Syntax

What do Reduced Pronominals Reveal about the Syntax of Dutch and German?

Part 1: Clause-Internal Positions

Hans-Martin Gärtner and Markus Steinbach

Abstract

We show that reduced personal argument pronouns in Dutch and German surface in a proper subset of the positions accessible to full argument DPs. Therefore, we argue for a unified syntactic analysis, which takes both types of DPs to be subject to the same phrase structural principles and the same positioning rules, namely, XP-scrambling and XP-‘topicalization’. Our argument here rests a.o.t. on the observation that the case against DP-permutability in Dutch has been overstated. As far as syntax proper goes, we suggest that a simple ‘filter’, banning the scrambling of deaccented DP-objects across the subject is responsible for restrictions on Dutch word order. Our theory has the virtue of providing a unified account for reduced and full DPs in both Dutch and German. We further argue that degrees of constituent permutability and frontability should be derived under a multifactorial account, drawing on independently motivated principles from the syntax-discourse interface and (morpho-)phonology as they interact with the system of pronouns. It follows that, as far as syntax goes, reduced pronouns in Dutch and German must not be treated as ‘special clitics’. Neither should they be analyzed as bare X°-categories. Thus, no syntactic argument for the existence or directional orientation of functional heads can be based on these elements. In developing our account, we draw heavily on colloquial variants of ‘Standard German’. Along the way we pay considerable attention to various methodological issues.
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1 Introduction

Ever since Chomsky (1981:52) postulated the phrase structure rules in (1) for English clauses, the question as to how OV- and V2-languages fit into the GB-picture has been intensively debated.

(1) a. $S' \rightarrow \text{COMP} \ S$
   b. $S \rightarrow \text{NP INF} \ \text{VP}$

Especially languages like Dutch and German, which instantiate both the OV- and the V2-property, have come into focus. Chomsky (1981) envisaged the optionality of subject NPs for Semitic languages (ibid.:27), (2a), and the absence of INF for Japanese (ibid.:128), (2b):

(2) a. $S \rightarrow (\text{NP}) \ \text{INFL} \ \text{VP}$
   b. $S' = S = V' \rightarrow \text{XP}^* \ V$  \[\text{XP} \in \{\text{NP, S'}\}\]

Against the theoretical background of (1) and (2), two major controversies over the syntax of Dutch and German have orbited around the issues in (3).

(3) a. Position of fronted constituents
   b. Existence and position of INFL

The existence of clause-initial complementizers necessitates at least one functional position at the left periphery of these languages. In accordance with the analysis of English, this position is usually identified with COMP. Given the availability of COMP at the left periphery, it is natural to try to analyze V2 as the positioning of an XP and a finite verb in a structured COMP-node. This is the well-known approach taken by den Besten (1983, 1989) and refined within the X-bar-theory of Chomsky (1986) by various people (cf. a.o. Grewendorf 1988), as illustrated in (4).

(4) a. $\text{CP} \rightarrow (\text{XP}) \ C'$
   b. $C' \rightarrow C^0 \ \text{IP}$

With respect to (3b), four prominent options arise: (i) INFL is absent, as in Japanese, accounted for by (2b), (ii) INFL is ‘conflated’ with COMP as argued for by Platzack (1983), (iii) INFL is to the right of VP, or (iv) INFL is to the left of VP, as in (1b) and (2a). While Haider (1993) pursues (i), a considerable number of generative linguists advocate option (iii) (see a.o. Platzack 1986 and Grewendorf 1988). It was Travis (1984) who developed line (iv) by postulating the phrase structure rules in (5) in addition to the ones in (4) for German.

(5) a. $\text{IP} \rightarrow \text{NP} \ I'$
   b. $I' \rightarrow I^0 \ \text{VP}$
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(4) and (5) form the basis of the so-called ‘asymmetry analysis’ (cf. Vikner & Schwartz 1996), according to which subject-initial V2-clauses are IPs and non-subject-initial V2-clauses CPs. This is exemplified in (6).1 2

   \[ Ralf\text{NOM} \text{drank} ] \text{beer\text{ACC}} \]
   ‘Ralf drank beer’


As pointed out by Schwartz & Vikner (1989) and Vikner & Schwartz (1996), this kind of analysis raises two important questions: (i) what are the grammatical differences between clause-initial subjects and nonsubjects and (ii) what could be independent evidence for the existence of clause-internal INFL, given that it doesn’t seem to be a landing site in complementizer-initial clauses, as shown in (7).

   ‘whether Ralf drank beer’


Interestingly, wrt both these issues, structures containing reduced pronominals have been appealed to as empirical support for the asymmetry analysis. Thus, Zwart (1991:80) notes that the subject-object asymmetry in (8) can elegantly be explained by assuming that “critics (or, more generally, unstressed elements) cannot move to [Spec,CP].” (8a’) and (8b’) show that phrase structural asymmetry. (Traces have been omitted).

(8) a. ‘K zag hem
   \[ F\text{SU} \text{saw him}\text{DO} \]
   ‘I saw him’


b.* ‘M zag ik
   \[ F\text{DO} \text{saw} F\text{SU} \]
   ‘Him I saw’

b’. \[ CP \{ [C' \{ [C° zag] ] [IP ik ] ] ] [G] \]

Likewise, split-INFL analyses paved the way for a more principled approach to the positioning of reduced pronominals in the Germanic OV-languages. The following quote from Zwart (1997:116), summing up work by a.o. Jaspers

---

1 Whether or not (6a) should involve an (empty) CP-shell varies on theory-internal grounds.
2 In this article we will use the following abbreviations for the languages we consider: [D] = Dutch, [F] = French, [G] = German, [WF] = West Flemish, [He] = Hessian, [Sa] = Suebian, and [Zh] = Zurich German. In the glosses of German, Hessian, Suebian, and Zurich German examples, we use the superscripts NOM, ACC and DAT for arguments bearing nominative, accusative, and dative case, respectively, while in the Dutch and West Flemish ones we use SU, DO and IO for arguments bearing the GFs subject, direct object and indirect object. We apologize for our fairly loose usage of GF terminology throughout.
(1989), Haegeman (1993), and Zwart (1991, 1992, 1993), sketches the basic idea behind this approach. “First, I will discuss the nature of the weak pronouns in Dutch and conclude that they are syntactic clitics [. . .]. Second, I will argue that the distribution of the clitics in Dutch and West Flemish shows that clitics must be associated with Agreement heads [. . .]. It then follows from the distribution of the clitics that there are functional heads to the left of the VP in Dutch and West Flemish.”

Simplifying somewhat, (9a), displaying a reduced pronoun in sentence-internal position, would receive the structural analysis in (9b).

(9) a. Gisteren heeft Jan 'm gezien
   ‘Yesterday Jan saw him’
   
   b. [CP Gisteren [C° heeft] [IP Jan [I° 'm I°] [VP gezien ]]]

While the intuitive appeal of such an approach is obvious, working out the details has proven more difficult than expected. None of the proposals has remained unchallenged. Thus a.o. Schwartz & Vikner (1989), Vikner & Schwartz (1996), and Gärtner & Steinbach (1994, 1997) raise various technical and empirical objections. See also Zwart (1994) for a reply. We will deal with the ones concerning reduced pronominals in section 3 and Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear).

However, for the sake of clarification, we would like to abstract away from minute detail for a moment. It seems to us that one of the major controversies can be roughly characterized as follows. Current work in generative syntax is pursued under two opposite perspectives on phrase structure. Call them ‘special-purpose positioning’ (SPP) and ‘multi-purpose positioning’ (MPP) respectively.

(10) a. SPP: special-purpose positioning
    b. MPP: multi-purpose positioning

SPP assumes that grammatical properties project into syntax in isolation. Thus, for example, agreement-object features can project agreement-object phrases, topic features topic phrases, and distributivity features distributivity phrases (cf. for the latter Beghelli & Stowell 1997). In contrast to this, MPP assumes syntactic properties to either project collectively or to take syntactic categories to be distributional abstractions from grammatical features altogether. The latter point of view implies that structuralist conceptions of syntax continue to have at least some theoretical impact. Thus, the possibility of positional categories, formed at least partly on the basis of linear order, is not discarded. Since we do not want to elaborate on this here, we refer the reader to the discussion of elements occupying the COMP-position in German V-final clauses in Kathol (1997). See also Stechow & Sternefeld (1988).

There is an important distinction between SPP and MPP, formulated in (11).

(11) a. SPP is in need of ‘weakening’ principles
    b. MPP is in need of ‘strengthening’ principles
(11a) tends to be true because, to the extent that optionality isn’t built into the phrase-structure rules, SPP predicts word order to be fairly rigid. (11b), on the other hand, is a consequence of less fine-grained restrictions on word order inherent in the MPP view.3

In the light of these distinctions, the remainder of this article, as well as Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear), will be devoted to the following two things, namely, (i), we will criticize SPP approaches to the kind of data in (8) and (9), and (ii), we will instead be advocating a version of MPP with respect to the landing sites of reduced pronouns. This is based on the intuition that, when applied to the syntax of Dutch and German, our system of ‘MPP-plus-strengthening-principles’ yields greater insight into the grammatical phenomena discussed than ‘SPP-plus-weakening-principles’. We will ultimately draw the conclusion that reduced pronouns do not provide evidence for the existence of head-initial functional projections between COMP and VP in Dutch and German and that reduced pronouns do not provide distributional evidence for an ‘asymmetry analysis’ of verb second. More specifically, in section 2, we will discuss the pronominal systems of Dutch and (colloquial variants of) German. We then show that syntactic distribution doesn’t warrant any ‘special clitic’ status for reduced pronouns (section 3). Instead, an XP-scrambling approach is defended in the present article. Uniform XP-fronting to Spec,CP is then motivated in Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear), which also introduces additional (‘strengthening’) conditions on the fronting of reduced pronouns, responsible for microdistributional differences.

2 Dutch and German personal pronouns

When transposing to German arguments from Standard Dutch that are built on the pronoun facts in (8) and (9), one faces an immediate problem. There is no variant of ‘Standard German’ that contains a comparably large set of ‘weak’ personal pronouns showing similar behavior to the Dutch ones in (13). These ‘weak’ pronouns correspond to the ‘strong’ forms in (12).4

3 Of course, the two concepts should be taken to be idealized extreme ends of a scale, allowing for degrees, that is, mixed approaches. Obviously, skillful definition of features could translate an MPP-analysis into an SPP counterpart. Whether the reverse holds in any non-trivial sense is not so clear.

