Handout 2: Syntactic Analyticity and the Other End of the Parameter
C.-T. James Huang

1. Interim summary:

Analyticity vs. synthesis may be seen at 3 different levels:
- Lexical categories (as shown in (1.1))
- Functional categories (as shown in (1.2))
- Argument structure (as in (1.3), to be illustrated below)

1.1. Analyticity and Synthesis of Lexical Categories

A. The extensive use of light verb constructions (rather than incorporated verbs)
B. Compound and complex predicates (phrasal predicates) rather than simplex verbs
C. No simplex accomplishment verbs; simplex action verbs are atelic verbs
   (atelic = unbounded, mass; telic = bounded, count)
D. Classifiers [ = light nouns], i.e., N = mass N
E. Localizers [= light nouns], i.e., N = normally without [+place] feature
   □ Chinese as a Davidsonian language par excellence

1.1. The Analyticity and Synthesis of Functional Categories

A. The distribution of nobody and other negative NPs
B. Reciprocal each other
C. Binominal each
D. Word Order patterns (verb-late vs. verb-early)
E. Wh-movement vs. wh-in-situ
F. What-the-hell vs. daodi … wh-word
G. Agreement, tense, case, plural morphology, etc.
   □ Chinese as a healthy, ‘virus-free’ language

1.3. The Analyticity and Synthesis of Argument Structure

A. Robust syntax-semantics mismatches I & II
B. Unselectiveness of subjects and objects
C. Rusultatives, the DOR, and causativization of the unergative

2. Syntax-Semantics Mismatches I: Possessive Agent Construction

2.1. Fact:

(1)  a. 他去他的北京，我回我的上海。
    ta qu ta-de Beijing, wo hui wo-de Shanghai
    he go his Beijing, wo return my Shanghai
    ‘He went on with his going to Beijing, and I went on with my returning
to Shanghai.’
b. 你靜你的坐，他示他的威。
   ni jing ni-de zuo, ta shi ta-de wei
   you quiet your sit, he demon- his –strate (shi-wei = demonstrate)
   ‘You sat in, and he demonstrated.’ (You joined a sit-in, he went to a rally.)

More examples:
c. 他念他的書，我睡我的覺。
d. 你批你的林，我尚我的孔。
e. 你走你的陽關道，我過我的獨木橋。

(2) a. 他哭他的，我笑我的
   ta ku ta-de, wo xiao wo-de
   he cried his, I laughed mine.
   ‘He goes on crying and I go on laughing.’

More examples:
b. 快快走你的吧！
c. 你們吃你們的，別等我。
d. 去你的！

2.1. Analysis:

(3)
(4) a. 你 DO 你的 哭
   ni DO [GP ni-de [VP ku]]
   you ___ your cry  (merged underlying structure)

b. ni ku, ni-de ti
   you cry your t.

2.3. Some independent evidence

A: “Visible movement”:

(5) a. 他搞他的革新，你搞你的复古  （輕動詞 = 搞）
   ta gao ta-de gexin, ni gao ni-de fugu.  (gao = overt light verb)
   he do his innovate you do your renaissance
   He did his innovation, and you did your renaissance.

b. 他革他的新，你復你的古  （詞性補入輕動詞位置）
   ta ge ta-de xin, ni fu ni-de gu.
   he ge- his -xin you fu- your -gu.
   (ge-xin 'to innovate', fu-gu 'to revive')
   literally: ‘He inno- his –vate, you re- your –vive’

B: Argument from the activity-state contrast:

(6) 他喜歡他的書，我喜歡我的筆。
   ta xihuan ta de shu, wo xihuan wo de bit.
   He likes his books, and I like my pen.
   • There is no syntax-semantics mismatch. Ta-de and wo-de are true possessors of
   the books and pens. Why?

← Activity, but not State, involves V-to-(N-to)-to-DO movement

C. Argument from idiom chunks:

(7) a. John took advantage of Bill.
   b. *John took this advantage of Bill.
   c. *Which advantage did John take of Bill?
   d. *Advantage, John took of Bill.

(8) a. 你怎麼老是跟他幽這個默？
    ni zemme laoshi gen ta yu zhe-ge mo?
    You why always with him hu- this -mour?
    ‘Why do you always tease him this way? “hu- this –mour with him”
b. 你這個默幽得真不是時候。
   ni zhe-ge mo, yu de zhen bu shi shihou
   you this –mourn, hu- de really not be time
   ‘This –mourn of yours, you really hu-ed at the wrong time.’

c. 牛，他倒是不吹的。
   niu, ta daoshi bu chui de.
   ‘Cow, he nevertheless does not blow.’ (He does not bluff.)

