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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. Nachsten 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. *Nachsten 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 Vallduvi 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.


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. We 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 addresses 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 'asym¬
detic' 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'

(ii) Asyndetic clauses:
   a. I think they're coming for dinner tomorrow.
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.\(^5\)

\[(7) \text{ daß sie nächsten Dienstag einen neuen Tisch kaufen wird (German) that she next Tuesday a new table buy will} \]

\[(8) a. * \text{ daß sie wird nächsten Dienstag einen neuen Tisch kaufen that she will next Tuesday a new table buy} \]
\[b. * \text{ daß nächsten Dienstag wird sie einen neuen Tisch kaufen that next Tuesday will she a new table buy} \]
\[c. * \text{ daß einen neuen Tisch wird sie nächsten Dienstag kaufen that next Tuesday will she a new table buy} \]

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.

\[(9) \text{ V-to-C movement analysis of V2 (CP V2):} \]
\[a. \text{ Subordinate clause:} \]
\[\{ [CP \ldots C [IP Su [VP \ldots XP \ldots Vf]]] \}
\[b. \text{ Root clause:} \]
\[\{ [CP Su [C Vf]] [IP t_i [VP \ldots XP \ldots t_j]]] \]

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).

\[(10) \]
\[a. \text{ Subject topic:} \]
\[\{ [CP Su [C Vf]] [IP t_i [VP \ldots XP \ldots t_j]]] \]
\[b. \text{ Nonsubject topic:} \]
\[\{ [CP XP_t [C Vf]] [IP Su [VP \ldots t_i \ldots t_j]]] \]

(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 \textit{er} and the homonymous partitive clitic are realized as a single instance of \textit{er} after complementizers and fronted verbs.

d. Certain instances of the German expletive \textit{es} ‘it’ cannot appear after complementizers or fronted verbs.

I will refer to the instances of \textit{es} ‘it’ mentioned in (10d) as ‘topic \textit{es}’. Topic \textit{es} is in complementary distribution with other topics, in contrast to expletive subject \textit{es} (Pütz 1978). See Chapter ?? for further discussion of topic \textit{es} in Yiddish.

\[(11) \text{ Topic \textit{es}:} \]
\[a. \text{ Es lebte ein König in Frankreich.} \]
\[\text{it lived a king in France} \]
\[\text{‘There lived a king in France.’} \]
\[(Pütz 1975:1, (9)) \]

b. In Frankreich lebte (*es) ein König, in France lived it a king \[\text{‘there lived a king in France’} \]
\[(Pütz 1975:1, (10)/(11)) \]

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

(12) Subject \textit{es}:

\[a. \text{ Es fehlt an Geld in Frankreich.} \]
\[\text{it is missing on money in France} \]
\[\text{‘There is not enough money in France.’} \]
\[(Pütz 1975:1, (12)) \]

\[\]

\[\]

\[5\text{ For simplicity, I disregard the possibility of rightward movement phenomena such as PP and clausal extraposition.} \]
\[6\text{ In the analysis of den Besten 1983, the finite verb actually adjoins to Comp in V2 clauses. The variant of the analysis with substitution is proposed in den Besten 1978.} \]
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.\(^8\)

\[\begin{align*}
(13) \quad \text{a.} & \quad \text{Pyt sei dat hy hie my sjoen. (Frisian)} \\
& \quad \text{said that he had me seen} \\
& \quad \text{‘Pyt said that he had seen me.’} \\
& \quad \text{(de Haan and Weerman 1986:34, (12b))} \\

\text{b.} & \quad \text{Pyt sei dat my hie er sjoen.} \\
& \quad \text{(Iatridou and Kroch 1992:4, (13c))} \\

\text{c.} & \quad \text{Pyt sei dat er my sjoen hie.} \\
& \quad \text{(cf. de Haan and Weerman 1986:85, (23))}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
(14) \quad \text{a.} & \quad \text{*Pyt betreuret dat hy hie my sjoen.} \\
& \quad \text{regrets that he had me seen} \\
& \quad \text{‘Pyt regrets that he had seen me.’} \\
& \quad \text{(Iatridou and Kroch 1992:4, (14b))} \\

\text{b.} & \quad \text{*Pyt betreuret dat my hie er sjoen.} \\
& \quad \text{(cf. Iatridou and Kroch 1992:4, (14a))} \\

\text{c.} & \quad \text{Pyt betreuret dat er my sjoen hie.} \\
& \quad \text{(cf. Iatridou and Kroch 1992:4, (14a))}
\end{align*}\]

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.

\[\begin{align*}
(15) \quad \text{a.} & \quad \text{Karen siger at den bog har Peter ikke læst. (Danish)} \\
& \quad \text{says that that book has not read} \\
& \quad \text{‘Karen says that Peter hasn’t read that book.’} \\
& \quad \text{(Reinholtz 1989:103, (4b))} \\

\text{b.} & \quad \text{Karen siger at Peter har ikke læst den bog.} \\

\text{c.} & \quad \text{Karen siger at Peter ikke har læst den bog.} \\
& \quad \text{(Reinholtz 1989:103, (4a))}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
(16) \quad \text{a.} & \quad \text{*Peter fortræd at den film havde han ikke set.} \\
& \quad \text{regretted that the film had he not seen} \\
& \quad \text{‘Peter regretted that he had not seen that film.’} \\

