

ON MAIN CLAUSE PHENOMENA IN GERMAN

Thomas F. Shannon

University of California, Berkeley

0. Introduction.

In recent years various restrictions on syntactic rules, particularly those known as "root transformations", "highest island phenomena", or "main clause phenomena", have attracted the attention of a number of linguists (cf. Hooper and Thompson 1973, Green 1976, and Bolinger 1977). These different labels refer basically to the same fact, namely that certain syntactic constructions are apparently found only in main clauses but not, or at least to a much lesser extent, in subordinate clauses. Whereas previous work on this topic has dealt exclusively with data from English, the purpose of the present paper is to investigate such phenomena in German. Specifically, we will assess with respect to the corresponding German facts Hooper and Thompson's theory, according to which 'assertion' is the crucial factor influencing the applicability of root transformations. It will be found that in German very little, if indeed any correlation can be established between assertion and constructions which might be analyzed as the result of root transformations. In fact, functional or pragmatic factors such as the functional sentence perspective and even structural factors such as the position of the finite verb and therefore the presence versus absence of the so-called "forefield" in the sentence seem to play a significantly greater role in determining the permutability of sentence elements in German.

1. Hooper and Thompson's Explanation of Root Transformations.

Emonds' concept of root transformation forms the starting point for Hooper and Thompson's (hereafter: H & T) theory of main clause phenomena. According to Emonds (1969, 1976) only so-called root transformations may move nodes into non-phrase-structure positions, as opposed to structure-preserving transformations, which do not.¹ But the former are restricted so as to apply only in root sentences, that is, roughly, in non-embedded (main) clauses. Thus, for example, Negative Constituent Preposing, which operates on the sentence underlying (1a) to derive (1b), would be considered a root transformation, because it produces a word order not derivable by the usual phrase-structure rules.

(1a) I had never seen anything like that before.

(1b) Never had I seen anything like that before.

Because all such root transformations are blocked from applying in subordinate clauses according to Emonds' theory, this syntactic rule should not be able to operate in embedded sentences. Examples like

(2) would appear to bear out this prediction.

- (2) *The children that never had seen anything like that before were obviously impressed.

However, as H & T point out, numerous counterexamples to Emonds' hypothesis can be found with embedded sentences in which root transformations have evidently applied. Compare the following.

- (3) Robert was nervous, because never before had he had to borrow money.

Clearly, Emonds' simple formal constraint is not sufficient to handle such cases where root transformations may occur in some embedded clauses but not in others. H & T offer the following hypothesis. They investigate 15 different proposed root movement transformations and conclude that with the exception of Subject-Aux Inversion and Tag Question Formation, they all have the common functional property of emphasizing some particular element of the sentence by shifting it into one of the prominent sentence positions, namely sentence-initial or sentence-final. H & T (p. 472-473) explain the constrained application of root transformations in English by relating their function to the notion of assertion:

Emonds showed that RTs [= root transformations, TFS] may not apply in some embedded structures. We claim that their restricted distribution is a natural consequence of their emphatic function, since many embedded structures cannot be made emphatic. ... RTs that produce emphasis would be unacceptable in clauses that are not asserted, e.g. embedded clauses which are presupposed, or clauses which are questions or imperatives.

The concept of assertion is clearly central to the proposed explanation of main clause phenomena. Unfortunately, H & T only give the following loose and rather vague definition of the term (p. 473): "The assertion of a sentence is its core meaning or main proposition. ... The assertion of a sentence may be identified as that part which can be negated or questioned..." Although "in most cases the assertion of a declarative sentence is found in the main clause," they claim that "there are also some subordinate clauses that are asserted, even though they are slightly subordinate to the main assertion of the sentence." Then they proceed to investigate sentential complements, relative clauses, and adverbial subordinate clauses and show how some of these embedded sentences can be asserted while others are not, and that hence RTs apply only in the former but not the latter.

