

3. APR. 1995

Universität Tübingen
NEUPHIL. FAKULTÄT

S & P Sprache und Pragmatik **36**
Arbeitsberichte

Susan Olsen

**Alternative grammatische Realisierungen
lokativer Komplemente**

1

Marga Reis

Wer glaubst du hat recht? On So-called
**Extractions from Verb-Second Clauses
and Verb-First Parenthetical Construc-
tions in German**

27

Lund 1995

- Höhle, T. (1982), Explikationen für 'normale Betonung' und 'normale Wortstellung'. In: Abraham, W. (Hrsg.), Satzglieder im Deutschen. Tübingen: Narr, 75-153.
- Hundsnurscher, F. (1968), Das System der Partikelverben mit AUS in der Gegenwartssprache. Göppingen: Kümmerle.
- Lenneberg, E. (1967), Biological Foundations of Language. New York: Wiley.
- Olsen, S. (1994), Über Präfix- und Partikelverbsysteme. Ms. FAS Berlin.
- (1995), Lokativalternation im Deutschen und Englischen. [Erscheint in: Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft]
- Pinker, S. (1989), Learnability and Cognition. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Rappaport, M./Levin, B. (1988), What to do with Theta-Roles. In: Wilkins, W. (Hrsg.), Thematic Relations. New York: Academic Press, 7-36.
- Rosengren, I. (1991), Zur Fokus-Hintergrund-Gliederung im Deklarativsatz und im w-Interrogativsatz. In: Reis, M./Rosengren, I. (Hrsg.), Fragesätze und Fragen. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 175-200.
- Stiebels, B./Wunderlich, D. (1994), Morphology Feeds Syntax: The Case of Particle Verbs. [Erscheint in: Linguistics]
- Tracy, R. (1990), Spracherwerb trotz Input. In: Rothweiler, M. (Hrsg.), Spracherwerb und Grammatik (= Linguistische Berichte Sonderheft 3), Opladen, 22-49.
- Wunderlich, D. (1994), CAUSE and the Structure of Verbs. Ms. Universität Düsseldorf.
- (1994a), Modification and the Syntax-semantics Interface. Ms. Universität Düsseldorf.
- Zimmermann, I. (1992), Der Skopus von Modifikatoren. In: Zimmermann, I./Strigin, A. (Hrsg.), Fügungspotenzen. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 251-279.

Marga Reis, Tübingen

Wer glaubst du hat recht? On So-called Extractions from Verb-Second Clauses and Verb-First Parenthetical Constructions in German*

Contents

1. Introduction
 2. Background
 3. Parenthetical vs. extraction analysis of EV2-constructions: Against the canonical arguments
 4. Further arguments pro parenthetical and contra extraction analysis
 5. Arguments from interpretation: On 'parenthetical' vs. 'extraction' interpretations
 6. Some aspects of the grammar and pragmatics of integrated V1-parentheticals
 7. Final remarks
- References

1. Introduction

In this paper, I should like to challenge the by now standard generative views on extraction from verb-second clauses in German. In particular, I shall be concerned with the structure of sentences such as (1) – henceforth

*Earlier versions of various parts of this working paper were presented at the GGS meeting in Tübingen (5/1994), at the S&P network meeting in Rendsburg (9/1994), and in lectures at the University of Lund (5/1994), the 'Arbeitsstelle Strukturelle Grammatik'/Berlin (10/1994) and the University of Potsdam (11/1994). I am grateful to all the audiences for useful discussion and comments. Special thanks are due to M. Brandt, F. D'Avis, U. Lutz, J. Pafel, I. Rosengren, and I. Zimmermann, who were particularly helpful in tackling various problems discussed in this paper. Thanks also to S. Dipper, R. Meyer, and I. Reich for technical assistance while preparing the manuscript.

Part of the material covered here will also be included in Reis (1995). A concise version covering the contents of both papers is scheduled to appear in the anthology on extraction currently prepared by U. Lutz and J. Pafel.

called EV2-constructions¹ -,

- (1) a. Wo glaubst du, wohnt sie seit der Trennung?
- b. In Bonn meint Franz, wohnt sie seit der Trennung.

arguing that the extraction analysis along the lines of (2) which they have been given since Thiersch (1978), cannot be upheld, and that a return to the traditional parenthetical analysis, roughly exemplified in (3), is in order.

- (2) a. [Wo glaubst du, [t' wohnt sie t seit der Trennung]]?
- b. [In Bonn meint Franz, [t' wohnt sie t seit der Trennung]].
- (3) a. [Wo [glaubst du,] wohnt sie t seit der Trennung]?
- b. [In Bonn [meint Franz,] wohnt sie t seit der Trennung].

My primary goal, then, is purely descriptive as well as language specific. If attained, however, the consequences will go well beyond that, for the peculiarities of the purported V2-extraction in German have played a prominent role in much syntactic theorizing, and have also influenced comparative issues of Germanic syntax in many important ways. Last but not least, the case of EV2-constructions is apt to teach a much-needed lesson about the form and function of parenthetical vs. extraction constructions in general, for neither the differences between them nor their similarities have so far been properly appreciated.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 will provide some factual, historical and motivational background for the analyses in question. In sections 3-5, I shall examine the case for the extraction analysis vs. its parenthetical alternative in detail, arguing that none of the arguments put forth against a parenthetical analysis stands up under scrutiny, and that there are conclusive structural and interpretive arguments against an extraction analysis that have been overlooked. I shall also, by way of completing the structural argument, point out putative, albeit marginal cases of genuine V2-extraction in German. Section 6 will be devoted to relevant issues in the grammar and pragmatics of verb-first parenthetical constructions. Section 7 contains a short summary and a list of consequences to be dealt with in further research.

¹This term is meant to pick out German surface structures of the form (i), and thus to be neutral with respect to the competing analyses (EV2 being a happy abbreviation at least in German, since *E* may stand for 'Extraktion' as well as 'Einschub' [= 'parenthetical']).

(i) XP - V_{fin1} - Y - V_{fin2} - Z (Z a variable over the postfinite parts of V2 clauses headed by V_{fin2},
Y a variable over the postfinite parts of V1 clauses headed by V_{fin1},
XP a constituent belonging to the V2-clause)

2. Background

2.1. The nongenerative tradition and some crucial parenthetical data

While grammarians in the nongenerative tradition have always been aware of *daß*-clause constructions that had to be given an extraction analysis ('Satzverschränkungen'), the parenthetical nature of EV2-constructions has more or less been taken for granted.² Looking at constructions like (4)-(5), in the company of which EV2-examples like (1) and (6) usually appear,

- (4) Wo wohnt sie *meinst du/glaubt er/sagt Paul* seit der Trennung?
In Bonn wohnt sie *meinst du/glaubt er/sagt Paul/scheint es* seit der Trennung.
In Bonn wohnt sie seit der Trennung *meinst du/glaubt er/sagt Paul/scheint es* bei einer Beamtenwitwe.
- (5) Wo wohnt sie seit der Trennung *meinst du/glaubt er/sagt Paul*?
In Bonn wohnt sie seit der Trennung *meinst du/glaubt er/sagt Paul/scheint es*.
- (6) Wo *meinst du/glaubt er/sagt Paul* wohnt sie seit der Trennung?
In Bonn *meinst du/glaubt er/sagt Paul/scheint es* wohnt sie seit der Trennung.

it is easy to see, why: (i) For obvious reasons, (4) and (5) *must* be parenthetical rather than extraction structures; (ii) EV2-constructions and constructions like (4)-(5) share conspicuous formal, semantic and functional similarities showing them to be constructionally related:

- they all parse as V2-clauses containing a V1-expression,
- the V2-clause satisfies the propositional object argument of the V1-verb,

In citing EV2-constructions (and related constructions), my using or omitting commas before and after the verb-first expression in question is linguistically insignificant. Rather, intonational breaks will be indicated by dashes (" - "). If necessary, the main accented syllable will be indicated by capital letters.

²Cf. Andersson/Kvam (1984:80ff.), and the literature cited there. There is, however, next to no explicit argumentation against an extraction analysis of cases like (1)/(6), the rare exception being Andersson/Kvam themselves (1984:53ff.).

- the V1-clause always functions as 'parenthetical', i.e.
 - = the information conveyed by it is mere side information to the information conveyed by the V2-clause,
 - = it has always the same special function of putting the V2-clause into the perspective of the V1-clause subject.³

Given (i)-(ii), it follows (iii) that EV2-constructions should be parenthetical structures just like (4)-(5), that is main clause structures into which a parenthetical verb-first expression *meinst du/glaubt er/sagt Paul* has been inserted. The remaining difference - in EV2-constructions the V1-parenthetical is inserted in prefinite position, in constructions like (4)-(5) it is inserted in various postfinite positions - need not be considered decisive, for prefinite as well as postfinite position(s) serve as parenthetical niches also for other types of parentheticals.

Note that the respective V1-expressions in (4)-(5) also share prosodic properties with (1) and (6) which can be roughly characterized as follows:⁴ (a) They are integrated into the focus-background-structure of their host clause, i.e. they do not have a focus-background-structure of their own, (b) they are unstressed/unfocussed, iff (a) obtains, (c) they tend to be integrated into their host clause without intonational breaks, iff (a) obtains.⁵ (a)-(c) are confined to parentheticals that are 'interpretationally dependent' on the host clause (in that the host clause obligatorily functions as the propositional argument of the parenthetical verb), the prime examples being V1-parentheticals,⁶ whereas 'interpretationally independent' parentheticals cannot be prosodically integrated in this way, cf. (7). This does not preclude apparent V1-parentheticals to occur in an unintegrated

³This is no more than a first approximation to V1-parenthetical uses. For some elaboration s. below (6.2).

⁴There has been little systematic work on the prosodic properties of German parentheticals in general (for a short sketch cf. Altmann 1981:63-65, 202f., useful material and discussion is presented in Uhmann 1994:282ff.), and none on the particular properties of V1-parentheticals (prosodic or otherwise, for that matter) at all. Thus, the following remarks are of necessity somewhat impressionistic. (Concerning the prosody of English parenthetical structures, cf. Downing 1973, Bing 1979; s. also Reinhart 1983:179ff. Matters may not be entirely comparable, though.)

⁵(c) is meant to cover two facts concerning the parentheticals in question: (i) explicit comma intonation is incompatible with (a)/(b), (ii) given (a)/(b), which can be easily identified by ear, all markings of the boundaries of an intonational phrase tend to (and can even entirely) be reduced. Accidentally recorded examples (cf. e.g. the postfinite example (32-01) in Uhmann 1994:287) bear this out. Unfortunately, clear phonological cues for intonational integration (such as \pm flapped consonants in American English, s. Reinhart 1983:179ff.) seem hard to come by in German.

⁶Other types that may (but need not) be used this way are *wie*-parentheticals (s. Brandt 1994, Zimmermann 1994), and perhaps also *so*-parentheticals, s. sections 6.1.2, 6.2.1. By contrast, V1-parentheticals, seem to be primed for dependent use.

fashion, cf. (8). But if they do, (a)-(c) must covary, cf. (9), showing that being \pm prosodically unintegrated and \pm bearing stress/focus are in fact two sides of the same coin. (And it might even be true that the apparent V1-parentheticals used this way are in fact always elliptic \emptyset V2-structures, s. 6.2 below).

- (7) In BONN wohnt sie - wen WUNderts? - seit der Trennung.
(*In BONN wohnt sie (-) wen wunderts? (-) seit der Trennung.)
In Bonn wohnt sie - das sagt jedenfalls FRANZ - seit der TRENnung.
(*In Bonn wohnt sie (-) das sagt jedenfalls Franz (-) seit der TRENnung.)
- (8) In BONN wohnt sie - sagt PAUL - seit der Trennung.
- (9) *In BONN wohnt sie sagt PAUL seit der Trennung.
*In BONN wohnt sie - sagt Paul - seit der Trennung.
*In Bonn wohnt sie sagt PAUL seit der Trennung.

Thus, (a)-(c) help define a unique type of parentheticals,⁷ which from now on I shall call VIPs (= *Verb-first Integrated Parentheticals*), the bona fide instances being cases like (4)-(5). For ease of further reference their properties are summarized in (10):

- (10) *Defining properties of VIPs:*
 - (i) Verb-first
 - (ii) Interpretational dependence on the host clause
 - (iii) Prosodic integration into the host clause
 - a) no focus-background structure of their own
 - b) no stress/focus
 - c) no intonational breaks (i.e. no 'comma intonation')

2.2. The generative 'extraction' tradition and its motives

Why then should an extraction analysis for EV2-constructions have become attractive in the first place? Mainly, I suspect, because certain well-known facts about German make us expect that there is extraction from verb-second clauses:

⁷Actually, what is defined is a particular 'integrated' use constellation, in which V1-parentheticals prominently take part. This is, however, of no importance for the following discussion, so I shall continue speaking of V1-parenthetical expressions as constituting the type themselves.

(i) In certain dialect areas of German (and, marginally, also in the standard language) extraction from *daß*-complement clauses is possible,⁸ cf. the examples in (11)-(12).

- (11) a. In Bonn glaube ich, daß sie seit der Trennung wohnt.
 b. Mit Computern sagte Franz, daß er sich genügend beschäftigt hätte.
- (12) a. Wo glaubst du denn, daß sie seit der Trennung wohnt.
 b. Womit sagte Franz, daß er sich genügend beschäftigt hätte.

(ii) In Standard German, verb-second clauses may substitute for *daß*-complement clauses after certain verbs, cf. the examples in (13)-(14).

- (13) a. Ich glaube, daß sie seit der Trennung in Bonn wohnt.
 b. Franz sagte, daß er sich mit Computern genügend beschäftigt hätte.
- (14) a. Ich glaube, sie wohnt seit der Trennung in Bonn.
 b. Franz sagte, er hätte sich mit Computern genügend beschäftigt.

(iii) The class of predicates licensing extraction ('bridge verbs') is largely identical with the class of predicates licensing substitution of *daß*-complements by verb-second clauses ('V2 verbs'), prominent members of both classes being i.a. *sagen, meinen, glauben, finden, behaupten, denken*, cf. (12)-(14).⁹

Given (i)-(iii), the prediction is clearly that we also find extraction from verb second clauses in German, – what should prevent it? This prediction seems to be forced by comparative evidence:

(iv) In Germanic languages like English or Swedish that allow complementizer drop in declarative complements, extraction from the 'complementizerless' variant is possible and even less restricted than from the *that-/att*-introduced variant, cf. (15)-(17):

- (15) a. Who_i do you think [(that) he met t_i yesterday]?
 b. This-man_i, I think [(that) he met t_i yesterday].

⁸For a short overview s. Reis/Rosengren (1992:§§1,2), and especially Lühr (1988). For a more general picture s. D'Avis et al. (1993).

⁹It is often maintained that the two classes are completely identical, s. i.a. Grewendorf (1989:54), Müller (1993:362f., 364f.n.7). This is most likely wrong, s. Reis (1994/in prep.).

- (16) a. Vem_i tror du [(att) Peter inte träffade t_i igår]?
 Who think you [(that) Peter not met yesterday]?
 b. Denna-man_i tror jag [(att) Peter inte träffade t_i igår].
 This man think I [(that) Peter not met yesterday].
- (17) a. *Who_i do you think [that t_i met him yesterday]?
 b. Who_i do you think [t_i met him yesterday]?
- (17') a. *Vem_i tror du [att t_i har träffat Peter]?
 b. Vem_i tror du [t_i har träffat Peter]?
 Who think you [(that) has met Peter]?

The class of verbs licensing declarative complementizer drop corresponds closely to the class of V2-verbs in German, suggesting that V2-clause substitution for *daß*-clauses in German and declarative complementizer drop in English and Swedish are instances of the same phenomenon.¹⁰ But if so, extraction from verb-second clauses in German should also definitely be expected to occur. Moreover, since the complement status of unintroduced English and Swedish clauses as in (15)-(17') is beyond doubt, the parallel just mentioned strengthens the assumption (18) underlying all expectations of V2-extraction in German:

- (18) Verb-second clauses alternating with *daß*-complement clauses are true complement clauses.

