NOMINAL PATHS AND THE HEAD
   PARAMETER
Tomio Hirose
   Kanagawa University

1 Introduction

When a given object goes from A to B, A is the ''source'' and B is the ''goal.'' Extending between the source A and the goal B is the object's trajectory or ''path.'' Defined this way, a pair of source and goal is considered a unit that specifies the two endpoints of a path—at least conceptually or semantically. That the source-goal pair even forms a syntactic unit is shown by Williams (1994). Williams argues that in some cases, *from* A (i.e., source) and *to* B (i.e., goal) form a single constituent, rather than a simple juxtaposition of two prepositional phrases. One piece of evidence he adduces is the following contrast:

(1) a. From Alabama to Louisiana John played the banjo.
   b. *To Mary for Bill I gave a book.
     (Williams 1994:12)

The contrast follows, he argues, on the assumption that only a single PP is allowed to be fronted. Williams (1994:13) continues, ''*[F]rom-to* means more than the sum of its parts—it designates a path by specifying its endpoints. In short, *from-to* is a thing in itself, not simply *from* plus *to*.''

   In this squib, I argue that there exist nominal paths in the syntax, in addition to PP paths. More precisely, I propose that nominal paths have a coordinated structure headed by an adposition (i.e., preposition or postposition) as a coordinator. If one adposition of a pair is missing, its semantics is ''recovered'' by the existing one if they constitute a path as a semantic unit. For the coordinator, English makes use of one endpoint of a path and Japanese the other. I conclude that this fact suggests that linear order plays a nontrivial role in the syntax of natural language.

2 Full-Fledged and Defective Paths

Syntactically, paths are most typically realized as PPs. For example, in both English and Japanese, one can refer to a store's business hours in the following way:[1]

(2) a. That store is open from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. every day.

   Abbreviations: ACC = accusative, COND = conditional, GEN = genitive, INF = infinitive, NOM = nominative, TOP = topic.

[1] Paths can be defined in several different conceptual or semantic domains, besides the perhaps original spatial domain (see Gruber 1976, Jackendoff 1990).

    b. Ano mise-wa mainiti   gozen kuzi-*kara*   gogo
        that store-TOP every.day a.m. nine.o'clock-from p.m.
        gozi-*made*   aiteiru.
        five.o'clock-till be.open
        'That store is open from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. every day.'

The temporal path expressed in these sentences is an eight-hour time span that begins at 9 a.m. as the source, indicated by *from* in (2a) and *kara* 'from' in (2b), and ends at 5 p.m. as the goal, indicated by *to* in (2a) and *made* 'till' in (2b).[2] Importantly, both the source and the goal of the temporal path are introduced by adpositions in both languages: prepositions in English and postpositions in Japanese.

    Of interest in the present context is the following pair:

  (3) a. It will take [three *to* five days] for him to recover.
        b. Kare-ga kaifukusuru-noni [mikka-*kara*   ituka]
            he-NOM recover-INF   three.days-from five.days
            kakaru-daroo.
            take-will
            'It will take three to five days for him to recover.'

Here, the path in question is a temporally defined extent where the period for his recovery is estimated to vary from three days to five days. Thus, three days defines the minimum and five days defines the maximum endpoint of the temporal extent or path. In other words, three days is the source and five days is the goal in (3). But how do we know this for sure? In (3a), only the goal is explicitly so identified by the preposition *to*, leaving the source unmarked. The opposite is true in (3b): the source is identified by the postposition *kara* 'from', but no postposition explicitly specifies the goal. Nevertheless, one can still tell that *three* (*days*) defines the source in (3a) and *ituka* 'five days' the goal in (3b). How is this possible?

    Two factors seem to be involved here. One factor is linear order. A ''full-fledged'' path such as those in (2) consists of the source as its left-hand constituent and the goal as its right-hand constituent.[3] The other factor is the hypothesis that a pair of source and goal constitutes the two defining components of a path. Given these, one component may well be left unmarked, up to ''recoverability''—namely, as

---

[2] The use of the postposition *ni* 'to' is impossible here.

(i) *Ano mise-wa mainiti   gozen kuzi-kara   gogo
      that store-TOP every.day a.m. nine.o'clock-from p.m.
      gozi-ni   aiteiru.
      five.o'clock-to be.open

Intuitively, the distinguishing feature is whether the path in question is ''discontinuous'' in that only the two endpoints count as its constituents or ''continuous'' in that intermediate points also count. It seems that continuous paths require *made* and discontinuous paths *ni*. A discontinuous path might not form a unit in the first place.

