

Provided for non-commercial research and education use.  
Not for reproduction, distribution or commercial use.



This article appeared in a journal published by Elsevier. The attached copy is furnished to the author for internal non-commercial research and education use, including for instruction at the authors institution and sharing with colleagues.

Other uses, including reproduction and distribution, or selling or licensing copies, or posting to personal, institutional or third party websites are prohibited.

In most cases authors are permitted to post their version of the article (e.g. in Word or Tex form) to their personal website or institutional repository. Authors requiring further information regarding Elsevier's archiving and manuscript policies are encouraged to visit:

<http://www.elsevier.com/copyright>

Available online at [www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com)

SciVerse ScienceDirect

Lingua 122 (2012) 1148–1157

Lingua

[www.elsevier.com/locate/lingua](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/lingua)

## Book review

**The Syntax of German, Hubert Haider, Cambridge University Press (2010), 386 pp., Price: £64.00, ISBN: 978-0-521-86525-8**

This book, published in the Cambridge series devoted to the theoretically oriented description of the main features of the clausal syntax of individual languages, is concerned with one of the best studied languages of the world, German. However, although a great deal of work has been carried out in different frameworks about many aspects of the historical development and the synchronic properties of German syntax, there remain many open issues which are heatedly debated among syntacticians working on German. Among the generatively oriented syntacticians, the author of the present book has been one of the leading figures in these debates since the 1980s. Haider can be characterised as the leader of the minority party, which has always been opposed to the supposedly uncritical imposition on German of any currently prevailing theoretical premises of Generative Grammar and presumed features of Universal Grammar (which, until not so long ago, had often been tracked down just by the study of English). A straightforward example of Haider's scepticism is his continual argumentation against the assumption that every (German) clause has a subject. Nevertheless, Haider subscribes to many of the premises of the Chomskyan framework and uses the tools offered by the theory, whereby he maintains some concepts and terminologies of the Principles and Parameters framework which have been abandoned by Chomsky in his more recent writings (like, e.g. Spec-Head agreement, A-movement vs.  $\bar{A}$ -movement, indices). Haider is a confident advocate of the view that the grammar faculty is a pattern matching capacity and not a derivational capacity. That is, Haider subscribes to the representational view of grammar, and not to the derivational one, which is predominant in the current Chomskyan Minimalism framework.

The book tries to give answers to two very fundamental questions of the syntax of Germanic languages: Which properties of the languages are determined by the OV/VO-property and what influence does the verb-second property have on the system?

**Chapter 1** introduces the most basic features of the syntax of German. German has the V2-property, and it is a partial OV-language, i.e., it is head final in the verbal and adjectival projections, and it is head initial in the nominal and prepositional projections and in the functional projections, at least in those which exist beyond doubt. The chapter also introduces Haider's most basic claims: Only head-final projections do not have to be compact, i.e., an adjunct may intervene between a head and its argument, and, a particularly far-reaching thesis, only head-final projections allow scrambling. Furthermore, only OV-structures allow verb clusters with their concomitant clause union effects. Another important claim is that only VO-structures have a functional subject position. It follows that German does not have a functional subject position, and therefore it does not show subject-object asymmetries, subject expletives, or quirky subjects. Whether German shows genuine subject-object asymmetries was vigorously debated in the eighties (e.g., Grewendorf, 1988 arguing pro; Haider, 1983 arguing contra) and is still controversial (see Kiziak, 2010 for a recent view arguing in favour of the existence of subject-object asymmetries). In giving a negative answer in Chapters 1–3, Haider takes the stance which he has taken from the beginning.

Haider claims that the basic facts of German sentence structure follow from two central assumptions he makes together with his Principle of Directional Identification (PDI). The first premise is that every head has a canonical direction of licensing. The second one is that universally projections are right branching: Branching nodes of the (functionally or lexically extended) projection line follow their sister node. This is expressed in his *basic branching constraint*, which he already formulated in the early 1990s. (Note, however, that Haider has to admit the exception of the left-branching structure of the verbal complex, see below.) An immediate consequence of the two assumptions is the shell structure in head-initial projections (Larson, 1988). Since a head has to be embedded most deeply in its phrase, it can only precede two objects if a shell structure is assumed. The PDI in turn is supposed to derive the compactness of a head-initial phrase. However, as observed by Johannes Winter, the definition of the (rather central) PDI as stated on p. 29 does not give the intended result of compactness (and thereby also the impossibility of scrambling). The condition that the licensee has to be in the directionality domain of (a projection of) the licensor and

the condition that (a projection of) the licenser and the licensee c-command each other minimally have to be reformulated in such a way that these two conditions must be fulfilled by (the chain of) one and the same licensing element. If this adjustment is made, it then follows that only in head-final phrases does the head not have to be adjacent to its arguments, since only in head-final phrases do the head's projections have the arguments in the canonical licensing direction, such that the PDI can also be fulfilled in case a phrase intervenes between the head and an argument. According to Haider, it also follows that in SVO-languages, the subject is necessarily opaque for extraction and a *wh*-subject in situ induces superiority effects, whereas in the OV-language German this is not true. The reason for this is that in an SVO-language the subject is not situated in the licensing domain of the verb, but is situated in the Spec-position of a functional projection, whereas in an OV-language it is in the verb's licensing domain. An immediate consequence of Haider's reasoning is that in VSO-languages there should exist no subject-object asymmetries either. However, Haider does not discuss this issue. Another property which Haider ascribes solely to OV-languages is not derived by grammatical principles: that OV-languages show verbal clustering is just seen as the result of a processing need to avoid centre-embedding structures.

