Within Language, Beyond Theories (Volume I)

Within Language, Beyond Theories (Volume I)

Studies in Theoretical Linguistics

Edited by

Anna Bondaruk and Anna Prażmowska

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Within Language, Beyond Theories (Volume I):
Studies in Theoretical Linguistics

Edited by Anna Bondaruk and Anna Prażmowska

Reviewed by
Dr. hab. Gréte Dalmi (Jan Kochanowski University)
Prof. Dr. hab. Bogdan Szymanek (John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin)

This book first published 2015

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-7204-0
ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-7204-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

The monograph *Within Language, Beyond Theories* presents a collection of insightful studies pertaining to the most perplexing problems in the areas of theoretical and applied linguistics. Contributors offer accounts of new evidence drawn from a number of the world's languages and analyses that surpass the limits of contemporary frameworks in search of more explanatorily adequate solutions to linguistic dilemmas. We delve into the previously unexplored areas of linguistic reality, aiming to gain insight into the structure of the system and establish laws governing its inner organization. Importantly, linguists of different persuasions share the belief that our enhanced understanding of the grammar of language and its constituent modules will foster new advances in the novel application of the models proposed. Assisted by innovative ideas in corpus studies, translators and discourse researchers will be able to make invaluable contributions to the development of their fields.

Volume One, entitled *Studies in Theoretical Linguistics*, comprises twenty five chapters, organized into three parts. Part I, called Studies in Syntax and Morphology, consists of twelve chapters devoted to current developments in syntactic and morphological theorizing. The leading framework adopted in the syntactic works is the Minimalist Program (henceforth, MP) of Chomsky (1995, 2000, 2001, 2008), in which the derivations are taken to be minimal and based on independently motivated extra-grammatical, cognitive constraints (cf. the third factor of Chomsky 2005). Another model that stems from the MP, which is used in Caruso's work (cf. Chapter One) is the cartographic model (cf. Rizzi 1997; 2004, Cinque 1999; Belletti 2004, among others), in which the left periphery of the clause is split into several distinct projections to incorporate items such as topics, foci, force markers, finiteness markers, etc. By analogy with the CP, the split has recently been postulated within the structure of a DP to account for focalization, topicalization, informational prominence and quantification (cf. Ihsane and Puskás 2001; Aboh 2004; Länzlinger 2005, 2010; Giusti 2005, among others). The main syntactic area analysed in Part I relates to the DP in various languages, including English, Croatian, Polish, and Romanian (cf. the contributions by Caruso, Pskit, Wietrzyk, Tigău, and Cetnarowska), which is approached from distinct angles, including its internal structure, the order of elements inside a DP, the

treatment of certain structures as DPs, and the sensitivity of clitic doubling to the type of DP involved. Information structure is central to Caruso's and Mokrosz's chapters, while Case valuation and φ-feature agreement figure prominently in Bartczak-Meszyńska's and Mokrosz's analyses. The notion of transitivity is examined in two different languages from two different theoretical standpoints by Charzyńska-Wójcik and Bartczak-Meszyńska. The former focuses on the definition of transitivity in Old English, while the latter concentrates on the structure of the double object construction in English and German. Various interpretational possibilities are discussed in the chapters by Cetnarowska and Lee, with respect to the position of adjectives in a Polish DP in the former and negative quantifiers in Cantonese in the latter.

There are three morphological chapters in Part I, which represent two very different traditions of morphological description. The chapter by Bloch-Trojnar adopts the Lexeme Morpheme Base Morphology of Beard (1995), in which morphology is taken to be a part of the lexicon. The contributions by Alghamdi and Malicka-Kleparska have their roots in the Chomskyan vision of grammar, with grammatical structure constituting the backbone of any linguistic analysis. Alghamdi's work adopts the framework of Distributed Morphology (cf. Marantz 1984; Halle and Marantz 1993, 1994; Halle 1997; Harley and Noyer 1999, 2000; Arad 2005; Embick and Noyer 2007, inter alia). Malicka-Kleparska's analysis utilises the root based approach and thus belongs to a new trend in structure dependent morphology, as outlined in Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (2004), Pylkkänen (2008), Doron and Labelle (2010), Embick (2009), Alexiadou and Doron (2012). The morphological chapters focus on data from Polish and Arabic.

