

How to get an object-*es* into the German prefield*

Werner Frey, ZAS Berlin

1. Introduction

For a long time, it was a standard assumption that in German, the neuter personal pronoun *es* ('it') can only be moved to the prefield¹ if it has the function of a subject; if it is an object, the prefield was assumed to be disallowed for *es* (e.g., Travis 1984, 1992, Lenerz 1993, Cardinaletti & Starke 1996). A pair like the following was supposed to demonstrate this fundamental difference:

- (1) a. *Es hat das Heu gefressen.*
it has the hay eaten (it = the horse)
b. **Es hat das Pferd gefressen.*
it has the horse eaten (it = the hay)

This observation had far reaching consequences for the structure linguists proposed for German. It was one of the main points which led Travis (1984, 1992) (and similarly, e.g., Zwart 1997) to argue for the so-called asymmetric analysis of German verb-second clauses (V2-clauses). According to this theory, IPs represent V2-clauses which have the subject as the first element, whereas CPs represent V2-clauses which have a non-subject as the first element. Thus, in this theory the sentences in (1) would get the structures in (2):

- (2) a. [_{IP} *Es hat*₁ [_{VP} *das Heu gefressen* t₁]]
b. [_{CP} *Es*₂ *hat*₁ [_{IP} *das Pferd* t₁' [_{VP} t₂ *gefressen* t₁]]]

Travis (1984, 119) states that unstressed pronouns may not topicalize, i.e., they may not be \bar{A} -moved to SpecCP but can only be A-moved to SpecIP. Since it is usually assumed that a weak pronoun like *es* cannot be stressed, the data in (1) seem to follow.

However, there are examples which show that an object-*es* can in fact appear in the prefield:

- (3) a. (*Ihr Geld ist ja nicht weg, meine Damen und Herren.*)
(‘Your money is not gone, ladies and gentlemen.’)
Es haben jetzt nur andere. Lenerz (1994)
it have now just others (it = the money)
‘It is just in the possession of others now.’
b. (*Hans hat im Supermarkt eine Flasche Grappa gestohlen.*)
(‘Hans stole a bottle of grappa in the supermarket.’)
Es hatte keiner gesehen. Grewendorf (2002)
it had nobody seen (it = the stealing-event)
c. (*Wie ist denn das Kind zu dem Buch gekommen?*)
(‘How did the child get the book?’)
Es hat ihm jemand geschenkt. Gärtner & Steinbach (2003)
it has it.DAT someone given as a present (it = the book)

* Many thanks go to Josef Bayer, Hans-Martin Gärtner, Andreas Haida, André Meinunger and to an anonymous reviewer. Obviously, I remain responsible for all errors.

¹ The term ‘prefield’ refers to the position in front of the finite verb in a German verb-second clause.

- d. (*Dieses Schild können Sie genauso weglassen.*)
(‘You can just as well leave this sign out.’)
Es hat ohnehin keiner beachtet. Haider (2005)
it has anyway nobody observed (it = the sign)
- e. (*Gestern bin ich erstmals ohnmächtig geworden.*)
(‘Yesterday I became unconscious for the first time.’)
Es hat zum Glück niemand mitgekriegt. Meinunger (to appear)
it has luckily nobody noticed (it = the event of becoming unconscious)

What is the difference between (1b) and the sentences in (3)? It is Meinunger (to appear) who makes the following important observation. Sentences like (1b), which disallow the object-*es* in the prefield, and sentences like the ones in (3), which allow it, differ in the referential status of their subjects appearing in the middle field.² (1b) has a referential subject, whereas the sentences in (3) have non-referential subjects. Furthermore, Meinunger (to appear) points out that these different subject types are likely to occupy different positions in the middle field.

Meinunger’s (to appear) observation can be made a bit more precise. Consider the examples in (4):

- (4) *Wo ist das Lehrbuch “Syntax”? Ich kann es nicht finden.*
‘Where is the textbook “Syntax”? I can’t find it.’
- a. *Es hat leider jemand der Maria ausgeliehen.*
it has unfortunately someone the.DAT Maria loaned
‘Unfortunately, someone loaned it to Maria.’
- b. **Es hat Otto leider jemandem ausgeliehen.*
it has Otto unfortunately someone.DAT loaned
‘Unfortunately, Otto loaned it to someone.’
- c. ?*Es hat leider Otto jemandem ausgeliehen.*
- d. (?)*Es hat leider der Maria jemand ausgeliehen.*
- e. *Es hat der Maria leider jemand ausgeliehen.*

The example in (4a) is similar to the ones in (3). It also contains a non-referential subject. However, the examples in (4b,c) show that in fact it is not the referential status of the subject that really matters, but the position of the subject. The subjects in (4b,c) are identical, but their positions differ. In the bad example (4b), the subject appears to the left of a sentence adverbial, while in the much better example (4c) it appears to the right. Furthermore, it is interesting to see that the position of a further object in the middle field has no influence on whether an object-*es* may or may not appear in the prefield. (4d,e) are both fine. Thus, it seems that it is just the middle field position of the subject that determines whether an object-*es* in the prefield is possible or not.³

The present paper tries to explain Meinunger’s observation and the data in (4). To do so, the different ingredients of the explanation have to be established. First, Section 2 discusses the difference between positioning an element to the left or to the right of a sentence adverbial. Then, in Section 3 different options for getting an element into the prefield will be studied. Section 4 argues that in the German middle field there exist three different regions which

² With regard to a V2-clause, the term ‘middle field’ refers to the region between the finite verb and possibly occurring non-finite verbal elements; with regard to a complementizer-introduced verb-final clause, it refers to the region between the complementizer and the verbal element(s).

³ As indicated, (4c) and (4d) are not perfect. I assume that the deviance of these sentences has nothing to do with the positioning of the object-*es* in the prefield. The degraded status of (4c) is due to the fact that a referential subject is the preferred topic of a clause, i.e., it should occur in the topic domain, which is to the left of a sentence adverbial, cf. Section 2. The degraded status of (4d) I relate to the fact that given the context in (4), scrambling of the dative object to a position below the topic domain is not really motivated.

could be connected to different subject positions. In Section 5, claims about the possibilities of the placement of personal pronouns⁴ in the middle field are put forward. Section 6 combines these ingredients to deduce an explanation for the data in (4) as well as for further examples.

2. 'Middle field topics'

Many linguists subscribe to the so-called 'aboutness concept' of topics. A well-known advocate of this concept is Reinhart (1981):

- (5) A topic is an expression whose referent the sentence is about. The concept 'topic' is a category of pragmatic aboutness.

In this paper, the aboutness concept will be assumed too. What is the position of an aboutness topic in a regular German clause? Many syntacticians working on topics in German assume that a sentence internal topic has to be moved to the prefield (e.g., Vallduví and Engdahl 1996, Reis 1999):

- (6) *Peter reist heute nach Italien.*
Peter goes today to Italy

It is very natural to construe *Peter* as the aboutness topic of the clause.

However, Frey (2004), for instance, argues that topics do not have to be placed in the prefield. In that paper, the following thesis is argued for (see Fanselow this vol. for a critical discussion):

- (7) In the middle field of the German clause, directly above the base position of sentence adverbials (SADVs), there is a designated position for topics (in the aboutness sense): all topical phrases occurring in the middle field, and only these, occur in this position.

The term 'SADV' refers to adverbials which express the speaker's estimation of the eventuality, e.g., *zum Glück* ('luckily'), *anscheinend* ('apparently'), or *wahrscheinlich* ('probably'). (7) refers to SADVs in their neutral use, in which they modify the whole proposition. In this use, the base position of SADVs is higher than the base position of any other element in the German clause (cf., e.g., Frey 2003). SADVs may also have a focus inducing use, in which the SADV relates to one narrowly focussed constituent, the rest of the clause being presupposed. In the following, the focus inducing use of SADVs is not relevant and should be disregarded.

Two kinds of evidence for (7) are given below (for further evidence, see Frey 2004):

The context forces aboutness

- (8) *Ich erzähle dir etwas über Hans.*
I tell you something about Hans
a. *Bald wird den Hans zum Glück eine vornehme Dame heiraten.*
soon will the.ACC Hans luckily a fine lady marry
'Luckily, a fine lady will soon marry Hans!'
b. *#Bald wird zum Glück den Hans eine vornehme Dame heiraten.*

⁴ In the following the term 'pronoun' will always be used as an abbreviation for 'personal pronoun'.

