

## Selection and size of clausal complements

**Overview.** There has been a controversy whether syntactic selection and semantic selection are independent or one of them can be derived from the other (e.g. Pesetsky 1982; Pollard and Sag 1987; Chomsky and Lasnik 1993, see also Odijk 1997). In this paper, I suggest that syntactic selection is independent and cannot be derived from semantic selection based on novel data regarding clausal complements of evidential markers and adjectival elements in Japanese.

**Introduction: *mitai* and *yoo*.** *Mitai* and *yoo* in Japanese are used to mark inferential evidentiality, as shown in (1). These elements can also occur in prenominal positions (in relative clauses), as in (2).

- (1) John-ga ki-ta-{*mitai/yoo*}-da.  
John-Nom come-Past-MITAI/YOO-Cop  
'It seems that John came.'
- (2) [[okaasan-ga tuku-tta]-{*mitai/yoo*}] -na karee  
mother-Nom make-Past-MITAI/YOO-Cop curry  
'curry like ones the mother cooked'

*Mitai* and *yoo* have the same or at least a very similar meaning. In fact, Narrog (2009) notes that they are "stylistic variant[s]".

**Syntactic differences of clausal complements.** While *mitai* and *yoo* are semantically (almost) the same, there is a number of differences regarding properties of the clausal complements *mitai* and *yoo* take. Thus, as shown in (3a), the imperative marker can appear in the clause introduced by *mitai*, not in the one introduced by *yoo*. The same holds for the volitional marker and the politeness marker; they can appear in the clausal complement of *mitai*, but not in that of *yoo*, as shown in (3b) and (3c), respectively.

- (3) a. [asita a-e]-{*mitai*/\**yoo*}-na hito  
tomorrow meet-Imp-MITAI/YOO-Cop person  
'(a) person like (the) one who you should meet tomorrow'
- b. [asita a-oo]-{*mitai*/\**yoo*}-na hito  
tomorrow meet-Vol-MITAI/YOO-Cop person  
'(a) person like (the) one who I will meet tomorrow'
- c. [asita ai-masu]-{*mitai*/\**yoo*}-na hito  
tomorrow meet-Pol-Pres-MITAI/YOO-Cop person  
'(a) person like (the) one who I will meet.<sub>POLITE</sub> tomorrow'

***Mitai* takes a larger complement.** I suggest that the contrast between the clausal complements of *mitai* and *yoo* found in (3) is due to the syntactic selectional difference between *mitai* and *yoo*; *mitai* takes a larger complement than one *yoo* takes. Specifically, assuming that the imperative/volitional/politeness markers head a CP (e.g. Rizzi 1997, Cinque 1999, see also Miyagawa 2012 and Ueda 2007 for Japanese), I argue that *mitai* takes a CP complement. What is important for us is that *ppoi* takes a smaller complement than CP. Given that the tense morpheme, but not the imperative/volitional/politeness markers, can appear in the clausal complement of *yoo* (see the past tense marker in (1) and (2)), I suggest that *yoo* selects a TP complement, as schematically illustrated in (4).

- (4) a. [CP [TP ... ]]-*mitai*  
b. [TP ...]-*yoo*

In the clausal complement of *mitai*, the C-layer, where the imperative/volitional/politeness markers can be located, is present. In the clausal complement of *yoo*, on the other hand, there is no syntactic position for these elements.

As observed above, while *mitai* and *yoo* are semantically the same (or at least very similar),

there is a number of differences regarding syntactic properties of their clausal complement, which can be captured under the current analysis. If selection of clausal complements of *mitai* and *yoo* were solely semantically determined, the differences observed in (3) would be difficult to capture, as the lexical semantics of *mitai* and *yoo* are almost the same. Thus, the contrast between the type of clausal complements of *mitai* and *yoo* shows the independence of syntactic selection from semantic selection, as argued by Pollard and Sag (1987) a.o. (contra e.g. Pesetsky 1982).

***Teki vs. ppoi.*** The contrast found with *mitai* and *yoo* is not limited to these two elements, suggesting the difference between *mitai* and *yoo* in their clausal complements is not idiosyncratic. In Japanese, *teki* ‘like, -ish’ and *ppoi* ‘like, -ish’, both of which express similarity, usually take a nominal complement, forming AP, as in (5).

- (5) a. seizi                    b. seizi- {teki/ppoi}  
       politics                politics-TEKI/PPOI  
       ‘politics’              ‘political’

However, the use of *teki* and *ppoi* is not limited to the canonical use found in (5). In their more innovative use, *teki/ppoi* can take a sentential complement, as in (6) (see Yamashita 2000, Saito 2017 for the innovative use of *teki*).

- (6) [okaasan-ga   tuku-tta]-teki-na/ppoi        karee  
       mother-Nom    make-Past-TEKI-Cop/PPOI    curry  
       ‘curry like ones the mother cooked’

Crucially, in this innovative use, they show the same contrast as the one between *mitai* and *yoo*. Thus, in the clausal complement of *teki*, the imperative/volitional/politeness marker can appear, while they cannot appear in the clausal complement of *ppoi*, as shown in (7) (see Saito 2017 for *teki*).

- (7) a. [asita        a-e]- {teki-na/\*ppoi}        hito  
       tomorrow meet-Imp-TEKI-Cop/PPOI    person  
       ‘(a) person like (the) one who you should meet tomorrow’  
       b. [asita        a-oo]- {teki-na/\*ppoi}        hito  
       tomorrow meet-Vol- TEKI-Cop/PPOI    person  
       ‘(a) person like (the) one who I will meet tomorrow’  
       c. [asita        ai-masu]- {teki-na/\*ppoi}        hito  
       tomorrow meet-Pol-Pres- TEKI-Cop/PPOI    person  
       ‘(a) person like (the) one who I will meet.<sub>POLITE</sub> tomorrow’

This contrast is straightforwardly captured if *teki* and *ppoi* have the same syntactic selectional properties as *mitai* and *ppoi*, respectively. Namely, *teki* takes a CP complement while *ppoi* takes a TP complement; the former selects a larger complement than the latter. Just like *mitai* and *yoo*, even though *teki* and *ppoi* are semantically almost the same, there are syntactic selectional differences in their clausal complements, indicating that syntactic selection is independent from semantic selection.

Selected references. Chomsky and Lasnik. 1993. The theory of principles and parameters. Odjik. 1997. C-Selection and S-Selection. *Linguistic Inquiry*. Pesetsky. 1982. *Paths and categories*. MIT dissertation. Pollard and Sag. 1987. Information-based syntax and semantics. Saito. 2017. Like/type, Say, and C. *Proceedings of GLOW in Asia XI*. Yamashita. 2000. Kangokeisetsubizi no gokeisee to zyojika -teki o tyuusin ni site. *Nihongogaku*.