Adverbial resumption in V2 languages: the background

Liliane Haegeman, Karen De Clercq, Terje Lohndal, Christine Meklenborg

1. Adverbial resumption in V2 languages: the background

Liliane Haegeman (Ghent University), Karen De Clercq (CNRS/ LLF/ Université de Paris) Terje Lohndal (NTNU Norwegian University of Science and Technology/ UiT The Arctic University of Norway) and Christine Meklenborg (University of Oslo)

1. Background: V2

The goal of this chapter is to lay out the background assumptions that will underlie the discussions in the present volume, setting 'adverbial resumption', the core issue addressed in this volume, against the general background of the Verb Second (V2) pattern. Readers familiar with the literature on V2, on left dislocation structures in V2 and on resumptive patterns, will not find much new by way of empirical discoveries in this chapter and could skip it. However, the chapter provides a novel synthesis of the available literature. Section 2 provides a wider background for the volume, focusing on cases where the finite verb seemingly appears in a third position. In section 3, we provide an inventory of a set of empirical issues that arise in relation to adverbial V3 resumption. Many of these will be discussed in more detail in the individual contributions to the volume, which is to say that the goal of this section is to introduce properties that may be relevant in later discussions.

It is rather uncontroversial that a range of languages can be informally characterised as 'verb second' languages (V2). In the prototypical V2 languages (see a.o. Benincà 2004, 2006, 2013; Benincà and Poletto 2004; Poletto 2002b, 2013; Wolfe 2015a, 2015b, 2016a for refinements), root clauses have the finite verb in second position. The finite verb is preceded by one constituent, with few if any constraints on the category or the function of the first

constituent. (1) illustrates the pattern from Standard Dutch: the finite verb, here the perfective auxiliary *heeft* ('has'), is in second position; in (1a), the initial constituent is a subject, in (1b), it is a direct object, in (1c), it is a benefactive, in (1d) the fronted constituent is the verbal predicate, in (1e) it is an adjectival predicate and in (1f-h) it is an adjunct. As can be seen, the category of the initial constituent is fairly free: the initial constituent can be nominal (1a,b), prepositional (1c), verbal (1d), adjectival (1e), adverbial (1f,g) and clausal (1h). In all cases except for (1a), in which the initial constituent is the subject, the finite verb inverts with the subject.

(1) a. Jan heeft gisteren die wagen gekocht.
Jan has yesterday that car bought
'Jan bought that car yesterday.'

b. Die wagen heeft Jan gisteren gekocht.
that car has Jan yesterday bought
'That car, Jan bought yesterday.'

c. Voor zijn dochter heeft
for his daughter has
Jan gisteren die wagen gekocht.
Jan yesterday that car bought
'For his daughter, Jan bought that car yesterday.'

d. Gekocht heeft Jan die wagen niet
bought has Jan that car not
'Jan did not BUY that car.'

e. Erg duur is de wijn tegenwoordig niet.
very expensive is the wine nowadays not

‘Very expensive, wines are not nowadays.’

f. Gisteren heeft Jan die wagen gekocht.
yesterday has Jan that car bought
‘Yesterday Jan bought that car.’

g. Misschien heeft Jan die wagen gekocht.
maybe has Jan that car bought
‘Perhaps Jan bought that car.’

h. Toen hij in Gent was, heeft Jan die wagen gekocht
when-3SG-he in Ghent was has Jan that car bought
‘When he was in Ghent, Jan bought that car.’

All the examples in (1) are grammatical; alternative patterns for the same examples in which two constituents precede the finite verb are unacceptable. This is illustrated with some examples in (2). In (2a), both the subject *Jan* and the direct object *die wagen* (‘that car’) precede the finite verb and the result is ungrammatical. As (2b) shows, reordering the subject and the object would not improve the sentence. Similarly, in (2c) and (2d), the subject *Jan* and the indirect object *voor zijn dochter* (‘for his daughter’) are fronted; in (2e) and (2f) the temporal adjunct *gisteren* (‘yesterday’) and the subject *Jan* precede the finite verb, in (2g) the finite verb follows the participle *gekocht* (‘bought’) and the direct object *die wagen* (‘that car’). The ungrammaticality of (2a-2g) is usually directly ascribed to the V2 constraint, though, as we shall see in section 2, it is not the case that a linear third position is categorically precluded for the finite verb. For completeness’sake note that the fact that (2h) is grammatical is not in contradiction with the V2 constraint: while the finite verb is preceded by two constituents, these two constituents, the participle *gekocht* (‘bought’) and the direct object *die wagen* (‘that car’), can be taken to constitute one constituent, hence (2h) satisfies

the V2 constraint. On the other hand, given that objects do not appear to the right of the verb that selects them, such a constituent construal is unavailable for (2g), which thus violates the V2 constraint.

(2) a. *Die wagen Jan heeft gisteren gekocht.
That car Jan has yesterday bought

b. *Jan die wagen heeft gisteren gekocht.
Jan that car has yesterday bought

c. *Voor zijn dochter Jan heeft
for his daughter Jan has
gisteren die wagen gekocht.
yesterday that car bought

d. *Jan Voor zijn dochter heeft
Jan for his daughter has
gisteren die wagen gekocht.
yesterday that car bought

e. *Gisteren Jan heeft die wagen gekocht.
yesterday Jan has that car bought

f. *Jan Gisteren heeft die wagen gekocht.
Jan yesterday has that car bought

g. *Gekocht die wagen heeft Jan niet
bought that car has Jan not

h. Die wagen gekocht heeft Jan niet
that car bought has Jan not

As seen in (1b), Standard Dutch displays object fronting to initial position without the need for a resumptive element, a configuration which, following Benincà (2006), Wolfe (2015a, 2016a) identifies as diagnostic of the Germanic V2 languages (see however section 2 for resumptive patterns). [1]

Like Standard Dutch and its dialects, a range of other contemporary Germanic languages display the V2 pattern: German, Afrikaans, Yiddish, the Scandinavian languages Swedish, Danish, Norwegian, Faroese and Icelandic. In most of these, the V2 pattern is a root phenomenon: in Dutch, German, and Afrikaans, the finite verb is sentence-final in embedded clauses introduced by a complementizer, whereas in Danish, Swedish, and most varieties of Norwegian, the verb remains in the middle field in most cases, although there are instances of embedded V2. On the other hand, Yiddish and Icelandic also allow V2 in non-root domains, whereas Faroese is somewhere between Danish and Icelandic (Angantýsson 2016 and references therein).

Among the contemporary Germanic languages, English is the exception: there is no V2 constraint in present-day English, as shown by (33), though there are some vestiges in subject auxiliary inversion patterns (cf. Rizzi's 1990a, 1996 'residual V2'). In (3), the finite auxiliary *will* is preceded by two constituents: in (3a), both the direct object and the subject precede the finite verb; in (3b), both the subject and the temporal adjunct precede the finite auxiliary and in (3c) the finite auxiliary is preceded by the indirect object and the subject.

(3) a. The car John will buy next week.

b. Next week John will buy the car.

c. For his daughter John will buy the car.

What would amount to a 'regular' V2 pattern with the finite auxiliary in second position and the subject to the right of the finite auxiliary is excluded in English:[2]

(4)	a.	*The car	will	John	buy next week.
	b.	*Next week	will	John	buy the car.
	c.	*For his daughter	will	John	buy the car.

Though the contemporary Germanic languages have long been considered the prototypical representatives of V2 languages, it has become clear that the pattern is also instantiated in other languages. In recent work, it has been established that the V2 configuration also plays a role in earlier stages of the Germanic V2 languages (Tomaselli 1995; Axel 2007; Hinterhölzl and Petrova 2010; Walkden 2015; Axel-Tober this volume), as well as in earlier stages of English (see also Haeberli and Pintzuk this volume and the literature cited), and it is generally considered that earlier stages of Romance languages such as French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Occitan, and Rhaeto-Romance are characterised by the V2 property (see among others Vanelli, Renzi, and Benincà 1985; Salvi 2004; Poletto 2002b; Benincà 2006; Vance, Donaldson, and Steiner 2009; Ledgeway 2012; Meklenborg Salvesen 2013; Wolfe 2015a, 2015b, 2016a; Casalicchio and Cognola 2018; but pace Kaiser 2002; Rinke and Meisel 2009; Sitaridou 2012; Eide 2006, among others for Old Portuguese). Of these, certain varieties of Rhateo-Romance have retained V2 (Poletto 2002b). Some Germanic languages display a V2 pattern closer to that of Old Romance (see Cognola 2013a; Casalicchio and Cognola this volume). For a state of the art overview of V2 we refer to Woods and Wolfe (2020).

