

[Review Article]

Hubert Haider
The Syntax of German
Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010, xiv + 371 pp.*

JIRO INABA
Hiroshima University

Key words: basic branching constraint, canonical directionality, OV vs. VO, extraposition

The Syntax of German by Hubert Haider, published in the *Cambridge Syntax Guides* series, deals with some of the most important and well-discussed topics in German syntax within the Principles and Parameters (henceforth P&P) approach. The book consists of seven chapters as well as a foreword. The basic ideas advocated in each chapter remain in principle the same as those in a series of Haider's previous publications. In this sense, the present book can be regarded as a compilation of the theses that Haider has been advocating for about twenty years.¹

In this review article, after presenting the author's most important ideas that serve as guiding principles throughout, I go through the whole book chapter by chapter.² Since each chapter deals with different empirical phenomena, summarizing the whole book without incorporating some concrete data would make little sense. For some of the chapters, I discuss Haider's essential claims in some detail, point out their problems and provide an alternative analysis of my own. In the following, page numbers refer to the book by Haider under review. For the sake of consistency, I keep alterations of the cited examples and their glosses to a minimum, doing so only where necessary or appropriate. The translations of texts by

* I would like to thank Hubert Haider and two anonymous reviewers of *Gengo Kenkyu* for their useful comments which contributed to the enormous improvement of this article. I am also indebted to Marc Richards for correcting my English as well as for providing me with valuable suggestions.

¹ As an anonymous reviewer of *Gengo Kenkyu* points out, one of Haider's most important theses is his view of the grammar faculty as a "pattern matching capacity" rather than a "derivation capacity" (p. ix), as opposed to the majority of mainstream generative theoreticians. This theoretical aspect will not be taken up in the empirical discussions that follow.

² Chapter 6 ("Case: a nominative-accusative language with a four-way case paradigm") will not be treated in this review, partly for lack of space, and partly because the discussion there is only indirectly relevant to the general picture of the author's theory.

other authors originally in German are my own.

First, in the foreword to the book, Haider's essential claim is expressed concisely, his main aim being to elucidate the grammatical properties of German (or Germanic OV-languages in general) (p. viii):

These two properties – the head-final VP and the ‘movability’ of (finite) verbs – are the core properties that trigger a cascade of implications within a universal grammar framework. It is the major concern of this book to demonstrate in detail how this minimal set of initial conditions is sufficient for a deeper understanding of the major syntactic properties not only of German and its Germanic kin, but also of the systematic contrasts between an OV organization of sentence structure vis-à-vis a VO organization of sentence structure.

Whichever theoretical framework one assumes, it is a descriptively valid observation that the head-finality of VP and V2 (positioning of the finite verb in the second position of the main clause) are the essential syntactic properties of German, especially when compared to English, a closely related Germanic language.³ Haider's view of universality in linguistic theory is then represented in the following passage (p. 9; emphasis by Haider):

Present-day theorizing focuses primarily on a universal model of clause structure and emphasizes the *shared* properties. [...]. In the author's view, languages do not necessarily share a universal clause structure. What they share is a universal set of principles and processes that determine the organization of the grammar of a human language.

Based on this strategic background, Haider lays out in the substantial part of chapter 1 (“A comparative survey: German – V2 and partially OV”) his most important ideas that pervade the whole book. I summarize the relevant proposals, which Haider calls premises, as follows (p. 26):

- (1) Basic branching constraint (BBC):
The merged phrase precedes rather than follows its host.

³ As an anonymous reviewer of *Gengo Kenkyu* correctly points out, Haider is not only concerned with the comparison of German and English, but also engaged in elucidating the syntactic properties of the (Germanic) OV structure in contrast to the (Germanic) VO structure (see the above citation in the text). Despite that, in this review article, German facts are contrasted just with English data (as is also the case in many parts of the book under review). This is partly for expository reasons, and partly because Haider also seems to be especially cautious about directly carrying over the facts from English into the analyses of German: “As for English, it is *the* exceptional language, not only within the Germanic language family. [...]. Nevertheless, English still serves as *the* model language for grammar theory. This is not detrimental as long as the exceptional qualities of English are recognized and not mistaken as a model of a universal grammar.” (p. 9; emphasis by Haider)

(2) Canonical directionality:

The merged phrase is licensed under the (parametrized) canonical directionality by (the projection of) the head.

First, the BBC dictates that phrase structure is in principle right-branching. To that extent it would seem to be no different from the thesis advocated by Kayne (1994), known as the LCA. There is, however, a crucial difference between Haider's and Kayne's theories (cf. also Haider 2013: Ch.9) when we look at the most deeply embedded level of the phrase structure, namely a zero-level head and its complement. Under the LCA, the head universally precedes its complement, whereas the BBC admits not only head-initial, but also head-final structures. Whether a (lexical) head⁴ selects its complement to its right or left depends on the "canonical directionality" of the head in question, which is expressed by (2): V^0 in English, for example, selects its complement to its right, whereas in German it canonically does so to its left. Once a zero-level head H^0 is merged with its sister and projects to H^n , where $n \geq 1$, the projection line is now always on the right, in accordance with (1). In short, as regards phrase structure, Haider's proposal shares the same insight as the LCA except for the lowest level of the projection line, namely the one between X^0 and YP: There *is*, for Haider, a head (or directionality) parameter.⁵

For the sake of illustration, let us take up the following structures:

(3) $[_{VP} XP [_{VP} YP [_{VP} ZP V]]]$

(4) $[_{VP} XP [_{V'} V [_{VP} YP [_{V'} V ZP]]]]$

(3) represents the typical phrase structure for German, an OV-language, and (4) for English, a VO-language, respectively. In German, the canonical licensing directionality of V is to the left, so the V first merges its sister ZP with the ordering ZP-V. The next argument, YP, is then also merged as the left-hand sister of the verbal projection, and so on. The resulting representation, as it is, conforms to the BBC. The situation is somewhat more complicated in a VO-language like English, (4). Following the canonical directionality of licensing, the V in English first selects its sister to its right. Then, in the next step, the next argument is, in

⁴ Haider (1997b, 2001) is of the opinion that the (non-lexical) functional heads are universally head-initial. See also Haider (2013: 68–81) and Vikner (2001: 87–88), among others, for a similar idea.

⁵ Cf. Haider (pp. 9–10): "Canonical directionality is the basic parametric factor that produces head-final or head-initial structures, respectively."

Roughly speaking, what the BBC dictates is a mixture of the LCA and the phrase structure theory proposed by Fukui & Takano (1998), who posit a universal complement-head order for the lexical categories. While all three theories postulate a right-branching phrase structure in principle, which facilitates on-line processing, only Haider's BBC allows for a variation in the linear order between head and complement. Although it is in this respect less "elegant" from the viewpoint of universality in theory, the BBC is flexible enough to adequately describe core syntactic observations regarding word order both in OV- and VO-languages.

accordance with the BBC, merged on the left of the projection line, parallel to the case of (3). The YP in (4), however, is not in the canonical directionality domain of the licensing head, so the structure is merged again with another head, *v*, in conformity with the BBC. The lexical head *V* then raises to *v* and thus licenses the VP-internal argument YP, which is now in the canonical direction of the licensing head.⁶

For the universal right-branchingness of phrase structure, or the BBC, as given in (1), Haider (pp. 26–27) provides a parsing-based account (for more discussion, see Haider 2013: Ch.2):

- (5) [[[h⁰ A] B] C] (left-branching)
 (6) [A [B [C h⁰]]] (right-branching)

When the processor meets the first element in the left-branching structure (5), namely h⁰, it is unable to predict how many brackets it needs to open, whereas in the right-branching structure (6) the first element is inevitably the highest one and is therefore dominated by the root of the phrase. This “who is first is higher” property of the BBC, as “the description of a property of Universal Grammar”, “guarantees parser-friendly phrase structures” (p. 27).

