1. **Introduction**: syntactic positions

2. **Transitivity failures**: left periphery, middle field, adverbs, adjectives

3. **Consequences for Germanic syntax**: CP-domain, topics, subjects, objects

1. **Introduction**

   (1) What is a syntactic position? (cf. Nilsen 2003)
   a. defined in terms of a map of the clause (cartographic approach)
   b. defined in terms of local environment (dynamic approach)

   (2) Weak cartographic approach:
   Not all projections need to be realized (in full), but when they are realized, they appear in a strict hierarchical order.

   (3) Strong dynamic approach:
   Every operation merge is triggered and takes place without consideration of overall syntactic architecture.

   (4) Proposal: a syntactic position is defined in terms of the operation Merge

   (5) Merge: assign an element from the resource (numeration) to the workspace (current derivation)
   ['unary merge']

   (6) Position: the occurrence of the workspace (i.e. of the current stage of the derivation).

   (7) Occurrence (Chomsky 2000:115): \( \text{occ} (\alpha) \) in \( K = K - \alpha \)

   (8) When an element \( \alpha \) merges to a workspace \( \delta \) yielding \( P \), the position of \( \alpha = \text{occ} (\delta) \) in \( P \).

   (9) \[\text{position of } \alpha \rightarrow \_ \rightarrow \delta \]

   (10) It follows that \( \delta \) (the current stage of the derivation at the moment of Merge) and \( P \) (the result of Merge) have no position (they are not positioned but created by Merge)

   (11) Typical positions: subject/object, topic/focus/wh, adjective/adverb/negation, specifier

   (12) A position is created because its occurrence needs it (trigger for Merge) (cf. Frampton & Gutmann 2000 "crash-proof syntax")

   (13) Proposal: what the occurrence needs is resolution of an inner conflict (= EPP):
   Examples: subject within a predicate, topic within a focus domain, etc.

   (14) Merge = externalization
   but: Merge involves
   1. new addition from the resource (no ‘internal Merge’)
   2. elimination of the offending element (yielding an open position = trace/copy)
It follows that positions are not absolute but relative to an occurrence.

Terms like Spec,CP should be used with caution.

2. Transitivity failures

Empirical evidence against (even) the (weak) cartographic approach has accumulated in recent years, focusing on failures of word orders expected on the basis of reasoning by transitivity.

If $A$, $B$, $C$ are absolute positions, then we may infer:

- $A$ needs $C$, $C'$ needs $B$, $B'$ needs $A$
- $A'$ does not need $B$ or $C$

C > A may occur if there is an inner conflict within $A'$ caused by $C$

2.1 Van Craenenbroeck (2006) on the left periphery

CP: Force > (Top) > Foc > (Top) > Fin (Rizzi 1997)

- $wh > che$
  Me domando $chi$ $che$ Nane ga visto al marcà (*$che$ $chi$)
  I wonder who that Nane saw at the market
- $che > CLLD$
  Me dispiase $che$ a Marco i ghe abia ditto cussì (*a Marco $che$)
  I'm sorry that to Marco they told him so
- $*wh > CLLD$
  *Me domando $a$ $chi$ (che) el premio Nobel (che) i ghe lo podarla dar
  I wonder to who that the Nobel prize that they should give it to him
  (Venetian, data from C. Poletto by p.c.)

 Inner conflict in (22c/d): TOPIC (CLLD) within FOCUS domain (defined by WH)

2.2 Nilsen (2003) on adverbs

- $Adverb$ hierarchy (fragment): possibly > always (Cinque 1999)
(25) a. *possibly > NEG*
   Ståle har muligens ikke spist hvetekakene sine (*ikke muligens*)
   Ståle has possibly not eaten his weaties
   b. *NEG > always*
   Ståle hadde ikke alltid spist hvetekakene sine (*alltid ikke*)
   Ståle had not always eaten his weaties
   c. *always > possibly*
   ..hvor spillerne alltid muligens er et klikk fra å vinne $1000
   where players always possibly are one click away from winning $1000
   (Swedish, Nilsen 2003:10-11)

(26) Explanation: *possibly* is a positive polarity item, yielding an inner conflict if contained within a negative domain (explaining 25a). No such conflict in (25b/c).

2.3 Bobaljik (1999) on argument/adjunct interaction

(27) a. Adverb hierarchy (Cinque 1999):
   speech act > evaluative > temporal > aspectual > manner
   b. GF hierarchy: subject > indirect object > direct object

(28) a. *low argument > high adjunct*
   ..dat Jan Marie het boek eerlijk gezegd niet gegeven heeft (Dutch)
   that John Mary the book frankly not given has
   b. *low adjunct > high argument*
   ..dat Jan snel Marie het boek gegeven heeft
   that John quickly Mary the book given has

(29) Both hierarchies appear to play in different dimensions.

