On peripheral doubling in Scandinavian

Øystein Alexander Vangsnes
University of Tromsø

1. Introduction

In colloquial Norwegian and Swedish various constituents of the middle or pre-field (i.e. IP and CP) can appear with a correlate in the sentential right periphery. This rightward correlate can be either a proform or a fuller XP. In the latter case the fuller XP is always coreferential with a proform inside the sentence proper, whereas proforms in the right periphery can be coreferential with both proforms and full XPs. Consider the Norwegian examples in (1).

(1)	a.	Jon	har	mye	penger,	han!	
		Jon	*has*	*a-lot-of*	*money*	*he*	
	b.	Han	har	mye	penger,	han!	
		he	*has*	*a-lot-of*	*money*	*he*	
	c.	Han	har	mye	penger,	han Jon!	
		he	*has*	*a-lot-of*	*money*	*that Jon*	
	d.	*Han Jon	har	mye	penger,	han Jon!	
		he	*Jon*	*has*	*a-lot-of*	*money*	*that Jon*

In the first two examples a pronoun in the right periphery doubles the subject, which is a full noun phrase in the first case and another pronoun in the second case. In the third example the situation is reversed in the sense that a full noun phrase appears in the right periphery whereas a pronoun occupies the sentence internal subject position. In the fourth example, which is ungrammatical, the (intended) co-referential phrase for the sentence final noun phrase is itself a full noun phrase.[1]

Askedal (1987) uses the term 'correlative right dislocation' (CRD) to cover both the case where a proform and an XP appears in the right periphery. In this paper I will argue that although there are great overlaps in the semantics and pragmatics of the two cases, they constitute distinct syntactic constructions. The claim is that the constructions are doubling processes of different kinds: the case with a full noun phrase involves a correlative pronoun inside the clause proper and an antecedent in the right periphery, whereas with the right peripheral pronoun/light element it is the other way around. I will henceforth refer to the former as *right dislocation* (RD) and the latter as *right peripheral doubling* (RPD).

In short the arguments for distinguishing RD from RPD are the following: (i) RPD can involve doubling of both a proform and a full phrase whereas RD can only double a proform (cf. above), (ii) RPD and RD can appear in one and the same sentence, but then in a fixed order (the right preipheral proform preceding the right dislocated phrase) and with clause typing particles intervening (if present), (iii) RPD is also compatible with *left dislocation* (LD), but RD is not, (iv) RPD can only double

[1] Notice incidentally that the instance of *han* right before the proper name in the (1c) and (1d) is a proprial demonstrative, and thus part of the full noun phrase, rather than a pronominal copy. To my ear the presence of this proprial demonstrative on the right peripheral full noun phrase make them sound more natural (but crucially does not save the example in (1d)).

constituents of the CP or IP, and thus for example objects only if they are fronted, whereas RD can apply also to constituents in lower parts of the sentence.

Whereas both RD and LD appears to be quite wide-spread across languages and language areas, the RPD construction appears to be a somewhat more exotic phenomenon. I will therefore next present some further details concerning the latter construction. In the subsequent sections I will then return to the differences between the constructions mentioned above in more detail. I will then eventually end up suggesting that all three constructions are, despite appearance, related to the left periphery of the clausal structure, but that shifting processes render some constituents to the right. All examples will be taken from Norwegian unless otherwise indicated.

2. Right peripheral doubling

It is important to notice that RPD is not restricted to subjects and in fact not to nominal expressions either. The following examples from Faarlund et al. (1997:908f) show that various kinds of constituents may enter into a RPD relation.

(2) a. Dem er det synd på, dem! (oblique argument)
them is it pity on them
'They can be pitied (indeed)!'

b. Nå skal det bli koselig, nå! (temporal adverb)
now shall it become cosy now
'Now we're going to have pleasant time!'

c. Du har jo gløymt meg, jo! (epistemic particle)
you have yes forgotten me yes
'You forgot about me!'

d. Det var så kjedelig, så! (measure adverb)
It was so boring so
'It was so boring!'

As shown by the very first pair of examples the antecedent for a pronominal doublee can be either a pronoun or a full noun phrase. A further refinement concerning pronominal antecedents is that they may appear in either a full (strong) form or, provided that the syntactic environment allows cliticization, a reduced (weak) form. The doublee must however always have the full form. These facts are illustrated in (3).

