1. Introduction

(1) Hale’s (1982) configurationality parameter:
The phrase structure in non-configurational languages is not projected from the lexicon. Non-configurational languages are not subject to the Projection Principle.

(2) a. “free” word-order
   b. complex verb-words or verb-cum-Aux systems
   c. free or frequent “pronoun drop”

(3) Miyagawa’s (1996) hypothesis:
Japanese phrase structure is non-configurational within VP.

(4) Kuroda’s (1988) agreement parameter:
Agreement is obligatory and 1-1 in English, but is optional and can be X-1 in Japanese.

(5) Derivational configurationality parameter:
Selectional relation (broadly construed to include feature-checking relation) is a necessary condition for Merge in English-type languages, but not in Japanese-type languages.

(6) a. Merge applies only to satisfy selectional requirements. (Merge implies selection.)
b. Selectional requirements must be satisfied by the application of Merge.
   (Selection implies Merge.)

(7) a. scrambling
   b. complex predicates (the light verb construction)
   c. NP-ellipsis
2. Scrambling

(8) Japanese/Korean scrambling is an instance of “pure Merge.”

(9) a. [Yamada-ga sono hon-o yonda] (koto)
-NOM that book-ACC read fact

‘Yamada read that book.’

b. [Sono hon-oj [Yamada-ga ₁₁ yonda]] (koto)
that book-ACC -NOM read fact

‘That book, Yamada read ₁₁’

(10) a. [Tanaka-ga [Yamada-ga sono hon-o yonda to] omotteiru] (koto)
-NOM -NOM that book-ACC read that think fact

‘Tanaka thinks that Yamada read that book.’

b. [Sono hon-oj [Tanaka-ga [Yamada-ga ₁₁ yonda to] omotteiru]] (koto)
that book-ACC -NOM -NOM read that think fact

‘That book, Tanaka thinks that Yamada read ₁₁’

2.1. Scrambling is not Topicalization

(11) What₃ did John buy ₃ : [For which x: x a thing] John bought x

(12) That book₃, Mary read ₃ : [For x: x = that book] Mary read x

(13) a. Who₃ ₃ said that John bought that book
b. Who₃ ₃ said that that book₃, John bought ₃

(14) a. Who₃ ₃ said that John bought which book
b. *Who₃ ₃ said that which book₃, John bought ₃

(15) A Wh-phrase cannot be interpreted as a topic.
(16) a. Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga dono hon -o katta to] omotteiru no
    -TOP -NOM which book-ACC bought that think Q

    ‘[Q [Taroo think that Hanako bought which book]]’

    b. Taroo-wa [dono hon -oî Hanako-ga ōtî katta to] omotteiru no
    -TOP which book-ACC -NOM bought that think Q

    ‘[Q [Taroo think that which book, Hanako bought ōtî]]’

(17) Sono hon -waj Taroo-ga eî katta no
    that book-TOP -NOM bought Q

    ‘As for that book, did Taroo buy it’

(18) a. Taroo-ga dono hon -o katta no
    -NOM which book-ACC bought Q

    ‘Taroo bought which book’

    b. Dono hon -oî Taroo-ga ōtî katta no
    which book-ACC -NOM bought Q

    c. *Dono hon -waj Taroo-ga eî katta no
    which book-TOP -NOM bought Q

2.2. Radical Reconstruction

(19) *John asked who to find out [whatî [Mary bought ōtî]]

(20) *Taroo-ga dare-ni [Hanako-ga nani -o katta ka] tazuneta (koto)
    -NOM who-to -NOM what-ACC bought Q asked fact

    ‘(the fact that) Taroo asked who [Q Hanako bought what]’

(21) A Wh-phrase can only take scope at a CP that contains it.
(22) a. Who_t knows [[which picture of whom]j Bill bought tj]
    (van Riemsdijk and Williams 1981)

    b. ??[Which picture of whom]j does John know [who_t bought tj]

(23) a. \[_{TP}\text{Taro} - {CP}_{TP}\text{Hanako} - {CP}_{CP}\text{book} - \text{read} - \text{want-to-know fact}\]

    ‘(the fact that) Taro wants to know [Q Hanako read which book]’

    b. ??[_{TP}\text{book} - \text{read} - \text{want-to-know fact}]

(24) a. \[\begin{align*}
    &_{TP}\text{Taro} - {CP}_{TP}\text{book} - \text{read} - \text{want-to-know fact} \\
    &\text{omotei} - {CP}_{CP}\text{Hanako} - {CP}_{TP}\text{book} - \text{read} - \text{want-to-know fact} \\
    &\text{think} - \text{want-to-know fact}
\end{align*}\]

