

- bling, reconstruction and subject binding. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 21:67–106.
- Kang, Jung-Goo, and Gereon Müller. 1996. Reconstruction vs. copying: The case of *wh*-scope. In *Japanese/Korean linguistics 5*, ed. Noriko Akatsuka, Shoichi Iwasaki, and Susan Strauss, 269–285. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.
- Kim, Byong-Kwon. 1995. Scrambling and scope interaction. In *Interfaces in Korean linguistics: '93 Ohio State LSA workshop*, ed. Chungmin Lee, 51–67. Seoul: Taehaksa.
- Lee, Jeong-Shik. 1992. Case alternation in Korean: Case minimality. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- McGinnis, Martha. 1999. Evidence for feature-driven A-scrambling. In *WCCFL 18*, ed. Sonya Bird, Andrew Carnie, Jason D. Haugen, and Peter Norquest, 364–379. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Press.
- Park, Iksan. 1999. Korean scrambling. Honors thesis, University of Sydney.
- Pesetsky, David. 1982. Paths and categories. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

#### RESTRICTIONS ON VERB RAISING

André Meinunger

ZAS, Berlin/Universität Leipzig

#### 1 The Problem

This squib is concerned with a phenomenon that has so far been almost completely unnoticed. In the narrower view it deals with the rule of verb-second (V2) in German; in a broader sense it concerns the process of verb movement in general. As for the former, the allegedly exceptionless rule says that in German a finite verb occupies the rightmost position in subordinate clauses, whereas in main clauses it must be (moved) in(to) the second position; that is, it follows the first XP constituent without exception.

The crucial observation that led to the present investigation was made by Haider (1997). However, Haider only considered one example, involving comparison—namely, (1)–(3) (slightly modified for present purposes). (1) consists of a periphrastic tense construction where the finite verb is an auxiliary that has moved to the V2 position. (2) is the infelicitous attempt to move the full main verb of a simple tense to the V2 position.

- (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 mehr als verdreifachte  
because self the value more than tripled  
'because the value more than tripled'

Haider argues as follows. The comparative element *mehr* 'more' has to c-command its associate at S-Structure. Since *mehr* quantifies over the verb *verdreifach(en)* 'triple', the verb must stay in its base position. This does not happen in (2). A subordinate structure with any verbal form (i.e., not only a periphrastic tense) is grammatical because the verb does not raise over *mehr* (3).

In this squib I will argue that Haider's explanation is not completely convincing for several reasons: (a) under other circumstances verb movement does not depend on scopal configurations at (so-called) D- or S-Structure; (b) other comparative constructions involving *mehr* 'more' allow the associate to appear to its left or even not to be phonologically expressed at all; and (c) the same phenomenon of impossible verb movement can be observed in many other cases that do not involve comparison.

Regarding (a): Haider himself agrees that negative polarity verbs do not obey an S-Structure requirement on the licenser c-commanding the polarity verb. The well-known case is *brauchen* (something like *need* or *must* under negation and question operators), which can appear in the V2 position leaving its licenser (*nicht* 'not' in (4)) behind.

- (4) Man braucht<sub>i</sub> es \*(nicht) zu sehen e<sub>i</sub>.  
 one need it (not) to see  
 'One need not see it.'

It would be a mystery if one case (comparison) required S-Structure c-command whereas the other (negative polarity verbs) did not. This is even more surprising, for licensing of negative polarity verbs is known to be a very strong S-Structure phenomenon. Comparative constructions on the other hand are less strict (see (b)). In certain examples the comparative associate may precede *mehr* 'more'.

- (5) \*Als Jo / <sup>OK</sup> im Vergleich zu Jo / <sup>OK</sup> verglichen mit  
 \*than Jo / in comparison with Jo / compared to  
 Jo hat Eva mehr Aufgaben gelöst.  
 Jo has Eva more tasks solved  
 'Compared to Jo, Eva solved more problems.'

