



2017

Speech Act Phrase, Conjectural Questions, and Hearer

Takeshi Oguro
Chiba University of Commerce

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl>

Recommended Citation

Oguro, Takeshi (2017) "Speech Act Phrase, Conjectural Questions, and Hearer," *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*: Vol. 23 : Iss. 1 , Article 22.
Available at: <https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol23/iss1/22>

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. <https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol23/iss1/22>
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Speech Act Phrase, Conjectural Questions, and Hearer

Abstract

Speech Act Phrase is proposed by Speas and Tenny (2003) as a projection hosting discourse roles such as Speaker and Hearer. Miyagawa (2012) argues for its existence by looking at Japanese WH-questions. His proposal is that the politeness marker motivates the presence of Hearer, which is necessary in information-seeking questions. In this paper, I deal with conjectural questions, which do not require the presence of Hearer, and argue for the relevance of Speaker to them. In particular, I examine the behavior of *yara*-conjectural questions and *daroo ka*-conjectural questions. I suggest that they contain a modal projection, whose Spec hosts a Point-of-View operator, whose value is determined by the closest c-commanding sentient element. In conjectural questions, Speaker is the only relevant c-commander, since they are typically uttered in soliloquy. I also consider polite versions of such questions, which involve Hearer. Despite the presence of Hearer, which is due to the presence of a politeness marker, the conjectural question interpretation is allowed in these questions. This is, I argue, because in these questions, unlike in information-seeking questions, Hearer is positioned lower than CP, which makes Speaker the only sentient c-commander of the Point-of-View operator. This analysis can be applied to cover the pattern of Jussive clauses as well.

Speech Act Phrase, Conjectural Questions, and Hearer

Takeshi Oguro

1 Introduction

Speech Act Phrase is a projection proposed by Speas and Tenny (2003), which is located above CP and dedicated to dealing with discourse roles such as Speaker and Hearer. This idea can be regarded as a modern version of Ross' (1970) performative hypothesis and at the same as part of the research project initiated by Rizzi (1997) concerning clausal peripheries.

Miyagawa (2012), assuming that Japanese is an agreement language just like any other languages, argues for the existence of Speech Act Phrase. He claims that Japanese politeness markers such as *-mas-* induce allocutive agreement, which has to do with Hearer. His argument is based on some effects found in Japanese (information-seeking) WH-questions. His point is that matrix (information-seeking) WH-questions require the politeness marker, whose allocutive agreement motivates Speech Act Phrase. In short, matrix (information-seeking) WH-questions require Hearer.

In this paper, I would like to examine properties of conjectural questions, which generally do not require Hearer, and consider their implications to the understanding of Speech Act Phrase. I also deal with polite conjectural questions, which are addressed to Hearer but do not expect response, and suggest that the behavior of such questions can be accounted for by assuming that the so-called flip, proposed by Speas and Tenny (2003), can be optional. The proposed analysis is shown to be extended to cover the pattern of jussive clauses as well.

2 Miyagawa (2012)

In this section, I introduce Miyagawa's analysis of WH-questions in a way that makes reference to Speech Act Phrase. Miyagawa (2012) provides the following sets of examples, which were originally observed in Miyagawa (1987).

- (1) a. Dare-ga ki-masu ka?
 who-NOM come-POLITE Q
 'Who will come?'
- b. *Dare-ga kuru ka?
 who-NOM come Q
 'Who will come?'
- (Miyagawa 2012: (15-6))
- (2) a. Bill-wa [dare-ga kuru ka] ki-ita.
 Bill-TOP who-NOM come Q ask-PAST
 'Bill asked who will come.'
- b. *Hanako-wa [dare-ga ki-masu ka] sittei masu.
 Bill-TOP who-NOM come Q ask-PAST
 'Hanako knows who will come.'

The contrasts above show that matrix WH-questions must involve the politeness marker, while embedded WH-questions reject it.

Miyagawa's analysis is based on the following:

- (3) a. *Ka* must be selected by a head.
 b. The politeness marker induces allocutive agreement.

Let us first see how (3) takes care of matrix WH-questions. Miyagawa adopts the structures suggested by Haegeman and Hill (2013). Then the structure of (1a) is like (4).