Topic marking particles

- (9) a. **[Die Polizei jedenfalls] kommt.*
the police at any rate is coming
b. *weil [dem Hans jedenfalls] zum Glück jeder gratuliert hat*
since the.DAT Hans at any rate luckily everyone congratulated has
'Since luckily everyone congratulated Hans at least.'
c. **weil zum Glück [dem Hans jedenfalls] jeder gratuliert hat*

The context in (8) states that the next sentence will be about Hans. Thus, it requires that if *Hans* occurs in the following sentence, it has to be an aboutness topic. The sentences (8a,b) demonstrate that if the topical *Hans* occurs in the middle field, it has to precede a SADV. With regard to (9), note that in German there are particles which signal that the phrases they extend are topics.⁵ That *jedenfalls* ('at any rate') is one of these particles is shown by (9a): the subject of athetic sentence, i.e., a non-topic, cannot be modified by *jedenfalls*. (9b,c) show that, in the middle field, a DP which is extended by *jedenfalls* has to occur in front of a SADV.

Let us draw two consequences from (7). It can easily be shown that anaphoric phrases do not have to appear in the topic position, i.e., they need not be topical:

- (10) *Gestern hat Paul [eine nette Frau]₁ kennengelernt. Er wird hoffentlich*
yesterday has Paul a nice woman met He will hopefully
[die Dame]₁ wiedersehen.
the lady see again

Next, it follows that a clause may contain more than one topic. The reason is that in the middle field, more than one phrase may precede a SADV, cf. (11), and all these phrases are topical, cf. Frey (2004).⁶

- (11) *Heute wird Maria dem Hans wahrscheinlich helfen.*
today will Maria the.DAT Hans probably help

That (7) refers to a designated structural topic position and that the examples (8)-(9) do not just concern the linearization of a topic and a SADV is shown by examples like (12a,b):

- (12) a. *[In Peters₁ Firma]₂ hat Maria überraschenderweise t₂ diesen Kerl₁*
in Peter's company has Maria surprisingly this guy
bloßgestellt.
unmasked
'In Peter's company, Maria surprisingly unmasked this guy.'
b. **[In Peters₁ Firma]₂ hat Maria diesen Kerl₁ überraschenderweise t₂ t₁ bloßgestellt.*

In (12a), the definite description does not induce a Principle C-violation for the co-indexed *Peter*, while in (12b), it does. These data find a straightforward explanation once we take into

⁵ This test for the claim in (7) I owe to Marga Reis (p.c.).

⁶ For example, in the middle field inherently non-topical phrases like quantified phrases cannot appear to the left of a SADV:

- (i) a. **Während des Vortrags hat keiner glücklicherweise geschlafen*
during the lecture has no one fortunately slept
b. **Otto wird nur morgen leider arbeiten*
Otto will only tomorrow unfortunately work

account that in (12b) the definite description has been moved to the topic position. The sentences in (12) contain the locative adverbial *in Peters Firma*. This adverbial, be it treated as a frame adverbial or as an event-related adverbial, has its base position (indicated by t_2 in (12)) below the base position of the SADV and above the base position of the object (cf., e.g., Frey 2003). For the checking of binding principle C, the phrase containing the R-expression is reconstructed to its base position if it has been moved. The bindee is reconstructed to the highest A-position it has occupied during the derivation (cf. Frey 1993). In (12a), the definite description does not c-command the base position of the adverbial in the prefield, and, therefore, no Principle C-violation arises for *Peter*. However, due to the movement of the definite description *diesen Kerl* to the topic position in (12b), the definite description c-commands the base position of the adverbial and a Principle C-violation arises for the phrase *Peter*.

Thus, the data in (12) not only show that topic marking of a phrase happens by means of moving that phrase to a certain position, they also give the first evidence that this movement is an instance of A-movement, since it is A-movement which extends the binding options of the moved phrase. Another piece of evidence that the movement to the topic position is A-movement is given by the fact that it is clause bound:

- (13)* *Seit kurzem glaubt dem Paul₁ anscheinend jeder,* [CP *dass man t₁*
since recently believes the.DAT Paul apparently everyone that they
den Preis zuerkennen wird].
the prize award will
'Recently, apparently everybody believes they'll award the price to Paul.'

(13) shows that it is not possible to move the topic of an embedded clause to the designated topic position in the middle field of a higher clause. Thus, the data in (12) and (13) constitute strong evidence that in German, topic preposing is an instance of A-movement.

The conclusion that A-movement of a phrase can be triggered by the need to license that phrase's pragmatic status of being a topic is also arrived at by Holmberg and Nikanne (2002) with regard to Finnish. Holmberg and Nikanne (2002) propose that the head of the position to which in Finnish a topic is A-moved is associated with the agreement features of the subject (Φ -features), but that these features do not define this head. On the one hand, this assumption makes it plausible that the topic position is an A-position and that a referential subject can be regarded as a kind of default topic; on the other hand, this assumption allows other categories to be moved into the topic position, i.e., to be topics. In the following, I will adopt for the structural implementation of (7) the assumptions made by Holmberg and Nikanne (2002). I will call the projection in the middle field which hosts topics TopP.

3. Movement to the prefield

Sentences like the following differ in markedness:

- (14) a. *Karl hat das Paket weggebracht.*
Karl has the package taken away
b. *Das Paket hat Karl weggebracht.*
the package has Karl taken away

With a transitive verb the subject in the prefield yields an unmarked sentence, cf. (14a), while the object in the prefield yields a marked structure, cf. (14b). Travis (1984, 1992) takes these observations as further evidence for the asymmetrical analysis of German V2-clauses: a clause with a subject in the prefield is an IP, whereas a clause with another constituent in its prefield is a CP, cf. (2). However, this proposal cannot be the solution to account for the dif-

ference in (14). Certain adverbials in the prefield also give rise to unmarked structures; furthermore, the objects of certain verbs are the unmarked elements in the prefield:

- (15) a. *Leider hat keiner dem alten Mann geholfen.*
unfortunately has nobody the.DAT old man helped
b. *In Europa spielen Jungen gerne Fußball.*
in Europe play boys willingly football
'In Europe, boys like to play football.'
c. *Dem Karl hat das Spiel gut gefallen.*
the.DAT Karl has the match well pleased
'Karl liked the match very much.'

The sentences (15a,b) contain in their prefields a sentence adverbial and a frame adverbial, respectively. In (15c), the prefield is occupied by the oblique object of a psych verb. Note the contrast to the marked sentences in (16), which have an event-related locative adverbial and an instrumental adverbial, respectively, in their prefields:

- (16) a. *Im Görlitzer Park hat Eva den Grill aufgebaut.*
in (the) Görlitz park has Eva the barbecue set up
b. *Mit dem Hammer hat Otto das Fenster eingeschlagen.*
with the hammer has Otto the window smashed

What is the difference between the unmarked examples in (14a) and (15) on the one hand and the marked examples in (14b) and (16) on the other? The answer becomes clear if we consider the base positions the prefield constituents have in the middle field. The base positions of the prefield elements in (14a) and (15) constitute the highest positions in the middle fields of the respective sentences. For (14a) and (15c), this has been shown by Lernerz (1977), and for (15a,b) by Frey and Pittner (1998), among others. Therefore, if we transform the sentences in (14a) and (15) into sentences which have all their sentence constituents in the middle field but in the same order as (14a) and (15), we get unmarked sentences. The following sentences illustrate this for (15a,c). (17a,b) are as neutral as (15a,c) are:

- (17) a. *weil leider keiner dem alten Mann geholfen hat*
since unfortunately nobody the.DAT old man helped has
b. *weil dem Karl das Spiel gut gefallen hat*
since the.DAT Karl the match well pleased has

By contrast, the base positions of the prefield elements of (14b) and (16) do not constitute the highest element in the middle field. It is uncontroversial that the base position of the object in (14b) is below the base position of the subject. Furthermore, in, for example, Frey and Pittner (1998) it is argued that the base positions of event-related locative adverbials and instrumental adverbials are between the base positions of the subject and the object of a transitive verb. Thus, the base positions of the prefield elements of (16) do not constitute the highest elements in the middle fields. This explains why the following sentences, for instance, which have their phrases in the same order as the sentences in (16a,b) but all occurring in the middle field, are marked:

- (18) a. *weil im Görlitzer Park₁ Eva t₁ den Grill aufgebaut hat*
b. *weil mit dem Hammer₁ Otto t₁ das Fenster eingeschlagen hat*

These observations indicate that there exists a mechanism to fill the prefield with the highest constituent of the middle field of the same clause, which preserves the semantic/pragmatic properties of the constituent without endowing it with additional ones. Thus, this mechanism does not seem to be related to any contentful property but seems to be a purely formal one.

Therefore, Frey (2006) follows Fanselow (2002) in adopting for German a proposal originally made by Bhatt (1999) for Kashmiri. A rough characterization can be given as follows:

- (19) [_{CP} XP [_C V_{fin} [_{IP} ...]]] can be derived from [_{IP} XP ... V_{fin}] (by moving the finite verb to C and) by moving XP as the highest element of IP to SpecCP (Attract Closest) just in order to fulfil the EPP requirement associated with C, i.e., without any additional intonational, semantic or pragmatic effects.