In view of the expectations raised by (i)-(iv), the properties of EV2-constructions like (1), (6) are, at first glance, more than suggestive: There is just one constituent preceding the V1-expression, the verbs normally involved are V2-verbs as well as bridge verbs, hence it seems possible to view EV2-constructions as matrix-complement structures as exemplified in (2), with *glaubst du/meint Franz*, etc. being part of the matrix clause and the phrase in the initial matrix position extracted out of the V2-complement. Besides, EV2-constructions provide the most natural translations for extraction constructions like (15)-(17'), underlining their similarity. Small wonder then that Thiersch, who was the first to explicitly suggest an extraction analysis for this type of construction (1978:134ff.), was readily believed. The belief in the extraction analysis was strengthened by Tappe (1981) and Grewendorf (1988:83-87), whose arguments pro extraction

¹⁰For an explicit statement to this effect s. Müller (1993:386f.), who also insists on the identity (already denied by Erteschik 1973) of the contexts English complementizer drop occurs in with bridge contexts. – Concerning 'V2' rather than 'lack of complementizer' as the (only) appropriate tertium comparationis for comparative Germanic issues involving German embedded V2-clauses, s. Gärtner/Steinbach (1994), and in particular Reis (1995).

and contra parenthetical analysis of EV2-constructions have been generally accepted, partial revisions notwithstanding.

The success of these argumentations, however, generated a by now notorious problem: If EV2-sentences are in fact extraction constructions, then V2-extraction is subject to quite peculiar restrictions that have no parallels among extractions from *daß*-clauses (or from any other domain): the 'initial gap restriction' (19i) and the 'V2 route restriction' (19ii), cf. the respective illustrations in (20)-(21'):

- (19) *Restrictions on putative extraction from verb-second clauses:*
- (i) Initial gap restriction: Regardless of base position of the movee, extraction must leave a gap in the initial position ('Vorfeld') of the V2 clause.
- (ii) V2 route restriction: Extraction may occur via V2 clauses and into V2 clauses only.
- (20) a. **Wo/*In Bonn glaubt er, sie wohnt t seit der Trennung.*
 b. **Seit wann/*Seit der Trennung glaubt er, sie wohnt in Bonn t.*
- (20') a. *Wo/In Bonn glaubt er, t' wohnt sie t seit der Trennung.*
 b. *Seit wann/Seit der Trennung glaubt er, t' wohnt sie in Bonn t.*
- (21) a. **Ich möchte wissen, wo er glaubt, wohnt sie t seit der Trennung.*
 b. **In Bonn meint Klaus, daß Peter glaubt, wohnt sie t seit der Trennung.*
 c. **Wo Klaus nur wieder meint, wohne sie t seit der Trennung.*
- (21') a. *In Bonn meint Klaus, glaubt Peter, wohnt sie t seit der Trennung.*
 b. *In Bonn meint Klaus, glaubt Peter, daß sie t seit der Trennung wohnt.*

Again starting with Thiersch (1978), numerous proposals have been presented to come to terms with (19i-ii) (cf. Tappé 1981:208ff., Staudacher 1990, Sternefeld 1989, Haider 1993:189ff., Müller/Sternefeld 1993:497f., Müller 1993:449ff., for an overview s. *ibid.* 449-485), all of them, however, far more ingenious than convincing. Worse, while (i) is at least conceptually suggestive, (ii) looks so ad hoc, that there seems little hope that a principled solution for both of them will be forthcoming.

Now, it is easy to see that the data illustrating (19i-ii) would not pose serious problems under a parenthetical analysis at all: The ungrammaticality of (20a,b) could be predicted from the ungrammaticality of the putative host clauses of the parenthetical (**Wo sie wohnt seit der Trennung?*, etc.), and the grammaticality pattern of (21)-(21') could be made to follow from the well-formedness vs. ill-formedness of the putative parentheticals, *er glaubt* (21a), *meint Klaus, daß Peter glaubt* (21b), *Klaus nur wieder*

meint (21c) being ill-formed parentheticals, *meint Klaus, glaubt Peter* (21') being well-formed.¹¹ The fact that this approach to the problems caused by (19i-ii) has never even been considered in the literature, is a strong sign of faith in the extraction analysis for EV2-constructions. An even stronger sign is that further theorizing has been confidently built on it: In particular, the initial gap-restriction (19i) has been used as crucial evidence in a number of theoretical contexts where extraction comes in, cf. Haider's (1986:116ff.) argumentation against Lasnik/Saito (1984) concerning the issue of intermediate traces, the 'canonical direction' argument by Cinque (1990:42,169/fn.38) pro distinguishing between barriers for government and barriers for binding,¹² the argumentation pro a sentential Top node by Müller/Sternefeld (1993:479ff.), or the theory-laden debate about the minimalist conception of clause structure and verb movement (cf. Zwart 1993, Gärtner/Steinbach 1994:29ff., Zwart 1994:34ff., Wilder 1993), to mention just the more prominent examples.

A further fact about EV2-constructions immediately at odds with an extraction analysis, but not with a parenthetical analysis, is that they occur freely in so-called extraction and non-extraction dialects alike. However, – perhaps due to the parallels between EV2-constructions and complementizerless constructions like (15)-(17), which allow extraction more freely (17'), this fact did not play a role in arguing about the respective analyses either.

My diagnosis for this state of affairs is that plausible expectations concerning V2-extraction have not only triggered, but also canonized the wrong analysis for EV2-constructions. In the following, I shall dissociate myself totally from this tradition by defending (22):

- (22) *Parenthetical Hypothesis (PH):*
 EV2-constructions are not V2-extraction constructions, but constructions containing parentheticals of a certain type: VIPs.

In the course of this discussion, I will also show that, inasmuch as there are genuine cases of V2-extraction in German at all, they are not subject to the restrictions (19i-ii). While I shall concentrate on exploring (22) and its consequences for the grammar of VIPs in this paper, it should be noted that (18) is also called into question by my findings (cf. Reis 1995). In other words, what is ultimately at stake is not just the present picture of

¹¹The question of parenthetical structures will be discussed in more detail in section 4.4.

¹²The consequences of this argument – (perhaps) only successive-cyclic wh-movement in languages with mixed branching (Cinque 1990:42) – have in turn played a role in arguing about (the uniformity of) German clause structure, s. BRRZ (1992:8) as opposed to Vikner/Schwartz (1991).

extraction analysis for EV2-constructions, or at least for a subclass of them.

This gets us to the four arguments commonly held to be decisive in favour of the extraction analysis:

3.3. Iterative EV2 constructions

After Thiersch (1978:140), it was in particular Staudacher (1990:320) who drew attention to iterative EV2-constructions like (27), calling them 'hardly compatible with a parenthetical analysis'. According to Haider (1993:187) they provide the most compelling argument pro extraction analysis:

- (27) Welche Extraktionen meinst du habe Karl behauptet, könne man iterieren?
(Staudacher 1990:320/9)
 Wer sagte sie glaube er daß ihm seine Arbeit hier bezahlen werde?
 Wer sagte sie glaube er werde ihm seine Arbeit hier bezahlen?
(Haider 1993:187/(4c,d))

However, it is not compelling enough, cf. (28)-(30):

- (28) Dort liege *glaubt sie meinten alle*, noch ein ganz gewaltiges Problem.
 In Bonn wohnt sie *scheint es glaubt er*, seit der Trennung.
 (29) Wen *fragt sie denke man*, werde der Chef entlassen?
 Wen *denke man fragt sie*, werde der Chef entlassen?
 (30) Was *glaubst du schätzt er*, wieviel das kosten wird.
 (!:*Was glaubst du er schätzt, wieviel das kosten wird)
 Was *glaubst du denkt sie*, wer ich bin.
 (!:*Was glaubst du sie denkt, wer ich bin).

(28) shows that iterated verb-first expressions may also occur in bona fide parenthetical positions, and they may be prosodically integrated into their host clause, in other words they are VIPs. (29) shows that iterated verb-first expressions may contain a bona fide VIP in first or second place even when occurring in prefinite position. In (30), finally, the iterated expressions appear in the interrogative *was*-construction which, under standard assumptions, does not undergo overt *was*-extraction at all (s. McDaniel 1989).

No matter how these structures are to be analyzed (for some suggestions s. below 4.3, 6.), one thing is clear: Since the occurrence of iterated verb-first expressions is independent of extraction configurations, extraction

cannot be crucial in accounting for them. Hence, iterative EV2-constructions are no argument pro extraction analysis.

3.4. Binding data

The original binding argument pro extraction and contra parenthetical analysis is due to Tappe (1981:204f.). It is based on binding contrasts like (31) vs. (32), which no doubt imply a structural contrast between the parenthetical construction (31) and the EV2-construction (32):

- (31) a. Karl_i fing – wie er_j gesagt hatte – zu schreien an.
 b. *Er_j fing – wie Karl_i gesagt hatte – zu schreien an.
 (32) a. *Wen sagt er_j hat Karl_i gesehen.
 b. Wen sagt Karl_i hat er_j gesehen. (Tappe 1981:204f.)

The argument has been widely accepted in its original form (s. i.a. Grewendorf 1988:86, Reis/Rosengren 1992:84f., 90f.); lately, improved versions of it relying on data from anaphoric and quantifier binding have been suggested (s. especially Mrotzek 1991:57ff., Haider 1993:188f.).

As far as I can see, however, the argument is beside the point in all its forms: First, EV2-constructions are always compared with the wrong type of parentheticals (with the assumptions about their structural relation to the host clause remaining obscure). Second, if we compare with the right type, i.e. VIPs, contrasting "bridge" candidates for V2-extraction with bona fide VIPs in prefinite position, we find that they exhibit exactly the same binding behaviour, no matter which binding elements are involved:

- (32') a. *Wen fragt er_j hat Karl_i gesehen. (= parallel to 32a)
 b. Wen fragt Karl_i hat er_j gesehen. (= parallel to 32b)
 (33) a. Wen fragt jeder_i, werde er_j als Zimmerkollegen bekommen?
 b. *Wen fragt er_j, werde jeder_i als Zimmerkollegen bekommen?
 (33') a. Wen meint jeder_i, werde er_j als Zimmerkollegen bekommen?
 b. *Wen meint er_j, werde jeder_i als Zimmerkollegen bekommen?

Third, when comparing EV2-constructions with bona fide extraction constructions, matters are not as parallel as the extraction analysis would predict:

- (34) a. Diesen Sender sagt jeder_i, daß seine_j Kinder hassen.
 b. ?Diesen Sender sagt jeder_j hassen seine_i Kinder.
(examples by J. Jacobs)

- (35) (Heinz glaubt, daß du die meisten Kollegen sehr schätzt, aber ...)
- IHN_i meint Heinz_i, daß du t_i verachtest.
 - ?IHN_i meint Heinz_i, verachtest du t_i.
- (35') (Die meisten Kollegen glauben, daß du fast alle andern verachtest, aber...)
- ??IHN_i meint [fast jeder]_i, daß du t_i liebst.
 - *IHN_i meint [fast jeder]_i, liebst du t_i.
- (examples (35a)/(35'a) by T.N. Höhle)

Hence, there is no valid binding argument pro extraction and contra parenthetical analysis whatever. If at all, it is the other way around.¹⁴

3.5. Predicate restrictions induced by sentence type

According to Tappe (1981:204), predicates in parenthetical expressions are subject to a coherence requirement with the sentence type of their host clause, cf. his examples (36), whereas the predicates in EV2-constructions are not, cf. (37)-(37'):

- (36) a. Hans – so sagt Karl/*so fragt Karl – hat Fritz getroffen.
b. Wen – so fragt Karl/*so sagt Karl – hat Fritz getroffen?
- (37) Wen sagt/behauptet/meint/hofft Hans, wird der Chef entlassen?
(37') Wen fragt/wünscht Hans, soll der Chef entlassen?

(cf. Grewendorf 1988:84)

Since matrix predicates in extraction constructions are not subject to coherence conditions with overall sentence type, Tappe claims (followed by Grewendorf 1988, Haider 1993) the difference between (36) and sentences like (37)-(37') to be an argument pro extraction and contra parenthetical analysis of EV2-constructions.

Again, due to comparing with the wrong type of parentheticals, the argument as given is beside the point, and if we compare with the right type of parentheticals, it does not go through any longer: Not only do we find much more predicate variation in postfinite VIPs than a coherence requirement with sentence type would condone, cf. (38),

¹⁴Because of the potential influence of linear order on binding relations, there is nothing to be gained from comparing EV2-constructions with postfinite VIP-constructions in this respect. Besides, the binding data in postfinite VIP-constructions are hard to structurally interpret, the more so since binding relations seem to be sensitive to the interpretive difference between 'speaker-oriented' vs. 'subject-oriented' parentheticals of this type (cf. Reinhart 1983:175ff.). (As far as I can see, however, they can be interpreted in line with the structure for VIP-constructions suggested below in 4.3, 6. Cf. also the discussion of binding data mainly directed against a slifting analysis in BRRZ 1992:12/n.11.)

- (38) a. Was wird er meinst du tun?
b. Wen soll der Chef entlassen, meint ihr?
c. Wohin wird er fahren, glaubst du?
d. Mit wem wird er verreisen, sagt er?
e. Wen (fragt sie) wird der Chef (fragt sie) demnächst entlassen (fragt sie)?
f. Damit ist Paul meint sie/sagt sie/hofft sie endlich zufrieden.

but also that the predicates occurring in postfinite position and those in prefinite position cover, in fact, the same semantic range: mental attitude verbs and verbs of saying (including *fragen* and *wünschen*¹⁵).

This is not to deny that there are lexical differences between what occurs in prefinite vs. postfinite position. Thus, it seems to me, that verbs like *behaupten*, *erzählen* are much better in prefinite than in postfinite position:

- (39) a. Wen hat Hans behauptet/erzählt, wird der Chef zum 1.3. entlassen?
b. ??Wen wird hat Hans behauptet/erzählt, der Chef zum 1.3. entlassen?
c. *Wen wird der Chef hat Hans behauptet/erzählt, zum 1.3. entlassen?
d. ??*Wen wird der Chef zum 1.3. entlassen, hat Hans behauptet/erzählt?

However, since the difference apparently at work is not one of semantic classes, but of semantic complexity – only the simplest items of the respective classes: *sagen*, *meinen*, *glauben*, *fragen* seem to occur happily within postfinite VIPs – the extraction hypothesis is of no help in explaining it, for bona fide extractions are negatively sensitive to the same factor (s. Erteschik 1973).¹⁶

¹⁵Note that (37') cannot be interpreted as a genuine question containing *fragt Karl* as part of the complex interrogative proposition, but only as the report of a situation in which Karl asks about who the boss is supposed to fire. Likewise, (37') containing *wünscht Karl* can only be interpreted as a question concerning an utterance by Karl in which he expressed a wish as to who the boss should fire (the *sollen*-paraphrase indicating that the expression of a wish is reported). Note that as a pure verb of volition *wünschen* does not take V2-clauses as complements, cf. *wenn Karl (sich heimlich) wünscht, daß Peter morgen in Paris ist* vs. **wenn Karl (sich heimlich) wünscht, Peter ist morgen in Paris/Peter soll morgen in Paris sein*.

¹⁶A possible explanation for this parallel between VIP- and bona fide extraction constructions might be that the prefinite position has greater integrating potential (s. 6.3.2 below). This would also imply that it allows longer and more complex items in VIP use.

In any case, the argument in question does not further the case pro extraction or contra parenthetical analysis of EV2-constructions.

3.6. Subjunctive data

The subjunctive argument, which is implicit in Thiersch (1978), but has never been properly spelled out, is probably the strongest argument pro extraction analysis of EV2 constructions. It is based on the distinctive uses of the two subjunctive forms (so-called 'subjunctive I' and 'subjunctive II') in German main vs. complement clauses: Confining ourselves to V2-main clauses, we find subjunctive I in V2-declaratives and (marginally) in wh-V2-interrogatives as a signal of reported speech only, whereas subjunctive II signals either reported speech or modus irrealis (in V2-declaratives), or modus irrealis only (in wh-V2-interrogatives). By contrast, subjunctive in complement clauses depends on the matrix predicates allowing it, with subjunctive I and II both having the distinctive function to signal dependency of the complement on the matrix clause (or matrix-subject orientation of the complement proposition respectively); as such they are more or less interchangeable.

