

**To the left,
to the right,
and much in between:
*A Festschrift
for Katharina Hartmann***

EDITED BY:

ANKE HIMMELREICH, DANIEL HOLE & JOHANNES MURSELL

ASSISTANT TO THE EDITORS:

THI BICH PHUONG DANG

COVER BY:

KLAUS RÖDLER

PUBLISHED BY:

GOETHE-UNIVERSITÄT FRANKFURT
FRANKFURT AM MAIN, JANUARY 2024

ISBN: 978-3-00-077791-2

Contents

Preface	
<i>A. Himmelreich, D. Hole, J. Mursell</i>	v
Part I: Syntax and morphosyntax	
D is not a syntactic primitive	
<i>E.O. Aboh</i>	3
Resumption and long-distance wh-movement in Likpakpaan	
<i>S.O. Acheampong</i>	27
More than two infinitives in Frisian	
<i>F. Bergsma</i>	43
<i>How dost thou and thy master agree?:</i> (Un)resolved agreement with conjoined subjects in German	
<i>E. Fuß</i>	55
Agreement patterns of coordination	
<i>A. Himmelreich, M. Jeckel & J. Mursell</i>	71
Direct modifiers in non-free phrases in Japanese	
<i>V. Köhlich</i>	89
Two types of prosodic diversity masking Universal Grammar, exemplified in Ìgbo	
<i>V. Manfredi</i>	107
Suprasegmentals in negation: A cross-modal perspective	
<i>R. Pfau</i>	127
Inflectional verb tone in Buli	
<i>A. Schwarz</i>	139
Non-illusory linear effect in Closest Conjunct Agreement	
<i>Z. Shen</i>	151
Asymmetries in isiZulu possessor raising constructions	
<i>J. Zeller</i>	171
Part 2: Information structure	
Topic and focus asymmetries in Yorùbá	
<i>D. Aremu</i>	185

Relative clause extraposition and information structure <i>M. Bader</i>	205
A focus grammar of Aja <i>I. Fiedler</i>	217
Bite one's thumb and turn one's nose: A minimal pair of focus assignment in "Romeo and Juliet" <i>M. Krifka</i>	229
Topicalization and prosodic phrasing in Akan <i>F. Kügler</i>	241
Verum focus is not verum <i>H. Lohnstein</i>	259
From information structure to argument structure <i>E. Onea</i>	275
Part 3: Semantics and discourse	
Ist die denn schon 60?! An essay on <i>denn</i> (and <i>auch</i>) in questions <i>D. Büring</i>	291
Ideophones across modalities? <i>C. Ebert & M. Steinbach</i>	305
Phrasal compounds are quotational compounds <i>D. Gutzmann & K. Turgay</i>	319
Against <i>wohl</i> in ForceP <i>D. Hole</i>	333
Che cazzo di articolo di merda! <i>G. Vanden Wyngaerd & E. Cavarani</i>	337
Katharina ist eben die beste: On conclusive discourse particles in Wolof and German <i>M. Zimmermann</i>	351

Preface

1 Editing a *Festschrift* for Katharina

The idea to this *Festschrift* was born on May 10th, 2022, 608 days out from the occasion for it – Katharina’s 60th birthday. Countless secret emails were exchanged since then between us, the editors, and the many dozens of linguists we invited, whose paths had crossed with Katharina’s decades-long journey at some point. Katharina has always been a role-model in her research areas syntax, information structure and West-African linguistics, deeply entrenched in the respective research communities, and in high demand as a co-author. For way over 400 days, all of the invited contributors were brooding over ideas for topics or eagerly bringing their latest research in shape for a paper.

A year later, the first contributions arrived. Slowly, but steadily, we could cross the most reliable and overly punctual people off our list. The suspension to hand over this book to Katharina was hard on us, but we had to be patient and wait many more months while all the contributors set time apart from their busy schedules to express their gratitude to their dear colleague in form of an article.

Then suddenly, with the last paper formatted and the table of contents written, the *Festschrift* was finally assembled. Now, as we are writing this preface on December 12th, 2023 – only 27 days out, we would like to end this editing process with the following: We are immensely grateful for all the work by the contributors, who eventually made this collection possible, and we are immensely grateful for having Katharina in our lives, for being who she is, for inspiring and motivating and advising, and for unknowingly transferring to us some of her relentless optimism that keeps us going. She is thorough and elegant as a researcher, rigorous and warm as a colleague and boss, and dear to us as a friend. Here’s to you, Katharina!

