PART II

INVERSION, DISCOURSE PRAGMATICS, AND THE LEFT PERIPHERY

Comp. by: SatchitananthaSivam   Stage : Proof   ChapterID: 0005016827   Date:9/12/20
Time:15:36:03   Filepath:d:/womat-filecopy/0005016827.3D
Dictionary : OUP_UKdictionary   194

OUP UNCORRECTED PROOF – FIRST PROOF, 9/12/2020, SPi

8

V2 and topicalization in Germanic and Romance

Roland Hinterhölzl

8.1 Introduction

While V2 has been considered to be a hallmark of Germanic languages, a growing body of evidence has been accumulated showing that the Older Romance languages exhibited a fairly robust system of V-to-C-movement (cf. Benincà 2006; Wolfe 2015f.), as is evidenced by numerous cases of subject–verb inversion in basically all varieties of Older Romance. The examples to illustrate this core property of V2 in (1–4) are taken from Wolfe (2015f.).

(1) Adoncs dis   le lector   mot consolatz   que...   (Old Occitan)
     Then said   the clerk   very comfortingly   that...
     'Then the clerk said in a comforting manner that...'

(2) et   por ce   vos=pre je...   (Old French)
     and   for this you=ask I
     'and therefore I ask you'

(3) et desque   nascieron   dixo   el Mal   al Bien   (Old Spanish)
     and after   they-were-born said   the Bad   to the Good
     'and after they were born, the bad said to the Good'

(4) Vinendu   lu tempu di la morti   di kistu Stephanu,   (Old Sicilian)
     come   the time of the death   of this Stephan
     vinneru   multi pursoni   a visitari=lu
     came   many persons   to visit=him
     'When the time of death of that Stephan came, many people came to visit him'

While this property is acknowledged by most researchers on diachronic Romance syntax, it is often pointed out that these varieties, though displaying V-to-C

movement in declarative clauses, do not respect the condition of <u>linear V2</u> observed in modern Germanic languages like Dutch and German in declaratives. This has prompted some researchers to claim that Older Romance did not exhibit V2 but was subject to a different rule triggering movement of the finite verb into the C-domain in conditions not yet understood and to be investigated in the future.

Note, however, that recent research on older Germanic brought forward that these varieties were not categorically different from Older Romance in exhibiting V-to-C movement, while failing to the respect the <u>linear V2</u> constraint, since they allow for V1, V2, and V>2 orders in the same functional domain (cf. Hinterhölzl & Petrova 2010; Walkden 2015), as is illustrated in (5) for Old English (OE) and in (6) for Old High German (OHG), with the data in (5bc) taken from Haeberli (2002b: 248).

(5) a. **Com** þa   to lande   lid-manna helm (Beo 1623)   V1
        came   then   to land   sailors$_{Gen}$ protector
        'Then the protector of the sailors came to the shore'

     b. Him **geaf** þa   se cync   twa hund gildenra paeninga   V2
        him gave   then   the king   two hundred golden pennies
        'Then the king gave him two hundred golden pennies'

     c. Hiora umtrymnesse   he   **sceal** ðrowian   on his heortan   V3
        their weakness   he   shall atone   in his heart
        'He shall atone their weakness in his heart'

(6) a. **Was** liutu filu   in flize,   in managemo agaleize (O I 1,1)   V1
        were   people many   in diligence   in great effort
        'There were many people in diligence, in great effort'

     b. then   **scuóf**   hér   namon (T 59, 21)   V2
        them.DAT   created   he   names
        'He gave them names'

     c. erino portun   ih   **firchnussu** (I 157)   V3
        iron doors   I   smatter
        'I will smatter iron doors'

Considering the data in (5) and (6), we either have to withhold the status of a V2 language from Older Germanic as well, or address the question of how the V2 property can be characterized in systems that allow for V1 and <u>V3 orders</u> in the same functional domain. In this chapter, I will pursue the second option and argue for a compositional approach to the V2 rule that distinguishes between V-to-C movement, on the one hand, and the linear constraint that itself involves a syntactic and a prosodic part (cf. Hinterhölzl 2017), on the other hand.

If we assume that both older Germanic and older Romance were characterized by a similar V2 system, we also have to address the diachronic question of why and how German (and Dutch) developed a generalized V2 system but English and the Romance languages did not. Hinterhölzl & Petrova (2010) present a scenario in which topics plays a major role in the development of a generalized V2 rule in the history of German. They note that declarative clauses in OHG come in two patterns: V1 clauses, representing coordinating discourse relations, either introduce a situation that serves as the background for the main story, or move the main storyline forward by shifting from one situation to the next, while V2 clauses represent subordinating discourse relation that provide information about a discourse referent or protagonist.

In other words, V1 clauses represented thetic, topicless statements, whereas V2 clauses involved an <u>Aboutness topic</u> (A-topic) in the terminology of Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl (2007) and provided new information about this individual in a complex topic–comment structure. In the historic scenario, it is proposed that an originally clause-external topic is prosodically integrated into a V1 clause and reanalysed as having been moved to the left periphery from an IP-internal position, as is illustrated in (7abc). In (7), round brackets indicate prosodic constituents, while square brackets indicate syntactic constituents as usual.

(7) Scenario for the development of generalized V2 in German (Hinterhölzl & Petrova 2010)
   a. (A-topic) ([CP V1 [IP . . . pro / pronoun . . .])
   b. ((A-topic) (V1 [IP . . . pro / pronoun . . .]))   prosodic integration
   c. [CP ((A-topic) (V1 [IP . . . . t / resumptive pronoun . . .]))   reanalysis

The analysis in (7c) of sentences expressing subordinating discourse relations was then taken to have been analogically extended to sentences expressing coordinating discourse relations by moving an originally IP-internal *tho*-adverbial into the C-domain that serves to link the comment of a thetic judgement to a given situation just as an A-topic serves to link the comment of a categorical judgement to a given individual. This second reanalysis then was taken to lead to the reanalysis of the clause-initial position as an IS-neutral position, involving an EPP-feature in Force. This is so since in a unified analysis of questions and declaratives, Spec-ForceP has to be assumed to host a focused element in questions, an A-topic in categorical judgements and an adverbial element that can neither be analysed as focus nor as A-topic in thetic judgements.

This account leaves the question open why English and the Romance languages did not develop a generalized V2 rule as well. Note furthermore that the neutralization account sketched above rests on the assumption that there is a unique position in the C-domain—Spec-CP or Spec-ForceP—that is targeted *wh*-movement,

Comp. by: SatchitananthaSivam   Stage : Proof   ChapterID: 0005016827   Date:9/12/20
Time:15:36:03   Filepath:d:/womat-filecopy/0005016827.3D
Dictionary : OUP_UKdictionary   198

OUP UNCORRECTED PROOF – FIRST PROOF, 9/12/2020, SPi

198   ROLAND HINTERHÖLZL

topicalization, and the fronting of adverbials. This raises the question how realistic the given scenario is, given that in Rizzi's (1997) framework there are at least two positions in the C-domain, FinP, and ForceP that the finite verb can be taken to target.

Furthermore, the basic question remains whether superficial V1, V2, and V3 orders in OHG, OE, and Old Romance were really alike structurally as well as from a discourse functional perspective. In the following subsection, we will thus take a closer look at V3 patterns in Older Germanic.

8.1.1 V3 patterns in Old English, Old High German, and Old Saxon

Walkden (2015) provides a careful study of V3 word orders in OE, OHG, and Old Saxon (OS) and discovers important differences in use and structure between the three language stages. Walkden (2015) observes that the pattern XP given-subject V_{fin}, where XP is not a *wh*-word or a *tho*-adverb is quite frequent in OE. It is important to point out that new subjects typically follow the finite verb in these cases, indicating the presence of V-to-C movement. Furthermore, he notes that the preverbal subjects in this pattern comprise both weak pronouns and full DPs. In OHG, the respective pattern is less frequent and declining with preverbal subjects comprising only weak pronouns. Finally in OS, the order XP given-subject V_{fin} does not seem to be a productive pattern at all.

