

Einführung: Was ist Restbewegung und warum ist dieses Phänomen interessant?

Gereon Müller (Universität Leipzig)

October 15, 2013

1. Background: Rule Interaction

1.1 Counter-Feeding and Counter-Bleeding

(1) Two types of transparent rule interaction

- a. *Feeding*:
 - (i) Rule A creates the context in which rule B can apply.
 - (ii) If A applies before B, there is feeding of B by A; A feeds B.
 - (iii) If A does not apply, either B cannot apply; or it can apply because its context is present independently of A.
- b. *Bleeding*:
 - (i) Rule A destroys the context in which rule B can apply.
 - (ii) If A applies before B, there is bleeding of B by A; A bleeds B.
 - (iii) If A does not apply, either B cannot apply because its context is not present independently of A, or B can apply because its context is present independently of A.

(2) Two types of opaque rule interaction

- a. *Counter-Feeding* (underapplication):
 - (i) Rule A creates the context in which rule B can apply.
 - (ii) If A applies before B, there is feeding of B by A.
 - (iii) However, the evidence shows that B has not applied even though A has applied.
 - (iv) Therefore, A must have applied *after* B.
- b. *Counter-Bleeding* (overapplication):
 - (i) Rule A destroys the context in which rule B can apply.
 - (ii) If A applies before B, there is bleeding of B by A.
 - (iii) However, the evidence shows that B has applied even though A has also applied.
 - (iv) Therefore, A must have applied after B.

Opacity:

Rule interaction in counter-feeding and counter-bleeding environments is opaque because it cannot be determined by simply looking at the respective output representations why rule B has not applied even though its context of application would seem to be present (*counter-feeding*), and why rule B has applied even though its context of application would not seem to be present (*counter-bleeding*).

(3) Questions raised by output representations:

- a. Counter-Feeding (underapplication):
Why could rule B not apply even though its context seems to be present?
- b. Counter-Bleeding (overapplication):
How could rule B apply even though its context does not seem to be present?

Rule of the thumb:

A rule B that applies *early* will, as a tendency, be fed less often (therefore: counter-feeding), and will also, as a tendency, be bled less often (therefore: counter-bleeding).

1.2 Counter-Bleeding in Syntax: Remnant Movement in German

Observation:

Remnant movement constructions instantiate counter-bleeding and thus provide an argument for a derivational approach syntax (cf. Müller (1998)).

(4) Traces within moved categories: anti-freezing with remnant movement vs. freezing effects:

- a. [_{VP} t₁ Gelesen] hat das Buch₁ keiner t₂
read has the book no-one
- b. *Was₁ denkst du [_{VP} t₁ gelesen] hat keiner t₂ ?
what think you read has no-one
- c. *Was₁ hat [_{VP} t₁ gelesen] keiner t₂ ?
what has read no-one

(5) a. Condition on Extraction Domain (CED; Huang (1982), Chomsky (1986), Browning (1987), Cinque (1990)):

- (i) Movement must not cross a barrier.
 - (ii) An XP is a barrier iff it is not a complement.
- b. *X-Criterion*:
An [X]-marked XP must show up in SpecY, where Y requires [X] (= Y_[•X•]).

(From (5-b) it follows that a [topic]-marked XP must show up in SpecC_[top], a wh-phrase must show up in SpecC_[wh], a [Σ]-marked XP must show up in Specv[Σ] (scrambling), etc.)

Observations:

- In (4-a), VP topicalization should bleed scrambling via the CED, but it doesn't because it applies too late – scrambling applies earlier, when VP is still in situ and the CED can be respected by extraction: counter-bleeding.
- In (4-bc), VP movement (topicalization or scrambling) blocks scrambling via the CED because it applies earlier – scrambling applies later, when VP has already undergone movement, which violates the CED: bleeding.

Question:

What determines the order of operations presupposed here?

Answer:

The order here is determined by the most basic principle of a derivational grammar, the Strict Cycle Condition, more on which later.

- (6) *Strict Cycle Condition* (Chomsky (1973), Perlmutter & Soames (1979)):
Within the current cyclic node α , a syntactic operation may not target a position that is included within another cyclic node β that is dominated by α .
(Assumption: Cyclic nodes are XPs.)

