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

Part 2: Fronting

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 for a subject-/nonsubject-asymmetry wrt fronting into Spec,CP has been overstated. Instead we diagnose what we call 'Conditional Symmetry'. We thus suggest that a more insightful account can be developed if Dutch and German possess exactly one target-position for fronted XPs. 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.

* This article has originally been conceived together with Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming), which now contains the first half of our argument. For comments, suggestions, and criticisms, we would like to thank Peter Eisenberg, Gisbert Fanselow, Caroline Féry, Paul Law, Juliane Möck, Gereon Müller, Inger Rosengren, Matthias Schlesewsky, Tonjes Veenstra, Ruben van de Vijver, Ralf Vogel, and Christian Wartena, as well as audiences at UPotsdam, UStuttgart, UVienna, the "Graduiertenkolleg Ökonomie und Komplexität" at HUBerlin, the 1999 DGfS Workshop on Clitics at UKonstanz, and the 2001 DGfS Workshop on "Dialektsyntax" at Leipzig. Thanks to everyone who invited us. Common disclaimers apply.

to appear in Linguistische Berichte

1 Introduction

The behavior of reduced pronominals (henceforth RPs) in Dutch and German has been argued to have a bearing on two major controversies in syntactic theory, which can be formulated as in (1).

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

In Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming) we have dealt with (1b), arguing that a "standard" XP-approach to RPs is superior to "special clitic theories". Hence, we reject RP-based arguments for lefthand INFL or Agr°-heads between VP and COMP. Here we will address issue (1a).

In Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming) we already noted that the controversy over "the position of fronted constituents" in Dutch and German has to come to grips with examples like (2).[1] [2] [3]

(2) a. 'K zag hem
I^{SU} *saw him*^{DO}
'I saw him'
b.* 'M zag ik
Him^{DO} *saw I*^{SU}
'Him I saw'
[D]

These can be replicated in Hessian (and other southern German dialects), as shown in (3).

(3) a. 'Sch glaub 'm net
I^{NOM} *believe him*^{DAT} *not*
b.* 'M glaub isch net
Him^{DAT} *believe I*^{NOM} *not*
[He]

Further evidence in the same direction is provided by the Standard German pattern in (4).[4]

[1] See also Geerts et al. (eds.)(1984:174), Everaert (1986:33), and Weerman (1989:62).

[2] In this article we will use the following abbreviations for the languages we consider: [D] = Dutch, [F] = French, [G] = German, [He] = Hessian, [Su] = 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.

[3] The pronominal forms we are considering here are listed in (i) for Dutch and (ii) for Hessian. For our views on the pronominal system and the appeal to colloquial variants of German such as "Hessian", see Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming: section 2).

(i) a. subject: {'k ; je ; ie, ze, 't ; we ; -- ; ze}
b. object: {me ; je ; 'm, 'r, 't ; -- ; -- ; ze}
(ii) 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; -- ; -- ; --}

[4] See a.o. Travis (1984:122) and Haider (1984:75). For Dutch *het*, see Travis (1984:127f) and Berendsen (1986:97,fn1), and Travis (1984:117) for Yiddish *es*. The same contrast arises for expletive *es*, depending on whether it replaces a subject – or a nonsubject clause.

(4) a. Es hat den Kohl gefressen [G]
It^{NOM} *has the cabbage*^{ACC} *eaten*
'It ate the cabbage'
b.* Es hat der Wolf gefressen
It^{ACC} *has the wolf*^{NOM} *eaten*
'The wolf ate it'

Travis (1984) and Zwart (1991a, 1993, 1997) take this kind of example as independent empirical evidence for the 'asymmetry analysis' of Germanic V2. Such an analysis assumes that movement of the finite verb in declarative subject-initial V2-clauses targets AgrS° (INFL), the subject being able to remain in its designated position, Spec,AgrSP (Spec,IP). Nonsubject-initial declarative V2-clauses, on the other hand, require the finite verb to move to C° (COMP), while the fronted constituent ends up in Spec,CP. Under these premisses, (2a) and (2b) are roughly analyzed as (5a) and (5b) respectively.[5]

(5) *Asymmetry Analysis*
a. $[_{AgrSP}$ 'K $[_{AgrS°}$ zag$_1$ $]$ $[_{TP}$ hem t$_1$ $]$ $]$
b.* $[_{CP}$ 'M$_2$ $[_{C°}$ zag$_1$ $]$ $[_{AgrSP}$ ik $[_{AgrS'}$ t$_2$ t$_1$ $]$ $]$ $]$

The more 'traditional' so-called 'symmetry analysis' of V2 assigns a uniform structure to both (2a) and (2b). Accordingly, the finite verb invariably targets C° and one XP – subject or nonsubject – must fill Spec,CP, as den Besten (1983) a.m.o. argues.[6] This rival analysis of (2a) and (2b) would roughly look like (6a) and (6b) respectively.

(i) a. Es leuchtet uns ein, dass … [G]
It ^{NOM} *shines us* ^{DAT} *in that …*
'It makes sense to us that … '
b. *Es hat Hans eingesehen, dass …
It^{ACC} *has Hans* ^{NOM} *realized that …*
'Hans realized that …'

That "([s]tressed) pronouns appear in the root [Spec,CP] positions, clitics don't," belongs to the diagnostic "properties" that "confirm [. . .] clitic status" according to Haegeman (1993:144). This would apply to the fronted RPs in (2b), (3b), and (4b). As long as no stronger than terminological conclusions are drawn, we have no objections. To the extent, however, that 'special clitic syntax' is made responsible for such facts, we urge adherents of such an approach to apply their theories to the following contrast in English as well.

(ii) a. HIM, Marsha met b. * 'M Marsha met

For discussion of RPs in Germanic SVO-languages see Josefsson (1992) and Platzack (1996). Curiously, Haegeman (1993) does not apply the same test to subject RPs.

5 The CP layer of (5a) may be absent according to Zwart (1997:159).

6 There are a number of variants of this analysis that diverge on independent grounds. Thus another so-called 'asymmetry analysis' by Reis (1985) takes only complementizer-initial clauses to be of category CP, while V2-clauses are invariably analyzed as IP. Stechow & Sternefeld (1988) discuss a so-called 'difference hypothesis', become wider known as 'split-COMP analysis' (Müller 1995). According to that view IP is dominated by two projections, CP and TopP, the former hosting complementizers and WH-elements while the latter provides landing sites for sentence-initial non-WH XPs and the finite verb.

(6) *Symmetry Analysis*
a. [$_{CP}$ 'K$_2$ [$_{C°}$ zag$_1$] [$_{IP}$ t$_2$ hem t$_1$]]
b.* [$_{CP}$ 'M$_2$ [$_{C°}$ zag$_1$] [$_{IP}$ ik t$_2$ t$_1$]]

Clearly, the asymmetry-analysis presupposes the existence of (at least) two head-initial functional projections on top of VP, while the symmetry analysis requires only one. Thus, which of the two analyses is more successful will have obvious consequences for the second phrase structural controversy as well, namely, "the existence and position of INFL" (=1b). Likewise, generalizations holding equally for fronted subjects and nonsubjects are less straightforwardly stateable in terms of the asymmetry analysis. In fact, it was originally considered one of the virtues of a minimalist asymmetry-analysis that in the "theory of Economy of Derivations and Representations [. . .] linear notions such as 'second position' are meaningless. [. . .] A 'second effect' shows up whenever both the head and the specifier position of a functional projection are filled in overt syntax" (Zwart 1991b:32f). We take it that the notion of 'highest specifier' is equally considered to be epiphenomenal. To the extent that that view is still implicit in asymmetry analyses, it constitutes one of the problematic 'hidden assumptions', given that there are many generalizations one has to make about the 'highest specifier' of Dutch and German V2 declaratives. (See Vikner & Schwartz (1996); and Gärtner & Steinbach (1994, 1997) for facts independent of the RP issue.)

In the following, we will provide evidence that the symmetry analysis should be considered correct, while the asymmetry analysis suffers from technical, conceptual, and empirical defects (section 2). Section 3 is devoted to an exploration of syntax-external principles on which can be built an alternative account for the asymmetry effects that originally gave rise to asymmetry analyses.

2 The Pros and Cons of (Special) 'Clitic'-Syntax: Fronting[7]

Although (5) is suggestive of a principled distinction between fronted reduced subject and object pronouns (henceforth abbreviated as RSPs and ROPs, respectively), the question arises as to what it is exactly that prohibits (2b)/(5b), while allowing (2a)/(5a). According to Travis (1984:119) the following constraint does the trick.[8]

(7) *Restriction on Topicalization*
Unstressed pronouns may not topicalize

[7] See Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming: sections 2 and 3) for our view on the "special clitic (syntax)" issue and the distinction between "special-purpose positioning" (SPP) and "multi-purpose positioning" (MPP), which we will keep referring to.

[8] Haider (1984) assumes that for (individually) fronted non-nominative NPs "the licensing context is focusing." This account is subject to the same objections as (5).

To the extent that the term 'unstressed' covers both neutral pronouns and RPs, (7) is easy to falsify, as has been pointed out by Lenerz (1993:120) for Standard German (8a), which is easily replicable for Dutch, as (8b) illustrates.

(8) a. Dich KENN ich doch [G]
b. Jou KEN ik toch [D]
you know I surely
'I surely know what you're up to'

(8) instantiates (an idiomatically extended use of) so-called 'Verum-focus' (Höhle 1992), i.e. the focusing of the veridicality of a sentence. For V2 clauses this requires the main accent to fall on the finite verb, while everything else is backgrounded and thus deaccented. Obviously, the 'unstressed' neutral object pronoun *dich*/*jou* can be fronted under such circumstances, in direct violation of condition (7). Let us therefore consider a slight reformulation of (7), such as (9).

(9) *Restriction on Topicalization*
RPs must not topicalize

Recall further that we take Standard German *es* to be an RP (cf. Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming: section 2)). Then the contrast in (2)-(4) would fall out straightforwardly, if we assumed in addition that fronted RSPs are not 'topicalized'.

Of course, it would now be desirable to give an independent characterization of what it means to be 'topicalized', at least for Dutch and German. However, it is hard to see how such a characterization could – terminology notwithstanding – be derived from the domain of information-structure.[9] Thus, the asymmetry analysis seems to have to be based on a trivialized version of (7)/(9), namely (10).

