Infinitive Controls in the Syntax of Lexical Verbs
─The Syntax Argument and Aktionsart Correspondence Hypothesis─

語彙動詞統語構造における統率
─統語項-アクションサート呼応仮説─

森　　　延　江
Nobue　MORI

〈要旨〉

This paper argues for a syntactic system of lexical verbs which generates progressively more complex structures in accordance to an inductive algorithm within the general confines of the Minimalist Program. In particular, I propose the SAAC Hypothesis wherein more elaborated syntactic structures of lexical verbs are created by addition of syntactic arguments as event participants, leading to the denotation of progressively more complex eventualities as a whole. My proposal predicts absolute rigidity of syntactic positions of theta role bearing elements, eliminating independent notion of the theta roles and extra-linguistic mappings between the theta hierarchy and syntactic structure. Evidence comes from the possibility of purposive infinitive control by implicit Befactive arguments (Chierchia 1989) in verbal predicates of the corresponding orders of complexities.

〈キーワード〉

syntax, Minimalism, lexical verb,

1　Introduction

In the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1995), a lexical item consists of a set of features with their syntactic specifications utilized by the human computational system C_{hl}. What syntax then is operative at all within the feature bundle that defines the verbal lexical domain? I will be presenting evidence that sub-lexical components of a lexical verb are ruled by fully operative narrow syntactic mechanisms. First I lay out the overall theoretical framework, the Dimensional Theory (Uriagereka 1995). Then I propose the SAAC Hypothesis. Lastly, I examine the validity of the SAAC Hypothesis in English and Japanese.

2　Theoretical Background

Baker (1997) proposes a radical version of Unified Theta Assignment Hypothesis (r-UTAH) in which Conceptual system is necessarily the assumed LF. The r-UTAH, combined with the Vendler Hierarchy (1967),

thus has a theoretical beauty and empiricism analogous to the Dimensional Theory, just like other syntactic proposals on lexical verbs.

The Dimensional Theory (DT), however, sharply distinguishes itself from other frameworks with its unique syntactic approach. In the DT, the C_{hl} takes the most basic lexico-conceptual mental space of dimension 1 as the Base, and defines the dimension 2 through a topological induction, which in turn serves as the Base for the dimension 3, and so on. This process creates a series of small clauses (sc's) thanks to the Presentations akin to a functional head taking an sc, and to the relational/possessive structure by Kayne (1994), inter alia. The inductive nature of the DT ensures the entailments within a lexical verb, as well as the attainment of the syntactic architects via consecutive Presentations.

3　The SAAC Hypothesis for lexical verbs

Based on the DT, I propose the Syntax Argument and Aktionsart Correlation (SAAC) Hypothesis:

1. A lexical predicate with n arguments ⟷
    n^{th} dimension (Mori 2006)

The verbal syntactic structure I propose decomposes a lexical space into a maximum of five verbal layers of projections which mirror the complexities of verbal predicates expressed in traditional 'Aktionsart' (Tenny 1987 inter alia):

2. [VP5 Causer [VP4   Agent [VP3 Locative [VP2 Goal$_{VP4}$/Benefactive $_{VP5}$ [VP1   v Theme]]]]]

The syntactic positions of each element interpreted as bearing a certain theta role at the CI components are fixed and rigid. Crucially, as in (2), the 2nd syntactic argument involved in building the VP2 must be interpreted as Goal for the VP4, and Benefactive for the VP5. I proceed to demonstrate this in infinitive controls.

4   Control by Implicit arguments

Chierchia (1989) notes that Benefactives are capable of controlling an implicit argument e in the subject position of a purpose phase in 3b:

3a. Mary built that board [Benefactive for the children]
    [e to play with]
3b. That board was built [e to play with]
    e = 'the children' (Chierchia 1989: 156)

If indeed the SAAC is true, then we predict that the Benefactive control is possible only in the VP5, such as *build* (4b), but not the VP4 with *stab* (5b):

4a. [Scenario] The ABC Steel Company had the construction workers build Professor Angelou two office buildings. Professor Angelou's sole intention in accepting this offer was to raise the revenue of the American Poetry Society.
4b. The two office buildings were built [e to raise the revenue of the American Poetry Society. <e = Professor Angelou> (Mori 2006: 62, 63)

5a. [Scenario] George is about to lose to Ron in the Presidential nomination. The G.O.P. had a professional killer stab a pro-Ron VIP for/on behalf of George. George accepted this offer with the sole purpose of beating Ron in the Presidential nomination.
5b. #This pro-Ron VIP was stabbed [e to beat Ron in the Presidential nomination]. <e = George>

The Japanese counterparts swing in tandem in VP5 with *build* (6, =4b) and in VP4 with *stab* (7, =5b):

6. ?Futatu-no ofisu biru-wa [e APS-no sainyu-o
    two-gen office building-top APS-gen revenue-gen
    fuyasu-tame-ni] **tate**-rare-ta <e =Prof. Angelou>
    increase-in.order.to   build-pss-pst

7. #Kono Ron-ha VIP-wa [e Ron-ni daitoryo
    this Ron-pro VIP-top Ron-to presidential
    senkyo-de katu-tame-ni] **sas**-are-ta
    election-at win-in.order.to stab-pss-pst <e = George>

5   Conclusion

The data presented here argue for the universality of the syntactic complexity governed by the narrow syntax at the subliminal level of a lexical verb. I leave out additional pieces of evidence for the lack of space.

参考文献

Baker, M. (1997) "Thematic Roles and Syntactic Structure", Haegeman, L. (ed.), Elements of Grammar, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 73-137.
Chierchia, G. (1989) "Structured Meanings, Thematic Roles, and Control", Chierchia, G., Partee, B., and Turner, R. (eds.), Properties, Types, and Meaning, II, Dordrecht,Kluwer Academic Publishers, 131-166.
Chomsky, N. (1995) *The Minimalist Program,* Cambrdige, MIT Press.
Kayne,R(1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax,* Cambridge, MIT P.
Mori, N. (2006) *A Syntactic Structure of Lexical Verbs,* Massachusetts, UMI.
Tenny, C. (1987) "Aspect and affectedness", NELS 18, Toronto.
Uriagereka, J. (1995) "Warps: Some Thoughts and Categorization", UMCP WPL 3, 119-158.
Vendler, Z. (1967) Linguistics in Philosophy, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.