



K O N I N K L I J K E N E D E R L A N D S E
A K A D E M I E V A N W E T E N S C H A P P E N

Intermediate landing sites

Barbiers, S.

published in
GLOT International
2000

document version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in KNAW Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)
Barbiers, S. (2000). Intermediate landing sites. *GLOT International*, 4-7, 15-16.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the KNAW public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the KNAW public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:
pure@knaw.nl

Intermediate landing sites

by Sjef Barbiers

1. The problem

In the standard view on A-bar movement (Chomsky 1981), extraction from embedded CP proceeds in two steps: first, the extracted constituent moves to embedded SpecCP; subsequently, it moves to the next SpecCP higher up in one fell swoop. The evidence for embedded SpecCP as an intermediate landing site is only indirect. When some constituent is in the embedded SpecCP, this blocks extraction of another constituent from the same CP. In addition, in some languages extraction triggers the occurrence of a different complementizer (e.g. Irish). However, direct evidence for movement via embedded SpecCP is not available, as it is not possible to strand a part of a moved constituent in an embedded SpecCP.

Less standard is the view in Chomsky (1986: 29) that long extraction obligatorily takes place via two intermediate positions: the embedded SpecCP and another intermediate landing site in the middle field of the dominating clause. The existence of the second intermediate landing site follows from barriers theory in which matrix VP is a barrier which can only be voided by intermediate adjunction of the moved constituent to this VP. As far as I know, no evidence has been provided for intermediate adjunction. This squib presents a set of new data strongly suggesting that long A-bar movement in Dutch proceeds via a position in the middle field of the dominating clause, but not via the embedded SpecCP.

2. Stranding in intermediate positions

Dutch has three constructions in which material from a moved constituent is stranded: the well-known *wat voor*-split construction (1), the preposition stranding construction (2), and the less well-known focus particle stranding construction ((3); Barbiers 1995).

(1)
Wat_i had je gedacht [_{CP} dat Jan [_{t_i} voor boeken] zou lezen]?
what had you thought that John what for books would read
'What kind of books did you think that John would read?'

(2)
Waar_i denk je [_{CP} dat Jan het brood [_{t_i} mee] heeft gesneden]
where think you that John the bread where with has cut
'What do you think John has cut the bread with?'

(3)
a. [EEN boek]_i had ik gedacht [_{CP} dat Jan [maar t_i] zou lezen]
one book had I thought that John only would read
'I had thought that John would read only one books'
b. EEN student had gedacht [_{CP} dat Jan maar zou werken]
one student had thought that John just would work
#'Only one student thought that John would work'

The stranding in (1) and (2) is self-evident. As for stranding of focus particles, the minimal pair in (3) shows that a focus particle can only be interpreted as modifying the numeral of a noun phrase in the matrix clause if this noun phrase originates in the embedded clause. As is argued in Barbiers (1995), in such cases the focus particle must be adjacent to the base position of the extracted noun phrase.

It is well-known that stranding of material in embedded SpecCP is impossible:

(4)
a. *Wat_i had jij dan gedacht [_{CP} [_{t_i} voor boeken]_i [_C dat [_{FP} Jan t_i zou lezen]]]
what had you then thought for books that John would read
b. *Waar_i had jij dan gedacht [_{CP} [_{t_i} mee]_i [_C dat [_{FP} Jan de vis t_i zou snijden]]]
where had you thought with that John the fish would cut
c. *[EEN boek]_i had ik gedacht [_{CP} [maar t_i]_i [_C dat [_{FP} Jan t_i zou lezen]]]
one book had I thought only that John would read

From the data in (1)–(4) it might be concluded that stranding is possible only in base- (or A-) positions. However, the novel data in (5a–c) show that this cannot be the right generalization. Stranding in the middle field of the matrix clause is possible when a verb takes a propositional complement (CP-complements typically occurring with verbs like THINK, HOPE, EXPECT), even though this clearly is not the base position of the

moved constituents. It can not be their base-position because verbs like THINK do not take DP-arguments or *with*-PP-arguments. The sentence in (5d) is added to show that *maar* 'only' can only modify *EEN boek* 'one book' if the latter is extracted from the embedded clause. For some speakers, (5d) is even ungrammatical, which confirms that the possibility to have *maar* 'only' in the middle field as in (5c) depends on the presence of the preposed constituent.