Part I of the volume is organized as follows. The first two chapters address the syntactic structure of the nominal domain of two Slavic languages – Croatian and Polish. Chapter One presents an analysis of the structure of the nominal left periphery within the split-DP approach. This approach stems from the split-CP analysis of clauses, where several functional projections, such as TopicP or FocusP, are located above the TP. Analogously, the split-DP analysis assumes the existence of a functional structure above the noun, which is generally associated with the category of determiners. It is argued that Croatian, although an articleless language, possesses a rich functional structure above noun phrases, which conveys information pertaining to the notions of (in)definiteness and specificity.

Chapter Two examines the categorial status and the structure of NPN forms (e.g., *day after day*) in English and Polish. The categorial status of

these constructions has not yet been conclusively established in the literature and ranges from nominal (cf. Quirk et al. 1985), through quantificational (cf. Travis 2001, 2003), to prepositional (cf. Haïk 2013). Here, it is proposed that Polish NPNs belong to the nominal domain and, as in English, they seem to be derived through syntactic reduplication.

Chapter Three also aims at establishing a categorial status but, this time, of Polish clausal subjects. The properties of Polish nominal and clausal subjects were juxtaposed and the subject status of CP subjects positively tested with reference to obligatory raising, agreement, coordination, control and case. It is proposed that Polish clausal subjects do have a nominal status and they do possess a DP layer within which the head of the DP is realized by *to* 'it.'

Chapter Four addresses the syntax of clauses as well. More precisely, it offers an argument for the reanalysis of cleft clauses as relative clauses. Some significant similarities in agreement patterns between relative and cleft clauses are identified and employed as a starting point for an investigation into the possibility of analyzing the English *it*-clefts as either appositive or restrictive relative clauses.

Chapter Five provides an insight into three types of Double Object Constructions in German, realized by different case patterns (dative-accusative, accusative-dative, double accusative), and related structures employing a PP as one of the objects. The discussion of the structure and derivation of German DOCs is supplemented with an examination of certain processes that both objects undergo, such as Case and φ-feature valuation and passivisation.

Chapter Six explores the syntax of object negative *wh*-quantifiers (Neg-whQ) from the perspective of a feature-based approach. The language under investigation is Cantonese, where object Neg-whQs are unique in that they can yield both a negative and an existential reading. In order to account for the overt raising of object Neg-whQs and their dual interpretation, two features are proposed, namely [Quant] (interpretable and strong), responsible for the movement phenomenon, and [uNeg], to which the distinction between the existential and negative reading is attributed.

Chapter Seven offers an investigation into the clitic doubling phenomenon in Romanian, which is obligatory with definite pronouns, optional with proper names, definite descriptions and indefinites, and ungrammatical with bare quantifiers. It is observed that the presence of clitic doubling and the presence of PE marking in Romanian, although often correlated in the literature, are not always mutually dependent on each other. In the proposed analysis, the clitic is considered to be an

agreement marker and the double is argued to be an argument, rather than an adjunct.

Chapter Eight offers a critical insight into the transitivity of Old English verbs viewed from the perspective of two traditional approaches to the concept of transitivity. One of them is referred to as the quantitative approach, where the number of arguments is taken into account, and the other one as the qualitative approach, concerned with the types of arguments. It is demonstrated that, although separately they are insufficient to successfully deal with all the intricacies of Old English passivisation facts, when applied jointly, the two approaches can cover a significant part of these facts (excluding, however, the issue of object case alternation).

Chapter Nine examines the nature of roots within the framework of Distributed Morphology. It is shown that, at least in Standard Arabic, roots are devoid of compositional semantic features, which have been claimed to identify roots (Marantz 1995, 1998). Instead, it is proposed that a root index, i.e., the property of a root morpheme containing a primitive conceptual feature (Pfau 2009), is responsible for the proper identification of the root in the Vocabulary and the Encyclopedia components.

Chapter Ten is concerned with the morpho-syntax of a group of prefixed causative verbs in Polish which lack corresponding synthetic anticausatives, despite their semantics and despite the availability of an applicable morphological pattern for anticausative formation in Polish. The proposed analysis, couched within the root-based approach, offers a bipartite structure where the prefixes of the aforementioned causatives function as heads of the active voice projection.

The focus of Chapter Eleven is on attributive adjectives in Polish, in particular on classifying adjectives occupying not only post-nominal but also pre-nominal positions. The difference in interpretation between complex predicates, consisting of a noun followed by a classifying adjective (‘tight units’), and adjective + noun sequences is demonstrated and investigated with reference to some semantic and pragmatic factors.

