First draft — comments welcome
Please check with me before citing

The syntax of verbs in Yiddish

Beatrice Santorini

~~b-santorini@nwu.edu~~
beatrice@babel.ling.upenn.edu

September 1, 1995

Comments welcome!
BTS

Contents

Abbreviations in glosses

ACC	accusative
DAT	dative
DEM	demonstrative
DIM	diminutive
DOS	expletive *dos* 'that'
EMPH	emphatic
FEM	feminine
GEN	genitive
INF	infinitive
NOM	nominative
PART	particle
PL	plural
REFL	reflexive
SG	singular
SUBJ	subjunctive

ll

Other abbreviations

EC	Empty Category
ECP	Empty Category Principle
Su	Subject
Vf	finite verb
V1	verb-first
V2	verb-second
V3	verb-third

Chapter 1

V2 in Yiddish

1.1 Overview

In a subject-initial main clause like (1a), the finite verb in German occupies second position, just like its English modal counterpart in (1b).

(1) a. Sie *wird* nächsten Dienstag einen neuen Tisch kaufen.
she will next Tuesday a new table buy
'She will buy a new table next Tuesday.'

b. She *will* buy a new table next Tuesday.

But in clauses with a topic,[1] the two languages differ: in German, the subject and the finite verb must invert, whereas in English, in general, they cannot.[2]

(2) a. Nächsten Dienstag *wird* sie einen neuen Tisch kaufen.
next Tuesday will she a new table buy
'She will buy a new table next Tuesday.'

b. Einen neuen Tisch *wird* sie nächsten Dienstag kaufen.
a new table will she next Tuesday buy

(3) a. * Nächsten Dienstag sie *wird* einen neuen Tisch kaufen.
next Tuesday she will a new table buy

[1] In the literature on V2, the phrase before the finite verb and its movement to clause-initial position are conventionally called 'topic' and 'topicalization'. I will follow this convention, even though the discourse functions of the clause-initial phrase are by no means limited to that of topic in any of the several, often incompatible senses that the term has been given in the discourse literature (for an excellent review, see Vallduví 1990, Chapter 3).

[2] Translations here and in what follows do not necessarily capture the nuances associated with particular word orders.

b. * Einen neuen Tisch sie *wird* nächsten Dienstag kaufen.
a new table she will next Tuesday buy

(4) a. * Next Tuesday *will* she buy a new table.
b. * A new table *will* she buy next Tuesday.

(5) a. Next Tuesday, she *will* buy a new table.
b. A new table, she *will* buy next Tuesday.

Clauses with the obligatory subject-verb inversion illustrated in (2) are called verb-second clauses, and they have the property in (6).

(6) Verb-second (V2) phenomenon:
The finite verb of a V2 clause is preceded by exactly one constituent. The preverbal constituent can, but need not, be the subject.

V2 is found in all the Germanic languages except modern English, and even the oldest forms, Runic and Gothic, already exhibit some evidence of it (Eythórsson 1995). Through language contact with Germanic, V2 came to characterize medieval Romance, where it is preserved today in Rhaeto-Romance, and it is also found in Breton (Romance: Adams 1987a, 1987b, 1988, Benincà 1984, 1986, Dupuis 1988, 1989, Fontana 1993, Haiman and Benincá 1992, Hulk and van Kemenade 1993, 1994, Lemieux and Dupuis 1994, Ribeiro 1994, Sprouse and Vance 1995, Vance 1989, 1994, Vanelli et al. 1986; Breton: Timm 1989, Schafer 1994, 1995). Outside Europe, V2 is found in Kashmiri (Bhatt 1994, Bhatt and Yoon 1992, Hook 1984, Hook and Manaster-Ramer 1985).[3]

Even in languages with productive V2, not all finite clauses exhibit the constraint, and it is possible to set up a spectrum of languages according to the range of syntactic contexts in which V2 is possible. At the most restrictive end of the spectrum are Dutch and German, with obligatory V2 in root clauses (including embedded ones), but no V2 in subordinate clauses.[4] Close to these languages in their V2 syntax, but distinct from them, are Frisian, the mainland Scandinavian languages and Kashmiri, where V2, in addition to being obligatory in root clauses, is optional in certain subordinate contexts. At the least restrictive end of the spectrum are Icelandic and Yiddish, where V2 is possible in all finite clauses; Old English and (the southern dialects of) early Middle English and at least some varieties of medieval Romance appear to belong here as well. I will use the terms 'strict asymmetric,' 'liberal asymmetric' and 'symmetric' as pretheoretical descriptive labels for these three types of V2 languages.

The remainder of the chapter is organized as follows. In Section 1.2, I review the facts of the asymmetric V2 languages and the classic analysis based upon them, according to which the verb moves to C in V2 clauses. Section 1.3 turns to the symmetric V2 languages and discusses three proposals concerning them. For Vikner 1995, V2 universally involves verb movement to C, and CP recursion structures, which are impossible in the strict asymmetric V2 languages and restricted to certain syntactic contexts in the liberal asymmetric ones, are generally available in the symmetric V2 languages (Vikner 1995). Following Iatridou and Kroch 1992, I reject Vikner's generalized CP recursion approach. Instead, I adopt an analysis according to which the domain of V2 in the symmetric V2 languages is IP, not CP as in the asymmetric V2 languages. The IP V2 analysis raises conceptual issues concerning the licensing of nominative case and agreement, which are addressed in Section 1.3.2.1. Moreover, Vikner 1995 has put forward a number of empirical objections to the IP V2 analysis, which I discuss and refute in Section 1.3.2.2. Finally, I discuss and reject a third proposal (Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991), according to which Agr is split into two components, the higher one of which serves as the landing site of verb movement in the symmetric V2 languages. A number of recent studies have suggested that subordinate V2 is freely available in the symmetric V2 languages only in subordinate root contexts, but that it is restricted to clauses with subject gaps in the general case. Section 1.4 adresses the status of the proposed subject gap condition in Yiddish. The result of a quantitative investigation, presented in Section 1.4.2, is that there is indeed a subject gap effect in Yiddish. In Section 1.4.3, I present further quantitative evidence that this effect is better regarded as a reflection of discourse considerations than as a syntactic licensing condition.

[3] V2 is reported for modern Hebrew by Shlonsky and Doron 1991. To the extent that it is productive in that language, it is likely to be the result of imperfect second language acquisition of Hebrew by native speakers of German and Yiddish.

[4] I will distinguish two sorts of embedded clauses: 'subordinate' clauses, whose embedded status is overtly signalled by a complementizer or by a fronted wh-phrase in the absence of verb movement to C, and 'asyndetic' clauses, whose embedded status is not so signalled.

(i) Subordinate clauses:
a. I think *that they're coming for dinner tomorrow.*
b. Ich glaube, *daß sie morgen zum Abendessen kommen.* (German)
I think that they tomorrow to the dinner come
'I think that they're coming for dinner tomorrow.'

(ii) Asyndetic clauses:
a. I think *they're coming for dinner tomorrow.*
b. Ich glaube, *sie kommen morgen zum Abendessen.*
I think they come tomorrow to the dinner
c. Ich glaube, *morgen kommen sie zum Abendessen.*
I think tomorrow come they to the dinner

1.2 Asymmetric V2

1.2.1 Strict asymmetric V2

As is well known, the position of finite verbs in Dutch and German differs according to clause type. As we have just seen, the finite verb in root clauses must occupy the second position in its clause. In subordinate clauses, on the other hand, the finite verb must occupy final position.[5]

(7) daß sie nächsten Dienstag einen neuen Tisch kaufen *wird* (German)
that she next Tuesday a new table buy will
'that she will buy a new table next Tuesday'

(8) a. * daß sie *wird* nächsten Dienstag einen neuen Tisch kaufen
that she will next Tuesday a new table buy

b. * daß nächsten Dienstag *wird* sie einen neuen Tisch kaufen
that next Tuesday will she a new table buy

c. * daß einen neuen Tisch *wird* sie nächsten Dienstag kaufen
that next Tuesday will she a new table buy

In Dutch, the position of the finite verb in subordinate clauses is somewhat obscured by so-called verb raising (see Chapter ??), but the basic word order asymmetry between root and subordinate clauses holds in Dutch as well (Koster 1975). Root clauses with the finite verb in final position are ungrammatical in both Dutch and German.

Following Higgins 1973:152, fn. 5, who suggests that root transformations involve movement to Comp, den Besten 1983 argues on the basis of the complementary distribution between elements in Comp and fronted verbs that finite verbs in V2 clauses occupy the same position as complementizers in subordinate clauses (see also Thiersch 1978). The idea is that the presence of an element in Comp in subordinate clauses prevents the finite verb from moving there from its underlying clause-final position.[6] The structure of subordinate and root clauses in an asymmetric V2 language under this analysis is given in (9). The phrase structure reflects the assumptions of Chomsky 1986.

(9) V-to-C movement analysis of V2 (= 'CP V2'):

a. Subordinate clause:
$[_{CP} \dots \text{ C } [_{IP} \text{ Su } [_{VP} \dots \text{ XP } \dots \text{ Vf }]]]$

b. Root clause:

i. Subject topic:
$[_{CP} \text{ Su}_i \, [_{C} \text{ Vf}_j \,] \, [_{IP} \, t_i \, [_{VP} \dots \text{ XP } \dots \, t_j \,]]]$

ii. Nonsubject topic:
$[_{CP} \text{ XP}_i \, [_{C} \text{ Vf}_j] \, [_{IP} \text{ Su } [_{VP} \dots \, t_i \, \dots \, t_j \,]]]$

In addition to the complementary distribution between elements in the C projection and fronted verbs, further support for the CP V2 analysis comes from a number of well-known distributional parallels in Dutch and German, which are briefly summarized in (10) (den Besten 1983, Section 3.2).

(10) a. Weak subject pronouns in Dutch and German must immediately follow complementizers and fronted verbs.

b. Weak object pronouns in German can immediately follow complementizers and fronted verbs.

c. Consecutive instances of the Dutch expletive subject *er* and the homonymous partitive clitic are realized as a single instance of *er* after complementizers and fronted verbs.

d. Certain instances of the German expletive *es* 'it' cannot appear after complementizers or fronted verbs.

I will refer to the instances of *es* 'it' mentioned in (10d) as 'topic *es*'. Topic *es* is in complementary distribution with other topics, in contrast to expletive subject *es* (Pütz 1975). See Chapter ?? for further discussion of topic *es* in Yiddish.

(11) Topic *es*:

a. Es lebte ein König in Frankreich.
it lived a king in France
'There lived a king in France.'
(Pütz 1975:1, (9))

b. In Frankreich lebte (*es) ein König.
in France lived it a king
(Pütz 1975:1, (10)/(11))

c. daß (*es) in Frankreich ein König lebte
that it in France a king lived
'that there lived a king in France'

(12) Subject *es*:

a. Es fehlt an Geld in Frankreich.
it is missing on money in France
'There is not enough money in France.'
(Pütz 1975:1, (12))

[5] For simplicity, I disregard the possibility of rightward movement phenomena such as PP and clausal extraposition.

[6] In the analysis of den Besten 1983, the finite verb actually adjoins to Comp in V2 clauses. The variant of the analysis with substitution is proposed in den Besten 1978.

b. In Frankreich fehlt *(es) an Geld.
in France is missing it on money
(Pütz 1975:2, (13))

c. daß *(es) in Frankreich an Geld fehlt
that it in France on money is missing
'that there is not enough money in France'

1.2.2 Liberal asymmetric V2

Since the CP analysis of V2 in (9) was formulated on the basis of the strict asymmetric V2 languages, it does not accommodate subordinate V2. Unexpectedly, however, Frisian, Kashmiri and the mainland Scandinavian languages allow V2 in certain 'subordinate root' contexts (de Haan and Weerman 1986:83–89, Platzack 1986, Section 5, Holmberg 1986:109–113, Reinholtz 1989, 1993, Vikner 1995, Chapter 4);[7] . In Frisian, for instance, which is head-final in I′ and V′, the second position of the finite verb in subordinate V2 clauses contrasts strikingly with its clause-final position in ordinary subordinate clauses.[8]

(13) a. Pyt sei dat hy *hie* my sjoen. (Frisian)
said that he had me seen
'Pyt said that he had seen me.'
(de Haan and Weerman 1986:84, (12b))

b. Pyt sei dat my *hie* er sjoen.
(Iatridou and Kroch 1992:4, (13c))

c. Pyt sei dat er my sjoen *hie*.
(cf. de Haan and Weerman 1986:85, (23))

(14) a. * Pyt betreuret dat hy *hie* my sjoen.
regrets that he had me seen
'Pyt regrets that he had seen me.'
(Iatridou and Kroch 1992:4, (14b))

b. * Pyt betreuret dat my *hie* er sjoen.

c. Pyt betreuret dat er my sjoen *hie*.
(cf. Iatridou and Kroch 1992:4, (14a))

In the mainland Scandinavian languages, which are head-initial in I′ and V′, evidence for a structural contrast between subordinate V2 clauses and ordinary subordinate clauses comes from the occurrence of nonsubject topics in subordinate V2 clauses as well as from the finite verb's position with respect to sentence adverbs and negation: the finite verb precedes these elements in subordinate V2 clauses, just as in root clauses, but follows them in ordinary subordinate clauses.

(15) a. Karen siger at den bog *har* Peter ikke läst. (Danish)
says that that book has not read
'Karen says that Peter hasn't read that book.'
(Reinholtz 1989:103, (4b))

b. Karen siger at Peter *har* ikke läst den bog.

c. Karen siger at Peter ikke *har* läst den bog.
(Reinholtz 1989:103, (4a))

(16) a. * Peter fortrød at den film *havde* han ikke set.
regretted that the film had he not seen
'Peter regretted that he had not seen that film.'

b. * Peter fortrød at han *havde* ikke set den film.

c. Peter fortrød at han ikke *havde* set den film.

Although subordinate V2 clauses are possible in the liberal asymmetric V2 languages, their distribution is restricted enough that a wholesale revision of the CP analysis of V2 does not seem called for. Accordingly, de Haan and Weerman 1986, Platzack 1986 and Holmberg 1986 propose that subordinate V2 clauses are so-called CP recursion structures with two C positions, a higher one for the complementizer and a lower one for the finite verb of the subordinate clause to move into. The structure for subordinate V2 in Scandinavian is given in (17); in Frisian and Kashmiri, the I projection would be head-final.

(17) CP recursion analysis of subordinate V2:

a. Subject topic:
$[_{CP} \ldots C\ [_{CP} Su_i\ [_C Vf_j\ ]\ [_{IP} t_i\ [_I t_j\ ]\ [_{VP} t_i\ t_j \ldots XP \ldots\ ]\ ]\ ]$

b. Nonsubject topic:
$[_{CP} \ldots C\ [_{CP} XP_i\ [_C Vf_j\ ]\ [_{IP} Su_k\ [_I t_j\ ]\ [_{VP} t_k\ t_j \ldots t_i \ldots\ ]\ ]\ ]$

1.3 Symmetric V2

As is well known, Icelandic and Yiddish allow subordinate V2 more freely than even the liberal asymmetric V2 languages (Icelandic: Maling and Zaenen 1978, Zaenen 1980, Rögnvaldsson 1984, Thráinsson 1986, Maling 1990/80; Yiddish: Lowenstamm 1977, Waletzky 1980). Because the finite verb moves to I in these languages and therefore invariably precedes sentence

[7] Some Dutch speakers also allow subordinate V2 in these contexts (Hulk and van Kemenade 1993:183, (4d)).

[8] *Hy* 'he' has a clitic form *er*, which is ruled out as a topic in V2 clauses (de Haan and Weerman 1986:85) but otherwise preferred. Where not otherwise indicated, the following examples and/or judgments are due to Ger de Haan (Frisian) and Sten Vikner (Danish).

adverbs and negation for independent reasons, the relevant evidence comes from nonsubject topicalization in subordinate clauses. In Icelandic and Yiddish, such topicalization is not restricted to subordinate root contexts. This is illustrated below for Yiddish.

(18) That-clauses outside subordinate root contexts:

a. Es iz a shod, vos *hayntike tsaytn* kenen azoy fil mentshn afile nit
it is a shame that today's times can so many people even not
leyenen.
read
'It is a shame that nowadays, so many people can't even read.'
(Diesing 1990:44, (5b))

b. Oyf ali land kartin iz men akhtung gebin oyf [di] fir zaytin, az *ven du*
on all maps is one attention give on the four sides that if you
leygst es f[a]r zikh oyf den tish, iz in d[e]r rekhti hand m[i]zr[e]kh.
place it before REFL on the table is in the right hand east
With all maps, one must pay attention to the four sides, that if you place it in front of you on the table, east is on the right.
(Geografye, 3)

c. un hobn oysgeloshn ale lompn, az *in shtub* iz geven fintster-khoyshekh
and have extinguished all lamps that in room is been dark darkness
'and extinguished all the lamps so that the room was in total darkness'
(Royte pomerantsen, 41)

d. Oyber ba aykh iz rekht, az *tsulib ayere finf kopikes* zol a yid
if with you is right that on account of your five kopecks shall a guy
dertrunken vern, vel ikh geyn.
drowned become will I go
'If it is all right with you that a guy should drown on account of your five kopecks, I'll go.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 188)

(19) Adverbial clauses:

a. Ober azoy vi *oyf dem ritmishn element fun unzere reyd* leygt men
but so how on the rhythmic element of our speech lays one
veynik akht in gramatik, iz keday, dos ritmishe aroystsuheybn.
little attention in grammar is worthwhile the rhythmic out to lift
'But as little attention is paid to the rhythmic element of our speech, it is worth emphasizing it.'
(Mark, 34)

b. Un az *in meyn eygener shprakh* iz aza konstruktie nito, iz mir
and as in my own speech is such a construction not there is me-DAT
take shver tsu kvalifitsirn di dersheynung.
really hard to describe the phenomenon
'And as I do not have such a construction in my own speech, it is very difficult for me to describe the phenomenon.'
(Zaretski, Mendele, 50)

(20) Conditional clauses:

a. Az *in shtetl* voltn geven nor finf azelkhe balebatim vi ir, volt ikh
if in shtetl would been only five such elders like you would I
geblibn!
stayed
'If there were only five elders like you in town, I would stay.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 115)

b. Oyber *ba aykh* iz rekht, az tsulib ayere finf kopikes zol a yid
if with you is right that on account of your five kopecks shall a guy
dertrunkn vern, vel ikh geyn.
drowned become will I go
'If it is all right with you that a guy should drown on account of your five kopecks, I'll go.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 188)

c. Vos toyg mir di polke mazurke, az *tantsn* tants ikh zi nit?
what is of use me-DAT the polka mazurka if dance-INF dance I her not
'What use is the polka mazurka to me, if I don't dance it?'
(Mir trogn a gezang, 28)

d. Vos mir shtot un ven mir, ven yarid, az *keyn ferdl* darf ikh nit.
what me-DAT city and if me-DAT if fair if no horse need I not
'What do I need the city for or the fair, when I don't need a horsey.'
(Mir trogn a gezang, 70)

e. A mentsh a groyser geven volt fun im zikher ... ven *iber im* volt
a person a great been would of him surely if over him
gevakht a mames oygn.
would watched a mother's eyes
'He would surely have been a great man ... if a mother's eyes had watched over him.'
(Mir trogn a gezang, 201)

(21) Headless relative clauses:

a. ... kegn di vos dertseyln oys far goyim vos *bay yidn* tut
against those that tell out before non-Jews what with Jews does
zikh.
REFL
'against those who speak about Jewish matters in front of non-Jews'
(Dubnov, Vaad, 18)

b. Volt er gepaskent, vi *far got* iz gut.
would he judge how for God is good
'He would judge in a way that benefits God.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 244)

c. Vet ir paskenen, vi *far mir* iz gut.
will you judge how for me is good
'You will judge in a way that benefits me.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 244)

(22) Indirect questions:

a. Ikh veys nit, tsi *morgn* vestu kumen.
I know not whether tomorrow will you come
'I don't know whether you'll come tomorrow.'
(Mark, 11)

b. Zol ikh azoy visn fun beyz, vi ikh veys, vos *ba mir* tut zikh.
shall I so know from evil how I know what with me does REFL
'May I know from evil if I know what is happening with me.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 92)

c. Ir kent zikh forshteln, vi *di yidn* iz gevorn oyfn hartsn.
you can REFL imagine how the Jews-DAT is become on the heart
'You can imagine what the Jews felt like.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 133)

d. Az ir vet, kinder, elter vern, vet ir aleyn farshteyn,
when you will, children, older become, will you yourselves understand
vifl *in di oysyes* lign trern.
how many in the letters lie tears
'As you grow older, children, you will understand how many tears the letters contain.'
(Mir trogn a gezang, 2)

e. Got veyst vos *mit ir* iz geshen.
God knows what with her is happened
'Gods knows what's become of her.'
(Mir trogn a gezang, 206)

(23) Relative clauses:

a. Dem 28 april 1712 hot der kinig aroysgegebn a dekret in velkhn *barufndik*
the has the king out given a decree in which appealing
zikh oyf dem oytoritet fun galekh Zhukovski hot er tsugestimt, az di
REFL on the authority of priest has he agreed that the
yidn zeynen shuldik in hargenen kristlekhe kinder.
Jews are guilty in murdering Christian children
'On April 28, 1712, the king issued a decree in which, appealing to Father Zhukovsky's authority, he agreed that the Jews were guilty of murdering Christian children.'
(Shatzky, Teshuat, 66)

b. der yid vos *shabes bay nakht* vet Khayim zen
the guy that Sabbath by night will see
'the guy that Khaim will see Friday night'
(Diesing 1990:65, (35b))

c. Itst iz vikhtik festtsushteln az mir hobn do tsu ton mit an
now is important to observe that we have there to do with an
interesantn poylishn yidn ... velkher hot bakumen dos vos *andere*
interesting Polish Jew who has obtained that that other
shlikhim fun poyln far im hot zikh nisht ayngegebn.
emissaries from Poland before him has REFL not succeeded
'Now it is important to observe that we are dealing here with an interesting Polish Jew ... who obtained what other emissaries from Poland before him had not succeeded in obtaining.'
(Shatzy, Teshuat, 39)

1.3.1 Generalized CP recursion

In order to maintain that the domain of V2 is CP universally, Vikner 1994, 1995 proposes that all instances of subordinate V2 are CP recursion structures as in (17). According to this view, the different types of V2 languages correspond to the extent to which CP recursion is licensed: the strict asymmetric V2 languages allow no CP recursion at all, the liberal asymmetric V2 languages allow it in subordinate root contexts, and the symmetric V2 languages allow CP recursion in all finite contexts.

Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991:6 object to Vikner's analysis on the grounds that it provides "no way to avoid unlimited recursion of C^0." However, in their own analysis of embedded V2 in the asymmetric V2 languages, they postulate an upper and a lower C with distinct feature content. It is this difference that enables certain matrix heads to select the upper C which in turn selects the lower C into which the finite verb moves to yield embedded V2. But once such a distinction between two types of C is introduced, it is trivial to extend it to the symmetric V2 languages. Preventing unlimited CP recursion in these languages does

not therefore present a conceptual difficulty.

Iatridou and Kroch 1992 also reject Vikner's generalized CP recursion approach, but on empirical grounds. Arguing that CP recursion is independently motivated by the syntax of if-then conditionals in English (Iatridou 1991), they show that the distribution of these conditionals in English matches the distribution of V2 clauses in the liberal asymmetric V2 languages. For instance, neither if-then conditionals nor V2 occurs in the complement of predicates like 'doubt' or 'regret'. Iatridou and Kroch propose that the possibility of CP recursion depends on the semantic feature content of the complementizer selected by the matrix verb (the higher C in (17)): specifically, the complementizer must be semantically transparent. Given this proposal, maintaining the generalized CP recursion analysis of subordinate V2 in the symmetric V2 languages would mean that the semantic content of the complementizer selected by predicates like 'doubt' and 'regret' would have to vary crosslinguistically precisely in accordance with whether a language is a symmetric V2 language—a conceptually undesirable result (see also Rögnvaldsson and Thráinsson 1990:30).

1.3.1.1 English if-then conditionals

In simple conditional constructions in English like (24a), the antecedent clause adjoins to the consequent clause to yield a two-segment category (here, IP), as in (24b).

(24) a. If it rains, I will visit you.
b. $[_{IP}$ if it rains $[_{IP}$ I will visit you]]

Extending this analysis to if-then conditionals like (25) would give the three-segment structure in (26a). However, following Iatridou 1991, Iatridou and Kroch 1992 argue that conditionals with *then* have the CP recursion structure in (26b) instead.

(25) If it rains, then I will visit you.
(26) a. $[_{IP}$ if it rains $[_{IP}$ then $[_{IP}$ I will visit you]]]
b. $[_{CP}$ if it rains $[_{CP}$ then $[_{IP}$ I will visit you]]]

Evidence in favor of the CP recursion analysis over the three-segment analysis comes from two sources: selection and extraction. Just as selection between a verb and its clausal complement is not disturbed in clitic left-dislocation (CLLD) structures in which the dislocated element adjoins to a complement CP, selection is not disturbed either by an intervening simple if-clause. The acceptability of examples like (27) is therefore consistent with the analysis in (28), where the configurational relation between the matrix verb and the lower CP segment (or more precisely, its phonetically empty head) is sufficiently local to satisfy the verb's selection requirements.[9]

[9]For a treatment of the selection mechanism required for examples like (27) that is based on CP recursion like Iatridou and Kroch's, but semantically more nuanced, see McCloskey 1992, Section 4.

(27) a. Every boy wonders if his mother comes what he will eat.
(Iatridou and Kroch 1992:12, (54a))
b. Every boy wonders if he flunks his courses what is going to happen.
(Iatridou and Kroch 1992:12, (54b))

(28)

(29) V $[_{CP}$ [if ...] $[_{CP}$ ... $[_{C_{+wh}}$] $[_{IP}$ ...]]]

But adding *then* to such examples, as in (30), makes them completely unacceptable.

(30) a. * Every boy wonders if his mother comes then what he will eat.
(Iatridou and Kroch 1992:12, (55a))
b. * Every boy wonders if he flunks his courses then what is going to happen.
(Iatridou and Kroch 1992:12, (55b))

The sharp contrast between (27) and (30) is surprising if *then* simply adds a third segment (here, CP) to the structure in (28). But if *then* is associated with a head with feature content of its own (whose category Iatridou and Kroch take to be C), then this intervening head interrupts the local relation between the matrix verb and the head of the complement clause, and the unacceptability of (30) follows straightforwardly.

A second source of evidence in favor of the CP recursion analysis comes from contrasts like those between (31) and (32).

(31) a. What does John think that if his mother comes the guests will eat?
(Iatridou and Kroch 1992:13, (58a))
b. How/where did Mary say that if her mother visits the car will be fixed?
(Iatridou and Kroch 1992:13, (58b))

(32) a. * What does John think that if his mother comes then the guests will eat?
(Iatridou and Kroch 1992:13, (59a))
b. * How/where did Mary say that if her mother visits then the car will be fixed?
(Iatridou and Kroch 1992:13, (59b))

In (31), extraction is (marginally) possible because adjoining the if-clause to the embedded IP introduces no barrier to movement. By contrast, adding *then* in (32) introduces a projection that is not L-marked by the matrix verb, and movement out of the embedded IP is blocked as a result. As Iatridou and Kroch note, the impossibility of extracting out of subordinate if-then conditionals in English is parallel to the impossibility of extracting out of subordinate V2 clauses in Frisian and mainland Scandinavian (de Haan and Weerman 1986:87, (36–37), Holmberg 1986:111, (84)).

1.3.1.2 Crosslinguistic distribution of CP recursion structures

Having motivated the existence of CP recursion structures in English, Iatridou and Kroch argue that such structures are restricted to governed contexts,[10] but that they cannot appear in a host of other syntactic contexts, including adverbial clauses, sentential subjects, extraposed or topicalized clauses, relative clauses, and wh-complements. The contrast between the two contexts is illustrated in (33).

(33) a. John believes that if it rains then the party will be cancelled.
(Iatridou and Kroch 1992:13, (62))

b. *I regret/doubt/am surprised that if it rains then the party will be cancelled.
(Iatridou and Kroch 1992:15, (72))

Iatridou and Kroch conclude from this that CP recursion is licensed only in connection with semantically transparent complementizers.

The significance of Iatridou and Kroch's paper for the purposes of the present discussion lies in bringing the English CP recursion facts to bear on the proper analysis of subordinate V2. They draw attention to the fact that the distribution of V2 in Frisian and the mainland Scandinavian languages matches that of CP recursion in English, but that the distribution of V2 in Icelandic and Yiddish is not similarly restricted. Iatridou and Kroch therefore reject a generalized CP recursion analysis of subordinate V2 in the symmetric V2 languages, since it amounts to giving up the licensing condition on CP recursion that is independently motivated by the English facts, a step that would deprive the concept of CP recursion of any empirical content.

1.3.2 IP V2

An alternative to a generalized CP recursion analysis of the symmetric V2 languages is the proposal that the domain of V2 in these languages is IP rather than CP (Icelandic: Thráinsson 1986, Rögnvaldsson and Thráinsson 1990, Yiddish: Diesing 1988, 1990, Santorini 1989, 1992, Old English: Pintzuk 1991, 1993, medieval Romance: Adams 1988 (contra Adams 1987a, 1987b), Dupuis 1988, 1989, Fontana 1993, Lemieux and Dupuis 1994). Except for Thráinsson 1986, who assumes a flat structure within S, the above authors all adopt the basic phrase structure of Chomsky 1986 and the VP-internal subject hypothesis (Fillmore 1968, McCawley 1970, and many others, including Fukui 1986, Fukui and Speas 1986, Kitagawa 1986, Kuroda 1987, Manzini 1988, Sportiche 1988, Zagona 1988, Koopman and Sportiche 1991), and the structure that they propose for V2 clauses in these languages is given in (34).

(34) V-to-I movement analysis of V2 (= 'IP V2'):

a. Subject topic:
$[_{CP} \ldots\ C\ [_{IP}\ Su_i\ [_{I}\ Vf_j\ ]\ [_{VP}\ t_i\ t_j\ \ldots\ XP\ \ldots\ ]\ ]\ ]$

b. Nonsubject topic:
$[_{CP} \ldots\ C\ [_{IP}\ XP_i\ [_{I}\ Vf_j\ ]\ [_{VP}\ Su\ t_j\ \ldots\ t_i\ \ldots\ ]\ ]\ ]$

In principle, it is possible for root clauses in the symmetric V2 languages to be CP's, but there is no evidence in favor of such a treatment, and I will therefore assume a uniform treatment of all (declarative) V2 clauses in these languages as IP. The schematic structures in (34) capture the common core of the various proposals cited above, which differ concerning two questions: (a) whether the subject originates in Spec(VP) or adjoined to VP, and (b) whether Spec(IP) is a pure A′-position or a mixed A/A′ position. I argue for an adjunct treatment of subjects in Section 1.3.2.2.7, but will assume a standard version of X-bar theory until then. I will not address (b) in what follows at all.

