CALL ME AN AMBULANCE
NELS 35, University of Connecticut, Storrs, October 22-24, 2004

An injured man dials 911 for help.

**Man:** Operator, operator, call me an ambulance!

**Operator:** Okay, sir, you’re an ambulance.

### 1. **Introduction**

What is the syntax of proper names?

- They are simplex directly referring **rigid designators** (Kripke (1980)), or **indexicals** (Recanati (1997), Pelczar and Rainsbury (1998))
- They are **definite descriptions** Frege (1983), Russell (1911), Searle (1958), Kneale (1962), Burge (1973), Katz (1977, 1990, 1994), Geurts (1997), Elbourne (2002), Liu (2004), etc.). These definite descriptions have been viewed as simplex or complex.

Proposal: **verbs of naming** (1) are essential for the understanding of the syntax and semantics of proper names. The syntax of naming constructions argues that **proper names are essentially predicates, whose contents mention the name itself** (it’s a quotation theory, cf. Geurts (1997)). In argument positions they will be argued to become **indexical** due to being internally **complex**.

1. a. **Arthur** was named the king of all England.  
   b. The king of all England was named **Arthur**.

**The structure of the argument:**

(i) First impression given by verbs of naming is that they are ditransitive (2a)
(ii) This impression is false: **verbs of naming take a small clause complement** (2b)
(iii) This means that proper names enter syntax as **predicates**
(iv) In argument positions they are generally **definite descriptions**
(v) The **indexicality of the proper names** (rigidity, according to Kripke (1980)) can be **compositionally derived** from their semantics in naming constructions
(vi) How much better can it get? 😊

2. a. **vP** ditransitive simplified  
   b. **vP** ECM/raising simplified
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We will begin by comparing verbs of naming with verbs of nomination:

(3) a. Arthur was named the king of all England. nomination
    b. The king of all England was named Arthur. naming

We will argue that both involve a small clause. This should also dispose of the hypothesis that the meaning of the proper name in examples like (3b) involves mention as opposed to use.

2. Verbs of naming and nomination

anoint, appoint, baptize, call, choose, christen, crown, declare, designate, dub, elect, entitle, make, name, nickname, nominate, proclaim, pronounce, style, title, vote…

(4) Major assumption

The structure that verbs of naming and nomination project is invariant across languages.

NB: This is actually false for verbs of naming in Georgian (Lea Nash, p.c.) and Hindi (Anoop Mahajan, p.c.). In the latter case the verb is bi-morphemic and means “give a name” (incorporation). In the former case, the case is true for one of the two relevant verbs. These facts do not mean that the data presented in this talk need not be explained; they still show what they show: proper names can be predicates.

These verbs form a natural class:

• The syntactic properties of both constructions, listed below, seem to be consistently the same across languages (Arabic, Breton, Finnish, German, (Modern) Greek, Latin, Portuguese, Russian, Scandinavian… and of course, English and French)
• The same verbs may be used in both constructions (cf. (3))
• Article-drop with DP2 (below)

NB: The second noun phrase in naming and nomination constructions can be indefinite in nomination constructions. I use DP2 to designate it only because it’s easier to pronounce than xNP2 (extended NP2).

Proposal: we know that verbs of nomination are ECM. If they form a natural class with verbs of naming, the latter would take small clause complements as well.

Important: the verb call may be special, in English and in other languages, allowing many more uses than the others. We will not base any conclusions on its properties alone.

NB: I will be leaving aside cases where the DP1 or DP2 is introduced by a (Dative) preposition (e.g. Hebrew k-r-h ‘call’, English promote), though this might be too much of a simplification.

2.1. DP1 is an argument

The first noun phrase (DP1) is always a (non-predicative) DP – it doesn’t have to be referential, but it cannot be predicative; the article cannot be omitted with a singular noun:

(5) a. The Senate nominated/elected/declared Caesar consul. referential
    b. Gloria baptized every child Karl. non-referential
    c. *The Senate nominated senator consul. predicative

The interpretation of DP1 (GOAL) is the same for naming and nomination, suggesting a double-object analysis, which we will argue against.

2.2. DP1 is not the goal, DP2 is not the theme

It is a general property of English that to passivize, a DP has to start out as the object of a verb (or of a preposition, in pseudo-passives). GOAL and THEME can both do so:
(6)  a. **Marie was given a book.**
   b. A book was given to Marie.

However, in naming constructions only DP1 can passivize:

(7)  a. Caesar was nominated/elected/declared consul (by the Senate).
   b. *A/the/Ø consul was nominated/elected/declared Caesar (by the Senate).

(8)  a. I was called/christened/named/baptized Al.
   b. *Al was called/named/baptized me.

⇒ DP2 does not behave like the THEME object in English.

In Dutch double object constructions, only the most internal argument (Accusative, though it is not Case-marked) can be passivized (Eddy Ruys, p.c.):

(9)  a. het Marie/ een meisje gegeven boek
the Marie/ a girl given book
the book given to Marie/to a girl
   b. *het Anna Karenina/een boek gegeven meisje
the Anna Karenina/a book given girl
   the book given to Anna Karenina/to a girl

If verbs of naming have double-object syntax, then we expect the THEME to be able to passivize, and the GOAL to be unable to do so. In other words, the proper name should behave like a book and the name-bearer should behave like a girl. The facts are exactly the opposite:

(10)  a. de Marie genoemde/gedoopte vrouw
the Marie named/baptized woman
   b. *de een vrouw genoemde/gedoopte Marie
   the a woman named/baptized Marie

The GOAL can be “externalized”/passivized, while the THEME cannot. This is unsurprising if the naming (and nomination) construction is not a ditransitive, but contains a small clause:

(11)  a. ?de de baas gemaakte vrouw
the the boss made woman
the woman made the boss
   b. **de een vrouw gemaakte baas?
   the a woman made boss
   ? under the reading the boss made into a woman

⇒ DP1 doesn’t behave like the GOAL object in Dutch.

We conclude that the naming construction is not ditransitive

2.3. DP2 is a predicate

DP2 is either a name (naming) or a nominal predicate (nomination).

Claim: to maintain the similarity, it is natural to suppose that a name DP2 is a predicate.

Interrogation and anaphora

With animate subjects, the interrogative is what rather than who:

(12)  a. What/*who was Caesar nominated?
   b. What/*who did they christen the boy that Mr. Earnshaw found?
With verbs of naming, anaphora of the name can be expressed by the pronominal predicates so and that. No other pronoun (and in particular no anaphor like itself) can appear as DP$_2$.

(13) Latimeria is called *latimeria*/that/so/*it/*itself after Miss Marjorie Courtney-Latimer.

What more to say? *Let’s call a spade itself.*

**Bare definites**

Stowell (1989) analyzes verbs of nomination as containing a small clause: they can appear with a bare nominal predicate:

(14) a. The queen appointed her lover treasurer of the realm.
   b. Anne’s death made George (the) king of England.

The omission of the definite article is conditional on there being only one individual satisfying the predicate at every given moment.

NB: This may be why superlatives allow article drop relatively easily (cf. Borthen (1998, 2003) for Norwegian).

(15) We named him public enemy *(number 1)/*enemy of the state.

In languages where names can appear with definite articles (or pronouns), they usually don’t do so with verbs of naming, except with modification.