→ The referentiality of idiom chunks is only apparent; it is the whole event that is referential.

D: Argument from classifier selection:

(9) 這個牛，我覺得你是吹得太過火了。
    zhe-ge niu, wo juede ni shi chui de tai guohuo le.
    ‘This cow, I feel you really have too much overblown.’
    (You have bluffed way too much this time.)

(10) *這頭牛，我覺得你是吹得太過火了。
     zhe-tou niu, wo juede ni shi chui de tai guohuo le.
     ‘This cow, I feel you really have too much overblown.’
     (You have bluffed way too much this time.)

→ The classifier selects an event, not a cow! In (9), we have topicalized an event, which is, further, definite.

Possible homework: discuss (9-10) and indicate how exactly (9) should be derived, discuss any technical questions that may or may not arise. (1-3 pages!)

3. Syntax-Semantics Mismatches II: Event Quantification

3.1. Fact:

(11) ta kan shu kan-le san tian.
    he read book read-Perf three day
    He read (books) for three days.

(12) ta chang ge chang-le liang ci.
    he sing song sing-Perf two times
    He sang (songs) twice.
(13) 他看了三天（的）书
    ta kan-le san tian de shu.
    he read-Perf three day book
    He read (books) for three days.

(14) 他唱了两次歌
    ta chang-le liang ci ge.
    he sing-Perf two time song
    He sang twice.

(15) 他连一天（的）书都没看过
    ta lian yi tian (de) shu dou mei kan.
    he even one day (of) book all not read
    He did not even for one day read a book.

(16) 他连一次歌都没唱过
    ta lian yi ci ge dou mei chang-guo
    he even one time song all not sing-Exp
    He did not even sing once.

  → yi tian shu ‘one-day-book’ and yi ci ge ‘one-time-song’ are constituents

(17) 他练了三次钢琴、两次吉他
    ta lian-le san ci gangqin, liang ci jita.
    he practiced thrice piano, twice guitar.
    He practiced the piano three times and the guitar 2 times.

(18) 他教了三年英文、两年数学
    ta jiao-le san nian Yingwen, liang nian shuxue.
    he taught 3 years English  2 years math
    He taught English for 3 years and math for 2 years.

  → ‘3 time piano’ and ‘2 years’ English’ are constituents.

(19) 他两次北京和三次上海都去了很久。
    ta liang ci Beijing he san ci Shanghai dou qu le hen jiu.
    he two time Beijing and 3 time Shanghai dou go Perf very long
    Literally: he two-time Beijing and 3-time Shanghai both went a long time.

  → liang ci Beijing ‘two time Beijing’ and san ci Shanghai ‘three time Shanghai’ are constituents
3.1. Analysis

(20)  

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V' } \\
\text{V} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{DO} \\
\text{G'} \\
\text{G} \\
\text{VP} \\
\end{array}
\]

他 'he'  

ta ‘he’  

\[\text{三天的} \quad 3 \text{ days’} \]

三 'three'  

\[\text{kan ‘read’} \quad \text{shu ‘book’} \]

Discussion of 2-3:

- Consequence: There is no syntax-semantics mismatches. The possessives and event quantifiers do not directly modify objects, but (nominalized) events.
- Typological question of our main concern: why Chinese, but not, say, English?
- Claim: 2-3 are again manifestations of high analyticity of Modern Chinese
- But isn’t this a contradiction? (Chinese has the proposed movement, English does not.)
- Answer: No
  - These are recent innovations.
  - Because Chinese is analytic, they occur in the syntax, hence ‘visible’ movement across adjuncts, etc. Because English is (relatively) synthetic, the composition of an action verb (DO + Root) is carried out in L-syntax (Hale and Keyser). No head-movement to DO in S-syntax (perhaps, VP movement, according to recent claims about the (non)existence of head movement).
  - Possibly also: the nature of ‘gerund’ in Chinese being ‘lexical’ (thus side-stepping Yafei Li’s *L-F-L).

