Syracuse/Cornell Workshop on Word Order and Scrambling

(Co-)Sponsored by the Central New York Humanities Corridor from an award by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

and the Linguistic Studies Program, Syracuse University

Saturday May 8 (all times EST)
8am   Mamoru Saito, Nanzan University
              "Weak Heads in Labeling: Why J/K-type Scrambling is allowed"

     Among the fundamental problems with scrambling in Japanese and Korean is the precise mechanism that makes it possible. I suggest in this paper that Case markers and predicate inflections in these languages are weak heads in the sense of Chomsky (2015) and that this allows clause structures with scrambling to be properly labeled. I argue that this hypothesis has further desirable consequences for the analysis of scrambling and other phenomena in Japanese/Korean. For example, it opens up a way to analyze the fact that long scrambling of anaphors extends their binding possibilities despite the radical reconstruction property of scrambling. It also leads to an analysis for the fact widely discussed since Kuno (1973) that these languages allow various kinds of prenominal sentential modification aside from relative clauses.

9am   Josef Bayer, University of Konstanz
              "Particles as functional heads: Recycling in the syntax of wh-questions"

Particles in situ. Unlike adverbs, sentence particles, discourse (DiP) as well as focus (FP) particles are syntactic heads which occur in pre-vP position. They are immobile and take scope right where they occur. For FPs it is established that their scope is fixed when they are in pre-vP position. DiPs depend on illocutionary force. We argue they are in a probe/goal agreement relation with force. No movement (LF or other) is involved. DiPs can be stacked. Their order is usually fixed.

(1)   An wen könnte er sich   denn   gewandt haben?
         at who could he REF DENN turned   have
         "Who could he have turned to? (I'm wondering)"
(2)   An wen könnte er sich   denn   in dieser Sache schon   gewandt haben?   (*…schon …
         denn …)
         at who could he REF DENN in this   affair SCHON turned   have
         "Who could he have turned to in this affair ? (Isn't it obvious?)"

Each particle heads a 'Particle Phrase' (PrtP). This provides the unmarked standard case.

Particles ex situ. Next, there are cases in which the particle is not in a scope position and apparently seems to be in a "wrong" position. A prominent case is FP in a lower position: John will eat only vegetables. Its scope awaits fixing. In German, also DiPs may occur ex situ, namely in SpecCP.

(3)   An wen denn   könnte er sich   gewandt haben?
       at   who DENN could   he REF turned   have

V2 suggests that an wen denn is a single constituent. We call this a 'Small Particle Phrase' (SPrtP). Prosody signals that there is emphatic fronting of the wh-phrase to the left of the DiP: [denn [an wen] ⇒[an wen]] [denn [~~an wen~~]]. The SPrtP is generated in a separate work space and then gets merged into the phrase marker for the clause.

Fitting the parts together. How does the DiP in a SPrtP get scope? We show it is recycled via the specifier of an empty Prt-head.

(4) [CP [an wen denn] könnte er sich [PrtP [~~an wen denn~~] [Prt· ∅ [vP [~~an wen denn~~] gewandt haben]]]]?

The DiP has reached its irreversible scope position by agreement with the silent Prt-head. Since the SPrtP also happens to be a wh-phrase, movement will continue up to SpecCP. Importantly, the DiP moves there only as a consequence of pied-piping, not for any semantic reason. How can we be sure? Returning to (2), imagine that a SPrtP has been formed with schon. In spite of the "wrong" word order in (5a), the structure is well-formed. (5b) shows how and why it is correctly interpreted in the scope of denn.

(5) a. An wen schon könnte er sich denn gewandt haben?
    b. [CP [an wen schon] könnte er sich [PrtP2 [Prt2· denn [PrtP1 [~~an wen schon~~] [Prt1· ∅ [vP gewandt haben]]]]]]?

The dual occurrence of the sentence particle provides the right format for the safisfaction of the CI- and the SM-interface. Notice there are ample spoken language data according to which ∅ is spelled out: An wen schon könnte er sich denn schon gewandt haben?
With the assumption of particles as functional heads, various things fall into place which otherwise remain mysterious or give rise to stipulations. The syntax of FP is very similar. Semantic complications such as type raising become superfluous. References will be provided.

10am   **Mia Gong, Cornell University**
                 "Condition C reconstruction revisited: Scrambling, late merger, and
                 the A/A' distinction in Mongolian"

Frank, Lee, and Rambow (1996) observe that in German and Korean, a locally scrambled element generally does not reconstruct to its base position so as to be bound, a property typically associated with A-movement. The sole exception is when the binding relation is affected by scrambling involving a **subject** binder. Only then does reconstruction take place. This pattern, which Frank et al. attribute to the special status of subject binders, raises a paradox for the A/A' status of scrambling. Drawing on local and long distance scrambling data in Mongolian, I show that the subject binder's special status in Condition C reconstruction is only apparent. Further, I revisit the core phenomenon and propose an account for it in terms of wholesale late merger (Takahashi & Hulsey 2009). The current account departs from previous proposals which bear on the A/A' distinction as directly responsible for when movement bleeds Condition C. If this is on the right track, the distribution of reconstruction effects in Mongolian ultimately derives from the

possibility of late merger, which is constrained by the case assignment mechanism and other independent properties of the grammar.

