

Word-order and scope in finite embedded non-argument clauses

Krisztina Szécsényi

University of Szeged, Hungary

kszecsenyi@gmail.com

Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium

6-8 June 2013



Introduction: finite embedding

More than one clause domain, Main Clause Phenomena (MCP): SAI, argument fronting, V2 → differences!

Potential interaction with the main clause (even in spite of apparent locality restrictions):

- high and low readings
- quantifier scope interpretation
- binding
- negation

Difference at the top:

- different left peripheries (Haegeman (2003), Sawada and Larson (2004))
- operator movement (Haegeman 2010)
- constraint families evaluating the same structural configuration in different locations (Grimshaw 2006)

Hungarian: scope-rigid pre-verbal field, no ambiguity

(1) Pál **nem** ***(azért)** adta el a biciklijét, mert rossz a fék.
Paul not that-CAUS sold PV his.bike as bad the brake
N(egated) A(djunct) he sold it, but not bec. of the brake

(2) Pál **(azért)** **nem** adta el a biciklijét, mert rossz a fék.
Paul that-CAUS not sold PV his.bike as bad the brake
N(egated) H(ead) reading: he did not sell the bike

English (discussed in Johnston 1993):

(3) He did not sell the bike because the gears were broken.
ambiguous between a NA and a NH reading

High and low readings in temporal clauses

(4) 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.'

(5) Addig maradok, [a-meddig mondod [hogy maradjak]]
that-WHILE stay-1SG **REL-what-WHILE** say-2SG 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]

A different Hungarian construction

Lack of low readings in certain Hungarian temporal clauses

(6) Azután indulok el [miután szólsz, [hogy Péter elindult]].
that-AFTER leave-1SG PV **what-AFTER** tell-1SG 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 relativization strategies →
Different underlying syntax!

Kusumoto (2009): German and Japanese

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 Reason: either Long Distance Movement is blocked or not employed at all (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)

Hungarian temporal adjunct clauses:

long distance dependencies allowed (where not, ECP, HMC violation) ↔ Dependent time readings not allowed

→ 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 (6): Lipták (2005)
No dependent time readings: both types of TACs (9)

Most problematic: in Hungarian free relative TACs long distance dependencies are allowed (5), but dependent time readings are not (9).
→ **Not a/the same kind of locality violation!**

Quantifier scope

Temporal adjunct clauses: counterexamples to the generalization that quantifier scope is clause-bound (Artstein 2005): quantificational arguments can take scope outside of **temporal adjunct clauses (TACs)**.

(7) 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**

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

Hungarian

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

(10) **Mivel** minden vezető-t kirúgtak, sírt egy titkárnő
as every executive-ACC fired-3PL cried a secretary
no ambiguity

(11) Minden vezető kirúgása **után/miatt** sírt egy titkárnő.
every executive firing after/because of cried a secretary
ambiguous, but only one clause domain

No difference bw temporal & non-temporal clauses

Explaining the data

Ex. (9): similar pattern in binding:

(12) *Amikor/Mi-után/Mi-előtt minden
when/what-after/what-before every
gyerek lefekszik, [(pro) kap egy puszit].
child goes.to.bed gets a kiss

(13) Amikor/Mi-után/Mi-előtt (pro) lefekszik,
when/what-after what-before goes.to.bed
[minden gyerek kap egy puszit].
every child gets a kiss

(14) Amikor/Miután/Mi-előtt Péter
when/what-after/what-before Peter
lefekszik, [(pro) kap egy puszit.] ✓!!!
goes.to.bed gets a kiss

The English pattern:

→ Before each boy_i goes to sleep I give him_i a kiss. ✓!!!

→ Before he_i goes to sleep, I give each boy_i a kiss

covert operator movement in English, *each boy* not in QP

problem related to QP!

It is overt operator movement, that is, the scope-transparent property of Hungarian that blocks dependent readings in Hungarian.

Literature cited

- 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-0-0.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.
- Johnston, Michael (1993) Because-clauses and Negative Polarity Licensing. *Proceedings of ESCOL*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- 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.
- 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*. Amherst: GLSA, pp. 517-52.

Acknowledgments

This research has been 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").