

Word order and scope in finite embedded non-argument clauses

Krisztina Szécsényi

University of Szeged

kszecsenyi@gmail.com

CGRH meeting

Organized by the Graduate School in Linguistics at University of Szeged, supported by the TÁMOP-4.2.2/B-10/1-2010-0012 project (“Broadening the knowledge base and supporting the long term professional sustainability of the Research University Centre of Excellence at the University of Szeged by ensuring the rising generation of excellent scientists”)

1 Finite and non-finite embedding

- Non-finite clauses: obligatorily embedded
- Finite clauses: main or embedded, but different properties

Main Clause Phenomena (MCP): SAI, argument fronting, V2, etc.

Difference at the top: different left peripheries (projections, features: assertion/presupposition) Haegeman (2003), Sawada and Larson (2004); operator movement (Haegeman 2010); constraint families evaluating the same structural configuration in different locations (Grimshaw 2006)

2 Finite embedding

- More than one clause domain
- Potential interaction with the main clause (even in spite of apparent locality restrictions).
 - high and low readings
 - quantifier scope interpretation
 - binding
 - negation

2.1 High and low readings in temporal clauses

(1) I will leave after you said that Peter left.

high: ‚I leave after the time t when you tell me that Peter has left.’

low: ‚I leave after time t. You tell me that Peter left at time t.’

(2) Addig maradok, [ameddig mondod
that-WHILE stay-1SG REL-what-WHILE say-2SG

[hogy maradjak]]

that stay-SUBJ-1SG

high: ‚I stay until the time you keep saying that I should stay.’

low: ‚I stay until time t. You say I should stay until time t.’

[Lipták, 2005:143]

2.1.1 A different Hungarian construction

- Lack of low readings in certain Hungarian temporal clauses

(3) Azután indulok el [miután szólsz,
that-AFTER leave-1SG PV what-AFTER tell-1SG

[hogy Péter elindult]].
that Peter left-3SG

high: ‚I leave after the time t when you tell me that Peter has left.‘

*low: ‚I leave after time t. You tell me that Peter left at time t.
[Lipták, 2005:158]

different underlying syntax!

2.2 Quantifier scope in temporal clauses

English temporal adjunct clauses provide counterexamples to the generalization that quantifier scope is clause-bound (Artstein 2005)

- quantificational arguments can take scope outside of temporal adjunct clauses.

A secretary cried before/after/when the board fired each executive.
each executive: wide or narrow scope, both single time and dependent time reading possible

A secretary cried if/although/because the board fired each executive.
wide-scope for each executive/dependent time reading not possible

2.2.1 Hungarian data

- Amikor/Miután minden vezető-t kirúgtak,
when after every executive-ACC fired-3PL

sírt egy titkárnő.
cried-3SG a secretary
no ambiguity

- Mivel minden vezető-t kirúgtak, sírt egy titkárnő.
as every executive-ACC fired-3PL cried-3SG a secretary
no ambiguity

- Minden vezető kirúgása után/miatt sírt egy titkárnő.
every executive firing-POSS after/because of cried-3SG a secretary
ambiguous

3 Explaining the data

3.1 High and low readings

Lipták (2005)

1. (a)mikor, (a)mikorra, (a)mióta, ameddig
a-when a-by.when a-since.when until.when

2. mialatt, miközben,
what-under (=while) what-during (=while)

mielőtt, miután
what-before what-after

Different relativization strategies: ordinary free relatives in (1) with real question words as opposed to IP-relativization in (2): relative clause in a PP containing the CP → long movement of low RelP leads to ECP, HMC violations).

