The 4th Joint Conference of Neo-Grammar Circle (NGC) and the Fukuoka Linguistic Cricle (FLC)

The 4th Joint Conference will be held online via Zoom on April 17, 2021.
※ Please make sure that you use Zoom 5.3.1 or the newer version, so that you can select a breakout room by yourself during online reception.

Each session lasts 50 minutes, 40 minutes for presentation followed by a 10-minute Q&A.

13:00-13:10	**Opening Remarks** (Keisuke Koga, Fukuoka University)
13:10-14:00	**Session 1** (chair: Norimasa Hayashi, Kyushu University)
	Presentation 1 Masako Maeda (Seinan Gakuin University) A Movement Approach to Nominative Object Constructions in Japanese
14:10-15:00	*10-minute break*
	Presentation 2 Jeonghee Byun and Kyoungmi Lee (Kyungpook National University) Serial Verbs in Echoed Predicate Constructions
	15-minute break
15:15-16:05	**Session 2** (chair: Masako Maeda, Seinan Gakuin University)
	Presentation 3 Yuya Sakumoto (Kyushu University) A Phase-based Approach to Adjuncts
16:15-17:05	*10-minute break*
	Presentation 4 Gwangrak Son (Kyungpook National University) Object Positions and Floating Quantifiers in Korean
17:20-17:50	Online Reception

A Movement Approach to Nominative Object Constructions in Japanese

Masako Maeda (Seinan Gakuin University)

How is Case on nominal elements licensed has been one of the central topics in generative grammar. In Japanese, subjects are typically marked with the nominative Case, and objects, with the accusative Case; however, when a non-stative predicate is followed by the potential suffix *–(r)are/(r)e*, which makes the complex predicate stative, the object may be marked either as accusative or as nominative (Kuno 1973a, Takezawa 1987, Tada 1992, Koizumi 1994, 1998, a.o.). As nominative objects deviate from the typical Case licensing pattern in Japanese, the mechanism and position of Case licensing of nominative objects have gained much attention in the literature. For instance, Tada (1992) argues that the nominative object undergoes A-movement to Spec, AgrOP and the potential affix moves to AgrO. The stative feature of the potential affix is responsible for the nominative Case assignment (cf. Yatsushiro 1999, Kasai 2018); Koizumi (1994, 1998) argues that nominative objects move to Spec, TP, where the nominative Case is licensed by T; Nomura (2005) and Takahashi (2010) argue that nominative objects can remain within VP, with its Case licensed by Agree with T.

Among them, Yatsushiro (1999) argues that nominative objects do not undergo movement to TP for Case based on the *v*P-preposing data. In Japanese, *v*P can be fronted to the sentence-initial position when a focus particle such as *-sae* 'even' is attached to *v*P (Yatsushiro 1999, Funakoshi 2020). Of importance here is the fact that the nominative object can be included in the fronted $vP_{(r)are}$, as shown in (1b) (cf. Kishimoto 2001).

(1) a. Kai-ga   [hon-ga   yom-e]-sae   si-ta.
         Kai-NOM   book-NOM   read-POT-even   do-PAST
         'Kai managed even to be able to read a book.'
     b. [Hon-ga   yom-e]-sae   Kai-ga   si-ta.
          book-NOM   read-POT-even Kai-NOM   do-PAST
         'Kai managed even to be able to read a book.'   (Yatsushiro 1999: 96)

If nominative objects must move to TP overtly, as argued by Koizumi (1994, 1998), then it would be expected that the nominative object moves out of *v*P that undergoes *v*P-preposing, and hence it could not be a part of the fronted *v*P, contrary to fact. Therefore, the grammaticality of (1b) rejects the possibility that nominative objects overtly move to TP for Case, leaving us with the possibility of them moving to *v*P or remaining in-situ.

Furthermore, the following example indicates that while accusative objects may remain in-situ, nominative objects do not. Consider (2), where the potential affix follows not the main verb but the causative affix *(s)ase*. In such cases, when the transitive *v*P is fronted, as shown in (2b), the accusative object is allowed, while the nominative object is disallowed. This would be

unexpected if the nominative object could stay an in-situ position. The ungrammaticality of the nominative object in (2b) then suggests that the nominative object needs to move out of the transitive *v*P.

