VERBAL REPETITION AND THE COPY THEORY OF MOVEMENT

OVERVIEW AND EMPIRICAL FOCUS This paper discusses the implications of the phenomenon of verbal repetition for the Copy theory of movement (Chomsky 1995). A verbal repetition construction is one in which multiple morphosyntactically identical verbal elements surface within a single finite clause without the multiplication of the verb's overt arguments or the mediation of coordination or subordination. These constructions are found in a healthy handful of languages (1), but have been under-documented and under-analyzed in the literature. Focusing on the case of Nupe, a central Nigerian language, we argue that verbal repetition constructions cannot be base generated constructions like verb serializations for instance, or cases of morphological copying (i.e. reduplication). Rather, they must derive from syntactic copying. In particular, they involve the phonetic realization of both the head and tail of a V^0 chain. The paper thus provides empirical motivation for the Copy theory over the traditional trace theory of movement and sheds light on the mechanics of Copy-Spell Out operations.

VERBAL REPETITION AS SYNTACTIC COPYING WITHOUT DELETION We can ask whether V1 and V2 are syntactically related or independent terms in verbal repetition constructions. The burden of proof is to show that verbal repetition in a language with rich verb phrase structures like Nupe is a derived construction and not a variety of some existing base generated VP construction type. One such VP construction is the serial verb construction (SVC), which shows many similarities to the verbal repetition construction typified by (1a). Consider the data in (2). In this construction, multiple verbal elements appear without marking of coordination or subordination, the arguments of V2 (and other serialized verbal occurrences) are overtly missing, and there is a single tense/aspect specification for the verbs, as in instances of verbal repetition. However, there is telling evidence that the two constructions are distinct. Aside from the semantic differences, V2 cannot be unergative in an SVC (2b), but may be unergative in a verbal repetition construction (3). Furthermore, verbal repetition is bounded in the sense that only two instantiations of V may exist in a clause, whereas more than two verbs may be serialized (2a). In Nupe, only V1 can be repeated in an SVC. However, neither verb in a doubling construction can undergo (further) repetition. These facts are illustrated in (4). (5) shows that objects can be focused in SVCs, unlike in verbal repetition constructions. Finally, acoustic/experimental results show that in addition to the segmental identity of both verbs in a given verbal repetition construction, there is tonal identity between V1 and V2 (Kandybowicz to appear). Thus, the tonal specification of a repetition is a function of the tonal identity of the base verb. This mirrors the intuitions of native speakers and is reflected in the orthography. It is striking because there are morphological copying operations in the language in which tone is not perfectly copied. A case in point is verb reduplication (6), where the copy always bears a mid tone. Furthermore, there is no vowel height alternation between V1 and V2 in a verbal repetition construction as in verb reduplication.

Thus, verbal repetition seems to be a distinct phenomenon/construction type (i.e. distinct from serial verb constructions and morphological reduplication). The Copy theory of movement supplies the conceptual tools needed to understand and account for these facts in a straightforward way. On a Copy theoretic analysis, a verbal repetition construction is simply a case in which both the head and tail of a V^0 head movement chain are phonetically realized. Given that verb raising is well documented in West African languages and independently motivated in Nupe (Kandybowicz & Baker 2003), the analysis is conceptually motivated. The phenomenon is largely mysterious under the traditional trace theoretic approach. This is not to say that no puzzles or problems remain.

ANALYTICAL PUZZLES RAISED BY VERBAL REPETITION Among the issues raised by the phenomenon is the question of why verbal repetition is typologically limited and what properties of grammar exclude simultaneous head-tail spell out in say, English, but not in Nupe. Why is the tail link deleted in typical movement operations, but not in cases of verbal repetition? If the head and tail of a chain can be phonetically realized, why can't the chain's intermediate links be spelled out? (I.e. why are at most two verbal copies licensed?) Are the chain heads in these constructions endowed with features not shared by the tail and if not, how are the semantic interpretations of verbal repetition constructions composed? These questions and their theoretical implications are addressed in the paper as well.

REFERENCES

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Kandybowicz, Jason. To appear. Nupe Tonology and the Categorical Identity of Verb Copy Tones: A Pilot Experimental Study. In John M. Mugane (ed.) *Trends in African Linguistics 6*.

Kandybowicz, Jason and Mark C. Baker. 2003. On Directionality and the Structure of the Verb Phrase: Evidence from Nupe. *Syntax* 6:2, 115-155.

EXAMPLES

(1) a. Musa à **yà** etsu èwò **yà**. (NUPE)
Musa FUT give chief garment give
'Musa WILL give the chief a garment.' (Emphatic/polarity focus)

b. Lame a **kraze kraze** vil la. (HAITIAN)
army the destroy destroy town the
'The army REALLY destroyed the town.' (Emphatic)

c. Cheolswu-ka Younghui-lul **manna**-ki-nun **manna**-ss-ta. (KOREAN)
Cheolswu-NOM Younghui-ACC meet-KI-TOP meet-PST-DECL
'Cheolswu MET Youngui. (But…)' (Contrastive topicalization)

d. Meg-**erkez**-ni meg-**erkez**-ett. (HUNGARIAN)
PreV-arrive-INF PreV-arrive-PST
'(S/he) ARRIVED. (But…)' (Contrastive topicalization)

(2) a. Musa à **wan** bise **zun** **gi**. (Consequential SVC)
Musa FUT catch hen slaughter eat
'Musa will catch the hen, slaughter it, and (then) eat it.'

b. Elúgi á **nikin** **tsu**/***fu**. (Resultative SVC)
bird PRF fall die/fly
'The bird has fallen to its death.' (NOT: 'The bird has fallen, causing it to fly.')

(3) Elúgi **fu** **fu**. (*Elúgi **fu fu fu**.)
bird fly fly
'The bird DID fly.'

(4) a. Musa **du** eci **du** kun.
Musa cook yam cook sell
'Musa ACTUALLY cooked the yam and (then) sold it.'

b. *Musa du eci **kun** **kun**.
Musa cook yam sell sell

c. *Musa **du** eci **du** **du**.
Musa cook yam cook cook

(5) a. Eci$_i$ Musa du ~~eci$_i$~~ kun o.
yam Musa cook ~~yam~~ sell FOC
'It's a yam that Musa cooked and (then) sold.'

b. *Eci$_i$ Musa du ~~eci$_i$~~ du o.
yam Musa cook ~~yam~~ cook FOC

(6)

gé	'be good'	**gi**-gé	'goodness'
du	'cook'	**du**-du	'cooking'
gò	'receive'	**gu**-gò	'receiving'