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Typological literature

• VS order strongly correlates with NS order
• VS correlates with NA order

Hawkins, 1983.
NG V1: 51/53.
NA V1: 38/53

--Take the typological correlations seriously.
• How do the correlations follow? What do they tell us about the structure of the theory?
• Analyses that yield insight in correlations can provide strong support for particular theories.

test-case: Kisongo Maasai (Eastern Nilotic)
Kisongo Maasai

**strict V initial**
ed'oki  
3-say-appl  
he-nom  
ol-boy.acc  
mekweta  
he/she told a/the boy to run

**strict N “S”**
oldia  
ol-dog  
l-oo  
il-boys  
‘the boys’ dog/ the dog of some boys, a dog of the boys, a dog of some boys’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dem</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ina</td>
<td>mêsáî</td>
<td>ârè</td>
<td>sidán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in_fem-dem</td>
<td>tables</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>nice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

two nice tables

---

analysis?

‘Lexicalist Minimalism’
a standard head movement approach is empirically inadequate, it is incomplete, and fails to provide an account for the correlations.

‘ Decompositional Minimalism’ (Kayne, antisymmetry, remnant movement, Cinque 1999, Koopman and Szabolcsi (2000)….)

Koopman 2000, 2003: DPs headed by a common noun in Maasai are relative clauses containing a nominal small clause predicate (oldia = citation form, a dog, some dog, the dog, predicate nominal…)

D  C  I  [sc x (it) dog]

Surface constituency is derived via phrasal movements (no head movement);
unified analysis of DPs; yields insights into DP clausal paralellism
---> great stability in derivation: (towards) perfect parallelism, locates exact points of divergence.
A traditional head movement account...

Do V/N move to same height?

possessors
N M pronounpos num A
N num A M DPpos/acc
(not clear what to do with M and agreement)

Subjects in clauses: raise to nominative
V DPnom Vraising V

trouble... adverb placement

Adverbs: Maasai has very few genuine adverbs. There is a class of adverbs that is important for the analysis:
naji: mentioned a few hours ago
duoo: mentioned this morning
ñoole: yesterday
nari: sometime ago
apa: long time ago
ojí: usual

These adverbs occur both in DPs and CPs:
[Scl-V] Adv DPnom *scl Adv V DPnom
[ol] Adv N(gender), number, case

cannot be made to work: does not account for adverb placement once a broader set of data are included

post-syntactic reallocation:
adverb is not a clitic; ol/in/etc is ojí to ojí diain --> ojí diain
head movement analysis in a nutshell

Both N and V raise but to different positions

Lexical DPs do not raise in possessive constructions, pronouns do; all nominative DPs raise in clauses

Adverbs occur quite high in both DPs and clauses, but in a different location with respect to N/V. If fuller distribution is considered, no coherent description emerges. What are these adverbs doing within DPs anyways?

empirical problems: no account for extensive asymmetric agreement and the complex morphology of the possessor construction

The parallelism?

Theory fails to capture DP/clausal parallelism: nothing in the current theory forces heads to move high within DP and clauses: they move to different head positions.

Why then do we find this strong correlation between V1 and NS? Or, why is this correlation so striking in verb first languages.

An alternative analysis: Common nouns are D CP: alayeni = al-ayeni ~‘which/who is a boy’

Maasai NP-ellipsis as pro-drop?..
Extending the analysis...

--possessor constructions. (Kayne, 1984..) (and tensed relative clauses (not discussed here)). -- capturing agreement, adverb placement, and different distribution pronominal/lexical DP; clauses

Possessor constructions: merging a different small clause predicate

agreement in case number and gender

ol-dog l-oo il-boys

ol-dog l-oo il-boys three_{pl,ms,acc}

*ol-dog l-oo il-boys one_{ms,acc}

what can x be?
why are DP possessors final?

*ol-dog  l-oo  il-boys  one_{sg,ms,acc}

how can you ever modify possessed (dog)? *A>be  -->  be>A

be licenses possessive small clause. Possessive small clause is considerably larger than be licensing a common N.

pronominal possessors

il-dogs  l-you_{pl, big_{pl}}  *l-OO-you

absence of morphology related to beP; presence of D agreement

Maasai possessive pronouns are adjectives (Storto, 2000) --> pick up category label A in syntax by NP movement: this forces merger in a very tiny possessor small clause and absence of beP
how to continue the derivation?

pronominal possessors continued...

need CP level to attract dogs --> form relative clause

how to continue?

--> embed in a predicate
what forces things to be this way?
Types of possessive small clauses...

category label A must be merged very low; D/CP is not available for merger at that point; nothing bigger than NumP can merge below A(cat)

no bigger than NumP

general question: what can be merged where and why?

DPs so far: common nouns, possessor constructions: stable derivation; differences in SC and beP/AP (tensed rel clauses..)

What about the differences between clauses and DPs? There are all kinds of elements that occur in clauses but not in DPs. --> The I level (and CP level coming up)

I = Tense; licenses adverbs.
Tense is zero, it occurs in clauses with non-verbal predication; and differs from verbal tenses/aspects
verbal and non-verbal predication

“V”SO: a template for ‘V” (verbal predicate)

Non verbal predication: Pred DP_nom

1. sídái ènà
timply this
‘this is/was nice’

2. armálímúí nîhè
teacher(acc) he (nom)
he is a teacher/he was a teacher

--> if we could make V cooccur with V appear in these constructions, we should get Scl Fut-Perf etc.

the verb: V+be+SC

Maasai: 1st and second person pronominal arguments must be doubled by a clitic (cf. Kayne 2000 for French); this forces the presence of V. These forms have specific tense interpretations (present/past/futur), as all stative verbs in Maasai do:

Pred S pred
ара nanú. armálímúí
1S.ra I.nom teacher.acc
I am a teacher

kitaåf yook irmalimuñí
ta=perf+V+Agr
1S.perf-a.pl we pl.teachers.acc
we were teachers

akåku nanú armálímúí
aku=fut+V+Agr
1S.-aku I.nom teacher.acc
I will be a teacher’
In sum: CP with nominal predicate

same I (=T) in CPs with non verbal predication; licenses adverbs.

Nom in clauses/ acc(default) in DPs

What about left periphery?

Rizzi: 1997-- 2002

Force

TopP*

IntP/declP/impP

predicate

TopP

FocP

Mod*[Adv]

def DP

FinP/

S>O

IP
left periphery in Maasai

VSO: superiority S>O
VOS: O is either focus or more discourse prominent topic.

PP CP can be to the left of the V, but DPs can never be so (unless clefted objects)! (Like Malagasy)

wh-questions? --> clefts

wh-questions and clefts

subject object asymmetry
subject can be clefted without any special morphology
subject requires special Scl preceding the verbal predicate

merge D (cleft)
instead, attracts wh higher than predicate
summary...

how do the typological properties of Maasai arise? (shared properties with strict V1 languages)
--movement of predicates to a very high position in the left periphery: this position has nothing to do with finitedness
--this movement ‘forces’ clefting for wh-movement
--clauses containing non-verbal predication
--non verbal be induces predicate inversion

further questions
relative clauses; the ins and outs of predicate inversion; extensions to other languages.

English versus Maasai
these three big boys

English: be

NP movement
Parallelism and differences: keeping derivations constant and accounting for differences

- finer structure of CP?
- adverb placement
- perfect parallelism expected: with CP containing a non verbal predicate
- wh-movement and be=PredP movement
- what can x be?
- what is this I?
- what can be merged together in the small clause?
- variation in predicates
- variation in predicates
- what can x be?
- what can x be?