



# snippets

---

Issue 19

July 2009

---

## Contents

1. Bridget Copley and Heidi Harley. *Futurates, directors and have-causatives.*
2. Xuan Di. *Predicate types in relative clauses and complementizer deletion.*
3. Aviad Eilam. *Evidence for covert syntax in complement coercion.*
4. Nancy Hedberg and Richard C. DeArmond. *On complements and adjuncts.*
5. Ken Hiraiwa. *Kakarimusubi in Okinawan and its microparametric implications.*
6. Karine Megerdoomian. *Telicity in Persian complex predicates.*
7. Andrea Moro. *Rethinking symmetry: a note on labeling and the EPP.*
8. Lucia Pozzan and Giuliano Bocci. *Here there is an ambiguity: two readings for the sequence here/there-P in Italian.*
9. Emilio Servidio. *A puzzle on auxiliary omission and focalization in English: evidence for cartography.*



ISSN 1590-1807

Published in *Led on Line* - Electronic Archive by  
LED - Edizioni Universitarie di Lettere Economia Diritto - Milano - Italy  
<http://www.ledonline.it>

JULY 2009

### **Copyright**

The works included in *Snippets* are the property of their authors and are used by permission. Readers must apply the same principles of fair use to the works in this electronic archive that they would to a printed archive. These works may be read online, downloaded and printed for personal use, copied and freely distributed, or the URL of *Snippets* included in another electronic document. Any reference to material included in *Snippets* must cite the author and the source. The texts may not be published commercially (in print or electronic form), edited, or otherwise altered without the permission of the author.

### **Editors**

Carlo Cecchetto (University of Milan-Bicocca)  
Caterina Donati (University of Rome-La Sapienza)  
Orin Percus (University of Nantes)

### **Review Board**

Sigrid Beck (University of Tübingen)  
Rajesh Bhatt (University of Massachusetts, Amherst)  
Valentina Bianchi (University of Siena)  
Daniel Büring (UCLA)  
Danny Fox (MIT)  
Hisatsugu Kitahara (Keio University)  
Roumyana Pancheva (USC)  
Josep Quer (ICREA and UPF, Barcelona)  
Norvin Richards (MIT)  
Anna Roussou (University of Patras)  
Uli Sauerland (ZAS, Berlin)  
William Snyder (University of Connecticut)  
Michal Starke (CASTL, Tromsø)

E-mail: [snippets@unimi.it](mailto:snippets@unimi.it)

## EDITORIAL STATEMENT

### 1. Purpose.

The aim of *Snippets* is to publish specific remarks that motivate research or that make theoretical points germane to current work. The ideal contribution is the ideal footnote: a side remark that taken on its own is not worth lengthy development but that needs to be said. One encounters many short comments of this kind in the literature of the seventies. We feel that there no longer is a forum for them. We want *Snippets* to help fill that gap.

### 2. Content.

We will publish notes that contribute to the study of syntax and semantics in generative grammar. The notes are to be brief, self-contained and explicit. They may do any of the following things:

- point out an empirical phenomenon that goes against accepted generalizations or that shows that some aspect of a theory is problematic;
- point out unnoticed minimal pairs that fall outside the scope of any existing theory;
- point out an empirical phenomenon that confirms the predictions of a theory in an area where the theory has not been tested;
- explicitly describe technical inconsistencies in a theory or in a set of frequently adopted assumptions;
- explicitly describe unnoticed assumptions that underlie a theory or assumptions that a theory needs to be supplemented with in order to make desired predictions;
- call attention to little-known or forgotten literature in which issues of immediate relevance are discussed.

We also encourage submissions that connect psycholinguistic data to theoretical issues. A proposal for a pilot experiment in language acquisition or language processing could make for an excellent snippet.

The earliest Linguistic Inquiry squibs exemplify the kind of note we would like to publish. Some of them posed unobserved puzzles. For instance, a squib by Postal and Ross in LI 1:1 ("A Problem of Adverb Preposing") noted that whether or not we can construe a sentence-initial temporal adverb with an embedded verb depends on the tense of the matrix verb. A squib by Perlmutter and Ross in LI 1:3 ("Relative Clauses with Split Antecedents"), challenging the prevailing analyses of coordination and extraposition, noted that conjoined clauses neither of which contain a plural noun phrase can appear next to an "extraposed" relative that can only describe groups. Other squibs drew attention to particular theoretical assumptions. For instance, a squib by Bresnan in LI 1:2 ("A Grammatical Fiction") outlined an alternative account of the derivation of sentences containing believe and force, and asked whether there were principled reasons for dismissing any of the underlying assumptions (among them that semantic interpretation is sensitive to details of a syntactic derivation). A squib by Zwicky in LI 1:2 ("Class Complements in Phonology") asked to what extent phonological rules refer to complements of classes. None of these squibs was more than a couple of paragraphs; all of them limited themselves to a precise question or observation.

### **3. Submission details.**

*Snippets* is an electronic journal. We will solicit submissions twice a year: the submission deadlines are April 1 and October 1. The submissions that we accept will be posted on the journal website approximately 3 months after each deadline, and all accepted submissions will remain permanently on the website.

*Snippets* is intended as a service to the linguistics community. Consequently, authors are advised that, when they submit to *Snippets*, we understand them as allowing their submission to be reproduced if published. At the same time, the rights for the notes themselves will remain with the authors. As a result, citation of *Snippets* material will have to indicate the author's name and the specific source of the material.

We will accept electronic submissions at the address [snippets@unimi.it](mailto:snippets@unimi.it). Electronic submissions may take the form of (a) the text of an e-mail message, or (b) an attached file. The attached file should be a simple text file, a Word file (Mac or Windows), or a Rich Text Format (RTF) file. All submissions must state the name and affiliation of the author(s), and a (postal or electronic) return address.

Submissions are to be a maximum of 500 words (including examples), with an additional half page allowed for diagrams, tables and references. Given that we envision the submissions themselves as footnotes, the submissions may not contain footnotes of their own. The ideal submission is one paragraph; a submission of five lines is perfectly acceptable. We will not consider abstracts.

### **4. Editorial policy.**

Submissions will be reviewed by our editorial board, and review will be name-blind both ways. While we guarantee a response within 3 months of the submission deadline, we will only provide a yes/no response to the submitter. We will not request revisions (barring exceptional cases). We allow resubmission (once) of the same piece.

## 1.

**Bridget Copley - CNRS**

**Heidi Harley - University of Arizona**

***Futurates, directors, and have-causatives***

bridget.copley@sfl.cnrs.fr, hharley@email.arizona.edu

---

Copley (2008, 2009) proposes a treatment of futurate sentences like that in (1a) according to which an existentially quantified, presupposed-capable 'director' entity *d* is asserted to be committed to the realization of the proposition expressed in the sentence. On this account, (1a) ends up entailing the event's occurrence because the director (whoever has the ability to tell Clinton where to go, perhaps Clinton herself) is presupposed to be able to bring it about. By contrast, (1b) is unacceptable insofar as no animate director has the ability to make it rain tomorrow. It is acceptable, however, if there is someone who has the ability to make the rain event happen (God, or a screenplay writer, e.g.).

- (1) a. Clinton travels to France tomorrow.  
b. #It rains tomorrow.

We argue that the English *have*-causative exemplified in (2) has the same properties as the futurate. In particular, we claim that the subject of *have* is the director.

- (2) Obama had Clinton travel to France last Tuesday.

In a *have*-causative, the embedded subject must normally be animate, in independent control of the event denoted by the embedded verb. It has long been observed (Ritter and Rosen 1993, 1997, Belvin 1993, 1996, Harley 1998) that causative *have* is ill-formed with uncontrollable embedded events in a way that more mundane causatives are not:

- (3) #Obama had it rain last Tuesday.  
(4) Obama made it rain last Tuesday.  
(5) #Obama had Clinton collapse last Tuesday.  
(6) Obama made Clinton collapse last Tuesday.

Causative *have* with such uncontrollable events is not ungrammatical, precisely. Rather, what is often termed the 'director's reading' emerges. On this reading, the subject of *have* is an omnipotent being with respect to the universe of the embedded predicate, arranging the dispositions and behaviors of entities in it at will. If Mary is an author of a book or the director of a movie in which the embedded subjects are characters, for example, these are good readings:

---

- (7) a. (In the opening scene), Sorkin had Barlett collapse.  
b. (During Josh's big confession to Toby,) Sorkin had CJ asleep.  
c. Sorkin had it rain (to give his protagonists a reason to go in the shop).

In other words, there's nothing wrong with *have*-causatives of normally unplannable events. It's just that to interpret them, Mary's powers must be extended from mere authority-over-actions-of-other-humans (i.e. planning-for-humans authority) to authority-over-everything-in-the-universe (planning-for-everything authority). The same effect emerges in futurates, as shown in (1) above. The contrast between regular and 'director's' readings of a *have*-causative thus stems from the fact that the embedded event has to be plannable (or, we might say, directable) by the subject of *have*, in the exact same sense that a futurate requires plannability/directability. The similarity of these constructions suggests that Copley's futurate operator and causative *have* are the same entity.

### References

- Belvin, R. (1993) "The two causative *haves* are the two possessive *haves*." In *Papers from the Fifth Student Conference in Linguistics, MITWPL 20*, ed. V. Lindblad and M. Gamon. Cambridge: MITWPL, 19-34.
- Belvin, R. (1996) *Inside Events: The Non-Possessive Meanings of Possession Predicates and the Semantic Conceptualization of Events*. PhD. dissertation, University of Southern California.
- Copley, B. (2008) "The plan's the thing: deconstructing futurate meanings." *Linguistic Inquiry* 39: 2.
- Copley, B. (2009) *The Semantics of the Future*. New York: Routledge.
- Harley, H. (1998) "You're having me on: aspects of *have*", in *La grammaire de la possession*, ed. J. Guéron and A. Zribi-Hertz. Paris: Université Paris X - Nanterre, 195-226.
- Ritter, E. and S.T. Rosen (1993) "Deriving causation." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11: 519-555.
- Ritter, E. and S.T. Rosen (1997) "The function of *have*." *Lingua* 101: 295-321.

## 2.

### **Xuan Di - CASTL, University of Tromsø; Haskins Laboratories, Yale** ***Predicate types in relative clauses and complementizer deletion***

di.xuan@yahoo.com

---

Leaving all the analyses of *de* aside, let's tentatively call it a complementizer in relative clauses such as (1).

