In the mood of desire and hope : remarks on the German subjunctive, the verb second phenomenon, the nature of volitional predicates, and speculations on illocution

André MEINUNGER
ZAS Berlin

1. About predicates that disallow V2 - Do they form a natural class ?
1.1. Predicate classes – the big divide : V2 licensors and V2 blockers

Much work has been spent on constructions in which a predicate or whatever linguistic entity licences a clause that behaves similarly to a matrix-sentence. Only to mention a few examples for the sake of illustration, Hooper and Thompson (1973), in response to Emonds (1969), list predicates that are able to embed CPs that exhibit phenomena which are expected to occur in main clauses only. For German or Germanic in general, there is an ongoing debate concerning embedded or dependent verb second (V2) constructions. Almost all researchers that have worked on dependent V2 in German present a classification of predicates that potentially allows for main clause word order in argument (realizing) clauses ('Argument realisierende Sätze' in Reis' notation). Classifications can be found in Reis (1977, 1997) ; Helbig and Kempter (1974), Butulussi (1991), Romberg (1999), and to a lesser degree in Dunbar (1979), Oppenrieder (1987, 1991), and Meinunger (2004, 2006), and even standard grammars like Eisenberg (1994) or Duden (e.g., 1995) illustrate the facts and list predicates. The proposed classifications differ rather minimally and are listed below. Class (v) will be the main object of investigation in the present study, and its placement among the V2 licensors will be critically discussed.

Class (i)   verbs of saying : *sagen, antworten, behaupten, bemerken, berichten,...*
(say, reply/respond, claim, remark, report,...)

Class (ii)   evidential verbs : *hören, merken, spüren, bemerken, sehen, auffallen, ...*
(learn/hear, notice, feel, realize, see, strike…)

Class (iii)   verbs of thinking : *annehmen, denken, einsehen, fürchten, glauben, meinen,...*
(assume, think, see, be afraid, think, believe, mean...)

Class (iv)   semifactive verbs : *wissen, begreifen, beweisen, herausfinden, herausbekommen...*
(know, realize, prove, find out (both)...)

Class (v)   volitional predicates : *wollen, wünschen, hoffen [1], empfehlen, überreden, das beste/besser/lieber sein, lieber haben (hätte...), vorziehen, bitten, verlangen...*
(want, wish, hope, recommend, convince, be better, prefer, ask, demand/require…)

The predicates that do not allow for embedded or dependent V2 have been of much less interest. The reason seems obvious : the non-V2 realization, i.e., a verb-final construction introduced by a complementizer is the canonical case for an embedded clause, and insofar no extra story has to be told about the unmarked use.

To my knowledge, a notable exception is Romberg (1999) inspired by classifications in Reis (1977 : 202). Romberg lists '*Berücksichtigungs¬prädikate*' (predicates of consideration) = class (a), semantically complex, inherently negative predicates (b) and emotive verbs (c).

Class (a)   *vernachlässigen, ignorieren, bedenken, beachten...*
(neglect, ignore, consider, bear in mind...)

Class (b)   *verdrängen, vergessen, verheimlichen...*
(repress/suppress, forget, hide/conceal...)

Class (c)   *bedauern, bereuen, übelnehmen, beklagen,...*
(regret/feel remorse, take offense, deplore...)

(1)   *Ich bereue, dass ich es nicht sofort   gekauft habe.*
       I   regret that I   it not immediately bought have

(2)   **Ich bereue, ich habe es nicht sofort   gekauft.*
       I   regret   I have it not immediately bought
       both : 'I regret that I did not buy it right away.'

One can easily see that the given classification is rather tentative than completely satisfying. Cross-classification, hence ambiguity, is inevitable. Class (a) and (b) are not very distinct, the first two verbs of class (a) could as well be argued to belong into class (b) [2].

Furthermore, Romberg mentions causative verbs and gives the following example (Romberg 1999 : 25) :

(3)   *Hans hat verursacht/bewirkt, dass Peter nach Hause geht.*
       Hans has tried   /caused, that Peter to   home goes

---

[1]   This predicate (i.e. '*hoffen*') is very delicate; see the discussion in paragraph 3.
[2]   Few people, e.g., Eisenberg (1994) find semi-factives like *herausfinden, entdecken, beweisen* etc. (find out, discover, prove) and claimed-to-be factive ,*wissen*' relatively unacceptable and argue for an unintegrated reading with the so-called '*Doppelpunktlesart*'.

(4)   *Hans hat verursacht/bewirkt, Peter geht nach Hause.*
        Hans has tried   /caused, Peter goes to   home
         both : 'Hans caused Peter to go home.'

Romberg cites these sentences to show that only verbs that potentially report a propositional attitude can realize their complements in a V2 pattern. Meinunger (2004), considering work by Quer (1998, 2001) argues that Romberg's observation can be stretched to cover more than only pure causatives. It seems that generally implicative predicates do not allow for independent, integrated V2 clauses (causatives being only weakly implicative). Note also that most of Reis' negative predicates are considered to be negatively implicative (see Bußmann (1990), also the pioneer study Karttunen (1971), after Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970)).

Furthermore Meinunger (2004, 2006) argues that volitional predicates (volitive predicates, preferential expressions, desideratives, Reis' so-called '*Präferenzprädikate*' etc.) are misclassified if they are claimed to belong to the V2-licensors (as for V2 and volitional predicates see also the work of Frank (1998)). Nevertheless all researchers have classified volitional predicates as V2 licensors. However, examples like (5) vs. (6) show that under normal circumstances, volitional verbs do not allow for V2 complements. For details and more examples see below.

(5)   *Hans will,   dass du ihm sein Hemd mitbringst.*
        Hans wants that you him his shirt   with-bring
(6)   *Hans will, du bringst ihm sein Hemd mit.*
        Hans wants you bring him his shirt with(=prt)
        'Hans wants you to bring (along) his shirt.'