1.3 Another Case of Counter-Bleeding in Syntax: Reconstruction for Principle A

Observation:

Reflexive pronouns can undergo movement, or they can occur in phrases that undergo movement. After the movement operation, they should not be able to satisfy Principle A of the binding theory.

- (7) *Reconstruction*
- dass [DP_[Σ] sich]₁ der Fritz₁ gestern im Spiegel gesehen hat
that REFL the Fritz yesterday in the mirror seen has
 - [DP_[top] Himself]₁ John₁ does not really like
 - [DP_[top] Sich selbst]₁ gibt Maria₁ immer als letzte den Kaffee
REFL self gives Maria always as the last one the coffee
 - [DP_[top] Bücher über sich]₁ hat er₁ keine gelesen
books about REFL has he none read
 - [DP_[wh] Welche Bilder von sich]₁ hat die Diva gehasst ?
which books about SELF has the diva hated
 - [DP_[wh] Which book about himself_{1/2}] does John₁ think that Bill₂ likes ?
- (8) a. *Principle A*:
An anaphor is bound within its minimal clause.
b. *X-Criterion*:
An [X]-marked XP must show up in SpecY, where Y requires [X] (= Y_[•X•]).

Analysis:

Movement would bleed satisfaction of Principle A, but it does not if Principle A can apply earlier (e.g., because it may be an 'anywhere principle'; see Belletti & Rizzi (1988)).

1.4 Representational Approaches

Basic strategy:

Some opaque interactions in syntax can be captured in declarative approaches by enriching representations of linguistic expressions with abstract material that encodes (what would otherwise qualify as) earlier derivational steps (e.g., by assuming traces/copies, and various type of empty pronouns, like *pro* and *PRO*), and by then postulating (more complex) constraints

that refer to the enriched structure.

1.4.1 Reconstruction

- (9) *Principle A* (revised):
At S-structure, an anaphor is chain-bound in its binding domain.
- (10) *Chain-Binding* (Barss (1984)): α chain-binds β iff (a), (b), and (c) hold:
- α and β are co-indexed.
 - α occupies an A-position.
 - (i) α c-commands β , or
(ii) α c-commands a trace of γ , where $\gamma = \beta$ or γ dominates β .

Note:

The concept of *chain accessibility sequences* Barss (1986) which extends the chain binding proposal is even more complex.

1.4.2 Remnant Movement

Problem:

In output representations, a trace may or may not be included in a moved item (with its antecedent outside), depending on whether the trace is bound or unbound. This will have to be reflected in the representational constraint.

- (11) *Freezing and anti-freezing*:
At S-structure, a bound trace t may not be included in a moved XP if the antecedent of t is excluded by XP; an unbound trace may be included in a moved XP even though the antecedent of t is excluded by XP.

Conclusion:

- First, empty categories are dubious from a minimalist perspective if they are conceived of as items that specific constraints refer to (see Chomsky's (1981) Empty Category Principle (ECP), or the licensing conditions for *pro* in Rizzi (1986) (vs. Holmberg (2005))).
- Second, constraints that explicitly model effects of the interaction with other constraints are even more dubious.

2. The Phenomenon

Basic references:

Thiersch (1985), Besten & Webelhuth (1987); den Besten & Webelhuth (1990) propose remnant movement analyses of incomplete category fronting.

- (12) a. [_β Gelesen]₁ hat [TP das Buch keiner t₁]
read has the book_{acc} no-one_{nom}
- b. [_β Gelesen]₁ hat [TP keiner das Buch t₁]
read has no-one_{nom} the book_{acc}

(13) [VP t₂ Gelesen]₁ hat [TP [NP das Buch]₂ [TP keiner t₁]]
 read has the book_{acc} no-one_{nom}

(14) [VP t₂ Gelesen]₁ hat [TP keiner [VP [NP das Buch]₂ t₁]]
 read has no-one_{nom} the book_{acc}

Alternatives:

Fanselow (1983; 1992), Riemsdijk (1989), Frey & Tappe (1991).

(15) a. [V Gelesen]₁ hat [TP das Buch keiner t₁]
 read has the book_{acc} no-one_{nom}

b. [VP Gelesen]₁ hat [TP [NP das Buch]₂ keiner [VP t₂ t₁]]
 read has the book_{acc} no-one_{nom}

3. The Remnant Movement Approach

3.1 A Conceptual Argument for Remnant Movement

(16) Only XPs and X⁰ categories can undergo movement.