2. V3 patterns in V2 languages

While the V2 status of Germanic languages is uncontroversial, it remains true that even in the well established V2 languages, not every root sentence has the verb in linearly second position. Relevantly to the focus of this volume, prototypical V2 languages still display a range of what could be called V2 transgressions (Catasso 2015), in which it looks like the finite verb occupies a third position. We briefly go over some of these here. To sketch the wider background for the volume, we first introduce those patterns that will be only tangentially relevant to the volume, namely configurations in which a full fledged V2 clause combines with a peripheral element which specifies or narrows down the relation between the host clause and the discourse context. Then we consider patterns in which a first constituent is followed by a resumptive constituent that picks up (some of) the features of the constituent to its left and which is itself left-adjacent to the finite verb. Anticipating the discussion, what we will be mainly interested in in this volume (and hence in this introduction) is those resumptive patterns in which the initial constituent is an adjunct.

2.1 Extra-sentential modifiers

At first sight, the Dutch examples in (5) illustrate a V2 violation: the initial constituent of the sentence is a speech act modifying adjunct *inderdaad* ('indeed') or *eerlijk gezegd* ('honestly') (see also Meinunger 2004 for German):

(5) a. Inderdaad, Jan heeft zijn wagen verkocht.
Indeed Jan has his car sold

b. Eerlijk gezegd, ik wist dat niet.
honestly said, I knew that not

Similar structures are found in other languages such as Norwegian (c) and Old French (d), indicating that this is not a language-specific phenomenon.

(c) Helt ærlig, det vet jeg ikke
whole honest it know I not
'Honestly, I don't know.'

(d) Certes nos voldrions mielz morir que soffrir tel desloiauté com
Surely we will better die than suffer such disloyalty than
vos demandez. (QGraal col 216c, l 23)
you ask
'Surely, we will rather die than suffer such disloyalty that you ask us.'

To capture these patterns while retaining the hypothesis that these languages are in fact V2 languages, it seems legitimate to propose that the superficial V3 configuration results from the combination of a genuine V2 root clause with a main clause external (Vance 1997; Broekhuis and Corver 2016) modifier. Discussing Dutch, Zwart (2005a) considers the initial constituent in such patterns as 'extra cyclic'(on extra-sentential constituents in general, see Astruc-Aguilera 2005). The main clause external status of such modifiers would entail that they do not 'count' for the computation of the V2 constraint. Haegeman and Greco (2018) and Greco and Haegeman (2020) offer one proposal for a precise syntactic and semantic analysis.

A similar analysis would extend to those examples in which the regular V2 configuration is preceded by what Haegeman (2003, 2012) labelled 'peripheral' adverbial clauses.[3] In the examples in (6), a subject-initial V2 root clause is preceded by an adverbial clause which – Haegeman's terminology - would be characterized as 'peripheral': in such

examples, the adverbial clause does not affect the denotation of the matrix clause, i.e., it does not modify the truth conditions of the proposition expressed by the matrix clause. In (6a), the truth value of the main proposition 'there is bread in the cupboard' is independent of that of the adverbial clause ('if you are hungry tonight'); the bread is there now regardless of whether the interlocutor is or will be hungry tonight. Observe that in this example, there is no temporal dependency between the conditional clause and the main clause: the bread is there at the moment of speech, the adverbial clause relates to a future time sphere. The specific type of peripheral adverbial clause in (6a) has been referred to as a 'relevance conditional' (see also Scheffler 2008 for discussion of the semantic and syntactic properties; this type of non-integrated conditional has also been labelled 'biscuit conditionals'; see, among others, DeRose and Grandy 1999; Siegel 2006; Franke 2007; and Predelli 2009). In (6a) the adverbial clause provides a relevant context for the main clause proposition. In (6b) and in (6c), the initial adverbial clause provides a contextual condition for the legitimacy of the speech act associated with the matrix clause, from which it is temporally independent. (6d) illustrates a V3 linear order with what d'Avis (2004) has called an irrelevance conditional preceding the regular V2 root clause. In this example too, the truth value of the main proposition 'we are going for a walk' is independent from that of the adverbial clause.

(6) a. Als je vanavond honger hebt, er ligt brood in de kast.
if you tonight hunger have, there lies bread in the cupboard.
'If you are hungry tonight, there is bread in the cupboard.'

b. Als je geïnteresseerd bent, we gaan morgen naar de bioscoop.
if you interested are, we go tomorrow to the cinema
'If you are interested, we're going to the cinema tomorrow.'

c. Als je het mij vraagt, Goffin zal het niet halen.

if *you it* *me* *ask,* *Goffin will* *it* *not* *get*

'If you ask me, Goffin won't make it.'

d. Of het nu regent of niet, we gaan zeker wandelen.

whether it *now* *rains* *or not, we* *go* *certainly* *walk*

'Whether it rains or not, we're going for a walk.'

It thus seems plausible to argue that in (6) the regular root V2 clause itself is preceded by a main clause external or extra-sentential constituent.

To reconcile V2 transgressions like those in (6) with the assumption that Dutch is a V2 language, various approaches can be imagined. One way to proceed may be to propose that the combination of the root V2 clause with the main clause external adverbial clause does not reside in the narrow syntax and pertains to discourse syntax, which may be regulated by specific constraints. In the words of Cinque (2008), who postulates a specific discourse building configuration HP:

> we must also assume that the 'Discourse Grammar' head H, as is the general rule for sentences in a discourse, blocks every 'Sentence Grammar' relation between its specifier and complement (internal Merge, Agree, Binding, etc.), despite the asymmetric c-command relation existing between the two under the extension of the LCA to Discourse Grammar. (Cinque 2008: 119)

Though of independent interest, the nature of the discourse syntactic relations envisaged here is not central to the main theme of the present volume.

Additional V2 transgressions have been noted for individual V2 languages. For instance, Haegeman and Greco (2018) and Greco and Haegeman (2020) discuss patterns such

as those in Standard Dutch (7), in which an initial temporal or conditional modifier precedes a regular V2 root clause:

(7) a. Als mijn tekst klaar is, naar wie zal ik hem opsturen?
when my tekst ready is, to whom shall I him send
'When my text is ready, to whom shall I send it?'

b. Als er morgen een probleem is, MIJ moet je niet bellen.
if there tomorrow a problem is, ME must you not call
'If there is a problem tomorrow, don't call ME.'

The same authors also signal microvariation in the range of patterns in which such initial adjuncts combine with regular V2 clauses. Typically, in Standard Dutch when a temporal or conditional adverbial clause is the first constituent of a V3 linear order, the root V2 clause which follows it (i.e. with which it combines) displays subject auxiliary inversion. (8a), which combines a temporal modifier with a non-inverted root V2 clause, is rejected by speakers of Standard Dutch as well as by speakers of some Flemish varieties of Dutch. On the other hand, West Flemish speakers do accept this pattern (8b), and it is widely found in natural production of Flemish speakers. For illustrations and an account, we refer to Haegeman and Greco (2018) and Greco and Haegeman (2020, this volume).

(8) a. *Toen ik aankwam, de deur stond open en het licht was aan.
when I arrived, the door stood open and the light was on
'When I arrived, the door was open and the light was on.'

b. Oan-k toekwamen,
when -I arrived,

de deure stond open en de lucht was aan.

the door stood open and the light was on

'When I arrived, the door was open and the light was on.'

In more general terms, it has been noted that many urban vernaculars of the Germanic languages allow for V3 patterns with initial adverbial adjuncts. Among those, Kiezdeutsch ('neighborhood-German') is the most extensively studied variety of these urban vernaculars (Wiese 2009, 2013; Wiese and Rehbein 2016; Walkden 2017; Wiese et al. 2020). Indeed, urban vernaculars with marked linguistic properties arise in many large European cities and in V2 languages, these varieties often display unexpected V3 patterns (Freywald et al. 2011, 2015; see also Alexiadou and Lohndal 2018).

The Kiezdeutsch examples in (9) show different types of categories in the initial position.

(9) a. [$_{DP}$ Jedes jahr] (.) ich=ch **kauf** mir bei DEICHmann

every year I buy me at Deichmann

'Every year I buy (shoes) at Deichmann's.'

(KiDKO, transcript MuH9WT, Walkden 2017: 54)

b. [$_{PP}$ ab JETZT] ich **krieg** immer ZWANzig euro

from now I get always twenty euros

'From now on, I always get twenty euros.'

(KiDKo, transcript MuH17MA, Walkden 2017: 54)

c. [$_{CP}$ wenn der mann dis HÖRT] er **wird** sagen ...

if the man this hears he will say

'If the man hears this, he will say ...'

(KiDKo, transcript MuH9WT, Walkden 2017: 55)

d. danach er **sagt** zu O., geh mal WEG

afterwards he says to O. go PTCL away

'Afterwards, he says to O. [=name], go away.'

(KiDKo, transcript MuH9WT, Walkden 2017: 55)

The West Flemish patterns and the Kiezdeutsch patterns, though similar, show interesting variation. Though we won't go into the micro variation here, we mention just two differences.

In the WF variety *wh*-adjuncts cannot give rise to the V3 pattern and they invariably trigger inversion.

(10) a. Woarom weundige-tje in Gent?

why lived- he in Ghent

'Why was he living in Ghent?'

b. Wanneer weundege-tje in Gent?

when lived-he in Ghent

'When was he living in Ghent?'

