Phrasal and Clausal Architecture

Syntactic derivation and interpretation

Edited by

Simin Karimi
Vida Samiian
Wendy K. Wilkins

Phrasal and Clausal Architecture

Syntactic derivation and interpretation
In honor of Joseph E. Emonds

Edited by

Simin Karimi
University of Arizona

Vida Samiian
California State University

Wendy K. Wilkins
Michigan State University

Phrasal and Clausal Architecture

Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today

Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today (LA) provides a platform for original monograph studies into synchronic and diachronic linguistics. Studies in LA confront empirical and theoretical problems as these are currently discussed in syntax, semantics, morphology, phonology, and systematic pragmatics with the aim to establish robust empirical generalizations within a universalistic perspective.

Series Editors

Volume 101

Phrasal and Clausal Architecture: Syntactic derivation and interpretation
In honor of Joseph E. Emonds
Edited by Simin Karimi, Vida Samiian and Wendy K. Wilkins

此为试读，需要完整PDF请访问：www.ertongbook.com

Table of contents

Phrasal and clausal architecture

Syntactic description and interpretation

Simin Karimi, Vida Samiian, and Wendy K. Wilkins

Introduction

The current volume pays tribute to Joseph E. Emonds for the significant impact that he has had on generative linguistics and on the lives and academic careers of so many of us, his friends and advisees. It is a collection of articles written by Joe's students and colleagues from close to four decades of his career as a linguist, professor, and department chair across three continents and at four universities. Following completion of his Ph.D. at MIT in 1969, Joe spent approximately a decade at each of the four institutions where he has taught. Starting at UCLA in the 1970's, he moved to chair the Department of Linguistics at the University of Washington in the 1980's, and then to Durham in the 1990's to serve as department chair. Since 2001, he has been at the University of Kobe-Shoin, Japan. Each decade and each move has inspired books and numerous articles, including *A Transformational Approach to English Syntax* that appeared in 1976, *A Unified Theory of Syntactic Categories* in 1985, and *Lexicon and Grammar: The English Syntacticon* in 2001.

Affectionately called Dr. Syntax, Joe has created an indelible mark on the lives and linguistic development of his students, friends and colleagues, all of whom were fortunate to be among his inclusive and constantly growing inner circle. Honest linguistic analysis, love of all the important pleasures of life, good food and conversation, and a sense of justice and equity are among Joe's most remarkable attributes. As a teacher, he shared with us his passion for linguistic analysis, prioritizing the data, as well as his passion for life, his sense of adventure, his honesty and intellectual curiosity, and his deep commitment to questioning authority and the status quo and to standing against oppression and injustice.

In 2001, Joe's students, friends and colleagues had a surprise tribute and fest for him on the occasion of his retirement and Emeritus award from Durham. Many who could not attend the event sent personal statements to honor him on that occasion. In writing this introduction, we read those comments and testimonials. There is a notable common thread that unites them: Joe is someone who cares deeply about his students

and friends. He is kind and caring. He is adventurous and intellectually curious. He questions authority, the establishment and, by extension, institutional inertia. Joe loves linguistics and politics. He stands for social justice and the marginalized.

More uniquely, friendship with Joe was never a casual affair. It was, and it is always, an intimate affair. You can go for years without seeing him, meet again, and pick up the friendship where it left off, with the same level of closeness and intimacy. For those of us who were in his classes, we not only learned about linguistic data and analysis, but equally importantly, we learned about life, politics, revolution, and of course food, drinks, conversations, and life's adventures and pleasures.

There are many stories told about Joe, and many recounted in the testimonials written for the Durham volume. We share here one that gives a real sense of what it was like to sit in Joe's syntax class in the 1970's.

Joe's way of teaching a class was simply to do linguistics. Especially in his graduate courses, he would come in with a problem in mind and then set about trying to figure out something important – right there before our eyes. He would begin with a phrase marker or a couple of sentences on the board and then he would begin to think out loud. He would fill the boards with other examples, other phrase markers, alternative analyses, comparisons from other languages (most often French), references and related arguments and structures from articles he had recently read, and so on. Typically, after an hour or so, he would find that he had come to a dead end. Well, of course, most first tries and good ideas just don't pan out. As this became obvious, he would go back to the first board and begin erasing – to the dismay and audible groans of his students, many of whom had been laboriously copying every example, phrase marker and labeled bracketing. On one memorable occasion, he turned to the class and shouted, "Don't take notes, THINK!"

The current volume has papers from Joe's students and advisees from the three decades and three of the institutions where he taught, UCLA, UWA, and Durham, and also includes work by some of his linguistics colleagues and friends over the years. We hope that he will agree that he helped us all learn to think.

Thank you, Joe, for being our teacher and friend.

Before we turn to a brief review of the content of this volume, we express our appreciation to many individuals. First and foremost, we are grateful to the authors of the chapters. The majority of these are based on papers that were first presented at the September 2003 WECOL Conference, held at the University of Arizona. We are thankful to the faculty, students, and staff in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Arizona for their support and encouragement. We are also indebted to our reviewers, all of whom invested time in providing carefully crafted and constructive comments: Cedric Boeckx, Mark Baltin, John Bailyn, Andrew Carnie, Heles Contreras, Peter Culicover, Rafaella Folli, Sue Gass, Elly van Gelderen, Heidi Harley, Nobuko Hasegawa, Hajime Hoji, Anders Holmberg, Kyle Johnson, Terry Langendoen, Anne Lobeck, J. J. Nakayama, Fritz Newmeyer, Yukio Otsu, Henk van Riemskyk, Rudy Troike, and Karen Zagona. We thank also Kyle Wade Grove for his editorial assistance.

The working draft title that inspired this collection of articles was *Clever and Right*. It is derived from a comment by Morris Halle on one of Joe's first papers on French syntax. Joe submitted the paper with his application for admission to the graduate program at MIT, and Halle's comment read: "Clever but wrong!" Many of Joe's own students, then, surely remember hearing: "Clever, but is it right?" Those of us who have had the pleasure of discussing linguistics, especially syntax, with Joe over the last 30 or so years have been guided by his questions, comments, and suggestions, and have been working to join Joe in being both clever and right.

In the first chapter, **Agbayani and Shekar** discuss restructuring and clausal architecture in Kannada, a Dravidian language. These authors show that Kannada uses mono-clausal lexical/VP-level restructuring, as proposed by Wurmbrand (2001, 2004) for German. They argue that embedded non-finite clauses are invariably "restructured" VPs. This lexical/VP-level restructuring is quite widespread in Kannada and is the only type of restructuring that this language allows. Tense/Agreement, though morphologically rich in this language, is shown to be syntactically *inert* in that it does not license case or motivate NP raising. Moreover, both infinitival and finite clauses exhibit "VP-like" behavior. The authors further argue that these facts require a new typology for clausal architecture.

Baltin addresses the position of adverbials in the second chapter. He shows that the conflicting evidence for the structure of adverbials, some of which are outside of the VP and some very low within the VP, can be resolved if these elements are generated outside of the verb phrase, with the object moving into a higher position, yielding the surface order.

Fassi-Fehri examines bare, generic, mass, and referential Arabic DPs in the third chapter. He discusses various flavors of bareness in Arabic within a comparative cross-linguistic perspective, taking into account both common nouns and proper names. The author's investigation motivates a computational process of N-to-Gen movement, an Indefinite Gen Parameter, and a Bare Numeral Parameter, to account for variation between Arabic, Romance, and English.

Hasegawa is the author of the fourth chapter, in which she examines the possessor raising construction and the interpretation of the subject. Though it is often assumed that transitive sentences invariably involve the small v that assigns both an external role and object Case, this author claims that non-agentive transitives whose subject is interpreted as an experiencer and serves as the possessor of the object involves the little v category that does not have an external role at vP-spec, but assigns object Case nevertheless. In such transitives, the subject moves from the possessor position of the object, constituting a type of possessor raising construction. This claim is supported by various facts seen in non-agentive causative constructions in Japanese, as well as the experiencer use of *have* and *get* in English.

Hendrick investigates syntactic labels and their derivation in chapter five. There has been some interest in minimalist theories in deriving category label from a head of phrase without having to stipulate them directly. Hendrick's paper considers whether the head of a phrase and the label it supplies are fixed and unique throughout a deriva-

tion or whether they can change from one step of a derivation to the next. His response is that a minimalist version of the familiar Projection Principle is required to answer this question negatively, and produces some evidence from selection in English and in Tongan light verb constructions to support this view.

In chapter six, **Horvath** revisits the case of (apparent) "Focus-movement" as manifested in one of its best-studied instances, Hungarian, and assesses it in relation to minimalist views of A-bar movement. The author examines in particular whether or not the movement is due to a formal [Focus] feature, and argues against this hypothesis. The paper advances the proposal that the movement involves a distinct quantificational "Exhaustive Identification" (EI) operator (which interacts with Focus only indirectly), and argues that the [EI] operator feature projects a clausal functional head that drives the syntactic movement construed mistakenly in the previous literature to be Focus-driven movement. The paper evaluates the implications of these findings for purely interface-based treatments of Focus in the model.

