

In Japanese and Korean, embedded clauses headed by *-to/-ko* can appear without selecting predicates. We review a wide range of empirical phenomena surrounding this structure, which we call *Bare Quotatives*, and argue that the Bare Quotative structure represents an embedded speech act. While the interpretation of the missing predicate is either *say* or *think*, the difference is neither lexical nor categorical. It is a consequence of the referent of the addressee argument of the embedded speech act: When it is distinct from the speaker, the embedded quotative was an actual utterance. When it is coreferential to the speaker, on the other hand, the embedded speech act is a mental monologue by the speaker, which leads the *think*-interpretation.

In Japanese and Korean, an embedded clause headed by *-to/-ko* can appear without overt predicates that selected them, as shown below.

- (1) a. [kwacey-ka mahni iss-ta-**ko**] Mina-nun pang-ey thulepakhi-ess-ta.
homework-Nom a.lot exist-Decl-Quot Mina-Top room-Loc be.confined-Past-Decl
'Mina stayed in her room, (saying that) she had a lot of homework.'
b. [shukudai-ga takusan aru-**to**], Mina-wa heya-ni komotte-simatta.
homework-Nom a.lot exist-Quot Mina-Top room-Loc be.confined-finish
'Mina stayed in her room, (saying that) she had a lot of homework.'

We call this structure *Bare Quotative (BQ)*. Building on the previous studies of BQs, most notably Fujita (2000) and Oshima (2015, 2017), we propose a novel analysis of BQs as embedded speech acts.

Let us begin by listing some essential attributes of the BQ structure. First of all, the BQ structure can embed all the possible clause types.

- (2) a. Interrotative (Japanese)
[Mari-wa itsu kuru-no-ka-to], yakimokishite matte-i-ta.
Mari-Top when come-NML-Q-Quot impatiently wait-Prog-Past
'(I) was waiting (for Mari), (saying/thinking,) 'when will she arrive?'.'
b. Imperative (Japanese)
[Kore-de sukina-mono-o ka-e-to], obaachan-ga kozukai-o
[this-with favorite-thing-Acc buy-Imp-Quot grandma-Nom spending.money
kure-ta.
give.me-Past
'Grandma gave me money, (saying), 'buy what you like'.'
c. Exhortative (Japanese)
[Rainen mana a-ou-to], akushu-shite wakare-ta.
next.year again meet-Exort-Quot shake.hand-do part-Past
'(We) shook hands and parted, (saying), 'let's see each other again next year'.
d. Promissive (Korean)

[Cemsim-kaps-ul pothaycwu-ma-ko] halmeni-ka ton-ul na-eykey
 lunch-money-Acc provide-PRM-Quot grandma-Nom money-Acc me-Dat
 cwu-ess-ta.
 give-Past-Decl

‘Grandma gave me money, (saying that) she would provide (me) with lunch money.’

These sentences seem to be missing attitude report verbs, either *iu* ‘say’ or *omou* ‘think’, and the choice between them is not always indicated clearly.

- (3) a. [Yatto ame-ga agat-ta-to], Yumi-wa niwa-no souji-o hajime-ta.
 [finally rain-Nom stop-Past-Quot Yumi-top garden-Gen cleaning-Acc begin-Past
 ‘Yumi began cleaning the garden, (saying/thinking) it finally stopped raining.’
- b. [Yatto ame-ga agari-mashita-ne-to], Yumi-wa niwa-no souji-o
 [finally rain-Nom stop-Past.Honor-Part-Quot Yumi-top garden-Gen cleaning-Acc
 hajime-ta.
 begin-Past
 ‘Yumi began cleaning the garden, (saying) ‘It finally stopped raining, didn’t it?’.’