**Chapter 2** introduces a further notorious topic of the German generative syntax of the last 30 years, namely, the question of whether German has an I-projection (or T-projection) (which may or may not be subdivided into several functional projections). Again, Haider maintains the position he has advocated from the beginning of this debate: German exhibits no I-projection. First, Haider argues that the assumption of a clause-final I-projection, to which the finite verb would have to move, leads to many false predictions. Second, he claims that there is no evidence for the presence of an I-projection in the 'Mittelfeld' (*midfield*), i.e., in the part of the clause in-between the verb-second/C<sup>0</sup>-position and the clause-final verb position. Haider only sees evidence for one functional projection in the German clause structure, and this is the C-projection, which hosts the complementisers, to which the finite verb moves in a verb-second clause (V2-clause) and whose Spec-position represents what is traditionally called the prefield.

Against the postulation of a clause-final I-projection, Haider offers a conceptual argument (why should the functional head I<sup>0</sup> be head final, whereas the top functional head C<sup>0</sup> is head initial?) and various empirical ones. One empirical argument is given by German verbs which cannot be the finite verb in a V2-clause (1a). Crucially these verbs can appear in finite form in a verb-final clause (1d):

- (1) a. \* Die Zeitung vorabdruckte die Rede.  
       *the newspaper pre-off-printed the speech*  
       'The newspaper preprinted the speech.'
- b. \* Die Zeitung druckte die Rede vorab.  
 c. \* Die Zeitung abdruckte die Rede vor.  
 d. weil die Zeitung die Rede vorabdruckte

Cases of undoubted verb movement as in (1a-c) yield ungrammaticality. Thus, the grammaticality of (1d) suggests that here, no verb movement has occurred. From this it follows that there is no V-to-I-movement, which indicates that there is no clause-final I<sup>0</sup>-position in the first place. Note that the grammaticality of (1d) also shows that in German, there is no V-movement to a clause-medial I<sup>0</sup>-position. Another argument against clause-final I<sup>0</sup> is the fact that there is no extraposition site preceding the finite verb (2). In (2a), the verbs form a verbal cluster, which cannot be broken up. (2b) shows that an extraposed relative clause belonging to the first of two objects cannot precede the finite verb. It follows that there is no V-to-I-movement of the finite verb.

- (2) a. \* dass er viel gelernt haben dafür muss  
       *that he much learnt have it-for must*
- b. \* dass sie dem Hund<sup>1</sup> etwas, der<sup>1</sup> dort saß, gab  
       *that she the dog something who there sat gave*  
       'that she gave the dog that sat there something'

In addition to the lack of overt verb movement, Haider offers two further arguments against the assumption of the presence of a clause-internal I<sup>0</sup>. First, in German subjectless clauses no expletive may appear in the midfield, although with *es* an appropriate expletive would be available. Haider takes the second argument to be even more important. According to Haider, in German extraction out of a subject is possible (3a) (and out of a phrase scrambled across a subject, for that matter). This is taken as clear evidence that in German, subjects (and midfield-internal phrases to the left of the subject) do not occupy a functional Spec-position, since for the different languages it holds that a phrase which is undoubtedly sitting in a functional Spec-position is opaque for extraction, cf. (3b).

- (3) a. Mit wem<sub>1</sub> hätte denn [t<sub>1</sub> speisen zu dürfen] dich besonders erfreut?  
 b. \* Whom<sub>1</sub> would [to have dinner with t<sub>1</sub>] please you?

As already noted, Haider assumes that only in VO-languages is a functional subject position present. Consequently, he argues that the expletive in a Dutch example like (4a) is not an expletive for the subject, the evidence being that it does not disallow extraction of the subject, which would be expected if it corresponded to, say, an English subject expletive (4b).

- (4) a. Wie<sub>1</sub> denk je dat er t<sub>1</sub> is aangekomen?  
 b. \* Who<sub>1</sub> do you think that there arrived t<sub>1</sub>?

The first part of **Chapter 3** has to some extent a didactic function. It introduces the phenomena of *wh*-movement and partial *wh*-movement and their most basic restrictions, and illustrates them with different German constructions and data. Of some interest for more advanced readers is the discussion of comparative clauses since some German dialects show on the surface that these constructions involve movement of a *wh*-phrase. Furthermore, in a footnote Haider takes sides in the long-standing debate on how to analyse German examples like “Wie oft hat sie gesagt habe man sie angerufen?” (*How often has she said one has phoned her*) (the ‘parenthesis versus extraction debate’). He assumes that such sentences are ambiguous between a long-distance extraction analysis and a parenthetical structure.

The rest of Chapter 3 is concerned with so-called superiority effects, which, however, Haider does not at all consider to be the result of a violation of any kind of superiority condition, but just the result of the nature of the VP-external subject position in VO-languages, i.e., the result of the subject position being a functional Spec-position. Thus, according to Haider the classic examples of superiority effects reflect a ban on *wh*-in situ in a Spec-position. Here, Haider's considerations are somewhat opaque. He does not discuss any example involving no *wh*-subject but different *wh*-objects. Thus, without any discussion he assumes that *wh*-objects never trigger a ‘superiority’ effect, a view which certainly is not the standard view. Instead, he claims that a functional Spec-position is an operator position and that sentences like (5) are bad because the *wh*-subject cannot perform the operator function, (5b) being highly relevant for Haider's view, since its ungrammaticality cannot be due to any violation of the superiority condition. However, Haider does not say why a functional Spec-position is necessarily an operator position and what kind of operator is induced with a VP-external subject position.

