UC Berkeley

Dissertations, Department of Linguistics

Title

A Constructional Approach to Japanese Internally Headed Relativization

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1d82f0c3>

Author

Ohara, Kyoko

Publication Date

1996

A Constructional Approach to Japanese Internally Headed Relativization

by

Kyoko Hirose Ohara

B.L.A. (University of Tokyo) 1985

M.A. (University of California, Berkeley) 1991

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Linguistics

in the

GRADUATE DIVISION

of the

UNIVERSITY of CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Committee in charge:

Professor Charles J. Fillmore, Chair

Professor Paul Kay

Professor Eve Sweetser

Professor Yoko Hasegawa

1996

The dissertation of Kyoko Hirose Ohara is approved:

Charles J. Fillmore 12 March 96
Chair Date

Paul Kay March 19, 1996
Date

Eve E. Sweetser 12 Mar '96
Date

Kyoko Ohara 18 March 96
Date

University of California, Berkeley

1996

A Constructional Approach to Japanese Internally Headed Relativization

Copyright © 1996

by

Kyoko Hirose Ohara

To my ancestor, a scholar, and an educator

Tansoh Hirose (1782-1856)

Table of Contents

Lists of Texts and Abbreviations	vii
Acknowledgements	ix
1. Introduction	1
1.1 The internally headed relativization (IHR) construction	1
1.2 Salient properties of the Japanese IHR construction	6
1.2.1 Restricted external marking	6
1.2.2 The target of relativization	9
1.2.3 IHR as a bi-clausal construction	11
1.3 The focus of analysis	12
1.4 Objectives of the thesis	14
1.5 Preliminaries: Are IHRCs really internally headed?	16
1.6 Theoretical framework	22
1.7 Organization of the thesis	23
2. Comparison with IHRCs in other languages	25
2.1 Introduction	25
2.2 Commonly accepted properties of IHRCs	26
2.2.1 Nominalization	29
2.2.2 Target identification	29
2.2.3 Relation to complementation	30
2.2.4 Relation of S1 to the larger construction	30
2.3 Japanese IHRCs	31
2.3.1 Nominalization	32

2.3.2 Target identification	34
2.3.3 Relation to complementation	38
2.3.4 Relation of S1 to the larger construction	41
2.4 Conclusion	43
3. Previous accounts of Japanese IHRCs	45
3.1 Introduction	45
3.2 Kuroda 1974-77	46
3.3 Relativization analyses	52
3.3.1 Movement analyses	52
3.3.2 Non-movement analyses	54
3.4 Adverbial analyses	58
3.5 Conclusion	64
4. Form-meaning-use correlations of the IHR construction	66
4.1 Introduction	66
4.2 Pragmatically motivated morphosyntax of IHRCs	69
4.2.1 The morphosyntax of IHRCs	70
4.2.2 The event-reporting pragmatic function of IHRCs	74
4.3 IHR as a clause-linking narrative-advancing construction	80
4.4 Narrative-advancing constructions in Japanese and English	82
4.4.1 The English continuative relative construction	82
4.4.2 Comparison	83
4.5 Conclusion	86
5. From relativization to clause-linkage	88
5.1 Introduction	88
5.2 The concessive clause-linking construction	90

5.3 IHR <i>vs.</i> concessive clause-linkage	97
5.3.1 Structural comparison	97
5.3.2 Semantic comparison	99
5.3.3 Pragmatic comparison	102
5.4 From relativization to clause-linkage	103
5.4.1 The reanalysis hypothesis	103
5.4.2 Arguments for the reanalysis hypothesis	104
5.4.3 Similar changes and constructions	109
5.5 Conclusion	112
6. Conclusion	114
6.1 Structural underdetermination	116
6.2 On the semantic relation of ENABLEMENT	118
6.3 Toward a semantic typology of IHRCs	121
Bibliography	123

Lists of Texts and Abbreviations

LIST OF TEXTS

The label 'Asahi Newspaper' in square brackets following many of the examples shows that the sentence is taken from the newspaper. The name in square brackets indicates the author of the text from which the sentence is taken. Some sentences have been slightly modified to clarify the point under discussion.

Asahi Newspaper

Taken from articles in the Asahi Newspaper.

Miyao, Tomiko.

Kyara no kaori (The scent of yew). 1981. Tokyo: Chuo Koron.

Kureopatora (Cleopatra). Currently appearing in serial form in the Sunday Edition of the Asahi Newspaper.

Mukoda, Kuniko.

A un (A pair of stone lions). 1981. Tokyo: Bungei Shunju.

Onna no hitosasi yubi (A woman's finger). 1982. Tokyo: Bungei Shunju.

Murakami, Haruki.

Sekai no owari to haado boirudo wandaarando (Hard-boiled wonderland and the end of the world). 1985. Tokyo: Shinchosha Ltd.

Seiko, Tanabe.

Uba tokimeki (The beating of Grandma's heart). 1984. Tokyo: Shinchosha Ltd.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ABL	ablative	IND	indicative
ACC	accusative	INSTR	instrumental
ADV	adverbial	LOC	locative
ALL	allative	NEG	negative
ASP	aspect	NMLZ	nominalizer
CAUS	causative	NOM	nominative
CL	classifier	NPAST	nonpast
CMPL	complementizer	PASS	passive
COM	comitative	PAST	past
CONJ	conjunction	POLITE	polite form
COP	copula	PRON	pronominal
DEM	demonstrative	Q	interrogative
GEN	genitive	SFP	sentence final particle
HON	honorific	TOP	topic

Acknowledgements

I would like first of all to thank the members of my dissertation committee: Charles J. Fillmore, Paul Kay, Eve Sweetser, and Yoko Hasegawa. Charles J. Fillmore gave me intellectual and moral support from my first day at Berkeley. I am indebted to him for guiding me this far. It was an honor to have been able to study with such a great grammarian. Paul Kay's thought-provoking comments and questions always reminded me not to drown in the sea of Japanese data. Eve Sweetser read all my papers and gave me insightful comments on each of them, helping me uncover what was valuable in my ideas. I always walked out of her office feeling revived and encouraged. Yoko Hasegawa was there whenever I needed her, as a friend, as a graduate student instructor, and later as a professor. She was always willing to spend time listening to me and discussing ideas, giving me friendly criticism and invaluable suggestions.

This dissertation was essentially born out of my participation in the intense summer sessions on the NTT clause-linking project headed by Charles J. Fillmore. I will never forget the many hours spent huddled with other Japanologists around a computer screen, analyzing sentences from Japanese science textbooks.

I also benefited in countless ways from the Japanese Linguistics Seminar at the University of California, Berkeley. Among past and present members, I would especially like to thank Charles J. Fillmore, Seiko Yamaguchi Fujii, Yoko Hasegawa, Derek Herforth, Yukio Hirose, Katsuya

Kinjo, Eric Long, Kojiro Nabeshima, Minoru Nakau, Toshio Ohori, Paula Rogers, Meryl Siegal, Takashi Sugimoto, Nigel Ward, Natasha Warner, and Tomoko Yamashita.

I received intellectual inspiration and moral encouragement from Yoon-Suk Chung, Hana Filip, Mirjam Fried, Orin Gensler, Sara Gesuato, Adele Goldberg, Kaoru Horie, Chris Johnson, Katsuya Kinjo, George Lakoff, Jim Matisoff, Yoshiko Matsumoto, Sam Mchombo, Laura Michaelis, John Ohala, Shigeko Okamoto, Jeang-Woon Park, and Lionel Wee. Julia Elliott deserves special thanks for generously reading and proofreading my papers at a moment's notice. My heartfelt thanks also go to Dan Slobin for encouraging me to continue working on contrastive analysis of Japanese and English and to Karl Zimmer for teaching me the fun of working on relative clauses.

I am greatly indebted to IBM Japan, Ltd. for selecting me as their Overseas Graduate Student, for agreeing to let me stay for my Ph.D. studies, and for supporting me financially for five years. Research assistantships through grants from Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation and financial support from the University of California, Berkeley and the Department of Linguistics were also invaluable.

I owe special thanks to my parents and my brothers for their unwavering faith in me. Their letters, phone calls, and care packages as well as their e-mail and faxes from thousands of miles away kept me going. I especially want to thank my parents for encouraging their daughter to pursue whatever career she wished. Thanks also to my two grandmothers, who missed me during my stay in the States. I am grateful to my parents-in-law and my sister-in-law for all their support and understanding.

And finally, I would like to thank my husband Mori – for believing in me, challenging me, cheering both of us up while we were finishing our dissertations, and making it always so nice to come home.

1. Introduction

1.1 The internally headed relativization (IHR) construction

This thesis analyzes the internally headed relativization (IHR) construction in Modern Japanese in comparison with other constructions related to it either formally or semantically. Japanese sentences such as (1) and (2) have structures that suggest literal translations in (1a) and (2a) respectively, but in fact have the meanings shown in (1b) and (2b):

- (1) [[ringo ga teeburu no ue ni atta]₃₁ no] o midori wa
apple NOM table GEN top LOC existed NMLZ ACC Midori TOP
totta.
took
a. 'Midori picked up [that there was an apple on the table].'
b. 'There was an apple on the table, and Midori picked (it) up.'
- (2) [[ringo ga teeburu no ue ni atta]₃₁ no] ga otita.
NMLZ NOM fell
a. '[That there was an apple on the table] fell.'
b. 'There was an apple on the table, and (it) fell.'

The morpheme *no*, which follows S1 in the sentences above, can be used as a sentence nominalizer, hence the pseudo-translations in (1a) and (2a).¹ The

¹ In Japanese, which is a strict verb-final language, the predicate of the 'subordinate' clause, whether the clause is embedded or not, precedes the 'main' predicate. Throughout this thesis I

direct object argument referent of the main predicate in (1) must be an entity and not a proposition. The same is true for the subject argument referent in (2). Hence, the meanings shown in (1b) and (2b).

NP coreferentiality obtains between the two clauses in the sentences above. The coreferenced NP *ringo* 'apple' is shown in bold type. Also, the case marking on the nominalized clause (i.e. S1 plus *no*) coincides with the one required by the main predicate for the role of the coreferenced NP: In (1) the case marker is the accusative *o* and in (2) it is the nominative *ga*, as indicated by underlinings.

These two properties, namely, NP coreferentiality between the two clauses and the 'case-matching' phenomenon between the actual case-marking on the nominalized S1 and the one required by the main predicate for the role of the coreferenced NP, have led researchers to characterize these types of sentences as involving internally headed relative clauses (IHRCs) (Kuroda 1992 (1974-77), Itô 1986, inter alia). In this thesis, I will refer to these as 'IHR sentences' and 'IHRCs', in keeping with the convention in the literature.² The IHRC is typically defined as a nominalized clause pertaining to a target NP which occurs inside the clause. It is commonly recognized as one type of relative clause and is attested in a number of languages (Andrews 1985 (1975), Keenan 1985, Lehmann 1984). The term 'IHRC' can mean

will call the 'subordinate' clause S1 and the 'main' clause S2, based on the order of the predicates.

