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Assuming recent developments of the Minimalist Program, e.g. (Chomsky 2013; 2015), Universal Grammar (UG) must provide the means for constructing constituents through Merge and present all available cases, properly Labeled, at the conceptual-intensional (CI) interface for interpretation. We show how UG deals with certain verbal complements: there is considerable variation in how English verbs take sentential (and sentence-like) complements such as small clauses, gerundives and full (tensed) clauses.

The clausal complement to verbs of immediate perception such as see exhibit dependent time reference (DTR), to use Noonan (2007)’s terminology, and thus are predicted to be only compatible with complements not containing Tense (T). The time-frame of the complements is dependent on the time reference of the matrix selecting verb. (1) (a) I saw {α that John/he/*him left} (b) *I saw {β John/he/him to leave}

(c) I saw {γ John/*he/him leaving} (d) I saw {δ John/*he/him leave}

In (1d), uninflected δ = vP, is a small clause. γ in (1c) contains also a small clause selected by the categorizer -ing. We propose that there is no T present in (1c-d). β in (1b) is headed by nonfinite T and is ungrammatical. Note that (1a) also is ungrammatical with respect to immediate perception see. This is, however, well-formed under the interpretation in which see is a predicate of (acquisition of) knowledge, to retain Noonan’s (2007) terminology, referring to knowledge that was obtained before the act of seeing. Since α = CP, and a full CP contains T, this is predicted.

Sentential complement-taking verbs that exhibit independent time reference (ITR) are predicted to have complementary distribution to verbs such as see. The complements to these verbs must have unique time references from the selecting matrix verb. Consider the knowledge predicate know:

(2) (a) I know {α that John/he/*him left}

(b) I know {β John/*he/him to go (sometimes/from time to time)}

(c) *I know {γ John/he/him leaving}

(d) *I know {δ John/he/him leave}

The event of leaving is not tied to knowledge acquisition time, and thus must be specified via independent T, as in (2a). (2b) has a potential event interpretation, made clear by the adverbials, so it is well-formed. Examples (2c-d) are ruled out since there is no T in γ and δ, and no T necessitates DTR, but know is an ITR-selecting verb.
Consider now the corresponding syntactic environment at the CI interface shown in (3), with \( R_1 \) the matrix verb, viz. see in (1a-d) and know in (2a-d), and \( R_2 \) the intransitive complement verb, viz. leave in (1) and (2). Furthermore, \( EA = \) external argument. In the case of transitive \( R_2 \), not discussed here, \( \{v^*, \{R_2, IA\}\} \) may be freely substituted for the intransitive \( \{v, R_2\} \), \( IA = \) internal argument; Object Shift (OS) not shown, (perhaps) is required for IA Labeling (Chomsky 2015).

(3)  
(a) \( \{T, \{v^*, \{R_1, \{C, \{EA, \{T, \{EA, \{v, R_2}\}\}\}\}\}\}\} \)  
(b) \( \{T, \{v^*, \{R_1, \{EA, \{T\-to, \{EA, \{v, R_2\}\}\}\}\}\}\} \)  
(c) \( \{T, \{v^*, \{R_1, \{EA, \{-ing, \{v, R_2\}\}\}\}\}\}\} \)  
(d) \( \{T, \{v^*, \{R_1, \{EA, \{v, R_2\}\}\}\}\}\} \)

The selectional requirements for clausal complementation can be checked at the CI-interface as follows: suppose \( R, v \) and \( T \) must always come together (a requirement from Full Interpretation, perhaps grammaticalized through obligatory categorization of undifferentiated \( R \) and the affixal nature of \( v \)). In (3c-d), the lower \( v \) must find a \( T \) although no \( T \) exists in the small clause. Then, the nearest \( T \) is the \( T \) in the higher clause. Should lower \( v \) find higher \( T \), the lower clause exhibits DTR. But ITR obtains if there is a lower \( T \) present. Note that there is no Phase boundary problem in (3c-d), assume higher \( v^* \) and \( T \) come together. In (3b), we assume nonfinite \( T \) does not require \( C \), e.g. following Chomsky (2019 UCLA lectures), and the required accusative Case on the pronoun in (2b) is predicted. Similarly, accusative Case is predicted for (1c-d). In (3a), tensed \( T \) requires and co-occurs with \( C \), optionally pronounced as \( that \). (In the case of Germanic V2, \( R, v, T \) and \( C \) must come together.)

(4)  
(a) *John leave  
(b) *You know John leave  
(c) *I saw you knew John leave  
(d) You know I saw him leave  
(4a) is ruled out by Full Interpretation as no \( T \) exists. (4b) is explained if the higher \( T \), associated to ITR-taking predicate \( know \), is not accessible to lower \( v \), due to a lexical property of \( know \). (4c) shows a blocking effect; i.e. lower \( v \) cannot access the (even higher) \( T \) associated with \( see \), cf. (4d). Blocking effects must fall out from third factor considerations, i.e. access must be subject to minimal search.

We will also explain in detail how this analysis works with respect to these verbs, and other related verbs that behave slightly differently, such as \( want \) and \( prefer \).

Identification by Stancetaking in Corporate Mission Statements
Mana Kitazawa (Keio University)

This paper discusses the discursive practices of identification in corporate mission statements. Most of the research focusing on the dynamic process of identification has attempted to uncover how people create their own identities within discourse, especially in spoken language, such as narrative or dialogue (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006; De Fina, 2019). Inspired by them, this paper examines whether this process of self-identification can also be observed in corporate mission statements, using the perspective of stancetaking (Du Bois, 2007).