(2) a. Hitomi-wa   Maki-ni   piiman-o/ga   tabe-sase-rare-ru.
         Hitomi-TOP   Maki-DAT   green.pepper-ACC/NOM eat-CAUS-POT-PRES
         'Hitomi can make Maki eat green pepper.'
     b. [piiman-o/*ga   tabe-sae]$_i$ Hitomi-wa   Maki-ni t_i s-ase-rare-ru.
          green.pepper-ACC/*NOM eat-even   Hitomi-TOP Maki-DAT do-CAUS-POT-PRES
         'Hitomi can even make Maki eat green pepper.'

Therefore, I argue that nominative objects, including the ones in causative constructions, overtly move out of VP in order to get the nominative Case licensed by *v* that hosts the potential affix *(r)are* (cf. Tada 1992, Yatsushiro 1999). In support of the proposal, I examine binding conditions, coordination, *ga/no* nominative alternation in some dialects, and NPI in nominative objects in causative-potential constructions where the causative affix is followed by the potential affix.

Serial Verbs in Echoed Predicate Constructions

Jeonghee Byun and Kyoungmi Lee (Kyungpook National University, Korea)

Abstract

This study aims to examine the syntactic structures of echoed predicate constructions (henceforth, EPCs), applying them to the serial verb constructions (henceforth, SVCs) in Korean. EPCs feature predicate doubling with a nominalizer *ki* and the topicalization marker *nun* attached to the preceding predicate. The same verb appears with full inflections in the second predicate position, which are optional with the first predicate. Contrary to the simple sentence, EPCs can have an adversative implicature due to the contrastiveness of the first predicate. The verb in the second predicate can be substituted with the dummy *ha* 'do' verb with the same meaning (Choi 2002, C. Lee 2013, Jo 2013).

EPCs show some properties. First, the inflections in the first predicate should be included in the second predicate in EPCs. On the contrary, the inflections in the second predicate need not be included in the first one. In addition, there are some limitations for inflections in the first predicates; for example, mode inflections such as 'te', 'li', 'keyss' only appear in the second predicate. Second, objects or low adverbs which occur in the first predicate can be permitted optionally in the second predicate (Choi 2002, Cho & Kim 2002, Park 2018). In this case, the echoed elements in the second predicates must be the same as in the first predicate. Next, VP negation 'an' or 'mos' in the first predicate must be echoed in the second predicate if it appears in the first predicate.

As for EPCs in Korean, there are two approaches: the head movement approach (Choi 2002, C. Lee 2013) and the phrasal movement approach (Jo 2013, Park 2018, Ishihara 2013). The former argues that the verb head moves cyclically to the higher heads and KI-insertion is arbitrary at any head. Where the nominalizer is inserted determines the range of the first predicate in doubling. This approach, however, cannot support the empirical evidence of the occurrence of the object, low adverbs, and mode inflections in the second predicate. On the contrary, the latter approach successfully accounts for these shortcomings from head-movement accounts.

We will present the way in which serial verbs support the phrasal movement approach of EPCs. One of the common properties of SVCs is sharing arguments (Aikhenvald 2006). According to K. Lee (2020), SVCs fall into two categories: total argument sharing and partial argument sharing. In total argument sharing, all verbs in SVCs are the same type in terms of transitivity, unergativity, and unaccusativity. This homogeneity is not found in partial argument sharing. As a consequence, the two types have different structures: head-head merger for the former and phrase-phrase merger for the latter.

