

Control in Japanese

Shin Fukuda
University of California, San Diego

*Japanese (JPN), Japanese
also known as Nihongo
spoken in Japan (Asia)*

1 Grammar Profile

1.1 Morpho-Syntax

1.1.1 Head position

Head final: Attribute adjectives and relative clauses must precede nouns. Argument precedes predicates. Intensifiers precede adjectives, etc.

1.1.2 Morphological type agglutinating

1.1.3 Case system Nom/Acc

1.1.4 Verbal Agreement Subject agreement: honorific, animacy. Object agreement: honorific.

1.1.5 Transitivity Patterns Direct and indirect passive, direct and indirect causative, and middle-like construction (Miyagawa 1989, Matsumoto 1996)

1.1.6 Null Arguments Any argument can be null, with subject being the most frequent (Nakayama 1996)

1.1.7 Non-Finite Categories Bare form of a verb is the only form that cannot be used as finite.

1.2 Matrix Clause

1.2.1 Basic word order

SOV

1.2.2 Alternate word orders

Scrambling and topicalization are very common; thus, basically any order is possible.

1.2.3 Ordering of nominal and pronominal arguments

Personal pronouns are used for somewhat special purposes (i.e. *kare* 'he' means 'someone special, i.e. a boy friend'). When they are used, however, their ordering is the same as lexical nouns.

1.3 Embedded Clause

1.3.1 Basic word order

SOV

1.3.2 Verbal agreement

Honorific agreement can show up in embedded contexts.

1.3.3 Restrictions on tense, aspect, mood

Some verbs require its embedded verb to have a particular verbal morphology. Many of them are discussed in the data presented in this questionnaire.

1.3.4 Possible morphological categories of embedded clause

-ru and *-ta* form have been called as present (or non-past) and past, respectively.

-te form has been called gerundive or participial.

Deverbalized nominals look just like bare form of verbs. If a verb ends in a vowel, it doesn't change; if it ends in a consonant, the vowel 'i' is found word-finally. Nominalized adjectives either end in *-mi* or *-sa* (Sugioka 1984).

1.3.5 Non-control complements

Finite complementation:

- (1) Ken-ga [Hanako-wa kashikoi]-to iw -ta
K-Nom [H-Top cleaver]-Comp think -Pst
'Ken said that Hanako was clever.'

Passive and causative are considered to involve non-finite complementation.

There are a number of combinations of two verbs that are considered to be morphologically single words (Kageyama 1993, 1999, Matsumoto 1996).

Subject-to-subject raising (Nakau 1973, Uchibori 2001):

- (2) Ken_i-ga [t_i benkyo-su -ru -yooni] nar -ta
K_i-Nom [t_i study-do -Prs -Mod] become -Pst
'Ken has become studious.'

Subject-to-object raising (Kuno 1976, Tanaka 2002, but see Dubinsky and Davies 2003 for a discussion of different views about this construction):

- (3) Ken-ga Hanako_i-o [t_i kashikoi]-to omow -ta
 K-Nom H_i-Acc [t_i cleaver]-Comp think -Pst
 'Ken considered Hanako to be clever.'

2 Control Profile

2.1 forward subject control into bare (infinitival) complements

2.1.1 Example structure

- (4) Ken-ga [rombun-o kaki] oe -ta
 K-Nom [paper-Acc write] finish -Pst
 'Ken finished writing the paper.'
- (5) Ken-ga [rombun-o kaki] wasure -ta
 K-Nom [paper-Acc write] forget -Pst
 'Ken forgot to write the paper.'

(Shibatani 1973, 1978, Kuno 1987, Nishigauchi 1993, Kageyama 1989, 1993, 1999, Matsumoto 1996, Aoshima 2000)

2.1.2 Predicates participating in the construction

verb, aspectual, *oe* 'finish'

verb, implicative, *wasure* 'forget'

2.1.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

There is some evidence which suggests that sentences with these verbs are mono-clausal:

These verbs allow long passive, a commonly assumed sign of mono-clausality (Kageyama 1993, 1999, Nishigauchi 1993).

Nothing can intervene between the embedded verb and the matrix verb.

2.1.4 Evidence of empty category

Kageyama (1993, 1999) claims that the complement of these verbs is subject-less.

2.1.5 Selectional restrictions

Non-volitional subjects are incompatible with these verbs (Shibatani 1973, Nishigauchi 1993)

2.1.6 Control type

Aoshima (2000), based on her judgments upon applying several diagnostics listed below to sentences with these verbs, concludes that these are obligatory control verbs.

