

The left periphery and the variation in V2

Den Besten (1989) studied word order in German and Dutch and showed that the phenomena observed with the conjunction in subordinate clauses are observed with the verb in main clauses as given in (1) and (2) respectively:

- (1) ...dat (*gisteren) je/ze (gisteren) ziek **was**.
that yesterday you/she yesterday sick was (DEN BESTEN, 1989, p. 25)
- (2) **Toch** (*gisteren) **was** je/ze (gisteren) ziek.
Still yesterday was you/she yesterday sick (DEN BESTEN, 1989, p. 26)

In the examples (1) and (2), if the weak pronoun “je/ze” is adjoined to the conjunction or the verb, the sentence is grammatical. When the adjacency fails, sentences become ungrammatical. Thus, for Den Besten (1989), the verb is located in the same projection as the conjunction, that is, in COMP (nowadays, C).

Thráinsson (1986) pointed out that in Icelandic, unlike German, there is symmetry between main and subordinate clauses in relation to the order of constituents:

- (3) a. Helgi **hefur** trúlega keypt bókina.
Helgi has probably bought the book
- b. Jón segir að Helgi **hefur** trúlega keypt bókina.
Jón says that Helgi has probably bought the book (THRÁINSSON, 1986, p. 171)

For Thráinsson (1986), the presence of the conjunction in the sentence (3b) is a sign that the verb is in a lower position, that is, in INFL (now, I).

After them, Vikner (1995) questioned this perspective proposing that, in any V2 language, the verb is located in C and that there is independent evidence to assume that the CP field can have more than one projection:

- (4) a. **Hafði** Pétur þá ekki enn lesið bókina
Has Pétur then not still read book.DEF
- b. ***Hafði** bókina Pétur þá ekki enn lesið
Has book.DEF Pétur then not still read (VIKNER, 1995, p. 88)

In any V2 language, any constituent beyond the subject can occupy the first position. For Vikner (1995), if SpecIP were an A' position in symmetrical languages, the observed contrast between (4a) and (4b) would not be expected. Sentence (4a) whose subject precedes the verb, as the only grammatical option, shows that SpecIP is an *A position* and the verb is located in C.

Considering the arguments presented by Vikner (1995), Pinto (2011) proposed an analysis that explains the variation in the manifestation of the V2 effect in relation to symmetrical and asymmetrical languages, assuming the generalized movement of the verb to the CP field. We start from three propositions: a) the CP field is a set of projections with pragmatic and discursive values as proposed by Rizzi (1997); b) the element that triggers the movement of the verb for the CP field is the EPP feature in FinP according to Roberts (2004); c) the V2 effect is related to the feature [+assertion] in ForceP following Julien (2010).

Our presentation has two main goals as follows in (a) and (b):

a) to discuss Wolfe's (2020) proposal, regarding the structure of the left periphery, in which he proposes that FrameP dominates ForceP:

Pinto (2011) and Wolfe (2020) proposed that in asymmetrical languages, the verb moves to ForceP in main clauses and stays in IP/VP in subordinate clauses. In symmetrical languages, the verb moves to FinP in both types of clauses. Considering that symmetrical languages exhibit greater flexibility of order V>2 than asymmetrical languages, Pinto (2011) proposed that there is a FrameP projection between ForceP and FinP where scene setters and hanging topics are located (note the object shift constructs in Icelandic). However, Wolfe (2020) systematizes the first constituent in the order V>2 in the different types of V2

languages and shows that in German, a very restricted types of constituents (especially scene setters), can be in the first position and assumes that FrameP precedes ForceP. Since ForceP is the place where the subordinate introducers (conjunctions and relative pronouns) are located, we show, from subordinate clause data, that scene setters and hanging topics are always located to the right of those elements, which indicates that ForceP, as proposed by Rizzi (1997), since the cartography hierarchy is universal and invariable, is the highest category of the CP field.

b) to test the analysis developed in Tescari Neto (2021) based on Chomsky (2001) that head movement is not possible in the narrow syntax, developing the analysis of the verb movement based on syntagmatic movement (generalized remnant movement):

Hinterhölz (2006) showed data from German in which V2 are generated by remnant movement of an entire XP to the left of the verb. Pinto (2023) showed that medieval Spanish had evidence for remnant movement in V>2 clauses. Following Tescari Neto (2021), we would present two preliminary analyses to V2: a) one XP moves to left periphery; other elements of vP move to IP area and the remnant vP that only bears the verb moves to some CP position; b) alternatively, the remnant vP with other elements can move to a CP position, surfacing a V>2 order. German is again the problem for three reasons: a) how to explain the relationship between matrix and embedded clauses? b) how to explain the very restricted cases of V>2? c) how to explain which position vP reaches if the only position available is SpecForceP? The last part of the work tries to relate problems (a) and (b) from a cartographic and comparative view.

References:

- CHOMSKY, N. (2001). Derivation by Phase. In: KENSTOWICZ, Michael (ed.). *Ken Hale: A life in language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, p. 1-52.
- DEN BESTEN, H. (1989). On the Interaction of Root Transformations and Lexical Deletive Rules. *Studies in West Germanic Syntax*, n. 20, p. 14 -100.
- HINTERHÖLZ, R (2006). *Scrambling, Remnant Movement, and Restructuring in West Germanic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- JULIEN, M. (2009). The force of the argument. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*, v. 84, p. 225–232.
- PINTO, C. F. (2011). *Ordem de palavras, movimento do verbo e efeito V2 na história do espanhol*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Universidade Estadual de Campinas.
- _____. (2023). Remnant movement no espanhol medieval: primeiras reflexões. In: Cristiane Namiuti; Elisângela Gonçalves. (eds.). *Morfologia, sintaxe e interfaces*. Campinas: Pontes, p. 166-184
- RIZZI, L. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In: HAEGEMAN, L. (ed.). *Elements of grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, p. 281-337.
- ROBERTS, I. (2004). The C-System in brythonic celtic languages, V2 and the EPP. In: RIZZI, L. (ed.). *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*. v. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 297-328.
- THRÁINSSON, H. (1986). V1, V2 e V3 in Icelandic. In: HAIDER, H.; PRINZHORN, M. (eds.). *Verb second Phenomena in Germanic languages*. Dordrecht: Foris, p. 169-194.
- VIKNER, S. (1995). *Verb movement and expletive subjects in the Germanic languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- WOLFE, S. (2020). Redefining the typology of V2 languages: the view from Medieval Romance and beyond. *Linguistic Variation*, v. 19, n. 1, p. 16-46, 2019.
- TESCARI NETO, A. (2021). *Sintaxe Gerativa. Uma introdução à cartografia sintática*. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP.