LINGUISTIK AKTUELL

This series provides a platform for studies in the syntax,
semantics, and pragmatics of the Germanic languages
and their historical developments.
The focus of the series is represented by its German title
Linguistik Aktuell (Linguistics Today).
Texts in the series are in English.

Series Editor

Werner Abraham
Germanistisch Instituut
Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
Oude Kijk in 't Jatstraat 26
9712 EK Groningen
The Netherlands

Advisory Editorial Board

Hans den Besten (University of Amsterdam)
Guglielmo Cinque (University of Venice)
Günther Grewendorf (J.W. Goethe-University, Frankfurt)
Hubert Haider (University of Stuttgart)
Christer Platzack (University of Lund)
Ken Safir (State University of New Jersey)
Høskuldur Thraínsson (Harvard University)
Lisa deMena Travis (McGill University)
Sten Vikner (University of Stuttgart)

Volume 11

Uli Lutz and Jürgen Pafel (eds)

On Extraction and Extraposition in German

ON EXTRACTION AND EXTRAPOSITION IN GERMAN

Edited by

ULI LUTZ

JÜRGEN PAFEL

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY
AMSTERDAM/PHILADELPHIA

Kayne, Richard S. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press.

Koopman, Hilda & Dominique Sportiche. 1982. "Variables and the Bijection Principle". *The Linguistic Review* 2.139-160.

Lasnik, Howard & Mamoru Saito. 1984. "On the Nature of Proper Government". *Linguistic Inquiry* 15.235-289.

Lasnik, Howard & Juan Uriagereka. 1988. *Lectures on Binding and Empty Categories*. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press.

May, Robert. 1985. *Logical Form*. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press.

Müller, Gereon. 1995. "Cyclicity and Economy. Movement Theory in the Minimalist Program". Manuscript, University of Tübingen.

Müller, Gereon. This Volume. "On Extraposition & Successive Cyclicity". 213-243.

Müller, Gereon & Wolfgang Sternefeld. 1993. "Improper Movement and Unambiguous Binding". *Linguistic Inquiry* 24.461-507.

Müller, Gereon & Wolfgang Sternefeld. 1995. "A bar Chain Formation and Economy of Derivation". Manuscript, University of Tübingen. To appear in *Linguistic Inquiry* 27.2 (1996).

Obenauer, Hans-Georg. 1984. "On the Identification of Empty Categories". *Linguistic Review* 4.153-202.

Pafel, Jürgen. This volume. "Kinds of Extraction from Noun Phrases". 145-177.

Reis, Marga. This volume. "Extractions from Verb-Second Clauses in German?". 45-88.

Reis, Marga & Inger Rosengren. 1992. "What do *WH*-Imperatives Tell Us about *WH*-Movement?". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10.79-118.

Riemsdijk, Henk van & Edwin Williams. 1986. *Introduction to the Theory of Grammar*. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1978. "Violation of the *wh*-Island Constraint and the Subjacency Condition". *Montreal Working Papers in Linguistics* 11.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press.

Ross, John Robert. 1967/86. *Infinite Syntax!*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Ross, Haj. 1984. "Inner Islands". *Proceedings of the 10th Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*, 258–265.

Sternefeld, Wolfgang. 1991. *Syntaktische Grenzen. Chomskys Barrierentheorie und ihre Weiterentwicklungen*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Trissler, Susanne. 1993. "P-Stranding im Deutschen". *Extraktion im Deutschen I* by Franz-Josef d'Avis, Sigrid Beck, Uli Lutz, Jürgen Pafel & Susanne Trissler, 247-291. Arbeitspapiere des Sonderforschungsbereichs 340 Bericht Nr. 34.

Watanabe, Akira. 1992. "Wh-in-situ, Subjacency, and Chain Formation". *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* Number 2.

Webelhuth, Gert. 1984. "German is Configurational". *The Linguistic Review* 4. 203-246.

Wilder, Chris. This volume. "Rightward Movement as Leftward Deletion". 273-309.

Extractions from Verb-Second Clauses in German?

Marga Reis
University of Tübingen

1. Introduction*

In this paper, I shall challenge the by now standard generative views on extraction from V2-clauses in German. In particular, I shall be concerned with the structure of sentences such as (1) – henceforth called EV2-constructions[1] –

(1) a. *Wo glaubst du, wohnt sie seit 1985?*
         where believe you lives she since 1985
         'Where do you believe she has lived since 1985?'

     b. *In Bonn meint Franz, wohnt sie seit 1985.*
         in Bonn thinks F.   lives she since 1985
         'Franz thinks it is in Bonn that she has lived since 1985.'

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 1985*]]?
     b. [*In Bonn meint Franz*, [t' *wohnt sie* t *seit 1985*]].

(3) a. [*Wo* [*glaubst du*,] *wohnt sie* t *seit 1985*]?
     b. [*In Bonn* [*meint Franz*,] *wohnt sie* t *seit 1985*].

My primary goal then is descriptive and language specific (honni soit qui mal y pense!). If attained, however, the consequences will be more far-reaching, 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 important ways. Moreover, closely examining EV2-constructions yields insights into the form-function relation of

parenthetical and extraction constructions that have so far not been properly appreciated.

The paper is organized as follows: section 2 will provide some background for the analyses in question. In sections 3-5, I shall examine the case for the extraction analysis vs. its parenthetical alternative, arguing that none of the arguments put forth against a parenthetical analysis and for an extraction analysis stands up under scrutiny, and that there are conclusive arguments to the contrary that have been overlooked. In section 6, I shall be concerned with hitherto unnoticed cases of genuine V2-extraction in German. Section 7 contains a short summary of what has been and what still has to be done.

2. The Analysis of EV2-Constructions: Background

2.1 The Traditional View and Some Crucial Parenthetical Data

While grammarians in the nongenerative tradition have always been aware of *daß*-clause constructions that have to be given an extraction analysis, the parenthetical nature of EV2-constructions has been more or less taken for granted.[2] Looking at constructions like (4)-(6),

(4)   *Wo (/In Bonn) wohnt sie **meint er** (/sagt Paul) mit dem Kind*
      where (/in Bonn) lives she thinks he (/says P.)   with the kid
      seit 1985?
      since 1985

(5)   *Wo (/In Bonn) wohnt sie mit dem Kind **meint er** (/sagt Paul)*
      where (/in Bonn) lives she with the kid thinks he (/says P.)
      seit 1985?
      since 1985

(6)   *Wo (/In Bonn) wohnt sie mit dem Kind seit 1985 **meint er** (/sagt*
      where (/in Bonn) lives she with the kid since 1985 thinks he (/says
      ***Paul**)?*
      P.)

it is easy to see why: (i) for obvious reasons, (4)-(6) MUST be parenthetical rather than extraction structures; (ii) EV2-constructions and constructions like (4)-(6) share conspicuous formal, semantic and functional similarities show-

ing them to be constructionally related: a) they all parse as V2-clauses containing a V1-expression, b) the proposition of the V2-clause always satisfies the propositional object argument of the V1-verb, c) the V1-clause is in the scope of the illocutionary force of the V2-clause, and the information it conveys is not only mere side information to the information conveyed by the V2-clause, but is always confined to the function of putting the V2-clause proposition into the perspective of the V1-clause subject.[3]

Given (i)-(ii), it follows that (iii) EV2-constructions should be parenthetical structures just like (4)-(6), that is, V2-main clauses into which a V1-expression *meint er/sagt Paul* has been inserted. The remaining difference – in EV2-constructions the V1-parenthetical is inserted in prefinite position, in cases like (4)-(6) in postfinite position(s) – need not be considered decisive, for prefinite as well as postfinite positions are niches for other types of parentheticals as well.

Note that the respective V1-expressions in (4)-(6) also share three covarying prosodic properties with (1):[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, c) they tend to be integrated into their host clause without intonational breaks.[5] (a)-(c) are confined to parentheticals that are 'interpretationally integrated' into the host clause in the sense of (iib,c) above. By contrast, parentheticals not conforming to (iib,c) – i.e. those that are interpretationally self-contained, interpretive links to the host clause being established by the usual devices, for example anaphora – cannot be prosodically integrated in this way, cf. (7) vs. (8).

(7)   a.   *Jetzt wohnt sie – wen WUNdert's? – in BONN.*
           now lives she   whom astonishes it?   in Bonn
           'Now she lives – who'd be surprised? – in Bonn.'

      b.   *Jetzt wohnt sie – das sagt jedenfalls PAUL – in BONN.*
           now lives she   that says at any rate P.   in Bonn
           'Now she lives – according to Paul – in Bonn.'

(8)   a.   *Jetzt wohnt sie (–) wen wunderts? (–) in BONN.*
      b.   *Jetzt wohnt sie (–) das sagt jedenfalls Paul (–) in BONN.*

Prima facie there are also cases of unintegrated V1-parentheticals, cf. (9), conforming to the prosodic-interpretational correlation just stated.

(9) *Jetzt wohnt sie – sagt PAUL – in BONN.*
now lives she   says P.   in Bonn

But there is good reason to assume that all these cases are in fact V2-struc-
tures which have undergone so-called Topic-Drop, whereas those in inte-
grated use are genuine V1-structures (see Reis 1995:§6.2). If so, V1-paren-
theticals seem to be primed for integrated use, although the reverse does not
hold.[6]

In any case, the properties just outlined define a unique type of parentheti-
cals, which from now on I shall call VIPs (= Verb-first Integrated Parenthe-
ticals). For ease of further reference, their properties are summarized in (10):

(10) *Defining Properties of VIPs*
  (i)   Verb-first
  (ii) Interpretational integration into 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:

(i) In certain dialect areas of German (and, marginally, also in the standard
language) extraction from *daß*-complement clauses is possible,[7] cf. (11):

(11) a. *Wo glaubst du denn (/sagt er), daß sie jetzt wohnt?*   particle]
      where believe you MP (/says he) that she now lives   [MP=modal
      'Where do you believe (/does he say) that she lives now?'

    b. *In Bonn glaube ich (/sagt er), daß sie jetzt wohnt.*
      in Bonn believe I (/says he) that she now lives
      'In Bonn I believe (/he says) that she lives now.'

(ii) In Standard German, V2-clauses may substitute for *daß*-complement
clauses after certain verbs, cf. (12), hence the traditional assumption (13):

(12) a. *Ich glaube (/Er sagt), daß sie jetzt in Bonn wohnt.*
    b. *Ich glaube (/Er sagt), sie wohnt jetzt in Bonn.*
      'I believe (/He says) (that) she lives in Bonn now.'

(13) V2-clauses alternating with *daß*-complement clauses are true
    complement clauses.

(iii) The class of predicates licensing extraction ('bridge predicates') is largely
identical with the class of predicates licensing substitution of *daß*-comple-
ments by V2-clauses ('V2-predicates'), prominent members of both classes
being i.a. *sagen* ('say'), *meinen, denken* ('think'), *glauben* ('believe'), *fin-
den* ('think'), *behaupten* ('claim'), cf. (11)-(12).[8]

Given (i)-(iii), the prediction is clearly that we should also find extraction
from V2-clauses in German. This prediction seems to be forced by compara-
tive evidence:

(iv) In Germanic languages like English or Swedish that allow complemen-
tizer drop in declarative complements, extraction from the 'bare' variant is
possible and even less restricted than extraction from the *that-/att*-introduced
variant:

(14) *Who$_i$ do you think (that) he met* t$_i$ *yesterday?*

(15) *Vem$_i$ tror du   (att) Peter inte träffade* t$_i$ *igår?*
      whom think you (that) P.   not met yesterday

(16) *Who$_i$ do you think (*that) t$_i$ met him yesterday?*

(17) *Vem$_i$ tror du (*att) t$_i$ inte träffade Anders igår?*
      who think you (that) not met   A. yesterday

The class of predicates licensing declarative complementizer drop corre-
sponds closely to the class of V2-predicates in German, which has been taken
as evidence that V2-clause substitution for *daß*-clauses in German and
declarative complementizer drop in English and Swedish are instances of the
same phenomenon.[9] But then extraction from V2-clauses in German should
also definitely be expected to occur.