As argued by Walkden (2017, his (16-18)), though, in the Kiezdeutsch variety the equivalent of 'why' does allow for the V3 pattern:

(11) a. warum du machst DINGS

why you do thing

'Why are you doing that?'

(KiDKo, transcript MuH12MD_05)

b. wieso er is nich gegangn

why he is not gone

'Why didn't he go?'

(KiDKo, transcript MuP6MD_03)

Walkden (2017) points out that there are only two such examples, but to the extent that they are reliable, the difference suggests that while the initial position of the V3 pattern in Kiezdeutsch can contribute to clause typing and is thus by hypothesis main clause-internal, the WF adjunct in the V3 pattern cannot participate in clause typing; Haegeman and Greco (2018) and Greco and Haegeman (2020) use the latter restriction in support of their hypothesis that in the West Flemish non-inverted V3 pattern, the initial constituent is main clause-external.

Another contrast is that though the majority of the West Flemish attestations of the V3 pattern do have a pronominal subject, Saelens (2014) and Lybaert et al. (2019) show that the DP vs. pronoun contrast is not statistically significant. On the other hand, in the Kiezdeutsch variety, the large majority of V3 patterns have a pronominal subject (Walkden 2017).

We will not dwell on the overall picture of the V2 transgressions, but in relation to Standard Dutch (7a), we add one relevant observation pointed out in Haegeman and Greco (2018) but not accounted for there. In this example, a temporal adverbial clause combines with an interrogative root V2 clause, yielding the superficial V3 order. For a subset of speakers of Standard Dutch, (7a) is degraded or even ungrammatical and it improves significantly by inserting the adverbial *dan* ('then') in medial position (12a), which picks up the semantics of the initial constituent.[4] The adverbial *dan* acts as a resumptive element, i.e. a TP internal place holder for the initial constituent.

Note that no such improvement is available for (8a), where the insertion of a place-holder such as *toen* (‘then’) does not alter the judgement (12b):

(12) a. Als mijn tekst klaar is, naar wie zal ik hem %*(dan) opsturen?
when my tekst ready is, to whom shall I him send
‘When my text is ready, to whom shall I send it?’

b. *Toen ik aankwam, de deur stond %(toen) open en het licht was aan.
when I arrived, the door stood (then) open and the light was on
‘When I arrived, the door was open and the light was on.’

These examples naturally lead into a further exploration of linearly V3 patterns such as that in (12a) with an initial constituent which is itself resumed within the regular V2 root clause and which we will globally refer to as ‘resumptive V3’. For a discussion of the Kiezdeutsch data, we refer to Sluckin and Bunk (this volume).

The present volume will not systematically explore the divergent V3 patterns illustrated in the present section but several of them may turn out to be directly or indirectly relevant for analytical purposes in some of the chapters.

2.2 Resumptive V3

An additional V2 transgression that has been widely discussed in the literature is illustrated by examples from German (13a), Icelandic (13b), Dutch (13c), and Norwegian (13d).

(13) a. Der Gärtner, **der** ist der Mörder.
the garderner that *is the killer*
`The gardener is the killer.' (from Altmann 1981:247)

b. Siggu, **hana** þekki ég ekki.
Sigga her *know I NEG*
'Sigga, I don't know her.' (from Meklenborg Salvesen 2013)

c. Over taalkunde, **daar** kan ik niet over praten.
about linguistics, there *can I not about talk*
'As for linguistics, I cannot talk about it.'

d. At han har sagt opp, **det** er helt utrolig.
that he has said up that *is whole unbelievable*
'That he has resigned is completly unbelievable.'

In this type of example, the finite verb also occupies a linearly third position. It is preceded by an initial phrasal constituent and by a resumptive element which is anaphorically dependent on the initial constituent: for instance, in (13a), the initial constituent *der Gärtner* 'the gardener', the subject, is followed by a pronominal resumptive *der,* which is also the demonstrative pronoun in German. In (13b), an initial object argument is doubled by the personal pronoun *hana* 'her'. In (13c), the initial constituent, the PP *over taalkunde* ('about linguistics'), is resumed by the typical R-pronoun *daar* ('there'), which functions as the object of the stranded preposition *over* ('about'). Again *daar* ('there') can also function independently as the R-pronoun complement of a preposition (see Van Riemsdijk 1978). In (13d), finally, the initial embedded clause is reprised by the resumptive demonstrative pronoun *det* ('that').

In the literature, the pattern in (13) is usually Contrastive Left dislocation, Copy Left Dislocation or simply Left Dislocation. In fact it is not the case that a contrastive interpretation is present for all speakers (cf. Broekhuis and Corver 2016; De Vries 2009; den Dikken and Surányi 2017, for recent discussion). In the resumptive V3 patterns in (13), the

initial constituent which is resumed by the pronominal type element corresponds to an argument of the associated clause. There is a considerable literature on the derivation of these V3 patterns and their variants in the Germanic languages (see den Dikken and Surányi 2017 for a review of various analytical possibilities), which we cannot hope to summarize or evaluate here. The main focus of the debate concerns, a.o., the syntactic status of the resumptive constituent (head, phrasal), its surface position and how it is related to the initial constituent, its first merge position, as well as the syntactic status of the initial constituent, the derivation of its position etc.

For completeness' sake, we add that the discussion of resumptive patterns has also addressed the pattern in (14), in which the resumptive constituent occupies a TP internal position. In the literature, this pattern is referred to as Hanging Topic Left Dislocation (Broekhuis and Corver 2016: 1691). For discussion and surveys see a.o. for Standard Dutch De Vries (2009), for German Altmann (1981); Grohmann (2000); Grewendorf (2002a); Frey (2004a); for Norwegian Faarlund (1992); Helland, Meklenborg Nilsen, and Lohndal (2020); Meklenborg, Helland, and Lohndal (2021). Depending on the languages, the resumptive patterns in (13) and (14) may also come with distinctive prosody; for instance, in Standard Dutch (14) there is a prosodic break between the initial constituent and the V2 root clause with which it combines.

(14) a. Jan ik ken **hem** niet.
Jan I know him *not*
'Jan, I don't know him.'

b. Dat boek ik ken **dat** niet.
that book I know that *not*
'I don't know that book.'

c. Taalkunde, ik kan **daar** niet over praten.
linguistics, I can there *not about talk*
'Linguistics, I can't talk about.'

The examples in (13) and (14) are reminiscent of similar resumptive patterns in Romance referred to as Clitic left dislocation or Hanging topic left dislocation, though with interesting differences (Cinque 1977, 1990; Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl 2007; Meklenborg Salvesen 2013; van Kemenade and Meklenborg 2021). In line with Cinque's 1990 work, for instance, Benincà and Poletto (2004) make a clear distinction between left dislocated topics and hanging topics. Consider (15), based on Benincà and Poletto (2004: 64–65). In (15a), an initial PP, *di Mario* 'of Mario', functions as a Left Dislocated Topic, and it is resumed by a clitic *ne* ('of him'). See Rizzi (1997) and Garzonio (2008) on conditions on resumption of initial PPs. In (15b), the fronted element is a Hanging Topic, which typically is realized as a DP, and which can be resumed by various types of elements, including also epithets like the DP *quell'imbecille* ('that imbecile') in (15b).

(15) a. Di Mario_i, non **(ne_i)** parla più nessuno
of Mario NEG of.him *talks anymore anyone*
'Of Mario, nobody talks of him anymore.'

b. Mario, non darò più soldi a **quell' imbecille**
Mario not will.give anymore money to that idiot
'Mario, I will not give more money to that idiot.'

The examples in (15) already suffice to show show that argumental resumption as such is not correlated directly with the V2 phenomenon, present-day Italian, for instance, is not a V2 language.

The empirical focus of the present volume is the V3 resumptive pattern illustrated for Standard Dutch in (16), in which the initial constituent picked up by a resumptive element does not correspond to an argument of the following clause but rather to an adjunct. (But see also the discussion in section 3.2.) We illustrate the pattern here for Standard Dutch.

In Standard Dutch (16a), the initial constituent is a locative PP *in Gent* ('in Ghent'), it is resumed by the locative adverb *daar* ('there'); in (16b), a temporal adjunct *wanneer je terugkomt naar Griekenland* ('when you return to Greece') is resumed by the temporal adverb *dan* ('then'); in (16c), the temporal adverb *dan* ('then') picks up a conditional clausal adjunct *als ik dat wist* ('if I knew'); in (16d), the temporal adverb *toen* picks up an adverbial clause *toen ik thuiskwam* ('when I arrived home'),[5] and in (16e) the manner adverb *zo* ('so') picks up a manner adverb *rustig* ('quietly').