Now, almost all predicates appearing in the EV2-construction allow subjunctive in their complements and in the V2-clauses substituting for them. Hence, the distinctive uses of the subjunctive seem to provide a handy diagnostics concerning extraction vs. parenthetical analysis, for under the extraction analysis the clause containing the second verb is embedded, whereas under the parenthetical analysis it is the main clause. Applying this diagnostics to EV2-constructions, the result is clear: The subjunctive uses we find there are typical complement uses that do not appear in the bare main clause analogues, cf. (40) vs. (41): While (41a-c) have to be interpreted as cases of reported speech (41a,c) or of modus irrealis (41b,c), subjunctive I/II in (40a-c) must or may be interpreted as mere signs of dependency.

- (40) a. Wohin glaubt Peter, sei Petra gefahren.
 b. In welcher Stadt meint Peter, hätte er Luise getroffen.
 c. Nur mit Luise glaubte Fritz, hätte Karl Duett gesungen.
- (41) a. *Wohin sei Peter gefahren?
 b. In welcher Stadt hätte er Luise getroffen? (40b≠41b)
 c. Nur mit Luise hätte Karl Duett gesungen. (40c≠41c)

At first glance, this looks like a very strong argument pro extraction analysis. And, in fact, there are also many bona fide VIP-constructions, as a rule VIP-final constructions, that do not allow subjunctive or complement subjunctive use either:

- (42) a. *Wohin sei Petra gefahren, glaubt sie?
 b. ??In welcher Stadt hätte er Luise getroffen, meint Peter?
 c. Nur mit Luise hätte Karl Duett gesungen, glaubte Fritz. (ok only in the modus irrealis reading of (41c))

Still, the argument does not go through, cf. (43)-(44):

- (43) a. Wo fragte sie, liege das Problem. (Haider 1993:188:(7f))
 b. Wie gedenke man fragt Max, auf seinen Vorschlag zu reagieren?
 c. In Bonn habe/hätte sie (sagt er) danach (sagt er) eine neue Heimat gefunden (sagt er)?
- (44) a. Dort liege glaubt sie, noch ein gewaltiges Problem.
 b. Dort liege meint er hätte sie gesagt, noch ein gewaltiges Problem.
 c. Woran habe/hätte man meint er, zu spät gedacht?

(43a-c) show that bona fide parentheticals in prefinite and postfinite position may also license complement subjunctive uses, (44a-c) show that the licensing power extends beyond verbs of saying with subjunctive indicating reported speech¹⁷ to mental attitude verbs, so there are irrefutable cases in point. In other words, the occurrence of complement subjunctive uses does by no means presuppose the licensing predicate in matrix position. Rather a much weaker condition seems to suffice: The licensing predicate must precede (perhaps: c-command) the trace of the subjunctive verb, cf. (42) vs. (44)/(40). While this is certainly no more than a preliminary formulation, one thing is clear: The subjunctive data do not allow a conclusive argument pro extraction or contra parenthetical analysis either.

To sum up: None of the canonical arguments stands up under scrutiny.

¹⁷One could hope to cover these cases with the special rule needed for 'inserts' in/comments to quoted or reported speech anyway, cf. (i). (i) is only licit, if the verb in question *sich freuen* is interpreted as a verb of saying (i.e. as 'to say with clear signs of joy').

(i) Das hab ich mir schon lange gewünscht, freute sich Max.
 Das habe er sich, freute sich Max, schon lange gewünscht.

4. Further arguments pro parenthetical and contra extraction analysis

Let me now produce some additional arguments showing that only the parenthetical analysis can be correct:

4.1. Distribution of items sensitive to \pm main clause status

It is well known that certain lexical items, notably modal particles and speaker-oriented expressive elements, are functionally restricted to main clauses. If so, they provide a clear diagnostics for the structure of EV2-constructions, for the structures assigned to them by the competing analyses differ precisely in this respect. Accordingly, the parenthetical analysis predicts that modal particles etc. are compatible with the clause the second verb belongs to (with unclear predictions concerning the verb first-clause), the extraction analysis predicts that they are only compatible with the clause the first verb belongs to.

Again the predictions of the parenthetical analysis are borne out, cf. (45), where *denn* (a question-specific modal particle) and *verdammt noch mal* (a pejorative expressive) happily occur in the second clause, whereas in bona fide extraction constructions they are in fact limited to the first clause as predicted, cf. (45'):

- (45) a. Wohin glaubt sie, ist Fritz *denn* gefahren?
 Wohin meinst du glaubt sie, ist Fritz *denn* gefahren?
 a'. ?*Wohin glaubt sie/meinst du *denn*, ist Fritz gefahren?¹⁸
 b. Und wozu glaubt er/sagen alle/behauptet der Kerl ist das *verdammt noch mal* notwendig?
 b'. *Und wozu glaubt er/sagen alle/behauptet der Kerl *verdammt noch mal*, ist das notwendig?
- (45') a. *Wohin glaubt sie, daß Fritz *denn* gefahren ist.
 *Wohin meinst du, daß sie glaubt, daß Fritz *denn* gefahren ist?
 a'. Wohin glaubt sie *denn*, daß Fritz gefahren ist.
 b. *Und wozu glaubt er/sagen alle/behauptet der Kerl, daß das *verdammt noch mal* notwendig ist?

¹⁸Cases like (45a') do not always strike me as fully unacceptable. My explanation for this is that the functional similarity to extraction constructions like (45'a) leads to the kind of analogical effect already appealed to in Chomsky (1970). Note that parallel bona fide VIP-constructions (?**Wohin ist sie glaubst du denn, gestern so eilig gefahren?*) seem to exhibit the same effect, thus supporting the view that the extraction analysis has nothing to gain from these variations in acceptability.

- b'. Und wozu glaubt er/sagen alle/behauptet der Kerl *verdammt noch mal*, daß das notwendig ist?

Much the same point can be made using discourse connecting expressions like the 'conjunctive adverb' *nur* (which is limited to the initial field) or *übrigens*: Although likewise restricted to main clauses and thus excluded from V2 complement clauses, cf. (46), they happily occur in the initial position of EV2-constructions, cf. (46'):

- (46) a. (...) *Hans glaubt, nur ginge es auch ohne den Chef.
 b. (...) *Hans glaubt, übrigens ginge es auch ohne den Chef.
 (46') a. (...) *Nur* glaubt Hans, ginge es auch ohne den Chef.
 b. (...) *Übrigens* glaubt Hans, ginge es auch ohne den Chef.

This shows that (46') cannot be the result of V2-extraction, whereas, of course, it is again fully compatible with the parenthetical analysis.

4.2. Predicate restrictions

As is well known, complement extraction is subject to bridge conditions, which means in particular that it is licit only with a certain class of predicates, so-called 'B[ridge]-predicates'. Likewise, there is only a certain class of predicates that may appear in VIPs ('VIP-predicates'). The corresponding predictions for EV2-constructions are then as follows: If they are extraction structures, they are subject to the B-predicate restriction (in addition, of course, to the V2-predicate restriction), if they are VIP-structures, they are subject to the VIP-predicate restriction.

Since the respective classes are largely coextensive, the prominent members being the same, the question is, of course, whether there is any testable difference between these predictions at all. Contrary to what has been tacitly taken for granted, there is (s. also Reis 1994/in prep.), the relevant subclass being 'preference predicates', cf. (47)-(49):¹⁹

¹⁹There exists no systematic study of these predicates and the conditions under which they license V2-clauses. An informative list of recorded examples of this construction is provided by Kaufmann (1972:55-60), all of which can be paraphrased by *wenn*-clauses and, in principle, also by *daß*-clauses. Judging from its syntactic and semantic behaviour, I think that optative *wünschen/wollen*+V2, cf. (47d), though not paraphrasable by means of a *wenn*-clause, belongs to the same class, the common denominator being that preference for the alternative described in the V2-clause is expressed.

As for the possible complement status of *wenn*-clauses in these constructions, cf. Fabricius-Hansen (1980); her arguments carry over to the V2-clauses that are relevant here. – Note that, depending on the matrix predicate, the 'complement *wenn*-clauses' may also be paraphrased by V1-clauses (s. also Kaufmann 1972:55ff.), with some predicates

- (47) a. Es ist besser, du gehst zu Fuß dorthin.
 b. Das beste ist, wir klären ihn über diesen Vorfall sofort und gründlich auf.
 c. Mir wäre lieber, Hans würde mit dieser Sache bis morgen warten.
 d. Er wollte/wünschte, er hätte schon früher mit Japan Bekanntschaft gemacht.
 e. Ich würde vorziehen, du sagtest mir endlich über diesen Vorfall die Wahrheit.
- (48) a. ?Dorthin ist (es) besser, daß/wenn du zu Fuß t gehst.
 ?Dorthin wäre (es) besser, daß/wenn du zu Fuß t gingest.
 b. ?Über diesen Vorfall ist (es) das beste, daß/wenn wir ihn t sofort und gründlich aufklären.
 c. ?Mit dieser Sache wäre mir lieber, daß/wenn Hans t bis morgen warten würde.
 d. ?Mit Japan wollte/wünschte er, daß er schon früher Bekanntschaft t gemacht hätte.
 e. ?Über diesen Vorfall würde ich vorziehen, daß/wenn du mir endlich die Wahrheit t sagtest.
- (49) a. *Dorthin gehst du *ist (es) besser* zu Fuß.
 b. *Mit dieser Sache würde Hans *wäre mir lieber* bis morgen warten.
 c. *Nach Paris wäre er/ich *wollte/wünschte ich* öfter gefahren.
 d. *Du sagtest mir *würde ich vorziehen*, über diesen Vorfall endlich die Wahrheit.
- (49) a. *Dorthin gehst du zu Fuß *ist (es) besser*.
 b. *Mit dieser Sache würde Hans t bis morgen warten, *wäre mir lieber*.
 c. *Nach Paris wäre er/ich öfter gefahren *wollte/wünschte ich*.
 d. *Du sagtest mir über diesen Vorfall endlich die Wahrheit, *würde ich vorziehen*.

(47) shows that preference predicates allow V2-clauses for complements, i.e. they are V2-predicates. (48) shows that they are also quite acceptable B-predicates, no matter whether the complement is introduced by *daß* or *wenn* (s. fn.19). They are, however, unacceptable in bona fide VIP-con-

being in between, *vorziehen* being, in my idiolect, a case in point. This may account for the comparative acceptability of (52e) below.

structions, as illustrated by (49)-(49'). What seems to hold then about preference and B-predicates is summarized in (50) and (51):

- (50) Preference predicates are B-predicates as well as V2-predicates, but not VIP-predicates.
 (51) VIP-predicates include verbs of saying (including those taking interrogative complements like *fragen*) and attitudinal verbs, but no preference predicates.

Turning now to EV2-constructions, we find that they are quite impossible with preference predicates:

- (52) a. *Dorthin ist (es) besser, gehst du zu Fuß t.
 b. *Über diesen Vorfall ist (es) das beste, klären wir ihn t sofort und gründlich auf.
 c. *Mit dieser Sache wäre mir lieber, würde Hans t bis morgen warten.
 d. *Mit Japan wollte/wünschte er, hätte er schon früher Bekanntschaft t gemacht.
 e. ??Über diesen Vorfall würde ich vorziehen, sagtest du mir endlich die Wahrheit t.

In view of (50), this is incompatible with what the extraction analysis predicts, but it jibes well with the parenthetical analysis. In fact, from all the examples cited so far, it is obvious that (51) also covers the relevant predicate distribution in EV2-constructions, i.e. (51') holds:²⁰

- (51') All and only the predicates figuring as VIP-predicates also figure in EV2-constructions, i.e. as EV2-predicates, and vice versa.

The only way to make sense of this correlation is to conclude that EV2-constructions as a whole are prefinite VIP-constructions, thus providing strong evidence for the parenthetical analysis.²¹

A further predicate distinction between *daß*-extraction constructions and VIP-constructions involves (explicit or implicit) negation: The former allow it (53), the latter do not (54):

²⁰It is claimed in Grewendorf (1988:86) that *bedauern*, while happily appearing in post-finite parenthetical positions, may not appear in EV2-constructions. If the factive vs. verb of saying use of *bedauern* is properly controlled, this apparent counterexample to (51') simply disappears: factive *bedauern* is allowed in neither construction, in its verb of saying use it is possible in either.

²¹Preference predicates (vs. EV2-predicates) also play a decisive role in licensing exceptional 'normal' V2-extractions, s. below 4.5.

- (53) a. Mit wem glaubt keiner, daß sie verheiratet ist.
 b. Am Dienstag glaube ich nicht, daß er kommt.
 c. Zu diesem Treffen bezweifle ich, daß er gehen wird.
- (54) a. *Mit wem ist sie glaubt keiner, verheiratet.
 b. *Am Dienstag kommt sie glaube ich nicht, ins Institut.
 c. *Zu diesem Treffen kommt sie, bezweifle ich.

Again, EV2-constructions side with the VIP-cases, cf. (54'):

- (54') a. *Mit wem glaubt keiner, ist sie verheiratet.
 b. *Am Dienstag glaube ich nicht, kommt sie.
 c. *Zu diesem Treffen bezweifle ich, kommt sie.

While this is perhaps, strictly speaking, no additional support – on the whole, V2-predicates may not be negated either –,²² it is certainly completely in line with the parenthetical analysis.

4.3. Differences in relative predicate scope

A further interesting testing ground is provided by the interpretation of iterated EV2-constructions as illustrated in 3.3. Since the extraction analysis imposes on them the same hierarchical structure as on iterated *daß*-extraction constructions, and on multiply embedded complement constructions in general, the prediction is, clearly, that they are all interpreted in the same way, the relative predicate scope being determined by the embedding relation.

The prediction is borne out with respect to *daß*-extraction constructions, cf. (55)-(55'):

- (55) weil sie glaubt, daß alle meinen, daß das Problem gelöst ist
 weil sie glaubt, alle meinen, das Problem ist gelöst
 [1 [2 [3]]]
 relative predicate scope: $\sqrt{1} > [2 > [3]]$, $*2 > [1 > [3]]$

²²As pointed out by Ulvestad (1955, 1956), there are systematic exceptions to this restriction, in particular cases like (i) (cf. also Butolussi 1991:122ff.). Interestingly, however, the corresponding *daß*-extraction vs. EV2-variants differ in acceptability, cf. (ii), thus suggesting again that the parenthetical analysis is correct.

- (i) Glaube ja nicht/Niemand glaube/Es soll niemand glauben, Karl könnte den Hund alleine füttern.
 (ii) Den Hund soll niemand glauben, daß Karl alleine füttern könnte.
 *Den Hund soll niemand glauben, könnte Karl alleine füttern.

- (55') das Problem glaubt sie, daß alle meinen, daß t gelöst ist.
 [1 [2 [3]]]
 relative predicate scope: $\sqrt{1} > [2 > [3]]$, $*2 > [1 > [3]]$

But it is certainly not borne out with respect to EV2-constructions, cf. (56)-(57):

- (56) Das Problem glaubt sie meinen alle ist gelöst.²³
 relative predicate scope: $\sqrt{1} > [2 > [3]]$, $\sqrt{2} > [1 > [3]]$
- (57) a. Welche Extraktion behauptet A meine B könne man iterieren.
 relative predicate scope: $\sqrt{1} > [2 > [3]]$, $*2 > [1 > [3]]$
 b. Welche Extraktion behauptet A meint B könne man iterieren.
 relative predicate scope: $*1 > [2 > [3]]$, $\sqrt{2} > [1 > [3]]$

(56) shows that in iterated EV2-constructions the second V1-expression may have scope over the first one, which is incompatible with EV2-constructions having the same hierarchical structure as (55)-(55'). At the same time, (56) shows that linearity is not the decisive factor either.

This is confirmed by (57), where it is clearly not hierarchy or linearity that determines relative predicate scope, but the distribution of indicative vs. subjunctive as such. It is easy to understand, how and why this can be decisive: Interpreting a complex clause like (57a) or (57b) amounts to giving it a consistent interpretation integrating all its parts, in the course of which the mutual relationship of the *meinen* and the *behaupten* proposition must also be determined. Subjunctive in the respective clause parts of complex clauses like (57) signals dependency on a licensing verb, a role *meinen* as well as *behaupten* could fill. Hence, given the absence of other determining factors, the distribution of indicative vs. subjunctive determines their relative scope interpretation.

