Core Adjuncts and the Notion of Combinatorial Dependencies

Core Adjuncts and the Notion of Combinatorial Dependencies

Naoki Kimura

1. Introduction

The main purpose of this paper is to reconsider the grammatical properties of the middle adjuncts and obligatory adjuncts in English and Japanese, and to provide an adequate generalization to these phenomena upon basic observations at the descriptive level. The former is a group of adjuncts which necessarily occur in the middle voice construction, and the latter are adjuncts which obligatorily appear under a lexical demand from certain verbs. Adverbs and adjuncts have been traditionally known as optional constituents that need not satisfy the verbal requirement of the lexical frame fulfillment on NPs, but this categorization apparently contradicts the obligatory presence of adjuncts in some sentence constructions concerned in this article. By focusing on the similar distributive patterns of the middle adjuncts and obligatory adjuncts between Japanese and English, I propose that they both fall into a unified category which will be called "Core Adjuncts", and that their obligatory occurrence with certain verbs are well-captured if we assume that the relationship between core adjuncts and verbs are uniformly regulated by a simple notion of "Combinatorial Dependencies", in a sense of Hawkins (2001, 2004).

The organization of this paper is as follows. In section 2 I investigate the fundamental factor that differentiates the shared properties between middle adjuncts and obligatory adjuncts from those of other types of VP adjuncts. Section 3 introduces the notion of combinatorial dependencies and its interaction with a VP adverbial licensing mechanism which is termed the "Closest". Section 4 deals with possible hypothesis on the distribution of core adjuncts from the view of combinatorial dependencies, and some diagnostic tests are conducted on the basis of the initial assumption. Section 5 provides a brief summary and conclusion of the article.

2. Basic Properties of Obligatory Adjuncts and Middles

Although it was basically thought that adjuncts and adverbs are optional constituents of a sentence, McConnell-Ginet (1982) proposed that under some circumstances adjuncts have to appear obligatorily. In fact, absence of adjuncts induces ungrammaticality of sentences, both in English and in Japanese.

(1)　　a. *Joan behaved to Marcia.

　　　　b. Joan behaved rudely to Marcia.　　　　　　　　　　　　(McConnell-Ginet, 1982: 164)

(2)　　a. Taroo-wa　　　Hanako-ni　　tumetaku　　furumat-ta.

　　　　　Taro-NOM　　Hanako-DAT　　coldly　　baheve-PAST

　　　　　"Taro behaved coldly to Hanako"

　　　　b. *Taroo-wa　　　Hanako-ni　　furumat-ta.

　　　　　Taro-NOM　　Hanako-DAT　　behave-PAST

　　　　　"Taro behaved to Hanako"

It seems that a closed set of verbs which indicates the manner of certain events necessitates the co-occurrence with obligatory adjuncts. Verbs that seemingly belong to this group are *behave*, *treat*, *dress*, and *word* for English (cf. Larson, 1985), and on the other hand, *furumau* (behave) and *atukau* (treat) for Japanese. One assumption that immediately arises at this point is that such verbs are lexically deficient since they cannot present enough information for propositional content. Indeed, manner adjuncts such as *tumetaku* (coldly), *akaruku* (brightly), and *yasasiku* (kindly) are the typical examples of adjuncts that co-occur with the verbs which require obligatory adjuncts.

Adjuncts in middles show similar parallelism between English and Japanese with regard to the inability of omission.

(3)　　a. The car drives nicely.

　　　　b. *The car drives.　　　　　　　　　(Adapted from Keyser and Roeper, 1984: 384)

(4)　　a. Kono　　kuruma-wa　yoku　　hasir-u.

　　　　　This　　　car-TOP　　well　　drive-PRES

　　　　　"This car drives well"

b. *Kono   kuruma-wa   hasir-u.