- Local & c-commanding antecedent required
- No split antecedent
- Only sloppy reading available with ellipsis
- Interpretation of *only* + NP

2.2 forward subject/object control into *-te* complement

2.2.1 Example structure

- (6) Ken-ga [rombun-o kai -te] mi -ta
 K-Nom [paper-Acc write -TE] try -Pst
 ‘Ken tried to write a paper.’
- (7) Ken-ga Hanako-ni [rombun-o kai -te] moraw -ta
 K-Nom H-Dat [paper-Acc write -TE] receive -Pst
 ‘Ken had Hanako write a paper (for him).’
- (8) Ken-wa Hanako-ni [rombun-o kai -te] hoshi -i
 K-Top H-Dat [paper-Acc write -TE] desirebel -Prs
 ‘Ken would like Hanako to write a paper.’
- (9) Ken-ga [kuruma-o naoshi -te] ok -ta
 K-Nom [car-Acc repair -TE] put -Prs
 ‘Ken has repaired the car (before some anticipated event).’
 (Shibatani 1978, McCawley and Momoi 1986, Kageyama 1993, Matusmoto 1996, Aoshima 2000)

2.2.2 Predicates participating in the construction

verb, implicative, *mi* ‘try’

verb, giving/receiving, *moraw* ‘receive’

adjective, desiderative, *hoshi* ‘desirable’

verb, aspectual, *ok* ‘have V-ed in advance of an anticipated event’

2.2.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

There are pieces of evidence which suggest that this may be a mixed group:

Some of these verbs, such as *mi* ‘try’ and *ok* ‘have V-ed’, allow long passive, a sign of monoclausality (Kageyama 1993).

With all the verbs, an NPI, *shika* ‘only’, can be licensed by negation on the matrix even when it is inside of the complement, unlike the clear cases of finite complement (McCawley and Momoi 1986):

- (10) Ken-ga [aka-wain-**shika** nom -te] mi **na** -katta
 K-Nom [red-wine-**only** drink -TE] try **neg** -Pst
 ‘Ken only tried to drink the red wine.’

However, Matsumoto (1996) argues for a bi-clausal analysis of sentences with *hoshi* ‘desirable’ with the same NPI, *shika* ‘only’:

- (11) Boku-wa Mary-ni [Tokyo-e Bill-to-shika ik anai -de] hoshi -i
 I-Top M-Dat [Tokyo-to B-with-only go Neg -TE] want -Prs
 ‘I want Mary to go to Tokyo with Bill only.’
- (12) *Boku-wa Bill-to-shika Mary-ni [Tokyo-e ik anai -de] hoshi -i
 I-Top B-with-only M-Dat [Tokyo-to go NEG -TE] want -IMP
 ‘I want Mary to go to Tokyo with Bill only.’

In Matsumoto’s 2nd example, however, one may argue that the negation fails to c-command the NPI. Thus, the example may not show that the sentence is bi-clausal. Therefore, licensing of the NPI does seem to suggest that there appears to be a difference in the degree of transparency between the finite complementation and *te* complement. With a finite complement, the negation fails to license the NPI

in the complement even when it c-commands it. With *te* complement, the negation in the matrix can license the NPI in the complement, as long as it c-commands it.

2.2.4 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument

Overt subject is never possible with these verbs.

With object control verbs in this class (i.e. *moraw* and *hoshi*), the binding of the reflexive *jibun* ‘self’ has been used to argue for presence of a covert embedded subject, assuming that *jibun* is subject-oriented (Nakau 1973, Matsumoto 1996):

- (13) Ken_i-ga Hanako_j-ni [jibun_{i/j}-no-koe-o rokuonshi -te] moraw -ta
 K-Nom H-Dat [self-Gen-voice-Acc record -TE] receive -Pst
 ‘Ken_i had Hanako_j record his_i/her_j own voice.’

2.2.5 Selectional restrictions

Non-volitional subjects/dative objects are not possible.

2.2.6 Control type

Aoshima (2000), based on the same diagnostics discussed above, concludes that these verbs are obligatory control verbs.

2.3 *forward subject control into a complement*

The complement is introduced by *to* with a ‘volitional’ marker on the embedded verb.

2.3.1 Example structure

- (14) Ken-ga [kawa-o booto-de water -oo]-to shi -ta
 K-Nom [river-Acc boat-Ins cross -Vol]-Comp try -Pst
 ‘Ken tried to cross the river on a boat.’
 (Nakau 1973, Hasegawa 1984, Nemoto 1991, Aoshima 2000)

2.3.2 Predicates participating in the construction

verb, implicative, sur ‘try’

verb, desiderative, *kuwadata* ‘plan, plot’

2.3.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

Despite the presence of the complementizer-like element *to*, which suggests that the complement may be a CP, the complement shows a high degree of transparency.

An NPI inside *to* complement can be licensed by negation in the matrix.

- (15) Ken-ga [niku-**shika** tabe -yoo]-to shi **na** -katta
 K-Nom [meat-**only** eat -Vol]-Comp try **neg** -Pst
 ‘Ken only tried to eat meat.’

In fact, having the only negation-like element allowed in this environment, *mai*, makes the sentence awkward:

- (16) ?Ken-ga [niku-**shika** tabe **mai**]-to shi -ta
 K-Nom [meat-**only** eat **neg**]-Comp try -Pst
 ‘Ken tried to eat only meat.’

Nemoto (1991) claims that scrambling out of *-to* complements is A-movement, based on reciprocal anaphor binding:

- (17) [John-to-Bob_i-o]_j otagai_i-no-chichioya-ga [t_j rikaishi -yoo]-to kokoromi -ta
 [J-and-B_i-Acc]_j each other_i-Gen-father-Nom [t_j understand -Vol]-Comp attempt -Pst
 'John and Bob, each other's father attempted to understand.'