As a description of the differences between head-initial and head-final structures, Haider (pp. 11–25) lists some eight observations, which are “immediate effects of head-final vs. head-initial phrase structure [cf. (2); directionality parameter] in combination with [the BBC; (1)].” They will be explicated below, with Haider’s rationale being added:

Observation 1: “compactness” or the adjacency between a head and its complement in VO-languages;

- (7) They will [investigate (*thoroughly) something].
 (8) Sie werden [etwas (gründlich) untersuchen].
 they will [something (thoroughly) investigate]

This contrast follows once it is assumed that a merged phrase *P* must be in the directionality domain of the head *h* and that *P* and an extension of *h* (= *h* or a projection of *h*; p. 29) minimally *c*-command each other (“Principle of Directional Identification”; p. 29). The presence of the adverb in (7), but not in (8), blocks the *minimal* mutual *c*-command between the head and the complement (cf. pp. 30–31). The same reasoning is applied to the presence and the absence of scrambling in the OV-language (German) and the VO-language (English), respectively:

Observation 2: strict word order vs. variable word order;

- (9) a. He showed [some students] [this problem].
 b. *He showed [this problem]_i [some students] *t*_i.

⁶ The remaining argument, XP in (4), is the subject, which is licensed by the higher functional head in VO-languages. See the discussion below.

- (10) a. Er hat [einigen Studenten] [dieses Problem] erklärt.
 he has [some students]_{Dat} [this problem]_{Acc} explained
 'He explained this problem to some students.'
 b. Er hat [dieses Problem]_i [einigen Studenten] _t erklärt.

The fronted (or remerged) indirect object in (9b), just like the adverb in (7), blocks the licensing of the direct object.

Observation 3: the relative order and the relative embedding of arguments;

- (11) that they will send [everybody]_i [a parcel] [to his_i home address]
 (12) dass sie [jedem]_i [ein Paket] [an seine_i Privatadresse]
 that they [everybody]_{iDat} [a parcel]_{Acc} [to his_i private-address]
 schicken werden
 send will

Observation 4: the position of verb particles;

- (13) Susan *poured* the man *out* a drink.
 (14) *dass er es *ein* gut *wickelt*
 that he it Part well wraps
 'that he wraps it well'

Both of these observations follow from the universal right-branchingness of the phrase structure, i.e. arguments are merged to the left (cf. (1)) and, therefore, what comes earlier is structurally higher (ergo Observation 3). The right-branchingness also requires a so-called VP-shell for the VO-structure (cf. (4)). The position of the particle in (13), for example, represents the "base position" of the "verb+particle" combination, from which the verb alone undergoes movement to a higher head. In the OV-structure, by contrast, there is no such intermediate position (cf. (3)). The particle immediately precedes (the base position of) the verb in question.

Observation 5: obligatory verbal clustering in OV;

- (15) The new law certainly *may* possibly *have* indeed *been* badly *formulated*.
 (16) dass das neue Gesetz wohl wirklich schlecht *formuliert* (*)
 that the new law possibly indeed badly formulated (*)
worden (*) *sein* (*) *mag*
 been (*) be(*) may
 [adverbials may not appear in any of the (*) positions]

OV-complementation produces center-embedding, which is a processing obstacle. By admitting clustering, UG provides a grammatical means for circumventing it. Within the verbal cluster, which is a result of head-to-head merger, intervention of adverbials as in (16) is excluded.

Observation 6: "obligatory structural subject position (i.e. EPP) in VO but not in OV", Observation 7: "positional nominative in VO but not in OV" and Observation 8: "absence of subject-object asymmetries in OV" may well all be subsumed under the reasoning that the subject (or the subject position) in

VO-structures possesses a special status as compared with other arguments. In VO-languages, the subject (cf. XP in (4)) is not in the canonical directionality domain of the head.⁷ As a directional licenser of this argument, there must be a functional head above it (and thus to the left of it, according to the BBC). In order to fulfill the mutual c-command requirement (i.e. the Principle of Directional Identification), the subject must then raise to the Spec position of this functional head, where nominative is licensed; the functional head c-commands the VP-internal subject position and the raised subject c-commands the functional head. Being in a functional Spec position, the subject in VO-structures constitutes an opaque domain. The subject in OV-structures (cf. XP in (3)), by contrast, can be licensed within the VP, just like other arguments.⁸ Relevant examples will be presented and discussed below.

At this point, one might well discuss the validity of each of the observations and the explanations Haider provides for them, but I do not do so in this review.⁹ What appears remarkable is Haider's insight that various syntactic differences found between OV- and VO-languages can ultimately be reduced to a single factor: the head parameter. Insofar as Haider's argumentation is on the right track, his thesis can be considered no less "elegant" (and minimal) than those that postulate no (syntactic) head parameter.

Chapter 2 ("The functional architecture of a German clause: facts and controversies") is devoted to problems concerning the functional category "I(nfl)" (or in the newer model "T(ense)") in German. In the case of English, there seems to be no controversy as to the existence of I, which had already appeared in essence as Aux in the earliest days of generative research (cf. Chomsky 1965). The question to be addressed now is how the situation should be described in German. Although I cannot go into the details of the discussion due to lack of space, I will briefly out-

⁷ Haider's reasoning up to this point is very similar to the idea of Naoki Fukui (cf. e.g. Fukui 1993, Fukui 1995, and especially Saito & Fukui 1998), who ascribes the special status of the subject in English (or in VO-languages), as opposed to that in Japanese (or in OV-languages), to the fact that the former appears on a different side of the head than is expected by the head parameter. Based on that, Fukui (1995: sec. 4) lists some six syntactic differences between English and Japanese, some of which overlap with Haider's observations in the text. Thus, in a sense, the underlying intuitions of these two researchers appear to be essentially the same, although the theoretical technicalities are different. Interestingly, they also seem to share the thesis that the postulation of functional categories in a given language should in principle be restricted to the minimum (see the discussion below for Haider's view on this matter).

⁸ Essentially the same applies to dislocated or scrambled constituents, out of which, according to Haider, extraction is permitted in German. See the discussion below.

⁹ As for the "compactness" expressed in the first two observations, Tokizaki (2008), for example, comes up with an apparently contradicting generalization that the boundary in the head-initial structure is stronger than in the head-final structure. See also Frey (2012), who points out some empirical problems for Haider's proposals.

line Haider's argumentation leading to the conclusion that the functional category I is not needed in German.

On the theoretical level, Haider affiliates himself with the convergent structuring (CS) approach, which "characterizes the sentence structure as the minimal convergent projection for the terminals of the given clause", instead of the absolute cartography (AC) strategy, which maintains that "if language X has an overt functional head H, any language must have this functional layer, and if it is not overt in language Y, it is covert" (p. 49).¹⁰ Haider is thus of the opinion that "UG determines what is a possible grammar; the grammar of the individual language determines the possible structures for given arrays of terminals in this language" (pp. 49–50). Once we adopt this concept of phrase structure and universality, we need not assume the functional category I (and accordingly the "EPP") for German if there is no substantial evidence for its existence. And this actually is the position Haider takes (or has been taking). That is why this category is always put in quotation marks in his discussion, to indicate any functional head related to finiteness features (Haider, p.c.).

However, the majority of authors working within the generative framework assume, implicitly or explicitly, that there is a functional category I (or T) as a right-hand sister to the verbal projection (VP or vP) in German and that the inflected verb in the clause-final position is raised from its original position within VP to this I-position (see, among others, Sabel 1996: 12–14 and the literature cited there). Haider explicitly denies this "standard" assumption and claims that the clause-final verb, even when finite, does not raise to a higher functional head but stays in its base position within VP:¹¹ He demonstrates in this chapter, as in his previous publications, that the criteria that militate in favor of I in English do not hold in German (see also Grewendorf 1988: Ch.13, Sternefeld 2006: Ch.4).

The absence of I (or its lack of necessity)¹² in German is rendered possible

¹⁰ Sternefeld (2006: 506) also explicitly speaks against the "hasty and [in his opinion] excessive universalistic demand of an Anglocentric science" with an "undeniable ad hoc character." As concerns the postulation of a cascade of functional projections, Sternefeld (2006: 510), for example, finds it "completely absurd if one would have to realize all these categories in *every* language in the syntactic structure of *every* sentence – even if as empty projections or otherwise 'abstractly'." As for I in German, Sternefeld comes to the same conclusion as Haider, although he gives a critical assessment of Haider's arguments.

¹¹ The data Haider draws on for his claim pertain to (i) the order of the clause-final finite verb and extraposed material, (ii) the existence of a group of verbs in German that resists movement into the V2-position, which presupposes a stop-over in the putative I-position, and (iii) the scopal relationship between a finite verb like *verdreifachen* ('triple') in the putative I-position and a constituent in the middle-field (but see Meinunger 2001 for discussion with further data, as well as Sternefeld 2006: 511 for a critical assessment). All of these arguments are repeatedly provided in Haider's previous works.

¹² In the present book, Haider seems rather more equivocal about whether I exists in German or not. It is claimed, on the one hand, that I should be head-initial, just as the other functional categories, D and C, are head-initial in German (p. 66). On the other hand, the

by the observation that all the arguments in German are located in the canonical directionality domain of the verb, as discussed on the basis of (3) above. English, by contrast, needs a functional head to the left of VP or vP that licenses the subject in the canonical direction, the subject then being raised to the Spec of that functional projection, IP. In a nutshell, the subject in English possesses a special status as compared with other arguments, whereas in German it does not, behaving just like the other arguments.¹³ This contrastive generalization, which is a natural consequence of the minimal premises, (1) and (2), and the VO vs. OV parameter setting, will prove to be a useful tool for explaining other data, some of which are presented in the following.

Chapter 3 (“Targeting the clause-initial position: German *wh*-constructions”) is about movement into the clause-initial operator position, i.e. *wh*-movement. The foregoing finding, i.e. no special status for the subject in German, plays an essential role for some of the phenomena concerned with *wh*-movement. In other words, German lacks the kind of subject-object asymmetry that is found in English. Here I present just one of the cases Haider points out: extraction out of the subject (p. 79):¹⁴

- (17) a. [Mit wem]_i hätte denn [_{t_i} speisen zu dürfen] dich besonders
 [with whom]_i had Part [_{t_i} dine to may] you_{Acc} especially
 gefreut?
 pleased
 b. *[Who(m)]_i would [to have dinner with _{t_i}] please you?

It should be mentioned at this point that Haider’s assessment of the relevant data is not shared by every researcher. For several speakers, extraction out of the subject is unacceptable also in German (cf. Müller 1995: 40. See also Fanselow 1987: 68–77, Webelhuth 1992: 171–172, Sternefeld 2006: 526–527, etc.):

- (18) a. [Über wen]_i hat der Wolfgang [ein Buch _{t_i}]
 [about who_{Acc-i} has the Wolfgang_{Nom} [a book _{t_i}]
 geschrieben?
 written
 ‘About whom did Wolfgang write a book?’

author advances his own view in a later chapter (p. 133) that VP is selected by C, namely that there is no functional layer between VP and C. Each of these views is entertained in the author’s previous publications (cf. e.g. Haider 2001 for the former and Haider 1997c for the latter, where the absence of I in German is more explicitly stated).

¹³ As for nominative Case, Haider (p. 245) maintains that it is licensed by way of agreement with the finite verb.

¹⁴ Haider puts forth further data, concerning (i) the *that*-trace effect (p. 88) and (ii) the superiority effect (p. 112). The corresponding sentences in German are acceptable:

- (i) *What_i do you think [that _{t_i} is responsible for the deviance]?
 (ii) *It is unclear whom_i what shocked _{t_i}.

- b. * $[\text{Über wen}]_i$ hat $[\text{ein Buch } t_i]$ den Wolfgang beeindruckt?
 [about who_{Acc-i}] has [a book t_i] the Wolfgang_{Acc} impressed
 ‘A book about whom impressed Wolfgang?’
- c. * $[\text{Über wen}]_i$ hat den Wolfgang $[\text{ein Buch } t_i]$ beeindruckt?

Haider implies here that “PP-extraction out of NP” does not involve movement at all (p. 155) and thus is not a reliable test for the transparency of the constituent in question. De Kuthy (2002: 41–71) argues elaborately that sentences like (18a) are not a result of *extraction* out of the NP but rather of the reanalysis of the PP as a dependent of the matrix verb. She provides examples in which the “extraction” out of the subject NP is possible and claims, drawing on the insight of Kuno (1987: 11–29), that it is the focus-background structure of the sentence that is crucial for the acceptability of the construction.

Starting from the thesis that extraction out of the subject is *in principle* possible in German, Haider (p.c.) is of the opinion that the unacceptable cases should be excluded due to factors whose status in grammatical theory is not completely clear but which appear to be at work for a proper description of the data. He gives the following examples:

- (19) a. (?) $[\text{Über wen}]_i$ hat denn damals $[\text{eine Biographie } t_i]$
 [about who]_i has Part then [a biography t_i]_{Nom}
 alle so sehr beeindruckt?
 everybody_{Acc} so very impressed
 ‘A biography of who impressed everyone so much?’
- b. * $[\text{Was}_i$ ist $[\text{ } t_i$ für ein Flugzeug] (denn) abgestürzt?
 what_i is $[\text{ } t_i$ for an airplane] (Part) crashed?
 ‘What kind of an airplane crashed?’

