

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00784-0 - The Acquisition of Syntactic Structure: Animacy and Thematic Alignment

Misha Becker

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE ACQUISITION OF SYNTACTIC STRUCTURE

This book explains a well-known puzzle that helped catalyze the establishment of generative syntax: how children tease apart the different syntactic structures associated with sentences such as “John is easy/eager to please.” The answer lies in animacy: taking the premise that subjects are animate, the book argues that children can exploit the occurrence of an inanimate subject as a cue to a non-canonical structure, in which that subject is displaced (The book is easy/*eager to read). The author uses evidence from a range of linguistic subfields, including syntactic theory, typology, language processing, conceptual development, language acquisition, and computational modeling, exposing readers to these different kinds of data in an accessible way. The theoretical claims of the book expand the well-known hypotheses of Syntactic and Semantic Bootstrapping, resulting in greater coverage of the core principles of language acquisition. This is a must-read for researchers in language acquisition, syntax, psycholinguistics, and computational linguistics.

MISHA BECKER is an Associate Professor in the Linguistics Department at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, where she has taught courses in linguistic theory and child language acquisition since 2002.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00784-0 - The Acquisition of Syntactic Structure: Animacy and Thematic Alignment

Misha Becker

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN LINGUISTICS

General Editors: P. AUSTIN, J. BRESNAN, B. COMRIE,
S. CRAIN, W. DRESSLER, C. J. EWEN, R. LASS,
D. LIGHTFOOT, K. J. RICE, I. ROBERTS, S. ROMAINÉ,
N. V. SMITH

*The Acquisition of Syntactic Structure
Animacy and Thematic Alignment*

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00784-0 - The Acquisition of Syntactic Structure: Animacy and Thematic Alignment

Misha Becker

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*In this series*

- 106 SHARON INKELAS AND CHERYL ZOLL: *Reduplication: doubling in morphology*
 107 SUSAN EDWARDS: *Fluent aphasia*
 108 BARBARA DANCYGIER AND EVE SWEETSER: *Mental spaces in grammar: conditional constructions*
 109 HEW BAERMAN, DUNSTAN BROWN AND GREVILLE G. CORBETT: *The syntax–morphology interface: a study of syncretism*
 110 MARCUS TOMALIN: *Linguistics and the formal sciences: the origins of generative grammar*
 111 SAMUEL D. EPSTEIN AND T. DANIEL SEELY: *Derivations in minimalism*
 112 PAUL DE LACY: *Markedness: reduction and preservation in phonology*
 113 YEHUDA N. FALK: *Subjects and their properties*
 114 P. H. MATTHEWS: *Syntactic relations: a critical survey*
 115 MARK C. BAKER: *The syntax of agreement and concord*
 116 GILLIAN CATRIONA RAMCHAND: *Verb meaning and the lexicon: a first phase syntax*
 117 PIETER MUYSKEN: *Functional categories*
 118 JUAN URIAGEREKA: *Syntactic anchors: on semantic structuring*
 119 D. ROBERT LADD: *Intonational phonology, second edition*
 120 LEONARD H. BABBY: *The syntax of argument structure*
 121 B. ELAN DRESHER: *The contrastive hierarchy in phonology*
 122 DAVID ADGER, DANIEL HARBOUR AND LAUREL J. WATKINS: *Mirrors and microparameters: phrase structure beyond free word order*
 123 NIINA NING ZHANG: *Coordination in syntax*
 124 NEIL SMITH: *Acquiring phonology*
 125 NINA TOPINTZI: *Onsets: suprasegmental and prosodic behaviour*
 126 CEDRIC BOECKX, NORBERT HORNSTEIN AND JAIRO NUNES: *Control as movement*
 127 MICHAEL ISRAEL: *The grammar of polarity: pragmatics, sensitivity, and the logic of scales*
 128 M. RITA MANZINI AND LEONARDO M. SAVOIA: *Grammatical categories: variation in Romance languages*
 129 BARBARA CITKO: *Symmetry in syntax: merge, move and labels*
 130 RACHEL WALKER: *Vowel patterns in language*
 131 MARY DALRYMPLE AND IRINA NIKOLAEVA: *Objects and information structure*
 132 JERROLD M. SADOCK: *The modular architecture of grammar*
 133 DUNSTAN BROWN AND ANDREW HIPPLISLEY: *Network morphology: a defaults-based theory of word structure*
 134 BETTELOU LOS, CORRIEN BLOM, GEERT BOOIJ, MARION ELENBAAS AND ANS VAN KEMENADE: *Morphosyntactic change: a comparative study of particles and prefixes*
 135 STEPHEN CRAIN: *The emergence of meaning*
 136 HUBERT HAIDER: *Symmetry breaking in syntax*
 137 JOSÉ A. CAMACHO: *Null subjects*
 138 GREGORY STUMP AND RAPHAEL A. FINKEL: *Morphological typology: from word to paradigm*
 139 BRUCE TESAR: *Output-driven phonology: theory and learning*
 140 ASIER ALCÁZAR AND MARIO SALTARELLI: *The syntax of imperatives*
 141 MISHA BECKER: *The acquisition of syntactic structure: animacy and thematic alignment*

