

Extraction in German: What constitutes *bridgedness*?

Whereas English and especially the Scandinavian languages allow A'-movement quite generously, in German, extraction phenomena seem to be rare. The German counterparts to the Norwegian (cf. (1)), Danish (cf. (2)) and Icelandic constructions (cf. (3)) in (ii) are all ungrammatical.

- (1) (i) Den slags har vi folk som kan.
(ii) *So etwas haben wir Leute, die können. Kvam (1983:2)
- (2) (i) Ham ved jeg ikke hvem der kan lide.
(ii) *Ihn weiß ich nicht wer dort mag Erteschik-Shir (1973:43)
- (3) (i) Hann spurði hvern ég hefði talað við?
(ii) *Er frage wem ich hatte gesprochen mit Maling/Zaenen (1985:155)

However, some German CP-complements are transparent for extraction (cf. (4) vs. (5)).

- (4) Wen glaubt Peter, dass Maria zur Party eingeladen hat?
Who believes Peter that Mary to-the party invited has
'Who does Peter believe that Mary has invited to the party?'
- (5) *Wen vergisst/ignoriert Peter, dass Maria zur Party eingeladen hat?
Who forgets/ignores Peter that Mary to-the party invited has?
'Who does Peter forget/ignore that Mary has invited to the party?'

This talk argues that the feature [\pm decided] (cf. Farkas (2003)) characterises a transparent or opaque *that*-clause. Verbs that allow for extraction from their complements are characterised semantically by the fact that the subordinated proposition's truth value is undecided. For a phase-driven approach to movement phenomena (e.g. Chomsky (2000)), my account would mean to couple a feature of the type [+decided] with opacity even when the *phase impenetrability condition* of Chomsky (2000:108) has been met.

There are numerous accounts trying to define transparent and opaque extraction domains. Syntactic works so far limit themselves to enumerating a couple of possible embedding verbs or else to stimulate structural differences. Semantic, functional and parsing accounts on this phenomenon suggest opacity factors such as *dominance*, *semantic complexity*, *referential specificity* or *frequency* (e.g. Erteschik-Shir (1973), Kluender (1991), Featherston (2004)). However, verb classes which allow or disallow extraction have never been defined consistently.

My account ties in with work by Erteschik-Shir (1973) and Engdahl (2000), who show that, even in the Scandinavian languages, extraction does not apply completely unrestricted from the domains mentioned above, but is subject to information-structural or semantic constraints, too.

- Chomsky, N. (2000): Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework. In: Martin, R. et al. (eds.) Step by step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik. Cambridge, MA. pp. 89–155.
- Engdahl, E. (2000): Integrating pragmatics into the grammar. In: Coopmans, P. et al. (eds.): Lexical specification and insertion. Amsterdam/PA. pp. 175-194.
- Erteschik-Shir, N. (1973): On the nature of island constraints. Ph.D. Diss., MIT (reproduced by the Indiana University Linguistics Club, Bloomington, IN).
- Farkas, D. (2003). Assertion, Belief and Mood Choice. presented at ESSLLI, Conditional and Unconditional Modality Workshop, Vienna.
- Featherston, S. (2004): Bridge verbs and V2 verbs: The same thing in spades? In: Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft 23 (2). pp. 181-210.
- Kluender, R. (1991): Deriving Island Constraints from Principles of Predication. In: Goodluck, H./Rochemont, M. (eds.): Island Constraints. Theory, Acquisition and Processing. Dordrecht. pp. 223–258.
- Kvam, S. (1983): Linksverschachtelung im Deutschen und Norwegischen. Eine kontrastive Untersuchung zur Satzverschränkung und Infinitivverschränkung in der deutschen und norwegischen Gegenwartssprache. Tübingen.
- Maling, J./Zaenen, A (1985): Preposition-Stranding and Passive. In: Maling, J./Zaenen, A. (eds.): Modern Icelandic Syntax. pp. 153-164.