

## Bewegungsparadoxe bei Verb Projection Raising

Martin Salzmann (Konstanz); martin.salzmann@uni-konstanz.de

- Abstract
- VPR presents mixed evidence for movement vs. base-generation:
  - a) there are no movement effects (semantic, freezing) in canonical orders
  - b) movement effects obtain in non-canonical orders
- observations are parallel to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Construction and Incomplete Category Fronting
- evidence for adverb “scrambling”
- free word order is licensed by predicate-raising as in Fanselow (2001, 2003)
- As a side-effect, (LF-)predicate raising accounts for scope reconstruction effects that are unexpected under base-generation

### 1 Historical Development

#### 1.1 Evers (1975): adjunction of VP to a higher head

- Verb Raising: dependent verb attaches to the higher verb
- right-adjunction in Dutch, Zurich German; left-adjunction in Standard German

- (1) a) dass er <sub>[VP1 [VP2 es Buech läse] wett]</sub> D-structure →  
       that he           a book read wants
- b) dass er <sub>[VP1 [VP2 es Buech \_\_\_1] wett+läse<sub>1</sub>]</sub> S-structure  
       that he           a book           wants+read

- Verb Projection Raising: the VP-projection adjoins to the higher verb:

- (2) a) dass er <sub>[VP1 [VP2 es Buech läse] wett]</sub> D-structure →  
       that he           a book read wants
- b) dass er <sub>[VP1 \_\_\_1 [wett+ [VP2 es Buech läse]<sub>1</sub>]]</sub> S-structure

#### 1.2 Haegeman & van Riemsdijk (1986): Reanalysis

- VR and VPR involve reanalysis between the higher verb and
    - the dependent V → VR
    - the entire or parts of the dependent VP → VPR
  - reanalysis is followed by PF-inversion
- (3) a) dass de Hans <sub>[VP1 [VP2 de Muetter es Buech schänke] wett]</sub> D-structure  
       that the John           the.DAT mother a book give wants
- (4) b) dass de Hans <sub>[[VP de Muetter es Buech schänke] [V wett]]</sub> reanalysis with VP →  
       dass de Hans <sub>[[V wett] [VP de Muetter es Buech schänke]]</sub> after inversion
- c) dass de Hans <sub>[[VP de Muetter] [[V es Buech schänke] [V wett]]]</sub> reanalysis with V'  
       dass de Hans <sub>[[VP de Muetter] [[V wett] [V es Buech schänke]]]</sub> after inversion
- Despite its many virtues (esp. scope), this approach has been abandoned for conceptual reasons (reanalysis no longer permitted, multidimensional representation uneconomical)

### 1.3 Haegeman (1992): VPR = extraposition

- involves a – more or less – well-established operation: extraposition:
    - OV-structure, dependent VP adjoins to higher VP
- (5) a) dass er <sub>[VP1 [VP2 es Buech läse] wett]</sub> D-structure →  
       that he           a book read wants
- b) dass er <sub>[VP1 [VP1 \_\_\_1 wett] [VP2 es Buech läse]<sub>1</sub>]</sub> S-structure  
       that he           wants a book read
- Partial VP: a DP not included in the raised constituent and undergoes scrambling BEFORE extraposition → remnant extraposition
- (6) a) dass de Hans <sub>[VP1 [VP2 de Muetter es Buech schänke] wett]</sub> S-structure →  
       that the John           the.DAT mother a book give wants
- b) dass de Hans <sub>[de Muetter]<sub>1</sub> [VP1 [VP2 \_\_\_1 es Buech schänke] wett]</sub> Scrambling  
       that the John the.DAT mother           a book give wants
- c) dass de Hans <sub>[de Muetter]<sub>1</sub> [VP1 [VP1 \_\_\_2 wett] [VP2 \_\_\_1 es Buech schänke]<sub>2</sub>]</sub> Extraposition  
       that the John the.dat mother           wants a book give

### 1.4 den Dikken (1994/1995/1996): VPR = base-generated

#### 1.4.1 Arguments against Haegeman (1992): opacity paradox

- The raised cluster is transparent for extraction (Haegeman & van Riemsdijk 1986: 450):
- (7) Was<sub>1</sub> häsch <sub>[VP wele em Rägeli [\_\_\_1 für Buecher] chauffe]<sub>?</sub>  
       What have.2s wanted the.DAT Rachel for books buy</sub>
- requires extraction to take place before extraposition → remnant extraposition
- The paradox: the raised cluster is opaque for scopal elements – asymmetry VR/VPR:
- (8) a) dass er i de Ferie **2 Fraue** [*wett* küsse] VR: 2 > want; want > 2  
       that he in the vacation 2 women wants kiss
- b) dass er i de Ferie [*wett* **2 Fraue** küsse] VPR: \*2 > want; want > 2  
       that he in the vacation wants 2 women kiss
- Haegeman (1992): no QR at LF because VPR is extraposed
  - den Dikken (1994): does not follow from any theory of locality
  - the problem is more general: indefinites can otherwise easily escape strong islands:
- (9) a) Mary dates every man who knows a producer I know.  
       b) ∃y [**producer-I-know**'(y) ∧ ∀x [[**man**'(x) ∧ **know**'(x,y)] → **date**'(mary',x)]]
- extraposition cannot explain the opacity for scope

1.4.2 den Dikken's analysis

- antisymmetric VO-analysis → the raised cluster occupies its base-position → explains transparency for extraction
- difference VR/VPR:
  - VR: agreement projection outside the VP
  - VPR: agreement projections inside the VP (which is actually a TP):

- (10) a) [AgrO mod [<sub>VP</sub> inf]] VR  
 b) [mod [<sub>TP</sub> AgrO inf]] VPR

- This is then taken to explain the scope facts:
  - X has scope over Y if X c-commands a link of the chain of Y
  - VR: object moves across mod → ambiguity
  - VPR: object does not move across mod → only mod > XP:

- (11) a) [<sub>AGROP</sub> Obj<sub>1</sub> [<sub>AGRO'</sub> AgrO [<sub>VP1</sub> V<sub>modal</sub> [<sub>VP2</sub> V2 \_\_<sub>1</sub>]]]] VR  
 b) [<sub>VP1</sub> V<sub>modal</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> [<sub>AGROP</sub> Obj<sub>1</sub> [<sub>AGRO'</sub> AgrO [<sub>VP2</sub> V2 \_\_<sub>1</sub>]]]]] VPR

1.4.3 Arguments against den Dikken

- Movement for case-checking is unattractive in languages with free word order like German and its dialects (Fanselow 2001); free word order is also found in VPR:

- (12) dass er **s Buech de Muetter** [wett zum Geburtstag schänke] VPR  
 that he the book the.DAT mother wants to.the birthday give

- den Dikken assumes a scrambling mechanism different from movement for case checking if in VPR an argument occurs within the projection of the modal:

- (13) a) Er hät **käm Schüeler** [wele es Buech schänke]. VPR: no student > want;  
 he has no.DAT student wanted a book give want > no student
- b) [[**käm Schüeler**]<sub>1</sub> wele [<sub>TP</sub> [<sub>AGROP</sub> \_\_<sub>1</sub> [es Buech]<sub>2</sub> AgrO schänke \_\_<sub>1</sub> \_\_<sub>2</sub>]]] VPR  
 scrambling case-checking

→ since the scrambling chain crosses the modal, ambiguity is correctly predicted

- However, there are arguments against a scrambling operation
- material that is usually taken not to be able to scramble can occur in higher positions:

- (14) a) dass er **känere Flüüg** [hät chöne öppis z Leid tue] idiomatic NPs  
 that he no.DAT fly has could something to suffering do
- b) dass er sis Bier [hät **küelt** wele mitnee] predicative APs  
 that he his beer has cooled wanted take.along

- DPs that occur in higher positions do not prevent focus projection (as long as they occur in normal order; all of the following variants allow focus projection):

- (15) a) Er hät **de Muetter s Buech vom CHOMSKY** [wele schänke].  
 he has the.DAT mother the book of.the Chomsky wanted give  
 'He wanted to give mother the book by Chomsky.'  
 b) Er hät **de Muetter** [wele s Buech vom CHOMSKY schänke].  
 he has the.DAT mother wanted the book of.the Chomsky give  
 c) Er hät [wele **de Muetter s Buech vom CHOMSKY** schänke].  
 he has wanted the.DAT mother the book of.the Chomsky give

- Extraction from objects is possible not only if the object is inside the VPR-constituent, but also if it occurs outside it. This means that there are *no freezing effects*:

- (16) a) Was<sub>1</sub> hät de Hans [\_\_<sub>1</sub> **für Lüüt**] [wele vo siine Idee überzüüge]?  
 what has the John for people wanted of his ideas convince?  
 b) Was<sub>1</sub> hät de Hans [wele [\_\_<sub>1</sub> **für Lüüt**] vo siine Idee überzüüge]?  
 what has the John wanted for people of his ideas convince?

→ cf. Geilfuss (1991): Pseudoscrumbling

- seems incompatible with the idea that last-merged specifiers of phases are opaque (Müller 2008)

2 Movement effects emerge under non-canonical order

- interestingly, movement effects obtain once the arguments occur in non-canonical order
- elements that are normally thought not to scramble cannot occur in higher positions:

- (17) a)\*dass **känere Flüüg de Hans** [hät chöne öppis z Leid tue] idiomatic NPs  
 that no.DAT fly the John has could something to suffering do  
 b)\*dass **küelt de Hans sis Bier** [hät wele in Park mitnee] predicative APs  
 that cooled the John his beer has wanted in park take.with

- Focus projection is blocked under non-canonical order (narrow scope on 'mother' only)

- (18) a) Er hät **s Buech vom Chomsky de Muetter** [wele schänke].  
 he has the book of.the Chomsky the.DAT mother wanted give  
 'He wanted to give the book by Chomsky to the mother.'  
 b) Er hät **s Buech vom Chomsky** [wele de Muetter schänke].  
 he has the book of.the Chomsky wanted the.DAT mother give  
 c)?Er hät [wele **s Buech vom Chomsky** de Muetter schänke].  
 he has wanted the book of.the Chomsky the.DAT mother give

- Freezing effects re-emerge under non-canonical order (especially mvt from above the SU)

- (19) \*Was<sub>1</sub> hät [\_\_<sub>1</sub> **für Lüüt**] de Hans [wele vo siine Idee überzüüge]?  
 what has for people the John wanted of his ideas convince?

### 3 Parallels with remnant movement

- a remnant movement analysis requires scrambling of all arguments before topicalization
- (20) [<sub>1</sub> <sub>2</sub> Geschenk<sub>t</sub>] hat er das Buch<sub>2</sub> keinem<sub>1</sub>  
           given          has he the book no.one.DAT
- Fanselow (2002: 100), Hinterhölzl (2002: 137): Often, however, the evacuation operation has to apply to elements that normally do not scramble, e.g. predicative APs:
- (21) a) [Angemalt] hat er sein Haus **rot**.  
           painted has he his house red
- b) ??dass er **rot** das Haus anmalte  
           that he red the house painted
- Furthermore, elements scrambled out of the remnant VP do not trigger freezing effects if they occur in canonical order (Fanselow 2002: 107, Hinterhölzl 2002: 136):
- (22) a) [Überzeugt] haben die Männer wohl ihre Frauen nicht **damit**.  
           convinced have the men PRT their wives not with.it
- b) [Überzeugt] haben die Männer **da**<sub>1</sub> wohl ihre Frauen nicht <sub>1</sub> **mit**.  
           convinced have the men there PRT their wives not with
- Freezing effects re-emerge if extraction takes place from a higher position
- (23) a)\*Die Männer haben **da**<sub>1</sub> wohl **mit**<sub>1</sub> ihre Frauen noch nicht überzeugt  
           the men have there PRT with their wives still not convinced
- b)\*[Überzeugt] haben die Männer **da**<sub>1</sub> wohl <sub>1</sub> **mit** ihre Frauen nicht .  
           convinced have the men there PRT with their women not