(17) [_β Ein Buch gegeben]₁ hat die Claudia dem Peter t₁
 a book_{acc} given has ART Claudia_{nom} ART Peter_{dat}

(18) Every non-head is an XP.

(19) – hat die Claudia [VP dem Peter [VP ein Buch [VP gegeben]]₁]
 has ART Claudia_{nom} ART Peter_{dat} a book_{acc} given

(20) [VP Dem Peter [VP ein Buch [VP gegeben]]₂ hat die Claudia t₂
 ART Peter_{dat} a book_{acc} given has ART Claudia_{nom}

(21) a. [_β Dem Peter gegeben]₂ hat die Claudia ein Buch t₂
 ART Peter_{dat} given has ART Claudia_{nom} a book_{acc}

b. [_β Einem Mann geschenkt]₂ hat sie die Kette t₂ nicht
 a man_{dat} given has she_{nom} the chain_{acc} not

(22) a. [VP t₁ Vermutet]₂ habe ich sie [PP in Prag]₁ t₂
 assumed have I her in Prague
 ‘I have assumed that she is in Prague.’

b. [VP (t₂) t₁ Angestrichen]₃ hat er [NP das Haus]₂ [AP blau]₁ t₃
 painted has he the house_{acc} blue

3.2 Cross-linguistic Variation

(23) [VP Kicked the dog]₂ John never has t₂

(24) a. *[VP t₂ Kicked]₁ John [NP the dog]₂ never has t₁

b. *[VP t₂ Kicked]₁ John never has [NP the dog]₂ t₁

(25) a. [VP t₂ Gelesen]₁ hat [TP [NP das Buch]₂ keiner t₁]
 read has the book_{acc} no-one_{nom}

b. [VP t₂ Gelesen]₁ hat [TP keiner [NP das Buch]₂ t₁]
 read has no-one_{nom} the book_{acc}

(26) *John has [NP the dog]₁ never kicked t₁

(27) [VP Criticized t₂ by his boss]₁ John₂ has never been t₁

(28) *[How likely t₁ to be a riot] is there₁ ?

(29) There₁ is likely [t₁ to be a riot]

(30) [VP Kysst t₁]₂ har jag henne₁ inte t₂ (bara hållit henne i handen)
 kissed have I her not (just held her by the hand)

(Swedish)

(31) Lennet₁ en deus t₁ Tom al levr
 read have_{3.Sing/Masc} Tom the book
 ‘Tom has read the book.’

(Breton)

(32) *[VP Al levr lennet]₁ en deus Tom t₁
 the book read have_{3.Sing/Masc} Tom

(33) Čitao₁ sam t₁ knjigu
 read have_{1.Sing/Cl} book
 ‘I have read the book.’

(Serbo-Croatian)

3.3 Remnant NPs

3.3.1 The Phenomenon

(34) a. [NP Ein Buch t₁]₂ hat Antje [PP über die Liebe]₁ t₂ gelesen
 a book_{acc} has Antje_{nom} about the love read

b. [NP Ein Buch t₁]₂ hat [PP über die Liebe]₁ niemand t₂ gelesen
 a book_{acc} has about the love no-one_{nom} read

(35) [VP [NP Ein Buch t₁]₂ gelesen]₃ hat [PP darüber]₁ keiner t₃
 a book_{acc} read has about that no-one_{nom}

3.3.2 Extraction from NP

(36) a. Worüber₁ hat keiner [NP ein Buch t₁] gelesen ?
 about what has no-one_{nom} a book_{acc} read

b. dass darüber₁ keiner je [NP ein Buch t₁] gelesen hat
 that about that no-one_{nom} ever a book_{acc} read has

(37) *Worüber₁ hat keiner [NP ein Buch t₁] geklaut ?
 about what has no-one_{nom} a book_{acc} stolen

(38) *Worüber₁ hat [NP ein Buch t₁] Antje beeindruckt ?
 about what has a book_{nom} Antje_{acc} impressed

(39) *[PP Worüber]₁ hat man [NP einem Buch t₁] einen Preis gegeben ?
 about what has one_{nom} a book_{dat} an award_{acc} given

