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Abstract

The properties of embedded V2-clauses in Mainland Scandinavian, as opposed to non-V2 clauses, have been a topic of much debate recently. This paper defends the view that all V2 clauses have illocutionary force, which for a declarative clause means that it is asserted. First clauses embedded under the predicate types identified by Hooper & Thompson (1973) are discussed, and it is shown that the generalisation that V2 is closely related to assertion holds for all types. After that, I present arguments against the claim that seemingly embedded V2 clauses are not in fact embedded, and then the analysis of embedded V2 is spelled out more formally. This is followed by a discussion of possible tests for assertion, which leads to the conclusion that few of the proposed tests really work, but that certain discourse-oriented elements seem to be sensitive to the presence of illocutionary force. Finally, I look at embedded questions with main clause word order, and I tentatively conclude that these too have illocutionary force.
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1. Introduction

The explanations that have been offered for embedded V2 in Mainland Scandinavian, and in Germanic more generally, are of two types. According to one view, the semantic and/or pragmatic properties of the embedded clause itself are crucial, since embedded V2 is more frequent in clauses that represent a proposition that is asserted, either directly, by the speaker, or indirectly, with the speaker reproducing a claim that

* I would like to thank audiences in Lund, Budapest, Utrecht, Tromsø, Oslo and Stockholm for valuable responses to earlier versions of this paper.
someone else has made (see Andersson 1975, G. Green 1976, Wechsler 1991, Holmberg & Platzack 1995). According to another view, the possibility of having V2 order in an embedded sentence is a consequence of certain properties of the matrix predicate. De Haan & Weerman (1986), Iatridou & Kroch (1992), and perhaps most famously, Vikner (1995), note that V2 is seen in clausal complements of certain verbs, called “bridge verbs”. But as Vikner points out, the verbs in question are not necessarily bridge verbs in the sense that they allow extraction out of the clause they have as complement. In fact, according to Vikner it seems that his “bridge verbs” are only distinguished as a group by their ability to take a V2 complement, and moreover, there is some variation between the Germanic languages as to which verbs have this property. Hence, Vikner concludes that its semantics is not what makes a verb a “bridge verb”.

These diverging claims form the backdrop of the attention that the phenomenon of embedded V2 has attracted more recently, especially with respect to Scandinavian. Thus, Julien (2007) argued that an analysis of embedded V2 based on the concept of bridge verb is empirically inadequate, and that V2 order in embedded declarative clauses goes hand in hand with assertion. Partly in response to this, Bentzen et al. (2007a, 2007b) and Wiklund et al. (2009) argued that V2 order in embedded clauses is only loosely connected to discourse properties. More specifically, they claimed that the relevant discourse property is the possibility of being the main point of the utterance, and that in embedded clauses this possibility entails and is entailed by the possibility of having V2 order—which means that there is no strict one-to-one relation between V2 order and any particular status in the discourse.

In this paper, I argue once again that at least in Mainland Scandinavian, embedded declarative clauses with V2 order are asserted, which means that they have the same
I start, in section 2, by presenting the results of an investigation of the distribution of embedded V2 in Mainland Scandinavian, which shows quite clearly that many cases of embedded V2 cannot be explained as a consequence of the properties of the matrix predicate. Instead, it is the properties of the embedded clause itself that matters—the clause must be asserted. In section 3 I address the claim, put forward by de Haan (2001) and Biberauer (2002), that seemingly embedded V2 clauses are not embedded after all. My conclusion is that at least in Mainland Scandinavian, clauses with V2 order can be embedded. In section 4 I return to the question of illocutionary force. I spell out my analysis of embedded V2 in some detail, and I look at some tests that might be used to demonstrate that embedded V2 clauses have illocutionary force. The upshot of the discussion is that few tests really work, but those that do suggest that my analysis is correct. The topic of the next section, section 5, is embedded interrogative clauses with main clause word order, which are also found in Mainland Scandinavian, although they are probably not as frequent as declarative clauses with main clause word order. I conclude, although somewhat tentatively, that these clauses too have illocutionary force—they are questions. Section 6 is a summary of the paper.

2. The distribution of embedded V2

In Julien (2007) I reported the results of an investigation of the distribution of embedded V2 clauses in Norwegian and Swedish, and of the illocutionary properties of these clauses. This section partly recapitulates that presentation, but in addition, I add here corresponding results from Danish, a language which was not included in the
original investigation. Thus, I will now present the results I got when I searched for embedded V2 in the following tagged corpora:

- NoTa. Tagged Norwegian corpus, spoken language, ca. 1 million words. The Text Laboratory, University of Oslo.
  URL: http://www.tekstlab.uio.no/nota/oslo/index.html

- The Oslo Corpus of Tagged Norwegian Texts, Bokmål section. Tagged Norwegian corpus, written language, ca. 18,5 million words. The Text Laboratory, University of Oslo.
  URL: http://www.tekstlab.uio.no/norsk/bokmaal/index.html

- The Oslo Corpus of Tagged Norwegian Texts, Nynorsk section. Tagged Norwegian corpus, written language, ca. 3,8 million words. The Text Laboratory, University of Oslo.
  URL: http://www.tekstlab.uio.no/norsk/nynorsk/index.html

- PAROLE. Tagged Swedish corpus, written language, ca. 19 million words. Swedish Language Bank, Göteborg University.
  URL: http://spraakbanken.gu.se/parole/

- KorpusDK. Tagged Danish corpus, written language, ca. 56 million words. Det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab. URL: http://ordnet.dk/korpusdk
The search string was <at(t) [max 4 words] Vfin Negation>. The relevant examples returned by the searches were constructions like (1), where an embedded clause introduced by the complementiser at(t) (in bold) has the finite verb (in italics) preceding the negation (underlined):

(1) Jag ska säga dej att jag är inte ett dugg intresserad. (P)¹

I will say you that I am not a dew interested

‘I tell you that I am not the least interested.’

There is a potential risk in taking the occurrence of the finite verb in front of the negation to be a diagnostic for V2, since this ordering of the verb and the negation might a priori have come about by V-to-I movement instead of by operations of the type that also give rise to V2 in main clauses. However, Bentzen (2007) reports that even in those dialects of North Norwegian that have (optional) verb movement in embedded clauses, this movement never raises the verb past the negation. Hence, I feel confident that my search method did return genuine examples of embedded V2.

Still, it might have been even better to look for examples where V2 is manifested as fronting of a non-subject. Unfortunately, the corpora I used do not allow for searches of this kind. Nevertheless, some of the embedded clauses that I found happened to have a non-subject in initial position in addition to having a negation following the finite verb:

---

¹ I use the following abbreviations to indicate which corpora examples are taken from: BM = The Oslo Corpus of Tagged Norwegian Texts, Bokmål section; DK = KorpusDK; NN = The Oslo Corpus of Tagged Norwegian Texts, Nynorsk section; P = Parole. Other examples are marked with D for Danish, N for Norwegian and S for Swedish.
(2) Madsvåg mener at i framtiden kan ikke alle drive med (BM)
M. thinks that in future. can not all be engaged in
all
‘Madsvåg thinks that in the future everyone cannot be engaged in everything.’

The chosen search method did not find embedded V2 clauses with the subjunction omitted. But these exist too, as example (3) shows (found by searching for <sa [1 word] Vfin Neg>):

(3) Karl sa han hadde ikke råd. (BM)
Karl said he had not means
‘Karl said he could not afford it.’

Embedded clauses with a sentence adverbial other than the negation following the verb, as in (4), were not detected either.

(4) Vet dere at jeg har aldri sett vinter før! (BM)
know you.PL that I have never seen winter before
‘Do you know that I have never seen winter before?’

However, since my searches did return lots of examples of embedded V2-clauses in many different environments, and since there is no reason to believe that embedded
clauses like those in (2), (3) or (4) appear with different matrix verbs than examples like
(1), I think I got a representative sample of embedded V2-clauses.²

The relevant examples that I found were grouped in accordance with Hooper &
Thompson (1973), who classify verbal and adjectival predicates according to whether
they take an asserted or a presupposed clause as their complement. Below, I give some
examples from each category (more examples can be seen in Julien 2007), and I argue
that the Scandinavian data support Hooper & Thompson’s claim that root phenomena,
such as V2, are found in asserted embedded clauses.

