Movement and its Restriction in Terms of Argumenthood

Eriko Hirasaki
Kwansei Gakuin University

Movement is one of the most major topics in linguistics. There are many studies which focus on the issue as to where a moved element was base-generated or the path/landing site of the movement was. However, some data indicate that we need some other accounts.

(1) a. How many men, were there ti in that garden?
   b. *How many men, did there arrive ti at that station? (Ura 1994: 227)

The two sentences seem to have no difference in syntactic structure. Therefore, few studies can give a satisfactory analysis of this type of data, and we need a theory with some other point of view. It should be noted that since noun phrases with a WH-word used in the two sentences are the same, the difference must be explained without referring to the lexical properties of the nouns. This paper will give an explanation to some relation between A-bar movement and “Argumenthood” of the nouns. To be more precise, I will propose that some movements are prohibited because of an unchecked feature of a target of the movement. I will show that this proposal enables us to explain the data in question.

Relevant data have already been discussed by Postal (1998). Postal (1998) points out that some movements are restricted because of the base-generated position of the moved element. The following data exemplify the phenomena at issue.

(2) a. He painted the car green/that color.
   b. [No such color]i, would I ever paint my car ti.
   c. *[Green/That color]i, he never painted the car ti. (Postal 1998: 27)

(3) a. He knew that there were (no) such chemicals in the bottle.
   b. [No such chemicals]i, did he know that there were ti in the bottle.
   c. *[Such chemicals]i, he knew that there were ti in the bottle. (Postal 1998: 26)

(4) a. [What kind of dancer]i, do you want to be ti?
   b. [What kind of idiot]i, did they regard him as ti?
   c. Whati are you going to become ti?
   d. *[A good bodyguard]i, Frank is ti.
   e. *[The best bodyguard in the world]i, I never referred to Frank as ti.
   f. *[That kind of surgeon]i, Frank never became ti. (Postal 1998: 29)

As (2) and (3) show, negative extraction is compatible with NPs designating changes of color or with the “focus” position of Existential There Constructions, whereas Topicalization is not. (4) shows that predicative NPs cannot be a target of Topicalization while they can undergo Question Formation. According to Postal (1998), Topicalization, NP Clefing, and Nonrestrictive Relative Clause Formation are not compatible with some certain positions, which will be called Non-Argument
position in this paper, but other extractions such as Question Formation, Restrictive Relative Formation, Negative Inversion, Pseudo-Clefting are compatible with Non-Argument position. There seems to be room for more work to be done in this area because all the movements mentioned here have basically been treated in the same way since Chomsky (1977).

Here I propose that the (un)grammaticality of the above sentences can be explained by clarifying what Non-Argument positions are. In this paper I will assume that a noun phrase in a Non-Argument position does not reduce the adicity of a predicate. The notion of adicity here follows Heim & Kratzer (1998), whose definition is as follows: Arguments reduce the adicity of the predicate they combine with; modifiers leave it unchanged (H&K 1998: 64). Along this line, I will treat noun phrases in Non-Argument position as one kind of modifier, and assume that a certain feature, which I will call Argument feature (A-feature), remains unchecked if the noun phrase is used as a modifier. A-feature is assumed to be a feature which all noun phrases have, and this feature is checked if the noun phrase is used as an Argument of the predicate and refers to an entity. For example, green/that color in (2) does not refer to an entity, the associate of There-Construction and predicative nouns as well. Since the noun phrases used in the sentences above are not used as an Argument, their A-features remain. Therefore, assuming A-feature is incompatible with Topicalization, Clefting, and Nonrestrictive Relatives, the ungrammaticality of the sentences can be explained. Here I argue that the incompatibility can be deduced to LF-Reconstruction. If a movement has LF-Reconstruction, the remaining A-feature of the noun phrase will cause the ungrammaticality. Whether the movements have LF-Reconstruction can be supported by the existence/absence of Weak Crossover effect, which is studied by Safir (1986), Lasnik & Stowell (1991), Postal (1993) among many others. According to Safir (1986), Weak Crossover effects are not found in Nonrestrictive Relatives while they are in Restrictive Relatives. According to L&S (1991), Weak Crossover effects are absent in Topicalization. Assuming that movements which have LF-Reconstruction do not have Weak Crossover effect, which is also suggested by L&S (1991), the phenomena can be deduced to the same point.

