SPECIFICITY, DIFFERENTIAL OBJECTS AND SECONDARY PREDICATES: THE EVIDENCE FROM JAPANESE

Background. A robust cross-linguistic observation is that the shared arguments with adjectival secondary predicates (AdjSPs), if indefinite, can only be interpreted as *specific* (strong, wide scope indefinites); *weak indefinite* readings (i.e, *some student or other*) are not possible (ex. 2a,b-5); the nature of this restriction has proved difficult to derive in a non-stipulative way (Williams 1983, Basilico 2003, etc.) if a small clause configuration is assumed. ***Goals and analysis***. This talk has three goals: **i)** evaluate the less studied AdjSP data from Japanese, with the paradoxes it raises; **ii)** provide further support, through a variety of (novel) diagnostics (pseudo-gapping, adverb placement, floated quantifiers stranding, scopal interactions, etc.) for an analysis in which the shared argument (i.e., the DOM-ed object) is interpreted in an intermediate position *higher* than V but lower than *v* (Lasnik 1999, Frey 2001, López 2012); **iii)** further propose that this intermediate position is a (low) *evidential* projection, required for the (syntactic) composition of cognitive and evaluative predicates like *consider* and *seem*; the "shared argument" is *merged* as a specifier of this evidential head (as shown in 1). Initial merge in this intermediate evidential position: a) makes more specific the semantic processes applying in this position ('choice function' etc.); b) can further predict the presence of overt evidential marking (as preliminarily noticed in some languages), as well as the expected (high) scopal interaction with other quantifiers. The conclusion is that one of the sources of specificity is the presence of an evidential head; the vast literature on (high) evidentials has reinforced several times the observation that these heads prefer to take widest scope and only allow arguments under their scope to be interpreted as 'specific' (Cinque 2000, Speas 2004, 2011, etc.). Moreover, the complex predicate analysis argued for here avoids the problems canonical scrambling accounts have; but one important challenge this analysis potentially has is that in Japanese AdjSPs show honorific agreement which is canonically assumed to target *subjects* only (3c, see the discussion in Yokoyama 2012). However, a more in-depth examination into honorification signals that its conditions in Japanese are more complex than that – by analyzing data from other embedded contexts (causatives, etc.) it can be shown that the argument immediately c-commanding the embedded predicate is the origin of the honorification agreement. This observation, coupled with the problems scrambling accounts have leaves the complex predicate analysis as the only viable option (Williams 1983). **Scrambling**. Under a scrambling analysis (which would derive specificity by assuming movement from an embedded clause, see Diesing 1992, de Hoop 1996, López 2012), the restriction on specific readings with SPs is mysterious, given the existence of weak/narrow scope interpretations of indefinite shared arguments (and quantifiers, more generally) with infinitives (2a vs. 2b); such weak readings are normally obtained via a process of *quantifier lowering/reconstruction* (May 1985, Chomsky 1995, Boeckx 2001, Fox 2000, etc.); reconstruction makes available for interpretation the (relevant portion of) shared argument in its initial position in the embedded clause. The problem is that one can't simply block narrow scope readings with SPs by saying that small clauses are not domains of quantification. Williams (1983), and more recently Moulton (2012) have shown that quantification is possible inside the small clause (2c and 2d). The sentence in (2d) contains an (unaccusative) modal adjective, which initially introduces the shared argument as its complement (Zimmerman 1995, Cinque 1995, etc.). Examples like (2d) further suggest that the lack of narrow scope cannot be due to interactions with the degree component in adjectives (Matushansky 2002), as all scalar adjectives would be expected to behave uniformly. Lastly, that the specificity effects are obtained with

stage-level predicates ('happy', etc.) also shows that they are not the result of individual level structure (Diesing 1992, Basilico 2003, etc.). In turn, assuming that specificity readings must be connected to *strong Case* assignment (de Hoop 1996) leaves examples like the Finnish in (6) unexplained – what Finnish shows is a mismatch between the morphology of a weak Case (the partitive, which does not normally signal specificity with apparently atelic predicates) and an obligatory specific interpretation. **Mixed accounts.** Mixed accounts, in which scrambling places the shared argument in a position where a semantic operation ('choice function') can further apply (e.g., López 2012) are equally problematic in that they cannot explain why the relevant semantic process is *obligatory* with these shared arguments *only* (and not for other scrambling instances). Under the current analysis, specifity is a epi-phenomenon – predicates like *consider* need an evidential (propositional) component for their construction; this component cannot be merged with the SP, as adjectival SPs cannot project sentential structure (Kratzer 1996, Williams 1983). Instead the evidential projection merges with the matrix V and introduces the shared argument - syntactic and semantic wide scope becoming the only possibility. This shows that a complex predicate analysis (Chomsky 1975, Williams 1983) predicts the specificity behavior in a straightforward manner.

(1) [$_{vP}$ v [$_{EvidP}$ **DOM** Evid [V SP]]]

(2) ENGLISH

   a) The professor considers a student happy .   b)   A student seems sick.
       a student >> considers   a student >> seems
       *considers >> a student   * seems >> a student

   b) The professor considers a student to be happy.
         a student >> considers; considers >> a student

   bi) [$_{vP}$ v [$_{\alpha P}$ **shared argument** α [V [InfP <s̶h̶a̶r̶e̶d̶ ̶a̶r̶g̶u̶m̶e̶n̶t̶> to]]] (strong reading only)

   bii) [$_{vP}$ v [$_{\alpha P}$ s̶h̶a̶r̶e̶d̶ ̶a̶r̶g̶u̶m̶e̶n̶t̶ α [V [InfP <**shared argument**> to]]] (weak reading only)

   c) The professor considers the students interested in *a book*. (OK some book or other)
   d) The professor considered *a book* necessary. (some book or other)

(3) JAPANESE

   a) *Aru*   *seito*   ga   byooki rasii.   (information obtained by hearsay)
       Some   student   NOM. sick   seems.
       = 'A specific student seems sick.'   (a student >> seem; *seem >> a student)
   b) Sono   kyoozyu-wa   *aru*   *seito-o*   titeki-to   minas-u.
       that   professor-TOP. some student-ACC. intelligent-COMP.   consider-PRES.
       = 'That professor considers a specific student intelligent.'
       (a student >> consider; * consider >> a student)
   c) Siyoonin-ga   kokuoo-o   **go**-soomee   ni   kanzi-ta.
       servant-NOM   king-ACC   Hon-wise   SP   feel-PST
       'The servant felt that the king was wise.' (honorification on 'king')

(4) HINDI-URDU

   a) admi   kitab-**ko**/*Ø   [ach**a**   səməj^{h}t**a**   h**ɛ**.]
     man.M.SG.   book.**DOM**.   good.M.SG.   think.PRES.PRT.M.SG.   be.PRES.3.SG.
     'The man considers the/a book good.' (a book >> consider; *consider>> a book)

(5) FINNISH

   Miehet   pitävät   ***oppilaita***   ilois-i-*na*.
   Man.PL.NOM.   consider-PRES.3.PL.   student-**PART**.PL.   happy-PL-ESS.
   'The men consider the/ specific students happy.'