

**The Silence of the Bucks:
A Note on Kayne's “*Grand* and its Silent Entourage”**

Andrew Simpson
University of Southern California

Abstract

This paper probes the potential occurrence of silent elements in nominal structures, examining ideas in Kayne (2012) “A note on *grand* and its silent entourage”, and how covert heads such as TOTAL may affect the interpretation and morpho-syntax of DPs in both English and Chinese.

Keywords

silent elements, agreement, reanalysis, classifiers, *duo*

In his paper "A note on *grand* and its silent entourage", Richard Kayne (2012) investigates the status of the element *grand*, which is regularly used in informal contexts with the meaning "thousand dollars", as for example in (1):

(1) It'll cost you a grand just to get into the game.

Kayne points out that *grand* in such uses only occurs in a bare singular form, and not with any plural marking:

(2) *They've spent (tens of) grands on their new house just this year alone.

(3) It cost two grand(*s).

It is further noted that *grand* is not a simple substitute for the word *thousand*, as *grand* may not replace *thousand* in other, non-monetary contexts:

(4) a. They think they're gonna live to be a thousand.

b. *They think they're gonna live to be a grand.

In some clear sense, then, *grand* is both a substitute for the numeral *thousand* and the currency unit *dollars*. Referencing the fact that *grand* as a modifier is often found to co-occur with the amount-related term *total*, as in *A grand total of fifty applications have been received*, Kayne suggests that the slang, monetary use of *grand* in fact results from the occurrence of *grand* as the modifier of a silent/unpronounced lexeme *total*, which are further linked to a silent *thousand* and *dollars*, frequently modified by an overt numeral, as schematized in (5):

(5) ten grand = a grand ~~total~~ of ten ~~thousand~~ dollars

Kayne's actual representation of the underlying structure of *ten grand* is (6) (Kayne 2012: 76), in which silent/unpronounced terms are represented with capitals, and the silent *dollars* is actually taken to be a silent *bucks*, for the reason that *bucks* corresponds more closely in its level of informality to the register and situations in which *grand* is commonly used.

(6) grand TOTAL ten THOUSAND BUCKS¹

Somewhat later on in Kayne's article, a second, adjusted underlying source for forms such as *ten grand* is proposed, as shown in (7) (Kayne 2012: 76). The rationale for adopting (7) rather than (6) is that the sequencing of words in (7) maps more directly to the overt surface word order of elements that are pronounced, namely *ten grand*.

(7) ten THOUSAND BUCKS IN grand TOTAL

By means of such an analysis, Kayne is able to account for why *grand* is always singular in number and never pluralized with *-s* — in the underlying structure, "grand" is the modifier of a singular noun "total". The analysis also restricts the

¹ Note that the functional elements *a* and *of* are not included in Kayne's representation of the posited underlying structure of *ten grand*.

interpretation of *grand* to instances of amounts of money in which the elements *thousand* and *bucks/dollars* are understood.

The broad spirit of the analysis put forward in Kayne's paper is essentially that "some" kind of underlying structure involving both "grand (total)" and "ten thousand" is phonetically realized by two overt words, one coming from each part, and this might stem from an underlying sequence "ten thousand dollars in grand total", which would map quite directly into the overt linearization of words *ten grand*. Alternatively it might result from an underlying form "a grand total of ten thousand dollars", which would require the application of some movement to produce the sequence *ten grand*, perhaps the fronting of *ten* over/to *grand*.

Focusing on the "grand total" part of the construction here, the phonetic realization of just *grand* is an occurrence of string reduction in which an [Adj N] modifier-modifiee sequence is simplified and realized just with the modifier, as schematized in (8):

(8) a.	modifier	modifiee	→	b.	modifier	modifiee
	Adj	N			Adj	N
	grand	total			grand	total

Quite generally, when ellipsis of the N occurs in such [Adj N] pairs in English, two patterns can be found. In the first type of reduction, there appears to be reanalysis of the adjective as a noun, and the adjective-as-new-noun comes to be inflected like regular nouns, showing singular/plural distinctions which are otherwise not encoded overtly on adjectives, as illustrated in (9) and (10):

(9) [Adj N] Reduction Type I: reanalysis of Adj as N
[Adj N] → [N]

(10) Give me one medium, two smalls and three larges.