References
How the speakers create the common ground with audience in TED Talks?
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The aim of this study is to examine how the American and Japanese speaker deliver a speech to make common ground with audience in public speaking. When people communicate with the other, common ground, or the shared knowledge, facilitates better and smoothly mutual understanding (Clark and Brennan, 1991). In the context of public speaking, there is nearly empty of common ground between the speaker and audience because they meet for the first time and each audience has diverse social background. How does the speaker deliver a speech to gain better understanding for a large audience who do not share the common ground? This paper deals with “TED Talks” delivered by American and Japanese speakers as data and examines (1) the discourse structure and (2) rhetorical expressions. Through the analyses, this paper focuses on the difference of how the American and Japanese speakers create common ground and build the relationship with audience in a public speech.

Regarding the discourse structure, many studies in contrastive rhetoric and linguistic stylistics have pointed out that essay structure takes on different forms depending on cultures (Kaplan 1989, Leggett 1975, Honna 1989). As seen this, while many studies dealing with written language have been conducted, not much in available on spoken language. Regarding the rhetorical expressions in public speaking, many studies examine them in the political context but there are few research on the expression in the context of what the speakers deliver their own ideas based on various range of the theme.

This paper deals with 12 American English and 12 Japanese speeches of “TED (Technology, Entertainment, Design) Talks” as data; which is a webcast project of a globally-spreading speaking event, “TED Conference.” The paper focuses on (1) how the speakers construct episodes, and (2) how they employ rhetorical expressions when they enhance the interactivity and create common ground.

Results of the analysis (1) reveal that American and Japanese speakers construct speeches differently. American speakers give some episodes by emphasizing the certainty of their own thesis statement. They give the thesis statement, or the main point, at the beginning of a speech. The audience can thereby grasp the essence of the content of the speech right away. On the other hand, Japanese speakers show the thesis statement at the end of the speech. The speakers give some episodes to co-construct the path to the goal.
of the speech with audience. Audience does not know the conclusion until the end, they need to consider and imagine what the thesis statement is by referring to episodes which have already been presented by the speaker as cues.

Next, the results of analysis (2) will be shown. Both American and Japanese speakers use the method of parallelism and the method of question, their ways and effect show the difference. Moreover, American speakers use the words “fact” and “evidence” to highlight certainty of the information. On the other hand, Japanese speakers use the sentence-final particle ne which is a marker in showing a co-responding attitude (Kamio 1990) to attempt to share the emotion and create rapport with audience.

In conclusion, this paper shows the differences how the public speakers convey their own ideas toward audience who do not have common ground. American speakers tend to deliver a speech as the “leader” and make common ground by providing information which shows speaker’s possession and high accuracy. On the other hand, Japanese speakers deliver a speech as the “partner” with audience and make common ground by emphasizing assent and rapport. As can be seen, American and Japanese speakers posit the speaker’s role differently and they have the own fashion of speaking respectively.
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What to Do with PGs in Japanese: An Anti-Lexicalist Approach
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Synopsis: This paper gives an argument for an inventory of Japanese null arguments (JNAs) involving pro & parasitic gaps (PGs) (A 2011, Mi 2017) to the (almost) exclusion of argument-ellipsis (AE) of O (1998). I discuss the word-formation (WF)/lexical-acquisition (LA) of JNAs under Anti-Lexicalism (AL; Mu 2016, B 2015). I follow A (2011) in assuming the presence of PGs in J in addition to pro. A (2011) observes: “Adopting the functional determination approach taken by Ch (1982), let us suppose that all instances of NAs in fact originate from one entity that lacks all features ….” Capitalizing on “one entity that lacks all features,” I take the symbol Φ (meaning ‘one entity that lacks all features’) as the “lexical precursor cell (LPC)” for pro & PGs (B 2015, Mu 2016 for LPCs as input to narrow-syntactic NS). The WF/LA procedure under AL for JNAs may be one according to which the LPC Φ is Merged into NS, is derivationally manipulated & acquires lexical features, and then is realized as either pro or a PG. For acquisition purposes under AL, my analysis is couched in the terms of Y’s (2005, 2011) Elsewhere Condition (EC). I take derivational fragments as micro-cues of W (2009) & such fragments can count as exceptions for the EC’s serial search procedure.

