Nominal Behavior of Verb Reduplication and Its Implications on Double Nominative Constructions

Lei Liu
Dept. of Linguistics
Stony Brook University

Augest 24, 2016
Outline

1. Introduction

2. Proposal
   - Overview
   - Internal topics
   - Restricting internal topics

3. Concluding remarks
Double nominative constructions (DNC) in Asian languages

(1) 
\[ Sono \ otokono \ hito-wa \ su:tsu-ga \ kitanai \]
that \ male \ person-TOP \ suit-NOM \ dirty

‘As for that gentleman, the suit is dirty.’

Japanese

(2) 
\[ Ku \ sinsa-ka \ yangpok-i \ telep-ta \]
that \ gentleman-NOM \ suit-NOM \ dirty-DECL

‘As for that gentleman, the suit is dirty.’

Korean (Han and Kim, 2004)

(3) 
\[ nei-wei \ xiansheng \ xifu \ zang \ le \]
that-CL \ gentleman \ suit \ dirty \ SFP

‘As for that gentleman, the suit is dirty.’

Mandarin
Introduction

Structural analyses of Chinese DNC

1. There is a single subject-predicate structure in double nominative constructions. (Tsao, 1990)
   - NP₁ \([pred \ NP₂ \ V]\) or \([NP₁ [NP₂]] [pred \ V]\)

2. Dangling topics: topics in Chinese can be licensed by a semantic gap/variable without syntactic realization (Pan and Hu, 2002)

3. SOV sequences with a [−human] object DP can be analysed as double topicalization structure or internal topic structure (Paul, 2005)
Structural analyses of Chinese DNC

1. Single subject-predicate structure (Tsao, 1990)

(4) $[\text{subject } Zhangsan][\text{pred. touteng}]$

\begin{align*}
Z. & \quad \text{head-pain} \\
\text{‘Z. is having a headache.’}
\end{align*}

(5) $[\text{subject } Zhangsan \; \text{nv’er}][\text{pred. piaoliang}]$

\begin{align*}
Z. & \quad \text{daughter} \quad \text{pretty} \\
\text{‘Z. ’s daughter is pretty.’}
\end{align*}
Structural analyses of Chinese DNC

2. Dangling topics: topics in Chinese can be licensed by a semantic gap/variable without syntactic position

(Pan and Hu, 2002)

(6) *tamen shei dou mei lai*

they  who  all  not  come

‘None of them are coming.’

\[ \lambda Z \forall x \left[ x \in Z \rightarrow \neg \text{la"i} \ ‘\text{come}'(x) \right] \] (tamen ‘they’)

\[ tamen \ shei \ dou \ mei \ lai \]
Structural analyses of Chinese DNC

3. SOV sequences with a [-human] object DP can be analysed as double topicalization structure or internal topic structure

(Paul, 2005)

(7) $tamen_j ne$ $zhongyao_i$ $t_i$ $yijing$ $yong-guo$ $t_i$

they PART chinese.medicine already use-EXP

‘They have already taken Chinese medicine.’

(8) $tamen$ $zhongyao_i$ $yijing$ $yong-guo$ $t_i$

they chinese.medicine already use-EXP
1. Nominal behaving reduplicated verbs in Wu suggest a separate syntactic projection, possibly internal topic (Paul, 2005)

2. The internal topic position is restricted to discourse-anchored NPs (a la Von Heusinger, 2002)
(9) Internal topic position

1. Internal topics do not adjoin to vP
   ▶ Only one internal topic is allowed
2. Internal topics differ from external topic
   ▶ Movement to internal topic is clause-bound
1. Internal topics do not adjoin to vP
   ▶ Only one internal topic is allowed

(10) *Ni [DP1 huiyuan dahui] [DP2 mingtian -de richeng] anpai
   2SG member meeting tomorrow -sub program plan
   -hao -le meiyou?
   -finish -LE NEG

   ‘(int.) The general membership meeting, have you prepared tomorrow’s program?’
   (Paul, 2005)
2. Internal topics differ from external topic
   ▶ Movement to internal topic is clause-bound

(11) *Wangwu [na-ben xiaoshuo]i shuo Lisi du -wan -le ti
    Wangwu that-CL novel say Lisi read -finish -LE

(12) ([na-ben xiaoshuo]i) Wangwu shuo ([na-ben xiaoshuo]i) Lisi
    that-CL novel Wangwu say that-C novel Lisi
    du -wan -le ti
    read -finish -LE

1. Nominal behaving reduplicated verbs in Wu suggest a separate syntactic projection, possibly internal topic (Paul, 2005)

2. The internal topic position is restricted to discourse-anchored NPs (a la Von Heusinger, 2002)
1. Nominal behaving reduplicated verbs in Wu suggest a separate syntactic projection, possibly internal topic (Paul, 2005)

(13) \( \text{Ni baubau} \ \text{hen tauie} \) 
\[ \text{you run.RED. very be.sick.of} \]
‘As for you, running is disgusting.’  

