

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Title        | Nominative and Genitive Cases in Japanese : From Dialectal and Cross-Linguistic Perspectives |
| Author(s)    | 猿渡, 翌加   |
| Citation     | 大阪大学, 2017, 博士論文   |
| Version Type | VoR  |
| URL          | <a href="https://doi.org/10.18910/61839">https://doi.org/10.18910/61839</a>                  |
| rights       |  |
| Note         |  |

*Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA*

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

Osaka University

**Nominative and Genitive Cases  
in Japanese:  
From Dialectal and Cross-Linguistic Perspectives**

**A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy,  
Studies in Language and Culture,  
Graduate School of Language and Culture,  
Osaka University**

**by**

**SARUWATARI, Asuka**

(猿渡 翌加)

**November 2016**



## Acknowledgments

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to the many people who have helped me throughout this project. As for any mistakes or errors, they are my own.

First of all, I would like to thank the three professors, Hiroshi Mito, Yoko Yumoto, and Masao Ochi, for reading this thesis and making valuable comments and suggestions. I would like to express my deep gratitude to Hiroshi Mito for his constant and warm encouragement that allowed me to persist with my work. He read my thesis a number of times and gave me invaluable suggestions to clarify my ideas. He responded to any questions I had and explained until I understood. I have a deep respect for him and cannot thank him enough. I also wish to thank Yoko Yumoto for her valuable suggestions and advices. Her words motivated me and, as a result, my thesis improved a great deal. In addition, without her comments, I would not have been interested in the *-ka* inflectional ending in Nagasaki Japanese. I am also grateful to Masao Ochi for reading the draft and making the time to listen to my dialectal perspective despite his extremely busy schedule. I would also like to thank Yoichi Miyamoto whose classes I attended and from whom I received valuable comments for my research.

In addition, I am thankful to the following teachers who gave me various constructive comments: Junko Sasaguri, Manabu Wada, Tadashi Eguchi, Yumiko Kinjo, Hiroshi Aoyagi, Seiki Ayano, Duk-Ho An, Kenichi Mihara, Norio Nasu, Nobuaki Nishioka, Tomohiro Fujii, Takeshi Oguro, Toshiaki Nishihara, Hisao Osaki, Shiro Kori, Chizuko Suzuki, and Shota Yoshihara. My special thanks also go to the following teachers for their native-speaker judgements and valuable comments: Murray Lawn, Trane DeVore, Dale Brown, Andrew Murakami-Smith, Zhijun Wang, and Heesun Han.

Moreover, I would like to thank the following former students and fellow students who listened to my presentations, provided me with helpful comments, and offered their native-speaker judgments: Tomoko Nakao, Maiko Yamaguchi, Asako Hirota,

Mika Ebara, Hideharu Tanaka, Masashi Yamaguchi, Yuta Tatsumi, Ryota Nakanishi, Akiemo Mukai, Kyoko Inoue, Keiko Yamamoto, Keina Hamagami, Ryoko Nakano, Yasuhiro Iida, Yuto Hirayama, Kenta Mizutani, Taku Yamada, Shun Ihara, Yuya Noguchi, Aimi Fujihira, Yuki Tagi, Miles Neale, Yuta Sakamoto, Koji Shimamura, Shinta Tamaki, Masako Maeda, Fumiya Tanaka, Hiromasa Itagaki, Akina Tagawa, Teyon Kim, Minji Ju, Jeehyun Kim, Seonmi Yu, Yuchen Zhang, Simon Yu, Lucy Hon, Jing Nie, Xi Chen, Hisae Takakura, Ritsuko Izutani, Yoko Nishida, Worasri Kulrumpa, and Risa Kaneko.

Many thanks go to my friends: Etsuko Lawn, Haruka Mori, Kana Ohashi, Saori Ishizue, Akiko Shindo, Ayumi Kawahara, Misuzu Isozaki, Emi Nakayama, Natsuko Kuwahara, Yukari Kodama, Yuko Adachi, Eri Muta, Chigusa Iwasaki, Yoshie Yamaji, Yuko Watanabe, Chiaki Takada, Yoshimi Ito, and Shihoko Hatano. They helped me with the data collection for this research. But what I thank them for the most is for meeting and spending time with me and for mailing me, regardless of whether or not my research was going well. Special thanks also go to the people in Nagasaki who kindly offered their judgments.

Finally, I deeply thank my parents and my elder sister for their warm support, encouragement, and love. I would like to give back more than what I have received from them.

# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements iii

Table of Contents v

## Chapter 1: Introduction 1

- 1.1 The Aim of the Thesis 1
- 1.2 Issues 2
  - 1.2.1 General Overview of the Nominative and Genitive Cases 2
  - 1.2.2 The Issues 12
- 1.3 The Organization of the Thesis 16

## Chapter 2: *Ga/No* Conversion 19

- 2.1 Introduction 19
- 2.2 Previous Research on NGC in Standard Japanese 23
  - 2.2.1 Harada's (1971, 1976a) Data 23
  - 2.2.2 The D-licensing Hypothesis (Miyagawa 1993, Ochi 2001) 25
  - 2.2.3 Watanabe (1996) 30
  - 2.2.4 Hiraiwa (2001) 33
  - 2.2.5 Takahashi (2010), Miyagawa (2012) 36
- 2.3 Previous Research on NGC in the Hichiku Dialects 39
  - 2.3.1 Honorific Case Marker *No* and Disparaging Case Marker *Ga* 41
  - 2.3.2 ND Readings and EL Readings 43
  - 2.3.3 Kato (2005, 2007) and Sakai (2013) 47
- 2.4 Genitive Case Licensors in Nagasaki Japanese 51
- 2.5 Neutral Descriptions and Genitive Subjects 59
  - 2.5.1 Kuno's (1973a, 1973b) ND Examples and the Hichiku Dialects

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 2.5.2 Kuroda (1965, 1972, 1992), Hasegawa (2008, 2010, 2011),<br>and Genitive Subjects in the Nagasaki Dialect | 65  |
| 2.5.3 Aoyagi (1999) and Genitive Subjects in the Nagasaki Dialect  | 71  |
| 2.6 Position of the Genitive Subject   | 81  |
| 2.6.1 Position of the Genitive Subject in Unaccusatives and Unergatives  | 81  |
| 2.6.2 Derivation and Subject Position of the Major Subject Construction  | 84  |
| 2.7 Genitive Subjects and Copula Sentences   | 88  |
| 2.7.1 Issues   | 89  |
| 2.7.2 Nishiyama (1999)   | 91  |
| 2.7.3 Data and Analysis  | 93  |
| 2.7.3.1 Genitive Subjects in Copula Sentences in Nagasaki<br>Japanese  | 93  |
| 2.7.3.2 Distribution of the Inflectional Ending <i>-Ka</i> in NJ   | 97  |
| 2.7.3.3 The <i>S-no baka!</i> “S is a fool!” Construction  | 106 |
| 2.7.4 Concluding Remarks on Genitive Subjects in Copula Sentences<br>in Nagasaki                               | 110 |
| 2.8 Further Issues   | 111 |
| 2.8.1 <i>Ga/No</i> Conversion and Focus  | 111 |
| 2.8.2 Genitive Subjects of Transitive Verbs  | 113 |
| 2.9 Concluding Remarks   | 115 |

### **Chapter 3: *Wh*-NP (Rhetorical) Questions and Nominative Case Markers 117**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 3.1 Introduction                                  | 117 |
| 3.2 Previous Research                             | 119 |
| 3.2.1 The Different Behaviors between OQs and RQs | 120 |

|       |   |     |
|-------|---|-----|
| 3.2.2 | Caponigro and Sprouse (2007)  | 124 |
| 3.2.3 | Cheung (2009)   | 130 |
| 3.2.4 | Yamadera (2010)   | 140 |
| 3.3   | Analysis  | 144 |
| 3.3.1 | More Data on <i>Wh</i> -NP Rhetorical Questions in Chinese, Korean,<br>and Japanese | 144 |
| 3.3.2 | The Structure of <i>Wh</i> -NP Rhetorical Questions                                 | 148 |
| 3.4   | Conclusion  | 154 |

## **Chapter 4: N Pro-Form Versus NP-Ellipsis 156**

|         |   |     |
|---------|---|-----|
| 4.1     | Introduction  | 156 |
| 4.2     | Distribution of the Pro-Form <i>One</i>   | 158 |
| 4.2.1   | Introduction of the Pro-Form <i>One</i>   | 158 |
| 4.2.2   | Previous Research   | 159 |
| 4.2.2.1 | Llombart (2002)   | 159 |
| 4.2.2.2 | Murasugi (1991) and Radford (1989)  | 164 |
| 4.2.3   | Analysis  | 166 |
| 4.2.3.1 | Linguistic Antecedents  | 167 |
| 4.2.3.2 | Not in Complementary Distribution   | 168 |
| 4.2.3.3 | Pro-Form <i>One</i> and Pro-Form <i>So</i>  | 170 |
| 4.2.4   | Concluding Remarks on the Pro-Form <i>One</i>   | 173 |
| 4.3     | Pro-form <i>To</i> ( <i>No</i> ) and Genitive Marker Reduction                              | 173 |
| 4.3.1   | Introduction  | 173 |
| 4.3.2   | Previous Research   | 175 |
| 4.3.3   | “ <i>To</i> ” as a Uniform and Genuine Pro-Form   | 180 |
| 4.3.4   | Genitive Marker Reduction/Drop in NC and Korean   | 188 |
| 4.3.5   | Concluding Remarks on the Pro-form <i>To</i> ( <i>No</i> ) and Genitive Marker<br>Reduction | 193 |
| 4.4     | Conclusion on the N Pro-Form and NP-Ellipsis  | 193 |



**Chapter 5: Conclusion 196**

5.1 Summary 196

5.2 Concluding Remarks 198

**References 201**

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

### 1.1 The Aim of the Thesis

Although the connection between syntactic structure and meaning has been extensively investigated in linguistics, this link is not always clear, which is what attracts linguists' interests. This thesis explores the nominative case *ga* and the genitive case *no* in Japanese and the constructions in which they are involved in terms of structure and meaning. We reveal the more precise rule and structure of the Japanese language by providing detailed data from dialectal and cross-linguistic perspectives. Primarily, three phenomena are examined: Nominative/Genitive Conversion (NGC), *wh*-NP (Rhetorical) questions with nominative case markers, and the N pro-form versus the NP-ellipsis.

First, in NGC, we pursue the connection between genitive case licensors in Japanese, particularly in Nagasaki Japanese (NJ), and neutral description (ND) interpretations. It is impossible to elucidate the detailed view of the NGC without examining interpretations or contexts. Regarding *wh*-NP (Rhetorical) questions, this thesis explores whether ordinary questions and (negative) rhetorical questions are syntactically and semantically equivalent. In addition to previous semantic analyses, more accurate syntactic structure is given. In other words, we elaborated how structures of ordinary questions apply to negative rhetorical questions. Finally, regarding the issue of NP-ellipsis, we investigate whether the N pro-form involves NP-ellipsis. We observe whether the NP-ellipsis is available in the same syntactic conditions and semantic situations as the N pro-form.

We also conduct the study from a dialectal and cross-linguistic perspective. By providing new sets of data from NJ, we explain the many characteristics of the Japanese language, especially with regard to the nominative and genitive cases. NJ is more delicate for case marking *ga* “nominative” and *no* “genitive” than standard Japanese (SJ). In addition, in NJ, *no* or sometimes *n* (genitive case marker) is

differentiated from *to* (*no* for SJ corresponding to pro-form *one*), which contributes toward resolving the issue of NP-ellipsis.

Second, by comparing data of (Nagasaki) Japanese with data of other languages, we investigate the commonality of these languages and provide the uniform analysis for the constructions cross-linguistically. In particular, we offer the structures for *wh*-NP rhetorical questions, which are applied to Japanese, Korean, and Chinese. In addition, we argue that N pro-forms do not involve ellipsis, based on data in English, Korean, and (Nagasaki) Japanese. Further connections between Japanese and Korean are also suggested in terms of the genitive case marker and NP-ellipsis.

## 1.2 Issues

### 1.2.1 General Overview of the Nominative and Genitive Cases

The Japanese nominative case *ga*, in contrast to *wa*, has been said to have a focus meaning (see for an exhaustive listing (EL), Kuno 1973a, 1973b) and a non-focus reading (i.e., athetic judgment in the sense of Kuroda (1965, 1972, 1992), and a neutral description (ND) for Kuno (1973a, 1973b)). Thethetic judgment as in (1.1a) is “a direct response to the perceptual cognition of an actual situation” (Kuroda 1992:22) and a nonpredicational sentence. In contrast, the *wa* sentence is a categorical judgment as seen in (1.1b), conforming to the Subject-Predicate form, predication in the traditional logical sense, and the *cat* in the perceived situation is “apprehended as an entity that is fulfilling a particular role in the situation” (Kuroda 1992:23).

- (1.1) a. Neko-ga asokode numutte iru. (specific,thetic judgments)  
cat-Nom there sleep be  
‘A cat is sleeping there. (It can be ‘The cat is sleeping there.’)’
- b. Neko-wa asokode nemutte iru. (specific,categorical judgments)  
cat-Top there sleep be  
‘The cat is sleeping there.’ (See Kuroda 1992:13)

Unlike thethetic judgment sentence, the *ga* sentences in (1.2) are interpreted as focus.

- (1.2) a. Neko-ga hashiru.  
           cat-Nom run  
           ‘It is the cat/cats that runs/run.’
- b. Neko-ga nezumi-o oikakeru.  
       Neko-Top mouse-Acc chase  
       ‘It is the cat/cats that chases/chase the mouse/mice.’
- c. Ningen-ga doobutsu dearu  
       men-Nom animal be  
       ‘Men are animals.’ (See Kuroda 1992:50-51)

The *ga* sentences in (1.2b) are used to answer questions like (1.3a) or when they have readings of the pseudo-cleft sentence like (1.3b).

- (1.3) a. Nani-ga nezumi-o oikakeru ka  
           what-Nom mouse-Acc chase Q  
           ‘What chases mice?’
- b. Nezumi-o oikakeru no-wa neko dearu.  
       mouse-Acc chase C-Top cat be  
       ‘That which chases mice is the cat.’ (See Kuroda 1992:51)

Although Kurod’s (1965, 1972, 1992) classifications for *ga* are not equivalent to Kuno’s (1973a, 1973b), the latter argues that the sentence in (1.1a) is an ND reading, whereas the one in (1.2c) is a focus reading.

As for the structural position of NP-*ga* and NP-*wa*, Kishimoto (2007, 2011) proposes an insightful analysis. When we compare the sentences with *ga* and *wa* in (1.4), (1.4a) can mean that *the dog* is in the scope of *dake*, unlike the case of (1.4b) with *wa*, which merely indicates “As for the dog, it only runs.”

(1.4) a. Inu-ga hashiru dake da.  
 dog-Nom run only Cop

‘The dog only runs.’

b. Inu-wa hashiru dake da.  
 dog-Top run only Cop

‘As for the dog, it only runs.’

(Kishimoto 2011:121, see also Kishimoto 2007)

Based on this distinction, Kishimoto proposes the structures for the sentence with *ga* and *wa* illustrated in (1.5a) and (1.5b), respectively.

(1.5) a. [<sub>ModP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> Inu-ga hashiru dake](da)]

b. [<sub>ModP</sub> Inu-wa [<sub>TP</sub> hashiru dake](da)]

(Kishimoto 2011:121, see also Kishimoto 2007)

Assuming *dake* attaches to T head, the NP-*ga* resides in the TP while the NP-*wa* is outside the TP region.

Moreover, Kishimoto (2001) argues that the NP-*ga* is in the higher position than the NP-*o* “NP-Acc” according to the indeterminate pronoun binding test. Indeterminate pronouns (including *nani*, “anything,” or *dare*, “anyone”) serve as negative polarity items when these pronouns are bound by the Q particle *mo*. In (1.6a), the sentence is grammatical as the object *nani* stays inside the scope of *mo*. In contrast, (1.6b) is ungrammatical because the subject indeterminate pronoun *dare* resides outside the scope of *mo*.

(1.6) a. Taroo-wa *nani-o* kai-**mo** si-nakat-ta.  
 Taroo-Top anything-Acc buy-Q do-Neg-Past

‘Taroo did not buy anything.’

(Kishimoto 2001:598)


b. \* *Dare-ga* warai-**mo** si-nakat-ta.  
 anyone-Nom laugh-Q do-NEG-Past

‘Anyone did not laugh.’

(ibid.:600)

Under the split VP analysis, after a complex head *V* with *mo* is raised to the head of the *vP*, only *vP* internal arguments and the spec of *vP* fall under the scope of *mo*; hence, only *YP* and *ZP* fall within the scope of *mo* as demonstrated in (1.7).

(1.7)



Kishimoto (2001) assumes that the subject is merged in [Spec, *v*] and overtly moved to [Spec, T].

Thus, the subject NP-*ga* occupies the position lower than NP-*wa* and higher than NP-*o*, i.e., the Spec of TP position.<sup>1</sup>

In addition, Miyagawa (2001) provides evidence that the nominative subject overtly moves to [Spec, TP] based on the scope fact of the universal quantifier *all*. The object *all* falls within the scope of negation but subject *all* is outside of the scope of negation as in (1.8a) and (1.8b), respectively.

- (1.8) a. Taro-*ga*                    zen'in-o home-nakat-ta                    (yo/to omou).  
           Taro-Nom                    all-Acc praise-Neg-Past                    (Excel/Comp think)  
           ‘(I think that) Taro didn’t praise all(!)’                    not>all, (\*) all>not


<sup>1</sup> Kishimoto (2001) argues that the nominative object moves out of the scope of *mo* by the LF output because it must be licensed by tense.

(i) Taroo-*wa*    *nani-o/\*nani-ga*                    wakari-**mo**    si-nakat-ta.  
       Taroo-Top    anything-Acc/anything-Nom    understand-Q    do-Neg-Past  
       ‘Taroo did not understand anything.’                    (Kishimoto 2001:607)


- b. Zen'in-ga            sono    tesuto-o    uke-nakat-ta    (yo/to omou)  
 all-Nom                that    test-Acc    take-Neg-Past  
 'All did not take that test.' \*not>all, all>not    (Miyagawa 2001 :298)

Miyagawa (2001) argues that the object *all* stays within VP as the complement position as seen in (1.9a). In contrast, the subject *all* moves to [Spec, TP], triggered by the EPP-feature on T as in (1.9b).<sup>2</sup>

(1.9) a.



b.



(Miyagawa 2001 :298-9)

So far, we have reviewed the interpretations and the structural position of *ga*. Now we turn to the genitive case marker *no*.

In Japanese, *no* can function as a genitive case, pro-form (pronoun), and complementizer. As a genitive case, the NGC is a controversial topic. The example is illustrated in (1.10), wherein the subject is marked by the genitive *no* as well as the nominative *ga*.

- (1.10) Boku-{ga/no} yonda hon  
 I-Nom/Gen read book

<sup>2</sup> Miyagawa (2001) also mentions the case of object scrambling. If an object is scrambled to the position preceding the subject *all*, the subject can be interpreted inside the scope of negation as in (i). Since the object satisfies the EPP, the subject can stay in [Spec, vP].

(i) Sono            tesuto-o<sub>i</sub>            zen'in-ga t<sub>i</sub>    uke-nakat-ta    (yo/to omou)  
 that            test-Acc<sub>i</sub>            all-Nom t<sub>i</sub>    take-Neg-Past    (Excel/Comp think)  
 'That test, all didn't take.' not>all, (all>not)    (Miyagawa 2001:299)

‘the book which I read.’

(see Harada 1971)

There are mainly two approaches: the genitive case is licensed by a nominal element, D (or N) (Miyagawa 1993, 2012, Ochi 2001), or the genitive is licensed by C (Hiraiwa 2001, Watanabe 1996). More concrete introduction on NGC is available in Subsection 1.2.2.

Unlike (1.10), the genitive case marker, *no* in (1.11a-c) is said to be inserted (Bedell 1972, Saito 1982, Fukui 1986, Kitagawa and Ross 1982 among others).

- (1.11) a. Hanako-no      hon  
          Hanako-Gen    book  
          ‘Hanako’s book’
- b. yabanzin-no    toshi-no            hakai  
          barbarian-Gen city-Gen            destruction  
          ‘the barbarian’s destruction of the city’
- c. America            kara-no            tegami  
          America            from-Gen            letter  
          ‘a letter from America’
- d. shiroi fudebako  
          white pencil.case  
          ‘a white pencil case’
- e. hashitteiru      neko  
          running            cat  
          ‘the cat which is running’

It has been discussed that the genitive case *no* is inserted after any NP or PP immediately dominated by a projection of N (see Saito 1982, see also Bedell 1972) because the genitive case cannot appear after adjectives or relative clauses as in (1.11d-e). Kitagawa and Ross (K&R) (1982) compare the occurrence of the prenominal modification marker (MOD) (i.e., the Japanese *no* and the Chinese *de*) and propose the



MOD insertion rule as in (1.12). While the Chinese *de* is allowed even after relative clauses or adjectives, the occurrence of Japanese *no* is more restricted. So, K&S (1982) assume the *no*-deletion rule as in (1.12ii).

(1.12) i. MOD Insertion Rule

$[_{NP} X NP] \rightarrow [_{NP} \dots X MOD NP]$

ii. *NO*-deletion

$[_{NP} X no NP] \rightarrow [_{NP} X NP]$

where (a)  $NP \neq e$  (i.e., the head NP is occupied by a phonologically full lexical item); and

(b)  $X = [\dots tense]$  (i.e., X is tensed [+V] final).

(K&R 1982:23)

Except for (1.12iia), K&R's (1982) suggestion is analogous to the analysis of the *no*-insertion proposed by Saito (1982) and Bedell (1972). Let us consider examples for (1.12iia). When it comes to *no* in (1.13), K&R (1982) postulate the empty pronoun following the genitive case *no* as in (1.14). In particular, *no* in (1.13b) or (1.13c) is ambiguous as to whether it is a genitive case or a pronoun. Therefore, under the condition that "NP = e" as in (1.14), *no*-deletion is not applied to Japanese.

- (1.13) a. shiroi      no  
           white      Gen  
           'the one which is white'
- b. John      no  
           John      Gen  
           'the one which is John's'
- c. Arizona    kara      no  
           Arizona    from      Gen  
           'the one from Arizona'

- d. hashitte iru no  
 running Gen  
 ‘the one which is running’ [SJ]
- (1.14) a. shiroi no [e]  
 white Gen  
 ‘the one which is white’
- b. John no [e]  
 John Gen  
 ‘the one which is John’s’
- c. Arizona kara no [e]  
 Arizona from Gen  
 ‘the one from Arizona’
- d. hashitte iru no [e]  
 running Gen  
 ‘the one which is running’

This empty pronoun analysis, however, is disputed as it encounters several problems (see Murasugi 1991 for the discussion below). First, *no* cannot refer to human beings as shown in (1.15), as opposed to the case of *pro*, which does refer to human beings as in (1.16).<sup>3</sup>

- (1.15) \*John no sensei wa kite-irasharu keredo,  
 John Gen teacher Top come-honorific though  
 Mike no wa mada kite-irasharanai yoo da.  
 Mike Top yet come-honorific seem is  
 ‘John’s teacher is here, but Mike’s one does not seem to be here yet.’
- (See McGloin 1985:11, Murasugi 1991:68)

---

<sup>3</sup> Murasugi (1991) suggests that it is ungrammatical unless the teacher is treated as a thing. To be more specific, *no* does refer to a person, but in that case, the person seems to be looked down or does not seem to be respectable.

- (1.16) a. sensei-ga irashita.  
 teacher-Nom came.honorific  
 ‘The teacher came.’  
 b. pro irashita.  
 came.honorific  
 ‘(The teacher) came.’ (Murasugi 1991:69)

Second, *no* cannot stand for abstract nouns as stated in Kamio (1983) and shown in (1.17), while *pro* can refer to abstract objects as in (1.18).

- (1.17) a. katai shinnen  
 firm conviction  
 ‘a firm conviction’  
 b. \*katai no  
 firm one  
 ‘a firm one’ (Kamio 1983:82)

- (1.18) a. Shinnen-ga John-o kaeta.  
 belief-Nom John-Acc changed  
 ‘The belief changed John.’  
 b. pro John-o kaeta.  
 John-Acc changed  
 ‘(The belief) changed John.’ (Murasugi 1991:70)

Third, the pronoun *no* can be overtly pronounced according to Yuzawa (1953).

- (1.19) Kore-wa watashi-no no de-wa arimasen  
 This-TopI-Gen one Cop-Top exist.not.  
 ‘lit. This is not my one.’ (Yuzawa 1953:302)

Finally, Murasugi (1991) provides data from the Toyama dialect, in which the genitive case is *no*, as pronounced in the same way as SJ, but the pronoun is realized as *ga* in contrast with *no* in SJ. As in the case of the pronoun *no* in Yuzawa (1953), the pronoun overtly appears as *ga* in the Toyama dialect as shown in (1.20), which contradicts K&R's (1982) empty pronoun analysis. Thus, the *no* in (1.13) of SJ should be a pronoun.

#### The Toyama dialect

- (1.20) a. shiroi        ga  
           white        one  
           ‘the one which is white’
- b. John        no ga  
       John        Gen one  
       ‘the one which is John’s’
- c. Arizona    kara            no ga  
       Arizona    from            Gen one  
       ‘the one from Arizona’
- d. hashitte        iru        ga  
       running                    one  
       ‘the one which is running’

The pronoun *ga* in the Toyama dialect also shows the same characteristics as the *no* in SJ, as seen in (1.15) and (1.17); it can refer to neither human beings nor abstract objects as seen in (1.21) and (1.22), respectively (see Murasugi 1991:73).

- (1.21) \*John no        sensei wa        kite-irasharu    keredo,  
       John Gen        teacher Top     come-honorific though  
       Mike no ga wa    mada    kite-irasharanai yoo    da.  
       Mike            Top     yet     come-honorific seem    is  
       ‘John’s teacher is here, but Mike’s one does not seem to be here yet.’

- (1.22) a. katai shinnen  
           firm conviction  
           ‘a firm conviction’
- b. \*katai ga  
           firm one  
           ‘a firm one’       (Murasugi 1991:73)

Therefore, Murasugi (1991) concludes that the pronoun is realized as *no* in SJ, which is different from the genitive case *no*.

The following subsection discusses several issues underlying the nominative and genitive cases.

### 1.2.2 The Issues

First, as for the non-focus *ga*, Kuroda’s (1965, 1972, 1992)thetic judgment and Kuno’s (1973a, 1973b) ND reading are not equivalent. In Kuroda’s (1965, 1972, 1992) analysis, only independent clauses with nontopicalized sentence are identified asthetic judgements, which is based on the perceptual cognition of an actual situation, so that verbs are generally used as the *teiru* form. In contrast, Kuno (1973a, 1973b) argues that NDs for independent clauses are restricted to the types of verbs and adjectives that denote the current temporal states: action verbs, existential verbs, and adjectives expressing changing state. However, this is not the case for subordinate clauses; hence, any types of verbs or adjectives are acceptable for NDs in the subordinate clauses. Thus, according to Kuno (1973a, 1973b), (1.2a-b) can be classified as NDs, which opposes Kuroda’s suppositions. How, then, do we deal with this difference between Kuroda (1965, 1972, 1992) and Kuno (1973a, 1973b)? Second, it does not seem that thethetic judgment or the ND reading is related to the structure in Japanese since both of them are realized as *ga*, which resides around T region, according to Kishimoto (2001). To resolve these two issues, this thesis observes the NJ dialect (one of the Hichiku dialects) in Kyushu. The Hichiku dialects are widely known to have two manifestations: *ga* for a focus reading and *no* for a non-focus reading (NDs in Kuno

(1973a, 1973b)) (Kanbe 1982, Yoshimura 1994, Kato 2005, 2007, etc.). Elaborating on this distinction in the NJ dialect will lead us to reveal the first construction, NGC, as well as the second construction, *wh*-NP (Rhetorical) question.

The third issue is the genitive case and pronoun (N pro-form), both of which are realized as *no* in SJ. In Saito and Murasugi (1990), the second nominal in (1.23) involves deletion as the pronoun cannot refer to the abstract object as stated in Kamio (1983), meaning NP complement, *taido*, is elided as illustrated in (1.24). So, *no* in *Mariko-no* is a genitive case.

(1.23) Haruna-no taido-wa Mariko-no yorimo rippadatta. [SJ]  
 Haruna-Gen attitude-Top Mariko-Gen than good  
 ‘lit. Haruna’s attitude was better than Mariko’s.’

(1.24) [DP Mariko-no [D’ [NP ~~taido~~] D ]  
 Mariko-Gen attitude

However, as discussed in the Toyama dialect, in the NJ dialect a pronoun and the genitive case marker are realized differently: *to* for a pronoun and *n* for a genitive case as in (1.25).

(1.25) Haruna-n taido-wa Mariko-n to yorimo rippayatta.  
 Haruna-Gen attitude-Top Mariko-Gen one than good  
 ‘lit. Haruna’s attitude was better than Mariko’s one.’

(NJ; See Bae 2012, Maeda and Takahashi 2013)

Maeda and Takahashi (2013) claim that *to*, as in (1.25), in NJ is a pronoun but also involves NP-ellipsis. By examining this issue by incorporating the Nagasaki dialect and cross-linguistic data, *no* in the second nominal in (1.23) will be clear. Later, (in the last paragraph of this subsection) we will elaborate on the issue in detail.

A more concrete guide for NGC (in Chapter 2) is as follows. Instead of the nominative case, subjects in adnominal clauses can be marked by the genitive case in

standard Japanese (SJ) as in (1.26) (Harada 1971, Miyagawa 1993, Ochi 2001, Hiraiwa 2001, etc.). The NGC has also been reported by other languages in the world: Cuzco Quechua (Lefebvre and Muysken 1988), Chamorro (Chung 1982), Turkish (Kornfilt 2008), Dyrbal (Dixon 1969), Tibetan (Mazaudon 1978), and Apatani (Abraham 1985) (see also Hiraiwa 2001).<sup>4</sup> Importantly, some Kyushu dialects (Hichiku dialects including Saga, some parts of Fukuoka, and most parts of Kumamoto and Nagasaki) spoken in the southwestern part of Japan show genitive subjects in independent clauses such as (1.27). (1.28) is from NJ.

- (1.26) Boku- $\{ga/no\}$  yonda hon  
 I-Nom/Gen read book  
 ‘The book which I read.’ [√ Standard J; √ the Hichiku dialects]
- (1.27) Basu-no ki-ta.  
 Bus-Gen come-past  
 ‘The bus has come.’ [\* Standard J; √ the Hichiku dialects]
- (1.28) Taro-no hashita bai.  
 Taro-Gen run.past C  
 ‘Hey, Taro ran.’ [\* Standard J; √ Nagasaki J]

Some questions arise. First, how is the genitive case licensed in NJ (among the Hichiku dialects)? Should we treat NJ completely differently from SJ? It is discussed in the literature that an ND reading and a focus reading (an EL reading) affect *ga/no* in the Hichiku dialects. More detailed analysis of interpretation and genitive case licensors are performed in Chapter 2.

---

<sup>4</sup> It is said that Modern Korean does not allow NGC (Sohn 2004 among others) while Late Middle Korean (in 15<sup>th</sup>–16<sup>th</sup> centuries) allows it (Jang 1995, Jin 2015 etc.). Significantly, in the song called *Kohyang-ui Pom* “Spring in the hometown” written by Wonsu Lee in 1926, genitive subjects are used as in (i), which indicates that NGC may have been allowed around 1926 in Korean. In Korean *ui* represents a genitive case marker.

(i) Na-ui saldeon gohyang-eun kott pineun sangol  
 I-Gen lived hometown-Top flower.bloom village.in.the.mountain  
 “The hometown I had lived is a village in the mountain where flowers bloom.”





the N pro-form as an ellipsis; M&T (2013) provides data from NJ in (1.31) with an overt pro-form *to* “corresponding to *one*” and proposes that this type of *to* contains what Merchant (2001) calls the E(llipsis)-feature, which means Japanese has an NP-ellipsis. Importantly, Korean does not show an NP-ellipsis as illustrated in (1.32) (See Saito and An 2010 among others).

(1.30) She likes the student with short hair better than the one with long hair.

(See Hornstein and Lighthood 1981, Murasugi 1991 among others)

(1.31) Haruna-n taido-wa Mariko-n to yorimo rippayatta. [NJ]  
 Haruna-Gen attitude-Top Mariko-Gen one than good  
 ‘lit. Haruna’s attitude was better than Mariko’s one.’ (M&T 2013)

(1.32) \*[Cheolsu-ui yeongu-edaehan taedo]-neun jo-chiman,  
 Cheolsu -Gen research-toward attitude-Top good-though  
 [Suni-ui \_\_\_\_]-neun jochi anta  
 Suni-Gen -Top good not  
 ‘Cheolsu’s attitude toward research is good, but Suni’s isn’t.’

[Korean; See Saito and An (2010)]

By comparing data from English, Korean and the Nagasaki City dialect in the Nagasaki Prefecture, we could find the real figures of these languages with regards to the issue on the N pro-form and the NP-ellipsis.

### 1.3 The Organization of the Thesis

This thesis is organized as follows. Chapter 2 provides comprehensive data of NGC from NJ and highlights the connection of genitive case licensors and NDs. How the genitive case is licensed in various constructions including major subject constructions, transitive (stative) sentences, and copula sentences is described. Although the genitive subject denotes NDs (in the sense proposed by Kuno (1973a,

1973b)), both in SJ and NJ, which these varieties of dialects have in common, when we look at NGC from the viewpoint of NJ, it is much clearer that the ND reading plays a prominent role for genitive case marking in Japanese. Technically, a weak *v* and C heads act as genitive case licensors in NJ. While the Hichiku dialects retain genitive subjects from Middle Japanese, SJ loses most of the cases and only allows them in nominalized clauses. Finally, *no* in the peculiar example of the independent clause, the *S-no Baka* “S is a fool” construction in Standard Japanese (as well as NJ) is discussed.

Chapter 3 first overviews previous research on rhetorical questions: mainly Caponigro and Sprouse (2007), Cheung (2009), and Yamadera (2010). As Cheung’s (2009) proposal that distinguishes *wh*-questions like (1.29) from ordinary rhetorical questions leaves some uncertainty, it is proposed that (1.29) should be equivalent in semantics and syntax. The negative interpretation should be dealt with at the pragmatic level, as argued by Caponigro and Sprouse (2007). Second, this thesis proposes that, based on data from Japanese, Korean and Chinese, these rhetorical *wh*-NP questions are copula sentences and have an embedded structure in which any type of predicates can occur, as opposed to Yamadera’s (2010) adjunct analysis.

Chapter 4 discusses the fact that the N pro-form, in principle, does not involve deletion. First, we focus on the pro-form *one* in English and proposes that the pro-form *one* does not involve ellipses, and the pro-form *one* and the NP-ellipsis are different constructions since they do not necessarily share the same semantic or syntactic properties; the NP-ellipsis shows more restrictions than the pro-form *one* when the antecedent is not linguistically expressed. In addition, they are not exactly complementary in distribution. This finding is significant to analyze N pro-forms in Japanese and Korean. The current analysis also claims that, contrary to M&T (2013), *to* in (1.31) does not involve NP-deletion based mainly on three points. Like the pro-form *one*, pro-forms in NJ and Korean can occur without a linguistic antecedent. Moreover, although pro-forms do not stand for abstract nouns (as stated in Okutsu 1974), they do so when used in the context in which two things are compared (as Kinsui (1994)), applied to English, Korean, and NJ. In particular, the Nagasaki City (NC) dialect in NJ represents two distinct forms for a genitive marker, *no* and *-n* as in

(1.33). The former manifests before certain head nouns including the pro-form *to*, which is a condition that coincides with the case when the genitive is dropped in Korean. We propose that the *-n* form of genitive case in NC and genitive drop in Korean are some forms of phonological reduction. With the aid of the Nagasaki City dialect, it is clear that *to* in (1.31) or (1.33) has nothing to do with ellipsis.

(1.33) Haruna-**no** taido-wa Mariko-**n** to yorimo rippayatta. [NC]  
Haruna-Gen attitude-Top Mariko-Gen one than good  
'lit. Haruna's attitude was better than Mariko's one.'

Accordingly, pro-forms (uniformly in English, Korean, and NJ) do not involve deletion.

## Chapter 2

### *Ga/No Conversion*<sup>1</sup>

#### 2.1 Introduction

This chapter explores the Ga/No Conversion “Nominative/Genitive Conversion (NGC)” through an examination of detailed data from the Nagasaki dialect (one of the Hichiku dialects spoken in the northwestern part of Kyushu).

Although genitive subjects are only allowed in adnominal clauses in standard Japanese (Harada 1971, Miyagawa 1993, Ochi 2001, Hiraiwa 2001) as in (2.1), some Kyushu dialects (Hichiku dialects) show genitive subjects in independent clauses such as (2.2).

- (2.1) Boku-*{ga/no}* yonda hon  
I-Nom/Gen read book  
‘the book which I read.’ [ $\checkmark$ Standard J;  $\checkmark$  Nagasaki J]
- (2.2) Basu-no ki-ta.  
Bus-Gen come-Past  
‘The bus has come.’ [ $\checkmark$ Standard J;  $\checkmark$  Nagasaki J]

The Hichiku dialects seem to retain genitive Case systems in Middle Japanese (e.g., in the 13th century, genitive subjects were used with *shushi*-form ‘end-form’ in independent clauses as seen in *Ujishui monogatari*<sup>2</sup>). This example is from

---

<sup>1</sup> An earlier version of some parts of Section 2.6 was presented at the 150th Conference of the Linguistic Society of Japan, held at Daitobunka University on June 20, 2014, and later published as Saruwatari (2016b). Some of the ideas presented in Ochi and Saruwatari (2014) were revised and extended. Section 2.7 is a revised version of a paper that originally appeared in the *Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar* 18, 515-534. I am grateful to Junko Sasaguri for providing me with references on Ga/No conversion and Hichiku dialects. I also wish to thank Hiroshi Mito, Yoko Yumoto, Masao Ochi, Yoichi Miyamoto, Hiroshi Aoyagi, Seiki Ayano, Manabu Wada, and Tadashi Eguchi for their suggestions and comments. My special thanks go to informants of Nagasaki and Standard Japanese for their kindness in providing me with judgements. All remaining errors and inadequacies are my own.

<sup>2</sup> In Old Japanese, null Case was the default for subject marking and *no* as well as *ga* were

*Ujishuimonogatari* (5-8), where the genitive subject is acceptable even though the auxiliary verb used is the end-form *keri*.

- (2.3) Toshigoroarikeru saburai-no tuma-ni gushite inakani ini-keri  
 many years servitor-Gen wife-with together rural home go.Aux  
 ‘One of the servant who had served (at the grand Japanese residence) for many years had returned to rural home with his wife.’

It has been accepted that genitive subjects are used for neutral descriptions (NDs) and that nominative subjects are used for exhaustive listings (ELs) or focus in Hichiku dialects (Kanbe 1982, Kato 2005, Yoshimura 1994 etc.). In comparison to the subjects in unaccusatives, as in (2.2), subjects in unergatives cannot take *no*, as in (2.4). The major subject is marked with *ga* as it has an EL interpretation, as in (2.5) (Yoshimura 1994, Murakami 1995, Kato 2005 etc.).

- (2.4) \* Hanako-no hashi-tta. [Kumamoto J]  
 Hanako-Gen run-Past  
 ‘Hanako ran.’ (See Kato 2005, Sakai 2013)

- (2.5) Taro-ga/\*no se-no takaka.  
 Taro-Nom/\*Gen height-Gen tall  
 ‘lit. Taro is tall in height.’  
 (See Yoshimura 1994 for Kumamoto J and Murakami 1995:25 for Nagasaki J)

However, when there are some ending discourse particles such as *bai/yo* (*yo* for SJ), genitive subjects do appear even with unergatives or the major subject in NJ, as in (2.6) and (2.7). Importantly, the subjects in (2.6) and (2.7) are an ND reading.

---

used only in subordinate clauses. Although both *no* and *ga* were used for subject marking even in independent clauses in Middle Japanese, *no* fell into decline and *ga* came to be used mainly in the *Edo* period (Oda 2007).

- (2.6) Hanako-no hashi-tta bai/yo [Nagasaki J]<sup>3</sup>  
 Hanako-Gen run-Past C

‘Listen, Hanako ran.’

- (2.7) Taro-no (kanari) se-no takaka bai/yo.  
 Taro-Gen quite height-Gen tall C

‘lit. Listen, Taro is tall in height.’

In addition, the genitive subject appears in subordinate clauses headed by various Cs, regardless of the types of verbs in the NJ, as in (2.9) and (2.11). This is unlike the case for SJ, in which the genitive is allowed only with unaccusative verbs in certain subordinate clauses, as in (2.8), that is called the *genitive of dependent tense* (GDT) by Miyagawa (2012). It seems reasonable that subjects of any predicates are marked by *no* in subordinate clauses in NJ as the subjects are ND readings.

- (2.8) [Taro-no kita toki], tonari-no heya-ni ita.  
 Taro-Gen came when next-Gen room-in was

‘I was in the next room when Taro came.’ [√Standard J; √Nagasaki J]

(See also Miyagawa 2012:151-2 for SJ)

- (2.9) [Taro-no waratta toki], tonari-no heya-ni ita.  
 Taro-Gen laughed when next-Gen room-in was

‘When Taro laughed, I was in the next room. [\*Standard J; √Nagasaki J]

- (2.10) [[S Yamadasan-ga/??no atta] **no**]-wa Russell-ni da.  
 -Nom/??Gen met C-Top -Dat is

‘It is Russell that Yamada met.’ (SJ; Murasugi 1991:98)

---

<sup>3</sup> Some data of NJ in this analysis are different from Kumamoto Japanese presented in previous research.

- (2.11) [[S Yamadasan-no atta] to]-wa Russell- ni bai.<sup>4</sup>  
 -Gen met C-Top -Dat C  
 ‘It is Russell that Yamada met.’ [Nagasaki J]

This chapter elucidates the distribution of the genitive subject in NJ, which has not yet been comprehensively discussed. As genitive subjects in NJ show great sensitivity to an ND interpretation, it is illustrated how an ND reading can be assured by comparing various examples in NJ with the conditions for an ND reading in Kuno (1973), Kuroda (1965, 1972, 1992), and Hasegawa (2008, 20011). It is also shown how genitive subjects are licensed in NJ. Technically, the genitive case licensors in NJ are considered to be D, C and weak *v*, which can be treated as being parallel to those in SJ (D, weak *v* in conjunctions with dependent tenses (Miyagawa 2012)) to a certain extent. The current analysis also accounts for why genitive subjects are allowed in copula sentences (including canonical adjectival and nominal adjective predicates), as in (2.12). The investigation of the adjectival *-ka* inflectional ending in (2.12a,b) casts some light on nominal adjectives in Japanese and the *no, as* in the unique *S-no Baka* “S is a fool,” construction in (2.12c).

- (2.12) a. Hanako-no otomashika. (Canonical Adjective) [NJ]  
 Hanako-Gen gentle  
 ‘Hanako is gentle.’  
 b. Hanako-no shizukaka. (Nominal Adjective)  
 Hanako-Gen quiet  
 ‘Hanako is quiet.’

