(3) $$(CP\ [Force_{[+EPP]} \ [Topic \ [Topic \ [wh \ [Fin_{[-EPP]} \ [V \ ]]]]]]])$$

NB: recall that the EPP-feature is usually in Fin⁰, but in R it is in Force⁰ when a focus is fronted.

**References:**
V2 in the history of English: why did it arise, why was it lost, and what difference did it make?

Old English has been shown to have a version of V2 since van Kemenade (1987). Subsequent work (Haeberli 2002, van Kemenade 2012) has arrived at a consensus that Old English may move the finite verb to C, as do Present-Day Dutch and German, but also to an additional lower position F. The Old English verb moves to C if the first constituent is a negative or wh-constituent (or a temporal adverb þæ/onone, which is a separate development), while it is in F when the first constituent is an object or an adverbial. Spec,FP is a position for pronouns and certain types of nominal subjects: The examples in (1) demonstrates that movement to C may have been motivated originally to mark off focused constituents, and movement to F to demarcate discourse links (ðuruh þæ/onone gescead ana, Mid þam) and established referents (we) from new information (sælran þonne þa ungesceadwysan nytena, an mãeden).

(1)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spec</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>SpecFP</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>TP – VP – …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hwæt</td>
<td>selþ</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>ungesceadwysan nytena an mãeden</td>
<td>hwæt selþ he …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ðuruh þæ/onone gescead ana</em></td>
<td>we</td>
<td><strong>synd</strong></td>
<td>sælran þonne þa</td>
<td>through that understanding alone we are better than the unreasoning animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid þam with those (people)</td>
<td>wunode</td>
<td><em>an mãeden</em></td>
<td>a maidend</td>
<td>with those (people) lived a maiden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Movement to C survives to Present-Day English as syntactically motivated T-to-C movement, although structures as in (2a) have suffered some competition from the stressed-focus it-cleft (cf. (2c), which emerged in the 15th Century (Ball 1991; Komen 2013).

(2)  

a. Only after a few minutes did I realize that everyone was staring at me.

b. *Only after a few minutes, I realized that everyone was staring at me.

c. It was only after a few minutes that I realized that everyone was staring at me.

Movement to F, however, declined in the 15th Century (van Kemenade and Westergaard 2012), for reasons that are not fully understood (e.g. Fischer et al. 2000: 131-4). One clue to its demise is the decline of adverbial discourse links in first position as measured by the ratio of clause-initial PPs containing demonstratives (Los & Dreschler 2012; Dreschler 2015;
Pérez-Guerra 2005: 357ff). There is a loss in the ability to refer to the immediately preceding discourse in elements of the D-system other than demonstratives, too, like then and there (Los & van Kemenade forthcoming). First-position demonstratives used independently, whether subjects, objects or as complement of prepositions, function as topic shifters in Present-Day Dutch and German (Bosch et al. 2003), as they did in Old English, but this ability is lost, too, when demonstratives can no longer refer to singular animate referents, the result of the loss of gender. These various losses in referentiality affected the function of V to F as a demarcator of information structure.
This talk will review various strands of evidence from acceptability and production experiments and from corpus studies concerning the linearization of verb arguments in German. The order of arguments is relatively free in German in the sense that besides the most common SO pattern sentences with OS order also occur with some regularity. This variability has three distinct sources. First, an interplay of lexical-conceptual and grammatical factors determine a base order that constitutes the unmarked order in the middlefield. Second, phrases can change position within the middlefield (so-called scrambling). Third, a single phrase has to be put into the prefield. If the middlefield initial phrase is put into the prefield, this does not cause a change in word order, but if any other phrase is put into the prefield, word order deviates from the middlefield internal word order.

The main focus of my talk will lie on differences between word order in the middlefield and word order when the prefield is involved. One part of the evidence will concern effects of lexical accessibility and verb semantics. While word order in the middlefield is strongly affected by these factors, word order involving the prefield is much less so. Several production experiments show that participants are very reluctant in producing OS sentences with the object in the prefield. Instead, passivization is used to bring an argument into the prefield when this is favored by lexical-conceptual considerations (animacy, verb semantics). A further strand of evidence pertains to the interaction between different referential means (pronouns, d-pronouns, full NPs), word order, and syntactic position (middlefield vs. prefield). The evidence that will be discussed – mainly corpus evidence and results from acceptability judgments – indicates both parallels and differences between putting an object pronoun into the first position within the middlefield and into the prefield. On the one hand, those factors (animacy, verb semantics) that strongly favor the placement of an object pronoun before the subject in the middlefield also allow the placement of the object pronoun in the prefield. On the other hand, OS order within the middlefield always seems to be possible with an object pronoun as long as the subject is not a pronoun itself, even if this is not particularly favored. Putting the object pronoun into the prefield under the same circumstances leads to degraded acceptability, however. In this case, either SO order is preferred or the replacement of the pronoun by a d-pronoun.
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Goal: We investigate how V2-verbal information affects the parsing of transitive sentences. More specifically, we contrast sentences with a neutral auxiliary with sentences with a lexical verb in second position and determine the effect on predictive processing of arguments, as witnessed by eye movements.

