## The Predicate Structure of Past Participial Reduced Relatives in English

## Chigchi Bai

## Inner Mongolia University of Finance and Economics

Past participles in reduced relative clauses in English, exemplified in (1), have two functions; they are postnominal modifiers and are predicated of the noun.

(1) [The books sent to me] are about global warming.

This paper aims to clarify the predicate structure of such relative clauses in English. The discussion is concerned with three questions listed below.

- (2) a. Evidence: from As
  - b. Structure: of Subject-predicate relation
  - c. Extension: to non-reduced relatives

First, this paper presents syntactic evidence for the predicate structure. As shown in (3), *as* is a lexical realization of a functional head in the predicate structure of, for example, small clauses. Importantly, *as* introduces postnominal modifiers including adjectives and past participles, as in (4) and (5). Noteworthy is the fact that both in small clauses (3) and in reduced relatives (4, 5) the subject-predicate relation is mediated by *as*, indicating that past participles in reduced relative clauses have a predicate structure like small clauses.

- (3) They regard John <u>as crazy</u> and <u>as a fool</u>. (Bowers (1993: 605))
- (4) The faculty of speech is the most salient quality of [men <u>as distinct from animals</u>]. (Egawa (1991: 397))
- (5) [The plan <u>as currently conceived</u>] is seriously flawed. (Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1146))

Second, based on the above fact, this paper proposes the structure in (6), in which the past participle is embedded under AspP selected by a functional head  $Pred^0$  and the modified NP is located in the Spec of PredP, whereby the subject-predicate relation is established. As shown in more detail in (7-9), NP originates as an internal argument of the verb in AspP and raises to the Spec of PredP, followed by subsequent raising to the surface position, where it projects so that the label of the entire phrase is NP. *As* is a lexical realization of Pred<sup>0</sup>.

(6)  $\begin{bmatrix} P_{redP} & NP_{subj} & Pred^0 & [A_{spP} & Participle \dots] \end{bmatrix}$ (7)  $\begin{bmatrix} P_{redP} & plan_i & as & [A_{spP} & currently conceived & t_i \dots] \end{bmatrix}$ (8)  $\begin{bmatrix} P_{redP} & books_i & \varPhi & [A_{spP} & sent & t_i & to me \dots] \end{bmatrix}$ (9)  $\begin{bmatrix} NP & books_i & [P_{redP} & t_i & \varPhi & [A_{spP} & sent & t_i & to me \dots] \end{bmatrix}$ 

Third, this predicate structure also applies to non-reduced relative clauses, exemplified in (10) and (11), in which each of the relative clauses contains a gap of a certain element, as indicated by Jespersen (1927: 168) and Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1150).

- (10) a. such woman as knew Tom
  - b. such woman as Tom knew
  - c. such woman as Tom dreamed of (Jespersen (1927: 168))
- (11) a. This is a photograph of the church as it was  $\_$  in 1900.
  - b. No one thought that Margot, as she was then known \_ , would last the distance. (Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1150))

As shown in (12) and (13), NP originates within CP and raises to the Spec of PredP, from where it subsequently raises to the surface position. Predication is established in the Spec-head configuration in PredP and modification is completed when NP raises from/is relativized out of the Spec of PredP.

(12)  $[_{DP} [_{NP} \text{ woman}_i \ [_{PredP} t_i \ \Phi \ [_{CP} \text{ that}/\Phi \ [_{TP} \text{ Tom knew } t_i \ ]]]$ (13)  $[_{DP} [_{NP} \text{ woman}_i \ [_{PredP} t_i \ as \ [_{CP} \ \Phi \ [_{TP} \text{ Tom knew } t_i \ ]]]$ 

A side issue concerning the landing site of NP and labeling will also be discussed. The paper will modify Donati and Cecchetto's (2011, 2015) relabeling analysis of relativization and presents a refined one, as proposed in Chigchi (2016, 2017).

The present analysis of the predicate structure of past participial reduced relative clauses thus has an important consequence; it provides a unified basic structure for reduced and non-reduced relatives, identifying the highest projection as PredP, whose head can be lexically realized as *as*.

(14)  $[P_{redP} \ [CP \dots \ [AspP \dots \ (non-reduced relatives)$ (15)  $[P_{redP} \ [AspP \dots \ (reduced relatives)$ 

The structural difference between them lies in the presence/absence of the CP layer, as shown in (14) and (15). In the case of non-reduced relatives, the CP layer is present, while in reduced relatives, it is absent because reduced relatives lack finiteness and discourse-scope properties. In both cases, however, PredP is present because both reduced and non-reduced relatives are predicated of the modified noun.

## **Selected References:**

Bowers, John (1993) "The Syntax of Predication" Linguistic Inquiry, 591-656.

- Chigchi, Bai (2017) "Synchronic and Diachronic Aspects of Adnominal Past Participles in English" Ph.D Dissrtation, Nagoya University.
- Donati, Caterina and Carlo Cecchetto (2011) "Relabeling Heads: A Unified Account for Relativization Structures" *Linguistic inquiry* 42, 519-560.
- Egawa, Taiichiro (1991) A New Guide to English Grammar, Kaneko Shobo, Tokyo.
- Huddleston Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Jespersen, Otto (1909-1949) *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*, vol 3, George Allen and Unwin, London.

## Lexicogrammatical Patterns of Speech Acts in English and Japanese Legal Discourse

## Sonya Chik

## The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

The regulative function of speech acts in legal discourse has been extensively researched (cf. Trosborg, 1997; Geis, 2006; Cao, 2007, just to name a few). For example, in legal contracts, directive acts or language use to impose action on the addressee through obligation and commissive acts or language use to commit the speaker to certain course of action (cf. Searle, 1985; Trosborg, 1997) are two common speech acts with regulative functions. However, different languages and cultures have different lexicogrammatical preferences on the construction of directives and commissives even within comparable legal contexts. Yet, most studies in regulative speech acts are English-centric, and cross-linguistic research in this area remains under-represented. In the case of contrastive analysis between English and Japanese legal discourse, most studies have been conducted with a focus on legal translation (e.g. Kono, 2010 and Takeda & Sekine, 2014). This study investigates the lexicogrammatical features that characterize regulative speech acts in English and Japanese legal discourse by offering a detailed description of the speech acts from a systemic functional perspective.

The data of this study is drawn from a bilingual corpus that contains sixteen privacy policies (eight in English and eight in Japanese, both in their original and target languages) collected from social media websites and top global company websites. Privacy policy is chosen as the object of this study because it is one of the most common legal agreements that are publicly available online and in multiple languages including English and Japanese. Drawing on Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) theory, this study identifies and classifies the major speech acts in privacy policies from a 'trinocular' perspective. First, the text is analyzed 'from above' based on the contextual variables of field or subject matter, tenor or writer-reader relationship, and mode or medium and style in which the text is produced (cf. Halliday & Hasan, 1989:26). Next, the text is scrutinized 'from below' by examining the lexicogrammatical features in which the functions of the speech acts are realized. Each text is analyzed under the systems of MOOD (declarative, imperative and interrogative) and MODALITY (probability and obligation) at the rank of clause (see Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014 for English; and Teruya, 2007 for Japanese). Finally, the text is analyzed at the semantic level where different speech acts are identified and classified according to the communicative purposes.

Findings from the study reveal that privacy policy is hybrid in nature, which is evidenced in the lexicogrammatical features that characterize both legal and commercial text types. In addition to regulative speech acts such as directives and commissives, privacy policies also contain the speech acts of warning and advising, which are not common features in legal contracts. In general, the epistemic modality is preferred over deontic in both English and Japanese privacy policies. In terms of cross-linguistic variation, it is observed that linguistic expressions for the speech acts in Japanese tend to be more lexical and phrasal, compared to those in English, which are more grammatical. Moreover, the social hierarchical relationship between service provider and user is explicitly coded in Japanese through the systems of Honorification and Politeness. Although the cross-linguistic variation identified in this study is mainly language-specific, the linguistic choices reflect the divergence between the two languages in enacting the writer-reader relationship, which is motivated by the context of language use. These findings are significant in terms of the implications on cross-linguistic variation in communicative contrasts between the two languages in general (cf. House, 2006), and potential contributions to translation studies in particular.

## References

- Cao, D. (2007). Legal speech acts as intersubjective communicative action *Interpretation, law and the construction of meaning,* 65-82. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.
- Geis, M. L. (2006). Speech acts and conversational interaction: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1989). Language, context, and text : aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (Fourth ed.). London and New York: Routledge.
- House, J. (2006). Communicative styles in English and German. *European Journal of English Studies*, 10(3), 249-267.
- Kono, T. (2010). The Transparency Project, Its Achievements, and Some Cross-Cutting Issues. Japanese YB Int'l L., 53, 306-319.
- Searle, J. R. (1985). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*: Cambridge University Press.
- Takeda, K., & Sekine, Y. (2014). Translation of Japanese Laws and Regulations. In L. Cheng, K. K. Sin and A. Wagner (eds.), *The Ashgate Handbook of Legal Translation*. Surrey, UK & Burlington, USA: Ashgate, 223-235.
- Teruya, K. (2007). A systemic functional grammar of Japanese, two volumes. London: Continuum.
- Trosborg, A. (1997). *Rhetorical strategies in legal language : discourse analysis of statutes and contracts*. Tübingen Germany: Gunter Narr.

## vP movement in Japanese Right-Dislocation

## Kaori Furuya

## **University of North Texas**

This paper examines Japanese right-dislocation constructions (RDCs) with adverbs postverbally and provides new arguments for a mono-clausal analysis with vP movement for some RDCs. Unlike cases of postposing adverbs alone (e.g. Endo 1996), it has not been observed that adverbs can be postposed together with arguments as in (1).

(1) Did Taro read the book on the table a lot?

Taro-wai[e]iyomanakatta-yo,sono honi-oi(nandomo/zenzen).Taro-Topread.did.not-Prtthebook-Accrepeatedly/never'(Lit)Taro did not read [e]i, (the booki repeatedly/never).'

In reply to the question written in italicized English, (1) can be uttered with the combination of the accusative-Case marked DP and an adverb postverbally. These postverbal elements appear to be an afterthought added later and thus the sentence (1) is fine even without them.

The most prevailing analysis adopts the perspective that a RDC consists of two clauses (Abe 1999, 2019 Takita 2011, a.o.). In this analysis (1) can be schematized in (2), where postposed elements exist in  $S_2$  and are taken as afterthoughts added later on what  $S_1$  states (Kuno 1987), as in *Taro did not read it*<sub>i</sub>, *he did not read the book*<sub>i</sub> *repeatedly/at all*.

(2)  $[s_1 ...] [s_2 DP-Acc_i Adv [-t_i-]]$ 

However, the bi-clausal analysis is puzzling in (3) since the RDC with an adverb attached by the Negative Polarity Item (NPI) -sika 'only' is not properly interpreted in the analysis.

(3) Did Taro eat the apple<sub>i</sub> on the table?

 $Taro-wa \quad [e]_i \quad tabenakatta-yo \quad (sono \ ringo(-o)_i \quad \textit{sukosi-sika}).$ 

Taro-Top did.not.eat-Prt the apple-Acc little-SIKA

'Taro ate the apple<sub>i</sub> only a little bit.'

\* 'Taro did not eat it<sub>i</sub>, he ate the apple<sub>i</sub> only a little bit.'

As the English translations indicate, the postposed NPI should be associated with the verb preverbally in the single clause, rather than in the bi-clausal structure. Note that Takita's (2014) mono-clausal analysis with base-generation fails to explain (3) since it is unlikely that the object and the adverb postverbally function as topic(s) together or separately.

Alternatively, provided that a verb is overtly raised to T (Hayashi & Fujii 2015, Sato & Hayashi 2018), I suggest a mono-clausal analysis with vP movement in (4). The proposed analysis with vP movement correctly explains the word order and the interpretation of (3).

(4)  $[s \dots t_i V_{neg}] [v_P DP-Acc_i Adv-sika t_v]_i$ 

The proposed analysis also explains the distribution of the adverbs in (5), where *oogoe-de* 'loudly' modifies the matrix verb whereas *ichijikan* 'one hour' modifies the embedded verb in CP.

(5) Taro-wa [e]<sub>i</sub> itta, [[Mari-ga [e]<sub>j</sub> hasitta-to]<sub>i</sub> kouen-o<sub>j</sub> *itizikan oogoe-de*]. Taro-Top said Mari-Nom ran-Comp park-Acc one.hour loud.voice-in 'Taro<sub>i</sub> said *loudly* that Mari<sub>i</sub> ran in the park *for one hour*.'

In the proposed analysis vP undergoes rightward movement in (6a). In (6b) the matrix adverb

successfully modifies the trace of the matrix adverb in the raised vP (Sato & Hayashi 2018). In

(6c), vP in the embedded CP is right-dislocated to the right periphery, in which the embedded adverb likewise modifies the trace of the verb.



Notice that (5) is problematic to the bi-clausal analysis (and Tanaka's 2001 tripartite analysis) along with the perspective that postposed adverbs are originally right-adjoined without moving (Kamada 2009) since these analyses would predict no asymmetry between (5) and (7) (which is ungrammatical when it involves adverbs), contrary to what we observe.

