

Head-Head Movement with Topic

Tsutomu Ogawa

0.

English has constructions with the unmarked word order, S+V (+O, C, A), but sometimes it has constructions with a marked word order V+S... when it has a topicalized element. Some have described this construction with Top+V+S from syntactic and semantic points of view. Others have explained it in a theoretical point of view, the minimalist approach is one of them. The purpose of this paper is to show that a minimalist approach is able to explain constructions which have a topicalized element with a marked word order or inverted word order, but is not able to explain constructions which have a topicalized element with an unmarked word order. Also we show that there are two kinds of constructions which have topicalized elements and these two constructions have some relations to the unmarked word order and the marked word order, respectively.¹⁾

1. Topicalized Negative Element

1.1 When negative words or phrases are moved to the top of the clause, it is said that the Subject-Auxiliary Inversion or in the current theory (Travis (1984), Chomsky (1986)), the Head-Head Movement of I (NFL) to C (OMP) occurs.

The following are such examples :²⁾

- (1) With no coaching will he pass the exam.
- (2) Not even ten years ago could you see such a film.
- (3) Not without reason had Charles flown into a rage.
- (4) Veronica Taubman's oration was magnificent. Nor could anyone fail to be impressed by both her learning and her wit.
- (5) Very rarely did Mary receive letters from her brother.
- (6) Scarcely ever has the British nation suffered so much obloquy.

Note that this head-head movement can occur not only in the main clause but also in the subordinate clause :³⁾

- (7) You said that not once had Robin raised his hand.

1.2 Laka (1990) postulates that ΣP (a projection of Negation or Affirmation) occurs above IP in Basque and below IP in English in a phrase structure :

- (8) Basque

[ΣP [Neg/Aff] [IP [AP VP A] I]]

- (9) English

[IP I [ΣP [Neg/Aff] [AP A [VP ...]]]]

Since Chomsky (1977), it is generally agreed that Topic occurs above IP. So we may postulate the following phrase structure for the main clause :^{4),5)}

- (10) [$TopicP$ Topic [$AgSP$... [ΣP [$AgOP$

and for the subordinate clause :

- (11) [CP C [$TopicP$ Topic [$AgSP$... [ΣP [$AgOP$

In a minimalist's approach such as Chomsky (1992), Chomsky & Lasnik (1991) and others, the head-head movement in the negative topic structure will be analyzed as follows, auxiliary being moved in the overt syntax :

- (6) [TopicP scarcely ever [Topic has]_i] [AgrSP the British nation [AgrS *t*_i] [ΣP
[Σ *t*_i] [VP *t* [AgrOP AgrO [VP suffered so much obloquy]]]]]]
- (7) you said [CP that [TopicP not once [Topic had]_i] [AgrSP Robin [AgrS *t*_i] [ΣP
[Σ *t*_i] [VP *t* [AgrOP AgrO [VP raised his hand]]]]]]]]

In these structures, the negative-topic elements occur in the specifier position of the TopicP and the moved element, auxiliaries occur in the head position of the TopicP. [+Topic] feature of the negative-topic elements can be checked by the [+Topic] features of auxiliaries. So these derivations converge.⁶⁾

1.3 We have already noted that auxiliaries have to move to the head of TopicP to check the negative-topic elements in the Spec position of TopicP in overt syntax. In other words the negative-topic elements in the Spec position have to have their checker of features in the head position. So it is natural to speculate that when there is not any auxiliary in the head, there is no way for the [+Top] feature to be checked. And the derivation will not converge.

But against this speculation there are several constructions which does not show any head-head movement of auxiliary in the overt syntax.

- (12) (Even) with no coaching he will pass the exam.
- (13) Not even ten years ago you could see such a film.
- (14) Not without reason, Charles had flown into a rage.
- (15) I couldn't do anything for her. Nor you could—but you might have got someone else to help.
- (16) Very rarely, Mary received letters from her brother.
- (17) Scarcely any of us had any experience in sailing.

2. Topicalized Object NP

In this section, we examine the first inverted construction without any negative elements; object NP being inverted:

- (18) That kind of antisocial behaviour can we really tolerate in a civilised society?
- (19) Such gallantry did he show, that he was awarded the Victoria Cross.

As in the section 1, the structures of (18) and (19) will be as follows:

- (18) [TopicP that kind of antisocial behaviour [Topic can_i] [AgrSP we [AgrS *t*]
[ΣP [Σ *t*] [VP *t* [AgrOP AgrO [VP really tolerate in a civilised society]]]]]]]]
- (19) [TopicP such gallantry [Topic did_i] [AgrSP he [AgrS *t*] [ΣP [Σ *t*] [VP *t*
[AgrOP AgrO [VP show], that he was awarded the Victoria Cross]]]]]]

In this kind of construction without any negative elements, [+Topic] feature of topic elements is to be checked by the [+Topic] feature of the auxiliary, and the derivation converge.

