Alleged small clauses in Japanese

Miyiha Kawai
Huron University College and University of Western Ontario

This paper is concerned with what is referred to as an alleged small clause (ASC-) construction, as in John-wa Mary-o itoshiku omotta/John-TOP Mary-ACC lovable thought/’John considered Mary lovable’. The most popular view among researchers today is that Mary-o and itoshiku form a small clause complement of the epistemic predicate omotta (e.g., Kikuchi and Takahashi 1990, Sode 1999, and Fukumitsu 2002). Koizumi (2002), however, points out a number of problems in the standard view. In this paper, I also argue against the small clause analysis of ASC-constructions, because a cluster of the syntactic and morphological properties of ASC-constructions is not predicted by a small clause analysis. Under the present analysis, itoshiku and omotta form a V-complex [itoshiku omotta] taking Mary-o as the direct (theme) object, and John as the experiencer subject. As such, itoshiku is a V-modifier, not having a direct thematic relation with Mary-o.

1. Introduction

The sentences in (1) are commonly assumed to involve a small clause (e.g., Kikuchi and Takahashi 1990, Sode 1999, Fukumitsu 2002), as in (2a), parallel to the English example in (2b). Instead, I argue in this paper that the sentences in (1) involve the configuration in (3), first proposed by Koizumi (2002), to the best of my knowledge.

(1) a. John-wa Mary-o/-*ga itoshiku omotta.
   John-TOP Mary-ACC/-NOM lovable thought
   ‘John considered Mary lovable (Koizumi 2002)/John longed for Mary.’

* I would like to thank Howard Lasnik, Mamoru Saito, Timothy J. Vance, and Hajime Hoji. I am also grateful to the organizers of the 2006 ICEAL conference for this excellent conference. I am also grateful to the conference participants and the editors of the working papers for their questions, insightful comments and suggestions.
b. John-wa Mary-o/-*ga kinodoku-ni omotta.
   John-TOP Mary-ACC/-NOM pity thought
   ‘John thought Mary (to be) pity/John felt sorry for Mary.’

b. John considers [SC Mary lovable/pitiful].

(3) John-wa [vP Mary-o [vP [v itoshiku ] [v omotta ] ] v ].

Under Koizumi’s (2002) analysis, to be discussed in Section 3, covert head movement (incorporation) of itoshiku to omotta allows the former to θ-mark John and Mary, thereby establishing a predication relation without forming a constituent. In this paper, the spirit of Koizumi’s (2002) analysis is adapted into what I believe is a simpler, and more descriptively adequate, analysis. Under the present analysis, the V-complex [itoshiku omotta] takes Mary as its direct object, and John as its subject, as to be elaborated in Section 2.

In what follows, we will refer to (i) the constructions in (1) as alleged small clause (ASC-) constructions, (ii) the “matrix subject” as DP-ga, (iii) the “subject DP of the small clause” as DP-o, and (iv) the “adjectival predicate” in (1b) as AD. This is to avoid theory-dependent terms. The constructions in (4) will be referred to as epistemic small clause (ESC-) constructions.

(4) a. John-wa Mary-o itoshii to omotta.
   John-TOP Mary-ACC lovable quote thought
   ‘John considered Mary to be lovable.’

b. John-wa Mary-o tensai da to omotta.
   John-TOP Mary-ACC genius copula quote thought
   ‘John thought Mary to be a genius.’

I will be assuming, without any supporting argument, that ESC-constructions involve a small clause (or, some untensed clausal complement) and the raising of subject to the matrix object (See Kitagawa 1986, Ohta 1997, Kawai 1998, 2003a, 2005a, 2006, Davies and Dubinsky 2004, but contra Kuno 1976, Hoji 1991, 2005).

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 outlines the present proposal; Section 3 discusses the problems of any small-clause analysis of ASC-construction in (1); Section 4 compares Koizumi’s (2002) analysis and the present proposal; Section 5 deals with some of the remaining challenges, and a brief concluding remark is given at the end of this paper.

2. Present proposal

This section presents a non-small clause analysis of ASC-constructions, schematically represented in (5).