Walkden (2015) proposes that V2 clauses have the finite verb moved into ForceP, while V3 clauses are to be analysed with the finite verb in FinP, where given subjects, both pronominal and nominal ones, are analysed as occupying Spec-FinP. He then proposes that the pertinent change involves a generalization of V_{fin}-movement to Force^0, first in OS and then in OHG. I think that this scenario is on the right track and I will provide further motivation for its validity. At the same time the investigation by Walkden (2015) shows that there were already interesting differences between V3 orders in OE and in OHG as far as the nature of preverbal subjects is concerned. I will argue in the remainder of the chapter that this difference points to the relevance of a prosodic condition that was already in place in OHG but failed to apply in OE.

Modern English displays V3 orders in cases of topicalization and clause-initial adverbials as in (8a,b), but preserved V2 orders in questions and in cases of focus-affected fronting as in (8cd), termed residual V2 in the literature. In the following subsection I will address the question whether Romance languages can also be considered to be residual V2 languages.

(8) a. Beans I like, but rice I hate
     b. On Sunday John visited my mother

    c. Who(m) did John visit on Sunday

    d. With no job would John be happy

8.1.2 Residual V2 in Romance

As far as this question is concerned, I follow Rizzi (1996), who argues that *wh*-questions in Italian and French involve V-to-C-movement of the finite verb to fulfil his *wh*-criterion, raising the question why a (nominal) subject cannot occur between the finite verb in C and the non-finite part of the predicate, as is illustrated for Italian in (9a) and for French in (10a). As is illustrated in (9b) and (10b) respectively, the subject has to occupy a lower position in this case. However, this restriction only applies to nominal subjects; pronominal subjects may occur between the finite verb and the non-finite part of the (complex) predicate, indicating that V-to-C movement has applied, as is illustrated in (10c) (cf. Cardinaletti 2004, 2009 among others).

(9) a. *Che cosa ha Gianni detto?   (Italian)
         What thing has John   said

     b. Che cosa ha detto Gianni
         What thing has said   John
         'What did John say?'

(10) a. *Qu'a   Jean vu?   (French)
         what=has John seen

     b. Qu'a   vu   Jean?
         What=has seen John

     c. Qu'-a-t-il   vu ?
         what=has=t=he seen
         'What has John/he seen?'

The difference in grammaticality between post-finite DP subjects and DP pronouns is attributed to the failure of the finite verb to assign Case to the subject in the lower Spec-TP position in Rizzi's (1996) account, with pronouns and pro (in Italian) being (Case-)licensed by cliticizing onto the finite verb. This account raises the question of why the same restriction does not apply in *wh*-questions in German. I will argue that this property follows from the general movement conditions operative in a <u>low V2</u> language, to be discussed and defined in §8.2 below. Crucially, the condition does not apply in languages which behave like <u>high V2</u> languages in questions, as will be argued in detail in §8.3.

8.1.3 Main claims and outline of the chapter

In this chapter, I will develop an account of V2 that allows for alternative V1 and V3 orders in the same functional domain, that is in declaratives, and explains why linear V2 is nevertheless categorial in these systems in *wh*-questions. Furthermore, I will address the empirical question of which factors led to the generalization of a linear V2-rule in Germanic and which factors led to the retention of only residual V2 in questions in French and Italian and argue that a central factor in this differential development consists in the prosodic (non-)integration of topics and in the way in which they are derived, via internal or external merge, in Germanic and Romance.

The chapter is organized in the following way: §8.2 discusses the relevance of the bottleneck-effect for the questions at issue and introduces the important distinction between high and low V2-languages and its relevance for the properties of the V2-system that embodies either FinP or ForceP as a phase edge.

§8.3 discusses the properties of topicalization, *wh*-movement and focus-fronting in a language with a relaxed V2-system, that is within a language that allows for V2 and V3 orders in declarative and interrogative sentences. Furthermore, the section introduces the important distinction between higher and lower topics.

§8.4 represents the empirical core of the chapter showing that high topics in Italian and French are not prosodically integrated into the clause and are base-generated in the C-domain, while high topics in German are prosodically integrated in the clauses and—with the sole exception of frame adverbials—are derived by movement from an IP-internal position. The evidence is based on the presence/absence of reconstruction effects. Furthermore, evidence is presented that shows that low topics are derived by movement from an IP-internal position in Modern Italian.

Finally, §8.5 discusses the properties of frame adverbials in West Flemish, Dutch, and German and shows why they give rise to V3 orders in West Flemish, but not in Dutch and in German. It is discussed in detail how the V2 rule can be decomposed in a syntactic and a prosodic part that derives the relevant distinction between West Flemish on the one hand and Dutch and German on the other hand. A new type of interface condition is proposed, given in (11), which fixes the syntactically flexible phase edge in the C-domain to a head that satisfies a prosodic condition. This head is then required to be lexicalized by the finite verb for transparency reasons, making plausible why the (non-)integration of topics into the intonation phrase of the CP had a main impact on the (non-)generalization of the V2-rule in Germanic and Romance.

(11)   Prosodic edge condition (PEC):
       The finite verb must occupy a left-peripheral position in its prosodic phrase
       in the phase edge.

8.2 The bottleneck-effect and high and low V2

In the standard account to V2 (cf. Den Besten 1983; Tomaselli 1990), V-to-C movement is intrinsically coupled with the condition guaranteeing linear V2, since it is assumed that the unique or the highest head targeted by finite verb movement is endowed with an EPP-feature, thereby categorically excluding V1 and V3 orders (if we abstain from the assumption of CP-adjunction or adjunction in general). Getting rid of the EPP-feature in the account of V2 and assuming that the finite verb may possibly target different heads in questions and declaratives—a higher head in questions and a lower head in declaratives—will provide more flexibility in accounting for alternative orders in language stages that also exhibit strict V2 orders in specific cases.

Such a move is also necessary considering the ample evidence that has been accumulated in recent years that supports Rizzi's (1997) proposal for an extended C-domain illustrated in (12). Within this extended C-domain, the question arises which head is targeted by movement of the finite verb in a V2 system and how linear V2 can be enforced.

(12)   [ForceP [TopicP* [FocusP [TopicP* [FinP [IP . . .]]]]]]

In this respect it is important to note that the empirical research on older Romance brought to light (cf. Benincà 2006; Poletto 2002) that linear V2 is observed if a constituent can be argued to be remerged in the C-domain rather than being base-generated there. This opens up the possibility for V1 orders being compatible with the V2-rule, if no discourse-pragmatic function in the C-domain is activated in the context, and for V>2 orders, if activated discourse-pragmatic functions are realized with constituents first-merged in the C-domain. These considerations lead us to the working hypothesis specified in (13).

(13)   **Compositional approach to V2:**
        The syntactic part of the V2 constraint is compatible with V1, V2, and V>2
        orders and strict linear V2 is enforced by the presence of a prosodic
        condition.

This implies that the syntactic part of the V2 constraint contains as central conditions (a) the requirement that the finite verb move into the C-domain and (b) a constraint that limits the number of constituents that can be remerged in the C-domain to one (without requiring that at least one constituent be remerged in the C-domain). V1 orders would then be compatible with the V2 rule if no other constraint in the grammar requires remerge of an IP-internal constituent in the C-domain and V3 and V>2 orders would then be compatible with the V2 rule in

the presence of constituents that can be argued to be first-merged, that is, to be base-generated in the C-domain. This is the approach, sketched in Hinterhölzl (2017) that I will argue for on a broader basis of comparative data in the present chapter.

Furthermore, it has been proposed that the V2 rule can be parameterized as to the locus in which the V2 property is observed. This can be modelled by stipulating which head in the C-domain bears an uPhi feature (cf. Haegeman 1996; Cardinaletti & Roberts 2002; Holmberg 2015; Meklenborg Salvesen 2013) or via the Phrase Impenetrability Condition (PIC), if it is assumed that the finite verb marks the phase edge in the C-domain (cf. Hinterhölzl 2017).

