Contents

3. Alex Drummond. *An argument for the existence of null DPs.*
4. Akira Omaki and Chizuru Nakao. *Does English resumption really fail to repair island violations?*
7. Christos Vlachos. *Merchant says that MaxElide works for instances of wh-movement followed by VP-deletion but it’s not clear how or how it does.*
Yosuke Sato – National University of Singapore
Evidence for the bimorphemic analysis of ‘everything’ from relative clauses

yosuke78@hotmail.co.jp

In his recent squib discussing post-nominal attributive adjectival modification in English, as illustrated in (1a,b), Kishimoto (2000) proposes a bimorphemic analysis for indefinite pronouns.

(1)

a. everything interesting
b. * a book interesting (cf. an interesting book)

According to Kishimoto, every and thing in (1a) are two independent items within the syntax. The two elements later undergo PF-Merger (cf. Halle and Marantz 1993) into a single word in the post-syntactic morphological component. Kishimoto further argues that (1a) is derived by N-raising, as in (2).

(2) [DP every [Num thing] [NP interesting [NP t]]] (adapted from Kishimoto 2000: 560)

In (2), the adjective is base-generated to the left of the NP that dominates thing. The surface order obtains as the result of the N-raising of thing across the adjective to the Num head. Kishimoto’s argument for the bimorphemic analysis comes from (3b). It is well-known since Postal 1969 that a lexical word, including compounds, forms an opaque domain for adverbial modification (3a). Notice, however, that almost/virtually/nearly can successfully modify part of what appears to be a single word everyone in (3b), on a par with (3c), which contains the fully phrasal DP every student.

(3)

a. A very [hot dog]
b. Almost/virtually/nearly everyone
c. Almost/virtually/nearly every student ((3a,b) from Kishimoto 2000: 561)

Kishimoto’s contribution contains two claims: 1) the bimorphemic treatment of indefinite pronouns and 2) N-raising. Larson and Marušič (2004) and Marušič and Žaucer (2009) present evidence against 2) but 1) has been unchallenged. This squib provides an argument for 2) from amount relatives (Carlson 1977; Grosu and Landman 1998).

Consider (4a, b).

(4)

a. I need to find someone that knows everything there is about websites.
b. Everyone there was on US Airways Flight 1549 was saved thanks to Chelsey Sullenberger.
In (4a,b), *everything/everyone* serves as the relative pronoun modified by the existential. Under the Raising analysis of Vergnaud 1979 / Kayne 1994, one could imagine the derivation in (5), which involves the movement of *everything* from the immediately post-verbal position to [Spec, CP].

(5) \[\text{CP Everything, } [\text{C} \text{ [TP there is } t_i \text{ about websites}]\text{]}\]

On this analysis, arguably *everything* would have to have the kind of semantics that we normally attribute to the determiner *every*: the relative clause would serve as the restrictor to this quantifier. This assumption is questionable. Moreover, the analysis is untenable due to the *Definiteness Effect* (Milsark 1974), which prohibits the occurrence of a term like *everything* in the immediately post-verbal position (6a,b).

(6) a. * There is everything about websites.
   b. * There was everyone on the US Airways Flight 1549 saved thanks to Chelsey Sullenberger.

A more appropriate analysis for (4a,b), then, would be the one in (7), where what undergoes movement in the syntax is only the restrictor part of *everything*.

(7) \[\text{DP Every [CP thing, } [\text{C} \text{ [TP there is } t_i \text{ about websites}]\text{]}\text{]}\]

The Definiteness Effect does not arise in (7) because *every* is base-generated in the TP-external position independently from its restrictor.

In sum, (4a,b) provide further support for the bimorphemic analysis of indefinite pronouns.
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