(19a) demonstrates the same point as (17a), i.e. another case of extraction out of the subject of a transitive verb. What appears curious is the ill-formedness of (19b), in which the extraction takes place out of the subject of an unaccusative predicate, i.e. from the underlying object, and which is, therefore, expected to be acceptable,¹⁵ contrary to fact. Haider (p.c.) points out as a descriptively valid generalization here that extraction out of a constituent at the left edge of the middle field leads to less acceptability.

As concerns the extraction out of infinitival subjects (cf. (17)), those researchers who exclude PP-extraction out of NP-subjects (Fanselow 1987: 80–81, Müller 1995: 54–55, Webelhuth 1984: 228–229, etc.) are somewhat more tolerant here. In this case, the contrast with English (cf. (17b)) becomes more conspicuous.

What deserves special emphasis here is Haider’s thesis that extraction out of subjects is not essentially different from extraction out of objects and is in principle an option in German. If the grammar of German were subject to the same kind of

¹⁵ Cf. contrasts of the following kind (cf. Chomsky 2008: 147):

- (i) * $[\text{Of which car}]_i$ did $[\text{the driver } t_i]$ cause a scandal?
 (ii) $[\text{Of which car}]_i$ was $[\text{the driver } t_i]$ awarded a prize?

“subject condition” as English, then data like (17a) or (19a) would remain a mystery. This observation, which seems to have been given insufficient consideration in mainstream generative theorizing, is a direct and natural consequence of Haider’s theory of phrase structure.

In chapter 4 (“Targeting left: clause-internal word order and word order variation”), which deals with scrambling, we find further original insights of a similar kind to those in the previous chapter. Haider first excludes pronoun fronting as different from scrambling, the former exhibiting no flexibility in the ordering of arguments. Then he refutes the standard assumption (cf. Diesing 1992: 31–35) that the verbal argument appearing to the left of “information structuring particles” like *ja/doch*, VP-adverbials or negation must have been scrambled (p. 170):

- (20) dass hier wer was_i nicht (*t_i) begreift
 that here someone_{Nom} something_{iAcc} not (*t_i) understands
 ‘that someone does not understand something here’
- (21) a. Hier will ich jetzt wem was erklären.
 here want I now someone_{Dat} something_{iAcc} explain
 ‘I want to explain something to someone here.’
 b. */?Hier will ich jetzt was_i wem t_i erklären.

(20) cannot be a case of scrambling of the indefinite pronoun *was* over the negation, since *w*-indefinites resist scrambling (cf. (21)). Rather, according to Haider (p. 148; cf. also Frey & Pittner 1998), adjuncts (i.e. non-arguments) are generated freely, and scrambling should accordingly be confined to re-serialization of *arguments* (p. 157).

The author’s other original insight into scrambling, which is also of direct relevance to the main thesis of the book, is his claim (pp. 160–166) that scrambling is contingent on head-final projections (see also Haider & Rosengren 2003). We have already seen, by means of Observations 1 and 2 above, that English does not allow scrambling (cf. (9)); the scrambled element prevents the skipped-over argument from being licensed. In German (cf. (10)), the scrambled element lands in a VP-internal position, i.e. within the same maximal projection as the base position of the scrambled element, and is, therefore, still in the directionally canonical domain of the verb.

The thesis Haider presents here leads necessarily to the conclusion that the landing site of scrambling is an A-position. This is related to his observation that a scrambled element does not constitute an opaque domain for extraction (p. 156):

- (22) [Von Mozart]_i hat ja [die ersten Symphonien t_{i,j}] kaum einer t_j
 [of Mozart]_i has Part [the first symphonies t_{i,j}] hardly anyone t_j
 auf CD aufgenommen.
 on CD recorded
 ‘Hardly anyone has recorded the first symphonies of Mozart on CD.’

However, researchers are far from unanimous about the A- vs. A-bar-status of

scrambling, even for German (cf. e.g. the contributions in Corver & Riemsdijk 1994 as well as Webelhuth 1992). Furthermore, several authors point out that the scrambled constituent *is* an island for extraction, as shown in (23) by Müller (1995: 73).¹⁶ Countering these data, Haider (p.c.) remarks that the two sentences in (24) do not differ in acceptability:

- (23) a. [Über wen]_i hat keiner einer Frau [ein Buch t_i]
 [about whom]_i has no-one_{Nom} a woman_{Dat} [a book t_i]_{Acc}
 gegeben?
 given
 'About whom did no-one give a book to a woman?'
 b. *[Über wen]_i hat [ein Buch t_i]_j keiner einer Frau t_j gegeben?
- (24) a. ?[Auf wen]_i hat denn damals ein Polizist [einen Anschlag t_i]
 [on who]_i has Part then a policeman_{Nom} [an assault t_i]
 von ihm] verhindert?
 by him]_{Acc} avoided
 'An assault on who did a policeman avoid at that time?'
 b. ?[Auf wen]_i hat denn damals [einen Anschlag t_i von ihm]_j ein Polizist t_j
 verhindert?

Along the same lines as the discussion in the previous chapter, Haider concludes that the grammar of German permits extraction out of a scrambled constituent, which is theoretically derived from his theses and empirically attested. Although it is true that research on scrambling has lacked a general consensus on many of its properties, as Haider himself mentions towards the end of this chapter (pp. 184–185), the empirical observations he provides fit into the general picture of his theory.

The topic of the fifth chapter ("Targeting the right edge: extraposition") is represented by its title. Extraposition affects, amongst other things, clausal complements of V (25) and relative clauses (26), which will be discussed intensively in the following, as well as clausal complements of N and PPs (see below), and, marginally, ("heavy") NPs (pp. 188, 198).

- (25) Man hat geglaubt [dass sich die Sonne um die Erde drehe].
 one has believed [that itself_{Acc} the sun_{Nom} around the earth_{Acc} rotates]
 'They believed that the earth rotated around the sun.'

¹⁶ Infinitival complements, again, do not constitute islands even if scrambled (Müller 1995: 75):

- (i) Was_i hat [PRO t_i repariert zu haben]_j der Frank t_j gelehnet?
 what_{iAcc} has [PRO t_i repair to have]_j the Frank_{Nom} t_j denied
 'What did Frank deny having repaired?'

However this observation may be derived, the fact seems to be that "infinitives in German are generally more transparent for extraction than in English" (Sternefeld 2006: 527). Haider (p.c.) maintains that this apparent transparency, which is not a property of the infinitival clause itself, should not be mixed up with the "restructuring" effect of German infinitives (see below).

- (26) Sie hat dem Mann etwas zugeflüstert [das er nicht verstand].
 she has the man_{Dat} something_{Acc} whispered [that he not understood]
 'She whispered something to the man that he did not understand.'

Based on the OV-character of German, it has been standardly assumed in the generative literature that elements appearing to the right of the clause-final verb (i.e. in the postfield, or 'Nachfeld') have been extraposed or moved rightward from a position to the left of the verb (i.e. the middle field, or 'Mittelfeld').