(11) What have we collected so far? Two reds, three blues and a lot of greens.

This kind of reanalysis is common with size and color terms, when it is contextually clear what is being referred to via the reduced forms, but is not so regularly productive with other adjective types, and seems unacceptable with many adjectives regardless of the degree of contextualization that is applied:

(12) a. *two intelligents b. *those stupids c. *two hots d. ?three uglies

In the second kind of [Adj N] reduction, the adjective does not appear to undergo any reanalysis as a noun, and plural inflections are not added to the adjective. Plural *-s* is simply fully absent in this type of [Adj N] simplification when plural entities are referred to. The most natural analysis of such forms is therefore that the understood noun, along with any plural suffix that would occur, is syntactically present but phonetically elided. As shown below, adjectives which refer to materials may often allow for this kind of reduction, in contexts where it is clear what the elided noun refers to:

- (13) [Adj N] Reduction Type II: PF ellipsis of N
[Adj N] → [Adj N̄]
- (14) a. What kinds of roofs are you going to build on these houses?
b. Two slate and three wood.
- (15) a. What kinds of containers do you need?
b. Three plastic, two steel, and one copper.

With certain adjectives, there seems to be a degree of optionality relating to the reduction strategy that is made use of, and adjectives that refer to color terms may occur with either patterning, this being revealed in the absence/occurrence of plural *-s*:

- (16) a. Give me two blues and three reds. Type I
b. Give me two blue and three red. Type II

It can be noted that at an early point in the use of *grand* as a monetary term, a certain optionality actually appears to have occurred with this item, and both Type I and Type II reduction strategies were employed. While plural *-s* most certainly does not occur with *grand* any more in contemporary English, in the early/mid-20th century, the *Oxford English Dictionary*² records that pluralizations of *grand* both with and without affixal *-s* were attested:

- (17) "A hundred and fifty grands!" I breathed. "You're cuckoo."
[1921; Collier's 26 Mar. 24/2]
- (18) "I stepped out with the spree-bent suckers into this world where the black market boys gamble in grands."
[1946; People 7 Apr. 2/3]
- (19) "I lose twenty-five thousand dollars!" "Twenty-five grand!"
[1921; Collier's 27 Aug. 4/3]
- (20) "I don't know how much it is, but I suppose around ten, twelve, fifteen grand."
[1932; Amer. Mercury Jan. 16]

Considering the basic *grand* pattern, and the adaptation of words in new ways to substitute for established monetary terms, such reanalysis is in fact quite common, and there are indeed many alternate slang or non-literal appellations for units of money which occur in informal contexts both in English and other languages. A selection from US and British English is given in (21) below:

- (21) US English
i. dollar = a **buck** ii. 25c = a **quarter**
iii. 5c = a **nickel** iv. 10c = a **dime**

- (22) British English
i. pound = a **quid** ii. 25 pounds = a **pony**
iii. 100 pounds = a **ton** or a **century**
iv. 500 pounds = a **monkey**
v. 1 shilling = a **bob**

In Chinese, there are also terms for units of money which have been borrowed or reanalyzed from words which have other meanings, for example:

- (23) Mandarin
i. dollar/yuan = **kuai** from 'clump'; classifier
ii. 10c = **mao** from 'feather'

- (24) Cantonese
i. 10c = **hou-zi** from 'hair'

With the English examples above, it can be noted that both reduction strategies may seem to occur — some of the new informal monetary terms are pluralized with *-s*, while others are not. Examples of elements which cannot attach plural *-s* are shown in (25).

- (25) a. ten quid(*s)
b. two bob(*s)
c. five grand(*s)
d. two large(*s) (= two thousand dollars/pounds: *I'm gonna bet two large.*)

Of clear interest here is the term *large*. When *large* is used as a slang monetary term meaning "one thousand dollars/pounds", it does not allow plural *-s*, in a way entirely similar to *grand*. This contrasts with the use of *large* in other contexts, when referring to items with a three-dimensional shape and size. As illustrated in (10) above, *large* in such elliptical contexts does accept plural *-s*, hence *large* participates in both reduction types, but with different meanings.