1.2. Valency and discourse properties

This concludes our detour concerning verb classes. Another important observation is that the option of V2 also depends on factors different from just the nature of the sole verb (al predicate). Pinkal (1981) and Vogel (1998) observe that 3-place 'glauben' is also not construable with a V2-argument.

(7)   *Hans glaubt, Peter   geht nach Hause.*
        Hans believes, Peter goes to   home.
(8)   *Hans glaubt seinem Bruder, Peter geht nach Hause*
        Hans believes his   brother, Peter goes to   home.
        'Hans believes (his brother) that Peter is going home.'

Both authors offer a similar explanation according to which the 3-place variant implicates a discourse-old reading for the dependent clause. I.e., they both argue for a reading where the embedded proposition is known to hearer and speaker.

1.3. More factors to render V2 impossible

Other linguistic triggers for the inapplicability of V2 in dependent clauses other than the nature of the matrix predicates have also been discussed in literature. There is the famous negation restriction (already Blümel (1914), see however Butulussi (1991) and Meinunger (2004)), i.e., (9) and (11) vs. (10).

(9) *Er hat gesagt / geglaubt, sie ist schwanger.*

    He has said / believed she is pregnant

(10) **Er hat nicht gesagt/ geglaubt, sie ist schwanger.*

    He has not said / believed she is pregnant

(11) *Er hat nicht gesagt/ geglaubt, dass sie schwanger ist.*

    He has not   said / believed that she pregnant is

    'He did not say /believe that she was/is pregnant'

Apart from negation other focus (sensitive) operators like *nur*, *lediglich*, *auch* (only, just, too…) and the like render V2 close to impossible (Romberg 1999, for an overview). Less clear are the facts for a non-assertive mood in the matrix, but the observed tendency is that V2 becomes worse if the root clause is a question or a command (Meinunger 2004, 2006). Last but not least it has been observed that old information, i.e. if the proposition expressed in a CP is known or can easily be inferred from what is known, V2 is not appropriate either (Mikame (1986), Meinunger (2006)). Meinunger states : "A further important observation is that prominence in discourse renders V2 awkward albeit under a licensing predicate." (Meinunger 2006 : 465) That means that if (the proposition of) a V2 utterance is to be repeated, the subordinated shape sounds much more appropriate (12Ba) vs. (12Bb).

(12) A : *Bernd ist endlich gekommen !*

       'Bernd has arrived – finally.'

    B : (a) *Ja, ja – ich weiß/habe schon gehört, dass Bernd endlich gekommen ist.*

       (b) #*Ja, ja – ich weiß/habe schon gehört, Bernd ist endlich gekommen.*

        'O yeah,   I   know/have heard #(*dass*) Bernd has finally arrived.'

But not only if the sentence is repeated with the same lexical material – even if the propositional content can be inferred (13), V2 sounds inappropriate.

(13) A : *Bernd ist endlich gekommen !*
           'Bernd has arrived – finally.'
      B : (a) *Ja, ja – ich weiß/habe schon gehört, dass Bernd hier ist.*
           (b) #*Ja, ja – ich weiß/habe schon gehört, Bernd ist hier.*
              'O yeah,   I know/have heard #(*dass*) Bernd is here.'

This also holds if an obvious fact is being uttered. The scenario is such that a speaker enters a room where a specific person he had been looking for is present. Then speaker makes a more natural statement if he utters (a) instead of (b).

(14) *Hans hat gesagt, dass du hier bist.*
      Hans has said   that you here are
(15) *Hans hat gesagt, du bist hier.*
      Hans has said   you are here
      Both : 'Hans said you're here.'

Thus the conclusion is that discourse-linked propositions (whether explicitly introduced into the discourse by a speaker's statement, or by mere accommodation) cannot be uttered in the shape of V2. Note that this observation reminds a lot of the condition on the licensing of definite anaphoric noun phrases. So much for the non-lexical, i.e. grammatical restrictions.

1.4. Back to V2 blocking predicates

At this point, I want to come back to the categorical V2 blockers. In 1.2 and 1.3, I discussed the contexts in which potential V2 licensors cannot embed a V2 clause. It seems that some form of givenness of the subordinate proposition disallows the V2 realization. Now, reconsidering again the verbal classes, the following question arises. Is there something common to the relevant predicates ? To come to a proposal, let me present the predicate classes in a single list :

(16) (i) Emotive verbs
      (ii) Predicates of consideration
      (iii)Inherently negative predicates
      (iv) Implicative verbs (including causatives, i.e. weakly implicative verbs)
      (v) Volitional predicates

My claim will be that all of these predicate classes make reference to factivity. (i) Emotive verbs are the prototypical representatives of factive

verbs. However, even they display one intriguing factor. It is an old observation that emotive verbs can be coerced to act as *verba dicendi*, i.e. they can be used as verbs of saying. For a brand new treatment of this phenomenon in German see Fabricius-Hansen and Sæbø (2004). The authors show that with Konjunktiv 1 (a special German form of subjunctive), many of these verbs lose their factive character and acquire a reading in which the embedded proposition is the object of an utterance report (=reportive subjunctive).

(17) *Der Chef bedauerte, dass er ein Drittel der Belegschaft entlassen müsse.*

   The boss regretted that he a third the employees fire   must-subj

(18) *Der Chef bedauerte, er müsse ein Drittel der Belegschaft entlassen.*

   The boss regretted he must-subj one third the employees fire

   'The boss said in a sad way that he was forced to dismiss a third of the employees.'

This use, however, must be disregarded here. This is not so difficult since Konjunktiv I (a special German subjunctive) signals this non-factive use. And indeed the non-indicative verbal mood is obligatory in this construction [3].

   Furthermore, Reis (1977) shows convincingly that true factives can also be found among the non-emotives and lists the German examples from above (next to some English predicates), which she differentiates into considératives (ii) and negatives (iii) [4]. However – just to mention it : it seems to me that these (cognitives) are still somewhat less factive than emotive, they appear to be marginally possible with if or 'ob' for that matter - a use which does not trigger a factivity presupposition, and which is not available to emotives.

