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1 Introduction

In this paper, we investigate one specific case of clausal complementation in Japanese, which has been argued to involve obligatory Control, namely, the one with the volitional modal -yoo, which expresses the speaker’s will or determination, embedded (Fujii 2006, 2010; cf. Takano 2010, Uchibori 2000).1 To be more specific, we are exclusively concerned with the two constructions Fujii analyzes as Subject Control (SC) and Split Control (SpC). Below, I show that his analysis is empirically inadequate in failing to capture the fact that the attitude holder of the embedded -yoo and the agent of the embedded verb can be different, and propose that apparent Control-like cases involving -yoo are derived by indexical shifting. I also show that the size of the embedded clause can be different in accordance with the selection of a matrix verb. That is, when a given matrix verb is proposition-taking, its embedded clause

---

1 I thank Yuta Sakamoto and Hideharu Tanaka for comments and discussion. This research is funded by JSPS KAKENHI (20K13017), so I hereby acknowledge it.

1 In what follows, we will be concerned with obligatory Control but not nonobligatory Control. Whenever I use the term Control, I intend to refer to the former.
is full-fledged CP, but when the former is event-taking such as ‘try’, the latter can be as small as vP. This sort of semantic correlation between the size of a complement clause and the choice of a matrix verb is proposed by Wurmband and Lohninger (2019), who term it the Implicational Complementation Hierarchy (ICH), and I argue that this state of affairs also holds for the -yoo complementation in Japanese.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we go over the analysis of the alleged SC and SpC by Fujii (2006, 2010), raising some empirical issues of it. Then, in Section 3, I propose that the pertinent SC/SpC-like constructions are derived by indexical shifting of the lexically specified 1st-person feature of -yoo, giving a way to semantically compute the embedded -yoo complement, and Section 4 discusses the -yoo complementation in terms of the ICH, showing that the different sizes of complement clauses lead to several different syntactic/semantic behaviors of them. Section 5 concludes.

2 The Properties of (Embedding) the Modal -yoo

2.1 Fujii (2006, 2010) – the Movement Theory of Control

Let us start our discussion by looking at typical examples of the relevant two constructions rendered by embedding -yoo: (1a) exemplifies SC, and (1b), SpC. In (1), the embedded null arguments are given as e, which allows me to be theory-neutral.

(1) a. Hiroshi1-wa [e1 {??kare1/zibun1}-o hihan-si-yoo-to ] Hiroshi- TOP he/self-ACC criticism-do-MOD-REP
[omot-ta/kessin-si-ta],
think-PAST/determination-do-PAST ‘Hiroshi [thought of criticizing/decided to criticize] {him/himself}.

b. Taro01-wa Hiroshi2-ni [e1+2 otagai-o Taro- TOP Hiroshi-DAT each.other-ACC
sonkee-si-a-oo-to ] {kt-ta/teian-si-ta},
respect-do-RECIPE-MOD-REP say-PAST/proposal-do-PAST Lit. ‘Taro1 [said/proposed] to Hiroshi2 that e1+2 respect-yoo each other.’

(based on Fujii 2006, 102, 115)

In (1a), e1 corefers to the matrix subject, so that a Condition B effect is observed with a pronominal object, and Fujii (2006) contends that e1 is bound by the matrix subject (but see discussion below on Condition B in Japanese). In (1b), the embedded verb is reciprocalized, and it thus requires a plural subject (see Fujii 2006, Ch. 3.2 for the detail of reciprocalization). Therefore, he also argues that e1 is bound by the matrix subject and the matrix indirect object in a split fashion.
Adopting the Movement Theory of Control (MTC) (Hornstein 1999), Fujii (2006, 2010) proposes that (1a) and (1b) are derived as in (2a) and (2b), respectively.

