

Table of contents



<https://doi.org/10.1075/la.172.toc>

Pages v–x of

The Syntax of the *Be*-Possessive: Parametric variation and surface diversities

Hakyung Jung

[Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, 172]

2011. xiii, 269 pp.

© John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way. For any reuse of this material written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: www.copyright.com).

For further information, please contact rights@benjamins.nl or consult our website at benjamins.com/rights




Table of contents

Acknowledgements	XI
List of abbreviations	XIII
CHAPTER 1	
Parametric variation in synchrony and diachrony	1
1. Introduction	1
2. Parameters in linguistic theories	3
2.1 Parameters and cross-linguistic variation	3
2.2 Functional categories as the loci of parametric variation	6
2.2.1 Featural variations in functional categories	6
2.2.2 Parametric variation in the Minimalist Program	7
2.3 Microparameters	8
3. Parameters and syntactic change	9
3.1 Markedness and parametric change	9
3.1.1 Mechanism of language change	9
3.1.2 Markedness and the direction of language change	12
3.2 Grammaticalization and markedness	15
3.2.1 Grammaticalization as an unmarking process	15
3.2.2 Grammaticalization in the Minimalist framework	16
4. <i>Have</i> vs. <i>be</i> as parametric variation	17
4.1 Is the <i>have-be</i> alternation parametric?	17
4.1.1 <i>Have</i> and <i>be</i> in the possessive construction	17
4.1.2 Possession as a special instance of existence	19
4.1.3 Language-internal alternation of <i>have</i> and <i>be</i> in possessive/existential constructions	20
4.1.4 <i>Have</i> vs. <i>be</i> as an auxiliary	21
4.1.4.1 Perfect and obligation	21
4.1.4.2 Ergativity and the <i>be</i> -perfect	24
4.2 Word order and the <i>have/be</i> parameter in Russian	25
5. Theoretical preliminaries	27
5.1 Case and Agreement in light of the Minimalist Program	27
5.2 Structural symmetry of CP and DP	29
5.3 The Low Focus Phrase (Belletti 1999, 2001, 2004)	31
6. Summary and the organization of the book	34

CHAPTER 2

The syntax of the *be*-possessive in Russian

37

1. Introduction 37
2. What do we call the possessive in Russian? 38
 - 2.1 *Est'* as a hallmark of the existential: Kondrashova 1996 38
 - 2.2 *Perspective Structure* with *THING* being a predicate
(Borschev & Partee 2002; Partee & Borschev 2007) 43
3. The syntax of existential and possessive
be-constructions in Russian 46
 - 3.1 Decompositional approaches to *have* and *be* 46
 - 3.1.1 P-to-BE incorporation (Freeze 1992) 46
 - 3.1.2 Possessor as the subject (Kayne 1993) 50
 - 3.1.3 Possessor as the predicate (den Dikken 1995, 1997) 53
 - 3.2 The argument structure
of the possessive/existential construction 54
 - 3.2.1 Location/possessor PP as a predicate 54
 - 3.2.1.1 Predicate inversion (Moro 1991, 1997) 54
 - 3.2.1.2 Unaccusative structure (Harves 2002) 59
 - 3.2.2 Location/possessor PP as a subject 61
 - 3.2.2.1 *There* as the subject
(Williams 1994 & Hazout 2004) 61
 - 3.2.2.2 Serbian existential *Loc* as the subject
(Hartmann & Milićević 2007) 65
 - 3.2.2.3 Polish existential *Loc* as the subject
(Błaszczak 2007) 69
4. Proposal for the *be*-possessive structure in Russian 73
 - 4.1 The possessor PP as a subject
and the possessee NP as a predicate 73
 - 4.1.1 Existing arguments revisited 73
 - 4.1.2 The lack of predicate inversion
in the Russian possessive sentence 74
 - 4.1.3 Asymmetrical structure
of the embedded clause under BE 81
 - 4.1.4 Hazout (2004) and Kayne (1993) revisited 83
 - 4.2 The Low Focus Phrase in Russian 85
 - 4.2.1 Subject inversion in Russian (Bailyn 2004) 85
 - 4.2.2 Low Focus Phrase in Russian 88
 - 4.2.3 Low Focus Phrase and the possessive construction
in Russian 91
 - 4.3 Is P-to-BE incorporation necessary? 93
5. Conclusion 95

CHAPTER 3

The consequences of the *be*-possessive structure: Modal and perfect 97

1. Introduction 97
2. Dative-infinitive deontic modal construction (DIM) in Russian 98
 - 2.1 The argument structure of the DIM in Russian 99
 - 2.1.1 Control analysis 100
 - 2.1.2 Raising analysis 101
 - 2.1.3 Distributional constraint of PRO and null expletives 103
 - 2.2 Proposal of the underlying structure 104
 - 2.2.1 Parallelism between possessive and obligation constructions 104
 - 2.2.2 Null prepositional complementizers as the source of the dative of obligation 105
 - 2.2.3 Prepositional complementizers and the lack of PRO/expletives 108
 - 2.3 The distribution of infinitival datives in Russian 109
3. The North Russian *be*-perfect construction 111
 - 3.1 The argument structure of the *be*-perfect 113
 - 3.1.1 The *u*+GEN phrase as external argument: Semantic evidence 113
 - 3.1.2 The *u*+GEN phrase as external argument: Syntactic evidence 115
 - 3.2 Proposal of the underlying structure of the *be*-perfect 117
 - 3.2.1 Application of the *be*-possessive structure 117
 - 3.2.2 Prepositional complementizer and the lack of PRO and null expletive subjects 118
4. Prepositional complementizers and the licensing of oblique subjects 119

