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1. Introduction


(1) a. John-wa Mary-o BAS [itooshiku /kinodoku-ni ] omotta.1
    John-top Mary-acc lovable /pity considered
    ‘John considered Mary pitiful/lovable.’

    John-top Mary-nom lovable /pity considered
    ‘John considered Mary pitiful/lovable.’

The ASC is schematically represented as in (2a), where SUBJ stands for subject, ADP as accusative DP, BAS as bare adjectival stem, and MP as matrix predicate. A BAS may be in the “stem form” (ren-yoo-kei ‘conjunctive form’ in the Japanese grammatical terminology) of either an adjective (–ku) or an adjectival nominal (–ni).

(2) a. SUBJ ADP BAS MP.
    b. [SUBJ [SC ADP BAS] MP].

There are two major competing approaches in literature: a small clause (SC) approach, where the ADP-BAS sequence forms a complement of an epistemic predicate (Stowell 1991), as in (2b); and a complex verb (CV) approach, where the BAS and the MP form a complex verb (CV), where the BAS is a secondary predicate of the ADP (2d).

---
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1 The following abbreviations are used below: topic (-top), nominative (-nom), accusative (-acc), dative (-dat), genitive (-gen), quotation marker (-qt), and negation (-neg).
The SC approach is arguably the preferred approach of the two, as the ASC is commonly referred to as *(epistemic)* small clause construction; even non-SC approaches typically use the SC approach as a reference point; for example, Matsuoka (2012) refers to the ASC as *pseudo-small clause construction*. This is in part due to the surface similarity between the ASC and *ECM epistemic construction* (EEC) in (3a) and *finite epistemic construction* (FEC) in (3b).

(3)  
\[ \text{a. John-wa Mary-o itooshi-i /kinodoku-da -to omotta.} \]  
\[ \text{John-top Mary-acc lovely-is /pity-is -qt considered} \]  

‘John considered Mary to be lovable.’

\[ \text{b. John-wa Mary-ga itooshi-i /kinodoku-da -to omotta.} \]  
\[ \text{John-top Mary-nom lovely-is /pity-is -qt considered} \]  

‘John considered that Mary is lovable.’

(3a) appears identical to (1) except for the forms of the embedded predicates: viz., the predicate form (*shu-shi-kei* in the Japanese grammatical terminology). Further, in the FECs (3b), *Mary* is marked nominative, indicating that it is the subject of the embedded complement. This markedly contrasts with (1b), which follows naturally from the SC approach; SC clauses, being tenseless, lack a nominative Case. Therefore, it seems natural to regard the ASC as the small clause-counterpart of the epistemic constructions (EECs/FECs), as expressed in their English glosses. (See also M. Kuno 2002.)

The goal of this paper is to challenge this standard assumption. Pieces of its supporting evidence do not fit together nicely, and this fact has not attracted sufficient attention, in my view. This paper, a progress report, does not offer a decisive refutation of the SC approach; rather, it argues for further investigation on this construction. In what follows, we argue that (i) the ASC and the EEC are not parallel constructions (Section 2), (ii) three arguments in support for the SC approach, presented by Yokoyama (2012), are inconclusive (Section 3), and (iii) an alternative non-SC analysis of the ASC is available (Section 4). Finally, we consider two possibilities where the polemic debate on the two approaches for ASCs may not be on the right track.

### 2. ASC vs. epistemic constructions

This section examines the dissimilarity between ASCs and EECs/FECs. First, independent of the empirical consideration, there is a theoretical motivation for pursuing a non-SC approach for the ASC. A number of SC-analyses (e.g., Stowell 1991, Fukumitsu 2001, Koizumi 2002) include the involvement of complex predicate formation, which involves either covert syntactic reanalysis of the VP or counter-cyclic head adjunction of the BAS to the MP (4).

(4)  
\[ \text{a. [ SUBJ [VP [SC ADP BAS] MP-BAS ] ]} \]  
\[ \text{b. [ [consider-intelligent] [ John [intelligent] ] ]} \]
Both options will violate the No-Tampering Condition (Chomsky 2008, 2013), however. Thus, if a complex predicate is indeed involved in an ASC, as Stowell, Fukumitsu and Koizumi argue, then it should be created via merger of the BAS and MP, without first creating an SC.