(16) a. Ich habe den Karl gesehen. Bavarian German (Nina Rothmayr, p.c.)
   I have the-Acc Karl seen.
   *I have seen Karl.*

   b. Ich habe ihn (*den) Karl genannt
   I have him-Acc the-Acc Karl called
   *I called him Karl.*

   c. Die Polly wird *(die) neue Mary Poppins genannt
   the Polly was *(the new Mary Poppins called
   *Polly was called the new Mary Poppins.*

In colloquial Icelandic, Northern Norwegian and Northern Swedish argument proper names are also preceded by a definite article (Delsing (1993), p. 54). In **Northern Norwegian**, it takes the form of a 3$^\text{rd}$ person pronoun (examples by Peter Svenonius, Øystein Alexander Vangsnes, p.c.):

(17) a. ho Marit så han Øystein
   she Marit saw he Øystein
   *Marit saw Øystein.*

   b. han Øystein så ho Marit
   he Øystein saw she Marit
   *Øystein saw Marit.*

In naming constructions (as well as some others, such as vocatives, play-acting and sometimes possessives) this **preproprial article** disappears (Delsing (1993))!

(18) a. Dæm døpte barnet (*ho) Marit
    they baptized child.the (she) Marit
    *They baptized the child Marit.*

   b. Han heter (*han) Øystein.
   he is-called he Øystein
   *He is called Øystein.*
If names are used predicatively here, this is an **obvious analogue of bare predicate definites** in (14) (see also article drop with nominal predicates in French (Kupferman (1979), Pollock (1983), Boone (1987), Longobardi (1994), Chierchia (1998), Roy (2001), Matushansky and Spector (2003), among others), Dutch (de Swart, Winter and Zwarts (2004)) and German. The same is true for **Catalan** (Louise McNally, p.c.). That the effect is not due to some syntactic ban on definite DPs in that position is shown by the fact that modified proper names necessitate the definite article in naming contexts:

(19) a. Va resultat que *(en) Joanet el van anomenar (*en) Jonathan
go-3sg turn-out that the John-DIM him go-3sg name the Jonathan
It turned out that Johnny had been named Jonathan.

b. Li diuen *(el) Lord Nelson francés.
him call-3sg the Lord Nelson French
They call him the French Lord Nelson.

**NB:** The definite article varies, depending on whether it appears with a bare proper name (*Joanet*) or with a modified proper name (*Lord Nelson*). See Longobardi (1999) for some discussion of Catalan and Campbell (1991) as cited by Delsing (1993) on the subject of special preproprial articles in Malagasy, Maori, and Tagalog.

Same holds for the Uto-Aztecan language **Pima** (Marcus Smith, p.c.) and **European Portuguese** (except the article is the same for modified and non-modified proper names).

### 2.4. **Case-marking**

The strongest argument for a small clause analysis of verbs of naming and nomination is given by languages with morphological Case-marking. The **Case on DP** is **predicative**.

**Predicate case**

In **Hungarian** (Veronika Hegedüs, p.c.), **DP** in both naming and nomination constructions bears Dative, which is the predicative Case:

(20) a. a la’ny- om-at Mari-nak nevezt-em el
the daughter 1sg-Acc Mary-Dat named-1sg PREVERB
I named my daughter Mary.

b. a la’ny- om-at elnök-nek jelölt-em
the daughter 1sg-Acc president-Dat nominated-1sg
I nominated my daughter president.

c. okos-nak tart-om a la’ny-om-at
clever-Dat keep-1sg the daughter-1sg-acc
I consider my daughter clever.

The same happens in **Syrian Arabic**, where the predicate Case is Accusative (Nisrine Al-Zahre, p.c.) and in Russian, where the predicate Case is Instrumental (Bailyn and Rubin (1991), Bailyn and Citko (1999), Pereltsvaig (2001), etc.). These facts are suggestive, but not conclusive.

