

snippets

Issue 4

July 2001

Contents

1. Yves-Ferdinand Bouvier. *Some audible effects of a silent operator.*
2. Dirk Bury. *German V3 and the origin of adverbs.*
3. Uli Sauerland. *Intermediate cumulation.*
4. Gwangrak Son. *Reflexives: a category defective in c-commanding ability.*
5. Mark Volpe. *The causative alternation and Japanese unaccusatives.*



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 2001

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 The texts may not be published commercially (in print or electronic form), edited, or otherwise altered without the permission of the author.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 Urbino)
Orin Percus (NSF/ University of Milan)

Review Board

Sigrid Beck (University of Connecticut)
Rajesh Bhatt (University of Texas)
Valentina Bianchi (Scuola Normale Superiore Pisa)
Daniel Büring (UCLA)
Danny Fox (Harvard Society of Fellows)
Hisatsugu Kitahara (Keio University)
Roumyana Pancheva (USC)
Josep Quer (University of Amsterdam)
Norvin Richards (MIT)
Anna Roussou (University of Cyprus)
Uli Sauerland (Universität Tübingen)
William Snyder (University of Connecticut)
Michal Starke (University of Geneva)

E-mail: 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.

The best examples of what we have in mind are the earliest *Linguistic Inquiry* squibs. Some of these 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 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 groups. Other squibs drew attention to particular theoretical assumptions. For instance, a squib 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.

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:

- a. point out an empirical phenomenon that goes against accepted generalizations or that shows that some aspect of a theory is problematic;
- b. point out unnoticed minimal pairs that fall outside the scope of any existing theory;
- c. point out an empirical phenomenon that confirms the predictions of a theory in an area where the theory has not been tested;
- d. explicitly describe technical inconsistencies in a theory or in a set of frequently adopted assumptions;
- e. explicitly describe unnoticed assumptions that underlie a theory or assumptions that a theory needs to be supplemented with in order to make desired predictions;
- f. propose an idea for a pilot experiment in language acquisition or language processing that directly bears on theoretical issues;
- g. call attention to little-known or forgotten literature in which issues of immediate relevance are discussed.

3. Submission details.

We will solicit submissions issue by issue. A new submission deadline will be announced for each issue, and the submissions that we receive we will consider only for that issue. The submissions that we accept will be printed in the upcoming issue; none will be scheduled for a later issue.

It is important to us that readers will be able to copy the newsletter and freely distribute its content. 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.

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.**

We will accept electronic submissions at the address

snippets@unimi.it

and paper submissions at the address

Caterina Donati
Facoltà di Lingue
Università di Urbino
Piazza Rinascimento 7
61029 Urbino
ITALY

We strongly encourage electronic submissions. 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.

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 submission, **we will only provide a yes/no response to the submitter**. We will not request revisions (barring exceptional cases). Space constraints mean that we may reject a large proportion of submissions, but with this in mind we allow resubmission (once) of the same piece.

5. Distribution.

Our initial plan is to publish 2 or 3 times a year, with a maximum of 10 pages for each edition. Our goal in publishing the newsletter is to provide a service to the linguistics community, and *Snippets* will therefore be **free of charge**. There will be a limited number of copies, which we will send to institutions on request. Individuals who wish to take advantage of the newsletter should therefore ask their institutions to request a copy, and make their own copy of the institution's version. Individuals who are not affiliated with an institution and do not have access to the web version of the newsletter can request copies by writing to us at the postal address above. Further questions should be addressed to snippets@unimi.it.

1.

Yves-Ferdinand Bouvier - University of Geneva *Some audible effects of a silent operator*

Yvesferdi@wanadoo.fr

Negative clitic *ne* is almost never pronounced in colloquial French, but lack of spell-out doesn't imply lack of covert existence: sometimes a dropped *ne* exhibits syntactical effects at spell-out.

In a widespread colloquial use, a phonological rule optionally reduplicates the initial liquid consonant that constitutes, after the schwa-drop, the third person singular accusative clitic, when it stays between two vowels in overt syntax:

- (1) ✓ Jel-l'aime.
Ih-him love.
'I love him.'