Proposal: PG constructions in J discussed by A (2011) are judged by the criterion of English PGs. Turning to JNAs, A (2011) observes: “The bound pro strategy preempts the AE strategy,” limiting JNAs to pro and PGs, given last resort AE. While he does not discuss PGs, Mi (2017) claims that all JNAs are pro, with possibility of sloppy interpretation due to pro serving as an E-type pronoun. Look at the following, based on Y (2005):

(1) Elsewhere Condition Serial Search (ECSS) for pro & PGs in Japanese
(the darkened, derivational fragment as ‘triggering’ micro-cue & as an ‘exception’ for ECSS)

If Φ is in [ … XP … [ … Φ ... ] … t ... ], where XP locally A'-binds Φ, with t as a real gap,
THEN Φ = a PG.

ELSE: Apply R (R: Φ = pro)

(i) If Φ is in [ … XP … [ … Φ ... ] … t ... ], where XP locally A'-binds Φ, with t as a real gap, then Φ = pro.
(ii) If Φ is in [ … XP … [ … Φ ... ]], where XP is a (salient) discourse entity, then Φ = pro, interpreted in terms of XP via the E-type pronoun strategy.

Consequences & Implications: Look at the NS-structures into which the LPC Φ is Merged (NL = nominalizer; (2a) being A’s 2011: (42) & (2b) A&N’s 2009: (27)):

(2) a. Dare-o [hazimete Φ atta] hito-ga t kenasita no desu ka?
who-Acc for-the-first-time saw person-Nom criticized NL be Q
b. Zibun-no donna syasino-o [Φ mita] subete-no hito-ga Mary-ga self-Gen what picture-Acc saw every-Gen person-Nom M.-Nom
   t kiniitteiru to itta no?
   like C said Q
(3) a. [dare-o [hazimete (Φ =>) pro atta] hito-ga t ...] (for (2a))
(Dare-o A-scrambled to the position in (3a) A-binds Φ, allowing it to be identified as pro without inducing a weak crossover (WCO) violation; (1i) above)

b. [zibun-no donna syasin-o [(Φ =>) PG mita] subete-no hito-ga Mary-ga t ...]
(for (2b); Zibun can refer to subete-no hito ‘everyone’, but not to Mary, showing Φ to behave like a PG with Condition A reconstruction into Φ possible; Zibun-no donna syasin-o long-distance scrambled to this position is A’-movement, so Φ is A’-bound by it & identified as a PG; see (1)) As for “?”[Hazimete Φ atta] hito-ga dare-o kenasita no desu ka?” (discussed by T 2006 & A 2011: (41)), I take its ungrammaticality to be due to the absence of A- or A’-movement binder for Φ, A-scrambling of dare-o being barred because of the constraint prohibiting ‘covert’ scrambling (A&H 2012: n.10), & also to the wh-phrase dare-o serving as intervener for some null discourse topic acting as identifier for Φ (as pro)). Look at the example involving a null discourse topic (NDT; ‘Øtopic’):

(4) a. [[Hyaku-peeji-nimo Φ mitanai-noni] Φ hiratojini-sareteita].
  one hundred pages-up-to-even full become-Neg although hiratoji-bind-Pass-be-Past
  ‘Although it was less than 100 pages long, it was hiratoji-bound.’
(Situation: The clerk working at the secondhand bookstore gets interested in a thin booklet newly arrived at the store; Yonezawa 2009: 7)

b. (i) [(Φtopic (‘sono syoossasi (the booklet))) [(Φ =>) pro hiratojini-sareteita]]
(The NDT’s content is sono syoossasi (the booklet); In the absence of A- or A’-movement binder, Φ is identified as pro (as an E-type pronoun))