In the following, I will call the operation described in (19) ‘F(ormal) M(ovement)’. Note that FM can only move the highest element of the middle field to the local prefield. Since German allows long movement to the prefield, it is clear that there must exist at least one other kind of movement to the prefield besides FM. Such movement will be called ‘true \bar{A} -movement to the prefield’.

FM can be applied to a scrambled phrase if the scrambled phrase occupies the highest position in the middle field. A constituent scrambled to this position induces pragmatic markedness. If such a phrase is moved to the prefield by FM, the markedness status of the construction will be preserved. Thus, (20c) (= (16b)), for example, can be derived from (20a) by scrambling the instrumental to the highest position of the middle field followed by application of FM:

- (20) a. *(dass) Otto mit dem Hammer das Fenster eingeschlagen hat* Scrambling →
 b. *(dass) mit dem Hammer₁ Otto t₁ das Fenster eingeschlagen hat* FM →
 c. *Mit dem Hammer₁ hat t₁ Otto t₁ das Fenster eingeschlagen.*

(20c) is marked because (20b) is marked. In contrast, a sentence like (21b) (= (15b)), for example, can be obtained by FM without first scrambling the constituent to be moved by FM to the highest position, because the base position of the frame adverbial constitutes the highest middle field position of the sentence:

- (21) a. *(dass) in Europa Jungen gerne Fußball spielen* FM →
 b. *In Europa₁ spielen t₁ Jungen gerne Fußball.*

(21b) is unmarked because (21a) is unmarked.

(19) also provides an explanation for (22). In (22b), the sentence adverbial is in the prefield of the clause it belongs to. The sentence is fine; however, in (22a) the sentence adverbial in the prefield of the matrix clause cannot be understood as belonging to the embedded clause:

- (22) a. **Leider₁ sagte Karl, dass t₁ keiner dem alten Mann geholfen hat.*
 unfortunately says Karl that nobody the.DAT old man helped has
 b. *Leider₁ hat t₁ keiner dem alten Mann geholfen.*

A sentence adverbial cannot be topical, focal, emphasized, backgrounded, nor can it acquire any other pragmatic or semantic property. Since true \bar{A} -movement is supposed to always have semantic or pragmatic effects (cf., e.g., Rizzi 2004), these elements cannot undergo true \bar{A} -movement. Therefore, (22a) is ungrammatical. The assumption that elements can be moved

by FM to the local prefield without any semantic or pragmatic effect makes the grammaticality of (22b) plausible.

Which options exist to fill the prefield and which effects does true \bar{A} -movement to the German prefield have? Frey (2006) argues for the following generalization:

- (23) The German prefield can be filled either
- (i) by means of FM, which may move whatever is the highest XP-constituent in the middle field – be it base-generated there or scrambled to this position – to the local prefield, and which has no intonational, semantic or pragmatic effect; or
 - (ii) by means of true \bar{A} -movement to the prefield, which may move (cyclically) any constituent in the middle field, and which always has the effect of inducing stress on the moved item and its contrastive interpretation; or
 - (iii) by base generation of certain adverbials, which are licensed by C.

For evidence for the claims (23)(ii) and (iii), the reader is referred to Frey (2006). For our present purposes it is enough to consider one piece of evidence for the claim embodied in (23) that in fact there exist only the three listed options to fill the prefield.⁷ In German, there are elements which cannot be scrambled:

- (24) a. **dass Maria grün₁ die Tür t₁ streichen wird*
that Maria green the door paint will
'that Maria will paint the door green'
- b. **Julia ist Präsidentin endlich geworden.*
Julia has president finally become
'Julia has finally become president.'

Thus, these elements cannot get to the highest position in the middle field. It follows that the sentences in (25) cannot be derived by FM.

- (25) a. *Grün wird Maria die Tür streichen.*
b. *Präsidentin ist Julia endlich geworden.*

The prefield constituents in (25) have to be stressed and interpreted contrastively. Given (23), this follows immediately: the only option to derive these sentences is by means of true \bar{A} -movement, which is associated with accent and a contrastive interpretation of the moved item.

True \bar{A} -movement can be to the local prefield, or it can be long distance; FM, by definition, can only be to the local prefield. For our topic, the following data are important:

⁷ There is one option to fill the prefield not mentioned in (23). This is the so-called genuine 'Vorfeld-es', as it appears in the following examples:

- (i) a. *Es wurde viel gearbeitet.*
it was a lot worked
'A lot of work was done.'
- b. *Es spielt für Sie Erwin Lehn und sein Tanzorchester.*
it plays for you Erwin Lehn and his dance orchestra
'And now, Erwin Lehn and his orchestra will play for you.'

An *es* like in (i) is not an argument or an adverbial of the clause. It cannot appear in the middle field; its only function seems to be to fulfil the EPP requirement associated with a German V2-clause. Therefore, according to the standard assumption, a genuine 'Vorfeld-es' is base-generated in the Vorfeld as a pure expletive.

The option to fill the prefield with a genuine 'Vorfeld-es' is not mentioned in (23) since, at the moment, I want to leave it open whether genuine 'Vorfeld-es' in fact only satisfies a formal EPP property or whether it has some semantic property after all. It seems to me worthwhile to pursue the assumption that the 'Vorfeld-es' in (i) denotes the eventuality described by these sentences.

- (26) a. **Es*₁ *glaube ich, dass das* *t*₁ *Heu gefressen hat.*
it think I that the hay eaten has
b. (*Gestern bin ich erstmals ohnmächtig geworden.*)
(‘Yesterday I became unconscious for the first time.’)
**Es*₁ *glaube ich, dass zum Glück niemand* *t*₁ *mitgekriegt hat.*
it think I that luckily nobody noticed has

(26a,b) show that *es*, be it a subject or an object, cannot undergo long movement to the prefield. This means that the inherently unstressed *es* cannot get into the prefield by true \bar{A} -movement. From this, we can conclude that the only way of getting *es* into the prefield is by FM. (See also Bayer this vol. for a discussion of data like (26).)

Therefore, as a first intermediate result we note that in all the grammatical sentences of (1), (3) and (4), *es* arrived at its position by FM. That is, at the point in the derivation of such a sentence right before FM applies, *es* must occupy the highest XP-position in the middle field.

4. Three regions in the middle field

Since Diesing (1992) at the latest, it has been a standard assumption that there exist at least two subject positions across languages. Sentences like the following constitute crucial evidence for this claim:

- (27) a. *dass Jungen ja doch die Romane von Karl May lesen werden*
that boys PRT PRT the novels of Karl May read will
b. *dass ja doch Jungen die Romane von Karl May lesen werden*

The bare plural subject in (27a), which appears to the left of the particles, only has a generic interpretation. The bare plural subject in (27b), which appears to the right of the particles, allows an existential interpretation. Diesing (1992) takes the particles as marking the vP-boundary. Therefore, she assumes that the subject in (27a) occupies SpecIP while the subject in (27b) stays in SpecvP.

Kiss (1996) questions the assumption that the lower subject position is SpecvP because in English the subject in a sentence corresponding to (27b) precedes the auxiliary. Furthermore, Kiss (1996) argues that the difference in interpretation that correlates with the different positions of the subject should be described in terms of specificity. Thus, according to Kiss, there are two subject positions outside of vP, i.e., outside of the theta-domain. The lower one is identified as SpecIP, and the higher one as the specifier of an additional projection dominating IP and dominated by CP. This projection is called Referential Phrase (RefP). Specific subjects move to SpecRefP, non-specific ones to SpecIP. With these assumptions and the assumption that sentence adverbials are adjoined to IP, Kiss accounts for the data in (28). (28a) is bad because its predicate does not allow a specific interpretation of its subject:

- (28) a. ?? *Boys luckily were born.*
b. *Luckily boys were born.*

Kiss takes SpecRefP to be the position that realizes the semantic function ‘subject-of-predication’. Although Kiss (1996) does not discuss the issue, it is plausible to assume that RefP does not belong to the C-domain but to what is standardly called the I-domain. Thus, the similarity between Kiss’ SpecRefP and the topic position argued for in (7) is obvious.