- (4) [SAP Speaker [SA' [saP Hearer [sa' [CP TP [c⁰ ka]_[allocutive probe] sa⁰]] SA⁰]]

In (4), CP, headed by *ka*, is dominated by a shell structured Speech Act Phrase. Speech Act Phrase involves three pragmatic roles: Speaker, which is in the Spec of the higher shell, Hearer, which is located in the Spec of the lower shell, and Utterance Content, in other words, CP, which is in the complement position of the lower shell.

He assumes that Speech Act Phrase is motivated by the politeness marker, or, more precisely, the allocutive probe in it. The politeness marker originates in C, just like in Basque (Oyharçabal 1993) and gets inherited by T (Chomsky 2008), where it is pronounced. The allocutive probe in C undergoes raising through the lower Speech Act head to the higher Speech Act head, where it c-commands Hearer, thereby establishing the probe-goal relation. One effect of the politeness marker moving to the Speech Act domain is that it takes Utterance Content under its scope, making it a polite utterance.

As for the degraded status of (1b), he assumes that it has the following structure.

(5) *[_{CP} ... *ka*]

The example in (1b) does not involve the politeness marker, so it does not have an allocutive probe, meaning that Speech Act Phrase is not motivated. Thus, the *ka*-clause is not selected by a head, which violates (3a), resulting in deviance.

Let us then see the embedded questions in (2). The partial structures relevant here are given in (6).

(6) a. [_{CP} ... *ka*] V
 b. *[_{SAP} [_{SA'} [_{saP} [_{sa'} [_{CP} ... *ka*] *sa*⁰]]] SA⁰]] V

(6a) is a partial structure of (2a), which is fine. The embedded question in (2a) does not have the politeness marker, so it is a “bare” *ka*-clause, which is successfully selected by the matrix verb. (6b) shows the problematic aspect of (2b), which is degraded. (2b) involves the politeness marker, which, due to its allocutive probe, projects up to Speech Act Phrase. The matrix verb selects CP but not Speech Act Phrase, hence the degraded status.

3 Conjectural Questions

Miyagawa’s analysis is based on the observation that matrix WH-questions require the politeness marker. This section provides some fine matrix WH-questions without the politeness marker.

3.1 Simple Conjectural Questions

Although Miyagawa finds (1b) severely degraded, it sounds fine on a certain kind of interpretation, as shown in the following.

(7) Dare-ga ku-ru ka.
 who-NOM come-PRS Q
 ‘(I wonder/I am not certain) Who will come.’

(7) is fine in the context where Speaker utters it in soliloquy, without talking to any addressees. I call this kind of questions conjectural questions.¹ (1b), on the other hand, is intended to solicit information from an addressee. This interpretative difference is reflected in intonation: The information-seeking (1b) is supposed to be read with rising intonation, while the conjectural (7) is read with falling intonation.

Assuming Miyagawa’s analysis, (7) involves Speech Act Phrase, but it does not contain Hearer, since (7) is uttered in soliloquy. (7) has a structure like (8).

¹Littell, Matthewson, and Peterson (2010) and Yokoyama (2013) deal with “hearer-less” questions and refer to them as conjectural questions. The questions they examine involve an evidential morpheme or a modal element. I assume that conjectural questions include questions without such an element, like (7).

(8) [_{SAP} Speaker [_{SA'} [_{CP} ... ka] SA⁰]]

In (8), the *ka*-clause is selected by the Speech Act head, satisfying (3a). (7) fails to be a complement clause in embedded contexts. The fine status of (2a) can be accounted for by assuming, as did Miyagawa, that the embedded clause in (2a) is CP.

Miyagawa assumes that Hearer is present only when its presence is motivated due to allocutive agreement. (4) involves an allocutive probe, so Hearer is motivated. Thus the information-seeking question interpretation is available. In (4), the condition in (3b) is satisfied because of Hearer, which motivates Speech Act Phrase. (8), on the other hand, has no allocutive probe, so Hearer is not motivated and hence it lacks Hearer, forcing it to have the conjectural question interpretation. (1b) is intended to have the information-seeking question interpretation, but it fails to, because it does not involve Hearer due to the lack of the allocutive probe.

