

Clause Types and Subordination

Peter Öhl

IFL, University of Stuttgart, Germany

(Erschienen in: Mattheoudakis/ Nikolaidis (eds.), Proceedings of the 13th International Symposium on Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, School of English, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece, April 1999.)

ABSTRACT

In this paper one of the most important minimalist ideas is exploited for a model of clause linking. The formal encoding of information through bundles of features projected from the lexicon into syntax is thereby presented in a modified way. It is proposed that the numeration contains only interpretable features needed for the syntactic representation of information. The VP is extended by exactly the necessary functional projections. It is claimed that there are functional features marking clause type, focus extension and subordination. They classify clauses and make them legible. In the proposed theory both the illocutionary function of sentences and the structural and semantic dependency of subordinate clauses must be marked in the upmost functional phrases of the structure. This may happen in different ways language specifically, depending on universal properties of lexical categories and the repertory of the lexicon. The claims are supported by both synchronic and diachronic data from Indoeuropean.

1 MINIMALIST GENERATIVE GRAMMAR

1.1 *Features, Extended Projection and Economy*

We adopt Chomsky's (1995) view that from the internal lexicon *lexical* and *functional features* (LexFs and FFs) are projected and that the *numeration* NUM of a sentence S contains all *features* (Fs) that compose to the words and phrases of S and to S itself. LexPs are *extended* by FPs hosting FFs (cf. Grimshaw 1991). Here we assume a version of *structural economy* as proposed by Haider (1997): Not all kinds of FPs are projected *universally* but only those hosting the FFs serving the expressivity of S.

We propose that there are no *categorial* FFs used for the computation of sentence structure. Like Roberts and Roussou (1997) we assume that there are only *positive* values of *interpretable* Fs. Not *checking* of Fs leads to the visible structure of a sentence, but language specific rules of *lexicalisation/ phonological realisation* of positively marked FFs. Whether or not an F is lexicalised and the way of becoming phonetically realised we regard as *parameterised*. In our view, an FP is projected iff FF is [+], and it is filled by lexical elements inserted there (*merge*) or moved there from a lower position (*move*) according to the parametrised specification in the lexicon.

1.2 *Features Encode Markedness*

Clause types (declaratives, interrogatives (Qs), imperatives, exclamatives, optatives) have been suggested to be marked by *type features* in C° (cf. Cheng 1991, Bhatt and Yoon 1991, Brandt et al 1992, Brandner 1994, Roberts and Roussou forthcoming). We give some examples from English (Eng.), French (Fr.) and standard German (Gm.) Following the claim in 1.1, we propose that C is not projected in all sentences, but instead Ty° containing the positive type features realised in a parameterised way.

There are instances of *move V* in Y/N - Qs in all three languages and instances of *merge X* (particle) in French and German, forming a special type of Q.

- (1) a) [_{Typ} [_{Ty} *Does* [he study linguistics] ?
 b) [_{Typ} [_{Ty} *Etudie_v* [-t-il *t_v* la linguistique] ?
 c) [_{Typ} [_{Ty} *Studiert_v* [er Linguistik *t_v*] ?
- (2) a) * [_{Typ} [_{Ty} *If* [he does study/ studies linguistics] ?
 b) [_{Typ} [_{Ty} *S'* [il *étudie* la linguistique] ?

In other languages (e.g. Persian), all Y/N-Qs are marked by a particle.

- (3) [_{Typ} [_{Ty} *Aya* [pesar zabanshenasi mikhanad] ? (Pers.)
 Q-part. - the boy - linguistics - study?

WH-Qs have a Wh-element lexicalising an operator (Wh-F) in SPEC/TyP by movement. V in Ty° lexicalises a Q-F.

- (4) a) [_{Typ} *Who_n* [_{Ty} *e* [*t_n* studies linguistics/ what] ?
 b) [_{Typ} *Qui* [_{Ty} *étudie_v* [*t_n* *t_v* la linguistique/ quoi] ?
 c) [_{Typ} *Wer_n* [_{Ty} *studiert_v* [*t_n* Linguistik/ was *t_v*] ?

