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COMPLEMENTSIZER DROP AND IN COMPLEMENTATION IN JAPANESE

Mitsuo Sakoda
Tokyo University

Abstract: This paper focuses on the complementation structure of Japanese sentences, using the Complementizer Drop and Complement Argument drop phenomena. The main point of this paper is to introduce the theory of a compositional approach to Japanese complementation. The Complementizer Drop (or "CC drop") phenomenon can be explained in terms of a compositional approach, which is the key issue in this paper. There are several lines of evidence to support this hypothesis. First, the fact that the complementizer drops under all conditions is a strong back-up for the hypothesis. Second, the fact that the Complementizer Drop (CC drop) is found in all Japanese dialects is another strong back-up. Finally, the fact that the Complementizer Drop (CC drop) is found in all Japanese dialects is another strong back-up. This paper concludes with a discussion of the implications of these findings for the study of Japanese complementation.

1 Introduction

In Standard Japanese, the presence of a complementizer can be inferred in an embedded clause, as illustrated in (1).

(1) Mary-ko John-wo *gakko-ni itta (koto)
    Mary-ga John-ko gakk-reni i-te (koto)
    *The fact that Mary said to John that he would go to school.

However, Saito (2006) points out that the existence of a complementizer can appear without an overt complementizer. This phenomenon is called "Complementizer Drop" (or "CC drop") in this paper. The following examples are from the Kobe Dialect, where a rather than to move as a complementizer (Saito 1994, 412, note 8).

(2) a. Mary-ko John-wo *gakko-ni yas-iti (koto)
    Mary-ko John-ko gak-keni yas-iti (koto)
    *The fact that Mary said to John that he would go to school.

b. Mary-ko John-ko *gaku-ko yas-iti (koto)
    Mary-ga John-ko gaku-ga n-a yas-iti (koto)

Saito (2006) also notes that the CC complements are not adjacent to the matrix verb. Complement Drop (CC drop) is allowed, and suggests that the adjacency requirement can be avoided in terms of the Empty Complement Principle (ECP).
In this paper, we argue against the ECP approach and propose a different, but more general analysis to explain how relevant linguistic phenomena are derived.

This paper is organized in the following way. In section 2, we give a critical review of the ECP approach to Comp Drop, originally suggested by Stowell (1981) and later adapted to a wider dialect of Japanese by Saito (1984). In section 3, we suggest that the complement clause without Comp is not CP but a smaller category like IP. In section 4, we propose that when the complementizer is missing, the embedded verb moves out of the complement clause along with top and adjoints to the matrix verb. Consequently, Comp Drop can be explained without recourse to the ECP. In section 5, we summarize the discussion.

2. ECP Approach

Under the government and binding theory of generative grammar, Stowell (1981) argues that when the complementizer of the English complement clause is missing, there is an empty category (EC) in the Comp position. This EC is required to satisfy the ECP, although it is not a true left boundary by movement. We should note here that ECP and ECP share the same structural configuration: i.e., both have the projection of Comp.

5. a. We believe that she is honest.
   b. We [believe [IF [that] she is honest]]

6. a. We believe she is honest.
   b. We [believe [IF [she is honest]]]

Saito (1984) argues that Stowell's (1981) proposal can be extended to the Japanese dialect of Japanese. Thus, when the complementizer is missing, an EC occupies the Comp position, as shown in (7b).


Since this EC is a commanded ad, therefore, properly governed by the matrix verb you say, the ECP is satisfied, and hence Comp Drop is allowed.

It is naturally predicted that if the complement clause is outside of a governed position, the contraction should be ill-formed because the EC in the Comp position is not properly governed. This prediction is borne out by the impossibility of (8b), where the scrambled complement clause is not commanded by the matrix verb.
Although this approach appears to be convincing to the extent that it can account for the examples given above, the following issues arise. First, if we assume that the ECP applies in LF, we are led to posit that it applies in the CP-internal Spec-TP position. In a hierarchical theory of syntactic structure, if it applies to the CP, the ECP should not interfere with the VP-internal Spec-TP position. However, if it applies to the Spec-TP position, it will interfere with the VP-internal Spec-TP position. Therefore, the ECP does not provide a clear account.