2.1 Type A: Strongly assertive predicates

In this group we find reportive verbs, and adjectives like true and clear. As expected, I
found many examples of V2 clauses embedded under predicates of this type. Here is a
small selection:

(5) Så ringer jeg og sier at jeg kommer ikke på torsdag. (NoTa)
then call I and say that I come not on Thursday
‘Then I call and say that I won’t be coming then on Thursday.’

² I could have looked at other subjunctions in addition to at(t). However, Garbacz (2005) did this, and he
concluded that embedded V2-clauses are often introduced by at(t). He also noted that V2 is relatively
frequent in clauses introduced by ettersom (Danish, Norwegian)/eftersom (Swedish) ‘since’ and fordi
(Danish, Norwegian) ‘because’. These are all adverbial subjunctions, introducing causal clauses similar to
those discussed in 2.6 here.
he adds quickly that so bad builds not council.

‘He quickly adds that as bad as that the council isn’t building today.’

it is clear that it does not get any better that way.

‘It is clear that it does not get any better that way.’

Arguably, clauses embedded under strongly assertive predicates can be asserted, which means that when they are uttered, the propositions that they represent are presented as true in the possible world that complies with some person’s beliefs (see Stalnaker 1978). This person can be the speaker—in other words, the speaker is actually making the assertion—in which case we have what Hooper & Thompson (1973) call *direct* assertion. (7) is an example of this. Alternatively, the assertion has been made by someone else, and the speaker just reproduces the assertion without necessarily adhering to it. The assertion is then an *indirect* one, as in (6) and in principle also in (5), where the speaker quotes herself.

In some cases the embedded clause is marked as a quote, which makes it even clearer that we have an indirect assertion:

‘And besides, it said that “this law cannot be changed”.’
I should however point out that V2 order is never obligatory in Scandinavian embedded clauses. For example, the embedded clauses in (5)–(7) could alternatively be realised with non-V2 order, as in (5’)–(7’):

(5’) Så ringer jeg og sier at jeg ikke kommer på torsdag.
then call I and say that I not come on Thursday
‘Then I call and say that I won’t be coming then on Thursday.’

(6’) Han tillägger snabbt att kommunen inte bygger så galet idag.
he adds quickly that council.DEF not builds so bad today
‘He quickly adds that the council isn’t building as bad as that today.’

(7’) Det er jo klart, at det ikke bliver bedre på den måde.
it is clear that it not gets better on that way
‘It is clear that it does not get any better that way.’

In cases like these, the proposition that the embedded clause represents is not asserted; that is, claimed to be true. It is just reported, while it is the whole sentence containing the embedded clause that is asserted.

2.2 Type B: Weakly assertive predicates

In this group we find some verbs of cognition, and predicates like seem to and be possible. These too take directly or indirectly asserted complements, and again I found many examples of embedded V2 after them:
(9) Men det er sånn jeg føler at det kommer ikke til å skje. (NoTa)
    but it is such I feel that it comes not to happen

    ‘But it’s like this — I feel that it is not going to happen.’

(10) Vi anser att problemet är inte av teknisk natur. (P)
    we reckon that problem.DEF is not of technical nature

    ‘We reckon that the problem is not of a technical nature.’

(11) Derefter konkluderer de, at gruppen kan ikke overleve (DK)
    thereafter conclude they that group.DEF can not survive
    uden succes.
    without success

    ‘Then they conclude that the group cannot survive without success.’

2.3 Type C: Non-assertive predicates

These are predicates like deny and be impossible. They take non-asserted clausal complements, which are not expected to have V2 order. Accordingly, I did not find any examples in the corpora of V2 clauses embedded under predicates of this type. However, the constructed example in (12), with a V2 clause embedded under the non-assertive matrix predicate tveka ‘doubt’, is judged as acceptable by myself and other speakers I have consulted:

3 This result is also in accordance with the results that Heycock, Sorace & Svabo Hansen (2009) report concerning V2 after ‘doubt’ and ‘deny’ in Danish.
(12) Det är väl ingen som tvekar på att dom gör det

it is nobody that doubts on that they do it

alltid för att få upp försäljningen?

always for to get up sale.DEF

‘I bet nobody doubts that they always do it to raise sales.’

The acceptability of (12) has to do with the negative subject. As Andersson (1973) observed, a negated non-assertive predicate behaves like an assertive predicate and allows asserted clausal complements. Thus, (12) serves to demonstrate that the matrix predicate in itself does not determine whether or not a V2 complement clause is possible. Rather, it is the matrix clause as a whole that is compatible or incompatible with an asserted embedded clause, and hence with embedded V2.

2.4 Type D: Factive predicates

Factive predicates take presupposed clausal complements, as Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1971) made clear, so these complements should, on traditional assumptions, not be able to have V2 order. The propositions that they represent are nomally just mentioned and not asserted. Nevertheless I found some examples of embedded V2 after factive predicates:

(13) Alltid glemte de att den gutten var ikke som andre.

always forgot they that that boy.DEF was not like others

‘They always forgot that that boy was not like the others.’
(14) Han finn det rimeleg at Jens vil ikkje nekta han det.  (NN)
    he finds it reasonable that Jens will not deny him that
    ‘He finds it reasonable that Jens will not deny him that.’

(15) Tänk på att det är inte en enskild person som gör vinst här (P)
    think on that it is not a single person that makes profit here
    ‘Consider that it is not just an individual who makes a profit here.’

I will comment on this when we have looked at semifactive predicates.

2.5 Type E: Semifactive predicates

This group includes predicates like realise, discover and know. They are factive in the declarative indicative, but not in questions and in conditional clauses (Karttunen 1971). Still, they often take V2 complements even when they are factive, as in the following examples:

(16) Eddie innser at han kan ikkje lenger leve med Mona.  (BM)
    Eddie realises that he can not longer live with Mona
    ‘Eddie realises that he can no longer live with Mona.’

(17) Du veit at eg er ikkje slik som eg ynskte å vera.  (NN)
    you know that I am not such as I wanted to be
    ‘You know that I am not like I wanted to be.’
(18) Hun må indrømme, at han har ikke noget bevis for det. (DK)

She must admit that he has no proof for it.

‘She must admit that he has no proof for it.’

It is generally assumed that clauses that represent presupposed propositions cannot also be asserted. If this is true, it is not clear that it is their asserted status that makes it possible for clauses embedded under factive and semifactive predicates to have V2 order. However, I would argue that a presupposed clause can in fact at the same time be asserted. This is also noted by Teleman, Hellberg & Andersson (1999, vol. 4 p. 545) who say that “formally presupposed embedded clauses are sometimes employed to convey new information, i.e. they are asserted” [my translation]. And interestingly, Searle (1969) formulates one condition for a successful assertion as follows: “It is not obvious to both speaker and hearer that the hearer knows and does not have to be reminded of p.” In other words, it is okay to assert something that the hearer knows if we think that a reminder might be in place. Accordingly, we often state something that we take everybody present to know—and sometimes we even do so explicitly. This is illustrated by the fact that a search for the phrase As we all know returned nearly 4 million hits on Google! Some of them are shown here:

(19)a. As we all know, insufficient communication is the source of much disappointment.

b. As we all know, the standard of English in Hong Kong is becoming worse.

c. As we all know, shit rolls downhill.
Although this phrase is in many cases used as a rhetoric device, it is nonetheless true that we often assert things that we take to be part of the common ground, or in other words presupposed. We utter these statements to remind the listeners of the state of facts or bring a topic back in the centre of attention.

In addition, as Stalnaker (2002) points out, the speaker’s presuppositions need not actually be known by the hearer. It is appropriate for a speaker to treat a piece of information as presupposed if she can reasonably assume that the hearer is willing to add that piece to the common ground as soon as the utterance has been made. Moreover, whatever is entailed by a statement that the speaker makes will normally be included in the common ground after the statement is made. From the speaker’s point of view, the actual presupposition is presented as an informative presupposition, and from the hearer’s point of view, it is an example of accommodation. In these cases too, a formally presupposed clause can also be asserted.

