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The present article critically reviews Zubizarreta and Oh (henceforth, Z&O)'s (2007) work, which proposes novel syntactic treatments of the well-known “manner-motion conflation” parameter among languages such as Korean, Germanic, and Romance (Talmy (1985)) and of a serial-verb construction parameter that explains the difference between Edo and Korean. Because there has been a long tradition of lexicalist studies on these matters (Talmy (1985), Pinker (1989), Kageyama (1993), Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998), among others), Z&O’s work is specifically examined to see if their approach is advantageous over the lexicalist approach in terms of the predictability of the parameter setting. It is shown in the present article that Z&O’s approach is actually not as explanatory as they argue—at least it is hard to conclude that their approach has been proven better.
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1. Introduction

Since the demise of Generative Semantics in early 1970s, and during most of the Government and Binding era, a very simplified model of the syntax-lexicon interface was implicitly or explicitly adopted in the tradition of what Jackendoff (2002) would call the “main stream” Chomskyan generative grammar (henceforth, the term “Chomskyan” in the present article refers to this narrower sense). In such a simplified model, verbs assign theta roles, noun phrases receive them, and that’s the end of the story concerning the VP-internal semantics. Lexical semanticists, on the other hand, were not satisfied with such a simplified view, and hypothesized that lexical items are associated with “hidden” lexical semantic structures (Jackendoff
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(1983, 1990), Pinker (1989), Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1990, 1995), Pustejovsky (1995), Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998), among many others). In the 1980s and 1990s, the lexicalists successfully argued that a simple Theta-theoretic approach to the lexico-syntactic interface cannot deal with the full range of the relevant phenomena including the dative alternations, the locative alternations, the middle alternations, the anti-causative alternations, the resultative constructions, and so on. In the course of their studies, the lexicalists have questioned the Chomskyan hypothesis that syntax is the only hierarchical and computational component in language.

The view of the syntax-lexicon interface in the Chomskyan syntax, however, has undergone a drastic shift—or more precisely, a dramatic theoretical enrichment, for it is probably not a real “shift,” strictly speaking—concerning the model of lexico-syntactic interface. The landmark of this shift (or enrichment) is Hale and Keyser’s (1993) influential article on l-syntax. According to Hale and Keyser, there exists a type of syntactic structure that is below the syntax in a traditional sense, and above the lexicon. By assuming such an l-syntactic structure, there is no longer any need for Theta theory, because the predicate-argument relationships are now captured as structural relationships between (often phonologically null) predicative heads and their arguments. Since then, numerous studies on the “enriched” VP syntax/morphology have been published in the tradition of the Chomskyan syntax (Pesetsky (1995), Marantz (1997), Ritter and Rosen (1998, 2000), Borer (2005), Folli and Ramchand (2005), among many others). Because of this shift, the Chomskyan syntax can now deal with the lexico-syntactic issues in terms of events, rather than theta roles.

As a result, many of the criticisms raised by the lexicalists in the 1980s and early 1990s are no longer applicable to the current Chomskyan syntax. For example, Pinker (1989) argued that the poverty of stimuli and the absence of negative evidence would force us to assume the existence of lexical structures and lexical rules, because otherwise, various alternation facts are not learnable (= what Pinker (1989) called Baker’s paradox). However, this type of argument can no longer be regarded as a straightforward argument for the existence of lexical semantic structures, because Chomskyan syntax now has a formal way of capturing the complex event structure behind what appears to be a simple lexical item.

After having gone through such a research history, the lexicalist and syntactic approaches to the lexico-syntactic issues, although once sharply opposed to each other, now (at least superficially) look similar to each other, occasionally to the point that one wonders whether lexicalists and l-
syntacticians actually deal with the same linguistic objects using different names. For Jackendovian semanticists who hypothesize a parallel modular model (Jackendoff (2002)), the two approaches are conceptually distinct, but not all lexicalists necessarily endorse Jackendoff’s parallel model, and for them, the distinction is rather blurred. Rappaport Hovav and Levin state:

“[T]here are many elements shared by both approaches …. the challenges facing both are the same. …. [W]e believe that the choice between the two approaches is not clear at this point, though we believe that a choice between them will ultimately be possible.”

(Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998: 129))

The apparent similarity between lexical semantics and l-syntax is especially prominent in the study of motion predicates, because the event structure of a motion predicate is relatively simple, and is associated with a more or less linear causal chain, leaving not much room to differentiate the two approaches in terms of representations. Compare the proposed representations for the predicate \textit{x goes into the room}:

(1) Syntactic approach:

\[
[\text{VP DP} [\text{v go} [\text{PP in-to} [\text{PP (in) the room)]]]]
\]

(Zubizarreta and Oh (2007))

(2) Lexicalist approach:

a. \[
[\text{Event GO (x, [Path TO [Place IN the room])]}]
\]

(Jackendoff (1990), Pinker (1989))

b. \[
[[x \text{ACT<GO>}] \text{CAUSE [BECOME [x AT the room]]}]
\]

(cf. Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998))

The book under review, \textit{On the Syntactic Composition of Manner and Motion} by Zubizarreta and Oh, puts forth an l-syntactic approach to the typology of motion predicates, and the authors (Z&O) are well aware of the above issue, i.e. the problem of how we can tease apart the two approaches. Z&O state:

“[T]he lexical approach, like the syntactic approach, can readily capture the compositionality of the phenomenon under discussion. The true challenge for any approach is to provide a principled account of the linguistic variation mentioned above.”

