

On certain adverbials in the German 'Vorfeld' and 'Vor-vor-feld'

(in: S&P - Sprache und Pragmatik 52: 64-78)

1 Introduction

This article is concerned with constructions where the verb second (V2) rule meets difficulties whose root will be argued to lie in parsing strategies (as for the notion of 'parsing, see below¹). It will be shown in how much the 'pre-prefield' ('Vor-Vorfeld') position, which gives rise to a verb third (V3) construction, is / must be used to save grammaticality.

With new trends in Generative Grammar such as Bare Phrase Structure as integral part of the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1994, 1995), head movement as a syntactic device (especially deriving V2) has been object to heavy critique. One of the furthest reaching proposals is Chomsky's attempt from 2000 to eliminate head movement completely from (core) syntax and to place it into phonology. Zwart (2001) shows that – especially with V2 – things are not so simple and that genuine syntax must be involved despite the undeniable role of phonology to account for the phenomenon in its entire complexity. The introductory comments from section 1.1 below underline the interaction of syntax and phonology when it comes to verb movement. However, it appears that too much attention has been spent to the impact on V2

¹ The term 'parsing' here does not make reference to any particular articulated parsing theory, but it is used having in mind the seminal work by Fodor and his colleagues and fellows (i.e. Fodor et al. (1974), Fodor (1978), Frazier (1979)). The intuition behind the use of the notion is to allude to phenomena like garden path effects and related topics investigated within a/the 'derivational theory of complexity'. It seems to me that the observation discussed in this article is comparable to this sort of problem(s), where no sharp line can be drawn between true structural ungrammaticality on the one hand and parsing effects resulting from complexity and contextual expectations on the other.

with respect to phonology. The old T-model of Government & Binding Theory as well as the concept of spell-out and phases in the Minimalist Program consider syntax as ‘feeder’ of **two** interfaces: (i) phonology (A-P system, PF) **and** meaning/interpretation (C-I system, LF).

This article will demonstrate that there are also interpretational (i.e. C-I-related) restrictions on head movement. Thus, this paper tries to focus on the other side of grammar: interpretation, meaning, semantics; and is hence trying to balance out the interface restrictions on X^o-raising – illustrated with verb second (V2) in German (especially section 2).

1.1 Remarks on problems with the V2 slot for finite verbs

Arguable the V2 rule in German(ic) is not a blind, purely syntactic verb movement device which puts the finite verb form the sentence final base position into the predestined slot after some arbitrary constituent in the so-called ‘Vorfeld’ (prefield) in the matrix clause. There are interface restrictions at work that ban the relevant verb raising process to produce the canonical shape of a German(ic) main clause with the finite verb in the second position.

The most famous observation is with prefixed verbs like ‘uraufführen’ (to première, to perform first), ‘voranmelden’ (pre-schedule), and denominal conjoined forms like ‘kopfrechnen’ (do mental arithmetics), ‘bauchtanzen’ (to belly dance) and the like, see Höhle (1991), McIntyre (2002). These verbs are completely fine in sentence final position, especially if they occur in some infinite form (infinitive, participle) (1), (2). They are not allowed in the verb second position though: (3), (4) - where they are necessarily finite.

- (1) weil sie das Stück gar nicht uraufführen
because they the piece part not premier
‘because they don’t premier the piece at all’
- (2) Sie haben das Stück noch gar nicht uraufgeführt.
‘they haven’t premierd the piece yet’
- (3) *Sie uraufführen das Stück gar nicht.
- (4) *Sie führen das Stück gar nicht urauf.

The second, less wellknown observation is with complex quantificational expressions like

‘mehr als (more than)’, ‘so gut wie’ (as much as), ‘sowas von’ (so much (of)) where their presence in the German lower middle-field renders verb raising ungrammatical if the relevant expression is stranded, i.e. if it ends up in a rightperipheral position.