Background: In the past decade or so, evidence has accumulated that language users make use of verbal information to predict upcoming referents (e.g. Altmann & Kamide, 1999; Knoeferle et al., 2005; a.m.o.). Previous research has mainly focused on the prediction of a single argument based on the verb and one additional argument. We take this research one step further by investigating the anticipation of both arguments in a transitive sentence and how this is mediated by verbal information and animacy. To this end we crucially exploit the V2-property, which makes it possible to provide the verb before its arguments when an adverbial expression occupies the sentence-initial position (the net result being a V-initial parsing situation).

Experiment: We recorded eye-gaze patterns of 87 native speakers of Dutch, while they looked at a two-picture display containing an animate and inanimate character and listened to sentences with an XP-V-NP1-NP2-(Participle)-PP structure, in which NP1 can only be interpreted as the subject. We manipulated two factors: (i) verb type in V2-position: auxiliary (\textit{heeft} ‘has’) or lexical; (ii) animacy configuration of the NPs. This resulted in four conditions:

1. XP-V\textsubscript{AUX}heeft-NP1\textsubscript{SU}anim-NP2\textsubscript{OBJ}inan-Participle\textsubscript{Vlex}-PP
2. XP-V\textsubscript{AUX}heeft-NP1\textsubscript{SU}inan-NP2\textsubscript{OBJ}anim-Participle\textsubscript{Vlex}-PP
3. XP-V\textsubscript{LEX}-NP1\textsubscript{SU}anim-NP2\textsubscript{OBJ}inan-PP
4. XP-V\textsubscript{LEX}-NP1\textsubscript{SU}inan-NP2\textsubscript{OBJ}anim-PP

Results: We found a significant effect of verb type in the window from verb offset until onset of NP1+100ms, in which information about NP1 is critically not yet accessible. A lexical verb in second position elicited a larger proportion of fixations to the inanimate character in comparison to an auxiliary verb (see Figure). Also, the data suggests that the later integration of arguments is delayed in sentences with an auxiliary verb in V2-position.
**Interpretation:** Our data suggest a clear effect of V2-information on both predictive processing and integration. The auxiliary verb *hebben* ‘have’ evokes an expectation for an animate character with a long lasting effect on parsing (not shown in the Figure). Lexical verbs, on the other hand, anticipate an inanimate argument. We suggest that this is an effect of ‘VP’-frequency. Even though NP1 was always the subject in our sentences, in everyday speech a lexical verb in V2-position is most frequently followed by an inanimate object (the subject being in sentence-initial position).

**Implications:** This study suggests a more important role for verbal information occurring in second position than hitherto assumed based on findings from earlier experiments on German (Scheepers et al., 2000; Bayer & Bader, 2006). It also contrasts with the theoretical proposal that “the lexical part [of the verb] is evaluated in its base position” (Bayer, 2008, p.3).
Hör endlich auf/zu (‘Now stop/listen’)! – The Lexical Representation and Semantic Activation of German Particle Verbs

Eva Smolka¹ & Bettina Braun¹
¹Department of Linguistics, University of Konstanz
Eva.Smolka@uni-konstanz.de, Bettina.Braun@uni-konstanz.de

Thursday, 25.02.2016, 10:30-11:00, Raum: G 309

Because German is a verb-second language with an SOV word order (e.g., Haider, 1985), particle verbs in German are decomposed whenever they occur in finite forms. Since the particle, which complements the meaning of the whole particle verb, must appear sentence final, it can be presented many words after the stem, as the following example of the base hören (‘hear’) demonstrates:

(1) Der Junge hörte, nachdem er vergeblich um Eis gebettelt hatte, schließlich wieder auf / zu.
   (L: ‘Finally, the boy stopped/listened after having unsuccessfully cried for ice cream’).

Consequently, the meaning of the whole verb is fully understood only by the end of the sentence, when the particle is encountered. It is possible that German readers/listeners are therefore used to keeping more than one possible meaning of the verb active upon encountering a verb stem. The present study investigated (1) how particle verbs are stored and represented in lexical memory, (2) and whether the morphological activation of the stem cascades through to the semantic level.