Second, the available MPs in ASCs are narrowly restricted relative to the available epistemic predicates (5). This suggests that the ASC is not an epistemic construction, but a construction specific to omou ‘consider’, kanjiru ‘feel’ (and, perhaps, a handful of others).

(5) *kangaeru/*dantei-suru/*handan-suru/*utagau/*kigatsuku/*ninshiki-suru
   ‘consider’ ‘determine’ ‘judge’ ‘suspect’ ‘realize’ ‘recognize’
*minasu/*shinjiru/*rikai-suru/*suitei-suru/*katei-suru/*kiga-suru
   ‘regard’ ‘believe’ ‘understand’ ‘estimate’ ‘hypothesize’ ‘feel’

Third, observe the contrast in interpretation of human ‘dissatisfied’ in (6) (Sakai et al. 2004, Kawai 2008). In the EEC, Mary is the one who is dissatisfied (6b), whereas in the ASC, John is the one who is dissatisfied (6a). The same is true in (7); in (7a) Mary is dissatisfied, whereas that in (7b) John is.

    John-top Mary-acc dissatisfied considered
    ‘John was not happy about Mary.’

    John-top Mary-nom/acc dissatisfied-be-qt consider
    ‘John considered Mary to be dissatisfied.’

(7) a. Mary-wa human da.
    Mary-top dissatisfied is
    ‘Mary is unhappy.’

   b. John-wa Mary-ga human da
    John-top Mary-nom dissatisfied is
    ‘John is unhappy with Mary.’

The contrast in (6) is not due to the properties of SCs, as the same contrast is absent in the spontaneous construction (8), which consists of a nominative DP, BAS, and such MPs as kikoeru ‘sound’, mieru ‘appear’, omoeru ‘strike’, and kanjiru ‘feel’.

    John-dat Quechua-nom difficult sounded
    ‘To John, Quechua sounded difficult.’
   John-dat Mary-nom beautiful seemed
   ‘To John, Mary seemed/appeared beautiful.’

c. *It seems to John [sc Mary beautiful].

According to Ura (2014), the nominative Mary-ga and BAS form an SC, and neither John-ni nor Mary-ga occupies the matrix subject position; an expletive pro does. Mary-ga remains in the SC subject position with a default nominative case, something comparable to (8c). No experiencer reading arises in (9).

(9) John-ni Mary-ga human-ni mieta/kikoeta.
John-dat Mary-nom unhappy seemed/sounded
   ‘To John, Mary seemed/sounded unhappy.’
   *‘John seemed/sounded unhappy about Mary.’

Thus, the contrast in (6a/b)/(7a/b) does not arise from the properties of SCs, per se, but from the properties of ASC. A generalization thus emerges as in (10) (Kawai 2008), which is a modified version of Sode’s (2000) original generalization.3

(10) Revised Sode’s (2000) Generalization
    The interpretation of the BAS-MP in an ASC must be compatible with an Experiencer reading.

The SC approach fails to derive (10) since, under this approach, the only relevant difference between the EECs and ASCs is the presence/absence of the embedded tense. Finally, subject-predicate idioms are not licensed in ASCs, unlike the corresponding FEC

---

2 If Ura’s (2014) account of the spontaneous construction is correct, then the account given for the ungrammaticality of (1b) is lost, as the default nominative should be available inside the SC. Further investigation is in order.

3 Sode’s original generalization states that one-place predicates, such as erai ‘respectable’, kashikoi ‘smart’, and shitsukoi ‘pestering’, are not allowed as the BAS of an ASC. However, this descriptive generalization is not quite correct, as (ic) is perfectly acceptable with kibishii, a one-place predicate as shown in (ia/b). See Kawai 2008 for additional supporting arguments for (10).

(i) a. Mary-no-saiten-ga kibishii.
   Mary-gen-grading-nom tough
   ‘Mary’s grading is tough.’

   John-top Mary-gen-grading-nom tough

c. John-wa Mary-no-saiten-o kibishiku omotta
   John-top Mary-gen-grading-acc tough thought
   ‘John considered Mary’s grading tough.’
(Hoshi and Sugioka 2009, Matsuoka 2012), as in (11). The SC approach fails to predict the contrast in (11), as idiom readings should be available under a subject-predicate configuration (Nakato 2009).