(16) a. In Gent, **daar** kan je lekker eten.
in Ghent, there *can you well eat*
'You eat well in Ghent.'

b. Wanneer je terugkomt naar Griekenland.
when you back.come to Greece
dan moet je ons bezoeken.
dan *must you us visit*
'When you come back to Greece, you must visit us.' (Meklenborg 2020a: 95)

c. Als ik dat wist **dan** zou ik het zeggen.
If I that knew then *would I it say*

'If I knew that, I would say it.'

d. Toen ik thuiskwam, **toen** merkte ik
Toen I home-came, toen *noticed* *I*
dat ik mijn laptop vergeten was.
that *I* *my laptop* *forgotten was*
'When I came home, I noticed I had forgotten my laptop.'

e. Rustig, **zo** moet je ademen.
quietly so *must* *you* *breathe*
`You should breathe quietly' (Broekhuis and Corver 2016: 1704, (65))

Linearly, the resumptive pattern in (16) violates the V2 constraint: in all examples, the finite verb occupies the third position. Nevertheless, and somehow paradoxically, it has been noted in the literature that the availability of what we could label 'adverbial V3 resumption' has a remarkable correlation with the V2 property. The crucial finding reported in the literature is that adverbial V3 resumption is absent from languages that do not have a V2 structure. Henceforth, we will designate the patterns in (16) and (17) with the pretheoretical terms 'adverbial V3 resumption' or' 'adverbial V3'.

Adverbial V3 resumption constitutes the focus of our volume, though, to a higher or lesser degree, the pattern will be discussed in relation to the 'nominal' type of resumption, as illustrated for Standard Dutch in (13) and (14), and, where relevant, adverbial V3 resumption may also be discussed against the wider background of the nature of V2 transgressions discussed in section 2.1. In addition, adverbial V3 patterns will be discussed that look like resumption at first sight, but turn out to be of a quite different nature, raising the question of

what resumption actually is and whether there is a unified concept underlying the patterns (see De Clercq and Haegeman this volume).

3. Adverbial V3 resumption

In the relatively recent past, adverbial V3 resumption has become the focus of research both in synchronic and diachronic syntax. One reason for the interest in the pattern is the paradoxical situation hinted at above: a pattern that is linearly not a V2 pattern seems to be present only in the V2 languages. Meklenborg (2020a: 90) writes:

> All modern Verb Second (V2) languages make regular use of a resumptive structure, which places the verb in third position in the linear string. […][…] The archetypal structure involves a fronted adverbial clause followed by the resumptive particle and the finite verb. The subject is post-verbal.[note omitted, the editors].

[(18)] Als je morgen laat bent, **dan** zal je spijt krijgen
when you tomorrow late are, *dan* shall you sorry get
'If you're late tomorrow, then you'll be sorry.' [Dutch]

The structure in [(18)] does not only occur in Modern Germanic V2 languages, but is also substantially attested in the Old Romance languages. These languages were V2 languages also (see among numerous others Vanelli et al. 1985; Salvi 2004; Benincà 2006; Ledgeway 2012; Wolfe 2015b). In other words, even though the resumptive structure is an apparent violation of the V2 rule in that it places the finite verb in third position, there seems to be a link between the V2 property and the use of resumptive

structures. Crucially, the resumptive particle does not occur in languages that do not have the V2 structure.

This volume brings together some of the research that has developed in this area. The adverbial V3 resumption pattern will be discussed in relation to a number of different languages, also including considerations of microvariation in contemporary varieties and diachronic variation:

- Medieval Romance (Vance; Wolfe)
- Old Italian (Poletto)
- Old English (Haeberli and Pintzuk)
- Diachronic and synchronic varieties of German (Axel-Tober; Casalicchio and Cognola; Sluckin and Bunk)
- Varieties of Flemish and Dutch (De Clercq and Haegeman)
- Icelandic (Jónsson)
- Varieties of Swedish (Holmberg)
- Norwegian (Meklenborg and Lohndal)

The present section inventorizes a set of empirical issues that arise in relation to adverbial V3 resumption, some or all of which will ultimately play a role into formulating a syntactic analysis and will hence be discussed in more detail in the contributions to this volume. The goal of this section is to introduce properties that may be relevant in the later discussion. At this point the objective is explicitly not to develop a full fledged analysis.

3.1 Typology of resumptive constituents: specialized vs. generalized

We operate with an informal definition of resumption: whenever an initial constituent, in the present case with adjunct function, is picked up by a place holder, i.e. a proform which reduplicates it clause-internally; we will refer to this constituent as a resumptive. As mentioned before, it will turn out that in spite of the superficial similarities, it is not clear that a clearly defined and unified concept 'resumptive' underlines all the patterns investigated (see a.o. De Clercq and Haegeman 2018, this volume and Haeberli and Pintzuk this volume).

One contrast noted in the literature and highlighted in recent work by Meklenborg (2020a) is the differentiation between specialized resumptives and generalized resumptives. So far, specialized resumptives have probably been given more attention in the literature.

3.1.1 Specialized resumptives

Adverbs that function as specialized resumptives in adverbial V3 resumption have retained their original adverbial meaning (and – we speculate – function), i.e. they have the semantics and the syntax of their non-resumptive adverbial use. Interpretively the resumptive adverbial matches the initial constituent. (19) below illustrates this in a sample of languages which all deploy a special adverb which is the equivalent of the English temporal adverb *then* to resume an initial temporal adverbial clause (examples from cf. Meklenborg 2020a: 96).

(19) a. Als je morgen laat bent, **dan** zal het je spijten.
if you tomorrow late are, dan *will it you regret* [Dutch]

b. Wenn du morgen zu spät kommst, **dann** wird dir das Leid tun.
if you tomorrow too late come, dann *will to you that regret* [German]

c. As jy more laat is, **dan** sal jy jammer wees.
if you tomorrow late are, dan *will you sorry be* [Afrikaans]

d. Hvis du er sein i morgen, **da** kommer du til å angre.
if you are late tomorrow, da *come you to regret it* [Norwegian]

e. Om du är sen imorgon, **då** kommer du att ångra dig.
if you are late tomorrow, da *come you to regret it* [Swedish]

f. Hvis du kommer for sent i morgen, **?da** vil du komme til at fortryde det.
if you are late tomorrow, da *will you come to regret it* [Danish]

'If you are late tomorrow, you will regret it.'

The specialized nature of the resumptive emerges clearly from the Standard Dutch data in (16), in which the choice of the resumptive element co-varies with the semantics of the initial constituent: Standard Dutch deploys the locative adverb *daar* ('there'), the manner adverb *zo* ('so'), the temporal adverbs, *dan* ('then') and *toen* ('then'). Among the temporal adverbs there is additional specialization: *dan* is used for future/conditional contexts, *toen* is reserved for past contexts; this difference is replicated in the resumptive use (16b,c,d).

Specialized resumptives are independently used as adverbs: for instance, the Dutch adverbs *dan, toen, daar* and *zo* can all be used in a regular V2 clause, either as the first constituent in initial position (20) or in mid position (21). Given their demonstrative/deictic meaning they are anaphorically dependent on an accessible antecedent in the discourse.

(20) a. **Daar** kan je lekker eten. [Dutch]
there *can you well eat*
'You eat well there.'

b. **Dan** moet je ons bezoeken.
dan *must you us visit*
'You must visit us then.' (Meklenborg 2020a: 95)

c. **Toen** merkte ik dat ik mijn laptop vergeten was

toen *noticed I that I my laptop forgotten was*

'Then I noticed I had forgotten my laptop.'

d. **Zo** moet je ademen

So *must you breathe*

'You must breath in this way. '

(21) a. Je kan **daar** lekker eten. [Dutch]

you can there *well eat*

'You eat well there.'

b. Je moet ons **dan** bezoeken.

You must us then *visit*

'You must visit us then.' (Meklenborg 2020a: 95)

c. Ik merkte **toen** dat ik mijn laptop vergeten was

I noticed then *that I my laptop forgotten was*

'I noticed then that I had forgotten my laptop.'

d. Je moet **zo** ademen

you must so *breathe*

3.1.2 Generalized resumptives

Generalized resumptives differ from the specialized resumptives in that they have undergone semantic bleaching, and as a result one resumptive becomes compatible with a semantically wider range of initial constituents.[6] One example is Old French *si* illustrated in (17) (van Reenen and Schøsler 2000; Ferraresi and Goldbach 2003; Wolfe 2015a, 2015b, 2016a). Resumptive *si* will be taken up by Vance (this volume) and Wolfe (this volume). Another

example is Old Italian *sì*. Poletto (this volume) argues that the general use of *sì* with different types of embedded clauses can be traced back to the fact that *sì* can be used in a variety of other contexts in Old Italian as well, turning it into a bleached pro-adverb.

Another example that has received a lot of attention is the Mainland Scandinavian resumptive element *så* ('so') (Elmquist 1945; Ekerot 1998; Eide og Sollid 2011; Eide 2011; Egerland and Falk 2010; Nordström 2010; Østbø 2006), which is discussed in this volume in relation to Swedish by Holmberg and in relation to Norwegian by Meklenborg and Lohndal. We illustrate the pattern for Norwegian in (22).