Secondly, the ECP approach does not provide us with a fully satisfactory account for the linguistic fact observed in the dialect spoken in the Hikigawa Prefecture of the Chugoku district. Comp Div is referred to as an "Ecote (E. missing)" by traditional Japanese grammarians, who point out that it is typically observed in the Hikigawa dialect (see Shibata, 1968, d.c). According to these investigations, in contrast to (b), (b) is acceptable in the Hikigawa dialect. Therefore, a consideration of the Spec-TP position in the Kobé Dialect does not apply to the Hikigawa dialect.

(b) a. Omote senzei (Toro-ga musuko de) you teacher to Toro's son said
and don't you
"Did you say "Toro is stupid!" to the teacher, didn't you?"
"Yes. But, Kanji was a senior in Toro's son's class, so he's not stupid."
b. Omote [Toro-ga musuko de] senior to you Toro's son said
and don't you
"Did you say "Toro is stupid!" to the teacher, didn't you?"
Since the ECP is expected to trigger constructions like (b) in the CP, the well-formedness of (b) is not predictable under the ECP approach.

Thirdly, Sales (1992) as well as Snow (1991) assumes that the ECP takes care of non-typed ECs like an EC on the Spec-TP position as well as those left behind by movement. In other words, the ECP is supposed to deal with both heterogeneous types of EC. A conceptually new predicative situation is that the ECP deals with one type of EC, and that the distribution of the other is independently determined by other principles of grammar so that it simply does not exist. We will argue that this situation can be obtained under the hypothesis that constructions like (b) do not involve an empty complement.  

3. IP Complement Hypothesis
Prepositional phrases introduce the complement clause, and lacks a complement in IP as well as CP (the phrase, the word, or the position, the word, and hence in the phrase, in the phrase and hence in the phrase).
(9) Mary ga John ni "(y) pro Kobi ni liki yan-a (koro)

Let us first examine the distribution of sentence final particles such as yan-a of the Kobe Dialect and a yo of the Hiroshima Dialect. Since these clinical data are not given in (8), it seems plausible to assume that they follow IP. Thus, they occupy the position outside of the IP projection.°

(10) a. Kobe Dialect:
    Omue koppa menda sate\?
you cup broke pet

    You broke the cup, didn’t you?

b. Hiroshima Dialect:
    Taro-ga ano bon mamban d’yo.
    T-vern blue book stole pet
    "Taro stole that book."

Interestingly enough, when the sentences in (10) are embedded, the constructions sound odd to the speakers, as in the following (a)-sentences show, where the complementizer does not show up.

(11) Kobe Dialect:
    a. Omue ga Omue ga [omue ga koppa menda sate\?]
       brother-mon you-mon cup broke pet
       you\?
your brother was saying "you?

    b. Omue ga [omue ga koppa menda sate\?]
       you-mon cup broke pet

    c. [omue ga koppa menda sate\?]
       you\?
       your brother was saying the cup broke

(12) Hiroshima Dialect:
    a. Taro-ga Taro-ga [ano bon mamban d’yo]
       T-vern blue book stole pet

    b. [Taro-ga ano bon mamban]
       T-vern blue book stole

    c. [ano bon mamban]
       T-vern blue book stole

    d. [Taro-ga]
       T-vern blue book stole

    e. [an\?-\?] bon mamban
       don’t you blue book

    "You said ‘Taro stole the book, didn’t you’?"

This fact can be taken as indicating that the complement or embedded clause in (11) and (12) do not have a place for a particle that takes in (10) have. In other words, the complement clauses without a complementizer do not constitute CP but a smallest prospection like IP.

