Nor Jnl Ling 33.1, 81–91 © Nordic Association of Linguists 2010 doi:10.1017/S0332586510000041

Wiklund, Anna-Lena. 2010. In search of the force of dependent verb second. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 33(1), 81–91.

In search of the force of dependent verb second

Anna-Lena Wiklund

This short communication is a brief extension of recent work on verb second (V2) in Scandinavian declarative clauses and a contribution to research on the relation between V2 and illocutionary force. It is argued that Swedish data present a problem for the hypothesis that a bi-conditional relation holds between the illocutionary force of an assertion and V2 word order. The relevant force, to the extent that we can identify it, appears to be available also in the absence of V2 word order. It is tentatively suggested that V2 encodes evidentiality.

Keywords assertion, evidentiality, illocutionary force, Swedish, V2

Anna-Lena Wiklund, Centre for Languages and Literature/NORMS, Lund University, Box 201, 221 00 Lund, Sweden. Anna-Lena.Wiklund@nordlund.lu.se

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper arises from an investigation of the alleged semantic difference between the two members of minimal pairs like (1) in view of hypothesis (2).

(1) a. Olle sa att han inte hade läst boken. (non-V2)
Olle said that he not had read book.DEF
b. Olle sa att han hade inte läst boken. (V2)
Olle said that he had not read book.DEF
'Olle said that he had not read the book.'

(2) *Illocution hypothesis of V2 (declaratives)*
V2 declaratives have illocutionary force, V-*in-situ* declaratives do not.

Example (1a) shows the more common non-V2 word order in Mainland Scandinavian embedded clauses, (1b) embedded verb second. The question is whether it is possible to identify an illocutionary force in (1b) that is absent in (1a), in which case the V2 word order (V-in-C) would be a potential force marker. A related question is whether this force is always absent in V-*in-situ* declaratives, in which case the force perceived would actually be dependent on V2 word order, in support of (2).

Recent research on embedded verb second in Scandinavian declarative clauses falls into two camps regarding (2), with the more optimistic Julien (2007, 2009) on the one side and the more sceptical Wiklund et al. (2009) and Wiklund (2009a,b) on the other. The debate bears some resemblance to that presented in *Theoretical*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000041 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Linguistics 32(3) between Truckenbrodt (2006) and e.g. Reis (2006) on the semantic motivation of verb movement to C in German. Other works on the relation between illocutionary force and V2 include Andersson (1975), den Besten (1983), Wechsler (1991), Gärtner (2002), and Heycock (2006).

V2 is one of many phenomena that calls for scrutiny if we are to choose between theoretical models where illocutionary force is not directly encoded in syntax (even though it can be traced to syntactic properties), as in Zanuttini & Portner (2003), and models where syntax takes over a great deal of the burden of pragmatics, as in Speas & Tenny (2003). In the latter, phenomena related to sentence mood and point of view are taken to be deducible from a layered speech act phrase and a layered sentience phrase, respectively. This note is a contribution to the research on the relation between V2 and illocutionary force. I will show that to the extent that we can identify such a force, it also appears to be available in V-*in-situ* declaratives. This weakens the relation between V2 and illocutionary force even though there is little doubt about there being such a relation in Mainland Scandinavian, by virtue of V2 being restricted to syntactic environments in which a proposition is asserted.

2. DECLARATIVE V2 IS LIMITED TO ASSERTED PROPOSITIONS

The illocutionary act normally associated with declaratives is that of ASSERTING, roughly the act of uttering a sentence with the intention of making the addressee accept the content of it and take it as part of the common ground. Given that V2 word order in Swedish and other languages is excluded in the complement of the factive predicate *ångra* ('regret'), see (3a), where the content of the clause is presupposed (already part of the common ground), we seem to have evidence for a relation between V2 word order and assertion or the corresponding assertoric force.[1] We can at least conclude that a fully presupposed proposition cannot be expressed by using V2 word order.