[3] I believe this to be true across languages, going beyond English and Japanese.

long as the other component of the path is overtly marked.[4] In other words, given the (perhaps universally true) source-goal order, the explicit marking of one constituent as one endpoint of a path enables the other constituent with no explicit marking to be interpreted as the path's other endpoint (i.e., ''recovered''), effecting the emergence of a ''defective'' path such as those in (3). Again, this would be impossible unless a pair of source and goal forms a unit—be it a semantic or even a syntactic constituent.

3 Adpositions as Coordinators

The recoverability account may explain why one component of a path is allowed not to be marked by an adposition. It doesn't explain, however, why it is the source that is left unmarked in English and the goal in Japanese. In fact, the other choice leads to ungrammaticality in both languages.

(4) a. *It will take [*from* three five days] for him to recover.
   b. *Kare-ga kaifukusuru-noni [mikka   ituka-*made*]
      he-NOM recover-INF   three.days five.days-till
      kakaru-daroo.
      take-will

The generalization seems to be that the adposition that would otherwise occupy an edge of the path phrase is the one that fails to occur. Or conversely, the adposition that does occur is the one that appears between the source and goal noun phrases.[5]

   What this generalization means, I argue, is that a well-formed ''defective'' path phrase consists of two noun phrases that are conjoined by *to* or *kara* as an adpositional coordinator.[6] In short, *three*

---

[4] The term *recoverability* may be misleading here; in fact, the sentences become ungrammatical if the ''missing'' preposition and postposition are added, as will be shown in the next section. In short, the missing adpositions are recoverable only semantically, not syntactically.

[5] It does not help here to flip the order of the relevant constituents in (4), so that the adposition comes between the two noun phrases.

(i) a. *It will take [five *from* three days] for him to recover.
   b. *Kare-ga kaifukusuru-noni [ituka-*made*   mikka]
      he-NOM recover-INF   five.days-till three.days
      kakaru-daroo.
      take-will

The ungrammaticality of these sentences must relate to the goal-source order, which fails to form a syntactic unit; see (1).

(ii) *To Louisiana from Alabama John played the banjo.

It seems that only the source-goal order can define a syntactic as well as a semantic path.

[6] The coordinator analysis of *to* finds support in the colloquial substitution of *to* for *and* in the complement of *between*.

(i) a. The labor union of that factory organized few strikes *between* [1990 *and* 2000].

to five days in (3a) is a noun phrase, and so is *mikka-kara ituka* in (3b).[7] This helps explain why the ''full-fledged'' path phrase is ungrammatical for the complement of *take* or *kakaru* 'take'.

> (5) a. *It will take [PP *from* three *to* five days] for him to recover.
>
> b. *Kare-ga kaifukusuru-noni [PP mikka-*kara*
>   he-NOM recover-INF   three.days-from
>   ituka-*made*] kakaru-daroo.
>   five.days-till take-will

The presence of *from* in (5a) and of *made* 'till' in (5b) forces the entire path phrase to be a (coordinated) PP. However, the temporal path in question cannot be a PP. Rather, it must be a noun phrase, owing to the subcategorization frame of the verbs in the intended context—for example, *It will take (*for) three days for him to recover*. Since the temporal paths are realized as PPs in (5), the sentences are ill formed.

Returning to (4), the reason that these sentences are ungrammatical is now clear: the coordinator must come between the two conjuncts. To repeat, the overall explanatory machinery hinges on the hypothesis that adpositions can function as coordinators.[8]

4 Conclusion

The path noun phrase in examples such as (3a–b), repeated here, has a coordinate structure, with the adposition between the two noun phrases being the coordinator.

> b. The labor union of that factory organized few strikes *between* [1990 *to* 2000].

If *1990 and 2000* in (ia) is a coordinated noun phrase, it seems not far-fetched to conceive of *1990 to 2000* in (ib) as a coordinated noun phrase, too.

[7] The bracketed phrase in (3a), for example, can be paraphrased by *three, four, or five days*—that is, a coordinated noun phrase. Also, one of the reviewers brings to my attention the fact that the Japanese accusative suffix *-o* attaches only to noun phrases (Fukui 1995:116, fn. 16). The reviewer provides the following example (my glosses):

> (i) Okaasan-no kaifuku-no   mikomi-tosite-wa [mikka-kara
>   mother-GEN recovery-GEN prospect-as-TOP   three.days-from
>   ituka]-o   miteok-eba   ii   desyoo.
>   five.days-ACC estimate-COND good will.be
>   'Speaking of the prospect for your mother's recovery, we can say that it will take three to five days maximally.'

The grammaticality of (i) shows that the path in question is indeed a noun phrase.

[8] I do not commit myself to whether coordination is implemented in terms of binary or ternary branching. If binary, *to* first merges with *five days* in (3a) and *kara* with *mikka* in (3b), as *to* is a preposition and *kara* a postposition (see Johannessen 1998).

