

Hans den Besten

SOME ACCOMPANYING REMARKS ON DEN BESTEN AND EDMONDSON 'THE VERBAL COMPLEX IN CONTINENTAL WEST GERMANIC'

The following has been written on behalf of the Workshop on 'Infinitivkonstruktionen in der Westgermania'.

1. Introductory remarks

The paper written by Jerry Edmondson and me is the result of long discussions we had in Salzburg in 1979 about Jerry Edmondson's paper 'Gradienz und die doppelte Infinitivkonstruktion im Deutschen' which originally neglected Evers' Verb Raising proposal completely. It eventually appeared in *Papiere zur Linguistik* 22, 1 (1980), 59-82, now containing a few pages on the question of how Verb Raising might improve the description proposed.

Since I had been able to show how useful the concept of Verb Raising could be in the solution of problems in the analysis of dialects Jerry Edmondson was studying at the time and since Jerry - being the typologist he is - was struck by the VO-character of the verbal complex in Dutch, we decided to combine our efforts in writing a paper on the verbal complex in Dutch, German, and related dialects.

It should be borne in mind that the resulting paper has been written by a generative grammarian and by a categorial grammarian interested in language typology who decided to 'go transformational' for a while. The first half of the paper is a reworking of Edmondson (1980). The second half deals with Dutch and concentrates upon the rule of Verb Raising and its properties. The audience that is aimed at is not exactly the readership of *Linguistic Inquiry* but a more traditional one.

I think the paper should be seen as an expansion on Evers' Verb Raising analysis for Dutch and German (1975) showing on the one hand what was lacking in Evers' description of the German verbal complex, and on the other hand how the line of comparative research started in Evers' dissertation can be extended.

In the following paragraphs a list of questions and remarks

concerning the analysis presented in our paper will give an indication of problems that could be tackled at the Groningen conference.

## 2. Problems, questions, remarks obtaining

There seem to me to be relationships among the rules of INFINITIVIZATION, INVERSION and VERB RAISING which are not expressed in the description proposed. These rules in German are each gradient in nature. Furthermore, Infinitivization most probably is a necessary consequence of Verb Raising as I showed in my paper presented at the Fourth Groningen Round Table Conference on Auxiliaries (1979). If the pertinent analysis can be maintained one rule can be dropped but Verb Raising will consequently become an optional 'gradient rule' - that is, in so far as German syntax is concerned. To be more precise, the rule of Verb Raising in German will take over the gradient properties of Infinitivization as expressed in rule (19).

If the above is correct the overlap between the SDs of the rules of Verb Raising (once Infinitivization) and Inversion can be tackled. Note that the rule of Inversion as formalized under (77) in the text contains a lot of information which - strictly speaking - belongs to the rule of Infinitivization (Verb Raising). Thus the hierarchy in the first term of the SD of (77) starting under *haben* is not a hierarchy in so far as inversion with the governing auxiliary *haben* in the second term of the SD is concerned. If the pertinent verbs/auxiliaries are [+INF] Inversion with *haben* is obligatory. However, the decision to make such verbs/auxiliaries [+INF] has already been made dependent upon a similar hierarchy in rule (19). Similarly, the stipulation that the verb/auxiliary inverted with *haben* does not have to be accompanied by another infinitive, is an exact replica of a similar requirement in the rule of Infinitivization (rule (19)). Now disregarding the South German Infinitivization + Inversion of a single verb/auxiliary, it seems to me that rule (77) could be simplified to the requirement that two Vs be inverted with *haben*, *werden*, *Modal* if the second one is [+INF]. It is up to the German participants to decide

whether *werden* and *Modal* invert more easily with modals than with say *lassen*. I have my doubts about that. Furthermore I would like to know whether there is any reason to believe that *werden* and *Modal* invert with single verbs. If not the description of inversion in German can be highly simplified, by taking away the hierarchy out of the first term in the SD of rule (77) and may be also out of the second term. The obligatoriness of application with *haben* as a governing verb might be relegated to a filter (something like: \* [+V, +INF] - *haben*).

This leads to the following question which I will pose without trying to answer it: What determines the gradience in the rule of Infinitivization/Verb Raising? - which, in so far as I can judge, is an observationally sound one.

An important, but unsolved, problem noted in the paper, concerns the properties of Inversion. If the Verbs and Auxiliaries are indicated by numbers, 1 indicating the highest auxiliary and the highest number indicating the deepest main verb, we note that the orders 1243 and 1432 are grammatical whereas 2431 is ungrammatical (compare (40)).

Inversion of a V with number *i* apparently entails the inversion of the next number *i-1* (if there is any). Just to give something to chew on, suppose syntactic rules are ordered in a linear cycle one rule after the other. In fact ordering is not necessary, as long as rules apply in linear-cyclic fashion. In that case might assume the following pair of rules: A left-adjoining rule Verb Raising as proposed by Evers, and instead of the rule of version (77) a second rule of Verb Raising raising clusters of or more verbs to the right of the governing V. The linear cycle will ensure that 243, after the right-adjunction of 43 to 2, will not be left-adjoined but right-adjoined to 1. There are problems with this proposal which will not be spelled out here.