(2)

a. \[
\text{MAT DP}_1 \left[ EMB \text{DP}_1 \text{V-MOD-REP} \right] \text{V} \]

b. \[
\text{MAT DP}_1 \left[ \text{DP}_1 + \text{DP}_2 \right] \left[ EMB \left[ \text{DP}_1 + \text{DP}_2 \right] \right] \text{V-MOD-REP} \right] \text{V} \]

The matrix subject in (2a) is first merged as the agent argument of the embedded domain (\(EMB\)), and it is moved to the matrix domain (\(MAT\)), functioning as the matrix agent argument. Thus, it takes up two \(\theta\)-roles (more precisely, checks two \(\theta\)-features) in moving from the embedded domain to the matrix domain.\(^2\) In principle, the same holds for (2b), but it involves a slightly more complex movement. As (2b) illustrates, the embedded agent starts out as the amalgam of two conjoined DPs, and it is “split up” en route to the final landing site (as the term “Split Control” alludes to), so that only \(\text{DP}_1\) moves to check the matrix agent role.\(^3\)

Then, what Fujii’s (2006) analysis predicts is that when there is an intervener between the base position of a moving DP to its final landing site, Control is excluded; that is, the configuration in (3) is predicted to be ungrammatical.

(3) \[
\text{MAT DP}_1 \text{DP}_2 \left[ EMB \text{DP}_1 \text{V-MOD-REP} \right] \text{V} \]

In (3), \(\text{DP}_1\) moves to the matrix domain by skipping \(\text{DP}_2\) (which presumably is a dative goal), and this violates the locality/minimality of movement. For the impossibility of (3), Fujii (2006) gives the following:

\(^2\) I am not concerned with the details of the relevant movement steps, which are orthogonal to the main discussion of this paper.

\(^3\) This analysis brings up several issues, some of which Fujii (2006) is aware. I will not discuss them in detail since they are irrelevant to the purpose of this paper, and what is more, I do not adopt the MTC analysis in this paper. However, one potential challenge I point out at this juncture concerns the movement step of the conjoined DPs to the indirect object position, which Fujii assumes is motivated by \(\theta\)-checking one of them (i.e. \(\text{DP}_2\)) against the goal role. If the entire \(\text{DP}_1 + \text{DP}_2\) were to enter into such a \(\theta\)-checking process, the predicted construal would mandate that \(\text{DP}_1\) also be interpreted as part of the goal argument, contrary to fact. Then, he assumes that \(\text{DP}_1\) does not get the goal role since it is moved alongside \(\text{DP}_2\) via pied-piping. Then, whatever principle/structure would allow pied-piping of \(\text{DP}_1\), the entire \(\text{DP}_1 + \text{DP}_2\), before movement, should have been merged to the embedded agent position (e.g. Spec+\(\text{V}P\)) in such a way that \(\text{DP}_1\) is allowed not to be \(\theta\)-checked against any \(\theta\) role. Then, the question is why \(\text{DP}_1\) must get the embedded agent role while it can avoid getting the matrix goal role. It seems that he does not provide any solutions to this issue.
(4) a. *Taroo\textsubscript{1}-wa Yooko-ni [ e\textsubscript{1} kanozyo-o sonkei-si-yoo-to ]
    Taroo-TOP Yoko-DAT she-ACC respect-do-MOD-REP
    it-ta.
say-PAST
    Lit. ‘Taro\textsubscript{1} said to Yoko e\textsubscript{1} to respect her.’

b. Taroo\textsubscript{1}-wa [ e\textsubscript{1} kanozyo-o sonkei-si-yoo-to ] omot-ta.
    Taroo-TOP she-ACC respect-do-MOD-REP think-PAST
    Lit. ‘Taro\textsubscript{1} thought e\textsubscript{1} to respect her.’
(based on Fujii 2006, 129)

Fujii takes (4a) as a case of (3). The grammatical judgment in (4a) is due to
him, but I do not find its deviancy as severe as he observes; for me (and my
language consultants), ? or ?? at worst. Since there is no use disputing over
the different grammaticality judgments, I would like to point out one potential
problem in (4a), which is irrelevant to Control. As Kuroda (1965) discusses,
overt pronouns in Japanese are different from those in English. Observe:

(5) Kesa this.morning Taroo-wa Taro TOP
    kinoo yesterday pro/he-NOM see-PAST
    zyosee-ni pro/he-DAT syokuba-de workplace-in
    woman at-ta.
    mata again at-ta.
    ‘This morning, Taro met the woman again in his workplace who he
    met yesterday.’

In (5), null pronouns are preferred to their overt counterparts, and overt pro-
ouns behave like R-expressions as follows:

(6) Kesa this.morning Taroo-wa Taro TOP
    kinoo yesterday pro/he-NOM see-PAST
    zyosee-ni pro/he-DAT syokuba-de workplace-in
    woman at-ta.
    ?(?)Taroo\textsubscript{1}-no
    mata at-ta.
    ‘This morning, Taro met the woman again in Taro’s workplace who
    Taro met yesterday.’