Exclamatives also have WH in SPEC/TyP, but no V-movement. Optatives have something denoting irrealis in Ty°, imperatives move V or AUX to Ty°:

- (5) a) [_{Typ} [_{DP} *What a beautiful weather*]_n [_{Ty} *e* [we have *t_n* today] !
 b) [_{Typ} [_{DP} *Quel beau temps*]_n [_{Ty} *e* [il fait *t_n* aujourd'hui] !
 c) [_{Typ} [_{DP} *Welch schönes Wetter*]_n [_{Ty} *e* [wir (doch) heute *t_n* haben] !
- (6) a) * [_{Typ} [_{Ty} *Would_v* [he *t_v* be there] !
 b) [_{Typ} [_{Ty} *Puisse_v* [-t-il *t_v* être là-bas] !
 c) [_{Typ} [_{Ty} *Wäre_v* [er dort *t_v*] !
- (7) a) [_{Typ} [_{Ty} *If* [I *were* there] !
 b) [_{Typ} [_{Ty} *Si* [je *pouvais* être là-bas] !
 c) [_{Typ} [_{Ty} *Wenn* [ich dort *wäre*] !
- (8) a) [_{Typ} [_{Ty} *Do* [you/*e* study] !
 b) [_{Typ} [_{Ty} *Va_v* [tu/ *e* *t_v* à l'école] !
 c) [_{Typ} [_{Ty} *Geh_v* [du/*e* zur Schule *t_v*] !

Thus, there are three distinguishable ways for type features becoming lexicalised: *Move* XP to SPEC/TyP, *move* X (=V°) to Ty° or *merge* X (particle) in Ty°.

In Eng. and Fr. *main clause declaratives* (MCDs) neither TyP nor CP are visible. We claim that there is only an IP. This follows straightforwardly if main clauses without topicalisation are regarded as *unmarked*, i.e. featureless. Thus, MCDs should be IPs universally, whereas declarative subordinate clauses (SubCs) should exhibit the order CP-IP-VP. For Gm. (cf. Brandt & al 1992) this causes a need for explaining a well known asymmetry: Apparently, only in MCs but not in SubCs V moves to I° (cf. 10).

- (9) a) We wonder [_{CP} why [_{C'} [_{IP} I – zero [_I is [_{VP} empty]
 b) Nous demandons [_{CP} pourquoi [_{C'} [_{IP} I – zero [_I est [_{VP} vide]

It has been suggested that the CP in V2 languages is a hybrid (C/IP, CONFL, cf. den Besten 1983, Platzack 1986 etc). In minimalist terms this could translate as follows: Inflectional Fs, type features and the F [C] can either project to distinct heads or syncretise; how many Fs a head can host is parameterised. Eng. and Fr. have to project two distinct heads, Gm. can syncretise C/I°.

- (10) a) Das Verb *geht* nicht nach I° in eingebetteten Sätzen.
the - verb - goes - not - to - I° - in - embedded - sentences
- b) *Das ist so, [C' weil [IP I – null [I' *ist*_v [VP in deutschen CPen nicht vorhanden *t_v*]
this - is - so - because - I-zero - is - in - German - CPs - not - existent
- c) Das ist so, [C/T weil [VP I – null in deutschen CPen nicht vorhanden *ist*]

This hypothesis is supported by COMPs exhibiting AGR in West Flemish and Bavarian:

- (11) a) ... [C' *dan* (dat + n) [VP Jan en Pol noa Gent goan] (West Flemish, WF)
 ... COMP(3rd pl) *John and Paul to Gent go* (cf. Haegeman 1991)
- b) Du duast grad aso [CP als [C' wiest [VP du da King waarst]. (Bavarian, Bav.)
You behave right so as COMP(2nd sg) you the king was (cf. Brandner 1994)

The same asymmetry is true for Gm. Qs, exclamatives and optatives (cf. 2, 4 - 7), which shows that [Ty] and [I] syncretise as well. Our approach has a desirable result: MCDs have one structure in all three languages.

- (12) a) [IP The boy will study linguistics].
 b) [IP Le garçon étudiera la linguistique].
 c) [IP Der Junge wird einmal Linguistik studieren].