The interesting thing, however, is that verb movement of the sort discussed here can be observed in environments that are not related to comparison at all (see (c)). Thus, it seems that there is no blind mechanism that raises the finite verb in main clauses to C<sup>0</sup> automatically and irrespective of all factors.

## 2 The Other Constructions

In (6)–(13) I list eight constructions that behave very much like *mehr als* 'more than'; that is, they contain verbal forms in which the main verb must be placed after a certain element in the Mittelfeld. In these cases V2 movement of the full verb form into C<sup>0</sup> is ungrammatical. Some of these constructions belong to informal spoken registers. The contrast, however, is very sharp.

- (6) a. Der Angeklagte hat *so gut wie* gestanden.<sup>1</sup>  
 the accused has SO GUT WIE confessed  
 b. weil der Angeklagte *so gut wie* gestanden hat / gestand  
 c. \*Der Angeklagte gestand *so gut wie*.  
 'The accused almost confessed (his crime).'
- (7) a. Der Wert hat sich nun *soviel wie* verdoppelt.  
 the value has self now SOVIEL WIE doubled  
 b. weil sich der Wert nun *soviel wie* verdoppelt hat / verdoppelte  
 c. \*Der Wert verdopplete sich nun *soviel wie*.  
 'In the meantime the value almost doubled.'
- (8) a. Der Wert hat sich *mehr denn* verdoppelt.  
 the value has self MEHR DENN doubled  
 b. weil sich der Wert *mehr denn* verdoppelt hat / verdoppelte  
 c. \*Der Wert verdopplete sich *mehr denn*.  
 'The value more than merely doubled.'
- (9) a. Der Besuch hat *sowas von* geprahlt.  
 the guest has SOWAS VON boasted  
 b. weil der Besuch *sowas von* geprahlt hat / prahlte  
 c. \*Der Besuch prahlte *sowas von*.  
 'The guests were boasting in such an incredible manner.'
- (10) a. Der Hamster hat *so eine Art von* gehustet.  
 the hamster has SO EINE ART VON coughed  
 b. weil der Hamster *so eine Art von* gehustet hat / hustete  
 c. \*Der Hamster hustete *so eine Art von*.  
 'The hamster sort of coughed.'
- (11) a. Die Kommission hat *nichts als* gemeckert.  
 the commission has NICHTS ALS grumbled  
 b. weil die Kommission *nichts als* gemeckert hat / meckerte  
 c. \*Die Kommission meckerte *nichts als*.  
 'The commission didn't do anything but grumble.'
- (12) a. Die Kommission hat *nichts außer* gemeckert.  
 the commission has NICHTS AUßER grumbled  
 b. weil die Kommission *nichts außer* gemeckert hat / meckerte

<sup>1</sup> To avoid redundancy, I outline the patterns displayed in (6)–(13). In each case the (a) example, with perfect tense in main clause shape, is glossed. The (b) example is not. It has subordinate shape, with perfect and simple past tense separated by '/'. The (c) example, which is always ungrammatical, results from attempting to raise the simple past tense verb to the V2 position. A tentative translation follows. Since simple past and perfect tense can be used synonymously in German, one translation is sufficient.

- c. \*Die Kommission meckerte *nichts außer*.  
‘The commission didn’t do anything but grumble.’
- (13) a. Die Kommission hat *weder* gemeckert, . . . noch . . .<sup>2</sup>  
the commission has neither grumbled nor  
b. weil die Kommission *weder* gemeckert hat / meckerte, . . . noch . . .  
c. \*Die Kommission meckerte *weder*, . . . noch . . .  
d. *Weder* meckerte die Kommission, . . . noch . . .  
‘The commission neither grumbled, nor . . .’

All (c) examples become grammatical if something follows the italicized chunk. In some cases it even suffices for the following element to be the separable prefix of a morphologically complex verb (17).

