The subject of imperatives in generative grammar

Asai, Tatsuo

2007FB007

Abstract

Does a subjectless imperative have a subject? While each sentence has a subject, it is said in traditional grammar that an imperative does not have a subject because the subject does not appear in the sentence. However, can we deny easily that an imperative subject exists? The purpose of this thesis is to show that an imperative subject exists and understand how the subject functions grammatically from the perspective of generative grammar. We can understand, with binding between the antecedent and the reflexive and tag question formation, that an imperative has the subject *you* in the deep structure. Also, although the subject that appears in the surface structure may seem to function only as a vocative, the NP actually functions as not only a vocative but also as an imperative subject as Schmerling (1975) shows in the example where an imperative subject occurs with a vocative like *You, you open the door*. It seems difficult to identify the initial NP of an imperative as an imperative subject or a vocative. However, we can distinguish an imperative subject from a vocative in terms of a separate intonation contour, occurrence at the post-verbal position, Binding Theory, and the features of NP such as deixis. This thesis concludes that an imperative has a subject that functions as an imperative subject or a vocative.

A study of modifications

Murakami, Taichi

2007FB131

Abstract

In this paper I discuss the structures of modifications, especially the structure of postnominal adjectives. Adjectives are postnominal when they modify compound pronouns like *something* or common nouns in specific situations while it is thought that adjectives are generally prenominal.

I give a hypothesis about the reasons why the adjectival modifications have different structures, prenominal or postnominal. The clues of the hypothesis are the underlying locations of adjectives and the features of *something*. I analyze the locations of adjectives by comparing the adjectival modification with other modifications, especially the modification by relative clauses. One of the features of *something* I discuss is the compound form. I introduce N-raising which can explain the compound form of *something* and the postnominal adjectives, but the analysis has some problems. One of the problems is that I cannot adopt the analysis to the cases of common nouns modified by postnominal adjectives. So I insist that the difference in the locations of adjectives is not caused by N-raising, but by adjective movement.

I also refer to the differences between English and Japanese about the adjectival modifications and present one assumption about the Japanese circumstances, which is related to the form of *something* in Japanese. I assume that *something* in Japanese is separated to two words keeping the original meaning of *something*.

Complementizer deletion of English

and the Kansai dialect of Japanese

Asahi, Yuka

2008FB012

Abstract

This is a study on the similarities between English and the Kansai dialect of Japanese with respect to the complementizer deletion. I got interested in this topic when I engaged in the assignment of my seminar, in which we compared complementizers between English and Japanese. I was surprised when I learned English and the Kansai dialect of Japanese have similarities in their complementizer deletion. I wonder how similar the complementizer deletion is between English and Japanese. I researched when we can or cannot delete the complementizers.

In chapter 1, I discussed when we can delete the complementizer *that* in English. According to Stowell (1981), when the complementizer is properly governed, we can omit it. Complementizer is properly governed if it is in the object position of the main verb. Thus, we can omit the complementizer when the complementizer is in the object position.

In chapter 2, I showed when we can delete a complementizer in the Kansai dialect of Japanese. According to my survey, native speakers of the Kansai dialect of Japanese delete a complementizer in the same way as in English.

There is a strong connection between English and the Kansai dialect of Japanese with respect to the complementizer deletion. Complementizers in these two languages can be omitted in similar ways. I show when we can delete the complementizers in English and the Kansai dialect of Japanese through this thesis.

The syntactic analysis of cognate object construction in English

Goto, Hiromi

2008FB023

Abstract

This thesis is about cognate object construction in English. First I introduced what the cognate object construction is. The cognate object construction is recognized as the construction which uses the object which has the same with or close to the origin of the verb. Next I wrote about the usage of this construction. This construction mainly appeared in literature. The main verbs and objects which are used in this construction are live-life, smile-smile, sing-song and die-dead. Then I explain the basic characteristics of the construction. The verbs which can be used in cognate object construction are a part of intransitive verbs, and objects in general cognate object construction have to be cognate ones, and be modified by something, and appear with indefinite articles. In the next chapter, I mention problematic status of this construction, and introduce two kinds of previous studies. At first, I write about two linguists who thought that the verbs in this construction are intransitive ones, and the cognate objects are actually adjuncts. Secondly I summarized opinions of two linguists that the verbs are used as transitive and the cognate objects are objects of the verbs in the construction. Then I show the antilogies and state my opinion by referencing previous studies in this thesis and presenting exceptional instances.

On two types of past participles in English

Nagao, Haruna

2008FB112

Abstract

This thesis aims to point out the possibility that every past participle has either the feature [＋φ] or [－φ]. That is, if a past participle has [＋φ] feature, the past participle can be derived into adjectives and that means the past participle with [＋φ] feature can be treated as adjectives. On the other hand, if a past participle has [－φ] feature, the past participle cannot be derived into adjectives. On introducing this assumption, I would like to mention the differences between adjectival passive sentences and verbal passive sentences as example. By supposing that adjectival passive and verbal passive are different from each other because the structures of the sentences which accept the past participles are different before the past participles are constructed as the passive sentences, the appropriateness of my assumption that the past participles can be derived into adjectives would be considered. In Chapter 1, the derivation of the two types of the past participles is considered on the word level. After that, the constructions of the verbal passive sentences and the adjective sentences are mentioned in Chapter 2, in order to introduce the derived past participles. In conclusion, the discussion moves into the interpretation that the derived past participles which can be used like adjectives would go into the adjective sentences, not into the passive sentences. As a result, the question of why the adjectival passive is different from the verbal passive may be solved with my assumption that the past participle with the [＋φ] feature would go into the adjective sentences because the sign [＋φ] derives the past participles into the adjectives.