Given (5) and (6), only pro is functionally equivalent to pronouns in English.
In this respect, it is also notable that overt pronouns in Japanese cannot be
used as bound variables (Hoji 1985, 1991); Hoji (1991) claims that overt pro-
ouns behave in the same way as demonstratives, which then explains why
they cannot get bound variable interpretations. If he is on the right track, then
overt pronouns like kare ‘he’ are construed like ‘this/that man’, so that the
badness of (4a) is due to Condition C. Namely, Yooko and kanozyo cannot be
co-indexed there. As I said, I find that it is not totally bad but only marginal,
and this can be explained in terms of an unexpected state of affairs where
both Yooko and kanozyo accidentally refer to the same individual (without binding). Then, we predict that if an embedded object that is co-indexed with a matrix goal argument is pro (3) becomes implementable, which is the case:

(7) a. Taroo₁-wa Yooko₂-ni [ e₁ pro₂ sonkei-si-yoo-to ] it-ta.
    Taroo-TOP Yoko-DAT pro respect-do-MOD-REP say-PAST
    Lit. ‘Taro₁ said to Yoko₂ to respect pro₂.’

b. Taroo₁-wa Hanako₂-ni [ e₁ pro₂ Kyootho-ni
    turete-ik-oo-to ] it-ta.
    Taroo-TOP Hanko-DAT pro Kyoto-to
    take.CONJ-go-MOD-REP say-PAST
    Lit. ‘Taro₁ said to Hanako₂ e₁ to take pro₂ to Kyoto.’

I thus conclude that the SC configuration with a matrix goal argument is possible. If (3) is an option, the MTC-style analysis cannot be adopted as it is.

Before leaving the discussion on Fujii (2006, 2010), let us discuss two more properties he provides to support his claim that embedding -yoo is a case of Control. First, Fujii (2006) observes that the volitional content of the embedded clause in (8) must be interpreted as de se relative to the matrix subject, so that the given context is not compatible with (8).

(8) CONTEXT: Hiroshi planned to go abroad. He had already got his passport and made a visa available recently. One day, he went to drinking and came home badly drunk. He found the passport on the table, without remembering that this was what he himself got from the embassy. Looking at the picture on the passport and the visa, he thinks, ‘I don’t know who this guy is, but he seems to be planning to go abroad soon. I wish I could!’

#Hiroshi₁-wa [ e₁ gaikoku-ni ik-oo-to ]
Hiroshi-TOP foreign.country-to go-MOD-REP
omote-i-ru.
think-ASP-COP-PRES
‘Hiroshi thinks of going abroad.’ (Fujii 2006, 106)

(8) is a case of SC under Fujii’s analysis, and it is well known for the fact that it only allows the de se interpretation. Then, (8) can be taken as a piece of evidence that supports his Control analysis.

Second, associating the antecedent DP with its PRO (a moved trace in the MTC) in the Control configuration can only traverse one clause boundary:

(9) *John thinks that it was expected PRO to shave himself. (Hornstein 1999, 73)
Then, concerning the ban on this sort of “long-distance” Control in Japanese, Fujii (2006) gives (10), where the highest subject cannot be the antecedent of the silent subject in the most embedded clause.

(10) *Karera₁-wa [ Hiroshi-ni [ e₁ otagai-o they-TOP Hiroshi-DAT each.other-ACC nargi-a-o-to ] omow ]-ase-ta. hit-RECIP-MOD-REP think -CAUS-PAST

Intended ‘They₁ made Hiroshi think e₁ to hit each other.’ (Fujii 2006, 104)

This one-clause-up requirement can also be considered to constitute another piece of evidence for embedding -yoo to be a case of Control. Notwithstanding, as we will see below, these two facts, although prima facie supporting the Control analysis of the -yoo complementation, can be handled without Control if we adopt indexical shifting.

2.2 Severing the Attitude Holder from the Agent of the -Yoo Clause

Unlike infinitive complements, clauses with -yoo can appear as a matrix clause, expressing the actual speaker’s volition. Therefore, in its default interpretation, (11) expresses the volitional attitude of -yoo is ascribed to the speaker, who is also the agent of cleaning the classroom.