(3) a. Har han vært i Tromsø, han? *Norwegian*
has he been in Tromsø he
'Has *he* been to Tromsø?'

b. Har'n vært i Tromsø, han/*'n?
has'he.W been in Tromsø he.S/he.W

c. Han/*n har vært i Tromsø, han, ikke sant?
he has been in Tromsø he not true
'He has been to Tromsø, right?

d. Var det i Tromsø'n hadde vært?
was it in Tromsø he.W had been
'Was it in Tromsø that he had been?'

A crucial piece of information here is that the illegitimate cliticization in (6b), i.e. of the reduced pronoun to *Tromsø*, is not impossible *per se*, as witnessed by (6d). It should also be pointed out that the doublee does not have to carry any contrastive or emphatic stress.

By now it should be clear that RPD can be found in both declaratives, *wh*-questions, and *yes/no*-questions. Imperatives may also embody a RPD structure as shown by (4).

(4) Bare dra til Tromsø, du!
only go to Tromsø you
'Just you go to Tromsø!'

We may thus conclude that RPD is not a clause typing process. However, the construction is very clearly a root phenomenon.

(5) Jeg lurer på ... (*embedded)
I wonder on
a. ?*om han har vært i Tromsø, han.
if he has been in Tromsø he
b. ?*hvor han egentlig bor hen, han.
where he actually lives LOC he

Askedal (op.cit.:102f) makes the same observation. In the corpus of his study—a particular children's book series, written in quite a colloquial style—he found four examples of embedded RPD, namely the following.

(6) a. plutselig så han at marken den var jo et stykke nede den, jo!
suddenly saw he that worm.DEF it was PRT a part down it PRT
b. "og så skal du se at jeg blir nok tykk jeg også," sa mor og smilte.
and then shall you see that I become PRT thick I too said mother and smiled
c. "Ja, du vet jeg går på skolen nå, jeg," sa Ole Aleksander, [...]
d. "Jeg tror nok vi skal få det hyggelig her også, vi."

All of the examples involve *that*-clauses, and the two first ones moreover have embedded Verb Second as witnessed by the placement of the modal particles *jo* and *nok*. The first example even have an embedded left dislocated subject (*marken —> den*).

These facts suggest treating RPD as a marker of illocutionary force. The fact that embedded RPD triggers (embedded) V2 squares with the general observation (see e.g. Wechsler 1991 and references cited there) that embedded V2 in Mainland Scandinavian is licit when the embedded clause can be argued to carry illocutionary force of its own. The fact that embedded RPD is generally speaking awkward would then parallel the claim that embedded clauses normally do not carry illocutionary force of their own.

This conclusion is in line with that of Askedal (op.cit: 105). He furthermore points out that the RPD (and on his view CRD more generally) does not alter the truth conditions of the sentence. Rather, adding a double in the right periphery seems merely to have a pragmatic effect, and Askedal concludes that the construction is used either (i) "to rhematize non-rhematic material by placing it at the end of the sentence; or (ii) [...] as a means of repetition of non-rhematic material, without any rhematization being involved." Below we will see that making the syntactic distinction between RPD and

RD may go hand in hand with a further refinement of the pragmatic properties of the constructions.

In terms of dialect geography Askedal (op. cit.: 107) notes that within Scandinavian RPD appears to be a Norwegian and Swedish phenomenon, and one that is not found in Danish, Faroese, and Icelandic. In a wider Germanic context it appears to be absent in the German and Dutch linguistic area, thus suggesting a dialect boundary within Germanic that sets Norwegian and Swedish apart from the rest of the Scandinavian area as well as Germanic more generally.

It should furthermore be pointed out that also within Norwegian and Swedish there may be variation as to what kind of constituents allow RPD. Finland Swedish, and possibly other Swedish dialects, does for instance allow RPD of negation as well as certain modal particles, whereas this sounds quite exotic to a Norwegian ear. Consider the examples in (7) and (8) provided by Jan-Ola Östman (p.c.).

(7) a. Har du en penna? *Finland Swedish*
have you a pen
'Do you have a pen?'
b. Inte har du en penna, inte?
not have you a pen not
'You haven't got a pen, have you?'
c. Inte har du en penna?
not have you a pen
'Do you have a pen?'
d. *Har du en penna int?
have you a pen not

(8) No är det så, no *Finland Swedish*
well is it so well
'That's probably the way it is.'

