#### On the Selection of Clausal Complements in a Minimalist Framework

Jason GinsburgHiroshi TeradaSandiway FongOsaka Kyoiku UniversityOsaka Kyoiku UniversityUniversity of Arizona

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 { $_{\alpha}$  that John/he/\*him left} (b) \*I saw { $_{\beta}$  John/he/him to leave}

(c) I saw { $\gamma$  John/\*he/him leaving} (d) I saw { $\delta$  John/\*he/him leave}

In (1d), uninflected  $\delta = vP$ , is a small clause.  $\gamma$  in (1c) contains also a small clause selected by the categorizer *-ing*. We propose that there is no T present in (1c-d).  $\beta$  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  $\alpha =$ 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 { $_{\alpha}$  that John/he/\*him left}
  - (b) I know { $_{\beta}$  John/\*he/him to go (sometimes/from time to time)}
  - (c) \*I know { $\gamma$  John/he/him leaving}
  - (d) \*I know { $\delta$  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  $\gamma$  and  $\delta$ , 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<sub>1</sub> the matrix verb, viz. see in (1a-d) and know in (2a-d), and R<sub>2</sub> 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<sub>1</sub>, {C, {EA, {T, { $EA, {v, R_2}}}}}}}}$ 
  - (b) {T, { $v^*$ , {R<sub>1</sub>, {EA, {T-to, {EA, { $v, R_2$ }}}}}}
  - (c) {T, { $v^*$ , {R<sub>1</sub>, {EA, {-*ing*, { $v, R_2$ }}}}}}
  - (d) {T, { $v^*$ , {R<sub>1</sub>, {EA, { $v, R_2$ }}}}

The selectional requirements for clausal complementation can be checked at the CIinterface 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 pronominal 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*.

References: [1] Chomsky, N. 2013. Problems of projection. Lingua 130. 33-49. [2] Chomsky, N. 2015. Problems of projection: Extensions. In di Domenico et al. (eds.), Structures, strategies and beyond: Studies in honour of Adriana Belletti, 1-16. [3] Noonan, M. 2007. Complementation. In T. Shopen (ed.), Language typology and syntactic description, 52-150.

#### 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 that *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 highquality healthcare, innovative programs, and a wide range of health solutions that help families and individuals get well, stay well, and be well.

## References

- Baetz, M. C., & Bart, C. K. (1996). Developing mission statements which work. *Long Range Planning*, 29(4), 526–533.
- Benwell, B. & Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and identity*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- De Fina, A. (2019). Discourse and identity. In *Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0326.pub2
- Du Bois, J. W. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction* (pp. 139–182). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Feng, D. W. (2019). Interdiscursivity, social media and marketized university discourse: A genre analysis of universities' recruitment posts on WeChat. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 143, 121–134.

#### Token-Merge and Its Implications for Copy/Repetition Distinction

Daiki Matsumoto / Kyoto University & JSPS Research Fellow (DC1)

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) 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 <u>what</u>*) 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 *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 *what* in {hit, what}, the superset {what, {T, {hit, what}}} contains two *identical what-tokens*. In contrast, SELECT by definition generates *copies/tokens* of its inputs, the set {what, {T, {hit, what}}} in the case of multiple applications of this operation has two *distinct tokens* of *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.

#### References

Boeckx, C. (2015). Elementary Syntactic Structures. Cambridge: CUP / Chomsky, N. (1995). The Minimalist Program. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press / Chomsky, N. (2004). Beyond explanatory adequacy. In A. Belletti (ed.), Structures and Beyond, 104-131. Oxford: OUP / Chomsky, N. (2008). On phases. In R. Freidin et al. (eds.), Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory. Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud, 291-321. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press / Chomsky, N., Gallego, Á. J. and Ott, D. (2019). Generative grammar and the faculty of language: Insights, questions and challenges. ms., <u>lingbuzz/003507</u> / Collins, C. (2017). Merge(X, Y) =  $\{X, Y\}$ . In L. Bauke and A. Blümel (Eds.), Labels and Roots, 47-68. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter / Collins, C. and Stabler, E. (2016). A formalization of minimalist syntax. Syntax, 19, 43–78 / Collins, C. and Groat, E. (2018). Distinguishing copies and repetitions. ms., NYU and Newcastle University / Hauser, M. D. (2009a). The origin of the mind. Scientific American, 44-51 / Hornstein, N. (2001). Move! A Minimalist Theory of Construal. Oxford: Blackwell / Kosta, P. and Krivochen, D. E. (2014). Flavors of movement: Revisiting the A/A' distinction. In P. Kosta et al. (eds), Minimalism and Beyond: Radicalizing the Interfaces, 236-266. Amsterdam: John Benjamins / Krivochen, D. G. (2016). Tokens vs. copies: displacement revisited. Studia Linguistica, 70(3), 250–296 / Poeppel, D. (2012). The maps problem and the mapping problem: Two challenges for a cognitive neuroscience of speech and language. Cognitive Neuropsychology, 29(1-2), 34-55.