   This   car-TOP   drive-PRES

   "This car drives"

Of course, not all of the pairs of sentences with or without adjuncts exhaustively show this kind of correspondence between English and Japanese. Noticing the cross-linguistic variation of the acceptability of middle construction, I mainly consider verbs that can commonly make the middles between the two languages throughout this paper, with a few exceptions concerning the data from elsewhere. The middle verbs that are to be taken up here are: cut, sell, learn, write, and drive, for English, and *kireru* (cut), *ureru* (sell), *manaberu* (learn), *kakeru* (write), and *hasiru* (drive/run) for Japanese. An important characteristic of middle verbs in Japanese is that most of them are necessarily accompanied by the potential morpheme *–e-ru* in their suffix positions. In addition to the problems of specificity onto NPs in the middles (Takami, 1997), I discuss the issue later in section 2.2.

2.1   Obligatory Adjuncts as Core Adjuncts

When I refer to the term "Core Adjunct", the definition can be described as the following.

(5)   Core Adjunct:

   a.   VP adjunct that modifies a core event of a sentence.

   b.   VP adjunct that reciprocally establishes lexical dependency with verbs.

For the usage of a term "core event" I mean by a principle like the following:

(6)   Core Event (cf. Tenny, 2000):

   An event which is represented by the meanings of certain kinds of verbs and is associated with manner, stativity or inchoativity.

In this article, I assume that the notion of core event includes the precise description of manner as well as stativity or inchoativity, although it is not generally assumed to be a part of the core event. However, as I argue in the sections below, a description of a VP-internal event should obviously include manner

associated with certain verbs and thus there is no reason to exclude this notion from the core event. For the term "Core Adjunct", to the best of my knowledge, it was first introduced by Ernst (1994). There he applies the term for one type of adjuncts in Chinese that occur in a very restricted environment, apart from the obligatoriness of adjuncts. The term should be thus distinguished from the one I adapt here for Japanese, for I use the term to describe that the obligatory occurrence of adjuncts and the core event are closely connected to each other. SVO languages like English allow post-verbal placement of adjuncts, whose properties are described as "an unusual or unexpected qualification of an action / event will most likely come after the verb (Ernst 1984: 331)."In this sense, Japanese seems to provide a good testing-ground for the distribution of VP-internal adjuncts and its relationship with issues on eventuality, because strict head-final language like Japanese never allows post-verbal placement of adjuncts. That is, how those various kinds of VP adjuncts in Japanese involve the core event is harder to distinguish than those of SVO languages. Despite the word order restriction, what I argue here is that core adjuncts require mutual dependency with certain verbs and therefore truly exceptional for that they cannot be omitted, while almost all adjuncts are optional modifiers of VP or some higher projection which indicates outer event of a sentence, as in the following example (cf. Koizumi, 1993, Kimura, Kim & Koizumi 2005).

(7)　　a. Taroo-wa　　yasasiku　[$_{VP}$　Hanako-ni　　　hanasikaketa].

　　　　　Taro-TOP　　gently　　　　Hanako-DAT　　　talked to

　　　　"Taro talked to Hanako gently"

　　　b. Taroo-wa　　akaruku　[$_{VP}$　Hanako-ni　　　furumatta].

　　　　　Taro-TOP　　brightly　　　Hanako-DAT　　　behaved

　　　　"Taro behaved brightly to Hanako"

It is intuitively clear that the adjunct *yasasiku* (gently) in the example (a) modifies the whole event of Taro's opening the door, not just modifying the verb *hanasikake-ta* (talked to) only. In the example (b), it is fair to say that the adjunct is modifying rather smaller portion of VP, or perhaps even the verb only. This is further shown in the examples below.

(8)　　a. *Taroo-wa　　yasasiku　*e*　hanasikake-ta.

Taro-TOP   gently   talk to-PAST

"Taro gently talked to"

b. ?Taroo-wa   akaruku   *e*   furumat-ta.

Taro-TOP   brightly   behave-PAST

"Taro behaved brightly"

While the example (b) allows an interpretation of arbitrary goal NP for the empty argument, the example (a) does not evoke such reading. This indicates that the normal VP adjuncts modifies an event consists of object and verb whereas obligatory adjuncts modifies the core event of a verb. Given that the obligatory adjuncts are a kind of core adjuncts that are involved in the deepest part of the event in a sentence, I further argue in the following section that adjuncts in middles yield quite similar distribution as those of obligatory adjuncts.

