Abstract

This article presents two case studies concerning verb second (V2) in German. It investigates two different phenomena where the characteristic verb raising in German is blocked. The relevant data show clearly that the V2 rule is not blind with respect to the interfaces. It is not merely a syntactic movement rule whose output is interpreted by the phonological component on the one hand and by the conceptual-intentional system on the other. It is rather the case that both systems restrict V2, they have a direct influence on the verb getting to its final position. This article thus focuses on both sides of grammar: phonology on the one hand, and interpretation, meaning and semantics on the other. Hence, the present study is trying to balance out the interface restrictions on x0-raising – illustrated using verb second in German (and to a certain degree in French). It is shown that parsing strategies guide V2: phonological processing as well as interpretation-related parsing.

1. Introduction

Verb second (henceforth V2) in Germanic continues to be a mystery. It has been a focus of research for decades and is still lively and controversially debated. The fact that the German finite verb appears in the sentence final position...
(rechte Satzklammer, 'right sentence bracket') in subordinate clauses and in the second position in main clauses (linke Satzklammer, 'left sentence bracket') has all possible analyses: the canonical one is still standard and goes back to den Besten’s analysis of Dutch (1977/1983), and to Thiersch’s analysis of German (1978). According to this standard analysis, the finite verb raises via head-to-head movement from its base position under a head-final $V^0$ to the head-initial $C^0$ node. Recently three different proposals have been put on the market: (i) Fanselow (2004) develops a Bare-Phrase-Structure-conform verb raising analysis called Münchhausen movement, (ii) Müller (2004) proposes an analysis that does not require head movement at all (remnant XP-movement, see also Koopman and Szabolcsi 2000), and (iii) Chomsky (2001) banishes V2 into the phonological component getting V2 outside the core area of syntax.

This article presents two case studies concerning V2. It investigates two different phenomena where the characteristic verb raising in German is blocked. The relevant data show clearly that the V2 rule is not blind with respect to the interfaces. It is not merely a syntactic movement rule whose output is (to be) interpreted by the phonological component on the one hand and by the conceptual-intentional system on the other. It is rather the case that both systems restrict V2; they have a direct influence on the verb getting to its position.

With new trends in Generative Grammar, such as Bare Phrase Structure as an integral part of the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1994, 1995), head movement as a syntactic device (especially deriving V2) has been subjected to heavy criticism. One of the furthest reaching proposals is Chomsky’s attempt from 2000 to eliminate head movement completely from (core) syntax and to place it into phonology – a view that is developed in detail in Boeckx and Stjepanovic (2001). Zwart (2001) shows that – especially with V2 – things are not so simple and that genuine syntax must be involved, despite the undeniable role of phonology, to account for the phenomenon in its entire complexity. An elaborated phonology-syntax interplay for head movement is also developed in Bošković (2001). A corresponding conclusion will be drawn in the first part of this article. However, the old T-model of Government & Binding Theory as well as the concept of spell-out and phases in the Minimalist Program consider syntax as the “feeder” of two interfaces: (i) phonology (A-P system, PF) AND (ii) meaning/interpretation (C-I system, LF). In the second part, this article will demonstrate that there are also interpretational (i.e., C-I-related) restrictions on head movement.

This article thus focuses on both sides of grammar: phonology on the one hand and interpretation, meaning, semantics on the other. Hence, it is trying to balance out the interface restrictions on $X^\circ$-raising – illustrated using verb second in German (and to a certain degree in French). It is shown that parsing strategies guide V2: phonological processing as well as interpretation-related parsing.
The present article is organized as follows: In the first part a special construction where the finite verb fails to undergo V2 is presented and discussed. This relatively neglected pattern is given an analysis that makes recourse to phonological wellformedness constraints. It is argued that a tree gets a syntactic and a phonological interpretation, sometimes in parallel and corresponding to each other – sometimes diverging. If either one fails to meet necessary wellformedness conditions, the derivation crashes. The second part discusses the behavior of speech act adverbials. These may appear in a position before a canonical CP. In that case, verb third emerges (V3). Often these same adverbials, however, are also fine in the canonical Vorfeld (‘prefield’) giving rise to a regular V2 structure. Sometimes V2 is not permitted. The reason for this pattern is a parsing effect that has an impact similar to other better known garden path effects. Both constructions thus show that V2 is restricted from outside the core syntax.

2. Elements that block verb raising – a discussion

2.1. Haider’s observation

In his 1997 article, Haider observes the pattern in (1) to (3).2 (1) consists of a periphrastic tense construal where the finite verb is an auxiliary that has moved to the V2 position. (2) is the unfelicitous attempt to move the full main verb of a simple tense into the V2 position. (3) shows that it is not the simplex form that triggers the ungrammaticality, but the position: as long as a verbal element stays in the so-called right sentence bracket, the construction is fine.

(1) Der Wert hat sich weit mehr als verdreifacht.
the value has ‘self’ far more than tripled
‘The value has far more than (only) tripled.’

(2) *Der Wert verdreifachte sich weit mehr als.

(3) weil sich der Wert weit mehr als verdreifachte.
because ‘self’ the value far more then tripled
‘because the value has more then (only) tripled.’

2. It is important to distinguish the construction to be discussed in this contribution from another C◦-phobia that Haider (1993) discusses elaborating on a discovery by Höhle (1991). What I mean is immobile verbs like uraufführen and bausparen (‘to put on a play for the first time’ and ‘to save with a building society’ – respectively). These verbs are also trapped in the right sentence bracket (i.e., only grammatical in verb-final constructions) presumably because of a categorical mismatch or an undecided morpho-syntactic status. For these facts and a recent discussion see Vikner (2005). However, for our purposes it is important that the phenomenon of verbal immobility is not dependent on the verb (itself), but on an element clearly outside the (minimal) VP or the V◦-node.
Haider explains this pattern as the result of c-command failure: *mehr als* as scope-taking operator must c-command its associate at some s-structure-like level, which is not given in (2). Meinunger (2001) argues that this reasoning cannot cover the whole phenomenon. He shows that there are many other expressions that block verb raising in quite similar fashion to *mehr als*.

(4) Der Angeklagte hat **so gut wie** gestanden.
The accused has so good as confessed
‘The accused almost confessed (his crime).’

(5) *Der Angeklagte gestand so gut wie.*

(6) weil der Angeklagte **so gut wie** gestanden hat /
because the accused so good as confessed has /
gestand
confessed
‘because the accused almost confessed (the crime).’

(7) Der Besuch hat **sowas von** geprahlt.
The visitor has so-what of boasted
‘The guest(s) was/were boasting so much …!’