(19) *Ich habe vergessen, ob er nach München fährt.*

   I   have forgotten, if he to   Munich goes.

   'I forgot whether he is going to Munich.'

(20) *Du musst bedenken, ob du das wirklich willst.*

   You must think-about if you that truely   want

   'You have to think if you really want it.'

Implicative verbs (iv) are also relatively easily classified as factives in the broad sense. Whereas factives are defined as predicates that presuppose the

---

[3]   There are rare cases of *Konjunktiv II* under emotive verbs that are due to tense phenomena. It might again complicate matters if spoken registers are taken into consideration, so this should not concern us here.

[4]   The English terminology is my own.

truth of the argument proposition regardless of negation, implicatives are predicates that trigger a less rigid validity of the argument proposition. These predicates trigger (a claim about) the truth of the embedded proposition only if the relevant predicate is used positively, and they mark its falsity (i.e., non-truth) if the predicate is used under negation. Such an example would be '*zustande bringen*' (to manage, to bring about), '*sich die Zeit nehmen*' (to take one's time). Weakly implicative verbs comprise causatives. These verbs only trigger a presuppositional reading in the positive use. Romberg's examples belong in this category ; see (3) and (4) above.

2. The counter-factivity of volitionals
2.1. Counter-factive predicates

This leaves us with volitional predicates (v). These verbal and adjectival predicates can hardly be argued to be factive in the canonical sense. However, there seems to be something to them which transforms them into factives. In order to see what this is exactly, we have to undertake one more detour. In some work on factives, one finds vague mentioning of counter- or anti-factivity triggered by the use of predicates (e.g. Manning 1995). The English examples that are normally given – if at all – are pretend and wish (or sometimes imagine, which I think is not a good candidate). The German counterpart to pretend is '*vorgeben*', and indeed a sentence like (21) seems to carry the presupposition that the negation of the complement proposition is true, i.e. if (22) is true (see Meibauer 1999).

(21) *Egon gibt   vor, dass seine Frau Nastassja ist.*
       Egon pretends prt   that his   wife Nastassja is.
       'Egon pretends Nastassja to be his wife.'

(22) *Nastassja ist nicht seine Frau.*
       'Nastassja is not his wife.'

However, if there were a complete mirror image in the behaviour of the presupposition, we would expect the falsity of the complement proposition also under negation. This is arguably not the case. From a negated sentence containing vorgeben, nothing about the validity of the argument proposition can be concluded.

(23) *Egon gibt nicht vor / hat nie vorgegeben, dass seine Frau eine Adlige war.*
       Egon gives not prt / has never pretended, that   his   wife   a   nobility was
       'Egon never pretended / does not pretend his wife to belong to the nobility.'

In this respect, the verb vorgeben is rather something like a mirror image of a semi-factive or a weak implicative. There is yet one more curiosity found

with this verb. It seems that it is possible to construe a grammatical sentence with it (i.e. *Vorgeben*), which can embed a verb second clause. In this case, however, the embedded verb must show subjunctive mood.

(24) *Egon gibt/gab vor,   seine zukünftige Frau sei/wäre Millionärin.*
     Egon pretends/pretended his   future   woman be-subj millionaire.
     'Egon pretended/pretends that his future wife is a millionaire.'

With indicative mood the complex sentence sounds rather bizarre.

(25) *?/*Egon gibt/gab vor, seine zukünftige Frau ist/war Millionärin*
     Egon pretends/pretended his future   woman be-ind millionaire.
     'Egon pretended/pretends that his future wife is/was a millionaire.'

2.2. Volitional predicates

With respect to the verbal mood in the subordinate, 'pretend' behaves similarly to the other counter-factive verb, 'wish'. This verb is (mainly) used for counter-factual wishes with the subordinate sentence surfacing in subjunctive mood.

(26) I wish you were here.

Or less idiomatic :

(27) They wish you had spent more energy on this….

'Wish' sounds slightly marked with a canonical subordinate sentence exhibiting a complementizer (26) and ungrammatical with indicative mood (27).

(28) ?I wish that you came once more.
(29) *I wish (that) you are taller [5].

Despite the sentences in footnote 5, under regular circumstances wish cannot be negated (30), (31).

(30) ??/*I don't wish that you be tall.
(31) ??/*They do not wish that he come/came once more.

---

[5]   Under specific conditions (negation of the very predicate in a dialogue) the ban on indicative mood under *that* can be dispensed with.
      (i) Do you really wish to get the job?
      (ii) Well… I do not really wish that I get the job (…but…)

In these respects it resembles German constructions with '*wünschte*'. This verb is morphologically defective in the sense that it seems to have no regular indicative present (Präsens Indikativ), and depending on the point of view it could be argued that it does not have an infinitive either. It is also difficult to imagine past and true future tense(s). Be it as it may, sentences like (32) are relatively easy to be found.

(32) *Ich wünschte, du hättest   mehr Zeit für mich.*

    I   wish   you had-subj more time for me

    'I wish you had more time for me.'

(33) *Seine Eltern wünschten sehr wohl, er hätte   sie nie kennen gelernt.*

    His parents wished   very well he has-subj her never know learned

    'Certainly, his parents wish(ed) he had never met her.'

The phenomena that we observed with 'wish' also occur here. That is, the proposition expressed in the complement clause can be inferred to be false, i.e. it seems the whole sentence presupposes that [you have more time for me] or [he never met her] does not hold in the actual world with (30) and (31) respectively. In German, even more than with English wish, the verb '*wünschte*' cannot be negated (34).

(34) **Ich wünschte nicht, sie könnte/würde sich   dabei   verletzen.*

    I   wish   not   she could/would herself thereby hurt

    'I don't wish that she hurt herself doing this.'

The subordination shape with '*dass*' is also slightly marked, though fully grammatical – but only on the condition that the verb carries subjunctive mood (35) vs. (36), (37). Subordination under '*wenn*' (=if) is completely out also (38).

