

Sjef Barbiers

Sjef Barbiers
Johan Rooryck
Jeroen van de Weijer
(eds.)

Small words in the big picture
Squibs for Hans Bennis

Holland Institute of Generative Linguistics (HIL)
P.O. Box 9515
NL – 2300 RA Leiden
The Netherlands

tel. +31 71 527 2101
fax +31 71 527 2125

E-mail: hil@rullet.leidenuniv.nl
<http://www.leidenuniv.nl/hil>

© by the authors. All rights reserved.

Contents

Preface.....	v
1. Sjef Barbiers: Gaps and remnants	1
2. Hans den Besten: What a little word can do for you: <i>wat</i> in Afrikaans possessive relatives	7
3. Hans Broekhuis: A note on the notion of internal argument	13
4. Marcel den Dikken: ‘Almost’ Dutch	19
5. Jenny Doetjes: <i>Een beetje</i> or the ‘mass only’ puzzle	25
6. Rob Goedemans and Ellen van Zanten: Second thoughts on the phonological reality of Indonesian word stress	31
7. Vincent J. van Heuven: Effects of focus distribution and accentuation on the temporal and melodic organisation of word groups in Dutch	37
8. Berend Hoff: Carib translations of <i>doen</i> and <i>laten</i>	43
9. Aafke Hulk: “Spurious” <i>een</i>	47
10. Ans van Kemenade: The rise of V-movement and its echoes in Old English	53
11. Jan Kooij: Particle verbs and incorporation in Dutch	57
12. Anikó Lipták: <i>Er</i> as a locative expletive	61
13. Bettelou Los: The OV/VO change and split infinitives in early Middle English	65
14. Marc van Oostendorp: Bergen op Zoom diminutives in phonological theory	71
15. Gertjan Postma: Pronominal clitics and clitic clusters in Kambera – Morphological case and syntactic movement	77
16. Chris Reintges: The Highest Subject Restriction in Coptic relative clauses	83
17. Karin Robbers: Non-verbal complements of modals in Afrikaans	91
18. Esterella de Roo: A dummy tense element in agrammatic speech?	97
19. Johan Rooryck and Guido Vanden Wyngaerd: It’s a small word	101
20. Petra Sleeman: The quantative pronoun <i>er</i> in Dutch dialects	107
21. Jan W. de Vries: The <i>wat voor (een)</i> construction revisited again	113
22. Mark de Vries: <i>Zich</i> in adjectival prepositional objects	117
23. Jeroen van de Weijer: Analogical change	121
24. Ton van der Wouden: Niet huilen maar: negation, directives and particles	125

Gaps and remnants*

Sjef Barbiers
HIL/Leiden University

Dutch verbs such as *denken* 'think' normally select a clausal or a prepositional but not a nominal complement. Constructions in which *denken* seemingly takes a nominal complement, such as the answer in (1a), arguably involve reduced complement clauses, not nominal complements. First, the pronominal *hij* in the answer in (1a) is nominative, whereas nominal complements are accusative in Dutch. Secondly, the answer in (1b) shows that this construction is not limited to nominal constituents. It is also possible with adverbials and PPs. These adverbials and PPs do not entertain a direct semantic relation with *denken*, as is normally the case with the complement of a transitive verb. They are interpreted as modifiers of a silent verb *aankomt* 'arrives'. Thirdly, the anaphor *zichzelf* 'himself' in (1c) is grammatical and interpreted as *Jan*, even though there is no visible antecedent in the sentence.

- (1) a. Q: Who do you think has read the book?
A: Ik denk JAN/HIJ
I think John/he
- b. Q: When/where do you think John will arrive?
A: Ik denk MORGEN/IN AMSTERDAM
I think tomorrow/in Amsterdam
- c. Q: Do you think that John will make Pete or himself chair?
A: Ik denk ZICHZELF
I think himself

It seems safe to assume that the answers in (1) involve reduction of a *that*-clause.¹ Clearly, it cannot be reduction of a non-finite clause, as (1a) shows: non-finite clauses cannot have a nominative subject in Dutch. The only constituent that is pronounced after *that*-clause reduction, henceforth the remnant, is the one that answers the question and represents new, pragmatically salient and phonologically prominent information. The other constituents, which represent given information, are phonologically silent but must be visible at the level of interpretation, such that the modifiers can be interpreted as such and binding can take place.²

- (2) a. Ik denk dat JAN het boek heeft gelezen
I think that John the book has read
- b. Ik denk ~~dat Jan~~ MORGEN/IN AMSTERDAM ~~aankomt~~
I think that John tomorrow/in Amsteram arrives

* I thank Marcel Den Dikken and Marc van Oostendorp for comments on an earlier version of this squib. The usual disclaimers apply.

¹ Reduction of non-finite clausal complements is proposed for related but different constructions with intensional transitive verbs in Larson, Den Dikken and Ludlow (1997). The data and proposal presented here provide additional support for their idea that intensional transitives involve clausal reduction.

² Constituents that are present at LF but phonologically silent are indicated by a strike-out. Phonological prominence is indicated by capital letters.