In chapter seven, **Johnson** examines Chomsky's proposal that syntactic derivations are interpreted by the phonological and semantic components before they are complete. According to Chomsky, syntactic representations are built up from the bottom, and at particular stages, called "phases", the result of the derivation is interpreted semantically and phonologically. What constitutes phases has been determined in the past by way of reconstruction effects, which can be used to determine how a syntactic derivation has occurred. This paper argues against this method, and argues that the locality condition employed for determining anaphor-antecedent relationship should be used instead.

Karimi and Taleghani examine the syntax and semantics of Persian wh-arguments and wh-adjuncts in chapter eight. Persian is a wh-in-situ language that exhibits (seemingly) optional wh-movement. These authors show that the two types of wh-phrases have distinct internal structures that are responsible for their different syntactic behavior, including their distinct landing sites. The discussion in this work further indicates that the movement of both types of wh-phrases has an affect on the semantic output of the derivation, and thus wh-scrambling is not a semantically vacuous operation, contrary to some of the previous claims in the literature. The authors finally show that the wh-feature of both wh-types must be in a local Agree relation with a wh-operator in Spec/CP to allow scope marking and sentence typing. This last claim predicts that an intervening polarity item would block the Agree relation, a prediction that is borne out empirically.

Koster examines Emonds' Structure Preserving Hypothesis in chapter nine. According to this paper, the insight behind this hypothesis survives reformulation in terms of recent minimalist theory: each structure created by internal merge can also, independently, be created by external merge. As before, this makes movement (as expressed by its successor concept "internal merge") redundant. From a meta-theoretical perspective, merge has the same form as other local relations, such as "displacement", reflexivization and agreement. This suggests a generalization in terms of triads: lin-

guistic relations can only affect sisters and/or their immediately dominating node. Variables can be eliminated by successive chaining of triads.

Chapter ten is devoted to a discussion of language awareness. **Lobeck**, in the spirit of Emonds' (1986) article, Grammatically deviant prestige constructions, proposes a way to heighten students' awareness of language by applying the tools of descriptive linguistic analysis to prescriptive grammatical rules. Students are then able to make informed decisions about prestige usage (Emonds' PU), and to critique (and undermine) the role of prestige usage in linguistic discrimination.

Newmeyer investigates syntactic complexity in chapter eleven. He reminds us that Emonds (1980) conjectured that in one limited domain there is a robust correlation between the complexity of a syntactic derivation and the rarity of the sentence type produced by that derivation. Other scholars, however, have hypothesized a more general correlation between complexity and rarity. Newmeyer argues that this more general correlation is not well motivated. In the three major historical periods of transformational syntax, we find typologically rare sentence types derived by means of simple operations and typologically common sentence types with complex derivations. The author speculates that correlations between complexity and rarity are not, in general, to be expected, since implicational and frequency-based typological generalizations do not belong to the realm of I-language.

In chapter twelve, **Ostler** argues that eighteenth-century prescriptive grammars were based for the most part on observable linguistic facts. Discrepancies between the prescriptive rules and actual usage in general indicate changes in progress, typically resolved when the usages in question either disappeared or became standard. A major exception to this pattern is nonstandard case marking. The same nonstandard forms that grammarians condemned two hundred years ago are still in use and still considered marginal. The author proposes that case marking continues to be problematic because, as Emonds (1986) and Hudson (1995) claim, abstract case does not exist in modern English. Ostler then argues that when the grammar does not dictate a specific case marking, speakers tend to choose the more stylistically marked form – nominative case or *whom.*

Pesetsky and Torrego present a particular proposal about the nature of agreement processes and the syntax of its output in chapter thirteen. These authors demonstrate that their proposals not only advance the overall understanding of agreement, but also contribute to a clearer and simpler view of a number of specific syntactic phenomena. At the heart of their proposal is a conception of agreement that draws on various traditions that view it as "feature sharing". They combine this conception with a proposal that valuation and interpretability of features are independent concepts. These ideas taken together allow the authors to revise existing analyses of a number of syntactic constructions. In particular, they focus on the role of verbal tense morphology in specifying other properties of a sentence, and the comparable role played by *wh*-morphology in specifying clause type. Particular attention is devoted to the syntax of raising constructions and to an analysis of sentential subjects that improves on earlier work of their own.