**Case-doubling**

**Case-doubling** is a characteristic property of small clauses (especially in secondary predication, even in languages that don’t have it in primary predication)

**NB:** Case doubling also occurs in Japanese and Korean with inalienable possession. This might be relevant: Massam (1985) and following her Cho (1998) argue that Korean Case doubling involves ECM. This is suggestive when one recalls that possessives is one of the environments in Northern Norwegian where the preproprial article disappears).
Latin small clauses exhibit Case-doubling: the **Case on DP**₂ **is the same as that on DP**₁:

(21) a. Ciceronem clarum habent. Latin SC  
Cicero-Acc famous-Acc consider/hold  
*They consider Cicero famous.*

b. Cicero clarus habetur Latin SC (passive)  
Cicero-Nom famous-Nom consider/hold-Pass  
*Cicero is considered famous.*

When passivization renders DP₁ Nominative, this is reflected in the Case of DP₂ (here an AP).

Case-doubling also happens with verbs of naming and nomination.

(22) a. Filium meum Lucium voco. verb of naming  
son-Acc my-Acc Lucius-Acc call-1sg  
*I call my son Lucius.*

b. Meus filius vocatur Lucius passive  
my-Nom son-Nom call-Pass Lucius-Nom  
*My son is called Lucius.*

(23) a. Ciceronem consulem creat verb of nomination  
Cicero-Acc consul-Acc make  
*S/he makes Cicero consul.*

b. Cicero creatur consul passive  
Cicero-Nom is-created consul-Nom  
*Cicero is made consul.*

There is no accepted theory of Case-doubling, but while “copying” the Case of the subject onto the predicate can be viewed as a kind of agreement, no relation is commonly assumed to exist between two internal arguments of a ditransitive verb that would permit to connect their Case-marking.

In **German** and in **Modern Greek** the same effects obtain (though this is harder to show for the former, since proper names do not decline).

NB: If the analysis of verbs of naming and nomination as ECM verbs is correct, then German does have ECM.

### 2.5. have/be alternation

The name or the nominal predicate cannot be substituted with *the name/office of*:

(24) a. They named him (*the name (of)) Heathcliff.  
b. The Senate nominated him (*the office/function/duty… (of)) consul.

**Potential counter-example** due to Roger Schwarzschild, p.c.:

(25) She called him every name in the book.

How can a predicate be universally quantified?  
Answer: when *be* means *have* (see Partee (1987) answering Williams (1983)):

(26) This house has been every color.

The similarity between (25) and (26) means that (25) is an argument in favor of the theory – but we promised to not rely on *call* for our conclusions 😊

⇒ In naming constructions **names are predicates**.
2.6. Raising

Having proposed the existence of ECM verbs of naming, we predict that there should be raising verbs of naming (Eddy Ruys, p.c.):

(27) zij heet Marie
she be-named Marie
*She is named Marie.*

2.7. Other predicate positions

Proper names can be small clause predicates with ECM/raising verbs (including copula) as well as secondary predicates:

One might be tempted to believe that this is an identity statement, but name predicates can be coordinated with regular predicates (examples due to Jim Higginbotham, p.c.):

(28) a. The Pope called himself John-Paul and a devout Christian.
    b. I am Sam and a Catholic.

Also, proper names can appear as secondary predicates and as complements of other ECM verbs:

(29) Born [PRO Charles Lutwidge Dodgson], the man who would become Lewis Carroll was an eccentric and an eclectic.

Use vs. mention?

(30) a. ‘Arthur’ starts with an *a*.
    b. ‘Guinevere’ is a pretty name.

Kripke (1980), p. 62, fn: ‘Sloppy, colloquial speech, which often confuses use and mention, may, of course, express the fact that someone might have been called, or not been called, ‘Aristotle’ by saying that he might have been, or not have been, Aristotle.’

(31) Lewis Carroll, *Beyond the Looking-Glass*:
    “The name of the song is called *Haddocks’ Eyes.*”
    “Oh, that’s the name of the song, is it?” Alice said, trying to feel interested.
    “No, you don’t understand,” the Knight said, looking a little vexed. “That’s what the name is called. The name really is *The Aged, Aged Man.*”
“Then I ought to have said ‘That’s what the song is called’?” Alice corrected herself. “No you oughtn’t: that’s another thing. The song is called *Ways and Means* but that’s only what it’s called, you know!” “Well, what is the song then?” said Alice, who was by this time completely bewildered. “I was coming to that,” the Knight said. “The song really is *A-sitting On a Gate*: and the tune’s my own invention.”