---

<sup>4</sup> *To* (*no* for SJ) is used as a complementizer, a nominalizer and a pro-form in NJ. In this case, *to* (*no* for SJ) is considered a complementizer and not a nominal element, as the genitive is not allowed in SJ, as in (2.10) (see Section 2.4 for details). In Kumamoto, *tsu* as well as *to* appear to correspond to *no* in SJ. According to my informants in KJ, *tsu* does occur in the cleft sentence contrary to Yoshimura and Nishina (2004) or Sakai (2012). As for the pro-form *to* in NJ (or *tsu* in KJ), see the discussion in Chapter 4.

|                   |        |         |
|-------------------|--------|---------|
| c. Jiro-no        | baka!  | [SJ/NJ] |
| Jiro-Gen          | a.fool |         |
| ‘Jiro is a fool!’ |        |         |

The organization of this chapter is as follows: Section 2.2 reviews previous research on NGC in standard Japanese. Section 2.3 reviews previous studies on NGC in Hichiku dialects, particularly in relation to the honorific/disparaging distinction, the ND/EL reading and the position of the genitive subject. Section 2.4 proposes genitive subject licensors in NJ. Section 2.5 examines the connection between the genitive licensors and an ND reading. The ending particles *yo/bai* and the *toru* form (*teiru* form for SJ) play a prominent role for ND, which is supported by Hasegawa (2008, 2011) and Kuroda (1965, 1972, 1992). Section 2.6 offers additional evidence that genitive subjects stay within  $\nu$ P. Section 2.7 discusses copula sentences (nominal predicates and adjectival predicates) in NJ and, demonstrates how the subject can take *no*. Furthermore we provide the structure for cases such as *S-no Baka*, “S is a fool!” Section 2.8 lays out some remaining issues, and finally, section 2.9 concludes this chapter.

## 2.2 Previous Research on NGC in Standard Japanese

### 2.2.1 Harada’s (1971, 1976a) Data

NGC was first pointed out by Harada (1971), who noted that NGC occurs only in certain embedded clauses. In relative clauses, the nominative *ga* can alternate with genitive *no* for subjects, as in (2.13), as well as for objects, as in (2.14). In nominal clauses headed by *koto* “that/fact” in (2.15) or the nominalizer *no* in (2.16), NGC also appears.

|                   |       |      |
|-------------------|-------|------|
| (2.13) a. Boku-ga | yonda | hon  |
| I-Nom             | read  | book |
| b. Boku-no        | yonda | hon  |
| I-Gen             | read  | book |



‘the book which I read.’ [Standard Japanese; Harada 1971:26]

(2.14) a. Okashi-ga sukina onnanoko

Candy-Nom like girl

b. Okashi-no sukina onnanoko

Candy-Gen like girl

‘the girl who likes candies.’ [Standard Japanese; *ibid.*]

(2.15) a. Taroo-wa kinoo Ziro-ga kita koto-o siranakatta.

Taroo-Top yesterday Ziro-Nom came fact-Acc know-not-past

‘Taro wasn’t aware the fact that Jiro came yesterday.’

b. Taroo-wa kinoo Ziro-no kita koto-o siranakatta.

Taroo-Top yesterday Ziro-Gen came fact-Acc know-not-past

[Standard Japanese; *ibid.*:27-8]

(2.16) a. Taroo-wa kinoo Ziro-ga sinda no-ni odoroit.

Taroo-Top yesterday Ziro-Nom died NO-NI got-surprised

‘Taro was surprised that Jiro died yesterday.’

b. Taroo-wa kinoo Ziro-no sinda no-ni odoroit.

Taroo-Top yesterday Ziro-Gen died NO-NI got-surprised

[Standard Japanese; *ibid.*:27-8]

However, when it comes to the complementizer *to*, NGC cannot occur.

(2.17) a. Taroo-wa kinoo Ziro-ga kita to omotta.

Taroo-Top yesterday Ziro-Nom came C thought

‘Taro thought that Jiro came yesterday.’

b. \* Taroo-wa kinoo Ziro-no kita to omotta.

Taroo-Top yesterday Ziro-Gen came C thought

[Standard Japanese; *ibid.*:27-8]

Harada (1971) also points out that there is an idiolectal variation in the Tokyo dialect (Standard Japanese) concerning (2.18b), which is acceptable for speakers of dialect A

but not for speakers of dialect B in the two dialectal groups A and B. Harada states that the dialect A is losing its status while the dialect B has gained predominance for speakers of the Tokyo dialect. In fact, most researchers have considered (2.18b), in which the direct objects follow the genitive subjects, to be unacceptable in SJ. Therefore, genitive subjects show a transitivity restriction (TR).

- (2.18) a.    Watashi-wa Nixon-ga        uso-o    tsuite   iru     koto-o    satotta.  
               I-Top            Nixon-Nom    lie-Acc   telling   be     fact-Acc   realize  
               ‘I realized that Nixon was telling a lie.’
- b. (\*) Watashi-wa Nixon-no        uso-o    tsuite   iru     koto-o    satotta.  
               I-Top            Nixon-Gen    lie-Acc   telling   be     fact-Acc   realize

Accordingly, NGC occurs in adnominal clauses although genitive subjects show TR even in these clauses. Following Harada’s research, there are two further insightful approaches outlined related to NGC: the D-licensing hypothesis (Miyagawa 1993 and Ochi 2001) and the C-licensing hypothesis (Hiraiwa 2001 and Watanabe 1996). Let us first review the D-licensing approach.

### 2.2.2 The D-licensing Hypothesis (Miyagawa 1993, Ochi 2001)

Bedell (1972) and Saito (1983) propose that the genitive subject moves from the TP and must be directly dominated by a projection of D (N) to be marked with *no*, as shown in (2.19). However, this analysis does not account for instances such as in (2.20), which is raised by Nakai (1980). Here the adverb *kinoo* ‘yesterday’ appears directly before the genitive subject. Such adverbs appear within TP and therefore the genitive subject is also within the same projection, so is not directly dominated by a projection of D.

- (2.19) [<sub>DP</sub>Taro<sub>i</sub>-no            [<sub>TP</sub> *t<sub>i</sub>* kaita] hon]  
           Taro-Gen                wrote book  
           ‘the book Taro wrote’

(2.20) [<sub>DP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> kinoo Taro-no kaita] hon]  
 Yesterday Taro-Gen wrote book  
 ‘The book Taro wrote yesterday’

To solve this issue, Miyagawa (1993) argues that case features are checked at LF which is along the lines of Chomsky (1993). In Miyagawa’s analysis, a subject with a genitive case moves into the Spec of the higher DP for case checking across the sentence-initial adverb if there are such adverbs. As can be seen in (2.21), the nominative case only has reading (i) while the genitive case has both (i) and (ii). The nominative subject does not move and is c-commanded by the head noun, which takes only reading (i). Reading (ii) in (2.21b) is because the subject phrase with *no* is raised into Spec,DP for genitive case checking and takes scope over the head noun *kanousei* ‘possibility’.

(2.21) a. [[John-ka Mary]-ga kita] kanousei-ga 50%izyoo da  
 John-or Mary]-Nom came probability-Nom 50%over is  
 (i) ‘The probability that John or Mary came is over 50%.’  
 (ii) ‘\*The propability that John came or the probability that Mary came is over 50%.’

b. [[John-ka Mary]-no kita] kanousei-ga 50%izyoo da  
 John-or Mary]-Gen came probability-Nom 50%over is  
 (i) ‘The probability that John or Mary came is over 50%.’  
 (ii) ‘The propability that John came or the probability that Mary came is over 50%.’ (Miyagawa 1993: 6-7)

Miyagawa (1993) also points out that the Spec of the DP may be in an A or A’ position, with the former leading to a wide scope reading over the head nouns, as in (2.21bii), while the latter has a narrow scope reading (2.21bi). As seen in (2.22), if a PP modifier occurs to the left of the genitive subject, only a narrow scope is allowed. This is because PP modifiers block the A-movement of the genitive subject. In (2.22), only the A’-movement of the genitive phrase is possible, so the genitive phrase has a narrow

scope reading. If the Spec of the DP is A', the genitive subject is reconstructed in the original position.

- (2.22) [DP [IP disuko-de [John-ka Mary]-no odotta] riyuu]-o oshiete.  
 disco-at John-or Mary-Gen danced reason-Acc tell.me  
 'Tell me the reason why John or Mary danced at the disco.'  
 Reason>John or Mary; \*John or Mary> reason (Miyagawa 1993: 20)

In contrast to prenominal gapless clauses, for relative clauses as in (2.23), both the nominative subject and the genitive subject can take scope over the head noun 'book'. This reading obtains because the nominative subject c-commands the relative gap, which has the same head noun coindexed through the operator.

- (2.23) [DP [CP OP<sub>i</sub> [IP [John-ka Mary]-ga/no t<sub>i</sub> kata]] hon<sub>i</sub>]-o misete.  
 [DP [CP OP<sub>i</sub> [IP [John-or Mary]-Nom/Gen t<sub>i</sub> bought]] hon<sub>i</sub>]-Acc misete.  
 'Show me the book that John or Mary bought.'  
 book >John or Mary; John or Mary >book (See Miyagawa 1993: 10)

Modifying Miyagawa (1993), Ochi (2001) argues that the genitive phrase optionally raises from within a prenominal gapless clause in overt syntax; only when the genitive subject overtly raises to SpecDP, it takes scope over the head noun. When it is the case where the head noun takes scope over the genitive subject or the case of relative clauses, Ochi (2001) proposes that only the case feature of the genitive subject moves as in the Move-F in Chomsky (1995). Ochi (2001) explains the scope ambiguity shown by genitive phrases such as (2.24b) and (2.21b) as follows. When the genitive subject overtly raises to SpecDP, it takes scope over the head noun, as in (2.24bii) (and (2.21bii)). In contrast, reading (i) in (2.24b) (or 2.21b) is obtained by moving the case feature of the genitive subject.

- (2.24) a. [[Rubi-ka        shinju]-ga        yasuku-naru]        kanousei]-ga  
           Ruby-or        peal-Nom        cheap-become        probability-Nom  
           50% izyoo    da  
           50% over    is
- i. ‘The probability that rubies or peals become cheap is over 50%.’  
 ii. \* ‘The probability that rubies become cheap or the probability that peals become cheap is over 50%.’
- b. [[Rubi-ka        shinju]-no        yasuku-naru]        kanousei]-ga  
           Ruby-or        peal-Gen        cheap-become        probability-Nom  
           50% izyoo    da  
           50% over    is
- i. ‘The probability that rubies or peals become cheap is over 50%.’  
 ii. ‘The probability that rubies become cheap or the probability that peals become cheap is over 50%.’

In contrast with Miyagawa’s argument that an A’ movement must be reconstructed for scope, Ochi points out that a scope reconstruction with an A’ movement is not obligatory, based on data of Szabolcsi and Zwarts (1997) as shown in (2.25).

- (2.25) a. Every man read few books.  
           every>few, \*few>every
- b. Few books did every man read.  
           every>few, few>every

For relative clauses such as (2.23), based on Sakai’s (1994) observations, Ochi argues that only covert movements are possible. According to Sakai, an ambiguous reading exists only if the genitive subject precedes the relative clauses, as in (2.26) unlike (2.27).

- (2.26) John-no            kino            unten-shite-ita    kuruma  
           John-Gen        yesterday        drive-doing-was car  
 a. ‘the car that John was driving yesterday’ (John =agent)  
 b. ‘John’s car that he was driving yesterday.’ (John =agent + possessor)

- (2.27) [Kinoo            unten-shite-ita] John-no            kuruma  
           Yesterday        drive-doing-was John-Gen        car  
 a. \*‘the cat that John was driving yesterday’ (John =agent)  
 b. ‘John’s car that he was driving yesterday.’ (John =agent + possessor)


(Ochi 2001:265)

Crucially, when the genitive subject resides outside the relative clause as in (2.28), the agent reading of the genitive subject is not available. This indicates that not the overt raising structure but the control structure is possible as illustrated in (2.29).

- (2.28) John-no,            [totemo atarashii], kinoo            unten-shite-ita            kuruma  
           John-Gen            very    new            yesterday    drive-doing-was            car  
 a. \*‘the very new car that John was driving yesterday’ (John =agent)  
 b. ‘John’s very new car that he was driving yesterday.’ (John =agent + possessor)

(Ochi 2001:267)

- (2.29) a. \*<sub>[D<sub>agr</sub>P</sub> John-Gen<sub>i</sub> [very new] [<sub>t<sub>i</sub></sub> yesterday was-driving] car]



- b. [<sub>D<sub>agr</sub>P</sub> John-Gen<sub>i</sub> [very new] [<sub>pro<sub>i</sub></sub> yesterday was-driving] car]

(Ochi 2001:268)<sup>5</sup>

Therefore, Ochi concludes that only a covert movement of the genitive case feature is available for relative clauses.

<sup>5</sup> Ochi assumes that the D<sub>Agr</sub> head is present in Japanese, as outlined in Abney (1987).

(i) [<sub>D<sub>agr</sub>P</sub>[NP            N] D<sub>Agr</sub>]

In opposition to the D licensing approach, Hiraiwa (2001) and Watanabe (1996) provide examples in which no nominal head seems to appear. An analysis of C licensing is given in the next subsection.

### 2.2.3 Watanabe (1996)

Watanabe (1996) provides comparative clauses such as in (2.30) where there is no nominal-like head, which is contrary to the expectations of the D-licensing approach. Watanabe follows Kikuchi's (1987) comparative deletion analysis, and argues that the comparative clause involves an operator movement (*wh*-movement).

- (2.30) John-wa [Mary-no yonda yori] takusan-no hon-o yonda.  
 John-Top Mary-Gen read than many-Gen book-Acc read  
 'John read more books than Mary did.' (Watanabe 1996: 394)

Watanabe (1996) argues that NGC is an instance of *wh*-agreement, which is related to CP area. In addition to relative clauses or comparative clauses (as in (2.30)), Watanabe assumes that the nominal complement *koto* is not a noun but a subjunctive complementizer that is occupying the C head, as it appears in imperative sentences as in (2.31).

- (2.31) Gozi made-ni shukudai-o sumasu koto!  
 5'clock by-Dat homework-Acc finish Comp  
 'Finish the homework by 5 o'clock.' (Watanabe 1996:392)

As NGC occurs in only certain embedded clauses, such as relative clauses, comparative clauses, and subjunctive clauses, and genitive subjects show a transitivity restriction (TR) as stated in Harada (1971), Watanabe (1996) points out that it should be treated in parallel with French Stylistic Inversion, which shows the same properties as NGC in Japanese. Watanabe's (1996) idea is based on Zaenen's (1983)





- (2.36) a. [CP [Agr-sP Agr [TP John-no Tns [Agr-oP Agr [VP t hon-o kashita]]]]]hito  
 b. [CP [Agr-sP Agr [TP Tns [Agr-oP Agr [VP John-no hon-o kashita]]]]]hito  
 (Watanabe 1996:389)

In contrast, no minimality violation is observed in nominative subjects. The nominative subject moves to the Spec of Agr-sP in overt syntax. Without violating minimality, the object can move to the Spec of Agr-oP as the Spec of VP and the Spec of Agr-oP are equidistant after the verb is raised to Agr-o, as discussed in Chomsky (1993).

- (2.37) a. [John-ga hon-o kashita] hito  
 John-Nom book-Acc lent person  
 ‘the person to whom John lent a/the book’  
 b. [CP [Agr-sP John<sub>i</sub>-ga Agr [TP Tns [Agr-oP hon<sub>j</sub>-o Agr [VP t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>j</sub> kashita]]]]]hito  
 (Watanabe 1996)

The argument that genitive subjects remain within VP is supported by data from the Hichiku dialect, which is discussed in Section 2.4 and 2.6. However, Watanabe’s *wh*-agreement proposal (feature checking in the Tns-Agr-C<sup>0</sup> system) is unclear as to why the subject takes *no* in the prenominal gapless clause, as in (2.38).

- (2.38) [DP [IP disuko-de [John-kaMary]-no odotta] riyuu]-o oshiete.  
 disco-at John-or Mary-Gen danced reason-Acc tell.me  
 ‘Tell me the reason why John or Mary danced at the disco.’  
 (Miyagawa 1993: 20)

Besides, as for the example in (2.31), Uchibori (2006) argues that genitive subjects are not allowed in imperative sentences as shown in (2.39a).<sup>7</sup> In contrast, the genitive case appears in (2.39b) because *koto* here is a nominal-like element.

- (2.39) a. Anata-ga/\*no kuru koto!  
 you-Nom/\*Gen come C(Mod)  
 ‘You come!’ [SJ; Uchibori 2006:76]
- b. Oujosama-ga/no nanto outsukushii koto!  
 princess-Nom/Gen how beautiful C(Mod)  
 ‘How beautiful the princess is!’ [SJ; Uchibori 2006:79]

In addition to Watanabe’s data, in which no D head appears, Hiraiwa provides significant counter-examples to the D-licensing analysis. In Hiraiwa’s data, there are neither nominal like elements nor operator movements, which also raises a question about Watanabe’s (1996) analysis.

#### 2.2.4 Hiraiwa (2001)

In addition to Watanabe’s data, Hiraiwa (2001) provides important data, which does not involve D head, such as in (2.40) and (2.41).

- (2.40) John-wa [ame-ga/no yamu made] office-ni i-ta.  
 John-Top rain-Nom/Gen stop until office-at be-Pst  
 ‘John was at his office until the rain stopped.’
- (2.41) [Boku-ga/no omou ni] John-wa Mary-ga  
 I-Nom/Gen think-Pres-Adn-Dat John-Top Mary-Nom  
 suki-ni-chigainai.  
 like-must-Pres  
 ‘I think that John likes Mary.’ (Hiraiwa 2001:77-8)

<sup>7</sup> As for (2.39), this judgment is also shared in the Hichiku dialects. See Subsection 2.5.2 for the interpretation of the subject in imperative sentences.

Hiraiwa observed NGC cross-linguistically and proposed that NGC is only licensed by the special verbal inflection, predicate adnominal form (the P-A form (*Rentai-kei* for Japanese)), which is a realization of the syntactic C-T-V head amalgamate formed via AGREE. Hiraiwa also shows the example in Classical Japanese in which there is no overt complementizer and only the P-A inflection form appears.

(2.42) Classical Japanese

[<sub>CP</sub> Tomo no empoo yori ki-tar-u]-wo yorokobite  
 Friends-Gen away from come-Pst-Adn-Acc delighted-at  
 ‘(bing) delighted at the fact that friends came all the long way...’

(Hiraiwa 2001:105, Kinsui 1994:163)

However, in an example from *Ujishuimonogatari* (5-8) in (2.16), the genitive subject occurs even though the auxiliary verb is in the end-form *keri*, which contradicts what Hiraiwa predicts.<sup>8</sup>

(2.43) Toshigoroarikeru saburai-no tuma-ni gushite inakani ini-keri  
 many years servitor-Gen wife-with together rural home go.Aux  
 ‘One of the servant who had served (at the grand Japanese residence) for many years had returned to rural home with his wife.’

Regarding standard Japanese, Kishimoto (2015) provides a significant example of exclamatives with the P-A form as shown in (2.44). Notably, the P-A form does not license the genitive case in (2.45), in contrast to the nominalized form suffix-*sa* illustrated in (2.46). Kishimoto’s data suggests that unless the predicates are nominalized, the genitive subject is not licensed.

---

<sup>8</sup> The genitive subject also appears even with *mizen kei* ‘an imperfective/infinitive form’ or *izen kei* ‘a classical conditional form’ in classical Japanese. In Section 2.3, we will see that the genitive subject also appears with various forms other than the P-A form in the Hichiku dialects.

- (2.44) Nantoyuu oroka-na!  
 what stupid-Atr.Prs  
 ‘How stupid!’ (Kishimoto 2015:161)
- (2.45) a. \* Nan toyuu kare-no oroka-na!  
 what he-Gen stupid-Atr.Prs  
 ‘lit. What his stupid!’ (ibid.:166)
- b. \* Kare-no nantoyuu oroka-na!  
 he-Gen what stupid-Atr.Prs  
 ‘lit. What his stupid!’ (ibid.:167)
- (2.46) a. Nan toyuu kare-no oroka-sa (da)!  
 what he-Gen stupid-Nomnl Cop  
 ‘lit. What his stupid!’ (ibid.:166)
- b. Kare-no nantoyuu oroka-sa (da)!  
 he-Gen what stupid-Nomnl Cop  
 ‘lit. What his stupid!’ (ibid.:167)

Hiraiwa also argues that the genitive subject has genuine subject properties and it raises to [Spec, TP] based on Ura’s (1993, 1996, 2000) analysis in which subject honorific agreements are indications of  $\phi$ -feature checking on T.

- (2.47) Kinoo Yamada-sensei-**{ga/no}** o-kaki-ni-**nat**-ta hon  
 yesterday Yamada-teacher-Nom/Gen H-write-Dat-H-Pst.Adn book  
 ‘the book which Teacher Yamada bought yesterday’ (Hiraiwa 2005:121)

However, according to Kishimoto (2012a), subject honorification is a  $vP$  level agreement. Notably, the subject-*kara*, which occupies the Spec of  $vP$  as in (2.48), can be a target for honorification (see Kishimoto 2012a for details). The genitive subject in (2.47) is identified in Watanabe’s (1996) analysis that genitive subjects remain  $vP$ .

(2.48) {*Ito-sensei-kara/Ito-sensei-ga*} John-ni sono-koto-o o-hanasi-**ni-nat**-ta.  
 Ito-teacher-from/Ito-teacher-Nom John-Dat that-fact-Acc Hon-tell-Lv-Past  
 ‘Prof. Ito told John about that fact.’ (Kishimoto 2012a:11)

(2.49) a. [TP [HP [VP SU-kara [VP V ]V-v] H] T]  
 b. [TP SU-NOM [HP [VP SU-NOM [VP V ]V-v] H] T] (ibid. 12)

Since Hiraiwa’s analysis confronts these problems, we still need to address cases where the genitive case is licensed by a nominal element. So, how do we deal with examples of SJ as shown in (2.40) and (2.41) (and also in Wanatanabe’s (1996) data for the *yor*i clause in (2.30)), which do not involve D heads? Miyagawa (2012) has an insightful analysis for this issue, building on Takahashi (2010).

### 2.2.5 Takahashi (2010), Miyagawa (2012)

Miyagawa (2012) argues that the genitive case, as in (2.50) (as well as (2.41)), is licensed by an empty nominal D head corresponding to *teedo* “degree” (in the sense of Maki and Uchibori (2008)). In the case of (2.51), however, Miyagawa (2012) proposes that the genitive subject is licensed by a weak *v* in combination with a dependent tense, *genitive of dependent tense* (GDT), along the lines of the genitive of negation in Slavic. Miyagawa’s proposal is based on the following two points:

(2.50) John-wa [Mary-ga/no yonda yori] takusan-no hon-o  
 John-Top Mary-Nom/Gen read-Pst-Adn than many-Gen books-Acc  
 yonda.  
 read-Pst

‘John read more books than Mary did.’ (Watanabe 1996:396)

(2.51) John-wa [ame-ga/no yamu made] office-ni i-ta.  
 John-Top rain-Nom/Gen stop-Pres-Adn until office-at be-Pst  
 ‘John was at his office until the rain stopped.’ (Hiraiwa 2001:77-8)

First, according to Takahashi (2010), (2.51) is not considered to bear a silent D head. The reason is that the sentence without overt nominal head, as in (2.52), and the one with overt nominal head, as in (2.53), show different scope facts. In (2.52), neither a nominative subject nor genitive subject leads to scope ambiguity. In (2.53), however, a genitive subject does bear scope ambiguity. Hence, Takahashi (2010) claims that Maki and Uchibori's (2008) silent D analysis cannot account for this difference.

(2.52) a. [[John-ka Mary]-ga kuru -made] mati-masyou.

[John-or Mary]-Nom come -until wait-let.us

'Let's wait until the time when John or Mary comes.'

\*'Let's wait until the time John comes or the time Mary comes.'

(Takahashi 2010:367)

b. [[John-ka Mary]-no kuru -made] mati-masyou.

[John-or Mary]-Gen come -until wait-let.us

'Let's wait until the time when John or Mary comes.'

\*'Let's wait until the time John comes or the time Mary comes.' (ibid.:368)

(2.53) a. [[John-ka Mary]-*ga* kuru *zikan*-made] mati-masyou.

[John-or Mary]-Nom come time-until wait-let.us

'Let's wait until the time when John or Mary comes.'

\*'Let's wait until the time John comes or the time Mary comes.' (ibid.:367)

b. [[John-ka Mary]-*no* kuru *zikan*-made] mati-masyou.

[John-or Mary]-Gen come time-until wait-let.us

'Let's wait until the time when John or Mary comes.'

'Let's wait until the time John comes or the time Mary comes.' (ibid.:367)

Second, only unaccusative verbs have a salient property in terms of genitive case licensing. In a temporal adjunct clause headed by elements like *toki*<sup>9</sup> "when" and an unergative verb, only a nominative subject is allowed as illustrated in (2.54), in

---

<sup>9</sup> The adjunct clause headed by *toki* 'time' is CP and *toki* is considered as C (see Whitman 1991).

contrast to the example with an unaccusative verb in (2.55), where either a nominative or genitive subject is possible.

(2.54) [kodomō-ga/\*-no waratta toki], tonari-no heya-ni ita.  
 child-Nom/\*Gen laughed when next-Gen room-in was  
 ‘When the child laughed, I was in the next room. (Miyagawa 2012:151)

(2.55) [Kodomō-ga/-no kita toki], tonari-no heya-ni ita.  
 child-Nom/-Gen came when next-Gen room-in was  
 ‘I was in the next room when the child came.’ (ibid.:152)

Analogous situations are observed in Slavic languages, where the genitive of negation is only possible in internal arguments, such as the subject of passives and unaccusatives and the direct object of transitives but not as the subject of unergatives or transitives (see Miyagawa 2012 for detailed data). As shown in (2.56), unaccusative subjects can be marked genitive. Miyagawa notes that genitive case licensing occurs for Slavic languages, as in (2.57).

(2.56) Unaccusative subjects

- a. Griby zdes’ ne rastut.  
 mushrooms.Nom here Neg grow.3Pl
- b. Gribov zdes’ ne rastet.  
 mushrooms.Gom here Neg grow.3Sg (Miyagawa 2012:154)

(2.57) In Slavic, the combination of weak v + negation licenses genitive case.  
 (ibid.:159)

Since, in Japanese, the genitive case is not licensed in main clauses as seen in (2.58), Miyagawa (2012) proposes the generalizations listed in (2.59).

(2.58) \*Ame-no futta. [Standard J]  
rain-Gen fell  
‘It rained.’

(2.59) a. Genitive subjects in Japanese are contained in a TP headed by T that is not fully specified as independent tense.

b. Genitive of dependent tense (GDT)

The combination of weak *v* + dependent tense licenses genitive case in Japanese.

As Miyagawa (2012) indicates, the unaccusative verb, weak *v* plays an important role for genitive case licensing, which is also applied in Hichiku dialects. This will be discussed in Section 2.4.

### 2.3 Previous Research on NGC in the Hichiku Dialects

From the view of Hichiku dialects such as the Nagasaki dialect, neither an N/D licensing approach nor Hiraiwa’s predicate adnominal form (the P-A form) is appropriate. As shown in (2.60), the conclusive form with an unaccusative verb licenses the genitive Case.

(2.60) Basu-no ki-ta.  
Bus-Gen come-Past  
‘The bus has come.’ [ \*standard J; √ Hichiku dialects ]

Moreover, not just the P-A form but also other forms as illustrated in (2.61) do occur in subordinate clauses with genitive subjects as in NJ of (2.61), in contrast with the standard Japanese of (2.62). Thus, even *kitemo* in (2.61a) or *kureba* in (2.61b) can license genitive subjects in NJ.



(2.61) Nagasaki Japanese

- a. [Dai-ga/no            **kite**            **mo**]            kamawan.  
[whoever-Nom/Gen   come-Cond   even-if ]       care-not-Pres.  
'I don't care whoever will come.'
- b. [John ga/no            **kureba**]            minna    yorokobu yo.  
[John-Nom/Gen        come-Cond        everyone be-pleased-Pres  
'Everyone will be delighted if John comes.'


(2.62) Standard Japanese (Hiraiwa 2001:83)

- a. [Dare-ga/\*no            **kite**            **mo**]            kamaimasen.  
[whoever-Nom/\*Gen   come-Cond even-if ] care-not-Pres.  
'I don't care whoever will come.'
- b. [John-ga/\*no            **kureba**]            minna    yorokobu yo  
[John-Nom/\*Gen        come-Cond]        everyone be-pleased-Pres  
'Everyone will be delighted if John comes.'

So far, the N/D licensing approach or the P-A form cannot cover NGC in the Hichiku dialect.

Now let us review previous research on genitive subjects in the Hichiku dialects. According to Kanbe (1992:56), the shaded area in Kyushu Island (2.63) is where the Hichiku dialects are spoken and where the genitive subject is allowed in a main clause. For instance, the sentence *Basu no* (Bus+ Gen) *kita* (came) "The bus has come." is allowed in the shaded area, which includes Saga, some parts of Fukuoka, most parts of Kumamoto and Nagasaki. This is a map of Kyushu island.

(2.63) A Map of the Kyushu Island



(Kanbe 1992:56)

### 2.3.1 Honorific Case Marker *No* and Disparaging Case Marker *Ga*

Historically, the choice of *ga* or *no* has been influenced by the social status of the referent of the subject; that is, whether they are an aristocrat or a plebian; *no* is generally used for aristocrats or a people of high social standing, while *ga* is used for plebeians or people of low social standing (see Hashimoto 1969, Nomura 1993a, 1993b etc.). Only a few Hichiku dialects such as the Tosu dialect (in Saga prefecture) or certain dialects in Kumamoto still retain this distinction (see Kyushuhougengakkai 1991 and Akiyama and Yoshioka 1991). *No* is used for a person, such as a *sensei*, ‘teacher’, who has a social status superior to the speaker as in (2.64a), whereas *ga* is used for a *kojiki*, ‘beggar’. This distinction between the honorific *no* and the disparaging *ga* is said to be more obvious in the Kagoshima dialect spoken in the southern part of Kyushu Island (see Kyushuhogengakkai 1991 and Kanbe 1992).

- (2.64) a. Sensei-no        korasshatta.  
           teacher-Gen    came.H.Pst  
           ‘A teacher came.’
- b. Kojiki-ga        kita.  
           beggar-Nom    came  
           ‘A beggar came.’        [The Tosu dialect; Kyushuhogengakkai 1991:215]

In most parts of Hichiku area, *no* is accompanied by honorific affixes such as *-su*, and *-naru* (*-nharu*) as in (2.65a) and (2.65b). Usually only *no* and not *ga* agrees with these honorific expressions, which maintains the classical honorific case marker, *no*. Unless the subject is focused, however, the subject cannot be marked by *ga* for a person considered to be of low social status such as the beggar in (2.65c).

- (2.65) a. Sensei-no        hashirashita. [NJ, Kumamoto J; See KJ for Sakai 2013]  
           teacher-Gen    run.H.Past  
           ‘A teacher ran.’
- b. Sensei-no        hashirinatta. [NJ]  
           teacher-Gen    run.H.Past  
           ‘A teacher ran.’
- c. Kojiki-{\*ga/no}        kita.        [NJ]<sup>10</sup>  
           beggar-Nom        came  
           ‘A beggar came.’

Hatsushima (1998) states that in the Saga dialect (another Hichiku dialect) the focused subject has to be marked by *ga* as seen in (2.66) even if an honorific expression such as ‘satta’ appears.

<sup>10</sup> Sakai (1993) provides a similar example, which demonstrates that even if *dorobo* ‘thief’ is used, the subject cannot be marked with *ga*.

(i) Dorobo-{??ga/no}        oru.  
       thief-{??Nom/Gen}    exist  
       ‘There is a thief.’

- (2.66) Kononaka-ja chochosan-{ga/\*no} gaikokuni ikinsatta tobai.<sup>11</sup>  
 these-among-in mayor-{Nom/\*Gen} foreign.country-to went.H.Pst C  
 ‘Among these people, it is the mayor who has been to foreign countries.’

Therefore, even if honorific expressions occur, the distinction between *ga/no* in the Hichiku dialects is more sensitive to whether the subject is focused or not. Let us look at this point in more detail in the following section.

### 2.3.2 ND Readings and EL Readings

When the subject is particularly focused in contrast to others, *ga* is preferred to *no*. *Ame* ‘rain’, which is marked by *ga* in (2.67b), has an EL reading because ‘rain’ is focused rather than ‘snow’ or ‘hail’ in that “It rained but it didn’t snow or hail.” On the other hand, (2.67a) is a normal sentence and states a fact. The subject in (2.67a) has an ND reading. *Sashimi* or *tsukue* in (2.68) is focused by comparing it with others, so is marked by *ga*.

- (2.67) a. Ame-n futta.<sup>12</sup>  
 rain-Gen fall.Past  
 ‘It rained.’
- b. Ame-**ga** futta.  
 rain-Nom fall.Past  
 ‘It rained.’ (Kanbe 1992:66)
- (2.68) a. Tempura yoi sashimi-no.hou-**ga** umaka.  
 tempura than row.fish-Gen.side-Nom tasty  
 ‘Sashimi is tastier than row fish.’
- b. Tsukue-**ga** ichiban yoka.  
 desk-Nom best good  
 ‘A desk is best.’ (Kanbe 1992: 60, See also Murakami 1995)

<sup>11</sup> *Satta* is another honorific expression.

<sup>12</sup> The genitive marker *no* can be pronounced as just *n* in the Hichiku dialects

As shown in (2.69), genitive subjects are not allowed if they are modified by *-dake* ‘only’ (see Hatsushima 1998, Kato 2007). This restriction also has been seen for the NGC in the adnominal clause in SJ by Akaso and Haraguchi (2010) and Miyagawa (2012), as shown in (2.70).

(2.69) Kon-naka-jaa      Taro-dake {ga/\*no}      gaikoku-ni      itta      to bai.  
 these-among-in      Taro only Nom/\*Gen foreign.country-to went      C  
 ‘Among these people, it is only Taro who has been to foreign countries.’

(2.70) Taro-dake {ga/\*no}      itta      kuni  
 Taro-only Nom/\*Gen      went      country  
 ‘the country that only Taro went’      (See Akaso and Haraguchi 2010 etc.)

According to Kuno (1973a, b), only the subject of action verbs, existential verbs, and adjectives that indicate changing states are marked by the descriptive *ga* (Neutral Description (ND) *ga*). The verbs in (2.71) describe actions. The verbs in (2.72) indicate existence, and the adjectives in (2.73) represent current temporary states.

(2.71) a. Tegami-ga      kita.  
 letter-Nom      came  
 ‘Mail has come.’  
 b. Ame-ga      hutteiru.  
 rain-Nom      falling  
 ‘It is raining.’      (Kuno 1973a:50)

(2.72) a. Tsukue-no      ue ni      hon-ga      aru.  
 ‘table’s      top.on      book      is  
 ‘There is a book on the table.’  
 b. Oya, asoko ni      John-ga      iru.  
 oh there.at      John-Nom      is  
 ‘Oh, John is there.’      (ibid.)

(2.73) Sora-ga akai  
 sky is-red  
 ‘Look! The sky is red. (ibid.)

All the examples in (2.71-3) have the ND interpretation. In contrast, the following sentences indicate states and contain the exhaustive listing (EL) *ga*. Note that the object *ga*, as in (2.74c), does not represent EL.

(2.74) a. John-ga gakusei desu.  
 John-Nom student is  
 ‘(Of all the people we are talking about) John (and only John) is a student; it is John who is a student.’

b. Saru-ga ningen-no sossen desu.  
 monkey-Nom man-Gen ancestor is  
 ‘It is the monkey that is the ancestor of man.’

c. John-ga nihongo-ga dekiru.  
 John-Nom Japanese-Nom can  
 ‘John (and only John) can speak Japanese.’ (Kuno 1973a:51)

These sentences are typically used as answers for questions such as those in (2.75), which require exhaustive listings.

(2.75) a. Dare-ga gakusei desu ka?  
 who-Nom student is Q  
 ‘Who is a student?’

b. Nani-ga ningen-no senzo desu ka?  
 what-Nom man-Gen ancestor is Q  
 ‘What is the ancestor of mankind?’

When it comes to Hichiku dialects, all the examples of ND *ga* can be turned to *no*. In contrast, all the examples of EL *ga* remain the same (see also Kato (2007) and Nishioka (2014)).

#### ND interpretation in Hichiku dialects

(2.76) a. Tegami-no      kita.            (Kato 2005, 2007, Nishioka 2014)

letter-Gen      came

‘Mail has come.’

b. Ame-no            huriyuru.

rain-Gen        falling

‘It is raining.’

(2.77) a. Tsukue-no      ue ni      hon-no      aru.      (Nishioka 2014)

table-Gen      top.on      book-Gen      is

‘There is a book on the table.’

b. Oya, asoko ni      John-no            oru.

oh there.at      John-Gen      is

‘Oh, John is there.’

(2.78) Sora-no Akaka

sky-Gen        is-red

‘Look! The sky is red.

#### EL interpretation in Hichiku dialects

(2.79) a. John-ga            gakusei      bai.

John-Nom      student      C

‘(Of all the people we are talking about) John (and only John) is a student; it is John who is a student.’      (See also Nishioka 2014 and Kato 2005)

b. Saru-ga            ningen-no      sossen      bai.

Monkey-Nom      man-Gen      ancestor C

‘It is the monkey that is the ancestor of man.’ (See *ibid.*)

c. John-ga            nihongo-no        dekiru.  
 John-Nom        Japanese-Gen    can  
 ‘John (and only John) can speak Japanese.’    (Kato 2005)

Accordingly, *ga* is used for an EL reading or for focused elements, while *no* appears when subjects have an ND reading.

As mentioned in Hatsushima (1998), the first person and second person tend to be focused when they are pronounced (with *ga*), so they are marked by *ga* in the Hichiku dialects.<sup>13</sup>

(2.80) An byooin-de        watashi/aata- $\{ga/*no\}$     umareta            tai  
 that hospital-in    I/you- $\{Nom/*Gen\}$         was born            C  
 ‘In that hospital I/you was/were born.’                            (Nishioka 2014)

Whether the subject has an ND reading or not is far clearer when we turn to genitive subjects in the Nagasaki dialect. We consider data in NJ after reviewing Kato (2005, 2007) and Sakai (2013).

### 2.3.3 Kato (2005, 2007) and Sakai (2013)

Kato argues that the subjects of stative predicates as in (2.81), intransitives as in (2.82) and transitives as in (2.83), as well as a major subject as in (2.84), cannot be marked by *no*, whereas objects of stative predicates, a regular subject in the major subject construction, and a subject of unaccusatives do bear *no*, as seen in (2.81), (2.84), and (2.85) respectively.

(2.81) Taro-ga/ $*no$         eigo-no            dekuru            to.  
 Taro-Nom/ $*Gen$     English-Gen        can                C  
 ‘Taro is capable of English.’    (Kato 2007:120)


---

<sup>13</sup> Nishioka (2014) argues that non-anaphoric weak personal pronouns such as *I* and *you* are always topics as stated in Erteschik-Shir (1997) and cannot be marked with *no*.






(2.86) Active-Inactive: Intransitive subjects are divided according to whether they are voluntary/active or not. A and the volitional intransitive subject are grouped together while O and the involuntary intransitive subject are classified together.




However, as the object is marked by *ba* in the Hichiku dialects, Sakai classifies these dialects as Tripartite, as in (2.87).

(2.87) Tripartite: A different case marker is assigned for A, O, and S.



SJ belongs to the Nominative-Accusative pattern as shown in (2.88). Sakai mentions that even if the object is scrambled to the sentence-initial position, the transitive subject cannot be marked by *no* according to her informants of Kumamoto Japanese.

(2.88) Accusative-Nominative: S and A are marked by the nominative while O is marked by the accusative.



So far, it is obvious that unaccusative subjects (inactive intransitives) act differently. This also applies to SJ, as only unaccusative subjects can take *no* in conjunction with a dependent tense, as claimed by Miyagawa (2012).

- (2.89) a. [kodomō-ga/\*-no waratta toki], tonari-no heya-ni ita.  
 child-Nom/\*Gen laughed when next-Gen room-in was  
 ‘When the child laughed, I was in the next room. (Miyagawa 2012:151)
- b. [Kodomō-ga/-no kita toki], tonari-no heya-ni ita.  
 child-Nom/-Gen came when next-Gen room-in was  
 ‘I was in the next room when the child came.’ (Miyagawa 2012:152)

As Sakai (2013, 2016) states, the level of the transitivity influences the subject marking. The level increases in the following order: the unaccusative subjects (inactive intransitives), unergatives (active intransitives) and transitives. The higher the level of the transitivity, the less possibility that the subject takes *no*.

However, data from the Nagasaki dialect shows that even unergatives and transitive subjects are marked by the genitive if some ending particles or a progressive form occurs, as in (2.91) and (2.92).

- (2.90) Basu-no ki-ta. [NJ]  
 Bus-Gen come-Past  
 ‘The bus has come.’

- (2.91) a. Hanako-no hashi-tta \*(tobai/toyo)/\*(bai/yo).  
 Hanako-Gen run-Past C  
 ‘Listen, Hanako ran.’ (See also Maeda and Maki 2014)<sup>14</sup>

- b. Hanako-no son hon-ba katta \*(tobai/toyo)/\*(bai/yo).  
 Hanako-Gen the.book-Acc buy-Past C  
 ‘Listen, Hanako bought the book.’

- (2.92) a. Hanako-no hashiri-yoru.  
 Hanako-Gen running  
 ‘Hanako is running.’

<sup>14</sup> Maeda and Maki (2014) provide the data shown below.

(i) Kinoo-wa Masashi-{ga/no} hashitta yo.  
 yesterday-Top Masashi-{Nom/Gen} ran C  
 ‘Yesterday, Masashi ran.’

b. Hanako-no son hon-ba kaiyotta.

Hanako-Gen the.book-Acc buying-Past

‘Hanako was buying the book.’ (See also Maeda and Maki 2014)<sup>15</sup>

Genitive subjects in NJ are more submissive to an interpretation of an ND reading. In the next section, I reveal the distribution of the genitive subject in NJ and its mechanisms, as well as highlight some parallelism between SJ and NJ.

## 2.4 Genitive Case Licensors in Nagasaki Japanese

This section discusses the genitive case licensors in NJ. As illustrated in SJ by Takahashi (2010) and Miyagawa (2012), the unaccusative verb (weak *v*) also plays an important role in NJ. However, a weak *v* or a C alone can license *no* in NJ.<sup>16</sup>

A general view of the genitive case licensors in NJ are shown in (2.93ii). Genitive subjects are allowed in NJ when there are certain licensors such as D, weak *v*, and C as listed in (2.93ii), in contrast to the licensors in SJ shown in (2.93i).

### (2.93) Genitive Case licensors<sup>17</sup>

(i) in standard Japanese:

a. D (Miyagawa 1993, Ochi 2001 etc.)

b. weak *v*, in conjunction with dependent tense (Miyagawa 2012)

(ii) in Nagasaki Japanese:

a. D

b. weak *v*

c. C

---

<sup>15</sup> Here is an example from Maeda and Maki (2014).


(i) Kinoo Masashi-no baiorin-ba hiki-yotta.  
yesterday Masashi-Gen violin-Acc play-Prg.Past  
‘Yesterday, Masashi was playing the violin.’