(10) *Restriction on Fronting*
RPs must not be put into Spec,CP

Given the well-formedness of (2a), (3a), and (4a), condition (10) would trivially presuppose some kind of asymmetry analysis of Germanic V2-clauses. RSPs could be taken to stay in Spec,AgrSP in compliance with (10), provided, of course, that AgrSP is head-initial. The unenlightening nature of (10) considerably weakens the independent *empirical* support for an asymmetry analysis, purportedly derivable from contrasts like (2). Thus, without much ado one could change the term *RP* in (10) into *ROP* and pursue a symmetry analysis instead.

[9] See a.m.o Reinhart (1981), Dowty (1991), Drubig (1992), Gärtner & Steinbach (1994, 1997) and Büring (1999) for reasons to believe that subjects are '(default) topics' under any sensible pragmatic construal of the term 'topic'. See a.m.o. Drubig (1992) and Prince (1998) for the pluri-functionality of fronting, even in English.

This might be one of the reasons why Zwart (1997) takes a different line on the asymmetry issue.[10] Let us emphasize (again) that Zwart (1997) only provides "the bare outlines of an approach to cliticization" (ibid.:282). The reason we nevertheless go through the following lengthy excercise is to (a), convey the flavor of X°-based approaches to 'clitic'-placement in Germanic and to (b), dispel the impression that developing such an approach is simply a matter of a few definitions or that X°- and XP-based approaches to this problem are just notational variants.

Note that up to now, constraints on the fronting of RPs are formulated in a way that takes them to be XPs. Zwart's theory, however, is based on the assumption that "clitics are generated in X°- specifier positions of functional heads" (ibid.:282), i.e. 'clitic'-placement is a matter of X°-internal syntax (and postsyntactic morpho-phonology).[11] Zooming in on the details of this approach, we have to make an X°-internal distinction first. Take X° in (11a) to be a functional head, instantiated by AgrDO° in (11b) (cf. ibid.:268ff).

(11) a. $[_{X^\circ}$ N $[_{X^\circ}$ V X°]] b. $[_{AgrDO^\circ}$ DO-CL $[_{AgrDO^\circ}$ F(v) AgrDO°]]

The higher attachment site hosts elements (like pronominal 'clitics') that check *nominal* (=*N*-) features against X°. The lower projection hosts elements (like the formal features of the finite verb, F(v)) that check *verbal* (=*V*-) features against X°. Let us call the positions NAS ('nominal attachment site', corresponding to the term 'X°-specifier' in the earlier quote) and VAS ('verbal attachment site') respectively. As we are going to see, at least two VASs seem to be allowed for placing the finite verb. However, it is required that, wrt one X°, every NAS (of X°) c-commands every VAS (of X°). N-feature checking can occur either X°-internally, as in (11b) or through a YP-specifier of X°, as illustrated in (12).

(12) $[_{AgrDOP}$ DO $[_{AgrDO'}$ $[_{AgrDO^\circ}$ F(v) AgrDO°]]]

(2a) would now be treated as follows. Movement of the verbal features, F(v), which are pied-piped by AgrDO° and T°, and attachment of the subject-'clitic' target AgrS°, as shown in (13).

(13) $[_{AgrS^\circ}$ SU-CL $[_{AgrS^\circ}$ $[_{T^\circ}$ $[_{AgrDO^\circ}$ F(v) AgrDO°] T°] AgrS°]]

Given that there is no C-projection and no more features to be checked, (13) should be 'spelled-out' (as part of a larger clause structure). However, "Morphology will not be able to interpret isolated formal features" (Zwart 1997:182). Apparently, F(v) needs some kind of lexical support. For (13), this support is going to be provided by a Last Resort raising of LC(v), the 'lexical categorial

[10] Zwart (1997) supersedes (at least) two earlier versions of asymmetry analyses, on which accounts for the contrast in (2)-(4) were based. Vikner & Schwartz (1996), Platzack (1996), and Gärtner & Steinbach (1994, 1997) thoroughly criticize and reject these earlier versions. See Zwart (1994) for a reply.

[11] We have already pointed out the disadvantages of such an approach wrt M(iddle)F(ield)-placement of RPs in Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming: 3.1).

features' of the finite verb, which were stranded inside VP when F(v) raised to AgrS° earlier (ibid.:182f). LC(v), being of verbal provenance, must target a VAS. In fact, "the LC-features of the verb adjoin above the highest V-position in the head adjunction structure" (ibid.:272). (13) would thus be transformed into (14).

(14) $[_{AgrS°}$ SU-CL $[_{AgrS°}$ LC(v) $[_{AgrS°}$ $[_{T°}$ $[_{AgrDO°}$ F(v) AgrDO°] T°] AgrS°]]]

LC(v) determines the actual spell-out position of the finite verb. Consequently, V2 in subject-initial-declaratives hosting an RSP in AgrS°, such as (2a) and (3a), crucially involves structures like (14).

Turning next to what prohibits (3b), we have to make a little detour. Zwart (1997:279) observes that French yes/no-questions differ from their Dutch and West Flemish (and Hessian) counterparts insofar as the former allow, while the latter disallow, sentence-initial ROPs, as illustrated in (15) (ibid.:279f).[12]

(15) a. L' as tu vu? [F]
It have you seen
'Have you seen it?'
b.* 'N hat de Hans gesehe? [He]
Him^{ACC} *has the Hans*^{NOM} *seen*
'Has Hans seen him?'

It is conjectured that this difference "is a matter of proclisis versus enclisis, rather than a matter of pied piping versus stranding" (ibid.:280). Both French (15a) and Hessian (15b) coincide wrt the structure of the C°-node, given in (16).

(16) $[_{C°}$ LC(v) $[_{C°}$ $[_{AgrS°}$ … DO-CL … F(v) …] C°]]

However, only French can avail itself of an additional application of 'clitic-raising', which targets an NAS of C°. Thus, (16) would be the basis for the well-formed Hessian yes/no-question in (17).

(17) Hat 'n de Hans gesehe? [He]
Has him^{ACC} *the Hans*^{NOM} *seen*
'Has Hans seen him?'

The underlying structure of French (15a), however, is (18).

(18) $[_{C°}$ DO-CL$_1$ $[_{C°}$ LC(v) $[_{C°}$ $[_{AgrS°}$ … t_1 … F(v) …] C°]]]

[12] To speed things up, we use Hessian examples instead of West Flemish (or Dutch) ones. Unfortunately the analysis of Dutch in Zwart (1997) is confusing, because on the one hand it is observed that Dutch object 'clitics', as opposed to their West Flemish (and Hessian) counterparts, never reach C°, but have to be stranded in AgrS° the latest (ibid.:276). On the other hand, a number of structures (ibid.:271,(55)) and (ibid.:274,(59)) do show object 'clitics' attached inside a complex C°-node. These structures are mapped into Dutch (not West Flemish) sentences on the respective pages. So, in order not to misrepresent things, we keep mentioning Dutch even where only West Flemish and Hessian might in the end be at stake.

The question, of course, must be posed as to how principled an account this is. Thus, short X°-internal 'clitic-raising' as such must be available in Germanic OV-languages, in order to allow RPs to strand in the MF (ibid.:280), as discussed at length in Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming: 3.1). Why then should the same operation be prohibited in the C-domain of the same languages? Now, mention of the directionality of cliticization ('proclisis versus enclisis') is suggestive of Cooper's (1994:93) solution for the same kind of problem in Zurich German.[13]

(19) Object clitics in Zurich German can only cliticize to the left, as enclitics

Transposing (19) to Dutch, West Flemish, and German might be the key to an account for the ill-formedness of (2b), (3b), and (15b), although (4b) would seem to remain as a problem. However, we have presented evidence in Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming: 3.3) that at least for Dutch the equivalent of (19) cannot be generalized. Thus compare (20a) with Zurich German (20b) (Cooper 1994:92).[14]

(20) a. ['r gegeven] heb ik 't niet [D]
her^{IO} *given* *have I*^{Su} *it*^{DO} *not*
b.* [em aazlüüte] hät er gar nöd probiert [Zh]
him^{ACC} *call up* *has he*^{NOM} *even not tried*
'He not even tried to call him up'

Hessian seems to pattern with Dutch, as (21), the direct translation of (20b), shows.[15]

(21) a. ?['n AAzurufe] hat er gar net probiert [He]

Thus, while constraint (19) properly rules out (20b), a generalized version of it is too strong for Dutch and Hessian. It therefore looks as if nothing short of a stipulation like (22) can prevent the X°-approach to 'clitic'-placement from failing on the issue at hand.

(22) There is no 'clitic-raising' inside C° in Dutch, West Flemish, and Hessian

(22) is clearly necessary independently, in order to rule out unwelcome V3 structures like (23) from surfacing.[16]

[13] See Gärtner & Steinbach (1997) for an attempt to apply Cooper's idea to German. Note that her principle (19) is taken to apply at PF, Zurich German ROPs being considered "phonological clitics only" (Cooper 1994:90).

[14] Werner (1999:98) presents data that directly contradict Cooper's judgments, which heightens the prospects for a unified analysis.

[15] See Abraham & Wiegel (1993:27) for similar observations in Austrian dialects.

[16] (20) may also play a crucial role in ruling out the following derivation. Suppose C° in (16) bore an unchecked [+top]-feature, or whatever it is nonsubject constituents check in Spec,CP of declarative V2-clauses. Why couldn't 'clitic-raising' in (18) be triggered by the need to check that [+top]-feature? Of course, the unwelcome effect of such a derivation would be the generation of

(23) a.* [$_{CP}$ XP [$_{C'}$ [$_{C°}$ DO-CL$_1$ [$_{C°}$ LC(v) [$_{C°}$ [$_{AgrS°}$ t$_1$ F(v) …] C°]]] IP]]
b.* Heute 'n hat de Hans net gesehe [He]
Today him^{ACC} *has the Hans*^{NOM} *not seen*

Now, the example Zwart (1997:271) actually discusses is not (2a) but (24a), a (partial) structural analysis of which is given in (24b) (ibid.:273).

(24) a. 'k heb 't [D]
I^{SU} *have it*^{DO}
b. [$_{AgrS°}$ SU-CL [$_{AgrS°}$ LC(v) [$_{AgrS°}$ [$_{T°}$
[$_{AgrDO°}$ DO-CL [$_{AgrDO°}$ F(v) AgrDO°]] T°] AgrS°]]]

Again, one might wonder why short 'clitic raising' cannot apply in (24). In Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming: 3.1) we already noted that DO-IO 'clitic'-clusters in the Dutch M(iddle)F(ield) (and 'clitic'-stranding) are brought about by such an operation. By analogy, (25a) and (25b) threaten to be possible spell-outs of the structure in (25c) (cf. ibid.:273).[17]

(25) a.* 'k 't heb b.* 't 'k heb [D]
c. [$_{AgrS°}$ [$_{SU\text{-}CL}$ DO-CL$_1$ SU-CL] [$_{AgrS°}$ LC(v) [$_{AgrS°}$ [$_{T°}$
[$_{AgrDO°}$ t$_1$ [$_{AgrDO°}$ F(v) AgrDO°]] T°] AgrS°]]]

The – tacit – assumption seems to be that something like constraint (26) holds.

