

A verb’s hierarchy regulates the clause-direct quotation integrity: Evidence from Japanese

We argue that direct quotation, as exemplified in (1) but not sufficiently testable in English, shows various degrees to which it can integrate with a clause.

- (1) a. Peter said, “I’m leaving!” [complementation]
 b. Peter shut the door, “I’m leaving!” [adjunction]

More fine-grained data come from Japanese. First, Japanese, unlike English, provides two types of questions targeting quotation. One (*what*-C⁰ V_{matrix}) treats it as a complement, another (*what*-C⁰ *saying* V_{matrix}) as a manner-adjunct.

- (2) Tarô-wa nan-to itta/ nobeta/ setumei.sita/ [×]kitai.sita?
 Tarô-TOP what-C⁰ said/ stated/ explained/ [×]expected?
 (3) Tarô-wa nan-to itte [×]itta/ [×]nobeta/ setumei.sita/ kitai.sita?
 Tarô-TOP what-C⁰ saying said/ stated/ explained/ expected?
 (2)-(3) What did Tarô say/ state/ say as an explanation/ say to express his expectations?

This shows that direct quotation is a complement for typically reporting verbs, for others being more acceptable as an adjunct. Secondly, the adjunct position is not fixed for all verbs. Quotative adjuncts appear within the scope of quantifiers in the case of clause-taking verbs, but rather outside it in the case of other verbs.

- (4) Tarô-wa ni-kai “Kore-de ii”-to setumei.sita/ hohoenda.
 Tarô-TOP two-time “This-INSTR good”-C⁰ explained/ smiled
 Tarô explained twice saying [twice/ [×]once] “It’s OK”.
 i. Tarô smiled twice, saying [once] “It’s OK”.
 ii. Tarô smiled [once], saying twice “It’s OK”.
 iii. [×]Tarô smiled twice, saying twice “It’s OK”.

Accordingly, quotation for *smile* can be higher in a structure than for *explain*; in this sense it is less integrated.

Finally, the third marker of clause-quotation integrity comes from the CP-NP relation.

- (5) John said/ explained the opinion “Peter is smart”.
 (6) Tarô-wa “Kore-de ii”-to iken-o itta/ setumei.sita.
 Tarô-TOP “This-NOM good”-C⁰ opinion-ACC said/ explained
 Tarô said the opinion “It’s OK”/ explained an opinion [by saying] “It’s OK”.

Contrary to English, only for *iu* “say” quotation modifies the NP; thus only for this type of verb the relation $Content(opinion) = “It’s OK”$ holds.

We claim that these effects are reflected by the implicational verbs’ hierarchy (Wurmbrand & Lohninger 2019). Verbs situated low in the hierarchy have a typically reportative character. Direct quotation taken by such verbs is most integrated, occupying the complement position, as in (2), and modifying the content NP, see (6). Quotation taken by verbs situated higher is less integrated. It is an adjunct, as in (3) and, as a bare CP, does not modify content NPs, see (6). Still, it is within the scope of quantifiers, as in (4). Finally, quotation appearing with verbs not embedding clausal complements (not figuring in the hierarchy) can be situated above the quantifier; thus it can appear outside its scope, like *smile* in (4).

We capture these effects in two steps. First, the syntactic position of quotation (complement, lower adjunct, higher adjunct) accounts for (1)-(4). Second, dependent semantic types of matrix verbs (applied by Elliott 2020, but not to verbs) encode modification of content NPs, see (5)-(6). Importantly, both steps are regulated by the position of matrix verb assumed by verb’s hierarchy.