- (5) weil mich das sowas von nervt
because me that ,so-much of' nerves
‘because this is getting on my nerves so much...’
- (6) weil mich das sowas von genervt hat
- (7) Das hat mich sowas von genervt.
- (8) *Das nervt mich sowas von.

In Meinunger (2001, 2004) I try to give an account for the observations in terms of misalignments. Inspired by van Riemsdijk’s grafting approach (1998, 2000) it is argued that in the relevant examples there is a mismatch between morpho-phonological bracketing on the one hand and syntactico-sentential on the other. This as such is not yet a reason for ungrammaticality, but if a construction emerges where the wellformedness conditions for either one of the parsers is violated - the phonological one **or** the syntactic one – then the construction crashes and ungrammaticality arises.

1.2 The actual problem to be explored

In this article I would like to present another restriction on V2. As it will turn out: also in the case at hand it is a so-called interface factor which interacts with core-syntax and seems to be able and active to restrict movement operations that are not only generally available, but even canonically required in German(ic) syntax. This time the interface is not the PF-branch, but the syntactic out-put delivered by the computational system to the C-I-system - the interface with the semantic, logic, interpretational, and pragmatic side – thus the LF-branch.

Since Rizzi’s proposal about the fine structure of the left periphery in the late 90ies (Rizzi 1997) the former CP-layer has gained an enormous amount of interest. For linguists working on German, the CP-split was especially challenging insofar as under normal circumstances the German main clause tolerates only one single constituent in the so-called ‘Vorfeld’

(prefield). There are a few constructions, however, where more than just one XP seems to open a matrix clause. Some of the suspicious constructions are quoted in (9) and (10) from Müller (2003) via Reis (2002, 2003), but also the longer known constructions as in (11), which under a certain perspective could be argued to contain a fronted VP remnant².

- (9) Morelli in seiner Not wandte sich...
Morelli in all his worries addressed himself
- (10) Effenberg indessen beschuldigte...
Effenberg in-the-meantime accused
- (11) Einer Dame rote Rosen sollte jeder Gentleman mitbringen.
a lady red roses should every gentleman withbring
'Every true gentleman should give red roses to a lady.'

In these examples both preverbal XPs could in principal occupy the prefield each by itself, i.e. alone. The explanation of such cases is not straightforward. Fanselow (to appear and already 1993) goes as far as to propose a mixture of pragmatic and phonological constituency as decisive factor and argues for a single large pragmatic constituent in related constructions.

The next case might be a pseudo problem for some people, but it should be mentioned for completeness sake. Jacobs (1983), Büring and Hartmann (2001), and to some degree Reis (2002, 2003) again, consider constructions like (12) as instances of V3.

- (12) Nur / auch / sogar mit Eiern ist das Brot belegt.
Only / als/ even with eggs is the bread
'The sandwich is only / also / even / made with eggs.'

Such an analysis is forced by the assumption that focus sensitive particles can adjoin to verbal projections only. There are indeed arguments for such an approach (see the quoted references). And since [mit Eiern] is a PP, only CP is left as an appropriate adjunction site for expressions like 'nur', 'sogar', 'auch'. The resulting bracketing gives rise to a structure with two (relatively) independent constituents before the finite verb: the focus adverbial **and** the

² Müller also analyzes (9) and (10) as examples of VP-fronting with a verb gap (using HPSG), which equals VP remnant topicalization in a Chomskyan framework.

associate XP, hence V3. Under a standard view, however, the focus sensitive particle adjoins to the focal XP and forms a constituent together with it.

More famous V3 constructions, however, are left-dislocated constituents (or for some linguists also hanging topics (15)). Those have enjoyed a hot debate in recent years. Constructions like (13) and (14) are already found in Altmann (1981) and more recently discussed intensively in Frey (to appear) and Grohmann (2003).

