

一致と格の所在

(Location of Agreement and Case)

林 憲将 (HAYASHI, NORIMASA)*

九州大学 (Kyushu University)

概要

- ・言語毎に様々に見られる一致、格の多様性を捉えるためにどのようなメカニズムが必要なのか議論する。
- ・Agree の他、統語論で与えられるラベルに基づき、感覚運動インターフェイスで一致、格の値を付与する可能性を提案する（実質的に支配/統率 (domination/government) 関係の効果をラベルの観点から捉え直す）。
- ・従来統語論内で提案された特殊な一致、格付与（の一部）は上記のメカニズムで捉えられることを示す。
- ・Agree/最小探査は上から下、統語論内の情報は変えない二点を守り、一致/格により統語論を複雑にしない。

1. 一致の振る舞い

(1) Agree: [uF] (を持つ要素) が、その c 統御領域を探査し、対応する[F]の値を得て[vF]に変わる。

- (2) a. Pá hafið þetta sennilega bara verið þið
then have.2PL this probably only been you.NOM
'Then this/it has probably only been you.'
- b.*Pá hafið henni sennilega aldrei líkað þið
then have.2PL her.DAT probably never liked you.NOM
'i.e., Then she has probably never liked you.'

(Sigurðsson 2004: 74)

(*ibid.*)

Agree は活性条件 (activity condition) (Chomsky 2000, 2001) に従い、[uCase]を持つ最も統語的に近い名詞と行われる（最小性）ため、(3b, c) のようなパターンは予測されない。

- (3) a. T[uphi][Nom]-DP[phi][uCase]
b. T[uphi][Nom]-DP1[phi][uCase] & DP2[phi][uCase]
c. T[uphi][Nom] & V[uphi][Acc]- DP[phi][uCase]
- (4) a. Er lässt ihn {einen guten Mann/ein guter Mann} sein.
he let-3SG him a good man-ACC/-NOM COP
'He lets him be a good man.' (German; adapted from Schütze 1997: 87)
b. Juma a-li-kuwa a-me-pika chakula.
Juma 3SG-PST-be 3SG-PERF-cook 7food
'Juma had cooked food.' (Swahili; Carstens 2001: 150)
c. ngunha watharri-ku nyurna-yu warrapa-la-ku
that look=for-PRES snake-ACC grass-LOC-ACC
'He is looking for the snake in the grass.'

(Panyjima; Plank 1995: 35)

(4a, b) はそれぞれ (3b, c) に対応し、一致が統語論で Agree により起こると考えると問題となる。これらに、multiple Agree (Hiraiwa 2005) や simultaneous Agree (Chomsky 2008) を考えても（その概念的問題 (cf. Zeijlstra 2012) の他に）、(4c) の Case stacking (suffixaufnahme) が依然として問題となる。

- (5) a. [Which[uQ] cat] do[Q] you like? (cf. Epstein, Kitahara, and Seely (EKS) 2017)
b. Who[uQ] will[Q] be offended if we invite which[uQ] philosopher? (Reinhart 1998: 36)

c 統御関係が無い位置への Agree はできない。

2. 提案

- (6) a. [uphi]素性、格を持たない名詞表現は感覚運動インターフェイスで可読性条件 (legibility condition) により問題となる。 (cf. Chomsky 2004, EKS 2010, 2017)
b. 統語論内で起こる Agree は最小性に従う。 (Chomsky 2000, 2001)
c. 統語構造が持つラベルに従い感覚運動インターフェイスで一致/格が与えられる。 (EKS 2017, 2018, Hayashi in press) (cf. Chomsky 1981, Young 1988)
d. 主格/対格はそれぞれ T/R が ([phi]素性一致により) 与える。 (cf. EKS 2012)