2 The contributions

The overall classification of contributions to Katharina’s *Festschrift* came to us quite naturally. They fall within one of the large areas “Syntax and morphosyntax,” “Information Structure,” or “Discourse and semantics,” where all of these fields constitute domains to which Katharina has contributed significantly.

2.1 Syntax and morphosyntax

Enoch O. Aboh suitably sets the stage for the Syntax and morphosyntax section with his article ‘D is not a syntactic primitive,’ a title that somewhat understates the scope and ambition of his contribution. Taking the standard wisdom of article systems of Germanic and Romance as a point of departure, and contrasting this with the situation as found in Gungbe (Kwa), he first arrives at a more abstract left-periphery (LP) notion of DPs unifying the European and the Gungbe case. He then goes on to extend this LP notion to the verbal/CP domain. A Wiltschko-like overall structure for DP and CP is arrived at, a structure that abstracts away from the pronominal (European) or the verbal (African) nature of LP complementation.

In his contribution ‘Resumption and long-distance wh-movement in Likpakpaanl’, **Samuel O. Acheampong** focuses on differences between subject and object wh-movement in Likpakpaanl, a Mabia language. After presenting the basic pattern, he extends the discussion of the asymmetries to long-distance wh-movement, showing how both differ with respect to the element in the base position, with resumptives for long-distance subject extraction, and gaps for long-distance object extraction. Despite this difference, it is shown that both long-distance dependencies, for subjects as well as for objects, are based on movement, since both are sensitive to islands.

The article ‘More than two infinitives in Frisian’ by **Fenna Bergsma** revisits a classical topic of research into Frisian: infinitives. She shows that the two morphologically distinct forms of the Frisian infinitive, if looked at distribution-wise, require the assumption of three different categories. Taking the *te*-INF ‘*to*-INF’ into account on top of that, Bergsma arrives at a set of four different forms of the infinitive.

In ‘How dost thou and thy master agree?’, **Eric Fuß** tackles the question of ϕ -feature resolution in finite verbs with conjoined ϕ -divergent subject DPs in German. He does so from a diachronic perspective, noting a drift from single conjunct agreement (agreement doing justice to only one conjunct; SCA) to resolution (agreement somehow calculating a plural “best” form). Both SCA and resolution are analyzed as post-syntactic repair strategies enabling vocabulary insertion in the sense of Distributed Morphology.

Anke Himmelreich, Melissa Jeckel and Johannes Mursell report on their medium-scale crosslinguistic survey of ‘Agreement patterns of coordination’, thereby contributing to a strain of Katharina’s research that was also the topic of the immediately preceding text. Comparing 27 languages from seven language families, the authors concentrate on the factors that favor Resolved Agreement vs. Closest Coordinand Agreement. It turns out that disjunctions are correlated with Closest Coordinand Agreement, whereas conjunctions are more likely to trigger Resolved Agreement. Moreover, SV order tendentially goes along with

Resolved Agreement, and VS order favors Closest Coordinand Agreement.

Leaving the topic of coordination for a while, **Viktor Köhlich**'s paper on 'Direct modifiers in non-free phrases in Japanese' takes us into the rabbit hole of idiomatic adjective-noun phrases in Japanese, which are comparable to *white lie* in English. Based on these constructions, Köhlich shows that direct modifiers exist in Japanese, something believed to be false in previous work. The paper demonstrates the absence of a predicative use – a major diagnostic for indirect modification – for these adjectives. Further, these modifiers have to appear close to the stem, which leads Köhlich to assume that they are inside the low domain for direct modification in the DP.

The high tone of **Victor Manfredi**'s 'Prosodic diversity masking Universal Grammar' comes with a broody message. The message of his topic, the status of lexical and grammatical (African) tone in Universal Grammar, is clear: there exists the strong possibility that the – call it colonialist – commonly accepted view of tone in African languages is just a hyper-theoretical, often circular, Chimera that should make place for a new tonology which reconciles intonation and tones at a higher level.

What **Roland Pfau** does in his contribution 'Suprasegmentals in negation: a cross-modal perspective' is paying tribute to a time when his and Katharina's research interests in suprasegmentally expressed negation overlapped by coincidence. Roland studied this phenomenon in German Sign Language (DGS), and Katharina did the same for Hausa. The fact that suprasegmentality is a common way of expressing negation in DGS (head-shake) and Hausa (tonal changes) constitutes a stunning cross-linguistic parallel.

