1. Newsdesk

ANNOUNCEMENT: CGSW 15
The 15th Comparative Germanic Syntax Workshop will be organized on May 26 and 27, 2000, at the University of Groningen, the Netherlands. Invited speakers: Richard Kayne (NYU), Marga Reis (Tuebingen), Anders Holmberg (Tromsoe). Local organizers: Werner
Abraham and Jan-Wouter Zwart. The deadline has passed. The program will be announced February 5, 2000. E-mail address: cgsw15@let.rug.nl. Web site: http://www.let.rug.nl/~zwart/cgsw/

CALL FOR PAPERS: GLAC 6
The 6th Germanic Linguistics Annual Conference (GLAC) will take place at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee April 28-30, 2000. Colleagues at all levels (faculty and graduate students) are invited to submit abstracts for 30-minute papers on any linguistic or philological aspect of any historic or modern Germanic language or dialect, including English (to 1500) and the extraterritorial varieties. Papers from a range of linguistic subfields, including phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, sociolinguistics, language acquisition, contact, and change, as well as differing theoretical approaches, are especially welcome. Please send a one-page, 12-point abstract that is headed only by the title of your paper, as well as a separate 3" x 5" index card with your name, institutional affiliation, mailing address, phone/fax numbers, e-mail address, and the title of your paper to: GLAC-6, Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, P.O. Box 413, Milwaukee, WI 53201-0413, U.S.A. Submissions must be postmarked by January 10, 2000. Notifications of acceptance will be sent out by February 15, 2000. For more information, e-mail Prof. Garry W. Davis (gdavis@uwm.edu) or Prof. Gregory K. Iverson (iverson@uwm.edu). As of December 1, 1999, you may also consult the GLAC-6 website:
http://www.uwm.edu/~iverson/GLAC6.html

OTHER CONFERENCES OF INTEREST
BERKELEY GERMAN LINGUISTICS ROUNDTABLE, April 7-8, 2000, Berkeley, California. Deadline: February 1.
irauch@socrates.berkeley.edu
cls@diderot.uchicago.edu
http://www.ling.lu.se/
digs-vi@umail.umd.edu
perfect@man.ac.uk

GRONINGEN DISSERTATIONS IN LINGUISTICS ON SALE VIA INTERNET
The dissertations appearing in the Groningen Dissertations in Linguistics Series (Grodil) can now be ordered on line through
http://www.let.rug.nl/clcg/
Researchers at the Department of Linguistics of the University of Tilburg are currently preparing “A Modern Grammar of Dutch” (MGD), a grammar of Dutch written in English and incorporating findings from modern theoretical linguistics. Two (voluminous) prepublications have appeared, both prepared by Hans Broekhuis:


These can be ordered at: Katholieke Universiteit Brabant, Grammaticamodellen, MGD, P.O. Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg. Check out the MGD web site:
http://cwis.kub.nl/~fdl/research/gm/mgd/index.htm

2. Postings

FROM SUZI WURMBRAND (susi@alum.mit.edu):
This posting is directed to German speakers! I apologize for cross postings.
I am conducting a survey on word order variation in so-called verb clusters (i.e., sentences with more than one verb). Data reported in the literature and a preliminary survey have shown that in two verb clusters, both orders are documented to be acceptable by certain speakers; in three verb clusters, of the six possible word orders five are documented in at least some West Germanic dialect. However, a systematic characterization and correlation of word order possibilities and languages/dialects is not available yet. I have thus developed a questionnaire (at the moment only for German) which addresses this word order variation in verb clusters. The results of the questionnaire are intended to serve as the basis for a dialect atlas which systematizes the variation found in the ordering of verbal elements in verb clusters.
If you are a native speaker of German and are interested in supporting this project I would appreciate it very much if you could take a few minutes and fill out the questionnaire. The questionnaire can be obtained in a number of ways. You can download it from my web page:
http://web.mit.edu/susi/www/verbclusters.html (post script and Word 98 available) or you could contact me at: susi@alum.mit.edu and I could send you either a file in a different format or a paper copy of the questionnaire.
Many thanks, -- Susi Wurmbrand.
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WEB SITE
The Germanic Generative Syntax Newsletter has a web site which 
allows you to SUBSCRIBE, SUBMIT contributions, and READ or PRINT
previous issues of the GGSN (in PDF format). The URL is:
http://www.let.rug.nl/~zwart/gsn/gsn.htm