In mission statements, various stances should coexist, because there are many people involved, ranging from inside stakeholders, such as employees and partners, to outside stakeholders, such as customers, shareholders, and communities. Baetz and Bart (1966) maintained that the wider the range of stakeholders who get involved with the process of making mission statements—for example, by exchanging their opinions—the more likely it is for a corporation to succeed in management and to increase employee commitment and satisfaction. This paper argues that, during the process of developing mission statements, corporations attempt to align themselves with employees and stakeholders by indicating that they understand each stance and incorporating them into the mission statements. Further, it claims that incorporating this affiliation into mission statements helps employees to discursively construct their own identities as staff members.

Du Bois (2007) noted that stancetaking, which means that a person takes a stance on something, occurs in dialogue, and the stance is intersubjectively determined within that dialogue. He maintained that the process of stancetaking always involves three actions: “The stancetaker (1) evaluates an object, (2) positions a subject (usually the self), and (3) aligns with other subjects” (Du Bois, 2007, p. 163). He suggested a model of stancetaking, called the stance triangle (Figure 1), and argued for the importance of the intersubjectivity of the stancetaking.

This paper demonstrates that several stances coexist in a mission statement, and, through reading it, employees begin to construct an identity appropriate to a member of the organization. Although mission statements are media discourses that have “multiple communicative purposes (e.g. a mixture of information, promotion and entertainment)” (Feng, 2019, p. 123), this paper focuses only on the function of promoting the creation of identity among employees.

This paper suggests a stance trigonal pyramid (Figure 2) instead of the stance triangle. In example (1), the corporation (Subject 1), Centene, highly values people live healthier lives (Objective) because it displays a positive attitude with the evaluative phrase is committed to helping. The description, which reflects the feedback of stakeholders gained during the making process of the mission statement, indicates the convergent alignment with the stakeholders (Subject 3). Further, the evaluation and positioning are shared by employees as readers (Subject 2) through the convergent alignment marker Centene. In the second sentence, the first-person plural pronoun We plays a crucial role in the corporation aligning itself with the employees and sharing the evaluations and positioning, which arise from the intersubjective interactions with the stakeholders. Through this mission statement, the employees, as members of the corporate community, come to correctly understand what the stakeholders desire (e.g., wanting to have healthier lives and to get well, stay well, and be well) and what they should do (e.g., provide...
access to high-quality healthcare, innovative programs, and a wide range of health solutions) to realize it.

To summarize, this paper argues for the importance of analyzing stancetaking in mission statements to reveal how people dynamically construct their own identities within discourse. Although the significance of the dynamic process of identification has been taken for granted, there has been little research focusing on the relationship between media discourse and identity construction. This paper demonstrates that employees can discursively gain an identity as staff members through mission statements, which are the product of the stancetaking implemented by three subjects: corporations, employees, and stakeholders.

**Figures and Example**

*Figure 1. The stance triangle* (Du Bois, 2007, p. 163).

*Figure 2. The stance trigonal pyramid in mission statements.*

(1) **Who We Are**

Centene is committed to helping people live healthier lives. We provide access to high-quality healthcare, innovative programs, and a wide range of health solutions that help families and individuals get well, stay well, and be well.
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I argue that Copy/Repetition Distinction (CRD), a serious problem in the Minimalist Program (MP), can be successfully conceptually solved by making use of the idea of token-Merge and the SELECT.

MP assumes that an elementary combinatoric computation Merge is the sole generative engine of syntax (see Chomsky 2008; Collins 2017). Merge takes two discrete items and produces a set out of them. The input types of Merge are in turn defined as follows (Collins 2017).

(1) \( X \) is an input to Merge iff \( X \) is a Lexical Item LI or an output of previous Merge(s).

One thing that is unclear in this intuitively-obvious definition of Merge’s inputs, however, is the status of LIs; what specifically are they? Answering this question should be regarded as one of the primary objects of inquiry in MP, since, given the genericity and ubiquity of Merge as an “elementary” computation across other cognitive/sensorimotor domains, the inputs to syntactic Merge lie at the heart of Hauser’s (2009) “humaniqueness” of language (see Boeckx 2015; Poeppel 2012 for the genericity and ubiquity of Merge from a biolinguistic viewpoint). Nonetheless, to the best of my knowledge, no serious attention to this has been paid in the history of MP.

An exception can be found in Hornstein (2001). Hornstein argues that inputs to Merge are actually copies of LIs stored in the long-term memory (LTM). His logic is simple: if the LIs were taken (Selected, in the sense of Chomsky 1995 and Collins and Stabler 2016) as inputs to Merge, they would be eliminated from LTM after generating an expression from them, contrary to fact. Thus, Merge operates on copies of LIs in lieu of LIs themselves. Notice in passing that this indicates that inputs to Merge are tokens of the LIs stored in the long-term memory (LTM). Put differently, Merge combines tokenized items of types.