(ii) [(Φtopic [hyaku-peeji-nimo (Φ =>) PG mitanai-noni]
  (pro/E-type pronoun =>) sono syoossasi-wa hiratojini-sareteita)]
(E-type pronoun interpretation of pro via the NDT; The adjunct clause ‘[hyaku-peeji-nimo Φ mitanai-noni]’ is late-Merged into the matrix clause; & as for Φ in the adjunct, the configuration ‘[Øtopic [[ … Φ … ] sono syoossasi-wa … ]]’ may serve as the micro-cue fragment (see (1)) for PG acquisition ‘[ … XP … [ … Φ … ] … t …]’, where XP locally A’-binds Φ, ‘so that Φ is identified as a PG)
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A Hybrid Analysis of Multiple Sluicing in Mandarin Chinese
Chyan-an Arthur Wang
Chung Yuan Christian University, Taiwan

Multiple sluicing is an elliptical construction in which more than one wh-phrase survives in the elided clause (i.e., the sluice). Examples from English and Japanese are shown below:

(1) I know that in each instance one of the girls got something from one of the boys. But they didn’t tell me which from which. (Bolinger 1978)

(2) Dareka-ga dareka-ni atta sooda. Dakedo boku-wa dare-ga dare-ni ka soozoodekinai.
someone-NOM someone-DAT met I.heard but I-TOP who-NOM who-DAT Q cannot.imagine
Lit. ‘I heard someone met someone. But I can’t imagine who who.’ (Takahashi & Lin 2012)

With reference from English and Japanese counterparts, this paper aims to investigate multiple sluicing in Mandarin Chinese (hf. Mandarin), as shown in (3), focusing on its syntactic derivation from the generative perspective.

(3) Lisi shuo ta jiandao-le yi-ge dongxi keshi ta bu keng toulu shi shenme zainali
Lisi say 3SG find-PRF one-CL thing but 3SG NEG willing reveal SHI what where
‘Lisi said he found something, but he was not willing to reveal what where.’

A particular research question is how Mandarin, a wh-in-situ language, derives multiple sluicing under the condition that not any single wh-word can normally front in forming (multiple) wh-questions. Even though there are abundant studies on Mandarin sluicing in the literature (Wang 2002, 2008, 2012; Wei 2004, 2009, 2011; among others), there appears to be only two works (Chiu 2009; Takahashi & Lin 2012) on multiple sluicing, both of which lack a conclusive analysis and suffer from empirical challenges. Therefore, by systematically scrutinizing novel data to build the empirical basis, I propose a novel deletion-based analysis for multiple sluicing. Specifically, I suggest an alternative based on different movement operations, with which the multiple wh-remnants in a sluice evacuate from the elliptical site. The movement operations in question include wh-focalization and wh-topicalization whose landing sites are the focus projection and iterative topic projections, respectively, in the left periphery. Depending on their compositional natures, I suggest that wh-remnants in a sluice can take up different movement operations. In particular, minimal wh-words like shei ‘who’ and shenme ‘what’, which are morphologically atomic, provide no given information and can thus be used to ask out-of-the-blue questions, so they can only undergo focus movement to the unique syntactic focus projection and are subsequently marked by the copula shi. This captures the fact that minimal wh-phrases can occur only once in Mandarin multiple sluicing, as exemplified in (4):

(4) *Lisi zhi jide you ren mai-le dongxi dan ta wang-le shi shenme (shi) shei
Lisi only remember have person buy-PRF thing but 3SG forget-PRF SHI what SHI who
Int. ‘Lisi only remembered someone bought something, but he forgot what who.’
On the other hand, complex ones like *zai-na-li* ‘at-which-place/where’ and *shenme-shihou* ‘what-time/when’ either are discourse-linked or provide a common nominal set in mind (cf. Pan 2014) as can be seen from the way they are composed; hence, they can serve as *wh*-topics. Given the iterative nature of topic projections (Rizzi 1997; among others), it is expected to see more than one instance of complex *wh*-words undergoing *wh*-topicalization to the left periphery. Accordingly, more than one *wh*-topics can be immune from deletion in Mandarin multiple sluicing, as shown in (5). The proposed analysis thus captures the restriction on the number of *wh*-remnants as well as the distribution patterns of multiple sluicing in Mandarin.