One way to account for this binding fact is to assume that the control structure with a *-to* complement is mono-clausal (i.e. *to* complement is not a CP). Alternatively, one can maintain that *to* complement is a CP, thus the entire sentence is structurally bi-clausal, but it is transparent due to the nature of the embedded CP (Uchibori 1999).

2.3.4 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument

Hasegawa (1984) notes that the reflexive *jibun* is marginally possible for some speakers:

- (18) Ken_i-wa [jibun_i-ga Hanako-o bengo-shi -yoo]-to -shi -ta
 K-Top [self-Nom H-Acc defend-do -Vol]-Comp -try -Pst
 'John tried to defend Hanako himself.'

If one assumes that a sentence with this verb is bi-clausal, interpretation of a stranded numeral quantifier phrase in the complement argues for presence of an empty category, since a numeral quantifier phrase is clause-bound:

- (19) **Shuujin**-ga [kangoku-kara **3-nin** nige -yoo]-to shi -ta
 inmate-Nom [jail-from 3-Cl escape -Vol]-Comp try -Per
 'Inmates, from the jail, 3 of them, tried to escape'

However, if one assumes mono-clausal structure, the interpretation the numeral quantifier phrase offers another piece of evidence for such position.

2.3.5 Selectional restrictions

Non-volitional subject is impossible.

2.3.6 Control type

Aoshima (2000) concludes that this verb is not an obligatory control verb.

However, if it involves pro subject, the following contrast is mysterious:

- (20) Ken_i-no-otosan_j-ga [pro_{i/j} kyo yasumu]-to iw -ta
 K_i-Gen-father_j-Nom [pro_{i/j} today be_absent]-Comp say -Pst
 'Ken_i's father_j said that pro_{i/j} will be absent today.'
- (21) Ken_i-no-otosan_j-ga [ec_{i/j} kyo yasum -oo]-to shi -ta
 K_i-Gen-father_j-Nom [ec_{i/j} today be_absent -Vol]-Comp try -Pst
 'Ken's father tried to be absent (=take a day off) today.'

2.4 forward subject/object control into a complement

Complement is introduced by *to* with the subjunctive mood marker on the embedded verb.

2.4.1 Example structure

- (22) Ken-ga Hanako-ni [Tokyo-e ik -e]-to susume -ta
 K-Nom H-Dat [Tokyo-Goal go -Sub]-Comp advise -Pst
 'Ken advised Hanako that she should go to Tokyo.'
- (23) Ken-ga Hanako-ni [Bill-o suisenshi -ro]-to meiji -ta
 K-Nom H-Dat [B-Acc recommend -Sub]-Comp order -Pst
 'Ken ordered Hanako to recommend Bill.'
 (Uchibori 1996)

2.4.2 Predicates participating in the construction

verb, manipulative, *susume* ‘suggest’

verb, manipulative, *meiji* ‘order’

2.4.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

The complement of these verbs also shows a high degree of transparency:

Uchibori (1996) claims that scrambling out of this complement can be A-movement, just like the case with *to* complement under *sur* ‘try’:

- (24) Karera_i-o koochoo-ga [otagai_i-no-sensei-ni [t_i suisenshi -ro]]
 Them_i-Acc principle-Nom [each other_i-Gen-teacher-Dat [t_i recommend -Sub]]
- to meiji -ta
 -Comp order -Pst

‘Them, the principle ordered to each other’s teacher to recommend.’

She also shows that a locally bound anaphors, *X-jishin* (i.e. *jibun-jishin* ‘self-self’, *kare-jishin* ‘he-self’) can be bound by an antecedent that is in the matrix:

- (25) Taro_i-ga iin’kai_j-ni [ec_j jibun-jishin_{i/*j}-o suisenshi -ro] -to meiji -ta
 T_i-Nom committee_j-Dat [ec_j self-self_{i/*j}-Acc recommend -Sub] -Comp order -Pst
 ‘Taro_i ordered the committee_j ec_j to recommend self_{i/*j}.’

2.4.4 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument

An overt subject is at best marginal with *meiji*- ‘order’ and *susume*- ‘suggest’ (Uchibori 1996: footnote 16).

- (26) Taro-ga Jiro_j-ni [??jibun_j/??kare_j-ga Tokyo-e ik -e]-to meiji -ta
 T-Nom J-Dat [self/he-Nom Tokyo-Goal go-Sub]-Comp order -Pst
 ‘Taro ordered Jiro to go to Tokyo.’

Since the reflexive cannot be interpreted to have the dative argument as its antecedent, there is no evidence that suggests that there is a covert subject.

2.4.5 Selectional restrictions

Uchibori (1996) shows that with verb such as *meiji*- ‘order’, the dative argument must be a sentient being:

- (27) ??Shacho-ga **kojo**-ni [heisashi-ro]-to meiji -ta
 president-Nom factory-Dat [close -Sub]-Comp order -Pst
 ‘The president ordered the factory to close.’

2.4.6 Control type

The standard diagnostics (local & c-commanding antecedent, no split antecedent, sloppy reading under ellipsis) suggest that it is obligatory control.