Finally, an indication of subjects which have been only superficially dealt with in our paper: The syntax of Inversion in Southern Standard German (*kommen hätte können*) and the syntax of finite modals in Dutch. To this I might add that in several dialects the order '[*zien dansen*] heeft' (see dance has) is the prevalent one, to be found only with the temporal auxiliary. This ties in with the observation that Dutch - in spite of its VO order for finite and infinitival verbs prefers an OV order

for participles (*gelachen heeft* but also *heeft gelachen*; *toegestuurd gekregen heeft*, *toegestuurd heeft gekregen*, but *\*heeft gekregen toegestuurd*). The syntax of participles in Dutch deserves attention, and I might reread the paper I presented at the Groningen Conference on Auxiliaries, which partly dealt with this topic and partly with the syntax of double infinitives. The problem of the syntax of participles in Dutch leads to similar questions for German concerning the exact properties of Verb Raising in German. These questions will be dealt with in the following section.

### 3. Some questions concerning Verb Raising in German

In our paper we have assumed Evers' left-adjunction analysis for VR in German and we have furthermore assumed a refined version of Edmondson's Inversion rule (Edmondson 1980). In the preceding section I have indicated that there might be other descriptive means to account for the Inversion phenomena. However let us assume that the phenomenon of Permutation inside the verbal complex is indicative of Verb Raising.

Let us furthermore assume that participles in Dutch do not take part in the rule of VR as such but obey their 'own' rules of 'Verb Raising'.

Observations leading to that conclusion were presented in my talk for the Groningen Auxiliaries conference (Den Besten (in prep.)). In the present version of our paper this data is only hinted at. The general observation runs as follows: Whereas all infinitives obligatorily undergo VR past participles do so only optionally:

- (1) --, dat hij *gelachen* heeft / heeft *gelachen*  
--, that he laughed has / has laughed
- (2) --, dat hij het *gezongen* zou kunnen hebben / zou kunnen hebben  
--, that he it sung would can have / would can have  
*gezongen*  
sung

Second observation: Past participles may not invert w.r.t. each other. Therefore, it is unlikely that they undergo the rule of Verb Raising that applies to infinitives. Apparently, there is a rule right-adjoining past participles to Vs (nonparticipial

verbs), whether these Vs are single verbs or VR clusters:

- (3) a --, dat zij dat *opgedragen gekregen* heeft  
--, that she that ordered obtains has  
b --, dat zij dat *opgedragen* heeft *gekregen*  
c \*--, dat zij dat heeft *gekregen opgedragen*

Furthermore we know that two participles may invert with the governing verb/auxiliary without inverting with respect to each other:

- (4) --, dat zij dat heeft *opgedragen gekregen*

This may be due to a rule left-adjoining participles to the verbs that they are governed by *iff* that verb is participial itself. The participial cluster in (4) then can be inverted by the same rule that inverts single participles (vide (1), (2), and (3)a and b).

Third observation: In Belgian Dutch slightly different rules apply (compare Pauwels 1970). The inversion of participles as indicated in (1) and (2) is considered bookish by speakers of that variant of Dutch. However such speakers of Dutch apply a rule that yields results that sound archaic to speakers of Hollandic Dutch. The pertinent phenomenon is illustrated in (5): Apparently past participles in Belgian Dutch may be left-adjoined to the V governing them irrespective of whether such a V is infinitival or not:

- (5) --, dat hij zou kunnen *gezongen* hebben  
--, that he would can sung have

Let us now turn our attention to Verb Raising phenomena in German. Our paper is very vague on the subject of the behaviour of participles.

In the preceding section I accepted without further discussion Jerry Edmondson's claim that it is the feature [+INF] which triggers Inversion (rule 77). However, one might make this claim part of the rule of Verb Raising in German. Suppose that neither infinitives nor participles raise to their governing V/Aux if that V/Aux is participial itself. Such an assumption would suffice to explain why Inversion is ungrammatical if the first V to the left of the governing V is participial itself. Compare:

- (6) \*--, daß noch nie ein gutes Buch von ihm ist geschrieben *worden*  
--, that yet never a good book by him has written been
- (7) \*--, daß er seinen Hund hat schlafen *gelassen*  
--, that he his dog has sleep let

Also compare Den Besten (to app.) 'A Case Filter for Passives' in: A. Belletti, L. Rizzi a.o. (to app.) *Proceedings of the 1979 GLOW Colloquium in Pisa* for similar remarks to that effect.

