

Restructuring in the nominal domain: Evidence from English kind-words

Heidi Klockmann (*h.e.klockmann@uu.nl*), Utrecht University

Introduction: Much research is dedicated to identifying parallelisms between the nominal and verbal domains (e.g. Chomsky 1970, Abney 1987, Szabolcsi 1994, a.m.o.), under the hypothesis that there is a more general template which guides structure-building (cf. Wiltschko 2014). The phenomenon of restructuring (Wurmbrand 2001 and many others) might seem to argue against this parallelism, given the general lack of a restructuring correlate within the nominal domain. In this talk, I present data from English kind-words (the lexical items *kind*, *type*, and *sort*), which show a similar behavior to restructuring verbs, and argue that restructuring also exists within the nominal domain.

The kind-generalization: Previous mentions (Carlson 1977, Lehrer 1986) and studies (Zamparelli 1998) of kind-words have noted the **kind-generalization**, an identity condition on the expression of number on a kind-word and its accompanying noun (N2). If a kind-word is singular, N2 is singular ((1) vs. (3)), and if a kind-word is plural, N2 is plural ((2) vs. (4)).

- | | | |
|-----|--|---------------|
| (1) | This kind of rabbit, this type of car, this sort of rug | <i>sg-sg</i> |
| (2) | These kinds of rabbits, these types of cars, these sorts of rugs | <i>pl-pl</i> |
| (3) | *This kind of rabbits, *this type of cars, *this sort of rugs | <i>*sg-pl</i> |
| (4) | *These kinds of rabbit, *these types of car, *these sorts of rug | <i>*pl-sg</i> |

((4) *improves if N2 is interpreted as massified*)

Examples from the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) (Davies 2008-), verified by native speaker(s), show there to be systematic exceptions to the kind-generalization. If either the kind-word or the N2 lacks a count syntax, the kind-generalization fails to apply. Cases include mass N2s (5), count N2s which appear to be massified (6), and numberless kind-words (7), as evidenced by the plural demonstratives.

- | | |
|-----|---|
| (5) | Some silty kinds of sand, those different types of coffee, what sorts of food (COCA) |
| (6) | Both types of fan, all kinds of investigation (COCA) // <i>context improves acceptability</i> |
| (7) | These kind of images, those type of events, these sort of remarks (COCA) |

The kind-generalization seems to exist on the condition that both the kind-word and the N2 are capable of expressing number, i.e. they have a count syntax.

Proposal: I propose that the effect arises from a sharing of number between the kind-word and the N2. If the kind-word or the N2 lacks number, no sharing effect can emerge (for the simple reason that there is no number to share). This accounts for the obligatory number matching effect: shared number implies identical number. I further propose that the “sharing” is a case of restructuring. Just as restructuring in the verbal domain can result in shared tense between two verbs (e.g. example (8) in which the timing of the first verb coincides with the timing of the second verb), restructuring in the nominal domain can result in shared number.

- | | |
|-----|---|
| (8) | Leo tried to tame an elephant (*tomorrow). (Wurmbrand 2015: ex. 4b) |
|-----|---|

Implementation: I follow the exoskeletal approach (Borer 2005) in taking the count/mass distinction to arise from the presence or absence of a number head (represented here as #). I further follow de Belder (2011) in assuming an additional projection between the #-head and the root, which is responsible for giving boundedness to the interpretation, termed Size. Count syntax arises when both Size and # Merge above a root. According to de Belder (2011), Size (= boundedness) is dependent on # (= dividing).

- | | |
|-----|--|
| (9) | Count syntax: [_{#P} # [_{SizeP} Size [<i>root</i>]]] |
|-----|--|

Wurmbrand (2015) shows that restructuring verbs can combine with verbs of different sizes (e.g. VP, vP, TP). I propose that kind-words, as restructuring nouns, also combine with N2s of different sizes. They can combine with a bare root, which, given the absence of SizeP and #P, will be interpreted as mass. No number matching effect emerges in this configuration.

