2002年度 KUIS-CLS 言語学コロキアム報告

神田外語大学言語科学研究センター（KUIS-CLS）主催の言語学コロキアムが以下のような日程、内容で開催されました。

第1回 コロキアム

講演者：**宮川　繁** 氏(マサチューセッツ工科大学言語哲学科教授)

演　題：**The Nature of Weak Islands**

日　時：6月12日(水)　16:00～17:30

場　所：神田外語大学　3号館　106教室

要　旨

Weak islands are called "weak" because they don't block extraction of arguments but they do block extraction of adjuncts.

(1) a. What do you wonder [whether to fix *t*]?
b. *Why do you wonder [what to fix *t*]?

Does this mean that argument extraction is not affected at all? It is well-known that a weak island bars an interpretation otherwise available with argument extraction, that of pair-list (Longobardi 1985, Cresti 1995).

(2) What do you wonder [whether everyone will buy *t*]?

This example only has a single-pair interpretation ("I'm wondering whether everyone will buy a new coat"). Using Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990) as a guiding principle, and extending Aoun and Li's (1989) general approach, I will argue that the effects we can observe with weak islands are part of a general property of quantification.

(3) All quantification is local.

If Quantifier X c-commands Quantifier Y, Y cannot take "inverse" scope over X. A weak island is a form of quantification, because it is headed by such an element as a *wh* operator. It thus prohibits any scope-bearing item, either an argument or an adjunct, from taking proper scope above it. I will show that the reason why argument extraction appears to be possible is due to a covert resumptive pronoun strategy (cf. Cinque 1990, Postal 1998, Stroik 1992). I will formally characterize the locality of quantification using Beck's (1996) Quantifier-Induced Barrier (QUIB), making a subtle but crucial revision in her definition to incorporate a much wider range of data. Weak islands, as we will see, are simply a subset of QUIBs. This also explains a mystery noted by Hoji (1986) that in Japanese,

an example such as the following lacks a pair-list interpretation.

(4) Nani-o daremo-ga *t* katta no?
what-ACC everyone-NOM bought Q
'What did everyone buy?'

Independently, we can see that the universal quantifier in Japanese is a QUIB (cf. Hoji 1985). The lack of pair-list in this example is exactly the same as the lack of this interpretation in the English weak-island example in (2). Time permitting, I will also explore the issues that naturally arise with inverse scope in English, as in the example, "Someone loves everyone".

第2回 コロキアム

講演者：**Zeljko Boskovic** 氏　(University of Connecticut 準教授)

演　題：**A-Movement and the EPP**

日　時：7月31日(水)　16:00-18:00

場　所：神田外語大学　2号館　204教室

要　旨

The talk argues that the EPP should be eliminated from the grammar (cf. also Martin (1999), Castillo, Drury, and Grohmann (1999), Epstein and Seely (1999) and Boeckx (2000)). It is shown that in a number of constructions the EPP does not hold at all. Where it does appear to hold its effects follow from independent mechanisms of the grammar. The main argument against the EPP comes from constructions involving expletives, which are argued not to undergo A-movement, contrary to standard assumptions. As a result, intermediate SpecIPs are never created in raising constructions involving expletive subjects. Thus, the embedded IP in (1) is argued not to have a Spec at any point of the derivation.

(1) There seems to be a woman in the garden.

The main conclusion of the talk will be shown to have important consequences for the proper formulation of locality restrictions on movement.