In chapter fourteen, **Schwartz and Sprouse** present a direct response to an article by Jürgen Meisel in which he concludes, on the basis of his survey of studies on the L2 acquisition of negation, that "second language learners, rather than using structure-dependent operations constrained by UG, resort to linear sequencing strategies which apply to surface strings" (p. 258). In agreement with Lardiere (1999) and Prévost & White (1999), Schwartz and Sprouse argue that the L2ers exhibit not an insensitivity to the [+/−] finite distinction (claimed by Meisel), but rather a delay in uniformly Target-like mapping of abstract syntactic features onto phonetic forms. The authors examine additional L2 data from various languages, and show that these data are unexceptional once one considers the L1 syntax of negation, target-language negation input, and L2 proficiency level. Finally, a brief review of the generative L2 literature reveals that "linear sequencing strategies" are grossly inadequate to account for the range of available and well-studied Interlanguage data.

In chapter fifteen, **Vainikka and Young-Scholten** discuss Minimalism versus Organic Grammar, and define Organic Grammar for syntax (Organic Syntax) as an alternative to the Minimalist Program. These authors argue that a Master Tree is gradually acquired for a particular language that ends up including all possible functional projections for that language. They provide a reanalysis of recent data from child vs. adult L2 acquisition of root infinitives using their own theory.

Van Riemsdijk and Huijbregts examines spatial semantics in chapter sixteen. The authors take notions such as location and change of location to be basic in the study of spatial semantics and addresses the question of whether these notions are reflected in syntax and morphology. They state that there are indeed languages in which there is a direct grammatical correlate of the notions location and path. Accordingly, and following Jackendoff (1983) and Koopman (1993), the authors take the abstract structure of a spatial phrase in the verbal domain to be $[_{V'} V^{\circ} [_{PP} DIR^{\circ} [_{P'} LOC^{\circ} [_{N'} N^{\circ}]]]]$. The goal of this paper is to present new evidence for such a structure based on locality considerations. A robust notion of locality (heads involved in a syntactic relation R must be hierarchically adjacent) provides the following predictions: $\sqrt{}R(V,P^{DIR})$, $\sqrt{}R(P^{DIR},P^{LOC})$, $\sqrt{}R(P^{LOC},N)$, $*R(V,P^{LOC})$, $*R(P^{DIR},N)$, $*R(V,N)$.

In chapter seventeen, **Wakefield and Wilkins** describe what they take to be the essential cognitive and neurobiological relationship between spatial structure (SpS) and conceptual structure (CS), as relevant for language. SpS, and the brain areas within which it is constructed (Posterior Parietal Cortex [PPC], ventral premotor cortex [F4, F5]), are characterized as the essential evolutionary precursors of CS and the brain areas within which it, in turn, is constructed (Broca's area, parietal-occipital-temporal junction [POT]). The authors outline a scenario in which a restricted class of SpS primitives – defined as the subset of inherent, action-related spatial property representations of body parts, objects, and extrapersonal locations – is evolutionarily translated into the fundamental class of primitives (including, e.g. Theme, Location, Source, Goal) that define the content and organization of the spatial tier of CS.

In the final chapter, **Zagona** discusses "quasi-argument" thematic roles (Instrument, Benefactive and certain Locations), and argues on the basis of their reconstruc-

tion properties and their dependence on event-related features that they should be analyzed as generated in the event-related functional projections for VP, rather than in VP itself. This supports an approach to thematic roles as defined relative to syntactic relations, since the roles in question are argued not to be definable in relation to lexically specified verbal predicates.

Restructuring and clausal architecture in Kannada*

Brian Agbayani and Chandra Shekar

In this paper we discuss restructuring and clausal architecture in Kannada, a Dravidian language. We show that Kannada uses mono-clausal lexical/VP-level restructuring, as proposed in Wurmbrand (2001, 2004) for German, and argue that embedded non-finite clauses are invariably "restructured" VPs. This lexical/VP-level restructuring is quite widespread in Kannada and is the only type of restructuring that this language allows. We show that tense/Agreement, though morphologically rich in this language is syntactically *inert* in that it does not license case or motivate NP raising. Moreover, both infinitival and finite clauses exhibit "VP-like" behavior. We further argue that these facts require a new typology for clausal architecture.

1. Introduction

Clausal restructuring effects have been studied extensively for a number of languages. In this paper we investigate widespread restructuring effects in Kannada (Dravidian) within a mono-clausal approach. Recent literature on restructuring contains two representative mono-clausal approaches. Cinque (2001, 2002), based on Romance data, has proposed that restructuring results from the fine structure of the functional domain in the clause, where the restructuring verb is a functional head that combines with the main predicate of the non-finite clause. Alternatively, Wurmbrand (2001, 2004) has suggested, based primarily on German data, that another type of restructur-

---

ing exists where the restructuring verb is a lexical predicate that takes a VP complement (Wurmbrand in fact argues for the existence of both "functional" and "lexical" restructuring). The latter species of restructuring is a mono-clausal phenomenon which occurs in the matrix clause's lexical (VP) domain.