(22) a. I Paris **så** møtte vi våre gamle naboer. [Norwegian]
in Paris så *met we our old neighbours*
'In Paris, we met our former neighbours.'

b. I går **så** var vi i teatret.
In yesterday så *were we in the.theatre*
'Yesterday, we went to the theatre.'

c. Hvis du er sein i morgen, **så** kommer du til å angre.
If you are late tomorrow, så *come you to to regret*
'If you are late tomorrow, you will regret it.'

d. Da han hadde hentet avisen, **så** laget han seg en kopp kaffe.
When he had picked the.newspaper så *made him self a cup coffee*
'After he had picked up the newspaper, he made himself a cup of coffee.'

e. Derfor **så** har jeg ikke gjort det ennå.
Therefore så *have I not done it yet*
'Therefore I haven't done it yet.'

Etymologically, resumptive *så* 'so' in Norwegian (Danish and Swedish) derives from a manner adverb (see Meklenborg 2020a: 105). Like many generalized resumptives, the adverb *så* has a range of uses that go beyond its original use as a manner adverb: in (24a) resumptive *så* follows a locative adjunct *I Paris* ('in Paris'), whereas in (24c) it appears following a conditional embedded clause.

The Mainland Scandinavian languages which deploy the generalized resumptive *så* also have access to specialized resumptives, in which case there is a matching relation between the initial constituent and the specialized resumptive. For instance, in Norwegian, an initial temporal adjunct may be followed either by the specialized temporal resumptive *da* ('then'), but it cannot be followed by the specialized locative resumptive *der* ('there'). Conversely, an initial locative adjunct locative cannot be followed by a specialized temporal resumptive. These patterns are illustrated in (23):

(23) a. Da jeg kom hjem, **så/ da/ *der** var jeg sliten. [Norwegian]
When I came home $\text{så}_{\text{general}}$/$\text{da}_{\text{temporal}}$ /$\text{der}_{\text{locative}}$ *was I tired*
'When I came home, I was tired.'

b. I Paris **så/ *da/ der** møtte vi våre gamle naboer.
In Paris $\text{så}_{\text{general}}$/$\text{da}_{\text{temporal}}$ /$\text{der}_{\text{locative}}$ *met we our old neighbours*
'In Paris we met our old old neigbours.'

c. Hvis du dør, **så/ da/ *der** vil mange sørge.
if you die $\text{så}_{\text{general}}$/$\text{da}_{\text{temporal}}$ /$\text{der}_{\text{locative}}$ *will many grieve*
'If you die, many will grieve.'

Observe that our presentation of the data above is a simplification and as such it is slightly misleading because it might be taken to entail that in adverbial V3 resumption, specialized

resumptives and generalized resumptives are syntactically equivalent and interchangeable and that they only differ in terms of the degree of their semantic specification and the relative range of constituents they can follow. One might even infer from the description above that the two types of resumptives alternate and are hence in complementary distribution. While this state of affairs is conceivable (and this remains to be established empirically), it is not necessarily the case. One diagnostic that would obviously test the syntactic equivalence of the specialized resumptive and the generalized resumptive is whether the two are in complementary distribution. As seen in Norwegian (24), for the Scandinavian languages this is not the case. In (24), the generalized resumptive *så* co occurs with the special temporal resumptive *da,* which it necessarily follows.

(24) a. Da jeg kom hjem, **da så** var jeg sliten. [Norwegian]
When I came home da $_{temporal}$ så $_{general}$ *was I tired*
'When I come home, I was tired.'

b. *Da jeg kom hjem, **så da** var jeg sliten.
When I came home så $_{general}$ da $_{temporal.}$ *was I tired*

The same pattern will be shown to hold for what looks like a generalized resumptive, invariant *die*, deployed in the Ghent variety and discussed in De Clercq and Haegeman (this volume), where what looks like a generalized resumptive, here *die*, can co occur with a specialized resumptive, again with the specialized resumptive to the left of the generalized resumptive. Whenever a specialized resumptive can co-occur with a generalized resumptive, this is a conclusive indication that the two items, though functionally similar, must be kept apart. Whenever the two CAN co-occur, then of course the relative order and any ordering restrictions will play a role in formulating an account.

The co-occurrence of the specialized resumptive and the generalized resumptive in (24a) raises the question, though, as to the definition of the concept resumption. In (24a), intuitively speaking, the temporal adverb *da* ('then') is the placeholder, it is a proform which reduplicates some of the features of the initial constituent, the temporal clause *da jeg kom hjem* ('when I came home'), and thus would seem to qualify as a 'resumptive'. But then one may well wonder whether *så* itself should also be considered to have a resumptive function, and if so, how that function is defined and diagnosed.

The co occurrence of the specialized resumptive and the generalized resumptive is one diagnostic that provides evidence for their non-equivalence. Below are listed additional diagnostics to detect differences between the specialized and the generalized resumptives, both language internally and cross-linguistically. These differences will constitute the empirical basis for a formal analysis.

For our demonstration, we use the specialized resumptive pattern in Standard Dutch. Occasionally, where relevant for the argumentation, we will provide contrasting examples from generalized resumptives, though this comparative component of the discussion is not intended to be exhaustive. More detailed comparisons will be found in the specific chapters. For instance, De Clercq and Haegeman (2018, this volume) show that by the criteria displayed below we are led to the conclusion that invariant *die* in the Ghent variety not only has a different semantics from the adverbial resumptive but it also has a different syntax. Vance (this volume) further shows that both in Old French and in Old Occitan, the syntax of clauses introduced by general resumptive *si* is markedly different from that of clause introduced by specialized resumptives.

The diagnostics developed below help shed light on to the nature of the resumptive and its relation with the initial constituent. In particular, they help identify the categorial and interpretive properties of the initial constituent in adverbial V3 resumption and they will

contribute to determining the syntactic status of the resumptive element, i.e. whether it should be analysed as a phrasal constituent or as a head. The diagnostics may also shed light on the syntactic position of the initial constituent and the resumptive element. For instance, the evidence may point to the initial constituent being main clause external (in the sense of Broekhuis and Corver 2016; Haegeman and Greco 2018; Greco and Haegeman 2020) or the evidence may suggest that, instead, it remains part of the root V2 clause. This obviously has implications for the derivation of adverbial V3 resumption. In the present volume, the contributions of Axel-Tober on German, Haeberli and Pintzuk on Old English, Jónsson on Icelandic and Meklenborg and Lohndal on Norwegian in particular further explore the relation between the initial constituent and the matrix clause in resumptive patterns.

3.1.3 Diachronic development of resumptives

One further point of interest is the origin of the resumptives and how the generalized resumptive diachronically relates to the specialized resumptives. While in the case of Scandinavian *så* or Romance *si*, the generalized resumptive at first sight derives from a specialized resumptive through bleaching, the same is not obviously true for Ghent *die*, which at least superficially seems to derive from a pronominal element.

Casalicchio and Cagnola (this volume) explore the nature of the bleaching process that underlies the emergence of resumptives. In relation to the Romance resumptive *si,* Wolfe (this volume) explores the syntactic correlate of the bleaching which, using a cartographic perspective, he interprets in terms of upward grammaticalisation (in line with Roberts and Roussou 2003). For an insightful discussion of the development of adverbial resumptions in German in relation to a general discussion of adverbial resumption strategies, we also refer to Catasso (2021).

3.2 The category and function of the initial constituent

3.2.1 Categorial status

The semantic matching of the specialized resumptive with the initial adjunct does not necessarily entail categorial matching. For instance, the Standard Dutch temporal adverb *toen* ('then') can resume an initial constituent that is an adverbial clause as in (16d), repeated here as (25a), a PP, as in (25b), a nominal constituent (25c), or a temporal adverb (25d):

(25) a. Toen ik thuiskwam, **toen** merkte ik [Dutch]
Toen *I home-came,* then *noticed I*
dat ik mijn laptop vergeten was.
that I my laptop forgotten was
'When I came home, I noticed I had forgotten my laptop.'

b. Bij zijn aankomst, **toen** merkte hij
upon his arrival then noticed he
dat hij zijn laptop vergeten was.
that he his laptop forgotten was
'Upon his arrival, he noticed that he had forgotten his laptop.'

c. Vorige week, **toen** merkte hij
last week then noticed he
dat hij zijn laptop vergeten was.
that he his laptop forgotten was
'Last week he noticed that the had forgotten his laptop.'

d. Toen hij wilde vertrekken, **toen** merkte hij
when he wanted leave, then *noticed he*

dat hij zijn laptop vergeten was.

that he his laptop forgotten was

'When he wanted to leave, he noticed that he had forgotten his laptop.'

3.2.2 Thematic status

In the examples of adverbial V3 resumption with a specialized resumptive element illustrated above, the initial adverbial constituent does not have a thematic relation with the main clause predicate and is as such 'optional' with respect to the argument structure of the clause, as would be the corresponding resumptive. Of courecourse, due to the V2 constraint, omission of the adverbial and of the resumptive leads to a change of word order. The examples in (26) rephrase those in (25) omitting the initial constituent and its resumptive:

(26) a. Ik merkte dat ik mijn laptop vergeten was. [Dutch]

noticed I that I my laptop forgotten was

'I noticed that I had forgotten my laptop.'

b/c/d. Hij merkte dat hij zijn laptop vergeten was.