This is quite compatible with Kosta and Krivochen’s (KK) (2014) token-Merge (see also Krivochen 2016 among others). They argue that Merge combines tokens assembled in a Lexical Array (LA). However, contra Chomsky (1995 inter alia), KK’s token-Merge does not exhaust the tokens in a given LA; i.e., even after an item is taken from an LA to be an input to Merge, it remains accessible in that array. Put yet another way, tokens in an LA become types of the corresponding items in the workspace (WS), and the items in the WS are the tokens of the LIs.

However, KK’s token-Merge and Hornstein’s proposal suffer a serious problem; they remain silent on how the copies/tokens are mapped onto the WS. Also, KK do not discuss how an LA is formed in the first place (notice that the same holds for Chomsky 1995 and Chomsky et al. 2019).

Reflecting all these problems in KK’s and Hornstein’s analyses, I argue that what I call SELECT is responsible for this labor. SELECT is a copying procedure which maps its outputs (viz. copies = tokens) from LTM to the syntactic WS, formally defined in (2) below.

(2) \( \text{SELECT}(A) = A’ \), where \( A’ \) is a copy in the WS of \( A \) stored in LTM.

I claim that this operation secures the computational efficiency of Merge by restricting its search-domain. Specifically, since SELECTed copies are treated as a single, flat item in the WS, this function enables Merge to “ignore” all of the inner semantic and phonological features of the copy/token; SELECT makes Merge “blind” to all these inner properties of its inputs. Succinctly put, as
only SELECTed copies are “mergeable,” it attaches the edge feature (EF) in the sense of Chomsky (2008) to its outputs and only this EF is visible to Merge (what Chomsky 2004 calls 0-Search).

Based on these observations regarding the SELECT operation, I propose a(n novel) idea that solves the problem of CRD. Collins and Groat (2018) persuasively argue that the current MP theory provides no satisfactory way of distinguishing copies (what was hit what) and repetitions (what hit what). Although Chomsky et al. (2019) claim that Chomsky’s (2008) Phase Impenetrability Condition circumvents this problem, their argument is far from satisfactory since they rely on the difference between External and Internal Merge, which they argue to be virtually the identical operation (after all, how can one type of operation be responsible for two distinct phenomena?)

My claim is that the SELECT theory, together with KK’s token-Merge, can neatly solve this recalcitrant conundrum. Suppose we SELECT an LI what and map its copy onto the WS, and Merge it with an independently SELECTed copy hit, yielding the set {hit, what}. Successive applications of Merge yield the final output \{what, \{T, \{hit, what\}\}\} (here I abstract away from irrelevant details). In the case of repetitions, we want these two \textit{whats} in the generated set above to be the same tokens, whereas they should be different in the case of copies. It is now easy to provide an answer. As KK argue, tokens cannot be duplicated. Therefore, it can be deduced that repetitions are multiple SELECTs while copies are multiple applications of Merge. Put more formally, since (Internal) Merge does not tokenize the \textit{what} in \{hit, what\}, the superset \{what, \{T, \{hit, what\}\}\} contains two \textit{identical what-tokens}. In contrast, SELECT by definition generates \textit{copies/tokens} of its inputs, the set \{what, \{T, \{hit, what\}\}\} in the case of multiple applications of this operation has two \textit{distinct tokens} of \textit{what-type}. In this way, the type-token dynamics by an independently necessary operation SELECT can successfully distinguish copies and repetitions, with no recourse to types of Merge nor PIC nor Numeration (Chomsky 1995) in any artificial way.
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Clausal and phrasal readings of English ‘phrasal’ comparatives

Yoshiaki Morimoto (Graduate School of Letters, Osaka University, Japan)

**Introduction:** This presentation will take up so-called phrasal comparatives in English: e.g. *John is taller than me.* In this presentation, I will focus on four types of *than*-NP’s: the *than*-accusative (*than*-ACC), the *than*-reflexive (*than*-REF), the *than*-wh-words (*than*-WH), and the *than*-numeral (*than*-NUM). I will argue that the *than*-ACC, the *than*-REF, and the *than*-WH have underlying clausal structure and that the *than*-NUM is a preposition phrase (hereafter PP). In the course of my arguments, inspired by Merchant (2004)’s discussion on fragment answers, I will employ binding tests to show that the *than*-NP’s at issue other than the *than*-NUM are reduced clauses.

**Background:** It has been pointed out that a *than*-XP can take both a clausal form (1a) and a phrasal form (1b), with *than*-NP’s included in the latter. It has also been pointed out that many of the phrasal *than*-XP’s are reduced clauses (2). However, it is still not clear whether some types of the *than*-NP’s have clausal structure or not, though they do not seem to be reduced finite clauses (3). These *than*-NP’s cannot have their finite clausal forms derived in the same way as (2), so these forms seem to be PP’s. However, (3a-c) have semantically corresponding clausal forms. This dilemma cannot be accounted for the assumption that the *than*-NP’s like (3a-c) are PP’s. It remains unclear clear whether they have some clausal structure or not.

