

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_{*t*_{*i*}} were there *t*_{*i*} in that garden?

b. *How many men_{*t*_{*i*}} did there arrive *t*_{*i*} 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]₁ would I ever paint my car *t*₁.

c. *[Green/That color]₁, he never painted the car *t*₁. (Postal 1998: 27)

(3) a. He knew that there were (no) such chemicals in the bottle.

b. [No such chemicals]₁ did he know that there were *t*₁ in the bottle.

c. *[Such chemicals]₁, he knew that there were *t*₁ in the bottle. (Postal 1998: 26)

(4) a. [What kind of dancer]₁, do you want to be *t*₁?

b. [What kind of idiot]₁ did they regard him as *t*₁?

c. What₁ are you going to become *t*₁?

(Postal 1998: 28)

d. *[A good bodyguard]₁, Frank is *t*₁.

e. *[The best bodyguard in the world]₁, I never referred to Frank as *t*₁.

f. *[That kind of surgeon]₁, Frank never became *t*₁. (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 Clefting, 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

- Chomsky, N. 1977. On *wh*-movement. In P. Culicover, T. Wasow, and A. Akmajian, eds., *Formal Syntax*. New York: Academic Press.
- Heim, I. and A. Kratzer. 1998. *Semantics in Generative Grammar*. MA. Blackwell Publishing.
- Lasnik, H. and T. Stowell. 1991. Weakest crossover. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 687-720.
- Postal, P. 1993. Remarks on Weak Crossover Effects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 539-556.
- Postal, P. 1998. *Three Investigations of Extraction*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Safir, K. 1986. Relative Clauses in a Theory of Binding and Levels. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 663-689.
- Ura, H. 1994. A Short Note on Partitive Case Checking and the Expletive *There*. *English Linguistics* 11: 227-236.

How the speakers create the common ground with audience in TED Talks?

Reika Sakurada

(Graduate school of Humanities, Japan Women's University)

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 is 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.

References

- Clark, H. H., and Brennan, S. A. (1991). In L.B. Resnick, J.M. Levine, & S.D. Teasley (Eds.). *Perspectives on socially shared cognition*. Washington: APA Books.
- Honna, N. 1989. *Nihongo no buntai to eigo no buntai* [The stylistics in Japanese and English]. *Kooza: Japanese language and Japanese language education* 5: 363-385. Meiji shoin.
- Kamio, Akio. 1990. *Joo-hoo-no nawabari riron: Gengo-no kinoo-teki bunseki* (The theory of territory of information: A functional analysis of language). Tokyo: Taisyuukan Shoten.
- Kaplan, Robert. 1966. Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language learning* 16, 14. 1-20.
- Leggett, A. 1975. Notes on the writing of scientific English and Japanese physics. 21, 11. The Physical Society of Japan.

What to Do with PGs in Japanese: An *Anti-Lexicalist* Approach

Norio Suzuki *Kobe Shinwa Women's University (former professor)*

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-syntax 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 syasin-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 ($\Phi \Rightarrow$) *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 [($\Phi \Rightarrow$) 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; ‘ \emptyset_{topic} ’):

(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) [CP \emptyset_{topic} (‘*sono syoosassi*’ (the booklet)) [($\Phi \Rightarrow$) *pro* hiratojini-sareteita]]
 (The NDT’s content is *sono syoosassi* (the booklet); In the absence of A- or A'-movement binder, Φ is identified as *pro* (as an E-type pronoun))

(ii) [CP \emptyset_{topic} [[hyaku-peeji-nimo ($\Phi \Rightarrow$) PG mitanai-noni]
 (*pro*/E-type pronoun \Rightarrow) *sono syoosassi-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 ‘[\emptyset_{topic} [[... Φ ...] *sono syoosassi-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)