Unaffected by the pensive stance of Manfredi's text, 'Inflectional verb tone in Buli' by **Anne Schwarz** lays out the intricate system of grammatical tone in this Mabia language. With great precision, she shows that the marked imperfective varies in its tone much less than the unmarked perfective, which can show different tonal patterns depending on various factors like mood or its status as dependent verb. In addition to this detailed description of the tonal patterns, the paper makes a strong argument for the assumption that tone plays a major role in the grammar of at least some Mabia languages.

Zheng Shen observes a 'Non-illusory linear effect in Closest Conjunct Agreement,' thereby concluding the trilogy of papers dealing with conjoined subjects and their agreement patterns in this book. Thoroughly reviewing configurational vs. linear-distance approaches, he identifies a new argument for the existence of true linearity effects in the context of right-node raising.

In 'Asymmetries in isiZulu possessor raising constructions,' **Jochen Zeller** tackles the puzzling fact that, in his language of study, canonical ditransitive structures allow passivizations and either recipient or theme subjects in them; in possessor raising structures, however, only possessors can become subjects

in passives, but not the possessum phrases. Zeller contrasts two analytical options one may wish to apply to account for this contrast: the *Generalized Proper Binding Condition* and the Mobility Feature approach. The author's sympathies lie with the second solution, but the conclusions nevertheless remain ultimately agnostic.

2.2 Information structure

Daniel Aremu analyzes 'Topic and focus asymmetries in Yorùbà' through a classical cartographic lens. Topics, contrastive topics and subject foci are base-generated in the left periphery of Clitic-Left Dislocation constructions (with pronominal resumption in the canonical argument position). Non-subject foci move to their left-peripheral position, with no resumption occurring.

Markus Bader tackles an issue in an empirical domain that Katharina is well known for: 'Relative clause extraposition and information structure.' His constrained production experiment makes use of fragments of target sentences that the participants had to group into a sentence. One fragment was always a relative clause, and another fragment the definite-marked head noun. The variable under analysis was whether the DP (with its relative clause as a fragment presented as such to the participants) was focal or topical. It turns out that focal relative clauses extrapose more frequently than topical ones. The effect is surprisingly small, though. Bader considers the short extraposition distance of the test items to contribute to the smallness of the effect. An issue left for future research is why overall extraposition rates differ greatly across the participants in the experiment. The modality (spoken vs. written) may be a relevant factor here.

'A focus grammar of Aja' (Gbe continuum of the Kwa languages) is what **Ines Fiedler** contributes. Aja presents the researcher with a multitude of information structural devices. First there's the option to not mark anything at all and leave the utterance in its canonical word order. This allows for focus on anything, except subjects. Movement to the left periphery is a syntactic way to mark focus. The morphological means of focus marking include a particle that follows the preposed focus (portion), where a second particle allows the focus marking of predicates/verbs. Notions such as 'also' and 'only' come with their own post-focal morphology, not much different from other languages.

Manfred Krifka's study is about a Shakespearean minimal pair from "Romeo and Juliet": 'Bite one's thumb and turn one's nose: a minimal pair of focus assignment in *Romeo and Juliet*.' The servants of the Capulets engage in provoking the servants of the antagonistic Montagues by making an obscene gesture, and the ensuing verbal fight centers around the question of whether this gesture was directed towards the Montague servants or not. The scene involves

a string-identical minimal pair, and Krifka shows in a variety of ways that the information structure of both strings is different. He then goes on to find translations of this minimal pair in German, Norwegian, Spanish, Italian, Czech, Hungarian, Japanese, Vietnamese and Turkish. For each of the languages he discusses the various information-structural devices that these languages have at their disposal to convey the contrast, which in English, is just intonational.

‘Topicalization and prosodic phrasing in Akan’ by **Frank Kügler** investigates the prosodic phrasing of topics vis-à-vis their comments in this Kwa language. The author is able to show that topics constitute their own prosodic phrases in left-dislocated topicalization structures with (proclitic) pronominal resumption. They are separated from their comments by significant pauses of more than 500 ms, and downstep patterns are interrupted at the right topic boundary. However, pitch reset as observed with embedded clause intonation phrases does not occur in sufficient strength after topics. This leads the author to speculate that the prosodic unit characterizing topics in Akan is not an intonation phrase, but a mere phonological phrase.

Whether ‘Verum focus is not verum’ or verum focus is not focus is the question under discussion in **Horst Lohnstein**’s paper. He opposes the jubilarian and her co-author’s claim that the phenomenon termed verum “focus” by Tilman Höhle is actually not focus but the realization of a verum predicate. Lohnstein counters this claim and proposes that such a verum predicate does not exist, based on Frege’s reasoning about the truth of clauses. Instead, a focused sentence mood results in various crosslinguistic realizations of verum focus.