HOW TO SUBSCRIBE TO THE GGSN
Please note that the editors are not in a position to manage your subscription: you can only do that yourself. There are two ways:
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   www.let.rug.nl/~zwart/gsn/gsn.htm
to use the Linguist List subscription form, or go directly to
   http://linguistlist.org/subscribing/sub-ggsn.html
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6. Abstracts

6.1 Books and Dissertations


This dissertation deals with various aspects of the syntax of arguments in the Germanic languages. Its main claims are: (a) The EPP and the theory of abstract Case can be eliminated from the grammar and their effects can be derived from other components of the grammar; (b) Several types of crosslinguistic variation in the syntax of arguments can be related to syntactic parameters whose values reflect morphological properties.
The thesis is divided into three main parts. The first part (chapter 2) focuses on the principles determining the syntax of A-positions, and in particular on the Extended Projection Principle (EPP) and the theory of abstract Case. Within the generative literature over the last twenty years, these two principles have played a central role for the analysis of the syntax of A-positions. However, both the EPP and the theory of abstract Case are simply stipulations and they have never been derived in a satisfactory way. The main proposal of the first part of this thesis is that such stipulations are not necessary. It is argued that the apparent effects of the EPP and of the theory of abstract Case can in fact be derived from the interaction between two other components of the grammar, namely the theory of syntactic categories (going back to Chomsky 1970) and checking theory (Chomsky 1995). As a consequence, the EPP and Case Theory can be eliminated from the grammar.

The goal of the second part of this thesis (chapters 3 to 6) is to identify parameters which determine aspects of the variation found among the modern Germanic languages in the domain of the syntax of arguments. Chapter 3 deals with syntactic phenomena that have traditionally been related to the presence of rich case morphology (variable argument order, nominal complements of adjectives). It is argued that these phenomena are the result of processes which are triggered by case features and that case features are syntactically represented only in languages with a productive morphological case system. Given the elimination of abstract Case in chapter 2, languages without productive case morphology do not have any syntactically represented case features and they therefore lack certain syntactic processes which are found in languages with productive case morphology. Chapter 4 discusses the crosslinguistic variation found among the Germanic languages with respect to the word order 'adjunct-subject'. It is proposed that the presence or absence of syntactically represented agreement features plays an important role for the analysis of this variation and that the syntactic representation of agreement is closely linked to morphological properties. Chapter 5 focuses on Icelandic. In terms of the discussion in chapters 3 and 4, Icelandic has three unexpected properties: relatively rigid argument order, restrictions on 'adjunct-subject' orders and the licensing of oblique subjects. It is argued that these three properties can all be related to a common source and that morphological properties which determine the syntactic representation of agreement again are crucial in this context. Thus, the main conclusions reached on the basis of the crosslinguistic variation discussed in chapters 3 to 5 support proposals made in the literature (cf. in particular Bobaljik 1995, Thrainsson 1996, Bobaljik & Thrainsson 1998) that certain morphological properties determine syntactic representation and, hence, crosslinguistic variation in the syntax. Finally, chapter 6 shows how the main properties and several areas of variation found with constructions involving expletives can be analyzed.
in terms of the proposals made in the previous chapters.
The third part of this thesis (chapters 7 and 8) applies the proposals made in the earlier chapters to diachronic variation in the history of English. Chapter 7 discusses the situation found in Old English with respect to issues such as argument order, 'adjunct-subject' orders, V2 and oblique subject constructions. And finally in chapter 8, certain developments in the Middle English period are considered and it is shown that these developments can be related to the parametric options proposed in the second part of the thesis.

6.2 Papers and Articles


It is well known that unaccented pronouns in English cannot occur in the postverbal position in locative inversion, in the postparticle position in a verb+particle construction, and in the second NP position in a double [object] construction. This study shows that the hypothesis that pronouns must appear in a derived position is valid, and that by adopting such a position we can explain the restrictions noted above. This is done by showing that pronouns have a nearly identical distribution to subjects of a categorical predication, which have been argued to be in a derived position. There is one case where the positioning of pronouns and the positioning of categorical subjects is not parallel-infinitival clauses. This asymmetry shows that the placement of pronouns in a derived position is not the result of a correlation between topic function for pronouns and derived positions, but of a correlation between topic marking for pronouns and derived positions.