As is evident from (34b), the IP analysis of symmetric V2 makes it necessary to provide a way of licensing nominative case and agreement on subjects in Spec(VP). In what follows, I pursue an approach according to which nominative case is uniformly licensed under government, and subject-verb agreement is mediated by nominative case licensing (Hulk and van Kemenade 1988, 1993, 1994, Platzack and Holmberg 1990, Santorini 1992, 1994a, 1994b, Sigurðsson 1990a, 1993). Such an approach evidently contradicts a substantive tenet of the Minimalist Program: the constraint that case and agreement must be licensed as specifiers of functional heads (Chomsky and Lasnik 1991, Chomsky 1993, Lasnik 1993). This incompatibility may strike some readers as a fatal flaw and lead them to reject the analysis out of hand, but such a step would be both premature and misguided. It is necessary to bear in mind the distinction between the morphosyntactic relation of agreement (agreement properly speaking) and its configurational representation as the relation between nodes in a tree. A desire for conceptual economy may enjoin us to seek a uniform and universal configuration to represent morphosyntactic relations, but does not determine the correct configuration (or even guarantee that there is one). We are, as it were, in the position of Croesus, who learned at Delphi that "if he should send an army against the Persians he would destroy a great empire" (Herodotus 1.53). But the oracle did not, and could not, tell Croesus whether the empire he would destroy was the Persians' or his own, for it is not in the power of Apollo, or any god, to determine the outcome of human activity. It is worth reflecting on Croesus's experience in connection with our own activity as linguists. When we press Apollo, whom we worship in his latter-day professional incarnation as conceptual economy, and inquire of him whether to choose the Spec-head configuration or government as the correct representation for licensing case and agreement, we cannot expect a more informative answer than: "Seek the proper representation, and you may find it." Since the Spec-head configuration is not endowed with any conceptual privilege *a priori*, its appeal as the representation for

[10] Iatridou and Kroch actually restrict CP recursion to the complements of verbs (1992:17, (82); see also Authier 1992:334, (11)). This restriction is too narrow (see Section 1.4.2.3), although the outcome of their argument for present purposes is not affected. See de Haan and Weerman 1986 and Cinque 1989 for evidence that embedded V2 is restricted to contexts that are governed, but not necessarily by verbs.

licensing case and agreement is exactly proportional to the degree to which its claim to universality and uniformity can be maintained. The decisive battles in this regard will likely be fought over such issues as the licensing of nominative objects in languages like Icelandic and Kashmiri, and the licensing of nominative case in English inversion constructions of the type discussed by Hoekstra and Mulder 1990. The detailed treatment of these issues is beyond the scope of the present work. I hope, however, that the considerations above have convinced the reader that the proposal developed below is in principle consistent with the spirit, if not the letter, of the Minimalist Program.

1.3.2.1 Arguments concerning licensing

1.3.2.1.1 Formal licensing of nominative noun phrases I begin by assuming that nominative noun phrases must be formally licensed by one of the two functional heads in the extended verbal projection, I or C (see Platzack 1986 for an early expression of this idea). In earlier work (Santorini 1992, 1994a, 1994b), I expressed this parameter in terms of the locus of the finiteness operator [+F] (Pollock 1989, Platzack and Holmberg 1990, Kosmeijer 1991) and the feature composition of C and I (Rizzi 1990b). Here, I will follow Hulk and van Kemenade 1993 in referring to the head that licenses nominative noun phrases in a language as its 'dominant functional head'. Nominative noun phrases are licensed according to (35). For the moment, I focus on local licensing, leaving the more complex case of nonlocal licensing for Section 1.3.2.1.3.

(35) Local licensing of nominative case:
A nominative noun phrase must be governed by the dominant functional head.

The definition of government below and the more fundamental principles upon which it relies draws heavily on Sigurðsson 1990a, Section 1. In contrast to Sigurðsson, however, I define government in terms of c-command, not m-command; the distinction is not immediately relevant here, but is necessary to account for the distribution of empty expletives in Yiddish (see Chapter 2.3.2.1).

(36) *a* governs *b* iff:
  a. *a* c-commands *b* (*a* and *b* do not stand in a dominance relation, and every node that dominates *a* dominates *b*), and
  b. no category intervenes between *a* and *b*.

(37) a. A category consists of a head *H* and all its projections.
  b. The head and its projections are all segments of the same category.

(38) *c* intervenes beween *a* and *b* iff:
  a. *c* excludes *a*, and
  b. *c* properly dominates *b*.

(39) *a* excludes *b* iff no segment of *a* dominates *b*.

(40) *a* properly dominates *b* iff:
  a. *a* dominates *b*, and
  b. all other segments of *a* either dominate or c-command *b*.

A distinction between head government and antecedent government can be drawn depending on whether *a* is a head or a maximal projection; here, only head government will be of interest. By (35), nominative noun phrases are licensed in Spec(IP) in C-dominant languages (the asymmetric V2 languages) and in Spec(VP) in I-dominant ones (the symmetric V2 and non-V2 languages).

1.3.2.1.2 Identification of I features This is the correct result for the symmetric V2 languages, since it leaves Spec(IP) available for nonsubject topics. But in non-V2 languages like English and French, Spec(IP) is restricted to subjects. Some independent difference between the two language types must therefore be responsible for the contrast in the distribution of subjects. Two possibilities come to mind, both of which have been explored in the literature. On the one hand, Icelandic and Yiddish have richer agreement morphology than either English or French; on the other hand, they make an overt distinction between nominative and oblique case on full noun phrases.

Hulk and van Kemenade 1988, 1993, 1994 and Platzack and Holmberg 1990 both rely on agreement to account for the restriction of Spec(IP) to subjects in English and French. Platzack and Holmberg 1990 impose a licensing condition on I (or more precisely, on a nominative case feature on the Agr feature of I), according to which it must be identified as nominative. In their system, the relatively impoverished agreement morphology of English and French has the consequence that this case feature must be identified configurationally by a nominative antecedent governor. By contrast, the rich agreement morphology of Icelandic and Yiddish means that the case feature is identified morphologically and need not be identified in the syntax, thus making available Spec(IP) for non-nominative constituents (Platzack and Holmberg 1990, Section 4.4.1).[11]

According to Platzack and Holmberg's analysis, subject-verb agreement stands in a biunique relation with a nominative element in the sentence. Hulk and van Kemenade 1993:192 dispute the assumption of biuniqueness on the grounds of agreement mismatches in languages like Florentine Italian and Icelandic, where the finite verb can bear singular agreement morphology in clauses with plural postverbal subjects. Default agreement of this sort is also found in Yiddish (Prince 1988b).

[11] Platzack and Holmberg are strangely hesitant to pursue the full implications of their analysis, restricting the topics in their examples to oblique subjects and experiencer datives. Apparently, they wish to maintain that the domain of V2 is CP universally (Platzack and Holmberg 1990:3), a metatheoretical desire that is at odds with the substance of their analysis.

(41) a. Es *iz* faran andere, vos shenkn dem khosn oder der kale a kheylik fun
it is there others that give the groom or the bride a part of
zeyer lebn.
their life
'There are others, who give the groom or the bride a part of their life.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 26)

b. Es *iz* dokh do tsvey meglikhkaytn.
it is after all there two possibilities
'After all, there are two possibilities.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 91)

c. Un in telegram *iz* geshtanen nor tsvey verter.
and in telegram is stood only two words
'And the telegram contained only two words.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 109)

As a result, Hulk and van Kemenade propose to dissociate the licensing conditions for nominative case from those for agreement. For them, movement of the subject from Spec(VP) to Spec(IP) in English and French is motivated not by considerations related to nominative case, but solely by the need for the agreement (person and number) features on I to be identified configurationally, given that morphological identification is not possible in these languages.

In what follows, I will take the alternative tack of relating the restriction of Spec(IP) to subjects in English and French to their lack of overt case morphology (Holmberg and Platzack 1988, Trosterud 1989, Haider 1989, 1993). Like Platzack and Holmberg, I impose a licensing condition on I as in (42).

(42) I must be identified as nominative at surface structure.

But I differ from Platzack and Holmberg in how nominative identification is achieved: I is identified morphologically in languages with overt case-marking on full noun phrases (rather than in ones with rich agreement morphology), but must be identified configurationally, by a nominative antecedent governor, in languages without such case-marking. This straightforwardly yields the restriction of Spec(IP) to subjects in English and French and its availability for nonsubject topics in Icelandic and Yiddish.

A strong empirical argument in favor of this case-based approach comes from the status of Spec(IP) in languages like Italian. Platzack and Holmberg do not address Italian, but their analysis makes a very clear prediction regarding it. Since Italian is not an asymmetric V2 language, the dominant functional head (the locus of [+F], in their terms) is I. But unlike its fellow I-dominant languages English and French, Italian has rich agreement morphology. Just as in Icelandic and Yiddish, therefore, subjects should be able to remain in Spec(VP), and Spec(IP) should be available for nonsubject topics. In short, Platzack and Holmberg's

analysis incorrectly turns Italian into a symmetric V2 language. Hulk and van Kemenade's analysis faces the same difficulty, and they meet it head-on by concluding that Italian is in fact an IP V2 language (1993:205). Implicitly addressing the contrast in (43), Hulk and van Kemenade 1993:185 (see also their fn. 24) adduce the existence of Icelandic V3 word orders (Thráinsson 1986:174–176, Sigurðsson 1986, Section 3, Maling 1990:88–89, fn. 4) as grounds for relaxing strict adherence to superficial XP-Vf word order as a criterial diagnostic for IP V2 languages.[12]

(43) a. Una pizza ha mangiato Francesco. (Italian)
a pizza has eaten
'Francesco ate a pizza.'
(Hulk and van Kemenade 1993:205, (32d))

b. * Una pizza ha Francesco mangiato.
a pizza has eaten

Clearly, however, any decoupling of IP V2 status from superficial XP-Vf word order makes a straightforward statement of the commonalities between CP V2 and IP V2 more difficult. Moreover, since Hulk and van Kemenade provide no analysis for the Icelandic V3 orders or for the absence of Xf-Vf-Su orders in Italian, their IP V2 analysis of Italian has no real theoretical standing. In contrast to Platzack and Holmberg's and Hulk and van Kemenade's agreement-based approach to the licensing of I, the case-based approach adopted here straightforwardly and correctly accommodates the non-V2 character of Italian evident in (43).

Table 1 summarizes the interaction between the two parameters that govern the local licensing of nominative case.

[12]Ironically, given the CP V2 analysis of Old English defended in van Kemenade 1993, Hulk and van Kemenade's suggestion is consistent with the IP V2 analysis of that language proposed by Pintzuk 1991, 1993, 1994; see Section 1.4.2.4.1 for further discussion.

Table 1: Parameters determining the status of Spec(IP)

Dominant functional head	Identification of I	Nonsubjects in Spec(IP)?	Languages
C	syntactic	no	Dutch, modern mainland Scandinavian
C	morphological	no	German
I	syntactic	no	English, modern Romance
I	morphological	yes	Icelandic, Yiddish, medieval Scandinavian

I conclude this section by pursuing an implication of the imperfect correlation between the licensing of nominative case and agreement noted by Hulk and van Kemenade. In light of this observation, the condition in (42) requiring that I, intuitively the locus of agreement features, be identified as nominative appears mysterious and unmotivated. Moreover, in I-dominant languages without overt case morphology (English, French and Italian), I must be licensed as nominative by a nominative antecedent governor which is itself licensed by I (Caroline Heycock, personal communication). It is technically possible to eliminate the circularity of the mechanism in these cases by appealing to the distinction between formal licensing and identification (Rizzi 1986, Section 3): it is the underlying position of the nominative noun phrase, not its content, that is licensed under government by I, whereas it is the content of I, not its position, that is identified by the nominative noun phrase from its derived position. Nevertheless, the quasi-circularity noted by Heycock is sufficient to engender some mental discomfort (to borrow an apt formulation from Higgins 1973:168) and suggests that the licensing condition in (42) may be not a purely structural condition, but the grammaticization of a parsing strategy. This view is consistent with the results of several recent parsing studies of German and Dutch (both languages with reasonably rich agreement), which demonstrate that instances of case syncretism as in (44), where either noun phrase may be construed as nominative or accusative, are preferentially parsed as SVO, not OVS (Bayer and Marslen-Wilson 1992, Hemforth 1992, Hemforth et al. 1993, Kaan 1994, Lamers et al. 1995).

(44) Die Tochter liebt die Mutter. (German)
the daughter loves the mother
Preferred: 'The daughter loves the mother.'
Dispreferred: 'The mother loves the daughter.'

1.3.2.1.3 Nonlocal licensing of nominative noun phrases As first noted by den Besten 1985 for Dutch and German, it is necessary to postulate a nonlocal licensing mechanism for nominative noun phrases. In Yiddish, the need for such nonlocal licensing is illustrated by sentences like (41) and (45) (see also Prince 1993).

(45) a. Un es hot ongehoybn kostn *a kvort bronfn* finfuntsvantsik kopikes.
and it has begun cost a quart liquor twenty-five kopecks
'And the price of a quart of liquor went up to twenty-five kopecks.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 50)

b. Habin mir es gidrukt oyf gimayn taytshi sprakh, be-kedey es zalin es
have we it printed on common German language so that it shall it
kenin *ali* fr shteyn
be able all understand
'We have printed it in Yiddish so that everyone can understand it.'
(Geografye, 1)

c. Oykh kerin *mir* tsu veynin [oyf] azoy eyn frume isho, vas fun ir
also must we to cry on such a God-fearing woman that of her
hat zikh an gihoybn *di harige.*
has REFL started the massacre
'We must also lament such a God-fearing woman, with whom the massacre started.'
(Elmale 2, 51)

Sigurðsson 1990a (see especially Section 5) proposes an analysis of nonlocal licensing of nominative noun phrases in Icelandic based on the notion of chain-government (den Besten 1985:42, (51)). The definitions in (46)–(48) are drawn from Sigurdhsson's discussion; in principle, chains can consist of XP's, but only chains consisting of heads are relevant here.

(46) a chain-governs b iff:
a. a is a member of the chain $C = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$, and
b. a_n governs b.

(47) $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ is a chain iff for every i, $1 \leq n$, a_i governs a_{i+1}.

(48) In a chain $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$, (a_1 is the chain's initial and initiates it, and a_n) is its terminal and terminates it.

A generalized licensing condition for nominative noun phrases can now be stated as in (49).

(49) Generalized licensing of nominative case:
A nominative noun phrase must be chain-governed by the dominant functional head.

Although the condition in (49) formally subsumes local licensing of nominative noun phrases as in (35) as the special case where $n = 1$ in (46) and (47), there are linguistic

reasons to continue to distinguish local from nonlocal licensing. One of them I discuss here, and another in Section 1.3.2.1.4. As I have argued above, nominative noun phrases in I-dominant languages can remain in the position in which they are locally licensed in languages with overt case-marking on full noun phrases. Nonlocally licensed nominative noun phrases, on the other hand, can remain *in situ* even in languages without overt case-marking, such as Dutch and Italian.[13] Nonlocal nominative case licensing is most restricted in English, and the case marking on pronouns and agreement in there-sentences suggests that it may not actually be available (cf. Borer 1986:386).[14]

(50) a. There's me/*I.
b. * There am me/I.

The descriptive generalization that emerges concerning nonlocal licensing of nominative case is given in (51) (see also Hulk and van Kemenade 1993:201).

(51) Nonlocal nominative case licensing is possible in languages with dominant C or with sufficient subject-verb agreement to trigger V-to-I raising.

It goes without saying that one would hope to eventually eliminate the disjunction in the formulation.

1.3.2.1.4 Agreement The finite verb in Icelandic and Yiddish agrees in person and number with the subject of its clause, not with a nonsubject topic, and Vikner 1994:141–143, 1995:100–103 raises the objection (already discussed in general terms above) that the IP analysis of subordinate V2 is incompatible with the universal representation of morphological agreement as the configurational relation between an agreement head and its specifier. This objection is independent of whether it is the verb stem that raises from V to I in order

[13]Nontrivial chains with nominative noun phrase terminals are also possible in French and the mainland Scandinavian languages, but with overt expletive initials.

[14]It is generally assumed among syntacticians that the logical subject in English there-sentences must be indefinite (the so-called definiteness effect). This assumption is incorrect, as Ward and Birner 1995a, 1995b demonstrate on the basis of a large corpus of naturally-occurring data. The alleged definiteness effect is in fact an epiphenomeon of the strong (but not perfect) correlation between the information status of a discourse entity and the morphosyntactic form of the postverbal noun phrase expressing it. This means that even discourse entities that are hearer-old (Prince 1992) can appear as the focus of a presentational there-sentence under appropriate discourse conditions—namely, when they represent new information in context. For instance, the acceptable variant in (50a), occurred as part of the following discourse.

(i) ST: I just don't know how much longer I can stick with this job at this pay.
BES: Well, but it does have some advantages. Like, you've got a lot of flexibility about taking days off. And we take you seriously.
ST: Well, yeah, ...
BES: And there's me!

to merge with the agreement morpheme, as Vikner assumes, or whether the already fully inflected verb moves to (some component of) I in order to check off its V-features, as is assumed in the Minimalist Program. However, it is by no means obvious how to reconcile the Spec-head licensing condition with the failure of finite verbs to agree with oblique subject topics in languages like Icelandic and Kashmiri, and with the converse existence in these languages of agreement between finite verbs and nominative objects (Bhatt 1994, Sigurðsson 1989, 1992, 1993, Thráinsson 1994:159). In response to this difficulty, Vikner 1994:143, 1995:102 suggests that the agreement between finite verbs and nominative objects is of a different type than ordinary agreement. But this concession seriously compromises his original objection, since the conceptual appeal of the Spec-head configuration, as noted earlier, rises and falls with its claim to universality and uniformity.

What the Icelandic and Kashmiri facts show is that the linking between nominative case-marking and the grammatical function of subject is not absolute, and that subject-verb agreement is a misnomer for what is actually nominative-verb agreement. Since the chain-government approach adopted is purely structural and does not rely on grammatical function, nominative case can be licensed on objects in the same way as on subjects. As a result, agreement can be taken to be mediated by nominative case, as in (52), and thus to be ultimately licensed in a government configuration (Sigurðsson 1993, Section 7).

(52) The finite verb agrees with the nominative noun phrase of its clause.

The mismatches in (number) agreement as in (41) can be treated as instances of default agreement, along the lines of Hulk and van Kemenade 1993, Section 4.2.4.

(53) In the absence of agreement with a nominative noun phrase, the finite verb bears default (third person singular) morphology.

Of course, the statement in (53) leaves a number of important questions concerning default agreement unanswered. First, it is mysterious why agreement mismatches are restricted to certain features (number), but not others (person). Further, not all structural contexts permit default agreement; for instance, the simple statement in (53) does not account for the unavailability of default agreement in (54b,c) (Prince 1988b:5, (17)).

(54) a. Es zenen / iz gekumen di balebatim. (Yiddish)
it are is come the elders
'The elders came.'
b. Es zenen / *iz di balebatim gekumen.
it are is the elders come
c. Di balebatim zenen / *iz gekumen.
the elders are is come

(55) represents a first attempt at a descriptive generalization; it is worth noting that local and nonlocal licensing of nominative case must again be distinguished.

(55) a. Default agreement is not possible in clauses with local licensing of the (trace of the) nominative noun phrase.

b. Default agreement is possible in clauses

i. without an overt nominative noun phrase (impersonal constructions), and

ii. with nonlocal licensing of the nominative noun phrase, but apparently only in VO languages.

1.3.2.2 Empirical arguments bearing on IP V2

The hypothesis that the domain of V2 can be IP has focused attention on the distinction between the asymmetric and the symmetric V2 languages. But although the need for distinguishing descriptively between two types of V2 is now widely recognized, a number of empirical arguments have been put forward against the IP analysis of symmetric V2 (Vikner 1994:137–143, 1995:91–100, 103–107). In what follows, I show these arguments to be inconclusive.

1.3.2.2.1 Adjunction site of sentence adverbs In German and Swedish, sentence adverbs cannot adjoin to CP but may adjoin to IP, provided the subject is not an unstressed pronoun (Vikner 1995:103–107, contra Travis 1991:356).

(56) a. * Tatsächlich dieses Buch hat der Junge gelesen. (German)
actually this book has the boy read
'The boy actually read this book.'
(Vikner 1995:103, (94b))

b. * Tatsächlich der Junge hat dieses Buch gelesen.
actually the boy has this book read

c. daß tatsächlich der Junge dieses Buch gelesen hat
that actually the boy this book read has
'that the boy actually read this book'
(Vikner 1995:104, (97d))

Vikner argues that the surface distribution of sentence adverbs in Yiddish is partially parallel.[15]

(57) a. * (az) leyder dos bukh hot dos yingl geleyent (Yiddish)
that unfortunately the book has the boy read
'(that) unfortunately, the boy read the book'
(Vikner 1995:106, (109/110c))

b. * (az) leyder dos yingl hot dos bukh geleyent
that unfortunately the boy has the book read
(Vikner 1995:107, (111c))

c. (az) dos bukh hot leyder dos yingl geleyent
that the book has unfortunately the boy read
(Vikner 1995:106, (109/110d))

d. (az) dos yingl hot leyder dos bukh geleyent
that the boy has unfortunately the book read
(Vikner 1995:107, (111d))

Vikner argues that the partial parallelism between (56) and (57) is more perspicuously captured by a unitary CP V2 analysis than by one in which the adjunction site for adverbs varies between IP for asymmetric V2 languages and VP for symmetric ones. But Vikner's conclusion is compelling only if syntactic node labels are taken to be theoretical primitives. On the other hand, if they are simply abbreviations for feature bundles, as is standardly assumed, then nothing stands in the way of recasting Vikner's generalization in (58a) as in (58b).

(58) a. Vikner's generalization:
In V2 languages, adjunction to CP is not permitted.

b. Alternative generalization:
In V2 languages, adjunction to the maximal projection of the dominant head is not permitted.

Admittedly, the restriction on adjunction to V2 clauses remains mysterious in (58b), but not more so than in Vikner's original formulation; in any event, it is not in fact absolute, as we will see in Chapter 2.4.

1.3.2.2.2 Adverb interpretation Vikner 1994:139–140, 1995:92–93 adduces the interpretation of adverbs in Icelandic examples like (59) as evidence against the IP analysis of subordinate V2: *örugglega* 'surely' must be interpreted as a sentence adverb when clause-medial, as in (59a), but as a manner adverb when clause-final, as in (59b).[16]

[15] Sentence adverbs in Icelandic cannot precede definite subjects and are therefore unavailable for comparison (Vikner 1995:106–107, but see Sigurðsson 1986:143, (22)). See Section 1.3.2.2.8 for further discussion.

[16] According to Vikner 1994:139, 1995:92, the English facts concerning adverbs that allow both sentence and manner interpretations are parallel to the Icelandic ones. In this, he is mistaken: although such adverbs cannot be interpreted as sentence adverbs in postverbal position without an intonation break, they can be interpreted as manner adverbs in preverbal position. It is true that preverbal adverbs are perhaps more likely to be interpreted as manner adverbs than as sentence adverbs, but a manner adverb interpretation can be forced into prominence—for instance, by adding a frequency adverb as in (i).

(59) Ég held að í gær hafi ...
I believe that yesterday has
'I believe that yesterday, ...'

a. ... Jón *örugglega* hitt eplið.
surely hit the apple
'... Jón definitely hit the apple.'
(Vikner 1995:93, (71b))

b. ... Jón hitt eplið *örugglega*.
hit the apple surely
'... Jón hit the apple in a sure manner.'
(Vikner 1995:93, (71c))

Assuming that the subject is in Spec(VP), Vikner notes that if a single functional projection intervenes between CP and VP, then the only available adjunction site for clause-medial adverbs as in (59a) is V'. Given that clause-final adverbs as in (59b) might also be adjoined to V', the question arises why the interpretation of the adverbs depends on their position in the string.[17] This question receives a straightforward answer, Vikner argues, if subordinate V2 arises through generalized CP recursion. The lower C projection then provides the basis for a structural representation of the semantic contrast in (59), since sentence adverbs can adjoin to nodes higher than VP, and VP itself can be reserved as an adjunction site for manner adverbs. The structure in (17) actually requires some modification in order to make it consistent with the prohibition against adjunction to intermediate projections that Vikner adopts from Chomsky 1986:4, (4d), 6, (6). This is because Vikner wishes sentence adverbs to adjoin higher than VP, but their string position following the subject prevents them from adjoining to IP. The only available adjunction site in the CP recursion structure in (17) is therefore I', an intermediate projection. In order to eliminate this difficulty, Vikner introduces a TP projection under IP (= AgrSP) in the course of his discussion, and he then proposes to derive the semantic contrast in (59) by adjoining the clause-medial adverb to the left of TP and the clause-final adverb to the right of VP.

Vikner's proposal remains silent, however, concerning the two remaining combinations of linear order and adjunction site—left adjunction to VP and right adjunction to TP. The absence of a manner adverb interpretation in (59a) and of a sentence adverb interpretation in (59b) therefore remains just as puzzling for the generalized CP recursion analysis of subordinate V2 as for the IP analysis.

(i) He has always surely guided the ship into the harbor.

[17]Vikner 1995:93 objects further that "[i]f the adverbial in [(59b)] is adjoined to VP or higher, we would expect it to have wider scope than the one in [(59a)], which is not borne out either." It is not clear to me what interpretation Vikner has in mind here for the clause-final adverb, but his point appears to be that since nothing prevents clause-final adverbs from adjoining high up in the tree, they should be able to be interpreted as sentence adverbs.

1.3.2.2.3 Scope of adverbs and QP's Vikner 1994:140, 1995:93–94 presents a related argument based on the scope of frequency adverbs and quantifier phrases (QP's) in Icelandic. According to his description, the relative scope of these elements matches their linear order: in (60a), *oft* 'often' takes scope over *margar bækur* 'many books' ('there are many occasions on which Jón read many books'), whereas in (60b), *margar bækur* takes scope over *oft* ('there are many books that Jón read on many occasions').[18,19]

(60) Ólafur sagði að þess vegna hafði ...
said that therefore had
'Ólafur said that that is why ...'

a. ... Jón *oft* lesið *margar* bækur.
often read many books
'... Jón had often read many books.'

b. ... Jón lesið *margar* bækur *oft*.
read many books often
'... Jón had read many books often.'

Given its position in the string, *oft* 'often' in (60b), which has narrow scope relative to *margar bækur* 'many books', cannot adjoin lower than V', and Vikner argues that when *oft* has wide scope relative to *margar bækur*, as in (60a), it must occupy a position higher than adjoined to V'. But if the subject *Jón* occupies Spec(VP), there is no such higher position for the adverb in (60a) (recall that Vikner rejects adjunction to intermediate projections). Therefore, Vikner concludes, the subject cannot occupy Spec(VP). Instead, it occupies Spec(IP), with *oft* 'often' adjoining to the left of TP when it is preverbal and to the right of VP when it is postverbal.

There are two difficulties with this argument. First, the same difficulty arises in connection with (60) as with (59): since Vikner's proposal fails to prohibit *oft* 'often' from left-adjoining to VP or right-adjoining to TP, each of the two word order variants in (60) should be two-ways ambiguous, contrary to the judgments that Vikner reports.[20] The second difficulty is that the semantic asymmetry reported in (60) does not bear on the syntactic analysis of subordinate V2 in the direct way that Vikner envisages. This is because no matter how low 'often' attaches, it necessarily c-commands 'many books'. As a result, it is not clear why 'often' needs to adjoin to TP to take scope over 'many books'. Of course, the reason that Vikner proposes TP adjunction for 'often' is that he wishes to relate differences in semantic interpretation to differences in syntactic structure. But by implicitly assuming that scope relations reflect linear order, he is driven to the view—equally implicit in his discussion—that the structural position of a scope-bearing element in one sentence (here,

[18]For some Icelandic speakers, *oft* 'often' is marginal, if not downright ruled out, in postverbal position.

[19]Vikner 1994:140, 1995:94 incorrectly states that English behaves like Icelandic in this respect; see the excursus on scope assignment below for further discussion.

[20]See the excursus on scope assignment below for further discussion.

preverbal 'often' in (60a)) depends on its structural position in some other sentence in which it receives a different interpretation (here, its position in (60b)). Such global comparisons across sentences are run-of-the-mill in pragmatics, where they enter into the calculation of Gricean implicatures, but they are invoked in no formal theory of scope assignment that I know of. Rather, scope relations are standardly taken to arise from the relations among scope-bearing elements within a single sentence. In conclusion, then, the facts in (60) provide no evidence against the IP analysis of subordinate V2.

1.3.2.2.4 Excursus on scope assignment As is well known, the view that scope relations reflect linear order is inadequate in the general case (Aoun and hui Audrey Li 1991, 1993, Kroch 1974, May 1977, 1985).[21] In the classic example *Everyone loves someone*, for instance, *someone* can take scope over *everyone*. Scope relations between subject QP's and adverbs show the same effect, as illustrated in (61).

(61) *All* of his friends *never* arrive at once.

Here, the presence of the phrase *at once* forces an interpretation in which the adverb takes scope over the subject QP, contrary to their linear order: 'it is never the case that all of his friends arrive at once'. Since Vikner's examples involve adverbs and object QP's, the question arises whether scope relations between these two types of scope-bearing elements behave differently than the general case. The answer is that they do not. For instance, consider (62).

(62) a. John has (quite) *often* eaten *many* cookies.
b. John has eaten *many* cookies (quite) *often*.

Here, the semantics of *eat* makes implausible the reading 'there are many cookies that John has eaten on many occasions'. As a result, the alternative reading 'there are many occasions on which John has eaten many cookies' is forced into prominence, and it is available in both word order variants. As (63) shows, this scope preference can be reversed.

(63) a. John has (quite) *often* conducted *many* world-class orchestras.
b. John has conducted *many* world-class orchestras (quite) *often*.

In this example, the fact that conductors normally conduct a single orchestra at a time favors the interpretation 'there are many orchestras that John has conducted on many occasions' over the alternative interpretation 'there are many occasions on which John has conducted many orchestras'. Finally, examples like (64) exhibit no marked scope preference.

(64) a. John has (quite) *often* invited *several* friends for dinner.

[21] I would like to thank Anthony Kroch for several very helpful discussions.

b. John has invited *several* friends for dinner (quite) *often*.

In both word order variants, the adverb can be interpreted with wide scope ('there are many occasions on which John has invited several friends') or narrow scope ('there are several friends that John has invited on many occasions') with respect to the object QP.

An important question that is skirted in Vikner's discussion is how object QP's can acquire scope over adverbs despite their lower position in the surface structure tree. One possibility is to adopt the Scope Principle of Aoun and Li 1993:21.

(65) Scope Principle:
A quantifier A may have scope over a quantifier B
iff A c-commands a member of the chain containing B.

Assuming that object QP's adjoin to VP at LF, we obtain schematic LF representations of the examples above as in (66).[22]

(66) a. $[_{VP}\ QP_i\ [_{VP}\ Subj\ [_{V'}\ Adv\ [_{V'}\ V\ t_i\ ]\ ]\ ]\ ]$
b. $[_{VP}\ QP_i\ [_{VP}\ Subj\ [_{V'}\ [_{V'}\ V\ t_i\ ]\ Adv\ ]\ ]\ ]$

Given these representations, the Scope Principle leads one to expect examples like those discussed above to be ambiguous regardless of word order, since the object QP c-commands the adverb and the adverb in turn c-commands the object QP's trace. As we have just seen, this expectation is borne out for English. An explanation of the Icelandic scope judgments remains elusive.

1.3.2.2.5 A movement asymmetry Vikner 1994:138, 1995:91–92 argues that movement across sentence adverbs is ruled out for nonarguments, but not for arguments.[23]

(67) a. * *Hvað* hefur Jón *ekki* lesið [t margar bækur]? (Icelandic)
what has not read many books
'How many books has Jón not read?'
(Vikner 1995:92, (69b))
b. *Hversu margar bækur* hefur Jón *ekki* lesið?
how many books has not read
'How many books has Jón not read?'
(Vikner 1995:92, (68b))

[22] See Section 1.3.2.2.6 for evidence that adjunction to intermediate projections is necessary if subjects are generated in Spec(VP), as Vikner assumes. The VP subject position in English is occupied by a trace of the subject, a fact not explicitly indicated here. Finally, the scope assignments that result from applying the Scope Principle are independent of the particular analysis of subordinate V2 that is adopted.

[23] Vikner does not say why he uses *hversu margar* 'how many' in the instances of acceptable extraction instead of the expected *hvað margar*, literally 'what many'.

The counterparts of (67) without negation show no corresponding contrast.

(68) a. *Hvað* hefur Jón lesið [t margar bækur]?
what has read many books
'How many books has Jón read?'
(Vikner 1995:92, (69a))

b. *Hversu margar bækur* hefur Jón lesið?
how many books has read
'How many books has Jón read?'
(Vikner 1995:92, (68a))

Vikner follows Rizzi 1990a in attributing the contrast between (67a) and (68a) to relativized minimality: in (67a), the nonargument *hvað* 'what' in Spec(CP), an A′-position, fails to antecedent-govern its trace because negation intervenes in Spec(TP), another A′-position.[24] But if negation occupies Spec(TP), Vikner argues, then the subjects in (67) and (68), given that they precede negation, must occupy a position higher than Spec(TP)—and therefore necessarily higher than the VP subject position that they occupy in the IP analysis of symmetric V2.