2.2 Middle Adjuncts as Core Adjuncts

I devote this section mainly on the basic observation on middles in Japanese, and the adjuncts that are required for the grammaticality of the sentences. What I insist here is that the obligatory occurrence of adjuncts in middles are affected by the property such as specificity on noun phrases in the middles, but it is also strongly related with the eventuality induced by the potential predicate. It is posited that the middle adjuncts should rather be regarded as a realization of lexical combination between adjuncts and verbs that consist the core event of a sentence.

Most of the middle verbs require two factors on its sentence construction: specificity on subject NP, and potential predicates such as *–e-ru* or *–are-ru*. If the middles lack the specificity condition, a sentence ends up in ungrammaticality as shown in (9).

(9)   a. Kono   hon-wa   yoku   ur-e-ru.

This   book-TOP   well   sell-POT-PRES

"This book sells well"

b. *Hon-wa   yoku   ur-e-ru.

book-TOP   well   sell-POT-PRES

"Book sells well"

Takami (1997) argued that the subject NPs of the middle constructions in Japanese demand assignment of meaningful specification for the sentences to be judged correctly. His proposal is that as far as the subject NPs are given enough specifications, the middle sentences can be approved regardless of the existence of the demonstrative pronoun "*kono* (this)".

(10) a. Kono   sake-wa   nom-e-ru.

　　　　　this   liquor-TOP   drink-POT-PRES

　　　　"This liquor is good to drink"

　　　b. Kono   geemu-wa   tanosim-e-ru.

　　　　　this   game-TOP   enjoy-POT-PRES

　　　　"This game is enjoyable"

　　　c. Kono   houcho-wa   kir-e-ru.

　　　　　this   food chopper-TOP   cut-POT-PRES

　　　　"This food chopper cuts (well)"

　　　d. Kono   kinoko-wa   taber-are-ru.

　　　　　this   mushroom-TOP   eat-POT-PRES

　　　　"This mushroom is eatable"　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Takami 1997: 84, (23c)-(23f))

(11) a. *Kono   syatu-wa   ara-e-ru.

　　　　　this   shirt-TOP   wash-POT-PRES

　　　　"(Lit.) This shirt washable"

　　　b. *Kokusai denwa-wa   kaker-are-ru.

　　　　　international call-TOP   call-POT-PRES

　　　　"(Lit.) International calls are able to call"　　　　　(Takami 1997: 84, (25a), (26a))

Takami (1997) explains the reason of unacceptability of the sentences in (11), that when characteristics of the subjects are essentially indicated by the potential predicate, the subjects lack the meaningful specification and thus induce ungrammaticality. In other words, shirts in (11a) and international call in (11b) are essentially washable or basically able to be used by anyone so they need not be expressed in middle construction which necessitates the specific implication on the subjects. This generalization can also explain why the sentence in (9b) is unacceptable. However, his argument cannot precisely

capture the whole phenomena of middles without adjuncts, because if the essential properties of the subjects and the lexical information of verbs are involved in the acceptability of the examples in (11), the examples in (10) should also be unacceptable for the subjects not being given significant specification: liquor is essentially drinkable, and knives are essentially used to cut something but nothing else. In addition to the assumption of necessary specification on subjects, I propose an alternative analysis that the middles require denotation of specific core event with obligatory adjuncts. Thus, the acceptability of the middles are not affected by the existence/non-existence of the demonstrative pronoun "*kono*" or any semantic specification on subjects, but rather affected by the degree of the description of core event, which is called forth by the potential predicates: –*e-ru* and –*are-ru*. As shown in the examples below, the specification on subjects using "*kono*" merely have effect on the grammatical judgments as far as there is a core event description consisting of adjuncts and verbs:

(12) a. Kono syatu-wa   sentakuki-de   ara-e-ru.

        this shirt-TOP   laundry machine-with   wash-POT-PRES

        "This shirt is machine washable"

      b. Syatu-wa   sentakuki-de   ara-e-ru.