**Previous attempt to treat *than*-NP’s as clauses and its drawbacks:** Lechner (2004) argued that the *than*-ACC and the *than*-REF have clausal structure. He proposed to describe these *than*-NP’s as reduced small clauses. Under this assumption, he argues, it is possible to claim that these two *than*-NP’s are reduced clauses (4)-(5). However, there are two problems with this small-clause analysis. First, the small-clause analysis deals only with copular constructions, and it doesn’t work for non-copular constructions (6). Second, the small-clause analysis doesn’t provide evidence that the *than*-NP’s taken up here have clausal structure. It just provides a potentially effective way to describe the *than*-NP’s under the assumption that they are (nonfinite) clauses. It is necessary to solve these problems in order to determine how to treat these *than*-NP’s. With regard to the *than*-NUM’s like (3d), they should be PP’s, because NUM in the *than*-NUM directly refers to the degree of compared element (e.g. *fifteen million* in (3d)) and does not require a speaker to invoke clausal structure. Lechner (2004) takes up (7a) as an example of small clauses (7b), but as pointed out by Zhang (2013), this analysis doesn’t work. If the world record is the reduced nonfinite clause, the clausal form should be like *than the world record ran y-fast* (7c), but this cannot be true. Rather, the *world record* is interpreted referentially, e.g. as 9.58 (7d), which indirectly makes it possible to interpret (7a) phrasally, in the same way as the *than*-NUM.

**Observations:** Inspired by Merchant (2004)’s binding tests on fragment answers (8), I conducted binding tests on the *than*-ACC, the *than*-REF, and the *than*-WH to see whether the *than*-NP’s in question have clausal structure (9). These tests contained non-copular constructions, which are beyond the scope of Lechner’s small-clause analysis. The *than*-WH was judged as ungrammatical, but *wh ... than* was fine, so the binding test was conducted on this *wh ... than* version (hereafter WH+*than*). Given (3), if the *than*-NP’s are clauses, they should be nonfinite. First, I examined (9a), and, it was found that it is impossible to interpret *him* as referring to *John*. Given that *John* in the matrix clause does not bind *he* or *him*, Binding Condition B is not violated, and obviously Binding Condition A is not involved here, so the only possibility is that Binding Condition C is violated, which indicates that an elided referential is bound by *himself*. This suggests that *he/*him binds covert *John*, and that clausal structure is elided under *than*. (9b-d) are intended to examine whether sloppy reading is possible with each type of *than*-NP’s: the *than ACC* (9b), the *than-REF* (9c), and the WH+*than* (9d). The result is that sloppy reading was possible with all of them: *than her* can be interpreted as *than SHE hurt herself* (9b), *than himself as than HE was looking at himself* (9c), who *+ than as than ‘who is looking at himself or herself* (9d). This shows that NP’s in *than*-NP’s bind a covert element, and that the *than*-NP’s have clausal structure identical to the matrix clause.

**Proposals and unsettled problems:** Based on the discussions above, my proposals are, (i) the *than*-ACC, the *than*-REF, and the WH+*than* have underlying nonfinite clausal structure and all the elements except the overt NP are always covert, and (ii) the *than*-NUM is a PP. However, there still remains two other problems. First, it has not been made clear how the *than*-NP’s as in (3a-c) are derived from underlying clausal structure. Second, there are still problematic *than*-NP’s which I didn’t take up here: *than*-NEG (e.g. *Tom is taller than no one* (*#is*)), for example. These two problems need to be examined in future research.
Data

1. a. John is more intelligent than Mary is. [clausal]  
b. John is more intelligent than Mary. [phrasal]

2. John is taller than Mary. [John is x-tall; Mary is y-tall; x>y]  
a. John is taller than Mary is y-tall.  
c. John is taller than Mary is y-tall. [obligatory deletion]  
e. John is taller than Mary. [nonobligatory ellipsis]

3. a. than-ACC: She is older than me (*am). (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 1113)  
   (can be paraphrased into: … older than I am)  
b. than-REF: He married a woman fifteen years younger than himself (*was). (ibid: 1117)  
   (can be paraphrased into: … fifteen years younger than he was)  
c. than-WH: It was decided by Judge Darwin, than whom (*was) no one could be more impartial.  
   (ibid: 1117)  
d. than-NUM: The population of Mexico is more than fifteen million. (McCaulay 1998: 693)

4. a. John is older than me. (Lechner 2004: 179) [than-ACC]  
b. John is older than [Small Clause me y-old].  
   ¬John is older than [Small Clause me y-old].

5. a. John couldn’t possibly be taller than himself. (ibid:181) [than-REF]  
   ¬John couldn’t possibly be taller than [Small Clause himself d-tall].  
   ¬John couldn’t possibly be taller than [Small Clause himself d-tall].

6. He runs faster than me. (= He runs faster than I do/run/*am.)

7. a. She ran faster than the world record. (ibid: 182 & Zhang 2013: 2090)  
b. She ran faster than [Small Clause the world record d-fast]. (Lechner’s analysis) → doesn’t work  
   c. She ran faster than the world record ran d-fast. → doesn’t work  
   d. If the world record is 9.58, ‘than the world record’ is paraphrased into ‘than 9.58.’ [phrasal OK]

a. Where is he, staying?—*In John’s; apartment./*He’s is staying in John’s; apartment. [*Condition C]  
b. Who did John try to shave?—*Him,/*John tried to shave him. [Condition B]  
c. Who does John like?—Himself./John likes himself. [Condition A]

   - violation of Binding condition C  
   - him=SUBJ … hurt=V … John=OBJ [than him, paraphrased into than he, hurt John]  
b. John hurt himself more badly than her. [than-ACC]  
   - than her paraphrased into than she hurt herself [sloppy identity] → OK  
   - her=SUBJ … hurt=V … herself=OBJ  
c. John found Mary looking at herself more closely than himself. [than-REF]  
   - than himself paraphrased into than HE was looking at himself [sloppy identity] → OK  
   - himself/John=SUBJ … looking=V … himself=OBJ  
d. I wonder who Mary is looking at herself more closely than. [WH+thanH]  
   - who is looking at himself or herself [sloppy identity] → OK  
   - who=SBJ … looking=V … himself or herself=OBJ