Taking a different starting point, Bobaljik and Jonas (1996) and Holmberg and Nikanne (2002) also argue for the existence of two subject positions outside of vP. For their argumen-

tation the Transitive Expletive Construction and the Multiple Subject Construction in Icelandic and Finnish are crucial:

- (29) a. *Það lesa margir stúdentar bækur Chomskys ekki.* (Icelandic)
 EXP read many students books Chomsky's not
 b. *Sitä ovat nämä lapset jo oppineet uimaan.* (Finnish)
 EXP have these children already learned to swim

Bobaljik and Jonas (1996) assume that in (29a), the expletive is in AgrS and *margir stúdentar* is in SpecTP. According to Holmberg and Nikanne (2002), in (29b) the expletive occupies the topic position which the authors assume for Finnish, encoding a so-called stage topic; *nämä lapset* has left the vP.⁸

Next, let us once more consider German data like the ones which motivated Diesing's assumptions:

- (30) a. *Weiterhin werden wahrscheinlich ja doch* [_{vP} *Jungen die Romane*
 furthermore will probably PRT PRT boys the novels
von Karl May lesen]. (subj. existential or generic)
 of Karl May read
 b. *Weiterhin werden wahrscheinlich* [_{TP} *Jungen₁ ja doch* [_{vP} *t₁ die Romane von Karl*
May lesen]]. (subj. generic)
 c. *Weiterhin werden* [_{TopP} *Jungen₁ wahrscheinlich* [_{TP} *ja doch* [_{vP} *t₁ die Romane*
von Karl May lesen]]]. (subj. generic and topical)

In (30a) the subject is in its base position, and it can get a weak reading. In contrast, the subjects in (30b) and in (30c) are in front of the particles. Thus, they have left the vP, i.e., the domain of existential closure. They are interpreted generically.⁹ But indefinites which are positioned higher than the vP are still crucially different. The indefinite in (30b) is scrambled to a position below the sentential adverbial. According to (7), this indefinite cannot be a topic. Only an indefinite occurring in front of the sentential adverb is a topic. This is confirmed by tests for topichood, for instance, by the test using the topic marking particle *jedenfalls*:

- (31) a. **Laut Maria spielen glücklicherweise* [*Fußballer jedenfalls*]
 according to Maria play fortunately footballer at any rate
auf Reisen Schach.
 on travels chess
 b. *Laut Maria spielen* [*Fußballer jedenfalls*] *glücklicherweise auf Reisen Schach.*

In (31), the topical bare plural cannot appear below the sentence adverbial, cf. (31a). Only when it is moved to the topic position as in (31b) does grammaticality result.

The data in (30) show that in the German middle field three regions should be differentiated. Furthermore, I assume that there exists a connection between the three different subject positions presumed to exist across languages by Kiss (1996), Bobaljik and Jonas (1996) or Holmberg and Nikanne (2002), among others, and the three different regions in the German middle field. That is, I will assume that each region identified in the German middle field is made available by a projection with a special relation to the subject. The lowest region is the

⁸ See Guasti and Rizzi (2002) for arguments based on language acquisition that AgrSP exists as an independent projection from TP.

⁹ Thus, whereas in English a bare plural which, according to Kiss (1996), has left the vP can get an existential reading, cf. (28b), I assume, like Diesing (1992), that in German this option exists only for a bare plural inside vP.

theta-domain, which, in the standard case, is identified with vP with the (non-ergative) subject sitting in SpecvP. That the highest region, the topic domain, is made available by a projection which has a special relation to the subject was already assumed above with reference to the proposals made by Holmberg and Nikanne (2002). Furthermore, I will assume that the medial region is made available by TP. Some authors (e.g., Bobaljik and Jonas 1996) propose that T carries the nominative case-feature (for a strong thesis about the relation between T and nominative case, see Pesetsky and Torrego 2001). However, as in the case of Top, which is assumed to be associated with the Φ -features of the subject without being defined by them, I assume that the nominative feature does not define the head T. Thus, other categories than the subject have the option of moving to the Spec-position(s) of TP.¹⁰

5. Options for positioning personal pronouns in the middle field

Cardinaletti and Starke (1996) put forward a very important and widely accepted proposal for the classification of pronouns:

- (32) According to Cardinaletti and Starke (1996), across languages pronouns can be classified
- into strong pronouns and deficient ones.
- The deficient pronouns can again be classified into
- weak pronouns and clitics.

The most important criteria this classification is based on are the following:

- (33) only strong pronouns can be coordinated, can be modified and can be stressed;
only deficient pronouns allow a non-human referent.

According to Cardinaletti and Starke (1996), the classes of pronouns also differ in their distributions. A strong pronoun may stay in its base position, while a deficient pronoun has to leave the θ -domain. A weak pronoun is an XP-element and appears in an XP-position; a clitic is an X^0 -element and therefore has to appear in an X^0 -position.

Let us consider German *es*. It can be shown that *es*, be it a subject or an object, is necessarily deficient, in contrast to the other personal pronouns (cf. Cardinaletti and Starke 1996). The masculine personal pronoun, for example, can be coordinated, modified or stressed, cf. (34); none of these options exists for the deficient pronoun *es*, cf. (35):¹¹

¹⁰ An interesting question to be investigated concerns the relationship between Grewendorf's (2005) 'lower topic-focus field', which in his framework is positioned between the Case position of the subject and the Case position of the object, and the region provided by the 'middle' subject projection TP assumed in the present paper.

¹¹ If, for instance, the masculine personal pronoun is used as a deficient pronoun, as, for example, in case its referent is non-human, it also cannot be coordinated, modified or stressed (cf. Cardinaletti and Starke 1996):

- (i) a. **Hans wird ihn und den Motorroller waschen.* (*ihn = den Wagen*)
Hans will him and the scooter wash (him = the car)
- b. **Allein er kam für Paul in Frage.* (*er = der neue VW Passat*)
only he was by Paul considered (he = the new VW Passat)
- c. **Ich habe IHN nicht gesehen, die Kuh schon.* (*ihn = den Esel*)
I have him not seen, the cow yet (him = the donkey)
'Him I didn't see, but I did see the cow.'

With regard to the examples in (26) above, it was observed that *es* cannot undergo true \bar{A} -movement. As to be expected, this is true for deficient pronouns in general:

- (ii) **Ihn₁ glaube ich, dass Hans bald t₁ waschen sollte.* (*ihn = den Wagen*)
him believe I that Hans soon wash should (him = the car)

- (34) a. *Heute wird Peter ihn und Maria treffen.*
today will Peter him and Maria meet
b. *Nur er hat das Problem wirklich verstanden.*
only he has the problem really comprehended
c. *Dort drüben stehen eine Frau und ein Junge. ER hat gerufen, nicht SIE.*
over there stand a lady and a boy he has called not she
- (35) a. *Wo ist das Lehrbuch "Syntax"?*
'Where is the textbook "Syntax"?'
**Gestern hat Maria es und das Semantikbuch ausgeliehen.*
yesterday has Maria it and the semantics book loaned
b. **Nur es hat das Problem wirklich verstanden.* (es = das Mädchen)
only it has the problem really comprehended (it = the girl.NEUTER)
c. **Dort drüben stehen ein Mädchen und ein Junge. ES hat gerufen, nicht ER.*
over there stand a girl.NEUTER and a boy it has called not he

Because *es*, as other German deficient pronouns, can be positioned in the prefield (as noted above, for Cardinaletti and Starke 1996 only deficient pronouns which are subjects can occupy the prefield), Cardinaletti and Starke assume that *es* and other German deficient pronouns always have the status of a weak pronoun.

I will adopt Cardinaletti and Starke's (1996) classification, especially their assumption that *es* is always deficient. However, their claim that *es* is always weak, i.e., that it is never a clitic, will be challenged.

I will argue for the claims in (36):

- (36) (i) A deficient pronoun has to leave vP. Its movement to TP or to TopP results in 'Tucking In' (cf. Richards 1997).
(ii) Between TopP and the C-domain, only clitics are possible.
(iii) Only XPs can occur in the prefield.

(36iii) will be assumed without discussion. The other two claims will be justified in the following.

In the examples in (37), the bare plural *Kollegen* has an existential interpretation. Thus, it has not left vP:

- (37) a. *Ich kam gut über die eisbedeckte Straße, weil glücklicherweise*
I came well across the iced street since fortunately
[_{vP} *Kollegen mir geholfen haben*].
colleagues me helped have
b. ?? *Ich habe mein Notizbuch wieder, weil glücklicherweise*
I have my notebook back since fortunately
[_{vP} *Kollegen es gefunden haben*].
colleagues it found have

(37) confirms what Cardinaletti and Starke (1996), among others, observe: a pronoun like *mir*, when strong, may remain inside vP, while the deficient *es* has to leave it. (38) makes the same point:

- (38) a. *Was₁ haben t₁ für Leute dir geholfen?*
what have for people you helped
'What sort of people have helped you?'

- b. ?* *Was₁ haben t₁ für Leute es gesehen?*
 what have for people it seen
 ‘What sort of people have seen it?’

It is often assumed that the so-called ‘was-für-split’ can only occur with a phrase which is in vP (cf., e.g., Meinunger 2001). Therefore, (38b) shows that *es* may not be inside vP.