(26) There is no 'clitic-raising' inside AgrS° in Dutch, West Flemish, and Hessian

Like (22), (26) appears to be a necessary addition to an X°-theory of 'clitic'-placement, whose sole function is to X°-internally guarantee the V2-property. Otherwise, even (27) should be derivable.

(27) * Jan 't heeft [D]
Jan^{SU} *it*^{DO} *has*

Trying to unify (22) and (26) on the basis of (28) is not an attractive option for the asymmetry-analysis, given the view – mentioned earlier – that notions like 'second position', and, derivatively, 'highest specifier' are 'meaningless' (cf. Zwart 1991b:32f).

examples like (2b) and (3b). Thus, (22) might make the addition of constraints like (ia) or (ib), reminiscent of Travis's original 'restriction on topicalization', superfluous.

(i) a. [+top] must be checked by an XP in Spec,CP
b. RPs cannot bear the feature [+top]

[17] Additionally, for double-object structures that realize all the arguments as 'clitics' there would be the unacceptable permutations in (i) to worry about.

(i) a. * 'k 't 'm gaf b. * 'k 'm 't gaf c. * 't 'k 'm gaf [D]
d. * 't 'm 'k gaf e. * 'm 'k 't gaf f. * 'm 't 'k gaf

Haegeman (1993) would seem to steer clear of this kind of problem, since her 'clitic-heads' do not interact with the inflectional heads involved in verb-movement. See Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming).

(28) There is no 'clitic-raising' inside the highest clausal head in Dutch, West Flemish, and Hessian

Clearly, the framework laid out in Zwart (1997) is an instance of what we called a S(pecial)P(urpose)P(ositioning)-approach in Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming). (22) and (26) belong to the unilluminating weakening principles that tend to have to be added to this kind of approach. An XP-approach to the placement of RPs, like the one we already defended for clause-internal positions in Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming: 3.1), can avail itself of a single generalization for argument placement in OV-languages displaying the V2-property. Exactly one XP can access Spec,CP, a multi-purpose position. The other – non-extraposable – XPs have to stay in the MF. This generalization would follow under standard X-bar theory from the availability of exactly one specifier in the C-domain and a ban on adjunction to C' and CP. All of these things have to be assumed by the asymmetry analysis as well, both for the C-projection and its AgrS counterpart.[18] We can thus preliminarily conclude that the asymmetry analysis of V2 in Zwart (1997), based on an X°-approach to the placement of RPs, does not look like a serious rival to a symmetry analysis.[19]

Yet, our proposal to stick with the more traditional M(ulti)P(urpose) P(ositioning)-approach to Spec,CP discussed in Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming) doesn't seem to yield any interesting solution for the contrast in (2)-(4), as the structures in (6) indicate. In fact, it looks as if we would have nothing interesting to say about it. This is not so, however. But let us first have a closer look

[18] AgrSP must actually be an adjunction site as long as it is immediately dominated by C'. Again, stating the appropriate principle is not fully in the spirit of the asymmetry analysis. For more detailed discussion see Schwartz & Vikner (1989) and Vikner & Schwartz (1996).

[19] Another issue to be addressed by asymmetry analyses of V2 – irrespective of their view on RPs – is provided by the following well-known alternation presented in Koster (1987:257).

(i) a. dat het boek hem gegeven werd [D]
that the book SU *him* IO *given is*
b. dat hem het boek gegeven werd

Koster (1987:259) assumes that the subject in (ib) can remain in its base position inside VP, while the derived subject position is filled by an empty category. Translated into Agr-based clause structure this would look like (ii) We omit TP and AgrDOP.

(ii) [C' dat [AgrSP [NP e] AgrS° [AgrIOP hem AgrIO° [VP het boek gegeven werd]]]] [D]

The obvious question to be asked is why (iiia) is not a well-formed declarative sentence of Dutch, given the analysis in (iiib), predicted to be fine by asymmetrists.

(iii) a. *Werd hem het boek gegeven [D]
b. [AgrSP [NP e] werd$_1$ [AgrIOP hem t'$_1$ [VP het boek gegeven t$_1$]]]

Again, a generalization about Spec,CP and the availability of topic-drop (see section 3.1 and Gärtner & Steinbach 1997:section G), as well as the use of expletives would be a preferable line to pursue. However, as already noted, "second position principles", and thus, derivatively, "highest specifier principles," the latter to range over Spec,CP and Spec,AgrSP, would seem to go against the spirit of the "asymmetry analysis" (cf. Zwart 1991b:32f). The same kind of problem arises with every kind of "low subject effect". For further data see den Besten (1985) and Broekhuis (1992). On the issue of expletives see Vikner & Schwartz (1996). Another full set of difficult facts for an asymmetry analysis to handle, arising in the area of indefinite pronouns, has been discussed by Gärtner & Steinbach (1997:section F).

at some additional data. Interestingly, contrary to what the asymmetry-analysis might lead one to expect, there is a considerable number of RSPs that cannot occur sententence-initially either. For Dutch, this has been observed by den Besten (1983, 1989:27), Geerts et al. (eds.) (1984:175, 941) and Weerman (1989:63).

(29) a. dat ie niet kan komen
that he^{SU} *not can come*
'that he cannot come'

b.* Ie will niet komen [D]
He^{SU} *wants not come*
'He doesn't want to come'

For Hessian this effect seems to be fairly wide-spread.[20]

(30) a. Zu spät seid 'r
Too late are you^{NOM}
'You are too late'

b.* 'R seid zu spät [He]
You^{NOM} *are too late*

It looks as if phonological constraints on cliticization have to be taken into account after all. Thus one has to develop a theory why a.o. Dutch *ie* and Hessian *'r* do not procliticize while they do figure as enclitics. We'll come back to this in section 3.2.

Turning to ROPs, there is another surprise in store. As Weerman (1989:62) pointed out already, there are exceptions in Dutch to the ban on fronting these elements.

(31) 't hebben we 'm gisteren nog verteld [D]
it/that^{DO} *have we*^{SU} *him*^{IO} *yesterday yet told*
'We managed to tell him that, yesterday'

In addition, Geerts et al.(eds.)(1984:942) mention the following example.[21]

(32) Me dunkt dat hij daar wel wat eerder [D]
Me^{DO} *seems that he*^{SU} *there well what earlier*
aan had kunnen denken
at had can think
'It seems to me that he could well have thought about that somewhat earlier'

For Hessian, similar examples have been given by Gärtner & Steinbach (1994:38,fn61, 1997:3).[22]

[20] Examples from other Germanic languages, Swedish and Norwegian among them, abound. This has been documented in Gärtner & Steinbach (1997:7).

[21] Declaring (32) irrelevant on the basis that it is highly 'idiomatic' wouldn't seem to be consistent with the earlier claim that one of the key properties of Dutch RPs is to figure in idioms (see Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming: section 2)).

[22] In the light of (4) above, it may be objected wrt (31) and (33a) that the fronted ROPs do not derive from personal pronoun *het* and *es* but from the weak demonstratives *dat* and *das*. This has been proposed by Cooper (1994:93fn7). However, if *'s* derives from *das* in (33a), why can't *'m* in (3b) derive from its demonstrative counterpart *dem*? As (i) shows, such a process is fully regular in the domain of determiners, which are form-identical to the weak demonstratives.

(33) a. ’s hab isch net gewusst [He]
it^{ACC} *have I*^{NOM} *not known*
‘I didn’t know that’
b. mer habbe se de Giggel geklaut
me^{DAT} *have they*^{NOM} *the bike*^{ACC} *stolen*
‘They have stolen my bike’

Furthermore, the contrast in (4) may not be as solid either. Thus, *es* in Spec,CP can – under ‘favorable circumstances’ – receive an object interpretation, as illustrated in (34a) (Lenerz 1994:162) and (34b) (Beatrice Santorini p.c.).[23]

(34) a. Ihr Geld ist ja nicht weg, meine Damen und Herren. [G]
Your money^{NOM} *is indeed not away my ladies and gentlemen.*
Es haben jetzt nur andere
It^{ACC} *have now only others*^{NOM}
‘Indeed, your money isn’t gone, ladies and gentleman. It’s only that others have it now’
b. Das wissen nicht nur die Experten, es wissen auch die Laien
That^{ACC} *know not only the experts*^{NOM}*, it*^{ACC} *know even the laymen*^{NOM}
‘Not only the experts know that, even the laymen do’

Clearly, context factors and syntactic parallelism contribute to the well-formedness of (34). An even more striking example is (35).

(35) a. A: Wie ist denn das Kind zu dem Buch gekommen? [G]
How is then the child^{NOM} *to the book come*
‘How did the child get the book, by the way?’
b. B: Es hat ihm jemand geschenkt.
It^{ACC} *has him*^{DAT} *someone*^{NOM} *presented*
‘Someone gave it to him as a present’

In the context set up by question (35a), putting object *es* into Spec,CP appears to be unobjectionable.

(i) a. Das/ ’s Buch kannst de gleich weglege [He]
the book ^{ACC} *can you* ^{NOM} *immediately away-lay*
‘The book, you can put away at once’
b. Dem/ ’m Hans glaub isch net
The Hans ^{DAT} *believe I*^{NOM} *not*
‘I don't trust Hans’

[23] Susie Wurmbrand (p.c.) pointed out to us that the *es*-initial sentence of (34a) may be derived from the expletive-initial variant in (i).

(i) Es haben es jetzt nur andere
It have it ^{ACC} *now only others* ^{NOM}

One could indeed speculate that something like the Dutch *er-er*-contraction rule (cf. den Besten 1983, 1989) may then produce (34a) from (i). We do not think, though, that one has to go that far. See, however, section 3.1 below for some remarks on the role of ‘syncretism’ in the licensing of fronted ROPs.

Crucially, we take the existence of examples like (31)-(35) as evidence that syntax proper should not be in charge of banning the fronting ('topicalization') of ROPs in Dutch and German. The unilluminating *ad hoc*ness of attempts to formulate the necessary constraint further assures us that our point of view is justified. There being no absolut subject/nonsubject asymmetry in the domain of fronted RPs in the first place, it follows that no asymmetry-analysis of V2 is called for. Let us therefore call the more complicated picture emerging for fronted RPs 'conditional symmetry'.