One logical question has to do with the presence of Speaker. There does not seem to be any special motivation for Speaker in (4) or in (8). Miyagawa says nothing about Speaker, but some qualification should be necessary. I assume that unlike Hearer, Speaker comes free due to its privileged status as the one who makes the utterance.

Admittedly, this argument concerning Speaker is rather conceptual and it obviously requires empirical justification. In the following subsections, I provide other conjectural questions, whose properties suggest that positing Speaker is warranted.

3.2 *Yara* Conjectural Questions

Japanese questions typically end with the complementizer *ka*, but there is another way to end a question, as shown in the following.

- (9) Dare-ga kuru yara.
 who-NOM come yara
 ‘(I’m not sure) who will come.’

In (9), the question ends with *yara*. What is worth of note concerning *yara*-questions is that they are always interpreted as conjectural questions and they cannot be employed as information-seeking questions. Unlike polite WH-questions like (1a), this question can be uttered in soliloquy. There is one more point where *yara*-questions can be distinguished from *ka*-questions.

- (10) a. Dare-ga kuru ka (o) yosoo dekinai.
 who-NOM come Q ACC predict cannot
 ‘I cannot predict who will come.’
 b. *Dare-ga kuru yara (*o) yosoo dekinai.
 who-NOM come yara ACC predict cannot
 ‘I cannot predict who will come.’

As shown in the contrast in (10), regular *ka*-questions like (10a) can be Case-marked, while *yara*-questions cannot, as observed in Takamiya (2004).

3.3 *Daroo Ka* Conjectural Questions

Ka-questions can also function as conjectural questions when they involve the modal expression *daroo*, patterning with *yara*-conjectural questions.

- (11) Dare-ga kuru daroo ka?
 who-NOM come MOD Q
 ‘(I wonder) who will come?’

Daroo ka-questions are also typical cases of conjectural questions. They can be uttered in soliloquy. What is interesting is that these questions fail to be Case-marked, on a par with *yara*-

questions.

- (12) Dare-ga kuru daroo ka (*o) yosoo dekinai.
 who-NOM come MOD Q ACC predict cannot
 ‘I cannot predict who will come.’

This suggests that *yara*-questions *daroo ka* conjectural questions call for a unified treatment.

3.4 *Yara* Involves a Modal

We have seen that *yara*-conjectural questions pattern with *daroo ka*-conjectural questions. What separates *daroo ka*-questions from regular *ka*-questions like (1a) is the presence of the modal *daroo*, which seems to be the key element. It is thus tempting to ask whether *yara*-questions also involve a modal element. It is widely observed in the literature that *daroo* is a genuine modal in the sense that it cannot co-occur with other genuine modals such as *mai* (negative surmise), *nasai* (order), and *masyoo* (invitation) (Nitta 1991 and Ueda 2007). Here the cases with *daroo* and *mai* are given to show the point.

- (13) a. Kare-wa kuru daroo.
 he-TOP come MOD
 ‘(I think) he will come.’
 b. Kare-wa ko-nai daroo.
 he-TOP come-NEG MOD
 ‘(I think) he will not come.’
 c. Kare-wa kuru mai.
 he-TOP come MOD(NEG)
 ‘(I think) he will not come.’
 d. *Kare-wa kuru mai daroo/daroo mai.
 he-TOP come MOD(NEG) MOD/MOD MOD(NEG)
 ‘(I think) he will not come.’

Given this, if *yara*-questions involve a modal element corresponding to *daroo*, then it is expected that they are incompatible with it. This expectation is borne out.

- (14) *Dare-ga kuru daroo yara/yara daroo ka.
 who-NOM come MOD yara/yara MOD Q
 ‘(I’m not sure) who will come.’

Thus, *yara*-conjectural questions should be analyzed as having a similar structure as *daroo ka*-conjectural questions.

4 An Analysis

4.1 Speaker and a Modal

In this section let us consider how the properties of *yara*-conjectural questions and *daroo ka*-conjectural questions can be captured in Miyagawa’s analysis. As we have seen, they have several things in common, one of which is that they both involve a modal element. I assume the following set of assumptions, basically following Ono (2006).