---

1 The brackets in (2) show the thematic property, not the constituency; they ignore the raising of Mary to the matrix object (cf. Postal 1974, Kuno 1976, Lasnik and Saito 1991).
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(5) Subj-ga DP-o AD-omotta

(6) a. \([v \text{ itoshiku} [v \text{ omotta} ]]\)  
    b. \([vP \text{ Mary-o} [v \text{ itoshiku} [v \text{ omotta} ]]]\)  
    c. \([vP \text{ John-ga} [vP [vP \text{ Mary-o} [v \text{ itoshiku} [v \text{ omotta} ]]] v]]\)

Therein, vP is formed through the derivational steps in (6). First, AD and omou merge, forming a V-complex (6a); then, the AD-V complex merges with Mary, forming the VP (6b); and, finally, the VP merges with John, completing the vP structure (6c). To be concrete, let us adapt the following view of thematic relations:

(7) a. Thematic relations are established by external Merge (McGinnis 2005).

In (6c), the AD is not a predicate, but a V-modifying item; thus not having a direct thematic relation with the arguments of omotta. That is, itoshiku and omotta are jointly interpreted at the interface as a single semantic entity, perhaps not unlike a verb+particle complex in English or a preverb+verb complex in Hungarian (cf. Kenesei, Vago, and Fenyvesi 1998). The AD-V complex “Case-marks” — and “θ-marks” — the DP-o as its complement, not as the subject of AD. DP-o is interpreted as the Theme of itoshiku-omotta, and DP-ga “receives” the external θ-role from the AD-V complex. Specifically, omou is assumed as an experiencer-subject transitive verb, just as in fear, feel, find, like, remember. (Gruber 1965, Filmore 1968, Harley 1997, among others).

3. Problems with small clause analyses

This section presents four arguments against the small clause status of the DP-o AD sequence.

3.1. Morphological clue: ReNyoo-Kei (Adverbial Form)

Morphology gives us a clue on the categorical status of AD. Notice that AD is in either –ku or –ni form, which are traditionally referred to as reNyoo-kee (Adverbial Form), not in the predicate forms –i/–da, (shuushi-kee (Conclusive Form)). (Cf. Shibatani 1990, Takezawa 1993, among others).

    John-TOP the letter-ACC quickly/meticulously read
    ‘John read the letter quickly.’

---

2 Hoji (1991, 2005) puts forward a major-object analysis of ESC-constructions similar to what is defended here for ASC-constructions. (Hajime Hoji (personal communication) and J.-R. Hayashishita (personal communication)). On the other hand, I have argued elsewhere (1998, 2003a, 2005a) for a small-clause analysis of Japanese ESC-constructions. I will leave this matter open in this paper, since nothing crucially hinges upon it.
b. Mary-wa yasashiku, akarui hito da.
   Mary-TOP kind cheerful person is
   ‘Mary is a kind and cheerful person.’

c. Kyoo-wa samuku, ame-ga futte-iru.
   Today-TOP cold rain-nom falling-is
   ‘Today is cold, and it’s raining.’

d. Mary-wa teenee-de/-ni shinsetsu-na hito da.
   Mary-TOP meticulous-pred/-ni kind-particle person is
   ‘Mary is a kind and meticulous person.’

e. Kyoo-wa hare-de/-ni, atatakai.
   Today-TOP clear-pred/-ni warm
   ‘Today is clear/fine, and warm.’

(8) illustrates adverbial use of reNyoo-kee (8a), and non-adverbial use, as in conjoined adjectives (8b) and conjoined clauses (8c). However, under the contexts in (8b/c), adjectival nominals are marked with –de (8d/e), not –ni, thus morphologically distinct from the adverbial use (8a).

3.2. Prohibition against Nominal Predicates

ASC-constructions prohibit a nominal predicate (9a), even though ESC-constructions generally allow it, as seen in the English gloss of (9a).

(9)  a. *John-wa Mary-o riidaa-ni omotta.
   John-TOP Mary-ACC leader-DAT thought
   ‘John considered Mary the leader.’

   b. John-wa Mary-o kawaisoo-ni omotta.
   John-TOP Mary-ACC pity-dat thought
   ‘John felt pity on Mary.’

The ungrammaticality of the Japanese sentence in (9a) does not arise from morphological incompatibility of the Case-particle –ni with the construction. An adjectival nominal is allowed in this context (9b). The present analysis, on the other hand, explains the exclusion of nominal predicates. Even though they are morphologically compatible, pure nouns cannot be adverbially interpreted at the interface.