(14) \( \text{Ni lie tseitsei a hen chiohlieh} \) 
\[ \text{you even walk.RED. also very tiring} \]
‘Even walking is tiring for you. (let alone running)’

Cf. ??\( \text{Ni lie tsei a hen chiohlieh} \)  

(15) \( \text{Ni tseitsei pi baubau (we) chiohlieh} \) 
\[ \text{you walk.RED. compare run.RED. (even) tiring} \]
‘Walking is more tiring than running for you.’

Cf. i. ??\( \text{Ni tsei pi bau chiohlieh.} \) ii. \( \text{Ni kontsy ‘salary’ pi ciancin, ‘bonus’ (we) sao} \)  

Comparative constructions select nominals

- Unconceivable semantic licensing between NP\(_1\) and V.RED(NP\(_2\))
- Extra position needed between NP\(_1\) and main predicate
  \[ \Rightarrow \text{Candidate: internal topic (Paul, 2005)} \]
1. Nominal behaving reduplicated verbs in Wu suggest a separate syntactic projection, possibly internal topic (Paul, 2005)

(13) \( \text{Ni baubau hen tauie} \)
you run.RED. very be.sick.of
‘As for you, running is disgusting.’  

(14) \( \text{Ni lie tseitsei a hen chiohlieh} \)
you even walk.RED. also very tiring
‘Even walking is tiring for you. (let alone running)’
Cf. ??\( \text{Ni lie tsei a hen chiohlieh} \)  
Focus structures select nominals

(15) \( \text{Ni tseitsei pi baubau (we) chiohlieh} \)
you walk.RED. compare run.RED. (even) tiring
‘Walking is more tiring than running for you.’
Cf. i. ??\( \text{Ni tsei pi bau chiohlieh} \). ii. \( \text{Ni kontsy ‘salary’ pi ciancin, ‘bonus’ (we) sao} \)  
Comparative constructions select nominals

- Unconceivable semantic licensing between NP\(_1\) and V.RED(NP\(_2\))
- Extra position needed between NP\(_1\) and main predicate
  ⇒ Candidate: internal topic (Paul, 2005)
2. The internal topic position is restricted to discourse-anchored NPs (a la Von Heusinger, 2002)

▶ [-human] restriction (Paul, 2005)

(16)  *Shei;/Lilaoshi.k [zhexie xuesheng]i t\_j/k qinglai -le \_t_i
who/teacher.Li these student invite -LE
‘Teacher Li has invited these students.’

(17)  Shei/Lilaoshi [zhongyao]i yijing yong -guo \_t_i le
who/teacher.Li Chinese.medicine already use -EXP LE
‘Who/Teacher Li has already taken Chinese medicine?’

▶ SOV order with the object being *[+human](16) and[-human] (17)
▶ External topic cannot be wh-questioned, subjects can

(18)  [*Shei ne]i ni renshi \_t_i
[who PART]j you know
▶ Internal topics are restricted to [-human] DPs
2. The internal topic position is restricted to discourse-anchored NPs (a la Von Heusinger, 2002)

▶ [-human] restriction (Paul, 2005)

(16) *Shei\_j/Lilaoshi\_k [zhexie xuesheng]_{i} t_{j/k} qinglai -le t_{i}
who/teacher.Li these student invite -LE
‘Teacher Li has invited these students.’

(17) Shei/Lilaoshi [zhongyao]_{i} yijing yong -guo t_{i} le
who/teacher.Li Chinese.medicine already use -EXP LE
‘Who/Teacher Li has already taken Chinese medicine?’

▶ SOV order with the object being *[+human](16) and[-human] (17)
▶ External topic cannot be wh-questioned, subjects can

(18) *[Shei ne]_{i} ni rensi t_{i}
[who PART]_{i} you know

▶ Internal topics are restricted to [-human] DPs
2. The internal topic position is restricted to discourse-anchored NPs (a la Von Heusinger, 2002)

- [-human] restriction $\rightarrow$ interpretation restriction
  - Counterexamples to [-human] restriction
    
    (19) \textit{Zhe wei guanyuan [nv’er]i yijing songzou t\textsubscript{i} le}  
        this CL officer daughter\textsubscript{i} already send-away t\textsubscript{i} LE  
        ‘This officer has sent away his daughter.’