<sup>16</sup> Some details of the genitive case licensors are revised from Ochi and Saruwatari (2014) (O&S 2014). I interviewed more people with the Nagasaki dialect, so new data are provided in this chapter.

<sup>17</sup> Assuming the Probe-goal system in Chomsky (2000), C, weak *v*, and D Agree with the NP and license the genitive case in NJ. In SJ, D can be a probe, while weak *v* alone cannot function as a probe and needs the aid of a dependent tense.



b.



(See also O&S 2014)

There is more evidence to show that a weak *v* licenses the genitive on its own in NJ. In (2.97a), the adjunct clause headed by *-te* contains an unergative predicate, and the subject of the unergative verb is not marked by *no* in either NJ or SJ (since there is no weak *v* in the adjunct *-te* clause, which is a bare TP lacking a CP layer). In contrast, when an unaccusative verb appears instead of an unergative verb, the sentence is grammatical in NJ (but not in SJ) as in (2.97b), which indicates that *-te* on T (a temporal sequential marker according to Nakatani 2013), is not considered to be a dependent tense in the perspective of Miyagawa (2012).

- (2.97) a. *Hanako-no odot-te minna-wa yorokon-da.*  
 Hanako-Gen dance-TE everyone-Top rejoice-Past  
 ‘Everyone was glad as Hanako danced.’ [\*standard J; ?\*Nagasaki J]
- b. *Hanako-no ki-te minna-wa yorokon-da.*  
 Hanako-Gen come-TE everyone-Top rejoice-Past  
 ‘Everyone was glad as Hanako came.’ [\*standard J; √ Nagasaki J]
- (See also O&S 2014)

Now we turn to evidence for C licensing. Under Miyagawa (2012), the genitive on the unaccusative subject in the adverbial *-toki* clause is licensed via GDT in SJ. Its counterpart in NJ is also acceptable, as in (2.98a). Importantly, even the genitive case on the unergative subject is licensed in NJ, unlike in SJ. The genitive case is licensed by the C head *toki* “when” in NJ.

- (2.98) a. Hanako-no      ki-ta            **toki**,      minna-wa      yorokon-da.  
                  Hanako-Gen      come-Past      when      everyone-Top rejoice-Past  
                  ‘Everyone was glad when Hanako came.’      [√standard J; √Nagasaki J]
- b. Hanako-no      odot-ta            **toki**,      minna-wa      yorokon-da.  
                  Hanako-Gen      dance-Past      when      everyone-Top rejoice-Past  
                  ‘Everyone was glad when Hanako danced.’      [\*standard J; √Nagasaki J]

(See also O&S 2014)

Likewise, regardless of the types of the predicate, in subordinate clauses with *toki* or *made*, as well as clauses with *ken* “because” or *nara* “if,” *no* is allowed in NJ, as in (2.99), which indicates that various Cs license the genitive case in NJ unlike SJ.

- (2.99) a. Hanako-no      odoru      **toki/made**,      kaijo-ni      oru-ne.  
                  Hanako-Gen      dance      when/until      hall-at      be-C  
                  ‘When/until Hanako dances, I’ll be at the hall.’
- b. Hanako-no      odoru      **ken**,      kaijo-ni      oru-ne.  
                  Hanako-Gen      dance      because      hall-at      be-C  
                  ‘Because Hanako will dance, I’ll be at the hall.’
- c. Hanako-no      odoru      **nara**,      kaijo-ni      oru-ne.  
                  Hanako-Gen      dance      if      hall-at      be-C  
                  ‘If Hanako dances, I’ll be at the hall.’      [\*standard J; √Nagasaki J]

(See also O&S 2014)


Although Murasugi (1991) (see also Hiraiwa and Ishihara (2002)) argues that *no* in the cleft sentence is not a nominal element and *ga/no* conversion is not possible in SJ, as in (2.100a), genitive case is licensed in NJ as shown in (2.100b), as predicted. C head *no* in SJ corresponds to *to* in NJ.





- (2.102)a. Hanako-no hashitta bai.<sup>18</sup>  
 Hanako-no run-Past C  
 ‘Hey, Hanako ran.’

b.



A question arises as to whether *bai* and *tobai* can be treated in a similar way. In some Hichiku dialects including the Nagasaki dialect and the Kumamoto dialect, the copula *ya* (*da* for SJ) is not overtly realized when ending particles such as *bai* and *yo* co-occur with the copula, or when the sentence ends with the copula (see also Kodama 2006).

<sup>18</sup> Instead of *bai*, *yo* can be used for female speakers in NJ. *Yo* is accounted for in terms of speech acts according to Saito (2013) and Saito and Haraguchi (2012), among other scholars, and it is assumed that *yo* does not select its complement. However, *yo* as well as *bai* are infelicitous in application after every major constituent in NJ as in (i). So, *bai* as well as *yo* in NJ are sentence-ending particles and not interjections.

- (i) \*Hanako-ga bai/yo, soko-ni bai/yo, it-te bai/yo, ... [NJ]  
 Hanako-Nom bai/yo there-to bai/yo go-and bai/yo  
 ‘Hanako went there, and ...’

There are several reasons why the sentence-ending particle *yo* as in (2.103b) and the interjection particle *yo* as in (ii) should be differentiated.

- (ii) Hanako-ga (yo), soko-ni (yo), it-te (yo), ... [SJ; Saito and Hraguchi 2012:119]  
 Hanako-Nom yo there-to yo go-and yo  
 ‘Hanako went there, and ...’

First, *yo* cannot act as an interjection for female speakers even in SJ, whereas the sentence-ending *yo* can be used for both females and males or preferred by females. Second, the interjection particles function differently from sentence-ending particles; the former is generally used to continue an utterance and show considerations for an addressee, whereas the latter (for instance, *yo*) conveys information that a listener does not know and even the latter case of *ne* indicates confirmation or shares information (see Izuhara 2003, 2008, 2011 and Kinsui 1993, among many others). Third, their intonations have distinct patterns (see Kori 2016 and Izuhara 2003, among others). As various issues arise when treating interjections and sentence-ending particles uniformly, it is suggested that they should be classified as different categories.

Accordingly, (2.103) should be analyzed as a *noda* construction. (2.103a) in NJ corresponds to (2.103b) in SJ. The structures in (2.103) for NJ and SJ are shown in (2.104a) and (2.104b).

- (2.103)a. Hanako-no hashitta to bai. [NJ]  
 Hanako-no run-Past C C(Force)  
 ‘Listen, Hanako ran.’
- b. Hanako-ga hashitta n da yo. [SJ]  
 Hanako-Nom run-Past C Cop C(SA)
- (2.104) a. [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>PredP</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> [Hanako-no hashitta] to] Cop(=∅)]bai] [NJ]  
 b. [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>PredP</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> [Hanako-ga hashitta] n] Cop(=da)]yo] [SJ]

*Tobai* and *bai* look similar and both convey information that a listener has not heard before; however, the former has a structure in which the whole CP ‘Hanako-no hashitta to’ is embedded in the PredP and the *bai/yo* added at the end.<sup>19</sup> (2.103a) is more like a subordinate clause rather than an independent clause. Therefore, (2.102) is a crucial example of C licensing in the independent clause in NJ. The ending particles *bai* and *yo* are important for an ND reading, which is discussed in Section 2.5.

As for the major subject, although it has been thought to take only *ga*, as seen in (2.105) (Yoshimura 1994, Murakami 1995, Kato 2005, etc.), it can also be marked by *no* if the sentence is embedded in *tobai/toyo*, as shown in (2.106a).

- (2.105)a. Taro-ga/\*no se-no takaka. [NJ; Murakami 1995:25]  
 Taro-Nom/\*Gen height-Gen tall  
 ‘lit. Taro is tall in height.’
- b. Taro-ga/\*no se-ga/\*no takai. [SJ]  
 Taro-Nom/\*Gen height-Nom/\*Gen tall

<sup>19</sup> Generally, the *noda* construction is used when a speaker conveys information which a listener cannot easily understand or a listener has not heard of before (Tanomura 1990:34).

(2.106)a. Taro-no (kanari) se-no takaka tobai. [NJ]  
 Taro-Gen quite height-Gen tall C  
 ‘lit. Listen, Taro is tall in height.’

b. Taro-ga/\*no (kanari) se-ga/\*no takai ndayo. [SJ]  
 Taro- Nom/\*Gen quite height-Nom/Gen tall C

As seen in the cleft sentence, C head *no* in (2.104) does not license the genitive subject in SJ, so it is natural that the genitive subject is not allowed in (2.106b). Needless to say, (2.106b) is ungrammatical; the genitive subject is not allowed in independent clauses in SJ. In the same fashion as (2.106a), we can explain why the subject of the stative predicate *Taroo* is marked by a genitive in (2.107).

(2.107) Taroo-no eigo-no dekuru tobai  
 Taroo-Gen English-Gen can Fin.Force  
 ‘Listen, Taroo is capable of English.’ [NJ/KJ; See also O&S (2014) for NJ data]

Crucially, even the subject of the stative predicate can take *no* in independent clauses if *bai* is added.

(2.108) a. Taro-no (kanari) se-no takaka bai. [NJ]  
 Taro-Gen quite height-Gen tall C  
 ‘lit. Listen, Taro is tall in height.’  
 b. Taroo-no eigo-no dekiru bai  
 Taroo-Gen English-Gen can C  
 ‘Hey, Taroo is capable of English.’

The semantic differences between *tobai* and *bai* are elaborated on in the next section.

Moreover, as the C head *to* (*no* for SJ) appears, genitive is licensed in *who*-questions as shown below.

(2.109) Dai-*{ga/no}* hashitta to?  
 who-Nom/Gen ran C  
 ‘Who ran?’

In sum, this section discussed genitive case licensors in NJ. It was demonstrated that the mechanism regarding how the weak *v* occurring on top of unaccusative verbs and various C heads license genitive subjects in NJ. These genitive licensors are closely related to ND interpretations, which will be elaborated on in the next section.

## 2.5 Neutral Descriptions and Genitive Subjects

This section explores the connection between the licensors of genitive subjects and ND reading by providing various data from NJ. From the viewpoint of NJ, ND readings in general (including main clauses and subordinate clauses) are reconsidered. Developing Kuroda’s (1965, 1972, 1992) thetic judgment, Hasegawa (2008, 2010, 2011) analyzes what Kuroda calls thetic judgment as “Presentationals” by revising Kuno’s (1973a, 1973b) ND readings; she proposes more restricted conditions for ND readings, particularly for main clauses. Since subjects with ND readings are said to be marked by *no* in NJ (and other Hichiku dialects), the distribution of genitive subjects in NJ indicates the conditions for ND interpretations. On the basis of proposals given by Kuroda (1965, 1972, 1992), Hasegawa (2008, 2010, 2011), and Kuno (1973a, 1973b), I argue that the occurrence of genitive subjects in NJ as well as ND readings is explained as defocusing phenomena in the sense of Aoyagi (1999) and Vallduví (1992, 1995). The genitive case licensors such as *toru* (*teiru* for SJ) and certain Cs in NJ contribute to defocusing subjects.

The organization of this section is as follows. First, basic data of ND readings by Kuno (1973a, 1973b) and the Hichiku dialects are recited in Subsection 2.5.1. Subsequently, in Subsection 2.5.2, other ND conditions in NJ are discussed by comparing them with those in the proposals presented by Kuroda (1965, 1972, 1992) and Hasegawa (2008, 2011). In Subsection 2.5.3, we will consider why the *teiru* form or the ending particles such as *bai* are necessary for ND reading in terms of new



b. Tsukue-no ue ni hon-no aru.  
 table's top.on book is  
 'There is a book on the table.'

c. Sora-no akaka  
 sky is-red  
 'Look! The sky is red.'

Kuno (1973b) mentions that sentences with ND reading such as (2.110) indicate that the whole sentence, including the subject and predicate, is new information. In other words, sentences expressing existence or appearance are the most appropriate to convey new and unexpected events.

On the other hand, in the case wherein predicates indicate the individual level, the subject holds EL readings, and only *ga* is available for the subject marking in NJ (and in other Hichiku dialects) as in (2.113).

#### Standard Japanese

- (2.112) a. John-ga gakusei desu.  
 John-Nom student is  
 '(Of all the people we are talking about) John (and only John) is a student;  
 it is John who is a student.'
- b. Saru-ga ningen-no sossen desu.  
 monkey-Nom man-Gen ancestor is  
 'It is the monkey that is the ancestor of man.'
- c. John-ga nihongo-ga dekiru.  
 John-Nom Japanese-Nom can  
 'John (and only John) can speak Japanese.' [SJ; Kuno 1973a.51]

Nagasaki Japanese (and other Hichiku Dialects)

(2.113) a. John-ga           gakusei bai.

John-Nom    student C

‘(Of all the people we are talking about) John (and only John) is a student;

‘It is John who is a student.’           (See also Nishioka 2014 and Kato 2005)

b. Saru-ga           ningen-no           sossen bai.

monkey-Nom man-Gen           ancestor C

‘It is the monkey that is the ancestor of man.’   (See *ibid.*)

c. John-ga           nihongo-no           dekiru.

John-Nom    Japanese-Gen    can

‘John (and only John) can speak Japanese.’   (See also Kato 2005)

Unlike sentences with ND readings, sentences with EL readings make only the subject new information and the rest of the sentence, including the predicate, expresses old information (Kuno 1973b).

When it comes to subordinate clauses, the subjects of any kinds of predicates including the transitive stative verb indicate ND readings in SJ (Kuno 1973a, 1973b). For instance, the subject *John* in (2.114) is interpreted as ND.

(2.114) Anata-wa           [John-ga           Nihongo-ga           dekiru    koto]-o  
          you-Top           John-Nom           Japanese-Nom       can       fact-Acc  
          shitteimasu    ka?

know           C

‘Do you know the fact that John can (speak) Japanese?’ (Kuno 1973a:56)

In SJ, the major subject *Taro* with *no* holds no EL reading in contrast with *ga*, as in (2.115).

- (2.115) Minna Taro-{ga/no} (kanari) se-no takai koto-o  
 Everyone Taro-{Nom/Gen} quite height-Gen tall fact-Acc  
 shitteiru.  
 know  
 ‘lit. Everyone know that Taro is (quite) tall in height’ [SJ]

Now, recall the NJ data in Section 2.4. Sentences with *tobai/toyo* in NJ, which correspond to the *noda* construction in SJ as reproduced in (2.116a) and (2.117), show that it is natural that the subject holds ND interpretation in the same way as a normal subordinate clause and *no* is licensed by the C head *to* (*no* in SJ) here.

- (2.116) a. Taro-no (kanari) se-no takaka tobai/toyo. [NJ]  
 Taro-Gen quite height-Gen tall Fin.C  
 ‘lit. Listen, Taro is tall in height.’  
 b. Taro-ga/\*no (kanari) se-ga/\*no takai ndayo. [SJ]  
 Taro-Nom/\*Gen quite height-Nom/Gen tall Fin.Cop.C
- (2.117) Taro-no eigo-no dekuru to bai/yo  
 Taro-Gen English-Gen can Fin C  
 ‘Taro is capable of English.’ [NJ/KJ; See also O&S(2004) for NJ data]

According to Kuno (1973a, 1973b), the predicates expressing action, existence, or current temporary state are typical examples of ND readings and the sentences with such predicates convey new information. As for subordinate clauses, even subjects of individual-level predicates can have ND interpretations. This seems to be consistent with genitive subjects in the *noda* construction in NJ.

However, Kuno’s proposal is not comprehensive enough to cover the contrast between (2.118a) and (2.118b) or (2.118c). Even in the case of action verbs, the *toru* (*teiru* for SJ) form or the sentence-ending particles like *bai* are necessary to have genitive subjects in NJ. Besides, subjects of individual-level predicates and the *wh*-subject in NJ are marked by *no* in independent clauses as shown in (2.118d-e) and



(2.118f), respectively.

- (2.118) a. Hanako-{ga/\*no} hashitta. [NJ]  
Hanako-{Nom/\*Gen} ran  
'Hanako ran.'
- b. Hanako-no hashit-toru.  
Hanako-Gen run-Prog  
'Hanako is running.'
- c. Hanako-no hashitta bai.  
Hanako-no ran C  
'Hey, Hanako ran.'
- d. Taro-no (kanari) se-no takaka bai.  
Taro-Gen quite height-Gen tall C  
'lit. Listen, Taro is tall in height.'
- e. Taro-no eigo-no dekiru bai  
Taro-Gen English-Gen can C  
'Hey, Taro is capable of English.'
- f. Dai-no kita to?  
who-Nom came C  
'Who came?'

Kuno (1973a, 1973b)'s idea is impressive, but some modifications are necessary to capture the genitive subjects in NJ.

In the next section, we will first review Kuroda's (1965, 1972, 1992) and Hasegawa's (2008, 2010, 2011) proposals, which give us some hints for solving the issue presented by (2.118a-c). Then, the data in (2.118d-f) are considered by adopting Aoyagi's (1999) and Vallduví's (1992, 1995) findings.

### 2.5.2 Kuroda (1965, 1972, 1992), Hasegawa (2008, 2010, 2011), and Genitive Subjects in the Nagasaki Dialect

The distribution of ND readings by Kuno (1973a, 1973b) is not totally equivalent to Kuroda's (1965) original proposal. Now, we review Kuroda's (1965, 1972, 1992) ideas.

Kuroda (1965, 1972, 1992) analyzes sentences with *ga* or *wa* in Japanese in terms ofthetic or categorical judgment. There is a distinction between categorical andthetic judgment. Kuroda classifies a categorical judgment, which conforms to the Subject-Predicate form, as Predication andthetic judgment as a nonpredicational description.<sup>20</sup>

- (2.119) a. Neko-ga asokode numutte iru. (specific,thetic judgments)  
cat-Nom there sleep be  
'A cat is sleeping there. (It can be 'The cat is sleeping there.')
- b. Neko-wa asokode nemutte iru. (specific,categorical judgments)  
cat-Top there sleep be  
'The cat is sleeping there.' (See Kuroda 1992:13)

Thetic Judgment as in (2.119a); The judgment expressed by (2.119a) , ..., is a direct response to the perceptual cognition of an actual situation. There is a perceptual intake of information about an actual situation. (Kuroda 1992:22) Athetic judgment is based on a perception. I have a perception of a cat sleeping. In the perception an entity is recognized as a cat. The use of expression *neko* ('a cat') is indefinite, but specific. It refers to a specific cat perceived. It has an object of reference, and object perceived. However, this object cognitively exists only in and with this perception. When the perception goes away, so does this object. (Kuroda 1992:27)

---

<sup>20</sup> Kuroda (1992) states that the capital subject as "Subject" does not refer to a grammatical relation of subject in syntax but indicates the classical, logical sense of the term.

Categorical Judgment as in (2.119b); this categorical judgment does not simply reflect a perceptual intake of information, not a simple recognition by perception of the existence of an actual situation. In the judgment expressed by (2.119b) the cat in the perceived situation is apprehended as an entity that is fulfilling a particular role in the situation. The categorical judgment is as much the apprehension of this role-laden entity (Subject) as the recognition of the existence of a perceived situation. (Kuroda 1992:22-23)

Categorical Judgment is also expressed by generic sentences as in (2.120a-b), which are not connected to specific situations. In contrast, generic sentences with *ga* as in (2.120c-d), which cannot express athetic judgment but are used as independent sentences with ‘focus.’<sup>21</sup>

- (2.120) a. Neko-wa hashiru. (generic, categorical judgment)  
           cat-Top run  
           ‘Cats run./The cat runs.’ (See Kuroda 1992:43)
- b. Neko-wa nezumi-o oikakeru. (generic, categorical judgment)  
           cat-Top mouse-Acc chase  
           ‘Cats chase mice.’ (See *ibid.*)
- c. Neko-ga hashiru. (generic, focus readings)  
           cat-Nom run  
           ‘It is the cat/cats that runs/run.’ (See Kuroda 1992:50)
- d. Neko-ga nezumi-o oikakeru. (generic, focus readings)  
           Neko-Top mouse-Acc chase  
           ‘It is the cat/cats that chases/chase the mouse/mice.’ (See *ibid.*)

---

<sup>21</sup> Kuroda (1992:51) also mentions the nontopicalized form of a generic sentence as an embedded sentence, in which *Socrates* is not a focus.

(i) Socrates-ga ningen dearu toyuukoto-wa bunsekitekina meidai-dearu.  
       Socrates-Nom man be that-Top analytic proposition-be  
       ‘That Socrates is a man is an analytic proposition.’

Generic sentences as in (2.120d) are grammatical when they are used as an answer to questions as in (2.121a) or when they obtain readings of pseudo-cleft forms like (2.121b).

- (2.121)a. Nani-ga nezumi-o oikakeru ka  
 what-Nom mouse-Acc chase Q  
 ‘What chases mice?’
- b. Nezumi-o oikakeru no-wa neko dearu.  
 mouse-Acc chase C-Top cat be  
 ‘That which chases mice is the cat.’ (Kuroda 1992:51)

In Kuroda’s (1965, 1972, 1992) claim, a categorical judgment is expressed by a topicalized sentence including specific or generic interpretations, whereas athetic judgment is identified as a nontopicalized specific sentence.<sup>22</sup> The sentences with ‘focus’ as in (2.120c-d) are nontopicalized generic sentences.<sup>23</sup>

Importantly, sentences without the *teiru* form as in (2.120c-d) are focus readings that are not mentioned by Kuno (1973a, 1973b). Moreover, athetic judgment is only maintained in independent clauses; this contrasts with Kuno’s ND reading in subordinate clauses.

Hasegawa (2008, 2011) adopts Kuroda’sthetic judgment sentences and reanalyzes Kuno’s ND reading, particularly in main clauses as “Presentationals.”<sup>24</sup> Hasegawa (2008, 2011) argues that in main clauses, *te-iru* “be-stative” is needed for NDs in the case of activity/process predicates as in (2.122) following Kuroda (1965, 1972, 1992) but departing from Kuno (1973a, 1973b).

---

<sup>22</sup> Kuroda (1992) assumes the *wa* sentence has the structure given below.

(i) NP-wa [.....]s

<sup>23</sup> Kuroda (1992) also argues that the topicalized sentence is considered to be the act of asserting, whereas the nontopicalized sentence for either athetic judgment or a focus is identified as the act of affirming.

<sup>24</sup> Hasegawa (2008, 2011) treats ND readings in Japanese main clauses in parallel with English Locative Inversion and the Presentational *There* construction.

Neutral Description (See Hasegawa 2008:70, Hasegawa 2011:98)

(2.122) a. \*?Oya, Taro-ga hon-o yonda.

Hey, Taro-Nom book-Acc read

‘Hey, Taro read a book.’

b. \*?Are, Hanako-ga Taro-ni dennwashuru.

Hey, Hanako-Nom Taro-Dat call

‘Hey, Hanako calls Taro.’

(2.123) a. Oya, Taro-ga hon-o yondeiru.

Hey, Taro-Nom book-Acc reading

‘Hey, Taro is reading a book.’

b. Are, Hanako-ga Taro-ni dennwashiteiru.

Hey, Hanako-Nom Taro-Dat calling

‘Hey, Hanako is calling Taro.’

In addition, some sentence-final particles (*yo*, *zo*, *ne*, and *wa*) that are used to convey information to the listener play an important role for NDs as shown in (2.124).

(2.124)a. Oya, Taro-ga hon-o yonda \*?(zo/yo).

Hey, Taro-Nom book-Acc read.Past C

‘Hey, Taro read a book.’

b. Are, Hanako-ga Taro-ni dennwasuru \*?(zo/yo).

Hey, Hanako-Nom Taro-Dat call C

‘Hey, Hanako calls Taro.’

According to Hasegawa’s data, without the *teiru* form (a progressive or result state) or sentence-final particles, the subject is not sufficient to get ND readings as seen in (2.122-3) and (2.124), respectively. Inthetic judgment sentences or presentationals, the event is happening or has happened right before the speaker’s eye, which should be new information (Hasegawa 2008, 2011). The *teiru* form indicates the situation (happening) now in front of the speaker. Also, the sentence-final particles convey a

new situation that is about to happen or has just happened in front of the speaker or the listener. As Kuno (1973a, 1973b) indicates, new information is considered to be a key to further exploration of ND interpretations.

Accordingly, the claim that *bai* or *yo* and *toru* (*teiru*) (consisting of *-te* and the unaccusative verb *oru* (*iru* for SJ)) are necessary for genitive case licensing in main clauses in NJ as in (2.118b-c), is supported by Kuroda and Hasegawa's observation.<sup>25</sup> Yet, it is still unclear why *no* is allowed with transitive stative verbs and *wh*-subjects as in (2.118d-f). Hasegawa (2008, 2011) also claims other conditions for ND readings in main clauses.

Other conditions for NDs in main clauses (Hasegawa 2008:68)

- (i) Sentence types: Affirmative sentences (no interrogative, imperative, or request sentences)
- (ii) *Person restriction on the subject*: Neither the 1st nor the 2nd person

In Hasegawa's (2008, 2011) analysis, Force head is identified as "presentational," which is only realized in affirmative sentences and not in interrogative, imperative, or request sentences. She also states that the thetic judgment does not allow the 1st or 2nd person subject. Apart from interrogatives, her observation is consistent with genitive subjects in NJ as seen in (2.125) of SJ and (2.126) of NJ.

- (2.125)a. \*Soko-ni            anata-ga            iru.    (Hasegawa 2008:68)  
                   there-Dat        you-Nom            be  
                   'You are there.'
- b. \*Watashi-ga        byoki    da.    (ibid.)  
                   I-Nom            sick     be  
                   'I am sick.'

---

<sup>25</sup> Hasegawa proposes that *ga*, which yields ND reading, stays inside *vP*; however, this proposal needs to be investigated further since *ga* cannot remain within *vP* under Kishimoto's (2001) indeterminate pronoun binding.

- c. Hanako-ga koi/kuru-na/kitekudasai. (EL)  
 Hanako-Nom come.Imp/come-Neg/come.please  
 ‘lit. Hanako come!/don’t come!/come, please.’
- (2.126)a. Soko-ni anta-ga/\*no oru. [NJ/KJ; See Nishioka 2014 for KJ]  
 there-Dat you-Nom/\*Gen be  
 ‘You are there.’
- b. Oi-ga/\*no byoki bai. [NJ/KJ; See Nishioka 2014 for KJ]  
 I-Nom/\*Gen sick C  
 ‘I am sick.’
- c. Hanako-ga/\*no koi/kuru-na/kite(kudasai). [NJ]  
 Hanako-Nom/\*Gen come.Imp/come-Neg/come.please  
 ‘lit. Hanako come!/don’t come/come, please’.

This point of the ND reading is further supported. The existence or action of the speaker (first person) or the addressee (second person) cannot be new information, since it is presupposed in a conversation (see Kuno 1973a, 1973b). In an imperative or a request sentence, the subject is the addressee (listener) (see also Mihara and Ebara 2012). Accordingly, examples of those (first or second person and subjects of imperative and request sentences) are infelicitous for ND readings as in (2.125) in SJ and cannot be marked by *no* in NJ as in (2.126). However, subjects in interrogatives as in (2.127), which are EL readings according to Hasegawa, can obtain ND interpretations and bear a genitive in NJ as in (2.128) as well as (2.118f).

- (2.127)a. Dare-ga kimashita ka? (EL reading)  
 who-Nom come.Past Q  
 ‘Who came?’
- b. Doko-ni Hanako-ga imasu ka? (EL reading)  
 where-Dat Hanako-Nom exist Q  
 ‘Where is Hanako?’ [SJ; Hasegawa 2011:99]

- (2.128)a. Dai-*{ga/no}*                      kita                      to?  
           who-*{Nom/Gen}*                      come.Past                      C  
           ‘Who came?’
- b. Doko-ni                      Hanako-no                      oru                      to?  
           where-Dat                      Hanako-Nom                      exist                      C  
           ‘Where is Hanako?’    [NJ]

The fact that even interrogative sentences can bear *no* in NJ contradicts Hasegawa’s ND conditions in main clauses. Therefore, a question arises as to whether it is plausible, as Hasegawa (2008, 2011) claims, to determine Force head as “presentational.” To account for the distribution of genitive subjects in interrogatives in NJ, we will apply Aoyagi’s (1999) analysis of defocusing phenomena (based on Vallduví (1992, 1995)) and reconsider the ND conditions argued by Kuroda (1965, 1972, 1992), Hasegawa (2008, 2011), and Kuno (1973a, 1973b).

### 2.5.3 Aoyagi (1999) and Genitive Subjects in the Nagasaki Dialect

Recall that in Kuno (1973a, 1973b), the subjects of any kind of predicates, including the transitive stative verb, hold ND readings in subordinate clauses. Therefore, the subject *John* in (2.129) receives an ND reading.

- (2.129) Anata-wa [John-ga Nihongo-ga dekiru koto]-o shitteimasu ka?  
           You-Top John-Nom Japanese-Nom can fact-Acc know C  
           ‘Do you know the fact that John can (speak) Japanese?’ (SJ; Kuno 1973a:56)

Against Kuno’s exhaustive-listing *ga*, Aoyagi (1999) argues that what Kuno calls EL *ga* does not contain exhaustiveness since (2.130) can be followed after (2.131), as also stated by Shibatani (1990) and Heycock (1993).



(2.130)a. (Kujira, penguin, kamonohashi nouchi) nani-ga honyuruidesuka?

(whale, penguin, platypus among) what-Nom mammal

‘Among a whale, a penguin, and a platypus, which is a mammal?’

b. Kujira-ga honyurui desu.

whale-Nom mammal Cop

‘A whale is a mammal.’

(2.131) Soshite kamonohashi mo honyuruidesu.

and platypus too mammal

‘A platypus is also a mammal.’ (Aoyagi 1999:772-773)

Aoyagi (1999) also claims that Kuno’s hypothesis (1973a, 1973b) that the EL *ga* becomes neutralized in subordinate clauses is in fact a defocusing phenomenon. Thus, the subject *John* in (2.129) is not focused since it is in the embedded clause. Now, consider example (2.132b). The EL interpretation of (2.132b) is obtained from contexts such as when the sentence is used as an answer to *wh*-questions.

(2.132)a. Dare-ga gakusei desu ka?

Who-Nom student is Q

‘Who is a student?’

b. John-ga gakusei desu.

John-Nom student is

‘(Of all the people we are talking about) John (and only John) is a student; it is John who is a student.’

In a discourse, since every sentence should contain new information (Grice 1975), Aoyagi (1999) mentions that a focus exists in every sentence.<sup>26</sup> Adopting Vallduví’s assertion (1992, 1995), a sentence is divided into FOCUS and GROUND as in (2.133).

---

<sup>26</sup> While Aoyagi (1999, 2010) argues that a focus is necessary for every sentence (following Vallduví (1992, 1995)), Heycock (1993, 2008) proposes that every sentence, but not every clause, must have a topic. Heycock (1993, 2008) argues that a stage-level predicate has the Davidsonian event argument as the topic so that the subject or the entire

- (2.133) a. S={FOCUS, GROUND}  
 b. GROUND={LINK, TAIL}

The FOCUS is an essential part for a sentence and contributes to the hearer's knowledge-store (as new information). It can stand alone as an all-focus sentence or a sentence-fragment utterance. The GROUND is the rest of the sentence as a complement of the FOCUS, is equivalent to the presupposition or the open-proposition, and acts as "a vehicular frame for the informative focus (Vallduví 1992:46)." The LINK is akin to topic, whereas the TAIL is the complement of the LINK. Following Vallduví's notion, the sentence (2.132b) is more specifically exemplified as (2.134).<sup>27</sup>

- (2.134) [<sub>F</sub> John-ga]            [<sub>G</sub> gakusei desu]    (See also Aoyagi 2010)

Vallduví (1992) also provides all-focus structures with the GROUND null, which correspond to Kuroda's (1972)thetic judgment and Kuno's (1973) neutral descriptions (sentences expressing nothing but new information).

- (2.135) Waiter! [<sub>F</sub> There's a fly in my cream of broccoli soup!]    (Vallduví 1992:51)

Bearing this point in mind, NJ data in (2.118a) and (2.118b) are analyzed as follows.

---

material in (i) is the focus.

- (i) [<sub>F</sub> [<sub>F</sub> John-ga]            kita].  
       John-Nom            came  
       'JOHN came.'        (See Heycock 2008:61)

In contrast, as a stage-level predicate does not contain the Davidsonian argument, the predicate must be the topic, leading the subject as the focus as in (ii).

- (ii) [<sub>F</sub> John-ga]    kasikoi.  
       John-Nom smart  
       'JOHN is smart.'    (See Heycock 2008:61)

<sup>27</sup> The answer for question (i) is analyzed as (ii) according to Vallduví's (1992) analysis.

- (i) a. What does John drink?  
 b. [<sub>G</sub> [<sub>L</sub> John] [<sub>T</sub> drinks]] [<sub>F</sub> beer]

In (2.136a), *Hanako* is focused, whereas it is no longer focused in (2.136b) in the same way as the case of existence and current temporary state as in (2.136c-d).

- (2.136) a. [<sub>F</sub>Hanako-ga]            hashiru  
                  Hanako-Nom            run  
                  ‘It is Hanako who runs.’
- b. [<sub>F</sub>Hanako-ga            hashitteiru]  
                  Hanako-Nom            running  
                  ‘Hanako is running.’
- c. [<sub>F</sub>Tegami-ga    kita]  
                  letter-Nom    came  
                  ‘Mail has come.’
- d. [<sub>F</sub>Sora-ga        akai]  
                  sky-Nom        red  
                  ‘Look! The sky is red.’

Developing this analysis, Aoyagi (1999) argues that *John* in (2.132b) is no longer focused when the whole sentence of (2.132b) is embedded as in (2.137), wherein the focus has shifted toward the sequence *John-ga gakusei da*.

- (2.137)a. Minna            nanto    itta    no?  
                  everyone    what    said    C  
                  ‘What did everyone say?’
- b. Mina            [John-ga            gakusei da]    to    iimashita.  
                  everyone    John-Nom    student Cop    Quote    said  
                  ‘Everyone said that John is a student.’ (see Aoyagi 1999:781)

Along the lines of Vallduví (1992, 1995) and Aoyagi (1999), the reason why some sentence-final particles (*yo*, *zo*, *ne*, and *wa*) conveying information to a listener are necessary for the ND reading is explained. By adding these sentence-final particles, the

whole sentence *Taro-ga hon-o yonda* of (2.138a) or *Hanako-ga Taro-ni denwa suru* of (2.138b) is focused as underlined so that *Taro* or *Hanako* is not the only focus element.

(2.138)a. Oya, Taro-ga hon-o \_\_\_\_\_ yonda \*?(zo/yo).

Hey, Taro-Nom book-Acc \_\_\_\_\_ read.Past C

‘Hey, Taro read a book.’

b. Are, Hanako-ga \_\_\_\_\_ Taro-ni \_\_\_\_\_ dennwasuru \*?(zo/yo).

Hey, Hanako-Nom Taro-Dat \_\_\_\_\_ call C

‘Hey, Hanako calls Taro.’

Now, we consider the cases of (2.139) with individual-level predicates. If those sentence-final particles accompany them, the genitive can be licensed in NJ and the sentences no longer indicate the individual level.

(2.139) a. Taro-no (kanari) se-no takaka bai/yo. [NJ]

Taro-Gen quite height-Gen tall C

‘lit. Listen, Taro is tall in height.’

b. Taroo-no eigo-no dekiru bai/yo [NJ]

Taroo-Gen English-Gen can C

‘Listen, Taroo is capable of English.’

Given below are situations these sentences express:

(2.140) SITUATION 1

Hanako and Kenji need a new staff member for the café. Their friend recommended Taro, and they heard that Taro is short. However, one day, Kenji accidentally received the information about Taro’s height. It said that Taro is 186 centimeters tall. Then, Kenji said to Hanako,

Kenji: Taro-no (kanari) se-no takaka bai/yo. [NJ]

Taro-Gen quite height-Gen tall C

‘lit. Listen, Taro is tall in height.’

(2.141) SITUATION 2

Hanako and Kenji need a new staff member for the café. Their friend recommended Taro, and they heard that Taro is poor at English. However, one day, Kenji accidentally received information about Taro’s English ability. It said that Taro’s TOEIC score is 900. Then, Kenji said to Hanako,

Kenji: Taro-no eigo-no dekiru bai/yo

Taro-Gen English-Gen can C

‘Taro is capable of English.’

(2.142) SITUATION 3

Hanako, Kenji, and Taro used to go to the same primary school in Nagasaki and were close friends, but Taro transferred to a school in Tokyo. Hanako and Kenji have not met Taro since then. Taro did not like studying at all at that time. One day, Kenji met an old friend, Jiro, and heard that Taro is now a doctor. Kenji was surprised and said to Hanako,

Kenji: Taro-no isha bai.<sup>28</sup>

Taro-Gen doctor C

‘Listen, Taro is a doctor.’

In the situations above, the whole sentence Kenji uttered can express new information and *Taro* is defocused, which indicates that the whole sentences underlined are focused in the sense argued by Aoyagi (1999) and Vallduví (1992, 1995). Thus, the conditions for ND readings are satisfied, and the subjects can be marked by *no*.

---

<sup>28</sup> How the genitive subject is licensed in the copula sentence will become clear in Section 2.7.

Now, we consider interrogatives. Regarding interrogative sentences, the subject is considered to be old information and should be marked by topic *wa*. The whole sentence is not new information (see Kuno 1973b). (2.143a) is only available when confirming information as seen in (2.143c).

- (2.143) a. ?Taro-ga kimashita ka?  
 Taro-Nom came Q  
 ‘Did Taro come?’
- b. Taro-wa kimashita ka?  
 Taro-Top came Q  
 ‘Did Taro come?’ (Kuno 1973b:214)
- c. So-desu-ka. Taro-ga kimashita ka.  
 so-Cop-Q Taro-Nom came C  
 ‘I see. He came.’ (Kuno 1973b:214)

In a usual interrogative sentence, a subject is marked by topic *wa*, which cannot alternate with *no* (see Nishioka 2014). Regarding why the subject of a question in (2.144) provided in O&S (2014) is marked by *no*, when confirming information, (2.144) is acceptable, as Kuno (1973) argues. The complementizer *to* in (2.144) is *no* in SJ.

- (2.144) Taro-no odoru to?  
 Taro-Gen dance Fin  
 ‘Will Hanako dance?’ (O&S 2014)

By obtaining the meaning of confirmation with *to* (*no* for SJ), the whole sequence *Taro-no odoru* is the focus. Moreover, (2.145c) and especially (2.145d), with the complementizer *to*, can be grammatical in such cases when they are used to confirm information as in (2.146).

- (2.145) a. ?Taro-ga eigo-ga dekiru to.  
 Taro-Nom English-Nom can C  
 ‘Taro is capable of English.’  
 b. Taro-ga eigo-no dekiru to.  
 c. ?Taro-no eigo-ga dekiru to.  
 d. Taro-no eigo-no dekiru to. (cf. Kato 2007, O&S 2014)

(2.146) So-ne. Taro-no eigo-no dekiru to. [NJ]  
 so-C Taro-Gen English-Gen can C  
 ‘I see. Taro is capable of English.’

Therefore, (2.145) as well as (2.146) is acceptable in the situation when the whole string like *Taro-no eigo-no dekiru* is focused (as a confirmation). Now, we consider the situation (2.147).

(2.147) SITUATION

Taro and Kenji heard that Hanako was not going to perform at the school festival, but Kenji found out from the program of the festival that Hanako was going to dance. Then, Kenji was surprised and uttered,

Kenji: Hanako-no odoru to? Nanimu shinai tte itteta noni.  
 Hanako-Gen dance Fin nothing do.not Quote said C  
 ‘Will Hanako dance? She said she would do nothing.’

In this situation, the whole sentence can act as new information and the speaker, Kenji, is conveying surprise and confirming the situation so that the subject, Hanako, is marked by *no*. It is clear that the C head *to* alone can act as a genitive case licenser even in independent clauses like the case of *bai* or *yo*. In interrogatives, if the whole sentence can convey new information or is a confirmation, the subject can have ND interpretations.

Besides, the genitive subject is also allowed in (2.148). As stated before, a usual question should have topic *wa* and resist *ga*, and the subject should not be marked by *no* in NJ. Genitive subjects appear here; this occurrence must be analyzed.

- (2.148)a. Doko-de            Hanako-no            odot-ta            to? [NJ]  
               where-at            Hanako-Gen            dance-Past            C  
               ‘Where did Hanako dance?’
- b. Doko-ni                    Hanako-no            oru            to?  
               where-Dat                    Hanako-Gen            exist/is    C  
               ‘Where is Hanako?’

According to Kuno (1973b), when *itsu* “when” or *dokoni* “where” introduces sentences like (2.149), subjects marked by *ga* are attributed to the fact that the subjects are in subordinate clauses as illustrated in (2.150).

- (2.149)a. Itsu    Taro-ga            kimashita ka?  
               when    Taro-Nom            came    Q  
               ‘When did Taro come?’
- b. Doko-ni            Taro-ga            tatteimasu            ka?  
               where-Dat            Taro-Nom            standing            Q  
               ‘Where is Taro standing?’ (Kuno 1973b:215)
- (2.150)a. Itsu                    [<sub>CP</sub> Taro-ga            kimashita]            ka?  
               b. Doko-ni                    [<sub>CP</sub> Taro-ga            tatteimasu]            ka? (ibid.:216)

Thus, since the subject *Hanako* in (2.148) is in the subordinate clause, it is defocused and is marked by *no* in NJ as shown in (2.151).

- (2.151)Doko-de            [<sub>CP</sub> Hanako-no            odot-ta]            to?  
               Doko-ni                    [<sub>CP</sub> Hanako-no            oru]            to?            [NJ=(2.148)]



This structure, which will be recited in the next chapter, is also crucial for discussion of *wh*-NP questions in Chapter 3. Finally, let us consider *wh* subject questions. In (2.152), the genitive *wh*-words do not bear EL interpretations as opposed to nominatives.<sup>29</sup>

(2.152)a. Dai-*{ga/no}* hashitta to?

who-Nom/Gen ran C

Who ran?

b. Dai-*{ga/no}* kita to?

who-Nom/Gen came C

‘Who came?’

In other words, with regard to the speaker comparing several things and really intending to choose one, *ga* is preferred to *no* because *nan* “what” or *doko* “where” is focused. See the examples below.

(2.153) a. Between the two choices of sweets or shops, the speaker really wants to choose the one that is the more delicious of the two.

Docchi-*{ga/\*no}* oishika to?

which-*{Nom/\*Gen}* delicious C

‘Which is the more delicious of the two?’

b. Among the three choices of sweets or shops, the speaker really wants to choose the one that is the most delicious.

Dore-*{ga/\*no}* ichiban oishika to?

which-*{Nom/\*Gen}* the.most delicious C

‘Which is the most delicious (of the three)?’

---

<sup>29</sup> In SJ, *wh* subjects can also be marked by the genitive in subordinate clauses. I would like to thank Masao Ochi for pointing out genitive *who* questions in SJ.

(i) Anata-wa dare-*{ga/no}* kaita hon-o kaimashita ka?  
 you-Top who-*{Nom/Gen}* wrote book-Acc bought Q  
 ‘Who is the person x such that you bought the book that x wrote?’

Therefore, genitive subjects and ND interpretations are available even in interrogatives in NJ.