3.3. Restriction on Epistemic (B-type) Predicates

The matrix verb of the ASC-constructions is highly restricted. Typical epistemic predicates are unacceptable under the intended reading, as shown in (10b). This is not

---

3 Adjectival nominal is a class of adjectives consisting mostly of loan words without the internal morphology of Japanese adjectives.
expected, if ASC-constructions are parallel to ESC constructions (Postal 1974), as in (10a).

(10) a. John-wa Mary-o kawaii-to daNtee shita/minashita/shiNjita
     John-TOP Mary-ACC smart-QUOTE determined/regarded/believed
     ‘John determined/regarded/proved/believed Mary to be smart.’

b. # John-wa Mary-o kawaiku daNtee shita/minashita/shiNjita
     ‘John determined/regarded/believed Mary cutely.’

Under the present analysis, ASC-constructions are distinct from ESC constructions. The matrix predicates are restricted to a small number of experiencer-subject verbs, such as *omou*, that are semantically compatible. It is not clear to me what the relevant criterion for “semantic compatibility” is. Intuitively speaking, the interpretation of *omou* is less specific than those epistemic predicates in (10), which may be relevant. We will return to the question of ‘semantic compatibility’ later.

3.4. Sode’s (1999) Generalization

Forth, Sode (1999) observes that the AD in ASC-constructions must have two θ-roles: theme and experiencer. This is demonstrated in (11) and (12), which are adapted from Koizumi 2002 with minor modification; the grammaticality judgment is that of Koizumi’s.

(11) a. Taroo-ga Hanako-o natsukashiku/kawaiku/nikurashiku omotta.
     Taroo-NOM Hanako-ACC nostalgic/lovable/hateful think-past
     ‘Taroo considered Hanako nostalgic/lovable/hateful.’

b. Watashi-wa sono hito-ga natsukashii/kawaii/nikurashii.
     I-TOP that person-nom nostalgic/cute/hateful
     ‘That person is nostalgic (i.e., I miss the person) /cute/hateful.’

     Taroo-NOM Hanako-ACC great/strict/wise/persistent think-past
     ‘Taroo considered Hanako great/strict/wise/persistent.’

     I-DAT-TOP that person-nom great/strict/wise/persistent
     ‘That person is great/strict/wise/persistent.’

The predicates in (11a) all license two arguments, as demonstrated in (11b); the predicates in (12a), on the other hand, license only one argument, as demonstrated in (12b). In an ASC-sentence, the predicates in (11a) are allowed, whereas those in (12a) are excluded. Given this, Sode (1999) presents a generalization in (13), to be referred to as *Sode’s Generalization*.
(13) **Restriction on adjectival predicates in small clauses (SCs)**

Only two-place adjectives can occur in the SC complement structure

\[\text{[NP-ga NP-o Adj-ku omou]}\].

(13) does not follow from standard small clause analyses of ASC constructions; it must be stipulated. This is a further problem for the small-clause status of ASC-complements. Before proceeding further, it is worth making a note of Koizumi’s (2002: fn2) disclaimer: namely, “there are two groups of speakers, i.e., those who accept [(12a)] … and those who do not” and (13) is “applicable only to” the speakers of the latter type. I believe that this is a relevant fact, to be revisited in Section 3.5.

In order to maintain the core spirit of the small clause analysis, Sode (1999) offers an alternative where DP-o is accusative-marked by a transitive adjective. Koizumi (2002) points out that this alternative is problematic, however. Among others, there are no other instances of transitive adjectives in Japanese. Further, adds Koizumi, this proposal fails to predict the passivized ASC-constructions.

(14) **Subj1-ga [t1 Obj-o Adj\text{transitive }] omou.**

(15) a. Taroo-wa Hanako-o natsukashiku omotta.

\[\text{‘Taroo thought back to Hanako with nostalgia.’}\]

b. Hanako-ga Taroo-ni natsukashiku omow-are-ta.

\[\text{‘Hanako was thought back to with nostalgia by Taroo.’}\]

If the accusative Case is assigned by the transitive adjective, passivization of the matrix verb would not absorb the accusative Case. Therefore, Sode’s alternative is not tenable. Koizumi further demonstrates that without transitive adjectives, Sode’s Generalization (13) and the standard small clause analysis are incompatible. Being a two-place predicate, \text{itoshiku} forms a small clause with its two arguments before merging with \text{omou}. After the merger with \text{omou}, (27b), the external argument would be incorrectly accusative-marked by \text{omou}.\(^4\)

(16) a. \[\text{[sc John Mary itoshiku]}\]

b.* \[\text{[sc John-o Mary itoshiku]} \text{omou}\]

In short, if we accept Sode’s Generalization, then small clauses are incompatible with ASC-constructions. Naturally, this problem does not arise with the present analysis, since \text{itoshiku} does not individually establish θ-relations with \text{Mary} or \text{John}.