(36) *Conditional Symmetry*
   a. RSPs can be fronted under conditions c_i, … , c_n
   b. ROPs can be fronted under conditions c_j, … , c_m

It crucially follows from all of this that no empirical argument in favor of head-initial AgrSP (IP) in the Dutch and German MF is forthcoming from this domain either (cf. Gärtner & Steinbach forthcoming).

Having said that, we immediately concede that the fronting of ROPs isn't anywhere nearly as frequent as the fronting of their subject counterparts. In keeping with what we called an MPP-approach to RP placement in Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming), we contend that these frequency effects can be put to – independently motivated, 'suprasyntactic' – 'strengthening principles'. Section 3 will be devoted to substantiation of this claim providing a case study of RP-frontability, i.e. our account for 'conditional symmetry', which demonstrates the lines along which, we think, further research on Dutch and German RPs should be pursued.

3 Fronting Reduced Pronouns: A Multifactorial Account

We are now going to add the 'strengthening rules' to our MPP-account of the fronting of reduced argument pronouns.[24] These principles correspond to the conditions appealed to in our empirical diagnosis from section 2, called 'Conditional Symmetry'.[25]

Section 3.1 concentrates on (negative) conditions for (36b), some of which constitute conditions for (36a) as well. Thus, RP-fronting can be blocked to the extent that the grammar offers one or both of the following functionally related strategies, namely, topic-drop and fronting of a weak demonstrative. On the positive side, frontability of RPs is enhanced if they are put first on the scale of unmarked argument order. An additional factor involved is morphological 'syncretism'. Section 3.2 adds (negative) conditions for (36a), derived from phonol-

[24] For the sake of brevity we concentrate on German/Hessian here. Clearly, a lot more research on Dutch is needed to construct the argument fully in parallel.

[25] Some of the conditions have been hinted at in our discussion of scrambling in Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming).

ogy. These crucially rest on a preference for phonological *en*- over *pro*cliticization.

3.1 Blocking and the Functional Paradox

Our first step will be to point out the triviality that German V2 declaratives require Spec,CP to be filled. In minimalist jargon, this means that the appropriate C° contains a strong TOP-feature.[26] Given that, at least in the Germanic V2-languages, TOP is category-neutral, the question arises as to which element should be fronted under which circumstances.

Concerning discourse conditions, to begin with, it has repeatedly been observed that fronted constituents can serve either an 'anchoring-function' or a 'furthering-function', to use Szabolcsi's (1981) theory-neutral terminology.[27] More specifically, fronted elements can either be deaccented, I-topicalized, or focused. Thus, much like Σ, the trigger for scrambling (cf. Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming)), TOP comes in three varieties, TOP^{deacc}, $TOP^{I\text{-}top}$, and TOP^{foc}. The choice of a particular instantiation of TOP is governed by pragmatic principles of discourse structuring. Fortunately, we can ignore $TOP^{I\text{-}top}$ and TOP^{foc} for the case at hand, given that RPs are incompatible with the required pitch accent.

Next, it is another well-known fact that the main discourse function of deaccented personal pronouns, reduced or neutral, is to pick up a salient (discourse) referent.[28] Since this function is independent of syntactic position, we have to dig even deeper and ask what the specific effect of *fronting* a deaccented personal pronoun could be. It is another triviality that fronting puts a constituent into a (locally) 'exposed' position. Thus, Spec,CP in German (and Dutch) could be called the 'α^{ex}–position' in analogy to the 'α-position' in the MF (cf. Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming)). From this 'exposure' we can derive what we tentatively call a 'functional paradox'.

(37) *Functional Paradox*
Fronted RPs have to keep the balance between 'high exposure' and 'low referential energy'

'High exposure' can be understood in the following two ways. First, arguments in α^{ex}–position serve as the 'subject' for the main clausal predication. It is this relation which speakers assert by using a V2 declarative. Secondly, adopting notions from centering theory, we can observe that expressions in α^{ex}–position

[26] Throughout, we have favored the more neutral term 'fronting' over 'topicalization'. Thus, the feature could be called FRONT instead. However, we stick to common usage for the sake of readability.

[27] For English this has been pointed out a.o. by Drubig (1992) and Prince (1998), for German see a.o. Haider (1984).

[28] See Bosch (1983) and Reinhart (1991) We gloss over the distinction between anaphora and deixis highlighted in Bosch (1983). Also, we abstract away from bound variable readings for the sake of brevity.

seem to be functionally equivalent to English subjects insofar as they normally determine which referents are most "salient in the *output* attentional state" (Kameyama 1999:312). Thus, choice of an element for the α^{ex}–position is one of the delicate tasks in fitting a V2 declarative into discourse.[29]

The second important causal factor in the 'functional paradox' can be explicated on the basis of centering theory as well. Thus, wrt the "nominal expression type hierarchy, [. . .] an entity realized by a higher-ranked phrase is normally more salient in the *input* attentional state" (Kameyama 1999:311f). RPs occupy one of the highest positions on that hierarchy. Inverting the perspective, we therefore suggest that picking up a salient referent consumes only little 'referential energy'.[30]

Now, interestingly, the grammar of German provides two alternative devices for resolving this paradox, namely, *topic-drop* and *weak demonstratives*. Take topic-drop first, illustrated in (38).

(38) a. ∅ komm gleich [He]
come soon
'I'm coming'

b. A: Was is 'n mit dem Kennedy?
What is then with the Kennedy
'What about Kennedy'

c. B: ∅ kenn isch net
know I^{NOM} *not*
'I don't know him'

Topic-drop, the zero-realization of a fronted constituent, constitutes the lowest position on the scale of 'referential energy'. At the same time, high exposure is eluded through a trick, at least as far as PF goes. Thus, the paradox seems to be avoided.

Clearly, using topic-drop competes with the fronting of RPs. What we therefore suggest is that the existence of structures like (38c) contributes to the *blocking* of structures like (2b), (3b), and (4b). More specifically (38c) seems to be preferred over (39).

(39) * 'n kenn isch net [He]

[29] Dowty (1991:564) reminds us that "in English and languages of similar typology, the grammatical relation 'subject' is a weak indicator of 'Topic'," the latter term to be construed in the 'aboutness' sense (cf. Reinhart 1981). For German, there is evidence that the α^{ex}–position is that indicator (cf. Haider 1984). Thus, in the terminology of Li & Thompson (1976), German has a number of properties typical of 'topic-prominent languages.' Dutch may be in between English and German in this respect. Clearly, conditions for the MF α–position are different. Thus, the task of computing the exact subordination relation for V-final clauses interferes with the internal establishing of predication and centering relations connected with arguments in that position.

[30] Clearly, a lot more research into Kameyama's EXP ORDER hierarchy is needed. Thus, in the same way as the behavior of stressed vs. unstressed pronouns in English is derived wrt a single position on that hierarchy called 'pronoun', refining the system-based interaction of RPs, neutral pronouns and weak demonstratives is required for a deeper understanding of the German and Dutch system. That English personal pronouns take over some of the demonstrative functions has been noted in Gärtner (1998, 2001).

Interestingly, topic-drop fails to be available in a number of environments. First, as discussed by Cardinaletti (1990:79), the null-pronominal supposedly occupying Spec,CP under topic-drop cannot be construed as a 1. or 2. person *object*. Neither, secondly, can it stand in for a dative, as (40) illustrates.[31]

(40) a. A: Un wieso hat den Asylante niemand geholfe? [He]
And why has the asylum-seekers^{DAT} *noone*^{NOM} *helped*
'Why didn't anyone help the asylum-seekers'
b.* B: ∅ hilft hier doch nie einer
helps here for-all-that never one^{NOM}
'No one ever helps them over here'

Even if the salient discourse referent is itself presented in dative case in the preceding discourse segment, zeroing a dative object via topic drop is ill-formed. Crucially, it should now come as no surprise that 1.DAT ROPs *can* be fronted. We have seen this in section 2. The example is repeated below as (41a). (41b) illustrates the same thing.

(41) a. Mer habbe se de Giggel geklaut [He]
Me^{DAT} *have they*^{NOM} *the bike stolen*
'They have stolen my bike'
b. Mer gefällt 's hier net
Me^{DAT} *pleases it here not*
'I don't like this place'

Clearly, (41a) and (41b) lack a competitor from the domain of topic drop, so we expect them to behave differently from (39) above.

Note furthermore that none of the more complex cases of ROP-fronting in (34) is rivaled by topic-drop, as (42) shows.

(42) a. A: Ihr Geld ist ja nicht weg, meine Damen und Herren. [G]
b.* A: ∅ haben jetzt nur andere.
c. A: Das wissen nicht nur die Experten.
d.* A: ∅ wissen auch die Laien.

This is due to the fact that topic-drop is restricted to colloquial registers of language use.[32] The examples in (42), however, clearly belong to the more formal

[31] This is pointed out in Sternefeld (1985:407,427). Cardinaletti (1990) discusses "categorial restrictions on pro" only wrt PPs, which are not allowed to be affected by topic-drop either, at least in German and Dutch. Zurich German seems to provide an exception in the area of instrumental PPs, as Cooper (1994:150) observes. That datives follow the same constraint would seem to force Cardinaletti's analysis to be modified in one of the following ways: (i) topic-drop is not contrained wrt category but grammatical function or (ii) datives are analyzed as hidden PPs. For the latter proposal wrt Dutch see Mulder & den Dikken (1991). Weerman (1989:54), however, shows that IO *can* undergo topic-drop in Dutch. This counts against strategy (i) and implies that Mulder & den Dikken's analysis must be rejected for Dutch indirect objects.

[32] An exception seems to be 'diary-drop', as discussed by Haegeman (1990).

register typical of public speeches. Even (35) may be slightly degraded, if topic-drop replaces the fronted ROP *es*.

(43) a. A: Wie ist das Kind zu dem Buch gekommen? [G]
b.? B: ∅ hat ihm jemand geschenkt

This could follow from the decreased accessibility of the intended referent *das Buch*, as opposed to the DP *das Kind*, the latter providing another salient discourse referent picked up by a personal pronoun.[33]

Turning to weak demonstratives, we get a similar picture. An alternative to (38c), showing no easily observable contextual differences, would be (44).

(44) Den kenn isch net [He]
that^{ACC} *know I*^{NOM} *not*
'I don't know him'

Moving up on the scale of 'referential energy' from an RP to a weak demonstrative resolves the functional paradox in the other direction. We suggest that (44) is another part in the 'conspiracy' against (39). In other words, the existence of (38c) and (44) together contribute to the blocking of (39).