Obviously, then, the facts from relative predicate scope are incompatible with the extraction analysis. Are they compatible with the parenthetical analysis? In point of fact, they must be, for iterated V1-expressions in bona fide parenthetical position behave the same way, cf. (56'):

²³I am indebted to J. Pafel for insisting on the availability of the 'nonhierarchical' reading, and for validating his point by carrying out an informal test. (8 informants were asked to judge the sentence *Das Problem glaubt sie meinen alle ist gelöst* with respect to the availability of the two possible readings – L1: 'She believes that everybody thinks that the problem is solved', L2: 'Everybody thinks that she believes that the problem is solved' – which were explicitly provided. The judgments of 4 speakers were L1:*, L2:√, of 1 speaker L1:√, L2:*. 3 speakers found both readings equally acceptable. Although this is not a sufficient test by any standards, its results are certainly suggestive, and in line with the judgments supplied for (56)-(57), which represent my own intuitions.)

- (56') Das Problem wurde damals glaubt sie meinen alle recht gut gelöst.
relative predicate scope: $\sqrt{1 > [2 > [3]]}$, $\sqrt{2 > [1 > [3]]}$

A satisfactory way to account for this behaviour is the following: Let us assume that iterated V1-expressions do not form one complex parenthetical à la (58)-(58') – in this case there would have to be an internal structural relationship, minimally a linear one, that should play a role in determining their mutual meaning relationship –, but rather are inserted into their host clause one by one, in other words: Let us assume that every simple VIP is directly related to its host clause, no matter whether the latter already contains another VIP or not, cf. (59)-(59')

- (58) Das Problem [glaubt sie meinen alle] ist gelöst.
(58') Das Problem wurde damals [glaubt sie meinen alle] recht gut gelöst.
(59) a. Das Problem [glaubt sie] meinen alle ist gelöst.
b. Das Problem glaubt sie [meinen alle] ist gelöst.
(59') a. Das Problem wurde damals [glaubt sie] meinen alle recht gut gelöst.
b. Das Problem wurde damals glaubt sie [meinen alle] recht gut gelöst.

If so, the linear order of VIPs is nothing but the accidental result of insertion which cannot be expected to play a role in interpretation, for a) interpretation respects structure, b) according to (59)-(59'), every VIP is directly related to the host clause as a whole, of which the other VIP is just one part. It is easy to see how on the basis of this assumption all the data from relative scope follow: Sentences containing iterated V1-expressions are always structurally ambiguous, and the structural ambiguity translates directly into a scope ambiguity, cf. (56)-(56')/(58)-(58'), unless a non-structural factor resolving it – for example subjunctive as in (57) – intervenes.

As far as I can see, there is no argument whatever against adopting (59)-(59') as structures of iterated VIP-clauses.²⁴ Hence, the data from relative predicate scope are not only a strong argument against the extraction analysis, but also in favour of the parenthetical analysis of EV2-constructions.

²⁴The fact that iterated VIPs tend to be inserted in the same parenthetical niche may be related to processing preferences.

4.4. The problems with the putative extraction process

As already pointed out in section 2.2, the extraction analysis causes apparently insoluble structural problems concerning the putative extraction process, cf. (19i-ii), for which a parenthetical analysis suggests a simple way out: The problematic data motivating (19i-ii) could be handled by appealing to the well-formedness vs. ill-formedness of either the putative host clauses, or the putative parentheticals, or both. If this works, this would, of course, constitute a crucial argument pro parenthetical and contra extraction analysis. The following data (which concern parenthetical structures only, the pertinent regularities of host clause structures being well-known) show that it does work (IP = 'integrated parenthetical'):

- (60) a. V1-IP
Dort liege *glaubt sie*, noch ein gewaltiges Problem.
b. V2-IP?
*Dort liege *sie glaubt*, noch ein gewaltiges Problem.
c. Vfinal-IP?
*Dort liege *sie gesagt hat*, noch ein gewaltiges Problem.
(61) a. *Dort liege, *glaubt sie es*, noch ein gewaltiges Problem.
b. *Dort liegt noch ein gewaltiges Problem, *sagt sie das Offensichtliche*.
(62) a. [V1-V2]-IP?
*Dort liege *glaubt sie alle meinten*, noch ein ganz gewaltiges Problem.
*Was wird er *glaubst du sie denkt*, morgen tun?
b. [V1-*daß/ob*+Vfinal]-IP?
??Dort liege *glaubt er, daß alle meinten*, noch ein ganz gewaltiges Problem.
*Was wird er *glaubst du, daß sie denkt*, morgen tun?
*Was wird er *fragt sie, ob Karl denkt*, morgen tun?
c. [V1-infinitive]-IP?
Dort liege *könnte man meinen*, noch ein ganz gewaltiges Problem.
?Was wird er *glaubst du sagen zu können*, damit morgen tun?
c'. ??Dort liege *war Peter so nett ihm zu sagen*, das eigentliche Problem.
?*Dort liegt *überredet Peter Hans dazu anzunehmen*, das eigentliche Problem.

Concentrating, as we must, on bona fide integrated parentheticals, we learn from (60) that 'bare' integrated parentheticals must be verb-first

(i.e. VIPs), from (61) that the structural object, which all VIP-verbs are subcategorized for, must never be realized VIP-internally, and from (62) that VIPs with finite V2- or *daß/ob*-complements are, as a rule, impossible, whereas the acceptability of infinitival structures seems to vary with the syntactic 'coherence' of the construction in question, in other words: the closer an infinitival structure gets to being interpreted as a complex verb, the better it is as a parenthetical VIP-structure.

Observationally, then, all parenthetical structures that should be ill-formed in order for the parenthetical analysis of EV2-constructions to work as suggested (for example the cases in (21)), are in fact ruled out in bona fide VIP-contexts, and only the simple V1-structure (including apparent iterations, s. 3.3., 4.3.) is clearly ruled in. The infinitival variation in postfinite parentheticals is in line with what we find in EV2-constructions (s. the examples in Haider 1993:191f.). Hence, all the data that cause the above-mentioned notorious problems for the extraction analysis, are easily accounted for under the parenthetical analysis, thus providing a crucial argument for adopting the latter.

As for the possibilities of a descriptively adequate account of the restrictions on VIP-structures observed in (60)-(62) s. section 6. below.

4.5. Normal V2-extraction cases

In view of the last three arguments, the case pro parenthetical and contra extraction analysis is practically clinched. Rounding up the argumentation I should like to draw attention to the fact that 'normal' cases of V2-extraction exist in German, albeit marginally, cf. (63):

- (63) a. Dorthin ist (es) besser, du gehst zu Fuß t.
 b. Wohin meinte er, es sei besser, ich ginge zu Fuß t.
 c. Mit dieser Sache wäre mir lieber, Hans würde t bis morgen warten.
 d. Nach Paris wollte ich/wünschte ich, ich wäre noch öfters t gefahren.
 e. Womit wollte/wünschte er, er hätte schon früher Bekanntschaft t gemacht.
 f. Über diesen Vorfall würde ich vorziehen, du sagtest mir endlich t die Wahrheit.
- (64) a. Wohin/Dorthin meinte er, daß es besser sei, ich ginge t zu Fuß.
 b. Wohin du immer meinst, es sei besser, man ginge t zu Fuß.
 c. Oma weiß schon, wohin Opa meint, daß es besser sei, ich ginge t zu Fuß.

What is 'normal' about them, is that the putative restrictions (19i-ii) do not hold: Contrary to (19i) the constituents are extracted from their base position, the initial field being always filled, s. (63)-(64); contrary to (19ii) extraction via and into non-V2 clauses is possible (64). What is 'marginal' about them, is the following:

First, the occurrence of 'normal V2-extraction' is severely restricted: (a) the only possible bridges are, more or less, preference predicates (cf. 4.2), (b) only certain types of adjuncts may be extracted, cf. (63)-(64), subjects and (in particular definite) objects may not (65).²⁵

- (65) a. *Vertreter der Regierung wollte ich, es wären t öfter nach Japan gefahren.
 b. *Die Papiere wäre (es) besser, du würdest t sofort vernichten.

Second, acceptability judgments on sentences like (63)-(64) are strongly divided: Some speakers find them just as bad as the EV2 constructions in (52), and the corresponding extractions from *daß*- and *wenn*-clauses in (48) much better, but just as many others find (63)-(64) quite good, sometimes even better than (48), and at any rate, by far superior to (52), which are unanimously rated as ungrammatical.

Given this, the conclusion to be drawn is somewhat janus-faced: On the one hand, constructions like (63)-(64) are undoubtedly bona fide instances of V2-extraction: They do not have 'abnormal' structural restrictions such as (19i-ii), and restrictions on possible bridge predicates and extractable constituents are, by themselves, nothing unusual.²⁶ On the other hand, German(s) cannot really be said to standardly 'have' normal V2-extraction, not only because of the idiolect split observed, but also because even in the accepting idiolects it is so severely restricted that its status is only marginal. What can be said, however, taking both sides of the conclusion seriously, is that bona fide V2-extractions in German *potentially* follow the 'normal' pattern. To put it differently: *If* – for whatever synchronic or

²⁵We also observe that extraction from the initial field never occurs. However, since there is next to no word order variation in these 'conditional' V2-clauses, with the initial field typically occupied by the subject, this restriction can be more or less derived from (b).

²⁶Following certain theories about extraction, there is a tendency in the literature to consider argument (object) extraction rather than adjunct (plus subject) extraction to be the unmarked case. This cannot be taken to mean, however, that in any given configuration argument extraction is more normal than adjunct extraction. Thus, empirical studies show that extraction of adverbial constituents from *daß*-clauses in German is clearly the most normal case (in terms of frequency as well as acceptability, s. Andersson/Kvam 1984, Andersson 1988:5f.); note also that exceptional long-distance processes such as 'long scrambling' from finite clauses seem to involve adverbials only (s. Rosengren, in prep.). Hence, not only the type of restriction (b), but also its content is nothing unusual. As for the content of restriction (a), s. 2.2.

diachronic reason – bona fide V2-extractions occur, they are not subject to (19i-ii).

Setting aside the explanatory problems posed by these findings (cf. Reis 1995), let us ask what their import is on the issue at hand: Strictly speaking, the existence of 'normal' V2-extractions as such is no conclusive argument against an extraction analysis of EV2-constructions. Of course, assuming the existence of structurally different extraction processes from apparently identical domains would be strange, but why not claim that the V2-extraction domains in EV2-cases vs. 'normal extraction' cases like (63)-(64) only *appear* to be identical, but in terms of Deep Structure are not? Given the 'conditional' features of (63)-(64) that are totally absent in EV2-constructions, this would certainly not be unlikely.

Be this as it may, there is a remarkable descriptive regularity involving 'normal V2-extraction' vs. VIP-/EV2-constructions that ultimately leads to an argument in favour of the parenthetical analysis of the former, cf. (66):

- (66) V2-predicates that allow the structurally normal V2-extraction (i.e. 'preference predicates'), do not allow EV2-constructions/VIP-constructions in general, s. (51), and vice versa (s. above).

Since all VIP-/EV2-predicates taking declarative complements figure as bridge predicates in *daß*-extractions, s. 4.2:(50)-(51), the complementary distribution described in (66) cannot be structurally motivated. Given the fact that VIP-constructions are functionally so close to potential V2-extractions that they can be considered functional alternatives (s. also 5. below), a plausible functional interpretation of (66) could be the following: We have recourse to (exceptional) V2-extraction if and only if VIP-constructions are unavailable. Since verbs of saying and attitudinal verbs freely allow VIP-constructions, recourse to exceptional V2-extraction is never needed in these cases. This leaves preference predicates as the only possible case of need.

From this perspective, even (66) provides structural support for the parenthetical analysis of EV2-constructions: The fact that 'normal V2-extractions' are formed in analogy to *daß*-extraction constructions rather than EV2-constructions suggests that the latter must be something else, viz. parenthetical constructions.

4.6. Conclusion

In 4.1.-4.5. strong arguments were presented supporting the parenthetical over the extraction analysis. Since the canonical arguments to the contrary were already refuted in 3., the overall conclusion is clear: The parentheti-

cal hypothesis (22) is structurally correct. In other words: All EV2-constructions are prefinite VIP-constructions.

5. Arguments from interpretation: On 'parenthetical' vs. 'extraction' interpretations

If the above conclusion is correct, we should also expect that the interpretation of EV2-constructions is parallel to VIP-constructions rather than to extraction constructions, in short: that they have a 'parenthetical' rather than a 'bridge' interpretation. But what kind of difference in interpretation does that amount to and in which contexts does it show up?

5.1. What 'parenthetical' vs. 'bridge' interpretations are not

The only extensive discussion of the difference in question I am aware of is by Mrotzek (1991:49ff., 97f.). Concentrating on examples involving verbs of saying only, such as (67),

- (67) Wen sagt Paul hat Ernst gesehen.

she points out that they have two readings: (i) as an indirect speech report (i.e. (67) may be used for reporting a situation in which Paul has said/asked 'Wen hat Ernst gesehen?'), (ii) as a true question inquiring about the identity of whom Paul said that Ernst saw (i.e. (67) may be used in a situation, in which the speaker of (67) knows/presupposes that Paul had said who the person seen by Ernst was, but does not know whom Paul had actually named). Mrotzek (ibid., s. also Falkenberg 1994) identifies (i) as the 'parenthetical', (ii) as the 'bridge' reading, calling for an additional extraction analysis of EV2-constructions. Apparent confirmation for this is provided by the fact that EV2-constructions involving purely parenthetical, nonbridge verbs like *fragen*, cf. (68), admit only reading (i) (s. also 3.6/fn.15).

- (68) Wen fragt Paul hat Ernst gesehen.

However, while (67) certainly has two interpretations, the identification as given cannot be correct: First, the same two interpretations occur also with postfinite and final VIP-constructions, s. (69). Since an extraction analysis is out of the question here, it does not make sense, strictly speaking, to call (ii) a 'bridge' interpretation, – both (i) and (ii) are parenthetical interpretations, albeit different ones.

- (69) Wen hat Ernst sagt Paul, damals gesehen.
Wen hat Ernst damals gesehen, sagt Paul.

Second, the distinction in readings does not carry over to EV2-constructions involving attitudinal verbs (nor to the respective VIP-constructions in general), cf. (70)-(71):

- (70) Wen glaubt/hofft Paul hat Ernst gesehen?
Wen hat Ernst glaubt/hofft Paul damals gesehen?
Wen hat Ernst damals gesehen glaubt/hofft Paul?
(71) Inwiefern findest du hat er sich zu seinem Nachteil verändert?
Inwiefern hat er sich zu seinem Nachteil verändert findest du?

The sentences in (70) and (71) always have just one interpretation, which (a) remains the same no matter which position the VIP is in, (b) corresponds to reading (ii). According to (a) the reading involved is a bona fide 'parenthetical' one, hence, according to (b) 'the' parenthetical reading must be (ii). But then the initial identifications of 'parenthetical' vs. 'bridge' interpretation with (i) vs. (ii) are completely untenable.

From this, several conclusions can be drawn: First, there is apparently good reason to set apart the reported speech reading of (a subclass of) VIP-constructions from the other, more interesting parenthetical reading (ii) that is in principle available with all declarative VIP-predicates (s. also below 6.1).²⁷ Second, since the ambiguity of cases like (67) cannot be traced to a structural ambiguity in terms of 'parenthetical' vs. 'extraction' structure, any attempt to use it for an argument pro extraction analysis of EV2-constructions is futile. Third, in trying to find out what 'bridge' interpretations really are, and what (if at all) distinguishes them from 'parenthetical' interpretations, we shall have to return to a comparison of EV2-/VIP-constructions with bona fide extractions from *daß*-clauses. Since it has been well-known since Erteschik (1973) (s. also Erteschik/Lappin 1979, Fodor 1992) that bridge conditions are largely 'nondominance' conditions determined by many of the factors (\pm complexity, \pm focus, \pm factivity, etc.) that also figure in VIP-constructions, it should be clear from the start that gross differences cannot be expected, – even the failure to find any difference would be compatible with the parenthetical analysis of EV2-/VIP-constructions as such. But if we do find any, they will, of course, provide a final important testing ground for the parenthetical analysis of EV2-constructions.