(11) (Boku-wa) kyoositu-o soozi-si-yoo.
    I-TOP classroom-ACC cleaning-do-MOD
    ‘I will clean the classroom.’

However, this does not exhaust the patterns. Since we can have SpC via embedding -yoo, the plural agent including the speaker and the addressee is expected to be possible, and this is indeed the case. Note that in (12) the volitional attitude is only due to the speaker, so we do not know if the addressee is also willing to clean the classroom. Thus, the addressee can felicitously reply to (12) by saying ‘I don’t wanna do that’.

(12) (Boku-tati-wa) kyoositu-o soozi-si-yoo.
    I-PL-TOP classroom-ACC cleaning-do-MOD
    ‘Let’s clean the classroom.’

In addition, the agent does not have to be the speaker. Suppose that the speaker is a teacher who can tell you or students to clean the classroom. With kimi ‘you’, the speaker tells you to clean the classroom. With kono seeto ‘this student’, the speaker can utter (13) as a soliloquy, probably when s/he is arrang-

4 This is not as strong as an imperative, but only a suggestion.
ing the school-cleaning schedule alone. Thus, it is like a performative modal, meaning ‘I hereby decide that this student clean the classroom’.

Note also that both the 2nd- and the 3rd-person subjects can be plural. Thus, to extent that the speaker expresses his or her volitional attitude, the agent interpretations can be diverse.

(13) [Kimi/kono seeto](-tati)-wa kyoositu-o soozi-si-yoo.

‘You/This student will clean the classroom.’

As expected, embedding -yoo exhibits these multiple interpretations for the embedded agent. Besides (1), we have a (partial-)Object-Control-like interpretation in (14a) as well as partial-Subject and partial-Split Control-like ones as in (14b) and (14c), respectively.

(14) a. Tanaka-sensee-wa Taroo-ni [ e2+1 ] dono kyoositu-o
Tanaka-teacher-TOP Taro-DAT which classroom-ACC
soozi-si-yoo-to it-ta-no.
cleaning-do-MOD-REP say-PAST-Q
‘Which classroom did Mr. Tanaka tell Taro (and other students) to clean?’

b. Taroo-wa [ taihen-na toki-koso e1+ ]
Taro-TOP difficulty-COP.ADN time-very
tasuke-a-o-to kime-ta.
help-RECIP-MOD-REP decide-PAST
Lit. ‘It is in difficult times that Taro decided e1+2 help each other.’

c. Taroo1-wa Hanako2-ni [ e1+2 pikunikku-ni ik-oo-to ]
Taro-TOP Hanako-DAT picnic-DAT go-MOD-REP
it-ta.
say-PAST
Lit. ‘Taro1 said to Hanako2 e1+2 to go on a picnic.’

5 This point can be reinforced by the fact that a propositional negation such as sore-wa uso-da ‘that’s a lie’ cannot be used to negate (13) (cf. Kaufmann 2012).
Albeit the embedded agent can be interpreted multiply, the attitude of the embedded -yoo must be attributed to the matrix subject, so it is not like -yoo in the matrix setting, where the attitude holder is the actual speaker. Then, this indicates that the 1st-person parameter of -yoo, when embedded, is shifted in accordance with the context of the matrix subject. I thus claim that embedding -yoo does not involve Control but indexical shifting.

3 Deriving the -Yoo Complementation via Indexical Shifting

In this section, I lay out my idea regarding how -yoo is embedded and its 1st-person semantics is shifted. First, I propose the structure in (15), where I intentionally have the structure between ModP and RepP vague. However, (15) suffice to understand how indexical shifting of -yoo is carried out. Second, I assume with Shimamura (2018, 2019, 2022) that the quotative complement in Japanese involves a covert verb, SAY. Crosslinguistically, indexical shifting tends to be observed in the complement clauses that are introduced by complementizers originating from verbs meaning 'say' (Messick 2017); I assume that this covert SAY introduces a set of universally quantified new contexts that is compatible with the matrix subject’s SAYing content, and that SAY can be eventive or stative (cf. Major 2021). Then, I assume that the embedded clause is abstracted over contexts only when SAY is merged. Finally, I assume a simple semantics of -yoo given in (16), where -yoo encodes the information of its attitude holder as \( \alpha_c \) (the actual speaker) in \( w_c \) (the actual world). It should be more complex, but since we are only concerned with the person-parameter shifting, this just serves the purpose of this paper.

