



UPM
UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA
BERILMU BERBAKTI



MICOLLAC

2014

MICOLLAC 2014

***8th Malaysia International
Conference on Languages,
Literatures & Cultures
12 - 14 August 2014***

***Rainbow Paradise Beach Resort,
Tanjung Bungah, Penang, Malaysia***

**RESEARCH REVERENCE:
CULTIVATE, INNOVATE AND IMPACT**

Organised by

Department of English
Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication
Universiti Putra Malaysia
Serdang



eventually lead to the realignment of policy against practice, which may suggest a 'wash-back effect' of the linguistic landscape on language behavior.

**ALEX LAU ZHE MING, KAMELIA TALEBIAN SEDEHI
& WAN ROSELEZAM WAN YAHYA**

Universiti Putra Malaysia, Serdang

zheming88@hotmail.com, cml_talebiana@yahoo.com, roselezam@gmail.com

A Journey through Nature in Margaret Atwood's *Surfacing*

Julia Kristeva's melancholic subject is one who feels the sense of loss within herself and cannot express it with other people as she thinks that this feeling is private. As such, the melancholia is seen as a disorder of self-identity. As a result of melancholia, the subject's language is repetitive, nonsensical and ungrammatical. This melancholic subject mourns for the lost and unnamable object. The aim of this paper is to discuss the way Margaret Atwood's melancholic protagonist in *Surfacing* deals with her sense of loss and starts to use language in order to express her unnamable lost object. In fact, Atwood's *Surfacing* deals with female subjectivity in relation with nature. Throughout the novel, the protagonist destroys the vital parts of herself through loveless union with men, through her family and through her abortion, but she is reborn through connections with nature and gains self-possession. Like classical novels, this novel has a journey-quest motif. The female protagonist, who is a melancholic subject and unable to express and share her sense of loss with other people who are around her, goes on an expedition not only in nature to find her missed father but also in her own psyche to find her own identity. Through the help of nature, she gains self-recognition and learns how to deal with her psychological problems. This paper addresses the relationship of the female protagonist with nature and the way the Kristevan melancholic subject of this novel gains self-understanding through interaction with her surroundings.

ALI ALIZADEH & LEILA RAHIMZADEH

University of Birjand, Iran

aalizadeh@birjand.ac.ir, leilarahimzadeh@yahoo.com

VP Internal Subject Hypothesis (ISH) In Turkish

There is a new hypothesis in the Government and Binding theory concerning the structural relations between sentence elements especially subject. Sportiche (1988) and then Koopman and Sportiche (1991) investigated for the first time to determine the base position of subject in sentence structure. They determined a position for subject inside the verb phrase at D-Structure of French and English sentences. They believed that subjects are base generated in the specifier position of verb phrase (Spec.VP). The specifier position of inflection phrase (Spec IP), where subject is placed at surface structure level, is specifically a derived one to which subject is moved as the result of NP movement transformational rule. This is called "subject-in-VP- hypothesis" (ISH). The purpose of this paper is to investigate the "ISH" hypothesis in Turkish. The data from Turkish show the applicability of this hypothesis in this language in which subjects are base generated in Spec of VP at D-Structure level. However, there is something different in this language concerning the landing site of VP internal subject of non-ergative verbs. While definite subject is moved to a specifier position of TP

VP INTERNAL SUBJECT HYPOTHESIS (ISH) IN TURKISH

* *Ali Alizadeh , 1. Leila Rahimzadeh*

* *1. University of Birjand,Iran*

* *aalizadeh@birjand.ac.ir , 1. leilarahimzadeh@yahoo.com*

* *corresponding author*

Abstract

There is a hypothesis in the Government and Binding theory concerning the structural relations between sentence elements especially subject. This is what Sportiche (1988) and then Koopman and Sportiche (1991) investigated for the first time to determine the base position of subject in the sentence structure. They determined a position for subject inside the verb phrase at D-Structure of French and English sentences. They believed that the subjects are base generated in the specifier position of verb phrase (Spec.VP). The specifier position of inflection phrase (Spec IP) where subject is placed at surface structure level is specifically a derived one to which subject is moved as a result of NP movement transformational rule. This is called "subject- in-VP- hypothesis " (ISH).