- (5) a. \*It is unclear whom<sub>1</sub> what shocked t<sub>1</sub>.  
 b. Who thinks that she/\*who won the prize?

Haider also refers to the difference in grammaticality between (6a) and (6b).

- (6) a. Who left when/\*why/\*how?  
 b. Wer hat wann/warum/wie gesungen?

Haider adopts the view that adverbials like *why* and *how* are of a higher semantic type than, say, adverbials like *where* or *when*. He then stipulates that a higher order adverbial, in contrast to one of the lower order, needs to c-command the main verb. Haider assumes that this is not fulfilled in (6a), since, as he argues in Chapter 5, postverbal adverbials in a VO-language are embedded in the (right branching) vP, rather than adjoined to it. Note, however, that one would have to add the assumption that the adverbial in (6a) cannot be generated as the verb's sister in the VP.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, again it is not said why it should be true that higher order adverbials have to c-command the verb, but adverbials of ‘standard’ type do not. In sum, as novel and interesting as Haider's thoughts about the phenomena usually labelled superiority effects may be, they are perhaps presented in too sketchy a way to allow the reader to evaluate their merits.

**Chapter 4** again is concerned with one very central topic of the clausal syntax of German: the word order in the midfield and the concomitant phenomenon of scrambling. Although in recent decades so many efforts have been made to find out what the reason for scrambling is, the question is still unanswered. Interestingly, Haider does not see this failure as the result of a lack of ingenuity but as an indication that the question has to be put differently. For Haider, the grammatical system of an OV-language like German just allows it to license arguments at different positions. Sometimes, the conceptual interface exploits the fact that on the surface an argument is not in its standard position, and sometimes it does not care. According to Haider, the crucial point is that there is no grammar-internal reason why scrambling should occur. He shows that none of the triggers that are standardly proposed account for the data (case; givenness or a similar

<sup>1</sup> Thanks to an anonymous reviewer for pointing out this problem.

interpretative property; so-called 'strong' readings of DPs, i.e., generic or specific readings of indefinites, anaphoric readings of definites). In particular, scrambling cannot be movement to a functional Spec-position since scrambled phrases are transparent for extraction. Furthermore, contrary to some claims in the literature, the grammaticality contrast of the data in (7), which contain a *wh*-indefinite, does not show that there is obligatory scrambling of an indefinite out of the domain of negation, since *wh*-indefinites resist scrambling. Rather, (7b) gives rise to the far-reaching consequence that the standard assumption in Generative Grammar according to which the negation particle is universally in a pre-VP-position is not true. Instead, referring also to typological literature, Haider argues that the correct universal constraint is the weaker condition that the sentence negation particle is in the lowest possible position such that it c-commands the finite verb or its trace (obviously, this goes along with the assumption that finite auxiliaries in languages like English or French move to I<sup>0</sup>). In an OV-language, this position is VP-internal. Thus, in (7b) all elements are in their base positions, and no scrambling has occurred. (7a) is ungrammatical because in the OV-language German, sentence negation is positioned below the arguments.

- (7) a. \* weil Hans heute nicht wen begrüßt hat  
       *since Hans today not someone greeted has*  
       b. weil Hans heute wen nicht begrüßt hat

Thus, there is no obligatory scrambling. This view of Haider's becomes even more interesting due to the fact that he, like the majority of syntacticians working on German, considers scrambling to be the result of a movement process, which leaves a trace (copy) in the base position of the moved item. Thus, Haider not only rejects the view of current Minimalism that any kind of movement needs a trigger belonging to core syntax, but also the more liberal view of standard Generative Grammar that all movement needs some trigger.

Haider presents some of the tests to determine base positions of arguments in German and brings forward the standard, and in my view convincing, arguments in favour of a movement account of scrambling and, in particular, of its being A-movement (it is clause-bound; it may affect scope and binding possibilities; it may involve more than one constituent per domain; a scrambled phrase is transparent for extraction). He argues that scrambling differs crucially from object shift in that it does not prohibit lexical material between the phrase to be permuted and the left edge of the VP and in that it changes the sequence of arguments. Furthermore, Haider assumes that only arguments have unique base positions and may scramble; adjuncts do not have base positions, and they may just be inserted into different slots. It follows that, for example, in Dutch different serialisations of an argument and an adjunct are not related to scrambling but are simply the result of variation of adjunct placement. Haider mentions literature which takes quite a different view (Cinque, 1999; Frey and Pittner, 1998), but he does not discuss this issue in any depth.

One of the most exciting claims of the book is that scrambling only applies in head-final phrases. First, Haider shows that although in German scrambling is possible in the head-final lexical projections VP and AP, it is not in the head-initial ones NP and PP. Second, Haider discusses Yiddish, which undoubtedly exhibits scrambling, and which in the literature (Diesing, 1997) has been claimed to be a Germanic VO-language. Firmly opposing this claim, Haider argues that Yiddish is basically an OV-language, but alternatively it may license to the right and project a VP-shell with possible V-fronting within the VP-shell structure. Thus, Yiddish is of a third type. Importantly, the verb in a language of this third type may switch its licensing direction in the course of merger. Thus, in the derivation of a sentence like (8a), the verb starts with licensing to the right and then its directionality of licensing switches to the left. Haider does not discuss an example like (8b). However, according to his premises the base position of *dos bukh* would be licensed under the verb's directionality to the right and then the directionality value would switch to the left to allow scrambling.