(15)
When we combine (16) with vP whose agent is the speaker himself/herself as in (11), we get the semantics in (17).

(17) \[ [I\ clean-yoo\ the\ classroom] = \forall w'\ compatible\ with\ \alpha_c's\ determination/will\ in\ w_c : \alpha_c\ clean\ the\ classroom\ in\ w' \]

Now, let us consider what semantically happens to (17) when it is embedded:6

(18) Boku-wa [ pro kyoositu-o soosi-si-yoo-to ] omot-ta.
I-TOP pro classroom-ACC cleaning-do-MOD-REP think-PAST
'I thought of cleaning the classroom.'

We ignore the semantic role of the reporting marker -to, simply taking it to be an identity function, so that the semantics of the entire RepP is the same as that of (17).7 Now, SAY is merged to RepP, and I assume with Shimamura (2022) that the semantics of SAY is (19), where SAY also introduces a source argument (Major 2021).8

(19) \[ [SAY] = \lambda q. \lambda x. \lambda e. \text{SOURCE}(x)(e) \land e \in w_c \land \forall c' \in \text{CON}(e) : q(c') \]

In (19), the argument \( q \) type-semantically corresponds to RepP, but RepP can be semantically diverse, contingent on what Rep actually takes. In any case, let us focus our attention on the semantic composition of (17) and (19):

(20) \[ [VP] = \lambda x. \lambda e. \text{SOURCE}(x)(e) \land e \in w_c \land \forall c' \in \text{CON}(e) : [\text{pro clean-yoo the classroom}](c') \]

As I said above, lambda abstraction over contexts is possible inside the complement of SAY (or ‘say’ complementizers in general) (Messick 2017, Shimamura 2022), hence (21), where I assume that a newly introduced context \( c' \) is tripartite \( \langle x, h_{c'}, w_{c'} \rangle \) (the speaker variable, the addressee, and the world).

Therefore, SAY is monstrous (cf. Schlenker 2003).

(21) a. \[ [VP] = \lambda x. \lambda e. \text{SOURCE}(x)(e) \land e \in w_c \land \forall c' \in \text{CON}(e) : (\lambda e' [[\text{pro clean-yoo the classroom}]](c')) \]

6 For interpretation of \( pro \) in (18), I assume: \( [pro]\rangle^{-d}, \) where \( g(1) = \alpha_c, \) which is eventually indexical-shifted in (21).

7 This is just for an expository purpose and due to the limited space. The reporting marker in Japanese is semantically significant in that it changes any semantic type into an utterance of type \( u \) (Shimamura 2022). We also ignore what the semantics of the . . . part in (15) actually is.

8 In (19), SAY has a set of contentful events/states in its denotation (Hacquard 2010), but it is not a set of worlds but a set of contexts.
b. \( \text{[VP]} = \lambda x. \lambda e. \text{SOURCE}(x)(e) \land e \text{ in } w_c \land \forall e' \in \text{CON}(e) : \forall w' \) compatible with \( x \)'s determination/will in \( w_c' : x \) clean the classroom in \( w' \)

Then, I assume that when the entire VP projected by SAY is merged to the matrix verb 'think' the source argument is not saturated but passed up via Event Identification (Kratzer 1996), so when the matrix verb, which I take to be a set of events, and the matrix \( v \) are merged, we get (\( v = \text{event type} \)):

(22)

In this way, the source argument and the matrix agent argument are identified via Predicate Modification (PM) (cf. Heim and Kratzer 1998). Given this analysis, the attitude semantics is severed from lexical verbs like ‘think’ or ‘believe’ (Elliot 2018, Lohndal 2014, Shimamura 2019).