To this end, we conducted two experiments with cross-modal priming, a paradigm that is typically used to tap into lexical processing (for a review see Smolka et al., 2014). In Experiment 1, 21 participants heard isolated complex verbs in isolation and made lexical decisions to visually presented base verbs (e.g., fallen, ‘fall’), see (2). Auditory primes were (a) semantically transparent particle verbs (whose meaning can be constructed from the meaning of particle and stem, e.g., hinfallen, ‘fall down’), (b) semantically opaque particle verbs (whose meaning cannot be constructed from the meaning of the particle and the stem, e.g., auffallen, ‘attract attention’), and (c) form-related controls (whose stem is phonologically related to the target, e.g. ausfalten, ‘fold out’).

auditory prime: (a) hinfallen/(b) auffallen/(c) ausfalten – visual target: (2) fallen/(3) Sturz

Relative to the form controls, semantically transparent and opaque particle verbs primed their base to the same extent. Equivalent morphological priming effects replicate previous findings (Smolka et al., 2009, 2014) that particle verbs undergo morphological decomposition regardless of their meaning composition. We conclude that particle verbs are lexically represented via their stem.

Experiment 2 tested whether the morphological access to the stem influences also the semantic level. In Experiment 2, 47 participants heard the same primes as in Experiment 1
(i.e., semantically transparent and opaque particle verbs and form controls) and made lexical
decisions to visually presented associations to the stem, see (3) – these associations were
previously collected in a web experiment, with 105 participants. Results showed that neither
semantically transparent nor opaque verbs induced priming to the stem associations (relative
to form controls). These findings indicate that the previously observed morphological effects
do not extend to a semantic level. That is, the previous decomposition of the stem does not
activate its meaning.

In sum, the present findings indicate that German particle verbs are lexically represented
via their stem. This may be a characteristic of particle verbs in a verb-second language,
where particles are separated from the stem in finite forms. Nevertheless, even though the
stem represents the lexical level, its meaning is not automatically cascaded to the semantic
level (or is inhibited by the meaning of the particle verb). This latter finding corresponds to
previous findings (with prefix verbs) in languages other than verb-second with SOV word
order. We will discuss present models of lexical representation and meaning representation
with respect to particle verbs in German.

References: • Haider, Hubert (1985). V-Second in German. In H. Haider & M. Prinzhorn (Eds.), Verb second
phenomena in Germanic languages (pp. 49-75). Dordrecht: Foris Publications. • Smolka, E., Komlósi, S., & Rösler,
F. (2009). When semantics means less than morphology: The processing of German prefixed verbs. Language and
primes ‘stehen’ (‘stand’): Morphological structure overrides semantic compositionality in the lexical representation
of German complex verbs. Journal of Memory and Language, 72, 16-36.
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The acquisition puzzle: Schönenburger (2001, 2008) describe a detailed longitudinal study of the spontaneous productions of 2 Swiss German (SG) children between ages 3;10-8;01. Early in the study, the children make systematic errors in the placement of the finite verb in embedded clauses. In contrast to the adult grammar, which places the finite embedded verb clause-finally in (1a), in the children’s productions of such an embedded clause, the finite verb appears in a non-final position (1b).

(1)  
\[ \text{a. Adult: [Complementizer S O V]} \ldots \]
\[ \text{b. #Wenn du trinksch öppis... (M: 4;01)} \]
\[ ‘When you drink something...’ \]

After a period of near ceiling error rates, the error rates gradually decline as the children approach adult-like performance. The puzzle is: why do the SG children make such errors, which differ from the input they hear? I present a probabilistic learning model that arrives at the errors in a principled way: the errors result from a grammar that is compatible with a majority of the input, which is ambiguous and underdetermines the correct structural analysis. The model also has the potential to capture variability in error rates across German-learning children.

‘Outline of proposal’ Schönenburger proposes that the SG children raise the verb to some head-initial phrase, whereas adults do not. Such verb raising would account for the errors, but it remains unclear what would cause the errors in the first place. I build on this analysis in proposing that the SG children initially misanalyse T as head-initial and raise the verb to this position (2a). They then gradually reset the parameter to T-final, as in the adult grammar (2b).

(2)  
\[ \text{a. #T-initial: [CP dass [TP V+T [VP Subj [VP Obj V ] ] ] ] } \]

The misanalysis crucially relies on the ambiguity of matrix clauses for T-init/final. Matrix clauses are the primary source of German input (85%; cf. Sakas 2003). Moreover, a majority of the grammars compatible with matrix clauses are in fact T-initial, thus favoring T-initial. These grammars are constrained in the model by the 5 basic parameters in (3), which determine verb placement.
Parameters:

a. [+V-to-T]
b. [+T-to-C]
c. [V-init/fin]
d. [T-init/fin]
e. [C-init/fin]

The majority of the schematic corpus used for the learning model strongly favors T-initial. (The input types represent a diverse range of declarative matrix and embedded clauses.) For example, given SVO input and a grammar that raises the verb to T but not to C, T must be head-initial in order for the verb to precede the object. Further, although embedded clauses favor T-final, they are still compatible with T-initial given a non-verb raising grammar.