(Z&O (2007: 4))

The goal of the present article is to evaluate the book under review examining how successful it is in achieving the goal it sets itself above.

2. Overview of the Main Claims

This section reviews the main claims of the book. Ultimately, the ma-
Major goal of this book is to present a new theory of the “manner-motion conflation” parameter (Talmy (1985) etc.) as well as the serialization parameter. Talmy’s (1985) idea of conflation accounts for the typological difference between languages like English and languages like Korean in the following way:

(3)  
   a. English: RUN + GO = (Lexicalized) → run (to the park)  
   b. Korean: (No such lexicalization) → (kongwen-ey) talli-e ka
      ‘(park to) run go’

That is to say, in languages like English, the semantics of the motion predicate can be conflated with a manner verb, lexicalized into a single verb such as run, whereas in languages like Korean, no such lexicalization is available, hence the absence of an expression like run to the park. In contrast, Z&O’s major claim is that the “conflation” parameter is a matter of morphosyntax and phonology, rather than a matter of lexicalization. The different conflation patterns found in different languages are accounted for in terms of morphosyntactic and phonological properties, such as the verbal compounding constraints and the timing of spell-out. According to Z&O, the contrast between English and Korean shown in (3) is accounted for this way: English example (3a) and Korean (3b) both have similar (though not identical) morphosyntactic structures, and the difference is that in English, go cannot be phonologically realized. This idea may be very roughly represented as below:

(4)  
   a. English: run + Vgo = (phonologically realized as) → run φ  
   b. Korean: talli + Vgo = (phonologically realized as) → talli-e ka ‘run go’

The difference between English and Korean in terms of the possibility of having go/come phonologically realized is derived from the difference in the details of the [run/talli + GO] structures in the two languages (we will come back to this later).

Each of the following subsections (2.1–2.3) summarizes each of the three chapters in the book in the order it appears. Chapter 1 of the book lays the theoretical foundations of Z&O’s analyses. Chapter 2 discusses Korean data, and the final chapter examines Germanic (English and Dutch) and Romance (Spanish, Italian and French) data.

2.1. Basic Assumptions
2.1.1. Unaccusatives, Unergatives, and Transitives

Z&O’s analyses are built upon an elaborated version of Hale and Keyser’s (1993, 2002) framework. The structure under VP is supposed to be l-
syntactic, while the structure above it (vP etc.) is (s-)syntactic. The subject of an unaccusative verb originates in VP; on the other hand, an unergative VP lacks its specifier position, and its subject must be licensed by v, the transitivity/causation marker. In principle, v can be freely merged with a VP, thus creating a transitive structure from an unaccusative VP. This is summarized as follows:

(5) a. Unaccusative: \([vP \mathcal{D} [v \ldots ]]\)
   
b. Unergative: \([vP \mathcal{D} [vP V \ldots ]]\)
   
c. Causative transitive: \([vP \mathcal{D} [vP [vP V \ldots ]]\)]

2.1.2. Path and State Are Structurally Distinct

One of the crucial claims of Z&O is the treatment of path and state. According to Z&O, the state interpretation and the change-of-state interpretation are associated with certain “constructions” (or structural templates). As for PP, a complex PP is interpreted as a path, while a simplex PP is interpreted as a state (location):

(6) a. \([P P \mathcal{D}] (= \text{path})\)
   
   e.g. into the room, (go) to \(\varphi\) the park, (go) \(\varphi\) in the park
   
   b. \([P P \mathcal{D}] (= \text{state})\)
   
   e.g. (be) in the park, (stay) at home

As for AP, a bare AP is interpreted as a path, while an AP selected by little \(a\) is interpreted as a state:

(7) a. \([A A] (= \text{path})\)
   
   e.g. (become) \([A \text{ sour}]\)
   
   b. \([a D [a A]] (= \text{state})\)
   
   e.g. (be) \([a (the milk) [a [A \text{ sour]}]]\]

2.1.3. Light Vs Are Semantically Empty

Now we have two types of unaccusative VP: a change-of-state-denoting unaccusative and a state-denoting unaccusative. The VP with a path complement is interpreted as the former, whereas the VP with a state complement is interpreted as the latter:

(8) a. \([v D [v X_{\text{path}}]] (= \text{change-of-state-denoting unaccusative})\)
   
   where \(X_{\text{path}}\) is \([P P [P P \mathcal{D}]]\) or \([A A]\)
   
   b. \([v D [v X_{\text{state}}]] (= \text{state-denoting unaccusative})\)
   
   where \(X_{\text{state}}\) is \([P P \mathcal{D}]\) or \([a D [a A]]\)

For Z&O, these two distinct interpretations of VP emerge from the interpretation of the complement (\(X_{\text{path}}\) or \(X_{\text{state}}\)), but not from V, which is completely neutral (or empty). In other words, V does not play any role in
determining the semantic distinction between (8a) and (8b). Thus the distinction between *The milk went sour* and *The milk is sour* does not originate from the semantics of the verbs *go* and *be*: it originates from the structural (or constructional) distinction between \([\text{AP} \ sour]\) and \([\text{aP} \ sour]\). In other words:

(9) The light verbs *go*, *come*, *become* are the morphological signature of a constructional meaning. \((Z&O: 20)\)

Specifically, Z&O assume \((Z&O: 21)\):

(10) CP and \(vP\) (or VP in the absence of \(v\)) are phases and phases constitute the domain of spell-out.
\((Z&O: 21, \text{following Fox and Pesetsky (2005)})\)

(11) If VP is a phase and its head V is lexically unspecified, the V is spelled out as:
   a. *become* when the complement of the V is a bare AP;
   b. *go* when the complement of the V is a complex PP \([P [P \ D]]\) that expresses movement away from the speaker;
   c. *come* when the complement of the V is a complex PP \([P [P \ D]]\) that expresses movement towards the speaker.

