

David Petersson, Lund University

## Embedded V2 in Swedish - Two main clauses and a cataphoric pronoun

### 1. The syntax and semantics of prototypical main clauses and subordinate clauses in Swedish

I. Swedish is a verb second-language, meaning that the finite verb of a main clause holds the second position of the clause and can be preceded by no more than one constituent. A Swedish main clause has the following word order: topicalized constituent > finite verb > (subject) > sentence adverbial.

(1) *Gusten ska nog flytta till Florida när han går i pension.*  
*Gusten will probably move to Florida when he goes in pension*  
'Gusten is probably going to move to Florida when he retires.'

(2) *När han går i pension ska Gusten nog flytta till Florida.*  
*When he goes in pension will Gusten probably move to Florida*  
'When he retires, Gusten is probably going to move to Florida.'

(3) \* *När han går i pension Gusten ska nog flytta till Florida.*  
*When he goes in pension Gusten will probably move to Florida*  
'When he retires, Gusten is probably going to move to Florida.'

V2-word order normally only applies to main clauses. A prototypical Swedish subordinate clause has the following constituent order: complementizer > subject > sentence adverbial > finite verb.

(4) *att amerikanskt kaffe inte är vatten.*  
*that american coffee not is water*  
'that american coffee is not water'

II. The structural asymmetry between main clauses and subordinate clauses can be described in terms of V-to-C movement. A strong finiteness feature in C° attracts the finite verb in a main clause. In a subordinate clause, this feature is lexicalized by a complementizer (Platzack, 1998).

III. Main clauses and subordinate clauses also differ with respect to semantic/pragmatic interpretation. A prototypical main clause expresses a speech act, whereas a prototypical subordinate clause does not.

(5) Elvis bästa vän bodde i Darmstadt.  
Elvis' best friend lived in Darmstadt.

(6) att Elvis bästa vän bodde i Darmstadt.  
that Elvis' best friend lived in Darmstadt.

IV. The connection between syntax and semantic/pragmatic interpretation can be formalized in a syntactic model with a split CP. Rizzi (1997) proposes a CP containing four functional projections: FinP, TopP, FocP and ForceP.

Rizzi (1997, p. 283) explains the CP as “the interface between a propositional content (expressed by the IP) and the superordinate structure (a higher clause or, possibly, the articulation of discourse, if we consider a root clause)”.

The lower projection, FinP, faces inwards, towards the IP, whereas the higher projection, ForceP, faces outwards, towards a superordinate clause or the discourse (Rizzi, 1997, pp. 283-285).

Applied to Swedish, this means that if Force<sup>o</sup> is occupied by a complementizer, the clause is connected to, and anchored in, a higher CP and lacks an independent speech act value. But if Force<sup>o</sup> is held by the finite verb, the clause is the highest CP, facing towards the discourse or context, and has an independent speech act value.

## 2. “Embedded V2”

(7) Gusten sa att fantomen har inte tio tigrars styrka.  
*Gusten said that the phantom has not ten tigers strength*  
'Gusten said that the Phantom doesn't have the strength of ten tigers.'

“Embedded” V2-clauses display properties which are contradictory with respect to the division into main clauses and subordinate clauses.

### **Reasons for analyzing “embedded” V2-clauses as subordinate clauses:**

- i) They are introduced by what seems to be a complementizer (*att*).
- ii) From a logical point of view, they constitute necessary complements of the “matrix” verb.

### **Reasons for analyzing “embedded” V2-clauses as main clauses:**

- i) The finite verb has moved from V to C. (V-to-I-movement can be ruled out, since other constituents than subjects may be topicalized).
- ii) Apart from the presence of the complementizer *att*, “embedded” V2-clauses display the same syntactic structure as prototypical main clauses.
- iii) They express speech acts (normally assertions) (cf. Julien, 2007).

### **Properties of “embedded” V2-clauses:**

- A) “Embedded” V2-clauses do not occur in isolation. They must be preceded by a “matrix” clause.
- B) From a logical point of view, an “embedded” V2-clause seems to function as an argument in relation to the verb of the preceding clause.
- C) “Embedded” V2 always contains the word *att* 'that'.
- D) The finite verb of an “embedded” V2-clause has moved from V to C. In a model with a split CP, one can assume that it has moved from V to Force<sup>o</sup>.
- E) Both the “matrix” clause and the “embedded” V2-clause express speech acts.

### 3. The recursive CP-analysis

An analysis that aims to describe and explain “embedded” V2 must handle the following properties:

- A) The *att*-clause displays V2 word order and has a speech act value of its own.
- B) The “embedded” clause seems to function as an argument of the verb in the first clause.
- C) The “embedded” V2-clause contains the word *att* 'that', which is normally regarded as a complementizer.

The core problem is that the finite verb and the complementizer commonly are assumed to compete for the same structural position.

A solution that has often been suggested is a recursive CP. According to such an analysis, the “embedded” V2-clause has two CPs: a lower one which hosts the finite verb and a higher one which is occupied by the complementizer (cf. Vikner, 1995; Holmberg & Platzack, 1995).

### 4. Problems with the recursive CP-analysis

A) “Embedded” V2-clauses cannot be topicalized.

(8) *Att Nobels grammatikpris inte finns glömmes Gusten ofta bort.*

*That Nobels grammar-prize not exists forgets Gusten often PART.*

'That the Nobel Prize for grammar doesn't exist is something that Gusten often forgets.'

(9) \* *Att Nobels grammatikpris finns inte glömmes Gusten ofta bort.*

*That Nobels grammar-prize exists not forgets Gusten often PART.*

'That the Nobel Prize for grammar does not exist is something that Gusten often forgets.'