(36i) claims that the movement of pronouns results in ‘Tucking In’. ‘Tucking In’ refers to the targets of movement in the theory of Richards (1997). Richards (1997) proposes a featural theory of movement according to which a head Z with a strong feature may have multiple Spec-positions. After a higher XP moves to SpecZP, a lower YP can move to the lower SpecZP as long as XP and YP are moving to check a strong feature in Z. Thus, in this theory multiple attraction by a single attractor is possible. Just in this case, it derives countercyclic movement. The following Bulgarian data constitute a very popular contrasting pair this theory accounts for:

- (39) a. *Koj kogo vižda?*
 who whom sees
 ‘Who sees whom?’
 b. **Kogo koj vižda?*

The leftmost wh-phrase in a Bulgarian question is the first to move. It has the higher base position of the two wh-phrases. The second wh-phrase has tucked in underneath the first phrase, forming the lower specifier. Richards argues that it is to be expected that the second instance of movement to a given attractor should tuck in if, in addition to the ‘attractor-oriented’ condition Attract Closest, movement also obeys the ‘mover-oriented’ economy condition Shortest Move. Shortest Move demands that the number of nodes crossed by the movement be as low as possible.¹²

Note that Richards (1997) gives evidence from different languages that Tucking In can be found with \bar{A} -movement and with A-movement.¹³

It is an interesting fact of wh-movement in Bulgarian that if three wh-phrases are fronted, the leftmost wh-phrase must correspond to the highest element prior to movement, while the order of the following wh-phrases is free; thus, the orders *wh₁ wh₂ wh₃* and *wh₁ wh₃ wh₂* are both good. This is explained by Richards’ (1997) ‘Principle of Minimal Compliance’: if the condition Attract Closest is satisfied once by the attraction of the highest element, it does not have to be satisfied any further. Thus, in the next step *wh₂* or *wh₃* can be attracted first.

What happens if the subject is not affected by wh-movement but lower constituents are? In Bulgarian, one gets a rigid ordering between a pair of non-subject wh-words:

- (40) a. *Kogo kakvo e pital Ivan?*
 whom what AUX asked Ivan
 ‘Whom did Ivan ask what?’
 b. ?**Kakvo kogo e pital Ivan?*

These facts follow given Richards’ (1997) assumptions for the attraction of wh-elements. In Section 6 we will consider related cases important for our concerns.

¹² A different theory to account for data like the Bulgarian examples in (39) is developed in Grewendorf (2001). This theory assumes the formation of a cluster in a low position which is afterwards moved further as a whole. For our purpose, as far as I can see, this would also be a possible way to go.

¹³ As evidence that instances of A-movement have the property of Tucking In, Richards (1997) refers, for example, to certain cases of local scrambling in Japanese and to object scrambling in Dutch and Icelandic.

The following examples demonstrate that the movement of a deficient pronoun to the TP-region has to tuck in:

- (41) a. *Ich habe mein Notizbuch wieder, weil glücklicherweise* [_{TP} *Maria es gefunden hat*].
I have my notebook back since fortunately Maria it found has
- b. **Ich habe mein Notizbuch wieder, weil glücklicherweise* [_{TP} *es Maria gefunden hat*].

In the indicated analysis of (41a), the subject has left vP and has moved to SpecTP; the following pronoun *es* has also left vP, the domain in which it cannot stay. (41b) shows that the object *es* has to tuck in below the subject. It cannot occur higher in the TP-domain.

We may note in passing that several of the examples considered so far show that – at least in German – pronouns do not have to be topical. This observation is in conflict with the claim found in the literature (cf., e.g., Erteschik-Shir 1997) that pronouns are inherently topical.

In the case of the TP-domain it is not enough that a deficient object-pronoun tucks in below a subject which occurs in this domain. As Lenerz (1993, 1994) observes, a deficient object-pronoun can only occur below a sentence adverbial if the subject does too:

- (42) **Ich habe mein Notizbuch wieder, weil Maria glücklicherweise es gefunden hat.*

Let us now continue to justify (36i). If we consider pronouns which are moved to the topic domain, we again find that they have to tuck in:

- (43) *Die Direktorin hat nach dem Syntax-Buch gefragt.*
the director has for the syntax book asked
- a. *Morgen wird Hans es der netten Dame sicherlich ausleihen.*
tomorrow will Hans it the.DAT nice lady certainly loan
- b. ?*Morgen wird Hans der netten Dame es sicherlich ausleihen.*
- c. ?*Morgen wird der netten Dame Hans es sicherlich ausleihen.*
- d. **Morgen wird der netten Dame es Hans sicherlich ausleihen.*

The important point is the difference between (43a,b,c) on the one hand and (43d) on the other. In (43a,b,c), the deficient pronoun has been tucked in below the subject. Although (43a) certainly sounds more natural than (43b,c), all three sentences are judged grammatical by my informants. (43d), however, is not grammatical. This demonstrates that inside the topic domain the deficient pronoun may not occur above the subject.

(43c) shows that the order of full DPs in the topic domain is not strict (cf. Frey 2004). (43c), though sounding a bit clumsy, is grammatical. Thus, we may assume either that full DPs do not tuck in or that they can be moved further inside the topic domain after having been tucked in.¹⁴

From the observations concerning (43), it follows that in (44), *es* must be outside of the domain made available by TopP. This is what will be argued for below: in (44), *es* is a clitic attached to the lexically realized head-position of the C-domain.

¹⁴ Corresponding facts hold in the TP-domain. In Richards' (1997) theory, one would assume that there exist further A-heads above Top and T, respectively, which can attract full DPs but not deficient pronouns. At the moment I have no specific suggestion to make on how to account for the permutations of full DPs inside the different domains. However, for our purposes this point is not crucial.

(44) *Morgen wird es Hans der netten Dame sicherlich ausleihen.*

We find the same pattern as in (43) if together with the subject and an object-*es* a low adverbial phrase is moved to the topic domain. Again *es* has to tuck in below the subject:

- (45) *Das Fenster ist verklemmt. Aber*
the window is stuck however
a. *bald wird Hans es mit Marias Hilfe sicherlich aufbekommen.*
soon will Hans it with Maria's help certainly get open
b. *?bald wird Hans mit Marias Hilfe es sicherlich aufbekommen.*
c. *?bald wird mit Marias Hilfe Hans es sicherlich aufbekommen.*
d. **bald wird mit Marias Hilfe es Hans sicherlich aufbekommen.*

(46) shows that it is not only the deficient *es* which has to tuck in, but any unstressed pronoun:

- (46) a. **Morgen wird der freundlichen Dame ihn Hans sicherlich vorstellen.*
tomorrow will the.DAT friendly lady him Hans certainly introduce
b. **Bald wird mit ihrem Porsche ihn Maria zum Glück abholen.*
soon will with her Porsche him Maria luckily pick up

Let us now move on to (36ii). As mentioned above, Cardinaletti and Starke (1996) assume that German does not have clitics at all. The same assumption is held by, among others, Lenerz (1993, 1994).¹⁵ However, consider the following examples:

- (47) a. *Vor kurzem hat der Peter sie ihm leider weggeschnappt.*
recently has the.NOM Peter her him.DAT unfortunately snatched away
b. *Vor kurzem hat der Peter ihm sie leider weggeschnappt.*
c. *Vor kurzem hat sie ihm der Peter leider weggeschnappt.*
d. **Vor kurzem hat ihm sie der Peter leider weggeschnappt.*

Let us consider (47a,b) first. The pronouns occur in different orders. It was mentioned above that Tucking In of more than two elements does not have to preserve the order of elements prior to movement. Thus, we expect that the accusative pronoun and the dative pronoun, when following the subject, may change their order. Now, compare (47c,d). Interestingly, when the pronouns precede the topical subject, only the order 'accusative – dative' is possible.

The difference between (47a,b) and (47c,d) constitutes a first piece of evidence that the status of pronouns preceding a topical lexical subject is different from the status of pronouns following a topical lexical subject. Across languages, it is a fact that clitics tend to build clusters, i.e., the privileged clitic position can contain a number of clitics, usually in a fixed order. Thus, the observed difference makes sense if we assume that the pronouns between the C-domain and the topical subject are clitics, i.e., they are X^0 -elements, whereas the pronouns following the subject are XPs.¹⁶

¹⁵ Another view is taken by Grohmann (2000,183), who assumes "that an overtly high pronoun can only be a clitic." Although there are important differences between Grohmann's approach and the present one, the cited assumption is, at least broadly, shared by the two approaches.

¹⁶ Inside the 'clitic field', the distribution of the reduced form of *es* is freer than that of the other pronouns:

- (i) a. *Vor kurzem hat 's ihr Hans zum Glück gegeben.*
recently has it her Hans luckily given
b. *Vor kurzem hat ihr's Hans zum Glück gegeben.*

It is plausible to assume that this freedom is due to the special phonological status of the reduced 's.