CHAPTER 4

The *be*-perfect and ergativity in North Russian 121

1. Introduction 121
2. Ergativity 122
 - 2.1 Case and argument alignments 122
 - 2.2 Mixed system and splits 123
 - 2.2.1 Morphological ergativity and three-way systems 124
 - 2.2.2 Tense/Aspect-split and *be*-perfect 126
 - 2.3 Verbal nominalization and ergative structure 132
3. The North Russian perfect and ergativity 134
 - 3.1 Morphosyntactic features of the *-no/-to* construction 134

3.2	Previous accounts of ergativity in the North Russian perfect	138
3.2.1	Lexical ergative case and morphological object case (Lavine 2000)	138
3.2.2	Split-verb structure (Tsedryk 2006)	142
4.	The semantic and syntactic features of North Russian - <i>no</i> /- <i>to</i> perfect	144
4.1	The <i>u</i> +GEN phrase as an external argument: Intransitive split	144
4.2	The <i>u</i> +GEN phrase as a surface subject	147
4.3	The <i>u</i> +GEN phrase as an agent phrase	149
4.4	The <i>be</i> -perfect structure and the licensing of the <i>u</i> +GEN phrase	150
4.5	Lexicalization of the <i>phi</i> -features of the participle	151
5.	Passivization analysis revisited	153
6.	Conclusion	154

CHAPTER 5

Microvariations in Case and Agreement 157

1.	Introduction	157
2.	Agreement	158
2.1	Preliminaries of agreement in the perfect	158
2.1.1	The Romance perfect	158
2.1.2	The basic structure of the North Russian perfect	161
2.2	Agreeing participle and copula	163
2.3	Agreement with argument vs. agreement with participle	164
3.	Verbal nominalization and object case variation	167
3.1	Verbal nominalization	167
3.2	Nominative object structure	168
3.3	Accusative object structure	170
3.4	Aspect and Case of the object	173
4.	Conclusion	176

CHAPTER 6

Thematic feature reduction: The historical extension of the syntax of the *be*-possessive to the *be*-modal 177

1.	Introduction	177
2.	The possessive-to-modal hypothesis for Russian	178
2.1	The parallelism between the <i>be</i> -possessive and the <i>be</i> -modal	178
2.2	Nominative object and word order in the DIM in Old North Russian	179
2.3	Language-internal variants of the DIM	185
2.3.1	Dative-infinitive existential construction (DIE)	185
2.3.2	PP-infinitive possessive construction (PIP)	187

3. Innovations in the evolution of the DIM 189
 - 3.1 Category shift and removal of the possessee 189
 - 3.2 The innovative *u*+GEN and removal of the possessor 191
 - 3.3 Chronology of the innovations 192
4. Grammaticalization of the *be*-modal 194
 - 4.1 The change of *be* as an Asp-to-Mod/T shift 194
 - 4.2 (Un)markedness and economy 196
5. Conclusion 197

CHAPTER 7

- Thematic feature reduction: The development of the *-no/-to* perfect** 199
1. Introduction 199
 2. Features of the *-no/-to* construction in modern North Russian 202
 - 2.1 Morphosyntactic features of the *-no/-to* construction 202
 - 2.2 Function of the *-no/-to* construction 204
 - 2.3 Geographical distribution of the *-no/-to* construction 206
 3. The development of the North Russian *-no/-to* construction 208
 - 3.1 The rise of the agentive *u*+GEN phrase 208
 - 3.1.1 Attestations of the *u*+GEN agent in the passive in old North Russian 208
 - 3.1.2 Semantic derivation of the agentive *u*+GEN 211
 - 3.1.3 Change of the syntactic status of the agentive *u*+GEN phrase 213
 - 3.2 Functional reanalysis of the non-agreeing participle 216
 - 3.2.1 The suffix *-no/-to* as a morphological realization of fixed agreement features 216
 - 3.2.2 The rise of ⟨*u*+GEN + non-agreeing *-no/-to*⟩ as the perfect 218
 - 3.2.3 The extension of the *u*+GEN + *-no/-to* construction to intransitive verbs 220
 - 3.3 Voice shift 221
 - 3.3.1 Nominative object construction 221
 - 3.3.2 The rise of ⟨*u*+GEN + *-no/-to* + ACC⟩ 224
 - 3.4 The Baltic-Finnic substratum effect 226
 4. Preconditions and triggers in the developmental path of the *-no/-to* perfect 231
 - 4.1 The evolution of the underlying structure 231
 - 4.2 From the existential *be* to the auxiliary *be*? 235
 - 4.3 Grammaticalization of the P(reposition) and economy/markedness 237
 5. Conclusion 239

CHAPTER 8

Conclusion 241

1. Summary of the chapters 241
2. Possessive, perfect, modal, and ergative constructions
with *be* as consequences of the *have/be* parameter 245

Bibliography 249

Index 265