    ‘Taro wants to know [Q everyone thinks that Mary read which book]’

    b. ??[\begin{align*}
    &{CP}\text{book} - \text{read} - \text{want-to-know fact} \\
    &\text{omotei} - {CP}_{CP}\text{Hanako} - {CP}_{TP}\text{book} - \text{read} - \text{want-to-know fact} \\
    &\text{think} - \text{want-to-know fact}
\end{align*}\]

    ‘[That Hanako read which book], Taro wants to know [Q everyone thinks ti]’

(25) Scrambling is not represented at LF. (It does not form an operator-variable chain.)
(26) a. ye baat [kii raam jaanna caahtaa hE [kii siitaa-ne laibreri-se kOnsi kitaab this talk that Ram to know wants is that Sita -erg library -from which book
nikaalii]]
took-out

‘the fact that Ram wants to know which book Sita took out from the library’

b. *ye baat [kii kOnsi kitaabij raam jaanna caahtaa hE [kii siitaa-ne laibreri-se this talk that which book Ram to know wants is that Sita -erg library -from

\[t_i\] nikaalii]]
took-out (Ayesha Kidwai, p.c.)

(27) a. There is no operator feature that triggers Japanese/Korean scrambling.

b. This confirms Hale’s (1982) assumption that scrambling does not affect the interpretation.


(29) a. \([_{CP}.XP[_{C}.C.TP]]\) b. \([_{TP}.XP[_{T}.T.vP]]\)

(30) \([_{TP}.XP[_{T}.NP[_{T}.T.vP]]]\)

(31) Scrambling involves Merge without selection.

3. The Light Verb Construction

(32) The syntax-semantics mismatch is dissolved by covert head-movement.
(Saito and Hoshi 2000)

(33) Hanako-ga Taroo-ni /-e [\[NP.\text{toti\,-no\,zyooto}\]-o sita (= su + ta (past))
-NOM -DAT/-to land-GEN giving -ACC did

‘Hanako gave a piece of land to Taroo.’ (Grimshaw and Mester 1988)
(34) Hanako-ga [np,(suugaku-no) syukudai]-o sita
       -NOM math -GEN homework-ACC did

   ‘Hanako did the (math) homework.’ (the main verb su)

3.1. An Argument for a Real Syntax-Semantics Mismatch  (Sells 1988)

(35)a. Taroo-ga hasiru
       -NOM run

   ‘Taroo runs.’

   b. Hanako-ga [Taroo-ni/-o hasir]-aseru
       -NOM -DAT/-ACC run -make

   ‘Hanako makes Taroo run.’

(36)a. Taroo-ga hon -o yomu
       -NOM book-ACC read

   ‘Taroo reads a book.’

   b. Hanako-ga [John-ni/*-o hon -o yom]-aseru
       -NOM -DAT/ -ACC book-ACC read -make

   ‘Hanako makes Taroo read a book.’

(37)a. Taroo-ga hamabe-o hasiru
       -NOM beach -ACC run

   ‘Taroo runs on the beach.’

   b. Hanako-ga [Taroo-ni/*-o hamabe-o hasir]-aseru
       -NOM -DAT/-ACC beach -ACC run -make

   ‘Hanako makes Taroo run on the beach.’
(38) A sentence with two accusative argument NPs is hopeless, but it is only marginal when one of the accusative NPs is a non-argument.

(39) a.??Honda-ga ohaio-de akoo-do-o [NP seisan] -o site -iru
-NOM Ohio -in -ACC production-ACC doing-is

‘Honda is producing Accords in Ohio.’

b.??Hanako-ga Taroo-ni /-e toti -o [NP zyooto]-o sita
-NOM -DAT/-to land-ACC giving -ACC did

‘Hanako gave a piece of land to Taroo.’

(40) The second accusative NP in (38) must be a non-argument. – It is a predicate.

(41) Japanese phrase structure does not necessarily reflect the predicate-arguments structure.

3.2. The Covert Head-movement Analysis

(42) [500x500]

(43) The weak “double-o effect” disappears when one of the accusative NPs is dislocated.
(44) a. \*_{CP}_Op_{i} [_{TP}_Hanako-ga Taroo-o \_i yom-aseta] no] -wa hon -o_{i} da
   -NOM -ACC read-made COMP-TOP book-ACC is

   ‘It is a book that Hanako made Taroo read.’ (cf. (36b))

   b. \*_{CP}_Op_{i} [_{TP}_Hanako-ga \_i hon -\_o yom-aseta] no] -wa John-o_{i} da
      -NOM book-ACC read-made COMP-TOP -ACC is

   ‘It is Taroo that Hanako made read a book.’