- (1) *Nana mai de shu hen gui.*  
Nana buy COMP book very expensive  
“The book(s) Nana bought is (are) very expensive.”

A well-known fact (discussed in Liu Danqing 2005 among others) is that *de* is optional when the ‘head noun’ is preceded by a demonstrative (2).

- (2) a. *Nana mai (de) nei shu hen gui.*  
Nana buy COMP that book very expensive  
“The book(s) Nana bought is (are) very expensive.”  
b. *Nana mai (de) nei ben-r shu hen gui.*  
Nana buy COMP that CLF-R book very expensive  
“The book Nana bought is very expensive.”  
c. *Nana mai (de) nei san ben-r shu hen gui.*  
Nana buy COMP that three CLF-R book very expensive  
“The three books Nana bought are very expensive.”

The purpose of this snippet is to show that when the predicate is resultative (3), or when the main verb (in (4a), *mai* “to buy”) is suffixed with *le*, the relative clauses with these predicates do not allow *de* to be deleted even when the ‘head noun’ is modified by a demonstrative.

- (3) a. *Nana mai dao le nei ben-r shu (le).*  
Nana buy arrive LE that CLF-R book LE  
“Nana (has already) managed to buy that book.”  
b. *Nana mai dao nei ben-r shu le.*  
Nana buy arrive that CLF-R book LE  
“Nana already managed to buy that book.”  
(4) a. *Nana mai le nei ben-r shu (le).*  
Nana buy LE that CLF-R book LE  
“Nana (has already) bought that book.”  
b. *Nana mai nei ben-r shu le.*  
Nana buy that CLF-R book LE  
“Nana already bought that book.”

Firstly, when the predicate is a resultative compound *mai-dao* [buy-arrive], *de* cannot be deleted for most of the speakers I consulted (5). And even for speakers who find (5b) possible, complementizer deletion with a resultative verb phrase leads to ungrammaticality in contexts like (6), where the complex NP appears in object position of an existential sentence. Other types of resultatives -- *ran-hong* [dye-red], *da-si* [beat-die] etc. -- all behave similarly in terms of disallowing *de* deletions.

- (5) a. *Nana mai dao \*(de) (nei) shu hen gui.*  
 Nana buy arrive COMP that book very expensive  
 “The book(s) Nana got is (are) very expensive.”
- b. *Nana mai dao \*(de) nei ben-r shu hen gui.*  
 Nana buy arrive COMP that CLF-R book very expensive  
 “The book Nana got is very expensive.”
- c. *Nana mai dao \*(de) (nei) san ben-r shu hen gui.*  
 Nana buy arrive COMP that three CLF-R book very expensive  
 “The three books Nana got are very expensive.”
- (6) *zhuo shang fang zhe Nana mai dao \*(de) nei ben-r shu*  
 table up put ZHE Nana buy arrive COMP that CLF-R book  
 “On the table is the book that Nana managed to buy yesterday.”

Secondly, when the verb is suffixed with the aspectual marker *le*, *de* again cannot be deleted (7).

- (7) a. *Nana mai le \*(de) (nei) shu hen gui.*  
 Nana buy LE COMP that book very expensive  
 “The book(s) Nana bought is (are) very expensive.”
- b. *Nana mai le \*(de) nei ben-r shu hen gui.*  
 Nana buy LE COMP that CLF-R book very expensive  
 “The book Nana bought is very expensive.”
- c. *Nana mai le \*(de) (nei) san ben-r shu hen gui.*  
 Nana buy LE COMP that three CLF-R book very expensive  
 “Those three books that Nana bought are very expensive.”

Analyses taking *de* as a D head (Simpson 2000), or as a linker (den Dikken and Singhapreecha 2004), cannot readily explain why the ‘internal’ structure of the relativized predicate has such an effect. How to account for these restrictions remains a challenge.

## References

- den Dikken, M. and P. Singhapreecha. (2004) “Complex noun phrases and linkers.” *Syntax* 7:1.
- Liu, D. (2005) 《汉语关系从句标记类型初探》 *中国语文* 2005.1
- Simpson, A. (2000) “On the re-analysis of nominalizers in Chinese, Japanese and Korean.” In *Functional Structures, Form and Interpretation*, ed. A. Li and A. Simpson. London: Routledge Curzon.

### 3.

**Aviad Eilam - University of Pennsylvania**  
***Evidence for covert syntax in complement coercion***

eilamavi@ling.upenn.edu

---

Complement coercion, in which a verb that semantically selects for an event predicate can occur with an individual-denoting object, as in Modern Hebrew (MH) (1), is generally assumed not to involve a null syntactic head (Pylkkänen & McElree 2006).

- (1) ha-yeled hitxil et ha-sefer.  
the-boy began ACC the-book  
'The boy began the book.'

The MH example in (1) is identical to its English counterpart, except for the occurrence of accusative case marking through the object marker *et*. Although it is not entirely clear what assigns accusative in such an example, given that an aspectual verb like *hitxil* 'begin' bears no thematic relation to the object, and accusative is not a default case in MH (unlike English; see Schütze 2001), it is not convincing evidence for a null V, since accusative case marking seems to be the norm crosslinguistically in this sort of example.

However, there is another configuration in MH which arguably provides support for the existence of a null V in complement coercion contexts. Consider (2): the unaccusative verb *niš'ar* 'remain' takes an optional dative argument and a DP subject, which has remained in its base-generated position and with which the verb agrees.