        shirt-TOP   laundry machine-with   wash-POT-PRES

      c. *Syatu-wa   ara-e-ru.

        shirt-TOP   wash-POT-PRES

The examples in (12a, b) are given appropriate description by the appearance of secondary predicate "*sentakuki-de* (machine-wash)", one of the VP adjuncts, but the omission of the pronoun does not evoke unacceptability. However, if the middles lack the adjuncts, the sentences become unacceptable as in (12c). These examples thus indicate that the organization of core event which includes potential verbs and obligatory adjuncts is a more important factor than the specification on subjects when we concern the whole licensing mechanism of the middles. Further evidence for the importance of core events in the middles are shown in the examples below.

(13) a. Kono naifu-wa   yoku   kir-e-ru.

this   knife-TOP   well   cut-POT-PRES

"This knife cuts well"

b. #Naifu-wa   yoku   kir-e-ru.

knife-TOP   well   cut-POT-PRES

"Knife cuts well"

c. *Kono   naifu-wa   kir-u.

this   knife-TOP   cut-PRES

"This knife cuts"

d. *Naifu-wa   yoku   kir-u.

knife-TOP   well   cut-PRES

"Knife cuts well"

Despite the lack of demonstrative pronoun in (13b), if we assume the comparison of knives with other materials to cut something, such as paperknives, the sentence would not be unacceptable. Therefore, as we have seen up to here, the marginal judgment of middles with or without meaningful specification on subjects is due to whether the presupposition is available from the full description in the core events. However, from (13c) and (13d), it seems that the existence of potential predicates is rather a crucial factor for the judgments, regardless of the occurrence of the adjuncts in the related sentences. Given that the potential predicates require obligatory occurrence of adjuncts to supplement the information in the core events, it is fair to say that the adjuncts in the middles share the same properties with those of "behave-type" sentences. The issues on presupposition, nevertheless, remain unanswered in this article. It may be rather related to pragmatic analysis as proposed by Goldberg and Ackerman (2001), and I leave this issue as a future research.

3. Combinatorial Dependencies

In this section I turn to the notion of combinatorial dependencies, and argue that the relationships between core adjuncts and verbs are the foremost instance of the combinatorial dependencies: namely, the core event. Fundamental principles of "Combination" and "Dependencies" are stated below.

(14)   Combination (Hawkins 2004: 20)

Two categories A and B are in relation of combination iff they occur within the same mother phrase

node and maximal projection (phrasal combination), or if they occur within the same lexical co-occurrence frame (lexical combination).

(15)   Dependency (Hawkins 2004: 22)

Two categories A and B are in a relation of dependency iff the parsing of B requires access to A for the assignment of syntactic or semantic properties to B with respect to which B is zero-specified or ambiguously or polysemously specified.

The key concept of "Combination" and "Dependency" together form a combined notion of "Combinatorial Dependencies", under which the two categories A and B constitute a bidirectional, phrase-internal lexical dependencies. I assume that the simultaneous dependencies from both of the constituents that organize minimal sister relationship within VP -from verbs to core adjuncts or from core adjuncts to verbs- are needed for licensing the core adjuncts. The most crucial evidence that supports this proposal is given below.

(16)   a. Yasasiku   Taroo-ga   Hanako-ga   Jiroo-ni   kisu-sita   to   hanasi-ta.
          gently   Taro-NOM   Hanako-NOM   Jiro-DAT   kiss-PAST COMP   say-PAST
        "Gently, Taro said that Hanako kissed Jiro"
       b. *Yasasiku   Taroo-ga   Hanako-ga   Jiroo-ni   furumat-ta   to   hanasi-ta.
          gently   Taro-NOM   Hanako-NOM   Jiro-DAT   behave-PAST   COMP   say-PAST
        "Gently, Taro said that Hanako behaved to Jiro"

In both sentences, a VP adjunct "*yasasiku* (gently)" is scrambled out to the sentence initial position. The example (16a) is ambiguous in two ways: intuitively it should be associated with the matrix verb "*hanasi-ta* (said)", but it is not impossible to make an interpretation of the VP adjunct associating with the verb in the embedded clause of (16a), in which the interpretation of the embedded clause should be "Hanako kissed Jiro gently". This means that when VP adjuncts are placed outside of their canonical domain, they start to search for the event that they should essentially modify. On the other hand, (16b) does not allow embedded reading of the VP adjunct. Thus it amounts to saying that the core adjuncts must be licensed within the domain which stands as the largest boundary of the core event. If so, as far as they are placed within the propositional content of *furumau* (behave) in the embedded clause, the sentence would not cause violation. This is indeed born out as in an example below.