(3) a. *Olle ångrade att han hade inte läst boken.
Olle regretted that he had not read book.DEF
b. Olle ångrade att han inte hade läst boken.
Olle regretted that he not had read book.DEF
'Olle regretted that he had not read the book.'

Looking at semi-factives like *upptäcka* 'discover', we see that factivity is irrelevant to V2, but whether the content of the embedded clause is presupposed by both the speaker and the hearer or only by the speaker appears to be relevant for the possibility of verb second (see Wiklund et al. 2009 for details).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000041 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(4) Olle upptäckte inte att Lena hade redan gått.
Olle discovered not that Lena had already gone
'Olle did not discover that Lena had already left.'

In (4), the proposition expressed by the embedded clause has to be presupposed by the speaker but need not be presupposed by the hearer, in which case the illocution of the clause potentially qualifies as an assertion; the sentence may be uttered with the intention of informing the addressee about the fact that Lena had already left. To the extent that we want to accept calling something that is presupposed ASSERTED in this context, which is a matter of terminology, the data confirm the old assumption that the less presupposed the content of the clause is, the more compatible it is with verb second. (4) contrasts with (3) in precisely this way. In (3), the content of the embedded clause has to be part of the common ground (presupposed by both speaker and hearer).[2] Therefore, it does not tolerate the V2 word order, cf. (3a).

Another point to note is that there is compatibility between verb second and matrix negation in Scandinavian under semi-factive verbs, as in (4).[3] This is in fact also possible with *säga* 'say' as long as negation is an illocutionary negation (in the sense of Searle & Vanderveken 1985). The negation of a non-assertive verb like *tvivla* 'doubt' shows the same (marginal) compatibility, see (5a), despite the fact that this verb is otherwise not compatible with V2 word order, cf. (5b).

(5) a. ?Jag tvivlar inte på att den boken köper du.
I doubt not on that that book buy you
b. *Jag tvivlar på att den boken köper du.
I doubt on that that book buy you

These facts show us that there is a relation between V2 word order in declaratives and assertion in the sense that V2 word order is ruled out in cases where the speaker is not undertaking some commitment to the proposition expressed, as in (5b), and in cases where there is no wish to update the common ground (to inform the hearer of something), as in cases where the embedded proposition is already part of the common ground, (3a). In what follows, I will show that even though V2 is restricted to assertive environments in the above sense, the bi-conditional version of the illocution hypothesis as formulated in (2) above – quasi-formalized in (6) – does not hold.

(6) *Strong illocution hypothesis of V2 (declaratives)*
V2 word order ↔ Illocutionary force

3. V-*IN-SITU* DECLARATIVES

One immediate problem for the strong version of the illocution hypothesis arises from the fact that non-V2 word order is the default word order of Swedish embedded

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000041 Published online by Cambridge University Press

clauses and it is not clear in what sense clauses with non-V2 word order under *sa*, as in (1a), and *upptäckte* 'discover' in the relevant sense, as in (7), are not also assertions; at least (7) yields the interpretation of a commitment to the embedded proposition on the part of the speaker and on the parenthetical use (see below) we can also infer a wish that the embedded proposition is added to the common ground (i.e. it also becomes known to the addressee).

(7) Olle upptäckte att Lena inte hade gått.
Olle discovered that Lena not had gone
'Olle discovered that Lena had not left.'

The sentences in both (4) and (7) seem to have parenthetical uses, just like (1a) and (1b), in the sense that there seems to be no way to distinguish the two word orders in terms of notions like MAIN ASSERTION (Hooper & Thompson 1973). In Wiklund et al. (2009), a detailed investigation of Icelandic, Norwegian, and Swedish is conducted, using the diagnostics presented in Simons (2007) in search for differences between the two word orders regarding the status of the clause in terms of main assertion (or Main Point of Utterance – MPU in the terminology of Simons 2007). Whenever the content of an embedded clause alone can constitute the answer to a question, the embedded clause has the possibility of being the MPU. Wiklund et al. (2009) shows that V2 word order is neither necessary for a clause to represent the main assertion nor is it unambiguously the main assertion of the sentence. As an illustration, consider the example sentences in (9) and (10), which are all possible answers to the question in (8). In (9), the embedded clause expresses the main assertion (he did not come to the party because he did not have time), and in (10) the whole sentence represents the main assertion (he did not come to the party because someone said something that offended him). In both uses, non-V2 word order (a-sentences) and V2 word order (b-sentences) are both possible.