In summary, this section illustrated the connection between ND readings and genitive case licensors in NJ. Genitive licensors such as the progressive *toru* (*teiru* for SJ) form and certain ending particles play a role in preventing subjects from being focused. Since a genitive appears in NJ in both subordinate clauses and main clauses, I argue—on the basis of Kuroda’s (1965, 1972, 1992), Hasegawa’s (2008, 2010, 2011), and Kuno’s (1973a, 1973b) views—that the condition for genitive subjects in NJ is attributed to a subject defocusing phenomenon along the lines of Aoyagi’s (1999) and Vallduví’s (1992, 1995) ideas. Even subjects of stative verbs and subjects in interrogatives can bear *no* under the condition wherein a speaker conveys new information or confirms information. So far, as the connection between licensors and meaning is clear, we consider why the genitive subject is located at such low places as seen in the structure in Section 2.4.

## **2.6 Position of the Genitive Subject**

First, we examine the genitive subject positions for unaccusatives and unergatives, after which the derivation of the major subject construction is discussed to understand the subject position of the construction.

### **2.6.1 Position of the Genitive Subject in Unaccusatives and Unergatives**

Kato argues that the subjects of stative predicates and transitives, as well as a major subject, cannot be marked by *no*, whereas objects of stative predicates and a regular subject in the major subject construction do bear *no*, as seen in (2.154) and (2.156), respectively. As in (2.155b), however, when the object of transitives is scrambled to the sentence-initial position, the subject can reside within *vP* and bear *no*, because the object moves out of *vP* to [Spec, TP]. Thus, Kato concludes that the NP-*no* has to stay within *vP*.

- (2.154) Taro-ga/\*no eigo-no dekuru to.  
 Taro-Nom/\*Gen English-Gen can C  
 ‘Taroo is capable of English.’ (Kato 2007:120)
- (2.155)a. Taro-ga/\*no sonhon-ba kota bai.  
 Taro-Nom/\*Gen the.novel-Acc bought C  
 ‘Taro bought the novel.’
- b. Sonhon-ba Taro-no kota bai. (ibid., 120-121)
- (2.156) Kumamoto-ga/\*no baniku-no umaka.  
 Kumamoto-Nom/\*Gen horse.meat-Gen tasty  
 ‘It is Kumamoto where horse meat is tasty.’ (Yoshimura, 1994:19)

Kato’s observation that genitive subjects stay within  $\nu$ P is supported by the scope fact based on Miyagawa (2001).<sup>30</sup> When the subject is marked with *no*, it is interpreted inside the scope of negation, which will also be applied to the case of the major subject in Subsection 2.6.2. Although Kato (2007) indicates that genitive subjects with unaccusatives remain within  $\nu$ P, data in NJ suggest that genitive subjects with both unaccusatives and unergatives stay within  $\nu$ P as in (2.157b) and (2.158b), unlike the case of *ga* as in (2.157a) and (2.158a).

- (2.157)a. Zenin-ga ko-n.  
 All-Nom come-Neg  
 (all>not: \*not>all)

<sup>30</sup> If an object is scrambled to the position preceding the subject ‘all,’ the universal quantifier falls within the scope of negation as in (ic) in contrast with (ib). Since the object satisfies the EPP, ‘all’ does not need to move to [Spec, TP] and stays in [Spec,  $\nu$ P].

- (i) a. Taro-ga zen’in-o home-nakat-ta (yo/to omou).  
 Taro-Nom all-Acc praise-Neg-Past (Excel/Comp think)  
 ‘(I think that) Taro didn’t praise all(!)’ not>all, (\*) all>not
- b. Zen’in-ga sono tesuto-o uke-nakat-ta (yo/to omou)  
 all-Nom that test-Acc take-Neg-Past  
 ‘All did not take that test.’ \*not>all, all>not
- c. Sono tesuto-o<sub>i</sub> zen’in-ga  $t_i$  uke-nakat-ta (yo/to omou)  
 that test-Acc;all-Nom  $t_i$  take-Neg-Past  
 ‘That test, all didn’t take.’ not>all, (all>not) (Miyagawa 2001:298-9)

b. Zenin-no ko-n.

All-Gen come-Neg

((?)all>not; not>all)<sup>31</sup> (See also O&S 2014)

(2.158)a. Zenin-ga hashira-n yo/bai.

All-Nom run-Neg C

(all>not: \*not>all)

b. Zenin-no hashira-n yo/bai.

All-Gen run-Neg C

((?)all>not; not>all)

This analysis is further supported by Kishimoto's (2001) indeterminate pronoun binding. Indeterminate pronouns including *nani* 'anything' or *dare* 'anyone' function as negative polarity items when these pronouns are bound by the Q particle *mo*. After a complex head comprised of V and *mo* moves to the head of *vP*, only *vP* internal arguments and the spec of *vP* fall within the scope of *mo*. In (2.159a), the object *nani* resides inside the scope of *mo*; hence, the sentence is grammatical. In contrast, the subject indeterminate pronoun *dare* lies outside the scope of *mo*; hence, (2.159b) is ungrammatical.

(2.159)a. Taroo-wa *nani-o* kai-**mo** si-nakat-ta.

Taroo-Top anything-Acc buy-Q do-Neg-Past

'Taroo did not buy anything.'

(Kishimoto 2001:598)

b. \**Dare-ga* warai-**mo** si-nakat-ta.

anyone-Nom laugh-Q do-Neg-Past

'Anyone did not laugh.'

(ibid.:600)

---

<sup>31</sup> The reason why a genitive subject might be interpreted outside the scope of negation is similar to the case of the object in (ia) of Miyagawa (2001:298) in note 30. An anonymous reviewer of *Journal of Language and Culture* asked whether the NP-*ga* resists reconstruction due to some independent properties of its particle. To answer the question, the NP-*ga* might fall within the scope of negation as in Nomura's (2005) observation of nominative objects. This indicates that NP-*ga* can reconstruct.

When we look at the genitive subjects of NJ, both genitive subjects of unaccusatives and unergatives are bound by *mo* unlike the nominative subjects as seen in (2.160a) and (2.160b), respectively. This suggests that genitive subjects reside within *vP*.

- (2.160) a. Dai-{\*ga/no}                      ki-mo                      se-nkat-ta.  
                  anyone-{\*Nom/Gen}              come-Q                      do-Neg-Past  
                  ‘Anyone did not come.’
- b. Dai-{\*ga/no}                      hashiri-mo                      se-nkat-ta                      bai/yo.  
                  anyone-{\*Nom/Gen}              run-Q                      do-Neg-Past                      C  
                  ‘Listen, anyone did not run.’

For major subjects with *no*, the position is treated in the same way. We examine the derivation of the major subject in the next subsection.

### 2.6.2 Derivation and Subject Position of the Major Subject Construction

This subsection illustrates how the major subjects are derived and the subject positions of the construction. Kuno (1973a, 1973b) presents the Subjectivization rule, which changes the leftmost NP-*no* of a sentence to NP-*ga* to obtain the new subject (the major subject), as illustrated in (2.161). For instance, the Subjectivization rule is applied to *dansei* ‘men’ in (2.162a), and then, its genitive maker *no* is changed into *ga*, as shown in (2.162b).


- (2.161) a. Subjectivization (Kuno 1973a:71, 1973b:41)  
                  Change the sentence-initial NP-*no* to NP-*ga*, and make it the new subject of the sentence.  
                  b.  $[_S [_{NP} NP-no \dots N] \dots]] \rightarrow [_S NP-ga [_S [_{NP} \dots N] \dots]]]$
- (2.162)a. [Dansei-no                      heikinjumyo-ga]                      mijikai.  
                  men-Gen                      their.average.life-span-Nom                      is short  
                  ‘Men’s average life-span is short.’

- b. [Dansei-ga] [heikinjumyo-ga] mijikai.  
 men-Nom their.average.life-span-Nom is short  
 ‘It is men that their average life-span is short.’

(See Kuno 1973a: 71, 1973b: 41)

Under Kuno’s (1973a, 1973b) analysis, the major subject is derived in the manner of possessor raising. To support this analysis, Kishimoto (2013) provides evidence including the possessive honorification originally discussed by Harada (1976b), who states that the possessive honorification rule is allowed if the possessor refers to a person “socially superior to the speaker.” As in (2.163), the possessor should occupy the specifier position of the possessum and the honorific marker *o* is attached to the head N.

- (2.163)a. Suzukisan-no o-toshi  
 Suzuki.Mr.-Gen Hon-age  
 ‘Mr. Suzuki’s age’



Some idiomatic expressions like the one in (2.164) also occur in the major subject construction. Example (2.164a) shows that the possessor is included within the possessum nominal since an adverb such as *kanari* ‘fairly’ cannot intervene between the possessor and the possessum, as illustrated in (2.164b). Contrastively, (2.164c) allows the adverb *kanari* to occur between the two, which shows that the possessor is outside of the possessum nominal<sup>32</sup>.

---

<sup>32</sup> The question of how the left branch extraction out of a DP can be possible might be explained by adopting Bošković’s (2005) proposal to the effect that NP languages (article-less languages) allow extraction out of NP. In the main text, I follow Kishimoto (2013) and label the noun phrase as DP, but this need not be taken at face value.

- (2.164)a. [Ito-sensei-no kuti]-ga katai.  
 Ito-teacher-Gen mouth-Nom firm  
 ‘Professor Ito is discreet (about the affair).’
- b. [Ito-sensei-no (\*kanari) kuti]-ga katai.  
 Ito-teacher-Gen fairly mouth-Nom firm  
 ‘Professor Ito is discreet (about the affair).’
- c. Ito-sensei-ga (kanari) kuti-ga katai.  
 Ito-teacher-Nom fairly mouth-Nom firm  
 ‘Professor Ito is discreet (about the affair).’ (see Kishimoto 2013:177-8)

Notably, the possessive honorification is legitimate in this idiom even though the adverb appears to the right of the possessum, as in (2.165b), which indicates that the possessor *Ito-sensei* is base-generated in the specifier position of the possessum, where the possessor is regarded to be worthy of respect, and it is extracted from within the possessum nominal, as demonstrated in (2.166).

- (2.165)a. [Ito-sensei-no o-kuti]-ga katai.  
 Ito-teacher-Gen HON-mouth-Nom firm  
 ‘Professor Ito is discreet (about the affair).’
- b. Ito-sensei-ga (kanari) o-kuti-ga katai.  
 Ito-teacher-Nom fairly HON-mouth-Nom firm  
 ‘Professor Ito is discreet (about the affair).’ (See Kishimoto 2013:177)

(2.166) [<sub>TP</sub> Ito-sensei-ga [<sub>DP</sub> ~~Ito-sensei-ga~~ o-kuti]-ga katai]  
 (See Kishimoto 2013:178)

In NJ, the possessor *Ito-sensei* also bears *no* with the adverb *kanari* following it, as in (2.167b), which suggests that the possessor with *no* in NJ is derived from within the possessum nominal.

- (2.167)a. [Ito-sensei-no o-kuti]-ga/no kataka. [NJ]  
 Ito-teacher-Gen HON-mouth-Nom/Gen firm  
 ‘Professor Ito is discreet (about the affair).’
- b. Ito-sensei-no (kanari) o-kuti-ga/no kataka bai.<sup>33</sup>  
 Ito-teacher-Gen fairly Hon-mouth-Nom/Gen firm C  
 ‘Hey, Professor Ito is discreet (about the affair).’

Before considering how sentences like (2.167b) in NJ are derived, I will discuss the structure of the major subject construction in SJ. An example from SJ and its structure are shown in (2.168) and (2.169), respectively. The possessor, generated within the possessum nominal, moves to the Specifier of TP.

- (2.168)Taro-ga se-ga takai. [SJ]  
 Taro-Nom height-Nom tall  
 ‘Taro is tall in height.’

- (2.169)a. [TP [AP [DP Taro-no se-ga ] [takai(=A)] T] [SJ]  
 Taro-Gen.height-Nom tall
- b. [TP Taro-ga [AP [DP ~~Taro~~ se-ga ] [takai (=A)] T]]<sup>34</sup>

Now, our focus turns to NJ. For the adjectival phrase *takaka*, the *-ka* adjectival inflectional ending is considered to be a contracted form of the adjectival inflection *ku/shiku* plus the verb *ari* (unaccusative verb), which indicates that *se-no* is licensed by

<sup>33</sup> We can use the sentence with *tobai* as in (i), but such sentences are similar to a subordinate clause. So, I provide the sentence with *bai*, which is considered to be a more independent clause.

(i) Ito-sensei-no (kanari) o-kuti-ga/no kataka tobai.  
 Ito-teacher-Gen fairly Hon-mouth-Nom/Gen firm C  
 ‘Listen, Professor Ito is discreet (about the affair).’

<sup>34</sup> Kishimoto (2013) assumes that the possessor must be extracted from within the host possessum to be assigned a theta role (experiencer/possessor) in Spec $\nu$ P by  $\nu$ , whereas genitive arguments reside within DP in overt syntax, following Kitagawa and Ross (1982), Fukui (1986), and Saito et al. (2008).



a weak *v* connected with the *-ka* inflectional ending. We discuss the *-ka* inflectional ending in detail in Section 2.7. The structure for (2.170a) is represented in (2.170b).

(2.170)a. Taro-no                    se-no                    takaka                    bai.                    [NJ]  
                   Taro-Gen                    height-Gen                    tall                    C  
                   ‘lit. Listen, Taro is tall in height.’

b. [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> [<sub>AP</sub> Taro-no [<sub>DP</sub> ~~Taro~~ se-no ] [ takaka(=A)]] T] bai]<sup>35</sup>

Let me now explicate the position that the major subject occupies in NJ, which becomes clearer with the indeterminate pronoun binding in the sense of Kishimoto (2001). These major subjects with *no* are bound by the Q particle *mo*, as shown in (2.171).

(2.171) Dai-?no/\*ga                    (sogan) se-no                    tako-mo naka bai [NJ]  
                   Anyone-Gen/\*Nom                    quite                    height-Gen tall-Q                    Neg C  
                   ‘lit. Listen, anyone is not quite tall in height.’

Accordingly, major subjects remain in SpecAP (with *no* raising to TP), as (2.170b) illustrates, since they are bound by *mo* attached to *takai*. The subject *Taro* is marked with *no* since *bai* occurs in (2.170).

In Section 2.6, it was shown that a subject marked by *no* is not raised as high as one marked by *ga* even for a major subject. This is also applied to the subject of the copula sentence in Section 2.7.

## 2.7 Genitive Subjects and Copula Sentences

We have discussed that a subject is marked by *no* if there is a certain licenser in connection with ND readings in the major subject construction as well as in (in)transitive sentences. In this section, we focus primarily on copula sentences:

---

<sup>35</sup> Following Kishimoto (2013), I assume that the possessor must move out of the possessum; otherwise, it stays within DP and *no* is inserted within the DP domain in NJ.

nominal predicates, nominal adjectival predicates and adjectival predicates.<sup>36</sup> Regarding nominal predicates, the question of whether genitive subjects are allowed in the Hichiku dialects has not been discussed often. A new set of data is provided; in which even the subjects of the nominal predicates are marked by *no*. Subsequently, it is revealed how *no* is licensed in the peculiar *S-no Baka!* ‘S is a fool!’ construction in SJ (as well as NJ).

### 2.7.1 Issues

With respect to the copula sentences using nominal predicates as in (2.172), as well as adjectival predicates (canonical adjectives (CAs) and nominal adjectives (NAs)) as in (2.173), why or under what circumstances these genitive subjects have been allowed in the Hichiku dialects has received little research attention.<sup>37</sup> Further, how the genitive subjects in (2.174) in SJ (as well as in NJ) are licensed has not been previously clarified.

(2.172) Taro-no yukuefumei yatta.  
 Taro-Gen missing Cop.Past  
 ‘Taro was missing.’ [NJ]

(2.173) a. Hanako-no otonashika. (CA) b. Hanako-no shizukaka. (NA)  
 Hanako-Gen gentle Hanako-Gen quiet  
 ‘Hanako is gentle.’ ‘Hanako is quiet.’ [NJ]


(2.174) Jiro-no baka!  
 Jiro-Gen fool  
 ‘Jiro is a fool!’ [SJ/ NJ]

In this section, I first show how genitive subjects in the nominal predicate are marked by *no* in NJ. As illustrated in (2.175), the weak *v* occurring on top of the unaccusative

<sup>36</sup> According to Nishiyama (1999), an adjectival predicate is considered a copula sentence.


<sup>37</sup> Nishiyama (1999) and Urushibara (1993) claim that CAs involve a copula as well as NAs, which is discussed in Section 2.7.2.

verb *aru* licenses a genitive case of (2.172), which reflects Nishiyama’s (1999) copula structures in SJ (*yatta* is realized as *datta* (*deatta*) in SJ).



Second, it is also shown that the genitive subjects in the adjectival predicates in (2.173) are also licensed by a weak *v* because the *-ka* attached to NAs or CAs is derived from the classical adjectival *kari*-inflection (the adjectival inflection *ku/shiku* plus the verb *ari* (another form for the unaccusative verb *aru*)).

Third, a unique example of the independent clause is given: the *S-no Baka!* “S is a fool!” construction, as seen in (2.174), the structure for which is shown in (2.176). The genitive case at hand is considered to be inserted because of the *no* insertion rule (See Saito et al. 2008:249 and Kitagawa and Ross 1982 for this rule).



This section is organized as follows. In Subsection 2.7.2, the ideas of Nishiyama (1999) are reviewed and discussed. In Subsection 2.7.3, an analysis is given as to why *no* is licensed in copula sentences in NJ and the peculiar construction *S no baka!* “S is a fool!” The adjectival inflectional ending *-ka* in NJ and its occurrence distributions are also discussed. The *-ka* inflectional ending is one of the keys to explore the

characteristics of the *S no baka!* construction. Finally, some concluding remarks are given in Subsection 2.7.4.

### 2.7.2 Nishiyama (1999)


To consider copula sentence structures with nominal predicates, as well as adjectival predicates (CAs and NAs) in NJ, first those in SJ are examined. The copula sentences in SJ are as shown in (2.177–9).

- (2.177) Taro-ga            yukuefume            {da/dearu}. (Noun)        [SJ]  
           Taro-Nom        missing                Cop  
           ‘Taro is missing.’
- (2.178) Yoru-ga            shizuka                {da/dearu}. (NA)        [SJ]  
           night-Nom        quiet                    Cop  
           ‘The night is quiet.’
- (2.179) Yama-ga            takakatta/takai.        (CA)                    [SJ]  
           mountain-Nom    high.past/high.pres  
           ‘The mountain was/is high.’


The basic copula sentence structures in SJ in the study by Nishiyama (1999) are as follows. Based on the study by Nakayama (1988) and Urushibara (1993), Nishiyama assumes that *da* is a contracted form of *de-ar(u)*, and the *ar(u)* in *de-ar(u)* as in (2.177) or (2.178) is inserted to support the tense and has no semantic content. However, contrary to their analyses Nishiyama (1999) classifies the *de* in *de-ar(u)* as a predicative copula (pred.cop) and the *ar* as a dummy copula (dum.cop) as the *de* is seen as an essential part of predication by Bloch (1946a, 1946b).<sup>38</sup> Nishiyama (1999) assumes that the dummy copula *ar* projects VP selected by T. The structure for (2.178) is shown in (2.180). (2.177) has the same structure as (2.180), except that *yukuefumei* is an NP.

---


<sup>38</sup> Urushibara (1993) assumes only *ar* to be the copula.



The past form of the CA in (2.179) has a similar structure to the NA as demonstrated in (2.181).



As Nishiyama assumes that the present form of *taka-i* is realized after deleting the *k* from *taka-k-i*, the present tense form of (2.179) has the following structure.



According to Urushibara (1993), in reference to the absence of the dummy copula in (2.179) or (2.182), the present tense does not tend to require an overt form of the (dummy) copula cross-linguistically.

By adopting copula sentence structures in the study by Nishiyama (1999) and examining the history of NJ, the puzzle as to why the genitive case is allowed in copula sentences in NJ is illuminated in the following section, in which it is argued that the weak *v* is related to genitive case licensing.

### 2.7.3 Data and Analysis<sup>39</sup>

In this subsection, the licensing of the genitive subjects in the NJ copula sentences is demonstrated (in 2.7.3.1), and the *-ka* inflection form of the CAs or NAs in NJ and its occurrence distributions are discussed (in 2.7.3.2). In sub-subsection 2.7.3.3, the *S no baka!*, “S is a fool!,” construction is examined to reveal why the *no* appears and what category the *baka* “a fool” is in this construction.

#### 2.7.3.1 Genitive Subjects in Copula Sentences in Nagasaki Japanese

Nishiyama (1999), Nakayama (1988), and Urushibara (1993) treat the copula *da* as a contracted form of *de-aru*. This is supported by a historical observation as Tsukishima *et al.* (1982) also claims that the *de aru* as in (2.183) became *da*.

<sup>39</sup> I wish to thank Hiroshi Mito and Yoku Yumoto for valuable comments on the *-ka* inflectional ending and the property of *baka* in the *S no baka!* “S is a fool!” construction.

(2.183) Hanako-ga shizuka {da/dearu}. (NA) [SJ]  
 Hanako-Nom quiet Cop  
 ‘Hanako is quiet.’

*da* was formed through a fusion of *de-aru* into one and by dropping *ru*, as illustrated in (2.184) (See Tsukishima *et al.* 1982 for details).

(2.184) dearu → dea → da

*gia* or *ya* is another variation of *da*; *gia* sounds old fashioned but is still used in conversation and *ya* is used in some western parts of Japan, including Nagasaki.<sup>40</sup> This indicates that *da* (*gia, ya*) contains the unaccusative verb *aru*.

As with *da*, unaccusative verbs also appear in the adjectival inflectional ending *-ka* in NJ. In this dialect (and also other Hichiku dialects), NAs can have the same inflectional ending *-ka* as CAs; this provides further evidence that the two types of adjectives in Japanese share the same characteristics.

(2.185) a. Hanako-no otonashika. (CA) b. Hanako-no shizukaka. (NA)  
 Hanako-Gen gentle Hanako-Gen quiet  
 ‘Hanako is gentle.’ ‘Hanako is quiet.’ [NJ]

The inflectional ending *-ka* in the NA or CA is derived from the classical adjectival *kari*-inflection, which comprises an adjectival *ku/shiku* conjugation and the verb *ari* (another form for the unaccusative verb *aru*).<sup>41</sup> In other words, the inflectional ending *-ka* is a contracted form of *ku/shiku* plus the unaccusative verb *ari*.

<sup>40</sup> Following Tsukishima *et al.* (1982), I typed *gia* but it may not be the Hepburn system of Romanizing Japanese.

<sup>41</sup> *ari* belongs to the irregular verb conjugation in the *ra* column of the *kana* syllabary “ragyohenkakukatuyo”; however, the verb became extinct in Middle Japanese and was replaced by *aru*, the verb with “godankatuyo” (the five-tier conjugation of a Japanese verb).

(2.186) *-ka* = *ku/shiku* + *ari*  
 (kari-inflection) (the adjectival conjugation) (unaccusative verb)

In (2.187), according to Kanbe (1980), *karu*, “the end/attributive form (*shushi/rentai* form)” of the *kari* inflection is observed in Kumamoto Japanese and shows a vestige of the *kari* inflection. Generally, *ru* is dropped and only *ka* is pronounced as in (2.188), which is also applied to the NA in (2.189).

(2.187) Taigai kitsu**karu** ne (CA)  
 Very tiring C  
 ‘It’s very tiring, isn’t it?’ [Kumamoto Japanese; Kanbe 1980:536]

(2.188) Taigai kitsu**ka** ne. (CA)  
 Very tiring C  
 ‘It’s very tiring, isn’t it?’


(2.189) Taigai shizuka**ka** ne. (NA)  
 Very quiet C  
 ‘It’s very quiet, isn’t it?’

Therefore, in NJ, a weak *v* in connection with the verb *aru/ari* uniformly licenses the genitive case in the copula sentence in a similar way to a noun predicate, as illustrated in (2.191).

(2.190) Taro-no yukuefumei yatta. [NJ]  
 Taro-Gen missing Cop.Past  
 ‘Taro was missing.’



(2.191)



There is evidence that genitive subjects such as *Taro* occupy the Spec of NP predicates in (2.191). Let us look at Kishimoto's (2001) indeterminate pronoun binding test. In (2.192), the sentence is grammatical as the object *nani* stays inside the scope of *mo*. By contrast, (2.193) is ungrammatical as the subject indeterminate pronoun *dare* resides outside the scope of *mo*.

(2.192) *Taroo-wa nani-o kai-mo si-nakat-ta.*  
 Taroo-Top anything-Acc buy-Q do-Neg-Past  
 'Taroo did not buy anything.' (Kishimoto 2001:598)

(2.193) \**Dare-ga warai-mo si-nakat-ta.*  
 anyone-Nom laugh-Q do-Neg-Past  
 'Anyone did not laugh.' (ibid.:600)

The genitive subject is bound by *mo*, as opposed to the nominative subjects shown in (2.194). This indicates that genitive subjects reside in the predicate internal position, the Spec of NP (AP) predicates. This further suggests that even in SJ, in which the copula sentence subjects are marked by the genitive, as in nominal clauses like (2.195), the subjects are located at the predicate internal position.

(2.194) *Dai-{\*ga/no} yukuefumeidemo naka bai.*  
 anyone-Nom/Gen missing.Q not C  
 'No one is missing.'

(2.195) Taro-no   gakusei       dearu       koto [SJ]  
 Taro-Gen student   Cop       fact  
 ‘The fact that Taro is a student.’

In this section, the licensing of the genitive case in NJ copula sentences was explained. Genitive subjects in copula sentences with nominal predicates and adjectival predicates (CAs and NAs) are uniformly licensed by a weak *v* on top of an unaccusative *aru* or *ari*. In the next section, the *-ka* inflectional ending and its distributions are examined.

### 2.7.3.2 Distribution of the Inflectional Ending *-ka* in NJ

The inflectional ending *-ka* in NJ is basically an adjectival inflection and corresponds to the *-i* form in SJ. The *-ka* is used as a sentence-final form and a prenominal form for adjectives, as illustrated in (2.196–7) (See also Kyushuhogengakkai “Kyushu Dialects Society” 1991 and Kanbe 1980).

#### Sentence-Final Forms for CAs

(2.196) a. Kare-*{ga/no}*   otonashika. [NJ]   b. Kare-ga           otonashii [SJ]  
           he-*{Nom/Gen}* gentle                    he-Nom           gentle  
           ‘He is gentle.’                           ‘He is gentle.’

#### Prenominal forms for CAs

(2.197) a. otonashika   hito [NJ]       b. otonashii       hito [SJ]  
           gentle        person           gentle        person  
           ‘a gentle person’                   ‘a gentle person’

However, *-ka* also appears in NAs (See Kyushuhogengakkai 1991, Kanbe 1980 etc.) as in (2.185b), reproduced here as (2.198b).

- (2.198) a. Hanako-no      otonashi**ka**. (CA) b. Hanako-no      shizuka**ka**. (NA)  
 Hanako-Gen      gentle                      Hanako-Gen      quiet  
 ‘Hanako is gentle.’                      ‘Hanako is quiet.’                      [NJ]

For sentence-final forms, in NJ, the NAs can have either an adjectival *-ka* inflectional ending or the copula *ya* (*da* for SJ), as shown in (2.199). Both CAs and NAs have the *-ka* inflectional ending, as shown in (2.199–2.200). On the other hand, in NJ, the nominal predicate cannot have a *-ka* inflectional ending but is followed by the copula *ya*, as in (2.201). Comparing NJ with SJ, it is obvious that the present form of the CA *-i* and the past form of the CA *-katta* in (2.203) do not appear in the NA in SJ, as in (2.202).

#### Nagasaki Japanese

- (2.199) a. Hanako- $\{ga/no\}$       shizuka- $\{ka/ya-ne\}$ .<sup>42</sup> (NAs)  
 Hanako-Nom/Gen      quiet- $\{Pres/Cop.Pres-C\}$   
 ‘Hanako is quiet.’  
 b. Hanako- $\{ga/no\}$       shizuka- $\{katta/yatta\}$ .  
 Hanako-Nom/Gen      quiet-Past  
 ‘Hanako was quiet.’
- (2.200) a. Hanako- $\{ga/no\}$       yasashi**ka**. (CAs)  
 Hanako-Nom/Gen      kind.Pres  
 ‘Hanako is kind.’  
 b. Hanako- $\{ga/no\}$       yasashi**katta**.  
 Hanako-Nom/Gen      kind.Past  
 ‘Hanako was kind.’
- (2.201) a. Taro- $\{ga/no\}$       yukuefumei      **ya-ne**. (Nominal Predicates)  
 Taro-Nom/Gen missing      Cop.Pres-C  
 ‘Taro is missing.’

<sup>42</sup> In the Hichiku dialects, the realization of the copula *ya* (*da* in SJ) is conditioned by the end particles; in particular, the copula does not stand alone for the present tense as it needs certain end particles such as *ne* and *zo*.

- b. Taro-{ga/no} yukuefumei **yatta**.  
 Taro-Nom/Gen missing Cop.Past  
 ‘Taro was missing.’

Standard Japanese

- (2.202) a. Hanako-ga shizuka-**da**(-ne). (NAs)  
 Hanako-Nom quiet-Cop.Pres(-C)  
 ‘Hanako is quiet.’
- b. Hanako-ga shizuka-**datta**.  
 Hanako-Nom quiet-Past  
 ‘Hanako was quiet.’
- (2.203) a. Hanako-ga yasashii. (CAs)  
 Hanako-Nom kind.Pres  
 ‘Hanako is kind.’
- b. Hanako-ga yasashi**katta**.  
 Hanako-Nom kind.Past  
 ‘Hanako was kind.’
- (2.204) a. Taro-ga yukuefumei **da**(-ne). (Nominal Predicates)  
 Taro-Nom missing Cop.Pres(-C)  
 ‘Taro is missing.’
- b. Taro-ga yukuefumei **datta**.  
 Taro-Nom missing Cop.Past  
 ‘Taro was missing.’

Before considering the prenominal form of NAs, some NA characteristics are first examined. It has been widely argued in SJ that NAs play a dual role as both nouns and adjectives (Kageyama 1982, Miyagawa 1987, Nishiyama 1999, Kato 2003, Mihara 2008, among many others). For the noun-like elements, NAs take a copula *da* as for nouns, as shown in (2.202) and (2.204), respectively. Moreover, the NAs and nouns can

stand alone without *da*, but the CAs must co-occur with the inflection *-i*, as illustrated in (2.205).

#### Standard Japanese

- |                             |                     |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| (2.205) a. Kore hon? (Noun) | b. Kore kirei? (NA) |
| This book                   | this clean          |
| ‘Is this a book?’           | ‘Is this clean?’    |
| c. Kore furui? (CA)         | d. *Kore furu? (CA) |
| this old                    | this old            |
| ‘Is this old?’              | ‘Is this old?’      |

(See also Uehara 1998, Kato 2003, and Mihara 2008)

The counterparts in NJ are shown in (2.206). When the inflectional ending *-ka* is not available, CAs cannot occur.

#### Nagasaki Japanese

- |                               |                     |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| (2.206) a. Kore hon? (Noun)   | b. Kore kirei? (NA) |
| This book                     | this clean          |
| ‘Is this a book?’             | ‘Is this clean?’    |
| c. Kore furu <b>ka</b> ? (CA) | d. *Kore furu? (CA) |
| this old                      | this old            |
| ‘Is this old?’                | ‘Is this old?’      |

Although NAs seem to behave as nouns, NAs and CAs have some properties in common. First, prenominal phrases such as *ano*, “that,” or *kanari-no*, “quite-Gen,” only occur with nouns but not with NAs and CAs, as in (2.207).

- |                          |                |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| (2.207) a. ano/kanari-no | daigaku (Noun) |
| that/quite-Gen           | university     |

- b. \*ano/kanari-no            shizuka    (NA)  
    that/quite-Gen    quiet
- c. \*ano/kanari-no            yasashii    (CA)  
    that/quite-Gen    kind                    (Kato 2003: 103)

Second, NAs and CAs are expressed with degree phrases *kanari*, “quite,” and *totemo*, “very,” as opposed to nouns, as in (2.208).

- (2.208) a. \*kanari/totemo            daigaku            da.            (Noun)  
    quite/very            university            Cop
- b. kanari/totemo shizuka da.            (NA)  
    quite/very    quiet    Cop
- c. kanari/totemo yasashii.            (CA)  
    quite/very    kind

As illustrated in (2.209), the *-ka* in NJ only attaches to CAs or NAs.

- |            |            |                |
|------------|------------|----------------|
| (2.209) CA | NA         | noun           |
| yasashi-ka | shizuka-ka | *daigaku-ka    |
| kind       | quiet      | university     |
| hiro-ka    | kiree-ka   | *yukuefumei-ka |
| wide       | clean      | missing        |

So far, it has been shown that NAs can appear as both nouns and CAs. Here, the prenominal NA forms are examined, which are different forms from nouns or CAs. In SJ, NAs take a *na* form whereas nouns take *no*, as seen in (2.210). The CA has a regular inflection form *-i*, as in (2.197b) and (2.210e-f). On the other hand, NAs in NJ can have the same *-ka* inflectional ending as CAs or *na*, and the nouns take *no* as in SJ, as illustrated in (2.211).

(2.210) Prenominal Forms in SJ

Noun

- a. yukuefumei-**no** kodomo    b. gakusei-**no**    fuku  
missing            child            student            clothes

NA

- c. shizuka-**na**heya                    d. kiree-**na**            heya  
quiet      room                    clean            room

CA

- e. yasashi-**i**    sensei                    f. aka-**i**    pen  
kind      teacher                    red    pen

(2.211) Prenominal Forms in NJ

Noun

- a. yukuefumei-**no** kodomo    b. gakusei-**no**    fuku  
missing            child            student            clothes

NA

- c. shizuka-**{ka/na}**    heya    d. kiree-**{ka/na}**    heya  
quiet                    room    clean                    room

CA

- e. yasashi-**ka**            sensee                    f. aka-**ka**            pen  
kind                    teacher                    red                    pen

For some NAs, however, depending on the meaning of the word, the choice of *na* or *no* is decided. If a word like *shinsetsu* is used as an adjective, *na* is selected as in (2.212a). In contrast, if the word is used as a noun, the *no* form appears as seen in (2.212b). *shinsetsu* in (2.212a) denotes the “property” of the person. On the other hand, (2.212b) denotes the abstract “entity” of kindness.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> There are other examples which take either *na* or *no* but the meaning varies. Only when the word takes the *na* form, *-ka* is available in NJ.

(i) a. zeitaku-**{\*no/na}**    kurashi    b. zeitaku-**{no/\*na}**    kekka    [SJ]  
luxurious            life            luxury            result

|                                   |                                    |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| (2.212) a. shinsetsu-{*no/na}hito | b. shinsetsu-{no/*na} tsumori [SJ] |
| kind person                       | kindness by.way.of                 |
| ‘a kind person’                   | ‘by way of kindness’               |

Therefore, the *-ka* inflectional ending is available (as well as *na*) only when the word is used as an adjective, as in (2.213).

|                                      |                                   |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| (2.213) a. shinsetsu-{*no/ka/na}hito | b. shinsetsu-{no/*ka/*na} tsumori |
| kind person                          | kindness by.way.of                |
| ‘a kind person’                      | ‘by way of kindness’              |

More importantly, nouns such as *baka*, “a fool,” in (2.214) can take either *na* or *no* in SJ; the choice does not influence the meaning so much.<sup>44</sup>

---

|                                     |                                    |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| ‘a luxurious life’                  | ‘the result of luxury’             |
| (ii) a. zeitaku-{*no/ka/na} kurashi | b. zeitaku-{no/*ka/*na} kekka [NJ] |
| luxurious life                      | luxury result                      |
| ‘a luxurious life’                  | ‘the result of luxury’             |
| (iii) a. heiwa-{*no/na} kuni        | b. heiwa-{no/*na} sisya [SJ]       |
| peaceful country                    | peace messenger                    |
| ‘a peaceful country’                | ‘a messenger of peace’             |
| (iv) a. heiwa-{*no/?ka/na} kuni     | b. heiwa-{no/*ka/*na} sisya [NJ]   |
| peaceful country                    | peace messenger                    |
| ‘a peaceful country’                | ‘a messenger of peace’             |
| (v) a. kenko-{*no/na} hito          | b. kenkyo-{:no/*na} zytai [SJ]     |
| healty person                       | health condition                   |
| ‘a healthy person’                  | ‘health condition’                 |
| (vi) a. kenko-{:no/?ka/na} hito     | b. kenkyo-{:no/*ka/*na} zytai [NJ] |
| healty person                       | health condition                   |
| ‘a healty person’                   | ‘health condition’                 |

In (vii) *iroiro* modifies nouns, but acts as an adverb as in (viii). There are other examples: *kanari* ‘quite’, *takusan* ‘a lot’, *wazuka* ‘a few’ etc. These examples cannot co-occur with the *-ka* inflectional ending as seen in (viii). The more the word acts as a noun or an adverb, the less the word can co-occur with the *-ka* inflectional ending.

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| (vii) a. iroiro-{:no/na} koto      | b. iroiro(to) kanngaeta. [SJ]                       |
| various thing                      | various thought                                     |
| ‘various things’                   | ‘I consider various things/I considered variously.’ |
| (viii) a. iroiro-{:no/na/*ka} koto | b. iroiro(to) kanngaeta. [NJ]                       |
| various thing                      | various thought                                     |
| ‘various things’                   | ‘I consider various things/I considered variously.’ |

<sup>44</sup> Kato (2003) provides another example: *mondai no/na hatsugen* “question *no/na* remark.” *no* tends to mean “the remark in question” while *na* is likely to mean “the



|                           |           |                    |           |                      |
|---------------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|----------------------|
| (2.214) a. <b>baka-na</b> | tomodachi | b. <b>baka-no</b>  | tomodachi | [SJ]                 |
| fool                      | friend    | fool               | friend    |                      |
| ‘a foolish friend’        |           | ‘a foolish friend’ |           | (See Kato 2003: 120) |

Here, *-ka* is not allowed in NJ as in (2.215a). This further supports the belief that *-ka* does not attach to nouns.

|                          |           |                    |           |      |
|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|------|
| (2.215) a. baka-{*ka/na} | tomodachi | b. baka-no         | tomodachi |      |
| fool                     | friend    | fool               | friend    |      |
| ‘a foolish friend’       |           | ‘a foolish friend’ |           | [NJ] |

The words, including *baka*, in (2.216) can take both *na* and *no* prenominal forms, and they are considered to be nouns. Nouns in (2.216a) have a negative connotation, whereas those in (2.216b) tend to have a positive connotation. (2.216a) is related to the *S is a fool!* construction, which is discussed in the next section.

- (2.216) a. *baka* ‘a fool’, *usotsuki* ‘a liar’, *ikujinashi* ‘a coward’, *rokudenashi* ‘a good-for-nothing’, *sekenshirazu* ‘a greenhorn’, *wakarazuya* ‘an obstinate person’, *yowamushi* ‘a wimp’
- b. *tensai* ‘a genius’, *ganbariya/doryokuka* ‘a hard-worker’, *eri-to* ‘an elite’, *yarite* ‘a capable person’

Kyushuhogengakkai (1991) claimed that the noun *nonashi*, “an incompetent,” refers to a person’s characteristics and cannot co-occur with the inflectional ending *-ka*, which was compatible with the fact that *-ka* cannot attach to the nouns in (2.216), as shown in (2.215a).

---

trouble-prone remark,” but either interpretation is possible for both *no* and *na*.

There is some evidence that the words in (2.216) are nouns as shown below. First, the prenominal phrases, *ano*, “that,” and *kanari-no*, “quite-Gen,” can precede these words, as exemplified in (2.217).

- (2.217) a. a-no                      baka-ga              mata                      shippaishita.  
                     That-Gen              fool-Nom              again                      failed  
                     ‘That fool failed again.’
- b. a-no                      tensai-ga              mata              shou-o                      moratta.  
                     That-Gen              genius-Nom              again              prize-Acc                      receive.Past  
                     ‘That genius received a prize again.’
- c. kanari-no              baka              da.  
                     quite-Gen              fool              Cop
- d. kanari-no              tensai              da.  
                     quite-Gen              genius Cop

Although it is natural to consider the words in (2.216) to be nouns, they also share some characteristics with NAs as seen in (2.218). In general, CAs, including NAs, can co-occur with degree phrases such as *kanari* or *totemo* and denote a property, but as nouns represent an entity, they cannot occur with such degree phrases. However, nouns such as *baka* occur with these degree phrases because the nouns can denote a property as CAs and NAs.

- (2.218) a. kanari/totemo              baka                      da.  
                     quite/very              fool                      Cop
- b. kanari/totemo                      tensai              da.  
                     quite/very                      genius Cop

To recapitulate, the distribution of the inflectional ending *-ka*, nouns that denote either entity or property cannot have the inflectional ending in NJ; the *-ka* is an adjectival inflection and attaches only to adjectives (CAs or NAs), as seen in (2.219).<sup>45</sup>

- |         |                    |                    |
|---------|--------------------|--------------------|
| (2.219) | a. *gakusee-ka (N) | b. *baka-ka (N)    |
|         | student            | fool               |
|         | c. yasashi-ka (CA) | d. shizuka-ka (NA) |
|         | kind               | quiet              |

Although it has been accepted that NAs as well as CAs in NJ have a *-ka* inflectional ending, this section provided more sets of data to clarify that the nouns in (2.216) cannot have this inflectional ending even if they denote the property as adjectives; a crucial consideration when examining the *S no baka* construction in the following section.

### 2.7.3.3 The *S-no baka!* “S is a fool!” Construction

With regard to the unique “S is a fool!” construction in (2.220), typically, a negative word or abusive language like *baka*, “a fool,” often co-occurs; a word carrying a negative connotation or evaluation should follow *no*, meaning that a word with a positive connotation (evaluation) would be ungrammatical regardless of its category, as illustrated in (2.221).

<sup>45</sup> I would like to thank Yoko Yumoto for pointing out the example *pechanko-no kutsu* ‘flat shoes’ as provided in Muraki (2012). As well as the *no* form, the *na* form as in *pechanko-na kutsu* is available according to my informants of SJ. (See also *pechanko-na futon* ‘a flat Japanese-style bed’ as provided in the digital *Daijisen* dictionary.) This indicates that the choice of the *na* or *no* form in SJ does not always tell us the category of the word. As seen in (i)-(iii), *pechanko* can occur with *kanari/totemo* but not with *kanari-no* or *ano*. Thus, *pechanko* is an NA and, crucially, the *-ka* inflectional ending is available in NJ as in (iv).

- |       |               |          |      |
|-------|---------------|----------|------|
| (i)   | kanari/totemo | pechanko | da.  |
|       | very          | flat     | Cop  |
| (ii)  | ??kanari-no   | pechanko | da.  |
|       | very-Gen      | flat     | Cop  |
| (iii) | * ano         | pechanko |      |
|       | that          | flat     |      |
| (iv)  | pechanko-ka   |          | [NJ] |

- (2.220) Jiro-no            baka!                    [SJ/ NJ]  
 Jiro-Gen            fool  
 ‘Jiro is a fool!’
- (2.221) a. \*Jiro-no            tensai (Noun)  
           Jiro-Gen            genius  
           ‘Jiro is a genius!’
- b. \*Jiro-no            kirei (NA)  
           Jiro-Gen            beautiful  
           ‘Jiro is beautiful!’
- c. \*Jiro-no            kakkoi (CA)  
           Jiro-Gen            cool  
           ‘Jiro is cool!’

