On restructuring infinitives in Japanese: Adjunction, clausal architecture, and phases

Masahiko Takahashi *

University of Maryland, Department of Linguistics, 1401 Marie Mount Hall, College Park, MD 20742-7505, United States

Abstract

This paper investigates the syntax of Japanese restructuring verbs and makes two major claims: (i) there are (at least) three types of restructuring infinitives in Japanese, which is consistent with Wurmbrand's (2001) approach to restructuring infinitives and (ii) there is a general ban on adjunction to complements of lexical restructuring verbs, which is best explained by an interaction of spell-out domains and Case-valuation. It is also shown that this ban regulates adverb insertion, adjective insertion, and quantifier raising.
© 2012 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

‘Restructuring’ (i.e. clause-downsizing) has been extensively discussed in the generative literature, with a variety of approaches proposed to capture the phenomenon. Thus, while Cinque (2006) argues that all ‘restructuring’ verbs are functional heads, researchers like Hoshi (2006) and Saito and Hoshi (1998), for example, argue that ‘restructuring’ involves complex predicate formation via direct merger of the verbs. Wurmbrand (2001) pursues yet another approach and argues that there are degrees of ‘restructuring’, which are determined by the size of infinitival complements (CP, TP, *v*P, VP, for example), where the various sizes of infinitival complements correlate with various (non-) ‘restructuring’ phenomena.

One of the goals of this paper is to resolve this tension from the perspective of Japanese. There is considerable literature on ‘restructuring’ in Japanese (see Asano, 2007; Bobaljik and Wurmbrand, 2007; Hoshi, 2006; Kageyama, 1993; Koizumi, 1994, 1995, 1998; Kuno, 1973; Matsumoto, 1996; Miyagawa, 1987; Nakatani, 2004; Nishigauchi, 1993; Nomura, 2003, 2005; Saito and Hoshi, 1998; Shibatani, 1978; Sugioka, 1984; Tada, 1992; Takezawa, 1987; Terada, 1990; Tomioka, 2006; Tsujimura, 1993; Ura, 1996, 1999, 2000; Yumoto, 2004; Zushi, 1995, 2008; Wurmbrand, 2001, among many others). However, to the best of my knowledge, most of the important paradigms in the context of restructuring have been addressed only partially in this literature. Hence, previous studies on Japanese restructuring constructions have not drawn a comprehensive picture that should have emerged from the observed data. I take up this issue seriously and provide a more comprehensive description of ‘restructuring’ constructions in Japanese. I show that Japanese data lead us to posit a three-way distinction in ‘restructuring’ configurations, which is broadly consistent with Wurmbrand's (2001) proposals concerning restructuring infinitives.

A theoretical concern of this paper is a restriction on adjunction found in restructuring contexts. I argue that there is a ban on adjunction to complements of lexical verbs, which is derived through an interaction of the contextual emergence of

---

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 301 405 7002.
  E-mail addresses: mstakahashi@gmail.com, takahas@umd.edu.

spell-out domains (see Bobaljik and Wurmbrand, 2005; Bošković, 2010; den Dikken, 2007; Takahashi, 2010, 2011, among others) and obligatory late insertion of adjuncts within spell-out domains (cf. Stepanov, 2001). I also argue that the constraint is a general constraint, which yields a unified account of the distribution of adverbs, adjectives, and quantifiers.

This paper is organized in the following way. In section 2, mainly based on the observations made in the literature (see Bobaljik and Wurmbrand, 2007; Matsumoto, 1996; Miyagawa, 1987; Nakatani, 2004; Tsujimura, 1993, among many others), I provide a detailed description of several restructuring constructions in Japanese and show that they do not exhibit uniform behavior. In section 3 I provide an analysis of the generalization made in section 2 and propose that there is a ban on adjunction to certain restructuring infinitives. In section 4 I extend the analysis of the ban on adjunction to other 'restructuring' constructions and show that the ban is actually a general constraint. In section 5 I critically discuss alternative approaches in the literature and show that they face various empirical problems. Section 6 concludes the paper.

2. Restructuring infinitives in Japanese and adverbs

This section offers a detailed description of three types of restructuring constructions and shows that they are different from each other regarding the distribution of adverbs. In particular, I discuss two types of restructuring motion verb constructions and the potential construction. I start with examples involving two types of motion verb constructions, namely, the Purpose Expression (PE) construction, and the Sequential Expression (SE) construction[1]:

(1)   Taroo-ga   gakkoo-ni sono hon-o   kai-**ni** it-ta.   **(PE)**
      Taro-NOM school-to the   book-ACC buy-**NI** go-PAST
      'Taro went to school to buy the book.'

(2)   Taroo-ga   gakkoo-de sono hon-o   yon-**de** it-ta.   **(SE)**
      Taro-NOM school-at the   book-ACC read-**TE** go-PAST
      'Taro read the book at school and went (somewhere).'

The infinitive in (1) is followed by *-ni* while the one in (2) is followed by *-te*.[2] As we will see below, both constructions involve optional clause-union effects (i.e. restructuring). However, the two constructions show different syntactic behavior in other respects.

An indication of clause-union effects comes from nominative marking of objects (see Bobaljik and Wurmbrand, 2007; Koizumi, 1994, 1995, 1998; Kuno, 1973; Nomura, 2003, 2005; Saito and Hoshi, 1998; Tada, 1992; Takezawa, 1987; Ura, 1996, 1999, 2000, among many others). Consider the following sentences:

(3)   Taroo-ga   eego-o/ga   hanas-e-ru.
      Taro-NOM English-ACC/NOM talk-can-PRES
      'Taro can speak English.'

(4)   Boku-ga Mary-ni   Taroo-ga   eego-o/*ga   hanas-u-to   i-e-ru.
      I-NOM   Mary-DAT Taro-NOM English-ACC/NOM speak-PRES-that say-can-PRES
      'I can say to Mary that Taro speaks English.'

In (3), the object is marked nominative in the presence of the potential morpheme *-e* 'can'. In (4), on the other hand, there is a clausal boundary between *-e* 'can' and the object and the object cannot be marked nominative. This shows that nominative Case-licensing of objects is clause-bounded.

Both the PE construction and the SE construction can involve (optional) restructuring. This is supported by the fact that the embedded objects in these constructions can be nominative when the matrix verbs are accompanied by the potential morpheme (see Miyagawa, 1987; Tsujimura, 1993, among others). I assume that this (apparent) non-local Case dependency is an indication of restructuring following a number of researchers (see Bhatt, 2005; Bobaljik and Wurmbrand, 2005, among others). This is further supported by typical distributional properties of restructuring, namely the

---

[1] See Matsumoto (1996), Miyagawa (1987), Tsujimura (1993) and Wurmbrand (2001), among others, for discussion of PEs, and Kuno (1973), Matsumoto (1996), Nakatani (2004), Shibatani (2007) and Tsujimura (1993), among others, for discussion of SEs. Note that V-*te*-motion verb constructions have a variety of interpretations, which I do not discuss here. See Nakatani (2004) and Teramura (1984), among others, for a more comprehensive description.

[2] *Te* is pronounced as *de* when the former is preceded by a verb stem with a voiced consonant (Kuno, 1973). Kuno (1973) and Martin (1975) define *-te* as a gerundive marker. I will not discuss the nature of *-te* in this paper. See Nakatani (2004) and references cited therein for discussion of *-te*.