<div align="center">

Restructuring restructuring:
explaining long passive phenomena in Dutch

Jan-Wouter Zwart
University of Groningen

Amsterdam/Leuven verb clusters workshop, Amsterdam, May 29, 2015

</div>

1. Introduction

● 'Long passive' attested in German but not in Dutch

(1) *German long passive*
      … dass die   traktoren zu   reparieren   versuch-t wurden
      that DET:NOM.PL tractor:PL INF   repair:INF   try-PART   AUX.PASS:PAST:PL
      '… that they tried to repair the tractors.'   (Wurmbrand 2001:19)

(2) *Dutch long passive*
   * … dat de   tractoren ge-probeer-d   werden   te   repareren
      that DET:PL tractor:PL GE-try-PART AUX.PASS:PAST:PL INF   repair:INF
      (intended) '… that they tried to repair the tractors.'
   (* … werden geprobeerd …)

● Wurmbrand (2001): long passive is the hallmark of restructuring
● Restructuring: construction of infinitival complementation functioning like a simple clause with a single verbal core
● Wurmbrand: ± restructuring is a matter of subcategorization/category of the infinitive
      restructuring verb takes VP
      nonrestructuring verb takes vP/TP/CP
● Dutch restructuring verbs don't select VP (Wurmbrand 2001:24 fn 10)
● Evers (1975): restructuring is the result of syntactic head movement ('verb raising') with subsequent pruning of embedded clausal structure

(3) a. *Dutch restructuring (verb raising)*
         … dat hij   de   tractoren **probeerde te   repareren**
         that he   DET tractor:PL try:PAST.SG   INF   repair:INF
         '… that he tried to repair the tractors.'
      b. *Dutch nonrestructuring (extraposition)*
         … dat hij   **probeerde** de   tractoren **te   repareren**
         that he   try:PAST.SG   DET tractor:PL INF   repair:INF
         '… that he tried to repair the tractors.'

morphological effect of restructuring in the relative past ('perfect') = IPP-effect
(4) *Dutch simple past vs. relative past*
      a. probeer-de   b. heeft   ge-probeer-d
         try-PAST.SG   AUX.TEMP:3SG   GE-try-PART
         'tried' (simple past)   'tried' (relative past)

(5) a. *Dutch restructuring (verb raising)*
    ... dat hij de tractoren **heeft**   **proberen** te repareren
       that he DET tractor:PL AUX.TEMP:3SG try:INF   INF repair:INF
    '... that he tried to repair the tractors.'
  b. *Dutch nonrestructuring (extraposition)*
    ... dat hij **heeft**   **ge-probeer-d** de tractoren te repareren
       that he AUX.TEMP:3SG GE-try-PART   DET tractor:PL INF repair:INF
    '... that he tried to repair the tractors.'

2. The issue.

- why does it always have to be so complicated?
- hidden assumption: clause is derived in a single derivational run
- alternative: every derivation is a network of derivations (derivation layering)
- syntactic operations: i) merge, ii) recursion (= derivation layering)

> **restructuring = derivation layering**

- verb cluster created in separate derivation, introduced in the next derivation as a single item
- NB, 'verb second' = interface effect (Chomsky 2001), so no excorporation needed

3. Analytic verb morphology

- assume morphology after syntax (cf. Halle and Marantz 1993)
- input: syntactic terminal, output: item from a morphological paradigm
  (point of connection: morphosyntactic features and their values)

(6) *Dutch present/simple past/relative past*
  a. Hij { slaap-t / sliep /   heeft   ge-slap-en   }
     he   sleep-3SG sleep:PAST.SG   AUX.TEMP:3SG GE-sleep-PART
     'He sleeps/slept/slept.'
  b. Hij { *slaap-t / **sliep** /   *heeft   ge-slap-en   }
     he   sleep-3SG   sleep:PAST.SG AUX.TEMP:3SG GE-sleep-PART
       toen   ik binnen kwam
       when   I inside come:PAST.SG
     'He slept when I came in.' (cotemporaneity with reference point in the past)

(7) a. Hij beweert   te   slapen
     he   claim:3SG INF sleep:INF
     'He claims to be sleeping.'
  b. Hij beweert { *te slapen / **ge-slap-en**   te   **hebben** }
     he   claim:3SG   INF sleep:INF GE-sleep-PART INF   TEMP.AUX:INF
       toen   ik binnen kwam
       when   I inside come:PAST.SG
     'He claims to have been asleep when I came in.' (**infinitival simple past**)

(8) *Dutch tense paradigms across finiteness*

	FINITE	NONFINITE
PRESENT	slaap	slapen
PAST	sl**ie**p	**ge**slap**en hebben**

- morphological paradigms contain analytic forms
  input: single terminal (V [–FIN, +PAST]), output: verb cluster

- NB, the single terminal may be a **verb cluster** (output of previous derivation)
  > this gives you a seemingly three-verb cluster,
  but actually a two-verb cluster with nonfinite past tense morphology

(9) *Dutch verb cluster tense paradigms across finiteness*

	FINITE	NONFINITE
PRESENT	moet werken	moeten werken
PAST	moe**s**t werken	**hebben** moeten werken

- bracketing must be [*heeft* [*moeten werken*]], otherwise IPP-effect unexplained

(10) a. ... dat   hij   heeft   [**moeten**   werken]
          that he   TEMP.AUX:3SG   must:INF   work:INF
       '... that he had to work.'
     b. Het heeft   **ge-moet-en**
        it   TEMP.AUX:3SG   GE-must-PART
       'It was inevitable.'