- (14) Der Angeklagte gestand *so gut wie* gar nicht.  
the accused confessed SO GUT WIE not at all  
‘The accused as much as didn’t confess.’
- (15) Der Besuch prahlte *sowas von*  
the guest boasted SOWAS VON  
{oft / unverschämt / peinlich . . . }.  
often / impertinently / embarrassingly  
‘The guests boasted so often / in such an impertinent way /  
in such an embarrassing way.’
- (16) Die Kommission meckerte *weder* davor (noch danach).  
the commission grumbled WEDER before nor after  
‘The commission didn’t grumble either before or afterward.’
- (17) Unser Besuch gab *sowas von* an.  
our guest boasted SOWAS VON PARTICLE  
‘Our guests were boasting in such an incredible manner.’

A similar pattern of verb movement blocking can be observed in other languages. French has a construction consisting of a negative clitic that is morphologically attached to a finite verb in I<sup>0</sup> and semantically associated with *que* (18). Such a construction triggers a focus reading similar to *only*. Movement of the full verb across *que* triggers ungrammaticality (19). Putting something after *que* makes the sentence grammatical (20). In case the verb is supposed to be the target of focus in a nonperiphrastic construction, a dummy verb (*faire* ≈ *do*-support) has to be inserted (21).

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

<sup>2</sup> This example is a bit different and less clear. *Weder* can induce V2 (13d) and save the construction.

- (19) \*Il ne bosse *que*.  
 he not hard-work QUE  
 'He doesn't do anything but work.'
- (20) Il ne bosse *que* le dernier jour avant  
 he not hard-work QUE the last day before  
 l'examen / pour son frère.  
 the exam / for his brother  
 'He works hard only the day before his exam / only for his  
 brother.'
- (21) Il ne fait *que* bosser.  
 he not does QUE work-hard  
 'He doesn't do anything but work.'

A similar construction may also occur in English. The situation is different insofar as in this language full verbs do not undergo verb movement. However, some quantifying elements that target the verb precede it, whereas others may also follow it.

- (22) He *somehow* / *sort of* wheezed.
- (23) He wheezed <sup>OK</sup>*somehow* / \**sort of*. (under unmarked flat intonation)

### 3 A Possible Explanation

A look at the elements that (may) block verb movement suggests two possible directions for an explanation: one rather semantic, the other lexical/phonological. Let us pursue the first option. All the italicized elements in (6)–(23) somehow operate on the verb; that is, they focus it, measure it, or compare it. The explanation might thus follow the lines suggested by Haider: the operator must c-command the operandum at S-Structure. In other words, the quantifying element must c-command and therefore precede the verb. A similar idea is embodied in the *fast*-generalization for German proposed by Rapp and von Stechow (1999). *Fast* roughly means 'almost' and is therefore close in meaning to several expressions blocking V2 (e.g., *soviel wie*, *so gut wie*; see above). Rapp and von Stechow give the judgments in (24) and (25) and formulate the *fast*-generalization: '*Fast* cannot attach to a phrase with a phonetically empty head.'

- (24) Gestern hätte sie mich fast getroffen.  
 yesterday had she me almost met  
 'Yesterday she almost met me.'
- (25) \*Gestern traf sie mich fast.

*Fast* is also an element that operates on the verbal meaning. However, such a rule (a more general *fast*-generalization) would be too strong. There are many other constructions in which the operator element need not c-command the verb; that is, although the verbal action is quantified over, the full verb may raise over its operator and leave the latter behind. Also, contrary to what Rapp and von Stechow claim, *fast* can

certainly be stranded by the verb (even (25) is grammatical for most speakers).

- (26) Genug! Der Reifen platzt fast.  
 enough the tire bursts almost  
 'Enough! The tire is likely to burst soon.'
- (27) Sie erkannte mich fast.  
 she recognized me FAST  
 'She almost recognized me.'