(11) a. *John-wa Mary-no kuchi-o karuku omotta. (ASC)
    John-top Mary-gen mouth-acc light considered
    ‘John considered Mary a blabbermouth.’

    b. John-wa Mary-no kuchi-ga karui-to omotta. (FEC)
    John-top Mary-gen mouth-nom light-is-qt considered
    ‘John considered that Mary is a blabbermouth.’

To sum up, this section offered four reasons for reconsidering the SC approach to the ASC: (i) a number of the SC analyses form a complex predicate formation from the SC configuration via counter-cyclic head adjunction; (ii) the choice MP is very narrowly restricted (5); (iii) the ASC has a thematic restriction on the BAS (10), not predicted by the SC approach; and (iv) subject-predicate idioms are not available for ADP-BAS sequences (11a), even though they are in the FEC (11b). To the best of my knowledge, the concerns raised here have thus far not received a satisfactory answer.

3. Three arguments for the SC approach

This section reviews arguments for the SC approach – in particular, the three arguments offered by Yokoyama (2012) in terms of the licensing of (i) subject-oriented reflexive jibun, (ii) a hyper-polite (HP) prefix on a BAS, and (iii) an ADP with negative-polarity items (indefinite NPI Q-mó and exceptive NPI DP-shika). I believe that they are inconclusive, contrary to Yokoyama’s contention.

Yokoyama’s argument is constructed on (12a) as the configuration of ASCs.

(12) a. SUBJ [vP [PP [nP [aP (=SC) ADP [a [n \sqcup BAS [a]]] aP] [n] NP] [P] pp] MP vP].

    b. SUBJ [vP [AP=SC ADP [\sqcup BAS ] ] MP ].

The complement of MP is a PP headed by -ku or -ni, which in turn takes an nP complement; the SC is the aP complement of n, consisting of the head a and the BAS as the adjectival root; and the ADP is in the [spec, a]. (12a) is essentially a “minimalist” translation of (12b), where the SC in Japanese is a bare AP (Kikuchi and Takahashi 1991).4 The most relevant here is the fact that, in both cases, the ADP resides inside the SC projection, be it a PP or an AP. With (12), Yokoyama points out the following.

First, Japanese subject oriented reflexive jibun can be licensed by the ADP, (13) (Kikuchi and Takahashi 1991).

---

4 Kikuchi and Takahashi (1991: 87) argue that the SC in English is an AgrP, but the Japanese SC is a bare AP because Japanese lacks Agr.
   ‘John thought Mary strict to herself/him.’

   ‘John introduced Mary to his own friends.’

Second, Kikuchi and Takahashi (1991: 91) show that successful licensing of the honorific prefix (HP) o- or go- indicates the small clause status of the BAS-MP sequence (14). Yokoyama (2012: 11) claims that Japanese “honorification must be triggered by an argument within the same clause, which is the subject of the clause,” and that ADPs are the subject of the embedded predicate, checking the [+HP] feature inside the SC projection. If this is correct, then the ADP is indeed the subject of the BAS.

(14) a. Watashi-wa Tanaka-sensei-o o-yasashiku omotta.  
   I-nom Tanaka-teacher-acc HP-kind thought  
   ‘I considered Professor Tanaka kind’

b. Tanaka-sensei-ga watashi-o o-yasashiku omotta.  
   Tanaka-teacher-nom I-acc HP-kind thought  
   ‘Professor Tanaka considered me kind’

Finally, Yokoyama argues that the patterns of NPI shika-licensing follow from the SC analysis. That is, shika obeys the Clause-mate Condition (15), as evidenced in (16a/b).

(15) An NPI must be a clause-mate of negation (Muraki 1978).

---

5 Kikuchi and Takahashi (1991: 80) state, instead, that when “an adjective appears with an honorific prefix (=HP), it is the subject of the adjective that is interpreted as socially superior to the speaker.”

6 Here, indeterminate NPI wh-mó (e.g. dare-mó...neg ‘no one’) is omitted from our discussion due to space limitation. Although the licensing condition of the two NPIs are not exactly identical (Aoyagi and Ishii 1994), their difference is negligible within the ASC environment of our consideration.

