

INCORPORATION IN LIGHT VERB CONSTRUCTIONS AND TEMPORAL AFFIX CONSTRUCTIONS, AND THE MINIMALIST PROGRAM

Hiroto Hoshi, SOAS, University of London, London WC1B 0XG, U.K.
hoshi@clus1.ulcc.ac.uk/hh5@soas.ac.uk

Purpose: The purpose of this paper is to show that nominal θ -markers incorporate to the light/empty verb in both the light verb construction (henceforth, LVC) and the temporal affix construction (henceforth, TAC), and to support Chomsky's (1992) proposal that D-structure does not exist.

Incorporation process in LVCs and TACs: The LVC has been discussed as a potential problem for D-structure θ -role assignment in the literature (Grimshaw and Mester 1988; henceforth, GM). In (1a), the θ -marker *SEESAN* 'production' appears as an object, and two of its arguments are realized as sentential arguments outside the projection of the θ -marker. To explain this property, Hoshi and Saito (1993) and Saito and Hoshi (1994) (henceforth, HS/SH) propose an LF incorporation analysis: *SEESAN-o* in (1a) first assigns a θ -role to *akoodo* within its maximal projection NP; then, it incorporates to the light verb (henceforth, LV) at LF, assigning θ -roles to *amerika-de* 'in the U.S.' and *Honda* at the clausal level [1b].

Regarding the nature of θ -role assignment, TACs such as (2a) display exactly the same property (Sells 1988, etc). As was seen in (1a), two arguments of the nominal θ -marker *SEESAN* appear as sentential arguments in (2a). This striking similarity between the LVC and the TAC, thus, seems to demand the same type of explanation for both constructions. I, therefore, propose the derivational process illustrated in (2b) for the TAC (2a), extending HS/SH's analysis of the LVC. To pursue the parallelism between LVCs and TACs further, I assume that in TACs, there is a VP shell above the nominal θ -marker's maximal projection [2b].

Consequences: The proposed analysis, among other desirable consequences, straightforwardly explains the contrast between the TACs (4a-b) (Sells 1988), in the same way HS/SH account for the contrast in the LVCs (3a-b). In the structure (5a) which I propose for (4a), the nominal θ -marker *SEESAN* first θ -marks the theme argument *akoodo* within its projection NP. In the course of the movement up to the temporal affix *go*, *SEESAN* moves into the empty V position, and successfully assigns θ -roles to *amerika-de* and *Honda*. However, as shown in the representation (5b) for the TAC (4b), *SEESAN* cannot θ -mark *amerika-de* first, and then, *akoodo* and *Honda*, because this is an impermissible order of θ -marking (Larson 1988, Chomsky 1992, etc).

Among the mysterious properties of the LVC discussed in GM is that at least one internal argument of the θ -marking noun must be a sentential argument; hence, ✓(6a) vs. *(6b). Importantly, however, the TAC (7), which corresponds to (6b), is perfectly grammatical. I derive this difference from a single minimal distinction between LVCs and TACs: incorporation is triggered for θ -role assignment in LVCs as is argued by HS/SH, whereas the incorporation process is forced for a morphological reason in TACs. If only an external argument appears outside the projection of *KEKKON-o* as in (6b) (cf. 6a), the noun cannot incorporate to the LV for θ -role assignment. HS/SH argue that this is because nouns need not assign external θ -roles and thereby, Chomsky's last resort principle/greed prohibits *KEKKON-o* from undergoing LF incorporation. Consequently, the subject *John-ga* fails to receive a θ -role in (6b). In (7), only the external argument of *KEKKON* appears as a sentential argument as well, and thus, the nominal θ -marker does not seem to be able to move up to assign a θ -role. *KEKKON* in (7), however, must raise and incorporate to the temporal affix for a morphological reason in syntax, since *KEKKON* is a stem form of a noun. In the course of the movement up to *go*, it succeeds in assigning its external θ -role to *John* in the empty VP shell, as illustrated in (8). I will show that other properties of the LVC and the TAC discussed in GM, Miyagawa (1989), Tsujimura (1990), among others are also naturally explained under the proposed analysis.