\text{b.} & \quad \text{*Peter fortræd at han havde ikke set den film.} \\

\text{c.} & \quad \text{Peter fortræd at han ikke havde set den film.}
\end{align*}\]

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.

\[\begin{align*}
(17) \quad \text{CP recursion analysis of subordinate V2:} \\
& \quad \text{a. Subject topic:} \\
& \quad \text{subject CP recursion:} \\
& \quad \text{[CP \ldots C [CP Su_k [\_ [\text{Vf}_j] \text{[IP t_i t_j] } \text{[VP t_i t_j] } \text{XP \ldots \ldots ] } ] ] ]} \\
& \quad \text{b. Nonsubject topic:} \\
& \quad \text{subject CP recursion:} \\
& \quad \text{[CP \ldots C [CP XP_i [\_ [\text{Vf}_j] \text{[IP Su_k [t_i t_j] } \text{[VP t_i t_j] \text{XP \ldots \ldots ] ] ] ] ] ]}
\end{align*}\]

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
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 ha
tyke tsa
tn kenen azoy fil mentshn afte nit it is a shame that today's times can so many people even not leyenen.

'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] fr zaytin, az ven du on all maps is one attention give on the four sides that if you legyt es f[a]r sikh off den tish, iz in d[e]r rekht hand mili[ez]r[ek].

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 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)

(19) Adverbial clauses:

(a) Ober aykh vi off dem ritnishn 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 aroystsuhheybn.

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)

(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-OAT 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 sikher ... ven iber im volt a person a great been would of him surely if over him gevakht 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:

b. Un az in meyn eygener shprakh iz aza konstrukti nito, iz mir and as in my own speech is such a construction not there is me-DAT take shiver tsu kvalifitsern 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)
(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 be 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 forshtelyn, vi di yidn iz gevorn oyfn hartan.
   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 farahteyn,
   when you will, children, older become, will you yourselves understand
   vifl in di oyves 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)

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 C0.” However, in their own analysis of embed­
ded 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 cross-linguistically 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. \[\text{IP if it rains [IP I will visit you]}\]

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. \[\text{IP if it rains [CP then [IP I will visit you]}\]
   b. \[\text{CP if it rains [CP then [IP I will visit you]}\]

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) \[\text{V [CP [if ...] [CP ... [c+wh [IP ...]]]]}\]

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, but that they cannot appear in a host of other syntactic contexts, including adverbial clauses, sentential subjects, extra-posed 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


(34) V-to-I movement analysis of V2 (= ‘IP V2’):
   a. Subject topic:
      \[ CP \ldots C_{IP} [V_f] [V_f] [V_f, t_i \ldots XP, t_i \ldots ] ] \]
   b. Nonsubject topic:
      \[ CP \ldots C_{IP} [XP, t_i] [V_f] [V_f, t_i \ldots t_i \ldots ] ] \]

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; Plaatzeck and Holmberg 1990, Santorini 1992, 1994a, 1994b, Sigurðsson 1990a, 1993). Such an approach apparently 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, 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
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 between 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.
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, Måling 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.

12Ironically, 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant functional head</th>
<th>Identification of I</th>
<th>Nonsubjects in Spec(IP)?</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>syntactic</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Dutch, modern mainland Scandinavian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>morphological</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>syntactic</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>English, modern Romance medieval Scandinavian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>morphological</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Icelandic, Yiddish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 finuntsvantsik 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 pomeranssen, 50)

b. Habin mir es gidsukt oof gimayn tayshi 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 fur 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. b is a member of the chain C = (a1, ..., an), and
    b. an governs b.

(47) (a1, ..., an) is a chain iff for every i, 1 ≤ i ≤ n, ai governs ai+1.

(48) In a chain (a1, ..., an), (ai is the chain’s initial and initiates it, and an) 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

\[\text{(52)}\]
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 / *ix 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.
Default agreement is not possible in clauses with local licensing of the (trace of the) nominative noun phrase.

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))

      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

15Sentence 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.

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: orugglega ‘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

(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.

16According 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).
1.3.2.2.3 Scope of adverbs and QP’s

According to his description, the relative scope of these elements matches their linear order: in (60a), oft ‘often’ takes scope over margar bakur ‘many books’ (‘there are many occasions on which Jón read many books’), whereas in (60b), margar bakur takes scope over oft (‘there are many books that Jón read on many occasions’).\(^{18,19}\)

(60) Ólafur sagði að þess vegna hafði ...

\begin{itemize}
\item a. ... Jón órugglega hitt eplið.
\item b. ... Jón hitt eplið órugglega.
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item a. ... Jón oft lesið margar bakur.
\item b. ... Jón lesið margar bakur oft.
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item a. ... Jón oft lesið margar bakur.
\item b. ... Jón lesið margar bakur oft.
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item a. ... Jón oft lesið margar bakur.
\item b. ... Jón lesið margar bakur oft.
\end{itemize}

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\(^{\prime}\). Given that clause-final adverbs as in (59b) might also be adjoined to V\(^{\prime}\), 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 V\(^2\) 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\(^{\prime}\), 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 V\(^2\) as for the IP analysis.

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

---

\(^{17}\)Vikner 1995:93 objects further that “[if 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.

\(^{18}\)For some Icelandic speakers, oft ‘often’ is marginal, if not downright ruled out, in postverbal position.\(^{19}\)Vikner 1994:140, 1995:93–94 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.
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).
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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.