7 It has been noted that the Clause-mate Condition is too coarse-grained a condition for this phenomenon. It is known to be obviated in non-finite clauses (Aoyagi and Ishii 1994: 307), as in (i) (taken from Yamashita 2003 with minor modifications, which in turn is adapted from Uchibori 2000). Roughly, shika is licensed if it is c-commanded by the closest c-commanding negation within a finite tense domain (cf. Aoyagi and Ishii 1994 and Sells and Kim 2006), which we refer to as the Inside-the-Negation Domain Requirement (INDR). See also Vasisht 1999, Hoeksema 2000, for alternative, “non-syntactic structure-oriented” licensing conditions.

   Bill-nom John-nom Mary-with-shika see-purpose-dat wish-not-past  
   ‘Bill wished John to meet only with Mary.’
    Mary-only leader-dat suitable /suitable-neg.
    ‘Only Mary is suitable for the leader.’

   b. *John-wa [CP kinoo Mary-shika paattii-ni kita]-to shinjite-nai.
    John-top yesterday Mary-only party-to came-qt believe-neg
    ‘John does not believe that only Mary came to the party yesterday.’

In (17a), the negation is with the BAS, satisfying (15), whereas (17b) violates (15), and, thus, ruled out. Therefore, Yokoyama concludes, the grammaticality of (17a) indicates that the BAS and the NPI are clause-mates; that is, they form a small clause.8

    John-top Mary-only leader-dat suitable-neg thought.
    ‘John considered only Mary suitable for being the leader.’

    John-only Mary-acc leader-dat suitable-neg thought
    ‘Only John considered Mary suitable for being the leader’

To sum up, Yokoyama’s arguments (i) and (ii) support the subjecthood of the ADP, and (iii), the clause-mate status of the ADP and the BAS. However, the coherence of the three types of evidence is called into question, as we will see below.

First, the configurations in (12) are problematic. Recall that for Kikuchi and Takahashi, the MP assigns accusative Case to the ADP under government, a standard ECM analysis (Chomsky 1981); yet, Yokoyama’s (2012) minimalist analysis presumably cannot appeal to the same analysis. Independently, the data in (18) support the raising-to-object analysis of the ECM phenomena (S. Kuno 1976, Lasnik and Saito 1991).

    John-top physics-acc first-time interesting thought
    ‘John, for the first time, considered physics interesting.’

---

8 The Clause-mate Condition effect is observed in an EEC with a [+past] embedded predicate (iiib), but not with a [-past] one (ia). This is consistent with the observation made by Kitagawa (1987) that the [+past]-tense makes the embedded clause a barrier in this construction. Kitagawa’s judgment is shared by Ohta (1997) and Kawai (2006), but not by everyone (cf. Kawai 2006: fn. 3), a topic for further investigation.

    John-top physics-only interesting is-qt think-neg-past
    ‘John considered only physics to be interesting.’

    John-top physics-only interesting-was-qt think-neg-past
    ‘John did not consider that only physics was interesting.’
b. John-wa Mary-no-koto-o kibishiku kanjita.
   John-top Mary-gen-koto-acc strict felt
   ‘John felt Mary (to be) strict’

In (18a), *hajimete* ‘for the first time’, which modifies the MP, intervenes the ADP and the BAS, indicating that the ADP is in the matrix clause. In (18b), the ADP appears with the formal noun *koto*, which “can be inserted only in the surface direct-object position” (Koizumi 2008: 144). Thus, the relevant configurations must be (19), rather than (12).

(19) a. [SUBJ [vP ADP [V [SC ADP BAS] [V MP]]]]
   b. [SUBJ [vP ADP [V [neg [SC ADP BAS]-neg] [V MP]]]]

The configurations in (19) are problematic for Yokoyama’s (2012) analysis of NPI-licensing, however. There are a number of proposals for the licensing condition for NPIs in literature. However, it is generally assumed (cf. Laka 1994, Vasishth 1999, Shibata 2012) that surface positions matter for NPI-licensing, not the first-merged (i.e., DS/LF-reconstructed) positions. It is based upon such data as (20a/b); if *anyone* can be evaluated in its first-merged positions at LF, then it is inside the domain of negation, incorrectly predicting their grammaticality, as parallel to (20c).9

(20) a. *Anyone wasn’t arrested *anyone by the police.
   b. *Anyone does not seem to have been arrested *anyone by the police.
   c. It does not seem to have been anyone arrested by the police.