I propose a probabilistic learning model implemented in Church (Goodman et al. 2008) that adopts a grammar of best fit, which at first is T-initial. In such a learning model, each parameter value is associated with some probability. When presented with some input, the model will sample a grammar from these probabilities and reinforce them if the sampled grammar is compatible with the input (cf. Yang 2002). Early in the learning process, on average we expect the model to sample and reinforce T-initial more than T-final. Further, there is robust unambiguous evidence (35.46% of the input) for verb raising. Thus the model is pushed toward a non-target [+V-to-T, T-init] grammar, which results in the embedded clause production errors. The effect of unambiguous evidence is to push the learner even more strongly toward [+V-to-T] than the ambiguous evidence pushes toward T-initial. Once the model has learned [+V-to-T], then, a new grammar of best fit emerges: embedded clauses can be taken as evidence for T-final. As embedded clauses are a relatively small proportion of the input, the switch to T-final (and thus the adult grammar) is gradual.

Results and Discussion: 50 simulations were run, and in 13 (26%) we see development like the SG children. As expected, we see nearly ceiling error rates for [+V-to-T, T-init] grammars (striped segments), which are gradually displaced by the adult grammar. These non-target parameter settings successfully account for verb placement errors in embedded clauses. Unexpectedly, the errors are partially due to a [–T-to-C] grammar. We thus expect to see errors in matrix clauses with a verb third position verb. Indeed, such errors are attested in the SG corpus, though rare (4).

(4) #[Nämlich] [ned alli Lüt] händ di gliiche Schtimm. (M: 4;11)
‘Not everybody has the same voice.’

Support for these results comes from Waldmann (2011) who reports such errors are relatively frequent in Swedish before 3;6, but then become rare. Gawlitzek-Maiwald et al. (1992) report similar errors in Standard German around age 3;0. This is consistent with the SG corpus, which begins later at 3;10. A further strength of the model is the possibility to capture variability in error rates across children learning a variety of German dialects. Note that the simulations do not always have high error rates, and that the input types in Figure
are found across German varieties. The results are also consistent, then, with reports of low (Clahsen 1982; Standard German), intermediate (Penner 1996; Bernese), and high error rates (Gawlitzek-Maiwald et al. 1992; Standard German) of finite embedded verb placement reported in the literature. The model thus mis-sets a parameter, recovers, and sheds further light on SG acquisition.
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This study investigates the structure of the so-called V2 relative clauses, labeled iV2 structures (iV2) following Gärtner (2001a/b). In German relative clauses (RCs), the verb usually occupies the final position (1a). However, under specific conditions iV2 structures as in (1b) are licensed (cf. Brandt 1990, Gärtner 2001a/b, Zwart 2005).

(1) a. Da sind zwei Frauen, die den Präsident *getroffen haben* V-final
    b. Da sind zwei Frauen, die *haben* den Präsident *getroffen* iV2

’Here there are two women that met the President.’

iV2 structures are licensed under the following conditions: (a) the predicate in the main clause optimally is presentational/existential; (b) the antecedent must be indefinite and have wide scope; (c) the relative pronoun in the iV2 has to be a d-pronoun; (d) the iV2 clause must be in sentence final position; (e) the iV2 must be prosodically integrated in the main clause.

In the literature iV2 structures are usually treated as main clauses linked by a discourse paratactic head to CP, da sind zwei Frauen in (1b) (Gartner 2001 a/b, Endriss & Gärtner 2005). Here, we will rethink this conclusion and argue that iV2 structures are an instance of embedded root phenomena, which rephrases Gärtner’s (2001: 107) observation. Our claim in a nutshell is that iV2 structures are a subtype of subordinate clauses, i.e. TopicP in which the verb has moved to Fin⁰ and the demonstrative is a resumptive topic pronoun (2). Building on Chung & Ladusaw’s (2004) proposal, we argue that IV2 are merged as adjunct in the specifier at the topmost v/VP level, where they saturate the weak indefinite NP as in (2).