(45) a. \_i Op_{i} [_{TP}_Hanako-ga Taroo-o \_i hasir-aseta] no] -wa hamabe-o_{i} da
      -NOM -ACC run -made COMP-TOP beach -ACC is

   ‘It is on the beach that Hanako made Taroo run.’ (cf. (37b))

   b. \_i Op_{i} [_{TP}_Hanako-ga \_i hamebe-o hasir-aseta] no] -wa Taroo-o_{i} da
      -NOM beach -ACC run -made COMP-TOP -ACC is

   ‘It is Taroo who Hanako made run on the beach.’

(46) a. \_i Op_{i} [_{TP}_Hanako-ga Taroo-ni /-e \_i zyooto-o sita] no] -wa toti -o_{i} da
      -NOM -DAT/-to giving -ACC did COMP-TOP land-ACC is

   ‘It is a piece of land that Hanako gave to Taroo.’ (cf. (39b))

   b. \*_{CP}_Op_{i} [_{TP}_Hanako-ga Taroo-ni /-e toti -\_o \_i sita] no] -wa zyooto-o_{i} da
      -NOM -DAT/-to land-ACC did COMP-TOP giving -ACC is

   ‘Lit. It is giving that Hanako did a piece of land to Taroo’

(47) The ungrammaticality of (46b) is predicted by the covert head-movement analysis.

(48) The analysis implies that Merge can apply in the absence of selectional relation in
    Japanese. The goal argument Taroo-ni in (42), for example, is merged into a position
    where it is not selected.

(49) Japanese has scrambling and the light verb construction because Merge does not imply
    Selection.
4. Further Extension to Argument Ellipsis

(50) a. Taroo-wa sono hon -o mottekimasita ka
   -TOP that book-ACC brought Q
   ‘Did Taroo bring the book?’

   b. Hai, e e mottekimasita
      yes brought
      ‘Yes, he brought it.’

(51) Kuroda 1965: Japanese has phonetically empty pronouns.

4.1. Kim’s 1999 Argument for NP Ellipsis

(52) Otani and Whitman's 1991 VP-deletion analysis

   TP
   /\  
  /   
TP   T'
  /   /
NP   V+T
     /\v
    /   
   NP   tv

(53) John-wa zibun-no tegami-o suteta; Mary-mo e suteta
   -TOP self -GEN letter -ACC discarded -also discarded
   ‘John threw out his letter, and Mary did too.’

   a. Mary threw out his (John's) letter, too. (strict reading)
   b. Mary threw out her (Mary's) letter, too. (sloppy reading)

(54) Peter likes his picture, and Joan likes it too.

   a. Joan likes his (Peter's) picture, too. (strict reading)
   b. *Joan likes her (Joan's) picture, too. (sloppy reading)
(55) Peter likes his picture, and Joan does too.
    a. Joan likes his (Peter's) picture, too. (strict reading)
    b. Joan likes her (Joan's) picture, too. (sloppy reading)

(56) Kim’s 1999 argument ellipsis hypothesis (See also Oku 1998.)

(57) a. Mike-nun James-lul tali-lul ketechassta
     -TOP -ACC leg-ACC kicked
     ‘Mike kicked James on the leg.’
    b. *Mike-nun tali-lul James-lul ketechassta

(58) a. Jerry-nun caki-uy ai -lul phal-ul ttayliessta
     -TOP self-GEN child-ACC arm-ACC hit
     ‘Jerry hit his child on the arm.’
    b. Kulena Sally-nun e tali-lul ttayliessta
     but -TOP leg -ACC hit
     i) ‘Sally hit his (Jerry's) child on the leg.’ (strict reading)
     ii) ‘Sally his her (Sally's) child on the leg.’ (sloppy reading)

(59)
```
      TP
     /   \
NP   T'
    /  \
  VP   T
 /    \
NP   V'
    /  \
   NP  V
```

(60) Null objects must result from deletion, but not VP-deletion. They involve NP-ellipsis. The analysis extends to the Chinese data discussed in Xu 1986 and Huang 1987.
(61) Zhangsan da le e
    hit Perf

   a. *‘Zhangsan hit himself.’
   b. ‘Zhangsan hit someone else.’

(62) Meigeren piping le ziji ma? Bu, John mei piping le e
    everyone criticize Perf self Q no not criticize Perf

    ‘Did everyone criticize himself? No, John did not criticize himself.’

(63) Then, why is it that Chinese/Japanese/Korean allow NP ellipsis and English does not?

