SPECIFIC EVIDENCE: DIFFERENTIAL ARGUMENTS AND (NON-ADJUNCT) SECONDARY PREDICATES Monica Alexandrina Irimia – University of Toronto

Background. A rarely noticed (for two recent exceptions see Irimia 2011, or López 2012) pattern of differential objects (DOMs) is their *obligatory* formal marking in the context of a (non-adjunct) secondary predicate. More specifically, the sentences in (2-6) contain shared arguments functioning as objects with consider-type predicates. As seen in examples (2, 3, 4) languages that have overt differential object marking must use that morphology in such contexts. Another robust cross-linguistic observation is that these types of shared arguments, 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. 3-5); example (1b) shows that this restriction also extends to subjects of seem-type verbs with SPs. Goals and analysis. This talk has three goals; i) further consolidate, through a generative typology investigation, another rarely investigated DOM split; if in all 40 (genetically unrelated) SP-permitting languages investigated under the current project shared (indefinite) arguments can only be interpreted as specific, and must be marked differentially with SPs (when corresponding morphology is present in the language), specificity/DOM is not always required in other non-finite/small clause environments (i.e., infinitives, gerunds, subjunctives); ii) provide further support, through a variety of (novel) diagnostics (pseudo-gapping, adverb placement, floated quantifiers stranding, scopal interactions, multiple agreement spreading, 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. 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.). The current account also provides strong support for DOM analyses (e.g., López 2012) which require both syntactic conditions (a position above V) and semantic principles to derive specificity and differential marking. Moreover, it avoids the problems canonical scrambling accounts have. 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 saving 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/DOM behavior in a straightforward manner. **Definiteness scales**. The SP contexts also pose serious problems for definiteness scale-type analyses (Silverstein 1976, Aissen 2003). It is not clear how the constraints imposed by the SPs, which appear to be of a different nature than animacy and humanness can be mixed inside a scale in a non-stipulative way. What seems to be relevant is not necessarily the presence of a scale, but rather a larger concept of 'saliency' (of which specificity is a subtype). Saliency can be derived syntactically, semantically, or pragmatically. Extensions. Another less discussed fact about DOM and SPs is that the differential marking as well as the specificity effects also extend to adjunct SP. This is illustrated with an example from Hindi-Urdu (3b), but such facts hold in all languages examined here; the shared argument the fish can only have differential marking. Preliminary investigation also indicates that native speakers of various languages do not attribute a propositional interpretation to consider-predicates (i.e., what is considered is not the statement of a student being intelligent, but rather a student is considered and some property is attributed to him/her). If on the right track, this observation could prove that adjunct and nonadjunct SPs are more tightly related, and that understanding DOM is not just a syntactic phenomenon.

```
(1) [_{vP} v [_{EvidP} \mathbf{DOM} \text{ Evid } [\text{ V SP}]]]
```

(2) ENGLISH

a) The professor considers a student happy a student >> considers
 b) A student seems sick.
 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) $[v_P \ v \ [\alpha_P \ \text{shared argument} \ \alpha \ [\ V \ [InfP < \frac{\text{shared argument}}{\text{shared argument}} > \text{to}]]]$ (strong reading only)
- bii) [$_{vP}$ v [$_{\alpha P}$ shared argument 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) HINDI-URDU

a) admi kitab- \mathbf{ko}/\mathbf{O} [acha səməj^hta $\mathbf{h}\epsilon$.] man.M.SG. book. \mathbf{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)

b) Admi machli-ko/*Ø [kacha karaha hɛ.]
Man.M.SG. fish.F.SG.-DOM. raw.M.SG. eat.PRES.PRT.M.SG. be.3.INDIC.PRES.M.SG.
'The man is eating/eats the fish/a specific piece of fish raw.'

(4) SPANISH

El professor consideró **a/*Ø** un estudiante intelligente. The professor considered (**a= DOM**) un student intelligent. 'The professor considered a student intelligent.' (a student >> consider)

(5) TURKISH

Ali bir öğrenc-i-**yi**/***Ø** zeki bulu-yor. Ali a student-EP.V.-**DOM**/***Ø** intelligent find-PRES.PROGR.3.SG. 'Ali finds/considers a (specific) student intelligent.' (a student >> find; *find>> a student)

(6) 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.'