(5) Lisi yinggai yijing mai-le fangzi  
Lisi should already buy-PRF house  
zhishi ta bu gaosu women (shi) { *zainali shenmeshihou* / *shenmeshihou zainali* }  
only 3SG NEG tell 1PL SHI where when when where  
‘Lisi should have already bought a house; just that he didn’t tell us {where when/when where}.’

In the literature, it has been shown that multiple sluicing observes the so-called clausemate condition, regulating that the two (or more) *wh*-remnants (and accordingly their antecedent correlates) in multiple sluicing should be local to one another. The locality in question is roughly equivalent to the clausal boundary. The condition works in English (Merchant 2006; Lasnik 2014) and in Japanese (Takahashi 1994; Nishigauchi 1998; Takahashi and Lin 2012). However, this is not really the case for Mandarin multiple sluicing since the clausemate condition is not observed, as evidenced in (6):

(6) cengjing you yi-ge ren, gaosu wo [Lisi zui xihuan mou yi-zhong jiu],  
once have one-CL person tell 1SG Lisi most like certain one-CL wine  
zhishi wo zao yijing wang-le shi sheis na yi-zhong jiu,  
only 1SG early already forget-PRF SHI who which one-CL wine  
‘Someone once told me that Lisi likes a certain kind of wine the most; just that I already forgot who which kind of wine.’

The non-observance of the clausemate condition follows naturally from the proposed analysis which assumes different kinds of movement operations, each of which is independently capable of crossing clausal boundaries. As such, there is no clausemate effect, as expected.
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Proposal

In this paper, subject raising in Japanese is reconsidered and I will argue that oblique subject can involve subject raising as well as nominative subject. It is well-known that subjects are assigned different Cases in Japanese. That is, in Japanese, subject is assigned not only nominative Case but also oblique Case, as in (1). In previous studies, it has been argued that while nominative subject involves subject raising, oblique subject does not (Kishimoto 2010 and among others). Kishimoto (2010) confirms this proposal by using a focus particle bakari. Kishimoto (2010) argues that the focus particle bakari takes scope over vP but not TP, and that this property accounts for the fact that while nominative subject is not associated with bakari, oblique subject is. Based on this data, it is claimed that while nominative subject involves subject raising, oblique subject does not.

This analysis is, however, problematic with respect to Agentivity of subject nominals. Let us demonstrate this using muriyari ‘forcefully’, an Agent-oriented adverb. This adverb is used only in the case that there is a (di-)transitive verb or an unergative verb in a sentence. In other words, this adverb is not used with an unaccusative verb, as in (3). Given the fact that the Agent-oriented adverb is used only in the cases where the subject nominal with that adverb shows Agentivity, it can be assumed that the Agent-oriented adverb can be adjoined to vP or the upper projection. Otherwise, not only grammatical sentences but also ungrammatical sentences should be generated. If we follow Kishimoto’s analysis, however, the linear order of oblique subject in (4) cannot be generated because oblique subject is generated in Spec of vP and stays in-situ.

To solve this problem, I propose that oblique subject involves subject raising to Spec of the projection upper than vP and lower than TP. The data in (4) indicate that the subjects in (4) are assigned the theta role Agent. However, this is problematic in terms of theta-role assignment because the kara-marked subjects are assigned both Agent and Source. This multiple theta-role assignment is not allowed by Theta Criterion in (5). This problem can be solved by introducing PRO generated in Spec of VP (see Hasegawa 1990) and the structure shown in (6). In this structure, the theta-role Agent is assigned to subject nominal, and the theta-role Source is assigned to this PRO. Consequently the problem of theta-role assignment is solved.