But why the V2 effect in Gm. MCDs with topicalisation? On a pretheoretical level we could suggest that *topicalisation* is also feature driven and that there are TopP and IP in English, a single Top/IP in German:

- (13) a) [TopP [DP *Linguistics*]_n [Top' *e* [IP the boy will study *t_n* one day]
 b) [Top/IP [DP *Linguistik*]_n [Top/I' *wird*_v [VP der Junge einmal *t_n* studieren *t_v*]

Whereas Zwart (1993) explicitly suggests a *topic feature*, Brandner (1994) and Roberts & Roussou (forthcoming) assume that SPEC/C must be filled since a head of another category occupies C°. We propose instead that V movement over the extended argument serves for a special purpose, i.e. extending the *sentence focus*, hereby dethematising S. This might be driven by an FF. In Gm., there exist so called *rheme sentences*, where the preverbal position is only PF - filled by a (colloquially omissible) expletive:

- (14) [FocP % (Es) [Foc' *zogen* [IP einst fünf wilde Schwäne nach Süden] (% = colloquial)
there migrated once five wild Swans to the south

V2 in Gm. can serve to lexicalise an F [Foc]. In Eng., SPEC/FocP must be filled in order to realise this feature by *move XP*. Hence, there are no rheme sentences in Eng.

Thus, there are 3 kinds of features deriving clauses other than MCDs from propositions: Type features, focus features extending the sentence focus and making topicalisation possible, and the C feature deriving a SubC. Only the parameter syncretising all three in one FP makes Gm. a V2/ SOV - language

2 SUBORDINATION

In the following we support the claim that a specific F [C] marks SubCs. Our proposal is that C is not just the categorial F of C° heading clauses but has interpretational relevance in that it projects all and only in SubCs. German does not project a separate CP in this case, so that V_{INFL} is not moved from its base position, if C° is filled by a COMP. Like type features this FF can be lexicalised by *merge X* (insertion of a COMP), *merge XP* or *move V*. In Eng., *merge X* is optional, *move XP* is okay, *move X* is not an option.

- (15) a) Er denkt, *daß* das niemand glauben wird. /He thinks (*that*) noone will believe that.
 b) Er fragt sich, *wer* das glauben soll. /He wonders *who* should believe that.
 c) Er denkt, niemand *werde* (SUBJUNCTIVE) das glauben. /(no equivalent)

Our postulate finds support in comparative data.

2.1 Gothic, Bengali and other Indoeuropean (IE) languages

In Gth., the COMP *ei* marks argument and purpose clauses, and, with the demonstrative (*sa*, 1st sg NOM), relatives and free relatives (biblical verses taken from Streitberg 1965; gospels: Mt = Matthew; J = John; Mc = Marc; letters: T = Timothy, R = Romans).

- (16) ni hugjaiþ [ei qemjau gatairan witop aiþþau praufetuns] (Mt 5/17)
not-think-COMP-come(1st sg)- *destroy* - *law*(ACC) - *or* - *prophets*(ACC)
 “Do not think that I have come in order to abolish the law or the prophets!”
- (17) sa ist hlaifs saei us himina atstaig, ei [saei þis matjai] ni gadaupnai.
this – is – loaf – DEM-COMP – from – heaven – descended – COMP – DEM-
COMP – of-it – eat – NEG – die(3rd sg. OPT) (J 6,49)
 “This is the bread which descended from heaven so that who eats of it won’t die.”
- (18) galagida ita in hlaiwa þat- ei was gadraban us staina (Mc 15,45)
laid-down - it - in - grave - DEM-COMP - was - chiseled - of - stone

Cliticised to adverbs, it also marks other adverbial clauses:

- (19) a) jah suns-ei nehva was ...
and – soon-COMP (=as-soon-as) – near – he-was (T 5,13)
 b) swa-ei nu jah jus (...) afdauthidai waurthuth
so-COMP (=so-that) – now – also – you (...) – condemned – became (R 7,4)