Chapter Twelve aims at establishing the female counterpart of the Polish noun *minister* ‘minister’ on morphological grounds. Several possible candidates are closely examined with reference to the etymology of the word *minister*, the patterns of paradigmatic derivation, markedness relationships, the economy principle, and the increasing tendency towards analytic structures in Polish. It is argued that *pani minister* ‘Mrs minister’ is the linguistically optimal form since the analytical form (as opposed to the synthetic variants) is semantically more precise and unambiguous, and,

additionally, it is deemed to be more prestigious due to the use of the honorific pronoun.

Part II of the volume, entitled Studies in Phonetics and Phonology, consists of eight chapters. The main research area in current phonological studies concerns the interface between phonology and phonetics. The issue of the phonology and phonetics interface arises only if these two disciplines are viewed as separate computational systems. Then, their interface can be taken to represent a spell-out operation converting the phonological output into units of phonetic representation (cf. Scheer 2014). If, on the other hand, phonology and phonetics are not treated as autonomous, but rather as closely integrated, then they must be seen as not interfacing with each other (Ohala 1990). The interface between phonology and phonetics is central to the chapters by Bloch-Rozmej, and Urban and Zdziebko. Some aspects of suprasegmental phonology are studied by Taranenko. Kalyta investigates speech energetics, i.e., the peculiarities of emotional utterances and their phonetic organization, relying, to some extent, on other disciplines, including pragmatics, stylistics, semantics, etc. Beňuš, in turn, goes beyond the Articulatory Phonology of Browman and Goldstein (1986, 1989, inter alia) to examine entrainment, i.e., the tendency of interlocutors to synchronize, coordinate and speak in a more similar way over the course of mutual communicative interactions, manifested, among others, in the sphere of articulatory gestures. The predominant theoretical framework adopted in the phonological works is the Government Phonology of Kaye, Lowenstamm and Vergnaud (1985, 1990) (cf. also Harris 1994; Gussmann 2007; Cyran 2010; Bloch-Rozmej 2008). The model, which operates on just one level of representation and makes use of a limited number of primes, called elements, is adopted in the chapters by Bloch-Rozmej, Urban and Zdziebko, Czerniak, and Drabikowska. Another model which prominently figures in the work by Gregová is the framework proposed by Duanmu (2009). Duanmu (2009) suggests that all surface strings may be reduced to a fixed and invariant syllable template, C(onsonant) V(owel) X, and thus stands in sharp opposition to the CVCV model, advocated by Lowenstamm (1996), Scheer (2004), and Cyran (2010), inter alia. The languages that are analysed in the eight chapters devoted to phonology and phonetics include: English, Slovak, Welsh, Scottish English, Old English, and German.

Part II is organized as follows. Chapter Thirteen provides a discussion of the nature of the mid central vowel schwa from the perspective of the Government Phonology framework. The distinct properties of representation and distribution of the English and the French schwa are demonstrated and explored. It is shown that, in English, the representation

of the schwa vowel is that of a mono-elemental headless segment, whereas the French schwa is a phonetically realized ungoverned empty nucleus.

Chapter Fourteen offers an empirical insight into the phonological constitution of Scottish laterals in terms of the Element Theory. On the basis of acoustic measurements, it is argued that the elements A and U cannot and do not constitute the representation of the Scottish lateral /ɬ/. Instead, it is proposed that the non-vocalized laterals contain elements U and I (and, in the vicinity of /ɔ/, an additional element A), whereas vocalized laterals contain only the element U.

Chapter Fifteen is concerned with melody spreading, in particular with vowel epenthesis and tonic lengthening in Welsh. The chapter offers a uniform representation of the two phenomena within the CV-model of Government Phonology, supporting the analysis with rich data from South Welsh.

Chapter Sixteen examines English and Slovak word-initial consonant clusters and, applying the CVX syllable model, challenges the claim that, cross-linguistically, most consonant clusters can be reanalysed as complex segments (Duanmu 2009). It is shown that, although they can be phonemically considered as complex segments, phonetically, these clusters are much longer than single segments, which stands in direct opposition to the claim under investigation.

Chapter Seventeen explores the structure of two Old English digraphs <eo> and <ea> from the perspective of the Government Phonology 2.0 framework (Pöchtrager 2006, among others), which borrows (and adapts for phonology) some concepts from minimalist syntax. It is demonstrated that GP 2.0 offers tools which can be efficiently employed in the analysis of certain sets of data that often prove problematic for the standard GP theory.