## 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 *him/he*. This suggests that *he/him* binds covert *John*, and that clausal structure is elided under *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.

Dat	ta							
(1)	a. b.	John is more intelligent than Mary is. John is more intelligent than Mary.	[clausal] [phrasal]					
(2)	Joł	nn is taller than Mary.	[John is <i>x</i> -tall; Mary is <i>y</i> -tall; <i>x</i> > <i>y</i> ]					
	a.	John is taller than Mary is y-tall.						
	с.	John is taller than Mary is <del>y-tall</del> .	[obligatory deletion]					
	e.	John is taner than Mary <del>is</del> .						
(3)	a.	<i>than</i> -ACC: She is older than me (*am).	(Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 1113)					
	h	b. <i>than</i> -REF: He married a woman fifteen years younger than himself (*was). (ibid: 1117)						
	0.	(CAN BE PARAPHRASED INTO: fifteer	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.	(CONVEYS: no one could be more in than-NUM: The population of Mexico is n	nore than fifteen million. (McCauley 1998: 693)					
(4)	a.	John is older than me. (Lechner 2004: 179)	[than-ACC]					
	b.	John is older than [small Clause me y-old].						
(5)	a	$\rightarrow$ John is older than [Small Clause file $\frac{1}{y}$ -old].	lf (ibid <sup>-181</sup> ) [than-REF]					
(0)	b.	John couldn't possibly be taller than [small	all Clause himself <i>d</i> -tall].					
		$\rightarrow$ John couldn't possibly be taller than [sm	all Clause himself <i>d</i> -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 rec	ord <i>d</i> -fast]. (Lechner's analysis) $\rightarrow$ doesn't work					
	c.	She ran faster than the world record ran $d$	$\frac{1}{1} \rightarrow \text{doesn't work}$					
	d.	If the world record is 9.58, 'than the world	record' is paraphrased into 'than 9.58.' [phrasal OK]					
(8)	Qu	estions—Fragment answers./Full-sentence A	Answers. (Merchant 2004: 679-680)					
	a.	Where is he <sub><i>i</i></sub> staying?—*In John's <sub><i>i</i></sub> apartmet	ent./*He <sub>i</sub> is staying in John's <sub>i</sub> apartment. [ $^{\times}$ Condition C]					
	b.	Who did John <sub>i</sub> try to shave?—*Him <sub>i</sub> ./*Joh	$n_i$ tried to shave him <sub>i</sub> . [*Condition B]					
	c.	Who does John like?—Himself./John likes	himself. [*Condition A]					
(9)	a.	*Mary hurt John, more badly than he <sub>i</sub> /him <sub>i</sub>						
		- violation of Binding condition C	[than him we say any are than he burt John]					
	b.	John hurt himself more badly than her.	[than him, paraphrased into than he, nurt John,] [than-ACC]					
		- than her PARAPHRASED INTO than SHE h	urt herself [sloppy identity] $\rightarrow OK$					
		- her=SUBJ hurt=V herself=OBJ						
	c.	John found Mary looking at herself more c	losely than himself. [than-REF]					
		- than himself PARAPHRASED INTO than HE	E was looking at himself [sloppy identity] $\rightarrow$ OK					
	d	- nimsell/Jonn=SUBJ looking=V	$ \text{IIIIISell=OB} $ ore closely than $ [WH \pm than H] $					
	u.	- who is looking at himself or herself	[sloppy identity] $\rightarrow OK$					
		- who=SBJ looking=V himself of	r herself=OBJ					
		-						

**Cited Workds:** Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.Lechner, Winfried (2004) *Ellipsis in Comparatives*. Mouton De Gruyter, Germany. / McCauley, James D., (1998) *The Syntactic Phenomena of English*, 2nd ed. US: University of Chicago Press. / Merchant, Jason (2004) "Fragments and ellipsis." In *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27: 661-738. Netherland: Kluwer Academic Publishers. / Zhang, Xiaowen (2013) "The Formation of English Phrasal Comparatives: Study of Lechner's Small Clause Analysis." *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 11: 2086-2091, Finland.

## 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-IN I-present		gather-INI-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 me	lt (intransitive)'
		solve-INT-p	resent	
(8)	a.	*Nao-ga	koori-o	toi-ta
		Nao-Nom	ice-Acc	solve-past
		'Nao dissolv	red the ice.'	
	b.	Nao-ga	koori-o	tok-asi-ta
		Nao-Nom	ice-Acc	solve-TR-past
		'Nao dissolv	red the ice.'	
	c.	Koori-ga	oori-ga tok-e-ta.	
		ice-Nom	solve-INT-p	past
		'The ice mel	ted.'	
			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	

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

(9) Koori-ga tok-asar-ta/\*tok-as-asar-ta/\*tok-e-rasar-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)  $\begin{bmatrix} TP & [FP & [VoiceP & NP & [vP & NP & [v' & root + v ]] \end{bmatrix}$  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**

Bošković, Željko. 2016. Contextual phasehood and the ban on extraction from complements of lexical heads: When does X become a phase? In Phase Theory and its Consequences, ed. by Miyoko Yasui and Manabu Mizuguchi, 5-39, Tokyo: Kaitakusha.