Again, there is a curious constraint on the use of weak demonstratives. As is well-known, the paradigm of weak demonstratives lacks 1. and 2. person instances altogether. Once more, fronting of a 1. person ROP in cases like (41) is unsurprising, as there is no alternative to such a strategy. The availability of 3. person weak demonstrative *das*, on the other hand, contributes to the precarious status of examples like (4b), (34), and (35). For those speakers who judge these degraded, using weak demonstratives under fronting must be a strong preference.

Let us briefly summarize where our 'conspiracy-theory' stands at this stage. We suggest that there is a (weak) inverse correlation between the availability of topic-drop or weak demonstratives and the possibility of ROP-fronting. This is expressed in (45).

(45) a. Availability of topic-drop or weak demonstratives makes ROP-fronting less felicitous
b. Non-availability of topic-drop or weak demonstratives makes ROP-fronting more felicitous

Although (45a) and (45b) captures the observations made in this section so far, it cannot be formulated more strictly. Otherwise, one would expect (46a) and (46b) to hold.

(46) a. $[\ \mathrm{ROP}(x) \wedge x \in \{1., 2.\}\ ] \rightarrow \mathrm{frontable}(x)$
b. $[\ \mathrm{ROP}(x) \wedge x \notin \{1., 2.\}\ ] \rightarrow \neg\mathrm{frontable}(x)$

[33] This would be directly derivable from Kameyama's (1999:312) GF ORDER hierarchy.

Such a picture is too simplistic, though. Even if the frontable ROPs in (41) fall under (46a) and (46b), additional constraints complicate the picture. It is another well-known fact that word order of (DP-) arguments in German is influenced by something that could most neutrally be called 'verbal (or clausal) perspective'.[34] Here we are only interested in which argument should occupy the highest (most prominent) position, c-commanding its coarguments. Sidestepping the thorny issue of linking theory, we simply note that, in German, the default for this is (47).

(47) Nom < {Dat, Acc}

(47) – ultimately to be theoretically embedded in centering theory – we consider to play an important role in accounting for the fact that RSPs almost invariably go for the α-position in the MF (cf. Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming)). Likewise, we suggest that (47) accounts for the fact that among RPs, RSPs are the default candidate for the α^{ex}-position, i.e. they occur in Spec,CP most naturally. More specifically, the elements highest on the hierarchy induced by (47) can be fronted without the investment of extra 'referential energy'. This is due to the triviality that some XP has to be fronted in every German V2 declarative.[35] Conversely, the reordering of such a hierarchy, as most of the time necessary under ROP-fronting, does consume extra 'referential energy', a state of affairs in conflict with the reduced nature of RPs.

However, in the case of certain predicates, involving a shift of verbal (or clausal) 'perspective', (47) can be neutralized, i.e. the hierarchy of arguments can be altered. Thus, psych-verbs like *gefallen* allow the dative-experiencer to be the highest argument. Therefore, (41b) is expected not to run into the functional paradox. See also (48) for the instantiation of a psych-verb with an accusative object.[36]

[34] See also Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming). Dowty (1991:562ff) makes a strong case for the distinction between 'event- dependent' and 'discourse-dependent' definitions of thematic roles, the latter indirectly responsible for the ordering pattern we call 'perspective.' He suggests that that term be reserved for discourse-dependent notions. We compensate for our 'misuse' by prefixing 'verbal (or clausal)' to it.

[35] Further default candidates for α^{ex}-position are stage setting adverbials and the multi-purpose expletive *es*, the latter one of the indicators that German is a 'topic-prominent' language.

[36] It would be interesting to explore the relation between our views and the relativized minimality approaches to ROP fronting, as discussed in Vikner & Schwartz (1996). As (41a) shows, the hierarchy in (47) is likewise reorderable if a dative ROP and a nominative RSP differ wrt specificity of reference. Thus, in that famous example, the 1.SG.DAT ROP picks up a salient referent, 'chaining' or 'establishing' a center (cf. Kameyama 1999:312), while the 3.PL.NOM RSP, being used generically, contributes a referent of much lower attentional status, i.e. it doesn't chain a center, but establishes – a less salient – one instead. Where this picture is reversed, unacceptability results, as (i) shows.

(i) *Mer will se net zuhöre [He]
Me^{DAT} *want she*^{NOM} *not listen-to*
'She doesn't want to listen to me'

(48) ? m'sch JUCKT des net [He]
Me^{ACC} *itches this*^{NOM} *not*
'This doesn't bother me'

Even so, there are further subtleties ahead of us. Thus note that 2. person ROPs as opposed to their 1. person counterparts are degraded under fronting.[37]

(49) a.??Der habbe se de Giggel geklaut [He]
You^{DAT} *have they*^{NOM} *the bike stolen*
'They have stolen your bike'
b.??D'sch JUCKT des wohl net
You^{ACC} *itches that well not*
'That doesn't bother you, I guess'

Likewise, a number of further ROPs remain degraded under fronting, even if psych- predicates are used. This is illustrated in (50).

(50) a.* 'R / ??'M gefällt des net [He]
b.??'N / ?? Se juckt des net

As for the contrast between (49a) and (41a), one can note that only the latter contains a fronted ROP supported by 'syncretism'. Thus, looking at the paradigm of ROPs, we observe that the surface-form *mer* occurs not only in the 1.SG.DAT slot but also in 1.PL.NOM. Additionally, RSP *mer* is the Hessian realization of the frequently used 'generic' pronoun *man* ('one') from Standard German. Syncretism plays an equally important role in stabilizing the fronted ROP *'s* and *es* in (33a), (34), and (35), given that over and above the corresponding RSP, there is the widely used expletive of identical surface shape canonically occuring in α- or α^{ex}-position. Although appeal to syncretism may sound fairly speculative at this stage, some such factor may be far more important in accounting for RP positioning than is evident at this point. Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming) already noted that in West-Flemish there are "three elements whose distribution cannot be equated to that of the other pronouns" (Haegeman 1993:142). These are IO *ze* and DO *ze*, *t*, and *er*, which optionally occur in 'higher' positions. Crucially, each of these four ROPs is syncretically related to an RSP or expletive 'clitic'. Furthermore, it has regularly been observed that syncretism in pronominal systems is an important factor in licensing hybridization phenomena.[38]

Note, finally, that relying solely on syncretism in the licensing of fronted ROPs would be insufficient. Thus, syncretism doesn't seem to make a difference in the case of 3.SG.F.DAT *'r* as well as 3.SG.F.ACC. and 3.PL.ACC *se*. Although

[37] It is tempting to postulate a constraint banning fronted 2. person RPs across the board, since the RSP *de* is equally unacceptable in Spec,CP.

[38] See a.o. Gärtner (1998, 2001) on 'paradigm syncretism' linking relative pronouns and weak demonstratives and Vogel (2000) on 'case syncretism' governing the behavior of wh-relative pronouns in free relative clauses. The function of syncretism/analogy in language change is also widely recognized, as discussed by Howe (1996).

these forms possess a form-indentical counterpart in the RSP paradigm they are unacceptable in α^{ex}-position. This, however, is due to the fact already hinted at in section 3.2, that these specific RSPs themselves are unacceptable in that position. Recall that under 'conditional symmetry' as stated in (36a), RSPs too can only be fronted if they meet certain constraints. These constraints we suggest stem from the domain of phonology, to which we turn in the next section. (51) and (52) summarize the empirical findings so far.

(51) a. ROP^{DAT} = { mer ; der ; 'm , 'r, 'm ; -- ; --; -- } [He]
b. frontable: √ ?? ?? * ??

(52) a. ROP^{ACC} = { m'sch ; d'sch ; 'n , se , es / 's ; -- ; -- ; se } [He]
b. frontable: ? ?? ?? ?? √ √ ??

3.2 The phonology of cliticization

In the next subsection we will add phonological restrictions on procliticization that RPs must obey if they occupy sentence-initial position. Hence, the phonology of 'cliticization' provides further 'strengthening principles'. In 3.2.1 we will show that *en*cliticization is the preferred option in languages like Dutch and German. In section 3.2.2 we turn to fronted RPs.

3.2.1 Encliticization versus procliticization

It is well-known that RPs in Dutch and German are not phonological words. Berendsen (1986), Prinz (1991), Booij (1996), and Hall (1998) among others argue that RPs project at most a syllable node. According to Hall (1998:109), the reduced forms of pronouns[39] violate constraint (53), which governs the minimal size of a phonological word (π-word) in German.

(53) *Minimal word requirement:*
The π-word in German is minimally bimoraic

Moreover, RPs violate further well-formedness conditions on π-words. Thus they differ from π-words in that they can have short full lax vowels in word-final position ('Lax Vowel Constraint') and they are able to begin with a schwa ('Schwa Constraint'). Hence, an RP is not parsed as an independent π-word. Instead it must prosodically integrate into an adjacent π-word.

Unlike Romance 'clitics', German RPs can be integrated into quite different phonological hosts. This is illustrated in (54) for ROPs and in (55) for RSPs.

[39] Hall's terminology differs from the one proposed here. Following Kohler (1977), he calls RPs 'weak' and neutral pronouns 'strong'. All reduced forms of function words and possibly even all the neutral forms seem to violate constraint (53).

Enclitic ROPs can be π-hosted by complementizers (54a), nouns (54b), finite auxiliaries (54c), finite verbs (54d), adverbials (54e), or prepositions (54f).

(54) *Possible π-hosts for ROPs* [He]
a. …dass 'm de Hans heut die Meinung gesagt hat
...that him^{DAT} *the Hans*^{NOM} *today the opinion*^{ACC} *told has*
'… that Hans told him off today'
b. …dass de Hans 'm heut die Meinung gesagt hat
c. De Hans hat 'm heut die Meinung gesagt
d. De Hans sagt 'm heut die Meinung
The Hans^{NOM} *tells him*^{DAT} *today the opinion*^{ACC}
e. …dass heut 'm de Hans die Meinung gesagt hat
f. De Hans hat net mehr mit 'm gerechnet
The Hans^{NOM} *has not anymore with him counted*
'Hans didn't expect him anymore'

RSPs have a more limited distribution than ROPs. We argued in Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming) that unstressed, i.e. neutral or reduced, subject pronouns are the best candidates for the α-position in the MF. Therefore, they are expected to be adjacent to whatever occupies COMP.[40] This can be either a complementizer (55a), a relativizing DP (55b), a finite auxiliary (55c) or a finite verb (55d). Furthermore, adverbials (55e) and reduced (55f) or prominent object pronouns (55g) may intervene between COMP and an RSP.