These assumptions regarding the *go/com* verbs are supposed to be universal (except that phonological realizations of the verbs may vary across languages)—at least they are adopted in the analyses of all the languages discussed in the book.

2.1.4. Three Ways of Forming a Complex Predicate

Another crucial claim of Z&O concerns the ways that verbal complex predicates in general are formed in different languages. Z&O assume at least three kinds of Merge operations that enable the formation of a verbal complex, which are informally summarized below:

(12) a. \(V + \text{VP's head (Generalized Transformation)}\) \((Z&O: 34)\)
   b. \(\text{VP + VP's head (Generalized Transformation)}\) \((Z&O: 34)\)

(13) \(V + V\) (Compound Rule) \((Z&O: 45)\)

(12a) is an operation that externally merges a V with the V head of an already established VP structure, and is supposed to yield Resultative Serial-Verb Constructions (Resultative SVCs) (found in Yoruba). (12b) merges a VP with the V head of another VP, and is supposed to yield Consequential SVCs and Simultaneous SVCs (found in Yoruba and Korean). (13) is a regular compounding rule externally merging two V heads, and is assumed to be responsible for Germanic manner-motion conflations. Romance languages do not employ any of the above options, except that (13) is found
in very limited cases in an unproductive way; Italian shows a slightly more productive pattern, which is given a different analysis ($V_{aux} + V$), to which we will come back later in section 2.3. If the empty motion $V$ enters a configuration shown in (13), then it is not phonologically realized because the motion $V$ is merged with a non-empty $V$ head at the point of spell-out. On the other hand, if the empty motion $V$ enters a configuration like (12), it is phonologically realized because of its morphological complexity (i.e. each VP is a phase).

2.2. Deriving Crosslinguistic Variations

Now let us see how crosslinguistic variations are accounted for in Z&O’s theory.

2.2.1. Korean (vs. Edo)

According to Z&O (2007: 33), Serial-Verb Constructions (SVCs) are divided into three types (cf. Déchaine (1993), Baker and Stewart (1999)):

(14) a. Consequential SVC (“buy-book-read”)
   b. Simultaneous SVC (“swim-go”)
   c. Resultative SVC (“push-tree-fall”)

While Edo and many other West African Kwa languages exhibit all the listed patterns, Korean and Japanese only have (14a, b), but not (14c) (according to Z&O). The present subsection summarizes how Z&O analyze (14a, b) in Korean and what their explanation for the lack of (14c) in Korean is.

Let us begin with the Consequential SVCs, an example of which is given below (Z&O: 68):

    John-Nom fish-Acc catch-L eat-Past-Decl
    ‘John caught and (then) ate the fish.’

The interpretation of $V_1$ (“catch”) in (15) relative to $V_2$ (“eat”) is neither a manner nor a cause; rather, it is a presupposition for the event that $V_2$ denotes to happen, hence the name of Consequential SVC. This construction is derived by applying GT (12b), namely by merging a VP to the head of another VP (adapted from Z&O: 73):¹

¹ While the terminal nodes in Z&O’s tree diagrams are all given in the original languages (Korean, Edo, etc.), they are all replaced by the corresponding English glosses in the present article to make them more accessible to those who are not familiar with those languages.
In (16), V1 (fish-Acc catch) is adjoined to the head of V2 (fish-Acc eat) through GT (12b), which creates a new node indicated in boldface, the label of which carries the information related to syntactic computation, i.e. the categorial feature (V) and the formal feature (FF). Furthermore, Z&O endorse the view that “the semantics is compositionally read off the syntactic structure” (Z&O: 75), and assume that this newly created node includes the information specifying the semantic relation between the two Vs. In the case of Consequential SVCs, “the event denoted by V1 is a necessary condition for V2 to take place” (Z&O: 75), and thus the semantic information \{V1←V2\} is included in the newly created node. Thus the node in boldface in (16) should be elaborated as the following (Z&O: 75):

\[
(17) \quad \text{V, FF, \{V1←V2\}}
\]

Because of this syntactically encoded semantic information \{V1←V2\}, V1 is interpreted to be semantically the matrix event, and thus adverbs can only modify V1 (Z&O: 75ff). Morphosyntactically, however, the head V2 is the higher one, and thus is eventually attracted by T.

Now let us turn to the Simultaneous SVCs, exemplified below (Z&O: 70):

\[
(18) \quad \text{John-i hoswu-lul heyemchi-e kenne-ss-ta.}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{John-Nom lake-Acc swim-L cross-Past-Decl} \\
\text{‘John crossed the lake by swimming.’}
\end{array}
\]

Here, V1 ("swim") denotes the manner of V2 ("cross"). The manner-motion complex predicates with the go/come verbs in Korean are of this type (Z&O: 70, 86):

\[
(19) \quad \text{John-i kongwen-ey talli-e ka-ss-ta.}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{John-Nom park-Loc run-L go-Past-Decl} \\
\text{‘John ran to the park.’}
\end{array}
\]

As is known (Talmy (1985) etc.), the go verb cannot be omitted (*kongwen-ey talli-ess-ta).