2.6 Embedded V2 in other contexts

In addition to embedded V2 clauses embedded under the predicate types that I have just presented, I also found embedded V2 in various contexts that do not fit into Hooper & Thompson’s classification. Some embedded V2 clauses were predicates in copula constructions:

(20) Mitt poeng er at vi kjenner ikke omfanget. (BM)

‘My point is that we do not know the extent.’
The answer is that I was not thinking at all.'

'The result is that the citizens don’t get the help they need.'

In these cases, it is the speaker that asserts the content of the embedded V2 clause. Sometimes the matrix clause is little more than an introduction to the embedded clause, which represents the main assertion, as for example in (20).

Other embedded V2 clauses were complements to nouns, as in (23) and (24), or to the inanimate third person pronouns det (neuter), as in (25), or den (non-neuter) as in (26).

'Then he draws the conclusion that nothing else is to be expected.'
(24) Men dagen efter kom koncernchefen ud med det klare budskab at “vi forhandler ikke med mafiaen”.

‘But the next day the director brought forward the clear message that “we do not negotiate with the maffia”.’

(25) Mikkel må seia det at han har ikkje tent noko.

M. must say it that he has not earned anything

‘Mikkel has to say that he has not earned anything.’

(26) Sandheden er snarere den, at hylder og støv sladrer ikke.

‘The truth is rather that shelves and dust don’t give away anything.’

The nouns that take V2 clauses as complements are morphologically and semantically related to verbs of saying and of cognition, and their complements represent assertions in the same way as complements to the related verbs. We also see that when V2 clauses are complements to pronouns, these pronouns tend to represent clause content. In the examples shown here, the embedded V2 clauses represent indirect assertions in (23), (24) and (25) and a direct assertion in (26).

There were also many examples of embedded V2 clauses introduced by causal subjunctions like sånn at/slik at (Nor)/så att (Swe) ‘so that’ and for (det) at (Nor)/fordi at (Dan)/ (där)för att (Swe.) ‘because’:
(27) Nei det blir ikke vasket for det at i morgen er ikke (NoTa)
no it becomes not washed for it that tomorrow is not
Elsa her.
E. here
‘No there will be no cleaning since tomorrow Elsa won’t be here.’

(28) Det er set inn ekstraferje, slik at folk er ikke heilt (NN)
it is put in extra.ferry such that people are not totally
innestengde.
closed.in
‘They have scheduled an extra ferry, so people are not totally isolated.’

(29) Jeg siger det bare fordi at man skal ikke tro at jeg hader (DK)
I say it only because one shall not think that I hate
alle tyskere.
all Germans
‘I say it only because one mustn’t think that I hate all Germans.’

(30) Jag är skeptisk, därför att jag tycker inte slutförvarsmetoden (P)
I am sceptical because I think not end.storage.method.DEF
är den rätta.
is the right
‘I am sceptical, because I don’t think the final storage method is the right one.’
These subjunctions often introduce embedded clauses that are just as asserted as their matrix clauses. It is possible to paraphrase the utterance so that the assertion that the embedded clause represents is presented instead as a main clause—compare, for example, (30) to (30'):

(30') Jag tycker inte slutförvarsmetoden är den rätta och därför
I think not end.storage.method.DEF is the right and therefore
är jag skeptisk.
am I sceptical
‘I don’t think the final storage method is the right one and therefore I am sceptical.’

Pragmatically, (30) and (30') are equivalent. Hence, I conclude that the embedded clause in (30) is asserted.

Finally, I found lots of examples of V2 in clauses embedded under degree expressions of the type so X that — that is, in the consequence of degree construction.  

(31) Det var så liten plass at vi kunne ikke bo der (NoTa)
it was so little space that we could not live there
når vi fikk barn.
when we got children
‘The place was so small that we could not live there after we had children.’

---

4 Iatridou & Kroch (1992) have been informed that så...at does not take V2 complements in Danish. This is clearly not true for all speakers.
(32) Likevel har vi oppnådd så mye at jeg kan ikke klage.  (BM)
still have we achieved so much that I can not complain
‘Still we have achieved so much that I can’t complain.’

(33) Så mange melde seg at det var ikke plass til alle.  (NN)
so many reported REFL that it was not space for all
‘So many signed up that there wasn’t room for everyone.’

(34) Jag var så elegant att det går inte att beskriva!  (P)
I was so elegant that it goes not to describe
‘I was so elegant that it cannot be described.’

(35) Hun var så optaget at hun havde ikke lagt mærke til at  (DK)
she was so busy that she had not noticed that
han var kommet hjem.
he was come home
‘She was so busy that she had not noticed that he had come home.’

Just like many embedded clauses introduced by causal subjunctions, a that-clause in the consequence of degree-construction can become a main clause in a paraphrase. Thus, (31) is pragmatically equivalent to (31’):
(31’) Vi kunne ikke bo der når vi fikk barn, fordi det
we could not live there when we had children because it
var så liten plass.
was so little space

‘We could not live there after we had children because the place was so small.’

Hence, I conclude that embedded clauses in the consequence of degree-construction are
normally asserted, and that this is the reason why they can have V2 order.

Before moving on to the analysis of embedded V2, I would like to point out that all
the examples of embedded V2 that I have presented here are compatible with one single
grammar, such as my own, which is a grammar without any general V-to-I movement
and without the short verb movements, found in North Norwegian varieties, that are
described in Bentzen (2007). Hence, what we see in the preceding examples is ordinary
Mainland Scandinavian embedded V2.

3. Embedded or not?

Having seen that seemingly embedded V2 clauses appear in many different contexts in
Mainland Scandinavian, we will now turn to the question whether they are really
embedded, since there have been claims to the effect that they are not.

Biberauer (2002) says that embedded clauses in Afrikaans that have the finite verb in
an early position (as opposed to the expected final position) are either TPs or else not
embedded. The embedded TPs have the subject, and not some other constituent, in
initial position, and an auxiliary, that is, a T element, as finite verb. Those V2-clauses
that have a non-subject in initial position or a clausal adverb or negation following the
finite verb are genuine V2 clauses, but Biberauer takes them to be juxtaposed with their "matrix" clauses. Consequently, there are no truly embedded V2 clauses in Afrikaans.

The Scandinavian embedded clauses that I have presented are clearly not TPs on Biberauer’s definition, since they all have negation following the finite verb. Hence, if Biberauer is right, they have to be juxtaposed with what seems to be their matrix clause. However, Biberauer’s arguments are mainly semantic: she notices that embedded V2 clauses are informationally independent of their matrix clauses, and that the content of the embedded clause could in some cases just as well be presented in a matrix clause. We have already seen that this also holds for embedded V2 clauses in Mainland Scandinavian, but as I have suggested, I see this as a consequence of the asserted status of these clauses and not as evidence that they are not embedded.

De Haan (2001), on the other hand, presents more substantial arguments, based on West Frisian, in defence of the analysis that we might call the coordination analysis. He is of course aware that V2 clauses sometimes appear to be arguments of the matrix verb, but according to him, the real argument is then an empty element which the V2 clause is related to. The V2 clause is coordinated with its "matrix" clause, he argues, and what seems to be a subjunction is instead a conjunction.

However, if we consider de Haan’s arguments from a Scandinavian point of view, it appears that they either do not go through or else they are not quite convincing. In the following subsections, we take a closer look at these arguments.

3.1 Variable binding
Firstly, de Haan (2001) says that in Frisian, a quantifier in the “matrix” clause cannot bind a pronoun in an “embedded” V2 clause. This could be an indication that the
“embedded” clause is not embedded after all. But things are different in Scandinavian. Bentzen et al. (2007a) present the Swedish example in (36), which according to them is fully grammatical, and the corresponding Norwegian example in (37) is also fine:

(36) Varje mani sa att hans mamma hade inte läst boken. (S)
    every man said that his mommy had not read book.DEF
    ‘Every man said that his mommy had not read the book.’

