

Ling 112 Section

September 16

Problematic Analyses

What are some problems with the following analyses of constituency tests?

- (1)
 - a. Sue said she ate the cake, and indeed she did eat ~~the cake~~ → Because “the cake” cannot be elided, “the cake” is not a constituent.
 - b. The smart doctor saw this patient > Which doctor saw this patient? → Because “The smart doctor saw” can be made into a wh-phrase (Which doctor saw) and move to the left of a clause, “The smart doctor saw” is a constituent.
 - c. Sue will eat the octopus, and Sue ~~will eat~~ the shrimp, too. → Because “Sue will eat” can be elided, “Sue will eat” is a constituent.
 - d. The fluffy kitty > That kitty → Because “that” can replace “the fluffy” as a pro-form, “the fluffy” forms a constituent.

Manchu Rightwards Movement

Manchu is a typically SOV language, but optionally allows a constituent of the phrase to move rightwards after the verb.

- (2)
 - a. bi inenggi sini gucu-i ara-ha buda be je-he.
1sg.nom today 2sg.gen friend-gen make-pfv meal acc eat-pfv
'Today, I ate the meal that your friend cooked'
 - b. inenggi sini gucu-i ara-ha buda be je-he bi.
today 2sg.gen friend-gen make-pfv meal acc eat-pfv 1sg.nom
 - c. bi sini gucu-i ara-ha buda be je-he inenggi.
1sg.nom 2sg.gen friend-gen make-pfv meal acc eat-pfv today
 - d. bi inenggi je-he sini gucu-i ara-ha buda be.
1sg.nom today eat-pfv 2sg.gen friend-gen make-pfv meal acc
 - e. *sini gucu-i ara-ha buda be je-he bi inenggi.
2sg.gen friend-gen make-pfv meal acc eat-pfv 1sg.nom today
 - f. *bi inenggi ara-ha buda be je-he sini gucu-i.
1sg.nom today make-pfv meal acc eat-pfv 2sg.gen friend-gen

What does the grammaticality of the sentences in (2) tell us about the constituents of (2a)? Do you think *bi inenggi* is a constituent? What about *sini gucu-i*? How might you hypothesize a more accurate definition of Manchu rightwards movement?