

Verb-first under Evaluatives and Psych Verbs in Swiss German

CGSW37, Zurich

David Diem

david@dxd.at

Nov 11, 2025

Embedded declarative V1

(1) Verb-first in Swiss German

- a. *(as isch) guet sinder do*
 (it is) good are+you

“(It is) nice that you are here.”

- b. *mer freued üs sinder do*
 we are-glad us are+you

“We’re glad you’re here.”

- Understudied, but: Lötscher 1997
- Pattern: [_{CP} Evaluative/Decl [_{CP} V1]]

Where's the evaluative A?

(2) Ruling out a topicalized modifier

a. *guet sinder GGANGE*
good are+you gone

"It's good that you went."

b. *GUET_i sinder t_i ggange*
good are+you {} gone

"It's good how you went."

- (a) vs. (b): Ambiguity with scrambled-up ADJ.
- ADJ and ADV are morphologically indistinguishable
- Linear order is ambiguous
- Intonation doesn't really help (free stress placement in both, under various XP focuses)
- Different structures account for the semantic difference.

Embedded declarative Vx typology

Table: Grammaticality of embedded orders by matrix V and complementizer realization

order _{emb}	C _{emb}	V _{matrix} = stat	V _{matrix} = psych
Vfin	overt	i säg dass der do/cho siend	i freu mi dass der do/cho siend
V2	overt	<i>i säg dass der siend do/cho</i>	i freu mi dass der siend do/cho
V1	overt	*i säg dass sind ihr do/cho	*i freu mi dass siend ihr do/cho
Vfin	∅	*i säg ihr do/cho siend	*i freu mi ihr do/cho siend
V2	∅	<i>i säg ihr siend do/cho</i>	*i freu mi ihr siend do/cho
V1	∅	*i säg siend ihr do/cho	i freu mi siend ihr do/cho

- *Embedded V2 is only possible in [stat], regardless of the complementizer.*
- Today's concern: **Embedded V1 is only possible and is the only possibility in [psych] [without complementizer].**

Meaning

Any construction involving V1 (in Alemannic) can be rephrased where dass-Vfin replaces V1.

- (3) a. *Mi freuts siender do.*
Me pleases are+you here.
“I am happy that you are here.”
- b. *Mi freuts dassder do siend.*
Me pleases that+you here are.
“I am happy you are here.”

Why is this odd?

- Alemannic is usually SVO/SOV (V2/Vfin) in embedded declaratives, when there is an overt complementizer.
- V1 is usually seen in interrogatives
- Exception: conditionals (More later).

Biclausality I

The higher (the evaluative/psych) clause is a root CP, since it is in Verb-second.

- (4) a. *[CP1 I bi mega froh [*bisch* Du bi üs]]*
 I am mega happy are you at us

“I am super happy that you’re with us.” [LC 48083]

- b. *[CP1 Mir sinn au sehr froh gsi, isch nit mehr passiert]*
 We aux also very glad been, is not more happened

“Also we were very glad that not more has happened.” [LC 65102]

LC = Leipzig Corpora Collection gsw-web-2016/7 (Goldhahn, Eckart, and Quasthoff 2012), a collection from scraped websites}

Biclausality II

The lower CP (the V1 one) is also a CP, since

- its semantics are that of a *dass*-clause
- it's in complementary distribution to *dass*+Vfin variants of the same meaning

Licensing condition

Embedded [CP1 [CP2 ...]] can be verb first iff

- ① CP1 is headed by a psych verb or a V+A evaluative predicate
- ② CP2 is that verb's/predicate's theme (see Belletti and Rizzi (1988)).

(5) *As freut mi [CP sinder do.]*
 It delights me.EXP [are+you here].THM
 "I am glad you are here."

(6) *I freu mi [CP sinder do.]*
 I.EXP delight REFL [are+you here].THM
 "I am glad you are here."

Licensing predicates (Examples)

Two/Three kinds of licensors:

- ① Psych verbs: **freue**
- ② Evaluatives:
 - A) V + A: **schö/schad/guet finde**
 - B) (Expl Copula) A: **schö/schad/guet sii**

Licensing predicates (Examples)

- (7) a. *Mi freuts* [siender do]
Me pleases are+you here
“I am happy that you are here.”
- b. *I fiends schad* [sinder bald nüm do]
I find+it pity are+you soon no-longer here
“It is a shame you’ll be gone soon.”
- c. *(Es isch) schö* [siender do]
It is beautiful are+you here
“It’s nice that you are here.”