There are also informal monetary terms which require or accept plural *-s*, such as *buck* (*ten buck**(s)) and *nickel* (*two nickel**(s)). In certain cases, the most common use of slang monetary terms is in the singular with the indefinite article, and the combination of such terms with numerals sometimes seems rather odd. However, to the extent that any kind of quantification with numbers is possible, pluralization appears to prefer affixation with *-s* rather than the absence of *-s*, as illustrated in (26):

- (26) a. How much is he gonna pay?
b. A pony/monkey. '25 pounds/500 pounds.'
c. ?Two ponies/three monkeys.
d. *Two pony/three monkey.

Returning to consider the principal character in Kayne's paper, *grand*, as noted above, this element is now not inflected for plural when occurring with numerals,

² OED accessed on line April 5, 2012: <http://www.oed.com/>.

hence instantiates Reduction Type II, with a silent or elided noun *total* syntactically present. Probing the patterning of *grand* and its other monetary cousins further, one might ask whether NPs such as *three grand* and *two large* pattern as plural NPs for purposes of NP-external agreement. In Kayne's initial analysis "grand TOTAL ten THOUSAND BUCKS", it might seem that the silent (but syntactically present) TOTAL is the head noun, with "ten THOUSAND BUCKS" being its complement, as in the fully overt sequence *a grand total of ten thousand bucks*. If the head noun *total* is indeed overt in such an NP, the NP triggers singular verbal agreement:

(27) A total of \$300 was/*were paid.

In the second, adjusted analysis adopted by Kayne, "ten THOUSAND BUCKS IN grand TOTAL", silent TOTAL looks less obviously like the head of the NP, and an overt sequence *ten thousand bucks in grand total* allows for plural agreement on a verb much more readily than in (27):

(28) Ten thousand bucks in grand total were spent on the project.

If we now consider verbal agreement in the reduced usage of *grand*, it suggests that sequences such as *ten grand* are essentially singular for purposes of morphological agreement, and the combination of *ten grand* or *two large* with a plural verb is unnatural and rather odd:

(29) There is/??are three grand/large in the bag.

(30) Ten grand is/?are in the bag.

The observation that singular agreement occurs here seems to provide useful further support for the hypothesis that a silent, morphologically singular TOTAL is present in NPs with the surface form "number + *grand*", and that silent TOTAL may also be the head of the underlying construction, resulting in singular agreement patterns being licensed externally by the NP. There may also be grounds for extending the silent TOTAL analysis further to various of the other monetary terms mentioned above, and assuming that TOTAL is indeed widely present in instances where the interpretation of a sum total of money occurs. Considering the slang terms *monkey*, *pony*, *bob* and *quid* in British English, the dominant (and perhaps only) interpretation which arises from the combination of these words with numerals is reference to an unindividuated sum of money, rather than to a plurality of discrete monetary units. Hence *fifty quid* is commonly interpreted as the sum of money equivalent to fifty pounds, and not a set of fifty pound units, and because of this, singular rather than plural agreement occurs on associated verbs:

(31) Fifty quid is/?are in this bag.

(32) There's/??are fifty quid in this bag.

In fact, with certain monetary terms, only a sum/total interpretation can arise, as there are no real world forms of currency (banknotes, coins) which correspond exactly to the amount of money represented by the slang/informal money term.

This is the case with British *pony* '25 pounds', *ton* '100 pounds', *monkey* '500 pounds' and *grand/large* '1,000 pounds'. There are no banknotes which have the values 25, 100, 500, or 1,000 pounds, hence the statements in (33) and (34) can only refer to amounts/totals.

(33) Here's a ton/a pony.

= Here is money equivalent to 100/25 pounds.

Not: Here is a 100/25 pound note.

(34) Here's/*here are two grand/large.

= Here is money equivalent to 2,000 pounds/dollars.

Not: Here are two 1,000 pound/dollar notes.