Haider (pp. 205–231) lists nine phenomena associated with extraposition for the purpose of comparing competing analyses, roughly classified as (i) syntactic movement, (ii) PF-movement, (iii) base generation. As counter-evidence to the syntactic movement analysis, Haider, on the one hand, calls attention to data in which extraposition behaves differently from leftward movement, such as, e.g., movement out of an adjunct:

- (27) a. ?*[Wen] bist du eingeschlafen [ohne *t* gesehen zu
 [who_{Acc}] are you fallen-asleep [without *t* seen to
 haben]? (Müller 1995: 88)
 have]
 b. Er hat [die ganze Nacht *t*] geschlafen [die er im
 he has [the whole night *t*] slept [which he in-the
 Verlies zubrachte]. (p. 206)
 dungeon spent]
 'He slept the whole night he spent in the dungeon.'

As an objection to PF-movement analyses, Haider, in addition to the problem of overgeneration (pp. 231–232), draws on semantic effects brought about by extraposition:

- (28) a. Sie war [mit nichts] zufrieden.
 she was [with nothing_{Dat}] satisfied
 ('There was nothing that she was content with.')
- b. Sie war zufrieden [mit nichts]. ('She was content without anything.')

In a series of his previous works (Haider 1994, 1995, 1997a/b, 2000), Haider in fact argued in favor of base generation for extraposition *in general*, in clear contrast to the majority of other researchers, while extensively discussing the problems brought about by the movement analysis. In the present book, however, Haider does not take a decisive stance in favor of the base generation analysis, but just alludes to it (p. 232): "If these obstacles [brought about by movement analyses] turn out to be insurmountable, the only remaining option is the *base-generation option*." Haider actually acknowledges that the latter approach is still "unsatisfactory" (p. 233): (i) We do not yet have a "proper understanding of the structure of the right edge"; (ii) it still needs to be explained why the right edge "does not discriminate" between selected elements and non-selected elements, and why arguments in the right edge are licensed there; (iii) it remains unclear what determines

the relative order of the extraposed phrases (see below). Summing up the discussion, he concludes (p. 231):

Extrapolation turns out to be a recalcitrant phenomenon for an adequate grammar-theoretic modelling. None of the three strategies (i.e. movement and reconstruction, PF movement, base generation plus construal) of modelling this phenomenon has been developed into a fully satisfactory account yet.

As far as I can see, this chapter on extraposition is the only one in this book in which the essential problems are left unanswered, as Haider (p.c.) himself acknowledges.

It is true that extraposition, encompassing such a variety of elements, *is* a “recalcitrant phenomenon”, and a complete analysis for the whole range cannot be provided in this review, either. In my view, however, the essential problem with Haider’s approach, both in this book and in his previous works, resides in his very strategy of treating every kind of postfield occupation in German in a uniform way,¹⁷ which has prevented him (and most other researchers heretofore; cf. e.g. Büring & Hartmann 1997: 26) from gaining a clearer view of the phenomena in question. I would instead like to propose that we subclassify cases of extraposition with respect to their grammar-theoretic status.

As for complement clauses to verbs in the postfield (cf. (25)), I support the view that they occupy their base position, as extensively and persuasively argued in Haider’s previous works as well as by some other authors not necessarily working within the LCA-based framework (cf. e.g. Webelhuth 1992, Bayer 1996). To illustrate, I cite data related to VP-topicalization, which preferably applies to elements that stand nearest to the infinitival verb in the underlying structure (cf. e.g. Grewendorf 1988: 297):

- (29) a. [Auf den Tisch gestellt] hat Maria die Vase.
 [on the table_{Acc} put] has Maria the vase_{Acc}
 ‘Maria put the vase on the table.’
 b. *[Die Vase gestellt] hat Maria auf den Tisch.

Against this background, let us look at the following data (Inaba 2007: 42):

¹⁷Haider (1993: 175), for example, claimed in light of the following data that “relative clauses and object clauses occupy the same *extraposition position*”:

- (i) [Hunde füttern [die Hunger haben]] kann jeder.
 [dogs feed [which hunger have]] can everybody
 ‘Everybody can feed dogs that are hungry.’
 (ii) [Zugegeben [dass er dort war]] hat er zwar nicht, aber ...
 [admitted [that he there was]] has he indeed not, but ...
 ‘He may not have admitted that he was there, but ...’

In my view, however, these data show merely that both kinds of subordinate clauses (can) occupy a *topologically* identical position, not necessarily a *structurally* identical position. This uniform treatment of extraposition by Haider applies not only to his own analysis but also to his refutations of other approaches.

- (30) a. [Gesagt [dass er sie liebt]] hat er gestern.
 [said [that he her_{Acc} loves]] has he yesterday.
 'He said yesterday that he loves her.'
 b. #/*[[Dass er sie liebt] gesagt] hat er gestern.
- (31) a. [Erzählt [dass er dort war]] hat er der Polizei nicht.
 [told [that he there was]] has he the police_{Dat} not
 'He did not tell the police that he was there.'
 b. ?[Der Polizei erzählt] hat er nicht [dass er dort war].

The contrast in (30) attests to the assumption that it is not the preverbal but the postverbal position that is the base position for the complement clause. Furthermore, (31) suggests that the *postverbal* complement clause stands structurally nearer to the lexical verb than the dative object in the base structure. If the postverbal clause were right-adjoined to a higher maximal projection, as assumed within the "standard" movement analysis (cf. Müller 1995, Buring & Hartmann 1997), the opposite acceptability contrast would result in each pair. For further pieces of evidence for the postverbal base-generation of the complement clause, see the works by Haider cited above as well as Bayer (1996: Ch.6) and Inaba (2007: Ch.3).

For the postverbal relative clause in German, I am of the opinion that this is a result of post-syntactic rightward movement, as opposed to the majority of authors other than Truckenbrodt (1995). This assumption, first of all, rescues the movement analysis from the apparent problem that extraposition does not obey the usual movement constraints (cf. (27)), which has constituted the main argument against treating extraposition as movement. On the contrary, the empirical data rather reveal that the rightward movement of the relative clause in German is subject to constraints that are hard to capture in terms of syntactic notions. I here put forth the locality constraint that is most relevant for the present discussion:¹⁸

- (32) Extraposition places the relative clause into the nearest postfield.

The post-syntactic status of relative clause extraposition implies that it does not show LF-relevant semantic effects. This is actually the case in German (cf. also Buring & Hartmann 1997, Sternefeld 2006: 777–779):¹⁹

¹⁸(32) might be considered a specific version of a more general constraint proposed by Truckenbrodt (1995: 503) as in (i), where XP is a syntactic category which, under extraposition, is turned into a prosodic category π (either a phonological phrase or an intonational phrase):

(i) [π ... XP ...] \rightarrow [π ... t_i ...] [π XP_i]

In the case discussed in the text, XP is a finite clause. Both appearances of π on the right of the arrow in (i) being of the same prosodic size, the end of the first π signals the end of the middle field or the right sentential frame ('rechte Satzklammer') of the matrix clause. The extraposed XP is thus landing in the postfield in this case.

¹⁹In English it is different. See Inaba (2005, 2007: 108–116) for details and discussion.