This construction is derived through GT (12b), just like the Consequential
SVCs (adapted from Z&O: 92):

(20) \[ \text{D} \rightarrow \text{John-Nom} \rightarrow \text{park-Loc} \rightarrow \text{V}\{\text{FF}\} \rightarrow \text{V}\{\text{FF}\} \rightarrow \text{V}\{\text{FF}\} \rightarrow \text{X} \rightarrow \text{V}\{\text{FF}\} \rightarrow \text{go} \rightarrow \text{run} \]

In (20), V1 (run) is adjoined to the head of V2 (John-Nom park-Loc go) through GT (12b), which creates a new node indicated in boldface. The semantic information this new node carries is different from the Consequential SVCs: “In an S[imultaneous]SVC, V1 and V2 are simultaneous events, where V2 denotes the matrix event and V1 modifies V2” (Z&O: 76). Thus “it may be assumed that such a node [KN: the newly created node] introduces the semantic relation that articulates the relation between the two Vs, namely the relation of modification, whereby V1 modifies V2” (Z&O: 92). Thus the node in boldface in (20) should be elaborated as the following (Z&O: 92):

(21) \[ \text{V, FF, \{V1 Mod V2\}} \]

This analysis is motivated by the facts about adverbial modification (Z&O: 83ff) and the V2’s selectional restrictions on the choice of V1 (Z&O: 88ff): V1 is supposed to denote a path-like event. Apart from this difference in the semantic feature assigned to the newly created node, the Simultaneous SVCs (20) are just like the Consequential SVCs (16), and it is the head of V2 that is eventually attracted by T.

Finally, let us examine Z&O’s explanation as to why Korean (and Japanese) lack the Resultative SVCs, where V2 is an unaccusative that is predicated of the object of V1 (“shoot die” rather than “shoot kill”). One crucial assumption is that the Resultative SVCs involve a complex head derived through GT (12a) (following Baker and Stewart (1999)). This analysis is motivated by the difference between the Consequential SVCs and the Resultative SVCs in Edo in their quantifier scope interpretations (Baker and Stewart (1999)). In a Consequential SVC in Edo like “buy a few books read,” the buying event and the reading event are interpreted as separate events, and thus the books that are read must refer to all of the books.
that have been bought (that is, "a few books are bought, and then all these books are read"). In a Resultative SVC like "push a few trees fall," on the other hand, the quantifier "a few" is applied to the intersection of the pushing event and the falling event; therefore, it could be the case that many trees are pushed but only a few of them actually fall. In order to account for this contrast, Z&O assume that the Consequential SVCs are derived by merging two VPs (12b), whereas the Resultative SVCs involve a complex V-head structure, triggered by (12a). The latter structure is illustrated below (Z&O: 38–39):

\[
(22)
\]

\[
\text{(22) } \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{V}\{\text{FF}\} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{tree} \\
\text{V}\{\text{FF}\} \\
\text{X} \\
\text{V}\{\text{FF}\} \\
\text{V}\{\text{FF}\} \\
\text{push} \\
\text{fall}
\end{array}
\]

In (22), X represents, as far as I understand it, the abstract path (change of state) of unaccusative verb fall, which can be ignored for the present purpose. The point here is that push minus transitivity (because transitivity is later introduced by v) is directly merged into the unaccusative structure tree fall, through GT (12a), creating the potential word order push fall. The whole VP is then selected by v, and push is raised and internally merged with v, resulting in the word order push tree fall.

Then the question is why Korean and Japanese lack such a construction. Z&O’s answer is that, in short, the head-final word order is responsible for the lack of Resultative SVCs. In Korean (and Japanese), the push-fall predicate should start off with a structure just like (22) (except that X is to the left of its sister V). Then push moves out to v, again, just like in Edo, resulting in a structure like the following:

\[
(23) \quad [v_p [v_p \text{tree fall}] \text{push-v}]
\]

push-v further moves up to T, which comes to the right of v. However, such a structure is banned because it violates the iconicity constraint (Z&O (2007: 37), Li (1993)):

\[
(24) \quad \text{Temporal Iconicity Condition (TIC)}
\]

In an SVC, if the events denoted by the SVs are sequential, the surface order of Vs must reflect the temporal ordering of events. Thus, Z&O’s theory predicts that head-final languages in general should lack
Resultative SVCs, because there is no way in head-final languages to derive Resultative SVCs without violating TIC, assuming that the V denoting the cause event must move up, crossing the V denoting the result event. This is supposed to be one of the major advantages of Z&O’s theory over lexicalist theories, because the distinction between Korean and Edo need not be stipulated: it follows from certain morphosyntactic properties of these languages that are attested independently of the SVC parameter.

2.2.2. Germanic vs. Romance

Now let us see the derivations of the manner-motion predicates in Germanic languages such as English and Dutch and in Romance languages such as Spanish, French, and Italian.

Let us start with Germanic. According to Z&O, the GTs given in (12a, b) are not part of Germanic languages (or Romance), which is the reason why Germanic is not an SVC language (nor is Romance). Germanic, however, utilizes a Compound Rule (13), which is formally given in the following (Z&O: 136):

\[(25) \text{ Compound Rule}\]

Merge two lexical categories of the same category type.