This article presents an approach to the English ‘to’-infinitive where ‘to’ is a preposition with a bare infinitive complement and ECM and object control complements receive a small clause analysis. Crucial to this approach is the positioning of PRO, which always occurs in the subject position of ‘to’‘s complement. This positioning allows a complementary distribution of PRO, lexical Nps, and NP-trace. The distribution of these elements, in conjunction with the small clause approach, creates multiple advantages including the elimination of current inconsistencies in the theory of null case, the reduction of control to anaphoric binding, and a general and uniform theory of complementation.

Buering, Daniel. Forthcoming. Let's Phrase It! -- Focus, Word

A case study in focus related word order variation. It is argued that focus does not interact with word order at all, but only with prosody, and that, accordingly, all focus related word order variation is really related to prosodic structure. I propose a number of constraints on prosodic structure and its relation to syntax, as well as one focus related constraint, FocusProminence, and show how these interact to derive the well-known word order variation facts in the German Mittelfeld. The paper is couched within an optimality framework (39 pages).


We propose a comprehensive account of both the distribution and interpretation of German focus particles such as nur, auch and sogar ('only', 'also', 'even'). We argue that they always adjoin to non-arguments (in recent terms this means that they can adjoin to VPs, IPs, APs and root CPs, but never to argument DPs or argument CPs), and that they do not undergo LF raising. Presenting a range of mostly new data and observations, we show how this theory accounts for a variety of puzzling distributional facts with adverbial and adjectival PRTs, their specific interpretations, and their behavior w.r.t. scoping, in particular reconstruction.


Taking Bowers (1993) as our point of departure, we argue that natural language employs a predication operator that may be lexicalised and constitute the head of a syntactic projection. First, following Bowers’ suggestion that the English particle ‘as’ may lexicalise the predication operator, we show that the corresponding particle ‘som’ of certain clauses in Norwegian serves the same function. Then, departing from Bowers, we argue that the copula and certain prepositions may lexicalise the predication operator as well. Last, we argue against Bowers’ non-unitary construal of the verb phrase as made up of a V-projection and an independent predication projection. Instead, we adduce evidence that the predication operator is directly lexicalised by the main verb, in effect claiming that the unmarked verb phrase is a unitary VP, with V’ constituting a Fregean unsaturated function exactly in virtue of having the predication operator incorporated into the main verb.

This paper attempts to unify the analyses of a wide range of wh-extraction phenomena by developing Chomsky’s idea that movement relations must lead, at LF, either to chains with local links or operator-variable pairs. By assuming that variables in operator-variable pairs are interpreted as “individual variables” and relating the possibility of interpreting traces as individual variables to theta-role assignment and the level at which it occurs, a number of phenomena associated with extraction from weak islands fall into place: asymmetries in subject/object extraction, tense effects, Cinque’s discoveries about extraction of what he and Rizzi call “non-referential” arguments, Longobardi’s discoveries about scope reconstruction, and the adjunct/argument asymmetry itself. The theoretical framework is Chomsky’s barriers theory.


Based on spontaneous data from 50 German children with specific language impairment (SLI), we explore several aspects of impaired clause structure. Our findings are that children with SLI use more finite than nonfinite verb forms (57% vs. 36%). In declarative main clauses they prefer the verb in clause-final position (44%) over genuine (3%) or subject-initial (27%) verb-second patterns; the vast majority (80%) of *wh*-questions and subordinate clauses are not target consistent. Several current models of clause structure deficits are tested against these findings, especially the Missing Agreement Hypothesis, the Optional Tense Hypothesis, the Truncation Hypothesis, and the Minimal Default Grammar Hypothesis. It is shown that only the latter can account for the entirety of error patterns found in German SLIs. The model is further explored with respect to tense marking in the speech of German SLIs, which is shown to be correct in the presence of overt temporal adverbs.


Pseudoclefts constitute a difficult challenge for linguistic theory, displaying effects of core syntactic conditions in a noncanonical configuration that cannot be normalized with standard syntactic operations. We argue that these 'connectedness' effects follow from the nature of pseudoclefts as equatives. This treatment yields an integrated account of the syntactic and semantopragmatic properties of the construction, but leads to the conclusion that certain syntactic constraints apply to a level of representation more abstract than LF under most current conceptions. This representation is built up in the process of discourse interpretation and may constitute the interface with the
conceptual-intentional system of mind.


Norwegian has a distinction between simple and complex reflexives. The traditional view is that complex reflexives are used in local binding, while simple reflexives are used in nonlocal binding (for example Hellan 1988). A well-known problem is that there are many cases of simple reflexives that seem to be locally bound. The traditional view is that these cases involve reanalysis. This view will be criticized, and it will be shown that inalienables with external possessors have a distribution that is strikingly similar to the distribution of the simple reflexive. It will be proposed that the distribution of inalienables and simple reflexives should be described directly by the same theory, and that this theory should be the theory of inalienables. This gives a view of the simple reflexive that is very different from the traditional view.


