COMPLEX VERBS IN THE ALLEGED SMALL CLAUSE CONSTRUCTION IN JAPANESE*

Michiya Kawai
Huron University College and Western University

1.   Introduction

This paper is concerned with what I call *alleged small-clause construction (ASC)* in Japanese as in (1a) (Nakau 1973, Inoue 1976, Shibatani 1976, Okutsu 1978, Y. Kitagawa 1985, Takezawa 1987, Kikuchi and Takahashi 1991, Kawai 2008, Yokoyama 2012, among others). *Mary* may not be nominative-marked in this construction, as in (1b).

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

     b.   *John-wa   Mary-ga   [BAS itooshiku /kinodoku-ni]   omotta.
            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].
     c.   [SUBJ   [vP ADP   [v BAS [v   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).

[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) a.   John-wa   Mary-o   itooshi-i /kinodoku-da   -to   omotta.
          John-top   Mary-acc   lovely-is /pity-is   -qt   considered
          'John considered Mary to be lovable.'

     b.   John-wa   Mary-ga   itooshi-i /kinodoku-da   -to   omotta.
          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) a.   [SUBJ [$_{VP}$ [$_{SC}$ ADP   ~~BAS~~] MP-BAS]]
     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.

(6) a. John-wa   Mary-o   human-ni   omotta.
         John-top Mary-acc   dissatisfied   considered
         'John was not happy about Mary.'

     b. John-wa   Mary-ga/o   human-da-to   omotta.
         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'.

(8) a. John-ni   kechuago-ga   muzukashiku   kikoeta.
         John-dat Quechua-nom   difficult   sounded
         'To John, Quechua sounded difficult.'

b.   John-ni   [SC Mary-ga   utsukushiku]   mieta.
     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).[2] 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.'

      b.   *John-wa   Mary-no-saiten-ga   kibishii.
           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 [$_{a'}$ [$_a$ $\sqrt{}$BAS [a]]] $_{aP}$] [n] $_{NP}$] [P] $_{PP}$] MP $_{vP}$].
      b.   SUBJ [$_{vP}$ [$_{AP=SC}$ ADP [$_{A'}$ 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.

(13) a. John$_1$-wa Mary$_2$-o jibun$_{1/2}$-ni kibishiku omotta.
John-to Mary-acc self-dat strict thought
'John thought Mary strict to herself/him.'

b. *John$_1$-wa Mary$_2$-o jibun$_{1/*2}$-no tomodachi-ni shookai-shita.
John-top Mary-acc self-gen friends-dat introduced
'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.[5] 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.[6] That is, *shika* obeys the Clause-mate Condition (15), as evidenced in (16a/b).[7]

(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 ommitted 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 in 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 Vasishth 1999, Hoeksema 2000, for alternative, "non-syntactic structure-oriented" licensing conditions.

(i) ?Bill-ga [John-ga Mary-to-shika au-yoo]-(ni) nozom-anak-atta.
Bill-nom John-nom Mary-with-*shika* see-purpose-dat wish-not-past
'Bill wished John to meet only with Mary.'

(16) a. Mary-shika   riidaa-ni   *fusawashii/fusawashiku-nai.
         Mary-only   leader-dat   suitable /suitable-neg.
         'Only Mary is suitable for the leader.'

    b. *John-wa [CP kinoo   Mary-shika paatii-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]

(17) a. John-wa Mary-shika   riidaa-ni   fusawashiku-naku   omotta.
         John-top Mary-only   leader-dat   suitable-neg   thought.
         'John considered only Mary suitable for being the leader.'

    b. *John-shika Mary-o   riidaa-ni   fusawashiku-naku   omotta.
         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).

(18) a. John-wa butsuri-o   hajimete   omoshiroku   omot-ta.
         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 (iib), 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.

(ii) a. John-wa   butsuri-shika   omoshiroi-to   omow-a-nak-atta.
         John-top   physics-only   interesting is-qt   think-neg-past
         'John considered only physics to be interesting.'

    b. *?John-wa   butsuri-shika   omoshirok-atta-to omow-a-nak-atta.
         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.[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.