In his article entitled ‘From information structure to argument structure,’ **Edgar Onea** pursues the project to add TOPIC (and communicative GOAL) to the set of semantic or theta roles that any theory of argument structure must accommodate. *About*-phrases in predications reporting speech and thinking events, as well as *as-for*-phrases in root clauses, play a crucial role in establishing this. Prime evidence for Onea’s claim would come from direct objects that undoubtedly encode TOPICS (as opposed to CONTENT). Importantly, Onea emphasizes that one can adopt his general line of thought without necessarily subscribing to any version of the Performative Hypothesis.

2.3 Semantics and discourse

Daniel Büring asks himself: ‘Ist die denn schon 60?!’ and develops ‘An essay on *denn* (and *auch*) in questions’ out of this incredulous exclamative. Contrasting modal *denn* and *auch* in four types of meticulously chosen contexts, Büring shows that *denn* always relates to a contextually salient CLAIM proposition, a precondition of which gets checked by the preadjacent polar question of the *denn*

clause. The prior discourse expectation of the hearer is that the answer to this question comes out in the negative, thereby contradicting the CLAIM. *Auch* is the unmarked opposition member that signals no such expectation and lends itself to serve as a contrasting element after pragmatic enrichment. Occurrences of *denn* in ‘wh’-questions and in ‘if’-clauses are subsumed under this analysis.

‘Ideophones across modalities’ is the title of **Cornelia Ebert and Markus Steinbach**’s contribution. Their goal is to establish that the ideophones of spoken languages find a direct counterpart in so-called “idiomatic signs” in sign languages. The authors admit that iconicity is more widespread in sign than in spoken languages, so iconicity alone cannot serve as a sufficient condition for a given sign to be counted among the ideophonic/idiomatic signs. They identify the expressive component of gestural demonstrative depictions which complements the descriptive portion of idiomatic signs as the decisive feature to single out ideophones/idiomatic signs in sign languages. This yields a successful overarching notion which unifies spoken ideophones and signed idiomatic signs.

That ‘Phrasal compounds are quotational compounds’ is what **Daniel Gutzmann and Katharina Turgay** argue for. The quotation analysis of phrasal compounds is not new, but it had met with strong criticism in the past. Endowed with a modern theory of quotation à la Recanati, and after taking a closer critical look at some potential empirical counterarguments, they resurrect Wiese’s original idea. Of particular importance is the authors’ highlighting of the fact that indexicals which are contained in phrasal compounds do not refer within the communicative situation at hand when a phrasal compound is uttered.

The proper interpretation site of German illocution-sensitive modal particles such as *wohl* is the topic of **Daniel Hole**’s short note. He argues ‘Against *wohl* in ForceP’. Some researchers like to think of *wohl* as LF-moving to ForceP, where it can interact with the right semantic object if it occurs in polar questions, the question radical $\{p, \neg p\}$. Such a movement analysis would have to assume that other operators between the surface position of *wohl* and Force in declaratives – such as ‘fortunately’, or ‘honestly speaking’ – would have to move along to get the scope facts right. Hole deems this to be unlikely. He sketches an account for *wohl* in questions that has Force inform T about the required question radical form of the denotations shipped on upwards from T.

Guido Vanden Wyngaerd and Edoardo Cavirani are the only ones who take full advantage of the license that a *Festschrift* article provides. ‘Che cazzo di articolo di merda’ studies the different behaviors of the two expressive words *cazzo* and *merda* in Italian. By going through the descriptive categories “predicative position”, “stacking”, “transparency” and “rigidity”, they arrive at a classification which has *cazzo* occupy a functional position, where *merda* is

still very much on the common noun side of the scale. While *cazzo* behaves rather rigidly in terms of number marking, *merda* is somewhat on the softer side.

The squib ‘On conclusive discourse particles in Wolof and German’ by **Malte Zimmermann** aptly concludes the series of contributions to Katharina’s *festschrift*. It demonstrates the astonishing and complete parallels between Wolof (Senegambian/Niger-Congo) *daal* and German *eben*. Both particles are discourse-anaphoric, they are inquiry-terminating, and they rely on more involved discourse strategies than simple question-answer sequences. Zimmermann shows that a discourse-tree model with QUDs is empirically superior to one making use of the so-called Table Model, as the function of *eben* and *daal* is more about discourse flow than about interlocutors’ commitment states. Importantly, though, there are other discourse particles like *ja* which lend themselves easily to an analysis in terms of the commitment-sensitive Table Model.