4 The slots indicated by colon are 1.SG through 3.PL and the ones indicated by comma encode masculine (M), feminine (F), and neuter (N) gender respectively, where required. For basically the same paradigm see Geerts et al. (eds.) (1984:163, 164, and 167) and Berendsen (1986:36). For just the object paradigm see also Everaert (1986:32). The form ‘r’ is often written as het. This may actually lead to spelling pronunciations, as noted by Berendsen (1986:97fn1). It is unclear to us whether this would justify the inclusion of het among the ‘strong’ forms. Wherever an apostrophe appears in writing, a schwa may be pronounced, depending on the phonotactic surrounding. The case of ‘r’ in German, pronounced [õ], is an exception. For the sake of brevity we leave out a number of alterna-
(12) **Dutch ‘strong’ personal pronouns** (Zwart 1997, p.117)

a. subject: \{ik ; jij ; hij, zij, -- ; wij ; jullie ; zij\}
   
   *I you he she we you they*

b. object: \{mij ; jou ; hem, haar, -- ; ons ; jullie ; hen\}
   
   *me you him her us you them*

(13) **Dutch ‘weak’ personal pronouns** (ibid.)

a. subject: \{'k ; je ; ie, ze, 't ; we ; -- ; ze\}

b. object: \{me ; je ; 'm, 'r, 't ; -- ; -- ; ze\}

In order to achieve comparability, one has to turn to regional variants of colloquial German. In this article we concentrate on south-western variants of German for the following reasons. First, we only have native speaker intuitions about the ones regionally related to Hessian and Suebian dialects. Secondly, the underlying south-western Rheno-Franconian and Alemannic dialects form an especially interesting group insofar as they consistently distinguish accusative and dative morphology in the pronominal system. As will be documented in detail in section 3, this property seems to result in an enhanced word order flexibility of the superimposed colloquial variants, which is only latently present in other varieties of German, ‘Standard German’ among them. In the following, we refer to our colloquials as ‘Hessian’ and ‘Suebian’. The Hessian system of personal pronouns is given in (14)-(16) below.

5 For the description of these colloquial variants, see Munske (1983). The ones we will be looking at are formally very close to the dialects discussed in more detail by Abraham & Wiegel (1993), Bayer (1984), and Cooper (1994). Those works also contain methodological remarks on the relevance of dialect research for generative grammar. See also the introduction to Abraham & Bayer (eds.) (1993), and, last but not least, Chomsky & Lasnik (1977) for an insightful discussion of similar issues.

6 See Howe (1996:271, 273), where the pertinent maps are provided.

7 Given that Hessian and Suebian in the sense just indicated overlap with Standard German to a very considerable degree, data from (Standard) German will be considered whenever finer distinctions do not yield deeper insights. Likewise, we (boldly) extrapolate our results to ‘German’, aware that a lot of further research will be necessary. Thus, our usage of the term ‘German’ might be considered controversial.

8 For the sake of brevity, we take the term ‘pronoun’ to henceforth stand for ‘personal pronoun’ unless indicated otherwise. We put \*es\* among the reduced pronouns as a variant of \*s\* since, being schwa-initial, it shows clear signs of reduction (cf. Hall 1998). See Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear) for discussion. In this area, the German writing system seems to have a certain influence on pronunciation. Thus, some speakers of German realize \*es\* with an /e/ instead of a schwa.

Where non-obvious, the pronunciation of reduced forms is as follows: the vowel of \*de\* and \*se\* should be rendered as schwa, while the one in \*der\* and \*mer\* approximates /ə/. \*m\* and \*n\* are schwa-initial in certain phonetic contexts, while \*r\* is realized by something close to just /ə/. We’ll deal with phonology in Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear). The one major divergence of Hessian from Standard German concerns 1.PL.NOM \*mir\*, which becomes \*mîr\*. The resulting syncretism with 1.SGDAT, preserved under reduction seems to have important syntactic consequences (see Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear)). Suebian, which we will consider alongside with Hessian, has \*i\*, \*mi\*, and \*di\* as 1.SGNOM, 1.SGACC, and 2.SGACC neutral pronouns, respectively. The corresponding reduced pronouns arise from replacing \*i\* by schwa. The Suebian 2.SGACC reduced pronoun is phonologically empty.

See for discussion. In this area, the German writing system seems to have a certain influence on pronunciation. Thus, some speakers of German realize \*es\* with an /e/ instead of a schwa.

Where non-obvious, the pronunciation of reduced forms is as follows: the vowel of \*de\* and \*se\* should be rendered as schwa, while the one in \*der\* and \*mer\* approximates /ə/*. \*m\* and \*n\* are schwa-initial in certain phonetic contexts, while \*r\* is realized by something close to just /ə/*. We’ll deal with phonology in Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear). The one major divergence of Hessian from Standard German concerns 1.PL.NOM \*mir\*, which becomes \*mîr\*. The resulting syncretism with 1.SGDAT, preserved under reduction seems to have important syntactic consequences (see Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear)). Suebian, which we will consider alongside with Hessian, has \*i\*, \*mi\*, and \*di\* as 1.SGNOM, 1.SGACC, and 2.SGACC neutral pronouns, respectively. The corresponding reduced pronouns arise from replacing \*i\* by schwa. The Suebian 2.SGACC reduced pronoun is phonologically empty. See
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Hessian prominent pronouns
a. NOM: {ISCH ; DU ; ER, SIE, -- ; MIR ; IHR ; SIE}
b. ACC: {MISCH ; DISCH ; IHN, SIE, -- ; UNS ; EUSCH ; SIE}
c. DAT: {MIR ; DIR ; IHM, IHR, IHM ; UNS ; EUSCH ; IHNE}

Hessian neutral pronouns
a. NOM: {isch ; du ; er, sie, -- ; mir ; ihr ; sie}
b. ACC: {misch ; disch ; ihn, sie, -- ; uns ; eusch ; sie}
c. DAT: {mir ; dir ; ihm, ihr, ihm ; uns ; eusch ; ihne}

Hessian reduced pronouns
a. NOM: {'sch ; de ; 'r, se, 's/es ; mer ; 'r ; se}
b. ACC: {m'sch ; d'sch ; 'n, se, 's/es ; -- ; -- ; se}
c. DAT: {mer ; der ; 'm, 'r, 'm; -- ; -- ; --}

The reason for making three distinctions in the Hessian paradigm has to do with a comparability issue once again. One of the crucial differences between ‘strong’ and ‘weak’ pronouns in Dutch is illustrated in (17) (Zwart 1997:119).

(17) a. Je leeft maar een keer [D]
   you live but one time
   (i) ‘You (= addressee) have but one life’
   (ii) ‘One has but one life’

b. Jij leeft maar een keer
   you live but one time
   (i) ‘You (= addressee) have but one life’
   (ii) * ‘One has but one life’

While the ‘weak’ pronoun in (17a) supports an additional idiomatic (generic) interpretation, (17b), containing the ‘strong’ counterpart of that pronoun, is unambiguous. The exactly corresponding distinction is made in Hessian in terms of stress, as shown in (18).

(18) a. Du lebst nur einmal [G]
   you live but one time
   b. DU lebst nur einmal

The segmentally complete unstressed pronoun in (18a), which we are going to call a neutral pronoun, gives rise to the readings of (17a), while its stressed counterpart, called a prominent pronoun henceforth, gives rise to just the one reading of (17b). Given that Hessian has a third layer of pronominal forms, formally close to the Dutch ‘weak’ forms, we propose the following system of personal pronouns for Hessian (and Suebian).

Cooper (1994:94f) for detailed discussion of this pro-drop-phenomenon in the related Zurich German dialect. Finally, the Suebian neutral 3.SG.F.DAT form is *dera, the reduced counterpart of which becomes ra.

9 Standard German possesses only a single reduced item, namely, es.
The reduced forms, as for example the one in (20), pattern with the neutral ones wrt the issue in (17) and (18) since they support both readings.

In order to systematize terminology, we will extend the schema in (19) to Dutch. Thus, the forms in (12) will be called neutral and the ones in (13) reduced. The term ‘reduced pronoun’ will henceforth be abbreviated as RP. Dutch prominent pronouns are derived from their neutral counterparts by phonological stress.

Now, having said all of this, we must come back to the syntactic issues sketched in section 1. More specifically, we have to ask why syntacticians should worry about RPs. This leads us to the extremely slippery area of ‘cliticization’. Recall that Zwart (1997:116) concluded from the ‘nature’ of Dutch RPs that they must be ‘syntactic clitics’. That conclusion actually rests on two quite heterogeneous pillars, the first of which we will have to spend some time on, in order to put the subsequent syntactic and phonological debate of section 3 and Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear) into proper perspective. Thus, the observation has repeatedly been made that Dutch RPs are not just “phonologically reduced

10 Geerts et al. (eds.) (1984) also use the term ‘reduced’ for the Dutch ‘weak’ forms in (13). Everaert (1986:32) calls the forms in (12) ‘stressed’ and the ones in (13) ‘unstressed’. Cardinaletti & Starke (1999:153, 163) offer empirical arguments from French against taking [– stress] as a defining property of ‘deficient’ pronouns. We take this as evidence that their theory cannot insightfully be applied to Germanic reduced pronouns. The crucial examples only illustrate the diverging phonological status of schwa in French, being part of the lexical representation of French reduced pronouns while it looks more like the output of phonological reduction in Germanic. Other phonological differences between French on the one hand and Dutch and German on the other concern the assignment of stress under focusing (Féry p.c.) correlated with the fact that Dutch and German as opposed to French are “stress-shift languages” (Ladd 1996).

11 Should a ‘strong’/‘weak’ distinction be desirable in describing facts like the ones in (17), we can project that distinction onto our system in the following way.

A similar difference between Dutch and German exists in the domain of reflexive pronouns (see Everaert 1986, Steinbach 1999, 2002). Starke (1996), Cardinaletti (1999), and Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) suggest a different tripartition of pronominal forms, based primarily on observations about Italian. It remains to be seen how to integrate their system with ours. One of their key diagnostics for ‘deficiency’, based on reference to animate objects has been shown to be problematic for German in Gärtner & Steinbach (1997). For reasons of space we skip the demonstration that Hessian and Dutch RPs behave exactly alike wrt to the ‘Kayne-tests’, as discussed in detail for example by Haegeman (1993).
forms of corresponding strong forms” (Berendsen 1986:19). Otherwise, the term ‘phonological clitic’ might be more appropriate, presupposing, of course, that the term ‘clitic’ can be given a satisfactory theoretical basis. Thus, phonology may be responsible for the following alternation in English (cf. Berendsen 1986:19).12

(21) a. Marsha met him  
   b. Marsha met ‘m

This could mean that, given the right phonotactic context, somewhere in the PF-component phonological reduction rules can turn the neutral form *him into its RP counterpart. One crucial argument against such an approach to Dutch RPs comes from the behavior of 3.SG.M.SU pronouns, as illustrated in (22).

(22) a. dat hij wandelt  
   c. dat ie wandelt  [D]  
   b.* dat he wandelt  
     \textit{that he}}^{31} walks

While regular phonological reduction could be responsible for pairs like \textit{jij} > \textit{je}, \textit{zij} > \textit{ze}, and \textit{wij} > \textit{we}, in the case of \textit{hij} the output \textit{he} would be phonologically ill-formed (van de Vijver p.c.; cf. Zwart 1997:118). However, rather than tolerating such an arbitrary gap, Dutch fills up the paradigm of RPs with \textit{ie}, which in all likelihood derives from the weak demonstrative \textit{die} (Zwart 1997:33fn28).