(17) Taroo-ga (yasasiku) Hanako-ga (yasasiku) Jiroo-ni furumat-ta to hanasi-ta.

     Taro-NOM (gently) Hanako-NOM (gently) Jiro-DAT behave-PAST COMP say-PAST

     "Taro said that (gently) Hanako behaved to Jiro (gently)"

In the example above, the adjunct is placed at adjacent positions to the subject in the embedded clause. In this case the adjunct receives an appropriate interpretation of being associated with the embedded verb. As shown below, the same kind of grammatical contrast can be also seen in the middles.

(18)   a. Taroo-ga   Kono kuruma-wa   yoku   hasi-ru.   to   it-ta.

       Taro-NOM   this car-TOP   well   run-PRES   COMP   say-PAST

       "Taro said that this shirt is machine-washable"

     b. Taroo-ga   yoku   kono kuruma-wa   hasi-ru.   to   it-ta.

       Taro-NOM   well   this car-TOP   run-PRES   COMP   say-PAST

     c. *Yoku   Taroo-ga   kono kuruma-wa   hasi-ru   to   it-ta.

       well   Taro-NOM   this car-TOP   run-PRES   COMP   say-PAST

Notice that the middle verb *hasi-ru* (run) requires the presence of core adjuncts to describe how something runs well. When the adjunct *yoku* (well) is placed at the sentence initial position, it cannot have an embedded reading and thus the sentence ends up in ungrammaticality. However, as we have seen in (16a), the normal VP adjuncts permit both matrix and embedded readings. Based on these observations, the minimal licensing boundary of core adjuncts can be schematically shown as follows (CA stands for core adjuncts:

(19)   a.   [S   [<CA> S <CA> (IO) <CA> Verbs]   V]

                ↑   [Core Event]⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⏋

    b.   *[S <CA> [S   (IO)   Verbs]   V]

                  ↑⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯[Core Event]⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⏋

Upon the establishment of assumption based on combinatorial dependency and core event, I propose the

following for the licensing system of core adjuncts:

(20)   The Closest Condition:

   Core adjuncts must be associated with a closest head to which they are affiliated, or with a constituent which induces a furthest boundary of a core event.

Considering these properties of middles and obligatory adjuncts, in the following section I discuss some of the predictions that can be derived from the notions of combinatorial dependencies.

4.   Conditions on the "Closest" and Core Adjuncts

   The combinatorial dependencies and the closest condition together predict that the verbs that are informationally deficient and the core adjuncts that supplement lexical information for the core event do not prefer any other kind of constituent to intervene between them. Normal verbs and common VP adjuncts, on the other hand, should not induce such aversion. First, consider the examples below.

(21)   a. Gakusei-ga   sono hon-wo   **kanari**   tebayaku   yon-da.
        student-NOM   that book-ACC   considerably   quickly   read-PAST
        "Students read the book considerably quickly."
        b. Gakusei-ga   sono hon-wo   tebayaku   **kanari**   yon-da.
        student-NOM   that book-ACC   quickly   considerably   read-PAST

Although the scope interaction differs between (a) and (b) sentences, a degree adjunct "*kanari* (considerably)" can appear either on the left or right side of a VP manner adjunct "*tebayaku* (quickly)". It is an essential property of the degree adjunct "*kanari*" that induces a quantitative interpretation when it is placed at the adjacent position to the verb: *Taro-wa kanari oyoida*, for instance, means that Taro swam quite a long distance. Since some of the degree adjuncts like "*kanari* can directly modify the verbs, I consider them to be one type of VP adjuncts. Another important characteristic of the placement of "*kanari*" is that it enables the co-occurring VP manner adjunct to keep the original interpretation over a sentence even though it is not put right next to the verb. Now, consider the same kind of order permutation in behave-type verb.