Given the expectations raised by (i)-(iv), the properties of EV2-construc-
tions look more than suggestive: there is just one constituent preceding the
V1-expression, and 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). Small wonder then that Thiersch,

who was the first to explicitly suggest an extraction analysis for EV2-con-
structions (1978:134ff),[10] was readily believed. The belief was strengthened by
Tappe (1981) and Grewendorf (1988:83-87), whose arguments pro extrac-
tion and contra the parenthetical analysis of EV2-constructions have been
generally accepted.

The success of these argumentations, however, generated a by now noto-
rious problem: if EV2-constructions are in fact extraction structures, then V2-
extraction is subject to quite peculiar restrictions that have no parallels among
extractions from *daß*-clauses, cf. (18i-ii) and the respective illustrations (19)-
(21):

(18) *Restrictions on putative extraction from V2-clauses*
  (i) Initial gap restriction: Regardless of the base position of the
  movee, extraction leaves a gap in the initial position of the V2-
  clause.
  (ii) V2 route restriction: Extraction may occur via V2-clauses and
  into V2-clauses only.

(19) *Wo (/*Hier) glaubt er, sie wohnt t jetzt.*
  where (/here) believes he she lives now

(20) *Wo (/Hier) glaubt er, t' wohnt sie t jetzt.*

(21) a. *Wo er nur wieder meint, wohnt sie.*
  where he MP again thinks lives she

  b. *Wo meint er, daß Peter geglaubt hat, wohnt sie.*
  where thinks he that P. believed has lives she

(22) *Wo meint er, hat P. geglaubt, wohnt sie (/daß sie wohnt).*
  where thinks he has P. believed lives she (/that she lives)
  'Where does he think Peter believed (that) she lives?'

Again starting with Thiersch (1978), numerous proposals have been pre-
sented to come to terms with (18i-ii) (Tappe 1981:208ff, Sternefeld 1989,
Staudacher 1990, Haider 1993:189ff, Müller & Sternefeld 1993:497f; for an
overview see Müller 1993:449-485), all of them, however, far more inge-
nious than convincing. Worse, while (i) is at least conceptually suggestive,
(ii) looks so ad hoc that a principled solution covering both of them cannot
really be hoped for.

Now, it is easy to see that the data illustrating (18i-ii) would not pose seri-
ous problems under a parenthetical analysis: the ungrammaticality of (19)

would follow from the ungrammaticality of the putative host clauses (*Wo sie
wohnt jetzt?*, etc.), and the grammaticality pattern of (21)-(22) could be made
to follow from the ±well-formedness of the putative parentheticals, *er nur
wieder meint* in (21a) and *meint er, daß Peter geglaubt hat* in (21b) being ill-
formed parentheticals, *meint er, hat Peter geglaubt* in (22) being well-
formed.[11] The fact that this approach has never been considered in the litera-
ture is a strong sign of faith in the extraction analysis. An even stronger sign
is that further theorizing has been built on it: in particular, the initial gap re-
striction (18i) has been used as crucial evidence in a number of theoretical
contexts where extraction comes in, cf. Haider's argument (1986:116ff)
against Lasnik & Saito (1984) concerning the issue of intermediate traces, the
'canonical direction' argument by Cinque (1990:42; 169n.38) in support of
distinguishing between barriers for government and barriers for binding, the
argumentation for a sentential Top node by Müller & Sternefeld (1993:479ff),
or the debate about the minimalist conception of clause structure and verb
movement (Zwart 1993, Gärtner & Steinbach 1994:29ff, Zwart 1994:34ff,
Wilder 1993), to mention just the more prominent examples.

A further obvious 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. This too, how-
ever, has been simply ignored in discussions about the respective analyses.

My diagnosis of this state of affairs is that the vital role of extraction for
generative theorizing plus seemingly plausible expectations concerning V2-
extraction in German have prematurely canonized the wrong analysis. In the
following sections, I shall dissociate myself totally from this tradition by de-
fending (23),

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

and by showing, as a kind of corollary to (23), that if there is genuine V2-
extraction in German, it is not subject to the restrictions (18i-ii). In other
words, I am aiming at a complete reversal of the present generative picture of
V2-extraction in German.

3. Parenthetical vs. Extraction Analysis of EV2-Constructions: Against the Canonical Arguments

3.1 Methodological Objections

Let me begin with two methodological objections to the way the case of the parenthetical vs. the extraction analysis has up to now been argued.

The first is that the wrong type of parentheticals has been used for comparison. Obviously, EV2-constructions, if viewed as parenthetical constructions, are closest to VIP-constructions like (4)-(6), for the putative parenthetical would share all the properties outlined in (10), and differ only in position. We should expect then that the parenthetical hypothesis for EV2-constructions would be evaluated with respect to VIP-constructions as their parenthetical next of kin. ALL arguments in the canonical literature, however, are based on a comparison with unintegrated parentheticals as in (7), the existence of integrated parentheticals being unknown or neglected. This, of course, immediately invalidates the arguments against the parenthetical analysis based on crediting EV2-constructions with the 'integrated' prosodic properties (10iii) which bona fide parentheticals allegedly lack (see Grewendorf 1988:83ff, arguments a,c,f). The same goes for the argument based on ±occurrence of focus particles (*nur* 'only', *sogar* 'even', etc.) and certain sentence adverbials (ibid., argument e), which correlates with there being ±separate focus-background domains; see (25) below. But it also flaws the other arguments, as we shall see shortly.[12]

Note that even under an extraction analysis, at least some EV2-constructions MUST be analysed as VIP-structures, cf. (24),

(24)   *Wen fragt Hans, wird der Chef entlassen?* (Grewendorf 1988:84)
        whom asks H.   will the boss fire?
        'Who, Hans asks, is the boss going to fire?'

for *fragen* may not take *daß*- or V2-clauses (see also Mrotzek 1991:50f); neither is a true question interpretation corresponding to an extraction structure available (see 5.1 below). The minimal conclusion is that the extraction analysis of EV2-constructions does not hold in general.

The second problem is the absence of systematic comparison with bona fide extractions (see also below 4.1). This can also be illustrated by the prosodic properties of EV2-constructions: not only do they provide no evi-

dence against a parenthetical analysis, they rather provide evidence for it and against an extraction analysis, for bona fide VIP-constructions also have these properties, cf. (10iii), but bona fide extraction constructions do not; cf. (25) vs. (26):

(25)   ?**Wen glaubt (nur) HANS, wird der Chef entlassen?*

(26)   *Wen glaubt (nur) HANS, daß der Chef entlassen wird?*
        'Who does (only) Hans believe (that) the boss is going to fire?'

That this has gone unnoticed so far is due to the one-sided concentration on proving the parenthetical analysis wrong, which has been tacitly equated with proving the extraction analysis right, clearly a *non sequitur*.

The minimal conclusion from (25)-(26) is that EV2-constructions have inherently strong parenthetical characteristics. The real question to be asked then is whether there are additional characteristics that still force an extraction analysis of (a subclass of) EV2-constructions.

This brings us to the arguments commonly held to be decisive in favour of the extraction analysis.

3.2 Iterative EV2-Constructions

After Thiersch (1978:140), it was in particular Staudacher (1990:320) who used iterative EV2-constructions like (27)-(28) as an argument for the extraction analysis; according to Haider (1993:187), they provide the most compelling argument:

(27)   *Was **meint er behaupte Karl**, könne man nicht länger dulden?*
        what thinks he claims$_{subj.I}$ K.   can$_{subj.I}$ one no longer tolerate
        'What does he think Karl claims can no longer be tolerated?'

(28)   *Wieviel **glaubst du schätzt er**, daß das Auto kosten wird?*
        how much think you estimates he that the car cost will
        'How much do you think he estimates that the car will cost?'

However, it is not compelling enough, cf. (29)-(30):

(29)   *Was könne man **meint er behaupte Karl**, nicht länger dulden?*
        what can$_{subj.I}$ one thinks he claims$_{subj.I}$ K. no longer tolerate

(30)   *Was **glaubst du schätzt er**, wieviel das Auto kosten wird?*
        what believe you estimates he, how much the car cost will
        'How much do you think he estimates that the car will cost?'
        (!: **Was glaubst du er schätzt, wieviel das kosten wird?*)

(29) shows that iterated V1-expressions also occur in bona fide parenthetical positions, prosodically behaving like simple VIPs. And in (30), the iterated V1-expressions appear in the interrogative *was*-construction, which, under standard assumptions, does not undergo overt *was*-extraction at all (see McDaniel 1989).

No matter how these structures are to be analysed (for some suggestions see below 4.3), one thing is clear: since their occurrence is independent of extraction configurations, extraction cannot be crucial in accounting for them. Hence, iterative EV2-constructions are no argument for the extraction analysis.

3.3 Binding Data

The popular binding argument pro the extraction and contra the parenthetical analysis was originally based on binding contrasts like (31) vs. (32) (see Tappe 1981:204f):

(31) a.   *Karl$_i$ begann – wie er$_i$ gesagt hatte – zu schreien.*
          K.   began   as he said   had   to shout
          'As he had announced, Karl began to shout.'
     b.   **Er$_i$ begann – wie Karl$_i$ gesagt hatte – zu schreien.*

(32) a.   *Wen sagt Karl$_i$ hat er$_i$ gesehen?*
          whom said K. had he seen
          'Who did Karl say he had seen?'
     b.   **Wen sagt er$_i$ hat Karl$_i$ gesehen?*

Lately, improved versions of it relying on data from anaphoric and quantifier binding have been suggested (see Mrotzek 1991:57ff, Haider 1993:188f).

However, the argument is beside the point in all its forms. First, EV2-constructions are compared with the wrong type of parentheticals. Second, if we compare them with the right type, 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:

(33) a.   *Wen fragt Karl$_i$ hat er$_i$ gesehen?*
     b.   **Wen fragt er$_i$ hat Karl$_i$ gesehen?*

(34) a.   *Wen   meint (/fragt) jeder$_i$,   werde er$_i$ dort treffen?*
          whom thinks (/asks) everyone will$_{subj.}$ he there meet
          'Who does everyone think (/ask) will he meet there?'
     b.   **Wen meint (/fragt) er$_i$, werde jeder$_i$ dort treffen?*

Third, when comparing EV2-constructions with bona fide extraction constructions, matters are not as parallel as the extraction analysis would predict:[13]

(35) [*Heinz glaubt, daß du die meisten Kollegen sehr schätzt, aber*]
     a.   *IHN$_i$ meint Heinz$_i$, daß du t$_i$ verachtest.* (example by T.N. Höhle)
     b.   *?IHN$_i$ meint Heinz$_i$, verachtest du t$_i$.*
          '[Heinz believes that you think highly of most colleagues, but]
          him$_i$ Heinz$_i$ thinks (that) you despise.'

(36) a.   **Wen$_i$ meinst du, daß seine$_i$ Mutter abgeholt hat?*
          whom think you that his mother up-picked has
     b.   *?Wen$_i$ meinst du, hat seine$_i$ Mutter abgeholt?*
          whom think you has his mother up-picked
          'Who$_i$ do you think (that) his$_i$ mother has picked up?'

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

3.4 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, whereas the predicates in EV2-constructions are not, cf. his examples (37)-(38):

(37) a.   *Hans – so sagt Karl (/*so fragt Karl) – hat Fritz getroffen.*
          H.   so says K.   so asks K.   has F. met
     b.   *Wen – *so sagt Karl (/so fragt Karl) – hat Fritz getroffen?*
          whom so says K.   so asks K.   has F. met

(38)   *Wen sagt (/meint/fragt) Karl hat Fritz getroffen?*
          whom says (/thinks/asks) K. has F. met
          'Who does Karl say (/think/ask) did Fritz meet?'

