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]_i der_i 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. (Christian meinte) [in der Stadt]_i da_i werde er es nicht mehr Christian meant in the city there would he it no more lange aushalten long bear (Altmann 1981:149)

'(Christian said that) in the city he couldn't bear it much longer there.'

- c. [Eine Brigg]_i was ist das_i?
 a *Brigg* what is that
 'A *brigg*, what's that?' (Altmann 1981:148)
- [Dass man über unterschiedliche Lösungswege diskutieren kann]i that one about different solution-ways discuss can Deutschlands Abiturienten haben davoni gehört nie Germany's A-level students have of-it never '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 base-generated. 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_i gestern hat t_i den Kuchen gegessen Frank yesterday has the cake eaten 'Frank ate the cake yesterday.' $\begin{array}{cccc} \text{b.} & \text{*Gegessen}_i & \text{Frank hat (gestern)} & \text{den Kuchen } t_i \\ & \text{eaten} & \text{Frank has yesterday} & \text{the cake} \end{array}$

*Frank_i den Kuchen hat (gestern) t_i gegessen 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. $XP_i YP V_i [... Pro_i ... t_j] = (1)$
 - b. $*XP_i YP V_i [... t_i ... t_i] = (2)$

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.