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Boxes and Piles and What’s in Them: Two Extended Projections or One?

JANE GRIMSHAW

10.1 Introduction

This paper follows up recent research by van Riemsdijk (1998), Vos (1999), Cardinaletti and Shlonsky (2004), and papers collected in Corver and van Riemsdijk 2001. These works suggest that in addition to the familiar concepts “lexical” and “functional”, heads can have an intermediate standing, called “semi-lexical”. The present paper presents an analysis of two kinds of DPs which characterize, very roughly speaking, the location or organization of the nominal they are associated with. In a bottle of wine, a pile of pebbles, bottle is a “container” (as in Vos 1999), and pile I will call, following the suggestion of Roger Schwarzschild, a “portion”. Some of the empirical foundations of work in this area were laid in place in Jackendoff 1977 and Selkirk 1977, Delsing 1993 where the syntax of partitives is a major focus.

The investigation will establish that boxes and piles are lexical heads. However, this conclusion sets the scene for the analysis of quantity nominals (such as pound in a pound of rice, and lot as in a lot of rice.) These turn out, I will show in Grimshaw in prep., not to behave as

1 Thanks are hereby extended to Adrian Brasoveanu, Alan Prince, participants in the Rutgers Seminar in Syntax for 2003, and especially to Roger Schwarzschild for a lot of invaluable discussion.
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lexical nouns; differing in various ways from the nouns discussed here. The full study covering all of these nouns adds to the evidence that such nouns can be intermediate in status between lexical or functional. The overall conclusion thus supports a version of the “semi-lexical” proposal. Further examples of the DPs under discussion are:

1 Containers:
   a. A box/basket/case/shelf/ of books
   b. A bottle/glass/cup/flask/bucket of water
   c. A bag/plate of (the) cookies
   d. A scoop of (the) ice cream

2 Portions:
   a. A ball of (the) clay, wax
   b. A block of wood
   c. A bunch of (the) flowers (not when it means “many”)
   d. A wad of (the) paper

An informal characterization of portions is that they describe an arrangement of the material in the second nominal.

10.2 The Independence of the two Phrases

From here on I will refer to the container or portion noun as “N-1” and to the contained or portioned noun as “N-2”. The DP headed by N-1 is “DP-1”, the DP headed by N-2 is “DP-2”. Is N-1 lexical? I will approach the question by trying to decide whether these expressions involve two extended projections or one, following the proposals in Grimshaw 1991, 2001, 2005; van Riemsdijk 1990, 1998. The assumption is that if they clearly contain two extended projections, then they contain two lexical heads, and N-1 must be lexical. If they contain only one extended projection then “N-I” is not truly a noun (i.e. a lexical head) but falls into the more obscure area of “somewhere in between”. The evidence shows that they contain two extended projections and hence two lexical heads. The first noun in these structures, N-1, patterns as a noun with respect to numerous syntactic properties, as does the second noun, N-2. N-1s occur in exactly the configurations that nouns like picture appear in. N-1 can be preceded by a determiner, a demonstrative and other pronominal functional elements. This will be illustrated in the examples below. It will also be evident from the examples to be cited that N-2 can be shown to be a true nominal for essentially the same reasons.

10.2.1 Elements in DP-1 and elements in DP-2

The load-bearing wall of the lexical-head-analysis of N-1 is the fact that the syntax of the two DPs is independent. The syntax of DP-1 and the syntax of DP-2 vary independently. In this respect, containers and portions behave exactly like representational nouns: pictures of horses, a discussion of DPs. I assume that these uncontroversially contain two extended projections and two lexical heads. Using “< . . . >” to indicate the edge of the lower extended projection, the representations are given in (3).

(3) a. a picture < of horses > (representational noun)
   b. a bottle < of red wine > (container)
   c. a pile < of the pebbles > (portion)

No element inside the angled brackets is part of the higher extended projection, and no element outside the angled brackets is part of the lower extended projection. Material inside the angled brackets and material outside the angled brackets are not locally related, while material within a single extended projection is. The special relationship among elements within the angled brackets motivates the Extended Projection hypothesis (Grimshaw 1991, 2000, 2005; van Riemsdijk 1990, 1998). The grammatical independence of DP-1 and DP-2 manifests itself in several ways. DP-1 and DP-2 can have two of grammatical entities that an extended projection may have only one of, and while determiners and modifiers within each extended projection must be consistent, those of DP-1 and DP-2 need not be. The positioning of adjectives in DP-1 relative to those in DP-2 is unconstrained, while relative positioning of adjectives within a DP (i.e. a single extended projection) is fixed in certain cases. (4) summarizes all of these generalizations, which point to the conclusion that each DP is an extended projection, headed by a lexical noun.