Since matrix predicates in extraction structures are not subject to coherence conditions with the overall sentence type, Tappe claims (followed by Grewen-

dorf 1988, Haider 1993) that the difference between (37) and (38) is an argument pro the extraction and contra the parenthetical analysis of EV2-constructions.

Since *fragen* cannot possibly figure in V2-extraction (see 3.1), the argument is not very strong to begin with. Apart from that, due to comparison with the wrong type of parentheticals, it is again 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 Tappe's coherence requirement of parentheticals with sentence type would condone, cf. (39),

(39) a. *Was wird sie meinst du (/glaubst du/sagt er/fragt er) tun?*
what will she think you (/believe you/says he/asks he) do
'What is she going to do, do you think (/does he say/does he ask)?'

b. *Was wird sie tun, meinst du (/glaubst du/sagt er/fragt er)?*

but we also find that the predicates occurring in postfinite position and those in prefinite (= EV2-)position cover, in fact, the SAME small semantic range: verbs of thinking, believing, saying.[15]

This is not to deny that some verbs may be better in prefinite than in postfinite VIP-positions, cf. for example *behaupten* ('claim') or *erzählen* ('recount'). 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*, etc. 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 (see Erteschik 1973).

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

3.5 Subjunctive Data

The subjunctive argument (implicit in Thiersch 1978, but never properly spelled out) is probably the strongest argument pro the extraction analysis of EV2-constructions. It is based on the distinctive uses the two subjunctive forms (so-called 'subjunctive I, II') have in German main vs. complement clauses: in main clauses, subjunctive I occurs in V2-declaratives and marginally in *wh*-V2-interrogatives, signalling reported speech only, whereas sub-

junctive II signals either reported speech or modus irrealis (V2-declaratives), or modus irrealis only (*wh*-V2-interrogatives). By contrast, subjunctive in complement clauses normally signals dependency of the complement on the matrix clause (viz. matrix-subject orientation of the complement proposition); in this use it is subject to licensing by the matrix verb, and subjunctive I and II are more or less interchangeable.

Since almost all predicates appearing in the EV2-construction license subjunctive in the V2-clauses dependent on them, the distinctive uses of the subjunctive seem to provide a clear diagnostics for EV2-structure, for under the extraction analysis the respective V2-clause is embedded, while under the parenthetical analysis it is the main clause. Applying this diagnostics, we find typical complement uses of the subjunctive in EV2-constructions (40) which may not appear in the bare main clause analogues (41): while subjunctive I/II in (40a,b) must or may be interpreted as mere signs of dependency, (41a,b) MUST be interpreted as cases of reported speech or modus irrealis respectively.

(40) a. *Wohin glaubt Peter, sei Petra gefahren?*
where-to believes P. is$_{subj.I}$ P. gone

b. *Wohin meint Peter, wäre Petra gefahren?*
where-to thinks P. is$_{subj.II}$ P. gone
'Where does Peter think Petra went?'

(41) a.(*)*Wohin sei Petra gefahren?*

b. *Wohin wäre Petra gefahren?*

At first glance, this looks like a very strong argument for the extraction analysis. And, in fact, bona fide VIP-constructions like (42) do not allow complement subjunctive use either ((42b) is good only in the modus irrealis reading):

(42) a. **Wohin sei Petra gefahren, glaubt sie?*

b. **Wohin wäre Petra gefahren, meint Peter?*

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

(43) a. *Wo   fragte sie, liege   das Problem?* (Haider 1993:188, (7f))
where asked she lies$_{subj.I}$ the problem
'Where's the problem, she asked.'

b. *Wo liege, fragte sie, das Problem?*

(44) a. *Dort liege glaubt sie, ein großes Problem.*
     b. *Dort liege glaubt sie habe (/hätte) er gesagt, ein großes Problem.*
         there lies believes she has (/had)$_{subj.I/II}$ he said a big problem
         'There is, she believes he (had) said, a big problem there.'

(43) shows that bona fide parentheticals in prefinite and postfinite position may also license complement subjunctive uses. (44) shows that this is not only true for verbs of saying (where subjunctive could be said to just indicate reported speech), but also for mental attitude verbs. In other words, the occurrence of complement subjunctive uses by no means presupposes 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. (40), (43)-(44). While this is certainly no more than a preliminary formulation, one thing is clear: the subjunctive data do not allow a conclusive argument for the extraction or against the parenthetical analysis either.

3.6 The Propositional Object Requirement of EV2-Predicates

Let me now turn to an argument that never surfaced in the debate, but was probably still operative in favour of the extraction analysis. It is a fact that all predicates occurring in EV2-constructions ('EV2-predicates') obey restriction (45):[16]

(45) EV2-predicates select a propositional argument, which is
      – lexically specified as a finite clausal argument in structural object position,
      – (in the declarative case) also realizable by a V2-clause.

It is also a fact that in EV2-constructions this argument is satisfied by the V2-clause the V1-expression containing the EV2-predicate is in construction with. Under the extraction analysis this is in line with standard conditions on argument satisfaction, for the V2-clause figures as the complement properly governed by the EV2-predicate. But it is not so under the parenthetical analysis, for the V2-clause is the main clause surrounding the V1-expression, and no object argument may in fact ever show up inside the VIP itself, cf. (46). In other words, if EV2-constructions are VIP-constructions, they consistently violate the theta-criterion and/or require an exceptional mechanism of theta-role assignment.[17]

(46) a. *Dort liege   glaubt sie das,   noch ein Problem.*
         there lies$_{subj.}$ believes she that still a problem
     b. *Dort liege sagt sie das Offensichtliche, noch ein Problem.*
         there lies$_{subj.}$ says she the obvious   still a problem

But, on closer inspection, this does not yield a viable argument pro the extraction and contra the parenthetical analysis either, for the same 'irregularities' are typical of ALL integrated parenthetical constructions:

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 the VIP being in a matrix-complement relation to its surface host clause, a number of 'slifting' and splitting operations would have to be postulated in order to derive the various surface structures. While this has well-known (though controversial) precedents,[18] it is conceptually more unattractive today than ever.

Take, second, the subclass of integrated *wie*-parentheticals ('*wie*-IPs').[19] They are formed from approximately the same predicates that appear in declarative VIP-constructions (see also Brandt 1994); likewise, the propositional object requirement is satisfied by the host clause, as is made obvious by its sensitivity towards the differing semantic complement restrictions of *glauben* vs. *finden* (47)-(48), and corresponding objects inside the *wie*-IP are impossible (49):

(47) a. *Das Auto kostet, wie Peter glaubt (/findet), zuviel.*
     b. *Das Auto kostet, wie Peter glaubt (/*findet), DM 53683.-.*
         'The car costs, as Peter thinks (/finds), too much/DM 53683.-.'

(48) a. *Peter glaubt (/findet), das Auto kostet zu viel.*
     b. *Peter glaubt (/*findet), das Auto kostet DM 53683.-.*
         'Peter thinks (/finds) the car costs too much/DM 53683.-.'

(49)   **Das Auto kostet, wie Peter es glaubt/findet, zuviel.*
         the car costs   as Peter it thinks (/finds) too-much

Hence, the theta-criterion is also violated in the same way, but in this case, obviously, there is not even a chance of resolving the conflict by a 'deep structure-plus-chopping operation' strategy (cf. note 18). But then there is no attraction in assuming a chopping operation anywhere, including in particular EV2-constructions. One might just as well take the 'insertion' analysis at face value. If so, this argument pro the extraction and contra the parenthetical analysis fails.

It might still be considered a problem, though, that the analysis of integrated parenthetical constructions (including VIP-constructions) should presuppose a nonstandard process of argument satisfaction: the object variable of the VIP-predicate must first be blocked, i.e. become a free parameter to be specified in co-text or context, which then is just as obligatorily specified by the host clause proposition.[20] But note that such a nonstandard, halfway 'pragmatic' process is independently needed anyway; cf. in particular

– passive cases, in which the (optional) agent argument usually satisfied by a *von*-phrase is satisfied by locative PPs (see Höhle 1978:147ff,158ff) or APs:

(50) *Der Agent wurde zwischen den Polizisten abgeführt.*
      the agent was   between the policemen away-led.
      'The agent was led away by the policemen.'

(51) *Al Dente wird   jetzt polizeilich gesucht.*
      Al Dente becomes now police-ly looked for.
      'Al Dente is wanted by the police now.'

– implicative constructions like (52), which are true coordinations in all relevant respects, but still allow the propositional argument required by the predicate in the first conjunct (usually satisfied by an infinitival clause) to be satisfied by the second conjunct (see Reis 1993):

(52) *Sei bloß nicht so blöd **und komm**.*
      be only not   so stupid and come.
      'Don't be so stupid as to come.'

– nominalizations like (53), in which arguments of the head are satisfied by attributive APs rather than the requisite DPs:[21]

(53) *der **deutsche** Angriff (auf), **spanisch-deutsche** Beziehungen*
      'Germany's attack (on)', 'relations between Spain and Germany'

In all these cases, the argument in question is apparently not projected into the syntax in its lexically prescribed form, but rather the corresponding variable gets specified by the respective phrase in boldface via an inferential process at a late interpretive level. One triggering factor is, obviously, that these phrases allow an interpretation that meets the semantic requirements on the missing arguments. Moreover, the predicate and the phrase picking up its dangling theta-role always belong to the same focus domain. It is intuitively plausible that this is a major factor in licensing theta-role assignments as those in (50)-

(53), for focus domains determine units of information structure (see Brandt 1990), requiring everything in them to be interpreted as part of a meaningful whole.

The parallels to the parenthetical constructions in question are obvious. In particular, these constructions fulfill the focus domain condition by virtue of being integrated. Thus, the exceptional theta-role assignment in VIP-constructions[22] does not only seem to follow a more general rule, but also to be systematically related to one of its defining properties: integration. But if the consequences of the VIP-analysis regarding theta-role assignment are non-ad hoc, nothing of the argument against the parenthetical analysis we started out with is left.

3.7 Two Recent Arguments

Finally, let me deal with two recent arguments pro the extraction analysis.

The first one (suggested by C. Wilder, p.c., see also Wilder 1993:§6.3) is based on the extraction behaviour of certain pronouns, cf. (54)-(55):

(54) a. *Es$_i$ geht t$_i$ hier um ein unlösbares Problem.*
         it goes here around an insoluble problem
         'We are dealing with an insoluble problem here.'

     b. **Es$_i$ glaubt er, daß t$_i$ hier um ein unlösbares Problem geht.*
         it believes he that here around an insoluble problem goes

(55) a. **Es glaubt er, geht hier um ein unlösbares Problem.*

     b. *Es geht hier glaubt er, um ein unlösbares Problem.*

(54) shows that nonreferential subject-*es* allows short movement, whereas long movement from *daß*-clauses is out. (55) shows that the analogous EV2-construction is also out, whereas postfinite VIP-variants are good. This suggests that EV2-constructions are extraction rather than VIP-structures.

But note that 'conjunction-adverbials' like (56), which are licensed in prefinite position just like VIPs – i.e. both types of expressions amalgamate with the head occupant of the initial field to form one constituent, see (57)-(58)[23] – are also incompatible with nonreferential *es* (likewise *man* 'one') in the initial field, cf. (59):

(56) *aber, jedoch, indessen* ('however'), *schließlich* ('finally'),
      jedenfalls ('at any rate'), etc.