However, what do we make of the fact that while some verbs of nomination allow infinitival, indicative or subjunctive complements (though sometimes with a subtle change in meaning), verbs of naming do not?

(32) a. They proclaimed Arthur to be the king of all England.  
    b. The prince declared that the war was inevitable.  
    c. Sir Gawaine chose that Dame Ragnell be a beauty by day and a hag by night.

(33) a. Earnshaw named the foundling Heathcliff.  
    b. * Earnshaw named the foundling to be Heathcliff.  
    c. * Earnshaw named that the foundling is/be Heathcliff.

Possible explanations:

- verbs of naming c-select an xNP complement
- an embedded verb would introduce an event argument, which might be incompatible with the semantics of naming verbs

NB: The reason why proper names cannot appear with verbs like *seem or believe* has to do with a scalarity constraint on their complement (Matushansky (2002)).

2.8. **Summary**

Verbs of naming take a SC complement (like verbs of nomination, which are clearly ECM):

- The preproprial definite article on the predicate proper name is dropped in naming constructions
- Case-marking of the proper name is that of a predicate (dedicated predicative Case or Case-doubling)
- Raising and *have/be* alternation both allowed
- Proper names can function as both primary and secondary predicates

By Occam’s razor names in argument positions have to incorporate the meaning that names have in predicate position, just like definite argument DPs incorporate the meaning of corresponding NP predicates. The meaning that we will give for predicate proper names will also allow us to account for modified and complex proper names in a way parallel to modification inside DPs.

3. **Analysis**

Suppose that (proper) names are not simplex.

(34) $\lambda x \in D_s \cdot \lambda R \cdot x$ is a referent of $[\text{Alice}]$ by virtue of the naming convention $R$

Note that the contents of the name quote the (phonological form of) the name itself. This is not an approach where an artificial predicate $\lambda x \cdot x = \text{Alice}$ is created.

3.1. **Predicate names**

(35) $[\text{Alexandra is nicknamed Al}] \approx \text{Alexandra is a referent of [æl]}$ by virtue of *nicknaming*
The naming verb (actually its root) is then an argument of the proper name, even if the small clause with the name head is structurally its complement. The agentive \( v^0 \) introduces the become component of the meaning, and the structure is topped by a causative \( v^0 \) head:

\[
(36) \quad \text{simplified}
\]

Danny Fox, p.c.: an additional argument in favor of having a bi-clausal structure associated with verbs of naming is modification by *again* (von Stechow (1996), Beck and Johnson (2004)):

\[
(37) \quad \text{You can't call her Griselda again.}
\]

(37) can be used in a situation where the challenge is to give a doll different names (a) without repeating oneself or (b) without repeating someone else (causing the doll to have the same name)

NB: Why not \( \text{[CAUSE \ [BECOME \ [his heroine Alice]] by naming]} \)?

In some Arabic cultures, a woman drops her own name when she bears a child and instead becomes Umm plus the name of her child, as in *Umm Kulthum* (umm means “mother of”). However, you do not name someone *Umm Kulthum* by naming her son *Kulthum*.

The difference between verbs of naming and verbs of nomination is that in the former case, the verb is an argument of the small clause (so it seems to be rather different from Hale and Keyser (1993) and Harley (2003), especially given that no incorporation is involved).

The fact that the naming small clause can appear with some ECM verbs, as in (29), suggests that the argument slot of a naming relation \( R \) can be saturated by a free variable. What variable is it? To answer this question, we need to consider proper names in argument positions.

