"Exceptional Accusative Objects" in Statives at the Interfaces

Naomi Harada
ATR International & Kobe Shoin Institute for Linguistic Sciences
nharada@atr.jp, nharada@alumni.uci.edu

The Goals:
• Account for a mismatch observed with a class of stative predicates, where verbs fail to mark the (apparent) grammatical object as accusative but adjectives may mark the grammatical object with the accusative marker.
• Category-specifying functional heads can be activated after CHL.
• Speculate on how semantic/pragmatic factors improve the acceptability of the Exceptional Accusative objects.

1. Basic Patterns of Case with Stative Predicates

1. Potential (bimorphemic)
   Hanako-ga tyuugokugo-ga/-o hanas-e-ru.
   Hanako-Nom Chinese-Nom/-Acc speak-Potential-Pres
   'Hanako can speak Chinese.'

2. Desirous (bimorphemic)
   June-ga mizu-ga/-o nomi-ta-i.
   June-Nom water-Nom/-Acc drink-want -Pres
   'June wants to drink water.'

3. Potential (monomorphemic)
   Hiroshi-ga sukii-ga/*-o deki-ru.
   Hiroshi-Nom sukii-Nom/-Acc can-Pres
   'Hiroshi can do skiing.'

4. 'Understand' (monomorphemic)
   Tomoko-ga rosiago-ga/*-o wakar-u.
   Tomoko-Nom Russian-Nom/-Acc understand-Pres
   'Tomoko understands Russian.'

5. Adjectival Predicates (monomorphemic)
      Taro-Nom pancake-Nom/-Acc fond-Cop.Pres
      'Taro is fond of pancakes.'
   b. Hanako-ga ninzin-ga/*-o kirai-da.
      Hanako-Nom carrot-Nom/-Acc dislike.Cop.Pres
      'Hanako dislikes carrots.'

6. Generalizations (Preliminary)
   a. NP_theme of bimorphemic stative predicates can be marked as Nom/Acc.
   b. NP_theme of monomorphemic stative predicates must be marked as Nom.

2. "Exceptional Accusative Objects" in Statives - Accusative Objects with Adjectives?

• NP_theme-Acc with stative adjectival predicates such as suki- 'like' and kirai- 'dislike' are acceptable, mainly in colloquial speech. (cf. Kuno 1973)

   classics-Acc like-Cop.Pres though modern-Gen thing-also like-Cop.Pres
   '(I) like classics, but (I) also like contemporary ones.'
Musume-wa sakuhin-ni tuite "Koko-o kirai-na-no-de-wa na-i" to hanas-u. Neg-Pres Dec tell-Pres
'(The) daughter comments on her work: "(I'm not claiming that I) dislike this place."'
((7)-(8) from The Saga Newspaper Database, 1994-2003)

• Transitive adjectives do not mark their object with the accusative marker.

Ziroo-ga obake-ga/*-o kowa-i. Jiro-Nom ghosts-Nom/-Acc afraid-Pres
'Jiro is afraid of ghosts.'

Generalizations (revised)

a. NP Theme of bimorphemic stative predicates can be marked as Nom/Acc.
b. NP Theme of monomorphemic stative verbs must be marked as Nom.
c. NP Theme of monomorphemic stative adjectival predicates may be marked as Nom/Acc.

"Exceptional Accusative predicates"

Puzzle 1:
In contrast with monomorphemic stative verbs which do not allow Case alternation at the object NP, monomorphemic stative adjectives, despite their categorial status, may allow their object to be marked as accusative.

How can adjectives mark their object with accusative?

3. Determining the Structure of a Sentence with Exceptional Accusative Predicates
3.1. Intensionality

Mary-wa Han Solo-ga/-o suki-da. Mary-Top Han Solo-Nom/-Acc fond-Cop.Pres
'Mary is fond of Han Solo.'

Mary-wa Harrison Ford-ga/-o suki-da. Mary-Top Harrison Ford-Nom/-Acc fond-Cop.Pres
'Mary is fond of Harrison Ford.' --- truth not preserved

Mary-wa Pikachu-ga/-o suki-da. Mary-Top Pikachu-Nom/-Acc fond-Cop.Pres
'Mary is fond of a Pikachu.' --- can be true

⇒ Exceptional Accusative predicates exhibit intensionality; suggesting involvement of clausal complementation (along the lines of Quine 1960; cf. also Larson, den Dikken, and Ludlow 1997).
3.2. Case-marker Drop

Kuno (1973), Saito (1985), Takezawa (1987), among others:
The Case-marker on the object can be dropped, as long as the object NP is adjacent to the verb.