Regarding verbs which take that-S complements, they distinguish five classes of verbs (cf. Hooper 1973) which differ in the assertedness and factivity (cf. Kiparsky and Kiparsky 1971) of the complement. The verbs of class A are the strong assertives, verbs of saying such as say, report, claim, be true; in class B we find the weak assertives like suppose, believe, it seems, these being the so-called Negative Transport verbs; class C consists of verbs

whose complements are neither asserted nor presupposed, such as be likely, be possible, doubt; in class D we have the true factives like regret, bother, be strange, which presuppose the truth of their complement; and finally in class E are the semi-factives like realize, discover, know, see. It is claimed that only with verbs of groups A, B and E are the complements assertable and that this correlates with their ability to undergo Complement Preposing as in (4).

(4) It's just started to rain, he said.

More important in our context is the fact that root transformations are only supposed to be applicable in the assertable complements of verbs from these three classes.

H & T make a number of other very interesting observations and claims in their work, some of which we will take up later, but this brief outline of their theory will suffice for present purposes. Despite certain inadequacies in their theory (cf. Green 1976 on this), it goes quite a way toward explaining such main clause phenomena and hence has a certain appeal. Since their theory is based not on language-specific structural constraints but rather appeals to semantic and communicative considerations of a general nature, one might surmise that other languages would obey this principle and that therefore the theory could be applied to them with similar success. With this aim in mind I posed the question: Are root transformations applicable only in asserted embedded clauses in German?

2. The Basis of This Study.

In order to answer this question I decided to test the acceptability of RTs in various subordinate clauses in German. For the most part daß-complements with verbs from H & T's five classes were concentrated upon, although to a lesser extent noun complements, relative clauses and adverbial subordinate clauses were investigated. The results of this study will be presented in the following sections. Native speakers of German were consulted for their grammaticality judgments; these judgments proved to be extremely subtle and difficult at times, however. I believe that the same is true for H & T's data too, by the way, but they do not show any concern for this problem. In interesting cases, a questionnaire with examples was presented to 22 native speakers in an attempt to ascertain fairly reliable findings. The questionnaire mainly concerned Preposing around be (sein) and the five verb classes, but also touched upon relative clauses. Other environments did not appear to provide any correlations and so no questionnaire was used here. Because of the subtlety of the judgments, perhaps a wider-based sampling would be called for in future research.

In beginning this study, one difficult problem to resolve was the question which movement rules in German might plausibly be counted as RTs. Obviously this an important point, since H & T's

theory deals with such rules. While the basic word order as well as the (marked) deviations from it are relatively easy to determine for English, a language in which the word order is quite rigid, the issue of what should count as "basic" in a language with more flexible word order like German is much more difficult. In fact, it is not clear that there is a single basic word order for German in which sentence elements occupy a single, fixed position. At any rate, a solution to the problem of what rules are RTs in German would have to be based on a long and intensive study of this question. Hence it was decided to start from a simpler and more favorable initial hypothesis. All possible word order variations in German which correspond to the English permutations studied by H & T were treated as potential products of the operation of RTs and their distribution in embedded sentences, at first with the finite verb in final position and introduced by the conjunction daß, were studied. These structures included the German counterparts to the English rules of Negative Constituent Preposing, Directional Adverb Preposing, Preposing around be (=Comparative Preposing), Prepositional Phrase Substitution (=Locative Preposing), Adverb Dislocation, Topicalization, Subject Replacement (Emonds' inverse of Extraposition), Left Dislocation and Right Dislocation (see H & T 1973: 466-468 for examples of these rules).² The research strategy of considering the German counterparts of the English rules entailed that perhaps some non-RTs were being included (as probably was the case; cf. later discussion), as well as some others possibly being missed, but it at least insured that a number of likely candidates were considered. Further work on this topic may well turn up more RTs not treated here.

3.0. Root Transformations in German daß-complements.

The results of my investigation were generally quite negative for H & T's theory: on the whole very little, if any, correlation was found between their verb classes and the acceptability of embedded clauses in which putative RTs had applied. Only one transformation, Comparative Preposing, appeared to evince any positive correlation between the type of matrix verb and rule applicability. Of the other transformations, some were never acceptable in subordinate clauses with the verb in final position and introduced by the conjunction daß, while others were always acceptable. H & T's verb classes did not seem to have any perceptible influence on the acceptability of any of these rules in embedded sentences, although we should perhaps be cautious here, since the judgments involved are extremely subtle and further digging might come up with some weak correlation missed in this study. At any rate such influence would be very weak at best. Let us examine each of the above-mentioned cases individually.