The purpose of this paper is to investigate "ISH" hypothesis in Turkish. The data from Turkish show the applicability of this hypothesis in this language in which subjects are base generated in Spec of VP at D-Structure level. However, there is something different in this language concerning the landing site of VP internal subject of non ergative verbs. While definite subject is moved to specifier position of TP [Spec TP] at S-Structure by NP movement transformational

rules, the indefinite subject can not move to the initial position of sentence and remains *in situ* in Spec of VP . In Turkish , the landing site of these subjects differ from those proposed by Sportiche .we will provide enough evidence based on word order at syntactic level and prosodic phonology to prove this claim .

Keywords: internal subject, prosodic phonology, verb phrase ,word order

1.Introduction

The question of where the nominative arguments as a subject can appear has been studied within the fields of syntax and semantics. Most of the debate has centered around the issue of whether a nominative phrase has to be licensed in Spec TP(Chomsky, 1991) or it may remain in its base position after being base generated in specifier position of verb phrase. It is supposed that specific subjects are probably placed in the VP internal position and never raise to Spec TP in Turkish.(Kornfilt 1984 and öztürk 2004).However, some subjects can raise to [Spec TP].This was the most important factor in motivating us for the study of base position of subjects in Turkish. The VP-internal subject hypothesis was introduced by Sportiche in (1988) and then by Koopman and Sportiche in(1991).By using floating quantifiers, they proved the subjects are generated inside the verb phrase in sentences. In this paper, we also intend to investigate and support ISH in Turkish by floating quantifiers. Then, two different subjects including definite and indefinite will be discussed regarding their position as to inside or outside the VP. We provide evidence such as word order and prosodic phonology in order to conform different subject positions of non ergative verbs at S- Structure to show that indefinite subjects occupy a position immediately before the verb which is a focus position and definite subjects are raised to the initial position of the sentence which is a topic position. The prosodic phonology of definite and indefinite subjects also gives us insight into the issue of syntactic subject positions. In

conclusion, a correlation exists in Turkish, between the syntactic phrasal domain where a nominative subject appears and the prosodic phonological phrase domain.

1.1. Subject position in Turkish language

We analyze some Turkish sentences with floating quantifiers similar to those studied by Sportiche in French to study the position of subject in Turkish. Consider the following sentences:

(1)a. *Bütün çocuklar film-i seyret-di-lar.*

All children movie-Acc watch-Pst-Pl

“ All children watch the movie”

b. *Çocuklar bütün film-i seyret-di-lar.*

Children all movie-Acc watch- Pst- Pl

“ The children all watched the movie”

A question is posed here: whether (1a) is derived from (1b) or (1b) is derived from (1a)? It has often been proposed that they are syntactically related, in the sense that one is derived from the other. So, there are two possibilities here: One possibility would be that (1b) is derived from (1a). As we know, in (1b) the quantifier *bütün* occupy the position identified as Spec of VP. While this possibility is true, it can also be said that the quantifier *bütün* in (1b) has moved downwards from the subject position Spec of IP into the VP. But since the movement should be

outwards, this movement is not canonical. So, (1b) cannot be derived from (1a). The other possibility would be that (1a) is derived from (1b). In this case the quantifier *bütün* in (1a) has moved outwards from the position Spec VP into the Spec IP. Although the direction of this movement is acceptable the Spec of IP in (1a) is not empty and the quantifier *bütün* cannot be placed there. Thus, this possibility is not true too.

Investigating sentences above more deeply will result in the fact that none of the answers is acceptable. That is, none of them is derived from the other. We assume that the NP *Bütün çocuklar* is originated in Spec of VP. This view involves movement. In (1a) the NP *Bütün çocuklar* moves as a whole to the subject position of the sentence, in (1b) only the phrase *çocuklar* moves, leaving behind the quantifier in the original position, that is, Spec, VP. Moreover, every movement leaves a trace (t) *in situ*. So the third sentence in D-S would be such as (2).

2. [IP[NP e [I [VP[NP Bütün çocuklar]V[NP filmi [v seyrettiler]]]]]].