(7) \*[Mari-ga [e]<sub>j</sub> hasitta-to]<sub>i</sub> kouen-o<sub>j</sub> *itizikan oogoe-de* Taro-wa [e]<sub>i</sub> itta Mari-Nom ran-Comp park-Acc one.hour loud.voice-in Taro-Top said '(Intended) Taro<sub>i</sub> said *loudly* that Mari<sub>i</sub> ran in the park *for one hour*.'

Moreover, under the proposed analysis the preverbal null element in (8) is a trace of the moved vP attached by the focus particle -sae 'even'.

(8) Did Taro eat anything?

Taro-wa [e]<sub>i</sub>/<sub>\*j</sub> sinakatta-yo, [ie-de ringo-o<sub>j</sub> tabe-sae]<sub>i</sub>

Taro-Top did.not-Prt house-at apple-Acc eat-even

'(Intended) Taro did not even eat an apple at home.'

Note that the fact that the preverbal null element cannot be *pro* (or a(n) argument/vP ellipsis) is problematic to the extant analyses including the bi-clausal analysis.

This paper analyzes RDCs with the combination of adverbs and arguments postverbally, and demonstrates that the prevailing bi-clausal analysis and extant mono-clausal analyses with base-generation fail to account for the distribution of adverbs postverbally. I argue that a mono-clausal analysis with vP movement is the best to account for the distribution of the combinations of adverbs and arguments postverbally for some Japanese RDCs. The proposed analysis indicates that postverbal elements do not always fit the typical uses of afterthoughts added later in the bi-clausal structure (Kuno 1987). Moreover, it also challenges a uniform analysis of RDCs regardless of whether it is a mono- or a bi-clausal analysis since a postverbal adverb may not obligatorily occur in the second clause of a RDC.

#### **Selected references:**

- Abe, J. (2019). Two types of Japanese right dislocation under the bi-clausal analysis. Proceeding of WAFL.
- Kuno, S. (1978). Japanese: A characteristic OV language. In Syntactic typology, ed. By W.P. Lehmann, 57-138. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Sato, Y. and S. Hayashi. 2018. String-vacuous head movement in Japanese: new evidence from verb-echo answers. Syntax 21(1): 72–90.

Tanaka, H. (2001). Right-dislocation as scrambling. Journal of Linguistics 37: 551-579.

Takita, K. (2014) "Pseudo-right dislocation, the bare-topic construction, and hanging topic constructions." *Lingua* 140.137-157.

## **Remarks on Root Removal and Placement Verbs** Hideaki Gen'ey (Saitama-Gakuen University)

This paper provides a compositional account of verbal lexical decomposition of English removal and placement verbs. I focus on a particular verb class, which I call "Root Removal Verbs (henceforth RRV)," as illustrated by seed the butternut. My definition of this verb class is that these verbs entail the removal of an entity, but the entity is not expressed by an argument of the verb, thus implicit. Importantly, the "removed" argument is a *structured part* (tentatively represented as  $\leq_{\text{structured}}$ ) of a whole (= source) (similar to the finger - hand - arm relation). Root Placement Verbs (RPV's) come in two types: ① those which entail the placement of an entity but the entity is not expressed by an argument of the verb like *She buttered the toast*, and (2) those which entail a location but the location argument itself is implicit like Juddy bagged the carrots. I assume that the verbs like *seed* with the meaning of "to remove seeds from the plant" are derived from roots like vseed but these roots do not bear categories like "verb" or "noun." Lexical items like seed contains a property, extracted from the root, of being a noun (represented as a "small n") and of being a verb (represented as an agent-introducing "small v") and they are represented as  $[n\sqrt{\text{seed}}]$  and  $[\sqrt{\text{seed}}]$  respectively when categories are distinguished. For example, roots like  $\sqrt{\text{skin}}$  are related to "(removal) source" arguments like *fresh*caught fish by preposition-like functional heads, called OUT (properties extracted from the root) in the semantic structure, and ultimately combine with a small v head jumping the object DPs (N.B. Levinson 2014:212). OUT is not pronounced (N.B. Levinson 2007:47, 112). Namely, a small v is a syntactic conflation of  $\sqrt{\text{Root}}$  and OUT.

(1)  $[v [_{DP} fresh-caught fish]] [OUT [_{\sqrt{skin}}]]]$ 

1

OUT can be explicit as in attested examples like (2).

(2) Looking across the stream to where the gun bearers were skinning out the lion ...

I argue that skin as a noun is converted a verb by "association which pick up the most appropriate meaning on the situation", which Gil (2005) claims to work at the beginning of language, where categories like preposition and tense are not discriminated. I claim that association survives in noun-verb conversion and a few other areas (thus OUT is often not pronounced). The structures like (2) and (3) have the associational meaning of "removing the skin/gut," based on the relation structured parthood (i.e., the relation that holds between whole entities and their proper parts (cf. Champollion 2017: 13)).

(3)  $[_{\nu P}[_{\nu}[_{\nu}] \text{ skin}]]$  [DP fresh-caught fish]] (skin  $\leq_{\text{structured}}$  fish; skin is a structured part of fish) Note Champollion's (2017) classical extensional mereology only concerns unstructured *parthood*, represented by a relation  $\leq$ , "wholes' are collection without internal structure

(=*sum*)," as in (4).

(4) Eight men, twenty pieces, some of them large. (some of them  $\leq$  twenty pieces) The denotation for the phrases like "gutting fish" will be a predicates of events: "A set of removal events which cause an event in which gut (= the structured part of 'fish') is removed." I extend the notion of "structured parthood" relation to pseudo-resultatives (PR's) given in (6), which do not modify the DP object as resultatives do. I claim that resultative predicates like *thick* might, but not always, predicate *structured parts* like *peel*. (6) The rich peel potatoes <u>thick</u>.  $\rightarrow$  At least one thick peel was removed (from a potato). The resultative-like interpretation of PR's is contributed not by modification of a resultant state, but by modification of an individual which is separated as a result of the event, corresponding to the "structured part (= removed *peel*)" of *potatoes*. Notice that *peeling potatoes* refers to an obviously separable part of the item. But in "2 apples, <u>cored</u> and cut into wedges," the core is created because of the removing action (cf. *Bob balled his fist*.)

In (8) structured parthood appears to be "transitive": *blood* is not only the structured part of a vein but also that of *you*. But extensionality (i.e., \**blood* = *you*) does not hold here. (8) I'll bleed you dry.  $\leftarrow$  *dry* might modify the whole human being ("you") Note also "a feet missing toe" is acceptable but "??a leg missing a toe" sounds strange.

RRV milk might form the following (semantic) structure:

(9)  $[_{\nu P}[_{\nu}[_{\nu}[]] [OF [OUT [_{DP} his cow]]] (milk \leq_{structured} his cow)$ 

The syntactic derivation of *milk* as a RPV is shown in (10), barring *\*milk the cup*, the fact of and the reason for which Clark and Clark (1979) neither mention nor address:

(10) [ $\nu$  [DP the tea [WITH [IN [ $\forall$ milk]]]]](milk  $\leq$ structured the tea)  $\leftarrow$  "milk the tea"  $\uparrow$  cf. "Milk in first"

"Milk the tea" yields "tea with milk" but the cup and milk don't merge (cf. *milk the baby*). Once the noun-verb conversion with its associational meaning established, the use of *milk* might extends to yield other expressions like *milk the cash-cow* or *I'll milk you properly*.

Finally, under a telicity test, RRV's like *dust* pattern as follows: (a) *She <u>dust</u>ed furniture for /?in five minutes.* vs. (b) *She <u>dust</u>ed all of the furniture \*for/in five minutes.* RRV's with unbounded mass objects give rise to atelic clauses but with bounded objects they yield telic clauses. In the former cases, there arises "the minimal-parts problem."

References: Clark, E.V., and H.H. Clark. 1979. "When Nouns Surface as Verbs." *Language* 55. Gil, D. 2005. "Word Order without Syntactic Categories." In Harley and Dooley. Eds. Kajita, Masaru. 1977. "Towards a Dynamic Model of Syntax." *SEL* 5. Levinson, L. 2007. *The Roots of Verbs*. Ph.D. diss., NYU. Levinson, L. 2014. "The Ontology of Roots and Verbs." In Alexiadou et al. Eds. Champollion, L. 2017. *Parts of a Whole*. Oxford Univ. Press. Moltmann, D. 1997. *Parts and Wholes in Semantics*. Oxford.

#### When and How Does Search Take Place? Nobu Goto (Toyo University)

In personal communication with Epstein, Kitahara and Seely (EKS), Chomsky suggests: "Labeling is a search procedure, like Agree (and in fact Merge, which searches for things to merge). So why isn't it enough to say that all search procedures are governed by the third factor principle of economy (shortest search)" (EKS 2018:268).

That said, however, it is still unclear (at least to me) how a search procedure is governed by the  $3^{rd}$  factor principle and involved in the formulation of Merge(X,Y) $\rightarrow$ {X,Y}. So I propose: a search procedure be involved not only in labeling the output of  $Merge{X,Y}$ (which I call Label-Search, LS), but also in determining the input of Merge(X,Y) (which I call Input-Search, IS), claiming that the 3<sup>rd</sup> factor principle require all search procedures not to access the deep interior of a complex structure such as {XP,YP}. Thus in an XP-YP structure such as {IS(H)...{ $_{LS(\alpha)}$  { $_{XP}}$  X, {...Z...}}, { $_{YP}$  Y, {...W...}}}, XP, YP are accessible to both  $LS(\alpha)$  (search to determine the label of  $\alpha$ ) and to IS(H) (search to determine the input of Merge with H), but the deep interiors of them, i.e., the gray zones containing Z, W, are inaccessible to them. Note here that I assume with Chomsky's POP system (2013; 2015) that the label of syntactic objects is determined as follows:  $\{H, XP\}=H$ ;  $\{XP_F, YP_F\}=\langle F, F \rangle$ ; and {XP,YP}=unlabeled (where H, a head; XP/YP, a phrase; [F], agreement features like Q), and with Sorida (2015), Bošković (2016), Rizzi (2016) and Saito (2016) that LS applies at each step of a derivation (contra the POP system where LS is assumed to operate at the phase level, CP and vP, in one fell swoop). Under this theory, therefore, it follows that search (LS and IS) always operates over the minimum binary branching structure in a workspace. I take this as the so-called Minimal Search (MS), and dub it "MS-3" to mean 3<sup>rd</sup>-factor-contsrianed MS.

The MS-3 provides a unified account of two (unrelated) phenomena: if  $\alpha$  pied-pipes  $\beta$ , then  $\alpha$  must be at the edge of  $\beta$  (1) ("Pied-Piping problem," Heck 2008; 2009); and extraction out of non-complements is disallowed (2) ("CED problem," Huang 1982; Chomsky 1986):

(1) a. **[Whose** problem] did he solve? (2) a. **Who**<sub>i</sub> did you believe [that he saw  $t_i$ ]?

b. \*[The problem of **what**] did he solve? b. \***Who**<sub>i</sub> did [pictures of  $t_i$ ] please you?

c. **\*Who** did he leave [before speaking to *t*<sub>i</sub>]?

The relevant derivations of	(1a, b) and	l (2a, b, c) are (3	(4a, b) and $(4a, b, c)$	), respectively:
-----------------------------	-------------	---------------------	--------------------------	------------------

(3) a. $\{LS(\alpha) \in Q, \{DP \text{ whose problem}\}\}, \{CQ \in C_Q, \{TP \text{ he solve}\}\}\}$	(=(1a))
b. $\{LS(\alpha) \in D(the), \{problem of what\}\}, \{CQ C_Q, \{TP he solve\}\}\}$	(=(1b))
(4) a. {IS(v) { $_{\alpha}$ who <sub>i</sub> , { $_{CP}}$ C(that), {t <sub>i</sub> }}}}	(=(2a))

b. \*{IS(C) { $_{\alpha}$  { $_{DP}}$  D, {picture of who}}, { $_{vP}$  v, {...}}}}

c. \*{IS(C) { $_{\alpha}$  { $_{vP}}$  v, {...}}}, { $_{CP}$  C(before), {...speaking to who...}}}} (=(2c))

In (3a), Q and C<sub>Q</sub> are accessible to  $LS(\alpha)$ ;  $\alpha$  is labeled as <Q,Q>. But in (3b), Q is not

accessible to  $LA(\alpha)$ ;  $\alpha$  is not labeled, resulting in an interpretation failure at the CI (Ott 2015). Likewise, in (4a), *who* is accessible to IS(v); *who* can be the input of IS(v) (the same holds for the next CP). But in (4b, c), *who* is not accessible to IS(C); *who* cannot be the input of IS(C), failing to derive (2b, c). The contrasts above receive a unified account. Note that in the POP system, where it is unclear how the 3<sup>rd</sup> factor principle governs LS and assumed that Merge applies freely, it would be an unresolved mystery why (1b) and (2b, c) are bad (see Goto 2016 and Blümel and Goto 2019 for further empirical consequences of our analysis of CED).

