Double fronting and parasitic gaps in Bavarian

1. The phenomenon: double fronting

- A constituent (argument or adjunct) is moved from a fronted adverbial or argumental clause to a position immediately preceding that clause (*Bavarian extraction (BE)*):

\[\text{[De Mass]}_1 \quad \text{[wenn } i \quad t_i \quad \text{no drink], bin i bsuffa.}
\]

This liter if I still drink am I drunk

'I if still drink this Mass, I will be drunk.'

\[\text{[An Hans]}_1 \quad \text{[ob } i \quad t_i \quad \text{no amoi wählen], woäß i ned.}
\]

the Hans if I once more vote know I not

'I don't know if I will vote for Hans again.'

\[\text{[Wegen an Hans]}_1 \quad \text{[dass } a \quad t_i \quad \text{kimmt], hätt i ned denkt.}
\]

because of the Hans that he comes had I not thought

'I would not have thought that he was going to come because of Hans.'

2. Crucial properties of BE

(P1) \text{BE LICENSES A GAP IN THE MATRIX CLAUSE} (see examples in (4))

(4) a. \text{[Den], [wenn } i \quad t_i \quad \text{dawisch], daschlog i e_i.}

him if I catch kill I

'If I catch him, I will kill him.'

b. \text{[An Pfarrer], [statt dass } i \quad t_i \quad \text{bsuach], loss i d'Arbat e_i liaba}

the priest instead that I visit let I the-work rather selber macha.

himself do

'Instead of visiting the priest, I rather let him do the work himself.'

(P2) \text{BE REQUIRES CLAUSAL FRONTING}

(5) \text{*I bin bsuffa, [de Mass]}_1 \quad \text{[wenn } i \quad t_i \quad \text{no drink].}

I am drunk this liter if I still drink

(6) \text{*I woäß ned, [an Hans]}_1 \quad \text{[ob } i \quad t_i \quad \text{no amoi wählen].}

I know not the Hans\text{ACC} if I once more vote

While the extraction illustrated in (1) and (2) is possible with adverbial as well as argument clauses, the construction with an additional gap in the matrix clause is only possible with (a certain kind of) \text{wenn} ('if')-clauses but not with 'strong' complementizers in the sense of Reis (1985) such as \text{weil} ('because'), \text{obwohl} ('although'), \text{nachdem} ('after') (see Felix 1985). The kind of \text{wenn} ('if')-clauses involved concerns "central adverbial" if-clauses in the sense of Haegeman (2002).
• If the dependent clause is not located in the left periphery, extraction is licensed if the extracted element occupies a position in front of the matrix clause, and if the clause from which extraction takes place is an argument:

(7) \[ \text{An Hans, woab i ned, [ob i ti no amoi wahl].} \]
the Hans\textsubscript{ACC} know I not if I once more vote

• If the dependent clause is adverbial, extraction to the front of the matrix clause is not possible:

(8) *\[ \text{De Mass bin i bsuffa, [wenn i ti no drink].} \]
this liter am I drunk if I still drink

• No BE in (7) but successive cyclic movement into the matrix clause: ungrammaticality of (8) due to the islandhood of adjuncts.

• Property (P2) captures the fact that BE is possible from clauses that occur in the left periphery of a verb second complement (Lutz 1993, Weiβ 1998):

(9) Da Sepp glaad, [an Hans], [wenn a ti dawischt], daschlogt a e, the Sepp believes the Hans if he catches kills he

(P3) **BE IS POSSIBLE FROM WH-CLAUSES NOT INTRODUCED BY A COMPLEX WH-ELEMENT:**

(10) \[ \text{An Sepp, [wer (dass) ti gseng hod], woab i ned.} \]
the Sepp who that seen has know I not

(11) *\[ \text{Den Kaas, [welcher Lehrer dass ti vazapft hod], mecht i} \]
the cheese which teacher that told has would I wissen.
like-to-know
'I would like to know which teacher has told that nonsense.'

• To the extent that Bavarian has free relatives, BE appears not to be possible with free relatives:

(12) a. \[ \text{Wos a gsogt hod}, \] is a Schmarrn.
what said has is a nonsense
b. *\[ \text{Da Sepp, [wos ti gsogt hod], is a Schmarrn.} \]
the Sepp what said has is a nonsense

• There are no constraints on the elements that can undergo BE. Arguments as well as adjuncts can be extracted.

