Towards a Criterial V2*

1. Theoretical Background
1.1. Cartography of Syntactic Structures (Cinque & Rizzi 2010; Rizzi & Cinque 2016)

(1) \[\text{CP} \text{[IP [vP]]}\] (Chomsky 1986)

The attempt of Cartography is to draw maps as precise and detailed as possible of syntactic configurations:

(2) \textit{Cartographic maps}

\textbf{CP:}
\[\text{CP: [Force [Top* [Int [Top* [Foc [Top* [Mod [Top* [Qemb [Fin [IP [...]]]]]]]]]]]]}\]
(Rizzi & Bocci, forthcoming; Rizzi & Cinque 2016:146)

\textbf{IP:}
\[\text{IP: [SubjP [EppP [AgrSP]]]}\] (Cardinaletti 2004: 154; 156)

\[\text{[MoodSpeech-actP [MoodEvaluateP [MoodEvidentialP [ModEpistemicP [TpastP [Tfuture \modIrrealisP \modNecessityP \modPossibilityP \aspHabitualP \aspRepetitiveP \aspFrequentative(I)P \aspVolitionalP \aspTerminativeP \aspContinuativeP \aspPerfect(?)P \aspRetrospectiveP \aspProximate}\aspGeneric/progressiveP \aspProspectiveP \aspSg.Completive(I)P \aspPl.Completive [VoiceP \aspCelerative(I)P \aspRepetitive(I)P \aspFrequentative(I)P \aspSg.Completive(I)P] [aspSg.Completive(II)P] [aspPl.Completive(II)P] [aspPl.Completive(II)P]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]} (Cinque 1999)

\text{TEMPORAL > LOCATIVE > COMITATIVE > BENEFACTIVE > REASON > SOURCE > GOAL > MALEFACTIVE > INSTRUMENTAL > MATTER > MANNER} (Schweikert 2005: 132)

\[\text{[TopP [FocP [TopP]]]}\] (Belletti 2004)

\textbf{vP:}
\[\text{[V_{EVT}P [V_{INIT}P [V_{PASS}P [V_{PROC}P [V_{RES}P]]]}]}\] (Ramchand & Svenonius 2014)

\textit{Guidelines:}
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. One feature, one head (Cinque & Rizzi 2010)
  \item b. Locality effects in terms of (featural) Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990, 2004; Starke 2001)
  \item c. \textit{Criterial Approach}
\end{itemize}

* This research is funded by the ERC project n. 340297 SynCart. I thank all of my informants.
The criterial approach contributes to the "syntactisation" (Cinque & Rizzi 2010, Rizzi 2013) of semantics, pragmatics and prosodic properties.

(3) **Criterial approach to scope-discourse semantics properties**
    (based on Rizzi 2015: 316 – 317)
    a. The criterial head attracts a phrase bearing the matching criterial feature and creates a Spec-head configuration of matching elements.
    b. The criterial head gives instructions to the system of sound and meaning to properly interpret the dependents. (Bocci 2013)
    c. Once “a phrase enters into a criterial configuration, it is frozen in place, and becomes unavailable to further movements” (Rizzi 2015: 317). Further movement is excluded because the element should be readable at the interfaces with sound and meaning.

Spec-head configurations can take several forms. Adopting a split CP as in (2a),

(2) \[\text{[Force [Top* [Int [Top* [Foc [Top* [Mod [Top* [Qemb [Fin [IP [...]]]]]]]]]]]]]}
    (Rizzi & Cinque 2016:146)

Natural languages realizes the activated functional head with a specific particle morpheme, like in Gungbe (Aboh 2004) or in Japanese (Saito 2012):

(4) **Gungbe**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{SpecFoc} \\
\text{Kofi} \\
\text{Foc} \\
\text{2sg} \\
\text{call}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{KÌfì wè [ùn yró]!}
\end{array}
\]

‘I called KOFI’

Languages can also “prefer” not to realize this head.

(5) **Italian**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{SpecFoc} \\
\text{IL LIBRO} \\
\text{Foc} \\
\text{- [ Gianni ha letto ___ (non l’articolo)]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{THE BOOK} \\
\text{John} \\
\text{has read ___ (not the article)}
\end{array}
\]

The movement of a head can satisfy the relation of Agree\(^1\): *ResidualV2* in English (Rizzi 1991).