⇒ BigWiggle (S-syntax movement) vs. Small Wiggle (L-syntax movement). 😊

BTW: 09:30 pm tonight at Sala de Puerto Rico!
4. Unselectiveness of Subjects and Objects (Lin 2001)

(21) Unselectiveness of subject in Mandarin Chinese

a. Laozhang kai-le yi-liang tanke-che.  
   p.n. drive-Perf one-Cl tank  
   'Laozheng drove a tank.'

   expressway-on drive-Dur one-line tank  
   'There is a line of tanks on the expressway.'

c. Zhe-liang po-che kai-de wo xia-si le.  
   this-Cl broken-car drive-Ext I scare-dead Prt  
   'Driving this broken car made me scared to death.'

(22) Unselectiveness of object in Mandarin Chinese

- 吃牛肉麵  chi niurou mian ‘eat beef noodles’ (Theme/patient)
- 吃大碗  chi da wan ‘eat big bowl’ (Instrument)
- 吃下午  chi xiawu ‘eat the afternoon’ (Time)
- 吃館子  chi guanzi ‘eat restaurant’ (Location)
- 吃頭疼  chi touteng ‘eat headache’ (Reason)

(23) More examples of unselectiveness of the object:

a. 他開了一輛坦克車
   ta kai-le yi-liang tankeche  
   ‘He drove a tanker.’

b. 他開左邊，我開右邊
   ta kai zuobian, wo kai youbian  
   ‘He drives the left side, I drive the right side.’

c. 他開白天，我開晚上
   ta kai baitian, wo kai wanshang  
   ‘He drive the daylight, I drive the night.’

d. 他開駕照，我開身分證
   ta kai jiazhao, wo kai shenfenzheng.  
   ‘He drives the driver’s license, I drive the ID card’
e. 我開好玩
wo kai hao wan
‘I drive fun.’

(24) a. qie zhe-ba dao 切這把刀
cut this-Cl knife
'use this knife to cut'

b. 

```
  VP
   \  / \
  V DO NP V'
   \    / \
  zhe-ba dao V USE V
       \      \    
        qie USE qie
          'cut'
```

c. 

```
  VP
   \  / \
  V DO NP V'
   \    / \
  USE qie USE USE
               zhe-ba dao
            \    \    
             t    t
```

**Question:** why can’t you derive Q2 from Q1 below:

Q1: ta yong zhe-ba dao qie cai. He use this knife to cut vegetables.
Q2: ta USE zhe-ba dao qie cai. USE = [e]
Q3: *ta qie zhe-ba dao t cai. He cut, this knife, vegetables. (result of V-to-USE)

**Answer:** *Case theory and repair by Asterisectomy* (cf. Merchant and Lasnik, repair by deletion)

Q3: ta qie, zhe-ba dao t, *cai. (cai ‘vegetable’ is ruled out by Case Filter)
Q4: ta qie, zhe-ba dao t. (the sentence is cured by Asterisectomy)
The typological question: Why Chinese, why not English, for example.
Lin’s proposal:

- In Chinese: the main verbs (i.e., roots) do not select arguments (subject or object), it is the light verbs above them that do the work. Similar terms: Root P, Encyclopedia item, etc.

- I.e., a Chinese verb enters into syntactic computation as a ‘pure’ verb with no argument structure requirement. Therefore it can occur with any argument of any light verb that it combines with in syntax.

- An English verb enters into syntax already with a full argument structure (it already has the features represented by \{1, 2, 3\}, \{Agent, theme, location\}, etc., as a result of L-syntax computation (conflation). These features need to be ‘checked off’ at appropriate places in S-syntax, and they limit the locations where a verb can move to. [Assume that (lexical-structure) conflation structures do not include adjuncts and modifiers.] (cf. Borer 2005; & DM. There is clearly some convergence here, cf. Huang 1991, Lin 1999, etc., though our interest in characterizing the typological differences makes it incompatible with DM.)
  - English: put <Subject, Object, Location>
  - Japanese: oku <Object, Location>
  - Mandarin: fang < >

- Hence Chinese verbs are more analytic and English verbs are more synthetic. So the existence of visible (and apparent) syntax-semantics mismatches is again to be seen as a reflection of the relative syntactic analyticity of Chinese over English. (Argument structure features—as grammatical (i.e., syntactic, formal, not just conceptual) features—count toward the degree of synthesis.)

- Again, Chinese is Big Wiggle and English, Small Wiggle, w.r.t. V-movement.

Further discussion:

- Apparent paradox: The facts in (21-23) are reminiscent of Archaic Chinese with its versatile simplex verbs. (See the examples under Section 3.1 of Handout 1.) How can analytic languages do the same thing?