**QUESTIONS:**

Q1: Is the target position of BE in the embedded or in the matrix clause?
Q2: What are the properties of the gap in the matrix clause and how is this gap licensed?
Q3: What motivates BE and why is clausal fronting required?
Q4: Why is BE from wh-clauses with complex wh-elements disallowed?
3. Question Q1: the target position of BE

EVIDENCE FOR TARGET POSITION IN THE MATRIX CLAUSE:

- **1. argument**: licensing of the gap in the matrix clause (examples in (4))
  (Stechow/Sternefeld 1988)
- **2. argument**: preposed quantifier phrase (Lutz 1992)

(13) [Koa Hund], [wenn e, g'schlogn wead], traut t, si'
no dog if beaten is dares himself
no amool zur Tür nei’.
once more through the door

- (13) cannot be interpreted as (14a) but must be interpreted as (14b):

(14) a. [Wenn kein Hund geschlagen wird], traut kein Hund/er sich
if no dog beaten is dears no dog/he himself
noch einmal zur Tür herein.
once more through the door
b. [Wenn er geschlagen wird], traut sich kein Hund noch
if he beaten is dares himself no dog once
einmal zur Tür herein.
more through the door

- **Against this argument**: (13) does not constitute an instance of BE.:  

(15) ?a person who, people that talk to e, usually end up fascinated with t,
(Kayne 1983: 169)

(16) des is a Hund, [der, [wenn e, gschlogn werd], t, nimma hoam
this is a dog which if beaten is never home
kummt] comes

- As expected, in sentences like (16) it is the gap in the wenn-clause rather than the gap in the matrix clause that can be resumed by a personal pronoun:

(17) a. des is a Hund, [der, [wenn er gschlogn werd], nimma
this is a dog which if he beaten is never
hoam kummt] home comes
b. *des is a Hund, [der, [wenn gschlogn werd], er nimma
this is a dog which if beaten is he never
hoam kummt] home comes

EVIDENCE FOR TARGET POSITION IN THE EMBEDDED CLAUSE:

Generalization: the left periphery of the German clause cannot be occupied by more than two overt phrasal elements (SpecTopP, SpecFinP, no overt focus fronting)
1. argument: the interaction of left dislocation and movement to the prefield (SpecFinP) in the embedded and the matrix clause of BE

(19) \[ [\text{An Ratzinger}], \ [\text{dass t} \ \text{nehmen}], \ [\text{des}] \ \text{hätt i ned denkt.} \]
the ratzinger that they-accept this had I not thought

2. argument: no multiple left dislocation in German (Altmann 1981)

(20) \[ [\text{Die Gretel}], \ [\text{den Hans}], \ \text{die, \ wird \ den, \ schon \ noch} \]
the GretelNOM the HansACC she will him yet still
\text{überzeugen.} \]
convince

3. argument: BE of wh-element

(22) \[ [\text{Wer}], \ [\text{seit t} \ \text{do \ is}], \ \text{lafft ois \ besser?} \]
who since here is goes everything better

4. argument: constituency

(23) a. Da Peter \text{glaabd} \[ [\text{de Mass} \ \text{wenn er t} \ \text{no \ drinkt}], \ \text{is a bsuffa}. \]
the Peter thinks this liter if he still drinks is he drunk
b. [\text{De Mass} \ \text{wenn er t} \ \text{no \ drinkt}], \ \text{glaabd da Peter, [t} \ \text{is a bsuffa.}
this liter if he still drinks thinks the Peter is he drunk
4. Question Q2: what are the properties of the gap in the matrix clause and how is this gap licensed?

**THE TRUE GAP IS IN THE EMBEDDED CLAUSE:**

- Semantic argument:

  (24) a. [Weg an Hans dass a kimmt], hätt i ned denkt. because of the Hans that he comes had I not thought
  
  b. [Heit wenn a fehlt], werd a was dalebn. today if he is-absent will he something experience

- Unlike the gap in the matrix clause, the gap in the embedded clause cannot be replaced with a resumptive pronoun:

  (25) a. *[Den], wenn i\textsubscript{n}i dawisch], daschlog i e, him if I-him catch kill I
  
  b. [Den], wenn i t\textsubscript{i} dawisch], daschlog i\textsubscript{n}i, him if I catch kill I-him

**QUESTION:** Is the gap in the matrix clause a parasitic gap?

**PROPERTIES TYPICALLY ASSOCIATED WITH PARASITIC GAPS :**

- parasitic gaps tend to appear in positions that are inaccessible to movement (Chomsky 1982)

  (26) a. Here is the influential professor that John sent his book to t in order to impress e.
  
  b. He is a man whom everyone who meets e admires t.