3.1. A Possible Correlation between Assertion and an RT: Comparative Preposing.

The only transformation which showed any appreciable correla-

tion between assertion and its applicability within embedded sentences was Comparative Preposing. Even here the findings were not perfectly conclusive, but I do not feel that H & T's data are as clear as they make them out to be either. For the sake of reliability sample sentences were presented to 22 native speakers for their judgments. These data are reproduced here in full. The numbers after the sentences give the totals of speakers who found the sentences acceptable versus unacceptable.

Class A verbs

- (5a) Ich bin sicher, daß noch schwerer verständlich der Aufsatz von Hooper/Thompson ist. (17:5)
- (b) Meine Tante behauptet, daß besser der Kaffee nicht sein kann. (17:5)
- (c) Es ist klar, daß noch peinlicher die Begegnung mit seiner Ehefrau war. (17:5)

Class B verbs

- (6a) Ich nehme an, daß noch peinlicher die Begegnung mit seiner Ehefrau war. (17:5)
- (b) Es scheint, daß noch schädlicher die Einnahme zweier Medikamente gleichzeitig ist. (16:6)
- (c) Ihr glaubt, daß weitaus wichtiger die Entwicklung der Kernenergie ist. (18:4)

Class C verbs

- (7a) ?Es ist wahrscheinlich, daß weitaus wichtiger die Entwicklung der Kernenergie ist. (14:8)
- (b) *Es ist unmöglich, daß noch schwerer verständlich der Aufsatz von Thompson ist. (8:14)
- (c) *Er bestreitet energisch, daß weitaus korrupter die Republikaner sind. (8:14)

Class D verbs

- (8a) *Sie bedauert, daß besser der Kaffee nicht sein kann. (7:15)
- (b) ?Es ist merkwürdig, daß noch peinlicher die Begegnung mit seiner Ehefrau war. (14:8)
- (c) ?*Es beunruhigt mich sehr, daß weitaus korrupter die Republikaner sind. (10:12)

Class E verbs

- (9a) ??Wir fanden heraus, daß weitaus korrupter die Republikaner sind. (12:10)
- (b) Ich erfuhr, daß noch schädlicher die Einnahme zweier Medikamente gleichzeitig ist. (19:3)
- (c) ?Du siehst jetzt, daß noch schwerer verständlich der Aufsatz von Hooper ist. (14:8)

As we see in these examples, Comparative Preposing correlates rather nicely, though by no means absolutely, with H & T's verb classes. It is always acceptable, albeit at times just barely (cf. [9a]), in the complements of verbs from classes A, B and E, the as-

sertives, whereas it is largely unacceptable, or at least less acceptable, in the complements of the non-assertive verbs from classes C and E. But there are clear exceptions to this general trend. Class E verbs seem to be less tolerant here than those from classes A and B, for example (cf. [9a] and [9c]), although (9b) received the best score of all! A majority of speakers found sentences (7a) and (8b) tolerable, even though they have a matrix verb from classes C and D respectively. Quite clearly, acceptability is not an all-or-nothing matter here, but rather gradient. There are undoubtedly other factors playing a role in determining acceptability, so that the choice of examples is very important. Nonetheless, a comparison of the differences in acceptability between such sentences as (5a) vs. (7b), (5b) vs. (8a) or even (6a) vs. (8b) makes it quite evident that the class of the matrix predicate, and thus H & T's notion of assertion, is one of the determining factors.

Even so, I am still not certain why it should be that Comparative Preposing alone of the rules investigated should correlate with assertion. Certainly the construction would appear to be "emphatic" in some sense; the preposed comparative bears main stress, as does the post-verbal subject, which is usually contrasted. Perhaps more important, however, is the connective function of the preposed element, which ties the sentence into a previous part of the discourse through the comparison which it introduces. Compare the following example.

- (10) Energie ist schon wichtig, aber noch wichtiger ist die Sicherheit der Menschen.