He noticed that he his laptop forgotten was

'He noticed that he had forgotten his laptop.'

The 'optionality' of the adjunct might appear to set 'adverbial V3 resumption' apart from the kind of 'nominal' resumption illustrated by the CLD patterns in section 2.2, in which the initial constituent and the resumptive correspond to an obligatory clausal argument selected by the predicate and hence at least the resumptive or the initial constituent must be retained to ensure grammaticality. For instance, in (13a), repeated here as (27a), the resumptive *die*

corresponds to the direct object, in (13c), repeated as (27b), the initial constituent and the resumptive R-pronoun *daar* correspond to the complement of the preposition *over*.

(27) a. Jan **die** ken ik niet. [Dutch]
Jan that *know I not*
'As for Jan, I don't know him.'

b. Over taalkunde, **daar** kan ik niet over praten.
About linguistics, there *can I not about talk*
'I cannot talk about linguistics.'

A slight complication is that omission of the initial constituent and the resumptive without word order changes is in fact possible in Standard Dutch – though not for speakers of West Flemish – but the resulting sentences, illustrated in (28), will be construed as having a null topic operator in first position. We signal the null topic by TOP.

(28) a. TOP ken ik niet. [Dutch]
TOP know I not
'Don't know.'

b. TOP kan ik niet over praten.
TOP can I not about talk
'Can't talk about.'

Given the possibility of the initial null topic, what looks like a regular V2 clause may also be construed as a V2 transgression, at least for those speakers who admit the null topic:

(28) c. Jan, TOP ken ik niet. [Dutch]

Jan, TOP know I not

'I don't know Jan.'

d. Taalkunde, TOP kan ik niet over praten.

Linguistics, TOP can I not about talk

'Linguistics. I can't talk about it.'

In (29) a null topic analysis is precluded because the subject *ik* ('I') occupies first position; the examples are ungrammatical because the verb lacks one of its arguments:

(29) a. *Ik ken niet. [Dutch]

I know not

b. *Ik kan niet over praten.

I can not about talk

Specialized adverbial resumptives such as *daar* ('daar'), *dan* ('then') or *toen* ('then') may also correspond to constituents with argumental status: this will be the case where they are selected by the clausal predicate: in (30a) locative *daar* ('there') is selected as the complement of the verb *wonen* ('live'). In that case, again, omission of the initial constituent and the resumptive (30b) will be marginally acceptable provided it is construed as having a null topic in initial position and reordering to preclude the null topic, as in (30c), is ungrammatical:

(30) a. In den Haag **daar** woont een graaf. [Dutch]

in the Hague there *lives a count*

'There is a count living in the Hague'

b. ? TOP woont een graaf.
TOP lives a count

c. *Een graaf woont.
a count lives

3.3 Topicality of the constituent to the left of the resumptive

With respect to the Standard Dutch nominal CLD pattern in (13), one common assumption in the literature – with various analytical implementations - is that the constituent to the left of the resumptive pronoun has topical status. According to some analyses, the initial constituent is a main clause external constituent (cf. Koster 1978 for a seminal proposal). Both the topical reading of the initial constituent and its main clause external syntax would predict that negative constituents or *wh*-constituents are degraded in the initial slot in the CLD pattern. This is so because on the one hand quantificational constituents are not good candidates for topic status (see Rizzi 1997), and, on the other hand, if the initial constituent in the CLD pattern were indeed main clause external, i.e. outside the domain of application of narrow syntax (see Haegeman and Greco 2018; Greco and Haegeman 2020), their position would prevent them from taking clausal scope.

(31) a. *Niemand **die** heeft ze gekust. [Dutch]
no.one die *has she* *kissed*
(Hoekstra 1999: 66; Broekhuis and Corver 2016: 733 (260b), 1458, 1697: (49b)).

b. *Wie **die** ga je dan uitnodigen? (Broekhuis and Corver 2016: 1699, (54b))

Who die *go* *you* *then* *invite*

The adverbial counterpart of Standard Dutch CLD with the specialized resumptives (*daar* 'there', *dan* 'then', *toen* 'then') is also incompatible with a bare negative adverbial (32a,b) or with a *wh*-constituent (32c,d) in initial position.

(32) a. *Nergens **daar** verkopen ze nog kleine notebroodjes.[7] [Dutch]
Nowhere there *sell* *they* *part small nutrolls*

b. *Nooit **dan** kunt ge kleine notebroodjes krijgen
never then *can* *you* *small nutrolls* *obtain*

c. *In welke periode **toen** woonde zij in Geneve?
in which period then *lived she* *in Geneva*

d. *In welke van die twee winkels **daar** verkopen ze biofruit?[8]
In which of those two shops daar *sell* *they biological fruit*

The resumptive patterns contrast with regular V2 patterns in which negative and quantificational constituents are suitable first constituents, as is shown in (33) and (34):

(33) a. Niemand heeft ze gekust. [Dutch]
no one has she *kissed*
'She kissed no one.'

b. Wie ga je dan uitnodigen?
who *go* *you* *then* *invite*
'Who are you going to invite?'

(34) a. Nergens verkopen ze nog kleine notebroodjes.

Nowhere sell they part small nutrolls

'Nowhere do they sell small nutrolls.'

b. Nooit kunt ge kleine notebroodjes krijgen

never can you small nutrolls obtain

'Never can you obtain small nutrolls.'

c. In welke periode woonde zij in Geneve?

in which period lived she in Geneva

'When did she live in Geneva?'

d. In welke van die twee winkels verkopen ze biologisch fruit?

In which of those two shops sell they biological fruit

'In which of those two shops do they sell organic fruit?'

Further research has to establish to what extent specialized resumptives are cross-linguistically incompatible with quantificational initial constituents; if there is variation then the question arises how it can be accounted for.

In Mainland Scandinavian languages, the generalized resumptive is ruled out if the fronted adverbial is a *wh*-constituent (Nordström 2010; Holmberg this volume). This can be excluded, for instance, in terms of the left peripheral position of *så* and/or in terms of its features which may make it incompatible with a quantitative or a *wh*-feature.

(35) a. *Hvorfor **så** sa du ikke noe? [Norwegian]

why så *said you not anything*

'Why didn't you say anything?'

b. *Når **så** kommer du hjem?

when så *come you home*

'When will you come home?.'

c. *Hvor **så** skal du?
where så *shall you*
'Where are you going.'

However, the ban of initial *wh*-constituents reported for some Mainland Scandinavian varieties is not universal. Holmberg (this volume) reports that in Fenno-Swedish the general resumptive can occur with an adjunct *wh*-phrase or with a D-linked *wh* nominal in initial position. Similarly, as shown in De Clercq and Haegeman (2018, this volume: their (13a)), the general resumptive *die* in the Ghent variety is compatible with an initial *wh*-constituent: (36) is accepted by 7 out of 12 speakers.

(36) Wanneer **die** komt ze terug? [Ghent]
when die *comes* *she* *back*
'When is she coming back?'

The question then arises, of course, how much cross-linguistic variation there is in terms of the nature of the initial constituent with generalized resumption and what accounts for the observed variation. Assuming that the initial constituent in the adverbial resumptive pattern contributes also to the information structure of the sentence, the question arises to what extent – if at all – this should be formalized in its syntactic position, a point that features prominently, among others, in the contributions to this volume by Casallicchio and Cagnola, De Clercq and Haegeman, Holmberg, Sluckin and Bunk, and Vance.

3.4 Modification of the resumptive constituent

In the Dutch nominal CLD pattern, the resumptive constituent can be modified by focusing elements such as *net* ('precisely') or *zelfs* ('even') or *alleen* ('only'):

(37) a. De eerste aflevering, **net** **die** vond ik niet goed. [Dutch]
the first episode, precisely that *found* *I not good*
'Precisely the first episode, I didn't like.'

b. De eerste aflevering, **zelfs** **die** vond ik niet goed.
the first episode, even that *found* *I* *not good*
'Even the first episode, I didn't like.'

c. De eerste aflevering, **alleen** **die** vond ik niet goed
the first episode, only that *found* *I not good*
'Only the first episode, I didn't like.'

d. Over zijn ziekte, **juist** **daar** kunnen we niet over praten.
about his illness, precisely there *can* *we* *not* *about talk*
'Precisely his illness, he cannot talk about.'

e. Over zijn ziekte, **zelfs** **daar** kunnen we niet over praten.
about his illness, even there *can* *we* *not* *about talk*
'Even his illness he cannot talk about.'

f. Over zijn ziekte, **alleen** **daar** kunnen we niet over praten.
about his illness, only there *can* *we* *not* *about talk*
'He can only talk about his illness.'

