Readings for next time:

Cinque (1999). *Adverbs and functional heads: A crosslinguistic perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press. Chapter 1, through section 1.4 (pp. 3–28), 1.71 (pp. 33–34), Chapter 3, through section 3.1 (pp. 52–56), Chapter 4, sections 4.25–4.27 and 4.29 (pp. 103–107), Chapter 6, sections 6.2 (pp. 132–134). That’s actually only about 40 pages in all.


Comments on Cinque (1999).

Chapter 1 has a pretty basic point to make (adverbs seem to come in a strict, and largely crosslinguistically invariant, order), which it does with quite a bit of thoroughness. Once you see what he’s doing, you may skim a bit. Section 1.4 takes a little bit more thinking to get, but it’s relatively clear what the problem is and what he needs to say. The latter part of chapter 1 goes through a number of case studies—I’ve just selected English for you to look at, but you are free to look at the other ones too. Section 1.7.7 is a very brief version of the facts from the Rackowski & Travis work.

Chapter 3 does something pretty similar except now not with adverbs but with functional heads. We’ll just look at the introduction, not at all of the case studies that he follows it up with.

Chapter 4 ties the adverb ordering to the functional head ordering, showing that not only do both have strict orders, but they match up semantically. Again, this chapter is full of case after case, so I’ve just assigned the last couple of cases he looks at, and the summary. Section 4.29 is the proposal in all its glory.

Chapter 6, section 6.2 comments on how this huge clause structure might not be as incompatible with the minimalist program as you might at first think.

Comments on Rackowski and Travis (2000)

Rackowski and Travis are looking at Malagasy and Niuean adverbs, using Cinque’s adverb tests to support Kayne’s antisymmetry approach (and to provide an analysis for Malagasy and Niuean). It’s a fairly straightforward paper, I think you should have most of the background that you’d need to get most of it.

Stuff for you to do:

- Do the readings.
- Write a short (1–2 page) summary of Travis & Rackowski’s article.

Some points about the write-ups (this one and future ones):

- Single-space them, so that you have more room to comment if you wish.
- Email is fine, just get them in by class (need not necessarily be earlier).
- Mention: major points, major arguments.
- Don’t mention: ways of dealing with isolated possible objections / potential counterexamples, picky technical revisions to the theory, (unless they significantly “advance the plot”)
- For one or more major point(s), try to outline at least one argument for it in somewhat more detail—no examples needed, something like:

  In Icelandic, a shifted object can (under certain circumstances) be seen overtly preceding the subject, which indicates that the base position of the subject must be lower than the derived position of the object—hence, providing damaging evidence against the Split-VP hypothesis.

- If something occurs to you—questions, possible support or possible counterexamples from a language you know—mention those too.

Next time:

Student presentation of Travis & Rackowski (2000), with the discussion of Cinque (1999) led by me.