This head can vary from language (stage) to language (stage). For instance, Benincà (2006) has proposed that this head is Foc^0 in Older Italian. In ample empirical work, Wolfe (2015f.) has argued that word order patterns in the C-domain of Old Romance can be explained best if it is assumed that this head is $Force^0$ in Older Spanish, Older French,[1] and Older Venetian, but Fin^0 in Occitan and Old Sicilian. Note furthermore that there is evidence from Old English (OE) that the locus of V2 can vary between clause types within one language (stage) such that interrogatives involve Focus (or Force)-V2, while declaratives involve Fin-V2 (cf. Hinterhölzl & van Kemenade 2015).

For the sake of concreteness and to limit parametric choices to an absolute minimum, I will follow Wolfe (2015f.) that only Force and Fin can count as the locus of the V2-constraint and use his terminology in referring to them as high and low V2. It is important to note at this point that high V2 seems to be more basic from a typological point of view and more stable from a diachronic point of view than low V2. In many languages focused constituents and *wh*-elements are the only elements triggering V2, as in Armenian, and high V2 in questions is retained in the history of English (residual V2), while low V2 in declaratives has arguably been lost in this language. The modern Germanic languages are particular in that both focused and *wh*-constituents on the one hand and topics on the other hand trigger—what then comes out to be—a uniform linear V2 order leading to our basic hypothesis that is re-iterated in (14).

(14)   **Hypothesis:**
       V2 is retained and generalized if topics become integrated into the clause, optionally giving rise to an additional prosodic constraint on V2.

In the following section, I will take a closer look at a residual V2 language that is relatively well described to work out the details of the compositional approach delineated so far.

---

[1] Older French in fact must be divided in two phases: one Fin phase and one Force phase. I thank Christine Meklenborg for pointing this out to me.

8.3 A case study of V2 in a relaxed V2 language

Cimbrian and Mòcheno are analysed as relaxed V2 languages. In this chapter, I will concentrate on Cimbrian (cf. Bidese & Tomaselli 2005, 2010; Bidese & Padovan 2012; Grewendorf & Poletto 2010; Kolmer 2012). Cimbrian is German dialect spoken in Luserna in Trentino. The data in this section are taken from Cognola & Hinterhölzl (2016, 2020).

What does it mean to say that a language exhibits a relaxed V2 system? It means that a language bears clear signs of a generalized V2 system like Modern German but also shows word orders that violate the linear V2 constraint. As far as the first point is concerned, there is clear evidence for the presence of V-to-C movement, since subject–finite verb inversion is obligatory with subject pronouns in Cimbrian, as is illustrated in (15ab). Furthermore, with the exception of topic drop, V1 declaratives clauses are ungrammatical in Cimbrian, as is illustrated in (15cd).

(15) a. Gestarn   hatt-se   gekhoaft   in libar   (Cimbrian)
          yesterday   has=she   bought   the-Acc book

      b. *Gestarn   se-hatt   gekhoaft   in libar   (Cimbrian)
          yesterday   she=has   bought   the-Acc book

      c. *Hatt-se   gekhoaft   in libar   (Cimbrian)
          has=she   bought   the-Acc book

      d. *(S)   hat   garenkt   (Cimbrian)
          Expl   has   rained
          'It rained'

On the other hand, examples abound in which more than one constituent precedes the finite verb in the C-domain. As is illustrated in (16) and (17), two topics or a topic + *wh*-element/a focus can precede the finite verb in Cimbrian main clauses. The constituent in capital letters constitutes a contrastively focused constituent in (17).

(16) In Luca   dar Maria   hån-e-sar   gezoaget   gester
      the-acc   Luca the-dat   Maria have=I=her shown   yesterday
      'I have introduced Luca to Mary yesterday'   (Cimbrian)

(17) Dar   Maria,   IN LIBAR   hån=e   gakhoaft,   net di bombela
      the-DAT   Maria   the- ACC book have=1.SG   bought   not the sweets
      'It is the book that I bought for Maria, not the sweets.'

204   ROLAND HINTERHÖLZL

In this respect, it is important to note that a *wh*-element or a focus can never be followed by a topic. In other words, the order of elements must be TOPIC–WH/FOCUS but not *WH/FOCUS–TOPIC (see also Cognola 2013a: chapter 4 for more examples on this). This is illustrated by the minimal contrast in (18).

(18)   a. *Bas   en   de   boteiga   hat=ar   gakhoaft   (Cimbrian)
           what   in   the   shop   has=he   bought

       b. En   de   botega   bas   hatt=ar   gakhoaft?   (Cimbrian)
           in   the   shop   what   has=he   bought
           'What did he buy in the shop?'

In §8.3.2, I will show that these restrictions follow from the assumption in the compositional approach to V2 that Cimbrian is characterized as a <u>low V2</u> language. In the following section, we will have a closer look at the distribution of subjects in *wh*-questions in Cimbrian that will provide us with an important clue for the correct analysis of a <u>low V2</u> language.

8.3.1 The interaction between subjects and *wh*-movement in Cimbrian

Looking at the distribution of subjects in *wh*-questions we note that the subject, very much as in French and in Italian, has to occupy a low postverbal position. In addition, it must co-occur with a subject clitic or with the locative adverb *da* ('here') attached to the finite verb, as is illustrated in (19a). The typical subject–verb inversion of <u>high V2</u> languages as in German is ungrammatical, as illustrated in (19bc).

(19)   a. Bas   hatta / hatt=ar$_j$ gekoaft   dar Luca$_j$?   (Cimbrian)
           what   has=da/has=he   bought   the Luca
           'What did Luca buy?'

       b. Was hat   der Luca   gekauft   (German)
           what has   the Luca   bought

       c. *Bas hatt / hatta /hatt-ar   dar Luca   gekoaft?   (Cimbrian)
           what has/has=da/has=he   the Luca   bought
           'What did Luca buy?'

On the other hand, both locative *da* and the subject clitic are excluded if the subject precedes the finite verb, as is illustrated in (20a). Only a clitic is possible with a pre-finite subject just in case the subject is left-dislocated, as is illustrated in (20b).

(20) a. Dar Luca   hat/*hat-ta / * hat-ar   gekoaft   in   libar
          the Luca   has / has-da / has-he   bought   the   book
          'Luca has bought the book'

      b. Dar Mario$_j$ bas   hat=ar$_j$ gekoaft?   (Cimbrian)
          the Mario   what   has-he   bought
          'What did Mario buy?'

The distribution of subjects and of subject clitics and *da* is explained in detail in
Hinterhölzl (2019) and Cognola & Hinterhölzl (2020). The most important tenets
of the account can be summarized in the following way: the subject serves to
anchor the predicate to the discourse (in categorical statements). This is achieved
by movement of a referential subject into Spec-FinP, where it is taken be assigned a
specific value for its referential argument. If the subject has to stay in a low position,
anchoring is achieved either via a subject clitic or via the locative adverb *da*. This
account raises the question why a referential subject is forced to remain in a low
postverbal position in *wh*-questions that is addressed in the following section.

8.3.2 V2, phase edges, and the Phase Condition

Adopting the split-CP structure in Rizzi (1997) illustrated in (11), I assume that
the finite verb moves to Fin° in all main clauses in Cimbrian (see Bidese &
Tomaselli 2005, 2010, Cognola 2013a). As is illustrated in (21), movement of
the subject into the C-domain interferes with licensing movement of the *wh*-
element into Spec-FocP.

(21) a. *Dar Mario   bas   hat=ta/hat   gakhoaft?   (Cimbrian)
          the Mario   what   has=da/has   bought
          'What did Mario buy?'

      b. *Bas   dar Mario   hat=ta/ hat   gakhoaft?   (Cimbrian)
          what   the Mario   has=da / has   bought
          'What did Mario buy?'

