The Syntax and Semantics of the Quotative Complement in Japanese

Koji Shimamura
Kanazawa Gakuin University

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

Recommended Citation
Available at: https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol29/iss1/21

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol29/iss1/21
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.
The Syntax and Semantics of the Quotative Complement in Japanese

Abstract
I will consider the quotative complement (QC) in Japanese, which is prima facie introduced by -to, a reporting suffix. In the literature, it has been widely assumed that -to is a (reporting) complementizer and that it introduces clausal complements (cf. Saito 2010). However, I will propose that there is a hidden structure in the QC in Japanese, arguing that it is an invisible verbal phrase headed by a phonologically null verb, SAY. This verb is presumably derived/grammaticalized from a lexical verb, iw- ‘say’, and, there are versions of Japanese where it can be overt. As we will see, the analysis to be proposed captures two important facts regarding the QC: (i) why -to can embed various linguistic expressions via indirect quotation, and (ii) why -to is used in both direct and indirect quotations.
The Syntax and Semantics of the Quotative Complement in Japanese

Koji Shimamura*

1 Introduction

In this paper, I will consider the quotative complement (QC) in Japanese, which is prima facie introduced by -to, a reporting suffix (with its colloquial variant, -tte).\(^1\) In the literature, it has been widely assumed that -to is a (reporting) complementizer and that it introduces clausal complements (cf. Saito 2010). However, I will propose that there is a hidden structure in the QC in Japanese, arguing that it is an invisible verbal phrase headed by a phonologically null verb, SAY. This verb is presumably derived/grammaticalized from a lexical verb, iw- 'say', and, there are versions of Japanese where it can be overt. As we will see, the analysis to be proposed captures two important facts regarding the QC: (i) why -to can embed various linguistic expressions via indirect quotation, and (ii) why -to is used in both direct and indirect quotations.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we will overview the syntactic/semantic properties of the QC in Japanese. Then, building on but somewhat departing from a recent proposal by Major (2021) for SAY in English, I will propose in Section 3 that there is a hidden SAY in the QC in Japanese, showing that there are dialects where the relevant verb can be overt. In Section 4, I will give a new way to interpret the QC, showing how to semantically calculate the QC. Then, 5 concludes this paper.

2 The Properties of the Quotative Complement in Japanese

In the generative literature, the QC introduced by -to has been widely regarded as a CP or some projection belonging to the CP region, so that -to is sometimes treated as the same element as that in English. However, the QC exhibits several properties different from those of that-clauses in English.

First, the QC in Japanese can occur with various kinds of matrix verbs. For instance, we can have attitude verbs as in (1) and manner-of-speech/factive verbs as in (2).

(1) Taroo-wa [ Hanako-ga tensai-da-to ] [it/omot/sinzi]-ta.
   Taro-top Hanako-nom genius-cop:pres-rep say/think/believe-past
   ‘Taro said/thought/believed that Hanako was a genius.’

(2) Taroo-wa [ zibun-ga matigat-tei-ta-to ] [nagei/kookai-si/kizui]-ta.
   Taro-top self-nom mistake-asp-past-rep cry/regret-do/realize-past
   ‘Taro cried/regretted/realized that he was a wrong.’

Albeit this much is the same for that, both indirect and direct quotations are introduced by -to unlike that. As (3b) shows, an English sentence, which is a foreign language to Japanese and hence a case of direct quotation, can be embedded by -to.

   John-top he-top Japanese-acc speak-can-NEG:pres-rep say-past
   ‘John said that he couldn’t speak Japanese.’

   John-top I can’t speak Japanese-rep it-past
   ‘John said, “I can’t speak Japanese.”’

Finally, -to can indirectly quote different kinds of clausal complements plus a name. Observe:

\(^{1}\)I thank three PLC 46 reviewers and those who gave me helpful comments and suggestions at the conference. This research is funded by JSPS KAKENHI (20K13017), so I hereby acknowledge it.

\(^{2}\)In most literature, it has been assumed that the difference between -to and -tte is only being colloquial or not. However, see Sode and Sugawara (2021) for their semantic disparity.
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In (4a), an imperative sentence is indirectly quoted, which is clear from the availability of a long-distance wh-dependency. In (4b), the embedded clause is an interrogative, and the matrix subject binds the embedded self-anaphor, so it is also indirectly quoted; (4c) illustrates a case of the naming construction, and -to directly attaches to the name which is questioned (cf. Fujita 2000, Shimamura 2018). This shows that -to does not have to attach to a clausal item.