(8) *Der Besuch prahlte sowas von.*

(9) weil der Besuch **sowas von** geprahlt hat / prahlte
because the visitor so-what of boasted has / boasted
‘because the guest(s) were boasting so much’

Other examples listed in Meinunger (2001) are: *so eine Art von* (‘sort of’), *mehr denn* (both: ‘more than’), *nichts als* (‘nothing but’), and similarly, but a bit different *weder* (‘neither-nor’) and *außer* (‘but’, ‘unless’, ‘except’). Interestingly, all examples become grammatical if something follows the boldfaced chunks (cf. (10)–(12)). In some cases it even suffices to have a separable prefix of a morphologically complex verb (12):

(10) Der Angeklagte gestand **so gut wie** gar nicht.
The accused confessed so good as particle not
‘The accused confessed as much as not at all’.

(11) Die Kommission meckerte **weder** davor, (noch danach).
The committee grumbled neither before, nor afterwards
‘The committee neither grumbled before nor afterwards.’

(12) Unser Besuch gibt **sowas von an**.
Our visit boasts so-what of particle
‘Our guest boasts so much …’
Meinunger also shows that a similar pattern of verb movement blocking can be observed in other languages. French has a construction consisting of a negative clitic element which in most cases is morphologically attached to a finite verb in I° and semantically associated with a constituent that starts with the element que. Such a construction triggers a focus reading on the relevant phrases – similar to only in English. In periphrastic tenses and constructions, when the infinite verb remains behind que the construction is grammatical (13). Movement of the full finite verb across que triggers ungrammaticality (14). Putting something after que makes the sentence grammatical again (15). In case the verb is supposed to be the target of focus in a non-periphrastic construction, a dummy verb (faire: do-support) has to be inserted (16).

(13) **Il n’a que bossé.**  
he not-has ‘que’ hard-worked  
‘He didn’t do anything but work.’

(14) *Il ne bosse que.**  
he not hard-work that  
‘He doesn’t do anything but work.’

(15) **Il ne bosse que le dernier jour avant l’examen /**  
he not hard-work ‘que’ the last day before the exam /  
pour son frère ... for his brother  
‘He works hard only the day before his exam/only for his brother.’

(16) **Il ne fait que bosser.**  
he not makes ‘que’ hard-work  
‘He doesn’t do anything but work.’

Similar constructions also occur in English. The situation is different insofar as there is no verb movement of full verbs. However, some quantifying elements that target the verb must precede it, whereas others may also follow the verb.

(17) *He somehow wheezed.*  

(18) *He sort of wheezed.*  

(19) *He wheezed somehow.*  

(20) *He wheezed sort of.* (under unmarked flat intonation)

Here one can also add examples inspired by Kajita, who discovered the peculiarities of such constructions as early as 1977. Kajita, however, was not concerned with the contrast in the examples in (21) to (24).

(21) *This amount far from suffices.*
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(22) *This amount suffices far from.

(23) The number of visitors to London close to tripled.

(24) *The number of visitors to London tripled close to.

2.2. A possible explanation

A look at the elements that block verb movement suggests two possible directions for an explanation: one is rather semantic, the other one lexical/phonological. In the end, neither one will be completely satisfying in isolation, and a mixed approach will turn out to be correct. It will be argued, however, that the latter one is much more important.

Let us start with the first option. All the relevant expressions in the examples (1) to (9), or even up to (24) somehow indeed operate on the verb, i.e., they focus, measure or compare it. The explanation might thus be something along Haider’s lines: the operator must c-command the operandum at s-structure. To put it differently, the quantifying element seems to have to c-command and therefore linearly precede the verb. A similar idea has been proposed in the fast-generalization for German advocated by Rapp and von Stechow (1999). fast roughly means almost and as such it is close in meaning to other expressions blocking V2, e.g. soviel wie, so gut wie (see above). Rapp and von Stechow give the judgments in (26) and (27), and claim (25). Thus, they argue that fast cannot stand alone at the right edge of a clause.

(25) fast-generalization: ‘fast’ cannot attach to a phrase with a phonetically empty head.

(26) Gestern hätte sie mich fast getroffen.
yesterday had she me almost met.
‘Yesterday she almost met me.’

(27) *Gestern traf sie mich fast.

fast is also an element which operates on the verbal meaning. However, a rule like (25) would be too strong. There are many other constructions in which the operator element need not c-command the verb. That means although the verbal action is quantified over, the full verb may raise over its operator and leave the latter behind. Also fast – contrary to what Rapp and von Stechow claim – can certainly be stranded by the verb (even (27) is grammatical for most speakers).

(28) Genug! Der Reifen platzt fast.

enough! the tire bursts almost
‘Enough! The tire is likely to burst soon.’
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The same is true for operator words like *nicht, nur, wieder, kaum, mehrmals* and so on. Each of them can be used to quantify over the verbal action, and yet they are completely compatible with a finite verb to their left. Moreover, all of these expressions can be located right-peripherally, i.e., they do not require a continuation. Almost all of these elements are semantically very similar, or even synonymous to some of the blocking elements. For example, strandable *nur* is synonymous to *nichts als* (‘only’) – *so gut wie* means the same as *fast* (‘almost’), the latter ones never allow for stranding (see above):

(30) *Der Wert verdoppelte sich fast_/ wieder_/ kaum_/ nicht_/ nur_*.
    ‘The value almost / again / hardly / not / only doubled.’

Given this, the facts seem to call for another option, possibly one with a phonological background.

2.3. The internal structure of the blockers

It appears that all the blocking elements – even across languages and irrespective of the verb’s final landing site (no or very little verb movement in English, *I* in French and *C* in German) – end in or even consist only of an element that can be analyzed as either a *C* element, or as some sort of functional preposition (*P*, *K*-seebelow).

I would like to take a look at all elements mentioned so far that are able to block verb movement. First there is *wie* from *so gut wie* and *soviel wie*. Apart from its status as an interrogative or relative manner pronoun, *wie* can act as a *C* (Zimmermann 1991; also Hahnemann 1999, see below). It does so with a special semantics in subordinate clauses selected by verbs of perception as in (31). In contrast to the canonical complementizer *dass* (‘that’), the use of *wie* implies that the matrix subject was a witness of the hair cutting process, a reading which is not obligatorily triggered by the use of *dass*, hence the English translation with the *accusative*-ing construction.
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(31) Ich habe gesehen, wie du ihm die Haare geschnitten hast.
    ‘I saw you cutting his hair.’

Wie also appears in comparative constructions of equality. Its corresponding element of inequality in Standard German (not necessarily in substandard dialects) is als. Als is another element able to block verb movement, see above. I suggest that it is possible to analyze many of its uses as instances of C◦ as well (also proposed in Hahnemann 1999). Of course there are problems with such an analysis:

(32) Er tut so, als wüsste er alles.
    he does so, as knew he everything
    vs.
    *Er tut so, als _ er alles wüsste.
    ‘He pretends to know everything.’

(33) Er tut so, als ob er alles wüsste.
    He does so, as if he everything knew

(34) Er tut so, als wenn er alles wüsste.
    He does so, as when he everything knew
Both: ‘He pretends to know everything.’