(6) **English**

a. \[\text{SpecFoc} \text{What [Foc' have [you done]]]?\]

b. \[\text{SpecFoc} \text{Which book [Foc' did [you read]]]?\]

The sentences in (6) may be the result of a Spec-head configuration in FocusP, like Gungbe (3) and Italian (5) examples\(^2\).

1.2. Verbo Second (V2)

1.2.1. Pre-Cartographic Analyses (Den Besten 1983) of V2 languages

(7) **Standard German**

a. Hänsel liest das Buch.
   Hansel reads the book

b. Das Buch liest Hänsel
   the book reads Hansel

c. Gretel sagt dass Hänsel das Buch liest.
   Gretel said that Hansel the book reads.

\(^1\) The reader is referred to Miyagawa 2010, ch.1 for an overview.

\(^2\) A further combination is possible, namely that the head is realized (through particles or verb movement) and the element does not move to the specifier of the activated position (see Bonan, in prep.).
Gretel glaubt – Hänsel liest das Buch.
Gretel thinks – Hansel reads the book.

(8) **Analysis:** Infl moves to C° in root clauses. {\textnormal{PPT}}

a. \[[\text{CP} \Delta [\text{SpecCP} [\text{C° dass [\text{IP Hänsel das Buch liest]}]]]]\]

b. \[[\text{CP} \Delta [\text{SpecCP Hänsel [\text{C° liest [\text{IP <Hänsel> das Buch <liest>}>]]}}]]\]

\(\text{V2 languages (Holmberg 2015)}\) {\textnormal{PPT}}

Although some language-specific exceptions (e.g. Cimbrian, cf. Bidese et al 2016), there are no great restrictions (Biberauer 2002) concerning the type of the first constituent before the inflected verb. The only requirement is that only one item is placed to the left of the finite verb.

(9) **Pre-cartographic analyses of V2: some milestones**

1978: **Den Besten**

1984/1997: **Travis**

1984/1997: **Zwart**

1991/1996: **Haegeman**/

1995: **Schwartz & Vikner**


Less-Subject Initial \{Old Romance\} +V3 orders

1.2.2. Cartographic Analysis today (since Haegeman 1996)

(10) **Properties of V2** (Holmberg 2015)

(a) A functional head in the Left Periphery attracts the finite verb;

(b) This functional head requires a constituent moved to its specifier position.

→ Edge Feature EPP feature (Roberts and Roussou 2002 following Chomsky 2000 built on Chomsky 1982:10), as proposed in Roberts (2004).

Ledgeway (2008: 439) observed that “V2 is not understood as a superficial descriptive label, but as a syntactic constraint which requires the finite verb in root clauses to raise to the otherwise vacant C position”.

In other words, the V2 phenomenon seems to be the result of a non-criterial\(^3\) head movement\(^4\) which is absolutely required in these languages.

(11) **Mainstream Analyses for V2 adopting a SplitCP**

a. a slightly different LP (Benincà & Poletto 2004). Two layers of base-generation, namely FrameP and Topic.

[Frame [\text{Force [Topic [Focus [\text{Fin}]]]]]]

\(^3\) We will avoid to use the term formal movement.

\(^4\) In this work, we will exclude V2 as a result of a phrasal movement (Koopman and Szalbocsi 2000; Mahajan 2003; Nilsen 2003; Müller G. 2004).
b. Mainstream analyses of V2 are in line with Haegeman (1996), in proposing that the EF relies in Fin°, the lowest head of the CP domain. \[ \text{FrameP} [\text{Force} [\text{Top} [\text{Foc} [\text{SpecFinP} \text{ XP} [\text{Fin}° \text{ V} [\text{Inf} [\text{IP} [\text{XP} [\text{TP} [\text{T}° <\text{V}> [\text{XP} [\text{vP} <\text{V}> <\text{XP}>]]]]]]]]]]]) \]

c. According to Mohr (2009: 146 – 154), if the element bears some informational properties, it undergoes a double-step movement, first to SpecFinP and then to the specifier of the activated criterial position.

d. The fronted item or the “copy” of the fronted item in SpecFinP create a “bottleneck” effect (Haegeman 1996, 2012; Poletto 2002; Roberts 2004) and are able to block any other movement to the LP in terms of Relativized Minimality (henceforth RM, Rizzi 1990, 2004; Starke 2001). The feature triggering the violation is considered of a “general” type (cf. Roberts 2004).

e. Less-Strict V2 languages: Topics may be base-generated and V3 orders are possible.

f. Strict V2 languages: further EF in Force°, XP moves to ForceP. V3 orders only with base-generated Items in FrameP.