The crucial data is the ungrammaticality of (21b), raising the question of why *wh*-
movement should be blocked by a preverbal referential subject, arguably occupy-
ing Spec-FinP which counts as an A-position (Rizzi 2007). In particular, note that
according to our assumption the utterance can be taken to be anchored to the
discourse by a referential subject in Spec-FinP and that nothing in the theory rules
out A'-movement of the *wh*-object across the subject in an A-position. We are
confronted with a typical case of a <u>bottleneck-effect</u> (cf. Haegeman 1996; Roberts
2004; Cardinaletti 2009).

Comp. by: SatchitananthaSivam   Stage : Proof   ChapterID: 0005016827   Date:9/12/20
Time:15:36:04   Filepath:d:/womat-filecopy/0005016827.3D
Dictionary : OUP_UKdictionary   206

OUP UNCORRECTED PROOF – FIRST PROOF, 9/12/2020, SPi

206 ROLAND HINTERHÖLZL

I propose to account for this <u>bottleneck-effect</u> in the following way. Cimbrian is a <u>low V2</u> language which means that FinP counts as the phase edge in the C-domain, implying that all movement operations targeting higher positions in the C-domain must go through Spec-FinP. This assumption limits the number of pre-finite constituents in the C-domain to one. If a referential subject is moved into the Spec-FinP to anchor the clause to the context, movement of the *wh*-element into the C-domain is blocked by the Phase Impenetrability Condition, resulting in ungrammaticality. The only alternative consists in leaving the subject in a lower position and in anchoring the utterance via head movement of a subject clitic or of the locative element *da* to Fin^0, leaving Spec-FinP free as an escape hatch for *wh*-movement, as in (19a). I will not go into the specifics why the subject has to occur in a postverbal position in this case. The reader is referred to Hinterhölzl (2019) for the details.

This account raises the question how we can explain the data in (16–19) which showed that topics can precede a focus or a *wh*-element but cannot follow it. These data follow if it is assumed that topics above FocP are base-generated, but the ones below it are derived via movement from an IP-internal position. Hence the latter but not the former interferes with focus- and *wh*-movement and with the anchoring movement of the subject. Of course, this claim is still subject to empirical investigation. Some evidence for this proposal comes from Italian to be discussed in §8.4.

Note now that this account can be extended to the quirky facts of *wh*-movement in Italian and French discussed in (9) and (10) above. If it is assumed that Italian and French have residual V2 in questions and are to be treated as <u>low V2-</u> languages in which Fin^0 counts as the phase edge, these facts follow from the PIC, obviating the recourse to unmotivated differences in Case assignment between Germanic languages and Romance languages as in Rizzi's original (1996) account. Note that a pre-finite subject in Italian blocks *wh*-movement as in Cimbrian, as illustrated in (22).

(22) *Che   cosa   Gianni   ha   detto?   (Italian)
       What   thing   John   has   said
       'What did John say'

In conclusion, the compositional account to V2 has several advantages: (A) It predicts strict linear V2 order in cases in which a constituent is moved into the C-domain; (B) It allows for V1 orders in declarative clauses without a topic, that is in so-called thetic judgements; (C) It allows for V>2 orders just in case preverbal constituents can be analysed as base-generated making clear predictions about the nature and the interpretation of topics that we will address in the following section.

8.4 Topicalization and left dislocation (LD)
in German and Romance

In the historic scenario for the development of generalized V2 in German, it was assumed that the V2 rule was extended from interrogative to declarative clauses through the prosodic integration and the syntactic reanalysis of topics as constituents being remerged in the C-domain. The Romance languages did not develop generalized V2 since they did not integrate and reanalyse topics in this way. As far as the historical stages of the diverse Romance languages is concerned, this is a difficult and elaborate task consisting of a thorough empirical research that is well worthwhile doing, but beyond the scope of this chapter. What can be done on the basis of empirical research that has been done is to evaluate the claim/ the prediction that topics in the modern Romance language are not prosodically integrated into the clause and not derived by movement.

The first important step in this direction has been made by Cinque (1990) who proposed that there are four types of A'-dependencies based on their behaviour with respect to islands, as is summarized in (23).

(23) a. there is (cyclic) *wh*-movement which is subject to weak and strong islands
      b. there is (long) *wh*-movement of discourse-linked constituents which is subject just to strong islands
      c. there is (cyclic) topicalization of DPs which is subject just to strong islands
      d. there is a Hanging Topic (HT) construction involving a base-generated topic (in root clauses only) which is totally insensitive to any island condition

As far as ClLD is concerned, Cinque (1990) proposed that it involves a (binding) relation between a constituent base-generated in an A'-position and a clause-internal *pro* rather than a movement relation into the C-domain of the clause. In the following subsections, I will evaluate this claim for Italian and French and compare ClLD in Italian with topicalization in German.[2]

8.4.1 ClLD in Italian

Frascarelli (2004) takes up Cinque's proposal and argues against the movement account of Cecchetto (1999). She applies a battery of tests that indicate that

---

[2] Cinque points out (p.c.) that HT-constructions need to be distinguished from ClLD, the properties of the latter becoming visible only when involving PPs. A dislocated PP does show reconstruction effects and is subject to islands (cf. also Benincà 2006). See §8.4.4. for data indicating that some topics types in Italian do in fact show reconstruction effects.

Comp. by: SatchitananthaSivam   Stage : Proof   ChapterID: 0005016827   Date:9/12/20
Time:15:36:04   Filepath:d:/womat-filecopy/0005016827.3D
Dictionary : OUP_UKdictionary   208

OUP UNCORRECTED PROOF – FIRST PROOF, 9/12/2020, SPi

208   ROLAND HINTERHÖLZL

ClLD-constituents are not derived by A'-movement. As is illustrated in (24), ClLD other than *wh*-movement does not give rise to <u>Weak Cross-Over</u> effects (WCO) (cf. 24a) and does not license parasitic gaps, as is illustrated by the contrast between (24b) and (24c). Moreover, ClLD can apply to various constituents without giving rise to minimality effects, since they can appear in any order in the left periphery of the clause, as is illustrated in (25).

(24) a. Gianni   la sua madre   l'ha   sempre   apprezzato   (Italian)
          John   the his mother cl=has   always   appreciated
          'His mother has always appreciated John'

      b. *Quel libro   l'ho   cercato   [senza trovare *pg*]
          This book   cl=have-I   searched   without finding it
          'I have looked for this book without finding it'

      c. Quale libro   hai cercato *t*   [senza trovare *pg*]
          Which book   have-you searched   without finding it
          'Which book did you look for without finding'

(25) a. A me, Gianni, dei vestiti,   nel quel negozio   non me ne
          to me, John, of clothes,   in that shop   not me of-it
          ha mai comprato
          has never bought

      b. dei vestiti, a me, nel quel negozio,   Gianni   non me ne
          of clothes, to me, in that shop,   John   not me of-it
          ha mai comprato
          has never bought
          'John has never bought clothes to me in that shop'

Cecchetto (1999) had proposed a movement account of ClLD based on the observation that the ungrammaticality of (26a) can be explained as a <u>Principle C-effect</u> if it is assumed that the ClLD-object is reconstructed into its base position. Frascarelli (2002) points out that the effect noted by Cecchetto is restricted to *pro*-subjects. The effect disappears if *pro* is replaced with a lexical pronoun (cf. 26b) and is also meliorated if the name in the ClLD constituent is not a genitive object, as is illustrated in (26c).

(26) a. *il libro di Leo$_i$ pro$_i$ l'ha letto   volentieri   (Cecchetto 1999)
          the book of Leo   pro cl=has read   readily
          'He has read the book of Leo readily'

      b. ?il rittratto di Leo$_i$ lui$_i$ l'ha guardato   volentieri
          the painting of Leo   he cl=has looked-at   readily
          'He has looked at the painting of Leo readily'

    c. il libro per Leo$_i$ lui$_i$ l'ha visto   ieri
       the book for Leo   he cl=has seen   yesterday
       'He has seen the book for Leo yesterday'

Furthermore, Frascarelli (2004) points out that a pronoun contained in ClLD-direct object cannot be bound by a quantifier contained in the indirect object in the clause, as would be expected under reconstruction, as is illustrated by the contrast in (27).