Chapter Eighteen aims at establishing the correspondence between the pragmatic features of a fable containing moral admonition and its prosodic organization. An algorithmic analysis of several fable plots is conducted, resulting in the identification of two distinct patterns with distinct prosodic organization displaying differences in such prosodic features as volume, voice range, tempo, rhythm, melodic contour, and the frequency and duration of pauses.

Chapter Nineteen offers a discussion of the energetic approach to phonetic research proposed therein, which presupposes that phonetic phenomena are the outcome of a non-deterministic speech generation process motivated by psycho-physiological energy redistributed over the speaker's mental spheres of the conscious, the subconscious and the unconscious. The discussion is supplemented with a quantitative analysis

of different levels (high, mid and low) of the emotional-and-pragmatic potential of utterance actualization.

Chapter Twenty investigates the nature of communicative entrainment, focusing on the search for a formalized link between linguistic (and also non-linguistic) entrainment and cognitive representations, or, in more general terms, a link between linguistic and social cognitive systems. In particular, the proposed analysis advocates modelling (acoustic and prosodic) entrainment analogously to the modelling of communicative intention.

Part III, called Studies in Cognitive Linguistics, comprises five chapters. Cognitive Grammar represents a theory of grammar developed by Langacker (1991, 2000, 2009), which differs from the Generative Grammar of Chomsky in that it primarily focuses on the meaning of linguistic expressions, not on their form. Meaning in Cognitive Grammar is seen as flexible and dynamic, and as involving conceptualisation (Langacker 1991). In this framework, language is seen as a part of the cognitive faculty, not as a module autonomous with respect to other linguistic cognitive systems, as in the generative tradition (Croft and Cruse 2004). Some specific models stemming from Cognitive Grammar that have been adopted in the contributions by Jabłońska-Hood and Rusinek correspond respectively to the Conceptual Integration Theory, devised by Fauconnier and Turner (2006), which is based on a mental spaces theory and the Conceptual Metaphor Theory, proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 2003) and Kövecses (2010). The major areas of research in Cognitive Grammar that have found their way into this volume include metonymy (cf. Wiliński's chapter), metaphor (see Rusinek's chapter), conceptualisation or construction of meaning (cf. Głaz's, and Żyśko and Żyśko contributions), and mental spaces blending (see Jabłońska-Hood's work). The data in the final five chapters of the volume come primarily from English, including its earlier varieties, such as Old and Middle English.

Part III is organized as follows. Chapter Twenty One examines the non-standard use of English articles in terms of Langacker's model of Cognitive Grammar. In particular, the study focuses on the phrase *the dad*, employing in the analysis the juxtaposition of the concepts of actuality and virtuality.

Chapter Twenty Two offers a discussion of the study of meaning construction, understood as the process of a word acquiring new senses, and its relation to the study of historical semantics. It is shown, on the basis of an analysis of the diachronic semantics of the English 'joy' vocabulary (*bliss*, *cheer* and *delight*), that the motivation underlying

meaning construction is extra-linguistic in nature, being dependent on such factors as experience, mental associations and the influence of the dominant ideology in a particular society.

Chapter Twenty Three provides an analysis of the notion of humour based on Monty Python's work and couched within conceptual blending theory put forward by Fauconnier and Turner (2006). It is suggested that Conceptual Blending Theory, operating on mental spaces and their integration, i.e., blending, could prove to be a major stepping stone to creating a uniform theory of humour applicable to various kinds of comedy.

Chapter Twenty Four is devoted to an investigation into one of the major metonymic relations, namely 'the part for the whole' relation. It is observed and illustrated that this relation, or rather its name, in particular the term 'whole,' is misleading in presupposing too wide a domain; hence, the term 'metonymic expansion' is proposed as a more precise one.

The final chapter of this volume, Chapter Twenty Five, presents a corpus-based study of the gender differences in the metaphorical uses of 'cooking' terms, such as *boil*, *cook* and *simmer*, based on data from the British National Corpus and conducted within the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). It is demonstrated that men tend to use 'cooking' terms in the metaphorical sense more frequently than women. The gender distinctions made in employing different kinds of conceptual metaphors constructed on the basis of 'cooking' terms are also examined and discussed.

We would like to thank Prof. Anna Malicka-Kleparska for the various forms of assistance she has provided during our work on this volume. We are grateful to Dr Sławomir Zdziebko and Marietta Rusinek, for helping us to understand the recent developments in phonology and Cognitive Grammar. We are also deeply indebted to Elżbieta Sielanko-Byford and Nigel Byford for having proofread the entire volume.

Anna Bondaruk and Anna Prażmowska

References

Aboh, Enoch. 2004. "Topic and Focus within D." *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 21:1–12.