- (2) niš'aru li štei ha-calaxot še-kanita li.  
remain.3PL to.me two the-plates that-bought.2MSG for.me  
'I still have the two plates that you bought me.'

Alongside (2), MH also has (3), where *niš'ar* lacks subject agreement and *et* precedes the lower argument. Pace Danon (2006), who claims that (2) and (3) are interchangeable, with agreement and *et*, respectively, constituting different mechanisms for checking Case on the DP subject, the underlying structure of the two examples is fundamentally different. Specifically, (3) involves an implicit infinitival complement to *niš'ar*, as shown in parentheses below.

- (3) niš'ar li (lenakot) et štei ha-calaxot še-kanita li.  
remain.3SG to.me (to.clean) ACC two the-plates that-bought.2MSG for.me  
'I still have (to clean) the two plates that you bought me.'

Evidence for the covert infinitival structure of the complement in (3) comes from its semantics: the latter is infelicitous in a context like (4), and only appropriate if B has something left to do with or to the plates.

(4) Context: There was a fire which destroyed most of B's house.

A: nisraf lexa ha-kol?

burnt to.you the-all?

'Did everything of yours burn?'

B: # lo, niš'ar li et štei ha-calaxot še-kanita li.

no remain.3SG to.me ACC two the-plates that-bought.2MSG for.me

'No, I still have the two plates that you bought me.'

The fact that two distinct structures underlie these examples explains the difference in agreement: in (2) the DP is the subject, and hence agreement is expected, while in (3) it is not. Crucially, the appearance of *et* in (3) is a problem for the assumption that complement coercion never involves a null V head: where is accusative case coming from if not from the implicit verb? If indeed it is licensed in the example under discussion by a silent V, the question arises why similar examples have not been reported in the literature on other languages, and why other types of evidence for this V produce mixed results at best (Pylkkänen & McElree 2006). One possibility is that next to true semantic coercion, there exist cases of syntactic ellipsis which produce comparable results.

#### References

- Danon, G. (2006) "Caseless nominals and the projection of DP." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 24:977–1008.
- Pylkkänen, L. and B. McElree. (2006) "The syntax-semantic interface: on-line composition of sentence meaning." In *Handbook of Psycholinguistics (2nd Ed)*, ed. M. Traxler and M.A. Gernsbacher. New York: Elsevier, 537–577.
- Schütze, C. 2001. "On the nature of default case." *Syntax* 4: 205–238.

#### 4.

### Nancy Hedberg and Richard C. DeArmond – *Simon Fraser University* *On complements and adjuncts*

hedberg@sfu.ca, dearmond@sfu.ca

---

The distinction between complements and adjuncts has long been recognized in generative grammar, and given a structural explanation. Thus, the '*do-so* test' is widely taken to distinguish complements from adjuncts in English (e.g., Lakoff and Ross 1966, Baker 1978, Radford 1988).

- (1) Mary studies in the evening and John does so in the morning.
- (2) Sue worked in a quick manner and Pete did so in a slow manner.
- (3) ?Fred laughed at the giraffe, and John did so at the clown.
- (4) \*Kim went to the library, and Mary did so to the store.

*Do so* is considered to be a pro-form standing in for a complete VP, so this behavior is explained by postulating that adjuncts are adjoined to VP while complements are sisters to the verb.

We have found in teaching undergraduate syntax that intuitions are not clear in (3), for example. We propose that another test employing *do* leads to sharper intuitions. We term this the '*pseudocleft test*'. Even our beginning students agree that (7) is ungrammatical or anomalous.

- (5) What John does in the morning is study.
- (6) What Pete did in a slow manner was work.
- (7) \*What John did at the clown was laugh.
- (8) \*What Mary did to the store was go.

A third test for distinguishing complements from adjuncts we call the '*preposition stranding test*'. Huang (1982) proposes the '*Condition on Extraction Domains*', which states that constituents can be extracted from complements but not from adjuncts because in the latter the trace would not be properly governed. This test confirms the classification in (1)-(8).

- (9) \*It is the morning that John studies in.
- (10) \*It was a slow manner that Pete worked in.
- (11) It was the store that Mary went to.
- (12) It was the clown that Sue laughed at.

What has not been noted before is that the two types of test do not always pattern opposite to each other. Thus, instrumental and benefactive phrases test out as adjuncts according to the pseudocleft test, but as complements according to the preposition-stranding test.

- (13)a. What Bill did with a key was open the door.  
b. It was a key that Bill opened the door with.
- (14)a. What Mary did for John was write a book.  
b. It was John that Mary wrote a book for.

We propose that three types of verb dependents must be distinguished: primary complements, secondary complements, and adjuncts. We suggest that this three-way distinction is semantically based. When a complement of either type is merged, an argument is added to the event structure: valency is thus increased. A complete event is denoted when all primary complements have been added. *Do* in the *do so* and pseudocleft construction must denote a complete event. Secondary complements increase valency but are not required for a complete event to be denoted. Adjuncts apply to complete events and modify them rather than expanding valency. We conclude that any theory of syntax needs to accommodate these three different dependent types.

### References

- Baker, C.L. (1978) *Introduction to Generative-Transformational Syntax*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Huang, C.-T. J. (1982) *Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar*. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Lakoff, G. and J.R. Ross (1966) "Criterion for Verb Phrase Constituency." Technical Report NSF-17, Aiken Computation Laboratory, Harvard University.
- Radford, A. (1988) *Transformational Grammar: A First Course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## 5.