- (28) Ken_i-ga Hanako_j-no-otooto_k-ni [ec_{*i/*j/k} motto benkyoshi -ro]
 K_i-Nom H_j-Gen-brother_k-Dat [ec_{*i/*j/k} more study -Sub]
- to meiji -ta
 -Comp order -Pst

‘Ken_i ordered Hanako_j’s brother_k ec_{*i/*j/k} to study harder.’

- (29) Ken_i-ga Hanako_j-ni [ec_{*i+j+k} iss honi benkyoshi -ro]-to
 K_i-Nom H_j-Dat [ec_{*i+j+k} together study -Sub]-Comp

meiji -ta
 order -Pst

‘Ken_i order Hanako_j ec_{*i+j+k} to study together.’

- (30) Ken_i-ga Hanako_j-ni [kare_i-o shijishi -ro]-to meiji -ru-
 K_i-Nom H_j-Dat [he_i-Acc support -Sub]-Comp order -Prs-

to Satoshi-mo so shi -ta
 and S-also so do -Pst

‘Ken ordered Hanako to support him, and so did Satoshi (Satoshi ordered Hanako to support Ken too).’

2.5 forward subject/object control into a complement

The embedded verb is marked with *yooni* (which is optionally introduced by *to*, a presumed complementizer).

2.5.1 Example structure

- (31) Ken-ga Hanako-ni [Tokyo-e ik -u -yooni] susume -ta
 K-Nom H-Dat [Tokyo-Goal go -Prs -Mod] advise -Pst
 ‘Ken advised to Hanako that she should go to Tokyo.’

- (32) Ken_i-ga [musuko-o rikaisu -ru -yooni] tsutome -ta
 K-Top [son-Acc understand -Prs -Mod] endeavor -Pst
 ‘Ken tried to understand (his) son.’
 (Nakau 1973, Uchibori 1996, Aoshima 2000)

2.5.2 Predicates participating in the construction

verb, manipulative, *susume*- ‘suggest’

verb, desiderative, *tsutome*- ‘endeavor’

2.5.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

The complement of these verbs also shows transparency:

Nemoto (1991) claims that scrambling out of this complement can be A-movement, and Uchibori (1996) shows that a locally bound *X-jishin* anaphora can be bound by an element in the matrix:

- (33) Karera_i-o koochoo-ga [otagai_i-no-sensei-ni [t_i suisensu
 Them_i-Acc principle-Nom [each other_i-Gen-teacher-Dat [t_i recommend
 -ru -yooni] meiji -ta
 -Prs -Mod] order -Pst

‘Them, the principle ordered to each other’s teacher to recommend.’

- (34) Taro_i-ga iin’kai_j-ni [ec_j jibun-jishin_{i/*j}-o suisensu -ru -yooni] meiji -ta
 T_i-Nom committee_j-Dat [ec_j self-self_{i/*j}-Acc recommend -Prs -Mod] order -Pst
 ‘Taro_i ordered the committee_j ec_j to recommend self_{i/*j}.’

However, the NPI licensing from the matrix is not as natural:

- (35) ??Sensei-ga Ken-ni [3-tsu-koto-**shika** suru yooni] meij na -katta.
 Teacher-Nom Ken-Dat [3-Cl-thing-only do Mod] order neg -Pst
 ‘The teacher ordered Ken to only do three things.’ (intended)

2.5.4 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument

With *susume* ‘suggest’, an alleged object control verb, Nakau (1973) offers the reflexive pronoun *jibun* as an argument for assuming a covert embedded subject.

- (36) Ken_i-ga Hanako_j-ni [**jibun**_{i/j}-no-heya-e ik -u -yooni] susume -ta
 K-Nom H-Dat [self-Gen-room-to go -Prs -Mod] advise -Pst
 ‘Ken_i advised Hanako_j to go to self_{i/j}’s room.’

As with the case with *-to* complement, there have been discussions of the possibility of having an overt subject with *yooni* complement. It appears that the alleged object control verbs allow an overt embedded subject, while the alleged subject control verb like *tsutome* does not (Saito 1982, Hasegawa 1984):

- (37) Ken-ga Hanako_i-ni [**kanojo**_i-ga Tokyo-e ik -u -yooni] susume -ta
 K-Nom H-Dat [she-Nom Tokyo-Goal go -Prs -Mod] advise -Pst
 ‘Ken advised to Hanako that she should go to Tokyo.’
- (38) Ken_i-ga [?**jibun**_i/**kare**_i-ga musuko-o rikaisu -ru -yooni] tsutome -ta
 K-Top [self/he-Nom son-Acc understand-Prs -Mod] endeavor -Pst.
 ‘Ken_i tried himself_i/he_i understand (his) son.’

2.5.5 Selectional restrictions

Non-volitional subjects/dative arguments not allowed.

2.5.6 Control type

Aoshima (2000) claims that the same diagnostics discussed above show that the verbs in this group are also obligatory control verbs.