But as we have observed in the section 1, there are several counter-examples to this analysis.

- (20) We all know that weidos, they give you the creeps.
- (21) His book, I really like.
- (22) Whether they succeeded I know not.
- (23) He's a man to whom liberty we could never grant.

3. Topicalized Adjunct

In this section, we examine the second inverted construction without any negative elements; adjunct being inverted:^{(7),(8)}

- (24) Slowly out of its hangar rolled the gigantic aircraft.
 (25) On the very top of the hill lives a hermit.
 (26) Here comes the winner!
 (27) Down came the prices, and up went the sales.

As in the sections 1 and 2, the structures of (24) and (27) will be as follows :

- (24)' [_{TOPICP} slowly out of its hangar [_{TOPIC} rolled_i] [_{AGRSP} the gigantic aircraft [_{AGRS} *t*]_i] [_{ΣP} [_Σ *t*]_i] [_{VP} *t* [_{AGROP} AgrO [_{VP} *t*]]]]]]]
 (27)' [_{TOPICP} down [_{TOPIC} came_i] [_{AGRSP} the prices [_{AGRS} *t*]_i] [_{ΣP} [_Σ *t*]_i] [_{VP} *t* [_{AGROP} AgrO [_{VP} *t*]]]]]]]

But as we have observed in the sections 1 and 2, there are several counter examples to this minimalist approach:⁹⁾

- (28) Here he comes.
 (29) In Chicago he lived (and in Chicago...)
 (30) Down they flew.
 (31) On the platform, she kissed her mother on the cheek.
 (32) In the garden, she saw my brother.

4. Topicalized Complement

In this section, we examine the third inverted construction without any negative elements ; complement being inverted:¹⁰⁾

- (33) Especially remarkable was her oval face.
 (34) Faint grew the sound of the bell.
 (35) Her face was stony and even stonier was the tone of her voice.
 (36) Happy is he who is reconciled with his lot.
 (37) Far be it from me to spoil the fun.

As in the sections 1-3, the structures of (33) and (34) will be as follows :

- (33)' [_{TOPICP} especially remarkable [_{TOPIC} was_{S_i}] [_{AGRSP} her oval face [_{AGRS} *t*]_i] [_{ΣP} [_Σ *t*]_i] [_{VP} *t* [_{AGROP} AgrO [_{VP} *t*]]]]]]]

- (34) [_{TOPICP} faint [_{TOPIC} grew_t] [_{AGRSP} the sound of the bell [_{AGRS} *t_i] [_{ΣP} [_Σ *t_i] [_{VP} *t_i [_{AGROP} AgrO [_{VP} *t]]]]]]]****

But as we have observed in the sections 1-3, there are several counter examples to this minimalist approach.

- (38) Ann said she would be late, and late she was.
 (39) Eloquent though she was, she could not persuade them.
 (40) Worthless parasites though everyone says they are, people still befriend them.
 (41) The { _{more old} } we are, the { _{more wise} } we become.
 (42) An utter fool she made me feel.

And less acceptable sentences are :

- (43) ? Especially remarkable her oval face was.
 (44) ? Faint the sound of the bell grew.

5. Topicalized Verb

In this section, we examine the fourth inverted construction without any negative elements ; verb phrase being inverted :^{(11),(12)}

- (45) Please look after my dog should I die.
 (46) I'm going to win this game. Says you!
 (47) Bill said he would win the match, and win the match he did.
 (48) Long live the Republic!
 (49) John intends to make a table, and make one he will.
 (50) Working late do you really think he was?
 (51) He won't tell me what will he do.
 (52) I wonder will they like it.
 (53) Oil costs less than would atomic energy.
 (54) I spend more than do my friends.

(55) She looks forward, as does her secretary, to the completion of the building.

(56) They go to concerts frequently, as do I.

In constructions which we have observed so far, auxiliaries or verbs are to be moved to the head position of TopicP to check the topicalized elements in the Spec position of TopicP. But in this construction, it is VP that is to be topicalized and there is no elements to check the topicalized element. So in a minimalist approach there is no way to explain why VPs are to be moved to the head of the TopicP. Moreover, there are some sentences in which no inversion is not taken place. The following are such cases :

(57) What his name is, is of no interest to me.

(58) That brother of yours, to be so uncouth!