- (8) a. Maks hot Rifken gegeben dos bukh.  
       *Maks has Rifken given the book*  
       b. Maks hot dos bukh gegeben Rifken.

Haider brings forward two pieces of evidence that Yiddish is basically OV. First, the verb particle order is as it is in OV-languages: In Yiddish, the particle may occur in the preverbal position in non-V2-constructions, which never happens in VO-languages. Second, there is variation in auxiliary verb orders. This often happens in OV-languages, but it never happens in VO-languages. In a VO-language, the dependent verb always follows. In Yiddish there is the head-final variant as well as some variations.

In passing, Haider notes that Slavic languages should also belong to the third type of language (in Chapter 7, Hungarian is mentioned as belonging to this type too, because of its verb clustering property). Unfortunately, he does not discuss this issue any further and does not apply his tests to the Slavic languages.

**Chapter 5** is concerned with an especially delicate topic, extraposition. All available movement accounts, be they formulated in the GB-framework (or in LFG- or HPSG-variants thereof), Minimalism, or [Kayne's Antisymmetry Theory \(1994\)](#), face such fundamental problems with extraposition that [Koster \(2000\)](#) notes that "it is therefore reasonable to say that *extraposition* is more the name of a complex of problems than the name of a successful explanatory pattern." Some of the problems of the standard analysis of extraposition as the result of rightward movement are also presented by Haider.

An alternative to movement to the right is Kayne's stranding theory of extraposition, in which the antecedent and the 'extraposed' element are base generated together and the antecedent is moved to the left, leaving the 'extraposed' element behind. Haider, like [Koster \(2000\)](#), is well aware of the many problems of Kayne's theory (e.g., in OV-languages the source structure would very often be ungrammatical since DPs do not follow the verb; if the antecedent and the 'extraposed' element occur together in the IP-domain, the antecedent cannot be split from the 'extraposed' element, neither by A-movement, say in passives, nor by  $\bar{A}$ -movement, say with 'topicalisation'). Equally problematic is the variant of the stranding analysis which [Zwart \(2000\)](#) proposes. Here, first the material to be 'extraposed' is moved to the left, and then the VP containing the stranded antecedent is fronted to the left of the 'extraposed' material. Since extraposition is optional, remnant movement is optional, which, as Haider notes, predicts that it should be possible to have leftward movement without remnant VP fronting, which clearly is not the case. Furthermore, Haider argues that Zwart's theory leads to a problematic conceptual consequence: Extraposition is subject to other conditions than leftward movement, however, in Zwart's theory these conditions would have to be formulated as conditions on leftward movement of the material to be extraposed and on leftward movement of the remnant VP.

I believe it is fair to say that Haider does not solve the collection of problems called extraposition either. As noted above, Haider assumes that all syntactic structures are right branching. Thus, there is no right-adjunction, which means that in Haider's view (as in Kayne's), extraposition cannot be movement to the right on principled grounds. The alternative which Haider proposes is the base generation of the extraposed material in a shell structure which is generated by an empty head, whose status remains to be investigated. If there is an antecedent, the extraposed material is related to it by construal. Haider acknowledges that many questions and problems remain open in his approach: What is the structure of the right edge? How are extraposed arguments licensed? What determines the order of the extraposed phrases? However, I think one has to be more critical than that. For example, Haider is keenly aware of the fact that the constraints on the extraposition of relative clauses are quite different from the constraints on, say, the extraposition of argument clauses of nouns, and he is completely right in stating that these differences are a great problem for all existing theories. Also with regard to the ordering constraints, extraposed relative clauses are quite special. However, it is not clear at all how in Haider's proposal these differences could be captured, since he does not offer any theory of the construal relations between the extraposed phrases and their antecedents, much less any means of formulating different construal conditions for different extraposed items. Another critical point regarding this chapter is that it is written in a rather opaque style. For readers who are not familiar with at least some of the standard literature on extraposition, many remarks are likely to be unintelligible. For example, the binding data, which have always played a central role in the discussion of extraposition and about which one admittedly finds contradictory statements in the literature, are not presented in a clear and consistent way. To be sure, although the chapter on extraposition is perhaps the weakest part of the book, it contains some important observations and statements. For example, it is of interest that Haider makes it very clear that the phenomena called extraposition not only occur in clauses but in many other constituents (APs, DPs, PPs, VPs). Furthermore, it is important that Haider explicitly states that his insights and convictions have led him to adopt at least partially [Phillips' \(2003\)](#) parsing-based approach for incremental structure assignment. Haider argues, convincingly in my view, that only in such an approach can one cope with the contradictory evidence for structure assignment raised especially by VP-preposing in German and English. However, it is not immediately clear how Phillips' approach is to be reconciled with Haider's strict representational view of grammar, although Haider assumes this to be self-evident.

