LOCALITY IN SYNTAX AND FLOATED NUMERAL QUANTIFIERS

1 Importance of QF

VP-internal subject position

(1) a. Tous les enfants ont vu ce film.
   all the children have seen this movie
b. Les enfants ont tous vu ce film.
   the children have all seen this movie (Sportiche 1988: 426)

Intermediate trace (McCloskey 2000)

(2) West Ulster English
   a. What all did he say (that) he wanted?
   b. What did he say (that) he wanted all?
   c. What did he say all (that) he wanted?

NP trace (Miyagawa 1989)

(3) a. Kuruma-ga doroboo-ni ti ni-dai nusum-are-ta. (passive)
   car-Nom thief-by ti 2-CL steal-Pass.-Past
   ‘Two cars were stolen by a thief.’
   b. Doa-ga, kono kagi-de ti futa-tu aita. (unaccusative)
   doori-Nom this key-with ti 2-CL opened
   ‘Two doors opened with this key.’
   c. *Kodomo-ga geragerato san-nin waratta. (unergative)
   children-Nom loudly 3-CL laughed
   ‘Three children laughed loudly.’

2 Locality of Floated Numerical Quantifiers

‘Standard judgment” Haig (1980) and Kuroda (1980)

(4) a. Gakusei-ga san-nin sake-o nonda.
   student-NOM 3-CL SUB sake-ACC drank
   ‘Three students drank sake.’
   b. *Gakusei-ga sake-o san-nin nonda.
   student-NOM sake-ACC 3-CL SUB drank
   ‘Three students drank sake.’ (Haig 1980, Kuroda 1980)
   c. Hon-o gakusei-ga go-satu katta.
   book-ACC student-NOM 5-CL OBJ bought
   ‘Students bought five books.’ (Haig 1980, Kuroda 1980)

Problem with (4): why not (5)?

Nuclear Stress

(7) *Gakusei-ga sake-o san-nin nonda.
   student-NOM sake-ACC 3—CLSUB drank
   ‘Three students drank sake.’

(8) [sake-o san-nin]…
    [sake-ACC 3—CLSUB]…

(9) Hon-o i gakusei-ga t_i go-satu katta.
    book-ACC_i student-NOM t_i 5—CLobj bought
    ‘Students bought five books.’

3 Counterexamples to Localitivity


Two patterns:

(10) ?Gakusei-ga sake-o imamadeni san-nin nonda
    student-NOM sake-ACC so far 3—CLSUB drank
    ‘Three students drank sake so far.’ (Gunji and Hasida 1998: 57)

(11) Gakusei-ga watasi-no hon-o futa-ri-sika kaw-anakat-ta
    student-NOM my-GEN book-ACC 2—CLSUB-only buy-not-past

4 Responding to the Counterexamples

Saito (1985) assumed the following for the standard judgment.

(i) NQ and the associated noun phrase observe strict locality.
(ii) The subject in Japanese cannot scramble.

Every linguist who has presented a counterexample has concluded that (12i) must be rejected.
(13) SUB [VP OBJ NQSUB V]

(14) (i) Subjects may scramble (Ko, to appear)
(ii) Local A-movement scrambling is due to the EPP

(15) a. [TP SUB [vP OBJ [vP [tSUB NQSUB] ... tOBJ ...]]] “Sportiche-type”

b. [TP SUB [TP OBJ [vP [tSUB NQSUB] ... tOBJ ...]]]

5 The Analysis


(16) Taroo-ga zen’in-o sikar-anakat-ta.
   Taro-NOM all-ACC scold-NEG-PAST
   'Taro didn't scold all.'  
   not > all, all > not

    all-NOM test-ACC take-NEG-PAST
    'All did not take the test.'  
    *not > all, all > not

(18) Tesuto-o, zen’in-ga ti uke-nakat-ta.  (Miyagawa 2001)
    test-ACC, all-NOM t take-NEG-PAST
    'That test, all didn't take.'  
    not > all, all > not
5.1 Evidence
We will first give two pieces of evidence that in the non-standard judgment structure, the object occurs in the Spec of TP.
5.1.1 Negation and “all”

(22)a. Gakusei-ga futa-ri zen’in-o mi-nakat-ta (not > all, all > not)
      student-NOM 2-CL all-ACC see-NEG-PAST
      ‘Two students did not see all.’

      b. Gakusei-ga zen’in-o futa-ri-tomo mi-nakat-ta (*not > all, all > not)
      student-NOM all-ACC 2-CL-both see-NEG-PAST
      ‘Neither of the two students saw all.’

      c. Gakusei-ga zen’in-o futa-ri-dake mi-nakat-ta (*not > all, all > not)
      student-NOM all-ACC 2-CL-only see-NEG-PAST
      ‘Only two students saw all.’