Crucially, this phonological rule isn't available in negative sentences:

- (2) * Jel-l'aime pas.
Ih-him love not.
'I don't love him.'

We take this to mean that *ne*, though not pronounced, is syntactically present—it may be the phonologically null 'NEG-operator' proposed by Haegeman 1995 under the strong hypothesis that the NEG-criterion is always satisfied at s-structure. The correct representation of (2) would thus be something like (3), with a clitic negative Boolean operator blocking the reduplication rule:

- (3) * Jel-¬-l'aime pas.
Ih-¬-him love not.

Consistently, the reduplication rule becomes available again when *ne* is phonologically realized, since it provides another vowel able to host the reduplicated consonant (though (4) is a rare form owing to the large extent of *ne*-drop in colloquial register):

- (4) ✓ Je nel-l'aime pas.
I neh-him love not.
'I don't love him.'

The existence of '¬' could also account for the variations shown in clitic ordering between negative and non-negative sentences.

In the Southeast of France, regional order of singular argumental clitics is dative-accusative (instead of standard order accusative-dative), as in (5a); the former is plausibly derived from the latter by an incorporation rule, as proposed for Italian by Laenzlinger (1993:253-254). Plural dative cannot incorporate in a non-negative sentence, as in (5b):

- (5) a. % Je lui le donne.
I to-him it-M give.
'I give it to him.'
b. * Je leur le donne.
I to-them it-M give.
'I give it to them.'

The problem could be of phonological nature. At the singular, no problem arises with [lqi:l]; on the other hand, *[lœ:rl] contains a sequence [rl] which is ungrammatical as a syllabic coda in French. Now, the negative clitic forces a resyllabification, so that [r] becomes the coda of the first syllable, and [l] is included in the second one—either along with *ne* as [lœ:r nəl], or along with '¬' as [lœ:r lə]:

- (6) % Je leur {ne/ ¬} le donne pas.
I to-them {ne/ ¬} it give not.
'I don't give it to them.'

The existence of '¬' could also account for the possibility of proclisis in negated imperatives as in (7b) (vs. its impossibility in non-negated imperatives as in (7a)), in a manner that remains to be understood:

- (7) a. * Le fais!
It do!
'Do it!'
b. ✓ ¬ Le fais pas!
¬ It do not!
'Don't do it!'

References

- Haegeman, L. (1995) *The Syntax of Negation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Laenzlinger, C. (1993) "A syntactic view of Romance pronominal sequences", *Probus* 5:3, 242-270.

2.

Dirk Bury - University College London **German V3 and the origin of adverbs**

d.bury@ucl.ac.uk

While German is a strict verb-second language, some verb-third orders are also possible. V3 may be possible in structures where a pronoun coreferential with the initial constituent occurs lower in the clause:

- (1) a. (Er sagte) [der Hans]_i der_i habe schon wieder Hunger
he said the Hans the have-SUBJ already again hunger
'(He said that) Hans is hungry again already.' (Altmann 1981:149)
- b. (Christian meinte) [in der Stadt]_i da_i werde er es nicht mehr
Christian meant in the city there would he it no more
lange aushalten
long bear (Altmann 1981:149)
'(Christian said that) in the city he couldn't bear it much longer there.'
- c. [Eine Brigg]_i was ist das_i?
a Brigg what is that
'A brigg, what's that?' (Altmann 1981:148)
- d. [Dass man über unterschiedliche Lösungswege diskutieren kann]_i
that one about different solution-ways discuss can
Deutschlands Abiturienten haben davon_i nie gehört
Germany's A-level students have of-it never heard
'A-level students in Germany never knew it was possible to discuss
different ways to get to a solution.' (*Die Zeit* 48/2000)

It seems reasonable to assume that in examples of this kind the initial phrase is base-generated. The ungrammaticality of V3 examples like (2) can then be derived from a general locality condition (e.g. an appropriate version of Rizzi's 1990 Relativised Minimality or Chomsky's 1995 Minimal Link Condition).

- (2) a. *Frank_i gestern hat t_i den Kuchen gegessen
Frank yesterday has the cake eaten
'Frank ate the cake yesterday.'