Earlier issues not listed are also available

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00784-0 - The Acquisition of Syntactic Structure: Animacy and Thematic Alignment

Misha Becker

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00784-0 - The Acquisition of Syntactic Structure: Animacy and Thematic Alignment

Misha Becker

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

THE ACQUISITION OF SYNTACTIC STRUCTURE

ANIMACY AND THEMATIC
ALIGNMENT

MISHA BECKER

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00784-0 - The Acquisition of Syntactic Structure: Animacy and Thematic Alignment

Misha Becker

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107007840

© Misha Becker 2014

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2014

Printed in the United Kingdom by Clays, St Ives plc

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-107-00784-0 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

	<i>List of figures</i>	page x
	<i>List of tables</i>	xi
	<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xiii
1	Introduction	1
2	The syntax of displacing and non-displacing predicates	14
2.1	Raising-to-subject and subject control: <i>seem</i> vs. <i>claim</i>	16
2.1.1	The structure of raising	19
2.1.2	The structure of control	25
2.1.3	Raising-to-object and object control: <i>expect</i> vs. <i>persuade</i>	28
2.2	<i>Tough</i> -constructions: <i>easy</i> vs. <i>eager</i>	30
2.2.1	Structure of <i>tough</i> -constructions	32
2.2.2	Related constructions	36
2.2.3	Structure of control adjective constructions	39
2.3	Unaccusatives and unergatives: <i>arrive</i> vs. <i>dance</i>	39
2.3.1	A semantically-driven syntactic distinction	40
2.3.2	Formal representations of unaccusativity	42
2.4	Passive	45
2.4.1	Structure of passive	46
2.4.2	A different displacing predicate	49
2.5	The learning problem	52
3	Argument hierarchies	61
3.1	The Animacy Hierarchy	63
3.1.1	Linguistic effects of animacy: morphosyntax and argument structure	64
3.1.2	Animacy, agency, degree of control, and teleological capability	69
3.2	The Thematic Hierarchy	75
3.2.1	A brief history of thematic roles	76
		vii