- | | |
|------|---|
| (10) | Mass N2: [_{#P} # [_{SizeP} Size [<i>kind-word</i> [<i>N2_root</i>]]]] |
|------|---|

Kind-words can also combine with a SizeP, which gives boundedness to the N2 root. In the scenario in (11), because no #P is projected between the kind-word and the N2, the Size-head (which is dependent on #) is controlled, or rather, shares the #P above the kind-word. This creates a number matching effect, which is realized via the morphological expression of number on both the kind-word and the N2.

(11) **SizeP N2:** [_{#P} # [_{SizeP} Size [*kind-word* [_{SizeP} Size [*N2_root*]]]]]

The kind-generalization is due to there being only one #P for two SizePs.

Prediction: If number matching is related to the presence of a SizeP without a corresponding #P, then cases with an intervening #P should not be subject to the kind-generalization. Notice that kind-words also combine with N2s accompanied by the indefinite article.

(12) This kind of a situation, this type of a camp, that sort of a program (COCA)

Supposing that the presence of the indefinite marks the presence of a singular #-head (Borer 2005, Lyons 1999), the N2 must be accompanied by a #P in such examples, e.g.:

(13) [_{#P} # [_{SizeP} Size [*kind-word* [... [_{#P} a/SG [_{SizeP} Size [*N2_root*]]]]]]]

This predicts that examples with an indefinite on the N2 should freely occur with a plural kind-word. However, the configuration is generally infelicitous on semantic grounds, following Carlson's (1977) observation that a single entity cannot instantiate multiple (sub)kinds; kinds are mutually exclusive (14).

(14) There are two kinds of cars in the world: cars that run right and Fords (Carlson 1977: 213)

A plural kind-word with a singular N2, as in (15), implies a single entity which instantiates two or more subkinds, contra mutual exclusivity:

(15) #Two kinds of a rabbit, #two types of a car, #two sorts of a rug

But, given the right context, this can be circumvented, as in (16), confirming the prediction.

(16) I was interested in portraying that a sexual life for a woman isn't necessarily compartmentalized: it flows in and out of **the other kinds of a woman** that she is – a worker, a lover, a mother, a daughter, a friend – all those dimensions are woven into one another. (COCA)

When a #P intervenes between the kind-word and the N2, no identity condition arises. Such restructuring involves a larger chunk of the N2 (up to #P), and thereby, no number sharing.

The particle of: The English kind-construction requires the particle *of*, regardless of whether the N2 is mass (= bare root (17)), bounded/count (= SizeP (18)), or count (= SizeP + #P (19)).

(17) *This kind water, *this type soap, *this sort sand *root*

(18) *This kind rabbit, *this type car, *this sort rug *SizeP*

(19) *This kind a rabbit, *this type a car, *this sort a rug *SizeP + #P*

I propose that the particle *of* is the nominal correlate of the particle *to* in the verbal domain, which combines with verbs of different sizes (Wurmbrand, p.c.). It serves to mark the nominality of the N2, but does not have a dedicated syntactic position (see Doetjes 1997).

Conclusions: Certain nouns are capable of combining with nouns of different sizes in a restructuring-like way. The parallel suggests that the nominal domain is also characterized by restructuring phenomena. Differences arise in how the effects of restructuring are realized. Shared number has a morphological correlate (both the kind-word and N2 show number), while shared tense does not (**Leo tried (to) tamed an elephant*). This talk provides an initial exploration into restructuring in the nominal domain.

Selected references:

Borer, H. (2005). *Structuring Sense, Vol. 1: In Name Only*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. • de Belder, M. (2011). *Roots and Affixes: Eliminating Lexical Categories from Syntax*. PhD dissertation. Utrecht University. • Carlson, G. (1977). *Reference to Kinds in English*. New York: Garland Publishing Inc. • Wurmbrand, S. (2001). *Infinitives: Restructuring and Clause Structure*. Berlin: De Gruyter. • Wurmbrand, S. (2015). Restructuring cross-linguistically. In T. Bui & D. Ozyildiz (eds.), *Proceedings of the NELS Annual Meeting 45*, pp. 227-240. Amherst, MA: GLSA. • Zamparelli, R. (1998). A theory of kinds, partitives, and *off/z* possessives. In A. Alexiadou & C. Wilders (eds.), *Possessors, Predicates, and Movement in the Determiner Phrase*, pp. 259-302. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.