This structural difference is reflected in EPCs. The verb in the second predicate in doubling should include the second verb of SVCs, while the preceding verb is optionally duplicated. Interestingly, when the object in the former type (total argument sharing) of SVCs appears in the second predicate, it requires all the verbs to be doubled with the object. However, this obligation is somewhat weakened in the other type (partial argument sharing) of SVCs when the object belongs only to the second verb. This supports our assumption that the EPCs result from phrasal movement.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. Serial Verb Constructions in Typological Perspective. *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, 1-68.
Cho, Sae-Youn and Jong-Bok Kim. 2002. Echoed Verb Constructions in Korean: a Construction-based HPSG Analysis. *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 27: 661-681
Choi, Kiyong, 2002. The Echoed Verb Construction in Korean: Evidence for V-raising. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 12: 139-167
Ishihara, Yuki. 2013. Nominalization in the Japanese Predicate Doubling Construction. *English Linguistics* 30.1: 269–291
Jo, Jung-Min. 2013. Predicate Contrastive Topic Constructions. *Lingua* 131: 80-111
Lee, Chung-hoon. 2013. The Types, Motivation, and Formation of Korean 'V-ki'
Reduplication Constructions. *EOMUNHAK* 122: 155-180.
Lee, Kyoungmi. 2020. Two Structures of Serial Verb Constructions. *Studies in Modern Grammar* 105: 61-82.
Park, So-young. 2018. An Analysis of Korean V(P)-Copying Constructions. *Korean Linguistics* 80: 87-124

A Phase-Based Approach to Adjuncts

Yuya Sakumoto (Kyushu University)

The aim of this presentation is to demonstrate that adjuncts are visible in syntax unlike the assumption in Chomsky (2004). During the development of generative grammar, the nature of the adjuncts has been at the center of attention. Particularly, a number of researchers attempt to account for their invisibility in syntax. One of the empirical facts for their invisibility can be observed in (1).

(1) a. *Who_i did John go home [before he talked to t_i]?
     b. *Who_i did John go home [after he talked to t_i]?
     c. *Who_i did John fall asleep [while he was talking to t_i]?

(Truswell (2011: 176))

As can be seen in (1), extraction from adjunct clauses is impossible, which is known as an adjunct island (Ross (1967)). The adjunct island effect is also observed from prepositional adjuncts.

(2) a. *The $break_i$ was met [after t_i].
     b. *Which $break_i$ did they meet [after t_i]?

(Bode (2020: 64))

In order to capture these cases of invisibility, Chomsky (2004) puts forth the notion of pair-Merge. Crucially, this operation renders syntactic objects invisible in syntax, and they are metaphorically argued to be on a "separate plane." Since adjuncts need to be interpreted at the interfaces, they must come back to the "primary plane" at the timing of the Transfer. Hence, Chomsky (2004) proposes the operation SIMPL, which converts an ordered pair <α, β> to a simple unordered set {α, β} at the timing of the Transfer.

However, there is some empirical evidence showing the visibility of adjuncts. Truswell (2011) argues that there are cases where extraction from adjunct clauses is not always impossible, as we can see in (3).

(3) a. $What_i$ did you come round [to work on t_i]?
     b. Who_i did John get upset [after talking to t_i]?
     c. $What_i$ did John come back [thinking about t_i]?

(Truswell (2011: 129))

If they are on a "separate plane," internal Merge cannot be applied to *wh*-adjuncts in (4), as pointed out by Oseki (2015) and Otsuka (2017).

(4)   {How/When/Where$_{[uQ]}$} do you fix it {~~how/when/where~~$_{[uQ]}$}?

Moreover, the pair-Merged analysis for adjuncts cannot account for the existence of overt inflections on adjectives in some languages (e.g. Baker (2008, 2011)).

Therefore, we argue that unlike Chomsky's assumption, pair-Merged adjuncts are syntactically visible, and provide an explanation for the peculiar behavior of adjuncts with a phase-based analysis. In so doing, we claim that the notions of the "separate plane" and the

operation SIMPL are dispensable, which leads to empirically and theoretically desirable consequences.

References

Baker, Mark C. (2008) *The Syntax of Agreement and Concord*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Baker, Mark C. (2011) "When Agreement Is for Number and Gender but Not Person," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29, 875–915.

Bode, Stefanie (2020) *Casting a Minimalist Eye on Adjuncts: Routledge Studies in Linguistics*, Routledge, London.

Chomsky, Noam (2004) "Beyond Explanatory Adequacy," *Structures and Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 3*, ed. by Adriana Belletti, 104–131, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Oseki, Yohei (2015) "Eliminating Pair-Merge," *WCCFL* 32, 303–312.