There is reason, however, to be skeptical about a relativized minimality approach to the contrast in (67). For one thing, Vikner 1995:92, fn. 15 notes that Yiddish does not exhibit contrasts parallel to that between (67a) and (68a). For another, even some Icelandic speakers accept nonargument movement across sentence adverbs, as in (69).[25]

(69) *Hvað* hefur Jón *örugglega / sennilega* lesið [t margar bækur]?
what has surely probably read many books
'How many books has Jón definitely/probably read?'

Moreover, nonargument movement across negation is possible if negation is stressed (stress indicated by small caps).

(70) a. Fyrsti framburðurinn a spolunni er *hvernig* a EKKI að segja þetta.
first the pronunciation on the tape is how should not to say this
'The first pronunciation on the tape is how not to say this.'

b. Ég hef sagt þer ad minnsta kosti tiu sinnum *hvenær* þu att EKKI ad
I have told you at least ten times when you should not to
trufla mig.
disturb me
'I've told you at least ten times when not to disturb me.'

[24]Here, it is crucial for Vikner that adverbs occupy a specifier position. Elsewhere, he takes them to adjoin to maximal projections. He leaves the discrepancy unresolved.

[25]Thanks to Johannes Gísli Jónsson for the judgments in (69) and (70).

The same pattern obtains for English and German.[26]

(71) a. The first pronunciation on the tape is *how* you should NOT say it.

b. I've told you at least ten times *when* you should NOT disturb me.

c. *As* some of you may NOT know, classes are now starting September 11.
(Voice mail message of the Actors' Gymnasium, Noyes Cultural Arts Center)

(72) a. Als erstes hören Sie auf dem Band, *wie* man es NICHT ausspricht.
as first hear you on the tape how one it not pronounces
(German)

'What you hear first on the tape is how you don't pronounce it.'

b. Ich habe dir mindestens zehnmal gesagt, *wann* du mich NICHT stören
I have you at least ten times told when you me not disturb
darfst.
may
'I've told you at least ten times when you are not allowed to disturb me.'

One might be tempted to analyze stressed negation in such examples as constituent negation of VP, but the same effect is found with English *n't*, which must be sentence negation.

(73) a. Remind me *how* I should NOT say it.

b. Remind me *how* I SHOULDN'T say it.

(74) a. *When* should I NOT disturb you?

b. *When* SHOULDN'T I disturb you?

In conclusion, then, whatever the explanation for the pattern of acceptability judgments in (67a) and (68a) turns out to be, the contrast itself does not bear on the viability of the IP analysis of subordinate V2.

1.3.2.2.6 Object shift Vikner 1994:140–141, 1995:97–100 presents an argument against IP V2 based on object shift, a leftward movement process in Scandinavian that is akin to scrambling but distinct from it in several respects (Holmberg 1986, contra Jonas and Bobaljik 1993): it is restricted to clauses with fronted main verbs, it never results in object-subject word orders and it does not license parasitic gaps.

[26]It might be argued that nonargument movement in the German examples in (72) is irrelevant, since the nonargument could first scramble across negation (which, since scrambling does not exhibit the characteristics of (pure) A′-movement (Webelhuth 1989), would not violate relativized minimality) and then move on to Spec(CP). But such an objection actually cuts against a relativized minimality approach, since examples from German, which allows scrambling, should then contrast with ones from English and Icelandic, which do not.

In (75), the position of *bókina* 'the book' preceding negation shows that it has undergone object shift.

(75) Hann veit ...
he knows
'He knows ...'

a. ... að þess vegna las$_i$ Jón bókina$_j$ ekki t$_i$ t$_j$.
that therefore read the book not
'... that that is why Jón didn't read the book.'
(Vikner 1995:97, (79a))

b. *... að þess vegna las$_i$ bókina$_j$ Jón ekki t$_i$ t$_j$.
that therefore read the book not
(Vikner 1995:97, (79b))

If the only subject position in subordinate V2 clauses in Icelandic is Spec(VP), Vikner argues, then the contrast in (75) forces one to assume that shifted objects adjoin to V′, an intermediate projection and therefore not a possible adjunction site in his view.

However, the prohibition against adjunction to intermediate projections cannot be sustained, at least not if stranded quantifiers reliably indicate the VP subject position (Sportiche 1988) and subjects originate in Spec(VP), as Vikner assumes (see also Jonas and Bobaljik 1993:81, fn. 28). Evidence to this effect comes from the contrasts in (76)–(78), where the inability of stranded quantifiers to follow aspectual adverbs shows that these adverbs must adjoin to V′ given Vikner's assumptions.[27]

(76) a. * The students have probably *completely* all read the book.

b. The students have probably all *completely* read the book.

(77) a. * Die Studenten haben das Buch wahrscheinlich *vollständig* alle gelesen.
the students have the book probably completely all read
(German)

'The students have probably all completely read the book'

b. Die Studenten haben das Buch wahrscheinlich alle *vollständig* lesen.
the students have the book probably all completely read

(78) a. * Stúdentarnir hafa sennilega *alveg* allir lesið bókina. (Icelandic)
the students have probably completely all read the book
'The students have probably all completely read the book.'

b. Stúdentarnir hafa sennilega allir *alveg* lesið bókina.
the students have probably all completely read the book

[27]Thanks to Höskuldur Thraínsson and Christer Platzack for the Icelandic and Swedish judgments.

(79) a. * Studenterna har troligen *helt och hållet* alla læst boken.
the students have probably wholly and completely all read the book
(Swedish)

'The students have probably all completely read the book.'

b. Studenterna har troligen alla *helt och hållet* læst boken.
the students will probably all wholly and completely read the book

1.3.2.2.7 IP V2 reformulated Indeed, on closer examination, sentences with a stranded quantifier obligatorily preceding an aspectual adverb provide evidence against the existence of intermediate projections. On the one hand, aspectual adverbs can topicalize together with the verb in German.

(80) *Vollständig* lesen müssen die Studenten das Buch alle. (German)
completely read must the students the book all
'The students must all completely read the book.'

On the other hand, it is also possible to strand such adverbs in topicalization constructions; for completeness, I show that the contrast in (77) is preserved.[28]

(81) a. * Lesen müssen die Studenten das Buch *vollständig* alle.
read must the students the book completely all
'The students must all completely read the book.'

b. Lesen müssen die Studenten das Buch alle *vollständig.*
read must the students the book all completely

Since topics are maximal projections (see den Besten and Webelhuth 1990) the grammaticality of (80) and (81b) shows that aspectual adverbs attach to maximal rather than to intermediate projections. This entails that the underlying subject position is an adjunct position, as in (82) ('Asp-Adv' stands for 'aspectual adverb').

(82) [$_{VP}$ Subj [$_{VP}$ Asp-Adv [$_{VP}$ ... V ...]]]

The view that subjects originate as adjuncts rather than as specifiers has recently been argued for on independent grounds (Manzini 1988, Sportiche 1988, Koopman and Sportiche

[28]It might be thought that aspectual adverbs and stranded quantifiers can scramble string-vacuously, yielding a remnant topicalization structure for (81b) as in (i) (see den Besten and Webelhuth 1990 for the notion of remnant topicalization).

(i) [$_{VP}$ t$_i$ [$_{V'}$ t$_j$ lesen]]$_k$ müssen die Studenten das Buch [$_{VP}$ alle$_i$ [$_{VP}$ vollständig$_j$ [$_{VP}$ t$_k$]]]]

But since scrambling need not be string-vacuous, such an analysis would incorrectly allow (81a).

1991, Hellan 1991, Heycock 1991, Hoekstra 1991, Zwart 1993, Kayne 1994, see also Déprez 1989). According to this view, the lowest VP in (82) is a predicate (perhaps containing a trace of the adjoined subject), whereas the highest VP is a complete (= 'saturated') predication structure.

Heycock 1991 goes further to argue that clauses consist of more than one such layer of predication, and that subjects are adjuncts at each of these layers. In English, ordinary sentences consist of two layers of predication, one at the VP level and another at the IP level. In asymmetric V2 languages, the movement of the verb to C adds an additional layer of predication, with the topic functioning as the subject of the CP layer. Recasting IP V2 in light of her analysis, Heycock 1991, Section 2.3.1 gives subordinate V2 clauses in the symmetric V2 languages the structure in (83), which I adopt.

(83) IP V2 in a layers of predication analysis:

a. Subject topic:
$[_{CP} \cdots [_{IP}\ Su_i\ [_{IP}\ Vf_j\ [_{VP}\ t_i\ [_{VP} \cdots\ t_j \ \ldots\ XP\ \ldots\ ]\ ]\ ]\ ]\ ]$

b. Nonsubject topic:
$[_{CP} \cdots [_{IP}\ XP_i\ [_{IP}\ Vf_j\ [_{VP}\ Su\ [_{VP} \cdots\ t_j \ \ldots\ t_i \ \ldots\ ]\ ]\ ]\ ]\ ]$

Having eliminated a principled distinction between specifiers and adjuncts, we are free to continue to speak of specifier positions for expository convenience, with the understanding that Spec(XP) refers to the minimal adjunct to a category XP, the "aunt" of X. In (84), Spec(XP) is ZP.

(84) $[_{XP}\ YP\ [_{XP}\ ZP\ [_{XP}\ X\ WP\ ]\ ]\ ]$

1.3.2.2.8 Distribution of sentence adverbs and subjects Vikner's final argument against the IP V2 analysis of subordinate V2 is based on the distribution of sentence adverbs and subjects. In Icelandic, sentence adverbs can either precede or follow indefinite subjects, but must follow definite ones (Ottósson 1989:96–97, 1994:108–109, but see Sigurðsson 1986:143, (22)) (examples based on Thráinsson 1994:155, (5)–(6)).

(85) a. ?Í gær hafa einhverjir stúdentar *sennilega* stolið smjörinu.
yesterday have some students probably stolen the butter
'Yesterday some students probably stole the butter.'

b. Í gær hafa *sennilega* einhverjir stúdentar stolið smjörinu.
yesterday have probably some students stolen the butter

(86) a. Í gær hafa stúdentarnir *sennilega* stolið smjörinu.
yesterday have the students probably stolen the-butter
'Yesterday the students probably stole the butter.'

b. *Í gær hafa *sennilega* stúdentarnir stolið smjörinu.
yesterday have probably the students stolen the butter

Assuming that sentence adverbs adjoin to VP, Ottósson argues for two subject positions in Icelandic: a lower one in Spec(VP) and a higher one in Spec(IP). This allows a statement of the distribution of subjects and sentence adverbs as in (87).

(87) Variable position of subjects:
In Icelandic, indefinite subjects can remain within VP, but definite ones cannot.

Building on this generalization, Vikner 1994:137 (see also 1995:91) observes that definite subjects must precede sentence adverbs in root and subordinate V2 clauses alike, and he rejects the IP analysis of subordinate V2 on the grounds that it provides only a single position for subjects, Spec(VP).

It is important to recognize, however, that (87) on its own does not rule out (86b), since the following structure is consistent with it.

(88) *í gær hafa $[_{IP}$ sennilega $[_{IP}$ stúdentarnir stolið smjörinu.]]

Since IP adjunction of sentence adverbs is not ruled out universally, a language-particular stipulation as in (89) is necessary to describe the contrast in (86).

(89) In Icelandic, sentence adverbs cannot adjoin above definite subjects.

The necessity of (89) opens the possibility of formulating an alternative analysis of the distribution of subjects and sentence adverbs that is based on the structures in (83). Rather than focusing on the position of subjects, as in (87), the alternative analysis in (90) focuses on the adjunction site of sentence adverbs

(90) Variable position of sentence adverbs:
Sentence adverbs attach to either segment of VP.

Both (87) and (90) express the variable position of indefinite subjects and adverbs in (sent-adv-indef-subj-i) with comparable simplicity, and both need to be supplemented by the stipulation in (89) in view of the contrast in (86).

1.3.2.2.9 Object shift revisited As we saw in (75), repeated here as (91), subjects must precede objects in clauses with object shift.

(91) a. ... að þess vegna las_i Jón $bókina_j$ ekki t_i t_j.
that therefore read the book not
'... that that is why Jón didn't read the book.'
(Vikner 1995:97, (79a))

b. *... að þess vegna las$_i$ bókina$_j$ Jón ekki t$_i$ t$_j$.
that therefore read the book not
(Vikner 1995:97, (79b))

In order to ensure adjacency between the fronted verb and the subject, one might appeal to a generalization of the stipulation in (89). But such a treatment fails to extend to the case of indefinite subjects, where the contrast recurs (examples based on Jonas and Bobaljik 1993:90–91, (32a,b)).

(92) Hann veit ...
he knows
'He knows ...'

a. ... að í gær las$_i$ sennilega einhver þessar bækur$_j$ alveg t$_i$ allar t$_j$
that yesterday read probably someone these books completely all
'... that someone probably completely read these books yesterday.'

b. *... að í gær las$_i$ sennilega þessar bækur$_j$ einhver alveg t$_i$ allar t$_j$
that yesterday read probably these books someone completely all

In these examples, the relative order of the object and the aspectual adverb *alveg* 'completely' shows that the object has undergone object shift. The object-oriented stranded quantifier *allar* 'all' shows that the adverb is not generated in postverbal position, as would otherwise be possible given that *alveg*, like its English counterpart *completely*, occurs both pre- and postverbally.

If subjects are adjuncts, as argued above, then the contrasts in (75) and (92) are both puzzling for the same reason: given that shifted objects adjoin to VP, what prevents them from adjoining to the VP segment that immediately dominates the subject? Vikner's analysis faces the same difficulty, for he assumes that shifted objects move out of VP (Vikner 1995:97). For him, the contrast in (92) is particularly mysterious, since he assumes that indefinite subjects can remain in Spec(VP) (Vikner 1994:146, fn. 8, 1995:91), where shifted objects should be able to precede them.

One avenue to pursue in attempting to explain the obligatoriness of the subject-object order relies on the notion of predication. Specifically, adjunction, while free in principle, might be constrained by a requirement that the subject be the highest argument within IP. An unsolved difficulty for this approach is that in languages with scrambling, objects can precede subjects.

(93) Vielleicht hat den Hund gestern ein Bekannter von euch / dein Vater
perhaps has the dog yesterday an acquantaince of you-PL your father
ausgeführt. (German)
out led
'Perhaps an acquaintance of yours/your father walked the dog yesterday.'

Heycock 1991:118–124 argues that examples like (93) have the structure in (94), with an empty expletive in Spec(IP) satisfying the predication requirement and forming a chain with the subject in Spec(VP).

(94) vielleicht hat [$_{IP}$ *e* den Hund gestern [$_{VP}$ ein Bekannter von euch / dein Vater ausgeführt]]

But since Icelandic has empty expletives by the same criteria that German does, postulating empty expletives as IP subjects does not elucidate the difference between object shift and scrambling. One might appeal to the A′ properties of scrambling (the ability to license parasitic gaps) that set it apart from object shift and argue that objects scrambled past subjects do not count as arguments. But in the absence of a deeper understanding of why scrambling exhibits the A′ properties that it does and why object shift does not, any appeal to the A/A′ distinction simply amounts to a restatement of the problem.

Although I must leave the problem unsolved, it is worth noting in conclusion that the appeal to predication proposed above is precisely as successful with regard to the distinction between object shift and scrambling as the analysis of the object shift facts presented by Jonas and Bobaljik 1993. Assuming the articulated phrase structure of Chomsky 1993 with the functional heads AgrO, T, and AgrS, Jonas and Bobaljik argue that shifted objects move to Spec(AgrOP) and that all subjects, even indefinite ones, leave VP in Icelandic and raise at least to Spec(TP). Since T c-commands AgrO, the desired subject-object order follows. However, since Jonas and Bobaljik treat scrambling and object shift as the same phenomenon, their analysis does not accommodate object-subject orders as in (93). One initially attractive solution, namely to treat scrambling as a combination of object shift (= A-movement) with subsequent adjunction to the maximal projection immediately the subject (= A′-movement), as proposed by Déprez 1989 and Mahajan 1989, cannot be maintained (Frank et al. 1992, Lee 1991, Section 2.3.1).

1.3.3 A double Agr analysis

In this section, I review a third analysis of symmetric V2 that is based on an elaboration of the split INFL hypothesis of Pollock 1989, and reject it on both empirical and conceptual grounds.

1.3.3.1 Verb movement to Agr1

Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991 propose that in certain languages, including those with symmetric V2, Agr is split into two further components, Agr1 and Agr2. In the symmetric V2 languages, the finite verb moves to Agr1, Spec(Agr1P) is the topic position and Spec(Agr2P) is a derived subject position that is assigned nominative case under government by Agr1. The structure of a subordinate V2 clause in a symmetric V2 language is as in (95).

(95) A 'double Agr' analysis of subordinate V2:

a. Subject topic:
$[_{CP} \ldots\ C\ [_{Agr1P}\ Su_i\ [_{Agr1'}\ Vf_j\ [_{Agr2P}\ t_i\ [_{Agr2'}\ t_j \ldots\ [_{VP}\ t_i\ t_j \ldots\ XP \ldots\ ]]]]]$

b. Nonsubject topic:
$[_{CP} \ldots\ C\ [_{Agr1P}\ XP_i\ [_{Agr1'}\ Vf_j\ [_{Agr2P}\ Su_k\ [_{Agr2'}\ t_j\ ] \ldots\ [_{VP}\ t_k\ t_j \ldots\ t_i \ldots\ ]]]]]$

According to Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991, a double Agr analysis is necessary in the symmetric V2 languages because subjects, at least definite ones, would otherwise have no position to move to. The two potential subject positions besides Spec(Agr2P)—Spec(TP) and Spec(VP)—are not available, they argue. On the one hand, they take Spec(TP) to be "an inherently A'-position and as such not a possible landing site for the subject" (Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991:7). On the other hand, they adduce the contrast in (96) as evidence that the VP-subject position is unavailable for definite subjects: taking *oft* 'often' to adjoin to VP, they conclude from the obligatoriness of the subject-adverb order that the subject must have moved out of VP.

(96) a. að þegar hefur María oft lesið þessa bók (Icelandic)
that already has often read this book
'that María has already often read this book'

b. * að þegar hefur oft María lesið þessa bók
that already has often read this book

Neither of these arguments is compelling, however. First, in the absence of direct evidence bearing on the A/A' character of Spec(TP), the assumption that it is necessarily an A' position is simply a stipulation. Certainly, the assumption is not general: Jonas and Bobaljik 1993, for instance, crucially take Spec(TP) to be an A-position (see also Bhatt 1994, Chapter 5). Second, the argument based on (96) has already been refuted in Section 1.3.2.2.8; since frequency adverbs like *oft* allow adjunction to IP in general, the considerations concerning sentence adverbs discussed there carry over to them.

1.3.3.2 Clitic movement to Agr1

In addition to elucidating the syntax of symmetric V2 languages, a major goal of Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991 is to provide a unified analysis of V2 phenomena and so-called second position clitics in various Germance and Romance languages. I focus here on their treatment of the Germanic facts; for a critique of their treatment of second position clitics in Romance, see Fontana 1995.

Cardinaletti and Roberts assume that second position clitics are head clitics of the type discussed extensively in the literature on Romance[29] and propose that the same Agr1 head

[29]This assumption is not uncontroversial; see Fontana 1993 and references cited therein.

that serves as the landing site for verb movement in the symmetric V2 languages hosts unstressed pronouns in other languages, including German, Dutch and Old English.

(97) a. $[_{CP}$ Gestern $[_{C}$ hat $]$ $[_{Agr1P}$ $[_{Agr1}$ *es ihm* $]$ $[_{Agr2P}$ der Johann $[_{VP}$ gegeben $]]]]$
yesterday has it him the given
(German)

'Yesterday, Johann gave it to him.'
(Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991:20, 25b)

b. $[_{CP}$ Gestern $[_{C}$ hat $]$ $[_{Agr1P}$ der Johann$_i$ $[_{Agr1}$ *es ihm* $]$ $[_{Agr2P}$ t_i $[_{VP}$ gegeben
yesterday has the it him given
$]]]]$

(Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991:21, 27c)

In such languages, Spec(Agr1P) is a subject position to which nominative case is assigned under agreement, and Spec(Agr2P) can be a subject position as well (Cardinaletti and Roberts assume that the government and agreement options of nominative case assignment can both be realized in a single language).[30] In short, the status of Spec(Agr1P) reflects the content of its head: depending on whether Agr1 is a landing site for verbs or clitics, its specifier is a topic or a subject position.

Given Cardinaletti and Roberts's treatment of Agr1 as a verb position in Yiddish and a clitic position in German, the distribution of clitics in the two languages should differ substantially; indeed, we might expect Yiddish, like Icelandic, not to have clitic pronouns at all. Contrary to this expectation, however, the surface distribution of Yiddish clitics parallels that of German ones (Zaretski 1929:244, §757).

(98) a. (az) nekhtn hot *es im* Dovid gegebn (Yiddish)
that yesterday has it him given
'(that) yesterday, David gave it to him'

b. (az) nekhtn hot Dovid *es im* gegebn
that yesterday has it him given

Cardinaletti and Roberts analyze the mirror image of the verb-clitic order in (98a), which occurs in Old English, as resulting from the leftward adjunction of clitics to the verb in Agr1.

[30]In contrast to German, clitics in (modern standard) Dutch must follow the subject. Cardinaletti and Roberts propose to derive this contrast between the two languages by allowing Spec(Agr2P) to be a subject position in German, but not Dutch. Clitics in medieval Dutch preceded the subject (Weerman 1987, cited in Fontana 1993:215; Weerman 1989:15, cited in Haider 1993:191, fn. 8) and still do in some present-day dialects (Weijnen 1966:327; see also Gerritsen 1991, Map 18).

(99) [$_{Agr1P}$ Fela spella [$_{Agr1}$ *him* + sædon] [$_{Agr2P}$ þa Beormas ...]] (Old English)
many stories him told the Permians
'The Permians told him many stories.'
(Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991:31, (41), analyzed in (46a))

Spec(Agr1P), they argue, retains its character as a topic position because Agr1 dominates a verb. Adapting this treatment to the Yiddish case yields (100) as the structure for (98a).

(100) [$_{C}$ (az)] [$_{Agr1P}$ nekhtn [$_{Agr1}$ hot + *es im*] [$_{Agr2P}$ Dovid [$_{VP}$ gegebn]]] (Yiddish)

But such a treatment leaves a number of questions unanswered. First, the clitic-subject order in Old English vs. the subject-clitic order in Yiddish would simply be stipulated. Further, Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991:32, 37 state that verb movement to Agr1 is restricted to main clauses in Old English, but their analysis leaves this restriction, along with the concomitant restriction of topicalization to main clauses, mysterious. Finally, Cardinaletti and Robert give no reason for why verbs should have precedence over clitics in determining the character of Spec(Agr1P) in clauses in which Agr1 dominates both. In view of these shortcomings, then, I reject the double Agr analysis of subordinate V2.

1.3.4 Summary

The discussion in this section concerning subordinate V2 in the symmetric V2 languages has yielded the following results:

- A generalized CP recursion analysis of symmetric V2 must be rejected on empirical grounds (Iatridou and Kroch 1992).
- The conceptual and empirical arguments put forward by Vikner 1994, 1995 against an IP analysis of symmetric V2 are inconclusive.
- The distribution of aspectual adverbs provides evidence that the IP analysis of V2 should be reformulated as in (101).

  (101) a. Subject topic:
  [$_{CP}$ ... [$_{IP}$ Su$_i$ [$_{IP}$ Vf$_j$ [$_{VP}$ t$_i$ [$_{VP}$ ... t$_j$ ... XP ...]]]]
  b. Nonsubject topic:
  [$_{CP}$ ... [$_{IP}$ XP$_i$ [$_{IP}$ Vf$_j$ [$_{VP}$ Su [$_{VP}$ ... t$_j$ ... t$_i$ ...]]]]

- A double Agr analysis of symmetric V2 (Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991) is too stipulative to be adopted.

1.4 A subject gap effect

A number of recent investigations have suggested that a subject gap is necessary to license the topicalization of nonsubjects in ordinary subordinate clauses (that is, subordinate clauses outside subordinate root contexts) (Icelandic: Sigurðsson 1990b:59–60, Thráinsson 1994:156–157, see also Magnússon 1990; Old English: van Kemenade 1993, Section 2.2; Old French and Yiddish Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991:17–19, 59–62). The subject gap can arise in a number of different ways: in connection with impersonal or ambient predicates or by wh-movement, subject postposing, cliticization or pro-drop.[31] In this section, I provide a quantitative investigation of nonsubject topicalization in Yiddish and its correlation with the presence of a subject gap. The result that emerges is that nonsubject topicalization in ordinary subordinate clauses correlates almost, but not quite, perfectly with the presence of a subject gap. After reviewing a number of previous analyses of embedded V2 (and embedded root phenomena more generally) in light of the Yiddish data, I provide some indirect quantitative evidence that the asymmetry between root clauses and ordinary subordinate clauses with regard to topicalization should not be taken to reflect a syntactic licensing condition (see also Lemieux and Dupuis 1994, Section 5.1). The argument is based on a comparison of the rate of nonsubject topicalization in four clause types: root clauses, asyndetic clauses, subordinate root clauses and ordinary subordinate clauses. Contrary to what one would expect on syntactic grounds, asyndetic clauses pattern with ordinary subordinate clauses, rather than with ordinary root clauses or subordinate root clauses, and I conclude from this that the rate of nonsubject topicalization in a clause type is not a reliable indicator of its syntactic structure.

1.4.1 Preliminaries

Before presenting and discussing the results of the quantitative analysis, I give examples of the subordinate clause types as well as the different types of subject gaps that I distinguished.

1.4.1.1 Types of subordinate clauses

That-clauses form the most diverse group of subordinate clauses, and several subtypes need to be distinguished. An important distinction is between 'neutral' and 'subjective' heads (cf. Classes A, B, C and E vs. Class D of Hooper and Thompson 1973)

[31] A subject gap condition on nonsubject topicalization immediately brings to mind the same condition on stylistic fronting (Maling 1990:76, (9)), a process closely akin to topicalization (sometimes taken as a special instance of it) that fronts lexical heads to the position preceding the finite verb. For further discussion of stylistic fronting, see Rögnvaldsson and Thráinsson 1990, Jónsson 1991, Fontana 1993, Chapter 3.3.3.2.1, Santorini 1994a, Section 5.

1.4.1.1.1 Complements of neutral predicates

In this group, I included both neutral verbs and adjectives.

(102) a. Hot zi *farshtanen*, az der yingl hot dos gemakht.
has she understood that the boy has that done
'So she understood that the boy did that.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 2)

b. *Gemeynt*, az haynt veln mir nisht lernen.
thought that today will we nothing learn
'I thought that today we wouldn't learn anything.'
(Grine felder, 77)

c. *Zogt* Berke, az aza shlak vil er nit.
says that such a shrew wants he not
'So Berke says that he doesn't want a shrew like that.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 29)

d. *Meglekh*, az do darf men gikher haltn 'Vi ruft men es' far a
possible that there must one rather hold how calls one it for a
bemerkzats mit shans fun fregikeyt.
parenthetical with chance of interrogation
'It is possible that here, 'Vi ruft men es' is better considered a parenthetical with interrogative overtones.'
(Zaretski, Mendele, 144)

1.4.1.1.2 Complements of negated neutral predicates

Since CP recursion is unacceptable in the complement of negated or modal predicates in Frisian, even ones that normally allow CP recursion (de Haan and Weerman 1986:84–85), I tabulated complements of negated neutral predicates separately.

(103) a. 'Kh hob gornisht *gevust*, az du kenst azoy vern in kas.
I have not known that you can so become in anger
'I didn't know that you could get so angry.'
(Grine felder, 66)

b. un *zog* nisht dem rebn, az du host mikh oysgelernt ontsushraybn zayn
and tell not the rabbi that you have me out learned on to write his
nomen un mayn nomen.
name and my name
'and don't tell the rabbi that you taught me to write his name and my name.'
(Grine felder, 101)

c. un er *ken* nit gedenken, az er hot ir amol gezen.
and he can not remember that he has her once seen

'and he can't remember ever having seen her.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 60)

d. Dos iz bazunder kharakteristish far zatsn mit a vuntsh vos es iz
that is especially characteristic for sentences with a wish that it is
ummiglekh, az er zol mekayem vern.
impossible that it shall satisfied become
'That is especially characteristic for sentences containing a wish that cannot be fulfilled.'
(Mark, 342)

1.4.1.1.3 Complements of neutral nouns

(104) a. Zenen zey gekumen oyfn *seykhl*, az mistome iz di shif tsu shver.
are they come on the idea that probably is the ship too heavy
'So it occurred to them that probably the ship was too heavy.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 101)

b. Hot men gefunen in der erd drotn, a *simen*, az in altn Grikhnland hot
has one found in the earth wires a sign that in old Greece has
men shoyn gehat telegrafn.
one already had telegraphs
'So they found wires in the ground, a sign that they already had telegraphy in ancient Greece.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 110)

c. un hot gornisht nit gefunen, a *simen*, az undzere alte yidn hobn shoyn
and has nothing not found, a sign that our old Jews have already
gehat bezprovolotshne telegrafn.
had wireless telegraphs
'and they found absolutely nothing, a sign that our ancient Jews already had wireless telegraphy.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 110)

1.4.1.1.4 Complements of degree adverbs

(105) a. Ikh nem on *aza* groysn bunt hey oyfn kop, az men zet nor di fis
I take on such a big pile hay on the head that one sees only the feet
aroys.
out
'I carry such a big load of hay on my head that only my feet can be seen sticking out.'
(Grine felder, 81)

b. Eyn mol hobn zey zikh *azoy* shtark tsekrigt, az zi hot dos nit
one time have they REFL so strong fought that she has that not
gekent mer aribertrogn.
been able more over carry
'One time they had such a big fight that she couldn't stand it any more.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 104)

c. Ikh hob dikh *azoy* lib, az mit dir volt ikh geven tsefridn mit broyt
I have you so dear that with you would I been satisfied with bread
un mit vaser, mer nit!
and with water more not
'I love you so much that with you I would be satisfied with bread and water, nothing more.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 97)

d. Er iz geven *azoy* karg, az ven me flegt im fregn, vifl der zeyger
he is been so stingy that if one used him ask how much the clock
halt, flegt er zogn shtendik mit tsen minut veyniker.
holds used he say always with ten minutes less
'He was so stingy that if you asked him what time it was, he would subtract ten minutes.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 162)

1.4.1.1.5 Noncomplement that-clauses

(106) a. Az es vet kumen tsu epes, vel ikh nisht veln.
that it will come to something will I not want
'I don't want it to come to anything.'
(Grine felder, 65)

b. Es felt mir nokh kholile, az er zol azoyne zakhn zen.
it lacks me still God forbid that he shall such things see
'That's all I need, God forbid, that he should see such things.'
(Grine felder, 67)

c. Az ikh bin aza khokhem, hob ikh nit getrakht!
that I am such a wise man have I not thought
'That I'm so wise, I didn't know!'
(Royte pomerantsen, 53)

1.4.1.1.6 Complements of subjective heads

Yiddish distinguishes two types of *that* complements: *az*, already seen above, and *vos*, a special complementizer for complements of heads that are simultaneously factive and emotive (Class D of Hooper and Thompson 1973) (see Chapter ?? for further discussion of *vos* with these predicates).

(107) a. Oyb azoy, iz dokh take an *avle*, vos zi hot azelkhs gezogt oyf
if so is after all really a wrong that she has such said on
Tsinen.