(59) Whatever she does, does not concern me.

6. Structural Pattern

We have already observed several kinds of inverted constructions and non-inverted constructions. There is one thing to be noted between these two constructions. That is when we have a inverted construction, we do have the pattern (a) but not have the pattern (b) :

(60) (a) $\left. \begin{array}{c} \text{Neg} \\ \text{O} \\ \text{A} \end{array} \right\} \text{V S}$

(b) $\left. \begin{array}{c} \text{Neg} \\ \text{O} \\ \text{A} \end{array} \right\}, \text{V S}$

but when we do not have a inverted construction, we not only have the pattern (c), but also (d) and (e):

- (61) (c) $\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{Neg} \\ \text{O} \\ \text{A} \end{array} \right\} \text{S V}$
- (d) $\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{Neg} \\ \text{O} \\ \text{A} \end{array} \right\}, \text{S V}$
- (e) S, V

7. Conclusion

We have observed that a minimalist approach is not able to derive all the constructions which have topicalized elements. It is in the construction with unmarked S+V order and with a topicalized element that a derivation can not be converged. To this problem a minimalist approach might propose that among the constructions with the topicalized elements, the construction with marked V+S order is the unmarked construction and a construction with unmarked S+V order is the marked construction. And the latter construction will be derived after some stylistic rule in PF Component. That is in PF, Aux or V elements will be lowered to the position after S from the head of TopicP.

And we also have observed that there is a difference of structural pattern between an unmarked construction with a topicalized element and a marked construction with a topicalized element. The marked construction not only takes the pattern (c) but also the patterns (d) and (e), and takes the unmarked word order, S+V. So we may suggest that in the marked construction, the topicalized element is more independent than in the unmarked construction to the rest of the construction.

In this paper we have made analysis in some parts, and made some description in some parts. But there are many phenomena left without

explaining their structures. So these are to be left for the further study.

Notes

1) We use the following abbreviations with syntactic and functional categories mixed informally. S = Subject, V = Verb, O = Object, C = Complement, A = Adjunct, Neg = Negative element.

2) Note that there are some questionable constructions. Among them is:

- (i) (?) We could not hear the soprano, but nor could some friends who were nearer the front.

We do not discuss the questionable or ungrammatical constructions in this paper.

3) Note that there are some ungrammatical constructions. Among them is:

- (i) *I know that never have I been so humiliated in all my life.

4) Note that IP is equal to AgrSP.

5) Culicover (1991) postulates a functional category, Polarity Phrase (hence PolP) between CP and IP in a phrase structure:

- (i) [_{CP} Spec C [_{PolP} Spec Pol IP]]

He also postulates that a main clause has a PolP as its syntactic category and a subordinate clause CP.

6) The [+ Neg] feature is a weak feature and is to be checked in LF.

7) The following sentence may tell us that the constructions in this section may be variants of *there*-construction.

- (i) Into the room (there) had staggered a total stranger.

8) Note that there are some ungrammatical constructions. Among them are:

- (i) *Up cracked the soldier.
(ii) *Up blew the tank.
(iii) *At certain times may this door be left unlocked.

9) Note that there are some ungrammatical constructions. Among them are:

- (i) *Down the car broke.
(ii) *Up it blew.

(iii) *Out he passed.

These sentences take the A S V pattern. And the sentences taking the A S, V pattern are as follows.

(i) *In Chicago, he lived.

(ii) *To the very top of the mountain, they climbed.

10) There are some idiomatic expressions taking this pattern.

(i) Far be it from me to condemn him in any way.

(ii) Unlucky the man who hates his work.

11) The following has an idiomatic use.

(i) Suffice it to say we lost.

12) Note that there are some ungrammatical constructions. Among them is :

(i) *She wondered whether/if would he come back again.

References

- Chomsky, N. (1977) "On WH-Movement," in Culicover, P., A. Akmajian and T. Wasow *Formal Syntax*, Academic Press: New York, 71-132.
- Chomsky, N. (1986) *Barriers*, MIT Press, Cambridge: Massachusetts.
- Chomsky, N. (1992) "A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory, *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics*, Number 1.
- Chomsky, N. and H. Lasnik (1991) "Principles and Parameters Theory," ms., MIT and University of Connecticut.
- Culicover, P. (1991) "Topicalization, Inversion, and Complementizers in English," ms., The Ohio State University.
- Lake (1990) *Negation in Syntax*, Ph. D. dissertation, MIT.
- Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J. Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, Longman: New York.
- Travis (1984) *Parameters and Effects of Word Order Variation*, Ph. D. dissertation, MIT.