

## On Further Similarities between Japanese and Spanish Complementizers

In his seminal work, Saito (2009 et seq.) shows that complementizers in Japanese (*to*) and Spanish (*que*) have striking similarities regarding their complements and types of verbs which select clauses headed by these complementizers. In this talk, looking at another complementizer *tte* in Japanese, I present further similarities between complementizers in these two languages, focusing on their uses in matrix clauses. I suggest that the morphological transparency of *tte* in Japanese gives us evidence for Demonte & Fernández-Soriano's (2014) analysis of matrix *que*.

**Matrix “*que*”s in Spanish.** Etxepare (2007) and Demonte & Fernández-Soriano (2014, D&F henceforth) observe that the distribution of the complementizer *que* in Spanish, which is often assumed to be a counterpart of English *that*, is not limited to embedded clauses (see also Spitzer 1942); *que* can also appear in matrix clauses, as shown in (1). As indicated by the translation, the matrix *que* expresses reports of a speech event (D&F).

- (1) Que ha dimitido el decano  
 QUE has resigned the dean  
 ‘The dean has resigned (someone said/I heard)’.

Showing similarities between *que* in (1) and evidential markers in other languages, D&F argue that *que* in question is an evidential marker, which heads an Evidentiality Phrase (EvidP) in the fine-grained split-CP domain, as illustrated in (2) (*evidential que*).

- (2) Evidential *que*: [EvalP ... [EvidP ... [Evid' Evid (*que*) ... ]]]

D&F further suggest that *que* has another matrix use, called *echoic que*, as in (3). The main property of *echoic que* is that “the source of the *que*-clause [i.e. the reported information] is inside the linguistic context, i.e. there is a particular portion of speech that is (partly) reproduced” (D&F).

- (3) A: No me he acordado de sacar las entradas B: ¿Que no te has acordado?  
 not Refl have remembered of get the tickets QUE not Refl have remembered  
 ‘I did not remember to get the tickets.’ ‘Are you saying you did not remember?’

D&F show that, despite apparent similarities between (1) and (3), *echoic que* in (3) is different from evidential *que* in (1) in a number of respects, e.g. only evidential *que* can occur discourse-initially, only *echoic que* is restricted to declaratives, and they behave differently regarding scopal interactions with negation and disjunction (see D&F for additional differences). Based on these differences, D&F suggest a different structure for *echoic que* as in (4), where *que* heads ForceP which is selected by a silent verb like ‘say’, as in (4).

- (4) Echoic *que*: V<sub>say(silent)</sub> [ForceP [*que*...]]

**Japanese *tte*.** Japanese has a complementizer(-like) item *tte*, which has developed from the combination of the unmarked complementizer *to* and *iu* ‘say’ (Lord 1976, 1993, Matsumura 2017 (*Digital Daijisen*, Online dictionary), see also Maki 1997). Just like Spanish *que* and the unmarked complementizer *to* in Japanese, *tte* can head a clausal complement of verbs. In fact, complementizers which have developed from ‘say’ is very common cross-linguistically (Lord 1976, 1993).

- (5) John-wa [[asita kuru] {to/tte}] itta  
 John-Top tomorrow come C/TTE said  
 ‘John said that he would come tomorrow.’

What is crucial for us is that *tte* shows the exactly same behavior as *que* regarding (1) and (3). (6) and (7) correspond to evidential and *echoic que*, respectively (e.g. Martin 1975, Ishii 2015 for evidential *tte*). Thus, for example, evidential *tte*, but not *echoic tte*, can appear discourse initially, and *echoic tte* can co-occur with non-declarative clauses, as in (8).

- (6) Gakubutyoo-ga yameta tte  
 dean-Nom resigned TTE  
 ‘The dean has resigned (someone said/I heard)’.

- (7) A: Tiketto-o kau-no wasuretyatta. B: tiketto-o kai-wasureta-tte?  
 ticket-Acc buy-NML forgot ticket-Acc buy-forgot-TTE  
 ‘I forgot to buy the tickets.’ ‘(Did you say) you forgot to buy?’

- (8) A: John-ga kita-yo. B: Dare-ga kita-tte?  
 John-Nom came-Particle who-Nom came-TTE  
 ‘John came.’ ‘Who did you say came?’

Following D&F and Ishii (2015), I suggest that evidential *tte* in (6) is a head of EvidP, which encodes evidentiality (specifically, hearsay evidentiality), exactly like Spanish *que* in (2) but with the head-

final structure, as in (9).