(8) Varför kom han inte på festen?
why came he not to party.DEF
'Why didn't he come to the party?'

(9) a. Han påstod att han inte hade tid.
he claimed that he not had time
b. Han påstod att han hade inte tid.
he claimed that he had not time
'He claimed that he did not have time.'

(10) a. Någon sa att dom inte ville ha en idiot där.
someone said that they not wanted have an idiot there
b. Någon sa att dom ville inte ha en idiot där.
someone said that they wanted not have an idiot there
'Someone said that they didn't want an idiot there.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000041 Published online by Cambridge University Press

MPU-readings, just like V2 word order, are not possible when the content is already part of the common ground or when it is under non-assertive predicates (e.g. *tvivlar*). Under assertive predicates and semi-factives, however, MPU-readings are possible, just as V2 word order is; see Wiklund et al. (2009) for details. Importantly though, non-V2 word order is also possible.

4. IDENTIFYING FORCE

Suppose that relevant clauses with non-V2 word order nevertheless lack the FORCE of an assertion. The question is how to identify that force. Assertive particles, speech act adverbials, and swear words would seem to constitute candidate indicators. However, these elements appear perfectly fine also with non-V2 word order, see (11).[4]

(11) a. Hon upptäckte att han **ju** inte hade rest.
she discovered that he you.know not had gone
b. Hon sa att han **fasen** inte hade gjort ett skit.
she said that he [SwearWord] not had done a shit
c. Hon sa att han **ärligt talat** inte hade förstått det.
she said that he honestly speaking not had understood that
d. Vi upptäckte att de **nämligen/minsann** inte hade kommit.
we discovered that they you.see/indeed not had come

According to Julien (2008, 2009), V2 word order is preferred with the swear word *för fasen*, which she claims has a closer affiliation with (certain types of) illocutionary force than the discourse-oriented expressions exemplified above. However, I have not been able to find a speaker of Swedish who systematically prefers V2 word order when faced with examples like the following (see Wiklund 2009b):

(12) a. Han blir förbannad och ropar att han för fasen inte alls är doktor.
he gets angry and shouts that he [SwearWord] not at.all is doctor
b. Han blir förbannad och ropar att han är för fasen inte alls doktor.
he gets angry and shouts that he is [SwearWord] not at.all doctor

(13) a. Han sa att han för fasen inte ens visste vem hon var.
he said that he [SwearWord] not even knew who she was
b. Han sa att han visste för fasen inte ens vem hon var.
he said that he knew [SwearWord] not even who she was

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000041 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(14) a. Du kunde ha sagt att man för fasen inte kan jämföra vin och öl.
you could have said that one [SwearWord] not can compare wine and beer

b. Du kunde ha sagt att man kan för fasen inte jämföra vin och öl.
you could have said that one can [SwearWord] not compare wine and beer

In fact, the non-V2 word order is judged to be preferred by some speakers, which may be taken as evidence that assertoric force is not the difference at issue between the word orders. Examples can also be retrieved from the internet, see (15) below found on Google (2010–01-18).

(15) Det hajar väl alla att snacks för fasen inte är nyttigt.
that understands surely everyone that snacks [SwearWord] not is healthy

It is not unreasonable to think that the presence of a swear word has the effect of producing a force of some kind. Importantly, however, such a force is also perceived with the V-*in-situ* word order in the presence of a swear word and, to me, also in the presence of the other discourse-related elements exemplified above.