On the presumption that fronted elements are more ample candidates for being copied in the right periphery, the crucial dividing line in this respect may in fact be to what extent negation and modal particles may be fronted. Negation and modal particles are indeed not felicitous in initial position in Norwegian.

(9) a. ?*Ikke har du en penn, vel?
not have you a pen
b. Du har ikke en penn, vel?

(10) a. *Nok er det sånn.
well is it so
b. Det er nok sånn.
it is well so

At this point we may return to comparisons between right peripheral doubling and right dislocation (and to some extent left dislocation).

3. Right peripheral doubling versus dislocation

One thing RPD and RD have in common is the general restriction to root contexts: also right dislocation is by and large impossible in embedded clauses.

(11) a. Han skal komme i morgen, Petter.
he shall come in morning Petter
'He'll come tomorrow, Petter.'
b. ?*Jon lovte at han skal komme i morgen, Petter.
Jon promised that he will come in morning Petter

As we saw in the introduction a right periheral pronoun can double both a pronoun and full noun phrase whereas a full noun phrase in the right periphery can be correlative only with a pronoun. The examples are repeated here.

(1)	a.	Jon	har	mye	penger,	han!	
		Jon	*has*	*a-lot-of*	*money*	*he*	
	b.	Han	har	mye	penger,	han!	
		he	*has*	*a-lot-of*	*money*	*he*	
	c.	Han	har	mye	penger,	han Jon!	
		he	*has*	*a-lot-of*	*money*	*that Jon*	
	d.	*Han Jon	har	mye	penger,	han Jon!	
		he Jon	*has*	*a-lot-of*	*money*	*that Jon*	

It is not immediately clear what to make of this difference in structural terms: the puzzling fact, if anything, is that the doubling pronoun can be correlative with another pronoun. The pragmatic difference between RPD and RD appear rather subtle, but there is a sense in which RPD is more emphatic than RD. It also seems that the interpretation of the predicate can be different in the the two cases. When comparing for instance (1a) and (1c) it seems that (1a) is more felicitous in a situation where 'money' is the subject matter (hence given information). Conversely, if the predicate is contrastive (hence new information) we get quite different interpretations of the RPD and RD. Consider the examples in (12) where contrastive stress is added to (a constituent of) the predicate of the relevant sentences.

(12)	a.	Jon	har	mye	PENGER,	han!
		Jon	*has*	*a-lot-of*	*money*	*he*
	b.	Han	har	mye	PENGER,	han Jon!
		he	*has*	*a-lot-of*	*money*	*that Jon*

In the first RPD example there is to my ear an obligatory presupposition that there is something other than money that Jon does not have. The same presupposition can also be contextually salient with the RD example in (12b), but not necessarily so. I will leave the further exploration of such interpretational differences to the future and in the present context merely state that there appears to be a greater degree of emphaticness connected to RPD than to RD.

The second argument for treating RPD and RD as distinct syntactic phenomena is that the two types of correlative elements may cooccur, and then crucially in a fixed order with the pronoun preceding the full noun phrase. Clause typing particles like *da* 'then' will furthermore intervene between the two, thus suggesting that the right

peripheral pronominal double and the right dislocated full noun phrase appear in distinct syntactic positions. These facts are illustrated by the examples in (14).

(14) a. Hvor mye penger har han egentlig han (da), han Jon?
how much money has he actually he then that Jon
'How much money does he actually have, then, this Jon
b. *Hvor mye penger har han egentlig han Jon (da), han?
c. *Hvor mye penger har han egentlig han Jon da?

Furthermore, whereas RPD is compatible with *left dislocation* (henceforth LD) it is impossible to have both a left dislocated and right dislocated full noun phrase in a sentence.

(15) a. Han Jon, han har mye penger, han (ass)!
that Jon he has a-lot-of money he PRT
b. *Han Jon, han har mye penger (ass), han Jon!
that Jon he has a-lot-of money PRT that Jon

Left dislocation (LD) is like RD, it appears, in that a full noun phrase is coreferential with a pronoun inside the clause proper, the obvious difference being that the antecedent precedes rather than follows the clause proper. Schematically, we may thus represent the differences between the three construction types as follows.

