

NOTES ON SESSION 13 (26.01.2009)

We were more or less able to finish off Andreas's handout. As can be perceived from Kayne's general drift, he seems to want one and the same structure pertaining to the totality of the syntax. The standard answer to the very basic question of why there are so many functional projections is given by the more recent Kayne by posing 50-100 parametric options; these could then account for the functional projections.

Jumping ahead a bit, again, and alluding once more to the Chomsky-Kayne debate, Neven posed the question of how Chomsky would implement linearization. The answer to that question is given in chapter 6 of BPS: Linearization is not a part of the C_{HL} , the narrow syntactic processes, if you will.¹ On the one hand, for Chomsky, linearization holds at the post-morphological level. For Kayne, on the other hand, linearization holds at all levels of representation. This is, at least to my mind and in a nutshell, the single most important difference between Chomsky's and Kayne's conceptions of linearization processes.² Now on to Andreas's handout.

I will not go into the detailed tree representations here, but the DP structure that is under Kayne's investigation is (8a) and (8b). The basic problem for Kayne seems to be that a clause such as (9) should be ruled out or at least of a highly dubitable stance:

(9) *? I found the pictures of John's/*his.

The thing is that with the pronoun it clearly looks ill-formed, but with the proper name it does not sound so bad. As I promised to do a short *Google/Corpus* search, here is what I found:

(i) The mere sentence *I found the pictures of John's*. only gets **one hit**, referring to a paper on DPs from a generativist point of view.

¹ It is really striking to say that Syntax has nothing to do with word order proper. To my mind and from a more historical perspective word order was one of the triggers to unleash interest in the combinatorial properties of the syntactic mechanism that would yield it. Word order phenomena are so obvious that it is highly counterintuitive to not try to account for them via Syntax proper (C_{HL}).

² An already mentioned reference regarding the unification of BPS and LCA: **BARRIE, MICHAEL (2004)**: "On Unifying Antisymmetry and Bare Phrase Structure". In: NELS 35.

(ii) *the pictures of John's* seems to be fine only when followed by a further NP such as *the pictures of John's* [_{NP} *car*] or something along these lines.

(iii) Using the search engine *Metacrawler* on *Webcorp* with the full clause *I found the pictures of John's*. the search yields **zero hits**.

(iv) *the pictures of John's* generated **zero hits** using *Google* on *Webcorp*.

A note on the searches: If you use *Google* via *Webcorp*, it will generate different results than if you used it via *Google* itself, specifying search options in the given slots provided by *Google*. Unfortunately, *Webcorp* did not turn out to be as good as I first thought.³

As we saw, Kayne correctly rules out such structures, which is backed up somehow by the search – further methodological reflections aside. The problem, however, is (11) on Andreas's handout; why should it be grammatical? Kayne's answer to this is that D selects a sister CP complement. Once you assume such an analysis, then you also rule ambiguity phenomena out (13). Remember that in (13), *John* and *Bill* can both be coreferential with *himself*.

(13) John_i bought the picture of himself_{i/?k} that Bill_k saw.

To our minds, John is much "more" coreferential with himself than Bill is. Perhaps, this is a performance problem. A search: So I did indeed search for (13) and again, the same evaluations for the search engines have to be stated: *Webcorp zero hits*, *Google 16 hits*.⁴ In the end I could not really say whether (13) is alright or not with regard to actual performance based usage.

With regard to relative clause phenomena in general, we criticized Kayne for having somewhat crappy examples – assuming wholeheartedly that Andreas's representation of Kayne is spot on.

³ I can here only speak for my personal experience having used this type of corpus rather superficially. But, as far as I could see, no "categorical" or "phrasal" options were available.

⁴ Again, a "tagged" corpus would have been good. *Google* found papers and monographs on and by Kayne, which was rather recursive to say the least.

Some explicit questions:

Michael asked what Kayne's position towards the **Hierarchy of Projections** was. Remember that the **Hierarchy** indicates which functional projection comes when in the derivation. This functional projection is then topped by the next head "higher in the tree" and so on. As of yet nobody really knows how many functional projections there are, but CP (Head: C) as one of the projections "higher in the tree" is certainly undoubted.⁵ The reasonable answer seems to this question to be that Kayne assumes a uniform **Hierarchy of Projections**. Although we did not know this explicitly, his stance towards the **Spec-Head-Comp** type of projections makes it deducible. As to the influences of, say, Cinque on Kayne's syntactic thinking, only speculations could be stated.

Another related question was whether the **intermediate bar-level projection was there all the time**, even if not filled out. Well, as far as we got in our discussion, it probably is there permanently.

As to some "heavy stuff"⁶ on Andreas's hand-out, it is usually assumed in ditransitive constructions that the direct object (DO) precedes the indirect object (IO). If, however, the DO is rather long/complex/difficult to process, i.e. "heavy", then it tends to be right adjoined. The pragmatic constraint on this could be something like: Most informative parts (=heavy parts) come last – the status of notions such as "information" not being subject to discussion here. But since Kayne cannot handle right adjunction phenomena, he proposes to raise the IO. Now, one would really have to look at German to see how possible NP shift could work there. A relevant example could maybe be:

Er spendete [30 Euro] [an die von Thomas Gottschalk in schlechter Art und Weise moderierte Benefizsendung].

? Er spendete [an die von Thomas Gottschalk in schlechter Art und Weise moderierte Benefizsendung] [30 Euro].

⁵ Note that this pertains to GG approaches. Trivial here as it may seem, so-called *Construction Grammars* maintain a totally different stance towards notions such as "projections" in general.

⁶ It is just now that I get the play on words – processing takes time.

At least to me, the second example is somewhat pragmatically and stylistically bad.⁷ This is not meant prescriptively. As it comes to "heaviness" another point is: **How could one measure it?** Is it just the number of syllables or morphemes or categorial entities that make a certain constituent heavy or could it be the case that **structural complexity** is responsible for heaviness effects? On the stairs down, Benni came up with an example that points to the structural complexity position. If you just stack some adjectives, what comes out:

? Er spendete [an die schlechte, langweilige, billige, einschläfernde und abstoßende Benefizsendung] [30 Euro].

Is this really better? I cannot distinctly remember Benni's examples, but it surely was something along these lines.

⁷ We already had this a couple of times: What determines the DO-IO order in German? "Scrambling" was always the catch phrase.