If so, the configurations in (19) are incompatible with Yokoyama’s (2012) account of the NPI-licensing in ASCs, as in (21). In (21), the ADP is outside the NegP, the domain of the SC-negation, and, thus, the SC-negation cannot license it, failing to satisfy the Clause-mate Condition (and the INDR (FN 7)). Thus, Yokoyama’s analysis incorrectly predicts the ungrammaticality of (17a).

(21) … [vP ADP-shika [NegP [SC (SC BAS-) neg] ] MP ]

Second, consider the following examples of *jibun* licensed by the direct object.

(22) a. John-wa Mary-o jibun-ni kibishiku sodateta.
   John-top Mary-acc self-dat strict raised
   ‘John raised Mary (to be) strict to herself.’

---

9 This is consistent with an independent observation that A-movement does not reconstruct (Lasnik 2000). An option of semantic reconstruction (Rullmann 1995) is presumably available under certain conditions, according to Shibata (2012). Potentially relevant is that Shibata (2012) argues that the ADP raises to a position higher than the direct object position: even higher than the clausal negation in Japanese. We leave open the implications of Shibata’s proposal, although it is quite interesting.
b. Denki-sakka-wa Mary-o jibun-ni kibishiku egaita.
   biographer-top Mary-acc self-dat strict described/illustrated
   ‘The biographer described Mary as strict to herself.’

The licensing condition of *jibun* has been intensely investigated for decades (See C. Kitagawa 1981, Abe 1997, Oshima 2004, Ura 2014), and its subject orientation has been widely recognized. However, it has also been attested that *jibun* can be licensed by a non-subject under some conditions, such as logophoric coreference (Ura 2014). See C. Kitagawa 1981 for an extensive discussion on this topic.\(^\text{10}\)

If (22) are real cases of reflexive binding, not logophoric coreference, then the construction must involve an SC where *Mary-o* is the underlying subject, by assumption. If so, (i) the sentence comparable to (22) can also license an HP-prefix and (ii) a negative counterpart of (22) should license *shika*-NPI on the ADP. However, both predictions are not borne out in (23) and (24), respectively.

   parents-top Mori-professor-acc HP-self-dat HP-strict raised
   ‘His parents raised Professor Mori (to be) strict to himself.’

b. *Chosha-wa Mori-sensei-o (go-jibun-ni) o-kibishiku egaita.
   author-top Mori-professor-acc HP-self-dat HP-strict described
   ‘The author described Professor Mori as strict to himself.’

   John-top Mary-only self-dat strict-neg raised
   ‘John raised only Mary (to be) strict to herself.’

b. *Denki-sakka-wa Mary-shika jibun-ni kibishiku-naku egaita.
   biographer-top Mary-only self-dat strict-neg described
   ‘The biographer described only Mary as strict to herself.’

The licensing condition of *shika*, *jibun*, and the HP-suffix do not paint a coherent picture; they do not collectively support the SC analysis, when they are put into one sentence.

Finally, *jibun-, HP-, and shika*-licensing do not obtain in a construction classified as an SC construction (25a) by Kikuchi and Takahashi (1991: 75), as shown in (25b-c).

\(^{10}\) One could try to derive *sodate-ru* ‘raise/grow’ from its intransitive counterpart *sodat-u*, thereby making the surface object as the underlying subject, as in the Japanese causative constructions; causative objects also license reflexive *jibun*. This coincides with C. Kitagawa’s (1981) observation that those “transitive verbs that “possess morphologically related intransitive counterparts in such a way that neither can be considered naturally to have derived from the other”: e.g., *kaesu* ‘return’, *nokasu* ‘put to sleep’, *nobasu* ‘elongate’, *nagasu* ‘flow’, and *nokosu* ‘leave behind. However, this solution does not extend to *egaku* ‘describe/illustrate’ in (22) as it lacks its intransitive counterpart. C. Kitagawa (1981) suggests that “the semantic … notions "agent" and "experiencer" are relevant in Japanese reflexivization, even apart from the grammatical function of subjecthood.”
Therefore, the three arguments that Yokoyama (2012) presents as evidence for the SC approach to the ASC are not successful. The licensing condition for jibun and HP-prefixes are more complex than mere subject-orientation; shika-licensing does not show the clause-mate status of the ADP and BAS; given the configuration in (19), then (17a), the key datum for his argument for (iii), would be as ungrammatical as (17b) by the Clause-mate Condition (15), (or, by the INDR (FN7)).