- (39) [PP Worüber]₁ hat man Antje [NP ein Buch t₁] gegeben ?
about what has one_{nom} Antje_{dat} a book_{acc} given
- (40) ?*[PP Worüber]₁ hat Antje [NP das Buch t₁] gelesen ?
about what has Antje_{nom} the book_{acc} read
- (41) *[PP Worüber]₁ hat Antje [NP Karls Buch t₁] gelesen ?
about what has Antje_{nom} Karl's_{gen} book_{acc} read
- (42) a. *[PP Worüber]₁ hat [NP ein Buch t₁]₂ keiner t₂ gelesen ?
about what has a book_{acc} no-one_{nom} read
b. [PP Worüber]₁ hat keiner [NP ein Buch t₁] gelesen ?
about what has no-one_{nom} a book_{acc} read
- (43) a. dass Fritz (?es) [PP über die Liebe] gelesen hat
that Fritz it about the love read has
b. *dass Fritz (es) [PP über die Liebe] geklaut hat
that Fritz it about the love stolen has
- (44) *dass man (es) Antje [PP über die Liebe] gegeben hat
that one_{nom} it_{acc} Antje_{dat} about the love given has
- 3.3.3 *Remnant NPs*
- (45) a. [NP Ein Buch t₁]₂ hat Antje [PP über die Liebe]₁ t₂ gelesen
a book_{acc} has Antje_{nom} about the love read
b. [NP Ein Buch t₁]₂ hat [PP über die Liebe]₁ niemand t₂ gelesen
a book_{acc} has about the love no-one_{nom} read
c. [VP [NP Ein Buch t₁]₂ gelesen]₃ hat [PP darüber]₁ keiner t₃
a book_{acc} read has about that no-one_{nom}
- (46) *[NP Ein Buch t₁]₂ hat Antje [PP über die Liebe]₁ t₂ geklaut
a book_{acc} has Antje_{nom} about the love stolen
- (47) a. *[NP Ein Buch t₁]₂ hat t₂ Antje [PP über die Liebe]₁ beeindruckt
a book_{nom} has Antje_{acc} about the love impressed
b. *[NP Ein Buch t₁]₂ hat t₂ [PP über die Liebe]₁ Antje beeindruckt
a book_{nom} has about the love Antje_{acc} impressed
- (48) a. *[NP Einem Buch t₁]₂ hat man darüber₁ t₂ einen Preis gegeben
a book_{dat} has one_{nom} about that an award_{acc} given
b. [NP Ein Buch t₁]₂ hat man Antje [PP über die Liebe]₁ t₂ gegeben
a book_{acc} has one_{nom} Antje_{dat} about the love given
- (49) ?*[NP Das Buch t₁]₂ hat Antje darüber₁ t₂ gelesen
the book_{acc} has Antje_{nom} about that read
- (50) *[NP Karls Buch t₁]₂ hat Antje [PP über die Liebe]₁ t₂ gelesen
Karl's_{gen} book_{acc} has Antje_{nom} about the love read

3.4 *Remnant PPs*

- (51) a. Wo₁ hat keiner [PP t₁ mit] gerechnet ?
where has no-one_{nom} with counted
b. *[NP Dieser Sache]₁ hat keiner [PP mit t₁] gerechnet
this thing_{dat} has no-one_{nom} with counted
- (52) a. ?[VP [PP t₁ Mit] gerechnet]₂ hat da₁ keiner t₂
with counted has there no-one_{nom}
b. *[VP [PP t₁ Mit] gerechnet]₂ hat [NP dieser Sache]₁ keiner t₂
with counted has this thing_{dat} no-one_{nom}
- (53) a. ?[VP [PP t₁ Für] gekonnt]₂ hat er da₁ wirklich nichts t₂
for could_{part} has he there really nothing
'He really was not responsible for that.'
b. *[VP [PP Für t₁] gekonnt]₂ hat er [NP diese Entwicklung]₁ wirklich nichts t₂
for could_{part} has he this development really nothing
'He really was not responsible for this development.'
- (54) *[PP t₁ Mit]₂ hat da₁ keiner t₂ gerechnet
with has there no-one_{nom} counted
- (55) a. *[PP Mit]₁ hat gestern keiner t₁ gespielt
with has yesterday no-one_{nom} played
b. Gestern spielte keiner [PP mit]
yesterday played no-one with
- (56) [PP Addosso t₁]₂ non gli₁ è caduta t₂
on not him_{dat} (she) is fallen
(Italian)