→ similar parallels have been noted for the third construction (Bayer & Kornfilt 1994: 45, Geilfuss 1991, Wöllstein 2001)

- 3 possible conclusions
- 1: two different operations: pseudoscrumbling/licensing movement + real scrambling (Geilfuss 1991, Wöllstein-Leisten 2001, Hinterhölzl 2002, 2006)
- 2: pseudoscrumbling involves base-generation while real scrambling involves movement (Sternefeld 2006, at least if a position in front of the subject is targeted)
- 3: all phenomena are base-generated, semantic effects are the result of surface structure generalizations (as e.g. in Müller 2001), freezing depends on topicality (e.g. Fanselow 2002, 2003a/b)
- Arguments in favor of option 3
- if movement is involved as in option 1, it is unclear why there are no freezing effects
- even if scrambling involves reordering it often takes place for altruistic reasons, e.g. to allow another element bear a certain pragmatic function (Haider & Rosengren 1998) → such an operation cannot be formulated in Minimalist terms, cf. Fanselow (2001) for discussion.
- but cf. Assmann & Heck (2009) for an alternative in terms of edge features

### 4 A caveat (Assmann & Heck 2009)

#### 4.1 Anti-freezing because of remnant movement?

- counterargument: the absence of freezing in (16) and (22) could also be due to remnant movement (cf. e.g. Abels 2003):
- (24) a) Was<sub>1</sub> hät de Hans [<sub>1</sub> für Lüüt] [wele vo siine Idee überzüüge]?  
           what has the John for people wanted of his ideas convince?
- b) [<sub>DP</sub> Was <sub>1</sub> ]<sub>2</sub> hät de Hans [für Lüüt]<sub>1</sub> [wele <sub>2</sub> vo siine Idee überzüüge]?  
           What has the John for people wanted of his ideas convince
- but why the ungrammaticality in (19) and (23)b?
- (25) \*Was<sub>1</sub> hät [<sub>1</sub> für Lüüt] de Hans [wele vo siine Idee überzüüge]?  
           what has for people the John wanted of his ideas convince?
- under RM, one has to account for the contrast between (24) and (25) somehow
  - one could say that the difference is not due to freezing, but due to the target position of scrambling of *für Lüüt*. If it targets a position above the subject → ungrammaticality

#### 4.2 Against the remnant movement account

- a RM account is subject to the same criticism as RM approaches to incomplete category fronting (section 3) in that an evacuation operation is postulated just to get the right constituent
  - More seriously, one can construct examples with putatively scrambled DPs from which scrambling has taken place, but which are grammatical (underline = putative base-pos.):
- (26) a) dass niemert [über de Chomsky] [hät es Buech] wele \_\_ schriibe|  
           that no.one about the Chomsky had a book wanted write
- b) dass niemert [über de Chomsky] [es Buech] [het chöne i äim Jaar \_\_ schriibe|  
           that no.one about the Chomsky a book had could in one year write
- (27) a) dass [über de Chomsky] niemert [hät [es Buech] wele \_\_ schriibe|  
           that about the Chomsky no.one has a book wanted write
- b) dass [über de Chomsky] niemert [es Buech] [het chöne i äim Jaar \_\_ schriibe|  
           that about the Chomsky no.one a book had could in one year write
- if these are derived via remnant movement by first scrambling out *es Buech* and then scrambling out *über de Chomsky*, one would expect a violation of the constraint on remnant movement (Müller 1996: 359f.):
  - APs can in principle be scrambled (at least marginally):
- (28) a)?dass [<sub>AP</sub> stolz auf sein Kind]<sub>1</sub> der Fritz nicht <sub>1</sub> gewesen ist  
           that proud of his child the Fritz not been is  
           'that Fritz was not proud of his child'



## 5.4 Fanselow (2003a/b)

- theta-role assignment is a side-effect of the checking of formal features
- takes place within the projection of P, the argument c-commands the predicate (cf. also Neeleman & Weerman 1998)
- XP can be assigned theta roles of P and of predicates incorporated into P
- theta-role assignment takes place at Merge, not at some later point (e.g. at LF)
- → incorporation of the complement V into matrix V takes place cyclically (single-output syntax with pronunciation of lower copy?)