Data

(1) a. Taro-ga Hanako-ni booru-o nage-ta.  
Nominative subject
Taro-nom Hanako-goal ball-acc throw-past
“Taro threw a ball to Hanako.”
b. Taro-\textit{kara} Hanako-\textit{ni} booru-\textit{o} nage-\textit{ta}. \textit{Oblique subject}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
Taro-\textit{ところ} Hanako-\textit{の球} ball-\textit{acc} throw-\textit{past} \\
\end{tabular}  
\textquotedblright Taro threw a ball to Hanako.\textquotedblright 

(2) a. Kodomo-\textit{ga} manga-\textit{o} yon-de-\textit{bakari} i-\textit{ru}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
child-\textit{持} comic-\textit{acc} read-\textit{only} be-\textit{past} \\
\end{tabular}  
\textquotedblright The child is only reading the comics.\textquotedblright \hspace{1cm} (Kishimoto 2010: 631)  
b. John-\textit{kara} keeka-\textit{o} osie-te-\textit{bakari} i-\textit{ru}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
John-\textit{から} result-\textit{承} teach-\textit{only} be-\textit{past} \\
\end{tabular}  
\textquotedblright Only John is telling the results.\textquotedblright \hspace{1cm} (Kishimoto 2010: 650)  

(3) \textit{muriyari} \thinspace \textquoteleft forcibly\textquoteright  
a. *Ken-\textit{ga} muriyari oniyome-\textit{o} kowagat-\textit{ta}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
Ken-\textit{名} forcefully horrible wife-\textit{持} fear-\textit{past} \\
\end{tabular}  
\textquotedblright Ken was forcefully afraid of his horrible wife.\textquotedblright  
b. *kabin-\textit{ga} muriyari koware-\textit{ta}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
vase-\textit{持} forcefully break-\textit{past} \\
\end{tabular}  
\textquotedblright The vase forcefully broke.\textquotedblright \hspace{1cm} (Yamaguchi 2016: 57)  

(4) a. John-\textit{kara} muriyari Mary-\textit{ni} booru-\textit{o} nage-\textit{ta}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
John-\textit{ところ} forcefully Mary-\textit{の球} ball-\textit{acc} throw-\textit{past} \\
\end{tabular}  
\textquotedblright John threw a ball to Mary.\textquotedblright  
b. John-\textit{kara} muriyari Mary-\textit{ni} himitu-\textit{o} hanasi-\textit{ta}  
\begin{tabular}{l}
John-\textit{ところ} forcefully Mary-\textit{の秘密} secret-\textit{acc} talk-\textit{past} \\
\end{tabular}  
\textquotedblright John forcefully talked to Mary about a secret.\textquotedblright  

(5) Theta Criterion  
(i) Each argument bears one and only one \theta-role. \hspace{1cm} (Chomsky 1981: 35)  
(ii) Each \theta-role is assigned to one and only one argument.  

(6) \[ [\theta \text{ Spec} [\text{v-spec} SBJ-kara]\text{-}\text{subject} [\theta \text{ Spec} [\text{v-abs} \text{ ADV [\theta t [\text{v-abs} PRO-secret]] [\text{v-abs} \text{ NP-secret] V-secret] V-secret]}]} X] T]. \]
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In this talk, I would like to propose that NP-ellipsis (NPE) with an adjectival remnant in English is licensed by focus-based licensing mechanism and also suggest that the assumption of deleting the complement of the licensing head is plausible under the current labeling theory.

It has been argued that NPE licensing is related to the morphological realization of the spec-head relation (Saito and Murasugi (1990), Lobeck (1995)). Haumann (2003) argues that while the headless DP in the second conjunct is not possible in English, as in (1), it is attested in Old English texts, as in (2).

