

Conference Report

**The 10th Comparative Germanic Syntax Workshop
Catholic University of Brussels,
17-19 January 1995**

by Jan-Wouter Zwart

(from *Glott International* 1.2)

The 10th Comparative Germanic Syntax Workshop took place in Brussels on January 17-19, 1995. The Workshop was well-organized, and featured papers on a variety of subjects: verb movement (H.Bennis/F.Beukema/M.Den Dikken, J.Bobaljik, A.Henry, Chr.Platzack), Verb Raising (E. Hoekstra/M.Den Dikken, J-W.Zwart), 'Extrapolation' (S.Barbiers, D.Büring/K.Hartmann), scrambling (E.Haerberli, S.Menuzzi, F.Weerman), binding (M.Everaert, T.Taraldsen), phrase structure (E.P. Kester (AP), J.Zwarts (PP)), expletive constructions (Groat), and possessive constructions (T.Hoekstra/J.Rooryck). Attendance was surprisingly low, but those present enjoyed a lively and interesting workshop.

The recent work by Chomsky and Kayne has led to a reassessment of the central ideas that have governed Germanic syntax since the 1970s: the idea that verb second languages feature verb movement to C in all verb second constructions, and the idea that there is a split in the Germanic family between SVO languages and SOV languages. The tension generated by these recent developments has made the past Comparative Germanic Syntax Workshops particularly interesting, and this 10th edition was no exception. On the other hand, issues not addressed in Chomsky's or Kayne's recent work, such as bounding theory, were conspicuously absent from the presentations at this workshop.

The paper I would like to report on in more detail is Sjef Barbiers' 'An Antisymmetric Analysis of PP Extrapolation'. This paper deals with the phenomenon of the grammar of Dutch (and other languages) traditionally referred to as PP-over-V, in which a non-predicative PP optionally appears to the right of the verb in embedded clauses:

- (1) a. ..dat Jan gewerkt heeft in de tuin
that John worked has in the garden
b. ..dat Jan in de tuin gewerkt heeft
that John in the garden worked has

On the assumption of Koster (1975) that Dutch is an OV-language, the order in (1a) can be derived from the order in (1b) by moving the PP *in de tuin* to the right. This is the traditional analysis, although other approaches, involving optional base-generation of the PP to the right of the verb have been attempted as well. However, if Kayne (1994) is correct, neither rightward movement, nor rightward adjunction are a part of the grammar. This rules out the traditional extraposition analysis, and severely restricts the potential of the base-generation analysis. The latter can only be maintained if *in de tuin* in (1a) is generated in the complement domain of *gewerkt (heeft)*, but then the position of *in de tuin* in (1b) would be strange.

Barbiers proposes an analysis in which the PP *in de tuin* is generated as a left adjunct to the VP *gewerkt heeft*, with the VP subsequently moving to the specifier position of this PP:

- (2) [VP [PP [VP gewerkt heeft]_i in de tuin] [VP t_i]]

The movement of the VP to the specifier position of the PP is triggered by the need to establish a predication relation between the PP (*in de tuin*) and the VP (*gewerkt heeft*). In (1b), this movement is covert.

One of the advantages of this analysis is that it explains why predicative PPs can never undergo 'PP-over-V':

- (3) a. ..dat Jan de stoel in de tuin zet
 that John the chair in the garden puts
 `..that John is putting the chair in the garden'
 b. * ..dat Jan de stoel zet in de tuin

Assuming *in de tuin* in (3) to be a predicate of *de stoel*, and assuming predication of this type to be represented in a Small Clause-like structure, generated in the complement domain of *gezet* (*heeft*), *in de tuin* in (3) can never be generated as a VP-adjunct like *in de tuin* in (1). Movement of the VP to the specifier of *in de tuin* is not an option in (3a), explaining the non-occurrence of (3b). (Movement of the predicative PP to a position to the left of the verb, as in Zwart 1994, would still not create the possibility of VP-movement to Spec,PP, because, as Barbiers assumes, the specifier of the PP *in de tuin* is occupied by the (trace of the) subject *de stoel*.)

Another important advantage is that the distribution of focus-particles like *maar* 'but' can be understood more clearly. Barbiers observes that generally these focus-particles can have a numeral-associated interpretation if and only if they are sisters of the PP or DP containing the numeral:

- (4) a. Jan heeft maar in EEN tuin gewerkt
 John has but in a SINGLE garden worked
 b. Jan heeft maar EEN boek gelezen
 John read but a SINGLE book

In the PP-over-V variant of (4a), *maar* does not appear to the right of the verb:

- (5) a. * Jan heeft gewerkt maar in EEN tuin
 b. Jan heeft maar gewerkt in EEN tuin

In Barbiers' analysis (cf. (2), m.m.), *gewerkt in EEN tuin* is a PP, with *gewerkt* in the specifier position of this PP. Hence, we can maintain the generalization that the focus particle must be a sister of the PP (or DP) containing the numeral.

Barbiers' analysis also explains why extraposition is not allowed with DPs (i.e. there is no DP-over-V). Unlike PPs, argument DPs are not predicates of the event denoted by the VP. Therefore, the trigger for VP-movement would be absent, even if VP-movement to the Spec,DP would not be barred otherwise.

Most importantly, Barbiers' analysis accounts for the mirror image effect of PP-over-V in Dutch first discussed in Koster (1974). According to this effect, the order of the PPs to the right of the verb mirrors the order of the PPs to the left of the verb. This observation, not illustrated here, is rather robust. Barbiers derives the mirror image effect automatically, by assuming that the VP-segment that contains the rightmost PP (PP3) moves to the specifier position of the PP in the middle (PP2), after which the VP-segment containing PP2 moves to the specifier position of the leftmost PP (PP1):

- (6) a. [_{VPa} PP1 [_{VPb} PP2 [_{VPc} PP3 [_{VPd} V]]]]
 b. [_{VPa} [_{PP1} [_{VPb} [_{PP2} [_{VPc} [_{PP3} [_{VPd} V] PP3]]] PP2]]] PP1]]

This stunning result makes us look forward to Barbiers' University of Leiden dissertation, soon to be completed, and to be reviewed in the columns of this journal.

References

- Chomsky, N. (1993) 'A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory.' In *The View from Building 20*, K. Hale and S.J. Keyser, eds. Cambridge: MIT Press.
 Kayne, R.S. (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
 Koster, J. (1974) 'Het werkwoord als spiegelcentrum.' *Spektator* 3, 601-619.
 Koster, J. (1975) 'Dutch as an SOV Language.' *Linguistic Analysis* 1, 111-136.
 Zwart, C.J.W. (1994) 'Dutch is Head Initial.' *The Linguistic Review* 11, 377-406.