Class Notes: Tsujimura (2007), Ch. 5. Syntax (2), pp. 220-235

1. Syntactic structures

REVIEW: What are ‘Phrase structure rules’?
→ They indicate the CONSTITUENCY of each phrasal category, and the ORDER among the constituents

‘Phrase structure rules should be able to express an infinite number of Ss, and be restrictive enough to be able to specify the regularities of the generation of such syntactic structures.

Phrase Structure (PS) Rules

\[
\begin{align*}
S' & \rightarrow S \text{ COMP} \\
S & \rightarrow \text{NP VP} \\
\text{NP} & \rightarrow (S') (\text{NP}) (\text{AP}) \text{ N} \\
\text{VP} & \rightarrow (\text{PP}) (\text{NP}) (\text{PP}) (\text{NP}) (S') \text{ V} \\
\text{PP} & \rightarrow \text{NP P}
\end{align*}
\]

NOTE: COMP (complementizer) introduces a clause (=S)

p. 220

1.5. Subcategorization

pp. 220-222

Why are Ss (26a)-(26c), pp. 220-221 ill-formed even though they are consistent with PS rules?

a. *Taroo-ga sushi-o itta (‘went’).
b. *Hanako-ga Jiroo-ni sushi-o waratta (‘laughed’).
c. *Taroo-ga Hanako-ni sushi-o tabeta (‘ate’).

→ Because PS rules don’t care about the nature of the verb in terms of the number & types of NPs with which it co-occurs.

How can we avoid such ill-formed Ss?
→ We use SUBCATEGORIZATION!

What do the ‘subcategorization frames’ of the following verbs look like?

a. ik ‘go’: [___] ← a S would look like: subject + ik
b. waraw ‘laugh’: [___] ← a S would look like: ________?
c. tabe ‘eat’: [NP ___] ← a S would look like: subj + NP + tabe

What do the verbs age ‘give’ & ok ‘put’ subcategorize for, respectively?

age ‘give’: [NP NP ___]
ok ‘put’: [PP NP ___]

What do the following verbs subcategorize for?

a. yom ‘read’:
b. ku ‘come’:
c. mat ‘wait’:
d. okur ‘send’:
e. tetsudaw ‘help’:
f. su- ‘do’:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Subcategorization_frame

Subcategorization frames … are believed to be listed as LEXICAL information (that is, …as part of a speaker's knowledge of the word in the vocabulary of the language).
1.6. Structural Relations

Describe the relationships among A-G.

A is a ‘mother’ to B & C.
B & C are ‘daughters’ to A.
B & C are ‘sisters’ to each other.
D & E are ‘sisters’ to each other.
F & G are ‘sisters’ to each other.
B is a ‘mother’ to ____
C is a ‘mother’ to ____
F & G are ‘daughters’ to ____
Are E and F ‘sisters’? ____
Are F and G ‘sisters’? ____

X DOMINATES Y if there is a uniformly downward path from X at a higher level to Y at a lower level. = Just go down, never up!

What does A dominate?
⇒ B, C, D, E, F, & G.


What does C dominate? ⇒

X IMMEDIATELY dominates Y if X dominates Y and they are apart by just ONE hierarchical level.

Does A immediately dominate B? ⇒ Yes.
Does A immediately dominate C? ⇒ Yes.
Does A immediately dominate D? ⇒ No.
Does A immediately dominate E, F, or G? ⇒ No.

What does C immediately dominate? ⇒ ____

'subject' = the NP immediately dominated by an S.
'direct object' =

X c-commands Y if the first node above X (also) dominates Y, and X does not dominate Y. = Go one level UP (to a branching node), then DOWN!

F c-commands G, H, & I.
G c-commands F, but not H, I, D, or E.
C c-commands ________.
D c-commands ________.
I c-commands ________.
2. Transformational rules

Transformational rules ‘map’ one PS tree to another.

Transformational rules derive a new S from a related one

\[ \text{Active S: Mary invited John to the party.} \]
\[ \text{Passive S: John was invited to the party by Mary.} \]

\[ \text{Active S \rightarrow (passivization rule) \rightarrow Passive S} \]

2.1. Yes-No Questions

DS (deep structure, d-structure): e.g. John should leave.