**The relationship between Sar(u) Expression and Argument Selection in Kesen**

Fumikazu Niinuma  
Morioka University

**Introduction:** Sar(u) expression, which is mainly spoken by people who live in Northern part of Japan, is considered as a spontaneous auxiliary (see Niinuma and Takahashi (2013), and Niinuma (2018) and references therein). One of the interesting properties of the expression, which is first pointed out by Takahashi (2013), is that a verb which has the transitive/intransitive marker e cannot concatenate with the sar(u) expression, as in (1-2). Notice that the sar(u) expression can be concatenated with transitive verbs as well as intransitive verbs, as in (3).

(1) a. atsum-ar-u  ‘to gather’  atsum-ar-asar-u  
gather-INT-present  gather-INT-SARU-present  

b. atsum-e-ru  ‘to gather’  *atsum-e-rasar-u  
gather-TR-present  gather-TR-SARU-present  

(2) a. kir-u  ‘to cut’  kir-asar-u  
cut-present  cut-SARU-present  

b. kir-e-ru  ‘to be cut’  *kir-e-rasar-u  
cut-INT-present  cut-INT-SARU-present  

(3) a. kak-u  ‘to write’  kak-asar-u  
write-present  write-SARU-present  

b. nak-u  ‘to cry’  nak-asar-u  
cry-present  cry-SARU-present  

Based on these findings, Niinuma (2019) examined all types of transitive-intransitive pairs (cf. Jacobsen (1992)), and points out that when the sar(u) expression is concatenated with a verb, there is a competition between every type of the transitive-intransitive pair. Then, he makes a generalization regarding the spontaneous expression and the transitive/intransitive verbs in Kesen, as shown in (4).

(4) Generalization concerning the morpheme asar- and the intransitive verbs which have their transitive counterpart  
   a. The morpheme asar- can concatenate with the transitive verbs when the transitive marker is phonetically null.  
   b. Otherwise, the morpheme asar- concatenates with the intransitive verbs.

This generalization correctly explains the acceptability of (5-6). (5b) is unacceptable because there is an overt transitive marker, and (6a) is also unacceptable because the transitive counterpart does have a phonetically-null transitive marker.

(5) a. ag-ar-u  ‘to go up’  ag-ar-asar-u  
go.up-INT-present  go.up-INT-SARU-present  

b. ag-e-ru  ‘ro raise’  *ag-e-rasar-u  
go.up-TR-present  go.up-TR-SARU-present  

(6) a. hasam-ar-u  ‘to be put in’  *hasam-ar-asar-u  
put.in-INT-present  put.in-INT-SARU-present  

b. hasam-u  ‘to put in’  hasam-asar-u  
put.in-present  put.in-SARU-present  

**Question:** Even though the generalization in (4) correctly explains the morphological form of the transitive/intransitive verb pair, there is a problem concerning the relationship between the verb form and the selection of the argument. Suga (1980) points out that there are some verbs which allows intransitive-transitive-transitive “triplets” in Japanese, as in (7). Interestingly, he observes that there are some cases where the internal arguments that these transitive verbs take are different, as in (8).

(7) a. tok-u  ‘to solve’  
solve-present  

b. tok-as-u  ‘to melt (transitive)’  
solve-TR-present
c. tok-e-ru ‘to melt (intransitive)’
   solve-INT-present

(8) a. *Nao-ga koori-o toi-ta
   Nao-Nom ice-Acc solve-past
   ‘Nao dissolved the ice.’

b. Nao-ga koori-o tok-as-i-ta
   Nao-Nom ice-Acc solve-TR-past
   ‘Nao dissolved the ice.’

   ice-Nom solve-INT-past
   ‘The ice melted.’

With them in mind, let us consider (9).

(9) Koori-ga tok-asar-ta/*tok-as-ar-ta
   ice-Nom solve-SARU-past/solve-TR-SARU-past/solve-INT-SARU-past
   ‘The ice is melted unintentionally.’

The derived subject in (9) is the one that is taken by (8b) tokasu or (8c) tokeru, not by (8a) toku. Note that (9) shows that the output of the verb is correctly accounted for by the generalization (4), since the transitive verb in (7a) does not have any overt transitive marker. Thus, there is a mismatch between the verb form which the spontaneous auxiliary sar(u) is attached to and the argument NP.

**Analysis:** As for transitive/intransitive competitions, Following Oseki (2017), who argues that transitive/intransitive marker is located in Voice, and Niinuma (2019) assumes that the spontaneous auxiliary is just above VoiceP, as in (10). Niinuma (2019) then argues that the Elsewhere Condition as well as locality, especially phase theory, correctly explain the competitions, as in (11-12).

(10) [TP [FP [VoiceP NP [vP NP [v’ root + v]] Voice] auxiliary] Tense]
(11) Elsewhere Condition (Bobaljik (2012: 9), (12))
    If two (incompatible) rules R1, R2 may apply to a given structure, and the context for application of R2 is contained in that of R1, then R1 applies and R2 does not.
(12) Bošković (2016)’s contextual phase theory
    a. the highest projection in the extended domain of a lexical head/clause functions as a phase (vP and CP are phases).
    b. the next merger determines the phasehood of XP.
    c. X can be targeted by movement due to the need to undergo successive-cyclic movement without violating the PIC (cf. Chomsky 2000, 2001)).