'If so, it really IS WRONG THAT SHE SAID THAT KIND OF THING ABOUT TSINE.'
(GRINE FELDER, 65)

b. Badarf nokh haltn far a groysn *koved*, vos Tsine khavert zikh mit ir
need still hold for a great honor that is friends REFL with her
tokhter.
daughter
'She still needs to consider it a great honor that Tsine is friends with her daughter.'
(Grine felder, 65)

c. Es iz nit *vert*, vos men lebt oyf der velt.
it is not worth that one lives on the world
'It's not worth living on earth.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 125)

1.4.1.1.7 Causal and concessive clauses

As we will see, Yiddish clauses that are introduced by the causal conjunctions *bansher*, *makhmes* and *vayl* or by the concessive conjunction *khotsh* freely allow nonsubject topicalization in their complements. This is reminiscent of vernacular German, where clauses introduced by *weil* 'because' or *obwohl* 'although' often exhibit V2.[32]

(108) Causal clauses:

a. *Bansher* itster shemt zi zikh, ober az zi vet zayn dayn vayb, vet zi
because now shames she REFL but when she will be your wife, will she
dir krikhn unter di negl.
you creep under the nails.
'Because now she is ashamed, but once she is your wife, she will get under your skin.'
(Grine felder, 88)

[32]In German, root clause word order in these clause types is possible only when the causal or concessive clause follows the clause it modifies. For Yiddish, I was conservative for the purpose at hand and grouped together all V2 clauses introduced by any of the four conjunctions above, regardless of their position with regard to the clause being modified.

b. Di kine B bahandlt di gesheenisn fun yor 1656, velkhe ikh muz do
the lament B treats the occurrences of year 1656 which I must there
karakterizirn, *makhmes* in Shturemvint, z.75 hob ikh zey bahandlt
characterize because in Shturemvint, p.75 have I them treated
binshime-akhes.
in one breath
'Lament B treats the occurrences of 1656, which I must describe here, because I treated them only very briefly in Shturemvint, p.75.'
(Weinreich, Kines, 33)

c. Stere iz gekumen, *vayl* Hersh-Ber iz in gortn.
is come because is in garden
'Stere came because Hersh-Ber is in the garden.'
(Grine felder, 65)

d. Ikh rekhn, az 'hot' shteyt do afn erstn ort, *vayl* dos
I assume that has stands there on the first position because the
bindvort 'vos' farnemt nit keyn ort in verterzeyder.
conjunction that occupies not no position in word order
'I assume that *has* here occupies first position because the conjunction *that* does not count for position.'
(Zaretski, Sholem, 163)

(109) Concessive clauses:

a. Di tsveyte kine, on a yor un on a drukort, hot
the second lament, without a year and without a place of publication has
Shteynshneyder ... farfelt tsu fartseykhnen in zeyn katalog, *khotsh* dos
failed to record in his catalog, although the
bikhele iz shoyn in zeyn tseyt geven in der Bodleiane.
book is already in his time been in the
'The second lament, without a year or a place of publication, Steinschneider failed to record in his catalog, even though the book was already in the Bodleian in his time.'
(Weinreich, Kines, 30)

b. Dos alts, vos far 'kumt', ... farnemt eyn 'ort,' *khotsh* do
the everything that before comes takes a position although there
kumt arayn a gantser bayzats.
comes in an entire subordinate clause
'Everything before 'comes' occupies a single position, even though it consists of an entire subordinate clause.'
(Zaretski, Sholem, 40)

1.4.1.1.8 Adverbial clauses In addition to introducing various types of complement clauses, *az* introduces adverbial clauses. Adverbial clauses can also be introduced by *eyder* 'before', *oyb* 'if', *ven* 'if, when', and *vibald az* 'as soon as', among others.

(110) *Az* 'if, when':

a. *Az* me vil vern a rov, badarf men opkern dem gedank derfun.
if one wants become a rabbi must one turn the thought therefrom
'If one wants to become a rabbi, one must turn one's thoughts away from it.'
(Grine felder, 78)

b. *Az* mayn yidene varft an umkheyn oyf a zakh, iz shoyn nisht
if my wife throws a dislike on a thing is already not
ibertsumakhn.
to change
'If my wife takes a dislike to something, there is nothing to be done.'
(Grine felder, 64)

c. Vos tu ikh, *az* me falt arayn ba mir in shtub?
what do I that one falls in with me in room
'What do I do if they break into my room?'
(Royte pomerantsen, 58)

d. *Az* er vil geyn, zol er geyn.
if he wants go, shall he go
'If he wants to go, let him go.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 59)

(111) *Eyder* 'before':

a. Gikher vest du nemen biln, *eyder* der hunt vet redn!
sooner will you take bark before the dog will talk
'You will start to bark sooner than the dog will talk.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 86)

b. Ober keyner zol zikh nit antvegn geyn, *eyder* ikh vel zogn "dray,"
but nobody shall REFL not dare go before I will say three
farshtanen?
understood
'But don't anybody dare to go before I say 'three', understand?'
(Royte pomerantsen, 87)

(112) *Oyb* 'if':

a. Ikh vel mir efsher in vaser araynvarfn, *oyb* du tust es.
I will me maybe in water in throw if you do it
'Maybe I'll drown myself if you do it.'
(Grine felder, 69)

b. *Oyb* ir vilt durkhoys, vel ikh aykh batsoln a tsvey rubl, ober dokh
if you want absolutely will I you pay a two rubles but after all
nit fuftsik.
not fifty
'If you insist, I'll pay you two rubles, but certainly not fifty!'
(Royte pomerantsen, 241)

(113) *Ven* 'if, when':

a. un demolt *ven* du zitst nit in vagon, ligst du in der erd!
and then if you sit not in wagon sie you in the earth
'and then if you're not sitting in the train compartment, you're dead!'
(Royte pomerantsen, 202)

b. Men hot fun im dertseylt, az *ven* er leygt zikh shlofn, fargest er
one has of him told that when he lays REFL sleep forgets he
oyftsushteyn.
up to stand
'They said of him that [he was so forgetful that] when he lay down to sleep, he would forget to get up.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 216)

(114) *Vibald az* 'as soon as':

a. un *vibald az* me zogt mir: "Di fish zenen zis vi tsuker," iz dokh
and as soon as one says me the fish are sweet as sugar is after all
mistome tsuker beser fun fish.
probably sugar better than fish
'and if I'm told, "The fish are sweet as sugar," then after all, sugar is probably better than fish.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 46)

b. un *vibald az* aroys kayklt zikh yo, un arayn kayklt zikh nit, iz dokh
and as soon as out rolls REFL yes and in rolls REFL not, is after all
shlekht.
bad
'and as soon as it [money] rolls out, and doesn't roll in, it's bad, after all.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 145)

1.4.1.1.9 Free relative clauses

(115) a. *Avu* der alter flegt geyn, flegt der yunger oykh mitgeyn.
where the old man used to go, used to the young one also with go
'Wherever the old man went, the young one used to go as well.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 15)

b. un hot zikh fardint, *vifl* zey hobn gedarft.
and has REFL earned how much they have needed
'and earned however much they needed.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 57)

c. Git aykh di vaybl a gloz vareme tey, oder kave, oder *vos* ir hot
gives you the woman a glass warm tea or coffee or what you have
lib.
dear
'Your wife brings you a glass of hot tea, or coffee, or whatever you like.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 17)

d. Rebe, ikh hob geton, *vos* ir hot mir geheysn.
rabbi I have done what you have me told
'Rabbi, I did what you told me.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 63)

1.4.1.1.10 Relative clauses

Yiddish has three strategies for ordinary relative clauses: wh-movement (overt or covert), *vos* 'that' in conjunction with resumptive expressions and *vos* 'that' in conjunction with 'chopping' (Tarallo 1983). In subject relative clauses formed by wh-movement, the first position often remains empty (see Chapter 2.3.2.2 for discussion).

(116) Wh-movement:

a. Ot vet er oyf im oysgisn dem gantsn kas, *vos* __ hot zikh
there will he on him out pour the whole anger that has REFL
ongeklibn in im di ale yorn.
on collected in him the all years
'So he will pour out on him all the anger that has collected within him all those years.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 190)

b. Ir vilt zen dem gortn mit kartofl, *vos* mir hobn haynt farzetst?
you want see the garden with potatoes that we have today planted
'Do you want to see the garden with potatoes that we planted today?'
(Grine felder, 76)

c. un tsugelofn tsu dem geleger, *vu* der betler iz gelegn.
and to run to the place where the beggar is lain
'and ran to the place where the beggar lay.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 182)

d. Hobn zey gelernt a posik, *in velkhn* es iz geven der vort 'isho'.
have they learned a verse in which it is been the word
'They learned a verse that contained the word 'isho'. (Royte pomerantsen, 10)

(117) Resumptive expressions:

a. Men dertseylt di mayse fun eynem a melamed, *vos* men hot im gerufn
one tells the story of one a teacher that one has him called
Berke.

'The story is told of a teacher by the name of Berke.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 29)

b. Ikh hob gezen do nit lang in a kleyn shtetl a yidn mit a bord, *vos*
I have seen there not long in a littel shtetl a Jew with a beard that
dayne iz akegn ir blote.
yours is against it mud
'Not long ago in a little shtetl, I saw a Jew with a beard that yours can't hold a candle to.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 85)

c. Iz faran oyfn ban an atomat, *vos* az men varft arayn a zilberne
is there on the railway an automat that if one throws there-in a silver
tsenkopikene, geyt aroys a bilet.
ten-kopeck coin goes there-out a ticket
'There is a machine at the train station that if you throw in a ten-kopeck coin, a ticket comes out of it.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 96)

d. Taynet der gvir, az er darf keyn tsavoe nit shraybn, vayle er hot
objects the rich man that he needs no will not write because he has
nor eyn eyntsikn zun, *vos* im gehert di gantse yerushe.
only a single son that him belongs the entire inheritance
'So the rich man objects that he doesn't need to draft a will because he has only a single son who the entire inheritance belongs to.
(Royte pomerantsen, 167)

(118) Chopping:

a. Ban undz in shtetl iz geven a kheyder, *vos* der melamed iz geven
by us in shtetl is been an elementary school that the teacher is been
fun di hayntike.
of the today's
'In our shtetl was an elementary school, the teacher of which was one of those modern folks.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 3)

b. Es iz faran a sakh zakhn, *vos* di toyre darf vern opgehit.
it is there a lot things that the Torah must become protected
'There are a lot of things that the Torah must be protected against.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 248)

The resumptive expression strategy is very productive in Yiddish; see Chapter ?? for further discussion. By contrast, the chopping strategy is rare; it is perhaps related to the (also rare) occurrence of Chinese/Japanese-type topics in Yiddish, as illustrated in (119).

(119) A tokhter volt dokh keyn simkhe nit geven.
a daughter would after all no party not been
'After all, there wouldn't be a party for the birth of a daughter.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 108)

1.4.1.1.11 Comparative clauses

(120) a. Hob ikh opgenumen mer, *vi* di hoyz mitn gesheft zenen vert
have I up taken more than the houses with the business are worth
geven.
been
'So I collected more than the house and the business were worth together.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 31)

b. Es iz nit azoy gut, *vi* ir meynt.
it is not so good as you think
'It isn't as good as you think.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 31)

c. Ober der pristav hot nit andersh gevolt, *vi* az zey zoln
but the police commissioner has not otherwise wanted as that they should
zikh shvern.
REFL swear
'But the police commissioner insisted that they take an oath.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 122)

1.4.1.1.12 Indirect questions

(121) a. Gib a kuk, *vifl iberike verter* du host do ongeshribn.
give a look how many superfluous words you have there on written
'Take a look at how many superfluous words you've written.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 108)

b. Hobn di mentshn fun shif genumen trakhtn, *vos* men zol do ton.
have the people of ship taken think what one should there do
'So the people on the ship started to think about what to do.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 101)

c. Az ikh volt gehat dray milyon kerblekh, veyst ir *vos* ikh volt
if I would had three million rubles know you what I would
gemakht?
done
'If I had three million rubles, do you know what I would do?'
(Royte pomerantsen, 105)

1.4.1.2 Types of subject gaps

This section contains examples of the various ways in which subject gaps can arise in Yiddish.

1.4.1.2.1 Impersonal and ambient predicates Clauses with impersonal predicates have empty expletive subjects, and clauses with ambient predicates can have empty subjects as well. Since it can be difficult to decide whether a predicate is impersonal or ambient, I have not distinguished the two cases.

(122) a. Mir volt __ geven azoy gut ven keyner veyst nisht.
me would been so good when nobody knows not
'I would have liked it so much if nobody knew.'
(Grine felder, 69)

b. Ikh veys oykh, az droysn iz __ sheyn.
I know also that outside is beautiful
'I too know that it's nice out.'
(Grine felder, 77)

c. Aykh iz __ den shlekht bay undz?
you-DAT is PART bad with us
'Don't you like it with us?'
(Grine felder, 78)

d. Tsi zey iz __ geven umetik, tsi zey hobn gevolt shporn
whether them is been lonesome whether they have wanted save
gelt, ober zey zenen geshlofn in eyn tsimer.
money but they are slept in one room
'Whether they were lonesome, whether they wanted to save money, in any event, they slept in a single room.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 151)

e. Az du vilst nit, iz __ nit.
if you want not is not
'If you don't want to, it's no go.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 163)

f. Bansher 's iz zumer, iz __ shver tsu zayn in shtub, az dort iz __ azoy
because it is summer is hard to be in room when there is so
gut.
good
'Because it's summer, it's hard to stay indoors, when it's so nice outside.'
(Grine felder, 78)

1.4.1.2.2 Wh-movement Wh-movement can affect the subjects of ordinary relative clauses, free relative clauses and indirect questions. As noted in Section 1.4.1.1.10, first position often remains empty in ordinary relative clauses on subjects. In free relative clauses and indirect questions, on the other hand, first position must be occupied by topic *es* or a true topic (see Chapter 2.3.2.2).

(123) Ordinary relative clauses:

a. Eyner a yid vos __ hot geheysn Sholem, hot gekrogn a briv fun
one a guy that has been named has gotten a letter from an
an ander yidn, vos __ hot geheysn Faytl.
other guy that has been named
'One guy by the name of Sholem got a letter from another guy by the name of Faytl.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 230)

b. In a shtot iz geven a balegole, vos __ hot zikh lib gehat tsu zidlen.
in a town is been a teamster who has REFL dear had to curse
'In a town, there was a teamster who loved to curse.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 234)

c. Afn erstn, a spetsiel hilfvort 'es', vos __ vet shpeter derklert
on the first a special auxiliary word it that will later explained
vern.
become
'In first position is a special auxiliary word *es*, which will be explained later on.'
(Zaretski, Sholem, 44)

(124) Free relative clauses:

a. ... kegn di vos dertseyln oys far goyim vos bay yidn tut __
against those that tell out before non-Jews what with Jews does
zikh.
REFL
'against those who speak about Jewish matters in front of non-Jews'
(Dubnov, Vaad, 18)

b. Stere iz gekumen fleysn zikh, ver frier vet __ kontshn.
is come compete REFL who earlier will finish
'Stere has come to compete regarding who will finish sooner.'
(Grine felder, 63)

(125) Indirect questions:

a. Zol ikh azoy visn fun beyz, vi ikh veys, vos ba mir tut __ zikh!
shall I so know from evil, as I know what with me does REFL
'May I know from evil if I know what is happening with me.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 92)

b. Kent ir mir nit zogn, ver do iz __ a guter dokter ba aykh in shtetl?
can you me not say who there is a good doctor with you in shtetl
'Can you please tell me who is a good doctor in your shtetl?'
(Royte pomerantsen, 205)

1.4.1.2.3 Subject postposing Yiddish exhibits subject postposing of the type familiar from Italian (the subject need not be indefinite, and the verb of the clause need not be unaccusative) (Prince 1993).[33] In structurally unambiguous instances of subject postposing, the subject follows a nonfinite verb form, particle, directional adverb, or locative/existential adverb. For present purposes, the precise position of the postposed subject is immaterial; all that is relevant is that it occupies neither Spec(IP) nor Spec(VP). For expository convenience, I indicate a gap in the following examples, though the analysis of nonlocal nominative case assignment in Section 1.3.2.1.3 does not require one.

(126) Infinitive:

a. Zol __ zikh *arumdreyen* an eydem in shtub!
shall REFL around turn a son-in-law in room
'May a son-in-law turn around in the room!'
(Royte pomerantsen, 21)

[33]The postposing of pronoun subjects is not attested in the entire diachronic corpus, but there are examples attested outside the corpus.

(i) yener ring, far velkhn es darfn zikh mit ale koykhes onkhapn mir, di proletarishe
that ring for which it must REFL with all energies on seize we, the proletarian
melukhe-makht
state power
'that ring about which we, the proletarian state power, must become enthusiastic with all our energies'
(Zaretski 1929:254, §787)

I take the rarity of pronoun subject postposing to be due to discourse considerations of the sort that apply in English there-sentences; cf. fn. there-fn.

b. Durkh a kleyn shtetl hot __ gedarft *durkhforn* der keyser.
through a little shtetl has needed through drive the emperor
'The emperor was obliged to drive through a little shtetl.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 90)

(127) Past participle:

a. un es hobn __ zikh *tsuzamengeklibn* a sakh oylem tsu kukn.
and it have REFL together collected a lot people to watch
'and a lot of people collected to watch.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 33)

b. Es hobn __ zikh amol *getrofn* tsvey yidn in an akhsanye.
it have REFL once met two guys in an inn
'Two guys met once in an inn.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 44)

c. Geveyntlekh hot __ *ongehoybn* tsu esn der balebos.
of course has begun to eat the elder
'Of course, the head of the house began to eat.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 48)

d. Dortn zenen __ dokh *gegangen* mentshn!
there are after all walked people
'But there were people walking there!'
(Royte pomerantsen, 67)

e. In Peterburg oyfn gas zenen __ amol *gegangen* tsvey yidn.
in on the street are once gone two Jews
'Two Jews were once walking along the street in Petersburg.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 82)

f. Hot __ fun der geshikhte *gehert* der rov.
has of the story heard the rabbi
'So the rabbi heard of the story.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 119)

(128) Particle:

a. Eynmol oyf a khasene shteyt __ *oyf* a yid.
one on a wedding stands up a guy
'Once, at a wedding, a guy stands up.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 26)

b. Loyft __ tsun im *tsu* der yungerman.
runs to him to the young man
'So the young man runs towards him.
(Royte pomerantsen, 27)

c. In di 6 durkhgestudirte dertseylungn kumen __ *far* in hoyptzatsn 1811
in the through studied stories come fore in root clauses
perzonverter.
finite verbs
'The 6 stories investigated contain 1811 finite verbs in root clauses.'
(Zaretski, Sholem, 68)

d. "Sssa": shreyt __ *oys* plutsim der rebe.
calls out suddenly the rabbi
'"Sssa," calls out the rabbi suddenly.'
(Zaretski, Sholem, 83)

(129) Directional adverb:

a. Iz __ zikh *arayn* a tsveyter yid.
is REFL in a second guy
'And in comes a second guy.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 23)

b. Epes es geyen __ *arum* azelkhe modne nefeshes, vos er hot zey
something it go around such strange creatures that he has them
nokh keyn mol nit gezen, mit lange hor, mit zek onshtot hoyzn.
still no time not seen with long hair with sacks instead of pants
'There were such strange creatures walking around, that he had never seen before, with long hair and sacks instead of pants.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 61)

c. un es loyft __ *arayn* Vite.
and it runs in
'and in runs Witte.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 80)

(130) Locative/existential adverb:

a. un 's iz __ nisht *do* keyn tsayt ven afile optsushmaysn a kind.
and it is not there no time when even up to beat a child
'and there isn't any time even to spank a child.'
(Grine felder, 82)

b. un vayter iz __ *do* nokh a kleyner khesorndl.
and further is there still a small problem-DIM
'and there is yet a further small problem.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 14)

c. Oyf alts iz __ *faran* a tsayt.
on everything is there a time
'There is a time for everything.'
(Grine felder, 77)

d. Mistome iz __ dokh *faran* a seykhl derbay.
probably is after all there an idea therewith
'After all, there's probably a reason for it.'
(Grine felder, 102)

e. un ba mir in shtub zenen __ *faran* a sakh moly.
and with me in room are there a lot moths
'and in my room, there are a lot of moths.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 228)

I distinguished structurally unambiguous instances of subject postposing like those above from structurally ambiguous ones in which the subject occupies absolute clause-final position, but the clause contains no structural diagnostic for postposing. Given the absence of unambiguous cases of subject postposing with pronoun subjects, I analyzed pronoun subjects in clauses without structural diagnostics for subject postposing as occupying Spec(VP).

(131) a. Zey veln zen, az ba Meyer Eliohu Henikh in shtub brenen
they will see that with in room burn
tsveygraytsike likht.
two kreutser lights
'They'll see that there are two-kroytser candles burning in Meyer Eliohu Henikh's living room.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 127)

b. Fregt im di vayb zayne.
asks him the wife his
'So his wife asks him.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 129)

c. Es varft zikh in di oygn di konsekvente shreybung 'vab'.
it throws REFL in the eyes the consistent spelling
'Very striking is the consistent spelling 'vab'.
(Weinreich, Polak, 41)

d. Afn erstn iz der subyekt.
on the first is the subject
'In first position is the subject.'
(Zaretski, Sholem, 33)

1.4.1.2.4 Passive and unaccusative predicates According to van Kemenade 1993, subordinate V2 in Old English is possible in clauses with passive or unaccusative predicates.[34]

[34]Van Kemenade 1993 analyzes Old English as an INFL-final asymmetric V2 language with liberal rightward movement, and so V2 examples like (132) are actually only apparent instances of subordinate topicalization for her.

(132) a. gif us ne lyst ðæra ærrena yfela ðe we ær worhton
if us-DAT not pleases-3SG the earlier evils-GEN that we earlier wrought
'if the evil that we first wrought displeases us'
van Kemenade 1993:15, (17c))

b. þæt eallum folce sy gedemed beforan ðe
that all people-DAT be judged before you
'that all the people be judged before you'
van Kemenade 1993:15, (18a))

c. þonne ælce dæge beoð manega acennede þurh hys mihte on
when each day are many-NOM given birth through his power on
worulde
world
'when every day many are given birth through his power on earth'
van Kemenade 1993:16, (19a))

Following den Besten 1985, she argues that the subject in such examples can receive case in preverbal object position under chain-government, leaving Spec(IP) free to be occupied by nonsubjects.

However, since verb phrases in modern Yiddish are overwhelmingly verb-initial, there is only a single instance of subordinate topicalization—(20b)—in which the potential subject gap must be due to the presence of a passive or unaccusative predicate; in all other clauses with passive or unaccusative predicates, the subject gap might have arisen for other reasons. I therefore ignore this type of subject gap in what follows.

1.4.1.2.5 Complex infinitival constructions In complex infinitival constructions, the subject can occupy the lowest Spec(VP) position, leaving the highest Spec(VP) position empty—see (45b). This type of subject gap is very rare: there are only four instances in the entire diachronic corpus, and I therefore disregard it in what follows.

1.4.2 The subject gap effect in Yiddish

1.4.2.1 Results

Table 2 shows the frequency of nonsubject topicalization in various clause types in Yiddish. Expletive topic *es* 'it' is excluded from consideration since its status as a topic is not universally acknowledged. Root clauses subsume declaratives and V2 questions, but exclude V1 declaratives and questions, all imperatives and asyndetic embedded clauses. For other than root clauses, the table includes first conjuncts but not subsequent ones, since subsequent conjuncts tend to allow root clause word order even in strict asymmetric V2 languages like German (Behaghel 1932:25, §1442; see Thiersch 1994 for an analysis). Clauses which I could not decide how to classify are tabulated separately. The column 'Subtotal' gives the number of instances of nonsubject topicalization, whereas the column 'Total' gives the total incidence of a particular clause type regardless of whether it is an instance of nonsubject topicalization or not. I include this second figure in order to give the reader an idea of the overall frequency of the clause types and of nonsubject topicalization for each of them.

Table 2: Correlation of nonsubject topicalization and subject gaps in Yiddish

	Type of subject gap						
		Postposed subject					
Clause type	No gap	Ambi-guous	Unam-biguous	Empty expl.	Wh-trace	Subtotal	Total
Root	1614	218	304	102	180	2418	6200
Causal or concessive	10	0	0	1	0	11	74
That-complement of							
... neutral predicate	64	13	23	13	0	113	605
... neutral noun	6	1	0	0	0	7	33
... degree adverb	4	0	1	0	0	5	35
Relative, resumptive	7	7	6	0	0	20	104
Adverbial	2	2	3	6	0	13	843
Relative, wh-movement	1	0	0	0	9	10	167
Relative, chopped	0	3	0	0	0	3	7
Free relative	0	0	0	3	4	7	95
Indirect question	1	4	0	4	5	14	311
That-complement, subjective head	0	0	3	1	0	4	124
Comparative	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
That-complement, negated neutral predicate	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
That-complement, unclear status	0	1	0	0	0	1	33
other subordinate clause, unclear status	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The results of Table 2 can be summarized as follows. For convenience, I will refer to nonsubject topicalization in clauses with vs. without a subject gap as 'partial' and 'full' V2,

respectively.

- With regard to full V2, causal and concessive clauses introduced by the conjunctions *bansher*, *makhmes* and *vayl* 'because' and *khotsh* 'although' pattern with root clauses.
- Full V2 occurs in that-complements of neutral heads and degree adverbs and also in relative clauses with resumptive expressions.
- Full V2 almost never occurs in adverbial clauses, wh-movement or chopped relatives, free relatives, indirect questions or that-complements of subjective heads.
- Finally, nonsubject topicalization in comparative clauses and negated that-complements of neutral predicates is not attested in the corpus at all. The absence of nonsubject topicalization in negated that-complements is expected on comparative grounds; Ulvestad 1955:334 finds only 35 examples of embedded V2 in German, the functional equivalent of full V2 in Yiddish, in a corpus of 17 novels.[35]

Combining the data in Table 2 into larger groups gives Table 3; I omit the structurally ambiguous instances of postverbal subjects and the one unclear case.

[35]The discussion in Ulvestad 1955, 1956 is worth reading both for the data reported in it and for its methodological insights. Particularly interesting are examples like (i), where the context in the original source makes it clear that the oblique topic pronoun need not be stressed. Such examples are problematic for the analysis of V2 in Travis 1984 and Zwart 1993, according to which subject-initial and nonsubject-initial V2 clauses are topologically distinct (see Schwartz and Vikner 1990 and Gärtner and Steinbach 1994 for detailed discussion).

(i) Sage dann aber auch nicht, dich habe jemals eine Frau geliebt.
say then about also not you-ACC has-SUBJ ever a woman loved
'But then don't say you were ever loved by a woman.'
(Nossack 1948:183, cited in Ulvestad 1955:332, (28))

Further naturally-occuring examples of the same type from Early New High German and early Yiddish are given in (ii).

(ii) a. Das sah si niht allein, *ez* sahen ander swester auch.
that saw she not alone it saw other sisters also
'She was not the only one to see that; other sisters saw it too.'
(Ebert et al. 1993:432, §S 241)

b. Da ligt eyn mn tut dr shlgn, den *mikh* trign al meyn zinn.
there lies a man dead beaten than me-ACC deceive all my senses
'There lies a man beaten to death, unless all my senses deceive me.'
(Bovo, 76)

Table 3: Synopsis of Table 2

Clause type	No subject gap	Subject gap	Total
Root	1624 (73%)	587 (27%)	2211
Subordinate root	81 (65%)	43 (35%)	124
Ordinary subordinate	4 (10%)	38 (90%)	42

As is evident from Tables 2 and 3, full V2 hardly ever occurs outside subordinate root contexts in Yiddish. Nevertheless, examples are attested outside the corpus analyzed here (see (18a), (20c), (20d)), and the nearly but not quite categorical absence of these examples suggests that the subject gap effect is not due to a syntactic constraint. However, before presenting the evidence in favor of a nonsyntactic treatment, I review some previous treatments of nonsubject topicalization (and embedded root phenomena more generally) in light of the Yiddish data.

1.4.2.2 Lowenstamm 1977

According to the influential analysis put forward by Lowenstamm 1977, nonsubject topicalization in Yiddish is structurally incompatible with wh-movement. The evidence for Lowenstamm's claim is the minimal contrast in (133).

(133) a. Der yid vos in Boston hobn mir im gezen iz a groyser lamdn.
the man that in have we him seen is a great scholar.'
'The man that we saw in Boston is a great scholar.'
(Lowenstamm 1977:211, (34c))

b. * Der yid vos in Boston hobn mir ϕ gezen iz a groyser lamdn.
the man that in have we seen is a great scholar.'
(Lowenstamm 1977:211, (34d))

Lowenstamm first argues that relative clauses with resumptive pronouns do not involve wh-movement, in contrast to relative clauses with a gap. Assuming the phrase structure rule $\overline{S} \rightarrow$ Comp S, he then proposes to compare two treatments of topicalization in Yiddish. According to the first, topicalization permutes constituents within S; according to the second, topics move out of S into Comp (in its pre-*Barriers* sense, in which it subsumes Spec(CP) and C). Since wh-movement is uncontroversially movement to Comp, Lowenstamm concludes from the unacceptability of (133b) that topicalization and wh-movement compete for the same

structural position and that the Yiddish facts support the subsumption of topicalization under wh-movement proposed by Chomsky 1977.

However, Lowenstamm fails to complete his argument by ruling out a permutation derivation of (133b), and his argument therefore does not go through. As more recent work (Santorini 1989:56–57, Diesing 1990:66–67) has shown, relative clauses like (133b) are in fact acceptable under appropriate discourse conditions: namely, when the topic receives contrastive stress (indicated by small caps in (134)).

(134) Der yid vos mir hobn gezen in Niu-York iz an amorets, ober der yid vos
the man that we have seen in New York is an ignoramus but the man that
in BOSTON hobn mir gezen iz a groyser lamdn.
in Boston have we seen is a great scholar
'The man that we saw in New York is an ignoramus, but the man that we saw in Boston is a great scholar.'

Finally, the existence of partial V2 in subordinate clauses with wh-movement is left unexplained.

Although Lowenstamm's analysis is conceptually flawed and empirically inadequate, it is interesting to observe that his judgments in (133) precisely reflect the usage pattern in Table 2 concerning resumptive-strategy and wh-movement relative clauses. Prince 1994 argues that when speakers judge linguistic forms in the absence of an explicit discourse context, they necessarily create an unmarked context in which to judge them—that is, a context without any special assumptions concerning preceding or following discourse, salience, contrast, etc. It is this tendency that is responsible for the discrepancy between reported and actual usage in connection with phenomena like there-sentences (see fn. 14), and it is an important reason to complement elicited judgments with studies of naturally occuring usage. In a similar vein, it is likely that when speakers create examples, they tend to create them to be felicitous in an unmarked discourse context. Given this slight extension of Prince's argument, Lowenstamm's failure to note the acceptability of nonsubject topicalization in contrastive contexts is just what is expected. We may further speculate that when speakers create examples, they tend to create ones that are unmarked syntactically as well—that is, ones without any special syntactic properties, such as presence of a subject gap. Such a tendency would explain Lowenstamm's failure to note the existence of partial V2 in clauses with wh-movement.

1.4.2.3 Hooper and Thompson 1973

One of the earliest and best-known treatments of embedded root phenomena is Hooper and Thompson 1973. These authors investigate a wide range of English constructions argued by Emonds 1970 to be restricted to root contexts and conclude that the alleged root phenomena are possible in subordinate clauses as long as the subordinate clauses are asserted. Here, I will focus mainly on negative constituent preposing, since it is most closely related to

full V2 in Yiddish. Although I do not distinguish structurally between full and partial V2, but rather take the domain of V2 in Yiddish to be IP uniformly, it is striking that full V2 patterns like a root phenomenon with regard to Hooper and Thompson's assertedness criterion. Particularly interesting given the discussion of Lowenstamm 1977 above is the case of relative clauses. Hooper and Thompson 1973:489 argue that restrictive relative clauses modifying definite noun phrases are presupposed (hence not asserted), whereas restrictive relative clauses modifying indefinite noun phrases and nonrestrictive relative clauses are not presupposed (and hence in some sense asserted). Accordingly, they conclude that root phenomena are ruled out in restrictive relative clauses on definite heads, but possible in other relative clauses. In a similar vein, ? argues that relative clauses with resumptive expressions are used in Yiddish (and English) to predicate something of some independently evoked or identifiable entity, whereas ordinary relative clauses tend to be used to describe an entity with a view to enabling a hearer to identify it. Prince, too, notes that some restrictive relative clauses, particularly ones with indefinite heads, tend to pattern with nonrestrictive relatives. The distinct discourse functions of the two types of relative clauses are clearly reflected in the distribution of full V2 in Yiddish: relative clauses with resumptive expressions pattern with the complements of neutral heads and degree adverbs, freely allowing full V2,[36] whereas ordinary relative clauses pattern with ordinary subordinate clauses, allowing only partial V2. Not surprisingly, the one relative clause with full V2 in the corpus—(23a)—modifies an indefinite head.