(67) a. *Hvamð 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. Hvörð margar bækur hefur Jón ekki lesið?

how many books has not read

‘How many books has Jón not read?’

(Vikner 1995:92, (68b))

23 Vikner does not say why he uses hvörð margar ‘how many’ in the instances of acceptable extraction instead of the expected hefð margar, literally ‘what many’.

---

21I would like to thank Anthony Kroch for several very helpful discussions.
The counterparts of (67) without negation show no corresponding contrast.

(68) a. *Hvatt hefur Jón lesið [t margar bakur]?
   what has read many books
   ‘How many books has Jón read?’
   (Vikner 1995:92, (69a))

   b. Hvvers margar bakur 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 hvatt ‘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) Hvatt hefur Jón orugglega / sennilega lesið [t margar bakur]?
   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 spolumni er hvann a ekki að segja þetta.
   first the pronunciation on the tape is how one should not to say this.
   ‘The first pronunciation on the tape is how you should NOT say it.’

   b. Ég hef sagt þer ad minnsta kosti tuu sinnum hvann þu at ekki að
   I have you at least ten times when you should not to
   trøfla mig.
   disturb me
   ‘I've told you at least ten times when not to disturb me.’

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, Noves Cultural Arts Center)

(72) a. Als erstes hören Sie auf dem Band, wie man es NICHT ausspricht.
   ‘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
   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.

26It 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.

24Here, 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.

25Thanks to Johannes Gísli Jónsson for the judgments in (69) and (70).
In (75), the position of bökina ‘the book’ preceding negation shows that it has undergone object shift.

(75) Hann veit ...
he knows

‘He knows …’

a. ... að þess vegna lasi Jón bökina ekki ti ti.
that therefore read the book not ‘… that that is why Jón didn’t read the book.’
(Vikner 1995:97, (79a))

b. * ... að þess vegna lasi bökina Jón ekki ti ti.
(Vikner 1995:97, (79b))

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.

(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
   ‘The students must all completely read the book.’

(78) a. * Stüdantarnir hafa sennilega alveg allir lesið bökina. (Icelandic)
the students have probably all completely read the book
   ‘The students have probably all completely read the book.’
   b. Stüdantarnir hafa sennilega allir alveg lesið bökina.
the students have probably all 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.

(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
   ‘The students must all completely read the book.’

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

27 Thanks to Höskuldur Thránsson and Christer Platzack for the Icelandic and Swedish judgments.

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 ti [v, ti lesen ]k müssen die Studenten das Buch [vp alli [vp vollständig [vp ti ]]]]

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

\[(83) \text{IP V2 in a layers of predication analysis:} \]

a. Subject topic:
\[
\text{[CP} \ldots \text{[IP Su} \text{[IP V[VP t[VP} \ldots \text{t} \ldots \text{XP} \ldots \text{]}]}\]

b. Nonsubject topic:
\[
\text{[CP} \ldots \text{[IP XP[IP V[VP Su} \text{[VP} \ldots \text{t} \ldots \text{t} \ldots \text{]}]]}\]

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.

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

### 1.3.2.8 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)).

\[(85) \text{a. } \text{Í ger} \ hafa \text{ einhverjir stúdentarnir sennilega stolið smjörinu.} \]

\[\text{Yesterday have some students probably stolen the butter.}\]

\[\text{b. } \text{Í ger} \ hafa \text{ sennilega einhverjir stúdentarnir stolið smjörinu.} \]

\[\text{Yesterday have probably some students stolen the butter.}\]

\[(86) \text{a. } \text{Í ger} \ hafa \text{ stúdentarnir sennilega stolið smjörinu.} \]

\[\text{Yesterday have the students probably stolen the-butter}\]

\[\text{‘Yesterday the students probably stole the butter.’}\]

\[\text{b. } \text{Í ger} \ hafa \text{ sennilega stúdentarnir stolið smjörinu.} \]

\[\text{yesterday have probably the students stolen the butter}\]

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).

\[(87) \text{Variable position of subjects:} \]

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.

\[(88) \text{Í ger hafa [IP sennilega [IP stúdentarnir stolið smjórunu.]} \]

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).

\[(89) \text{In Icelandic, sentence adverbs cannot adjoin above definite subjects.}\]

### 1.3.2.9 Object shift revisited

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

\[(91) \text{a. } \ldots \text{ að þess vegna lasi Jón bókin} \text{ ekki t} \ldots \text{t,} \]

\[\text{that therefore read the book not} \]

\[\text{‘... that that is why Jón didn’t read the book.’} \]

(Vikner 1995:97, (79a))
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 1993:90-91, (32a,b)).

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 alveg ‘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 ausgeführt. (German)

‘Perhaps an acquaintance of yours/your father walked the dog yesterday.’

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)).

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).
A 'double Agr' analysis of subordinate V2:

a. Subject topic:
\[
[CP \cdots C [\lambda_{Aggr} P Sui [\lambda_{Aggr_l} Vf_1 [\lambda_{Aggr_r} t_1 \ldots [VP t_1 t_1 \ldots XP \ldots ]]]]
\]

b. Nonsubject topic:
\[
[CP \cdots C [\lambda_{Aggr} XP_i [\lambda_{Aggr_l} Vf_1 [\lambda_{Aggr_r} Sui_k [\lambda_{Aggr_r} t_1 ] \ldots [VP t_1 t_1 \ldots t_1 ]]]]
\]

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.