As a consequence of our analysis of Pied-Piping, the generalization that free relative (FR) interpretation is not available when the moved element is a phrase (Donati 2006) receives a simple principled explanation: "I read [[**what** book] you wrote]" (in which there can be no FR interpretation). This sentence cannot receive FR interpretation because the DP label that must be accessible for FR interpretation (Chomsky 2008) is inaccessible as in (3a). In addition, the unresolved contrast in (5) (Cable 2013) follows on the independently motivated principle that a root clause can remain unlabeled (Goto 2013; Blümel 2017; Chomsky et al. 2019):

(5) a. \*I wonder [[pictures of **whom**] you bought on the internet].

b. ??[Pictures of **whom**] did you buy on the internet?

(5a) is bad for the reasons stated in (3b), but (5b) is good because of the privilege of the root.

Furthermore, adopting the hypothesis that "language is optimized relative to the CI interface alone" (Chomsky 2014:7), I propose: the MS-3 be in turn governed by CI-visibility, claiming that the CI allow LS to "ignore" elements that are "invisible" at the CI and IS to "access" even the deep interior of the complex structure when the SO gets labeled so as to be "visible" at the CI. Thus in the XP-YP structure {IS(H)... { $_{LS(\alpha)=Y}$  { $_{XP-Case}$  X, {...Z...}}, { $_{YP}$  Y, {...W...}}}, the Case-marked XP (XP-Case) is a CI-invisible element (EKS 2014), so that XP-Case can be ignored by LS( $\alpha$ ) (Saito 2014) and  $\alpha$  gets the label of Y. Now, since the labeled  $\alpha$  is a CI-visible element, the deep interiors of XP, YP become accessible to IS(H). I name the dilemmatic MS-3 "CI-MS-3" in that MS is governed not only by the 3<sup>rd</sup> factor principle but also by the CI interface. Significantly, the CI-MS-3 neatly explains the contrast below (see Hasegawa 2005; Bianchi and Chesi 2014 for the judgment of the example (6)):

(6) **Nani-o**<sub>i</sub> A-ga [ $_{\alpha}$  [B-ga  $t_i$  kata koto ]-*ga/-\*wa* mondai-da] to omotteru no what-acc A-nom B-nom bought fact-nom/-top problem-is C think Q 'What<sub>i</sub> does A think that the fact B bought  $t_i$  is a problem?'

Since XP-*ga* (nom) is a CI-invisible element, it is ignored by LS( $\alpha$ ) and  $\alpha$  is labeled as v. The labeled  $\alpha$  is a CI-visible element; the deep interior of  $\alpha$  becomes accessible to IS(C). But since XP-*wa* (topic) is a CI-visible element, it is not ignored by LS( $\alpha$ ) and  $\alpha$  is unlabeled. The unlabeled  $\alpha$  is a CI-invisible element; the deep interior of  $\alpha$  becomes inaccessible to IS(C).

## Impact of Remedial Instruction on Rhyme Recognition among First Grade ESL Students

Maria Leonora D. Guerrero, John Xavier B. Nepomuceno, Ma. Lourdes D. Guerrero Cavite State University Naic

According to UNESCO (2013), statistics indicates that the Philippine population aged 15 to 24 years has a literacy rate of 97.8% in 2008. Despite this high literacy rate, the Philippine Functional Literacy, Education and Mass Media Survey in 2008 revealed that 30% or 20.1 million Filipinos cannot understand what they read (Nolasco, 2010). One of the most essential issues vis-à-vis reading comprehension is phonological awareness.

Greater change in phonological awareness is realized when instruction or intervention is provided to young children (Schuele & Boudreau, 2008). Because of this, the participants used in this study were early grade students who passed the criterion set by Konza (2011), that is, young children who can already discriminate separate phonemes. To her, these children are those who are ready for letter-sound relationships. Conversely, in the hierarchy of phonological awareness skills presented by Konza, it shows that in terms of the growing awareness of the sounds of the English language, children usually first become aware of rhythm. However, these participants are considered economically disadvantaged since they are children to parents residing in coastal barangays whose main source of living is fishing, farming or construction work. Nearly all families of the students from both elementary schools earn lower than Php 10,000 a month. A family with five members earning less than Php 10,000 monthly is considered poor according to the National Statistics Coordination Board (NSCB) of the Philippines (as cited in PinoyMoneyTalk, 2018). According to McDowell, Lonigan and Goldstein (2007), several studies indicate that socioeconomic status and phonological awareness are related. In fact, their study revealed that age is moderating the relations between socioeconomic status and phonological awareness. This is also supported by the claims of Lonigan (2004), Lonigan, Burgess, Anthony, & Barker (1998), Bowey (1995), Chaney (1994), Hecht, Burgess, Torgesen, Wagner, & Rashotte (2000), Raz & Bryant (1990), Webb, Schwanenflugel, & Kim (2004) that skills in phonological awareness are less evident among preschool and early grade students from low income and less educated parents than those who came from well-off families (as cited in Phillips, Clancy-Menchetti & Lonigan, 2008). In terms of educational attainment, majority of the parents of the participants from the two schools only obtained high school education. This implies that young children of low-income and less educated parents most likely will not improve phonological awareness, thus, the implementation of remedial intervention.

This quasi-experimental research study investigated the impact of remedial instruction on improving the rhyme recognition ability of Grade 1 students in two public elementary schools. Specifically, the study aimed to find out if there was significant difference in the preand post-test scores of the students after the intervention. Using t-test of dependent samples, pre- and post-test results for rhyme recognition in Bucana Elementary School showed that there was no significant difference between pre- and post-test scores at  $p \ge .05$  where the calculated t value was 1.62 and the calculated p value was 0.12. In contrast, pre- and post-test results for rhyme recognition from the three sections in Bancaan Elementary School showed significant difference at  $p \ge .05$ . In section *Mangga*, the value of *t* was 3.10 while the value of *p* was 0.00. In section *Atis*, the value of *t* was 2.82 while the value of *p* was 0.01. Lastly, in section *Santol*, the *t* value was 2.63 and the *p* value was 0.01.

This study generates two contradicting results. While results in Bucana Elementary School corroborates the previous studies, results in Bancaan Elementary School confirms that remedial instruction helps improve phonological awareness of Grade 1 students as claimed by Schuele & Boudreau (2008).

Resting on the results of the study, the following are recommended: administration of hearing ability test on students as hearing ability may influence the development of phonological awareness; investigation of teachers' articulation of sounds as teachers' articulation may affect students' articulation through mimicking; and training of parents on phonological awareness instruction as they can be potential partners of teachers in the development of students' phonological awareness.

## REFERENCES

- Bayetto A. (n.d.) Phonological Awareness. Retrieved September 13, 2018 from https://www.appa.asn.au/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Phonological-Awareness-article.pdf
- Konza, D. (2011). Phonological awareness: Research into practice: Understanding the reading process, 1(1.2), 1-6.
- McDowell, K., Lonigan, C., Goldstein, H. (2007). Relations among socioeconomic status, age, and predictors of phonological awareness: Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 50(4), 1079-1092.
- Nolasco, R. (2010, October 16). Reforms first or K+ 12 means nothing: Inquirer. Retrieved from <u>http://www.inquirer.net</u>
- Phillips, B., Clancy-Menchetti, J. & Lonigan, C. (2008). Successful phonological awareness instruction with preschool children: Lessons from the classroom: Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 28(1), 3-17.
- PinoyMoneyTalk. February 12, 2018. You are poor if your family income is less than P10k a month. Retrieved from <u>https://www.pinoymoneytalk.com/poverty-line-philippines/</u>
- Schuele, C. M. & Boudreau, D. (2008). Phonological awareness intervention: Beyond basics:Language, Speech & hearing Services in Schools, 39(1), 3-20.

# Learner Beliefs about English Learning among Japanese University Students Kenji KANEKO

Kyoto University of Advanced Science

## Abstract

Studies about both learner beliefs and metacognitive knowledge have been a part of educational psychology, sociology and second language studies, and past research has provided empirical explanations for individual learner differences and distinctiveness due to the diversity of cognitive skills and abilities (Bernat & Gvozdenko, 2005; Flavell, 1979; Horwitz, 1988; Kojima, 2015; Itoi, 2003; Matsuura, Chiba & Hilderbrandt, 2001; Wenden, 1998:1986). For learning, beliefs can be described as a person's prior knowledge consisting of various facts which may include insufficient or biased information (Ambrose et al., 2000, pp. 4-7). Metacognitive knowledge usually refers to a person's awareness of the acquisition of knowledge (Wenden, 1998, p. 516). This also means that it could become a starting point for learning as a series of events. When individuals acquire knowledge (Ambrose et al., 2000, pp. 15-27). In the case of foreign language learning, students mainly rely on common knowledge or beliefs to search for their answers: how difficult foreign language learning is or how to go about it. It is not unusual for students to "hold a range of beliefs with varying degrees of validity" (Horwitz, 1988, p. 293).

This research has examined learner beliefs among Japanese university students of English in Japan, and I am particularly interested in understanding the importance of the role of prior knowledge in the process of learning English as a foreign language. This research has also investigated learner beliefs that may become types of motivation for Japanese English learners. The objectives are to understand what common learner beliefs are among Japanese university students and to determine if certain types of learner beliefs may help or hinder them to study English successfully.

This research conducted a case study investigating learner beliefs among forty-one Japanese university students taking a weekly listening and speaking class for English at a university, Fukuoka, Japan. This research employed questionnaire that combined both qualitative and quantitative aspects. The questionnaire was mainly adopted from Horwitz (1988): the Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI), a set of survey questions for assessing individuals' beliefs about foreign language learning, although I removed, modified and translated some questions and methods for the specific aims of this study. Besides the collection of qualitative

survey data, I included an open-ended question survey to capture students' deeper feelings about the practice of English. For the qualitative analysis, open-ended questions were analyzed with Steps for Coding and Theorization (SCAT) method (Otani, 2011). One of the advantages of using the SCAT method was to have a clear and accessible data analysis.

The findings revealed that the participants had a range of beliefs about English learning, and these beliefs included more negative beliefs than positive ones. Negative learner beliefs are the ones that do not just consist of insufficient or incorrect information but also dismiss a positive outlook. There were relatively a few positive learner beliefs shared among the students. The analysis revealed that the students were aware of a large number of foreign tourists or working individuals coming to Japan in the recent years, and believed that they could get more opportunities if they were able to speak English well.

The findings of this research suggest that English instructors address learner beliefs to remove students' doubts that help them build confidence. Positive learner beliefs may motivate them to study English hard, but they will eventually conflict with a lot of negative learner beliefs. A struggle between two opposite views does not often help them keep studying it successfully.

## References

- Ambrose, S. A., Bridge, M. W., DiPietro, M., Lovett, M. C., & Norman, M. K. (2010). How learning works: Seven Research-based principles for smart teaching. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Bernet, E., & Gvozdenko, I. (2005). Beliefs about language learning: Current knowledge, pedagogical implications, and new research directions. *TESL-EJ*, 9(1), 1-21.
- Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitivedevelopmental inquiry. *American Psychology*, 34(10), 906-911.
- Horwitz, E. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 72(iii), 283-294.
- Itoi, E. (2003). Student's beliefs about English learning (Eigo gakushuu ni kansuru gakusei no biriifu). Gakubu kiyou / Bulletin of The Faculty of Language and Literature, 16(2), 85-100.
- Kojima, C. (2015). Jyugyou ni tsuite no Learners' beliefs to Teachers' beliefs ni kansuru kousatsu (An investigation into learners' and teachers' beliefs about classroom activities). Seisen jyoshi daigaku gengo kyouiku kenkyuujyo, Gengo kyouiku kenkyuu, 7, 1-17.
- Matsuura, H., Chiba, R., & Hilderbrandt, P. (2001). Beliefs about learning and teaching communicative English in Japan. *JALT Journal*, 23(1), 69-89.
- Otani, T. (2011). SCAT: Steps for coding and theorization. *Nihon kansei kogakukai ronbunshi* (Japanese Institutional Repositories Online), 10(3), 155-160.
- Wenden, A. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(4), 515-537.
- Wenden, A. (1986). Helping language learners think about learning. *ELT Journal*, 40(1), 3-12.

# Syntactic Nature and Semantic Effect of Dative Case in Japanese Takashi Kayashima (Seinan Gakuin University)

In this presentation, how dative Case functions syntactically and semantically in Japanese is explicated. A clue is found in potential sentences, which have irregular distribution of Case as follows.

- (1) a. Kodomo-ga hon-ga/o yom-er-u.
   child-NOM book-NOM/ACC read-Poss-Pres
   "A child can read a book."
  - b. Kodomo-ni hon-ga/\*o yom-er-u.
     child-DAT book-NOM/\*ACC read-Poss-Pres
     "A child can read a book."

As (1b) shows, we can mark a subject of a potential sentence as dative. In that case, an object cannot have accusative Case. A principled explanation to this fact is given in Ura (1999), according to which v in a potential sentence is idiosyncratic; it can assign dative Case to DP in its specifier, and it is not obligatory to assign accusative Case to a complement of V. Because of this nature of v, all the patterns shown in (1) are derived, including (1b) with an accusative object. This derivation does not converge because T cannot have its uninterpretable  $\varphi$ -feature checked since there is no DP with [u-Case] to agree with.

However, this explanation cannot capture the grammaticality of examples below.