This is in contrast with English, where the neutral pronoun \textit{me} simply lacks an RP-counterpart (\textit{me} > ?). Thus, it must be assumed that the Dutch pronominal system contains a grammaticalized slot for RPs. This has to go along with some kind of lexical storage.13 Yet, the conclusions that can be drawn from this are

12 Take main stress to fall on the verb. ‘M would be pronounced with an initial schwa.

13 Another piece of evidence would be the existence of RP ‘t (\textit{het}), which lacks a neutral counterpart altogether. The weak demonstrative \textit{dat} has to do duty in filling the gap, without apparently having lost its demonstrative properties. One needs to be careful, however, not to overinterpret this kind of evidence. Thus, it is doubtful whether one and the same form like 2.PL.OB \textit{ons} is both a neutral pronoun and an RP. Zwart (1997) diverges on this point from Geerts et al. (eds.) (1984), Berendsen (1986), and Everaert (1986) in allowing a gap in the paradigm. As far as phonological shape is concerned, this form is clearly not reduced. Conversely, given that German \textit{es} belongs to the RPs under all likelihood, one would have to take there to be a grammaticalized slot of RPs in the pronominal system of Standard German as well.

We actually believe that we are looking at two systems in transition, where writing systems further the grammaticalization of RPs in Dutch while hampering the same process in German.

As for the semantic effects arising at the boundary between neutral pronouns and RPs in Dutch, like generic interpretation of \textit{je} in (17), there are two ways of looking at them. Given lexical storage there is no problem with listing such readings item by item. On the other hand, the ‘interpretation’ of pronouns is known to be sensitive to the shape of the entire system, given that the system is closed. Thus, generic and idiomatic readings may simply require the ‘weakest’ possible form to be inserted, ‘stronger’ ones being blocked. See Williams (1997: section 1) for the possibilities of blocking even across grammatical levels. See also Kameyama (1999), whose ‘Complementary Preference Hypothesis’ does a similar job closer to the syntax-discourse interface. Similar means, deriving principles B and C as ‘elsewhere’ cases from principle A, have been established – pace Hestvik (1992) – for binding theory by Luigi Burzio, as summarized in Gärtner (1991). In the domain of Dutch and German reflexives and their various interpretations, Steinbach (1999 and 2002) fruitfully explores related interactions of stress and blocking. A typical case in point would be the inherent reflexive reading of (i).
still fairly weak. “Since these clitics are stored in the lexicon, they can potentially be adjoined [. . .] in the syntactic component, and in the phonological component” (Berendsen 1986:21).14 Clearly, what no theory of ‘clitics’ can do without is an account for why they seem to require phonological material to ‘lean on’, that is, they require a π-host.15 In this respect, Dutch and English (and German) RPs behave alike. Thus, *met* in (21b) and *dat* in (22c) are the respective π-hosts of *’m* and *ie*. This requires some kind of integration of the RP into one of the phonological constituents containing the π-host (see Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear)), which would be called π-adjunction in Berendsen’s terms. However, nothing follows from this as for the question whether or not there should be a special syntactic operation in addition, call it σ-adjunction, which could feed or complement phonology.16

Indeed, the existence of σ-adjunction would seem to depend on nothing short of proper syntactic argumentation. This, however, is only the second pillar the above diagnosis is based on (see section 3 and Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear)). The first – controversial – one seems to be part of an attempt to provide independent motivation for the necessity of σ-adjunction. This is built on the following rather problematic reasoning. RPs are not just the result of phonological reduction. Thus, they cannot be ‘simple clitics’ but must be ‘special clitics’ in the terminology of Arnold Zwicky, as laid out in detail by Klavans (1982) and

(i) Wij schamen ons
We do shame us

‘We are ashamed’

Rather than saying that *ons* is a reflexive RP, one could say it is a neutral personal pronoun that is not blocked by any more specific, i.e. ‘more reflexive’ and ‘weaker’, form in the 1.PL.OB cell. This alternative may look less compelling in this specific case. However, filling up every arbitrary gap occurring in any pronominal system of the world’s languages by this kind of lexical proliferation would have a distinctly baroque flavor to it.

What the blocking perspective predicts is that there should be cases of ‘unblocking’ in certain contexts. Thus, Edwin Williams (p.c.) pointed out that both unstressed and stressed you can carry the generic reading in (ii).

(ii) If you want to get things done, then YOU have to do them.

Similar effects can be replicated in German. Thus in a doctor-patient setting, doctors can refer to patients by means of a 1.PL.DAT neutral pronoun contained in the set phrase in (iii.a). As soon as there are two patients in the same room and each patient can be assumed to be able to hear what is being said to the other, the doctor, having used (iii.a) to talk to the first patient already, must use (iii.b), containing the same pronoun, but narrowly focused, to address the next patient.

(iii) a. Wie geht ’s uns dem heute
How goes it us today

‘So, how are we doing today?’

b. Und, wie geht ’s UNS heute?
And, how goes it us today

14 It looks as if in this quote Berendsen must take *and* to stand for logical nonexclusive disjunction. We skip the third possibility, namely, adjunction in the lexicon. Berendsen himself takes lexical adjunction to be the hallmark of affixation strictly distinct from ‘cliticization’.

15 Nespor & Vogel (1986:145) remind us of “the original meaning of the term ‘clitic’ from the Greek κλίνω ‘to lean’.”
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Berendsen (1986:19ff) notes that ‘Special clitics’, however, have ‘special syntax’ by definition! Thus, by nature, Dutch RPs would seem to require special syntactic treatment in terms of σ-adjunction to a σ-host. Of course, the deficient link in this argument is the nature of Zwicky’s categories.

“A striking feature of this type of work [...] is that in its argumentation it does not in the first place distinguish between phonological, morphological and syntactic characteristics of clitics. Secondly, this work is relatively pre-theoretical in that the inventories appear to be its main aim rather than the stimulating context of a theory which predicts certain inventories rather than others” (Berendsen 1986:20).

Zwicky’s inventory captures the generalization that grammaticalized or lexicalized ‘clitics’ tend to develop special syntactic behavior. This, however, is a rough-edged sword in two ways. First, no reason is given why there couldn’t be such forms which happen not to show ‘special syntactic behavior’. Thus, the categorization imposes a false alternative on linguistic analyses of ‘clitics’. Secondly, a theoretical characterization of what would count as ‘special syntax’ is pretty much absent. Thus, we are strongly inclined to think that this first pillar of the proof that Dutch RPs are ‘syntactic clitics’ by ‘nature’ is leaning heavily on the second one, namely, syntax-internal demonstration that Dutch RPs need σ-adjunction to a σ-host over and above π-adjunction to a π-host. It is the latter kind of discussion that we will be occupied with in the remainder of this article, as well as in Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear). We will try to show that such a demonstration, if possible at all, is on the wrong track wrt (most) systems of Germanic RPs, the Dutch one among them.

3 The Pros and Cons of (Special) ‘Clitic’-Syntax: Clause-Internal Positions

We already indicated that, as such, the term ‘special syntax’ is less informative than required for settling the subtle issues we are dealing with here. Let us, therefore, explore some of the potential ways to understand that term before we

17 See Bayer (1984:266fn36) for a similarly negative assessment wrt the distinction between affixes and clitics.
18 Such a narrow alternative is indeed what Zwart (1997:118) seems to feel forced to assume, as the following quote indicates. “The question arises whether the weak pronouns are phonologically reduced variants of the strong pronouns (simple clitics, in terms of Zwicky 1977) or elements with a syntactic status of their own (special clitics in terms of Zwicky 1977, henceforth referred to as clitics here).”
19 As will become clear later, the rule of thumb that ‘special clitics’ do not “tend to occur in exactly the same syntactic positions as the unreduced stressable forms” (Klavans 1982:260) is insufficient in the case of Germanic OV-languages for two reasons. First of all, an abstract hierarchical position need not always coincide with one and the same linear surface position in syntax, and secondly, phonological requirements of focus put additional constraints on the ‘position’ of inherently unstressed elements, as do the syntactic and phonological directionality-constraints on en- vs. pro-cliticization. For the latter see Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear).
go into Germanic syntax. Surely, distributional evidence would have to be taken as symptomatic for ‘special syntax’. Thus, *bona fide* members of the class of ‘special clitics’, namely, French RPs, do differ from their DP (and neutral pronominal) counterparts wrt word order possibilities, as (23) illustrates.

(23) a. Je connais la sœur de Zazie  
    *I know the sister of Zazie  
    I know her 

b. *Je la sœur de Zazie connais  

d. Je la connais

However, the order of surface strings is only a small part of what generative syntax is about. Thus, one would like to derive the pattern in (23) from deeper principles. Then, of course, the question arises, whether ‘special syntax’ automatically implies that something special is assumed about ‘clitics’ at such a deeper level. Consider the following two – fictional – accounts of (23).

(24) a.* [IP Je [?P [la sœur de Zazie] 1 [VP connais t1 ]]]  

Crucially, there would now have to be an X-bar theoretic difference between full-fledged DPs and object RPs, the latter being just X°-elements. Insofar, special syntactic assumptions would be made for ‘special clitics’.

A more ‘surfacey’ (and more complete) account of the same pattern could go as follows. Assume in the spirit of (one version of) the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1995) that, universally, objects have to check structural Case in Spec,AgrOP. Assume further that the features for this operation in French are weak. Assume in addition a copy-theory of movement plus a chain-based construal of the strong/weak-distinction, according to which the checking of weak features means that the foot of the chain is spelled-out at PF. Imagine, finally, that French RPs contain some inherent feature [+cl], which inverses the spell-out mechanism such that the head of the chain is pronounced instead of the foot. This, is illustrated in (25a) and (25b) respectively.

(25) a. [ AgrSP Je [ AgrS° [AgrOP [ la sœur de Zazie] [AgrO° [VP connais [ la sœur de Zazie]]]]]]  

b. [ AgrSP Je [ AgrS° [AgrOP [ la ]+[cl] [AgrO° [VP connais [ la ]+[cl] ]]]]]

This time, ‘special syntax’ would boil down to the feature [+cl], possession of which influences spell-out operations at the PF-interface. Let us call what can be inferred from distributional evidence like (23) ‘special concrete syntax’ (SCS) and what can be postulated along the lines of (24) and (25) ‘special abstract syntax’ (SAS). One might then expect there to exist four types of analyses for ‘clitic’ systems, as shown in (26).
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While following Jaspers (1989), Zwart (1997) takes Dutch to instantiate (26a),20 we insist on (26d) for both Dutch and German. In fact, reviewing the two already mentioned areas crucially involved in our debate, namely, clause-internal argument positioning (sections 3.1 to 3.4) and fronting (Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear)), we find that clear distributional evidence – of the kind available for French RPs – is lacking for the Germanic OV- and V2-languages under consideration. Given this, we suggest a unified (MPP-) account of the syntactic behavior of RPs, neutral pronouns, prominent pronouns, and full-fledged DPs. We assume that they all are XPs in syntax, their positioning being regulated by XP-scrambling and XP-fronting.