In this paper, firstly, we claim – based on long passives, binding effects, weak cross-over effects, and negative polarity licensing facts – that Kannada uses lexical/VP-level restructuring exclusively. We argue that embedded non-finite clauses are invariably "restructured" VPs. We show that this lexical/VP-level restructuring is quite widespread in Kannada and is the only type of restructuring that this language allows. Secondly, Tense/Agreement, though morphologically present in this language, is shown to be syntactically *inert* (in the sense of Fukui 1988, 1995) in that it does not enter into feature-checking/Agree with other elements (particularly, it does not license case or motivate NP raising).

The analysis proposed in this paper yields a new way of analyzing the clausal structure in Kannada-type languages (e.g., Malayalam, Tamil, Telugu; cf. Siddarmaiah 1994). Specifically, clauses, both infinitival and finite, are predicted to exhibit "VP-like" behavior. This is evidenced by: (a) the presence of Nominative case marked subjects in non-finite clauses, (b) the status of negative particles and Comp as defective verbal heads, (c) the occurrence of multiple Nominative NPs in the language, (d) widespread Accusative-to-Nominative conversion, and (e) lack of subject/object asymmetries.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we present evidence for widespread mono-clausal VP-level restructuring in Kannada. Evidence comes from long passive, reflexive/local anaphor binding, lack of weak cross-over with long scrambling, and cross-clausal negative polarity licensing. The facts suggest that the embedded infinitival is invariably a VP rather than a TP/AgrP. In Section 3, we address the issue of why Kannada exhibits only lexical/VP-level restructuring and seems to completely lack functional restructuring a la Cinque (2001, 2002). We propose that Tense/Agreement, though morphologically present in Kannada, is *syntactically inert*, in that it does not participate in case licensing. We show that elements that appear to occupy the functional layer of the clause in languages like English (such as Tense/Agr, Negation, and Comp) constitute defective verbal heads within an articulated VP-shell structure. This, we argue, is the source for VP-like behavior even in finite clauses, on a par with their infinitival counterparts. In Section 4 we explore consequences of this approach. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2.   Evidence for VP-level restructuring in Kannada

2.1   Long passive

Kannada (Dravidian) shows morphological person, number and gender agreement on verbs in finite clauses, whereas verbs in infinitival clauses surface with the infinitival marker -*al(u)*. We turn now to arguments for widespread VP-level restructuring in the

latter type of clauses in Kannada. First, Kannada allows for long passive of the object of the embedded infinitival predicate. In such cases the object surfaces as the Nominative subject of the main [+finite] verb that exhibits passive morphology.

(1) a. jaananu-Ø [hosa mane-(y)annu kaTT-al(u)] shurumaaDid-anu
John-NOM   new house-ACC   build-INF   started-3.SG.M
'John started to build the house'

b. hosa mane(y)u- Ø (jaanan-inda) [t kaTT-al(u)]
house-NOM   (John-by)   build-INF
shurumaaD-alpaTT-itu
started-PASS-3.SG.N
Lit: 'A house was started to be built (by John)'

Furthermore, the passivized object of the embedded infinitival predicate may undergo further raising. The raising predicate shows morphological agreement with the raised object of the embedded infinitive:

(2) hosa mane(y)u- Ø [[[t kaTT-al(u)] shurumaaD-alpaTT-it] endu]
new house-NOM   build-INF   started-PASS-3.SG.N   that
kaaNisutt-ide
appear-PERF-3.SG.N
Lit: 'It appears that a new house was started to be built'

Since A-movement of this sort usually does not occur 'long distance' out of infinitival control clauses (analyzable as CPs, generally), the above data suggest that the embedded infinitival may not constitute a CP, but something smaller. If the embedded infinitival is analyzed as a VP, then passive movement would be allowed to occur within a single functional clause structure.

2.2 Reflexive binding

The subject-oriented reflexive *adara/tanna*, whose antecedent generally must appear in the same clause (3a), may be bound by the passivized object which has been moved out of the embedded infinitival clause (3c).

(3) a. jaananu- Ø tanna bhoomiyalli mane-yannu
John-NOM   self   land-on   house-ACC
kaTTid-anu
built-3.SG.M [tanna=John]
'John built a house on his land'

b. jaananu-Ø [meeriyu- Ø tanna bhoomiyalli mane-yannu
John-NOM   Mary-NOM self's land-on   house-ACC
kaTTid-aLu] endu tiLididd-anu   [tanna=Mary/*John]
built-3.SG.F   that   thought-3.SG.M
'John thought that Mary built a house on her land'