(5)
a. Wat_i had jij dan [_{t_i} voor boeken]_i [_{VP} gedacht/*onthuld [_{CP} dat je t_i zou lezen]]?
what had you then for books thought/revealed that John would read
b. Waar_i had jij dan [_{t_i} mee]_i [_{VP} gedacht/*onthuld [_{CP} dat je de vis t_i zou snijden]]?
where had you then with thought/revealed that John the fish would cut
c. [EEN boek]_i had ik [maar t_i]_i [_{VP} gedacht/*onthuld [_{CP} dat Jan t_i zou lezen]]]
one book had I only thought/revealed that John would read
d. %Ik had maar [_{VP} gedacht [_{CP} dat Jan EEN boek zou lezen]]
I had only thought that John would read one book
#'I had thought that John would read only one book'

3. Intermediate positions as a final landing site

Not only is it impossible to strand material in embedded SpecCP, topicalization or focalization is also impossible in this position (6a). Moreover, as illustrated in (6b), propositional CP-complements that allow the construction in (5) never allow embedded *wh*.

(6)
a. *Ik had gedacht/gehoopt [_{CP} [het boek]_i [_C dat [_{FP} Jan t_i zou kopen]]]
I had thought/hoped the book that John would read
b. *Ik had gedacht/gehoopt [_{CP} [wat]_i [_C dat [_{FP} Jan t_i zou lezen]]]
I had thought/hoped what that John would read

On the other hand, focalization by moving a constituent into the middle field of the matrix clause is possible. This is found in a construction that I dub Long Answer Scrambling (LAS):

(7)
a. Wie denk je dat het probleem heeft opgelost?
Who do you think solved the problem?
Ik denk Jan/hij
I think John/he
b. Wie denk je dat Jan zal noemen?
Who do you think John will mention?
Ik denk zichzelf
I think himself
c. Waar denk je dat Jan zijn praatje zal geven?
Where do you think John will give his talk?
Ik denk in de tuin
I think in the garden

I would like to argue that the answers in (7) involve reduced embedded finite clauses. The pronoun in (7a) has nominative case, which is only available for the subject of a finite clause. The anaphor in (7b), subject to principle A, has no visible antecedent within the clause, but this does not give rise to ungrammaticality. There must be a hidden antecedent, since Dutch *zichzelf* cannot be a logophor (cf. Vanden Wyngaerd 1994, Veraart 1995, Barbiers to appear a). The locative PP in (7c) does not modify the verb THINK, but the event denoted by *give his talk*. Note incidentally that something similar holds for the construction *John prefers through the woods* discussed by Neeleman (1997) as evidence for the existence of a special type of argument of category PP. It is therefore plausible that *through the woods* is not a special kind of PP but the remnant of a reduced verbal constituent.

I propose the structure in (8) for LAS: a constituent moves into the middle field of the higher clause and the embedded CP is subsequently deleted at PF.

(8)
a. Ik denk zichzelf_i [_{CP} dat Jan t_i zal noemen]
b. I think himself_i [_{CP} that John will mention t_i]

Binding in (8) takes place under reconstruction of the

anaphor into its base position.

Next to reconstruction there are other indications that movement is involved in LAS, since it is only possible with propositional CPs, not with factive CPs (9a–d), and it is also impossible with CPs that are islands, such as CPs contained in DPs (10a) and CP-adjuncts (10b).

(9) John says that Pete will come and fix something.
a. en ik denk/hoop/meen/geloof de gootsteen
b. and I think/hope/think/belief the sink
c. *en ik weet/onthul/verklap de gootsteen
d. *and I know/reveal/let on the sink
(10)
a. *Jan laat [_{DP} de hoop [_{CP} dat Piet de gootsteen zal repareren]]
varen
John lets the hope that Pete the sink will repair go
b. *Jan werkt net zo lang tot [_{CP} dat de gootsteen gerepareerd is]
John works just as long until that the sink repaired is

LAS is not the same construction as sluicing or gapping: unlike LAS, the latter constructions are possible with factives:

(11)
a. Piet komt iets repareren en ik weet wat
b. Pete will come to fix something and I know what
c. Ik weet dat Jan het boek leest en Piet de krant
d. I know that John is reading the book and Pete the newspaper

LAS should further be distinguished from a construction in which the constituent following the verb is interpreted as a quotation (*I think: himself*). Unlike LAS, this construction involves two intonational phrases.