- three major conclusions
  1. some verb clusters are by-products of syntax-to-morphology conversion
     (no clausal complementation, no subcategorization, no verb raising/incorporation)
  2. word order variation in these clusters is not a syntactic explanandum
  3. verb second **must** be a postsyntactic linearization effect
     (the temporal auxiliary undergoing verb second does not exist in syntax)

4.   Passive

- again: morphological paradigm contains analytic forms
  input: single terminal (V [PASSIVE]), output: verb cluster

- long passive explanandum: presence of a passive form for a two-verb cluster
  (yielding a three-verb cluster after syntax-to-morphology conversion)

3

(11) *Dutch/German voice paradigm (partial)*

repair, 3SG	DUTCH	GERMAN
ACTIVE	repareert	repariert
PASSIVE	wordt gerepareerd	repariert wird

(12) *Dutch/German long passive paradigm (partial)*

try to repair, 3SG	DUTCH	GERMAN
ACTIVE	**probeert** te repareren	zu reparieren **versucht**
PASSIVE	***	zu reparieren versucht wird

- facts follow if morphology requires a head-final input
- = a random feature of linearization of clusters created in a previous derivation

5. Arguments against a lexicalist approach

- two sources of clusters: 1. morphological conversion (relative past, passive)
  2. derivation layering (restructuring)
- Wurmbrand (2001:20): long passives are problematic for lexicalist approaches
  > passivization of matrix verb affects case assignment potential of embedded verb
  > but matrix + embedded verb form a single item, so this is what you expect
  (see Hoeksema 1980, Van Noord and Bouma 1998, Williams 2004, Bhatt & Keine 2014)

6. Restructuring properties in the absence of long passives

- Dutch verb raising constructions show all the restructuring properties, even in the absence of long passivization
- argumentation shows wide scope of the embedded verb's internal argument
  (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2005, Bhatt and Keine 2014)

(15) ... dass er   die   traktoren zu   reparieren   vergessen   hat
         that he   DEF.PL.ACC   tractor:PL INF   repair:INF   forget:PART   AUX.TEMP:3SG
      '... that he forgot to repair the tractor.'
(16) ... dass er   nur einen   traktor zu   reparieren   vergessen   hat
         that he   just INDEF.ACC tractor INF   repair:INF   forget:PART   AUX.TEMP:3SG
      '... that he forgot to repair only one tractor.'   (*only* ≫ *forget* ; *forget* ≫ *only*)

(17) ... das nur ein   traktor zu   reparieren   vergessen   wurde
         that just INDEF.NOM   tractor INF   repair:INF   forget:PART   AUX.PASS:PAST.SG
      '... that they forgot to repair only one tractor.' (*only* ≫ *forget*)
(18) ... das nur einen   traktor zu   reparieren   vergessen   wurde
         that just INDEF.ACC tractor INF repair:INF   forget:PART   AUX.PASS:PAST.SG
      '... that they forgot to repair only one tractor.' (*forget* ≫ *only*)

- (15)/(16) are structurally ambiguous between ±restructuring
- (19) a. ... dass er die traktoren [zu reparieren vergessen hat]   (restructuring)
  - b. ... dass er [die traktoren zu reparieren] vergessen hat   (nonrestructuring)

- Dutch: no such surface ambiguity (verb raising and extraposition clearly different)
- (20) a. ... dat hij   de   tractoren [was   vergeten   te   repareren]
  - that he   DEF tractor:PL AUX.TEMP:PAST.SG forget:PART   INF   repair:INF
  - '... that he forgot to repair the tractors.'
  - b. ... dat hij   was   vergeten   [de tractoren te   repareren]
  - that he   AUX.TEMP:PAST.SG forget:PART DEF tractor:PL INF   repair:INF
  - '... that he forgot to repair the tractors.'

- passive of extraposition construction unproblematic
- (21) ... dat er   werd   vergeten   [de tractoren te   repareren]
  - that EXPL PASS.AUX:PAST.SG forget:PART DEF tractor:PL INF   repair:INF
  - '... that they forgot to repair the tractors.'