With many alternative slang terms for money, the numerical quantification of such terms results in an interpretation in which the numeral does not pick out distinct units referred to by the term, and communicate that there are two, three or ten of these elements, but instead triggers an amount reading, which is very naturally captured by the analysis that there is a silent TOTAL present in the structure.

Turning to consider Chinese and whether a silent TOTAL might also be present in certain NPs, it can be noted that, unlike English, Chinese actually does not have any overt NP-internal term encoding the meaning of *total*, and overt equivalents to *total* regularly occur as adverbial elements in pre-VP positions, taking scope over numerically-quantified NPs to the right of the verb in the VP, e.g. Mandarin *yigong* 'altogether', *zonggong* 'altogether' and Cantonese *zunggung* 'altogether':³

(35) Wo yigong/zonggong hua-le sanshi kuai qian.
I altogether spend-Asp 30 Cl money
'I spent a total of 30 dollars.'

(36) Nei zunggung bei gei-do cin keoi?
you altogether give how-much money he
'How much money did you give him in total?'

If the meaning of *total* needs to be applied to the subject, *yigong* 'altogether', *zonggong* 'altogether' are positioned before a pre-subject *you* 'have':

(37) Yigong you wushi-ge xuesheng lai jie shu le.
altogether have 50-Cl student come borrow book Asp
'Altogether fifty students have come to borrow books.'

If there is no regular NP-internal equivalent to *total* that is overt in Chinese, one

3 It is also possible for terms such as *zongji* 'total' to occur independently as an NP in subject position, as in (i), but not in positions "within" an NP which is numerically quantified:

(i) Jintian mai-de shu, zongji shi sanshi-ben.
today buy-DE book total be 30-Cl
'As for the books which I/we bought today, the total is thirty.'

might wonder whether there would be any motivation for positing the existence of a silent TOTAL NP-internally in Chinese, as assumed for English. Given the absence of any overt singular/plural agreement distinctions on verbs (or nouns) in Chinese, it is also not possible to investigate the underlying structure of Chinese numerically-quantified NPs in the same way as can be done in English.⁴ However, we might also think about and probe the potential presence of a silent TOTAL/AMOUNT in a somewhat different way. One might ask, in sequences of a numeral, classifier and noun such as [35 CI N], whether a set of 35 individual nouns is perceived as a plurality, or whether such a sequence can be/is perceived as a singular, unindividuated total/amount? And if the latter total/amount interpretation is available, one could try to probe what the head of the quantified NP might be — whether it is the lexical noun, or some other classifying element such as a silent TOTAL/AMOUNT, or perhaps the overt classifier? In English, numerically quantified NP structures are often ambiguous and "10 NOUNS" can have the interpretation "ten individual NOUNS", or, in certain circumstances, signal the sum total which corresponds to 10 NOUNS — a collectivity. The latter interpretation may in turn be due to a covert TOTAL which is syntactically present as a singular noun, licensing singular agreement on verbs when the amount/total reading of an apparently plural NP is selected, as in (38) and (39) from Lehrer (1986), and also example (41):

(39) Five courses is the maximum a student can take.

(40) Two brothers is one brother too many.

(41) Five workers is certainly enough for this task.

Where an overt "classifier"-type element occurs in English, there are patterns which suggest that either the classifier or the head noun can establish the singular/plural agreement features of the NP and determine verbal agreement (examples from Lehrer 1986):

(42) The herd of elephants was larger than I thought.

(43) The herd of elephants were stampeding towards us.

It can further be noted that English (overt) *total* appears to occupy the same pre-nominal position as "classifiers"/collective nouns in English, suggesting that *total*/TOTAL and classifiers/collective nouns in English may be potential instantiations of the same pre-nominal position:

(44) a total/herd of 50 elephants

Considering Chinese, one issue which such English patterns bring up is whether the classifier in Chinese NPs should be analyzed as the head of the NP construction in a way parallel to English classifiers/collective nouns, or whether the lexical noun must or can project as the head of the NP. While singular/plural agreement

patterns cannot be used to probe this issue in Chinese, it is possible to consider selection relations which NPs enter into with other predicates. Specifically, one can ask whether a verb shows signs of selecting for the classifier element in an NP, or directly for the noun. The patterns which are found seem to parallel those present in English, and show that for purposes of external selection, either the classifier/collective noun or the lexical noun can serve as the semantic head of the NP:

(45) a. John drank/spilled two bottles of wine.

b. John broke two bottles of wine.

