

Non-Finite Verb Fronting in South/West Slavic and Germanic

Takashi Toyoshima

Kyushu Institute of Technology

(toyo@brain.kyutech.ac.jp)

There are constructions with a **clause-initial non-finite verb** followed by a *finite auxiliary* both in South/West Slavic (1) and Germanic (2) as below:

- (1) a. **Koupil** *jsem* knihy. (Czech)
bought be.1SG books
'I have bought books.'
- b. **Napísal** *som* list. (Slovak)
written be.1SG letter
'I have written a letter.'
- c. **Čitao** *sam* knjigu. (Serbo-Croatian)
read be.1SG book
'I have read the book.'
- d. **Pročel** *sâm* knjigata. (Bulgarian)
read be.1SG DEF.book
'I have read the book.'
- (2) a. Maðurinn, sem **farinn** var heim, heitir Pétur. (Icelandic)
DEF.man that gone was home is-named Peter
'The man that had gone home is named Peter.'
- b. **Lest** *har* hun den sikkert, men har hun skjønnt (Norwegian)
read has she it surely but has she understood
noe av den?
anything of it
'She has surely read it, but has she understood any of it?'
- c. **Bo** *ska* han i Malmö, men han ska jobba i Köpenhamn. (Swedish)
live will he in Malmö but he willwork in Copenhagen
'He will live in Malmö, but he will work in Copenhagen.'
- d. **Gelesen** *hat* Hans das Buch nicht. (German)
read has Hans the book not
'Hans has not read the book.'
- e. **Gelezen** *heeft* hij het boek niet. (Dutch)
read has he the book not
'He has not read the book.'
- f. **gibn** *host* du mir gezogt [az zi git im a maykhl]. (Yiddish)
give have you me told that she gives him a dish
'You told me that she gives him a dish.'

This paper argues that they all involve V movement into a specifier position, Spec (IP) in (1–2a) and Spec(CP) in (2b–f), with concomitant resumption in (2f), instantiating Head-to-Spec Movement this paper proposes, in Chomsky's (1995) theory of Bare Phrase Structure.

South/West Slavic cases in (1) often involve a finite auxiliary that is a so-called "second position clitic," and it has been argued that they are derived by "Long Head Movement" (Lema & Rivero 1990, Rivero 1991, among others). Yet, it has also been observed that non-clitic auxiliaries participate in such constructions, in which cases the non-finite verb need not be the clause-initial element (Bošković 1995, Embick & Izvorski 1995, among others).

- (3) a. **Istukao** *bejaše* Petra. (Serbo-Croatian)
beaten was Petar
- b. *Bejaše* **Istukao** Petra.
was beaten Petar
'He had beaten Petar.'

- (4) a. **Pročela** *beše* knjigata. (Bulgarian)
 read.F was DEF.book
 b. *Beše* **pročela** knjigata.
 was read.F DEF.book

‘She had read the book.’

Furthermore, the V-Aux order is possible in some embedded environment (5), and it is incompatible with a subject in Spec(IP) (6).

- (5) Razbrah [če **pročel** *beše* knjigata]. (Bulgarian)
 understood.1SG COMP read was DEF.book

‘I understood that you had read the book.’

- (6) a. **Čitao** *je* Ivan knjigu. (Serbo-Croatian)
 read be.3SG Ivan book

- b. ***Čitao** Ivan *je* knjigu.
 read Ivan be.3SG book

‘Ivan has read the book.’

Thus, the South/West Slavic V-Aux constructions show essentially the same structural properties with Icelandic Stylistic Fronting (2a), instantiating V-to-Spec(IP) movement.

On the other hand, it has been standardly accepted that the V-Aux order in German (2d) and Dutch (2e) is derived by the so-called “remnant topicalization” (den Besten & Webelhuth 1987, Müller 1996, among others).

- (2d’) [_{VP} *t*₀ **Gelesen**] hat Hans [*das Buch*]₀ nicht *t*_{VP}

However, the “remnant topicalization” analysis cannot straightforwardly be extended to Continental Scandinavian, since “remnant” cannot always be created. In (2b), the direct object is a weak pronoun, hence it can shift out of VP, creating a “remnant” only with V head (Holmberg 1986). In (2c), in contrast, there is no object to shift, so that the only way to create a “remnant” only with V head is to shift the PP complement out of VP; no such movement has ever been proposed. Holmberg (1999) argues that somehow, we need to allow V to move into Spec(CP).

In principle, Chomsky’s (1995) theory of Bare Phrase Structure should allow such movement: there is no non-branching projections, so that a head can be a phrase at the same time. Thus, it is not at all unnatural or undesirable that V moves into Spec(IP) or Spec(CP). Once this analysis is accepted for South/West Slavic and Scandinavian, it becomes also natural to extend the analysis to the German/Dutch cases of “remnant topicalization.”

Further pursuing the natural extension to Yiddish (2f), it can be analyzed as V-to-Spec(CP/IP) movement with a “resumptive” V (Davis & Prince 1986, among others), or topicalization to Spec(CP/IP) of *v*, a “cognate head,” akin to the Predicate Cleft in Vata (Koopman 1984).

Selected References:

- Bošković, Ž. (1995) “Participle Movement and Second Position Cliticization in Serbo-Croatian.” *Lingua* 96.245–266.
 Chomsky, N. (1995) “Bare Phrase Structure,” pp.385–439 in G. Webelhuth (ed.) *Government and Binding Theory and the Minimalist Program*,. Basil Blackwell: Cambridge, MA.
 den Besten, H. & G. Webelhuth (1987) “Remnant Topicalization and the Constituent Structure of VP in the Germanic SOV Languages.” *GLOW Newsletter* 18.15–16.
 Davis, L. & E. Prince (1986) “Yiddish Verb-Topicalization and the Notion ‘Lexical Integrity.’” *CLS* 22:1.90–97.
 Diesing, M. (1990) “Verb-Second in Yiddish and the Nature of the Subject Position.” *NLLT* 8.41–79.
 Embick, D. & R. Izvorski (1995) “On Long Head Movement in Bulgarian.” *ESCOL* ’94.104–115.
 Holmberg, A. (1986) *Word Order and Syntactic Features in the Scandinavian Languages and English*. Doctoral dissertation: University of Stockholm.
 Holmberg, A. (1999) “Remarks on Holmberg’s Generalization.” *Studia Linguistica* 53.1–39.
 Koopman, H. (1984) *The Syntax of Verb*. Foris: Dordrecht.
 Lema, J. & M.-L. Rivero. (1990): “Long Head Movement: ECP vs. HMC”, *NELS* 20, 333–347.
 Müller, G. (1996) “A Constraint on Remnant Movement.” *NLLT* 14.355–407.
 Rivero, M.-L. (1991): “Long Head Movement and Negation: Serbo-Croatian vs. Slovak and Czech”, *TLR* 8, 319–351.