**Chapter 6** is concerned with case in German. Haider subscribes to a syntactic case theory in the sense that so-called structural cases are not assigned in the lexicon but in the syntactic structure. Two major claims of Haider's should be emphasised. The first one – by now probably no longer overly controversial – is that in German, structural case licensing is not restricted to specific structural positions; in particular, there is no evidence that any case is positionally tied to functional Spec-positions. The word order in German is not determined by case but rather by thematic roles, i.e., by the ranked theta-grid of the predicate. The second claim is more disputable. It is the claim that in German, dative is not a structural case but a lexical, invariant case. Although in the German literature there is some discussion devoted to the topic (e.g., [Wegener, 1991](#)), it is not immediately clear what exactly the contentious point is. According to Haider, it is not the predictability of the case form. Haider admits that for many ditransitive verbs, dative is predictable. It is not position in the sense that structural case in contrast to lexical case could only be licensed in a certain position. As just noted, Haider would be the first to claim that in German, case licensing is not related to a

specific position. So the central issue seems to be whether there is any regular syntactic operation by which the dative is changed into another case. In the regular German passive, datives are preserved. Furthermore, in nominalisation a verb's dative argument cannot become the noun's genitive argument, the genitive being the structural case assigned in NPs (it cannot remain dative either since nouns do not license dative in German). So, for the issue in question another construction becomes central, the so-called recipient passive, in which the dative of the active variant becomes nominative.

- (9) a. Peter schenkte mir ein Buch.  
*Peter presented me-DAT a book*  
 b. Ich kriegte/bekam ein Buch (von Peter) geschenkt.  
*I got a book by Peter presented*

Although the recipient passive maps argument structures onto each other in a systematic fashion, many linguists, among them Haider (2010), don't consider it to involve a syntactic function changing operation but rather to be a construction in which the semantically contentful verb *kriegen* or *bekommen* triggers a complex verb formation process with a perfect participle. According to this account, the theta-grid of the selected participle is unified with the theta-grid of *kriegen/bekommen*. The experiencer/recipient argument slot of *kriegen/bekommen* has to be identified with the experiencer/recipient argument slot of the participle, and this is why the participle must provide an experiencer/recipient argument. Some questions remain open in Haider's sketch of an analysis, though, among them a central one: It does not become clear how by the unification process, the dative argument of the participle can become the complex predicate's external argument, i.e., the potential nominative argument, given that dative is supposed to be preserved. Furthermore, if *kriegen/bekommen* unifies with a *zu*-infinitive, the selected infinitive does not seem to need to have an experiencer/recipient argument (10a).

- (10) a. Du kriegst dieses Buch nicht zu lesen.  
*you get this book not to read*  
 'You do not get this book to read.'  
 b. Er hat das Buch zu lesen.  
*he has the book to read*  
 'He has to read the book.'  
 c. Er hat das Buch gelesen.  
*he has the book read*  
 d. \*Er kriegt das Buch gelesen.  
*He gets the book read*

Finally, Haider states that *kriegen/bekommen*, like *haben*, re-instantiates the blocked external argument of the *zu*-infinitive, cf. (10a and b). So the question arises as to why, in contrast to *haben*, *kriegen/bekommen* is not able to re-instantiate the blocked external argument of the perfect participle (10c and d).

This chapter contains the interesting observation that in German, one finds instances of nominative case on predicative nominals which cannot be explained by agreement or case assignment and hence are not covered by current case theories. The nominative on the predicative NP in (11) cannot be due to agreement with the exceptional case marked subject, nor can it be licensed by *werden*, it not being the external argument.

- (11) Die Umstände ließen ihn ein ehrlicher Politiker werden.  
*the circumstances made him-ACC an honest politician-NOM become*  
 'The circumstances made him become an honest politician.'

One might consider the final **Chapter 7** a highlight of the book. Here, Haider presents his theory of the infinitival constructions in the Germanic languages, which he has been developing for many years. According to Haider, OV- and VO-languages crucially differ with regard to these constructions. The central point of Haider's theory is that in OV-languages there exist two major classes of infinitival constructions, namely those which are complete clausal complements, i.e., CPs, and those which are monoclausal clustering constructions, in which the selecting verb and the infinitival verb form a syntactic unit (a head-to-head adjunction structure with government to the left with some derived verb order variations). German has verbs which obligatorily select an infinitival CP-complement (e.g., control verbs whose infinitival clause is not the direct object), it has verbs which obligatorily trigger clustering (e.g., auxiliaries, modals, copulas, 'raising' verbs, causative and perception verbs), and it has verbs which optionally take a CP-complement or trigger clustering (control verbs whose infinitival clause is the direct object). Thus, according to Haider, OV-languages do not have IP-infinitives (TP-infinitives) or VP-infinitives (an exception is the so-called third construction in colloquial German,

which Haider analyses as an exceptional postverbal infinitival VP, i.e., a not fully saturated infinitival V-projection, which as a postverbal complement is not subject to the obligatory clustering requirement).<sup>2</sup> VO-languages do have CP-, IP- (TP-) and VP-infinitival constructions, but they do not allow verbal clusters. According to Haider, it is an advantage of his theory that it can derive this last fact. At first, Haider argues that OV-languages employ clustering to avoid centre-embedded, stacked verbal projections, a problem which does not arise in VO-languages. However, the fact that processing requirements do not demand verbal clusters in VO-languages obviously does not imply that verbal clustering should in principle be possible in OV-languages only. Haider also argues that OV-languages have no IP-complements because they do not have an I-projection (it is not completely clear, though, where he positions the expletive *er* in a Dutch impersonal passive example like *Ik denk dat er gedanst werd* – literally: *I think that there danced was*) and that in OV-languages, VP-complements are replaced by the clustering construction.