(15) Taroo*(−ga) moo kono hon(−o) yon-da (koto)
    Taroo-Nom already this book-Acc read-Past fact
    'Taro has already read this book.'

Nominative Case-marker drop of the nominative object of a stative predicate is as good as Case-marker drop of the accusative object NP of a transitive verb.

    Taro-Nom Russian-Nom read-Potential-Pres SFP
    'Taro can read Russian.'

b. Taroo-ga rosiago−o yom-e-ru yo.
    Taro-Nom Russian-Acc read-Potential-Pres SFP
    'Taro can read Russian.'

c. Taroo-ga Russiago−∅ yom-e-ru yo.
    Taro-Nom Russian read-Potential-Pres SFP
    'Taro can read Russian.'

(Adapted from Dubinsky 1992)

(17) Case-marker drop and the Exceptional Accusative predicate:

a. Taroo-wa tuugokugo-ga/-o suki-da yo.
    Taro-Top Chinese-Nom/-Acc like-Cop.Pres SFP
    'Taro likes Chinese.'

b. (?)Taroo-wa tuugokugo−∅ suki-da yo.
    Taro-Top Chinese like-Cop.Pres SFP
    'Taro likes Chinese.'

⇒ The nominative object of an Exceptional Accusative predicates is the same as ordinary cases of Case-marker drop with accusative object NPs.

3.3. Quantifier Interpretation

(18) Dareka-ga daremo-o aisi-te i-ru.
    someone-Nom everyone-Acc love-Ger be-Pres
    'Someone loves everyone'

    someone > everyone, ??-?*everyone > someone (Kuroda 1970, Hoji 1985)

(19) Dareka-ga [kinoo daremo-ga osoku-made gakkoo-ni i-ta
    someone-Nom yesterday everyone-Nom late-till school-at be-Past
    koto]-o sit-te i-ru.
    fact-Acc know-Ger be-Pres
    'Someone knows that everyone stayed home yesterday'

    someone > everyone, *everyone > someone

(20) Kodomo sannin-ga zuussyurui-izyoo-no doobutu-ga/-o suki-da.
    child three.CL-Nom ten.kind-Gen animal-Nom/-Acc fond-Cop.Pres
    'Three children are fond of more than ten kinds of animals.'

    three > more than ten, (?)more than ten > three

⇒ For those speakers who can interpret sentences like (18) as ambiguous, a sentence with an adjectival psych predicates and two quantifiers is also ambiguous.
3.4. The Position of the Subject of the Exceptional Accusative Predicates

(21) For 'biclausal/bipropositional' structure, clefting with the nominalized predicate is impossible.
   a. Taroo-ga ano kawa-de oyog-u koto-ga deki-ru.
      Taro-Nom that river-in swim-Pres fact-Nom can-Pres
      'Taro can swim in that river.'
   b. Taroo-ga deki-ru-no]-wa ano kawa-de oyog-u koto da.
      Taro-Nom can-Pres-NM-Top that river-in swim-Pres fact Cop.Pres
      'What Taro is capable (of doing) is to swim in that river.'
      can-Pres-NM-Top Taro-Nom that river-in swim-Pres fact Cop.Pres
      Lit. 'What (Taro) is capable (of doing) is that Taro swims in that river.'
      (Adapted from McCawley 1973:360)

(22) 1-place predicate and cleft:
   a. [CP Taroo-ga hayaku oki-ru koto]-wa mezurasi-i.
      Taro-Nom early wake.up-Pres fact-Top unusual-Pres
      'It is unusual that Taro gets up early.'
      unusual-Pres-NM-Top Taro-Nom early wake.up-Pres fact Cop.Pres
      'What is unusual is that Taro gets up early.'
      (Adapted from McCawley 1973:360)

(23) *Suki-na-no-wa Taroo-ga ninzin(-ga/-o) da.
      like-Cop.Attr.-NM-Top Taro-Nom carrots-Nom/-Acc Cop.Pres
      Lit. 'What (Taro) likes is that Taro, carrots.'

⇒ *Suki- (and kirai-) is not a 1-place predicate, selecting Taroo and one more constituent.

    Yamada-teacher-Nom chanson-Nom Hon-like-Cop.Pres.
    'Professor Yamada likes chansons.'