(16) Right peripheral doubling (RPD): $[_{\text{CLAUSE}} \ \ldots \ \text{XP}_i \ \ldots] \ \alpha_i \ \text{PRT}$
Right dislocation (RD): $[_{\text{CLAUSE}} \ \ldots \ \alpha_i \ \ldots] \ (\beta_i) \ \text{PRT} \ \text{XP}_i$
Left dislocation (LD): $\text{XP}_i \ [_{\text{CLAUSE}} \ \ldots \ \alpha_i \ \ldots] \ (\beta_i) \ \text{PRT}$

The incompatibility of RD and LD is quite suggestive from a theoretical point of view: we may argue that right and left dislocation, with copying, are varieties of the same syntactic process insofar as RD is derived from an LD structure simply by shifting the clause proper (including tags) around the dislocated XP. We will return to this matter below.

4. More on Left Dislocation

Both Right and Left Dislocation seem to be widespread across colloquial Scandinavian. As we have just seen both constructions qualifiy as a doubling construction in the sense that an overt pro-element for the dislocated element appears elsewhere in the sentence.

For the sake of completeness we may note that the pro-element varies according to the kind of left dislocated constituent: in the typical cases noun phrases are followed by an agreeing (strong) pronoun, argument clauses by a neuter inanimate strong pronoun, spatial constituents by a locative adverb, temporal clauses and constituents by a temporal adverb, and other adverbial clauses mostly by the elements like *så* ('so') and *da* ('then').[2] The following examples serve to illustrate this. (See otherwise Faarlund et al. (1997: 904ff) for further details on LD in Norwegian.)

[2] The use of the element *så* in the Left Periphery opens up a wider field of microvariation in Scandinavian, see Østbø (2006) and references cited there, however not of direct relevance to the doubling aspect of the Left Dislocation construction.

(17) a. Jon, han har jeg ikke sett på lenge.
Jon he have I not seen on long
'Jon I haven't seen in a long time.'

b. At du kommer for seint, det kan jeg tilgi.
that you come too late that can I forgive
'The fact that you are late, that I can forgive.'

c. I Nederland, der dyrker de mye tulipaner.
in Netherlands there grow they much tulips
'In the Netherlands they grow a lot of tulips.'

d. Neste fredag, da drar vi på ferie.
next Friday then go we on vacation
'Next Friday we'll go on vacation.'

e. Hvis dere er snille, så skal dere få litt sukkertøy.
if you are kind so shall you get some candy
'If you are nice you will get some candies.'

All of these latter examples except for the last one with *så*-insertion can be reproduced as RD sentences. The short elements that end up in first position need to be stressed, however.

(18) a. HAN har jeg ikke sett på lenge, Jon.
He *have I not seen on long Jon*
'I haven't seen him in a long time, Jon.'

b. DET kan jeg tilgi, at du kommer for seint.
That can I forgive that you come too late
'I can forgive the fact that you are too late.'

c. DER dyrker de mye tulipaner, I Nederland.
there grow they much tulips in Netherlands
'They grow a lot of tulips there, in the Netherlands.'

d. DA drar vi på ferie, neste fredag.
then go we on vacation next Friday
'We'll go on vacation then, next Friday.'

e. *SÅ skal dere få litt sukkertøy, hvis dere er snille.
so shall you get some candy if you are kind

One important difference between the two dislocation constructions is that LD appears to be less clearly restricted to root context than RD. Compare the following examples with the ones in (11) above.

(19) a. Petter, han skal komme i morgen.
Petter he shall come in morning
'He'll come tomorrow, Petter.'

b. Jon lovte at Petter, han skal komme i morgen.
Jon promised that he will come in morning Petter

It is nevertheless worth noticing that the word order of the embedded sentence in such cases needs to exhibit verb movement (i.e. V-to-C) and not the canonical Mainland Scandinavian embedded word order where the finite verb appears to the right of sentence adverbs.

(20) Jon lovte at Petter, han (*garantert) skal (garantert) komme i morgen.
Jon promised that Petter, he guaranteed will guaranteed come in morrow

This ties in with the observations made concerning RPD in embedded contexts above: embedded left dislocation is only allowed when the embedded clause can be assigned illocutionary force of its own, in which case the finite verb moves to the left periphery in Mainland Scandianvian.