(9) ...[EvidP [Evid\*P [... ] Evid(*tte*)]]

The status of *tte* as an evidential marker is confirmed by the fact that the evidentiality expressed by *tte* is not part of the at-issue content of the utterance (see Speas 2004). Thus, the addressee can only challenge the truth of the propositional content of (6), i.e. that the dean has resigned. She cannot challenge how the speaker of (6) got the relevant information; (6) can be countered by the utterance *that's not true, he has not resigned* but not *that's not true, you didn't hear that*. The reason why *tte* can function as an evidential marker is somehow clear morphologically; since it has developed from 'say' (with C), it can encode information about speech (though this is no longer its at-issue content arguably due to grammaticalization). This morphological transparency of *tte*, which has the same use as evidential *que*, can be seen as suggestive evidence for D&F's analysis of *que* as an evidential marker as in (4).

For echoic *tte* in (7)/(8), I suggest that there is a matrix verb *iu* 'say' which takes a CP complement headed by the unmarked C *to* (abstracting away the split CP, if we adopt D&F's (4), *to* would be located in Force<sup>0</sup> in the split CP), and the phonological string *to-iu* is contracted into *tte*, as schematically shown in (10). In fact, this contraction seems to be a source of the development of *tte* even though there is some controversy regarding its exact etymology (Yuzawa 1957, Maki 1997).

(10) [...[VP [CP [TP I forgot to buy the tickets] *to*] *iu*] ...] → *toiu* is contracted to *tte*

There is in fact independent evidence for the structure in (10). Suppose that (11) is a response to the utterance *I was told to go to Tokyo by John*.

(11) Tokyo-no doko-ni ik-e-*{tte}*?

Tokyo-Gen where-to go-Imp-TTE

'Which part of Tokyo should you go (according to John)?'

In Japanese, like many other languages, the co-occurrence of a question and an imperative is impossible, as shown in (11) without *tte*, i.e. "imperative questions" are not allowed, arguably because of the conflicting clause-type specification. Crucially, an apparent "interrogative question" becomes possible with echoic *tte*, as in (11) with *tte*. This is predicted under the proposed analysis, because (11) has the following bi-clausal structure: [*pro*<sub>(John)</sub> [(you) Tokyo-Gen where-to go-Imp C] say], where the embedded 'where' takes a matrix scope. Hence (11) involves a matrix question and an embedded imperative clause (note that Japanese allows embedded imperatives, Oshima 2006, Schwager 2006), and it is interpreted as "Which part of Tokyo does/did *pro*(John) say that you should go?". Thus, there is no conflict in clause-typing. Importantly, the echoic use of Japanese *tte* and the proposed structure in (10) give us morphological evidence for D&F's silent verb analysis of echoic *que* in (4). Even though the speech verb is completely silent in Spanish, it is partly present morpho-phonologically in Japanese, being contracted; i.e. (10) is minimally different from (4) in that the matrix verb of saying is not fully silent but phonologically reduced. It should also be noted here that the unmarked complementizer *to* in Japanese cannot be used in (6) and (7) instead of *tte* (in Tokyo Japanese), which indicates that regarding their matrix uses, the distribution of *que* is in fact more like that of *tte*, rather than *to*; in matrix clauses, *que* has wider distribution than *to*.

**Say+C as evidential markers.** Despite the striking similarities between *que* and *tte*, there is still a morphological difference between the two; *que* is the unmarked complementizer, while, even in its evidential use, *tte* is, at least historically, more like the combination of the complementizer and the verb of saying. We thus expect cases where the combination of 'say' and *que*, not just *que*, works as an evidential marker, which would be an exact morphological counterpart of *tte*. This is in fact the case in some varieties of Spanish as well as other Romance languages. Thus, Colombian Spanish has *dizque*, which has been grammaticalized from *dice que* '(s/he) says that'. Crucially, *dizque* marks evidentiality (see Cruschina & Remberger 2008 for the grammaticalized status of *dizque* and additional examples of this kind in Romance languages).

(12) Esto **dizque** va a ser pantano  
this DIZQUE go.Pres to be.Inf swamp

'This is going to be swamp, they say.'

(Kany 1944: 172)

**Selected References.** Demonte & Fernandez-Soriano. 2014. Evidentiality and illocutionary force: Spanish matrix *que* at the syntax-pragmatics interface. Ishii 2015. Evidential Marker in the Nominal Right Periphery: The Japanese Hearsay Marker *-tte*.