There have been two approaches to embedded topicalization in English: (1) the IP adjunction analysis by Baltin (1982) and Lasnik and Saito (1992); and (2) the CP recursion analysis by Authier (1992) and Watanabe (1993). The purpose of this paper is to defend the IP adjunction analysis and to derive restrictions on embedded topicalization from an independently motivated condition. We will argue that embedded topicalization requires two kinds of licensing: (1) a topic is licensed in the projection of INFL; and (2) INFL is licensed by adjoining to COMP in LF. We also show that English and Japanese have the same restrictions on embedded topicalization, and based on the Japanese data we argue for LF-movement of INFL to COMP in the construction. It is further argued that given the proposed analysis, there is no strong motivation to assume an independent functional category for embedded topicalization, contrary to Ueyama’s (1989) and Sato-Zhu and Larson’s (1992) claim.


In this paper, it will be argued that the discourse-functional status of arguments is to be realised in structural terms in modern spoken Afrikaans. Following Abraham’s proposal (1997a/b), elaborated for German, it will be shown that the Afrikaans clause structure is to be divided into a thematic (VP-external) and a rhematic (VP-internal) domain, where, according to their thema or rhema status, the arguments of the
verb have to be licensed. Thematicity of an argument is achieved by checking the feature +TH against a functional position between CP and Spec,VP, triggering the movement of unstressed pronouns and definite full NPs into the VP-external domain. If unchecked, the interpretation of the feature +Thema triggers a morphological effect within VP: the insertion of the morpheme ‘vir’ that, comparable to the contrast accent in German, signals the marked rhematicity of a category-inherently thematic argument. Analysing ‘vir’ as the morphological realisation of a discourse-functional feature (and not as a preposition with its own independent syntactic-semantic domain, as traditionally regarded) provides an adequate explanation for its specific syntactic-morphological distribution properties, e.g. for its obligatory presence within VP and for its absence in passive or in structural positions outside VP.


At the moment there is no theory for free relative clauses in German in the framework of Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG) (Pollard and Sag, 1994). >From GB literature on the subject it is known that free relative clauses behave partly like noun phrases. They can fill argument positions of verbs. And although they are finite sentences, they are serialized like noun phrases in the German Mittelfeld. The function free relative clauses can take is not restricted to complements. Depending on the properties of the relative phrase, free relative clauses can be modifiers as well. I will argue that free relative clauses project to a category that is tightly related to the category of the relative phrase. As Ingria (1990) has shown, assignment of different cases in the relative and the matrix clause poses problems for grammars that rely on unification alone. In the following paper I will show that his subsumption based account is incompatible with standard assumptions in the HPSG framework. The set-based approach of Dalrymple and Kaplan (1997), which is similar in many respects to Ingria's approach, will also be discussed. It will be shown that some of the problems of the subsumption based account are still present in the set-based approach. I will provide a different solution to the problem that relies on an additional case feature for the case form of NPs (abstract vs. morphological case). It is projected from the relative phrase and is not affected by case requirements of the verb in the relative clause. In general, there are three possibilities to describe the projections of free relative clauses: firstly, the direct projection of a phrase from the relative phrase and a finite sentence (Jackendoff, 1977; Bresnan and Grimshaw, 1978), secondly, an empty head or a unary projection that projects a relative clause and thirdly, a lexical rule that changes the subcategorization frames of governing heads in a way that they subcategorize for relative clauses (Avgustinova, 1996). Empirical evidence from a variety
of phenomena like agreement and coordination, semantics, and linearization will be provided that supports the analysis with the unary schema. Furthermore, issues related to the compatibility hierarchy for grammatical functions in matrix clauses and embedded free relative clauses will be discussed. Empirical evidence for all cases related to the hierarchy in (1) will be provided and it will be shown how this can be integrated into the analysis.