Ultimately, Haider tries to deduce the fact that in Germanic OV-languages infinitival constructions necessarily either comprise an infinitival CP or build a clustering construction from his *basic branching constraint*. His reasoning presupposes that the verbs which are going to enter the clustering construction in Germanic OV-languages and which build stacked VPs in VO-languages build one extended lexical projection – certainly not a self-evident assumption. According to Haider, different lexical verbs build one extended verbal projection if their pooled lexical features are equivalent to the feature format of a single lexical verb.

Haider presents an impressive amount of empirical evidence for the existence of verb clustering in German. To mention just a few examples: In the clustering construction the sequence of verbal elements is compact, i.e., no material may intervene between the verbal elements; a sentence negation has scope over the matrix predicate; matrix passive may affect the direct object of the infinitive (12a); the direct object of the infinitive may be NOM if the matrix predicate is unaccusative (12b); and the infinitive does not take a PRO-subject, which could prevent the Principle B violation in (12c).

- (12) a. dass er [vc zu reparieren versucht wurde]  
           that he-NOM to repair tried was  
       b. [vc Zu übersetzen gelungen] ist er mir nicht  
           to translate succeeded is he-NOM me not  
       c. \*[vc Zu zitieren erlaubt] hat Max<sub>1</sub> ihn<sub>1</sub> uns nicht  
           to quote permitted has Max him us not

To be sure, if a verbal projection is moved to the prefield in German, also Haider assumes a VP-constituent. However, Haider shows that the shape of the preposed constituent is not identical to the shape admissible in the base position. For example, a preposed VP is compatible with extraposition (13a and b), but reconstructing this preposed VP would produce ungrammaticality (13c).

- (13) a. [Sie konfrontieren mit dieser Frage]<sub>1</sub> wird<sub>2</sub> er t<sub>1</sub> müssen t<sub>2</sub>  
           her face with this question shall he have-to  
       b. [Konfrontieren mit dieser Frage]<sub>1</sub> wird<sub>2</sub> er sie t<sub>1</sub> müssen t<sub>2</sub>  
       c. \* dass er sie konfrontieren mit dieser Frage müssen wird  
           that he her face with this question have-to shall  
           ‘that he shall have to face her with this question’

Haider arrives at an unorthodox conclusion, which he argues to be unavoidable in a detailed line of argumentation in Chapters 2 and 7. The moved V-projection in (13a and b) is related to a trace in a base position. However, the antecedent-trace relation can have a mismatch with regard to the projection level. In (13a and b), the trace of the moved V-projection is interpreted as V<sup>0</sup> with a (partially) unsaturated argument grid. For (13a), this is the argument grid of an intransitive verb, while for (13b) it is the argument grid of a transitive verb. Thus, in the prefield the  $\bar{A}$ -moved verbal projection fulfils the

<sup>2</sup> Haider does not mention examples like the following containing an auxiliary and a following infinitival modal verb (substitute infinitive), in which material intervenes between the verbal elements:

- (i) dass er hat die Firma retten wollen  
       that he has the company save want-INF  
       ‘that he wanted to save the company’

Presumably he would treat such an example along the lines he indicated in his remarks on the third construction.

requirement of a phrasal projection, whereas in the trace position it must fulfil the requirements of an element in the cluster. Haider claims that since a trace is atomic, a  $V^n$ -trace can be considered to be equivalent to  $V^0$ .

It is a benefit of this chapter that Haider offers a detailed discussion of the standard approaches to modelling the clustering plus clause union phenomenon. Current approaches try to derive the clustering clause union variant from the clausal infinitival complement variant, whereas Haider argues that the two constructions are independently base generated with very different structures. Haider's main points of criticism are that none of the standard approaches capture the compactness property of the cluster properly and that many theories fail to account for possible word order variation in the cluster. Furthermore, he argues that the alternative approaches fail to capture the clause union properties in an illuminating way and that they do not make clear what triggers clustering and why clustering only appears in OV-languages. However, with regard to the latter point, remember that Haider bases his account on a rather unorthodox assumption.

In Haider's own account the clustering variant is analysed as a separate syntactic structure. It is an  $X^0$ -adjunction structure with in principle more than one theta-providing head. Pooling the arguments of the verbs into a single grid amounts to functional composition. Haider claims that since syntax constrains the application of clustering, the applicability of functional composition is constrained too. Note that Haider has to invoke a special mechanism for the clustering construction to replace the control relation of the infinitival complement construction. Control is compensated by direct identification of the controller with the argument slot that is linked to PRO in the clausal construction. This presupposes that the subject argument of the infinitival is not projected, but blocked. This, according to Haider, is managed by the infinitival marker *zu*. Whether *zu* has to find an external argument to block it or whether this is not necessary depends on the matrix verb, though:

- (14) a. \* weil sie bei dieser Musik nicht getanzt zu werden hofft  
*since she with this music not danced to be hopes*  
 'since she does not hope that there would be dancing with this music'  
 b. weil bei dieser Musik nicht getanzt zu werden scheint  
*since with this music not danced to be seems*  
 'since it seems that there is no dancing with this music'

The chapter concludes with two important considerations. First, Haider gives an interesting account of why an OV-language like German shows so-called remnant fronting (15a) (also (13b) for that matter), but a VO-language like English does not (15b).