4. **Alternative analysis: Light-verb (-like) constructions**

We now turn to an informal presentation of a candidate for an alternative proposal that involves a complex V. Let us first ask what distinguishes the MP in an ASC from that in an EEC/FEC. Recall that the MPs in an ASC, such as omou ‘think’ and kanjiru ‘feel’, are semantically less specified than typical epistemic predicates in (5).


John-top Mary-acc beautiful did  
‘John made Mary beautiful.’

b. *John-wa Mary-o jibun-no-buka-ni kibishiku shita.  
John-top Mary-acc self-gen-staff-dat rigorous did  
‘John made Mary rigorous with her own staff.’

c. *John-wa Yamada sensei-o o-yasashiku shita.  
John-top Yamada-prof-acc HP-kind did  
‘John made Prof. Yamada kind.’

John-top Mary-only beautiful-neg did  
‘John made only Mary not beautiful.’

John-top physics-acc study-did  
‘John studied physics.’

b. John-wa butsuri-no benkyoo-o shita.  
John-top physics-gen study-acc did  
‘John studied physics.’
Suru is semantically transparent, but it has an accusative Case and an agent θ-role. There are many proposals as to how the verbal noun (= benkyoo) and suru work together (cf. Uchida and Nakayama 1993); here, we assume that they are merged first, and the complex predicate \( v [ v \text{benkyoo} [ v \text{suru} ]] \) licenses the accusative Case, the agent role of suru ‘do’, and the theme of benkyoo ‘study’, as illustrated in (27a).

(27) a. \( \text{SUBJ<Agent> Theme<Acc> benkyoo<Theme> = suru<Acc, Agent>} \)
   
b. \( [ \text{DP1<Experiencer> DP2<Theme> BAS<Theme>} ] \text{MP<Acc, Experiencer>} \)

This, I suggest, is essentially what happens to the MPs (omou ‘think’ and kanjiru ‘feel’) in ASCs; MPs behave as a light verb (27b). (Sakai et al. 2004, Kawai 2008). The BAS-MP may form a complex predicate, which has the theme role of BAS, and an accusative Case and the Experiencer subject role, as illustrated in (27b). The relevant part of the derivation is given in (28).

(28) a. \( [ \text{BAS MP} ] \)
   
b. \( [ v [ \text{A BAS MP} ] \text{MP} ] \)
   
c. \( [ v' \text{ADP} [ v [ \text{A BAS, MP} ] \text{MP} ] ] \)
   
d. \( [ v' \text{ADP} [ v [ \text{A BAS, MP} ] \text{MP} ] ] \text{MP} ] \)

A BAS and an MP are merged first (28a), creating a complex verb; the MP then raises to create (28b) so as to break the symmetry (Chomsky 2013, 2015); this complex verb then takes ADP as its direct object (28c), possibly with string-vacuous V-raising, as in (29d). The BAS is a secondary predicate of the ADP.\(^\text{11}\) With this, it is no surprise that (29), an alleged SC with suru (25a), does not show the experiencer effect of (6a)/(7a), as demonstrated in (29b).

(29) a. John-wa Mary-o utsukushiku shita.
John-top Mary-acc beautiful did
‘John made Mary beautiful.’

   b. John-wa Mary-o human-ni shita.
John-top Mary-acc unhappy did
‘John made Mary unhappy.’

   *‘John made himself unhappy about Mary.’

Suru lacks the experiencer role, as shown in (27a), thus the effect described in (10) is not observed. (29b) is unambiguously about \textit{Mary being dissatisfied}, not \textit{John

\(^{11}\) The present analysis mirrors the English complex predicate constructions (ia/b) (cf. Irimia 2012).