(3) a. It will take [three *to* five days] for him to recover.
   b. Kare-ga kaifukusuru-noni [mikka-*kara*   ituka]
      he-NOM recover-INF   three.days-from five.days
      kakaru-daroo.
      take-will
      'It will take three to five days for him to recover.'

The adpositional coordinator in English is *to*, the marker of the goal
end of a path, and the Japanese equivalent is *kara*, the marker of the
opposite, source end of a path. Schematically, (6) illustrates the nomi-
nal paths in the two languages.[9]

(6) a. English: (FROM) [A TO B]
   b. Japanese: [A FROM B] (TO)

The opposite lexical choice in representing the semantically identical
(nominal) path emerges from the fact that what occurs between the
two noun phrases A and B is the goal preposition in English, as in (6a),
and the source postposition in Japanese, as in (6b). One crosslinguistic
prediction is readily available in this regard: prepositional languages
follow the English pattern and postpositional languages the Japanese
pattern. This must await empirical confirmation (or disconfirmation).

   The proposed analysis of nominal paths, I believe, has a nontrivial
implication for linear order in the syntax. No doubt coordination is an
essential engine for natural language syntax. Why does the head of
such a core syntactic construction end up being semantically reversed
between the two languages as it does (i.e., FROM vs. TO), unless linear
order is a fundamental part of syntax and the differing head-comple-
ment order (i.e., prepositional vs. postpositional) has a decisive influ-
ence on the construction of individual languages (see Fukui 1993)?[10]
The contrasting lexical choice in question makes sense only if the
eventual linear order is already known as early as the numeration, the
initial point of syntactic derivation at which an array of lexical items

---

[9] The prepositional source marker in (6a) and the postpositional goal
marker in (6b) are parenthesized to indicate that they never surface in the
respective nominal paths.

   In passing, a reviewer points out that the bracketing in (6) may be problem-
atic, because intonation suggests the constituencies [FROM A][TO B] for English
and [A FROM][B TO] for Japanese. The argumentation is moot, I must say,
since FROM in (6a) and TO in (6b) are unpronounced; as noted above, they are
syntactically absent and thus it is neither the case that A merges with FROM in
(6a) nor the case that B merges with TO in (6b).

[10] A uniformly head-initial analysis of natural language such as Kayne's
(1994) would not be able to predict the Japanese pattern.

   (i) [[α A FROM] B]

Whatever the internal structure of α in (i), semantics prevents B from merging
with FROM earlier than A does. This structure, however, is a patent violation
of the Linear Correspondence Axiom (Kayne 1994)—of course, as long as one
refrains from postulating a semantically vacuous null head and concomitant
leftward movement of α around B.

is selected that will undergo subsequent structure-building operations (Chomsky 1995).[11]

Linear order as a syntactic property constitutes a more integral part of the faculty of language—undeniably, it seems to me.

References

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Fukui, Naoki. 1993. Parameters and optionality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 399–420.

Fukui, Naoki. 1995. *Theory of projection in syntax*. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications, and Tokyo: Kuroshio.

Gruber, Jeffrey S. 1976. *Lexical structures in syntax and semantics*. New York: North-Holland.

Jackendoff, Ray. 1990. *Semantic structures*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Johannessen, Janne Bondi. 1998. *Coordination*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kayne, Richard S. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Williams, Edwin. 1994. *Thematic structure in syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

---

[11] Once again, the two nominal paths A ᴛᴏ B and A ꜰʀᴏᴍ B have the same semantics, owing to the semantic identity of the respective ''conceptual wholes'' they are associated with (i.e., ꜰʀᴏᴍ A ᴛᴏ B and A ꜰʀᴏᴍ B ᴛᴏ); see section 2.

Aʙᴏᴜᴛ Oʙᴊᴇᴄᴛ *ᴇs* ɪɴ ᴛʜᴇ Gᴇʀᴍᴀɴ *Vᴏʀꜰᴇʟᴅ*
André Meinunger
    Zentrum für Allgemeine
    Sprachwissenschaft, Typologie
    und Universalienforschung
    (ZAS)

1 The Standard View(s)

This squib is intended to show that the ban on object *es* in the first position of a German clause cannot be upheld. It will be shown that if certain criteria on the clausemates are met (the nature of the subject and potential adjunct material), an unstressed object *es* in the German *Vorfeld* (sometimes translated 'prefield') is, or at least may be, fully grammatical.[1]

Since the influential work by Lisa Travis (1984), linguists working on German(ic) clause structure are divided into two groups. Travis distinguished between subject-initial clauses and non-subject-initial clauses and pointed out the difference. This difference seemed so important that these days researchers speak of the so-called symmetric

---

[1] It should be pointed out that *es*—independently of its grammatical status ((referential) subject, object, expletive) is an obligatorily weak pronoun; that is, it must never bear stress.