## 6 Facts to be accounted for

- selective movement effects:
  - base-generating non-scrambling elements in higher positions (14)
  - no freezing effects in canonical positions outside the lexical projection (16)
  - freezing effects in non-canonical positions outside the lexical projection (19)
- locality: base-generation in (Swiss) German only within VR, VPR and coherent constructions, but not across finite clauses
- arguments must not be merged below the projection of the verb selecting them:

(33) a) ich ha **de** **Muetter** [ghulffe uf Amerika uuswandere]  
 I have the.DAT mother helped to America emigrate

b)\*ich ha [ghulffe **de** **Muetter** uf Amerika uuswandere]  
 I have helped the.DAT mother to America emigrate

- scope facts
  - no scope ambiguity if XP within VPR-constituent (8)
  - scope reconstruction if XP outside the VPR-constituent (13)
- reconstruction of adverbials (Haegeman & van Riemsdijk 1986, Hinterhölzl 2006):
  - adverbials above the modal can modify the lexical verb

(34) er hät s geschter no **morn** [wele de Muetter bringe]  
 he has it yesterday still tomorrow wanted the.DAT mother bring

### 6.1 Selective movement effects

- base-generation of non-arguments can be accounted for by all approaches if it is assumed that
  - a) non-arguments can in principle be freely merged and
  - b) their distribution is regulated by surface structure constraints (semantics/pragmatics)
- selective freezing effects
  - absence of freezing effects in low positions follows from base-generation
  - presence of freezing effects in non-canonical positions potentially follows from specificity islands (Meinunger 2000, Fanselow 2001, 2003a/b)

## 6.2 Locality

- Sternefeld (2006)
  - theta-role percolation is licensed by explicit rules like (31) which by definition derive the correct result
- Fanselow (2001, 2003a/b)
  - Since extension of the theta-marking domain depends on predicate raising, the correct result is derived as long as predicate raising is adequately restricted
- Boskovic & Takahashi (1998)
  - it is a priori completely unclear to what extent the lowering mechanism is restricted
  - The lowering mechanism is designed for Japanese where scrambling is only weakly sensitive to locality constraints – and has properties of A'-movement → but arguably too unrestricted for German

## 6.3 Merging arguments in the right projection

- Sternefeld (2006)
  - follows directly since theta-roles are assigned under sisterhood only
- Boskovic + Takahashi (1998)
  - does not follow, nothing prevents upwards LF-movement for that-role assignment
  - is in fact attested in Japanese (p. 357, ex. 16b)...→ but too unconstrained for German
- Fanselow (2001)
  - since theta-roles are not checked until LF and since theta-role checking only depends on c-command, nothing in principle rules out generating an argument below the projection of the verb that selects it
  - serious problem (cf. also Assmann & Heck 2009, section 5.1 for discussion)
- Fanselow (2003a/b)
  - fixes the problem of Fanselow (2001) since it requires that the argument c-command the predicate and be merged in the projection of the predicate (or of a head that the predicate has incorporated into)