1.2.3. Drawbacks of the theory

(12) Theory-internal drawbacks of the typology

a. Less Strict (I to Fin):

\( (i) \) Non-criterial movement is not expected under a criterial movement approach.

\( (ii) \) One feature, one head. A single head\(^5\) (Fin°) should not be expected to trigger the movement of different types of XPs (Subject, Focus, Topic, etc.) to its Specifier.

\( (iii) \) If Topics are base-generated in the CP (FrameP; TopP), they should not show hallmarks of movement.

b. Strict V2 (I to Force)

\( (i) \) The item in SpecForceP is a violation of Criterial Freezing effects.

\( (ii) \) Transparency at the interfaces with the systems of sounds. E.g.: Topicalized subjects in German bear different intonational contours, cf. Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl (2007).

\( (iii) \) Scene Setters behave differently among V2-to-Force languages (West Flemish vs. Dutch, Haegeman & Greco, forthcoming).

---

\(^5\) Theories which adopted a poly-functional head for the Left Periphery have been proposed. These frameworks are the (i) ‘stacked head theory’ (Lahne 2009, Manetta 2011) and the (ii) ‘feature-scattering hypothesis’ (Giorgi and Pianesi 1997). See Samo (in prep., ch.2) for discussion of the proposals in Cartographic terms.
2. Towards a Criterial V2

2.1 On Residual V2

Further candidates as a landing site for the verb movement within the CP domain.

(13) CriterialV2

a. “V2 could be a side effect of a Spec-head obligatory relationship established between the moved XP and the inflected verb” (Poletto 2000: 89)

b. “perhaps even the V2 constraint in Germanic can be looked at as a formal generalization of interpretively-determined Spec/head requirements” (Rizzi & Shlonsky 2007).

c. “macroparameters may possibly may be reinterpreted as the concerted action of some number of microparameters” (Cinque forthcoming: 1).

Poletto (2000: 89) suggested that the Spec-head obligatory relationship established between the moved XP and the inflected verb should be akin to the Wh-criterion (Rizzi 1991):

(14) Wh criterion: (Rizzi 1991)

a. A wh-operator must be in a Spec-head relation with a +wh-head.

b. A +wh-head must be in a Spec-head relation with a wh-operator

It is important to underline that INFL (and not the lexical verb) was thought to have a +wh feature, that allowed the movement of the verb to the left-peripheral position. (Rizzi 1991: 4)

Chamorro (Chung 1982), Hausa (Tuller 1984), Moore (Häik, Koopman & Sportiche 1984), Kikuyu (Clements 1984) and Paluan (Georgopoulos 1985).

Another residual V2 structure still preserved in English involves focalized negative items:

(15) English

a. In no case would I do that. (Haegeman & Zanuttini 1991: 244; 26c)

b. Never in my life did I see such a beautiful woman.

(16) NEG criterion (Haegeman 1991)

a. A NEG-operator must be in a Spec-head configuration with an X^0 [NEG];

b. An X^0 [NEG] must be in a Spec-head configuration with a NEG-operator

As for Negative Criterion, Rizzi (1991: 11, following Belletti 1990), assumes that there is an intermediate position between AgrP and TP called NegP, hosting negative adverbials, where the feature +Neg is licensed. An inflected verbal element can be “associated with this feature when it passes through Neg° under head to head movement, as proposed in Moritz (1989)” (Rizzi 1991: 11).

(17) Focus adjacency: Spec-Head with Focus, → a V2 without “the bottleneck-effect”.

Modern Eastern Armenian (Giorgi & Haroutyunian 2016), Modern Greek (Tsimpili 1995: 177;2b), Standard Arabic (Shlonsky 2000: 329; 6a); Hungarian (Puskás 2000: 332; 48a), Hindi-Urdu (Kidwai 2000), Georgian (Skopeteas & Fanselow 2010).