(37) Kvar einaste jente melde at ho kunne ikjie komma. (N)
    each only girl reported that she could not come
    ‘Every girl reported that she could not come.’

The binding possibilities shown in (36) and (37) suggest that we have embedding here after all, since the relation where a quantifier binds a variable requires that the quantifier c-commands the variable (see e.g. Partee 1978).

3.2 Embedded V2 clauses in initial position

Secondly, de Haan (2001) observes that in Frisian, an embedded V2 clause cannot be initial in its matrix clause. He takes this as another piece of evidence that V2 clauses are not embedded—meaning that they cannot occupy a structural position inside another clause. A similar effect in seen in Scandinavian—V2 clauses cannot as easily be fronted as their non-V2 counterparts. For example, the Norwegian construction in (38a), with a fronted V2 clause, is not well-formed, while (38b), with a non-V2 clause in initial position, is fine.
(38)a. * At jeg greide ikke jobben slik jeg skulle tenkte jeg på.  
that I managed not job.DEF such I should thought I on  
‘That I was not able to do the job as I ought to, I thought about.’

b. At jeg ikke greide jobben slik jeg skulle tenkte jeg på.  
that I not managed job.DEF such I should thought I on  
‘I thought about (the fact) that I was not able to do the job as I ought to.’

It appears, though, that in some cases fronting of a V2 clause is possible after all. Consider (39), where we find two manipulated versions of the authentic Norwegian example in (13). Both in (39a) and in (39b), the embedded clause has been fronted, but it has non-V2 order in the former case and V2 order in the latter. At least to my ear, (39b) is only marginally less acceptable than (39a).

(39)a. At den gutten ikke var som andre glemte de alltid.  
that that boy.DEF not was like others forgot they always  
‘That that boy was not like others, they always forgot.’

b. ? At den gutten var ikke som andre glemte de alltid.  
that that boy.DEF was not like others forgot they always  
‘That that boy was not like others, they always forgot.’

The tendency for embedded V2 clauses to resist fronting is probably due to their discourse status (as Faarlund, Lie & Vannebo (1997: 984) also suggest). Fronted
constituents are often topics, and clauses that are topics must have a content that is given in the discourse. That is, the proposition that they represent should be presupposed rather than asserted, and since V2 clauses are necessarily asserted, they are normally not good as topics. But as I argued in 2.5, some embedded V2 clauses are also presupposed, in addition to being asserted. We see an example of this in (39b)—the content of the embedded clause is treated as given but at the same time the hearer is reminded of it. It is its presupposed status that allows the clause to appear as a topic in initial position.

Fronted constituents in Scandinavian can however also be focused. Hence, we would expect that in a context where an embedded V2 clause is clearly focused, for example in the sense that it represents the relevant new information in an answer to a wh-question, it should be able to appear in the initial position of its matrix clause. This is borne out. In (40a), we have an example with an embedded V2 clause. In (40b), we have a pseudo-cleft version of (40a), with the embedded V2 clause as focus, and in (40c), we have an inverted pseudo-cleft, with the focused embedded V2 clause in initial position. All three versions would be possible as answers to a question like “What did she say?”

(40)a. Hun sa at poet kan du ikke bli. (N)
    she said that poet can you not become
    ‘She said that you cannot become a poet.’

b. Det hun sa var at poet kan du ikke bli.
    it she said was that poet can you not become
    ‘What she said was that you cannot become a poet.’
c. At poet kan du ikke bli var det hun sa.

that poet can you not become was it she said

‘That you cannot become a poet was what she said.’

We can now conclude that having an embedded V2 clause in the initial position of its matrix clause is not barred for structural reasons, at least not in Norwegian. Instead, it is the asserted status of embedded V2 clauses that in many cases prevents them from appearing in that position.

3.3 Iterated embedding

De Haan (2001) further claims that the special kind of clausal coordination that looks like embedding can be iterated, but then all the matrix clauses that are involved must be V2 clauses. That is, a seemingly embedded V2 clause must be connected directly to another V2 clause. He illustrates this requirement with Frisian examples like the following (his example (51a)):

(41) Ik tocht [dat Teake (sei) niis (*sei) [dat hy hie it net witten]].

I thought that Teake just said that he had it not known

‘I thought that Teake just said that he had not known it.’

Here we have a construction with double clausal embedding. Since the most deeply embedded clause has V2 order, the intermediate clause must also be a V2 clause, as indicated.
Scandinavian behaves differently from Frisian also in this respect. Searching the corpora mentioned in the introduction to section 2, I found several examples of multiple clausal embedding where a non-V2 clause intervenes between two V2 clauses. Two relatively frequent types are exemplified in (42) and (43). In (42), clause 1 is the root clause, while clause 2 is immediately subordinate to the root clause and has non-V2 order—both the subject and a clausal adverb precede the finite verb. Clause 2 in its turn embeds clause 3, which has V2 order, with the finite verb preceding the negation. Irreverently, clause 1 also has a V1 conditional clause (clause 4) in initial position.

(42) [₁ [₄ Läser man den långa dikten i sin helhet] ser man (P) reads one the long poem in REFL.POSS entirety sees one 
[₂ att det mera är fråga om broderliga råd that it more is question about brotherly advice 
[₃ att man ska inte vänta sig för mycket av äktenskapet.]])
that one shall not expect REFL too much of marriage.DEF
‘If one reads the long poem in its entirety, one sees that it is more a question of brotherly advice not to expect too much of marriage.’

In (43), clause 1 is also the root clause, and it embeds a relative clause, clause 2. Relative clauses can hardly be seen as coordinated with their matrix clause, and in this example, it has non-V2 word order.⁵ Nevertheless, inside the relative clause there is

---

⁵ It is generally assumed that Scandinavian relative clauses never have V2 order (Bentzen 2005, Garbacz 2005). However, there are indications that non-restrictive relative clauses sometimes have V2. This is not discussed much in the literature, but Sandøy (2001:139) gives an example.
another embedded clause, clause 3, that has V2 order. In addition, clause 3 has an embedded clause with ambiguous word order, since there is no adverbial present to show whether we have V2 or not.

(43) [1 Jeg hadde ei venninne på svømminga [2 som sa (NoTa)]
    I had a female.friend on swimming.DEF that said
    til meg [3 at du må ikke tro [4 du er noe bedre enn meg]]].
    to me that you must not think you are any better than me
    ‘I had a (female) friend in my swimming group who said to me that you mustn’t think you are any better than me.’

It seems that we have to conclude that in Norwegian and Swedish, an embedded V2 clause can have a non-V2 embedded clause as its matrix clause.

3.4 Extraction from embedded V2 clauses

Another argument put forward by de Haan in support of the coordination analysis is that extraction from embedded V2 clauses is not possible. This has also been claimed earlier, by Andersson (1975), Holmberg (1986) and de Haan & Weermann (1986), and it has come to be seen as an established fact. However, I have found speakers of Norwegian and of Swedish who can do such extractions. That is, they accept not only (44ab), where the object of a non-V2 embedded clause has been moved to the initial position of a matrix clause, but also (45ab), which is similar except that the embedded clause has V2 order. (The (a) examples below are Norwegian while the (b) examples are Swedish.)
Some speakers can even move a constituent out of a V2 clause that have a non-subject in initial position, as in (46). ((46a) is Norwegian, (46b) is Swedish.)

that article.DEF said she that yesterday got she not time to to read
‘That article, she said that yesterday, she could not find the time to read it.’
As I have tried to indicate, in such cases the fronted constituent in the embedded clause will get a contrastive focus interpretation, while the constituent that has moved to the matrix clause will be the topic of the whole expression. The fact that it is possible for some speakers of Scandinavian to move constituents out of one V2 clause and into another, is strong evidence, in my view, that the clause where the constituent originates is embedded under the clause that it lands in.

More generally, the arguments that de Haan (2001) presents as support for his coordination analysis are not valid for Norwegian and Swedish. In these languages, seemingly embedded V2 clauses are actually embedded. And note that if it should be true for certain Germanic languages that some V2 clauses that seem to be embedded are in fact root clauses, that would not make my analysis of V2 less appropriate. The connection that I have claimed to exist between V2 order and assertion could still be maintained. We would instead have to look more closely at the distinction between embedding and coordination.