### **Ken Hiraiwa** – *University of Victoria* ***Kakarimusubi in Okinawan and its microparametric implications***

hiraiwa@uvic.ca

---

#### **1. Predictions**

Hiraiwa and Ishihara (2002) propose that in Japanese, cleft constructions, nominalized in-situ focus constructions (what they call "no da" in-situ focus constructions), and sluicing are all "transformationally" linked. Specifically, nominalized in-situ focus constructions underlie clefts and sluicing. This makes one theoretical prediction. If a language/dialect close to Japanese lacks nominalized in-situ focus constructions, it should not allow syntactic cleft constructions. If sluicing is derived from syntactic clefts (Nishiyama et al. 1995), the same language/dialect should not allow sluicing, either. On the other hand, if sluicing is derived via Wh-movement + TP-deletion (see Ross 1969, Takahashi 1994), it should exist independently of clefts.

#### **2. Okinawan**

As is well known, endangered languages spoken in Japan such as the Okinawan language (and related languages) and the Hachijoo jima language, which split from Japanese more than one thousand years ago, still retain the so-called Kakarimusubi constructions, which used to be a glowing feature of Old Japanese. Kakarimusubi is a construction in which a Wh/focus phrase agrees with a particular sentence-final verbal inflection or a particle (see Miyara 2000).

Significantly, Okinawan lacks a counterpart of nominalized in-situ focus constructions (1) and syntactic cleft constructions (2). (All the data come from my informant Chie Inamine, native speaker of Naha dialect, to whom I am very grateful.)

(1) \*[Taraa-ga Naha-nkai ?zya si] yan.  
Taraa-Nom Naha-Dat go.Pst Nml Cop  
'It is that Taraa went TO NAHA.' (Nominalized in-situ focus)

(2) \*[Taraa-ga ?zya syee] Naha-nkai yan.  
Taraa-Nom go.Pst Nml.Top Naha-Dat Cop  
'It is (to) Naha that Taraa went.' (Cleft)

Instead, my informant consistently employs Kakarimusubi for focusing (cf. 3).

(3) Taraa-ga Naha-nkai-du ?zya-ru.  
Taraa-Nom Naha-Dat-Foc go.Pst-Adn.  
'It is (to) Naha that Taraa went.' (Kakarimusubi: Focus)

However, Okinawan does allow sluicing constructions, as Miyara (2007) observes (see Kurafuji to appear for truncated questions).

(4) Tāraa-ya maagana-nkai ?nzyoo-ru huuzi yasiga,  
Tāraa-Top somewhere-Dat go.Pst-Adn. appearance but  
'I heard that Tāraa went somewhere, but '

wanee maa-nkai ga wakaran.  
1Sg.Top where-Dat Q know.Neg  
'I don't know where to.' (Sluicing)

### 3. Conclusion

It is reasonable to think that the fact that Kakarimusubi is still active in the language has prevented a development of the counterpart of nominalized in-situ focus constructions. Then Okinawan lends empirical support for a strong syntactic connection between clefts and nominalized in-situ focus constructions. On the other hand, it suggests that syntactic sources for sluicing do not have to be clefts or nominalized in-situ focus constructions, and that a Wh-movement + TP-deletion analysis is an option permitted by UG even for Okinawan-type Wh -in-situ languages (see Ross 1969, Takahashi 1994 among others).

### References

- Hiraiwa, K. and S. Ishihara (2002) "Missing links: cleft, sluicing and 'no da' construction in Japanese." In *Proceedings of HUMIT 2001. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics #43*, ed. T. Ionin, H. Ko, and A. Nevins. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL, 35–54.
- Kurafuji, T. (to appear) "Clausal pied-piping and cyclicity of ellipsis: evidence from truncated Wh-questions in Okinawan." In *Proceedings of NELS 38*. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Miyara, S. (2000) *Utinaa-guti kooza*. Naha, Okinawa: Okinawa Times.
- Miyara, S. (2007) "On the properties of Wh and focus in Okinawan." In *Current Issues in the History and Structure of Japanese*, ed. Bjarke Frellesvig et al. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers, 187–205.
- Nishiyama, K., J. Whitman, and E.-Y. Yi. (1995) "Syntactic movement of overt Wh -phrases in Japanese and Korean". In *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 5*. Stanford, CA: CSLI, 337–351.
- Ross, J. R. (1969) "Guess who?" In *CLS 5*, 252–286.
- Takahashi, D. 1994. "Sluicing in Japanese." *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 3(3):265–300.

## 6.

### **Karine Megerdoomian – MITRE** *Telicity in Persian complex predicates*

karine@mitre.org

---

In their study of complex predicates in Persian, Folli, Harley and Karimi (2005) (henceforth, FHK) propose that the nonverbal component (NV) is the sole determiner of telicity in the complex verbal construction. The data from semelfactive verbs in Persian, however, do not support this analysis.