(22)   a. Taroo-wa   Hanako-ni   **kanari**   yasasiku   furumat-ta.

          Taro-NOM   Hanako-DAT   considerably   gently   behave-PAST

          "Taro behaved considerably gently to Hanako"

     b. *Taroo-wa   Hanako-ni   yasasiku   **kanari**   furumat-ta.

          Taro-NOM   Hanako-DAT   gently   considerably   behave-PAST

Notice that although the precedence of degree adjunct "*kanari*" to VP adjunct "*yasasiku* (gently)" is possible, the reversed order is not allowed as it can be seen in (22b), contrary to the fact observed in (21). This indicates that behave-type verbs prefer adjacency to the core adjuncts to other types of VP adjuncts. Similar contrast can be detected in the word order alternation in middles as well.

(23)   a. Kono naifu-wa   **kanari**   yoku   kir-e-ru.

          this knife-TOP   considerably   well   cut-POT-PRES

         "This knife cuts considerably well"

    b. *Kono naifu-wa   yoku   **kanari**   kir-e-ru.

          this knife-TOP   well   considerably   cut-POT-PRES

Again, the ungrammaticality of (23b) is not due to the placement of "*kanari*" right before the verb, because it alone can modify the degree of the core event.

(24)   Kono naifu-wa   kanari   kir-e-ru.

      this knife-TOP   considerably   cut-POT-PRES

      "This knife cuts considerably (well)"

Given that (24) is completely fine, we are able to consider that the core adjuncts which constitute core event with certain verbs prefer direct modification on the verbs and have tendency to exclude the intervention of constituent between core adjuncts and verbs.

5.   Loose Ends: Obligatory Adjuncts in Passives and Progressives

The following examples show that some verbs in English require obligatory appearance of by-phrase agents.

(25)　　a. *This house was built.

　　　　b. This house was built by a French architect.　　　　　(Grimshaw and Vikner 1993: 143)

Even more puzzling phenomenon can be seen in the English for-phrases. As discussed by Rapoport (1999) and Stroik (1999), some middles allow agents to be realized in for-PPs, while some do not.

(26)　　a. French books read easily for educated people.

　　　　b. Latin texts do not translate easily for Bill.

　　　　c. *These books don't sell for the average shopkeeper.

　　　　d. *Stows on floor or shelf for tidy people.　　　　　(Rapoport, 1999: 147, 152)

Japanese does not have the agentive distinction between for-PPs and by-PPs in passives, that is, they are uniformly expressed with –ni particle, or otherwise with -ni-yotte particle which is a derived form of -ni. However, despite the non-distinction of prepositional particles in Japanese, some verbs seem to disallow passivization without agentive PP.

(27)　　a. *Kono ie-wa　　　　　tate-rare-ta.

　　　　　　this house-TOP　　build-PASSIVE-PAST

　　　　　　"This house was built"

　　　　b. Kono ie-wa　　　[PP aru　chomeina　kenchikuka-niyotte]　　tate-rare-ta.

　　　　　　this house-TOP　certain　popular　　architect-by　　build-PASSIVE-PAST

　　　　　　"This house was built by a popular architect"

At this point I do not have sufficient explanation for these apparently divergent examples. One possibility is that the features of certain sentence constructions, whether they are explicitly realized as morphemes or not, yield deficits on information structure and evoke core event combination consisting of adjuncts and verbs. In fact, some other grammatical features such as aspect seemingly affect the naturalness of sentences.