viii *Contents*

3.2.2	Formal accounts of thematic role assignment	79
3.3	Animacy and thematic roles in opaque constructions	84
3.3.1	Raising constructions across languages	86
3.3.2	<i>Tough</i> -constructions across languages	103
3.4	Properties of derived subjects	109
3.4.1	Argument structure universals, and the “problem” of ergativity	114
3.5	A learning procedure	119
3.6	Summary	124
4	Animacy and adult sentence processing	126
4.1	Relative clauses	129
4.1.1	Reduced relative clauses	129
4.1.2	Subject vs. object relative clauses	136
4.2	Processing of raising and control	139
4.2.1	Sentence completion	140
4.2.2	Novel verb learning	147
4.3	Psycholinguistic effects of animacy on production of the passive	153
4.4	Summary	155
5	Animacy and children’s language	156
5.1	Development of the animacy concept	157
5.1.1	Featural properties of animates	158
5.1.2	Behavioral properties of animates	159
5.1.3	Intentional properties of animates	166
5.1.4	Further conceptual change	169
5.1.5	Agency	172
5.1.6	Summary	173
5.2	Children’s use of animacy in learning argument structure	174
5.2.1	The power and limitations of Semantic Bootstrapping	179
5.2.2	The power and limitations of Syntactic Bootstrapping	186
5.3	Children’s acquisition of displacing predicates	190
5.3.1	Acquisition of raising and control	192
5.3.2	Acquisition of <i>tough</i> -constructions	208
5.3.3	Acquisition of unaccusatives	227
5.3.4	Animacy and the acquisition of the passive	235
5.4	Summary	242
6	Modeling the acquisition of displacing predicates	245
6.1	Displacing predicates in the input to children	250
6.2	Computational modeling of language acquisition	256

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00784-0 - The Acquisition of Syntactic Structure: Animacy and Thematic Alignment

Misha Becker

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*Contents* ix

6.2.1	Learning as generalization	258
6.2.2	Restricting the hypothesis space	261
6.3	Hierarchical Bayesian Models	265
6.3.1	A model of learning raising and control	267
6.3.2	A model of learning <i>tough</i> -constructions	276
6.3.3	A model of learning unaccusatives and unergatives	279
6.4	Summary of modeling results	281
7	Conclusions and origins	283
7.1	Origins of knowledge of the animacy distinction	286
7.2	Origins of knowledge of linguistic animacy and displacing predicates	289
7.3	Further questions	296
	<i>Appendix</i>	298
	<i>Bibliography</i>	300
	<i>Index</i>	322

Figures

4.1	Percent “Correct” responses for novel raising (target) and control (filler) verbs; list condition only, averaged across frequency conditions	<i>page</i> 152
5.1	Mean RT in msec (log10) to warm-ups and fillers	218
5.2	Mean RT in msec (log10) to <i>hard</i> and <i>afraid</i>	219
5.3	Mean RT in msec (log10) for Group 1	220
5.4	Mean RT in msec (log10) for Group 2	221
5.5	Mean RT in msec (log10) for Groups 1 and 2, novel <i>tough</i> -adjectives	223
5.6	Percentage of correct categorizations of novel raising (target) and control (filler) verbs in adult experiment, 1-exemplar condition (Becker and Estigarribia, 2013)	224
6.1	A power law distribution, illustrating Zipf’s law	259
6.2	A power law distribution plotted on a log–log scale	260
6.3	Graphical representation of the Hierarchical Bayesian Model	267
6.4	Graphical representation of β and λ in Hierarchical Bayesian Model	268
6.5	Posterior distribution plots for λ ; CHILDES data	273
6.6	Posterior distribution plots for λ ; Switchboard data	273
6.7	Posterior distribution plots for λ for each adjective	278
6.8	Posterior distribution plots for λ ; unaccusative and unergative verbs	281