- parasitic gaps are not well-formed in finite clauses (Emonds 2001):

  (29) a. Which students did she criticize t after introducing e to the professor?
  
  b. *Which students did she criticize t after the boss had introduced e to the professor?

**from Engdahl 1983**

- a person that they spoke to because they admired

  (30) a. ?a person who people that talk to usually end up fascinated with
  
  b. ?a person who people that talk to usually end up fascinated with
  
  (Kayne 1983: 166, 169)

- an article that John read __ [before Mary glanced at __]

  c. Who did John visit __ [without claiming that he knew __]
  
  (Nissenbaum 2000: 33)
• position of an empty parasitic operator in Bavarian extraction if the gap in the matrix clause were the parasitic gap?

(31) \[ \text{CP } \text{Den}_i \text{ wenn } i \text{ t} \text{ dawisch, } \emptyset_i \text{ [C daschlog i e]]}. \]

• Preposed wenn ('if')-clauses in German do not necessarily occupy the SpecFinP position (König/van der Auwera 1988, von Fintel 1994, Günthner 1999; for Italian and Northern Italian dialects see also Munaro 2009).

(32) a. [Wenn ich noch ein Bier trinke], [dann] bin ich betrunken. 'If I drink one more beer, then I will be drunk.'

b. [Wenn er sich weigern würde], [die] würden ihn glatt ins Gefängnis stecken.. 'If he refused, they would even put him into prison.'

5. Question Q3: what motivates BE and why is clausal fronting required?

assumptions:
(i) German left clausal periphery: only two positions overtly filled (SpecTopP, SpecFinP)
(ii) SpecCP/SpecFinP ("prefield") neutral w.r.t. discourse-semantic properties (Roberts 1999)
(iii) BE can involve a Topic or a Focus:

(33) a. Wos hom-s g'sagt, wia-s an Xaver wieder g'seng hom?
   'What did they say when they saw Xaver again?'

b. An Xaver wie-s g'seng hom hom-sa-se recht g'freit.
   'As for Xaver, when they saw him they were really happy.'

(34) a. Wos fir-a Notn host gmoant dass-st kriagst?
   'Which grade did you think you would get?'

b. An Oanser dass-e kriag how-e g'moant.
   'Grade one I thought I would get.'
   (Bayer 2001: 20)

Conclusion: a focus or a topic (a "salient element") in SpecFinP must be licensed by an Agree relation with a corresponding feature of a higher head in the left periphery

Crucial claim: Agree of BE-element must be with a head in the left periphery of the matrix clause, and it is the necessity of this Agree relation that motivates fronting of the embedded clause.

WHAT MOTIVATES BE?
**Assumption on movement:** an element X in the domain of a phase head that bears an uninterpretable feature π moves to the edge of this phase head (otherwise PIC-violation); in other words, syntactic objects with unsatisfied feature requirements must move out of their phase (can be considered as part of the Transfer operation)

**WHAT TRIGGERS OBLIGATORY FRONTING OF THE EMBEDDED CLAUSE?**

**Answer:** assumption on movement

(35) [De Mass, wenn i t, no drink, bin i bsuffa, this liter if I still drink am I drunk

(36)

**QUESTION:** Is the specifier of a specifier accessible to a higher probe?

**Independent evidence:** free relatives with *wessen*-NPs (Fuß/Grewendorf/Groat 2012)

(37) [[Wessen, Studenten]pl sich langweilen, sollte, sich stärker in der Lehre engagieren, whose students Refl get bored should Refl stronger in teaching involve 'Whoever's students get bored, should be more involved in teaching.']
For "deep search":

- Chomsky (2012) on embedded wh-interrogatives
- M. Richards (2012): Whatever hasn't undergone Transfer is accessible; therefore, everything in the Spec of a phase head is accessible.

**LICENSING OF THE GAP IN THE MATRIX CLAUSE:**

**Problem:** neither the gap nor the empty operator is c-commanded by the antecedent in the "overt" syntax (not necessarily a problem for parasitic gap).