An immediate consequence of the proposed analysis is that the embedded agent can be anything since we have \( pro \) whose referent is independently determined, so it can accommodate the various agent interpretations, be -\( yoo \) used in the matrix domain or the embedded domain. Also, the obligatory \( de \, se \) interpretation and the one-clause-up requirement are now explained in terms of indexical shifting. That is, as pointed out in the literature, indexical shifting requires the matrix subject and the embedded subject to be \( de \, se \)-associated (cf. Anand 2006); under our analysis, this is achieved with the matrix subject binding into the embedded -\( yoo \) clause. Also, the one-clause-up requirement is reduced to the locality of indexical shifting: in (10), the 1st-person feature of -\( yoo \) can only be shifted in the second embedded clause where -\( to \) and hence SAY are used. The proposed analysis can thus explain the relevant empirical facts without the PRO/MTC analysis.
4 The Size of the -Yoo Complement and the Implicational Complementation Hierarchy

Recently, Wurmbrand and Lohninger (2019) propose an intriguing correlation between the size of an embedded clause and the semantics of its selecting verb, namely the ICH. We cannot go into the details of it for the space limitation of this paper, but the gist is the following:\footnote{Note that the ICH is not an absolute generalization regarding the clause size, but it is only concerned with the minimal structure we need for each of the three structures in (24). For instance, we can structure an event complement as TP or CP, but we cannot have a propositional complement as vP.}

\begin{align*}
\text{(23)} & \quad \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{a. Proposition} & \text{b. Situation} & \text{c. Event} \\
\ldots & \ldots & \ldots \\
\text{believe} \quad \text{Op} & \text{decide} \quad \text{TMA} & \text{try} \quad \text{Theta} \\
\ldots & \ldots & \ldots \\
\end{array}
\end{align*}

In (23), the propositional complement given as the Op-domain is syntactically realized as CP, and the situation complement that covers the tense, modal and aspect (TMA) domain is structured at least as TP/IP. Finally, the event complement corresponds to vP or VP, hence the theta domain. Following Wurmbrand and Lohninger’s (2019) classification, I argue the following:

\begin{align*}
\text{(24)} & \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{The Size of the -Yoo Complement} \\
\text{a. omow- ‘think’/iw- ‘say’: } [\text{CP } vP \text{ DP}_{AGT} \text{ VP }]_{-yoo} \\
\text{b. kime- ‘decide’: } [\text{TP } vP \text{ DP}_{AGT} \text{ VP }]_{-yoo} \\
\text{c. su- ‘do/try’\textsuperscript{10}: } [vP \text{ VP }]_{-yoo}
\end{array}
\end{align*}

Given (24), the part of the structure in (15) I intentionally had as \ldots is dependent on the choice of a matrix verb. For (24c), I assume that it is a sort of restructuring (Shimamura and Wurmbrand 2014, Wurmbrand and Shimamura 2017), and that -yoo needs to select vP without an agent argument. This then seems to require us to change the semantics of -yoo since as in (16) its argument is propositional (a set of worlds). However, I assume the same semantics while I take the mode of the semantic composition to be different. That is, following Jacobson (1990), vP without an agent and the relevant modal are combined via Function Composition.\footnote{Another ‘try’ verb in Japanese is kokoromi-, and it seems to me that this verb behaves in the same way as su- for the empirical facts below, but the relevant judgements are tricky, so I do not include it here.}

\footnote{SAY can select (25b) for its semantically flexible nature (Shimamura 2022). However, the}
   Taro-TOP room-ACC cleaning-do-MOD-REP do-PAST
   ‘Taro tried to clean the room.’

b. The Semantics of the Embedded Clause

\[ \lambda x. \forall w’ \text{ compatible with } \alpha_x \text{’s determination/will in } w’; x \text{ clean the room in } w’ \text{ (via } [[-yoo] \circ [[vP]]) \]

Notice at this point that for (24) to work out we need to assume that the reporting marker is not a complementizer. As I said above, I assume for a brevity’s sake that it is an identity function and SAY is type-flexible (but see Shimamura 2018, 2019, 2022). Then, the size of the -yoo complement can be different under the ICH. First, only (24a) is compatible with an embedded Q-marker. If the Q-marker is located at C or moves to C (cf. Cable 2010, Hagstrom 1998), (26) and (27) show that (24a) is on the right track.

(26) Taroo\textsubscript{1}-wa [ e\textsubscript{1} daigaku-o yame-yoo-ka-to ]
   Taro-TOP university-ACC quit-MOD-Q-REP
   [omot/it/*kime/*si]-ta.
   think/say/decide/do-PAST
   ‘Taro [thought of/talked about] quitting the university.’

(27) Taroo\textsubscript{1}-wa [ e\textsubscript{1} tugini nani-o si-yoo-ka-to ]
   Taro-TOP next what-ACC do-MOD-Q-REP
   [omot/it/*kime/*si]-ta.
   think/say/decide/do-PAST
   ‘Taro [thought of/talked about] what he should do next.’

