Happy Birthday, dear Josef!

JAKLIN KORNFILT

What brought Josef and me together was our interest in syntactic theory and cross-linguistic "unexpected constructions", and more specifically, our interest in locality and its (apparent?) violations. We met at a GLOW conference in Girona, in the mid-1980'ies, where I gave a paper on an intriguing and little-researched Turkish construction, which I dubbed "Infinitival Double Passives" (IDPs), and which I analyzed, at the time, as a long-distance application of "NP-movement", in one fell swoop, from the direct object position of an embedded infinitival clause with a passive predicate, to the matrix subject position of the root clause with a Control predicate—a predicate also bearing passive morphology:

(1)   Üniversite-ler (polis   tarafından) kuşat-ıl-mağ-a   başla-n-dı
        university-PL   police by   surround-PASS-INF-DAT begin-PASS-PAST
        'It was begun to surround the universities (by the police)' (Literally: 'The universities
        were begun to be surrounded (by the police)')

Josef approached me after my talk, pointing out a likewise somewhat mysterious and little-studied construction in German, in which the direct object of an embedded infinitival clause appears to have moved in the subject position of the root clause, as a result of apparent "NP-movement" in a passive construction, i.e. in a rather similar way to the Turkish construction in question; also, just like in Turkish, the root verbs that allow for this "long passive" construction in German are essentially Control verbs. One obvious difference between the two constructions, however, is that in Turkish, both predicates, i.e. the infinitive and the matrix Control verb, bear passive morphology, while in the German construction, only the root Control verb does:

(2)   dass der Wagen [PRO in   die Garage zu fahren] vergessen wurde
        that the car.NOM   into the garage to drive   forgotten was
        '...that it was forgotten to drive the car into the garage' (Literally: '...that the car was
        forgotten to drive into the garage')

The infinitival clause with which the matrix subject is associated in (2) can also be "extraposed":

(3)   dass der Wagen vergessen wurde [PRO in die Garage zu fahren]

The joint work that started from those discussions yielded a few joint conference talks and three related co-authored papers (Bayer & Kornfilt, 1990; Bayer & Kornfilt, 1991; Bayer &

Kornfilt, 1994). In addition, working with Josef inspired me to publish a couple of singly-authored papers on the Turkish construction, in particular Kornfilt (1996).

The ultimate outcome of this work, in a nutshell, was that the difference in the morphological marking of the passive in the two languages signals an important syntactic difference between these constructions: The German construction is viewed as a special case of a more general phenomenon of long-distance scrambling; this type of scrambling is treated in our joint work as the result of base-generating in the matrix a constituent of the domain traditionally viewed as an (infinitival) embedded clause. The motivation for this base-generation stems from arguments showing that scrambling (at least in its 'long' version) is neither an instance of A-movement, nor an instance of A'-movement, thus leading us to our base-generation account. This brings up the question of how to capture the thematic relationship between the surface (and base-generated) subject of the construction and the infinitival verb, which is not local to it, but which assigns a thematic role to it.

The solution for this problem that we proposed was a mechanism of Complex Category Formation (CCF), whereby for German, the complex category in question consists of I and V, with I as the head of the derived entity. This complex category projects jointly into a complex phrasal category. All the licensing properties (including Case) of V are kept intact in the projection(s) of V, within these complex projections. Again, for German, V and I are jointly visible at the mother node.

With respect to "long passive", our work treated the class of Control verbs that allow the long passive construction as Raising verbs that can trigger CCF. The subject which is thematically related to the infinitival verb is base-generated in the matrix in this construction, just as the corresponding scrambled constituents in general. With respect to the long passive in (2) and (3), we wrote, in Bayer & Kornfilt (1994):

> "The verbal projection (of *fahren*) within the embedded clause will be non-maximal, since on of its arguments (i.e. *der Wagen*), is missing from that clause. The matrix verb *vergessen* can govern the embedded verb; consequently, the embedded verb *fahren* can pass on its features to the VP-node dominated by *vergessen*." (Bayer & Kornfilt, 1994: 46-47)

And, now turning to the difference mentioned earlier between the German long passive and its Turkish counterpart, namely that in the German construction, there is only a single passive morphology:

> "Since the two verbs are co-present at one syntactic node, they can be jointly affected by passive morphology, which explains why that morphology is found on the matrix verb only. The matrix-I, also co-present in the node where the projection of the embedded V is completed, causes the nominative marking of the 'scrambled' NP." (Bayer & Kornfilt, 1994: 47)

The contrasting (yet similar) Turkish long infinitival passive, with its double passive morphology, must thus be analyzed differently, so as to account for this contrast, while also explaining the long-distance nature of the "passive". Taking Bayer & Kornfilt (1994) and the

German long passive as a point of departure, I claimed in Kornfilt (1996) (and against the approach taken in that GLOW presentation that brought Josef and me together) that the Turkish Double Infinitival Passive was the result of two short instances of DP-movement (or, in the parlance of those days, of NP-movement), rather than of one "long" (yet local) movement in a "restructured" complex construction. Crucially, this phenomenon is not a sub-case of what would correspond to scrambling, but is indeed a Case-driven movement, applied locally, but twice, thus explaining the double passive morphology. Tied to this are also arguments showing that the infinitival verb and the matrix control verb do not form an indivisible verbal complex, and are able to be separated (in contrast to other instances in Turkish of tight verbal complexes). This, then, explains both the common properties between the German and the Turkish constructions ("long" passive, with the infinitival verb's direct complement showing up as the matrix subject), while also shedding light on the differences, both with respect to observation and with respect to derivation.

It would have been very difficult for me to have reached these conclusions about Turkish, if I hadn't had the prior joint work with Josef to consult and to compare to.

Needless to say, while being engaged in this collaborative work, we became personal friends, sharing other interests—within linguistics (the syntax of German and Germanic, the interface between "narrow" syntax and information structure) and music (we both play the piano), sharing what was old and familiar to one of us (Wagner in the case of Josef, Brahms in my case) but rather new, and perhaps a bit strange and incomprehensible to the other; while I learned to appreciate at least some of Wagner, I am very happy to say that some of the works of Brahms I was able to share with Josef did kindle a good deal of appreciation on his part.

With all his various interests (neurolinguistics, processing, syntactic theory, theoretically informed typology, music, as well as good food and even cooking), Josef will probably be even busier after his 65th birthday than he has been until now.

Josef—Happy Birthday, and congratulations on a wonderful career, and on having been a fantastic role model not only for your students, but also for us, your friends and colleagues!

Jaklin

References

Bayer, J. & J. Kornfilt. 1990. Restructuring effects in German. In E. Engdahl, M. Reape, M. Mellor & R. P. Cooper (eds.), *Parametric variation in Germanic and Romance: Proceedings for a DYANA workshop, September 1989*, 21–42. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh, Centre for Cognitive Science.

Bayer, J. & J. Kornfilt. 1991. Against scrambling as Move-alpha. In T. D. Sherer (ed.), *Proceedings of NELS 21*, 1–15. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Bayer, J. & J. Kornfilt. 1994. Against scrambling as an instance of Move-alpha. In N. Corver & H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Studies on scrambling: Movement and non-movement approaches to free word-order phenomena*, 17–60. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kornfilt, J. 1996. NP-movement and "restructuring". In R. Freidin (ed.), *Current issues in comparative grammar*, vol. 35, 121–147. Dordrecht: Kluwer.