(55) *Possible π-hosts for RSPs* [He]
a. …dass mer 'm Hans heut die Meinung gesagt ham
...that we^{NOM} *the Hans* ^{DAT} *today the opinion*^{ACC} *told have*
'… that we told Hans off today'
b. …die Frau, dere Mutter mer die Meinung gesagt ham
...the woman whose mother^{DAT} *we*^{NOM} *the opinion*^{ACC} *told have*
c. Heut ham mer 'm Hans die Meinung gesagt
d. Heut sage mer 'm Hans die Meinung
Today tell we^{NOM} *the Hans* ^{DAT} *the opinion*^{ACC}
e. ?...weil heut mer 'm Hans die Meinung gesagt ham
...because today we^{NOM} *the Hans*^{DAT} *the opinion*^{ACC} *told have*
f. … weil mer 's hier gefällt
...because me^{DAT} *it here pleases*
'…because I like it here'
g. … weil (/)MIR se NET(\) gefalle
...because me^{DAT} *they*^{NOM} *not please*
'…because I don't like them'

To repeat, RPs are phonologically deficient elements that must be phonologically integrated into an adjacent π-word. We have already seen that in Dutch and

[40] Besides, subject pronouns cannot be π-adjoined to prepositions because in Dutch and German, subjects do not occur PP-internally for reasons of case.

German there aren't any special syntactic restrictions on the distribution or host of RPs. Hence, there is no evidence for a 'special clitic-syntax' and an analysis that simply assumes π-incorporation into or π-adjunction to an adjacent π-word would seem to be sufficient.

Now, many linguists working on RPs in Standard Dutch and Standard German or in different colloquial and dialectal variants of Dutch and German have claimed that enclitic forms interact more strongly with their hosts than proclitic ones.[41] They have tried to capture this asymmetry by assuming that only enclitics π-incorporate into the preceding π-word. Proclitics, on the other hand, cannot be π-*incorporated* into the following π-word. Instead, they either π-*adjoin* to the adjacent π-word or π-incorporate into the adjacent π-*phrase*.

It follows that rules whose domain are the prosodic word should exclusively apply to combinations of enclitics and their hosts, while being blocked in procliticization configurations. The clearest example for this asymmetry is resyllabification, the domain of syllabification being the π-word. This is illustrated in (56a).[42] Further rules that only apply under encliticization but not procliticization are schwa-deletion (56b),[43] /n/-insertion (56c),[44] and word-internal devoicing (56d).[45] Crucially, these rules do not apply under procliticization.[46] Resyl-

[41] Cf. Prinz (1991) for northern variants of German, Hall (1998) for Standard German, Berendsen (1986) for Standard Western Dutch, and Booij (1996) for Standard Dutch.

[42] See also Berendsen (1986) and Booij (1996) for similar data in Dutch. According to Berendsen (1986:48f), verb-forms followed by a schwa-initial RP have two different pronunciations in his variant of Dutch: a verb-final obstruent can either be voiced or voiceless, as shown in (i).

(i) a. he[b/p] [ə]r *have her*^{DO} b. gaa[v/f] ie *gave he*^{SU} c. laa[d/t] [ə]m *unload it*^{DO} [D]

He argues that schwa-initial RPs trigger resyllabification only optionally. Therefore, he takes them to be adjoined either to the π-word, annotated as ω, or to a prosodic category above the word level, which he annotates as ø. Resyllabification can be found only in the first case whereas final devoicing applies only in the second. This is illustrated in (ii).

(ii) a. $(\text{he.bəm})_{\omega}$ b. $((\text{hep})\ \text{əm})_{\text{ø}}$ [D]

[43] Hall (1998:120) accounts for this observation by means of the 'Prevocalic Schwa Constraint', which excludes ($_{\omega}$ …ə[-cons]…) if both the schwa and the following vowel belong to the same π-word. The configuration schwa+vowel is only grammatical when a π-word boundary occurs between the schwa and the vowel, as can be seen in (ia) for compounds and in (ib) for prefixed words. Proclitic RPs equal prefixes in this respect.

(i) a. ($_{\omega}$ Käse) ($_{\omega}$ auf) ($_{\omega}$ lauf) – [kɛ:zəaʊflaʊf] [G]
b. be($_{\omega}$ arbeiten) – [bəaʁbaɪtən]

[44] (56c) is from Suebian. Some variants of this dialect have /r/-insertion instead of /n/-insertion (cf. Haag-Merz 1995). See also Berendsen (1986) and Booij (1996) for similar examples of /n/- and glide-insertion in Dutch, and Cooper (1994:76f) on /n/-insertion in Zurich German.

[45] The generalization behind (56d) is that in German "within words […] a voiceless consonant+[sə] is occuring, whereas a voiceless consonant+[zə] is not. This phonotactic regularity holds within lexical words" (Hall 1998:128). Given that this test cannot be applied in procliticization configurations, it provides theory-internal evidence only (cf. also the following footnote).

In Dutch we find a voice-alternation with *d*-initial reduced determiners as is illustrated in (i), i.e. Dutch has word-internal devoicing and regressive voice assimilation (Berendsen 1986, Lahiri et.al 1990, and Booij 1996). The reduced *d*-initial pronoun /dər/ 'her' can either π-incorporate into the preceding π-word or land outside of it. In the latter case it either π-*adjoins* to the preceding π-*word* or it π-*incorporates* into the preceding π-*phrase*. π-incorporation triggers word-internal devoicing, whereas both consonants are voiced if the RP lands outside the π-word (Booij 1996:237).

labification is ungrammatical in this case, as is illustrated in (56a). The same holds for schwa-deletion in Dutch (56b) and /n/-insertion (56c). The examples in (56b) are taken from Booij (1996:226, 231) and the ones in (56a) and (56d) from Hall (1998) (cf. also Prinz 1991 and Haag-Merz 1995).[47]

(56) *Pro- and encliticization of RPs in Dutch and German*

		procliticization	encliticization	
a.	resyllabification:	'nAuto [n.au.to]/*[nau.to] *a car*	geht 'r [ge:.tɐ] *goes he*^{NOM}	[G]
b.	Schwa-deletion:	we eten [ʋəetən] *we*^{SU} *eat*	haalde 'm [haldəm]/*[haldəəm] *fetched him*^{DO}	[D]
c.	/n/-insertion:	d' Anna *[dənanna] *the Anna*	wo 'e [vonə] *where I*^{NOM}	[Su]
d.	word-internal devoicing:		kommt se [kɔmtsə] *comes she*^{NOM}	[G]

Apart from this asymmetry between pro- and encliticization, RPs in Dutch and German obey further phonological restrictions. Cliticization is, for example, unacceptable if the RP and the adjacent consonant of the π-host are homophonous. (57c) is due to den Besten (p.c.).

(57) a.* 'Sch schreib grad en Brief [He]
I^{NOM} *write just a letter*^{ACC}
'I'm just writing a letter'
b. Sie sehn 'n ??[nn]/[nən]
They^{NOM} *see him*^{ACC}
c.* 'K kus Marie [D]
I^{SU} *kiss Mary*^{DO}

(i) a. Ik mag d'r b. (ω mag d'r) [maxtər] [D]
I^{SU} *like her*^{DO} c. (ϕ (ω mag) d'r) [maɣdər]

Lahiri et.al. (1990) argue that speakers prefer the phonological representation that is faithful to the underlying lexical representation of the preceding verb, i.e. (ic).

46 This difference between pro- and encliticization is further confirmed by the following observation (cf. Kohler 1977). In German, apical plosives and nasals can be assimilated to the preceding and following adjacent labials and velars. There is, however, a crucial difference between progressive and regressive assimilation. Progressive assimilation applies within π-words whereas regressive assimilation applies across a π-word boundary. Hence, we expect assimilation of the RP [n] under both encliticization and procliticization. This is illustrated in (ib) and (iib) respectively. It looks as if the assimilation is only partial under procliticization, i.e. we only get feature-spreading of [+ labial] from [b] to [n] in (iib), the feature [+apical] remaining intact.

(i) a. Liebsch 'n Franz? (ω li:b.ʃ n) [Su]
(you) love the Franz ^{ACC}?
b. Ja, ich lieb 'n Franz (ω li:.bm)
Yes, I ^{NOM} *love the Franz* ^{ACC}
(ii) a. n' Hans lieb ich (ω n (ω hans))
the Hans ^{ACC} *love I* ^{NOM}
b. n' Bernd lieb ich (ω n/m (ω bɛnt))
the Bernd ^{ACC} *love I* ^{NOM}

47 We think that representing glottal-stops might ultimately be necessary to get a clearer picture of some of the processes.

Vowelless RPs like Dutch /k/ exhibit further coocurrence restrictions under encliticization. The reduced form /k/ can only be used if it forms a wellformed coda with the preceding consonant(s). According to Booij (1996) the schwa-initial 'allomorph' /ək/ must be used if the preceding consonant is [t], [x], or [p], because [tk], [xk], and [pk] are impossible codas in Dutch (Booij 1996:233).

(58) a. zal 'k [lk] b. moet 'k *[tk]/[tək] [D]
should I^{SU} *must* I^{SU}

Note finally that frequent combinations of π-host and enclitic interact more strongly than less frequent ones. The gemination in (59) can only be reduced in (59a) when the 1.PL.NOM. RSP /mɐ/ is π-hosted by the auxiliary *ham*[48] but not in (59b) where, homophonously, its 1.SG.DAT. ROP counterpart is π-hosted by the noun *Hamm* (Westphalian town). A similar asymmetry can be found in Dutch, as Booij (1996) argues.[49]

(59) a. gestern ham mer [ha.mɐ] zuviel gebabbelt [He]
yesterday have we^{NOM} *too-much talked*
b. weil Hamm mer [ham.mɐ]/*[hamɐ] gefällt
because Hamm^{NOM} *me*^{DAT} *pleases*

So far, we have established that in Dutch and German, enclitics interact more strongly with their π-host than proclitics. This difference is captured by different types of prosodic structures for pro- and encliticization. Booij (1996) and Hall (1998) analyze encliticization of RPs as π-incorporation into the preceding π-word as is illustrated in (60) (cf. also Prinz 1991).[50]

(60) *Enclitics*: $(\text{host} + \text{enclitic})_{\omega}$

[48] In Suebian the plural form of the auxiliary *haben* (have) is *hen*. In this case, encliticization triggers progressive assimilation of the final nasal:

(i) geschdern hem mer im Rebstöckle zviel trunke [Su]
yesterday have we ^{NOM} *in-the Rebstöckle too-much drunk*

[49] Prinz (1991) observes the following additional restriction that can be found in northern variants of German.