What is important here is that the spontaneous auxiliary is not a category-changing head, which means that it is not a phase head, and thus the verbal complex [[[root+v] Voice] auxiliary] is in the same phase. Based on the following analysis, I would like to propose that the syntax is free in the sense that all the verbs in (8) can enter the syntactic structure. More specifically, in syntax, the structure (13a) or (13b) can be constructed. After that, the internal argument undergoes movement to Spec TP, and licenses its nominative Case. However, in PF, because of the competition, the verb form which can be concatenated with the spontaneous auxiliary has to be competed, and the verb tok-u would be selected, as shown in (9).

(13) a. [TP [FP [VoiceP (agent) [vP ice [v’ tok + v]] as ] asar ] u]
    b. [TP [FP [VoiceP [vP ice [v’ tok + v]] e ] asar ] u]

If this analysis is on the right track, it constitutes an additional piece of evidence for the division of labor between syntax and morphology.

**Selected References**
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On the interpretations of English Cognate Object Constructions

Yoshitomo Oi (Graduate School of Osaka University)

The purpose of this presentation is to clarify the aspectual status of Cognate Object Constructions (hereafter COCs). Previous studies such as Tenny (1994) and Macfarland (1995) argue that the addition of cognate objects to unergative predicates makes possible a delimited (or terminative) reading as well as a non-delimited (or non-terminative) reading. This study, however, illustrates that COCs differ from typical accomplishment predicates in the behavior of diagnostic tests for telicity, and argues that COCs do not have the delimited reading.

Previous literature makes use of several test frames in order to state that COCs denote temporally delimited events, but a more careful examination reveals that those tests do not serve as evidence that COCs have the delimited reading. Horrocks and Stavrou (2010), for example, adopt the in the middle of frame to show that the event denoted by COCs has both beginnings and ends.

(1) a. ??* Kate was in the middle of smiling knowingly when her husband arrived.
   b. Kate was in the middle of smiling a knowing smile when her husband arrived.
   (Horrocks and Stavrou 2010: 297-298; italics mine)

However, their judgment on (1b) is questionable. In fact, my informants judge it as unacceptable because such a situation is difficult to imagine in which a speaker perceives the process of someone creating a knowing smile. Even if we assume that (1b) is acceptable, the problem remains. Contrary to their judgment on (1a), the actual use is attested in which the in the middle of phrase occurs with a simple unergative predicate.

(2) But in the middle of smiling his face stopped, and was convulsed in a moment with anguish unspeakable …
   (Google Books; italics mine)

In the specific context, (2) denotes the process of making a smile on his face, which is suspended. This actual data suggests that, with or without cognate objects, the in the middle of frame itself can coerce the delimited reading into the otherwise non-delimited predicate. Thus, (1b) does not support the argument that COCs have the delimited reading.

Another test for telicity – in-adverbials – is also called into question. Tenny (1994) shows that COCs can occur with in-phrases as well as for-phrases though, as Tenny admits, only the former varies in acceptability among speakers.

(3) a. Mary laughed {for an hour / *in an hour}.
   b. Mary laughed a mirthless laugh {in one minute / for one minute}.
   (Tenny 1994: 39)
   (ibid.)

The main issue to be concerned is whether COCs with the in-phrases, if possible at all, are really interpreted in the same way as typical accomplishment predicates with them. In order to make clear the interpretations, this study adopts a similar test frame called the take time construction. According to my informants, even though both (4a) and (4b) are less acceptable than (4c), (4a) can be read similarly to (4b), in which the in-phrase states the point of the occurrence of the event (# represents awkwardness of the interpretation).
Note that this reading is different from that of (4c), in which the *in*-phrase states the period of the durative event (cf. Kearns 2011).

(4) a. # *It took him a minute to laugh a hearty laugh.*
   b. # *It took him a minute to laugh.*
   (cf. *It took the gallery 1.6 seconds to laugh, …* (Google Books))
   c. It took him a minute to make a paper crane / eat an apple. [accomplishment]

Thus, COCs are non-delimited activity predicates rather than delimited accomplishment ones, regardless of the possibility for *in*-phrases to occur in COCs. This accounts for the acceptability of *for*-phrases in COCs.

It should be noted that such an argument that COCs only have the non-delimited reading does not affect a well-known distinction of the readings of cognate objects: an event reading and a result reading, as shown in (5).

(5) a. ‘Thinking about it, anyway.’ He smiled a quick smile. [event reading]
   b. Guido smiled a small smile devoid of humor. [result reading]

   (Höche 2009: 83, taken from British National Corpus)

It is often discussed that the result reading corresponds to the delimited reading (cf. Nakajima 2006), but it turns out that there is little difference between the result and event readings concerning the acceptability of the test frames examined in this study. The confusion of the result reading with the delimited reading arises from the term ‘result’ itself. Unlike the referents of typical resultant objects which occur as a ‘result’ of the process inherent to the action denoted by the main verb, the referents of cognate objects (e.g. a smile or laugh) occur as soon as the action denoted by the main verbs begins. This contrast is confirmed by the interpretations of the progressive form. Compare (6a) to (6b).