Selected References Abe/A. 2011. Real parasitic gaps in Japanese. *JEAL* 20/ Abe & Hornstein/A&H. 2012. “Lasnik-effects” and string-vacuous ATB movement. In *Ways of structure building*/ Abe & Nakao/A&N. 2009. On ATB-movement and parasitic gaps in Japanese. *SICOGG* 2009/ Boeckx/B. 2015. *Elementary syntactic structures*/ Chomsky/Ch. 1982. *Some concepts and consequences of the theory government and binding*/ Miyagawa/Mi. 2017. *Agreement beyond phi*/ Murphy/Mu. 2016. Phasal eliminativism, anti-lexicalism, and the status of the unarticulated. *Biolinguistics* 10/ Oku/O. 1998. *A theory of selection and reconstruction in the minimalist perspective*. PhD UConn/ Takahashi/T. 2006. Apparent parasitic gaps and null arguments in Japanese. *JEAL* 15/ Westergaard/W. 2009. *The acquisition of word order*/ Yang/Y. 2005. On productivity. In *Linguistic variation yearbook* Vol.5/ Yang/Y. 2011. Three factors in language variation. In *The biolinguistic enterprise*/ Yonezawa, Honobu. 2009. *Tsuisoo Godanshoo* (「追想五断章」) .

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_x gaosu wo [Lisi zui xihuan mou yi-zhong jiu_y],
 once have one-CL person tell 1SG Lisi most like certain one-CL wine
 zhishi wo zao yijing wang-le shi shei_x na yi-zhong jiu_y
 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.

Selected References

- Lasnik, Howard. 2014. Multiple Sluicing in English? *Syntax* 17.1: 1-20.
 Merchant, Jason. 2006. Sluicing. In *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax, vol. 4*, eds. M. Everaert, H. V. Riemsdijk, R. Goedemans, and B. Hollebrandse, 234–270. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
 Nishigauchi, Taisuke. 1998. 'Multiple Sluicing' in Japanese and the functional nature of *wh*-phrases. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 7:121-152.
 Takahashi, Daiko and Sichao Lin. 2012. Two Notes on Multiple Sluicing in Chinese and Japanese. *Nanzan Linguistics* 8: 129-145.
 Wang, C.-A. Arthur. 2008. Sluicing and Resumption. In *The Proceedings of the 37th Meeting of the NELS*, eds. E. Elfner and M. Walkow. Amherst, Mass.: GLSA, Univ. of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Reconsidering Subject Raising in Japanese -From a Perspective of Agentivity-

Takaya Yamaguchi

Graduate School of Humanities, Kobe University

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 ν P 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 ν P 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 ν P and stays in-situ.

To solve this problem, I propose that oblique subject involves subject raising to Spec of the projection upper than ν P 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-*kara* Hanako-ni booru-o nage-ta. *Oblique subject*

Taro-_{SOURCE} Hanako-_{GOAL} ball-_{ACC} throw-_{PAST}

“Taro threw a ball to Hanako.”

(2) a. Kodomo-*ga* manga-o yon-de-*bakari* i-ru

child-_{NOM} comic-_{ACC} read-_{PICP-ONLY} be-_{PRES}

“The child is only reading the comics.”

(Kishimoto 2010: 631)

b. John-*kara* keeka-o osie-te-*bakari* i-ru

John-from result-_{ACC} teach-_{PICP-ONLY} be-_{PRES}

“Only John is telling the results.”

(Kishimoto 2010: 650)

(3) *muriyari* ‘forcefully’

a. *Ken-ga *muriyari* oniyome-o kowagat-ta

Ken-_{NOM} forcefully horrible wife-_{ACC} fear-_{PAST}

“Ken was forcefullh afraid of his horrible wife.”

b. *kabin-ga *muriyari* koware-ta

vase-_{NOM} forcefully break-_{PAST}

“The vase forcefully broke.”

(Yamaguchi 2016: 57)

(4) a. John-*kara* *muriyari* Mary-ni booru-o nage-ta

John-_{SOURCE} forcefully Mary-_{GOAL} ball-_{ACC} throw-_{PAST}

“John threw a ball to Mary.”

b. John-*kara* *muriyari* Mary-ni himitu-o hanasi-ta

John-_{SOURCE} forcefully Mary-_{GOAL} secret-_{ACC} talk-_{PAST}

“John forcefully talked to Mary about a secret.”