2.6 forward subject/object control into complex NP/subjunctive complements

2.6.1 Example structure

- (39) Ken-wa Hanako-ni [hon-o kaes -u]-koto-o yakusokush- -ta
 K-Nom H-Dat [book-Acc return -Prs]-fact-Acc promise -Pst
 ‘Ken promised Hanako that he will return the book.’
- (40) Ken-ga [tegami-o das -u]-koto-o wasure -te -i -ta
 K-Nom [letter-Acc send -Prs]-fact-Acc forget -TE -be -Pst
 ‘Ken had forgotten sending the letter.’
- (41) Ken-ga [hon-o kaes -ana -i] -tsumori -da
 K-Nom [book-Acc return -Neg -Prs] -intend -Cop-Prs
 ‘Ken intends not to return the book.’
- (42) Ken-ga Hanako-ni [shiiwaseni nar -u]-koto-o nozom -da
 K-Nom M-Dat [happily become -Prs]-fact-Acc hope -Cop-Prs
 ‘Ken hoped Hanako to become happy.’
 (Nakau 1973, Saito 1982, Uchibori 1996, Aoshima 2000)

2.6.2 Predicates participating in the construction

verb, communication, *yakusokus-* ‘promise’

verb, implicative, *wasure-* ‘forget’

noun, desiderative, *tsumori* ‘intend’

verb, desiderative, *nozom-* ‘hope’

2.6.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

The complement of these verbs also shows some transparency:

Scrambling out of this complement can also be A-movement, and a locally bound X-*jishin* anaphora can also be bound by an element in the matrix (Nemoto 1991, Uchibori 1996):

- (43) **John-to-Bob**_i-o [otagai_i-no-chichioya-ga [t_i rikaishisur -u]-koto-o
J-and-B_i-Acc [each other_i-Gen-father-Nom [t_i understand -Prs]-fact-Acc

kokoromi -ta
attempt -Pst

‘John and Bob, each other’s father attempted to understand.’

- (44) **Taro**_i-ga iinkai_j-ni [jibun-jishin_i -o suisensu -ru] -koto-o
T-Nom committee-Dat [self-self-Acc recommend -Prs] -fact-Acc

nozom -da
hope -Pst

‘Taro_i hoped the committee_j to recommend self_i.’

However, licensing of an embedded NPI from the matrix does not seem possible:

- (45) ??Sensei-ga sento-ni kyoukasho-kara-**shika** monda-o dasu]
Teacher-Nom student-Dat [textbook-from-only problems present]

-koto-o yakusokushi na -katta
-fact-Acc promise neg -Pst

‘The teacher promised the students that he make the exam based solely on the textbook.’
(intended)

2.6.4 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument

Saito (1982) as well as Uchibori (1996) show that this complement can have an overt subject which can be either the reflexive or a pronoun.

- (46) Ken_i-ga [zibun_i/kare_i-ga erab are ru]-koto-o nozom -da
K-Nom [self/he-Nom choose -Pass Prs]-fact-Acc hope -Pst

‘Ken_i hoped self_i/he_i would be chosen.’

2.6.5 Selectional restrictions

Non-volitional subjects/dative arguments not allowed.

2.6.6 Control type

Aoshima (2000) argues that complements with *koto/no* do not involve obligatory control, based on the same diagnostics introduced above. However, as the ambiguity in the following sentence suggests, it is likely to be *pro*.

- (47) Ken_i-no-otosan_j-ga [pro_{i/j} tegami-o das -u] –koto/no-o wasure
 K_i-Gen-father_j-Nom [pro_{i/j} letter-Acc send -Prs] -thing/matter-Acc forget
- te i -ta
 -TE be -Pst

‘Ken_i’s father_j had forgotten pro_{i/j} sending the letter.’

However, *tsumori*, ‘intend’, appears to be a case of obligatory control:

- (48) Ken_i-no-otosan_j-ga [ec*_{i/j} hon-o kaes -ana -i]-tsumori -da
 K_i-Gen-father_j-Nom [ec*_{i/j} book-Acc return -Neg -Prs]-intend -Cop
 ‘Ken’s father intends not to return the book.’

2.7 forward subject/object control with verbal nouns (light verb constructions)

2.7.1 Example structure

- (49) Ken-wa Tokyo-ni ryoko-o shi -ta
 K-Top Tokyo-Goal travel-Acc do -Pst
 ‘Ken traveled to Tokyo’
- (50) Ken-ga Tokyo-e bushi-no-yuso-o hajime -ta
 K-Nom Tokyo-Goal goods-Gen-transport-Acc begin -Pst
 ‘Ken began sending goods to Tokyo.’
- (51) Ken-ga sono-spy-to sesshoku-o kokoromi -ta
 J-Nom that-spy-With contact-Acc attempt -Pst
 ‘Ken tried to contact that spy.’
 (Terada 1990, Matsumoto 1996, Miyamoto 2001)

2.7.2 Predicates participating in the construction

verb, light verb, *sur*- ‘do’

verb, aspectual, *hajime*- ‘begin’

verb, desiderative, *kokoromi*- ‘attempt’

2.7.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

In Miyamoto (2001), the light verb constructions are argued to be ‘*bi-predicational*’. He presents the possibility of honorification on both the verbal noun and the light verb as a piece of evidence for such analysis.