(2)

Under this analysis, a) the restrictive nature of iV2, b) their information unity with the host sentence, c) the behavior of focus sensitive particles, and d) the nature of the NP antecedent are derived as the result of the position where the iV2 originates. At the same time, this analysis accounts for several problems of existing iV2 analyses (e.g., licensing nominal predicates, the [+REL] feature on the discourse head), by maintaining the advantage of Gärtner’s (2001a/b) proposal, which treats iV2 as main clauses.

The last piece of evidence in support of (2) comes from acquisition. In our picture-supported delayed-imitation task, 3 to 5-year-old monolingual German-speaking children repeated V-final RCs more often correctly than iV2 structures at all ages, and changed iV2 structures
into V-final relatives significantly more often than the other way around. Whereas under a main clause analysis (Gärtner 2001a/b) these findings are unexpected, our proposal predicts this pattern: children are expected to acquire iV2 structures, a type of subordinate clause, later than the canonical subordinate configuration.

In sum, besides accounting for the core syntactic properties of iV2 structures, the analysis in (2) also offers a plausible explanation for our acquisition results.
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In some Germanic languages wh-exclamatives occur as verb-second (V2) or as non-verb-second structures (non-V2). Recently it was shown that V2/non-V2 in German and Dutch are not interchangeable. In Dutch, V2 underlies stricter semantic restrictions than non-V2, i.e. verb-final (Vf): the noteworthiness evaluation exclamatives are often thought to express can concern individuals and propositions in Vf but only individuals in V2 (Nouwen & Chernilovskaya 2013). For German, Vf has been shown to be more restricted than V2 w.r.t. the realization of the exclamative accent on the finite verb, which has been argued to be due to the availability of (verum) focus alternatives (Driemel 2015). The present paper presents evidence that there are different semantic restrictions on German V2 vs. Vf wh-exclamatives and argues that the two structures come with different force operators. Like Dutch, German allows the full range of wh-words that occur in questions also in exclamatives (Repp 2013). The evidence for different restrictions on V2/Vf comes from exclamatives with the wh-words wer/wen (‘who/m’) and was (‘what’). Both wh-words may occur with the quantifier alles (‘all’), which in questions indicates exhaustiveness (Zimmermann 2007), and in exclamatives a large amount, i.e. a high degree: (1) illustrates the semantic contribution of alles in Vf exclamatives with wen (‘whom’). (2) shows that the corresponding V2 exclamative is only felicitous with alles, i.e. is restricted to a high degree reading. Was is a multipurpose question word that can ask about entities, propositions, reasons (see 3a) and degrees. Was-exclamatives can express surprise at all these semantic objects, apart from reasons: (3b), which is string-identical to (3a), receives a high degree reading (in V2 and Vf). Note that the verb in (3) is intransitive so was cannot be the object of the verb. To explore the readings of was and the co-occurrence of alles with was in V2 vs. Vf exclamatives, a corpus study was conducted (268 mil token sub-corpus of deWaC (Baroni et al. 2009); was für (‘what a’) was excluded; who(m) exclamatives did not occur sufficiently often). The corpus analysis revealed that was in any of the above readings was combined with alles equally often in V2 and Vf (total n=105; $\chi^2(1) = 2.143, p>.05$). For was-exclamatives without alles, two types of readings were explored: was as a direct object of a transitive verb, and was combined with an intransitive verb (= degree was). The former readings only occurred in Vf exclamatives. The latter occurred in V2 and in Vf. So, again V2 but not Vf exclamatives can be shown to be subject to a degree restriction. To account for the difference I propose that V2 and Vf exclamatives host different exclamative force operators (rather than e.g. question operators as in D’Avis 2001, Abels 2005), see (4)/(5). V2 only allows degree readings and Vf allows degree, individual (and manner) readings. Wh-phrases are set restrictors requiring their complement
either to be a set of entities, degrees or manners so that \( wh \)-structures either are individual, degree or manner properties yielding the appropriate semantic object for the force operator in V2 vs. Vf.

(1)  
a. Wen der alles eingeladen hat!  
whom he all invited has  
\((\text{surprise at high nb of (noteworthy) people})\)  
b. Wen der eingeladen hat!  
\((\text{surprise at noteworthy person/people})\)

(2)  
a. Wen hat der alles eingeladen!  
\((\text{surprise at high nb of (noteworthy) people})\)  
b. Wen hat der eingeladen!  
\((\text{surprise at noteworthy person/people})\)

(3)  
a. Was hast du (so) geweint?  
what have you so wept  
\((\text{question about reason of weeping})\)  
b. Was hast du geweint!  
\((\text{surprise at degree of severity of weeping})\)

(4)  
\([\text{Excl-Deg}] = \lambda D_\langle d,t \rangle . \exists d \ [\text{the speaker finds } \lambda w . D(d)(w) \text{ surprising}] = V2\)