(4) (i) DP-1 and DP-2 can each have a determiner or demonstrative, and the two can be inconsistent.

A more sophisticated theory might allow them to be two extended projections but with a functional item heading the higher, and a lexical item heading the lower. The theory of Extended Projection as presented in Grimshaw 1991, 2000, 2005 does not allow for this possibility. The argument I make here assumes that only lexical heads can be the lowest head in an extended projection.
(ii) They can each have number marking and the number of the two can be inconsistent.

(iii) They can each contain a numeral. A numeral for N-1 is possible even if N-2 is mass, and a numeral for N-2 does not depend on the nature of N-1.

(iv) They can each contain an adjective, and the adjectives can be inconsistent.

The following examples support the claim in (i):

(5) a. a box of the books; the boxes of books
b. a ball of the clay; the balls of clay

(6) a. this box of books; these cases of wine
   (*this books; *these wine)
b. these piles of clay; that pile of pebbles
   (*these clay; *that pebbles)

The determiner or demonstrative on N-1 agrees with N-1, on N-2 it agrees with N-2. The determiners/demonstratives can be inconsistent, one definite and one indefinite, one appropriate for a mass noun and one for a count noun (more on this situation below).

The following examples, and some of those just cited, support the claim in (ii):

(7) a. a box of books
b. bottles of water

They show that the number of DP-1 can be singular while the number of DP-2 is plural (7a) and DP-1 can be singular or plural when DP-2 is a mass noun (7b). Examples in (8) show the behavior of numerals:

(8) a. 5 boxes of clay; 1 box of 10 books
b. 300 piles of pebbles; a pile of 20 pebbles; 1 box of 10 books;
c. 5 boxes of 10 books (each); 300 piles of 20 pebbles (each)

If we take the slightly odd interpretations of examples like those in (8b) and (8c) to reflect semantic effects rather than syntactic structure, a matter which needs to be evaluated more carefully, they show that both DPs can contain a numeral and the numeral of DP-1 and DP-2 need not be consistent.

N-2 can be modified by an adjective. When N-1 and N-2 are both modified by adjectives, the adjectives can be contradictory; combinations that can never occur in a single extended projection:

(9) a. a large box of small berries; a small box of large berries
b. *a large small box of berries/*a large small box of berries


(10) a. a small pile of large rocks; a large pile of small rocks
b. *a small large pile of rocks/*a large small pile of rocks
c. a new bunch of old flowers (newly composed but constructed from old flowers)
d. *a new old bunch/*an old new bunch

Surprisingly, an adjective on N-1 sometimes seems to be able to modify N-2, as in a delicious plate of (the) (ripe) strawberries; a fragrant bunch of red flowers, though this option does not seem to be available for all adjectives: *a ripe plate of (the) strawberries is marginal, and *a large bunch of flowers is completely impossible in the reading where it is the flowers that are large.4

10.2.2 The Order of Adjectives

Within a single DP, the order of APs is not free (see Sproat and Shi 1991 for extensive discussion). To put it another way, when two adjectives occur in a single extended projection, their relative order can be fixed:

(11) a. a fresh brown egg
b. *a brown fresh egg (except with "comma intonation")

However, the order of the adjective modifying N-1 and the adjective modifying N-2 is unconstrained, as van Riemsdijk (1998) and Vos (1999) point out. An adjective modifying N-1 precedes an adjective modifying N-2 even if the order between the two is disallowed by the ordering restriction that holds within a single extended projection.

(12) a. a fresh basket of brown eggs
b. a brown basket of fresh eggs
c. fresh brown eggs/*brown fresh eggs

d. a red box of big books; a big box of red books
b. a big red box of books; a box of big red books

c. *a red big box of books; *a box of red big books

This shows that any principles organizing adjectives within an extended projection (e.g. size before color) will fail, unless DP-1 and DP-2 are two separate extended projections.5

The analysis of Dutch and German given by van Riemsdijk (1998) and Vos (1999), applied to English, suggests that there might be a difference in grammaticality between examples in which N-2 is preceded by a determiner, and those in which it is not. I am not sure if this effect is found in English.

6The same point holds, mutatis mutandis, for clauses. E.g. often can precede reluctantly in a single clause, while the reverse order is ungrammatical. Nevertheless, reluctantly can precede often when they are in different clauses.
There is no constraint regulating the order of an item in one extended projection relative to an item in another extended projection. If DP-1 and DP-2 are separate extended projections the observed freedom of order in adjectives is explained.