²⁷This was repeatedly hinted at in the course of the foregoing discussion, s. especially 3.6. See also the distinctions between different types of parenthesisals pointed out by Reinhart (1983:175ff.).

5.2. Basic differences between 'parenthetical' vs. 'bridge' interpretation

Given the structural differences between parenthetical and extraction constructions (s. sections 1. and 4.3), we can derive one clear prediction for their respective meanings: Under the extraction analysis, the V1-expression is an integral part of the proposition affected by the respective sentence moods, i.e. part of the proposition that is ultimately asserted or wh-questioned, under the parenthetical analysis it is not. While this is a clear difference in theory, and unaffected by the neutralization concerning communicative weight pointed out in 5.1, it still does not lead to a clear empirical difference in many cases, for an obvious reason: Instantiating the grammatical meaning of the complex extraction structure and integrating the grammatical meanings of the host clause and the VIP into a reasonable interpretation of the whole VIP-construction, will often, almost inevitably, result in the same utterance meaning of the respective structures. Thus, cf. the minimal pairs of bona fide extraction vs. parenthetical cases (72) vs. (73):

- (72) a. Wo meint er/sagt er, daß sie seit der Trennung wohnt?
b. Wo glaubst du, daß sie seit der Trennung wohnt?
c. [Na rat mal:]
Wo glaub ich, daß sie seit der Trennung wohnt?
(73) a. Wo wohnt sie meint er/sagt er, seit der Trennung?
a'. Wo wohnt sie seit der Trennung, meint er/sagt er?
b. Wo wohnt sie glaubst du, seit der Trennung?
b'. Wo wohnt sie seit der Trennung, glaubst du?
c. [Na rat mal:]
*Wo wohnt sie glaub ich, seit der Trennung?
c'. *Wo wohnt sie seit der Trennung, glaub ich?

But there is order in the variation: If the verb-first expression is in second or third person, the interpretation of extraction-based vs. parenthetical wh-questions is virtually indistinguishable (72a,b)-(73a,b), if it is in first person, a clear difference shows up (72c)-(73c/c'). Likewise, it could easily be shown that declarative minimal pairs converge in first and third person cases, while in second person cases an interpretive difference can be forced. Obviously, then, the varying outcomes are systematically predictable on the basis of the components involved (the semantics/pragmatics of interrogatives vs. declaratives in their distinctive relation to first vs. second vs. third person, and the special interpretive relation of parenthesisals to their host clause as opposed to the predicate-argument relation in

the extraction case). This permits us to use differences like (72c) vs. (73c/c') as a diagnostics for parenthetical vs. extraction structure.

Applying it to EV2-constructions, s. (74),

- (74) a. Wo meint er/sagt er, wohnt sie seit der Trennung?
 b. Wo glaubst du, wohnt sie seit der Trennung?
 c. [Na rat mal:]
 ??Wo glaub ich, wohnt sie seit der Trennung?

we find that (74c) is far worse than (72c), contrary to what the extraction analysis predicts. To be sure, (74c) is not quite as bad as (73c/c'), but since this increase in acceptability is apparently related to the position of the VIP in the host proposition,²⁸ the data in (74) clearly strengthen the parenthetical analysis.

5.3. Further interpretive differences

5.3.1. Another case in point are rhetorical questions, cf. the *daß*-extraction variant (75) vs. the EV2-variant (76), which clearly differ in acceptability:

- (75) [A: Ich weiß nicht, was ich tun soll. Ich muß mal Franz fragen. – B: Hm, -]
 Was schon wird der sagen, daß du tun sollst – beten und arbeiten, das sagt er immer.
 (76) [A: Ich weiß nicht, was ich tun soll. Ich muß mal Franz fragen. – B: Hm, -]
 ?*Was schon wird der sagen, sollst du tun – beten und arbeiten, das sagt er immer.

This is contrary to what the extraction analysis for (76) would predict, but in line with the parenthetical analysis and can even be made to follow from

²⁸Note that the EV2-case (ia) is much worse than (74c), whereas the corresponding *daß*-extraction case (ib) is good:

- (i) [Na rat mal:]
 a. ?*Wen zu besuchen glaub ich hat er sich vorgenommen?
 b. Wen zu besuchen glaub ich, daß er sich ernsthaft vorgenommen hat?

What is apparently decisive is the portion of the host proposition preceding vs. following the verb-first expression: If no crucial parts of the proposition precede it, as is the case in (74c), then the host proposition – which corresponds to the propositional argument of the parenthetical verb anyway (s. 6.1) – is in the (linear) 'scope' of the parenthetical comment, thus coming close to the 'one point-of-view'-interpretation of the whole structure that true extraction constructions necessarily have. This accounts for the difference between EV2- vs. postfinite VIP-structures as in (74a) vs. (73a) as well as the difference between the two EV2-structures (74a) vs. (ia), thus strengthening the case for the parenthetical analysis.

it: (i) In rhetorical questions the interrogative proposition is subject to an inferential process that specifies the *wh*-variable and yields an *assertion* of the resulting proposition by the *speaker* (s. Meibauer 1986). (ii) By inserting a VIP-parenthetical (which remains extra-propositional), the host proposition is placed under the perspective of the VIP-subject, *Franz* in the case of (76), right from the beginning; hence, the inference process leading to a speaker assertion of the host proposition cannot take place. (iii) When in prefinite position as in (76), the modal particle *schon* forces a rhetorical interpretation (i.e. interpretation as a speaker assertion). Since (ii) and (iii) are in inevitable conflict, (76) is predictably unacceptable.

5.3.2. A last interesting piece of interpretive evidence is provided by data like (77)-(77'):

- (77) a. Sie glaubt, daß Fox bei den Bauern populärer ist als er ist.
 b. Bei wem/Bei den Bauern ist Fox populärer als er ist, glaubt sie.
 c. Bei wem/Bei den Bauern ist Fox populärer als er ist.
 (77') a. Bei wem/Bei den Bauern glaubt sie, daß Fox populärer ist als er ist.
 b. Bei wem/Bei den Bauern glaubt sie, ist Fox populärer als er ist.

As was originally pointed out by Reinhart (1983:173f.), matrix-complement structures like (77a) have two readings, a consistent and an inconsistent one (i.e. the attribution of a consistent vs. inconsistent belief), whereas bona fide VIP-structures (77b), or 'bare' main clauses (77c) have just the inconsistent reading. The availability of one vs. two readings correlates with the availability of one vs. two sources of beliefs, which is apparently structure-dependent: VIP-structures and bare main clauses provide only one: the VIP-subject (77b) and the speaker (77c) respectively, who are thus assigned inconsistent beliefs, whereas in (77a) the inconsistent propositions need not, but can be assigned to two different sources (the matrix subject vs. the speaker) yielding a consistent interpretation.

Extending these observations to *daß*-extraction constructions (77'a) and EV2-cases (77'b), we find that the former do admit both readings (although, according to my intuition, the inconsistent reading is preferred), whereas the latter admit only the inconsistent reading, just like bona fide parenthetical constructions. This is, of course, well in line with the parenthetical analysis. Is it also an argument against the extraction analysis? Interestingly, we observe that the putative source sentences con-

taining V2-clauses for complements do not readily allow the additional consistent reading either, cf. especially (78a,c):

- (78) a. Sie glaubt, Fox ist bei den Bauern populärer als er ist.
 b. weil man annahm, Fox sei bei den Bauern populärer als er ist,
 ...
 c. Glaub nicht, Fox sei bei den Bauern populärer als er ist.
 d. wenn einer annimmt, er ist populärer als er ist, ...

The data are no doubt murky, and my impression that the consistent reading requires the dependent status of the V2-clauses to be additionally marked (subjunctive, position within a dependent clause) may be mistaken. But no matter how they are interpreted, the result will be detrimental to the extraction analysis: If cases like (78) are taken to basically admit the inconsistent reading only, this saves the extraction analysis from this one particular argument, but casts doubt on (18), the central presupposition underlying the extraction analysis – what else could we cast doubt on in accounting for the interpretive difference between (77a) and (78)? If, on the other hand, cases like (78) are taken to basically admit both readings, (18) is preserved, but so is the counterargument against the extraction analysis based on (77)-(77').

In sum, the data in (77)-(77') are an argument pro parenthetical and contra extraction analysis at the same time.

5.4. Conclusion

All the interpretive data we have looked at in this section provide additional support for the parenthetical over the extraction analysis of EV2-constructions. With the argument part concerning (22) thus definitely completed, let us move on to considering in more detail some aspects of the grammar and pragmatics of VIPs so far left open.

6. Some aspects of the grammar and pragmatics of integrated V1-parentheticals

In this section, I shall take up some issues in the grammar of VIPs that directly relate to my account for EV2-constructions, arguing that they can be adequately treated in ways compatible with this account or even confirming it. In particular, I shall raise two questions: How is the apparent argument relation between VIP-predicates and their host clause to be captured? (6.1), What is the internal structure of VIPs – V1 or \emptyset V2? (6.2). Some remaining points of interest will be dealt with in 6.3. – In dealing

with these issues, the following discussion will repeatedly touch also upon basic aspects of the pragmatics of integrated parentheticals and suggest descriptive approaches to them that will hopefully stand up under closer scrutiny.

6.1. On the propositional argument of VIP-predicates

6.1.1. The lexical properties of VIP-predicates that will be relevant for the following discussion, are summarized in (79):

- (79) VIP-predicates
- (i) always select a propositional argument, which is
 - lexically specified as a finite sentential argument in structural object position,
 - also realizable by a V2-clause (in the declarative case);
 - (ii) (a) do not include
 - preference predicates,
 - factive and implicative predicates,
 - negative/negated predicates;
 - (b) include (non-negative/unnegated)
 - verbs of saying (taking declarative as well as interrogative complements),
 - epistemic and attitudinal verbs (always declarative complements).

As for (79ii), cf. 4.2, to which the obvious exclusion of factive and implicative predicates has been added as a further characteristics. As for (79i), a bit more elaboration is in order:

I take it for granted that the propositional argument VIP-predicates select may always be realized as a finite clause (*daß*-/*wh*-clause). That it is in structural object position, is clear in the case of VIP-predicates like *glauben*, *meinen*, *sagen*, *finden*, etc. which take an agent or experiencer argument in the nominative. But it is also true for the only prominent VIP-predicate with an apparent sentential subject argument: *scheint es/scheint mir*,²⁹ which, on closer inspection, has to be classified as a kind of predicate realizing its propositional argument in object position (s. Olsen 1981, Rosengren 1992), likewise for passivized VIP-predicates (*wird gesagt*, *wird angenommen*, etc.). Note, moreover, the systematic absence of

²⁹Other, more or less marginal cases are the impersonal verbs *schwant* (*mir*), *dünkt* (*mir/mich*) etc., all taking an obligatory experiencer argument, cf. *Der Herr ist dünkt ihm/ihn, außer sich*. Remarkably, there are next to no adjectival VIP-predicates, which, however, may be – pace Cinque (1989) – due to the lack of lexically fitting elements.

VIP-predicates that require obligatory realization of a pleonastic element (*es/da(r)+preposition*), cf. (80), which probably testifies to the same point.

- (80) a. Ich vertraue *(darauf), daß Peter morgen kommt.
*Peter vertraue ich, kommt morgen./ *Peter kommt morgen, vertraue ich.
b. Ich hoffe (darauf), daß Peter morgen kommt.
Peter hoffe ich, kommt morgen./ Peter kommt morgen, hoffe ich.
c. I trust (that) he will come tomorrow.
He will come tomorrow, I trust.

The point that VIP-predicates take a sentential argument in structural object position must be somewhat stretched to cover cases like (81)-(81'):

- (81) Ich habe den Verdacht/die Vermutung/das Gefühl, Peter will gar nicht kommen.
(81') Peter hab ich den Verdacht/die Vermutung/das Gefühl, will gar nicht kommen.

However, since 'V+DP' predicates involving 'light verbs' often act like one single verb (with the dependent clause behaving like an object rather than an attribute clause),³⁰ this extension is certainly legitimate.

The second specification, i.e. that declarative VIP-predicates are always V2-predicates, is practically derivable from the other lexical properties: The semantic range of declarative VIP-predicates (79iib) comprises V2-predicates only, and the restriction against negated predicates (79iia) plus the structural object restriction (79i) ensure that the additional conditions licensing V2-clauses for complements are always fulfilled.

6.1.2. Let us now face the central problem concerning the argument structure of VIP-predicates: How is it satisfied in VIP-constructions? The sore point, obviously and systematically, is the propositional argument: It never shows up within the parenthetical clause, but is always identified with the host clause instead. In other words: Since in terms of argument structure the host clause behaves as the complement of the VIP-predicate,

³⁰A case in point is their behaviour with respect to the Complex NP Constraint: extraction from the clauses dependent on expressions like *das Gefühl haben*, etc. is possible, whereas with expressions like *das Gefühl beschreiben* it is not, cf. (i)-(ii). The difference is most naturally explained, if the V+DP predicate in (i) is taken as one complex verb taking a sentential complement, whereas in (ii) the clause is part of the object DP.

- (i) Mit wem hat Hans das Gefühl, daß Brigitte ihn t betrug?
(ii) *Mit wem beschreibt Hans das Gefühl, daß Brigitte ihn t betrug?

VIP-structures, as I have analyzed them, consistently violate the theta-criterion.

Does this vindicate the extraction analysis of EV2-constructions at last? Not at all, if we take into consideration the whole range of integrated parenthetical constructions, in which the same violation of the theta-criterion occurs:

Take, first, postfinite VIP-constructions, for which an extraction analysis is unfeasible. If the theta-criterion were sufficient reason to postulate a 'deep structure' with a matrix-complement relation between the VIP-expression and its surface 'host clause', a number of different slifting and splitting operations would have to be postulated in order to derive the various surface structures. While this has well-known (albeit controversial) precedents,³¹ it is conceptually more unattractive today than ever.

Take, second, the subclass of *wie*-parentheticals that shares with VIPs the prosodic properties (10iii).³² These integrated *wie*-parentheticals – henceforth *wie*-IPs – are formed from approximately the same predicates that appear in declarative VIP-constructions,³³ and they satisfy the propositional object requirement in the same way, cf. (82), where the object identification of the host clause is made obvious by its sensitivity towards the semantic complement restrictions of *glauben* vs. *finden*:

- (82) a. Der Vorhangstoff ist wie Peter glaubt/findet, zu blau.
b. Der Vorhangstoff ist wie Peter glaubt/*findet, blau.
a. Peter glaubt/findet, der Vorhangstoff ist zu blau.
b. Peter glaubt/*findet, der Vorhangstoff ist blau.

³¹S. especially Ross (1973), Okada (1977), Emonds (1979), McCawley (1982), Holmberg (1982). A short overview over the more prominent proposals is given in Espinal (1991:736ff.).

³²S. Brandt (1994), Zimmermann (1994): While there can be no doubt that *wie*-parentheticals are often prosodically unintegrated and 'interpretationally independent' (s.2.1), integrated behaviour, combined with dependent use is also possible, cf. (i):

- (i) Hans hat wie es scheint/ wie ich glaube, dazu keine Zeit.

The correlation between \pm interpretational dependence (which corresponds to what is called 'operational' vs. 'appositive' use of *wie*-(*so*-)parentheticals in Zimmermann 1994) and \pm prosodic integration of these parentheticals seems to be systematic: Whenever they exhibit the prosodic properties (10iii), they seem to be restricted to the interpretation in which the parenthetical depends on the host clause (in that the latter is the propositional argument of the former), and whenever they are taken as independent, they also lack the properties (10iii). The systematic nature of this correlation is confirmed by distributional differences: *wie* in interpretationally independent, unintegrated parentheticals may be accompanied by *so*, whereas – at least in my idiolect – this is impossible in the case of integrated *wie*-parentheticals.

³³For a more detailed discussion of the class of *wie*-IP predicates s. Brandt (1994), Zimmermann (1994).