(39)  
\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{ ?Which senator}_1 \text{ did you persuade } \_1 \text{ to borrow which car}_2 \text{ [after getting an opponent of } \_2 \text{ to put a bomb in } \_2] ? \\
b. & \text{ ?Which kid}_1 \text{ did you give which candy bar}_2 \text{ to } \_1 \text{ [without first telling a parent of } \_2 \text{ about the ingredients in } \_2] ? \\
c. & \text{ ?Which book}_1 \text{ did you give } \_ \text{ to which student} [\text{without first showing } \_ \text{ to friends of } \_] ? \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Nissenbaum 2000: 116, 130)

**Implication:** empty operator in SpecFinP of the matrix clause (the gap in the matrix clause) is licensed by Agree with the left peripheral head ("salience") that licenses the BE element.

**Independent evidence for the presence of an empty operator:**

- licensing of the matrix gap (the empty prononominal) is no longer possible if SpecFinP of the matrix clause is occupied by another constituent (in that case, the matrix gap has to be lexicalized by a resumptive pronoun, cf. the contrast in (40) and (41):
(40) a. [An Hans\textsubscript{i} wenn i t\textsubscript{i} dawisch] daschlog i e\textsubscript{i} mi’m Hacke.
   the Hans-ACC if I catch kill I with the ax
b. *[An Hans\textsubscript{i} wenn i t\textsubscript{i} dawisch], mi’m Hacke daschlog i e\textsubscript{i}.
   the Hans-ACC if I catch with the ax kill I
c. [An Hans wenn i t\textsubscript{i} dawisch], mi’m Hacke daschlog i’i’n.
   the Hans-ACC if I catch with the ax kill I-him

- fronting of argument clauses (to SpecFinP) combined with BE

(41) a. [Deni wenn i t\textsubscript{i} dawisch], daschlog i e\textsubscript{i}.
   him if I catch kill I
b. *[Deni wenn i t\textsubscript{i} dawisch], dann daschlog i e\textsubscript{i}.
   him if I catch then kill I
c. [Deni wenn i t\textsubscript{i} dawisch], dann daschlog i’i’n.
   him if I catch then kill I-him

- interaction of BE with Weak Crossover effects

(42) a. *[An Sepp\textsubscript{i} wer dass t\textsubscript{i} bschissn hod], hob i e\textsubscript{i} gfrogt.
   the Sepp-ACC who that cheated has have I asked
b. *[Am Sepp\textsubscript{i} wer dass t\textsubscript{i} ghoifa hod], hob i e\textsubscript{i} gsogd.
   the Sepp-DAT who that helped has have I told

(43) [An Hans\textsubscript{i} wenn sei\textsubscript{i} Vata nausschmeißt], wundert me ned.
   the hans\textsubscript{ACC} if his father throws-out surprises me not
(44) Den Studenten\textsubscript{i} hat sein\textsubscript{i} Professor kritisier.
   the student\textsubscript{ACC} has his professor\textsubscript{NOM} criticized
(45) *[An Hans\textsubscript{i}, wenn’s t\textsubscript{i} nausschmeißn], werd sei\textsubscript{i} Vata e\textsubscript{i} daschlogn.
   the hans\textsubscript{ACC} if-they throw-out will his father\textsubscript{NOM} kill
   'Intended: If they throw out Hans, his father will kill him.'
(46) [An Hans\textsubscript{i}, wenn’s t\textsubscript{i} nausschmeißn], werd sei\textsubscript{i} Vata ned traurig be.
   the hans\textsubscript{ACC} if-they throw-out will his father not sad be
   'If they throw out Hans, his father will not be unhappy.'

NEW ANALYSIS: Topic drop rather than parasitic gap\textsuperscript{2}

Main characteristics of (German) topic drop (Trutkowski 2011)

- Possible with PPs (unlike parasitic gaps, see Cinque 1990)

(47) a. Neapel liegt am Meer\textsubscript{PP}.
   Naples lies by the sea
b. [ e ]\textsubscript{PP} Liegt Ostia auch.
   lies Ostia as well

\textsuperscript{2} Thanks to Erich Groat for drawing my attention to topic drop.
(48) a. [[Mit da Susi], wenn-a t\(_i\) aufgwachsen is], is-a a e\(_t\) verwandt.
   'If he grew up with Susi, he is related to her.'
   with the Susi if-he grown-up is is-he also related
   b. [[Nach Minga], wenn's mi t\(_i\) eildn], geh i sofort e\(_t\).
   'If they invite me to Munich, I will come immediately.'