Suppose the above suggestion is correct. In that case the following examples should be ungrammatical:

- (8) (--, daß er dein Buch mag zu lesen *versucht* haben)  
(--, that he your book may to read tried have)
- (9) (--, daß es mag liegen *geblieben* sein)  
(--, that it may lie kept have)

On the other hand the following examples may be grammatical, in that participles may be raised to their governing V if that V is infinitival, given data that can be found in Bech (1955):

- (10) --, wo das könnte *gewesen* sein  
--, where that could been have
- (11) --, daß es schon hätte *getan* sein sollen  
--, that it already had done be must

In brief, there is a lot of work on the behavior of participles under VR in German that could be done during the Workshop on 'Infinitivkonstruktionen in der Westgermania'.

In this context it is also interesting to ask whether *zu*+INF verbs such as *behaupten* and *versuchen* allow VR at all. I refer to Jerry Edmondson's example (12) (taken from Edmondson 1980) and also to the fact that the pertinent infinitival constructions may undergo WH-Movement. Compare for the latter observation example (13):

- (12) \*Das ist die Frau, die du eines Tages wirst zu lieben  
That is the woman which you one day will to love  
behaupten  
claim
- (13) ein Buch, das zu lesen er versucht hat  
a book, which to read he tried has

This again is material for the German and Germanicist participants to chew on.

#### 4. Concluding remarks

As I indicated in section 1., the pertinent paper on 'The Verbal Complex in West Germanic' owes a lot to Evers' dissertation (1975). What we have done basically is showing that Evers' Verb Raising schema can be expanded on to incorporate data on Alemannic and Flemish dialects. Furthermore it has been shown that the rule of Inversion in German (*if* there is such a rule) can be made a local rule in the sense of Emonds (1976). The latter conclusion is not yet present in the present version but will be included.

However, as I indicated in section 2. above, our paper is rather descriptivist and unilluminating in other respects - in that there is a lot of overlap among the rules of VR, Infinitivization, and Inversion. Finally, there is a problem we hint at in our paper, without solving it, concerning the nature of the verbal morphology in Dutch and German. *Zu* in German seems to be a syntactic element, whereas *te* in Dutch seems to be a simple prefix that does not influence other rules. Again something to chew on.

University of Amsterdam  
November 6, 1980.

Partial Bibliography

- G. Bech (1955). *Studien über das deutsche Verbum infinitum*.  
1. Band. Kopenhagen, Munksgaard.
- O. Behaghel (1932). *Deutsche Syntax Bd. IV*. Heidelberg, Carl Winter Verlag.
- J.A. Edmondson (1980). 'Gradienz und die doppelte Infinitivkonstruktion im Deutschen.' *Papiere zur Linguistik* 22, 1: 59-82.
- J.E. Emonds (1976). *A Transformational Approach to English Syntax. Root, Structure-Preserving, and Local Transformations*. New York, Academic Press.
- A. Evers (1975). 'The Transformational Cycle in Dutch and German.' Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- J. Grimm (1969). *Deutsche Grammatik. Bd. IV*. (Reprint of the edition Gütersloh 1898).
- T. Hoekstra and M. Moortgat (1979). 'Passief en het lexicon.' *Forum der Letteren* 20, 137-161.
- G. de Haan (1979). *Conditions on Rules. The proper balance between syntax and semantics*. Dordrecht, Foris Publications. *Publications in Language Sciences* 2.
- M. Kohrt (1979). 'Verbstellung und "Doppelter Infinitiv" im Deutschen.' *Leuvense Bijdragen* 68, 1-31.
- L. Koelmans (1965). 'Iets over woordvolgorde bij samengestelde predikaten in het Nederlands.' *Nieuwe Taalgids* 58, 156-165.
- A. Lötscher (1978). 'Zur Verbstellung im Zürichdeutschen und in anderen varianten des Deutschen.' *Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik* 45, 1-29.
- P. Nieuwenhuijsen (1976). Review of A. Evers, 'The Transformational Cycle in Dutch and German.' Utrecht 1976. Diss. Utrecht. *Spektator* 5, 589-602.
- J.L. Pauwels (1970). 'Statistisch onderzoek van de Nederlandse zinsbouw.' *Nieuwe Taalgids*, Van Haeringen-nummer, p. 93-100.
- H.C. van Riemsdijk (1978). *A Case Study in Syntactic Markedness: The Binding Nature of Prepositional Phrases*. Dordrecht, Foris Publications. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 4.



- D. Sanders (1898). *Satzbau und Wortfolge in der deutschen Sprache*. Weimar, Verlag von Emil Felber.
- V.F. Vanacker (1970). 'Een "Zuidnederlandse" konstruktie in een paar Zuidnederlandse dialekten.' *Nieuwe Taalgids*, Van Haerlingen-nummer, p. 140-157.
- F. Zwarts (1975). 'Some Remarks on the Linear Cycle in Dutch Syntax.' Unpublished, University of Amsterdam.