3.1 Scrambling

At least since Lenerz (1977), it is well-known that word order in what is descriptively called the ‘middle field’ (henceforth MF) of German clauses, that is, clause-internal positions to the right of COMP and to the left of the verbal cluster, is regulated to a considerable degree by ‘soft’, i.e. violable, principles.21


21 Uszkoreit (1986:883) calls this phenomenon “partially free word order which arises through the interaction of potentially conflicting ordering principles.” For a recent summary of and an OT-approach to these facts see Müller (1999a, 1999). In the following we will tacitly assume that generative theories of scrambling have to deal with (almost) the entire range of instantiations of constituent permutations in the MF of OV-languages like Dutch and German. This is in line with Müller (1999a:23), who pointed out what many others – even before the ‘scrambling-glasnost’ initiated by Diesing (1992) – have more or less explicitly been trying to get across (cf. a.o. Höhle 1982 and Reis 1987). Namely, that “it is indeed the exception rather than the rule for a VP-internal word order in German not to be grammatical at all.” In this article, we interpret Müller’s term ‘VP-internal’ as ranging over the entire MF. We’ll come to the position of subjects in section 3.4 and Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear). We thus fully agree that “[c]lause-internal word order in scrambling languages often exhibits degrees of markedness, rather than complete wellformedness or illformedness, and this fact is still in need of an explanation” (Müller 1998a:10). Emphasis here, should be put on the term ‘degrees’. A lot of the literature on scrambling is working with a dichotomy of unmarked (‘neutral’) and marked. Theories of scrambling are then – often implicitly – limited to ‘neutral’ cases only. Seldom, however, are these two terms defined in a satisfactory way, Höhle (1982) being an exception. If a more solid definition is given – e.g. in terms of maximal focus projection, i.e. the ability to be used a.o.t. in so-called ‘null-contexts’ – that definition is usually not adhered to in distributing * or √ among the example sentences. For reasons that will become clear in the text, we consider any such attempt as inadequate. We will thus not withdraw any example on the charge of its being ‘contrastive’ or ‘emphatic’ unless (i), we are given a proper definition of these terms, (ii), we are given a theoretically sound motivation why examples falling under the hypothetical definition of (i) should be left out of consideration and (iii), it is demonstrated that advocates of such a hypothetical position themselves actually apply the required distinction in a consistent way to syntactic phe-
For example, other things being equal, thematic (or backgrounded) elements precede thematic (or focused) ones. Likewise, definite items precede indefinite ones, and ‘heavy’ elements follow light ones. On all three counts, it is unsurprising that personal pronouns – unless focused – will show a preference for the left region of the MF. (27) illustrates the most extreme case, namely, adjacency to COMP.

(27) a. … dass sie dem Hans heut ein’ Buch geschenkt hat [He]
   ‘that she gave Hans a book today’

b. … dass ihrer de Hans heut ein’ Buch geschenkt hat
   ‘that Hans gave her a book today’

c. … dass sie de Hans heut (net) getroffe hat
   ‘(It is not the case) that Hans met her today’

Among RPs, however, positions further to the right are by no means unavailable, at least for the object ones.
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(28) a. Wenn de Hans die heut wieder net trifft, dann … [He]
    ‘If once again Hans doesn’t meet her today, then …’
b. Wenn de Hans heut endlich mal e’ Buch schenkt, dann …
    ‘If finally Hans gives her a book today, then …’
c. Wenn de Hans heut her again (not) meets, then …
    ‘If once again Hans doesn’t meet her today, then …’
d. Wenn de Hans heut e’ Buch schenke würd, dann …
    ‘If Hans were to give her a book today, then …’
e. Wenn die Maria die Buch him today again not gives, then
    ‘If once again Maria doesn’t give the book to him today, then …’
f. Wenn die Maria heut wieder net gibt, dann …
    ‘If once again Maria doesn’t give the book to Peter, then …’

Given the striking parallel between these facts and the (re-)ordering possibilities of full DPs in German, we suggest that the ‘best’ theory of scrambling (incorporating assumptions about discourse, information structure, and phonotactics) is adequate for both domains at the same time. We therefore assume that RPs in the MF are positioned by a scrambling operation. By the same token, no X°-positions in that clausal region have to be relied on in our account. This means that RPs do not furnish evidence in favor of head-initial functional projections between COMP and VP.

Proponents of an X°-approach to RP placement in Germanic OV-languages have primarily concentrated on Dutch and West Flemish. One of their central goals has been to account for observation (29).

(29) Clause-internally, non-prominent argument pronouns in Dutch and West Flemish never occur in positions lower than the ones accessible to their full (definite, unfocussed) DP-counterparts.

Starting from the clause-structure in (30), this falls out directly, if non-prominent argument pronouns are placed in their respective agreement projections (cf. Zwart 1997:194, 276).

various places. Further research will have to deal with phonological phrasing in German, and the conditions on where to fit in RPs.

This approach often goes along with the assumption that scrambling in Dutch and West Flemish can adequately be dealt with in terms of A-movement to specifiers of Agr-phrases. The observation that scrambling in these languages tends to be order-preserving (SU < IO < DO) would count as crucial support for such a hypothesis.\(^{26}\)\(^{27}\)

\(^{26}\) See Vikner (1990). Given the behavior of Dutch ‘PP-objects’, which pattern with ‘NP-objects’ wrt clause-internal positioning, Vikner (1990:4.21) calls an A-movement approach into question. Neeleman (1994:409) argues that scrambling via A-movement at least cannot be Case-driven. Webelhuth’s (1990) classical argument against reducing scrambling to A-movement, built on the alleged capability of scrambled NPs to license parasitic gaps, continues to divide the community. Thus, parasitic gaps are taken by Mulder & den Dikken (1991) to be crucial evidence for an adjunction approach to scrambling, while its relevance is dismissed by Zwart (1993:319), who conjectures that “scrambling induced parasitic gaps are not really parasitic gaps.” For further critical remarks see Fanselow (2001). As far as we can see, Hessian (and also Suebian) RPs scrambled across the subject can license what used to be called parasitic gaps, as (i) shows (‘n = den Brief / ‘the letter’).

(i) weil \(\text{n} \) de Hans \(\text{ACC} \) ohne t aazugucke \(\text{ACC} \) weggeworfe hat \(\text{He} \)

‘because Hans threw it away without looking at it’

\(^{27}\) Müller (1998a:36) suggests that the apparent order-preserveness of Dutch scrambling can be captured by an OT-constraint called ‘Parallel Movement’, which is defined as follows:

(i) PAR-MOVE (Müller 1998a:15)

\[ \text{If} \quad \alpha \text{ c-commands } \beta \text{ at level } L_n, \text{ then } \alpha \text{ c-commands } \beta \text{ at level } L_{n+1} \quad (\text{where } \alpha \text{ and } \beta \text{ are arguments}) \]

If PAR-MOVE is indeed applicable and if the relevant syntactic levels to be optimized by PAR-MOVE are D- and S-structure, the base-order of the Dutch VP requires IO to precede DO. This would seem to commit Müller’s theory to the prediction that anaphor binding in Dutch differs from German (cf. Müller 1997). There the contrast between (ii) and (iii) is taken as crucial evidence for a DO<IO base-order (cf. ibid.:6).

(ii) dass er \(\text{he} \) die Gäste \(\text{ACC} \) einander \(\text{DAT} \) vorstellte \(\text{G} \)

‘that he introduced the guests to each other’

(iii) *dass er \(\text{he} \) den Gästen \(\text{ACC} \) einander \(\text{DAT} \) vorstellte

‘that he introduced the guests to each other’

One interpretation of these cases is that the direct object cannot precede the indirect object in Dutch (Broekhuis 1992:85), however, provides the following piece of evidence for Dutch.

(iv) hij heeft die mensen \(\text{he} \) elkaar \(\text{DAT} \) aanbevolen

‘he recommended the people to each other’

There are two main interpretations of these cases. a) This is indeed an IO binding a DO reciprocal. That is reported to be the position of Daaddler & Blom (1976), “based on the implicit assumption that the direct object cannot precede the indirect object in Dutch” (Broekhuis 1992:85,fn7). Position a) would be fully in support of Müller’s approach if the D-structure of Dutch differed from the German one in that IO c-commands DO at that level. b) Rejecting the implicit premise of position a), one can take die mensen to be a DO binding an IO. That is the interpretation of Broekhuis (ibid.) also confirmed by Wartena (p.c.). If true, this would imply – pace Müller (1998a) – that scrambling can create new binding relations. Alternatively, (iv) would represent the unscrambled base order of Dutch, as a consequence of which the IO < DO default order is a result of scrambling rather than parallel movement.
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Obviously, placing non-prominent pronouns in the specifiers of the respective Agr-projections would already suffice to derive (29). 28 This is clearly adequate for neutral pronouns in West Flemish, given that “[p]ronouns pattern essentially with NPs” (Haegeman 1993:142). However, there are “three elements whose distribution cannot be equated to that of the other pronouns” (ibid.). Thus, “[u]nlike the related pronoun, IO clitic ze can precede the subject, and DO ze, t, and er can precede IO or subject” (ibid.). Although Haegeman (1993) develops an X°-account for these elements, she takes it to be “unlikely that these clitic positions correspond to the traditional functional heads posited in the literature” (ibid.:147). 29 Crucially, the additional ‘clitic’-heads are immunized against interaction with finite verb movement by assuming the latter to be able to either excorporate from or skip such X°-positions (ibid.:149). Thus, one loses one of the crucial independent criteria for clause-internal pronominal X°-positions, namely, non-trivial interaction with the one bona fide X°-element, the finite verb. 30

Although we hesitate to try to extend our account of German to West Flemish, we will offer some speculations in Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear) as for the exceptional behavior of the ‘clitic’ elements mentioned above.

Zwart (1997), on the other hand, takes both Dutch and West Flemish ‘clitics’ to be amenable to a treatment in terms of obligatory overt adjunction to Agr°. 31 Again, generalization (29) falls out directly, provided that adjunction to AgrS°, AgrIO°, and AgrDO° is banned. Deriving additional positions and regulating the interaction with finite verb-movement, though, leads to a system that, as we will show, overgenerates quite seriously. While Dutch DO-‘clitics’ seem to be unable to follow a full-DP IO, (31a) (ibid.:124), their West Flemish counterparts can do so, (31b) (ibid.:129).

(31)  a. ??dat Jan Marie ‘t gegeven heeft [D]
          that Jan Mary it give has
          ‘that Jan has given it to Mary’
   b. da Jan Marie ‘t gegeven eet [WF]

28 Obligatory (indirectly Case-driven) overt placement of RPs in Spec,Agr is advocated for Dutch by Corver & Delfitto (1999) as a first step in the licensing of such elements. They assume that RPs undergo an additional overt X°-movement step. However, they only “focus on the question why clitic/weak pronouns move at all, and not so much on the question where they get moved to” (ibid.:848,fn2). Thus “[w]hat is relevant to us is that clitic placement involves head movement to some head category in which ‘familiarity’ is encoded” (ibid.:fn7). The theory-independent evidence they provide to show “that movement of weak pronouns should be distinguished from scrambling of full nominal phrases” (ibid.:805) does not substantially differ from what will be discussed below. We conclude that their approach can be translated back into our XP-movement approach to ‘clitics’.

