

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.*

Super-local Remove in nominal preposing around *though*

Erik Zyman · University of Chicago


DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7358/snip-2018-033-zyma>

Müller (2017) argues that, whereas Merge builds structure, a mirror-image operation Remove removes structure. This squib provides more evidence for Remove, arguing that it explains an otherwise puzzling nominal-preposing paradigm.

Remove is feature-driven and highly local, being subject to (1):

- (1) **Strict Cycle Condition (SCC)** (ibid:4)
 Within the current XP α , a syntactic operation may not exclusively target some item δ in the domain of another XP β if β is in the domain of α .
- (2) The **domain** of a head X is the set of nodes dominated by XP that are distinct from and do not contain X.


A head's Remove-feature can target a maximal projection ($[-Y_2-]$) or a head ($[-Y_0-]$). In the former case, the entire YP is removed ((3)). In the latter case, the head Y and its "shell" are removed, and its dependents reattached to the main tree ((4)).



The Remove hypothesis predicts that a head should be able to attract an XP and remove its XP shell. This is correct. When *though* attracts a predicate nominal headed by *a*, the *a* must disappear for many speakers, myself included (Levine 2001:152; cf. Ross 2000):

- (5) Though she is a good doctor ...
- (6) (?*A) good doctor though she is ...

On the Remove hypothesis, this is straightforward to explain. Assume that *a*, the nominal's head, is a Numeral (Perlmutter 1970, though cf. Yasui 1975). *Though* optionally (i.e. in (6), but not (5)) bears a Numeral-probe with an EPP-subfeature ($[*Nmrl*]^{EPP}$). In (6), it probes, finds the *a*-nominal (satisfying $[*Nmrl*]$), and attracts it (satisfying the EPP-subfeature). This version of *though* also bears a Remove-feature $[-Nmrl_0-]$, as a lexical idiosyncrasy (on which more below). It therefore removes *a* (and the NmrlP shell):



(For me, *a*-nominals that are not profession-related behave identically: (?*A) *good person though she is ...*)

This analysis makes several predictions.

First, when the *though* lacking $[\ast\text{Nmrl}\ast]^{EPP}$ is chosen (so the *a*-nominal does not move), *though* should be unable to remove *a* long-distance—because Remove obeys the SCC ((1)), preventing long-distance Remove. This is correct:

(8) ***Though she is good doctor ...*

Secondly, recall that the cooccurrence of $[-\text{Nmrl}_0-]$ and $[\ast\text{Nmrl}\ast]^{EPP}$ on (one version of) *though* is a lexical idiosyncrasy. Nothing in the theory forces the *though*-bearing $[\ast\text{Nmrl}\ast]^{EPP}$ to also bear $[-\text{Nmrl}_0-]$. Therefore, it is possible for there to be grammars in which a version of *though* bears $[\ast\text{Nmrl}\ast]^{EPP}$ but not $[-\text{Nmrl}_0-]$, so an *a*-nominal can prepose around *though* and retain its *a*. There are indeed: for Postal (1998:29), (9) is acceptable.

(9) %A good doctor though she was ...

Thirdly, if indeed the Remove-feature is $[-\text{Nmrl}_0-]$, it should not remove *the* (a D). This is correct. For a reviewer, certain *the*-nominals can prepose around *though*, but the *the* must remain:

(10) %The best doctor though she might be ...

Remove, then, makes possible an explanation of the otherwise strange phenomenon of *a*-deletion, its strictly local nature, and the idiolectal variation it displays.

References

- Levine, Robert D. 2001. The extraction riddle: just what are we missing? Review of *Three Investigations of Extraction*, by Paul M. Postal. *Journal of Linguistics* 37:145-174.
- Müller, Gereon. 2017. Structure removal: An argument for feature-driven Merge. *Glossa* 2:1-35.
- Perlmutter, David M. 1970. On the article in English. In Bierwisch, Manfred and Karl Erich Heidolph (eds.), *Progress in Linguistics*, 233-248. The Hague: Mouton.
- Postal, Paul M. 1998. *Three Investigations of Extraction*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ross, John R. 2000. The frozenness of pseudoclefts – towards an inequality-based syntax. In Okrent, Arika and John P. Boyle (eds.), *Papers from the Thirty-Sixth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 385-426. Chicago, IL: CLS.
- Yasui, Izumi. 1975. Can the indefinite article be derived from *one*? *Linguistic Inquiry* 6:511-512.

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under Grant No. DGE-1339067. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Erik Zyman
ozyman@uchicago.edu
Department of Linguistics
University of Chicago
1115 E. 58th Street
Rosenwald Hall, Room #224
Chicago, IL 60637
USA