Secondly, we can obtain a conceptually interesting result if the complement clause that has no complementizer is not CP. Under this assumption, such a
component clause links to Cong position. It follows that the ECP, which is
referred to as such a construction, does not have to take care of non-time ECs,
and that it applies only to them.

Assuming an IP complement hypothesis, we must provide an alternative
account for Cong Drug, that does not point to the ECP. This line of inquiry is
consistent with the general stance of the Minimalism Program proposed by
Chomsky (1995). This program advances the claim that there is a bridge between
and principles of economy valued one over a crucial role.

Economy of Representation. Let us consider the IP complement hypoth-
esis in light of the Minimalist framework. In line with the program, NOV-ED
(1997, 23), applying Law’s (1991, 125) original proposal, suggests a principle
of economy of representation called the Minimal Surface Principle (MSP-)
(13) Minimal Surface Principle

Permitted the lexical requirements of relevant elements are satisfied.
If no representations have the long-transport structure and serve the
same function, then the representation that has fewer projections is to
be chosen in the syntactic optimization among those factors.

In the present situation, there are two possible candidates for the comple-
ment clause in (2b), i.e., it is either CP with [Th] or IP with [PI]. Since both
are functioning as a complement clause and IP has fewer projections than CP,
the MSP predicts IP structure shown in (14) for the complement clause in
(2b).

Methodology of Cong Drug. We should note here that taking an IP comple-
ment is a special or marked property of the verbs in question. According to
Chomsky (1986, 67), if a verb requires a theta role of proposition, it is lacking
a theta. That is, the minimal structural realization of CR is a theta role of
proposition is supposed to be a theta category like CP. To make sure that the
CIR of a theta role of proposition in (2b) is not a theta role of proposition
than CP, I argue for requirements (14).

(14) Requirements on the CSR of a Theta Role

The CSR of a theta role must be the empty type-defined category
among the possible categories for the theta role.

(15) a. In the unordered case, the CSR of a theta role of proposition is

b. In the ranked case, the CSR of a theta role of proposition is

According to Minna (1977) and many investigations, the verbs taking an IP
complement in the Soter and Oglala Dakota are divided into two "say" and "told-
think." It is therefore natural to expect that the phonetic or structural
property of these verbs is learned by means of "positive evidence" available to learners. This accords the fact that Comp Drop is observable at the facing area of a sentence where such evidence is to be found.

We should note here that the Kuno and Onaka Dialects allow two options with respect to the categorial status of the complement clauses i.e. either CP or IP. This is because the verbs in question are either complement clauses (see (2a) or Comp Drop complement clauses (see (2b) or (2c)). Thus, according to (4) and (5), a CP complement is regarded as the marked option, while as an IP complement is the unmarked option.

(16) Kuno and Onaka Dialects:
- A CP complement clause is an unmarked or unanalysed structural realization of a theta role of the complement
- An IP complement clause is a marked or non-canonical structural realization of a theta role of the complement.

In the Hida Dialects, on the other hand, no complementation manifestation to the complement clauses is adopted by the verbs like case and never. Thus, the Hida Dialects allow only one option with respect to the categorial status of the complement clause, i.e., IP. It is therefore plausible to assume that the complement clause within a complementizer is an unmarked realization of a theta role of the complement.

(17) Hida Dialects:
An IP complement clause is an unmarked or unanalysed structural realization of a theta role of the complement.

4 Head-Raising Approach

Licensing Condition on Non-canonical Structural Realizations: In order to provide an explanation for the mechanism of Comp Drop, we would like to adopt the following assumptions, along with the IP complement hypothesis, as our approach, we shall assume that at some stage of derivation the head of a marked structural realization must be licensed through a head-head relation within a clause that advertises it. In the present context, this licensing condition requires that the head of an IP complement clause, i.e., left-free and adjacent to the matrix verb.