(64) The covert head-movement analysis of the light verb construction suggests that selectional requirements can be satisfied by means other than Merge in Japanese.

4.2. A Restatement of Oku’s 1998 Analysis

(65) Boskovic and Takahashi’s 1998 analysis of Japanese scrambling:
    a) Scrambled phrases are directly merged at their surface positions and then undergo
       covert lowering to pick up their θ-roles.
    b) θ-features are weak in Japanese. English does not have scrambling because the feature
       is strong in the language.
    (cf. Kitagawa 1990)

(66) Oku’s 1998 account for argument ellipsis:
    Since θ-features are weak in Japanese, selectional requirements of verbs can be satisfied
    by the LF copying of arguments. Hence, a unified account for “free word-order” and “free
    or frequent pronoun drop” is achieved.

(67) In Japanese, selectional requirement can be satisfied by means other than Merge: covert
    head-movement in the case of the light verb construction and LF copying in the case of
    argument ellipsis.
5. Conclusion

(68) a. If Merge (pure Merge or Merge as part of Move) applies to α and β, there is a selectional relation between α and β.  
(Merge --&gt; selection)

b. If there is a selection relation between α and β, Merge applies to α and β.  
(selection --&gt; Merge)

(69) Chinese is subject to (66a), and English is subject to both (66a) and (66b).

(70) a. Since Chinese is not subject to (66b), it can have argument ellipsis.  
(Another possibly relevant factor is the lack of agreement.)

b. Since Japanese is not subject to (66a-b), it can have scrambling, the light verb construction and argument ellipsis.

(71) This is a derivational restatement of Hale’s original configurationality parameter that incorporates Kuroda’s parameterization on agreement.

APPENDIX: SYNTACTIC ANALYTICITY AND COMPLEX PREDICATES

1. Introduction

Huang 2005: 1. The extensive use of light verb constructions (p.3)  
2. The absence of “virus” on functional heads (p.5)

Are the “light verbs” functional heads?

Chinese and Japanese exhibit productive complex predicate formation in syntax.

(73) a. Baoyu xia -shu -le qi  
play-lose-asp chess

‘Baoyu played chess (and as a result he) lost it’
b. Daiyu ku -zou -le henduo keren
cry-leave-asp many guest

‘Daiyu cried (so much that) many guests left’
(similar to ‘run the pavement thin’ in English)

(74) a. Taroo-ga me-o naki-harasita
-NOM eye-ACC cry -made swollen

‘Taroo cried, and as a result, made his eyes swollen’

b. Hanako-ga rosiago-o /-ga yom-eru
-NOM Russian-ACC/-NOM read-can

‘Hanako can read Russian’

The light verb constructions seem to involve covert complex predicate formation.

2. The Japanese Light Verb Construction (Saito and Hoshi 2000)

Refer to the main text.

3. The Edo Resultative Serial Verb Construction (Baker and Stewart 1999, Saito 2001)

(75) Òzó ghá gbè éwé wù
Ozo FUT hit goat die

‘Ozo will strike the goat dead’

(76) a. Òzó tóbórè ghá gié!gié lé èvbäré
Ozo by self FUT quickly cook food

‘Ozo by himself will quickly cook the food’

b. Òzó ghá (gié!gié) tóbórè lé èvbäré
Ozo FUT quickly by self cook food
c. Ḍozó miánmián yá tòbórè lé èvbàrè
Ozo forgot to by self cook food

‘Ozo forgot to cook the food by himself’

(78) *Ọzó sùá ògó dé tòbórè
Ozo push bottle fall by self

‘Ozo pushed the bottle down by itself’

(79) Úyi dê tòbórè
Uyi fall by self

‘Uyi fell by himself’

4. The English Resultatives (Carrier and Randall 1992)

(80) a. She painted the barn red
    b. The kids laughed themselves sick

(81) a. How flat did they hammer the metal
    b. How red did she paint the barn ... No covert incorporation (cf. (46b))

(82) NP-movement like Japanese ni-direct passives. (cf. Whitman 2001)

(83) Edo vs. English: covert head movement vs. overt NP movement

(84) *L – F – L (cf. Li 1990)

(85) a. How proud of himself does John think Bill is
    b. How proud of himself does John consider Bill (cf. Huang 1993)

5. Tentative Conclusions

(86) Chinese/Edo/Japanese vs. English

(87) English verbs (and adjectives) need to be associated with functional heads.
(88) Chinese/Edo/Japanese verbs (and adjectives) are not subject to this requirement and hence, V-V incorporation (overt or covert) is possible in these languages.
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