LING 325 – Spring 05
Jonathan Bobaljik

Notes 7: paradoxes and alternatives

1. CINQUE

METHOD: Test cooccurrence restrictions of non-fronted, non-focused advs.

1. a. Non hanno *mica già* chiamato, che io sappia. C1. 3 (3)
   "They have not already telephoned, that I know."
   b. *Non hanno mica già chiamato, ...
      no have already not telephoned
      mica > già

2. a. All’epoca non possedeva già più nulla. C1. 4 (5)
   at the time no possess already any longer nothing
   "At the time (s)he did not possess already any longer anything."
   b. *All’epoca non possedeva più già nulla.
      at the time no possess any longer already nothing
      già > più

3. Prediction: mica > più
   a. Non hanno chiamato mica più, da allora. C1. 4 (7)
      no have telephoned not any longer, since then
      "They haven’t telephoned any longer, since then.”
   b. *Non hanno chiamato più mica, da allora.
      no have telephoned any longer not, since then

4. franco- > fortun- > evident- > probablin- > ora > forse > inteligenttem- >...
   frankly > fortunately > evidently > probably > now > perhaps > intelligently >...
   ... solitam- > mica > già > più > sempre > complet > tutto > bene
   ... usually > not > already > any longer > always > completely > everyth. > well

   [Top group are ‘higher” “IF” adverbs, lower are ‘lower” “VP”-initial]
   • Hierarchy (by meaning) holds cross-linguistically (up to focus, etc)
   • Hierarchy (by meaning) replicated with functional heads (auxiliaries, affixes).

(16) Finite verbs and IP adverbs
   C2. 66 (14)
   *Mi ero francamente purtroppo evidentemente formato una pesima impressione di voi.
   ’I had frankly unfortunately evidently formed a very bad opinion of you.
   a. *Mi ero francamente purtroppo evidentemente formato...
   b. Francamente mi ero purtroppo evidentemente formato...
   c. Francamente purtroppo evidentemente mi era formato...
   d. Francamente purtroppo evidentemente mi era formato...

(17) Active participle and VP adverbs
   C2. 62 (1, 4)
   Da allora, non hanno *rimesso* di solito mica più sempre completamente tutto bene in ordine.
   since then, no have put usually not any longer always completely everything well in order
   a. ... rimesso di solito mica più sempre completamente tutto bene in ordine.
   b. ... di solito rimesso mica più sempre completamente tutto bene in ordine.
   c. ... di solito mica rimesso più sempre completamente tutto bene in ordine.
   d. ... di solito mica più rimesso sempre completamente tutto bene in ordine.
   e. ... di solito mica più sempre rimesso completamente tutto bene in ordine.
   f. ... di solito mica più completamente rimesso tutto bene in ordine.
   g. *... di solito mica più sempre completamente tutto rimesso bene in ordine.
   h. *... di solito mica più sempre completamente tutto bene rimesso in ordine.

POSSIBILITIES: Alternative I: V in different positions, Adv’s in fixed positions.
   Alternative II: V in fixed positions, Adv’s in different positions.
   [Alternative III: Everything moves]

(5) A > B: A B X; A X B; X A B
   A,B = adverbs
  *B = A: *B A X; *B X A; *X B A
   X = verbal heads

(18) a. Non hanno mica mangiato. (They have not eaten.) C2. 64-65 (7)(11)
   b. Non hanno mangiato mica.
   c. Non hanno più mangiato. (They have not eaten.)
   b. Non hanno mangiato più.

(19) a. Non hanno mica più mangiato. (They have not any longer eaten.)
   b. * Non hanno più mica mangiato.
   c. Non hanno mangiato mica più.
   d. * Non hanno mangiato più. mica

(20) a. Non hanno mica mangiato più.
   b. * Non hanno più mangiato mica.
“One would need to complement Alternative II with an additional filter to the effect that the otherwise free generation of mica and più to either the left or the right of the past participle leads to ungrammaticality just in case più is generated in position A, on the left, and mica in position B on the right. This filter, however, simply recapitulates the ordering principle needed to account for the orders possible within position A [(19a-b)] and within position B [(19c-d)].”

fn. 6 “It could be claimed that the same ordering principle needed to determine the correct order of adjunction within position A, and position B, with mica > più, is sufficient to account for the ungrammaticality of [(20b)]; at least if the principle is abstract enough (possibly a semantic principle) to hold across positions A and B as well. But even so, Alternative II compares unfavourably with Alternative I, which needs no separate ordering principle for AdvPs qua specifiers, as their ordering can plausibly be made to follow from the independent ordering of the heads (via Spec/head agreement)…”


(6) Gianni purtroppo forse stupidamente mica gli ha più telefonato.
G. unfortunately perhaps stupidly not to-him has any longer telephoned.
(Cinque 1999, 51)

* auxiliary ha may occur lower than mica; hence base position of aux at least this low.