- Only salient discourse entities can be dropped

- Restricted to the position in front of the finite verb in V2 clauses

(49)a. *[Den\(_i\) wenn i t\(_i\) dawisch], [dass i e\(_t\) daschlog], hob i am Hans gsogt.
   him if I catch that I kill have I to Hans told
   b. *[Den\(_i\) wenn i dawisch], hob i am Hans gsogt, [dass i e\(_t\) daschlog].
   him if I catch have I to Hans told that I kill
   c. [Den\(_i\) wenn i t\(_i\) dawisch], gladb da Hans, [daschlog i e\(_t\)].
   him if I catch, thinks the Hans kill I

- Possible with adverbials:

(50) [Do\(_i\) wenn-a t\(_i\) arbatn mecht], muaß-a a e\(_t\) wohna.
   there if-he work wants must-he also live
   'If he wants to have a position there, he should also live there.'

6. Question Q4: why is BE from wh-clauses with complex wh-elements disallowed?

Problem: BE out of wh-interrogatives

(51)a. [[An Sepp], wer (dass) t\(_i\) gseng hod], woaß i ned.
   the Sepp\(_{ACC}\) who that seen has know I not
   'I don't know who saw Sepp.'
   b. [[Da Hans], warum (dass) sie t\(_i\) umbracht hod], mecht i wissen.
   the Hans why that himself killed has want I know
   'I would like to know why Hans has committed suicide.'

(52) a. [Den Hans], wer hat den\(_i\) gesehen?
   the Hans\(_{ACC}\) who has him seen
   'As for Hans, who has seen him?'
   b. *[Den Hans, wer hat gesehen?]
   the Hans\(_{ACC}\) who has seen

**QUESTION:** Why can the fronted XPs in (51) occur on the left of the wh-element although they are not resumed by a D-pronoun?

(53) [Da Hans], mecht i wissen, [warum (dass) t\(_i\) sie umbracht hod].
   the Hans want I know why that himself killed has

(54) [An Sepp\(_j\) wer dass t\(_j\) gseng hot\(_i\)], des\(_i\) woaß i ned.
   the Sepp\(_{ACC}\) who that seen has this know I not
Two possible answers:
(a) wh-element does not occupy SpecFinP in embedded clauses
(b) BE targets TopP

Evidence for (b):
- BE from wh-clauses not possible with quantifiers (unlike "standard" cases of BE, see (55)) (same reason that prevents quantifiers from undergoing left dislocation)

(55) [[[Neamd], [wenn ti kimmt], bin i a zfriedn.
   nobody if comes am I also satisfied

(56) a. *[Neamd, wer (dass) gseng ti hod], mecht i wissen.
   nobodyACC who that seen has want I know
b. *[Koa Geldi, wer (dass) ti verlorn hod], hod a gfrogd.
   no moneyACC who that lost has has he asked

- BE elements in wh-clauses can only function as topics

(57) a. [Wen, woäßt ned [weri dass ti tj gseng hod]]?
   whom know-you not who that seen has
b. ??[An Hansi, wer dass ti gseng hod], woäß i ned.
   the HansACC who that seen has know I not

(58) a. [Wen, mechst wissen, [warum dass’ ti umbracht ham]]?
   whom want-you know why that-they killed have
b. ??[An Hansi, warum dass’ ti umbracht ham], mecht i wissen.
   the HansACC why that-they killed have want I know

(59) a. *[Da Sepp, welche Buam dass ti vadroschn hod], woäß i ned.
   the Sepp which boys that beaten has know I not
   'I don't know which boys Sepp has beaten.'

b. *[Den Kaasi, welcher Lehrer dass ti vazapft hod], mecht i
   the cheese which teacher that told has would I
   like-to-know
   'I would like to know which teacher has told that nonsense.'

account of (59): If complex wh-phrases require licensing by a Top-head (see Rizzi 2001, Grewendorf 2012) and if the BE-element extracted from wh-clauses necessarily functions as a Topic as well, the ungrammaticality of (59) might be attributed to a minimality effect.
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