    Taro-Nom Yamada-teacher-Nom Hon-like-Cop.Pres.
    'Taro likes Professor Yamada.'

3.5. Summary: The Properties of the Grammatical Object with suki-, kirai-

(26)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>biclausal structure</th>
<th>monoclausal structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensionality</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrambling</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case-marker Drop</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantifier Interpretation</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(27) Puzzle 2:
The object of the Exceptional Accusative predicates exhibits apparently conflicting properties. Although sentences with Exceptional Accusative predicates exhibit intensionality, thereby suggesting a biclausal structure, the object NP exhibits canonical properties of the object.
4. Potential but Impossible Analyses
4.1. Syntactic Approaches
4.1.1. Predicate Raising?


(29) a. Before V-raising  
    Agr-oP  
    Spec Agr-o'  
    VP/AP Agr-o  
    VP  

b. After V-raising  
    Agr-oP  
    Spec Agr-o'  
    VP/AP Agr-o  
    VP  V/A [+stative]

4.1.2. Base-generation

(30) A "biphasal" analysis of potential sentences (Adapted from Takano 2003):

(31) Dubinsky's (1992) analysis of monomorphemic stative verbs:
    Postulate a VP-shell structure like (30), with the higher projection of V headed by a null counterpart of the potential morpheme -e-.

(32) Supporting evidence: The possibility of attaching the potential morpheme.
    *wakar-e-ru
    understand-Potential-Pres
    wakar-u (cf. (4))
    understand-Pres

(33) This test is not available for the Exceptional Accusative Predicates, since -e- only attaches to V.

(34) ??Doitugoi-ga John-ga t_i yom-e-ru
    German-Nom John-Nom read-Potential-Pres
    Lit. 'John can read German.'

(Takano 2003)
Honi-o John-ga t i yon-da.
'John read a book/books.'

• Does the nominative object originate in a position different from that of accusative objects?

   Takako-Nom carrots-Nom dislike-Cop.Pres.
   'Takako dislikes carrots.'

   b. *Ninzin-ga Takako-ga t i kirai-da.

   c. ?-??Ninzin-o Takako-ga t i kirai-da.
   carrots-Acc Takako-Nom dislike-Cop.Pres.

   a. [Takako-ga kono keeki-ga suki-na-koto]-wa yoku
   Takako-Nom this cake-Nom like-Cop.Attr.-fact-Top well
   sir-are-te i-ru.
   know-Pass-Ger be-Pres
   'It is well known that Takako likes this cake.'

   b. [Kono keeki-ga Takako-ga t i suki-na-koto]-wa yoku
   this cake-Nom Takako-Nom like-Cop.Attr.-fact-Top well
   sir-are-te i-ru.
   know-Pass-Ger be-Pres
   'It is well known that Takako likes this cake.'

⇒ In embedded contexts, in which semantico-pragmatic factors on NP-ga in statives are not in effect, the nominative object can be scrambled in front of the subject NP.

4.1.3. The "Smaller-Clause" Analysis

Watasi-ga \[TP pro-Dat/Loc okane-ga \(\emptyset_{BE}\) T\] hosi-i
I-Nom money-Nom want-Pres
'I want money.'

(Adapted from Endo, Kitagawa, and Yoon 2000)

(39) A problem:
The Smaller-Clause analysis would always predict that the Case on the object NP is nominative.

4.2. Semantic Approaches

• Semantic Factors in Stative Sentences
  (i): The grammatical subject lacks (proto)-typical properties of 'Agent'.
  (ii): Specificity of the accusative-marked object.

4.2.1. The Nature of "Transitivity" in Exceptional Accusative Stative Sentences

(40) Dowty's (1991) list of contributing properties for the Agent Proto-Role:
  a. volitional involvement in the event or state
  b. sentience (and/or perception)
  c. causing an event or change of state in another participant
  d. movement (relative to the position of another participant)
  (e. exists independently of the event named by the verb.)
(41) Dowty's (1991) list of contributing properties for the Patient Proto-Role:
   a. undergoes change of state
   b. incremental theme
   c. causally affected by another participant
   d. stationary relative to movement of another participant.
   (e. does not exist independently of the event, or not at all)

   ((40)-(41) from Dowty 1991:572)

(42) Canonical transitive sentences:
   Taroo-\textit{ga} hon-\textit{o} sansatu kat-ta.
   Taro-\textit{Nom} book-\textit{Acc} three.CL buy-Past
   'Taro bought three books.'