A fronting contrast

CP2 (the V1, or Theme) cannot be fronted, like *dass* counterparts can. Why? I don't know yet.

- (8) a. *Ich find schön, [dassder cho sind] / [sinder cho.]*
 I find beautiful, [that+you come have] / [have+you come]
 "I find it nice that you have come."
- b. *[Dassder cho sind] / *[Sinder cho] find ich schön.*
 [That+you come have] / *[have+you come] find I beautiful
 "I find it nice that you have come."

Conditional Inversion V1 vs. C + Vfin

- Declarative V1 exist elsewhere: Irrealis.
- *wenn* “if” and V1 are in complementary distribution, which reminds of the *dass* “that” : V1 alternation.

(9) V1 and Vfin irrealis in StG

- a. *Ginge* er heim, könnten wir aufräumen.
Goes.IRR he home, could.IRR we clean.

“If he’d go home, we could clean.”

- b. *Wenn* er heim *ginge*, könnten wir aufräumen.
If he home+goes.IRR, could.IRR we clean.

“If he’d go home, we could clean.”

(10) V1 and SVO irrealis in English

- a. *Had* it not been for that, I would’ve stopped.
- b. If it *had* not been for that, I would’ve stopped.

Conditional Inversion: Indicative V1

Konjunktiv mood is not even required for this. German, Yiddish, Icelandic, Swedish, Old and Middle English allow this inversion (= V1) also in the indicative (Iatridou and Embick 1994). The reading is still irrealis/conditional, though.

(11) V1 indicatives in German

Geht er wieder arbeiten, geht es ihnen besser.

Goes he again work, goes it them better.

“If he returns to work, they’ll be doing better.”

Conditional Inversion (continued II)

Reis and Wöllstein (2010): No fragment answers of V1 conditionals.

- (12) *[Wenn ich reich wäre]/[Wäre ich reich], würde ich ein Schloss kaufen.*
 If I rich were/Were I rich, would I a castle buy.

“If I were rich, I would by a castle.”

- (13) *Wann würdest du ein Schloss kaufen? Wenn ich reich wäre./ *Wäre*
 When would you a castle buy? If I rich were./ *Were
ich reich.
 I rich

“When would you buy a castle? If I were rich.”

The same is true for Alemannic embedded V1, when asking (what?) for the Theme.

Differences in distribution

Like conditionals, Alemannic V1 also do not work as fragment answers.

- (14) *Was freut di? *[Sinder do.]/[Dass si do sind.]*
 What delights you? **[Are they here.]/[That they're here.]*

Furthermore, they cannot *precede* the matrix CP, unlike conditionals.

- (15) **[Sinder do]/[Dassder do sind] freut mi.*
 [Are+you here][That+you are here] delights me.

	Conditionals (ind. or conj.)	ALS Factives (ind.)
follow matrix	ok	ok
precede matrix	ok	*
fragment answer	*	*

Differences in argument structure

Also, conditional Inversion V1 is different from Alemannic Evaluative V1 in its information structure.

Both phenomena involve two predicates. In CI, the conditional V1 predicate restricts the other predicate. In ALS Evaluative V1, the declarative V1 predicate is an argument of the other predicate (the theme).

V in C, not T

Refining the structural analysis, based on the assumption that V1 is partial V2.

- A verb in verb-first order has moved there by head-movement, originating in V or v.
- I cannot be in T, since T-adverbs must follow it (cf. Roberts 2005:9f)

(16) *i freu mi (*hüt) sind ihr alli (hüt) do*
 i am-glad me (*today) are you all (today) here
 I am gald that you all are here today

Premises on V2

- “Full Verb-second” as in German consists of two operations:
 - V-to-C and (see a.o. den Besten 1983, Vikner 1994), elsewhere called “**Filled C**” (Roberts 2005:22)
 - XP-to Spec-CP (“**EPP on C**”) (see a.o. Chomsky 2000, 2001, Haegeman 1996, Roberts 1993)
 - EPP being the “slightly mysterious” (Roberts 2005:4) condition $[_X \text{ [EPP]}]$ “Spec,XP must be filled.”
- Root/Embedded asymmetry: If C is filled, V cannot move there (den Besten 1983), predicting V2 (V in C) only in root clauses, but Vfin in embedded clauses.