(32) shows that als cannot block V2 in subordinate sentences, which makes it unlikely that als acts as a regular C◦-element. Furthermore, (33) and (34) show that als can only possibly be a C◦ if CP-recursion is assumed. Then als would occupy the higher C-head, ob and wenn would occupy the lower one – respectively. If one does not accept CP-recursion, then it is als which must be assumed to be something other than a C◦-element because ob and wenn are canonical complementizers. (A reviewer suggests as the simplest analysis that als just embeds conditional clauses in all possible forms, i.e., V-first, or introduced by wenn or ob. However, this reasonable assumption does not yet fully clarify the categorical status of als). In one construction, however, als seems to act as a relative complementizer to the modal adjunct insofern (or insoweit ‘insofar’). Here most speakers can use it in complementary distribution with dass.

(35) Das ist insofern günstig, als ich dann noch in Berlin sein werde.
    This is insofar opportune ‘als’ I then still in Berlin be will
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(36) ?Das ist insofern günstig, dass ich dann noch in Berlin sein werde.
    This is insofar opportune ‘dass’ I then still in Berlin be will.
    Both: ‘This is opportune insofar as at that time I will still be in Berlin.’

In southern varieties, however, doubling (als + dass) emerges again and (37) seems to be structurally close to (33) and (34).

(37) Das ist insofern günstig, als dass ich dann noch in München sein werde.
    This is insofar opportune ‘als dass’ I then still in Munich be will.
    ‘This is opportune insofar as at that time I will still be in Munich.’

A similar point can be made with respect to außer3 (‘except’, ‘apart from’), which is the next element making verb movement crash. außer behaves almost exactly as als, only that instead of ob it combines only with wenn (as in (40)) or falls (41), which both translate into English as if, or marginally again with dass):

(38) Er tut es, außer du törest den Hund.
    he does it except you kill the dog

vs.

(39) *Er tut es, außer du den Hund törest
    he does it except you the dog kill

(40) Er tut es, außer wenn du den Hund törest
    he does it except ‘if’ you the dog kill

(41) Er tut es, außer falls du den Hund törest
    he does it except ‘if’ you the dog kill

3. Note that there is a crucial difference. Außer cannot trigger V2, itself “representing” the Vorfeld (‘prefield’), whereas als seems to be able to, (cf. 32). However, see Pittner’s analysis where als is a coordinating conjunction (Pittner 1999: 259).

(i) *Er tut es, außer törest du den Hund.

It should also be noted here that außer is a complicated case in several other respects. It seems that it is more than an ordinary preposition. For example, it can introduce quasi-paratactic constructions (gapping) or substitute clausal constructions. Apart from that außer is phonologically not as poor as the proposal put forward here might expect it to be.
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(42) ¿Er tut es, außer dass du den Hund tötest.
    he does it except ‘that’ you the dog kill
    All: ‘He’ll do it, unless you kill the dog.’

The solution to this “problem” is not far fetched: all these constructions call for an analysis in terms of either CP-recursion or the assumption of a split CP layer: als can then be considered a head element in a split left periphery (Rizzi 1997). At any rate, the claim made here is – contrary to Haider – that it is the als, and not the mehr that triggers the failure of verb movement in (2).

The latter three elements, i.e., wie, als and außer are also considered to be P’s and are listed as such in the largest dictionary on German prepositions (Schröder 1990). Interestingly, Schröder characterizes them as Präpositionen ohne Kausforderung, i.e., prepositions without case requirement. What he means is that, unlike regular prepositions, these elements do not assign a specific case and they can thus appear adjacent to noun phrases with any case. In such a function they are definitely not case markers (K’s) themselves; however, the observed behavior underlines their deficient and ambiguous character.

denn – the next element to be considered – is just a synonym of als in comparative constructions. It means the same, just sounding a bit old-fashioned. In other contexts denn behaves as another sort of C’, but it obligatorily embeds a V2 structure. In yet other constructions it seems to be an ellipsis of *es sei denn (‘unless’), in which case it is synonymous with außer:5

(43) Er tut nichts (es sei) denn faulenzen.
    he does nothing (it be) ‘denn’ laze-around

(44) Er tut nichts außer faulenzen.
    he does nothing except laze-around
    Both: ‘He doesn’t do anything but laze around.’

---

4. As for CP-recursion, what I mean is a multiply-headed CP-layer. The data here are not relevant for the licensing of embedded V2 or similar cases discussed in the literature on Germanic/Scandinavian, e.g. Iatridou and Kroch (1992).

5. In other positions different from the middle-field, es sei cannot be left out. The parallelism with außer remains, however:

   (i)   Er tut es, es sei denn du den Hamster töst.
        he does, it be then you kill the hamster
        ‘He’s gonna do it unless you kill the hamster.’ (all three)
        *Er tut es, es sei denn du den Hamster töst.

   (ii)  Er tut es, es sei denn falls du den Hamster töst.
        he does, it be then if you the hamster kill

   (iii) Er tut es, es sei denn wenn du den Hamster töst.
One of the last blockers in German is *von*, which cannot be analyzed as a C°. *Von*, like English *of*, is a semantically empty preposition, thus a P°, or K°. So are *to* and arguably *from*. French *que* is unproblematic. It is the complementizer par excellence. Another regular French complementizer is *si* (‘if’, ‘whether’). Here the data are less clear: the facts seem to be similar, however. There is definitely a contrast.

(45) ?Il n’a pas *si* bossé que ça.
He neg-has not ‘si’ hard-worked that this
Something like ‘He didn’t work THAT hard . . .’

(46) *Il *ne* bossé pas *si* que ça.
He neg hard-work not ‘si’ that this

(47) ?Il n’a pas *si* bossé qu’il soit
He neg-has not ‘si’ hard-worked ‘que’ he is-subjunctive
fatigué.
fatigued
tired
‘He didn’t work so hard that he should be tired.’

(48) *Il *ne* bossait pas *si* qu’il soit fatigué.
He neg hard-work not ‘si’ ‘que’ he is-subjunctive
tired

*Weder* is a more complicated case. Its categorization as a C°-element is not evident. However, it does not seem impossible to analyze it as such. In any case, it shares some striking similarities with its French counterpart *ni*. *Ni* is another element which – similar to *que* – associates with clitic negation. Periphrastic tense constructions are acceptable (49). Ordinary verb movement in simple tenses is impossible (50). Auxiliaryless constructions must resort to other strategies. Either like in German, where *weder* must be placed into Spec,CP or some related left-peripheral position to precede the verb, *ni* can be fronted and replace the negation clitic *ne* and hence precede the finite full verb (51), (52), or again pleonastic *faire* (*do-support*) can save the construction (53). So it seems that *ni* (like *weder*) is very flexible in position and categorial status; what matters is its location in front of something.