(46) a. Zhangsan he-le liang-ping jiu.

Zhangsan drink-Asp 2-bottle wine

'Zhangsan drank two bottles of wine.'

b. Zhangsan da-po-le liang-ping jiu.

Zhangsan hit-break-Asp 2-bottle wine

'Zhangsan broke two bottles of wine.'

This would suggest that either the measure word or the lexical noun can function as the externally-visible head in Chinese, in a way similar to English. Where measures and amounts are therefore communicated in Chinese NPs, there may be reason to suppose that the element signaling the amount is (or can be) the head of the construction, in a way similar to that assumed for English *total*/TOTAL and the classifiers/collective nouns which occupy the same pre-nominal position as *total*/TOTAL. While we do not have direct evidence for a silent TOTAL in Chinese from such patterns, they nevertheless point to a clear parallel in the headedness which may project in amount/measure phrases.^{5,6,7}

⁵ Interestingly, the availability of the measure word as head of the NP seems to depend on the relation of the mass noun to the measure word, in both Chinese and English. When the material/mass contained by the measure word is "pre-loaded" in the measure, as with wine in bottles, the measure can function as head of NP and satisfy external selection requirements, as in (45b) and (46b). However, when the material/mass contained by the measure word is associated with the measure in a more temporary way (perhaps via multiple fillings of the measure), the measure word does not seem to allow for external selection, as shown in English (i) and its Chinese equivalent (ii):

(i) ??*John broke three cups of coffee.

(ii) ??*Zhangsan da-po-le san-bei kafei.

Zhangsan hit-break-Asp 3-cup coffee

⁶ A reviewer notes that examples such as (i) may be possible, in which no classifier/measure word occurs, and *da-po(-le)* 'broke' seems to combine directly with the noun *kele* 'Coca Cola':

(i) Zhangsan da-po-le kele.

Zhangsan hit-break-Asp cola

'Zhangsan broke the Coca Cola.'

The reviewer notes that (i) might be acceptable at a time period when Coca Cola was sold in bottles. Other informants concur that (i) may be possible if speakers clearly understand that the Coca Cola is contained in a bottle, and the direct translation into English also seems to be acceptable in the same circumstances. In such instances, it may be assumed that a covert classifier/measure word is present in the structure, allowing for such an interpretation.

⁷ For a recent, different analysis of patterns such as (45) and (46), see Zhang (2012). For other analyses which are closer to that assumed in the current paper, see Selkirk (1977), and Akmajian and Lehrer (1976).

⁴ And if a silent TOTAL were to be present, it might be that this element would occur adverbially, as a covert equivalent to *yigong* 'altogether' etc, and not NP-internally like English *total*.

A second patterning in Chinese which can be mentioned here which potentially relates to Kayne's discussion of TOTAL in English is the positioning of the element *duo* 'more than' within numerically-quantified nominals in Chinese. The surface distribution of this element is dependent on the type of numeral which occurs — whether the numeral is a multiple of ten or not — and the classifier/measure word which is present, as illustrated in (47). The central observation is that when the numeral is a multiple of ten (10, 20, 30 etc), *duo* follows the numeral and precedes the classifier (47a/b), but when the numeral is not a multiple of ten, the only possible position for *duo* is apparently following the classifier [numeral classifier *duo* N], as in (47c). However, such a [numeral classifier *duo* N] patterning is often not possible, as shown in (47d). It can also be noted that it is not possible to position *duo* following the classifier when the numeral is not a multiple of ten [numeral *duo* classifier N], as seen in (47e/f):