² Some Japanese grammarians call IHR sentences in Japanese *ringo-bun* 'apple sentences', since Kuroda's seminal work on the IHR construction uses sentences about *ringo* 'apple' as examples (Kuroda 1992 (1974-77)). This is similar to the situation of *donkey* sentences (e.g. *If a man owns a donkey, he always beats it; Every man who owns a donkey beats it.*) (cf. Heim 1982, Nishigauchi 1990).

different things in different languages, as we will see in Chapter 2. Unless otherwise noted, IHR and IHRC refer to those in Japanese.

As is well-known, Japanese also has externally headed relative clauses (EHRCs) and much study has been done on them (Kuno 1973, Yoshiko Matsumoto 1988, McCawley 1976). Since the seminal work by Kuroda (1992 (1974-1977)) (cf. Mikami 1972 (1959)), the amount of literature on IHRCs has also been growing steadily, especially in recent years (e.g. Hoshi 1994, Ishii 1988, Itô 1986). An important research question concerning the IHR construction is how to characterize the relation between EHRCs and IHRCs. The schematic representations of EHRCs and IHRCs are given:

(3)

a. Externally headed
relative clause (EHRC)

b. Internally headed
relative clause (IHRC)

At first glance, the two structures seem parallel to each other. They are, however, crucially different from each other in two respects: (i) in whether or not the target of relativization appears inside S1 and (ii) in what kind of constituent can follow S1. With EHRCs, as shown in (3a), the target of relativization and its case marker are phonetically missing inside S1. On the

other hand, inside IHRCs, as shown in (3b), the target is present. Second, in EHRCs, the head noun N_i follows S1. In contrast, it is the nominalizer *no* that always follows an IHRC.

Example (4a) gives the structural description of EHR sentences.¹ The crossed out $NP_i\text{-case}_x$ represents the phonetically missing target of relativization and its case marker, or a 'gap', in the relative clause. The head noun N_i is coindexed with the target of relativization. Case_y , which is attached to the complex NP as a whole, indicates the role of the complex NP in the main clause S2.

(4) EHR (externally headed relativization) sentences

- a. [... [[... ~~$NP_i\text{-case}_x$~~ ... V1]_{S1} N_i] case_y ... V2]_{S2}

~~$NP_i\text{-case}_x$~~ : the target of relativization (a gap)
 case_x : a case marker
V1: the predicate of the EHRC
S1: the EHRC
 N_i : the head noun
 case_y : a case marker
V2: the main predicate
S2: the main clause

- b. [[~~ringo-ga~~ teeburu no ue ni atta]_{S1} ringo]_i o
apple NOM table GEN top LOC existed ACC
midori wa totta.
Midori TOP took
'Midori picked up the apple that was on the table.'

¹ Here, what I mean by 'EHR sentence' is a sentence which contains an EHRC. It is not a natural category of sentence, unlike 'IHR sentence' (Section 1.2.3). Throughout this thesis I will have occasion to contrast sentences containing EHRCs and sentences containing IHRCs. 'EHR sentences' will be used to refer to the former, in order to keep the term parallel to 'IHR sentences', which refers to the latter. I will also assume that EHR sentences are instances of the EHR construction.

The structural description of IHR sentences is given in (5a). NP_i - $case_x$ is phonetically present in S1; NP_i represents the target and $case_x$ is appropriate for the role of NP_i within S1. Strictly speaking, the term 'target' is generally used to refer to the role of NP_i in S1, i.e. the 'internal syntax' of NP_i . Throughout this thesis, however, I will refer to NP_i , which is coreferenced by S1 and S2, as the 'target NP'. $case_y$ after the nominalizer indicates the role of NP_i in S2.

(5) IHR (internally headed relativization) sentences

- a. $[... [[... NP_i case_x ... V1]_{S1} no] case_y ... V2]_{S2}$

NP_i : the target of relativization
 $case_x$: a case marker
 $V1$: the predicate of the IHRC
 $S1$: the IHRC
 no : nominalizer (NMLZ)
 $case_y$: a case marker
 $V2$: the main predicate
 $S2$: the main clause

- b. = (1)

$[[ringo\ ga\ teeburu\ no\ ue\ ni\ atta]_{S1}\ no]\ o$
 apple NOM table GEN top LOC existed NMLZ ACC
 midori wa totta.
 TOP took

'There was an apple on the table, and Midori picked (it) up.' not
 'Midori picked up that there was an apple on the table.'

I will have occasion to mention 'external syntax of S1'. In the case of EHRCs, this refers to the syntactic role that the sequence S1 plus the head noun N_i plays within the larger sentence. In the case of IHRCs, it refers to the syntactic role of the sequence S1 plus no . Also, I will refer to the sequence S1

plus *no* in IHR sentences as ‘the (*no*-)nominalized clause’. Throughout this thesis, ‘the external marking on S1’ refers to *case_y*, shown in (4a) and (5a).

The reader may have noticed that the EHR sentence (4b) and the IHR sentence (5b) are translated differently into English. As will be discussed in Section 1.3, EHR and IHR sentences are typically used under different pragmatic circumstances. I have purposely avoided using ordinary restrictive relative clauses for the translations of the IHR sentences (1b), (2b), and (5b) above in order to reflect this fact.

1.2 Salient properties of the Japanese IHR construction

Although IHR sentences exhibit both the ‘case-matching’ phenomenon and NP coreferentiality between the two clauses, they also possess properties which are peculiar with respect to what we know about relativization.

1.2.1 Restricted external marking

The IHRC, or to be more precise, the *no*-nominalized IHRC, is restricted in its external marking. It is typically marked by either the nominative *ga* or the accusative *o*, as in (6a) and (6b). *No*-nominalized clauses marked with the dative (6c) or the instrumental (6e) are not usually construed as IHRCs, although IHRCs externally marked with the allative (6d), the ablative (6f), or the comitative (6g) are possible:

- (6) a. Nominative
 [[ookami ga ori kara tooboo sita] no] ga
 wolf NOM cage ABL ran.away NMLZ NOM

niwatori o osotta.
hen ACC attacked

'The wolf ran away from the cage, and (it) attacked the hen.'

b. Accusative

[[taroo ga hasittekita] no] o hanako wa tukamaeta.
Taro NOM came.running NMLZ ACC Hanako TOP caught

'Taro came running, and Hanako caught (him).'

c. Dative

*[[hanako ga kekkonsita] no] ni midori wa kabin o
NOM married NMLZ DAT Midori TOP vase ACC

ageta.
gave

Intended: 'Hanako got married, and Midori gave a vase to (her).'

d. Allative

[[mi o irete yuusaku ga tazuneru] no] e
body ACC put NOM ask NMLZ ALL

mitugu wa odayakani hanasita.
TOP calmly spoke

'Yusaku earnestly asked, and Mitsugu spoke calmly to (him).'

[Miyao, Tomiko]

e. Instrumental

*[[pen ga ohuisu ni atta] no] de taroo wa atena
pen NOM office LOC existed NMLZ INSTR Taro TOP address

o kaita.
ACC wrote

Intended: 'A pen was in the office, and Taro wrote the address with (it).'

f. Ablative

zimukan wa [[syorui ga mada dekiteinai] no] kara
secretary TOP papers NOM yet complete-ASP-NEG NMLZ ABL

katazukeyoo to sita.
tried.to.finish

'The paperwork was not done yet, and the secretary decided to finish (it) first.'

(Mihara 1994a:86, (17a))

g. Comitative

[[tomodati ga amerika kara nihon ni itizi kikoku siteita]
friend NOM America ABL Japan LOC was.on.a.home.leave

no] to zyuu-nen buri ni saikaisita.
NMLZ COM after.10-years.of.absence saw.again

'A friend of mine was in Japan on a home leave from America,
and I saw (him) after 10 years of absence.'

This kind of limited external marking is peculiar in light of commonly held views of relativization. Comrie (1989:153) notes that the role of the head noun in the main clause makes little or no difference to the possibility of forming relative clauses. The accessibility hierarchy proposed by Keenan and Comrie (1977) characterizes accessibility of a NP to relativization. Their analysis pertains to the role of the target within the relative clause, but what we are concerned with here is the role of the whole NP within the main clause. Hirose and Ohori (1992) suggest that the reason why *no*-nominalized clauses marked with the dative *ni* and the instrumental *de* are not usually construed as IHRCs has to do with the fact that there exist clausal conjunctions *noni* 'although' and *node* 'because', which look just like the nominalizer plus the dative and the nominalizer plus the instrumental respectively. The clausal conjunctions *noni* and *node* occur between two clauses. Note that S2 in (7b) explicitly contains a pronoun marked with the instrumental *de*.

- (7) a. Concessive clausal-conjunction *noni* 'although' cf. (6c)
 [hanako ga kekkonsita] noni, midori wa o-iwai o
 NOM married although TOP gift ACC
 agenakatta.
 give-NEG-PAST
 'Although Hanako got married, Midori did not give a wedding gift.'
- b. Causal clausal-conjunction *node* 'because' cf. (6e)
 [pen ga ohuisu ni atta] node, taroo wa sore de
 pen NOM office LOC existed because TOP that INSTR
 gaaru hurendo ni tegami o kaita.
 girlfriend DAT letter ACC wrote
 'Because there was a pen in the office, Taro wrote a letter to his girlfriend with that.'

1.2.2 The target of relativization

EHRCs in Japanese are used not only restrictively (i.e. to help identify the head noun referent) but also non-restrictively (i.e. to add a piece of parenthetical information about the head noun referent):

- (8) a. EHRC - Restrictive
 [[taihei yoo ni sundeiru] kuzira] wa ooki.
 Pacific Ocean LOC live-ASP whale TOP large
 'Whales that live in the Pacific Ocean are large.'
- b. EHRC - Non-restrictive
 [[honyuurui dearu] kuzira] wa sakana to wa kotonaru.
 mammal COP whale TOP fish COM TOP different
 'Whales, which are mammals, are different from fish.'

Thus, the target of relativization of EHRCs can be a proper noun (9a). IHRCs also allow proper-noun targets (9b), although the typical function of IHRCs is

neither restrictive nor non-restrictive in the usual sense, as will be discussed in the next section (cf. also Chapter 4).

(9) a. EHRC

[[hurimukikakeru] senkiti] o, tami ga karada de
about.to.turn.back-NPAST Senkichi ACC Tami NOM body INSTR

tometa.
stopped

'Tami stopped Senkichi, who was about to turn back, with her body.'

b. IHRC

[[senkiti ga hurimukikakeru] no] o tami ga
NOM about.to.turn.back-NPAST NMLZ ACC NOM

karada de tometa.
body INSTR stopped

'Senkichi was about to turn back, and Tami stopped (him) with her body.'

