

Phrasal movement approach to (non-) Restructuring phenomena

Infinitival Clauses (ICs) appear to be transparent to certain syntactic operations (**1**); the *-ga* marked OBJ of an embedded predicate is licensed by the potential morpheme *-(rar)e* appearing on the matrix V (V_{MAT}) despite a clause-mate condition (**1a vs. b**), suggesting that IC boundaries are inert for nominative licensing (**1a**). However, the IC boundary appears to be active when the predicate of the IC (ICV) and the matrix V (V_{MAT}) are non-adjacent (**2 vs. 1a**). I argue that the syntactic structures of restructuring and non-restructuring ICs (**1a vs. 2**) are identical, contra Wurmbrand (1998, 2001), with the exception of an uninterpretable feature associated with T, similar to Deguchi and Kitagawa (2002). Bi-clausal behaviors occur when the IC raises to spec-vP, otherwise mono-clausal behaviors are present (**1a**). The phrasal movement approach sheds light on the often-reported instability of judgements associated with restructuring constructions, while accounting for its string-adjacency requirement.

Two major approaches have been offered to the observed mono-/bi-clausal behaviors. Neither approach is satisfactory. One holds that ICs in a construction showing mono-clausal behaviors are smaller than those showing bi-clausal behaviors (e.g., IC = VP) (e.g. Wurmbrand, 1998, 2001). This approach wrongly predicts ICs appearing in restructuring contexts will show identical syntactic behavior regardless of construction-type. Comparison of Purpose Expressions (PE) (**1, 2**) and Gerundive Expressions (GE) (**3**) in Japanese (Miyagawa, 1987; Tsujimura, 1993) reveals that restructuring is irreducible to a size-variation in the IC. Although both PEs and GEs show mono-/bi-clausal alternations, their distribution suggests that the ICs in these constructions involve different functional structures. The ICV in a GE can license a modifier PP (**4b**) but the ICV in a PE cannot (**4a**) shows that the V_{MAT} -ICV relations in these constructions are different. The fact that PEs, but not GEs, require an animate subject (**5**) also implies that the IC in these constructions have different functional structures (e.g. obligatory *v* in the IC of PE). This suggests that mono-/bi-clausal alternations cannot arise simply from size variation in IC.

A second approach is that the V_{MAT} occurs in a functional position when the sentence behaves mono-clausally, but in a lexical position when it behaves bi-clausally (e.g. Cardinaletti & Shlonsky, 2004). The functional vs. lexical V approach fails to explain the string-adjacency requirement imposed in restructuring contexts. Despite the fact that a goal PP can be licensed in the mono-clausal contexts, as shown by Italian clitic-climbing (**6a**), the goal PP that appears linearly intervening between the V_{MAT} and ICV is not (**6b**). Since the goal PP is associated with the V_{MAT} in both cases, some stipulation will be needed to explain the grammaticality of (**6a**) vs. (**6b**) simultaneously in the functional/lexical approach. Furthermore, (**6c**) shows that the ill-formedness of (**6b**) comes from a failure in the operation of clitic movement, rather than of licensing PP.

Based on these facts, I propose that mono-/bi-clausal alternations arises from the presence/absence of an uninterpretable feature on T in syntax. Mono-clausal behavior is observed when the IC remains *in situ*, whereas bi-clausal behavior is observed when the IC Agrees with (a matrix) T via movement to spec-vP. (**7**) shows schematic structures with mono- (**7a**) /bi-clausal behaviors (**7b**) at the point of Spell-out. The IC movement into spec-vP (**7b**) is motivated by the presence of an uninterpretable prosodic feature in T, similar to Deguchi & Kitagawa (2002); the PF-feature on T (e.g. E_{PHON}) must be deleted prior to Spell-out via successful establishment of Agree with its Goal (= IC). The facts in (**8**) support the view that bi-clausal behaviors result from syntactic Move, motivated by PF convergence, rather than from surface non-adjacency between the V_{MAT} and ICV; disruption of V_{MAT} -ICV adjacency by extraposition of the IC results in ungrammaticality (**8a**), yet the similar linear sequence obtained via topicalization yields a grammatical sentence (**8b**). This suggests that the string-adjacency requirement is merely a byproduct of an interaction of various syntactic operations; the syntactic Move motivated by PF convergence, which cannot be undone in later syntactic computations, results in creating an environment in which LF conditions cannot hold. The proposed approach explains the nature of mono-/bi-clause alternation as follows; when the matrix T is not associated with an uninterpretable feature, the IC remains *in situ*, and the OBJ of ICV raises to spec-vP to establish Agree with *-(rar)e* (**9a**), whereby *-ga* marking is licensed. The presence of an uninterpretable feature on T, on the other hand, forces the IC to raise to spec-vP to Agree with T, whereby the OBJ of the ICV can no longer be extracted out (**9b**); the OBJ fails to Agree with *-(rar)e*, hence no *-ga* marking is possible. Note also that the *in situ* IC in this context results in failing to delete the uninterpretable feature in T, hence the derivation crashes.