In (3a), the content of the BQ could have been uttered, or else, it merely represents the content of Yumi’s thought. The second possibility is less likely in an actual discourse situation because the speaker of (3a) supposedly cannot look into what was on Yumi’s mind. However, this type of interpretation is definitely possible in fiction, as the author has access to the character’s (= Yumi’s) thinking. Even under the content of the BQ was uttered, it may not be identical to what Yumi actually said. In other words, the BQ need not be a direct quote in (3a). In contrast, (3b) only allows the ‘saying’ interpretation, and moreover, the BQ must represent a direct quote. That is because of the presence of the addressee honorific marker *mas-* and the discourse particle *-ne*.

Another important aspect of BQs is that they are part of the *at-issue* meaning of the sentences in the sense of Potts (2005), Roberts *et al.* (2009) and many others. For instance, the content of a BQ can be the basis of a ‘no’ answer, as in (4).

- (4) a. Masaya-wa [atarashii kuruma-o ka-ou-to] ima chokin-shite-i-ru.
 Masaya-Top new car-Acc buy-Propose-Quot now saving-do-Prof-Pres
 ‘Masaya has been saving money, (thinking that), he would buy a new car.’
- b. Iya, kai-tai-no-wa, booto-rashii-yo.
 No, buy-want-NML-Top boat-Evid-Part
 ‘No, (I hear that) what he wants to buy is a boat.’

It is also possible to ask a constituent question that targets the content of a BQ, as shown below.¹

¹The situation is slightly complicated if the missing predicate of a BQ is ‘say’. A wh-phrase can appear if the BQ is an indirect quote (although it is perhaps slightly degraded). The direct quotation interpretation, on the other hand, does allow a wh-phrase. In the example below, the presence of the discourse particle *no-yo* makes the intended reading impossible.

- (i) ?Ayako-wa [dono joushi-ga gaman-deki-nai(*-noyo)-to], kaisha-o yamete-it-ta-no?
 Ayako-Top which boss-Nom patience-can.do-Neg-(Particle)-Quot company-Acc quite-go-Past-Q
 ‘Which boss is such that Ayako left the company (saying that) she couldn’t stand that person?’

This is not surprising since the same restriction applies to the complement of the verb ‘say’ when it is overtly expressed.

- (ii) Ayako-wa [Mana-ga dare-ni at-ta(*-noyo)-to], it-ta-no
 Ayako-Top Mana-Nom who-Dat meet-Past-(Particle)-Quot say-Past-Q

- (5) Ayako-wa [**nani-o** ka-ou-to] sonna-ni chokin-o shite-iru-no?
 Ayako-Top what-Acc buy-Exhort-Quot such-Dat saving-Acc Do-Prog-Q
 ‘What is such that Ayako has been saving money so diligently (thinking that) she would buy that thing?’

Let us now discuss the nature of the missing attitude report predicates. The most pressing question is whether such a predicate is truly missing or merely unpronounced but syntactically present at the level relevant to semantic interpretation. Fujita (2000), who advocates the former view, notes that the BQ structure does not allow a manner adverb (e.g., ‘in a loud voice’). In addition, Oshima (2015) observes that a goal argument cannot be added in the BQ construction, which is quite unlike its minimally altered counterpart in which the attitude predicate ‘say’ is overtly expressed.

- (6) a. [**Oogoe-de** dareka imasen-ka-to *(itte)] doa-o tatai-ta.
 loud.voice-by anybody exist.Neg-Q-Quot (say.Ger) door-Acc knock-Past
 ‘(He) knocked on the door, (saying) ‘Is anybody here?’ in a loud voice.’ = (Fujita ?, (75))
 b. [**Boku-ni** jaana-to *(itte)] dete itta.
 I-Dat bye-Quot (say.Ger) exit.Ger go.Past
 ‘(He) left the room, (saying) “Bye” to me.’ = (Oshima 2015, (13b))

In contrast, elliptical structures typically allow such additions. The following are some instances of (multi-)fragment answers and elliptical questions that involve the missing predicate ‘say’.