[Mukoda, Kuniko]

Furthermore, IHR sentences differ from EHR sentences in allowing multiple-targets (Kuroda 1992 (1974-77)). In the following sentence, for example, the subject *Jiro* and the direct object *Saburo* of S1 are both taken as the direct object of V2:

(10) [[ziroo ga saburoo o onbu siyoo to siteiru] no] o
Jiro NOM Saburo ACC try.to.carry.on.one's.back-ASP-NPAST NMLZ ACC

taroo wa hutari-tomo okizarinisita.
Taro TOP two-people-both left.behind

'Jiro was trying to carry Saburo on his back, and Taro left both of them behind.'

The multiple-target phenomenon appears to be unique to Japanese IHRCs (cf. Chapter 2).

1.2.3 IHR as a bi-clausal construction

An IHRC plus the nominalizer, unlike an EHRC plus a head noun, cannot be used in isolation as a simple referring expression. Just as one can refer to a person using a lexical noun as in (11b), one can equally well use an EHRC followed by a lexical head for the same function, as in (11c). An IHRC followed by the nominalizer *no*, in contrast, cannot be used alone as a referring expression as shown in (11d). This illustrates that *no*-nominalized IHRC can only be used in combination with another clause and that the IHR construction is a bi-clausal construction.

- (11) a. Q: dare ga kawa ni otimasitaka?
 who NOM river LOC fall.off-POLITE-PAST-Q
 ‘Who fell into the river?’
- b. Lexical noun
 A: keekan.
 policeman
 ‘A policeman’
- c. EHRC + lexical head
 A: [[doroboo o oikaketeita] keekan].
 thief ACC chase-ASP-PAST policeman
 ‘The policeman who was pursuing a thief.’
- d. IHRC + nominalizer
 A: *[[keekan ga doroboo o oikaketeita] no].
 policeman NOM thief ACC chase-ASP-PAST NMLZ
 Intended: ‘The policeman who was pursuing a thief.’

1.3 The focus of analysis

Kuroda assumes that the IHR construction is typically used under pragmatic circumstances different from those under which the EHR construction is used. He argues that the notion of RELEVANCE characterizes the situations described in the two clauses in the IHR construction (cf. Chapter 3).² Semantics and pragmatics of the IHR construction, however, have not been fully revealed in previous analyses.

In this thesis, I will focus on a common use of the IHR construction which has been studied extensively in previous accounts. The IHR construction in this typical usage, I argue, involves a temporal sequence relationship between two situations. That is, the situation described in S1 precedes the situation described in S2. Compare the acceptable IHR sentence (12b), which expresses a temporal sequence relationship between two situations, with the unacceptable (13b), which does not. The EHR construction, on the other hand, does not require a temporal sequence relationship between the situations described in S1 and S2.

(12) a. EHR sentence

[[titioya ga mikka mae ni hurikondeoitekureta] okane]
father NOM 3.days earlier wired money

o midori wa kyoo hikidasita.
ACC Midori TOP today withdrew

'Today Midori withdrew the money which her father had wired her three days ago.'

² For an exploration of the idea that there is a single property - relevance - which makes information worth processing for a human being, see Sperber and Wilson 1995.

- b. IHR sentence
- [[titiyo ga mikka mae ni okane o hurikondeoitekureta] no]
money ACC NMLZ
o midori wa kyoo hikidasita.
ACC
'Three days ago her father had wired her money, and Midori withdrew (it) today.'
- (13) a. EHR sentence
- [[noti ni syusyoo ni natta] tanaka kakuei] o
later prime.minister became Tanaka Kakuei ACC
kanozyo wa syoogakkoo de osieteita.
she TOP elementary.school LOC taught
'In elementary school she had taught Kakuei Tanaka, who later became Prime Minister.'
- b. IHR sentence
- *[[tanaka kakuei ga noti ni syusyoo ni natta] no] o
NOM later prime.minister became NMLZ ACC
kanozyo wa syoogakkoo de osieteita.
Intended: 'Kakuei Tanaka later became Prime Minister, and she had taught (him) in elementary school.'

I will argue that the pragmatic function of the IHR construction in this common use may be characterized as NARRATIVE-ADVANCING in the sense of Fillmore (1989). He describes the function of the so-called continuative relative construction in English such as *I gave a package to Harry, who then dropped it* as narrative-advancing. That is, this English construction advances a narrative within a sentence by reporting two situations which share a

participant (cf. Chapter 4). Similarly, in typical IHR sentences, the situation described in S1 precedes the situation described in S2.³

Although this particular use of IHRC, which may be termed as 'the narrative IHRC', is very common in Japanese IHRCs, uses similar to this have not been reported in other languages. The study of the IHR construction is thus worthwhile from the typological point of view (cf. Chapter 2). Furthermore, in Japanese the narrative-advancing function is seen in IHRCs but not in EHRCs. I will illustrate in subsequent chapters that the IHR construction is related formally and semantically to clausal coordination and to a concessive construction (cf. Chapters 4 and 5).

1.4 Objectives of the thesis

The goal of the thesis is two-fold. First, it investigates the relationship between the IHRC and the EHRC. Second, it tries to account for the fact that IHRCs are limited in occurrence.

Previous accounts have tended to focus on analyzing the structure of IHRCs. Some assume that IHRCs are semantic equivalents of EHRCs and analyze the structure of IHRCs to be the same as that of EHRCs. Others argue that IHRCs are functionally similar to adverbial clauses and assign an adverbial structure to IHRCs. I will demonstrate that in order to adequately describe relations between the two types of relative clauses, it is necessary to

³ Kuroda (1992 (1974-77):152-153) compares the meaning of IHR sentences to that of gerundive sentences in English. He notes that (5b), for example, may be interpreted as *An apple being on the table, Midori picked it up*. Structurally, however, Japanese IHR sentences and English gerundive sentences are different. In English gerundive sentences, the first predicate is non-finite (i.e. a gerund). In Japanese IHR sentences, in contrast, V1 is finite.

compare their syntax, semantics, and pragmatics, and in particular, their referential and discourse structures. I will argue that the IHR construction is not only related to the EHR construction but also to clausal coordination and to a concessive construction.

Instead of regarding the IHR as merely a secondary relativization strategy in Japanese, following Kuroda, I assume that IHRCs and EHRCs are used under different pragmatic circumstances.⁴ As discussed above, a typical use of the IHR construction involves advancing a narrative within a sentence by reporting two events which share a participant. The IHR construction, moreover, is constructionally complex. For example, there is a 'mismatch' between syntax and semantics in this construction. The *no*-nominalized S1 satisfies a SYNTACTIC requirement of V2, while the NP corresponding to the target inside S1 fills a SEMANTIC requirement of V2. I will hypothesize the restricted occurrence of the IHR construction may be accounted for by taking into consideration its specialized function and the 'mismatch' between form and meaning exhibited by the construction.

Among the claims I will be making in this thesis are:

- With respect to syntax, the external syntax of the IHRC is a NP, just like that of the EHRCs. The semantics of IHR sentences is also the same as that of EHR sentences in that an EHR sentence and its corresponding IHR sentence have the same referential structure. The pragmatic function of the IHRC, however, is different from that of the EHRC: The IHRC asserts or reports an event,

⁴ Ikegami (1991) hypothesizes that IHR is a pattern which has been more preferred in Japanese than EHR.

while the EHRC describes a property of the head noun referent through modification.

- Although the external syntax of the IHRC is the same as that of the EHRC, the IHRC exhibits morphosyntactic behavior which resembles that of coordinated clauses rather than the EHRC. The key to resolving this paradox is the fact that the IHRC shares with coordinated clauses the pragmatic function of event-reporting. The 'coordination-like' behavior of the IHRC may be seen as a structural correlate of this function.
- The construction's restricted occurrence may be due to its specialized function of advancing a narrative by reporting two events which share a participant.
- Structural and semantic evidence suggests that the IHR construction is being reanalyzed as a concessive construction in which two clauses are connected by *no-ga* and *no-o*. This may also be responsible for the restricted occurrence of the IHRC.

1.5 Preliminaries: Are IHRCs really internally headed?

So far I have assumed that the post-relative *no* in the IHR construction is the nominalizer, but this is not the only possible analysis. *No* in Modern Japanese is polyfunctional between the genitive case-marking, nominalizing, and so-called 'pronominal' uses (14).^{5, 6}

⁵ Matisoff (1972) discusses the morpheme *ve* in Lahu, which is used as a subordinator (i.e. as the genitive marker and the relative-clause marker) and a clause nominalizer. Although the morpheme *no* in Japanese does not function as a relative-clause marker, many of the uses of *ve* in Lahu are similar to the uses of *no*.

⁶ Japanese grammarians generally believe these uses to be historically related (e.g. Konoshima 1966, Nishida 1977, Shibatani 1990, Tanaka 1977, Uchio 1973, Yamazaki 1965). Nomura (1995)

(14) a. Genitive

sakana no hone
fish GEN bone
'bone of fish'

b. Nominalizer

kuniko wa [sakana o yaku] no ga zyoozuda.
Kuniko TOP fish ACC grill NMLZ NOM is.good.at
'Kuniko is good at grilling fish.'

[Mukoda, Kuniko]

c. Pronominal

hugu no mise de [[kara age ni sita] no] ga
globefish GEN restaurant LOC deep.fried PRON NOM
deta.
appeared
'In a globefish restaurant, I was served deep-fried ones
(=globefish).'

It might be argued that the post-relative *no* in the IHR construction is the pronominal rather than the nominalizer. That is, it might be possible that the post-relative *no* is a pronominal coindexed with the target NP inside S1. This would mean that the IHR construction is externally headed, with the pronominal as the external head:

(15) An alternative analysis of the IHR construction

[... [[... NP_i case_x ... V₁]_{S1} no_i] case_y ... V₂]_{S2}

no_i: pronominal

gives a synchronic account of the uses of *no* in Modern Japanese within the Cognitive Grammar framework.

I ignore the possibility that *no* in the IHR construction could be the genitive case marker, since the genitive *no* cannot follow a predicate (cf. (14a) above). Kuroda argues against Martin (1975) that the post-relative *no* in this construction is indeed the nominalizer (cf. also Hoshi 1994, Murasugi 1994). He observes that the post-relative *no* behaves differently from the pronominal *no* in two respects. First, the pronominal *no* is generally replaceable by its explicit antecedent even though it would be wordy:

- (16) a. asoko ni aru ringo wa aokute, [[koko ni aru] **no**]
 there LOC exist apple TOP green-and here LOC exist PRON
 wa akai.
 TOP red
 'The apple which is there is green, and the one here is red.'
- = b. asoko ni aru ringo wa aokute, [[koko ni aru] **ringo**] wa akai.
 apple
 'The apple which is there is green, and the apple here is red.'

In the IHR construction *no* is not replaceable by the same noun as the target inside S1:

- (17) IHR
- a. [[aoi ringo ga sara no ue ni aru] **no**] o taroo wa
green apple NOMplate GEN top LOC exist ACC Taro TOP
totte,
took-and
'There was an apple on the plate, and Taro picked (it) up, and ...'
- b. *[[aoi ringo ga sara no ue ni aru] **ringo**] o taroo wa totte, ...
apple

Second, the pronominal *no* may not be used in reference to somebody who is linguistically shown deference. That is, stylistically the pronominal *no* does not harmonize with honorific expressions, as shown in (18b):

- (18) a. asoko ni tatteiru kodomo o soko ni suwarasete,
 there LOC stand-ASP-NPAST child ACC there LOC sit-CAUS
 [[mukoo ni tatteiru] no] o koko ni suwarasete kudasai.
 far.over.there PRON ACC here please
 'Please have the children standing over there sit there near you
 and have those standing far over there sit here.'
- b. *asoko ni tatteirassyarū go-roozin o soko ni
 stand-ASP-HON-NPAST HON-elders
 oyobisite, [[mukoo ni tatteirassyarū] no] o koko ni
 have.come.HON PRON
 oyobisite kudasai.
Intended: 'Please have those honorable elders standing over
 there come there near you and those standing far over there
 come here.'

The target NP in the IHR construction, in contrast, be used in reference to somebody who is linguistically shown deference, again suggesting that the post-relative *no* is not pronominal:

- (19) IHR
 taroo wa [[sensei ga hikoo-zyoo ni otuki ni natta] no] o
 Taro TOP teacher NOM air.port LOC arrive.HON-PAST NMLZ ACC
 sassokukuruma de hoteru e otoresita.
 directly car INSTR hotel ALL bring.HON-PAST
 'The teacher arrived at the airport, and Taro took (him) directly to the
 hotel by car.'

(Kuroda 1992 (1974-77):159, (8-11,13))

In addition to the contrasts above discussed by Kuroda, the pronominal *no* and *no* in the IHR construction also behave differently with respect to modifiers. The pronominal allows a modifier immediately preceding it, just like lexical nouns, as seen in (20a) and (20b). On the other hand, the post-relative *no* in the IHR construction cannot (21) (cf. also McCawley 1992, Ohara 1994b).

- (20) a. asoko ni aru ringo wa aokute,
 there LOC exist apple TOP green-and
 [[koko ni aru] [ookii] no] wa akai.
 here LOC exist big PRON TOP red
 'The apple which is there is green, and the big one here is red.'
- b. asoko ni aru ringo wa aokute, [[koko ni aru] [ookii] ringo] wa
 apple
 akai.
 'The apple which is there is green, and the big apple here is red.'

- (21) IHR
 *[[aoi ringo ga sara no ue ni aru] [ookii] no] o taroo
 green apple NOM plate GEN top LOC exist big ACC Taro
 wa totte, ...
 TOP took-and
Intended: 'There was a big apple on the plate, and Taro picked (it) up, and ...'

Based on these contrasting properties, I will assume that the post-relative *no* in the IHR construction is the nominalizer and not the pronominal. In other words, the IHR construction does not involve an external head. Incidentally,

the contrast between (20) and (21) suggests separate phrase structure rules for noun modification and the IHRC in Japanese:⁷

(22) a. Noun modification

NP → (MOD)* – N

N: noun (including the pronominal *no*)
 * (Kleene star): any number of occurrence including zero

b. IHRC

NP → S – NMLZ

NMLZ: nominalizer

No is not the only morpheme which functions as a nominalizer in Japanese. There is a closed class of grammaticalized nouns which are generally called *keisiki meisi* 'formal nouns' and such grammaticalized nouns can be used as sentence nominalizers (Ohara 1995, Teramura 1992). In fact, some have argued that sentences such as (23a) below, whose S1 is nominalized by *tokoro* 'place' instead of *no*, can also be characterized as IHR (cf. 6b) (Harada 1986 (1973), Kuroda 1992 (1983), Nakau 1973).⁸ I regard (23a) as an instance of another highly idiomatic grammatical construction with its own semantic and pragmatic constraints on the form, even though sometimes it is possible to replace *no* in IHR sentences with *tokoro* and get acceptable results as in the case of (6b) and (23a). Moreover, there are sentences in which *tokoro* is not followed by any case marker, as in (23b). I

⁷ I would like to thank Matthew Dryer for suggesting this to me (Dryer 1994).

⁸ *Tokoro* is used in various grammatical constructions and may thus be characterized as a HETEROSEMOUS morpheme in the sense of Lichtenberk (1991). Ohara 1995 gives a synchronic account of semantic and pragmatic relations among grammatical constructions containing *tokoro* (cf. Momiyama 1992, Takubo 1984).

therefore focus on analyzing IHR sentences with a *no*-nominalized clause as S1 and will not discuss *tokoro* sentences much in this thesis. See Hale and Kitagawa (1976-77) and Mihara (1994a) for more discussions against the IHR analysis of *tokoro* sentences.

- (23) a. cf. (6b)
- [[taroo ga hasittekita] tokoro] o hanako wa tukamaeta.
 Taro NOM came.running place ACC Hanako TOP caught
 'Hanako caught the situation in which Taro came running.'
- b. [[ie e kaetta] tokoro], saihi o gakkoo ni oitekita
 home ALL returned place wallet ACC school LOC left
 koto ni ki ga tuita.
 NMLZ DAT realized
 'When I got home, I realized that I had left my wallet at school.'

1.6 Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework adopted in this thesis is that of Construction Grammar (e.g. Fillmore, Kay and O'Connor 1988, Fried 1995, Goldberg 1995, Kay and Fillmore 1994, Koenig 1993, Lambrecht 1994, Michaelis 1994, Park 1994). A GRAMMATICAL CONSTRUCTION in Construction Grammar is a pairing of syntax with semantics and pragmatics and it constitutes the basic unit of language. Construction Grammar is thus a sign-based theory of grammar (cf. Langacker 1991, Pollard and Sag 1994). In this framework, semantic interpretations and pragmatic features may be a part of the description of some grammatical constructions. Thus, syntactic forms may be said to correlate with discourse functions, hence cannot be fully understood without reference to it.

Construction Grammar is generative in the sense that it tries to account for all and only acceptable sentences within a language, i.e. the infinite number of expressions that are allowed by the grammar, while attempting to account for the fact that an infinite number of other expressions are ruled out or disallowed. This framework, however, differs from the one assumed by a majority of previous analyses of IHRCs in at least three ways. First, Construction Grammar considers the conditions under which a given construction is used to be part of speakers' competence or knowledge of language. That is, it regards subtle pragmatic factors as an indispensable part of the characterization of grammatical constructions. Construction grammarians are thus interested in describing these conditions on use. Second, in Construction Grammar complex grammatical constructions are not seen as derived from highly abstract principles but rather as simply stipulated and used as ready-made templates by speakers of a language. They can be related to one another by the mechanism of 'inheritance'. Finally, in this framework all facts of a language, whether 'core' or 'peripheral', deserve equal attention in the description of the language. The present study does not adopt the formalism and notations currently developed by Kay and Fillmore.

1.7 Organization of the thesis

The organization of the thesis is as follows. Chapter 2 discusses Japanese IHRCs from a typological perspective. What are the characteristics of IHRCs in other languages? In what respects are Japanese IHRCs similar to those? Studies on IHRCs in other languages have tended to focus on analyzing the

structure of IHRCs. Structurally, Japanese IHRCs qualify as IHRCs. Semantically and pragmatically, however, Japanese IHRCs exhibit properties which have not been discussed in the cross-linguistic literature.

Chapter 3 reviews previous analyses of Japanese IHRCs. It will be pointed out that the notion of RELEVANCE, which Kuroda proposes as the notion characterizing the relation between the two clauses of acceptable IHR sentences, is inherently too vague to account for all and only acceptable sentences. Also, it will be shown that in order to describe the relation between IHRCs and EHRCs, it is necessary to compare not only their syntactic properties but also their semantic and pragmatic properties, especially their referential and discourse structures.

Chapter 4 investigates form-meaning-use correlations of the IHR construction and its relationships to other constructions. The syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic properties of the IHRC will be compared with those of the EHRC and coordinated clauses. Also, the IHR construction will be contrasted with the continuative relative construction in English, which is also characterized by the narrative-advancing function.

Chapter 5 attempts to account for the limited occurrence of IHRCs. It discusses the relation between IHR sentences and concessive sentences, in which two clauses are connected by *no-ga* or *no-o*. It will be hypothesized that the IHR construction is being reanalyzed as a concessive clause-linking construction.

Finally, Chapter 6 summarizes the findings in the thesis and presents suggestions for future study.

2. Comparison with IHRCs in other languages

2.1 Introduction

I have pointed out in Chapter 1 that the restricted distribution and the multiple-target phenomenon that Japanese IHRCs show are not characteristic of the widely accepted category of relative clause. In this chapter I will compare Japanese IHRCs specifically with IHRCs in other languages and discuss whether grammatical properties exhibited by Japanese IHRCs are common among IHRCs in other languages.

In spite of the fact that there have been a number of typological and cross-linguistic studies on IHRCs (e.g. Andrews 1985 (1975)), no systematic comparison has been done between Japanese IHRCs and those in other languages. Nonetheless, several proposals have been made regarding the correlation between typological characteristics of a language and the existence of IHRCs in the language (Cole 1987, Culy 1990, Gorbet 1977, Nichols 1984, Watanabe 1991). Culy, for example, proposes the following three correlations: (i) the language uses nominalized sentences in other constructions; (ii) the language has SOV word order; and (iii) the language is a pro-drop language. Although Japanese fits these descriptions, as I will show in the following sections, some of the properties of Japanese IHRCs do not perfectly coincide with commonly accepted characteristics of IHRCs. Such 'non-standard'

Chapter 2. Comparison with IHRCs in other languages

properties exhibited by Japanese IHRCs should be taken into consideration in any account of the Japanese construction. In particular, as a construction grammarian who pays attention to form-meaning-use correlations, I regard such properties as indispensable part of the IHR construction. Furthermore, I am interested in examining cross-linguistic variation of this particular construction and discovering the ranges of meanings which are associated with the particular structure. In this respect my approach may be characterized as a typological approach and thus contrasts with a universalist approach, which is not primarily concerned with variation of a specific construction across languages.

In Section 2.2, I will introduce two types of ‘internally headed relativization’ recognized cross-linguistically: IHRCs and correlatives. The main distinction between the two has to do with whether or not the clause has external nominal markings, such as case markers and determiners. I will argue in Section 2.3 that based on their structural properties Japanese IHRCs should be classified as IHRCs and not as correlatives. I will also show in what respects Japanese IHRCs differ from commonly accepted characteristics of IHRCs.

2.2 Commonly accepted properties of IHRCs

Internally headed relativization has been characterized as either IHRC or correlative (Keenan 1985, Culy 1990, cf. Andrews 1985 (1975)). Both types are attested in SOV languages. Although the distinction between the two is not always easy to make, it can be summarized as follows: (i) the external syntax

Chapter 2. Comparison with IHRCs in other languages

of the relative clause (S1); (ii) existence of a relative marker and a correlative marker; (iii) structural relation to complementation; and (iv) the relation of S1 to the whole sentence.

Examples of IHRCs are given below. They are indicated by square brackets:

(1) a. Lakhota IHRC

[[Mary owiža wə kaḡe] ki] he ophewathu
quilt a make the DEM I-buy

'I bought the quilt that Mary made.'

(Williamson 1987:171,(4a))

b. Wappo IHRC

?ah [ce kew-ø ?ew-ø tohta]-thu taka-ø mahesta?
I the man-ACC fish-ACC caught-DAT basket-ACC gave

'I gave the basket to the man who caught the fish.'

'I gave the basket to the fish that the man caught.'

(Li and Thompson 1978:107, (6))

First, an IHRC is a nominalized clause that takes determiners and/or case markers. In (1a) it externally takes a determiner *-ki*, and in (1b) it is followed by the dative case marker *-thu*. Second, there is no relative marker inside an IHRC to mark the target. Neither is there a correlative marker in the main clause. In (1a), for example, the target 'quilt' is not morphologically marked as such. In (1b) the target can be interpreted either as the 'man' or the 'fish', due to lack of a relative marker. Third, as I will show in Section 2.2.3, an IHRC structurally resembles a complement clause. Finally, an IHRC can occur wherever a NP can occur. In (1a) it occurs sentence-initially; in (1b) it occurs after the subject of the main clause.

Chapter 2. Comparison with IHRCs in other languages

The correlative construction is defined as a construction whose main clause contains an anaphoric element coreferential with some constituent in the relative clause (Keenan 1985). An example of correlatives from Hindi is given:

(2) Hindi correlative¹

[*Jis a:dmi ka kutta bema:r hai*], *us a:dmi ko mai ne dekha*
wh man GEN dog sick is that man DO I ERG saw

'I saw the man whose dog is sick.'

(lit: 'Which man's dog is sick, that man I saw.')

(Keenan 1985:164,(57))

First, the relative clause is not nominalized and it does not take determiners or case markers externally. Second, in correlative sentences there is a relative marker on the target inside the relative clause. There is also a NP in the main clause which is anaphoric to the target. In (2), the relative marker in the relative clause is *jis*, and *us* in the main clause is anaphoric to the target.² Finally, in contrast to an IHRC, a correlative occurs either sentence-initially or sentence-finally. In (2), the relative clause occurs sentence-initially as indicated by the square brackets.

In what follows I examine the commonly accepted properties of IHRCs in more detail, which will be the basis of the discussion on Japanese IHRCs in Section 2.3.

¹ 'DO' in the gloss stands for a direct object.

² There is a terminological confusion in the literature. Keenan calls the marker inside the relative clause the correlative marker. On the other hand, Culy 1990 and Pollard and Sag 1994 (following Culy) call the marker inside the relative clause the relative marker, and the marker inside the main clause the correlative marker. I will adopt Culy's convention, since it is more iconic.

2.2.1 Nominalization

The nominalized status of S1 has been considered an important defining property which distinguishes the IHRC from the correlative (e.g. Culy 1989). Among syntactic tests which are believed to be valid in determining whether or not a clause is nominalized, external markings on the clause such as case markers and determiners have been considered 'criterial', as seen by Culy's statement: 'a nominalized sentence is a sentence that can occur with the morpho-syntactic markings of a common noun (e.g. CASE, determiners)' (cf. Croft 1991, 1990:30-36). Existence of case markers and determiners has thus been used to determine whether internally headed relativization in a given language is IHRC or correlative. Keenan (1985), therefore, notes that the distinction between IHRC and correlative is difficult to make and that external nominal markings on IHRCs are often the only clue. In (1) above, for example, S1 in the Lakhota sentence (1a) takes a definite marker; S1 in the Wappo sentence (1b) is followed by the dative case marker. According to the external nominal marking tests, they are thus classified as IHRCs.

2.2.2 Target identification

Unlike correlatives IHRCs typically contain no relative marker to mark the target. In other words, inside IHRCs the target is morphosyntactically underdetermined. Li and Thompson (1978) note that either the subject or the object of the relative clause in (1b) above can be construed as the target. The Wappo sentence is thus potentially ambiguous, as the two translations show. Platero points out a similar ambiguity in Navajo IHRCs:

Chapter 2. Comparison with IHRCs in other languages

(3) Navajo IHRC

[Ashkii at'əəd yiyiitsá -(n)éé] yáiti'.
boy girl 3:perf:3:see-REL imp:3:speak

'The boy who saw the girl is speaking.'

'The girl whom the boy saw is speaking.'

(Platero 1974:205, (15))

2.2.3 Relation to complementation

At the beginning of this chapter I introduced Culy's remark that languages with IHRCs use nominalized sentences for other constructions as well (cf. also Gorbet 1977, Kaiser 1991). Moreover, IHR sentences are structurally ambiguous between IHR reading and complementation reading. Culy cites a Quechua IHRC to illustrate the point (cf. Bonneau 1992, Jhang 1994):

(4) Huallaga Quechua

chawra maman-shi willapaq wamran-ta
then his:mother-REPORT she:tells:him her:son-DAT

[marka-chaw tiya-shan-ta]
town-LOC lives-SUB-ACC

'Then his mother told her son that she had lived in a town.'
(complement)

'Then his mother told her son about the town in which she had lived.'
(IHRC)

(Culy 1990:67, (6c))

2.2.4 Relation of S1 to the larger construction

I pointed out that in contrast to correlatives, which occur either sentence-initially or sentence-finally, IHRCs do not have restrictions on their positions

Chapter 2. Comparison with IHRCs in other languages

within a sentence (see the IHRCs in (1a), (1b), and (4), as opposed to the correlative in (2)). Although the possible range of external markings of IHRCs has not been discussed much, it appears that cross-linguistically IHRCs can take various case markings and can thus assume different grammatical functions as long as they serve as a NP complement of the main predicate. Keenan cites an IHRC in Diegueño whose external syntax is locative, as seen by the fact that it takes a locative postposition *-L**:

(5) a. Diegueño IHRC

[Təṇay ?əwa:-ø ?əwu:w] -pu-L' ?ciyawx
yesterday house-DO I saw -DEF-in I-will-sing
'I will sing in the house that I saw yesterday.'

(Keenan 1985:162, (52c))

Jhang gives an example of a Korean adjunct IHRC marked with *ey* 'by':

(5) b. Korean IHRC

Changmwun-i [sonyen-i kong-ul cha-n kes] -ey
window-NOM boy-NOM ball-ACC kick-and CMPL-by
kkay-ci-ess-ta
break-PASS-PAST-IND
'The window was broken by the ball that the boy kicked.'

(Jhang 1994:33, (35a))

2.3 Japanese IHRCs

Internally headed relativization in Japanese has been generally classified as IHRC without any systematic comparison with IHRCs in other languages. In what follows I discuss properties of Japanese IHRCs in relation to the commonly accepted properties of IHRCs examined above.

2.3.1 Nominalization

As pointed out in Section 2.2.1, whether or not the clause is nominalized has been taken as vital in distinguishing between IHRCs and correlatives, and among various syntactic tests used to determine the nominalized status of a clause, external nominal markings such as case markers and determiners have been considered most important.

In Japanese IHR sentences the postposition that S1 plus *no* takes is analyzed as a case marker: The postposition alternates depending on whether the IHR sentence is passivized or causativized (cf. Ohara 1992, Ohori 1995).³ In Japanese, the patient NP is marked with the accusative *o* in active sentences and with the nominative *ga* in passive sentences:

(6) Lexical NP

a. Active

hanako wa taroo o tukamaeta.
Hanako TOP Taro ACC caught
'Hanako caught Taro.'

b. Passive

taroo ga hanako ni tukamae-rare-ta.
NOM DAT catch-PASS-PAST
'Taro was caught by Hanako.'

³ The purpose of this section is to see whether Japanese IHRCs are construed as syntactically nominalized with respect to the criterial test used in the cross-linguistic literature. Therefore, in order to avoid confusion, I do not refer to the morpheme *no* after S1 in IHR sentences as the 'nominalizer' in this section.

Chapter 2. Comparison with IHRCs in other languages

When the target inside a Japanese IHRC is coreferenced as the patient argument of the main predicate, the postposition after S1 plus *no* is *o* in active sentences and *ga* in passive sentences, just as in (6) above.

(7) IHRC + *no*

a. Active

hanako wa [[taroo ga hasittekita] no] o tukamaeta.
TOP NOM came.running NMLZ ACC caught

‘Taro came running, and Hanako caught (him).’

b. Passive

[[taroo ga hasittekita] no] ga hanako ni tukamae-rare-ta.
NMLZ NOM DAT catch-PASS-PAST

‘Taro came running, and (he) was caught by Hanako.’

It is therefore plausible to assume that the postpositions *o* and *ga* attached to S1 plus *no* in (7) are the accusative and nominative case markers respectively, just as in (6).

The causee nominal in causative sentences is marked with the accusative *o* as shown in (8b). Similarly, when S1 contains a target which is coreferenced as the causee NP in IHR sentences, S1 plus *no* is marked with *o*, as in (9b).

(8) Lexical NP

a. Transitive

taroo ga totuzen tatidomatta.
NOM suddenly stopped

‘Taro suddenly stopped.’

b. Causative

hanako ga taroo o tatidomara-se-ta.
NOM ACC stop-CAUS-PAST

'Hanako stopped Taro.'

- (9) IHRC + no

- a. Transitive

[[taroo ga hasittekita] no] ga totuzen tatidomatta.
NOM came.running NMLZ NOM suddenly stopped

'Taro came running, and (he) suddenly stopped.'

- b. Causative**

hanako ga [[taroo ga hasittekita] no] o tatidomara-se-ta.
 NOM NMLZ ACC stop-CAUS-PAST

'Taro came running, and Hanako stopped (him).'

The postpositions after S1 plus *no* in IHR sentences should thus be analyzed as case markers. Japanese IHRCs are thus analyzed as nominalized and externally functioning as NPs just like IHRCs in other languages, with respect to the structural criterion used in the cross-linguistic literature.

2.3.2 Target identification

There is no marker to identify the target inside a Japanese IHRC. In the following example, either the subject (*gakusei-tati* 'students') or the object (*CIA no supai* 'CIA spy') can be the target:

- (10) sono omawari wa [[gakusei-tati ga CIA no supai o
that cop TOP students NOM GEN spy ACC
kumihuseta] no] o uti-korosita.
held.down NMLZ ACC shoot-killed

'The cop shot and killed the

$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{students who held down the CIA spy.} \\ \text{CIA spy who the students held down.} \end{array} \right\},$

(Kuroda 1992 (1974-77):153, (24))

Chapter 2. Comparison with IHRCs in other languages

Here, BOTH the subject and the object can equally well be construed as the target, since in this sentence the referents of the subject and the object (students and the CIA spy) are both human and are thus equally likely to be shot down. The target of Japanese IHRCs is morphosyntactically underdetermined inside S1, just like in other languages.

It may be worth commenting that although IHRCs across languages do not contain a marker to identify the target, languages seem to differ to what extent the target is morphosyntactically underdetermined. In head-marking languages such as Navajo predicates carry agreement markers for their arguments (cf. Nichols 1984, Ohori 1995). Therefore, in the case of Navajo IHRCs agreement markers on main predicates may help identify the target, whereas in dependent-marking languages such as Japanese there is no morphological clue whatsoever on main predicates as to what the target NP is.

Pragmatic contexts play a role in narrowing down the range of possible targets. In (11a), although the verb phrase *tukamaeta* 'caught' can either take *neko* 'cat' or *nezumi* 'mouse' as its required valence participant, the most natural interpretation, presumably due to our world knowledge, is the one in which Taro caught the cat (by hand) and not the mouse (cf. Hirose and Ohori 1992, Ohara 1992). If, however, an adverbial phrase such as *saki-ni* 'ahead' is added in front of the main predicate as in (11b), the interpretation in which Taro caught the mouse before the cat did becomes stronger. In (11c), the quantifier *nihikitomo* 'both of the two' determines the identity of the target: the quantifier requires the target to be plural and thus the only reading is the one in which Taro caught both of the animals (cf. also (10) in Section 1.2.2).

Chapter 2. Comparison with IHRCs in other languages

- (11) a. taroo wa [[neko ga nezumi o oikaketeiru] no]
 Taro TOP cat NOM mouse ACC chase-ASP-NPAST NMLZ
 o tukamaeta.
 ACC caught
 'The cat was chasing the mouse, and Taro caught (the cat).'
 'The cat was chasing the mouse, and Taro caught (the mouse).'
- b. taroo wa [[neko ga nezumi o oikaketeiru] no] o saki-ni
 ahead
 tukamaeta.
 'The cat was chasing the mouse, and Taro caught (the mouse)
 before the cat did.'
- c. taroo wa [[neko ga nezumi o oikaketeiru] no] o ni-hiki-tomo
 two-CL-both
 tukamaeta.
 'The cat was chasing the mouse, and Taro caught both the cat
 and the mouse.'

The multiple-target phenomenon exhibited by sentences such as (11c) above, in which both the subject and the object of S1 are taken as the target, seems to be peculiar to Japanese IHRCs. It should be stressed that this phenomenon is quite different from the so-called 'split-antecedent' phenomenon found in English and Navajo relative clause sentences. Perlmutter and Ross note that in the English sentence below the discontinuous noun phrase *a man ... (and) a woman* seems to be the antecedent of the relative pronoun:

(12) English

A man entered the room and a woman went out who were similar.

(Perlmutter and Ross 1970:350,(3))

Chapter 2. Comparison with IHRCs in other languages

Note that in (12) *a man* and *a woman* are in different conjuncts of a coordinate clause. Yet the two NPs together are taken as the subject of the relative clause, as seen by the fact that the relative clause requires a plural subject. Navajo exhibits a similar sentence pattern:⁴

(13) Navajo

- a. Ashkii yah 'íiyá dóó at 'ééd ch'in-íiya [athinoolin'-éé]
 boy into PERF:3:go and girl out-PERF:3:go RECIP:3:look like-REL
 'A boy came in and a girl went out who were similar.'

(Andrews 1985 (1975):77, (137))

In addition, Navajo allows both the subject and the object of the simple main clause to be coindexed with a NP in the relative clause. In (13b), both the subject 'the dog' and the object 'the cat' are construed as coindexed with the subject of the relative clause:

- (13) b. bééchaą́í mási yinootchéét [ahigán-éé]
 dog cat 3:PROG:3:chase RECIP:IMP:3:fight-REL
 'The dog is chasing the cat which were fighting.' [sic]

(Andrews 1985 (1975):77, (139))

Japanese IHR sentences such as (11c) crucially differ from the English and Navajo sentences discussed above in the following respect. In Japanese, the relevant two NPs overtly occur inside the RELATIVE clause and are understood to be coindexed with an argument of the MAIN predicate. The situation is opposite in English and Navajo: The two overt NPs occur inside

⁴ In (13) 'REL' in the gloss refers to the relative complementizer, and not to a relative pronoun (Platero 1974). Therefore, I do not use the term 'antecedent (of a relative pronoun)' for the Navajo sentences. Although Navajo has IHRCs as well, the relative clauses in (13) are instances of extraposed relative clauses (cf. Andrews 1985 (1975)).

the MAIN clause and are understood to be coindexed with a constituent NP of the RELATIVE clause.⁵ Other languages with IHRCs do not seem to allow either the multiple targets of the Japanese type nor the English/Navajo type.⁶ In any case, it seems important to note the distinction between the two types of multiple targets.

To summarize, the target-identification mechanism in Japanese IHR sentences is similar to those in other languages in that the target is morphosyntactically underdetermined inside S1. The multiple-target phenomenon, however, seems to be unique to Japanese IHRCs.

2.3.3 Relation to complementation

In addition to being used in the IHR construction, a *no*-nominalized clause can be used for sentential complementation (cf. Josephs 1976, Kuno 1973, Nakau 1973).⁷ When V2 is a verb of physical action requiring its object

⁵ It is interesting that Navajo, a verb-final language just like Japanese, patterns with English, a SVO language, with respect to the multiple-target phenomenon.

⁶ Citing the sentence below, Nomura (1995) remarks that the multiple-target phenomenon is also observed in Walbiri adjoined relative clauses:

- (i) Walbiri adjoined relative clause
maliki-li ka minitja watjilipi-nji, kutja-lpa-pala-njanu kulu-qku nja-qu.
dog-erg AUX cat chase-NPAST, CMPL-AUXrecip anger-erg/inst look-PAST
*‘The dog is chasing the cat, which were looking at one another angrily.’
(Hale 1976:90,(29))

Here, the second clause, which is marked with the complementizer *kutja-*, is the relative clause. The two overt NPs occur in the main clause and not in the relative clause. Therefore, this is an instance of the English/Navajo type of multiple target, not the Japanese type. Hale notes that he is not sure whether such sentences are fully grammatical.

⁷ For typological surveys of complement clauses see Noonan 1985 and Horie 1993. See Kirsner and Thompson 1976 for the role of pragmatic inference in the semantics of sensory verb complement sentences in English.

Chapter 2. Comparison with IHRCs in other languages

argument referent to be a concrete entity such as *tukamaeru* 'catch', the *no*-nominalized clause is understood as an IHRC (14a). When V2 is a verb of knowledge such as *sitteiru* 'know', on the other hand, the nominalized clause is construed as a complement clause. Note that (14b) does not mean 'Hanako knew Taro, who came running':

(14) a. IHRC

hanako wa [[taroo ga hasittekita] no] o tukamaeta.
Hanako TOP Taro NOM came.running NMLZ ACC caught
'Taro came running, and Hanako caught (him).'

b. Complement clause

hanako wa [[taroo ga hasittekita] no] o sitteita.
knew
'Hanako knew that Taro came running.' not 'Hanako knew Taro, who came running.'

A question arises as to whether it is legitimate to analyze IHRCs as grammatically distinct from complement clauses. That is, it may be argued that the lexical semantics of V2 determines the relevant reading and that therefore there is no need to posit two separate constructions. Following Kuroda, who observes the following contrasts between the two types of nominalized clauses, I analyze IHRCs to be grammatically distinct from complement clauses. First, Kuroda notes that a conjoined sentence may not occupy the position of an IHRC (15a), whereas it may occupy the position of a complement clause (15b):

(15) a. IHRC

*taroo wa [ringo ga sara no ue ni ari,
TOP apple NOM plate GEN top LOC exist

Chapter 2. Comparison with IHRCs in other languages

nasi ga bon no ue ni aru] no] o totte, ...
pear NOM tray GEN top LOC exist NMLZ ACC took-and

Intended: 'An apple was on the plate and a pear was on the tray,
and Taro picked (them) up, and ...'

(Kuroda 1992 (1974-77):170, (72))

b. Complement clause

taroo wa [[ringo ga sara no ue ni ari, nasi ga bon no ue ni aru]
no] o omoidasita.
NMLZ ACC remembered

'Taro remembered that an apple was on the table and that a pear
was on the tray.'

Second, an IHRC may not contain an adverbial particle (*huku-zyosi*)
such as the topic marker *wa*, but a complement clause may (cf. Chapter 4, (7);
Chapter 5, (2)):

(16) a. IHRC

*taroo wa [[ringo wa sara no ue ni aru] no] o totte, ...
TOP

(Kuroda 1992 (1974-77):171, (74))

b. Complement clause

reizooko ni wa nani mo nakatta ga,
fridge LOC TOP nothing ADV did.not.exist CONJ

taroo wa [[ringo wa mada sara no ue ni aru] no] o omoidasita.
still remembered

'There was nothing in the fridge, but Taro remembered that an
apple was still on the table.'

The discussion above suggests that the IHR construction should be
treated as a separate construction from the complementation construction.

2.3.4 Relation of S1 to the larger construction

With respect to the position of S1, Japanese IHR exhibits two salient characteristics. First, the external case marking on S1 is restricted. Second, there is a semantic constraint on the two clauses: the situation described in S1 must be construed as preceding the situation described in S2.

2.3.4.1 Restricted distribution

As discussed in Section 1.2.1, Japanese IHRCs are restricted in their external marking and are most typically marked by either *ga* or *o*. The following sentences, in which the IHRC is externally marked with the locative and the instrumental, are unacceptable, in contrast to the acceptable Diegueño and Korean examples in (5) above.

- (17) a. Locative
*[atarasii ie o tateta] no] ni puuru o tukutta.
new house ACC built NMLZ LOC pool ACC made
Intended: 'We built a new house, and we made a swimming pool (there).'
- b. Locative
*[atarasii ie o tateta] no] de paatii o sita.
NMLZ LOC party ACC had
Intended: 'We built a new house, and we had a party (there).'
- Actual reading:* 'Because we built a new house, we had a party.'
- c. Instrumental
*[taroo ga booru o ketta] no] de mado garasu ga
Taro NOM ball ACC kicked NMLZ INSTR window NOM
wareta.
broke

Chapter 2. Comparison with IHRCs in other languages

Intended: 'Taro kicked a ball, and the window was broken by (it).'

Actual reading: 'Because Taro kicked a ball, the window broke.'

This kind of restricted external marking has not been reported for IHRCs in languages other than Japanese.

2.3.4.2 Temporal sequence

We saw in Section 1.3 that in typical IHR sentences the event described in S1 precedes the S2 event, in contrast to EHR sentences. Culy argues that one of the two 'independency' properties that distinguish IHRCs from other nominalized clauses is 'that the tense, aspect, and mood of an IHRC are independent of the tense, aspect, and mood of the matrix clause' (1990:202). Thus, according to him, 'there is nothing like a "sequence of tenses" holding between the matrix clause and an IHRC' (ibid.). The nonpast tense form *-(r)u* is allowed for V1 in IHR sentences, when both S1 and S2 denote two past situations, as shown in (18):

- (18) [[akanboo ga nakikakeru] no] o hahaoya wa
 baby NOM about.to.cry-NPAST NMLZ ACC mother TOP
 yasasiku dakiageta.
 mother TOP held

'The baby was about to cry, and the mother gently held (it) in her arms.'

In Japanese, however, the nonpast tense form may function as either an indicator of the nonpast time or the present imperfective aspect, when used for a non-final predicate (cf. Nakau 1976). S1 of (18) is construed as describing a situation which preceded the situation described in S2. The nonpast tense

form of V1 *nakikakeru* 'be about to cry' thus indicates the imperfective aspect and not the nonpast time. The temporal sequence that Japanese IHR sentences typically describes is thus not predicted by Culy's characterization of IHR.

2.4 Conclusion

No systematic comparison has been done between Japanese IHRCs and those in other languages. The purpose of this chapter has been to fill this gap — in particular, to examine whether Japanese IHRCs share characteristics with IHRCs in other languages.

There are four properties that are generally accepted in the cross-linguistic literature on IHRCs: (i) the 'nominalized' status of IHRCs, (ii) lack of a relative marker to identify the target, (iii) the position of the IHRC within a sentence, and (iv) structural resemblance to complementation.

Japanese IHRCs should be classified as IHRCs and not as correlatives from structural and cross-linguistic perspectives because of the following. Japanese IHRCs are nominalized, as seen by the fact that they take case markers: Passive and causative tests show that the postposition following an IHRC and the nominalizer is a case marker. In addition, Japanese IHRCs lack any marker on the target and structurally resemble complement clauses.

Japanese IHRCs, however, possess properties which have no counterpart in IHRCs in other languages. First, the multiple-target phenomenon seems to be found only in Japanese IHR sentences. Second, the external marking on Japanese IHRCs is morphologically restricted: It is

typically followed either by the accusative *o* or the nominative *ga*. Third, there is a temporal sequence between the situations described in the two clauses of IHR sentences: the S1 event must precede the S2 event. This is at variance with Culy's characterization of IHRCs.⁸ A close examination of data in each of the languages might reveal that IHRCs in these languages also possess such characteristics.

Previous accounts of IHRCs have in general focused on analyzing the structure and have rarely discussed semantic and pragmatic properties of IHRCs. In this respect, Williamson (1987) is one of the few exceptions. She argues that the target inside Lakhota IHRCs must be indefinite. As we saw in Section 1.2.2, Japanese IHRCs allow definite NPs and proper nouns as the target and do not pattern with Lakhota IHRCs (cf. also Hasegawa 1988, Kuroda 1992 (1974-77), Nomura 1995, Ohara 1994b). It may be hypothesized that in languages like Japanese with alternate relativization strategy (i.e. EHRCs), IHRCs behave differently from those in languages like Lakhota, in which IHRCs are the only means of relativization (cf. 1a). In any case, it is hoped that IHRCs in languages other than Japanese will be analyzed not only in terms of the structure but also in terms of semantics and pragmatics as well. In the rest of the thesis the terms IHR and IHRCs refer to those in Japanese unless otherwise noted.

⁸ Based on these and other structural properties of Japanese IHRCs which have not been reported in typological studies of IHRCs, I analyzed Japanese IHRCs as 'pseudo-relatives' in Ohara (1994) (cf. Dryer 1994). However, if we take the nominalized status of the clause, in particular the case-markings test, as the most 'criterial' test for IHRCs, then Japanese IHRCs should indeed be analyzed as IHRCs, as discussed in this chapter. I still believe, however, that in any typologically oriented study it is necessary to be interested in typological variation for a construction.

3. Previous accounts of Japanese IHRCs

3.1 Introduction

As I have shown in Chapters 1 and 2, some of the grammatical properties of IHRCs are not shared by EHRCs. In this chapter, I examine how previous analyses have dealt with relations between EHRCs and IHRCs.

I start the discussion by first looking into Kuroda's pioneering work. His insightful observations concerning the syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of IHRCs have been the basis for most subsequent discussions. The analyses presented since Kuroda's tend to focus on the structure of the construction, with the majority of them assuming the framework of Government and Binding Theory or its successors (hereafter GB) (e.g. Chomsky 1981, 1986, 1993, 1994) (but cf. Hirose and Ohori 1992, Nomura 1995, Ohara 1994a, Ohori 1995).¹ In discussing these analyses, I divide them into two: those which treat IHRCs as structurally related to EHRCs (relativization analyses) and those which regard IHRCs as a kind of adverbial clause (adverbial analyses). I will show that IHRCs do not fit the structural definition of relativization in GB and suggest that in order to describe similarities and differences between EHRCs

¹ For discussions on IHRCs in descriptive frameworks, see Martin 1975 and Lê 1988.

and IHRCs in Japanese we need a framework which can take into account their syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic properties.

3.2 Kuroda 1974-77

Kuroda (1992 (1974-77)) deserves special attention for laying the foundation for subsequent studies of Japanese IHRCs. He discusses IHRCs in Classical Japanese as well as their counterpart in Modern Japanese. Since this thesis is concerned with IHRCs in Modern Japanese, we focus on Kuroda's analysis of IHRCs in Modern Japanese here.² Kuroda takes pains to uncover the nature of the post-relative *no*, the differences between IHRCs and complement clauses, and the ability of IHRCs to undergo a morphosyntactic phenomenon known as *ga-no* conversion (cf. Sections 2.3.3 and 4.2.1). Here I mainly discuss his relevancy condition and his view concerning the target-identification mechanism in the IHR construction. Kuroda proposes the following structure for IHRCs. He analyzes the morpheme *no* as a nominalizer and thus regards the external syntax of the *no*-marked IHRC as a NP.

- (1) [[... NP_i-case ... V]_{S-no}]_{NP}
- NP_i: target
S: IHRC
no : nominalizer³

Kuroda (ibid.:153) observes that IHRCs are somewhat restricted in occurrence compared to EHRCs and attributes the fact to an acceptability

² See also Kaiser 196 and Modini 1993a,b for discussions on IHRCs in Classical Japanese.

³ Kuroda in fact calls *no* a 'nominalizing complementizer' but it is clear from his discussions that this corresponds to a 'nominalizer' as I use the term.

condition that IHR sentences must satisfy. That is, he considers the formula (1) to be 'a productive and general syntactic process' and assumes that syntax freely generates the structure, while his acceptability condition filters out unacceptable sentences. He also contends that there is 'minimal formal contrast' between EHRCs and IHRCs and that the condition can account for differences in acceptability between the two types of relativization sentences. His relevancy condition is stated as follows:

- (2) RELEVANCY CONDITION: For a p.-i. [pivot independent, i.e. our internally headed] relative clause to be acceptable, it is necessary that it be interpreted pragmatically in such a way as to be directly relevant to the pragmatic content of its matrix clause.

(Kuroda 1992 (1974-77):147, (6), bracketed words are mine)

As possible ways that an IHRC can be interpreted as 'directly relevant' to the content of the main clause, he enumerates 'simultaneity', 'co-positionality', and 'purposiveness'. For instance, in (3) below, the two situations described, namely, an apple being on a plate and Taro picking it up, do not occur simultaneously. While the EHR sentence (3a) is acceptable, the IHR sentence (3b) is thus ruled out due to lack of a 'simultaneity' relation between the two clauses:

- (3) a. EHRC

taroo wa kesa, [[kinoo sara no ue ni atta] ringo]
Taro TOP this.morning yesterday plate GEN top LOC existed apple
o totte, ...
ACC took-and

'This morning Taro picked up an apple which had been on a plate yesterday, and ...'

b. IHRC

*taroo wa kesa, [[ringo ga kinoo sara no ue ni atta] no]
NMLZ

o totte, ...

Intended: 'Yesterday there was an apple on a plate, and this morning Taro picked (it) up, and ...'

(Kuroda 1992 (1974-77):148, (9-10))

Even if the two situations described in an IHR sentence lack a simultaneous interpretation, the sentence may still be acceptable when the two situations can be understood as occurring at the same place ('compositionality' relation). The two events in (4) both take place at the back of the closet:

- (4) [[taroo ga san-nen mae tansu no oku ni okane o
Taro NOM 3-years ago closet GEN back LOC money ACC
kakusiteoita] no] o hanako wa guuzen mitukedasita.
hide-ASP-PAST NMLZ ACC Hanako TOP accidentally found
'Taro had hidden money behind the closet three years ago, and Hanako found (it) by accident.'

The S1 event in IHR sentences may also be 'purposively' related to the S2 event.⁴ Example (5a), in which the two events are interpreted as occurring at different times, is unacceptable. Adding *oita* in (5b), as indicated by the bold type, makes the sentence acceptable. Kuroda argues that this is because this expression has the connotation 'do something with later usefulness, convenience, etc. in mind':

⁴ I am using the term 'event' as a term that refers to situations and actions as well as events.

Chapter 3. Previous accounts of Japanese IHRCs

- (5) a. *taroo wa [[hanako ga kinoo ringo o sara no ue
TOP NOM yesterday apple ACC plate GEN top
ni oita] no] o totte, ...
LOC put NMLZ ACC took-and
Intended: 'Hanako had put an apple on a plate yesterday, and
Taro picked (it) up, and ...'
- b. taroo wa [[hanako ga kinoo ringo o sara no ue ni oite-oita]
put-ASP-PAST
no] o totte, ...
'Hanako had put an apple on a plate yesterday with some later
usefulness in mind which would result from her doing so, and
Taro took (it), and ...'