### 3.2. Argument proper names

If proper names are predicates in the naming construction, then we must assume they are definite descriptions in argument positions. This is nothing new:

- **The definite article is overt** in some languages (see above) and with some proper names (which Strawson (1950) calls *quasi-names*, see Burge (1973), Geurts (1997), Elbourne (2002), and Borer (in press)):

\[
(38) \quad \text{a. the Thames, the Pacific, the Alps…}
\]

\[
(39) \quad \text{b. the States, the Netherlands, the Sudan…}
\]

- Proper names have **bound variable uses** (Geurts (1997)) and **E-type uses** (Elbourne (2002)), just like definite descriptions:

\[
(39) \quad \text{a. If a child is christened ‘Bambi’, then Disney will sue Bambi’s parents.}
\]

\[
(39) \quad \text{b. Every woman who has a husband called John and a lover called Gerontius takes only Gerontius to the Rare Names Convention.}
\]

- Proper names can be used **generically** (Geurts (1997)):

\[
(40) \quad \text{The light bulb/Coca Cola was invented by an American.}
\]
The difference between names and definite descriptions is that argument proper names contain an indexical:

\( \exists x . x \text{ is a referent of [ælɪs] by virtue of the naming convention in force between the speaker } c \text{ and the hearer } c \)

Saturation by a contextual indexical argument is always available:

(42) a. The airport is close (to here).
    b. She is a close friend (of mine).

That proper names contain an indexical has been proposed before:

(i) Burge (1973) argues that the meaning of proper names contains a demonstrative (that Alice), while Larson and Segal (1995) propose that the null that is present in the syntax. See Elbourne (2002) for arguments against this view.

(ii) Recanati (1997) and Pelczar and Rainsbury (1998) propose the indexical of the naming convention in force between the speaker and the hearer.

(iii) Liu (2004) makes use of the relevant linguistic community.

In all these approaches, including mine, proper names refer to one individual due to the hidden definite article (overt in many languages) or the demonstrative. This also makes them compatible with there being more than one person with a particular name (as long as we consider only the universe of the discourse).

My contribution as I see it is to provide independent evidence for a definite description analysis with a “quotation” predicate and make it follow from compositionality.

NB: Proper names in naming constructions make the definite description theories where proper names abbreviate an artificial predicate (Aristotle = “the one who Aristotelizes”) rather difficult to maintain.

It is the ability to omit the article that is the morphological property of a particular lexical item, as is the choice of a special preproprial article.

Confirmation: modified proper names always appear with articles (except when modification is by evaluative adjectives (poor Mary) and possibly some others – see Borer (in press)):

(43) a. the *(French) Mary Poppins
    b. the *(young) Mozart
    c. the *(incomparable) Callas

3.3. Complex and modified proper names


Complex proper names

(44) a. [the Miss Alice Liddell]\(\approx\) \(\exists x . x \text{ is a miss AND x is a referent of [ælɪs] by virtue of the naming convention in force between the speaker and the hearer AND x is a referent of [liːdəl] by virtue of the naming convention in force between the speaker } c \text{ and the hearer } c \)

b. [the famous detective Sherlock Holmes]\(\approx\) \(\exists x . x \text{ is famous AND x is a detective AND x is a referent of [ˈʃɛrləukoʊm] by virtue of the naming convention in force between the speaker and the hearer AND x is a referent of [hoʊˈlɔˌmz] by virtue of the naming convention in force between the speaker } c \text{ and the hearer } c \)

Our analysis allows us to derive the fact that Sherlock Holmes is Sherlock and that he is Holmes.
Restrictive modification

(45) a. the older Miss Challoner there are two people named Miss Challoner
    b. Richard the Lionhearted there is more than one king named Richard

NB: I have nothing to say about the ordering in (45b), discussed in Longobardi (1994) et seq.