Even though the words have a negative connotation, the construction in question imposes further restrictions. Examples with CAs are ungrammatical as in (2.222). Interestingly, the copula *da/datta* or negations are not allowed, as in (2.223a) and (2.223b). Crucially, *no* cannot alternate with *ga* in this construction as in (2.223c).

- (2.222) \*Hanako-no            okashii/okorippoi/kibishii (CAs)  
           Hanako-Gen            strange/peppery/harsh  
           ‘Hanako is strange/peppery/harsh!’
- (2.223) a. \*Hanako-no            baka da/datta.  
           Hanako-Gen            fool Cop  
           ‘Hanako is/was a fool!’
- b. \*Hanako-no            bakajanai.  
           Hanako-Gen            fool.not  
           ‘Hanako is not a fool!’
- c. \*Hanako-ga            baka!  
           Hanako-Nom            fool!  
           ‘Hanako is a fool!’

Since *baka* is a typical example of this construction and is considered to be a noun as it can be modified by prenominal phrases such as *ano*, “that,” and *kanarino*, “quite-Gen,” as in (2.224) and (2.225), and the *-ka* inflectional ending cannot attach to *baka*, as in (2.226). The *-ka* inflectional ending is only allowed to occur with CAs or NAs. What makes this noun unique is that it is a noun but denotes a property as an adjective (CA or NA) unlike a normal noun that denotes an entity. This is proven by the degree phrases *kanari*, “quite,” and *totemo*, “very,” which can modify the word, as seen in (2.227). These points are the keys to examining the characteristics of words, such as *baka* that follow *no* in the *S no baka* construction.

(2.224) *ano baka*

that fool

(2.225) *kanari-no baka*

quite-Gen fool

‘that fool’

(2.226) \**baka-ka* [NJ]

(2.227) *kanari/totemo baka*

quite/very fool

Let us consider some other words in (2.228–9). These words cannot appear in this construction as they do not have the same characteristics as *baka*, “a fool.” The characteristics of these words, including *baka*, are summarized in Table 1.

(2.228) ??*Jiro-no ganko/jibunkatte*

Jiro-Gen stubborn/selfish

‘Jiro is stubborn/selfish!’

(2.229) a. \**Jiro-no homuresu*                      b. \**Jiro-no koroshiya*

Jiro-Gen homeless.person                      Jiro-Gen a.hit.man

‘Jiro is a homeless person!’                      ‘Jiro is a hit man!’

(2.230) Table 1

Occurrence of *Ano/Kanarino*, the *-Ka* Inflectional Ending, and *Kanari/Totemo*

|   | <i>baka</i> as in<br>(2.220) | <i>ganko</i> as in<br>(2.228) | <i>homuresu</i> as in<br>(2.229) |
|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <i>ano/kanarino</i>                     | ✓                            | ??                            | ✓                                |
| <i>-ka</i> inflectional<br>ending in NJ | *                            | ✓                             | *                                |
| <i>kanari/totemo</i>                    | ✓                            | ✓                             | *                                |

As shown in Table 1, *ganko* “stubborn” or *jibunkatte* “selfish” in (2.228) cannot have prenominal phrases such as *ano* or *kanarino* but can be modified by degree phrases *kanari* or *totemo*. These occur with the copula *da* as in *ganko-da* or *jibunkatte-da*, so they are not nouns but are NAs. The words in (2.229) such as *homuresu*, “a homeless person,” are nouns, but they do not denote a property; they occur with prenominal modifiers but cannot be modified by *kanari/totemo*. From Table 1, it is clear that the *-ka* inflectional ending cannot be attached to nouns. Nouns that show the same characteristics as *baka* and have a negative connotation are listed in (2.216a), reproduced here as (2.231).

(2.231) *baka* ‘a fool’, *usotsuki* ‘a liar’, *ikujinashi* ‘a coward’, *rokudenashi* ‘a good-for-nothing’, *sekenshirazu* ‘a greenhorn’, *wakarazuya* ‘an obstinate person’, *yowamushi* ‘a wimp’

Therefore, the category of the *baka* ‘a fool’ in this construction is a noun and is especially a property-denoting noun with a negative connotation.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>46</sup> I would like to thank Hiroshi Aoyagi for suggesting that this construction expresses the constant state of the subject but not the permanent state and also that the subject should be in a close relationship to the speaker. I also wish to thank Seiki Ayano for pointing out that *Jiro-no kashiko* ‘Jiro is wise!’, in which only the stem part of *kashikoi* appears, used to be acceptable but it is not so now.

Since words like *baka* are a noun and *no* cannot alternate with *ga* in this construction, as in (2.223c), the structure in (2.232b) coupled with (2.232a) can capture the facts and correctly account for the genitive case in this construction; *no* is inserted as defined in (2.233).<sup>47</sup>

(2.232) a. Jiro-no            baka!  
           Jiro-Gen        a.fool  
           ‘Jiro is a fool!’

b.                    NP  
                       /      \  
                   NP            N  
                   △            |  
                   Jiro         baka

(2.233) Mod-Insertion

$[_{NP} \dots XP N^a] \rightarrow [_{NP} \dots XP \text{Mod} N^a]$ , where  $\text{Mod} = no$

(Saito et al. 2008:249, attributed to Kitagawa and Ross 1982)

In summary, in Subsection 2.7.3, it was argued that a weak *v* (on top of the unaccusative verb) licenses the genitive subjects in copula sentences with nominal predicates and adjectival predicates in NJ. The adjectival inflectional ending *-ka* contains an unaccusative verb as the copula *ya (da)*. It was also shown that the inflectional ending *-ka* does not attach to the noun even if the noun denotes a ‘property’ as adjectives. This finding led to the conclusion that the category of the *baka* ‘a fool’ in the *S no baka!* construction is a property-denoting noun, so that the *no* in this construction is inserted by applying the *no*-insertion rule.

#### 2.7.4 Concluding Remarks on Genitive Subjects in Copula Sentences in Nagasaki

This section elucidated the mechanism as to why *no* is licensed in copula sentences in Hichiku dialects and in the peculiar *S no baka!* construction in SJ as well as in NJ. For the former, the *no* is licensed by a weak *v* and for the latter, the *no* is inserted according to the *no*-insertion rule. Importantly, the adjectival inflectional ending *-ka* in NJ was demonstrated to expand its usage in the case of NAs, but it was shown that it cannot be attached to any nouns, including property-denoting nouns. The distribution of the *-ka* inflectional ending provided additional evidence regarding the

<sup>47</sup> I am grateful to Masao Ochi for valuable comments on the use of the *no* insertion rule.

two types of adjectives, showing that the CAs and NAs in Japanese share the same characteristics. Although word categories based on an occurrence with the prenominal modifiers as *ano*, “that,” the inflectional ending-*ka*, and the degree phrases as *kanari* “quite” were examined, more research is needed to corroborate this analysis.

Before coming to the conclusion of this chapter, further issues are considered in terms of focus and transitive subjects.

## 2.8 Further Issues

### 2.8.1 *Ga/No* Conversion and Focus

In the Hichiku dialects, subjects marked by *no* denote an ND reading while subjects with *ga* have an EL reading or a focus reading. A subject cannot be marked by *no* if it is focused or has an EL reading. However, in some contexts, it is possible. As discussed in SJ in Akaso and Haraguchi (2013), theme arguments, unlike agents, can bear *no* even if they are accompanied by focus particles such as *dake* as exemplified in (2.234). The same conclusion holds for NJ of independent clauses, as in (2.235).

- (2.234) a. Taro                    dake- $\{ga/*no\}$     nonda                    kusuri  
                   Taro                    dake-Nom/\*Gen drink.Past                    medicine  
                   ‘The medicine only Taro drank.’
- b. Umi    dake- $\{ga/no\}$                     mieru    heya  
                   Sea    only-Nom/Gen                    see.can    room  
                   ‘The room where only sea can be seen.’
- (2.235) a. ??Taro                    dake-no                    nonda                    bai/yo.    [NJ]  
                   Taro                    dake-Gen                    drink.Past                    C  
                   ‘Hey, only Taro drank.’
- b. Umi dake-no                    mieru  
                   Sea    only-Gen                    see.can  
                   ‘Only sea can be seen.’



Contrary to Asako and Hraguchi (2013), Kato (2005) and Nishioka (2014) provide data such as (2.236a), which is unacceptable with *no*. This indicates that not all theme arguments followed by a focus particle are marked by *no*. As Kato (2005) and Nishioka (2014) argue, some examples with theme arguments (genitive subjects of unaccusatives) are unacceptable, as in (2.236b-c). If verbs denote events or actions, theme arguments with a focus particle tend to not be marked by *no*.<sup>48</sup> The verbs in (2.235b) and (2.237) are static and can be marked by *no*.

- (2.236) a. *kozutumi dake*-{*ga*/\**no*}      *todoita*.  
Parcel.only      {Nom/\*Gen}      arrived  
‘Only parcel arrived.’ [NJ, KJ; See KJ for Kato 2005:30, Nishioka 2014]
- b. *Ame dake*-{*ga*/\**no*}      *futta*.  
rain focus-{Nom/\*Gen}      fell  
‘Only, it rained.’ [NJ]
- c. *Taro dake*-{*ga*/\**no*}      *kita*.  
Taro only-{Nom/\*Gen}      came  
‘Only Taro came.’ [NJ]
- (2.237) a. *Heya-ni Taro dake*-{*ga*/*no*}      *otta*.  
room-in Taro.only-{Nom/Gen}      was  
‘In the room, there was only Taro.’
- b. *Taro-ga nihongo dake*-{*ga*/*no*}      *dekiru*.  
Taro-Nom Japanese-{Nom/Gen}      can  
‘Taro is only capable of Japanese.’

An explanation for this point is left open for future study.

---

<sup>48</sup> I am grateful to Manabu Wada for helpful comments on this point.

## 2.8.2 Genitive Subjects of Transitive Verbs

Before concluding this section, I would like to discuss transitivity restrictions and genitive subjects. In example (2.238) the genitive subject is licensed by the C head, *bai*, and the scope data in (2.239) tells us that the genitive subject resides within *vP* even if a direct object appears. Also the genitive subject is bound by *mo* as opposed to the nominative subject, as illustrated in (2.240).

(2.238) Taro-no            son hon-ba        kau                bai. [NJ]  
           Taro-Gen        the.book-Acc    buy-Pres        C  
           ‘Hey, Taro buys the book.’

(2.239) a. Zenin-ga        son hon-ba        kawan    bai.  
           All-Nom        the.book-Acc    buy.not   C  
           (all>not: \*not>all)

b. Zenin-no    son-hon-ba        kawan    bai  
           All-Gen    the.book-Acc        buy.not   C  
           ((?)all>not; not>all)

(2.240) Dai-{\*ga/no}            son hon-ba        kai-mo        se-n            bai.  
           anyone-{\*Nom/Gen}    the.book-Acc    buy-Q        Neg-Pres        C  
           ‘Hey, anyone does not buy the book.’

For the subordinate clauses in Hichiku dialects, Nishioka (2014) and Mori (2009) provide data that shows that *no* as well as *ga* is allowed even if objects intervene between the genitive subjects and verbs as in (2.241), which are infelicitous in SJ.

(2.241) a. Taroo-ga/no    antoki susi-ba    kuta ken        oo-mo kuta-ttai.  
           Taroo-Nom/Gen then    sushi-Acc ate because    I-also ate-C  
           ‘Because Taroo ate sushi then, I also ate it.’    [KJ; Nishioka 2014]

- b. Ora gakusei-ga/no hana-ba kureta kotu-ga nansama uresikatta  
 I student-Nom/Gen flower-Acc gave fact-Nom greatly was glad  
 ‘I was very glad that the students gave me flowers.’ [KJ; Nishioka 2014]
- c. Taro-ga/no Hanako-ba ryoshin-ni shokaishita ken  
 Taro-Nom/Gen Hanako-Acc parents-Dat introduce because  
 kekkon-no hi-mo sogen toku naka sa.  
 marriage-Gen day-MO so far not C.  
 ‘Taro introduced Hanako to his parents so that their marriage will not be so far.’ [NJ; Mori 2009]

The analysis here uniformly captures data for both independent clauses and subordinate clauses. The fact that genitive subjects stay within  $\nu$ P is consistent with Kato (2007), but the present analysis argues that the subject preceding the direct object is marked by *no* as there is a certain licenser and an ND reading is assured. However, the genitive subject does not always stay within  $\nu$ P. Importantly, when the major subject with a genitive case precedes the nominative phrases, it cannot fall within the scope of negation as in (2.242). In addition, in such cases, the major subjects with *no* are not bound by the Q particle, as illustrated in (2.243).

(2.242) Zen'in-no (sogan) se-ga takou-naka bai  
 all-Gen quite height-Nom tall-Neg C  
 ‘lit. Listen, all is not quite tall in height.’ all>not; \*not>all

(2.243) Dai-\*no/\*ga (sogan) se-ga takou-mo naka bai [NJ]  
 anyone-\*Gen/\*Nom quite height-Nom tall -Q Neg C  
 ‘lit. Hey, anyone is not quite tall in height.’

Genitive subjects tend to stay within  $\nu$ P but can move out of  $\nu$ P if forced. However, this point needs further investigation.

## 2.9 Concluding Remarks

This chapter examined the distribution of the genitive subject in NJ, which is in strict accordance with the ND interpretation, and which tells the semantic differences between an ND and EL reading more clearly. In particular, more detailed examples and contexts for an ND interpretation with stative predicates and interrogatives other than verbs denoting action or existence illustrated how the ND interpretation is possible in Japanese. *No* plays an important role in signaling ND readings in NJ, while its usage in SJ is declining and it is restricted to only certain subordinate clauses. Still, the connection between the ND reading and the genitive Case is shared between SJ and NJ, as can be seen from the fact that genitive subjects cannot follow focus particles except in the cases pointed out in section 2.8. It is suggested that the Japanese case markers *ga* and *no* are sensitive to this distinction. A significant difference between SJ and NJ is that NJ realizes the genitive case if subjects are interpreted as NDs, even in independent clauses. C heads *bai/yo* or unaccusative verbs were shown to be keys for genitive Case licensing. Modifying analyses by Kuroda (1965, 1972, 1992), Hasegawa (2008, 2010, 2011), and Kuno (1973a, 1973b), the ND reading and also the genitive case in NJ are explained as the defocusing phenomenon in the sense of Aoygi (1999) (and “all-focus” proposed by Vallduví (1992, 1995)). It is a natural consequence of this analysis that major subjects as well as subjects of (in)transitives or stative verbs can be marked by *no* if they are interpreted as ND. For nominal predicates and adjectival predicates, by adopting Nishiyama (1999)’s analysis and the historical observation of the *-ka* inflectional ending, it is unveiled that these predicates somehow contain unaccusative verbs. NJ data reveals the genitive subject position to be predicate internal even in the case of copula sentences, which is consistent with the analyses of Watanabe (1996) and Kato (2005, 2007). Some of the rare cases mentioned in 2.8.2 need further investigation. Finally, it was proposed that the *no* in *Jiro-No Baka!* “Jiro is a fool” construction is inserted in a way that is similar to a normal noun phrase, as the word *baka* is a property-denoting noun, with which the *-ka* inflectional ending cannot co-occur. The exceptional case of a genitive subject with a focus particle is reserved for future study.

The next chapter focuses on *wh*-questions. As mentioned in this chapter, generally the subject of the interrogatives denotes the topic and takes *wa*, but it can be *ga* in SJ as the subject is in the subordinate clause. The next chapter shows how *wh*-NP questions (with a rhetorical flavor) can be analyzed in the same fashion; i.e., subjects with *ga* are indeed in a subordinate clause.

## Chapter 3

### ***Wh*-NP (Rhetorical) Questions and Nominative Case Markers<sup>1</sup>**

#### 3.1 Introduction

In Chapter 2, we have discussed phenomena concerned with Nominative/Genitive Conversion: genitive case licensors in NJ (and SJ) and the relation between the genitive case licensors and ND interpretations. This chapter explores *wh*-rhetorical questions with *nani-ga* “what-Nom” and *doko-ga* “where-Nom” in Japanese by comparing them with similar constructions in Korean and Chinese.

Previous studies have argued that the same syntactic structure underlies ordinary questions (OQs) and rhetorical questions (RQs) (Caponigro and Sprouse (C&S) 2007, Cheung 2009, Fujii 2014, etc.). Although Cheung (2009) provides cross-linguistic data as seen in (3.1) and calls the constructions “Negative WH-Constructions (NWHCs),” how rhetorical *wh*-questions are analyzed syntactically has not been discussed enough.

- (3.1) a. *Kare-no doko-ga*            1 meetoru 80 senti            na            no?! [Japanese]  
          he-Gen where-Nom        1 meter 80 centimeter    Decl Q  
          ‘No way is he 6 feet tall.’ (lit. ‘Where of him is 1.80 m?!’) (Cheung 2009:310)
- b. *Eti/Ettehkhey*    John-i                    60 sai                    i-ni?!                    [Korean]  
          where/how        John-Nom                60.year.old            be-Q (ibid.: 298)  
          ‘No way is John 60 years old.’
- c. *Koei bindou jau hai tousyugun sik je aa?* [Cantonese]  
          he            where    have    be.at    library                    eat thing Q  
          ‘No way did he eat anything in the library.’ (ibid.)

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a revised version of a paper presented at the poster session of the 24th Japanese/Korean Linguistics Conference held at the National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics (NINJAL) on October 15, 2016. Section 3.3 is a revised version of a paper that originally appeared in Saruwatari (2016c). I wish to thank my informants of Chinese and Korean for their judgments; especially I thank Yuchen Zhang, Zhijun Wang, Jing Nie, Minji Ju, and Seonmi Yu. I am also grateful to Hiroshi Mito, Yoko Yumoto, Masao Ochi, and Yoichi Miyamoto for their invaluable comments and suggestions.

d. Since when is John watching TV now? [English] (ibid.)

Yamadera (2010) also discusses such *wh*-questions and she argues that *nani-ga* ‘what’ or *doko-ga* ‘where’ of (3.2) is an adjunct in the CP area. However, in her analysis, it is unclear whether these *wh*-questions can be analyzed in the same way as OQs or RQs.

(3.2) Nani-ga/Doko-ga Shinjuku-ga yakei-ga kirei na no?!  
 what-Nom/where-Nom Shinjuku-Nom night.view-Nom beautiful Cop C  
 ‘lit. Why do you say that it is Shinjuku that a night view is beautiful? (It is not.)’  
 [Japanese; Yamadera 2010:171]

Moreover, Cheung (2009) argues that the obligatory negative interpretation of NWHCs comes from the conventional implicature that is part of semantics, as opposed to the general RQ interpretation, which is attributed to pragmatic subject matter (C&S 2007). We need to ascertain whether NWHCs should be differentiated from RQs.

This section proposes that NWHCs are syntactically and semantically the same as ordinary RQs and that the constructions in question are copula sentences with embedded structures as in (3.3), wherein even direct quotes can occur. This structure also applies to Korean and Chinese data shown in (3.4a) and (3.4b), respectively.

(3.3) [<sub>CP</sub>[<sub>TP</sub>[<sub>DP</sub> Nani-ga/Doko-ga] [<sub>PredP</sub> [(in)direct quoted phrases] na]] no]

(3.4) a. Mwo-ga/Eodi-ga [John-i 60 sar ] i-ni? [Korean]<sup>2</sup>  
 what-Nom/where-Nom John-Nom 60.year.old Cop-Q  
 ‘Why do you say that John is 60 years old? (He is not.)’

b. Shenme [ta wenrou]. [Mandarin Chinese]  
 what he kind  
 ‘Why do you say that he is kind? (He is not.)’

<sup>2</sup> The Revised Romanization of Korean by South Korea's Ministry of Culture and Tourism is used in this thesis except for quotations from previous research.

The organization of this chapter is as follows: Section 3.2 reviews previous research on RQs, particularly C&S (2007), Cheung (2009) and Yamadera (2010). As Cheung (2009), who argues NWHCs are semantically different from RQs or OQs, faces several problems, we claim that NWHCs should be considered equivalent to RQs (and OQs) semantically as well as syntactically, following C&S (2007). Section 3.3 develops Yamadera’s data and examines RQs with *nani-ga* “what-Nom” and *doko-ga* “where-Nom” by comparing them to their Korean and Chinese counterparts. It is proposed that rhetorical *wh*-NP questions are copula sentences and have an embedded structure wherein any type of predicate can occur. Finally, section 3.4 concludes this chapter.

### 3.2 Previous Research

This section reviews the related work of C&S (2007), Cheung (2009), and Yamadera (2010). C&S (2007) argue that OQs and RQs are the same semantically and syntactically and the difference between them should be treated in pragmatics. Cheung (2009) calls *wh*-questions in a rhetorical manner as in (3.5) “Negative WH-Constructions (NWHCs)” wherein underlined *wh*-words express the speaker’s negative attitude toward a proposition. He also claims that, unlike ordinary RQs, the obligatory negative interpretations in NWHCs are due to conventional implicatures.

- (3.5) a. Kare-no doko-ga                    1 meetoru 80 senti                    na                    no?! [Japanese]  
           he-Gen where-Nom                    1 meter 80 centimeter                    Decl Q  
           ‘No way is he 6 feet tall.’ (lit. ‘Where of him is 1.80 m?!’) (Cheung 2009:310)
- b. Eti/Ettehkhey                    John-i                    60 sai                    i-ni?!                    [Korean]  
           where/how                    John-Nom                    60.year.old                    be-Q (ibid.: 298)  
           ‘No way is John 60 years old.’
- c. Koei                    bindou                    jau                    hai                    tousyugun                    sik je                    aa?! [Cantonese]  
           he                    where                    have                    be.at                    library                    eat thing Q  
           ‘No way did he eat anything in the library.’                    (ibid.)



After discussing different aspects between OQs and RQs in 3.2.1, we will review C&S (2007) and Cheung (2009) to see whether NWHCs are dealt with differently from OQs or RQs in semantics. Following that, the structure of NWHCs proposed by Yamadera (2010) is discussed.

### 3.2.1 The Different Behaviors between OQs and RQs

By reviewing different behaviors between OQs and RQs, we seek to confirm that NWHCs act like RQs.

OQs and RQs behave differently (Sadock 1971, Han 2002, C&S 2007 etc.). If the introductory phrase *after all* occurs in a *yes-no* question as in (3.6a-b) or a *yet*-clause follows an interrogative clause as in (3.6c), only a rhetorical interpretation is available.

- (3.6) a. After all, does Fred have a red cent? (Sadock 1974: 83)  
 b. After all, do phonemes have anything to do with language? (Han 2002:203)  
 c. Do phonemes have anything to do with language? Yet people continue to believe in them. (Han 2002:203)

This can be extended to *wh*-questions as seen in (3.7).

- (3.7) a. After all, who helped Mary?  
 b. Who helped Mary? Yet she managed everything by herself. (Han 2002:204)

In Cantonese, when the interrogatives are introduced by *lousat gong* ‘honestly speaking,’ it is interpreted as RQs as in (3.8a). Likewise, the NWHC is used with *lousat gong* ‘honestly speaking’ as seen in (3.8b).

- (3.8) a. Lousat gong aa1, bingo wui lei aa? [Cantonese]  
 honest speak Prt who will come Q  
 ‘Honestly speaking, who will come?’

- b. Lousat gong aa1, keoi bindou wui lei aa3?!  
 honest speak Prt he where will come Q  
 ‘Honestly speaking, no way will he come.’ (Cheung 2009:301)

In Japanese, Fujii (2014) argues that the phrases *to-iu-no/te-iu-no* ‘quote-say-C’ make questions rhetorical. The speaker can utter (3.9b) after (3.9a).

- (3.9) a. Dare-ga souji-o tetudattekureta to iu no?  
 who-Nom cleaning-Acc helped Quote say C  
 ‘Who helped you with the cleaning?’  
 b. Dare-mo tetudawanakatta desho.  
 anybody help.not.Past Cop.Mod  
 ‘Nobody helped you, did they?’ (See Fujii 2014)

The *te-iu-no* phrase can also appear with NWHCs as in (3.10).

- (3.10) a. Taro-no doko-ga ki-ga tsuyoi tte iunoyo.  
 Taro-Gen where-Nom mind-Nom strong Quote say.C  
 ‘Why do you say that Taro is strong in mind? (He is not.)’  
 b. Zenzen tsuyoku nai.  
 at.all strong not  
 ‘He is not strong at all.’

On the other hand, if questions are introduced either by the phrase *I’m really curious* or by *I really don’t know*, such questions are interpreted as only OQs as shown in (3.11).

- (3.11) a. I’m really curious: who helped Luca when he was in trouble?  
 b. I really don’t know: Who helped Luca when he was in trouble?  
 (C&S 2007:3)

Similarly, in Japanese, if *shiritai* follows a question, OQs are obtained as illustrated in (3.12).

- (3.12) Dare-ga Luca-o tetsudatta no ka shiritai-n-da.  
 who-Nom Luca-Acc helped C Q know.want-C-Cop  
 ‘I really want to know who helped Luka.’ [Japanese]

Accordingly, if the sequence *shiritai* accompanies NWHCs, they are interpreted only as OQs as in (3.13).

- (3.13) Kare-no doko-ga ki-ga tsuyoi no ka shiritai  
 he-Gen where-Nom mind-Nom strong Decl Q know.want  
 ‘lit. I want to know where of him is strong (in mind).’ [Japanese]

In addition, questions with the *te-iu-no* phrase can license Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) such as *ichi ~ datte* ‘one ~ even’ as illustrated in (3.14).<sup>3</sup>

- (3.14) Dare-ga ichiendatte charity-ni kifushitekuretatte iu no?  
 who-Nom one.yen.even charity-Dat donate Quote say C  
 ‘Who donated even one yen to the charity?’ [Japanese; see Fujii 2014]

The *te-iu-no* phrase can license NPIs in NWHCs as seen in (3.15).

- (3.15) Taro-no doko-ga ichimiri-datte nobita tte iu no?  
 Taro-Gen where-Nom 1 millimeter-even grow Quote say C

<sup>3</sup> The string *ichi ~ datte* ‘one ~ even’ is an NPI (See Fujii 2014).

- (i) Taro-wa koremade ichiendatte charity-ni kifushitekure-nakattayo.  
 Taro-Top until.now one.yen.even charity-Dat donate-not.past  
 ‘Taro has not donated even one yen to the charity.’  
 (ii) \* Taro-wa koremade ichiendatte charity-ni kifushitekure-tayo.  
 Taro-Top until.now one.yen.even charity-Dat donate-past  
 ‘Taro has donated even one yen to the charity.’

‘No way did Taro grow even 1 millimeter?’ [Japanese]

NPI licensing in RQs in English is also shown in (3.16) as opposed to OQs in (3.17) and their Japanese counterparts are seen in (3.18).

(3.16) a. After all, who lifted a finger to help Luca?

b. Who gave a damn when Paolo was in trouble? Yet he made it.

(C&S 2007:3, see also Han 2002:205)

(3.17) a. # I’m really curious: Who lifted a finger to help Luca?

b. # I really don’t know: Who gave a damn when Paolo was in trouble?

(C&S 2007:3)

(3.18) #Dare-ga Luca-wo ippun-demo tasuketa no ka shiritai.

who-Nom Luca-Acc one.minute-even helped C Q want

‘I really want to know who helped Luca.’

[Japanese]

Even if RQs can have a negative nuance (that they can license NPIs), they are different from statements. In cases such as in (3.19), the addressee and the speaker can utter *Luca* as an answer.

(3.19) SITUATION: Both the speaker and addressee know that Luca was the only one who was still dancing at the party last night at 3 am and both know that the other knows it as well. (See C&S 2007:4)<sup>4</sup>

SPEAKER: You should stop saying that Luca didn’t like the party last night.

*After all, who was the only one that was still dancing at 3am?*

ADDRESSEE or SPEAKER: Luca (ibid.)

---

<sup>4</sup> In fact, C&S (2007) wrote “at 2 am” in the situation but used “at 3 am” in the examples, so I changed “at 2 am” to “at 3 am” here.

In contrast, neither the addressee nor the speaker answers the statement in the case of (3.20).

(3.20) SPEAKER: You should stop saying that Luca didn't like the party last night.

*After all, Luca was the only one that was still dancing at 3am!*

ADDRESSEE or SPEAKER: #Luca (C&S 2007:4)

We will see that NWHCs are considered to be different from negative statements in Subsection 3.2.3. Another point worth discussing here is that NWHCs also contain question particles *ka* as in (3.21a), which cannot appear in negative statements such as in those of (3.21b) (see also Cheung 2009).

(3.21) a. Kare-no doko-ga 1 meeteru 80 senchi na n desu ka?! [Japanese]

he-Gen where-Nom 1 meter 80 centimeter Cop C Cop Q

'lit. Where of him is 1.80 m tall? (He is not 1.80 m.)'

b. Kare-wa 1 meeteru 80 senti dewa nai desu (\*ka).

he-top 1 meter 80 centimeter Cop.Topnot Cop (\*Q)

'He is not 1.80 m tall.'

Thus, NWHCs are questions that can function similarly to RQs. In the next subsection, some work by C&S (2007) is discussed, with particular focus on their argument that RQs should be analyzed syntactically and semantically in the same way as OQs.

### 3.2.2 Caponigro and Sprouse (2007)

Caponigro and Sprouse (2007) (C&S) assume that if RQs and OQs are semantically identical, this hypothesis extends to multiple *wh*-word questions. English only allows single-pair readings with ordering words such as *first* as in (3.22). According to the participants in their study, the constructions of OQs and RQs in (3.22) are judged acceptable and answerable as single-pair readings, (see C&S 2007 for

details of their experiment). Thus, C&S (2007) conclude that RQs are considered semantically identical to OQs.

(3.22) a. Who danced with who first? (OQ)

b. After all, who danced with who first? (RQ) (See C&S 2007:5-6)

This is also applicable to the case of Japanese where single-pair readings are available for both OQs and RQs.

(2.23) a. Saishoni dare-ga dare-ni kisushita no? [Japanese OQ]

First, who-Nom who-Dat kiss.Past Q

‘Who kissed who first?’

b. Kekkyoku, saishoni dare-ga darenis kisushita-tte-iu no?[Japanese RQ]

After.all, first, who-Nom who-Dat kiss.Past-C-say Q

‘After all who kissed who first?’

C&S (2007) also demonstrate that RQs can be embedded as OQs as exemplified in (3.24). As shown in (3.25), RQs can be embedded as enclosed in brackets in Japanese too.

(3.24) SITUATION: No one at the office likes the boss, and the boss knows this. One day she gets fed up with the situation, and says:

SPEAKER: Should I even ask who would give a damn if I stopped coming to work? (C&S 2007:6)

(3.25) [Kono office-de dare-ga ichibyodemo kinikaketekureru to]

This office-in who-Nom one.second.even worry C

omouno?

think [Japanese]

‘Who do you think worries about me for even one second in this office?’

Therefore, C&S (2007) argue that OQs and RQs are semantically and syntactically equivalent. However, there are some differences between OQs and RQs that seem to arise at a pragmatic level. As an illustration, answers are given only by the addressee in the case of OQs. In contrast, answers can be given by either the speaker or the addressee and are optional with RQs. One example of OQs is (3.26) where the speaker does not know who helped Luca and only the addressee can answer the question. Whereas in (3.27), which is an example of an RQ, the speaker as well as the addressee knows that nobody helped Luca, so either of them can answer, but they do not have to.

(3.26) Situation: The Speaker thinks that somebody must have helped Luca when he was in trouble, though he does not know who. The Speaker knows that the Addressee is a good friend of Luca's and therefore he is likely to be aware of what happened to Luca. Actually, nobody helped Luca, and the Addressee knows that.

SPEAKER: *Who helped Luca when he was in trouble?*

ADDRESSEE: Nobody / # <NO ANSWER>

or

SPEAKER: # Nobody / # <NO ANSWER> (C&S 2007:7)

(3.27) Situation: Nobody helped Luca when he was in trouble, and both the Speaker and the Addressee are aware of that. They both know that the other is aware of that as well. Now Luca doesn't trust people.

SPEAKER: It's understandable that Luca doesn't trust people anymore. *After all, who helped him when he was in trouble?*

ADDRESSEE: Nobody / <NO ANSWER>

or

SPEAKER: Nobody / <NO ANSWER> (ibid.)

Notably, in RQs, the speaker can answer as in (3.28b) as opposed to the case of OQs in (3.28a).

(3.28) a. Speaker: Who helped you? #Luca and Ken. (OQs)

b. Speaker: Who cares about you? Nobody. (RQs)

(C&S 2007, see also Fujii 2014)

Accordingly, OQs and RQs are defined as follows;

(3.29) *Definition of OQs*

An OQ is an interrogative clause whose answer is not known to the Speaker, but the Speaker thinks the Addressee may know it. An answer is required in order for the dialogue to be felicitous. Only the Addressee can answer.

(C&S 2007:9)

(3.30) *Definition of RQs*

A RQ is an interrogative clause whose answer is known to the Speaker and the Addressee, and they both also know that the other knows the answer as well. An answer is not required, but possible. Either the Speaker or the Addressee can answer.

(ibid.)

Now, let us look at C&S's (2007) semantic analysis for OQs and RQs, wherein these questions are analyzed in the same way, and then we consider their pragmatic analysis.

C&S (2007) adopts Groenendijk and Stokhof's (1989) analysis and assumes that an interrogative clause (Interr) is viewed as a partition of all possible worlds. Each partition is considered to be a set of possible worlds and is a complete semantic answer of the question. The interrogative in the world ( $w$ ) denotes the proposition that embodies its complete, true answer as in (3.31).



(3.31)  $\llbracket \text{Interr} \rrbracket^w = p$ :  $p$  is the complete true answer to Interr in  $w$  (C&S 2007:9)

For example, it is assumed that Andrea and Luca are the only relevant people who walk in the domain. The interrogative question *Who walks?* is illustrated in (3.32). If the result of the world  $w$  expresses the topmost cell, it denotes the proposition that “Andrea and Luca are the only people who walk (in that world).”

(3.32)

$\llbracket \text{Who walks?} \rrbracket =$

|   |
|---|
| $\{w: \llbracket \text{walk} \rrbracket^w = \{ \text{Andrea, Luca} \} \}$<br>$p = \text{Andrea and Luca are the ones who walk}$ |
| $\{w: \llbracket \text{walk} \rrbracket^w = \{ \text{Andrea} \} \}$<br>$p = \text{Andrea is the one who walks}$                 |
| $\{w: \llbracket \text{walk} \rrbracket^w = \{ \text{Luca} \} \}$<br>$p = \text{Luca is the one who walks}$                     |
| $\{w: \llbracket \text{walk} \rrbracket^w = \emptyset \}$<br>$p = \text{nobody walks}$  |

(C&S 2007:9)

Accordingly, C&S (2007) conclude that there is no semantic difference between OQs and RQs. The denotation of OQs and RQs in the world  $w$  is the proposition that forms their complete true answer in  $w$  (3.33).

(3.33)  $\llbracket \text{RQ} \rrbracket^w = \llbracket \text{OQ} \rrbracket^w = p$ :  $p$  is the true complete answer to RQ or OQ in  $w$ .

(C&S 2007:10)

With the confirmation of the absolute absence of semantic differences between OQs and RQs, we turn to a pragmatic analysis. C&S adopts Stalnaker’s (1978) notion of Common Ground (CG), which is a set of propositions characterizing what the discourse participants mutually believe. CG is a mutual knowledge set believed in by

both the speaker and the addressee. A Speaker's Beliefs (SB) are defined as a set of propositions that only the Speaker believes, as in (3.34).

$$(3.34) \text{ SB} = \{p: p \text{ is a belief of the Speaker}\} \quad (\text{C\&S 2007:10})$$

On the other hand, an Addressee's Beliefs (AB) is a set of propositions that only the Addressee believes, as modeled in (3.35).

$$(3.35) \text{ AB} = \{p: p \text{ is a belief of the Addressee}\} \quad (\text{C\&S 2007:10})$$

The speaker's and addressee's mutual knowledge/beliefs, Common Ground (CGS-A), is defined as (3.36).

$$(3.36) \text{ CGS-A} = \{p: p \text{ is mutually believed by the Speaker and the Addressee}\} \quad (\text{C\&S 2007:10})$$

As for a question  $Q$  in an OQ, the complete true answer to  $Q$  is formed from the Addressee's beliefs but does not include the Speaker's beliefs.

$$(3.37) Q \text{ is an OQ iff } \llbracket Q \rrbracket^w \notin \text{SB} \quad (\text{C\&S 2007:10})$$

On the contrary, for a question  $Q$  in a RQ, the true, complete answer is likely a shared belief of both the Speaker and the Addressee as CG.

$$(3.38) Q \text{ is a RQ iff } \llbracket Q \rrbracket^w \in \text{CGS-A} \quad (\text{C\&S 2007:11})$$

Thus, (3.37) and (3.38) correctly account for the differences between OQs and RQs, as defined in (3.39) and (3.40).

(3.39) *Definition of OQs*

An OQ is an interrogative clause whose answer is not known to the Speaker, but the Speaker thinks the Addressee may know it. An answer is required in order for the dialogue to be felicitous. Only the Addressee can answer.

(C&S 2007:9)

(3.40) *Definition of RQs*

A RQ is an interrogative clause whose answer is known to the Speaker and the Addressee, and they both also know that the other knows the answer as well. An answer is not required, but possible. Either the Speaker or the Addressee can answer.

(*ibid.*)

So far, we have reviewed C&S's (2007) analysis of OQs and RQs. In the next subsection, we discuss Cheung (2009), according to whom NWHCs differ semantically from RQs. Although his analysis faces some problems, our allegation is that NWHCs should be identical to RQs and OQs semantically and syntactically.

### 3.2.3 Cheung (2009)

Cheung (2009) discusses *wh*-questions in a rhetorical manner “Negative WH-Construction (NWHC)” as in (3.40) to express a speaker's negative attitude towards a proposition. Therefore, he paraphrases “NWH-word+*p*” as “No way *p*” or “It is not true that *p*.”

- (3.40) a. Kare-no doko-ga            1 meetoru 80 senti            na            no?!    [Japanese]  
          he-Gen where-Nom        1 meter 80 centimeter       Decl        Q  
          ‘No way is he 6 feet tall.’ (lit. ‘Where of him is 1.80 m?!’)
- b. Eti/Ettehkhey    John-i                    60 sai                    i-ni?!                    [Korean]  
          where/how        John-Nom                60.year.old            be-Q  
          ‘No way is John 60 years old.’

- c. Koei bindou jau hai tousyugun sik je aa?! [Cantonese]  
 he where have be.at library eat thing Q  
 ‘No way did he eat anything in the library.’ (Cheung 2009:310)

Following the logic of C&S (2007), Cheung (2009) argues that NWHCs are syntactically the same as interrogative *wh*-questions but asserts that NWHCs are interpreted negatively under conditions as in (3.41), which are identified as “NWHC +  $p$ ?!” = there is no  $q$  such that in view of  $q$ ,  $p$ ” and include conventional implicatures (semantics). In this view, NWHCs consist of (a) negative assertive meaning, (b) Conflicting View Condition (CVC), and (c) the Mis-Conclusion Condition (MCC) as defined in (3.41).

(3.41) When the speaker, SK, utters “NWH +  $p$ ?!”, it entails at least the following.

- a. (SK thinks)  $\sim p$ .
- b. SK thinks that the salient discourse participant, DP, believes that  $p$ . (CVC)
- c. For all SK knows, SK thinks that DP should have every reason to believe that  $\sim p$ . (MCC)

Following Grice (1975) and Pott (2005), Cheung (2009) classifies (3.41a) as an “at issue meaning,” and (3.41b, c) as conventional implicatures as in (3.42).

(3.42) Meaning of “NWH +  $p$ ?!”

- a. At-issue meaning:  $\sim p$
- b. Conventional Implicatures:
  - i. CVC: The SK thinks that the DP believes that  $p$ .
  - ii. MCC: For all the SK knows, the SK thinks that the DP should have every reason to believe that  $\sim p$ .

To consider the CVC, NWHCs are used to express the denial of a previous statement. For instance, the speaker (SK) opposes the discourse participant’s (DP)

statement as in (3.43), making NWHCs appropriate; whereas SK2 and DP have the same opinion and the NWHC in SK2's statement is infelicitous, unlike SK1's statement of a simple negation as represented in (3.44).

(3.43) DP: John hai 60 sei.

John be 60 year-old

'John is 60 years old.'

SK John bindou hai 60 sei aa?!

John where be 60 year.old Q

'No way is John 60 years old.'

(Cheung 2009:301)

(3.44) DP: John m-hai jat go gingcaat.

John not-be one Cl policeman

'John is not a policeman.'

SK1: (Mou co.) John m hai jat go gingcaat.

have.not wrong John have not one Cl policeman

'(Right.) John is not a policeman.' (negative assertion)

SK2: #John bindou hai jat go gingcaat aa?! (NWHC)

John where be one Cl policeman Q

'No way is John a policeman.'

(ibid.:302)

Thus, Cheung (2009) argues that a conflicting view is a necessary condition for NWHCs. Another condition is MCC. Cheung (2009) applies Grice's (1975) conversational maxim of truth and states that MCC is not pragmatic because it cannot be canceled. This means that MCC is concerned with conventional implicatures and a part of semantics. Now consider examples in English and Cantonese in (3.46) under the scenario (3.45).

(3.45) Scenario

John arranges to brief his team members on the progress of their project on Wednesday, and all team members are informed of the meeting. Subsequently, John receives a call from his family and has to leave town for several days for some urgent family matters. He has to cancel the Wednesday meeting. Before he has a chance to notify his team about the cancelation of the meeting, he runs into one of the team members, Mary, on Monday, two days prior to the scheduled meeting. (Cheung 2009:303)

(3.46) Mary: Hey, John, we will have a meeting tomorrow. I look forward to hearing about the project's progress.<sup>5</sup>

(English) John's response

a. #Since when will we have a meeting tomorrow?! I have to cancel it because . . .

b. We will not have a meeting tomorrow. I have to cancel it because . . .

(Cantonese) John's response:

c. #Ngodei singkeisaam bindou wui hoiwui aa?!

we Wednesday where will open.meeting Q

'No way will we have a meeting on Wednesday.'

d. Ngodei singkeisaam m wui hoiwui aa.

we Wednesday not will open.meeting SP

'We will not have a meeting on Wednesday.'

(Cheung 2009:303)

When John and Mary ran into each other, only John knew that the meeting would be canceled. Mary was not expected to know about it. Mary has every reason to think *p* as defined as (3.42). Since the NWHC is not felicitous in the scenario above, MCC cannot be canceled.

As C&S (2007) state that RQs are not negative statements, Cheung (2009) expresses some reasons to argue that NWHCs should be analyzed as *wh*-interrogatives.

---

<sup>5</sup> The scenario and the example are exact textual quotations from Cheung (2009) including "tomorrow" here.

First, question particles are used for this construction as well as for ordinary *wh*-interrogatives. As seen in (3.47), the question particles, *aa* in Cantonese, *ni* in Korean, and *no* in Japanese, are commonly used in *wh*-interrogatives.