Alexiadou, Artemis, and Elena Anagnostopoulou. 2004. "Voice Morphology in the Causative-Inchoative Alternation: Evidence for a Non-Unified Structural Analysis of Unaccusatives." In *The Unaccusativity Puzzle. Explorations of the Syntax-Lexicon Interface*,

edited by Artemis Alexiadou, Elena Anagnostopoulou, and Martin Everaert, 114–36. Oxford: OUP.
Alexiadou, Artemis, and Edit Doron. 2012. "The Syntactic Construction of Two Non-Active Voices: Passive and Middle." *Journal of Linguistics* 48:1–34.
Arad, Maya. 2005. *Roots and Patterns: Hebrew Morpho-syntax*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Beard, Robert. 1995. *Lexeme Morpheme Base Morphology.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
Belletti, Adriana, ed. 2004. *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*. Oxford: OUP.
Bloch-Rozmej, Anna. 2008. *Melody in Government Phonology*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
Browman, Catherine P., and Louis M. Goldstein. 1986. "Towards an Articulatory Phonology." *Phonology Yearbook* 3:219–52.
Browman, Catherine P., and Louis M. Goldstein. 1989. "Articulatory Gestures as Phonological Units." *Phonology* 6:201–51.
Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads.* Oxford: OUP.
Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
—. 2000. "Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework." In *Step by Step*, edited by Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 89–155. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
—. 2001. "Derivation by Phase." In *Ken Hale. A Life in Language*, edited by Michael Kenstowicz, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
—. 2005. "Three Factors in Language Design." *Linguistic Inquiry* 36:1–22.
—. 2008. "On Phases." In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory. Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, edited by Robert Freidin, Carolos P. Otero, and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, 134–66. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Croft, William, and D. Alan Cruse. 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: CUP.
Cyran, Eugeniusz. 2010. *Complexity Scales and Licensing in Phonology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Doron, Edit, and Marie Labelle. 2010. "An Ergative Analysis of French Valency Alternations." In *Romance Linguistics 2010: Selected Papers from the 40th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL), Seattle, Washington, March 2010*, edited by Julia Herschensohn, 137–54. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Duanmu, San. 2009. *Syllable Structure: The Limits of Variation*. Oxford: OUP.

Embick, David. 2009. "Roots, States, and Stative Passives." Abstract for Root Workshop, University of Stuttgart, June 2009.

Embick, David, and Rolf Noyer. 2007. "Distributed Morphology and the Syntax/Morphology Interface." In *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Interfaces*, edited by Gillian Ramchand and Charles Reiss, 289–324. Oxford: OUP.

Fauconnier, Gilles, and Mark Turner. 2006. "Mental Spaces. Conceptual Integration Networks." In *Cognitive Linguistics. Basic Readings*, edited by Dirk Geeraerts, 303–71. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Giusti, Giuliana. 2005. "At the Left Periphery of the Romanian Noun Phrase." In *On Space and Time in Language*, edited by Martine Coene and Liliane Tasmowski, 23–49. Cluj: Clusium.

Gussmann, Edmund. 2007. *The Phonology of Polish*. Oxford: OUP.

Haïk, Isabelle. 2013. "Symmetric Structures." *Corela* 11:1. Accessed September 08, 2013. http://corela.edel.univ-poitiers.fr/index.php?id=2875.

Halle, Morris. 1997. "Distributed Morphology: Impoverishment and Fission." *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 30:425–49.

Halle, Morris, and Alec Marantz. 1993. "Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection." In *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, edited by Kenneth Locke Hale, Samuel Jay Keyser, and Sylvain Bromberger, 111–76. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Halle, Morris, and Alec Marantz. 1994. "Some Key Features of Distributed Morphology." *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 21:275–88.

Harley, Heidi, and Rolf Noyer. 1999. "State-of-the-Article: Distributed Morphology." *Glot International* 4(4):3–9.

Harley, Heidi, and Rolf Noyer. 2000. "Formal Versus Encyclopedic Properties of Vocabulary: Evidence from Nominalisations." In *The Lexicon-Encyclopedia Interface*, edited by Bert Peeters, 349–74. Amsterdam: Elsevier Press.

Harris, John. 1994. *English Sound Structure*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ihsane, Tabea, and Genoveva Puskás. 2001. "Specific is not Definite." *GG@G (Generative Grammar in Geneva)* 2:39–54.