---

6. K here means the head of a Case Phrase (KP), a noun phrase accompanied by a case marker (=K°). English examples would be elements like *of, to*, etc.

7. The structure here is more complicated because there has to be a constituent beginning with *que*, i.e., *si* must be associated with an additional, separate CP. The relevant *que*-phrase (an NP or DP in (45) or a CP in (47)), however, opens a new phonological constituent and should therefore be considered as not being there, i.e., not counting, leaving the element *si* stranded at some abstract phonological level.
Now it is important to note that none of the other quantifying elements that do NOT trigger ungrammaticality, in case they stand right-peripherally (e.g., nicht, nur, fast and so on, see (30) above), can be analyzed as either a complementizer or an empty preposition. It thus seems that the impossibility of verb raising in the constructions considered here is due to the nature of the (last) elements that occur between the relevant verbs, immediately before the right sentence bracket. I have argued that the blocking elements are canonical occupants of either C◦ or P◦ (K◦). A proposal that suggests itself is the following: According to Grimshaw’s theory of extended projections (1991), these elements, i.e., C◦’s and P◦’s have something in common. They both close off the projection, i.e., they are the highest functional elements: C◦ of sentences, P◦ (K◦) of noun phrases. Having this status implies being a functional category, i.e., the relevant elements act as function(al) words in their canonical use. Many authors have argued that function words are special and distinct from lexical words in that they are not phonological words whereas lexical words are. According to Hall (1999) such a view is widely accepted by phonologists. Hall (1999: 102) quoting Prince und Smolensky (1993):

(54) ‘Lexical words are phonological words, function words are not phonological words.’

Not being a phonological word means that the relevant chunk of phonological material has to undergo phonological processes in order to survive at PF. Such processes can be attachment to a phonological word (cliticization) or stressing/focusing, for example.

Here is the place for the insertion of a short caveat. I am aware that some of the crucial items (wie, von etc.) can appear in isolation as independent elements (minimal words). Wie is also a regular interrogative and relative pronoun (55) that can occupy Spec,CP on its own. Von can be stranded as a preposition

---

(49) Il n’a ni travaillé, ni dormi.
‘He has neither worked nor slept.’

(50) *Il ne travaille ni, (il ne) dort ni.

(51) Ni il travaille, ni il dort.
or

(52) Il ne travaille pas, ni ne dort.

(53) Il ne fait ni travailler, ni dormir. (do-support)
he neg does nor work, nor sleep
All: ‘He neither works, nor sleeps.’
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in many northern German dialects and hence end up in the right peripheral position of a sentence (56).

(55) Wie hast du das Problem gelöst?
    How have you the problem solved
    ‘How did you solve the problem?’

(56) Da weiß ich nichts von _.
    There know I nothing of
    ‘I don’t know anything about this.’

However, such a distribution is not possible in the discussed examples where these elements are parts of larger expressions. This status makes the parts very hybrid in character. In the relevant examples these elements must be integrated twice (see below for the structural representation, see the tree in (77)). A careful and competent phonological analysis still needs to be elaborated. At this point it is only clear that being a part of a larger unit makes it impossible for them to achieve the status of a phonologically (and morphologically) independent expression. These elements are always only a subpart of a larger unit. This fact deprives them of phonological independence and triggers the clitic-like behavior.

Similar things must be said about heavier, bisyllabic words like außer and weder, which need not appear inside a larger unit, but still need right-peripheral material. For a discussion of the hybrid status, i.e., the fact that under certain circumstances clitics or clitic-like elements may appear in isolation, see Bošković (2001) again.

All facts considered, the decisive factor in the case at hand seems to be a special variant of cliticization. Given the phonological deficiency of C◦/P◦-categories and the C◦/P◦-analysis suggested above, the expectation is the following: The relevant functional elements can survive only if they can attach to a host to be a part of a phonological word. The host necessarily finds itself within the same phonological constituent. The most reasonable assumption is to let the beginning of a sentence, i.e., a CP in syntactic terms, coincide with the beginning of a phonological constituent that is or contains a phonological word. This phonological entity will then automatically serve as the host material for the phonologically deficient C◦-element. The phenomenon is not different with extended nominal projections, i.e., D◦ will also have to attach to the right. This explains the proclitic-like behavior of the elements under discussion. Stranding, thus leads to ungrammaticality. Putting phonological material after the clitic-like element saves the structure (even though with semantic consequences). In case quantifying over the verb is intended, only some form of do-support (or its language specific-counterpart) can achieve the desired result. The peculiarity of the whole phenomenon is that in contrast to canonical cliti-
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cization the clitics discussed here need NOT move in syntax, but they get hold of a host “with less effort”. They need not look for an attachment site; they just require something to follow them. If this requirement is not met, the structure is ungrammatical.

2.4. Van Riemsdijk’s grafting approach – simply a bracketing paradox?

Another, almost purely syntactic promising way of coping with the data is to apply van Riemsdijk’s grafting approach (1998, 2000). Van Riemsdijk is concerned in his work with true or apparent mismatches between syntax proper and other linguistic components (morpho-phonology, pragmatics). His theory seems to work well for a number of grammatical phenomena like transparent free relatives, or those constructions which Lakoff (1984) discussed first and called ‘syntactic amalgams’. Transparent free relatives are extensively discussed in Wilder (1998). Wilder points out that in contrast to regular free relatives, transparent free relatives exhibit specific properties which are unusual. Whereas canonical free relatives act as clausal arguments or adjuncts inside their respective matrix clause, it seems that only specific parts of a transparent free relative are syntactically active within sentences where they are embedded. Thus in (57), for example, the plural on pebbles triggers plural agreement on the matrix verb. A simple single subject clause (as a canonical free relative would be) can never trigger such an agreement pattern.

(57) [What could be best described as pebbles] were strewn across the lawn.

To explain this fact plus all the other transparent free relative vs. regular free relative differences, Wilder proposes an analysis according to which transparent free relatives are the result of a conjunct(ion) of two independent clauses followed by a phonological process of deletion (58), which is independently assumed to be productive in other constructions and hence a part of the grammar anyway.

(58) [What could be best described as [pebbles]] & [pebbles were strewn across the lawn]

Van Riemsdijk’s solution is radically different. He does not assume a double generation of constituents. Instead he develops a so-called grafting analysis and lets the syntactically active constituent be part of two structural trees simultaneously. This way he also solves all the problems that Wilder described. Look at his analysis of an example in (59).
Such a tree captures the intuition that the constituent gasoline is interpreted twice: (i) as the object of carried and (ii) as the predicate noun (i.e., the argument of be) inside the free relative. Van Riemsdijk proposes the same grafting structure for cases like a far from simple matter (60), first brought up in Kajita (1977, see above). Van Riemsdijk’s analysis:
There seems to me to be an important difference between the two constructions, however. In (59) both trees can be generated independently and can potentially appear in different environments. The deepest constituent gasoline is a good argument of both verbs involved. This is not the case with the adjective simple. From a compositional, i.e., semantically driven point of view, the bottom tree in (60) does not make much sense. From the labeling it does not follow that simple is the head of the construction. Instead it triggers a reading where simple is the complement of the preposition from, which is rather doubtful. 8 On the contrary, the fact that almost any category can appear after P in such a construction makes it unlikely that P acts here as a regular preposition, all the more given that an otherwise canonical DP complement seems to be the most marked option (67), (68).

