0. Preface

- Much of recent work on argument structure (alternation) has converged to argue for a grammatical architecture, where argument structure (alternation) is handled by Syntax, rather than a pre-syntactic lexicon (Ramchand 2008; Schäfer 2008; Cuervo & Roberge 2012; Marantz 2013; Wood 2012, 2015; Lohndal 2014, inter alia).

- In this talk, we will investigate a case of argument frame (structure) alternation in Japanese, where a certain argument frame of a main verb that appears originally impossible becomes possible when a V-V compound is rendered (Kishimoto 2010).

- Contra Kishimoto (2010) who argues this is a result of perspective shift in the sense of Pinker (1989), we argue that such an argument frame alteration is illusory, providing a purely syntactic account without the notion of argument frame alternation at pre-syntactic Lexicon.
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1. V-V Compound affects argument frame

(1) a. John-ga tairu-o yuka-ni siita.  [Motion Frame]
   John-NOM tile-ACC floor-DAT set
   ‘John set the tiles on the floor.’

b. *John-ga yuka-o tairu-de siita.  [Change of State (COS) Frame]
   John-NOM floor-ACC tile-with set
   ‘John set the floor with the tiles.’
John-NOM tile-ACC floor-DAT set-filled  
‘John laid the tiles on the floor.’

John-NOM floor-ACC tile-with set-filled  
‘John laid the floor with the tiles.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frames</th>
<th>Motion Frame</th>
<th>COS Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predicates</td>
<td>DP(Material)-Acc</td>
<td>DP(Material)-with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sik-‘set’</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siki-tume ‘set-fill’</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Summary of the argument frames of sik- and siki-tume-

2. The Syntax of Change-of-State Frame

2.1. The Syntax of siki-tume- in COS Frame

- We claim …
  - The accusative DP in (2b) (i.e. Locative DP) is not introduced by the V-V compound, but it is the subject of the small clause (SC), which we argue to be a secondary predicate (SP) in the sense of Koizumi (1994): -de ‘with’ in (2b) is a copula in the connective form (Nishiyama 1998);
  - V1 sik- ‘set’ adjoins to v realized as V2 tume- ‘fill’, modifying the manner of v (Marantz 2013)

(3)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{floor-ACC} \\
\text{Movement for measuring-out of the eventuality of vP} \\
\text{(Travis 2010)}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{v} = \text{V2}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{SC} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{SP} \\
\text{V1} \\
\text{tiles-be} \\
\text{v} \text{set} \\
\text{fill}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V1 simply adjoins to v,} \\
\text{modifying the manner of v}
\end{array}
\]
Tairu-de as an SP

- As Kishimoto (2010) notes, we can omit yuka-ni as in (4a), but not tairu-de in (4b), so the latter is not simply an instrumental adjunct PP, but an SP.

   John-NOM tile-ACC floor-DAT set-filled  
   ‘John laid the tiles on the floor.’

   John-NOM floor-ACC tile-with set-filled  
   ‘John laid the floor with the tiles.’

On the nature of V2 tume- ‘fill’

- V2 tume- ‘fill’ is now grammaticalized, void of its lexical meaning, and functions as hojodoshi (補助動詞).
- We understand this as V2 tume- ‘fill’ realizing v, where we assume that causative semantics is encoded (Wood 2014 among others).
- One might argue that V2’s grammaticalization into v contradicts the less productive nature of V-tume, while we suppose this is a result of the nature of V-tume created below VoiceP just like other “lexical” V-V compounds (cf. Marantz 1997; Ramchand 2008).

Consequences: More support for the SP analysis

- The SP can be referred back to by the adverbial anaphor soo ‘so’, but this is impossible for the instrumental PP.

(5) a. Taroo-ga maguro-o nama-de tabeta.  
   Taro-Nom tuna-Acc raw-be ate  
   ‘Taro ate the tuna raw.’

b. Ziroo-wa katuo-o soo tabeta.  
   Jiro-Nom bonito-Acc so ate  
   ‘Jiro ate the bonito in the same way.’
(6)  a.  Taroo-wa maguro-o *hasi-de* tabeta.
    John-Nom tuna-Acc -> tile-with ate
    ‘Taro ate the tuna with chopsticks.’
   
   b.  *Ziroo-wa katu-o soo tabeta.
    Jiro-Nom bonito-Acc so ate
    ‘Jiro ate the bonito with them.’

    John-Nom floor-Acc -> tile-be set-filled
    ‘John laid the the floor with the tiles.’
   
   b.  Bill-wa kabe-o soo siki-tumeta.
    John-Nom floor-Acc so set-filled
    ‘John laid the the wall in the same way.’

2.1.  *The Syntax of sik*- in COS Frame

   •  In fact, our informants state that (1b) is not so bad, if the result state interpretation is forced. This means that even in (1b), *tairu-de* is an SP.
   
   •  This implies that there is null v that denotes causative semantics and is modified by sik- ‘set’.

(8)

3.  *The Syntax of Motion Frame*

   •  Since V2 *tume*- ‘fill’ is aspectually telic, its endpoint can be given by a result state denoted by an SC as in (1, 2b).
   
   •  We argue that this situation is the same in the Motion Frame, too: quantized DP such as *tairu-o* in (1, 2a) starts out as the figure argument of pP in the sense of Talmy (1985) and Svenonius (2003, 2007); and the DP moves, again, to measure out the eventuality of vP.
Table 2: Summary of the present analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion Frame</th>
<th>COS Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comp. of the V-v</td>
<td>Material DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex head</td>
<td>Locative DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec. of the V-v</td>
<td>Material DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex head</td>
<td>Locative DP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Conclusion

- In this talk, we have argued for a purely syntactic account for the alleged argument frame alternation found in sik- ‘set’ and siki-tume- ‘set-fill’.

- The accusative-marked DPs in the Motion and COS Frames are not arguments of sik- ‘set’ and siki-tume- ‘set-fill’; Such DP is a figure argument of pP in the Motion Frame and is the subject of SC in the COS Frame.

- Importantly, (1b), which is argued to be impossible in Kishimoto (2010), is actually possible, as correctly predicted by our analysis.

- Our analysis shows that the argument frame alternation observed in Kishimoto (2010) is illusory and should not be handled by the Lexicon.

- Rather, the alleged argument frame alternation is a result of a grammatical architecture, which allows the verb sik- ‘set’ to enter into different argument structures derived in Syntax:
  - (a) the Motion Frame, where V-v takes pP as its complement and a Material DP as its specifier;
  - (b) the COS Frame, where V-v takes SC as its complement and a Locative DP as its specifier.
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