(23)　a.　*Ryooshin-wa　　　Mori-sensei-o　　　(go-jibun-ni) o-kibishiku　sodateta.
　　　　　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.'

(24)　a.　*John-wa　Mary-shika　　jibun-ni kibishiku-naku　sodateta.
　　　　　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', *nekasu* '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."

(25) a.　John-wa　　　[SC　Mary-o　utsukushiku] shita.
　　　　　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.'

　　　d.　*John-wa　Mary-shika　　　utsukushiku-naku　shita.
　　　　　John-top　Mary-only　　　beautiful-neg　　did
　　　　　'John made only Mary not beautiful.'

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).

The present study draws a parallel between the ASC-predicates and *light verb suru*, as in (26) (Grimshaw and Mester 1988, Hasegawa 1991, Kageyama 1991, Saito and Hoshi 2000, Harada 2003, Sakai et al. 2004, Hoshi and Sugioka 2009, Ishii 2009).

(26) a.　John-wa　butsuri-o　　　benkyoo-shita.
　　　　　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 *benkyoo* [v *suru*]]] licenses the accusative Case, the agent role of *suru* 'do', and the theme of *benkyoo* 'study', as illustrated in (27a).

(27) a.   SUBJ$_{<Agent>}$ Theme$_{<Acc>}$ benkyoo$_{<Theme>}$ = suru$_{<Acc, Agent>}$

      b.   [DP1$_{<Experiencer>}$ DP2$_{<Theme>}$ BAS$_{<Theme>}$] 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.   [BAS MP]

      b.   [v [A BAS ~~MP~~] MP]

      c.   [v′ ADP [v [A BAS, ~~MP~~] MP]]

      d.   [vP [v′ ADP [v [A BAS, ~~MP~~] ~~MP~~] 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.[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 *Mary being dissatisfied*, not *John*

---

[11] The present analysis mirrors the English complex predicate constructions (ia/b) (cf. Irimia 2012).

(i) a.   … [Mary [consider intelligent]]

      b.   … consider [Mary [~~consider~~ 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).[12] The ungrammaticality of (30a) is not predicted under the SC approach, however, as predicate raising is licit with an English small clause (30c).[13]

(30) a.   *John-wa   [doredake   omoshiroku]₁ butsuri-o   __₁ omotta-no?
           John-top   how much   interesting   physics-acc   thought
           'How interesting did John consider physics?'

      b.   *John-wa   [doredake   benkyoo]₁   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 licenser-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.'

      b.   [[vₚ butsuri-o [vₚ [A omoshiroku] o̶m̶o̶t̶t̶a̶]]] [John-wa [[v̶P̶] [ᵢ omotta]]]].

[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.

References

Abe, Jun. 1997. The locality of *zibun* and logophoricity. Ms., Nagoya University.

Akaso, Naoyuki. 2011. Against the non-raising analysis of Japanese raising-to-object. *Nagoya Gakuin Ronso* 22: 1−16.

Aoyagi, Hiroshi, and Toru Ishii. 1994. On NPI licensing in Japanese. In *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 4*, ed. Noriko Akasaka, 295−311. Stanford: CSLI.

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On phases. In *Foundational issues in linguistic theory. Essays in honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, ed. Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero, and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, 133−166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2013. Problems of projection. *Lingua* 130, 33−49.

Chomsky, Noam. 2015. Problems of projection extensions. In *Structures, Strategies and Beyond: Studies in honor of Adriana Belletti*, ed. Elisa Di Domenico, Cornelia Hamann, and Simona Matteini, 1−6. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Fukumitsu, Yuichiro. 2001. Covert incorporation of small clause predicates in Japanese. In *MIT Working Paper in Linguistics* 41, ed. Maria Cuervo, Daniel Harbour, Ken Hiraiwa, and Shinichiro Ishihara, 251–266.

Grimshaw, Jane, and Armin Mester. 1988. Light verbs and θ-marking. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19: 205–232.

Han, Chung-Hye, Jeffrey Lidz., and Julien Musolino. 2007. V-raising and grammar competition in Korean: Evidence from negation and quantifier scope. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38: 1–47.

Harada, Naomi. 2003. No head raising in light verb constructions. *Snippets* 7: 9–10.