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 adjoinment 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 Germanic 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 and 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. \[
[CP Gestern [C hat [\lambda_{Aggr_1} P Sui [\lambda_{Aggr_l} es ihm ] [\lambda_{Aggr_2} p der Johann [VP gegeben ]]]]
\]

b. \[
[CP Gestern [C hat [\lambda_{Aggr_1} P der Johann [\lambda_{Aggr_l} es ihm ] [\lambda_{Aggr_2} p gegeben ]]]]
\]

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). 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. \[
(az) nekhtn hot es im Dovid gegeben (Yiddish)
\]

b. \[
(az) nekhtn hot Dovid es im gegeben
\]

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

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).
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 Rögvaldsson and Thráinsson 1990, Jónsson 1991, Fontana 1993, Chapter 3.3.3.2.1, Santorini 1994a, Section 5.
1.4.1.1 Complements of neutral predicates  In this group, I included both neutral verbs and adjectives.

(102) a. Hot zi *farshten*, 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.'
(Grine felder, 110)

d. *Miglekh*, 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 remarzkats 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.'
(Zaretsky, Mendele, 144)

1.4.1.2 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 gezon. and he can not remember that he has her once seen

1.4.1.3 Complements of neutral nouns

(104) a. Zenen zey gekumen oyfn *seykhl*, az mistorne 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, 29)

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 besprovolotshne telegrafn. had wireless telegraphs
'and they found absolutely nothing, a sign that our ancient Jews already had wireless telegraphy.'
(Royte pomerantsen, 110)

1.4.1.4 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)
1.4.1.1.5 Noncomplement that-clauses

(106) a. Az es vet kumen tsu epes, vel ikh nisht vein. 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)

1.4.1.6 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 active 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 aue, vos zi hot azelkhs gezogt oyf if so is after all really a wrong that she has such said on Tsine. '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)

1.4.1.7 Causal and concessive clauses As we will see, Yiddish clauses that are introduced by the causal conjunctions bansher, makhes 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 gesheenis fun yor 1656, velkhe ikh muz do the lament B treats the occurrences of year 1656 which I must describe here, because I treated them only very briefly in Shturemvint, p.75.

(Weinreich, Kines, 33)

(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 tau fartseykhnen in zeyn katalog, khotsh dos failed to record in his catalog, although the bikhele iz shoyn in zeyn tseyt geven in der Bodleiane.

(Weinreich, Kines, 30)

b. Dos alts, vos far ‘kunt’, ... 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)

1.4.1.8 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 ishtsumakhn.

‘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 farshitanen? 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 durkhoyz, vel ikh aykh batsoin a tsvey rubl, ober dokh*
   if you want absolutely will I you pay a two rubles but after all
   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 wagon, 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 leytz sich 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 m ir: “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 besar 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 aroyz 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)

1.4.1.9 Free relative clauses

   (115) a. *Avu der alter flegt geyn, flegt der younger 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, 18)
   b. *un hot zikh fardint, vifl zey hobn gedarfet. 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)

1.4.1.10 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 yarn.
      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 gornt 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, esa der betler iz gelegen.*
      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 veilik 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)
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 little 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 s h raybn, 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 yerush e. 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)

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 hayntikte. 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 opgehiet. 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).

1.4.1.1.11 Comparative clauses

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 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

a. Gib a kuk, vift 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)
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
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)

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
REFL
'against those who speak about Jewish matters in front of non-Jews'
(Dubnov, Vaad, 18)
b. Stere iz gekumen fleyzn zikh, ver frier vet _ kontshn.
   ‘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!
   ‘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 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!
   ‘May a son-in-law turn around in the room!’
   (Royte pomerantsen, 21)

33The 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 REFLEX 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 _ gedarf durrkhform der keyser.
   ‘The emperor was obliged to drive through a little shtetl.
   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 REFLEX 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 REFLEX 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 menstehn!
   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 _ oyj a yid.
   ‘Once, at a wedding, a guy stands up
   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
finite verbs
'The 6 stories investigated contain 1811 finite verbs in root clauses.'
(Zaretski, Sholem, 68)

d. "Sssa": shreyt — ogs 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 gezeh, mit lange hor, mit zek onshhot 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 afle optsushmaysn a kind.
and it is not there no time when even up to beat a child
'And in isn't any time even to spank a child.'
(Grine felder, 82)

b. un vayter iz — do nokh a kleyn khesorndl.
and further is 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 sak moly.
and with me in room are there a lot moshs
'And in my room, there are a lot of moshts.'
(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 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 subjekt.
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

34Van 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 ġa:nə ærrena yfela ñe 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’
văn Kemenade 1993:15, (17c)

b. þæt eallum folce sy gedemed beforan ñe
that all people-DAT be judged before you
‘that all the people be judged before you’
văn Kemenade 1993:15, (18a)

c. þonne ælce dægæ beðod manega accennde 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’
văn 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 or ‘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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause type</th>
<th>No gap</th>
<th>Ambiguous</th>
<th>Unambiguous</th>
<th>Empty expl.</th>
<th>Wh-trace</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2418</td>
<td>6200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal or concessive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That-complement of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... neutral predicate</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... neutral noun</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... degree adverb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative, resumptive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative, wh-movement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative, chopped</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free relative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect question</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That-complement,</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjective head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That-complement,</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negated neutral predicate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That-complement,</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unclear status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other subordinate clause,</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unclear status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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バンシェル, 메히מס and וגל 'because' and קוטש '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 Gartner and Steinbach 1994 for detailed discussion).