Otsuka, Tomonori (2017) "Radical Free Merger," *English Linguistics* 34-1, 34-68

Ross, John Robert (1967) *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Truswell, Robert (2011) *Events, phrases and questions*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Object Positions and Floating Quantifiers in Korean (Abstract)

Gwangrak Son (Kyungpook National University, South Korea)

Aberrant examples such as (1) below have received a substantial amount of attention in the study of floating quantifiers (FQs) since Sportiche 1988. Given the combined hypotheses about the postverbal subject positions of the unaccusative/passive verbs (Perlmutter 1978, Burzio 1981) and the stranding analysis, where a quantifier Q and its associated nominal are inserted into a structure as a single constituent (Sportiche 1988, Déprez 1989, Miyagawa 1989, 2001, Shlonsky 1991, Benmamoun 1999, Ko 2007, among others), the FQ *all* construed with the subject in (1) should be able to surface in the postverbal subject θ-positions. However, this expectation is not borne out, as seen from the representation in (2).

(1) a. *The students arrived **all**.　　　　(unaccusative)

　　b. *The students were arrested **all**.　　(passive)

(2) a. The students$_i$ arrived [**all** t_i].

　　b. The students$_i$ were arrested [**all** t_i].

Bošković (2004) observed similar problems in multiple languages within the stranding analysis. In English, for instance, if an object moves overtly to AgrOP (with the accompanying movement of the subject and verb; see Johnson 1991, Lasnik 1999, and McCloskey 2000), then an FQ should be observable in the θ-position of the transitive construction (3a), where the object originates. However, as shown in (3b), this is manifestly not the case. In the same vein, in Japanese, if the object *hambaagaa* 'hamburger' in (4a) can move to AgrOP through scrambling, as is usually inferred, then the subject *gakusei-ga* meaning 'students' should be able to strand its adjoining Q *san-nin* in the subject θ-position, namely, Spec of vP (see (4b)). Again, the findings reveal that this is not the case.

(3) a. *Mary hates the students **all**.

　　b.　Mary hates [$_{AgrOP}$ the students$_i$ [$_{vP}$...[$_{VP}$ [**all** t_i]]]]

(4) a. *Gakusee-ga   hambaagaa-o   **3-nin** tabeta.

      students-NOM hamburger-ACC 3-CL   ate

      'Three students ate a hamburger.'

  b.   Gakusei-ga$_i$ [$_{AgrOP}$ hambaagaa-o$_j$ [$_{\upsilon P}$ [t$_i$ **san-nin**] [$_{VP}$ t$_j$ tabeta]]]

These kinds of deviations from multiple languages largely influenced Bošković's claim that the following (5) is a universal property of FQs. Purely for expository purposes, I label this generalization a *ban on quantifier float in θ-positions* (BQFT) throughout this talk.

(5) Quantifiers cannot be floated in θ-positions (Bošković 2004: 685).

Bošković derived the BQFT from two independent assumptions: (a) FQs are adjoined to the noun that they modify (Sportiche 1988, Benmanoun 1999) and (b) adjunction to arguments interferes with θ-role assignment (Chomsky 1986:16). Given these assumptions, Q-adjunction to arguments inescapably incurs a θ-role interference; consequently, all the aforementioned examples become consistent with the stranding analysis since they are independently ruled out by (5).

The main purpose of this talk is to present the following:

(6) a. In Korean, objects always exit a VP where they are inserted and may move to a VP-region (rather than to AgrOP above the base subject).

  b. Quantifiers in Korean can only be adjoined to a shifted object, observing the BQFT generalization.

  c. The object shift in (6a) and the overall phenomenon of BQFT are best explained under the minimalist computational system that emerges from Chomsky's (2013, 2015, 2019) labeling algorithm and the concepts of noun formation developed by Borer (2005a, b), Sportiche (2005), Takahashi and Hulsey (2009), and others.

  d. The present system, if correct, reduces clausal structures and more importantly, derives the dual properties of Q-float that have been controversial over the past decades.