Kaye, Jonathan, Jean Lowenstamm, and Jean-Roger Vergnaud. 1985. "The Internal Structure of Phonological Elements: A Theory of Charm and Government." *Phonology Yearbook* 2:305–28.

—. 1990. "Constituent Structure and Government in Phonology." *Phonology* 7:193–231.
Kövecses, Zoltan. 2010. *Metaphor. A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: OUP.
Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 1980/2003. *Metaphors we Live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Langacker, Ronald. 1991. *Concept, Image and Symbol. The Cognitive Basis of Grammar*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
—. 2000. *Grammar and Conceptualization*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
—. 2009. *Investigations in Cognitive Grammar*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Länzlinger, Christopher. 2005. "French Adjective Ordering: Perspectives on DP-internal Movement Types." *Lingua* 115:645–89.
—. 2010. "The CP/DP Parallelism Revisited." *Generative Grammar in Geneva GG@G* 6:49–107.
Lowenstamm, Jean. 1996. "CV as the only Syllable Type." In *Current Trends in Phonology. Models and Methods*, edited by Jacques Durand and Bernard Laks, 419–41. Salford: ESRI.
Marantz, Alec. 1984. *On the Nature of Grammatical Relations*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
—. 1995. "A Late Note on Late Insertion." In *Explorations in Generative Grammar: A Festschrift for Dong-WheeYang*, edited by Young-Suk Kim, Byung-Choon Lee, Kyoung-Jae Lee, Hyun-Kwon Yang, and Jong-Yurl Yoon, 396–413. Seoul: Hanakuk.
—. 1998. "'Cat' as a Phrasal Idiom: Consequences of Late Insertion in Distributed Morphology." Ms., MIT, Cambridge, MA.
Ohala, John J. 1990. "There is no Interface between Phonology and Phonetics: A Personal View." *Journal of Phonetics* 18:153–71.
Pfau, Roland. 2009. *Grammar As Processor: A Distributed Morphology Account of Spontaneous Speech Errors*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Pöchtrager, Markus A. 2006. "The Structure of Length." PhD diss., University of Vienna.
Pylkkänen, Liina. 2008. *Introducing Arguments. Linguistic Inquiry Monograph* 48. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. *The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery*. In *Elements of Grammar*, edited by Liliane Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

—. 2004. *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*. Oxford: OUP.

Scheer, Tobias. 2014. "Spell-out, Post-phonological." In *Crossing Phonetics-Phonology Lines*, edited by Eugeniusz Cyran and Jolanta Szpyra-Kozłowska, 255–75. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

—. 2004. *A Lateral Theory of Phonology, Vol. 1: What is CVCV and Why Should it Be?* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Travis, Lisa. 2001. "The syntax of reduplication." *Proceedings of NELS* 31:455–69.

—. 2003. "Reduplication feeding syntactic movement." In *Proceedings of the 2003 Annual Conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association*, edited by Sophie Burelle and Stanca Somesfalean, 236–47. Université du Québec à Montréal, Département de linguistique et de didactique des langues.

CONTRIBUTORS

Abdullah S. Alghamdi
Albaha University, Saudi Arabia
a.alghamdi@student.unsw.edu.au

Aleksandra Bartczak-Meszyńska
University of Finance and Management in Białystok, Poland
alexbartczak@poczta.onet.pl

Štefan Beňuš
Constantine the Philosopher University, Nitra, Slovakia
sbenus@ukf.sk

Anna Bloch-Rozmej
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland
abloch@kul.lublin.pl

Maria Bloch-Trojnar
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland
bloch@kul.lublin.pl

Durdica Zeljka Caruso
University of Stuttgart, Germany
zeljka@ifla.uni-stuttgart.de

Bożena Cetnarowska
University of Silesia, Katowice, Poland
bozena.cetnarowska@us.edu.pl

Magdalena Charzyńska-Wójcik
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland
mcwojcik@kul.pl

Tomasz Czerniak
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland
czerniakto@gmail.com

Karolina Drabikowska
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland
drabikowska.karolina@gmail.com

Adam Głaz
Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Lublin, Poland
adam.glaz@umcs.pl

Renáta Gregová
P. J. Šafárik University in Kosice, Slovakia
renata.gregova@upjs.sk

Joanna Jabłońska-Hood
Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Lublin, Poland
hood.asia@gmail.com

Alla Kalyta
National Technical University of Ukraine “Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”
kalitanewadd@gmail.com

Man-Ki Theodora Lee
University of York, United Kingdom
mtl503@york.ac.uk

Anna Malicka-Kleparska
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland
malic@kul.lublin.pl