Agree: 統語論内で[uF]が[vF]の値を受け取る。

(6c): インターフェイスで[uF]が利用可能な[vF]の値をラベル<F, F>を通じて受け取る。

(7) [uphi]や[uCase]が存在し、統語論で値が与えられると、それぞれの外在化情報は一つに制限される。

多重に値がある場合は[uphi]の値が統語論で与えられていない。また、本研究では[uCase]を想定しない。

*norimasa.8843@gmail.com

- (8) syntax SM
 $\{\gamma \text{vphi} \mid (\text{Agree} \text{ は一度のみ}) \rightarrow \text{Agree} \text{ で得た値を一つ表す。他の構造上の情報を参照する必要はない。}$
 $\{\beta \text{uphi} \mid \rightarrow \text{構造上の情報を利用して外在化を行う。その際複数の情報が利用できるのであれば複数の情報を外在化可能。}$
- (9) $\{\delta v^* \{\gamma \text{him}[\text{phi}] \mid \{\beta \sqrt{\text{let}}[\text{uphi}] \mid \{\alpha \text{be him}[\text{phi}] \mid \text{a good man}^1\}\}\}\} \quad (\alpha=\text{be}, \beta=\text{R}, \gamma=\langle \text{phi}, \text{phi} \rangle, \delta=v^*)$ (cf. (4a))
- (10) $\{\delta \text{Juma}[\text{phi}] \mid \{\gamma \text{T}[\text{vphi}] \mid \{\beta \text{Juma}[\text{phi}] \mid \{\alpha v^*[\text{uphi}], \text{food}\}\}\}\} \quad (\alpha=\beta=v^*, \gamma=\text{T}, \delta=\langle \text{phi}, \text{phi} \rangle)$ (cf. (4b))
- (11) $\{\gamma \text{look for} \mid \{\beta \text{snake} \mid \{\alpha \text{grass}[\text{Loc}]\}\}\} \quad (\alpha=\text{grass}, \beta=\text{snake}, \gamma=\text{look for})$

3. ラベルを(統語論で)用いた格と一致の先行研究 (Norris 2014 と Béjar & Rezac 2009)

- (12) Case Concord (Norris 2014: 150)
a. Let X and Y be two nodes in a single extended projection, Y immediately dominating X.
b. If Y has a valued case feature [CASE: α] (but X does not), then copy Y's case feature to X.
- (13)

```

graph TD
    ZP --> Z
    Z --> XP
    Z --- F["[F:α]"]
  
```
- 裸句構造 (bare phrase structure) (Chomsky 1995) に基づく Norris の分析 (12) は、1. 一致/格付与が統語論内で起こり、2. それらの情報がラベルに現れる必要がある。しかし、統語論で一致/格の値を与えるため、(7) に基づくと $[uF]/[uCase]$ が複数の値を持てず、(4c) が問題となる²。
- (14) a. enamik inimesi
majority people.PL.PAR
'a majority of people'
b. Enamiku-l inimes-te-l pole selle-ks raha.
majority-ADE person-PL-ADE NEG.be this-TRL money.PAR
'A majority of people do not have money for this.'
(Estonian; Norris 2014: 180)

- (15) a. g-waabm-in
2-see-1.INV 1→2=2 (Inverse Context)
'I see you.'
- b. g-waabm-i
2-see-DFLT.1 2→1=2 (Direct Context)
'You see me.' (Nishnaabemwin; Béjar & Rezac 2009: 49)
- (16) Person Specification in Nishnaabemwin: 3-1-2 (cf. Béjar & Rezac 2009: 43)
a. 3rd: [person]
b. 1st: [person], [participant]
c. 2nd: [person], [participant], [addressee]
- (17) Derivation of a Transitive vP (Béjar & Rezac 2009: 48)
Step 0: VP constructed as {V, {V, IA}}; v becomes locus
Step 1: Merge(v, VP) ⇒ {v_I, {v, {V, {V, IA}}}}
Step 2: Agree(v_I, IA)
Step 3: Merge(v_P, EA) ⇒ {v_{II}, {EA, {v_I, {v, {V, {V, IA}}}}}}
Step 4: Agree(v_{II}, EA), if there is still a probe on v_{II}

問題点: 1. ラベルは統語論内で使えるものではない (Seely 2006: 190)。2. ラベルはフェイズの最後につくもので、Agree はそれより前。→ v と T を用いても同じ結果が得られる (Béjar & Rezac 2009: 48; note 7)

- (18) a. $\{\delta \text{EA}[\text{phi}] \mid \{\gamma v^*[\text{uphi}] \mid \{\beta \text{IA}[\text{phi}] \mid \{\alpha V, \text{IA}[\text{phi}]\}\}\}\}$
b. $\{\delta \text{EA}[\text{phi}] \mid \{\gamma v^* \{\beta \text{IA}[\text{phi}] \mid \{\alpha V[\text{uphi}], \text{IA}[\text{phi}]\}\}\}$ ($\alpha=V, \beta=\langle \text{phi}, \text{phi} \rangle$)
c. $\{\delta \text{EA}[\text{phi}] \mid \{\gamma v^* \{\langle \text{phi}, \text{phi} \rangle \text{IA}[\text{phi}] \mid \{\nu V[\text{uphi}], \text{IA}[\text{phi}]\}\}\}$ ($\alpha=V, \beta=\langle \text{phi}, \text{phi} \rangle$)
d. $\{\langle \text{phi}, \text{phi} \rangle \text{EA}[\text{phi}] \mid \{\nu_{v^*} V-v^*[\text{uphi}] \mid \{\langle \text{phi}, \text{phi} \rangle \text{IA}[\text{phi}] \mid \{\nu V[\text{uphi}], \text{IA}[\text{phi}]\}\}\}$