(57) a. [*Wen aber*] *will jeder anstellen?*
'Who however does everybody want to hire?'
[*Wen meint er*] *will jeder anstellen?*
'Who does he think everybody wants to hire?'

b. [*Das Geld jedenfalls (/meint er)*] *will jeder haben.*
the money at-any-rate (/thinks he) wants everyone have
'Everyone wants to have the money at any rate (/he thinks).'

(58) [*Das Geld jedenfalls*], *das will jeder haben.*
[*Das Geld meint er*], *das will jeder haben.*

(59) **Es jedenfalls geht hier um ein unlösbares Problem.*

Hence, whatever the constraint is that rules out prefinite inserts after *es/man* in general, it also covers (55a), which, under the parenthetical analysis, is a case of prefinite VIP-insertion. Thus the data in (54)-(55) are fully compatible with the parenthetical analysis of EV2-constructions.

A second argument pro the extraction analysis is suggested by Afrikaans data cited in du Plessis (1977:724), cf. (60) (= his examples (5c-f)):[24]

(60) a. *waarvoor dink julle werk ons?*
wherefore think you work we

b. *waar/wat dink julle werk ons voor?*
where/what think you work we for

c. *waar/wat dink julle voor werk ons?*
where/what think you for work we
'What do you think we work for?'

The critical case is (60c), in which a preposition belonging to a *wh*-moved phrase is 'stranded' in an intermediate non-A-position: if (60c) is (i) grammatical, (ii) an extraction construction as du Plessis assumes, and (iii) a variant of the bona fide EV2-constructions (60a,b), then it would follow that Afrikaans EV2-constructions are extraction constructions. Since there are no appreciable differences between bona fide EV2-cases in Afrikaans and German, this would certainly be an argument for giving the German cases the same analysis.

However, all the premisses of the argument are open to doubt. First, my informants[25] judged (60c) and related cases as completely ungrammatical. But even if (60c) should be good in some dialects, (ii)-(iii) probably fail: note that Afrikaans a) allows V-final AND V2 in embedded *wh*-clauses (Waher

1982:65, Ponelis 1979:530f), b) has a doubling *wh*-construction (*waarvoor dink julle waarvoor werk ons?* (du Plessis 1977:725)), which according to my informants also occurs with V-final (... *waarvoor ons werk*), c) allows *wat* as the antecedent of dangling prepositions, although they cannot occur adjacently (du Plessis 1977). If so, (60c) may well be a peculiar instance of a doubling *wh*-construction with the *wh*-part in the embedded COMP left unrealized under identity with the matrix *wh*-phrase (which may be base-generated anyway, see (c)). Hence, neither (ii) nor (iii) need be accepted. But then there is no argument pro the extraction analysis any more.

To sum up: none of the canonical arguments pro the extraction and contra the parenthetical analysis stands up under scrutiny. Neither do the others I know of.

4. New Evidence pro the Parenthetical and contra the 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 ±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 again a clear diagnostics for the structure of EV2-constructions, for the structures assigned to them by the competing analyses differ precisely in this respect (complement vs. main clause status of the respective V2-clause).

Again the data confirm the parenthetical analysis. Compare the EV2-constructions in (61)-(62), in which *denn* (a question-specific modal particle) and *verdammt noch mal* (a pejorative expressive 'damn it') happily occur in the second, but not in the first clause. Note that in bona fide complement extraction cases it is predictably just the other way around, cf. (63)-(64):

(61) *Wohin glaubt sie, ist er denn (/verdammt noch mal) gefahren?*
where-to believes she is he MP (/damn it) gone
'Where does she think he went, damn it?'

(62) ?*Wohin glaubt sie **denn** (/**verdammt noch mal**), ist er
   gefahren?[26]

(63) *Wohin glaubt sie, daß er **denn** (/**verdammt noch mal**)
   gefahren ist?

(64) Wohin glaubt sie **denn** (/**verdammt noch mal**), daß er
   gefahren ist?

Much the same point can be made using discourse connectives like adverbial *nur* ('only'), *übrigens* ('by the way'), etc., which, although restricted to main clauses, may occur in the initial position of EV2-constructions, cf. (65)-(66):

(65) (...) *Hans glaubt, nur sei es schon zu spät.
     H. believes only is$_{subj.I}$ it already too late.

(66) (...) Nur glaubt Hans, sei es schon zu spät.
     only believes H. is$_{subj.I}$ it already too late.
     'It's only that Hans believes it's already too late.'

This shows that (61) and (66) 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; in particular it is licit only with so-called 'B[ridge]-predicates'. Likewise, only a certain class of predicates may appear in VIPs ('VIP-predicates'). The corresponding predictions for EV2-constructions are then as follows: if they are extraction structures, the EV2-predicates must be B-predicates (as well as V2-predicates); if they are VIP-structures, the EV2-predicates must be VIP-predicates.

  Since these classes are largely coextensive, the question is, of course, whether there is any testable difference between these predictions at all. Unexpectedly there is, the distinctive case being 'preference predicates', i.e. predicates expressing preference for the alternative described in the complement (*besser/das Beste sein* 'be better/best', *jemandem lieber sein/vorziehen* 'prefer', *wollen/wünschen* 'wish', etc.), which, in keeping with the conditional flavour of the whole construction, may be introduced by *wenn* (alternating with *daß*):[27]

(67) a. Es ist besser, wenn (/daß) du zu Fuß dorthin gehst.
    it is better if (/that) you on foot there-to go
    'It's better you walk there.'

  b. Mir wäre lieber, wenn (/daß) er damit aufhören würde.
    Me$_{dat.}$ was$_{subj.II}$ nice-er if (/that) he that-with stop would$_{subj.II}$
    'I'd prefer for him to stop it.'/'I'd rather he stopped it.'

Now, preference predicates are also V2-predicates (68), as well as respectable B-predicates, no matter whether the complementizer is *daß* or *wenn* (69). They are, however, unacceptable in bona fide VIP-constructions (70)-(71),

(68) a. Es ist besser, du gehst zu Fuß dorthin.
  b. Mir wäre lieber, er würde damit aufhören.

(69) a. ?Dorthin ist (es) besser, wenn (/daß) du zu Fuß gehst.
  b. ?Damit wäre mir lieber, wenn (/daß) er aufhören würde.

(70) a. *Dorthin gehst du, ist (es) besser, zu Fuß.
  b. *Damit würde er, wäre mir lieber, bald aufhören.

(71) a. *Dorthin gehst du zu Fuß, ist (es) besser.
  b. *Damit würde er aufhören, wäre mir lieber.

yielding the testable difference we looked for; cf. the summaries of our findings:

(72) Preference predicates are B-predicates as well as V2-predicates, but not VIP-predicates.

(73) VIP-predicates include verbs of saying, thinking, and believing, but no preference predicates.

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

(74) a. *Dorthin ist (es) besser, gehst du zu Fuß.
    there-to is (it) better go you on foot
  b. *Damit wäre mir lieber, würde er aufhören.
    that-with was$_{subj.II}$ me$_{dat.}$ nice-er would he stop

In view of (72), this is incompatible with the extraction analysis, but it jibes well with the parenthetical analysis. In fact, it is easy to see that (73) also covers the predicate distribution in EV2-constructions, i.e. (75) holds:

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

The only way to make sense of this correlation is to conclude that EV2-constructions as a whole are prefinite VIP-constructions. This provides strong evidence for the parenthetical analysis.[28]

4.3 Differences in Relative Predicate Scope

A further testing ground is provided by iterated EV2-constructions (cf. 3.2). Since the extraction analysis imposes on them the same hierarchical structure as on iterated *daß*-extraction cases and multiply embedded complement constructions in general, cf. (76), the prediction is that they are all interpreted in the same way, the relative predicate scope being determined by the embedding relation.

(76) a. *wenn sie glaubt,   daß alle meinen,   daß das Problem gelöst ist*
        if   she believes that all think   that the problem solved is

     b. *wenn sie glaubt,   alle meinen,   das Problem ist gelöst*
        if   she believes all think   the problem is solved
        'if she believes (that) everyone thinks (that) the problem is solved'
        [1   [2   [3   ]]]
        relative predicate scope: √ 1>[2>[3]], * 2>[1>[3]]

The prediction is borne out with respect to *daß*-extraction constructions:

(77)   *Das Problem$_i$ glaubt sie,   daß alle meinen,   daß t$_i$ gelöst ist.*
        [1   [2   [3   ]]]
        relative predicate scope: √ 1>[2>[3]], * 2>[1>[3]]

But it is certainly not borne out with respect to EV2-constructions:

(78)   *Das Problem glaubt$_{ind.}$ sie meinen$_{ind.}$ alle, ist gelöst.*[29]
        the problem believes   she think   all   is solved
        'The problem she believes everybody thinks is solved.'
        relative predicate scope: √ 1>[2>[3]], √ 2>[1>[3]]

(79) a. *Was behauptet$_{ind.}$ A meine$_{subj.I}$ B, könne man iterieren?*
        what claims   A think$_{subj.I}$ B can$_{subj.}$ one iterate
        'What does A claim B thinks can be iterated?'
        relative predicate scope: √ 1>[2>[3]], * 2>[1>[3]]

     b. *Was behaupte$_{subj.I}$ A meint$_{ind.}$ B, könne man iterieren?*
        what claim$_{subj.I}$ A thinks   B can$_{subj.}$ one iterate
        relative predicate scope: * 1>[2>[3]], √ 2>[1>[3]]

(78)-(79) show 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 (76)-(77). At the same time, they show that linearity cannot be the factor determining predicate scope either. This is confirmed by (79), where it is clearly the distribution of indicative vs. subjunctive as such that is decisive. It is easy to understand how and why this can be the case: interpreting a complex clause like (79a) or (79b) amounts to finding a consistent interpretation integrating all its parts, which means that the mutual relationship of the *behaupten* proposition and the *meinen* proposition must also be determined. Subjunctive in the respective parts of complex clauses like (79) signals dependency on a licensing verb, a role *meinen* as well as *behaupten* could fill. Hence, in 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 VIPs in bona fide parenthetical position behave the same way, cf. (80):

(80)   *Das Problem wurde damals glaubt sie meinen alle gut gelöst.*
        the problem was   then believes she think   all well solved
        'The problem was she believes everybody thinks solved well at the time.'
        relative predicate scope: √ 1>[2>[3]], √ 2>[1>[3]]

A satisfactory way to account for this behaviour is the following: let us assume that iterated VIPs do not form one complex parenthetical à la (81)-(82) – 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 or not it already contains another VIP, cf. (83)-(84):

(81)   *Das Problem [glaubt sie meinen alle] ist gelöst.*

(82)   *Das Problem wurde damals [glaubt sie meinen alle] gut gelöst.*

(83) a. *Das Problem [glaubt sie] meinen alle ist gelöst.*
     b. *Das Problem glaubt sie [meinen alle] ist gelöst.*

(84) a. *Das Problem wurde damals [glaubt sie] meinen alle gut gelöst.*
  b. *Das Problem wurde damals glaubt sie [meinen alle] gut gelöst.*

If this is so, the linear order of VIPs is nothing but the accidental result of insertion, hence cannot be expected to play a role in interpretation, for a) interpretation respects structure, and b) according to (83)-(84), every VIP is directly related to the proposition of the host clause as a whole, of which the other VIP, having applied to the proposition before, is just one part. It is easy to see how on this basis all the data from relative scope can be made to follow: sentences containing iterated VIPs are always structurally ambiguous, and the structural ambiguity translates directly into a scope ambiguity, see (78) and (80), (83)-(84), unless a nonstructural factor resolving it – for example subjunctive as in (79) – intervenes.[30]

As far as I can see, there is no pertinent argument whatever against adopting (83)-(84) as structures of iterated VIP-clauses. Hence, the data from relative predicate scope are not only a strong argument against the extraction analysis, but are also one in favour of the parenthetical analysis of EV2-constructions.

