

snippets

Issue 27

September 2013

Contents

1. Peter Arkadiev and Yury Lander. *Non-quantificational distributive quantifiers in Besleney Kabardian.*
2. Katharina Hartmann and Viola Schmitt. *Violations of the Right Edge Constraint in Right Node Raising.*
3. Giorgio Magri. *An argument for nominal lexical cumulativity.*
4. Emar Maier and Kees de Schepper. *Fake indexicals in Dutch: a counterexample to Kratzer 2009.*
5. Jacopo Romoli. *A problem for the structural characterization of alternatives.*
6. Philippe Schlenker and Gaurav Mathur. *A Strong Crossover effect in ASL.*
7. Hideaki Yamashita. *On (multiple) long-distance scrambling of adjuncts and subjects and the generalized additional scrambling effect.*



It is usually assumed that long-distance scrambling (LDS) of adjuncts and subjects is impossible in Japanese (Saito 1985; however, see Kuno 1980, Yamashita 2013, and references cited therein for the claim that LDS of subjects is indeed possible).

- (1) a. *naze_i Ken-ga [t_i Mari-ga yukkuri-to booru-o nageta-to] itta-no?
 why K.-NOM M.-NOM slowly ball-ACC threw-C said-Q
 ‘Why_i did Ken say [Mari threw the ball slowly t_i].’
 b. *yukkuri-to_j Ken-ga [Mari-ga t_j booru-o nageta-to] itta-yo.
 slowly K.-NOM M.-NOM ball-ACC threw-C said-SFP
 ‘Ken said [Mari threw the ball slowly].’
 c. *Mari-ga_k Ken-ga [naze t_k yukkuri-to booru-o nageta-to] itta-no?
 ‘(same as (1a))’
 d. *Mari-ga_k Ken-ga [t_k yukkuri-to booru-o nageta-to] itta-yo.
 ‘(same as (1b))’

Koizumi (2000:241–243) observes, however, that the otherwise illicit LDS of adjuncts becomes possible if it is accompanied by another clausemate phrase which can undergo LDS on its own.

- (2) a. naze_i booru-o₁ Ken-ga [t_i Mari-ga yukkuri-to t₁ nageta-to] itta-no?
 ‘(same as (1a))’
 b. yukkuri-to_j booru-o₁ Ken-ga [Mari-ga t_j t₁ nageta-to] itta-yo.
 ‘(same as (1b))’

Furthermore, as Fukui and Sakai (2003:335) and Agbayani et al (2009:4.1.2.) observe, even LDS of subjects becomes possible under the same circumstances.

- (3) a. Mari-ga_k booru-o₁ Ken-ga [naze t_k yukkuri-to t₁ nageta-to] itta-no?
 ‘(same as (1a))’
 b. Mari-ga_k booru-o₁ Ken-ga [t_k yukkuri-to t₁ nageta-to] itta-yo.
 ‘(same as (1b))’

Note, however, that the upgrading effects in (2)–(3) can be subsumed under additional scrambling effects which Boeckx and Sugisaki (1999) argue to be an instance of Richards’ 1998 Principle of Minimal Compliance (PMC); there is *licit LDS of an object* that “saves” the otherwise *illicit LDS of adjuncts and subjects*.

Consider now the following examples, which involve the combination of LDS of multiple adjuncts ((4a)) and adjunct and subject ((4b) and (5)). Quite surprisingly, these

multiple LDS are significantly much better than the single LDS of adjuncts ((1a,b)) and subjects ((1c,d)).

- (4) a. naze_i; yukkuri-to_j Ken-ga [t_i Mari-ga t_j booru-o nageta-to] itta-no?
'(same as (1a))'
b. naze_i; Mari-ga_k Ken-ga [t_i t_k yukkuri-to booru-o nageta-to] itta-no?
'(same as (1a))'
- (5) yukkuri-to_j; Mari-ga_k Ken-ga [t_k t_j booru-o nageta-to] itta-yo.
'(same as (1b))'

The hitherto unnoticed upgrading effects in (4)–(5) do not fall under Boeckx and Sugisaki’s PMC-based additional scrambling effect since the participants here cannot undergo LDS on its own. (4)–(5) show us that the upgrading effect emerges in the case of multiple LDS even when it is composed of illicit LDS, meaning that some sort of a PMC-independent but “generalized” additional scrambling effect is at work.

It remains to be seen how we can explain why the deviance of LDS of adjuncts and subjects significantly improves when another scrambling takes place, even when the additional scrambling is LDS of adjuncts and subjects. I hope that the effect discussed here can help us to better understand the nature of Japanese (-type) scrambling, whose nature is still subject to ongoing and lively debate.

References

- Agbayani, B., C. Golston and T. Ishii. (2009) “Prosodic scrambling in Japanese,” in *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on East Asian Linguistics (ICEAL 2)*. Vancouver: The Simon Fraser University Linguistics Graduate Student Association.
- Boeckx, C. and K. Sugisaki. (1999) “How to get a free ride: additional scrambling effect and the principle of minimal compliance.” In *WCCFL 18: Proceedings of the 18th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. S. Bird, A. Carnie, J. Haugen and P. Norquest, Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Press, 43-55.
- Fukui, N. and H. Sakai (2003) “The visibility guideline for functional categories: Verb raising in Japanese and related issues.” *Lingua* 113:4-6 (*Special Issue: Formal Japanese Syntax and Universal Grammar: The Past 20 Years*), 321–375. [Reprinted in: Fukui, N. (2006) *Theoretical Comparative Syntax*. New York: Routledge, 289–336.]
- Koizumi, M. (2000) “String vacuous overt verb raising.” *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 9:3, 227–285.
- Kuno, S. (1980) “A further note on Tonioko’s Intra-subjectivization Hypothesis,” in *Theoretical Issues in Japanese Linguistics*, ed. Y. Otsu and A. Farmer. Cambridge, Mass.: MITWPL, 171–184.
- Richards, N. 1998. The Principle of Minimal Compliance. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29:4, 599–629.
- Saito, M. (1985) *Some Asymmetries in Japanese and their Theoretical Implications*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Yamashita, H. (2013) “Toward a better understanding of Japanese scramblings: what makes long-distance scrambling of subject (im)possible?” in *Proceedings of the 36th Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium*, ed. K. Shwayder. Philadelphia, Penn.: University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics, 267–276.