(7) [ non hanno [VP mangiato [mica taux tpart [più tpart [VP tpart ]]]]]
* interleaving of chains of auxiliary and participle.

* but order preservation AUX > PARTICLE

(8) a. *Gianni stupidamente telefonato mica gli ha più.
G. stupidly telephoned not to-him has any longer più.

b. *Gianni stupidamente telefonato gli ha mica più.

G. stupidly telephoned to-him has not any longer più.

c. *Gianni stupidamente mica telefonato gli ha più.

G. stupidly not telephoned to-him has any longer più.

(Mario Fadda, Michela Ippolito and Lara Riente, personal communication, 7/99)

(9) A > B: A B X; A X B; X A B
   *B > A: *B A X; *B X A; * X B A

ABB = verbal heads

X = adverbs

But: further constrained by LEC.

* Order preservation is the ‘general case’, does not follow automatically. (equidistance?)

Above: order of adverbs is fixed by phrase structure, flexibility is due to verb movement.

Here: order of verbal heads is fixed by phrase structure, flexibility is due to adverb movement

Paradox: Both hierarchies cannot arise simultaneously solely from fixed phrase structure.

Can be replicated with verb / argumental elements (FQ, clitic), etc. See also Nilsen (2003).

General conclusion:

Ordering hierarchies exist (as generalizations)

Such hierarchies determine precedence, but not absolute precedence.

(precedence among some class of related items, but allows interleaving of other elements).

Not all ordering reducible to phrase structure alone.

2. WILLIAMS

2.1 Basic Ideas

F&P: Accept movement, hence puzzle of order preservation.

Introduce mechanism to derive order preservation, filtering out otherwise well-formed syntactic derivations,

Williams: rather than using movement for all cases, accept hierarchies,

economy as “shape conservation”

Given two independent hierarchies, the most economical representation is the one
which preserves the most isomorphy between them

Deviations are tolerated only when and to the extent forced.

Like Relativized Minimality, Autosegmental Phonology

No interaction (from shape conservation) b/w distinct hierarchies:

(10) A > B: A B X; A X B; X A B

ABB = verbal heads

*B > A: *B A X; *B X A; * X B A

X = adverbs

But: further constrained by LEC.

* Order preservation is the ‘general case’, does not follow automatically. (equidistance?)

(11) AgrSP

S > O in case layer

NPI

AgrS

S

AgrOP

VP

Ag > Th in theta layer

Ag

NPI

NPI

PL

Information coding: Agent = Subject, Patient = Object

i.e., ‘Subjecthood’ is about AgrS (incl. NOM case, etc)
Questions / concerns: Movement creates nested dependencies, not crossing.

Given covertness, why order preservation? * B X A; * DO ADV IO

Alternative: instead of movement; mapping (= correspondence between levels)

Theta-hierarchy stipulated (as on all theories), then

- economy as TS = CS
- + definition of "prominence" for each level.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Agent} > \text{Goal} > \text{Theme} \\
\text{Nom} > \text{Dat} > \text{Acc} \\
\text{*Agent} > \text{Goal} > \text{Theme} \\
\text{*Acc} > \text{Dat} > \text{Nom}
\end{array}
\]

- For any level (such as s-str) that involves c-command as prominence, if that level represents TS or CS, then Subj > IO > DO follows from economy without (necessarily) involving movement.

No movement.

Hence no paths.

Hence no interleaving of paths.

Hence order-preservation as the general case, with mismatches to be explained.

Like the Cinque paradoxes; phrase-structure alone is not source of all hierarchies.

Independence of theta-hierarchy: surfaces in morphology / compounding. [p.14]

TS: Goal > Theme: [ Goal [ Theme [H ] ] ]

SS: [ [ supply guns ] to an army ]

not obviously supported by ‘do–so’

also: supply an army with guns!

give noone anything H . . [ Goal [ Theme [ t ] ] ]

* give anyone nothing

X-ling evidence (Germanic)

MS: army gun supplier First-Order Projection Convention

**gun army supplier

FOPC in Morphology = U(T)AH in Syntax = isomorphism to Theta-Hierarchy (TS)

Mismatches allowed, but only as forced, e.g., by subcategorization frames in Syntax

no analogue in Morphology.

What are the levels?

What are the relations among them?