Ewelina Mokrosz
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland
ewelinamokrosz26@tlen.pl

Wiktor Pskit
University of Łódź, Poland / University of Economy in Bydgoszcz, Poland
pskit@vp.pl

Marietta Rusinek
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland
mariettarusinek@gmail.com

Larysa Taranenko
National Technical University of Ukraine “Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”
litera@i.ua

Alina Tigău
University of Bucharest, Romania
alina_mihaela_tigau@yahoo.com

Mateusz Urban
Jagiellonian University of Kraków, Poland
mateusz.urban@uj.edu.pl

Wojciech Wachowski
Kazimierz Wielki University in Bydgoszcz, Poland
wwachowski@wp.pl

Małgorzata Wietrzyk
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland
mwietrzyk@kul.pl

Sławomir Zdziebko
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland
s.zdziebko86@gmail.com

Angelina Żyśko
Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Lublin, Poland
angelinarusinek@gmail.com

Konrad Żyśko
Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Lublin, Poland
konradzysko@gmail.com

PART I:

STUDIES IN SYNTAX AND MORPHOLOGY

CHAPTER ONE

THE NOMINAL LEFT PERIPHERY IN SLAVIC: EVIDENCE FROM CROATIAN

DURDICA ZELJKA CARUSO

1. Introduction

It is generally assumed that in a communicative situation a speaker structures his utterances in such a way as to achieve an optimal exchange of information. Information Structure (IS) denotes the formal organization of linguistic expressions in relation to their discourse functions (cf. Halliday 1967; Chafe 1976; Lambrecht 1994). According to Aboh et al. (2010),

> information structure reflects the speaker's hypotheses about the hearer's state of mind (i.e., his assumptions, beliefs and knowledge) at the time of the utterance. (Aboh et al. 2010, 783)

Since its introduction in the late sixties, the term *information structure* has been widely used to refer to the partitioning of sentences into categories such as focus, topic or comment. However, no consensus has yet been reached as to which and how many categories of information structure can be distinguished and identified (cf. Büring 2005).

Within the DP,[1] the speaker's hypotheses about the hearer's familiarity with a particular referent are reflected in his choice of the determiner that

[1] The abbreviations used in this chapter are the following: ACC – accusative, C(P) – Complementizer (Phrase), D(P) – Determiner (Phrase), DAT – dative, DEF – definite, Def(P) – Definiteness (Phrase), Dem(P) – Demonstrative (Phrase), F – feminine, FP – Functional Phrase, Foc(P) – Focus (Phrase), GEN – genitive, INDEF – indefinite, MASC – masculine, MED – medial, NP – Noun Phrase, NOM – nominative, Num(P) – Number (Phrase), PL – plural, POSS – possessive, PP –

marks the noun as either identifiable or non-identifiable for the addressee, as shown in the nominal expression *a/the linguist from China* below (Aboh et al. 2010, 783):

(1) a. John invited [*a* linguist from China] (indefinite; non-identifiable)
b. John invited [*the* linguist from China] (definite; identifiable)

Unlike English, which uses (in)definite articles to express this distinction, Turkish, for instance, marks the distinction between identifiable vs. non-identifiable object noun phrases with the help of case marking (ibid.):

(2) a. Ahmet öküz- *ü* aldi. (accusative case, identifiable)
Ahmet ox-ACC bought
'Ahmet bought *the ox.*'

b. Ahmet öküz aldi. (no accusative marking, non-identifiable)
Ahmet ox bought
'Ahmet bought *an ox.*'

In a similar fashion, the difference between an identifiable and non-identifiable object noun phrase in Croatian can be expressed via an accusative/genitive case marking (Pranjković 2000, 345):

(3) a. dodati kruh (identifiable)
to fetch bread-ACC.SG.MASC

b. dodati kruha (non-identifiable)
to fetch bread-GEN.SG.MASC

Adopting the view that the notions of non-familiarity (new information) vs. familiarity (known information) are associated with the categories of focus and topic respectively (cf. Rizzi 1997), the question arises as to whether the nominal domain contains these categories as well and how they are realized. According to Isac and Kirk (2008, 142), there are two types of evidence for the existence of topic and focus projections within the DP. The first type of evidence comes from the NP-internal morphology, e.g., specificity markers in Gungbe (Aboh 2004). The second type of evidence is based on DP-internal displacement phenomena used to express topic and focus, e.g., word order alterations often entail different

---

Prepositional Phrase, SG – singular, TP – Tense Phrase, Top(P) – Topic Phrase, V(P) – Verb (Phrase), Voc(P) – Vocative Phrase.

interpretations, such as focalization or emphasis on a particular nominal constituent.