3.5 *Coherent Infinitives*

- (57) a. dass [NP das Buch]₁ keiner [α t₁ zu lesen] versucht hat
that the book_{acc} no-one_{nom} to read tried has
b. ?*dass [NP das Buch]₁ keiner [α t₁ zu lesen] abgelehnt hat
that the book_{acc} no-one_{nom} to read refused has
- (58) a. [α t₁ Zu lesen]₃ hat [NP das Buch]₁ keiner t₃ versucht
to read has the book no-one tried
b. *[α t₁ Zu lesen]₃ hat [NP das Buch]₁ keiner t₃ abgelehnt
to read has the book no-one refused
- (59) a. [α t₁ Zu lesen]₃ hat keiner [NP das Buch]₁ t₃ versucht
to read has no-one the book tried
b. *[α t₁ Zu lesen]₃ hat keiner [NP das Buch]₁ t₃ abgelehnt
to read has no-one the book refused

- (60) * $[_{VP} t_1 \text{ Zu lesen }]_3$ hat keiner $[_\alpha [_{NP} \text{ das Buch }]_1 t_3]$ abgelehnt
to read has no-one the book refused
- (61) a. $[_{NP} \text{ Das Buch }]_1$ hat keiner $[_\alpha t_1 \text{ zu lesen }]_3$ abgelehnt
the book_{acc} has no-one_{nom} to read refused
b. Was₁ hat keiner $[_\alpha t_1 \text{ zu lesen }]_3$ abgelehnt ?
what_{acc} has no-one_{nom} to read refused
- (62) a. $[_{VP} [_\alpha t_1 \text{ Zu lesen }]_3 \text{ versucht }]_2$ hat keiner $[_{NP} \text{ das Buch }]_1 t_2$
to read tried has no-one the book_{acc}
b. * $[_{VP} [_\alpha t_1 \text{ Zu lesen }]_3 \text{ abgelehnt }]_2$ hat keiner $[_{NP} \text{ das Buch }]_1 t_2$
to read refused has no-one the book_{acc}
- (63) a. $[_{VP} [_\alpha \text{ Dem Peter } t_1 \text{ zu geben }] \text{ versucht }]_2$ hat $[_{NP} \text{ das Buch }]_1$ keiner t_2
ART Peter_{dat} to give tried has the book_{acc} no-one_{nom}
b. * $[_{VP} [_\alpha \text{ Dem Peter } t_1 \text{ zu geben }] \text{ abgelehnt }]_2$ hat $[_{NP} \text{ das Buch }]_1$ keiner
ART Peter_{dat} to give refused has the book_{acc} no-one_{nom}
 t_2

4. Peculiar Properties

4.1 Proper Binding

- (64) *The Proper Binding Condition (PBC):*
Traces must be bound.
- (65) *John asked t_1 $[_{CP} \text{ who}_1 \text{ Mary saw Bill }]$
- (66) *dass Fritz t_1 sagte $[_{CP} \text{ dem Peter}_1 \text{ habe }]_{TP}$ keiner die Claudia
that Fritz said ART Peter_{dat} has_{subj} no-one_{nom} ART Claudia_{acc}
gesehen]
seen
- (67) a. dass Fritz dem Peter₁ sagte $[_{CP} \text{ die Claudia}_2 \text{ habe }]_{TP}$ keiner t_2
that Fritz ART Peter_{dat} said ART Claudia_{acc} has_{subj} no-one_{nom}
gesehen]
seen
b. dass Fritz dem Peter₁ sagte $[_{CP} \text{ es } \text{ habe }]_{TP}$ keiner die
that Fritz ART Peter_{dat} said EXPL has_{subj} no-one_{nom} ART
Claudia gesehen]
Claudia_{acc} seen
- (68) $[_{VP} t_2 \text{ Gelesen }]_1$ hat $[_{TP} [_{NP} \text{ das Buch }]_2 [_{TP} \text{ keiner } t_1]]$
read has the book_{acc} no-one_{nom}

4.2 Freezing

In general, extraction of one XP α from another XP β is possible only if β occurs in situ, as is depicted schematically in (69-a), and has not undergone movement itself, as shown in (69-b).