Hasegawa, Noriko. 1991. On head movement in Japanese: the case of verbal nouns. *Proceedings of Sophia University Linguistic Society* 6: 8–32. Tokyo: Sophia University Linguistic Society.

Hoeksema, Jack. 2000. Negative polarity items: Triggering, scope and c-command. In *Negation and Polarity: Syntactic and Semantic Perspectives*, ed. Lawrence R. Horn and Yasuhiko Kato, 123–154. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hoshi, Hiroto, and Yoko Sugioka. 2009. Agree, control and complex predicates. In *The Dynamics of the Language Faculty: Perspectives from Linguistics and Cognitive Neuroscience*, ed. Hiroto Hoshi, 177–202. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.

Inoue, Kazuko. 1976. *Henkei Bunpoo to Nihongo* (Transformational Grammar and Japanese). Tokyo: Taishu-kan.

Irimia, Monica-Alexandrina. 2012. *Secondary Predicates*. Ph.D Dissertation, University of Toronto.

Ishii, Toru. 2009. On PF-LF mismatch in the Japanese light verb construction. *Language and Linguistics* 10: 629–667.

Kageyama, Taro. 1991. Light verb constructions and the syntax-morphology interface. In *Current English Linguistics in Japan,* ed. Heizo Nakajima, 169–203. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kawai, Michiya. 2006. Raising to object in Japanese: A small clause approach. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37, 329–339.

Kawai, Michiya. 2008. Alleged small clause in Japanese. In *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 28, ed. Sarah Clarke, Manami Hirayama, Kyumin Kim, and Eugenia Suh, 89–105. Toronto: University of Toronto.

Kikuchi, Akira, and Daiko Takahashi. 1991. Agreement and small clause. In *Topics in Small Clauses*, ed. Heizo Nakajima and Shigeo Tonoike, 75–105. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.

Kitagawa, Chisato. 1981. Anaphora in Japanese: *Kare* and *Zibun*. In *Proceedings of Arizona Conference on Japanese: Linguistics: The Formal Grammar Sessions* (*Coyote Papers* 2), ed. Ann K. Farmer and Chisato Kitagawa, 61–75. University of Arizona Linguistics Circle, University of Arizona.

Kitagawa, Yoshihisa. 1985. Small but clausal. In *Papers from the Twenty-first Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society,* ed. William H. Eilfort, Paul D. Kroeber, and Karen L. Peterson, 210–220. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Kitagawa, Yoshihisa. 1987. Barriers to government. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual meeting of the North-Eastern Linguistic Society,* ed. Stephen Berman, Joyce McDonough, and Jae-Woong Choe, 249–273. Amherst, MA: GLSA, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Koizumi, Masatoshi. 2002. Control by predicate raising. In *The Proceedings of the 2002 Conference of Linguistics and Phonetics*, ed. Shosuke Haraguchi, Bohumil Palek, and Osamu Fujimura, 1–26. Tokyo: Charles University Press and Meikai University.

Koizumi, Masatoshi. 2008. Nominative object. In *The Oxford Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, ed. Shigeru Miyagawa, and Mamoru Satio, 141–164. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kuno, Masakazu. 2002. Finite small clauses in Japanese and their theoretical implications. In *Proceedings of the 16th Pacific Asia Conference,* ed. Ik-Hwan Lee, Yong-Beom Kim, Key-Sun Choi, and Minhaeng Lee, 237–248. Seoul: The Korean Society of Language and Information.

Kuno, Susumu. 1976. Subject raising. In *Syntax and Semantics 5: Japanese Generative Grammar*, ed. Masayoshi Shibatani, 17–49. New York: Academic Press.

Laka, Itziar. 1994. *On the Syntax of Negation*. New York: Garland.

Lasnik, Howard. 2000. Chains of arguments. In *Working Minimalism*, ed. Samuel D. Epstein and Norbert Hornstein, 189–215. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Reprinted in Lasnik, Howard. 2003. *Minimalist Investigations in Linguistic Theory*, 139–257. New York: Routledge.