Hooper and Thompson's analysis extends to at least one context that they themselves do not address: namely, that-complements of degree adverbs. These complements appear to be asserted; cf. the acceptability of English tag questions on the embedded clause.

(135) This problem was so hard (that) you worked on it all day, didn't you?

Given that the complements of degree adverbs are one of of the diagnostic environments for CP recursion in Frisian (de Haan and Weerman 1986), it is not surprising that they behave as subordinate root contexts in Yiddish, Old French (Adams 1987b:119, Vance 1989:48) and English.[37]

[36]According to Iatridou and Kroch 1992:16, fn. 12, if-then conditionals are ruled out in relative clauses with resumptive pronouns. Their particular example, given here as (i), is indeed unacceptable (due in part perhaps to the stylistic clash between the resumptive pronoun strategy and the relatively formal use of the wh-pronoun *who*).

(i) He is the kind of guy who if you give him a good argument (*then) he'll accept it.

On the other hand, (ii) sounds about as good to me with *then* as without.

(ii) Here's another idea that if you like it (then) we could collaborate on it.

[37]Embedded V2 complements of degree adverbs are unacceptable in German, Dutch and the mainland Scandinavian languages; I do not know why this should be.

(136) Your clothing wears so well that not only do they last 'till my children outgrow them, but I am able to pass them down to my sister's children who get a lot of use out of them, as well.
(L.L. Bean catalog, Fall 1995, children's section, p. 4)

According to Iatridou and Kroch 1992:5, fn. 4, if-then conditionals are ruled out in degree adverb complements, but examples like the following sound acceptable to me.

(137) These chocolates are so expensive that if you buy one of them, then you can't buy another one for a month.

However, an important shortcoming of Hooper and Thompson's approach concerns that-complements.[38] Since the complements of nouns are not asserted, negative constituent preposing should be ruled out in them, and Hooper and Thompson give (138) in support of their analysis (the judgment, with which I disagree, is theirs).

(138) *Your notion that never before have the children had so much fun is absurd.
(Hooper and Thompson 1973:485, (171))

But the status of such examples is controversial in English, and structurally parallel examples are judged by other authors to be acceptable (Culicover 1991:5, (8c)). Even clearer evidence against Hooper and Thompson's analysis comes from German, which uncontroversially allows V2 complements to nouns (Haider 1986:50, (2-1b), Cinque 1989:78, (4)), even in hypothetical contexts like (139b).

(139) a. Die Idee, die Erde sei rund, hatte der merkwürdige Genueser
the idea the earth is-SUBJ round had the strange Genoese
offensichtlich immer noch nicht aufgegeben.
always still not up given
'The strange Genoese evidently still hadn't given up the idea that the earth was round.

b. Gesetzt den Fall, er ist schon da, was dann?
set the case he is already there what then
'In case he is already there, what then?'

Given the German facts, it comes as no surprise that full V2 is attested in noun complements in Yiddish. Some of the nouns are part of light verb constructions, but full V2 is possible in ordinary noun complements as well (see also the examples in (1.4.1.1.3).

[38]Hooper and Thompson themselves note that some English speakers accept root phenomena in all that-clauses, regardless of whether they express an assertion, and they acknowledge that such judgments are problematic for them (1973:478–479).

(140) a. Ir muzt mir gebn a tekias kaf, az ven ir vet zayn in Grodne, vet
you must me give a handshake that when you will be in will
ir tsu mir arayngeyn.
you to me in go
'You must promise me with a handshake that when you come to Grodne, you'll visit me.' (Royte pomerantsen, 44)

b. Hot zi gegebn a neyder, az ven zi vet ariber geyn besholem, vet zi
has she given a oath that if she will over go in peace will she
gebn a rubl oyf Meyer-bal-nes.
give a ruble on collection for the poor in the Holy Land
'So she swore that if she got over safely, she would give a ruble to charity.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 68)

(141) a. Hot er gelozn a tsavoe, az zayne gantse gelt git er avek oyf glaykhe
has he let a will that his whole money gives he away on equal
khalokim zayne dray beste fraynd.
shares his three best friends
'So he left a will that all of his money should go in equal shares to his three best friends.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 137)

b. Er hot gelozt oyshengen in gantsn shtot moydoes, az dem un dem tog
he has let out hang in whole town notices that that and that day
vet er geyn oyf a shtrik.
will he walk on a rope
'He had signs put up all over town that on such and such day he would walk a tightrope.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 188)

Hooper and Thompson's analysis also rules out negative constituent preposing in the complements of predicates such *(un)likely*, *(im)possible*, *(im)probable*, since such complements are not asserted (1973:478–479). Here, German patterns as expected (cf. the facts in Cinque 1989); again, however, full V2 is possible in the complement of such predicates in Yiddish.

(142) Meglekh, az do darf men gikher haltn 'Vi ruft men es' far a bemerkzats
possible that there must one rather hold how calls one it for a parenthetical
mit shans fun fregikeyt.
with chance of interrogation
'It is possible that here, 'Vi ruft men es' is better considered a parenthetical with interrogative overtones.'
(Zaretski, Mendele, 144)

In summary, then, Hooper and Thompson's restriction on root phenomena to asserted clauses is too narrow to account completely for subordinate V2 in Yiddish.

1.4.2.4 Kroch and Taylor 1995

As noted in the introduction to this section, van Kemenade 1993 observes that in Old English, potential instances of nonsubject topicalization in subordinate clauses outside CP recursion contexts[39] are restricted to clauses with subject gaps. Kroch and Taylor 1995 attempt to provide a structural analysis of van Kemenade's observation. In this section, I review their analysis, which is forced in the end to appeal to discourse considerations to account for the rarity of nonsubject topicalization in ordinary subordinate clauses.

1.4.2.4.1 Clitic placement and V2 in Old English Kroch and Taylor's analysis of subordinate topicalization and symmetric V2 depends crucially on the distribution of clitics in Old English and the proper analysis of it, and I therefore begin with a brief review of the relevant facts. As Pintzuk 1991, Chapter 4, 1993, 1994 demonstrates in detail, Old English phrasal clitics (subject and object pronouns and certain light adverbs) can either precede or follow the first constituent in IP.[40]

(143) a. *Him* se gysel ongan georne lice fylstan.
them the hostage began willingly help
'The hostage willingly began to help them.'
(Pintzuk 1991:206, (28a))

b. & *ic* gehwam will þærto tæcan
and I everyone will thereto direct
'and I will direct everyone there'
(Pintzuk 1991:201, (20a))

c. for-þan-þe *him* nan deofol ne mihte bediglian hine sylfne
because him no devil neg could hide him self
'because no devil could hid himself from him'
(Pintzuk 1991:206, (28b))

d. þæt *he* þæt godes hus wolde mid fyre forbærnan
that he the God's house would with fire burn
'so that he would burn the house of God with fire'
(Pintzuk 1991:202, (20b))

[39]For expository convenience, I revert here to using the term 'CP recursion', since both van Kemenade and Kroch and Taylor assume certain aspects of the generalized CP recursion approach to subordinate V2.

[40]For simplicity, the following discussion abstracts away from the fact that Old English usage reflects not a single grammatical system, but an INFL-final phrase structure option inherited from proto-Germanic in addition to an innovative INFL-medial phrase structure option (contra Kemenade 1987, 1993). The distribution of clitics allows the conclusion that V2 in Old English is associated with the INFL-medial phrase structure option, but clitic placement itself is independent of the headedness of the I projection. It should also be noted that the variability in clitic placement described below holds for later Old English; in early Old English, as represented by *Beowulf*, clitics always attach before the first constituent in IP.

(144) a. þin agen geleafa *þe* hæfþ gehæledne.
your own faith you has healed
'Your own faith has healed you.'
(Pintzuk 1991:206, (30a))

b. Hiora untrymnesse *he* sceal *ð*rowian on his heortan.
their weakness he shall atone in his heart
'He shall atone in his heart for their weakness.'
(Pintzuk 1991:202, (22a))

c. þæt þa Deniscan *him* ne mehton þæs ripes forwiernan
that the Danes them not could the harvest refuse
'so that the Danes could not refuse them the harvest'
(Pintzuk 1991:206, (30b))

d. þa æt nihstan *hie* hæfden getogen eal Creca folc to *ð*æm
when at last they had drawn all Greece's people into the
gewinnum
war
'when at last, they had drawn all the people of Greece into that war'
(Pintzuk 1991:202, (22b))

In general, clitics precede the finite verb, but in a limited range of environments (including questions, imperatives, so-called narrative V1 clauses, clauses introduced by certain adverbs (notably *þa* 'then'), and clauses with a negated or subjunctive verb), the converse is true: it is the finite verb that precedes any clitics. According to Pintzuk, this order arises because the finite verb in such clauses leaves IP, the domain of cliticization, and moves to C (see Adams 1987b:157–160 for parallel Old French facts and a similar analysis).

(145) a. Hwi sceole *we* oþres mannes niman?
why should we other man's take
'Why should we take another man's?'
(Pintzuk 1993:24, (52))

b. þa ge-mette *he* scea*ð*an.
then met he robbers
'Then he met robbers.'
(Pintzuk 1993:24, (55a))

Following Klavans 1980, 1985, Pintzuk takes clitic placement to be determined by a number of parameters:[41]

[41]According to Klavans, clitics are subject to independent syntactic and prosodic requirements (see also Anderson 1992, 1993). (146) lists only syntactic parameters of clitic placement, since they are the only ones relevant here. A fourth parameter, the direction of phonological attachment, specifies whether a prosodically dependent clitic attaches to the preceding or following prosodic word.

(146) Parameters of clitic placement:

a. the domain (or scope) of cliticization, the maximal projection that immediately dominates the anchor

b. the anchor, the phrase that acts as the syntactic host of cliticization, constrained to be at the left or right edge of the domain

c. the orientation, the edge of the anchor to which the clitic adjoins

In the examples above, the domain of cliticization is IP, the anchor is the XP at the left edge of the domain, and clitics can either adjoin to the left or right edge of the anchor. (147) shows the resulting structures.

(147) a. $[_{IP}\ [_{XP}$ Clitic $[_{XP}$ Topic $]\ ]\ \ldots\ ]$

b. $[_{IP}\ [_{XP}\ [_{XP}$ Topic $]$ Clitic $]\ \ldots\ ]$

On the basis of the distribution of clitics, Pintzuk concludes that Old English is a symmetric V2 language and adopts an IP V2 analysis of the language.[42] Kroch and Taylor 1995 follow Pintzuk in her basic conclusion, but object to her analysis as it stands on two counts. First, it has nothing to say about van Kemenade's observation that full V2 is not attested in ordinary subordinate clauses in Old English. Some examples were already given in (132); I repeat them here for convenience.[43]

(148) a. gif *us* ne lyst *ð*æra ærrena yfela *ð*e we ær worhton
if us-DAT not pleases-3SG the earlier evils-GEN that we earlier wrought
'if the evil that we first wrought displeases us'
van Kemenade 1993:15, (17c))

b. þæt *eallum folce* sy gedemed beforan *ð*e
that all people-DAT be judged before you
'that all the people be judged before you'
van Kemenade 1993:15, (18a))

c. þonne *ælce dæge* beo*ð* manega acennede þurh hys mihte on
when each day are many-NOM given birth through his power on
worulde
world

[42]Pintzuk's analysis differs from the one in Kemenade 1987, 1993, according to which Old English is a verb-final, INFL-final liberal asymmetric V2 language like Frisian. Van Kemenade treats clitics as head clitics on the finite verb of the Romance type. In order to account for the difference in clitic placement between (143) and (144) on the one hand and (145) on the other, she stipulates that operators in Spec(CP) prevent clitics from adjoining onto the verb.

[43]As already noted above, the examples in (148) are only apparent instances of subordinate topicalization for van Kemenade herself, given her analysis of Old English as an INFL-final asymmetric V2 language. She treats examples like these as instances of chain-government or derives them by various independently motivated rightward movement processes.

'when every day many are given birth through his power on earth'
van Kemenade 1993:16, (19a))

Second, the adjunction of clitics to an anchor as in (147) is conceptually unattractive since it "has no counterpart elsewhere among the Germanic languages and does not have clear theoretical justification" (Kroch and Taylor 1995:12).

Addressing this second difficulty first, Kroch and Taylor propose to treat clitic placement in Old English as in German, where clitics move to the CP/IP boundary; cf. (97a).[44] As a consequence of this revision of Pintzuk's treatment of clitic placement, topics can no longer be IP-internal, but must move out of IP, just as in the asymmetric V2 languages. However, Kroch and Taylor continue to assume that finite verbs, lacking the proper feature content to license movement to C in Old English, move only as high as I. Since such a nonlocal relation between the topic and the finite verb leaves Spec(IP) empty, the question immediately arises why Old English does not exhibit topicalization of the modern English type (topic > subject > verb) as a matter of course.[45] The answer, Kroch and Taylor argue, lies precisely in the V2 character of Old English, which the modern language has lost. On the one hand, as the distribution of clitics shows (given their assumptions), the topic must move to Spec(CP), the highest specifier position of its clause, in order to be able to act as a subject of predication at the CP level. On the other hand, it must establish a surface Spec-head relationship with the finite verb, the analogue for topics of Rizzi's 1991 Wh-criterion. Both requirements are satisfied if and only if the topic moves to Spec(CP) through Spec(IP).[46] The resulting structure of a V2 clause with clitics is then as in (149).

(149) $[_{CP}\ \text{Topic}_i\ [_C \dots\ ]\ [_{IP}\ \text{Clitics}\ [_{IP}\ t_i\ [_I\ \text{Vf}_j\ ]\ [_{VP} \dots\ t_j \dots\ t_i \dots\ ]\ ]\ ]\ ]$

1.4.2.4.2 Subordinate V2 outside CP recursion environments If topics in all V2 languages move to Spec(CP), as Kroch and Taylor assume, and the only difference between asymmetric and symmetric V2 languages lies in where the finite verb lands, then subordinate topicalization should be limited to CP recursion environments, even in the symmetric V2 languages. Since this is not so (recall the examples in (148)), some mechanism must be provided that licenses subordinate topicalization outside CP recursion environments but simultaneously restricts it to clauses with subject gaps. In developing their analysis, Kroch and Taylor rely on van Kemenade's descriptive work: according to her, the contexts in which Spec(IP) in a subordinate clause may be filled by a nonsubject in Old English are unaccusative contexts in a broad sense, ones in which the verb does not assign a theta-role to an external argument. In such cases, it is plausible to assume that the subject is an empty expletive. In order to make Spec(IP) available for nonsubject topicalization, Kroch and Taylor propose that empty expletives are able to incorporate into I, checking off its case and agreement features.

As Kroch and Taylor 1995:17 note, expletive incorporation must also be the mechanism for checking off the agreement and case features on I in ordinary V2 clauses, where the topic has moved to Spec(CP), since there too, Spec(IP) is occupied not by the subject, but by the trace of the topic. But if expletive incorporation is available in V2 clauses across the board, then there remains no syntactic explanation for the subject gap effect. Accordingly, Kroch and Taylor 1995:17 appeal to discourse considerations to account for the differential incidence of topicalization in root clauses, CP recursion environments and other subordinate contexts.

1.4.2.4.3 Critique Kroch and Taylor's proposal that the absence of nonsubject topicalization in subordinate clauses reflects discourse constraints rather than syntactic ones is consistent with the Yiddish data in Tables 2 and 3. Simultaneously, however, the need to invoke a discourse constraint calls into question certain aspects of their structural analysis. First, in Yiddish and other languages, the subject gap effect seems to hold even where the subject gap is not an empty expletive, but the trace of wh-movement or *pro*, and the absence of nonsubject topicalization in wh-clauses in Old English is likely to be a statistical accident. In any event, Kroch and Taylor's proposal as it stands does not extend to such cases (nor does van Kemenade's); in order to accommodate them, the mechanism of expletive incorporation would have to be generalized along the lines of Section 1.3.2.1. Second, recall that expletive incorporation was introduced in order to restrict nonsubject topicalization to subordinate clauses with subject gaps. But since it does not actually succeed in doing so, the conclusion that originally motivated it (namely, that topics occupy Spec(CP)) and the generalization upon which that conclusion relies (namely, that clitics in Old English must move to the CP/IP boundary) are open to reinterpretation. A detailed reanalysis of the Old English clitic facts that is consistent with Kroch and Taylor's goal of providing a unified description of them and their German counterparts is beyond the scope of this work. However, the following possibility suggests itself. Recall from Section 95 that German clitic pronouns can either precede or follow the subject; the same pattern reported there for V2 clauses also holds for subordinate clauses.

(150) a. daß *es ihm* der Johann gestern gegeben hat
that it him the yesterday given has
'that Johann gave it to him yesterday'
(Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991:20, (25a))

b. daß der Johann *es ihm* gestern gegeben hat
that the it him yesterday given has
(Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991:21, (27b))

[44] Kroch and Taylor 1995 do not mention the variability in German clitic placement in (97).

[45] In a very restricted range of environments, Old English does allow V3 clauses (Pintzuk 1991:102–106). See Chapter 2.4 for further discussion.

[46] The same conclusion is reached in Vikner 1995:118. Assuming the double Agr structure discussed in Section 1.3.3, Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991:60–61 propose a notational variant, according to which topics in subordinate V2 clauses move through Spec(Agr2P) on the way to the canonical topic position, Spec(Agr1P).

Let us assume, following Kroch and Taylor 1995, that the clitics in (150a) attach to the left edge of IP. Given the treatment of subjects as adjuncts motivated in Section 1.3.2.2.7, this analysis immediately yields the order in (150b) as well: the two orders simply differ as to whether the clitics attaches to the higher or lower segment of IP (the equals sign indicates syntactic attachment).[47]

(151) a. daß *es ihm*=[$_{IP}$ der Johann [$_{IP}$ gestern gegeben hat]]
b. daß [$_{IP}$ der Johann *es ihm*=[$_{IP}$ gestern gegeben hat]]

Since Old English topics also occupy the IP subject position, the clitic-topic and topic-clitic orders in (143) and (144) follow straightforwardly as well.

1.4.3 Evidence against a syntactic treatment of the subject gap effect

In this section, I provide some indirect quantitative evidence against taking the subject gap effect discussed above to be due to a syntactic licensing condition. The argument is based on a comparison of subordinate clauses with asyndetic clauses with regard to nonsubject topicalization. Contrary to what is expected on syntactic grounds, the asyndetic clauses pattern neither with root clauses or subordinate root clauses, but with ordinary subordinate clauses. I conclude from this that the availability of nonsubject topicalization in a clause is independent of its syntax.

1.4.3.1 Asyndetic clauses

Yiddish allows asyndetic V2 clauses.

(152) a. Ober ikh hob aykh dokh gebetn, ir zolt zey oyslernen
but I have you after all asked you should them out teach
derekh-erets.
manners
'But I asked you to teach them manners.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 6)

b. Der yid zet, es shpilt zikh oyfn gas a yidisher yingl.
the guy sees, it plays REFL on the street a Jewish boy
'The guy sees there is a Jewish boy playing in the street.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 8)

[47]This analysis replaces the orientation parameter in (146c) with the values 'before' and 'after' by an equivalent parameter allowing adjunction to the upper or lower segment of a category.

c. Meynt ir, Roytshild iz a lamdn?
think you is a scholar
'Do you think Rothschild is a scholar?'
(Royte pomerantsen, 13)

d. Hot er zikh getrakht, es iz nokh tsu fri tsu geyn tsu der kale in hoyz
has he REFL thought it is still to early to go to the bride in house
arayn.
in
'He thought to himself that it was still too early to go and visit the bride's house.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 23)

The proper analysis of such clauses is not entirely clear. On the one hand, since the contexts in which asyndetic clauses are licensed in Yiddish are very similar (though not identical) to the contexts licensing full V2,[48] asyndetic clauses and subordinate root clauses might be minimal variants, differing only in that the complementizer is not overt in the asyndetic case (Müller and Sternefeld 1993:492). On the other hand, matrix heads might select embedded clauses directly; Pütz 1975:77 speaks of *Direkteinbettung* 'direct embedding' in connection with asyndetic V2 in German. The alternative structures are shown in (153) and (154); 'X' stands for the governing head.[49]

(153) Null complementizer:
a. [$_{XP}$ X [$_{C}$ ϕ] [$_{CP}$ Top Vf ...]] (German)
b. [$_{XP}$ X [$_{C}$ ϕ] [$_{IP}$ Top Vf ...]] (Yiddish)

(154) No complementizer:
a. [$_{XP}$ X [$_{CP}$ Top Vf ...]] (German)
b. [$_{XP}$ X [$_{IP}$ Top Vf ...]] (Yiddish)

Regardless of which analysis turns out to be correct, however, we would expect one of two outcomes if the rate of nonsubject topicalization in a clause is determined by its syntax: asyndetic embedded clauses should pattern either with subordinate root clauses or with ordinary root clauses.

[48]Yiddish has no asyndetic relative clauses.

[49]It might be thought that the possibility of extraction as in (i.a) tips the balance in favor of (154), but Reis 1995 argues that such questions need not be treated as instances of extraction; cf. (i.b).

(i) a. Wer glaubst du würde kommen?
who believe you would come
'Who do you think would come?'

b. Wer würde glaubst du kommen?
who would believe you come

1.4.3.2 Results

Table 4 shows a comparison of the rates of topicalizing various constituents in four clause types: root clauses, asyndetic clauses, subordinate root clauses and ordinary subordinate clauses. Root clauses here include declarative clauses and causal/concessive clauses introduced by *bansher*, *makhmes* and *vayl* 'because' and *khotsh* 'although', but not questions. Subordinate root clauses include that-complements of neutral heads and degree adverbs, and relative clauses with resumptive expressions. Asyndetic clauses include complements of neutral heads and degree adverbs. Ordinary subordinate clauses include adverbial clauses, wh-movement and chopped relatives, free relatives, indirect questions and that-complements of nonneutral predicates. Indirect objects include experiencer arguments.

Table 4: Topicalization in four contexts

	Type of topic					
Context	Subject	Expletive topic *es*	Direct or indirect object	Clause	Other phrase	Total
Root	3728	262	268	424	1677	6359
	(59%)	(4%)	(4%)	(7%)	(26%)	
Subordinate root	592	44	24	22	103	785
	(75%)	(6%)	(3%)	(3%)	(13%)	
Asyndetic	184	10	0	7	11	212
	(87%)	(5%)	(0%)	(3%)	(5%)	
Ordinary subordinate	1389	147	14	2	37	1589
	(87%)	(9%)	(1%)	(0%)	(2%)	

The results in the table are striking because they are consistent with neither of the hypotheses entertained above: instead of patterning with either ordinary root clauses or with subordinate root clauses, asyndetic clauses pattern with ordinary subordinate clauses. I conclude from this that there are as yet undiscovered discourse factors that play a significant role in determining the felicity of topicalizing nonsubjects in various clause types independently of their syntactic structure. If different speakers are more or less able to construct discourse contexts appropriate for nonsubject topicalization, then the observed idiosyncratic variability of judgments concerning nonsubject topicalization outside subordinate root environments follows (see also Kroch and Taylor 1995:17–18).

Chapter 2

Further issues in the clausal syntax of Yiddish

2.1 Overview

Chapter 1 discussed the V2 phenomenon in Yiddish in declarative clauses and its analysis in some detail. This chapter presents three further issues in the clausal syntax of Yiddish and places them in crosslinguistic perspective. Section 2.2 discusses V2 in direct questions, and Sections 2.3 and 2.4 cover two noncanonical word orders—verb-first (V1) and verb-third (V3).

2.2 V2 in questions

This section discusses the syntax of direct wh-questions in Yiddish. I will argue that such questions are structurally parallel to their counterparts in the asymmetric V2 languages: that is, the finite verb moves to C and the wh-phrase moves to Spec(CP) (Heycock and Santorini 1993, contra Diesing 1990).

2.2.1 Direct questions as IPs

Diesing 1990 observes a word order contrast between direct and indirect questions in Yiddish (see Thráinsson 1986:174, Kosmeijer 1991 on the same asymmetry in Icelandic). In indirect questions, Spec(IP) must be occupied by an overt element, either topic *es* or some other phrase, and the wh-phrase must therefore occupy Spec(CP).[1]

[1]Since indirect questions are not a subordinate root context and the indirect question in (156b) contains no subject gap, the topic requires contrastive stress for the sentence to be acceptable; this is the reason for

(155) a. * Zi iz gekumen zen, ver *vet* frier kontshn.
she is come see who will earlier finish
'She has come to see who will finish earlier.'

b. Zi iz gekumen zen, ver es *vet* frier kontshn.
she is come see who it will earlier finish

c. Zi iz gekumen zen, ver frier *vet* kontshn.
she is come see who earlier will finish
(Grine felder, 63, cited in Diesing 1990:50, (15b))

(156) a. * Zi veys, vemen *zoln* di kinder gebn di bikher.
she knows who-DAT shall the children give the books
'She knows who the children should give the books to.'
(based on Diesing 1990:72, (52))

b. Zi veys, vemen ot di bikher *zoln* di kinder gebn.
she knows who-DAT DEM the books shall the children give
'She knows who the children should give *these* books to.'

c. Zi veys, vemen es *zoln* di kinder gebn di bikher.
she knows who-DAT it shall the children give the books

In direct questions, on the other hand, only verb-second orders are acceptable.

(157) a. Ver *vet* frier kontshn?
who will earlier finish
'Who will finish earlier?'

b. * Ver es *vet* frier kontshn?
who it will earlier finish

c. * Ver frier *vet* kontshn?
who earlier will finish

(158) a. Vemen *zoln* di kinder gebn di bikher?
who-DAT shall the children give the books
'Who shall the children give the books to?'
(based on Diesing 1990:74, (52))

b. * Vemen ot di bikher *zoln* di kinder gebn?
who-DAT DEM the books shall the children give
'Who shall the children give *these* books to?'

c. * Vemen es *zoln* di kinder gebn di bikher?
who-DAT it shall the children give the books

the presence of the demonstrative particle *ot*.

Diesing concludes from this word order contrast that there is a structural asymmetry between direct and indirect questions; specifically, she argues that direct questions, in contrast to indirect questions, are IP's (see also Thráinsson 1986:174). Her proposal is given in (159) (order of traces within VP irrelevant).

(159) a. Direct questions:
$[_{IP}$ Wh-phrase$_i$ Vf$_j$ $[_{VP} \ldots$ t$_i$ $\ldots$ t$_j$ $\ldots$ $]]$

b. Indirect questions:
$[_{CP}$ Wh-phrase$_i$ C $[_{IP}$ Topic$_j$ Vf$_k$ $[_{VP} \ldots$ t$_i$ $\ldots$ t$_j$ $\ldots$ t$_k$ $\ldots$ $]]]$

According to this proposal, the ungrammatical (b,c) orders in (157) and (158) are ruled out because (159a) contains no phrase structure position for a topic. The ungrammaticality of the (a) examples in (155) and (156) follows straightforwardly as well if, as Diesing assumes, the null complementizer in indirect questions is not a proper governor (see also Déprez 1989:354, Rizzi 1990a:6); any trace in Spec(IP) will then violate the ECP (see Chapter 2.3.2.2 for further discussion).[2]

2.2.2 Direct questions as CPs

According to Diesing, the absence of a phrase structure position for a topic in (159a) also explains the unacceptability of topicalization in V2 questions.

(160) * Vos hot dem rov Max gegebn?
what has the rabbi-DAT given
'What did Max give the rabbi?'
(Diesing 1990:52, (18))

However, when *dem rov* receives contrastive stress (indicated by small caps), as in (161a), Diesing's example becomes acceptable (Braun 1992:5, (18)), just like its indirect question counterpart in (161b) (David Braun, personal communication).

(161) a. Vos hot ot DEM rov Max gegebn?
what has DEM the rabbi-DAT given
'What did Max give THIS RABBI?'

b. Ikh veys nit, vos ot DEM rov hot Max gegebn, ober YENEM hot
I know not what DEM the rabbi-DAT has Max given but that one has
er gegebn a bukh.
he given a book
'I don't know what Max gave THIS rabbi, but THAT one, he gave a book.'

[2]Diesing does not discuss the possibility of an empty expletive in Spec(IP); see Chapter 2.3.2.1 for discussion.

It is possible, of course, that (161a) is derived by scrambling (= adjunction to VP) rather than topicalization. But in the absence of evidence against a topicalization derivation, the acceptability of (161a) vitiates Diesing's analysis and is consistent with a structurally uniform analysis of direct and indirect questions as CP's, as in (162) (order of traces within VP irrelevant; (162b) = (159b)) (Braun 1992, Heycock and Santorini 1993).

(162) a. Direct questions:
$[_{CP}$ Wh-phrase$_i$ Vf$_j$ $[_{IP}$ Topic$_k$ t$_j$ $[_{VP}$ ... t$_i$ ... t$_j$ ... t$_k$ ...]]]

b. Indirect questions:
$[_{CP}$ Wh-phrase$_i$ C $[_{IP}$ Topic$_j$ Vf$_k$ $[_{VP}$ ... t$_i$ ... t$_j$ ... t$_k$ ...]]]

Under this uniform analysis of questions, the ungrammatical V3 questions in (157) and (158) are ruled out by the Wh-criterion of Rizzi 1991, according to which wh-phrases in Spec(CP) are required to stand in a local relation with the fronted verb in C. As in German, only certain clitic adverbs can intervene between the wh-phrase and the fronted verb (see Chapter 2.4.1.2.1).

A CP treatment of direct questions in Yiddish is clearly preferable to an IP treatment on comparative grounds (Heycock and Santorini 1993:272–273). As was mentioned in Section 1.4.2.4.1, the distribution of clitics provides evidence that the finite verb moves to C in questions in Old English, and the same evidence is available in medieval Romance (Adams 1987b, Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991, Fontana 1993). Further, the distribution of Icelandic topic *það* 'that', which is restricted to ungoverned positions, is consistent with verb movement to C in direct questions (Kosmeijer 1991).[3] Treating Yiddish direct questions as CP's therefore yields a uniform treatment of direct questions as CP's in all the symmetric V2 languages.

2.2.3 Embedded direct questions

Just as Yiddish allows asyndetic declarative clauses, so it allows embedded direct questions. As has been extensively argued in the literature, the predicates that subcategorize for embedded questions fall into two major classes: the *ask/wonder* class and the *know/tell* class (Baker 1968, Berman 1991, Ginzburg 1992, Groenendijk and Stokhof 1982, 1984, Munsat 1986, Plann 1982, Suñer 1991a, 1991b). Both types of predicates subcategorize for wh-complements, but their complements do not translate into the same semantic type: complements of *ask* and *wonder* translate into questions, whereas complements of *know* and *tell* translate into propositions. Accordingly, Suñer 1991a, 1991b distinguishes 'indirect questions' and 'semi-questions'.

[3]Kosmeijer's argument for Icelandic *það* extends straightforwardly to Yiddish topic *es*. On the other hand, evidence parallel to (161a) is not available for Icelandic, since object-subject orders are ruled out in that language (recall that Icelandic allows neither scrambling nor adjunction to IP).