Non-restrictive modification

(46) the charitable Miss Murray Anne Brontë, *Agnes Grey*, p. 165

Temporal modification of proper names

Temporal modification (Kayne (1994), Gärtner (2004)) is something that names do and definite descriptions seem not to:

(47) the Paris of my youth

A parallel with kinds (cf. Kripke (1980)): *The human of that era was not yet fully bipedal.*

3.4. Naming and necessity ☺

We can now explain why (48a) (with *named* understood as a current state) is a logical truth with existential import, while (48b) is not (Kneale (1962), Geurts (1997) vs. Kripke (1980)):

(48) a. The person named Alice is named Alice. a logical truth: F (ιx. F(x))
    b. Alice is named Alice. not a logical truth

In our system, the interpretation of (48b) is roughly equivalent to (48c):

(48) c. The unique individual who is Alice according to the naming convention in force between the speaker c and the hearer c is named Alice.

The naming convention in force between the speaker and the hearer is not necessarily the same as the naming convention established by the verb *name* (e.g. the namer(s) may not be the same)

3.5. Other determiners

Our semantics predicts that proper names should be able to combine with determiners other than (the covert) the:

(49) a. …but no Catherine could I detect, far or near. Emily Brontë, *Wuthering Heights*
    b. This Rover of yours has overturned the garbage again!

(49a) is more interesting, because somehow definiteness is preserved. Again, this is not unique to proper names: *There’s no largest number.*

Conversion to a common noun (see also Burge (1973)):

(50) He is such a (typical) John – he always has to appear as the subject of a sentence!

Here the name is no longer “proper”: *John* is interpreted as a (typical) representative of the kind defined by being named *John*. For this coercion to have occurred, it is highly helpful if the name *John* is interpreted as suggested above.

The appearance of an article does not mean that the name has shifted to a kind interpretation:

(51) There are relatively few Alfreds in Princeton. Burge (1973)

The difference between (50) and (51) is that (50) assumes that there are properties that all Johns share.
4. **TOPICS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

- **Case theory**
  The case-marking of the predicate of a naming small clause is *Instrumental in Russian* (same as other nominal predicates), *doubled in Latin*, etc., and *translative in Finnish*, which can be viewed as an argument for *multiple case assignment*. And what is the nature of Case-doubling?
- **Article omission or article insertion?**
- **Limits of cross-linguistic variation**: many languages use the benefactive structure to convey the same meaning (*She was given this name in honor of her grandmother*). How is the connection established?
- **Default and non-default names** (Zimmermann (to appear))
- **Proper names and kind names**

5. **APPENDIX: STRUCTURES TO AVOID**

5.1. **Secondary predication**

Secondary predicates (depictives or resultatives) also often feature Case-doubling. Can it be that verbs of naming and nomination do involve *small clauses, but not as primary predication*?

**Secondary predicates can be omitted.** This would work for *call* but not for others.

**Finnish: against depictives**

The interpretation is wrong: with verbs of naming and nomination, the small clause describes the *result* of the naming/nomination, in depictives it is simply the *state of affairs* that obtains at the culmination of the action.

This is reflected by the fact that *Finnish depictive DPs bear essive Case*, as opposed to DP$_2$ in naming and nomination, which is marked *translative*, the Case of resultatives (data due to Liina Pylkkänen, p.c.):

(52) Alice palas-i kotikaupunki-in-sa rikkaa-na/presidentti-na depictive
    Alice return-past hometown-illative-3sg.poss rich-Ess/president-Ess
    *Alice returned to her hometown rich/a president.*

(53) a. Me nimi-t-i-mme William Gates-in presidentti-ksi nomination
    we name-PST-CAUS-1pl William Gates-ACC president-Trs
    *We named William Gates president.*

b. Me kutsu-mme William Gatesi-a Billi-ksi naming
    we call-1pl William Gates-PART Billi-Trs
    *We call William Gates Billy.*

c. Me maalas-i-mme seinä-n keltaise-ksi resultative
    we paint-PAST-1pl wall-ACC yellow-Trs
    *We painted a/the wall yellow.*

Can verbs of naming and nomination be resultative?