(2)	a.	Boku-ni-*(ha)	kare-o	uragir-e-nai.
		I-DAT-*(Top)	he-ACC	betray-Poss-Neg
		"I cannot betray	y him."	
	b.	Kodomo-ni	Otona-o	taos-eru-ka?
		child-DAT	adult-ACC	beat-Poss-Q

"Can a child beat an adult?"

Since both (2a) and (2b) do not contain nominative marked argument, Ura's (1999) analysis expects that these sentences are ungrammatical because of unvalued  $\varphi$ -feature of T, which is not the case.

In this presentation, it is shown that the ungrammaticality of (1b) with an accusative object is reduced to failure of labeling. Saito (2014) claims that Japanese lacks  $\varphi$ -feature and it is problematic for labeling algorithm, which is proposed in Chomsky (2013). In his framework, some nodes are labeled with  $\varphi$ -feature. Then, if Japanese lacks  $\varphi$ -feature, how can these nodes labeled? Saito's (2014) answer is that grammatical Case in Japanese makes arguments invisible for labeling. This strategy makes it possible to label all the syntactic nodes in Japanese without  $\varphi$ -feature.

Now consider the structure of (1b) with an accusative object. The following example is helpful to clarify the syntactic position of the subject.

(3) John-ni-sika kono-mondai-o toke-nai-de iru.
 John-DAT-only this-quiz-ACC solve-Neg be-Pres
 "Only John has solved this quiz."

As discussed in Kishimoto (2013), *sika* in Japanese is negative polarity item, which must be licensed by negative head. Grammaticality of (3) shows that the subject is structurally below Neg. If a dative subject in a potential construction stays inside vP, the structure of (1b) with an accusative object is as follows.

(4) [TP [XP DP [v+R [RP DP R] v+R]] T]Here it is proposed that dative Case does not have function to make arguments invisible for labeling. XP in

(4) consists of two phrases and they do not share any feature, so XP is unlabeled and the derivation crashes. Then, how is this problem avoided in (2a) and (2b)? According to Suzuki (2017), which extends Diesing's (1992) Mapping Hypothesis, syntactic positions of arguments are differentiated depending on their interpretation as follows.

(5) 
$$[CP [TopP NP_{GEN}HA [FocP NP_{GEN}GA [TP NP_{GEN}GA [T', [vP NP GA [v', VP v]]]T_{GEN}]] C_{Topic/Focus} ]$$

A topic marked argument moves to [Spec, TopP] and a nominative marked argument which is given generic interpretation moves to [Spec, FocP]. Since the dative subject in (2a) has a topic marker *ha*, this argument is in [Spec, TopP]. And *kodomo* in (2b) is interpreted not as a child but a kind, which shows that this argument receives generic interpretation, so it is in [Spec, FocP]. Therefore, derivations of (2a, b) are as follows.

(6) a. 
$$[_{\text{Top, Top}} DP [_{\text{TopP}} [_{\text{TP}} [_{v+R} \frac{DP}{DP} [_{v+R} [_{RP} DP R] v+R]] T] Top]]$$

b. 
$$[F_{OC, Foc} DP [F_{OCP} [TP [v+R]] P [v+R [RP DP R] v+R]] T] Foc]]$$

Since subjects move out of vP in (6a) and (6b), the problem of labeling in (4) does not occur. The nodes where the subjects finally land are labeled with their shared feature, Top and Foc (cf. Rizzi (2015a)).

As an anonymous reviewer points out, (1b) with nominative Case would be predicted to be ungrammatical. A useful example to answer this question is as follows.

(7)	a.	*	Hon-ga	kodomo-ni	yom-er-u.
			book-NOM	child-DAT	read-Poss-Pres
			"A child can rea	ad a book."	
	h	Г	ז מתזזמת -		וודווס

b.  $[_{TP} DP[_{TP} [_{XP} DP [_{v+R} [_{RP} DP R]v+R]]T]]$ 

(7a) shows that we cannot alter the word order in (1b) with nominative object. This is because we cannot label XP in (7b) since the DP in [Spec, XP] has dative Case, which does not make a DP invisible for labeling algorithm. In (1b) with nominative object, the dative marked DP moves over nominative object, which is in [Spec, TP], to a position in left periphery. Labeling of the node which is a landing site of this DP is done with a discourse feature, which makes (1b) with nominative object grammatical.

Here, given that dative Case does not have a function to make a DP invisible for labeling algorithm, a question arises about importance of existence of dative Case in Japanese. Since it does not have syntactic effect, a possibility naturally pursued is that it has effect on interpretation. These properties are pursued comparing other dative marked arguments, such as thematic agent in causatives and passives.

## Selected References

Chomsky, Noam (2013) "Problem of Projection," Lingua 130, 33-49.

Kishimoto, Hideki (2013) "Verbal Complex Formation and Negation in Japanese," Linguia 135, 132-154.

Saito, Mamoru (2014a) "Case and labeling in a Language without φ-feature Agreement," *On Peripheries: Exploring Clause Initial and Clause Final Positions*, ed. by Anna Cardinaletti, Guglielmo Cinque and Yoshio Endo, 251-269, Hituzi Syobo Publishing, Tokyo.

Suzuki, Ayaka (2017) Zokuseijojutubun no togoteki imiteki bunseki (A syntactic and semantic analysis of property predication), doctoral dissertation, University of Tsukuba.

Ura, Hiroyuki (1999) "Checking Theory and Dative Subject Constructions in Japanese and Korean," Jurnal of East Asian Linguistics 8, 223-254.

## Notes on Reciprocals in Korean and Japanese Ellipsis

Mika Kizu, Notre Dame Seishin University Kazumi Yamada, Kwansei Gakuin University

Kim (1999) and Oku (1998) claim that the analysis of argument ellipsis (AE) applies equally in Japanese and Korean, as illustrated below:

(1)	a. Kuma-wa zibun-no kuruma-o fuita.	
	bear-Top self-Gen car-Acc wiped	'Bear wiped his own car.'
	b. Pengin-mo [e] fuita.	[ $$ strict reading, $$ sloppy reading]
	penguin-also wiped	'(lit.) Penguin also wiped [e].'
(2)	a. Kom-un caki-uy cha-lul takkassta	
	bear-Top self-Gen car-Acc wiped	'Bear wiped his own car.'
	b. Pengkwin-to [e] takkassta	[ $$ strict reading, $$ sloppy reading]
	penguin-also wiped	'(lit.) Penguin also wiped [e].'

The elided objects in both (1b) and (2b) are ambiguous in that they are interpreted either as 1) the strict identity reading (= Penguin also wiped Bear's car) or 2) the sloppy identity reading (= Penguin also wiped Penguin's car). The two languages seem to share the common property in their elliptical phenomena but they are not always identical. Saito and An (2010), for instance, points out that so-called N'-ellipsis is observed in Japanese but not in Korean due to slightly different parameterization of the genitive marker insertion rule.

This paper examines another micro-parametric difference between Korean and Japanese in relation to AE. When an elided object has a reciprocal pronoun as its antecedent in the preceding sentence, the interpretation of the missing object differs between the two languages. According to our informant work, reciprocal pronoun *selo* in Korean allows only a sloppy identity reading whereas Japanese reciprocal pronoun *otagai* observes both strict and sloppy identity readings.

Relevant examples are shown in (3) for Japanese and (4) for Korean respectively. In Japanese, the missing object in (3b) allows both strict and sloppy identity readings:

- (3) a. Harry to Ginny-wa otagai-o sonkeishiteiru.
   Harry and Ginny-Top each-other-Acc respect
   'Harry and Ginny respect each other.'
  - b. Ron to Hermione-wa [e] keibetsushiteiru.
    Ron and Hermione-Top despise [√ strict reading, √ sloppy reading]
    '(lit.) Ron and Hermione despise [e].' (Takahashi 2016, p. 245)

It is said that the possible interpretation in the elided object in (3b) is either 'Ron and Hermione despise Harry and Ginny' (i.e. strict identity reading) or 'Ron and Hermione despise each other

(i.e. sloppy identity reading).' Interestingly, however, the corresponding Korean missing object in (4b) obtains only the sloppy interpretation and its strict interpretation is constantly rejected by the Korean native speakers we consulted:

- (4) a. Chelswu-wa Younghi-nun selo-lul concwunghanta Chelswu and Younghi -Top each-other-Acc respect
   'Chelswu and Younghi respect each other.'
  - b. Tongsoo-wa Sooni-nun [e] silhehanta Tongsoo-and Sooni -Top despise

'(lit.) Tongsoo and Sooni despise [e].' [\* strict reading,  $\sqrt{\text{sloppy reading}}$ In theory, the strict identity reading can be made possible by either the *pro* hypothesis (Kuroda 1965, Hoji 1998) or the AE analysis with vehicle change (Fiengo and May 1994, Takahashi 2016). If the elided object would be *pro* in (3b)/(4b), it should be able to refer to 'Harry and Ginny' or 'Chelswu and Younghi' in the (a) sentences just like the overt counterpart such as *them*; however, this could explain only (3b) in Japanese but not (4b) in Korean.

The present paper argues that [e] in (3b)/(4b) is not *pro* referring to the antecedent in (3a)/(4a) but involves AE with vehicle change. The micro-parametric difference between (3b) and (4b) is concerned with the distinct internal structures of the reciprocals; unlike the reciprocal pronoun in Japanese, which is represented as [NP *pro* [N *otagai*]] (Hoji 2006), Korean *selo* does not contain such a pronominal property and hence, no 'tolerable mismatch' can be construed via vehicle change between the elided site and its antecedent (Hunter and Yoshida 2016). We will discuss how the AE analysis can account for (1) and (2), and present further empirical evidence to support our claim with some implications for research into second language acquisition.

### **Selected References**

Fiengo, R. and R. May. 1994. Indices and Identity. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Hoji, H. 2006. Otagai. In A. Ueyama, ed., *Theoretical and Empirical Studies of Reference and* Anaphora—Toward the establishment of generative grammar as an empirical science, a report of the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B), Kyushu University, pp. 126-138.
- Hunter, T. and M. Yoshida. 2016. A Restriction on 'Vehicle Change' and its Interaction with Movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 47 (3), 561-571.
- Saito, M. and D-H. An. 2010. A Comparative Syntax of Ellipsis in Japanese and Korean. In H. Maezawa and A. Yokogoshi, eds., *Proceedings of the 6<sup>th</sup> WAFL*, pp. 287-307.
- Takahashi, D. 2016. Ko-syoryaku (Argument Ellipsis). In K. Murasugi et. al, eds., Nihongo-bunpo Handbook: Gengo-riron to gengo-kakutoku no kanten kara (Japanese Grammar Handbook: from a viewpoint of linguistic theory and acquisition), Tokyo: Kaitakusha, pp.228-264.

## On the Semantics of the Japanese Degree Morpheme hoo

Kenta Mizutani Graduate Student, Osaka University

**Introduction:** Since Kennedy & McNally (2005), it has been pointed out that there have been various kinds of degree morphemes and modifiers. The aim of this paper is to argue that the Japanese morpheme *hoo*, which combines with gradable adjectives as in (1), is a degree morpheme in the sense of Kennedy (1999) and that this morpheme requires the existence of contextually determined standards.

**Observations**: This paper focuses on three observations about *hoo*. The first is the entailment pattern. (2a) and (2b) indicate that the sentence with *adjective-hoo* entails the sentence with the positive form of the adjective but not the sentence with the intensifier *totemo*. The second is the (in)compatibility of certain kinds of adjectives. As in (1) and (3), *hoo* is compatible with open scale adjectives such as *tall*, but incompatible with closed scale adjectives. The third is that *hoo* cannot appear in *yori*-comparatives as in (4).

**Entailment Pattern**. Following Kennedy (1999) I assume that a gradable adjective *g* is a measure function as in (5a) and it denotes a property of individuals by combining with the null degree morpheme *pos* in (5b). These assumptions derive the truth conditions of the example with the positive form of a gradable adjectives as in (5c), which require that the height of Taro should be greater than the contextually determined standard for tallness (=  $d_{s(se-ga takai)(c)}$ ). To capture the entailment pattern in (2), I adopt the semantics of *very* proposed by Svenonius & Kennedy (2006) and assume that the intensifier *totemo* has the same semantics. In (6a), the standard function  $d_{s(g)(c[{x | pos(g)(x)(c) = 1}])}$  indicates that the standard for *very g* is not calculated on the basis of ordinary individuals but on the basis of those which count as *pos g*. Hence, the standard is raised and the intensifying effect arises. Based on these assumptions, I propose that *hoo* has the denotation in (7a). This proposal derives the truth conditions of (1) as in (7b), according to which (1) is true in a context *c* iff the height of Taro is greater than the contextually determined standard for *tall* and is smaller than the standard for *very tall*. Hence, the entailment pattern in (2) is captured. In addition, the truth conditions capture our intuition that when we use the sentence *x is tall-hoo*, we do not regard *x* as particularly tall.