- (15) a. Vorenthalten<sub>1</sub> haben sie wem was t<sub>1</sub>  
*withheld have they someone something*  
 b. \* And shown<sub>1</sub> he has indeed t<sub>1</sub> the document to the police

According to the standard account, in (15a) a complete VP with the arguments removed is fronted. Note, however, that the arguments left behind in (15a) cannot have been scrambled; in German, *w*-indefinites like *wem*, *was* cannot be scrambled. This makes the standard account highly unappealing. Furthermore, the standard account raises the question of why an English example like (15b) cannot be derived by moving the objects out of VP to some functional Spec-position followed by remnant preposing. Haider suggests that the standard assumption that a preposed phrase has to be maximal should be given up and replaced by the condition that the preposed constituent, maximal or submaximal, is not allowed to induce a crossing violation, i.e., it must not contain a trace and cross the antecedent of the trace. Thus, remnant fronting is disallowed in general. (15a) is well formed, since the preposed V-headed constituent just contains the verb. The trace transmits the unsaturated argument grid. The situation is different for the preposed head-initial verbal projection in (15b). Head-initial VPs have the verb in a c-commanding position in a shell structure. So, in (15b) there is no way of preposing a 'remnant' of the VP without simultaneously preposing the subtree that contains the traces of the two arguments.

The second deliberation concerns 'restructuring' infinitivals in Italian. Since Haider argues that clustering is an OV-property, he has to comment on this kind of Italian infinitival, which might be thought to be related to clustering. However, Haider argues that Italian 'restructuring' does not involve verbal clusters, but the selection of a subsentential infinitival complement (VP-complement), which allows different transparency phenomena. His main argument for the principal difference between clustering and the Italian 'restructuring' construction is that in the latter compactness is absent.

This review only permits me to address some of the aspects discussed in the different chapters of this stunningly rich, unique, and thought-provoking book. This book bears witness to what fascinating insights can be achieved by an independent mind who, although working in a fairly well-defined framework which imposes restrictions on possible explanation, can at the same time listen to his common sense and be keen enough to discover new paths of thinking.

If one compares the present work with the previous monograph written in German (Haider, 1993), one realises that Haider maintains all his assumptions about the fundamental design of grammar in general and about the basic properties of German in particular. What is an important new aspect of the present book is that Haider is now more concerned with the comparison between different Germanic languages, and he especially now concentrates much more on the basic claim of his theory, namely that the OV/VO-parameter is responsible for a wide range of differences between the languages, some of them seemingly unrelated. This claim is in conflict with current minimalism, which treats the OV/VO-distinction more or less as a postsyntactic phenomenon of linearisation. However, Haider has good empirical arguments in his favour, and he is certainly not a person who is eager to be part of the latest trends in generative grammar. Needless to say, the two books also differ to a certain degree in the empirical material which is covered. For example, the present book treats extraposition, which was not discussed in the older one. In the older monograph, the chapter about infinitival constructions contained more empirical material than the corresponding chapter in the new book, which contains more detailed theoretical considerations.

As is unavoidable in a book addressing so many different phenomena, some lack of clarity and inaccuracies remain. In addition to the critical points already raised, I would like to mention some additional problems. For example, it does not become completely clear what the crucial ingredient is of Haider's account of the fact that Icelandic but not, for example, English has quirky subjects (p. 38). Does the account rely on the concept of spec-head agreement, in that only in English is nominative checking exclusively constrained to spec-head agreement? Or is it based on the assumption that only in Icelandic are there verbs whose highest ranked argument is not the nominative candidate? Furthermore, Haider remains silent on how his system could account for phenomena of non-compactness with prepositional objects in English (*John has spoken (nicely) to his mother (nicely) about her letter*), English being subject to the compactness property regarding DP-arguments. An example of an inaccuracy seems to be Haider's argument against a pro-drop analysis of German as involving pro-drop of an expletive in subjectless clauses (p. 75). Haider refers to the fact that in a sentence like (16) the presence of *es* makes the embedded clause opaque for extraction, arguing that for proponents of the possibility of expletive drop in German, opacity should be independent of the overt or covert status of the antecedent pronoun.

- (16) Wen<sub>i</sub> wurde (\*es) erwartet, t<sub>i</sub> dort anzutreffen?  
*who was it expected there to-come-across*

However, as Haider himself notes, there is strong evidence (Bennis, 1986; Sudhoff, 2003) that if *es* occurs with a verb like *erwarten*, it is not an expletive but a referential pronoun. Then, the construction is a right dislocation. So, the fact that (16) is ungrammatical if *es* is present and grammatical if *es* is not present is irrelevant for the question of whether expletives occurring in the midfield can be dropped as proponents of the existence of an I-projection in German would assume.

Another problematic point is to be found on p. 98. Haider argues that in German, a dependent *wh*-clause cannot have V2 because a verb in the complement's C<sup>0</sup> would not be compatible with the *wh*-feature the matrix verb wants to check there. Haider also mentions dependent *wh*-exclamatives, noting that these are not selected for a *wh*-feature. However, dependent *wh*-exclamatives likewise do not allow V2 (17), so one wonders how Haider rules out such sentences.