11am   Rajesh Bhatt, University of Massachusetts
**   Crossover asymmetries (with Stefan Keine)**

We investigate and analyze a crossover asymmetry in Hindi/Urdu scrambling: such scrambling is not subject to (secondary) weak crossover but at the same time shows clear (secondary) strong crossover effects. This asymmetry provides empirical evidence that the two types of crossover must be analytically decoupled from each other, and it sheds new light on the factors that condition each type. We find that weak crossover is conditioned by the landing site of movement, while strong crossover is determined by properties of the launching site. More specifically, we propose that weak crossover follows from a syntactic restriction on the placement of an operator that is required for pronominal binding from the landing site. Strong crossover, on the other hand, is determined by the amount of structure present in the launching site, which can itself be derived from Late Merge and nominal licensing along the lines developed by Takahashi & Hulsey 2009. In addition to contributing to our understanding of crossover phenomena, our argument also has implications for the A/A'-nature of scrambling (e.g., Webelhuth 1989, Mahajan 1990, Dayal 1994) and movement-type asymmetries more generally.

12-1pm   Discussion (Jaklin Kornfilt and John Whitman)

SUNDAY, MAY 9

8am   Kenyon Branan, National University of Singapore
**   "Scrambling and domains for linearization"**

C-command is commonly taken to be a relationship which matters for both PF and LF, leading us to generally expect a tight correlation between the linear order of elements in a sentence and their logical scope. Scrambling --- commonly modeled as movement --- is known to alter scopal relationships in some languages (such as Japanese), but not others (such as Tagalog), a difference which is surprising given the aforementioned expectation. This talk considers this distinction between the two languages as part of a bigger picture, with a generalization emerging capturing the facts for both languages. In both languages, there is a portion of the clause where the expected correlation is borne out, followed by a portion where it is not, with the verb delimiting the border between the two. I give a way of capturing the generalization, and discuss possible extensions of the model and general implications for the architecture of the grammar.

9am   Joachim Sabel, University of Louvain
**   "Scrambling in Multiple Wh-Questions in German"**

Wh-fronting from infinitives in German shows a surprising asymmetry that, to my knowledge, has not been pointed out before.

Extraction from extraposed infinitives that are transparent to scrambling shows no superiority effects in multiple questions, but extraction from extraposed non-transparent infinitives does.

The relevant examples show that transparency effects for scrambling in German infinitives do not follow from a difference of mono- vs. bi-sententiality, because bi-sententiality is always to be assumed. I discuss several potential analyses of the phenomenon and attempt to show that all analyses face counterevidence.

10am   **Shigeru Miyagawa, MIT**
               "Case, Late Merge, and A/A'-movements"

Local scrambling in Japanese exhibits A-movement properties (Saito 1992, Yoshimura 1989), paralleling local scrambling in Hindi (Mahajan 1989, 1990). Unlike A-movement in English, local scrambling in Japanese triggers a Condition C violation under reconstruction (Saito 1992). The same has been observed for Hindi by Bhatt and Keine (2019), who adopt Takahashi (2006) and Takahashi and Hulsey's (2009) Wholesale Late Merger analysis. The property of A-movement that triggers reconstruction is not limited to Hindi and Japanese. The same reconstruction effect has been observed for the CLLD construction in some Romance languages (Cechetto 2000), which otherwise exhibits A-movement properties (Escobar 1997, López 2009). I will try to account for the observations across these languages by extending Bhatt and Keine's analysis. Specifically, I propose to simplify the role that Case plays in Late Merger, bringing it more in line with the classic conception of case marking (Vergnaud 1976).

11am   John Bailyn, Stony Brook University
       "Two nagging Scrambling puzzles in a head-initial language"

Several decades of generative research on Russian word order has achieved considerable consensus that both A and A' processes of clausal scrambling known from studies of Japanese, Turkish and other head-final languages, are also found in Russian, despite its status as a prepositional, head-initial language (Müller & Sternefeld 1993, Bošković 2004, Bailyn 2020). However, two Russian word order puzzles have continued to resist satisfactory analysis, both involving highly local word order variation of a kind only visible in a generally head-initial language.
      The first of these puzzles concerns SOV surface order in Russian, which I show fails to systematically display the discourse properties one might expect from an A-scrambling / Object Shift process. The second puzzle involves word order variation within nominals, in which we also observe the availability of highly local reordering, leading to (surface) N^0-final (Gen > N^0) and D^0-final (NP > D^0) orders that are also unexpected for a head-initial language.
      In this talk, I show that neither a base-generated nor a typical movement account seems to satisfactorily account for the attested properties of these constructions, and argue instead for the availability of a super-local Scrambling process, which I call Tree Twisting. I briefly sketch how Tree Twisting works and what its advantages are, and then consider other possible domains of application, especially Inversion constructions and "mixed-headed" languages (German/Dutch),

and conclude with a discussion of the resulting typological status of Russian (and other Slavic scrambling languages).

12-12:30pm   Wrap up: General Discussion

Zoom link and other connection information:

Join Zoom Meeting
https://syracuseuniversity.zoom.us/j/95903897330?pwd=bm94K1RhWlhYbHUweUMxd2xhckRtUT09

Meeting ID: 959 0389 7330
Passcode: 391544
One tap mobile
+16468769923,,95903897330# US (New York)
+13017158592,,95903897330# US (Washington DC)

Dial by your location
        +1 646 876 9923 US (New York)
        +1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)
        +1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)
        +1 408 638 0968 US (San Jose)
        +1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)
        +1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)
        +1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)
Meeting ID: 959 0389 7330
Find your local number: https://syracuseuniversity.zoom.us/u/akkAPC316