Tables

3.1	Raising and control verbs in German and Italian	page 93
3.2	Raising and control verb meanings in Polynesian, European	97
3.3	Properties of <i>tough</i> -adjectives across languages	108
3.4	Properties of “basic” and derived subjects across languages	114
3.5	Typical properties of subjects and non-subject arguments	120
4.1	Percentage of raising and control responses in Becker (2005), Experiments 1–3	142
4.2	Percentage raising and control responses in Becker (2005), Experiment 4	143
4.3	Percentage raising and control responses in Becker (2005), Experiment 4 (separated by aspect of embedded verb)	144
4.4	Novel verbs and their pseudo-definitions	149
4.5	Observed mean percentage “Correct” responses	151
5.1	Mean percent correct (with predicate type)	176
5.2	Examples of test items in Becker (2006b)	200
5.3	Predicted responses depending on child’s assumptions	201
5.4	Results of experiment: relative proportion of OK/silly responses	202
5.5	Response time in msec to transitive vs. <i>there</i> -construction questions (5-year-olds)	207
5.6	Design of <i>tough</i> -adjective study	216
5.7	Response Time (msec) for novel <i>tough</i> -adjectives, group 2	222
5.8	Children’s use of animate subjects with unaccusative vs. unergative verbs in spontaneous speech	235
6.1	Mothers’ use of animate/inanimate subjects with raising and control verbs	251
6.2	Adults’ use of animate and inanimate subjects with <i>tough</i> /control adjectives	252

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00784-0 - The Acquisition of Syntactic Structure: Animacy and Thematic Alignment

Misha Becker

Frontmatter

[More information](#)xii *List of tables*

6.3	Mothers' use of animate and inanimate subjects with unaccusatives and unergatives	254
6.4	Distribution of raising and control verbs with animate/inanimate subjects, from CHILDES	270
6.5	Distribution of raising and control verbs with animate/inanimate subjects, from switchboard	271
6.6	Adults' use of animate and inanimate subjects with <i>tough</i> /control adjectives	277
6.7	Distribution of <i>ready</i> in speech to children	279
6.8	Mothers' use of animate and inanimate subjects with unaccusatives and unergatives	280

Acknowledgements

While working on my dissertation on the acquisition of the copula in child English, I happened to read an article by Bob Frank on the relative structural complexity of raising and control constructions. In the Tree Adjoining Grammar (TAG) framework, Frank argued, raising constructions involve additional complexity not found in control constructions. Because of this difference in complexity, he surmised that if someone heard the sentence *Gabriel glorps to eat gouda*, that person would first assume that the sentence had a control structure, and therefore that *glorp* was a control verb. When I read his prediction I thought, “I bet he’s right that people will assume *glorp* is a control verb, but I bet it’s for a different reason.” I quickly conducted an informal survey of the members of my department by giving them this very sentence and asking them what *glorp* meant. Sure enough, everyone offered me control verbs for *glorp*; not one person said it was a raising verb.

Initially, my hunch about why people would have this preference was that raising verbs are in some sense midway between functional and lexical categories (they are like function words, e.g. auxiliaries, in their argument structure, but lexical in their marking of subject agreement and lack of inversion), and I thought that people might be unwilling to assign a novel word to a category that is similar to closed class categories. But as I began to test people’s assumptions about these sentences with different kinds of inputs, in particular, with fill-in-the-blank sentences (where the participant is not assigning a novel verb to any category), I realized the explanation had to be something else. An early clue came from the observation that when I gave participants an inanimate subject, I got a lot more raising verb responses than I did when the subject was animate.

This was the beginning of my exploration of how learners come to identify the underlying structures of these kinds of sentences. And so although his influence was indirect and unintentional, I am grateful to Bob Frank for starting me on this path. Over the years my approach has broadened to

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00784-0 - The Acquisition of Syntactic Structure: Animacy and Thematic Alignment

Misha Becker

Frontmatter

[More information](#)xiv *Acknowledgements*

include different constructions (*tough* vs. control adjectives, and unaccusative vs. unergative verbs), child and adult participants, and different methodologies, all of which have been profoundly influenced by my colleagues around me. My early work on this topic was much influenced and enriched by Lila Gleitman, John Trueswell and the wonderful and insightful folks who made up the Cheese seminar at University of Pennsylvania's Institute for Research in Cognitive Science. I am deeply grateful to IRCS and NSF for the opportunity to be immersed in that stimulating environment for two years.