In the Indoarian language Bengali the particle *je* which is a cognate of *ei* is used similarly. It is used in argument sentences, relatives and adverbials:

- (20) Ami mone korini [(je) chele-ta (je) porbe]
I – mind(LOC) - *do*(NEG-pst) - COMP - *boy-the* - COMP - *study*(fut)
 “I didn’t think *that* the boy would study”. ((je) → either position possible)
- (21) O je nacchilo, (Se-ta) amader-ke haSalo.
he - COMP - dance(3rd pst/ progr) - DEM(NT) - *us*(ACC) - *laugh* (pret/caus)
 “*That* he danced, (this) amused us.”
- (22) (...) je -ta matir moddhe khura-holo
 (...) COMP-DEM - *ground*(GEN) - *into* - *dug-was*
 “(A grave), *that* was dug into the ground.”
- (23) purna Eto aste kOtha bolche je nupur ghum bhaNbe na
Purna–so–quiet–speech–speaks–COMP–Nupur(GEN)–*sleep–break*(FUT)– NEG
 “Purna speaks so quietly, *that* he won’t wake up Nupur” (cf. Dasgupta 1993)

A similar picture is notable concerning particles in Hittite (*kuit*), Vedic/Sanskrit (*yá(d)*), Anc. Greek (*Ô(ti)*), Latin (*ut*), WG (*þe*), where the empirical situation is not that clear. I am referring to W.P. Lehmann (1980), Justus (1980), Jeffers (1987). E.g. Latin:

- (24) a) ego ex hoc, ut factum est, scibo
I – from – that – that – done – it-is – will-know
 b) edere oportet, ut vīvās, non vīvere ut edās
eating - becomes - so-that - you-live - NEG - living - so-that - you-eat

- c) Alcibiadēs *ut* erat sagāx dēcipī non putuit
 A. - *because - was - smart - betray(PASS) - NEG - he-could*

In our view it would be a wrong conclusion that e.g. Lat *ut* had several lexical entries, like *that*, *so that*, *because*, etc. It rather was just the lexicalisation of a feature in C°, the different readings were merely implicit.

2.2 The F [C]

The Eng. COMP *that* and its Gm. cognate *dass* are found in similar structures:

- (25) a) I did not think [_{CP} *that* [_{IP} the boy would study]]. (complement)
 b) Ich habe nicht gedacht, [_{CP} *dass* [_{IP} der Junge studieren wird]].
 (26) a) He is speaking so softly, *that* he wont wake up anyone. (adverbial)
 b) He hides himself, %(so) *that* noone can see him. (% = marginal/ archaic)

This adverbial use corresponds to Goth. *ei* in (17) and *dass* in several German varieties.

- (27) I have two questions *that* no one can answer. (relative)

That in (27) is clearly a COMP, it does not have the properties of a pronoun:

- (28) a) The man to whom I gave the book.
 b) The man (*to) *that* I gave a book *(to). (no pied piping of P)
 (29) a) The boy whose father I met.
 b) *The boy *thats* father I met (no nominal inflection)

It behaves like the Upper German obligatory relative particle *wo*:

- (30) I han an Ma kennt (der) *(wo) alles gwißt het.
I – have – a – man – known – DEM – COMP – all – known – has

Obviously, the clause linkage is marked by the particle, the optional pronoun has mere deictic function. In these varieties the CP is also doubly filled in indirect questions:

- (31) D' Leit werrW wol wissW wer *daß* I be
 DET – people – AUX – well – know – who – COMP – I – am
 “People will well know who I am”.

Exactly the same sentence was possible in Middle English (ME):

- (32) men shal wel knowe who *that* I am (cf. Haegeman 1991: 349)

The classical GB explanation proposes the doubly filled COMP filter. Our alternative is a parametric difference allowing the modern standards to lexicalise different Fs in SPEC/C: Wh* and C* by *move* XP (= Wh-pronoun from the A-position).

We claim that clauses are not *a posteriori* classified as SubCs following from their function and the thereof resulting structural position in the configuration of a complex sentence. On the contrary, our knowledge of language makes an *a priori* systematic distinction between MCs and SubCs, where C serves as an indicator or licenser of a SubC. There are several parallels between C and case (cf. Brandt et al 1992). As specific prepositions or case marking are correlated with the syntactic function of nominals, FFs on sentence level are realised in CP and TyP in order to specify their function in S.