(1) Subject > D-Object > I-Object/Prepositional Object

The paper also includes an analysis of relative clauses in German that have an antecedent.  
http://www.dfki.de/~stefan/Pub/e_freeRel.html


The present paper presents a study on the functional assignment of the category *subject* in the production of instructions in English, German, and Spanish. It could be shown that the choice between the two natural candidates for this position (agent and topic) is determined by the conceptual accessibility of the entity functioning as agent and whether it is given in the communicative situation as specific or nonspecific (addressee present or absent). Presence or absence has different effects depending on the language. The unspecific agent is encoded in English and German preferentially in the subject position, while Spanish in the same situation shows a tendency to use the subject category to encode topic information, not mentioning the agent of the instructions. The specific agent, on the contrary, is encoded in Spanish as subject, while in English and German it remains mostly unmentioned. These differences reflect the linguistic means offered by the three languages to code the specificity of an agent and lead to a different conceptualization in organizing information for expression ("thinking for speaking"). They reflect an object-oriented versus an agent-oriented perspective depending on the communicative situation.


This paper corroborates the interpretability proposal of Chomsky (1995) with evidence from scrambling in Japanese and German. First it is shown that scrambling in Japanese is semantically vacuous, whereas scrambling in German is semantically contentful. Chomsky's proposal then predicts that the feature driving Japanese scrambling is erased after checking, while the corresponding feature in German remains visible, specifically for the Shortest Attract condition. Looking at patterns of movement that result in overlapping
paths, this predication is seen to be correct.


Sobin (1997) proposes an analysis of several ‘prestige’ constructions of English under which they result from grammatical viruses. Counter to his claim, I argue that plural agreement in expletive constructions introduced by ‘there’ results not from a virus but from the grammar of English, because it lacks signature properties of viruses. I show that the flat agreement seen in expletive constructions with conjoined associates can be explained as a processing effect. I then argue that singular agreement with plural associates represents a second alternative allowed within the grammar.

Schwartz, Bernhard. On the syntax of ‘either...or’. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 17, 339-370.

This study argues for the thesis that in sentences of the form ...either...or, ‘either’ overtly marks the left edge of the disjunction whose coordinator is ‘or’. This thesis is defended against Larson’s (1985) proposal that ‘either’ may be distant from its disjunction as the result of syntactic movement. It is argued that examples which appear to motivate such a movement are to be reanalyzed as involving silent material at the left periphery of a second disjunct. It is shown in detail that a variety of observations on ‘either/or’ disjunctions fall out from independently established properties of what Ross (1970) calls GAPPING. It will also be concluded that in certain cases, second disjuncts host silent subject pronouns. The results reached here are of relevance for future investigations in the syntax of coordinations and the scope of disjunctions.


Relativization in English is today commonly analysed in terms of a dichotomy of a wh-strategy and a non-wh-strategy, said to be applied in different dialects or levels of usage. The present paper approaches the question from a dialectological angle, concentrating on the non-wh-relativizers ‘that’, ‘at’, ‘as’, and ‘what’, which are today mostly classed as conjunctions (complementizers) but have in fact genitive forms which are used in some, but not all, varieties of English. Examining the origins of these relatively recent forms in the dialects where they are used, and testing the interpretation of the forms by speakers of varieties where they are not used, the paper argues that the non-wh relatives are treated and interpreted as pronouns like ‘who’ and ‘which’, rather than as conjunctions (complementizers), in both types of dialects. In this way the would-be contrast between two different modes of
relativization is fundamentally an inflectional difference in the grammar of the different types of pronouns even though it is accompanied by some syntactic differences as well.


In this paper I reconsider two types of ellipsis in coordinate structures that were most recently discussed in Buering & Hartmann 1998, "Asymmetrische Koordination" (Linguistische Berichte 174). The subject gap construction as in 'In Italien schaetzt man/i Rotwein und e/i hasst die Franzosen' is analyzed as having the same basic configuration in both German and Dutch: the first conjunct is a CP in German (IP in English), and the second always an IP with a subject gap at the left periphery. The object gap construction also requires the object gap to left-peripheral: Die Freunde/i trifft Peter im Restaurant und e/i sieht er spaeter im Konzert. This type in English can occur with an additional subject gap: His friends/i Peter/j is meeting in the restaurant and e/i e/j will be seeing later at the concert. The gaps are recovered by Feature Matching, shown to be a requirement in all coordinate structures and particularly crucial to those with ellipsis. Gaps are realized by Non-Spell-Out, with consequent non-realization in PF. The derivational steps required assure that Feature Matching occurs on the basis of head features and language-specific configurations, not on the basis of structural symmetry, i.e. "peripherality" is a result of properties non-specific to coordination. This analysis supports the assumption that subject-initial verb-second clauses in German are IPs, and that coordinate symmetry can be defined in terms of features only; structural symmetry is not a requirement. Rather, coordinate structures are structurally asymmetric like simplex sentences.