(27) a. Maria$_i$ ha presentato   ad ogni ragazzo$_k$ il suo professore$_{i/k}$
       Mary   has presented   to each boy   her/his professor
       'Mary has introduced her/his professor to each of the boys'

      b. Maria$_i$, il suo professore$_{i/*k}$, l'ha presentato   ad ogni raggazzo$_k$
       Mary   his/her professor   him=has presented   to each boy
       'Mary has introduced his/her professor to each of the boys'

In addition, Frascarelli (2000) shows on the basis of phonological evidence that whereas a focus is always mapped into the same intonational phrase as the verb, ClLD-topics in Italian are mapped into separate intonation phrases, as illustrated in (28).

(27) [YP $_{Topic}$]$_I$ [XP $_{Focus}$ V]$_I$

In conclusion, there is pretty strong evidence that ClLD topics are not prosodically integrated in the clause and are not subject to reconstruction in Modern Italian. This generalization will be made more precise in §8.4.3.

8.4.2 ClLD in French

As far as ClLD in French is concerned, De Cat (2007b) shows—based on the same sample of tests and arguments applied by Frascarelli (2000, 2004)—that topics in Modern French are not prosodically integrated into the clause and cannot be taken to be derived by movement. As in Italian, ClLD-constituents do not give rise to WCO-effects (cf. 28a), do not license parasitic gaps (cf. 28a), and are not subject to minimality constraints in that ClLD-constituents can occur in free order (cf. 28cd).

(28) a. Abelard$_i$, sa $_i$ mere   l'amait   trop
       Abelard,   his mother him=loves too.much
       'His mother loves Abelard too much'

Comp. by: SatchitananthaSivam   Stage : Proof   ChapterID: 0005016827   Date:9/12/20
Time:15:36:05   Filepath:d:/womat-filecopy/0005016827.3D
Dictionary : OUP_UKdictionary   210

OUP UNCORRECTED PROOF – FIRST PROOF, 9/12/2020, SPi

b. Les livres   tu les a déchirés   au lieu de   *(les) consulter
The books   you them=have torn   in place of   (them) consult
'you have torn the books instead of consulting (them)'

c. La pluie$_i$ ta salade$_j$ elle$_i$ lui$_j$ fera   du bien
the rain   the lettuce   she=to-it=do-FUT   some good

d. ta salate,   la pluie   elle lui fera   du bien
the salate   the rain   elle=to-it=do-FUT   some good
'The rain will be good for the lettuce.'

As far as binding and scope properties of ClLD-constituents is concerned, also ClLD in French does not show any reconstruction effects. As is illustrated in (29), a pronoun in a ClL-object cannot be bound by a quantifier in subject position. (30) illustrates that a name in ClLD-object is not subject to a Principle C-effect expected under reconstruction, confirming the judgements of Frascarelli (2002) in (26) above. Furthermore (31) shows that a quantifier contained in a ClLD-constituent cannot scope under a quantifier contained in a clause-internal constituent as would be expected under reconstruction.

(29)   a. Chaque maître$_i$ a renvoyé   un de   ses$_i$ disciples
Each master   has dismissed   one of   his (own)   students

b. *[un de ses$_i$ disciples]   chaque maître$_i$ l'a renvoyé
one of his students   each master   him=has dismissed
'Each master has dismissed one of his students'

(30)   Tes sales petites remarques   sur Leon$_i$ il$_i$ ne les apprécierait
your dirty little remarks   about Leon,   he not them would-appreciate
sûrement pas
for sure not
'He would not appreciate your dirty little remarks about Leo'

(31)   Toutes ces toiles,   Julie,   elle ne les a pas   vendues
all those canvases,   Julie,   she not them has not   sold
'Julie did not sell all of those canvases'

As far as prosody is concerned, De Cat (2007b) shows that LD-constituents which are ubiquitous in the spoken language are not prosodically integrated in the clause in French: 'the dislocated element forms a separate unit clearly set off from the rest of the utterance; the corresponding comma intonation is characterized by a high pitch on the accented (last) syllable, pre-boundary lengthening and/or a pause.'

In conclusion, there is equally strong evidence that LD-constituents in French are base-generated constituents that are not prosodically integrated with the rest of the clause.

8.4.3 German

If we compare ClLD in Italian and French with topicalization in German, we can note that there are major differences as far as reconstruction effects are concerned. Since German does not license parasitic gaps and does not license multiple topicalizations (arguably due to the Phase Condition of the V2 rule), we can test the movement nature of topicalization only with respect to the WCO-effects. As illustrated in (32), topicalization does give rise to strong WCO-effects, as is expected if topicalization is derived by movement, as generally assumed.

(32) *Mehr als einen Mann$_i$ hat   seine$_i$ Mutter   geliebt
      more than one man   has   his mother t   loved
      'His mother loved more than one man'

This is analysis is reconfirmed by clear reconstruction effects with respect to both binding and scope properties, as is illustrated in (33ab), respectively. (33a) shows a Principle C-effect that is only explained if the topicalized constituent is subject to reconstruction. (33b) shows that a quantifier in a topicalized constituent can be interpreted in the scope of an operator contained in the IP, giving rise to the reading: she did not sell all vases but some, besides the reading for all vases it holds that she did not sell them. This speaks in favour of reconstruction and the movement nature of topicalization in German.

Note in particular that this is not a construction-specific difference between LD and topicalization. Also, LD in German (that uses a d-pronoun) is subject to reconstruction, as is indicated by the parallel example in (34).

(33) a. *Das Buch von Leo$_i$ hat er$_i$ der   Maria t   geschickt
         the book of Leo   has he   DET.DAT   Mary   sent
         'He sent to Mary the book of Leo'

      b. alle Vasen   hat   sie   nicht verkauft
         all vases   has   she   not t sold
         'She did not sell all the vases'

(34) *Das Buch von Leo$_i$ das   hat er$_i$ der   Maria t   geschickt
      The book of Leo   that   has he   DET.DAT   Maria   sent
      'He sent Mary the book of Leo'

In conclusion, it seems that all topics in German (we will discuss in detail one exception to this rule in the final section, namely frame topics) have been prosodically integrated and been reanalysed as being derived by movement from a clause-internal position.

8.4.4 Topics in low V2 languages

Before I close this section, I would like to present some evidence for the claim that low topics in Cimbrian, that is topics that occur below FocP in the extended C-domain of Rizzi (1997) are derived by movement, while high topics are taken to be base-generated in this language, raising the question of whether there is any evidence for such a split nature of topics in a language, as is schematized in (35a).

Notably, there is some evidence for such a distinction coming from Italian. Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl (2007) observe that high and low topics in Italian are not of the same type and serve different discourse functions (see Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl 2007 for details), but Aboutness topics (A-topics) and Contrastive topics (C-topics) are mapped into the higher topic field (and are prosodically realized in a distinct way each), while Familiar topics (F-topics) are mapped into the lower topic field, as illustrated in (35b).

(35)   a. $[_{\text{ForceP}}$ base-generated topics $[_{\text{FocusP}}$ derived topics $[_{\text{FinP}} \ldots [_{\text{TP}} \ldots]]]]$
       b. $[_{\text{ForceP}} \ldots$ A-topic C-topic $[_{\text{FocusP}}$ F-topic* $[_{\text{FinP}} \ldots [_{\text{TP}} \ldots .]]]]]$

Interestingly enough, it can be shown—if their interpretation in the context is controlled for—that F-topics are subject to partial reconstruction in Italian. As Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl (2016) show in an elaborate empirical investigation, F-topics can be reconstructed to a position within IP (below the subject) but not into their base position. While the interpretation in (36b) involving binding by the subject is judged as almost perfect by native speakers on a 2-point Likert scale, the reading in (36b) corresponding to reconstruction into the base position is judged considerably worse. Note that if an interpretation as a high topic is enforced by the presence of a *wh*-element in FocP, even reconstruction to a position below the subject is impossible, as evidenced by the lack of Principle C-effects in (37).