(i) a. … [ Mary [ consider intelligent ] ]
   
b. … consider [ Mary [ considers intelligent ] ]
being dissatisfied at Mary. In short, (10) arises from the thematic properties of the BAS-MP sequence, not solely from the BAS.

Note, also, that with the configuration in (28d), the ungrammaticality of (30a) is predicted with a version of the A-over-A condition, as a parallel case of (30b). The ungrammaticality of (30a) is not predicted under the SC approach, however, as predicate raising is licit with an English small clause (30c).

(30) a. *John-wa [doredake omoshiroku] butsuri-o ___1 omotta-no?
   John-top how much interesting physics-acc thought ‘How interesting did John consider physics?’

b. *John-wa [doredake benkyoo] butsuri-o ___1 shita-no?
   John-top how much study physics-acc did ‘How much did John study physics.’

c. How interesting does John consider physics?

What remains is how to account for Yokoyama’s (2012) (i)-(iii) under the complex V analysis. I do not have a full solution, but merely suggest a plausible direction.

The secondary predicate status of the BAS in the present analysis makes the ADP a “subject”, which may handle the subject-oriented licensing of jibun and the HP-prefixes. The licensing condition of shika, on the other hand, does not appear to be strictly configurational (Hoeksema 2000), even though the syntactic licensor-licensee configuration may also be relevant. Thus, the examples examined here must also be analyzed in terms of semantics-based licensing conditions, as well. I leave this question as a topic for future investigation.

---

12 A potentially problematic case is found in (ia), which has been treated as good in literature (Kikuchi and Takahashi 1991). I find it quite marginal without a large pause after the dislocated, however. If (ia) is indeed good, then the present analysis must assume that the verb has raised to I, and (ia) is an instance of a remnant VP raising as in (ib).

Perhaps, the varied grammaticality judgments on (ia) may reflect two distinct dialects (idiolects) – those who have an SC in ASCs and those who do not, a point to be made in the concluding remark.

(i) a. Butsuri-o omoshiroku John-wa omotta.
   Physics-acc interesting John-top thought ‘John considered physics interesting.’


13 Kikuchi and Takahashi (1991) offers an independent reason why (16a) is ruled out, appealing to the difference in English and Japanese AGR projection. Under the current framework (Chomsky 2013, 2015), however, Agr is not assumed in English; thus, their Agr-based account is not tenable. An alternative account must be sought under the SC approach.
5. Conclusion

This paper presented potential counterarguments for the SC approach of ASC in Japanese. The presumed parallel between the EECs/FECs and ASCs, which is one of the motivations for the SC approach, were shown to be only apparent; and ASCs are better treated as a construction specific to the MPs such as omou ‘consider’ and kanjiru ‘feel’. Second, we saw that three major motivations for the SC approach, given by Yokoyama (2012), were inconclusive. Third, an alternative analysis was presented that involves complex verbs. In my assessment, the evidence that we considered above does not decisively refute the SC approach; yet, it suggests that the correctness of this approach may not be taken for granted; the SC approach deserves closer scrutiny.

Before closing, I would like to raise two possibilities that have not been considered thus far. This paper has implicitly assumed that both SC- and CV- analyses cannot be correct simultaneously, even though they can be simultaneously incorrect. Yet, this assumption may be challenged, as (i) there may be two kinds of Japanese grammars in this respect, or (ii) both analyses could be compatible with the ASC.

Regarding (i), Koizumi (2002) notes the existence of two dialectal groups in Japanese: one with, and the other without, Sode’s (2000) generalization for ASCs. This may explain the disagreement in grammaticality judgment among the Japanese native speakers, meticulously documented by Akaso (2011). Han, Lidz, and Musolino (2007) discuss a similar situation in Korean negation. The possibility (ii) is that the surface string of this construction may be compatible with both SC- and CV-analyses; one or the other analysis is preferred for some unknown reasons at a given sentence; and some speakers prefer the SC-parse more often than CV-parse, while the others, vice versa. In either case, we must control the data source so that the grammaticality judgment reflects those who belong to the same “dialect” group. For that, careful comparative studies of grammaticality judgment of ASC must be in order. No matter what the correct approach might ultimately be, challenging the current standard assumption – i.e., the adequacy of the SC approach – is a prerequisite first step forward.
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