Oseki, Yohei. 2017. Voice morphology in Japanese argument structures, Ms. NYU.

## 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. <sup>??</sup>\* 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.

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}. (Tenny 1994: 39)

b. Mary laughed a mirthless laugh {in one minute / for one minute}. (*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.

[activity]

(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 diagnostic 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.

# References

Horrocks, Geoffrey and Melita Stavrou (2010) "Morphological Aspect and the Function and Distribution of Cognate Objects Across Languages," *Lexical Semantics, Syntax, and Event Structure*, ed. by Malka Rappaport Hovav, Edit Doron, and Ivy Sichel, 284-308, Oxford University Press, Oxford. / Höche, Silke (2009) *Cognate Object Constructions in English: A Cognitive-Linguistic Account,* Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen, Tübingen. / Kearns, Kate (2011) *Semantics* (2nd edition), Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke. / Macfarland, Talke (1995) *Cognate Objects and the Argument/Adjunct Distinction in English,* Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University. / Nakajima, Heizo (2006) "Adverbial Cognate Objects," *Linguistic Inquiry* 37, 674-684. / Tenny, Carol L. (1994) *Aspectual Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface,* Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, Boston.

## The Genitive Case Marker in Azerbaijani Xiao-Shi Qiu and Hideki Maki Gifu University

### 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) Həsən-ø dünən kitab-ø aldı. Hasan-Nom yesterday book-Acc bought 'Hasan bought a book yesterday.'

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

Əli-nin kitab-1 Ali-Gen book-PoP.3 'Ali's book'

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

(3) Dünən Həsən-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

(2)

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

Dünən Həsən-in aldı-ğı 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) \* Həsən-ø yağış-nin dayanana qədər otaqda idi. Hasan-Nom rain-Gen stop until room.Loc was 'Hasan was at his office until it stopped raining.' Third, the Transitivity Restriction does not hold.
- (6) Həsən-in dünən kitab-ø verdi-yi adam-ø Əli di. 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.

(7) Həsən-in Əli-nin aldı-ğı-nı/\*alan düşündü-yü kitab-ø
 Hasan-Gen Ali-Gen bought-Adn-Acc/bought thought-Adn book-Nom
 bu kitab dı.
 this book be
 'The book Hasan thought Ali bought is this book.'
 Note, however, that this language allows the genitive subject in a non-relative clause, as shown

in (8).

(8) Həsən-ø Əli-nin qayıtdı-ğı-nı düşünür. Hasan-Nom Ali-Gen returned-Adn-Acc think 'Hasan thinks that Ali returned.'

Fifth and finally, N'-deletion is possible in Azerbaijani.

- (9) Kim-in münasibəti pisdir? who-Gen attitude bad?
   'Whose attitude is bad?'
- (10) Qardaş-ım-ın [N' münasibəti/e]. brother-my-Gen attitude 'My brother's.'

# 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-ø Ulayan-u *t*<sub>1</sub> qudaldun-ab-ysan/\*-ab-čai gejü Bagatur-Nom Ulagan-Gen bodu-ysan nom<sub>1</sub>-bol ene nom. think-Past.Adn book-Top this book

'The book which Bagatur thought [that Ulagan bought t] 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.

<u>Mandarin and its Goal Arguments in Ditransitives</u> 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) <u>bound variable anaphora</u>: (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) <u>passivization</u>: the contrast in (3) reveals that only the source argument can be the subject of a passive sentence.

(2) a.	*Lisi	song-le	meigereni	tadei	hongbao.	Intended. 'Lisi sent everyonei hisi cash-gift.'	,
	Lisi	sent	everyone	his	cash-gift		

- b. Lisi qiang-le meigeren<sub>i</sub> tade<sub>i</sub> hongbao. 'Lisi robbed everyone<sub>i</sub> of his<sub>i</sub> 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  $[_{HP} XP [_{H'} H...]]$ , 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 *tade* '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)	Taroo-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.	Taroo-ga	gakusei-ni	futa-ri	nimotu-o	okutta.	
	Taro-Nom	students-NI	2-CL	package-Acc	sent	
	'Taro sent two s	tudents a package.'				
b.	*Hito-ga	mati-kara	futa-tu	kita.		
	people-Nom	towns-KARA	2-CL	came		
	Intended: 'Peopl	le came from two tov	vns.' (Take	n from Miyagawa	& Tsujioka 20	04)

**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.