統語論で値を一つに定めず、インターフェイスの表示から利用可能な場所の一致の情報を用いる。

- (19) A particular functional head F can search the phase for something to agree with:
i. zero times, or
ii. one time, or
iii. two (or more?) times
(Baker 2008: 100)

一つの解釈として…Agree では統語論で $[uphi]$ の値が決まるのでそれ以上の一致は不可。インターフェイスでの表示に基づく一致では、利用可能な情報が複数あればそれらを参照でき、複数の一致が可能。

¹ Baker 2015 は述語名詞句の格を依存格 (dependent case) (Marantz 1991) と分析するが、Marantz に従うと依存格は無標の格に優先され、対格と無標の主格の随意性が説明できない。解釈の随意性に関しては (40) を参照。

² 統語論内で格を扱う中で、i. [uCase]を用いる立場 (Norris 2014) と ii. [uCase]無しに格を与える立場 (Deal 2016) があり、後者であれば格の積み重ねを許し (12) を用いて複数の値を持つ余地がある。ただし、Norris、Deal がともに想定する格情報の上書きは、改変禁止条件 (Chomsky 2005) の違反となり望ましくない。

4. 外在化におけるパラメーター

- (20) *NP if NP has phonetic content has no Case (Chomsky 1981: 49)
 (21) a. 全ての格を外在化する。 ((4c), cf. (15))
 b. 一つの格のみ外在化する。
 i. 複数格があった場合同じ形を持つものを外在化する (matching condition, case syncretism). ((22))
 (Groos and Riemsdijk 1981, Zaenen and Karttunen 1984, Young 1988, Riemsdijk 2021)
 ii. 最も有標な格のみ外在化する。 (Babby 1987, Vogel 2001) ((24), cf. (15))
 iii. 最も外側の格のみ外在化する。 (Pesetsky 2013, Deal 2016) ((14))
 iv. どれでも一つ外在化する。 ((26), (28))
- (22) a. *Wen du liebst ist ein Halunke.
 who.ACC you love.2SG COP.3SG a.NOM scoundrel
 ‘Who you love is a scoundrel.’ (German³; Riemsdijk 2021: 133)
 b. Was du liebst ist Pasta.
 what.NOM/ACC you love.2SG COP.3SG pasta
 ‘What you love is pasta.’ (German; *ibid.*)
- (23) {<phi, phi> {FR (DP) wh[phi]} {C {EA {T {v* {<phi, phi> wh[phi]} {R[u[phi], ...]}}}} {T[u[phi]] {v*, ...}}}}
- (24) a. Bogatye nikogda ne zavidujut bednym/*bednyx
 the.rich.NOM never NEG envy the.poor.DAT/the.poor.GEN
 ‘The rich never envy the poor.’ (Russian; Babby 1987: 95)
 b. Ivan vsegda est mjaso.
 Ivan.NOM always eats meat.ACC
 ‘Ivan always eats meat.’ c. Ivan nikogda ne est mjesa.
 Ivan.NOM never NEG eats meat.GEN
 ‘Ivan never eats meat.’ (Russian; *ibid.*)
- (25) {C {EA {T {Neg Neg {v* {...IA...}}}}}}
- (26) a. Urb-em qu-am statu-o vestr-a est.
 city-ACC.SG which-ACC.F.SG found-PRS.ACT.1SG your-NOM be.PRS.3SG
 ‘The city which I found is yours.’ (Latin; Bianchi 2000: 59, Kholodilova 2013: 97)
 b. Ab arbore abs terra pulli qui nascentur, eos in terram deprimito
 from the tree out of the earth sprouts-NOM which-NOM will germinate them-ACC in the earth (you must) layer
 ‘You must layer the sprouts that germinate out of the earth.’ (Latin; Bianchi 2000: 60)
- (27) {<phi, phi> {city city[phi]} {which C EA {v* {<phi, phi> city[phi]} {√find[u[phi]] {which, city[phi]}}}} {T ...}}
- (28) Wer/Wen Maria mag, wird eingeladen.
 who.NOM/who.ACC Maria likes is invited
 ‘Who Maria likes is invited.’ (German; Vogel 2001: 343)