   \textit{Taroo}: Volitionally involved in the event of buying the three books. \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Agent}
   \textit{hon}: Undergone change of state; coming into possession of Taro. \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Patient}

(43) Transitivity of stative sentences (monomorphemic verb):
   Taroo-\textit{ga} tyuugokugo-\textit{ga}/*-o wakar-u.
   Taro-\textit{Nom} Chinese-\textit{Nom}/-\textit{Acc} understand-Pres
   'Taro understands Chinese.'

   \textit{tyuugokugo}: Does not undergo change of state, not an incremental theme, not causally
   affected by \textit{Taroo}, cannot be defined in terms of stationary relative to the
   movement of \textit{Taroo}.

   \rightarrow \text{Not a prototypical Patient} \quad \rightarrow \text{failure of accusative licensing.}

(44) Stative predicates are "less transitive" than active predicates
   (Given that causation of change being typical of the PROTO-AGENT/PROTO-
   PATIENT relationship; see Fujimura 1989, McGloin 1989, Jarkey 1999, and Kuriki
   2002)

(45) Transitivity of stative sentences (monomorphemic verb):
   Taroo-\textit{ga} ninzin-\textit{ga}/-\textit{o} kirai-da.
   Taro-\textit{Nom} carrots-\textit{Nom}/-\textit{Acc} dislike-Cop.Pres.
   'Taro dislikes carrots.'

   \textit{Taroo}: No volitional involvement, does not cause the event/change of state, does not
   involve movement.
   \textit{ninzin}: Does not undergo change of state, not an incremental theme, not causally
   affected by \textit{Taroo}, cannot be defined in terms of stationary relative to the
   movement of \textit{Taroo}.

(46) A problem:
   In (45), both \textit{Taroo} and \textit{ninzin} lack prototypical roles of PROTO-AGENT/PROTO-
   PATIENT. Nevertheless, the object can be marked as accusative.
4.2. Specificity of the Object NP

(47) Desiderative sentences and non-specific objects:
   a. Mizu-ga nomi-ta-i.
      water-Nom drink-want-Pres.
      'I want to drink some water.'
   b. Hon-ga yomi-ta-i.
      book-Nom read-want-Pres.
      'I want to read a book.'
   c. Kuruma-ga kai-ta-i.
      car-Nom buy-want-Pres.
      'I want to buy a car.'

(48) Desiderative sentences and specific objects:
   a. Denki-o kesi-ta-i.
      electricity-Acc turn.off-want-Pres.
      'I want to turn off the lights.'
   b. Kaisya-o yame-ta-i.
      company-Acc quit-want-Pres.
      'I want to quit my job.'
   c. Heya-o soozisi-ta-i.
      Room-Acc clean-want-Pres.
      'I want to clean my room.'

((47)-(48) adapted from McGloin 1989)

(49) A Problem:
   Specificity/individuatedness may improve the acceptability of the accusative-marked
   object in stative sentences, but it is not a sufficient condition for accusative objects in
   stative sentences.

(50) Ookura-sama-no o-yukue-ga tazune-ta-i.
      Ookura-sir-Gen Hon-whereabouts-Nom ask-want-Pres
      'I would like to inquire about Sir. Okura's whereabouts.'
(Adapted from Shibatani 1978, citing Kookichiroo Yuzawa's Tokugawa zidai gengo no
   kenkyuu [A study of the language from the Tokugawa era].

(51) A further problem for the Semantic Approaches:
   The existence of Sino-Japanese predicates, which fall outside the attested patterns.

(52) a. (cf. (3))
      Hirosi-ga sukii-ga/-o/*-o deki-ru.
      Hiroshi-Nom sukii-Nom/-Acc can-Pres
      'Hiroshi can do skiing.'
   b. Shoka-o/-??-ga koonyuu-si-ta-i.
      book.shelf-Acc/-Nom buy-do-want-Pres
      '(I) want to buy some bookshelves.'
(Adapted from Kuno 1973)

5. Proposal
5.1. Exceptional Accusative Predicates as "Bare Predicates"
   * These adjectival predicates have verbal counterparts.

(53) Taroo-wa sanpo-o/-*-ga kira-u.
      Taro-Top walking-Acc/-Nom dislike PRES
      'Taro dislikes walking.'
(54) Hanako-wa mina-ni suk-are-te i-ru.
Hanako-Top everyone-by like-Pass-Ger be-Pres
'Hanako is liked by everyone.'