- (3.47) a. Zoengsaam      bindou wui      maai      go      bun      syu      aa  
           Zoengsaam      where will      buy      Dem      Cl      book      Q  
           ‘No way will Zoengsaam buy the book.’ [Cantonese]
- b. John-i              eti      6 feet-ni?!  
           John-Nom      where 6 feet-Q  
           ‘No way is John 6 feet tall.’ [Korean]
- c. Kare-no            doko-ga            1 meeturu 80 senti            na      no?!  
           he-Gen            where-Nom      1 meter 80 centimeter      Decl      Q  
           Literal: ‘Where of him is 1.80 m?!’  
           Meaning: ‘No way is he 1.80 m tall.’ [Japanese]            (Cheung 2009:308)

Second, *wh*-movement takes the place for *wh*-fronting languages such as English as in (3.48).

- (3.48) Since when is he flying to Hawaii tomorrow?!      (Cheung 2009:309)

Suppose NWHCs are interrogative questions, the constructions are analyzed as “What is the proposition *q* such that in view of *q*, *p*?” (where  $q = s_1 \wedge s_2 \wedge s_3 \wedge \dots$ ). Under Karttunen’s (1977) question semantics, a question represents a set of *true* answers or propositions and (3.49b) is the denotation of (3.49a).

- (3.49) a. Meaning of the *wh*-question underlying NWHCs

NWH + *p*?! ≡ What is the proposition *q* such that in view of *q*, *p*?

- b. Denotation of (3.49a) in Karttunen’s analysis of question semantics

{

“In view of *q*, *p*”,

“In view of  $q_2, p$ ”,  
 . . .  
 “In view of  $q_n, p$ ”  
 }

(Cheung 2009:313)

(3.50) signals the denotation of the *wh*-question.

(3.50)  $\llbracket \text{NWH} + p? \rrbracket^w$   
 $= \{r(w)=1 \wedge r \in D_{\langle s, t \rangle} : \exists q [q \in Q \wedge r = \text{in view of } q, \text{ John is a bus driver }]\}$   
 where  $Q$  is a set of (conjunctive) propositions.

(Cheung 2009:313)

(3.50) is explained as follows;

(3.51) a. Question: Since when is John a bus driver?!

b. (3.51a) denotes the following true answer set:

{  
 i. In view of the fact that John wears a bus driver uniform,  
     John is a bus driver;  
 ii. In view of the bus company’s records, John is a bus driver;  
 }

(Cheung 2009:313)

Under the conditions (CVC and MCC), Cheung (2009) assumes that the *wh*-question is independently interpreted as rhetorical. Since there is no true answer for the question, the answer set is empty as illustrated in (3.52).



(3.52) Rhetorical Interpretation of (3.49a):

a. Answer set: { }

b. There is no proposition  $q$  such that in view of  $q$ , John is a bus driver.

(Cheung 2009:313)

According to Cheung (2009), NWHCs are different from ordinary (negative) rhetorical questions, although they look similar in that none of them have a true answer to the question. For instance, if (3.53) is interpreted as “No one would buy this old car,” there are no values in the *wh* quantification domain that make the proposition true as NWHCs. In addition, neither NWHCs nor rhetorical questions expect an answer.

(3.53) Who would buy this old car? (Of course, no one)

In Cheung (2009), a significant difference between the two constructions is explained as follows. Such interpretations that the proposition cannot be true, are obtained at the pragmatic level in RQs as asserted by C&S (2007), according to whom the rhetorical interpretation arises if both the speaker and the addressee know the answer as in (3.54a, b). In contrast, because of the MCC, the NWHCs have no true answers.

(3.54) a. Negative Rhetorical Interpretation

SPEAKER: It's understandable that Luca doesn't trust people anymore.

After all, who helped him when he was in trouble?

ADDRESSEE/SPEAKER: Nobody / <NO ANSWER>

b. Positive Rhetorical Interpretation

SPEAKER: Luca should not have complained. After all, who helped him when he was in trouble?

ADDRESSEE/SPEAKER: His parents.

c. Interrogative Interpretation

SPEAKER: I am so surprised that Luca solved the problem. (By the way,) who helped him when he was in trouble? (See C&S 2007 and Cheung 2009)

Cheung (2009) also states that NWHCs have only negative rhetorical interpretations and no positive ones. A question arises against Cheung's analysis. *Wh*-questions like (3.55) can be interpreted as ordinary *wh*-questions as in (3.56) or NWHCs/negative rhetorical questions as in (3.57).

(3.55) Kare-no doko-ga ii no?  
 he-Gen where-Nom good Q  
 'What about him is good? (lit. Where of him is good?)'

(3.56) Speaker: Kare-no doko-ga ii no?  
 he-Gen where-Nom good Q  
 'What about him is good? (lit. Where of him is good?)'  
 Addressee: Seikaku yo.  
 personality C  
 'His personality.'

(3.57) Speaker: Kare-no doko-ga ii no? Zenzen yokunai.  
 he-Gen where-Nom good Q at.all good.not.  
 'What about him is good? (lit. Where of him is good?) He is not good at all.'

However, the *wh*-question can also be interpreted as a positive rhetorical question as demonstrated in (3.58), where the answer to the question is shared between the speaker, Hanako and the addressee, Kenji.

(3.58) Kenji: Taro-no tukkomi wa yokunai ne.  
 Taro-Gen playing.the.straight.man good.not C.  
 'Taro is not good at playing the straight man.'

Hanako: Monku iwanai no.  
 complain say.not C  
 ‘Don’t complain.’  
 Kare-no doko-ga ii no?  
 he-Gen where-Nom good C  
 ‘What about him is good?’  
 Anata-mo wakatteru desho.  
 you-Mo know Cop.Mod  
 ‘You also know that.’

Kenji: Wakatteru yo. Boke dayone.  
 I.know C. playing.the.fool Cop.C  
 ‘I know. His playing the fool.’

Here is another similar example of the positive rhetorical question, wherein both the speaker and addressee know the answer to the question.

(3.59) [SITUATION] Kenji and Hanako are watching a music program and talking about a singer.

Kenji: Kanojo-no toku-wa omoshirokunai ne.  
 she-Gen talk-Topinteresting.neg C  
 ‘Her talk is uninteresting.’

Hanako: Monku iwanai no.  
 complain say.not C  
 ‘Don’t complain.’  
 Kanojo-no nani-ga/doko-ga ninki nano?  
 she-Gen what-Nom/where-Nom popularity Cop.C  
 ‘lit. What/Where about her is popular?’

Kenji: Wakatteru yo. Utagoe dayone.  
 I.know C singing.voice Cop.C  
 ‘I know that it is her singing voice.’

Thus, under Cheung's (2009) analysis, it is unclear how the positive rhetorical interpretation illustrated in (3.58-9) is treated.

Furthermore, even negative RQs cannot be canceled under the similar scenario in (3.45). The negative RQ in (3.61a) is infelicitous in contrast to a simple negation in (3.61b).

- (3.60) Mary: Asuno meeting tanoshimi desu.  
tomorrow's meeting look.forward Cop  
'I'm looking forward to tomorrow's meeting.'
- (3.61) John: a. #Dare-ga meeting suru tte iundesuka?  
who-Nom meeting do Quote say.C.Cop.Q  
'Who is going to have a meeting?'
- b. boku cancel shinakerbanarimasen. Nazenara...  
I cancel do.have.to because  
'I have to cancel it because...'

Therefore, there is no clear distinction between NWHCs and negative rhetorical questions. Extending C&S's (2007) analysis, what Cheung calls NWHCs should be treated as rhetorical questions.

In sum, *wh*-questions as in (3.62-3) can be interpreted as OQs, a positive RQ, or a negative RQ (NWHC). This suggests that the interpretation of *wh*-questions is beyond semantics and should be dealt with at the pragmatic level.

- (3.62) Kare-no doko-ga ii no?  
he-Gen where-Nom good Q  
'lit. Where about him is good?'
- (3.63) Kanojo-no nani-ga/doko-ga ninki nano?  
she-Gen what-Nom/where-Nom popularity Cop.C?  
'lit. What/Where about her is popular?'

In particular, how the positive rhetorical interpretation is derived is unclear in Cheung's (2009) analysis. Although Cheung (2009) provides the example to show that the MCC (as conventional implicatures) cannot be canceled, in the similar scenario negative RQs as in (3.61) cannot be canceled, either. So, his example seems to lack plausibility. Thus, the negative interpretation of NWHCs should be analyzed just the same as negative RQs are, which indicates that OQs and RQs, including what Cheung (2009) calls NWHCs, are equivalent syntactically and semantically as C&S's (2007) analysis. The negative interpretation of RQs as well as NWHCs should be derived from pragmatics.

As C&S (2007) states that RQs can be embedded as OQs and argues that both of the questions are syntactically the same, NWHCs can also be embedded as in (3.64) and (3.65), wherein the sentence is embedded in *nodesuka* and *tteiuno*, respectively. This supports the view that NWHCs are syntactically equivalent to OQs (and RQs).

(3.64) *Kare-no doko-ga 1 meetoru 80 senti na n desu ka?! [Japanese]*  
 he-Gen where-Nom 1 meter 80 centimeter Cop C Cop Q

‘No way is he 6 feet tall.’ (lit. ‘Where of him is 1.80 m?!’)

(3.65) *Anata-no doko-ga ichimiri-datte nobita tte iu no?*  
 you-Gen where-Nom 1 mm-even grow C say C

‘No way did you grow even 1 mm?’ [Japanese]

In the next subsection, we will review Yamadera (2010) and discuss her syntactic analysis of *wh*-NP RQs (NWHCs).

### 3.2.4 Yamadera (2010)

While Cheung (2009) provides a Japanese example of *kare-no doko-ga* ‘where of him’, Yamadera (2010) illustrates some examples with *nani-ga* ‘what-Nom’ and she mentions that it can alternate with *doko-ga* as illustrated in (3.66).

- (3.66) Nani-ga/Doko-ga            Kenji-ni            eigo-ga            hanaseru  
 what-Nom/where-Nom    Kenji-Dat            English-Nom        speak  
 tte            iunoyo!  
 Quote        say.C  
 ‘Why do you say that Kenji can speak English? (He cannot speak English.)’  
 (Yamadera 2010: 166)

The *wh*-NPs can occur with various predicates. They appear with noun phrases as in (3.67) and (3.68), transitives as in (3.69), intransitives as in (3.70), unaccusatives as in (3.71), passive sentences as in (3.72), and adjectives as in (3.73) and (3.74). Yamadera (2010) mentions that these *wh*-NPs can occur with any type of predicates.

- (3.67) Nani-ga/doko-ga            datsukanryoseiji            na no?  
 what-Nom/where-Nom    non-bureaucratic.government is Q  
 ‘Why do you say that it is a non-bureaucratic government? (It is not.)’  
 (See Yamadera 2010:166)

- (3.68) Nani-ga/doko-ga            kinenchu            da!  
 what-Nom/where-Nom    off.cigarette            is  
 ‘Why do you say that she/he is off cigarettes? (She/he is not.)’ (ibid.)

- (3.69) Nani-ga/doko-ga            anata-ga            heya-o            soujishitat    te.  
 what-Nom/where-Nom    you-Nom            room-Acc    cleaned        Quote  
 ‘Why do you say that you cleaned the room? (You didn’t clean it.)’ (ibid.)

- (3.70) Nani-ga/doko-ga            anata-ga            hashittat te.  
 what-Nom/where-Nom    you-Nom            ran            Quote  
 ‘Why do you say that you ran? (You didn’t run.)’

(3.71) Nani-ga/doko-ga tsunami-ga kurut te.  
 what-Nom/where-Nom tsunami-Nom come Quote  
 ‘Why do you say that a tsunami will hit? (It won’t.)’ (Yamadera 2010:166)

(3.72) Nani-ga/doko-ga watashi-ga yugusarete te  
 what-Nom/where-Nom I-Nom be.treated.favorably Quote  
 iu no.  
 say Q  
 ‘Why do you say that I am treated favorably? (I’m not.)’ (ibid.)

(3.73) Nani-ga/doko-ga kare-ga yasashi noyo.  
 what-Nom/where-Nom he-Nom kind C  
 ‘Why do you say that he is kind? (He is not.)’

(3.74) Nani-ga/doko-ga Shinjuku-ga yakei-ga kirei  
 what-Nom/where-Nom Shinjuku-Nom night.view-Nom beautiful  
 na no.  
 is Q  
 ‘Why do you say that the night view of Shinjuku is beautiful?’  
 (Yamadera 2010:166)

*Nani-ga* can appear at the sentence-initial position of (3.75a) and between the subject and object of (3.75b) but not between the object and the verb as seen below.

(3.75) a. Nani-ga anata-ga heya-o soujishitat te iu no.  
 what-Nom you-Nom room-Acc cleaned Quote say Q  
 ‘Why do you say that you cleaned the room? (You didn’t clean it.)’  
 b. Anata-ga Nani-ga heya-o soujishitat te iu no.  
 you-Nom What-Nom room-Acc cleaned Quote say Q  
 ‘Why do you say that you cleaned the room? (You didn’t clean it.)’

- c. \*Anata-ga heya-o Nani-ga soujishitat te iu no.  
 you-Nom room-Acc What-Nom cleaned Quote say Q  
 ‘Why do you say that you cleaned the room? (You didn’t clean it.)’

(Yamadera 2010:170)

Furthermore, for major subject construction, *nani-ga* occurs at a position higher than the major subject *Shinjuku-ga* ‘Shinjuku-Nom’ as in (3.76). Thus, Yamadera (2010) concludes that *nani-ga* is in the CP area and analyzes it as an adjunct.

- (3.76) a. Nani-ga Shinjuku-ga yakei-ga kireina no.  
 what-Nom Shinjuku-Nom night.view-Nom beautiful C  
 ‘Why do you say that the night view of Shinjuku is beautiful?’

- b. ??Shinjuku-ga nani-ga yakei-ga kireina no.  
 Shinjuku-Nom what-Nom night.view-Nom beautiful C

- c. \* Shinjuku-ga yakei-ga nani-ga kireina no.  
 Shinjuku-Nom night.view-Nom what-Nom beautiful C

(Yamadera 2010:171)

Although Yamadera (2010) argues that *nani-ga* is an adjunct and can occur with any types of predicates, I discuss *nani-ga/doko-ga* by comparing them with Chinese and Korean counterparts, and propose that these *wh*-NP questions have an embedded structure in which even indirect quotes can occur.

In summary, this section mainly reviewed C&S (2007), Cheung (2009), and Yamadera (2010). Against Cheung’s (2009) arguments that NWHCs are not equivalent to (negative) rhetorical questions, we pointed out several problems he faces. First, NWHCs can have a positive rhetorical meaning which cannot be accounted for by his analysis. Moreover, since negative rhetorical questions as well as NWHCs cannot be canceled in a similar situation, his test for conventional implicatures does not seem to be plausible. Therefore, there are no significant semantic or syntactic differences between RQs, OQs, or NWHCs. C&S (2007) and Cheung (2009) do not provide



detailed elaboration on how NWHCs (RQs) are analyzed in the same syntactical way as OQs. Yamadera (2010) provides various data and the structure for NWHCs, but her analysis does not capture the equivalency between NWHCs (RQs) and OQs leaving it unclear as to how her analysis is applied to OQs. Following C&S (2009), the structure for NWHCs (RQs) should be applicable to OQs. In the next section, we provide a structure which can be uniformly applied to both NWHCs (RQs) and OQs.

### 3.3 Analysis

In contrast to Yamadera's (2010) analysis, this section proposes that these *wh*-questions (NWHCs) are copula sentences and have embedded structures as in (3.77), wherein any types of predicates can occur in the (in)direct quotations.

(3.77) [<sub>CP</sub>[<sub>TP</sub>[<sub>DP</sub> Nani-ga/Doko-ga     ] [<sub>PredP</sub> [(in)direct quoted phrases] na]] no]  
           what-Nom/where-Nom

First, more data from the Chinese and Korean languages are provided in Subsection 3.3.1. Based on this data, Subsection 3.3.2 offers an appropriate structure that can deal with both OQs and NWHCs (RQs).

#### 3.3.1 More Data on *Wh*-NP Rhetorical Questions in Chinese, Korean, and Japanese<sup>6</sup>

As Yamadera (2010) illustrates, *nani-ga* 'what-Nom' or *doko-ga* 'where-Nom' can occur with any types of predicates, which is also the case in Chinese and Korean. Chinese *shenme* and *nali* can appear with a nominal predicate as in (3.78), adjectives in (3.79), intransitives in (3.80), transitives in (3.81), unaccusatives in (3.82), and passives as in (3.83).

---

<sup>6</sup> I wish to thank Yuchen Zhang, Zhijun Wang, and Jing Nie for providing me with a sense of Chinese judgment, and Minji Ju, and Seonmi Yu for the same for Korean judgment.

Chinese

(3.78) a. Shenme ta shi yisheng. (nominal predicates)

what he is doctor

‘Why do you say that he is a doctor? (He is not a doctor.)’

b. Ta nali shi yisheng a.

he where is doctor C

(3.79) a. Shenme ta wenrou. (adjectives)

what he kind

‘Why do you say that he is kind? (He is not kind.)’

b. Ta nali wenrou.

he where kind

(3.80) a. Shenme ta zai pao (intransitives)

what he Prog run

‘Why do you say that he is running? (He is not running.)’

b. Ta nali zai pao

he where Prog run

(3.81) a. Shenme ta hui shuo yingyu. (transitives)

what he can speak English

‘Why do you say that he can speak English? (He cannot.)’

b. Ta nali hui shuo yingyu.

he where can speak English

(3.82) a. Shenme ta yao dao. (unaccusatives)

what he will fall.down

‘Why do you say that he will fall down? (He will not fall down.)’

b. Ta nali yao dao.

he where will fall.down

- (3.83) a. Shenmeta      bei      haozi      da      le.      (passives)  
           what    he      Pass    Hanako hit      past  
           ‘Why do you say that he was hit by Hanako? (He was not.)’
- b. Ta      nali      bei      haozi      da      le.  
           he      where    Pass    Hanako hit      past

In the same way, *mwo-ga* ‘what-Nom’ and *eodi-ga* ‘where-Nom’ in Korean are also allowed with any type of predicates: nominal predicates as in (3.84), adjectives as in (3.85), intransitives in (3.86), transitives in (3.87), unaccusatives in (3.88), and passives as in (3.89).

#### Korean

- (3.84) Mwo-ga/Eodi-ga      geu-ga    haksaeng    i-ni? (nominal predicates)  
           what-Nom/where-Nom    he-Nom    student      Cop-Q  
           ‘Why do you say that he is a student? (He is not.)’
- (3.85) Mwo-ga/Eodi-ga      geu-ga    sangnyangha    ni? (adjectives)  
           what-Nom/where-Nom    he-Nom    kind            Q  
           ‘Why do you say that he is kind? (He is not.)’
- (3.86) Mwo-ga/Eodi-ga      geu-ga    dallyeonni? (intransitives)  
           what-Nom/where-Nom    he-Nom    ran            Q  
           ‘Why do you say that he ran? (He didn’t.)’
- (3.87) Mwo-ga/Eodi-ga      geu-ga    chaeg-eul      sseon    ni? (transitives)  
           what-Nom/where-Nom    he-Nom    the.book-Acc    wrote    Q  
           ‘Why do you say that he wrote the book? (He didn’t.)’

(3.88) Mwo-ga/Eodi-ga           geu-ga sseureojyeon   ni? (unaccusatives)  
 what-Nom/where-Nom   he-Nom fell.down       Q  
 ‘Why do you say that he fell down? (He didn’t.)’

(3.89) Mwo-ga/Eodi-ga           geu-ga sangeo-hante meok-yeon   ni? (passives)  
 what-Nom/where-Nom   he-Nom shark-Dat   eat.pass-past Q  
 ‘Why do you say that he was eaten by the shark? (He wasn’t.)’

So far, Japanese *nani-ga/doko-ga* and their counterparts in Chinese and Korean can occur with any type of predicates. More importantly, even direct quotes can co-occur with them. Examples from Japanese and Chinese are shown below. The strings in the square brackets represent direct quotations supported by the fact that ending particles, *ne*, *yo*, and *ya* are contained in direct quotes.

Japanese

(3.90) a. Nani-ga/?Doko-ga       [watashi-ga   omiyage-o   takusan kattedkuru  
 what-Nom/where-Nom   I-Nom           souvenir-Acc a.lot   buy  
 ne]           yo.  
 C            C  
 ‘Why do you say, “I will buy a lot of souvenirs”? (It is not true.)’

b. Nani-ga/Doko-ga       [boku-wa kimi-o   aishiteiru yo] yo.  
 what-Nom/where-NomI-Top   you-Acc love    C   C  
 ‘Why do you say, “I love you, you know”? (It is not true.)’

Chinese

(3.91) Shenme   [wo   ai                   ni                   ya]   a.  
 what       I   love                   you                   C       C  
 ‘Why do you say, “I love you”? (It is not true.)’

In (3.92) of Korean, the ending particle *go* has an emphatic meaning. In principle, *go* cannot precede the question particle *ni* as shown in (3.93). (3.94) is a typical question without the ending particle. So, (3.92) indicates that the whole sentence *na-neun dangsin-eul saranghanda-go* is embedded as a direct quote.<sup>7</sup>

Korean

(3.92) Mwo-ga/Eodi-ga            [na-neun dangsin-eul        saranghanda-go] ni?  
           what-Nom/where-Nom    I-Top    you-Acc            love-C            Q  
           ‘Why do you say, “I love you!”? (It is not true.)’

(3.93) Geu-neun dangsin-eul        saranghanda-go (\*ni?)  
           he-Top    you-Acc            love-C            Q  
           ‘He loves you!’

(3.94) Geu-neun dangsin-eul        sarangha            ni?<sup>8</sup>  
           he-Top    you-Acc            love            Q  
           ‘Does he love you?’

Based on the data above, we provide a structure for these *wh*-questions in the next subsection.

### 3.3.2 The Structure of *Wh*-NP Rhetorical Questions

Contrary to Yamadera’s (2010) analysis, I propose the same structure for ordinary questions (OQ) and the constructions in questions as in (3.95), where (in)directly quoted phrases occupy the complement position of PredP. This can explain the fact that even direct quotes can appear in a quoted part. An example of an OQ is demonstrated in (3.97), which has the same structure as (3.95), as illustrated in (3.98).

<sup>7</sup> Here is another example of the Korean direct quote. The ending particle *ne* expresses exclamation.

(i) Mwo-ga/Eodi-ga            [na-neundangsin-eul        sarangha-ne]        ni?  
           what-Nom/where-Nom I-Top    you-Acc            love-C            Q  
           ‘Why do you say, “I love you!”? (It is not true.)’

<sup>8</sup> *hata* + *ni* becomes *hani*.

(3.95) [<sub>CP</sub>[<sub>TP</sub>[<sub>DP</sub> Nani-ga/Doko-ga ] [<sub>PredP</sub> [(in)direct quoted phrases] na]] no]

(3.96) Nani-ga/Doko-ga [kare-ga isha na] no.  
 what-Nom/where-Nom he-Nom doctor Cop C  
 ‘Why do you say, “He is a doctor? (He is not.)’

(3.97) a. Nani-ga/Doko-ga ninki na no?  
 what-Nom/where-Nom popularity Cop C  
 ‘What/Where is popular?’

b. Kono hon-ga/Kono omise-ga ninki da.  
 this.book-Nom/This.shop-Nom popularity Cop  
 ‘This book/This shop is popular.’

(3.98) [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> Nani-ga/Doko-ga] [<sub>PredP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> ninki] na]]no]

The current proposal can account for why subjects such as *kare* or *ku* “he” in (3.99) and (3.100) are marked as nominative.

(3.99) Nani-ga/Doko-ga kare-*{ga/\*wa}* yasashii no?  
 what-Nom/where-Nom he- Nom/\*Top kind C  
 ‘Why do you say that he is kind? (He is not.)’

(3.100) Mwo-ga/Eodi-ga geu-ga/\*neun 60 sar i-ni? [Korean]  
 what-Nom/where-Nom he-Nom/\*Top 60.year.old Cop-Q  
 ‘Why do you say that he is 60 years old? (He is not.)’

Recall the discussions in Chapter 2. In general, the subject in an interrogative sentence is a topic and is marked by *wa* in Japanese as in (3.101) in contrast to *ga* in (3.102), since the subject is considered to be old information (Kuno 1973, Tomioka 2015 among many others) except for the case of the *wh*-word itself being a subject as in (3.97a).

(3.101)?Taro-ga kimashita ka?

Taro-Nom came Q

‘Did Taro come?’

(3.102) Taro-wa kimashita ka?

Taro-Top came Q

‘Did Taro come?’

(Kuno 1973b:214)

However, the subject can be marked as a nominative in interrogatives such as (3.103). According to Kuno (1973b), in fact, subjects marked by *ga* occur in subordinate clauses as shown in (3.104) (see Chapter 2 for the relevant discussion).

(3.103) a. Itsu Taro-ga kimashita ka?

when Taro-Nom came Q

‘When did Taro come?’

b. Dokoni Taro-ga tatteimasu ka?

where-Dat Taro-Nom standing Q

‘Where is Taro standing?’

(Kuno 1973b:215)

(3.104) a. Itsu [<sub>CP</sub> Taro-ga kimashita] ka?

b. Dokoni [<sub>CP</sub> Taro-ga tatteimasu] ka?

(ibid.:216)

The fact observed by Kuno (1973b) is consistent with the proposal for the construction in question. Subjects marked as nominative as *kare-ga* “he-Nom” in (3.99) indicate that the whole sequence of *kare-ga yasashii* is embedded. In the same fashion, *ku* in the Korean example in (3.100) is marked as nominative. Thus, even direct quotes can appear in this construction.

The current analysis is further supported by data in the Nagasaki dialect. The example in (3.105) suggests that the subject is neither *topic* nor exhaustive listing (EL) reading since genitive subjects in NJ (and other Hichiku dialects) appear with Neutral

Description (ND) reading (see also Nishioka 2014 for a topic and an EL reading in Kumamoto dialects).

(3.105) Nan-ga/Doko-ga            kare-no yasashika            to? [NJ]  
           what-Nom/where-Nom    he-Gen kind                    C  
           ‘Why do you say that he is kind?’

Based on Kuno’s (1973b) argument of interrogative questions, the ND interpretation of *kare* in (3.105) is explained if the subject is in subordinate clauses as in (3.106) or is a direct quote. In an affirmative sentence, a genitive subject occurs with adjectival predicates. (See Chapter 2 for the relevant discussion.)

(3.106) Nan-ga/Doko-ga            [kare-noyasashika]            to? [NJ]<sup>9</sup>

For the direct quotes in (3.107-8), the topic marker *wa* rather than the nominative *ga* is allowed since they are direct utterances by speakers.

(3.107) Nani-ga/Doko-ga            [boku-wa kimi-o aishiteiru yo] yo.  
           What-Nom/where-Nom I-Top    you-Acc love            C    C  
           ‘‘Why do you say, ‘I love you, you know?’’’ [Japanese]

(3.108) Mwo-ga/Eodi-ga            [na-neun dangsin-eul            saranghanda-go] ni?  
           What-Nom/Where-Nom    I-Top    you-Acc                    love-C                    Q  
           ‘‘Why do you say, ‘‘I love you!’’? (It is not true.)’’ [Korean]

Accordingly, the proposal that the construction has embedded structure is confirmed. This analysis also applies to examples like (3.109) provided by Cheung (2009). ‘‘-no doko-ga’’ ‘‘-Gen where-Nom’’ can be used in OQs as shown in (3.110).

<sup>9</sup> In this sentence, *nan* ‘what’ and *doko* ‘where’ can be marked by *no*, which does not have a strong meaning like the *wh*-words with *ga*. If *nan* ‘what’ or *doko* ‘where’ is marked by *ga*, the meaning of *nan* or *doko*, that is, ‘‘in what point,’’ is focused (see also Chapter 2).



(3.109) Kare-no doko-ga 1 meetoru 80 senti na no?! [Japanese]  
 he-Gen where-Nom 1 meter 80 centimeter Decl Q  
 ‘No way is he 6 feet tall.’ (lit. ‘Where of him is 1.80 m?!’) (Cheung 2009:310)

(3.110) a. kare-no doko-ga ii no?  
 He-Gen where-Nom good Q  
 “lit. Where of him is good?”  
 b. kare-no seikaku-ga ii.  
 He-Gen personality-Nom good  
 “His personality is good.”

In the same way as a *wh*-question with *nani-ga*, *1 meetoru 80 senti* occupies the position of a quoted phrase in the embedded part as illustrated in brackets in (3.111).

(3.111) Kare-no doko-ga [1 meetoru 80 senti] na no?! [Japanese]  
 he-Gen where-Nom 1 meter 80 centimeter Decl Q  
 ‘No way is he 6 feet tall.’ (lit. ‘Where of him is 1.80 m?!’)

There are two noteworthy points here. First, while in Japanese and Korean *wh* rhetorical questions co-occur with any direct quotes, the Chinese *nali* shows some restrictions unlike the Chinese *shenme* “what.” See the Chinese examples in (3.112). *Nali*, which has to follow a subject, cannot occur with direct quotes like (3.113) as opposed to the indirect case as in (3.114).

(3.112) Shenme [wo ai ni ya] a.  
 What I love you C C  
 ‘Why do you say, “I love you”? (It is not true.)’

(3.113) a. \*Nali            wo        ai        ni        ya  
               where        I        love    you     C  
               ‘Why do you say, “I love you”? (It is not true.)’

b. \* Wo nali        ai        ni        ya  
       I        where love    you     C

(3.114) Ni        nali        ai        wo        ya  
               you        where love    me     C  
               ‘Why do you say that you love me?’

Second, in Japanese and Korean, predicates with noun phrases can appear with these *wh*-NPs as in (3.115); whereas, in Chinese, *shenme* is allowed as in (3.116), but not *nali* as illustrated in (3.117). *Nali* follows a subject as in (3.118).

(3.115)a. Nani-ga/doko-ga            datsukanryoseiji            na        no?  
               what-Nom/where-Nom    non-bureaucratic.government    is        Q  
               ‘Why do you say that it is non-bureaucratic government? (It is not.)’

[see Yamadera 2010:166 for Japanese]

b. Mwo-ga/Eodi-ga            talgwallyojeongchi            ni?  
               what-Nom/where-Nom non-bureaucratic.government Q  
               ‘Why do you say that it is non-bureaucratic government? (It is not.)’ Korean]

(3.116) a. yisheng shenme a.            [Chinese]  
               Doctor what    C

b. Shenme            yisheng a.  
               ‘Why do you say that he is a doctor? (He is not.)’

(3.117) a. \*Nali            yisheng a.  
               where            doctor C

b. \*yisheng nali a.  
               ‘Why do you say that he is a doctor? (He is not.)’

(3.118) Ta nali shi yisheng a.  
He where is doctor C  
'Why do you say that he is a doctor? (He is not.)'

*Nani-ga/doko-ga* "what/where" in Japanese and their counterparts in Korean as well as *shenme* "what" in Chinese behave in a similar fashion; whereas *nali* "where" in Chinese expresses different characteristics. The Chinese *nali* occupies a position following a subject and its position is restricted in contrast to *shenme*.

To recapitulate this section, we proposed the structure for the *wh-NP* (rhetorical) questions based on data from Korean, Chinese, and Japanese. The structure was analyzed as a copula sentence with embedded parts, which was supported by the fact that the subject is marked by nominative in SJ and Korean, genitive subjects can appear in NJ, and even direct quotes can occur. This analysis can also be applied to the *S-no doko-ga* "S-Gen where-Nom (what about S)" question provided in Cheung (2009). Finally, this section demonstrated how RQs have the same syntactic structure as OQs.

### 3.4 Conclusion

In the initial examination of whether NWHCs are different from negative RQs as proposed in Cheung (2009), Cheung's analysis leaves uncertainty regarding why NWHCs can have a positive rhetorical meaning. In addition, Cheung's cancelability test for conventional implicatures is not convincing enough, since negative RQs produce the same results as NWHCs, which cannot be canceled. This leads to the conclusion that NWHCs are in fact, identical to RQs as well as OQs in syntax and semantics. As C&S (2007) argues, the difference between OQs and RQs (NWHCs) needs analyzing pragmatically. Although Yamadera (2010) proposes a syntactic structure for NWHCs, her structure is unclear about how it is applied to OQs. With support from Chinese, Korean and the Nagasaki dialect data, we proposed that rhetorical *wh*-questions with *nani-ga* or *doko-ga*, are analyzed as copula sentences, just as in OQs and even direct quotes can appear in embedded parts. This analysis can correctly capture the data from the study by Yamadera (2010) and Cheung (2009). We

have focused on the structure in which *shenme* occurs in the sentence-initial position, but *shenme* can occur in the sentence-final position as in (3.122), which is in need of further explanation.

- (3.122) Taro hui shuo yingyu shenme. [Chinese]  
Taro can speak English what  
'Why do you say that he can speak English? (He cannot.)'

In the following chapter, the discussion will address whether N pro-forms involve NP-ellipsis and provide some evidence that they can be considered to be syntactically and semantically different, which is in opposition to the positions of Llobart (2002) and Maeda and Takahashi (2013).

## Chapter 4

### N Pro-Form Versus NP-Ellipsis

#### 4.1 Introduction

In Chapter 3, we discussed *wh*-NP rhetorical questions with nominative case markers. In Chapter 4, we will examine an N pro-form and NP-ellipsis concerned with genitive case in order to establish whether an N pro-form in Japanese involves NP-ellipsis and whether Japanese has NP-ellipsis. As the pro-form *no* in Standard Japanese (SJ) is not clearly distinguishable from genitive case, which is pronounced in the same way as *no*, I provide data of dialects in Nagasaki, which have different forms for them: *to* for the pro-form and *no* or *-n* for a genitive case marker. I also claim that the alleged NP-deletion example in Japanese is a pro-form and does not involve ellipsis as the pro-forms *one* in English and *geo* in Korean. Based on the fact about the pro-form *one* in English, I will discuss N pro-forms in Japanese and Korean.

As for the example of N pro-form in (4.1), Llobart (2002) and Maeda and Takahashi (M&T) (2013) argue that N pro-forms involve ellipsis.

(4.1) She likes the student with short hair better than the one with long hair.

(See Hornstein and Lighthood 1981, Murasugi 1991 among others)

In particular, M&T (2013) claim that an overt pro-form *to* in NJ “corresponding to *one*” in (4.2) contains what Merchant (2001) calls the E(llipsis) feature.

(4.2) Haruna-n      taido-wa      Mariko-n      to      yorimo rippayatta. [NJ]

Haruna-Gen    attitude-Top    Mariko-Gen    one    than    good

“lit. Haruna’s attitude was better than Mariko’s one.” (M&T 2013)

This indicates that Japanese has an NP-ellipsis as opposed to Korean, which resists an NP-ellipsis, as seen in (4.3) (See Saito and An 2010 among others).

- (4.3) \*[Cheolsu-ui yeongu-edaehan taedo]-neun jo-chiman,  
 Cheolsu -Gen research-toward attitude-top good-though  
 [Suni-ui \_\_\_]-neun jochi anta  
 Suni -Gen -top good not  
 ‘Cheolsu’s attitude toward research is good, but Suni’s isn’t.’

[Korean; See Saito and An (2010)]

In this chapter, it is proposed that contrary to Llombart (2002) and M&T (2013), N pro-forms do not involve ellipsis by observing data from English, Korean, and Nagasaki City dialect in the Nagasaki Prefecture. The findings here support Bae (2012)’s claim that NP languages such as Korean and Japanese do not have NP-ellipsis. This analysis also offers another commonality between Japanese and Korean in terms of genitive marker reduction.

This chapter comprises four sections. Section 4.2 analyzes the distribution of the anaphoric *one* and posits that the N pro-form *one* is distinct from NP-ellipsis. Section 4.3 provides new data sets on the N pro-form *to* in NJ. It is revealed that, like Korean, Japanese does not have NP-ellipsis. Moreover, as the occurrence of *-n* genitive marker (between *no* and *-n* genitive forms) in Nagasaki City (NC) coincides with when genitive is dropped in Korean, phonological reduction is applied to these genitive markers in NC and Korean. Section 4.4 contains some concluding remarks on the N pro-form and NP-ellipsis. First, let us focus on the pro-form *one*.

## 4.2 Distribution of the Pro-Form *One*<sup>1</sup>

### 4.2.1 Introduction of the Pro-Form *One*


Traditionally, the anaphoric *one* is considered to be a pro-form substituting noun phrase (N') (Ross (1967), Jackendoff (1977), Hornstein and Lighthood (1981) among others) since *one* substitutes *student* in N' in (4.4a, 4.5a) but does not stand for the *student* in N in (4.4b, 4.5b).

(4.4) a. She likes the student with short hair better than the one with long hair.


b. \*She likes the student of chemistry better than the one of physics.

(See also Murasugi 1991)

(4.5) a.



b.



Challenging this observation, Llobart (2002) claims that the *one* construction involves NP-ellipsis, in that *one* is inserted in Num<sup>0</sup> in order to give morphological

---

<sup>1</sup> An earlier version of this chapter was presented at the 33<sup>rd</sup> Conference of the English Linguistics Society of Japan, held at Kansai Gaikokugo University on November 22, 2015, and later published as (Saruwatari 2016a). I wish to thank Hisao Osaki for providing me with references on *one* in Middle English. I am grateful to Andrew Murakami-Smith, Dale Brown, Trane DeVore, Miles Neale, and Murray Lawn for their native-speaker judgements. I am also thankful to Hiroshi Mito, Masao Ochi, Yoko Yumoto, and Yoichi Miyamoto for their valuable and constructive comments.

support as *do*-support in  $I^0$ . Contrary to Llombart's analysis, I propose that the anaphoric *one* and the NP-ellipsis are different constructions; they do not necessarily share the same properties, nor are they exactly complementary in distribution. I will also show that there are tenable arguments that *one* occupies N (Radford (1989) and Murasugi (1991)) and that *one* needs to be licensed by certain modifiers (Murasugi (1991)), owing to the fact that the pro-form *so* substitutes head A and needs particular modifiers.

This section is organized as follows. Following the Introduction of the pro-form *one*, previous research on the anaphoric *one* (i.e., Llombart (2002), Murasugi (1991) and Radford (1989)) are reviewed (in 4.2.2). Some issues for which Llombart (2002) cannot account are also discussed. Subsection 4.2.3 lays out the present analysis and reveals the distribution of the pro-form *one*. Subsection 4.2.4 concludes this section.

#### **4.2.2 Previous Research**

In this section, I will discuss Llombart's (2002) theory that the anaphoric *one* involves NP-ellipsis and illustrate how his analysis raises some problems. Thereafter, I will review Murasugi (1991) and Radford (1989), both of which propose that *one* occupies N and that it cannot assign theta roles. In particular, the former analysis argues that *one* needs to be licensed by certain modifiers, and the latter offers significant data that *one* can take a complement.

##### **4.2.2.1 Llombart (2002)**

Contrary to the standard analyses of the pro-form *one* (Jackendoff (1977), Hornstein and Lighthood (1981), etc.), Llombart (2002) argues that the *one* construction involves NP-ellipsis, developing Lobeck's (1995) analysis that strong agreement features such as [+plural], [+partitive], and [+possessive] can license empty categories. Lobeck (1995) proposes that the empty categories in NP-ellipsis as well as VP-ellipsis obey the Empty Category Principle defined in (4.6).



(4.6) Empty Category Principle (ECP):

[e] must be properly governed.


In particular, Llobart proposes the following:

(4.7) a. The anaphoric *one* is inserted as a last resort procedure to give phonological support to Num<sup>0</sup>.<sup>2</sup>


b. The *one* construction and NP-ellipsis are in complementary distribution and display the same syntactic and semantic properties in that their different surface manifestations are reduced to the same underlying construction.

Llobart assumes that empty elements of functional categories should be licensed, but that this is not the case for lexical categories in which deletion occurs optionally. Let us observe how empty elements in NP-ellipsis are licensed in Llobart's analysis. The empty categories in (4.8a, b) are properly licensed since there are [+possessive] and [+plural] features.

(4.8) a.



b.




(See Llobart (2002: 77))

<sup>2</sup> Llobart postulates that *one* is inserted in the Number Phrase head since *one* cannot refer to mass nouns as in *\*I bought old furniture and new one* (Llobart 2002:60).

As for the sentence in (4.9a), *that* is [-plural], which does not license the empty element in Num<sup>0</sup> and Num<sup>0</sup> has to be overtly expressed as in (4.9c). Accordingly, *one* must be inserted as a last resort procedure in order to give morphological support as in (4.7a), otherwise Number affix (0 for singular and -s for plural) is stranded.


(4.9) a. I like this car but he prefers that one.

b. I like these cars but he prefers those. (See Llombart (2002: 59))<sup>3</sup>



Now, turn to the case where an adjective phrase appears as shown in (4.10).

(4.10) a. All the students took the exam but many lazy ones *ec* failed.



(Llombart (2002: 78))

Although Q head contains [+plural], the empty element in Num<sup>0</sup> is not licensed since there is an intervener, AP. So, *one* needs to be inserted here.

<sup>3</sup> To treat the contrast between (i) and (ii), Llombart suggests that Number Phrase is absent in the case of (ii) unlike (i), in which *one* should be inserted.

(i) (in a bookstore, to a salesperson holding a book): Give me that one.

(ii) (to a person holding a book): Give me that.

As for [+partitive], numerals such as *one* and *two* and quantifiers such as *many* and *each* in (4.11a) can appear in partitive constructions and license empty elements unlike *every* in (4.11b).

(4.11) [+partitive]

- a. one/ three / many / each of the men
- b. \*every of the men

The prominent evidence that the *one* construction and NP-ellipsis share the same syntactic and semantic properties in (4.7b) is as follows. First, either *one* or NP-ellipsis can occur in subordinate clauses as shown in (4.12) as well as coordinate clauses in (4.9), whereas in gapping and stripping constructions, the empty category occurs in coordinates but not in subordinate clauses as seen in (4.13) and (4.14).

- (4.12) a. We'll take my car because my sister's *ec* is too old. (Llombart (2002: 62))  
b. We'll take my car because this one is too old. (ibid.: 63)

- (4.13) a. Mary met Bill at Berkerley, and Sue *ec* at Harvard. (Gapping)  
b. Jane studied rocks but not John *ec*. (Stripping) (ibid.: 63)

- (4.14) a. \*Mary met Bill at Berkerley, although Sue *ec* at Harvard. (Gapping)  
b. \*Jane studied rocks even though not John *ec*. (Stripping) (ibid.: 63)

Second, linguistic antecedents do not need to be expressed in either *one* construction or NP-ellipsis as (4.15) illustrates.

- (4.15) a. (looking at some cars): Do you like these *ec*?  
b. (at a car dealer's): Which one do you like? I like the pink one.  
(Llombart (2002: 65))

Third, *one* construction and NP-ellipsis are in complementary distribution as observed in (4.16a) and (4.16b), and Llobart proposes that their surface difference is derived from the same underlying construction.


- (4.16) a. I like the blue car but I don't like the pink \*(one). (Llobart (2002: 66))  
 b. All the students took the exam, but many /some/ three (\*ones) failed.  
 (ibid.: 67)

Now, let us consider the following data in (4.17). Can Llobart's analysis capture them?

- (4.17) a. \*I bought {some/ a few / several} ones.  
 b. ok/?? I bought {some/ a few / several} ones that I liked.  
 c. I bought {some/ a few / several} that I liked.