Such focussing constituents can also modify the specialized resumptive constituent in adverbial V3 resumption:

(38) a. Als het regent, **juist** **dan** ga ik te voet naar het werk. [Dutch]

if it rains, precisely then go I on foot to the work

'When it rains, precisely then I walk to work.'

b. Als het regent, **zelfs dan** ga ik te voet naar het werk.

if it rains, even then *go I on foot to the work*

'When it rains, even then I walk to work.'

c. Als het regent, **alleen dan** ga ik te voet naar het werk.

if it rains, only then *go I on foot to the work*

'When it rains, even then I walk to work.'

d. In Ledeberg, **juist** **daar** kan je lekker eten.

in Ledeberg, exactly there *can you nicely eat*

'In Ledeberg, exactly there you can dine out nicely.'

e. In Ledeberg, **zelfs** **daar** kan je lekker eten.

in Ledeberg, even there *can you nicely eat*

'In Ledeberg, even there you can dine out nicely.'

f. In Ledeberg, **alleen** **daar** kan je lekker eten.

in Ledeberg, only there *can you nicely eat*

'In Ledeberg, only there can you dine out nicely.'

The resumptive constituent in nominal CLD pattern and in the adverbial CLD pattern can also itself be focally stressed:

(39) a. De eerste aflevering, **die** vond ik niet goed. [Dutch]

the first episode, that *found I not good*

'I didn't like the first episode.'

b. Over zijn ziekte, **daar** kunnen we niet over praten.
about his illness, there *can* *we* *not* *about talk*
'Linguistics, we cannot talk about.'

c. Als het regent, **dan** ga ik te voet naar het werk.
if *it rains,* then *go I* *on foot to* *the work*
'When it rains, then I walk to work.'

d. In Ledeberg, **daar** kan je lekker eten.
in Ledeberg, there *can* *you* *nicely eat*
'You can dine out nicely in Ledeberg.'

The fact that the Dutch resumptive elements illustrated above can be modified by focusing constituents or can themselves be focally stressed suggests that they – at least in those configurations – have phrasal status. As such the resumptive elements can be viewed as proforms for the phrasal constituents to their immediate left.

De Clercq and Haegeman (2021, this volume) show that in the Ghent variety the invariant element *die* is incompatible with focusing, while in the same dialect a specialized resumptive is compatible with focusing. The same is found to obtain in Mainland Scandinavian: while the specialized resumptive (*da* ('then') in (40a)) permits focusing, the generalized one (*så* in (40b)) does not do so.

(40) a. Da han kom hjem fra skolen, [Norwegian]
when *he* *came* *home* *from* *school*
akkurat da raste det snø fra taket.
right then *fell* *it* *snow* *from* *roof.DET*

'When he came home from school, right then, there was an avalanche from the roof.'

b. *Da han kom hjem fra skolen,
akkurat så raste det snø fra taket.

Questions arise of course as to whether the observed contrast in focusing possibilities between specialized and generalized resumptives is generalizable: do specialized resumptives cross-linguistically allow focusing? Are generalized resumptives cross-linguistically incompatible with focusing particles? What does this contrast (where verified) entail and what does it imply for the definition of the concept resumption?

3.5 Mid position of the resumptive

In Dutch nominal CLD, i.e. the resumption pattern with an argumental constituent in initial position, the resumptive demonstrative (*die* or *dat*) can occupy a middle field position: this pattern arises obligatorily whenever the left peripheral (LP) slot of the root clause that combines with the topical constituent is unavailable because a LP feature is independently activated. The pattern is illustrated in (41):

(41) a. Je laptop, **die** mag je meebrengen. [Dutch]
Your laptop, die *may you with bring*
'Your laptop, you can bring it along.'

b. Je laptop, waar heb je **die** gekocht?
Your laptop, where have you die *bought?*
'Your laptop, where did you buy it?'

c. *Je laptop, **die** waar heb je gekocht?

Your laptop, die *where* *have* *you* *bought?*

'Your laptop, where did you buy it?'

d. *Je laptop, waar **die** heb je gekocht?

Your laptop, where die *have* *you* *bought?*

'Your laptop, where did you buy it?'

In (41a) the specialized resumptive *die* occupies a left peripheral position; we assume that the initial constituent *je laptop* ('your laptop') is main clause external (in the sense of Koster 1978, updated in Broekhuis and Corver 2016: 1133-1134). The resumptive demonstrative *die* itself is the first constituent of the regular root V2 clause and immediately precedes the finite verb. In (41b) the *wh* phrase *waar* ('where') occupies the first slot in the root V2 pattern; in this case, resumptive *die* must remain in a middlefield position because the LP slot is already occupied (cf. Mikkelsen 2015). (44c) and (41d) are ungrammatical. Continuing to assume that the initial constituent is main clause external, (41c) and (41d) violate the V2 constraint because the finite verb *heb* ('have') is preceded by two constituents, the *wh*-phrase and the resumptive.

In imperatives too, the left periphery (LP) of the imperative is taken to be activated, for instance by a non-overt operator, as represented in (42a/b) and the V2 constraint is thus satisfied. Again, the resumptive constituent cannot precede the imperative: (42c) and (42d) violate the V2 constraint if one assumes that the initial constituent *je laptop* ('your laptop') is main clause external and that, in addition to the fronted resumptive *die*, the LP of the imperative hosts a null operator.

(42) a. Je laptop, laat **die** maar thuis. [Dutch]

Your laptop *leave* die *PART home*

'Just leave your laptop at home.'

b. Je laptop, OP laat **die** maar thuis.
Your laptop OP leave die *PART home*
'Just leave your laptop at home.'

c. *Je laptop, **die** OP laat maar thuis.
Your laptop die *OP leave PART home*

d. *Je laptop, OP **die** laat maar thuis.
Your laptop OP die *leave PART home*

The pattern in (42) carries over to Dutch adverbial V3 resumption: (43a-c) shows that the presence of a *wh* constituent in the LP forces mid-position for the temporal resumptive *dan* ('then'); (43d-e) illustrates the same pattern for an imperative.

(43) a. Als het regent, wat gaan we **dan** doen? [Dutch]
if it rains, what go we then *do*
'When it rains, what are we going to do then?'

b. *Als het regent, **dan wat** gaan we doen?
if it rains, then what *go we do*

c. *Als het regent, **wat dan** gaan we doen?
if it rains, what then *go we do*

d. Als het regent blijf **dan** maar thuis.
if it rains stay then *PART home*

e. *Als het regent **dan** blijf maar thuis.
if it rains then *stay PART home*

For insightful discussion of the distribution of anaphoric adverbs in Danish, see Mikkelsen (2015).

Among other things, the comparison between the specialized resumptive and the generalized resumptive will have to reveal to what extent the latter also occupies mid-position in environments with an activated LP. As will be shown in De Clercq and Haegeman (this volume), for the Ghent variety this is not the case, again suggesting that the general resumptive *die* is not a placeholder for the initial constituent, again raising the question as to how we define the concept resumption.

3.6 Optionality

It may appear that both in the nominal and the adverbial domain, the resumptive V3 strategy is 'optional' in the sense that in all cases, V3 examples of resumption can be rephrased with analogous V2 examples which lack the general or special resumptive constituent and in which the initial constituent of the resumptive pattern, which we tentatively have considered to be extra-clausal, becomes integrated in the V2 root clause.

We repeat some cases of Dutch nominal and adverbial resumption: as indicated by the parentheses, the special resumptive elements can be omitted without loss of grammaticality:

(44) a. Jan (**die**) ken ik niet [Dutch]
Jan that *know I not*
'Jan, I don't know him.'

b. Dat boek (**dat**) ken ik niet
that book that *know I not*
'I don't know that book.'

a. In den Haag (**daar**) woont een graaf

in the Hague there *lives* *a count*

'There is a count living in the Hague.'

Various approaches can be envisaged to capture the optionality. For instance, in line with Chomsky and Lasnik (1977), Koster (1978) postulates that in the absence of the overt resumptive element, the superficially linear V2 word order implicates the presence of a null resumptive, *de facto* meaning that the linear V2 order is underlyingly a V3 pattern (see also Zwart (1997: 250); and Broekhuis and Corver (2016)). So in fact the resumptive constituent would alternate with a null topic operator. However, this analysis cannot be generalized across all 'regular' V2 sentences. In some cases, the initial constituent in a V2 pattern does not obviously constitute a topic and as expected, such a constituent will be incompatible with specialized *dan* resumption (cf. Broekhuis and Corver 2016: 1707). This is, for instance, the case with initial modal adverbials like epistemic *waarschijnlijk* 'probably', (45d)). For this example, the analysis of the linear V2 word order which appeals to an underlying V3 order with a null topic operator in initial position is less plausible.

