How much structure is needed: The case of the Persian VP
Pegah Faghiri & Pollet Samvelian
Université Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3

In this paper we address the issue of the syntactic structure of the VP in Persian, a null subject SOV language with relatively free word order. The prevailing view of the Persian VP initially suggested in generative studies assumes a hierarchical structure, mainly motivated by the existence of differential object marking (DOM), which requires that definite DOs be marked by the enclitic rā. It has been claimed that rā-marked and unmarked DOs display several syntactic and semantic asymmetries, which can be straightforwardly accounted for if two distinct configurational positions are posited for each type of DO. Following insights from studies such as Diesing (1992), unmarked DOs have been assumed to be VP internal while rā-marked DOs are VP external (Karimi, 1990; Browning and Karimi, 1994; Ghomeshi, 1997; Karimi, 2003; Ganjavi, 2007). The higher syntactic position of the latter explains word order preferences in ditransitive constructions. It also accounts for other asymmetries concerning binding and scope. Recently, experimental and corpus-based studies have established that the most essential argument on which this view is built, namely ordering preferences, does not hold (Faghiri and Samvelian, 2014; Faghiri et al., 2014). Building on these studies, we will show that some other commonly accepted asymmetries also turn out to be dubious. These findings lead us to question the almost uncontroversially admitted hierarchical view of the Persian VP and to suggest a flat structure in line with Samvelian (2001) and Bonami and Samvelian (2015). We claim that differences between different types of DOs can be accounted for by semantics, information structure and universal functional principles, such as “given-first” preference.

1. The Persian VP: Prevailing Analyses

In (formal) Persian, there is no overt marker for definiteness. By contrast, indefiniteness is overtly marked by the enclitic yek in (1), are not specified for number and therefore can yield a mass reading: they have either an existential or a kind-level/generic reading. Indefinite NPs on the other hand are always specified for number and have an existential reading, ex. (2) and (3). Definite DOs are necessarily marked by the enclitic rā (colloquial: rō), (4). Meanwhile, DOM is not incompatible with the indefinite determination, ex. (3). In this case, the NP receives an indefinite specific reading.

(1) Sara xarguˇs did
Sara rabbit saw
’Sara saw a rabbit/rabbits.’

(2) Sara (yek) xarguˇs=i did
Sara (a) rabbit=INDEF saw
’Sara saw a (certain/particular) rabbit.’

(3) Sara (yek) xarguˇs=i=rā did
Sara a rabbit=DOM saw
’Sara saw the rabbit.’

(4) Sara xarguˇs=rā did
Sara rabbit=DOM saw
’Sara saw the rabbit.’

The “Two Object Position Hypothesis” (TOPH, Karimi, 2003) claims that rā-marked (specific in Karimi’s terms) DOs (definite or indefinite), on one hand, and unmarked (nonspecific) DOs (bare or indefinite), on the other hand, occur in two different syntactic positions. Figures (12-a) and (12-b) from Karimi (2003) illustrate these two positions and are assumed to account for the asymmetries presented in (A)-(F) below. Note that we do not always agree with Karimi’s grammaticality judgments (cf. section 2).

A. Word Order: In ditransitive constructions, rā-marked DOs precede while unmarked DOs follow the IO:

(5) a. Kimea aqlab barā mā še’r mi-xun-e
Kimea often for us poem IPFV-read-3SG
‘It is often the case that Kimea reads poetry for us.’

b. Kimea aqlab hame=ye še’r=ye tāza=ˇ se’r ro barā mā mi-xun-e
Kimea often all=EZ poem-PL=EZ new=EZ-3SG=DOM for us IPFV-read-3SG
‘It is often the case that Kimea reads all her new poems for us.’ Adapted from Karimi (2003, p. 91).

B. Semantic Fusion with the Verb: Rā-marked DOs are considered as (independent) participants of the event described by the verb and hence semantically autonomous, while unmarked DOs are assumed to be a part of the predicate, and semantically nonautonomous. This entails that (6), where the DO is unmarked, can be an appropriate answer to the question ‘What does Kimea do about...?’ With a rā-marked DO, the same sentence could only be an answer to the question ‘What does Kimea do to an/the apple every night?’ Karimi (2003, p. 100). This difference also accounts for the fact that sentences containing unmarked DOs can only receive an activity/process reading, ex. (7-a), while those containing a marked DO have an eventive reading, ex. (7-b).

(6) Kimea har ˇ sab (ye) sib mi-xor-e
Kimea every night (a) apple IPFV-eat.PRS-3SG
‘Kimea eats apples / does (an) apple eating every night.’
(7) a. (man) *dar do daqiqe / barâye yek sâat sib xord-am
   I in two minute / for one hour apple eat.PST-1SG
   ‘I ate apples for one hour.’
   b. (man) dar do daqiqe / *barâye yek sâat sib=râ xord-am
   I in two minute / for one hour eat.PST-1SG
   ‘I ate the apple in two minutes.’

C. Scope Ambiguity: Only râ-marked DOs trigger scope ambiguity when scrambled left to a DP quantified by a universal quantifier. That is, in (8), only (8-b) allows for both the wide or the narrow scope of existential quantifier over the universal quantifier (Karimi, 2003, p. 103).