This fronting of the connector also lets the new rhematic information concerning the thing compared appear later. Quite possibly it is this connecting function which allows Comparative Preposing to occur in asserted complements. In passing, we might just note that this transformation is probably a very good candidate for a RT in German, since I seriously doubt that anyone would want to claim that sentences with the (comparative) predicate adjective in clause-initial position and the subject in post-verbal position correspond in any sense to the "basic" word order of German.

3.2. Rules not Prohibited in Subordinate Clauses: Right Dislocation and Locative Preposing.

As we stated above, only Comparative Preposing appeared to be influenced to any degree by assertion; other rules studied did not. Some, like Right Dislocation and Locative Preposing, apparently can operate perfectly well in subordinate clauses, with the class of the matrix verb not influencing acceptability at all. Compare the following examples.

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| Right Dislocation
(11a) Er berichtete,
(b) Ich glaube,
(c) Es ist wahrscheinlich, | } | daß es die ganze Stadt zerstört hat, dieses zweite Erdbeben. |
|--|---|--|

- (11d) Es tut mir leid, } daß es die ganze Stadt zerstört hat,
 (e) Wir haben gehört, } dieses zweite Erdbeben.

Locative Preposing

- (12a) Es ist klar, }
 (b) Wir meinen, } daß an der Wand ein Bild von
 (c) Es ist wahrscheinlich, } Carter hing.
 (d) Es überrascht mich, }
 (e) Ich entdeckte, }

Let's take Right Dislocation first. Like Comparative Preposing this rule would seem a likely RT in German; however, it is not at all evident that it functions to emphasize, either in German or in English. H & T claim that Right Dislocation emphasizes an NP by placing it in sentence-final position, but they use the term "emphasis" vaguely and I fail to understand how it is appropriate here. As far as I can see, this rule serves a similar function in both languages, a function which is not emphatic in any proper sense of the word. With this construction the speaker indicates belatedly the referent of a preceding pronoun when he discovers that the hearer may not be able to establish who or what was intended. If this is the case, then Right Dislocation may be a RT, but a clarifying, not an emphatic RT. Then it can no longer be said that Right Dislocation is ruled out in non-asserted sentences because of its emphatic function. Instead the question becomes where is one likely to misjudge the identifiability of the referent of a pronoun and have to clarify it in an "afterthought". I guess that this is less probable with presupposed material, but I doubt that such afterthoughts are never necessary in such instances. In fact, I have a few problems with H & T's judgments on their English examples of Right Dislocation. Perhaps the problem here is that this rule is simply not an instance of the phenomenon in question ("emphatic" RTs) and it is for that reason that it does not correlate with assertion, at least not in German.⁴

Locative Preposing in German also runs counter to H & T's theory in that it apparently can apply in subordinate clauses. Note, however, that this transformation is not emphatic in German and is probably not a RT, at least not in the sense of producing a strongly marked deviation from "normal" word order like we find in English. As Prague School linguists have long recognized, the so-called "functional sentence perspective" plays a major role in determining the essentially "freer" word order in languages like German or Russian. Due to such functional considerations, initial position is a highly natural place to find locatives (in addition to clause-internal -- middle field -- position), as well as other adverbs such as temporals. These elements, often being thematic, frequently occur at the front of the clause, thus allowing more rhematic elements to

come later. In this way these adverbs serve to set the stage for the rest of the sentence by presenting the spatial or temporal scene of the action, particularly in presentative sentences. Incidentally, Locative Preposing has approximately the same function in English as well, except that there the resultant word order is highly marked, since Subject-Aux Inversion occurs, that is, the finite verb appears in second position after the preposed locative.⁵ This is probably an archaic relic of the same verb-second constraint (TVX order) found in modern German. Quite probably this relic has been kept as a marked word order to signal the presentative construction. I believe at any rate that what is marked about this construction (as well as others such as Negative Constituent Preposing, Directional Adverb Preposing, etc.) is unusual verb-second structure in a sentence other than a question and not so much the appearance of the adverb in clause-initial position.