A grammatical revolution in Indoeuropean (IE) made C visible through a particle in a specific FP. Before, IE sentences had already an FP providing sites for topicalisation, Q-pronouns and relative pronouns (cf. Garrett 1990, Hale 1995, Kiparsky 1995), the F [C], however, was not phonologically realised. See some examples from Vedic and Hittite:

- (33) a) rátham kó nír avart ayat ? (Rigveda (RV) 10.135.5)
chariot – who – down – rolled (from Kiparsky 1995)
 b) idhmám yás te jabhárac chasramânáh (RV 4.12.2)
kindling - REL - youDAT - carries - exerting himself (from Kiparsky 1995)
- (34) a) ištu égallim-ya-war-at-kan *kuit* para-udas nu-war-aš- mu-kann ul šàta
from – palace-it – COMP – brought – it – me – not – heart
 “I did not know that anyone took it from the palace”. (from Justus 1980)
 b) ka:š-ua *kuit* ti-anza e:šta nu šara: nepeš uemiškit
he-ptc. – COMP – healthy – was – ptc. – above – heaven – he-could-see
 “If he was hale, he could see the heaven above”. (from Lehmann 1980)

(33a) shows that in Vedic Wh was moved to FP, V was not. (33a + b) show that there was a site for topicalisation in front of Q- and relative pronouns. The examples in (34) illustrate Hittite after the introduction of the COMP *kuit*, which was grammaticalised from the RelPr 3rd sg; note that initial XP positions were available in front of COMP.

Though this does not mean that there were no SubCs in older IE. So called *paratactic* constructions in Vedic, where pitch accent on V could mark a SubC (cf. Delbrück 1888; example from Taittiriya-Samhita), have to be interpreted as adverbial constructions.

- (35) á:nyáh króçati prá:nya:h çansati
one - complâin - other one - praise
 “Whereas the first one is complaining, the other one is praising” (TS 7,5,9,3)

We think that there was an FP hosting both type features, [Foc] and (unlexicalised) [C]. The refinement of the hypotactical system started out with the lexicalisation of [C]. How and why this change took place must be left to future research. Marking subordination may be a precondition for marking the function of a SubC. This can happen either by different or by additional particles. There must be an implicational relation between C and other Fs that mark SubCs like type features mark MCs. This assumption is supported by the diachronic restriction of the use of COMPs. E.g: Old High German (OHG) *dass* could introduce different adverbials. (Np = Notker Psalter; from Piper 1895)

- (36) a) pirgo ich mich, *daz* ich meinero sundon iehen neuuile (Np 138,3)
hide – I – myself – because – I – of-my – sins –speak – not – want
 “I hide myself, I do not want to speak of my sins.” (→ causal)
 b) die gerno hier arm sint, *daz* sie hina sin riche (Np 9,10)
wo – gladly – here – poor – are – in-order-that – they – after – are – rich
 “Who are gladly poor on earth, they will be rich in heaven”.

It is obvious that both subordination and interpretation as adverbials are possible without specific markers. (36b), however, is ambiguous, it could be interpreted as both purpose, consecutive or cause adverbial. Specific markers have made the interpretation clear.

- (37) a) Sie sind hier gerne arm, *damit* sie im Jenseits reich sein werden.
 “They are gladly poor on earth *in order* to be rich in heaven”.
 b) Sie sind hier gerne arm, *so daß* sie im Jenseits reich sein werden.
 “They are gladly poor on earth *so that* they will be rich in heaven”.
 c) Sie sind hier gerne arm, *weil* sie im Jenseits reich sein werden.
 “They are gladly poor on earth, *because* they will be rich in heaven”.

2.3 Type features in SubCs - Selection or Licensing?

Four kinds of type features have been proposed in generative literature (cf. Cheng 1991):

- (38) [S]: syntactic declaratives (e.g. John was working all night.)
- [Q]: syntactic interrogatives (e.g. Was John working all night?)
- [M]: syntactic imperatives (e.g. Go to bed, John!)
- [E]: syntactic exclamatives (e.g. What a pity!)

