

What do Verb Second and Second Position Cliticization have in common?

Krzysztof Migdalski (University of Wrocław)

The hypothesis that the Verb Second (V2) rule in Germanic and Second Position Cliticization (2P) represent the same linguistic processes in different guises has a long tradition in linguistics. It was first proposed by Wackernagel (1892), and more recently it was adopted by Anderson (1993), Franks (2000), and Bošković (2001). Although these processes affect different categories (V2 requires that all finite verbs occur after the initial element in non-root environments, whereas 2P applies to phonologically deficient elements of different categories), they had similar stages in their diachronic development: at first they were restricted to operator contexts (e.g. focus marking) and became generalized to all cases only at a later stage (see Eythórsson 1995; Fuss 2003 for V2 in Germanic and Radanović-Kocić 1988; Migdalski 2007 for 2P in Slavic). Moreover, both V2 and 2P consist in placement of a verb/clitic in a position in which they can be preceded by categorially unrelated elements. This makes the operation rather different from other syntactic movements, which occur in order to establish a relation with a specific category resulting in feature checking. This fact makes it also difficult to explain the movement in minimalist terms, as it is hard to identify a uniform trigger that is responsible for it.

On the assumption that there is indeed a syntactic correspondence between V2 and 2P, I will examine some common ideas concerning V2 placement with respect to the trigger of the movement and the elements preceding the verb, in particular those that relate all cases of V2 to Force marking (cf. Brandner 2004, Wechsler 1991, Wiklund et al 2009). Using Slavic 2P data to test these ideas, I will show that Force-triggered movement to the second position is unrelated to other types of V2. For instance, in Slavic clitics move to the second position to mark Force even in those languages that do not have any 2P clitics otherwise (Bulgarian, Macedonian, Polish, Russian). Conversely, those Slavic languages that have generalized 2P clitics, such as Serbo-Croatian, violate the 2P cliticization pattern in Force-related environments; for example, when a clause is negated and the verb moves to the second position, rather than the clitic, which then occurs third in the structure. Given these observations, I will argue that it is incorrect to attribute all cases of V2 to a uniform syntactic trigger. V2 covers a number of unrelated cases of movement or base generation, and their only common property is the position of the verb after the first constituent

- Anderson, S., 1993. Wackernagel's Revenge: Clitics, Morphology, and the Syntax of Verb-Second Position. *Language* 69, 68-98.
- Bošković, Ž., 2001. *On the Nature of the Syntax-Phonology Interface. Cliticization and Related Phenomena*. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Brandner, E., 2004. Head-movement in Minimalism, and V2 as FORCE-marking. In: Lohnstein, H. Trissler, S. (Eds.), *The Syntax and Semantics of the Left Periphery*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 97-138.
- Eythórsson, Th. 1995. *Verbal Syntax in the Early Germanic Languages*. Ph.D. dissertation. Cornell University.
- Franks, S., 2000. Clitics at the Interface: An Introduction to *Clitic Phenomena in European Languages*. In: Beukema, F., Den Dikken, M. (Eds.), *Clitic Phenomena in European Languages*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 1-46.
- Fuss, E. 2003. On the Historical Core of V2 in Germanic. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 26.2, 195-231
- Migdalski, K., 2007. On the Emergence of Second Position Cliticization in Slavic. Paper presented at the Formal Description of Slavic Languages 7, University of Leipzig, December 2007.
- Radanović-Kocić, V., 1988. *The Grammar of Serbo-Croatian Clitics: A Synchronic and Diachronic Perspective*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Illinois, Urbana.
- Wackernagel, J., 1892. Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1, 333-436.
- Wiklund, A.-L. et al 2009. On the distribution and illocution of V2 in Scandinavian *that*-clauses. Forthcoming in *Lingua*.