(i) Sage dann aber auch nicht, dich habe jemals eine Frau geliebt.
   'But then don't say you were ever loved by a woman.'

Further naturally-occurring 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.
      '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 mich trign al meyn zinn.
   'There lies a man beaten to death, unless all my senses deceive me.'
   (Bovo, 76)
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)).

\[(134)\quad \text{Der yid vos mir hohn gezen in Niu-York iz an amorets, ober der yid vos the man that we have seen in New York is an ignoramus but the man that in Boston have we seen is a great scholar.} 'The man that we saw in New York is an ignoramus, but the man that we saw in Boston is a great scholar.'\]

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 occurring 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 existence of partial V2 in subordinate clauses with wh-movement is left unexplained.

### 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).

\[(133)\quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Der yid vos in Boston hohn mir im gezen iz a groyser lamdn.} \\
& \text{the man that in have we him seen is a great scholar.'} \\
& \text{('The man that we saw in Boston is a great scholar.' (Lowenstamm 1977:211, (34c)))} \\
\text{b. } & \text{*Der yid vos in Boston hohn mir } \phi \text{ gezen iz a groyser lamdn.} \\
& \text{the man that in have we seen is a great scholar.'} \\
& \text{('The man that we saw in Boston is a great scholar.' (Lowenstamm 1977:211, (34d)))}
\end{align*}\]

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 $S \rightarrow \text{Comp S}$, 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.

### 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

---

Table 3: Synopsis of Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause type</th>
<th>No subject gap</th>
<th>Subject gap</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root</td>
<td>1624 (73%)</td>
<td>587 (27%)</td>
<td>2211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate root</td>
<td>81 (65%)</td>
<td>43 (35%)</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary subordinate</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td>38 (90%)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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, I argue 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, 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 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.36

36According 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.

37Embedded 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, (2-1 b), Cinque 1989:78, (4)), even in hypothetical contexts like (139b).

(139) a. Die Idee, die Erde sei rund, hatte der merkwürdige Genuese
the idea the earth is-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).
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\(^\text{39}\) 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.\(^\text{40}\)

\begin{align*}
(140) & \text{a. Ir must 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)} \\
& \text{b. Hot zi gegebhn 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)}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(141) & \text{a. Hot er gelozn a tsavoe, az zayne gantse gelt giet er avek oyf glaykh he 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)} \\
& \text{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)}
\end{align*}

Hooper and Thompson's analysis also rules out negative constituent preposing in the complements of predicates such as\(^{\text{un}}\)likely,\(^{\text{im}}\)possible,\(^{\text{im}}\)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.

\begin{align*}
(142) & \text{Meglekh, az do darf men gikher haitn 'Vi ruft men es' far a bemerkzats possible that there must one rather hold how calls one it for a parenthetical mit shans fun fregkeyt. with chance of interrogation 'It is possible that here, 'Vi ruft men es' is better considered a parenthetical with interrogative overtones.' (Zaretski, Mendele, 144)}
\end{align*}

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.

\begin{align*}
(143) & \text{a. Him se gyssel organ geornice fylstan. them the hostage began willingly help 'The hostage willingly began to help them.' (Pintzuk 1991:206, (28a))} \\
& \text{b. & ic gehwam will pertz toxcan and I everyone will thereto direct 'and I will direct everyone there' (Pintzuk 1991:201, (20a))} \\
& \text{c. for-ban-he him nan deofol ne mihte bedigian hine sylfne because him no devil neg could hide him self 'because no devil could hid himself from him' (Pintzuk 1991:206, (28b))} \\
& \text{d. pæt he pæt godes hus wilde 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))}
\end{align*}
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 ] ... ]]
   b. [IP [XP [XP Topic ] Clitic ... ] ]

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. 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.

(148) 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 fælle 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 ælice dages beode manega acennede þurh hys mihte on when each day are many-NOM given birth through his power on worulde
   world

(145) a. Hwi sceole we obres mannnes niman? why should we other man’s take
   ‘Why should we take another man’s?’
   (Pintzuk 1993:24, (52))

b. þæt ge-mette he sceadan.
   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

41According 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.

(144) a. þin agen gelenas þe hæþp gehalede.
   your own faith you has healed
   ‘Your own faith has healed you.’
   (Pintzuk 1991:206, (30a))

b. Hiora untrymnesse þe sceal ðrowian 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 þæt nihtstan he hæfden getogen eal Creca folc to Bámen
   when at last they had drawn all Greece’s people into the 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 þæt ‘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).

(146) Parameters of clitic placement:

42Pintzuk’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 (148) 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.

43As 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.
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). 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. 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). The resulting structure of a V2 clause with clitics is then as in (149).