The sentence (4.17a) falls out from his analysis since there are [+plural] quantifiers such as *some*, *a few*, and *several*. The following is the primary point here: a relative clause is considered to occupy the same position as the adjective phrase in (4.10b), so that *one(s)* must be inserted to give support to Num<sup>0</sup>.

- (4.18) a. All the students took the exam but many lazy ones *ec* failed.



(Llobart (2002: 78);=(4.10))

This prediction, however, is not borne out, and (4.17c) without *ones* is grammatical. Some speakers who judge (4.17b) to be acceptable mention that *ones* is optional in this

case. Note that Llobart's analysis is not sufficient enough to explain either of these cases: (4.17c) and the optional insertion of *one* in (4.17b).

#### 4.2.2.2 Murasugi (1991) and Radford (1989)

Murasugi (1991), contrary to the standard analysis of the pro-form *one* treating *one* as N' constituent (Hornstein and Lightfoot (H&L) (1981)), argues that the anaphoric *one* is base-generated in N. She further attempts to capture the contrast in (4.4) by assuming that *one* can neither assign theta roles nor take a complement, following Chomsky's (1981) proposal that a complement must be assigned a theta role by its governing lexical category. In addition, Murasugi claims that *one* needs a modifier to be licensed. Her generalization is shown in (4.19).

(4.19) Only overt modifiers that are sisters to some projection of N can license *one* in the N position.<sup>4</sup> (See Murasugi (1991: 88))

According to her analysis, the data in (4.20) are treated as follows: Determiners like *those* occupy the head position of DP as shown in (4.21a). However, the possessor *John* is base-generated in N but must move to the DP SPEC position as (4.21b) illustrates so that *'s* is assigned by D (see Fukui (1986)). The DP SPEC position that is not the sister to the projection of N, or the trace cannot license *one* as shown in (4.21b), but when the adjective phrase *red* appears as in (4.21c), *one* can be licensed under (4.19). When a quantifier appears, a QP node exists between the DP and NP node, and the quantifier occupies the QP SPEC position as in (4.21d), which is not within the N projection. If there is an adjective *red* as shown in (4.21e), *one* can occur with the quantifier. Besides, the adjunct phrases in (4.20f) and (4.20g) license *one* as demonstrated in (4.22a) and (4.22b), respectively.

---

<sup>4</sup> Murasugi treats Japanese pro-form *no* in the same way as English pro-form *one*.

(i) Only overt modifiers that are sisters to some projection of N can license *one/no* in the N position. (Murasugi 1991:88)

- (4.20) a. those ones  
 b. \*John's ones  
 c. John's red ones  
 d. \*two ones  
 e. two red ones  
 f. one from Canada  
 g. one I like

- (4.21) a. [DP [D' [D those] [NP [N' [N ones]]]]]  
 b. [DP John's<sub>i</sub> [D' D [NP t<sub>i</sub> [NP[NP[N' [N ones ]]]]]]]  
 c. [DP John's [D' D [NP [N' red [N' [N ones ]]]]]] (Murasugi (1991: 84-89))  
 d. [DP [D' [QP two [Q' Q [NP [N' [N ones ]]]]]]] (See Murasugi (1991: 91))  
 e. [DP [D' [QP two [Q' Q [NP [N' red [N' [N ones ]]]]]]]]

- (4.22) a. [DP [D' D [NP [N' [N' [N one ]]] [PP from Canada ]]]]  
 b. [DP [D' D [NP [NP [N' [N one<sub>i</sub>]]] [CP Op<sub>i</sub> [C' C [IP I like t<sub>i</sub>]]]]]]]


Radford (1989) claims that *one* is a pro-N constituent because it can indeed occur with its complement. The conventional analyses such as H&L fail to deal with the data as illustrated in (4.23) with an *of* complement.


- (4.23) a. Which photo? The one of you in a bikini?  
 b. Which portrait? The one of the queen mother? (Radford (1989: 2))

Radford assumes that *one* is an N pro-form and has no thematic content as defined in (4.24).

- (4.24) *One* cannot assign a thematic role to its dependents. (Radford (1989: 5))

The difference between (4.25) and (4.26) is attributed to the function of *of*. Radford argues the thematic *of* is a preposition while the nonthematic *of* belongs to the category of Case (genitive Case) particles. The *of* in (4.25) assigns the theta role to its complement, whereas the *of* in (4.26) does not, but it only transmits a theta role of *student* to the complement *physics*.<sup>5</sup>

(4.25) the photo  *of* you

(4.26) the student  *of* physics

Importantly, the data as illustrated in (4.23) cannot be explained by Llobart's analysis, either.

### 4.2.3 Analysis

In this section, I will argue the following points:

(4.27) Distribution of the pro-form *one*

- a. The anaphoric *one* and NP-ellipsis do not necessarily share the same properties, nor are they exactly in complementary distribution.
- b. *One* needs to be licensed by certain modifiers as Murasugi (1991) suggests (i.e., *one* is not a last resort procedure to give morphological support when NP-ellipsis is not available, so it should be differentiated from *do*-support).

---

<sup>5</sup> Due to the following contrast between *a* and *b*, Radford classifies *of* below into two categories.

(i) Only thematic expressions can function as predicates.

a. The only nice photo I have is of you and me in a nightclub.

b. \*The best student I have is of Psycholinguistics.

(ii) Thematic *of* phrases can be extraposed.

a. Several photos \_\_\_ were discovered in his apartment of well-known politicians in compromising situations.

b. \*Several presidents \_\_\_ have been assassinated of America.

(iii) Prenominal complement

a. There are few good Linguistics students.

b. \*I took two Mary photos (=photos of Mary)

- c. The anaphoric *one* and *so* share some similarities and function as a place holder (pro-form) base-generated in N and A, respectively.

#### 4.2.3.1 Linguistic Antecedents

Let us first discuss whether the *one* construction and NP-ellipsis display the same properties in terms of the requirement of linguistic antecedents. As proposed by Lasnik and Saito (1992), NP-ellipsis is infelicitous when there is no linguistic antecedent as in (4.28).

[Context: Lasnik and Saito are in a yard with several barking dogs belonging to various people.] (Lasnik and Saito (1992: 161))

(4.28) Lasnik: # Harry's is particularly noisy.

This is clearer when we compare the *one* construction with NP-ellipsis as shown in (4.29) and (4.31), where the linguistic antecedent "book" is absent. Notably, *one* is available, but NP-ellipsis is not. However, when the antecedent "book" is linguistically expressed, either *one* or NP-ellipsis is possible as exemplified in (4.30) and (4.32).

[Context: Hanako and Taro dropped in at the bookstore, and Taro seems to be deliberating a purchase.]

(4.29) a. Hanako: Are you going to buy something?

b. Taro: \*I'm thinking of buying Haruki Murakami's.

c. Taro: I'm thinking of buying Haruki Murakami's new one.

(4.30) a. Whose book are you going to buy?

b. I'm going to buy Haruki Murakami's.

c. I'm going to buy Haruki Murakami's new one.

[Context: At the bookstore, Hanako is asking a clerk.]

(4.31) Hanako: Excuse me, I'm looking for Haruki Muraski's \*(new one).



(4.32) Hanako: Whose book is selling best in this shop?

Clerk: Haruki Murakami's (new one).

In the situation where the antecedent does not overtly appear, NP-ellipsis cannot freely occur unlike the case of the *one* construction (cf. (4.15)). The anaphoric *one* and NP-ellipsis do not always occur in the same context. This suggests that the *one* construction and NP-ellipsis are not semantically the same, which is also crucial to the analysis in the next section (we will discuss N pro-forms in Japanese and Korean in Section 4.3). Therefore, it is disputed that the *one* construction and NP-ellipsis display exactly the same semantic properties.

#### 4.2.3.2 Not in Complementary Distribution

Although Llombart (2002) claims that *one* and NP-ellipsis are in complementary distribution, I will provide sets of data which show that his analysis is not sustainable. First, according to Llombart (2002), *each* contains [+partitive] feature, but *one* is used optionally as in (4.33), and the use of NP-ellipsis is possible.

(4.33) Each (room/one) has its own shower.

Second, when a speaker is indicating the item in discourse, either the anaphoric *one* or NP-ellipsis is available for both singular and plural demonstratives as (4.34) shows.

(4.34) a. This letter is for my broker and that (one) is for my accountant.

b. These letters are for my broker and those (ones) are for my accountant.

Third, in the case where a definite NP occurs as in (4.35) and where an adjective refers to discrete points over a (discontinuous) defined scale (e.g., colors, sizes) as in (4.36), NP-ellipsis as well as the *one* construction are acceptable.

(4.35) I saw the green unicorn and Pat saw the red (one). (Channon (1982: 69))

(4.36) Betty bought a large blouse and Susan bought a medium (one). (ibid.: 70)

Fourth, although adjunct phrases such as in (4.37a, 4.37b) appear, *one* is optional. This cannot be predicted by Llobart's (2002) analysis, in which *one* must be inserted since such adjunct phrases are considered to occupy the same position as the adjective phrase in (4.10b). Again, his analysis cannot capture the fact that *one* can take a complement as in (4.37c).

- (4.37) a. Even though Mary's picture that was painted in Italy was nice, John liked  
Bob's (one) that was painted in his hometown. [relative clause]  
b. John's apple from America is more delicious than Bob's (one) from Japan.  
[adjunct]  
c. John's photo of you is nicer than Bob's (one) of you. [complement]

The data above lead us to conclude that the *one* construction does not involve NP-ellipsis. First, the *one* construction can appear in the context where there is no linguistic antecedent and NP-ellipsis is not allowed, which indicates that the former can be identified pragmatically but the latter cannot. They are not semantically identical. Second, the complementary distribution between the anaphoric *one* and NP-ellipsis does not hold. The anaphoric *one* can occur optionally with *each* as in (4.33), adjectives in case of (4.35–6), adjunct clauses as in (4.37a, b), and the case of complement *of* (4.37c). Moreover, the occurrence of *one* is not influenced by the choice of singular or plural demonstratives as in (4.34).

Concerning *of* complements, two types can arise. Even though some modifiers occur with *of* complements, the sequence as *\*intelligent one of physics* is ungrammatical, whereas *nice one of you* is grammatical. As Radford (1989) suggests, it is considered to be due to the ability of the theta role assignment; the former *of* can assign theta roles to its complements, but the latter cannot.

#### 4.2.3.3 Pro-Form *One* and Pro-Form *So*<sup>6</sup>

Before turning to the pro-form *so*, let us discuss *do*-support. “do” is inserted to give support to the affix on I<sup>0</sup> and does not necessarily act as an anaphor as seen in (4.38), which indicates that *do*-support is different from the anaphoric *one*.

*do*-support (Chomsky 1955, Lombart 2002)

- (4.38) a. Sam does not eat.  
b. Did John leave?  
c. Sam eats and Bill does too.

The arguments that *one* is N pro-form (Radford (1989), Murasugi (1991)) and that it requires modifiers (Murasugi (1991)) are supported by the fact that the anaphoric *so* shares some properties with *one*.

First, *so* substitutes A or a part of AP (A') as shown in (4.39) while, as has already been seen, *one* can substitute N and N' as in (4.40).

- (4.39) a. He is very fond of his mother, but less so of his sister.  
b. He used to be very fond of his sister, but these days he is less so.  
(Radford (1989: 7))
- (4.40) a. the most intelligent (ones/students)  
b. the most intelligent (ones/students of linguistics). (Radford (1989: 7))

Second, *so* takes complements such as *of his sister* as in (4.39a), together with *one* (in *photo/one of you* in (4.23)). Third, there are some restrictions on modifiers. *So* needs to be licensed by QP, for instance, *more/less/enough/extremely* as demonstrated in (4.41a), and needs a dummy element *much* inserted to Q<sup>0</sup> when co-occurring with Degree Phrases like *too/as/so/how* as in (4.41b). That is why *much* is not necessary in (4.42) and (4.43) as opposed to (4.44).

---

<sup>6</sup> I would like to thank Asako Hirota and Hideharu Tanaka for their valuable comments on the pro-form *so*.

- (4.41) a. [<sub>QP</sub> more/less/enough/extremely [<sub>AP</sub> so]]  
b. [<sub>DeGp</sub> too/as/so/how [<sub>QP</sub> much [<sub>AP</sub> so]]] (See Corver (1997: 128))

- (4.42) a. more (\*much) so  
b. less (\*much) so

- (4.43) The Black Widow is poisonous, as a matter of fact extremely (\*much) so.  
(Corver (1997: 155))

- (4.44) a. John is fond of Mary. Maybe he is too \*(much) so.  
b. John is fond of Mary. Maybe he is as \*(much) so as Bill.  
(Corver (1997: 127))

Recalling the restrictions on modifiers of *one* when it is co-occurring with a possessor phrase like *John's* or quantifiers *two*, *a few*, and *several*, certain modifiers such as adjective phrases are required so that we find *John's red one*, but not *\*John's one*. Moreover, *two red ones* is acceptable, but *\*two ones* is not acceptable.

Before summarizing, the fact shown in (4.45) that *one* and *so* can stand alone seems to be a drawback to this analysis.

- (4.45) a. John is fond of Mary. So is Bill.  
b. Svetlana has two red masks and Guido has one too.  
(Perlmutter (1970: 236))

However, *so* (inversion) as in (4.45a) is only allowed to occur in a preposed position and is considered to be an affirmative polarity marker, which should be treated as parallel to the negative polarity marker *neither* in *neither*-inversion (see Wood 2008). Thus, *so* (inversion) is different from the *so* in question (the pro-form *so*). Crucially,

the *so* inversion is not licensed by certain modifiers, unlike the pro-form *so* as in (4.46).

(4.46) John is fond of Mary. Bill is \*(less) so.

(4.47) \* John is fond of Mary. Less so is Bill.

Turning to *one* in (4.45b), according to Perlmutter (1970), it is a numeral as “four” in (4.48).

(4.48) Svetlana sold three masks and Guido sold four. (Perlmutter (1970: 237))

On the whole, most importantly, I showed that the anaphoric *one* does not involve NP-ellipsis, which is contrary to Llobart’s (2002) analysis that argues the *one* construction and NP-ellipsis display the same syntactic and semantic properties. First, the *one* construction is available without a linguistic antecedent, while NP-ellipsis has some restrictions for the same context. Second, the *one* construction and NP-ellipsis are not in complementary distribution. I showed that either the anaphoric *one* or NP-ellipsis can appear with *each* as in (4.33), the case of demonstratives in (4.34), some adjectives in (4.35–6), adjunct clauses of (4.37a, b), and complements such as in (4.37c). In Llobart’s (2002) analysis, the anaphoric *one* must not appear with *each* and plural demonstratives such as *those*, whereas *one* should be inserted in the case of adjectives, single demonstratives like *that*, and adjunct clauses. Llobart (2002) has no explanation for the case of complement. Moreover, it is reasonable to assume that *one* is an N pro-form and needs to be licensed by certain modifiers since both *one* and *so* display the following properties: i) they substitute not only a part of NP (N’) or AP (A’) but also N or A, ii) they take a complement, and iii) there are some restrictions on modifiers.

#### 4.2.4 Concluding Remarks on the Pro-Form *One*

In this section, I initially argued that the anaphoric *one* does not involve NP-ellipsis, in contrast to Llobart's (2002) analysis. The NP-ellipsis construction shows some restrictions when the antecedent is not linguistically expressed, whereas the anaphoric *one* can be used without such overt antecedents. Besides, complementary distributions of the anaphoric *one* and the NP-ellipsis are not valid in that, in some circumstances, either *one* or NP-ellipsis is available. Therefore, the anaphoric *one* and NP-ellipsis are different both syntactically and semantically. Second, the present analysis has corroborated Murasugi's (1991) claim that the pro-form *one* occupying N needs certain modifiers, by showing that the pro-form *so* occupies A and is licensed by specific modifiers. A more precise definition for such modifiers for *one* needs further investigation.

This section concluded that the anaphoric *one* does not involve NP-ellipsis. In the next section, I will show that the Japanese *no*, corresponding to *one* in English, does not involve ellipsis either, which indicates that Japanese, like Korean, has no NP-deletion (N'-deletion).

### 4.3 Pro-form *To* (*No*) and Genitive Marker Reduction<sup>7</sup>

#### 4.3.1 Introduction

In this section, we discuss the pro-form *no* in Japanese by comparing the English pro-form *one* and Korean pro-form *geo*. Since the pro-form *no* in SJ is not clearly distinct from genitive case, I also provide data from dialects of Nagasaki, in which distinct forms emerge: *to* for the pro-form and *no/-n* for a genitive case marker. Furthermore, I claim that the alleged NP-deletion example in Japanese is a pro-form and does not involve ellipsis as discussed with the pro-form *one*.

---

<sup>7</sup> This is a revised version of a paper that originally appeared in *Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar* 17, 457–470. I would like to thank my informants of Korean, English, and the dialects of Nagasaki prefecture, including Nagasaki City, for their kindness in providing me with their judgements. I would especially like to thank Teyon Kim, Minji Ju, Heesun Han, Jeehyun Kim, Seonmi Yu, Andrew Murakami-Smith, Dale Brown, Trane DeVore, Murray Lawn, Etsuko Lawn, Saori Ishizue, Akina Tagawa, Yasuko Tagawa and Kana Ohashi. All remaining errors are my own.

Saito and Murasugi's (S&M's) (1990) NP-deletion analysis for Japanese, according to which examples such as (4.49a) involve movement of a possessor phrase (e.g., *Mariko-no* "Mariko-Gen") into the spec of DP and deletion of the NP complement (e.g., *taido* "attitude") of D in the second nominal, has been influential till date. However, data such as (4.49b, c) from dialects spoken in Nagasaki, in which *to*, which is typically analyzed as a pro-form "one" (corresponding to *no* in standard Japanese) shows up (unlike in standard Japanese), poses a potential threat for such an analysis.

- (4.49) a. Haruna-no taido-wa Mariko-no yorimo rippadatta.  
 Haruna-Gen attitude-Top Mariko-Gen than good  
 'lit. Haruna's attitude was better than Mariko's.' [Standard J]
- b. Haruna-n taido-wa Mariko-n **to** yorimo rippayatta.  
 Haruna-Gen attitude-Top Mariko-Gen one than good  
 'lit. Haruna's attitude was better than Mariko's one.' [Nagasaki J; M&T 2013]
- c. Haruna-**no** taido-wa Mariko-**n** **to** yorimo rippayatta.  
 Haruna-Gen attitude-Top Mariko-Gen one than good  
 'lit. Haruna's attitude was better than Mariko's one.' [Nagasaki City]

In defending S&M's (1990) analysis, Maeda and Takahashi (M&T) (2013) propose that this type of *to* is an *-n* head that contains what Merchant (2001) calls the E(llipsis)-feature, as shown in (4.50). Against this theoretical background, this chapter makes the following claims. First, in contrast to M&T (2013), I argue that *to* in (4.49b-c) is a pro-form occupying the N position (as shown in (4.51)) and that data such as (4.49) do not involve NP-deletion. I also provide data on the pro-form *one* in English and the pro-form *geo* in Korean to support this analysis. The present analysis can correctly capture the fact that the *-n* genitive form in Nagasaki City (NC) as in (4.49c) is led by certain head nouns, including the pro-form *to*. Second, based on a comparison of the standard Japanese, a dialect spoken in NC, and Korean, I propose that the *-n* form of the genitive marker in NC and what An (2014) calls "genitive drop"





to concrete nouns but not abstract nouns (Kamio 1983) as shown in (4.53). Based on Kamio's (1983) generalization, S&M (1990) argue that an example such as (4.54) that includes *no* is an instance of NP-ellipsis since the head noun *taido* "attitude" is an abstract noun and *no* in the second nominal cannot stand for it.

(4.53) a. [<sub>RC</sub> katai                      shinnen-o                      motta] hito  
           firm                              conviction-Acc                      has            person  
           ‘a person who has a firm conviction’

b. \* [<sub>RC</sub> katai                      no-o                      motta] hito  
           firm                              one-Acc                      has            person  
           ‘(intended) a person who has a firm conviction’ (Kamio 1983:82)

(4.54) a. Haruna-no    taido-wa    Mariko-no    yorimo rippadatta. [SJ]  
           Haruna-Gen    attitude-Top    Mariko-Gen    than    good  
           ‘lit. Haruna's attitude was better than Mariko's.’

b. Taro-no    kenkyuu-nitaisuru    taido-wa    ii    ga,  
           Taro-Gen    research-toward    attitude-Top    is.good though  
           Mariko-no    -wa    yokunai.  
           Mariko-Gen    -Top    is-not-good  
           ‘Taro's attitude toward research is good, but Mariko's is not.’

The structure of the second nominal in (4.54) is illustrated in (4.55), where the genitive phrase *Mariko-no* in (4.55a) and (4.55b) is located in Spec, DP, and the NP complements *taido* and *kenkyuu nitaisuru taido* are elided.

(4.55) a. [<sub>DP</sub> Mariko-no                      [<sub>D'</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> ~~taido~~] D ]  
           Mariko-Gen                              attitude

b. [<sub>DP</sub> Mariko-no [<sub>D'</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> ~~kenkyuu nitaisuru taido~~] D ]  
           Mariko-Gen            research-toward            attitude



was allowed as (4.58) and (4.59) shown in the study by Yuzawa (1953:302).

(4.58) Kore-wa watashi-no no de-wa arimasen, tabun  
 This-Top I-Gen one Cop-Top exist.not, maybe  
 akiyamakun-no no de-sho.  
 Akiyama.Mr-Gen one Cop.modal  
 ‘lit. This is not my one, maybe it’s Mr. Akiyama’s one.’

(4.59) Kino-no no wa doshimashita. Moichido misetekudasai.  
 Yesterday-Gen one Top do.past once.again show.me  
 ‘lit. What did you do about yesterday’s one? Please show it to me once again.’

Thus this haplology analysis is not related with NP-ellipsis. S&M’s NP-ellipsis analysis fails to accommodate an example such as (4.56) with the overt pro-form *to*. As shown in (4.60c), *to* is a pro-form corresponding to *no* in SJ and *one* in English.<sup>9</sup>

(4.60) a. Haruna-wa akai wanpiisu-o katta.  
 Haruna-Top red one-piece.dress-Acc bought  
 ‘Haruna bought a red one-piece dress.’  
 b. Haruna-wa akai no-o katta. [Standard J]  
 Haruna-Top red one-Acc bought  
 ‘Haruna bought a red one.’

<sup>9</sup> As stated by Murasugi (1991) that pronouns in SJ and the Toyama dialect cannot refer to human beings, the pro-form *to* in NJ also cannot refer to a respectable person like a teacher, as in (i). It is acceptable only when the pro-form *to* refers to an unrespectable person who is looked down upon, as shown in (ii).

- (i) \*John no sensei wa kite-irasharu batten,  
 John Gen teacher Top come-honorific though  
 Mike n to wa mada kite-irasharan.  
 Mike gen one Top yet come-honorific  
 ‘John’s teacher is here, but Mike’s one does not seem to be here yet.’  
 (ii) Taro no musuko-wa yoka batten, Jiro n to wa hidoka.  
 Taro Gen son-Top good though, Jiro Gen one Top bad  
 ‘Taro’s son is good, but Jiro’s one is bad.’







‘Are you going to buy something?’

b. Taro: Murakami Haruki-no-o kaou-kato omotte.

Murakami Haruki-one-Acc buy-C think

‘lit. I’m thinking of buying Haruki Murakami’s one.’

(4.72) Taro: Murakami Haruki-n-to-ba kaou-kato omotte. [Nagasaki J]

Murakami Haruki-Gen-one-Acc buy-C think

[Context: At the bookstore, Hanako is asking a clerk.]

(4.73) Hanako: Murakami Haruki no-o sagashite iru n desu ga.

Murakami Haruki one-Acc look.for Prog Fin is though

‘lit. I’m looking for Haruki Murakami’s one.’ [Standard J]

(4.74) Hanako: Murakami Haruki-n to-ba sagashi toru to batten.

Murakami Haruki-Gen one-Acc look.for Prog Fin though

‘lit. I’m looking for Haruki Murakami’s one.’ [Nagasaki J]

Accordingly, as with the case of the pro-form *one* discussed in Section 4.2, *to* in NJ as well as *no* in SJ can refer to the linguistically absent antecedent, and they are different from NP-deletion.<sup>10</sup>

Second, as proposed by Kinsui (1994:158), the pro-form *no* can refer to an

---

<sup>10</sup> In Korean, *geo* is used as a pronoun. *Geo* in this example stands for *sinbare* “shoe”.

(i) i sinbar-eun neomu jagayo. Deo keun geo-reul ju-seyo.  
This shoe-Top too small more big one-Acc give-Exh

‘These shoes are too small. Please give me bigger ones.’

(See Yoon 2012, Kim 2004)

*Geo* can also be used without a linguistic antecedent.

[Context: Hanako and Taro dropped in at the bookstore, and Taro seems to be deliberating a purchase.]

(i) a. Hanako: mwo salgeo-ya. [Korean]  
what buy-Q

‘What are you going to buy?’

b. Taro: Murakami Haruki-geo-reul saryeogo hae.  
Murakami Haruki-one-Acc buy will

‘lit. I will buy Haruki Murakami’s one.’

[Context: At the bookstore, Hanako is asking a clerk.]

(ii) Hanako: Murakami Haruki geo-reul chatgoinneun deyo.  
Murakami Haruki one-Acc looking.for though

‘lit. I’m looking for Haruki Murakami’s one but (I don’t know where it is).’

abstract entity if it is used in the context where two (or more) things are compared, as shown in (4.75). Crucially, in the example of Nagasaki Japanese as in (4.76), the abstract nouns *shinnen* “belief” and *renai* “love” are replaced by the pro-form *to*, which also appears in the alleged NP-ellipsis example as in (4.77).

- (4.75) a. *Shinnen-ni-mo katai-no-to yawarakai-no-ga aru.* [SJ]  
 belief-Dat-mo firm-one-and soft-one-Nom is  
 ‘lit. Among the types of beliefs, there are firm ones and soft ones.’
- b. *Renai-ni-mo hadena-no-to jimina-no-ga aru.*  
 romance-Dat-mo showy-one-and plain-one-Nom is  
 ‘lit. Among (the types of) romances, there are showy ones and plain ones.’
- (4.76) a. *Shinnen-ni-mo kataka-to-to yawaka-to-ga aru.* [NJ]  
 belief-Dat-mo firm-one-and soft-one-Nom is  
 ‘lit. Among the types of beliefs, there are firm ones and soft ones.’
- b. *Renai-ni-mo hadena-to-to jimika-to-ga aru.*  
 romance-Dat-mo showy-one-and plain-one-Nom is  
 ‘lit. Among (the types of) romances, there are showy ones and plain ones.’<sup>11</sup>
- (4.77) *Haruna-n shinnen-wa Mariko-n to yorimo kataka.* [NJ]  
 Haruna-Gen belief-Top Mariko-Gen. one than firm  
 ‘lit. Haruna’s belief is firmer than Mariko’s one.’

<sup>11</sup> In Kumamoto Japanese and Kochi Japanese, pro-form *tsu* and *ga* appear in the same context.

- (i)a. *Shinnen-ni-mo kataka-tsu-to yawaka-tsu-ga aru.* [Kumamoto J]  
 belief-Dat-mo firm-one-and soft-one-Nom is  
 ‘lit. Among the types of beliefs, there are firm ones and soft ones.’
- b. *Renai-ni-mo hadena-tsu-to jimika-tsu-ga aru.*  
 romance-Dat-mo showy-one-and plain-one-Nom is  
 ‘lit. Among (the types of) romances, there are showy ones and plain ones.’
- (i)a. *Shinnen-ni-mo katai-ga-to yawarakai-ga-ga aru.* [Kochi J]  
 belief-Dat-mo firm-one-and soft-one-Nom is  
 ‘lit. Among the types of beliefs, there are firm ones and soft ones.’
- b. *Renai-ni-mo hadena-ga-to jimina-ga-ga aru.*  
 romance-Dat-mo showy-one-and plain-one-Nom is  
 ‘lit. Among (the types of) romances, there are showy ones and plain ones.’



As for the pro-form *one* in English, its antecedent in general cannot be an abstract noun as seen in (4.78a).<sup>12</sup> However, in a situation where two types of *attitudes* are compared, even an abstract noun may be replaced by *one* according to my informants as shown in (4.78b). An analogous pattern emerges with the Korean pro-form *geo*, which, as illustrated in (4.79), in principle does not refer to an abstract noun but can stand for it as shown in (4.80) according to my Korean informants.

(4.78) a. \*The public attitude towards the students was bad, but the one towards the teachers was good.

b. Mary's positive attitude toward research is more impressive than John's negative one.

(4.79) a. [ keun aejong-eul        gajin] saram    [Korean]  
           big.love-Acc        has    person  
           ‘a person who has a big love’

b. \*[ keun geo-ul                gajin] saram  
           big.one-Acc            has    person  
           ‘(intended) a person who has a big love’

(4.80) Nae        {aejeong/sarang}-eun        Cheolsu geo-boda        keo.  
           My        love-Top                            Cheolsu one-than        big.  
           ‘lit. My love is bigger than Cheolsu's one.’        [Korean]

(See also Bae 2012<sup>13</sup>)

M&T's (2013) NP-ellipsis analysis cannot account for both cases where NP-ellipsis has been considered to be involved as in (4.77) and where NP-ellipsis is not available

<sup>12</sup> Schütze (2001) provides similar data shown below.

(i) \*We sympathize both with the despair caused by the drought and with the one caused by the tornado.

<sup>13</sup> Bae (2012) mentions that not “geot,” which is used in a formal occasion, but “geo,” which is for ordinary conversations, can stand for an abstract noun. According to my sources, however, “geot” as well as “geo” can refer to an abstract noun in a context when two things are compared. As in the discussion in Subsection 4.3.4, certain head nouns, including “geo” force genitive markers on their modifiers to be dropped.

as in (4.76). M&T's (2013) analysis, in which *to* in Nagasaki Japanese is an *-n* head containing E(lliipsis)-feature, cannot explain why *to* appears with a relative clause in (4.76), which, as shown in previous studies such as those by Murasugi (1991), Saito, Lin and Murasugi (2008), and Miyamoto (2013), does not involve NP-ellipsis. In particular, Miyamoto (cf. Takahashi 2011) concludes that *no* occurring with a relative clause as in (4.81a) is a pro-form, with no NP-ellipsis involved. As shown in (4.81b), the pro-form *to* appears in the same environment in NJ. This is quite consistent with the hypothesis in this analysis that *to* is a pro-form.

(4.81) a. Standard Japanese (See Miyamoto 2013, Takahashi 2011)

[[kinoo okonawareta] syujyutsu]-wa kantan datta ga,

Yesterday was done operation-Top simple was though

[[kyo okonawareta]-no]-wa kanari muzukashi katta.

today was done-one-Top very difficult was

‘lit. The operation that was done yesterday was simple, but the one that was done today was very difficult.’

b. Nagasaki Japanese

[[kinoo okonawareta] syujyutsu]-wa kantan yatta batten,

Yesterday was done operation-Top simple was though

[[kyo okonawareta]-to]-wa kanari muzukashi katta.

today was done-one-Top very difficult was

‘lit. The operation that was done yesterday was simple, but the one that was done today was very difficult.’

Given this, it is reasonable to treat all instances of *to* in (4.76), (4.77), and (4.81b) as a conventional and genuine pro-form along the lines of Kuno (1973), Okutsu (1974), and Kamio (1983). In other words, (4.76), (4.77), and (4.81b), along with (4.56), belong to the same construction in which the pro-form *to* refers to abstract nouns.

As an additional empirical point, while M&T (2013) build their case on data such as (4.83), spoken in dialects in the southeastern or some part of northern Nagasaki

prefecture (SN), a slightly (and yet crucially) distinct pattern emerges when we turn to some other dialects in Nagasaki prefecture.

(4.82) Haruna-no taido-wa Mariko-no yorimo rippadatta. [SJ]  
Haruna-Gen attitude-Top Mariko-Gen than good  
'lit. Haruna's attitude was better than Mariko's.'

(4.83) Haruna-n taido-wa Mariko-n to yorimo rippayatta. [SN]  
Haruna-Gen attitude-Top Mariko-Gen one than good  
'lit. Haruna's attitude was better than Mariko's one.' (M&T 2013)

In the dialect spoken in Nagasaki City, for example, the antecedent noun phrase and the second noun phrase have distinct forms of the genitive marker, as shown in (4.84): *-no* in the former and *-n* in the latter. As shown below, the appearance of the two forms of the genitive marker is lexically conditioned by the type of head noun hosting the genitive phrase in question. When the head noun is an abstract noun (such as *taido* "attitude"), the genitive marker must be *-no*; when the head noun is *to* that is unequivocally a pro-form, as in (4.85), the genitive marker is *-n* (see below for the discussion that a small number of nouns other than the pro-form *to* also require the genitive marker to be *-n*). While the appearance of *-n* in (4.84) and (4.85) receives a unified analysis under this approach, it would be "accidental" under M&T's (2013) analysis, according to which the head noun of the second noun phrase is *taido* "attitude" (just as in the antecedent noun phrase).

(4.84) Haruna-no taido-wa Mariko-n to yorimo rippayatta. [NC]  
Haruna-Gen attitude-Top Mariko-Gen one than good  
'lit. Haruna's attitude was better than Mariko's one.'

(4.85) Hanako-n to wa yonda. [SN/NC]  
Hanako-Gen one Top read  
'lit. I read Hanako's one.'

Adopting Murasugi's (1991) description summarized in (4.86), I assume that pro-form *no* occupies the N slot and needs to be licensed by an element that occurs at a fairly low position, like the adjective phrase *akai* as illustrated in (4.87b). In (4.87), the movement of the adjective phrase into the spec of DP is not involved since the condition that the NP-deletion is allowed only when the Spec agrees with the head is not satisfied. M&T's (2013) postulation of *n* head with E(llipsis)-feature offers no advantage here. The present analysis, positing that *to* occupies N position as in (4.88), provides a coherent account for a pro-form, including those cases where NP-ellipsis has been considered to be involved as in (4.84) and the examples where simply a pro-form occurs as in (4.85) and (4.88).

(4.86) Murasugi's Generalization (Murasugi 1991:88);

Only overt modifiers that are sisters to some projection of N can license *one/no* in the N position.

(4.87) a. *akai no*

red one

b. [<sub>NP</sub> [<sub>AP</sub> *akai*][<sub>nO<sub>N</sub></sub>]]     [Standard J]

(4.88) a. *akaka to*

red one

b. [<sub>NP</sub> [<sub>AP</sub> *akaka*][<sub>tO<sub>N</sub></sub>]]     [Nagasaki J]

In sum, three important points have been made to show that the alleged NP-ellipsis examples in Nagasaki Japanese discussed in the study by M&T (2013) do not involve NP-ellipsis; 1) unlike NP-ellipsis, a pro-form including *to* in Nagasaki Japanese does not require a linguistic antecedent as demonstrated in (4.71), (4.72), (4.73) and (4.74), and it occurs with a relative clause as in (4.81) or an adjective phrase as (4.87) and (4.88) illustrate, 2) as Kinsui (1994) discusses with respect to the

pro-form *no* in standard Japanese, the pro-form *to* in Nagasaki Japanese can refer to an abstract noun, a property shared by the English pro-form *one* and Korean pro-form *geo* as seen in (4.78b) and (4.80), and 3) the NP-ellipsis analysis cannot explain the two forms of genitive markers, *no* and *-n* in NC as (4.84) illustrates.

The next subsection discusses the genitive markers, *no* and *-n* in NC in further terms of phonological reduction in connection with the Korean genitive drop.

#### **4.3.4 Genitive Marker Reduction/Drop in NC and Korean**

The preceding discussion of *-no* and *-n* in NC as two distinct manifestations of the genitive marker gains a new perspective when genitive drop in Korean (An (2014)) is considered, as there is a certain degree of similarity between Korean and NC with respect to the way in which the genitive marker is (or, is not) realized. In both Korean and NC, the (non-)overt manifestation of the genitive marker is lexically conditioned by the type of head noun hosting the genitive phrase in question. In particular, as the bottom row of Table 1 and the data in (4.89) indicate, the nouns in NC that force the genitive marker on their modifier/argument to be *-n* coincide with the nouns in Korean that force the genitive marker on their modifier/argument to be dropped: these include the *to* (pro-form), *naka* “inside,” *mae* “before/in front of” in NC and their Korean counterparts, each of which is a typical example of a formal or spatial noun and does not show rich content of meaning (i.e., the meaning is light.). Korean pro-form *geot* is pronounced as *geo* in ordinary conversations, in which case genitive marker *ui* should be dropped.

Table 1. Genitive case marker *-no/-n* in NC and *-ui* in Korean<sup>14</sup>

| Korean       | NC         | Examples  |
|--------------|------------|---|
| <i>(-ui)</i> | <i>-no</i> | <p>a. Chelswu ___ chayk [Poss]<br/> book<br/> ‘Chelswu’s book’ (See An 2014:374 for Korean)</p> <p>b. Loma ___ phagoy [Theme]<br/> Rome destruction<br/> ‘the destruction of Rome’ (ibid.)</p> <p>c. kongsankwun ___ chimlyak [Agent]<br/> communist army invasion<br/> ‘Communist army’s invasion’ (ibid.)</p> <p>d. ecey ___ nalssi [Temporal]<br/> yesterday weather<br/> ‘yesterday’s weather’ (ibid.)</p> <p>e. Thaiphei ___ nalssi [Locative]<br/> weather<br/> ‘Thaiphei’s wether’ (ibid.)</p> |
| <i>-ui</i>   | <i>-no</i> | <p>f. sey-kwen ___ chayk<br/> three-Cl book<br/> ‘three books’ (ibid.)</p> <p>g. Chomskhi-wa ___ inthebywu<br/> Chomsky-with interview<br/> ‘an interview with Chomsky’ (ibid.)</p> <p>h. mikwuk-ulopwuthe ___ phyenci<br/> America-from letter<br/> ‘a letter from America’ (ibid.:375)</p> <p>i. ywulep-ulo ___ yehayng<br/> Europe-to trip</p>   |

<sup>14</sup> I am grateful to Hiroshi Mito for invaluable comments about Korean noun phrases.

|                                |                                 |   |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
|                                |                                 | ‘a trip to Europe’ (ibid.:375)<br>j. Cheolse ___ {taedo / sinnyeom}<br>attitude/ belief<br>‘Cheolse’s attitude/ belief’ |
| ∅<br>(4.89a,c,e,g,<br>i,k,m,o) | -n<br>(4.89b,d,f,h,<br>j,l,n,p) | k. Cheolse __{geo/to}<br>one<br>‘lit. Cheolse’s one’<br>l. jeoncha ___ an<br>train inside<br>‘inside the train’         |

(4.89) Cases where *-ui* should be omitted in Korean and *-n* is used in NC

a. Hanako (\*ui) geo [Korean]

b. Hanako n/\*no to [NC]

Hanako Gen one

‘lit. Hanako’s one’

c. Osaka (\*ui) saram [Korean]

d. Osaka n/\*no mon [NC]

Oska Gen people

‘Osaka people’

e. doro (\*ui) geonneopyeon [Korean]

f. doro n/\*no mukou [NC]

street Gen across

‘across the street’


|                       |        |             |          |
|-----------------------|--------|-------------|----------|
| g. Daimaru            | (*ui)  | ap          | [Korean] |
| h. Daimaru            | n/*no  | mae         | [NC]     |
|                       | Gen    | in.front.of |          |
| ‘in front of Daimaru’ |        |             |          |
| i. jeoncha            | (*ui)  | an          | [Korean] |
| j. densha             | n/*no  | naka        | [NC]     |
| train                 | Gen    | inside      |          |
| ‘inside the train’    |        |             |          |
| k. Kobe               | (*ui)  | geuncheo    | [Korean] |
| l. Kobe               | n/*no  | niki        | [NC]     |
| Kobe                  | Gen    | around      |          |
| ‘around Kobe’         |        |             |          |
| m. uija               | (*?ui) | a-rae       | [Korean] |
| n. isu                | n/*no  | shita       | [NC]     |
| chair                 | Gen    | below       |          |
| ‘below the chair’     |        |             |          |
| o. Hanako             | (*ui)  | ttae        | [Korean] |
| p. Hanako             | n/*no  | toki        | [NC]     |
|                       | Gen    | time        |          |
| ‘Hanako’s case’       |        |             |          |

Given the similarity between the obligatory instances of genitive drop in Korean and the appearance of *-n* in NC, I propose that both are derived via phonological reduction, with the Korean cases being extreme instances (i.e., deletion). The position in this analysis somewhat departs from the study by An (2014), who, based on the study by



Saito et al. (2008),<sup>15</sup> argues that the genitive drop results from not applying the *-ui* insertion rule.<sup>16</sup> If An’s (2014) analysis is to be extended to NC, it would require two insertion rules, one for inserting *-n* and the other for inserting *-no*, despite the obvious resemblance between the two. This analysis needs no such complication. “Genitive Marker Reduction” is schematically illustrated in (4.90).<sup>17</sup>

(4.90) Genitive Marker Reduction



Overall, the proposal in this chapter that *to* in Nagasaki Japanese is a pro-form occupying N, contrary to M&T’s (2013) NP-ellipsis analysis, correctly captures the essential features of the nominal pro-form, which can occur without a linguistic antecedent and can also appear with a relative clause or adjective phrase, in which case NP-ellipsis is not involved. Simultaneously, this approach reveals that Kinsui’s (1994) analysis of standard Japanese can be extended to pro-forms in Nagasaki Japanese, English, and Korean. Importantly, this analysis is based on the fact that the dialect of NC has two distinct manifestations of genitive markers, *-n* and *no*, and the occurrence of the former, triggered by a small number of head nouns including the pro-form *to*, coincides with that of the Korean genitive drop, which leads us to conclude that some form of phonological reduction is applied to *-n* form genitive in NC, and its extreme case is the Korean genitive drop. This analysis achieves a far clearer grasp of the pro-form *to* and its surroundings than M&T’s (2013) analysis of *to* with the E(llipsis)

<sup>15</sup> Mod-Insertion (Saito et al. 2008:249) is attributed to Kitagawa and Ross (1982).

[<sub>NP</sub> ... XP N<sup>α</sup>] → [<sub>NP</sub> ... XP Mod N<sup>α</sup>], where Mod=*no*

<sup>16</sup> According to An (2014), *ui* is not realized when a prenominal element sits inside the lexical projection of the head noun (i.e., when it stays within the local domain of the theta role assigner) while *ui* is inserted when a prenominal constituent stays outside the lexical projection of the head noun (i.e., when it is outside the theta-domain of the head noun).

<sup>17</sup> I would like to thank Masao Ochi for invaluable comments for this point.

feature.

#### 4.3.5 Concluding Remarks on the Pro-form *To (No)* and Genitive Marker Reduction

Based on some empirical observations as well as theoretical considerations on the NP-ellipsis, this analysis has argued that Japanese does not involve NP-ellipsis by indicating that a nominal pro-form in general can occur in the cases where NP-ellipsis is not considered to be involved (i.e., the cases with relative clauses and adjective phrases, and the cases where no linguistic antecedent is present) and by discussing the fact that the pro-form can refer to an abstract noun, a property shared by Japanese, English, and Korean, and finally by providing evidence from the dialect of NC, none of which M&T's *n* head with the E(llipsis) feature succeeds in capturing. This analysis supports the analysis of Bae (2012), who concludes that Japanese like Korean (as seen in (4.91)) has no NP-ellipsis, as well as emphasizes the connection between Japanese and Korean genitive markers in terms of "Genitive Marker Reduction."