\(^4\) Koizumi’s argument rests upon the standard assumption that accusative Case (-o) marking of exceptional Case marking in Japanese is structural, say, via subject raising to object. Naturally, this argument loses its force, as J.-R. Hayashishita (personal communication) points out, if Japanese Case marking is done differently, as suggested, for example, by Kuroda (1965, 1978), Kuno (1973), and Ostler (1980).
3.5. Summary

In this section, we have seen the seriousness of the problems with small clause analyses of ASC-constructions. I believe that this is a sufficient reason to abandon the approach. Before moving onto non-small clause analyses, however, we investigate how Sode’s Generalization can be captured within the present proposal.

3.6. Experiencer and Sode’s Generalization in the Present Proposal

Let us further examine Sode’s Generalization (13). Recall that it is not fully accurate, as Koizumi (2002) reports in his footnote 2. According to Koizumi, there are two groups of Japanese speakers: those who allow one-place predicates for ASC-constructions and those who do not. This might suggest the existence of a parameter that divides the two groups: [± Sode’s Generalization], or the presence/absence of the principles behind this generalization. However, the fact is even more complicated. For example, my judgment on the examples in (12a) is as follows:

(17) a. Watashi-wa sono hito-o eraku/*kibishiku/*shitsukoku omotta.
    I-TOP that person-ACC great/strict/wise/persistent thought

b. Watashi-wa sono hito-ga *erai/*kibishii/*kashikoi/*shitsukoi.5
    I-TOP that person-ACC great/strict/wise/persistent

c. ?Watashi-wa sono haNketsu-o kibishiku omotta.
   I-TOP that verdict-ACC strict thought
   ‘I felt the verdict to be very harsh.’

Observe that the ADs in (17a) are all one-place predicates, as they fail to license two DPs, as shown in (17b). Nevertheless, in the ASC-context (17a), I found eraku perfect, and kibishiku and shitsukoku somewhat acceptable. In other words, whether an AD has one or two θ-roles does not play a critical role in my grammaticality judgment above. Given that many one-place predicates indeed yield bad results with ASC-constructions, (13) must have captured something correct; nevertheless, it cannot be strictly about the number of the arguments of an AD. I suggest, instead, that the distinguishing factor is whether or not the AD-omou complex yields an interpretation that is compatible with Experiencer reading of the predicate.

For example, returning to (17a), for me, eraku omou can be interpreted as respect, and, thus, the sentence is fine. With some effort, I can imagine sitsukoku omou as irritated or bothered by someone’s persistence, and kibishiku omou as feel something as harsh; thus they are marginally acceptable. It improves if the DP-o denotes something that can be harsh, as in (17c). On the other hand, kashikoku omou does not form any coherent interpretation, according to my judgment. What seems relevant is whether or not the predicate in question can acquire an interpretation involving an experiencer.

5 A number of participants at the ICEAL kindly informed me that their judgment of (17) and other examples in this paper is in accord with mine. At the same time, there appeared to be others who did not share my judgment. I have nothing interesting to say regarding this fact; some dialectal/idiolectal variations are observed among Japanese speakers.
place predicates have an overt experiencer role; therefore, the experiencer interpretation is given. Lacking the overt experiencer role, one-place predicates tend to be the description of substance, color, characteristics, among others, without psychological evaluation by the experiencer. Yet, speakers seem to be able to stretch the interpretation of some one-place predicates into something that can be “experienced” more readily than others. In other words, Sode (1999) is on the right track in noting the relevance of experiencer, but (13) fails because it refers strictly to the argument structure.

With color adjectives, I found it close to impossible to get an experiencer interpretation, whereas with degree-denoting adjectives (such as takai and nagai) I found it much easier. Thus, even with a single predicate, the difference in the interpretation affects the acceptability. Nagaku in (18a) refers to physical length, whereas that in (18b) does not.

(18) a. *? John-wa sono zubo-N-o nagaku omotta.
    John-TOP that pants-ACC long thought
    ‘(Intended) John thought the pants (to be) long.’

b. ?John-wa sono koogi-o nagaku omotta.
    John-TOP that lectura-ACC long thought
    ‘John felt/thought the lecture to be on the long side.’