---

6 Focus has also been proposed as unique locus of V2 for Benincà (2006) and Poletto (2005) for old stages of Romance.

7 Literature is uniform in claiming that Old English was a V2 language (cf. Roberts 2007), but it may not have been so strict as contemporary German (Haeberli 2002). A similar description can be made for Old German (cf. Tomaselli 1995, Axel 2007).
2.2. Towards a Peripheral Criterion

Modelling on the Wh-criterion and the Neg-criterion, one may propose a more general Left Peripheral criterion:

   a. An operator of the set {TOP, MOD, FOC, WH, SUBJ, ETC.} must be in a Spec-head relation with the matching head.
   b. A head of the set {+TOP, +MOD, +FOC, +WH, +SUBJ, ETC.} must be in a Spec-head relation with the relevant operator.

The relevant feature [□ PPT]: The Nilo-Saharan language Dinka (Van Urk & Richards 2015; Van Urk 2015) shows V2 orders: different constituents can be the first element (19a, b, c), but “in neutral word order, the subject is clause-initial” (Van Urk 2015: 61).

(19) **Dinka**
   a. Àyén à-càm cuîin nè păal
      Ayen 3s-eat.sv food prep knife
      ‘Ayen is eating food with a knife’
   b. Cuîin à-cëzm Àyèn nè păal
      food 3s-eat.ov Ayen.gen prep knife
      ‘Food, Ayen is eating with a knife’
   c. Păal à-cëzmè Àyèn cuîin
      knife 3s-eat-obl.v Ayen.gen food
      ‘With a knife, Ayen is eating food’ (Van Urk 2015: 61; 2)

As in other V2 languages, an auxiliary can be the “second element of the clause” (Van Urk 2015: 61; 3). The marking on the inflected verb (according to the fronted element) has been indicated in Van Urk’s glosses as Voice morphology (following Andersen 1993, 2002, 2007). According to Van Urk (2015: 64), it easy to compare Dinka voice system8 with the one of Austronesian language (cf. Pearson 2005: 389), in which the verb is initial and the relevant XP remains clause-final instead of clause-initial.

A difference with Germanic V2 is that the first position slot is necessarily filled with “nominals in the absolutive case” (Van Urk 2015: 66).

Van Urk (2016: 79 – 86) discovered that “a V2 effect is found at the edge of transitive verb phrases, so that the first XP in the verb must be a DP in the absolutive case” (Van Urk 2016: 79). Van Urk describes this phenomenon as “V2 in the verb phrase (Van Urk 2015: 78; 161), proposing that the “direct object occupies Spec-vP” Translating Spec-vP in Cartographic terms, I tentatively propose that the direct object may target (keeping an asymmetry with the LP) a position in the Low IP area (Belletti 2005), creating a Spec-Head configuration with the lexical verb.

(20) **Dinka**
   a. Yîin bé [vp miir tiîŋ]
      you fut.sv giraffe see.nf
      ‘You will see a giraffe’
   b. *Yîin bé [vp _____ tiîŋ miir]
      You fut.sv see.nf giraffe

---

8 Van Urk (2016: 67, ch.4) proposes “that Dinka C assigns case to the nominal that moves to Spec-CP”. I will leave the discussion related to case assignments to dedicated works (cf. Caha 2013, Zompi 2017).
Thus, I would propose (18’), adopting the label Peripheral Criterion.

a. An operator of the set \{TOP, MOD, FOC, WH, SUBJ, ETC.\} must be in a Spec-head relation with the matching head.
b. A head of the set \{+TOP, +MOD, +FOC, +WH, +SUBJ, ETC.\} must be in a Spec-head relation with the relevant operator.

2.3. The ideal mechanism

Mainstream analyses propose that multiple elements extracted from the IP cannot co-occur in the LP. \{ \[ \square \] PPT \}

(21) Adopting the guidelines of the Cartography of Syntactic Structures, it is possible to observe the V2 phenomenon as sum of Spec-Head configuration in the LP with the inflected verb targeting the highest activated configuration.