- Answer: the facts in AC arise because AC was highly synthetic (had a rich morphology, viz. L-syntax), but the facts in (21-23) arise in Modern Chinese arise because it has no (or extremely little) L-syntax.

- AC is small wiggle, MnC is big wiggle, then.

Therefore something happens under two different extremes: when there a lot of ‘viruses’, or none at all.
This is also the case with Pro Drop, Free Word Order, as it has been or will be shown.
5. Resultatives and the DOR: Another Case of Argument-Structure Analyticity

(31) The **DOR**: In a resultative construction, the result is predicated on an object, not the subject (Simpson 1983, Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995). Hence resultatives are not grammatical with intransitives unless a dummy object is provided as in (33d-f).

(32) a. John hammered the metal flat.
   b. *John hammered the metal tired (*on the resultative reading)

(33) a. *John laughed silly.
   b. *Mary ran tired.
   c. *Bill cried sad.
   d. John laughed himself silly.
   e. Mary ran herself tired.
   f. Bill cried himself sad.

(34) a. The metal \(_i\) was hammered \(_t\) flat.
   b. The garage door \(_i\) rumbles \(_t\) open
   c. The river \(_i\) froze \(_t\) solid.

Rappaport Hovav & Levin (2001):
(35) a. The wise men followed the star out of Bethlehem.
   b. The sailors managed to catch a breeze and ride it clear of the rocks.
   c. John danced mazurkas across the room.
   d. The children played leapfrog across the park.

Relevant data from Dutch (from Hoekstra, cited in Lisa Cheng’s handout for LSA.136):

D: a. … dat het vliegtuig (zich) te pletter vloog
   That the airplane (itself) to pieces flew
   ‘that the airplane flew (itself) to pieces.

b. … dat het vliegtuig (*zich) te pletter is gevlogen. (be as auxiliary)
   that the airplane (*itself) to pieces is flown
   ‘that the airplane has (lit. is) flown (*itself) to pieces.’
   [fly = unaccusative]

c. … dat het vliegtuig *(zich) te pletter heft gevlogen. (have as auxiliary)
   that the airplane *(itself) to pieces has flown
   ‘that the airplane has flown *(itself) to pieces.’
   [fly = unergative]

→ fly can be unaccusative or unergative.
5.1. The DOR and Mandarin Resultatives

(36)  a. 張三踢破了皮球。
Zhangsan tipo-le piqiu
Zhangsan kicked-broken-Perf ball

□□ 孟姜女哭倒了萬里長城。
Mengjiangnü ku-dao-le wanly-changcheng.
Mengjiangnü cry-fall-Perf Great.Wall
Mengjiangnü cried the Great Wall to ruins.

□□ 李四碰傷了張三。
Lisi peng-shang-le Zhangsan
Lisi bump-injured-Perf Zhangsan
Lisi bumped-insured Zhangsan.

(37) Potential counterexamples for the DOR

a. 張三騎累了馬了。 (ambiguous)
   Zhangsan qi-lei-le ma le.
   Zhangsan ride-tired-Perf horse Inc
   i. Zhangsan rode the horse tired.
   ii. Zhangsan rode a horse and got tired.

b. 吃飽了飯、下輸了棋、選敗了總統、看累了報紙。(主語取向)
   chi-bao-le fan, xia-shu-le qi, xuan-bai-le zongtong, kan-lei-le baozhi
   eat-full-Perf rice, play-lost-Perf chess, elect-lost-Perf president, read-tired-Perf newspaper.

(38) More details:

a. 張三騎累了那匹馬、騎累了三匹馬、騎累了哪匹馬 (賓語指向)
   Zhangsan qi-lei-le na4-pi ma / san-pi ma, / na3-pi ma?
   Zhangsan ride-tired-Perf that-Cl horse / three-Cl horse, which-Cl horse
   (Object-controlled only.  The horse got tired.)

b. 張三騎累了三次馬 (主語指向)
   Zhangsan qi-lei-le san-ci ma.
   Zhangsan ride-tired-Perf three-time horse
   (Subject controlled.)

□□ *吃飽了三碗飯、 *吃飽了那碗飯、 *吃飽了哪碗飯、 OK 吃飽了三頓飯
   *chi-bao-le san-wan fan, *…na4-wan fan, *…na3-wan fan, OK san-dun fan
   *eat-full 3-bowl rice, *…that-bowl rice, * which-bowl rice, OK 3-meal rice
Generalization about Resultative Predication in Mandarin:
In a resultative construction, the result is predicated on the object DP if DP is referential; it is predicated on the subject if there is no object, or if the object is non-referential (NP).