For Z&O, the “conflated” manner-motion predicates such as walk in walk to school are not derived through lexicalization as lexicalists argue (Talmy (1985), Pinker (1989), Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995), among many others): they are actually syntactic compounds, where a manner verb is directly merged with an empty verbal head V. As we have seen in (9) and (11), the go/come verbs are simply “morphological signature of a constructional meaning” (in this case, motion with a path), and are phonologically realized only when they are “lexically unspecified” at the point of spell-out. In the case of the “conflated” manner-motion predicates in English, the V head is lexically specified, because the empty V head is merged with a manner V head that is lexically specified (e.g. \(v \text{ walk } V\)). Therefore, the outcome would not include the “morphological signature” go or come. The same works with Dutch. In Korean (and Japanese), on the other hand, the go/come verbs must be phonologically realized, because the construction in question involves the merging of two VPs through a GT, and each VP is supposed to constitute a spell-out domain before the application of the GT (Z&O: 138). This is another major advantage of Z&O’s proposal over lexicalist theories, because now the parameterization concerning the manner-motion conflation is given a morphosyntactic motivation.

Romance is different from Germanic in that it does not employ the Com-
pound Rule (25) as a productive rule, and is different from Korean because the GTs given in (12) are not part of the Romance grammar. Italian, however, is found more productive than Spanish or French as far as the “conflation” of manner and motion is concerned, and this fact is explained by the assumptions (i) that Italian employs multiple restructuring (auxiliary-like) V layers between v and lexical V, and (ii) that some manner verbs such as correre ‘to run’ have the privilege of filling in the lowest restructuring V head position just above the regular VP, resulting in a structure like the following, where \( V_{MT} \) represents a motion-related restructuring head position (Z&O: 183):

\[
\begin{align*}
&V \\
&\quad \downarrow \\
&\quad V_{MT} \\
&\quad \quad \downarrow \text{run} \\
&\quad D \\
&\quad \quad \downarrow \text{Maria} \\
&\quad V \\
&\quad \quad \downarrow \text{to the house} \\
&\quad P_{path}
\end{align*}
\]

Although this structure does not involve a compounding, the empty V head (the lower V head) need not (and indeed must not) be phonologically realized because the lower VP does not constitute a spell-out domain in the above configuration (“in Italian, the verbal phase is extended to the \( V_{MT} \) projection” (Z&O: 182)). Z&O provide empirical support for the analysis given in (26), which I will not discuss in the present article.

In the following section, I will concentrate on Z&O’s proposals on the distinction between English, Korean and Edo, evaluating how successful they are in teasing their theory apart from lexicalist theories in terms of the theory’s capability in making predictions with fewer stipulations.

3. Problems

I have mentioned in section 1 that there are similarities between the lexicalist approach and the syntactic approach, as recognized by both sides. Lexicalists have generally concentrated on distinguishing possible lexical semantics from impossible ones in human language in general, rather than on explicating the reason why some semantic structures are (im)possible in a particular language. In fact, after reviewing Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995) and Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998), Z&O offer the fol-
lowing comment, rather than arguing against particular features of the lexicalist approach:

“How then would a lexical theory account for this variability [among Romance languages]? One could stipulate that verbs in Romance do not allow for [Rappaport Hovav and Levin’s (1998)] Template Augmentation. … One could stipulate that Template Augmentation applies to some manner-of-motion verbs, but not to others. Yet the question of what accounts for the typological variability remains unanswered. More specifically, what other independently attested properties are the above-mentioned crosslinguistic differences related to?” (Z&O (2007: 8))

This is a highly viable criticism. One of the reasons for this weakness of the lexical approach, I believe, is that the lexicalists (especially the projectionist lexicalists) attribute their explanatory mechanism to pre-syntactic entities (i.e. lexical semantic structures), so that it is sometimes difficult (if not impossible) to relate their theories to the variations in morphosyntax. In contrast, Z&O attempt in a very clear fashion to offer a theory of manner-motion conflation under which crosslinguistic differences need not be stipulated: they follow from independently motivated morphosyntactic properties of different languages. Or do they, really?

3.1. Deriving the Variations in the Availability of the Resultative SVCs

One of the major claims by Z&O concerns the distinction between the Kwa languages such as Edo on the one hand and Korean and Japanese on the other, with respect to the availability of the Resultative SVCs. In the literature, Kageyama (1993: 117) accounts for the lack of Resultative SVCs in Japanese in terms of his Principle of Transitivity Harmony, which bans the combination of a transitive/unergative verb and an unaccusative verb, and Nishiyama (1998) attempts to give a PRO-control account, which might be regarded as a syntactic variant of Kageyama’s Transitivity Harmony account. Neither of them, however, tried to explain why Japanese has such a restriction. Z&O’s approach is completely different, and is supposed to derive the crosslinguistic variation regarding the Resultative SVCs, as already reviewed in section 2.2. To replicate Z&O’s main point, the Resultative SVCs are analyzed in the following fashion:

(27) a. Edo: [\(v_P\) push-v [\(v_P\) tree (push-)fall]]

b. Korean: [\(v_P\) [\(v_P\) tree (push-)fall] push-v]
(27b) is bad because this output violates Temporal Iconicity Constraint (24) (TIC): push ends up following fall in the surface order, although temporally speaking, the push event should precede the fall event. Z&O’s theory thus predicts that head-final languages always lack a Resultative SVC. Although I am regrettably not knowledgeable enough to empirically evaluate this prediction, it sounds reasonable. One should note, however, that this account crucially depends on the assumption that it is the cause event (push in the above example) that must move up, because if it were the result event that moves up, then TIC would not be violated in head-final languages.

(28) Korean: $[vP [vP tree push-(fall)] fall-v]$

How is (28) ruled out? An easy answer is, fall is an unaccusative, so it is not supposed to be raised to $v$. If we have fell instead of fall, then we have the following:

(29) Korean: $[vP [vP tree push-(fell)] fell-v]$

Such an example is acceptable in Japanese (and probably in Korean as well), and thus the badness of (28) is readily explained: fall in (28) cannot be raised because it is not compatible with $v$. In Edo, on the other hand, fell tree push is bad because of TIC. So far, so good. My next question is, if (29) is good, and fall must be fell because of the transitivity head $v$, then how is push in (29) allowed to be push, even though it is not merged with $v$? Note that Z&O assume that “[t]he causative meaning is not associated with some abstract lexical item” (Z&O: 23), which also means that the semantics of transitivity is always brought in by $v$, and never by $V$. One might point out that (29) is actually bad, and Korean and Japanese push-fell is derived by GT (12b), i.e. by merging a VP with another VP. Such a derivation is actually argued for by Z&O (2007: 100), when they discuss a transitive-transitive complex ball garden-Loc kick send “to send the ball to the garden by kicking it”:

(30) Korean: $[vP [vP ball garden-Loc [vP (ball) kick]-(V)] V-v]$

According to Z&O, the V-v complex is realized as send rather than go in Korean because of the transitive nature of $v$, which is a reasonable assumption. However, the question remains: How is kick allowed to be kick in the above configuration, although it is not merged with $v$? Z&O may argue that the transitivity of kick is indirectly inherited by the governing $v$. If so, then a new question arises: How can fall in the Edo push-fall example remain fall in (27a)? Why isn’t it push-fell? These considerations lead to
a doubt on Z&O’s claim that the impossibility of *push-fall* in Korean and Japanese is automatically derived from the word-order parameter. We need an additional theory explaining how the transitivity of *v* is transferred or not transferred into the VPs it governs, in different languages.

On the other hand, Kageyama’s (1993) Transitivity Harmony principle gives clearer predictions on what kind of combinations are allowed—at least in Japanese. Adopting the standard dichotomy between the verbs with an external argument (transitives and unergatives) and the verbs without one (unaccustives), Kageyama (1993) proposes that a verb of the former type and a verb of the latter type cannot be combined in Japanese verbal compounds. I believe that this constraint can be restated fairly easily in terms of the Chomskyan syntactic theory as well, by hypothesizing that *v* somehow guarantees the transitivity of all the lexical *V* heads it governs, or that *v* takes its “transitivity” scope over all the VPs it governs; thus in Korean and Japanese, [*vP push-fall*] is not allowed, while [*vP push-fell*] is; also, the transitivity of *kick* in [*vP kick-send*] (see (30)) is guaranteed even if the *V* head *kick*, which cannot stand alone without *v*, is not directly merged with *v*. Now the question is why [*vP push-fall*] is allowed in Edo and many other West African Kwa languages and Caribbean Creoles. Here we need a parameter, in order to allow the Transitive Harmony principle to be ineffective in these languages. We can simply assume that the Transitivity Harmony principle may be deactivated in the Resultative SVCs in head-initial languages, because the surface order of the verbs and their arguments represents a canonical order of a causation chain:

2 One reviewer pointed out that such a syntactic approach might not be capable of dealing with exceptions for the Transitivity Harmony Principle such as *nomi tubure(-ru)* ‘(lit.) drink collapse = to get dead drunk,’ which may lead to the necessity of a lexical conceptual approach. This point is well taken, but I am not sure if we can instantly give up on the syntactic approach on this ground. First, such an example may be analyzed as a Consequential SVC, where a VP is merged with the *V* head of another VP; second, because *V2* is unaccusative in such an exceptional example like *nomi tubure(-ru)*, and thus in the syntactic approach, it is predicted that *V1* should not be transitive; finally, it is known that in an example like *nomi tubure(-ru)*, *V1* cannot license an accusative Case (Yumoto (2005) among many others), which actually conforms to the prediction of the syntactic approach that *V1* cannot be transitive; therefore, we cannot instantly dump the syntactic approach. I, of course, am not suggesting that the syntactic approach is problem-free regarding this issue, but at this point, we cannot deny the possibility that the syntactic approach may find a way out.
I am not necessarily suggesting that the “perception” paradigm given in (31) is part of grammar; rather, this may simply be a cognitive trigger for the parameter setting in question. Because children always have to process the linguistic input from left to right, it may be the case that the word order biases them as to how they acquire (i.e. set the parameters of) their native language.

Alternatively, we could assume that the Resultative SVCs are structurally akin to the resultative constructions, and should be treated differently from the other SVCs, which is the reason why they are not constrained by the Transitivity Harmony principle. Under such an assumption, English strike him dead and Kwa strike him die are structurally analyzed in the same way. Under such a hypothesis, the parametric variation lies in what syntactic category is allowed in the position of the secondary predicate. In English, it should be an adjectival phrase or a PP. In Japanese, it should be an adjective in its adverbial form. In Edo, it is a verb. The variation might stem from the differences in morphosyntactic properties between these languages.

I will not pursue any of the above alternative proposals any further, but my conclusion at this point is that Z&O’s claim is actually not as straightforward as they claim, and does not appear decisively more advantageous compared to the alternatives.