- (13) Die Gruberova, die kommt doch noch mit 60 weit übers hohe C.
The Gruberova, she comes particle still with 60 far above high C
The Gruberova, she will be able to climb far above the high C even at the age of 60.
- (14) Seinen_i Doktorvater, den verehrt jeder Linguist_i.
His doctor-father the admires every linguist
His thesis supervisor – every linguist admires him.
- (15) Pavarotti, jeder kennt den / sein berühmtes hohes C.
Pavarotti, everybody knows the / his famous high C
'(As for) Pavarotti, everybody knows him / his famous high C'

Two characteristics are quoted to argue for the CP-internal status of the left dislocated XPs (illustrated in (13) and (14)). Altmann (1981) recurs to phonology and points out that in these constructions, there is no pause or phonotactic break between the dislocated phrase and the proform (the d-pronoun) immediately before the verb. Frey (to appear) considers binding facts as decisive arguments: operator binding is possible in (14), whereas it is impossible with hanging topics:

- (16) *Sein(en)_i Doktorvater, jeder Linguist_i verehrt ihn.
His(acc) doctor-father, every linguist admires him.
'His thesis supervisor – every linguist admires him.'

1.3. Very recent work to be considered

Two very recent contributions are of high relevance to the problem(s) discussed in the present article: d'Avis (2004) and Pittner (2004).

D'Avis's data consist mainly of so-called 'conditionals of irrelevance' (=ICs) ('Irrelevanzkonditionale') of the type illustrated in (17):

(17) Ob es regnet oder nicht, wir gehen spazieren.

Whether it rains or not – we go walk

'Whether it rains or not - we will go for a walk.'

D'Avis sketches a possible treatment of ICs, either as some sort of parenthetical expressions or as adjuncts to a CP containing a 'potential' illocution (assertion) giving rise to a complex 'realized illocution'. In the introduction (abstract) to his article, he also mentions speech act adverbial clauses, probably having in mind those construction which will play the main role in the present paper (see below). These adverbial clauses, however, cannot be treated completely on a par with his ICs for – as will be shown – the relevant expression can occupy the prefield without any problems, which is a crucial point in d'Avis' analysis.

Basing herself on the mentioned references, especially Altmann, Frey, and also d'Avis, Pittner (2004) considers another special type of V3 constructions and comes up with a proposal that gets close in spirit to what I will suggest for yet different V3 constructions. Pittner's object of investigation is free relatives.

(18) Wer so laut singen kann, (der) muss in Wagneroperen auftreten.

who so loud sing can, (the-nom) must in Wagner operas appear

'Who may sing this loudly should performance in Wagner operas.'

(19) Wer so laut singen kann, */?? (den) sollte man für Wagneroperen engagieren.

*who so loud sing can, * (the-acc) should one for Wagner operas hire*

'People who can sing this loudly should be hired for Wagner operas.'

(18) vs. (19) illustrates the so-called matching effect: the d-pronoun can be dropped freely if it carries the same case as the w-constituent in the free relative (for the exact, and more complicated rules see Pittner (2004), Haider (1988) or Vogel (2003)). Pittner presents a corpus study that confirms the observation that the d-pronoun should not be left out if there is a case conflict. In other words: a V3 construction seems to be (almost) obligatory in case the

w-pronoun and the d-pronoun show different morphological case. Thus, left-dislocation seems to be the device to resolve the case conflict. Pittner draws the conclusion that

“...it is not implausible to assume that left dislocation is (being) used to circumvent case conflicts... In these cases there is no informational function to it (=left dislocation), but a rather purely morpho-syntactic one.”³

I will argue in the second part that this construction might indeed be used to facilitate interpretation. My conclusion, however, is not that V3 in these cases has a purely grammatical function (‘morphosyntax’), but that it is used to disambiguate readings and circumvent misinterpretation.

2. A reading for some adverbials in the left periphery

2.1. V3 vs. V2 – long and short speech act adverbials⁴

The observation can be laid down as follows. Some expressions, which semantically act as speech act adverbials (in Cinque’s terms, Cinque 2001) or discourse adverbs in Ernst’s terminology (Ernst 2002) or some sort of adverbials commenting on the mode of uttering (see the examples below), can occupy a position before the regular prefield (‘Vorfeld’).