(23) [TP SUB [TP
      zen’in-o [v
      tSUB NQSUB [v
      tOBJ V ]NEG]T]

5.1.2 Indeterminate Pronoun (Kishimoto 2001)

An indeterminate pronoun is a wh-phrase that is interpreted as a universal any in the scope of the
universal particle mo. To make this interpretation possible, the indeterminate pronoun must be c-
commanded by the universal –mo, and they must be clusemates.

      Taro-NOM what-ACC buy-MO-do-NEG-past
      ‘Taro did not buy anything.’

      b. *Dare-ga warai-mo-si-nakat-ta.
      who-NOM laugh-MO-do- NEG-PAST
      ‘No one laughed.’

      c. *Dare-ga Hanako-o home-mo-si-nakat-ta.
      who-NOM Hanako-ACC praise-MO-do-not-past
      ‘No one praised Hanako.’ (Kishimoto 2001: 600)

As Kishimoto notes, while the object position can host an indeterminate pronoun ((24a)), the
subject position cannot ((24b/c)). The subject position is outside the domain of the mo particle,
which he assumes is at v.

      kids-NOM 3-CL which-movie-ACC see-MO-do-NOT-PAST.
      ‘Three kids did not see any movie.’

      kids-NOM which-movie-ACC so far 3-CL see-MO-do-NOT-PAST
      ‘Three children did not see any movie so far.’

In (25b), which is a non-standard judgment case, the object indeterminate pronoun is
ungrammatical, indicating that this object has moved to the Spec of TP.
5.1.4 Anaphor Binding

(26) a. Gakusei-ga san-nin-dake zibunzisin-o hihansita.
   student-NOM 3-CL-only self-ACC criticized
   ‘Only three students criticized himself.’

   b.*Gakusei-ga zibunzisin-o san-nin-dake hihansita
   student-NOM self-ACC 3-CL-only criticized
   ‘Only three students criticized himself.’

5.1.5 Quantifier Scope

In Japanese quantifier scope is usually limited to surface scope (Kuroda 1971, Hoji 1985).

(27) Dareka-ga daremo-o sikatta.
    someone-NOM everyone-ACC scolded
    ‘Someone scolded everyone.’
    some > every, *every > some

However, note below.

(28) Dareka-ga daremo-o tugitugito sikatta.
    someone-NOM everyone-ACC one.after.another scolded
    ‘Someone scolded everyone one after another.’
    some > every, every > some

6. Why doesn't Japanese have the “Sportiche-style” QF?

    EPP + agreement – reconstruction possible; “pure” EPP – no reconstruction.

7 New Way to do NP trace (Miyagawa 1989)

(30) Sensayngnim-(tul)-i caki-uy haksayng-ul 3-myeng-* (i) honnay-ss-ta.
   teacher-(pl)-NOM self-GEN student-ACC 3-CL-*(NOM) criticized
   ‘Three teachers criticized his student.’

(31) Hon-o, gakusei-ga ti go-satu katta.
    book-ACCi student-NOM ti 5-CLobj bought
    ‘Students bought five books.’

(32) Hon-o, zen’in-ga ti go-satu yom-anakat-ta.
    book-ACCi all-NOM ti 5-CLOBJ read-NEG-PAST
    ‘All did not read five books.’
    all > not, *not > all

(33) a. Kuruma-ga doroboo-ni ti ni-dai nusum-are-ta. (passive)
    car-NOM thief-by ti 2-CL steal-Pass.-Past
    ‘Two cars were stolen by a thief.’
b. Doa-ga, kono kagi-de tī futa-tu aita. (unaccusative)
doori-Nom this key-with tī 2-CL opened
‘Two doors opened with this key.’

(34) Zen’in-ga tuk-anakat-ta.
all-NOM arrive-NEG-PAST
‘All didn’t arrive.’
not > all, all > not

(35) Miyagawa and Babyonyshev (2004) observe that this lack of the EPP for the unaccusative construction can be observed in other parts of the Japanese grammar.
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