1. Introduction

Standard assumption: If the word w₁ in the language L₁ corresponds to the words w₂ and w₃ in the language L₂, then w₁ is in fact lexically ambiguous.

Beck 2000: different is ambiguous between a relational adjective with a hidden reciprocal and a comparison operator.

Support: different lexical items in German – and in Dutch:

(a) Detmar en Kordula wonen in verschillende steden. (relational)
(b) Elk meisje las een ander boek. (comparison)

Because same is not interpretable in its base position, it must QR and adjoin to some node of the type (e, t), leaving behind a trace of the form (e, t, (e, t)):

Because same is not interpretable in its base position, it must QR and adjoin to some node of the type (e, t), leaving behind a trace of the form (e, t, (e, t)):

The licensing of same and different is a result of the obligatory QR.

Prediction: as same leaves behind a trace of the form (e, t, (e, t)), it is obligatorily attributive.

Two potential problems for Barker:

(a) The deictic reading: Barker argues against unifying it with the internal reading, despite the fact that it’s expressed by the same lexical item cross-linguistically

(b) The property comparison reading

2.1. Property comparison

Alrenga 2006: The standard analysis of different and same in the terms of object comparison does not account for the fact that they are scalar:

(a) My new car is a bit, quite, very, really different from my previous one.
(b) Frozen fish is almost, nearly, just about, not quite, roughly the same as fresh fish.

Alrenga 2006: same and different are similarity predicates, in the same class as like:

(i) My new car is the same as my previous one true in w iff \( \forall p [P_w(n) \leftrightarrow P_w(p)] \) where n is my new car and p is my previous car; and contextual restriction is assumed

NB: For different, property comparison and object comparison are truth-conditionally indistinct – this is not true for same

Three possibilities:

(i) same is ambiguous between property comparison and object comparison
(ii) The object comparison reading of same is basic. The property comparison reading is derived/coerced from it in certain environments (e.g., in the predicate position)
(iii) The property comparison reading of same is basic. The object comparison reading is derived/coerced from it in certain environments (e.g., in argument positions)

Observation: in English, the property comparison reading and the object comparison reading are in complementary distribution (against (i))

2.1.1. “Orphaned” same

In the post-copular position, same need not be followed by an NP:

(8) Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde are the same (both are selfish, male…). # j=h
The immediately obvious analysis involving NP-ellipsis has to be rejected – with an overt NP following same, the property comparison reading is not available (see also section 5.2):

(9) a. Re-Birth and The Chrysalids are the same book. *property comparison
   b. All men are the same one/human/being/personality…

However, there are reasons to believe that (8) does contain a null NP (e.g., the article)
Proposal: the null NP in (8) is the maximal contextually relevant property. It is subjected to the IDENT type-shift (Partee 1986) yielding type (⟨e, t⟩, t). The meaning of same then has to be type-shifted to apply to sets of properties rather than properties:

NE: IDENT has to happen because there is no such thing as absolute identity (cf. Geach 1967, 1973, Gupta 1980, Molmenn 2006). The shifting of same is type-driven

(10) [(λX ∃x<X 1y [ID(y)(x) ∧ fP(IDENT(P))(y)] (j@h))]

As a result, Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde both have all the contextually salient properties, which entails Alrenga’s semantics for the property comparison same.

NI: As the analysis stands, P can range over properties corresponding to APs (and maybe even VPs); we cannot evaluate the effects here

NI: Note that the free variable P can be cataphorically specified, as in (8), or quantified over

Further evidence 1: in Hebrew, an overt noun is used with same in the post-copular position (with some complications we leave aside for now):

(11) kol ha-gvarim hem oto (ha-) davar. DEM-M.SG = same
   all DEF men 3PL DEM-M.SG DEF thing
All men are the same.

Can the property comparison reading in the predicative position in French, English and Dutch be derived in the same way as in Hebrew, with a null noun (e.g., thing or sort)?

NI: Obviously, thing does not mean object, here, more likely the same kind of thing.