4. V2 clauses have illocutionary force

In this section, we return to the claim that embedded declarative V2 clauses are asserted. In the first subsection, I spell out my analysis in more detail, and in subsequent
subsections I discuss some tests that might be used to demonstrate that embedded V2 clauses have their own illocutionary force.

4.1 A formal analysis of V2

The traditional view on Scandinavian V2, after den Besten (1983) and Platzack (1983), is that V2 in main clauses is the result of the finite verb moving to C, the head where the subjunction is found in embedded clauses. Embedded V2 is then usually taken to involve CP-recursion, so that the higher C head hosts the subjunction and the lower C head hosts the finite verb (see de Haan & Weerman 1986, Wechsler 1991, Iatridou & Kroch 1992, Vikner 1995, Holmberg & Platzack 1995).

Some of those who have dealt with embedded V2 have also tried to explain why CP-recursion should only be possible in the complement of certain verbs—see for example de Haan & Weerman (1986) and Iatridou & Kroch (1992). But it should now be clear that the question is mistaken, since embedded V2 does not follow directly from any property of the matrix verb. What matters is that the matrix clause as a whole allows an asserted complement clause. In saying this I follow a line of thought that is as old as the “bridge verb” approach. The same claim is found for example in Andersson (1975), G. Green (1976), Wechsler (1991), Holmberg & Platzack (1995), Stroh-Wollin (2002), Roll (2004), and in Meinunger (2006) referring to German. On this view, the interesting question is: what is the connection between the asserted status of the embedded V2 clause and its word order?

One answer to this question was provided by Holmberg & Platzack (1995), who said that when a C head in Mainland Scandinavian is lexicalised by a finite verb, that CP gets a main clause interpretation, which means that it has its own illocutionary force.
This solution is compatible with the data, but it has the drawback that the main assumption, that a finite verb in C gives a main clause interpretation, is only a stipulation.

I will instead start from the idea, familiar from Rizzi (1997), that assertion, and illocutionary force in general, is encoded in a Force head, and I will assume that this is the case in embedded clauses as well as in main clauses. The Force head is part of the C-domain, and in a root clause it will be the highest head. Embedded V2 clauses are formed by merging a subjunction with ForceP, so that the whole embedded clause is a SubP. The higher part of an embedded V2 clause is then as sketched in (47):

(47)

In this configuration, the subjunction is nothing but a marker of subordination. The Force head, by contrast, has an unvalued finiteness feature and an EPP-feature. Together, these features are responsible for V2 in Mainland Scandinavian (and possibly in Germanic in general). The finiteness feature is valued by the finite verb, which explains why only finite clauses have illocutionary force. The finite verb is also attracted to Force. The EPP-feature triggers movement of some phrasal constituent to

6 A similar distinction between Sub and Force is proposed by Bhatt & Yoon (1992), Haegeman (2002, 2003), and also in Stroh-Wollin (2002). Stroh-Wollin’s analysis of the C-domain in asserted *at(t)*-clauses is however different from mine when it comes to details.
Spec-ForceP—or more specifically, movement of the phrasal constituent that happens to be closest to Force in that particular clause. It is important to note, though, that Force itself is blind to the properties of the phrase that ends up in its Spec (which is why Frey (2006) calls this movement Formal Movement). The constituent in Spec-ForceP in Scandinavian can be a focused or topicalised constituent, such as the underlined constituents in (48)–(49), or a non-focused and non-topicalised subject, as illustrated by the expletive subjects in examples (50)–(52) (for discussion, see e.g. Engdahl 1999): 7

(48) I__denne byen__ kan man oppleve en autentisk spansk atmosfære. (N)
    In this town can one experience an authentic Spanish atmosphere
    ‘In this town one can experience an authentic Spanish atmosphere.’

(49) Jag har bara nån soul-skiva men den här borde jag nog köpa. (S)
    I have only some soul-record but this here ought I PRT buy
    ‘I have only a few soul records but this one I should probably buy.’

(50) Det var bra at vi var to stykker. (N)
    it was good that we were two pieces
    ‘It was good that there were two of us.’

7 The choice of language for each example is not significant. The examples are meant to show that it holds for all varieties of Scandinavian that the initial position of the clause is not reserved for elements with any particular discourse function.
The fact that constituents with very different properties can appear in initial position in Scandinavian V2 clauses suggests that this position is not associated with any particular discourse function. Instead, any reordering of constituents having to do with discourse function, such as fronting of topics and focused constituents, targets positions lower than the initial position, and these reorderings feed movement to initial position.\[^8\] It

\[^8\] This means that constituents that appear in initial position have first moved to a position immediately below ForceP. For subjects it is trivially true that they will be closest to Spec-ForceP if no non-subject has moved to a position above the subject for focus or topic reasons. Consequently, the subject ends up in initial position in such cases. For most non-subjects, by contrast, it cannot be demonstrated directly that they move to Spec-ForceP via a position above the subject but below Force, since movement to Spec-ForceP is automatically triggered once they have moved across the subject to a focus or topic position. However, sentence adverbials have an interesting distribution in Scandinavian. They can appear after the subject, as in (i)–(ii), between the finite verb and the subject, as in (iii)–(iv), or in initial position, as in (v)–(vi):
(i) Er du Mac-bruker, har du antakelig ikke noe rullehjul på musa. (N)
   ‘If you are a Mac user you probably have no scrolling wheel on your mouse.’

(ii) I kveld skal vi muligens se Gossip Girl. (N)
   ‘Tonight we might be seeing Gossip Girl.’

(iii) Her har antakelig Märtha Louise et utviklingspotensial. (N)
   ‘Here Märtha Louise probably has a potential for development.’

(iv) Der skal muligens panteloven nå utvides til å gjelde (N)
   ‘There the bottle bill is possibly going to be expanded so as to apply even to sports drinks.’

(v) Antakelig har du andre ting å tenke på enn ferie. (N)
   ‘You probably have other things to think about than holidays.’

(vi) Muligens skal jeg bare finne en balanse i denne der. (N)
   ‘Possibly I just have to find some balance in that one.’

It is tempting to see their ability to appear in initial position as a consequence of their ability to precede the subject. In cases where the sentence adverbial precedes the subject and there is no focus or topic
follows that the initial position has to be associated with some other feature, such as Force. And since the same range of constituents are possible in initial position in embedded V2 clauses as in root V2 clauses, it follows that Force is present in embedded V2 clauses as well as in root clauses.

The claim that embedded clauses can have their own illocutionary force is however at present a rather controversial one. Those who are opposed to the idea hold instead that what embedded clauses have is clause type, which should not be confused with illocution (see e.g. Brandt et al. 1992 and Green 2000). I totally agree that clause type is not the same thing as illocution. But my point is that whereas all embedded finite clauses have a specification of clause type, embedded V2 clauses (and matrix clauses) have something more, a meaning component that is not found in non-V2 clauses. On my view, this component is illocutionary force, or more precisely, primary illocution, in the terms of Allan (2006). Primary illocution is the illocution that is typically associated with a clause of a certain type. I also agree with Allan that primary illocution is encoded in the grammar, thus contrasting with other illocutions that a given sentence may carry, which require pragmatics to be taken into account.\footnote{Searle (1969:64) expresses a similar view when he states the following: “Part of the answer to this question [whether illocutionary force is represented in the syntax, MJ] would depend on whether we can reduce all illocutionary acts to some very small number of basic illocutionary types. If so, it would then seem somewhat more likely that the deep structure of a sentence would have a simple representation of its illocutionary type.”}

\[\text{fronting, the sentence adverbial will be attracted to Spec-ForceP since it is the closest candidate. Also note that this indicates that Cinque (1999) was right in taking sentence adverbs to be specifiers and not heads in the clausal projection line.} \]
demonstrate convincingly that embedded V2-clauses do in fact have illocutionary force. This is the problem that we now will turn to.