FHK argue that telicity in complex predicates is determined by whether or not the NV denotes a definite endpoint or a result state. For instance, the complex predicate *be donya amædæn* (to world come = ‘to be born’) is telic because the NV is a prepositional phrase marking an endpoint to the event. Complex verbs with an eventive noun as in *shekæst dadæn* (defeat give = ‘to defeat’) are also telic. Locatum verbs provide further evidence for this claim: Harley (1999) investigates the aspectual properties of denominal verbs in English and argues that if the base noun is a spatially bounded thing, then the event denoted by the verb will also be bounded. Hence, if the incorporating noun in a locatum verb is bounded, the event described by the verb is inherently telic as shown in (1); but if the noun is unbounded, verbal aspect can be either telic or atelic as exemplified in (2).

- (1) a. John blindfolded the hostage in a flash / \*for a minute.  
b. Mary saddled the horse in 5 minutes / #for 5 minutes.
- (2) a. Jill painted the wall in an hour / for an hour.  
b. John oiled the pots in an hour / for an hour.

This contrast can also be seen in locatum verbs in Persian. All the nouns shown in (3) combine with the light verb *zædæn* ‘hit’ to form complex predicates, but the nominal NV’s boundedness properties determine the aspectual interpretation of the verb.

- (3) (i) Telic Aspect  
*æfsar* ‘harness’, *cheshmband* ‘blindfold’, *qællade* ‘collar’, *dæstbænd* ‘handcuff’, *puzebænd* ‘muzzle’, *pabænd* ‘shackle’, *mohr* ‘stamp’
- (ii) Atelic Aspect  
*roqæn* ‘oil’, *ræng* ‘paint’, *pudr* ‘powder’, *hæna* ‘henna’, *morækæb* ‘ink’,  
*vaks* ‘wax’, *lak* ‘nailpolish’, *næmæk* ‘salt’, *chashni* ‘spice’

Semelfactive verbs in Persian are also formed with the light verb *zædæn* ‘hit’. In these verbs, however, the boundedness of the preverbal noun, such as *jaru* ‘broom’ or *shune* ‘comb’, does not affect the telicity of the complex predicate as shown in (4). This behavior counters the claim by FHK that the preverbal noun is the sole determiner of telicity in Persian complex predicates.

- (4) a. nima dær ærze nim saæt / saæt-ha xunæ-ro jaru=zæd  
 Nima in half hour / hour-PL house-OM broom=hit.3SG  
 ‘Nima swept the house in half an hour / for hours.’
- b. ma dær ærze nim saæt / saæt-ha mu-ha-sh-o shune=zæd-im  
 we in half hour / hour-PL hair-PL-3SG-OM comb=hit-1PL  
 ‘We combed her hair in half an hour / for hours.’

In addition, we do not expect to see the same NV giving rise to distinct aspectual readings. In the examples in (5), however, the same NV element *dærd* ‘pain’ is used with different light verbs producing different aspectual interpretations.

- (5) a. dærd=keshidæn [atelic]  
 pain pull  
 ‘to hurt’ (as in ‘I hurt a lot’)
- b. dærd=gereftæn [telic]  
 pain catch  
 ‘to hurt’ (as in ‘my back hurt suddenly’)

These contrasts demonstrate that the nonverbal component alone is not responsible for determining the telicity of the complex predicate. The properties of the light verb and potentially the structural relation between the NV and the light verb should also be taken into account in determining verbal aspect.

### References

- Folli, R., H. Harley and S. Karimi (2005) "Determinants of event structure in Persian complex predicates." *Lingua* 115.10, 1365-1401.
- Harley, H. (1999) "Denominal verbs and aktionsart." In *Proceedings of the 2nd Penn/MIT Roundtable on Event Structure*, ed. L. Pykkänen and A. van Hout. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL, 73-85.

7.

**Andrea Moro – Università Vita-Salute San Raffaele**  
***Rethinking symmetry: a note on labeling and the EPP***

moro.andrea@hsr.it

---

The following sentence, uttered with neutral intonation (that is, with no focus intonation -- see the end of the snippet) stands out as a puzzle for syntactic theory:

- (1) \* pro è [ [una foto del muro] [la causa della rivolta] ]  
(pro is a picture of the wall the cause of the riot)

In a pro-drop language like Italian, pro-insertion as an alternative to DP raising should make the sentence grammatical as in the case of passives and unaccusatives satisfying the EPP. The copula, instead, requires raising of either the subject (*una foto del muro*) or the predicate DP (*la causa della rivolta*), yielding a canonical (2a) or an inverse (2b) copular sentence (in the sense of Moro 1997, 2000):

- (2) a. [una foto del muro] è [ t [la causa della rivolta]]  
(a picture of the wall is the cause of the riot)
- b. [la causa della rivolta] è [[una foto del muro] t ]  
(the cause of the riot is a picture of the wall)

This puzzle may lead to a rethinking of the EPP and the core mechanism of labelling in grammar along the following lines of reasoning.

Labels are not given (cf. Chomsky 2006 and, for an interesting advancement, the Probing Algorithm proposed in Cecchetto and Donati, in press): rather, they are derived computationally, via inspection within the search space of a head. When two maximal projections are Merged (either IM or EM), the resulting {XP, YP} can be either an adjunct structure – where either XP asymmetrically projects turning the other into a specifier – or an unlabelled syntactic object where none projects. If this is the case, such as for copular sentences, it is reasonable to assume that the configuration crashes because the search space for any head H that merges with it is ambiguous.