(55) a. The root of Exceptional Accusative predicate selects a proposition (a "smaller clause" in the sense of Endo et al. 2000) headed by $\emptyset_V$.
b. After Spell-Out, there are options: Either to derive a gerundive form by inserting an epenthetic vowel [i] or by PF movement of $v$ to $\emptyset_V$ to get a verbal form.
c. Morphological Case is determined after the categorial status of the root has been determined.

5.2. An Analysis

(57) Theoretical assumptions:
a. Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993)
b. A compositional approach to lexical categories. (Marantz 1997, Chomsky 2001)
c. A restrictive theory of functional categories:
   Legitimate functional categories are either (i) phonetically null and movement-triggering in $C_{\text{nil}}$ or phonetically overt and syntactically inert. (Fukui and Sakai 2003)
d. Japanese lacks syntactically active functional categories (Fukui 1986, 1995; cf. also Kuroda 1988)
   Nominative Case licensing: /ga/ $\leftrightarrow$ [CASE] /NP (XP*) T (C) #
   Accusative Case licensing: /o/ $\leftrightarrow$ [CASE] / V#
g. The rules in (57)f are constrained by the "Elsewhere Condition" (Chomsky and Halle 1968, Kiparsky 1973).

(58) CLAIM 1:
The roots suk- and kira(w)- enter into syntactic computation without a syntactically inactive category-specifying functional head (such as $v$).

(59) CLAIM 2:
Category-specifying functional heads can be inserted/activated as late as in Morphology in languages without syntactically active functional categories.
(60) In narrow Syntax:
... \[TP \{RootP \{Taroo, \{\text{smaller clause} \{pro, \{ringo} \{∅ \} \text{V}\} \{Root} \text{kiraw-}\} \text{T}\} \] ...

(61) Option 1: Deriving the variant with NP\textsubscript{Theme-Nom}:

\textit{Spell-Out}:
... \[TP \{RootP \{Taroo, \{\text{smaller clause} \{pro, \{ringo} \{∅ \} \text{V}\} \{Root} \text{kiraw-}\} \text{T}\} \] ...

\[ \text{Taro a pple} \text{ dislike} \]

\[ \downarrow \]

\textit{Linearization}

\textit{Morphological Case Licensing} (via Distributed Morphology; cf. (57)f)
\& \textit{Vocabulary Insertion}

... Taroo, \text{pro, } ringo-ga \text{∅ } kiraw da...
Taro \text{apple-Nom } dislike Cop.Pres

\[ \text{The object NP ringo 'apple' is marked with ga, which is the default Case under T} \]

\[ \downarrow \]

\textit{Morphophonemic rules}

... Taroo, \text{pro, } ringo-ga \text{∅ } kiraw\text{ī} da...
Taro \text{apple-Nom } dislike Cop.Pres

\[ \text{Root + } \text{i } \text{yields a gerundive form} \]

\[ \downarrow \]

Taroo-ga \text{pro, } ringo-ga \text{∅ } kirai da
Taro-Nom \text{apple-Nom } dislike

\[ \Rightarrow \text{Taro-ga ringo-ga kirai-da.} \]
\text{Taro-Nom apple-Nom dislike-Cop.Pres} 'Taro dislikes apples.'

(62) Option 2: Deriving the variant with NP\textsubscript{Theme-Acc}:

\textit{Spell-Out}:
... \[TP \{RootP \{Taroo, \{\text{smaller clause} \{pro, \{ringo} \{∅ \} \text{V}\} \{Root} \text{kiraw-}\} \text{T}\} \] ...

\[ \text{P F Movement } \& \text{ Linearization:} \]
... Taroo, \text{pro, } ringo \text{∅ } kiraw T ...
Taro \text{apple } dislike

\[ \downarrow \]

\textit{Morphological Case Licensing} (via Distributed Morphology; cf. (57)f)
\& \textit{Vocabulary Insertion}

... Taroo-ga \text{pro, } ringo-o \text{∅ } -kiraw da...
Taro-Nom \text{apple-Acc } dislike Cop.Pres

\[ \text{The NP left-adjacent to V is marked with the accusative marker} \]
\[ \text{(Kuroda 1965, 1978, 1983)} \]

\[ \downarrow \]