(61) She is far from out of the woods.
(62) It far from exhausts the relevant considerations.
(63) The number of visitors close to tripled.
(64) She is far from being an ideal partner / a beauty.

8. The given argumentation still holds if far is to be interpreted as the grafted construction’s head with from only having the status of an empty P° introducing the argument of the higher adjective.
Interface restrictions on verb second

(65)  This is far from what I expected. CP
(66)  She solved the problem far from elegantly. AdvP
(67)  ??!*She is far from a beauty. DP
(68)  ??!*She is far from an ideal partner. DP
(69)  better: She is a far from ideal partner. AP like:
(70)  a far from simple matter AP

This suggests that there is no selectional restriction along the path in van Riemsdijk’s bottom tree. Instead it seems that the relevant far from is to be analyzed as a quantificational adjunct, semantically and syntactically parallel to hardly. This was already done by Kajita (1977: 50), who proposes a reanalysis. Such a reanalysis approach is very much in the spirit advocated here and would be supported by a comparable construction in German. Van Riemsdijk’s other prime example of this sort, aside from far from, is close to as in (63) and (71).

(71)  This argument is close to convincing.

Here van Riemsdijk’s double-treeing within his grafting system is supposed to capture the fact that “at first sight, close is the predicative adjective while to convincing is a PP dependent on close. The actual meaning, however, is that close to is a hedge modifying the adjective convincing, yielding a meaning roughly like ‘almost fully convincing’.” (van Riemsdijk 2000: 2). This interpretative fact, in turn, was reason enough for Kajita to argue for a reanalysis approach regarding close to as a unit. Such a view would be supported by a comparable construction in German. One possible quasi-literal translation of close to is nahe zu. Here we get a locative meaning expressed in an adjectival or adverbial phrase where nahe selects for a PP headed by zu.

(72)  Von da aus ist es nahe zu den Traumstäenden.
of there out is it close to the dream-beaches.
‘From there it is close to the wonderful beaches.’

Such a reading would correspond to the bottom tree in (60). However, nahe-zu can also have a non-local interpretation, exactly as close to, meaning almost. In that case nahezu is reanalyzed as a unit, and German orthography reflects this difference by writing both together as a single word: nahezu.

(73)  Dieses Argument ist nahezu überzeugend.
This argument is close-to convincing
(meaning as (71))
Note also that van Riemsdijk discusses transparent free relatives like (74) and (75).

(74) (?)John is what I’d call snoring. (British English)

(75) *John what I’d call snores.

Here van Riemsdijk argues convincingly for string identity as a decisive criterion for grafting, categorial affiliation being of minor importance. (74) is more or less good because *snoring can have (i) a verbal and (ii) a nominal reading (as predicative NP, see van Riemsdijk 1998 and Wilder 1998). (75) is ill-formed because snores is unambiguously verbal and as such not licit in a (sub-) structure ‘#I’d call (that) snores.’ So far van Riemsdijk’s argumentation is reasonable and seems to speak in favor of his grafting approach to transparent free relatives. But it reveals itself as problematic for the cases discussed here, for verbal forms CAN appear adjacent to elements like close to, far from etc., see Kajita’s example below (62) and those given above.

(62) It far from exhausts the relevant considerations.

(76) it exhausts the relevant …

The same applies to all the German examples given at the beginning of the article, which are the main subject of this investigation. It seems odd to argue for a tree like (76), where a finite verb(al element) is the ultimate argument of a preposition. Such an approach is even less convincing under an analysis where the German finite verb in subordinate clauses is argued to occupy a head final I◦ node.

Instead the proposal advocated here is different, although in some sense similar. The idea is that there are indeed two distinct trees, but one is syntactic, the other one is phonological – a situation which is naturally given.
Nothing is strange or unusual with the analysis in (77). The upper part is classical syntax, the lower tree is classical phonology. Often there is a correspondence between syntactic and phonological trees, but it is well known that in some cases things pattern differently and the parallelism breaks down (cf. Truckenbrodt 1995 for German). It seems to me that in certain cases a morpho-syntactic: phonological mismatch is even systematic and motivated. Very often in inflectional morphology (often considered to be a part of generative syntax), morpheme and syllable boundaries diverge systematically (e.g., in the case of suffixation).
The functional explanation is that these mismatches create larger units; they concatenate pieces like a zipper, with some sort of interlocking principle. Sometimes this dovetail device is the regular pattern; sometimes it comes as some sort of parasitic construction.

2.5. Intermediate summary

As it stands, the picture that has emerged gives the impression that phonology can interfere with syntax and hence block syntactic movement. It seems that in the relevant constructions (see (1)–(20) above), verb movement is blocked because it creates a structure that violates phonological wellformedness constraints. The parser of phonological constituents cannot assign a legitimate structure to the syntactic object when a proclitic-like element ends up in a right peripheral position. As soon as some phonological material follows that element, the phonological parser finds a host and the structure is saved.

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

3.1. Overview over V3 constructions

This part of the article is concerned with constructions where the V2 rule faces difficulties, the root of which will be argued to lie in parsing strategies (as for the notion of “parsing”, see later and Footnote 8). It will be shown in how far the “pre-prefield” (Vor-Vorfeld) position, which gives rise to a verb third (V3) construction, is or must be used to save grammaticality. As it will turn out, also in the case at hand, it is a so-called interface factor that interacts with core-syntax and seems to be able to restrict movement operations that are not only generally available, but even canonically required in German(ic) syntax. This time the interface is not the PF-branch, but the syntactic output delivered by the computational system to the C-I-system – the interface with the semantic, logic, interpretational, and pragmatic side – thus the LF-branch (also cf. Meinunger 2004a and 2004b).