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) \[ [\text{CP} \quad \text{Topic} \quad [c \ldots ] \quad [\text{IP} \quad \text{Clitics} \quad [i_p \quad t_i \quad [i_V \quad [i_t \quad [. . . \quad t_i \quad . . . \quad ] \quad ] \quad ] \quad ] \quad ] \quad ] \quad ] \quad ]

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 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 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))

---

44Kroch and Taylor 1995 do not mention the variability in German clitic placement in (97).
45In a very restricted range of environments, Old English does allow V3 clauses (Pintzuk 1991:102–106). See Chapter 2.4 for further discussion.
46The 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 ayzh dokh gebtn, ir zolt zey oyslernen but I have you after all asked you should them out teach derekh-erets.  
     "But I asked you to teach them manners."  
     (Royte pomerantsen, 6)  

b. Der yid zet, es shpilt zikh oyfn gas a yidisher yngl. 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)

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 tsri tsu geyn tsu der kale in hoyz has he REFL thought it is still too early to go to the bride in house  
    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 [c X] [cp Top Vf ... ] ] (German)  
     b. [xp [c X] [ip Top Vf ... ] ] (Yiddish)  

(154) No complementizer:  
     a. [xp [c 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.

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.

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?'
     (Royte pomerantsen, 6)

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 hansher, 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of topic</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Expletive</th>
<th>Direct or indirect object</th>
<th>Other phrase</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root</td>
<td>3728</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>1677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(59%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td>(26%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate root</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asyndetic</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(87%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary subordinate</td>
<td>1389</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(87%)</td>
<td>(9%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

1Since 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
She has come to see who will finish earlier.

b. Zi iz gekumen zen, ver es vet frier kontshn.
She has come to see who it will finish.

c. Zi iz gekumen zen, ver frier ket kontshn.
She has come to see who will finish.

(Grinefeld, 63, cited in Diesing 1990:50, (15b))

(156) a. *Zi veys, vemen zoln di kinder gebn di bikher.
'She knows who the children should give the books to.'

b. Zi veys, vemen ot di bikher zoln di kinder gebn.
'She knows who the children should give these books to.'

c. Zi veys, vemen es zoln di kinder gebn di bikher.
'She knows who it shall the children give the books to.'

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

(157) a. Ver ves vet frier kontshn?
Who will finish earlier?

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

c. *Ver frier ket kontshn?
Who earlier will finish

(158) a. Vemen zoln di kinder gebn di bikher?
She knows who-OAT shall the children give the books

'Who shall the children give the books to?'

(based on Diesing 1990:72, (52))

b. *Vemen ot di bikher zoln di kinder gebn?
'She knows who-OAT DEM the books shall the children give

'Who shall the children give these books to?'

c. *Vemen es zoln di kinder gebn di bikher?
'She knows who-OAT it shall the children give the books

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 gegeben?
'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 gegeben?
What has the rabbi-DAT given

'What did Max give the rabbi?'

(based on Diesing 1990:74, (52))

b. Ikh veys nit, vos ot DEM rov hot Max gegeben, ober YENEM hot er gegeben a bukh.
'I don't know what DEM the rabbi-DAT has Max given, but that one has he given 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:  
\[ \text{[CP Wh-phrase, Vf, [IP Topic, \text{tj} [VP \ldots \text{tj} \ldots \text{tj} \ldots]]]} \]

b. Indirect questions:  
\[ \text{[CP Wh-phrase, C, [IP Topic, Vf, \text{tj} [VP \ldots \text{tj} \ldots \text{tj} \ldots]]]} \]

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 \( \text{það} \) 'that', which is restricted to ungoverned positions, is consistent with verb movement to C in direct questions (Kosmeijer 1991). Treating Yiddish direct questions as CP's therefore yields a uniform treatment of the wh-phrase and the fronted verb (see Chapter 2.4.1.2.1).

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 \( \text{ask/wonder} \) class and the \( \text{know/tell} \) class (Baker 1968, Berman 1991, Ginzburg 1992, Groenendijk and Stokhof 1982, 1984, Munsat 1986, Plann 1982, Sufer 1991a, 1991b). Both types of predicates subcategorize for wh-complements, but their complements do not translate into the same semantic type: complements of \( \text{ask} \) and \( \text{wonder} \) translate into questions, whereas complements of \( \text{know} \) and \( \text{tell} \) translate into propositions. Accordingly, Sufer 1991a, 1991b distinguishes 'indirect questions' and 'semi-questions'.

In Spanish, there is a very clear distinction between the two complements types: the complements of \( \text{ask/wonder} \) can be embedded under \( \text{que} \) 'that', whereas \( \text{know/tell} \) verbs can never be (Sufer 1991a, 1991b). In other languages, including Irish English (Henry 1995, McCloskey 1992) and Yiddish, the facts concerning embedded direct questions are more complex. The \( \text{ask/wonder} \) class freely allows the Wh-Vf order characteristic of direct questions; (153) gives some examples in the complement of \( \text{fregen} \) 'ask' and \( \text{vunders zhik} \) 'wonder'.

