

Lexical integrity is alive and kicking

Kazuhiko Fukushima

Kansai Gaidai University

Keywords: Montagovian lexicalism, bracketing paradox, bound morphemes, Japanese

Since Chomsky (1970), LEXICALISM (LEXICAL INTEGRITY inclusive) has been controversial. The debate between lexical proponents vs. syntactic advocates is far from settled, e.g. the recent exchanges of Bruening (2018a, 2018b) vs. Müller (2018). Defending lexicalism, Müller wages a counterargument against Bruening, stating that he “does not say anything about more interesting morphological phenomena that may indeed require tools different from what we use in syntax”. Bruening retorts back saying that “[Müller] does not say what those [phenomena] might be.”

In this paper, based on Montagovian lexicalism for bound morphemes explicated by Fukushima (2022), BRACKETING PARADOXES (BP) in Japanese (an agglutinating language) and lexical solutions for the paradoxes are presented as the very morphosyntactic phenomena that necessitate tools *unavailable* in syntax. This paper supports lexicalism by materializing Müller’s empirically unsubstantiated opposition to Bruening.

Three BP phenomena – apparent obstacles to lexicalism – and their lexical accounts are introduced for: (i) exocentric adverbial modification of an NP-internal size-morpheme in SIZED INALIENABLE POSSESSION (SIP) CONSTRUCTION, (ii) SUSPENDED AFFIXATION (SA) involving verbal suffixes, and (iii) scope properties of the negative morpheme *-nai*. It is claimed that the phenomena (only (i) is shown in depth here) are not simply lexically unproblematic but constitute serious challenges to syntactic accounts.

SIP expressions like *oo-guti* ‘big-mouth’ give rise to a BP where *oo-*, though properly contained in NP, functions as adverbial: *oo-guti-o akeru* ‘= [_{VP} [_{VP} open one’s mouth] widely]; ≠ open [_{NP} one’s big moth] (the mouth can be small)’. How can an NP-internal morpheme be adverbial? Syntacticians suppose morpheme raising that attaches the morpheme to VP. One problem: an SIP NP can be coordinated with a regular NP as in [_{VP} [_{NP} *oo-guti to ryoo-me*]-o *akeru*] (*to* conjoins nominals) ‘= open one’s mouth **widely** and open one’s both eyes’; ≠ open one’s mouth **widely** and open one’s both eyes **widely**’ – the latter is erroneously predicted to be possible by a syntactic account. A lexical account: NPs are GENERALIZED QUANTIFIERS taking predicate arguments. An SIP NP embodies an adverbial modifier already built-in compositionally via word-formation. After coordination with a regular NP, a predicate argument distributes over the two, avoiding the unavailable reading.

SA and negative morpheme scope are handled with HIGHER ORDER UNIFICATION (Dalrymple, Shieber, & Pereira 1991) and TYPE-RAISING (Hendriks 1987), respectively, both of which are independently motivated and standard (formal) semantic apparatuses.

References

- Bruening, B.: 2018a, The lexical hypothesis: Both wrong and superfluous, *Language* 94, 1–42.
- Bruening, B.: 2018b, Brief response to Müller, *Language* 94, e67–e73. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2018.0015>
- Chomsky, N. 1970. Remarks on nominalization, in R. Jacobs and P. Rosenbaum (eds.) *Readings in English transformational grammar*, Ginn, Waltham, MA, 184–221.
- Dalrymple, M., S. Shieber, & F. Pereira: 1991, Ellipsis and higher-order unification, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 14, 399–452.
- Fukushima, K. 2022, *Bracketing paradox and direct compositionality: Montagovian morphology for bound morphemes*, Lexington Books, Lanham, MD.
- Hendriks, H.: 1987, Type change in semantics: The scope of quantification and coordination, in E. Klein & J. van Benthem (eds.) *Categories, polymorphism and unification*, Center for Cognitive Science, University of Edinburgh, 96–119.
- Müller, S.: 2018, The end of lexicalism as we know it? *Language* 94, e54–e66. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2018.0014>.