(35) *(?)Ich wünschte, dass du mehr Zeit für mich hättest.*

    I   wished   that you more time for me   have-subj

    'I wish you had more time for me.'

(36) **Ich wünschte, du hast mehr Zeit für mich*

    I wished   you have-ind more time for me

(37) **Ich wünschte, dass du mehr Zeit für mich hast*

    I   wished   that you more time for me   have-ind

(38) **Ich wünschte, wenn du mehr Zeit für mich hast*

    I wished   if   you more time for me have-ind

Other volitional predicates show a behaviour which overlaps with '*wünschte*' only partly. The first division concerning volitional predicates I

would like to make at this time is also one that is inspired by Reis (1997). Firstly, there are the rather regular volitives like *mögen*, (*möchten*?), *wünschen, sich wünschen, wollen, bitten, fordern* (the English counterparts I give here are tentative translation proposals, the relevant verbs behave differently and have to be modified, however : like, want, (wish ?), ask, beg, demand). Among them '*möchte*' – a word used quite frequently - is a similarly defective case as '*wünschte*'. The other examples are rather regular, and as I have shown, they never allow for V2, see (5) vs. (6) above (and also Helbig and Kempter 1974 [6]).

Secondly we have the so-called '*Präferenzausdrücke*' – preferential expressions like *vorziehen, lieber haben / mögen, besser sein, günstiger sein* etc (prefer, be better, be more appropriate...). These predicates show an interesting behaviour (see also Meinunger 2004). Similarly to '*wünschte*', the subordinate sentence is mostly (though not necessarily in this case) in subjunctive mood. But this is not enough : for the relevant constructions to be grammatical the matrix itself must occur in '*Konjunktiv*', i.e. subjunctive mood, or, if the predicate is an adjective, the adjectival predicate must not be simple positive, but appear in comparative or superlative form.

(39)   *Es ist/wäre besser, du gehst nicht hin.*
       It   is/were better you go-ind not there
       Almost all below something like : 'It would be better for you not to go (there).'

(40)   *Es ist/wäre besser, du gingest nicht hin / du würdest nicht hin gehen.*
       It is/were better you go-subj not there / you would not there go

(41)   *Es ist/wäre das beste, du gehst nicht hin.*
       It is/were   the best you go-ind not there

(42)   *Es ist/wäre das beste, du gingest nicht hin / du würdest nicht hin gehen.*
       It is/were the best you go-sub not there / you would not there go

(43)   *??Es wäre gut, du gehst nicht hin.*
       It is/were good you go-ind not there

(44)   *Es wäre gut, du gingest nicht hin / du würdest nicht hin gehen.*
       It is/were good you go-sub not there /It is/were good you go-ind not there

---

[6]   The only possibility to get a relatively integrated V2 clause under a volitional verb like *bitten, fordern, verlangen* (ask, demand, require) etc. is to construe it with '*sollen'/'mögen*' :

(i)   *Peter bittet, du mögest an seine Tasche denken*.
       Peter asks,   you should of his   bag   think
       'Peter is asking you not to forget his bag.'

(45) *Es ist gut, du gehst nicht hin.

     It is good you go-ind not there

(46) *Es ist gut, du gingest nicht hin / du würdest nicht hin gehen.

     It is good you go-ind not there /It is/were good you not there go-ind

Furthermore, the corresponding verb final variant of the embedded clause must be introduced by the complementizer 'wenn', not by 'dass' – except for the realization with the simple positive.

(47) Es ist/wäre besser, wenn du nicht hingehst.

     It is/were better   if   you not there- go-ind

     Almost all below something like : 'It would be better if you don't go there.'

(48) Es ist/wäre besser, wenn du nicht hingingst / hingehen würdest.

     It is/were better   if   you not there- go-subj / go-would

(49) Es ist/wäre das beste, wenn du nicht hingehst.

     It is/were the best   if   you not there- go-ind

(50) Es ist/wäre das beste, wenn du nicht hingingst / hingehen würdest.

     It is/were the best if   you not   there- go-subj / go-would

(51) Es wäre gut, wenn du nicht hingehst.

     It were good if you not there- go-ind

(52) Es wäre gut, wenn du nicht hingingst / hingehen würdest.

     It were good if you not there- go-subj / go-would

(53) *Es wäre besser, dass du nicht hingehst [7].

     It were better that you not there- go-ind

(54) *Es ist/wäre besser, dass du nicht hingingst / hingehen würdest.

     It is/were   better   that you not there- go-subj / go-would

(55) ?/*Es ist/wäre das beste, dass du nicht hingehst.

     It is/were   the best   that you not there- go-ind

(56) *Es ist/wäre das beste, dass du nicht hingingst / hingehen würdest.

     It is/were   the best that you not there- go-subj / go-would

(57) *Es wäre gut, dass du nicht hingehst.

     It   were good that you not there- go-ind

---

[7] 'Es ist besser, dass du nicht hingehst' – i.e. the non-subjunctive variant is fully grammatical, but here we have indicative in the subordinate as well and the reading is factive and means something different. It means 'It is better that you are not going there', thus we have a different interpretation here – a factive one – thus one that is crucially distinct from the V2 variant – and from all the other as well, of course.

(58) *Es wäre gut, dass du nicht hingingst / hingehen würdest.
         It were good that you not there- go-subj / go-would

All this shows clearly that these verbs are to be kept apart from the other V2 licensors.

2.3. The nature of volitional predicates

The claim that I would like to put forward is that volitional predicates are factive in some sense (i.e. counter-factive). It seems possible to assume (as one reads occasionally in the literature) that wish and '*wünschte*' are really counter-factive in the sense that they presuppose the falsity of the complement proposition. The same seems to hold for the somewhat quirky preferential predicates. Here even the negation test seems to be applicable to some degree ; which means that negation leaves the subordinate proposition unaffected, i.e. the presupposition of the embedded proposition's falsity holds.