- scope facts showing restructuring with verb raising (cf. Bhatt and Keine 2014)

(22) *direct object*
a. ... dat hij   maar   één tractor   was   vergeten   te   repareren
- that he   just   one tractor:PL AUX.TEMP:PAST.SG forget:PART   INF   repair:INF
- '... that he forgot to repair only one tractor.'   (*only ≫ forget*)
b. ... dat hij   was   vergeten   maar   één tractor   te   repareren
- that he   AUX.TEMP:PAST.SG forget:PART just   one tractor:PL INF   repair:INF
- '... that he forgot to repair only one tractor.'   (*forget ≫ only*)

(23) *indirect object*
a. ... dat hij   mij   aan maar   één student was vergeten   voor te stellen
- that he   me   to   just   one student AUX forget:PART   to introduce:INF
- '... that he forgot to introduce me to only one student.' (*only ≫ forget*)
b. ... dat hij   was vergeten   mij   aan maar   één student voor te stellen
- that he   AUX forget:PART me   to   just   one student to introduce:INF
- '... that he forgot to introduce me to only one student.' (*forget ≫ only*)

(24) *event modifying adverbial*
a. ... dat hij   de   knop   vijf keer was vergeten   in te   drukken
- that he   DEF button five time AUX forget:PART in INF   press:inf
- '... that he forgot to press the button five times.'   (five x *forget*)
b. ... dat hij   was vergeten   de   knop   vijf keer in   te   drukken
- that he   AUX forget:part DEF button five time in   INF   press:inf
- '... that he forgot to press the button five times.'   (five x *press*)

- restructuring effects independent of long passive
- category of the embedded infinitival not a factor in restructuring

7. Restructuring restructuring

- how does it work, with just (i) merge and (ii) recursion (derivation layering) ?

toy examples
(25) John tried to read a book   > two options (26)/(27) and (28)
(26) a. numeration =   { try, read }   b. output of syntax: [try to read]
(27) *recursive step*
    a. numeration =   { John, [try to read], [a book] }
    b. output of syntax: [John tried to read a book]   = verb raising/restructuring
(28) a. numeration =   { John, try, read, [a book] }
    b. output of syntax: [John tried to read a book]   = extraposition/nonrestructuring

- clustering without syntactic operation (Hoeksema 1980, Coppen and Klein 1992)
no clausal source
(29) het   [**vergeten te   repareren**] van de   tractoren
    DEF.N   forget:INF INF repair:INF   of   DEF.PL tractor:PL
    'the (act of) forgetting to repair the tractors'
(30) ... dat Jan   de   tractoren zowel heeft   horen   starten
        that John   DEF   tractor:PL both   AUX.TEMP:3SG   hear:INF start:INF
            als   **heeft   zien   rijden**
            as   AUX.TEMP:3SG   see:INF ride:INF
    '... that John both heard the tractors start and saw them go.'

verb cluster idioms
(31)   zien zitten   laten zitten   kunnen hebben   staan te trappelen
        'appreciate' 'desist'   'tolerate'   'be eager'

fronting
(32) % [Vergeten   te   repareren] (dat)   werden alleen de   tractoren
        forget:PART INF   repair:INF   DEM.N AUX.PL only   DEF   tractor:PL
    'They forgot to repair only the tractors.'

- speakers who accept (32) use the d-word *dat* as a placeholder for the passive participle,
  removing the problem for the formation of the long passive in Dutch
- presence of the d-word suggests 'base-generation' of the participle/cluster
(33) (Ontslagen) dat   worden   we   niet
    fire:PART   DEM   AUX.PASS.PL we   NEG
    'We're not getting fired.'

References ter Beek 2008 *Restructuring and infinitival complements in Dutch* ● Bhatt and Keine 2014 Verb cluster formation and the semantics of head movement *WCCFL* 32 ● Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2005 The domain of agreement *NLLT* 23 ● Chomsky 2001 Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: a life in language* ● Coppen and Klein 1992 Het einde van Verb Raising. In *Nieuwe eskapades in de neerlandistiek* ● Evers 1975 *The transformational cycle in Dutch* ● Halle and Marantz 1993 Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. In *The view from Building 20* ● Höhle 1978 *Lexikalistische Syntax: die Aktiv-Passiv Relation und andere Infinitkonstruktionen im Deutschen* ● Hoeksema 1980 Verbale verstrengeling ontstrengeld *Spektator* 10 ● van Noord and Bouma 1998 Word order constraints on verb clusters in German and Dutch. In *Complex predicates in nonderivational syntax* ● Williams 2004 The structure of clusters. In *Verb clusters: a study of Hungarian, German and Dutch* ● Wurmbrand 2001 *Infinitives* ● Zwart 1996 Verb clusters in Continental West-Germanic dialects. In *Microparametric syntax and dialect variation* ● 2007 Some notes on the origin and distribution of the IPP-effect. GAGL 45 ●2009 Prospects for top-down derivation *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 8 ● 2011 Structure and order: asymmetric merge. In *The Oxford Handbook of linguistic minimalism* ● 2014 The tense of infinitives in Dutch. In *Black book.*