- b. *Gegessen_i Frank hat (gestern) den Kuchen t_i
 eaten Frank has yesterday the cake
- *Frank_i den Kuchen hat (gestern) t_i gegessen
 Frank the cake has yesterday eaten

These examples presumably involve A-bar movement (of the initial constituent) across an A-bar specifier (occupied by the immediately preverbal constituent). (3) illustrates the contrast between (1) and (2):

- (3) a. $XP_i YP V_j [\dots Pro_i \dots t_j] = (1)$
 b. $*XP_i YP V_j [\dots t_i \dots t_j] = (2)$

Given examples like (4), this reasoning suggests that adverbs in German must be inserted lower than the fronted verb.

- (4) a. *Gestern Frank hat Kuchen gegessen
 yesterday Frank has cake eaten
- b. *Manchmal Frank hat Kuchen gegessen
 sometimes Frank has cake eaten
- c. *Gerne Frank hat Kuchen gegessen
 gladly Frank has cake eaten

If the adverbs in (4) were base-generated in initial position, these examples would not be ruled out by a *Relativised Minimality*-type condition, and an additional constraint would have to be invoked.

References

- Altmann, H. (1981) *Formen der 'Herausstellung' im Deutschen: Rechtsversetzung, Linksversetzung, freies Thema und verwandte Konstruktionen*, Niemeyer, Tübingen.
- Chomsky, N. (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Rizzi, L. (1990) *Relativized Minimality*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

3.

Uli Sauerland - University of Tübingen
Intermediate cumulation

uli@alum.mit.edu

In this snippet, I will describe a new case where overt wh-movement leads to additional scope possibilities.

Scenario: Imagine we're organizing a conference together. We send out the abstracts to reviewers. But some reviewers write back that they think they got an abstract written by a student of theirs, which they therefore don't want to review. The organizers have another meeting to deal with this problem.

Examples (1a) and (1b) are inappropriate in such a situation.

- (1) a. #These five reviewers believed that those eight abstracts had been written by a student of theirs.
- b. #These five reviewers believed that a student of theirs had written those eight abstracts.

The examples in (1) would only be appropriate in a situation where the reviewers believe that they have a student who on his own wrote eight abstracts, thereby violating the restriction to maximally submit one individual and one joint abstract.

The sentences in (2), however, are appropriate in the situation described at the outset.

- (2) a. Which eight abstracts did those five reviewers believe that a student of theirs had written?
- b. These are the eight abstracts that those five reviewers believed that a student of theirs had written.

The data in (1) are expected from the observation of Sauerland (1998), Beck (2000), and Beck and Sauerland (2000) that cumulative interpretations of numeral are subject to the same locality restrictions as quantifier raising, in particular the clause boundedness condition. The data in (2) show that overt movement can obviate the clause boundedness condition. This is expected if an intermediate trace of the moved plural can be the argument of the cumulativity operator ** as defined in (3a). The LF-representation I propose for (2a) is shown in (3b).

(3) a. $[[**]](P^{ect}) = \lambda X \lambda Y [[\forall x \in X \exists y \in Y P(x)(y)=1] \& [\forall y \in Y \exists x \in X P(x)(y) = 1]]$

b. which eight abstracts $\lambda X [[\text{those five reviewers}] [X [** [\lambda x \lambda y \text{ y believed that a student of y had written x}]]]]$

My hope is that people interested in the syntax and semantics of questions will find this contrast to be a useful addition to their toolbox to investigate further questions: How does wh-in-situ behave? What does (2b) tell us about relative clauses?

It is worth noting that there is another known case where overt wh-movement leads to additional scopal possibilities. Namely the contrast in (4) with movement of a cardinal NP allowing for scope over the subject of a higher finite clause.

(4) a. Someone demanded that I read three books on logic.
 b. How many books on logic did someone demand that I read?

So a further question that arises is: can these contrasts receive a unified explanation?

References

- Beck, S. (2000) "Star Operators. Episode One: Defense of the Double Star", in K. Kusumoto and E. Villalta eds, *UMOP 23: Issues in Semantics*, GLSA (University of Massachusetts, Amherst), Amherst MA.
- Beck, S. and U. Sauerland. (2000) "Cumulation is needed: a reply to Winter (2000)", *Natural Language Semantics* 8:4, 349-371.
- Sauerland, U. (1998) "Plurals, Derived Predicates and Reciprocals", in U. Sauerland and O. Percus eds, *The Interpretive Tract: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 25*, MITWPL (Dept. of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT), Cambridge MA, 177-204.