3.3. Rules Which Cannot Occur in True Subordinate Clauses: Left Dislocation and Directional Adverb Preposing.

Besides these possible permutations which can almost always be found in true subordinate clauses with the verb in final position, there are others, for example Directional Adverb Preposing and Left Dislocation, which can almost never operate in such clauses.⁶ Now Left Dislocation is a plausible RT, perhaps Directional Adverb Preposing too, and certainly both are in some sense emphatic. However, H & T's verb classes do not influence the acceptability of these structures. Compare the following examples.

Directional Adverb Preposing

- (13a) *Er behauptet, daß nach Frankreich seine Freundin gefahren sei.
 (b) *Ich glaube, daß zu seiner Mutter Hans gefahren ist.
 (c) *Er bestreitet, daß nach Spanien Hans (nicht) geflogen ist.
 (d) *Es tut ihm leid, daß nach Amerika wir nicht fliegen können.
 (e) *Ich erfuhr, daß nach München seine Frau gefahren war.

Left Dislocation

- (14a) *Hans behauptet, daß dieser Kerl, der schon vorbestraft sei.
 (b) *Ich glaube, daß den Mann, den wir kennen.
 (c) *Es ist wahrscheinlich, daß die Frau, die ihren Mann verlassen hat.
 (d) *Ich bin überrascht, daß der Fuchs, der die Gans gestohlen hat.
 (e) *Wir haben erfahren, daß dieser Kerl, der schon vorbestraft ist.

Here we find another factor of extreme importance in the operation of such rules in German: the position of the finite verb in the clause. Transformations like Directional Adverb Preposing and Left

Dislocation, which are normally not possible with verb-final word order, are quite acceptable with the finite verb in second position, as we see in these examples.

- (15a) Hans behauptet, nach München sei er nie gefahren.
 (b) Ich glaube, nach Amerika wollen wir nächstes Jahr erst fliegen.
 (16a) Waltraut sagte mir, dieser Kerl, der sei schon vorbestraft.
 (b) Ich glaube, die Frau, die hat ihren Mann verlassen.

Constructions such as these in German evidently do not represent the simple fronting of one constituent to clause-initial position relative to other constituents but rather movement into what Germanists recognize as the so-called "forefield" of the sentence, i.e. the initial topological field defined by the finite verb in second position.⁷ This forefield only exists in a subordinate clause when there is no conjunction present (not a "true" subordinate clause) this requiring the finite verb to move to second position. Since there is no forefield in subordinate clauses with a conjunction and the verb at the end of the clause, "fronting" in verb-final clauses is not movement into the forefield but to the beginning of the middle field, and this is not acceptable in general with such elements as those in question.

Thus we see here that H & T's theory concerning the operation of emphatic RTs and assertion does not apply to the German counterparts of Left Dislocation and Adverb Preposing, even though they are equally "emphatic"; the assertiveness of the matrix verb does not increase acceptability. In fact, the determining factor in these instances is syntactic or structural in nature and not a semantic one. These transformations are apparently true "main clause phenomena" in that they only may occur in verb-second clauses where a forefield (a structural concept) is present.

3.4. Assertion, Complement Preposing and the Omissibility of daß.

One area where H & T's verb classes and their notion of assertion may have some validity in German concerns the omissibility of the conjunction ("complementizer", in generative terms) and the parenthetical use of matrix verbs ("Complementizer Preposing", as H & T call it; I do not think this construction should be derived from complements via preposing, but I will still use the term here).⁸ To a large extent, though certainly not without exception, there is a correlation between the verb's assertiveness and the omissibility of daß as well as the parenthetical usage of the verb. By and large only assertive verbs, i.e. those from classes A, B and E, allow both these phenomena, while verbs from classes C and D do not, as we see in the next sentences.⁹

- (17a) Peter hat gesagt, der erste FC hat gegen Schalke gewonnen.

- (17b) Der erste FC hat gegen Schalke gewonnen, hat Peter gesagt.
- (18a) Ich glaube, Karl ist nicht zu Hause.
(b) Karl ist nicht zu Hause, glaube ich.
- (19a) *Wir bezweifeln, Peter kommt heute abend.
(b) *Peter kommt nicht heute abend, bezweifeln wir.
- (20a) *Wir bedauern, sie hat ihn nicht geheiratet. (Unacceptable on the intended reading, though ok as elliptical for: Wir bedauern sagen zu müssen ...Cf. Bolinger 1977 for English.)
(b) *Sie hat ihn nicht geheiratet, bedauern wir.
- (21a) Ich sehe, du hast viel abgenommen.
(b) Du hast viel abgenommen, sehe ich.