- (15) a. Japanese clause structure may involve a modal projection in a position higher than TP but lower than CP.
 b. The modal projection has, in its Spec, a Point-of-View operator, whose value is determined by the closest c-commanding sentient element.

With (15), (9) and (11) can be assumed to have the following structures.

- (16) a. [_{SAP} Speaker [_{SA'} [_{CP} [_{C'} [_{MODP} POV [_{MOD'} TP [_{MOD⁰} daroo]]] [_{C⁰} ka]]] [_{SA⁰}]]]
 b. [_{SAP} Speaker [_{SA'} [_{CP} [_{C'} [_{MODP} POV [_{MOD'} TP [_{MOD⁰} yara]]] [_{C⁰} yara]]] [_{SA⁰}]]]

In each of the structures in (16), the modal projection is located between CP and TP. In (16a), it is headed by *daroo*, and in (16b) it is headed by *yara*, which I assume to be raised to the C head. The structures in (16) do not involve Hearer, which is because these questions are typically uttered in soliloquy, where Hearer is absent. They both involve Speaker, since its presence is assumed to come free due to its privileged status. In these conjectural questions, Speaker serves to determine the value of the Point-of-View operators, since Speaker is the only sentient c-commander.

4.2 The Ban on Case-Marked Conjectural Questions

Another distinguishing character of conjectural questions involving a modal is that they cannot be Case-marked. Miyagawa's observation, however, is that polite WH-questions cannot be complements in the first place, even without being Case-marked.

- (17) a. *Hanako-wa [dare-ga ki-masu ka] sittei masu.
 Hanako-TOP who-NOM come-POLITE Q know POLITE
 'Hanako knows who will come.'
 b. *Hanako-wa [dare-ga ki-masu ka] o sittei masu.
 Hanako-TOP who-NOM come-POLITE Q ACC know POLITE
 'Hanako knows who will come.'

A closer examination, however, suggests that polite WH-questions seem to indeed occur in such an environment.

- (18) a. [Dare-ga ki-masu ka] sirabemasyoo.
 who-NOM come-POLITE Q check.let's
 'Let's check who will come.'
 b. *[Dare-ga ki-masu ka] o sirabemasyoo.
 who-NOM come-POLITE Q ACC check.let's
 'Let's check who will come.'

Thus, whatever the source of deviance found in (2b) may be², the true generalization seems to be that polite WH-questions cannot be Case-marked, on a par with conjectural questions.

As for the fine status of (18a), I suggest that WH-questions, when dominated by Speech Act Phrase, can be adjuncts, modifying the null nominal expression that follows it. In other words, (18a) has a structure like (19a). (19b) is the case where the nominal argument is phonetically realized, being Case-marked.

- (19) a. [Dare-ga ki-masu ka] *pro* sirabemasyo.
 who-NOM come-POLITE Q check.let's
 'Let's check who will come.'
 b. [Dare-ga ki-masu ka] sore-o sirabemasyo.
 who-NOM come-POLITE Q it-ACC check.let's
 'Let's check who will come.'

In each example in (19), the true argument is the nominal expression. In (17b) and (18b), on the other hand, the polite WH-clause must be an argument, since it is Case-marked, but it fails to be, because the predicate does not select Speech Act Phrase, which conforms to Miyagawa's idea. The same story applies to the two conjectural questions. When they are Case-marked, they are

²The source of deviance in (17a) is unclear, but it seems that the choice of predicates might be relevant. I will leave this for future research.

arguments. Since the predicate does not select Speech Act Phrase, deviance arises.

In this section, it has been shown that *yara*-conjunctural questions and *daroo ka*-conjunctural questions involve a modal element, whose point of view is Speaker's and that the presence of Speech Act Phrase, which contains Speaker, leads to deviance when these conjunctural questions are Case-marked and treated as arguments.

5 Conjunctural Questions Involving Hearer

5.1 Conjunctural Questions Can Involve Hearer

As observed in the third section, conjunctural questions do not require the discourse role of Hearer. However, it does not necessarily mean that these questions reject or disallow it. In fact there are cases where they involve Hearer, as shown below.