**Russian: against resultatives**

No language that I’m familiar with allows nominal resultatives without a preposition:

(54) We hammered the metal flat/*sword/*a sword/✓ into a sword.

For an adjectival resultative, Russian uses a construction-specific PP rather than Case-marking:
(55) My raskalili metall dokrasna
    we heated metal until+red-SF+Gen-sg
  We heated the metal until it was red.

The fact that (nominal) resultatives are unattested elsewhere in Russian argues against a resultative analysis of naming and nomination.

5.2. Control

It is not impossible that verbs of naming and nomination project a control structure rather than a small clause one. Two objections can be raised to this hypothesis:

Predicate selection

Known control verbs never combine with non-verbal predicates and do, with xVPs.

Semantics

Comrie (1984): there is a clear semantic difference between subject and object control verbs, and between two types of subject control verbs.

- Subject control verbs, type 1: have the meaning of “mental orientation”, expectation or desire. Examples include want, wish, hope, need, hate and expect.
- Subject control verbs, type 2: verbs of “commitment”, including try, promise, decide, agree, refuse and threaten.
- All the object control verbs are verbs of “influence” (convince).

Verbs of naming and nomination do not belong to any of these classes and do not necessitate a human subject (cf. Tolstoy named his book “Anna Karenina”).

5.3. Double object

Against the standard perception of the interpretation

DP₁ can be viewed as the GOAL of the action, thus making it similar to DP₁ in ditransitives:

(56) a. give one’s daughter a name
    b. name one’s daughter Alice

Major difference: DP₂ is an argument in ditransitives, a predicate in naming

Refutation: a predicate may serve as an argument of another predicate (cf. former)

However, despite its interpretation, DP₁ is marked with Accusative (rather than Dative) case in Russian and Latin, and in Hungarian, DP₂ is marked Dative!

NB: DP₁ appears with a Dative preposition in Hebrew with call. The Hebrew equivalent of nickname (lexanot), the only other Hebrew naming verb, behaves like its English counterpart. Hebrew verbs of nomination require a PP.

See also section 2.2 on the syntax of DP₁ and DP₂.

The lexical category of the predicate

As a rule, DP₂ cannot be replaced by an AP:

(57) a. *The Senate nominated/elected him great/amazing.
    b. Name/christen/baptize me *French/*talented/*charming.

It seems to be true that there are no clearly ditransitive verbs that allow non-nominal second objects. But sometimes APs can appear with verbs of naming and nomination:

(58) a. My friends call me charming.
b. Here’s a pot calling the kettle black.
c. Amy was declared innocent/amazing.

These data are not conclusive. However, ECM verbs can constrain the lexical category of the predicate in their complement (cf. Stowell (1981)):

(59) a. I consider Elizabeth clever/a friend/in the running/*(to) live in Paris.
b. I let Elizabeth *clever/*a friend/into the house/*(to) live in Paris.
c. I made Elizabeth clever/a professor/*into the house/*(to) live in Paris.
d. I allowed Elizabeth *clever/*a friend/*into the house/*(to) live in Paris.

Alternation classes

Ditransitives usually allow some sort of an alternation in the argument ordering, effected via a preposition:

(60) a. give Coraline the key → give the key to Coraline Dative alternation
b. bake Mommy a cake → bake a cake for Mommy applicative alternation

No similar PP-alternate exists for verbs of naming and nomination:

(61) a. declare Arthur king → *declare king for/to/… Arthur
b. dub the knight Sir Lancelot → *dub Sir Lancelot for/to/… the knight

Possible reason: the accusative object cannot be a predicate. Why not?

Interestingly, verbs of nomination permit an alternation with the DP₂ predicate turning into the (Accusative) object (David Pesetsky, p.c.):

(62) declare the winner, elect the president

The object in this case must be definite. I have no explanation for these facts

Conclusion

There’s nothing a priori with the double object hypothesis, which is consistent with the fact that some languages employ this strategy. It just seems rather unlikely for the languages considered.
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