Patterns of Verb raising with Auxiliary 'be'

Howard Lasnik
University of Connecticut

I Raising Asymmetries - A θ-based Approach   (Pollock (1989)/Chomsky (1991))

(1) He is here.   He isn't here.   Is he here?

(2) He (is) here.   He ain't here.   Is he here?

(3) He dances.   *He dancesn't.   *Dances he?

(4) 'Infl' is not one head; it consists of (at least) Tense and Agr, each heading its own projection.

(5) English Agr, because not morphologically rich, is 'opaque' to θ-role transmission. Thus, if a verb with θ-roles to assign were to raise, it would be unable to assign them, resulting in a violation of the θ-criterion. (Pollock (1989))

(6)a Bob be writing his assignments
   b Bob don't be/ *ben't writing his assignments
(7)a Do you be happy when you talk to your sister?
   b *Be you happy when you talk to your sister?

(8)a Bob be working when the mailman come
   b Bob be getting mail from his friends
(9)a It be raining a lot during the summer
   b It be a blue car parked on the street at night

II A Minimalist Approach   (Chomsky (1993))

(10)a Strong lexicalism: verbs are pulled from the lexicon fully inflected.
    b The inflected V raises to Agr (and T) to 'check' the features it already has. This checking can, in principle, take place anywhere in a derivation on the path to LF.
    c Once a feature of AGR has done its checking work, it disappears.

(11) So what's the difference between French, a language where all verbs can raise, and English?

(12)a In French, the V-features of AGR (i.e., those that check features of a V) are strong.
    b In English, the V-features of AGR are weak.

(13)a If V raises to AGR overtly, the V-features of AGR check the features of the V and disappear. If V delays raising until LF, the V-features of AGR survive into PF.
    b V-features are not legitimate PF objects.
    c Strong features are visible at PF; weak features are not. Surviving strong features cause the derivation to 'crash' at PF.
    d This forces overt V-raising in French.

(14) In English, delaying the raising until LF does not result in an ill-formed PF object, so such a derivation is possible. What makes it necessary is:
(15) 'Procrastinate': Whenever possible, delay an operation until LF.

(16) Why do auxiliary have and be raise overtly?
(17) Have and be are semantically vacuous, hence not visible to LF operations. Thus, if they have not raised overtly, they will not be able to raise at all. Their unchecked features will cause the LF to crash. If habitual be has meaning (even though it lacks θ-roles), it will be visible in LF, so nothing will demand that it raise overtly.
(18) Questions about (17): (A) Should syntactic operations, even those in the LF component, care about purely semantic properties? (B) Even instances of have and be arguably possessing semantic content raise overtly. (C) According to (17), no language should allow inflected auxiliaries in situ, yet in Swedish, auxiliary verbs pattern exactly with main verbs in remaining in situ in embedded clauses.

(19)a Is there a solution / There isn't a solution
    b Have you any money / I haven't any money

(20)a ..., om   hon inte ofte har sett honom
         whether she not often has seen him
    b *   om hon har inte ofte sett honom
    c *   Om hon inte har ofta sett honom

III Notes Towards a Hybrid Minimalist Account

(21) Chomsky's lexicalist account demands that AGR and T are just abstract features that check against features of fully inflected verbs which raise to them. The earlier accounts treated such Infl items as bound morphemes that had to become affixes on otherwise bare verbs. Can both possibilities coexist? (22) sketches such a possibility.

(22)a French verbs are fully inflected in the lexicon (possibly correlating with the fact that there are no bare forms; even the infinitive has an ending).
    b English auxiliaries are fully inflected in the lexicon (possibly correlating with the fact that they are highly suppletive, although main verb go also has a highly suppletive past tense).
    c All other English verbs are bare in the lexicon.

(23) Infl is freely an affix or a set of abstract features.

(24)a Finite featural Infl is strong in both French and English.
    b Affixal Infl must merge with a V, a PF process (distinct from syntactic head movement) demanding adjacency.   (Halle and Marantz (1993); Bobaljik (1993); Lasnik (1994); all essentially following Chomsky (1957))

(25)a ... Infl ... V ... OK. V will overtly raise.
        +F   +F

    b ... Infl ... V ... OK. PF merger.
        Af   bare

    c ... Infl ... V ... * at LF. +F of I won't be checked;
        +F   bare   * at PF as well, since +F is strong.

    d ... Infl ... V ... * at LF. +F of V won't be checked.
        Af   +F   * at PF also, if merger fails.

(26)a French Infl will thus always have to be featural.
   b English Infl will always have to be featural, when the verb is auxiliary <u>have</u> or <u>be</u>.
   c English Infl will always have to be affixal with any other verb.