ForceP:  
Imperative clauses, Conditionals, 
Exclamatives, Optative sentences  
(Cardinaletti & Giusti 1996)

TopicP:  
Topicalized elements

FocusP:  
Wh questions, Focalized elements

ModP:  
Highlighted adverbials and complements (+ higher ModP, Bassong 2010)

SubjP: (A-movement, different positions)  
“canonical” subjects  
(Cardinaletti 2004)

(22) Sum of Residual V2s:

Scrambling can be considered targeting the LP (inspired by Frey 2006). Certain scrambled patterns may be ungrammatical because of standard fRM effects (cf. lack of multiple Topics in English, Rizzi 2013), not because of a generalized EPP feature.

3. Issues on a Criterial V2: On subject V2 and embedded clauses

3.1 On Subjects

Subject Criterion (Rizzi 2006, 2007; Rizzi & Shlonsky 2007)  
→ VITP analysis (Travis 1984, Zwart 1991)

(23) Subjects are not always topics  
What happened? contexts (Belletti & Rizzi 2017; Rizzi forthcoming)  
√ Subject initial answers  
# Object initial answers
Asymmetries between Subject-initial contexts and non-subject initial contexts.

(24) **Subject Clitic Doubling in Surmiran in non-subject initial sentences**

a. Ursus discorra (*=3l*) stupent Rumantsch
   Ursus speaks.3sg excellently Rumantsch
   ‘Ursus speaks Rumantsch very well’ *(Surmiran, Anderson 2005: 206; 7.43, 7.44a)*

b. Rumantsch discorra(=*l*) Ursus stupent
   Rumantsch speaks.3sg-3sg.m Ursus excellently
   ‘Ursus speaks Rumantsch very well’ *(Surmiran, Anderson 2005: 206; 7.45a)*

Adopting a Cartography of Subject Position

[SpecSubjP [SpecEPP [SpecAgrSP ]]] (Cardinaletti 2004)

\[ \text{Subject Initial} \]
[CP [SpecSubjP Ursus [Subj° [Epp° [AgrS° discorra [IP stupent Rumantsch]]]]]]

\[ \text{Non-subject initial} \]
[SpecFocP Rumantsch [Foc° discorral [SpecSubj Ursus [Subj° discorral [Epp° [AgrS° discorra [IP ]]]]]]]

(adapted from Anderson 2005 and Fuß 2005)

(25) **Icelandic V3 adverbs** (adopting Þráhinsson 2007: 39 – 40)

In Icelandic, a class of adverbials is able to intervene between the subject and the inflected lexical verb, creating the order **Subj – Adv – LexVerb.**

The adverbs triggering V3 structures (V3 adverbs, following Jónsson 2002 in Þráhinsson 2007: 39) are **auðvitað** 'obviously', **líklega** 'probably', **sennilega** 'probably', **ennþa** 'still', **kannski** 'maybe', **náttúrulega** 'naturally', **vonandi** 'hopefully'.

Other adverbs like **aldrei** 'never' and **alltaf** 'always' cannot intervene between the subject and the inflected verb.

Auxiliaries can only precede V3 adverbs (Jónsson 2002) \{  PPT \}

a. [SpecSubj Jón [Aux°- [ModEvaluative náttúrulega/vonandi [ModEvidential auðvitað [ModEpistemic likelega / sennilega [ModIrrealis kannski [AspContinuative ennþa [Tense° lýkur [AspPerfective alltaf / never ]]]]]]]]]

b. [SpecSubj Jón [Aux° hefur [ModEvaluative náttúrulega/vonandi [ModEvidential auðvitað [ModEpistemic likelega / sennilega [ModIrrealis kannski [AspContinuative ennþa [AspPerfective alltaf / never [Tense lokið ]]]]]]]]]
3.3. Embedded V2 and complementizers

Different V2 languages allow V2 in embedded contexts.