W(37) p.23:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{TS} & \text{QS} & \uparrow & \uparrow \\
\text{CS} & \text{SS} & \text{FS} & \text{AS}
\end{array}
\]

TS = Theta-Structure

CS = Case Structure

QS = Quantification Structure (Topic Structure)

SS = Surface Structure

FS = Focus Structure

AS = Accent Structure

The TS + CS ... = FS sequence mimics, in part, the 'Prolific Domains' idea of Grohmann.

but, as Williams notes, with no 'deep stranding'

2.2 HNPS CS + SS + FS

basic order (English): give NP PP  assumed, but not important here: [[ V NP ] PP ]

English: focus constituent identified by rightmost stress.

Focus-projection: [w Subj [v V [w OBJ ]]]]

Assume FS has ... ] FOC # (Focus at right edge of clause; English).

(11) a. John gave to Mary all of the money in the SATCHEL.

b. *John gave to MARY all of the money in the satchel.

c. John gave all of the money in the satchel to MARY.

d. John gave all of the money in the SATCHEL to Mary.

Neutral order shows no oblig focus-final requirement (11d).

(11a) vs (11d) shows optionality of HNPS

So why is HNPS bad in (11b)?

If SATCHEL is focus (or basis of focus projection), then there is an inherent CS : FS mismatch

CS: V NP PP, FS: ... ] FOC #

SS – the “heard order” must be unfaithful to one of the representations.

but being unfaithful to both is not tolerated: *(11b)
Parallel logic: discussion of there insertion and scope in Bobaljik 2002.

3 of 4 structures OK = optionality for one reading, but *ECM and *LF:PF (SS,QS) = *

Assumptions: HNPS order is possible in SS
HNPS is “free” @ SS; but will be filtered as CS ~! SS unless resolves s.th. else
Can be cast as movement (+ pronunciation?) or not.
CS ~> SS, SS ~ FS
not intrinsically ranked.

Pronounce “case copy”; Pronounce “focus copy/intonation” = Focus final.

Contrast: argument against Last Resort / Feature-Driven movement:

Focus as interpretation: any constituent.
PF-diagnostic: accent on rightmost (content?) word / NSR

Focus-projection: [\$ Subj [\$ V [\$ OBJ \$]]];

In HNPS (focus-driven movement), it need not be the focused constituent that moves.

Therefore, not: feature-driven by check FOC:

W (12) could be handled by Pied-Piping

W (13) could not moved constituent is extracted out of focus constituent
(\text{would require that focus projection is semantic rule})

see also:

A: John gave several pictures of some politician to Mary.
B: John gave several pictures of CLINTON
both have focus on CLINTON, but B’ shows pied-piping not oblig.

see comment, end pp. 35-36

aside: “feature-driven” / what is Williams arguing against?

independently detectable (phonology, morphology, interpretation)
items with X move, without X don’t.

vs. generalized EPP + some version of optionality (incl. Lasnik)
risks rendering thesis of “last resort” unfalsifiable.

2.3 Hungarian

p45 Moved quantifiers are unambiguous for scope; but unmoved quantifiers are ambiguous.

Contrast common description of scope-rigid languages like Japanese, Chinese.

Empirical puzzle = (37) \& (38)

Background assumptions

\begin{align*}
\text{[ V S O ]} & \text{ movement to} \quad \text{TOP* FOC V …} & \text{preverbal focus (exactly one)} \\
\text{movement of quantifiers to their scope positions (TOP*)}
\end{align*}

(37a): un-ambiguous every > few
(37b): ambiguous every not moved, can undergo QR (reconstr. unlikely to help)
but nuance, re: focus: (38)

Alternative characterization: (37a) vs. (38b) without focus, order is rigid

SS = QS

p.47: indices all messed up!

[37a](42) – only one focus = preverbal element

\begin{align*}
\text{scope reversal (42a) involves SS \neq QS} \\
\text{(42c) – revised – w/ overt movement preserves SS \neq QS mapping}
\end{align*}

[38b] focus irrelevant, absence of movement preserves SS = QS (42b)

\begin{quote}
FOR DISCUSSION AT THIS POINT, POSITION OF V IS ESSENTIALLY IRRELEVANT
\end{quote}

But why not say this is a surface scope language (wears its LF on its sleeve)?

[38a] non-transparent order.

\begin{align*}
\text{= (41): Focus structure requirement forces SS \neq QS mismatch.}
\end{align*}

Points of variation Hungarian vs. English:

Word order possibilities at S-Str; and focus (preverbal) in Hung.

SS = QS > SS = CS (H) Scope-rigid (but not totally!)
SS = CS > SS = QS (E) QR