

A non-configurationality parameter? (Baker 2001)

MIT, 24.951, We 12 Nov 2003

What are the limits on phrase structure, if any? ... on cross-linguistic variation ... ?

- (1) “[T]he question of how to fit nonconfigurational languages into linguistic theory is relevant to some of the deepest issues of linguistics, including the questions of how much variation Universal Grammar allows and what are its proper primitives (phrase structure, grammatical functions, or something else).” [p413]
- (2) “[S]ome [languages, e.g., Warlpiri] make breathtakingly little use of [constituent structure], as compared to English” (Bresnan 2000:46)
- (3) a. Are grammatical relations (e.g., subject, object) to be read off structural representations (i.e., are they parasitic on phrase-structure)? Is there a systematic mapping between θ -roles and syntactic positions?
- b. Recall the now very familiar Uniformity of Theta-Assignment Hypothesis (UTAH): Identical thematic relationships between items are represented by identical structural relationships between those items at the level of D-structure (i.e. θ -roles are uniformly projected in the syntax).
- c. In such framework, the appearance of one-to-many mappings between θ -roles and grammatical relations (in, e.g., actives, passives, unaccusatives, raising) is a side-effect of *movement* in the syntax.

What to do with Warlpiri?

- (4) a. *Kurdu-ngku ka-ju nya-nyi ngaju* (Simpson 1983:140 [7])
 child-Erg Pres-1SgO see-NonPast I(Abs)
 ‘The child sees me’
- b. *Kurdu-ngku ka-ju ngaju nya-nyi*
- c. *Nya-nyi ka-ju kurdu-ngku ngaju*
- d. *Ngaju ka-ju nya-nyi kurdu-ngku* etc.

No VP?

- (5) * *Ngaju nya-nyi ka-ju kurdu-ngku* (Simpson 1983:141 [8])
 I(Abs) see-NonPast Pres-1SgO child-Erg
 ‘The child sees me’
- (6) **Other “non-configurational” properties:**
- a. no operation taking verb and object as unit input

- b. (apparent) symmetry between subject and object
- c. free word order
- d. possible omission of all grammatical functions
- e. discontinuous NP constituents

In a nutshell: it's not clear how to use phrase-structure to distinguish among grammatical functions in these “non-configurational” languages.

The “factorization” solution

(7) a. The now-familiar alternative approach from LFG (and RG): Take grammatical relations as primitives—“first-class citizens”—in their own right, independent of phrase-structure. If so, correlations between θ -roles and grammatical relations on the one hand and on the other hand phrase-structure configurations are historical accidents that hold in only some languages—these correlations are not necessities of UG.

b. For example, “subject as Spec(IP)” and “object as [NP, V’]” would be true of English but not of Warlpiri. The latter would not make any use of our familiar X^l -schema: no VP for example— $S \mapsto X \text{ (Aux) } X^*$.

i. English:

$$\begin{array}{rcc}
 S \mapsto & \text{NP} & \text{VP} \\
 & (\uparrow\text{SUBJ}) = \downarrow & \uparrow = \downarrow \\
 \text{VP} \mapsto & \text{V} & \text{NP} \\
 & \uparrow = \downarrow & (\uparrow\text{OBJ}) = \downarrow
 \end{array}$$

ii. Warlpiri:

- $S \mapsto X \text{ (Aux) } X^*$
- $(\downarrow \text{ CASE}) = \text{ERG} \Rightarrow \downarrow = (\uparrow \text{ SUBJ})$
- $(\downarrow \text{ CASE}) = \text{ABS} \Rightarrow \downarrow = (\uparrow \text{ OBJ})$ if there is a SUBJ otherwise $(\uparrow \text{ SUBJ})$

(8) a. English and Warlpiri c-structures, though radically different, are directly associated—without transformations—with a $\text{Pred}\langle\text{Subj,Obj}\rangle$ f-structure.

b. “[LFG] choose[s] a more abstract representation of the grammatical functions subject and object, one which is neutral between the differing modes of expression of languages. On this alternative, grammatical functions are not reducible to phrase structure configurations . . . They are classes of differing formal expressions that are mapped into argument structure in equivalent ways.” (Bresnan 2000:9)

c. Thus, no movement, no grammatical-relation changes . . . Passives, unaccusatives, etc., are to be handled by various sorts of underspecification and by morpholexical rules (e.g., “suppression”) that apply *in the lexicon* to expand the stock of argument structures.

- d. The effect of movement is achieved via principles for mapping a-structure roles to (partially specified) grammatical functions and for mapping these roles and their grammatical functions onto f-structures.
- (9) a. For example, object-like properties of the derived subjects of passives and unaccusatives are due to the $[-r]$ feature that they have in common with the subjects of active transitive verbs. Take the fact that the subjects of passives and unaccusatives can be modified by secondary resultative predicates: LFG stipulates that resultatives apply only to $[-r]$ arguments (no movement is posited).
- b. Subject-like properties of these derived subjects (e.g., agreement with the verb) are due to the mapping of this argument to SUBJ in f-structure.
- $$S \mapsto \begin{array}{cc} \text{NP} & \text{VP} \\ (\uparrow\text{SUBJ}) = \downarrow & \uparrow = \downarrow \end{array}$$
- c. But see your answers to Homework 4 for potential problems in this approach.