### 6.4 Scope

- Boskovic & Takahashi (1998)
    - scope reconstruction (13) follows from LF-lowering
    - absence of scope-ambiguities (8) follows since modal c-commands the XP at LF  
→ no QR
  - Sternefeld (2006)
    - scope facts do not fall out from the analysis
    - Sternefeld (2006: 682ff.) stipulates LF-movement of the modal across the XP
    - captures scope reconstruction in (13), absence of ambiguities in (8) follows since modal always c-commands the XP
    - problem 1: what about the ambiguity in (13)? optional reconstruction/LF-movement?
    - problem 2: additional verbal elements: all verbs have to move across the XP – trigger? – only plausible for the modal; cyclicity?
- (35) dass er **käm Schüeler** [**hät wele** es Buech schänke]. VPR: no student > want;  
that he no.DAT student has wanted a book give want > no student
- Fanselow (2001)
    - since the approach is based on LF-predicate raising, the modal ends up in matrix T → c-commands the XP so that the mod > XP reading obtains
    - wide scope of the modal would follow from optional reconstruction
    - absence of scope-ambiguities (8) follows since modal c-commands the XP at LF irrespective of whether predicate raising is reconstructed or not
    - → the scope facts are in fact predicted in this approach (if covert head movement can lead to semantic effects, cf. also Lechner 2007)
  - Fanselow (2003)
    - it is unclear whether movement to T is still assumed since it is no longer necessary for theta-role assignment (as it no longer depends on c-command)  
→ unclear

### 6.5 Reconstruction of Adverbials

- Sternefeld (2006)
  - Since only theta-roles can percolate, adverbs have to be merged above the projection they modify
- Boskovic & Takahashi (1998)
  - explicitly rule out reconstruction of adverbials since they cannot be reconstructed in Japanese scrambling
  - theoretically: if adverbials are merged as specifiers of functional heads whose features are weak, it would be conceivable to get adverb reconstruction at LF
- Fanselow (2001)
  - scrambling of adverbials and thus reconstruction as in (34) is explicitly ruled out
  - however, if adverbials are merged as specifiers of functional heads whose features are weak, it might be possible to extend the predicate raising approach: suppose that the functional head is merged above the lexical projection in (34) while the adverb is merged

above the modal. At LF, V will incorporate into the modal, thereby carrying the functional head along so that it can license the adverb via c-command at LF:

- (36) a) Er hät s [<sub>TP</sub> geschter no **morn** [wele **F** de Muetter bringe]]. →  
 b) Er hät s [<sub>TP</sub> geschter no **morn** [wele **F** de Muetter bringe] V+**F**+v+Mod].
- Problem: scrambling of adverbials is normally ruled out on the basis of the following:
- (37) dass [**morgen**<sub>1</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> niemand [<sub>CP</sub> PRO \*\_\_<sub>1</sub> ein Buch zu lesen] versprach]] (Fanselow that tomorrow no.one a book to read promised 2001: 401)
- However, is this really correct? Some selected adverbials seem to resist scrambling while certain adjuncts do seem to scramble, cf. Fanselow (2003: 214)
- (38) a) ??dass man **im Hotel** niemandem zu wohnen versprechen sollte ARG  
 that one in.the hotel nobody to live promise should  
 'that one should not promise anyone to live in the hotel'
- b) dass man **in diesem Hotel** niemandem zu essen empfehlen kann ADJ  
 that one in this hotel nobody to eat recommend can  
 'that one cannot recommend anyone to eat in this hotel'
- Cf. also the following example involving the Third Construction
- (39) a) dass er mir das Buch **bis nächste Woche** versprach zu lesen  
 that he me.DAT the book until next week promised to read  
 → adverbial unambiguously in the matrix clause, but seems to have low construal
- if the adverbial occurs above the object, the object has to be indefinite:
- b) dass er mir **bis nächste Woche** \*das / ?ein Buch versprach zu lesen  
 that he me.DAT until next week the a book promised to read
- scrambling of adverbials seems possible as long as certain order constraints are not violated → it seems therefore worthwhile to integrate it into the predicate raising approach

- Fanselow (2003a/b)
  - the same possibilities as in Fanselow (2001) arise as long as incorporation of the functional head takes place cyclically

