

Montagovian Morphology for Bracketing Paradox: No Need for Syntax-semantics Iconicity

The notion of LEXICAL INTEGRITY (LI) (Lapointe 1980, Di Sciullo & Williams 1987, Bresnan & Mchombo: 1995, Booij 2005, Spencer 2005) has been and still is controversial (Lieber & Scalise (2006)). It suggests that—contra Baker 1988, Hale & Keyser 1993, Lieber 1992—the lexical mechanisms for word-formation are distinct from those in other domains (e.g. syntax). And word-internal structure is not susceptible to processes external to the lexicon. One challenge to LI is ‘bracketing paradox’ exemplified by *transformational grammarian*. Its morphology requires a structure like $[[\textit{transformational}] [\textit{grammarian}]]$ but its semantics demands $[[\textit{transformational grammar}] \textit{-ian}]$. A similar but more drastic conflict is observed with SIZED INALIENABLE POSSESSION (SIP) in Japanese. Though *ko-kubi* ‘small-neck’ in (1a) is, as indicated, clearly a single word, *ko-* modifies the verb *kasige* ‘tilt’ rather than the noun *kubi*.

An predominant/popular solution for such a paradox draws on syntax-semantics ‘iconicity’, e.g. via LF (invisible) movement of morphemes (Pesetsky 1985 and Kitagawa 1986). It would require (1b) that contradicts the morphology and violates LI. The current paper shows that (i) such a syntactic approach is unwarranted for SIP, and (ii) syntax-semantics iconicity is by no means a prerequisite for solving bracketing paradox (or ‘landing site coercion’ of Egg (2005)).

- (1) a. Taroo -ga $[_{NP} \textit{ko-kubi}]$ -o kasige-ta (Cf.: **ko Taroo-ga* $[_{NP} \textit{kubi}]$ -o kasige-ta)
 -NOM small-neck-ACC tilt-PAST
 ‘Taroo tilted his neck slightly’ but \neq ‘Taroo tilted his small neck’
- b. $[_S \textit{Taroo-ga} [_{VP} \textit{ko}_i [_{VP} \textit{t}_i\textit{-kubi-o kasige-ta}]]]$ (LF)
- c. Taroo -ga $[_{VP} [_{NP} \textit{ryoote to ko-waki}]$ -ni hon-o kakae-ta
 -NOM both.arm and small-underarm-at book-ACC hold-PAST
 ‘Taroo [held some books with both arms] and [lightly held others under his arm]’
 \neq ‘Taroo [lightly held some books with both arms] and [lightly held others under his arm]’
- d. Taroo-ga $[_{VP} \textit{ko}_i [_{VP} [_{NP} \textit{ryoote to t}_i\textit{-waki}]$ -ni hon-o kakae-ta]](LF)

An iconicity-based approach runs into a problem, among others, regarding (1c) where a SIP noun *ko-waki* is coordinated with a regular noun *ryoote* and the whole NP is an adjunct for a single verb *kakae-ta*. An iconicity-based structure will be (1d), giving rise to an impossible reading where *ko-* has wide scope (also violating the COORDINATE STRUCTURE CONSTRAINT).

Let me outline the central feature of the current proposal. Semantically, either argument or adjunct SIP expressions are treated as a FUNCTOR (i.e. a GENERALIZED QUANTIFIER or ENDO-CENTRIC MODIFIER—both being standard in formal semantics). This means that they take a predicate meaning as an argument to render an appropriate interpretation. More specifically, *ko-waki* in (1c) will be: $\lambda P \lambda y \lambda x. (\textit{lightly}'(\textit{under.arm}'(P(y)))(x))$, where **lightly'** and **under.arm'** are one-place predicate modifiers (Creswell 1985). This has the effect of *localizing* the unusual adverbial modification of *ko-* (**lightly'**) *internal* to SIP expressions. With this (1c) is semantically analyzed correctly as (2a) and, mutatis mutandis, (1a) as (2b).

- (2) a. **both.arms'**(**hold'**(books))(taroo) & **lightly'**(**under.arm'**(**hold'**(books)))(taroo)
 b. **slightly'**(**tilt'**(neck))(taroo)

We cannot brush (1a,c) aside merely calling them idioms because coordination is not possible for idioms in general: *asi-o hipparu* ‘pull leg’ means either ‘(Lit.) pull someone’s leg’ or ‘(Idiom) derail someone’s effort’ but $[\textit{te to asi}]$ -o *hipparu* ‘pull arm and leg’ means ‘(Lit.) pull someone’s arm and leg’ exclusively (cf. (1c)).

The current iconicity-free analysis accommodates the bracketing paradox above with ease. Without additional stipulations, it simultaneously solves problems (e.g. coordination) faced by a syntactic accounts (Kitagawa 1986 and Morita 2003) based on syntax-semantic iconicity. Moreover, since there is *no* process to disturb word-internal affairs, it enables us to remain faithful to LI (at least in the domain of SIP).

References

- Baker, M.: 1988, *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Booij, G.: 2005, *Construction-dependent Morphology*, *Lingue e Linguaggio* **IV**, 163-178.
- Bresnan, J. and S. Mchombo: 1995, 'The Lexical Integrity Principle: Evidence from Bantu', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **13**, 181-254.
- Cresswell, M.: 1985, *Adverbial Modification*, Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Di Sciullo, A. M. and E. Williams: 1987, *On the Definition of Word*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Egg, M.: 2005, *Flexible Semantics for Reinterpretation Phenomena*, CSLI, Stanford.
- Hale, K. and S. J. Keyser: 1993, 'On Argument Structure and the Lexical Expression of Syntactic Structure', K. Hale and S. J. Keyser (eds.) *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kitagawa, Y.: 1986, 'More on Bracketing Paradox', *Linguistic Inquiry* **17**, 177-183.
- Lapointe, S.: 1980, *A theory of grammatical agreement*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Lieber, R.: 1992, *Deconstructing Morphology: Word Formation in Syntactic Theory*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Lieber, R. & S. Scalise: 2006, *The Lexical Integrity Hypothesis in a New Theoretical Universe*, *Lingue e Linguaggio* **V**, 7-32.
- Morita, Y.: 2003, 'Quantificational Prefixes in Japanese', Working Papers of Otsuma Women's College 35, 11-25.
- Pesetsky, D.: 1985, 'Morphology and Logical Form', *Linguistic Inquiry* **16**, 193-245.
- Spencer, A.: 2005, 'Word-Formation and Syntax', P. Štekauer and R. Lieber (eds.) *Handbook of Word-Formation*, 73-97.