The same is true for operator words like *nicht* 'not', *nur* 'only', *wieder* 'again', *kaum* 'hardly', and so on. These elements can be used to quantify over the verb(al action) and yet are completely compatible with a finite verb to their left and with nothing pronounced after them. Some of these elements are semantically very similar to, almost synonymous with, some of the blocking elements. For example, strandable *nur* 'only' is synonymous with *nichts als* 'nothing but', which does not allow stranding (see (11)).

- (28) Der Wert verdoppelte sich fast / wieder / kaum  
 the value doubled self almost / again / hardly  
 / nicht / nur\_\_\_\_.  
 / not / only

Given these facts, I want to pursue the second option—that is, to look for a possible lexical reason for verb movement blocking. 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<sup>0</sup> in French, and C<sup>0</sup> in German)—end in or even consist only of an element that *can* be analyzed as a C<sup>0</sup> element, or as some sort of functional preposition (P<sup>0</sup>, K<sup>0</sup>).

Let us look at all the expressions italicized in (6)–(21)—that is, all the elements that are able to block verb movement. First we have *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<sup>0</sup> (Zimmermann 1991; also Hahnemann 1999, see below). It does so with a special semantics in subordinate clauses selected by verbs of perception as in (29). *Wie* in (29) implies that the matrix subject witnessed the hair-cutting process, a reading that would not be obligatorily triggered by the use of the canonical complementizer *dass* 'that', hence the English translation with the acc-*ing* construction.

- (29) Ich habe gesehen, wie du ihm die Haare geschnitten  
 I have seen WIE you him the hair cut  
 hast.  
 have  
 'I saw you cutting his hair.'

*Wie* also appears in comparative constructions of equality. Its corresponding element of inequality is *als*. *Als* is another element able to block verb movement (see above). I suggest that it is possible to ana-

lyze many of its uses as instances of  $C^0$  as well (also proposed in Hahnemann 1999). Of course, there are problems with such an analysis.

- (30) a. Er tut so, als wüsste er alles \_\_\_\_\_. vs.  
           he does so as knew he everything  
       b. \*Er tut so, als \_\_\_\_\_ er alles wüsste.  
 (31) Er tut so, als ob er alles wüsste.  
 (32) Er tut so, als wenn er alles wüsste.  
       ‘He is behaving as if he knew everything.’

(30) shows that *als* cannot block V2 in subordinate sentences, which makes it unlikely to act as  $C^0$ . (31) shows that only if CP-recursion is admitted could *als* possibly be a  $C^0$ . In a different analysis it must be something else because *ob* ‘if’ is the relevant  $C^0$ . A similar point can be made with respect to *außer*,<sup>3</sup> another element making verb movement crash. *Außer* behaves almost exactly like *als*, except that instead of combining with *ob*, it combines with *wenn* or *falls*, which both also translate into English as *if*.

- (33) a. Er tut es, außer du entschuldigst dich.  
           he does it except you apologize yourself  
       b. \*Er tut es, außer du dich entschuldigst.  
 (34) Er tut es, außer falls du dich entschuldigst.  
 (35) Er tut es, außer wenn du dich entschuldigst.  
       ‘He’ll do it, unless you apologize.’

Help could come from a more fine-grained syntax that assumes a split CP layer. *Als* could then be considered a head element in a split left periphery. An alternative is to analyze *als* and *wie* as empty prepositions that select a CP headed by some  $C^0$  element (*dass*, *ob*, ...). Both versions are compatible with the proposal suggested below. At any rate I claim—contrary to Haider—that it is the *als* and not the *mehr* that triggers the failure of verb movement in (2), but also in (11). *Denn*, the next element to be considered, is just a synonym of *als* in comparative constructions. It means the same, sounding just a bit old-fashioned. In other contexts *denn* behaves like another sort of  $C^0$  that blocks V-to-C movement, but obligatorily embeds a V2 structure. In other constructions it seems to be an ellipsis of ~~*es sei*~~ *denn*, in which case it is synonymous with *außer*.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Note that there is a crucial difference, however. *Außer* cannot trigger V2, itself ‘representing’ the Vorfeld, whereas *als* can ((30) vs. (33)).

<sup>4</sup> In positions outside the Mittelfeld *es sei* cannot be omitted. The parallelism with *außer* remains, however.

- (i) a. Er tut es, es sei denn du verkaufst den Hamster \_\_\_\_\_. vs.  
           he does it it be DENN you sell the hamster  
       b. \*Er tut es, es sei denn du den Hamster verkaufst.  
 (ii) Er tut es, es sei denn falls du den Hamster verkaufst.  
 (iii) Er tut es, es sei denn wenn du den Hamster verkaufst.

- (36) Er tut nichts (es sei) denn faulzen.  
 he does nothing (it be) DENN laze around
- (37) Er tut nichts außer faulzen.  
 'He doesn't do anything but laze around.'

The final blocker in German is *von*, which cannot be analyzed as a  $C^0$ . *Von*, like English *of*, is a semantically empty preposition, thus a  $P^0$  or  $K^0$ . French *que* is unproblematic. It is the complementizer par excellence.

*Weder* 'neither' is a more complicated case. Its categorization as a  $C^0$  element is not evident. However, it does not seem impossible to analyze it as such. In any case it shares some properties with its French counterpart *ni* 'nor'. *Ni* is another element that, like *que*, associates with clitic negation. Periphrastic tense constructions are acceptable (38). Ordinary verb movement in simple tenses is impossible (39). Auxiliaryless constructions must resort to other strategies. Either (as in German, where *weder* must be placed in [Spec, CP] to precede the verb (13)) *ni* can be fronted and replace the negative clitic *ne* and hence precede the finite full verb (40), or pleonastic *faire* (*do*-support) can save the construction (41).

- (38) Il n'a ni travaillé, ni dormi.  
 he NEG-has nor worked nor slept
- (39) \*Il ne travaille ni, (il ne) dort ni.
- (40) a. Ni il travaille, ni il dort. *or*  
 b. Il ne travaille pas, ni ne dort.
- (41) Il ne fait ni travailler, ni dormir.  
 'He neither works, nor sleeps.'

None of the other quantifying elements that do not trigger ungrammaticality when they occur right peripherally (e.g., *nicht*, *nur*, *fast*; see (28)) can be analyzed as either a complementizer or an empty preposition.

It thus seems that the impossibility of verb raising in the constructions considered in this squib is due to the nature of the (last) elements that occur between the relevant verb positions. I have argued that the blocking elements are canonical occupants of either  $C^0$  or  $P^0$  ( $K^0$ ). According to Grimshaw (1991), these elements have something in common. They both close off their projections; that is, they are the highest functional elements:  $C^0$  of sentences,  $P^0$  ( $K^0$ ) of noun phrases. It seems that these elements are not strandable. In German, for example, prepositions cannot be stranded (with very few and marginal exceptions). The same seems to be true of complementizers. It might be that an inherent lexical property of these elements is that they cannot stand alone. It could also be that this ban on stranding has its roots in the phonological component. The data are suggestive, but the final explanation must be left open for further research. However, a concrete solution to the problems discussed here will deliver new insights into the phenomenon of verb raising.

**References**

- Grimshaw, Jane. 1991. Extended projection. Ms., Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.
- Hahnemann, Suzan. 1999. *Vergleiche im Vergleich*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Haider, Hubert. 1997. Typological implications of a directionality constraint on projections. In *Studies on Universal Grammar and typological variation*, ed. Artemis Alexiadou and Tracy Hall, 17–33. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rapp, Irene, and Arnim von Stechow. 1999. *Fast*. Handout from talk presented at ZAS/Berlin.
- Zimmermann, Ilse. 1991. Die subordinierende Konjunktion *wie*. In *Fragesätze und Fragen*, ed. Marga Reis and Inger Rosengren, 113–122. Tübingen: Niemeyer.