29 Haegeman’s account is left somewhat vague, in that various options concerning the exact number and position of clitic phrases and additional X°-movement steps are left open. For a critique see Zwart (1992).

30 See Vikner & Schwartz (1996:48f) for a fuller discussion of this point.

31 Zwart (1997:267) actually cautions readers that he is providing no more than a ‘tentative approach’. Note that, for the sake of brevity, we use his term ‘clitic’ instead of our term RP where we directly relate his theory.
For (31b), it is assumed that the “object clitic remains in AgrO°” (ibid.:275).
Given that in both languages the derivation of (31) requires overt F(v)°-to-
AgrDO°, AgrDO°-to-AgrIO°, AgrIO°-to-T°, T°-to-AgrS°, and AgrS°-to-C°
movement, the distinction has to be made by allowing West Flemish to strand
the direct object ‘clitic’ (DO-CL) in AgrDO° or AgrIO°, while the same item has
to be pied-piped at least up to T° in Dutch. Looking only at ‘clitics’, however,
one observes that the Dutch DO-CL can surface behind an IO-CL, as illustrated
in (32a).33

\[(32)\]
\[
a. \text{ dat Jan ‘r ‘t gegeven heeft} \\
\text{‘that Jan has given it to her’}
\]
\[
b. \text{ dat Jan ‘t ‘r gegeven heeft} \\
\text{‘that Jan has given it to him’}
\]

Given that stranding in AgrIO° has just been ruled out for Dutch DO-CL, an
extra assumption is called for. Indeed, DO-CL is allowed to adjoin to IO-CL by
short X°-movement after it has been pied-piped by AgrDO°-to-AgrIO° move-
ment. The resulting structure looks like (33) (ibid.:279).

\[(33) \]
\[
[AgrIO° [IO-CL DO-CL] [AgrIO° [AgrDO° \[F(v) AgrDO° ]] AgrIO° ]] \\
\]

(33) is supposed to underlie both examples in (32), given that “[…] Morphology
interprets these clitics as a cluster, i.e. as a complex without clear hierarchical
organization. As a result, we expect the ordering of the clitics to be determined
by other factors […]” (ibid.:279).

32 F(v) designates the formal features of the finite verb. The actual positioning of the morphology-visible lexical content of the verb, LC(v), is a separate operation in Zwart’s system. See Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear).

33 There is said to be a “slight preference” for (32b) over (32a) (ibid.:124). See Abraham & Wiegel (1993) for data showing similar asymmetries in double-object RP clusters of some southern Germanic languages. However, such a contrast is lacking from Hessian, Suedian, and Bavarian (for the latter see Bayer 1984). In fact, the preference may be due to purely phonological constraints (cf. Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear)). Thus, van de Vijver (p.c.) finds (i) and (ii) unobjectionable.

(i) dat Jan ‘m ‘t gegeven heeft
\text{‘that Jan has given it to him’}

(ii) dat Jan ‘t gegeven heeft
\text{‘that Jan has given it to them’}

Jaspers (1989:243), on the other hand, stars the counterpart of (i). Likewise, variants of (32b)
are degraded for some speakers, as (iii) shows (van de Vijver, p.c.).

(iii) ?dat Jan ‘t ze gegeven heeft
\text{‘that Jan has given it to them’}

A consequence of putting the word order variation in (32) to the X° status of RPs would appear
to be that Dutch neutral pronouns have to be X° categories as well. Thus, note the following alternation,
pointed out by Geerts et al. (eds.)(1984:984).

(iv) a. Lever hem mij uit
\text{‘Turn him over to me’}

b. Lever mij hem uit
\text{‘Turn him over to me’}

The chances for working out such an analysis in an insightful fashion seem to us even more
bleak than the ones for the X°-approach to RPs rejected in the following.
Relative to the subject in embedded clauses, Dutch shows a preference for putting object clitics into an immediately right-adjacent position, as already shown in (32). Separation by a sentence adverbial is reported to be acceptable only where that adverbial carries stress, as indicated in (34) (ibid.:123).34

(34)  a. dat Jan GISteren ‘r gekust heeft
that Jan SU yesterday her DO kissed has
‘that Jan kissed her yesterday’

b. dat Jan ‘r gisteren gekust heeft

While (34b) is taken to be derived by pied-piping the ‘clitics’ into AgrS° (cf. ibid.:271), (34a) would seem to require some (optional) stranding of DO-CL in T°, again sticking to the assumption made above that AgrDO° and AgrIO° are not available ‘clitic’-stranding sites in Dutch, and sticking to the condition that there be no adjunction of adverbs to AgrS°.35

One of the most striking differences between Dutch and West Flemish wrt ‘clitic’ positioning concerns the slot between C° and subjects in Spec,AgrSP.36

(35)  a.* dat ‘r Jan gekust heeft
b.* Gisteren heeft ‘r Jan gekust

While (35b) are given in Zwart (1997:35), (35c) (ibid.:276), and (35d) in Zwart (1992:80).

Thus, Dutch ‘clitics’ must be stranded in AgrS° (or T°) while their West Flemish counterparts may be pied-piped by AgrS°-to-C° movement. Again this has to be stipulated.37

34 That in fact both slots around a temporal adverbial are accessible for ‘clitics’ in Dutch is suggested by (i), which Vikner & Schwartz (1996:58,fn42) attribute to Ad Neeleman.

(i)  dat Jan ‘t gisteren ‘m eindelijk gegeven heeft
that Jan SU it DO yesterday him IO finally given has
‘that yesterday Jan finally gave it to him’

35 AgrIO° may be missing in (32). Stranding of DO-CL in T° is less straightforward than might be expected. The result of AgrDO°-to-T° looks like (i):35

(i)  [T° [AgrDO° DO-CL [AgrDO° F(v) AgrDO° ] ] T° ]

Since T°-to-AgrS° has to pied-pipe F(v), (ibid.:252f), an intermediate step is necessary to create a constituent that includes T° and F(v) while excluding DO-CL. Two options seem to arise: a) short F(v)-to-T° targeting the lowest T° and then moving the resulting [T° F(v) T° ] structure, or b) short DO-CL-to-T° targeting the highest T° projection and then moving the lower T°-remnant. We would be inclined to think that b) is the more likely option under Zwart's morphosyntactic approach, since it keeps the functional information of verbal morphology (represented by AgrDO° and T°) available in one head.

36 (35a)/(35b) are given in Zwart (1997:35), (35c) (ibid.:276), and (35d) in Zwart (1992:80).

37 Note that “dialects spoken in the South of the Netherlands” seem to pattern with West Flemish (see Zwart 1997:35fn31,32). This may be in keeping with our conjecture concerning dialectal boundaries (see section 2).
Such a stipulation looks especially suspicious for Dutch, given the well-known ban on scrambling to the front of (definite, unfocused) subjects of transitive constructions, illustrated in (36).\(^\text{38}\)

\[(36)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{dat de boeken Jan niet koopt} \quad \text{[D]} \\
& \quad \text{that the books}^{\text{DO}} \text{Jan}^{\text{SU}} \text{not buys} \\
& \quad \text{‘that Jan doesn’t buy the books’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Gisteren heeft het boek Jan gelezen} \\
& \quad \text{Yesterday has the book}^{\text{DO}} \text{Jan}^{\text{SU}} \text{read} \\
& \quad \text{‘Yesterday, Jan read the book’}
\end{align*}
\]

Clearly, from our perspective of treating RP placement and XP-scrambling alike, the patterns in (35a)/(35b) and (36) look like a missed generalization if the former examples have to be filtered out by forcing AgrS°-movement to C° to strand X°-‘clitics’.\(^\text{39}\)

Crucially, if ‘r in (34b) is located somewhere inside AgrS°, it must be made sure that short DO-CL-shift of the type applied inside AgrIO°, as we’ve seen in (33) above, does not lead to unwelcome orders if applied inside AgrS° under the presence of a subject ‘clitic’. The kind of configuration we have in mind looks as follows (cf. Zwart 1997:271, 272 example (57) and 274 example (59)):

\[(37)\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\end{array}
\]

\(^38\) (36a) is taken from Neeleman (1994:395), (36b) is due to van de Vijver (p.c.). As is clear from Neeleman (1994) the scrambled objects in (36) must be deaccented.

\(^39\) The generalization we’re after has been made explicitly in Hinterhölzl (1999:15fn3). Thanks to the author for pointing this out to us. It is also latently present in Vikner (1994:510), where it is suggested that (i) and (ii) could be ruled out by assuming that “[o]bject shift cannot adjoin to IP: A-motion cannot cross an A-position (IP-spec) { … }.”

(i) \quad \text{*dat deze man Peter nooit voordien gezien heeft} \quad \text{[D]} \\
\quad \text{that that man DO Peter SU never before seen has} \\
\quad \text{‘that Peter never before has seen that man’}

(ii) \quad \text{*Waarom heeft ’t Jan gekocht} \\
\quad \text{Why has it DO Jan SU bought} \\
\quad \text{‘Why has Jan bought it’}

The A-movement approach is, however, discarded on independent grounds without giving another account instead. Neither are the implications (ii) might have for the cliticization controversy mentioned. Note, incidentally, that the same questions arise for CL-stranding in AgrS° as they did for CL-stranding in T°. See footnote 35. Deriving the right order for DO-CL and the complementizer in C°, as required for West Flemish, is also more complicated than one might expect. Thus, iterated X°-movement proceeding by left-adjunction would yield the following complex C°-node for West Flemish (33c) (cf. Zwart 1997:274).

\[(38)\]
\[
\text{(iii) [C° [AgrS° [T° [AgrDO° DO-CL [AgrDO° F(v) AgrDO° ] T° ] AgrS° ] C°-LC(c) ] C°]} \nonumber
\]

On a strict interpretation of Kayne’s (1994) LCA, mapping asymmetric c-command onto linear precedence, one would expect DO-CL to precede C°, given Kayne’s definition of c-command, which yields the following results for X°-complexes: if X° adjoins to Y°, then X° precedes Y°. Thus, we get F(v)<AgrDO°, DO-CL<AgrDO°, AgrDO°<T°, T°<AgrS° and AgrS°<C°. By transitivity, DO-CL precedes C°. Note also that without further assumptions DO-CL and F(v) would be unordered wrt each other. Given that the order in (35c) is the opposite of the one just computed, an additional assumption is needed. Zwart (1997) develops a procedure that orders constituents on the basis of the labels defined by the operation Merge. The exact algorithm is somewhat hard to recover from the text, so we cannot assess its adequacy.
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If OCL-to-SCL took place in analogy to DO-CL-to-IO-CL in (33), it is not easy to see how COMP < OCL < SCL-orders like (38) can be prevented.40

(38) a.* dat ’t ze gezien heeft [D]
    that itDO sheSU seen has
    ‘… that she saw it’
b.* dat ’r je gezien hebt c.* dat ’m ’k gezien heb
    that herDO youSU seen have that himDO I SU seen have
    ‘… that you saw her’ ‘… that I saw him’

Thus, while the X°-approach looks extremely dubious for Dutch and West Flemish, prevented from massive overgeneration by mere stipulation, it is most likely on the wrong track wrt Hessian, where (object-) RP placement targets the bona fide scrambling positions. In terms of Zwart’s (1997) X°-approach, this would mean that object ‘clitics’ can always either be stranded or be pied-piped by finite F(v)-movement. Such a state-of-affairs appears to be equivalent to complete non-interaction of the finite verb and object RPs in the MF. Obviously, then, no empirical argument in favor of X°-positions to the left of VP below C° can be derived from this domain of grammar.