    (20) \textit{Shei [nv’er]i yijing songzou t\textsubscript{i} le} ?  
        Who daughter\textsubscript{i} already send-away t\textsubscript{i} LE  
        ‘Who has sent away his daughter?’

- Ungrammatical Number-Classifier NPs

    (21) \textit{zhe wei guanyuan [*yi bi] zijin]i yijing zhuanyi t\textsubscript{i} le}  
        this CL officer one CL money\textsubscript{i} already transfer t\textsubscript{i} LE  
        (‘This officer has transferred one sum of money.’)
2. The internal topic position is restricted to discourse-anchored NPs (a la Von Heusinger, 2002)

- [-human] restriction $\rightarrow$ interpretation restriction
  - No scope ambiguity in sentences with internal topics

(22) *Mei* every *CL pianist* already *all* play *LE two CL sonata*

‘Every pianist played two sonatas.’

Two $\succ \forall$, $\forall \succ$ two

(23) *Mei* every *CL pianist [two CL sonata] already* all *play $t_i$ LE*

‘Every pianist played two specific sonatas.’

Two $\succ \forall$, $*\forall \succ$ two
Proposal

- For an internal topic...
  - No number-classifier NPs
  - No scope ambiguity possible
- Possibly because internal topic position requires discourse-old information...
  - Number-classifier NPs are indefinite expressions (Cheng and Sybesma, 1999; Huang et al., 2009, a.m.o) → generally not qualified for discourse-old interpretation, i.e., not qualify for topics

(24) *San-ge xuesheng wo yiwei chi-le dangao
three-CL student 1SG think eat-LE cake

(‘Three students, I thought they ate the cake.’) (Huang et al., 2009)

- Internal topic is interpreted via discourse-anchoring → no ambiguity
Proposal

- For an internal topic...
  - No number-classifier NPs
  - No scope ambiguity possible
- Possibly because internal topic position requires discourse-old information...
  - Number-classifier NPs are indefinite expressions (Cheng and Sybesma, 1999; Huang et al., 2009, a.m.o) → generally not qualified for discourse-old interpretation, i.e., not qualify for topics

(24) *San-ge xuesheng wo yiwei chi-le dangao
   three-CL student 1SG think eat-LE cake
   (‘Three students, I thought they ate the cake.’) (Huang et al., 2009)

- Internal topic is interpreted via discourse-anchoring → no ambiguity
Proposal

For an internal topic...
  - No number-classifier NPs
  - No scope ambiguity possible

Possibly because internal topic position requires discourse-old information...
  - Number-classifier NPs are indefinite expressions (Cheng and Sybesma, 1999; Huang et al., 2009, a.m.o) $\rightarrow$ generally not qualified for discourse-old interpretation
  - Internal topic is interpreted via discourse-anchoring $\rightarrow$ no ambiguity

(25) Bare NPs are interpreted as definite when in internal topic position

$Zhe\ wen\ guanyuan\ nv'er_i\ yijing\ songzou\ t_i\ le$

this CL officer $i$ daughter $i$ already send-away $t_i$ LE

‘This officer has sent away his daughter.’
Proposal

▶ For an internal topic...
  ▶ No number-classifier NPs
  ▶ No scope ambiguity possible
▶ Possibly because internal topic position requires discourse-old information...
  ▶ Number-classifier NPs are indefinite expressions (Cheng and Sybesma, 1999; Huang et al., 2009, a.m.o) → generally not qualified for discourse-old interpretation
  ▶ Internal topic is interpreted via discourse-anchoring → no ambiguity

(26) Number-classifier, when interpreted partitively (discourse-anchored (Von Heusinger, 2002)), the sentence becomes grammatical

\[
\text{zhe wei guanyuan } [yi \text{ ming nv’er}]_i \text{ yijing song-dao } t_i \text{ le this CL officer one CL daughter}_i \text{ already send-to } t_i \text{ LE faguo, } [yi \text{ ming nv’er}]_j \text{ yijing song-dao } t_j \text{ le deguo. France, one CL daughter}_j \text{ already send-to } t_j \text{ LE Germany.}
\]

‘This officer has sent one daughter to France and another to Germany.’
The current study...
  - assumes the internal topic analysis proposed in (Paul, 2005), but restricts
    the position to discourse-anchoring, instead of [-human]

Is it universal?
  - Does it apply to possessor-raising structures in Korean /Japanese?
  - What typological prediction would it make?