In Spanish, there is a very clear distinction between the two complements types: the complements of *ask/wonder* can be embedded under *que* 'that', whereas *know/tell* verbs can never be (Suñer 1991a, 1991b). In other languages, including Irish English (Henry 1995, McCloskey 1992) and Yiddish, the facts concerning embedded direct questions are more complex. The *ask/wonder* class freely allows the Wh-Vf order characteristic of direct questions; (163) gives some examples in the complement of *fregn* 'ask' and *vundern zikh* 'wonder'.

(163) a. Freg ikh dem fish, tsi *hot* er nit gezen in vaser dem yidn?
ask I the fish whether has he not seen in water the man
'So I asked the fish whether he hadn't see the guy in the water?'
(Royte pomerantsen, 47)

b. Vet ir fregn, vos *volt* ikh gemakht mitn dritn milyon?
will you ask what would I done with the third million
'Will you ask what I'd do with the third million?'
(Royte pomerantsen, 105)

c. un s' iz im afile nit ayngefaln zikh tsu vundern vi *kumt* es vos di
and it is him even not in fallen REFL to wonder how comes it that the
himlishe shtime hot genutst dem englishn oysdruk 'ready-to-wear'.
heavenly voice has used the English expression
'and it never even occurred to him to wonder why the heavenly voice used the English expression 'ready-to-wear'.
(Bakh, 22)

As expected given the Spanish facts, the *know/tell* verbs do not in general allow embedded direct questions. However, under certain pragmatic conditions—for instance, when the matrix verb is negated or embedded under a modal or if the matrix clause is interrogative or imperative (McCloskey 1992:34)—their complements can be interpreted as true questions and then they allow Wh-Vf word order.[4] Examples of Wh-Vf semi-questions are given in (164).[5]

(164) Negated context:

a. Ikh farshtey nit, vos *iz* dos far a verter.
I understand not, what is that for a words
'I don't understand what kind of words those are.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 152)

[4]Even under such favorable circumstances, Spanish does not allows the *know/tell* verbs to embed direct questions under *que* 'that' (Suñer 1991a, Section 4).

[5]Clause-internal expletive *dos* 'that' (and sometimes *es* 'it') occurs relatively frequently in modern Yiddish. Whether it is related to the expletive *dos* in topic position described by Prince 1988a is an open question. I will simply gloss it as DOS.

b. Nisht klor: tsi *kon* men nisht zogn ...
not clear whether can one not say
'It is not clear whether one can't say ... ' (Zaretski, Mendele, 71)

(165) Modal context:

a. Itlikher kan dos lezin un zehin, ts[i] *iz* es dos rekht.
everyone can that read and see whether is it the right
'Everyone can read that and see is it the right thing.'
(Judah, 635)

b. Nor etlikhe berger, dafke nisht keyn glernte, nor proste erlikhe
but several citizens certainly not no scholars but simple honest
gishvorene leyt mit seykhl, zolin pskinn ts[i] *iz* der mensh
sworn people with common sense shall judge whether is the person
shuldig oder unshuldig.
guilty or innocent
'But a number of citizens, certainly not scholars, but simple honest people with common sense, who are under oath, shall judge whether the person is guilty or innocent.'

c. Dernokh fregt er im: "Fundestvegn volt ikh gevolt visn, vos *iz* dos
afterwards asks he him nevertheless would I wished know what is DOS
ba ayer tatn geven far a besere bilder?
with your father been for a better pictures
'Afterwards he asked him, 'Nevertheless, I'd like to know what kind of better pictures there were in your father's house?"' (Royte pomerantsen, 194)

d. Ikh volt aykh gevolt betn, ir zolt undz zogn, vos *hot* dos ayer
I would you wished ask you should us tell what has DOS your
tate azoyns geton?
father such done
'I'd like to ask you to tell us what your father eneded up doing.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 208)

e. Koydemkol darf men derklern, vos *iz* azoyns 'ort in zats'.
first of all must one explain what is such position in clause
'First of all, one must explain what 'position in clause' means.'
(Zaretski, Sholem, 1)

(166) Imperative context:

a. Ver gevor, vos *kost* di kokuruts?
find out what costs the corn
'Find out, what the corn costs.' (Royte pomerantsen, 128)

b. Ze, vos *iz* dortn mit di vegener?
see what is there with the teamsters

'Find out what's with the teamsters.' (Royte pomerantsen, 128)

c. Zog, vifl *darf* men Yanklen batsoln.
say how much must one pay
'Tell me how much money Yankl gets.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 217)

(167) Interrogative context:

a. Kent ir mir nit zogn, vu *voynt* do der prezident fun der
can you me not tel where lives there the president of the
kehile?
congregation
'Could you please tell me where the president of the congregation lives?'
(Royte pomerantsen, 174)

(168) Other context:

a. Di mume hot ongehoybn moyre tsu hobn, tsi *iz* der bokher
the aunt has begun fear to have whether is the young man
kholile nit ban zinen.
God forbid not by the senses
'His aunt began to be afraid that the young man—God forbid—might be out of his mind.
(Royte pomerantsen, 49)

b. Me hot gemakht an asife in shul, vemen *zol* me do shikn.
one has made an meeting in synagogue whom shall one there send
'A meeting was held in the synagogue [to discuss] who should be sent.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 220)

c. Zitsndik azoy in vinkl, hot er zikh gut tsugehert, vos *vet* do vern
sitting so in corner has he REFL well to heard what will there become
mit Itshken.
with
'Sitting in the corner like that, he listened hard to what would happen with Itshke.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 222)

d. un er vart, vos *vet* do der amorets Itshke ton.
and he waits what will there the ignoramus do
'and he waited for what Itshke, uneducated as he was, would do.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 222)

e. Derlernen dos ort fun perzonvort in yidishn zats heyst oysgefinen,
learn-INF the position of finite verb in Yiddish clause means out find
vosere gezetsn *giltn* do.
what kind of laws are valid there

'Learning the position of the finite verb in the Yiddish clause means finding out what kind of laws apply there.'
(Zaretski, Sholem, 12)

As in Belfast English (Henry 1995:107, (16)-(18)), embedded direct questions are possible in subject position, and also in topic position.

(169) a. Tsi iz rabbi Volf der feter fun unzer rabbi Khaym Alskhikh, a
whether is the cousin of our a
direkter tsi an umdirekter korbn fun dem aliles dam, iz unz nisht bekant.
direct or an indirect victim of the blood libel is us not known
'Whether Rabbi Volf is the cousin of our Rabbi Khayim Alskhikh, a direct or indirect victim of the blood libel, we do not know.' (Shatzky, Teshuat, 74)

b. Nor tsi iz der bafel oysgefolgt gevorn iz nit gevust.
but whether is the order out followed become is not known
'But whether the order was carried out is not known.'
(Weinreich, Kinesd, 69)

(170) a. Ver iz der iberzetser, dos veysn mir fun erstn shar-blat.
who is the translator that know we from first title page
'Who the translator is, we know from the first title page.'
(Shatzky, Teshuat, 26)

b. Mit vos hot zikh demolst der protses geendikt un tsi iz biklal
with what has REFL then the trial ended and whether is in general
gekumen tsu a protses, deriber shveygn di kveln.
come to a trial about that are silent the sources
'How the trial ended and whether there even was a trial, those are questions about which the sources are silent.'
(Shatzky, Teshuat, 52)

c. Ven kleybt oys der shreyber di erste meglikhkeyt un ven di tsveyte,
when picks out the writer the first possibility and when the second
dos iz mir nokh nit gants klar.
that is me-scdat still not entirely clear
'When the writer chooses the first possibility and when the second, that is still not entirely clear to me.'
(Zaretski, Sholem, 114)

The distribution of embedded direct questions in Yiddish is freer than in Spanish or in the Germanic languages according to the descriptions that I am familiar with, but is identical to their distribution in Belfast English. There is some reason to believe, however, that embedded direct questions are underreported in the literature on standard varieties. For instance, embedded direct questions are attested, albeit rarely, even in standard German

(contra McCloskey 1992:21, fn.12),[6] as well as in standard English in the complements of nonlexical categories.

(171) a. Ich weiß nicht, *ist* sie zu stolz, zu edel oder zu gleichgültig, um
I know not is she too proud too noble or too indifferent for
Anteilnahme zu zeigen?
concern to show
'I don't know whether she is too proud, too noble or too indifferent to show concern.'
(Ulvestad 1955:330, fn. 8))

b. Ich weiß nicht, was *soll* es bedeuten, daß ich so traurig bin.
I know not what shall it mean that I so sad am
'I don't know what it means that I am so sad.'
(Heinrich Heine, Lorelei)

(172) I want you to look deep into your souls and find some advice on what *should* President Clinton do for the next two years.
(Daniel Zwerdling, All things considered, November 13, 1994)

2.3 V1 clauses

This section discusses V1 word order in Yiddish; Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 cover root and subordinate contexts, respectively. In Section 2.3.1.1, I present the various discourse uses of V1 declarative clauses in Yiddish and argue that their root character cannot be reduced to their syntactic structure. Sections 2.3.1.2–2.3.1.5 then illustrate the typologically more common uses of V1 in yes/no questions, imperatives, conditionals and exclamations. In contrast to the productivity of V1 in root clauses in Yiddish, V1 in subordinate clauses is almost entirely ruled out. Section 2.3.2 discusses this near-absence of subordinate V1. There are two sorts of clause-initial empty categories to rule out: empty expletives and wh-movement traces. Section 2.3.2.1 proposes a licensing condition on empty expletives that bars them from occupying first position, and Section 2.3.2.2 relates the distribution of traces of wh-movement in first position to the ECP.

2.3.1 Root V1

2.3.1.1 Declaratives

Declarative V1 is very common in Yiddish; indeed, it is established to the point where Hall 1979:283 regards V1 as the basic word order of the language.

[6]Thanks to Anthony Kroch for drawing my attention to the relevance of (171b).

2.3.1.1.1 Narrative V1 V1 is characteristic of narratives and anecdotes; (173) gives two examples.

(173) a. A yid hot a mol gevolt koyfn a tsig. *Iz* er gegangen
a man has once wanted buy a nanny goat is he gone to
in shtot. Ober keyn tsig hot er nit gekent gefinen, *hot*
town but no nanny goat has he not been able find has he
er gekoyft a tsap.
bought a billy goat
'A man once wanted to buy a goat. So he went to town. But he couldn't find a nanny goat, so he bought a billy goat.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 55)

b. Fun der vaytns zenen ongekumen dem soynes makhnes. *Hot* men
from the afar are on come the enemy's multitudes has one
geheysn shisn. *Hot* der yidisher zelner oyfgehoybn dem biks un hot
ordered shoot has the Jewish soldier up lifted the gun and has
geshosn in himl arayn, eyn shos nokhn andern. *Hot* men im avekgefirt
shot into sky in one shot after the other has one him away led
un in a tsayt arum hot men im gebrakht farn voyennem sud.
and in a time around has one him brought before the military court
Fregt men, far vos er hot geshosn in himl arayn. *Fregt* er: "Vizhe hob ikh
asks one for what he has shot in sky in asks he how have I
gedarft shisn?" *Zogt* men im: "Vos heyst vi? Khamer du eyner! Host
needed shoot says on him what means how blockhead you one have
gedarft shisn punkt antkegn dayn ponim!" *Makht* er: "Vos heyst? Dortn
needed shoot exactly against your face makes he what means there
zenen dokh gegangen mentshn!"
are after all gone people
'From far away, the enemy's troops approached, and the order was given to fire. So the Jewish soldier picks up his gun and fires into the sky, one shot after the other. He's led away, and after a while, he's court-martialled. They ask him why he fired into the sky. So he asks, "How should I have fired?" So they say, "What do you mean, how? You blockhead! You should have fired straight ahead of you!" So he goes, "What do you mean? There were people walking there!"'
(Royte pomerantsen, 67)

2.3.1.1.2 Conclusive V1 (174) gives examples of V1 with conclusive force.

(174) a. Zey hobn beyde gehat gedint in soldatn, *hobn* zey gekent shisn.
they have both had served in soldiers have they been able shoot
'They had both served as soldiers, so they knew how to shoot.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 51)

b. Er iz krank, *ken* er aykh nisht shraybn.
he is sick can he you not write
'He is sick, so he can't write you.'
(Birnbaum 1979:303, (209c))

c. Farvos lozt zikh zogn i "Shvaygt alts" i "S' shvaygt alts"
why lets REFL say both is silent everything and it is silent everything
(mit farshidene niuansn)? *Heyst* es, az der termin 'fiktiver subyekt'
with different nuances means it that the term fictitious subject
derklert gornisht.
explains nothing
'Why can one say both "Shvaygt alts" and "S' shvaygt alts" (with different nuances of meaning)? What this means is that the term 'fictitious subject' explains nothing at all.'
(Zaretski 1929:235, §730)

d. Ober ikh hob shpeter gehat a gelegnheyt tsu hern, vi tate-mame
but I have later had an opportunity to hear how father-mother
redn yidish mit a mentsh vos zey kenen nisht. Mit im hobn zey
speak Yiddish with a person that they know not with him have they
dafke gezogt 'ir'. *Heyst* es, az mir hobn yo aza forem.
absolutely said you-PL means it that we have yes such a form
'But I later had the opportunity to hear my parents speaking Yiddish with someone they didn't know. With him, they used the polite form of *you*. So that means that we do have such a form.'
(Bokhner, 6)

2.3.1.1.3 Adversative V1 V1 word order can also express an adversative relation between the V1 clause and the previous discourse.

(175) a. Kh' volt tsum im gekumen, *voynt* er (ober) zeyer vayt.
I would to him come lives he but very far
'I would visit him, but he lives very far away.'
(Shekhter 1986:61)

b. Er volt khasene gehat, *hot* er (ober) moyre far tate-mame.
he would wedding had has he but fear before father-mother
'He would marry, but he is afraid of his parents.'
(Shekhter 1986:61)

c. Volt ikh geven a rov, *ken* ikh nit keyn toyre.
would I been a rabbi, can I not no Torah

'I would be a rabbi, but I don't know the Torah.'
(Mark 1946:11)

Ellen Prince (personal communication) observes that adversative V1 can be subsumed under conclusive V1 by assuming that the proposition expressed by the V1 clause is ironically taken to be the consequence of a social order (and perhaps more generally, a natural order of things) in which one's goals and desires are thwarted at every turn as a matter of course.

2.3.1.1.4 Neutral V1 Finally, V1 word order occasionally occurs in Yiddish "even when there is clearly no causal connection" between the V1 clause and the prior discourse (Birnbaum 1979:303–304).

(176) a. Es iz geven a yid, *hot* er geheysn Meyer Eliyohu Henikh.
it is been a man has he been named
'There was a man by the name of Meyer Elijah Henokh.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 127)

b. A: Ven nor dos aleyn volt geven, volt shoyn nisht oysgemakht. B:
if only that alone would been would already not mattered
Vorem vos kholile? A: *Shmekt* ir nisht dos esn.
why what God forbid tastes her not the food
'A: If it were only that, it wouldn't matter.
B: Why, what else is the matter, God forbid?
A: She's lost her appetite.'
(Grine felder, 63)

c. Dos zest du, Elkone, *redt* shoyn dayn yidene narishkaytn.
that see you talks already your Jew-FEM foolishnesses
'You see yourself, Elkone, your wife is already saying silly things.'
(Grine felder, 64)

2.3.1.1.5 Comparison with other V2 languages As is evident from the above examples, the use of V1 in Yiddish generally implies a close connection between the V1 clause and the discourse preceding it (Zaretski 1927:8, 1928:22–23, 1929:235, §728, Mark 1946:9, Hall 1979:274, Weinreich 1981:122–123). As a result, V1 clauses do not occur discourse-initially and are particularly common in narrative, though not restricted to it (Hall 1979:274,fn. 14). The cohesive discourse function of V1 in Yiddish is also familiar from other V2 languages. For instance, Sigurðsson 1990b:45 characterizes V1 in Icelandic as follows:

> "Declarative V1 orders in main clauses are in general prompted by strong discourse cohesion (or continuity [reference omitted—BES]). Accordingly, they cannot initiate the discourse and are most common in particularly cohesive texts, such as modern memoirs of various sorts, narrative letters and diaries, some argumentative texts, many folktales, and most of the Old Icelandic sagas."

In the V2 languages other than Yiddish, the discourse cohesion expressed by V1 is mostly restricted to narrative contexts, although conclusive and neutral uses of V1 are reported for at least some of them—Dutch (den Besten 1989:32), German (Behaghel 1932:30, §1445, Önnerfors 1993, who provides numerous references for German and other V2 languages), Icelandic (Sigurðsson 1985, 1990b, Thráinsson 1986), Kashmiri (Bhatt 1994, Section 4.3.1), Swedish (Dahlbaeck and Vamling 1983, Platzack 1987), Old English (Pintzuk 1991:137–150), Old French (Adams 1987b:157–160), Old Norse (Bernstein 1897 and references in Önnerfors 1993:11), and Old Spanish (Fontana 1993:100–111). (177) gives three examples of V1 from modern German.[7]

(177) a. Narrative V1:
Ich sitze gestern nachmittag harmlos bei Kranzler und trinke meinen
I sit yesterday afternoon harmlessly by Kranzler and drink my
Kaffee. *Kommt* ein grosser, schwerfaelliger Herr herein und ...
coffee comes a large lumbering gentleman in and
'I'm sitting at Kranzler's yesterday, minding my own business and having a cup of coffee, when in comes a large, lumbering gentleman and ...'
(Maurer 1926:209)

b. Conclusive V1:
Der Autor hat zu Anfang seiner Arbeit drei Thesen vorgestellt. Davon
the author has to beginning of his work three theses presented of these
ist die erste These oben bereits widerlegt worden. Die zweite dürfte im
is the first thesis above already refuted become the second may in the
Verlauf der Erörterung ebenfalls hinfällig geworden sein. *Bleibt* die
course of the discussion also invalidated become be remains the
dritte These.
third thesis.
'At the beginning of his paper, the author presents three theses. Of these, the first has already been refuted above, and the second has also become irrelevant in the course of the discussion. There remains the third thesis.'
(Önnerfors 1993:32, (72))

c. Neutral V1:
Soll ich in ein trauriges Kino gehen und in dreckiger Luft da
shall I in a sad movie theatre go and in filthy air there
sitzen und mir einen alten Film anschauen? Nee, ich lese Bücher. *Ist* man
sit and me an old movie on look naah I read books is one

[7]Thanks to Anthony Kroch for (177c), a passage from an interview with Marlene Dietrich.

nie einsam, wenn man liest.
never lonely when one reads
'Do I want to go to some sad movie theatre and sit there in the filthy air and watch some old movie? Naah, I read books. You're never lonely when you read.'

The adversative use of V1, however, appears to be unique to Yiddish, presumably because of the special cultural presuppositions alluded to above.

2.3.1.1.6 Grammatical analysis Declarative V1 in Yiddish is a root phenomenon, and the question arises whether its root character should be attributed to its syntactic structure or its discourse function. Let us first consider the syntactic tack. In Old English, Old French and Old Spanish, the distribution of clitics provides clear evidence that the finite verb in declarative V1 clauses moves to C, just as it does in yes/no questions and imperatives (Pintzuk 1991:137–150, Adams 1987b:157–160, Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991, Section 2.2, Fontana 1993:133ff.). It is therefore tempting to relate the root character of V1 word order to the position of the finite verb in C. However, I know of no evidence in Yiddish that bears on the structural position of the verb in declarative V1 clauses of the sort that is available from the distribution of clitics in the medieval languages just mentioned. Moreover, even in languages in which there is clear evidence that the verb moves to C in declarative V1 clauses, V1 word order would still be available in principle in subordinate contexts, since universal grammar allows embedded root clauses, as we saw in Chapter 1 (see also Thráinsson 1986:180–181). I conclude from this that a purely syntactic approach to the root character of declarative V1 is not possible.

Beyond this, however, the proper analysis of declarative V1 clauses is difficult to establish. It has often been suggested that V1 word order can be treated as a special case of V2 by postulating an empty adverb in the topic position of V1 clauses, equivalent syntactically to the empty Q morpheme postulated in yes/no questions (Katz and Postal 1964, Baker 1970) and corresponding functionally to English *so* (Bernstein 1897:31, Hall 1979:281, (66), Dahlbaeck and Vamling 1983:8, Diesing 1990:56, fn. 14, Roberts 1993:56–57, Lemieux and Dupuis 1994:97). If this empty element is restricted to the initial position of matrix clauses, just like its overt English counterpart, then the absence in subordinate clauses of the uses of declarative V1 described above for Yiddish follows from whatever general discourse principle is responsible for the contrast in (178).

(178) a. She needed the money, *so* she took the job.
b. * She wrote me (that) *so* she took the job.

Önnerfors 1993 argues against such an assimilation of declarative V1 sequences to V2 structure and proposes instead that V1 clauses lack a topic position entirely (see also Sigurðsson 1985, Section 4, Thráinsson 1986:173). In consequence, V1 clauses would not be

associated with a topic-comment structure at the level of information structure and would therefore be interpreted as pure comments. Oennerfors does not explicitly address the absence of V1 declaratives in subordinate contexts, and it is not clear how it is accounted for in his proposal. He follows Brandt et al. 1992, Section 3.2.4, in considering examples like (179) as strong evidence against the empty adverb analysis.

(179) a. Kam da plötzlich ein Mann zur Tür herein.
came there suddenly a man to the door in
'Suddenly, a man came in the door.'
(Önnerfors 1993:15, (26))
b. ?? Da kam da plötzlich ein Mann zur Tür herein.
there came there suddenly a man to the door in
(Önnerfors 1993:15, (27))

However, replacing *da* (literally 'there') by *dann* 'then' restores (179b) to full acceptability.

(180) (Und) dann kam da plötzlich ein Mann zur Tür herein.
and then came there suddenly a man to the door in
'(And) then suddenly, a man came in the door.'

Moreover, the empty operator analysis might be revised so that the topic position is occupied not by an empty discourse adverb, but by a more abstract entity—say, the clause's event variable. The choice between the empty adverb analysis and the radically topicless analysis of declarative V1 is clearly subtle and requires more research, and I will not attempt to resolve the issue here.

2.3.1.2 Questions

2.3.1.2.1 V1 yes/no questions As in the other V2 languages, yes/no questions in Yiddish exhibit V1 word order.

(181) a. *Hot* ir do ayer Steren gezen?
have you there your seen
'Did you see your Stere there?'
(Grine felder, 64)
b. *Hot* es efsher Avrom-Yankev gezen?
has it maybe seen
'Did Avrom-Yankev perhaps see it?'
(Grine felder, 67)
c. *Vest* du haynt araynkumen tsu undz?
will you today in come to us

'Will you come by our house today?'
(Grine felder, 72)

d. *Zaynen* nokh yidn faranen in der gegnt?
are still Jews there in the area
'Are there other Jews in the area?'
(Grine felder, 75)

2.3.1.2.2 V2 yes/no questions Yes/no questions can also be introduced by *tsi* 'whether' (< Polish *czy* 'whether'), in which case they exhibit V2 word order, just like wh-questions. The existence of V2 yes/no questions provides support for the idea that yes/no questions are introduced by an abstract Q morpheme (Katz and Postal 1964, Baker 1970), as well as for a treatment of *whether* and its translation counterparts as wh-words rather than complementizers (Bolinger 1978, Larson 1985).

(182) Tsi *veyst* ir gor, vos far a goldn kind dos iz?
whether know you PART what for a golden child that is
'Do you know what a golden child that is?'
(Grine felder, 64)

2.3.1.2.3 Declarative word order in yes/no questions It is worth noting that declarative clauses with question intonation are very commonly used in Yiddish to elicit information, express surprise, etc. (Zaretski 1929:236, §731, Birnbaum 1979:304, (210a), Diesing 1990:55).[8]

(183) a. Zi *meynt* Hersh-Bern?
she means
'Does she mean Hersh-Ber?'
(Grine felder, 65)

b. Efsher *iz* es gor nisht keyn oreman?
maybe is it not at all no poor man
'Maybe it's not a poor man at all.'
(Grine felder, 71)

c. Dayn tate *vet* nokh haynt do zayn?
your father will still today there be
'Will your father still be there today?'
(Grine felder, 72)

[8]For Zaretski, V2 yes/no questions of the sort illustrated below are the unmarked order, and V1 questions have a special nuance of cohesion with the previous discourse that their V2 counterparts lack (1929:236, §731).

d. Shoyn lang *bist* du aza khakhome?
still long are you such a wise woman
'Have you been this wise for a long time?'
(Grine felder, 73)

e. Ir *vilt* zen dem gortn mit kartofl, vos mir hobn haynt farzetst?
you want see the garden with potatoes that we have today planted
'Do you want to see the garden with potatoes that we planted today?'
(Grine felder, 76)

2.3.1.3 Imperatives

Imperatives in Yiddish are regularly V1, but V2 word order is possible as well, as in the other V2 languages.

(184) a. *Loz* ir dort kontshn.
let her there finish
'Let her finish there.'
(Grine felder, 66)

b. *Kum* nor aher, mayn kind.
come only here my child
'Come here, my child.
(Grine felder, 66)

c. *Nem* dir a shtikl broyt mit puter.
take you a piece bread with butter
'Get yourself a piece of bread with butter.'
(Grine felder, 66)

d. *Zog* es nisht dem tatn.
say it not the father
'Don't tell Father.'
(Grine felder, 67)

e. *Zol* mikh Got nisht shtrofn far di reyd!
shall me God not punish for the speech
'May God not punish me for what I said.'
(Grine felder, 64)

(185) a. Ot *tshepe* zi nisht.
here bother her not
'Don't bother her.'
(Grine felder, 66)

b. Du *gey* shoyn aheym!
you go already home

'Go home already.'
(Mark 1946:10, (11b))

c. Shoyn *gey* aheym!
already go home
(Mark 1946:10, (11c))

2.3.1.4 Conditionals

2.3.1.4.1 V1 conditionals Like most other V2 languages, Yiddish allows V1 in the protasis of conditionals (Zaretski 1929:255, §790).[9] V1 is particularly common with the future and irrealis auxiliaries *veln* and *volt(n)*, but productive with main verbs as well, as in German. As in the other V2 languages, V1 protases generally precede their apodosis.

(186) a. *Vel* ikh im zen, vel ikh im zogn.
will I him see will I him say
'If I see him, I'll tell him.'
(Mark 1946:10, 6b)

b. *Vest* nokh lenger blaybn, vestu nokh mer narishkaytn redn.
will still longer stay will you still more foolishnesses speak
'If you stay any longer, you'll say even more foolish things.'
(Grine felder, 65)

c. *Gefelt* aykh mayn shlofbank, vel ikh aykh optretn.
pleases you my sleeping bench will I you cede
'If you like my cot, I'll let you have it.'
(Grine felder, 81)

d. *Git* ir mir ayer gelt, iz gut.
give you me your money, is good
'If you give me your money, everything is in order.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 147)

e. *Iz* ober der subyekt in bayzats nit farfelt, azoy kumt der
is but the subject in subordinate clause not missing so comes the
perzonvort nit afn erstn ort.
verb not on the first place
'But if the subject of the subordinate clause is not empty, then the verb doesn't occupy first position.'
(Zaretski, Sholem, 150)

[9] V1 conditionals are impossible in modern Kashmiri (Rakesh Bhatt, personal communication), though attested in older forms of the language, for instance in *Hatim's tales* (Rajesh Bhatt, personal communication).

2.3.1.4.2 *Tomer* conditionals In addition to V1 word order in conditionals, Yiddish also allows apparent V2 conditionals with the particle *tomer* 'in case' (Zaretski 1929:253, §782, 254, §788).

(187) a. Un 'kh vel zey mit der baytsh mekhaved zayn, tomer *folgn* zey nisht.
and I will them with the whip treat be in case follow they not
'And I'll treat them to the whip, if they don't obey.'
(Grine felder, 82)

b. Zog ir, zi zol nisht folgn ir tatn, tomer *misht* er zikh arayn.
tell her she shall not follow her father in case mixes he REFL in
'Tell her not to obey her father if he interferes.'
(Grine felder, 89)

c. Men hot kharote, tomer *tut* men a krume zakh.
one has regrets in case does one a crooked thing
'One ends up having regrets if one does something crooked.'
(Grine felder, 102)

d. Un tomer *volt* er zey yu gehat, volt er oykh nit geven imstand,
and in case would he them yes had, would he also not been able
epes bleybndiks arayntsubrengen in der yidisher poezie.
something lasting in to bring in the Yiddish poetry
'And even if he had had them, he would not have been in a position to make a lasting contribution to Yiddish poetry.'
(Weinreich, Messiah, 72)

At first glance, it appears that *tomer* is the overt counterpart of an otherwise empty conditional operator, occupying Spec(CP) (there is no evidence internal to Yiddish bearing on whether the verb is in I or in C, but I assume on crosslinguistic grounds that it occupies C). But such an analysis does not extend to examples like (188).

(188) Tomer a mol iz es take a gut gesheft?
in case once is it really a good business
'What if it turns out to be a really good deal?'
(Royte pomerantsen, 75)

I therefore propose for *tomer* a syntax analogous to that of English *then*, which is associated with a head that subcategorizes (or perhaps itself subcategorizes) for extended projections of V (IP's and CP's) (Iatridou and Kroch 1992:11, Iatridou 1994:186–191).

(189) a. If it rains, then [$_{IP}$ we won't go]

b. If it rains, then [$_{CP}$ can we go to the museum?]

c. If it rains, then [$_{CP}$ what do we do?]

Under this analysis, *tomer* conditionals are V1 structures parallel to those in Section 2.3.1.4.1 (see also Zaretski 1929:253, §782). Both types of conditionals presumably contain an empty operator in Spec(CP). The structures of the *tomer* clauses above are as in (190).

(190) a. Nonroot use:
[$_{CP}$ tomer [$_{CP}$ Op Vf ...]]
b. Root use:
[$_{IP}$ tomer [$_{IP}$ Topic Vf ...]]

2.3.1.4.3 Declarative word order in conditionals Finally, Yiddish allows declarative V2 word order in the protasis of conditionals.

(191) a. Zi *zol* visn, vos es tut zikh bay ir shvester, volt zi zikh
she shall know what it does REFL with her sister would she REFL
derkvikt.
delighted
'If she knew what is happening at her sister's, she would be delighted.'
(Birnbaum 1979:306)

b. Zayn vort *volt* zayn a brik, volt ikh moyre gehot aribertsugeyn .
his word would be a bridge would I fear had over to go
'If his word were a bridge, I'd be scared to cross it.'
(Mark, 11)

c. A kats *volt* gehat fligl, volt zi ale feyglelekh oysgevorgn.
a cat would had wings would she all birds out throttled
'If a cat had wings, it would throttle all the birds.'
(Zaretski 1929:251, 773)

This use of declarative word order is reminiscent of English examples like the following.

(192) Imperative:

a. (You) show up here one more time, and you're history.
b. (You) eat your spinach, or there's no story tonight.

(193) Indicative:
You want to mess with one of our Explorers, you are messing with the biggest gang in the city of Chicago.
(Streetwise, vol. 3, no. 24, p. 10)

However, the Yiddish examples lack entirely the sense of threat conveyed by the English examples, a difference perhaps related to the use of irrealis mood in Yiddish.

2.3.1.5 Exclamations

According to Mark 1946:10, V1 word order is common in exclamations.[10]

(194) Oy, *ligt* men in drerd!
lies one in the earth
'Boy, are we in trouble!'
(Zaretski 1929:241, §743)

On the other hand, V2 exclamations with clause-initial wh-phrases are ruled out (Zaretski 1929:236, §733.3, Marvin Herzog and Adah Lappin, personal communication). Instead, as in English, they exhibit the word order of indirect questions (see Section 2.4.1.3).[11]

(195) a. * Sara kluge *iz* zi!
what for clever-FEM is she
'What a clever one she is!'
(Zaretski 1929:236, §733.3)

b. * Vi *hot* zi zikh getsaplt in zeyne orims!
how has she squirmed REFL in his arms
'How she squirmed in his arms!'
(Zaretski 1929:236, §733.3)

The use of declarative V2 clauses as exclamations is possible, however.