(163) a. Freg ikh dem fish, tsi \( \text{hot} \) er nit gezehn in vaser dem yidn?  
\text{ask I the fish whether has he not seen in water the man}  
(Royte pomerantsen, 152)

b. Un s'iz im afle nit ayngefnal zikh tsu vundern vi \( \text{kumt} \) es vos di  
\text{and it is him even not in fallen REFL to wonder how comes it that}  
( Royte pomerantsen, 105)

c. Vet ir fregn, vos \( \text{votl} \) ikh gemakht mitn dritn milyon?  
\text{will you ask what I'd done with the third million?}  
( Royte pomerantsen, 47)

As expected given the Spanish facts, the \( \text{know/tell} \) 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 allow Wh-Vf word order. Examples of Wh-Vf semi-questions are given in (164).\(^4\)

(164) Negated context:  
a. Ikh farshtey nit, vos \( \text{iz} \) dos far a verter.  
\text{I understand not, what is that for a words}  
( Royte pomerantsen, 152)

\(^4\)Even under such favorable circumstances, Spanish does not allow the \( \text{know/tell} \) verbs to embed direct questions under \( \text{que} \) 'that' (Sufer 1991a, Section 4).

\(^3\)Kosmeier's argument for Icelandic \( \text{það} \) extends straightforwardly to Yiddish topic \( \text{es} \). 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).
Modal context:

b. Nisht klor: tsi kon men nisht zogn ... 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 thing. '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 sworn people with common sense shall judge whether is the person shuldig oder unshuldig. '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. Dengokh fregt er im: "Fundestvegn volt ikh gevolt visn, vos iz dos ayer afterwards asks he him nevertheless would I wished know what is DOS ha ayer tatz given 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 ended up doing.' (Royte pomerantsen, 208)

e. Koydemkol darf men derklern, vos iz dermns '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 ir dortn mit di vegener? see what is there with the teamsters

(167) Interrogative context:

a. Kent ir mir nit zogn, vu vognt 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)

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 gi/tn 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 direktor tsi an undirektor korbn fun dem allies 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 REFLE the trial ended and whether is in general
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. Von 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)

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.

(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 1955:30, 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)

2.3.1.2 Imperatives

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, in standard German (contra McCloskey 1992:112), as well as in standard English in the complements of nonlexical categories.

(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)
2.3.1.1 Narrative VI 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 to buy a nanny goat is he gone to in town. Ober keyn tsig hot er nit gekent gefinen, hot no nanny goat has he not been able to 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 far away came the enemy’s multitudes have one geheysn shisn. Hat der yidisher zelner oyfgehoybn dem biks un hot ordered shoot has the Jewish soldier up lifted the gun and has geshosn in him 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 and in a time around has one him brought before the military court. Fregt men, far vos er hot geshosn in him! asks one for what he fired into the sky asks he how have he gedarft shisn? “Vizhe hob ikh needed shoot says he what means there zenen dokh gedint in soldatn, hovn zey gekent shisn. they have both had served as soldiers, so they knew how to shoot.’ (Royte pomerantsen, 51)

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

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

c. Farvos lost 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 subjekt’ 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 later had the opportunity to hear how father-mother redn yidish mit a mentsh vos zey kenen nisht. With him have they dafke gezogt ‘ir’. Heyst es, az mir hobs 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)

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

(175) a. Kh’ volt tsun im gekumen, voynt er (ober) zoyer 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 given a rov, ken ikh nit keyn toyre. would I been a rabbi, can I not no ‘They had both served as soldiers, so they knew how to shoot.’ (Royte pomerantsen, 51)

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

(174) a. Zey hobn beyde gehat gedint in soldatn, hovn zey gekent shisn. They had both served as soldiers, so they knew how to shoot.
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 Elieynhu 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 oygemakht. B: if only that alone would been would already not mattered Voren 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 shoyjn dayn yidene narishkaytn. that shee sees you talks already your Jew-FEM foolishnesses ‘You see yourself, Elkone, your wife is already saying silly things.’ (Grine felder, 63)

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 1996b: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, Thrúðinsson 1986), Kashimir (Bhatt 1994, Section 4.3.1), Swedish (Dahlbeck and Vamling 1983, Platzack 1987), Old English (Pintzuk 1991:137–150), Old French (Adams 1997b: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 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 ist die erste These oben bereits widerlegt worden. Die zweite durfte im Verlauf der Erörterung ebenfalls hinfallig geworden sein. Bleibt die dritte These. ‘At the beginning of his paper, the author presents three theses. Of these, the first has already been refuted, the second may in the course of the discussion also invalidated become be remains the third thesis.’ (Önnerfors 1993:32, (72))
c. Neutral V1:
Soll ich in ein trauriges Kino gehen und in dreckiger Luft da sitzen und mir einen alten Film anschauen? Nee, ich lese Bücher. Ist man and me an old movie on look nah I read books is one

⁷Thanks to Anthony Kroch for (177c), a passage from an interview with Marlene Dietrich.
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 Thrainsson 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), Dahlbaek 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, Thrainsson 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. Önnerfors 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 gezeh?
   have you there your seen
   ‘Did you see your Stere there?’
   (Grine felder, 64)
   b. Hot es efsher Avrom-Yankev gezeh?
      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
      (89)
'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 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).

(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)

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 eit zen dem gortn mit kartofi, 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 aber, mayn kind.**  
come only here my child
'Come here, my child.'
(Grine felder, 66)

c. **Nem dir a shhtik 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 geyp shoyn aheym!**  
you go already home
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 vein 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 longer 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. Gif 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. Ix ober der subyekt in bayzats nit farfelt, azoy kumt der
   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)

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
   ‘Tell her not to obey her father if he interferes.’
   (Grine felder, 89)

c. Men hot kharote, tomer tüt 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 bleyndiks 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 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 [if we won’t go ]

b. If it rains, then [if can we go to the museum? ]
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 [IP Op Vf ... ]]

   b. Root use:
   [IP tomer [IP Topic Vf ... ]]

2.3.1.4.3 Declerative 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.
   '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 feygleleh 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 zil!
   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
   'Your playing with Berlens!'

