Verb first and verb second

How to implement verb first and verb second given the assumptions so far?
A striking similarity between embedded and root clauses
(see Hallman, 1976, 2001, Nilsen, 2000)

-->
FinP ends up being in second position
hierarchical (once embedded)
UG and the actual patterns of Dutch….

Finer structure… (Invert is responsible for final topics, (and foci depending on language..)
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UG and the actual patterns of Dutch….

If we have CP recursion, do all these CPs have Force, or do only certain types of clauses have Force?

---. The structure is embedded under a predicate; this is equivalent to Force.

--> Force is a predicate.. (performative verbs..)
Properties of individual players…(Universal)
Topic drop (Dutch specific).

*Generalized doubly filled C filter*
remnant TP to Fin…. +

Both contexts survive in declarative Force, but only b survives in Imp Force.
Both imperatives and declaratives are verb second: leg maar neer --> Zero Fin is “picky”: it needs to find the finite verb in the highest projection in its Spec overt Fin is not picky in this way (
Good contexts in imperatives….

Imp Force has a lexical property: it must find TP containing the imperative verb in the highest projection in its Spec. (verb second is due to the property of FinP.)
Filter (Force/declarative):
declarative Force is only compatible with:
restricts possible UG to actual attested patterns
Actual patterns...
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Explain both main and embedded clauses:

*ik den k niet dit boek dat je moet lezen

Filter also accounts for the absence of C deletion:

*ik denk niet je moet lezen

(Fin would end up too high)
Actual patterns... Root versus non-root FinP.

FinP attracts TP (universally). Root Fin (zero) has different properties from that (fin) root Fin is picky in a way that is not

---

Bel maar even op --op te bellen --wil opbellen
dat ik maar even opbel

--> Root Fin attracts minimal remnant TP
dat attracts TP that pied-pipes additional material
(big pied-piping is preferred)

Filter on Root Fin: Fin must find TP in Spec
Complementizer agreement. No complementizer agreement with embedded verb second… (check literature: Zwart, .., Hallman, ..)

Chance to agree

No chance to agree:
subject not in a local relationship with Fin
Extends very nicely to embedded and root clauses (these are also Fin second) 
no multiple Topics etc preceding dat -> would violate the Fin second filter. 
No embedded topics, lower than dat: would violate Fin second filter.
An aside about T to C and language variability:

All languages have overt T to C (TP to CP) movement. But surface effects are different due to the fact that different sized “TP”s occupy the Spec, CP position (or have transited through)

Crosslinguistic variation depends on the size of the pied-piped constituent (Koopman and Szabolsci (2000), also a variant on Pollock and Poletto (2000, Pollock, Munaro and Poletto (1999) ..) (Force Ground Top Op TP)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{d. } & [\text{WH} [[[\text{TP qui est venu}] [\text{CP} [\text{TP t} ] ] \ldots \ldots [} \\
\text{e. } & [\text{WH} [a \text{ qui }] [\text{CP} [\text{TP quel qu’un a }] \ldots t ] [\text{CliticP/S il parle [TPe]}] \ldots \\
\text{f. } & [\text{WH} [a \text{ qui }] [\text{CP} [\text{CliticP/S pro a parle}] [\text{TopP Jean}]
\end{align*}
\]

Vata: questions(Kru/ Gur…):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{g. } & [\text{WH} [ ][\text{CP [TP DP V-Tense]} [\text{CD [ ...Adv DP…] [la
\end{align*}
\]