4.4 The (Vanishing) Problems with the Putative Extraction Process

As already pointed out in section 2.2, the extraction analysis causes serious problems for the putative extraction process, (18i-ii), for which a parenthetical analysis suggests a simple way out: the data motivating (18i-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 be, of course, a crucial argument pro the parenthetical and contra the extraction analysis. The following data (which concern the well-formedness of (integrated) parentheticals only, the pertinent regularities of host clause structures being well-known) show that it does work (IP='integrated parenthetical'):

(85) a. *Dort gibt es* [IP] *noch ein Problem* [IP].
  there gives it   still   a problem
  'There's still a problem there.'

  IP=√*glaubt er* (V1), *er glaubt (V2), *er geglaubt hat (V-FINAL)
      believes he   he believes   he believed has

  b. *Was wird er* [IP] *morgen tun* [IP]*?*
  what will he   tomorrow do
  'What's he going to do tomorrow?'
  IP=√*meinst du* (V1), *du meinst (V2), *er gemeint hat (V-FINAL)
      think you   you think   he thought has

(86) a. *Dort gibt es* [IP] *noch ein Problem* [IP].
  IP= **glaubt sie er meint* (V1-V2),
        ??*glaubt sie, daß er meine*subj.I (V1-*daß*+V-FINAL)

  b. *Was wird er* [IP] *morgen tun* [IP]*?*
  IP= **glaubst du sie meint* (V1-V2),
        **glaubst du, daß sie meint* (V1-*daß*+V-FINAL),
        **fragt sie, ob er glaubt* (V1-*ob*+V-FINAL)

(87)   *Dort gibt es* [IP] *noch ein Problem* [IP].
  IP=V1-INFINITIVALS:

  √*könnte man meinen,*
  could one think   'could one think'
  ?*meinst du sagen zu können,*
  think you say to can   'you think you can say'
  ??*war er so nett ihm zu sagen,*
  was he so nice him_dat. to tell   'he kindly told him'
  ?*überredet er Hans dazu anzunehmen*
  persuades he H. that-to to assume 'he persuades H. to assume'

From (85) we learn that 'bare' integrated parentheticals must be V1 (i.e. VIPs). (86) shows that VIPs with finite V2 or *daß/ob*-complements are, as a rule, impossible, whereas the acceptability of infinitival structures (87) seems to vary with syntactic 'coherence'; in other words, the closer an infinitival structure is to functioning like 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 (see 2.2) are in fact ruled out in bona fide VIP-contexts, and only the simple V1-structure (including apparent iterations, see 3.2, 4.3) is clearly ruled in. The infinitival variation in postfinite parentheticals is in line with what we find in EV2-constructions (see Haider 1993:191f). Hence, all the data that cause the notorious problems (18i-ii) for the extraction analysis can be accounted for under the parenthetical analysis, thus providing a crucial argument for adopting the latter.[31]

4.5 Comparative Evidence

In view of the last three arguments, the case pro the parenthetical and contra the extraction analysis of EV2-structures is practically clinched. Rounding off the structural argumentation, let us look at some evidence from closely related languages that also have the EV2-construction. Let me just mention two instances:

It is reported in Penner & Bader (1991:80n.1) that Bernese Swiss German has a peculiar type of extraction from *daß*-complements involving resumptive pronouns, cf. (88), unknown in Standard German. Significantly, there are no corresponding EV2-constructions (89):

> (88) *Wär hesch   gseit dass du ne geschter troffe hesch?*
>   who have-you said that you him yesterday met have
>   'Who did you say that you met yesterday?'

> (89) **Wär hesch   gseit hesch   ne geschter troffe?*
>   who have-you said have-you him yesterday met
>   'Who did you say you met yesterday?'

For Penner & Bader, who adhere to the standard view that cases like (89) are V2-extraction constructions, this discrepancy is a problem they just have to leave open. However, if EV2-constructions are parenthetical constructions, this discrepancy is to be expected, for 'short' constructions are apparently impossible:

> (90) **Wär hesch   ne geschter troffe?*
>   who have-you him yesterday met
>   'Who did you meet yesterday?'

Since the Bernese Swiss EV2-construction is like the Standard German one in all relevant respects,[32] the data (88)-(90) can be taken as an additional argument for the parenthetical analysis (provided, of course, that Bernese Swiss allows for VIPs in the same way as Standard German, which it most likely does).

The other instance is Standard Dutch, which also has the EV2-construction, cf. (91). Again there is no reason to analyse it differently from the EV2-construction in Standard German.

> (91) a. *Wie zei Jan zou   hij niet helpen?* (Weerman 1989:142, (154b))
>   who said J. would he not help
>   'Who did Jan say he wouldn't help?'

>   b. *In Bern zegt Jan bevindt zich de schat.*
>   in Berne says J. finds itself the treasure
>   'The treasure, Jan says, is in Berne.'
>   c. *Wie gelooft (/vindt) Jan moet men kiezen.*
>   who believes (/finds) J. shall one choose
>   'Who does Jan believe (/think) should be chosen?'

However, as is well-known, while Dutch has V2 main clauses just like German, the occurrence of embedded V2-clauses is severely restricted: for some, it is confined to 'Colloquial Dutch', while for others, embedded V2-clauses are standardly possible, at least in reported speech/'erlebte Rede' contexts:[33]

> (92) a. *Jan zei hij zou ons niet helpen.* (Weerman 1989:142, (154a))
>   b. *?Jan zegt de schat bevindt zich in Bern.*
>   c. **Jan gelooft men moet Porz kiezen.*
>   d. *?Jan vindt men moet Porz kiezen.*

Be this as it may, the point is that the EV2-construction apparently IS standard, and not subject to the 'erlebte Rede' restrictions at all; see (92). Hence, a potential 'V2-extraction domain' does not independently exist. This is an obvious argument against the extraction analysis,[34] and (with the same proviso as in the case of Bernese Swiss German) in favour of the parenthetical analysis of EV2-constructions.

4.6 Conclusion

In 4.1-4.5 strong arguments were presented supporting the parenthetical over the extraction analysis. Hence, the overall conclusion to be drawn from sections 3 and 4 is clear: all EV2-constructions are prefinite VIP-constructions. In other words, (23) is correct.

5. Arguments from Interpretation

5.1 On So-Called 'Parenthetical' vs. 'Bridge' Interpretations

Given the above conclusion, we should also expect that the interpretation of EV2-constructions is parallel to that of VIP-constructions rather than to that of extraction constructions, in short: that the V1-expressions have a 'paren-

thetical' rather than a 'bridge' interpretation. But what kind of difference in interpretation does this amount to and in which contexts does it show up?

The only discussion of this question I am aware of is by Mrotzek (1991:49ff, 97f). Contrasting examples involving verbs of saying such as (93)-(94),

(93)   *Wen sagt Paul hat Ernst gesehen?*
       whom says P. has E. seen

(94)   *Wen fragt Paul hat Ernst gesehen?*
       whom asks P. has E. seen

she points out that (93) has two readings: (i) as an indirect speech report, i.e. (93) may be used for reporting a situation in which Paul said/asked *Wen hat Ernst gesehen?* ('Who did Ernst see?'), (ii) as a true question inquiring about the identity of the person Paul said that Ernst saw, i.e. (93) may be used in a situation in which the speaker of (93) assumes that Paul has said who the person seen by Ernst was, and does not know whom Paul actually named. Mrotzek (1991) identifies (i) as the 'parenthetical' and (ii) as the 'bridge' reading, claiming that (ii) calls for an extraction analysis of EV2-constructions. Apparent confirmation for this is provided by the fact that EV2-constructions involving purely parenthetical, nonbridge verbs like (94) admit only reading (i).

However, while (93) certainly has the two readings, their identification as given cannot be correct: first, the same two readings also occur with postfinite VIP-constructions, cf. (95), where an extraction analysis is out of the question. Hence, both (i) and (ii) are 'parenthetical' interpretations, albeit different ones.

(95) a.   *Wen hat Ernst sagt Paul, damals gesehen?*
          whom has E. says P. then seen
     b.   *Wen hat Ernst damals gesehen, sagt Paul?*
          whom has E. then seen says P.

Second, the distinction in readings does not carry over to EV2-constructions involving attitudinal verbs, nor to the respective VIP-constructions in general:

(96) a.   *Wen glaubst du hat Ernst gesehen?*
     b.   *Wen hat Ernst gesehen, glaubst du?*

The sentences in (96) have just one reading, which always corresponds to (ii), no matter which position the VIP is in. Hence, (ii) is 'the' parenthetical

reading – all VIPs in all positions have it in common. But then the initial identification of (i) vs. (ii) as 'parenthetical' vs. 'bridge' reading is completely untenable.

From this it follows first that the ambiguity of cases like (93) is no argument pro the extraction analysis of EV2-constructions. Second, the reported speech reading (i) of VIP-constructions should be set apart from the true parenthetical reading (ii), which is in principle available with all declarative VIP-predicates.[35] Third, in order to find out what a 'bridge' reading really is and how it differs from the parenthetical reading (ii), we have to compare VIP-constructions with bona fide *daß*-clause-extractions. Since it has been well-known since Erteschik (1973) (see also Erteschik & Lappin 1979) that bridge conditions are largely 'nondominance' conditions determined by many of the factors that also figure in VIP-constructions (±semantic complexity, ±focus, ±factivity, etc.), we should not expect gross differences – even the failure to find any would not detract from the analysis proposed here. But if we do find any, they will, of course, provide an important testing ground for the parenthetical analysis of EV2-constructions.

5.2   True Interpretive Differences

5.2.1   Given the structural differences between parenthetical and extraction constructions (see sections 1 and 4.3), we can derive one clear prediction for their respective meanings: under the extraction analysis, the V1-expression is part of the proposition affected by the respective sentence moods, i.e. of the proposition that is ultimately asserted or *wh*-questioned, while under the parenthetical analysis it is not. While this is a clear difference in theory (and unaffected by the convergence in communicative weight pointed out in 5.1), it frequently does not lead to a clear empirical difference; cf. the minimal pairs (97)-(98), where extraction and VIP-structures are virtually indistinguishable in meaning.

(97) a.   *Wo   glaubt er,   daß sie seither wohnt?*
          where believes he that she since-then lives
     b.   *Wo wohnt sie glaubt er, seither?*
     b'. *Wo wohnt sie seither, glaubt er?*

(98) a.   *Wo glaubst du, daß sie seither wohnt?*
     b.   *Wo wohnt sie glaubst du, seither?*
     b'. *Wo wohnt sie seither, glaubst du?*

Why this is so is easy to understand: since a) VIP- and extraction structures involve the same component parts, albeit in different relations, b) the natural relation between these components is the predicate-argument relation embodied in the grammatical meaning of extraction structures, c) every utterance of a structure must get a reasonable interpretation integrating all its parts (be it by mere instantiation or additional inferencing), interpreting extraction structures and VIP-structures will often, almost inevitably, result in the same utterance meaning.

Still, by using 1st person rather than 2nd or 3rd person in the V1-expression, a difference between extraction-based and parenthetical *wh*-questions can be forced:

(99) a. [*Na rat mal:*]   *Wo glaub ich, daß sie seither wohnt?*
         [DP guess MP]   (DP = discourse particle)
         '[Well, guess:] Where do I believe that she has lived since then?'

    b. [*Na rat mal:*]   **Wo wohnt sie glaub ich, seither?*
    b'. [*Na rat mal:*]   **Wo wohnt sie seither, glaub ich?*

Likewise, it could be shown that declarative minimal pairs converge in 1st and 3rd person cases, while differing in 2nd person cases. Obviously then, the varying outcomes are systematically predictable from the different propositional makeup of extraction vs. parenthetical structures (interacting with the semantics/pragmatics of interrogatives vs. declaratives in their distinctive relation to 1st vs. 2nd person). This permits us to use differences like in (99) as a diagnostic test for parenthetical vs. extraction structure.