**Incompatibility with Closed Scale Adjectives**. The notable feature of closed scale adjectives is that they do not utilize contextual information but the endpoints of their scales to determine their standards. To capture this fact, Kennedy (2007) proposes (8) and (9). Under this analysis, closed scale adjectives, when they combine with *pos*, return the endpoints of their scales, because the scale structures are a part of their conventional meanings. Crucially, this is also true of the standard function  $d_{s(g)(c[{x | pos(g)(x)=1}])}$ , because (8) and (9) demand that the standards for closed scale adjectives be fixed to their endpoints regardless of contexts. Given these facts, *hoo*, if it combines with closed scale adjectives such as *bent*, leads to the truth conditions in (10), which require that the rod has the degree of bentness that is greater than and at the same time smaller than the scale's minimum endpoint. Clearly, this is impossible and the truth conditions are contradictory (i.e. always false). I argue that the incompatibility of *hoo* with closed scale adjectives is due to these contradictory truth conditions.

**Incompatibility with** *yori-comparatives*: Following Sawada & Grano (2011), I adopt the derived measure function analysis of *yori*. As shown in (11a) the morpheme takes a gradable adjective and returns a new gradable adjective whose scale structure is converted into the one with a derived minimum endpoint. In (11b), for example, *hanako yori se-ga takai* denotes a measure function whose minimum endpoint is Hanako's height. What is crucial here is the fact that a new gradable adjective is similar to a lower closed scale adjective in that both of them have a minimum endpoint. This new adjective combines with *hoo* to yield the truth conditions in (12). Again, given the interpretive economy, the standard functions in (7a) return the scale's endpoint, namely, Hanako's height. Hence, the truth conditions require that Taro's height is taller and at the same time smaller than Hanako's height. This is clearly impossible, resulting in the problematic contradictory truth condition. Hence, the unacceptability arises.

takaku-wa-nai.

high-TOP-NEG

- (1) Taro-wa se-ga takai-hoo-da. Taro-TOP height-NOM high-HOO-COP Taro is tall-*hoo*.
- (2) a. #Taro-wa se-ga takai-hoo-da-ga, se-ga Taro-TOP height-NOM high-*hoo*-COP-but height-NOM 'Taro is tall-*hoo* but not tall.'

b. Taro-wa se-ga takai-hoo-da-ga, totemo se-ga takaku-wa-nai.  
Taro-TOP height-NOM high-hoo-COP-but very height-NOM high-TOP-NEG  
'Taro is tall-hoo but not very tall.'  
(3) a. ??Kono sao-wa magat-teiru-hoo-da.  
this rod is but not very tall.'  
(4) \*?Kono sao-wa massugu-na-hoo-da.  
this rod is straight-hoo.' (Lower-closed Scale Adjectives: *straight*)  
c. ??Kono doa-wa ai-teiru-hoo-da.  
this doo:TOP open-TEIRU-hoo-COP  
'This rod is straight-hoo.' (Upper-closed Scale Adjectives: *straight*)  
c. ??Kono doa-wa ai-teiru-hoo-da.  
this doo:TOP open-TEIRU-hoo-COP  
'This door is open-hoo.' (Totally Closed Scale Adjectives: *apen*)  
(4) \*'Taro-wa Hanako-yori se-ga takai-hoo-da.  
this door.TOP open-TEIRU-hoo-COP  
'Taro is taller-hoo than Hanako.'  
(5) a. [*se-ga takai*]° = 
$$\lambda c.height(X)$$
 (*e*, *d*)  
b. [*gos*]° =  $\lambda g.\lambda x. g(x) > d_{u(geto)}$  ((*form*)°)  
= height(Taro) >  $\lambda_{(cega takai}]° = [pos]°([se-ga takai]°)([Taro]°)
= height(Taro) >  $\lambda_{(cega takai]}° = height(Taro) > d_{stalke(x] postalbox(c) = 1}))$   
(6) a. [*love*]" =  $\lambda g.\lambda x. g(x) > d_{u(get(x) | postalbox(c) = 1))}$   
(7) a. [*hoo*]" =  $\lambda g.\lambda x. g(x) > d_{u(get(x) | postalbox(c) = 1))}$   
(8) Interpretive Economy (Kennedy 2007:35)  
Maximize the contribution of the conventional meanings of the elements of a sentence to the computation of its truth conditions.  
(9)  
(9) [*Kono sao-wa magat-teitru-hoo-da*]"  
=  $d_{u(auble(x)} < beight(Taro) < d_{u(auble(x) | postalbox(x)) = 1))$   
= min(bent) < bentness(this.rod) < min(bent)  
=  $L(Contradiction)$   
(10) [*Hanako yori se-ga takai*] = [*yori*]([*Hanako*])([*se-ga takai*])  
=  $\lambda y.heighthoopb (tumako]'(y) (Sawada & Grano 2011:212)
b. [Hanako yori se-ga takai] = [yori]([Hanako])([se-ga takai])
=  $\lambda y.heighthoopb (tumako)^{*}(y) (Sawada & Grano 2011:212)
b. [Hanako yori se-ga takai] = [yori]([Hanako])([se-ga takai])
=  $\lambda y.heighthoopb (tumako)^{*}(y) (Sawada & Grano 2011:212)
b. [Hanako yori se-ga takai] = [yori]([Hanako])([se-ga takai])
=  $\lambda y.heighthoopb (tumako)^{*}(y) (Sawada$$$$$ 

**Selected References**: Kennedy, Christopher. 1999. Projecting the adjective: The syntax and semantics of gradability and comparison / Kennedy, Christopher. 2007. Vagueness and grammar: The semantics of relative and absolute gradable adjectives. Linguistics and Philosophy 30(1) / Kennedy, Christopher & Louise McNally. 2005. Scale structure, degree modification, and the semantics of gradable predicates. Language 81(2) / Sawada, Osamu & Thomas Grano. 2011. Scale structure, coercion, and the interpretation of measure phrases in Japanese. Natural Language Semantics 19(2)/ Svenonius, Peter & Christopher Kennedy. 2006. Northern Norwegian degree questions and the syntax of measurement. In Mara Frascarelli (ed.), Phases of Interpretation.

## Negative WH-Phrases in Japanese

Takeshi Oguro Chiba University of Commerce

WH-phrases are often treated on a par with existential quantifiers. This presentation shows that Japanese has instances of WH-phrases that function as Negative Concord Items (NCIs). They are found in the following kind of constructions, namely, *mono ka* rhetorical questions (MRQs), which are examined in detail by Oguro (2018).

MRQs, exemplified in (1a), have various properties that distinguish them from ordinary questions (OQs) such as (1b).

(1) a.	Dare-ga iku m	ono ka!	b.	Dare-ga	iku no?
	who-NOM go C	Q		who-NON	∕lgo C
	'No one will go!'	1		'Who will	go?'

For one thing, even though (1) contains a WH-phrase and the question particle ka, it does not have the usual information-seeking interpretation that (1b) allows, but it has the negative assertion interpretation. Thus, it would be awkward to respond to (1a) by saying (2), while this response is perfectly fine in the case of (1b).

(2) Iya, daremo.

no anyone

'No, not anyone.'

Another striking property is that they license strict negative sensitive items like *daremo* 'anyone', which are not allowed in non-negative OQs.

(3) a.	Daremo	iku mono	ka!	b.	*	Daremo	iku no	ka?
	anyone	go C	Q			anyone	go C	Q
	'No one w	ill go!'				'Will anyo	ne go?'	

These interpretative characteristics indicate that MRQs should be regarded as negative assertions rather than negatively biased questions.

Given that (1a) and (3a) have essentially the same meaning, it is expected that the WH-phrase in (1a) and *daremo* in (3a) share some kind of properties. Miyagawa, Nishioka, and Zeijlstra (2016) (MNZ, hereafter) argue that *daremo* is an NCI, whose crucial property is the ability to be in fragment answers. *Dare-ga* in (1a) arguably has this property as well. Note that (1a) can be used as a reply to (4a), in which case (1a) is interpreted as meaning 'I won't go!' rather than 'No one will go!', which is the literal interpretation. With this in mind, consider the dialogue in (4).

(4) a.	Kimi-wa i	ku no?	b.	Dare-ga!
	you-TOP g	go C		who-NOM
	'Will you go	o?'		'I won't!'

(4b), which only contains the WH-phrase, is fine as a reply to (4a), indicating the speaker's strong refusal to go. Since this special interpretation is unique to MRQs, (4b) must be an MRQ as well, with only the WH-subject being pronounced. This shows that the WH-subjects in MRQs are NCIs.

MNZ also observe that NCIs like *daremo* 'anyone' have the following characteristics. They can be inside vP, whose left edge can be shown by a manner adverb.

(5) Taroo-wa [vP umaku nanimo tukur]-anakat-ta. Taro-top skillfully anything make-NEG-PAST 'Taro did not make anything well.'

This property is not shared by the WH-phrases found in MRQs. According to Oguro (2018), the WH-object in an MRQ must be fronted. There is additional evidence that the WH-phrase in this construction must be raised. Kishimoto (2009) suggests that subjects marked with *kara* 'from' stay inside vP. Importantly, the WH-subject in an MRQ cannot be

marked with it.

(6) a.	John-kara ayamar-u	b.	*	Dare-kara ayamar-u	mono	ka!
	John-from apologize-PRES			who-from apologize-PRES	С	Q
	'John will apologize.'			'No one will apologize!' 'I	will not	apologize!'

Another property of items like *daremo* which is not shared by WH-phrases in MRQs has to do with multiple occurrences. Daremo and nanimo can occur with each other in a sentence, but *dare-ga* and *nani-o* fail to do so, irrespective of their ordering.

(7) a. Daremo nanimo kawa-nai/kau mono ka! anything buy-NEG/buy C anyone Q 'No one will buy anything!' b. \*{Nani-o} dare-ga {nani-o} kau mono ka! what-ACC who-NOM what-ACC С buy

'No one will buy anything!'

MNZ suggest that the effects found in (5) and (7a) come from the unfocused nature of these NCIs. Then it must be that the deviance detected in (6b) and (7b) shows that WH-phrases in MRQs are focused NCIs.

Q

A natural expectation is that these two NCIs can occur with each other in a sentence, but this is not borne out.

- mono ka! (8) a. \* Dare-ga nanimo kau who-NOM anything buy С Q 'No one will buy anything!' b. \*
  - Nani-o daremo kau mono ka! what-ACC anyone buy С Q 'No one will buy anything!'

I assume that daremo/nanimo and the WH-phrases are licensed in different ways. To be specific, I suggest that just as interrogative complementizers are divided into Yes/No complementizers (kadooka, ka) and the WH complementizer (ka), the ka in MRQs is divided into the one licensing daremo/nanimo and the one licensing the WH-phrases. The examples in (8) are degraded because the two types of NCIs cannot be licensed at the same time. This idea is motivated by MRQs involving the predicate -te tamaru 'can bear', which license *daremo/nanimo* but not *dare-ga*, which means that they have the former type of ka.

- (9) a. Boku-ga aitu-ni make-te tamaru mono ka! I-NOM that.guy-to lose-TE bear С Q 'I will not bear losing to that guy!'
  - b. ? Darenimo make-te tamaru mono ka! anvone lose-TE bear С 0 'I will not bear being defeated to anyone!'
  - \* Dare-ga aitu-ni make-te tamaru mono ka! c. who-NOM that.guy-to lose-TE bear C Q 'No one/I will not bear losing to that guy!'

Thus, WH-phrases in MRQs function as focused NCIs, which can be taken to mean WH-MRQs can be regarded as a subcase of negative preposing.

## **Selected References**

Kishimoto, Hideki. 2009. Topic Prominency in Japanese. The Linguistic Review 26(4): 465-513.

Miyagawa, Shigeru, Nobuaki Nishioka, and Hedde Zeijlstra. 2016. Negative Sensitive Items and the Discourse-Configurational Nature of Japanese. Glossa: a Journal of General *Linguistics* 1(1): 33. 1–28

Oguro, Takeshi. 2018. Properties of Mono Ka Rhetorical Questions. Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFL13). 193-204.

# Free Rule Ordering in There Constructions

Jun Omune (Kansai Gaidai University)

Consider the following typical *there* constructions:

(1) There \*is/are three men (in the room).

PGA (Probe-Goal Agree) by Chomsky (2001) explains why verbs agree with IA (internal argument) in *there* constructions. If we, following EOS (Epstein, Obata, and Seely) (2017), assume that PGA holds for the free-Merge model proposed by Chomsky (2015), then the derivation of the typical *there* construction is as follows:

- (2) *There are three men:* 
  - i. Merge forms  $\{C, \{\text{there, } \{T, \{v, \text{three men}\}\}\}\}$ .
  - ii. FI (feature inheritance): T inherits uPhi (unvalued Phi-set) from C.
  - iii. PGA: The inherited uPhi on T probes into *three men*.

As a result of PBA between T and *three men* in (2), the phonological realization of the agreement is instantiated at T. Thus, the *be*-verb is phonologically realized as *are*. However, verbs do not always inflect based on the agreement with IA in the list reading. The 'T-probing' PBA therefore fails to explain empirical phenomena such as (3).

(3) *List There Constructions:* 

Who is still here to do the work?

- a. There is/\*am/remains/\*remain only me.
- b. There is/are/remains/remain only us/John and Bill.