To conclude, Sode’s Generalization (13) may be understood as an approximation of the restriction on the available predicates for ASC-constructions, and I suggest here that the key distinguishing factor is whether or not the interpretation of the AD-V complex is compatible with the experiencer role of its subject. The first approximation of the relevant generalization is given in (19).

(19) When combined, AD-omou must yield an experiencer interpretation.

This is far from a theory, given that we do not know how the semantic interpretation of each case arises at the interface. Yet, (19) is, I believe, not only a more descriptively adequate generalization, but also a more desirable way to capture the phenomenon, given the lack of robustness and consistency of grammaticality judgments among speakers.

3.7 Summary

In this section, we saw the problems with small clause analyses of ASC constructions, and how the present analysis provides an adequate solution to those problems.

---

6 Lexical semantics is notorious in this regard, as illustrated by Chomsky (1996) with swim and submarines. See also Pustejovsky 1995 and Pustejovsky and Boguraev 1996.
4. Non-Small Clause Analysis

4.1. Covert AD-V Incorporation

The present study greatly owes itself to Koizumi’s (2002) work on ASC-constructions, especially to his insight into the alternative configuration, repeated in (20).

\[(20)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{a. } [v \text{ itoshiku } [v \text{ omotta } ]] \\
&\text{b. } [vP \text{ Mary-o } [v \text{ itoshiku } [v \text{ omotta } ]] ] \\
&\text{c. } [vP \text{ John-ga } [vP [vP \text{ Mary-o } [v \text{ itoshiku } [v \text{ omotta } ]] ] v ] ] \\
\end{align*}
\]

Although a small clause with a two-place adjectival predicate is not physically present in (20c), Koizumi (2002) attempts to maintain the spirit of small clause analysis and Sode’s Generalization (13). Specifically, according to Koizumi,

\[\cdots\text{ the verb } \text{omou} \text{ assigns its external } \theta\text{-role to the subject } [\text{John}], \text{ and its internal } \theta\text{-role to the adjectival predicate } \cdots\text{ In addition, it assigns } [a]\text{ccusative Case to } [\text{Mary}]. \text{ The adjectival predicate undergoes covert head movement (incorporation) to the matrix verb in order to assign one of its } \theta\text{-roles to } [\text{Mary}]. \text{ The adjectival predicate then moves to the light verb, and assigns the other } \theta\text{-role to } [\text{John}]. \text{ The subject } [\text{John}] \text{ therefore receives two } \theta\text{-roles from different predicates. This, I suggest, is a way to establish a control relation… (Koizumi 2002: 11).} \]

In other words, Koizumi’s proposal creates a small clause via \(\theta\)-relations without physically forming one. Some details in Koizumi’s analysis are not very clear, however. For example, it is not clear why the theme role of \(\text{omou}\) is assigned to an adjective, which is presumably not its argument; if external merge is motivated in part by \(\theta\)-consideration (Chomsky 2000 and McGinnis 2005), then Mary would not merge with \(\text{omou}\), but with AD. Also unclear is why covert raising of AD to \(\text{omou}\) occurs. I will leave these questions open, since my proposal sidesteps them.

4.2. Lack of Predication Relation between DP-o and AD

In this subsection, I argue that DP-o is not predicated of AD. If this is indeed the case, then Koizumi’s analysis can be simplified. Consider (1a), again, repeated below.

\[(1)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{a. } \text{John-wa Mary-o kawaiku omou.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Precisely speaking, (1a) does not express Mary’s attributes, but John’s feeling toward (or evaluation of) Mary (cf. Morita 1977). (1a) is not a statement about Mary being lovable, but how John sees Mary. Strictly speaking, the interpretation of (1a) is not (21a) but (21b); (1a) can be true even if Mary is not actually pretty. Thus, (22a) reflects the interpretation of (1a) better than (22b).

\[(21)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{a. } \text{John thinks of Mary=x such that x is lovable. } (\neq (1a)) \\
&\text{b. } \text{John [lovable-thinks] Mary. } (\approx (1a)) \\
\end{align*}
\]
(22)  a. John adored/fondly thought of Mary.
    b. John considered Mary lovable.

(23)  John-ga Mary-o natsukashiku omotta.
      ‘John thought back to Mary with nostalgia.’