Anaphoric dependencies in Warlpiri—evidence for GB-type structurally-defined principles?

- (10) a. *Kurdu-jarra-rlu ka-pala-nyanu paka-rni*
child-D-Erg Pres-3DS-ReflO strike-NonPast
'The two children are striking themselves/each other'
- b. * *Ngarrka ka-nyanu-(\emptyset) nya-nyi* (Hale 1983:43 [11])
man-Abs Aux-Refl(-3SgO) see-NonPast
'Heself_i sees the man_i'
- (11) a. *John_i washed pictures of himself_i*
b. * *Friends of himself_i washed John_i*
- (12) **Binding Condition A in LFG:** An anaphor requires an antecedent that is “(\uparrow SUBJECT)” within the anaphor’s clause (Simpson 1983).

A (non)configurationality parameter? Hale 1983:26

- (13) **Projection Principle (Chomsky 1981):**
Structural representations at every syntactic level (D-structure, S-structure and LF) are projected from the lexicon. For example, subcategorization requirements of verbs are obeyed at all levels.
- (14) **Configurationality parameter (Hale 1983:26):** In non-configurational languages such as Warlpiri, the Projection Principle is (somewhat) suspended.

No (non-)configurationality parameter (Baker 2001)

“Non-configurational” languages are not alike—even w.r.t. their lack of subject-object asymmetry

(Apparent?) *Over-abundance of Condition C effects in Warlpiri—a dependent (Case-) marking language*

(15) a. * *Jakamarra-kurlangu maliki ka nyanungu-rlu wajili-pi-ny*
 Jakamarra-Poss dog-Abs Pres he-Erg hase-NonPast
 ‘He_i chases Jakamarra_i’s (own) dog’

b. * *Jakamarra-kurlangu maliki-rli ka nyanungu wajili-pi-ny*
 Jakamarra-Poss dog-Erg Pres he-Abs chase-NonPast
 ‘Jakamarra_i’s (own) dog chases him_i’

(Warlpiri; Simpson 1991:179f [18])

(Apparent?) *Lack of Condition C effects in Mohawk—a “head marking” (i.e., rich-agreement) language*

(16) a. *Wa'-t-há-ya'k-e'* [NP *ne thíkΛ Sak raó-[a]'share'*] (Mohawk; [15])
 Fact-Dup-1SgS-break-Punc PRT that Sak MSgP-knife
 ‘He_i broke that knife of Sak_i’s

b. *Ro-ya'takéhnh-Λ* [NP *thíkΛ ne Sak raó-[a]'share'*]
 MSgO-help-Stat that PRT Sak MSgP-knife
 ‘That knife of Sak_i’s is helping him_i’

Word order effects on Condition C in Japanese—a dependent (Case-) marking head-final language

(17) a. * *Soitu-ga Taroo-no hon-o mituke-ta* (Japanese; Hoji 1985 [19])
 guy-Nom Taro-Gen book-Acc found-Past
 ‘[The guy]_i found Taro_i’s book’

b. ? *Taroo-no hon-o soitu-ga mituke-ta*
 Taro-Gen book-Acc guy-Nom found-Past
 ‘Taro_i’s book, [the guy]_i found

Structure-based solutions using universal ingredients

(18) So-called “non-configurational” properties result from the conspiracy of operations and constraints that are either universal or independently attested elsewhere (in, e.g., so-called “configurational” languages). These operations include:

- NP-movement as in passives and unaccusatives,
- dislocation as in Italian and Spanish,

- secondary predication
- *pro*-drop
- predicate-argument distinction
- adjective-noun neutralization
- etc ...

Japanese puzzle in (17): Scrambling as NP movement

(19) a. * *He_i washed John_i's car*

b. *John_i's car was washed by him_i*

(20) Derivation for (17b):

[IP [NP *Taro_i's book*]_k [I' [VP [NP *that guy_i*] [V' *t_k find*]] PAST]]

Mohawk puzzle in (16): (Italian-type) *pro* + obligatory dislocation as an “escape” from Condition C (“Pronominal Argument Hypothesis” (Jelinek 1984)

A subject-object asymmetry? Incorporation

(21) a. *O-n \wedge 'y-a' wa'-t-ka-ts \acute{u} ser-á-hri-ht-e'* [24]

NSgO-stone-NSF Fact-Dup-NSgS-pane-O-shatter-Caus-Punc

‘The stone broke the window-pane’

b. * *O-ts \acute{u} ser-a' wa'-t-ka-n \wedge y-á-hri-ht-e'*

NSgO-pane-NSF Fact-Dup-NSgS-stone-O-shatter-Caus-Punc

‘The stone broke the window’

Massive *pro*-drop in Mohawk

(22) a. *wa'tháya'ke'* [p420]

‘He broke it’

b. *wa'akotí'*

‘She lost it’

(Optional)Dislocation in Italian

(23) a. *Gianni_i, lo_i conosciamo* ‘Gianni_i, we know him_i’ (Cinque 1990:60f [26])

b. * *Lo_i conosciamo (a) Gianni_i*

Mohawk as ‘Italian-Plus’