(33) Embedded V2 languages
    a. Yiddish  Avrom gloybt az Max shikt avek dos bukh.  
     Avrom believes that Max sends away the book (Diesing 1990)
    b. Surmiran  Ia pains tgi dultschems vegia Corinna gugent 
     I think that sweets have.subj.3sg Corinna gladly 
     ‘I think Corinna likes sweets’  (Anderson 2005: 212; 7.57a, b)
    c. Kashmiri  me buuz ki raath vuch rameshan shiila 
     I heard that yesterday saw Ramesh-E Sheila 
     ‘I heard that Ramesh saw Sheila yesterday.’  (Bhatt 1999: 98; 25a)
    d. Dinka  À-yùûkù luêeel [CP è cuin à-cîi] 
     3s-HAB.1pl say  COMP food 3s-PREF.OV 
     ‘We say that, food, Ayen has eaten with a knife’ 
     (Van Urk 2015: 129, 130; 2)

In Icelandic, in subject-initial embedded clauses the verb may undergo a movement to T position higher than *alltaf* ‘always’ (Wiklund et al 2007: 210). Non-subject-initial embedded clauses show the V2 pattern.

Standard German does not allow V2. The verb is at the very “right” of the sentence.

(34) Standard German
    Maria sagt dass Jan immer Bücher liest 
    Mary says that John always books reads

Why is the inflected verb on “the right”? Standard German and Standard Dutch are considered OV languages. (cf. Head Parameter, Graffi 1980)

(35) Standard German syntactic structure { [ PPT ]
    a. [CP1 Δ [specCP2 [C° dass [specSubjP XP+subj [IP [Tense° [AdvP XP [EA <XP+subj> [vP [IA XP <V>]]]]]]
        [Tense° V]]]]]]
    b. [CP1 Δ [specCP2 [C° dass [specSubjP XP [IP [AuxP [Past/TP [EA <XP+subj> [vP [IA XP <V>]]]] [Past/T° V]
        [Aux° AUX]]]]]]

German Subject Positions (adopting Cardinaletti 2004)
[SpecSubjP [Subj° [SpecEPP [SpecAgrSP] [AgrS°] [Epp°]]]]

Root: Subj Criterion Spec-head configuration in Subj°
Embedded: Subj Criterion satisfied through FinP (see Samo, in prep. ch.4)

Complementizers may be merged in lower position (see also why, Shlonsky & Soare 2011) and move higher. This proposal may be in line with the phenomenon of syncretic heads (a first proposal in Rizzi 1997, but see also Shlonsky 2006: 86) without postulating them, since syncretic heads challenge the idea of “one feature, one head”. On the other side, an idea of movement does co-exist with the guidelines of Cartography.

---

9 On headness, see also Vikner (2001: 87 – 124) and Haider (2010: 54 – 67).
10 Plausibly in PersonP (cf. Shlonsky 2013).
Therefore, one may propose that the complementizer *dass* in German is first merged in Fin° (or lower, see Samo, in prep.) and moved to Force° (following Leu 2015’s intuition, also cf. Grewendorf & Poletto 2011).

Evidence for a first merge in lower position (e.g. Fin°) comes from certain varieties of West Germanic like Luxemburgisch (spoken in Luxembourg) and Frisian (spoken in the north of Germany and of the Netherlands and in the south of Denmark).

(37) a. **Luxemburgish**
   
   [obs du wëlls ]
   
   Whether-2sg you want 2-sg
   ‘if you want’

   b. **Frisian**
   
   [dats (do) jûn komst]
   
   That-2sg you tonight come 2-sg
   ‘that you come tonight’

   (Zwart 1997: 138)

(38) **Cross-linguistic variation**

i. The complementizer is in Fin° and then it undergoes movement to Force°.

ii. The complementizer is directly generated in Force°

Ex. XP+Foc ; XP+Top  {□ PPT}

German

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[CP}_{1} & \Delta [\text{Force}^{°} \text{dass}]} \text{[SpecTop] XP+Top} \text{[SpecFocus] XP+Foc} \text{[Focus]} \text{[Fin]} \text{[IP <XP+Top> <XP+Foc> Infl]]}
\end{align*}
\]

Swiss Romansh varieties:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[CP}_{1} & \Delta [\text{Force}^{°} \text{tgi}]} \text{[SpecTop] XP+Top} \text{[Top] Infl} \text{[SpecFocus] XP+Foc} \text{[Focus]} \text{[Fin]} \text{[IP <XP+Top> <Infl> <XP+Foc>]]}
\end{align*}
\]

Icelandic

Subj: \[
\begin{align*}
\text{[CP}_{1} & \Delta [\text{Force}^{°} \text{að}]} \text{[SpecSubj] XP+Subj} \text{[SpecFocus] XP+Foc} \text{[Focus]} \text{[Fin]} \text{[IP <XP+Top> <Infl> <XP+Foc>]]}
\end{align*}
\]