(5)  
\([\text{Excl}] = \lambda P_\langle d,t \rangle . \exists x \ [\text{the speaker finds } \lambda w . P(x)(w) \text{ surprising}], \text{ for } \langle \tau \rangle = \langle e \rangle \text{ and } \langle \tau \rangle = \langle d \rangle \text{ and } \langle \tau \rangle = \langle m \rangle \text{ (manner)} = Vf\)
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Since the seminal work of Hooper & Thompson 1973, many researchers have pursued the insight that V2, as a classic Main Clause Phenomenon [MCP] is licensed in formally subordinate clauses to the extent that such clauses are asserted. H&T categorised embedding predicates into 5 classes largely according to whether their complement clauses could be interpreted as asserted, a status which they took to be the converse of presupposed. The class of verbs of communication such as say occupied one pole – allowing MCP freely in their complements – while factives such as be happy that occupied the other. In an important update of this tradition, Simons 2007 has considerably sharpened H&T’s concept of assertion, proposing that the crucial distinction is whether the subordinate clause contributes a proposition that makes the utterance relevant; as a diagnostic, in a question/response sequence, “whatever proposition communicated by the response constitutes an answer (complete or partial) to the question is the main point of the response.” Simons demonstrates that given this definition/diagnostic, even factive clauses may constitute the Main Point of Utterance MPU; hence, in such contexts, they should also allow V2.

In this talk we present the results of three experiments (one on Swedish and two on English) that aimed to test empirically the claim that the possibility of V2 in an embedded clause (EV2) follows from whether or not the embedded clause constitutes the MPU (cf. Julien 2007, Jensen & Christensen 2013). In the first experiment, 104 L1 speakers of Swedish were asked to judge the acceptability of question-response pairs where, following Simons 2007, the question was manipulated to vary the location of the MPU in the response: in the main or the embedded clause. There were two other independent variables: the classification of the embedding verb in the response, and whether or not the embedded clause in the response exhibited V2. We show that, on the one hand, the results support the claim that Swedish EV2 is possible under semi-factive (discover/realize) and non-factive (think/claim) clause-embedding predicates, but not under purely factive ones (be happy/be surprised) (Wiklund et al. 2007). Strikingly, the judgments also mirror the frequency difference between EV2 in the complements to epistemic vs. communicative non-factives (e.g. suppose vs. say) reported for Danish corpus data in Jensen & Christensen 2013. However, the results show no interaction between the effect of embedded V2 and embedded MPU: that is, our data suggest, contra Julien 2007, Jensen & Christensen 2013, that the low acceptability/frequency of V2 under factives cannot be explained by the twin hypotheses that MPU licenses EV2 and that factives cannot embed MPU.

An alternative interpretation, preserving the idea that MPU licenses EV2, would be that participants may have essentially ignored the MPU-licensing questions when evaluating the acceptability of the responses. Under such an account the low acceptability of EV2 under
factivs would have to follow from the inability of speakers to interpret clauses in this immediate environment as the MPU. In order to investigate this possibility, two follow-up experiments were conducted, this time with English speakers, where participants were presented with question-response pairs where the MPU of the response was either in the main or the embedded clause, or the response did not address the question. The second variable was whether the embedding predicate was factive or non-factive. In this experiment the participants were asked to judge whether the response was a direct or indirect answer to the question, or did not answer it at all. In the conditions where the response did not address the question, informants reliably scored the responses low for directness, showing that at least here the participants paid attention to the question, and that the question-response paradigm effectively manipulated MPU. Nevertheless, we found no effect of predicate type (factive/non-factive) on judgments of how well the response answered the question.

These follow-up experiments thus support Simons’ contention that speakers can interpret the complements to factives as the MPU. They therefore also support our conclusion that the low rating for EV2 in factive contexts in Swedish cannot be accounted for in purely pragmatic terms, but motivates instead a more narrowly semantico-syntactic explanation, such as Haegeman’s 2013 intervention account.
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The distribution and effects of embedded V2 (EV2) have been long debated. The analysis attracting the most support in recent times is that EV2 is conditioned by and marks assertion; it only appears under matrix predicates compatible with assertion, hence is blocked under negation and factives. However, as Wiklund (2010) notes, there are reasons to doubt that this is the whole story; some speakers allow EV2 under predicates which are not typically assertive such as semifactives and negation and EV2 is not essential in order to include other root phenomena such as speech act adverbs in the embedded clause.

This paper supports Wiklund (2010) by looking to unify Germanic EV2 with a parallel embedded root phenomenon in English: embedded questions with subject-auxiliary inversion (EIQs) such as (1).