Since discourse-related properties like topic and focus are encoded in the clausal left periphery (Rizzi 1997), the most prominent discourse-related notions associated with noun phrases, namely (in)definiteness and specificity, are assumed to be realized within the nominal left periphery. Accordingly, the nominal left periphery is decomposed into various functional categories including projections related to focalization, topicalization, informational prominence and quantification (cf. Ihsane and Puskás 2001; Aboh 2004; Länzlinger 2005, 2010; Giusti 2005, among others). The various proposals regarding its structure have been summarized under the term 'the Split DP-Hypothesis.' As far as the nominal left periphery in Slavic languages is concerned, to my knowledge, no such subdivision has been undertaken so far.[2] Noun phrases in Slavic are still considered to be either NPs (Bošković 2005, 2009, 2011; Zlatić 1998) or DPs (Progovac 1998; Leko 1999; Pereltsvaig 2007). Both views are still a matter of controversy. In spite of the obvious lack of the overt discourse-related markers of (in)definiteness and specificity, such as (in)definite articles, and the NP-internal morphology involved in the expression of topic and focus, I argue for a split DP-analysis of nominal expressions in Croatian because the decomposition of the nominal left periphery, along with the overall nominal structure captured by the split DP-proposal, allows me to explain certain DP constructions and syntactic patterns within Croatian noun phrases (e.g., constructions including the numeral *JEDAN* 'one,' deictically used demonstrative pronouns and vocative constructions).

The chapter is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces the categories of topic and focus, both on the clausal level and within the DP. Section 3 gives an overview of the different possibilities of (in)definiteness and specificity marking in Croatian and introduces nominal structures, whose syntactic analysis is provided in section 4. Section 5 offers a brief conclusion.

[2] Progovac (1998) and Leko (1999) provide a DP-analysis of Serbo-Croatian nouns, including the projection DefP in their structure, but their definition of a split DP differs from the standard cross-linguistic approaches to the layered nominal left periphery.

2. The categories of Topic and Focus (Split CP vs. Split DP)

The cartographic approach to syntactic structures (e.g., Rizzi 1997, 2004; Cinque 1999; Belleti 2004, among others), as Ihsane (2010) puts it,

> investigates the make-up of functional categories in the clause, and by extension in nominals. Essentially, it consists in identifying distinct positions in the structure dedicated to different interpretations. (Ihsane 2010, 8)

Following the idea that inflectional morphemes head their own functional projections (Chomsky 1986), clauses are viewed as being "articulated and formed of a succession of lexical and functional projections" (Ihsane 2010, 8). The cartographic approach has been successfully applied to the clausal inflectional domain (Pollock 1989) as well as to its left periphery (Rizzi 1997), and has recently been proposed for the nominal domain as well (cf. Ihsane and Puskás 2001; Aboh 2003, 2004; Länzlinger 2005; Giusti 2005).

According to the cartographic approach to syntactic structures, the noun phrase displays a parallel structure to the one of the clause: both can be decomposed into three domains. The NP/VP-shells represent the **thematic domain** of a verb or a noun, that is, a domain where their external and internal arguments are merged (Larson 1988; Chomsky 1995; Grimshaw 1990). The **inflectional domain** is made up of functional projections that host modifiers of each lexical category, such as adverbs within the clause or adjectives within the noun phrase. Agreement, φ-features and case are also checked in this domain. Finally, **the left periphery** is associated with the notions of topic and focus in the clausal domain (Rizzi 1997) and, within the nominal domain, with features related to the D head, such as (in)definiteness, specificity or referentiality (Aboh 2004). The established parallelism[3] between the two and the corresponding subdivision into three domains is illustrated in (4) below (Ihsane 2010, 17):

(4)

a.	$[_{DP}\ldots\ [_{DP}$	$[_{FP}$ adj1… $[_{FP}$ adj2…	$[_{nP}\ldots[_{NP}..]]]]]]$
b.	$[_{CP}\ldots\ [_{CP}$	$[_{FP}$ adv1…$[_{FP}$ adv2…	$[_{vP}\ldots[_{VP}..]]]]]]$
	left periphery	inflectional domain	NP/VP-shells

[3] Länzlinger (2005) labels these three domains *Vorfeld* (left periphery), *Mittelfeld* (inflectional domain) and *Nachfeld* (thematic domain).