5. syntax における格

- (29) [A]n element is visible for θ-marking only if it is assigned Case. (Chomsky 1986: 94, emphasis in original)
 (30) a.*It seems Mary to be believed *t* likes John.
 b.*It seems Mary to be *t* here.
 (31) {...{_β Mary {_α to be believed Mary likes John}}}} (α=to, β=??)
 (32) a.*who does it seem [_ε to be intelligent]
 b. {_ε who C...{_δ it {_γ T ... {_β who {_α to}}}}}} (Chomsky 1986: 95)
 (33) a. Mary seems to hit John.
 b.*Mary seems to hit.

6. 発展

- (34) Aba-kali ni ba-kuhi.
 2-women PRED 2-short
 ‘The women are short.’ (Kinande; Baker 2008: 171)
 (35) Bantu φEPP: *uφ*-features have EPP features in Bantu. (Carstens 2005: 222)
 Baker は Bantu には upward Agree が必要だと主張。
- (36) a. Nosotros com-emos las manzanas.
 we.M.PL eat-1ps the apples
 ‘We eat the apples.’ b. Nosotras com-emos las manzanas.
 we.F.PL eat-1ps the apples
 ‘We eat the apples.’ (Spanish; Baker 2008: 8, translation added)
 c. Nosotros estamos list-o-s.
 we.M.PL are-1ps ready-M-PL
 ‘We are ready.’ d. Nosotras estamos manzanas.
 we.F.PL are-1ps ready-F-PL
 ‘We are ready.’ (*ibid.*, translation added)

³ ドイツ語に matching condition が働くか否かは個人差がある (cf. Vogel 2001: 369; note 1).

- (37) Structural Condition on Person Agreement (SCOPA) (Baker 2008: 52)
 A functional category F can bear the features +1 or +2 if and only if a projection of F merges with an NP that has that feature, and F is taken as the label for the resulting phrase.
- (38) Ni altxa-tze-n probatu [na-Ø-u-te]_{aux}.
 me(ABS) lift-NMZ-LOC attempted 1.ABS-SG.ABS-√-3PL.ERG
 ‘They attempted to lift me.’ (Preminger 2011: 920)
- (39) Relative Aptitude for Failed Agreement (RAFA) (Preminger 2011: 922)
 person at-a-distance ➤ number at-a-distance (➤ any agreement at close range)
- (40) Interpretation by Contain (Hayashi in press)
 Given the structure
 $\{\gamma \{\beta Z[F], \dots\} \{\alpha X[uF] \{\dots Y\dots\}\}\}$ ($\alpha=X, \beta=Z, \gamma=<F, F>$)
 i) Y, contained in the set labeled $\langle F, F \rangle$, may be given the relevant interpretation according to the label at the interfaces.
 ii) X, immediately contained in the set labeled $\langle F, F \rangle$, must be given the relevant interpretation according to the label at the interfaces.
- (41) a. Gianni non ha detto niente a nessuno
 Gianni NEG has said n-thing to n-body
 ‘Gianni didn’t say anything to anybody.’ (Italian; Zeijlstra 2012: 519)
 b. [Gianni non[NEG]-ha [ditto niente[NEG] a nessuno[NEG]]] (ibid.)

SCOPA/RAFA や upward Agree を別の形で捉えられる可能性。

7.まとめ

- (42) 本発表では、インターフェイスにおけるラベルの解釈から一致/格を引き出した。本提案は Chomsky 2013 のラベルが集合の解釈を決定する見方からの自然な帰結であり、一致/格を部分的にインターフェイスに委ねることで、言語間の違いを外在化の際のパラメーターに帰することが可能となる。