4.2 The contradiction test

One criterion for assertion, the illocutionary force of declarative clauses, is given by Hooper and Thompson (1973), who say that the assertion of a sentence is that part which can be questioned and denied. With this in mind, Bentzen et al. (2007b) present the contrast shown here in (53) (their examples (40b) and (39b)). As we see, the embedded clause in (53a) can be followed by a denial, but this is not possible in (53b).

(53)a. De sa att den boken läste han varje dag, men det (S)
    they said that that book.DEF read he every day but that
    gjorde han inte.
    did he not

    ‘They said that he read that book every day, but he didn’t.’

b. De upptäckte att den bok-en läste han varje dag, # men det
    they discovered that that book-DEF read he every day but that
    gjorde han inte.
    did he not

    ‘They discovered that he read that book every day, # but he didn’t.’

According to Bentzen et al. this shows that the embedded clause in (53a), which is embedded under a reportive verb, is a statement, whereas the embedded clause in (53b),
embedded under a semi-factive verb, is presented as a fact—it is not asserted, and therefore it cannot be denied.

On my view, however, both embedded clauses are asserted, since they have V2 order. The relevant difference is that the embedded clause in (53a) represents an indirect assertion whereas the embedded clause in (53b) represents a direct assertion. The correct generalisation is that it is OK to deny an indirect assertion, one that the speaker does not take responsibility for, but one cannot felicitously deny a direct assertion—something that one has just claimed. That would be just as odd as uttering the following:

(54) # The earth is flat, but it isn’t.

This is either very deep or uttered by someone who is either linguistic impaired or insane. Nevertheless, it is clearly an assertion that is denied here. Hence, it cannot be a criterion for assertion that it should be possible to contradict it within the same utterance. Rather, the reasonable interpretation of Hooper and Thompson’s statement is that the assertion of a sentence is that part which can be questioned and denied at all.

However, for our present purposes the problem is that the contrast between (53a) and (53b) remains if the embedded clauses are given a non-V2 word order, as demonstrated in (53’):
(53’a). De sa att han läste den boken varje dag, men det gjorde
they said that he read that book every day but that did
han inte.
he not
‘They said that he read that book every day, but he didn’t.’

b. De upptäckte att han läste den boken varje dag, # men det
they discovered that he read that book # but that
gjorde han inte.
did he not
‘They discovered that he read that book every day, # but he didn’t.’

As mentioned in 2.1, an embedded declarative non-V2 clause represents a proposition
that is reported, while the main clause that it is part of is asserted. We see now as long
as the speaker does not contradict herself, an embedded proposition can be denied even
if it is just reported and not actually asserted. This is further illustrated below. First, I
show that the utterance in (3), with an embedded indirect assertion, allows the speaker
to follow up with a denial of that assertion, as in (3’). And likewise in (3’’), where the
word order of the embedded clause has been changed to non-V2, so that the proposition
that the embedded clause represents is reported, it is still possible for the speaker to
express the opposite view.
(3’) Karl sa han *hadde* ikke råd, men det *hadde* han.

Karl said he had not means but that had he

‘Karl said he could not afford it, but he could.’

(3’’) Karl sa han *ikke hadde* råd, men det *hadde* han.

Karl said he not had means but that had he

‘Karl said he could not afford it, but he could.’

If we now take (21) instead, which is an example of an embedded direct assertion, we see in (21’) that it cannot be followed by a denial of the embedded assertion. However, an immediate denial by the speaker is just as inappropriate if the embedded clause in question has non-V2 order, as in (21’’). In either case it will lead to a contradiction.

(21’) *Svaret är att* jag *tänkte* inte alls, *# men* det gjorde jag.

answer.DEF is that I thought not at.all but that did I

‘The answer is that I was not thinking at all, # but I was.’

(21’’) *Svaret är att* jag *inte tänkte* alls, *# men* det gjorde jag.

answer.DEF is that I not thought at.all but that did I

‘The answer is that I was not thinking at all, # but I was.’

Thus, it does not make much pragmatic difference whether an embedded clause is asserted in itself or just reported as a part of a more complex assertion. This means that whether or not an embedded clause can be denied in the same utterance is not a test of
its status as asserted, and cannot be used to show that the clause has its own illocutionary force.

If we try with contradictory listener responses instead of the speaker’s own denial, it appears that a listener may disagree with the proposition represented by the embedded clause regardless of whether that clause has V2 order or non-V2 order—compare (10’) to (10’’):

(10’) A: Vi anser att problemet är inte av teknisk natur.
    we reckon that problem.DEF is not of technical nature
    ‘We reckon that the problem is not of a technical nature.’

    B: Men det är det ju!
    but that is it PRT
    ‘But it is!’

(10’’) A: Vi anser att problemet inte är av teknisk natur.
    we reckon that problem.DEF inte is of technical nature
    ‘We reckon that the problem is not of a technical nature.’

    B: Men det är det ju!
    but that is it PRT
    ‘But it is!’
So we have to conclude that a test for illocutionary force cannot be based on the possibility of following up with a contrary statement.

4.3 Matrix clause properties

A more promising strategy is to manipulate the matrix clause so that it is no longer compatible with an asserted complement clause. Take for example the construction that was given in (4), which is a question with an embedded V2 clause. The embedded clause is asserted by the speaker:

(4) Vet dere **at** jeg **har** aldri sett vinter før!

know you.PL that I have never seen winter before

‘Do you know that I have never seen winter before?’

If we replace the matrix verb *vet* ‘know’ with *tror* ‘think’, V2 order in the embedded clause becomes bad, but with non-V2 order, the embedded clause is grammatical:

(4’a) * Tror dere **at** jeg **har** aldri sett vinter før?

think you.PL that I have never seen winter before

‘Do you think that I have never seen winter before?’

b. Tror dere **at** jeg **aldri har** sett vinter før?

think you.PL that I have never seen winter before

‘Do you think that I have never seen winter before?’
The striking fact is that *tro* ‘think’, a weakly assertive predicate, readily accepts V2 complements in many other cases. Hence, the ungrammaticality of (4’a) is another example which shows that the possibility of having V2 in an embedded clause in Scandinavian is not dependent on the matrix verb alone. The reason why V2 in the embedded clause leads to ungrammaticality here is that the whole utterance is best interpreted as a question with a rhetoric flavour, and the proposition that the embedded clause represents is not asserted, directly or indirectly. In fact, in the grammatical (4’b) the speaker suggests that her view is the opposite: she has indeed seen winter before. In (4), by contrast, the message is that she has *not* seen winter before. This is also the main assertion; the introduction *vet dere at* ‘do you know that’ is less prominent pragmatically.

I think the facts I have just presented strongly indicate that V2 order is connected to assertion in declarative embedded clauses in Mainland Scandinavian. More precisely, V2 order means that the clause is directly or indirectly asserted.

4.4 Discourse oriented swearwords

Another argument supporting the claim that embedded V2 clauses have illocutionary force can be constructed on the basis of the distribution of Scandinavian discourse oriented swearword phrases like *for fanden* (with spelling variants, all literally meaning ‘for the devil’). These are used to emphasize an assertion, as in (55), an imperative, as in (56), or a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer, as in (57). (I give Swedish, Danish and Norwegian examples, which is meant to indicate that the facts are the same in all three varieties.)
(55) Jag kan för fan inte gå och fika i mysbyxor! (S)
    I can for devil not go and have.coffee in sweat.pants
    ‘I can for hell’s sake not go and have a coffee wearing sweat pants!’

(56) Bestem jer for fanden! (D)
    decide you.pl for devil
    ‘Make up your minds, for hell’s sake!’

(57) Nei, for faen! (N)
    no for devil
    ‘No, for hell’s sake!’

They are not acceptable in questions, as we see in (58). Although (58a) is fine, the question in (58b) is ill-formed, with or without the negation. If we delete for faen, as in (58c), we get a perfectly well-formed question.

(58)a. Det er for faen ikke farten som dreper. (N)
    it is for devil not speed.DEF that kills
    ‘It’s not the speed that kills, for hell’s sake.’

    b. * Er det for faen (ikke) farten som dreper?
    is it for devil not speed.DEF that kills
c. Er det (ikke) farten som dreper?

is it not speed.DEF that kills

‘Is it (not) the speed that kills?’