- (17) \* Es ist großartig, wie schön ist es geworden.  
*it is wonderful how beautiful is it become*

On p. 117f, Haider exploits for his argumentation the amnesty effect that the addition of a third *wh*-phrase is claimed to have on violations of the Superiority Condition. However, Clifton et al. (2006) argue that experimental findings suggest that such an amnesty effect of third *wh*-phrases does not exist. I also find a statement on p. 136 problematic. Without discussion Haider notes in passing that all the evidence Frey (2004) brings forward to argue for a structural topic position in the midfield of German can be explained semantically. However, since Frey (2004) endeavours to show that at least some of the relevant data have to be accounted for in syntax, Haider's remark strikes me as being insufficient. Furthermore, on p. 137 he declares that "the generic *man* (indefinite 'one') is not a topic." It is unclear to me what the justification could be for this claim given that generic *man* may very well be analysed as a referential term.

Let me mention some more claims of Haider's which might be judged as being problematic. The first concerns pronouns. On p. 137ff, Haider repeats the often made assumption that in German (and other languages) personal pronouns have to occur in the order NOM < ACC < DAT. However, Lenerz (1993) already made generative-minded syntacticians aware that this is not generally true:

- (18) wenn Paul mir ihn so beschreibt  
*if Paul (to-)me him MP describes*

Second, on p. 211/212 Haider states without discussion that  $\bar{A}$ -movement does not reconstruct for the purpose of variable binding. This certainly is not the standard assumption. (Presumably, what is meant is that  $\bar{A}$ -movement of a

non-stressed phrase to the local prefield does not reconstruct.) Next, on p. 221, it is, in my view incorrectly, stated that if extraposition were cyclic movement, one would expect that the extraposed clauses mirror the relative base order. Finally, in Chapter 5 on various pages, it is said that German does not allow infinitival *wh*-clauses. At first glance, this clearly seems to be true (*\*Er wusste nicht, was zu kaufen* – ‘He didn’t know what to buy.’). However, Trissler (1991) presented data, which are still not accounted for in a satisfactory way, which seem to involve ‘pied piping’ infinitivals containing a +*wh* phrase (*?Was zu kaufen hat ihm seine Tochter geraten?* – ‘What did his daughter advise him to buy?’, *Ich weiß nicht, wen zu verlassen er den Entschluss fasste.* – ‘I don’t know who he decided to leave.’). So, it is not as crystal clear as Haider suggests that German does not allow any kind of *wh*-infinitives.

However, critical remarks on minor issues like the ones just given might well run the risk of sounding very small-minded in the face of the overwhelming depth, richness and originality of Haider’s thoughts on the major aspects of the clausal syntax of German and the other Germanic languages.

### Acknowledgement

This work was supported (in part) by Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF) (Grant Nr. 01UG0711).

### References

- Bennis, H., 1986. Gaps and Dummies. Foris Publications, Dordrecht.
- Cinque, G., 1999. Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-linguistic Perspective. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Clifton Jr., C., Fanselow, G., Frazier, L., 2006. Amnestying superiority violations: processing multiple questions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37 (1), 51–68.
- Diesing, M., 1997. Yiddish VP order and the typology of object movement in Germanic. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15, 369–427.
- Frey, W., 2004. A medial topic position for German. *Linguistische Berichte* 198, 153–190.
- Frey, W., Pittner, K., 1998. Zur Positionierung der Adverbiale im deutschen Mittelfeld. *Linguistische Berichte* 176, 489–534.
- Grewendorf, G., 1988. Aspekte der deutschen Syntax. Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen.
- Haider, H., 1983. Connectedness effects in German. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 23, 82–119.
- Haider, H., 1993. Deutsche Syntax – Generativ. Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen.
- Kayne, R., 1994. The Antisymmetry of Syntax. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Kiziak, T., 2010. Extraction Asymmetries—Experimental Evidence from German. Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Koster, J., 2000. Extraposition as Parallel Construal Ms. University of Groningen.
- Larson, R., 1988. On the double object construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 335–391.
- Lenerz, J., 1993. Zur Syntax und Semantik deutscher Personalpronomina. In: Reis, M. (Ed.), *Wortstellung und Informationsstruktur*. Niemeyer, Tübingen, pp. 117–154.
- Phillips, C., 2003. Linear Order and Constituency. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34, 37–90.
- Sudhoff, S., 2003. Argumentsätze und ‘es’-Korrelate – Zur syntaktischen Struktur von Nebensatzeinbettungen im Deutschen. *Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, Berlin*.
- Trissler, S., 1991. Infinitivische w-Phrasen? In: Reis, M., Rosengren, I. (Eds.), *Fragesätze und Fragen*. Niemeyer, Tübingen, pp. 123–144.
- Wegener, H., 1991. Der Dativ – ein struktureller Kasus? In: Fanselow, G., Felix, S. (Eds.), *Strukturen und Merkmale syntaktischer Kategorien*. Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen, pp. 70–103.
- Zwart, C.J.-W., 2000. A head raising analysis of relative clauses in Dutch. In: Alexiadou, A., Law, P., Meinunger, A., Wilder, C. (Eds.), *The syntax of relative clauses*. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 349–385.

Werner Frey  
Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft (ZAS), Schützenstr. 18, 10117 Berlin, Germany  
E-mail address: [frey@zas.gwz-berlin.de](mailto:frey@zas.gwz-berlin.de)

16 May 2011  
Available online 22 June 2012