(45) a. Jan **die**/OP ken ik niet [Dutch]
Jan that *know I* *not*
'Jan, I don't know him.'

b. Dat boek **die**/OP ken ik niet
that book that *know* *I* *not*
'I don't know that book.'

c. In den Haag **daar**/OP woont een graaf
in the Hague there *lives* *a* *count*

d. Waarschijnlijk (***dan**) komt hij morgen

*probably (*then*) comes he tomorrow*

In some cases, removal of the Dutch specialized resumptive element will entail additional readjustments because of its interaction with other possibly language-specific syntactic properties of the sentence. For example, more radical rephrasing is needed in the case of (13c) repeated as (46a), in which the resumptive element, *daar* ('there'), is the complement of a stranded preposition (*over* 'about') and resumes an initial PP *over taalkunde* ('about linguistics'). For independent reasons, the resumptive element cannot simply be omitted. On the one hand, in (46b) the initial PP *over taalkunde* ('about linguistics') would have to be analysed as itself originating as the complement of the preposition *over*, which is unacceptable: the preposition *over* requires a nominal complement, *taalkunde* ('linguistics') (46c) (but see Aelbrecht and den Dikken (2013) on P doubling in Flemish varieties of Dutch). In (46d), the fronted nominal constituent *taalkunde* ('linguistics') would constitute a licit complement of the preposition *over* ('about') but fronting of a nominal complement of a preposition and stranding of the preposition is not generally acceptable to speakers of Dutch. The acceptable non-resumptive variant of (46a) is (46e):

(46) a. Over taalkunde, **daar** kan ik niet over praten. [Dutch]
About linguistics, there can I not about talk

b. *Over taalkunde kan ik niet over praten.
About linguistics can I not about talk

c. Ik kan niet over (*over) taalkunde praten.
*I can not about (*about) linguistics talk*

d. %Taalkunde kan ik niet over praten.
Linguistics can I not about talk

e. Over taalkunde kan ik niet praten.
About linguistics can I not talk
'I cannot talk about linguistics.'

Another pattern in which the resumptive cannot be omitted is illustrated in (47), in which the resumptive *die* resumes the initial nominal *je laptop* ('your laptop') and where it occupies mid position because the LP is occupied by the *wh*-phrase *waar* ('where'). In its mid position, the resumptive is obligatory: this is so because in this case the resumptive functions as the complement of the verb.

(47) Je laptop, waar heb je *(**die**) gekocht? [Dutch]
Your laptop, where have you die *bought?*
'Your laptop, where did you buy it?'

Haegeman and Greco (2018, their (25)) report on Standard Dutch example (48), in which a special resumptive temporal adverbial *dan* ('then') occupies a TP internal mid position due to the fact that the LP slot of the V2 root clause is activated by the presence of the *wh*-phrase *waarom* ('why'). While five out of their eight informants accepted omission of the resumptive in this example, three informants found (48) to be degraded and required the presence of a resumptive adverb, *dan* 'then', in the middlefield of the main clause. Indeed, even those speakers who accepted (48) without *dan* in the middlefield found the variant with *dan* preferable.

(48) Als je abstract klaar is, [Dutch]
if your abstract ready is

waarom	heb	je	het	%*(**dan**)	niet	opgestuurd?
why	*have*	*you*	*it*	(then)	*not*	*up.sent*

'If your abstract is ready, why haven't you sent it?'

For the speakers requiring the presence of the resumptive in mid-position, this is then a case in which the strategy is not optional.

The superficial optionality of the resumptive constituent raises a number of analytical questions, already hinted at above. For instance, if patterns with specialized resumptives are analysed as summarized in (49a), we need to assess if a superficially linear V2 order without the resumptive (49b) should be derived by placing the initial XP in the specifier position related to the finite verb, or whether it should be considered as a main clause external constituent which is reprised by a non overt constituent as the specifier of the layer whose head hosts the finite verb (49d).

(49) a. XP [$_{CP}$ resumptive V_{fin} [$_{TP}$ subject

b. XP Vfin subject

c. [$_{CP}$ XP V_{fin} [$_{TP}$ subject

d. XP [$_{CP}$ OP V_{fin} [$_{TP}$ subject

Among other things the argumentation for one analysis or the other will also hinge on the information structure status of the initial constituent. Such arguments are difficult to use in diachronic research, since there is no access to native speaker intuitions for interpretation. As shown in contributions by Axel-Tober and by Haeberli and Pintzuk (this volume), the problem can be overcome by using sophisticated statistical approaches to corpus data.

3.7 The status of the generalized resumptive

So far the picture emerging is that in addition to specialized resumptives matching the constituent to their left in terms of its semantics, languages may deploy a single generalized resumptive that at first sight appears to take over the role of each of the specialized resumptives, an analysis explicitly endorsed for Dutch specialized resumptive adverbs and invariant *die* in the Ghent variety by Zwart (1997: 249-50). If the two resumptive elements were to be shown to be in complementary distribution, then the same position could be attributed to the invariant *die* in the Ghent dialect and Standard Dutch special resumptives (as in Zwart 1997: 249-250). However, as already discussed, the fact that the two elements can co-occur is evidence that this is not the right way to look at things.

It of course also turn out that specialized resumptives and/or generalized resumptives do not constitute a uniform class, as various authors will have occasion to point out.

3.8 V2 syntax

Observe that besides its intrinsic descriptive interest, the analysis of the resumptive patterns bears on a range of aspects in relation to the general analysis of the V2 pattern, especially so in those cases in which it can be shown that the initial adjunct which is resumed is not sentence-external and even more so in cases in which it can be shown that in addition to the finite verb there is another left peripheral head element. In these cases, it would seem that an expanded left periphery along the lines of Rizzi (1997) is inevitable to allow the positioning of the various elements. This point is addressed by several authors in this volume, and as such the pattern we present here bears on the more general issue of functional structure.

3.9 Summary

In this introduction, we first discussed the general background to verb second phenomenon (V2) and how it has been analysed in the literature, zooming in on patterns that seemingly violate V2, i.e. verb third patterns (V3). Some linear V3 patterns with extra-sentential modifiers and arguments are exemplified as background information, but the main focus of the chapter is on the properties of adverbial V3 resumption, which is the core focus of the volume. Both the properties of the adverbial constituent to the left of the resumptive and the nature of the resumptive itself, i.e. whether it is general or special, are discussed in detail.

---

[1] Further, in the passive, Standard Dutch deploys the special auxiliary *worden* ('become') for the passive in the simple tenses, a pattern which Postma (2017) correlates with V2.

(i) Jan wordt morgen gopereerd.
Jan becomes tomorrow operated
'Jan has surgery tomorrow.'

[2] Observe incidentally that unlike Dutch and German, present-day English does not deploy a specialised auxiliary for passive tenses, (6), but an earlier stage of the language, which was arguably V2 (see Haeberli and Pintzuk this volume) did deploy the specialised auxiliary *weorðan* ('become') (see Postma 2017).

(i) a. John will be interviewed tomorrow.
b. John is being interviewed today.
c. John has been interviewed already.

[3] See, however, Frey (2016, 2018, 2020a) for a more refined terminology setting apart non-integrated clauses from peripheral clauses. In terms of his terminology we are interested in non-integrated clauses.

[4] The resumptive element matches the initial constituent. Typically, in Standard Dutch temporal *dan* is specialized for future and conditional reference, while past time reference would be encoded with *toen.* In (14a) *dan* cannot be replaced by *toen* (ia). On the other hand, with an initial constituent that is past time related, only *toen* is appropriate (ib):

(i) a. *Als mijn tekst klaar is, naar wie zal ik hem toen opsturen?
when my text ready is, to whom shall I him then send

b. *Toen zijn tekst klaar was, naar wie heeft hij hem toen opgestuurd?
when his text ready is, to whom has he him then sent

[5] For the difference between *dan* ('then') and *toen* ('then') in Standard Dutch see Section 3.1.

[6] An issue that awaits to be addressed is the degree of 'bleaching' associated with generalised resumptives and to what extent they retain semantic features. A related question is whether there may be cross-linguistic variation in the degree of semantic bleaching and how resumptive develop through time.

Catasso (2021) offers a number of insights on these questions. Speculating on the interpretation of the Middle High German generalised resumptive *sô*, he identifies this as a 'hyper referential' (Catasso 2021: 25) or 'over referential' (Catasso 2021: 28) item, i.e. one compatible with almost any type of antecedent.

Catasso (2021: 17-18) also shows that specialized resumptives may have wider or narrower semantics. For instance, Middle High German *dô* can resumpt temporal adjuncts, causal adjuncts and locative PPs, i.e. it is compatible with temporality, causality and locality. For interpretation of this see his own paper (Catasso 2021: 18).

In addition, Catasso (2021: 30) shows how in Present Day German, *da* resumption is no longer compatible with causal antecedents, and restricted to temporal and locative

adjuncts. PDG *so* is restricted to formal registers and has significantly narrowed in interpretation. "[S]ô /so has lost the hyper-referentiality that we observe both in MHG and ENHG nd must be considered a specialised resumptive in PDG. … it can only resume conditional […] and concessive […] antecedents." (Catasso 2021: 31-2).

[7] This example is grammatical in an alternative parse in which *nergens daar* ('nowhere there') is one constituent meaning 'nowhere in that place'. This is not directly relevant for the issue at hand.

[8] Again, this example is grammatical with the alternative parse in which *daar* is part of one initial constituent, modifying *winkels*: 'in which of those two shops over there'.