(59) *Es wäre besser, sie trüge ihr   Haar offen / sie würde ihr Haar offen tragen.*
         It were better, she wear-sub her hair open / she would her hair open wear
(60) *Es wäre besser, wenn sie ihr Haar offen trägt / trüge / tragen würde.*
         It were better,   if   she her hair open wear (all forms, i.e., ind & sub)
         'It would be better she wore her hair down.'

Interestingly also :

(61) *Es wäre besser, trüge   sie ihr Haar offen / sie würde ihr Haar offen tragen.*
         It were better, wear-sub she her hair open

From (59), (60) and (61) one can infer :

(62) She wears her hair down.   i.e. not open

The same (i.e. (62)) is the presupposition under negation.

(63) *Es wäre nicht besser, wenn sie ihr Haar offen trägt / trüge / tragen würde.*
(64) *Es wäre nicht besser, trüge sie ihr Haar offen / sie würde ihr Haar offen tragen.*
(65) *??/* Es wäre nicht besser, sie trüge ihr Haar offen / sie würde ihr Haar offen tragen*
         (the same presupposition as for (59) to (61) – although just under negation)

The near-ungrammaticality of (65) seems interesting. V1 (64) and '*wenn*' in combination with verb-final order (64) is fine. V2 is not (65). However, V2 gets much better if embedded in a question :

(66) *Wäre es nicht besser, sie trüge ihr Haar offen ?*

However, the negation here is not a regular one. It is not used to negate inside and in combination with a question. Something similar is to be observed in connection with negation and canonical V2 licensors. (Here we are dealing with so-called meta-linguistic negation.) To recapitulate : Verbs of saying allow for V2 in complement clauses, negation usually takes this option away, see above (9) – (11). However, when putting quirky (non-canonical) negation inside a non-assertive sentence, things become possible all of a sudden :

(67) *Hat er nicht gesagt, sie ist schwanger ?*

Has he not   said   she is pregnant

'Didn't he say she was pregnant ?'

(68) *Glaube ja nicht, sie ist schwanger !*

Believe prt not, she is pregnant

'Don't be so stupid and think she's pregnant.'

Be it as it may, in most cases the counter-factuality of the embedded proposition can be argued to be presupposed. If a present tense volitional verb is used eventively and the embedded clause is a finite CP which is not the projection of a stative or habitual predicate, then it can be concluded that the resultative or change component of the predicate has not been reached yet, or does not hold (yet).

(69) *Ich wünsche (mir), dass du   in   den Garten gehst.*

I   wish   me   that you in   the garden go

'I wish you to go to the garden.'

(70) *Ich will,   dass er   ein Auto kauft.*

I   want   that he   a car buy

'I want him to buy a car.'

Similarly, if a non-present tense is used, it can (always) be concluded that if there is an event at all to which reference is possible, the event time must be after the event time of the matrix. This means again that at a relevant point the proposition described by the embedded clause must not be true or is presupposed not to hold.

(71) *Ich wollte, dass er ein Auto kauft.*

I   wanted that he a   car buy

'I wanted him to buy a car.'

(72) *Sie wollte, dass der Vogel stirbt.*

      She wanted that the bird   die

      'She wanted the bird to die.'

(73) *Hans bat Maria, dass sie ihm eine Goldmünze mitbringt.*

      Hans asked Maria that she him a   gold -coin with-bring

      'Hans asked Maria to bring him a gold coin.'

Thus, the implicature of (69) is that the addressee is not in the garden at speech time, also for (71) at the time of wish-holding, the referent of '*er*' did not have a car. These data, however, should not lead one to conclude that volitionals are robustly anti- or counter-factive. There are uses from which nothing about the validity of the embedded proposition can be concluded. This is so if the volitional predicate is to be understood as stative, i.e. the volition is carried over a long period, almost like predicates of an individual level.

(74) *Viele Männer wollen,   dass ihre   Frauen arbeiten.*

      Many men   want   that their   wifes work

      'Many men want their wives to have a job.'

(75) *Hans wünscht sich,   dass seine Frau ihr Haar offen trägt.*

      Hans wishes himself   that his   wife her hair open wears

      'Hans wants his wife to wear her hair down.'

(76) *Eine Mutter möchte, dass ihr Kind glücklich ist.*

      A   mother wants   that her child happy   is

      'A true mother wants her children to be happy.'

This use of volitional predicates remains mysterious. It is definitely an interesting topic for future research. Uli Sauerland (personal communication) suggests that there might be a hidden counter-factuality nevertheless. The wish-holders in (74) to (76) all seem to consider the possibility that in some accessible, but non-preferred world the embedded proposition does not hold (throughout).

Be it as it may, putting aside this (non-eventive) use illustrated in (74) – (76) – which is available to a subgroup of volitional predicates of the first class only – volitional predicates can be considered to be counter-factive. Considering the observations about stative verbs of wanting, the claim from Meinunger (2006 : 471) can still be made for most volitive constructions :

(77) Volitional predicates in a broad sense are anti-factive (or counter-factive). Similar to counterfactual constructions, they refer to eventualities that are not given.

The claim thus is that true volitional predicates presuppose the non-givenness of the proposition contained in their complement clause. Thus these predicates trigger the implicature that the proposition in the complement clause does not hold (in the actual world at the utterance or reference time). The relatedness of anti- or counter-factivity seems to be supported by the complementizer choice (if-like C°) and non-indicative verbal mood, see also Adger and Quer (2001).

3. '*Hoffen*' as special case within the special case

The authors who care about volitional predicates (especially Helbig and Kempter (1974), but also Reis (1977, 1997)) do not only classify them as V2 licensors, they also seem to be little interested in the differences that they show class-internally. However, there are crucial differences. An interesting predicate for further research seems to be the respective linguistic variants of the verb 'to hope'. The German corresponding verb '*hoffen*' is - traditionally and unsurprisingly – listed as V2 licensor among the volitional predicates [8].

However, having analyzed these predicates as V2 blockers, I am urged to say something about this verb. As a matter of fact, '*hoffen*' is a good V2 embedder (78).