Conclusions: My analysis, if successful, provides substantial support for HS/SH's incorporation analysis of the LVC. At the same time, it supports the theory of Larson (1988) and Chomsky (1992), in which θ -roles can be assigned during the derivation in accordance with thematic hierarchy. It also provides further support for Chomsky's (1986, 1991, 1992) proposal on the economy of Derivation, in particular, last resort/greed.

Examples:

- (1)a. Honda-ga Amerika-de [_{NP} akoodo -no SEESAN -o] siteiru (LVC)
-Nom America-in Accords-Gen production-Acc doing
'Honda is making Accords in the U.S.'
- b. [_S Honda-ga Amerika-de [_{NP} akoodo-no t_i] [_V [_N SEESAN-o]_i [_V sita]]]
- (2)a. Honda-ga Amerika-de [_{NP} akoodo -no SEESAN]-go , (TAC)
-Nom America-in Accords-Gen production]-after,
'After Honda made Accords in the U.S.,'
- b. [_{VP} Honda-ga Amerika-de [_{NP} akoodo-no t_i] t'_i] SEESAN_i-go,
(IP projection above VP is suppressed)
- (3)a. Honda-ga Amerika-de [_{NP} akoodo -no SEESAN -o] siteiru (LVC)
-Nom America-in Accords-Gen production-Acc doing (= 1a)
'Honda is making Accords in the U.S.'
- b. *Honda-ga akoodo-o [_{NP} Amerika-de-no SEESAN -o] siteiru (LVC)
(3b violates the weak/surface double-o filter as well)
- (4)a. Honda-ga Amerika-de [_{NP} akoodo -no SEESAN]-go , (TAC)
-Nom America-in Accords-Gen production]-after, (= 2a)
'After Honda made Accords in the U.S.,'
- b. *Honda-ga akoodo-o [_{NP} Amerika-de-no SEESAN]-go , (TAC)
- (5)a. [_{VP} Honda-ga Amerika-de [_{NP} akoodo-no t_i] t'_i] SEESAN_i-go,
- b. * [_{VP} Honda-ga akoodo-o [_{NP} Amerika-de-no t_i] t'_i] SEESAN_i-go,
- (6)a. John-ga Mary-to [_{NP} KEKKON -o] sita (LVC)
-Nom -with marriage-Acc did
'John married Mary'
- b. *John-ga [_{NP} Mary-to -no KEKKON -o] sita (LVC)
-Nom -with-Gen marriage-Acc did
'John married Mary' (marginally ok with the heavy verb interpretation of sita)
- (7) John-ga Mary-to -no KEKKON -go , Tom-ga Susan-ni atta (TAC)
-Nom -with-Gen marriage-after, -Nom -to met
'After John married, Tom met Susan'
- (8) [_{VP} John-ga [_{NP} Mary-to -no t_i] t'_i] KEKKON_i-go, (for 7)

Selected References:

- Chomsky (1986) *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin, and Use*, Praeger.
- Chomsky (1991) "Some Notes on Economy of Derivation and Representation," In *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*, ed. Robert Friedin.
- Chomsky (1992) "A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory," *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics Number 1*.
- Hoshi, H. and M. Saito (1993) "The Japanese Light Verb Construction: A Case of LF Theta Marking," In *Japanese Grammar (II)*, ed. Mamoru Saito, University of Connecticut, 45-62.
- Saito, M. and H. Hoshi (1994) "The Japanese Light Verb Construction and the Minimalist Program," ms., University of Connecticut.
- Grimshaw, J. and A. Mester (1988) "Light Verbs and θ -Marking," *LI* 19, 205-32.
- Larson, R. (1988) "On the Double Object Construction," *LI* 19, 335-391.
- Miyagawa, S. (1989) "Light Verbs and the Ergative Hypothesis," *LI* 20, 659-88.
- Sells, P. (1988) "More on Light Verbs and θ -Marking," ms., Stanford Univ.
- Tsujimura, N. (1990) "Ergativity of Nouns and Case Assignment," *LI* 21, 277-87.