In what follows, I will develop an analysis that can derive all the above examples by exploiting a recent discussion on SAY by Major (2021) (and mine too – Shimamura 2018).

3 The Syntax of the Quotative Complement in Japanese

There are many languages that have complementizers derived from some sort of verbum dicendi, which I dub SAY (see Messick 2017, Shimamura 2018 and references therein). Even English has SAY as Major (2021) claims. According to him, say can be stative or eventive and the former does not allow an agentive subject, a goal/indirect argument, manner adverb modification, past tense, progressive aspect, passivization etc. For instance:

(5) a. I ran into Katie yesterday and she gave me some excellent news! She (excitedly) said (to me) that she’s coming tonight!
   b. I ran into Katie yesterday and she gave me some excellent news! She (#excitedly) says (#to me) that she’s coming tonight!
   phantom. (Major 2021: 42).

Major proposes that when say in (5a) is eventive, SAY is merged with vDO and Voice; in contrast, when say in (5b) results from the merger of SAY and vBE:

\[\text{(6) a. Say}_{\text{Agent}}: \text{VoiceP} \quad \text{b. Say}_{\text{Source}}: \text{vP} \]

Following Grimshaw (2015), Major (2021) calls the internal argument of SAY “Linguistic Material” (LM). The definition of LM is the following:

(i) Linguistic Material:
   Direct quotation or any argument that can be substituted with direct quotation.
   (Major 2021: 26)

Under Grimshaw’s analysis, LM can only be introduced by SAY. Thus, those verbs that can take a direct quotation as their arguments have the abstract light verb SAY in them. For instance, [æsk] is derived by SAY+ask, and likewise, [skrjim], by SAY+scream (Major 2021: 25).
Then, *iw*-'say' in Japanese also exhibits the same contrast:

(7) a. Taroo-wa (happyoosya1-ni) (hakkirito) [ kanozyo1-no bunseki-wa Taro-top presenter-dat frankly she-gen analysis-top matigai-da-to ] it-ta.
    wrong-cop-pres-rep say-past

    ‘Taro said (to the presenter) (frankly) that her analysis was wrong.’

   b. Kono ronbun-wa (*happyoosya1-ni) (*hakkirito) [ kanozyo1-no bunseki-wa this paper-top presenter-dat frankly she-gen analysis-top matigai-da-to ] (iw/*it-ta) (no-da).
    wrong-cop-pres-rep say-pres/say-past nmlz-cop-pres

    ‘(It is that) this paper says (*to the presenter) (*frankly) that her analysis is wrong.’

Concerning the contrast between (7a) and (7b), there is another interesting fact: i.e. only *iw*-'say' in (7a) can be written with *Kanji* 'Chinese character’ (i.e. 言). Note that all the functional words in Japanese must be written in mora-based *Hiragana*. Since *iw*-'say’ in (7b) must be given in *Hiragana* (i.e. いう/*言う*), it is quite plausible that it is not a lexical verb, but a functional one.

Then, following Major (2021), I assume that *iw* in (7b) is an overt realization of SAY. As Major (2021) discusses, SAY is concealed if a more semantically specified verb is employed, e.g. a verb of speech manner (see Footnote 2):

    Taro1-top self1-gen analysis-nom wrong-cop-past-rep scream-past

    ‘Taro screamed that his analysis had been wrong.’

At this point, I however depart from Major (2021) in two respects. First, I do not assume that SAY lexically takes a source argument. This is because *kono ronbun-wa* in (7b) can be an adjunct:

(9) Kono ronbun-ni yor-eba [ kanozyo1-no bunseki-wa matigai-da-to ]
    this paper-dat base-cond she-gen analysis-top wrong-cop-pres-rep say-pres/say-past

    ‘According to this paper, her analysis is wrong.