4.

Gwangrak Son - University of Wisconsin-Madison *Reflexives: a category defective in c-commanding ability*

gson@facstaff.wisc.edu

According to Saito 1992, positions created by scrambling must i) disappear at LF, ii) be reanalyzed as an A-position, or iii) be reanalyzed as an operator position. In (1a) and (1b), in Korean, for example, a pronoun and an R-expression in scrambling position display a c-commanding capability, a typical property of an element in an A-position. A reflexive, on the other hand, as in (1c), obviates Condition C, acting as if it were in an operator position.

- (1) a. * ku_i-rul nae-ka John_i-uy emeoni-eykey *t* tolyo ponaessta
he-Acc. I-Nom. J.-Gen. mother-Dat. back sent
'Him_i, I sent *t* back to John_i's mother.'
- b. John_i-eykey casin_i-uy emeoni-ka *t* simpurum-ul sikiessta
J.-Dat. self-Gen. mother-Nom. errand-Acc. made
'To John_i, self_i's mother made an errand *t*.'
- c. casin_i-ul John_i-i *t* pinanhayssta
self-Acc. J.-Nom. blamed
'Self_i, John_i blamed *t*.'

Note further in (2) that a bare form of the reflexive must remain in an operator position at LF; if it disappeared from the scrambling position (i.e., Saito's option i)), the construal pattern established after scrambling would not be recovered.

- (2) a. John_i-i [Mary_j-ka casin_{ij}-ul pinanhaysstako] sayngkakhanta
J.-Nom. M.-Nom. self-Acc. blamed think
'John_i thinks that Mary_j blamed self_{ij}.'
- b. casin_{ij}-ul John_i-i [Mary_j-ka *t* pinanhaysstako] sayngkakhanta
self-Acc. J.-Nom. M.-Nom. blamed think
'Self_{ij}, John_i thinks that Mary_j blamed *t*.'

Such data as (1) and (2) lead us to conclude that the pronouns and R-expressions arrive at an A-position, while reflexives end up with an operator position after scrambling. This conclusion raises an intriguing question: Why do scrambling positions vary depending on the category moved by scrambling? Because the type of a lexical category does not alter the nature of movement (e.g., subject-raising is invariably A-movement, whether raising involves

a pronoun, a reflexive, or an R-expression), it casts serious doubt about the dual nature of the landing site of scrambling.

If we assume that reflexives occur as NP complements of D, as in (3), we can avoid the arbitrary nature of scrambling.

(3) [DP [D' [D [NP [N' [N casin]]]]]]]

In the structure (3), the reflexive is deeply embedded in the DP; in principle, it cannot c-command others. The perfect grammaticality of (1c) and (2b) is now explicable, as Condition C remains intact. In conjunction with the segment structure of May 1985, the construal pattern of (2b) also follows; only the matrix *John*, not the downstairs *Mary*, interacts with *casin* via c-command.

Not only does this approach eliminate the arbitrary dichotomy of scrambling (thereby unifying the landing site), it also sharpens the nature of anaphoric binding. Reflexives lack a full specification of referential features (number, gender, and person; see Chomsky 1981). Consequently, reflexives – as opposed to the pronouns and R-expressions, which rise from N to D to check the [referential]-feature of D – remain in their insertion position (see Longobardi 1994 for the N-to-D raising of the pronouns and R-expressions). When D selects an anaphoric complement, the [ref]-feature of D will only be licensed by virtue of binding, viz., c-command and coindexation with elements outside the DP.

References

- Chomsky, N. (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Foris, Dordrecht.
May, R. (1985) *Logical Form: Its Structure and Derivation*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
Longobardi, G. (1994) "Reference and Proper Names: A Theory of N-Movement in Syntax and Logical Form", *Linguistic Inquiry* 25: 609-665.
Saito, M. (1992) "Long Distance Scrambling in Japanese", *Journal of East Asian Languages* 1: 69-118.