In this paper we examine the topicalization paradigm for ten different verbal constructions in German. We argue that a uniform explanation for the observed behaviors follows from the interpretation of the relevant expressions as (parts of) lexical representations. To this end we motivate a revision of Functional Uncertainty as proposed in Kaplan and Zaenen 1989 to account for filler/gap relations in long-distance dependencies. We assume with the original formulation of this principle that topicalized elements share values with the (grammatical) function status of an entity an indeterminate distance away. We appeal to the inventory of functions posited within LEXICAL-FUNCTIONAL GRAMMAR (LFG), inclusive of the frequently neglected PREDICATE function, which, we argue, is associated with both simple and complex predicates. In
addition we show that topicalization, given this function-based proposal, should not be limited to maximal categories. We argue that the need to posit a PREDICATE function for German topicalization is supported by an independent line of research within LFG concerning the analysis of complex predicates. For this purpose we employ the proposals of T. Mohanan (1990/1994), which argue for the independence of the construct PREDICATE from its categorial realization. We show that this type of proposal extends to provide a uniform account of the German topicalization paradigm. This permits us to explain the similarities and differences in the behaviors of various sorts of predicators as well as certain idiomatic expressions interpreted as complex predicates.


The object of this paper, double or multiple negation with NC-reading, belongs to the linguistic phenomena which have gained increasing interest in recent years. In section 2, I develop a DRT-based theory of NC-constructions in a single language (Bavarian) which assigns double negation a well defined function on the syntax-semantics interface: double negation is a grammatical means to harmonize competing scope effects of negation and quantification. This theory permits the formulation of several hypotheses, for example, specifying contexts in which double negation with NC is excluded. In section 3, these hypotheses are formulated and empirically proved. In Section 4, I offer some speculations about why standard languages like German could survive without DN, but some not (e.g., Italian).


This paper addresses two related problems. The major empirical problem concerns the difference between two pronominal forms found in German: personal pronouns and so-called d-pronouns, which are also used as relative pronouns. The major theoretical question concerns the nature of relative pronouns in general. I will argue that d-pronouns are definite determiners, i.e., full Determiner Phrases (DPs) containing an empty NP, whereas personal pronouns are merely the spell out of phi-features (AgrD) not containing an NP-projection. This will allow us to account for the distributional differences between the two forms. In addition, I will argue for a restriction on operator-variable chains that will derive the fact that only d-words but not personal pronouns can be used as relative pronouns in a language that makes use of the A’-movement strategy for relativization. It will also follow that relativization without A’-movement is possible with either a
personal pronouns or a gap occupying the relativized position.


Modern Icelandic and fifteenth century English are both usually thought of as VO languages. Yet, the literature on Icelandic contains descriptions of four different syntactic patterns in which OV can be found, and recent empirical work on fifteenth century English texts shows that this language allows OV order in exactly the same patterns. This paper addresses the causes of this hitherto unnoticed word order parallel, suggesting that the facts can be understood if they are viewed from a diachronic generative perspective. It is concluded from this case-study that the generative view of language is entirely compatible with the traditional view that the forms and constructions in a language are a product of its history.

Wurmbrand, Susi. 1999. The Structure(s) of Particle Verbs. Ms., University of Vienna.

Among the numerous analyses of particle verb combinations (PVCs) two sets of approaches can be differentiated—a complex head approach vs. a small clause approach. This paper tries to shed light on this long-standing debate. We show that both structures exist (modulo certain qualifications) and that the choice between the two structures is predictable from the semantics of PVCs. The central claim is that PVCs fall into two classes semantically: transparent PVCs (i.e., the meaning of a PVC is determined by the meaning of its parts) vs. idiomatic PVCs (the meaning is not determined compositionally). We argue that this interpretive difference is reflected in the structure of PVCs since transparent and idiomatic particles are subject to different licensing conditions. In particular, transparent particles are licensed in a predicate/argument relation, which is prototypically represented by a small clause structure, whereas idiomatic particles are licensed in a local relation with the verb which is syntactically represented by a complex V' structure. The arguments for a predicate/argument relation (transparent PVCs) vs. a local relation (idiomatic PVCs) come from predication contexts, topicalization, verb second, and verb raising. Finally, we show that different licensing conditions also account for the well-known puzzle that (idiomatic) particles can only occur in topicalized position when the main verb occurs in C.