In (9), we have *yor*–‘base’ whose form is adverbial, giving rise to a conditional meaning. Then, I argue that the apparent subject in (7b) is not an argument of SAY but it is licensed by the “aboutness” relation, which is readily available in Japanese, and that it is adjoined to VP (cf. Heycock 1993). Therefore, the source DP can be introduced as an adverbial adjunct as in (9). Given this, the structure of (7b) and that of (9) are rendered as follows:

(10) a.  
    VP  
    vP  
    KP  
    DP  
    this paper  
    VP  
    RepP  
    V  
    ...  
    SAY  

   b.  
    VP  
    vP  
    KP  
    AdvP  
    based on this paper  
    RepP  
    V  
    ...  
    SAY

The other departure is concerned with the lexical version of SAY, namely (6b). Under Major’s (2021) analysis, the lexical version of *say* is made by merging vDO and Voice with SAY. However, in certain versions of Kansai and Okayama Japanese, we observe the following case of ‘say’ doubling:³

³In (11), we do not have Rep, but I assume that it is morphophonologically absent; see Saito (1986) for dropping Rep in Kansai Japanese.
In addition to regular attitude verbs, we have *yuu- ‘say’*, which is a dialectal variation of *iw-*, and typically used by speakers in Kansai and Okayama areas (and probably other areas in the west side of Japan). Worth noting is the fact that *yuu-* gloss as SAY appears with *yuu-* ‘say’. Thus, if SAY were to become ‘say’ in such a way as (6a) shows, it would be very difficult (if not impossible) to capture the dialectal variation depicted in (11). Therefore, I assume in line with Özyıldız et al. (2019) that SAY in (11) behave like ‘say’ complementizers found in Turkic languages. For instance, in Turkish, *diye* is a combination of the verb *de- ‘say’* and the linker *-yA*, according to Özyıldız et al. (2019) and Özyıldız (2019).

4 In this respect, *yuu-te* is very similar to *diye* since it also has a conjunctive suffix (sometimes called Te-form; see Hayashi 2015, Nakatani 2004 and reference therein), which I thus assume is a linker.

\[ \text{(12)} \] Biz gel-di-k diye | düşün-uyor-lar/um-uyor-lar].

\[ \text{1.NOM arrive-PAST-1P} \text{ diye} \text{ think-PRES-3p/hope-PRES-3p} \]

‘They [think, hope] that we’ve arrived.’ (Özyıldız 2019: 1)

Then, the structure of ‘say’ doubling in (11) can be considered as in (13), where SAY is overt and suffixed by -te, and LinkerP is merged with the matrix verbs. For Standard Japanese, I assume that SAY and Linker are covert, so that the QC in it has the same structure as (13).

\[ \text{(13)} \]

```
                     VP
                        |  \_Rep
                        |     \_SAY
                        \_LinkerP
                        \_V say/think
                        \_RePP \_V \_te
                        \_VP say/think
                        ... \_Rep \_to
```

Now, we have enough syntax for the QC so let us turn to its semantics – how the QC should be semantically computed.

### 4 The Semantics of the Quotative Complement in Japanese

To sample a case, let us calculate the meaning of (14). In (15), I provide the denotations of the syntactic items used (13). First, I propose that Rep (-to) is not a complementizer but a quotation shifter that takes a linguistic object whose semantic type can be anything; I use \( \sigma \) to represent this versatile semantic type.\(^5\) What is taken by Rep is given as \( q \) in (15a), and after taking it, Rep returns an utterance of type \( u \) (Potts 2007). RepP thus corresponds to a directly quoted item. Then, the utterance argument is selected by SAY, which I argue to denote a set of contentful eventualities (that can be eventive or stative) (cf. Hacquard 2006), and this covert verb also introduces a new utterance context of type \( k \) since indexical shifting is possible in the QC (Sudo 2012). In this respect, Messick (2017) proposes that ‘say’ complementizers in various languages such as Telugu take a complement

---

\(^4\) According to Özyıldız et al. (2019), the capital A represents a vowel that undergoes vowel harmony.