The phrase *for fanden* (and variants) is also incompatible with non-asserted clauses. I illustrate this in (59). In (59a) we have a construction with two embedded clauses. The first embedded clause is a temporal clause introduced by *da* ‘when’ and the second embedded clause is introduced by *at* ‘that’ and located inside a nominal phrase headed by *beskjed* ‘message’. The temporal clause is presupposed, whereas the *at*-clause can be interpreted as a direct or indirect assertion. And strikingly, it is possible to insert *for fanden* in the main clause and/or in the *at*-clause, but not in the temporal clause:

(59)a. Da vi kom fram til skranken fikk vi beskjed om (N) when we came forward to counter.DEF got we message about

at vi var 20 sekunder for sent ute.

that we were 20 seconds too late out

‘When we got to the counter we were informed that we were 20 seconds late.’
b. Da vi (*for fanden) kom fram til skranken fikk vi
when we (for devil) came forward to counter.DEF got we
(for fanden) beskjed om at vi var (for fanden) 20 sekunder
(for devil) message about that we were (for devil) 20 seconds
for sent ute
too late out
‘When we (*for hell’s sake) got to the counter we were (for hell’s sake) informed that we were (for hell’s sake) 20 seconds late.’

The generalisation is that *for fanden (and its variants) only appears in clauses that are assertions or commands. In other words, this phrase requires certain types of illocutionary force. And interestingly, the phrase is more acceptable in embedded V2 clauses that in embedded non-V2 clauses.¹⁰ We see this in (60) and (61).

(60)a. Hun sa at vikingene *hadde for faen ikke* horn på (N)
she said that vikings.DEF had for devil not horns on
hjelmene.
helmets.DEF
‘She said that the vikings had for hell’s sake no horns on their helmets.’

¹⁰ De Haan (2001) also notes that speaker-oriented inerjections are acceptable in embedded V2 clauses. He takes this as an indication that these clauses are not structurally integrated in the matrix clause. In my view, it is instead just a consequence of their asserted status, and does not in itself allow any conclusions concerning their external syntax.
b. ??Hun sa at vikingene for faen ikke hadde horn på hjelmene.
   she said that vikings.DEF for devil not had horns on helmets.DEF

   (61)a. Fattar du inte att det ska för fan inte vara (S)
   understand you not that it shall for devil not be
   några jävla ärtor i en pasta carbonara!
   any fucking peas in a pasta carbonara
   ‘Don’t you see that there should for hell’s sake not be any fucking peas in a
   pasta carbonara!’

   b. ?* Fattar du inte att det för fan inte ska vara
   understand you not that it for devil not be
   några jävla ärtor i en pasta carbonara!
   any fucking peas in a pasta carbonara

If it is true that for fanden only is acceptable in clauses with (certain types of)
illocutionary force, the contrast between the (a) and (b) examples above can be taken as
an indication that embedded V2 clauses have illocutionary force, while embedded non-
V2 clauses do not. So far, I have found no test that gives a more convincing result than
this one.

5. Embedded interrogative clauses with main clause word order

The preceding sections have focused on embedded declarative clauses with V2 order.
However, in Mainland Scandinavian embedded interrogative clauses also sometimes
have main clause word order. That is, embedded wh-questions can have V2 order, with the finite verb following immediately after the wh-phrase, as in the authentic (a) examples below. This can be compared to the more frequent word order with the verb following the subject, as in the (b) examples.

(62)a. Jag bara undrar **vart ska** ni åka i sommar? (S)  
I only wonder where shall you.PL go in summer  
‘I’m just wondering where are you going this summer?’

b. Jag bara undrar **vart ni ska åka** i sommar?  
I only wonder where you.PL shall go in summer  
‘I’m just wondering where are you going this summer?’

(63)a. Så stiller han spørsoml om **hvem er** nå denne JIJ? (N)  
then poses he question about who is now this JIJ  
‘Then he poses the question who is this JIJ?’

b. Så stillerhan spørsoml om **hvem nå denne JIJ er?**  
then poses he question about who now this JIJ is  
‘Then he poses the question who this JIJ is?’

(64)a. Jeg kan ikke rigtigt få noget at vide om **hvad er** 50 db. (D)  
I can not quite get anything to know about what is 50 db  
‘I can’t quite find out what is 50 db.’
b. Jeg kan ikke rigtigt få noget at vide om hvad 50 db er
   I can not quite get anything to know about what 50 db is
   ‘I can’t quite find out what 50 db is.’

Moreover, embedded polarity questions sometimes have V-initial order, as illustrated in (65a) and in (66a). For comparison, the more frequent word order, which includes an interrogative subordinator, is shown in (65b) and (66b).

(65a). ja kommer att se kan vi göra undantag för gravida (S)\textsuperscript{11}
   I come to see can we make exception for pregnant
   kvinnor
   women
   ‘I’ll see if we can make an exception for pregnant women.’

b. ja kommer att se om vi kan göra undantag för gravida kvinnor
   I come to see if we can make exception for pregnant women

(66a). Jeg lurer på kan de klare å hacke seg inn på min PC (N)\textsuperscript{12}
   I wonder on can they manage to hack REFLEX in on my PC
   ‘I wonder will they be able to hack into my PC?’

\textsuperscript{11} Example from Källström (2000), his example (2b).

b. Jeg lurør på om de kan klare å hacke seg inn på min PC?
I wonder on if they can manage to hack REF.L IN on my PC
‘So I wonder if they will be able to hack into my PC?’

Faarlund, Lie & Vannebo (1997: 994) state that the phenomenon primarily appears in formal speech, and especially in interrogative clauses that are not embedded under an interrogative verb. According to Teleman, Hellberg & Andersson (1999 vol. 4 p. 467) it is also becoming more frequent, at least in Swedish. The question is then if these embedded questions have illocutionary force, just like I have claimed to be the case with embedded declarative V2 clauses.

In some cases, the answer is clearly yes, since the embedded question is a direct quotation, as in the following example:

(67) Og butikkdamen spurte “hva har du i vesken?” (N)
and shop.lady.DEF asked what have you in bag.DEF
‘And the shop lady asked “what’s in your bag?”’

The answer would also be positive for constructions of the type exemplified in (68), where a question with main clause word order is separated from the rest of the utterance by a comma, which would correspond to a pause in the spoken language:

(68) Neida, jeg vet ikke, hva skal du gjøre egentlig? (N)
well.no I know not what shall you do actually
‘Well no, I don’t know, what are you going to do actually?’
But as Källström (2000) points out, the facts are sometimes more complicated. He gives examples like (69) (his example (2a)) of an embedded *wh*-question with V2 order that does not necessarily lend itself to a quotation analysis.

(69) man vet inte riktit va e detta (S)

   one knows not exactly what is this

   ‘One doesn’t exactly know, what is this.’

The same thing can be said of (64a) and (65a) above and of the following example from Teleman, Hellberg & Andersson (1999 vol. 4 p. 467):

(70) Vad vi tittar på är vad händer på bostadsmarknaden. (S)

   what we look at is what happens on residence.market.DEF

   ‘What we are looking at is what is going on in the housing market.’

However, Källström, who has studied numerous authentic examples of the phenomenon in spoken language, states that in quite a few cases there is no pause immediately before the interrogative clause. He concludes that these interrogative clauses are really embedded despite their main clause word order. He further notes that they differ from ordinary embedded questions in their rhetoric function, which is to “make the presentation more vivid and address and engage the listeners more directly” (Källström 2000:208, my translation), and he observes that accordingly, they often occur in public speeches, given by politicians and others—which is also what Faarlund, Lie & Vannebo (1997: 994) state.
What I would like to suggest is that embedded interrogative clauses with main clause order have illocutionary force—they are real questions, as their form and their use indicate. They have a Force head, just like their main clause counterparts and just like embedded declarative clauses with V2. Force attracts the finite verb, and in \textit{wh}-questions the \textit{wh}-phrase moves to Spec-ForceP. In polarity questions, it is generally assumed that there is a phonologically empty question operator in Spec-ForceP, but apart from that, they have a similar structure to V2 clauses, with the finite verb spelled out in Force.\footnote{Widoff (2007) claims that some embedded interrogative clauses with V2 order do not represent speech acts. In my opinion, his examples do not really show this, however. Moreover, his observation that compared to embedded interrogative clauses with non-V2 order, embedded interrogative clauses with V2 order are more closely related to direct questions and to quotes, seems to point in the direction of my analysis.}

My analysis is in line with the claim in Stroh-Wollin (2002:148) that a characteristic property of embedded interrogative clauses with main clause word order is that the speaker takes some sort of responsibility for the utterance. As I see it, this responsibility is the responsibility for an illocutionary act, and it means that the embedded clause expresses an illocutionary act that either originates with speaker or else is reproduced by the speaker but originated with someone else. These two alternatives parallels the two types of embedded direct assertions, which were discussed in 2.1.