- (47) a. *sanshi duo kuai qian*
30 DUO Cl money
'more than 30 dollars'
- b. *sanshi duo ben shu*
30 DUO Cl book
'more than 30 books'
- c. *wu kuai duo qian*
5 Cl DUO money
'more than 5 dollars'
- d. **wu ben duo shu*
5 Cl DUO book
- e. **wu duo ben shu*
5 DUO Cl book
- f. **wu duo kuai qian*
5 DUO Cl money

It is significant to note that the interpretation of *duo* in these examples is more specific and restricted than English "more than". When the numeral is a multiple of ten, the addition of *duo* results in an interpretation "more than the quantity of the numeral, but less than the quantity represented by the next sequential multiple of ten", hence 30-*duo* refers to the range 31-39, 40-*duo* to 41-49, 70-*duo* to 71-79 etc. When *duo* is added to a number that is not a multiple of ten, it communicates a quantity greater than the numeral it is combined with, but less than the quantity represented by the next sequential numeral. Hence 5-*duo* has the interpretation "between 5 and 6", and 8-*duo* "between 8 and 9", not simply "more than 5" or "more than 8" in an unrestricted fashion.⁸

Focusing on the alternation in (47c) and (47d), the difference in acceptability

of these apparently parallel forms indicates that *wu kuai (qian)* '5 dollars' in (47c) can be interpreted as a total (amount), rather than an individualized collective set of five units of money. Because of the available total-amount interpretation, the element *duo* can be applied to *wu kuai* and results in the interpretation of a sum total of money which is understood to be between five dollars and six dollars. In the case of books, however, applying *duo* to *wu ben* in (47d) results in the anomalous interpretation of five books plus a fraction of a sixth book (literally "between five and six books"), which does not make sense as books (at least in purchasing situations, as the object of verbs such as *mai* 'buy') are discrete units rather than fully variable amounts — the "fraction of" interpretation with numerals which are not multiples of ten can only occur with (total) amounts not sums of individual elements.⁹ This difference in patterning seen in (47c) and (47d) demonstrates that *kuai* in (47c) is not functioning as a classifier individualizing units (which should not allow for the application of *duo* when combined with a numeral that is not a multiple of ten) but rather amounts. The general conclusion relevant to Kayne's

⁹ If the verb is changed from *mai* 'buy' to *kan* 'read', however, it does become possible for a noun such as *shu* 'book' to be conceived of as a total amount (of pages that can be read), and in such circumstances, the "fraction-of" interpretation is legitimately available with the sequencing [numeral classifier *duo* N], as seen in (i). Many thanks to a reviewer for bringing attention to this example:

- (i) *Ni ji-lai de shu wo kan-le san-ben duo le.*
you send-come Rel book I read-Asp 3-Cl DUO Asp
'I have read over three of the books that you sent.'

The same reviewer also points out that examples such as (ii) are acceptable, where *duo* follows the numeral-classifier pair:

- (ii) *Xie zhe xie fang-cheng-shi yong-le yi-kuai duo heiban.*
write Dem Cl equation use-Asp 1-Cl DUO blackboard
'Writing these equations used up more than one blackboard.'

In such instances, the noun again allows itself to be conceived of as a total amount of space, which can be used up by the action of writing, rather than as an instantiation of individual entities. This is further confirmed by the possibility of saying (iii) in a situation where there is only one blackboard in a classroom — it is the total amount of space represented by the blackboard which can be referenced by the numeral, hence 'eight blackboards' (space) can be used up in a single writing event making use of a single physically-present blackboard. In such a context, *ba-ge duo heiban* does not refer to eight individual blackboard entities.

- (iii) *Ta xie-le ba-ge duo heiban.*
he write-Asp 8-Cl DUO blackboard
'He wrote over eight blackboards.'

Finally, it can be noted that certain syntactic configurations appear to make the amount interpretation of nouns quite inaccessible, as for example in (iv) where *heiban* 'blackboard' is in a preverbal PP. In such instances which focus on the individualization of the noun, rather than its possible amount reading, the NP-internal sequencing of [numeral classifier DUO N] which is acceptable in (ii) is no longer possible:

- (iv) ??*Ta zai yi-kuai duo heiban xie-le yi-wan zi.*
he on 1-Cl DUO blackboard write-Asp 10,000 word
Intended: 'He wrote ten thousand characters on over one blackboard.'