At this point it should be clear why we started our investigation of RTs with verb-final clauses introduced by the conjunction daß: since daß cannot be omitted after all verbs, verb-second structures cannot be constructed for all five verb classes. This means that we were unable to ascertain whether assertion influences the operation of potential RTs like Left Dislocation and Adverb Preposing which can only operate in clauses with a forefield, i.e. in verb-second structures. Specifically, according to H & T only the non-assertives should prohibit these emphatic constructions, but since daß cannot be omitted with these verbs, there is no way to eliminate the disturbing factor of verb position. In other words, the crucial test frame with a forefield cannot be constructed, so unfortunately we cannot test the theory in these important cases.

4.0. Further Observations on RTs and Assertion in Other Subordinate Clauses.

We have now completed the more systematic part of our study. Before closing, I would like to add a few comments on some other observations and claims made by H & T. These additional comments have to do with RTs and assertion in other types of subordinate clauses.

First of all, H & T claim that subject complements of verbs in class A behave differently in initial (subject) position than in final (extraposed) position. Because initial subject complements are not asserted, they supposedly do not allow RTs to apply, although they do in extraposed position. In German I have found no grounds for such a claim. Taking Comparative Preposing, our best example of a RT that follows H & T's theory, we find no difference between initial and final position.

- (22a) Daß noch peinlicher die Begegnung mit seiner Frau war, ist ganz klar.
(b) Es ist ganz klar, daß noch peinlicher die Begegnung mit seiner Frau war.

Furthermore, H & T note that in English when the complement be-

comes the subject through Passive predicates of class A cannot have a parenthetical sense. Instead the complement sentence must be presupposed (cf. Keenan 1971 for the criteria for presupposition). Thus, carrying this over to German, the complement in (23a) should be presupposed.

(23a) Daß der Präsident tot war, wurde von der BZ (nicht) berichtet.

However, it is not clear that it is presupposed; some speakers at least do not think it has to be. Moreover, as opposed to English, German has the possibility of using the subjunctive, in which case the presupposition is lost; cf. (23b).

(23b) Daß der Präsident tot sei, wurde von der BZ (nicht) berichtet.

More importantly for H & T, the predicate of class A can take on a parenthetical sense here, as in (24a), although apparently only with the subjunctive. This contradicts H & T's claim that such predicates cannot have a parenthetical sense when the complement is in subject position.

(24a) Der Kanzler sei tot, wurde von der BZ berichtet.

(b) *Der Kanzler ist tot, wurde von der BZ berichtet.

H & T further claim that complements after nouns such as the opinion, the idea, the theory, the claim are not asserted and that therefore no RTs may apply in such clauses. Green has pointed out (1976) that this claim is too strong for English because there are instances of this happening, as in (25).

(25) We can support the claim that standing in the corner was a black umbrella.

In German too such counterexamples can be found; in fact, after certain head nouns the complementizer can even be left out, behavior largely restricted to asserted clauses. Compare the following.

(26a) Pauls Behauptung, daß weitaus wichtiger die Entwicklung der Kernenergie sei, ist einfach absurd.

(b) Pauls Behauptung, weitaus wichtiger sei die Entwicklung der Kernenergie, ist einfach absurd.

Probably one of the strongest and most interesting claims that H & T make is that there are main clauses in which RTs do not apply because they are presupposed, not asserted. Specifically, they distinguish between restrictive (cf. [27a]) and non-restrictive (cf. [27b]) adverbial clauses and maintain that a main clause before a restrictive adverbial is always presupposed.

(27a) Sam is going out for dinner because his wife is cooking Japanese food. (Restrictive)

(b) Sam is going out for dinner, because I just talked with his wife. (Non-Restrictive)

Hence they claim RTs will not be acceptable in main clauses before restrictive adverbial clauses and offer the following examples to prove this point.