³ The quote is a translation by me. The original German is: “Wegen dieser deutlich höheren Zahl von ‚Kasuskonflikten‘ ist... ist es nicht unplausibel anzunehmen, dass die Linksversetzungskonstruktion eingesetzt wird, um Kasuskonflikte bei freien Relativsätzen... zu vermeiden. Sie hat in diesen Fällen keine informationsstrukturelle Funktion, sondern eben eine viel eher rein morphosyntaktische.“

⁴ Although I will mention it explicitly in the plain text, I will assume that the finite verb occupies the same position in both constructions, i.e. V2 and V3. The latter is a result of adjunction of some specific constituent to a canonical verb second CP. Alternatively I consider the possibility that there may be a facultative functional layer above, whose head happens to / must be phonologically empty. Nothing hinges on that, however.

- (20) Ehrlich gesagt, ich bin von dir total enttäuscht.
Honestly said, I am of you totally disappointed.
 ‘To be honest/ honestly, I am completely disappointed with you.’
- (21) Ehrlich, ich bin von dir total enttäuscht.
- (22) Ganz offen gestanden, ich bin von dir total enttäuscht.
Wholly open confessed, I am from you totally dissappointed
 ‘Frankly, I am completely disappointed with you.’
- (23) Ganz offen, ich bin von dir total enttäuscht.

From these examples it is not obvious that the pre-comma string forms indeed an integral part of the sentence and should therefore be integrated into the core tree of the respective clause. However, a few arguments can be given. In a theory of adverbials like Cinque (1999), these elements are taken to pattern like other adverbials and occupy a specific (base) position in the tree of sentence – universally a very high position in the tree of a sentence. However, there is also strong evidence from German clause structure itself that these elements can occupy a sentence internal position. They are fine both in the ‘Vorfeld’ directly preceding the finite verb (24), but also in the upper ‘Mittelfeld’ (middle field)⁵ (25).

- (24) Ehrlich gesagt bin ich von dir total enttäuscht.
- (25) Ich bin ehrlich gesagt von dir total enttäuscht.

This should be a strong enough piece of evidence for the integration of this sort of adverbials into the sentence (CP) they modify. Hence, they are to be regarded as really belonging to the clause forming a unit at the sentence level. (26) – (31) bring some more frequently used examples.

- (26) Ganz nebenbei bemerkt, ich habe mir die Sache ganz anders vorgestellt.
Wholly nearby remarked, I have the story completely differently pictured
- (27) Ganz nebenbei, ich habe mir die Sache ganz anders vorgestellt.

⁵ To argue for a clause internal reading one has to make sure that the intonation is different from a parenthetical structure, which is also possible with this word order. (25), however is also fine without intonational setting off, i.e. (25) can be read / pronounced without pauses integrating *ehrlich gesagt* like any other adverbial forming an intonational phrase with following clause internal material. Compare this claim to d’Avis’ claim(s) and findings and the constructions he investigates.

- (28) Ganz nebenbei bemerkt habe ich mir die Sache ganz anders vorgestellt.
 ‘By the way, I’ve had a completely different idea about it.’
- (29) Im Vertrauen gesagt, ich hab die Schnauze voll.
In confidence said I have the mouth full.
- (30) Im Vertrauen, ich hab die Schnauze voll.
- (31) Im Vertrauen gesagt habe ich die Schnauze voll.
 ‘Confidentially, I’ve got enough!’

(32) gives a list of more very frequent adverbials that pattern exactly alike (some examples are inspired from Pittner (1999)). The examples are divided into three groups. Without any exception, all of these adverbials belong to a common class that different linguists call ‘discourse-oriented adverbials’, ‘speech act adverbials’ or ‘pragmatic adverbials’. However, nobody who has worked on this type of high adverbials gives a subclassification – as I have tried to do in (32). Nevertheless, experts like Frey and Pittner or Ernst (all in p.c.) agree that there are at least two subgroups: (i) adverbials that express the speaker’s attitude toward the content of his utterance and (ii) adverbials that merely convey the speaker’s consideration with respect to the linguist form of his utterance. (A potential term for them could be ‘metalinguistic adverbials’. Apart from these two, there might be a third subgroup, which is even less easy to grasp. All subtypes pattern together in the relevant respect.