Applying it to EV2-constructions, we find that (100b) is far worse than (99a),

   (100) a. *Wo glaubt er (/glaubst du), wohnt sie seither?*
        b. [*Na rat mal:*] ??*Wo glaub ich, wohnt sie seither?*

contrary to what the extraction analysis predicts. To be sure, (100b) is not as bad as (99b,b'), but since this is apparently related to the position of the VIP in the host proposition,[36] the data in (100) clearly strengthen the parenthetical analysis.

5.2.2 To present just one more case in point,[37] let us look at the interpretive evidence provided by data like (101)-(102):

(101) a. *Sie glaubt, daß Fox hier populärer ist als er ist.*
           she believes that F. here popular-er is than he is
           'She believes that Fox is more popular here than he is.'

       b. *Wo (/Hier) ist Fox populärer als er ist.*
           where (/here) is F. popular-er than he is

(102)   *Wo   (/Hier) ist Fox populärer als er ist, glaubt sie.*
           where (/here) is F. popular-er than he is, believes she

As originally pointed out by Reinhart (1983:173f), matrix-complement structures like (101a) have a 'consistent' and an 'inconsistent' reading, whereas bona fide VIP-structures (102) and 'bare' main clauses (101b) have just the inconsistent reading. This difference 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 source, the VIP-subject (102) and the speaker (101b) respectively, who are thus assigned inconsistent beliefs, whereas in (101a) the inconsistent propositions need not, but can be assigned to different sources, the matrix subject vs. the speaker, yielding a consistent interpretation.

Extending these observations to *daß*-extraction and EV2-cases (103)-(104),

(103)   *Wo (/Hier)   glaubt sie, daß Fox populärer ist als er ist.*
           where (/here) believes she that F. popular-er is than he is

(104)   *Wo (/Hier)   glaubt sie, ist Fox populärer als er ist.*
           where (/here) believes she is F. popular-er than he is

we find that the former do admit both readings (although the inconsistent reading seems to be preferred), whereas the latter admit only the inconsistent reading, just like bona fide VIP-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 containing V2-clauses do not readily allow the additional consistent reading either:

(105)   *Sie glaubt, Fox ist hier populärer als er ist.*

The judgements on this are no doubt murky, but no matter which one is right, the extraction analysis will have a problem: if cases like (105) are taken to admit the inconsistent reading only, this saves the extraction analysis from this one particular argument, but casts doubt on the central assumption (13) underlying this analysis – what else could we cast doubt on in accounting for

the interpretive difference between (101a) and (105)? If, on the other hand, cases like (105) are taken to admit both readings, (13) is preserved, but so is the counterargument against the extraction analysis based on (101)-(102).

In sum, the data in (101)-(102) are most likely an argument for the parenthetical and against the extraction analysis at the same time.

5.3 Conclusion

All the interpretive data we have looked at in this section provide additional support for the parenthetical analysis of EV2-constructions. With the grammatical argumentation thus definitely completed, let me just point out that the parenthetical analysis can also be tested (and apparently confirmed) in 'extra-grammatical' areas, such as language processing[38] and analogical phenomena (no matter whether they are just exceptional or also the beginning of diachronic change).[39] Last but not least, it seems that the VIP-analysis proposed for EV2-constructions cannot only be integrated into a consistent account of the grammar of VIP-constructions, but also provides a suitable basis for deriving their pragmatic properties (see Reis 1995:§6). Since this is something one can only expect from an analysis that is grammatically correct, I take it as a final touch of evidence in support of the parenthetical analysis of EV2-constructions I have been defending.

6. On V2-Extraction in German

If the conclusion from sections 3 through 5 is to be accepted, does this mean that there is no extraction from V2-clauses in German at all? Not necessarily, for hitherto unnoticed cases of 'normal' V2-extraction exist, albeit marginally (interestingly, in just those cases where EV2-constructions fail, see 4.2 and below):

(106) a. *Dorthin ist (es) besser, du gehst zu Fuß t.*
        there-to is (it) better   you go on foot

    b. *Damit   wäre   mir   lieber, er würde   t   bald aufhören.*
        that-with was$_{subj.II}$ me$_{dat.}$ nice-er he would$_{subj.II}$ soon stop

    c. *Worüber   wünschte   er, er hätte   gleich mehr t erfahren?*
        what-about wished$_{subj.II}$ he he had$_{subj.II}$ right-away more heard

(107) a. *Dorthin meinte er, daß es besser sei, ich ginge t zu Fuß.*
        there-to thought he that it better is$_{subj.I}$ I went$_{subj.II}$ on foot

    b. *..., wohin er gemeint hat, es sei besser, ich ginge t zu Fuß.*
        ..., where-to he thought has it is$_{subj.I}$ better I went$_{subj.II}$ on foot

What is normal about them is that the restrictions (18i-ii) do not hold: contrary to (18i), the constituents are extracted from their base-position, the initial field being always filled, see (106)-(107); contrary to (18ii), extraction via and into non-V2 clauses is possible (107). What is marginal about them is twofold:

– Their occurrence is severely restricted: a) the only possible bridges are preference predicates (see 4.2),[40] b) only (certain types of) adjuncts may be extracted, cf. (106)-(107), while arguments (subjects and objects) may not:[41]

(108)   *Die Papiere wäre (es) besser, du würdest t sofort vernichten.*
        the papers was$_{subj.II}$ (it) better you would right-away destroy

– Acceptability judgements on cases like (106)-(107) are strongly divided: some speakers find them just as bad as the EV2-versions in (74), and the corresponding extractions from daß-/wenn-clauses in (69) much better. But just as many others find (106)-(107) quite good, sometimes even better than (69), and always by far superior to (74), which are unanimously rated as ungrammatical.

Given this, the conclusion to be drawn is janus-faced: on the one hand, cases like (106)-(107) are undoubtedly instances of normal V2-extraction (i.e. (18i-ii) do not hold, and the restrictions (a)-(b) are structurally normal in type).[42] 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 V2-extraction in German POTENTIALLY follows the 'normal' pattern. To put it differently: IF – for whatever synchronic or diachronic reason – bona fide V2-extractions exceptionally occur, they are not subject to (18i-ii).

While this is a satisfying result for extraction theory, it leaves open the central descriptive issue for German: what does it mean in terms of grammar for V2-extractions to be exceptional (nonstandard, marginal)? I cannot dwell on this issue at length here, so let me just point out what the options are:

The key fact upon which any account must center is certainly that V2-

extraction is restricted to V2-constructions involving preference predicates (= 'ppV2-constructions'). A GRAMMAR-INTERNAL account for V2-extraction would have to show then that (i) the possibility vs. impossibility of V2-extraction can be plausibly related to a structural difference between ppV2- and other V2-constructions, and (ii) its limited occurrence results from further restrictions that have a grammatical basis. If (i)-(ii) hold, V2-extraction would be exceptional (in the accepting idiolects) only in the sense of being rare, due to the rare occurrence of the complex configuration licensing it.

Now, given the distinctive 'conditional' flavour of ppV2-constructions (plus their distinctive behaviour concerning *es*-correlates and focus-background-structure), a structural difference may well exist. The snag is that these ppV2-properties usually prevent extraction,[43] so (i) seems at present hard to fulfil. If so, the chances for a grammar-internal account of V2-extraction in German are slight.

This leaves the option of treating cases like (106)-(107) as EXTRA-GRAMMATICAL (and in this sense 'exceptional') phenomena, which are not 'produced' by principles/rules of grammar, but rather live on analogy to such regular products: i.e. they are formed after the model of constructions with similar functions. There can be no doubt that many marginal synchronic and diachronic phenomena are of this nature, with functional needs typically coming into play.

There is at least one piece of evidence suggesting that ppV2-extractions have to be treated in this way: since preference predicates and VIP-predicates are in complementary distribution (see 4.2), (109) also holds:

(109)   V2-predicates that allow VIP-constructions do not allow normal
         V2-extraction constructions and vice versa.

Since VIP-constructions are functionally (not structurally!) so close to *daß*-extraction constructions that they often act as functional alternatives (see 5.2), (109) allows a plausible functional interpretation: if the need for corresponding constructions on a V2-basis arises, we have recourse to V2-extraction constructions if and only if VIP-constructions are unavailable. In the case of verbs of saying, thinking, and believing, which freely allow VIP-constructions, recourse to extra-grammatical means is never needed. This leaves ppV2-constructions as the only possible case of need, with analogy (significantly to *daß*-extraction rather than EV2-cases) being the last and only resort.

Since there are also functional differences between VIP- and extraction constructions (see 5.2), and since I do not know how much of them analogical processes tolerate, I shall not press the issue any further. So let me conclude by just stating the obvious: ppV2-extraction cases are no doubt in need of further research; still, the odds are at present in favour of an extra-grammatical account.

7. Final remarks

The results of this paper can be summarized as follows: (i) EV2-constructions are prefinite VIP- rather than extraction constructions; (ii) there is (probably) no V2-clause extraction in German to be accounted for in core grammar at all.

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

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

Second, there are comparative consequences: since German now joins the ranks of Germanic languages that disallow extraction from clauses with 'main clause' word order, many comparative Germanic issues concerning clause structure, subordination and extraction will have to be reformulated, and previous proposals reconsidered. Likewise, the grammar of VIP-constructions suggests itself as a necessary comparative supplement.

Third, there are language specific consequences: if (i) AND (ii) are correct, the 'complement' status of embedded V2-clauses in German is open to doubt; if (ii) is not correct (see 6.), it is the unity of their structural analysis that runs into trouble. At any rate, ppV2-constructions become an interesting descriptive issue, and so does, as a consequence of (i), the grammar and pragmatics of VIP-constructions in general.

Fourth, in arguing for (i)-(ii), we took note not only of the differences between parenthetical and (bona fide) extraction constructions, but also of remarkable points of contact: the semantic and pragmatic factors defining VIPs and bridge expressions largely overlap, VIP- and extraction constructions often behave as functional variants (see sections 5.2 and 6), and there may even be constructions sharing the salient properties of both.[44] Since these similarities cannot be predicted from the different structures in question, they

constitute a (hitherto unnoticed) problem of explanation that may be hard to handle unless functional as well as construction-specific notions are given some of the attention they have traditionally enjoyed.

In sum, there are many exciting problems waiting for the intensive care (18i-ii) no longer need.

Notes

*   Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the GGS meeting in Tübingen, the S&P network meeting in Rendsburg, in lectures at the Universities of Lund and Potsdam, and at the ASG, Berlin, all in 1994. I am grateful to all the audiences for useful discussion. Special thanks are due to M. Brandt, F. d'Avis, T.N. Höhle, U. Lutz, J. Pafel, I. Rosengren, and I. Zimmermann, who were particularly helpful in tackling various problems discussed here. – Major parts of the present paper (sections 1-3.5, 4.1-4.5, 5) are abridged and revised versions of the corresponding sections in Reis (1995). As for the related issues of V1-parentheticals and embedded V2-clause structures, see Reis (1995:§6) and Reis (in prep.) respectively.

1.   This term is meant to be neutral regarding the competing analyses in question (EV2 being a happy abbreviation at least in German, since E may stand for 'Extraktion' as well as 'Einschub' (='parenthetical')). – In citing EV2- and related constructions, my ±using commas before and after the V1-expression in question has no linguistic significance. If necessary, intonational breaks will be indicated by dashes ("–"), and the main accented syllable by capital letters.

2.   Cf. Andersson & Kvam (1984:80ff), who also provide a rare example of explicit argumentation against an extraction analysis of EV2-constructions (ibid. 53ff).

3.   For some elaboration of (a)-(c) see Reis (1995:§6).

4.   There exists no systematic work on the prosodic properties of German parentheticals (nor in particular of V1-parentheticals), so the following remarks are of necessity somewhat impressionistic.