While this is a subtle point, I believe that the difference is real. Koizumi’s (2002) gloss of (23) (his (21a) with minor modification) reflects this point precisely. The gloss clearly indicates that *nostalgia* is about how John thinks, rather than what *Mary* is like.

In short, DP-o is not predicated of AD. The sentences in (24) demonstrate the same point.

      ‘John didn’t think favorably of the new professor.’

  b. John-wa atarashii kyooju-o ii to omowa-nak-atta.
      ‘John didn’t consider the new professor (to be) good.’

The interpretation of (24a) is distinct from that of (24b), an ESC-sentence. (24a) is non-contradictory even if John thinks that the new professor is actually good; it suffices as long as John does not like the professor. In other words, (24a) does not express John’s opinion about the quality of the professor, indicating the impossibility of predication between DP-o and AD. This markedly contrasts with (24b), where DP-o is clearly predicated of AD. The interpretation of (24b) would be contradictory, if John thinks that the professor is indeed good.

In short, in ASC-constructions DP-o and AD do not hold a predication relation; in other words, AD does not θ-mark DP-o. If so, *omou* must be the one that does, as in the present proposal. This derives, for free, the effect of covert head-movement proposed in Koizumi’s (2002) analysis.

4.3. Summary

In this paper, I have argued ASC-constructions are not a version of small clause constructions; rather, they involve the configuration in (3) with an experiencer subject and theme object of AD-*omou*. The AD-V complex is compositionally interpreted at the interface. Under the present analysis, a number of characteristics of ASC-constructions can be naturally derived. For example, the morphological characteristic of AD follows immediately, because they are a v-level adjunct. Also, the interpretation of the predicates arises from the AD-V complex, not from the V itself, thereby excluding a number of epistemic (B-type) predicates. Further, the present study has demonstrated that DP-o is not predicated of AD; thus, covert AD raising to *omou* is unnecessary. Thus, the present study greatly simplifies Koizumi’s (2002) analysis while maintaining his original insight.
5. Remaining Challenges

In the remaining section, we will consider problems associated with the scrambling facts and *feel*-type ASC-construction (Fukumitsu 2002, Koizumi 2002, among others), and inalienable possession.

5.1. Scrambling


   John- NOM Mary-ACC hateful thought
   ‘John hatefully thought of Mary/John loathed Mary’

b. * John-ga nikurashiku Mary-o omotta.

c. * Nikurashiku John-ga Mary-o omotta.

(26) a. John-ga suguni Mary-o nikurashiku omotta.
   John-NOM immediately Mary-ACC hateful thought
   ‘Immediately, John hatefully thought of Mary.’

b. John-ga Mary-o suguni nikurashiku omotta.

c. * John-ga Mary-o nikurashiku suguni omotta.

(25) and (26) show that AD may not be separated from *omotta* by an argument or adverb. Koizumi (2002) takes this range of fact as the supporting evidence for his covert head raising; AD cannot covertly raise to V, if it has been short-distance scrambled out of the position. For the present analysis, this restriction is also immediate. The configuration at the interface is directly responsible for the interpretation of the AD-V complex. Without the required adjacency, AD will be interpreted as a vP adverb, which is semantically incompatible.

There are potentially problematic cases given by Fukumitsu (2002) and Koizumi (2002). For example, (27a) is considered by Koizumi (2002) as perfect.


b. [VP Mary-o [ nikurasiku t₁ ] ]₂ [ John-ga t₂ ] omotta₁

This sentence, if indeed good, is problematic for any non-small clause analysis, including the present analysis, as well as Koizumi’s own, because DP-o and AD appear to be moved together, as if they form a constituent. Koizumi (2002) suggests that in (27a) *omotta* actually raises to the light v before the movement of the remnant VP (27b), thereby allowing DP-o and AD to be a part of a non-small clause constituent.⁷ This

⁷ Suppose this is correct. Then, within Koizumi’s (2002) analysis it is not clear how the covert raising of
account works for the present analysis, as well. Yet, my intuition diverges from that of Koizumi’s; for me, (27a) is quite marginal, although it is certainly better than (25b/c) and (26c). Thus, I do not see any compelling reason to treat (27a) as acceptable. Naturally, more data must be collected, perhaps using corpus data.

Even if we were to accept this sentence, there is a reason to suspect that DP-o and AD do not form a constituent, judging from the prosody. For me, DP-o and AD are not pronounced together; rather, a pause after DP-o and a raising (Focus) intonation on AD is necessary.