B) “Embedded” V2-clauses are islands for movement.

Constituents cannot be extracted out of “embedded” V2-clauses. This kind of movement is normally possible in the case of a regular *att*-clause.

(10) Den boken vet jag att Gusten ~~inte har~~ läst den boken  
*That book know I that Gusten not-has read that book*  
'That book, I know Gusten hasn't read.'

(11) \*Den boken vet jag att Gusten har ~~inte~~ läst den boken.  
*That book know I that Gusten has not-read that book*  
That book, I know that Gusten hasn't read.

C) Deictic adjustment is not necessary.

In indirect speech, the quoted clause is anchored in, or related to, the finiteness of a matrix clause. The deictic expressions in the quoted clause are adjusted to the 'here' and 'now' of the matrix clause. In direct speech the deictic expressions of the quoted clause are not adjusted to the 'here' and 'now' of the “matrix” clause. Instead, direct speech must be construed as two clauses with separate and independent speech act and finiteness values (cf. Petersson, 2008).

(12) Jag äter gröt här.  
I eat porridge here

(13) Han sa, jag äter gröt här.  
He said: I eat porridge here.

(14) Han sa att han åt gröt där.  
He said that he ate porridge there.

“Embedded” V2-clauses pattern with quoted clauses in direct speech. They are not deictically adjusted to their matrices. Instead they have their own independent finiteness and speech act values.

(15) Han sa att jag inte äter sill här. (indirect speech. Deictic adjustment applies.)

*He said that I not eat herring here.*

'He said that I don't eat herring here.'

(16) Han sa att jag äter inte sill här. (“Embedded” V2. Deictic adjustment does not apply.)

*He said that I eat not herring here.*

'He said: I don't eat herring here.'

D) The “embedded” clause can be an imperative clause.

(17) Han hälsade mig välkommen i united states och sa att **drick** inte för mycket så du  
He greeted me welcome in united states and said that drink not too much so.that you  
hamnar i finkan.

end.up in jail

'He wished me welcome in the united states and said, don't drink too much, so you end up in jail.'

## 5. “Embedded” V2-clauses are not embedded

A) Constructions containing “embedded” V2-clauses do not consist of a matrix clause and a subordinate clause. Both clauses are independent main clauses.

B) This leads to two new problems:

i) The first clause lacks an argument.

ii) *att* 'that' has no status.

Both problems are solved through a reanalysis of the word *att* 'that'.

***Att* is not a complementizer, but a pronominal element which functions as an argument within the first clause of a sentence containing an “embedded” V2-clause. *Att* does not occupy the C-domain of the “embedded” clause. Instead it holds the complement position of the VP in the first clause. Its referent is the “embedded” V2-clause.**

Just like German *dass* and English *that*, the Swedish complementizer *att* has developed from the demonstrative pronoun *þat/þät*. It has originally had a demonstrative use, functioning as a constituent within the “matrix”. Gradually, however, “it has moved into the subordinate clause, lost its accent and its actual meaning and finally turned into a pure conjunction (Wessén, 1965, 74-75).

*At(t)* is still used as a (normally enclitic) pronoun in some Swedish dialects. It is neuter, singular and corresponds to the standard form *det*.

## References

Andersson, Lars-Gunnar (1975): *Form and function of subordinate clause*. Göteborg: Dept. of linguistics, University of Göteborg.

Besten, Hans, den (1983): On the interaction of root transformations and lexical deletive rules. In *On the formal syntax of the Westgermania. Papers from the "3rd Groningen Grammar Talks". Groningen, January 1981*. Ed. Werner Abraham, pp. 47 - 131. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Cristofaro, Sonia (2003): *Subordination*. New York, Oxford: Oxford university press.

De Haan, Gemen J. (2001): More is going on upstairs than downstairs: Embedded root phenomena in West Frisian. In *The journal of comparative linguistics* 4. pp. 3 - 38. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Hagren, Kristina (2008): *Hur märks infinitiven? Infinitivkonstruktioner i svenska dialekter med fokus på infinitivmärket*. Uppsala: Institutionen för nordiska språk.

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

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

Petersson, David (2008): Förhållandet mellan anföringsats och anförd sats vid direkt anföring. In Josefsson, Gunlög (ed.) *Syntax i gränssnittet – Tre uppsatser i*

*gränsområdet mellan lexikon, syntax och semantik*, pp. 57 - 110. Nordlund 29. Lund: Lund University.

Platzack, Christer; Rosengren, Inger (1998): On the subject of imperatives: A minimalist account of the imperative clause. In *The journal of comparative Germanic linguistics* 1. pp. 177 - 224. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Platzack, Christer (1998): *Svenskans inre grammatik – det minimalistiska programmet. En introduktion till modern generativ grammatik*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Rizzi, Luigi (1997): The fine structure of the left periphery. In Haegeman, Liliane (ed.), *Elements of grammar*, pp. 281 – 337. Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Roll, Mikael (2009): *The neurophysiology of grammatical constraints – ERP studies on the influence of syntax and morphology in Swedish*. Doctoral dissertation: Lund University.

Teleman, Ulf; Hellberg, Staffan; Andersson, Erik (1999): *Svenska Akademiens Grammatik*. Stockholm: Norstedts.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur (2007): *The Syntax of Icelandic*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

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

Wessén, Elias (1965): *Svensk språkhistoria III - Grundlinjer till en historisk syntax*. Lund: Almqvist & Wiksell/Gebbers förlag.