(adapted from Chomsky (2001: 149, fn. 90))

We argue that this problem is solved by adopting the free-rule-ordering system proposed by EOS (2017). They argued that FI and PGA apply 'freely in any order' because PGA needs to apply 'before FI' in the typical transitive structure (4) by Chomsky (2015). If FI applies before PGA, PGA fails, since no possible goal exits (see (4(1-2))). Thus, not T but C probes into the external argument (see (4(1-2))):



Note that *John* internally merges with (i.e. moves to) SPEC-T, and **John** is the lower copy, which is by definition invisible. We propose that the latter rule ordering  $\square - 2$  holds for the list *there* construction.

- (5) There is/are only John and Bill:
  - i. Merge forms  $\{C, \{there, \{T, \{v, John and Bill\}\}\}\}$ .
  - ii. PGA: The uPhi of C first probes into *there*, which bears 'only 3rd-person' (see Richards and Biberauer (2005)), and then *John and Bill*.
  - iii. FI: T inherits vPhi (valued Phi-set) from C.

In (5ii), the uPhi of C agrees with the two phi-sets: it first probes into the 3rd-person of *there* because *there* is the closest phi-bearer, and further probes into the full Phi-set of *John and Bill* to maximize matching effects (see Chomsky (2001)). If externalization (i.e. mapping of syntax-phonology) utilizes the information of the agreement between C and *there*, T is phonologically realized as the 'default form *is*' due to the '3rd-person' of *three*. If externalization utilizes the agreement information between T and *John and Bill*, T is realized as *are*. This matches with the fact in (3b). In (3a), externalization exploits the agreement data between uPhi and *there*, and the verbs are realized as *is* and *remains*. It is the null hypothesis that all agreement data (i.e. T-*there* and T-IA) are available to externalization. Therefore, *am* and *remain* in (3a) should be the valid realization, but they are not. Why not? This is because externalization does not regard the 'first-person singular' as a legible agreement pair for the expletive *there*; the contraction of *there* and *am* (i.e. *there'm*) is impossible.

Consider the following construction:

(6) There <sup>(\*)</sup>seems/seem to be some men in the garden.

It has been assumed that *seem* is only the acceptable choice in this sentence, since the matrix T agrees with the IA *some men*. Kallulli (2008: 286), however, pointed out that *seems* in (6) is acceptable, and five native speakers also judged *seems* acceptable in the survey by the author. Consider the structure of (6):



*there* first externally merges with SPEC-T<sub>to</sub> and then internally merges with SPEC-T before C is introduced (because Merge applies strict-cyclically in Chomsky (2015)). If FI first occurs and then PGA, the uPhi inherited by T agrees with *some men* alone because the lower copy **there** is invisible. Accordingly, the speakers using this rule order (1-2) judge *seems* unacceptable in (6). However, if PGA first occurs, the uPhi on C agrees with the closest phi-bearer *there* first and *some men* second. The subsequent FI makes T inherit the 'valued' Phi from C. The speakers using this rule order (1-2) judge both *seems* and *seem* acceptable in (6). Therefore, the (un)acceptability of *seems* in (6) is explained by the difference of rule ordering.

#### Selected References

- Chomsky, Noam (2001) "Derivation by Phase," *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1–52, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Chomsky, Noam (2015) "Problems of Projection: Extensions," *Structures, Strategies and Beyond: Studies in Honour of Adriana Belletti*, ed. by Elisa Di Domenico, Cornelia Hamann, and Simona Matteini, 3–16, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Epstein, Samuel D., Miki Obata, and T. Daniel Seely (2017) "Is Linguistic Variation Entirely Linguistic?," *Linguistic Analysis* 41, 481–516.

Kallulli, Dalina (2008) "There Is Secondary Predication in There-Existentials," WCCFL 26, 279–287.

Richards, Marc and Theresa Biberauer (2005) "Explaining Expl," *The Function of Function Words and Functional Categories*, ed. by Marcel den Dikken and Christina M. Tortora, 115–153, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

## A Case Study in *Monadic Concepts*: Comparative Constructions Norio Suzuki Kobe Shinwa Women's University (former professor)

This paper is a case study in *monadic concept* MC construction (Pietroski/P2011, 2012, 2018) for "comparative constructions CCs." MCs appear in P's *Minimal Semantic Instructions* MSI framework exploring basic operations of human language syntax-semantics (Hornstein& Pietroski/H&P2009), where "phrasal meanings are instructions for how to build conjunctive monadic concepts" (P2012). Minimal syntax-semantics is obtained via (complex) MC construction (with some dyadic resources) by means of conjunction. MCs will be seen derived for 'argument structure' & 'quantification.' We then move on to CCs.

*MC* Examples & Some Assumptions See MCs for a verb & *every* for 'argument structure' & 'quantification' respectively (E for *events* & ∃ for *existential closure;* P2012):

- (1) "... lexicalizers *abstract* the MC STAB (E) from the relational concept STAB (x, y) or STAB (x, y, E), by drawing on thematic concepts: STAB (x, y) = ∃E [STAB (x, y, E)]; STAB (x, y, E) = AGENT (E, x) & STAB (E) & PATIENT (E, y). Think of these biconditionals as providing a contextual definition CD of STAB (E)" (H&P2009)
- (2) a. "If 'every' (which lexicalizes a quantificational concept) can take a predicate of individuals as its internal argument IArg & a predicate of truth values as its external argument EArg, then 'every' is satisfied by things that have individuals as their internal participants IPs & truth values as their external participants EPs." (H&P2009)
  - b. i) Every spy is wearing a hat.
     (P2018; Q for *quantifiers*, MAX6/MAX3/MAX∞ NS)
    - ii) EVERY (Q)  $\land \exists Q$  [INTERNAL (Q, X)  $\land MAX: A-SPY (X)$ ]

 $\land \exists q [EXTERNAL (q, x) \land MAX6/MAX3/MAX_{\infty}: IS-WEARING-A-HAT (x)]$ 

The MC EVERY (Q) applies to some ordered pairs if & onlyif they meet three conditions: each of their IPs is one of their EPs; their IPs are the spies; & their EPs are the things wearing a hat. The concept MAX: $\Phi()$  applies to some things if & onlyif they are (all & only) *the* things to which  $\Phi()$  applies (P2018). EVERY () applies to both the six ordered pairs: <1, 1>; <2, 1>; <3, 3>; <4, 3>; <5, 5>; <6, 5> (three IPs, 1, 3, & 5, being the spies, & six EPs, 1-6, the people wearing hats) & the three ordered pairs: <1, 5>; <3, 3>; <5, 1> (the numbers of IPs & EPs being the same) (P2018). Then (2bii with MAX3) is a CD of EVERY (Q) for the latter 'three ordered pairs' case, with a CD of EVERY (Q) for the other, former 'six ordered pairs' case shown in (2bii with MAX6). Some implicature (e.g., Grice's maxim of Quantity: "Do not make your contribution more informative than is required") urges you to choose (2bii with MAX3) as the CD of EVERY (Q) for (2bi). Even in the 'six ordered pairs' case, the CD of EVERY (Q) in (2bii with MAX3) appears to be preferred over (2bii with MAX6). As for (2bii with MAX $\infty$ ), see H&P2009 for "... the external/sentential argument does not, ..., specify a second set."

**Comparative Constructions** Move on to the MC -ER (D) (D for *degrees* — NS) for comparatives. See the comparative (3a) with structure (3b) involving *-er* as 'head' of the CC taking two arguments:

(3) a. Mary is taller *than John is*.

b. [[ -er [than John is]] [Mary is tall]] (Hohaus, Tiemann&Beck/HTB2014)
In (3) John is is IArg of -er creating a set of degrees specifying all the gradable stages of John's tallness, while EArg Mary is tall... may allow of two possibilities: (4 with MAXMARY & MAX<sub>∞</sub>; also H&P2009):

(4) -ER (D)  $\wedge$  [than  $\wedge$   $\exists$ D [INTERNAL (D, x)  $\wedge$  [MAX: TALL (x)  $\wedge$  JOHN (x)]]]

 $\land$   $\exists D [EXTERNAL (D, x) \land [MAXMARY/MAX_{\infty}: TALL (x) \land MARY (x)]]$ 

In (4 with MAXMARY), a CD of -ER (D) is given for both the degrees of tallness of IPs & EPs being (all&only) the things to which 'TALL (\_)' applies, with IArg & EArg creating a set of degrees. In (4 with MAX $\infty$ ) EArg does not specify a set. -ER (D) applies to three similar contexts: (i) both IArg & EArg create a set of degrees of tallness (4 with MAXMARY), with "the set of degrees d such that Mary is d tall properly including the set of degrees d such that John is d tall:  $\lambda d$ . Mary is d tall  $\supset \lambda d$ . John is d tall" (Aloni&Roelofsen2014); (ii) there are some degrees of EP's tallness surpassing the set of all such degrees of IP's tallness (my interpretation; (4 with MAXMARY/MAX $\infty$ )); & (iii) the maximal height degree that Mary reaches is more than the maximal degree of height that John reaches: max ( $\lambda d$ . Mary is d-tall) > max ( $\lambda d$ '. John is d'-tall) (HTB2014; (4 with MAXMARY/MAX $\infty$ )). See a Japanese CC (5) with no syntactic degree operators:

- (5) a. Sally wa *Joe* yori kasikoi.
  Sally TOP Joe *yori/*than smart
  'Compared to Joe, Sally is smarter./Sally is smarter than Joe.' (HTB2014)
  - b. *YORI* (D)  $\land$   $\exists$ D [INTERNAL (D, x)  $\land$  [MAX: SMART (x)  $\land$  JOE (x)]]  $\land$   $\exists$ D [EXTERNAL (D, x)  $\land$  [MAXsally/MAX $\infty$ : SMART (x)  $\land$  SALLY (x)]]

The comparison word *yori* (than), constructed as the MC *YORI* (D) with its two CDs in (5b with MAXsALLy/MAX $\infty$ ), serves as 'head' of the CC in Japanese.

## Selected References

Aloni & Roelofsen. 2014. Indefinites in comparatives. Natural Language Semantics 22.

Hohaus, Tiemann, & Beck. 2014. Acquisition of comparison constructions. Language Acquisition 21.

Hornstein & Pietroski. 2009. Basic operations: Minimal syntax-semantics. Catalan J of L 8.

- Pietroski. 2011. Minimal semantic instructions. In The OxfordHB of linguistic minimalism. Oxford UP.
- Pietroski. 2012. Language and conceptual reanalysis. In *Towards a biolinguistic understanding of grammar*. John Benjamins.

Pietroski. 2018. Conjoining meanings. Oxford UP.

## On part-whole relations expressed by partitive and A out of B constructions

## Hideki Tanaka / Yokohama National University

What Jackendoff (1977) calls the true partitive (A *of* B) may express a groupmember relation, e.g. *two of the books I read*, where *two* denotes a subset of the main set denoted by *the books I read*. On the other hand, the A *out of* B construction may express either a ratio or a proportion (a kind of group-member relation). For instance, *two out of five books* has a proportional reading when *five books* denotes the main set; otherwise, a ratio reading occurs. This paper will claim that there are at least two subtypes of (true) partitives, one of which is semantically close to A *out of* B. If this analysis is correct, putative counterexamples to the so-called Partitive Constraint will have reasonable explanations. For ease of reference, let us refer to the N(P) in the A slot of A *of* B and A *out of* B as N(P)<sub>1</sub> and the one in the B slot as N(P)<sub>2</sub>.

Quirk et al. (1985) observe the contrastive behavior of partitives and the A *out of* B construction. Whereas A *out of* B can have an indefinite NP<sub>2</sub>, partitives cannot.

(1) a. Ten out of fourteen women were single. (Quirk et al. 1985:1287)

b.?\*Ten of fourteen women were single. (ibid.)

The ban on indefinite NP<sub>2</sub>s of partitives is known as the Partitive Constraint, according to which partitives should contain either demonstratives (including a definite article) or genitive specifiers in the NP<sub>2</sub> (cf. Jackendoff 1977:113). Notice that (1a) is acceptable, even with the proportional (or group-member) reading. In other words, what is crucial for the A *out of* B construction is whether two cardinals occur in the A and B slots rather than whether the NP<sub>2</sub> denotes a main set. This idea is borne out by the fact that proportional quantifiers such as *all* and *most* cannot occur in A *out of* B.

(2) \*{All / Most} out of fourteen women were single.

Proportional quantifiers can occur in partitives, as in {*all / most*} *of the fourteen women*. This is another sharp contrast between partitives and the A *out of* B construction.

These two constructions, however, do not always contrast each other. They are semantically close in the following pair of sentences:

- (3) a. This is only one instance out of many. (Kenkyusha's J-E Dictionary<sup>6</sup>)
  - b. This is only one of many instances of the breadth of Marryat's view.

## (BNCweb, EC8 373)

The A *out of* B in (3a) seems to denote a proportion rather than a ratio because it makes sense to talk about the size of the main set. The partitive in (3b) should denote a group-member relation; however, it does not satisfy the Partitive Constraint because it contains

an indefinite NP<sub>2</sub>. Indeed, similar examples have been pointed out in the literature.