NI: The use of a demonstrative to indicate identity is not limited to Hebrew – see below

Further evidence 2: In Dutch, the choice between the two readings has a grammatical effect:

(12) a. Deze krant is dezelfde als die krant. object
   This journal.C is the-N.SG+same as that journal
   This journal is the same as that journal (i.e., there’s only one journal).
   b. Deze krant is hetzelfde als die krant. property
   This journal.C is the-N.SG+same as that journal
   This journal is the same as that journal (i.e., these journals are alike).

In (12a), the definite article on same has the same gender as the subject. In (12b), the definite article on same is neuter.

Thus in (12a), but not in (12b), the missing NP in the post-copular DP is journal

2.1.2. Same under degree operators

Alrenga 2006: the property comparison reading of same is available in argument positions:

(13) a. Alice and Beth bought almost the same car.
   b. Interestingly, both too little iron and too much iron can cause almost the same symptoms.

The trick we have used to derive the scalar/property comparison reading of same in the post-copular position won’t work here (no syntactic slot for a null NP available). However, it can be shown that the property comparison reading here is not the same as in 2.1.1

Kind-interpretation is involved for singular NPs: (13a) can only mean that Alice and Beth bought cars that almost belong to the same kind. This suggests that we are dealing here with scalarity coercion (Matushansky 2002):

(14) P. λx . x has d-many of the typical properties associated with being P
   a. You’re such a linguist.
   b. This wine is more French than I am.

Note that (13a) cannot mean that the cars bought were the same with respect to e.g., weight

On the other hand, for plural NPs, as in (13b), we are concerned with the amount of overlap between the individuals in question. This looks like amount coercion, like in degree relatives (Carlson 1977, Grosu and Landman 1988, among others)

Strikingly, mass nouns are ambiguous between the two readings:

(15) It’s almost the same water.

Neither of these interpretations is involved in the nounless same, suggesting that different mechanisms are used

2.1.3. Same under cardinals

Unlike the English same, its Dutch equivalent can appear under a cardinal, with a reciprocal reading (though a deictic one is also available):

(16) Ik heb twee dezelfde boeken nodig. property comparison
   I have two the-same books need
   I need two books that are the same.

We have no plausible derivation for this environment now, though the presence of a definite determiner inside the indefinite NP is certainly suggestive.

2.2. Summary

Barker’s analysis of same can be extended to cover its appearance and behavior in the post-copular position, whether accompanied by an overt noun (section 5.2) or not

We derive the property comparison reading of same from its object comparison reading and show that different mechanisms are used in different environments:

a. identity coercion and a quantificational null NP in the post-copular position
b. scalarity coercion in combination with degree operators or modifiers

The different mechanisms involved argue against derivation in the opposite direction. Given the possibility of deriving one meaning from the other, lexical ambiguity is undesirable

3. THE SAME, IN RUSSIAN

Different lexicalization pattern: the particle že (roughly corresponding to the emphatic just in English) and the adjective odinakov-.

(17) a. Lena i Vera kupili odni i te že knigi
   Lena and Vera bought one-PL and those JUST books
   Lena and Vera bought the same books.

b. Lena i Vera kupili odinakovyèe knigi
   Lena and Vera bought same books
   Lena and Vera bought books that were the same.

(17a) means that Lena and Vera either bought the same stack of books (unlikely) or the same list of titles. (17b) means that they bought books that were the same in all the relevant ways.
3.1. Property comparison

The adjective *odinakov*—obligatorily involves property comparison.

(18) a. Lena kupila tri *odinakovye* knigi.
Lena bought three same books.

b. Ljuboj postupil by točno *tak* že.
Anyone would have behaved exactly so.

Liza byla *takaja* že, kak ee mama.
Liza brought up so exactly how her mother.

Object comparison is expressed by the distal demonstrative ‘that’ + *że*:

(24) Lena kupila *tu* že knigu, čto i Vera.
Lena bought that same book as Vera.

Other deixis-related pronouns also combine with *że*:

(25) a. Ja edu *tuda* že, kuda i ty.
I go-1SG there exactly where AND you

b. Ty pomniš’ *tu* četu- gretu, kotoraja živa.
you remember that same Greek which worked with us in Rome.

Since a comparison item is disallowed, the anaphoric reading is impossible. We conclude that it has a reciprocal reading only, which is confirmed by the fact that it disallows a comparison item (20):

(19) a. Lena i Vera kupili odin i *że* dom.
Lena and Vera bought one-M.SG and that-M.SG just house

b. *Lena i Vera kupili odinakovoyj dom.*
Lena and Vera bought same-M.SG house.

c. Lena i Vera kupili odinakovyj doma.
Lena and Vera bought same-PL house.