- | | | |
|----------|---|-----------------------------|
| (32) (i) | | |
| | offen gestanden | frankly |
| | offen gesagt | |
| | (ganz) im Vertrauen gesagt | confidentially |
| | hinter vorgehaltener Hand gesagt | ??? confidentially |
| | zugegeben | admittedly |
| | ernst(haft) gesagt | seriously speaking |
| | ohne Scheiß gesagt | no kidding |
| | kurz gesagt | briefly, in brief, in short |
| | ohne zu übertreiben | without exaggerating |
| | ohne Übertreibung gesagt | without exaggerating |

wenn ich ehrlich bin / sein soll	honestly
<u>mit Verlaub gesagt / zu sagen</u>	<u>with all due respect</u>
(ii)	
überspitzt formuliert	with (a bit of) exaggeration
mit anderen Worten gesagt	to put it differently,
anders ausgedrückt / gesagt	to put it differently, in other words
<u>so gesagt / ausgedrückt</u>	<u>said this way</u>
(iii)	
nebenbei bemerkt / gesagt	as a marginal remark, by the way
am Rande bemerkt	as a marginal remark, by the way
ohne Umschweife gesagt	to say it straight to the point

All these expressions come in a certain pattern: there is something – mostly some adverbial like phrase - and then a verbal form - mostly a participle of a *verbum dicendi*, i.e. of a verb of communication, a verb of saying - always **boldfaced** in the examples. However, as illustrated in (21), (23), (27) and (30), it is also possible to drop the performative verb. Thus, one can obtain the same effect if one leaves out the verbal part (= short form⁶). Semantically the sentences either with the verbal element or with just the short form are equal. There is, however, no free choice between the forms. The crucial observation is laid down in what follows. (20)–(23) are V3 structures, in classical terms: the adverbials seem to be CP-adjoined. If the short form is placed within the regular pre-field giving rise to V2, the sentences are bad (33)–(35); whereas the long form is a good occupant of the ‘Vorfeld’, see (24), (28), (31).

(33) *Ehrlich bin ich total enttäuscht von dir.

(34) *Nebenbei habe ich mir die Sache anders vorgestellt.

(35) *Im Vertrauen hab ich die Schnauze voll.

The question is: why is V2 blocked in these cases? It cannot be that the XPs in Spec,CP were no legitimate occupants of the ‘Vorfeld’. Under other conditions strings like *im Vertrauen* or *ehrlich* are fine in sentence initial position.

⁶ Often the short form sounds better if the adverbial element *ganz* (completely, wholly) precedes it. This is, however, just an improvement, it is not obligatory.

(36) Im Vertrauen liegt die Stärke der Gläubigen.

In trust lies the strength the-genitive believers

‘It’s in trusting where the believers’ strength is to be found.’

(37) Ehrlich kann man sich in solchen Situationen gar nicht verhalten.

Honestly can one oneself in such situations particle not behave

‘It’s just impossible that one behaves HONESTLY under those circumstances.’

The following data seem to suggest an explanation for the observed pattern. In some V2 cases dropping of the verbal part does not necessarily lead to ungrammaticality as in the above examples (33)–(35). Consider the following data in (38) to (41). The reading, however, is such that the speech act oriented interpretation is impossible.

(38) Am Rande bemerkt, steht da auch eine Telefonzelle (für den Fall...)

‘By the way, there’s a phone booth, ... just in case...’

(39) Am Rande steht da auch eine Telefonzelle.

‘On the edge of it, there’s also a phone booth.’ (local reading)

/##‘By the way...’ (speech act reading)

(40) Nebenbei bemerkt, ist so ein Job gar nicht zu schaffen.