(4) a. Only one of many applicants passed the test. (Reed 1989: 421)

b. This is one of a number of counterexamples to the PC. (Ladusaw 1982: 420) The partitives in these examples have an indefinite NP<sub>2</sub> with an indeterminate cardinal. Interestingly, if these cardinals are replaced with determinate ones like *ten*, the resulting phrases are unacceptable (e.g. \**only one of ten applicants*). This fact will be explained if we assume that the partitives in (3b) and (4) bear the semantic function of the A *out of* B construction. In other words, instead of denoting a group-member relation in the way ordinary partitives do, these partitives denote a "vague" proportion on which a determinate main set is not required. The point is that the denominator is expressed in such a way that it emphasizes the size of the set of the N(P)<sub>1</sub>. The following table describes the semantic relationship between A *of* B and A *out of* B:

Form	Relation bet. A & B	NP <sub>2</sub> element	Example
A of D	group-member	definite article	one of the (ten) applicants
A UJ D	vogue properties	aardinal quantifiar	one of many applicants
A out of D	vague proportion	cardinai quantifier	one out of many applicants
A out of B	ratio / proportion	cardinal number	one out of ten applicants

An important question is: What is the difference between *one of the many applicants* and *one of many applicants*? The answer is that the latter, unlike the former, does not require a main set to be introduced in previous discourse (and thus it is not subject to the Partitive Constraint); instead, the special use of partitives denotes that there are more individuals (save the one expressed by the NP<sub>1</sub>). It should be noted, however, that the partitive subtype and A *out of* B are not identical with respect to the status of the NP<sub>2</sub>. This is indicated by the fact of fronting the *of*-NP<sub>2</sub>.

(5) a. Out of many applicants, only one passed the test.

b. \* Of many applicants, only one passed the test.

(5b) becomes acceptable if the preposed *of*-phrase is changed to be definite, as in *Of the many applicants,* .... While A *out of* B compares the quantitative amounts between the NP<sub>1</sub> and the NP<sub>2</sub>, the special use of partitives employs the NP<sub>2</sub> to denote an indeterminate number and implies the existence of other individuals related to the NP<sub>1</sub>.

**References:** Jackendoff, R. (1977) *X-bar syntax*, MIT Press/ Ladusaw, W. (1982) "Semantic constraints on the English partitive construction," *WCCFL* 1, 231-242/ Quirk, R. et al. (1985) *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*, Longman/ Reed, A. (1989) "Discourse groups and semantic groups," *Proceedings of the fifth eastern states conference on linguistics*, 416-427. How people understand each other in interaction using figurative language: Comparing Japanese and English task-based dialogues

Midori Tanimura	Koichiro Nakamoto	Etsuko Yosida
Kyoto University of Foreign Studies	Yamanashi University	Mie University

## Abstract

Figurative language such as metaphor and simile can be used to convey meaning quickly and effectively, as many are commonly used in everyday life (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Lakoff 1987). According to Kövecses (2002), metaphor is used when one thing is compared to another (e.g. That young man is a lion.). In this case, the young man's courage or aggressiveness is compared to behavior of a lion. Simile, on the other hand, is used when two unlike entities are compared, signaled by the expressions starting like or as. Those previous studies have carefully analyzed mechanisms of how figurative language is used in many situations. However, it is unclear how these metaphors and similes are used in interactions where participants jointly act to mutually understand each other. In particular, no studies seem to shed a light on comparison between native Japanese speaker to native Japanese speaker (NJS-NJS) and native English speaker and native English speaker (NES-NES) dialogues. This paper explores how figurative language is integrated in both English and Japanese task-based dialogues to achieve mutual understanding.

We video-recorded task-based dialogues from five pairs of native Japanese speakers (NJS) and five pairs of native English speakers (NES). We used Clark and Krych's (2004) Lego task, where one of the pair (the builder) assembled the Lego blocks based on instruction from the other (the director). The total number of trials for each pair was twenty, and the total recording hours were approximately ten hours for all pairs in the study. As for figurative language, we looked at the following expressions: in English, *like, kind of*, and *kind*, and in Japanese, *-mitai, -teki, -katachi, -poi,* and *-nakanji*, as well as other metaphorical expressions.

The analysis of video-recordings showed three key points. First, when the NESs described prototype shapes of Lego blocks, they used figurative language as a resource to solve each particular problem. For example, they used letters of the alphabet (e.g. *T*, *V* and *U*), artifacts (e.g. *sitting in it, like a chair, looks like stairs, zigzag*), buildings or landmarks (e. g. *like making a central tower, like a small pyramid*) and some others (e.g. *snake, looks like two mushrooms, like a teetertototterish shape*). NJS also used figurative language such as *furansu no kokki mitai ni [like a French flag*], *totemu po-ru teki na [like like two mushrooms]* 

*a totem pole*], *hashi poi [kind of a bridge], kaidan mitai na [like a stair*]. These results indicate both NESs and NJSs assume that the resources they use are mutually identifiable to each other.

Second, though both NESs and NJSs used figurative language as the resources for accomplishing their mutual understanding, frequencies were quite different. As table 1 shows, it was revealed that both simile and metaphor were used more frequently in English task-based dialogues than in Japanese ones. Different frequency in Japanese and English implies that English relies heavily on this kind of structure for clarify of communication.

	Simile	Metaphor
Japanese dialogues	16	8
English dialogues	62	47

Table 1. Frequencies of simile and metaphor in NJS-NJS and NES-NES dialogues

Thirdly, figurative language is used by both the director and the builder as a joint action to accomplish mutual understanding. In particular, both similes and metaphors are used as communication repair strategies for smooth conversation. In the example below, the conversants used varied expressions to confirm understanding.

(1) Excerpt from a pair of NESs

D: And so that it joins out the green and the yellow.

B: And it looks *like an L*?

D: Yep. And then you take a little red one and make it no longer *an L*.

B: Okay. (hhh) (Note: D, director and B, builder)

The dialogue data interestingly showed that the NES and NJS pair used different referents. For example, the NES pair used the letter "L" as a referent, while the NJS pair used the katakana "ko." This is backed up by Clark's (1996) idea of communal common ground: people in the same community generally can understand each other's language.

In sum, we compared Japanese and English task-based dialogues. The study reveals that co-constructing builds mutual understanding; By looking at the dialogues, we can see that although the NES pairs and NJS pairs use different expressions, they are effectively communicating and mutually understanding through the use of metaphoric language (along with other strategies). This result indicates the emergent use of figurative language is based on items in the environment of our life which results in unique forms of languages in both English and Japanese, which may be supported by situated actions (Suchman, 1985).

# Assimilation of words or assimilation of the word-formation pattern? A case study of analytical N+N compounds in Russian

## Elizaveta Tarasova

#### **IPU New Zealand**

## Abstract

One of the obvious consequences of language contact relates to changes in the vocabulary of languages under the influence of lexical borrowing. Changes in morphology and syntax that are induced by language contact are not so common, and hence interesting for investigation. Recent studies on the word-formation processes in contemporary Russian (e.g. Janurik 2010, Marinova 2008, Patton 1999) claim that a large number of borrowings from English in the last three decades have triggered a rapid development of analytical tendencies, with the growing productivity of the English N+N compound pattern being reported as an example of that. In English N+N compounds, the first noun has no formal markers indicating grammatical or semantic relations between the elements of the compound, e.g. baby oil, coffee pot, sea salt, etc. Russian equivalents of English N+Ns follow the same pattern, which is not surprising because most of such compounds are partially assimilated loanwords, e.g. top-menedžer 'top-manager', prezident-salon 'president-salon'. At the same time, novel analytical N+N formations that originated in Russian (and do not exist in English) appear every day. Such sequences may be comprised of two borrowed words, e.g. biznes-ledi 'business lady' (business woman), or of one borrowed word and one Russian word (in either the head or the modifier position), e.g. Suvenir-Grad 'Souvenir City', kvass-meiker 'kvassmaker'. Some recent publications (e.g. Kapatsinski & Vakareliyska 2013) also comment on cases where two Russian words that were not borrowed (or at least are not recent borrowings) are involved into the formation of N+N analytical units, e.g. *babushka-otbojnik* 'car bumper' (lit. 'grandma car-bumper'), gopstop-komitet 'street-robber gang' (lit. 'thug-stop committee').

This trend is interesting because N+N compounding in Russian (and other Slavic languages) is by far less robust compared to English. The most frequently occurring type of nominal compounds in Russian is represented by the "classic" pattern  $N_{STEM}$  + LV + N, e.g. *khlebozavod* 'bread + LV + plant' (bread-making plant) or by sequences in which the first element is clipped, aka "stump compounds", e.g. *sportploščadka* 'sports grounds'. The limited range of nominal compounding is compensated for by compounds in which the first

element is represented by a relational adjective (see Ohnheiser 2019 for discussion), e.g. *knižnij magazin* 'book store', *železnaja doroga* 'railway' (lit. 'iron road').

The aim of this study is to analyse the current trends associated with the N+N pattern in Russian in order to examine how changes in the vocabulary of the language may affect its morphology. In particular, the analysis focuses on the processes involved in assimilation (or lack of assimilation) of N+N loans to see how they impact the Russian word-formation system. The descriptive and construction grammar approaches are used for the analysis of the corpus of Russian analytical N+N compounds collected from the Russian National Corpus (2003-2018), and Russian media websites. Krysin's (1975) framework is applied for the analysis of the assimilation of English N+N compounds in Russian.

The results of the study suggest that the N+N analytical pattern is applied as one of the possible routes for assimilation of loans that comprise borrowed N+N compounds in the new linguistic environment in order to compensate for their low derivational activity in contemporary Russian. The strong association of the N+N analytical pattern with English (and hence Western lifestyle and culture) promotes further development of the pattern and its use with original Russian words to create novel combined concepts.

## **References:**

- Janurik, S. (2010). The integration of English loanwords in Russian: An overview of recent borrowings. *Studia Slavica Hungarica*, *55*, 45–65.
- Kapatsinski, V. & Vakareliyska, C.M. (2013). [N[N]] compounds in Russian. A growing family of constructions. *Constructions and Frames*, 5, 69–87.
- Krysin, L. (1975). Stupeni morfemnoi chlenimosti inoyazychnyh slov. [Stages of morphemic analyzability of foreign words.] In E. Zemskaya (ed.), *Razvitie sovremennogo russkogo yazyka*. *Slovoobrazovanie*. *Chlenimost' slova*, 227–231. Moscow: Prosveshchenie.
- Marinova, E. V. (2008). Inoyazyčnye slova v sovremennoj russkoj reči konca XX načala XXI vv. [Borrowed words in the modern Russian language (end of the 20<sup>th</sup> – beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> centuries)]. Moscow: Ellipsis.
- Marinova, E. V. (2010). Vopros ob analitičeskix prilagatel'nyx v otečestvennoj i zarubežnoj lingvistike. [The issue of analytical adjectives in Russian and foreign linguistics.] *Vestnik Nižegorodskogo Universiteta im. Lobačevskogo*, *4*, 628–30.
- Ohnheiser, I. (2019). Compounds and multi-word expressions in Russian. In B. Schlücker (ed.), *Complex Lexical Units: Compounds and Multi-Word Expressions*, 251–278. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Patton, D. P. (1999). Analytism in modern Russian: A study of the spread of non-agreement in noun phrases. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Ohio State University.
- Russian National Corpus. (2003-2018). Retrieved from: www.ruscorpora.ru

#### Diachronic changes in expressions of perception in the English grammar

Junichi Toyota Osaka City University

One may assume that perception is expressed by certain verbs such as see, hear, feel, etc. It is true that these verbs refer straightforwardly to perception, and this is referred to here as lexical perception. However, there have been other means of referring to perception denoted by specific constructions. These are termed structural perception. This paper analyses how structural perception has changed over time in the history of English and argues that changes in structural perception signify a vital piece of evidence concerning key issues in the formation of the Present-Day English grammar, particularly transitivity. Note that perception is used here in a broad sense, including sensations of happiness, disappointment, enthusiasm, thinking, etc., and not merely for visual or aural sensation.

Structural perception in earlier English involves an involuntary stimulus and its recipient, and the recipient of the stimulus used to be expressed as a grammatical object in the dative case. The type of verb this involves is known as an impersonal verb, as exemplified in (1). There were about 40 verbs classified as impersonal verbs in older English, and they were not productive. In addition, during its development English borrowed some similar verbs from Old French and Scandinavian languages (Bauer 1998: 112; Pocheptsov 1997). What is typical about impersonal verbs is the marked case marking, and that the experiencer is expressed with the dative (deodne in (1), as opposed to the nominative form deoden) and the stimulus with the genitive case (i.e.  $\beta \alpha s$  'that' in (1)). These verbs either disappeared from the language or changed into a non-impersonal construction. Note that impersonal verbs, unlike earlier English, can be productive in other Indo-European languages, such as Slavic languages, by altering case marking on the experiencer, e.g. Serbian as in (2b). Notice that spavati 'sleep' is not even remotely related to perception (i.e. (2a)).

Old English

- (1)
- Mæg bæs bonne ofbyncan ðeodne Heaðobeardna may that.GEN then displease.INF lord.DAT Heathobards.GEN 'The lord of the Heathobards will be displeased.' (Beo 2032)
  - Serbian
- (2)a. *Ja* spavam I.NOM sleep.PRS.1SG 'I sleep.' (i.e. 'I go to bed.') b. Meni se spava I.DAT REF sleep.PRS.3SG 'I feel sleepy.'