(18) Licensing Condition on Non-canonical Structural Realization:
The head of a non-canonical (or marked) structural realization must be licensed through a head-head relation within a clause that advertises it.

In the spirit of the following examples (15a), (15b) and (15c) (Ishiga 1991), we will assume that a verb overtly moves out of VP, irrespective of whether it is a matrix verb or an embedded verb.

A contextual analysis of the above hypotheses, we are led to conclude that in case where Comp Drop takes place, the unmarked verb overtly moves out of

44
VP and articles in half and then the V-final combinations overtly agree and adjoin to the matrix verb.

Let us illustrate the relevant derivation for (20) by means of the following schematic representation:

(19) a. (V | nph – lv – lv – lv – V) (V | half) (V | C)
   b. (V | nph – lv – lv – lv – (V | half) (V | half)) C
   c. (V | nph – lv – lv – lv – (V | half) (V | half) (V | C))

The embedded verb, originally located in the V head position [nph | 19b|], moves out of VP and adjoin to half [19a|]. Relevant figures are checked at this point. Then V-final raises and adjoin to the matrix verb [19c|]. The matrix verb half is now in a head-final relation.

Adjacency Requirement: Let us now consider the impossibility of Comp Drop to (20) in the Kobe Debate, i.e., the adjacency requirement on Comp Drop. Given the absence of V-final scrambling (see Nagayama 1997), the presence of an IP complement means that the dominated argument is strongly required to be in a position higher than the verb. Thus, when V-final moves out of an IP complement and adjoins to the matrix verb, this move cannot be licensed since it is a constituent, as shown in (20). Thus, this movement results in a lowering violation, which is generally prohibited under any current version of syntactic theory.

(20) a. Mary give to Kobe of [ ] John of the see [ ] to
   b. Mary give to Kobe of [ ] John of [ ] see [ ] (20a).

This raises the claim that the licensing condition stated in (10) does not require V-extrafinality. Therefore, the combination is ill-formed.

Thus, why is (20a) of the Hoshioka Debate acceptable? To put it differently, why does the Hoshioka Debate fail to show the adjacency requirement explicitly? As described in (20b), an IP complement is a lexical or nonlexical constituent in the decisive, and hence the head of such a constituent must be lower than the matrix verb. That is, the licensing condition on non-constitu- tential non-constituent realizations, i.e., (11a), does not apply here. Therefore, the head of an IP complement does not move but it stays in situ, allowing the lowering operation. It follows that no violations of the ECP or the Prop Cancellation Condition occur (see note 6). The problematic acceptability of (20a) for the ECP approach is now assumed under our spell-out.

Complex Heads. Our next task is to show that when Comp Drop takes place, the embedded verb does not agree in the complement position, and that the matrix verb and the embedded verb span a constituent or constitute a clause adjunction structure with half (see 19c). There are two pieces of evidence to support the above:
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First, it is impossible to place a short phonetic break or pause, indicated as "#" in (21), between the complementizer and the matrix verb and the matrix verb "say" in the Osaka and Kobe Dialects. (3)

(3) Mary go the # say in (koto)
Mary go the koto
Mary in (koto)
(3a) The fact that Mary told that she would go

This fact can be accounted for using the natural assumption that such a break can be put at a clausal or, more generally, a phrasal boundary. Thus, (21) suggests that there is no such boundary between the matrix verb and the CP-complement clause.

Within the head-movement approach and VP complement hypothesis where the complementizer is missing, there is no clausal boundary between the embedded verb and the matrix verb (see (19b)). Thus, inserting such a short phonetic break between the two verbs would result in unacceptable. The validity of this prediction can be confirmed by (22).

(22) Mary go the # say in (koto)

On the other hand, the In approach wrongly predicts that this should always be possible to insert such a break between the two verbs, because the structural configuration of (22) (and (12a)) is different from that of (19) (and (19b)).