3.2. Deriving the Variations in the Possibility of the Manner-Motion Conflation

Another major claim by Z&O is the theory of parameterized complex predicate formation, an informal summary of which is repeated below:

(32) a. Edo: V + VP’s head (Generalized Transformation) (Z&O: 34)
    b. Korean (and Edo?): VP + VP’s head (Generalized Transformation) (Z&O: 34)

(33) English/Dutch: V + V (Compound Rule) (Z&O: 45)
(34) Italian: Layered VP [VP manner-V [VP motion-V PP]] (Z&O: 181)

The empty motion V must be phonologically realized in (32) because VPs are spelled out before they are merged with the manner V; in (33) as well as (34), on the other hand, the empty motion V is not phonologically realized
because it is merged with a non-empty V head before the spell-out. The question is whether Z&O’s explanations are motivated by independently attested morphosyntactic properties in these languages; otherwise, they cannot be considered a “principled account of the linguistic variation” (Z&O: 4).

Among the proposed configurations, (34) probably follows from an independently attested morphosyntactic property of Italian, because the assumption is that this “special” VP-layer configuration is made available by “recruiting the auxiliary position designed for the motion ‘restructuring’ verbs” (Z&O: 181). Thus, some manner verbs in Italian are allowed to fill in the auxiliary V position just above the regular VP, and if there were no such restructuring position available, such a configuration could not be built. Therefore, this configuration is found only in Italian among the Romance languages, and the reason is morphosyntactic, independent of the conflation parameter itself. (However, I do not see why the presence of other types of auxiliary V projections, which are widely attested in so many languages, are not allowed to trigger the derivation shown in (34).)

What about the other proposed derivations? Why does Korean not adopt the Compound Rule (33)? Why does English not employ Generalized Transformations shown in (32)? The answers are far from clear. Z&O state: “Unlike Korean, English and Dutch are not serial-verb languages” (Z&O: 135). “The above GT [the one depicted in (32b)] is not part of the grammar of Germanic languages. If it were, we should expect sentences like John ran go to the market” (Z&O: 136). But what is meant by “being a serial-verb language” is unclear. It seems to me that it is GTs like (32) that would make a language a serial-verb language. If so, the statement that a language does not employ GTs like (32) if it is not a serial-verb language is tautological. It is also not clear why Korean (and Japanese) do not adopt Compound Rule (33). Thus, apart from the proposal for Italian, which links the manner-motion conflation parameter with the existence of a specific restructuring position, Z&O’s hypothesis on the conflation parameter is no more explanatory than the lexicalist theories, with regard to the predictability of the parameter setting.

Once it is clear that Z&O’s proposals shown in (32) and (33) are not necessarily linked to independent morphosyntactic properties, their assumption that English is a “compounding” language starts to sound dubious. On the surface, English is definitely not a V-compounding language: V-compounds are rare in English. On the other hand, Korean and Japanese are generally considered V-compounding languages. Thus Japanese, for example, has an expression like \textit{stand-rise} (meaning ‘stand up’), \textit{shoot-kill} (meaning
‘shoot dead’), and *drink-exhaust* (meaning ‘drink up’), while English does not (it often makes use of V-particle constructions and resultative constructions instead). The only case where English makes use of V-compounding is Z&O’s hypothetical case of manner-motion compounding. In this case, however, one of the compounded verbs (i.e. the empty motion V) must not be phonologically realized. Thus we can never find a trace of V-compounding in English. It is true that Z&O’s hypothesis makes it possible to capture the “manner-motion conflation” in terms of syntactic configuration 
\[ V^{\text{manner}} V^{\text{motion}} \], which is equivalent to Rappaport Hovav and Levin’s (1998) \[ \text{ACT}<\text{MANNER}>, \] Pinker’s (1989) “manner adjunction” to ACT, and other similar notations in the lexicalist tradition; however, unless there is independent evidence that English is actually a V-compounding language, the claim may be simply regarded as an ad-hoc mechanism conveniently invented for the purpose of translating the idea of lexical conflation into syntactic terms.

3.3. The Status of “Constructions” in the Chomskyan Syntax

Finally, I would like to raise a number of questions on the status of the “constructionist” approach in the Chomskyan syntax. According to Chomsky (1995: 168): “The language is embedded in performance systems …. We can think of the SD [= structural descriptions generated by the language] as a complex of instructions for these performance systems ….” My first question is how Z&O’s “late insertion” hypothesis of the verbs of coming and going fits in the Chomskyan model. The insertion of *come* or *go* by itself is probably not a problem: we can simply hypothesize that the insertion is triggered when the V head is empty. But how about the choice between *come* and *go*? Z&O (2007: 21) state that the motion V “will be *go* if the P expresses movement away from the speaker (i.e. endpoint) and it will be *come* if the P expresses movement toward the speaker (i.e. source point).” This means that the choice between *go* and *come* is made depending on the interpretation of the path. However, the interpretation of the path orientation relative to the speaker often involves pragmatic inferences, and probably cannot be done in syntax. This means that in order to rightly choose between phonological forms *go* and *come*, the Conceptual-Intentional (C-I) system should be somehow involved. A theory assuming such an intervention from a performance system appears to be a significant departure from the Chomskyan model. If the assumption were that underspecified roots √GO and √COME à la Marantz (1997) were numerated from the lexicon, there would be no problem: phonological forms *go* and *come*, respectively, can be inserted later at PF, while the C-I system...
can check the matching between √GO/√COME and the semantics of its path argument. However, in Z&O’s system, motion V heads are completely empty semantically and phonologically, and thus there must be a system that should be capable of monitoring the matching between the right phonological form of the V head and the right semantic/pragmatic interpretation of its path argument. I wonder if such an interactive monitoring system is possible at all in the Chomskyan framework.