- (69) a. ... α_1 ... $[_\beta \dots t_1 \dots]_2$
b. *... α_1 ... $[_\beta \dots t_1 \dots]_2$... t_2
- (70) *Freezing:*
At S-structure, a trace t may not be included in a moved XP (i.e., an XP that binds a trace) if the antecedent of t is excluded by XP.
- (71) a. * $[_{PP} \text{ Worüber }]_1$ hat $[_{NP} \text{ ein Buch } t_1]_2$ keiner t_2 gelesen ?
about what has a book_{acc} no-one_{nom} read
b. $[_{PP} \text{ Worüber }]_1$ hat keiner $[_{NP} \text{ ein Buch } t_1]$ gelesen ?
about what has no-one_{nom} a book_{acc} read
- (72) a. Ich denke $[_{CP} [_{VP} \text{ das Buch } \text{ gelesen }]_2 \text{ hat } \text{ keiner } t_2]$
I think the book read has no-one
b. $[_{NP} \text{ Was }]_1$ denkst du $[_{CP} t'_1 \text{ hat } \text{ keiner } [_{VP} t_1 \text{ gelesen }]_2]$?
what think you has no-one read
c. * $[_{NP} \text{ Was }]_1$ denkst du $[_{CP} [_{VP} t_1 \text{ gelesen }]_2 \text{ hat } \text{ keiner } t_2]$?
what think you gelesen has no-one
- (73) a. $[_{VP} t_2 \text{ Gelesen }]_1$ hat $[_{TP} [_{NP} \text{ das Buch }]_2 [_{TP} \text{ keiner } t_1]]$
read has the book_{acc} no-one_{nom}
b. $[_{NP} \text{ Ein Buch } t_1]_2$ hat Antje $[_{PP} \text{ über die Liebe }]_1 t_2$ gelesen
a book_{acc} has Antje_{nom} about the love read
- 4.3 *Movement Type Asymmetries*
- (74) $[_\alpha t_1 \text{ Zu lesen }]_3$ hat $[_{NP} \text{ das Buch }]_1$ keiner t_3 versucht
to read has the book_{acc} no-one tried
- (75) *dass $[_\alpha t_1 \text{ zu lesen }]_3$ $[_{NP} \text{ das Buch }]_1$ keiner t_3 versucht hat
that to read the book_{acc} no-one tried has
- (76) a. $[_\alpha \text{ Das Buch } \text{ zu lesen }]_3$ hat keiner t_3 versucht
the book_{acc} to read has no-one tried
b. dass $[_\alpha \text{ das Buch } \text{ zu lesen }]_3$ keiner t_3 versucht hat
that the book_{acc} to read no-one tried has
- (77) a. $[_{NP} \text{ Was für ein Buch } t_1]_2$ hast du $[_{PP} \text{ über die Liebe }]_1 t_2$ gelesen ?
what for a book_{acc} have you about the love read
b. $[_{NP} \text{ Was für ein Buch } \text{ über die Liebe }]_2$ hast du t_2 gelesen ?
what for a book_{acc} about the love have you read
- (78) a. * $[_{VP} t_1 \text{ Gelesen }]$, das hat das Buch₁ keiner t
read that has the book no-one