(8) a. har dânešju=i ye še’r=ro bâypad be-xun-e
   every student=IND a poem=DOM must SUBJ-read.PRS-3SG
   ‘Every student has to read one poem (out of a specific set).’ (∀ > ∃)
   b. ye še’r=ro, har dânešju=i tı bâypad be-xun-e (∀ > ∃ ; ∃ > ∀)
   c. har dânešju=i ye še’r bâypad be-xun-e
   every student=IND a poem must SUBJ-read.PRS-3SG
   ‘Every student must read a poem.’ (∀ > ∃)
   d. ye še’rı har dânešju=i tı bâypad be-xun-e (∀ > ∃)

D. Binding. Only râ-marked DOs are able to bind an anaphora in the IO position (Karimi, 2003, p. 102):

(9) a. man [se=tā bačhe-hā=ro], be hamdigeı mo’arrefi kardam
   I three=CLF child-PL=DOM to each other introduction do.PST-1SG
   ‘I introduced three children to each other.’
   b. *man [se=tā baččeı], be hamdigeı mo’arrefi kardam

E. Licensing Parasitic Gaps. Only râ-marked DOs can license parasitic gaps (Karimi, 2003, p. 116):

(10) a. Kimea in ketāb=3o [qablaz in-ke –, be-xun-e] tı be man dâd
    Kimea this book=DOM before that SUBJ-read.PRS-3SG to me give.PST.3SG
    ‘Kimea gave me this book before reading (it).’
   b. *Kimea ketābı [qablaz in-ke –, be-xun-e] be man tı, dâd

F. Coordination. Specific and nonspecific DOs can not appear together in a coordination (Karimi, 2003, p. 103):

    I yesterday this picture=DOM and that book=DOM buy.PST-1SG
    ‘Yesterday, I bought this picture and that book.’
   b. man diruz [aks] va [ketāb] xarid-am
    I yesterday picture and book buy.PST-1SG
    ‘Yesterday, I bought pictures and books.’
    I yesterday this picture=DOM and book buy.PST-1SG

2. Getting the facts right

The main problem with the TOPH is the fact that the data on which it builds on is empirically dubious. The asymmetries either do not hold or are best represented as a cline and certainly not in terms of dichotomy. More specifically, by adopting a dichotomous view of DOs in terms of râ-markedness, this hypothesis aligns indefinite DOs with bare DOs. The latter are commonly taken to represent all unmarked DOs (bare and indefinite), which is somewhat expected, albeit misleading, given that bare DOs display the lowest level of specificity and definiteness. Yet, they differ from non-bare unmarked DOs, that is, DOs carrying an indefinite determination, in many non-trivial respects (e.g Ghomeshi and Massam, 1994; Samvelian, 2001; Ghomeshi; 2003; Ganjavi, 2007; Modarresi, 2014).

A. Canonical word Order and the behavior of non-specific DOs: Recent empirical studies on word order variations in Persian (Faghiri and Samvelian, 2014; Faghiri et al., 2014), including corpus and experimental data, clearly show that non-specific DOs do not display a homogenous behavior in this respect. Crucially, while bare DOs indeed follow the IO and thus appear adjacent to verb, indefinite unmarked (i.e. non specific) DOs group with specific (râ-marked) DOs and precede the IO. Based on a fine-grained typology of Persian NPs with respect to their degree of determination, the authors suggest that ordering preferences between the DO and the IO follow a continuum with bareness strongly favoring the IO-DO-V order and râ-markedness the inverse, and are influenced by functional factors such as relative length (corresponding to the “long-before-short” preference). The empirical findings of Faghiri and Samvelian (2014; Faghiri et al. (2014) drastically undermine the TOPH, whose backbone argument is the ordering asymmetries between specific (râ-marked DOs) on one hand and unmarked (non-specific) DOs on the other hand.
B. Semantic (in)dependence from the verb: Karimi’s claim on the semantic fusion of nonspecific DOs with the verb faces the same problem as word order preferences, since it similarly builds on the assumption that nonspecific DOs behave in the same way, which is not the case. While bare objects are highly cohesive with the verb leading some studies to consider them as semantically incorporated, non-bare non-rā-marked DOs are inarguably referential NPs and hence are construed as (independent) entities undergoing the event described by the verb rather than being a part of it. This explains why the “durative adverbial test” argument mentioned by Ghomeshi and Massam (1994) applies only to bare objects. The authors claim that bare DOs are non-referential and as such cannot delimit the event described by the verb and hence are only compatible with adverbials denoting a process. Indefinite unmarked DOs on the other hand being referential are compatible with adverbials denoting an event.

C. Licensing Parasitic Gaps: Contrary to Karimi’s claim, unmarked DOs do license parasitic gaps, ex. (12). This claim is supported by our preliminary acceptability rating experience. Further experiences are currently carried on in order to pin down parameters involved in favoring parasitic gaps with unmarked DOs. The problem with Karimi’s example in (10) results from the incompatibility between the referential properties of ketāb and the aspectual properties of the verb in the matrix clause. The felicity of the latter is incompatible with the cumulative reading implied by the bare DO (cf. e.g. Krifka, 1992).