- (20) a. Dare-ga ki-masu yara.
 who-NOM come-POLITE yara
 '(I am not certain) who will come.'
- b. Dare-ga kuru desyoo ka?
 who-NOM come MOD.POLITE Q
 'Who will come? What do you think?'
 '(I wonder) who will come?'

(20a) involves the politeness marker. This indicates that this question is addressed to Hearer. Quite interestingly, however, despite the presence of Hearer, (20a) is not an information-seeking question. It only has the conjunctural question interpretation. Thus, in (20a), Speaker only expresses his/her own ignorance to Hearer and does not expect an answer. (20b) involves the modal *desyoo*, which is a polite version of the modal *daroo*. This question is two-way ambiguous. In one interpretation, it asks Hearer his/her view concerning who will come. This is an information-seeking question interpretation. The other reading is that of a polite conjunctural question. In this reading, it expresses the speaker's own wondering in the presence of addressees. The paradigm in (20) raises two questions, as shown in (21).

- (21) a. Why can polite conjunctural questions be conjunctural questions, though they are addressed to Hearer?
 b. Why can *desyoo ka*-conjunctural questions be ambiguous between the conjunctural interpretation and the information-seeking interpretation, while *yara*-questions are always conjunctural?

In this section, I attempt to answer these questions.

5.2 An Answer to (21a)

First, let us consider why conjunctural questions can tolerate the presence of Hearer. In these questions, Speaker's point of view is expressed, so, in terms of structure, Speaker must be the closest sentient element that c-commands the Point-of-View operator in the modal projection.

We need to have a structure which has both the modal projection and Hearer, with Speaker being the closest sentient c-commander, which is shown in (22).

- (22) [_{SAP} Speaker [_{SA'} SA⁰ [_{saP} [_{CP} C⁰_[allocutive probe] [_{MODP} POV [_{Mod'} Mod⁰ TP]]] [_{sa'} sa⁰ Hearer]]]]

In (22), Speaker is in the Spec of the higher Speech Act Phrase, CP is in the Spec of the lower Speech Act Phrase, and Hearer is in the complement position of the lower Speech Act Phrase. Here, Speaker is the only sentient c-commander of the Point-of-View operator. The allocutive probe in C moves to the higher Speech Act head, where it c-commands Hearer, establishing the probe-goal relation. The allocutive probe undergoes movement to the higher Speech Act head and c-commands Hearer.

One thing that should be mentioned about (22) is the hierarchical ordering of Hearer and CP. In (22), CP is higher than Hearer. In Miyagawa's structure in (4), Hearer is higher than CP. The "flip" or the alternation of the two discourse roles is suggested by Speas & Tenny (2003) and Tenny (2006).³ They claim that the flip takes place in certain kinds of clauses. The relevant clauses are given in (23).

- (23) a. Declarative: Speaker > CP > Hearer
 b. Interrogative: Speaker > Hearer > CP
 c. Imperative: Speaker > Hearer > CP

In (23a), Hearer is located lower than CP. In (23b-c), the flip takes place, so Hearer is located higher than CP. In (23b-c), Hearer is expected to respond to Speaker, verbally or otherwise. In declaratives, there is no such expectation. Thus this flip takes place when Hearer is expected to respond to Speaker. In conjectural questions, on a par with declaratives, Speaker does not expect any response, which makes it natural to assume that the flip does not take place in conjectural questions, either.

Haegeman and Hill (2013) propose an alternative version of Speech Act Phrase. They base their ideas on the behavior of sentence final particles and do not assume the existence of the interrogative flip. It seems unclear at this point whether the facts reported here can be captured by their analysis.

5.3 An Answer to (21b)

In this subsection I consider the source of the ambiguity of *desyoo ka*-questions and the unambiguity of *yara*-questions. I suggest that the difference between the two kinds of questions lies in the feature makeup of the Point-of-View operators in them. Specifically, I assume (24).

- (24) a. The Point-of-View operator in *desyoo ka*-questions has the [*udisc.prt.*] feature, which must be valued by the closest discourse participant.
 b. The Point-of-View operator in *yara*-questions has the [*udisc.prt. uSpeaker*] features, which must be valued by the closest discourse participant.

Let us see how (24) handles the polite versions of the questions.