Verb-first is incomplete verb-second

- Hypothesis: Alemannic Verb-first is the result of the first of the two operations that result in (Alemannic, German) Verb-second
- Suggested for Old Irish in Carnie, Pyatt, and Harley (2000)
- Suggested for Gothic **embedded** clauses in Ferraresi (1997) and Longobardi (1994).
- Suggested for Welsh root clauses in Roberts 2005.

Split CP

- The Rizgian (1997) split CP consist of at least [ForceP [FocP [FinP] (as adopted in e.g. Roberts 2005).
- Roberts (2005) summarizes the occupation of positions in this split CP for Celtic and Germanic
- Welsh (VSO) can have particles, fronted XPs, and Adverbs in front of the verb.
- Irish (VSO) can havae Adverbs and possibly NPIs in front of verbs.
- The Alemannic V1 data of concern strictly cannot have any of these (or other) elements in front of the verb.
- I conclude that the verb, in these, must therefore occupy the highest head in split CP, **Force**.

Verb-first is incomplete verb-second (continued)

- Roberts (2005) assumes a Split CP of the kind [ForceP [FinP ...] (Rizzi 1997)
- Fin = Finiteness
- Force $\sim$ Clause-type/illocutionary force (declarative, interrogative, ...)
- Embedded clauses of both [dass-Vfin] and [V1] order are interpreted as **finite** and **declarative**.
 [C dass] ... Vfin marked by [C dass] (Rizzi 1997)
 [V] ... marked by moving V to C?
- In Alemannic, regardless of whether it is the head Force or Fin that V occupies, it does the same job as a complementizer.
- In a split-CP model, then, in Alemannic,
 - V-to-Fin or V-to-Force results in V1
 - subsequent XP-movement to SpecFinP or SpecForceP results in V2 Roberts (2005:138).

Why only under evaluatives/psych verbs? I

Recalling that the puzzle is why leaving empty the specifier of the relevant C-system head (Fin, Force) is grammatical if and only if

- the clause headed by this head is in irrealis mood (at least interpreted as such), or
- the clause headed by this head is in indicative mood and the proposition it constitutes is the Theme of an evaluative higher up in the tree.

Why only under evaluatives/psych verbs? II Path 1

- A desired refinement concerns the root-embedded asymmetry (V1 is only grammatical in embedded clauses).
- Path 1: Deduce it from the requirement of being a Theme. Without a matrix clause, it cannot be a theme.
- As shown earlier, inversion (THM in subject) does not work for some reason.

- (17) a. **sinder do freut mi*
b. *es freut mi sinder do*

(Likewise for evaluative predicates, with or without an expletive subject).

Why only under evaluatives/psych verbs? II Path 2

- ① Contrast: Why can V1 replace *dass* *only in these THEME clauses*, but not elsewhere in embedded clauses.
- ② Contrast: Why can V1 replace *dass* only in these THEME clauses when they are embedded?

Hypotheses Ad Contrast 1:

- ① In a Late Insertion framework, *dass* realizes a portion that does not include Force.
- ② Force is not realized in “normal” *dass* sentences, only in these THEME clauses. Indicated by the semantics of these: The THEME is presupposed, it must have happened. Not true for other (many/all?) *dass* sentences, i.e. under non-psych verbs/eval predicates. Assumption: V can move to Force but not (stay in/)to Fin.

Thoughts towards a hypothesis Ad Contrast 2:

- ① From a V1 (V in C/Force) state, no XP has to be moved, since there is no EPP feature on C/Force by assumption.
- ② Labelling Algorithm (LA) problem with a V1 root clause (iirc, see Andreas Blümel's work)
 - The root-most category [ForceP] = [$\emptyset$ Force~V]. Label = Force
 - A symmetric constituent/set poses a problem. If there is an atomic (simplex) silent [Decl] morpheme in spec,ForceP, there would be problematic symmetry. [Decl Force]
 - In selected (=embedded) V1 CP, the root problem does not arise: VP = [V ForceP] ; ForceP = [$\emptyset$ Force]

Why only under evaluatives/psych verbs? II Path 2 II

Path 2: Selection mechanics.

Roberts argues for a similar contrast where Welsh has V1 only in embedded clauses.

His claim: selected declarative Fin has no EPP feature.

