Could Adjuncts be Simpler? Juxtaposition and Syntactic Feature Valuation

Joseph Emonds, Kobe-Shoin University, and Arancha Mateos, Central Newcastle High School Adjuncts are defined as those phrases XP inside some maximal YP not lexically selected by Y⁰. Among these many constructions, syntactic criteria suggest three subgroups. Type 1 adjuncts project from Ps with lexical content, italicized in (1). For familiarity we use English when possible.

(1) [YP The crowd calmed down [PP { *while* he spoke / *near* the stadium/ *despite* the heat/

in order to hear well/ *since* it was late/ *after* the speech/ *though* he spoke excitedly }]]. **Interpretation.** Though interpretation may be sensitive to left-right order and affected by coindexing in e.g. relative or comparative clauses, the basic lack of selection of adjuncts by Y⁰ suggests: (2) Interpretation of adjunct XP is simply *juxtaposition* of XP with its sister Y^k and then *pragmatics*. This is transparent in (1). (2) also covers Larson's (1985) "Bare-NP Adverbs" if their heads are *covert* contentful Ps, with features identified by the same features on the head N (Emonds, 1987).

Type 2 adjuncts include various **XP sisters of "contentless" P or C**. These P/C, italicised in (3), exhibit much cross-linguistic variation, suggesting they have no role relating XP to Y^k in LF.

(3) a. Relative/comparative clauses with gaps: $[c_{,-WH} \{ that / for / than / as / \emptyset \}] + IP$. French: only que.

b. Result clauses with no gap: [c, -wH that] + IP. It was so calm [cP that [IP we slept]].

c. Absolute clauses: [P with] + non-finite IP. These are known to occur only as adjuncts.

d. Adjunct participles: Spanish [P -ndo] + VP. -ndo is a P since typical + PP verbs (estar,

andar) select such participles, and unlike adjectival participles ending in *-do, -ndo* never agrees. e. Manner and factive adverbial APs: Underlying [*P like*] + **AP**. *Wisely, he did that slowly.*

f. Manner adverbials: [$_{\rm P}$ in] + **DP**. In that way, in such a fashion, etc. French shows de 'of'.

g. Benefactive or adversative "datives of interest": [P on] + DP. That car broke down on me. Spanish shows a 'to'. The P can be covert and assign dative morphology to DP or to a clitic (French).

(4) **Type 3 adjuncts** are **agreeing adjectival APs**. In Romance, agreement with the nominal phrase APs modify is overt. We assume English has an abstract version of this agreement.

Syntactic derivations. If an adjunct's contentful head X⁰ is a P as in (1), no syntactic operation is required. But if X⁰ has a "+N" or "+V" feature (i.e., if XP = DP/IP/AP), one must ask, why are extra contentless Ps (3) *or* Agreement (4) necessary, not only for DP but also for AP/VP/IP? Plausibly, merely juxtaposing XP and Y^k *fails to satisfy some interface condition*. Our claim: while the categorial features +N and +V suffice for syntax, *they are unvalued for interface legibility*. To remedy this, we replace +N/+V with ON & OV. Now (5) becomes an *unstipulated corollary* of minimalist feature valuation: (5) *Derivations must assign values to the features ON and OV on all projections of lexical X⁰*.

Valuing DPs. The *familiar Case features* are actually the "values" that make 0N visible (= that interpret 0N). For Case assignment, a nominal projection DP/NP must at interfaces be a sister or SPEC of V, P, I or D. In this way, 0N gets valued as N(V), N(P), etc. Or DP/ NP can obtain Case in some other way, i.e., via agreement as below. (Case assigners are more plausible as values than binary { -, +}.)

(6) *Case features on DPs/ NPs are values assigned in syntax to 0N and its projections.* Thus, the "juxtaposed" DP adjuncts in (3f-g) are introduced by (contentless) Ps to provide them with Case. Japanese also allows certain *accusative* DP adjuncts (case-marked by V). (Murasugi, 1991).

Valuing IPs. The contexts for rendering visible a projection of 0V are more restrictive:

(7) *Case features include these same values assigned to 0V projections under sisterhood.* Thus, an IP or VP can be valued only as a sister of a P/C (the typical configurations) or of a V (bare ECM IPs). Using the argumentation that Cs are special cases of grammatical P (Emonds, 1985: Ch.7), all the clausal adjuncts in (3a-d).are introduced by Ps That is, their 0V feature gets a value V(P).

AP agreement as Case values. Unvalued APs can receive Case from P (3e); notably, such "adverbial" AP never agree. But APs that agree e.g. in Romance need no P. Mateos (2000) then argues that AP-type agreement is basically an *alternative Case assignment*, i.e. (4) is one way of satisfying (6). As 0N projections, APs can of course exhibit any Case; cf. Czech, Latin. Yet as 0V categories, APs appear only in positions *where IP/VP can be valued*, as *sisters* of "Case-markers." We thus also derive without stipulation why *APs never surface as subjects* via Case-marking in Spec(IP) or SPEC(DP).

References

Emonds, J. (1985) A Unified Theory of Syntactic Categories, Foris, Dordrecht.

- Emonds, J. (1987) "The Invisible Category Principle," *Linguistic Inquiry* 18, 613-631.
- Larson, R. (1985) "Bare-NP Adverbs," *Linguistic Inquiry* 16, 595-621.
- Mateos, A. (2000) *The Role of Agreement in Romance Nominal Projections*, University of Durham MA thesis.
- Murasugi, K. (1991) *Noun Phrases in Japanese and English: a Study in Syntax, Learnability, and Acquisition*, University of Connecticut doctoral dissertation.

jeemonds@sils.shoin.ac.jp