same in arguments and predicates

Peter Alrenga (UMass Amherst / UC Berkeley), Daniel Hardt (Copenhagen Business School),
Line Mikkelsen (UC Berkeley) & Yenan Sun (University of Chicago)

Anaphoric *same* can appear in argument (1) or predicative (2) NPs, with interpretive differences.

(1) I saw the rose on the table. Later I saw the same flower on the floor.

(2) The rose was red and beautiful. The carnation was *(the) same.

In (1), *the same flower* expresses simple identity of individuals, while in (2), *the same* expresses a similarity of properties – like the rose, the carnation was red and beautiful. Sun (2018) posits an ambiguity (see also Alrenga (2007) and Matushansky and Ruys (2007)): argument *same* expresses simple identity ($\lambda y \lambda x.x = y$), while predicative *same* expresses maximal similarity ($\lambda y \lambda x. \forall p \in P[p(x) \wedge p(y)]$) i.e. for some salient set of properties P, for every element p in P, p(x) and p(y). In (2) P = {red, beautiful}. But the obligatory presence of *the* in (2) goes unexplained by the similarity view. We propose instead that *same* always expresses simple identity, and that NPs with *same* have standard NP denotations. Following Partee (1987) and Ross (1969), who note that anaphoric reference to properties is possible with *that*, we claim that *the same* in (2) refers to a property, but is otherwise an ordinary anaphoric definite. Its antecedent is *red and beautiful*, and the denotation of *the same N* is NOM(⟦red and beautiful⟧) – the anaphoric definite requires a nominalized property (NOM is Chierchia's (1984) nominalization operator). Following Partee, the complement to *was* must be of type *e,t*, and this requires further application of Chierchia's PRED operator, giving the interpretation [$\lambda x.red(x) \wedge beautiful(x)$]. So in (2), the rose and the carnation are similar, but not identical. This is not because of any ambiguity in the interpretation of *same*, but because the anaphoric definite in which it appears takes a nominalized property as its antecedent.

We have argued that *the same (N)* is always an ordinary NP with an ordinary NP denotation, and that *same* always means simple identity. But there is still a puzzle here. In some ways, predicative *same* is sharply distinguished from argument *same*: in English, predicative *same-NP's* freely allow N-ellipsis, while argument *same-NP's* do not.

The distinction between the argument vs. predicative *same* is not uncommon cross-linguistically. In particular, Mandarin Chinese uses a determiner-like element *tong* to express argument *same* while predicative *same* is expressed by an adjective *xiangtong* (3). The N *yangzi* 'look' is also allowed to drop in the latter case and crucially the NP *xiangtong-de hua* in (3) is not anaphoric to the referent previously introduced even if *xiangtong* seems to directly modify *hua* 'flower'. Instead the identity of the relevant properties is involved so that the NP refers to a similar flower.

(3) Mali kanjian-le yi-duo meigui. wo kanjian-le {tong yi-duo hua/[xiangtong (yangzi)]-de hua}.
    Mary see-PERF one-CL rose   I   see-PERF {tong one-CL flower/[xiang.tong (look)]-MOD flower}
    Mary saw a rose. I saw {the same flower/the same-look flower}.

We tentatively conclude from such data that the two languages differ regarding the availability of (overt) lexical Ns that range over nominalized properties–in English, this option is highly restricted.

References

Alrenga, P. (2007). Dimensions in the semantics of comparatives. Ph. D. thesis, University of California, Santa Cruz.

Chierchia, G. (1984). Topics in the Syntax and Semantics of Infinitives and Gerunds. Ph. D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Matushansky, O. and E. Ruys (2007). Same in Russian. Foral Seatics i Moscow 3.

Partee, B. (1987). Noun phrase interpretation and type-shifting principles. In J. Groenendijk, D. de Jong, and M. Stokhof (Eds.), Studies in discourse representation theory and the theory of generalized quantifiers, pp. 115–143. Dordrect: Foris.

Ross, J. R. (1969). Adjectives as noun phrases. In D. A. Reibel and S. A. Shane (Eds.), Modern Studies in English. Readings in Transformational Grammar, pp. 352–60. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Sun, Y. (2018). Two strategies of sameness: Chinese tong and xiangtong. In Proceedings of the 20th Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar (SICOGG 20), Volume 20, pp. 369–380.