Hence, the theta criterion is also violated in the same way, but, obviously, without any chance of resolving the conflict by a 'deep structure-plus-chopping operation' strategy. If so, however, there is no attraction in assuming a chopping operation anywhere, including EV2-constructions.

Finally, there are VIPs occurring in verb-final embedded clauses, which are likewise understood as their object complement. In these cases, however, a deep structure in line with the formal requirements on VIP-complements (*daß*- or V2-clause, s. (79i)) cannot even be postulated:

- (83) a. Peter, der *glaube ich* bald Geburtstag hat, ...
 a'. Peter, der bald Geburtstag hat *glaube ich*, ...
 b. Peter schwänzt oft, weshalb er *meint Paul* eigentlich entlassen werden müsse.
 c. Peter verlangt eine Lohnerhöhung, weil man *sagt er* auch höhere Mieten zahlen müsse.
 d. Er hat viel erreicht, obwohl er *scheint mir* zu wenig arbeitet.
 d'. Er hat viel erreicht, obwohl er zu wenig arbeitet *scheint mir*.

Note that classifying these occurrences as 'main clause phenomena in subordinate clauses' – which they surely are, given their restriction to 'assertive' subordinate clauses – does not help, for the requisite chopping operations would be much harder to envision here than in other cases of main clause phenomena.

In sum, we can conclude three things:

(i) Chopping operations (including extraction) cannot be the answer to the problem at hand; hence, in looking for another solution, we might as well take the insertion structure of VIP-constructions at face value.

(ii) Since *all* integrated parentheticals satisfy their object argument in the same insubordinate way, there must be a systematic connection between integration and this insubordination which any solution should make use of.

(iii) Given cases like (83), the argument satisfaction process at work must involve a nonformal, inferential step, for what the host clauses satisfying the object argument have in common is not form, but the proposition bound to a specific illocutionary value ('assertion' in the case of declarative VIP-constructions, 'question' in the interrogative ones).

In principle, there are two forms such an argument satisfaction process could take in line with (i)-(iii): Either (A) there is an appropriate empty object element in the VIP-clause, which must get coindexed with the host clause proposition. Or (B) there is no empty object element in the VIP-clause, then the object variable must be blocked becoming a free para-

meter to be specified in cotext or context, which then must get specified by the host clause proposition.

Obviously, the task of identifying the target proposition is the same for both approaches, and so are the facts on which the identifying strategy – certainly a nonformal, inferential device – must be based: The host clause proposition a) fulfils the semantic requirements on the object argument in question, b) is the proposition closest to the VIP fulfilling it in that the VIP is ba) syntactically inserted into it, forming a syntactic unit with the host clause, bb) prosodically integrated into it, forming (also) a unit with the host clause in terms of information structure.³⁴ Thus, the crucial difference between the two approaches turns on the assumption of an empty object element and its consequences: If there is one (A), the theta criterion can be upheld, if there isn't (B), some unorthodox extension of it must be admitted.

The context in which this issue must be argued is the question of VIP clause structure in general. So let us directly move on to this question.

6.2. Are VIPs V1- or V2-structures?

6.2.1. Let me first point out that German has bona-fide verb-first structures that are productively used not only as conditionals and yes-no questions, but also as narrative declaratives (s. BRRZ 1992:16, Önnarfors 1993, 1995). Moreover, it allows 'Topic-Drop' in V2-clauses (s. Huang 1984, Fries 1988). Thus, in terms of clause structure, the option of analyzing VIPs as (declarative) V1-structures as in (84a) – which corresponds to option (B) – or (declarative) V2-structures as in (84b) – which corresponds to option (A) – is real.³⁵

- (84) In Bonn wohnt sie *glaubt er* seit der Trennung.
 a. V1-structure of VIP: ... [glaubt_i [er t_i]] ...
 b. V2-structure of VIP: ... [ø [glaubt_i[er t_i]]] ...

At first glance, (84b) looks more plausible by far:

³⁴Concerning the ways of extracting the appropriate proposition from the host clause, I have nothing to say. The problem, however, is not unique to the parenthetical constructions in question, but reoccurs with determining the antecedent, for example, of sentential relatives (*weil ja Peter, der Faulenzer, zu spät kam, was mich sehr ärgerte*), s. Brandt (1990), or of sentential discourse anaphora in general (s. Bäuerle 1989).

³⁵This is overlooked by Espinal (1991:728/n.1,758), who considers the V1-pattern of German and Dutch parentheticals as (unwanted) exceptions to the rule that parentheticals "obey all the independently motivated syntactic principles relevant in a given language." (p.728).

(i) The (to-be-dropped) pronoun in the initial field can be assigned the object theta role, thus preserving the theta-criterion.

(ii) Its zero status can be related to an independently necessary process: Topic-Drop, which might be taken to apply optionally as usual.³⁶

(iii) A ready parallel seems to be provided by unintegrated parentheticals, in which the apparent object pronouns are also understood as co-indexed with the host clause, and may frequently be topic-dropped:

- (85) a. Hans – (so/das) glaubt FRITZ – wird KOMMEN.
b. Hans – (so/das) finde ICH – ist DUMM.

(iv) The fact that VIPs are visibly always verb-first (s. above (60)), can be accounted for. Note that parenthetical *so* as in (85) is special in two ways: It may substitute for the object argument in parentheticals only (86), and if it does, it is positionally restricted to the initial field (85'). Hence, if we assume that the pronoun subject to Topic-Drop in VIPs is *so*, no integrated V2-structure may ever arise.³⁷

³⁶This is entirely unproblematic, if there are integrated uses of *so*-parentheticals, which is, as far as I can tell, not unlikely, cf. (i):

- (i) Hans hat so scheint es/so glaube ich, dazu keine Zeit.

Again, just like in the case of *wie*-parentheticals (s. fn. 32), there seems to be a systematic, if weaker correlation between \pm interpretational dependence and \pm prosodic integration, which is partially underlined by distributional differences: If *so* behaves like an adverb (positionally variable, capable of bearing stress/focus, thus also capable of taking focus particles), the respective *so*-parenthetical is interpretationally independent, whereas in dependent parentheticals it is always restricted to the initial field. There are, however, cases like (85) showing that the distributional parallel is not complete.

Note that even if the impression that *so*-parentheticals tend to be primarily (perceived as) unintegrated were to be confirmed, the ad-hoc assumption of obligatory Topic-Drop in VIPs is not inevitable: The very appearance of a sentential anaphor (from which the existence of two clauses, hence a clause boundary can be inferred) could account for this effect.

³⁷This is a good place to dispose of an apparent counterexample to the V1-constraint on VIPs: As is well-known, sentences like (i) may get a nonassertive, often so-called 'parenthetical' interpretation (which is notoriously difficult to define, s. Öhlschläger 1989:214ff. for an overview, s. also Rosengren 1985, who identifies the respective reading as a case of 'Einstellungsbekundung', and BRZ 1992:56ff.; for a recent, rather un-linguistic treatment of the general issue of parenthetical readings s. Hand 1993), such that (i) is functionally equivalent to a bona fide VIP-construction like (ii).

- (i) Ich finde er ist ein Idiot. = (ii) Er ist ein Idiot finde ich.

As can be easily verified, the prosodic properties (10iii) are also fulfilled. Does one have to assume then that *ich finde* is a sentence-initial variant of VIPs also in syntactic respects (requiring (10i) to be dropped from the definition), with V2-order induced by initial position? Diagnostic evidence is hard to come by, but cf. the behaviour of iterated constructions like (iii)-(iii')

- (86) a. Fritz glaubt, daß Hans kommen wird, und Paul glaubt das/*so auch.
b. A: Hans ist dumm. – B: Das/*So finde ich nicht.
(85') a. Hans – Fritz glaubt das / *Fritz glaubt so – wird kommen.
b. Hans – ich finde das / *ich finde so – ist dumm.

At second glance, however, there are several major snags to this solution:

(i) There are VIP-occurrences without acceptable *so*-parallel, cf. final VIPs in declarative constructions (87a) and all VIPs in interrogative constructions (87b). Unless we find reasons to treat these cases differently, we have to abandon *so*-drop in favor of assuming a special VIP-ghost pronoun, restricted to the initial field, in order to do the job. This would be clearly ad hoc.³⁸

- (87) a. *Hans wird kommen, so glaubt Fritz.
b. *Wohin ist er gegangen, so glaubst du?
*Wohin ist er, so meinst du, gegangen?
*Wohin, so meinst du, ist er gegangen?

- | | | | |
|-------|---|--------|--|
| (iii) | *Sie findet er meint, Peter sei zu intelligent. | (iii') | Peter findet sie meint er, sei zu intelligent. |
| | Er meint sie findet, Peter sei zu intelligent. | | Peter meint er findet sie, sei zu intelligent. |
| | *Sie finde er meint, Peter sei zu intelligent. | | Peter finde sie meint er, sei zu intelligent. |

In terms of relative predicate scope the V2-cases in (iii) behave like a hierarchical structure, which true VIPs do not, cf. (iii') and 4.3. Hence, whatever syntactic structure cases like (i), (iii) have (s. Reis 1995), it is certainly not parallel to the insertion structure of bona fide VIP-constructions. If so, the parenthetical interpretation is not structurally forced, hence must arise by virtue of an interaction of the (regular effects of the) syntactic, semantic and prosodic means involved. (I leave it to future research to figure out the details of this interaction.)

Note that even if (i), (iii) were cases of VIPs, this would not affect the argumentation presented in the text, for there is no free alternation between V1- and V2-structures, but complementary distribution. Hence, cases like (i), (iii) cannot serve as arguments pro V2-status of noninitial pre- and postfinite VIPs.

³⁸Regarding this argument, I. Zimmermann has drawn my attention to the fact that interrogatives do allow insertion of *was*-parentheticals. While these are interesting in their own right, cf. (i)-(i'), it still would seem ad hoc to me to postulate different sources (or two different VIP-specific \emptyset -pronouns) for VIPs in declaratives vs. interrogatives. And postulating just one specific \emptyset -pronoun doing the job in both contexts would be ad hoc in another way, since specific overt pronouns introducing parentheticals are always restricted to just one of them (*so/wie* to declarative contexts, *was* to interrogative contexts). Note, moreover, that *was* always induces a focus-background domain of its own.

- | | | | |
|-----|---|------|-----------------------------------|
| (i) | *Wohin ist er gegangen, was glaubst du? | (i') | Kommt er morgen, was glaubst du? |
| | Wohin, was glaubst du, ist er gegangen? | | ?Wird er, was glaubst du, kommen? |
| | Was glaubst du, wohin ist er gegangen? | | Was glaubst du, wird er kommen? |

(ii) Even if the *so*-drop hypothesis for VIPs were to be maintained, it is by no means clear that this really eliminates the problem with the theta criterion: Given the evidence in (86), the 'object' status of the *so* in question is doubtful, and the many other variants of *so* (and its *wh*-counterpart *wie*) in German, while all more or less anaphoric, do not support such a classification either. Thus, we probably need blocking of the object variable despite the presence of *so*, no matter what its grammatical status (apart from being an anaphoric pointer) is.

(iii) (i) and (ii) are confirmed by comparative data: All Germanic counterparts of VIPs, for example, share the property of the missing object, but as a rule there is no pronoun that could be assumed to have been dropped, nor an independently motivated dropping rule for that matter. English is a clear case in point, cf. (88)-(88''):

- (88) This man, I think, should be fired.
This man should be fired, I think.
(88') This man, (*so) I think/ I think (*so), should be fired.
This man should be fired, (*so) I think/ I think (*so).
(88'') [Should this man be fired? -] I think *(so).

But if (B) is the correct option for English, there is no reason why (B) should not also apply in German, i.e. why (84a), the instantiation of (B) in German, should not be correct.

Comparing the pros and cons cited we see that actually none of the apparent advantages of (84b) is left. This suggests that (B)/(84a) is at least as good a hypothesis of VIP-structure as (A)/(84b).

6.2.2. To see that (B)/(84a) is in fact a viable hypothesis, consider the following more or less pragmatic evidence relating to clause-type:

Pragmatically, nonparenthetical declarative V1- and V2-clauses differ in a number of respects: Unlike the V2-clauses, the V1-clauses (a) cannot be used to *strictly assert* the truth of propositions, but just to *express* i.e. 'recount' true propositions (that is what makes them narrative),³⁹ cf.

³⁹It should be clear that the illocutionary functions I have called 'strict assertions' vs. 'recounts' are subtypes of 'assertions' in the sense of BRRZ (1992:51,59), the difference being that the truth aspect/aspect of factuality is focussed in the former, and backgrounded in the latter (though not presupposed in the strict sense of the word). What I am trying to capture by this distinction is that, in the default case, V2-clauses are associated with the former (for a non-default case s. fn. 37), whereas (declarative) V1-clauses may only be associated with the latter. This gives rise to many questions concerning sentence (sub)types and illocutionary (sub)types, which, however, I will have to leave to further research. (For some interesting further observations, s. Falkenberg 1994).

(89)-(90); (b) they are unpartitioned in terms of information structure (meaning i.a. that they are all comment without containing a topic), and (c) they may not contain negated elements (s. Önerfors 1993, 1995).

- (89) [Was war auf dem Bild zu sehen? -]
a. Ein Mann steht an der Tür.
a'. *Steht da ein Mann an der Tür.
[Das gibts doch nicht, daß Max plötzlich soviel Geld hat. - Doch, das gibts:]
b. Die Frau Z., die er weiß Gott woher kennt, hat ihm 5 Mille zugesteckt.
b'. *Hat ihm die Frau Z., die er weiß Gott woher kennt, 5 Mille zugesteckt.
(90) a. Hans kommt zum Casino. Steht da ein Mann an der Tür und ...
b. Stell dir vor, Hans war gestern spazieren, und hat ne Bekannte getroffen, die Frau Z. Und was denkste, hat ihm die Frau Z., die er weiß Gott woher kennt, plötzlich 5 Mille zugesteckt ...

Now, since according to (84a) VIPs are V1-clauses, whereas unintegrated parentheticals like (85)-(85') are V2-clauses (apparent unintegrated V1-structures having undergone topic drop of *so/das*), the prediction is not only that they should have distinctive properties in other respects related to clause type, but also that these are parallel to the distinctive properties (a)-(c) of their nonparenthetical V1- vs. V2-counterparts.

This prediction is borne out in full: (c') Just like nonparenthetical V1- vs. V2-clauses, VIPs may not be negated (s. 4.2), whereas the respective V2-parentheticals may, cf. (91):

- (91) [Wie Paul sagt/glaubt, wird Hans bald Direktor.] Und als Direktor - das glaubt/sagt Paul allerdings nicht - wird er sofort den Produktionsleiter feuern.

(b') Whereas the V2-parentheticals admit all kinds of focus-background-partitions, VIPs are, by themselves, unpartitioned in terms of focus-background structure, s. (10iii), and there is no reason to assume a topic-comment partition for them either. Since VIPs as a whole cannot have topic status - they cannot be topics by themselves, and what could they be topic of, given that they are not really part of the respective host clauses, and that these certainly are not 'about' them? -, we may classify them as backgrounded all-comment expressions.⁴⁰ In terms of the pragmatic functions

⁴⁰In this respect, VIPs seem to be comparable to sentence adverbials like *leider*, *bekanntlich*, etc., (with which they share the integration property anyway), which, as far as I can

of VIPs (s. above, and also Brandt 1994), this seems to be intuitively correct. Besides, it confirms the informational parallel in question, the only remaining difference being that nonparenthetical V1-clauses are always comments in focus.

(a') Most importantly, there is a parallel to the most salient illocutionary difference between non-parenthetical V2- vs. V1-clauses, cf. (92)-(92')

- (92) Hans – (das) glaubt/sagte jedenfalls Paul – wird morgen zum Direktor gewählt.
 (92') Hans glaubt/sagte Paul, wird morgen zum Direktor gewählt.
 Hans wird morgen glaubt/sagte Paul, zum Direktor gewählt.