Although this fact does not preclude an interpretative difference between V2 and non-V2 word order in the absence of the above elements, V2 does not appear to be obligatory in the presence of the purported illocutionary force features. Note also that the above elements are impossible in precisely those environments where MPU readings are unavailable and where V2 word order is impossible in Swedish:

(16) a. Hon ångrade att hon (*ju) inte hade rest.
she regretted that he you.know not had gone

b. Hon tvivlade på att han (*för fasen) inte hade gjort ett skit.
she doubted on that he [SwearWord] not had done a shit

If assertoric force is possible in the absence of V2 word order, this weakens the connection between V2 and illocution considerably. The important observation is that the three phenomena – V2, MPU readings, and discourse oriented expressions (including modifiers of assertoric force) – are restricted to identical environments (asserted clauses) but may occur independently from one another.[5] Unless we have evidence to the contrary, the availability of these phenomena may be derived from whatever is responsible for the 'root' status of a clause, which in dependent clauses may be, for example, the presence of a certain layer of the C-domain in combination with other configurational properties. Thus, for example, V2-clauses appear to contrast with clauses displaying non-V2 word order in not being topicalizable, as in (17a) vs. (17b). This is also true of the embedded clauses in (11) that lack V2 word order but involve discourse elements, cf. (17c).[6]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000041 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(17) a. Att hon inte hade gått hem upptäckte han först igår.
that she not had gone home discovered he not.until yesterday
b. *Att hon hade inte gått hem upptäckte han först igår.
that she had not gone home discovered he not.until yesterday
c. *Att hon nämligen hade gått hem upptäckte han först
that she you.see had gone home discovered he not.until
igår.
yesterday

From the above facts, we may conclude that only a weaker version of the illocution hypothesis of V2 makes the correct predictions for Swedish, see (18).

(18) *Weak illocution hypothesis of V2 (declaratives)*
V2 word order → asserted clause

Anyone who wishes to link V2 to assertoric force needs an inclusive definition of ASSERTION in the sense that it has to cover also semi-factive verbs like *upptäcka* 'discover'. For the present purpose, we may assume (19) below.

(19) Assertion$_{def}$: The speaker intends
a. to undertake a commitment to the proposition expressed and
b. to update the common ground.

The first part of this definition, (19a), captures the difference between members of minimal pairs like those in (5) above. The second part, (19b), captures the impossibility of having the V2 word order in a clause with no update potential, for example, clauses embedded under *ångra* 'regret' in Swedish.[7] An additional piece of evidence against the strong version of the illocution hypothesis comes from appositives of the kind shown in (20).

(20) Vad tycker du om Olle, som jag faktiskt träffade igår?
what think you about Olle who I actually met yesterday
'What do you think about Olle, whom I actually met yesterday?'

The force of (20) must be interrogative. However, the appositive clause is not part of the question but instead constitues an assertion, given something like (19). The appositive displays non-V2 word order and, as shown in (21), V2 word order is in fact not even possible.

(21) *Vad tycker du om Olle, som jag träffade faktiskt igår?
what think you about Olle who I met actually yesterday

Note that V-*in-situ* is possible also in root clauses – in exclamatives of the kind shown in (22a). In these, a force is arguably present (exclamative) but V2 word order is impossible, as (22b) shows.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000041 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(22) a. Att han inte var där!
that he not was there
b. *Att han var inte där!
that he was not there

Although this fact says nothing about the relation between V2 and the specific illocutionary force of assertion (see Truckenbrodt 2006 on the difference between exclamatives and epistemic speech acts), it is another case where V-*in-situ* appears to come with illocutionary force. Examples of what appears to be the reverse situation – V2 without illocutionary force – can be found in Icelandic A (see Jónsson 1996, Gärtner 2003, and Hrafnbjargarson & Wiklund 2009), where V2 word order is possible also under non-assertive and factive predicates.[8]