On the other hand, if either XP or YP is targeted by H and then raised (yielding, for example: {YP, {H, {XP, YP}}}), the problem of labelling is solved: YP is no longer available for inspection to H - it being a discontinuous constituent - and the label can be properly assigned. This is why pro-insertion does not help in (1). (This is immediate within a representational perspective. Within a derivational perspective, instead, things are less clear: one possibility could be to assume that Merge and the copy mechanism yielding movement are simultaneous.)

---

Given these premises, the prediction is that there is no necessity to raise either DP to the copula: it is sufficient that either one is raised to *any* head that merges with {XP, YP}, neutralizing the problem given by the absence of a label. This prediction appears to be borne out, once we assume that the process of focalization involves raising to a specialized Foc<sup>o</sup> head, available in Italian in postverbal positions as suggested by Belletti (1999):

- (3) a. pro è [ UNA FOTO DEL MURO Foc [ t la causa della rivolta ] ]  
(pro is a picture of the wall the cause of the riot)
- b. pro è [ LA CAUSA DELLA RIVOLTA Foc [una foto del muro t ] ]  
(pro is the cause of the riot a picture of the wall)

In these structures pro-insertion can take place successfully, since the postcopular constituent is not unlabelled any more. The fact that pro-insertion does not meet the EPP in (1) shows that the EPP phenomena are not due to any special property of preverbal positions but rather they are the consequence of much more general computational mechanisms forcing movement from a symmetrical structure.

### References

- Belletti, A. (1999) "Inversion as focalization." In *Inversion in Romance*, ed. A. Hulke and J.-Y. Pollock. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cecchetto, C. and C. Donati (in press) "On labeling: principle C and head movement." *Syntax*.
- Chomsky, N. (2006) "On phases," in *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory*, ed. R. Freidin et al. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Moro, A. (1997) *The Raising of Predicates*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Moro, A. (2000) *Dynamic Antisymmetry*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

## 8.

**Lucia Pozzan** – *CUNY Graduate Center*

**Giuliano Bocci** – *Università di Siena*

***Here there is an ambiguity: two readings for the sequence here/there-P in Italian***

lpozzan@gc.cuny.edu, giulianobocci@unisi.it

---

In Italian, locative pronouns (LocPros) *qui/qua* ('here') and *lì/là* ('there') obligatorily follow light prepositions, paralleling full DPs and personal pronouns:

- (1) Mario parte {\*Milano/\*qui} da {Milano/qui}  
Mario leaves {Milan/here} from {Milan/here}

Conversely, LocPros contrast with full DPs and personal pronouns when used with heavy locative Ps (HPs), regardless of the occurrence of a light P. While full DPs and personal pronouns obligatorily follow HPs, LocPros obligatorily (though only optionally in the case of *fuori*, 'out') precede them (thus resembling Dutch R-words, Van Riemsdijk 1978):

- (2) Mario è {\*casa/\*mi} davanti {a casa/me}  
Mario is {home/me} in front {of home/me}
- (3) Mario è {qui} davanti {\*a qui}  
Mario is {here} in front {of here}

Rizzi (1988:530) notes that LocPros combined with HPs cannot be interpreted as HP-complements. As evidence for this, he argues that (4) cannot mean 'come behind the place designated by here', but only 'come here, which is behind (some relevant place)'. Following Rizzi, a case like (4), in which a LocPro is modified by an HP taking an empty complement (or, in Terzi's 2008 terms, by an HP combined with an empty noun, *Place*), will be referred to as the modified reading (ModR). We call complement reading (ComplR) the reading where LocPros are interpreted as the semantic complement of HPs.

- (4) Vieni                                      qui dietro  
Come<sub>2nd person singular</sub> here behind

Against Rizzi, we argue that LocPros can indeed be interpreted as preposed complements of HPs, but that the ComplR is unavailable in (4) due to the properties of 'come': the addressee must 'come' to the speaker's location ('here'), hence the availability of the ModR, but cannot 'come' where the speaker is not located ('behind here'), hence the unavailability of the ComplR.

The latter is the only available reading, when 'come' is substituted with 'go':

- (5) Vai    qui dietro  
Go<sub>2nd person singular</sub> here behind
-

The meaning of (5) is ‘go behind here’ and not ‘go here, which is behind’ since the addressee can never go to the speaker’s location and can ‘go’ only where none of the participants in the conversation is located: the PP ‘behind here’ can function as the complement of ‘go’ because it means ‘there’. The ambiguity of (6) confirms that the unavailability of the ComplR in (4) and of the ModR in (5) are due to the properties of ‘come’ and ‘go’:

(6) Il gatto è qui fuori  
The cat is here out

(6) can be uttered either when the speaker and the cat are outside (ModR), or when the speaker is inside and the cat outside (ComplR). Obviously, the ModR is forced when the HP has an explicit complement as in (7), preventing *qui* from being interpreted as the complement of *fuori*:

(7) Il gatto è qui fuori dalla porta  
The cat is here out of the door

With the ComplR, despite the linear order, fronted LocPros are interpreted as genuine semantic complements of HPs, like full DPs and personal pronouns, suggesting that LocPros move to a high position within the HP-projection (again resembling R-words, see Koopman 2000 and den Dikken 2006). This is supported by the fact that HP-modifiers (e.g. *three floors*) can only precede LocPros in the ComplR (see 8), while they follow them in the ModR (see 9).