(36)   **Il suo vicino di tavolo**   qualcuno lo ha presentato   ad ogni ospite
       his neighbour at the table   someone   him=has introduced   to each guest
       a. somebody introduced his own neighbour to every guest   1.77
       b. somebody introduced each of the guests with their neighbour   0.69

(37)   Il libro di Leo$_i$ a quale studente   lui$_i$ lo ha   mandato?
       The book of Leo   to which student   he it has   sent?
       'Which student did he send the book of Leo to?'

We are now in a position to explain the unexpected contrast in (26) above. Given that *pro* is identified with the A-topic (cf. Frascarelli 2007) and since there can only be one A-topic per clause and given that there is no contrast involved in (26a), the LD-constituent can only be interpreted as F-topic, which is reconstructed to a position below the subject, giving rise to a <u>Principle C-effect.</u> This effect does not appear in (26bc), since a lexical subject pronoun, differently from *pro*, can be analysed as an F-topic, allowing for the interpretation of the LD-constituent as an A-topic, which is not subject to reconstruction, hence the absence of a <u>Principle C-effect.</u>

In conclusion, I have argued that Italian is a <u>low V2</u> language in which the FinP counts as the phase edge and *wh*-elements are licensed in FocP. The *wh*-phrase can be preceded by topics since higher topics can be taken to be base-generated in Rizzi's extended C-domain and do not interfere with *wh*-movement. Lower topics, however, are derived via movement, as is evidenced by <u>reconstruction effects.</u> The Italian data thus provide indirect evidence for our analysis of the Cimbrian facts; a type of evidence, however, that needs to be confirmed by further empirical investigations of Cimbrian facts along the lines of data discussed in §8.4.1–8.4.3 above.

8.5 Frame adverbials and generalized V2

After having discussed that Italian and French can be considered to be residual V2 languages that involve <u>low V2</u> in questions, I will discuss in this section the particularities of V2 in a language with generalized V2 like German. I will focus here on the role and interpretation of frame adverbials, since they give rise to <u>V3 orders</u> in languages and language stages that have developed a generalized V2 system.

8.5.1 The role of frame adverbials

Note first that IP-related temporal adverbials express a relation between the reference event and the event time, as illustrated in (38). In the mini-discourse in (38a), the second sentence is interpreted—after anaphora-resolution—as John's mother was sick during his visit. This can be taken to be achieved in the following way. In a Reichenbachian (1947) system, tense is interpreted as expressing a relation between the utterance time and a reference time. In (38a), this reference time is identified with the time line of the event of John's visit that has been established in the previous sentence.

214   ROLAND HINTERHÖLZL

(38)   a. John visited his mother. She was sick
      b. John visited his mother. She was sick two weeks before

As shown in (38b), an IP-related (temporal) adjunct specifies a relation between the reference time and the event time—John's mother is understood to have been sick two weeks before his visit. As illustrated in (39), frame adverbials serve to introduce a new, or to shift to, a pre-established reference time. In (39A) a new reference time is established in the first sentence that is continued in the second sentence, but shifted into the future in B's response to speaker A's prior statement.

(39)   A: Last year Christmas was fun. We had 5 days of free holidays
      B: In not many years Christmas will fall on a Wednesday again

8.5.2 Frame adverbials and V3

In this respect it is interesting to note that the pattern frame adverbial > subject > V_{fin} springs up in various contemporary dialects as well as diachronically. As noted in Haegeman & Greco (2017), frame adverbials in West Flemish, unlike Standard Dutch, give rise to a V2 or a V3 pattern, with the crucial difference that the V3 pattern does not allow for a reconstructed reading, implying that frame adverbials are to be analysed as base-generated topics. The data in (40) to (42) are taken from Haegeman & Greco (2017).

(40)   a. Oan-k   toekwamen   vielt   den eletriek   ut.
        when-I   arrived   fell   the electricity   out
        'When I arrived there was a power failure'
      b. Oan-k   toekwamen,   den eletriek   viel   ut.
        when-I   arrived,   the electricity   fell   out
        'When I arrived there was a power failure'

In Dutch, on the other hand, the pattern found in (40b) is ruled out with subject-initial clauses, as is illustrated in (41). However, no difference between subject-initial and non-subject initial V2 clauses appears with what seem to be clear cases of clause external elements, as is indicated in (42). Note that the conditional clause in (42) is interpreted as a speech-act-related adverbial, specifying the relevance of the utterance in the main clause in case the hearer should be hungry rather than a material condition for the state of affairs that there is bread in the cupboard.

(41)   a. Als   er   morgen   een probleem   is,   mij   moet je   niet bellen.
        If   there   tomorrow   a problem   is,   me   must you   not call
        'If there is a problem tomorrow, don't call ME!'

b. *Als er   morgen   een probleem is,   je moet   mij   niet bellen.
   If there tomorrow a problem   is, you must me   not call
   'If there is a problem tomorrow, you don't have to call me!'

(42) a. [$_I$ Als je   honger   hebt,] [$_I$ er ligt   brood   in de kast.]
         if you   hunger   have, there lies   bread   in the cupboard
         'If you're hungry, there's some bread in the cupboard'

      b. [$_I$ Als je   geinteresseerd   bent,]   [$_I$ ik kan   morgen   ickets
         if you   interested   are,   I can   tomorrow   tickets
         krijgen   voor   Morricone.]
         obtain   for   Morricone.
         'If you're interested, I can get tickets for Morricone tomorrow'

In other words, there is a major difference between the interpretation of the
adverbial clause in (42) and in (41). The latter is interpreted as an event-related
adverbial specifying a condition for the evaluation of the proposition of the main
clause.

German shows the same distinction as Dutch, as illustrated in (43). As the
contrast between (43c) and (43d), however, shows, the restriction does not apply
to subjects in general but only to weak unstressed subjects, recalling Wackernagel's
law that weak atonic elements should occur in second position. Note furthermore
that the restriction, even though it records the Tobler/Mussafia law in Romance
languages, is not entirely compatible with it since the latter only applies at
the beginning of an intonation phrase. But the condition does not apply in cases
like (42) which deals with a sequence of two utterances, prosodically realized as two
separate intonation phrases, as is indicated with square brackets in (42).

(43) a. wenn   es   morgen   ein   Problem   gibt,   wen   soll   ich
         if   it   tomorrow   a   problem   exists, whom   should I
         kontaktieren?
         contact?
         'If there should be a problem tomorrow, whom should I contact'

      b. wenn   es   morgen   ein   Problem   gibt,   MICH   brauchst
         if   it   tomorrow   a   problem   exists, ME   need
         du   nicht   anzurufen
         you   not   call.up
         'If there should be a problem tomorrow, you do not need to call me up'

      c. *wenn   es   morgen   ein   Problem   gibt,   ich ruf   dich an
         if   it   tomorrow   a   problem   exists, I call   you up
         'If there should be a problem tomorrow, I will call you up'

Comp. by: SatchitananthaSivam   Stage : Proof   ChapterID: 0005016827   Date:9/12/20
Time:15:36:05   Filepath:d:/womat-filecopy/0005016827.3D
Dictionary : OUP_UKdictionary   216

OUP UNCORRECTED PROOF – FIRST PROOF, 9/12/2020, SPi

216   ROLAND HINTERHÖLZL

d. wenn   es   morgen   ein   Problem   gibt,   PETER   kann   dir
   if   it   tomorrow   a   problem   exists, PETER   can   you
   helfen
   help
   'If there should be a problem tomorrow, Peter can help you'

Haegeman & Greco (2017) assume that all these clauses, that is cases like (41) and (42), are CP-external and stipulate that subject-initial clauses do not involve V-to-C movement. That is to say that in (41b) the subject occupies Spec-TP with the verb remaining in TP as well. (41b) is then taken be ungrammatical in their account, since they reasonably assume that the verb (its reference time) needs to be linked to the frame adverbial in a local fashion and there is a locality violation in (41b) that is absent in (41a) where the verb (preceding subject) is taken by them to have been moved into the C-domain.

