

What's on the edge of small clauses?

1. It is required by the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC) (Chomsky 2001) that only the edge and the head of a strong phase be accessible to syntactic operations. Though considerable advances have been made in exploring a wide range of syntactic phenomena that meet the “edge” requirement on movement and feature match, less attention has been devoted to syntactic operations affecting the head of HP.

2. In some morphologically rich languages adjectival and nominal secondary predicates bear case. While in Icelandic and Slovak this case is always identical to the case assigned to the subject of the secondary predicate, (1)-(2), this is not so in Finnish, Russian or Hungarian (3)-(5):

- | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|--|
| (1) | Ég _j
I | tel
consider | [Ólaf _k -0
Olaf-ACC | leiðinlegan _k -0].
boring-ACC | ICELANDIC |
| ‘I consider [Olaf boring].’ | | | | | |
| (2) | Pavol
P. | považuje
considers | [Mari-u
Maria-ACC(F) | za
for | počtiv-ou].
honest-ACC(F) |
| ‘Pavol considers [Maria honest].’ | | | | | |
| (3) | Hän _j
he-NOM | nauroi
laughed | [itsensä _j -0
himself-ACC | kipea-ksi].
sick-TRANS | FINNISH |
| ‘He laughed [himself sick].’ | | | | | |
| (4) | Ja _j
I | scčita-ju
consider | [Ivan-a _k
Ivan-ACC | nemnožko
a little | pjann-ym _k].
drunk-INST |
| ‘I consider [Ivan a little drunk].’ | | | | | |
| (5) | Nem
not | tart-ott-am
hold-PAST-1SG | [Mari-t _k
Mary-ACC | boldog-nak _k].
happy-DAT | HUNGARIAN |
| ‘I did not consider [Mary happy].’ | | | | | |

Recent accounts of secondary predication within the DBP model (Chomsky 2001, 2004, Pesetsky & Torrego 2003, Sigurðsson 2004, Carnie 2005) usually assume that the matrix T₀ serves as the probe also for the small clause predicate head. Such an account may be marginally accepted in the first group of languages, and it would necessarily fail in the latter. Notably, there is nothing in the theory to predict the case of the small clause predicate head in the second group.

3. The theory of Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1998) can be extended to secondary predication. In languages with a predominant SVO order the Agree relation is established between the specifier and the head. In VSO languages, on the other hand, the agreement morpheme functions as an argument of the verb, thus Agree is realized by the agreement head and the predicate head. As is noted by Adger & Ramchand (2003), “*semantic predication always feeds off a syntactic structure containing a predicational head*”. Adjectival and nominal predicates enter into the same predication relation as verbal predicates do. Therefore, their syntactic structure also contains a functional projection where predication relation is established. Adjectival and nominal secondary predicates in both language groups bear number/gender and case features, thus it seems legitimate to locate the [+pred] feature together with all the above features in AGRP. The way the Agree relation materializes in small clauses in the two groups shows an interesting correlation with establishing primary

predication in SVO vs. VSO languages. This gives us a better understanding of primary and secondary predication in human languages.

References

- Adger, D. & G. Ramchand 2003. "Predication and equation". *Linguistic Inquiry* 34:325-359.
- Alexiadou, A. & E. Anagnostopoulou. 1998. "Parametrizing AGR: word order, V-movement and EPP-checking". *Natural Language and Linguistic Inquiry* 16:491-539.
- Carnie, A. 2005. "A phase-geometric approach to multiple marking systems". McGinnis, M. & N. Richards (eds): *Perspectives on phases. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 49:87-102. www.dingo.sbs.arizona.edu/~linguistics/~carnie
- Chomsky, N. 2001. "Derivation by phase". Kenstowicz, M. (ed.): Ken Hale. *A life in language*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press. 1-52.
- Chomsky, N. 2004. "Beyond explanatory adequacy". Belletti, A. (ed.): *Structures and beyond. The cartography of syntactic structures* 3:104-131. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pesetsky, D. & E. Torrego 2003. "Tense, case and the nature of syntactic categories". Gueron, J. & J. Lecarme (eds): *The syntax of time*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.000-000
- Sigurðsson, H. 2004. "Agree and agreement: evidence from Germanic". Abraham, W. (ed.): *Focus on Germanic typology*. *Studia Typologica* 6:59-99. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.