2.4 Adjective order

(30) QUALITY > SIZE > SHAPE > COLOR > ORIGIN (Vendler 1968)

(31) a. *color > origin*
   een rode Hongaarse auto (Dutch)
   a red Hungarian car
   b. *origin > color*
   een Hongaarse rode wijn
   a Hungarian red wine

(32) Adjectives from every semantic class may be construed in two ways: direct vs. indirect modification (Cinque 2003, Sproat & Shih 1988, Bolinger 1967).

(33) invisible a. direct: too far off for light to reach us
    b. indirect: temporarily blocked from sight

(33) *indirect > direct*
    the visible visible stars

(34) The difference between direct and indirect modification is a matter of *construction*

(35) a. morphological reduction
    een vlotte spreker (direct: manner; indirect: characteristic of the person)
    een vlot spreker (direct; *indirect)
    a well-paced (speech/behavior) speaker (Dutch)
b. syntactic position

\[ \text{un homme grand (direct: manner; indirect: characteristic of the person)} \]
\[ \text{un grand homme (direct; *indirect)} \]
\[ \text{a great (proportions/significance) man (French)} \]

c. modification (indirect; *direct)

\[ \text{een hongaarse (*belachelijk) rode wijn (Dutch)} \]
\[ \text{a Hungarian ridiculously red wine} \]

d. discontinuous construal (indirect; *direct)

\[ \text{dan-da kunya-a wa}lbu-wa nga-ku-l-da kurrka-n!} \]
\[ \text{this-NOM small-NOM raft-NOM 1-INC-PL-NOM take-NEGIMP} \]
\[ \text{jungarra kurrka-tha wa}lbu \]
\[ \text{(Kayardild; Evans 1995: 249-250)} \]
\[ \text{big:NOM take-IMP raft:NOM} \]
\[ \text{‘Let’s not take this small raft! Take the big raft.’} \]

(36) Two cycles of adjective hierarchy?

\[[\text{INDIRECT quality > size > etc.}] > [\text{DIRECT quality > size > etc.}]]

(37) Adjective hierarchy only obeyed in direct modification (Sproat & Shih 1990)

\[ \text{size > shape} \]
\[ \text{shape > size} \]

\[ \text{indirect a. xiao de lü de huaping lü de xiao de huaping} \]
\[ \text{small LINK green LINK vase} \]
\[ \text{direct b. xiao lü huaping *lü xiao huaping} \]
\[ \text{small green vase} \]
\[ \text{(Mandarin; Sproat & Shih 1990:565-566)} \]

(38) indirect modification allowed

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{AP} \\
A \\
N \\
\text{direct modification blocked} \\
\text{A} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{AP} \\
\text{*A} \\
\end{array} \]

(39) Property of syntax is a function of local requirements, not of absolute hierarchy.

3. Some consequences for Germanic syntax

3.1 CP-domain

3.2 topic/wh position

3.3 subject position

3.4 object position

3.1 CP-domain

(40) Cartographic analysis (Zwart 1996/2000)

\[ [\text{CP}_3 \text{ als/zo COND} [\text{CP}_2 \text{ of [\text{CP}_1 \text{ dat [TP (.) ] ] ] } ] ] \] (Dutch)

(41) Complex complementizers

als-of *of-als *als-of-dat
als-dat *dat-als
of-dat *dat-of
Relative clauses:

a. CP₁ 't jongsje dat à histeren van 't dek evalen is
   'the kid that fell off the deck yesterday' (Kruinings, Dek 1934:14)

b. CP₂ wie of tie vis köft, die skreef tat óp
   'whoever bought that fish made a note of that' (Katwijks, Overdiep 1940:230)

c. CP₁+₂ al wa dad ek doe
   'all I do' (Southeast Flemish, Teirlinck 1924:186)

d. CP₁+₂ de vrouw of die ik gezien heb
   'the woman I saw' (Amsterdams, Hoekstra 1994:316)

dynamic approach:

a. a single C
b. morphology of C shows agreement with REL (function of Merge)

d General approach:

a. Dat/welk boek ken ik niet
   'I don't know that book/Which book don't I know?'

b. dat ik het boek niet ken
   '...that I don't know the book'


cf. Bavarian der wo

3.2 Topic/wh position

a. [ WHP welk boek C ] [TopP dat boek C ]
   (ken) (ken)

(48) a. [ [GROUND ik welk boek niet ken ]]
   FOCUS

b. [ [COMMENT ik dat boek niet ken ]]
   TOPIC

(49) [ dat [PROPOSITION ik het boek niet ken ]]

V2: verb marks (the FOCUS-GROUND / TOPIC-COMMENT) dependency by position
   (Zwart 2005)

Subject initial main clause (SIMC): CP or TP?
Independent clause + topicalization: V2

a. Gisteren heeft Jan het boek gelezen (Dutch)
   ‘Yesterday, John read the book.’

b. * Gisteren Jan heeft het boek gelezen
   ‘Yesterday John read the book.’

