

snippets

Issue 33 - July 2018

Contents

1. Amir Anvari. *A problem for Maximize Presupposition! (Locally).*
2. Brian Buccola. *A restriction on the distribution of exclusive only.*
3. Patrick D. Elliott. *Collective predication and ellipsis.*
4. Maria Esipova. *QUD-addressing appositives don't have to be clause-final.*
5. Naga Selvanathan. *Dative adjuncts are not interveners in Tamil tough-movement.*
6. Gary Thoms. *Quantifiers and the derivation of fragments.*
7. Erik Zyman. *Super-local Remove in nominal preposing around though.*

Dative adjuncts are not interveners in Tamil *tough*-movement

Naga Selvanathan · National University of Singapore

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7358/snippet-2018-033-selv>

From Hartman 2011, Bruening 2014, and Keine & Poole 2017, the following putative generalization emerges: an adjunct cannot occur between the matrix predicate and the infinitival clause in *tough* movement (TM). The two positions that are most relevant to the discussion are shown below.

- (1) a. It is (to me)₁ important (to me)₂ to avoid cholesterol.
b. Cholesterol is (to me)₁ important (*to me)₂ to avoid.

While Bruening (2014) suggests that this shows a restriction on the position of the infinitival clause, Hartman (2011) proposes that this is an intervention effect even though English experiencer PPs do not otherwise show intervention effects. Whatever the correct analysis of (1) proves to be, it must take into account the observation put forward here, that the effect in (1b) is not found in all languages with TM. This will be illustrated for TM in Tamil.

First, note that Tamil TM has A/A'-properties, similar to English (Postal 1971).

- (2) a. [[ba:lə-nə adikɛ] (somu-ve kattaayepadutta)] soləbəmaa iru-nd-icci
Balan-ACC beat-INF Somu-ACC convince easy be-PST-3S.NEUT
'It was easy (to convince Somu) to beat Balan.'
b. ba:lɛ_i [[___i adikɛ] (somu-ve kattaayepadutta)] soləbəmaa
Balan-NOM beat-INF Somu-ACC convince easy
iru-nd-ā
be-PST-3S.MASC

(2a) shows an expletive construction like (1a). The embedded object (underlined) has accusative case and the matrix verb shows default neuter agreement. (2b), the TM variant, shows 'Balan' with nominative case, triggering matrix verb agreement, typical of clause subjects. The fact that 'Balan-NOM' crosses the argument 'Somu-ACC', and triggers agreement with the matrix verb, shows that Tamil TM is like English TM in having A/A'-properties.

Now consider dative experiencer placement, starting with an expletive construction.

- (3) [[ba:lə-nə adikɛ] (ɛnəkkɪ)₂ soləbəmaa (ɛnəkkɪ)₁] iru-nd-icci
Balan-ACC beat-INF PRN.1st.DAT easy be-PST-3S.NEUT
'It was easy (for me) to beat Balan.'

Since Tamil is head-final, then by hypothesis, positions 1 and 2 in (3) occur in reverse linear order to English, but in comparable structural positions. Crucially, the experiencer cannot be analyzed as an embedded subject and must be a matrix-level adjunct (as it is in English according to Hartman and Bruening); as (4a) shows, the subject of *adi* 'beat' takes nominative marking, not dative, and as (4b) shows, embedded subjects cannot occur after the embedded verb, unlike in (3).

- (4) a. [naan ba:lə-nə adikε] soləbəmaa iru-nd-cci
 PRN.1.NOM Balan-ACC beat.INF easy be-PST-3S.NEUT
 ‘It was easy for me to beat Balan.’
 b. *[_i ba:lə-nə adikε] naan_i soləbəmaa iru-nd-cci
 Balan-ACC beat.INF PRN.1.NOM easy be-PST-3S.NEUT

(5) shows TM.

- (5) ba:lē_i [_i adikε] (εnəkkɯ)₂ soləbəmaa (εnəkkɯ)₁] iru-nd-ā:
 Balan-NOM beat.INF PRN.1st.DAT easy be-PST-3S.MASC
 ‘Balan was easy (for me) to beat.’

In this structure, ‘Balan’ is in the highest [Spec,TP]. Position 1 is between the matrix copula and the matrix predicate *soləbəmaa* ‘easy’, and like in English it is not expected to cause ungrammaticality. However, unlike in English, the experiencer is also acceptable in position 2. Assuming that English and Tamil TM have similar (albeit reversed) structures, position 2 should still lead to the kind of effect we see in (1b).

In sum, the generalization regarding adjuncts does not hold cross-linguistically, and thus any complete theory of TM must account for the cross-linguistic contrast between (1b) and (5). What remains to be seen is to what extent the proposals cited above are able to account for this contrast.

References

- Bruening, Benjamin. 2014. Defects of defective intervention. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45:707-719.
 Hartman, Jeremy. 2011. Intervention in tough-constructions. In Lima, Suzi, Kevin Mullin, and Brian Smith (eds.), *Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society* (NELS 39), 387-397. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
 Keine, Stefan and Ethan Poole. 2017. Intervention in tough-constructions revisited. Ms.
 Postal, Paul. 1971. *Cross-over Phenomena*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Naga Selvanathan
ellns@nus.edu.sg
 Department of English Language and Literature
 National University of Singapore
 Block AS5, 7 Arts Link
 Singapore 117570