Returning now to the doubling aspect, in the case of LD in declaratives the pro-element will immediately follow the dislocated element. Consider the pair of examples in (21).

(21) a. Marit, henne har jeg ikke sett på lenge.
Marit her have I not seen on long
'Marit have I not seen in a long time.'
b. *Marit, jeg har ikke sett henne på lenge.

As pointed out by Faarlund et al. (1997:905), however, in interrogatives the pro-element will appear in the base position of the dislocated constituent. Compare the following two pairs of examples where the antecedent pronominal object is underlined.

(22) a. Marit, har du sett henne i det siste?
Marit have you seen her in the latest
'As for Marit, have you seen her lately?'
b. *Marit, henne har du sett i det siste?

Further declarative/interrogative asymmetries are the following. In declaratives the pro-element can be left out, and in such cases we have what appears to be a regular V2 topicalization structure.

(23) Marit har jeg ikke sett på lenge.
Marit have I not seen on long
'Marit have I not seen in a long time.'

However, in interrogatives the pro-element cannot be left out.

(24) a. *Marit, har du sett __ i det siste?
Marit have you seen Ø in the latest
b. Marit, hvor skulle du treffe *(henne)?
Marit where were-to you meet her
'As for Marit, where were you going to meet here?'

These facts may be interpreted as minimality/intervention effects: interrogation produces an intervening A'-constituent between the left dislocated topic and the base position which then requires the latter position to be overtly resumed by a pro element.

On the basis of this I will argue (i) that LD is a topicalization structure and (ii) that also regular V2 topicalization structures are LD in the sense that the fronted constituent occupies the same position as a so-called left dislocated constituent. The only difference between a LD proper and a topicalization structure is that there is no pro-element (i.e. doubling) in the latter case. In other words, I argue that (21a) and (23) have

the same basic syntactic structure with the initial XP (*Marit*) in the same topic position. The difference between the two structures will crucially be that LD also involves (syntactic) focalization: the pro-element that immediately follows the fronted element occupies a focus position. In the case of interrogatives this position must be reserved for either the *wh*-constiuent or, in the case of yes/no-questions, the question operator. In sum, the left peripheral structure of the different sentence types just mentioned can be sketched as in (25).

(25)	a.	$[_{TopP}$ Marit $[_{FocP}$ henne har $[_{FinP}$ jeg ...	(LD)
	b.	$[_{TopP}$ Marit $[_{FinP}$ har jeg ...	(regular topicalization)
	c.	$[_{TopP}$ Marit $[_{FocP}$ hvor skulle $[_{FinP}$ du ...	(LD + *wh*-question)
	d.	$[_{TopP}$ Marit $[_{FocP}$ Op^{q} har $[_{FinP}$ du ...	(LD + yes/no-question)

Notice that on this account the fact that a pro-element appears in the cases where the fronted constituent is not focalized is merely an intervention effect: topic and focus are featurally sensitive to each other, and doubling is required to avoid a minimality violation in the chain of the fronted XP.

If this approach to left dislocation is on the right track it would mean that also Scandinavian allows, contrary to standard beliefs, topic and focus to occur in one and the same sentence as allowed for by the general approach to left peripheral syntax opened up by Rizzi (1997) and his split-CP hypothesis.

5. What's left appears right

On the basis of this approach to LD we can home in on some of the observations and analytical pointers that have been given about RD and RPD above. First of all, I will argue that RD obtains on the basis of an LD structure by shifting the complement of TopP around itself to an even higher left peripheral head. Recall that RD was more clearly restricted to main clauses, and I will propose that this higher head is a clause typing head that does not occur in embedded clauses. An overt clause typing particle may occur in this projection, and the following examples will serve to illustrate the proposed analysis.

(26) a. Chomsky, [han har vært i Tromsø før], ikke sant?
Chomsky he has been in Tromsø before not true

b. [Han har vært i Tromsø før], ikke sant, Chomsky?
he has been in Tromsø before not true Chomsky

c. *[Han har vært i Tromsø før], Chomsky, ikke sant?

The a-example is an LD structure which in its entirety has shifted leftwards into the projection headed by the particle *ikke sant* 'not true' which types sentences with "declarative word order" as yes/no-questions. In the b-example on the other hand we have an RD structure where only the complement of the topicalized constituent (*Chomsky*) has shifted. The third example in (26c) suggests that the complement of TopP cannot shift around just the topic and then pied-pipe the topic along past the clause typing particle. The relevant derivations can be sketched as in (27) starting out with a structure where the clause typing particle is farthest to the left in what I choose to label 'ClauseP'.