When the impersonal verbs were disappearing, yet another structure emerged, known as the adjectival passive. Constructions such as I am surprised at the noise are rarely associated with perception. However, in spite of its similarity to the passive, semantic characteristics of the adjectival passive differ considerably from those of the passive (Toyota 2008), and it can be considered a structural perception. Verbs such as *amaze*, interest, satisfy, etc. are now almost exclusively used in the adjectival passive and their appearance in the active voice is rare (Toyota 2013). A clear difference between impersonal verbs and the adjectival passive is how the subject is expressed, i.e. a syntactic subject with an impersonal verb is the outer stimulus, but it is the experiencer with an adjectival passive construction. It is possible to argue that the adjectival passive came into existence in order to fulfil the expression of perception with a human syntactic subject, and its marginal use in the active voice is a sign that the adjectival passive can be considered a fluid ergative system, i.e. ergativity is found according to the semantic contents of verbs.

What should be noticed in the course of historical changes of English is the emergence of syntactic transitivity (cf. Toyota 2009, 2012). Syntactic transitivity expresses energy transfer based on its syntactic structure, and the subject is automatically considered an actor and the direct object an undergoer. Therefore, the presence of the direct object guarantees that the whole clause is transitive, regardless of the semantic contents of the verb (cf. Taylor 2003). This line of change concerning transitivity posed a challenge for perception verbs, and this point has been rather neglected in previous historical studies of English. Perception verbs, as realised in the adjectival passive, have indeed been grammatically marginalised as syntactic transitivity has become established, and it is estimated that all perception verbs have a human experiencer acting as a grammatical subject, neglecting earlier semantic characteristics of the recipient of a stimulus. Therefore, marginalisation (i.e. fluid ergativity) is visible since the grammar is in flux, developing into a generally syntax-oriented organisation.

### References

- Bauer, B. L. M. (1998). 'Impersonal verbs in Italic: their development from an Indo-European perspective.' *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 26, 91-120.
- Pocheptsov, G. G. (1997). 'Quasi-impersonal verbs in Old and Middle English.' In Fišiak, J. (ed.) *Studies in Middle English Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 469-488.
- Taylor, J. R. (2003). Cognitive Grammar. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Toyota, J. (2008). Diachronic Change in the English Passive. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Toyota, J. (2009). 'Passive as an indicator of alignment change: in terms of transitivity.' *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik, spezial issue The passive in Germanic languages,* 41-52.
- Toyota, J. (2012). 'Dialect mixing as a language contact in the history of English.' In Trušník, R. et al. (eds) *Theories and Practice: Proceedings of the third international conference on Anglophone Studies*. Zlín, Tomas Bata University, 95-110.
- Toyota, J. (2013). 'On so-called adjective passive in English.' *Belgrade English language and literature studies* 5, 11-48.

# Comparisons and speech acts in Japanese exclamatives.

Akitaka Yamada, Georgetown University (ay314@georgetown.edu)

**Introduction.** The interrogative sentence in (1)a and the exlcamative sentence in (1)b look alike, nevertheless achieving a different speech act. The purpose of this talk is to analyze how these effects are derived from the meaning of their constituents.

- a. Ano suimasen. Are-wa nomiya de-wa/zya ari-mas-en-ka?
   uhm excuse me that-TOP bar COP-FOC be-HONA-NEG-Q
   Uhm, excuse me. Isn't that a bar? Interrogative
  - b. *Nantekottai. Are-wa nomiya* **de-wa/zya ari-mas-en**-ka! Oh boy that-TOP bar COP-FOC be-HONA-NEG-Q Oh boy! That is a bar (e.g., not a restaurant)! Exclamative

**Data.** There are two differences between (1)a and (1)b. First, they differ in the pitch accent on -ka; (1)a has a rising pitch and (1)b has a falling pitch. Second, in interrogatives, -ka must be used with an addressee-honorific marker (AHON) (Miyagawa 2012, 2017), while exclamative sentences are licit without an AHON.

(2)	a.	Ano	suimasen.	*Are-wa	nomiya	de-wa/zya	<b>nai</b> -ka?	
		uhm	excuse me	that-TOP	bar	COP-FOC	NEG-Q	
		Uhm	, excuse me	. Isn't that	a bar? (i	intended)		Interrogative

b. Arama. Are-wa nomiya de-wa/zya nai-ka!
Oh boy that-TOP bar COP-FOC NEG-Q
Oh boy! That is a bar (not a restaurant)!

Oh boy! That is a bar (not a restaurant)! Exclamative

There also exist some similarities as well. First, they have a doxastic bias. In both (1)a and (1)b, the speaker has some evidence to believe that p (= *it is a bar*) is true, while, in (1)a, the speaker knows that  $\neg p$  is true. Second, two opposing propositions p and  $\neg p$  are compared in a certain way. As for (1)a, though the speaker believes p is likely, the speaker is not sure about his conclusion. He is still comparing p or  $\neg p$ . As for (1)b, what he had been assuming was  $\neg p$ . But now, he realizes that p is true; i.e., there is a discrepancy between what he had believed (=  $\neg p$ ) and what he is believing (= p).

Claim 1 (Partition in the proposition set). Based on the above observations, I propose the following analysis. First, the focus particle *-wa* in *-de-wa/zya* creates the high-pitch boosting, responsible for creating the alternative set. In (1)a and (1)b, the focus is put on *nomiya* 'bar,' creating a set of type *et* objects, i.e., candidates for dinner-eating places:  $D'_{et} = \{\text{restaurant, cafeteria, .....}\} \subset D_{et}$ .

Second, based on this set, the negation marker *nai/en* creates two opposing sets of propositions, as illustrated by  $S^1$  and  $S^2$  in (3) and (4) (clearly,  $S^1 \cup S^2 = S$ ,  $S^1 \cap S^2 = \emptyset$ ; the negation creates a partition in S).

- (3)  $S^1 = \{p : \exists f \in D' \setminus \{bar\}, p = f(that)\} = \{that is a restaurant, that is a cafeteria, ...\}$
- (4)  $S^2 = \{p : \exists f \in \{bar\}, p = f(this)\} = \{that is a bar\}$
- (5)  $S = \{p : \exists f \in D'. p = f(\text{that})\} = \{\text{that is a restaurant, that is a cafeteria, that is a bar, ...}\}$

Third, these partitioned sets are related to the speaker's modal backgrounds and the clause type determines which background to choose.

**Claim 2 (Dialogue feature).** The interrogative needs addressee-honorific markers to create an information-seeking question. To capture this, Miyagawa (2012, 2017) proposes (i) that *-ka* has a SYNTACTIC requirement that it be selected and (ii) that *-mas* head-moves to the Speech Act projection so it can select *-ka*. However, his analysis would not work for the exclamative because the same morpheme *-ka* is licit without *-mas* (unless we admit the polysemy for *-ka*; the one which needs to be selected and the other that has no such restriction, which seems to make the theory more complicated than necessary). In the spirit of DY-NAMIC PRAGMATICS (Portner forthcoming), this study, rather, proposes (i) that some discourse elements (such as *-mas*) have a DIALOGUE FEATURE, whose role is to declare that the referent of the speaker must be different from the referent of the addressee and (ii) Japanese has a PRAGMATIC requirement that the discourse feature must be grammatically encoded in the sentence when the speaker forms a speech act that binds the addressee to take particular action for the speaker.

**REFERENCES:** Goodhue 2018. On asking and answering biased polar questions. Ph.D. thesis, McGill University. Miyagawa, S. 2012. Agreements that occur mainly in main clauses. In Main clause phenomena: new horizons, (eds.), Aelbrecht, L., Haegeman, L., Nye, R.John Benjamins Publishing Company. Miyagawa, S. 2017. Agreement beyond phi. CUP. Portner, P. 2018. Mood. OUP. Portner, P. forthcoming. Commitment to Priorities. In New Work on Speech Acts, (eds.) Fogel, D., Harris, D. & Moss, M. OUP. Shimoyama, J., Goodhue, D. & Hirotani, M. 2018. Embeddability of biased negative polar questions in Japanese. WAFL 14. Zanuttini, R. & Portner, P. 2003. Exclamative Clauses: At the Syntax-Semantics Interface.Language.

## Two Types of Anti-causatives in English: A Cross-linguistic Perspective

Masaki Yasuhara Ibaraki University

Germanic languages such as German and Heerlen Dutch have two types of anti-causatives (Cornips and Hulk (1996), Schäfer (2008)). The following examples illustrate two types of anti-causatives in German.

l)	a.	Das	Wasser	kühlt		ab.	unmarked anti-causative
	b.	Das	Wasser	kühlt	sich	ab.	marked anti-causative
		the	water	cools	REFL	down	
		"The wa	ter cools down	"		(Schäfer (2008:37))	

"The water cools down."

(

The anti-causative in (1b) is called a marked anti-causative because it takes a reflexive pronoun as object and is apparently a transitive verb. The subject NP, however, is construed as neither Agent nor Causer. The anti-causative in (1a) lacks such an object and is called an unmarked anti-causative.

Alexiadou et al. (2015) propose two types of Voice, thematic Voice and non-thematic Voice. The external argument of marked anti-causatives is introduced by non-thematic Voice and receives neither an Agent nor a Causer role. They explore two types of anti-causatives cross-linguistically and observe that English has only unmarked anti-causatives and non-thematic Voice is unavailable in English anti-causatives.

In this paper, I aim to show that English also has two types of anti-causatives (i.e. marked and unmarked anti-causatives) in the same way with other Germanic languages. I propose that English marked anti-causatives are exemplified by the following examples.

- a. A solution to the problem presented itself yesterday. (Levin (1993:85)) (2)
  - b. Religious faith expresses itself in a variety of ways.
  - c. His illness began to manifest itself at around this time.
  - d. I'll look at my cookbooks and see if anything suggests itself.

(examples (b)-(d) are cited from LDCE)

The marked anti-causative analysis of these transitive sentences can be confirmed by the following four pieces of evidence. Firstly, these sentences include transitive verbs and take a reflexive pronoun as object but denote anti-causative events, in parallel with the marked anti-causative in (1b). Secondly, the subject NP of these sentences receives neither an Agent nor a Causer role. The referent of the subject NP a solution to the problem in (2a), for instance, brings about no events. The same observation is true of the other examples in (2).

The marked anti-causative analysis of the transitive sentences in (2) is further confirmed by the availability of a causer phrase. Causer phrases such as *due to strong wind* is compatible with unmarked anti-causatives, as in (3), whereas they cannot co-occur with transitive sentences with Agent or Causer subject, as in (4).

The vase broke due to strong wind. unmarked anti-causative (3)

(4)\* John broke the vase due to strong wind.

A causer phrase and Agent or Causer subject cannot co-occur in a single clause, as in (4), because both of them specify distinct direct causes, and hence a contradiction results. Marked anti-causatives, on the other

transitive

hand, permit the occurrence of a causer phrase, as shown in (5). Although marked anti-causatives are transitive syntactically, they do not have Agent or Causer subject.

(5) Die Tür öffnete sich durch einen Windstoß the opened REFL through blast-of-wind door а 'The door opened from a blast of wind' (Alexiadou et al. (2015:33))

The transitive sentences in (2) are also compatible with a causer phrase, as shown in (6) and (7).

- (6) His illness began to manifest itself due to immune deficiency.
- (7) The sand began to form itself into geometric patterns <u>due to strong wind</u>.

The subject NP of the transitive sentences in (2) is not construed as Agent or Causer, so these sentences denote anti-causative events, and therefore they are compatible with a causer phrase.

Anti-causatives generally permit the co-occurrence of adverbial phrases that denote spontaneity such as *by itself* and *of its own accord* (Kageyama (1996)). *By itself*, however, is not compatible with the transitive sentences in (2).

- (8) a.\* His illness began to manifest itself by itself.
  - b.\* The sand began to form itself into geometric patterns by itself.

The unacceptability of the occurrence of *by itself* is due to the duplication of the word *itself*. In fact, these transitive sentences go along with *of its own accord*, as shown by the following sentences.

(9) a. ... a world that does not manifest itself of its own accord.

(Hannah Arendt, The Life of the Mind)

b. ... the sentence had seemingly formed itself of its own accord, ...

(Campbell Black, *Letters from the Dead*)

The fact that the transitive sentences in (2) are compatible with *of its own accord* further supports our marked anti-causative analysis.

To sum up, this paper has shown that English has marked anti-causatives, in parallel with other Germanic languages. The anti-causative analysis of the transitive sentences in (2) is supported by the reflexive pronoun object, the non-thematic interpretation of the subject, the availability of a causer phrase and the adverbial phrase *of its own accord*. I hope this study will shed new light on the nature of marked anti-causatives in Germanic languages.

## References

- Alexiadou, Artemis, Elena Anagnostopoulou, and Florian Schäfer (2015) *External arguments in transitivity alternations: a layering approach*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Cornips, Leonie and Aafke Hulk (1996) "Ergative reflexives in Heerlen Dutch and French," *Studia Linguistica* 50.1, 1-21.
- Kageyama, Taro (1996) Doshi Imiron (Verb Semantics), Kuroshio, Tokyo.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (4th edition) (LDCE), Longman, London.
- Schäfer, Florian (2008) *The syntax of (anti-)causatives: external arguments in change-of-state contexts*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.