\(^5\) For direct quotation, there are cases, as we will see below, where we do not have to know of what semantic type the quoted item is
We now have a Linker, which is morphologically null in Standard Japanese but shows up as 
\(-te\)
of SAYing
u
(17)
\[ VP(\nu, t) \]
\[ \lambda e. e \in w^* \land \forall \epsilon' \in \cos(e) : (SEM([\text{genuis(hanako)]})(c')) \]
\[ \sim \lambda e. e \in w^* \land \forall \epsilon' \in \cos(e) : (\text{genuis(hanako)})(c') \]
\[ \sim \lambda e. e \in w^* \land \forall \epsilon' \in \cos(e) : \lambda c. : (\text{genuis(hanako)}(c))(c') \] via GPA
\[ \sim \lambda e. e \in w^* \land \forall \epsilon' \in \cos(e) : \text{genuis(hanako)}(c') \]

\[ \text{Rep} \]
\[ u \]
\[ \lambda q \in D_{\tau}. [[q]] \]
\[ \lambda q \in D_{\tau}. \lambda e. e \in w^* \land \forall \epsilon' \in \cos(e) : (SEM([[[q]]])(c')) \]
\[ \sim \lambda q \in D_{\tau}. \lambda e. e \in w^* \land \forall \epsilon' \in \cos(e) : (\text{genuis(hanako)})(c') \]
\[ \sim \lambda q \in D_{\tau}. \lambda e. e \in w^* \land \forall \epsilon' \in \cos(e) : \text{genuis(hanako)}(c') \]

\[ \text{SAY} \]
\[ \lambda q \]
\[ \lambda q \]
\[ \lambda q \]
\[ \lambda q \]
\[ \lambda q \]
\[ \lambda q \]
\[ \lambda q \]
\[ \lambda q \]

Then, we compute the meaning of (14) in a step-by-step fashion. First, the embedded clause, a
CP, is merged with Rep, yielding (16), which is of type \( u \), is combined with SAY, resulting in (17)
by Generalized Predicate Abstraction (GPA) (Sudo 2012, 199), which abstracts over the context:

(16)
\[ \text{Rep} \]
\[ u \]
\[ \lambda q \]
\[ \lambda q \]
\[ \lambda q \]
\[ \lambda q \]
\[ \lambda q \]
\[ \lambda q \]
\[ \lambda q \]

We now have a Linker, which is morphologically null in Standard Japanese but shows up as 
\(-te\) in
Kansai/Okayama Japanese, in order to combine SAY with the matrix verb, ‘say’ or ‘think’, so we have:

\[(18)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\langle v, t \rangle \\
\lambda e'', \exists e'. e' \sim e'' \land e' \in w^* \land \forall c' \in \cos(e') \colon \text{genuis(hanako)}(c') \land \text{say}/\text{think}(e'')
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{LinkerP} \\
\langle \langle v, vt \rangle, \langle v, vt \rangle \rangle \\
\lambda R. \lambda e''. \exists e'. e' \sim e'' \land e' \in w^* \land \forall c' \in \cos(e') \colon \text{genuis(hanako)}(c') \land R(e'')
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\langle v, t \rangle \\
\lambda e.e \in w^* \land \forall c' \in \cos(e') \colon \text{genuis(hanako)}(c') \land \text{say}/\text{think}(e')
\end{array}
\]

After (18), Voice is merged, introducing an external argument (agent) (Kratzer 1996). The semantic mode of combining (18) with Voice (or \(v\)) is Event Identification (EI). Thus, we have:

\[(19)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VoiceP} \\
\langle v, t \rangle \\
\lambda e. \exists e'. \text{Agt(taro)}(e) \land e' \sim e \land e' \in w^* \land \forall c' \in \cos(e') \colon \text{genuis(hanako)}(c') \land \text{say}/\text{think}(e')
\end{array}
\]

In (19), VoiceP is read as: a set of saying/thinking eventualities \(e\) whose agent is Taro and is directly causally linked to an event \(e''\) \(6\) in the actual world \(w^*\) whose content is the set of all contexts \(c'\) where Hanako is genius. The advantage of the current analysis is that we can explain why -to can

\(6\) This notion is supposed to cover “the relation between an event of hearing some utterance and the internal event of mentally representing/interpreting the incoming speech signal” (Özyıldız et al. 2019, 302). This totally makes sense in Japanese since the QC can appear with verbs like kik- ‘hear’ as in Taro-o-wa [dare-ga ku-ru-to] kii-ta-no.(Taro-top who-nom come-pres-refp hear-past-q ‘Who did Taro hear would come?’)
take various kinds of clauses as a case of indirect quotation. This state of affairs is possible due to Rep which always involves direct quotation. The trick is that even if we change an embedded clause into type of $u$, we can cancel the relevant change when $SEM$ takes $[q]$. In this connection, Saito (2010) contends that the function of -$to$ is to paraphrase a direct discourse. In a sense, the proposed analysis is a technical/formal-semantic implementation of his idea. Since the output of $SEM$ must be $\lambda$-abstracted over the context, we can embed an imperative with a long-distance question as in (4a).