Non-Subj: \[
\begin{align*}
\text{[CP}_{1} & \Delta [\text{Force}^{°} \text{að}]} \text{[SpecFocus] XP+Foc} \text{[Focus]} \text{[Fin]} \text{[IP <XP+Top> <Infl> <XP+Foc>]]}
\end{align*}
\]

(39) **Intralinguistic variation**

Cimbrian (Bides et al. 2014)

- *ke*-type \(\text{allows V2}\)
- *az*-type \(\text{does not allow V2}\)

Standard German:

- *denn* ‘because/for’ \(\text{allows V2}\)
- *weil* ‘because’ \(\text{does not allow V2}\)

Colloquial German (Guenthner 1996, Jivanyan & Samo, forthcoming)

- *weil* content \(\text{does not allow V2}\)
- *weil* epistemic/speech-act \(\text{allows V2}\)

---

\(\text{11 (14) Scrambling in Embedded Clauses: Standard German}\)

Er hat erzählt, daß DEN NEUEN LEHRER einige der Schüler angerufen haben.

He has said that the new teacher some the pupils phoned have

"He said that some of the pupils phoned the new teacher" (adapted from Bader & Meng 1999: 129; 106)
(40) **Intermediate stages (Emphatic topicalization in Bavarian)**

Am Fünfa **dass**-e griag, hed-e ned gmoand.
A five that-I get had-I not thought
‘I wouldn’t have thought that I get a grade five’

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CP1: } & \text{SpecTopP Am Fünfa dass-e griag } [\text{Top}° \text{hed-e [IP1 ned gmodand}}
\text{\&c]}}\]]
\end{align*}
\]

(41) **Towards a typology of (criterial) V2s?**

Adopting a criterial V2, one can predict that variations among V2 languages are based on:

a. Spec-Head configuration requirement of functional projections (FP)

b. In Subject-initial sentences, the height of the V movement (T°, AgrS°, Subj°)

c. Headness of inflection/verbal FPs;

d. In embedded clauses, the locus of generation of the complementizer.

As for V3 orders, one may propose that the highest activated criterial position does not require a Spec-Head configuration (41a)\(^{12}\).

For example, if we imagine that ModP does not require Spec-Head configurations:

(42) **Ideal V3 orders if ModP does not require Spec-Head configuration**

Subject-Initial sentences: **V3**

\[
\text{[Force° Topic° Focus° Mod° Yesterday [SpecSubjP the student [Subj° reads [IP the book]]]]]]
\]

Object-Initial sentences: **V2**

\[
\text{[Force° Topic° Focus° The book [Mod° Yesterday [SpecSubjP the student [Subj° reads [IP -]]]]]]
\]

The proposal can be in line with studies on the loss of V-to-C movement (cf. Roberts 2007). For example, TopicP without Spec-Head configuration in Old Romance

→ clitics and loss of V2 (Bidese 2008).

**4.1. A qualitative analysis of V3 orders involving Locative and Temporal items in the literature**


---

\(^{12}\) There are V3 orders (Samo in prep, ch. 6) in which V3 orders depend on the height of the verb movement (41b, e.g. Icelandic V3 adverbs).
V3 orders in German\(^\text{13}\) and non-German considered as FrameP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Non-subj</th>
<th>Kiezdeutsch, West Flemish, Urban Vernacular Swedish, Putèr</th>
<th>West Flemish, Putèr, Vallader</th>
<th>Kashmiri {wh-bare items}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The asymmetry between subject and non-subject can be explained in terms of the lack of Spec-Head configuration of ModP.

5. Conclusions

V2 does not represent a challenge to Cartography, if the analysis adopts Cartographic guidelines.

Further Research:
Micro-variation among V2 languages.

References (file)
https://www.unige.ch/lettres/linguistique/archive/enseignantschercheurs/equipesyntaxe/giuseppe-samo/

Further info on Cartography: www.unige.ch/syncart/about-cartography

\(^{13}\) Certain V3 orders described in Müller S. (2013) should be considered “superficial”. See Samo (in prep, ch. 3)