Another piece of evidence concerns the temporal interpretations. As in (28), (24a) and (24b) are compatible with two independent time adverbs. The impossibility of (29) then shows us that (24c) lacks the TMA domain.

(28) Kyoo Taroo\textsubscript{1}-wa [ e\textsubscript{1} asu pikunikku-ni ik-oo-to ]
   Today Taro-TOP tomorrow picnic-DAT go-MOD-REP
   [kime/omot]-ta.
   decide/think-PAST
   ‘Today, Taro [decided to go/thought of going] on a picnic tomorrow.’

(29) Kyoo Taroo\textsubscript{1}-wa [ e\textsubscript{1} (*asu) pikunikku-ni ik-oo-to ]
   Today Taro-TOP tomorrow picnic-DAT go-MOD-REP
   si-ta.
   do-PAST
   ‘Today, Taro tried to go on a picnic (*tomorrow.).’

\footnote{content of SAY is not a proposition but a property (a set of individuals who will clean the room in the embedded context).}
The complement size of *su-‘do/try’* is very small in that it only projects the theta domain (without an agent). This is diagnosed by licensing a negative concord item, which requires a clausemate negation:

(30) Taroo₁-wa [ e₁ dare-ni-mo aw-oo-to ]
    Taro-TOP who-DAT-also see-MOD-REP
    {si/*kime/*iwa}-nakat-ta.
    do/decide/say-NEG-PAST
    ‘Taro didn’t try to meet anyone.’

Furthermore, since (24c) lacks the embedded agent *pro*, it does not allow a partial-Control-like reading:

(31) Taroo₁-wa [ e₁+ kyoositu-o soozi-si-yoo-to ]
    Taro-TOP classroom-ACC cleaning-do-MOD-REP
    {omot/it/kime/*si}-ta.
    think/say/decide/do-PAST
    Lit. ‘Taro [thought of /talked about/decided] *e₁+ [cleaning/to clean] the classroom.

Finally, long passivization is possible for (24c) but not for (24a) and (24b) as (32) shows (cf. Wurmbrand 2001).

(32) Sin’yaku-ga sono kenkyuusya-niyotte umidas-o-to
    new.medicine-NOM that researcher-by create-MOD-REP
    {s-are/*kime-rare/*omow-are/*iw-are}-te-i-ta.
    do-PASS/decide-PASS/think-PASS/say-PASS-ASP-COP-PAST
    Lit. ‘A new medicine was being tried to create by the researcher.

Since the embedded clause lacks the external argument, *v* cannot assign an accusative case as Shimamura and Wurmbrand (2014) and Wurmbrand and Shimamura (2017) claim.

Before concluding this paper, let us discuss one more potential issue of the proposed analysis concerning the ICH in light of SAY, by which we have severed the argument-selecting property from the matrix attitude predicate. This semantic move may be problematic to the ICH, since this generalization concerns the relationship between the semantics of the attitude verb and the size of its complement clause. Under the analysis given here, what introduces the embedded clause is SAY, so that there is no direct selectional relationship between the matrix attitude verb and its complement clause. I thus assume that SAY and the matrix attitude verb are syntactically combined via head movement, forming a complex predicate, and the resulting amalgamated verb counts as one predicate to select the complement clause. In this respect, also
noteworthy is that *su-* that literally means ‘do’ is not an attitude verb. However, it can appear with a quotative clause with *-to*. Under our analysis, this is possible because there is a covert verb, SAY, and VP headed by SAY and *do* are semantically composed just like (22). Then, the combination of SAY and *su-* creates an idiomatic interpretation of the latter as ‘try’.

5 Conclusion

I have proposed a non-Control approach to embedding *-yoo*, which Fujii (2006, 2010) argues to instantiate SC and SpC. However, in view of the distributions of the embedded agent construal and the dissociation of the attitude holder from the agent, any Control analysis (either PRO or the MTC) will have difficulty in explaining the data presented in this paper, at least without any modifications, and such modifications will call for additional (probably ad hoc) assumptions. I have also contended that the size of the complement clause can vary in accordance with the semantics of the matrix predicate, and showed that the different sizes of complement clauses result in several different syntactic/semantic behaviors of them such as long passivization and negative concord item licensing.
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