(1) I asked him please would he cook dinner for me (North West English, UK)

EIQs are only available under interrogative predicates, including negated, modalised and questioned factive predicates, but are parallel to EV2 in being blocked under simple factives such as know and find out. EIQs are clearly not asserted but also like EV2 as they are islands for extraction, cannot appear in sentence-initial position, and license other root phenomena such as speech act adverbs. They also both disambiguate between competing perspectives: unlike unmarked embedded clauses, they are not ambiguous between reporting speaker and original speaker orientation. This will be argued to be the key effect of embedded verb movement.

Interestingly, the perspective marked by embedded verb movement differs from language to language; a fact noted with respect to embedded imperatives by Kaufmann (2015). In English EIQs, subject-auxiliary inversion gives rise to a quasi-quotational environment in which the perspective of the original speaker (the matrix subject) takes precedence. The embedded clause is clearly subordinate to the matrix clause as shown by indexicality and sequence of tense, as well as the (occasional) occurrence of the complementiser under the right syntactic conditions. However, expressive elements, speech act adverbs and discourse particles orient to the matrix arguments, i.e. the original speakers. The original discourse is also privileged in terms of the availability of de re and de dicto readings (only the latter are available, even if the reporting speaker has de re knowledge), and the fact that the matrix subject is understood to have a close relationship with or interest in the arguments of the embedded clause. The original discourse is also privileged in this way in the related Romance phenomenon of recomplementation (the presence of multiple complementisers). These facts
also hold in English embedded imperatives, whose subject must be the original addressee. Finally, the use of an EIQ presupposes that the EIQ was a question-under-discussion in the original discourse context, whereas use of an indirect question does not:

\[(2) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. Everyone wanted to know was Jack coming to the party = Jack's coming was discussed} \\
\text{b. Everyone wanted to know if Jack was coming to the party = does not entail a discussion}
\end{align*}\]

In EV2, by contrast, movement of the verb in the embedded clause promotes the perspective of the reporting speaker over that of the original speaker; Wiklund (2010) claims that expressive elements in Swedish EV2 clauses orient solely to the reporting speaker, while the same elements in non-V2 clauses can orient either to the reporting or original speaker. This fits Kaufmann’s (2015) claims that the subject of embedded imperatives in German must be the addressee in the reporting context.

It is proposed that these effects are brought about by the differences in the syntax between clauses with verb movement/marked with root phenomena and non-marked clauses. It is claimed that marked clauses contain extra structure, namely a nominalising Illocutionary Act (IA) head (cf. Potts 2002, Lahiri 2002) and a variable denoting the Centre of Evaluation (CoE) – the coordinates of the relevant discourse and the relationship between the relevant discourse participants. Evidence for the nominalising head includes the islandhood of the IAP and the fact that IAP clauses can directly modify overt content nouns. There is also cross-linguistic evidence (from Mupun, Frajzyngier 1985) for the overt spell-out of the CoE. In English, the CoE encodes the original discourse; in Swedish and German, the reporting discourse. This structure renders the EIQ/EV2 clause specific, picking it out in the relevant discourse and leading to the interpretations outlined above.

\[(3) \quad \text{I asked him [IAP [C or E] [IA n] [ForceP [Force would] [IP [DP he] [1] [VP [v cook] [DP dinner]]]]]].\]

This analysis contributes to the wider discussion of the syntactisation of perspectives and the embeddability of perspectives in language. It builds on Cook’s (2014) work on Plains Cree to show that overt marking of perspective can be embedded, helping work towards a better understanding of how languages and language families vary in this respect, and some of the micro-differences involved.
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In recent years, the literature on non-canonical V2 clauses introduced by formally subordinating connectors in German has extensively focused on the interaction between V-to-C movement and its pragmatic implications. In particular, the relevant question concerns the function of V2 and the conditions licensing its occurrence in adverbial clause structures in which both arrangements would, in principle, be possible. Cf. (1):

(1)  a. Das reicht deshalb nicht, weil das Programm des Landes {ist} keine dem suffices c.conn neg because the program of the country is no strukturelle Hilfe {ist}, sondern eine temporäre Unterstützung {ist}. (DLF, structural help is but-rather a temporary support is Nov. 25th, 2014)

       b. Find ich recht positiv, daß da irgendwie geholfen wird, diese Leute zu find I quite positive that there somehow helped is these people to finden, obwohl es hat auch seine Nachteile hat. (AGD, Dec. 12th, 1974) find although it has also its drawbacks has