- (25) a. *Desyoo ka* information seeking question
 [_{SAP} Speaker_[disc.prt] [_{SA'} [_{saP} Hearer_[disc.prt] [_{sa'} [_{CP} [_{MODP} POV_[udisc.prt] [_{MOD'} TP MOD⁰]]] C⁰]
 sa⁰]] SA⁰]]
 b. *Desyoo ka* conjectural question
 [_{SAP} Speaker_[disc.prt] [_{SA'} [_{saP} [_{CP} [_{MODP} POV_[udisc.prt] [_{MOD'} TP MOD⁰]]] C⁰] [_{sa'} Hearer_[disc.prt]
 sa⁰]] SA⁰]]
 (26) a. **Yara*-information seeking question
 [_{SAP} Speaker_[disc.prt, Speaker] [_{SA'} [_{saP} Hearer_[disc.prt] [_{sa'} [_{CP} [_{MODP} POV_[udisc.prt, uSpeaker] [_{MOD'} TP
 MOD⁰]]] C⁰] sa⁰]] SA⁰]]
 b. *Yara*-conjectural question
 [_{SAP} Speaker_[disc.prt, Speaker] [_{SA'} [_{saP} [_{CP} [_{MODP} POV_[udisc.prt, uSpeaker] [_{MOD'} TP MOD⁰]]] C⁰] [_{sa'}
 Hearer_[disc.prt] sa⁰]] SA⁰]]

In (25a), the Point-of-View operator has the perspective of Hearer because it is the closest c-commanding discourse participant, which makes the sentence ask the addressee's view. In (25b), the operator reflects the viewpoint of Speaker, which is the only c-commanding discourse participant, yielding the conjectural question interpretation. In (26a), just like (25a), the closest discourse participant is Hearer, which must be the POV holder, but the operator demands Speaker as its

³ The flip is originally assumed by Speas and Tenny to involve movement of Hearer from the complement position of the lower shell to its Spec, which makes Hearer c-command CP. In the text, I abstract away from the "base" position of Hearer in (22).

holder to have its [*u*Speaker] feature appropriately valued, leading to deviance. In (26b), which is fine, the property of the Point-of-View operator is satisfied.

6 Types of Clauses and Hearer

In the previous section, I have suggested that interrogative sentences can be classified into three types, according to the positioning of Hearer, which is given in (27).

- (27) a. Plain Conjectural Questions: Speaker > CP
 b. Polite Conjectural Questions: Speaker > CP > Hearer
 c. Information-Seeking Questions: Speaker > Hearer > CP

Plain conjectural questions, as in (27a), do not involve Hearer, so they only involve Speaker and CP. Polite conjectural questions, on the other hand, involve Hearer, who is not expected to respond to Speaker and therefore is located lower than CP, as in (27b). In information-seeking questions, Hearer is expected to respond to Speaker, which makes Hearer higher than CP, as shown in (27c). In this short section, I show that the same kind of classification is found in another type of clauses.

Slightly modifying the view offered by Zanuttini, Pak, and Portner (2012), Matsuda (2015) assumes that what they refer to as jussive clauses include intentives (cf. Fujii 2006), employed to express Speaker's intention to do something in monologues, in addition to promissives, in which Speaker expresses to Hearer his own intention to do something, imperatives, where Speaker orders Hearer to do something, and exhortatives, in which Speaker invites Hearer to do something together. Matsuda (2015) captures these four types in terms of the combination of Speaker and Hearer. Under the approach suggested in the previous section, these clauses are captured in the following manner.

- (29) a. Intentives: Speaker > CP
 b. Promissives: Speaker > CP > Hearer
 c. Imperatives: Speaker > Hearer > CP
 d. Exhortatives: Speaker > Hearer > CP

In the previous section, I have shown that the pattern of interrogative clauses can be captured by assuming Speech Act Phrase, especially according to what kind of role Hearer plays. The pattern in (29) indicates that our analysis of interrogatives can be extended to jussives, suggesting its validity. If this classification of clause types which draws on Speech Act Phrase is on the right track, it is predicted that the exhortative question without the politeness marker is possible, because the exhortative construction requires Hearer due to its nature. This prediction is correct, as shown in (30).