(28)  
   b. Mary-o <pause> NIKURASHIKU John-ga omotta.  
   c. [Topic Mary1-o [Focus nikurashiku2 ] [IP John-ga t1 [ t2 omotta ] ] ]

If my intuition is correct, then, (27a) may involve more than a short-distance scrambling of the remnant VP to the nearest landing site – presumably IP. Rather, it may be something like (i) nikurashiku moving to the Focus Field, receiving the contrastive focus intonation at PF and the relevant interpretation at the interface, and (ii) Mary-o, to the sentence initial Topic (presupposition) Field. (See Chomsky 1965, 2005, Lasnik and Saito 1985, Horvath 1986, É. Kiss 1987, Rizzi 1997, Bayer 2002, Kawai 2003b, 2005b, Borzdyko 2004, among others on interactions between clausal left-periphery and Topicalization/Focalization).

If this is essentially correct, then (i) the DP-o and AD do not form constituent, and (ii) the Focus movement, being long movement (Saito 1985, 1989), can reconstruct, yielding the desired AD-omotta complex at the relevant Interface. If, on the other hand, Koizumi is indeed correct in that Mary-o and AD are scrambled together, I am left with no option but adapting Koizumi’s (2002) remnant VP movement analysis.

5.2. Feel-type ASC-constructions

Koizumi (2002) claims that unlike ASC-sentences with omou, feel can take either one- or two-place AD. This appears to be confirmed by the data in (29).

(29)  
      John-TOP Mary-ACC great/persistent/rigorous felt  
      ‘John felt Mary (to be) great’
   b. John-wa Mary-o natskashiku kaNjita.  
      John-TOP Mary-ACC nostalgic felt  
      ‘John felt Mary (to be dear).’ (The gloss from Koizumi 2002)

      John-NOM that traffic light-GEN color-acc blue felt  
      ‘John felt that traffic light blue.’

AD to omotta (i.e., the AD-V incorporation) can take place under the configuration. Under the present analysis, AD must somehow be seen adjacent to V at the interface.
However, the situation is messier. The sentences in (29) are not the examples that Koizumi gives; rather, he gives (30), which is substantially worse than those in (29) for me as well as for those who I consulted with. It seems that the badness arises from the problem of interpretation. Namely, kaNJiru denotes some feeling or emotion, invoked through non-direct perceptual channels. Colors are not of this kind, since they are perceived through direct visual perception.

Likewise, (31a), which is acceptable to Koizumi, is marginal at best for me.

\[(31)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{?? John-wa Mary-o kawaiku kaNJita.}^8 & \text{//Transitive} \\
& \quad \text{John-TOP Mary-ACC lovable felt} \\
& \quad \text{‘John felt that Mary is lovable’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{Mary-wa (sono doresu-o kite) kawaiku kaNJita.} & \text{//Intransitive} \\
& \quad \text{Mary-TOP (the dress-acc wearing) lovable felt} \\
& \quad \text{‘Mary felt being cute in that dress.’}
\end{align*}\]

I cannot obtain the interpretation of kawaiku kaNJita, presumably because cuteness does not invoke immediate emotion. I can marginally accept (31a) by taking kaNJita as a weaker version of omou. In other words, “lovable-ness” is something to be recognized, not “felt.” Incidentally, kawaiku-kaNJita is quite acceptable, when used intransitively, as in (31b).

I do not have an analysis of this range of phenomena. However, it seems clear that the issue is not merely the number of θ-roles that an AD has; rather, whether or not each AD-V combination yields a plausible interpretation, a question falling into lexical semantics, but outside the narrow syntax.

5.3. Inalienable Possession

Mamoru Saito (personal communication) points out that the present analysis cannot derive (32b).

\[(32)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{John-wa Mary-no yokogao-o kawaiku omotta.} \\
& \quad \text{John-TOP Mary-GEN profile-acc lovable thought} \\
& \quad \text{‘John consider Mary’s profile lovable.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{John-wa Mary-o yokogao-ga kawaiku omotta.} \\
& \quad \text{John-TOP Mary-ACC profile-acc lovable thought} \\
& \quad \text{‘John consider Mary’s profile lovable.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[(33)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Mary-no yokogao-ga kawaii.} \\
& \quad \text{Mary-GEN profile-nom lovable} \\
& \quad \text{‘Mary’s profile is lovable/Mary has a lovable profile.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[8\] Brief internet search on kawaiku kaNJiru/kaNJita did not yield a single prose example, but I did find one entry in the lyrics of Boyfriend by Miki Fujimoto: www.miki.hellominna.com/lyrics/boyfriend.html.
b. Mary-ga yokogao-ga kawaii.
   Mary-NOM profile-NOM lovable
   ‘Mary’s profile is lovable/Mary has a lovable profile.’