(8) Vai {\*qui} tre piani {qui} sotto  
go {here} three floors {here} down

(9) Vieni {qui} tre piani {\*qui} sotto  
Come {here} three floors {here} down

As a final remark, it should be noted that native speakers in (7) and (9) favor *qui* to be the head of a phrasal prosodic constituent followed by an intonational boundary. This fact is presumably to be imputed to independent binary requirements on prosodic phrasing (Selkirk, 2000), rather than to properties of the ModR structure, given that in (6) *qui* is naturally phrased with *fuori*, both in the ModR and the ComplR.

## References

- den Dikken, M. (2006) “On the functional structure of locative and directional PPs.” Ms. CUNY.
- Koopman, H. (2000) “Prepositions, postpositions, circumpositions, and particles: the structure of Dutch PPs.” In *The Syntax of Specifiers and Heads*, ed. H. Koopman. London: Routledge, 204-260.
- Van Riemsdijk, H. (1978) *A case study in syntactic markedness*. Dordrecht: Foris
- Rizzi, L. (1988) “Il sintagma preposizionale.” In *Grande Grammatica Italiana di Consultazione* Vol. 1, ed. L. Renzi. Bologna: Il Mulino, 508-531.
- Selkirk, E. (2000) “The interaction of constraints on prosodic phrasing.” In *Prosody: Theory and Experiments*, ed. M. Horne. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 231-261
- Terzi, A. (2008) “Locative prepositions as modifiers of an unpronounced noun.” In *Proceedings of the 26<sup>th</sup> West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. C. B. Chang and H. J. Haynie. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 471-479.

**Emilio Servidio** – *Università degli Studi di Siena*  
***A puzzle on auxiliary omission and focalization in English: evidence for cartography***

emilio.servidio@gmail.com

---

In the terms of Rizzi (1997), contrastive focalization involves movement to the specifier of a dedicated functional projection in the left periphery. On the other hand, contrastive focalization in English is often observed in situ. Take the following paradigm (I owe these data to Justin Fitzpatrick):

- (1) (Have) you given John his grade yet?
- (2) Have YOU given John his grade yet?
- (3) (Have) you given JOHN his grade yet?
- (4) (Have) you given John HIS GRADE yet?
- (5) \*(Have) YOU given John his grade yet?

Sentences (3-4) show that auxiliary omission can occur in sentences with a focalized direct or indirect object, but (5) makes clear that the same does not hold for sentences with a focalized subject. This asymmetry is at first sight unexpected, but it can be derived by a few assumptions presently entertained in the cartographic literature.

Assume for auxiliary omission an explanation along the lines of Fitzpatrick (2006): the omitted auxiliary has moved to the edge of the root phase, and hence it is left unpronounced because of a phase-theoretic spell-out mechanism. According to Rizzi (2005a,b), every head in the left periphery is a plausible candidate for root phase head cross-linguistically:

- (6) [<sub>Force</sub> Force [<sub>Top</sub> Top [<sub>Foc</sub> Foc [<sub>Top</sub> Top [<sub>Fin</sub> Fin IP ]]]]]

As is well known, contrastive focalization is believed to require movement of the focalized constituent to the Spec of FocP in Italian. My hypothesis is the following: the same left-peripheral projection is involved in English as well. The difference would be that agreement is not forced to occur in a Spec-Head configuration, but long-distance Agree under c-command is available.

Suppose e.g. that in (2) YOU gets the focal interpretation from the left peripheral Foc head via Agree. An explanation of the ungrammaticality of (5) now suggests itself. From Fitzpatrick's analysis, it follows that in (5) *have* must be in the root-phase edge. In Rizzi's cartography, inverted auxiliaries are in Fin. So, in (5) FinP is expected to be the root. On the other hand, by hypothesis the focalization of the subject YOU requires

---

a FocP to be present in the left periphery. FocP is structurally higher than FinP, so a sentence that includes both cannot have FinP as its root. In brief, (5) is ungrammatical because it should satisfy two contradictory requirements (having and not having FinP as root).

This leaves the subject/ non-subject asymmetry in (5) vs (3-4) unexplained. A chance of explanation comes from Belletti (2004), who isolates a focus-related projection right above vP. My speculation is that this FocP, just like the left-peripheral one, can induce long-distance agreement with a focalized constituent in English.

The availability of these two different FocP projections would explain the asymmetry. In (3-4) direct and indirect object can be focalized in spite of auxiliary deletion, because the lower FocP can agree with them under c-command. Compare (5): there, in absence of the higher FocP, *you* cannot be focalized at all, because the lower FocP does not c-command it.

### References

- Belletti, A. (2004) "Aspects of low IP periphery." In *The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Vol. 2: The Structure of IP and CP*, ed. L. Rizzi. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fitzpatrick, J. (2006) "Deletion through movement." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 24, 399-431.
- Rizzi, L. (1997) "The fine structure of the left periphery." In *Elements of Grammar*, ed. L. Haegeman. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rizzi, L. (2005a) "Grammatically-based target-inconsistencies in child language". In *The Proceedings of the Inaugural Conference on Generative Approaches to Language Acquisition - North America (GALANA), UCONN / MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, ed. B.K.U. Deen, J. Nomura, B. Schulz and B.D. Schwartz. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rizzi, L. (2005b) "Phase theory and the privilege of the root." Ms., Università di Siena.