### 6.6 Comparison

- +/- indicates that a fact can only be derived with extensions

(40)

|                                       | <i>Sternefeld</i> | <i>B &amp; T</i> | <i>Fanselow 2001</i> | <i>Fanselow 2003</i> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Free base-generation of non-arguments | +                 | +                | +                    | +                    |
| Selective freezing effects            | +                 | +                | +                    | +                    |
| Locality                              | +                 | -                | +                    | +                    |
| Position of Merge                     | +                 | -                | -                    | +                    |
| Scope                                 | +/-               | +                | +                    | ?                    |
| Reconstruction of adverbials          | -                 | +/-              | +/-                  | +/-                  |



## 8.2 How to derive Verb Raising?

- den Dikken (1994):
  - modals in VPR-languages can select a TP, in non-VPR languages only a VP
  - arguments have to leave the VP for case checking (AgroP not included in the lexical VP) in languages like Dutch/German
- But: adverbial interpretation in VR suggests an embedded TP (but: Sternefeld 2006: 663)

(48) Geschter hāt er s Buch no **morn** [wele chauuffe].  
yesterday has he the book still tomorrow wanted buy

- and: are there real V-raising languages (except Dutch, cf. den Besten & Broekhuis 1992)?
- cf. limited VPR in German (Sternefeld 2006: 649):

(49) dass ihn gestern [hätte **jemand** besiegen können]  
that him yesterday had.SUBJ someone defeat could

## 8.3 West Flemish

- has VPR but no reordering of arguments
  - two independent processes so that the unification proposed here is undesirable?
  - alternatively: some surface parallelism constraint, cf. also Neeleman (1994)?

## 8.4 Right-branching or left-branching + PF-inversion?

- Are the embedded VPs/TPs right-hand complements of V (Dikken 1994, 1995, 1996) or are the orders derived via OV + inversion (Broekhuis 1993, Sternefeld 2006)?
- in favor of right-branching (at least for VPs, TPs and CPs as e.g. in Barbiers 2000)
  - the order is 123 in Swiss German (Seiler 2004) → one would have to stipulate that inversion takes place at all cycles
- ECM-facts:
  - Lötscher (1978: 8): ECM-subjects have to precede the ECM-verb:

(50) a)\*dass er wil *laa siini Chind* Medizin studiere  
that he wants let his children medicine study

b) dass er wil *siini Chind laa* Medizin studiere  
that he wants his children let medicine study

- These facts are problematic for both a right- and a left-branching account without AgrP
  - predicate raising: since case-assignment takes place at LF under c-command, the asymmetry in (50) is unexpected: the causative verb would c-command the ECM-subject
  - they are also problematic for a left-branching account with inversion since the object is to the left of the verb in the base:

(51) dass er [[[sini Chind Medizin studiere] laa] will ]

- but they follow under a right-branching account with Agr-projections (den Dikken 1994)

- There is no prohibition against VP-internal subjects in VPR
- (52) dass geschter het [chöne **öppert** iibräche]  
that yesterday had.SUBJ could someone break.in
- apparently the ECM-subject has to be merged/raised into the projection of the ECM-verb  
→ cf. also Assmann & Heck (2009: section 5.3) for problems with base-generating ECM