(i) a. *wohingegen də... b. weil də... [G]
whereas you ^{NOM} *because you* ^{NOM}

Encliticization is only grammatical in these variants of German if the final syllable of the host bears an accent. This restriction does not seem to hold in southern variants of German (cf. Haag-Merz 1995:129 for Suebian). Besides, morphologically complex complementizers like *wohingegen* cannot always be found in the southern variants of German that are under discussion.

[50] Hall (1998) argues that in German forms like /zɪ/ or /dʊ/ ending in a short full lax vowel, which are intermediate forms between neutral pronouns and RPs, must not π-incorporate into the preceding π-word. Otherwise they would violate the Lax Vowel Constraint (cf. above). Hence, Hall proposes the following alternative structure for encliticization.

(i) $((\text{host})_{\omega} + \text{enclitic})_{\phi}$

The voice-alternation in Standard Western Dutch mentioned by Berendsen (1986) would provide additional evidence for the assumption that some enclitics can optionally π-adjoin at the ϕ-level. In this dialect, all RPs can optionally π-incorporate into either the preceding π-word or π-phrase (cf. footnote 42 above). Note that Lahiri et. al. (1990) and Booij (1996) assume the same thing for encliticization of *d*-initial 'clitics' in Dutch.

RPs that contain a schwa or a full lax vowel and the German vowelless RPs with a nasal (i.e. /m/ and /n/) count as a syllable and thus π-incorporate into the last *foot* of their π-host. RPs like Dutch /k/ and /t/ or Hessian /s/ and /ʃ/, however, that consist of a [-nasal] consonant do not project a syllable and therefore are forced to π-incorporate into the last *syllable* of their π-host. As already mentioned, the latter option is only available if the RP and the final consonant of the π-host form a well-formed coda. Thus, encliticization is π-incorporation at the lowest possible level.

Procliticization, on the other hand, we analyze as π-incorporation into the following π-phrase, as argued by Hall (1998). Proclitic elements cannot π-incorporate into the following foot because feet are left-headed in Dutch and German. Left-headedness implies that the leftmost syllable of the foot must bear the accent. This, of course, excludes RPs from that position. Being unable to π-incorporate into or π-adjoin to the π-word, their lowest possible attachment site is the π-phrase as illustrated in (61).[51]

(61) *Proclitics*: (proclitic + (host)$_{\omega}$)$_{\phi}$

Because of the leftheadedness of Dutch and German, encliticization constitutes the optimal prosodic structure namely the one of type [sw]. Procliticization, on the other hand, results in a suboptimal prosodic structure ([ws]).

Further support for this encliticization preference comes from the fact that Dutch and German are 'stress-timed' languages (cf. Pompino-Marschall 1995:236f). Therefore, the boundaries of the relevant rhythmic constituent can be aligned with a ω- and/or ϕ-boundary in sequences of host+enclitic. Proclitic+host sequences, on the other hand, cannot align with the left edge of such a – necessarily stress-initial – rhythmic constituent. On the contrary, the boundary of this kind of constituent can even separate a proclitic from its host, an impossibility in the host+enclitic case (cf. Kohler 1977).

Last but not least, encliticization prevents the creation of schwa-initial phonological constituents as well as schwa-initial hiatus.

Summing up, the clear preference for encliticization in Dutch and German is not just an empirical coincidence but highly systematic and deeply rooted in the phonological systems of these languages.

Two further observations complete this picture. First, we would expect that an RP like Dutch /k/ should procliticize to the following π-word if by doing so it can avoid the forming of an illformed coda with the preceding word (see above).

[51] Booij analyzes procliticization as π-adjunction to the π-word as is illustrated in (i):

(i) (proclitic + (host)$_{\omega}$)$_{\omega}$

According to him, the intervening ω-node blocks the application of word-initial rules to the proclitic+host sequence in (i). One argument in favor of Hall's analysis is the distribution of schwa in German and Dutch. Booij's analysis predicts that sequences of proclitic schwa-initial RPs and their host form a π-word. However, structures like ($_{\omega}$ əs ($_{\omega}$ kɔmt)) 'it comes' or ($_{\omega}$ən ($_{\omega}$ man)) 'a man' seem to violate the 'Schwa Constraint' constraint already mentioned (cf. Hall 1998:118).

But even in this case, encliticization of the less-reduced schwa-initial form /ək/ wins out over procliticization as shown in (62), cf. Booij (1996:234).[52]

(62) a. (Dat) heb 'k aan
(That^{DO}*) have I*^{SU} *on*
'I wear that'
b. ($_\sigma$ he)($_\sigma$ pək)($_\sigma$ an) [D]
c.* ($_\sigma$ hep)($_\sigma$ kan)

Secondly, reduced forms of determiners *can* be used as proclitics, i.e. they can π-adjoin to the immediately following π-word of the NP they belong to, as (63a) illustrates. Encliticization is, however, the preferred option when the DP is embedded inside a PP. In this case, the reduced determiner encliticizes to the preposition, as (63b) and (63c) shows.

(63) a. 'M Hans
the Hans^{DAT}
b. hinter 'm Haus
behind the house
c. im Haus
in-the house
[G]

Combinations of preposition and reduced determiners like *in'm* are blocked by the lexicalized form *im* (cf. Prinz 1991 and Nübling 1995).

3.2.2 The phonology of fronted RPs

The preceding section provides us with a further factor in the conspiracy against RPs in α^{ex}-position. We have seen that proclitics are much more loosely integrated into their host than enclitics. The resulting degree of instability amounts to the (violable) principle in (64).

(64) Avoid procliticization

We are now going to appeal to this further condition in accounting for the fact that some RSPs, although they meet the criteria for fronting discussed in section 3.1, do not felicitously occur in α^{ex}-position. More specifically we want to derive the pattern in (65).

(65) *Frontability of Hessian RSPs*

	Hessian RSPs	frontability		
		√	??	*
a.	RSPs with syllabic sonorant /ɐ/:	mɐ		ɐ
b.	Consonant-initial RSPs containing /ə/:		də, zə	
c.	Consonant-final RSPs:	ʃ, s		

In order to derive the pattern illustrated in (65) we have to take the syntax-phonology mapping into account. Comparing the proclitic elements in the α^{ex}-position in (66) to the homophonous proclitic elements contained in morphological words (67a) or in a sentence-initial DP (67b) or VP (67c), we can observe that only in the latter contexts the proclitic element can π-incorporate into the following π-phrase.

[52] We come back to the phenomenon of reduction in 3.2.

(66) a.* ’r arbeitet [ʁaʁbaɪtət] [He]
he works
b.* de’ hast wiedermal nix verstande c.* ’n ruf isch net aa
you have again nothing understood *him call I not up*

(67) a. erarbeitet [ʁaʁbaɪtət] (morph. word) [He]
aquire-3.SG/2.PL.
b. de’ Hassan kommt morsche (DP)
the Hassan comes tomorrow
c. ?’n aazurufe hat er gar net probiert (VP)
him call up has he even not tried

These data suggest that some kind of phonological boundary must be postulated between the α^{ex}-position and the following C’-constituent. The absence of this boundary in the examples in (67) is due to the fact that the proclitic element bears a selectional relation to its host (bound morheme – stem in (67a), determiner – head noun in (67b) and complement – verb in (67c)).

What differentiates the elements in (65) is whether or not they are able to straddle that boundary. Thus the 3.SG.M.NOM. and 2.PL.NOM. form /ʁ/ is unable to project the required phonological constituent. /ʁ/ does not show the phonological independence necessary to surmount that boundary. The intermediate status of /zə/ and /də/ under fronting appears to result from the fact that for these elements the edge of reduction coincides with the edge of attachment. Under encliticization the same state of affairs is compensated by proper π-incorporation into the adjacent π-word. We know that procliticization doesn’t allow this. As a consequence speakers seem to try to compensate for the instable edge by – impressionistically speaking – lessening vowel reduction.[53] To the extent that this leads back to a form indistinguishable from the neutral pronoun, the degraded acceptability of fronted RP /zə/ and /də/ follows. In contrast to /zə/ and /də/ the element /mʁ/ is better equipped for the α^{ex}-position. First of all, reduction does not affect it at the edge of attachment. Secondly, the nasal segment /m/ is stronger than /s/ and /d/, preceding them on the sonority hierarchy. Both these properties in combination make /mʁ/ ‘fit for exposure’.

Finally, note that /ʃ/ and /s/ have a special status. It has frequently been observed that word-internally (alveo-)palatal fricatives can be added to an onset by a special rule (cf. a.o. Kenstowicz 1994:258f). The segmentally identical proclitics are parasitic on that process. [54]

This phonological account of the frontability of RSPs allows us to complete our account of ROPs developed in section 3.1. There we suggested that the

[53] This is further confirmed by the observation made by Nübling (1992) that in Bernese German, the vowel of enclitic forms is either reduced to schwa or completely deleted whereas most proclitic forms contain a short full lax vowel.

[54] Nevertheless, the difference between the status of /*s*/ and /ʃ/ as either part of the onset or as proclitic, π-adjoined to the π-phrase, can be clearly detected. For similar observations wrt Dutch see Berendsen (1986:80ff).

factor of syncretism with frontable RSPs contributes to the frontability of 1.SG.DAT /mɐ/ and 3.SG.N.ACC /s/. At the same time, syncretism with an RSP is useless in the case of 3.SG.F.ACC and 3.PL.ACC /zə/ as well as 3. SG.F.DAT *'r*. This is due to the fact that the corresponding RSPs themselves are unable to be fronted for purely phonological reasons.

4 Conclusion

In this article we argued that contrary to what is occasionally claimed in the literature,

(68) Reduced pronouns do not provide distributional evidence for an 'asymmetry analysis' of verb second.

Instead, their behavior is fully compatible with the 'traditional' assumption that V2 invariably targets a functional projection outside IP, the specifier of which is accessible to XPs irrespective of their grammatical function or categorial status. What microdistributional differences there remain between reduced pronouns and full DPs, on the one hand, and reduced object pronouns and reduced subject pronouns on the other hand, we put to independently motivated principles of (morpho-)phonology and discourse structure.