Since PF-deletion is optional, it is possible to do just the movement part of LAS:

(12)
a. %Ik had [EEN boek]_i [_{VP} gedacht ([_{CP} dat Jan t_i zou kopen]]]
I had one book thought that John would buy
b. %Ik had [in de TUIN]_i [_{VP} gehoopt ([_{CP} dat het feest t_i zou zijn]]]
I had in the garden hoped that the party would be

As Zwart (1993: 200) notes, the construction in (12) can be observed in colloquial Dutch, even though some speakers do not accept it. Those who accept the construction need a strong focus on the moved constituent. In English, PF-deletion seems to be obligatory with LAS: **I had thought in the garden that the party would be*; **I had thought a book that John would buy*.

The sentences in (12) clearly show that the landing site is not in the embedded clause, but in the middle field of the matrix clause. They further show that the LAS-construction cannot be analyzed as involving parentheticals.

As we have seen in (8), reconstruction of the moved constituent is possible. The moved constituent gives rise to Weak Cross Over effects (13a), and movement to this position cannot be triggered by case. There is sufficient reason, then, to conclude that the landing site in the matrix middle field is an A-bar position. This A-bar position has in common with matrix SpecCP that it is only accessible to constituents that can bear focus (13b,c). Finally, if the A-bar position in the middle field is filled, this gives rise to subjacency effects (13d).

(13)
a. *Ik had [iedere speler]_i gedacht [dat z'n trainer t_i zou bellen]
I had every player thought that his coach would call
b. [_{CP} Jan/*het/*'m [_C heb [_{FP} ik gezien]]]
John/it/him have I seen
c. *Ik had het/'m [_{VP} gedacht [_{CP} dat we zouden zien]]
I had it/him thought that we would see
d. *Wie_i had je [in de TUIN]_i gedacht dat je t_i zou ontmoeten
who had you in the garden thought that you would meet

4. Conclusion

The situation may now be characterized as follows. In Dutch, "embedded SpecCP" is on the wrong side of the matrix V, since there is an (intermediate) landing site for A'-movement preceding matrix V, but no such position following matrix V. The standard view on extraction from CP-complement is therefore in need of revision. The facts in this paper indicate that at least in Dutch embedded SpecCP does not project in long extraction constructions. In Barbiers (to appear b.), I explain why this is the case, and I give a further characterization of the landing site of LAS as the Spec of a functional projection previously thought to be in the

CP-layers of the embedded clause.

In English, the situation is more complicated. As opposed to Dutch, LAS in English is possible only if the embedded clause is deleted. Moreover, the possibility of LAS in English leads to the expectation that intermediate stranding should be possible in English as well. However, the only stranding test applicable to English yields ungrammatical results: **This knife I had thought with that John would cut the bread*. I leave these differences between English and Dutch for future research.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Hans Bennis, Hans den Besten as well as a number of anonymous reviewers for valuable comments and suggestions.

References

- Barbiers, S. (1995). *The syntax of interpretation*. Doctoral dissertation, Leiden University. The Hague: HAG.
- Barbiers, S. (to appear a.). On the Interpretation of Movement and Agreement: PPs and binding. In H. Bennis and M. Everaert (eds.) *Interface Strategies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Barbiers, S. (to appear, b.). *The right-periphery in SOV-languages: English and Dutch*. In P. Svenonius (ed). *OV and VO*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Neeleman, A. (1997). PP-Complements. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15, 89–137.
- Veraart, F. (1996). On the distribution of Dutch reflexives. MITWPL 10.
- Wyngaerd, G. Vanden (1994). *PRO-Legomena. Distribution and reference of infinitival subjects*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.