## References

- Abels, Klaus 2003. Successive Cyclicity, Anti-Locality, and Adposition Stranding. PhD thesis, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Assmann, Anke & Fabian Heck 2009. Reply to Fanselow (2001). Ms. University of Leipzig.
- Barbiers, Sjef 2000. The Right Periphery in SOV Languages. English and Dutch. In Peter Svenonius (eds.). *The Derivation of VO and OV*, 181–218. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bayer, Josef and Jaklin Kornfilt. 1994. Against Scrambling as an instance of Move-alpha. In *Studies on Scrambling. Movement and Non-Movement Approaches to Free Word-Order Phenomena*, ed. by Norbert Corver and Henk van Riemsdijk, 17–60. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- den Besten, Hans and Hans Broekhuis 1992. Verb Projection Raising in het Nederlands. *Spektator* 21, 21–34.
- Boskovic, Zeljko and Takahashi, Daiko 1998. Scrambling and Last Resort. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29:3, 347–366.
- Broekhuis, Hans. Verb Projection Raising. *Spektator* 22, 28–47.
- Dikken, M. den 1994. Minimalist Verb (Projection Raising). *GAGL* 37, 71–88.
- Dikken, Marcel den 1995. Verb (Projection) Raising, Scope, and Uniform Phrase Structure. Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS) 25, 95–110.
- Dikken, Marcel den 1996. The minimal links of Verb (Projection) Raising. In *Minimal Ideas. Syntactic Studies in the Minimalist Framework*, ed. by Werner Abraham, Samuel David Epstein, Höskuldur Thráinsson and Jan-Wouter Zwart, 67–96. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2001. Features, theta-Roles, and free Constituent Order. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32, 405–437.
- Fanselow, Gisbert 2002. Against Remnant VP-Movement. In Artemis Alexiadou, Elena Anagnostopoulou, Sjef Barbiers and Hans-Martin Gärtner (eds.). *Dimensions of Movement. From Features to Remnants*, 91–125. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fanselow, Gisbert 2003a. Free Constituent Order, A Minimalist Interface Account. *Folia Linguistica* 37, 191–231.
- Fanselow, Gisbert 2003b. Zur Generierung der Satzgliedabfolge im Deutschen. *Neuere Beiträge zur Germanistik* 112, 3–47.
- Fanselow, Gisbert and Cavar, Damir 2002. Distributed Deletion. In Artemis Alexiadou (eds.). *Theoretical Approaches to Universals*, 65–107. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Geilfuss, Jochen. 1991. Verb- und Verbphrasensyntax. *Arbeitspapier des SFB 340*, Nr. 11. University of Tübingen.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 1992. Theory and description in Generative syntax: A case study in West Flemish. Cambridge: CUP.
- Haegeman, Liliane and Henk van Riemsdijk. 1986. Verb Projection Raising, scope, and the typology of rules affecting verbs. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, 417–466.
- Haider, Hubert and Inger Rosengren. 1998. Scrambling. *Sprache und Pragmatik* 49, 1–104.
- Hinterhölzl, Roland 2002. Remnant Movement and Partial Deletion. In Artemis Alexiadou, Elena Anagnostopoulou, Sjef Barbiers and Hans-Martin Gärtner (eds.). *Dimensions of Movement. From Features to Remnants*, 127–149. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hinterhölzl, R. 2006. *Scrambling, Remnant Movement, and Restructuring in West Germanic*. OUP: Oxford.
- Lechner, W. 2007. Interpretive Effects of Head Movement. (LingBuzz; v 2.0)
- Lötscher, Andreas 1978. Zur Verbstellung im Zürichdeutschen und in anderen Varianten des Deutschen. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 45, 1–29.
- Meinunger, André 2000. *Syntactic aspects of Topic and Comment*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Müller, Gereon 1996. A Constraint on Remnant Movement. *NLLT* 14, 355–407.
- Müller, Gereon. 1999. Optimality, markedness and word order in German. *Linguistics* 37, 777–818.
- Müller, Gereon. 2008. On deriving CED effects from the PIC. Ms. University of Leipzig.
- Neeleman, Ad. 1994. Scrambling as a D-Structure Phenomenon. In *Studies on Scrambling. Movement and Non-Movement Approaches to Free Word-Order Phenomena*, ed. by Norbert Corver and Henk van Riemsdijk, 387–429. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Neeleman, Ad and Hans van de Koot. 2002. The Configurational Matrix. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33, 529–574.
- Seiler, Guido 2004. On three types of dialect variation and their implications for linguistic theory. Evidence from verb clusters in Swiss German dialects. In Bernd Kortmann (ed.). *Dialectology meets Typology. Dialect Grammar from a cross-linguistic Perspective*, 367–399. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sternefeld, Wolfgang. 2006. *Syntax. Eine morphologisch motivierte Generative Beschreibung des Deutschen*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Wöllstein-Leisten, Angelika. 2001. *Die Syntax der dritten Konstruktion*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.