‘By the way, such a job is undoable.’

(41) Nebenbei ist so ein Job gar nicht zu schaffen.

‘In addition to what you are already doing, such a job could be too much.’

(manner reading)

/##‘By the way...’ (speech act reading)

(42) Offen gestanden, war der Tresor ein Kinderspiel für den Dieb.

‘Frankly (speaking), the safe was a child’s play for the thief.’

(43) Offen war der Tresor ein Kinderspiel für den Dieb.

‘Being open, the safe was a child’s play for the thief.’ (secondary predication on

the direct object,

i.e. modifying ‘der Tresor’)

/##‘Frankly,...’ (speech act reading)

Thus, if the adverbial form is not unambiguously specified for a speech act reading, this reading will not emerge and hence the construction is bad. In case a reasonable manner reading (or something similar) is possible, the sentence is grammatical, but only with that reading, the speech act reading or the ‘commenting the utterance’ Reading are excluded.

2.2. On inherent speech act adverbials

Second related observation: German has ‘bare’ adverbials that are inherently speech act oriented, i.e. they can never have a reading under which they could possibly modify or affect the interpretation of the proposition in any way. These obligatorily speech act referring elements are: *übrigens*, *erstens*, *zweitens* (by the way, first(ly), second(ly) – respectively –) and so on⁷ and marginally *ungelogen* (literally: ‘un-lied’, meaning truly). Being unable to get a proposition internal, i.e. low reading; these expressions can appear in the Vorfeld without triggering an unwanted interpretation or leading to ungrammaticality (44). Unsurprisingly these adverbials are also fine in the pre-prefield (V3) (45) or in the upper middle field (46). The meaning is always the same. The adverbials are bad, however, if they are put in a position close to the right sentence bracket (47).

(44) *Übrigens bin ich vorige Woche in München gewesen.*

By the way was I last week in Munich.

‘By the way, I was in Munich last week.’

(45) *Übrigens, ich bin vorige Woche in München gewesen.*

(46) *Ich bin übrigens vorige Woche in München gewesen.*

(47) **Ich bin vorige Woche in München übrigens gewesen.*

⁷ But interestingly not: *letztens* (‘finally, as the last’), which has a non speech act reading, meaning ‘recently’, ‘some time ago’. This lexical feature seems to block the use of *letztens* as speech act adverbial.

2.3. On certain adverbials in the upper middle field

There is a third observation: however, more research is required concerning the following findings. Frey and Pittner (1998) mention in a footnote that scrambling of some (short, adjective-like) manner adverbials is bad (48) vs. (49)⁸.

(48) Sie hat jedes Hemd sorgfältig gebügelt.

She has every shirt carefully ironed

‘She ironed every shirt carefully.’

(49) ^{??/}*Sie hat sorgfältig jedes Hemd gebügelt

Whatever the reason for this behavior is, the topmost position in the upper middle field seems to be forbidden for adverbials with a manner interpretation. Nevertheless one can find manner adverbials there. The interesting thing is that **here** we observe the opposite to what happens in the ‘Vorfeld’. The relevant sentences **are** grammatical, but the reading of the adverbials must be speech act oriented. In this position, a manner reading is impossible⁹.

(50) Ich bin (ganz) ehrlich von dir total enttäuscht.

‘Honestly, I am totally disappointed with you.’

(51) Ich bin (ganz) nebenbei erst seit gestern von dieser Sache überzeugt.

‘By the way, I’ve only been convinced of this since yesterday.’

(52) Ich habe (ganz) im Vertrauen erst gestern von dieser Sache erfahren.

‘Confidentially, I only learned about this yesterday.’

Thus, a sentence corresponding in word order to (48) is not necessarily ungrammatical, consider (53) and (54).

⁸ I judge the sentence in (49) not as bad as they do. Frey and Pittner assign a star for complete ungrammaticality. I think this is too strong and hence assign a double question mark.