5. LOOSE ENDS

Summing up what we have seen so far, verb second does not always yield force and force does not appear to require verb second, not even the forces associated with epistemic speech acts. The contribution of the V2 word order to the perceived difference between sentences like (1a) and (1b) (in the absence of modifiers) remains unclear. A natural next step is to pin down what is meant by FORCE here, now that we have seen that assertion alone does not always distinguish V2 from non-V2 word order. One immediate possibility that comes to mind is that (1a) and (1b) differ from each other in POINT OF VIEW-NESS (see Speas & Tenny 2003 and references cited therein; cf. Wiklund 2009b). The importance of the discourse-oriented expressions *qua* evaluative elements mentioned above indicates that sentience/evidentiality may be relevant. Expressions of that kind yield an interpretation that, to me, appears identical to that produced by V2 word order. To me, the point of view in (1a) seems associated with either the matrix subject or with the speaker (being responsible for evaluating the truth of the embedded assertion), whereas the point of view in (1b) appears associated with only the speaker (being responsible for evaluating the truth of the embedded assertion). Swear words that *prima facie* seem to include reference to the speaker, such as *fan i mig* 'devil in me' are thus, as predicted, compatible with both word orders in my variety of Swedish:

(23) a. Hon såg att han fan-i-mig inte hade läst brevet.
she saw that he devil-in-me not had read letter.DEF
b. Hon såg att han hade fan-i-mig inte läst brevet.
she saw that he had devil-in-me not read letter.DEF

Although further research is needed to gauge the validity of these intuitions, these facts indicate that verb second has to do with the 'very fine' structure of the left periphery and encodes sentience/evidentiality, at least in Swedish. In embedded

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000041 Published online by Cambridge University Press

clauses, V2 word order disambiguates cases where the evidential role (the sentient being who is responsible for evaluating the truth of a proposition) coincides with the speaker and cases where this role can also be assigned to the matrix subject. I expect there to be micro-variation in this respect. If I am correct, the quasi-marked (parenthetical) status of embedded verb second (vis-à-vis the canonical non-V2 word order) is derivable from the interference of the speaker's point of view in environments where the subject of a verb of speakingor propositional attitude would be the most natural binder of the relevant role from a semantic point of view but where it is prevented from establishing this relation due to the V2 clause being an island for such binding. A similar difference appears to be present in Icelandic (or varieties of Icelandic) between the subject-initial and non-subject-initial V2 word orders in embedded clauses (Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, p.c.). The subject-initial word order is ambiguous between the two readings, whereas the non-subject-initial word order yields speaker-anchored assertoric force.

6. CONCLUSION

In this note, I have scrutinized the relation between V2 word order and assertoric force and concluded that such a force, to the extent that it is identifiable by discourse-oriented expressions, is available also in the absence of V2 word order in Swedish. This means that a strong (bi-conditional) version of the illocution hypothesis of V2 does not hold. I have tentatively suggested that the difference between the two word orders has to do with the point of view from which the proposition is evaluated: unambiguously speaker-anchored in clauses with V2 word order, and speaker-anchored or matrix-subject-anchored in clauses with non-V2 word order.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Björn Lundquist for judgments on Swedish data and Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, Christer Platzack, Sten Vikner, and two anonymous reviewers for *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* for comments. I am also indebted to the participants at Grammatikseminariet, Göteborgs Universitet (24 April 2009), for discussion of parts of what is presented here.

NOTES

1. Swedish *ångra* differs from English *regret* in that the content of the embedded clause is presupposed by both speaker and hearer.
2. I disregard here the possibility of introducing new information via the presupposition in these cases, exemplified by (3b) when uttered in a context where the addressee is not familiar

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000041 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with the content of the embedded clause. This use is not compatible with V2 in my variety of Swedish.