- (52) Sensei-ga seito-ni [eigo-no-go-kyoju]-o s -are -ta
 Teacher-Nom students-Dat [English-GEN-HN-teaching]-Acc do -HN -Pst
 ‘The teacher taught English to the students.’
 (Lit. The teacher did the teaching of English to the students)

However, the double honorification is also seen with non-light verb construction (i.e. a verb and an incorporated object):

- (53) Sensei-ga go-inkyō (*-o) s -are -ta
 Teacher-Nom HN-retire (*-ACC) do -HN -Prs
 ‘The teacher retired.’

Thus, it is not clear what the double honorification shows in terms of clausality.

2.7.4 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument

Miyamoto (2001) presents several arguments for the presence of a covert subject in the phrase headed by a verbal noun: a) *kata* ‘way’ gerund formation, b) honorification, c) *jibun* binding, and d) interpretation of an external argument of a verbal noun phrase. However, all of these are compatible with an analysis in which the light verb construction is mono-clausal (i.e. no embedded subject).

2.7.5 Selectional restrictions

Non-agent subjects are not allowed (Terada 1990).

- (54) *Kono-deta-ga atarashii-mondai-no shisa-o shi -te -i -ru
 This-data-Nom new-problem-Gen suggestion-Acc do -TE be -Prs
 ‘This data suggests a new problem.’
- (55) *Ya-ga mato-ni meichu-o shi -ta
 arrow-Nom target-to strike-Acc do -Pst
 ‘The arrow struck the target.’

2.7.6 Control type

Miyamoto (2001) applies the same diagnostics that Aoshima (2000) uses (local and c-commanding antecedent, no split antecedent, and sloppy interpretation) and concludes the light verb construction is obligatory control (Miyamoto assumes the light verb constructions are bi-clausal). Matsumoto (1996) also claims that the external argument of the verbal noun is obligatorily null with the light verb constructions, unlike cases with a non-light verb, such as *enki-sur* ‘postpone’ (with a non-light verb *enki-sur* ‘postpone’, an argument of the noun *mikkai* ‘secret meeting’, *the spy*, must be marked with genitive case).

- (56) John-ga spy-to (*Bill-no) mikkai-o shi/kokoromi -ta
 J-Nom spy-Com (*B-Gen) secret_meeting-Acc do/attempt -Pst
 ‘John did/attempted to have a/*Bill’s secret meeting with the spy.’
- (57) John-ga spy-to-no (Bill-no)mikkai-o enkishi -ta
 J-Nom spy-Com-Gen (B-Gen) secret_meeting-Acc postpone -Pst
 ‘John postponed Bill’s meeting with the spy.’

2.8 backward object control into an adjunct

2.8.1 Example structure

- (58) Keikan-ga [dorobo-ga nige -ru tokoro]-o tsukamae -ta
 Police_officer-Nom [burglar-Nom run_away -Prs scene]-Acc capture -Pst
 ‘The police officer captured Δ_i whole the burglar_i is running away.’
 (Harada 1973, Kuroda 1978, 1999, Fujii 2004)

2.8.2 Predicates participating in the construction

adjunct clause headed by *tokoro* ‘scene’

2.8.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

The clause headed by *tokoro* seems to possess many of the characteristics of finite complement: it has its own nominative marked subject, its verb bears finite morphology, i.e. *-ru*.

2.8.4 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument

The object of the matrix verb cannot be overt, presumably due to Double-o constraint (Harada 1979).

- (59) *Keikan-ga dorobo_i-o [ec_i nige -ru tokoro]-o
 police officer-Nom burglar_i-Acc [ec_i run_away -Prs scene]-Acc
- tsukamae -ta
 capture -Pst

‘The police officer captured Δ_i while the burglar_i is running away.’

Harada presents several arguments for the existence of an empty category in the matrix.

First, verbs such as *tsukamae* ‘capture’ subcategorizes for an object, which is absent from sentences with the *tokoro*-clause. However, the object argument may show up in cleft sentences:

Harada also shows that while passivization of an entire *tokoro*-clause is not possible, the passivization of the subject in a *tokoro*-clause is possible.

- (60) *[Sono-doroboo-ga nige ru -tokoto]_i-ga keisatsu-ni ec_i
 [that-burglar-Nom escape Prs -scene]_i-Nom police-By ec_i
- tsukamae -rare -ta
 capture -Pass -Pst

‘The burglar (who was) trying to escape was arrested.’

- (61) [Sono-doroboo]_i-ga keisatsu-ni [ec_i nige -ru -tokoto]-o
 that-burglar_i-Nom Police-By [ec_i escape -Prs -scene]-Acc
- tsukamae -rare -ta
 capture -Pass -Pst

‘The burglar was arrested by the police as he was trying to escape.’

Assuming that passivization from a finite embedded clause is not possible, Harada takes the grammaticality of the above example to be a piece of evidence for the existence of the matrix object.

2.8.5 Selectional restrictions

The subject of a *tokoro* clause must be compatible with the matrix verb (Harada 1973).

- (62) *Keisatsu-wa [ame-ga hur -te i -ru tokoro]-o tsukamae -ta
 police-Top [rain-Nom fall -TE be -Prs scene]-Acc arrest -Pst
 The police arrested (*pro*) while it was raining. (intended)

2.8.6 Control type

Tokoro clause has been analyzed to involve *pro* (Hale and Kitagawa 1977). However, Fujii (2004) presents arguments against such analysis.

Condition B effect

Kare, or he, is subject to Condition B:

- (63) Ken_i-ga **kare**_{*i/j}-o hagemashi -ta
 K_i-Nom he_{*i/j}-Acc cheer_up -Pst
 ‘Ken_i cheered him_{*i/j} up.’
- (64) Ken_i-ga **kare**_j-no-hahaoya-o hagemashi -ta
 K_i-Nom he_j-Gen-hahaoya-Acc cheer_up -Pst
 ‘Ken_i cheered up his_j mother.’

Kare in the subject of *tokoro* clause appears to be subject to Condition B effect:

- (65) Ken_i-ga Δ_i [**kare**_{*i/j}-ga ochikon -de i -ru -tokoro]-o
 K_i-Nom Δ_i [he_{*i/j}-Nom depress -TE be -Prs -scene]-Acc
- hagemashi -ta
 cheer_up -Pst

‘Ken_i cheered Δ_i up [when he_{*i/j} was depressed]’

In contrast, the reflexive *jibun* is the subject position of *tokoro* clause is grammatical.

- (66) Ken_i-ga Δ_i [**jibun**_i-ga ochikon -de i -ru -tokoro]-o
 K_i-Nom Δ_i [self_i-Nom depress -TE be -Prs -scene]-Acc
- hagemashi -ta
 cheer_up -Pst

‘Ken_i cheered Δ_i up [when self_i was depressed]’

Fujii argues that if the empty category is *pro*, and *pro* is subject to Condition B, both examples should be ungrammatical. If the empty category is anaphoric (i.e. trace), then both of them should be grammatical. Thus, he concludes that subjects of *tokoro* clauses behave like they belong to the matrix w.r.t. Condition B.

Quantifier scope

A sentence with a transitive verb and an object with a quantifier yields ambiguity.

- (67) Keikan-ga **san-nin-no-doroboo**-o tsukamae -ta
 Police-officer-Nom 3-Cl-Gen-burgler-Acc capture -Pst
 ‘The police officer arrested three burglars.’

- a) capture > 3 thieves: There is an arresting event in which three thieves were caught.
 b) 3 thieves > capture: There thieves were caught in three different capturing events.

Such ambiguity does not obtain over a clause boundary:

- (68) Taro-ga [Jiro-ga **san-nin-no-doroboo**-ni aw -ta]-to
 T-Nom [J-Nom 3-Cl-Gen-burglar-Dat mee -Pst]-Comp
- kanchigaish -ta
 misunderstand -Pst

‘Taro misunderstood that Jiro met three burglars.’

- a) Misunderstand > 3 : Taro misunderstood that there were three thieves that Jiro met (in either single or three arresting event(s)).
 b) *3 > misunderstand: There were three thieves that Taro misunderstood that Jiro met.

A *tokoro* clause also does not allow the ambiguity.

- (69) Keikan-ga Δ_i [**san-nin-no-doroboo**_i-ga nige -ru -tokoro]-o
 Police-officer-Nom Δ_i [3-Cl-Gen-burglar_i-Nom escape -Prs -scene]-Acc
- tsukamae -ta
 capture -Pst

‘The police officer arrested Δ_i [when three burglars (were trying to) escape].’

- a) capture > 3: there is an arresting event in which three burglars were caught by the officer.

- b) *3 > capture: There are three thieves which were arrested by the officer as each of them was trying to escape.

However, when passivized, ambiguity obtains.

(70)	San-nin-no-doroboo _i -ga	Keikan-ni	[ec _i	nige	-ru	-tokoro]-o
	3-Cl-Gen-burglar _i -Nom	Police-officer-By	[ec _i	escape	-Prs	-Scene]-Acc
	tsukamae	-rare	-ta			
	capture	-Pass	-Pst			

‘Three burglars were arrested [when e (were trying to) escape].’

- a) capture > 3: there is an arresting event in which three burglars were caught by the officer.
 b) 3 > capture: There are three thieves which were arrested by the officer as each of them were trying to escape.

Subjects of adverbial *tokoro* clauses behave like they belong to the adverbial phrase w.r.t. quantifier scope.

Fujii (2004)’s analysis assumes that theta-roles are features (Hornstein 1999) and included in [D]-features, which also include a categorial feature, and a selectional feature. Fujii also assumes that theta-features are “weak” in Japanese (= only features can move). Given these assumptions, he argues that [D]-feature of the subject DP of a *tokoro* clause moves to the matrix clause to check theta feature of the matrix verb (which would remain unchecked otherwise). Thematic relation between the subject DP and the matrix verb is established.

Condition B effect:

- [\pm pronominal] is one of the features included in [D]-features.
- [D]-features move to the matrix due to the theta-role feature checking, and that takes [\pm pronominal] as well.
- The subject DP of a *tokoro*-clause behaves like it belongs to the matrix w.r.t. Condition B.