⁸ For a similar description of *duo* 'more', see Lü (1980).

paper which one can draw from this is that the Chinese term *kuai*, which in some way resembles English *grand* in the sense of being a non-literal, somewhat informal monetary term is regularly associated with the communication of a total amount, and therefore conceivably might also be analyzed as inducing a silent TOTAL in the structure it projects.

As a final note on Kayne's investigation of English *grand* and other writings which have a similar analytical direction (e.g. chapters 7, 8, 10 of Kayne 2005, where silent NUMBER, AMOUNT, MANY, MUCH, and COLOR are discussed), we can ask two questions about the "silent" elements which are proposed by Kayne. First, one might wonder how the general hypothesis that "silent" elements are present in underlying syntactic structures may or may not be different from the assumption that "ellipsis" applies to delete the phonetic matrix of various words present in a structure. Here it can be noted that ellipsis is quite generally assumed to apply to groups of words which form a single syntactic constituent, and not to words which occur in a discontinuous string in distinct constituents.¹⁰ In the "grand" structures considered in Kayne's (2012) paper, if ellipsis were to be the operation deleting elements from the posited forms, it would need to apply to a discontinuous sequence of elements (or apply separately to four smaller constituents), deleting THOUSAND, BUCKS, IN and TOTAL in (7) repeated below:

(7) ten THOUSAND BUCKS IN grand TOTAL

If common assumptions about the nature of ellipsis are to be maintained, this suggests that Kayne's notion of silent elements should not be equated with the simple PF ellipsis of overt words from a syntactic structure, even though examples such as (7) could indeed be lexically realized with overt forms for all the regularly silent words, as *the thousand bucks in grand total*. In other instances of silent elements, however, it may not be possible for such elements to be realized overtly, as, for example, in (48), where (48a) with silent NUMBER cannot be pronounced as (48b):

- (48) a. John has many NUMBER friends. (Kayne 2005: 149)
b. *John has many number friends.

The range of silent elements hypothesized by Kayne as a way to account for a wide range of surface patterns therefore seem to be quite different in their fundamental

¹⁰ Certain occurrences of ellipsis which appear to show deletion of non-adjacent material, as in (i) from McCawley (1988: 536), have frequently been given analyses in which movement takes place and creates a single remnant constituent containing only the discontinuous material, which is then deleted by a single operation of ellipsis. Hence in (i), the NP *coffee* may be taken to raise, perhaps by focus-movement, to a position higher than the subject *they*, as represented in (ii), so that all the struck-through material can be deleted by ellipsis applying to the TP remnant. Thanks to a reviewer for bringing this kind of example up.

(i) In China, they serve wine in small cups, and in Turkey, they serve coffee in small cups.
(ii) In China, they serve wine in small cups, and in Turkey, coffee_k [_{TP} they-serve_k in small-cups].

status from cases of simple PF deletion, though many of such elements may have an obvious relation to words which do have overt forms, and the origin of certain silent form might perhaps diachronically lie in earlier, regularized ellipsis.

The second question, which ties in with the point just made above, is how semantically close should one assume that the underlying occurrences of silent elements are to possible overt lexicalizations? In other words, although a silent NUMBER might be assumed to have the same meaning as the overt term *number*, is this always a correct assumption? In the instance of *grand* and its silent entourage, there may be reason to believe that the overt surface combination of a numeral and *grand* may not be fully equivalent to what would be a direct lexicalization of the full silent entourage, hence that (49a) is not directly equivalent to (49b):

- (49) a. two grand (underlying form: two THOUSAND BUCKS IN grand TOTAL)
b. two thousand bucks in grand total

Two grand and *two thousand bucks in grand total* may not be fully equivalent to each other in two ways. First, the use of the phrase *grand total* regularly implies that speaker and hearer should be positively impressed by the sizeable amount of a sum of money (or other items) that is being referred to, due to the meaning of *grand* as "magnificent" that seems to be retained. Because of this, it is odd to use *grand total* when a negative attitude to the sum of money is being expressed by the speaker. Example (50) is therefore quite unnatural and pragmatically ill-formed:

- (50) ??He only gave me a grand total of \$2,000.