- c. Ik denk ~~dat Jan~~, ZICHZELF_i voorzitter maakt
I think that John himself chair makes

The phenomenon of *that*-clause reduction is limited to so-called propositional *that*-clauses, i.e., *that*-clauses that do not have a truth-value. Reduction of factive *that*-clauses, i.e., clauses with a presupposed truth, yields ungrammatical results:

- (3) a. Jan hoopt/denkt/vermoedt/meent/vreest ~~dat HANS~~ directeur wordt
John hopes/thinks/expects/means/fears that Hans director becomes
b. *Jan betreurt/onthult/weet ~~dat HANS~~ directeur wordt
John regrets/reveals/knows that Hans director becomes

In fact, *that*-clauses in other structural positions do not allow for reduction either. Some examples are given in (4). All sentences in (4) are grammatical without reduction.

- (4) a. *Piet laat [_{DP} de hoop [_{CP} ~~dat JAN~~ ~~het boek~~ zal lezen]] varen
Pete lets the hope that John the book will read go
'Pete gives up the hope that John will read the book'
b. *Ik hoop erop [_{CP} ~~dat JAN~~ ~~het boek~~ zal lezen]
I hope it for that John the book will read
c. *Ik vind [_{AP} [_{CP} ~~dat JAN~~ ~~het boek~~ zal lezen]] bedenkelijk
I find that John the book will read doubtful
d. *Jan schreeuwde zo hard [_{CP} ~~dat PIET~~ ~~het boek~~ liet vallen]
John cried so loud that Pete the book dropped

Another common property of the sentences in (4) is the impossibility of extraction from the embedded CPs. However, extraction from a propositional CP is possible (5e).

- (5) a. *Wat laat Piet [_{DP} de hoop [_{CP} dat Jan t zal lezen]] varen?
what let Pete the hope that John will read go
b. *Wat hoopt Piet erop [_{CP} dat Jan t zal lezen]?
what hopes Pete it on that John will read
c. *Wat vindt Piet [[_{CP} dat Jan t zal lezen]] bedenkelijk?
what finds Pete that John will read doubtful
d. *Wat schreeuwde Jan zo hard [_{CP} dat Piet t liet vallen]
what cried John so loud that Pete dropped
e. Wat hoopt Piet [_{CP} dat Jan t zal lezen]?
what hopes Pete that John will read

As is well-known, extraction from factive complements is worse than from propositional complements. This holds for factive complements that come with dummy *het* 'it' (cf. Bennis 1986), but also for those without *het*. This is illustrated for subject extraction in (6):

- (6) a. Wie denk je dat er t morgen komt?
who think you that there tomorrow comes
b. *Wie weet je / betreur je het dat er t morgen komt?
who know you / regret you it that there tomorrow comes

The generalization is that *that*-clauses which allow for extraction also allow for reduction and vice versa. Factives pattern with *that*-clauses within DP (4a,5a), in adjunct position (4b,d; 5b,d), and as the subject of a small clause (SC) (4c,5c). The impossibility of extraction from a CP within DP, from adjuncts and from SC-subjects is well-known and is usually ascribed to their structural position. For factive CPs to fall under this explanation, we may assume that they are adjuncts, as has been argued in Bennis (1986) for factives with dummy *het* 'it'. In Barbiers (1998), I argue that all factive complements, i.e. factive complements without *het* as well, are adjuncts to an (extended) projection of V, whereas propositional CPs are sisters of V. Evidence comes from Principle C, Sequence of Tense effects, and from topicalization.

Given the correlation between extraction and *that*-clause reduction, the obvious question to ask is whether *that*-clause reduction involves movement of the remnant. If it does, we immediately understand why it is sensitive to the structural position of the *that*-clause.³ Evidence for movement is that constituents that cannot be preposed cannot be a remnant, whereas constituents that can be preposed, can be a remnant. Some examples are given in (7).

- (7) a. (Does John want to read the book or sell it?)
Ik denk ~~dat Jan~~ ~~het boek~~ wil LEZEN
I think that John the book wants read
b. LEZEN denk ik dat Jan het boek niet wil
read think I that John the book not wants
c. (Must or may John read the book?)
*Ik denk ~~dat Jan~~ ~~het boek~~ MAG lezen
I think that John the book may read
d. *MAG denk ik dat Jan het boek lezen
may think I that John the book read

The correlation between extraction and reduction (cf. 4-6) on the one hand, and preposing and reduction (cf. 7) on the other support a movement analysis of *that*-clause reduction. The next questions to be answered are: (i) what kind of movement is it, and (ii) what is the landing site of this movement. As for the first question, it is clear that we are dealing with focus movement: non-focusable constituents cannot be remnants:

- (8) a. Jan hoopt ~~dat Piet~~ DAARaan/*eraandenkt
John hopes that Pete thereof/thereof thinks

³ *That*-clause reduction must be distinguished from two constructions that look similar but are different. First, *that*-clause reduction looks similar to Sluicing (Ross 1969), for which movement analyses have been proposed. An example of sluicing is (i-a). Ross already noticed that if sluicing involves movement, it violates all kinds of island constraints. However, *that*-clause reduction is sensitive to island constraints, as the data in (4) show. Whereas sluicing is possible with factive verbs (i-a), *that*-clause reduction is not (i-b). The latter also holds for a second construction, gapping (i-c), that looks similar to but is different from *that*-clause reduction.

- (i) a. Jan zegt dat er iemand komt en ik weet WIE
John says that there someone comes and I know who
b. Jan zegt dat er iemand komt en ik denk/*weet ~~dat PIET~~ komt
John says that there someone comes and I think/know Pete comes
c. Piet denkt/weet dat TRUUS JOU een boek geeft en ~~dat JIJ HAAR een boek geeft~~
Pete thinks/knows that Truus you a book gives and that you her a book give

- b. DAARAan/*eraan hoopt Jan dat Piet denkt
thereof/thereof hopes John that Petethinks

The landing site of this movement operation must be outside the embedded clause. If it were inside the embedded clause, there should be no island sensitivity. For example, a factive island can perfectly well be an embedded question (e.g. *Jan onthulde wie de maaltijd bereid had* 'John revealed who had prepared the meal'). The spec of the matrix CP cannot be the landing site either, or else we would not be able to distinguish between the two cases *Ik denk Jan* 'I think John' and *Jan denk ik* 'John I think'.

I tentatively propose that the remnant in *that*-clause reduction constructions moves to a position inside the matrix VP. The idea that the matrix VP is a landing site for movement was already put forward on theoretical grounds in Chomsky (1986). Although this type of movement has commonly been assumed to be impossible in Dutch, there is evidence that it is possible. In Barbiers (1995), I show that a preposed constituent extracted from the embedded clause may strand an associated focus particle in the matrix VP. A similar kind of stranding is possible with *wat-voor* split. Moreover, visible movement of an entire constituent to a position within the matrix-VP is often possible. Provided the right intonation, the sentences in (9) are grammatical for many speakers; they frequently occur in spoken language. Notice that there is a sharp contrast with factive CPs. As (9c) shows, it is impossible to have a remnant in (9a) to the right of *gedacht*, which supports the movement analysis.⁴

- (9) a. Ik had [MORGEN]_i gedacht/*toegegeven [_{CP} dat Jan t_i het boek zou brengen]
I had tomorrow thought/admitted that John the book would bring
b. Ik had [in de TUIN]_i gehoopt/*onthuld [_{CP} dat het feest t_i zou zijn]
I had in the garden hoped/revealed that the party would be
c. *Ik had MORGEN gedacht dat JAN zou — komen
I had tomorrow thought that John would come

In summary, a constituent (the remnant) moves to a focus position inside the matrix VP. This explains island sensitivity. The backgrounded embedded CP, including the trace of the moved constituent, is deleted at PF as a single constituent. An additional advantage of this analysis is that PF-deletion need not be defined over a discontinuous constituent.

A number of related, possibly problematic observations need to be taken into account in future research. First, as an answer to *How did you hope that who would work* we can get *Ik had gehoopt Jan hard, Piet langzaam* etc. (I had hoped John hard, Pete slowly etc.), but we cannot get **Ik had Jan hard gehoopt* (I had John hard hoped). Secondly, Marc van Oostendorp (p.c.) observes that **Ik denk JAN dat het boek leest* (I think John that the book reads) is ungrammatical, whereas *Ik denk JAN* 'I think John' is fine. However, for reasons that I do not understand, *Ik denk in de TUIN dat Jan het boek zal lezen* (I think in the garden that John the book will read) is much better. Thirdly, Marcel Den Dikken (p.c.) observes that head-like remnants as in *Ik zei MOET* (I said must) are fine in direct speech contexts. Finally, judgements with respect to case become unstable when a remnant subject precedes the matrix verb, whereas they are stable when a remnant subject follows it: (Who will buy the

book?) *Jan denkt ik/*mij* (John thinks I/me) versus *Jan had %ik / %mij gedacht* (John had I/me thought).

References

- Barbiers, S. (1995). *The syntax of Interpretation*. diss. Leiden University.
Barbiers, S. (1998). English and Dutch as SOV-languages and the distribution of CP-complements. In R. van Bezooijen and R. Kager eds. *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1998*.
Bennis, H. (1986). *Gaps and Dummies*. Dordrecht: Foris.
Chomsky, N. (1986). *Barriers*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Larson, R., M. den Dikken and P. Ludlow (1997). Intensional transitive verbs and abstract clausal complementation. Manuscript.
Ross, J.R. (1969). Guess who. In R. Binnick et al (eds), *Proceedings of the Fifth Regional Meeting of CLS*.

⁴ An alternative analysis to explain the facts in (9) would be that the embedded clause as a whole moves to the matrix VP, followed by PF-deletion of everything except the remnant. However, propositional clauses cannot occur in the middle field of the matrix clause overtly. Moreover, factive clauses can occur there, exactly the opposite of what one would expect given this alternative analysis.