(27) a. [$_{ClauseP}$ ikke sant [$_{TopP}$ Chomsky [$_{FocP}$ han …
b. [$_{ClauseP}$ [$_{TopP}$ Chomsky [$_{FocP}$ han …] ikke sant [$_{TopP}$ t
c. [$_{ClauseP}$ [$_{FocP}$ han …] ikke sant [$_{TopP}$ Chomsky [$_{FocP}$ t

This general approach to the status of clause typing particles and their interaction with dislocation is partly in line with the proposal in Poletto and Munaro (2005) and of course at the more general level with the antisymmetry program of Kayne (1994).

Turning now to RPD we know that this doubling process, whereby a strong pronoun or other pro-form occur in the right periphery, is compatible with both LD and RD. We have also seen that the right peripheral pro-element must precede clause typing particles, and the examples in (26) can thus be expanded as in (28) to incorporate also RPD.

(28) a. Chomsky, [han har vært i Tromsø før], han, ikke sant?
Chomsky he has been in Tromsø before not true
b. [Han har vært i Tromsø før], han, ikke sant, Chomsky?
he has been in Tromsø before not true Chomsky

We have furthermore seen that RPD is very clearly a root phenomenon and we have noted that the construction embody a sense of emphaticness. The structural analysis that I will propose for RPD is on the basis of this simply the following: the pronoun (or other pro-form) clusters with the clause typing particle in ClauseP. The rest will then follow without further ado—in LD TopP will shift into ClauseP and render the pronoun/pro-form to the right of both the left dislocated XP and the clause proper, and in RD FocP/FinP will shift around TopP into ClauseP and render the dislocated topic to the right of the right peripheral pronoun. The RPD pronoun/pro-form is of course not dependent on the presence of an overt clause typer and may head ClauseP by its own.

If this analysis of RPD is on the right track I would, at least as a basis for further explorations, take it that the emphaticness related to RPD stems from the fact that the pronoun/proform is intimately related to the domain responsible for clause typing, i.e. that the pragmatics that obtain must be studied in parallel with the pragmatic effects imposed by clause typing particles more broadly.

6. Conclusion

This paper has dealt with doubling structures in Norwegian, with parallels in other Scandinavian varieties, that pertain to the periphery of the clause: I have in fact argued that they are all related to the left periphery of base structure, although the diagnostic constituents of two of the constructions appear to the right in overt syntax.

Structurally speaking the main difference between the dislocation and right peripheral doubling is the directionality of the chain: with dislocation the most referential expression resides in the periphery of the clause and the proform in a more embedded position whereas with RPD it is the other way around. I believe that the proposed analysis has prepared the ground for a reasonable understanding of this difference: the analysis of dislocation should to varying degree be compatible with existing approaches, whereas RPD is considered an entirely different phenomenon where the doublee should be treated on a par with clausal particles. In this respect the present approach deviates from existing treatments, in particular that of Askedal (1987).

References

Askedal, John Ole. 1987. On the morphosyntactic properties and pragmatic functions of correlative right dislocation (right copying) in modern colloquial Norwegian. In Pirkko Lilius and Mirja Saari (eds.) *The Nordic languages and modern linguistics* 6, 93-110. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1987.

Faarlund, Jan Terje, Svein Lie, and Kjell Ivar Vannebo. 1997. *Norsk referansegrammatikk*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Kayne, Richard S. 1994. The antisymmetry of syntax. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Munaro, Nicola, and Cecilia Poletto. 2005. On the diachronic origin of sentential particles in North-Eastern Italian dialects.

Østbø, Christine Bjerkan. 2006. The Norwegian function word 'så' and Norwegian CP syntax. Ms., University of Tromsø. Paper presented at the *Workshop on Inversion and Verb Second* in Tromsø, January 2006.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (ed.): *Elements of Grammar*, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Wechsler, Stephen. 1991. Verb Second and Illocutionary Force. In Katherine Leffel and Denis Bouchard (eds.): *Views on Phrase Structure*, 177-191. Dordrecht: Kluwer.