- (7) a. *What was Kenji’s reaction to Makoto’s being late for the meeting?*
Oogoe-de bakayarou-to.
 loud.voice.by idiot-Quot
 ‘(He said) ‘You stupid!’ in a loud voice.’
 b. *When is Kenji coming back from his trip?*
Boku-ni-wa ashita kaeru-to.
 I-to-Top tomorrow return-Quot
 ‘To me, (he said) he would come back tomorrow.’
 c. *Kenji disappeared, but he should have left a message to the addressee.*
 Sorede, aitsu, **kimi-ni-wa** doko-ni iku-to?
 So that.guy you-Dat-Top where-Dat go-Quot
 ‘So, where (did he say) to you that he would go?’

These data suggest that the BQ structure lacks an attitude predicate both phonologically and syntactically. On the other hand, the interpretation of the BQ structure does seem to require the presence of an attitude predicate, ‘say’ or ‘think’, at some level of grammatical representation. Fujita (2000) endorses the view that there is no predicate involved in the BQ construction. Oshima (2015, 2017), on the other hand, provides a Sign-Based Construction Grammar account, which is based on the following observations (from Oshima 2015, (19i, iii, iv), with a minor paraphrasing).

- (8) a. SAY-BQs can be paraphrased with *itte* ‘saying’ or *ii* ‘to say’, and THINK-BQs with *omotte* ‘thinking’ or *omoi* ‘to think’.

‘Who did Ayako say that Mana saw?’

- b. SAY-BQs imply that there is no causal relation between the speech of the BQs and the matrix clause event.
- c. THINK-BQs imply that there is a causal relation between the thinking of the BQs and the matrix clause event, or a manner relation between the two.

Oshima (2017), however, changes his analysis of THINK-BQs in such a way that they neither demand nor ban particular semantic relations. In his newer analysis, the SAY-BQ construction contains a feature structure that encodes a variety of information, such as the predicate type (= *say*), the lack of causality and the temporal relation between the saying event and the main clause event (Oshima 2017, (96)). The THINK-BQ construction, on the other hand, specifies similar information but makes no reference to causal relations (Oshima

In contrasting Fujita's and Oshima's views, we would like to focus on the following question: whether the distinction between SAY and THINK should be grammatically represented. In particular, we examine whether the presence/absence of a causal relation is indicative of the distinction.

First of all, we concur with Oshima (2017), not with his earlier view, about THINK BQs. Consider the following THINK BQ example.

- (9) [Kyou-wa nani-o shi-you-ka-to], eki-made-no michi-o
 [today-Top what-Acc do-Exhort-Q-Quot], station-up.to-Gen street-Acc
 aruite-iru-to, ...
 walk.Ger-Prog-when
 'When I was walking to the station, (thinking about) what I should do today, ...'

In this example, the unsaid question, 'what shall I do today', is neither the cause of the speaker's walking to towards the station nor the manner of his action. Informally speaking, the best translation is '... omoi-**nagara**', which merely indicates the synchronicity of the thinking and the main clause event. The causal relation of THINK-BQs is also much more context dependent than Oshima's (2015) analysis predicts. The fluidity of the relevant causal relation is particularly noticeable with interrogative BQs.

- (10) a. [Dare-ga ki-ta-no-ka-to], doa-o ake-ta-ra, ...
 who-Nom come-Past-NML-Quot door-Acc open-past-Cond ...
 'When (I) opened the door (thinking) 'Who came?', ...'
- b. [Mou okane-wa ir-anai-no-ka-to], musuko-e-no shiokuri-o
 Any.more money-Top need-Neg-NML-Q-Quot, son-to-Gen sending.money-Acc
 yame-ta-ra, ...
 stop-Past-Cond, ...
 'When (I) stopped sending money to my son (thinking) 'Does he need money any longer?', ...

In (10a), the speaker's desire to find out the answer was the cause/explanation for his opening the door. On the other hand, the cause of the speaker's action in (10b) is the biased answer to the polar question embedded in the BQ structure. It should be noted that the addition of the overt verb *omotte* to these examples would maintain the same interpretations. In this sense, Oshima's analysis would predict this kind of fluidity, but it makes it difficult to formalize the range of possible causal relations in the BQs.