This necessarily positive component of the meaning of *grand* in *grand total* is now fully absent from the use of *grand*, which can occur in a frame parallel to that in (50) with no pragmatic incongruity:

- (51) He was supposed to give me ten grand, but he only gave me two grand.

This suggests that the relation of "two THOUSAND BUCKS IN grand TOTAL" to *two thousand bucks in grand total* is not direct, with a one-to-one equivalence between silent and overt elements, and consequently also not the result of simple ellipsis of the phonetic matrix of *thousand*, *bucks*, *in* and *total*.

Such a conclusion is reinforced by a further difference in meaning between *two thousand bucks in grand total* and *two grand*. Comparing (52) and (53) below, it can be noted that (53) can have a meaning that is not available in (52):

- (52) I'm going to bet \$2,000 in grand total on two horses.
(53) I'm going to bet two grand on two horses.

Example (53) is quantificationally ambiguous in a way that (52) is not, and readily permits the meaning that the speaker bets a total of \$4,000 (\$2,000 on each horse), which is not an interpretation open to (52). This difference in meaning again suggests that the underlying sequence of elements assumed to be present in *two grand*, namely "two THOUSAND BUCKS IN grand TOTAL" is not a simple

unpronounced equivalent to overt *two thousand bucks in grand total*, but one which apparently has lost some of the meaning present in the fully overt sequence. This kind of meaning adjustment and loss is not uncommon in processes of grammaticalization, hence not totally unexpected (Hopper and Traugott 1995, Harris and Campbell 1993).

The conclusion from a consideration of the above two questions is that the silent entourage accompanying overt elements such as *grand* may in certain instances be at some synchronic distance from the sequences of elements which have been their diachronic source, necessitating care in understanding the relation between silent elements and apparently corresponding overt terms — the *grand-GRAND*, *number-NUMBER* pairs. It will certainly be interesting to follow the further investigation of these silent ghosts which Kayne has shown may inhabit a range of syntactic constructions and which allow for insights into otherwise puzzling and complex patterns of data.

References

- Akmajian, Adrian, and Adrienne Lehrer. 1976. NP-like quantifiers and the problem of determining the head of an NP. *Linguistic Analysis* 2: 395-413.
- Harris, Alice, and Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical Syntax in Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, Paul, and Elizabeth Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. 2005. *Movement and Silence*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. 2012. A note on *grand* and its silent entourage. *Studies in Chinese Linguistics* 33(2): 71-85.
- Lehrer, Adrienne. 1986. English classifier constructions. *Lingua* 68: 109-148.
- Lü, Shuxiang, ed. 1980. *Xiandai Hanyu Babai Ci* [800 Words in Chinese]. Beijing: Commercial Press.
- McCawley, James. 1988. *The Syntactic Phenomena of English*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Selkirk, Elizabeth. 1977. Some remarks on noun phrase structure. In *Formal Syntax*, ed. Peter W. Culicover, Thomas Wasow, and Adrian Akmajian, 285-316. New York: Academic Press.
- Zhang, Niina Ning. 2012. Projecting semantic features. *Studia Linguistica* 66: 58-74.

Mailing address: Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California,
Los Angeles, CA 90089-1693, USA

Email: andrew.simpson@usc.edu

Received: April 16, 2012

Accepted: June 1, 2012

沉默的公羊： 略述 Kayne 的“英語 ‘Grand’ 一詞及其伴隨之無聲成份”

辛安住
南加州大學

提要

本文簡單探討名詞組結構中的無聲元素，主要根據 Kayne (2012) 的文章“英語 ‘Grand’ 一詞及其伴隨之無聲成份”中所提出的現象，討論無聲的中心成份，例如英文中的“TOTAL”，如何影響中英文名詞組結構的語義、詞法與句法。

關鍵詞

無聲元素，一致性，重新分析，量詞，“多”