(196) a. Ir *shpilt* zikh mit Berlen!
you play REFL with

[10]Mark, following Zaretski 1929:241, §743, treats (194) as an instance of V2, with *oy* in first position. I find this analysis unconvincing in the extreme given that *oy* is an interjection. Mark gives no examples of what he himself considers V1 exclamations.

[11]The constraint against wh-Vf exclamations in Yiddish appears to be of recent origin, since such exclamations are still attested from the early 1800's. Admittedly, the use of periphrastic *ton* 'do' in (i.a) is archaizing, and the V2 exclamations may be built on a German model.

(i) a. Vi fil ihudim kindr *hot* men dem zumer gitan avek leygin!
how many Jewish children has one the summer done away lay
'How many Jewish children were buried that summer!'
(Elmale 2, 51)

b. Vi *hobin* zey aykh far shpreyt in ali vegin!
how have they you dispersed in all ways
'How they have dispersed you in all directions!'
(Elmale 2, 53)

It is worth mentioning that the acceptability of root vs. subordinate word order in German exclamations is itself quite complex and a topic for further research. For instance, the German equivalents of (195) strongly prefer subordinate clause word order, but the equivalents of (i) are also acceptable with V2 order.

'You play with Berl!'
(Mark 1946:4, (3b))

b. Mit Berlen *shpilt* ir zikh!
with play you REFL
(Mark 1946:5)

2.3.2 Subordinate V1

I turn now to V1 subordinate clauses, which are generally ruled out in Yiddish, apart from two systematic exceptions to be discussed below. Two types of empty categories must be barred from first position: empty expletives and wh-traces. These are discussed in turn in Sections 2.3.2.1 and 2.3.2.2.

2.3.2.1 Empty expletives

In Yiddish, impersonal constructions are completely unacceptable if the finite verb occupies first position, although they are otherwise possible.

(197) a. * Er hot gefregt, tsi iz varem in shtub.
he has asked whether is warm in room
'He asked whether it was warm in the room.'
(Santorini 1994a:92, (12))

b. Er hot gefregt, tsi in shtub iz varem.
he has asked whether in room is warm
(Santorini 1994a:92, (13))

c. Er hot gefregt, tsi es iz varem in shtub.
he has asked whether it is warm in room

I propose the following explanation for the contrast in (197). In impersonal constructions, the subject is an empty expletive, and the structure of the subordinate clauses in (197) is as in (198).

(198) a. * $[_{CP}$ tsi $[_{IP}$ *e* iz $[_{VP}$ varem in shtub]]]

b. $[_{CP}$ tsi $[_{IP}$ in shtub iz $[_{VP}$ *e* varem]]]

c. $[_{CP}$ tsi $[_{IP}$ es iz $[_{VP}$ *e* varem in shtub]]]

Empty expletives are subject to the locality condition in (199) (Santorini 1992:604, (12), 1994a:93, (15), 1994b:65, (16)), following Safir 1985:206, Rizzi 1986:524, Platzack and Holmberg 1990:21).[12]

(199) Formal licensing condition on empty expletives:
Empty expletives must be governed by a case-assigner.

Recall from Chapter 1.3.2.1.1 that nominative case is assigned under government by a language's dominant functional head (I in Yiddish). Since government is defined in terms of c-command (rather than *m*-command), Spec(IP) is outside the government domain of I, and the empty expletive in (197a) fails to be licensed. Empty expletives in Spec(VP), on the other hand, are governed by I, and V2 impersonal constructions as in (197b,c) are therefore well-formed.

An explanation along the same lines can be given for contrasts that arise in connection with postposed subjects.

(200) a. * Ikh hob nit gevust, az geyn keyn Grinland azoy fil shifn.
I have not known that go to Greenland so many ships
'I didn't know that so many ships went to Greenland.'
(Santorini 1994a:94, (19a))

b. Ikh hob nit gevust, az haynt geyn keyn Grinland azoy fil shifn.
I have not known that today go to Greenland so many ships
'I didn't know that so many ships went to Greenland today.'
(Santorini 1994a:94, (19b))

c. Ikh hob nit gevust, az es geyn keyn Grinland azoy fil shifn.
I have not known that it go to Greenland so many ships

The structures of the subordinate clauses are as in (201): in the V1 clause, an empty expletive occupies Spec(IP), whereas the V2 variants contain no empty expletive, since nominative case is assigned to the postposed subject via chain-government (see Chapter 1.3.2.1.3).

(201) a. * $[_{CP}$ az $[_{IP}$ *e* geyn $[_{VP}$ keyn Grinland azoy fil shifn]]]

b. $[_{CP}$ az $[_{IP}$ haynt geyn $[_{VP}$ keyn Grinland azoy fil shifn]]]

c. $[_{CP}$ az $[_{IP}$ es geyn $[_{VP}$ keyn Grinland azoy fil shifn]]]

As in (198a), the clause-initial empty expletive in (201a) violates the licensing condition in (199).

2.3.2.2 Wh-traces

In the ungrammatical subordinate clauses in (202), first position might be filled by an empty expletive, in which case the clauses are correctly ruled out by the licensing condition in (199).

[12] In addition to the formal licensing condition in (199), empty expletives must also satisfy an additional identification requirement (see Rizzi 1986:520, (41)), which is of no concern here.

(202) a. * di oytsres, vos __ halt in zikh bahaltn der alter zokn Ural
the treasures that continues in REFL hold the old old man Ural
'the treasures that old man Ural continues to hold within him'
(Zaretski 1929:253, §784)

b. * Di kulturarbet, vos __ firt di yidkultkomisie, iz nisht umzist.
the culture work that leads the Jewish culture committee is not in vain

'The cultural activity of the Jewish cultural committee is not in vain.'
(Zaretski 1929:254, §784)

Alternatively, however, first position might be occupied by a trace of wh-movement, as in (203).

(203) a. * di oytsres, $[_{CP}$ t_i vos $[_{IP}$ t_i halt in zikh bahaltn t_i der alter zokn Ural]]
b. * di kulturarbet, $[_{CP}$ t_i vos $[_{IP}$ t_i $firt_j$ di yidkultkomisie t_j t_i]]

Assuming that complementizers are not proper head-governors (Déprez 1989:354, Diesing 1990:70, Rizzi 1990a:6), the italicized intermediate traces violate the ECP (here formulated as in Cinque 1990:45, (118)), and the clauses are correctly ruled out.

(204) Empty Category Principle (ECP):
A nonpronominal EC must be properly head-governed.

Although complementizers are not proper head-governors, verbs that move to C in connection with long-distance extraction from asyndetic embedded clauses are, and they can license traces in Spec(IP), as shown in (205b) (Diesing 1990, Section 5.2, see also Cinque 1990:42, (113)).

(205) a. * Ver_i hot er moyre $[_{CP}$ t_i az $[_{IP}$ t_i vet kumen ?]]
who has he fear that will come
'Who is he afraid will come?' (Diesing 1990:75, (53a))

b. Ver_i hot er moyre $[_{CP}$ t_i vet_j $[_{IP}$ t_i t_j kumen?]]
who has he fear will come
(Diesing 1990:75, (53b))

Finally, subject traces in first position are possible, and indeed the most common word order, in subject relative clauses (Zaretski 1929:253, §783, 254, §787).

(206) a. A yid a soykher, vos __ hot gefirt groyse gesheftn, hot amol gedarft
a Jew a merchant that has led great businesses has one needed
hobn toyznt rubl.
have thousand rubles

'A rich Jewish merchant who was in big business once needed a thousand rubles.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 126)

b. Ba eynem a tvuehendler hot gearbet a yungerman, vos __ hot
with one a grain merchant has worked a young man that has
geheysn Moyshele.
been named
'With a certain grain merchant there worked a young man by the name of Moyshele.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 128)

Such traces are licensed by whatever exceptional mechanism licenses them in English and other languages (Déprez 1989, Chapter 4.4.1.1, Rizzi 1990a, Chapter 2.5 and the references cited there).

2.4 V3 clauses

This section discusses V3 word orders in root and subordinate contexts in Yiddish. It should be stressed at the outset that the incidence of V3 orders is not at all proportional to the length of the discussion here; apart from instances involving left dislocation, V3 clauses are attested only a handful of times in the corpus.

2.4.1 Root V3

2.4.1.1 Declaratives

2.4.1.1.1 Left dislocation with anaphoric topic Like many V2 languages, Yiddish allows phrases (including clauses) to adjoin to a V2 clause if the topic is anaphorically related to the adjoined phrase.

(207) [Azoy vi ir farshteyt, vos tshuve ken helfn an oreman,]$_i$ azoy$_i$ *hot* er
so as you understand that penitence can help a poor man so has he
farshtanen.
understood
'In the same way that you understand that penitence can help a poor man, so he understood it.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 113)

The *vos mer ... alts* + comparative construction, the Yiddish counterpart of the English *the more ... the merrier* construction, may be regarded as a special case of this type of left dislocation (Zaretski 1929:250, §770, 254, §785).

(208) a. [Vos mer zayf s' vert farbroykht,]$_i$ [alts hekher]$_i$ *iz* der
what more soap it becomes used the higher
kultureler matsev.
is the cultural state
'The more soap is used, the higher is the state of cultural development.'
(Zaretski 1929:254, §785)

b. [Vos mer men lebt oyf der velt,]$_i$ [alts viniker]$_i$ *veys* men.
what more ones lives on the world the less knows one
'The longer one lives, the less one knows.'
(Mark, 463)

c. Un [vos mer mentshn es shvitsn ba mir,]$_i$ [alts beser un
and what more people it sweat with me the better and
voyler]$_i$ *iz* mir.
more comfortable is me-DAT
'And the more people sweat in my establishment, the better and more comfortable I feel.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 131)

2.4.1.1.2 Left dislocation without anaphoric topic Yiddish also allows left dislocation in the absence of an anaphoric relation between the left-dislocated adjunct and the topic, for instance with certain adverbs that serve as discourse connectives (Birnbaum 1979:302, (208b), Zaretski 1929:236, §733.3); they correspond to the conjuncts and disjuncts of Quirk et al. 1985, Chapter 8.

(209) a. *Agev,* ven der subyekt iz a perzonlekhe pronom, *ken* yemolt biklal
incidentally if the subject is a personal pronoun can then generally
nit gemolt zeyn keyn fiktiver subyekt *es.*
not imagined be no fictitious subject it
'Incidentally, if the subject is a personal pronoun, then topic *es* generally cannot be imagined.'
(Mark, 183)

b. *Aderabe,* konyunktivn *subordinirn* a bayzats dos rov tsu
by contrast conjunctives subordinate a subordinate clause the majority to
a substantiv.
a noun
'By contrast, conjunctives generally subordinate a subordinate clause to a noun.'
(Zaretski 1929:249, §769, s.v. *kedey*)

c. *A kitser,* es *hot* nit gedoyert keyn sho.
a summary it has not lasted no hour

'In short, it didn't last an hour.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 248)

d. *A shteyger,* tsu di verter fun der hagdome ... *git* er tsu a heore.
a kind to the words of the introduction gives he to a footnote
'For instance, to the words of the introduction ... he adds a footnote.'
(Weinreich, Messiah, 221)

e. *Dervayle,* er *zitst* zikh azoy.
meanwhile he sits REFL so
'Meanwhile, he is sitting there.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 215)

f. *Epes* ikh *hob* gehert nisim v'nifloes fun der groyser velt.
something I have heard miracle upon miracle of the great world
'Somehow, I have heard miracle upon miracle of the world abroad.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 237)

g. *Ersht,* es *geyt* tsun im tsu nokh eyner.
first it goes to him to still one
'At first, another one approaches him.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 102)

h. *Geveyntlekh,* az zey zenen gekumen in ovnt in zeyer tsimer, *hobn*
of course when they are come in evening in their room have
zey zikh dokh gedarft oyston.
they REFL after all needed out do
'Of course, when they returned to their room in the evening, they had to take off their clothes.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 38)

i. *Iberikens,* der eynshlisiker verter-seyder *iz* oftmol an individueler shtrikh
incidentally the inclusive word order is often an individual property
bay a gevisn reder oder shreyber, umophengik fun 'feyerlekhkeyt' fun
with a certain speaker or writer independent of ceremoniousness of
der reyd.
the speech
'Incidentally, verb-final word order is often characteristic of an individual speaker or writer, independent of the level of formality.'
(Zaretski 1929:243, §753)

j. *Iz* der yid *hot* gehat a zun.
so the Jew has had a son
'So, the man had a son.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 168)

k. *Kurts,* me *hot* geshikt zogn dem porets.
short one has sent tell the estate owner

'In short, someone was sent to tell the estate owner.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 220)

l. *Mamesh,* di shkhine *rut* oyf im.
truly the divine presence rests on him
'Truly, the divine presence rests on him.'
(Grine felder, 74)

m. *Nisht nor* er *lernt* nisht, *nor* er *tut* biklal gornisht.
not only he learns not but he does in general nothing
'Not only doesn't he learn, but he does nothing in general.'
(Zaretski 1929:237, §733.6)

n. Un *take* derfar *bin* ikh antlofn.
and really therefore am I run away
'And really, that's why I ran away.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 93)

Although distinct from the discourse connectives semantically, the adverb *rak* 'continually' patterns with them syntactically.

(210) a. *Rak* ir *vilt* nisht.
continually you want not
'You insist on refusing.'
(Birnbaum 1979:302, 208b)

b. *Rak* er *shlogt* zikh!
continually he hits REFL
'He is always getting into fights!'
(Mark, 409)

It is also possible for phrasal and clausal functional equivalents of the discourse connectives to adjoin to V2 clauses in the absence of an anaphoric relation between them and the topic of the V2 clause.

(211) a. Oyf morgn, me *kumt* zikh tsuzamen ban porets in hoyf.
on morning one comes REFL together by the estate owner in courtyard
'The next morning, everyone gathers in the courtyard of the estate.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 220)

b. Vi ikh bin a yid, ikh *veys* fun gornisht.
as I am a Jew I know of nothing
'As I am a Jew, I know of nothing.'
(Zaretski 1929:248, §768, s.v. *vi*)

c. Ven mentshn zenen do zeltn, es *roysht* nisht, es kokht nisht vi in di
if people are there seldom it roars not, it boils not like in the
shtet.
cities
'If there aren't many people there, it doesn't roar or boil like in the cities.'
(Zaretski 1929:248, §768, s.v. *ven*)

In left-dislocation structures without an anaphoric topic, the topic is sometimes thought to be constrained to be the subject (van te Velde 1993:7), but such a constraint cannot be maintained.

(212) a. Pamelekh vi ir geyt arop, *aroyf* zolt ir geyn!
carefully as you go down up shall you go
'Climb up as carefully as you go down.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 118)

b. Oyb du bist shoyn yo aza guter kirzhner, *efsher* vest du kenen
if you are already yes such a good furrier perhaps will you be able
makhn fun dem shtik di gantse fir hitelekh?
make of the piece the whole four hats-DIM
'If you really are such a good furrier, perhaps you can make four little hats out of the piece of fur?'
(Royte pomerantsen, 132)

The rarity of nonsubject topics in such structures is simply what is expected given the rarity of this type of left dislocation combined with the relative infrequency of nonsubject topics (Adams 1987b:193).

Left dislocation without an anaphoric topic is familiar from other V2 languages, even very strict ones like modern German (Adams 1987b:107, 191–195, Behaghel 1932:15–16, §1434, den Besten 1989:16–17, fn. 3, 33, Bhatt 1994:111, Ebert et al. 1993:434, §S 244.1, Fontana 1993:111, 114–115, Iatridou 1994:186–191, Kroch and Taylor 1995:11, fn. 9, Pintzuk 1991:102–106, Vance 1989:155–158).

(213) { Auf jeden Fall, kurzum, nichtsdestotrotz, trotzdem, übrigens: } wir
in any event in short nevertheless nevertheless incidentally we
müssen weiter. (German)
must further
'{In any event, in short, nevertheless, incidentally,} we must move on.'

(214) a. n
{ Wenn, weil } du's wirklich wissen willst: zwei und zwei *sind* vier.
if since you it really know want two and two are four
'{If, since} you really want to know: two and two is four.'

b. !{ Wenn, weil } du's wirklich wissen willst *sind* zwei und zwei vier.
if since you it really know want are two and two four

As is evident from (209j), the discourse connective *iz* 'so'—not to be confused with the third person singular present tense form of the verb 'to be'—can adjoin to V2 clauses. In addition, *iz* functions as a sort of reset button in the grammar of Yiddish, setting the number of constituents preceding the finite verb to zero, especially after parentheticals. The clause following *iz* can then be either V2 or V1.[13]

(215) a. Ban undz *iz* oyf khasenes shenkt yeder fun di gest droshe-geshank
by us so on weddings gives each of the guests sermon presents
farn por-folg.
for the couple
'With us, at weddings, each of the guests gives the young couple sermon presents (= presents given in place of a sermon to be delivered by the groom on the wedding day).'
(Royte pomerantsen, 26)

b. Vi er iz gekumen noent tsum shtetl, *iz* es geyt dos tsu tsun im eyner fun
as he is come close to the town so it goes DOS to to him one of
yene leytsim.
those jokers
'As he approaches the town, one of those practical jokers comes up to him.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 102)

(216) a. Un ver es vet zen dem shenstn kholem, *iz* vet er nemen dem
and who it will see the most beautiful dream so will he take the
beygl.
bagel
'And whoever has the most beautiful dream gets to keep the bagel.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 40)

b. Inmitn forn — iz der yid dokh a yid — *iz* treft dokh amol
during the driving is the man after all a man so occurs after all once
vi ba ale mentshn.
as with all people
'As they are driving—the man is a man, after all—he happens to experience a universal human urge.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 215)

When adverbial *iz* follows left-dislocated constituents as in the above examples, it is reminiscent of Swedish *så* 'so' (Holmberg 1986:114–118). Unlike its Swedish counterpart, however, it is not restricted to clauses with left-dislocated discourse connective expressions; in this respect, *iz* patterns with Finland-Swedish *så*, which can follow all sorts of constituents, including dislocated arguments. In addition, *iz*, unlike either variant of *så*, occupies a position outside the domain of V2, not the topic position of a V2 clause. The German counterparts of Yiddish *iz*, *so* 'so' and *dann* 'then', are restricted to clauses with left-dislocated adverbials, like Swedish *så*. Presumably, the less restricted distributions of *iz* and Finland-Swedish *så* are both related to interference effects arising from imperfect second-language acquisition; see Chapter ?? for more discussion. The dislocated position of *iz* is perhaps due to the prevalence of V1 in Yiddish.

A final type of left dislocation in Yiddish is illustrated in (217).

(217) a. A yid, az me dertseylt im a mayse, *makht* er: ...
a Jew when one tells him a story makes he
'A Jew, if you tell him a story, he goes: ...'
(Royte pomerantsen, 1)

b. Un a foni, az me heyst im, *tut* er.
and a Russian soldier when ones orders him does he
'And a Russian soldier, if you give him an order, he carries it out.'
(Royte Pomerantsen, 62)

Such examples are comparable to vernacular German examples like (218) (see also Ebert et al. 1993:433, §S 243).

(218) a. Die Franca, daß du die kennst, *glaub'* ich nicht.
the that you her know believe I not
'Franca, I don't believe that you know her.'
(Santorini 1989:191, (26a), based on Fanselow 1987:64, (69))

b. Die Franca, daß die geheiratet hat, *ist* nicht wahrscheinlich.
the that she married has is not likely
'Franca, it isn't likely that she has married.'
(Santorini 1989:191, (26b), based on Fanselow 1987:64, (70))

For the Bavarian counterparts of (218), which have traces corresponding to the standard German demonstrative pronouns *die*, Fanselow 1987:64–165 proposes the structure in (219), according to which *die Franca* moves to Spec(CP) of the subordinate clause.[14]

(219) a. $[_{CP}\ [_{CP}\ [$ die Franca $]_i$ daß du t_i kennst $]$ glaub' ich nicht $]$

b. $[_{CP}\ [_{CP}\ [$ die Franca $]_i$ daß t_i geheiratet hat $]$ ist nicht wahrscheinlich $]$

[13] *Iz* is characteristic of vernacular usage and subject to some prescriptive bias, particularly where it is seen as illegitimately salvaging anacoluthic constructions (Zaretski 1929:237–238, §735–736, Mark 1946, Section 5).

[14] I have modified Fanselow's analysis to be in accordance with Chomsky 1986. The examples do not reflect Bavarian phonology. Vance 1989:169–171 suggests the same analysis for analogous Middle French examples.

But given this structure, the ungrammaticality of (220) is surprising.[15]

(220) a. * Ich glaub' nicht [$_{CP}$ [die Franca]$_i$ daß du t_i kennst]]
b. * Es ist nicht wahrscheinlich [$_{CP}$ [die Franca]$_i$ daß t_i geheiratet hat]]

I therefore assume instead that the left-dislocated constituent adjoins to the maximal projection of the dominant functional head (IP or CP), and that Spec(CP) of the subordinate clause is filled by an operator which must be bound by the left-dislocated constituent (see Felix 1985:184 for a similar analysis).

(221) a. [$_{IP}$ [a foni]$_i$ [$_{IP}$ [$_{CP}$ Op_i az me heyst im_i] tut er]]
b. [$_{CP}$ [die Franca]$_i$ [$_{CP}$ [$_{CP}$ Op_i daß du die_i/t_i kennst] glaub' ich nicht]]

The ungrammaticality of (220) then follows from the unacceptability of embedding left-dislocation structures (though see Section 2.4.2. In all three varieties—Yiddish, standard German and Bavarian—the structural relation between the left-dislocated constituent and the operator in the Spec(CP) of the subordinate clauses is the same as between the noun phrase modified by a relative clause and the relative pronoun. The difference between the Yiddish and German examples on the one hand and the Bavarian ones on the other is parallel to the difference between relative clauses with and without resumptive pronouns.

2.4.1.1.3 Clitics Certain discourse connectives in Yiddish can intervene between the topic and the finite verb.

(222) a. Ikh *gor* hob a lange tsung?
I PART have a long tongue
'What, I'm a big talker?'
(Grine felder, 65)
b. Dem shnayder *ober* hot zikh es oysgedukht lang vi der goles.
the tailor but has REFL it out seemed long as the exile
'But to the tailor, it seemed as long as the exile of the Jews.'
(Bakh, 40)
c. Bay mir in shtub *take* iz er geshtorbn.
with me in room really is he died
'He died right in my living room.'
(Grine felder, 104)

[15]Fanselow 1987:65 attributes the ungrammaticality of (220) to the inability of constituents in Spec(CP) to receive an appropriate operator interpretation in subordinate contexts. In order to derive the contrast between (219) and (220), he stipulates that in Bavarian, unlike standard German, an index percolation mechanism allows the index associated with the operator in a matrix Spec(CP) to trickle down to the Spec(CP) of a subordinate clause just in case the subordinate clause occupies the matrix Spec(CP). Fanselow fails to note the existence of standard German clauses like (218).

The distribution of these particles is reminiscent of the Old English clitics discussed in Chapter 1.4.2.4, various German discourse connectives like *aber* 'but', *bloß* 'just, only', *dagegen* 'on the other hand', *übrigens* 'by the way', and *wiederum* 'again' (see also Behaghel 1932:14–15, §1431, 1433, Ebert et al. 1993:434, §S 244.2 for earlier stages of German) and the Icelandic adverbs discussed by Thráinsson 1986:175–176 and Sigurðsson 1986, Section 3.

(223) Meine Mutter { aber, dagegen, übrigens, wiederum } will damit
my mother but on the other hand by the way again wants therewith
nichts zu tun haben.
nothing to do have
'My mother, {on the other hand, by the way,} wants nothing to do with that.'

Very rarely, *es* behaves like the adverbial clitics above and the Old English pronoun clitics discussed in Chapter 1.4.2.4 (see Behaghel 1932:14, §1431, Ebert et al. 1993:434, §S 244.1, Tomaselli 1994 for German). *Es* is routinely pronounced /s/ in Yiddish (often reflected orthographically as *'s* or *s'*), and Zaretski 1929:235, §730 refers to it as a *prefiks* 'prefix'. For some speakers, the phonological reduction of *es* has apparently triggered a reanalysis of *es* as a syntactic clitic, so that it does not count for position.[16]

(224) a. Ven gefeln *s'* vet in klayzl, zogn zolstu zey ...
if please it will in family tell shall you them
'If your family likes it, you shall tell them ...'
(Mir trogn a gezang, 49)
b. Un vu gefaln *s'* iz a shprits fun undzer blut, shprotsn vet dort undzer
and where fallen it is a spurt of our blood sprout will there our
gvure, undzer mut.
strength our courage
'And where a drop of our blood has fallen, there our strength, our courage will sprout.'
(Mir trogn a gezang, 190)

2.4.1.1.4 Other cases V3 and even later positions of the finite verb are found in poetry (Zaretski 1929:237, 733.7). The corresponding phenomenon in German poetry is well known, where it represents the continuation of a syntactic option available in Old High German (Behaghel 1932:23, §1440). Like Old English, Old High German allowed verb-final root declarative clauses, and verb-final word order remained an emblem of high literary style even after V2 became obligatory in root clauses.

The cases of V3 discussed so far have clear parallels in other V2 languages. Ones that do not, such as those in (225), are extremely rare in Yiddish. It is possible that (225a,b) are actually instances of V2 with a directional small clause in topic position.

[16]According to Marvin Herzog (personal communication), cases like (224) are restricted to poetry.

(225) a. Gelt in polk arayn *vel* ikh dir shikn.
money in regiment in will I you send
'I'll send money to you in your regiment.'
(Mir trogn a gezang, 18)

b. Vinter fun dire *varft* men nisht.
winter from apartment throws one not
'You can't get rid of unpleasantness.'
(Zaretski 1929:237, §733.6)

c. Fun hunger on dir *gey* ikh oys!
from hunger without you go I out
'I'll die of hunger without you.'
(Mir trogn a gezang, 78)

d. Im aleyn in di gesheftn *iz* oykh gegangen shlim.
him self in the businesses is also gone badly
'His own business was also doing badly.'
(Zaretski 1929:237, §733.6)

2.4.1.2 Questions

2.4.1.2.1 Parallels with declaratives The same types of adjunction discussed in Section 2.4.1.1 in connection with declarative clauses are possible with questions as well, yielding V3 (or even V4) word orders. See Brandt et al. 1992:75–76 for German parallels to (228).

(226) Left dislocated clauses:

a. Az du host keyn moyre nit gehat, tsu vos *bist* du gelofn?
if you have no fear not had to what are you run
'If you weren't afraid, why were you running?'
(Royte pomerantsen, 82)

b. Vel ikh shisn dem taytsh, vozhe *art* dos mikh?
will I shoot the German what-EMPH bothers that me
'If I shoot the German, what does that bother me?'
(Royte pomerantsen, 91)

c. Az eyner git dem andern a patsh, vifl shtraf *darf* er tsoln?
if one gives the other a slap how much punishment needs he pay
'If someone hits another person, what should he pay in fines?'
(Royte pomerantsen, 207)

(227) Discourse connectives:

a. *A shteyger,* az ir volt gehat a bruder, *volt* er lib gehat lokshn?
a kind if you would had a brother would he dear had *noodles*
'For example, if you had a brother, would he like noodles?'
(Royte pomerantsen, 20)

b. Un *vayter,* vos *iz* epes fuftsik rubl?
and further what is something fifty rubles
'And moreover, what is fifty rubles?'
(Royte pomerantsen, 241)

c. Un *vider* tsu vos *darfst* du shraybn: 'Sohn'?
and again to what need you write son (German)
'And again, why do you need to write: 'Sohn'?' (Royte pomerantsen, 108)

(228) Clitics:

a. Iz vi den *zol* er shrayen?
so how then shall he cry
'So, how SHOULD HE CRY THEN?'
(ROYTE POMERANTSEN, 144)

b. Oyf vos den *iz* men a gvir?
on what after all is one a rich man
'Why, after all, is one a rich man?'
(Royte pomerantsen, 193)

In addition to *iz* 'so', *to/tu* 'then' is available in questions.

(229) a. Oyber az es vet blaybn frayvilik, *iz* ver *heyst* mikh geyn?
if that it will remain voluntary so who orders me go
'If it remains voluntary, then who will order me to go?'
(Royte pomerantsen, 91)

b. Vi bald az bikur khoylim iz ba aykh azoy khoshev, *tu* far vos *zayt*
as soon as sick visit is with you so esteemed then for what are
ir nit gegangen tsu andere kranke?
you not gone to other sick ones
'As you hold sick visits in such high regard, then why didn't you visit other sick people?'
(Royte pomerantsen, 193)

2.4.1.2.2 Pre-wh focus Yiddish allows questions in which a focused non-wh constituent (indicated by small caps) precedes a wh-phrase. This type of V3 question reflects language contact with Slavic (see Chapter **??**).[17,18]

[17] *Yakh* in (230e) is the (stereotyped) Polish Yiddish dialectal form of *ikh* 'I'.

[18] V3 questions are also found in Kashmiri, but there it is the wh-phrase that occupies a focus position, rather than the clause-initial non-wh phrase (Bhatt 1994:114–124).

(230) a. DU ver *bist*?
you who are
'You, who do you think you are?'
(Birnbaum 1979:304, (210d))

b. AHIN ver *geyt*?
there who goes
'Who's going there?'
(Zaretski 1929:236, §733.4)

c. NEKHTN vu *bistu* geven?
yesterday where are you been
'Yesterday, where were you?'
(Zaretski 1929:236–237, §733.4)

d. Mit di KINDER vos *tut* men?
with the children what does one
'With the children, what shall we do?'
(Zaretski 1929:237, §733.4)

e. Nu un yakh, un YAKH vu *bin*?
now and I and I where am
'And what about me, where am I?'
(Mir trogn a gezang, 170)

2.4.1.2.3 Multiple wh-questions Like Romanian and many Slavic languages, Yiddish allows multiple wh-questions (Comorovski 1989, Rudin 1986, 1988).

(231) a. Ver vuhin *geyt*?
who where to goes
'Who is going where?'
(Zaretski 1929:236, §733.4)

b. Vi ver *lakht*?
how who laughs
'Who laughs how?'
(Royte pomerantsen, 1)

Although such questions exhibit superficial V3 word order, they can be assimilated straightforwardly to the V2 questions discussed in Chapter 2.2. As the presence of topic *es* in the corresponding indirect questions clearly shows, the wh-phrases all occupy Spec(CP).

(232) a. Ikh veys nit, ver vuhin es *geyt*.
I know not who where to it goes
'I don't know who is going where.'
(Zaretski 1929:255, §789)

'Let's follow the crowd.' 'Let's be off, each wherever (he's going).'

b. Lomir geyn, ver vuhin es geyt.
let's go who where to it goes
'Let's each go wherever we're going.'
(Zaretski 1929:255, §789)

c. Me darf ... ibertseyln, vifl fun zey op velkhn ort es *shteyen*.
one must over count how many from them on which place it stand
'One must ... tabulate how many of them occupy which position.'
(Zaretski, Sholem, 25)

Thus, Yiddish belongs to the same group of multiple wh-languages as Bulgarian and Romanian, and not with Polish, Czech and Serbo-Croatian, where only the first wh-phrase occupies Spec(CP) and any remaining wh-phrases adjoin to IP. The verb clearly occupies I in indirect multiple wh-questions, and I will assume that it moves on to C in direct multiple wh-questions, just as in the corresponding simple wh-questions (see Chapter 2.2). The V2 constraint is violated in neither direct nor indirect multiple wh-questions, since the domain of V2 in Yiddish is IP, not CP.

2.4.1.3 Exclamations

As in English, exclamations in Yiddish have the syntactic structure of indirect questions, resulting in superficial V3 word order.[19]

(233) a. Sara kluge *zi iz*!
what for clever she is
'What a clever one she is!'
(Zaretski 1929:236, §733.3)

b. Vi zi *hot* zikh getsaplt in zeyne orims!
how she squirmed REFL in his arms
'How she squirmed in his arms!'
(Zaretski 1929:236, §733.3)

c. Vos er *hot* ibergelebt in di minutn!
what he has over lived in the minutes
'What he lived through in those minutes!'
(Zaretski 1929:236, §733.3)

d. Vos du zogst!
what you say

[19]Neither Zaretski 1929 nor Mark 1946 remark upon the fact that root exclamations have subordinate clause syntax.