(78) *Ich hoffe, du schaffst es.*
    I   hope you get   it
    'I hope you'll manage to do it.'

In all its uses, this verb imposes no commitment of the speaker to the (non-) validity of the complement proposition. For this reason, '*hoffen*' is not future oriented as canonical volitional predicates are claimed to be, and hence in contrast to volitionals, hoping can be directed toward the past.

(79) *Ich hoffe, du hast es geschafft / du warst pünktlich.*
    I   hope you have it gotten   / you were punctual.
    'I hope you did it / were on time.'

This is impossible with all the other canonical volitional predicates [9] :

---

[8]   Similar things must be said about *'fürchten'* (be afraid, fear) – which is some sort of not-hoping.

[9]   The only thing which can be observed is some sort of aspectual anteriority in the peculiar stative use (see above).

    (i) *Zahnärzte wünschen, dass sich ihre Patienten die Zähne geputzt haben (bevor sie zu ihnen kommen)*
      Dentists wish that (refl) their patients the teeth cleaned have (before they come to them)
      'Dentists prefer for their patients to arrive with brushed teeth.'

(80) *Ich will/ wünsche, du hast es geschafft / du warst pünktlich.*
      I   want/ wish   you have it gotten   / you were punctual.
      'I hope you did it / were on time.'

In earlier work of mine (i.e. Meinunger 2004, 2006), I have compared the
verb second phenomenon in German(ic) with the verbal mood selection in
the Romance languages. The claim I make is given here in (81) (Meinunger
2004 : 323; 2006 : 467) :

(81) Correspondence alignment : Those predicates and grammatical phenomena that
      block V2 in German(ic) subordinate clauses trigger subjunctive mood in
      Romance.

      This is correct for the predication for French '*espérer*'. German '*hoffen*'
allows for V2, thus '*espérer*' should not select for subjunctive, and indeed it
selects for indicative [10] [11].

(82) *J'espère que tu   es   /*sois   satisfait.*   (French)
      I hope   that you be-ind / *be-subj satisfied
      'I hope you are satisfied.'

      The other canonical volitional predicates like (bien) *vouloir, désirer,
préférer, demander, exiger* etc. (want/wish, desire, prefer, demand/ask,

---

(ii) *Manche Schulen fordern, dass die Erstklässler im Kindergarten waren.*
     Some   schools   require   that the first-class-pupils in-the kindergarten were
     'Some schools want to accept only children that have been to a
     kindergarten.'

     However, there is no sequence of tense observable in the sense that the
     embedded event time precedes the matrix event time, the reason being that in
     this use, there is no (matrix) event. The anteriority of the embedded CP
     exhibiting past tense is between the embedded temporal reference and another
     silent event, which is realized in (i) within brackets. The wanting or wishing
     itself is not directed toward the past. These sentences show, however, that there
     is no formal requirement : no +past in the scope of volitional predicates.

[10] The specific behavior of '*espérer*' in connection with mood selection is also
      discussed in Schlenker (2004). His approach, although considering
      presupposition issues, is different however.

[11] Interestingly, the French counterpart to '*fürchten*' - which licenses V2 without
      any problems as well as '*hoffen*' – i.e., '*craindre*' is more delicate. It rather
      selects for subjunctive. The reason is unclear. On the one hand it contains a
      negative semem in it (meaning not-hope) and hence it is expected to pattern like
      Reis' inherently negatives (class b). On the other hand – according to the
      correspondence alignememnt in (82), it is expected to patterns like its positive
      counterpart '*espérer*' as well as German '*fürchten*'. Closer scrutiny will have to
      explain this behavior.

require etc.) obligatorily select for subjunctive. However, most Romance languages do not only allow for, but strongly favour subjunctive under their respective verb for 'to hope'. The crucial difference is only that indicative is possible under certain conditions, which is not so under other volitionals [12]. Future research shall bring interesting results. Preliminary inquiries and descriptive characterizations in traditional grammars and text books seem to point into the direction that the mood choice under the 'hope'-predicate goes together with a different expectation as to the likeliness of the validity of the proposition. The suspicion is that the verb indeed carries different attitudes (towards a potential factivity of the embedded proposition). In the Slavic languages, like Russian for example, volitional verbs require a specific complementizer. This C-element is a complex formative that consists of the regular C-element '*čto*' (=that) and a particle that is found in the formation of irrealis or subjunctive mood '*by*' – resulting in '*čtoby*', which must co-occur with past morphology on the verb. Thus, the presence of this specific complementizer is related to the use of subjunctive mood under volitional predicates in Romance. Considering this, Russian (and Slavic) in general behaves more according to the expectations. The complementizer that the verb for 'to hope' (=*nadevat'sya*) selects for is not the one that all the other verbs of wanting and demanding subcategorize for (i.e., '*čtoby*' in Russian), but it is the neutral C-element '*čto*'.

(83) *Ya nadeyus' čto   on spit / vyspal.*   (Russian)
          I hope   indicative-C° he sleps / slept

(84) **Ya nadeyus 'čtoby'   on spit / spal / vyspal.*
          I   hope   subjunctive-C° he sleps / slept
          Both : 'I hope that he's sleeping / he slept.'

A closer look at this predicate might also reveal why 'hope' does not allow for neg-raising in English.

(85) I hope (that) he won't come.   -/->

---

[12]   Farkas (1992) (also) discusses the mood choice under factive predicates in Romance. This fact is completely ignored here, if not even challenged or neglected. However, this point in the discussion shall be used to refer to Farkas' excellent work on the matter, i.e., indicative vs. subjunctive selection in Romance – also in subsequent work of hers.
      Furthermore my speculation is that there are subtle differences in the meaning of the respective language-specific verb for 'hope'. A quite comparable case seems to me to be the difference between English 'to know' and German '*wissen*' ('ignorance reading', see Reis 1977 : 142). These lexical entries slightly differ in their semantics, which has important impact on their factivity implication.