- b. [_{VP} Das Buch gelesen], das hat keiner t
 the book read that has no-one

4.4 Unbound Intermediate Traces

- (79) (Ich weiß nicht) wen₁ sie gesagt hat [_{CP} t'₁ dass Fritz t₁ liebt]
 I know not who_{acc} she_{nom} said has that Fritz_{nom} loves
- (80) ??[_{CP} Dass Fritz Caroline liebt]₂ weiß ich nicht [_{CP} ob er t₂
 that Fritz_{nom} Caroline_{acc} loves know I_{nom} not whether he_{nom}
 zugeben würde]
 admit would
- (81) * [_{CP} t'₁ Dass Fritz t₁ liebt]₂ weiß ich nicht [_{CP} wen₁ er t₂ gesagt hat]
 that Fritz_{nom} loves know I_{nom} not who_{acc} he_{nom} said has
- (82) a. ??[_{VP} t₁ Auf den Mund geküsst]₂ weiß ich nicht [_{CP} wen₁ sie t₂ hat
 on the mouth kissed know I_{nom} not who_{acc} she_{nom} has
 b. ??[_{VP} Den Fritz auf den Mund geküsst]₂ weiß ich nicht [_{CP} ob
 ART Fritz_{acc} on the mouth kissed know I_{nom} not whether
 sie t₂ hat
 she_{nom} has
- (83) a. * [_{VP} Gesagt [_{CP} t'₁ dass Fritz t₁ liebt]]₃ weiß ich nicht [_{CP} wen₁ er
 said that Fritz_{nom} loves know I_{nom} not who_{acc} he_{nom}
 t₃ hat]
 has
 b. ??[_{VP} Gesagt [_{CP} dass Fritz Caroline liebt]]₃ weiß ich nicht [_{CP}
 said that Fritz_{nom} Caroline_{acc} loves know I_{nom} not
 ob er t₃ hat]
 whether he_{nom} has

5. Conclusion

Good:

1. The postulation of remnant movement seems inevitable according to well-established restrictions on movement and projection.
2. The remnant movement hypothesis offers a straightforward account of cross-linguistic variation.
3. Constructions involving fronting of incomplete NPs (and VPs containing incomplete NPs) mirror the properties of constructions involving extraction from NP.
4. Constructions involving fronting of VPs containing incomplete PPs mirror the properties of constructions involving extraction from PP.

5. Constructions involving fronting of incomplete infinitives (and VPs containing incomplete infinitives) mirror the properties of constructions involving scrambling from infinitives.

Bad:

1. Why can remnant movement violate the Proper Binding Condition?
2. Why is remnant movement an exception to the Freezing generalization?
3. Why does remnant movement show movement type asymmetries?
4. Why can remnant movement not create unbound intermediate traces?

Bibliography

- Barss, Andrew (1984): Chain Binding. Ms., MIT, Cambridge, Mass. (Talk at GLOW).
- Barss, Andrew (1986): Chains and Anaphoric Dependence. Ph.d. thesis, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Belletti, Adriana & Luigi Rizzi (1988): Psych-Verbs and Θ -Theory, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6, 291–352.
- Besten, Hans den & Gert Webelhuth (1987): Adjunction and Remnant Topicalization in the Germanic SOV-Languages. Paper presented at the GLOW-Conference, Venice.
- Browning, Marguerite (1987): Null Operator Constructions. PhD thesis, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Chomsky, Noam (1973): Conditions on Transformations. In: S. Anderson & P. Kiparsky, eds., *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 232–286.
- Chomsky, Noam (1981): *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Foris, Dordrecht.
- Chomsky, Noam (1986): *Barriers*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1990): *Types of A-bar Dependencies*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- den Besten, Hans & Gert Webelhuth (1990): Stranding. In: G. Grewendorf & W. Sternefeld, eds., *Scrambling and Barriers*. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 77–92.
- Fanselow, Gisbert (1983): Zur Behandlung der Anaphora in der Generativen Grammatik. Ein Überblick. Technical Report 84, Sonderforschungsbereich 99, Universität Konstanz.
- Fanselow, Gisbert (1992): The Return of the Base Generators. Ms., Universität Passau.
- Frey, Werner & Thilo Tappe (1991): Zur Interpretation der X-bar-Theorie und zur Syntax des Mittelfeldes. Grundlagen eines GB-Fragmentes. Ms., Universität Stuttgart.
- Holmberg, Anders (2005): Is There a Little Pro? Evidence from Finnish, *Linguistic Inquiry* 36(4), 533–564.
- Huang, Cheng-Teh James (1982): Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar. PhD thesis, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Müller, Gereon (1998): *Incomplete Category Fronting*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Perlmutter, David & Scott Soames (1979): *Syntactic Argumentation and the Structure of English*. The University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Riemsdijk, Henk van (1989): Movement and Regeneration. In: P. Benincá, ed., *Dialectal Variation and the Theory of Grammar*. Foris, Dordrecht, pp. 105–136.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1986): Null Objects in Italian and the Theory of ‘pro’, *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, 501–557.
- Thiersch, Craig (1985): VP and Scrambling in the German Mittelfeld. Ms., University of Tilburg.