- (28a) *In came Jerry because it was raining.
 (b) *Sitting in the corner was Tom because he had hidden
 Grandmother's teeth.

If this claim were correct it would be one of the best proofs of the theory, for no one else has claimed to have found main clauses in which RTs are in principle excluded. However, this does not appear to be true. Note first of all that the examples given ([28a-b]) are poorly chosen: even if we substitute a non-restrictive clause they do not improve.

- (29a) *In came Jerry, because he said so.
 (b) *Sitting in the corner was Tom, because his mother
 saw him there.

Furthermore, at least some RTs can occur in such clauses both in German and English, as we see in (30-31).

- (30a) Weitaus wichtiger wäre die Entwicklung der Kernenergie,
 weil normale Quellen nicht ausreichen werden.
 (b) Nie in ihrem Leben ist Waldtraut bei Rot über die Straße
 gelaufen, weil sie sowas für unmoralisch hält.
 (c) Nach München ist Hans gerade geflogen, weil er seine
 Freundin dort treffen soll.
- (31a) Even more important would be the development of Q-magic
 because normal means are not enough.
 (b) Never in her life has Stella crossed the street when the
 light was red because she considers it immoral.
 (c) Through the window flew a little bird because it was
 raining outside.

Note also that the main clause does not have to be presupposed, although of course it often is, as when we ask for the reason for x. Contexts can be found in which the main clause is not presupposed. Thus if we know that Sam always goes out to eat when his wife cooks Japanese food and just want to find out if this is the case today, we can ask:

- (32a) Is Sam going out for dinner again because his wife is
 cooking Japanese food?
 (b) Geht Sam wieder aus essen, weil seine Frau japanisch
 kocht?

Here the main clause is being questioned, not the causal connection. Thus we can answer:

- (33a) Yes, he is.
 (b) Ja, das tut er.

A rather trivial example such as this shows how much such a presupposition is context-dependent: given the proper situation it can easily be suspended.¹²

5.0. Conclusion.

In this paper we have critically assessed the viability in German of H & T's claim that RTs are applicable only in asserted clauses. It was found that by and large this claim cannot be supported for German, since most parallel rules do not show the hypothesized correlation with assertion. Of the rules studied here only Comparative Preposing, "Complement Preposing" and the deletion of the complementizer daß seemed to evince any positive correlation with H & T's notion of assertion and hence with their five verb classes. Other rules were either always possible or else never acceptable in embedded sentences, and the assertiveness of the matrix verb had no visible effect on the acceptability of the sentence. A number of other claims about RTs and subordinate clauses made by H & T were also investigated and refuted.

In conclusion, we have seen here that assertion plays a rather weak role, if any, in so-called main clause phenomena in German. As it turned out, both functional and structural factors were much more important than assertion in determining the regularities of word order in German subordinate clauses. Thus, the function of "neutral" rules such as Right Dislocation and Locative Preposing make it likely that they will apply in subordinate clauses, while more "marked" rules like Directional Adverb Preposing and Left Dislocation rely crucially on the structural presence of a forefield. These findings are in keeping with Georgia Green's investigation of such phenomena in English. The embeddability of main clause phenomena in both languages is a function of the complex interaction of several factors, pragmatic (or functional), semantic, and syntactic (or structural), but in German the semantic factor of assertion is apparently much less influential than it is in English.

NOTES

¹For criticism of Emonds' structure-preserving constraint see Hölle (1978).

²Other transformations such as Participle Preposing and Tag Question Formation were left out because they do not have a structural counterpart in German. Incidentally, I will continue to borrow H & T's formulations and talk about "transformations" and "rules" although I do not necessarily subscribe to the notion that the constructions in question should be derived or described in such a fashion. Cf. also my comments on "basic word order" in German.

³Instances such as these make it particularly questionable whether there really such a thing as a single basic word order in German. If so, what would be the underlying position of these

elements? It seems more likely that both positions are equally normal and thus that neither is more basic than the other. It is therefore not correct to assume that one order is "underlying" and the other rule-derived, despite the dictum of TG that sentences must be derived this way. This is a consequence of dealing almost exclusively with English and viewing other languages in terms of English structural relations and regularities.

