

The syntax of secondary predicates : some consequences of the theory of barriers

journal or publication title	Tsukuba English Studies
volume	11
page range	313-314
year	1992-08-31
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2241/7630

The Syntax of Secondary Predicates:
Some Consequences of the Theory of Barriers

Hidehito HOSHI

In this talk I discussed the syntactic nature of the following three types of secondary predicates, namely, circumstantial, depictive, and resultative predicates (cf. Hoshi (1991a)):

- (1) a. John left the room *angry*. (circumstantial)
- b. John ate the meat *rare*. (depictive)
- c. John hammered the metal *flat*. (resultative)

Interestingly enough, *wh*-extraction is possible with depictive and resultative predicates, but not with circumstantial predicates as the contrast in (2) illustrates:

- (2) a. *How angry did John leave the room *t*?
- b. How rare did John eat the meat *t*?
- c. How flat did John hammer the metal *t*?

In Hoshi (1991b), I provide the following configuration of the circumstantial predicate, assuming that it constitutes a SC with PRO, which is categorically IP and that it is adjoined to VP at some level of grammar (possibly at D-Structure) because of the PRO Theorem, which states that PRO must be ungoverned:

- (3) John [_{VP} [_{VP} left the room] [_{SC} PRO angry]].

That PRO is involved in circumstantial predicates is motivated by the parallel control phenomena between circumstantial predicates and rational clauses which obviously involve PRO:

- (4) a. John_i trained Mary_j [PRO_{i, /j} to make a living].
- b. John_i trained Mary_j [PRO _{/j} angry_{i, /j}].

- (5) a. [PRO_i / *_i to make a living], John_i trained Mary_j.
 b. [PRO_i / *_i angry_i / *_i], John_i trained Mary_j.

Furthermore, I assume, following Lasnik and Saito's (1992) Barriers system, contra Chomsky's (1986), that adjunction creates an additional maximal projection, which becomes a barrier when not L-marked. Thus, according to Lasnik and Saito, IP is not a "defective category" and all barriers are "inherent" barriers in the terminology of Chomsky; there is no inheritance of barrierhood.

Assuming that circumstantial predicates are not θ -marked because of its non-referential property, the trace left by the extraction of the circumstantial predicate *angry* out of a SC(=IP) can be neither θ -governed nor antecedent-governed, since IP is a barrier. Thus, I concluded that the trace left by the extraction of circumstantial predicates violates the Empty Category Principle, which I assume to be defined as follows:

(6) *Empty Category Principle:*

A nonpronominal empty category must be antecedent-governed or θ -governed.

(cf. Chomsky (1986))

Therefore, *wh*-extraction of circumstantial predicates is always impossible, while that of depictive and resultative predicates is grammatical as in the case of adjuncts extraction like *why* and *how*.

REFERENCES

- Chomsky, N. (1986) *Barriers*. MIT Press.
 Hoshi, H. (1991a) "Wh-extraction of Secondary Predicates: Some Theoretical Implications," *Tsukuba English Studies* 10.
 Hoshi, H. (1991b) *The Syntax of Secondary Predicates and the Theory of Barriers*. MA Thesis, University of Tsukuba.
 Lasnik, H. and M. Saito (1992) *Move- α : Conditions on its Application and Output*. MIT Press.