Another argument that supports the gap proposal comes from adverb interpretation. That, in fact, takes up the same status as the Osaka and Kobe Dialects. When there is a complementizer as in (23), the adverb "again" only modifies the main verb and the "go". Then (23), which has the interpretation shown in (24a), is ungrammatical. This suggests that (23) does not have the interpretation shown in (24b), where the adverb modifies the matrix verb rather than the embedded verb.

(23) Mary go the # say in (koto)

(24a) A. My aunt says, "that she will again go to Shizuoka"
B. My aunt again says, "that she will go to Shizuoka"

A descriptive generalization that accounts for the fact just noted is that "a clausal boundary imposed by the presence of a complementizer blocks the free-phrase association between the adverb and the verb that is located outside of the complement clause.

However, interestingly when Compl Del makes place, as illustrated in (24b), the verb "go" again" can be associated with either the embedded verb or the matrix verb. Thus, (25) ambiguously means either (24a) or (24b).

(25) Mary go the # say in (koto)
This factagain suggests that there is no close semantic boundary between the adverb and the two verbs. To accommodate this fact, we can assume that in some stage of derivation, (25) has the following structure, where the embedded verb moves out of the IP-complement chain and adheres to the matrix verb along with 'all' (see also [19a-c]). Thus, the adverb can modify either of the two verbs.

(26) [cef ilp... -few... -fp... -1 Adv V-Inf VI... -1]

Again, the difference between (23) and (25) with respect to adverb interpretation cannot be captured by the ECP approach, which assigns the same structural configuration to both constructions.

It is interesting to note that the Hiyoshina Dialect differs from the Osaka and Kobe Dialects with regard to the ambiguity of adverb interpretation. In the Hiyoshina Dialect, the adverb in the complement modifies the embedded verb rather than the matrix verb. Thus, (27b) is unambiguous and the interpretation is straightforward.

(27) a. Kyō kara yasut. today start said
'Someone else said they would come today'

b. Kyō kara hiru yasut. today again start said
'Someone else said they would come again today'

Within our analysis, the embedded verb is assumed to stay in situ in the complement chain. Thus, it is natural that the adverb is associated only with the embedded verb. The difference in adverb interpretation between the two dialects is no way surprising at all under our proposal.

5 Summary

To recapitulate our discussion, assuming the IP-complement hypothesis, we gave systematic account for Comp-Drop in terms of the head-moving analysis without recourse to any ECP. The difference in the possibility of Comp-drop between dialects can be accounted for under a theory of movement. Specifically, the IP-complement is not optional in the Osaka and Kobe Dialects, and hence the embedded V-Inf moves up to the matrix verb in situ, the Comp-Drop condition on non-canonical non-final elements. On the other hand, in the Hiyoshina Dialect, the IP-complement is an optional option, so that the embedded V-Inf does not have to move up to the matrix verb to satisfy the condition.
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1 It is generally assumed that so is a complementizer, the head of TP, in Japa-
nese. Kaplan (1990) summarizes previous arguments for the existence of a

complementizer in Japanese. Shibatani (1978) calls it a “gattō marker.” It

serves as a complementizer in some of the western dialects of Japanese.

2 It is also called “Complementizer Deletion.” However, we avoid the term

“deletion” because, as we will show in the course of discussion, we argue this

phenomenon to be irrelevant to such an operation.

3 According to Maki (1994, 131) and my investigations, Divei-Drop can be

observed in other dialects of West Japan. In this paper, we deal with dialects

spoken in Hiroshima, Kobe and Osaka. As we will demonstrate below, the

former differs from the latter two in linguistically interesting ways. It is inter-

esting to note that even in the colloquial speech of Standard Japanese, it is a

phonological variant of to, as used as a complementizer, but it cannot be

(reversed).

4) Maki (1994: 131) [Kobe in the “top”] 

Matsa: “Yōga wa to iro no de.” Comp said

Matsa: “Hyōka de.” she would go to Kobe.

