## **Dirk Bury -** University College London German V3 and the origin of adverbs

d.bury@ucl.ac.uk

While German is a strict verb-second language, some verb-third orders are also possible. V3 may be possible in structures where a pronoun coreferential with the initial constituent occurs lower in the clause:

(1)	a.	(Er sagte) [der Hans] <sub>i</sub> der <sub>i</sub> habe schon wieder Hunger he said the Hans the have-SUBJ already again hunger '(He said that) Hans is hungry again already.' (Altmann 1981:149)			
	b.	$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$			
	lange aushalten long bear (Altmann 1981:149) '(Christian said that) in the city he couldn't bear it much longer t				
	c.	[Eine Brigg] <sub>i</sub> was ist das <sub>i</sub> ? a <i>Brigg</i> what is that 'A <i>brigg</i> , what's that?' (Altmann 1981:148)			
	d.	[Dass man über unterschiedliche Lösungswege diskutieren kann] <sub>i</sub> that one about different solution-ways discuss can			
		Deutschlands AbiturientenhabendavoniniegehörtGermany'sA-level studentshaveof-itneverheard'A-level students in Germany never knew it was possible to discuss			

different ways to get to a solution.' (Die Zeit 48/2000)

It seems reasonable to assume that in examples of this kind the initial phrase is basegenerated. The ungrammaticality of V3 examples like (2) can then be derived from a general locality condition (e.g. an appropriate version of Rizzi's 1990 Relativised Minimality or Chomsky's 1995 Minimal Link Condition).

(2)	a.	*Frank <sub>i</sub> gestern	hat t <sub>i</sub>	den Kuchen	gegessen
		Frank yesterday	has	the cake	eaten
'Frank ate the cake yesterday		esterday.'			

Snippets - Issue 4 - July 2001 http://www.ledonline/snippets/

b.	*Gegesser	n <sub>i</sub> Frank ha	t (gestern)	den Kuchen t <sub>i</sub>	
	eaten	Frank ha	s yesterday	the cake	
		den Kuchen	hat (gestern)		
	Frank	the cake	has yesterday	eaten	

These examples presumably involve A-bar movement (of the initial constituent) across an A-bar specifier (occupied by the immediately preverbal constituent). (3) illustrates the contrast between (1) and (2):

- (3) a.  $XP_i YP V_i [... Pro_i ... t_i] = (1)$ 
  - b.  $*XP_i YP V_j [... t_i ... t_j] = (2)$

Given examples like (4), this reasoning suggests that adverbs in German must be inserted lower than the fronted verb.

(4)	a.	*Gestern Frank hat Kuchen gegessen
		yesterday Frank has cake eaten
	b.	*Manchmal Frank hat Kuchen gegessen
		sometimes Frank has cake eaten

c. \*Gerne Frank hat Kuchen gegessen gladly Frank has cake eaten

If the adverbs in (4) were base-generated in initial position, these examples would not be ruled out by a *Relativised Minimality*-type condition, and an additional constraint would have to be invoked.

## **References**

Altmann, H. (1981) Formen der 'Herausstellung' im Deutschen: Rechtsversetzung, Linksversetzung, freies Thema und verwandte Konstruktionen, Niemeyer, Tübingen. Chomsky, N. (1995) The Minimalist Program, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA. Rizzi, L. (1990) Relativized Minimality, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.