(1) * John bought the red car and the green. (Kester (1996: 58))

(2) se legfamblawenda seað & se fula … þæt wæs helle tintreges muð that emitting-foam pit & that foul RSP was hell's torment's mouth ‘the pit which foamed up with flame and was so foul … was the mouth of hell's torment’ (cobede, Bede_5:13.432.7.4345/translation in Miller (1891))

This difference is attributed to the presence/absence of the inflectional suffix on the adjective, and this idea is embodied, for example, by the (in)existence of the features on Agr, as in (3).

(3) a. [DP the [AgrP green [Agr′ Agr′ [NP …]]]]

b. [DP se [AgrP ful-a<sg, masc> [Agr′ Agr<sg, masc> [NP …]]]]

Such inflection-based licensing analyses of ellipsis appears to be successful, but consider the following example, taken from BYU-BNC (Davies 2004-).

(4) the gulf between the richer families and the very poor was getting wide. The second conjunct in (4) is an instance of NPE, in which its missing head noun “families” is recovered from the antecedent the richer families. NPE like (4) is possible in English when the adjectival remnant shows a sharp contrast (Günther (2011)). Since the adjective poor does not have any inflectional ending, so we cannot rely on the inflection-based licensing mechanism. In this talk, I assume with Corver and van Koppen (2008) that NPE is licensed by contrastive focus, not by inflection. Their analysis of NPE with an adjectival remnant is summarized as in (5), where [ ] is omitted, and the relevant notions are summarized as in (6).

(5) [DP D [FocAP] [Foc Foc′ Foc′ E] [XP tAP [X X [NP N]]]]

(6) a. Foc′ is specified for the [E] feature to attract a focused item and the [Op] feature on Foc′ to delete its complement.


Thus, we can successfully account for the inflection-less NPE like (4), under the focus-based licensing approach to ellipsis.

In the phase theory, this feature-driven deletion analysis seems plausible, so I basically follow this line of arguments. But the only issue that I would like to note is about the target of the deletion: why the complement of the licensing head can be marked for deletion? This will be accounted for under the current labeling theory (Chomsky (2015)), without assuming specific featural characteristics of the licensing head. Suppose that NPE in (5) can be updated to that in (7), and my analysis is summarized as in (8).
In (8a), AP\(^{[+Foc]}\) and FocP correspond to focus and presupposition, respectively, and then the pair corresponds to the traditional configuration which has been assumed to be essential to ellipsis licensing, namely the spec-head relation. Neither of AP\(^{[+Foc]}\) and FocP should be subject to any further operation, to keep the label <Foc, Foc> intact; if there is any further operation to them, the label collapses and some other interpretation which is not intended will come up (see Chomsky (2015)). However, the deletion of the complement of Foc\(^0\) is not problematic. In (7), NP is deleted, but Foc\(^0\) remains, so FocP remains as well. Hence, the label <Foc, Foc> survives and the intended interpretation can be obtained.

This focus-based licensing analysis of ellipsis implies a necessity of reconsidering instances of NPE in earlier English like (2). Under the inflection-based licensing analysis, it is the instance of NPE licensed by the rich adjectival inflection. Under the focus-based licensing analysis, however, we may question if it is true, since adjectives do not show a contrast. Compare the adjectives in (2); legfamblawenda ‘foaming up with flame’ and fula ‘foul, stinking’. They do not show a contrast. Rather, they modify the same noun seeð to attribute its property, and the whole nominal phrase functions as subject of the verb wæs, which is in its past singular form. Thus, the example in (2) may not be an appropriate instance to argue for the analysis of NPE in earlier English.
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A Spanning Approach to Quantifier in Classifier Languages
Yusuke Yoda (Toyo Gakuen University)

This paper argues for atomic CL (ASSIFIER), which is one of instances of the CL system within the tenet of DISTRIBUTED MORPHOLOGY and claims that CL is an position where allomorphs occur and such allomorphs should be accounted for by SPANNING (Svenonius 2016). Japanese is an instance of the classifier languages and has a variety of allomorphs depending on the host nominal. Among them, this paper focuses on atomic CLs (Matsumoto 1991, 1993) which alter among three forms depending on features on host nominal (i.e. [HUMAN, ANIMAL, INANIMATE]) as in (1).