10Mark, 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.

11The 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 (1.a) is archaizing, and the V2 exclamations may be built on a German model.

(i) a. Vi fil ihudim kindr hot men dem zemer 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 ] ]]


(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).

12In 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.
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 ti vos [ip t, halt in zikh bahaltn ti der alter zokn Ural ] ]

b. * di kulturarbet, [cp ti vos [ip t, firt ti di yidkultkomisie ti ti ] ]

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 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. * Veri hot er moyre [cp ti az [ip t, vet kumen ? ] ]

b. Veri hot er moyre [cp ti az [ip t, vet kumen ? ] ]

Who is he afraid will come?' (Diesing 1990:75, (53a))

b. Veri hot er moyre [cp ti az [ip t, vet ti 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 toyant 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
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, ] azoy, 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).
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 perzonlekh pronom, ken yemolt biklal incidentally if the subject is a personal pronoun can then generally nit gemolt zeyn keyn fiktler subyekt ex. not imagined be no fictitious subject is ‘Incidentally, if the subject is a personal pronoun, then topic ex generally cannot be imagined.’
   (Mark, 183)

   b. Aderabe, konyunktivin subordinirm 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 shtrayger, 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. Dervagle, er zis zikh azoy. meanwhile he sits REF so
   ‘Meanwhile, he is sitting there.’ (Royte pomerantsen, 215)

   f. Es es ikh hab gehert nisim v’nifl.oes 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. Es es 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 returned to their room in the evening, they had to take off their clothes.
   (Royte pomerantsen, 38)

   i. Iberiken, der cynshlisiker 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 the speech 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. Is der yid hot gehart 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)

Mamesh, di shkhine rut oyf im.
‘Truly, the divine presence rests on him.’
(Grine felder, 74)

Nisht nor er lernt nisht, nor er tut biklal gornisht.
‘Not only doesn’t he learn, but he does nothing in general.’
(Zaretski 1929:237, §733.6)

Un take derfar bin ikh antlofn.
‘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 shlojt 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 kunte 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 rele 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. vil)

c. Ven mentshn zenen do zelta, es reysht nisht, es kokht nisht vi in di if people are there seldom it roars not, it boils not like in the cities.
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. Pamelek vi ir geyt arop, aray zolet 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 az a guter kirzhner, efsher vest du kenen
if you are already yes such a good furrier perhaps will you be able
makhn fun dem shitik di gants 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).


(213) { Auf jeden Fall, kurzum, nichtsdestotrotz, trotzdem, übrigens: } wir
in any event in short nevertheless nevertheless incidentally we
must further
‘In any event, in short, nevertheless, incidentally,} we must move on.’

(214) a. { 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.

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

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. Vien *iz* gekumen noent tsum shtetl, *iz* geyt dos 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.

‘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 *sd* '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 *sd*, which can follow all sorts of constituents, including dislocated arguments. In addition, *iz*, unlike either variant of *sd*, 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 *sd*. Presumably, the less restricted distributions of *iz* and Finland-Swedish *sd* 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).


    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, daß du t, kennst] *glaubt* ich nicht ]]

b. [CP [CP [ die Franca, daß t, 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 (Zaretzki 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.
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. 1993:344, §§ 244.2 for earlier stages of German) and the
Icelandic adverbs discussed by Thórúnsson 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
noch ngs 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. 1993:344, §§ 244.1, Tomaselli 1994 for German). Es is routinely pronounced /s/ in Yiddish (often reflected
throughly as 'es or ş'), 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 a shprits fun undzer blut, shprotsn vet dort undzer
and where fallen it is spurt of our blood sprout will there our

(‘And where a drop of our blood has fallen, there our strength, our courage will

(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.
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).

(225) a. Gelt in polk arayn sel 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 sarft 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)

2.4.1.2.2 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

(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 repert, vos iz epes fuftsik rubl? and further what is something fifty rubles 'And moreover, what is fifty rubles?' (Royte pomerantsen, 241)
c. Un sider 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 keyst 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, tsu 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 ikeh ‘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).
2.4.1.2.3 Multiple wh-questions  Like Romanian and many Slavic languages, Yiddish allows multiple wh-questions (Comorovski 1989, Rudin 1986, 1988).

(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 biste 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)

Thus, Yiddish belongs to the same group of multiple wh-languages as Bulgarian and Romanian, and not with Polish, Czchef 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 is!**
what for clever she is
‘What a clever one she is!’
(Zaretski 1929:236, §733.3)

(b)  

**Vi zi hot zikh getsapl 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 minutha!**
what he has over lived in the minutes
‘What he lived through in those minutes!’
(Zaretski 1929:236, §733.3)

(d)  

**Vos du zoget!**
what you say

19Neither Zaretski 1929 nor Mark 1946 remark upon the fact that root exclamations have subordinate clause syntax.
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 maz haltn a*
has his family requested that not otherwise the rabbi must hold a
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 zeln xer hot zikh mit ir biz aher*
a true popular chronicle that seldom someone has REFL with her till now
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 tatz 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 infn-change), or more or less successful imitations of German word order.
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