We also believe that SAY-BQs sometimes allow causal relations, as illustrated in (11). In this example, the presence of the particle *-yo* indicates that the BQ represents what Akira actually said to someone else. At the same time, the content of his utterance is naturally interpreted as the cause or explanation of Akira's action.

- (11) [Konna tokoro-ni oite-wa abunai-yo-to], Akira-wa kabin-o shimat-ta.
 like.this place-Loc place.Ger-Top dangerous-Part-Quot Akira-Top vase-Acc put.away-Past
 ‘Akira put away the vase, (saying that) it is not safe to put it there’

Oshima’s observation is accurate if it is interpreted as a tendency or a trend, and it is can be explained in purely pragmatic terms. We make utterances while we are performing actions. Our utterances may be greetings, compliments, complaints or what have you, which may not be directly relevant to the on-going action. On the other hand, a thought that one is having while engaging some action is more likely to have some relevance to the action, especially when the thought is mention-worthy as a BQ. However, the distinction between saying and thinking is neither categorical nor absolute. For instance, we may choose to verbalize the explanation for an action while we are performing that very action. We may be distracted and be having a thought that is unrelated to the thing that we are doing at that moment and, for some reason, decide to express such an unconnected thought in the form of BQ.

We therefore conclude that the BQ structure does not make reference to any particular attitude predicate. Such a predicate is missing altogether in the BQ structure. In this regard, we endorse Fujita’s analysis, in which BQs are treated as a type of adverbial clause. Specifically, we argue that the BQ structure is a VP adjunct, a position in which both the matrix tense and the matrix subject c-command the BQ, and that the BQ is an embedded speech act phrase. Following Krifka 2014), we assume that speech acts are syntactically realized and can be embedded under certain circumstances. The following is the bullet point summary of our proposal:

- A speech act phrase comes with a temporal interval argument, which represents the time interval in which a speech act took place. This interval in the BQ structure is constrained in relation to the matrix even time in such a way that the former either overlaps with or immediately precedes the latter.
- A speech act phrase contains a speaker argument and an addressee argument. The speaker argument is PRO, (almost always) controlled by the matrix subject.
- The addressee argument is a small pro, which refers to the audience of the speech act. When it is distinct from the speaker argument, the BQ is necessarily regarded as an ‘utterance’.
- However, the addressee argument can be coreferential to or bound by the speaker argument. In such a case, the BQ is a *self-addressing monologue*, which can be a verbal act or a purely mental act.
- The speech act that corresponds to the BQ structure is existentially quantified (cf. Siegel 2006) and is integrated compositionally into the interpretation of the matrix sentence (see J.-Y. Kim 2018, Chapter 2).

While our account does not make a categorical distinction between SAY-BQs and THINK-BQs, the difference can still be represented. It also provides a more principled explanation for what we call the think-puzzle. In both Fukita’s and Oshima’s analyses, the ‘quotation’ status of the BQ structure is taken for granted. It is indeed true that the verb *omou* in Japanese and *sayngkakha* in Korean are not garden-variety epistemic attitude verbs in that they can select utterance-like objects.

- (12) a. Kenji-wa [baka-ni suru-na-to] omot-ta.
 Kenji-Top [idiot-Dat do-Neg.Imp-Quot] think-Past
 ‘Kenji thought, ‘don’t ridicule me!’

- b. [Keiki-wa hountouni yoku natte-iru-no-ka-to] omotte-iru hito-wa
 [Economy-Top really good become-Prog-NML-Q-Quot think-Prog person-Top
 takusan iru.
 many exist
 ‘There are many people who are thinking, ‘Is our economy really improving?’

However, we cannot ignore the fact that *p-to omou* / *p-ko sayngkakha* can also be used in a purely epistemic way. Under this interpretation, if *p* and *q* are semantically equivalent, then, *p-to omou* and *q-to omou* are expected to be equivalent as well. This prediction is borne out in the following pair.