In Japanese, inalienable possessors can be either genitive- or nominative-marked, as in (33a) and (33b), respectively. Under the present analysis, (33a) is expected to be acceptable, and (32b), to be ungrammatical since yokogao-ga cannot be nominative-marked. If (32b) is indeed acceptable, as it appears to be for some participants at the coreference, then it must involve a small clause from which the possessor is raised. This can be a serious problem for the present analysis, as Saito correctly points out. Personally, however, I found (32b) quite degraded, just as some participants did. I believe that my judgment is consistent, as the a-sentences in (34)-(36) are all degraded for me.

(34) a. *? John-wa Mary-o utagoe-ga subarashiku omotta.
    John-TOP Mary-ACC singing-voice-NOM wonderful thought
    ‘John regarded highly of Mary’s singing.’

b. John-wa Mary-no utagoe-o subarashiku omotta.
    John-TOP Mary-GEN singing-voice-ACC wonderful thought
    ‘John regarded highly of Mary’s singing.’

c. Mary-ga utagoe-ga subarashii (koto).
    Mary-NOM singing-voice-NOM wonderful (that)
    ‘(that) Mary has a great singing voice.

(35) a. *? John-wa Mary-o hanashikata-ga uttooshiku omotta.
    John-TOP Mary-ACC manner of speech-nom annoying thought
    ‘John was annoyed by the way Mary talks.’

b. John-wa Mary-no hanashikata-o uttooshiku omotta.
    John-TOP Mary-GEN manner of speech-ACC annoying thought
    ‘John was annoyed by the way Mary talks.’

c. Mary-ga hanashikata-ga uttooshii (koto).
    Mary-NOM manner of speech-NOM annoying
    ‘(that) Mary is an annoying talker.’

(36) a. *? John-wa Mary-o saite N-kujoN-ga kibishiku omotta.
    John-TOP Mary-ACC grade-standard-NOM strict thought
    ‘John thought Mary’s grade-standard tough.’

---

9 In fact, (32b) would be a problem even for a standard small clause analysis, since the nominative Case is not available within the alleged small clause, as seen in (1a/b). One might posit some sort of default nominative Case within a small clause for (32b), an option unavailable for the present proposal.
b. John-wa Mary-no saiteN-kijuN-o kibishiku omotta.
   John-NOM Mary-GEN grade-standard-ACC strict thought
   ‘John thought Mary’s grade-standard tough.’

c. Mary-ga saiteN-kijuN-ga kibishii (koto).
   Mary-NOM grade-standard-NOM strict (that)
   ‘(that) Mary has a tough grade-standard.’

At the same time, I suspect that some Japanese native speakers would accept all
the a-sentences in (34)-(36). For this reason, I cannot draw any conclusion with certainty
at this point; I need to collect a larger set of data before tackling this question.

6. Conclusion

This paper argued that ASC-constructions involve an ADV-V complex directly
taking DP-o as its argument, not a small clause complement with a raised subject. The
present analysis shares the configuration proposed by Koizumi (2002), but differs from
his analysis in that no predication is held between DP-o and ADV. The present analysis,
if correct, opens up a number of questions, in particular, how to treat v-level adjuncts and
their thematic roles (cf. Chomsky 2004). Finally, as was discussed above, there appears
to be a rather significant variation in grammaticality judgment among Japanese speakers;
the next step in this research must include the identification of idiolectal/dialectal
variations regarding ASC-constructions.

References

Bayer, Joseph. 2002. “Decomposing the left periphery.” The Israel Association for Theoretical Linguistics,
18, 1–24.


Chomsky, Noam. 1996. “Language and thoughts: Some reflections on venerable themes.” In Power and

Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.


Papers in Linguistics 41. M. Cuervo (ed.), pp. 251–266.


relations.” In The View from Building 20, Ken Hale and Samuel J. Keyser (eds.), pp.53–109.
Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.