---

9. The term “parsing” here does not make reference to any particular articulated parsing theory. Rather it is used in a sense inspired by the seminal work by Fodor and his colleagues and fellows (i.e., Fodor et al. 1974; Fodor 1978; Frazier 1979). The intuition behind the use of the notion is to allude to phenomena like garden path effects and related topics investigated within a/the “derivational theory of complexity”. It seems to me that the observation discussed in this article is comparable to this sort of problem(s), where no sharp line can be drawn between true structural ungrammaticality on the one hand and parsing effects resulting from complexity and contextual expectations on the other.
Since Rizzi’s proposal about the fine structure of the left periphery in the late 1990’s (Rizzi 1997), the former CP-layer has gained an enormous amount of interest. For linguists working on German, the CP-split was especially challenging insofar as under normal circumstances the German main clause tolerates only one single constituent in the so-called Vorfeld (‘prefield’) position. There are a few constructions, however, where more than just one XP seems to open a matrix clause. Some of the suspicious constructions are quoted in (79) and (80) from Müller (2003) via Reis (2003). There are also the longer known constructions, as in (81), which under a certain perspective could be argued to contain a fronted VP remnant.10

(79)  Morelli in seiner Not wandte sich …
      Morelli in his worries addressed himself
      ‘In all this trouble Morelli addressed himself …’

(80)  Effenberg indessen beschuldigte …
      Effenberg in-the-meantime accused
      ‘Effenberg on his own, however, accused …’

(81)  Einer Dame rote Rosen sollte jeder Gentleman
      a lady red roses should every gentleman
      mitbringen.
      with-bring
      ‘Every true gentleman should give red roses to a lady.’

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

The next case might be a pseudo-problem for some people, but it should be mentioned for the sake of completeness. Jacobs (1983) and Büring and Hartmann (2001) – but see Reis (2005) for an opposing view – consider constructions like (82) as instances of V3.

(82)  Nur / auch / sogar mit Eiern ist das Brot belegt.
      only / also / even with eggs is the bread covered
      ‘The sandwich is only / also / even / made with eggs.’

10. Müller also analyzes the given V3 examples as a result of VP-fronting with a verb gap (using HPSG), which corresponds to VP-remnant topicalization in a Chomskyan framework.
Such an analysis is forced by the assumption that focus-sensitive particles can
adjoint to verbal projections only. There are indeed arguments for such an ap-
proach (see the quoted references). And since [mit Eiern] is a PP, only CP is
left as an appropriate adjunction site for expressions like nur, sogar, auch. The
resulting bracketing gives rise to a structure with two (relatively) independent
constituents before the finite verb: the focus adverbial AND the associate XP,

\[ \] 

hence V3. Under a standard view, however, the focus-sensitive particle adjoins
to the focal XP and forms a constituent together with it (see Reis 2005 again).

More famous V3 constructions, however, are left-dislocated constituents
(and for some linguists also hanging topics, cf. (83)). Such construction types
have been the subject of a hot debate in recent years. Constructions like (84)
and (85) are already found in Altmann (1981) and more recently have been

(83)  

\[ \text{Die Gruberova, die kommt doch noch mit 60 weit} \]
\[ \text{the Gruberova, the comes particle still with 60 far} \]
\[ \text{übers hohe C.} \]
\[ \text{above high C} \]
\[ \text{The Gruberova, she will be able to climb far above the high C even} \]
\[ \text{at the age of 60.} \]

(84)  

\[ \text{Seinen, Doktorvater, den verehrt jeder Linguist,} \]
\[ \text{his doctor-father the admires every linguist} \]
\[ \text{‘His thesis supervisor – every linguist admires him.’} \]

(85)  

\[ \text{Pavarotti, jeder kennt den / sein berühmtes hohes C.} \]
\[ \text{Pavarotti, everybody knows the / his famous high C} \]
\[ \text{‘(As for) Pavarotti, everybody knows him / his famous high C.’} \]

Two characteristics are quoted to argue for the CP-internal status of the left
dislocated XPs (illustrated in (84) and (85)). Altmann (1981) makes a recourse
to phonology and points out that in these constructions, there is no pause
or phonotactic break between the dislocated phrase and the proform (the d-
pronoun) immediately before the verb. Frey (2005) considers binding facts as
decisive arguments: operator binding is possible in (84), whereas it is impossi-
able with hanging topics:

(86)  

\[ \text{*Sein(en), Doktorvater, jeder Linguist, verehrt ihn.} \]
\[ \text{his(acc.) doctor-father, every linguist admires him.} \]
\[ \text{‘His thesis supervisor – every linguist admires him.’} \]
3.2. Very recent work to be considered

Two very recent contributions are of high relevance to the problem(s) discussed in the present article: d’Avis (2004) and Pittner (2003).

D’Avis’s data consist mainly of so-called “conditionals of irrelevance” (ICs) (Irrelevanzkonditionale) of the type illustrated in (87):

(87)  *Ob es regnet oder nicht, wir gehen spazieren.*  If it rains or not, we go walk  

‘Whether it rains or not – we will go for a walk.’

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

Starting from the mentioned references, especially Altmann, Frey, and also d’Avis, Pittner (2003) considers another special type of V3 construction and comes up with a proposal that comes close in spirit to what I will suggest for yet different V3 constructions. Pittner’s object of investigation is (this time canonical, i.e., regular) free relatives.

(88)  *Wer so laut singen kann, (der) muss in Wagneropern auftreten.*  Who(ever) may sing this loudly, should perform in Wagner operas.

‘Who(ever) may sing this loudly, should perform in Wagner operas.’

(89)  *Wer so laut singen kann, * (den) sollte man für Wagneropern engagieren.*  Who(ever) may sing this loudly, should be hired for Wagner operas.

‘People who can sing this loudly, should be hired for Wagner operas.’

(88) vs. (89) illustrates the so-called matching effect: the d-pronoun can be dropped freely if it carries the same case as the w-constituent in the free relative (for the exact and more complicated rules see Pittner 2003; Haider 1988; or Vogel 2003). Pittner presents a corpus study that confirms the observation that the d-pronoun should not be left out if there is a case conflict. In other words: a V3 construction seems to be (almost) obligatory in case the w-pronoun and
the d-pronoun show different morphological case. Thus, left-dislocation seems to be the device to resolve the case conflict. Pittner draws the conclusion that

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

I will argue later that this construction, i.e., V3, might indeed be used to facilitate interpretation. My conclusion, however, is not that V3 in these cases has a purely grammatical function (“morphosyntax”), but that it is used to disambiguate readings and circumvent misinterpretation.

3.3. A reading for some adverbials in the left periphery – V3 vs. V2 – long and short speech act adverbials

The observation can be laid down as follows. Some expressions, which semantically act as speech act adverbials in Cinque’s terms (cf. Cinque 1999) or discourse adverbs in Ernst’s terminology (Ernst 2002), can occupy a position before the regular prefield (Vorfeld).

(91) Ehrlich gesagt, ich bin von dir total enttäuscht.
    honestly said, I am of you totally disappointed.
    ‘To be honest / Honestly, I am completely disappointed with you.’

(92) Ehrlich, ich bin von dir total enttäuscht.

(93) Ganz offen gestanden, ich bin von dir total enttäuscht.
    wholly open confessed, I am from you totally disappointed
    ‘Frankly, I am completely disappointed with you.’