The IC movement account sheds light on the unstable nature of grammatical judgements associated with the restructuring construction. As has been reported by Kitagawa (2005) for subjacency effects in Japanese, the subtlety of grammaticality judgements is associated with a mismatch between the information structure derived via syntactic computation and that derived from default prosodic structure. If the IC raises to Agree with T for PF convergence in non-restructuring contexts, hence establishing a PF relation between the T and IC distinct from the one obtainable when the IC remains *in situ*, a mismatch between information structure provided by syntactic computation and the one 're-constructed' from the prosodic pattern will be expected. Thus the phrasal movement account not only provides a unitary syntactic structure for a construction exhibiting mono-/bi-clausal alternations, but also explains the subtlety of the grammatical judgements associated with these constructions.

Data

- (1) a. John-ga [PP Kanda e] hon-ga kai-ni ik-e-ru (Mono-clausal PE)
-Nom to book-Nom buy-purpose go-potential-Pres
'John can go buy a book to Kanda'
- b. *John-ga [CP Tom-ga ringo-ga tabe-ta to] sinzi-rare-ta
-Nom -Nom apple-Nom eat-Past Comp believe-potential-Past
(intended) 'John could believe that Tom ate the apple'
- (2) *John-ga hon-ga kai-ni [PP Kanda e] ik-e-ru (Bi-clausal PE)
- (3) a. John-ga [PP Kanda de] hon-ga kat-te ik-e-ru (Mono-clausal GE)
-Nom at book-Nom buy-gerund go-potential-Pres
'John (went, having) bought a book in Kanda'
- b. *John-ga hon-ga kat-te [PP Kanda de] ik-e-ru (Bi-clausal GE)
- (4) a. *Taroo-ga tosyokan-de manga-ga kari-ni ik-e-ru (PE)
-Nom library-at comics-Nom borrow-purpose go-potential-Pres
'Taro can go to borrow comics at the library'
- b. Taroo-ga tosyokan-de manga-ga kari-te ik-e-ru (GE)
-Nom library-at comics-Nom borrow-gerund go-potential-Pres
'Taro (go, being capable of) borrow(ing) comics at the library'
- (5) a. *hokori-ga [koko made] mai-ni kita '(intend.) the dust came over here dancing' (PE)
dust-Nom here up.to dance-purpose came
- b. hokori-ga [koko made] mat-te kita 'the dust came over here dancing' (GE)
dust-Nom here up.to dance-gerund came
- (6) a. Gianni **lo** è andato a comprare a Roma
CL Aux went to buy to Rome
'Gianni went to Rome to buy it'
- b. *Gianni **lo** è andato a Roma a comprare
c. Gianni è andato a Roma a comprarlo
(p.c. Giusti, 2005)
- (7) a. [TP SUBJ_j [VP t_j [VP PP [VP t_j [VP OBJ V₁]-ni] V₂] v*]-T_{COMP}] (Restructuring)
b. [TP SUBJ [VP [VP PRO [VP OBJ V₁]-ni] [VP PP t_j V₂] v*]-T_{COMP}] (Non-Restructuring)
- (8) a. Extraposition b. Topicalization (Wurmbrand, 2001)
*dass Hans **muß** den Kuchen **essen** Den Kuchen **essen** hat nur der Hans **müssen**
that must the cake eat the cake eat has only the must
'that Hans must to eat the cake' 'Only Hans had to eat the cake'
- (9) a. [TP John-ga [VP [NP hon_j]-ga [VP [PP Kanda-e] [IC t_j kai-ni] ik]-e]-ru cf. (1a)
b. *[TP John-ga [VP [IC hon-ga kai-ni]_j [VP [PP Kanda-e] t_j ik]-e]-ru cf. (2)

Selected references

- Cardinaletti, A. & Shlonsky, U. (2004). "Clitic positions and restructuring in Italian". *Linguistic Inquiry* 35(4):519-557.
- Deguchi, M. & Kitagawa, Y. (2002). "Prosody and Wh-questions". *Proceedings of the NELS* 32: 73-92.
- Kitagawa, Y. (2005). "Prosody, syntax and pragmatics of Wh-questions in Japanese". *English Linguistics* 22 (2):302-346.
- Miyagawa, S. (1987). "Restructuring in Japanese". In: Imai, T. & Saito, M. (eds.). *Issues in Japanese Linguistics*:273-300, Foris Publications.
- Tsujimura, N. (1993). "Adjuncts and event argument in restructuring". In: Choi, S. (ed.). *Japanese/Korean linguistics* (3):121-136
- Wurmbrand, S. (1998). *Infinitives*. MIT dissertation.
- (2001). *Infinitives: Restructuring and clause structure*. Studies in generative grammar 53. Mouton de Gruyter.
- (2002). "A-movement to the point of no return". *Proceeding of NELS* 33