(28) a. *Bureaucrats are bribing easily.

     b. *The walls are painting easily.   (Fagan, 1988: 181)

(29) a. *Kono shytu-wa   sentakuki-de   ara-e-tei-ru.

        this shirt-TOP   laundry machine-with   wash-POSS-PROG-PRES

        "This shirt can machine-washing."

     b. *Kono naifu-wa   yoku   kir-e-tei-ru.

        this knife-TOP   well   cut-POSS-PROG-PRES

        "This knife is cutting well"   (Takami, 1997: 85)

The characteristics of these aspectual denotations and implicit arguments in the middles are circumstantially observed by Iwata (1999), but the similarity between Japanese and English with regard to the aspectuality and obligatory PPs still seem to have not been discussed in the literature. Thus it is left open toward a future research, of how combinatorial dependencies and the concept of core event are related to the obligatory presence of adjuncts in these constructions.

6. Conclusion

In this article I discussed some similarities between obligatory-adjunct construction and the adjuncts in the middles, and argued that they can be regulated by the notion of combinatorial dependencies and the core event licensing mechanism. Further investigations should be necessary, in order to reveal these obvious parallelism between English and Japanese, in respect to the lexical dependencies, event representations and obligatoriness of adjuncts.

References

Ernst, Thomas (1984) *Towards an Integrated Theory of Adverb Position in English*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistic Club.

Ernst, Thomas (1994) Conditions on Chinese A-not-A Questions. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 3, 241-264.

Ernst, Thomas (2002) *The Syntax of Adjuncts*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fagan, Sarah (1988) The English Middle. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 181-203.

Goldberg, Adele E., and Ackerman, Farrell (2001) The Pragmatics of Obligatory Adjuncts. *Language* 77: 798-814.

Grimshaw, Jane (1990) *Argument Structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Grimshaw, Jane and Vikner, Sten (1993) Obligatory Adjuncts and the Structure of Events. In: Eric Reuland and Werner Abraham (eds.) *Knowledge of Language, Volume II, Lexical and Conceptual Structure*, 143-155. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Hawkins, John (2001) Why Are Categories Adjacent? *Journal of Linguistics* 37: 1-34.

Hawkins, John (2004) *Efficiency and Complexity in Grammars*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Iwata, Seiji (1999) On the Status of Implicit Arguments in Middles. *Journal of Linguistics* 35, 527-553.

Keyser, Samuel J. and Roeper, Thomas (1984) On the Middle and Ergative Constructions in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15, 381-416.

Kimura, Naoki., Kim, Jungho., and Koizumi, Masatoshi (2005) Sentence Processing and Phrase Structural Determinacy of Aspect in Japanese. In: Taro Kageyama (ed.), *Lexicon Forum* 1, 133-161. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.

Koizumi, Masatoshi (1993) Modal Phrase and Adjuncts. In: Patricia M Clancy (ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 2, 409-428. Stanford: CSLI.

Larson, Richard (1985) Bare NP Adverbs. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16, 595-621.

McConnell-Ginet, Sally (1982) Adverbs and Logical Form. *Language* 58, 144-184.

Rapoport, Tova R (1999) The English Middle and Agentivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30, 147-155.

Stroik, Thomas (1999) Middles and Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30, 119-131.

Takami, Ken-ichi (1997) *Kinoo-teki Toogoron* (Functional Syntax). Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.

Tenny, Carol (2000) Core Events and Adverbial Modification. In: Carol Tenny and James Pustejovsky (eds.), *Events as Grammatical Objects*, 285-334. Stanford: CSLI.

Naoki Kimura

Graduate Student, Department of Linguistics

Graduate School of Art and Letters

Tohoku University

核付加詞と連結依存の概念について

木村　直樹

本論文ではこれまで集中的に取り上げられることの少なかった日英語の「義務的付加詞類」と「中間構文付加詞」に焦点を当て、それらの現象を記述し妥当な説明を与えることを目的とする。双方の付加詞類は文中において義務的な出現を求められるが、その共通性に基づき、それらの付加詞類は文中の様態描写の核を占める「核付加詞（Core Adjunct)」という単一の範疇に分類できるということを示す。また、核付加詞と動詞との語彙的な依存の背景には「連結依存 (Combinatorial Dependencies)」という概念が関わっているであろうことを、動詞句付加詞 (VP Adjunct)の特性である「最近接の条件 (The Closest Condition)」と結びつけて主張する。

（東北大学大学院文学研究科言語学研究室　大学院生）