While the standard analysis implies a paratactic categorization of such constructs in light of their apparent illocutionary independence (cf. Antomo & Steinbach 2010, Antomo 2012, Freywald 2014), it has also been pointed out that the corresponding Vfin embedded clauses may allow for an assertive potential (cf. Simons 2007, Holler 2008), although this hypothesis is still under debate. Building on syntactic-pragmatic evidence (licensing of assertive modal particles, agreeing test, question tags, resumption of clause-internal cataphoric connectors realized in the introducing predicate) in both Vfin and V2 adverbial clauses, I argue for a hypotactic analysis of V2 causal weil clauses and concessive obwohl and wobei clauses. Given that V2 may exclusively appear in certain types of COMP-introduced adverbial constructions allowing for an assertive reading, I will make the following points:

a. V2 weil and obwohl/wobei clauses are hypotactically, not paratactically, bound to their matrix predicate;

b. Their relative grade of integration into and dependency on the matrix clause is by no means affected by the position of the verb, which amounts to the assumption that the V2/ Vfin arrangement is basically not sensitive to Haegeman’s (2004, and much subsequent work)
distinction between central and peripheral adverbials (vs. Freywald 2014);
c. The role of V2 in COMP-introduced adverbial clauses consists in disambiguating the assertive potential of the embedded clause.

References:  
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We explore the claim that Tense and Assertion are separate projections in the grammar of some Germanic languages (following Klein 1998, 2006 and Duffield 2007). Our principal claim is that auxiliary inversion removes the presupposition of truth. Our approach leads towards an eventual mapping of the related effects of assertion, Verum Focus and point of view onto a syntactically present (and separately available) Illocutionary Act Phrase in both the matrix and the subordinate clause (Woods, to appear).

An asserted truth is the illocutionary force of a declarative with the tensed verb in situ. Inversion lifts the presupposition inherent in a declarative when Tense moves to V2. In German, for example, there are three positions for the tensed verb (assuming matrix V2 is between C and T in Fin):

(1) Tensed verb final (embedded clauses) – Presupposed; no assertion
   a. Ich weiss warum er singen kann (German)

(2) V2 (matrix and embedded clauses) – Asserted; no presupposition
   a. Ich kann nicht singen! (German)
   b. Maria sagte, er kann singen. (German)

(3) Auxiliary inversion – no assertion, no presupposition, therefore interrogative
   a. I asked her could he sing (English dialects, Woods to appear)

There is much evidence for this: in standard embedded clauses, the verb is left in situ and the clause is neutral as to illocutionary force. In embedded V2 clauses, the verb raises, the presupposition of its truth is dropped, and the clause is treated as an assertion (Julien 2009, Steinbach & Antomo 2010, Wiklund 2010). Embedded V2 is not available under predicates which independently induce a presupposition of their truth, such as factive complements:

(4) a. *Ich weiss warum kann er singen/*Ich weiss warum er kann singen (German)
    b. *I knew could he come tonight (English dialects, Woods to appear)

Furthermore, a fleeting but remarkable feature of English child language, auxiliary doubling, shows evidence of the two positions available to the tensed verb (e.g. “Is Tom is busy?”). Children use auxiliary doubling in the place of more complex tag questions (e.g. “Tom is busy, isn’t he?”) or cleft constructions (“Is it that Tom is busy?”) in order to maintain a presupposition about which a further question is asked:
In this case, the child is not asking if their friend wants or doesn’t want to go outside (i.e. a normal polar question), but whether the friend is in agreement with a view that presupposes not going outside. We argue that experimental studies (e.g. Rowland and Theakston 2009a,b) who elicit a large proportion (around 40%) of auxiliary doubled questions by children between 2;6 and 3;6 and claim them as incorrect polar questions actually induce these structures due to an experimental setup biased towards these kinds of semi-confirmation questions.

This talk provides an avenue of explanation for the presence of two tense positions in German, which has been a neglected problem for decades. We propose different semantic and discourse functions for each position: the lower position is purely a [+Tense] position where the higher position is also [+Assertion]. However, this distinction is masked in languages like English in which both functions are conflated on the same head, T. Our approach makes predictions about Verum Focus: where it typically attaches to Tense in English, it can only attach to the V2 position in German, so we predict that Verum Focus is only available on the complementiser and not the tensed main verb in verb-final clauses, but it is available on the verb in EV2: both predictions are borne out (Höhle 1992). Note that verb movement to the [+Assertion] position is the not only way to achieve an asserted interpretation: the presence of discourse particles and speech act adverbs in non-V2 clauses leads to an asserted interpretation in Swedish (Wiklund 2010) and in English, emphatic do-support forces an asserted interpretation when the verb remains low. The difference with German is that the verb final position makes explicit – particularly in embedded clauses – the separation of the two “Tense” positions, long a mystery.
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