(86)   ?/*I don't hope that he will come.

This is different from German. Hopefully future research will bring (some) clarification.

4. Conclusions and Speculations

Now, what is the impact of V2 ? In earlier works, there was the proposal that some version of assertion(ality) or assertivity plays the crucial role (e.g. see above or Wechsler for V2 in Swedish (1991), and in connection with the correlation expressed in the correspondence alignment (81), compare Panzeri (2003) for Romance). To a certain degree and for a subset of the cases I adopted this view for my QR-analysis (e.g., Meinunger 2004). Reis (1997) and Gärtner (2001a, b) also make reference to the notion of assertion, but they explicitly refrain from the standard notion as illocutionary force and speak of '*vermittelte Assertion*' (something like conveyed assertion) and 'proto-assertion' respectively.

However, there are many occurrences of dependent V2 clauses where an assertive speech act is hard or even impossible to argue for. The most convincing examples for non-assertive use are those with '*Konjunktiv*' (subjunctive mood) :

(87)   *Ihm wäre lieber, du würdest mit dem Rauchen aufhören.*
       Him were dearer, you would with the smoking stop
       'He'd prefer if you quit smoking.'

(88)   *(Du bist hier.) Ich dachte, du wärst diese Woche in München.*
       (you are here) I   though you were this   week in Munich.
       '(So you're here.) I thought you're in Munich this week.'

But also with the indicative, these sentences do not convey a statement to whose truth the speaker would be committed. Similar things hold for non-assertive sentences like (89) and (90).

(89)   *Glaubst du, er hat das Auto gekauft* [13] ?
       Think you, he has the car bought ?
       'Do you think he bought the car ?'

---

[13]   The embedded V2 clause can pronounced with raising intonation. In this case, the clause could and would not be a canonical assertion anyway. Then it either expresses 'force identity' or 'illocutionary agreement' with the matrix – or in the spirit of Gunlogsen (2003) or Asher (2005) it expresses some sort of hearer commitment – at any rate definitely no speaker assertion/commitment.

(90) *Sag bloß, er hat das Auto gekauft !*

Say just   he has the car   bought

'Don't tell me he bought the car !'

And similarly inside several forms of conditional sentences (91) - (94), where V2 clauses are to be found systematically (see Gärtner and Schwager, in preparation) :

(91) *Wenn du dann nach hause kommst und der Gerichtsvollzieher steht vor der Tür...*

if   you then to   home   come   and the   marshal   stands before the door

'If you come home with the marshal standing in front of your door…'

(92) *Kommt der heute abend, (dann) gehe ich.*

Comes him today evening then go   I

'Should he show up tonight, then I'll leave….'

(93) *Ich gehe sofort wieder, sehe ich, dass der auch nur ein Glas Wein trinkt.*

I   go   right-away again, see I,   that he   also only one glass wine drinks

'Even if I see that he has one glass of wine, I will leave right away.'

(94) *Du trinkst noch ein Bier und ich gehe.*

You drink yet one beer and I go

'You have one more beer and I go…'

In such cases, no statement is made about the truth of the antecedent (or about the consequent in isolation). Rather there is an implicature that the state of affairs described in the clause does not hold (in the actual world at the utterance time) – at least in the given sentences.

The tentative proposal thus is that something weaker than assertion is of concern. However, I want to maintain that the use of V2 has to do with an attitude of the speaker and not of a third individual (usually expressed as the subject of the matrix clause). In the many articles and books that have appeared after the classical writings of Austin and Searl, some researchers tried to refine and newly define the five to six canonical speech acts or illocutions (such as assertives, directives, commissives, expressives / expositives, declaratives, narratives). Some of those propose hypothesizing or supposing/speculating. Something like this might run in the mind of a theoretician like McGilfrey (1991). One can imagine that a speaker uttering a declarative sentence does not always make a statement about the (actual) world, thereby claiming the truth of what he is saying and committing himself to this. Often the speaker's intension is much less strong. He may present a case and invite the hearer to accept this just for a given context. Thus the use of a *verbum dicendi* with a third person subject followed by a

sentence that exhibits main clause features is similar to what McGilfrey calls 'mock saying'. Here, the speakers gives away something about the commitment comparable to what is going on when using evidential modifiers like 'according to the news', 'as per'…, *laut meiner Mutter, Berichten (ausländischer Beobachter) zufolge* ('as my mom says', 'according to reports of foreign observers'). Still, the speaker (himself) offers the following proposition and takes responsibility for it (to a certain degree). I will go on claiming that the role of V2 is to introduce new information (see Meinunger 2006). This claim seems pretty indisputable for V2 in adjunct clauses ; see the important work on V2 relatives by Gärtner (2001a, b). Although the facts seem less clear for argument - especially for complement sentences - I keep arguing that V2 is impossible with discourse-old propositions. Thus, in order to capture the different uses of V2 mentioned in this paper, a possible term would be to offer or to dispose a proposition. Ben Shaer (p.c.) proposes the term 'to entertain' a proposition. He is drawing on work of his own (Shaer 1996) and is inspired by work of McGilvray, who claims that in certain constructions – especially in indirect speech – sort-of-assertions are made by the speaker (see above 'mock saying'). At any rate, a speaker who uses present tense under a past verb of saying somehow expresses his own point of view concerning the embedded proposition. Shaer is also aware of Banfield's work (1982). Banfield construes acceptable complex sentences like (94) which prove that the speaker might not commit himself completely and once and for all times to a mock-utterance.

(95)   John said that his roommate has green eyes, but I know that they are blue.

Thus it seems to me that a weaker notion of assertion is needed to capture a main clause phenomenon like V2 in German.

References

Adger, D. ; Quer, J. (2001). The syntax and semantics of unselected embedded questions, *Language* 79(4).

Asher, N. (2005). *What's going on with final rises ?* talk delivered at ZAS research seminar.

Banfield, A. (1982). *Unspeakable Sentences*, London : Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Blümel, R. (1914). *Einführung in die Syntax*, Heidelberg : Impresum.