Since a comparison item is disallowed, the anaphoric reading is impossible. We conclude that *odinakov*—‘same’ does not contain a hidden reciprocal (cf. Beck’s analysis of the reciprocal different as underlyingly a relational adjective)

It would seem that deriving the property comparison reading of *odinakov*—‘same’ from some other reading (like we did for *same*) is problematic: no other reading is ever attested.

N.B.: *odinakov*—does not mean ‘similar’, which only requires for one property to be shared (Alrenga 2006)

(20) *Lena kupila odinakovyye knigi, čto vak i Vera.*
Lena bought same books that/AS AND Vera

Since a comparison item is disallowed, the anaphoric reading is impossible. We conclude that *odinakov*—‘same’ does not contain a hidden reciprocal (cf. Beck’s analysis of the reciprocal different as underlyingly a relational adjective)

It would seem that deriving the property comparison reading of *odinakov*—‘same’ from some other reading (like we did for *same*) is problematic: no other reading is ever attested.

The simplest analysis of *odinakov*—‘same’ would be to slightly modify the meaning proposed by Alrenga 2006:

(21) \[*odinakov*=λX . \forall x, y \le X [P(x)=P(y)]\]

Worse, the alternative “generic” *same* in Russian does not allow reciprocity!

3.2. Particle *że*: the distribution

The particle *że* always appears attached to some deictic element (the distal demonstrative to ‘that’, the similarity demonstratives *tak* ‘so’ and *takoj* ‘such’, or even adjunct demonstratives of time and space):

N.B.: On other uses of the particle *że* (all of them emphatic) see section 5.1

Property comparison is expressed by the similarity demonstratives *such* + *że*:

(22) a. Lena kupila *takuju* že knigu, kak (i) Vera.
Lena bought such just book that/AS AND Vera

b. Liza byla *takaja* že, kak (i) vsi devушки v ee vozraste.
Liza was such just how AND all girls in her age

3.2.1. Relative clause

The distribution of the particle *że* leaves us with little doubt that the deictic use of the Russian *same* is constructed on the basis of a relative clause introduced by a demonstrative:

N.B.: There are some dissimilarities, which need not concern us here, in particular concerning the presence of the relative pronoun

(27) a. Ryalka na *toga* daga, kogda ivaetsja spirt.
Fishing starts when the booze is over.

b. Ty pomniš’ *tu* studentku-grečanu, kotoraja rabotala u nas v Rome?
you remember that Greek student who worked with us in Rome?

As the English gloss in (27b) shows, the demonstrative here introduces a specific indefinite. This is fully in agreement with the choice-function treatment of *same* proposed by Barker to appear, with certain adjustments

The correlation between *same* and the demonstrative pronoun is also found in English:

(28) a. Alice bought *Neverwhere*. Beth bought *that very book* as well.

b. We already bought *Neverwhere*. Why did you have to buy *just that book*?

Further similarity between the English *that* and Russian *to* is revealed by the fact that in Russian, in absence of an overt comparison item (i.e., with a discourse-anaphoric reading), the elative adjective *samoj* ‘very’ (a possible cognate of *same*) must be added to the distal demonstrative (but not to the similarity demonstrative):
3.2.4. Predicational use of \textit{same}

In Russian as in Dutch, only the property comparison reading of \textit{same} is possible in the post-copular position. Two possible realizations: the particle \textit{že} accompanied by the similarity demonstrative \textit{takoj} \textquote{such} (for a deictic reading), or the adjective \textit{odinakov-} \textquote{same} (for a reciprocal reading):

\begin{enumerate}[a.]
\item Vse muž \textit{odinakovy} all men same-SF-PL
\textit{All men are the same.}
\item Liza byla \textit{takaja} \textit{že}, kak (i) vse devuški v ee vozraste. Liza was such - JUST how AND all girls in her age Liza was like other girls her age.
\item \*Èti knigi \textit{odni i te \textit{že}.} these books these one-PL AND these \textit{same}
\item \*Èti ljudi odni i te \textit{že.} these people one-PL AND these \textit{same}
\end{enumerate}

NI: We’re not committed to (22b) being predicative – it is fully compatible with NP-ellipsis (see Babby 1973, 1975, Bailyn 1994, Siegel 1976 and Pereltsvaig 2001 on long and short forms of Russian adjectives).