My investigations, which are based on interviews with native speakers and
data from my research, were conducted in the Osaka and Hiroshima Pro-

vinces in 1997 and 1998. The findings are summarized in Fukuda (1997) and

Fukuda (2000). It goes without saying that more comprehensive research is

necessary.

5) Saito (1984) defines government in terms of co-occurrence. For cognitive

purposes, we will assume the following definition of proper government.

(i) X properly governs Y if and only if (a) X is a lexical category

governing Y (i.e., lexical government); or (b) X commands Y and

there is no barrier intervening X and Y (i.e., antecedent govern-

ment).

Recently, under the Minimalist Program (see Chomsky 1995), lexical

government is no longer assumed, and antecedent government is incorporated

into the program in a slightly different form (see Chomsky and Lasnik 1993).
Lee (1993).

5 If we define government in terms of a constituent in Chomsky (1995b) does the IC in Comp properly project to (3b). Thus, Szczepanik (1995) argues against the IC in Comp realization of government in 3b of the constituent definition.

6 There is another possibility here that the logic in question is Modals, an intensional projection between IP and CP. See Uegaki 1994 for a discussion of Modals in English. We leave Chomsky (1995b)'s derived VP-phrase structure to simplify discussion.

7 Holzknecht (1997), Dobrov (1997) and Nakajima (1999) independently suggest that a complement clause is obligatory in a complement chain without a complement clause in Comp in English.

8 To my knowledge, there is no study on the syntactic position of sentence-final predicates in these chains, e.g., however, Polgári (1995) argues that sentence-final predicates occupy Comp positions in Standard (and colloquial) Hungarian, and that they differ discriminatively from other sentence-final constituents.

9 We adopt this principle here and assume that (10) is the sentence-final position of our locative in the Wh- position but not in the complement position.

10 The Wh-VP does not apply locally at any stage of derivation, but it applies (or at least structures allowed through derivation). In other words, it applies globally after the locative.

11 They also claim that the phrase can be considered a global scope condition when its local scope-condition condition. Although, Liddell (1979) notes that the language condition across global but not local, Frei (2000) gives favorable arguments for the global scope condition as well as the local scope condition and necessity of representation.

12 We should not that the Wh-VP is prevalent in the choice between the two cases discussed here.

13 We can assume that the raising operation takes place either in overt syntax or in PP; see note 12.

14 Kuroda (1999) argues that the verb raises up to a Comp position. However, dying to the view Movement Constraint (MC), who argues that the raised head cannot enter (or even mention) before its original position and its raising site (see Rizzi 1990, 441), it cannot directly move into Comp, simply because it contains the PP.

15 Kuroda (1999) in favor of the assumptions that verb raising takes place in PP rather than in overt syntax. If we adopt Kuroda's (1999) original, we may argue that the head of an IP-complement word and adjust the facts with verb in PP in our claim in note 11.

16 A slightly different analysis can be suggested. First, although the embedded verb needs to move into the embedded Comp position, as claimed by
Koizumi (1995), the complement clause has no such position. Thus, it must move up to the matrix Complement position instead. The most economical way to reach this position is for the verb-first moves out of the embedded clause and into (not to the matrix verb, which is then moves up to the matrix Complement position along with the embedded verb. In a sense, the embedded verb moves from the matrix N head position to the matrix Complement position as a "free rider." What is common to our proposal and the analysis just noted is that the embedded verb no longer stays in situ.

14 It can be argued that the movement results in failure to satisfy the antisymmetric government of the UCP (see note 4) or the Progres Binding Condition, which requires all moves to be bound (see Lustik and Saito 1992: 38).

15 According to my investigations, in contrast to the speakers of the Osaka and Kobe Dialects, the speakers of the Hiroshima Dialect do not allow such a break between the complement clause and the sentence verb.

13 We assume that adverbs constitute a phrasal unit. Therefore, the HMC effect is violated even when the embedded verb skips it.
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