Debate in the literature on the underlying word order for German has mainly centered on the position of the finite verb in deep structure. This pseudo-controversy is relatively uninteresting in the present context because the position of the finite verb in surface structure is determined strictly by functional considerations: its position signals the sentence (subordinate clause, yes-no question, imperative, declarative, etc.; cf. Duden-Grammatik, p.620. for further details). Note, however, that the verb-positioning rule(s) in German do(es), like Subject-Aux Inversion in English, conform to H & T's theory in that the restricted operation is related to its function in marking sentence types.

⁴H & T claim (p. 467) that RTs other than inversion do not occur in questions; Green disagrees (1976: 389). Note also that Right Dislocation, if it is a RT, is also a counterexample:

(i) Hast du den gesehen, den alten Mann, der hier gerade vorbeigelaufen ist?

This could also be interpreted as speaking against interpreting Right Dislocation as a RT.

⁵See Green (1978) for some discussion of preposing in English and its various functions; and Krylova and Khavronina (1976) for word order in Russian in general using functional notions.

⁶I say "almost" because I have found one example of Left Dislocation in a verb-final structure:

(i) ... weil mein Freund, der zu mir steht.

The fact that this comes from a verse in a song (by Wolfgang Ambros) may be responsible for this counterexample.

⁷For explanation of the topological fields in the German sentence see Duden-Grammatik (p. 619 ff.: "Die Wortstellung".) Lenerz (1977) gives a penetrating analysis of some of the factors determining the order of elements in the middle field.

⁸In "Complement Preposing" we have a true main clause followed by a (parenthetical) hedge ("I think", etc.). The first clause acts like a main clause. Green notes that truncations do not work in true subordinate clauses; the same holds true for German. But they do work in "Complement Preposed" structures.

(i) Was ist mit Hawaii? { War er noch nie, hat er gesagt.
*Er hat gesagt, war er noch nie.

⁹One major exception to this generalization is subject complement: they do not allow omission of daß generally, though some allow Complement Preposing.

¹⁰Due to lack of space I cannot go into these questions further at this time. Suffice it to say that relative clauses give no additional support to H & T's theory. Incidentally, it is not clear that their "non-restrictive adverbial clauses" are actually subordinate clauses at all: they generally correspond to coordinated structures (with the coordinating conjunction denn vs. the subordinating conjunction weil; cf. the similar distinction in Dutch between want and omdat) in German. Cf. Bolinger's (1977) comments on when in English as a coordinating conjunction.

REFERENCES

- Bolinger, Dwight. 1977. "Another Glance at Main Clause Phenomena." Language 53: 511-519.
- Emonds, Joseph, E. 1969. Root and Structure-Preserving Transformations. Unpublished MIT dissertation. Distributed by the Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- . 1976. A Structural Approach to English Syntax: Root, Structure-Preserving and Local Transformations. New York: Academic Press.
- Green, G. 1976. "Main Clause Phenomena in Subordinate Clauses." Language 52: 382-397.
- . 1978. "Discourse Functions of Inverse Constructions." Technical Report No. 98, Center for the Study of Reading, University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana.
- Höhle, Tilman N. Lexikalistische Syntax: Die Aktiv-Passiv-Relation und andere Infinitkonstruktionen im Deutschen. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Hooper, Joan B. 1973. "On Assertive Predicates." UCLA Papers in Syntax, 5, UCLA, Los Angeles.
- Hooper, Joan B. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1973. "On the Applicability of Root Transformations." Linguistic Inquiry 4: 465-497.
- Kiparsky, Paul and Carol Kiparsky. 1971. "Fact." In Bierwisch, M. and Karl Erich Heidolph (eds.) Progress in Linguistics. The Hague: Mouton.
- Krylova, Olga and Serafima Khavronina. 1976. Word Order in Russian Sentences. Moscow: Russian Language Publishers.
- Lenerz, Jürgen. Zur Abfolge nominaler Satzglieder im Deutschen. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Duden-Grammatik. Ed. by Paul Grebe. 1973. Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).