3.3. \textbf{Summary}

The lexicalization pattern for the Russian \textit{same} provides evidence for formally distinguishing property comparison and object comparison.

Russian also shows that the property comparison reading is the only one available in the predicate position. The fact that this reading can be \textit{purely adjectival} shows that it is not coerced in the same way it is in English.

Conversely, the lexical and syntactic decomposition of the \textquote{generic} (\textit{že}) construction shows that \textit{same} in Russian cannot be treated as a single lexical item.

Major issue: \textit{can} lexicalization patterns from one language be used to study lexical items in others?  

4. \textbf{Concluding Remarks}

An investigation of \textit{same} yields two immediate results:

\begin{itemize}
\item Property comparison vs. object comparison
\item Different lexicalization patterns across Beck\textquotesingle s characterizations
\end{itemize}

Conclusions:

\begin{itemize}
\item In English, property comparison readings are derived from the object comparison one.
\item In Russian, they are lexically distinguished; however, the Russian \textquote{generic} \textit{same} is itself not properly a lexical item.
\end{itemize}

Some of the questions for future research:

\begin{itemize}
\item Do these findings shed any light on \textit{different}, given that it is much more likely to be lexicalized as a true adjective?
\item We believe that a decomposition of Barker\textquotesingle s analysis is possible, which should also account for Russian. If so, the components of the analysis should be the same for the two languages, but the way they are combined may not be
It would seem that for English, it is possible to derive the deictic meaning from the reciprocal one, contrary to standard strategies (work in progress), but exactly the opposite appears to be true for Russian (given that the reciprocal use is augmented with respect to the deictic one; note also the strictly anaphoric use of just that NP in English).

As the English same can be licensed by relative clauses, under certain (restricted) syntactic conditions, the question arises how this use relates to the reciprocal one.

5. APPENDICES

5.1. Other uses of the Russian particle že

Russian equatives also contain the particle že (which confirms the general similarity between equatives and same (see Heim 1985, Beck 2000 on differently).

(34) a. Ėta gora takaja že vysokaja kak i ta. this-F.SG mountain such JUST tall how AND that- F.SG
b. Lena kupila takuju že doroguju knigu kak i Vera. Lena bought such-F.SG JUST expensive book how AND Vera

N.B: We have been unable to find cases where an AP-internal combination of tak ‘so’ or takoj ‘such’ with the particle same would have an interpretation other than degree. We intend to return to this fact eventually.

An alternative way of expressing the equative meaning is with the odinakov- advb:

(35) Liza i Lina odinakovo glupy. Liza and Lina same-ADV stupid-PL.

Finally, the affirmative use of too is also expressed via the particle že (though the spelling is different):

(36) a. Dina kupila knigu, a takže gazetu Dina bought book and also newspaper
b. Dina kupila knigu, a takže proča gazetu Dina bought book and also read newspaper
c. Dina prosto umnaja, a Rina takže i krasivaja Dina simply smart and Rina also AND beautiful
d. Obe podrugii kupili knigi, a Rina takže xošlila v kino both friends bought books and Rina and went to cinema

Under certain circumstances, takže ‘also, too’ is interchangeable with toče ‘too’. It is possible that takže ‘also, too’ and toče ‘too’ are verum counterparts of same. If true, this suggests that že is indeed the locus of emphasis.

There are other uses of the particle že, where it appears to be a second-position clitic, but they are probably not related.

5.2. Identity coercion

The same NP is an odd predicate:

(37) a. Ruth Rendell and Barbara Vine are the same person. true
b. Ruth Rendell and Barbara Vine are the same writer. false

Why is the post-copular NP singular?

(38) *Ruth Rendell and Barbara Vine are a writer/a person.