⁹ This finding should be considered crucial for the discussion whether V2 is a blind role that puts the finite verb between the first constituent and the rest, or whether there is a decisive semantic and categorial difference between the ‘Vorfeld’ and the highest position in the middle field.

(53) Sie hat (ganz) ehrlich alle Fragen beantwortet.

‘Honestly, she answered all questions.’

(54) Sie hat (ganz) ernsthaft alle Aufgaben gemacht.

‘Really/Seriously, she did all tasks.’

However, (*ganz*) *ehrlich* in (53) cannot get a reading where the answering is done in a honest way, i.e. without cheating; but – as the translation suggests - the only interpretation possible is that the speaker of (53) wants to convey explicitly that the statement is taken to be true. The same for (54): *ernsthaft* cannot mean that she worked on every task with seriousness.

The picture that emerges can be summarized in a table (55).

(55)

	‘Vor-vor-Feld’ (V3)	Canonical ‘Vorfeld’ (V2)	Upper middle-field position (TopP)
Complex, i.e. unambiguous speech act adverbial	ok	ok	ok
Bare adverbial, i.e. short form	ok	* / other reading	ok
Bare, but inherently speech act related adverbial (e.g. <i>übrigens</i>)	ok	ok	ok
Adverbial with a reading that is not speech act related, (mostly manner)	*	ok	*

The interpretation of table (55) suggests very much that the speech act reading must be made explicit. This can be done in two ways: (i) either a long form is used, which by its very meaning must be interpreted as speech related (upper line). In this case the verbal part that the expressions contains spells out the performative character of the utterance. The other option

(ii) is to put the adverbial in an unambiguous position. Two constructions are unambiguous: verb third (V3) with the adverbial in the leftmost position; or with the adverbial in a TopP-like position in the upper middle field) (first and third column). If the (bare) adverbial is put into the regular first position in a V2 clause, the parser wants to assign a sentence internal reading (mostly manner, but also local etc.). If such a reading is available, the sentence is grammatical, but there is no way to get a speech act reading. If no such reading can be triggered, the interpretative parser crashes. Thus:

we have a parsing related restriction for verb second.

This time not from the PF-path, but from the C-I-side.

3 Conclusion

The conclusion that can be drawn from this is that verb second remains a challenging phenomenon. The Minimalist position, i.e. to just declare it a phonological process outside syntax, does not do justice to its complexity. The interpretative impact is as well undeniable. For a complete and deep understanding of the phenomenon, all major grammatical aspects in the broader sense seem to interact: not only phonology, but also semantics, pragmatics, parsing, mental language processing and so forth.

References

- Altmann, Hans (1981) *Formen der Herausstellung im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Büring, Daniel & Katharina, Hartmann (2001) 'The Syntax and Semantics of Focus-Sensitive Particles in German.' *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19, 229-281.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1999) *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam A. (1994) Bare Phrase Structure. *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 5.
- Chomsky, Noam A. (1995) *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam A. (2000) Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In Roger, M. ; D. Michaels and J. Uriagareka (eds) *Step by step: papers in minimalist syntax in honour of Howard Lasnik*. 89-155, Cambridge, Mass, MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam A. (2001) 'Derivation by Phase' In: M. Kenstowicz and K. Hale, *A Life in Language*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass, pp. 1-52.
- d'Avis, Franz Josef (2004) 'In front of the prefield – inside or outside the clause?' In: H. Lohenstein & S. Trissler (eds) *The Syntax and Semantics of the Left Periphery*. Interface explorations, Mouton de Gruyter – Berlin New York, 139-177.
- Ernst, Thomas (2002) *The Syntax of Adjuncts*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fanselow, Gisbert (1993) *The return of the base generators*. In *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 36: 1-74.
- Fanselow, Gisbert (to appear) Surprising specifiers and cyclic spell-out. In *Proceedings of Generative Linguistics in Poland* 5. Warszawa.
- Fodor, Jerry A. & Bever, T and M. Garrett (1974) *The psychology of language: an introduction to psycholinguistics and generative grammar*. New York. McGraw-Hill.
- Fodor, Janet D. (1978) 'Parsing strategies and constraints on transformations'. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 9, 427-473.
- Frazier, Lyn (1979) *On comprehending sentences: syntactic parsing strategies*. PhD thesis, University of Connecticut.
- Frey, Werner & Karin Pittner (1998) 'Zur Positionierung der Adverbiale im Deutschen Mittelfeld'. In *Linguistische Berichte* 176, Westdeutscher Verlag, pp. 489-534.