5.   (c) is meant to cover two facts about 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 (e.g. the postfinite example (32-01) in Uhmann 1994:287) bear this out.

6.   While V1-parentheticals are the prime examples for integrated use, other types that may (but need not) be used this way are *wie*-parentheticals (see Brandt 1994, Zimmermann 1994), and perhaps also *so*-parenthticals (see Reis 1995:§6.1f).

7.   For a short overview see Reis & Rosengren (1992:81ff), and especially Lühr (1988).

8.   It is often claimed (i.a. by Grewendorf 1989:54, Müller 1993:362f,364f, n.7) that the two classes are completely identical. There is no good reason for this; see Reis (1994).

9.   For an explicit statement to this effect see i.a. Müller (1993:386f), Webelhuth (1992:89). However, English and the Scandinavian languages also have true subordinate V2-clauses, cf. (i)-(ii), which considerably complicates the popular analogy outlined in the text. As for 'V2' rather than 'complementizer drop' as the appropriate tertium comparationis for comparative Germanic issues involving German embedded V2-clauses, see Reis (in prep.).

(i)   Engl.:   *I found out that never before **had** he had to borrow money.*
(ii)   Swed.:   *Hasse sa att han **är** inte rädd för Ryska ubåtar.*
                  'Hasse said that he is not afraid of Russian submarines.'

10. First inklings of such an analysis are to be found in Ebert (1975:167f), although based on rather questionable data. (I am indebted to T.N. Höhle for drawing my attention to this reference.)

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

12. This also affects the argumentations by Mrotzek (1991) and Pittner (1994), who likewise oppose (parts of) the standard extraction analysis of EV2-constructions.

13. I am indebted to T.N. Höhle for pointing out the Weak Crossover contrasts in (36).

14. Since linear order potentially influences binding relations, there is nothing to be gained by comparing EV2- and postfinite VIP-constructions in this respect. (For some pertinent discussion mainly directed against a slifting analysis of postfinite VIP-constructions à la Ross (1973), see Brandt et al. 1992:12.)

15. *Wünschen* ('wish') also appears in EV2-constructions (see Grewendorf 1988:84), but only as a verb of saying, indicating that the expression of a wish is reported (just as *fragen* in EV2-cases is only used for reporting an 'asking event'; see 5.1 below), so it conforms to the above generalization. (Besides, as a verb of volition, *wünschen* is not a V2-verb.)

16. The lexical restrictions on EV2- viz. VIP-predicates (including semantic restrictions on predicate classes) are treated in more detail in Reis (1995:§6.1.1).

17. As I argue in Reis (1995:§6.2), the conceivable way out – there is some empty object element in the VIP coindexed with the host clause – is unattractive. Note that German has declarative V1-clauses (see Önnerfors 1995), of which VIPs could well be variants.

18. See especially Ross (1973), Emonds (1979), and McCawley (1982), and for a short overview of the more prominent proposals Espinal (1991:736ff).

19. See Brandt (1994) and Zimmermann (1994). – The correlation between ±prosodic and

±interpretational integration (see (10iii)) of *wie*-parentheticals (the latter corresponds to what Zimmermann calls their 'operational' vs. 'appositive' use) can be confirmed by distributional differences: in the integrated cases, the object argument cannot be realized inside the *wie*-IP, see (49), nor can *wie* be accompanied by *so* (at least in my idiolect), whereas both is possible in unintegrated cases: *Er brauchte dazu, (so) wie er (es) vorhergesagt hatte, 10 Minuten* ('It took him 10 minutes (just) as he had predicted (it).').

20. The reasons why the 'specifier' is always the host clause proposition are most likely the following (also backed up by parallels from other inferential processes): a) the host clause proposition is always the locally closest proposition fitting the propositional object requirement of the VIP, b) as indicated by their prosodic integration (see (10iii)), VIP and host clause proposition form a unit in terms of information structure, which has the pragmatic consequences outlined at the end of 3.6. – As to how the appropriate proposition is extracted from the host clause (which is a salient problem in the case of *wh*-host clauses), I have nothing to say. The problem, however, is not unique to the parenthetical constructions, but reoccurs, for example, with determining the antecedents for sentential relatives (*Wird sie selbst kommen, was ich vorziehen würde, oder schickt sie Jones?* 'Will she come herself, which I'd prefer, or will she send Jones?'), see Brandt (1990), or with determining discourse anaphora in general, see Bäuerle (1989).

21. A further, and perhaps the most important case in point may be constructions realizing the propositional argument as a V2-clause; see Reis (in prep.).

22. Licensing of VIP-arguments at a pragmatic level is also assumed by Espinal (1991:758).

23. Note that sentence adverbials like *vermutlich* ('presumably'), *anscheinend* ('apparently') do not occur in this (or in final) position (cf. Reis 1995:§6.3); hence, VIPs cannot be treated as a subclass of them as is apparently possible in English; see i.a. Jackendoff (1972:94ff).

24. Thanks go to W. Sternefeld, who drew my attention to these data and their potential significance for the issue at hand.

25. I was able to check the relevant data with two Afrikaans speakers, for which I owe particular thanks to H. Trossbach.

26. Judgements on cases like (62) vary; if modal particles are involved, many find them quite good, and some find parallel bona fide VIP-constructions (*?*Wohin ist er glaubt sie denn, gestern gefahren?*) worse. My explanation for this is that the formal and functional similarity to bona fide extraction cases like (64) leads to the kind of analogical effect already appealed to in Chomsky (1970:193f), and to be observed for many other closely related constructions. See also 5.2 below.

27. There exists no systematic study of these predicates (for recorded examples, see Kaufmann 1972:55ff). As for the complement status of *wenn*-clauses, see Fabricius-

Hansen (1980); her arguments carry over to the cases under discussion. (Note that, depending on the matrix predicate, the *wenn*-clauses may also alternate with V1-clauses, see Kaufmann (1972), which may account for the better ratings EV2-constructions like (74b) sometimes get. Note also that optative *wünschen/wollen*, which behave as preference predicates in all relevant respects, i.e. they conform to (72)-(73) and (75), do not take *wenn*-complements.)

28. For a possible further case in point (negative predicates, which occur in *daß*-extraction structures, but not in EV2- and VIP-constructions), see Reis (1995:§4.2). As for the decisive role of preference predicates in licensing 'normal' V2-extractions, see section 6 below.

29. I 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. (Its results are in line with the judgements supplied for (78)-(79), which represent my own intuitions. Interestingly, some of Pafel's informants got only the nonhierarchical reading for iterated cases.)

30. The question arises, of course, as to how and at what level the respective interpretations are represented. Since the level of parenthetical insertion presumably belongs (or is close) to discourse grammar (see Espinal 1991, Reis 1995:§6.4), and since we know very little about either, neither a speedy nor a comfortably orthodox answer can be hoped for.

31. As to how the restrictions on VIP-structures observed here may be accounted for, see the discussion in Reis (1995:§6). As for the ban on VIP-internal objects, see section 3.6.

32. In particular, the 'restrictions' (18i-ii) are also observed, although perhaps less rigidly so in the case of (18ii); see Penner & Bader (1991). As for Zürich German see note 40 below.

33. Cf. Zwart (1993:42) and especially de Rooy (1965), who also points out the widespread distribution of embedded V2-clauses in Dutch dialects. 'Erlebte Rede' cases are treated as standard in Weerman (1989:142f).

34. I am indebted to H. van Hoof (a Standard Dutch speaker from Noord-Brabant) for repeatedly checking out pertinent Dutch data. The sentences/judgements (91b,c) and (92b-d) are hers.

35. This distinction was repeatedly hinted at in the foregoing discussion; see especially 3.6.

36. EV2-cases like (i) are much worse than (100b) (in the relevant idiolects where the source sentence [*wen zu besuchen*]$_i$ *hat er sich* t$_i$ *vorgenommen* is good):

(i)   [*Na rat mal:*] ?*Wen zu besuchen glaub ich hat er sich vorgenommen?*
         [DP guess MP:] whom to visit believe I   has he himself$_{dat.}$ intended

What is apparently decisive is the portion of the host proposition *p* preceding vs. fol-
lowing the VIP: if no crucial parts of *p* precede it, as in (100b), then *p* is in the
(linear) 'scope' of the parenthetical comment, thus coming closer to the 'one point-of-
view'-interpretation of the whole structure that true extraction constructions necessar-
ily have. This accounts for the difference between EV2- and postfinite VIP-structures
as in (100b) vs. (99b,b'), as well as for the difference between the EV2-structures
(100b) and (i).

37. For further evidence see Reis (1995:§5.3); cf. also ibid.§6.2.

38. As first observed by Farke (1994:165ff), there ARE significant processing differences
    between German EV2-constructions and *daß*-extraction constructions, which are appar-
    ently confirmed by the (so far unpublished) results of the Potsdam group working on
    these issues. (I am indebted to G. Fanselow for supplying this information.) It is not
    unlikely that these differences can only be explained by giving up the standard extrac-
    tion analysis and/or adopting the parenthetical analysis for EV2-constructions.

39. For an explicit argument to this effect, see Reis (1995:§3.5); the core facts on which
    it is based are cited in section 6 below.

40. Constructions involving the normal bridge verbs (verbs of saying, mental attitude
    verbs) such as in *Was glaubt er (/meinst du/sagst du), sie wolle essen?* ('What does he
    believe/do you think/do you say does she want to eat') have been claimed to be gram-
    matical in Zürich German (judgements by K. Cooper, cf. Sternefeld 1991:185f,n.25f;
    see now also Cooper 1994:138,151). All native speakers of this dialect with whom I
    have checked, have emphatically denied this, however. See also note 32 above. – As
    for Standard German, cf. the tests carried out by Andersson & Kvam (1984:53f) con-
    firming that, with normal bridge verbs, this type of extraction construction is impos-
    sible.

41. We 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 ini-
    tial field typically occupied by the subject, this restriction can be more or less derived
    from (b).

42. Note that, irrespective of certain extraction theories, empirical studies of *daß*-clause
    extraction show that adverbial constituents are the most normal extractees in German
    (in terms of frequency as well as acceptability), see Andersson & Kvam (1984:49ff,
    58ff), Andersson (1988:5f), Andersson (1993:54ff). Hence, restriction (b) has struc-
    turally normal content. As for restriction (a), see below.

43. Conditionals are strong islands for the extraction in question (see Lutz 1993), and so
    are complement structures containing *es*-correlates (see i.a. Cardinaletti 1990:82). For
    further discussion, including the pertinent focus data, see Reis (in prep.).

44. A case in point is the interrogative *was*-construction: on the one hand (according to
    the standard analysis, see McDaniel 1989), it is equivalent to a long *wh*-extraction
    construction, with long *wh*-movement applying on LF. On the other hand, some of

its salient properties look like 'parenthetical' properties: (a) concerning its matrix
clause, there are *was*-parenthetical constructions (*Wieviel, was glaubst du, ist das?*
'How much, what do you think, is this?', *Was glaubst du, wieviel ist das?, Wieviel
ist das, was glaubst du?*) which are functionally close to the LF extraction *was*-con-
struction, (b) the same iteration problems arise as in VIP-constructions (see 3.2/4.3
above), (c) B-predicates in the LF extraction *was*-construction must be VIP-predicates
at the same time. What this means for the description of the *was*-construction is a
question I hope to take up in the near future.