Lasnik, Howard, and Mamoru Saito. 1991. On the subject of infinitives. In *Papers from the 27ᵗʰ Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society Part One: The General Session,* ed. Lise M. Dobrin, Lynn Nichols and Rosa M. Rodriguez, 324–343. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Matsuoka, Mikinari. 2012. On so-called small clause constructions in English and Japanese. *Yamanashi Daigaku Kyoiku Jinbun-Kagaku-bu Kiyoo* 14: 265–271.

Muraki, Masatake. 1978. The *sika nai* construction and predicate restructuring. In *Problems in Japanese Syntax and Semantics*, ed. J. Hinds and I. Howard, 155–177. Tokyo: Kaitaku-sha.

Nakato, Terue. 2009. Reconsidering syntactic reflexive-markers and "reflexive-marking" systems: from a typographical point of view. *Linguistic Research* 25: 57–70.

Nakau, Minoru. 1973. *Sentential Complementation in Japanese*. Tokyo: Kaitaku-sha.

Ohta, Kaoru. 1997. Tense in the subject raising constructions. In *Japanese Korean Linguistics* 6, ed. Ho-min Sohn and John Haig, 353–368. Stanford: CSLI.

Okutsu, Keiichiro. 1978. '*Boku-wa Unagi-da' no Bunpoo* (The grammar of 'Boku-wa Unagi-da'). Tokyo: Kuroshio Publisher.

Oshima, David Y. 2004. *Zibun* revisited: Empathy, logophoricity, and binding. In *University of Washington Working Papers in Linguistics* 23, ed. Sylwia Tur and Susannah Levi, 175–190.

Rullmann, Hotze. 1995. *Maximality in the Semantics of Wh-construction.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Saito, Mamoru, and Hiroto Hoshi. 2000. The Japanese light verb construction and the minimalist program. In *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 261–295. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Sakai, Hiromu, Adrian Ivana, and Chao Zhang. 2004. The role of light verb projection in transitivity alternation. *English Linguistics* 21: 348–375.

Sells, Peter, and Shin-Sook Kim. 2006. Korean NPIs scope over negation. *Language Research* 42: 275–297.

Shibata, Yoshiyuki. 2012. Obligatory wide scope as anti-reconstruction effects. In *Proceedings of GLOW in Asia IX 2012,* ed. Nobu Goto, Koichi Otaki, Atsushi Sato, and Kensuke Takita, pp. 15. Tsu city: Mie University. http://faculty.human.mie-u.ac.jp/~glow_mie/IX_Proceedings_Poster/14Shibata.pdf

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1976. *Nihongo no Bunseki* (The Analysis of Japanese). Tokyo: Taishu-kan.

Sode, Rumiko. 2000. *On the so-called small clause constructions in Japanese*. Doctoral Dissertation, The Ohio State University.

Stowell, Tim. 1991. Small clause restructuring. In *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*, ed. Robert Freidin, 182–217. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Takezawa, Koichi. 1987. *Configurational Approach to Case Marking in Japanese*. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Washington.

Uchibori, Asako. 2000. *The syntax of subjunctive complements: Evidence from Japanese*. Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Connecticut.

Uchida, Yoshiko, and Mineharu Nakayama. 1993. Japanese verbal noun constructions. *Linguistics* 31: 623–666.

Ura, Hiroyuki. 2014. Dative subject and impersonals in null-subject languages. In *Japanese Syntax in Comparative Perspective*, ed. Mamoru Saito, 275–308. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vasishth, Shravan. 1999. Surface structure constraints on negative polarity and word order in Hindi and English. A paper presented at the *11 European Summer School in Logic, Language and Information*, Utrecht, as part of the workshop on *Resource Logics and Minimalist Grammars*.

Yamashita, Hiroko. 2003. On the distribution and licensing of negative polarity items in Japanese and the phrase-impenetrability condition. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics*, ed. Yukio Otsu, 313–337. Tokyo: Hitsuji Shobo Publishing Company.

Yokoyama, Tomohiro. 2012. Small clauses: Evidence from Japanese. In *Proceedings of the 2012 annual conference of the Canadian Linguistics Association*, ed. Paula Caxaj, pp. 15. Toronto: Canadian Linguistic Association. http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~cla-acl/actes2012/Yokoyama_2012.pdf