(5) Theta Criterion

(i) Each argument bears one and only one θ -role.

(ii) Each θ -role is assigned to one and only one argument.

(Chomsky 1981: 35)

(6) [_{TP} Spec [_{XP} SBJ-*kara*_[AGENT]] [_{VP} ADV [_{VP} t_i [_{VP} PRO_[SOURCE]] [_{VP} ... NP_[THEME] V_{[THEME][SOURCE]}]]] v_[AGENT]]] X] T].

References

- Chomsky, Noam (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Hasegawa, Nobuko (1990). On VP-internal subject hypothesis. Tadashi Sakamoto and Yasuaki Abe (eds.) *Nihongokyoikukoku Kokusaisinpojiumu Houkokusyo*: 249-254. Aichi: Nanzan University.
- Kishimoto, Hideki (2010). Subjects and Constituent Structure in Japanese. *Linguistics* 48: 620-670.
- Yamaguchi, Takaya (2016). Nihongo no nizyutadoosi yurai tadoosi ni tsuite “Transitive Verbs Derived from Ditransitive Verbs in Japanese”. *Kobe Working Paper in Linguistics* 10: 51-68.

Focus-based Licensing Analysis of NP-ellipsis in English

Shuto, YAMAMURA (University of Tsukuba)

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 \square is omitted, and the relevant notions are summarized as in (6).

(5) [DP D [FocP AP_i^[+Op] [Foc' Foc^{0[E]/[+Op]} \square [XP *t*^{AP} [X' X [NP N]]]]]]

(6) a. Foc⁰ is specified for the [+Op] feature to attract a focused item and the [E] feature (Merchant (2001)) to delete its complement.
b. A prenominal AP originating in [Spec, XP] has the [+Op] feature to be attracted by [+Op] on Foc⁰.

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).

- (7) [DP D [_{<Foc, Foc>} AP^[+Foc] [_{FocP} Foc⁰ [_{NP} t^{AP} [_{NP} ...]]]]], where $\bar{\square}$ is deleted.
- (8) a. AP with a focus feature (AP^[+Foc]) internally merge with FocP to form a focus-presupposition configuration, resulting in a label <Foc, Foc>.
- b. The complement of Foc⁰ may be deleted, but Foc⁰ itself has to remain for later labeling and full interpretation.

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 Foc⁰ is not problematic. In (7), NP is deleted, but Foc⁰ 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 *seað* 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.

References

- Chomsky, Noam (2015) “Problems of Projection: Extensions,” *Structures, Strategies and Beyond: Studies in Honour of Adriana Belletti*, ed. by Eli Di Domenico, Cornelia Hamann and Simona Matteini, 3-16, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Corver, Norbert and Marjo van Koppen (2008) *Let's Focus on Noun Phrase Ellipsis*, ms.
- Davies, Mark. (2004-) *BYU-BNC*. (Based on the British National Corpus from Oxford University Press). Available online at <https://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/>.
- Günther, Christine (2011) “Noun Ellipsis in English: Adjectival Modifiers and the Role of Context,” *English Language and Linguistics* 15, 279-301.
- Haumann, Dagmar (2003) “The Postnominal ‘And Adjective’ construction in Old English,” *English Language and Linguistics* 7, 57-83.
- Kester, Ellen-Petra (1996) “Adjectival Inflection and the Licensing of Empty categories in DP,” *Journal of Linguistics* 32, 57-78.
- Lobeck, Anne (1995) *Ellipsis: Functional Heads, Licensing, and Identification*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Merchant, Jason (2001) *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands, and the Theory of Ellipsis*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Miller, Thomas (1891) *The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People* Part 1, 2, Oxford University Press.
- Saito, Mamoru and Murasugi Keiko (1990) “N'-Deletion in Japanese: A Preliminary Study,” *Japanese-Korean Linguistics* 1, 285-301.

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, $\langle \sqrt{rt}, n, \text{CL} \rangle$ constitutes a span and also $\langle \text{Q}, \text{CL} \rangle$ 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: $\sqrt{rt} - n - \# @$

b. Tongan: $\sqrt{rt} - n @ - \# @$

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.