



Limiting space- movement possibilities in German Double Object Construction

Aleksandra Bartczak (University of Finance and Management, Białystok, Poland)

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the structure and syntactic properties of Applicative Phrases (AppIP) in German Double Object Constructions (DOC). The problematic issue in the area of Applicatives is the asymmetry in the behaviour of Indirect Objects (IO) and Direct Objects (DO), in aspects such as availability of Object Shift or acceptability of object movement to the subject position of the passive sentence.

The analysis begins with the application of the theory proposed by McGinnis (2001, 2005), based on the division of Applicative Phrases into High and Low, according to their semantic features, developed by Pylkkänen (2002). In order to account for the differences in the properties of both types of Applicative Phrases, McGinnis adopts Chomsky's theory of Phases (Chomsky 2000, 2001). She claims that since High ApplPs are phases they allow relatively free object movement, thanks to an extra EPP position, addition of which is a feature of Phases. McGinnis explains limited possibilities of object movement within (Object Shift) and out of Low ApplPs (passivisation) with their non- phasal status.

McGinnis's approach seems to reach required conclusions, which are supported by the facts from a number of languages. However, the analysis of German data proves that adopting a phase- based account may not be compatible with phenomena present in German. Considering the results of this analysis and the fact that the existence of Phases themselves has been questioned (Jeong 2006, Boeckx and Grohmann 2007) another solution to this issue, advocated by Jeong (2006), will be applied. Her proposal requires consideration of objects' features, such as the category (DP vs. PP), the Case (inherent vs. structural) and the availability of scrambling without ascribing the phasal status to Applicative Phrases.

References:

- Boeckx, C. and K. Grohmann. (2007) "Putting phases into perspective". *Syntax* 10, 204-222.
- Chomsky, N. (2000) Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework. In: *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. Eds. R. Martin, D. Michaels, J. Uriagereka. MIT Press. 89-155.
- Chomsky, N. (2001) "Derivation by phase". In: *Ken Hale: a life in language*, ed. M. Kenstowicz, 1-50. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Jeong, Youngmi. (2006) *The landscape of applicatives*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.
- McGinnis, M. (2001) "Variation in the phase structure of applicatives". *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 1: 105-146.
- McGinnis, M. (2005) "UTAH at Merge: Evidence from multiple applicatives". In *MITWPL 49: Perspectives on Phases*, ed. Martha McGinnis and Norvin Richards, 183-200. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Pylkkänen, L. (2002) *Introducing Arguments*. PhD dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts.