Honorification Revisited*

Akira OHTANI** and Shravan VASISHTH***

本稿は、Chomsky 1995 に基づき、主語尊敬、目的語尊敬を中心に、従来の問題や、新たに指摘した現象を、統語構造とその構築を制限する、ミニマリスト理論で説明する。「一致」という概念のもとで統合された、日本語の敬語の分析は、非一致分析よりも説明力が高く、また、印欧語の敬語との比較を可能とし、普遍文法の一部である素性機構の研究資料を提供する。

1 Introduction

Minimalist syntax has as a basic theme the search for an explanation based on an overt/covert distinction in the agreement system of language. An example of a language with overt agreement is Magahi (1).

(1) ham unkaa dekha- -l- -i- -ain
I him(HN) see Pst 1p 3p,HN
'I saw him(hon).' (Verma 1993)

In the minimalist framework, it is assumed that Japanese has covert agreement. However, honorification in Japanese can be regarded as an instance of

*敬語化再考 (Akira OHTANI and Shravan VASISHTH)
**言語文化研究科博士後期課程
***言語文化部研究生

This is a revised version of Ohtani 1995a presented at the Japan Cognitive Science Society, Tokyo Institute of Technology, on July 15. We would like to express our gratitude to Koji Fujita, Taisuke Nishigauchi, Takao Gunji, Hiroshi Mito, Michael T. Wescoat, and Junko Muro. We also express our thanks to two anonymous reviewers for their comments. All the remaining inadequacies and errors, of course, are ours.
The following abbreviations are used in this paper. 1p: first person, 3p: third person, Acc: accusative, Cl: classifier, Dat: dative, Erg: ergative, Fem: feminine, Gen: genitive, HN,hon: honored, Infl: inflection, IntPart: interrogative particle, Masc: masculine, Nom: nominative, Pres: present, Plu: plural, Pst: past, Q: question marker, SC: small clause, Sing: singular, Top: topic.

overt agreement. (2a,b) show subject and object honorification respectively.

(2) a. Sensei-ga hon-o yom-*are*-ta/*o*-yomi-*ni-nat-ta*.
teacher(HN)-Nom book-Acc read-HN-Pst/HN-read-Dat-become-Pst
'The teacher read(hon) the/a book.'

b. Otooto-ga sensei-o *o*-tasuke *si*-ta.
brother-Nom teacher(HN)-Acc HN-assist do-Pst
'My brother assisted(hon) his teacher' (Shibatani 1978)

Note that the overt honorification morphology for (2a) is *rare*/*o-ni-naru*, and for (2b), *o–suru*, contrasting with non-honorific structures like (3).

(3) a. Sensei-ga hon-o yon-da. b. Otooto-ga sensei-o tasuke-ta.

The literature [1] treats (2a,b) as mere honorific parallels to the non-honorifics (3a,b) respectively. However, the minimalist framework requires an account for the difference between (2a,b) and (3a,b). Here, we develop an account for overt honorification morphology from UG principles, thereby contributing to the study of the feature system in minimalism [2] .

2 Honorification as Agreement

2.1 Overt Manifestation of Honorification-feature Checking

Toribio 1990 and Ura 1993 claim that Japanese honorification is an overt manifestation of ϕ-feature agreement. Ura 1993 recasts Toribio's 1990 analysis in the early minimalist framework by stating that subject honorification in Japanese is a reflex of ϕ-feature checking between AgrS and "subject".

Minimalism treats all morphological manifestations in terms of Spec-head relations. Hence, it is reasonable to suppose that Ura's claim that honorification is an overt manifestation of feature checking between an argument (checkee) and a licensing head (checker) applies to other honorific forms as

[1] See Harada 1976, Shibatani 1978, Kuno 1983, for example.
[2] Note that the definitions and stipulations introduced as needed have empirical justification. See the series of papers under the rubric of minimalism.

well, although a close study of object honorifics does not relate to Ura's concerns directly. So, as a point of departure, let us adopt Ura's claim.

2.2 Minimalist Assumptions: Attract and Overpass

In Chomsky 1995, the operation of *attract* is defined as follows:

(4) a. K *attracts* F if F is the *closest* feature that can enter into a checking relation with a sublabel of K.

b. If β c-commands α and τ is the target of raising, then β is *closer* to K than α unless β is in the same minimal domain as τ and α.

All the other definitions that relate to this study can be briefly restated as in (5):

(5) γ cannot overpass β, located in a minimal domain (MD (β)) that is different from the MD (γ), unless γ enters the MD (β) beforehand.

