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Introduction

complementiser – strictly speaking, an element that turns the clause into a complement clause (e.g. *that*)

(1)  
| a. | Ralph has already finished the report.          |
| b. | I know [that Ralph has already finished the report]. |
| c. | [That Ralph has already finished the report] is surprising. |
**Complex CP**

Doubly Filled COMP:

(2) They discussed a certain model, but they didn’t know *which model that* they discussed.

(Baltin 2010, 331, ex. 1)

multiple complementisers e.g. in hypothetical comparatives:

(3)

a. Mary speaks *as though* she were afraid.

b. Tilla läuft, *als wenn* sie um ihr Leben
   Tilla runs *than if* she for her life
   liefe.

run.SBJV.3SG

‘Tilla is running, as if she were running for her life.’

(Jäger 2010, 469)
Theory

question: how to model the CP-domain and maintain constraints on word order

various possibilities:

- COMP – as in Chomsky & Lasnik (1977)
- CP (compatible with normal X-bar theoretic notions)
- various designated CP layers, including information-structural notions – cartographic approach, going back to Rizzi (1997)
- flexible minimalist approach – no rigid X-bar-specific notions or cartographic template

proposal here: flexible approach (see Bacskai-Atkari 2018b) – focus on clause-typing elements (not on information structure)
Doubly Filled COMP

original idea of Chomsky & Lasnik (1977): COMP

(4)  a. \([S'[COMP \textbf{for}][S \text{ John to leave}] \text{ _____ would be a mistake}\)

\quad b. \([S'[COMP \textbf{that}][S \text{ John has left}] \text{ _____ is obvious}\)

\quad c. \([S'[COMP \textbf{whether}][S \text{ John left}] \text{ _____ is unclear}\)

(Chomsky & Lasnik 1977, 426, ex. 4)

all elements in (4) base-generated in COMP (\textit{whether} an operator but no movement, see Bianchi & Cruschina 2016)
Wh-movement

\[(5)\]
\begin{align*}
  \text{a. I know } & \textbf{who} \text{ has finished the report.} \\
  \text{b. I know the man } & \textbf{who} \text{ has finished the report.}
\end{align*}

\textit{wh}-element placed to the left of the complementiser (Chomsky & Lasnik 1977, 434) – actual co-occurrence (doubly-filled COMP) blocked by a surface filter:

\[(6)\]
\begin{equation}
*_{\text{COMP }} \textit{wh}-\text{phrase complementiser}
\end{equation}
Problems

- COMP not compatible with X-bar notions, head-adjunction of complex *wh*-phrases to COMP problematic → CP instead of COMP

- filter not universal (not even in English)
Complementisers in X-bar schema

(7) \[
\begin{array}{c}
CP \\
\, \downarrow \\
C' \\
\, \downarrow \\
C \quad TP \\
\, \downarrow \\
\text{that}
\end{array}
\]
Wh-elements in X-bar schema

(8) CP
    /\  who C'
    /   \    
   C    TP
Doubly Filled COMP in West Germanic

(9)  

a. %They discussed a certain model, but they didn’t know which model that they discussed.  
   (Baltin 2010, 331)

b. %I frog-me, fia wos dass-ma an zwoatn Fernseher I ask-REFL for what that-one a second TV braucht. needs ‘I wonder what one needs a second TV for.’  
   (Bayer & Brandner 2008, 88)

c. %Peter vroeg wie dat er boeken leuk vindt. Peter asked who that of.them books likeable finds ‘Peter asked who liked books.’  
   (Bacskai-Atkari & Baudisch 2018)
Logical possibility

(10)

[Diagram of a tree structure with nodes labeled CP, which model C', C, TP, and that.]
Doubly Filled COMP Filter

Doubly Filled COMP Filter: *[CP wh that]

notion of a filter problematic from a minimalist perspective – can alternatively be viewed as an economy principle ruling out the co-occurrence of elements with largely overlapping functions, cf. Van Gelderen (2009) – applicable in relative clauses but more problematic in embedded interrogatives

(11)  

a. Mein Schwiegervater hat morgen Geburtstag.  
    my.M father-in-law has tomorrow birthday  
    ‘My father-in-law has birthday tomorrow.’  

b. Morgen hat mein Schwiegervater Geburtstag.  
    tomorrow has my.M father-in-law birthday  
    ‘My father-in-law has birthday tomorrow.’
Structure

(12)  

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{morgen} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C} \\
\text{hat}
\end{array}
\]

question: whether and how (10) and (12) are related
Doubly Filled COMP in a cartographic framework

Structure

(13)

which model[wh] C'

C[wh] CP

C' CP

C[fin] TP

that[fin]
Fine structure of the left periphery

fine structure of the left periphery by Rizzi (1997, 297):
(14) Force Top* Focus Top* Fin IP

modified fine structure of the left periphery by Rizzi (2004, 242):
(15) Force Top* Int Top* Focus Mod* Top* Fin IP
Double CP

structure in (13) can correspond to:

- Force–Fin (probably most typical assumption in cartographic-style analyses, also by Baltin 2010)
- Int–Fin (interpreting *wh* primarily as interrogative)
- Focus–Fin (*wh*-elements targeting FocP, see Rizzi 1997)
Problem 1

*wh*-phrase + *that* word order always produces *that* as a Fin head problem: *that* assumed to be primarily a Force head by Rizzi (1997), if the CP is split – extraction asymmetries (agreement between Fin and subject gap):

(16) a. *Who do you think [that [t ∅ [t will win the prize]]]?*  
   b. Who do you think [t ∅ [t will win the prize]]?  
   (Rizzi 1997, 312 and 314)

→ Doubly Filled COMP pattern apparently not in harmony with the basic cartographic template
Problem 2

(13) with a separate interrogative phrase does not exclude combinations like *if that in English and *ob dass in German
Hypothetical structure

(17)

\[
\text{CP} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C[Q]} \quad \text{CP} \\
\text{if[Q]} \quad \text{C'} \\
\text{C[fin]} \quad \text{TP} \\
\text{that[fin]}
\]
Separation of [Q] and [wh]

(17) could correspond to Force–Fin or to Int–Fin

difference between features [wh] and [Q] – interrogative and disjunctive (see Bayer 2004, Bacskaï-Atkari to appear(c))

→ possible solution: wh in FocP and if in IntP (following Rizzi 2004) – difference between constituent questions and polar questions encoded in the template, different selectional restrictions
Doubling in polar interrogatives

(18) a. If þai anim child miht haue, Queþer þat it ware scho or he
‘If they might have any child, whether it were a she or he.’ (Van Gelderen 2009, 155)

b. I just wondered whether that as a next step we might look to see why this seems to be the case.
(Van Gelderen 2004, 96)

c. Ik vraag me af of dat Ajax de volgende ronde haalt.
‘I wonder whether Ajax will make it to the next round.’ (Bayer 2004, 65, quoting Hoekstra 1993)
So...

status of interrogative element (operator vs. complementiser, cf. Boef 2013, 141–142 on *of*) more decisive in Doubly Filled COMP than [Q] vs. [wh]
Problem 3

functional split not tenable in relative clauses (cf. Bacskai-Atkari 2018b; Doubly Filled COMP Filter proposed mainly for relative clauses by Chomsky & Lasnik 1977)

English: *wh*-element + *that* both in interrogative and relative Doubly Filled COMP patterns

(19) a. %They discussed a certain model, but they didn’t know *which model that* they discussed.  
   (Baltin 2010, 331)

   b. %It’s down to the community *in which that* the people live.  
   (Van Gelderen 2013, 59)

relative operators should be located in ForceP (Rizzi 1997)
Status of *that*

- finiteness marker: functional split (as in Baltin 2010) implies *that* is in Fin (again, clash with the assumption made by Rizzi 1997 that it is in Force)
- Force marker, in Force → Doubly Filled COMP pattern, which the proposal of Baltin (2010) intended to avoid
German

(20)  a. I frog mich wege wa dass die zwei Autos bruchet.
     ‘I wonder why they need two cars.’
     (Alemannic; Bayer & Brandner 2008, 88)

     ‘The money that I earn belongs to me.’
     (Hessian; Fleischer 2017)

c. Ich suech ebber wo mer helfe künnt.
     ‘I am looking for someone who could help me.’
     (Alemannic; Brandner & Bräuning 2013, 140)
So...

→ no functional split (two relative elements), hence no separate designated projections – Doubly Filled COMP arises in relative clauses anyway, question why not in interrogatives (not ruled out in principle, cf. also V2 and T-to-C)

→ cartographic-style split for avoiding Doubly Filled COMP problematic even for descriptive adequacy
A feature-based approach to Doubly Filled COMP

proposal: single CP for canonical Doubly Filled COMP structures –
direct merge to complementiser

lexicalisation of [fin] in C: generally observed in German (and
Germanic; English: T-to-C structures: interrogatives)
Declaratives in German

(21) a. Ralf hat eine Torte gebacken.
   Ralph has a.F cake baked.\textsc{PTCP}
   ‘Ralph has baked a cake.’

b. Ich weiß, dass Ralf eine Torte gebacken hat.
   I know.1SG that Ralph a.F cake baked.\textsc{PTCP} has
   ‘I know that Ralph has baked a cake.’
Structures

(22)  a.  

```
CP
   /
 C′
   /
 Ralf[edge]
   /
 C[fin],[edge]
   /
 hat
   /
 C
```

b.  

```
CP
   /
 C′
   /
 C[fin]
   /
 dass[fin]

C[fin],[edge]
   /
 TP
```
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Polar interrogatives in German

(23) a. **Hat** Ralf eine Torte gebacken?  
    has Ralph a.F cake baked.PTCP  
    ‘Has Ralph baked a cake?’

    b. *Ich weiß* nicht, **ob** Ralf eine Torte gebacken  
    I know.1SG not if Ralph a.F cake baked.PTCP  
    *hat*.  
    has  
    ‘I don’t know if Ralph has baked a cake.’
Structures

(24) a. CP
   \[\text{Op.}[\text{Q}] \quad C'\]
   \[\text{C}[\text{fin}], [\text{Q}] \quad \text{TP}\]
   \[\text{hat} \quad C\]

b. CP
   \[\text{Op.}[\text{Q}] \quad C'\]
   \[\text{C}[\text{fin}], [\text{Q}] \quad \text{TP}\]
   \[\text{ob}[\text{fin}], [\text{Q}]\]
Constituent questions in German

\[(25)\]

a. Wer **hat** eine Torte gebacken?
   who has a.F cake baked.PTCP
   ‘Who has baked a cake?’

b. Ich weiß **nicht**, wer (%dass) eine Torte
   l know.1SG not who that a.F cake
   gebacken hat.
   baked.PTCP has
   ‘I don’t know who has baked a cake.’
Structures

(26) a. CP
   \[ \text{wer}_{[\text{wh}]} \bigg\downarrow \]
   \[ C' \bigg\downarrow \]
   \[ C_{[\text{fin}],[\text{wh}]} \bigg\downarrow \]
   \[ \text{hat} \bigg\downarrow \]
   \[ C \]

   TP

b. CP
   \[ \text{wer}_{[\text{wh}]} \bigg\downarrow \]
   \[ C' \bigg\downarrow \]
   \[ C_{[\text{fin}],[\text{wh}]} \bigg\downarrow \]
   \[ \varnothing_{[\text{fin}]} \bigg\downarrow \]
   \[ \text{dass}_{[\text{fin}]} \]
Relative clauses in German

(27)  

a. Der Mann, der am Fenster steht, ist mein Nachbar.

Der the.M man who.M at.the window stands is my.M neighbour.

‘The man who is standing by the window is my neighbour.

b. %Der Mann, (der) wo am Fenster steht, ist mein Nachbar.

Der the.M man who.M REL at.the window stands is my.M neighbour.

‘The man who is standing by the window is my neighbour.
Structures

(28) a. CP
   └─ der[rel] C′
      │   └─ C[fin],[rel] TP
      │      └─ ∅[fin]

b. CP
   └─ (der)[rel] C′
      │   └─ C[fin],[rel] TP
      │      └─ wO[fin],[rel]
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Proposal

Doubly Filled COMP patterns in line with the general syntactic paradigm in German (and Germanic; English: interrogatives)

word order: arises naturally (merge)

difference between standard and non-standard patterns: lexical difference (not in terms of syntactic projections)

question: whether classical CP (specifier + head) always sufficient

proposal: more complex structures can arise (more features, more lexical elements)
Constituent questions

split of [Q] and [wh] in Dutch dialects (and beyond, see Bayer 2004): multiple specifiers or double CP (Bacskai-Atkari to appear(a))

(29) Ze weet **wie of dat** hij had willen opbellen
she knows who if that he had want call
‘She knows who he wanted to call.’
(Bayer 2004, 66, citing Hoekstra 1993)
Comparative subclauses

double CP in comparative subclauses due to comparative semantics (Bacskai-Atkari 2018a, 2016, 2014)

(30) a. %Mary is taller than how tall Susan is.
   b. %Ich bin gresser als wie du
       I am taller than as you
       ‘I am taller than you.’ (Upper Saxonian)
       (Jäger 2016, 230, citing Weise 1918, 174)
Hypothetical comparatives

double CP in hypothetical comparatives due to semantics reasons:
combination of a conditional and a comparative clause
(Bacskai-Atkari to appear(b))

(31)  

a. Mary speaks **as though** she were afraid.  
b. Tilla läuft, **als wenn** sie um ihr Leben  
   Tilla runs than if she for her life  
   liefe.  
   run.SBJV.3SG  
   ‘Tilla is running, as if she were running for her life.’  
   (Jäger 2010, 469)
Conclusion

Doubly Filled COMP effects in Germanic and the CP

- COMP – not even descriptively adequate
- cartographic approach – problems regarding descriptive adequacy OR even more refined differences expressed via even more distinct projections: problematic for explanatory adequacy (amounts to description)
- single CP – sufficient for ordinary Doubly Filled COMP but not for more complex combinations
- flexible CP based on features

proposal takes into account more general properties of the given lexical element (cf. syntactic paradigm) and may explain why certain elements are preferably present
Thank you!

Danke!
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