SubCs show that the F structure must be finer grained. E.g. embedded interrogatives (EQs) are only Qs if they are selected by a V like ASK (cf. Adger and Quer 1996).

- (39) a) He wonders *if* he is right.
- b) He claims *that* he is right.
- c) It is **(not)* obvious *if* he is right.
- d) Is it obvious *if/* that he is right?

The semantics of the MC can license a clause formally equal to EQs, though. In order to approach an explanation we start out with the hypothesis: Clause types follow secondarily from semantic features in Ty°. We use the concept of *veridicality* (cf. Giannakidou 1998).

- (40) a) A propositional operator Op in a given context c is *veridical* iff it holds that:
 $[[Op\ p]]_c = 1 \rightarrow [[p]] = 1$
- b) A nonveridical operator is *antiveridical*, iff it holds that
 $[[Op\ p]]_c = 1 \rightarrow [[p]] = 0$

Now clause types can be viewed differently. MCDs do and Wh-Qs can imply veridicality. This property distinguishes Wh-Qs from Y/N-Qs, so that we do not assume one single F [Q] common to both (on the contrary view cf. Brandt et al 1992, Brandner 1994).

- (41) a) $[[Linguistics\ is\ fun]] = 1 \rightarrow Linguistics\ is\ fun.$ (Veridicality is implied.)
- b) $[[Op\ what\ is\ fun]] = 1 \rightarrow Something\ is\ fun.$ (Veridicality is implied.)
- (42) $Is\ linguistics\ fun? \not\rightarrow Linguistics\ is\ fun.$ (No veridicality is implied.)

Note also that embedded WH-Qs share their environments with declarative SubCs:

- (43) a) It is obvious **if/* that he is right.
- b) It is obvious who is right.

Embedded Y/N Qs are actually clauses with an F [nonveridical] which is not selected by V but must be licensed by the MC proposition.

- (44) Nonveridicality in subcategorised SubCs is licensed either by
 - a) subcategorisation by the MC V or
 - b) nonveridicality of the MC.

If the same feature yielding exactly one type "Q" in MCs can mark a more neutral, nonveridical SubC type, we have to wonder how this difference works.

3 CONCLUSION - COOPERATION OF C AND TYPE FEATURES

We want to conclude with a working hypothesis for future research: We assume that there is a group of Fs [nonveridical] with subsumed Fs like [antiveridical]. Marked clause types are differentiated by these (sub)features realised in specific ways, yielding

all types of clauses. In SubCs, these Fs are lexicalised together with the F [C].

In MC Y/N-questions, V or particles (*merge* or *move*) mark the type (cf. 2):

(45) a) *Am* I right? / *Habe* ich recht?

b) *Ob* ich recht habe? / *Si j'ai* raison? (cf. 2)

Nonveridical + C cannot be realised by *move* V, since V cannot lexicalise C:

(46) a) Peter wonders *if* he is right. / Peter fragt sich *ob* er recht hat.

b) *Peter wonders *is* he right. / *Peter fragt sich *hat* er recht.

As seen above, [nonveridical] in SubCs doesn't necessarily yield an EQ. This parallels the relation of optatives and counterfactual conditionals that are marked by [antiveridical]. In Gm. optatives, the F can be lexicalised by either V with specific (irrealis) inflection or a specific particle. In Eng., there is no such inflection, the particle is obligatory.

(47) a) *Hätte* ich geschwiegen!

b) *Wenn* ich geschwiegen hätte! / *If* I had been silent!

The possibilities of lexicalisation in SubCs are exactly the same, and we assume that the same type feature is working here - though conditionals are no embedded optatives.

(48) a) Wenn du geschwiegen hättest, wärest Du ein Philosoph geblieben..

b) *Hättest* du geschwiegen, wärest du Philosoph geblieben.

(49) a) *If* you had been silent, you would have remained a philosopher.

b) **Had* you been silent, you would have remained a philosopher.