(39)  
Generalization about Resultative Predication in Mandarin:
In a resultative construction, the result is predicated on the object DP if DP is referential; it is predicated on the subject if there is no object, or if the object is non-referential (NP).

(40)  
a. 張三跑得很累。  
Zhangsan paode hen lei.  
Zhangsan run-DE very tired  
Zhangsan ran and got very tired.

b. 張三哭得很傷心。(under the resultative reading)  
Zhangsan ku-de hen shangxin.  
Zhangsan cry-DE very sad  
Zhangsan cried and got very sad.

c. 張三跳得氣喘如牛。  
Zhangsan tiao-de qichuan-runiu  
Zhangsan jump-DE panting-as.a.cow  
Zhangsan jumped to the point of panting like a cow.

d. 李四追累了。  
Lisi zhui-lei le.  
Lisi chase-tired Perf/Inc.  
Lisi chased (someone) and got tired.

e. 李四（看報紙）看花了眼睛。  
Lisi (kan baozhi) kan-hua-le yanjing  
Lisi (reading a newspaper) read-blurrred-Perf eyes

(41)  
Problem P:  
Why does Chinese allow for subject-predication, but not English?

5.3. The Causative-Inchoative Alternation

(42)  
a. The window broke.  >  They broke the window.  
b. The boat sank.  >  They sank the boat.
c. They are angry at the news. > The news angered them.
d. John cried > *They cried John (for “They caused John to cry.”)
e. John chased Bill tired > *Bill chased John tired (for “Bill caused John to become tired from chasing him.)

- Generalization: (d) and (e) are bad because an unergative or action verb (a DO type) cannot be causativized. Causativization operates on Ergative or Unaccusative verbs.

(43) However, this generalization seems not applicable to Chinese. In addition to ergatives (a-c below), even unergatives (d-f) can be causativized:

a. 张三累死了 > 這件事累了張三
   Zhangsan lei-si-le
   Zhangsan tired-dead-Perf
   This thing tired Zhangsan
d. 张三哭得很伤心 > 這件事哭得張三很傷心
   Zhangsan ku-DE very sad
   Zhangsan cried and got very sad
   This thing cried ZS very sad

b. 李四醉倒了 > 這杯酒醉倒了張三
   Lisi zui-dao-le
   Lisi drunk-fall-Perf
   This glass of wine drunk him
c. 他們為這件事生氣 > 這件事真氣人
   tamen wei zhejian shi shengqi
   They anger over this thing
   This thing really anger people
d. 張三追累了李四 > 李四追累了張三
   Zhangsan zhui-lei Lisi
   Zhangsan chased Lisi and got tired
   Lisi got ZS tired from chasing him.

(44) **Problem P:** Why does Chinese allow the causativization of an unergative or action verb as in (43d-f), but not English, as in (*42d-e)?
4.4. I submit that:

a. Problems P (41) & P (44) are the same problem and receive the same solution. The Chinese-English differences are again manifestations of their difference in the analytic-synthetic parameter.

b. Assuming with Lin (2001) that Chinese verbs do not come from the Lexicon with pre-specified argument structure, a verb like ‘cry, chase, read’ may have either a strictly unergative reading (if it moves into the light verb DO and selects an Agent), or an experiential or ergative (unaccusative-like) reading (if it moves into the light verb EXPERIENCE or BECOME and selects an Experiencer or a Theme as its subject). The availability of the ergative or experiential reading makes causativization possible. English activity verbs, however, come with a full specification of its argument structure {Agent, Theme}, etc. This prevents them from having Experiential or Ergative interpretations, which in turn—giving the Thematic Hierarchy—prevents them from having the causative readings by adding another argument on top of Agent. (cf. Sybesma 1992)

6. Conclusion:

6.1. Analyticity may be with respect to
   a. lexical categories
   b. functional categories
   c. argument structure features

6.2. Argument-Structure analyticity: conceptual structure is semantics. Argument structure is morpho-syntactic. Semantics is universal, but syntax/morphology is open to parametric variation.
→ Argument for the grammatical (i.e. formal) nature of argument structure (Grimshaw 1991, etc.) in addition to C-selection and S-selection.