5.

Mark Volpe - SUNY at Stony Brook ***The causative alternation and Japanese unaccusatives***

markv58@yahoo.com

Among the four classes of UNACCUSATIVE VERBS recognized by Levin and Rappaport-Hovav (1995), VERBS OF EXISTENCE, VERBS OF APPEARANCE, VERBS OF INHERENTLY DIRECTED MOTION, and VERBS OF CHANGE-OF-STATE, the verbs of change-of-state “figure most prominently in the CAUSATIVE ALTERNATION”, an alternation between pairs of underived verbs (Levin and Rappaport-Hovav 1994). In their 1995 monograph on the topic of unaccusativity, they argue for:

a fundamental division within the class of unaccusative verbs that is motivated with respect to the causative alternation...(V)erbs of existence and verbs of appearance [*and presumably verbs of inherently directed motion* MV], although bona fide unaccusatives, do not participate in the causative alternation. This property is not characteristic of only English, but is typical of a variety of languages (1995: 119).

We claim that in Japanese all four unaccusative classes participate in the causative alternation. If correct, a major claim of Levin and Rappaport-Hovav 1995, that for change-of-state verbs, the intransitive usage is derived from the more basic transitive one through “de-transitivizing”, becomes difficult to maintain.

A. Change-of-state

- (1) a. The chair broke
b. Isu-ga kow-are-ta.
Chair-NOM break-INTRANS-PAST
- (2) a. The gorilla broke the chair.
b. Gorira-ga isu-o kow-ashi-ta.
Gorilla-NOM chair-ACC break-TRANS-PAST

B. Appearance

- (3) a. A picture appeared on the screen. (Levin and Rappaport-Hovav, 1994: 39)
b. Eizō-ga gamen-ni araw-are-ta.
Picture-NOM screen-LOC appear-INTRANS-PAST
 - (4) a. *The programmer appeared a picture on the screen.
b. Purogurama-ga gamen-ni eizō-o araw-ashi-ta.
Programmer-NOM screen-LOC picture-ACC appear-TRANS-PAST
-

C. Existence

- (5) a. One hundred million yen remained in the bank account.
b. Ichioku-en ginkō kōza-ni nok-ot-ta.
100 million yen-NOM bank account-LOC remain-INTRANS-PAST
- (6) a. *My father remained one-hundred million-yen in the bank account.
b. Otōsan-ga ginkō kōza-ni ichioku-en-o nok-oshi-ta.
Father-NOM bank account-LOC 100 million yen-ACC remain-TRANS-PAST

D. Inherently Directed Motion

- (7) a. The ship arrived at the Port of Hakata.
b. Fune-ga Hakata fūtō-ni tsui-ta.
Ship-NOM Hakata Port-GOAL arrive-INTRANS-PAST
- (8) a. *The captain arrived the ship at the Port of Hakata.
b. Senchō-ga Hakata fūtō-ni fune-o tsuk-e-ta.
captain-NOM Hakata Port-GOAL ship-ACC arrive-TRANS-PAST

Examples (1)-(8) show that while only the change-of-state verbs participate in the English causative alternations, all four classes participate in Japanese. These are genuine examples of the causative alternation in Japanese since, as is the case for unaccusative verbs cross-linguistically, we find that the Subjects of the intransitives (marked by the postposition *-ga* in the odd numbered b) examples) are the Direct Objects (marked by *-o* in the even numbered b) examples) of the transitives. Additionally, the Japanese transitive verbs are all lexical causatives as further evidenced by their ability to undergo morphological causativization, e.g. *kowasu* ('to break' transitive) → *kowasaseru* ('to make break'), *arawasu* ('to show') → *arawasaseru* ('to make show'), *nokosu* ('to leave') → *nokosaseru* ('to make leave') *tsukeru* ('to attach') → *tsukesaseru* ('to make attach').

References

- Levin, B. and M. Rappaport-Hovav (1995) *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- Levin, B. and M. Rappaport-Hovav (1994) "A preliminary analysis of causative verbs in English", in L. Gleitman and B. Landau eds, *The Acquisition of the Lexicon*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA.