Verb Second, Mood, and Interclausal Cohesion

Summary. This paper argues that the indicative-subjunctive opposition of relative clauses in Romance and Modern Greek is expressed in a coordination-subordination opposition in Germanic. It shows that in contexts where Romance/Modern Greek must use a subjunctive relative clause, German and Dutch cannot use the so-called 'V2-relative' (Gärtner 2001), a clausal coordination construction where the second member specifies the reference of a nonspecific noun in the first (the 'head noun').

Background. *1.* Recent analyses of the indicative-subjunctive opposition in relative clauses converge on the generalization that the indicative relative requires a realis reading of the head noun, i.e. it must be possible to infer the existence of the referent of the head noun (in the speaker's belief system; Giannakidou 1998, Quer 1998). This restricts the range of contexts in which an indicative relative can be used, excluding questions, negative clauses, imperatives, conditionals, and leading to a referential reading of nonspecific head nouns in intensional contexts. *2.* V2-relatives are not relative constructions but clausal coordination constructions with a demonstrative pronoun linking the second clause to the head noun. They show properties of independent clauses, notably finite verb fronting to second position (verb second) [1]. They are typologically related to 'subject contact relatives' in Hiberno-English (Doherty 1993) [2] and to 'realis descriptive clauses' in Mandarin Chinese (Li & Thompson 1981:611-618) [3], in that the coordinated clauses share a single intonation contour, with the nuclear pitch accent located inside the V2 relative clause [4], and hence constitute a single information unit.

Data showing differences between V2 relatives and restrictive relatives: the V2 relative, but not the restrictive relative (a) has a nonspecific head noun [5], (b) must occur sentence finally, (c) fails constituency tests with the head noun, (d) may have an overt conjunction [1b], (e) may not have a complementizer cliticized to the clause initial pronoun (in languages like Frisian), (f) is disallowed in negative [6], interrogative, imperative, and conditional environments, (g) forces a referential reading of the head noun in intensional contexts [7], (h) resolves scope ambiguities in favor of a wide scope reading of the head noun [8].

Analysis. The fact that the head noun in V2 relatives must be nonspecific suggests that the cohesion relation between the two coordinated clauses (in the sense of Kehler 2000) be characterized as one of *specification* (a type not recognized by Kehler). This forces a coordination configuration, as the subordination configuration, characteristic of restrictive relatives, yields the semantics of *modification* (by way of set intersection) instead of specification. Coordination excludes subjunctive mood, hence the obligatory indicative/realis character of the V2-relative clause. This in turn forces a realis interpretation on the head noun, along the lines identified in research on the indicative-subjunctive opposition in relative clauses.

Consequences. *1.* The analysis predicts that not all nonspecific noun phrases can function as head nouns in the V2-relative construction. We show that only those weak determiners that entail the existence of the entities referred to can appear in the V2 relative head noun (OK: '(exactly) n', 'between n and n', 'no less than n', 'many', 'quite a few' (*niet weinig*), 'sm' (*enkele*), 'more than n', 'at least n', 'a'; excluded: 'zero', 'few', 'no', 'at most n', 'less than n', 'no', 'not a single'). *2.* The analysis explains that V2 relatives are mostly found in presentational contexts, where the head noun is truly existential. This argues against an analysis in terms of a discourse variable associated with the head noun (as in Gärtner 2001). The obligatory referential/wide scope reading of the head noun (properties (g) and (h) above) is not to be ascribed to the head noun itself, but to the circumstance that the reference of a weak noun phrase (the head noun) is specified by an indicative clause. *3.* The analysis suggests that the inventory of interclausal cohesion relations (of which Kehler 2000 identifies three types: parallel, narrative, and resultative) be expanded with a fourth, specification, which we show in many respects to be similar to the narrative/resultative cohesion type (which may now be coined *asymmetric cohesion types*), most notably in not allowing gapping and in showing Principle C and focus association effects across the two coordinated clauses in the absence of a c-command relation between the relevant elements.

Data sheet (data from Dutch unless indicated otherwise)

[1] a. *restrictive relative clause*
    Ik ken   iemand   die   een   tafel   heeft
    I   know someone REL   a   table   has
  b. *V2-relative*
    Ik ken   iemand (en) die   heeft   een   tafel
    I   know someone and   DEM   has   a   table
  both: 'I know someone who has a table.'
[2] a. *restrictive relative clause* (Hiberno-English)
    I have one student who speaks four languages
  b. *subject contact relative*
    I have one student (he) speaks four languages
[3] a. *restrictive relative clause* (Mandarin Chinese)
    tā   yǒu   yige [hěn   xǐhuān   kàn   diànyǐng de] mèimei
    3SG   have   one   very   like   see   movie   NOM sister
  b. *realis descriptive clause*
    tā   yǒu   yige mèimei [hěn   xǐhuān   kàn   diànyǐng]
    3SG   have   one   sister   very   like   see   movies
  both: 'He/she has a younger sister who likes to see movies.'
[4] a. *V2 relative construction*
    Ik ken   een   man   die   heeft   een   TAFEL
    I   know a   man   DEM   has   a   table:N[UCLEAR] P[ITCH] A[CCENT]
  b. *Two independent clauses*
    Ik ken   een   MAN.   Die   heeft   een   TAFEL
    I   know a   man:NPA DEM   has   a   table:NPA
[5] a. *definiteness*
    Ik zat naast   een/*de   man [die   vond   er   niets   aan]
    I   sat next.to   a/the   man DEM   found there nothing   on
    'I sat next to a guy who hated it.'
  b. *specificity*
    Er was   [de finale *(van een tennistournooi)]   op TV [die   duurde uren]
    there was the final   of a tennis tournament   on TV DEM   lasted hours
    'There was the final of a tennis tournament on TV that lasted for hours.'
[6] Niemand kent   een   man   die   (*heeft)   twee auto's ($^{\sqrt{}}$heeft)
    nobody   knows a   man   DEM/REL has   two   cars   has
    'Nobody knows a man who has two cars.'
[7] a. *restrictive relative: referential/existential*
    Ik zoek   een   meisje dat   uit   Zweden   komt
    I   search   a   girl   REL   from   Sweden   comes
  b. *V2 relative: referential/*existential*
    Ik zoek   een   meisje die   komt uit   Zweden
    I   search   a   girl   DEM   comes from   Sweden
  both: 'I am looking from a girl who is from Sweden.'
[8] Iedereen kent   een meisje   die   komt uit Zweden   ($^{\sqrt{}}\exists > \forall$ / $^{*}\forall > \exists$)
    everyone knows a girl   DEM   comes from Sweden
    'Everyone knows a girl who is from Sweden.'

References

Doherty 1993. The syntax of subject contact relatives. *CLS* 29.1, 155-169. ● Gärtner 2001. Are there V2 relative clauses in German? *JCGL* 3, 97-141. ● Giannakidou 1998. *Polarity sensitivity as (non)veridical dependency.* Benjamins. ● Kehler 2000. Coherence and the resolution of ellipsis. *L&P* 23, 533-575. ● Li & Thompson 1981. *Mandarin Chinese: a functional reference grammar.* UCP ● Quer 1998. *Mood at the interface.* Utrecht Diss.