I see two main problems with the account of Haegeman & Greco (2017). (A) They cannot explain the difference between (41b) and the parallel cases in (42). Note that also in (42) the adverbial clause must be taken to establish a parameter with respect to which the utterance in the main clause needs to be interpreted: in other words, rather than specifying the reference time, the adverbial clauses specifies a reference situation for the interpretation of tense and mood of the matrix verb. (B) More importantly, they cannot explain the difference between (43b) and (43c). Note furthermore that V3 orders also occur in Old English where the initial XP can be analysed as a frame adverbial. For this construction it has been proposed that the verb stays in a lower position in the C-domain, to be identified with FinP (cf. Hinterhölzl & van Kemenade 2015). Also, in these cases the verb would fail to be linked to the clause-initial adverbial in a local fashion.

Note, however, that there are no good reasons to assume that frame adverbials cannot occur inside ForceP, especially when they are realized by PPs, rather than by (temporal) adverbial clauses. In the extended C-domain, they can be assumed to occupy the higher topic field that hosts base-generated topics as we have shown in §8.4, as illustrated in (44), and has been proposed by Speyer (2008) on the basis of Early New High German data (cf. 45). Also, Petrova (2012) proposes a similar hierarchy on the basis of similar observations on the left periphery of Middle Low German. Note again that it is clause-initial temporal and locative adverbials that can be interpreted as frame adverbials that give rise to V3 orders in these varieties. Finally, the clause-initial adverbs that give rise to V3 orders in Kiez-Deutsch (cf. Wiese 2009, 2017) can be analysed as frame adverbials as well, as illustrated in (47).

(44)   [ForceP [FrameP [FocP [TopP [FinP [VP/IP . . .]]]]]]   (Speyer 2008)

(45) [Dar nach]   [die edel kungin]   fuer enhalb Ofen   auf des Laslaes
      after that   the noble queen   went beyond Oven   to the-Gen Lasla
      Wans   gueeter   mit grossem kummer
      Wan-Gen   properties   with great grief
      'After this the noble queen went out of Ofen to the properties of Laslae
      Wan with great grief'   (113.10.16; Speyer 2008, 481)

(46) [An   den   selven   tiden],   [Dyocletianus]   buwede   den   palas
      in   the   same   days,   Diocletian   built   the-Acc   palace
      to   Rome   das   gehetan   is   Terme   Dyocletiani
      in   Rome   rel   called   is   Baths   Diocletian-Gen
      'In the same days, D. built in Rome the palace that is called Baths of
      Diocletian'   (SW 113, 17, from Petrova 2012: 60)

(47) Heute   ich   geh   Aldi
      today   I   go   Aldi (a brand of supermarket)
      'Today I will go to Aldi'

In the following subsection, I will present an alternative account that is based on
the assumption that frame adverbials can occur outside and inside of ForceP but
that the minimal structure is preferred. With a Force-internal frame adverbial and
the subject in Spec-FinP, the two analyses given in (48) have to be considered: if the
verb raises to Force^0, a V2 structure will result. If the verb remains in Fin^0, a V3
structure will result. Movement of the finite verb to Force^0 must then be taken to be
triggered by weak subjects in Modern German and Modern Dutch, but unnecessary
in West Flemish, Kiez-Deutsch, and in various historic stages of German.

(48)   a. [$_{ForceP}$ wenn es ein Problem gibt, ruf [$_{FinP}$ ich [$_{TP}$ dich an]]
       b. [$_{ForceP}$ wenn es ein Problem gibt, [$_{FinP}$ ich ruf [$_{TP}$ dich an]]]

8.5.3 Decomposing V2

I submit that the V2 rule is a complex condition that is composed of the following
sub-conditions:

(A) A condition that requires the finite verb to move into the C-domain. For
     the sake of concreteness, I propose that this subcondition derives from a
     requirement to anchor the verbal event to the utterance situation.
(B) Fin^0 or Force^0 above it count as phase head, implying that constituents
     from an IP-internal position must move through the phase edge (there is
     only one position in the phase edge)

Comp. by: SatchitananthaSivam   Stage : Proof   ChapterID: 0005016827   Date:9/12/20
Time:15:36:06   Filepath:d:/womat-filecopy/0005016827.3D
Dictionary : OUP_UKdictionary   218

OUP UNCORRECTED PROOF – FIRST PROOF, 9/12/2020, SPi

218   ROLAND HINTERHÖLZL

(C) The phase edge may be fixed or flexible. A flexible phase edge is made possible when the phase edge is indicated via verb movement to the phase head.

We have seen above that Cimbrian, Italian, and French can be analysed as residual V2 languages where Fin^0 counts as the non-flexible phase head (low V2). Modern German does not observe the interaction between anchoring of the clause and *wh*-movement, suggesting that German should count as a high V2 language. For reasons that will become clear below, I submit that Modern German is a language with a flexible phase edge.

The first consequence of this assumption is that *wh*-movement in a language with FinP and ForceP as flexible phase edges will trigger obligatory verb movement to ForceP, since *wh*-movement would be blocked if the phase edge were to be identified with FinP.

Second, prosodic integration and reanalysis of a clause-external topic (with *pro*-drop) as derived by movement from a clause-internal position triggers verb movement to ForceP, independently of whether the V2-clause is derived from an original V1 clause or from a system allowing for V3 orders (low V2).

Third, strict linear V2 in Standard German and Dutch could be due to movement of a clause-internal adverb to FrameP or to a prosodic condition that was triggered by the integration of high topics (A- and C-topics). Note that the first option, namely the question of whether frame topics in the history of German and English were base-generated or derived by movement, is hard to prove empirically. One would have to show that low readings of the frame adverbial in the V3 pattern in OE are systematically excluded in the context of their use.

Note that at least in Modern German, there is evidence that frame adverbials are base-generated in the C-domain, as is indicated by the lack of reconstruction effects in (49). (49a) shows that frame topics are not subject to Principle C-effects and (49b) shows that a pronoun in a frame topic cannot be bound by a sentence-internal quantifier. Note that the relevant reading in (49b) is possible if the adverbial is analysed not as a frame topic but as a focus answering the question *When did every student go home*?

(49) a. Als   Peter$_1$ nach Hause   kam,   hat er$_1$ sofort
          When   Peter   to home   came,   has he immediately
          seine Freundin angerufen
          his girlfriend up-called
          'When Peter came home, he immediately called up his girlfriend'

    b. ??Als   er$_1$ die Arbeit   abgegeben   hatte,   ist   fast   jeder
          when   he   the work   delivered   hat   is   almost   every
          Student$_1$ nach   Hause   gefahren
          student   to   home   driven
          'When he had delivered his exam, almost every student went home'

Thus, the first option above is not tenable and we have to consider seriously the effect of a prosodic condition. Note in particular that the relevance of a prosodic condition is also called for by the difference in the V3-pattern between OE and OHG: remember that V3 orders in OHG were only possible with (weak) subject pronouns, while V3 orders in OE frequently also occurred with full DP subjects. The relevant condition is given in (50) and motivated and explained in more detail below.

(50)   Prosodic edge condition:
        V_{fin} must occupy a left-peripheral position in its prosodic phrase in the phase edge

Since frame topics are arguably base-generated in the higher topic field and since German allows for a flexible phase edge the verb can be analysed as occupying Fin^0 giving rise to V3 orders of the type frame + Subject + V_{fin}. No syntactic condition requires movement of the finite verb to $Force^0$. Note, however, that verb movement to $Force^0$ can be interpreted as being due to the prosodic condition in (50) given the following assumptions: (A) arguments are mapped into the same phonological phrase as the verb; while (B) adjuncts and high topics (A- and C-topics) are mapped onto a separate phonological phrase from the verb.