Quantifier Scope:

- Unlike [D]-features, the feature relevant to quantifier, [Quant], does not move to the matrix. There is no reason to believe lexical verbs have the feature [Quant].
- The subject DP of a *tokoro*-clause behaves like it belongs to the *tokoro*-clause w.r.t. quantifier scope.

References

- Aoshima, S. 2000. 'Control structures and scrambling,' *University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics*, 12.
- Dubinsky, S. and W. Davies. 2003. 'Raising (and control)' State-of-the-Article. *GLOT International*. Volume 7, number 9/10.
- Fujii, T 2004. *Binding and scope in Japanese Backward Control*. Paper presented at the Workshop on Control in Cross-Linguistic Perspective. ZAS, Berlin, May 2004.
- Grimshaw, J. and A. Mester. 1988. 'Light verbs and theta-marking,' *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 205-32.
- Hale, K. and C. Kitagawa. 1977. 'A counter to counter-equi', *Papers in Japanese linguistics* 5, 41-61.
- Harada, S. I. 1973. "Counter Equi NP Deletion," Annual Bulletin, *Research Institute of Logopedics and Phoniatics*, University of Tokyo, 8, 133-143.
- Hasegawa, N.1984. 'On the So-Called "Zero Pronouns" in Japanese,' *The LinguisticReview* 4: 289-341.
- Kageyama, T.1989. 'The place of morphology in the grammar,' In G. Booij and J. van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology* 2, Dordrecht: Foris Publishers.
- Kageyama, T. 1993. *Bumpo to Gokeisei* [Grammar and Word Formation], Tokyo: Hitsuji Shobo.
- Kageyama, T. 1999. 'Word formation,' In N. Tsujimura (ed.), *The Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, 297-325, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kuno, S. 1973. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kuno, S. 1976. 'Subject raising,' In M. Shibatani (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics 5: Japanese Generative Grammar*, 17-49.
- Kuno, S. 1987. 'Honorific marking in Japanese and the word formation hypothesis of causatives and passives.' *Studies in Language* 11.1; 99-128.
- Kuroda, S-Y. 1965. *Generative Grammatical Studies in the Japanese Language*. dissertation, MIT.
- Kuroda, S-Y. 1978. 'Case-marking, canonical sentence patterns and counter-equi in Japanese', In Hinds, J. and I. Howard (eds.), *Problems in Japanese Syntax and Semantics*, 30-51. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Kuroda, S-Y. 1999. 'Tokoro-setsu [Tokoro-clause]'. In Nakamura, A. and S-Y. Kuroda (eds.) *Kotobano Kaku to Shuuen* [The Core and the periphery of language], Tokyo: Kuroshio.
- Matsumoto, Y. 1996. *Complex Predicates in Japanese: a Syntactic and Semantic Study of the notion "Word"*. Stanford and Tokyo: CSLI and Kuroshio:
- McCawley, J.D. and K. Momoi. 1986. 'The constituent structure of *te* complements,' *Papers in Japanese Linguistics* 11, 1-60.
- Miyamoto, T. 2001. *The Light Verb Construction in Japanese: The Role of the Verbal Noun* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nakau, M.1973. *Sentential Complementation in Japanese*, Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Nakayama, M. 1996. *Acquisition of Japanese Empty Categories*. Tokyo: Kuroshio.
- Nemoto, N. 1991. 'Scrambling and conditions on A-movement,' *WCCFL* 10; 349-358.
- Nishigauchi, T. 1993. "Long Distance Passive", In N, Hasegawa ed., *Japanese Syntax in Comparative Grammar*, 79-114, Tokyo: Kuroshio.
- Saito, M. 1982. Case marking in Japanese: a preliminary study, ms, MIT.

- Saito, M. and H. Hoshi. 2000. 'Japanese light verb construction and the Minimalist Program,' In R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, 261-295. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Shibatani, M. 1973. 'Where morphology and syntax clash: a case in Japanese aspectual verbs,' *Gengo Kenkyu* 64, 65-96
- Shibatani, M. 1976. 'Causativization,' In M. Shibatani (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics 5. Japanese generative grammar*, 239-294. San Diego: Academic Press
- Shibatani, M. 1978. *Nihongo no Bunseki* [Analysis of Japanese], Tokyo: Taishukan.
- Sugioka, Y. 1984. *Interaction of Derivational Morphology and Syntax in Japanese*. doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Tanaka, H. 2002. 'Raising to object out of CP,' *Linguistic Inquiry*, 33, 637-652.
- Terada, M. 1990. *Incorporation and Argument Structure in Japanese*. doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Uchibori, A. 1996. 'Opacity and subjunctive complements in Japanese,' *Japanese Korean Linguistics* vol. 6, 399-414, Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Uchibori, A. 2001. 'Raising out of CP and C-T relations,' *Proceedings of the Third Formal Approaches to Japanese Linguistics*. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 41, 145-162.

Shin Fukuda
Department of Linguistics
University of California, San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive #0108
La Jolla, CA 92093-0108
fukuda-ling.ucsd.edu
<http://ling.ucsd.edu/~fukuda>