- (30) Doko-e ik-oo ka?
 where-to go-EXH Q
 'Where shall we go?'

Unlike information-seeking questions, exhortative questions do not require the politeness marker, as expected. It is further expected that they cannot be Case-marked because they involve Speech Act Phrase. This expectation is indeed borne out, as shown in (31).

- (31) Doko-e ik-oo ka (*o) kimeyoo yo.
 where-to go-EXH Q ACC decide.let's PRT
 'Let's decide where we will go'

Thus, our analysis of the classification of interrogatives in terms of Speech Act Phrase gains support from the classification of jussives, which have also been shown to involve Speech Act Phrase.

7 Conclusion

This paper has dealt with two kinds of conjectural questions in Japanese, and argued that their behavior can be captured by assuming Speech Act Phrase, which supports Miyagawa's analysis. It has shown that the behavior of polite conjectural questions suggests that Speas and Tenny's (2003) view of Speech Act Phrase is empirically more favorable than Haegeman and Hill's (2013). Our analysis provides a classification of interrogatives in terms of Speech Act Phrase and can be extended to jussives, which lends further support to it.

References

- Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On phases. In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory*, ed. R. Freidin, C. Otero and M.L. Zubizarreta, 133–166. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Fujii, Tomohiro. 2006. Some Theoretical Issues in Japanese Control. Doctoral dissertation. University of Maryland.
- Haegeman, Liliane, and Virginia Hill. 2013. The syntacticization of discourse. In *Syntax and its Limits*, ed. R. Folli, C. Sevdali, and R. Truswell. 370–390. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Littell, Patrick, Lisa Mathewson, and Tyler Peterson. 2010. On the Semantics of Conjectural Questions. *University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics 28: Evidence from Evidentials*. 89–104.
- Matsuda, Asako. 2015. Complement control without a DP controller. *Journal of the Ochanomizu University English Society 5*: 29–49.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 1987. LF affix raising in Japanese. *Linguistic Inquiry 18*:362–367
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2012. Agreements that occur mainly in the main clause. In *Main Clause Phenomena: New Horizons*, ed. L. Aelbrecht, L. Haegeman, and R. Dye, 79–112. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nitta, Yoshio. 1991. *Nihongo no Modariiti to Ninsho* [Modality and Person in Japanese]. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Ono, Hajime. 2006. An Investigation of Exclamatives in English and Japanese: Syntax and Sentence Processing. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.
- Oyharçabal, Beñat. 1993. Verb agreement with nonarguments: On Allocutive Agreement. *Generative Studies in Basque Linguistics*, ed. J. I. Hualde and J. Ortiz de Urbina, 89–114. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Syntax*, ed. L. Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Ross, John. 1970. On declarative sentences. In *Readings in English transformational grammar*, ed. Roderick Jacobs and Peter Rosenbaum, 222–272. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Speas, Peggy, and Carole Tenny. 2003. Configurational properties of point of view roles. In *Asymmetry in Grammar*, ed. A. M. Di Sciullo, 315–344. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Takamiya, Yukino. 2004. Yara(u) niyoru kansetsu gimon no seiritsu: Futei gimon wo chushin ni. *Mie University Japanese Language and Literature 15*:124–111.
- Tenny, Carol. 2006. Evidentiality, experiencers, and the syntax of sentience in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics 15*:245–288.
- Ueda, Yukiko. 2007. Syntactic structure and person restrictions of Japanese modals. In *Nihongo No Shusetsu Gensho* [Main Clause Phenomena in Japanese], ed. N. Hasegawa, 123–150. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Yokoyama, Tomohiro. 2013. Re-evaluating the “Question” Marker *Ka* in Japanese. Proceedings of the 2013 Annual Conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association
- Zanuttini, Raffaella, Miok Pak, and Paul Portner. 2012. A syntactic analysis of interpretive restrictions on imperative, promissive, and exhortative subjects. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 30*: 1231–1274.

Faculty of Commerce and Economics
 Chiba University of Commerce
 1-3-1 Konodai Ichikawa-shi
 Chiba, 272-8512, JAPAN
 t2oguro@cuc.ac.jp