- “Non-selected declarative Fin is in principle distinct from selected, declarative Fin; the former is a kind of default, while the latter is a selected C-head, entering into selection relations like other heads.” (Roberts 2005: 29)
- “... we adopt a variant of Chomsky’s (2000, 2001) EPP-features that are “interpretable” at the PF interface ([...] heads [that] require PF-realization). ‘EPP-effects’ arise when such features are associated with otherwise unselected heads.” (p. 154)
- Only “unselected C” (= the C of a root CP) needs to satisfy EPP.
- It is “so impoverished in feature content [that it] requires an EPP-feature, triggering XP-movement (...)”. (Roberts 2005:141).

(How this could work for Alemannic V1)

- Alemannic V1 are always embedded, so I postulate (following Roberts's (2005) account of Celtic), that embedded C (Roberts's Fin) has no EPP feature since it is selected. This means that no XP moves to specFinP, resulting in Verb-first.
- At this point, I have to postulate that Fin* (C*) (heads that must be realized) *can only be realized by external Merge of a complementizer* in varieties that do not exhibit this Swiss German V1 pattern, while Swiss German can do so *by internal Merge (= Move) of V~T to C*.

- (18) *Danke honder zuaglosat*
“Thanks, have you listened!”

References

-  Belletti, Adriana and Luigi Rizzi (1988). "Psych-verbs and θ -theory". In: *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, pp. 291–352.
-  Goldhahn, D., T. Eckart, and U. Quasthoff (2012). "Building Large Monolingual Dictionaries at the Leipzig Corpora Collection: From 100 to 200 Languages". In: *Proceedings of the 8th International Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'12)*.
-  Lötscher, Andreas (1997). "'Guet sind Si doo": Verbstellungsprobleme bei Ergänzungssätzen im Schweizerdeutschen". In: *Syntax und Stilistik der Alltagssprache. Beiträge der 12. Arbeitstagung zur alemannischen Dialektologie*, ed. by. Arno Ruoff und Peter Löffelad. (IDIOMATICA: Veröffentlichungen der Tübinger Arbeitsstelle "Sprache in Südwestdeutschland", Band 18. Tübingen: Niemeyer. 12, pp. 85–95.
-  Reis, Marga and Angelika Wöllstein (2010). "Zur Grammatik (vor allem) konditionaler V1-Gefüge im Deutschen". In: *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 29.1, pp. 111–179.

Evaluative adjectives

froh “glad”

- Är isch gloub froh gsi, [si mer wieder däne gsi] [8224]
- i bi froh [gseht min ma das genau glich] [2177]
- Auso ig bi emu froh gsi [hani eis gha] [9917]
- Doris Rätz tuet jetz i das Amt ispringe, u mir si froh [hei mir sie chönne gwinne] [28189]
- doch ich bi froh gsi, [hani e paar gfunde] [38457]

truurig “sad”

- Liebi Joya, truurig [hei mer am 9.Juni nach nume 4 Tag schlimmer Chrankheit vo dir müesse Abschied näh] [69504]

schad “unfortunate”

- Echt schaad hännd mir nid chönne/dörfe cho! [33431]
- Isch huere schad verpassi dä Event. [55651]
- Sisich scho fascht schad hani bestande ez chani nüm cho Nei seich! [79796]

Nouns

Freud “joy”

- Mir hei aui freud [bisch ändlech da] [32305]

Psych verbs

fröie “be-glad”

- Es het üs uf jedefau aui gfröit, [si wedr so vöu cho, trotz em schlächt gmäudete Wätter] ! [37518]
- Mi hets gspunne gfreut, [sönd so vill glatti Sántisler a die DV choo] ! [62908]
- Mie freue üs sehr [bisch du scho uf dr Wäut] [62745]

Other verbs

- (19) *[ich] danke, dörfermer debii sii [p.c. Muri/Aargau]*
[I] thank, may+we there+by be
“Thanks for letting us join”

Hodler's data

(20) From Lötscher's (3), collected from Hodler 1960

- a. *Es isch ke länge Verwich gsi, het Fritz de Läche nüt meh drnah gfragt.*

Es dauerte nicht lange, bis Fritz den Lehen nicht mehr nachfragte.

- b. *Es isch nüt drnebe gsi, het d'Wirti chly verständiger gredt.*

Es war nicht unangebracht, dass die Wirtin etwas verständiger sprach.

- c. *Cha sy, chunnt si im Fuehrwärch.*

Es kann sein, dass sie mit dem Fuhrwerk kommt.

- d. *Nid lang gäit's, stirbt äina.*

Es geht nicht lange, und es stirbt einer.

- e. *Es isch rächt, chunnsch de!*

Es ist gut, wenn du dann kommst.

- f. *Es isch guet, weiß i's*