3.2 Quantifier scope in temporal clauses

3.2.1 Temporal generalized quantifiers

Pratt and Francez (2001)

Temporal adjunct clauses (TACs) as temporal generalized quantifiers (implicit temporal determiner meaning in the adjunct clause as opposed to explicit determiners in temporal PPs)

Artstein (2005)

extending the analysis to quantification relations across the boundaries of temporal adjunct clauses

A very flexible system where the temporal determiner can be applied before a quantificational argument

→ wide scope for the argument

3.2.2 Kusumoto (2009): English

- a syntactic account as opposed to Artstein's semantic mechanism of lambda abstraction
- TACs: scope-taking, non-TACs: not scope-taking
- the class of adjunct clauses that allow dependent time readings and long-distance dependencies (high/low readings) is the same: German/Japanese: neither of the two
- account: null temporal operator movement (after the raising of the entire TAC before the main clause)

3.2.3 Kusumoto (2009): German and Japanese

- Neither dependent time readings, nor long-distance dependencies
 - some locality constraint might prohibit the long distance movement of the null temporal operator
 - the TACs in these languages do not employ such movement

Japanese TACs do not employ movement as the embedded tenses are relative tenses evaluated with respect to the dominating tenses. They have no null temporal operator of their own.

3.2.4 Hungarian

- Long distance dependencies allowed in (certain) temporal clauses (where not, ECP, HMC violation)
- Dependent time readings not allowed in TACs

→ Hungarian TACs can have null temporal operator movement (as opposed to Japanese), the question is what blocks it in those structures where it is not possible.

No long distance dependencies in IP-relatives: Lipták (2005)

No dependent time readings: both types of TACs

Most problematic: in free relative TACs long distance dependencies are allowed, but dependent time readings are not. Not (the same kind of) locality violation!

3.2.5 The data again

- Amikor/Miután minden vezető-t kirúgtak, sírt egy titkárnő.
when after every executive-ACC fired-3PL cried-3SG a secretary
no ambiguity

Similar pattern in binding:

- *Amikor/Miután/ Mielőtt minden gyerek lefekszik, (pro) kap egy puszit.
when what-after what-before every child goes.to.bed gets a kiss
- Amikor/Miután/ Mielőtt (pro) lefekszik, minden gyerek kap egy puszit.
when what-after what-before goes.to.bed every child gets a kiss
- Mielőtt Péter lefekszik, (pro) kap egy puszit.
what-before Peter goes.to bed gets a kiss

Problem related to the constituents in QP

3.2.6 The English pattern

- Before each boy_i goes to sleep I give him_i a kiss.
- I give each boy_i a kiss before he_i goes to sleep.

covert operator movement in TAC as opposed to Hungarian

4 Conclusion

(Some of) the factors that play a role in how embedded finite clauses interact with their main clauses:

- type of (relative) construction
- possibility of (temporal) operator movement (presence of operator/locality)
- overt or covert operator movement



Thank you for your attention!

References

- Artstein, Ron, 2005. Quantificational arguments in temporal adjunct clauses, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 28, 541-597.
- Grimshaw, Jane, 2006. Location Specific Constraints in Matrix and Subordinate Clauses. <http://roa.rutgers.edu/files/857-0806/857-GRIMSHAW-o-o.PDF>
- Haegeman, Liliane, 2003. Notes on long adverbial fronting in English and the left periphery. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34. 640-649.
- Haegeman, Liliane, 2010. The Internal syntax of adverbial clauses, *Lingua* 120. 628-648.
- Kusumoto, Kiyomi, 2009. Dependencies in Temporal Adjunct Clauses in T. Friedman and S. Ito (eds.), *SALT XVIII*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University
- Lipták, Anikó, 2005. Relativization strategies in temporal adjunct clauses. In: *LIVY Yearbook* 5, John Benjamins, Philadelphia/Amsterdam, pp. 133-185.
- Pratt, Ian and Nissim Francez, 2001. Temporal prepositions and temporal generalized quantifiers. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 24(2), 187-222.
- Sawada, Miyuki and Richard Larson (2004) Adjunct clauses, presupposition and root transformations, in Keir Moulton and Matthew Wolf (eds.), *Proceedings of the thirty-fourth annual meeting of the North East Linguistic Society* Volume Two. Amherst: GLSA, pp. 517-52.