While VIPs and the comparable unintegrated V2-parentheticals undeniably have much in common – both supply 'side' information that places the host clause proposition under the perspective of the parenthetical subject (such that it appears asserted or questioned from this subject's point of view, depending on whether the host clause is declarative or interrogative) –, they clearly differ in the following way: While both represent declarative sentence mood, unintegrated parentheticals like in (92) *strictly assert* that Paul believes/said that p, while the VIPs in (92') just *express* it (= the often so-called 'parenthetical' use, s. fn. 37), i.e. they just identify the source for the assertability of p. (In other words, and more precisely: Integrated parentheticals identify the individual x and his/her relation R of believing, saying, etc. to the respective proposition p, such that according to x's beliefs or sayings etc. p is an assertable proposition.)

Of course, the parallel thus drawn between narrative and parenthetical use of V1-clauses, which as far as I know is new, needs elaborating (s. also fn. 39), and so do the relations between grammar and pragmatics concerning parentheticals as well as clause types in general.⁴¹ But the parallel

see, can never be plausibly treated as topics of the clause they appear in either. A tangible reason for denying topic status to them as well as VIPs is that topics may be accented (cf. Molnár 1991:66ff. for an overview, s. also Jäger 1994). – Unfortunately, only the compatibility restrictions between focus and topic vs. comment status have been given due attention (s. Molnár, *ibid.*), but not the relation between background and topic vs. comment status, neither in general, nor for the particular cases (sentence adverbials, integrated parentheticals) that are of interest here.

⁴¹Let me just list the most important issues (doing justice to them is way beyond the scope of this paper):

– (a) What is the influence of the properties (10iii) on the specific pragmatic properties of VIPs? In particular, to what extent can their specific illocutionary use be derived from these properties?

– (b) How is the analysis presented here to be extended in order to cover VIPs in interrogative host clauses? Since nonparenthetical V1-clauses may also carry interrogative sentence mood, analyzing VIPs differently in declarative vs. interrogative clauses is not unfeasible, and in view of the English facts not unlikely, s. (i)-(ii). On the other hand, the

is certainly promising enough to count as an additional attractive feature, if not as evidence in favor of option (B) or (84a) respectively.

In short: Although, in view of my overall goals, the issue of V1- vs. V2-structure of VIPs could be left open, there is good reason to think that analyzing them as true V1-structures is on the right track.

6.2.3. This commits me, of course, to the assumption that VIP-structures have 'irregular', i.e. postsyntactic theta-role assignment. This commitment, however, seems bearable, for there are bona fide precedents, in particular passive cases like (93)-(93'), in which the (optional) agent argument is satisfied by locative PPs (s. Höhle 1978:147ff., 158ff.), or by APs,

- (93) a. Der Agent wurde *zwischen den Polizisten* abgeführt.
 b. Die Besucher wurden *im Aufzug* emporgetragen.
 (93') a. Frau X. wird seit gestern *polizeilich* gesucht.
 b. Die Werkzeuge werden *firmenseits/schulischerseits* gestellt.

and implicative cases like (94), which are true coordinative constructions in all relevant respects, but allow the propositional argument required by the predicate in the first conjunct to be satisfied by the second conjunct (s. Reis 1993a); cf. also comparable English cases like (94').⁴²

- (94) a. Du wirst sehen, der hat die Stirn *und bleibt weg*.
 b. Sei bloß nicht so blöd *und komm!*
 (94') *Try and catch me.*

respective phenomena in English host clauses containing negatives, s. (iii), show that what is involved may be a quite superficial agreement phenomenon, which in turn would force us to rethink the differential sentence mood interpretation of V1-clauses in German.

- (i) He will come, I think.
 (ii) Will he come, *you think/√do you think?
 When will he come, *you think/√do you think?
 (iii) Peter, I think/*I don't think, will not be able to come.
 Peter will not be able to come, *I think/√I don't think.

– (c) How does the analysis given to VIPs carry over to parentheticals having the same pragmatic function (i.e. to *wie*-IPs (and possibly *so*-IPs)? Perhaps, we should treat them in the way suggested for parenthetical uses of certain V2-clauses (s. fn. 37), one of the necessary preconditions being that, for informational reasons, the respective clause cannot be assigned a topic-comment structure (which could in principle be true also for V2-clauses).

⁴²A further case in point, and perhaps the most important one, are constructions in which the propositional object argument is realized by a V2-clause, for this clause is apparently not a complement of the matrix verb in a syntactic sense, s. Reis (1995).

What seems to be going on in these cases is that the argument in question is not projected into the syntax in its lexically prescribed form, i.e. the corresponding variable is treated as a free parameter that gets specified by means of the respective italicized phrases via an inferential process at the appropriate processing level. One triggering factor is, obviously, that these phrases allow an interpretation such that they fulfill the semantic requirements on the missing arguments. Moreover, the predicate and the phrase picking up its dangling theta role are always included in the same focus domain. It is intuitively plausible that this is a major factor in licensing theta role assignments as those in (93)-(94), for focus domains determine units of information structure (s. Brandt 1990), requiring everything in it to be interpreted as part of a meaningful whole.

The parallels between these cases and the VIP-case are obvious. In particular, the focus domain condition is fulfilled by virtue of VIPs (and also the respective *so*- and *wie*-parentheticals) being integrated. Thus, the exceptional theta role assignment in VIP-constructions that (84a) makes us assume⁴³ does not only seem to follow a more general rule, but also to be systematically related to one of its defining properties: integration.

6.3. Residual points

Rounding up the discussion let me just point out a few relevant facts about the positional variability and the grammatical status of VIPs:

6.3.1. In principle, VIPs can appear in all positions, in which other, un-integrated, parentheticals may appear, and vice versa. This ties in neatly with the parenthetical analysis of EV2-constructions. As to how these places of insertion are defined, I have nothing definite to say except that they must be peripheral to maximal projections (s. also Espinal 1991:752). It is obvious, though, that some peripheral positions are disallowed, in particular the absolute initial position (95)-(95'), and, under certain conditions, the initial position in the middle field (96)-(96'):

- (95) a. Diesen Mann glaube ich, haben wir schon öfters hier gesehen.
 b. *Glaube ich, diesen Mann haben wir schon öfters hier gesehen.
 (95') a. Diesen Mann – glaube ICH jedenfalls – haben wir schon öfters hier gesehen.

⁴³Which, by the way, is also assumed by others, cf. especially Espinal (1991:758): “/.../ the licensing of the host S as an argument of the disjunct (in the case of *I guess, I think*, etc.) takes place not at any linguistic level of representation, but postsyntactically, when the relevance of the information being processed is evaluated and access to discourse information allows argument places to be filled.”

- b. *Glaube ICH jedenfalls – diesen Mann haben wir schon öfters hier gesehen.
 (96) a. *DIESEN Mann hat glaub ich, er besuchen wollen.
 DIESEN Mann hat glaub ich, unsere Kollegin besuchen wollen.
 Diesen Mann hat glaub ich, ER besuchen wollen.
 b. ??ERST GESTern hat glaub ich, ihn ein Mädchen besucht.
 ERST GESTern hat glaub ich, den Kerl ein Mädchen besucht.
 (96') a. *DIESEN Mann hat – glaub ICH jedenfalls – er besuchen wollen.
 DIESEN Mann hat – glaub ICH jedenfalls – unsere Kollegin besuchen wollen.
 Diesen Mann hat – glaub ICH jedenfalls – ER besuchen wollen.
 b. ??ERST GESTern hat – glaub ICH jedenfalls – ihn ein Mädchen besucht.
 ERST GESTern hat – glaub ICH jedenfalls – den Kerl ein Mädchen besucht.

While the data allow us to identify factors of potential influence – left- vs. right-peripheral position in the initial field (95)-(95'), pre-Wackernagel position vs. later pre-VP positions in the middle field, viz. the structural makeup of this area (s. Lenerz 1993), the focus-background structure of the host clause and/or its segmentation into intonational phrases (96)-(96') –, it is by no means obvious, *how* they come into play, and whether a unitary explanation can be found. Answering these questions, however, is far beyond the scope of this paper. The same goes for the question, whether VIPs occur more happily in some parenthetical positions than in others, and whether they differ from unintegrated parentheticals in this respect. But even though the answer in both cases may very well be yes – VIPs seem to be less acceptable in postfinite medial than final positions, the pre-finite position to be more extensively used than either (s. also 3.5), and unintegrated parentheticals may be better in medial than in final positions –, this would be in no way incompatible with the parenthetical analysis of EV2-constructions and the proposed analysis of VIP-constructions in general. What we should not forget is that the possible positions of insertion may and do differ in integrating potential, about which we know so far very little.

6.3.2. A case in point is the prefinite position, whose integrating potential seems to be unusually high. This is borne out by ‘conjunction-adverbials’ like (97) also licensed in this position, which ‘amalgamate’ with (if not: cliticize to) the head occupant of the initial field to form one constituent (98). Likewise, modal particles may amalgamate to *wh*-phrases in this

position (99), whereas *wh*-phrases in situ do not readily allow amalgamation of either type of element (100). That indeed one constituent is formed is shown by their being able to be left-dislocated (101); moreover, the amalgamation process can be reiterated (102).

- (97) aber, jedoch, indessen, schließlich, jedenfalls, ...
 (98) a. Hans aber/jedenfalls/ ... wohnt in Bonn.
 b. Wo aber/jedenfalls/... wohnt Hans seit 1992?
 (99) Wen nur/schon/denn/... wird er für diesen Job anstellen?
 (100) a. ??Wann will es [wer aber] dem Freund sagen?
 b. ??Wann will es [wer schon] dem Freund sagen?
 (101) [Die Arbeiter von VW jedenfalls/aber/...]_i, (die)_i fordern einfach zuviel.
 (102) a. Was denn aber soll man tun?
 b. Wen denn nur wird er anstellen?

It will be obvious that VIPs in prefinite position behave exactly like these elements: Just like them, they join the preceding phrase to form one constituent (103), the process may be reiterated (s. above 3.3), and left-dislocation of the resulting constituent is possible (104):

- (103) a. Hans glaubt sie/scheint es ... wohnt in Bonn.
 b. Wo glaubt sie/scheint es ... wohnt Hans seit 1992?
 (104) [Die Arbeiter von VW glaube ich/scheint es ...]_i, (die)_i fordern einfach zuviel.

Note that VIPs may not cooccur with the pronouns *man* and nonreferential *es* in the initial field, cf. (105a) vs. (105b). But neither may the conjunction-adverbials (105c), so the fact that expletive viz. nonreferential *es* cannot be extracted from *daß*-clauses either (106),⁴⁴ cannot be used as a belated argument pro extraction analysis of EV2-constructions.

- (105) a. Es handelt sich glaubt er, um ein unlösbares Problem.
 b. *Es glaubt er, handelt sich um ein unlösbares Problem.
 c. *Es aber/schließlich/... handelt sich um ein unlösbares Problem.
 (106) *Es_i glaubt er, daß t_i sich um ein unlösbares Problem handelt.

6.3.3. Concerning the grammatical status of VIPs, the parallelism between conjunction adverbials and VIPs illustrated in 6.3.2 suggests that

⁴⁴I am indebted to Chris Wilder (p.c., s. also Wilder 1993) for drawing my attention to this potential problem for my analysis.

their status may be the same. This, however, is immediately falsified by looking at the initial field and the final position: Conjunction adverbials may, by themselves, occupy the former, but not the latter, with VIPs it is just the other way around.

On the other hand, VIPs seem to be similar enough in meaning and function to sentence adverbials like (107),

- (107) anscheinend, vermutlich, ihres Erachtens, laut Karl, meiner/Pauls Meinung nach, ihm zufolge, ...

to suggest classing them together into one category. For the English counterparts, this is often taken more or less for granted, the crucial evidence being that they pattern in fact alike (s. Rardin 1975, Stillings 1975, Jackendoff 1972:94ff., Emonds 1976:43ff., McCawley 1982). This has also led to the proposal to treat parentheticals as S-adverbials (s. especially Jackendoff:ibid.).

In German, however, the distribution of VIPs and comparable sentence adverbials differs in important respects: Whereas VIPs may occur in prefinite and final position, sentence adverbials like (107) may not, cf. (108), and judging from cases in which VIPs have developed into adverbials, cf. *scheint es* > *scheins* in Hessian German, this difference seems to be systematic, cf. (109):

- (108) a. Hans hat damals in Bonn gewohnt #.
 #: √glaub ich, √scheint es, ...
 *anscheinend, *vermutlich, ?*meines Erachtens, ...
 b. Hans # hat damals in Bonn gewohnt.
 #: √glaub ich, √scheint es, ...
 *anscheinend, *vermutlich, *meines Erachtens, ...

- (109) *Hessian German*:
 a. Hans hat scheins/anscheinend/scheint es damals in Bonn gewohnt.
 b. Hans scheint es/?*anscheinend/*scheins hat damals in Bonn gewohnt.

If true, this is certainly a marked surface difference between English and German. Only further research can tell, whether it reflects a genuine difference in adverbial or in parenthetical behaviour or in both, and whether it plays any role in the comparative issues surrounding V2-extraction vs. parenthetical constructions at all. For the time being, the safe conclusion is that VIPs in German are a category *sui generis* – in the same way as so many subclasses of particles and modal words are, whose distributional

features, if taken one by one, keep recurring, but taken in combination are unique.

6.4. Conclusion

It seems that the various points in the grammar of VIPs taken up in this section can all be settled in line with the parenthetical analysis of EV2-constructions. Of course, since so little is known about the grammar of VIPs and of parentheticals in general, my treatment of the relevant issues was neither intended nor should be taken to be complete or conclusive. So let me finish this section by just pointing out the two major general issues still unsolved that may affect the description of any particular point in the grammar of VIPs:

One is at what level parentheticals, integrated or not, are inserted: Since the bona fide levels of grammar are out of the question, is it the level at which (or just before which) discourse relations between separate clauses are computed? This is what is proposed by Espinal (1991), and is also confirmed by the results of 4.3 above, but plausible though it seems, the hard evidence does not seem to be all in yet.⁴⁵

The other is how the various properties distinguishing VIPs from other parentheticals – integration properties, object blocking accompanied by exceptional argument satisfaction, 'no topic'-clause type, absence of syntactic complexity – are connected, and how they interact to yield the special pragmatic effect these parentheticals have. Since integrated *wie*- and *so*-parentheticals have overlapping properties, including the ban on syntactic complexity,⁴⁶ and also yield overlapping pragmatic effects, this

⁴⁵Hard evidence relevant to the issue of levels might be provided by closely comparing the binding behaviour in parenthetical constructions with binding data in bona fide sentence grammar vs. discourse constellations. – Also interesting in this regard is the fact that initial VIP-position is possible in Topic-Drop constellations, cf. (i), showing either that Topic-Drop – a quite superficial phenomenon – is ordered after parenthetical insertion, or that the level on which the latter takes place is still sensitive to the distinction between 'nothing' and 'zero' caused by ellipsis. However, since unintegrated parentheticals are still out, cf. (ii), it is impossible to draw any interesting conclusions without taking many additional factors into account.

- (i) [Was ist mit seinen Hausaufgaben? –] Glaub ich, hat er schon erledigt.
(ii) [Was ist mit seinen Hausaufgaben? –] *Glaub ICH jedenfalls, hat er schon erledigt.

⁴⁶The observations concerning the lack of embedding VIPs, s. 4.4, can be reduplicated with *so/wie*-IPs:

- (i) *Wie Hans vermutet, alle meinten gestern, kommt Fritz nicht.
?*Fritz kommt, wie du weißt, daß Peter sagt, morgen nicht zu uns.
(ii) *Fritz kommt, so glaubt Hans, alle meinten gestern, nicht zu uns.
?*Fritz kommt, so glaubt Hans, daß alle meinen, nicht zu uns.

cannot be just coincidence, but the way in which certain factors come into play is far from obvious.⁴⁷

Despite these lacunae, however, it might have become evident that there is hope for a consistent account of the grammar of parentheticals which is not only in line with the VIP-analysis proposed for EV2-constructions, but also provides a suitable basis for deriving their pragmatic properties in general. Since this is something one should (and can only) expect from an analysis that is grammatically correct, I take this as a final touch of evidence for the parenthetical analysis of EV2-constructions I have been defending in this paper.

7. Final remarks

The results of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- (i) EV2-constructions are prefinite VIP-constructions rather than extraction constructions,
- (ii) a consistent account of the grammar and pragmatics of VIPs doing justice also to EV2-constructions is feasible,
- (iii) there is no extraction from verb-second clauses in German to be accounted for in core grammar at all.