- (33) a. Ich habe ihr_i mit Absicht viele Geschenke *t* geschickt
 I have her_{iDat} with intention many presents *t* sent
 [die Maria_i nicht mag].
 [which Maria_i not likes]
 ‘I intentionally sent Maria many presents that she does not like.’
- b. weil wir jedem_i die Daten *t* gegeben haben [die er_i
 because we everyone_{iDat} the data_{Acc} *t* given have [which he_i
 braucht]
 needs]
 ‘because we gave everybody_i the data that he_i needs’
- (34) a. Ich habe ihr_i mit Absicht viele Geschenke [die Maria_i nicht mag] geschickt.
 b. weil wir jedem_i die Daten [die er_i braucht] gegeben haben

The coreference relations in (33), i.e. in the variants with extraposition, correspond exactly to those observed in the underlying structures in (34), namely before extraposition. This observation, on the one hand, leads advocates of the syntactic movement analysis to claim that extraposition, after taking place in syntax, is *totally* reconstructed in LF. It should be noted, on the other hand, that the same observation presents a difficulty for the “base generation” analysis (cf. (iii) above), as advocated e.g. by Kiss (2005) as well as by Haider (see above). That is, there is simply no “base position” into which the extraposed relative clause could be reconstructed and in which it is interpreted. We will also see shortly below that the assumption of extraposition as an instance of syntactic movement, too, is problematic.

Among the problems left open by Haider in the present book, I now turn to the one for which a proper description of the data can be provided by my earlier assumptions. What is in need of explanation for Haider is the “fact that an extraposed relative clause *precedes* an extraposed argument clause”, as demonstrated in (35) (pp. 199–200):

- (35) a. Es fiel im vergangenen Jahrhundert einem Grammatiker auf
 it struck in-the past century a grammarian_{Dat} Part
 [der das untersuchte] [dass dieser Satz grammatisch ist].
 [who it investigated] [that this sentence grammatical is]
 ‘It occurred to a grammarian in the past century who investigated it that this sentence is grammatical.’
- b. *Es fiel im vergangenen Jahrhundert einem Grammatiker auf [dass dieser Satz grammatisch ist] [der das untersuchte].
- (36) Es fiel im vergangenen Jahrhundert einem Grammatiker [der das untersuchte] auf [dass dieser Satz grammatisch ist].

According to my proposal, we start from the underlying structure (36) in which the complement clause is located in the postverbal base position and the relative clause adjacent to its nominal antecedent. In accordance with (32), the relative clause is then dislocated into the nearest postfield, resulting in (35a). Were this operation a syntactic one, the strict cycle condition (cf. Müller 1998: 58–71) would

produce the ill-formed (35b).

A more complicated case is illustrated by what Haider calls a “binding paradox” (pp. 200–201), represented by (37):

- (37) Es hat ihr_i jemand *t* prophezeit [dem Ida_i blind vertraut]
 it has her_{iDat} someone_{Nom} *t* predicted [who Ida_i blindly trusts]
 [dass Ida_i uralt werde].
 [that Ida_i very-old would-become]
 ‘Someone who Ida trusts blindly predicted that she would grow to be very old.’
- (38) Es hat ihr_i jemand [dem Ida_i blind vertraut] prophezeit [dass Ida_i uralt werde].

What remains a mystery for Haider here, in addition to the serialization of the two subordinate clauses (see above), is that the indirect object in the matrix clause c-commands into the “extraposed” complement clause, but not into the postposed relative clause. The post-syntactic movement analysis proposed here provides a straightforward solution to this “paradox”: The complement clause stays in the complement position of the matrix verb throughout the derivation (see (38)), hence the violation of Principle C. The relative clause, however, is located in its original position at the point of spell-out, as in (38), and is as such sent to interpretation, the actual movement to the right taking place in another component of the model, namely at PF. The parallel grammaticality of (37) and (38) confirms this assumption. For further arguments that militate against syntactic approaches and for data that are subsumed under the post-syntactic approach to relative clause extraposition in German, see Inaba (2007: Ch.5).²⁰

Summing up the discussion so far, I should once again emphasize that “extraposition” is not a uniform phenomenon, not even in German. I have addressed just two instances of postfield occupation in German: clausal complements of V and relative clauses. As mentioned at the beginning of the discussion, there are still other cases of extraposition in German. The extraposition of the clausal complement of N in (39b), for example, is similar to that of the relative clause in (39a), in that they are both “extraposition from NP” (cf. Ross 1986: 4) and are completely optional, i.e. take place for stylistic or performance-based reasons, as opposed to

²⁰ Haider (p.c.), on the one hand, agrees with my claim that, syntactically, the complement clause and the relative clause should be characterized differently with respect to their post-verbal positioning. On the other hand, he points out problems for an approach of the kind proposed here. Theoretically, the nature of the “post-syntactic” movement needs clarification. Empirically, examples like (i) would be incorrectly ruled in:

- (i) *Er hat allen *t_i* erzählt [die es hören wollten]_i davon.
 he has everyone_{Dat} *t_i* told [who it hear wanted]_i of-it
 ‘He told everyone about it who wanted to hear it.’
- (ii) Er hat allen *t_i* erzählt davon [die es hören wollte]_i.

The data seem to suggest that the movement operation in question calls for phonological support à la Truckenbrodt (1995), which will not be pursued further here.

the postverbal positioning of the clausal complement of V. As already reported in the literature, these two instances of extraposition should nonetheless be explicitly distinguished, for example in terms of locality (pp. 216–217):

- (39) a. Man hat [_{NP} die Frau [_{NP} des Boten *t*]] beschimpft
 one has [_{NP} the wife [_{NP} of-the messenger *t*]]_{Acc} scolded
 [der den Befehl überbrachte].
 [who the order delivered]
 ‘They scolded the wife of the messenger who delivered the order.’
- b. *Man hat [_{NP} den Überbringer [_{NP} des Befehls *t*]] heftig
 one has [_{NP} the bearer [_{NP} of-the order *t*]]_{Gen} _{Acc} severely
 beschimpft [den Platz zu verlassen].
 scolded [the square to clear]
 ‘They severely scolded the bearer of the order to clear the square.’

The remarks here partly apply also to the extraposition of PPs, which can partake in “extraposition from NP”. The situation with PPs is, however, much more complicated; some NP-internal PPs are arguments and others adjuncts, and among NP-external ones, some are complements of V or A and others just modifiers (cf. also Sternefeld 2006: 182 for his remark that these distinctions are not always clear-cut). Furthermore, there are even cases in which it is not self-evident whether the PP is NP-internal or -external (cf. De Kuthy 2002: 67–71). It is beyond the scope of this short review article to provide a full account of all the instances of extraposition or postfield occupation in German. That the state of affairs is so complex, however, reveals at least that an adequate theory of extraposition requires a more fine-grained description.