The conclusion arrived at here is fully in line with what has been argued in Gärtner & Steinbach (forthcoming), namely that

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

In sum, we believe that a standard XP approach to RPs that derives their positions by means of XP-scrambling and XP-fronting offers a more unified and therefore more attractive perspective than its 'special clitic'-based rivals.

References

Abraham, Werner & Anko Wiegel. (1993): "Reduktionsformen und Kasussynkretismus bei deutschen und niederländischen Pronomina". In: Werner Abraham & Josef Bayer (eds.), Dialektsyntax. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag [= Linguistische Berichte, Sonderheft 5], 12-49.

Berendsen, Egon. (1986): The Phonology of Cliticization. Dordrecht: Foris.

Besten, Hans den. (1983): "On the Interaction of Root Transformations and Lexical Delitive Rules". In: Werner Abraham (ed.), On the Formal Syntax of the Westgermania. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 47-132.

Besten, Hans den. (1985): "The Ergative Hypothesis and Free Word Order in Dutch and German". In: Jindrich Toman (ed.), Studies in German Grammar. Dordrecht: Foris, 23-64.

Besten, Hans den. (1989): Studies in Westgermanic Syntax. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Booij, Geert. (1996): "Cliticization as Prosodic Integration: the Case of Dutch". The Linguistic Review 13, 219-242.

Bosch, Peter. (1983): Agreement and Anaphora. London: Academic Press.
Broekhuis, Hans. (1992): Chain-Government. Amsterdam: HIL.
Büring, Daniel. (1999): "Topic". In: Peter Bosch & Rob van der Sandt (eds.), Focus. Cambridge: CUP, 142-165.
Cardinaletti, Anna. (1990): "Subject/Object Asymmetries in German Null-Topic Constructions and the Status of SpecCP". In: Juan Mascaró & Marina Nespor (eds.), Grammar in Progress. Dordrecht: Foris, 75-84.
Chomsky, Noam. (1986): Barriers. Cambridge, MA: MIT-Press.
Cooper, Kathrin E. (1994): Topics in Zurich German Syntax. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh dissertation.
Dedenbach, Beate. (1987): Reduktions- und Verschmelzungsformen im Deutschen. Schwache Formen bei Artikeln und Pronomina. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.
Dowty, David. (1991): "Thematic Proto-Roles and Argument Selection". Language 67, 3.547-619.
Drubig, Hans-Bernhard. (1992): "On Topicalization and Inversion". In: Rosemary Tracy (ed.), Who Climbs the Grammar Tree? Tübingen: Niemeyer, 375-422.
Everaert, Martin. (1986): The Syntax of Reflexivization. Dordrecht: Foris.
Gärtner, Hans-Martin. (1998): Does German have V2-Relative Clauses? Sprache und Pragmatik 48.
Gärtner, Hans-Martin. (2001): "Are there V2 Relative Clauses in German?" Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics 3, 97-141.
Gärtner, Hans-Martin & Markus Steinbach. (1994): "Economy, Verb Second, and the SVO-SOV Distinction". Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax 53, 1-59.
Gärtner, Hans-Martin & Markus Steinbach. (1997): "Anmerkungen zur Vorfeldphobie pronominaler Elemente". Franz-Josef D'Avis & Uli Lutz (eds.), Zur Satzstruktur im Deutschen. Tübingen: Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340, Nr.90, 1-30.
Gärtner, Hans-Martin & Markus Steinbach. (forthcoming): "What do Reduced Pronominals Reveal About the Syntax of Dutch and German? Part 1: Clause-Internal Positions. To appear in Linguistische Berichte.
Geerts, G., W. Haseryn, J. de Rooij & M.C. van den Toorn (eds.) (1984): Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst. Groningen: Wolters-Nordhoff.
Haag-Merz, Christine. (1995): Pronomen im Schwäbischen – Syntax und Erwerb. Stuttgart: University of Stuttgart dissertation.
Haegeman, Liliane. (1990): "Understood Subjects in English Diaries: on the Relevance of Theoretical Syntax for the Study of Register Variation". Multilingua 9, 157-199.
Haegeman, Liliane. (1993): "Some Speculations on Argument Shift, Clitics, and Crossing in West Flemish". In: Werner Abraham & Josef Bayer (eds.), Dialektsyntax. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag [= Linguistische Berichte, Sonderheft 5], 131-160.
Haider, Hubert. (1984): Topic, Focus, and Verb Second. GAGL 25, 72-120.
Hall, Tracy. (1998): "Phonotactics and the Prosodic Structure of German Function Words". In: Tracy Hall & Ursula Kleinhenz (eds.), Studies on the Phonological Word. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 103-136.
Höhle, Tilman. (1992): "Über Verum-Fokus im Deutschen". Joachim Jacobs (ed.), Informationsstruktur und Grammatik. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag [= Linguistische Berichte, Sonderheft 4], 112-141.
Howe, Stephen. (1996): The Personal Pronouns in the Germanic Languages. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Josefsson, Gunlög. (1992): "Object Shift and Weak Pronominals in Swedish". Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax 49, 59-94.
Kameyama, Megumi. (1999): "Stressed and Unstressed Pronouns: Complementary Preferences". In: Peter Bosch & Rob van der Sandt (eds.), Focus. Cambridge: CUP, 306-321.

Kenstowicz, Michael. (1994): Phonology in Generative Grammar. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
Kohler, Klaus J. (1977): Einführung in die Phonetik des Deutschen. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.
Kohler, Klaus J. (1990): "Segmental Reduction in Connected Speech in German". In: W.J. Hardcastle & A. Marchal (eds.), Speech Production and Speech Modeling. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 69-92.
Koster, Jan. (1987): Domains and Dynasties. Dordrecht: Foris.
Lahiri, Aditi; Jongman, Allard & Joan A. Sereno. (1990): "The Pronominal Clitic [dcr] in Dutch: A Theoretical and Experimental Approach". Yearbook of Morphology 3, 115-127.
Lenerz, Jürgen. (1993): "Zu Syntax und Semantik Deutscher Personalpronomina". In: Marga Reis (ed.), Wortstellung und Informationsstruktur. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 117-154.
Lenerz, Jürgen. (1994): "Pronomenprobleme". In: Brigitte Haftka (ed.), Was determiniert Wortstellungsvariation? Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 161-173.
Li, Charles N. & Sandra A. Thompson. (1976): "Subject and Topic: a New Typology of Language". In: Charles N. Li (ed.), Subject and topic. New York: Academic Press, 459-489.
Müller, Gereon. (1995): A-bar Syntax. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Mulder, Rene & Marcel den Dikken. (1991): "Double Object Scrambling". MITWPL 14, 67-82.
Nübling, Damaris. (1992): Klitika im Deutschen. Schriftsprache, Umgangssprache, alemannische Dialekte. Tübingen: Narr.
Nübling, Damaris. (1995): "Entstehung von Irregularitäten im Enklisestadium: Beobachtungen zur Verschmelzung von Präposition und Artikel im Deutschen". In: Norbert Boretzky et al. (eds.), Natürlichkeitstheorie und Sprachwandel. Bochum: Brockmeyer, 221-235.
Platzack, Christer. (1996): "Germanic Verb Second Languages".In: Ewald Lang & Gisela Zifonoun (eds.), Deutsch – Typologisch. Berlin: De Gruyter, 92-120.
Pompino-Marschall, Bernd. (1995): Einführung in die Phonetik. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Prince, Ellen F. (1998): "On the Limits of Syntax with Reference to Left-Dislocation and Topicalization". In: Peter W. Culicover & Louise McNally (eds.), Syntax and Semantics 29. San Diego: Academic Press, 281-302.
Prinz, Michael. (1991): Klitisierung im Deutschen und Neugriechischen, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
Reinhart, Tanya. (1981): "Pragmatics and Linguistics: an Analysis of Sentence Topics". Philosophica 27, 53-94.
Reinhart, Tanya. (1991): "Pronouns". In: Arnim von Stechow & Dieter Wunderlich (eds.), Handbuch Semantik. Berlin: De Gruyter, 535-548.
Reis, Marga. (1985): "Satzeinleitende Strukturen im Deutschen". In: Werner Abraham (ed.), Erklärende Syntax des Deutschen. Tübingen: Narr, 271-312.
Schwartz, Bonnie D. & Sten Vikner. (1989): "All Verb Second Clauses are CPs". Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax 43, 27-49.
Selkirk, Elizabeth. (1995): "The Prosodic Structure of Function Words". In: Jill N. Beckman et al. (eds.), UMOP 18 – Papers in Optimality Theory, 439-469.
Stechow, Arnim von & Wolfgang Sternefeld. (1988): Bausteine syntaktischen Wissens, Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
Sternefeld, Wolfgang. (1985): "Deutsch ohne grammatische Funktionen: Ein Beitrag zur Rektions- und Bindungstheorie". Linguistische Berichte 99, 394-439.
Szabolcsi, Anna. (1981): "The Semantics of Topic-Focus Articulation". In: Jeroen Groenendijk et al. (eds.), Formal Methods in the Study of Language, Part 2. Amsterdam: Mathematisch Centrum, 513-540.
Travis, Lisa deMena. (1984): Parameters and Effects of Word Order Variation. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.

Vikner, Sten & Bonnie D. Schwartz. (1996): "The Verb Always Leaves IP in V2 clauses". In: Adriana Belletti & Luigi Rizzi (eds.), Parameters and Functional Heads. New York: Oxford University Press, 11-62.
Vogel, Ralf. (2000): Case Conflict in German Free Relative Constructions. An Optimality Theoretic Treatment. In: Gereon Müller & Wolfgang Sternefeld (eds.), Competition in Syntax. Berlin: de Gruyter, 341-375.
Weerman, Fred. (1989): The V2 Conspiracy. Dordrecht: Foris.
Werner, Ingegerd. (1999): Das Personalpronomen im Zürichdeutschen. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wicksell.
Zwart, Jan-Wouter. (1991a): "Clitics in Dutch: Evidence for the Position of INFL". GAGL 33, 71-92.
Zwart, Jan-Wouter. (1991b): Verb Movement and Complementizer Agreement. Groningen: University of Groningen, ms.
Zwart, Jan-Wouter. (1993): Dutch Syntax. Groningen: University of Groningen dissertation.
Zwart, Jan-Wouter. (1994): "The Minimalist Program and Germanic Syntax: a Reply to Gärtner and Steinbach". Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax 54, 1-41.
Zwart, Jan-Wouter. (1997): Morphosyntax of Verb Movement. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Berlin und Mainz Hans-Martin Gärtner und Markus Steinbach

Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Jägerstr. 10/11, D-10117 Berlin.
Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Deutsches Institut, D-55066 Mainz.