Several of the studies I report on in this book are the product of collaborations, and I thank Bruno Estigarríbia, W. Garrett Mitchener and Jeannette Schaeffer for their wonderful ideas and for being such inspiring and generous collaborators. Garrett Mitchener deserves a particularly big thank-you for his extensive input not only on our previous collaboration but on chapter 6 of this book. That chapter could not have materialized without his expertise and many hours of work. I thank him for developing our learning model, running the simulations, creating the figures for depicting the results, and most of all for his patience in explaining (and re-explaining) the details of the Bayesian model to me.

In addition, though not usually given author status, I thank the many undergraduate research assistants (Bianca Bulchandani, Marguerite Cameron, Brian Cansler, Adam Daland, Sam Farquharson, Alex Fine, Duna Gylfadottir, Michelle Hewitt, Molly Jabeck, Taylor Shirley, Lara Stephenson) and graduate students (Susannah Kirby, Inmaculada Gomez Soler) who helped me collect data.

I have been very fortunate to have had various sources and forms of support at the University of North Carolina, from the Faculty Partners and University Research Council small grants, to the Associate Professor Support grant through the College of Arts and Sciences. I could not have completed my various psycholinguistic experiments without this financial support. I am particularly grateful to the Institute for Arts and Humanities, whose Preyer Fellowship through the Faculty Fellows program allowed me a semester's leave in order to complete this book.

No less vital than financial and leave support, I have the great fortune of having wonderful, supportive, and challenging colleagues. I am particularly indebted to Elliott Moreton, Katya Pertsova, and Jennifer Smith for feedback on early drafts of this work. I am lucky to have colleagues in other departments with interests in language, whose provocative questions have helped move my research forward: Jennifer Arnold, Peter Gordon, and the other members of the Psychology and Language UNC Group (PLUG), Dorit Bar-On and Dean

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00784-0 - The Acquisition of Syntactic Structure: Animacy and Thematic Alignment

Misha Becker

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*Acknowledgements* xv

Pettit in philosophy, and the audience members of the Linguistics colloquium and the Expressive Communication and Origins of Meaning (ECOM) research series for their insightful questions.

Parts of this book have been presented to audiences at the Boston University Conference on Language Development, College of Charleston, Generative Approaches to Language Acquisition North America, University of Maryland, Università di Milano, WCCFL, the Workshop on Animacy (Radboud University, Nijmegen), the Workshop on Input and Syntactic Acquisition (Portland, OR), and the Workshop on Sentence Complexity (Universität Konstanz). I thank these audiences for their comments, questions, and feedback, which invariably improved my work.

For data, judgments, and general brainstorming help I would like to thank Ash Asudeh, Daniela Blettner, Julie Brittain, Ivano Caponigro, Sandy Chung, Alex Clark, Stephen Crain, Annie Gagliardi, Jean Berko Gleason, Vincent Homer, Yi Ting Huang, Nina Hyams, Kyle Johnson, Elsi Kaiser, Beth Levin, Jeff Lidz, Diane Massam, Yuko Otsuka, Lisa Pearl, Geoffrey Pullum, Susi Wurmbrand, Charles Yang and Hang Zhang. I also want to express my profound appreciation to all of the adults and children (and their families) who have so generously provided the data for my studies. I think 3- to 7-year-olds are pretty much the most fun data sources ever! A slightly less entertaining but absolutely crucial data source is the CHILDES database, and I'm grateful to Brian MacWhinney and all the members of the chi-bolts mailing list for help in using this important resource.

I also thank Helen Barton at Cambridge University Press for her guidance, and a reviewer who provided numerous helpful suggestions which have improved this work greatly.

Finally, but most important, a huge debt of gratitude is owed to my husband, Scott, and our children, Olivia and Lyra, whose early years have been touched (and hopefully not too much marred!) by the writing of this book. I thank them for their patience, love, and support, and I thank my children for unwittingly providing entertaining and highly appropriate data, some of which has found its way into this book. I'm also very grateful to my parents who have generously helped with childcare so that I could write uninterrupted, and who have provided general encouragement and support throughout my life.