(27)a *John not left {Merger couldn't have taken place because of non-adjacency.}
   b *John left not {<u>Left</u> isn't in the lexicon, so no feature could drive raising.}

(28) Jean (n')aime pas Marie
(29) John has not left

(30)a ..., om   hon inte ofte **har** sett honom
      whether she not often has seen him
   b * om hon **har** inte ofte sett honom
   c * Om hon inte **har** ofta sett honom

(31) Swedish verbs, like French verbs, are pulled from the lexicon inflected. The features
         responsible for V-raising are **weak** in Swedish, **strong** in French.

(32)a John is not foolish
   b *Be not foolish
   c Be foolish
   d Don't be foolish

(33)a The Imperative morpheme (generated in the position of Tense) is strictly affixal, hence
         there will never be raising to it (just merger with it)
   b OR Imp is freely affixal or featural, and <u>be</u> and auxiliary <u>have</u> (like main verbs) lack
         imperative forms in the lexicon.

(34)a *Not leave {Lack of adjacency blocks merger}
   b *Not be foolish

(35)   John slept, and now Mary will
(36)a *John slept, and now Mary will **slept**
   b John slept, and now Mary will **sleep**

(37) *John was here, and Mary will too
(38)a *John was here and Mary will **was** here too
   b John was here and Mary will **be** here too

(39) Leave. I don't want to.
(40) Mary left. I don't want to.

(41) Be quiet. I don't want to.
(42) Mary is quiet. *I don't want to.

(43)a Bob be writing his assignments
   b Bob don't be/ *ben't writing his assignments
(44)a Do you be happy when you talk to your sister?
   b *Be you happy when you talk to your sister?

(45) AAE has an affixal habitual morpheme. It is phonetically null, just like the imperative morpheme,
        yet morpho-syntactically active, just like the imperative morpheme.

Bibliography

Baker, C.L. 1991. The syntax of English <u>not</u>: the limits of core grammar. Linguistic Inquiry 22.387-429.

Bobaljik, Jonathan David. 1993. What does adjacency do? Cambridge, MA: MIT, ms.

Chomsky, Noam. 1955. The logical structure of linguistic theory. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, ms. [1975. New York: Plenum Publishing].

Chomsky, Noam. 1957. Syntactic Structures. The Hague: Mouton.

Chomsky, Noam. 1991. Some notes on economy of derivation and representation. Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar, ed. by Robert Freidin, 417-54. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. The View from Building 20, ed. by Kenneth Hale and S.J. Keyser, 1-52. Cambridge,MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1994. Bare phrase structure, MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics, Number 5. Cambridge, MA: MIT.

Chomsky, Noam and Howard Lasnik. 1993. The theory of principles and parameters. Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research, ed. by Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld, and Theo Vennemann, 506-69. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Emonds, Joseph. 1978. The verbal complex V'-V in French. Linguistic Inquiry 9.151-75.

Epstein, Samuel David. forthcoming. Scope marking and LF V2. Linguistic Inquiry.

Green, Lisa. 1993. Topics in African American English: the verb system analysis. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Ph.D dissertation.

Halle, Morris and Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. The View from Building 20, ed. by Kenneth Hale and S.J. Keyser, 111-76. Cambridge,MA: MIT Press.

Kayne, Richard S. 1989. Notes on English agreement. New York: Graduate Center, CUNY, ms.

Lasnik, Howard. 1981. Restricting the theory of transformations. Explanation in Linguistics, ed. by Norbert Hornstein and David Lightfoot, 152-73. London: Longmans. [Reprinted in Lasnik. 1990.]

Lasnik, Howard. 1990. Essays on Restrictiveness and Learnability. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Lasnik, Howard. 1993. Lectures on minimalist syntax. UConn Working Papers Occasional Papers in Linguistics, Number 1. Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut.

Lasnik, Howard. 1994. Verbal morphology: <u>Syntactic Structures</u> meets the minimalist program.

Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. Verb movement, universal grammar, and the structure of IP. Linguistic Inquiry 20. 365-424.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartik. 1972. A Grammar of Contemporary English. London: Seminar Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. Relativized Minimality. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Roberts, Ian G. 1993. Verbs and Diachronic Syntax. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Roberts, Ian G. 1994. Two types of head movement in Romance. Verb Movement, ed. by David Lightfoot and Norbert Hornstein, 207-42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Warner, Anthony R. 1986. Ellipsis conditions and the status of the English copula. York Papers in Linguistics 12.153-72.

Watanabe, Akira. 1993. AGR-based Case theory and its interaction with the A-bar system. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.

Wexler, Ken. 1994. Optional infinitives, head movement, and the economhy of derivations. Verb Movement, ed. by David Lightfoot and Norbert Hornstein, 305-50. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilder, Chris and Damir Čavar. 1993. Word order variation, verb movement, and economy principles. Sprachwissenschaft in Frankfurt Arbeitspapier 10. Frankfurt.