

About the syntactic integration of root-like adverbial clauses in German

Werner Frey – ZAS, Berlin

It is well known that so called peripheral adverbial clauses (PACs) allow (certain) root phenomena. For German, this can be illustrated by means of so called modal particles (MPs), which have a certain relation with the illocutionary force of a sentence (Jacobs 1986). In (1), it is illustrated that an adversative *waehrend*-clause does tolerate an MP, whereas a so called central adverbial clause like a temporal *waehrend*-clause does not (e.g. Coniglio 2009). In the literature, it is assumed that the fact that PACs show properties of root clauses is reflected by their external syntax: It is claimed that they are not embedded but are merged after the associated CP has been completed. The resulting structure is said to be close to that of co-ordination (e.g. Haegeman 2003). In German too, PACs exhibit important signs of (syntactic) non-integration. For example, a phrase occurring in a PAC cannot be bound by a phrase occurring in the matrix clause, (2).

Nevertheless, in German there exists a very basic fact which shows that the standard view concerning the external syntax of PACs cannot be right in general: PACs may very well occupy the prefield of a German verb-second clause (V2-clause), (3), a position, which is thought to host only phrases fully integrated into the clause.

That a PAC may host MPs is an indication that it has an illocutional potential. According to a popular view, in syntax an illocutional potential is reflected by the presence of a Force projection. (Note that it follows that Force cannot be the trigger of V2 in German). Force has to be anchored to a speaker or to a potential speaker (Haegeman 2003, 2006). The Force projection of an independent sentence is directly anchored to the speaker. The Force projection of a root-like object clause is anchored to the referent of the logical subject of the superordinated sentence, a potential speaker. I would like to propose that there exists another way of anchoring a Force projection, namely by its being licensed by a Force projection which itself is anchored. This is what happens with PACs: their Force projection is not directly but indirectly anchored to a (potential) speaker because it is licensed by the Force projection of the superordinated clause, which in turn is anchored to a (potential) speaker.

A V2-clause has Force in its left periphery. What is commonly called the prefield may correspond to SpecForce. The prefield does correspond to SpecForce when a PAC occupies it, the reason being that the PAC is licensed by Force of the V2-clause. Thus, we arrive at the conclusion that the prefield of a clause S in German may be filled by base generation of an XP with an illocutional potential (i.e. an XP containing a Force projection), XP being licensed by Force of S. Note that the proposal implies that, contrary to common assumptions, the prefield of a V2-clause in German (and in other Germanic languages) is a position where certain contentful phrases are base generated. As another option, a PAC may appear as a parenthetical. In syntax, a parenthetical is adjoined to ForceP of its host. Phonetically, it can be realised in a niche which is appropriate for the given parenthetical. Thus, if a PAC is serialised in the middle field, it appears as a parenthetical and not as a constituent of the IP-domain.

Thus, the syntactic licensing of a PAC is very different from the licensing of a central adverbial clause. Nevertheless, to a certain degree a PAC is syntactically integrated into its host. This modifies Haegeman's claim (2003, 2006) that embedded adverbial clauses do not have Force, and unembedded adverbial clauses do have Force. The paper demonstrates that different peculiarities of PACs find a natural explanation under this assumption. For example, it will be explained why in contrast to central adverbial clauses, PACs cannot be questioned, and why they are not just part of the speech act performed with the matrix clause, (4).

An important point to observe is that PACs can be embedded albeit only in root-contexts, (5). (Clearly, central adverbial clauses do not impose such a restriction). The Force of the PAC has to be licensed by the Force of its host which in turn has to be licensed by the

embedding predicate. Because only in root contexts the Force of the complement clause can be licensed, the status of (4) follows.

The paper argues that PACs have to be sharply distinguished from unintegrated verb-final clauses (UNC), to which e.g. continuative relative clauses and German free *dass*-clauses (contra Heycock 2006) belong. It is argued that an UNC has no syntactic relationship to its preceding clause. Its Force projection has to be directly anchored to the speaker. It follows that there are verb-final clauses in German which are syntactically independent from the clause they relate to. Several differences between PACs and UNC follow: UNC cannot appear in the prefield of a V2-clause; UNC never can be embedded, (6a); unlike PACs, UNC can constitute an independent speech act, (6b,c); a PAC can, but an UNC cannot be part of an answer to all-focus question; an UNC necessarily has to follow a PAC, (6d).

The paper will conclude with comparing remarks on the degree of integrations of PACs, the degree of integration of embedded V2-object-clauses in German, and the degree of integration of verb-final complement clauses with and without Force.

- (1) a. Gestern ist sie den ganzen Tag zu Hause geblieben, während sie doch
yesterday has she the whole day at home stayed while she MP
sonst bei schönem Wetter einen Ausflug macht.
otherwise in nice weather an excursion makes
b. *Während wohl den Brief schrieb, ist er gestört worden.
while he MP the letter wrote has he disturbed been
- (2) *Jede Kollegin₁ ist am Sonntag, während sie₁ sonst bei schönem Wetter
every colleague has on Sunday while she otherwise in nice weather
einen Ausflug macht, am Institut gewesen.
an excursion makes at-(the) institute been
- (3) Während sie sonst bei schönem Wetter einen Ausflug macht, blieb sie gestern zu Hause.
- (4) *Ist Maria für Physik begabt, während ihr Bruder nur an Sprachen interessiert ist?
is Maria for physics gifted while her brother only in languages interested is
- (5) a. Max meint, dass Maria Fußball liebt, während Paul für Opern schwärmt.
Max thinks that Maria soccer loves while Paul about operas is-crazy
b. *Max bestreitet (*denies*), dass Maria Fußball liebt, während Paul für Opern schwärmt.
- (6) a. *Hans meint, Maria wird kommen, worüber sich alle freuen werden.
Hans thinks Maria will come about-what REFL everyone happy will-be
b. Hans wurde gewählt, [worüber wir uns gewundert haben, nicht wahr?]
Hans was elected about-which we REFL surprised were, weren't we?
c. *Maria ist für Physik begabt, [während ihr Bruder nur an Sprachen interessiert ist, nicht wahr?]
d. *Maria ist für Physik begabt, worüber sich alle freuen, während ihr Bruder nur an Sprachen interessiert ist.

Coniglio, M. (2009): Die Syntax der deutschen Modalpartikeln: Ihre Distribution und Lizenzierung in Haupt- und Nebensätzen. – Doctoral Dissertation, University of Venice. **Haegeman, L. (2003):** Conditional Clauses: External and internal syntax. *Mind & Language*, 18.4, 317-339. – (2006): “Conditionals, Factives and the Left Periphery.” *Lingua* 116, 1651–1669. **Heycock, C. (2006):** Embedded Root Phenomena. In: M Everaert & H van Riemsdijk (eds.): *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, vol. II, 174–209. Oxford: Blackwell. **Jacobs, J. (1986):** Abtönungsmittel als Illokutionstypmodifikatoren. – In: W. Abraham (ed.): *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 27, 100–111.