The topic of the seventh and final chapter (“Non-finite verbs and their constructions”) is constructions with non-finite verbs, which remain one of the most problematic and disputed research areas in the syntax of German. Amongst the most controversial issues here is the question of how mono-clausal (“coherent”, cf. Bech 1983; “restructuring”, cf. Wurmbrand 1998, 2001) constructions with some non-finite verbs should be treated. As a descriptive fact, some infinitival constructions in German behave as if they are mono-clausal, i.e. the infinitival part is integrated into the matrix clause (cf. e.g. Sabel 1996, Wurmbrand 1998, 2001, etc.). This is the case not only with all bare infinitives and past participles but also with some infinitives with the particle *zu* (‘to’). Here I present just one of the numerous criteria distinguishing “restructuring” (non-sentential) and “non-restructuring” (sentential) infinitival constructions (cf. Wurmbrand 1998: 248):

- (40) a. weil [dem Jörg] der Hans *t* zuzuhören versuchte
 because [the Jörg]_{Dat} the Hans_{Nom} *t* to-listen-to tried
 ‘because Hans tried to listen to Jörg’
- b. *weil [dem Jörg] der Hans [*t* zuzuhören] bedauerte
 because [the Jörg]_{Dat} the Hans_{Nom} [*t* to-listen-to] regretted

As is well known, German does not allow scrambling out of a clause (cf. Müller & Sternefeld 1993, Müller 1995, Grewendorf & Sabel 1999, Haider & Rosengren 2003, etc.). Because the infinitival complement in (40b) is sentential, extraction out of it is barred. The acceptability of (40a) then leads to the assumption that the infinitival here does not constitute a full clause.

It seems to me that there has been no consensus among researchers as to how the non-clausal status of such “restructuring” infinitival constructions is to be explained. Very roughly speaking, the proposals can be grouped as follows: (i) all the non-finite complements are CPs (at least in the base) and their non-sentential status is derived by some mechanism (Sternefeld 1990, Sabel 1996, etc.); (ii) non-sentential infinitival complements are base-generated as smaller categories than CP, e.g. VP (Wurmbrand 1998, 2001, etc.); (iii) non-finite verbs form a verbal complex together with the matrix verb, i.e. there is no “infinitival complement” as such. As in his previous works, Haider explicitly takes the third position, which is a minority position within the P&P model and preferred mainly by advocates of HPSG. Haider (pp. 309–321) lists a total of 16 phenomena in which non-sentential infinitival constructions behave differently from sentential ones and claims that they are all derived from the verb clustering analysis he advocates.

One of the arguments Haider puts forward in support of his thesis is the observation that obligatorily clustered verbal complexes cannot be interrupted in German, as shown in (41) (p. 305; cf. (16) in Observation 5 above):

- (41) *dass er mich nicht überrascht [mit dieser Frage] hat
 that he me_{Acc} not surprised [with this question] has
 ‘that he has not surprised me with this question’
 (42) Er hat mich nicht überrascht [mit dieser Frage].

It seems to me too that this observation is actually amenable to the clustering analysis while the other analyses (see above) are required to come up with some mechanism to rule out cases like (41), since the right edge of the VP is a possible site for extraposed materials, as shown by (42).

As already mentioned above, however, the facts relating to non-finite verbs in German are not so straightforward. Haider mentions the following example:

- (43) [Überrascht [mit dieser Frage]] hat er mich nicht.

When the topicalized constituent here is “reconstructed” in its base position, we get the unacceptable (41). Although Haider (p. 306) is descriptively correct in that the shape of the topicalized element “is not necessarily identical with the shape admissible in the base position”, as just demonstrated here, I am of the opinion, along with many other researchers, that the topicalized elements form a constituent not only in the surface structure, but also in the underlying structure, at least as an option. The ill-formedness of (41) should rather be attributed to some extra-syntactic (i.e. prosodic) constraint for extraposition, if the proposals by Truckenbrodt (1995) and by Büring (to appear), among others, are on the right track. Were verb clustering the only possible underlying representation for the

coherent infinitives, as Haider consequently claims, there is no way to derive cases like (43) (cf. Grewendorf 1988: Ch.13 for discussion).²¹

My impression, on the one hand, is that Haider could have argued against the competing analyses more concretely; these are after all the more “standard” approaches within the P&P model. On the other hand, it would in any event be almost impossible in a book chapter to present a complete theory of non-finite constructions in German. The author apparently focuses on demonstrating how neatly the differences between German and English in their “verb-clustering” constructions can be derived from his main claim about the phrase-structural architecture for OV- and VO-languages. Considering the guiding principles of the book as a whole, represented by the BBC and the directionality parameter, this chapter on non-finite verbs can be regarded as another attempt by the author to subsume these controversial issues in German syntax under the general schema of his theory.

I have thus far gone through Haider’s present publication chapter by chapter. The topics dealt with in each chapter are all ones that have been the target of intense discussion and are thus worthy of a whole book each rather than just a book chapter. In spite of that, they all come together to form a coherent work exactly because they serve to implement the author’s main theses, namely the BBC and parametrized licensing directionality. Due to the breadth and depth of the research areas, the present review has only been able to touch the surface of the topics of most of the chapters.

²¹I would like to point out some other problems of Haider’s approach in this footnote without going into detail:

(i) The so-called “third construction” (i.e. “long-distance scrambling” out of the “extraposed” infinitival complement): Haider (p. 284) seems to be of the opinion that extraposed infinitives are sentential, but regards the third construction as “a variant of the clause union construction” (p. 285). To this apparently contradictory state of affairs, Haider provides no satisfactory solution but just points out that it “arguably is a construction with a postverbal VP” (p. 286). Furthermore, while arguing against the “long-distance scrambling” analysis, Haider is not very explicit about how the third construction is derived or how it is correlated with the “unmarked” cases, with and without “extraposition”, in which no “long-distance scrambling” has taken place.

(ii) The raising construction: The raising verb *scheinen* (‘seem’) is an obligatorily restructuring verb and thus, according to Haider, forms a verb cluster with the governed *zu*-infinitive. This, however, obscures the parallelism between the finite and infinitival *scheinen*-constructions, as opposed to the case of the English *seem*-constructions. Whilst I certainly agree with Haider that there is no need for *overt* A-movement here in German, this need not lead to the absence of raising (and ECM-) constructions in German.

(iii) Haider (pp. 340–343) excludes VP-stacking structures in German (* $[_{VP1} [_{VP2} [_{VP3} \dots V_3] V_2] V_1]$) on the basis of processing considerations in accordance with the BBC, namely the avoidance of center-embedding. This reasoning, which tries to derive a property of the core grammar from performance considerations, is obviously problematic, since not only in languages like Japanese, but even in German, still heavier constituents (e.g. clausal infinitives in German, which Haider acknowledges to be CPs; pp. 307–308) can be center-embedded.

I have the impression that Haider's general works on German syntax (the present book and Haider 1993) are somewhat harder to follow, especially for non-Germanic linguists,²² than such introductory books as e.g. Grewendorf (1988, 2002) or Fanselow & Felix (1987). That is presumably because Haider's theses, whilst certainly situated within the P&P model, are unique, often arguing against the standard views entertained by "mainstream" generativists. The German data that he puts forward and builds his theory on are often very inventive and interesting. From a pedagogical point of view, Haider's writings thus serve as good material for learning syntactic argumentation, with well-established assumptions being subjected to critical scrutiny on the basis of empirical data.

As for the theoretical aspects of the book, as far as I can see, Haider has been consistent in his essential theses, the BBC and parametrized licensing directionality, for nearly 20 years, whilst the generative paradigm itself has experienced non-trivial changes. Of these, one of the most relevant here is surely the treatment of word order in the grammar model adopted, and it is exactly on this front that Haider displays his original and ingenious insight. That is, Haider is clearly of the opinion that word order (or the directionality parameter) plays an essential role in the syntax, in that it enables us to provide a uniform account for various syntactic phenomena cross-linguistically, as he tries to demonstrate in this book.

Haider's present book, which is surely a good introduction to the most important aspects of German syntax, is thus to be recommended for all syntacticians, not only those working on German, but also those who are familiar only with the latest trends in generative theory.

References

- Bayer, Josef (1996) *Directionality and logical form: On the scope of focusing particles and *wh*-in-situ*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Bech, Gunnar (1983) *Studien über das deutsche Verbum inifinitum*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Büring, Daniel (to appear) Syntax, information structure and prosody. In: Marcel den Dikken (ed.) *The Cambridge handbook of generative syntax*. Cambridge, Cambridge UP.
- Büring, Daniel & Katharina Hartmann (1997) Doing the right thing. *The Linguistic Review* 14: 1–42.
- Chomsky, Noam (1965) *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (2008) On phases. In: Robert Freidin, Carlos Otero & Maria Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.) *Foundational issues in linguistic theory*, 133–166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Corver, Nobert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.) (1994) *Studies on scrambling: Movement and non-movement approaches to free word-order phenomena*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.
- De Kuthy, Kordula (2002) *Discontinuous NPs in German: A case study of the interaction of syntax, semantics, and pragmatics*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Diesing, Molly (1992) *Indefinites*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

²² A similar remark might apply to Stechow & Sternefeld (1988) and Sternefeld (2006), in both of which the peculiarities of German (morpho-)syntax are highlighted and readers are thus warned against directly applying the "standard" findings from e.g. English.

- Fanselow, Gisbert (1987) *Konfigurationsalität: Untersuchungen zur Universalgrammatik am Beispiel des Deutschen*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Fanselow, Gisbert & Sascha Felix (1987) *Sprachtheorie 2: Die Rektions- und Bindungstheorie*. Tübingen & Basel: Francke.
- Frey, Werner (2012) Book review: The syntax of German, Hubert Haider, Cambridge University Press (2010). *Lingua* 122: 1148–1157.
- Frey, Werner & Karin Pittner (1998) Zur Positionierung von Adverbien. *Linguistische Berichte* 176: 489–534.
- Fukui, Naoki (1993) Parameters and optionality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 399–420.
- Fukui, Naoki (1995) The principles-and-parameters approach: A comparative syntax of English and Japanese. In: Masayoshi Shibatani & Theodora Bynon (eds.) *Approaches to language typology*, 327–372. London: Clarendon Press.
- Fukui, Naoki & Yuji Takano (1998) Symmetry in syntax: Merge and demerge. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 7: 27–86.
- Grewendorf, Günther (1988) *Aspekte der deutschen Syntax: Eine Rektions- Bindungs-Analyse*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Grewendorf, Günther (2002) *Minimalistische Syntax*. Tübingen & Basel: Francke.
- Grewendorf, Günther & Joachim Sabel (1999) Scrambling in German and Japanese: Adjunction versus multiple specifiers. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 17: 1–65.
- Haider, Hubert (1993) *Deutsche Syntax – Generativ: Vorstudien zur Theorie einer projektiven Grammatik*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Haider, Hubert (1994) Detached clauses – The later the deeper. *Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340*, 41: Universität Stuttgart.
- Haider, Hubert (1995) Downright down to the right. In: Uli Lutz & Jürgen Pafel (eds.) *On extraction and extraposition in German*, 245–271. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Haider, Hubert (1997a) Extraposition. In: Dorothee Beerman, David Le Blanc & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.) *Rightward movement*, 115–151. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Haider, Hubert (1997b) Typological implications of a directionality constraint on projections. In: Artemis Alexiadou & Alan Hall (eds.) *Studies on universal grammar and typological variation*, 17–33. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Haider, Hubert (1997c) Projective economy. In: Werner Abraham & Elly van Gelderen (eds.) *German: Syntactic problems, problematic syntax*, 83–103. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Haider, Hubert (2000) Branching and discharge. In: Peter Coopmans, Martin Everaert & Jane Grimshaw (eds.) *Lexical specification and insertion*, 135–164. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haider, Hubert (2001) Heads and selection. In: Nobert Corver & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.) *Semi-lexical categories: The function of content words and the content of function words*, 67–96. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.
- Haider, Hubert (2013) *Symmetry breaking in syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Haider, Hubert & Inger Rosengren (2003) Scrambling: Nontriggered chain formation in OV languages. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 15: 203–267.
- Inaba, Jiro (2005) Extraposition and the directionality of movement. In: Sylvia Blaho, Luis Vicente & Erik Schoorlemmer (eds.) *Proceedings of ConSOLE XIII*, 157–169. Leiden: Leiden University.
- Inaba, Jiro (2007) *Die Syntax der Satzkomplementierung: Zur Struktur des Nachfeldes im Deutschen*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

- Kayne, Richard (1994) *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kiss, Tibor (2005) Semantic constraints on relative clause extraposition. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23: 281–344.
- Kuno, Susumu (1987) *Functional syntax: Anaphora, discourse and empathy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meinunger, André (2001) Restrictions on verb raising. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 732–740.
- Müller, Gereon (1995) *A-bar syntax: A study in movement types*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Müller, Gereon (1998) *Incomplete category fronting: A derivational approach to remnant movement in German*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Müller, Gereon & Wolfgang Sternefeld (1993) Improper movement and unambiguous binding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 461–507.
- Ross, John (1986) *Infinite syntax!* Norwood: Ablex.
- Sabel, Joachim (1996) *Restrukturierung und Lokalität: Universelle Beschränkungen für Wortstellungsvarianten*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Saito, Mamoru & Naoki Fukui (1998) Order in phrase structure and movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29: 439–474.
- Sternefeld, Wolfgang (1990) Scrambling and minimality. In: Günther Grewendorf & Wolfgang Sternefeld (eds.) *Scrambling and barriers*, 239–260. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.
- Sternefeld, Wolfgang (2006) *Syntax: Eine morphologisch motivierte generative Beschreibung des Deutschen*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Stechow, Arnim von & Wolfgang Sternefeld (1988) *Bausteine syntaktischen Wissens*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Tokizaki, Hisao (2008) Symmetry and asymmetry in the syntax-phonology interface. *Phonological Studies* 11: 123–130.
- Truckenbrodt, Hubert (1995) Extraposition from NP and prosodic structure. *NELS* 25: 503–517.
- Vikner, Sven (2001) *Verb movement variation in Germanic and optimality theory*. Habilitationsschrift. Universität Tübingen.
- Webelhuth, Gert (1984) German is configurational. *The Linguistic Review* 4: 203–246.
- Webelhuth, Gert (1992) *Principles and parameters of syntactic saturation*. New York & Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Wurmbrand, Susi (1998) Infinitives. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Wurmbrand, Susi (2001) *Infinitives: Restructuring and clause structure*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Author's contact information:

Jiro Inaba (稲葉治朗)
Hiroshima University
1-2-3 Kagamiyama, Higashi-Hiroshima-shi
Hiroshima 739-8522, Japan
jinaba@hiroshima-u.ac.jp

[Received 1 March 2012;

Accepted 9 January 2013]