- Frey, Werner (forthcoming) Pragmatic properties of certain German and English left peripheral constructions. To appear in : *Linguistics*.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes (2003) *Prolific Domains: On the Anti-Locality of Movement Dependencies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haider, Hubert (1988) Zur Syntax der deutschen Nominalphrase. In *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 7: 32-59.
- Haider, Hubert (1997) 'Typological implications of a directionality constraint on projections', in Artemis Alexiadou and Tracy Hall (eds), *Studies on Universal Grammar and Typological Variation*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 17–33.
- Höhle, Tilman N. (1991) Projektionsstufen bei Verben. Ms, University of Tübingen.
- Jacobs, Joachim (1983) *Fokus und Skalen. Zur Syntax und Semantik der Gradpartikeln im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer (= *Linguistische Arbeiten* 138.)
- McIntyre, Andrew (2002) Verb-Second and Backformations and Scalar Prefix Verbs in German: The Interaction between Morphology, Syntax and Phonology. Univesity of Leipzig, Draft. Available in the internet under:
<http://www.uni-leipzig.de/~angling/mcintyre/mcintyre.v2.pdf>
- Meinunger, André (2001) 'Restrictions on Verb Raising', *Linguistic Inquiry* [Squib] 32.4, 732–740.
- Meinunger, André (2004) Interface Restrictions on Verb Second, In: Vogel, R. (ed.) *Linguistics in Potsdam (LiP) 22*, Three papers on German verb movement. 51-81.
- Müller, Stefan (2003) Mehrfache Vorfeldbesetzung. *Deutsche Sprache* 31(1): 29-62. to be published again in a newer version in *Linguistische Berichte*.
- Pittner, Karin (1999) *Adverbiale im Deutschen. Untersuchungen zu ihrer Stellung und Interpretation*, (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 60), Tübingen, Stauffenberg.
- Pittner, Karin (2004) 'Grammatisch motivierte Linksversetzung am Beispiel freier Relativsätze'. Hand-out and talk deliverd at the ZAS institute, Berlin.
- Reis, Marga (2002) 'V3 in Modern German? On certain aspects of the anslysis of certain language-specific particle structures'. Talk & Handout (Berlin Humboldt-University). From workshop: Language specific discourse linking – 1.
- Reis, Marga (2003) 'Wie fängt der deutsche Satz an? Anmerkung zu syntaktischer Fehlbarkeit'. Talk & Handout (Berlin Humboldt-University)

- van Riemsdijk, Henk (1998) 'Trees and Scions – Science and Trees: Fest-Web-Page for Noam Chomsky' (32 pp.) URL:
<http://mitpress.mit.edu/chomskydisc/riemsdyk.html>.
- van Riemsdijk, Henk (2000) 'A far from simple matter: Syntactic reflexes of syntax-pragmatics misalignments'. In: R. M. Harnish and I. Kenesei (eds.), *Semantics, Pragmatics and Discourse. Perspectives and Connections. A Festschrift for Ferenc Kiefer*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997) 'The fine structure of the left periphery'. In L. Haegemann (ed.), *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 281–337.
- Vogel, Ralf (2003) 'Surface Matters. Case Conflict in Free Relative Constructions and Case Theory'. In E. Brandner, H. Zinsmeister (eds): *New Perspectives on Case Theory*. CSLI publications. 269-299.
- Zwart, Jan Wouter (2001) Syntactic and phonological verb movement. In: *Syntax* 4.1, 34-62.