(4) and (5) will be shown to explain several phenomena in Honorifics.

3 Licensing Condition on Subject Honorifics

3.1 Licensing Condition on *RARE* Honorifics

Ohtani 1995b discussed the previously ignored agglutinative character of Japanese as being central to a UG based account, and examined it for various constructions under (6) to account for complex predicate formation.

(6) *Feature-Based Classification of (Abstract) Verb* ($\pm\theta$, $\pm$[ACC],...)
Theta-assigning property is determined intrinsically ($\pm\theta$). Accusative case may be chosen arbitrarily [$\pm$ACC], linking with properties of the lexical entry as the V^0enters the Numeration.

He also claims that the *rare*$_4$ ($-\theta$, [$-$ACC]) carries a language-particular honorification Formal Feature (HN) for derivation purposes and this surfaces as honorific *rare*[3] . We omit a detailed explanation of (6), but refer to the

[3]This is *contra* Hoshi 1994 which, using Zubizarreta's 1985 *Principle of Morphological Nonredundancy*, suggests that *rare*$_4$ is redundant and cannot surface.

syntactic process of *rare* honorifics as in (7) [4] .

(7) *Rare* Honorifics : $rare_4$ ($-\theta$, [$-$ACC], D, HN, ...)
$[_{V^{max}}$ $SUBJ_j$ (D, HN) ... $[_{V^{max}}$ t_j ...(OBJ (D)) t_i]
V_i ([±ACC])$-rare_4$ (D, [$-$ACC], HN)][5]

The nature of the (*rare*) complex predicate is a result of incorporating a main verb into a structurally higher verb, i.e., *rare*. The subject and *rare* in (7) have an HN, just another ϕ-feature, which must be checked off for the checker, i.e., *rare*, since it is not interpretable. The Japanese subject conforms to the EPP and so if it raises directly to [Spec,TP], the non-interpretable feature HN of *rare* remains unchecked. The subject must therefore enter [Spec, *rare*] to check off the D-feature of *rare*, and in this sense, HN gets a free ride on the D-feature with which it forms a pair. Examples of *rare* honorifics' amalgam:

(8) a. Sensei-ga suwar-are-ta. b. Sensei-ga hon-o kak-are-ta.
teacher-Nom sit-HN-Pst teacher-Nom book-Acc write-HN-Pst
'The teacher sat down(hon).' 'The teacher wrote(hon) a book.'

As shown in (8), *rare* honorifics (i) do not show subject selection, as against the *ni*-marked (in)direct passives which strongly require affectee subject, and (ii) are free to dominate both the intransitive verb in (8a) and the transitive verb in (8b), as against the (*ni-yotte*) direct passives which require a transitive verb for accusative Case absorption. Under Ohtani's analysis, (i) and (ii) derive from the capabilities of *rare*, i.e. [$-$ACC] and $-\theta$ respectively.

Ohtani's claim that $rare_4$'s existence is also justified by its having an HN will receive independent motivation if we can show that HN is a ϕ-feature. Additional support for this proposal will be presented in following sections.

[4]According to (6), other *rare* constructions are classified as in (i):

(i)

$rare_1$ ($+\theta$, [+ACC])	$rare_2$ ($+\theta$, [$-$ACC])	$rare_3$ ($-\theta$, [+ACC])
ni-direct passive	(*ni*-) indirect passive	*ni yotte*-direct passive

[5]This incorporation causes the Case Absorption Effect through the head-head checking of [+ACC] in the case of $rare_1$ and $rare_3$.

3.2 Licensing Condition on *O–NI NARU* Honorifics

O–ni naru honorifics dominate both (in)transitive verbal nouns as in (9a, b) and adjectival nouns as in (9c).

(9) a. Sensei-ga o-suwari-ni nat-ta.
teacher-Nom HN-sit-Dat become-Pst
'The teacher sat down(hon).'

b. Sensei-ga hon-o o-kaki-ni nat-ta.
teacher-Nom book-Acc HN-write-Dat become-Pst
'The teacher wrote(hon) a book.'

c. Ôjyo-ga o-utukusiku nat-ta.
Princess-Nom HN-beautiful become-Pst
'The princess became beautiful(hon).'

Now, since (i) *o* obviously functions as an honorific marker and should therefore carry an HN as delineated in our analysis, and (ii) *naru* is a raising predicate as discussed in the literature, it follows that we can simply assume that *o* is a head of a small clause (or some functional category of D or the like) [6] which selects a predicative/adjectival nominal as its complement, and can propose a single syntactic process (10) for the derivation of all the examples in (9).

(10) *O–NARU* Honorifics : *o* (D, HN, ...)
$[V^{max}\ [_{SC}\ SUBJ_j\ [X^{max} t_j\ \ldots t_i\ ]\ X_i\text{-}o_{(D,\ HN)}]\ naru]$

Both the subject and *o* in (10) have an HN and D-feature. The strong D-feature of *o* is especially needed for convergence. That is, in order that overt HN checking take a proper free ride on the D-feature, the D-feature of *o* must be strong. For details of HN checking refer to the discussion of *rare*.

The proposal for HN's checking being licensed at [Spec, *o*] along with the D-feature checking of the subject DP is further supported if we can give independent motivation for this analysis by showing a similar process in operation elsewhere. NP-internal honorifics, discussed below, provide such motivation.

[6] Word order is a potential problem here. Note that word order is determined by morphology (Chomsky 1995) and is therefore assumed to be irrelevant. This point owes a great deal to comments from a reviewer and Takao Gunji.

3.3 Licensing Condition on NP-Internal Honorifics

Although several studies have focussed on subject honorifics in the sentence (VP), little attention has been paid to NP-internal honorifics, as in (11).

(11) a. Sensei-no o-kuruma
teacher-Gen HN-car
'Teacher's car(hon)'

b. Sensei-no o-karada
teacher-Gen HN-body
'Teacher's body(hon)'

Assuming the agreement system spelt out in the previous section provides a simple explanation for honorification in NPs having a structure parallel to that of sentences. However, a contrast exists in NP-internal honorifics that would need to be explained:

(12) a. Watasi-no o-kuruma
I-Gen HN-car
'My car(hon)'

b. * Watasi-no o-karada
I-Gen HN-body
'My body(hon)'

In (12), even though the subject is marked in both examples by *o*, only (12a) is grammatical. We treat this in terms of a difference in honorification licensing. Following Ura (1995), we assume that an inalienable and alienable noun have the structure (13a) and (13b) respectively (head order irrelevant).

(13) a. $[_{D^{max}}\ DP_i\ _{(\theta,Gen,\phi)}\ [_{D'}\ D\ _{(\theta,Gen,\phi)}\ [_{N^{max}}\ t_i\ N_{(\theta)}]]]$

b. $[_{D^{max}}\ DP\ _{(\theta,Gen)}\ [_{D'}\ D\ _{(\theta,Gen)}\ [_{N^{max}}\ N\ \ldots]]]$

The difference between (13a) and (13b) lies not only in the θ–marking ability but in the licensing of genitive Case. The inalienable noun involves feature checking of genitive Case (structural case assignment) of the possessor DP_i by raising to [Spec, DP] from its base-generated position in [Spec, NP] where it is assigned a Possessor role by the inalienable noun. In the alienable noun case, however, inherent case assignment takes place: the alienable possessor DP is base generated at [Spec, DP] and is assigned its Possessor role not by the noun but by the D that has its own θ role. Assuming Ura's analysis means that HN feature checking also occurs with Case checking. In other

words, in (13a), the possessive DP moves to have both its Case feature (and D feature) and HN checked, and an honorific construction is therefore licensed. In (13b), however, the possessive DP does not move at all: its genitive Case is inherent. Accordingly, any ϕ-feature (including HN) present on the possessive DP remains unchecked, and an honorific construction is ruled out. That is, although (11a) and (12a) are honorifics in a broad sense, we do not take them into consideration under our agreement system [7].

The behavior of the event nominal in (14) supports this extension of Ura's analysis.[8] Considering that there is a θ relation between an event nominal *happyo* and its subject *watasi*, the same explanation is applied to (14).

(14) a. Sensei-no go-happyo
teacher-Gen Hon-presentation
'The teacher's presentation (hon)'

b. *Watasi-no go-happyo-o
I-Gen Hon-reading-Acc
'My presentation (hon)'

As in the case of inalienable nouns, whether honorification can be triggered or not is determined according to the argument of *happyo*.

