

Ling 315 Lecture notes. Mon 26 Feb 2007.

1. Where we left off: Yes/No-Questions. In some languages, including English, *Yes/No-Questions* are formed by inverting T with the subject:

(1) You are dreaming. → Are you dreaming?

We proposed last class that this is a form of head(-to-head) movement, with T raising up into C, as formalized in the following transformation:

T-to-C Movement. Raise T to C.

This means that *yes/no-questions* at deep structure will be CPs headed by an unoccupied C; T then moves up into C to form these interrogatives.

Like other transformations, we need to think about whether this transformation is crucially ordered with respect to the others. Which transformations, if any, must this rule apply before or after? This should become clear from thinking about the derivations for the following examples:

Are you dreaming? (2) Are you awake? (3) Does he understand?

Recall that evidence that T moves to C comes from examples like the following, which show that in embedded clauses, inversion is only possible if C is not overt:

- (4) He asked if I would marry him.
- (5) He asked would I marry him.
- (6) *He asked if would I marry him.

These examples can be explained if we assume that T moves to C: assuming that a head cannot move into an already occupied head, (6) is ungrammatical because *would* cannot move into C, which is already occupied by *if*.

Further support that T moves into the C position comes from looking at the form of *yes/no-questions* crosslinguistically: many languages, such as Japanese, use an overt interrogative complementizer -- usually called a question particle in traditional grammars -- to introduce interrogative main clauses:

- (7) Naoko-ga ki-ta ka/no (Japanese)
Naoko-NOM come-PAST Q
'Did Naoko come?'

- (8) *Razve on ne prixodil?* (Russian)
Whether he not came?
'Hasn't he come?'

- (9) *Aya Ali ketab darad?* (Persian)
Whether Ali books has?
'Does Ali have books?'

- (10) *An bpósfaidh tú mé?* (Irish)
Whether will-marry you me
'Will you marry me?'

- (11) *Hwæ er ge nu secan gold on treowum?* (Old English)
Whether you now seek gold in trees
'Has he read the book?'

The generalization across many languages, then, is that C must be occupied to form a *yes/no-questions*. While some languages move T into C, others insert a lexical item into this position. In both cases, C must be occupied.

Since, under this analysis, all interrogative sentences are CPs, the question arises as to whether **all** sentences -- including declaratives -- are in fact CPs. This might not immediately seem plausible for English since main clauses cannot be introduced by an overt complementizer:

- (12) **That* I could hear you. **Whether* he will resign.

However, many languages do use overt complementizers to introduce main clauses. (See data in previous handout.)

Given that main clauses can contain overt Cs, it seems plausible to propose that main clauses in English are also CPs headed by a covert complementizer.

Further crosslinguistic evidence that declaratives are CPs comes from looking at the structure of Dutch and German.

2. Verb Second (V2) in Germanic.

2.1 Background: Assignment 5.

What are the rules for S and VP in German, based on the following:

- (13) Er hat eine Katze gesehen.
he has a cat seen
“He has seen a cat.”
- (14) Jan wird Susi treffen.
Jan will Susi meet
“Jan will meet Mary.”

Are German VPs head-initial or head-final?

The following sentences illustrate *Yes-No* Questions in German. Based on these examples, does German use V-to-T Movement, or Tense Hopping?

- (15) Hast du eine Katze gesehen?
Have you a cat seen
“Have you seen a cat?”
- (16) Wird Jan Susi treffen?
Will Jan Susi meet
“Will Jan meet Susi?”
- (17) Siehst du eine Katze?
see you a cat
“Do you see a cat?”
- (18) Trifft Jan Susi?
Meets Jan Susi
“Is Jan meeting Susi?”

Consider now the following examples, in which no auxiliary occurs:

- (19) Ich sehe eine Katze.
I see a cat
“I see a cat.”
- (20) Jan trifft Susi.
Jan meets Susi
“Jan is meeting Susi.”

How does the position of the main verb differ in these examples? Do they require a revision in the VP rule, or are they already accounted for?

The following examples illustrate the placement of main verbs with respect to adverbs; Is the ordering of the main verb and adverb what we would expect?

- (21) Ich sehe oft eine Katze.
I see often a cat
“I often see a cat.”
- (22) Jan trifft immer Susi.
Jan meets always Susi
“Jan is always meeting Susi.”

2.2 V2. In this section, we will look at data that will require us to make major changes to the analysis so far.

What does the position of *habe* in the following example suggest about the position of T?

- (23) Er weiß, dass ich eine Katze gesehen habe.
He knows that I a cat seen have
“He knows that I have seen a cat.”

This forces us to reconsider the position of auxiliaries and main verbs in all of the above examples... What position might these items be occupying? Observe the word order in an embedded clause when C is **not** overt:

- (24) Er weiß, ich habe eine Katze gesehen.
He knows I have a cat seen
“He knows that I have seen a cat.”
- (25) *Er weiß, dass ich habe eine Katze gesehen.
He knows that I have a cat seen

This is illustrative of a broader phenomenon, referred to as **Verb Second** or V2.

Many Germanic languages exhibit **Verb Second** or V2 word order. V2 describes a requirement on word order by which some constituent appears first in a clause, and the verb immediately follows it (thus occupying the “second position”.) The first constituent counts, roughly, as the **topic** of the clause. Here are some examples:

(26) Ich sehe oft eine Katze.
I see often a cat

(27) Eine Katze sehe ich oft.
a cat see I often

(28) Oft sehe ich eine Katze.
Often see I a cat

V2 is not possible in embedded clauses if there is an overt complementizer:

(29) Er weiß, dass ich oft eine Katze sehe.
he knows that I often a cat see
“He knows that I often see a cat.”

(30) *Er weiß, dass ich sehe oft eine Katze.
he knows that I see often a cat

(31) *Er weiß, dass eine Katze sehe ich oft.

(32) *Er weiß, dass oft sehe ich eine Katze.

V2 **is** possible when there is **no** overt complementizer:

(33) Er weiß, ich sehe oft eine Katze.

(34) Er weiß, eine Katze sehe ich oft.

(35) Er weiß, oft sehe ich eine Katze.

Topicalization in English is a related phenomenon:

(36) He rarely speaks of those kinds of things.

(37) Those kinds of things, he rarely speaks of.