(6) a. John was smiling a knowing smile / laughing a mirthless laugh.
   b. John was making a doghouse / digging a hole.

To sum up, COCs only have the non-delimited reading as ascertained by the diagnost tests for telicity, and this conclusion does not reject the event/result distinction in the readings of cognate objects, though the term ‘result’ is misleading.
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1. Introduction

This paper investigates the distribution of the genitive case marker in Azerbaijani, a Tungusic language spoken in the Republic of Azerbaijan and Iran, and elucidates the mechanism that regulates it. We owe all examples used in this paper to Khalida Alizada, a native speaker of the language from Baku, the capital of Azerbaijan. Our findings are as follows. First, Azerbaijani exhibits the nominative/genitive alternation. Second, in sentences with no overt relative head, headed by qədər ‘until,’ for example, the genitive subject is disallowed. Third, the Transitivity Restriction does not hold. Fourth, the genitive subject is not actually allowed in embedded clauses, although it apparently seems possible. Fifth and finally, N’-deletion is possible. It will be argued that these findings suggest (i) that Azerbaijani and Japanese are more or less identical in the distribution of the genitive case marker, and (ii) that the conditions on genitive subject licensing in Mongolian proposed by Maki et al (2016) apply not only to Mongolian, but also to Japanese and Azerbaijani.

2. Background

This section provides basic syntactic properties of Azerbaijani as background to subsequent sections. First, Azerbaijani is an SOV language.

(1) Hәsәn-ø dünәn kitab-ø aldi.
Hasan-Nom yesterday book-Acc bought
‘Hasan bought a book yesterday.’

Second, the genitive case marker is -nin in Azerbaijani.

(2) Әli-nin kitab-ı
Ali-Gen book-PoP.3
‘Ali’s book’

Third, a relative clause precedes the head noun in Azerbaijani.

(3) Dünәn Hәsәn-ø alan kitab-ø bu kitab dı.
yesterday Hasan-Nom bought book-Nom this book be
‘The book Hasan bought yesterday is this book.’

3. Data

Let us now examine relevant data in Azerbaijani. First, Azerbaijani exhibits the nominative/genitive alternation, as shown in (3) and (4).

(4) Dүnәn Hәsәn-in ald-ı-ğи kitab-ø bu kitab dı.
yesterday Hasan-Gen bought-Adn book-Nom this book be
‘The book Hasan bought yesterday is this book.’

Second, in the adjunct clause headed by qədər ‘until,’ the genitive subject is not allowed.

(5) * Hәsәn-ø yağış-nin dayanana qədər otaqda idi.
Hasan-Gen rain-Gen stop until room.Loc was
‘Hasan was at his office until it stopped raining.’

Third, the Transitivity Restriction does not hold.

(6) Hәsәn-in dүnәn kitab-ø verdi-yи adam-ø Әli dи.
Hasan-Gen yesterday book-Acc gave.Adn person-Nom Ali be
‘The person who Hasan gave a book to yesterday is Ali.’

Fourth, the genitive subject is not allowed in embedded clauses, although it apparently seems possible. (7) shows that Azerbaijani seems to allow the deep genitive, as the subject in the embedded clauses is marked genitive.
4. Discussion

Let us now consider what the observed facts might suggest for the theory of (Azerbaijani) syntax. First, the findings suggest that Azerbaijani and Japanese are more or less identical in the distribution of the genitive case marker, although they differ in the Transitivity Restriction and the availability of genitive subject in the until-clause. The Japanese counterpart of (5) is grammatical, and the Japanese counterpart of (6) is ungrammatical. The fact that (5) is ungrammatical in Azerbaijani seems to stem from the fact that the predicate is not in the adnominal form.

Second, the findings suggest that the conditions on genitive subject licensing in Mongolian proposed by Maki et al (2016) apply not only to Mongolian, but also to Japanese and Azerbaijani.

(11) **Conditions on Genitive Subject Licensing in Mongolian**
    a. A genitive subject must be c-commanded by a nominal element in a local domain.
    b. A genitive subject must be in a local relationship with the adnominal form of a predicate.

(11a, b), which were proposed based on the fact that the Mongolian counterpart of (7) shown in (12) is grammatical, properly predict the distribution of genitive subject in the three languages.

(12) Bayatur-o Ulayan-u t1 qudaldun-ab-yisan/*/ab-cai gejü
    Bagatur-Nom Ulagan-Gen buy-take-Past.Adn/-take-Past.Con that
    bodu-yisan nomi-bol ene nom.

think-Past.Adn book-Top this book

‘The book which Bagatur thought [that Ulagan bought t1] is this book.’

In (12), the subject in the embedded clause is marked genitive only when the predicate is in the adnominal from. The Japanese counterpart of (12) is ungrammatical due to the fact that the embedded predicate cannot take the adnominal form, and the Azerbaijani counterpart of (12) is grammatical, because (8) is grammatical to begin with, due to the fact that the embedded predicate is in the adnominal form, which is followed by the accusative case maker, which suggests that the predicate is nominalized, and contains a sort of nominal element.
Some Comparative Notes on Obliqueness in Argument Structure
Hsiao-hung Iris Wu (iriswu@ntnu.edu.tw)
National Taiwan Normal University

Overview
The distinction between direct and oblique arguments has mostly been explored in morphologically complex languages, in which information on core/oblique arguments is generally revealed by overt morphosyntactic coding. In these languages, for instance, oblique arguments may take a special case or appear marked with an adposition to be distinguished from other arguments. In contrast, identifying arguments as syntactically direct or oblique is often a problem in languages where very limited properties reflecting the distinction can be observed. This talk starts by showing that the direct-oblique distinction is encoded in the argument structure of Mandarin Chinese and discusses how the distinction is fleshed out in the syntax. Comparative remarks are further offered on the generalizability and parametric variation of the current proposal.