11. The quote is my translation of the original German, made on the basis of a (2004) handout: “Wegen dieser deutlich höheren Zahl von ‘Kasuskonflikten’ ... ist es nicht unplaßibel anzunehmen, dass die Linksversetzungskonstruktion eingesetzt wird, um Kasuskonflikte bei freien Relativsätzen ... zu vermeiden. Sie hat in diesen Fällen keine informationsstrukturelle Funktion, sondern eben eine viel eher rein morphosyntaktische.”

12. Although I will not mention it explicitly in the plain text, I will assume that the finite verb occupies the same position in both constructions, i.e., V2 and V3. The latter is a result of adjunction of some specific constituent to a canonical verb second CP. Alternatively, I consider the possibility that there may be a facultative functional layer above, whose head happens to / must be phonologically empty. Nothing hinges on that, however.
Interface restrictions on verb second

(94) Ganz offen, ich bin von dir total enttäuscht.

From these examples it is not obvious that the pre-comma string is indeed an integral part of the sentence and should therefore be integrated into the core tree of the respective clause. However, a few arguments can be given. In a theory of adverbials like Cinque’s (1999), these elements are taken to pattern like other adverbials and occupy a specific (base) position in the tree of the sentence – universally a very high position. However, there is also strong evidence from German clause structure itself that these elements can occupy a sentence-internal position. They are fine in both the Vorfeld directly preceding the finite verb (95), and also in the upper Mittelfeld (‘middle field’) (96).

(95) Ehrlich gesagt bin ich von dir total enttäuscht.

(96) Ich bin ehrlich gesagt von dir total enttäuscht.

This should be a strong enough piece of evidence for the integration of this sort of adverbial into the sentence (CP) it modifies. Hence, such adverbials should be regarded as really belonging to the clause forming a unit at the sentence level. (97)–(102) give some more frequently used examples.

(97) Nebenbei bemerkt, ich habe mir die Sache ganz anders vorgestellt.

‘By the way, I’ve had a completely different idea about it.’

(98) Nebenbei, ich habe mir die Sache ganz anders vorgestellt.

(99) Nebenbei bemerkt habe ich mir die Sache ganz anders vorgestellt.

(100) Im Vertrauen gesagt, ich habe die Schnauze voll.

‘Confidentially, I’ve got enough!’

(101) Im Vertrauen, ich habe die Schnauze voll.

13. To argue for a clause-internal reading one has to make sure that the intonation is different from a parenthetical structure, which is also possible with this word order. (95), however, is also fine without intonation setting off, i.e., (95) can be read / pronounced without pauses integrating ehrlich gesagt like any other adverbial forming an intonational phrase with following clause-internal material. Compare this claim to d’Avis’ claim(s) and findings and the constructions he investigates (d’Avis 2004).
(102)  
Im Vertrauen gesagt habe ich die Schnauze voll.
in confidence said have I the mouth full.

(103) lists other very frequent adverbials that pattern exactly alike (some are examples inspired by Pittner 1999). The examples are divided into three groups. Without any exception, all of these adverbials belong to a common class that different linguists call “discourse-oriented adverbials”, “speech act adverbials” or “pragmatic adverbials”, see above. However, nobody who has worked on this type of ‘high’ adverbials gives a subclassification – as I have tried to do in (103). Nevertheless, experts like Frey and Pittner or Ernst (all in p.c.) agree that there are at least two subgroups: (i) adverbials that express the speaker’s attitude toward the content or the validity of his utterance and (ii) adverbials that merely convey the speaker’s consideration with respect to the linguistic form of his utterance. A potential term for them could be “metalinguistic adverbials”. Apart from these two, there might be a third subgroup, presumably a mixed type (iii), which is even less easy to grasp. All subtypes pattern together in the relevant respect.

(103)  
a. offen gestanden  
frankly
offen gesagt  
frankly (ganz) im Vertrauen gesagt  
confidentially hinter vorgehaltener Hand gesagt  
confidentially unter uns gesagt  
confidentially zugewiesen  
admittedly ernsthaft gesagt  
seriously speaking ohne Scheiß gesagt  
no kidding ohne zu übertreiben  
without exaggerating ohne Übertreibung gesagt  
without exaggerating wenn ich ehrlich bin / sein soll  
honestly mit Verlaub gesagt / zu sagen  
with all due respect

b. überspitzt formuliert  
with (a bit of) exaggeration mit anderen Worten gesagt  
to put it differently gelinde gesagt  
to put it mildly kurz gesagt  
briefly, in brief, in short anders ausgedrückt / gesagt  
to put it differently, in other words besser gesagt  
to say it in a better way genauer gesagt  
to be more direct, strictly speaking auf Deutsch gesagt  
to say it bluntly, ‘pardon my French’ so gesagt / ausgedrückt  
said this way
All these expressions come in a certain pattern: there is something – usually some adverbial-like phrase – and then a verbal form – usually a participle of a verbum dicendi, i.e., of a verb of communication, a verb of saying – always boldfaced in the examples. However, as illustrated in (92), (94), (98) and (101), it is also possible to drop the performative verb. Thus, one can obtain the same effect if one leaves out the verbal part (short form14). Semantically the sentences either with the verbal element or with just the short form are identical. There is, however, no free choice between the forms. The crucial observation is laid down in what follows. (91)–(94) are V3 structures, in classical terms: the adverbials seem to be CP-adjoined. If the short form is placed within the regular pre-field giving rise to V2, the sentences are bad (104)–(106); whereas the long form is a good occupant of the Vorfeld, see (95), (99), (102).

(104) *Ehrlich bin ich total enttäuscht von dir.
(105) *Nebenbei habe ich mir die Sache anders vorgestellt.
(106) *Im Vertrauen hab ich die Schnauze voll.

The question is: why is V2 blocked in these cases? It cannot be that the XPs in Spec.CP were not legitimate occupants of the Vorfeld. Under other conditions, strings like im Vertrauen or ehrlich are fine in sentence-initial position.

(107) Im Vertrauen liegt die Stärke der Gläubigen.
\hspace{1cm} 'It’s in trusting where the believers’ strength is to be found.'

(108) Ehrlich kann man sich in solchen Situationen gar nicht verhalten.
\hspace{1cm} 'It’s just impossible that one behaves HONESTLY under those circumstances.'

14. Often the short form sounds better if the adverbial element ganz; ('completely', 'wholly') precedes it. This is, however, just an improvement; it is not obligatory.
The following data seem to suggest an explanation for the observed pattern. In some V2 cases, dropping of the verbal part does not necessarily lead to ungrammaticality as in the above examples (104)–(106). Consider the following data in (109) to (114). The reading, however, is such that the speech act oriented interpretation is impossible.