3. Another verb with the same properties, which is factive when complemented by a finite clause (but which does not belong to the semi-factives) is *glömma* 'forget'.
4. The same seems to be true for Norwegian (Kristine Bentzen, p.c.).
5. Some swearwords, including *för fasen*, are also possible in imperative clauses and hence not restricted to assertions.
6. Another property that seems to show the same distributional split is the obligatoriness of (or preference for) the complementizer in V2 clauses and clauses involving the discourse elements mentioned in section 4 (I am indebted to Christer Platzack (p.c.) for reminding me of this fact):

(i) a. Hon sa (att) hon inte hade läst den.
she said that she not had read it
b. Hon sa ??(att) hon hade inte läst den.
she said that she had not read it
c. Hon sa ??(att) hon nämligen inte hade läst den.
she said that she you.see not had read it

7. English *regret* differs from Swedish *ångra* in this respect.
8. See Wiklund et al. (2007) and Wiklund et al. (2009) for arguments in favor of taking all Icelandic verb movement to be to C.

REFERENCES

Andersson, Lars-Gunnar. 1975. *Form and Function of Subordinate Clauses*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Gothenburg, Gotenburg.

den Besten, Hans. 1983. On the interaction of root transformations and lexical deletive rules. In Werner Abraham (ed.), *On the Formal Syntax of the Westgermania*, 47–131. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gärtner, Hans-Martin. 2002. On the force of V2 declaratives. *Theoretical Linguistics* 28, 33–42.

Gärtner, Hans-Martin. 2003. How Icelandic can you be if you speak Icelandic B? In Lars-Olof Delsing, Cecilia Falk, Gunlög Josefsson & Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson (eds.), *Grammar in Focus: Festschrift for Christer Platzack, 18 november 2003*, 115–122. Lund: Institutionen för nordiska språk, Lunds Universitet.

Heycock, Caroline. 2006. Embedded root phenomena. In Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, vol. II, 174–209. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hooper, Joan & Sandra Thompson. 1973. On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4, 465–497.

Hrafnbjargarson, Gunnar Hrafn & Anna-Lena Wiklund. 2009. General embedded V2: Icleandic A, B, C, etc. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 84, 21–51.

Jónsson, Jóhannes Gísli. 1996. *Clausal Architecture and Case in Icelandic*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Julien, Marit. 2007. Embedded V2 in Norwegian and Swedish. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 80, 103–161.

Julien, Marit. 2008. On embedded V2 in Mainland Scandinavian. NORMS Workshop on Root Phenomena and the Left Periphery, Tromsø, 20 May 2008.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000041 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Julien, Marit. 2009. The force of the argument. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 84, 225–232.
Reis, Marga. 2006. Is German V-to-C movement really semantically motivated? Some empirical problems. *Theoretical Linguistics* 32, 369–380.
Searle, John & Daniel Vanderveken. 1985. *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Simons, Mandy. 2007. Observations on embedding verbs, evidentiality, and presupposition. *Lingua* 117, 1034–1056.
Speas, Peggy & Carol Tenny. 2003. Configurational properties of point of view roles. In Anna Maria Di Sciullo (ed.), *Asymmetry in Grammar*, 315–344. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Truckenbrodt, Hubert. 2006. On the semantic motivation of syntactic verb movement to C in German. *Theoretical Linguistics* 32, 257–306.
Wechsler, Stephen. 1991. Verb second and illocutionary force. In Katherine Leffel & Denis Bouchard (eds.), *Views on Phrase Structure*, 177–191. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Wiklund, Anna-Lena. 2009a. In search of the force of dependent V2: A note on Swedish. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 83, 27–36.
Wiklund, Anna-Lena. 2009b. May the force be with you: A reply from the 5th floor. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 84, 233–236.
Wiklund, Anna-Lena, Kristine Bentzen, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson & Þorbjörg Hróarsdóttir. 2009. On the distribution and illocution of V2 in Scandinavian *that*-clauses. *Lingua* 119(12), 1914–1938.
Wiklund, Anna-Lena, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, Kristine Bentzen & Þorbjörg Hróarsdóttir. 2007. Rethinking Scandinavian verb movement. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 10(3), 203–233.
Zanuttini, Raffaella & Paul Portner. 2003. Exclamative clauses: At the syntax–semantics interface. *Language* 79, 39–81.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586510000041 Published online by Cambridge University Press