More trivially, Z&O’s constructionist treatment of the distinction between the Consequential SVCs and the Simultaneous SVCs also appears problematic. These two types of SVCs are assumed to be derived in the same way except for the “semantic information” that the newly created node is supposed to hold. Z&O (2007: 75) state that “[i]f the semantics is compositionally read off the syntactic structure, which is the view that the present work endorses and argues for, then the meaning stated in (215) [= the semantic relation between V1 and V2 in the Consequential SVCs] must be structurally encoded.” Thus Z&O propose that the node created by GT (32b) should “include the semantic information (i.e. V1 ← V2).” However, under what mechanism can such “semantic information” be assigned to the node created by the GT in question? One (and probably the only) possibility is that syntax provides such information to the new node, based on the adjunction relation between V1 and V2: V1 is adjoined to V2, hence {V1 ← V2}. Although I do not see why an adjunction modification necessarily entails {V1 ← V2}, let us just put this problem aside because there seems to be no other possibility than to assume this. Now, the problem is that, later in the book, Z&O (2007: 92) further argue that the node newly created through GT (32b) may be assigned different semantic information, {V1 Mod V2}, in the Consequential SVCs. But how? What component of grammar is capable of distinguishing the two types of SVCs when they are derived through the same GT operation, correctly assigning one of the two possible semantic features, {V1 ← V2} or {V1 Mod V2}? Regarding this point, Z&O (2007: 72) state: “The semantic relations between the subevents encoded by the SVC may be of two kinds: a consequential relation (CSVC) or a manner relation (SSVC). Whether or not we can establish such

3 Nor do I understand, in the first place, why V1 must be semantically regarded as the matrix event under the relationship V1 ← V2 (Z&O: 75). In a sentence like “Only if she comes, I’ll stay” (come(s) ← stay(i)) do we have to regard the conditional proposition come(s) as the “semantically matrix event”?
semantic relations between the two SVs depends on our cognitive understanding of these relations, our knowledge of the world, and the discourse context.” This seems to mean that the choice cannot be made without the help of pragmatic inferences. Then, unless we assume that the C-I system interacts with the syntactic computation, it seems impossible to assign the correct “semantic information” to the newly created node so that the semantics can be “compositionally read off the syntactic structure.”

Finally, I would like to briefly discuss Z&O’s selectional condition concerning $v$. One of the biggest challenges for the anti-lexicalist, constructionist approach is the treatment of (anti-)causative alternations. It is widely known that not all intransitives can be transitivized (Pinker (1989), Levin (1993), among many others), although the concept of “causation” by itself is compatible with most intransitives: for example, we cannot say *I smiled my baby, or *He came me, although there is nothing wrong with I made my baby smile, or He made me come. Thus the anti-lexicalist, constructionist approach must deal with a potential possibility of massive overgeneration of causative structures triggered by $v$. Z&O’s (2007: 15) solution is to assume the following:

\begin{enumerate}
\item $v$ may be freely merged with a VP.
\item If VP lacks a Specifier, $v$ must be merged with VP.
\item In the unmarked case, only one $v$ per l-structure is allowed.
\end{enumerate}

In Z&O’s hypothesis, unergative VP is assumed to lack a Specifier, and thus it must be selected by $v$. This assumption in combination with assumption (35c) prevents unergative verbs from being further transitivized, thus making I smiled my baby and He came me ungrammatical. Apart from the empirical question of whether this hypothesis really covers the full range of data, a conceptual question arises: Why must a Spec-less VP be selected by $v$? It is not clear to me what component of grammar enforces such a constraint. Also, it is not entirely clear why certain V heads lack a Spec and must always be selected by $v$, and what the theoretical implication of the existence of such verbs is. If it is known from the beginning that a certain lexical item V is destined to be an unergative or transitive, isn’t it the same thing as assuming that the transitivity information is already available as part of the lexical information? As cited in section 1, Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998: 129) state that “the choice between the two approaches [= lexicalist vs. constructionist] is not clear at this point,” and after finishing examining Z&O’s work, it was still unclear to me.
4. Conclusion

In this article, Z&O’s syntactic proposals on the “manner-motion conflation” parameter have been critically reviewed, particularly from the viewpoint of how successful they are in explaining the language variations in question in connection with independently attested morphosyntactic properties of different languages. Although their theory appears to introduce several novel and straightforward syntactic accounts for the “manner-motion conflation” parameter, it may actually not be so much motivated by independent morphosyntactic properties as they argue at the beginning of the book. Among the various proposals Z&O present, their analysis of the Italian “conflation” is probably motivated by certain independent morphosyntactic properties of Italian (i.e. the existence of a certain restructuring V projection); however, their analyses of the (un)availability of “conflation” in Germanic and Korean as well as the analysis of the unavailability of the Resultative SVCs in Korean do not seem to link to independent morphosyntactic properties in these languages. This makes Z&O’s theory weak, and the explanatory advantage of their work over lexicalist theories is not immediately clear. Their endeavor, however, is still valuable, because any serious investigations into the role of syntax and the role of the lexicon will inevitably contribute to the advancement of the field, even when they are not proven successful. And for those readers who adopt the l-syntactic approach as a working hypothesis, this book would be very informative, because it shows ways to syntactically deal with the problems that have been subjected to detailed investigation in the lexicalist tradition.
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