That is, the imperative semantics undergoes indexical shifting as Sauerland and Yatsushiro (2014) propose. Details aside, if we assume with Portner (2007) and Zanuttini et al. (2012) that imperatives are a set of entities ($To-do$ list), its type will be $\langle et \rangle$. However, we need a slot for the context argument, so the right semantic type is $\langle k, et \rangle$, which is obtained by GPA. After the context argument goes into the embedded imperative, its command will be evaluated in a new context introduced by SAY, so that embedded imperatives are possible in Japanese. Then, whatever semantic type embedded questions and non-clausal items like names may be endowed with, the current analysis can provide a uniform analysis to the QC in Japanese.

Then, let us consider how the current analysis derives direct quotation in Japanese. As we saw, both direct and indirect quotation employs -$to$, which is a matter of course under the proposed analysis since it changes anything quotable into an utterance. However, for indirect quotation, we need to retrieve the original semantics of such an utterance, and this is implementable because of $SEM$. Then, I contend that direct quotation does not need it because we do not have to know or interpret what is directly quoted. For instance, we can say (3b) even if we do not know what the quoted English sentence means. Such the case, we do not know what the chunk of English sounds type-semantically signifies. Just reproducing the sounds of English words we heard is good enough to make the relevant direct quotation work. Also notable is the fact that various kinds of non-linguistic items can be embedded via direct quotation. For instance, we subscribe to the act of winking or hand-waving as in the following:

7

(20) Taroo-wa watasi-ni (wink)-[tte/to] si-ta.
Taro-top I-DAT -REP do-PAST
‘Taro winked at me.’

(21) Taroo-wa boku-ni (a waving-his-hand gesture)-to aisatu-si-ta.
Taro-top I-DAT -REP greeting-do-PAST
‘Taro greeted me by waving his hand.’

In (20), the quoted item is an actual movement of Taro’s eyelid. The meaning of winking at someone may vary, depending on a context. Other non-linguistic gestures can be directly quoted and they may be propositional or making a command. Thumbing up, for instance, may be propositional, meaning “This is good” whereas pointing at something may mean “Get it!”, and these gestures can appear in the place of (wink) in (20). They can be quoted since -$to$ semantically changes them into a linguistic object of type $u$, which is then selected by SAY. Given the above, I assume that $SEM$ is not present in direct quotation, and that SAY does not introduce a new context, simply denoting an abstract uttering event. Therefore, SAY for direct quotation is:

(22) $\text{[[SAY]]} = \lambda[q] \in D_\text{a}. \lambda e. \text{utter}([q])(e)$

In (22), the interpretation of $\text{utter}$ can involve sound but does have to, for cases like (20) and (21), so that the proposed analysis can explain why -$to$ is used for both indirect and direct quotations.

Given the discussion above, we have two types of SAY: one is for indirect quotation, and the other, for direct quotation, and the former has a relatively complex semantics compared to the latter. This is reminiscent of the dichotomy of say in English: namely, $\text{John said that he was busy}$ vs. $\text{John said, “I’m busy”}$. In this connection, one might say that (22) is basically similar to the semantics of “utter” encoded in the English quotative $say_q$ proposed by Potts (2007). He argues that the meaning of $say_q$ is two-dimensional, providing (23), where $[[S]]$ is, which is our $[q]$, an utterance, and $[[b]]$ is some speaker argument.

---

7For some reason, I prefer the colloquial version of the reporting marker -$tte$ to -$to$ in (20).
In (23), we have not only the utterance dimension but also the propositional dimension. Under his analysis, the former part is construed as a conventional implicature. However, I reject this semantics for direct quotation in Japanese. This is because even a directly quoted item can be negated by a propositional negation such as *that’s not true* or *that’s a lie*. For instance, we can negate (21) by saying:

    that-top lie-cop.pres this_way-cop.pres 
    ‘That’s a lie. This way (while the speaker is showing some different hand-waving).’