Mandarin and its Goal Arguments in Ditransitives
At least two (apparent) double object constructions can be identified in Mandarin (cf. Tsai 2012, Kuo 2014), though they look similar in that the agent is the highest argument, generated above the indirect object and direct object, with the former preceding, and presumably c-commanding, the latter.

(1) a. Lisi song-le wo wubai kuai. ‘Lisi sent me 500 dollars.’
   Lisi sent me 500 dollar
b. Lisi qiang-le wo wubai kuai. ‘Lisi robbed me of 500 dollars.’
   Lisi robbed me 500 dollar

Despite the superficial resemblances, two major differences exist between send-verbs and rob-verbs: (I) bound variable anaphora: (2a) shows the quantified goal phrase cannot bind the pronominal possessor inside the theme phrase as a variable, while the quantified source in (2b) can. (II) passivization: the contrast in (3) reveals that only the source argument can be the subject of a passive sentence.

(2) a. *Lisi song-le meigeren; tade; hongbao. Intended. ‘Lisi sent everyone his cash-gift.’
   Lisi sent everyone his cash-gift
b. Lisi qiang-le meigeren; tade; hongbao. ‘Lisi robbed everyone of his cash-gift.’
   Lisi robbed everyone his cash-gift
(3) a. *Wo bei (Lisi) song-le wubai kuai. Intended. ‘I was sent 500 dollars.’
   I PASS Lisi sent 500 dollar
b. Wo bei (Lisi) qiang-le wubai kuai. ‘I was robbed of 500 dollars.’
   boss PASS Lisi robbed 500 dollar

To account for these patterns, I propose as in (4) that Mandarin verbs, in addition to the number of arguments, need to specify whether the argument is oblique, which is the complement of a phonologically null adposition (cf. Baker 2012). Following Landau (2007), I further propose this null-headed PP makes it impossible for an oblique argument, such as the goal argument of ditransitive verbs, to satisfy the EPP property of INFL, thus resisting appearing in Spec,IP.

(4) a. Oblique goal arguments are projected as null headed PPs.
b. In \([\_\_\_\_\_H^P\_\_\_\_\_XP\_\_\_\_\_\_H\_\_\_\_\_\_]\), where XP is merged to satisfy the EPP of H, X must be pronounced.

Under this view, the fact that the goal phrase fails to bind the theme is expected since it is an oblique argument of null-headed PP structure such that the potential binder (i.e. a universal quantifier) is embedded within the PP, thus unable to c-command outside of the PP and bind the bindee (i.e. a pronominal) inside the theme as in (2a). On the other hand, in (2b), since the source argument is projected as a NP, the pronominal *ta de ‘his’ can be bound and interpreted as a variable. Moreover, the resistance of the goal argument to serving as a subject in passivization like in (3a) can be attributed to the presence of a null P governing the goal.

**Parametric Variation**

Though the obliqueness distinction is attested also in other languages such as Amharic (Baker 2012), making a goal argument to be oblique seems not to be a universal rule (e.g. goals in English do allow variable binding into the themes). If we believe there is certain universality with the role of obliqueness, it is conceivable to assume languages to be parameterized in terms of which argument to be marked oblique in the lexicon. One possible relevance is to consider the contrast in (5), which apparently suggests that goal arguments are direct in English while benefactives are oblique such that it cannot be the subject of passives.

(5) a. John was given a book.
   b. *John was made a cake. (cf. I made John a cake)

Another candidate for considering the locus of parametric variation is from Japanese. A Japanese numeral quantifier may float off its host only if the host is a NP (Miyagawa 1989):

(6) Taro-ga mati-o futa-tu otozureta. ‘Taro visited two towns.’
   Taro-Nom towns-Acc 2-CL visited.

Example (7a) further shows that just as the theme object can be targeted by quantifier float, so the goal (marked by *ni) can allow the numeral quantifier constructed with it to float. Crucially, the floating numeral quantifier off the source phrase in (7b), is unacceptable. (7) thus suggests that goals in Japanese behave as nominals but source do not. Their behavior seems to be the opposite of Mandarin such that goals can be direct but sources are oblique in Japanese.

(7) a. Taro-ga gakusei-ni futa-ri nimotu-o okutta.
   Taro-Nom students-NI 2-CL package-Acc sent
   ‘Taro sent two students a package.’

   people-Nom towns-KARA 2-CL came
   Intended: ‘People came from two towns.’ (Taken from Miyagawa & Tsujioka 2004)

**Conclusion**

This study shows that the peculiar properties of goal arguments in Mandarin can be captured by the proposal that they are oblique and thus null-headed PPs. It also shows that, though a language may not exhibit morphological marking, it can still draw a distinction between oblique/direct arguments and have corresponding syntax to reflect such a distinction. Thus obliqueness should be considered a component of argument structure in syntax.