参考文献

- Babby, L. H. 1987. Case, prequantifiers, and discontinuous agreement in Russian. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 5: 91-138.
 / Baker, M. 2008. *The syntax of agreement and concord*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. / Baker, M. 2015. *Case: its principles and its parameters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. / Béjar, S. & M. Rezac. 2009. Cyclic Agree. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40:35-73. / Bianchi, V. 2000. Some issues in the syntax of relative determiners. In *The syntax of relative clauses*, ed. A. Alexiadou, P. Law, A. Meinunger & C. Wilder, 53-82. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. / Carstens, V. 2001. Multiple agreement and case deletion: against φ-(in)completeness. *Syntax* 4:147-163. / Carstens, V. 2005. Agree and EPP in Bantu. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 23:219–79. / Chomsky, N. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge: MIT Press. / Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris. / Chomsky, N. 1986. *Knowledge of language: its nature, origin, and use*. NY: Praeger Publishers. / Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. / Chomsky, N. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: the framework, *In Step by step: essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. R. Martin et al., 89-155. MA: MIT Press. / Chomsky, N. 2001. Derivation by Phase. In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. M. Kenstowicz, 1-52, MA: MIT Press. / Chomsky, N. 2004. Beyond explanatory adequacy. In *Structures and beyond: the cartography of syntactic structures*, Vol.3, ed. A. Belletti, 104-131. Oxford: Oxford University Press. / Chomsky, N. 2005. Three factors in language design. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36:1-22. / Chomsky, N. 2008. On phases, In *Foundational issues in linguistic theory*, ed. R. Freiden et al., 133-166. MA: MIT Press. / Chomsky, N. 2013. Problems of Projection. *Lingua* 130: 33-49. / Deal, A. R. 2016. Cyclicity and connectivity in Nez Perce relative clauses. *Linguistic Inquiry* 47:427-470. / Epstein, S. D., H. Kitahara, & T. D. Seely. 2010. Uninterpretable features: what are they and what do they do? In *Exploring crash proof grammars*, ed. M. Putnam, 125-142. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. / Epstein, S. D., H. Kitahara & T. D. Seely. 2012. Structure building that can’t be! In *Ways of structure building*, ed. M. Uribe-Etxebarria & V. Valmala, 253–270. Oxford: Oxford University Press. / Epstein, S. D., H. Kitahara & T. D. Seely. 2017. Successive Cyclic Wh-Movement without Successive Cyclic Crashing. Conference paper, 10th International Spring Forum of the English Linguistic Society of Japan, Meiji Gakuin University, Tokyo, April 23. / Groos, A. & H. C. van Riemsdijk 1981. Matching effects in free relatives: a parameter of core grammar. In *Theory of markedness in generative grammar*, ed. A. Belletti et al., 171-216. Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore. / Hayashi, N. in press. Labeling at the interfaces: on the notions and the consequences of Merge and Contain. Fukuoka: Kyushu University Press. / Hiraiwa, K. 2005. *Dimensions of symmetry in syntax: agreement and clausal architecture*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT. / Kholodilova, M. 2013. Inverse attraction in Ingrian Finnish relative clauses. *Linguistica Uralica XLIX*: 96-116. / Marantz, A. 1991. Case and licensing. In *ESCOL ’91: Proceedings of the Eighth Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*, ed. G.F. Westphal et al., 234-253. Columbus: ESCOL Publications Committee. / Norris, M. 2014. *A theory of nominal concord*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Cruz. / Pesetsky, D. 2013. *Russian case morphology and the syntactic categories*. MA: MIT Press. / Plank, F. 1995. (Re-)introducing suffixaufnahme. In *Double case: agreement by suffixaufnahme*, ed. F. Plank, 3-109. NY: Oxford University Press. / Preminger, O. 2011. Asymmetries between person and number in syntax: a commentary on Baker’s SCOPA. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 29:917-937. / Reinhart, T. 1998. Wh-in-Situ in the Framework of the Minimalist Program. *Natural Language and Semantics* 6: 29-56. / van Riemsdijk, H. C. 2021. Case mismatches and match fixing cases. In *Syntactic architecture and its consequences III: inside syntax*, ed. A. Bárány et al., 125-144. Berlin: Language Science Press. / Schütze, T. R. C 1997. *INFL in child and adult language: agreement, case and licensing*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT. / Seely, T. D. 2006. Merge, derivational c-command, and subcategorization in a label-free syntax. In *Minimalist essays*, ed. C. Boeckx, 182-217. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. / Sigurðsson, H. Á. 2004. Agree and agreement: evidence from Germanic. In *Focus on Germanic typology*, ed. A. Werner Abraham, 59-99. Berlin: Akademie. / Vogel, R. 2001. Case conflict in German free relative constructions: an optimality theoretic treatment. In *Competition in syntax*, ed. G. Müller & W. Sternefeld, 341-376. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. / Young, K. M. 1988. *Multiple case assignments*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT. / Zaenen, A. and L. Karttunen 1984. Morphological non-distinctiveness and coordination. *ESCOL’84: Papers from the Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*: 309-320. / Zeijlstra, H. 2012. There is only one way to agree. *The Linguistic Review* 29:491-539.