We propose that these Fs produce certain MC - types due to their illocutionary force. In SubCs they yield specific semantics making them suitable for specific functions as complements (e.g. EQs) or modifiers (conditionals etc.).

REFERENCES

1. Adger, D. and Quer, J. (1996) Subjunctives, Unselected embedded questions and clausal polarity items. Proceedings of the North Eastern Linguistics Society 27.
2. Besten, H. den (1983) On the interaction of root transformations and lexical deletive rules. IN W. Abraham (ed) *On the Formal Syntax of the Westgermania*. Amsterd.: Benjamins, 47-131.
3. Bhatt, R. and Yoon, J. (1991) On the composition of COMP and Parameters of V2. Ms., University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
4. Brandner, E. (1994) *Specifiers and Functional Projection*. Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Stuttgart.
5. Brandt, M., Reis, M., Rosengeren, I. and Zimmermann, I. (1992) Satztyp, Satzmodus und Illokution (Sentence type, sentence mood and illocution). IN Inger Rosengren (ed) *Satz und Illokution* (Sentence and Illocution). Tübingen: Niemeyer. 1-90.
6. Cheng, L. (1991) *On the Typology of WH-Questions*. MIT-Dissertation, Cambridge, MA.
7. Chomsky, N. (1995) *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.
8. Dasgupta, P. (1993) Remarks on Subjunctivity. Ms, Univ. of Hyderabad.
9. Delbrück, B. (1888) *Altindische Syntax* (Old Indian Syntax). Halle (Saale): Verlag der Buchhandlung der Waisenhäuser.
10. Garrett, A. (1990) *The Syntax of Anatolian Pronominal Clitics*. PhD Dissertation, Harvard.
11. Anastasia Giannakidou (1998) *Polarity Sensitivity as (Non) Veridical Dependency*. (Linguistik aktuell; V. 23). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
12. Grimshaw, J. (1991) Extended Projections. Ms. Brandeis University.
13. Haegeman, L. (1991) *Introduction to Government & Binding Theory*. Oxford, Cambridge (MA): Blackwell.

14. Haider, H. (1997) Projective economy. IN Werner Abraham (ed) *German: syntactic problems - problematic syntax*. Tübingen : Niemeyer. 83-103.
15. Hale, M. (1995) *Wackernagel's Law in the Language of the Rigveda*. PhD. Diss. Montreal.
16. Jeffers, R. J. (1987) On Methodology in syntactic reconstruction. Reconstructing inter-clause syntax in prehistoric Indo-European. IN A.G.Ramat et. al. (eds) *Papers from the 7th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 305-23.
17. Justus, C. F. (1980) Typological symmetries and asymmetries in Hittite and IE complementation. IN Ramat, Paolo (1980) (ed) *Linguistic Reconstruction and Indo-European Syntax*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 183-206.
18. Kiparsky, P. (1995) Indo-European origins of Proto Germanic syntax. IN A. Battye & I. Roberts (eds) *Clause Structure and Language Change*. NY, Oxf.: Oxf. Univ. Pr. 140-169.
19. Lehmann, W. P. (1980) The reconstruction of non-simple sentences in Proto-Indo-European. IN Ramat, Paolo (1980) (ed) *Linguistic Reconstruction and Indo-European Syntax*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 113 – 144.
20. Paul Piper (1895) (ed) *Die Schriften Notkers und seiner Schule* (The Writings of Notker and his School). Freiburg i. Br. und Leipzig.
21. Platzack, C. (1986) COMP, INFL and Germanic word order. IN L. Hellan & K. K. Christensen (eds) *Topics in Scandinavian Syntax*. Dordr.: Reidel. 185 – 234.
22. Roberts, I. and Roussou, A. (forthcoming) The extended projection principle as a condition on the tense-dependency. IN Peter Svenonius (ed) *Subjects, Expletives and the EPP*.
23. Streitberg, Wilhelm (1965) *Die Gotische Bibel* (The Gothic Bible). Heidelberg : Winter.
24. Zwart, J. W. (1993) *Dutch Syntax*. PhD. Diss., Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.