Bußmann, H. (1990). *Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart : Kröner.

Butulussi, E. (1991). Studien zur Valenz kognitiver Verben im Deutschen und Neugriechischen, *Linguistische Arbeiten* 262.

Duden [Band 4] (1995). *Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. Mannheim / Leipzig / Vienna / Zurich : Dudenverlag.

Dunbar, R.W. (1979). *Discourse Pragmatics and Subordinate Clause Word Order in German : An Explanation of Related Main Clause Phenomena in German and English Clauses*. Ph.D. dissertation, Ann Arbor : University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Eisenberg, P. (1994). *Grundriß der deutschen Grammatik* (2., überarb. u. erw. Auflage), Stuttgart : Metzler.

Emonds, J. E. (1969). *Root and Structure Preserving Transformations*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT (unpublished ms., printed in 1970).

Fabricius-Hansen, C. ; K. J. Sæbø (2004). In a meditative mood : The semantics of the German reportative, *Natural Language Semantics* 12 : 213-257.

Farkas, D. (1992). On the semantics of subjunctive complements, in : P. Hirschbühler ; K. Koerner, (eds), *Romance Languages and Modern Linguistic Theory*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia : Benjamins, 69-104.

Frank, N. (1998). *Präferenzprädikate und abhängige Verbzweitsätze*. Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340, *Linguistic Theory & the Foundations of Computational Linguistics* 128.

Gärtner, H. M. (2001a). *Bound focus and assertionality*, http://www2.hu-berlin.de/asg/blutner/dialog [Online paper only].

Gärtner, H. M. (2001b). Are there V2 Relative Clauses in German ? *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 3 : 97-141.

Gärtner, H. M. ; Schwager, M. (in preparation), *Pseudo-Coordination Meets the Type/Force Square*, Ms, Berlin&Frankfurt/M.

Gunlogson, Ch. (2003). *Rising and Falling Declaratives as Questions in English*, Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics New York : Routledge (Taylor and Francis).

Helbig, G. ; Kempter, F. (1974). Die uneingeleiteten Nebensätze im Deutschen und ihre Vermittlung im Fremdsprachenunterricht, *DAF* 11 : 75-86.

Hooper, J. B. ; Thompson, S.A. (1973). On the Applicability of Root Transformations, *Linguistic Inquiry* 4 : 465-479.

Karttunen, L. (1971) Implicative verbs. *Language* 47 : 340-358.

Kiparsky, P. ; Kiparsky, C. (1971). Fact, in : D. Steinberg ; L. Jakobovitz, (eds), *Semantics.* Cambridge : CUP, 345-369.

Manning, C. (1995). *Presents embedded under pasts* [Online paper], http:/nlp.Stanford.edu/~manning/papers/tense.ps

McGilfrey, J. A. (1991). *Tense, Reference, and Worldmaking*, Montréal/Kingston/London/Buffalo : McGill–Queen's University Press.

Meibauer, J. (1999). *Pragmatik. Eine Einführung,* Tübingen : Stauffenburg Verlag.

Meinunger, A. (2004). Verb position, verbal mood and the anchoring (potential) of sentences, in : H. Lohnstein ; S. Trissler, (eds), *Syntax and Semantics of the Left Periphery*, Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter, 459-487.

Meinunger, A. (2006). The discourse status of subordinate sentences and some implications for syntax and pragmatics, in : V. Molnár ; S. Winkler, (eds), *The Architecture of Focus*, (Studies in Generative Grammar 82.) Berlin/New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 459-488.

Mikame, H. (1986). Die Einstellung des Sprechers zur Komplementsatzpropo sition und diesbezügliche syntaktische Phänomene bei Komplementsätzen mit, dass, *Deutsche Sprache* 14 : 232-337.

Romberg, J. (1999). *Magisterarbeit : Verbzweitstellung in Komplemen-tsätzen*, Masters thesis, TU Berlin.

Oppenrieder, W. (1987). Aussagesätze im Deutschen, *Linguistische Arbeiten* 180 : 161-189.

Oppenrieder, W. (1991). *Von Subjekten, Sätzen und Subjektsätzen*, Tubingen : Niemeyer.

Panzeri, F. (2003). In the (indicative) or subjunctive) mood, in : M. Weisgerber, (ed.), *Proceedings of the Conference "sub7 – Sinn und Bedeutung"*, Arbeitspapier Nr. 114, FB Sprachwissenschaft Universität Konstanz.

Pinkal, M. (1981). Some Semantic and Pragmatic Properties of German glauben, in : H-J. Eikmeyer ; H. Rieser, (eds), *Words, Worlds and Contexts*, Berlin/New York : de Gruyter, 469-484.

Quer, J. (1998). *Mood at the Interface*, LOT dissertation, Holland Academic Graphics.

Quer, J. (2001). Interpreting mood, *Probvs* 13(1) : 81-112.

Reis, M. (1977). *Präsuppositionen und Syntax*, Tubingen : Niemeyer.

Reis, M. (1997). Zum syntaktischen Status unselbständiger Verbzweit-Sätze, *Sprache im Fokus*, 121-144.

Schlenker, P. (2004). *The Lazy (French)man's Approach to the Subjunctive (Reference to Worlds, Presuppositions and Semantics Defaults in the Analysis of Mood : Some Preliminary Remarks)*, ms., University of California at Los Angeles.

Shaer, B. (1996). *Making sense of tense : Tense, time reference, and linking theory*, Ph.D. thesis, McGill, ms.

Vogel, R. (1998). *Polyvalent verbs*, Dissertation, Berlin : University of Berlin : http://dochost.rz.hu-berlin.de/dissertationen/vogel-ralf-1998-07-13/PDF/Vogel.pdf.

Wechsler, S. (1991). Verb Second and Illocutionary Force, in K. Leffel ; D. Bouchard, (eds), *Views on Phrase Structure*, Dordrecht : Kluwer, 177-191.