7. Making some connections

7.1. Remarks on Mamoru’s lecture on 7/19:

• To derive the parametric variations w.r.t. free word order (scrambling), complex predicate (light verb), and ‘radical pro drop’ (argument ellipsis), as properties of analyticity

• Parameter w.r.t. selection and merge:
  A: Merge entails Selection.  [a.k.a. Theta Criterion A]
  B: Selection entails Merge.  [a.k.a. Theta Criterion B]
  - English: +A, +B
- Chinese: +A, -B
- Japanese: -A, -B

**Consequence:**
- English: no scrambling, no radical pro drop
- Chinese: no scrambling, has radical pro drop
- Japanese: scrambling and radical pro drop

**Remark:**
- Parameters like +/-A, +/-B is at variance with the lexical/functional parameterization hypothesis
- Parameter B can be rephrased as the analyticity vs. synthesis of argument structure feature on lexical items
- How about Parameter A? dunno……
- Note: scrambling (‘free word order’) has a different source than that of Mahawk free word order. The former happens where there is ‘nothing’ to prevent it, and the latter happens when there is a lot (sufficiently rich system) to allow it.

7.2. Remarks on Andrew’s lecture on 7/21:

- To show the existence of nominal classifier systems in languages in South East Asia that also exhibit (generally speaking) others hallmarks of analyticity (no agreement, no wh-movement, light verbs, etc.).

- To exhibit the rich variety of classifier systems which can be characterized by the application or non-application of certain head-movement or XP-movement rules. That is, there is considerable ground for micro-parametric or sub-macro-parametric variation.

- In many languages, nouns denoting time units and other naturally individuated elements may be used without classifiers. Such should be analyzed as Ns which have undergone N-to-CL raising, i.e., the N is the result of incorporating the mass N with CL, hence has become a count noun. Some languages differ w.r.t. whether (and how many) ‘normal’ nouns may also undergo N-to-CL raising.

**Remark 1:** Taiwanese and Mandarin differ with Some micro-parametric differences among Chinese dialects. Taiwanese and Mandarin differ w.r.t.:

- Possessive Agent Construction: (Henry Hsieh, 1991, p.c.)
  Mandarin: ni ku ni-de ‘You cry yours’. (see above)
  Taiwanese: li tso li kao. You DO you cry. (with overt light verb, no V-V)

- Causative Compounds:
  Mandarin: ta lei-si wo le. He tire-die me ‘He tired me to death’
  Taiwan.: i ka goa tiam si a. he LV me tire die. ‘He caused me to tire to death.’
Taiwanese is a little more analytic than Mandarin, not having participated in certain grammaticalization processes that occurred in the North since the Tang dynasty.

- *Remarik 2:* with respect to parametric N-to-CL, adapting Borer (2005) we can say that English count nouns have now all acquired the [+individuality] feature as a result of N-to-CL raising. Except that, in my system, I would say that this portion is in the L-syntax. That is, Small Wiggle. As a result, English book is equivalent to *ben + book*, more synthetic, that is!

### 7.3. Back to the classical properties of “non-configurationality”

- **7.3.1.** Free word order: two sources, (a) polysynthesis (as in Baker); (b) high argument-structure analysis (i.e., Saito’s [-A])

- **7.3.2.** Discontinuous constituents: a property of high analyticity [only, almost by definition]

- **7.3.3.** Pro Drop, on the other hand, may arise from polysynthesis ala Baker 1996; or it may arise (in part) from “argument structure analyticity” (by non-projection of an argument in conceptual structure). Still other licensors of empty pronominals: control in English and other languages with infinitives by a sentence-internal argument, or by predication to an argument (null operator) or to a discourse antecedent (null topic).

### 7.4. Final remarks: A lot vs. little vs. none.

Something happens when there is “a lot” (of relevant materials). Something also happens when there is none. But it does not happen when there is a little, but not quite enough.

- This is the case with Pro Drop (the former in Mohawk, Pashto, and the latter in Chinese-Japanese-Korean type; cf. Huang 1984, 1989; Safir and Jaeggli 1989 and references cited. Also the paper for Andrew’s lecture next week, on radical pro drop). *English* is the miserable one that is caught in between.

- This is the case with Free Word Order (the former in Mohawk, and the latter in Japanese, for example)

- This is the case with ‘richness of verb meaning’ (the former exhibited by Archaic Chinese derivational morphology, the latter exemplified by the robust syntax-semantics mismatches in Modern Chinese)

- So is this the case with Life?