(109) Am Rande bemerkt, steht da auch eine Telefonzelle (für den Fall ...) ‘By the way, there’s a phone booth, … just in case …’

(110) Am Rande steht da auch eine Telefonzelle. ‘On the edge of it, there’s also a phone booth.’ (local reading) ///‘By the way …’ (speech act reading)

(111) Nebenbei bemerkt, ist so ein Job gar nicht zu schaffen. ‘By the way, such a job is undoable.’

(112) Nebenbei ist so ein Job gar nicht zu schaffen. ‘In addition to what you are already doing, such a job could be too much.’ (= manner reading) ///‘By the way …’ (speech act reading)

(113) Offen gestanden, war der Tresor ein Kinderspiel für den Dieb. ‘Frankly (speaking), the safe was a child’s play for the thief.’

(114) Offen war der Tresor ein Kinderspiel für den Dieb. ‘Being open, the safe was a child’s play for the thief.’ (secondary predication on the direct object, i.e., modifying ‘der Tresor’) ///‘Frankly, …’ (speech act reading)

Thus, if the adverbial form is not unambiguously specified for a speech act reading, this reading will not emerge and hence the construction is bad. If a reasonable manner reading (or something similar) is possible, the sentence is grammatical, but only with that very reading. The speech act reading or the “commenting the utterance” reading is excluded.
3.4. On inherent speech act adverbials

A second related observation is given: German has “bare” adverbials that are inherently speech-act oriented, i.e., they can never have a reading under which they could possibly modify or affect the interpretation of the proposition in any way. These obligatorily speech act referring elements are: übrigens, erstens, zweitens (‘by the way’, ‘first(ly)’, ‘second(ly)’ – respectively – ) and so on\(^{15}\) and marginally im Übrigen (also: ‘by the way’) and ungelogen (literally: ‘un-lied’, meaning ‘truly’). Being unable to get a proposition-internal, i.e., low reading, these expressions can appear in the Vorfeld without triggering an unwanted interpretation or leading to ungrammaticality (115). Unsurprisingly, these adverbials are also fine in the pre-prefield (V3) (116) or in the upper middle field (117). The meaning is always the same. The adverbials are bad, however, if they are put in a position close to the right sentence bracket (118).

(115) Übrigens habe ich vorige Woche in München gearbeitet.  
    by the way have I last week in Munich worked  
    ‘By the way, I worked in Munich last week.’

(116) Übrigens, ich habe vorige Woche in München gearbeitet.  

(117) Ich habe übrigens vorige Woche in München gearbeitet.  

(118) ?!*Ich habe vorige Woche in München übrigens gearbeitet.  

3.5. On certain adverbials in the upper middle field

There is a third observation; however, more research is required concerning the following findings. Frey and Pittner (1998) mention in a footnote that scrambling of some (short, adjective-like) manner adverbials is bad (119) vs. (120).\(^{16}\)

(119) Sie hat jedes Hemd sorgfältig gebügelt.  
    she has every shirt carefully ironed  
    ‘She ironed every shirt carefully.’

(120) ?!*Sie hat sorgfältig jedes Hemd gebügelt.

\(^{15}\) But interestingly not: letztens (‘finally, as the last’), which has a non speech act reading, meaning ‘recently’, ‘some time ago’. This lexical feature seems to block the use of letztens as speech act adverbial.

\(^{16}\) I do not consider the sentence in (120) to be as bad as Frey and Pittner do. They assign a star for complete ungrammaticality. I think this is too strong and hence assign a double question mark.
Whatever the reason for this behavior is, the topmost position in the upper middle field seems to be forbidden for adverbials with a manner interpretation. Nevertheless one can find manner adverbials there. The interesting thing is that in such cases we observe the opposite to what happens in the *Vorfeld*. The relevant sentences are grammatical, but the reading of the adverbials must be speech act oriented. In this position, a manner reading is impossible.\(^\text{17}\)

\[\text{(121)} \quad \text{Ich bin (ganz) ehrlich von dir total enttäuscht.}
\quad \text{I am (wholly) honest of you totally disappointed}
\quad \text{‘Honestly, I am totally disappointed with you.’}
\]

\[\text{(122)} \quad \text{Ich bin (ganz) nebenbei erst seit gestern von dieser}
\quad \text{thing convinced}
\quad \text{‘By the way, I’ve only been convinced of this since yesterday.’}
\]

\[\text{(123)} \quad \text{Ich habe (ganz) im Vertrauen erst gestern von}
\quad \text{this thing learned}
\quad \text{‘Confidentially, I only learned about this yesterday.’}
\]

Thus, a sentence corresponding in word order to (120) is not necessarily ungrammatical, consider (124) and (125).

\[\text{(124)} \quad \text{Sie hat (ganz) ehrlich alle Fragen beantwortet.}
\quad \text{she has (wholly) honest all questions answered}
\quad \text{‘Honestly, she answered all questions.’}
\]

\[\text{(125)} \quad \text{Sie hat (ganz) ernsthaft alle Aufgaben gemacht.}
\quad \text{she has (wholly) seriously all tasks done}
\quad \text{‘Really/Seriously, she did all tasks.’}
\]

However, (ganz) *ehrlich* in (124) cannot get a reading where the answering is done in an honest way, i.e., without cheating; but – as the translation suggests – the only interpretation possible is that the speaker of (124) wants to convey explicitly that the statement is taken to be true. The same for (125): *ernsthaft* cannot mean that she worked on every task with seriousness.

\(^{17}\) This finding should be considered crucial for the discussion of whether V2 is a blind role that puts the finite verb between the first constituent and the rest, or whether there is a decisive semantic and categorial difference between the *Vorfeld* and the highest position in the middle field.
The picture that emerges can be summarized in the table shown in (126).

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

The interpretation of Table (126) suggests very much that the speech act reading must be made explicit. This can be done in two ways: (i) either a long form is used, which by its very meaning must be interpreted as speech related (upper line). In this case the verbal part that the expressions contain spells out the performative character of the utterance. The other option (ii) is to put the adverbial in an unambiguous position. Two constructions are unambiguous: verb third (V3) with the adverbial in the leftmost position; or with the adverbial in a TopP-like position in the upper middle field (first and third column). If the (bare) adverbial is put into the regular first position in a V2 clause, the parser wants to assign a sentence internal reading (mostly manner, but also local etc.). If such a reading is available, the sentence is grammatical, but there is no way to get a speech act reading. If no such reading can be triggered, the interpretative parser crashes. Thus, we have a parsing-related restriction for V2.

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

4. Conclusion

The conclusion that can be drawn from everything discussed in this article is that verb second remains a challenging phenomenon after all. The Minimalist position, i.e., to just declare it as a phonological process outside syntax, does not do justice to its complexity. The interpretative impact is undeniable as well. For a complete and deep understanding of the phenomenon, all major grammatical aspects in the broader sense seem to interact: not only phonology, but also semantics, pragmatics, parsing, mental language processing and so
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forth. Either side – PF and LF – pose restrictions on the syntactic phenomenon of verb second (V2).
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