(1) a. Gakusei san-{nin/*biki/*tsu}  c. Hako mi-{*nin/*biki/tsu}
    student three-CL                             box 3-CL
b. Inu san-{*nin/biki/*tsu}                  d. Gakusei san-{nin/*biki/*tsu}
dog 3-CL

In all cases of (1) above, Numeral Quantifier, which consists of Q(uantifier) and CL, counts the number of its host, and CL interprets one of three features on the host nominal. For instance, gakusei “student” is a nominal which bears the [HUMAN] feature, and therefore, the CL’s exponents should be a variant of /nin/. Moreover, phonologically speaking, each of CLs in (1) has allophones as illustrated in (2).

(2) a. /nin/ $\leftrightarrow$ [ri], [nin]
    b. /hiki/ $\leftrightarrow$ [piki], [hiki], [biki]
    c. /tu/ $\leftrightarrow$ [tsu], φ

To sum, Japanese has following three types of dependency.

(3) a. NP-CL dependency
    b. NP-Quantifier dependency
    c. Quantifier-CL dependency

However, the existing analysis within the tenet of DM, $\sqrt{rt}$ must be categorized to be spelled-out. In other words, the host nominals in (1) must be a results of $\sqrt{rt}$ + cyclic or categorial determining head (c), which intervenes for the CL to interpret the features on $\sqrt{rt}$. To prevent such state of affairs and to put all the features of $\sqrt{rt}$ out into one single domain, I assume SPANNING proposed by Svenonius (2016). Spanning is based on Extended Projection and defined as in (4).

(4) A span in a contiguous sequence of head in a head-complement relation

For instance, this spanning mechanism accounts for Lexical Insertion in the following manner. For the case of “mouse-mice” alternation, $<N, n, #>$ targets the Lexical Matching (i.e. Vocabulary Insertion). In another case like “piglets”, the same span can lexicalizes multiple exponents as in:

(5) a. /pig/ $\leftrightarrow$ $<\sqrt{rt}>$
    b. /let/ $\leftrightarrow$ $<n>$
    c. /l/ $\leftrightarrow$ $<#>$

Furthermore, I assume the [[[\sqrt{rt} n] Q] CL] Case] D] for the nominal structure, where $\sqrt{rt}$ adjoins to n (cf. Wood & Marantz 2016). This is because if, in the hypothetical context, some new technology invents a
stick-shaped apple, then we are most likely to count it by using hon, which is dedicated to counting the number of the stick-shaped objects. Under the current approach, \(< \sqrt{\sqrt{l}}, n, \text{CL}>\) constitutes a span and also \(< Q, \text{CL} >\) constitutes another span for the Vocabulary Insertion since they are all components of one single DP Extended Projection. The current approach predicts “gakusei 3-nin-ga” (N-Q-CL-CASE) order as a default, but Japanese has two other orders such as “3-nin-no gakusei” (Q-CL-Linker-N) and “gakusei-ga-3-nin” (N-Case-Q-CL), but *Q-N-(Case)-CL or *CL-N-(Case)-Q. This can be also accounted for within Svenonius’s (2016) proposal, where he proposes “[t]he edge of a lexical word is interpreted in the input to phonology as a boundary of a phonological word” and “[t]he exponents of a span is linearized within the phrase it projects according to the spell-out feature @.” Based on @, in Japanese, N and Q-CL consist of @-span, and therefore, Q and CL are inseparable. Moreover, as Svenonius (2016) and Noyer (1998) note, there are some cases where two sets of @-span can be relocated. For instance, the English nominal structure must hold the plural marker following N. Thus, it has N-n-# within the same @-span, whereas in Tongan, the plural marker must precede nominal, so that it has two @-span.

(6)  a. English: \(\sqrt{\sqrt{l}} - n - \# @\)  
     b. Tongan: \(\sqrt{\sqrt{l}} - n @ - \# @\)

Japanese is an instance of Tongan type languages and @-span (Q+CL) can optionally be the target of relocation, and thus it has three distinct positions for the host nominal whose number is to be counted.