Also relevant is that Potts (2007) rejects a purely quotational explanation of direct quotation since even the semantic content of a directly quoted item can be an antecedent of ellipsis. For instance, observe:


The same holds for Japanese:

(26) Mikka-mae Hanako-wa “Uti-wa asita Kyooto-ni kae-ru-dosu”-to 
    three_days-before Hanako-top I-top tomorrow Kyoto-to return-pres-pol_rep 
    it-tei-ta-ga, kanoyo-wa kina so si-nakat-ta. 
    say-asp-past-but she-top yesterday so do-neg-cop-past 
    ‘Three days ago, Hanako said, “I will go back to Kyoto tomorrow,” but she didn’t do so yesterday.’

In (26), the quoted sentence is uttered in a version of Kyoto Japanese; the 1st-person pronoun *uti* is typically used by female speakers of Kansai/Kyoto Japanese, and the sentence-final particle -*dosu* is a polite marker and typically used by a subset of female speakers of Kyoto Japanese. Also, the time adverbs show that (26) involves a case of direct quotation. Then, the *soo-su*-‘do so’ anaphor is licensed by referring to the subpart of the directly quoted item in the first sentence. I assume with Sakamoto (2019a) that the *soo-su*-‘do so’ anaphor involves an elliptic structure. Then, (26) as well as (25) can be considered as a counterexample to the view of direct quotation as a pure utterance type. However, my analysis allows the directly quoted sentence to be a usual sentence until -*to* is merged (or the quotation marks are merged; see Partee 1973). That is, even the directly quoted sentence is of the actual speaker’s own making. This is what Clark and Gerigg (1990) and Kamada (2000) argue for and recently developed by Davidson (2015) in formal-semantic terms. For the *soo-su*-‘do so’ anaphor, Sakamoto (2019a) proposes that it is a case of ellipsis that involves an LF-copy operation, or LF-recycling in Sakamoto’s (2019b) term, and that LF-copy is carried out on the Spell-Out basis (Sakamoto 2019b). Then, to the extent that LF-copying is still syntactic, we can copy something from the directly-quoted antecedent expression, for building the directly quoted item is also syntactic.

Then, what about the syntactic opaqueness of direct quotation? That is, sentences like (27) are said to be impossible; this is a case of subclausal/mixed quotation.

(27) *[What kind of feature]* did Quine say quotation “has $t_1$”? (Maier 2008:189)

However, Maier (2020) gives an apparent counterexample where such an extraction is possible as in (28). Following Shan (2007, 2011), he suggests that it is a case of unquotation, a typical case of which is overtly marked with square brackets [ . . . ] as follows:

(28) Who did Mary say that she would “never misunderstand ever again”?
Who did Mary say that she would “never underestimate them ever again”? (Maier 2020: 23)

Given this, the syntactic opaqueness of direct quotation may not be so reliable in discerning direct quotation from indirect quotation, and it can be said that even wh-movement is possible when the unquotation strategy is employed. Then, a natural question that will arise is how to distinguish direct quotation from indirect quotation with indexical shifting. For this, I suggest that it depends on how faithfully the actual speaker would like to report someone else’s original utterance. There are several features for a given report to be regarded as directly quoted. For instance, original intonations, speech manners and even facial expressions will be mimicked for direct quotation. However, for indexical shifting, such intonational and gesture-related modifications do not seem to be necessary, and if we want to do direct quotation at all, we can be choosy about what factors are important to mimic in order to render some report as an instance of direct quotation. At least for Japanese, I surmise that the dichotomy of direct and indirect quotation is not so clear-cut as it is widely assumed to be, and that these two are continuous with the boundary between them being rather fuzzy, and this view has sometimes been pointed out in the literature (cf. Kuno 1988), but I leave this issue for my future research. 

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have investigated the syntactic and semantic nature of the QC in Japanese. I have proposed that there is a hidden structure in the QC in Japanese, i.e. VP projected by SAY, and I have shown how the proposed analysis can explain why -to can take various linguistic/non-linguistic items and why it is employed for both direct and indirect quotations.

The gist of the idea lies in the semantics of SAY. Just like say in English, we have two kinds of SAY, one for indirect quotation and the other for direct quotation, while keeping the semantics of -to uniform. However, what is different from English is that SAY in Japanese always takes directly quoted items, but SAY for indirect quotation is special in that it can change the semantics of direct quotation into that of indirect quotation.
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