- (13) a. Gakusei-wa zen’in shiken-ni ukaru-darou-to, sensei-wa omotte-iru.
 student-Top all exam-Dat pass-Evid-Quot teacher-Top think-Prog
 ‘The teacher thinks that all the students will pass the exam.’
 b. Gakuse-wa daremo shiken-ni ochi-nai-darou-to, sensei-wa omotte-iru.
 student-Top anyone exam-Dat fail-Neg-Evid-Quot teacher-Top think-Prog
 ‘The teacher thinks that none of the students will fail the exam.’

In (13ab), the equivalence between the embedded propositions leads to the equivalence between the whole sentences. Suppose that one hears the teacher say, ‘I think that none of the students will fail.’ Later, someone asks, ‘Does the teacher think that all the students will pass?’ The expected answer is definitely ‘yes’. However, this equivalence does not seem to hold with BQ-containing sentences, at least not as easily as one would expect. Consider (14ab).

- (14) a. Gakusei-wa zen’in shiken-ni ukaru-darou-to, sensei-ha oiwai-no
 student-Top all exam-Dat pass-Evid-Quot teacher-Top celebration-Gen
 junbi-o hajime-ta.
 preparation-Acc begin-Past
 ‘The teacher started preparing for a celebration, (thinking that) all the students would pass the exam.’
 b. Gakuse-wa daremo shiken-ni ochinai-darou-to, sensei-ha oiwai-no
 student-Top anyone exam-Dat fail-Neg-Evid-Quot teacher-Top celebration-Gen
 junbi-o hajime-ta.
 preparation-Acc begin-Past
 ‘The teacher started preparing for a celebration, (thinking that) none of the students would fail the exam.’

In these examples, we are more reluctant to treat them as equivalent. Our judgment seems to reply on how the teacher would have expressed her thought to herself, rather than on the propositional content of her thought. So, the think-puzzle can be stated as follows: Given that *omou* / *sayngkakha* can be purely epistemic, how could the BQ structure be kept from having that interpretation?

Our analysis can answer to this puzzle. The BQ structure represents a speech act (either actual or mental), and our compositional semantic system requires the extra syntactic layer of Speech Act Phrase. Therefore, even if two BQs are semantically equivalent at the propositional level, the BQs are not identical if they were expressed differently. What is **not** possible is to represent a *-to/-ko* phrase as a proposition, the semantic argument of the purely epistemic *think*, in the BQ structure. If such a *-to/-ko* phrase is adjoined to VP, there is no way to interpret it compositionally.

We have proposed an analysis of BQs that can capture all the basic facts that have been reported in the previous literature. It can be regarded as a generative syntactic / formal semantic implementation of Fujika’s analysis of BQs as adverbial clauses.

References

- Fujita, Yasuyuki (2000), *Kokugo In'you-koubun no Kenkyuu*. Osaka: Izumi Shoin.
- Kim, Jooyoung (2018), *Embedding without a License?: Typology of Unselected Embedded Clauses*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Delaware.
- Krifka, Manfred (2014), "Embedding illocutionary acts." In *Recursion: Complexity in cognition*, Springer, pp. 59–87.
- Oshima, David Y (2015), "Ellipsis of SAY, THINK, and DO in Japanese subordinate clauses: A constructional analysis." In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*.
- Oshima, David Y (2017), "Shuyoubu-wo Motanai Nihongo Juuzokusetsu." *GENGO KENKYU (Journal of the Linguistic Society of Japan)*.
- Potts, Christopher (2005), *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, Craige, Mandy Simons, David Beaver, and Judith Tonhauser (2009), "Presupposition, conventional implicature, and beyond: A unified account of projection." In *Proceedings of the ESSLI 2009 Workshop New Directions in the Theory of Presupposition*, pp. 1–15.
- Siegel, Muffy (2006), "Biscuit Conditionals: Quantification Over Potential Literal Acts 167-203." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 29: 167–203.