To summarize, we presented a unified agreement-based account of *rare*, *o-ni naru* and NP-internal honorifics. *Rare* honorification is shown to follow from Ohtani's 1995b. *O-ni naru* is accounted for in terms of a small clause analysis. NP-internal honorifics in Japanese are shown to be accountable for by extending Ura's 1995 analysis by treating HN as a ϕ-feature that is checked along with D-feature checking. A parallelism is observed in the structures of noun phrases and sentences. Throughout, HN is shown to take a free ride with the D-feature with which it forms a pair.

[7] The difference between (11a,b) may lie in the correspondence between politeness and honorification.

[8] The difference between simple nominal and event/inalienable is observed in the licensing of binding conditions, floated quantifiers, secondary predication and so on. See Kikuchi 1994 for a detailed discussion.

4 Licensing Condition on Object Honorifics

4.1 Licensing Condition on *0-SURU* Honorifics

As Watanabe 1993 suggested under the Agr-Based Case theory, (15) shows that the object in a transitive clause may not overpass the base-position of a subject associated with a floated quantifier before Spell Out.

(15)*Gakusei-ga sake-o san-nin non-da
student-Nom sake-Acc three Cl drink-Pst
'Three students drank sake.'

However, as in (16), overt object shift is allowed in *o–suru* object honorifics.

(16) (?)Gakusei-ga Yamada sensei-o san-nin o-tasuke-si-ta
student-Nom Yamada teacher-Acc three Cl HN-help-do-Pst
'Three students helped Mr. Yamada.'

This can be also found in the object of a control complement clause, if we assume PRO can launch a floated quantifier as shown below:

(17) Gakusei-ga$_i$ [$_{V^{max}}$[$_{\nu^{max}}$ sake-o [$_{\nu^{max}}$PRO san-nin
student-Nom sake-Acc three CL
[$_{V^{max}}$ t_i nomi]]] -oe]-ta.
drink -finish-Pst
'Three students finished drinking sake.'

As we claimed in the previous section, if both *o* and, in turn, the object in (16) have HN, and D-feature which leads the optional object shift observed not only in (16) but also in (17), then we have a natural explanation of the mechanism of object honorifics as in (18), without introducing a new device.

(18) *O–SURU* Honorifics : *o* (D, HN, ...)
[V^{max} SUBJ$_i$ [$_{SC}$ OBJ$_j$ (D, HN) [V^{max}PRO$_i$ t_j ...t_k] V_k -*o*(D, HN)] *suru*]

We assume that the D-feature (or the feature relevant to object's feature checking) of the head, i.e. ν in transitive clause, is weak and it does not tolerate overt object shift, as in (15), but that though the feature of the object feature-checking is weak, the feature in control complement clause optionally

undergoes object shift, since the head tolerates a violation of Procrastinate, following Ura 1995's *violability of Procrastinate*. Thus, we now propose that the similarity between (16) and (17) in terms of the possibility of optional object shift should be accounted for by assuming that o in the former and v in the latter in the VP shell of the predicate embedded by a control predicate tolerates a violation of Procrastinate.

4.2 Locality of Honorific Licensing

In ditransitives, the indirect honorific object, not the direct honorific object, is licensed, but the literature has no natural explanation for this.

(19) a. Watasi-wa Yamada sensei-ni otooto-o go-syookai si-ta.
I-Top teacher-Dat brother-Acc HN-introduce do-Pst
'I introduced(hon) my younger brother to Prof. Yamada.'

b.*Watasi-wa otooto-ni Yamada sensei-o go-syookai si-ta.
I-Top brother-Dat teacher-Acc HN-introduce do-Pst
'I introduced(hon) Prof. Yamada to my younger brother.'

If (19) were explained by word order in S-structure as by Toribio 1990, then the pair in (20), which applies overt object shift, would be inexplicable.

(20) a. Watasi-wa otooto-o Yamada sensei-ni go-syookai si-ta.
I-Top brother-Acc teacher-Dat HN-introduce do-Pst
'I introduced(hon) my younger brother to Prof. Yamada.'

b.*Watasi-wa Yamada sensei-o otooto-ni go-syookai si-ta.
I-Top teacher-Acc brother-Dat HN-introduce do-Pst
'I introduced(hon) Prof. Yamada to my younger brother.'

However, our analysis presented here provides an explanation for these honorification asymmetries, without other stipulations.