'You don't say!'
(Grine felder, 68)

2.4.2 Subordinate V3

V3 word order in subordinate contexts is very rare. It is sometimes attested in subordinate root environments.

(234) Hot zayn mishpokhe farlangt, az nit andersh: der rov *muz* haltn a
has his family requested that not otherwise the rabbi must hold a
hesped.
funeral oration
'So his family requested that the rabbi must absolutely give a funeral oration.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 116)

Ebert et al. 1993:433, §S 243.2 reports comparable examples from Early New High German, and Ulvestad 1955:331, (14) has the following striking example from modern German.

(235) Sagt uns nicht, weil unser Herz schweigt, unser Herz hätte keine Stimme.
tell us not because our heart is silent our heart had-SUBJ no voice
'Do not tell us that since our heart is silent, our heart has no voice.'

Very rarely, there are examples with clitics of the sort discussed in Section 2.4.1.1.3.

(236) an emese folks-kronik ... vos zeltn *ver* hot zikh mit ir biz aher
a true popular chronicle that seldom someone has REFL with her till now
interesirt
interested
'a true popular chronic that hardly anyone has evinced an interest in until now'
(Dubnov, Ukraine, 26)

Finally, V3 and later positions occur in frozen expressions and in poetry.

(237) nit ... vos der hor vert *iz*
not what the hair worth is
'not worth a bean'

(238) ven nokh als kind er a tatn *volt* gehat
if still as child he a father would had
'if he had had a father when he was still a child'
(Mir trogn a gezang, 201)

These are either holdovers from early Yiddish, which allowed INFL-final phrase structure (see Chapter infl-change), or more or less successful imitations of German word order.

Bibliography

Adams, Marianne Patalino. 1987a. From Old French to the theory of pro-drop. *Natural language and linguistic theory* 5:1–32.

Adams, Marianne Patalino. 1987b. *Old French, null subjects and verb second phenomena*. PhD thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.

Adams, Marianne Patalino. 1988. Embedded *pro*. In James Blevins and Julie Carter (eds.), *Proceedings of NELS 18*, 1–21, Amherst, MA. GSLA.

Anderson, Stephen R. 1992. *A-morphous morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, Stephen R. 1993. Wackernagel's revenge: clitics, morphology and the syntax of second position. *Language* 69:68–98.

Aoun, Joseph and Yen hui Audrey Li. 1991. The interaction of operators. In Robert Freidin (ed.), *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*, Current Studies in Linguistics 20, 163–181. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Aoun, Joseph and Yen-hui Audrey Li. 1993. *Syntax of scope*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Authier, Jean-Marc. 1992. Iterated CPs and embedded topicalization. *Linguistic inquiry* 23:329–336.

Baker, C.L. 1968. *Indirect questions in English*. PhD thesis, University of Illinois, Urbana.

Baker, C.L. 1970. Notes on the description of English questions: the role of an abstract question morpheme. *Foundation of language* 6:197–219.

Bayer, Josef and William Marslen-Wilson. 1992. Configurationality in the light of language comprehension: the order of arguments in German. University of Leipzig and Birbeck University College London.

Behaghel, Otto. 1932. *Deutsche Syntax. Eine geschichtliche Darstellung*. Vol. 4. Heidelberg: Winter.

Benincà, Paola. 1984. Un'ipotesi sulla sintassi delle lingue romanze medievali. *Quaderni patavini di linguistica* 4:3–19.

Benincà, Paola. 1986. L'interferenza sintattica: di un aspetto della sintassi ladina considerato di origine tedesca. *Quaderni patavini di linguistica* 5:3–17.

Berman, Steve. 1991. *On the semantics and logical form of WH-clauses*. PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Bernstein, Ludwig. 1897. *The order of words in Old Norse prose with occasional references to the other Germanic dialects*. PhD thesis, Columbia University.

Besten, Hans den. 1978. Cases of possible syntactic interference in the development of Afrikaans. In Pieter Muysken (ed.), *Amsterdam creole studies*, Publikaties van het Instituut voor Algemene Taalwetenschap 20, 5–56. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.

Besten, Hans den. 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. First circulated in 1977. Published in 1981 in *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik* 20. Reprinted as Chapter 1 of den Besten 1989.

Besten, Hans den. 1985. The ergative hypothesis and free word order in Dutch and German. In Jindřich Toman (ed.), *Studies in German grammar*, Studies in generative grammar 21, 23–64. Dordrecht: Foris.

Besten, Hans den. 1989. *Studies in West Germanic syntax*. PhD thesis, Katholieke Universiteit Brabant.

Besten, Hans den and Gert Webelhuth. 1990. Stranding. In Günther Grewendorf and Wolfgang Sternefeld (eds.), *Scrambling and barriers*, Linguistik aktuell 5, 77–92. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bhatt, Rakesh. 1994. *Word order and Case in Kashmiri*. PhD thesis, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Bhatt, Rakesh and James Yoon. 1992. On the composition of Comp and parameters of V2. In Dawn Bates (ed.), *Proceedings of WCCFL 10*, 41–52, Stanford. CSLI.

Birnbaum, Solomon. 1979. *Yiddish. A survey and a grammar*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Bolinger, Dwight D. 1978. Yes-no questions are not alternative questions. In Henry Hiz (ed.), *Questions*, 107–150. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Borer, Hagit. 1986. I-subjects. *Linguistic inquiry* 17:375–416.

Brandt, Margareta, Marga Reis, Inger Rosengren, and Ilse Zimmermann. 1992. Satztyp, Satzmodus and Illokution. In Inger Rosengren (ed.), *Satz und Illokution. Band I*, 1–90, Tübingen. Max Niemeyer.

Braun, David. 1992. Refinements on the phrase structure of Yiddish. Ms., University of Pennsylvania.

Cardinaletti, Anna and Ian Roberts. 1991. Clause structure and X-second. Ms., Università di Venezia and Université de Genève. To appear in *Levels, principles and processes: the structure of grammatical representations*, eds. Wynn Chao and Geoffrey Horrocks. Berlin: Foris/de Gruyter.

Chomsky, Noam. 1977. On *wh*-movement. In Peter W. Culicover, Thomas Wasow, and Adrian Akmajian (eds.), *Formal syntax*, 71–132. New York: Academic Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In Kenneth Hale and Samuel J. Keyser (eds.), *The view from Building 20*, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam and Howard Lasnik. 1991. Principles and parameters theory. In Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld, and Theo Vennemann (eds.), *Syntax: an international handbook of contemporary research*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1989. On embedded verb second clauses and ergativity in German. In Dany Jaspers, W. Klooster, Y. Puteys, and Pieter Seuren (eds.), *Sentential complementation and the lexicon: studies in honor of Wim de Geest*, 77–96. Dordrecht: Foris.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of $\overline{A}$-dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: mitpress.

Comorovski, Ilena. 1989. *Discourse and the syntax of multiple constituent questions*. PhD thesis, Cornell University.

Culicover, Peter. 1991. Topicalization, inversion, and complementizers in English. *Proceedings of the Fifth Symposium on Comparative Grammar. Going Romance and Beyond. University of Utrecht. OTS Working Papers*.

Dahlbaeck, Hans and Karina Vamling. 1983. "tog han da foto"—ett syntaktiskt fenomen in malmoitiskt talsprak. Ms., University of Lund.

Déprez, Viviane. 1989. *On the typology of syntactic positions and the nature of chains: Move α to the specifier of functional projections*. PhD thesis, MIT.

Diesing, Molly. 1988. Word order and the subject position in Yiddish. In James Blevins and Julie Carter (eds.), *Proceedings of NELS 18*, 124–140, Amherst, MA. GSLA.

Diesing, Molly. 1990. Verb movement and the subject position in Yiddish. *Natural language and linguistic theory* 8:41–79.

Dupuis, Fernande. 1988. Pro-drop dans les subordonnées en ancien français. *Revue québécoise de linguistique théorique et appliquée* 7:41–62.

Dupuis, Fernande. 1989. *L'expression du sujet dans les subordonnées en ancien français.* PhD thesis, Université de Montréal.

Ebert, Robert Peter, Oskar Reichmann, Hans-Joachim Solms, and Klaus-Peter Wegera. 1993. *Frühneuhochdeutsche Grammatik.* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Emonds, Joseph E. 1970. *Root and structure-preserving transformations.* PhD thesis, MIT.

Eythórsson, Thórhallur. 1995. Functional categories, cliticization, and verb movement in the early Germanic languages. Ms., Cornell University.

Fanselow, Gisbert. 1987. *Konfigurationalität. Untersuchungen zur Universalgrammatik am Beispiel des Deutschen.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Felix, Sascha. 1985. Parasitic gaps in German. In Werner Abraham (ed.), *Erklärende Syntax des Deutschen*, Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 25, 173–200. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1968. The case for case. In Emmon Bach and Robert T. Harms (eds.), *Universals in linguistic theory*, 1–88. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Fontana, Josep Maria. 1993. *Phrase structure and the syntax of clitics in the history of Spanish.* PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.

Fontana, Josep Maria. 1995. On the integration of second position phenomena. Ms., The Ohio State University.

Frank, Robert, Young-Suk Lee, and Owen Rambow. 1992. Scrambling as non-operator movement and the special status of subjects. In *Proceedings of the Third Leiden Conference for Junior Linguists*, 135–154.

Fukui, Naoki. 1986. *A theory of category projection and its applications.* PhD thesis, MIT.

Fukui, Naoki and Margaret Speas. 1986. Specifiers and projection. *MIT working papers in linguistics* 8:128–172.

Gärtner, Hans-Martin and Markus Steinbach. 1994. Economy, verb-second and the SVO-SOV distinction. *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 53:1–59.

Gerritsen, Marinel (ed.). 1991. *Atlas van de nederlandse dialectsyntaxis (AND).* Amsterdam: P.J. Meertens-Instituut.

Ginzburg, Jonathan. 1992. *Questions, queries and facts: a semantics and pragmatics for interrogatives.* PhD thesis, Stanford University.

Groenendijk, J. and M. Stokhof. 1982. Semantic analysis of wh-complements. *Linguistics and philosophy* 5:175–233.

Groenendijk, J. and M. Stokhof. 1984. *Problems and prospects in the theory of questions.* Amsterdam: Juriaans.

Haan, Germen de and Fred Weerman. 1986. Finiteness and verb fronting in Frisian. In Hubert Haider and Martin Prinzhorn (eds.), *Verb second phenomena in Germanic languages*, Publications in language sciences 21, 77–110. Dordrecht: Foris.

Haider, Hubert. 1986. V-second in German. In Hubert Haider and Martin Prinzhorn (eds.), *Verb second phenomena in Germanic languages*, Publications in language sciences 21, 49–75. Dordrecht: Foris.

Haider, Hubert. 1989. θ-tracking systems—evidence from German. In László Marácz and Pieter Muysken (eds.), *Configurationality. The typology of asymmetries*, Studies in generative grammar 34, 185–206. Dordrecht: Foris.

Haider, Hubert. 1993. *Deutsche Syntax—generativ.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Haiman, John and Paola Benincá. 1992. *The Rhaeto-Romance languages.* London: Routledge.

Hall, Beatrice L. 1979. Accounting for Yiddish word order, or what's a nice NP like you doing in a place like this? In Jürgen M. Meisel and Martin D. Pam (eds.), *Linear order and generative theory*, Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science IV. Current issues in linguistic theory 7, 263–287. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hellan, Lars. 1991. A two-level X-bar system. *Lingua* 84:239–257.

Hemforth, B. 1992. *Kognitives Parsing.* PhD thesis, Ruhr-Universität, Bochum.

Hemforth, B., L. Konieczny, and G. Strube. 1993. Incremental syntax processing and parsing strategies. In *Proceedings of the XVth annual conference of the Cognitive Science Society.* Hilldale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Henry, Alison. 1995. *Belfast English and standard English: dialect variation and parameter setting.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Heycock, Caroline. 1991. *Layers of predication: the non-lexical syntax of clauses.* PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania. Published in 1994 in the *Outstanding dissertations in linguistics* series. New York: Garland.

Heycock, Caroline and Beatrice Santorini. 1993. Head movement and the licensing of non-thematic positions. In Jonathan Mead, Luc Moritz, and Marti Wessels (eds.), *Proceedings of WCCFL 11*, 262–276, Stanford, CA. CSLI.

Higgins, F. Roger. 1973. On j. emonds's analysis of extraposition. In J.P. Kimball (ed.), *Syntax and semantics 2*, 149–195. New York: Seminar Press.

Hoekstra, Eric. 1991. *Licensing conditions on phrase structure*. PhD thesis, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

Hoekstra, Teun and René Mulder. 1990. Unergatives as copular predicates; locational and existential predication. *The linguistic review* 7:1–79.

Holmberg, Anders. 1986. *Word order and syntactic features in the Scandinavian languages and English*. PhD thesis, University of Stockholm.

Holmberg, Anders and Christer Platzack. 1988. On the role of inflection in Scandinavian syntax. *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 42:25–42.

Hook, Peter Edwin. 1984. Some further observations on Kashmiri word order. In Omkar N. Koul and Peter Edwin Hook (eds.), *Aspects of Kashmiri linguistics*, 145–153. New Delhi: Bahri Publications.

Hook, Peter Edwin and Alexis Manaster-Ramer. 1985. The position of the finite verb in Germanic and Kashmiri: towards a typology of V-2 languages. In Jan Terje Faarlund (ed.), *Germanic linguistics: papers from a symposium at the University of Chicago*, 46–58. Distributed by the Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Hooper, Joan B. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1973. On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic inquiry* 4:465–497.

Hulk, Aafke and Ans van Kemenade. 1988. Nominative identification in Germanic and Romance languages. In Peter Coopmans and Aafke Hulk (eds.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, 69–79. Dordrecht: Foris.

Hulk, Aafke and Ans van Kemenade. 1993. Subjects, nominative case, agreement and functional heads. *Lingua* 89:181–215.

Hulk, Aafke and Ans van Kemenade. 1994. Verb second, pro-drop, functional projections and language change. In Adrian Battye and Ian Roberts (eds.), *Language change and verbal systems*, 227–256. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Iatridou, Sabine. 1991. *Topics in conditionals*. PhD thesis, MIT.

Iatridou, Sabine. 1994. On the contribution of conditional *then*. *Natural language semantics* 2:171–199.

Iatridou, Sabine and Anthony S. Kroch. 1992. The licensing of CP-recursion and its relevance to the Germanic verb-second phenomenon. *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 50:1–24.

Jonas, Dianne and Jonathan Bobaljik. 1993. Specs for subjects: the role of TP in Icelandic. *MIT working papers in linguistics* 59–98.

Jónsson, Jóhannes Gísli. 1991. Stylistic fronting in Icelandic. *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 48:1–43.

Kaan, Edith. 1994. Processing Dutch main clauses: a self-paced reading study. Ms., University of Groningen.

Katz, Jerrold J. and Paul M. Postal. 1964. *An integrated theory of linguistic descriptions*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kayne, Richard S. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kemenade, Ans van. 1987. *Syntactic case and morphological case in the history of English*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Kemenade, Ans van. 1993. V2 and embedded topicalization in Old and Middle English. Ms., Free University of Amsterdam. To appear in *Proceedings of the Third Diachronic Generative Syntax Conference*, eds. Ans van Kemenade and Nigel Vincent. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kitagawa, Yoshihisa. 1986. *Subject in Japanese and English*. PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Klavans, Judith L. 1980. *Some problems in a theory of clitics*. PhD thesis, University College London. Published in 1994 in the *Outstanding dissertations in linguistics* series. New York: Garland.

Klavans, Judith L. 1985. The independence of syntax and phonology in cliticization. *Language* 61:95–120.

Koopman, Hilda and Dominique Sportiche. 1991. The position of subjects. *Lingua* 85:211–258.

Kosmeijer, Wim. 1991. The distribution of það: an argument against a generalized COMP analysis. In Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson (ed.), *Papers from the 12th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*, 182–193. Reykjavík: Linguistic Institute, University of Iceland.

Koster, Jan. 1975. Dutch as an SOV language. *Linguistic analysis* 1:111–136.

Kroch, Anthony S. 1974. *The semantics of scope in English*. PhD thesis, MIT. Published in 1979 in the *Outstanding dissertations in linguistics* series. New York: Garland.

Kroch, Anthony S. and Ann Taylor. 1995. Verb movement in Old and Middle English: dialect variation and language contact. Ms., University of Pennsylvania. To appear in *Proceedings of the Third Diachronic Generative Syntax Conference*, eds. Ans van Kemenade and Nigel Vincent. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kuroda, Shige-Yuki. 1987. Whether we agree or not. In William J. Poser (ed.), *Papers from the Second International Workshop on Japanese Syntax*, 103–143. Stanford: CSLI.

Lamers, M.J.A., L.A. Stowe, and Th.C. Gunter. 1995. Parsing Dutch sentences: SVO versus OVS structure. Poster presented at the 8th CUNY Conference on Human Sentence Processing, Tucson.

Larson, Richard. 1985. On the syntax of disjunctive scope. *Natural language and linguistic theory* 3:217–264.

Lasnik, Howard. 1993. Lectures on minimalist syntax. *UConn working papers in linguistics: occasional papers* 1:1–80.

Lee, Young-Suk. 1991. Scrambling and the Adjoined Argument Hypothesis. Ms., University of Pennsylvania.

Lemieux, Monique and Fernande Dupuis. 1994. The locus of verb movement in non-asymmetric verb-second languages: the case of Middle French. In Adrian Battye and Ian Roberts (eds.), *Language change and verbal systems*, 80–109. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lowenstamm, Jean. 1977. Relative clauses in Yiddish: a case for movement. *Linguistic analysis* 3:197–216.

Magnússon, Friðrik. 1990. Kjarnafærsla og það-innskot í aukasetningum í íslensku (topicalization and það insertion in subordinate clauses in Icelandic. Master's thesis, University of Iceland.

Mahajan, Anoop. 1989. On the A/A-bar distinction: scrambling and weak crossover and binding in Hindi. Ms., M.I.T.

Maling, Joan. 1990. Inversion in embedded clauses in Modern Icelandic. In Joan Maling and Annie Zaenen (eds.), *Modern Icelandic syntax*, Syntax and semantics 24, 71–91. San Diego: Academic Press. First published in 1980 in *Íslenskt mál og almenn malfræði*/ 2:175–193.

Maling, Joan and Annie Zaenen. 1978. The nonuniversality of a surface filter. *Linguistic inquiry* 9:**–**.

Manzini, Maria Rita. 1988. Constituent structure and locality. In Anna Cardinaletti, Guglielmo Cinque, and Giuliana Giusti (eds.), *Constituent structure*, 157–201. Dordrecht: Foris.

Mark, Yudl. 1946. Dos ort fun beygikn verb in dem zats (the position of the finite verb in the clause). *Yidishe sprakh (Yiddish language)* 6:1–15.

Maurer, Friedrich. 1926. *Untersuchungen über die deutsche Verbstellung in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*. Heidelberg: Winter.

May, Robert. 1977. *The grammar of quantification*. PhD thesis, MIT.

May, Robert. 1985. *Logical Form. Its structure and derivation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

McCawley, James D. 1970. English as a VSO language. *Language* 46:286–299.

McCloskey, James. 1992. Adjunction, selection and embedded verb second. Technical report LRC-92-07, University of California, Santa Cruz.

Müller, Gereon and Wolfgang Sternefeld. 1993. Improper movement and unambiguous binding. *Linguistic inquiry* 24:461–507.

Munsat, Stanley. 1986. Wh-complementizers. *Linguistics and philosophy* 9:191–217.

Nossack, H. 1948. *Dorothea*. Hamburg.

Önnerfors, Olaf. 1993. Über narrative Verb-erst-Deklarativsätze im Deutschen. *Sprache und Pragmatik* 31:1–52.

Ottósson, Kjartan. 1989. VP-specifier subjects and the CP/IP distinction in Icelandic and mainland Scandinavian. *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 44:89–100.

Ottósson, Kjartan. 1994. Comments on the paper by Santorini. In Norbert Hornstein and David Lightfoot (eds.), *Verb movement*, 107–116. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Pintzuk, Susan. 1991. *Phrase structures in competition: variation and change in Old English word order*. PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.

Pintzuk, Susan. 1993. Verb seconding in Old English: verb movement to Infl. *The linguistic review* 10:5–35.

Pintzuk, Susan. 1994. Cliticization in Old English. To appear in *Second position clitics and related phenomena*, eds. Aaron Halpern and Arnold Zwicky. Stanford: CSLI Press.

Plann, S. 1982. Indirect questions in Spanish. *Linguistic inquiry* 13:297–312.

Platzack, Christer. 1986. COMP, INFL and Germanic word order. In Lars Hellan and Kirsti Koch Christensen (eds.), *Topics in Scandinavian syntax*, 185–234. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Platzack, Christer. 1987. The case of narrative inversion in Swedish and Icelandic. *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 31:9–14.

Platzack, Christer and Anders Holmberg. 1990. The role of AGR and finiteness in some European VO languages. Paper presented at the 1989 GLOW Colloquium, Utrecht. Ms., University of Lund.

Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. Verb movement, Universal Grammar, and the structure of IP. *Linguistic inquiry* 20:365–424.

Prince, Ellen. 1994. Subject pro-drop in Yiddish. Ms., University of Pennsylvania.

Prince, Ellen F. 1988a. On pragmatic change: the borrowing of discourse functions. *Journal of pragmatics* 12:505–518.

Prince, Ellen F. 1988b. Yiddish wh-clauses, subject-postposing, and topicalization. *Proceedings of ESCOL* 6:403–415.

Prince, Ellen F. 1992. The ZPG letter: subjects, definiteness and information-status. In S. Thompson and W. Mann (eds.), *Discourse description: diverse analyses of a fund raising text*, 295–325. Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Prince, Ellen F. 1993. Syntactic form in Yiddish: expletive es and subject postposing. In David Goldberg (ed.), *The field of Yiddish. Studies in language, folklore, and literature. Fifth collection*, 59–86. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Pütz, Herbert. 1975. *Über die Syntax der deutschen Pronominalform* es. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language.* London: Longman.

Reinholtz, Charlotte. 1989. V-2 in mainland Scandinavian: finite verb movement to Agr. *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 44:101–117.

Reinholtz, Charlotte. 1993. Verb second, negation and minimality in Danish. In Jonathan Mead, Luc Moritz, and Marti Wessels (eds.), *Proceedings of WCCFL 11*, 405–420, Stanford, CA. CSLI.

Reis, Marga. 1995. *Wer glaubst du hat recht?* on so-called extractions from verb-second clauses and verb-first parenthetical constructions in German. *Sprache und Pragmatik Arbeitsberichte. Lund* 36:27–83.

Ribeiro, Ilza. 1994. Evidence for a verb-second phase in Old Portuguese. In Adrian Battye and Ian Roberts (eds.), *Language change and verbal systems*, 110–139. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. Null objects in Italian and the theory of *pro*. *Linguistic inquiry* 17:501–557.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1990a. *Relativized minimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1990b. Speculations on verb-second. In J. Mascaró and Marina Nespor (eds.), *Grammar in progress: a Festschrift for Henk van Riemsdijk*, 375–386. Dordrecht: Foris.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1991. Residual verb second and the wh-criterion. University of Geneva Technical Reports in Formal and Computational Linguistics, No. 2.

Roberts, Ian. 1993. *Verbs and diachronic syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Rögnvaldsson, Eiríkur. 1984. Icelandic word order and það-insertion. *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 8:1–21.

Rögnvaldsson, Eiríkur and Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1990. On Icelandic word order once more. In Joan Maling and Annie Zaenen (eds.), *Modern Icelandic syntax*, Syntax and semantics 24, 3–40. San Diego: Academic Press.

Rudin, Catherine. 1986. *Aspects of Bulgarian syntax: complementizers and wh constructions*. Columbus, OH: Slavic.

Rudin, Catherine. 1988. On multiple questions and multiple wh-fronting. *Natural language and linguistic theory* 6:445–501.

Safir, Kenneth. 1985. Missing subjects in German. In Jindřich Toman (ed.), *Studies in German grammar*, Studies in generative grammar 21, 193–229. Dordrecht: Foris.

Santorini, Beatrice. 1989. *The generalization of the verb-second constraint in the history of Yiddish*. PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.

Santorini, Beatrice. 1992. Variation and change in Yiddish subordinate clause word order. *Natural language and linguistic theory* 10:595–640.

Santorini, Beatrice. 1994a. Some differences between Icelandic and Yiddish. In Norbert Hornstein and David Lightfoot (eds.), *Verb movement*, 87–106. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Santorini, Beatrice. 1994b. Two types of verb-second in the history of Yiddish. In Adrian Battye and Ian Roberts (eds.), *Language change and verbal systems*, 53–79. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schafer, Robin. 1994. *Nonfinite predicate initial constructions in Breton*. PhD thesis, University of California, Santa Cruz.

Schafer, Robin. 1995. Negation and verb second in Breton. *Natural language and linguistic theory* 13:135–172.

Schwartz, Bonnie and Sten Vikner. 1990. All verb second clauses are CPs. *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 43:27–49.

Shekhter, Mordkhe. 1986. *Yidish II (Yiddish II).* Philadelphia: ISHI.

Shlonsky, Ur and Edit Doron. 1991. Verb second in Hebrew. In Dawn Bates (ed.), *Proceedings of WCCFL 10*, 431–445, Stanford. CSLI.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1985. The root behaviour of (some) verb-initial declaratives in Icelandic: a syntactic or a semantic problem? Ms., University of Kiel.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1986. Verb post-second in a V2 language. In Östen Dahl and Anders Holmberg (eds.), *Scandinavian syntax*, 138–149. Stockholm: Institute of Linguistics, University of Stockholm.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1989. *Verbal syntax and case in a comparative GB framework.* PhD thesis, University of Lund.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1990a. Feature government and government chains. *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 46:5–36.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1990b. V1 declaratives and verb raising in Icelandic. In Joan Maling and Annie Zaenen (eds.), *Modern Icelandic syntax*, Syntax and semantics 24, 41–69. San Diego: Academic Press.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1992. The case of quirky subjects. *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 49:1–26.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1993. Agreement as head visible feature government. *Studia linguistica* 47:32–56.

Sportiche, Dominique. 1988. A theory of floating quantifiers and its corollaries for constituent structure. *Linguistic inquiry* 19:425–449.

Sprouse, Rex and Barbara Vance. 1995. An explanation for the decline of null pronouns in certain Germanic and Romance languages. Ns., Indiana University.

Suñer, Margarita. 1991a. About indirect questions and semi-questions. *Linguistics and philosophy* 15:45–77.

Suñer, Margarita. 1991b. Indirect questions and the structure of CP: some consequences. In H'ector Campos and Fernando Mart[ínez-Gil (eds.), *Current studies in Spanish linguistics*, 283–312. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Tarallo, Fernando. 1983. *Relativization strategies in Brazilian Portuguese.* PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.

Thiersch, Craig. 1978. *Topics in German syntax.* PhD thesis, MIT.

Thiersch, Craig. 1994. On some formal properties of coordination. In Carlos Martín-Vide (ed.), *Current issues in mathematical linguistics*, North-Holland Linguistic series, volume 56, 171–180. Amsterdam: Elsevier-North Holland.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1986. V1, V2, V3 in Icelandic. In Hubert Haider and Martin Prinzhorn (eds.), *Verb second phenomena in Germanic languages*, Publications in language sciences 21, 169–194. Dordrecht: Foris.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1994. Comments on the paper by Vikner. In Norbert Hornstein and David Lightfoot (eds.), *Verb movement*, 149–162. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Timm, Lenora. 1989. Word order in 20th century Breton. *Natural language and linguistic theory* 3:361–378.

Tomaselli, Alessandra. 1994. Cases of verb third in Old High German. In Adrian Battye and Ian Roberts (eds.), *Language change and verbal systems*, 345–369. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Travis, Lisa. 1991. Phrase structure and V2 phenomena. In Robert Freidin (ed.), *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*, Current Studies in Linguistics 20, 339–364. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Travis, Lisa deMena. 1984. *Parameters and effects of word order variation.* PhD thesis, MIT.

Trosterud, Trond. 1989. The null subject parameter and the new mainland Scandinavian word order: a possible counterexample from a Norwegian dialect. In J. Niemi (ed.), *Papers from the Eleventh Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*, Vol. 1, 87–100. Joensuu, Finland: University of Joensuu.

Ulvestad, Bjarne. 1955. Object clauses without "daß" dependent on negative governing clauses in modern German. *Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht, deutsche Sprache und Literatur* 47:329–338.

Ulvestad, Bjarne. 1956. A note on object clauses without "daß" after negative governing clauses. *Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht, deutsche Sprache und Literatur* 48:273–276.

Vallduví, Enric. 1990. *The informational component.* PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania. Published in 1992 in the *Outstanding dissertations in linguistics* series. New York: Garland.

van te Velde, John R. 1993. Deriving V2 in Germanic: a comparison of Yiddish and German. Ms., Oklahoma State University.

Vance, Barbara. 1989. *Null subjects and syntactic change in Medieval French*. PhD thesis, Cornell University.

Vance, Barbara. 1994. On the decline of verb movement to Comp in Old and MiddleFrench. In Adrian Battye and Ian Roberts (eds.), *Language change and verbal systems*, 173–199. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vanelli, Laura, Lorenzo Renzi, and Paola Benincà. 1986. Typologie des pronoms sujets dans les langues romanes. In *Linguistique descriptive: phonetique, morphologie et lexique*, 163–176, Aix-en-Provence. Université de Provence.

Vikner, Sten. 1994. Finite verb movement in Scandinavian embedded clauses. In Norbert Hornstein and David Lightfoot (eds.), *Verb movement*, 117–147. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

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

Waletzky, Joshua. 1980. Topicalization in Yiddish. In Marvin Herzog et al. (eds.), *The field of Yiddish. Fourth collection*, 237–315. Philadelphia: ISHI.

Ward, Gregory and Betty Birner. 1995a. Definiteness and the English existential. *Language* 71.

Ward, Gregory and Betty Birner. 1995b. On the discourse function of rightward movement in English. In Adele Goldberg (ed.), *Conceptual structure, discourse and language*. Stanford: CSLI.

Webelhuth, Gert. 1989. *Syntactic saturation phenomena and the modern Germanic languages*. PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Weerman, Fred. 1987. Middle Dutch could be Middle Dutcher than you think (and vice versa). In Willem Koopman, F. van der Leek, O. Fischer, and R. Eaton (eds.), *Explanation and linguistic change*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Weerman, Fred. 1989. *The V2 conspiracy. A synchronic and diachronic analysis*. PhD thesis, University of Utrecht.

Weijnen, A.A. 1966. *Nederlandse dialectkunde*. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Weinreich, Uriel. 1981. *College Yiddish. An introduction to the Yiddish language and to Jewish life and culture. Fifth revised edition*. New York: YIVO.

Zaenen, Annie. 1980. *Extraction rules in Icelandic*. PhD thesis, Harvard University. Published in 1985 in the *Outstanding dissertations in linguistics* series. New York: Garland.

Zagona, Karen. 1988. *Verb phrase syntax: a parametric study of English and Spanish*. Boston and London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Zaretski, Aizik. 1927. Tsu Sholem-Aleykhems verter seyder (on Sholem Aleykhem's word order). *Di yidishe sprakh (The Yiddish language)* 1:5–10.

Zaretski, Aizik. 1928. Tsu Mendeles verterseyder (on Mendele's word order). *Di yidishe sprakh (The Yiddish language)* 3:19–26.

Zaretski, Aizik. 1929. *Yidishe gramatik (Yiddish grammar)*. Vilna: Vilner Farlag.

Zwart, C. Jan Wouter. 1993. *Dutch syntax. A minimalist approach*. PhD thesis, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.