A Study of Prepositional Phrase Subject

Taguchi, Ai

2008FB161

Abstract

The purpose of my research is to clarify the usage of prepositional phrase subjects. We often use Japanese PP subject sentences in our daily life like (1):

(1)Tsukue-no shita-ga neko-wo yorokobaseru.

  *Under the table pleases the cat.

The sentence in (1) is grammatical in Japanese, but its English counterpart is ungrammatical. On the other hand, (2) is grammatical even though it includes PP subject:

(2) Under the bed needs to sweep.

It seems that the PP subject in English has restrictions in its usage. In my thesis, I would like to solve the question of why this restriction occurs.

First of all, I propose the hypothesis that PP subjects in English can be grammatical when thematic roles are properly assigned in the sentence. From the research of case-theory, we can find PP has property of NP, and PP can become an argument of thematic role. However I concluded PP subject sentence can be regarded ungrammatical even if it has thematic role.

Can we say the same restriction exists in Japanese? In my opinion, the answer of this question is negative. This is because Japanese sentences can be grammatical even if they lack some constituents of the sentences. From the research concerning the restrictions of PP subjects we have a result. It is the fact that, in both English and Japanese, thematic role does not have influence on the restriction of PP subject.

The Study of the Theories of Quantifier Floating

Takagi, Mika

2008FB164

Abstract

This paper aims to study Quantifier Floating (QF), researching two representative theories of QF-*Theory A* and *Theory B*. Many linguists have been studying QF and suggest their hypothesis. Some linguists, for example, Postal (1974: Sec 4.5), Mailing (1976), suggested that quantifiers move rightward to the first position of VP from the subject. (Theory A) On the other hand, in late 1980s, since the *VP-internal subject hypothesis* that the base-position of the subject is VP-internal and it moves to [Spec, IP]: it is the landing position of the subject have been accepted, Sportiche (1988) suggested that the quantifier is left in the base-position of the subject NP: [Spec, VP] when the subject NP moves to [Spec, IP] from the VP-internal. (Theory B)

In conclusion, this paper will compare two theories and advocate theory B because it is a better-supported theory than theory A in a theoretical respect. That is because it is based on leftward movement that cannot be condemned. Even though, theory B still has unsolved problems, it is a coherent and persuasive theory. Truthfully, theory A is also theoretically explained; however, rightward NP-movement of theory A disobeys the rule of the fundamental movement such as c-command. This violation would make theory A reprehensible. Therefore, for these reasons, this paper advocates theory B.

The New Approach of *be*: *Be*-support

Watanabe, Sayo

2008FB191

Abstract

This thesis proposes a new approach to analyzing *be*. I raise a fundamental question of what *be* is, and I propose *Be*-support as a new hypothesis concerning *be*. Unlike ordinary lexical verbs, *be* is used in many sentences and has many functions. It is sometimes used as a main verb but it is also used as an auxiliary verb. I try to solve the problem found in ordinary analyses of *be* by the hypothesis of *Be*-support. *Be*-support is proposed based on careful analyses of negative and interrogative sentences using *be* as well as sentences using ordinary lexical verbs. Especially, I focus on the distribution of *be* in the negative and interrogative sentences which I raise as examples, and I find that *be* has the same distribution with *Do*-support *do*. On the basis of this analysis, I point out that *be* is an auxiliary verb, and *be* and *Do*-support *do* have almost the same function in a sentence. However, *be* is used in sentences which use a modal or an infinitival clause unlike *Do*-support *do*. Therefore, I propose that *be* is an inserted word like *Do*-support *do,* although *be* supports the category of V in a sentence unlike *Do*-support *do,* which supports Tense.

On the Structure of English Noun Phrases

Yasuda, Kana

2008FB203

Abstract

This paper discusses the structure of noun phrases in English. I compare English with Japanese for that purpose. There are some strings which Japanese people may make mistakes about; especially, I focus on the string *this my book* and the string *dear my friend* in this thesis.

In the first chapter, I describe the reason why the phrase *this my book* is ungrammatical, and why Japanese people make such a mistake. There are three reasons; (i) difference of parts of speech, (ii) difference of word order, and (iii) difference of the structure. My conclusion is that the difference of the structures between English and Japanese is the main reason why Japanese people may make such a mistake.

In the second chapter, I discuss why the phrase *dear my friend* is ungrammatical, and why Japanese people may wrongly think this phrase is grammatical. There are two reasons; (i) the function of the word *dear*, and (ii) the part of speech of the word *dear*. I suggest the misunderstanding of the part of speech of the word *dear* is the main reason why Japanese people may make such a mistake.

Both of the strings *this my book* and *dear my friend* tend to be wrongly used by Japanese people. The reasons for the errors may look the same at first glance. A careful analysis of the grammatical errors shows that they are different from each other. This is the result of my study.