- (4.91) \*Suni-ui      sarang-un Cheolsu-ui      ~~sarang~~      boda      keo.  
Suni-Gen    love-Top    Cheolsu -Gen    love      than      big.  
'Suni's love is bigger than Cheolsu's.'      [Korean; cf. (4.80)]

Future studies must conduct a more detailed examination of the Korean genitive marker *ui*. In addition, why N pro-forms can refer to abstract nouns in the context of comparing several things, as Kinsui (1994) argues, should be further investigated.

#### 4.4 Conclusion on the N Pro-Form and NP-Ellipsis

This chapter discussed the N pro-form and NP-ellipsis. As to the questions of whether an N pro-form in Japanese involves NP-ellipsis and whether Japanese has NP-ellipsis, we concluded that the answers to these questions are negative; the N pro-form in Japanese does not involve deletion and Japanese does not have NP-ellipsis. These findings are supported by data from English, Korean, and Nagasaki Japanese.

We showed, contrary to Llobart (2002), that *one* in English is syntactically and semantically different from NP-deletion. NP-ellipsis is more restricted than the pro-form *one* when the antecedent is not linguistically present. Moreover, the complementary distribution of these two constructions argued by Llobart (2002) is not always effective. Thus, *one* is not an inserted element to give support to Num<sup>0</sup> when empty category is not licensed, but it is an N pro-form (occupying head N) as Radford (1989) and Murasugi (1991) argue so that it has little to do with NP-ellipsis.

Following the discussion on the English pro-form *one*, Korean and (Nagasaki) Japanese pro-forms also appear when NP-ellipsis is prohibited, such as the case when linguistic antecedents are absent. This indicates that N pro-forms in principle do not involve deletion, contrary to the claims by Llobart (2002) and M&T (2013). Since pro-forms can stand for abstract nouns when several things are compared, which is commonly observed in English, Korean, and Japanese, the alleged NP-ellipsis examples suggested in S&M (1990) in Japanese are in fact pro-forms. Therefore, a similar pattern emerges between Korean and one of the dialects in Japan (in particular, in the southeastern part of Nagasaki) as in (4.92), in which the NP complement of the second nominal cannot be elided as opposed to English, since no NP-deletion is allowed in the two languages.

(4.92) a. \*Suni-ui    sarang-un Cheolsu -ui    ~~sarang~~    deyo    keo.  
           Suni-Gen   love-Top Cheolsu -Gen   love            than    big.  
           ‘Suni’s love is bigger than Cheolsu’s.’            [Korean]

b. \*Haruna-n    taido-wa    Mariko-n    ~~taido~~    yorimo rippayatta.  
           Haruna-Gen attitude-Top   Mariko-Gen   attitude than    good  
           ‘Haruna’s attitude was better than Mariko’s.’    [SN]

In addition, although M&T’s (2013) analysis cannot account for the occurrence of *-n* genitive form in NC, which is triggered by certain head nouns with less content of meaning, including the pro-form *to*, the current analysis can capture the manifestation of *-n* form in NC in connection with Korean genitive drop by coherently treating them

as a phonological reduction. The present analysis offers further and fresh perspectives that Japanese and Korean are alike in terms of NP-ellipsis and genitive marker reduction.

# Chapter 5

## Conclusion

### 5.1 Summary

This thesis has conducted a study of the nominative and genitive cases in Japanese from dialectal and cross-linguistic perspectives in terms of three constructions: Nominative/Genitive Conversion (NGC), *wh*-NP (rhetorical) questions with nominative case markers, the N pro-form versus the NP-ellipsis. Throughout the present study, the connection between the structure and meaning of these constructions has been clarified.

Chapter 1 introduced the aim of this thesis and discussed some underlying issues on the nominative and genitive cases in Japanese and these three constructions.

Chapter 2 examined NGC in Japanese, particularly in Nagasaki Japanese (NJ). As to the question as to whether NJ should be treated completely differently from SJ, the answer given by this thesis is that NJ and SJ share some similarities; unaccusative verbs show unique behaviors and genitive subjects are generally used for Neutral Descriptions (NDs). The prominent difference between SJ and NJ is that in NJ, a weak *v* and a C head alone can license genitive subjects, which retains Case licensing systems from the classical Japanese (especially around the 13<sup>th</sup> century), while SJ merely keeps some of the systems in the form of weak *v*, licensing the genitive case only with the aid of a dependent tense (genitive of dependent tense (GDT) in the sense of Miyagawa (2012)). I provided crucial data for major subject and transitive sentences and argued that genitive subjects are allowed even in these sentences if certain licensors such as C *bai/yo* (*yo* in SJ) or weak *v oru* (*teiru* in SJ) appear. Significantly, the definition of the ND interpretation has been different for Kuroda (1965, 1972, 1992), Hasegawa (2008, 2010, 2011), and Kuno (1973a, 1973b). Various data in NJ made it clear that the *teiru* form and C heads such as *bai* act as a defocusing subject along the line of Aoyagi (1999) and Vallduví (1992, 1995). The current analysis also accounts for the subject in the subordinate clause and showed comprehensive data and

conditions for ND interpretations in Japanese. Moreover, I elaborated how the subject is marked by *no* in the copula sentence in NJ and the peculiar sentence, *S-no Baka!* “S is a fool!” in SJ (and NJ). In the latter, *no* is inserted as an ordinary noun phrase. The present study clearly indicates the position of genitive subjects, and the connection between genitive subjects and ND readings in Japanese, on the basis of data from NJ.

Chapter 3 discussed *wh*-NP rhetorical questions with nominative case markers, which Cheung (2009) calls “Negative WH-Constructions (NWHCs).” Chiefly, two issues were addressed. The first issue concerns whether NWHCs in the sense of Cheung (2009) are totally different from usual (negative or positive) rhetorical questions. According to Cheung (2009), the distinct negative interpretations of these *wh*-rhetorical questions arise from semantic factors (conventional implicatures). Under Cheung’s (2009) analysis, it is uncertain why NWHCs can be used in a positive rhetorical way. Besides, the non-cancelability test given in Cheung (2009) seems to be inappropriate as it is applicable to negative rhetorical questions. It is more plausible that negative interpretations of NWHCs are considered at the pragmatic level as C&S (2007) propose and NWHCs should be treated as rhetorical questions. Second, as for the issue of the structure of NWHCs, the coherent structure between OQs and RQs (NWHCs) was provided. Although Yamadera (2010) argues that *nani-ga* “what-Nom” in Japanese in NWHCs is an adjunct and occupies the CP area, I showed that the NWHC with *nani-ga* is analyzed as a copula sentence that contains the embedded part, which cannot be influenced by the choice of predicates. This structure applies to the similar construction in Korean and Chinese.

Chapter 4 investigated whether N pro-forms (such as *one*) in general involve NP(N’)-ellipsis. First, I showed that the pro-form *one* does not involve deletion. Against Llombart’s (2002) analysis, we discussed the fact that an NP-ellipsis shows some restrictions when it is used without overt antecedents unlike the pro-form *one*, and the pro-form *one* and the NP-ellipsis are not exactly complementary in distribution. This analysis is corroborated by the claim of the N pro-form in Japanese. Along the lines of Llombart’s (2002), Maeda and Takahashi (M&T) (2013) argue that the pro-form *to* in NJ is a realization of what Merchant (2001) calls the E(llipsis)-feature,

which instructs PF not to pronounce its complement NP. However, their analysis is disputed and I showed that the pro-form in general is different from an NP-ellipsis. First, pro-forms appear where the ellipsis is prohibited: the cases with relative clauses (and adjective phrases) and the cases where no linguistic antecedent is present. Second, in some contexts, abstract nouns can be substituted by pro-forms as in Kinsui (1994), which is also observed in the pro-forms of English, Korean and NJ. Third, the occurrence of the *-n* form of the genitive marker (out of two genitive markers *-n/no*) before the pro-form *to* in Nagasaki City (NC) and that of the Korean genitive drop should both be analyzed in terms of “phonological reduction.”

Some issues remain as subjects of future study. In Chapter 2, I indicated the exceptional case of genitive subjects and focus particles and genitive subjects in subordinate clauses in NJ, which need further explanations. Chapter 3 still requires a closer examination of the occurrence of *shenme* in the sentence-final position in the negative rhetorical usage. Chapter 4 is left open for the precise licensing system for the pro-forms. In addition, more research should be conducted on the Korean genitive marker and on certain contexts or conditions, as in Kinsui (1994), where N pro-form can refer to abstract nouns.

## 5.2 Concluding Remarks

Overall, the present thesis elaborated on the connection between structures and meanings of the constructions concerned with nominative or genitive case markers: Nominative/Genitive Conversion (NGC), *wh*-NP (rhetorical) questions with nominative case, and the N pro-form versus the NP-ellipsis.

First and most importantly, a uniform analysis was given for the ND interpretation in Japanese by explaining the connection between the ND reading and genitive case licensors in NJ, such as *toru* (*teiru* for SJ) and C head *bai*. The ND reading has varied among researchers: Kuroda (1965, 1972, 1992), Kuno (1973a, 1973b), and Hasegawa (2008, 2010, 2011). Kuroda and Hasegawa call it a thetic judgment, which only appears in independent clauses and arises through the speaker’s perceptual cognition of the actual situation happening or having happened in front of

him or her. So, the action verbs in Kuno (1973a, 1973b) should be used with the *teiru* progressive form or some sentence-ending particles conveying information to a listener. This condition is consistent with genitive case licensors in NJ. However, as Kuroda and Hasegawa's observations cannot capture genitive subjects in interrogatives and subordinate clauses in NJ, we analyzed ND interpretations as defocusing phenomena developing Aoyagi (1999) and Vallduví (1992, 1995): the subject is no longer focused when the genitive licensors occur.

Second, we investigated the parallelism between syntax and semantics. We examined Cheung(2009)'s claim that NWHCs are different from (negative) RQs and we showed that the constructions are classified as (negative) RQs and should be treated equivalently to OQs in syntax as well as semantics as in C&S (2007). Examples of NWHCs provided in Cheung (2009) are used as a positive RQ. The cancelability test in Cheung (2009) is not plausible since it applies to negative RQs. Accordingly, the difference between RQs and OQs should be pragmatically derived.

As to the third construction, the N pro-form versus the NP-ellipsis, it was revealed that they should be differentiated syntactically and semantically. NP-ellipsis is not freely recovered in the context where no linguistic antecedent exists as opposed to the N pro-form. In addition, the N pro-form can accompany even relative clauses, where the NP-ellipsis does not occur. From these three constructions, we clarified the connection between syntactic structure and semantics.

This thesis also revealed characteristics of the Japanese language (through the Nagasaki dialect) regarding the following points. Even in SJ, the relation between nominative and genitive case markers are somehow affected by the interpretation, that is, whether the interpretation is an ND or an EL. Notably, genitive subjects tend to appear at the lower position in the structure than nominative subjects. In Chapter 4, *no* in the alleged NP-ellipsis example is obviously a pro-form and different from genitive case marker, which indicates that Japanese does not have NP-ellipsis as stated in Korean. Moreover, the analysis here sheds new light on the commonality between Japanese and Korean in that there is no NP-ellipsis in either language, and they are alike in terms of the phonological reduction of the genitive case marker. Furthermore,



this thesis provided a uniform analysis across languages. First, the negative *wh*-question (NWHC) occurs in a copula sentence that contains an embedded structure, in which the subject is marked by nominative or even direct quotes can occur in the embedded part in this construction. Second, N pro-forms in general do not involve deletion. These two points will be corroborated by collecting extensive and detailed data from other languages.

## References

- Abney, Steven (1987) *The English Noun Phrases in Its Sentential Aspect*, Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.
- Abraham, P. T (1985) *Apatani Grammar*, Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore.
- Akaso, Naoyuki and Tomoko Haraguchi (2010) “Japanese Relative Clauses: Larger than TP,” poster presented at GLOW in Asia VIII, Beijing Language and Culture University, August 12-14.
- Akaso, Naoyuki and Tomoko Haraguchi (2013) “On the Agent/Theme Asymmetry in Japanese Nominative/Genitive Conversion,” *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 67, 1-6.
- An, Duk-Ho (2014) “Genitive Case in Korean and its Implications for Noun Phrase Structure,” *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 23, 361-392.
- Aoyagi, Hiroshi (1999) “Iwayuru Sokino Ganikansuru Oboegaki (A Note on the So-called Exhaustive Listing *Ga*),” *Academia*, Nanzan University, 769-788.
- Aoyagi, Hiroshi (2010) “Nihongo ni okeru Kakimaze Kisoku, Shudaika to Johokoza (The Scrambling Rule, Subjectivization and Information Structure in Japanese),” *Togoron no Shintenkai to Nihongo Kenkyu* (New Developments in Syntax and a Study of the Japanese Language), ed. by Nobuko Hasegawa, 193-226, Kaitakusha, Tokyo.
- Bae, Sun-Hee (2012) *NP Languages Do Not Have NP-Ellipsis: Examination of Korean and Japanese*, Ms. Harvard University.
- Bedell, George (1972) “On *No*,” *UCLA Papers in Syntax 3: Studies in East Asian Syntax*, 1-20.
- Bloch, Bernard (1946a) “Studies in Colloquial Japanese I: Inflection,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 66, 97–109. [Reprinted in *Bernard Bloch on Japanese*, ed. by R. A. Miller, 1969, Yale University Press, New Haven.]
- Bloch, Bernard (1946b) “Studies in Colloquial Japanese II: Syntax,” *Language* 22, 200–248. [Reprinted in *Bernard Bloch on Japanese*, ed. by R. A. Miller, 1969,

Yale University Press, New Haven.]

- Blome-Tillmann, Michael (2013) “Conversational Implicatures (and How to Spot Them),” *Philosophy Compass* 8(2), 170-185.
- Bošković, Zeljko (2005) “Left Branch Extraction, Structure of NP, and Scrambling,” *The Free Word Order Phenomenon: Its Syntactic Sources and Diversity*, ed. by Joachim Sabel and Mamoru Saito, 13-72, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Bures, Anton (1993) “There is an Argument for an LF Cycle Here,” *CLS* 28, 14–35.
- Caponigro, Ivano and Jon Sprouse (2007) “Rhetorical Questions as Questions,” *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 11, 121-133.
- Channon, Robert (1982) “On the English Pronoun Ø,” *CLS* 18, 61-71c.
- Cheung, Lawrence Y.-L (2009) “Negative Wh-Construction and Its Semantic Properties,” *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 18, 297-321.
- Chomsky, Noam (1955) *The Logical Structure of Linguistic Theory*, Harvard U., Cambridge, MA. Ms.
- Chomsky, Noam (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Foris, Dordrecht.
- Chomsky, Noam (1993) “A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory,” *The View from Building 20 : Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, ed. by Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, 1–52, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Chomsky, Noam (2000) “Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework,” *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 89–156, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Chomsky, Noam (2001) “Derivation by Phase,” *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1–52, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Chung, Sandra (1982) “Unbounded dependencies in Chamorro grammar,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 13, 39-78.
- Corver, Norbert (1997) “Much-Support as a Last Resort,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 28, 119-164.
- Dixon, R.M.W (1969) “Relative Clauses and Possessive Phrases in Two Australian Languages,” *Language* 45, 35-44.

- Emonds, Joseph E. (1985) *A Unified Theory of Syntactic Categories*, Foris, Dordrecht.
- Endo, Yoshio (2007) *Locality and Information Structure: A Cartographic Approach to Japanese*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi (1997) *The Dynamics of Focus Structure*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Fujii, Tomohiro (2014) “Notes on Rhetorical Questions in Japanese and English.” paper presented at the 32<sup>nd</sup> conference of The English Linguistic Society of Japan, Gakushuin University, November 8.
- Fukui, Naoki (1986) *A Theory of Category Projection and Its Applications*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Grice, Paul (1975) “Logic and Conversation,” *Syntax and Semantics* 3, 41-58.
- Groenendijk and Stokhof (1989) “Type-Shifting Rules and the Semantics of Interrogatives,” *Properties, Types, and Meanings. Volume 2: Semantics issues*, ed. by Gennaro Chierchia, Barbara Partee, and Raymond Turner, 21-68, Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Guerzoni, Elena (2004) “Even-NPIs in Yes/No Questions,” *Natural Language Semantics* 12.4, 319-343.
- Han, Chung-Hye (2002) “Interpreting Interrogatives as Rhetorical Questions,” *Lingua* 112, 201-229.
- Hankamer, Jorge and Ivan Sag (1976) “Deep and Surface Anaphora,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 7, 391-426.
- Harada, Shin-Ichi (1971) “*Ga-No* Conversion and Idiolectal Variations in Japanese,” *Gengo Kenkyu* 60, 25-38.
- Harada, Shin-Ichi (1976a) “*Ga-No* Conversion Revisited: A Reply to Shibatani,” *Gengo Kenkyu* 70, 23-38.
- Harada, Shin-Ichi (1976b) “Honorifics,” *Syntax and Semantics* 5: Japanese generative grammar, 499-561, Academic Press, New York.
- Hasegawa, Nobuko (2005) ‘The EPP Materialized First, Agree Later: *Wh*-Questions, Subject and *Mo*‘also’-Phrases’ *Scientific Approaches to Language* 4, 33-80,

Center for Language Sciences, Kanda University of International Studies.

- Hasegawa, Nobuko (2007) "The Possessor Raising Construction and the Interpretation of the Subject," *Phrasal and Clausal Architecture: Syntactic Derivation and Interpretation in honor of Joseph E. Emonds*, ed. by Simin Karimi, Vida Samiian, and Wendy K. Wilkins, 62-99, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Hasegawa, Nobuko (2008) "Teiji-bun Toshiteno Churitujojutubun (Neutral description sentences as presentationals)," *Gengo-kenkyu no genzai: Keishiki to imi no intafeisu* (The state of art in linguistics research: The interface of form and meaning), ed. by Yoshiaki Kaneko, Akira Kikuchi, Daiko Takahashi and Etsuro Shima, 62-80, Kaitakusha, Tokyo.
- Hasegawa, Nobuko (2011) "Hatsuwato Bunno Modariti (Modality of the Utterance and Sentence)," *Togokozoto Hatsuwano Chikara: Nihongono CP Ryoikigenshokara* (The Syntactic Structure and the Force of the Utterance: Through the phenomena of the CP Region in Japanese), ed. by Michiko Takeuchi and Hiromi Sato, 89-114, Hitsuji Shobo, Tokyo.
- Hashimoto, Shinkichi (1969) *Joshi Jodoshi no Kenkyu* (A Study of Postpositional Particles and Auxiliary Verbs) Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo.
- Hatsushima, Yasuko (1998) "Sagahogenno Kenkyu: Syukakuno Josi 'No' to 'Ga' no Tsukaiwakenitsuite (A Research on the Saga Dialect: The Proper Use of Nominative Case 'No' and 'Ga')," *Studies in Language and Culture* 7, 51-64, Tokyo Women's Christian University.
- Heycock, Caroline (1993) "Focus Projection in Japanese," *NELS*, 24, 157-171.
- Heycock, Caroline (2008) "Japanese -Wa, -Ga, and Information Structure," *The Oxford Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, ed. by Shigeru Miyagawa and Mamoru Saito, 54-83, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Hiraiwa, Ken (2001) "On Nominative-Genitive Conversion," *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 39, 66-125.
- Hiraiwa, Ken (2005) *Dimensions of Symmetry in Syntax: Agreement and Clausal Architecture*, Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.

- Hiraiwa, Ken and Shinichiro Ishihara (2002) "Missing Links: Cleft, Sluicing, and "No *da*" Construction in Japanese," *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 43, 35–54.
- Hornstein, Norbert and David Lightfoot (1981) *Explanation in Linguistics: The Logical Problem of Language Acquisition*, Longman, London/New York.
- Izuhara, Eiko (2003) "Shujoshi *Yo, Ne, None* Saiko (Reanalysis of Sentence-Ending Particles *Yo, Ne, and Yone*)" *Aichi Gakuin University*, 51(2), 1-15.
- Izuhara, Eiko (2008) "Kantojoshi, Shushojojino Danwakanrikino Bunseki (Analysis of Discourse-Management Functions of Interjections and Sentence-Ending Particles)," *Aichi Gakuin University*, 56(1), 67-82.
- Izuhara, Eiko (2011) "Kantojoshiwa Donoyoni Ichizukeraretekitaka (How Have Interjectional-Particles Been Treated?)" *Aichi Gakuin University*, 58(3), 1-12.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1977) *X-Bar Syntax*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Jang, Youngjun (1995) "Genitive subject in Middle Korean," *Harvard studies in Korean Linguistics* VI, 223-224.
- Jin, Yinji (2015) *A Comparative Study of Nominative-Genitive Conversion*, Doctoral dissertation, Yokohama National University.
- Jonas, Dianne and Jonathon D. Bobaljik (1993) "Specs for Subjects: The Role of TP in Icelandic," *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 18, 59-98.
- Kadowaki, Makoto (2005) "NP-ellipsis Reconsidered," *Proceedings of the 6th Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics*, ed. by Yukio Otsu, 191-215, Hitsuji Shobo, Tokyo.
- Kageyama, Taro (1982) "Word Formation in Japanese," *Lingua* 57, 215–258.
- Kageyama, Taro (1993) *Bunpoto Gokeisei* (Grammar and Word formation), Hitsuji Shobo, Tokyo.
- Kamio, Akio (1983) "Meishiku-no Koozoo (The Structure of Noun Phrase)," *Nihongo-no Kihon-Koozoo* (Basic Structures of Japanese), ed. by Kazuko Inoue, 77-126, Sanseido, Tokyo.
- Kanbe, Hiroyasu (1980) "Kyushu Seibu Hogenno Keiyogo (On Adjectives in the Dialects in the Western part of Kyushu Island)," *Kokugokyoiku kenkyu* 26-1,

536-546.

- Kanbe, Hiroyasu (1992) *Kyushuhogen no Hyogenteki Kenkyu* (A Research on Expressions in Kyushu Dialects), Izumishoin, Osaka.
- Karttunen, Lauri (1977) "Syntax and Semantics of Questions," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1, 3-44.
- Kato, Sachiko (2005) "Kumamoto Hogen niokeru 'Ga' to 'No' no Tsukaiwake nikanshite (On -Ga and -No in the Kumamoto dialect)," *Journal of Linguistic Science* 9, 25-36, Tohoku University.
- Kato, Sachiko (2007) "Scrambling and the EPP in Japanese: From the viewpoint of the Kumamoto dialect in Japanese," In *Formal approaches to Japanese linguistics: Proceedings of FAJL 4*, ed. by Yoichi Miyamoto and Masao Ochi, 113-124. MIT working papers in linguistics 55, MA: MIT, Cambridge.
- Kato, Shigehiro (2003) *Nihongosyusyokukozo-no Goyoronteki Kenkyu* (A Pragmatic Analysis of Japanese Noun Modifying Construction), Hitsuji Shobo, Tokyo.
- Kido, Yasuhito (2013) Fukuoka Hogen niokeru 'Bai' 'Tai' no Togoteki Bunpu (Syntactic Distributions of 'Bai' and 'Tai' in the Fukuoka Dialect), paper presented at the 147th Conference of the Linguistic Society of Japan, Kobe City University of Foreign Studies, November 23-24.
- Kikuchi, Akira (1987) "Comparative Deletion in Japanese," m.s, Yamagata University.
- Kim, Min-Joo (2004) *Three Kypes of Kes-Nominalization in Korean*. ms. University of Massachusettes, Amherst.
- Kinsui, Satoshi (1993) "Shujoshi *Yo, Ne* (The Ending Particles *Yo, Ne*)," *Gekkanengo* 22(4), 118-121..
- Kinsui, Satoshi (1994) "Nihongo-no Iwayuru N'-Sakujo nitsuite (On the So-Called N'-Ellipsis in Japanese)," paper presented at Nanzan University Symposium on the Japanese Language, Nanzan University.
- Kishimoto, Hideki (2000) 'Hitaikakuseisaiko (Reconsidering Unaccusativity).' *Nichieigonojitakotai (Alternations of Intransitives and Transitives in Japanese and English)*. 71-110. Hitsuji Shobo, Tokyo.

- Kishimoto, Hideki (2001) "Binding of Indeterminate Pronouns and Clause Structure in Japanese," *Linguistic Inquiry* 32-4, 597-633.
- Kishimoto, Hideki (2005) *Togokozo to Bunpokankei* (The Relation of Syntactic Structure and Grammar), Kurosio Shuppan, Tokyo.
- Kishimoto, Hideki (2007) "Daimokuyuuigengo to shite no Nihongo (Japanese as a Topic-Prominent Language)," *Nihongono Shubungensho: Togokozo to Modariti* (Japanese Main Clause Phenomena: Syntactic Structures and Modality), ed. by Nobuko Hasegawa, 25-71, Hitsuji Shobo, Tokyo.
- Kishimoto, Hideki (2011) "Setsuno Shuhen Yoso: Modariti to Daimoku (Elements on the Clausal Periphery: Modality and Topic)," *Togokozoto hatsuwano chikara: Nihongono CP ryoikigenshokara* (The Syntactic Structure and the Force of the Utterance: Through the Phenomena of the CP Region in Japanese), ed. by Michiko Takeuchi and Hiromi Sato, 115-137, Hitsuji Shobo, Tokyo.
- Kishimoto, Hideki (2012a) "Subject Honorification and the Position of Subjects in Japanese," *Journal of East Asian Linguistics*, 1-41.
- Kishimoto, Hideki (2012b) "Nihongo Kopulabunno Imi to kouzo (Semantics and Structures of Japanese Copula Sentences)," *Zokusei Jojutsu no Sekai* (The World of Property-Denoting Predicates), 39-67, Kurosio Shuppan, Tokyo.
- Kishimoto, Hideki (2013) "Covert Possessor Raising in Japanese," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31, 161-205.
- Kishimoto, Hideki (2015) "Exclamatives and Nominalization in Japanese," *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 76, 159-170.
- Kitagawa, Chisato, and Claudia Ross (1982) "Prenominal Modification in Chinese and Japanese," *Linguistic Analysis* 9, 19-53.
- Kodama, Nozomi (2006) "Kumamoto hogen no shitei jodoshi (The Copula in the Kumamoto Dialect)" *Ariake Kumamoto daigaku gengogaku ronshu* 5. 71-90.
- Kori, Shiro (2016) "Kantojoshi no Intonation to Kantojoshi teki Intonation: Kata to Tsukaiwake nituite (Japanese Interjection Particles and Interjectional Intonation: Factors Determining the Choice of the Intonation Type)," *Studies in Language and Culture* 42, 61-84.



- Kornfilt, Jaklin (2008) "Subject Case and Agr in Two Types of Turkic RCs," *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 56, 145-168.
- Kuno, Susumu (1973a) *The Structure of the Japanese Language*, MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Kuno, Susumu (1973b) *Nihonbunpokenkyu* (The Structure of the Japanese Language), Taishukanshoten, Tokyo.
- Kuroda, S.-Y (1965) *Generative grammatical studies in the Japanese language*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Kuroda, S.-Y (1972) "The Categorical and the Thetic Judgments," *Foundations of Language* 9, 153-185.
- Kuroda, S.-Y (1992) "Judgment Forms and Sentence Forms," *Japanese syntax and semantics: Collected papers*, 13-77, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Kyushuhogengakkai (1991) *KyushuhoGenno Kisoteki Kenkyu* (The Basic Research on the Kyushu Dialects), Kazamashobo, Tokyo.
- Lasnik, Howard and Mamoru Saito (1992) *Move a: Conditions on Its Application and Output*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Lefebvre, Claire and Pieter Muysken (1988) *Mixed categories: nominalizations in Quechua*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Llombart-Huesca, Amàlia (2002) "Anaphoric *One* and NP-Ellipsis," *Studia Linguistica* 56(1), 59-89.
- Lobeck, Anne (1995) *Ellipsis: Functional Heads, Licensing and Identification*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Maeda, Masako and Daiko Takahashi (2013) "NP-Ellipsis in the Nagasaki Dialect of Japanese," *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 23, 119-132.
- Maeda, Masako and Hideki Maki (2014) "Where the Nagasaki Japanese Stands," poster presented at the 7th Formal Approaches to Japanese Linguistics, National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics, Jun 27-29.
- Maki, Hideki and Asako Uchibori (2008) "Ga/No Conversion," *The Oxford Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, ed. by Shigeru Miyagawa and Mamoru Saito, 192-216, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

- Manzoudaon, Martine (1978) "La Formation des Propositions Relatives en Tibétain," *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, 401-414.
- McGloin, Naomi (1985) "No-Pronominalization in Japanese," *Papers in Japanese Linguistics*, 10, 1-15.
- Merchant, Jason (2001) *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands, and the Theory of Ellipsis*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Mihara, Kenichi (1998) *Seiseibunpoto Hikakutogoron* (Generative Grammar and Comparative Syntax), Kurosio Shuppan, Tokyo.
- Mihara, Kenichi (2008) "Iwayuru Nakeiyoshi no Kekkajutsugo o Megutte (On the Resultative Predicate of the So-Called *Na*-Adjectives)," *Gengo-Kenkyu no Genzai: Keishiki to Imi no Intafeisu* (The State of Art in Linguistics Research: The Interface of Form and Meaning), ed. by Yoshiaki Kaneko, Akira Kikuchi, Daiko Takahashi and Etsuro Shima, 62-80, Kaitakusha, Tokyo.
- Mihara, Kenichi and Ken Hiraiwa (2006) *Shin Nihongo-no Toogokoozoo* (Syntactic Structure of Japanese (Revised and Extended Edition)), Shohakusha, Tokyo.
- Mihara, Kenichi and Mika Ebara (2012) "Chizuseisaku Keikaku niokeru Nihongo no Meireibun (Japanese Imperatives in the Cartographic Project)," *Studies in Japanese Language and Culture* 22, 1-16.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru (1987) "Lexical Categories in Japanese," *Lingua* 73, 29-51.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru (1993) LF Case-Checking and Minimal Link Condition. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 19, 213-254.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru (2001) "The EPP, Scrambling, and *Wh*-insitu," *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 293-338, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru (2012) *Case, Argument Structure, and Word Order*, Routledge, New York.
- Miyamoto, Yoichi (2013) "On the Unavailability of NP-Ellipsis with Japanese Relative Clause," *Nanzan Linguistics* 9, 51-83.
- Miyamoto, Yoichi (2014) "On NP-ellipsis in Kyushu and Shikoku dialects," paper presented at the *ELSJ Spring Forum*, Doshisha University, April 19-20.
- Mori, Hiroko (2009) *Kyotugoto Hogenkenkyuno Koryuniyoru Nihongo Togoron*

- eno Apurochi* (An Approach to Japanese Syntax through Cross-Dialectal Studies of Standard Japanese and Nagasaki), BA thesis, Osaka University.
- Murakami, Mami (1995) *Kakujoji Ga/No no Shubunchuniokeru Kotaino Seiyaku* (The Restriction of Case Alternation of *Ga* and *No* in Independent Clauses), BA thesis, Kyushu University.
- Muraki, Shinjiro (2012) *Nihongono Hinshitaiki to Sonoshuhen* (The Parts of Speech of Japanese and Their Circumference), Hitsuji Syobo, Tokyo.
- Murasugi, Keiko (1991) *Noun Phrases in Japanese and English: A Study in Syntax, Learnability and Acquisition*, Doctoral dissertation, The University of Connecticut.
- Nakai, Satoru (1980) "A Reconsideration of Ga-No Conversion in Japanese," *Papers in Linguistics* 13, 279-320.
- Nakatani, Kentaro (2013) *Predicate Concatenation: A study of the V-te V predicate in Japanese (Studies in Japanese Linguistics 12)*, Kurosio Shuppan, Tokyo.
- Nakayama, Mineharu (1988) "Empty Copulas," *Mita Working Papers in Psycholinguistics* 1, Mita Psycholinguistics Circle, Keio University, 121–128.
- Nishioka, Nobuaki (2014) "On the Positions of Nominative Subject in Japanese: Evidence from Kumamoto Dialect," paper presented at the 10th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics, MIT, May 2.
- Nishiyama, Kunio (1999) "Adjectives and the Copulas in Japanese," *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 8, 183-222.
- Nitta, Yoshio (1995) "Shitekei Setsuzokuo Megutte (On *Shite* Clauses)," *Fukubunno Kenkyu Jo* (A Study of Complex Sentences, vol.1), ed. by Nitta Yoshio, 82-126, Kurosio Shuppan, Tokyo.
- Nitta, Yoshio (2009) *Nihongono Bunpo Kategorio Megutte* (On Japanese Grammatical Categories), Hitsuji Shobo, Tokyo.
- Nomura, Masashi (2005) *Nominative case and AGREE(ment)*, Doctoral dissertation, The University of Connecticut.
- Nomura, Takashi (1993a) "Jodai no 'No' to 'Ga' nitsuite (Jo) (On *No* and *Ga* in Classical Japanese, vol. 1)," *Kokugo Kokubun* 62(2), 1-17.

- Nomura, Takashi (1993b) “Joodai no ‘No’ to ‘Ga’ nitsuite (Ge) (On *No* and *Ga* in Classical Japanese, vol. 2),” *Kokugo Kokubun* 62(3), 30-49.
- Ochi, Masao (2001) “Move F and Ga/No Conversion in Japanese,” *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 10, 247-286.
- Ochi, Masao and Asuka Saruwatari (2014) “Nominative Genitive Conversion in (In)dependent Clauses in Japanese,” paper presented at the 10th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFL 10), MIT, May 2.
- Oda, Masaru (2007) *Kodai Nihongo Bunpou* (Classical Japanese Grammar), Ohfu, Tokyo.
- Ogihara, Toshiyuki (2007) “Tense and Aspect in Truth-Conditional Semantics,” *Lingua* 117(2), 392-418.
- Okutsu, Keiichiro (1974) *Seisei Nihon Bunpooron: Meisiku no Koozoo* (Generative Grammar of Japanese: Noun Phrase Structure), Taishyukan, Tokyo.
- Perlmutter, David (1970) “On the Article in English,” *Progress in Linguistics: A Collection of Papers*, ed. by Manfred Bierwisch and Karl Erich Heidolph, 233-248, Mouton, The Hague.
- Potts, Christopher (2005) *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures: Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Radford, Andrew (1989) “Profiling Proforms,” ms., University of Essex.  
< <http://arcaold.unive.it/handle/10278/1566>>
- Sadock, Jerrold (1971) “Queclaratives,” *CLS* 7, 223-331.
- Sakai, Hiromu (1994) “Complex NP Constraint and Case-Conversions in Japanese,” *Current Topics in English and Japanese*, 179–203, ed. by Masaru Nakamura, Hitsuji Syobo, Tokyo.
- Sakai, Mika (2012) “Gendai Kumamotoshi Hogen no Juntai Joshi: *Tsu* to *To* no Chigai nitsuite (On the Difference between Particles ‘Tsu’ and ‘To’ in the Contemporary Kumamoto City Dialect),” *Handai Shakaigengo Kenkyu Note* 10, 30-47.
- Sakai, Mika (2013) “Gendai Kumamotoshi Hogen no Shukaku Hyoji (Subject Case Marking in the Contemporary Kumamoto City Dialect),” *Handai Shakaigengo*

*Kenkyu Note* 11, 66-83.

Sakai, Mika (2016) “Kyushu niokeru Bunretsu Jidoshisei (Split Intransitivity in the Kyushu Dialects),” paper presented at the Workshop “Nihongo Hogen no Case Marking no Toritasesei to Bunretu Jidoshisei (Focusing and Split Intransitivity of Case Marking in Japanese Dialects)” in the 150th Conference of the Linguistic Society of Japan, Nagoya University, November 29.

Saito, Mamoru (1982) “Case Marking in Japanese: A Preliminary Study,” ms., MIT.

Saito, Mamoru (1983) “Case and Government in Japanese,” *WCCFL* 2, Proceedings of the Second West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics, CSLI, Stanford, 247-259.

Saito, Mamoru (2013) “Conditions on Japanese Phrase Structure: From Morphology to Pragmatics,” *Nanzan Linguistics* 9, 119-145.

Saito, Mamoru and Duk-Ho An (2010) “A Comparative Syntax of Ellipsis in Japanese and Korean,” *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 61, 287-307.

Saito, Mamoru and Keiko Murasugi (1990) “N’-Deletion in Japanese” *The University of Connecticut Working Paper in Linguistics* III, 87-107.

Saito, Mamoru, T.-H. Jonah Lin, and Keiko Murasugi (2008) “N’-Ellipsis and the Structure of Noun Phrases in Chinese and Japanese,” *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 17, 247-271.

Saito, Mamoru and Tomoko Haraguchi (2012) “Deriving the Cartography of the Japanese Right Periphery: The Case of Sentence-Final Discourse Particles,” *Iberia: An International Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*, 4(2), 104-123.

Saruwatari, Asuka (2015a) “*Ga No* Kahento Tadosei Seiyaku (*Ga/No* Conversion and Transitivity Restriction),” *Theoretical Approach to Natural Language: Research Project at Graduate School of Language and Culture, Osaka University* 2014, 21-30.

Saruwatari, Asuka (2015b) “Daishugokobunniokeru *Ga/No* Kotai: Nagasakihogen karano Kosatsu (*Ga/No* Conversion in Major Subject Construction: Viewpoint of Nagasaki Japanese),” paper presented at the 150th Conference of the Linguistic Society of Japan, Daitobunka University, June 20.

- Saruwatari, Asuka (2015c) “Nominal Pro-forms and Genitive Marker Reduction in Japanese and Korean,” *Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar* 17, 457-470.
- Saruwatari, Asuka (2016a) “Distribution of the Pro-Form ‘One’,” *JELS* 33, 128-134.
- Saruwatari, Asuka (2016b) “Nominative/Genitive Conversion: From the Viewpoint of the Nagasaki Dialect of Japanese,” *Journal of Language and Culture*, 45-61.
- Saruwatari, Asuka (2016c) “Wh-NP Rhetorical Questions in Japanese and Chinese,” *Theoretical Approach to Natural Language: Research Project at Graduate School of Language and Culture, Osaka University 2015*, 21-30.
- Saruwatari, Asuka (2016d) “Genitive Subjects and Copula Sentences in Japanese,” *Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar* 18, 515-534.
- Saruwatari, Asuka (2016e) “Wh-NP (Rhetorical) Questions in Japanese: In Comparison with Korean and Chinese,” poster presented at the 24th Japanese and Korean Linguistics Conference, National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics, October 15.
- Schütze, Carson.T (2001) “Semantically Empty Lexical Heads as Last Resorts,” *Semi-lexical Categories: On the Content of Function Words and the Function of Content Words*, ed. by Corver, Norbert and Henk van Riemsdijk, 127–187, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi (1990) *The Language of Japan*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Sohn, Keun-Won (2004) “Nom-Gen Conversion as a Spurious Phenomenon,” *Hankwuk Cwungang Yenge Yengmwun Hakhoy* (Journal of The English Language and Literature) 46 (4), 183-202.
- Stalnaker, Robert (1978) “Assertion,” *Pragmatics: Syntax and Semantics, Volume 9*.
- Szabolcsi, Anna and Frans Zwarts (1997) “Weak Islands and an Algebraic Semantics for Scope Taking,” *Ways of Scope Taking*, ed. by Anna Szabolcsi, 217–262, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Takahashi, Daiko (2008) “Scope Interaction in DPs with NP-Deletion in Japanese,” *The State of the Art in Linguistic Research: the Interface of Form and Meaning*,

- ed. by Yoshiaki Kaneko, Akira Kikuchi, Daiko Takahashi, Yoshiki Ogawa and Etsuro Shima, 397-407, Kaitakusya, Tokyo.
- Takahashi, Hisako (2010) "Adverbial Clauses and Nominative/Genitive Conversion in Japanese," *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 61, 357-371.
- Takahashi, Masahiko (2011) *Some Theoretical Consequences of Case-Marking in Japanese*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Tanomura, Tadaharu (1990) *Noda no imi to yoho* (Meaning and Usage of *noda*), Izumi Shoin, Osaka.
- Tomioka, Satoshi (2015) "Embedded wa-phrases, predication, and judgment theory," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 33(1), 267–305
- Tsukishima, Hiroshi *et al.* (1982) *Bunposhi* (The Historical Research on Japanese Grammar), Taishukan Shoten, Tokyo.
- Uchibori, Asako (2006) "*Meirei, Kigan, Kantanhyogen no Togokozo o megutte* (On the Syntactic Structure for the Imperative, the Optative, and the Exclamation forms)," *Scientific approaches to language, Kanda University of International Studies* 5, 71-83.
- Uehara, Satoshi (1998) *Syntactic Categories in Japanese*, Kurosio Shuppan, Tokyo.
- Ura, Hiroyuki (1993) "L-Relatedness and Its Parametric Variation," *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 19, 377-399.
- Ura, Hiroyuki (1996) *Multiple Feature Checking: A Theory of Grammatical Function Splitting*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Ura, Hiroyuki (2000) *Checking Theory and Grammatical Functions in Universal Grammar*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Urushibara, Saeko (1993) *Syntactic Categories and Extended Projections in Japanese*, Doctoral dissertation, Brandeis University.
- Vallduví, Eric (1992) *The Informational Component*, Garland, New York.
- Vallduví, Eric (1995) "Structural Properties of Information Packaging in Catalan," *Discourse Configurational Languages*, ed. by Katalin É Kiss, 122-152, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Watanabe, Akira (1996) Nominative-Genitive Conversion and Agreement in

- Japanese: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective, *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 5, 373-410.
- Watanabe, Akira (2006) "Functional Projections of Nominals in Japanese: Syntax of Classifiers," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 24, 241-306.
- Whitman, John (1991) "String Vacuous V to Comp," paper presented at GLOW, Cornell University, March 26.
- Wood, Jim (2008) "So-Inversion as Polarity Focus," *Proceedings of the 38th Western Conference on Linguistics* 19, 304-317.
- Yamadera, Yuki (2010) "Wh Fukashi Kobun 'Naniga Konohonga Omoshiroino' (The Wh-Adjunct Construction "Why do you say that this book is interesting? (It is not.)")" *Nihongo Bunpo* 10(2), 160-176.
- Yoshimura, Noriko (1994) "Ga no Mondai (Issues of Ga), *Henyo-suru gengo bunka kenkyu, University of Shizuoka*, 13-28.
- Yoshimura, Noriko (2007) "Ga No Kotai o Hogentekini Miru (Ga-no conversion: Dialectal perspectives)," *Nihongo no Shubun Gensho: Togokozo to Modariti* (Japanese Main Clause Phenomena: Syntactic Structures and Modality), ed. by Nobuko Hasegawa, 189-223, Hitsuji Syobo, Tokyo.
- Yoshimura, Noriko and Akira Nishina (2004) "The Syntax and Semantics of Japanese Clefts: Evidence from Old Japanese and a Kyushu Dialect" *University of Shizuoka* 7, 55-72.
- Yoo, Hang-Jin (2012) "Different Types of Kes Constructions in Korean," *Studies in Generative Grammar* 22(3), 557-577.
- Yuzawa, Kokichiro (1953) *Kogohoseisetsu* (Detailed Explanations for Colloquial Grammar), Meijishoin, Tokyo.
- Zaenen, Annie (1983) "On Syntactic Binding," *Linguistic Inquiry* 14, 469-504.