The problem doesn’t arise if (37) is an identity copula, rather than the predicate one:

(39) a. 3X ðX y<y<y y y(f(person)(y)) (Ruth Rendell®Barbara Vine) = ðX y(y)(Ruth Rendell) ðy(y)[Barbara Vine] ðf(person)(y)]
b. 3X ðX y<y<y y y(f(writer)(y)) (Ruth Rendell®Barbara Vine) ðX y(y)(Ruth Rendell) ðy(y)[Barbara Vine] ðf(writer)(y)]

Program: How can (39a) and (39b) have different truth values given (40)?

(40) a. Ruth Rendell/Barbara Vine is a writer.
   b. Ruth Rendell/Barbara Vine is a person.

We therefore need to assume that identity is a bit looser than we had thought when it comes to individuals:

(41) [ ð(x)(y) = 1 if [ x y x z y y x ] identity coercion

Importantly, identity coercion (ż) is only applicable between entities of the same type/sort and has nothing to do with part/whole relations obtaining between a plural and its component singulars, or between a kind and its component realizations, or even between a singular entity and its parts.

Identity coercion is also required for the regular identity copula, without same:

(42) Barbara Vine is Ruth Rendell.

We can now propose an explanation for relative identity:

(i) Different predicates have different applicability conditions (e.g., being a person holds throughout the lifetime of a human being, while being a writer does not)

(ii) However, one entity can be a stage or an aspect of another entity (cf. (42)), in a more or less similar fashion

(iii) This holds also for entities picked out by choice functions, where it is the NP that permits identifying what sub-type an entity belongs to

N.B: It is possible that a generalized version of the identity coercion operator ż is available for any argument NP. Then it is possible to rethink identity in terms of predication, which is not a project to be undertaken lightly.

The coercion analysis naturally extends to the “transitive” same, even we have not provided a lexical entry for it (nor do we intend to, for the purposes of this presentation):

(43) a. Ruth Rendell is the same person as Barbara Vine.
   b. Ruth Rendell is the same writer as Barbara Vine.

5.3. Identical is not the same

Unlike same, identical does not require a noun:

(44) a. These books are identical.
   b. This man is identical to that man.

Moltmann 2006: identical is about absolute rather than relative identity. Does this mean that a sortal is not required? How can this explain why a sortal is impossible?

(45) Suppose I have a statue that I decide to melt and re-cast. On the next day, I point at my new masterpiece and say

a. ??It’s an identical lump of metal.
   b. ??It’s not an identical statue.

Furthermore, unlike same, identical does not have an object comparison reading:

(46) Ruth Rendell and Barbara Vine are the identical writer.

(47) *Ruth Rendell and Barbara Vine are the identical same writer.
(46) a. *Re-Birth and Trouble with Lichen are the same book.
b. Re-Birth and Trouble with Lichen are the/ an identical book.

Since universals license an object-comparison reading only, it is unsurprising that identical cannot be licensed by a universal:

(47) *Every girl bought an identical book.

Plural NPs do not license identical with a singular. When we see identical with a plural NP, it is because it can have a reciprocal reading inside the plural it is contained in:

(48) a. Allie and Bee bought the same book.
b. *Allie and Bee bought an identical book.
c. Allie and Bee bought identical books.

This difference between identical and same confirms Beck’s distinction between the plural NP-dependent reading and the reciprocal one.

Just like the property-comparison reading of same, identical can be discourse-anaphoric:

(49) Since Allie always does whatever Bee does, it unsurprising that she bought an identical book.

Just like the property-comparison same, identical is scalar.

(50) These books are almost/nearly/completely identical.

Unlike same in English and like dezelfde in Dutch, identical can appear under a cardinal with a reciprocal reading:

(51) Three identical books stood on the shelf.

However, the property-comparison reading of identical is not that of same:

(52) a. Men are all the same.
b. ↩Men are all identical.

As we already know that the English same does not have a reciprocal reading except in the predicate position, and as in the predicate position it arises as a result of coercion, this is not really surprising.

However, it is also unlike the strictly reciprocal Russian odinakov: identical allows an overt argument, which is necessarily phrasal (rather than clausal):

(53) a. *Lena kupila odinakovye knigi, čto/kak i Vera/eti
   Lena bought same books that/as AND Vera/these
b. Lena bought books identical to these*to Vera/*as Vera.

This is another distinction between same and identical: same combines with what looks like a CP (introduced by as).
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