10.3 Nouns and Determiner Choice

The independence of DP-1 and DP-2 is supported additionally by another generalization about determiners. The grammaticality of a DP is never affected by a D which is outside. D-noun relations in DP-1 are determined by N-1 alone. D-noun relations in DP-2 are determined by N-2 alone. This is as expected. If DP-1 is an independent extended projection, it has N-1 as its lexical head and N-1 determines which determiners may and must occur. The same holds for DP-2: it is N-2 which controls the determiner system of the DP. The evidence for this comes from the well known fact that count nouns and mass nouns, plural nouns and singular nouns, have different determiner possibilities in English. With mass nouns and plurals, the indefinite determiner a is impossible. With singular count nouns either the indefinite or the definite determiner is required. The possibility of having a particular determiner, and whether it is obligatory or not, depends on the mass/count/plural status of N.

The empirical question is then whether only D-1 can satisfy the requirements of N-1, or whether D-2 can satisfy them. Likewise for D-2 and D-1 with respect to N-2. In fact, N-1 is the “enforcer” for D-1 and N-2 for D-2. We conclude that the potential for a determiner to occur, and the obligatoriness of a determiner, depend on the mass/count/plural status of the lexical head of the DP extended projection, the noun. If N-1 is a singular count noun, it requires a determiner. If N-1 is plural, it disallows a, allows the definite, and is grammatical with no determiner at all. The pattern is just the same for picture nouns as for box or pile: D-1 cannot be absent/covert when N-1 is singular and count:

(14) a. a picture of horses; a box of books; a pile of the books
b. *picture of a horse; *box of the books; *pile of pears/hay

D-1 can be a even when N-2 is plural or mass, but not when N-1 is plural (see note 6 on N-1 as a mass noun):

(15) a. a picture of (the) horses/snow; a box of (the) pears/hay; a pile of (the) pears/hay
b. *a pictures of (a) horse; *a boxes of (the) pears/hay; *a piles of pears/hay

NP-1 and NP-2 are both grammatical with no determiner provided that N-1 and N-2 are not singular count nouns:

(16) pictures of horses/hay; boxes of books; piles of books

It seems that the ungrammaticality of a D + N-1 combination can never be attributed to the nature of the determiner for N-2. Likewise, the ungrammaticality of D + N-2 combination can never be rescued by the nature of the determiner for N-1. Moreover, the generalizations governing container and portion N-1s are identical to those governing picture nouns. All cases are explained in the same way if:

(17) (i) Determiner requirements of nouns must be satisfied within the noun's extended projection,
(ii) Container and portion N-1 N-2 configurations contain two extended projections.

To clarify: If N-1 and N-2 were members of the same extended projection (both counting as heads, for example) it would have to be stipulated that N-1 and D-1 are assessed together, and that N-2 and D-2 are assessed as a pair also. However this is done, it seems to inevitably replicate the effect of positing two extended projections, by stipulating special relationships among particular heads in a syntactic structure.

10.4 Conclusion

The two-extended projection-hypothesis explains why N-1 entirely controls the syntax of the higher part of the structure, and N2 entirely controls the syntax of the lower part, with no inter-penetration between them. It follows that each noun can occur with a determiner, and that the two determiners need not be consistent. The implication for adjectives is the same. It follows that each noun can have a number specification which is independent of the number of the other. It follows that the order of adjectives modifying N-1 and those modifying N-2 is unconstrained. Finally, it follows that the determiner requirements of N-1 enforce restrictions on the D system in DP-1 and the determiner requirements of N-2 enforce restrictions on the D system in DP-2.

N-1 and N-2 must be the lexical heads of two different extended projections, just like picture and horses in a picture of horses. This is why DP-1 and DP-2 are self-contained, with no flow of grammatical information between them.
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An Analysis of Japanese Honorific Predicates
AKIRA ISHIKAWA

11.1 Introduction

Honorific expressions constitute part of the system known as verbal treatment, in which linguistic expressions referring to certain people, their activities, and belongings in an utterance change their forms according to the degree of politeness the speaker wishes to have the utterance imbued with. The degree of politeness is determined by the relative social status of the participants of the utterance situation, i.e., speaker, hearer, the referents of the described event, and the degree of formality called for by the occasion. It is a characteristic of Japanese along with a few other languages such as Korean that expression of politeness is primarily a matter of using specific "grammatical and lexical means" to encode certain kinds of things such as mentioned above rather than the choice of the concepts themselves — what you say matters less than how you say it (Tuzimura 1988). Thus, the same cognitive content can...

---

Nagata (2001) is one of the first studies which deals with the changes of verbal treatment systems over an extended period of the history of the Japanese language. According to this study, the verbal treatment system has been changing more and more in the direction of a hearer-oriented one based on the distinction between within-group and without-group members from a more absolute system reflecting the social ranks of the participants in the early 11th century, at which the period of the study begins.

Hayashi and Minami (1974) deal with different systems of verbal treatment seen in Asian languages and Nahuatl.