(12) man bastani, [bā-inke xeyli – ā dust dār-am] ba’d-az šām – ne-mi-xor-am
   I ice-cream even-though very like have.PRS-1SG after dinner NEG-IPFV-eat.PRS-1SG
   ‘I don’t eat ice cream after dinner even though I like (ice cream) very much.’

D. Coordination between marked and unmarked DOs: Here again, contra Karimi and on the basis of acceptability rating experiences, we claim that the coordination between unmarked and rā-marked DOs is perfectly grammatical, as illustrated by (13).

(13) a. man diruz [ĉand-tā ruznāmeh] va [in majalla=ro] xarid-am
   I yesterday a-few newspaper and this magazine=DOM buy.PST-1SG
   ‘Yesterday, I bought a few newspapers and this magazine.’

b. man diruz [ruznāmeh], [ĉand-tā majalla] va [in ketāb=ro] xarid-am
   I yesterday newspaper a-few magazine and this book=DOM buy.PST-1SG
   ‘Yesterday, I bought a newspaper/newspapers, some magazines and this book.’

3. Less structure, more functional/cognitive principles

The data presented in the previous section shows that there is no conclusive empirical evidence in favor of the TOPH. If a hierarchical analysis is to be maintained, it should either posit more than two positions, or group unmarked non-bare DOs with rā-marked one. None of these solutions is satisfactory, given, among other things, that different types of DOs can be coordinated and that different groupings occur according to the phenomenon considered. Based on this body of evidence, we dismiss with this consensual hierarchical analysis and adopt instead a flat structure for the Persian, in line with Samvelian (2001) and Bonami and Samvelian (2015). We claim that differences in the behavior of different types of DOs, which constitute a cline rather than a categorical distinction, can be accounted for in terms of universal functional principles. On an unrelated issue, Bonami and Samvelian (2015) claim that word order facts and constituency tests provide no motivation for a VP/S asymmetry in Persian, since subjects and phrasal complements may be freely reordered. We stick to their view, represented by the head-valence phrase schema given in Figure (16). The latter realizes multiple dependents of the head in the same local tree without constraining their relative order. Under this view, word order preferences for different DO types, can be explained via a set of cross-linguistically valid interacting factors, such as discourse accessibility, definiteness, length (or grammatical weight) and animacy, and stated in terms of the principle of "prominent-first", pointed out for other SOV languages, such as Japanese (Yamashita and Chang, 2001).

With respect to binding, we have previously suggested (Faghiri and Samvelian, 2015) – building on an argument mentioned by Karimi herself 1999, p. 707 –, to account for the ungrammaticality of (9) in terms of the semantic mismatch between the pronoun and its antecedent. Namely, the nonspecific NP is not a felicitous antecedent for hamdige. Meanwhile, examples like (14) show that any generalization based on a binary specific vs. nonspecific feature is too strong and therefore flawed. Indeed, in a proper context a nonspecific DO can bind the IO.

(14) [ĉand varaq kāqaz], be hamdige, mangane mi-kon-e
   a-few sheet paper to each other staple IPFV-do.PRS-1SG
   ‘(S)he staples a few sheets of paper together (lit. to each other).’

A comparison between (14) and (9) indicates, in consistency with the line of argumentation pursued here, that plausibly other factors play a role, e.g., humanness of the antecedent, the strength of the distributive reading implied by the predicate (Dalrymple et al., 1998). It is interesting to note that this is reminiscent of rā-marking in Persian. As pointed out by several studies, contra Karimi, rā-marking is not triggered by a single binary feature. It allows for a certain degree of variability and is sensitive to functional and discourse-related factors (cf. e.g. Samvelian, 2016). In any case, further investigation is necessary to identify various parameters involved.
The same holds for scope relations. Not all studies accept Karimi’s acceptability judgments and generalizations. For instance, Modarresi and Simonenko (2007) and Modarresi (2014) claim that indefinite unmarked DOs can display both narrow and wide scope over a universal quantifier. Any attempt for accounting for scope properties of DOs in Persian is vain without solid data based on experimental investigations.

4. Conclusion

In this paper we showed that the behavior of the DOs in Persian cannot be accounted for in terms of a hierarchical phrase structure, since the differences between different types of DOs are a matter of cline rather than a dichotomous opposition. Trying to account for these empirical facts by adding more structure, as theoretically appealing as it may seem, not only does not provide an appropriate modeling of data but also makes wrong predictions. On the contrary, a simplified structure accompanied by few functional principles constitutes a more satisfying option to explore.

Figures

(15) a. $[\text{VP} \ \text{DP}_{[\text{Specific}] \ [V \ \text{PP} \ V]}$]

b. $[\text{VP} \ [V \ \text{PP} \ [V \ \text{DP}_{[\text{Specific}] \ V}]]$

(16) $\text{hd-val-ph} \rightarrow \text{val} \ [\text{ss} \ [\text{ss} \ldots \ [\text{ss} \text{list} (\text{synsem})]]]$
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