SS (surface structure, s-structure): e.g. Should John leave?

Is a transformational rule necessary in the formation of interrogative Ss in JPN (like the rule (39), p. 225 for English)?

\[ \rightarrow \text{No.} \]

Then how do you generate an interrogative S in JPN?

\[ \rightarrow \text{In the PS rules: } S' \rightarrow S \text{ COMP} \]

Cf. COMP: \( \text{ka, ne, yo, to, …} \)

2.2. Wh-movement

Phrase structure rules in English (crude kind here)

\[ \begin{align*}
S' & \rightarrow \text{COMP } S \\
S & \rightarrow \text{NP } \text{AUX } \text{VP} \\
\text{VP} & \rightarrow V (NP) (NP) \\
\text{PP} & \rightarrow P \text{ NP}
\end{align*} \]

Wh-movement: Move a wh-phrase into the COMP position.

What happens when an element is moved from one location to another?

\[ \rightarrow \text{It leaves a } \text{trace } t. \]

Cf. p. (45)-(46), p. 227

REVIEW:

(18a) H-ga [NP [S' [S T-ga \( t_i \) tsukut-ta] [COMP ⊗]] sushi\(_i\)-o] tabe-ta

We will posit trace whenever a constituent is moved by a movement rule.

How are wh-Qs formed in JPN?

\[ \rightarrow \text{Replace an NP with an interrogative word at the same position, and add the question particle } \text{ka at the end of the S.} \]

(i.e. no obvious movement transformation, like the one in Eng.)

Multiple wh-Qs like (50f) can freely be generated in JPN.
3. Word Order and Scrambling

3.1. Scrambling Phenomenon

What is “SCRAMBLING”?
→ A rule by which a constituent is MOVED to a noncanonical location. Cf. canonical order in JPN = SOV

NOTE: “In JPN, the word order is relatively free. This is ostensibly because the Case particles (ga, o, ni, no, wa) express the function of the accompanying NP in a S, wherever they may be” (p. 230). ← BUT consider the following. (MEH)

Aitsu-Ø Mari-chan-Ø yonda-no?   (ambiguous)
he/him Mari invited-Ø
(1) ‘Did he invite Mari?’
(2) ‘Did Mari invite him?’ (i.e., scrambled S)

Assumption: ALL languages have a Case system, regardless of whether individual Cases (e.g. Nom, Acc, Dat, Gen) are overtly manifested.
↓
Even languages that lack overt Case marking have Cases abstractly.

Languages (like JPN) w/ overt Case marking are more likely to display scrambling than languages w/o it.

3.2. Configurationality

(a) JPN as a configurational lang.

(b) JPN as a non-configurational lang.

(i.e. ‘flatter’ structure)

Phrase structure for a non-configurational language:
X’ → X* X
X = head (e.g. N, V, A, P)
X* = phrase (e.g. NP, VP, AP, PP)
X* = any number of X (0, 1, 2, 3...)

What does the tree structure of the following S look like in (b) analysis? How about in (a) analysis?
H-ga hon-o katta. ‘H bought a book.’

[Do NOT worry about (b) analysis!]

H-ga hon-o katta
Arguments for positing a VP in JPN
(= for regarding JPN as a CONFIGURATIONAL language):

(1) In almost all languages, the SO order is more fundamental than is the OS order ('marked'); i.e. SO > OS
(2) In formal JPN speech and in writing, SO > OS.
(3) JPN speakers intuitively feel SO is more basic than is OS.
(4) The configurational analysis reflects the fact that subject is more prominent than is object. (MEH)

Scrambling
DS: [s Taroo-ga [vp sushi-o tabeta]]. ‘Taro ate sushi.’
SS: [s sushi-o [s Taroo-ga [vp t tabeta]]].

Under the configurational analysis of JPN:
(1) There is a VP node in JPN.
(2) Subject and object have different hierarchical status.
(3) Scrambling is an instance of a movement rule that fronts a constituent and leaves a trace behind.