We therefore disagree with Grohmann (1997:181fn17), who states that “the more [word order; H.M.G. & M.S.] possibilities there are, the harder a unified analysis becomes.” Quite on the contrary, we suggest that RP placement in (southern variants of) German is a subcase of scrambling. Thus, the more word order possibilities there are, the easier the account gets.

At the same time we agree with Zwart (1997:277) “that the Minimalist Program is ill equipped to deal with optional movement phenomena.”41 This need not be construed as a weakness of the MP, but could simply imply that ‘stylistic phenomena’, scrambling among them, lie outside its scope altogether.

Interestingly, though, a closer look at Dutch suggests that the only real ‘clitic-puzzle’, i.e. something that requires a non-trivial account, is posed by (35a)/(35b). Thus, the relative unacceptability of (31a) can be challenged, that is, some speakers of Dutch find that sentence acceptable as indicated in (39b) (van de Vijver p.c.). If so, the picture emerging for IO<DO-orders would be as in (39). For (39a) see Zwart (1997:32).

40 As already indicated in footnote 35, T° would seem to be available as an intermediate attachment site, given the analysis of stranding. Note that we are not saying that there is no solution for all of this. We are just trying to convey our intuition that it may well be difficult to keep the combinatorial possibilities of the X°-internal approach to ‘clitics’ (pied-piping, stranding, short-shift, and morphological LC(v) placement) under control in an insightful fashion. We’ll come back to structures like (37) in Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear).

41 Assuming optional Σ-features (Σ = ‘scrambling’) on Agr-heads, to be checked via adjunction to AgrP (Grewendorf & Sabel 1997:62), while technically feasible, raises the follow-up question as to what motivates insertion of Σ. A successful account of scrambling in German and Dutch seems to require an interface-oriented approach that allows for at least some competing (violable) principles. See a.o. Reinhart (1997), Neeleman & Reinhart (1998), and Müller (1998a, 1999).
(39)  a. dat Jan Marie het boek gegeven heeft [D]
b. dat Jan Marie ‘t gegeven heeft

Within Zwart’s system, the well-formedness of (39b) would indicate that – contrary to what had to be assumed above – DO-CL can be stranded in AgrDO° or AgrIO°. This state-of-affairs we again interpret as evidence for the non-interaction between the finite verb (features) and ‘clitics’.

Now the opposite order in (40) (Zwart 1993:130f), i.e. DO<IO, is taken to show the crucial contrast.42

(40)  a.??dat Jan het boek Marie gegeven heeft [D]
b. dat Jan ‘t Marie gegeven heeft

However, whatever is responsible for the degraded status of (40a), DO < IO orders are not ruled out in principle. Thus, Koster (1986:5) reports on examples like (41), which are unobjectionable.43

(41)  Hij gaf het boek Marie cadeau [D]

‘He gave Mary the book as a present’

What seems to be going on in (41), is familiar from scrambling in German. The default position of clausal nuclear stress in German is on the final constituent in the MF (cf. a.o. Höhle 1982, Jacobs 1988, 1993, Stechow 1991, and Krifka 1998). As long as the MF-constituents are in their canonical order, stress on the final one, call it Ω, leads to an information-structural ambiguity, in so far as semantic focus can be attributed to Ω or any constituent containing Ω. If a larger constituent containing Ω is interpreted as focus, focus is said to have ‘projected’ and Ω is called the ‘focus exponent’ (henceforth FE). Adverbs and pronouns cannot serve as FE. Exclusively stressing an adverb or a pronoun is therefore

42 Although (40a) is conspicuously absent from Mulder & den Dikken (1991), their theory would seem to predict this kind of example to be straightforward. In fact, they appear to provide at least four alternative derivations for such a string. First, simple scrambling of DO across IO.

(i)  dat Jan het boek1 Marie1 ‘t gegeven heeft [D]

Second, short scrambling of IO plus scrambling of DO across the landing site of IO.

(ii)  dat Jan het boek1 Marie2 ‘t2 ‘t1 gegeven heeft [D]

(ii) satisfies Pesetsky’s Path Containment Condition, which the authors adopt (ibid.:73). Third, base-generating IO as a ‘concealed’ PP below the base position of DO.

(iii)  dat Jan het boek [ PP ∅ Marie] gegeven heeft [D]

Fourth, applying short scrambling to DO in (iii), as illustrated in (iv).

(iv)  dat Jan het boek1 ‘t1 [ PP ∅ Marie] gegeven heeft [D]

43 Interestingly, Koster (1986) considers the equivalent of (40a) to be just “somewhat unnatural”, i.e. it receives only one question mark. V2-order does not influence the point at issue here. Thus, judgments and analyses will be the same for the V-final variant of (39), as Wartena (p.c.) informs us. Further examples of “surprising” DO-IO-inversions are given in Zwart (1997:32).

(i)  dat Jan het boek ‘t terug gegeven heeft [D]

that Jan ‘t the book back given has
‘that Jan gave the book back to Mary’

Since the analysis of (i) may be even more complicated than the analysis of (41), we – reluctantly – refrain from providing it here for the sake of brevity.
interpreted as narrow focus (cf. Schwarzschild 1999 for potential complications). On the other hand, internal arguments of the main clausal predicate constitute the canonical FE, as illustrated in (42).

(42) a. A: Warum sind denn hier alle so aufgeregt? [G]
   ‘Why are then here all so upset’

b. B: Weil ein Zoowärter einem Kind eine Tarantel gegeben hat
   ‘because a zoo-keeper gave a child a tarantula’

One of the (many) motivations for scrambling is to narrow the focus by removing backgrounded material from the focus domain (cf. a.o. Jacobs 1988, Rosen gren 1993, Reinhart 1997, Haider & Rosengren 1998, and Neeleman & Reinhart 1998). Thus, reordering DO and IO in (43b) makes the result pragmatically somewhat ‘odd’ in the context provided by (42a) (= 43a).

(43) a. A: Warum sind denn hier alle so aufgeregt? [G]

b. B: Weil ein Zoowärter einem Kind eine Tarantel gegeben hat
   ‘because a zoo-keeper gave a child a tarantula’

After scrambling DO over IO, focus would fall on IO in Ω-position, which is semantically interpretable as focus on IO or on the remnant constituent [IO V°]. Crucially, many PPs and secondary predicates can serve as FE when they surface in Ω-position. Thus consider (44).

(44) a. A: Warum sind denn hier alle so aufgeregt? [G]

b. B: Weil ein Zoowärter einem Kind eine Tarantel als Geschenk gegeben hat
   ‘because a zoo-keeper gave a child a tarantula as a present’

The facts in (42)-(44) we consider to be the key to an analysis of (40) and (41). Scrambling the FE of (40a) leaves IO in Ω-position. This leads to a narrowing of focus as in (43b). Concomitantly, (40a) – if taken out of the blue – will appear ‘marked’ to many a linguist’s ear, for at least two reasons. First, it is compatible with fewer contexts, where search for an appropriate context – the accommodation of common ground knowledge – could potentially account for degraded acceptability. Secondly, there is a competing DP < PP structure in Dutch.

44 Judging from Gussenhoven (1984) and Zwart (1997), we have no reason to believe that stress assignment in Dutch should significantly differ from German. It seems, by the way, as if there existed a contextually equivalent alternative of (44b) in which main stress is placed on DO, as shown in (i):

(i) Weil ein Zoowärter einem Kind eine Tarantel als Geschenk gegeben hat [G]

In this case, als Geschenk is felt to form a closer union with the main verb, which is semantically light. See Jacobs (1993) for the outlines of a general theory of such ‘integration’-phenomena.
which can express the same thing as (40a), but without scrambling, as illustrated in (45).

(45)  dat Jan het boek aan Marie gegeven heeft  

The PP counts as an FE here. Its semantic focus could be PP itself or the partial constituent [PP V]. Apparently, Dutch speakers prefer to avoid scrambling but rather put stress on PP than on IO-DP. This leads to the one or two question marks for structures like (40a) in the cited literature.\(^{45}\)

Things are different wrt (41). *Cadeau* serves as FE, whether or not DO has scrambled. The effect of scrambling – an exact analysis of which would lead us too far afield here\(^{46}\) – is thus much less perceptible, and the example is judged acceptable. We thus conclude that Dutch *does* allow scrambling of DO over IO. The operation only renders the resulting string ‘more marked’ (cf Müller 1998a, 1999).\(^{47}\) Likewise, it is no surprise that RPs should be much more scrambling-prone, given that they can’t serve as FE in the first place. Consequently, we will extend our analysis of Hessian/German to Dutch and claim that the positioning of RPs in the MF is a subcase of XP-scrambling in *both* languages.

Recall that we already suggested to derive the generalization wrt the ill-formedness of (35a)/(35b) and (36) from a single constraint on scrambling. To

\(^{45}\) Although we believe that our account is along the lines things should be pursued, further research on the Dutch MF is clearly needed. Thus, note the following contrast pointed out by Corver & Delfitto (1999:906).

(i)  a.  dat ik het boek gisteren *(aan) Marie gegeven heb 
    b.  dat ik ’t gisteren *(aan) Marie gegeven heb

\(^{46}\) There is no evidence that the argument presented here is affected by the more complicated derivation of predicate positions in terms of small clauses and PredP, as proposed by Zwart (1993:IV.2.3.). That such an analysis is not without problems is pointed out by Gärtner & Steinbach (1994:3.2.1). Zwart (1997:102, fn 15) abandons one of the most problematic aspects of the original analysis, namely, overt V°-to-Pred° movement. The exact distributional properties of the new analysis are not addressed.

\(^{47}\) The following alternation, presented in Broekhuis (1992:82), points in the same direction.

(i)  dat ik Jan de boeken aangeboden heb
    (ii)  dat ik de boeken Jan aangeboden heb

Likewise, Wartena (p.c.) informs us that (iii) and (iv) can have constant GF-assignment under reordering (‘elkaar’ = IO, J.O. = DO).

(iii) Zij hebben elkaar Johannes Ockeghem aanbevolen
    (iv)  Zij hebben Johannes Ockeghem elkaar aanbevolen

GF-assignment (IO/DO) in (iv) seems to be ambiguous, as Veenstra (p.c.) points out to us.

It is hard to decide whether scrambling or (genuine) base-generation is the right approach in the case of verbs like ‘aanbevelen’ (‘recommend’), ‘aanraden’ (‘recommend’), and ‘afraden’ (‘dis-suade’) (see den Besten 1985:60f11 and Meinunger 1996 for remarks on similar cases in German). For our purposes it is sufficient to note that Dutch MF-orders are more liberal than often assumed in debates on ‘cliticization’, i.e. that the case for ‘elitic’ syntax is vastly overstated. See Vogel & Steinbach (1998) for more work on the base-positions of dative DPs. Further empirical evidence in the same direction is indirectly provided by Geerts et al. (eds.) (1984:988) and directly by Verhagen (1986:204).
flesh this out in more detail, we adopt the proposal by Grewendorf & Sabel (1997) to implement scrambling in terms of a scrambling feature Σ, optionally assigned to an X°-member of the (extended) verbal projection and checked by adjunction to the maximal projection of that head. To capture information-structural effects, it will be necessary to distinguish various instances of Σ. If a scrambled item is deaccented, we take it to have checked Σ_deacc. If it is I-topicalized, we take it to have checked Σ_I-top. Restricting discussion to these two choices for the moment, we propose the following constraint on AgrS°/I° in Dutch.

(46) AgrS°/I° in Dutch cannot be assigned Σ_deacc

The pattern in (35a)/(35b) follows immediately, given the requirement on Σ_I-top to be checked by an element that bears a special accent (L*H), a condition incompatible with the unstressed status of RPs.

(36) also falls out directly as long as the scrambled DO is deaccented. Thus, DO < SU order is possible as soon as another stress pattern is assigned. This has been observed by Neeleman (1994:395f). (47b) is due to Zwart (1997:29).

(47) a. dat zulke boeken zelfs Jan niet koopt
   that such books DO even Jan SU not buys
   ‘that such books even Jan doesn’t buy’

b. dat MaRIE de jongens vaak KUSsen
   that Mary DO the boys SU often kiss
   ‘(that) as for Mary, the boys often KISS her’

DO in both (47a) and (47b) has checked Σ_I-top. This operation goes along with putting the mentioned L*H accent somewhere inside DO, which gives rise to special pragmatic inferences (cf. Büring 1999). At the same time, an I-topicalized element requires a narrow(er) focus to show up somewhere in its c-command domain. In (47a) this is the focus on Jan ‘bound’ by the focussing particle zelfs (even). In (47b) focus is on the stressed verb.

Taking adverbs like vaak to be attached at the left periphery of VP, we have to assume at least for (47b) that the subject is not in its base position, but in Spec,AgrSP. Consequently, I-topicalization of Marie can be taken to have been adjunction to AgrSP, licensed by the checking of Σ_I-top in AgrS°. The relevant partial structure would look like (48).50

(48) [CP [c: dat [AgrSP MaRIE [AgrSP de jongens [AgrS°: AgrSP{Σ_I-top} [TP ]]]]]]

For our purposes, V° and I°, triggering scrambling to VP and IP, will ultimately be sufficient. In order to yield the correct word-order effects, Σ must not be pied-piped under verb-movement, i.e. it has to be checked before the head it is attached to can move.

48 For our purposes, V° and I°, triggering scrambling to VP and IP, will ultimately be sufficient. In order to yield the correct word-order effects, Σ must not be pied-piped under verb-movement, i.e. it has to be checked before the head it is attached to can move.

49 See Jacobs (1997), Molnár & Rosengren (1997), Krifka (1998), and Büring (1999) for recent literature on I-topicalization. It must be considered an open issue whether scrambling of focused elements is an option, i.e. whether scrambling can check something like Σ_deacc (cf. Müller & Sternefeld (1993) and Choi (1999)).

50 Note that we analyze AgrSP as head-initial for expository purposes only (see Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear)).
The picture that emerges for Dutch and German scrambling is that the two languages differ minimally wrt the presence [D] vs. absence [G]/[He] of constraint (46). At the same time, it seems to us that X°-approaches to the same field of data will have a hard time providing an account that is both insightful wrt the ‘markedness’ of certain structures and as parsimonious in syntax-internal assumptions.51

51 It would take us too far afield to give a more elaborate account of to what extent examples such as (28) are compatible with the ordering principles mentioned earlier. Suffice it to say that we are not claiming that these examples are statistically as frequent as their counterparts displaying ‘higher’ pronoun positions. We are only saying that the more insightful theory of German clause-structure, i.e. a version of MPP-plus-strengthening-principles, rules these examples in and looks for an explanation of frequency effects elsewhere. See Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear) for discussion of more urgent cases.

Note, however, that there are remaining areas of ‘optional’ constituent placement in German, regulated – if at all – by factors of co-text and individual speaker preferences. The alternations in (i) and (ii) would seem to be clear cases of this kind of ‘optionality’.

(i)  a. dass ‘n de Hans gesehe hat [He]
  that him ACC the Hans NOM seen has

  b. dass de Hans ‘n gesehe hat
     ‘that Hans saw him’

(ii)  a. Da1 hab ich net [ t1 mit ] gerechnet
     there have I NOM not with reckoned

     b. Da1 hab ich net gerechnet [ t1 mit ]
        ‘I didn’t expect that’

See also our conclusion in 4. Our analysis might have to be complicated if it turned out that subjects in Dutch have more positions available to them, as usually assumed in the literature. However, there is little reason to assume such a complication not to affect competing accounts in exactly the same way. Lenerz (1993:144) comes to a similar conclusion wrt Standard German neutral pronouns, while doubting the applicability of a scrambling approach to RPs in Dutch and West Flemish. For Standard German see also Haider & Rosengren (1998). While Starke (1996:416) claims that neutral pronouns in Standard German occupy XP-positions, his fairly vague usage of the term “rigid placement” (“feste Positionierung”) (ibid.:418f) does not allow us to draw any strong conclusions as to where he stands on the scrambling issue. Cardinaletti (1999) and Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) do not seem to essentially differ from Starke’s (1996) analysis.

On the basis of the contrast in (iii), Müller (1998b) argues that the Standard German RP es should not be treated by scrambling.

(iii)  a. dass [ t1 zu lesen ]2 es1 keiner t2 versucht hat
      that to read it ACC no one NOM tried has
      ‘that no one tried to read it’

     b. *dass [ t1 zu lesen ]2 [ das Buch ]1 keiner t2 versucht hat
        that to read the book ACC no one NOM tried has
        ‘that no one tried to read the book’

Note first of all, that this would not vindicate an X°-approach to RPs, given that weak demonstrative das seems to pattern with es, as shown in (iv).

(iv)  a. dass [ t1 zu lesen ]2 das1 keiner t2 versucht hat [G]
      that to read that ACC no one NOM tried has
      ‘that no one tried to read that’

In addition, we don’t consider the theory underlying the conjecture that (iiiia) cannot be scrambling to be as solid as necessary for it to be taken as decisive. Thus, (iiib) is ruled out on the basis of the postulation that a constituent cannot be α-extracted from an α-moved constituent, for α = scrambling. However, pace Müller (1998b), (v) seems to allow a constituent to be I-topicalized from an I-topicalized constituent.
What do Reduced Pronominals Reveal about the Syntax of Dutch and German?

3.2 ECM

Let us now turn to the *prima facie* clearest case of RP placement in a position unavailable for an XP. Consider the following Dutch ECM-constructions (Zwart 1992:74).

(49) a. dat Jan [ ‘t ]$_1$ gisteren Piet t$_1$ heeft zien doen [D]
   ‘that yesterday Jan saw Piet do it’
   *dat Jan [ de afwas ]$_1$ gisteren Piet t$_1$ heeft zien doen
   ‘that yesterday Jan saw Piet do the dishes’

This contrast, however, does not carry over to German, since examples like (50) are fairly acceptable.

(50) ? wenn du [ ihren Kindern ]$_1$ die Mutter t$_1$ abends [G]
   etwas vorsingen hörst
   ‘if you hear the mother sing a song to her children in the evening …’

The corresponding version with RPs sounds most natural, if embedded in a larger piece of discourse. Thus (51a) and (51b) should constitute a textual sequence.

(51) a. Was is denn mit den alte Zeitunge? [He]
   ‘What’s the matter with the old newspapers’
   b. Lass [ se ]$_1$ misch t$_1$ gleich zum Altpapier bringe [ACC]
   ‘let me take them immediately out to the waste paper bin’

Again, we conclude that at least for German the positioning of RPs and full DPs coincides. Thus, no X°-approach to ‘clitics’ is called for and no empirical argument in favor of head-initial functional phrases between CP and VP can be built on these grounds. The same case might be harder to argue for Dutch. However, according to Veenstra (p.c.) (52) is acceptable as well.

(v) dass [ t zu LESen ]$_2$ [ DIESes Buch ]$_1$ KEINer t$_2$ versucht hat [G]
   ‘that to read this book no one tried’

52 Lenerz (1993:142) presents the following example to argue the same case.

(i) wenn du [ das Buch ]$_1$ eine Kundin t$_1$ lesen siehst,
   die dir verdächtig vorkommt [G]
   ‘if you read a female customer that looks suspicious to you’

Since the ECM-subject is an indefinite here, the example may not be fully comparable to (49b).

53 See also Cooper (1994:90) for Zurich German.
(52)  dat Jan [dat liedje] gisteren Piet t1 heeft horen zingen  [D]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{that Jan} & \quad \text{that song}\text{ yesterday Piet has heard sing} \\
\text{\hspace{1cm} \text{\textquoteleft\textquoteleft that yesterday Jan heard Piet sing that song\textquoteright\textquoteright}}
\end{align*}
\]

We conclude that some kind of scrambling across ECM-subjects must be available even in Dutch, which can then be applied to the RP in (49a) as well.54

3.3 VP-Fronting

VP-fronting is another area of syntax standardly assumed to give indirect evidence for the structure of the MF in Dutch and German. Applying this diagnostic to RP placement, though, is not as common as one might wish.55 Zwart (1992:77fn8), however, presents the following Dutch example.56

(53)  \[ 'r gegeven \] heb ik 't niet \[D\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{her} & \quad \text{give I it not} \\
\text{\hspace{1cm} \text{\textquoteleft\textquoteleft her I give I it not\textquoteright\textquoteright}}
\end{align*}
\]

Now, a direct movement approach to VP-fronting would postulate a VP-trace to the right of niet in (53) (cf. den Besten & Webelhuth 1990). In the light of the foregoing discussion, at least two important questions arise. First, how is the RP within the fronted constituent licensed? Secondly, what is the structure of the ‘VP-less’ MF? To answer the first question, Zwart (1991:84) suggests “that some functional projection is preposed along with the VP”. The example actually discussed there is (54).

(54)  \[ 't 'm geven \] (dat) deed ik zelden \[D\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{it} & \quad \text{him do that I seldom} \\
\text{\hspace{1cm} \text{\textquoteleft\textquoteleft it I him do that I seldom\textquoteright\textquoteright}}
\end{align*}
\]

In keeping with our earlier discussion of generalization (29), we must assume the fronted constituent to be at least (a lower segment of) AgrIOP.57 The IO-CL

---

54 The quasi-idiomatic status of de afwas doen, resulting in reduced ‘separability’, might be responsible for the degraded status of (49b).

55 It is conspicuously absent from the overview of Cardinaletti (1999).

56 Note the object ‘clitic’ ‘r in absolute string-initial position. We’ll come to potential restrictions on that phenomenon in Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear).

57 The adverb zelden could be attached to a higher segment of AgrIOP or TP. The existence of examples like (i) forces another interesting conclusion on this kind of analysis.

(i)  \[ geven \] (dat) deed ik 't 'm zelden \[D\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{give} & \quad \text{that do I it him I seldom} \\
\text{\hspace{1cm} \text{\textquoteleft\textquoteleft give that do I it him I seldom\textquoteright\textquoteright}}
\end{align*}
\]

If the ‘clitics’ are in AgrO in (i) as well, the adverb must be attached lower than that this time. AgrDOP or VP would be possible adjunction sites. Aware of this kind of optionality, Zwart (1997:91) assumes that “adverbs may be generated in various positions.” Now, recall that the order adverb-RP in (34) went along with a narrowing of focus (i.e. number of compatible context types) while the order RP-adverb is perceived as ‘more neutral’. Clearly, it cannot simply be high vs. low attachment of the adverb that causes this effect. Some relativity seems to be involved instead. Thus, it makes a difference whether or not the RPs are in the surface scope of the adverb. Otherwise, (54) would have to be as ‘marked’ as (34a), which it doesn’t seem to be. Of course, principles of information structure distinguish the two examples. Thus, the adverb in (54) is most naturally construed as
within the fronted constituent of (53) and (54) seems to require the latter to be at least an AgrIOP. The lowest possible attachment site for negation or adverbials would have to be a (stranded) higher segment of AgrIOP, as indicated in (55) (Wartena p.c.).

(55) \[ CP [AgrIOP 'm gegeven ]1 heeft [AgrSP Jan het boek [D] [AgrIOP niet t1 ]] ]

The obvious question to ask wrt (55) is the following. How come, DO is attached higher than AgrIOP? The original assumption of a fixed AgrIOP < D AgrDOP hierarchy is clearly not sufficient. Two remedies suggest themselves immediately. Either one allows an extra short-scrambling of DO across IO before AgrIOP is fronted. This could be taken to be similar to the short DO-CL shift allegedly necessary to account for (32b). Alternatively, one could optionally base-generate AgrDOP higher than AgrIOP. Of course, this has not (yet) been proposed explicitly, so we are speculating here. 58 Anyway, we are inclined to think that both repair strategies would have an irrevocable flavor of *ad hoc*ness to them. Thus, even if one were not convinced by our more complicated argument in favor of the (*marked*/’virtual’) existence of DO<IO-orders such as (35a) developed in section 3.1, one would have to allow such orderings in the Dutch MF after all, in order to properly analyze VP-fronting. Most importantly, the consequence of adopting either of the two strategies makes the Agr-approach to argument placement in the MF of Dutch and German virtually indistinguishable from ‘traditional’ scrambling analyses based on the cruder CP < D IP < D VP distinction of Chomsky (1986), which allow XP-objects – RPs among them, as we have argued – to freely adjoin to VP and IP. VP-fronting therefore provides another potentially strong argument in favor of our XP-plus-scrambling approach to the positioning of RPs in the MF of Dutch and German.

Of course, we cannot do justice to the complexities of (remnant) VP-fronting here but refer the reader to den Besten & Webelhuth (1990), Haider (1990), and Müller (1998b). 59

part of the focus (*thematic*), while the one in (34a) is most easily taken to be ‘I-topicalized’. As already noted, the latter operation requires a special accent, which, as also already noted, we count among the typical effects of reordering phenomena in the MF.


59 Whether or not VP-fronting can be reduced to Left-Dislocation in the sense that the fronted XP is base-generated rather than moved is an independent but difficult matter to decide. The following contrasts from German would seem to count against such a move (cf. Haider 1990).

   only rarely
   ‘Only rarely did winners of the Nobel-prize call me up’

   b. * [ Nobelpreisträger angerufen ], das haben mich nur selten
      Nobelpreisträgernom angerufen (G)
      only rarely
      that have me only rarely
3.4 Subject Positions

It should be clear from section 3.1 why in V-final clauses subjects, especially deaccented definite ones, show a strong tendency to surface in the leftmost position of the MF. Call this the ‘α-position’. Such an effect is, of course, strongest for neutral and reduced pronominal subjects. In Dutch, principle (46) contributes further to this tendency. Nevertheless, from our perspective we expect exceptions to arise under ‘favorable circumstances’. Thus, consider the alternations in (56).60

(56) a. weil ’s ’m gefalle hat because itNOM himDAT pleased has [He]
   b. weil ’m’s gefalle hat
   c. weil se (/)MIR NET() gefalle habbe because theyNOM meDAT not pleased have
   d. weil (/)MIR se NET(()) gefalle habbe

In order to be able to say more about the inversion in (56b) and (56d), we have to discuss another more basic factor responsible for MF ordering. Let us begin with the triviality that, as soon as more than one argument of a clausal predicate is expressed, one has to precede the other. Normally, this order reflects the GF-hierarchy SU < IO < DO and/or case-hierarchy NOM < DAT < ACC.61 The mapping of arguments into a position of these hierarchies depends, as is also well-known, on the semantics of the predicate, which implies certain semantic properties of its arguments, crucial ones stemming from the domain of animateness, agentivity, volition, and causation etc. In Germanic languages, arguments with more ‘Proto-Agent entailments’ are likely to surface as SU/NOM in active sentences, while the ones with more ‘Proto-Patient entailments’ are likely to become DO/ACC.62 For ‘psych-predicates’ like ‘gefallen’, these semantic properties are more symmetrically distributed among the two arguments, which results in a much looser hierarchization. This manifests itself in enhanced permutability, as shown in (56), and free choice of which argument may serve as focus exponent in Ω-position.63

(ii) a. [ Bücher lesen ] tut der Hans booksACC read does the HansNOM
   b. [ Bücher lesen ], das tut der Hans booksACC read that does the HansNOM
   c. *[ Bücher lesen ] macht der Hans booksACC read makes the HansNOM
   d. [ Bücher lesen ], das macht der Hans booksACC read that makes the HansNOM

Example (ii) is taken from Gärtner & Steinbach (1994:48,fn69).

60 See Grohmann (1997:178) for more German examples.

61 Note that these hierarchies differ from the ones concerning ‘extractability’ (cf. Keenan & Comrie 1977) and ‘obliqueness’ (cf. Pollard & Sag 1994 and Steinbach 2002).


63 See Höhle (1982), Reis (1987), and Jacobs (1993). We’ll come back to this in Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear).
What do Reduced Pronominals Reveal about the Syntax of Dutch and German? 31

Although a lot of further research is required to integrate these facts into a full-fledged theory of Dutch and German word order, it suffices here to point out that simplistic (SPP-) treatments of subject RPs in terms of COMP-oriented ‘Wackernagelization’ are non-obvious.

Nevertheless there seems to be a wide-spread opinion among syntacticians that more can be said about the positioning of neutral and reduced subject pronouns in the MF of Dutch and German. Thus, to the extent that right-adjacency to COMP is considered strict, a ‘Wackernagel-effect’ (henceforth WE) tends to be diagnosed. At the same time, there is an absence of insightful, comprehensive, and consistent syntactic analyses of that WE.

Proposals, of course, have been made. These vacillate between the assumption of specialized ‘clitic’ phrases between COMP and Spec,IP (cf. a.o. Tomaselli 1990, Platzack 1996, and Müller 1998a, 1998b, 1999), and syntactic adjunction of pronouns to C° (cf. Tomaselli 1990, Cooper 1994, and Zwart 1997). In fact, our approach would not exclude the addition of an extra ‘strengthening principle’ for neutral and reduced subject pronouns. However, we have not yet found a satisfactory formulation of such a principle, a fact that correlates with the as of yet absence of satisfactory phrase structural SPP-style analyses. Since an analysis of subject pronouns has to be consistent with their ability to surface in the initial position of V2-clauses, we will have more to say about them in Gärtner & Steinbach (to appear).

4 Conclusion

We have provided substantial evidence that RPs in Dutch and German can access exactly the same clause-internal syntactic positions as their (deaccented, definite) full DP counterparts. It follows that they should not be conceived of as ‘special clitics’. Therefore, (Agr-based) X°-approaches to the positioning of these elements appear to be on the wrong track. Indeed, we have argued that the few more explicit proposals of this kind of approach lead to serious empirical, technical, and conceptual problems. These shortcomings can only be patched up by means of unilluminating ad hoc (‘weakening’) principles.

Thus, contrary to what is occasionally claimed in the literature,

(57) RPs do not provide evidence for the existence of head-initial functional projections between COMP and VP in Dutch and German.

More specifically, we suggest that all Dutch and German RPs are XPs. In addition we rely on a barriers-style phrase structure (Chomsky 1986), built on a CP <D IP <D VP-hierarchy. MF word order variation in these languages is largely due to XP-scrambling, construed as adjunction to VP and IP. The most attractive aspect of treating RPs on a par with their full DP counterparts is that

the syntactic topology of Dutch and German can be stated in the most general way. Thus, the fact that, in the Dutch MF, definite subjects cannot be preceded by any other deaccented argument, RPs included, can be made to follow from a single principle. We suggest that (46) serves that purpose.

(46) \( \text{AgrS}^0/\text{I}^0 \) in Dutch cannot be assigned \( \Sigma_{\text{deacc}} \)

Zooming in on the ‘microdistribution’ of RPs, we observe that they follow a number of additional constraints. Globally, RPs have a leftward tendency in the MF. The well-known word order principles in (58) already warrant that.

(58) a. Thematic (or backgrounded) elements precede rhematic (or focused) ones
b. Definite items precede indefinite ones
c. ‘Heavy’ elements follow ‘light’ ones

Locally, RSPs are by far the best candidate for the initial position of the MF, which we call ‘\( \alpha \)-position’. Thus, in addition to the principles in (58), there must be some linearization principle making reference to the GF- and/or case-hierarchy implied by the (semantics of the) clausal predicate. We showed that RSPs most easily appear in non-\( \alpha \)-position if the clausal predicate implies a flattened (or reorderable) hierarchy.

All in all, this unifies studies of RPs with studies of ‘free word order’ in the German (and Dutch) MF. Thus, progress on the RP issue, we believe, hinges on urgently needed research into the following familiar questions: How exactly do the above principles interact, that is, how much genuine competition/cumulativity is there? And, can these principles be reduced, e.g. to discourse-semantic and phonotactic principles? We insist that even RP placement in German and Dutch, which is regularly taken to be the most likely candidate for ‘special syntax’ must find substantial explanation from beyond “the limits of syntax.”\(^65\)
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