(24) “The only difference is that whereas object clitics are optionally generated on the verb in Italian, they are obligatory in Mohawk as a basic typological property of the language: Mohawk is by all accounts a pure and obligatory head marking language (the Polysynthesis Parameter of Baker 1996). Therefore, overt NPs in the object

position will always be un-Case marked in Mohawk, in violation of the Case Filter.”
[p421f]

Warlpiri puzzle in (15) (= (25)): NPs as depictive secondary predicates (Speas 1990)

- (25) a. * *Jakamarra-kurlangu maliki ka nyanungu-rlu wajili-pi-ny*
 Jakamarra-Poss dog-Abs Pres he-Erg chase-NonPast
 ‘He_i chases Jakamarra_i’s (own) dog’
- b. * *Jakamarra-kurlangu maliki-rli ka nyanungu wajili-pi-ny*
 Jakamarra-Poss dog-Erg Pres he-Abs chase-NonPast
 ‘Jakamarra_i’s (own) dog chases him_i’

(Warlpiri; Simpson 1991:179f [18])

The positioning of secondary predicates

- (26) *John wanted to leave the room happy. . .*
 a. . . . and [_{VP} leave the room happy] he did.
 b. * . . . and [_{VP} leave the room] he did happy.
- (27) a. *I believe John with all my heart to be a fine person*
 b. *The D.A. proved the defendents to be guilty on each others trials*
 c. * *Mary believes him_i to be a genius even more fervently than Bob_i does*
- (28) a. * *He_i always sent soldiers_k to the front [loyal_k to Hitler_i’s ideals].*
 b. ?* *John_k tried to read it_i [sympathetic_k to [Mein Kampf]_i’s basic thesis]*
- (29) a. *As much as possible, every dictator_i sends soldiers_k to the front loyal_k to his_i ideals*
 [30]
 b. *As much as possible, John_i reads [every book]_k sympathetic_i to its_k basic thesis*

One fundamental property of (secondary) predicates—they can’t be used as arguments

- (30) a. *Intelligence will solve your problems* [p430]
 b. * *Intelligent will solve your problems*

. . . And English DPs cannot be used as depictive secondary predicates

- (31) a. *I never saw Reagan angry*
 b. * *I never saw Reagan (the) president*
 (Intended meaning: *I never saw Reagan when he was the president*)

Other differences between N vs. Adj in English

- (32) a. *a genius* [p429]
 b. * *an intelligent*

- (33) a. *an intelligent woman* [p429]
 b. * *a genius woman*

What about Warlpiri? No N-vs-Adj distinction—nominals as secondary predicates?

- (34) *Nya-nyi ka-rna-ngku ngarrka-lku* (Hale 1983 [34])
 see-NonPast Pres-1SgS-2SgO man-after
 ‘I see you as a man now’

- (35) *Kurdu-ngku wita-ngku ka wajili-pi-nyi* (Simpson 1991: 265)
 child-Erg small-Erg Pres chase-NonPast
 ‘The childish small thing is chasing it’ **or** ‘The small child
 is chasing it’

**DP-licensing via dislocation (Mohawk) or via secondary predication (Warlpiri)—
 What are some the predictions?**

Condition C effects and lack thereof

- (36) Full DPs are either in or outside the pronominal arguments’ c-command domain—
 contrast (15) in Warlpiri with (16) in Mohawk.

(Dis-)Continuous constituents

- (37) a. *Kuyu* \emptyset -*rna lwa-rnu wawirri* (Warlpiri; Hale p.c. [42a])
 animal Perf-1SgS hoot-Past kangaroo
 ‘I shot a kangaroo’

- b. ?* *K \wedge 'tsu* *ne auha'a te-wak-éka'-s rababhót* (Mohawk; [42b])
 fish PRT most Cis-1SgO-like-Hab bullhead
 ‘I like bullhead fish the best’

- (38) a. *Wawirri* *kapi-rna panti-rni yalumpu* (Warlpiri; Hale 1983 [43a])
 kangaroo Aux-1SgS spear-NonPast that
 ‘I will spear that kangaroo’

- b. ?* *Kwéskwes* *wa-hi-yéna-' kík \wedge* (Mohawk; [43b])
 pig Fact-1SgS/MSgO-catch-Punc this
 ‘I caught this pig’

- (39) Mohawk dislocation as in Spanish—a single dislocated DP per (pronominal) argument:

* Este_i, lo_i ví en la fiesta, [(el) hombre]_i

That one 3sg+masc+ACC saw+1sg at the party, (the) man

‘That one, I saw him at the party, the man’

- (40) Warlpiri secondary predicates as in English—more than one can be used to depict a single argument:

a. *I only eat fish raw fresh*

b. *I often send Mary home drunk, and she gets there just fine. The problem is that on Tuesday I sent her home drunk exhausted.*

Problems:

- (41) Universal constraints on the syntax-pragmatics interface (of dislocation and secondary predication)? (Consider the pragmatics of *Gianni*_i, *lo*_i *conosciamo* and English *John ate it raw*.)