Consider now (48), which has the subject below the topic domain:

- (48) *Vor kurzem hat ihm sie leider jemand weggeschnappt.*
recently has him.DAT her unfortunately someone snatched away

Here, in contrast to (47d), the pronouns can occur in the order ‘dative – accusative’. This is to be expected. The pronouns can be analysed as occupying different Spec-positions of TopP.

Another piece of evidence for the clitic status of pronouns occurring right-adjacent to the lexically filled head position of the C-domain (‘C-position’) is given by the data in (49). Cardinaletti and Starke (1996) recall the fact that, in many languages (also in unrelated ones), an accusative 1st/2nd person clitic cannot cooccur with a dative 3rd person clitic. In German, this ban holds for pronouns appearing between the C-position and a topical lexical subject, cf. (49a). It does not hold if the pronouns occur further to the right, cf. (49b):

- (49) a. **Heute hat mich ihm Peter zum Glück vorgestellt.*
today has me.ACC him.DAT Peter luckily introduced
b. *Heute hat Peter mich ihm zum Glück vorgestellt.*

The fact that in front of the topical subject the order *ihm – mich* is not possible either follows from the observation we made with regard to the examples in (47).

Let us move to another difference between pronouns preceding and pronouns following a topical lexical subject. The following observation I owe to Josef Bayer (p.c.):

- (50) a. ??*weil sie, äh, ihm der Peter leider*
since her.ACC INTJ him.DAT the.NOM Peter unfortunately
weggeschnappt hat
snatched away has
b. *weil der Peter sie, äh, ihm leider weggeschnappt hat*

Although the difference in (50) is subtle, it is confirmed by informants: it is easier to interrupt with an interjection (like *äh*) (or a parenthesis, for that matter) a sequence of pronouns which follow the topical lexical subject than a sequence of pronouns which occur between the C-domain and the topical subject. This constitutes another indication that the higher pronouns build a clitic-cluster, which cannot be broken up.

A final piece of evidence that deficient pronouns right-adjacent to the C-domain are clitics builds on FM, one of the mechanisms to fill the prefield introduced in Section 3. The crucial observation is that C-adjacent pronouns do not block FM:

- (51) *Wo liegt Ihrer Meinung nach Köln?*
‘In your opinion, where is Cologne situated?’
a. *Köln liegt am Rhein.*
Cologne is situated on the Rhine
b. ??*Am Rhein liegt Köln.*
c. *Am Rhein liegt ’s/es.*
on the Rhine is situated it

(51a) is a natural way to answer the question. *Am Rhein* is in its base position. The subject has reached the prefield by means of FM. (51b) is awkward. The reason is that as the answering term to the wh-question, *am Rhein* cannot be scrambled (Lenerz 1977). Therefore, *am Rhein* cannot be moved to the prefield by FM but is \bar{A} -moved and gets a contrastive interpretation (cf. (23ii) in Section 3), which is not really appropriate in the given context, which is just in-

formation seeking. In the same context, however, (51c) is perfect. This means that the pronoun does not block FM. If we assume that the pronoun in (51c) is a clitic, this follows immediately. Clitics are X^0 -elements, which do not interfere with FM. FM attracts the closest XP.

A confirmation that high pronouns are clitics might be given by reduction phenomena. Bayer (1999) gives the following judgements:

- (52) a. *als 'm der Hans den neuen Chef vorgestellt hat*
 when him.DAT the.NOM Hans the.ACC new boss introduced has
 b. **als der Hans 'm den neuen Chef vorgestellt hat*
 c. **als der Hans den neuen Chef 'm vorgestellt hat*

In Standard German, there are very few reduced pronouns possible. A clear case is the reduced form of *es*. For the sentences in (53), most informants have the intuitions indicated (some informants, however, accept (53b)).¹⁷

- (53) a. *Heute hat 's Kurt gelesen.*
 today has it Kurt read
 b. **Heute hat Kurt 's gelesen.*

So far, it has been argued that deficient pronouns occurring between the C-domain and a topical lexical phrase are clitics.¹⁸ To conclude this section we should ask in passing whether strong pronouns may occur in this part of the clause. Consider the following sentences:

- (54) a. **Heute hat IHN der Kollege anscheinend getroffen.*
 today has him the colleague apparently met
 b. **Heute hat ihn und Maria der Kollege anscheinend getroffen.*

A strong pronoun can be stressed and it can be coordinated. Both possibilities do not exist for a pronoun occurring between the C-domain and a topical subject. We can conclude that this part of the clause is reserved exclusively for clitics. Weak and strong pronouns are not allowed there.¹⁹

¹⁷ If the sentences were transformed into my Swabian dialect, I would also have the judgements indicated in (53). With a reduced dative pronoun I have the corresponding judgements:

- (i) a. *Heut hat 'm dr Kurt zum Glück gholfe.* (Swabian)
 today has him.DAT the Kurt luckily helped
 b. **Heut hat dr Kurt 'm zum Glück gholfe.* (Swabian)

¹⁸ This paper remains neutral with regard to the question of whether there are other positions in the German middle field in which clitics occur, although I believe that the answer would be negative (cf., e.g., Uriagereka 1995 and Manzini and Savoia 2004 for claims that clitics occupy fixed positions).

¹⁹ Note that the following examples do not disprove this claim:

- (i) a. *weil IHN der Kollege anscheinend getroffen hat*
 since him the colleague apparently met has
 b. *weil IHN und MaRIa der Kollege anscheinend getroffen hat*
 since him and Maria the colleague apparently met has

In Frey (2006), it is argued extensively that true \bar{A} -movement, introduced above in (23ii), can target an \bar{A} -position right-adjacent to a complementizer. This position belongs to the C-domain, which according to Frey (2006) is (minimally) split in German. In (i), the phrases between the complementizer and the subject are \bar{A} -moved to this position. Note that, as expected, these phrases are stressed and contrastively interpreted.

Frey (2006) argues furthermore that in the C-domain of German, at most one Spec-position can be filled. Thus, in the examples in (54), the phrases between the finite verb and the subject cannot be moved by true \bar{A} -movement to the C-domain. Therefore, these sentences constitute the crucial examples to test whether strong pronouns may occur between the C-domain and a lexical topical subject.

6. How to get an object-*es* into the prefield

In this final section, let us now try to explain the data in (4), repeated here for convenience:

- (55) *Wo ist das Lehrbuch "Syntax"? Ich kann es nicht finden.*
'Where is the textbook "Syntax"? I can't find it.'
- Es₁ hat t₁ leider jemand der Maria ausgeliehen.*
'Unfortunately, someone loaned it to Maria.'
 - **Es₁ hat Otto t₁ leider jemandem ausgeliehen.*
'Unfortunately, Otto loaned it to someone.'
 - ?*Es₁ hat t₁ leider Otto jemandem ausgeliehen.*
 - (?)*Es₁ hat t₁ leider der Maria jemand ausgeliehen.*
 - Es₁ hat t₁ der Maria leider jemand ausgeliehen.*

Why is (55b) bad whereas the other examples in (55) are fine? In connection with the data in (26), it was observed that a weak pronoun like *es* can only get to the prefield by means of FM, and can never undergo true \bar{A} -movement. This follows from the facts that weak pronouns cannot be stressed, cf. (35c) and (ic) in fn. 11, and that, according to (23ii), true \bar{A} -movement is always associated with stress. Now, it can be shown that (55b) is the only example in (55) in which *es* cannot reach the prefield by FM.

Let us start with (55b). Recall that the attracting A-heads of the different regions in the middle field are all associated with features of the subject. Thus Top, which is relevant for the examples in (55), probes two different features. It probes the subject's Φ -features and it probes a topic feature. The topic feature, in contrast to the subject's Φ -features, has the EPP property, i.e., Top attracts a phrase by means of an EPP-feature if the phrase is a topic.²⁰ In the derivation, it is free which of the features of Top will be chosen first to be probed. If in (55b), Top first probes the subject's Φ -features, the topic feature of the subject will also be probed. Therefore, the subject will be the first to move to SpecTopP. If the topic feature is probed first, it is again the subject which will move first. It occupies the highest base position. It follows that the object-*es* necessarily has to tuck in below the subject. Thus, FM cannot attract *es*, the subject being closer. In order to get *es* into the prefield in (55b), true \bar{A} -movement would have to apply to *es*, which is not possible.

Let us now consider (55a,c,d). Nothing speaks against the analyses indicated in (55a,c,d). *Es* is the only element attracted by Top. Thus, *es* has occupied the XP-position closest to the prefield. It does not matter what goes on lower in the structure. In particular, it does not matter what kind of subject occurs in the lower structure: although (55c) has the same subject as (55b), the non-topical subject of (55c) does not interfere with the topical *es*.

Let's move to (55e). Why is the indicated analysis, which allows *es* to be moved by FM, possible? In this sentence, the subject, which occupies the highest base position, is not topical, but lower constituents are. It can be shown that in such a situation, the lower constituents after being moved to the topic domain do not have to appear in the same order as they appear in the base. This is different from the related case of the Bulgarian example in (40), in which the subject is not a wh-element, but lower phrases are, and in which the movement of the lower wh-elements has to respect their order in the base. The reason for this difference is that in (40), the attracting head in the C-domain probes only one feature, whereas Top in the German middle field probes two different features. Let us see why this is so.

Richards' (1997) condition Attract Closest has to be replaced by the condition Probe Closest since according to current theorising, not all feature-licensing involves movement. Now, Top can always successfully probe the subject because Top is associated with the sub-

²⁰ That the EPP is a property of a feature of a head – and not a property of the head itself – is also assumed by Pesetsky and Torrego (2001).

ject's Φ -features. Thus, if the subject's Φ -features are chosen first to be probed, the Probe Closest requirement for Top will be satisfied also in a case in which the subject is not a topic. It follows from the 'Principle of Minimal Compliance' that other sentential constituents can then be probed in any order.²¹ Therefore, in a sentence like (55e), where the subject is not a topic, it is possible to probe the topic feature of the accusative object before that of the dative object is probed. As a result, as indicated in (55e), *es* occupies the SpecTopP-position higher than the SpecTopP-position of the dative, although in the base there is the order 'subject – dative – accusative'.²²

Let us now investigate other examples with a weak pronoun in the prefield. Consider first the difference in (56):

- (56) *Das Pferd₁ hat eine Verletzung.*
 the horse has an injury
 a. **Ihm₁ wird Peter zum Glück helfen können.*
 him will Peter luckily help can
 b. *Ihm₁ kann zum Glück geholfen werden.*
 him can luckily helped be

The pronoun in (56a) cannot have a non-human referent. Thus, it is not weak. This is expected. The highest position in the middle field which *ihm* could have occupied is below the topical subject because it has to be tucked in below the subject. FM cannot catch it in this position. Therefore, in (56a) *ihm* has arrived at the prefield via true \bar{A} -movement, which can only be possible if *ihm* is conceived as a strong pronoun. In contrast, in (56b), *ihm* can have reached the prefield via FM, because there is no interfering element. Thus, it can be a weak pronoun and may have a non-human referent.²³

The following sentences contain an experiencer verb:

- (57) a. *Ihm hat das Galoppieren anscheinend gut gefallen.* (*ihm = dem Pferd*)
 him has the gallop apparently well pleased (him = the horse)
 b. *Es hat dem Pferd anscheinend gut gefallen.*
 it has the horse apparently well pleased

²¹ The assumption that if a head has more than one feature, the condition Probe Closest is satisfied for the head if Probe Closest is satisfied for one of its features is also held by Pesetsky and Torrego (2001).

²² In the following example, the lower arguments are probed in the other possible order, i.e., the dative object is probed before the accusative object. As a consequence, the weak pronoun *him* can get into the prefield by means of FM:

- (i) *Ihm hat das Heu zum Glück bereits jemand gegeben.* (*ihm = dem Pferd*)
 him has the hay luckily already someone given (him = the horse)

²³ Meinunger (to appear) observes that the following sentence with a deficient reflexive pronoun of an inherent reflexive verb in its prefield is marginally possible:

- (i) ? *sich darf nur anstellen, wer noch keine Karten hat*
 REFL may only line up, who yet no tickets has
 'Only those may line up who have no tickets yet.'

We may note the contrast to (ii):

- (ii) * *sich darf Hans jetzt endlich anstellen*
 REFL may Hans now finally line up

Given our assumptions we can explain (i) and (ii). In (i), the reflexive moves to the prefield via FM; no constituent is in its way. To account for (ii) we just have to observe that if in the middle field the lexical subject of an inherent reflexive verb is present, the reflexive either has to be a clitic as in (iiia), or it has to be c-commanded by the subject, cf. (iiib,c):

- (iii) a. *weil sich jetzt endlich Hans anstellen darf*
 b. * *weil jetzt endlich sich Hans anstellen darf*
 c. *weil jetzt endlich Hans sich anstellen darf*

Thus, there is no way in a sentence like (ii) for the reflexive to get to the prefield via FM.

In (57a) and (57b) the pronoun in the prefield is weak. In particular, (57a) is interesting: *ihm* must have moved to the prefield via FM. Why does the topical subject not block FM of *ihm*?

The crucial difference between a standard transitive topical subject like the one in (55b), which blocks FM of an object pronoun, and the one in (57a), which does not, consists in their base positions. Whereas a standard transitive subject is generated higher than any object, it can be shown that the subject of *gefallen* is generated below the dative object (cf., e.g., Haider 1993). Let us therefore see what happens if in (57), Top probes the arguments of *gefallen*. Top carries the subject's Φ -features and a topic feature associated with the EPP property. Probe Closest can be satisfied in two different ways. In one option, the subject's Φ -features are probed first. Probe Closest is satisfied by probing the subject although the subject is generated below the dative object. The subject is the closest phrase with structural case. Since the subject is topical, this procedure also has the effect that the subject will be moved to the highest Spec-position of TopP. This structure forms the basis of (57b). Alternatively, Top first probes its topic feature. Probe Closest will first probe the topical dative object, because it is higher than the subject. The dative will be moved and will occupy the highest SpecTopP-position. This structure, then, forms the basis of (57a).

Thus, the reason why both sentences in (57) are grammatical lies in the fact that the base order of the arguments of *gefallen* is 'dative – nominative'. The base order 'dative – nominative' is also induced if a ditransitive verb is passivized. Such a verb appears in (58):

- (58) a. *Ihm wurde das Heu zum Glück schon gegeben.* (*ihm = dem Pferd*)
 him.DAT was the hay luckily already given (him = the horse)
 b. *Es wurde dem Pferd zum Glück schon gegeben.*
 it was the horse luckily already given

We find the same pattern as in (57). A weak object pronoun can occupy the prefield despite the fact that the subject occurs in the topic domain, cf. (58a), and a weak subject pronoun can appear in the prefield while the object occurs in the topic domain, cf. (58b). The explanation for (58) is the same as for (57).²⁴

Consider now (59):

- (59) *(E)s hat 'r zum Glück gar net gmerkt.*
 it has he luckily not at all noticed

(59) is an example in the Swabian dialect which I consider grammatical. It is of interest because it contains an object-*es* in the prefield and a subject pronoun which occurs high in the structure. The subject pronoun does not block FM of *es* to the prefield. Given our assumptions, such behaviour should be possible. In (59), the subject pronoun is treated as a clitic, i.e.,

²⁴ Another example in which a weak object pronoun may occur higher than the subject in the topic domain is given in (ib):

- (i) *Der neue 'Harry Potter' ist in England erschienen.*
 the new 'Harry Potter' is in England appeared
 a. *Laut FAZ werden in Deutschland die Fans ihn zum Glück*
 according to FAZ will in Germany the fans him luckily
auch bald lesen können. (*ihn = der neue 'Harry Potter'*)
 also soon read can (him = the new 'Harry Potter')
 b. *Laut FAZ werden in Deutschland ihn die Fans zum Glück auch bald lesen können.*

In the natural reading of the sentences in (i), *in Deutschland* is a frame adverbial. A frame adverbial has its base position above the base position of a standard transitive subject (cf., e.g., Frey 2003). Thus, the explanation for (i) is straightforward. One option for Top is to first probe the topic feature. In this case, *in Deutschland* is the first phrase to be moved to the topic domain. The other phrases can be tucked in in different orders.

as an X⁰-element, which does not block FM.²⁵

In the middle field, subject pronouns can occur to the right of other pronouns in some special cases.

- (60) a. *Ich bin in Pauls Auto kurz ohnmächtig geworden.*
'I became briefly unconscious in Paul's car.'
Meinem Gefühl nach hat es zum Glück nur er bemerkt.
according to my feelings has it luckily only he noticed
- b. *weil 's ihm ER nicht geglaubt hat*
since it him he not believed has

In (60a), the subject pronoun is part of a quantificational expression occurring below the topic domain. In (60b), the stress indicates that *er* is treated as a strong pronoun, which may occur low in the structure.

In (61), a lexical phrase and a pronoun occur in front of a topical subject pronoun:

- (61) a. *da dem Kritiker sie anscheinend sehr gut gefallen hat*
since the.DAT critic she apparently very much pleased has
- b. *da ihm sie anscheinend sehr gut gefallen hat*
since him.DAT she apparently very much pleased has

These examples contain an experiencer verb. Thus, Top may first probe and attract the topical dative object. Then, the topical subject pronoun is probed and tucked in below the object (cf. (57a), (58a)). The next sentence, which is based on an example of Lenerz (1993), shows that in the topic domain a high adverbial may precede a subject pronoun:

- (62) *weil in der gegenwärtigen weltpolitischen Situation es offensichtlich*
since in the current worldpolitical situation it obviously
von außergewöhnlicher Bedeutung ist, dass ...
of extraordinary importance is that

In this case it is the topical frame adverbial which is first probed and attracted by Top (cf. fn. 24).

In standard cases, in the middle field a topical subject pronoun of a transitive verb has to precede other pronouns (e.g., Lenerz 1993), cf. (63a); a lexical phrase to the left of a topical subject pronoun is not possible either, cf. (63b):

- (63) a. **dass es sie_{NOM} wahrscheinlich verkaufen wird*
that it she probably sell will
- b. **dass das Auto sie wahrscheinlich verkaufen wird*
that the car she probably sell will

To account for sentences like (63), Hinterhölzl (2004) assumes that a 'high' subject pronoun in the middle field is realized as a clitic. As a nominative clitic it necessarily precedes other elements. However, this stipulation rules out examples like (61) and (62). Therefore, to ac-

²⁵ Gärtner & Steinbach (2003) give an example in the Hessian dialect similar to (59):

(i) *'s hab isch net gewusst.*
it have I not known

(i) can be analysed like (59) since, as far as I can see, *isch* can be treated as a clitic. It should be noted, however, that Gärtner and Steinbach (2003) presumably would not agree because they argue against any special 'clitic-syntax' for the analysis of German pronouns.

count for (63a) I will assume that in the middle field, a sequence of deficient pronouns is treated alike, i.e., all pronouns of the sequence are treated as clitics or all are treated as XP-elements. Under this assumption, (63a) cannot be derived, since in (63a), *es* would have to be a clitic and *sie* an XP-element. However, I have to leave for further research the question as to why it should be that a sequence of deficient pronouns has to be treated in a uniform manner. To account for (63b), I assume that it is not possible to scramble a topical lexical phrase in front of a topical subject pronoun. This would have to follow from a general theory about the pragmatic effects of scrambling, which has yet to be developed.²⁶

Let me finally come back to example (1b), repeated in (64):

(64) *Es hat das Pferd gefressen.*
it has the horse eaten

In Section 1, the sentence was judged ungrammatical because in Travis (1984, 1992) it was judged this way. Sometimes, however, authors are not so sure how to judge a sentence like (64). Grohmann (2000, 183), for example, rates an analogous example with a question mark.

From our perspective, the sentence is bad if *das Pferd* is taken to be a topic. This is certainly a very natural thing to do. However, given the sentence in isolation, one does not necessarily have to do this. According to our assumptions, the sentence will not be judged ungrammatical if *das Pferd* is not conceived as a sentence topic.

References

- Bayer, J. (1999). Comments on Cardinaletti and Starke “The typology of structural deficiency”. In: H. van Riemsdijk (ed.), *Clitics in the languages of Europe*, 235-241. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bayer, J. (this volume). A Note on targets of A'-movement in the Left Periphery.
- Bhatt, R. M. (1999). *Verb movement and the syntax of Kashmiri*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Bobaljik, J. and D. Jonas (1996). Subject positions and the roles of TP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27, 195-236.
- Cardinaletti, A. and M. Starke (1996). Deficient pronouns: a view from Germanic. A study in the unified description of Germanic and Romance. In: H. Thräinsson, S. Epstein and S. Peter (eds.), *Studies in comparative syntax II*, 21-65. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Diesing, M. (1992). *Indefinites*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Erteschik-Shir, N. (1997). *The dynamics of Focus Structure*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Fanselow, G. (2002). Quirky subjects and other specifiers. In: I. Kaufmann and B. Stiebels (eds.), *More than words*, 227-250. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Fanselow, G. (this volume). On pure syntax (uncontaminated by information structure).
- Frey, W. (1993). *Syntaktische Bedingungen für die semantische Interpretation*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag (studia grammatica 35).
- Frey, W. (2003). Syntactic conditions on adjunct classes. In: E. Lang, C. Maienborn and C. Fabricius-Hansen (eds), *Modifying adjuncts*, 163-209. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Frey, W. (2004). A medial topic position for German. *Linguistische Berichte* 198, 153-190.
- Frey, W. (2006). Contrast and movement to the German prefield. In: V. Molnár and S. Winkler (eds.), *The Architecture of Focus* (Studies in Generative Grammar 82). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Frey, W. and K. Pittner (1998). Zur Positionierung der Adverbiale im deutschen Mittelfeld. *Linguistische Berichte* 176, 489-534.
- Gärtner, H.-M. and M. Steinbach (2003). What do reduced pronominals reveal about the syntax of Dutch

²⁶ My suspicion is that scrambling of phrases is related to the (recursive) establishing of a hierarchy of points of view from which an eventuality is reported. It might be that scrambling a phrase in front of a topical subject pronoun results in a conflict because a topical subject pronoun inherently establishes the ‘highest’ point of view.

- and German? Part 2: Fronting. *Linguistische Berichte* 196, 459-490.
- Grewendorf, G. (2001). Multiple *wh*-fronting. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 31.1, 87-122.
- Grewendorf, G. (2002). *Minimalistische Syntax*. Tübingen: UTB.
- Grewendorf, G. (2005). The discourse configurability of scrambling. In: J. Sabel and M. Saito (eds.), *The free order phenomenon: Its syntactic sources and diversity*, 75-135. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Grohmann, K. (2000). Towards a syntactic understanding of prosodically reduced pronouns. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 26.3, 175-210.
- Guasti, M. T. and L. Rizzi (2002). Agreement and Tense as distinct syntactic positions: Evidence from acquisition. In: G. Cinque (ed.), *Functional structure in DP and IP* (The Cartography of syntactic structures; Vol. 1), 167-194. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Haider, H. (1993). *Deutsche Syntax – Generativ*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Haider, H. (2005). How to turn German into Icelandic – and derive the OV-VO contrasts. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 8, 1-53.
- Hinterhölzl, R. (2004). Scrambling, optionality and non-lexical triggers. In: A. Breitbarth and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Triggers*. (Studies in Generative Grammar 75), 173-203. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Holmberg, A. and U. Nikanne (2002). Expletives, subjects and topics in Finnish. In: P. Svenonius (ed.), *Subjects, expletives, and the EPP*, 71-105. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kiss, K. É. (1996). Two subject positions in English. *The Linguistic Review* 13, 119-142.
- Lenerz, J. (1977). *Zur Abfolge nominaler Satzglieder im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Narr (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 5).
- Lenerz, J. (1993). Zur Syntax und Semantik deutscher Personalpronomina. In: M. Reis (ed.), *Wortstellung und Informationsstruktur*, 117-154. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Lenerz, J. (1994). Pronomenprobleme. In: B. Haftka (ed.), *Was determiniert Wortstellungsvarianten?* 161-173. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Manzini, M. R. and L. M. Savoia (2004). Clitics: cooccurrence and mutual exclusion patterns. In: L. Rizzi (ed.): *The structure of CP and IP* (The Cartography of syntactic structures; Vol. 2), 211-250. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Meinunger, A. (2001). *Syntactic aspects of Topic and Comment*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Meinunger, A. (to appear). About object *es* in the German ‘Vorfeld’. *Linguistic Inquiry*.
- Pesetsky, D. and E. Torrego (2001). T-to-C movement: causes and consequences. In: M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: a life in language*, 355-426. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Reinhart, T. (1981). Pragmatics and linguistics: an analysis of sentence topics. *Philosophica* 27, 53-94.
- Reis, M. (1999). On sentence types in German: an enquiry into the relationship between Grammar and Pragmatics. *Interdisciplinary Journal for Germanic Linguistics and Semiotic Analysis*, 4.2, 195-236.
- Richards, N. (1997). What moves where in which language? Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Rizzi, L. (2004). On the form of chains: criterial positions and ECP effects. Ms., University of Siena.
- Travis, L. (1984). *Parameters and effects of word order variation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.
- Travis, L. (1992). Phrase structure & V2 phenomena. In: R. Freidin (ed.), *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*, 339-364. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Uriagereka, J. (1995). Aspects of the syntax of clitic Placement in Western Romance. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26, 79-123.
- Vallduví, E. & E. Engdahl (1996). The linguistic realization of information packaging. *Linguistics* 34, 459-519.
- Zwart, J.-W. (1997). *Morphosyntax of verb movement – a minimalist approach to the syntax of Dutch*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.