The crucial points of derivations for (19a) and (19b) are listed below:

(21) a. [V^{max}SUBJ$_i$ [$_{SC}$[V^{max}PRO$_i$ [$_{V^{max}}$IO [$_{V^{max}}$DO V1] V2] V3] $o_{(D,\ HN)}$] suru] (structure after Spell Out of (19))

b. $[V^{max}\text{SUBJ}_i\ [SC\text{IO}_j\ (\text{D, HN})\ [V^{max}t_j\ [V^{max}\text{PRO}_i\ [V^{max}\text{DO}_k\ (\text{D})\ [V^{max}t_j$
$[V^{max}t_k$ V1] V2] V3] $o_{(\text{D, HN})}$] suru] (19a)

c.* $[V^{max}\text{SUBJ}_i\ [SC\text{DO}_k\ (\text{D, HN})\ [V^{max}\text{IO}_j\ (\text{D})\ [V^{max}\text{PRO}_i\ [V^{max}t_k\ [V^{max}t_j$
$[V^{max}t_k$ V1] V2] V3] $o_{(\text{D, HN})}$] suru] (19b)

As is evident from (19) and (20), word order is irrelevant for honorific licensing. With feature movement being the movement occurring at LF, if, as we have been arguing, HN has a strong tendency to be a free rider, and if the feature taking the HN as a free rider is present in either the DO or the IO (considered here to be the feature D), the IO will always be closer to the checkee at LF. Although this was not discussed in the section dealing with NP-internal honorifics, this analysis resolves a similar problem in NP-internal honorifics that would occur in the case where genitive Case is checked off at LF.

Our analysis also predicts the grammaticality of (22).

(22) a.*Watasi-wa otooto-kara hon-o o-kari si-ta.
I-Top brother-from book-Acc HN-borrow do-Pst
'I borrowed a book from my brother.'

b. Watasi-wa sensei-kara hon-o o-kari si-ta.
I-Top teacher-from book-Acc HN-borrow do-Pst
'I borrowed a book from my brother.'

There is substantial motivation for analyzing PPs that occur within VPs as behaving like DPs (NPs)[9] . Although not discussed here, if PPs in verbs are θ marked in the same way as NPs are, and if feature checking proceeds as in NPs, then PP-in-VP constructions can also be explained in just the same manner as the ditransitive constructions, as discussed before.

To conclude, in subject honorification, object honorification too is amenable to a unified analysis in terms of agreement. Next, we turn to corroboratory cross-linguistic evidence for the agreement analysis of honorification.

[9]For example, in Takezawa 1994, floating quantifiers, binding, secondary predicate are mentioned in this context. Moreover, PPs are also regarded as case-marked.

5 Crosslinguistic variation with Honorific-licensing

5.1 Agreement and Honorification in Hindi-Urdu

Verb agreement in Hindi-Urdu is subject to the following constraints: the verb agrees with the highest available nominative-case marked nominal (subject or (direct) object), and if all the nominals are non-nominative, then the verb receives a default masculine, third person, singular suffix.

5.1.1 Subject Agreement in Hindi-Urdu

In Hindi-Urdu the object has accusative case marking when it is animate/human and therefore will never agree with the verb:

(23) *Tom-ne Mary dekhii
-Erg see-Pst,Fem
'***'

b. Tom-ne Mary-ko dekhaa
-Erg -Acc see-Pst,Masc
'Tom saw Mary.'

Following our assumption that the feature HN is a member of the set of ϕ-features, and given the above fact about the Hindi-Urdu human object, our prediction would be that object honorification is not overtly manifested on the verb in Hindi-Urdu. Indeed, Hindi-Urdu allows only subject honorification:

(24) a. **guru-jii** skuul jaa-**tee** th-**ee**
teacher-HN school go-Masc,Sing,HN be-Pst,Masc,Sing,HN
'(The) teacher(hon) used to go to school.'

b. mɛ guru-jii-ko mil-**aa** th-**aa**
I-Nom teacher-HN-Acc meet-1p,Sing,Masc be-Pst,1p,Masc,Sing
'I met the teacher(hon).'

5.1.2 The Plurality morph as an honorification marker

Plurality marking on the verb to indicate honorification exists in many languages[10]. Some examples are given below from Slovenian and Russian.

[10] See Brown and Levinson 1987 for a list mentioning more than 14 languages in which this phenomenon is attested.

In Slovenian (25a), any noun referring to a person could take plural agreement. In 19th century Russian (25b), a plural predicate noun was used for singular reference (examples from Barlow et al. 1988).

(25) a. oče so šli
father be-Plu gone-Plu
'Father(hon) went.'

b. izmenniki vy , čto li
traitor-Plu you that IntPart
'Are you(hon) a traitor, then?'