\textit{Morphophonemic rules}

Taroo-ga \text{pro, } ringo-o \text{∅ } -kirai\text{ī}-da
Taro-Nom \text{apple-Acc } dislike-Cop.Pres

\[ \Rightarrow \text{Taro-ga ringo-o kirai-da.} \]
\text{Taro-Nom apple-Acc dislike-Pres} 'Taro dislikes apples.'
5.3. Explaining the Facts
(64) The biclausal-like properties of Sentences with Exceptional Accusative Predicate
  a. Intensionality: \( \leftrightarrow \) Exceptional Accusative Predicates selects a proposition (SRC)
  b. Cleft: \( \leftrightarrow \) In the structure (60), is 'bipropositional', in which the subject NP in the
     higher proposition and the object NP in the lower proposition do not form a single
     constituent.

(65) The monoclausal properties of Sentences with Exceptional Accusative Predicate
  a. Scrambling, Quantifier Interpretation: \( \leftrightarrow \) Assuming that the output of
     PF-movement is visible to LF, the structural information sent to LF is that of a
     single clause.
  b. Case-marker drop: By the time morphological Case licensing takes place,
     the structure has already been linearized, rendering the object of the embedded null V
     adjacent to the matrix predicate.

(66) Answers to the puzzles:
  a. Answer 1: The Exceptional Accusative adjectives may mark their object NP since (i)
     they are devoid of categorial feature-specifying morpheme, and (ii) they select a
     smaller clause with a null V.
  b. Answer 2: The hybrid properties exhibited by the sentences with Exceptional
     Accusative adjectives follow from the fact that Linearization (i.e., clause-reduction
     processes) feeds LF.

5.4. On the Relevance of Semantic/Pragmatic Factors:
(67) "...Native speakers, both young and old, often hesitate to accept uncontextualized
     examples like the ones Kuno [1973:NH] gives, particularly with the underived stative
     predicates such as suki da 'like'...."

     (Jarkey 1999:201)
(68) Excerpts from *Bokkotyan* 'Little Bokko' by Shin’ichi Hoshi (1971):

Customer: "Okyakusan-no-naka-de, dare-ga suki-dai."
who-Nom like-Cop.Pres.Q
'Who do you like (best) among the customers?'

Little Bokko: "Dare-ga suki-kasira."
who-Nom like-Q.Polite
'I wonder who I like (best).'

Customer: "Boku-o suki-kai"
I-Ace like-Q
'Do you like me?'

Little Bokko: "Anata-ga suki-da-wa."
you-Nom like-Cop.Pres-SFP
'I like you.'

(69) Issyookenmei benkyoo-si-ta node, Masao-wa tyuugokugo-no
hard study-do-Past because Masao-Top Chinese-Gen
nyusu-ga/-o zimaku-nasi demo waka r-u yoo-ni nat-ta.
news- Nom/-Acc caption-without even understand-Pres way P become-Past
'Because (he) studied hard, Masao came to be able to understand news in Chinese without
captions.'

(70) NP first gets formal licensing, after which contextual features may figure in.

6. On Post-Syntactic Computation

(71) Post-Syntactic Compounds (Shibatani and Kageyama 1988)

a. [ameri-ka-o hoomon]-no ori
America-Acc visit-Gen occasion
'On the occasion in which (one) visits America'

b. [ameri-ka hoomon]-no ori
America visit-Gen occasion
'On the occasion in which (one) visits America'

(72) Not only the output of (narrow) syntax but also phrasal phonology feeds this process:

a. [aMERIKA:hoOMON] post-syntactic compound

b. [aMERIKA-ohoOMON] phrase

↑↓

cf. The accent pattern of lexical compounds:

[kaiGAI-RYOkoo] 'abroad-travel'
[aMERIKA-HOOMON] 'a visit to America'

7. Concluding Remarks

- Explained the Syntax-Morphology mismatch (i.e., Adjectives licensing accusative Case)
  by having recourse to "Late Insertion" or "Late Determination" of the categorial feature
  specification with a limited class of roots that select a "smaller clause" headed by a
  phonologically null V.
- On the marked status of Exceptionally Accusative Objects:
  (i) An option based on a phonologically null element is more costly for language
      learners?
  (ii) Economy in Morphology: Movement is more costly than epenthesis.
- Improvement of acceptability of Exceptional Accusative object arises since the processes
  in question take place at the Interfaces of Syntax, Morphology, and the Semantic
  Component.
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