However, unlike embedded declarative clauses, embedded interrogative clauses cannot have V2 order if they are introduced by a complementiser. Thus, the embedded clauses in (71a) and (72a), introduced by \textit{om} ‘if’ and with the finite verb after the
negation, become ungrammatical if the finite verb is moved to the front of the negation, as shown in (71b) and (72b).\footnote{Heycock, Sorace & Svabo Hansen (2009) also conclude that V2 is strongly dispreferred in indirect questions introduced by \textit{om} (Danish), \textit{um} (Faroese) and \textit{hvort} (Icelandic).}

(71)a. Kokken lurer på \textbf{om} vi 
\textbf{ikke liker} maten hans. (N)
\begin{verbatim}
chef.DEF wonders on if we not like food.DEF his
\end{verbatim}
‘The chef is wondering if we don’t like his food.’

b. * Kokken lurer på \textbf{om} vi 
\textbf{liker ikke} maten hans.
\begin{verbatim}
chef.DEF wonders on if we like not food.DEF his
\end{verbatim}

(72)a. Alicia \textbf{frågade om} jag \textit{inte ville} veta vad som hade (S)
\begin{verbatim}
Alicia asked if I not would know what that happened
\end{verbatim}
‘Alicia asked if I didn’t want to know what had happened.’

b. * Alicia \textbf{frågade om} jag \textit{ville inte} veta vad som hade
\begin{verbatim}
Alicia asked if I would not know what that happened
\end{verbatim}
In this respect, clauses introduced by *om* contrast sharply with clauses introduced by *att(t)* ‘that’, which often allow the finite verb to precede sentence adverbials, as we have seen.

It might be relevant here that *om* also differs from *att(t)* in other respects. Firstly, *om* but not *att(t)* licenses negative polarity items.15 This is illustrated in (73), where the negative polarity item *nånsin* ‘ever’ is licensed in the main clause polarity question in (72a), in the embedded polarity question with main clause word order in (73b), and in the embedded polarity question, introduced by *om*, in (73c), but not in the declarative main clause in (73d) or the embedded declarative clause, introduced by *att*, in (73e).16

(73)a. Kommer det nånsin att hända? (S)

comes it ever to happen

‘Will it ever happen?’

b. Jag undrar kommer det nånsin att hända.

I wonder comes it ever to happen

‘I wonder will it ever happen.’

c. Jag undrar om det nånsin kommer att hända.

I wonder if it ever comes to happen

‘I wonder if it ever will happen.’

15 Thanks to Christer Platzack for reminding me of this.

16 The examples in (73) are Swedish, but the pattern would be the same in other Scandinavian varieties.
d. Det kommer *nånsin/ÖK snart att hända.
   it comes ever soon to happen
   ‘It will *ever/ÖK soon happen.’

e. Jag tror att det *nånsin/ÖK snart kommer att hända.
   I think that it ever soon comes to happen
   ‘I think that it will *ever/ÖK soon happen.’

Secondly, in many varieties of Scandinavian *om can function as a question marker in main clause polarity questions. The example in (74), found in Faarlund, Lie & Vannebo (1997:946), is from the Norwegian dialect of Stavanger:

(74) Om eg kan få ei kaga?
    If I can get a cake
    ‘Can I have a cake?’

*At(t) can also introduce main clauses, but these are not declarative but instead exclamative—see Faarlund, Lie & Vannebo (1997:864) and Teleman, Hellberg & Andersson (1999, vol. 4 p. 760). The following example is from Teleman, Hellberg & Andersson:

(75) Att det ändå blev så galet till slut!
    that it still became so wrong in the end
    ‘Would you believe it still went so wrong in the end!’
In short, whereas \textit{at(t)} has different interpretations depending on the status of the clause that it introduces, \textit{om} marks questions whether or not these are embedded. I would hesitate to claim that \textit{om} is the phonological realisation of the Force head when it introduces embedded clauses, as in (72c), although it clearly is when it introduces main clauses, as in (73). In any case, unlike \textit{at(t)}, \textit{om} is never just a subordinator—it also has operator-like properties, which enables it to license negative polarity items.\footnote{In addition to marking questions, \textit{om} introduces conditional clauses in Swedish and Norwegian (parallel to English \textit{if}). Conditional \textit{om} also licenses negative polarity items.} Hence, I take \textit{om} to be an integrated part of the clause—maybe representing a Force head—and consequently, \textit{om} cannot take a fully expanded clause, including a Force head, as its complement.

6. Conclusions

This paper has focused on the claim that embedded declarative clauses with V2 word order in Mainland Scandinavian are asserted, which is taken to mean that they have their own illocutionary force, encoded in a Force head, which is also responsible for the V2 order. I first presented the results of an investigation of the distribution of embedded V2, which showed that embedded V2 clauses do not only occur as complements of a set of verbs. Hence, the idea that embedded V2 is possible only in clauses that are complements of “bridge verbs” cannot be maintained. Instead, we have seen that embedded V2 is possible whenever the matrix clause is such that the proposition represented by the embedded clause can be asserted, as opposed to merely reported or mentioned. Moreover, I argued that it is also sometimes possible to assert embedded
clauses that represent presupposed propositions. The assertion will then be presented as reminder and not as new information.

I then dealt with the proposals put forward by Biberauer (2002) and de Haan (2001), according to which there are no embedded V2 clauses, but instead, seemingly embedded V2 clauses are coordinated with the clause that might be taken to be the matrix clause. I showed that the arguments that are given in support of this idea do not go through in Scandinavian. On the contrary, there are several indications that in Scandinavian, V2 clauses can be embedded.

The next question to be addressed was if it really is plausible that embedded clauses can have illocutionary force. As mentioned earlier, many researchers have objections against this idea, and consequently, substantiation of the claim is called for. However, it appears that there are very few tests that differentiate between asserted and non-asserted embedded clauses. Just like asserted embedded clauses, non-asserted declarative embedded clauses represent propositions, and the range of felicitous continuations and replies is the same regardless of whether the proposition is asserted or merely reported. It is striking, though, that in many cases of embedded V2, minor modifications of the matrix clause render the V2 order ungrammatical, and only when the embedded clause can be interpreted as an assertion on the part of the speaker or as the reproduction of somebody else’s assertion is V2 order acceptable.

I also suggested that a more precise test can be constructed on the basis of the behaviour of certain discourse oriented expressions that arguably only appear in clauses with illocutionary force. My example was the swearword for fanden, which is found in declarative main clauses and in imperatives. The fact that it is also acceptable in
embedded declarative clauses with V2 order is an indication that these clauses are in fact asserted.

Finally, I looked at embedded interrogative clauses with main clause word order. My conclusion was that these too have illocutionary force—they are questions. This is why they are used as rhetoric devices, differently from ordinary embedded interrogative clauses.

Summing up, I have argued in this paper that in Mainland Scandinavian, where the typical main clause word order differs from the typical embedded clause word order, main clause word order goes hand in hand with illocutionary force. Hence, embedded clauses with main clause word order have illocutionary force, just like main clauses. More technically, my proposal is that main clause word order is the result of movement operations that are triggered by Force, the functional head where illocutionary force is encoded. Even if some other formal explanation of V2, and of main clause word orders more generally, should turn out to be more correct, I am fairly confident that the connection between main clause word order and illocutionary force is real.
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