Dependent clause + topicalization: adjunction to TP

a. ... dat gisteren Jan het boek gelezen heeft
   ‘...that yesterday John read the book.’

b. * ... gisteren dat Jan het boek gelezen heeft
   ‘... which book John read.’

If SIMC = TP, (52b) should be ✓, witness (53a)

But (53b) shows: linker dat is merged after resolution of the inner conflict (topicalization) of the proposition it links.

... welk boek of / dat / ofdat Jan gelezen heeft
   ‘... which book John read.’

Complementizer creates a domain that requires externalization of FOCUS (Van Craenenbroeck 2006; cf. (22a))

3.3 Subject position

‘Structural subject position’ = Spec,TP. Why?

VP = lexical domain (cf. Travis 2000: l-syntax, a subpart of event structure, the heads of which may be realized in a single word)

TP = VP + tense/aspect = event

GF subject = center of the event

TP = centered event

EPP
An event must be centered ("a clause must have a subject")

proposition
A proposition is the expression of a centered event (TP)

SIMC = proposition + declarative force
a. declarative force = unmarked case
b. declarative force = operator

SIMC [ForceP DECL [TP PROPOSITION ]]}

Dutch SIMC structure in cartographic terms

a. [CP Jan heeft [TP het boek gelezen ]] ‘symmetric analysis’

b. [TP Jan heeft [XP het boek gelezen ] ] ‘asymmetric analysis’

John has the book read

Question in terms of dynamic approach
Is there an inner conflict in (66) forcing merger of the subject to \( [\text{FORCE} + \text{TP}] \) ?

Apparently not: \([\text{welk boek heeft Jan gelezen}]\)

which book has John read

3.4 Object position

Structural object position = outer spec, vP (Spec, AgrOP)

Object shift (not restricted to pronouns)

a. .. dat ik hem niet zag (Dutch)
   \( \text{that I: NOM he: ACC not saw} \)
   '... that I did not see him.'

b. .. dat zij hem niet schijnt te kennen
   \( \text{that she: NOM he: ACC not seems to know} \)
   '... that she does not seem to know him.'

Vanden Wyngaerd (1989): object shift = A-movement

Problem: object position varies with discourse status/specificity/prosody

a. Wil je de telefoon even pakken? (object = given)
   \( \text{Would you the phone PRT the phone take} \)
   'Please get the phone.'

b. .. dat ze illegalen altijd op pakken (obj = generic)
   .. dat ze illegalen altijd op pakken (obj = existential)
   \( \text{that they illegals always illegals up take} \)
   '... that they always arrest / are always arresting illegal aliens.'

Cartographic approach: mapping hypothesis (Diesing 1992)

\([\text{TP (object) DISCOURSE PARTICLES } [\text{VP (object) .. }]]\)


a. .. weil feuerwehrleute ja doch verfügbar sind (i)
   \( \text{since firemen PRT firemen available are} \)
   '... since firemen are available' (i: generic; ii: existential)

b. .. weil feuerwehrleute ja doch intelligent sind (i)
   *.. weil feuerwehrleute intelligent sind (ii)
   \( \text{since firemen PRT firemen intelligent are} \)
   '... since firemen are available' (i: generic; ii: *existential)

Lay-out in (75) assumes a certain prosody, but prosody and order are partially independent: discourse particles like \textit{ja doch} may be further to the left, interpretation is a function of prosody
(78) generic NP: destressed
existential reading: episodic predicate

(79) a. \[
\text{DISC.PRT} \quad [\text{FOCUS} \quad \text{NP} \quad +\text{FOC} \quad \text{Predicate}] \]
(existential)
b. \[
\text{DISC.PRT} \quad [\text{NP} \quad +\text{TOP} \quad \text{FOC} \quad \text{Predicate}] \]
(generic)
c. \[
[\text{NP} \quad +\text{TOP} \quad \text{DISC.PRT} \quad \text{FOC} \quad \text{Predicate}] \]
(generic)

(80) No evidence that the object (in Continental West-Germanic) ever stays inside VP

(81) .. dat er iemand een boek [zonder uit te lezen] teruggebracht heeft
.. that someone a book without finishing returned has
‘.. that someone returned a book without finishing it.’ (Dutch; cf. Ter Beek 2006)

(82) What is the nature of the object position? (What is its occurrence?)

4. Conclusion

(83) 1. Syntactic positions can be defined in terms of their local environment (i.e. in terms of Merge)

2. Word order generalizations are to be (and can be) formulated in terms of local environments, not by reference to absolute (cartographically defined) positions
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