“The children all watched the movie”

It is clear that Sportiche hypothesis (ISH) is applicable in Turkish language too. However, Sportiche hypothesis about the landing sites of the subjects of non ergative verbs is not correct in Turkish due to existing multiple subject positions for definite/ indefinite subjects at S-Structure. We are going to prove this by two pieces of evidence in Turkish such as word order and prosodic phonology. On the whole, there are two options for the subject positions that are illustrated in (1) below:

(1) Possible subject positions:

- (i) Spec TP (ii) Spec VP

In Turkish, depending on definiteness/specificity, arguments occupy different positions in the sentence. This is easier to see with objects since definite objects in Turkish are overtly marked whereas indefinite objects are not. No such distinction is made in the case of subjects (except for subjects of embedded clauses (Kornfilt 1984)). As for subjects, they are morphologically unmarked in Turkish (Kornfilt 1984; Göksel & Kerslake 2005). Nevertheless, we can still see a contrast, in word order, between indefinite / definite subjects similar to the one between (3a) and (3b). Examine (3):

(3)a. Dün adam gel-di. b. Adam dün gel-di yesterday a
 man/the man com- PAST * a man/the man yesterday come-PAST

Whereas *adam* in (3a) could have a definite or an indefinite interpretation, it could only be interpreted as definite in (3b). It means that indefinite subjects must occur in the immediately preverbal position which is a focus whereas a definite subject does not have to. So, indefinite subjects of unaccustomed verbs stay *in situ*, never raising to Spec TP whereas definite subjects can move to the canonical subject position (Kornfilt 1984, 1997; Öztürk 2004, 2005). So, there are two different views about where a subject is licensed in syntax. One view, subjects are licensed in Spec TP (Chomsky 1981), where movement is because of EPP requirement on T (Chomsky 1991, 1995). On another view, subjects can stay *in situ*, and Case-licensing can thus be met via Agree, where no movement is involved (Chomsky 2000). Alternatively, we present prosodic evidence in support of multiple subject positions. Since definite subjects are separate phonological phrases, they cannot stay within the same phonological domain as the verb. So, the definite subjects of a non-ergative verb must raise to Spec TP, and thus creating a phonological phrase separate from that of the predicate, thereby resulting in a definite reading. Since the prosodic structure with a single phonological phrase (one in which the verb and subject share the same PPh) is not possible, the definite subjects of nonnegative have to be external. However, the indefinite subjects remain within the same projection as the verb and thus sharing the same phonological phrase with it.

3. Conclusion

In this paper , we have demonstrated ISH in Turkish language. And we showed that all subjects(definite/indefinite) are base generated inside the VP .However, in non ergative constructions, the definite subjects must raise to Spec TP whereas the indefinite subjects cannot raise and they remain *in situ*. So, in proving different subject positions in surface structure we presented word order and prosodic evidence .

References

Chomsky, Noam (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht:

Foris

Chomsky, Noam (1991). some notes on the economy of derivation and representation. In *principles and parameters in comparative grammar*, ed. R. Freidin, 417-454. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Chomsky, Noam (1995). *Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.

Chomsky, Noam (2000). Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In *Step by Step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 89–155. Cambridge,

MA: MIT Press.

Göksel, Asli, and Celia Kerslake (2005). *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. New York: Routledge.

Koopman, H. and D. Sportiche (1991). *The position of Subjects* *Lingua*, 85, 211-58.

Kornfilt, Jaklin (1997). *Turkish Grammar*. London: Routledge.

Kornfilt, Jaklin (2003). Subject Case in Turkish nominalized clauses. In *syntactic structure and Morphological information*, ed. Uwe Junghanns and Luka Szucsich, 129-215. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sportiche, D. (1988a) *A theory of floating quantifiers and its corollaries for constituent structure* *Linguistic Inquiry*, 19, 425-49.

Biodata: Dr Ali Alizadeh is an associate professor of linguistics in Birjand University. He has been teaching linguistics for 20 years. He has also presented a couple of papers in some international seminars and conferences. His main areas of interest are Syntax, semantics and syntax interface and applied linguistics.

aalizadeh@birjand.ac.ir

Leila Rahimzadeh has an MA in Linguistics from Birjand University with an experience of teaching English for 5 years.

leilarahimzadeh@yahoo.com