References

Andersson, Sven-Gunnar. 1988. "Zur Grammatik und Pragmatik von Heraus-
    stellungsstrukturen". *Sprache & Pragmatik* 1.1-8.
Andersson, Sven-Gunnar. 1993. "Zu Satzspaltung (Cleft) und Langer Extrak-
    tion in germanischen Sprachen". *Wortstellung und Informationsstruktur* (=
    Linguistische Arbeiten, 306.) ed. by Marga Reis, 39-61. Tübingen: Nie-
    meyer.
Andersson, Sven-Gunnar & Sigmund Kvam. 1984. *Satzverschränkung im heu-
    tigen Deutsch* (= *Studien zur deutschen Grammatik*, 24.). Tübingen: Narr.
Bäuerle, Rainer. 1989. *Ereignissemantik im DRT-Rahmen*. Projektantrag, im
    Finanzierungsantrag 1989-1990-1991 des Sonderforschungsbereichs 340
    'Sprachtheoretische Grundlagen für die Computerlinguistik' (Stuttgart &
    Tübingen), 263-279.
Brandt, Margareta. 1990. *Weiterführende Nebensätze. Zu ihrer Syntax, Seman-
    tik und Pragmatik* (= *Lunder Germanistische Forschungen*, 57.). Stockholm:
    Almqvist & Wiksell.
Brandt, Margareta. 1994. *Zur Pragmatik von Satzadverbialphrasen mit* wie.
    Paper presented at the Colloquium on Clause Linkage, Wuppertal, 11/1994.
Brandt, Margareta, Marga Reis, Inger Rosengren & Ilse Zimmermann. 1992.
    Satztyp, Satzmodus und Illokution. *Satz und Illokution I* (= *Linguistische
    Arbeiten*, 278.) ed. by Inger Rosengren, 1-90. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
Cardinaletti, Anna. 1990. *Impersonal Constructions and Sentential Arguments
    in German*. Padova: Unipress.
Chomsky, Noam. 1970. "Remarks on Nominalization". *Readings in Trans-
    formational Grammar* ed. by R. Jacobs & P. Rosenbaum, 184-221. Waltham
    (Mass.): Ginn and Company.
Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A'-Dependencies* (= *Linguistic Inquiry Mon-
    ographs*, 17.). Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press.
Cooper, Kathrin E. 1994. *Topics in Zurich German Syntax*. Ph.D. Dissertation,
    University of Edinburgh.

Ebert, Robert P. 1973. "On the Notion 'Subordinate Clause' in Standard German". *You Take the High Node and I'll Take the Low Node. Papers from the Comparative Syntax Festival: The Differences between Main and Subordinate Clauses, 12 April 1973. Paravolume to Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting. Chicago Linguistic Society.* ed. by Claudia Corum et al., 164-177. Chicago (Ill.).

Emonds, Joseph. 1979. "Appositive Relatives Have No Properties". *Linguistic Inquiry* 10.211-243.

Erteschik, Nomi. 1973. *On the Nature of Island Constraints.* Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

Erteschik, Nomi & Shalom Lappin. 1979. "Dominance and the Functional Explanation of Island Phenomena". *Theoretical Linguistics* 6.41-86.

Espinal, M. Teresa. 1991. "The Representation of Disjunct Constituents". *Language* 67.726-762.

Fabricius-Hansen, Catherine. 1980. "Sogenannte ergänzende *wenn*-Sätze. Ein Beispiel semantisch-syntaktischer Argumentation". *Festschrift für Gunnar Bech* (= *Kopenhagener Beiträge zur Germanistischen Linguistik*, Sonderband 1) ed. by Mogens Dyhr et al., 160-188. Kopenhagen: Institut for germansk filologi, Københavns Universitet..

Farke, Hildegard. 1994. *Grammatik und Sprachverarbeitung. Zur Verarbeitung syntaktischer Ambiguitäten.* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Gärtner, Hans-Martin & Markus Steinbach. 1994. "Economy, Verb Second, and the SVO-SOV Distinction". *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 53.1-59.

Grewendorf, Günther. 1988. *Aspekte der deutschen Syntax* (= *Studien zur deutschen Grammatik*, 33.). Tübingen: Narr.

Grewendorf, Günther. 1989. *Ergativity in German.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Haider, Hubert. 1986. "Affect α: A Reply to Lasnik and Saito *On the Nature of Proper Government*". *Linguistic Inquiry* 17.113-126.

Haider, Hubert. 1993. "ECP-Etüden: Anmerkungen zur Extraktion aus eingebetteten Verb-Zweit-Sätzen". *Linguistische Berichte* 145.185-203.

Höhle, Tilman N. 1978. *Lexikalistische Syntax. Die Aktiv-Passiv-Relation und andere Infinitkonstruktionen im Deutschen* (= *Linguistische Arbeiten*, 67.). Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Jackendoff, Ray. 1972. *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar* (= *Studies in Linguistics*, 2.). Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press.

Kaufmann, Gerhard. 1972. *Das konjunktivische Bedingungsgefüge im heutigen Deutsch* (= *Institut für deutsche Sprache. Forschungsberichte*, 12.). Tübingen: Narr.

Lasnik, Howard & Mamoru Saito. 1984. "On the Nature of Proper Government". *Linguistic Inquiry* 15.235-289.

Lühr, Rosemarie. 1988. "Zur Satzverschränkung im heutigen Deutsch". *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 29.74-87.

Lutz, Uli. 1993. "Zur Extraktion aus Adjunktsätzen im Deutschen". *Extraktion im Deutschen I* by Franz-Josef d'Avis, Sigrid Beck, Uli Lutz, Jürgen Pafel & Susanne Trissler, 133-189. Arbeitspapiere des Sonderforschungsbereichs 340 Bericht Nr. 34.

McCawley, James D. 1982. "Parentheticals and Discontinuous Constituent Structure". *Linguistic Inquiry* 13.91-106.

McDaniel, Dana. 1989. "Partial and Multiple Wh-Movement". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7.565-604.

Mrotzek, Claudia. 1991. *Parenthetische Konstruktionen des Deutschen* (= IWBS Report, 199.). M.A. Thesis, University of Stuttgart.

Müller, Gereon. 1993. *On Deriving Movement Type Asymmetries* (= SfS-Report-05-93). Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Tübingen.

Müller, Gereon & Wolfgang Sternefeld. 1993. "Improper Movement and Unambiguous Binding". *Linguistic Inquiry* 24.461-507.

Önnerfors, Olaf. 1995. "On Narrative Declarative V1 Sentences in German". To appear in *Modality in the Germanic Languages* ed. by Toril Swan & Olaf Jansen. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.

Penner, Zvi & Thomas Bader. 1991. "Main Clause Phenomena in Embedded Clauses: the Licensing of Embedded V2-clauses in Bernese Swiss German". *The Linguistic Review* 8.75-95.

du Plessis, Hans 1977. "*Wh* Movement in Afrikaans". *Linguistic Inquiry* 8.723-726.

Pittner, Karin. 1994. *Zur Syntax von Parenthesen.* Paper presented at the GGS-Meeting, Tübingen, 5/1994.

Ponelis, F[riedrich] A. 1979. *Afrikaanse sintaksis.* Pretoria: van Schaik.

Reinhart, Tanya. 1983. "Point of View in Language – The Use of Parentheticals". *Essays on Deixis* ed. by Gisa Rauh, 169-194. Tübingen: Narr.

Reis, Marga. 1993. "Satzfügung und kommunikative Gewichtung. Zur Grammatik und Pragmatik von Neben- vs. Unterordnung am Beispiel 'implikativer' *und*-Konstruktionen im Deutschen". *Wortstellung und Informationsstruktur* (= *Linguistische Arbeiten*, 306.) ed. by Marga Reis, 203-249. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Reis, Marga. 1994. *Brückeneigenschaften von Matrixsätzen bei langer Extraktion im Deutschen.* Paper presented at the Workshop on Extraction, DGfS-Jahrestagung Münster, 3/1994.

Reis, Marga. 1995. "*Wer glaubst du hat recht?* On So-called Extractions from Verb-Second Clauses and Verb-First Parenthetical Constructions in German". *Sprache & Pragmatik* 36.27-83.

Reis, Marga. In preparation. *Complex Verb-Second Constructions in German.* Ms. Tübingen.

Reis, Marga & Inger Rosengren. 1992. "What Do *WH*-Imperatives Tell Us about *WH*-Movement?". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10.79-118.

de Rooy, Jan. 1965. "I Knew You Knew He Knew. Een dialectgeografische studie over objectzinnen zonder voegwoord met hoofdzinvolgorde". *Taal en Tongval* 17.105-123.

Ross, John R. 1973. "Slifting". *The Formal Analysis of Natural Languages. Proceedings of the First International Conference* (= *Janua Linguarum. Series Maior*, 62.) ed. by Maurice Gross et al., 133-169. The Hague & Paris: Mouton.

Staudacher, Peter. 1990. "Long Movement from Verb-Second Complements in German". *Scrambling and Barriers* ed. by Günther Grewendorf & Wolfgang Sternefeld, 319-339. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Sternefeld, Wolfgang. 1989. "Extractions from Verb-Second Clauses in German". *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 44.119-140.

Sternefeld, Wolfgang. 1991. *Syntaktische Grenzen. Chomskys Barrierentheorie und ihre Weiterentwicklungen*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Tappe, Thilo. 1981. "Wer glaubst du hat recht? Einige Bemerkungen zur COMP-COMP-Bewegung im Deutschen". *Sprache: Formen und Strukturen. Akten des 15. Linguistischen Kolloquiums Münster 1980, Vol. I* (= *Linguistische Arbeiten*, 98.) ed. by Manfred Kohrt & Jürgen Lenerz, 203-212. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Thiersch, Craig. 1978. *Topics in German Syntax*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

Uhmann, Susanne. 1994. *Grammatische Regeln und konversationelle Strukturen. Fallstudien aus Syntax und Phonologie*. Habilitationsschrift Universität-GHS Wuppertal.

Waher, Hester. 1982. "The Position of the Finite Verb in Afrikaans". *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics* 8.51-78.

Webelhuth, Gert. 1992. *Principles and Parameters of Syntactic Saturation*. New York & Oxford: Oxford Universitiy Press.

Weerman, Fred. 1989. *The V2 Conspiracy. A Synchronic and Diachronic Analysis of Verbal Positions in Germanic Languages* (= *Publications in Language Sciences*, 31.). Dordrecht: Foris.

Wilder, Chris. 1993. *Derivational Economy and the Analysis of V2*. To appear in *Linguistics*. Preprinted in: FAS Papers in Linguistics 1.117-156 (1995).

Zimmermann, Ilse. 1994. *Das relativische Pronominaladverb* wie. Paper presented at the Colloquium on Clause Linkage, Wuppertal, 11/1994.

Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 1993. *Dutch Syntax. A Minimalist Approach*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Groningen.

Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 1994. "The Minimalist Program and Germanic Syntax. A Reply to Gärtner and Steinbach". *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 54.1-41.

On *wh*-Islands in German

Franz-Josef d'Avis
University of Tübingen

There must be some
way out of here!
Crusoe, R.

1. Introduction

German, unlike English, restricts extraction from embedded questions to topicalization, i.e. there is no *wh*-movement from *wh*-islands; compare (1) and (2).

(1) **Welche Radios fragst du dich, wer repariert?*
    which radios   ask   you yourself, who repairs
    'For which radios do you ask yourself, who repairs them?'

(2) *?Radios weiß ich nicht, wer repariert.*
    radios know I   not, who repairs
    'As for radios, I don't know who repairs them.'

First, in section 2, I will represent different approaches to *wh*-island violations in English and Italian (Chomsky 1986, Rizzi 1990, Cinque 1990), which will be tested against the German data and shown not to be transferable in section 3. The following discussion of Bayer (1990) and Müller & Sternefeld (1993) in section 4 makes it clear that a purely configurational approach has to be somehow extended to distinguish between different classes of adjuncts with respect to extractability and to cope with the influence of focus-background-structure. In section 5, data concerning the topicalization of bare plural objects and their interpretation with respect to quantificational adverbs are given which show (i) that topicalization from