## snippets

Issue 24

## November 2011

## Contents

1. Theresa Biberauer and Johan Oosthuizen. *More unbearably light elements? Silent verbs demanding overt complementizers in Afrikaans.* 

2. Alex Drummond. The ban on rightward P-stranding is a global constraint.

3. Giorgio Magri. The plurality inference of object mass nouns.

4. Jacopo Romoli. *Presupposition wipe-out can't be all or nothing: a note on conflicting presuppositions.* 

5. Philippe Schlenker. Generalized bishop sentences.

6. Carson Schütze. There does not undergo predicate inversion.

7. Michelle Sheehan. A note on case assignment to CP.

8. Gary Thoms. P-stranding diagnoses A'-movement in tough constructions.

9. Honglei Wang, David Potter and Masaya Yoshida. *Cross-conjunct binding in nominal gapping*.



**Theresa Biberauer, Johan Oosthuizen** – University of Cambridge, Stellenbosch University **More unbearably light elements? Silent verbs demanding overt** complementizers in Afrikaans

mtb23@cam.ac.uk

Van Riemsdijk (2002) observes structures in certain West Germanic/WGmc varieties, including Afrikaans, which permit temporal and modal auxiliaries without an accompanying lexical verb:

(1) Hy is/moet biblioteek toe [Afrikaans] he is/must library to 'He has gone/has to go to the library'

As the translation indicates, the "missing" verb is related to motion-verb *go*. Van Riemsdijk accordingly postulates a "super-light" verb  $e_{[GO]}$  for (1)-type structures. Crucially,  $e_{[GO]}$  is not identical to the overt motion-verb, exhibiting several distinctive properties (cf. Kayne 2005 on the more general non-identity of overt and "silent" elements). One difference is  $e_{[GO]}$ 's unavailabity in finite form:

 $\begin{array}{ccc} (2) & ^{*}Hy \; e_{[GAAN]} \; biblioteek \; toe \\ & he \; \; GO \quad library \quad to \end{array}$ 

For Afrikaans specifically, we note that hypothetical  $e_{[GAAN]}$  appears to select for the *be*-auxiliary, despite Afrikaans, unlike its WGmc counterparts, systematically employing *have* in perfect-tense structures featuring overt lexical verbs:

(3) Hy **\*is/ het** biblioteek toe gegaan he is/ has library to gone 'He has gone to the library'

Also not previously registered and, to the best of our knowledge, unique to Afrikaans is a further "silent verb"-containing structure:

(4) Ek sal/moet/wil/gaan/het,etc. dat Wanda die boeke bestel
I shall/must/want/go/have,etc. that Wanda the books order
'I will/must/have organize(d)/ensure(d)/propose(d)/ask(ed) that Wanda orders the books'

As before, we observe a lexical verb omissible in the presence of modals and a temporal auxiliary – here, *have* and not *be* as in (1)-type structures. Identifying a single silent verb is less straightforward than in the latter case, however: as (4)'s (non-

Snippets - Issue 24 – November 2011 http://www.ledonline.it/snippets/ exhaustive) translation shows, a range of lexical verbs may be "implied". Nevertheless, there are clear restrictions, verbs like *hope, wish* and *think* not being possible, with feasible verbs having broadly "organizational" meanings (cf. Levin 1993). The possibility of identifying a "super-light" verb, potentially something like  $e_{[MAKE]}$  (Afrikaans  $e_{[MAKE]}$ ), therefore remains.

Importantly,  $e_{[MAKE]}$ , like  $e_{[GO]}$ , would differ from overt counterparts in a range of ways, most strikingly in obligatorily requiring an overt complementizer:

(5) \*Ek het Wanda bestel die boeke I have Wanda order(ed) the books

(6) Ek het gereël... I have organised

**dat** Wanda die boeke bestel that Wanda the books order

Wanda bestel die boeke Wanda order the books

'I organised that Wanda orders the books'

As (6) shows, complementizer omission is possible where *het* selects an overt "organisation"-verb, but not where this verb is "silent" ((5)). Further, hypothetical  $e_{[MAKE]}$  requires finite declarative *dat*, being incompatible with finite interrogative *of* even where an *ask*-type meaning is implied. This follows directly if specifically "organisational" *ask-that*, rather than interrogative *ask-if*, is at stake, and can also be understood in relation to  $e_{[MAKE]}$  "organisational"  $e_{[MAKE]}$  corresponds in relevant respects to overt *maak dat* ("make that") and not *maak of* ("make (as) if"). Like  $e_{[GO]}$ ,  $e_{[MAKE]}$ 's presence is dependent on a main-clause auxiliary, finite forms being unavailable (\**Ek e<sub>[MAAK]</sub> dat Wanda die boeke bestel*). Embedded auxiliaries are, however, severely restricted, present-tense verbs being the norm in  $e_{[MAKE]}$ -complements.

These newly-observed overt-"silent" asymmetries seem to us to merit more detailed investigation, both for their own sake and in developing our understanding of "silent syntax" more generally.

## **References**

Kayne, R. (2005). Movement and Silence. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Levin, B. (1993). English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Van Riemsdijk, H. (2002). "The unbearable lightness of GOing. The projection parameter as a pure parameter governing the distribution of elliptic motion verbs in Germanic." *Journal* of Comparative Germanic Linguistics 5: 143 – 196.