The consequences of (i)-(iii) are considerable:

First, since the peculiarities of the purported V2-extraction have figured prominently in many syntactic argumentations (s. 2.2), quite a few theoretical and/or descriptive proposals will have to be scrapped or revised.

Second, there are comparative consequences: Since closely related languages like English and Swedish do have extraction from bare finite complements that are functionally equivalent to EV2-constructions, but not

⁴⁷This is especially true for the ban on complexity (s. also fn.46). Its simplest explanation would be, of course, that it is processually linked to integration: producing or perceiving parentheticals as integrated presupposes their being short. Although there is certainly a tendency to this effect, it does not really explain why short embedding parentheticals are still markedly worse than longer simple ones, cf. (i)-(ii):

- (i) *Hans glaub ich sie denkt ist dümmer als die Polizei erlaubt.
?*Hans glaub ich, daß sie denkt ist dümmer als die Polizei erlaubt.
(ii) Hans glaub ich sagen zu müssen, ist dümmer als die Polizei erlaubt.
Hans hat man immer gedacht, ist dümmer als die Polizei erlaubt.

Hence, a more structural explanation seems to be called for. An intriguing idea is to try to reduce object blocking and the ban on complexity, which is also a sort of object blocking, to one factor, but so far I do not see, how this could be made to work.

from complements with 'main clause' word order, in the light of (iii) many comparative issues concerning clause structure, subordination and extraction in Germanic languages will have to be reformulated, and the respective results of previous research reconsidered.

Third, and closer to home, if (iii) is correct, the 'complement' status of embedded verb-second clauses in German is called into question. (S. Reis 1995).

Fourth, inasmuch as (ii) is convincing, there are a number of interesting descriptive proposals concerning the little-known grammar and pragmatics of parentheticals as well as a nonstructural supplement to the theta-criterion, that have (i.a.) the VIP-data going for them, but are waiting for confirmation on a larger scale.

Fifth, in arguing for (i)-(iii), we did not only gain a better picture of the syntactic and pragmatic differences between parenthetical and extraction constructions, but also of some remarkable points of contact: The semantic and pragmatic factors defining VIPs and bridge expressions largely overlap, VIP- and extraction constructions often behave as variants of each other not only in terms of use (5.1f.), but also in more grammatical terms (4.5), and certain constructions, in particular the interrogative *was*-construction,⁴⁸ seem to share salient properties of both. Since these similarities cannot be predicted from the different structures in question, they constitute a problem of explanation that has so far gone unnoticed and may be hard to handle unless functional as well as construction-specific notions are given some of the attention they traditionally enjoyed. Clarifying this issue, however, clearly requires a lot of further research, as do the other issues the consequences listed in this final section give rise to. So for the moment, I have to leave it at that.

References

Altmann, H. (1981), Formen der "Herausstellung" im Deutschen. Rechtsversetzung, Linksversetzung, Freies Thema und verwandte Konstruktionen. Tübingen. (= Linguistische Arbeiten 106)

⁴⁸On the one hand, according to the standard analysis (s. McDaniel 1989), *was*-constructions are equivalents to *wh*-extraction constructions, with long *wh*-movement applying overtly (SS) in the latter, and covertly (LF) in the former case. On the other hand, to mention just three properties that have a parenthetical flavour, (a) there are *was*-parentheticals (s. fn. 38) with the function of *was* being close to the function of *was* in the complex interrogative construction, (b) the same iteration possibilities and problems arise (s. above 3.3: (27)-(29) vs. (30)), (c) the *was*-matrix clause may not contain a negation either (s. Beck 1993). What this could mean in terms of the synchronic (as well as diachronic) description of the *was*-construction is a question I hope to take up in near future.

- Andersson, S.G. (1988), Zur Grammatik und Pragmatik von Herausstellungsstrukturen. In: S&P 1, 1-8.
- Andersson, S.G./Kvam, S. (1984), Satzverschränkung im heutigen Deutsch. Tübingen. (= Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 24)
- Bäuerle, R. (1989), Ereignissemantik im DRT-Rahmen. [Projektantrag.] In: Sonderforschungsbereich [340] Stuttgart-Tübingen: Sprachtheoretische Grundlagen für die Computerlinguistik. Finanzierungsantrag 1989-1990-1991, 263-279.
- Beck, S. (1993), Interventionseffekte für LF-Bewegung. Magisterarbeit Universität Tübingen. Stuttgart-Tübingen-Heidelberg. (= Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340, Nr. 39)
- Bing, J. (1979), Aspects of English Prosody. PhD Diss. University of Mass. [Unpubl.]
- Bolinger, D. (1972), That's That. The Hague/Paris. (= Janua Linguarum. Series Minor 155).
- Brandt, M. (1990), Weiterführende Nebensätze. Zu ihrer Syntax, Semantik und Pragmatik. Stockholm. (= Lunder Germanistische Forschungen 57)
- (1994), Zur Pragmatik von Satzadverbialphrasen mit *wie*. [Talk given at the Colloquium 'Koordination, Subordination und andere Formen der Satzverknüpfung', Wuppertal, November 1994]
- Brandt, M./Reis, M./Rosengren, I./Zimmermann, I. (1992), Satztyp, Satzmodus und Illokution. In: Rosengren, I. (ed.), Satz und Illokution. Vol. I. Tübingen. (= Linguistische Arbeiten 278), 1-90. [= BRRZ 1992]
- Butolussi, E. (1991), Studien zur Valenz kognitiver Verben im Deutschen und im Neugriechischen. Tübingen. (= Linguistische Arbeiten 262)
- Chomsky, N. (1970), Remarks on Nominalization. In: Jacobs, R./Rosenbaum, P. (eds.), Readings in Transformational Grammar. Waltham, Mass., 184-221.
- Cinque, G. (1989), On Embedded Verb Second Clauses and Ergativity in German. In: Jaspers, K. et al. (eds.), Sentential Complementation and the Lexicon. Studies in Honour of Wim de Geest. Dordrecht, 77-96.
- (1990), Types of A-Dependencies. Cambridge, Mass./London. (= Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 17)
- D'Avis, F./Beck, S./Lutz, U./Pafel, J./Trissler, S. (1993), Extraktion im Deutschen I. Stuttgart-Tübingen-Heidelberg. (= Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340, Nr. 34)
- Downing, B. (1973), Parenthesization Rules and Obligatory Phrasing. In: Papers in Linguistics 6, 108-128.
- Emonds, J.E. (1976), A Transformational Approach to English Syntax. New York etc.

- (1979), Appositive Relatives Have No Properties. In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 10, 211-243.
- Erteschik, N. (1973), On the Nature of Island Constraints. PhD Diss. MIT.
- Erteschik, N./Lappin, S. (1979), Dominance and the Functional Explanation of Island Phenomena. In: *Theoretical Linguistics* 6, 41-86.
- Espinal, M.T. (1991), The Representation of Disjunct Constituents. In: *Language* 67, 726-762.
- Fabricius-Hansen, C. (1980), Sogenannte ergänzende *wenn*-Sätze. Ein Beispiel semantisch-syntaktischer Argumentation. In: Dyhr, M. et al. (eds.), *Festschrift für Gunnar Bech*. Kopenhagen. (= Kopenhagener Beiträge zur Germanistischen Linguistik, Sonderband 1), 160-188.
- Falkenberg, G. (1994), Parenthesen, Schaltsätze, Einstellungsverben. [Talk given at the Colloquium: 'Koordination, Subordination und andere Formen der Satzverknüpfung', Wuppertal, November 1994]
- Fodor, J.D. (1992), Islands, Learnability and the Lexicon. In: Goodluck, H./Rochemont, M. (eds.), *Island Constraints. Theory, Acquisition and Processing*. Dordrecht etc., 109-180.
- Fries, N. (1988), Über das Null-Topik im Deutschen. In: *S&P* 3, 19-49.
- Gärtner, H.M./Steinbach, M. (1994), Economy, Verb Second, and the SVO-SOV Distinction. In: *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 53, 1-59.
- Grewendorf, G. (1988), Aspekte der deutschen Syntax. Tübingen. (= Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 33)
- (1989), Ergativity in German. Dordrecht.
- Haider, H. (1986), Affect α : A Reply to Lasnik and Saito, "On the Nature of Proper Government". In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, 113-126.
- (1993), ECP-Etuden: Anmerkungen zur Extraktion aus eingebetteten Verb-Zweit-Sätzen. In: *Linguistische Berichte* 145, 185-203.
- Hand, M. (1991), On Saying That Again. In: *Linguistics and Philosophy* 14, 349-365.
- Höhle, T.N. (1978), Lexikalistische Syntax. Die Aktiv-Passiv-Relation und andere Infinitkonstruktionen im Deutschen. Tübingen. (= Linguistische Arbeiten 67)
- Holmberg, A. (1982), Performer-Parentheticals in Swedish, English, and French. In: *Papers From the Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics* 7.1, 60-79.
- Huang, C.T.J. (1984), On the Distribution and Reference of Empty Pronouns. In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 15, 531-574.
- Jackendoff, R.S. (1972), *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass./London. (= *Studies in Linguistics* 2)
- Jäger, G. (1994), Topic, Focus and Weak Quantifiers. In: Van der Sandt, R. (ed.), *Focus and Natural Language Processing*. IBM, Heidelberg.

- Kaufmann, G. (1972), Das konjunktivische Bedingungsgefüge im heutigen Deutsch. Mannheim. (= Institut für deutsche Sprache. Forschungsberichte 12)
- Lasnik, H./Saito, M. (1984), On the Nature of Proper Government. In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 15, 235-289.
- Lenerz, J. (1993), Zu Syntax und Semantik deutscher Personalpronomina. In: Reis, M. (1993b) (ed.), 117-154.
- Lühr, R. (1988), Zur Satzverschränkung im heutigen Deutsch. In: *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik* 29, 74-87.
- McCawley, J.D. (1982), Parentheticals and Discontinuous Constituent Structure. In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 13, 91-106.
- McDaniel, D. (1989), Partial and Multiple Wh-Movement. In: *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7, 565-604.
- Meibauer, J. (1986), *Rhetorische Fragen*. Tübingen. (= *Linguistische Arbeiten* 167)
- Molnár, V. (1991), Das TOPIK im Deutschen und Ungarischen. Stockholm. (= *Lunder germanistische Forschungen* 58)
- Mrotzek, C. (1991), *Parenthetische Konstruktionen des Deutschen*. Magisterarbeit Universität Stuttgart. Stuttgart. (= *IWBS Report* 199).
- Müller, G. (1993), On Deriving Movement Type Asymmetries. Phil.Diss. Universität Tübingen. Tübingen. (= *SfS-Report-05-93*)
- Müller, G./Sternefeld, W. (1993), Improper Movement and Unambiguous Binding. In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 461-507.
- Öhlschläger, G. (1989), Zur Syntax und Semantik der Modalverben des Deutschen. Tübingen. (= *Linguistische Arbeiten* 144)
- Okada, N. (1977), On Parenthetical Clauses. In: *Studies in English Linguistics* 5, 154-162.
- Olsen, S. (1981), Problems of *seem/scheinen* Constructions and Their Implications for the Theory of Predicate Sentential Complementation. Tübingen. (= *Linguistische Arbeiten* 96)
- Önnerfors, O. (1993), Über narrative Verb-erst-Deklarativsätze im Deutschen. In: *S&P* 31, 1-52.
- (1995), On Narrative Declarative V1 Sentences in German. In: Swan, T./Jansen, O. (eds.), *Modality in Germanic Languages*. Berlin/New York.
- Pittner, K. (1994), Zur Syntax von Parenthesen. [Talk given at the GGS-Meeting, Tübingen, May 1994]
- Rardin, R. (1975), *Sentence-Raising and Sentence Shift*. Indiana University Linguistics Club, Bloomington.
- Reinhart, T. (1983), Point of View in Language - The Use of Parentheticals. In: Rauh, G. (ed.), *Essays on Deixis*. Tübingen, 169-194.
- Reis, M. (1993a), Satzfügung und kommunikative Gewichtung. Zur Grammatik und Pragmatik von Neben- vs. Unterordnung am Beispiel 'im-

- plikativer' *und*-Konstruktionen im Deutschen. In: Reis, M. (1993b) (ed.), 203-249.
- (1993b) (ed.), Wortstellung und Informationsstruktur. Tübingen. (= Linguistische Arbeiten 306)
- (1994/in prep.), Brückeneigenschaften von Matrixsätzen bei langer Extraktion im Deutschen. [Talk given at the Workshop on Extraction, DGfS-Jahrestagung Münster, March 1994]
- (1995), Extraction From Verb-Second Clauses? A More than Parenthetical Inquiry into Complex Verb-Second Constructions in German. [To appear in: Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340. Stuttgart-Tübingen-Heidelberg]
- Reis, M./Rosengren, I. (1992), What Do *WH*-Imperatives Tell Us About *WH*-Movement? In: *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10, 79-118.
- Rosengren, I. (1985), Die Beziehung zwischen Sprachsystem und Sprachhandlungssystem am Beispiel der Einstellungsbekundung. In: *Zeitschrift für Germanistik* 6, 322-337.
- (1992), Zum Problem der kohärenten Verben im Deutschen. In: Suchsland, P. (ed.), *Biologische und soziale Grundlagen der Sprache. Interdisziplinäres Symposium des Wissenschaftsbereiches Germanistik der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena*, 17-19. Oktober 1989. Tübingen (= *Linguistische Arbeiten* 280), 265-297.
- (in prep.), Scrambling: The Riddle of the Empty Cell. Ms. University of Lund.
- Ross, J.R. (1973), Slifting. In: Gross, M. et al. (eds.), *The Formal Analysis of Natural Languages. Proceedings of the First International Conference. The Hague/Paris.* (= *Janua Linguarum. Series Maior* 62), 133-169.
- Staudacher, P. (1990), Long Movement from Verb-Second Complements in German. In: Grewendorf, G./Sternefeld, W. (eds.), *Scrambling and Barriers.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 319-339.
- Sternefeld, W. (1989), Extractions from Verb-Second Clauses in German. In: *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 44, 119-140.
- Stillings, J. (1975), *Sentence Raising.* Repr. Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Tappe, H.T. (1981), Wer glaubst du hat recht? Einige Bemerkungen zur COMP-COMP-Bewegung im Deutschen. In: Kohrt, M./Lernerz, J. (eds.), *Sprache: Formen und Strukturen. Akten des 15. Linguistischen Kolloquiums Münster 1980. Vol. 1.* Tübingen (= *Linguistische Arbeiten* 98), 203-212.
- Thiersch, C. (1978), *Topics in German Syntax.* PhD Diss. MIT. [Unpubl.]

- Uhmann, S. (1994), *Grammatische Regeln und konversationelle Strukturen. Fallstudien aus Syntax und Phonologie.* Habilitationsschrift Univ.-GHS Wuppertal. [Unpubl.]
- Ulvestad, B. (1955), Object Clauses Without "daß" Dependent on Negative Governing Clauses in Modern German. In: *Monatshefte für Deutschen Unterricht, Deutsche Sprache und Literatur* 47, 329-338.
- (1956), A Note on Object Clauses Without "daß" After Negative Governing Verbs. In: *Monatshefte für Deutschen Unterricht, Deutsche Sprache und Literatur* 48, 273-276.
- Vikner, S./Schwartz, B. (1991), The Verb Always Leaves IP in V2 Clauses. Ms. Stuttgart/Boston, Mass. [Unpubl.]
- Wilder, C. (1993), *Derivational Economy and the Analysis of V2.* Ms. Berlin. [To appear in: *Linguistics*]
- Zimmermann, I. (1994), Das relativische Pronominaladverb *wie*. [Talk given at the Colloquium: 'Koordination, Subordination und andere Formen der Satzverknüpfung', Wuppertal, November 1994]
- Zwart, C.J.W. (1993), *Dutch Syntax. A Minimalist Approach.* Diss. University of Groningen. [Unpubl.]
- (1994), The Minimalist Program and Germanic Syntax. A Reply to Gärtner and Steinbach. In: *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 54, 1-41.