In Hindi-Urdu too, the plural marking on the verb (e.g., *-tee*) marks honorification (see 24a). Since a ϕ-feature like 'plural' can serve a second purpose of honorification, we have further motivation for treating HN as a ϕ-feature.

5.1.3 Passives and honorification

In Sanskrit, a passive construction is used in much the same way as Japanese to indicate honorification. Compare the constructions in (26).

(26) a. kor *are* masu ka?
come passive Pres Q
'Will you(hon) come?'

b. aagam *ya* taam
come passive 3p,Sing
'Please come in.' (Verma 1993)

The connection between passive morphs and honorification is thus not limited to Japanese but is present in other languages as well (see Verma 1993 for other examples). Further, the structure of Sanskrit could be accounted for along the same lines as our analysis for *rare* in Japanese, lending further credibility to our analysis by virtue of its generality of application.

5.2 Agreement and Honorification in Magahi

The agreement-honorification interaction in Magahi is complex but entirely predictable, given our analysis in this study. As the examples (27) show (cf. Verma 1993), HN is a component of ϕ-feature agreement.

(27) a. uu okraa/unkaa dekha- -l- -thin
He-HN him-non-HN/HN see Pst 3p,HN
'He (hon) saw him (non-hon/hon).'

b. uu unkaa dekha- -l- -kain
He-non-HN him-HN see Pst 3p.Hn
'He (non-hon) saw him (hon).'

c. ham unkaa dekha- -l- -i- -ain
I him-HN see Pst 1p 3p.HN
'I saw him (hon).'

Magahi parallels Japanese in permitting only indirect object honorification:

(28) ham unkaa paisaa de- -l- -i- -ain
I him-HN money give Pst 1p 3p.HN
'I gave him (hon) money.' (Verma 1993)

As in Japanese (Section 4.2), the explanation for this rests on our assumption that HN checking of the indirect object occurs when it shifts at LF, resulting in the IO-DO word order. This fact from Magahi provides independent support for our explanation regarding Japanese IO/DO asymmetry.

In this section, evidence was presented that supports our claim that the HN feature behaves like a ϕ-feature. Furthermore, IO-honorification in Magahi is shown to behave in a manner parallel to Japanese.

6 Concluding Remarks

We have tried to provide an empirical basis for our claim that honorification is a component of agreement, and have detailed the mechanisms of agreement in the particularly problematic area of Japanese subject and object honorification, providing additional support for our analysis by accounting for the grammaticality constraints on honorification in the case of inalienable and alienable Noun Phrases and by presenting diverse crosslinguistic phenomena that are uniformly accountable in terms of our analysis.

References

Barlow, M. and Ferguson, C.A. (eds.). 1988. *Agreement in natural language: Approaches, theories, descriptions* CSLI.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S.C. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* CUP.

Chomsky, N. 1995. *Categories and transformations.* Ms., MIT.

Harada, S.-I. 1976. "Honorifics." in M. Shibatani ed. *Syntax and semantics 5: Japanese generative grammar.* Academic Press.

Hoshi, H. 1994. *Passive, causative, and light verbs: A study on theta role assignment.* Doctoral dissertation, UConn.

Kikuchi, A. 1994. "Extraction from NP in Japanese." in M. Nakamura ed.

Kuno, S. 1983. *Sin nihon bunpoo kenkyuu.* Taisyuukan Syoten.

Nakamura, M. 1994. *Current topics in English and Japanese.* Hituzi Syobo.

Ohtani, A. 1995a. "Honorification as Agreement." *JCSS* 12.

Ohtani, A. 1995b. *Suru constructions as complex predicate formation.* Ms., Osaka University.

Shibatani, M. 1978. *Nihongo no bunpoo.* Taisyuukan Syoten.

Takezawa, K. 1994. "Movement and the roles of case and agr in Japanese nominalization constructions." in M. Nakamura ed.

Toribio, A.-Y. 1990. "Specifier-head agreement in Japanese." *WCCFL* 9.

Ura, H. 1993. "L-Relatedness and its parametric variation." *MITWPL* 19.

Ura, H. 1996. To appear. *A Theory of grammatical function splitting.* Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Verma, M. 1993. "Linguistic strategies of politeness in Bhojpuri." *SALR* 3.

Watanabe, A. 1993. *Agr-based Case theory and its interaction with the A-bar system.* Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Zubizarreta, M. L. 1985. "The relation between morphophonology and morphosyntax: the case of Romance causatives." *LI* 16.