Under these assumptions the subject in an Argument position in FinP in (51) occupies the left-peripheral position in the prosodic phrase in the phase edge, violating the prosodic condition in (50), if V_{fin} is in FinP and FinP counts the phase edge. This can be resolved if V_{fin} moves to Force to respect (50) given that the frame or subject—moved into Spec-ForceP—is phrased as a separate φ, as illustrated in (52). Phrasing of the subject as a separate phonological phrase may be due to the A'-nature of ForceP or to the interpretation of the subject in this position as a high topic. I will leave this issue for further research.

(51) $[_{ForceP}$ (Frame) $[_{FinP}$ ((Subj) V_{fin})....]]

(52) $[_{ForceP}$ (Subj / Frame)$_{+DL}$ (V_{fin}....]

This approach has the advantage that dialects and language stages that allow for V3 orders with a sentence-initial frame topic can be characterized with the same kind of syntactic V2 system since the relevant difference can be attributed to the lack, that is non-grammaticalization, of the prosodic condition in (50).

Some additional evidence for the relevance of the prosodic edge condition comes from the fact that Modern German does not allow multiple frames. Multiple frames are rare and only marginally acceptable if they form a syntactic constituent and a prosodic unit, as illustrated in (53), while there is no restriction

on multiple LD-elements including frames in Modern French, as illustrated in
(54). The commas in the examples in (53) and (54) are intended to mark a
prosodic break.

(53) a. *Gestern,   im   Bus,   habe   ich   eine   interessante   Geschichte
        Yesterday, in.the bus,   have   I   an   interesting   story
        gehört   German
        heard

     b. Gestern   im   Bus   habe   ich   eine   interessante   Geschichte
        Yesterday   in.the bus   have   I   an   interesting   story
        gehört
        heard
        'Yesterday I heard an interesting story in the bus'   (Zifonum et al. 1997)

(54)   Cette   année,   en   Alsace,   contrairement   aux   prévisions   de
        that   year   in   Alsatia   contrary   to-the   predictions   of
        la   météo,   l'   été   a   été   pluvieux,   au
        the   weather.channel the   summer   has   been   rainy   to.the
        grand   dam   de   vigneron   French
        big   detriment of   vineyards
        'That year the summer was rainy contrary to the predictions of the weather
        channel in Alsatia much to the detriment of the vineyards'
                                                    (Riegel, Pellat, & Rioul 2016: 260)

As is illustrated in (55), multiple frames lead to a violation of the prosodic edge
condition in (50), where round brackets indicate phonological phrase boundaries.
While (55a) shows the initial phrasing, (55b) shows the phrasing after the
outermost boundary has been interpreted as an intonation phrase boundary. As
can be seen in (55b), the finite verb does not occupy a left-peripheral position in its
prosodic phrase in the phase edge.

(55) a. ((gestern) ((im Bus) (habe (ich) (eine interessante Geschichte) gehört)))
     b. [$_I$ (gestern) ((im Bus) (habe (ich) (eine interessante Geschichte) gehört))]

(56) a. ((im Bus) (habe (ich) (eine interessante Geschichte) gehört))
     b. [$_I$ (im Bus) (habe (ich) (eine interessante Geschichte) gehört)]

Similarly, (56a) shows the initial prosodic phrasing of a clause with a single frame
topic, and (56b) shows the prosodic phrasing after the outermost prosodic
boundaries have been interpreted as intonation phrase boundaries. As is evident,
the phrasing in (56b) does not violate the prosodic edge condition in (50), since

the verb in the phase edge occupies a left-peripheral position in the prosodic constituent that contains it.

If these considerations are on the right track, frames and other topics could be assumed to occupy the same positions in Germanic and Romance with the difference following from the fact that frames and A- and C-topics are prosodically integrated into the intonation phrase of the propositional IP in German, but project separate intonation phrases in Romance, as illustrated in (57).

(57) a. Germanic structure: [$_I$ Force (Frame) (Topic) ... (Fin)]
      b. Romance structure : [$_I$ Force [Frame] [Topic] ... [Fin]] ->
          [Frame] [Topic] [Fin]

Since the focus of a clause needs to be integrated into the intonation phase containing the verb (Frascarelli 2000), lower topics in Romance should behave like topics in Germanic and are subject to the bottleneck-effect.

In conclusion, I have sketched an account of the differential development of the V2 rule in Germanic and Romance and have argued that this difference, namely the loss of the V2 rule in declarative clauses derives from a difference in the status of high topics in the two language families—they are not prosodically integrated and are base-generated in Italian and French, but prosodically integrated and derived by movement in Germanic.

The only exception to this process is constituted by frame topics in the history of German. They have been prosodically integrated into the utterance but have not been reanalysed as being derived by movement, probably because of their particular role of situating the reference situation that plays a crucial role in the interpretation of matrix tense. These topics give rise to V3 orders in varieties in which the compositional V2 rule does not employ the prosodic edge condition.

This process of integrating clause-external constituents still continues in the present-day language, as illustrated in (58). The clause-initial adverbial is modifying the entire utterance, that is the speech act, and can thus be taken to be base-generated outside of ForceP, giving rise to the representation in (58a), in which a prosodically non-integrated constituent precedes a V2 clause. However, there is also a variant in which the adverbial is prosodically integrated and analysed as being base-generated in Spec-ForceP, triggering V-to-Force movement required by the prosodic edge condition, as illustrated in (59).

(58) a. ehrlich   gesagt,   ich   bin   enttäuscht   von   dir   (V3)
          honestly   said,   I   am   disappointed from   you

      b. ehrlich   gesagt   bin   ich   enttäuscht   von   dir   (V2)
          honestly   said   am   I   disappointed from   you
          'Frankly, I am disappointed by you'

Comp. by: SatchitananthaSivam   Stage : Proof   ChapterID: 0005016827   Date:9/12/20
Time:15:36:06   Filepath:d:/womat-filecopy/0005016827.3D
Dictionary : OUP_UKdictionary   222

OUP UNCORRECTED PROOF – FIRST PROOF, 9/12/2020, SPi

(59)   a. [ehrlich gesagt] [$_{ForceP}$ ich bin enttäuscht von dir]
       b. [$_{ForceP}$ (ehrlich gesagt) (bin ich enttäuscht von dir)]

This prosodic condition can be assumed to have arisen early in the history of German, explaining the difference between V3 orders in OHG and OE, given that the difference between pronominal and non-pronominal subjects cannot be explained in terms of syntax but only in terms of prosody: a weak subject pronoun can be assumed to be adjoined to the phonological word or the phonological phrase of the finite verb in the phase edge, as is illustrated in (60), permitting the latter to occupy a left-peripheral position in its phonological phrase.

(60)   (φ pron (φ verb . . .))

To conclude, the prosodic edge condition arguably never applied in the history of the Romance languages. We know that for a certain period the Tobler-Mussafia law was in order applying to clitic pronouns at the edge of an intonation phrase, as proposed by Renzi (1983, p. 2) for Ancient Italian (around the twelfth century): 'la legge Tobler-Mussafia per cui il pronome è enclitico se il verbo finito è in prima posizione, assoluto o dopo una congiunzione' (the law of Tobler-Mussafia, which requires that the pronoun is enclitic, if the verb is in first position or follows directly after a conjunction). This quote indicates that this law applied at the left edge of an intonation phrase since it applied utterance initially and after prosodically non-integrated topics. The prosodic edge condition applies clause-internally and is concerned with the phonological phrase of the verb. The present chapter is thus also intended to encourage more thorough empirical investigations comparing the prosodic status of left-peripheral constituents in early Romance and Germanic.