(Kuroda 1992 (1974-77):149, (12),(15))

Moreover, an IHR sentence may be acceptable on the grounds that the S1 event and the S2 event are causally related. The difference in acceptability between the two IHR sentences in (6) is attributed to the fact that while being attacked gives one a natural motivation to floor and hold down the attacker (6a), someone's having come a long way to visit is not likely to provide a good motivation for a violent reaction (6b):

- (6) a. taroo wa [[hanako ga osoikakatte kita] no] o
TOP NOM approached.to.attack NMLZ ACC
nezihuseta.
floored.and.held.down
'Hanako approached him to attack, so Taro floored and held
(her) down.'
- b. *taroo wa [[hanako ga harubaru tazunete kita] no]
a.long.way visit came NMLZ
o nezihuseta.
Intended: 'Hanako came a long way to visit him, so Taro floored
and held down (her).'

(Kuroda 1992 (1974-77):151, (18-19))

None of the relations above, however, seems more central than the rest. Kuroda must be credited for discovering that there exists a close pragmatic relation between the two clauses in IHR sentences, but as he himself admits, the relevancy condition is vague. For example, it is not clear how it can account for the unacceptability of the sentence (7). The fact that a student is smart is likely to give a good motivation for inviting the student to one's (a professor's) office and in that sense the S1 event may be seen as 'directly relevant' to the S2 event. Yet the sentence is unacceptable:

- (7) *[[gakusei ga kasikoi] no] o watasi wa kenkyuu-situ
 student NOM smart NMLZ ACC I TOP office
 ni yonda.
 LOC invited

Intended: 'The student is smart, and I invited (him/her) to my office.'

Insightful as it was, the relevancy condition, which is based on the notion of RELEVANCE, is inherently too vague to account for all and only acceptable sentences. It is possible to construct a context for virtually any two situations so that they are relevant to each other, and yet there exist pairs of situations which cannot be expressed by the IHR construction (cf. also Section 4.2.2).

As we saw in Section 1.2.1 and Section 2.3.4.1, occurrences of IHR sentences are not only pragmatically restricted but also morphologically restricted as well. The formula (1) is thus not as productive as Kuroda claims. The contrast exhibited by the pair of EHR and IHR sentences in (8) does not seem to be attributable to the relevancy condition but rather due to the

restricted external marking on IHRCs and to the fact that there exists a causal clausal-conjunction *node* 'because':

(8) a. EHRC

[[titi ga atarasiku katta] pasokon] de geemu o
father NOM newly bought PC INSTR game ACC
sita.
played

'I played a game on the new PC which my father bought.'

b. IHRC

*[[titi ga atarasiku pasokon o katta] no] de geemu o sita.
NMLZ INSTR

Intended: 'My father bought a new PC, and I played a game on (it).'

Actual reading: 'Because my father bought a new PC, I played a game.'

To my knowledge, Kuroda was the first to note the multiple-target phenomenon. By introducing the phenomenon he demonstrates that the syntax of the construction underdetermines the target and that the hearer construes it using lexical and world knowledge. The phrase *hutari-tomo* 'both of the two' below forces a multiple-target reading:

(9) [[zyunsa ga doroboo o kawa no hoo e oitumete
policeman NOM thief ACC river GEN direction ALL track.down
itta] no] ga ikioi amatte hutari-tomo kawa no naka e
went NMLZ NOM power exceed two.people-both river GEN inside ALL
otita.
fell

'A policeman was tracking down a thief toward the river, and both of them, losing control, fell into the river.'

(Kuroda 1992 (1974-77):155, (32) modified)

To summarize, Kuroda has contributed significantly to the study of Japanese IHRCs by revealing their basic syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic properties. In spite of his contention that the relevancy condition can account for the contrast in acceptability between EHR and IHR sentences, however, there seem to be more semantic and pragmatic as well as formal constraints on IHRCs than Kuroda assumes.

3.3 Relativization analyses

In discussing the relativization analyses, I divide them into two: those which resort to LF movement (the movement analyses) and those which do not (the non-movement analyses).

3.3.1 Movement analyses

The movement analyses include Itô (1986), Ishii (1988), and Watanabe (1992). Following Cole (1987:278), they assume that in S-structure (and also in D-structure) IHRCs have phonologically null heads (e_i), which are pronominal and which are coindexed with the target NP (NP_i), as shown in (10). Furthermore, after Williamson (1987), they argue that there is a LF movement, which moves the target NP (NP_i) to the head of NP (i.e. to the position of e_i in (10)).⁵ In other words, these analyses assume that IHRCs basically have the same structural configuration as EHRCs.

⁵ To be precise, Itô argues that the movement occurs at the level of LF'. We are, however, more interested in examining the over-all claims made in the relativization analyses, so the subtle differences among them do not concern us here (cf. Mihara 1994a).

- (10) [_{NP} [_{CP} [_{IP} ... NP_i ...] COMP] e_i]
- NP_i: target
e_i: phonologically null head
CP: IHRC + *no*⁶

Moreover, Watanabe argues that just as in the case of EHRCs the movement is subject to Subjacency effect.⁷ He argues that the IHRC in (11a) is ruled out since the lower clause forms a weak island for movement:

- (11) a. ?*[[zyon ga [[mearii ga subarasii ronbun o kaita
John NOM Mary NOM excellent paper ACC wrote
to yuu] uwasa] o kiita] no] ga syuppansareta.
CMPL say rumor ACC hear-PAST NMLZ NOM was.published
Intended: 'John heard a rumor that Mary had written an
excellent paper, and (the paper) got published.'
(Watanabe 1992:261, (11b))

Mihara (1994a) questions Watanabe's claim. He points out that if *kiitu* 'heard' in S1 in (11a) is replaced by *kii-te-ita* 'was hearing', then the sentence becomes acceptable:

- (11) b. [[zyon ga [[mearii ga subarasii ronbun o kaita to yuu] uwasa]
o kii-te-ita] no] ga syuppan sareta.
hear-ASP-PAST
'John occasionally heard a rumor that Mary had written an
excellent paper, and (the paper) got published.'

⁶ Itô analyzes *no* as a complementizer, while Ishii and Watanabe do not explicitly discuss the nature of the morpheme.

⁷ Some GB researchers argue that Subjacency applies not only to S-structure movement but also to LF movement, contrary to Huang (1982)'s claim that S-structure movement is constrained by Subjacency and the ECP, whereas LF movement is only sensitive to the ECP (e.g. Nishigauchi 1986, 1990, Pesetsky 1987). Watanabe argues that Subjacency effects observed in Japanese IHRCs in fact involve S-structure movement of a null operator and not LF movement (cf. Haegeman 1994). However, I am not concerned with these details here.

(Mihara 1994a:83, (9))

Mihara thus argues that (11a) should not be ruled out on the basis of its structure, i.e. Subjacency violation, but rather on the basis of a semantic/pragmatic constraint such as Kuroda's relevancy condition. That is, *kii-te-ita* in (11b) but not *kiita* in (11a) allows an interpretation in which the S1 event is simultaneous with the S2 event and therefore (11b) but not (11a) is acceptable in spite of having the same structure.

There seems to be another problem with the movement analyses. They coindex the target inside S1 with a valence requirement of V2 through the structural device of movement. In this respect, they contrast with Kuroda's account, which argues for the syntactic underdetermination of the target. Kuroda contends that syntax underdetermines a range of interpretations and that the semantic target is ultimately construed on semantic and pragmatic grounds. Existence of multiple-target sentences such as (9) above seems to argue in favor of Kuroda's view. It would be difficult for the movement analyses to account for the phenomenon, since in order to structurally identify both the subject and the object of S1 as targets they would have to allow two NPs to move simultaneously to the head position of the NP.⁸

3.3.2 Non-movement analyses

The non-movement analyses include Tsubomoto (1991) and Uchibori (1992). Just as in the movement analyses, Uchibori posits (10) as the structure of

⁸ See Itô 1986 for an attempt to structurally derive a multiple-target interpretation using Absorption Analysis presented by Higginbotham and May (1981).

IHRCs. Instead of advocating a movement analysis, she argues that IHRCs involve binding relations between an indefinite NP in S1 and the null operator in the Spec position, following Williamson (1987). However, her assumption that the target NP inside Japanese IHRCs is indefinite just like that of Lakhota IHRCs is not compatible with the fact that Japanese IHRCs allow definite NPs and proper nouns as the target (Section 1.2.2 and Section 2.4).⁹

Let us now focus on Tsubomoto's account. He proposes that the target inside S1 is coindexed with a zero pronoun in S2 and that IHRCs are base-generated, dislocated relative clauses. In (12) below, the target NP is indicated as 'NP_i' and the zero pronoun as 'pro_i'. When pro_i functions as the subject of the main clause the structure of the IHR sentence is as (12a), in which the dislocated relative clause (shown as CP below) is adjoined to the IP. When pro_i functions as the object of main clause, then the structure is as (12b), in which the relative clause CP is adjoined to the VP:

- (12) a. [IP [CP ... NP_i ... [C *no*]] [IP pro_i ... I]]
 b. [IP ... [VP [CP ... NP_i ... [C *no*]] [VP pro_i V]] ...]
- NP_i: target
 pro_i: zero pronoun
 CP: dislocated relative clause (IHRC + *no*)¹⁰

By analyzing IHRCs as dislocated relative clauses he can avoid violation of the binding theory (cf. Tsubomoto 1991 for details). What is more relevant to us here is his treatment of case markers on the IHRC and on the

⁹ See Ohori 1995 for another potential problem with Uchibori's analysis.

¹⁰ Tsubomoto analyzes *no* not as a nominalizer but as a complementizer.

zero pronoun in the main clause. Tsubomoto argues that in (12a) INFL, or 'I', assigns the nominative case to both the *no*-nominalized relative clause CP and *pro*, whereas in (12b) the main predicate (V) assigns the appropriate case to both CP and *pro*, based on the case theory (cf. especially Chomsky 1981). In other words, he contends that only structural cases and not inherent cases can follow *no* in IHR sentences. He gives the following examples to illustrate the point:

(13) a. Nominative

[gakusei_i ga natu yasumi ni kisei siteita] no] ga
 student NOM summer-break LOC went.home NMLZ NOM

pro_i omiyage o kattekitekureta.
 souvenirs ACC bought.me

'A student went home during the summer break, and (s/he) bought and gave me souvenirs.'

b. Accusative¹¹

taroo wa [hanako ga kinoo ringo_i o katteoita] no]
 Taro TOP Hanako NOM yesterday apple ACC buy-ASP-PAST NMLZ

o pro_i totte tabeta.
 ACC took-and ate

'Hanako bought an apple yesterday, and Taro took and ate (it).'

c. Object-marking *ni*

sutanto man ga [moo supiido de kuruma_i ga
 stuntman NOM extreme-speed LOC car NOM

hasittekuru] no] ni pro_i butukatta.
 come.running-NPAST NMLZ DAT hit

'A car approached at an extreme speed, and the stuntman hit (it).'

(Tsubomoto 1991)

¹¹ Tsubomoto notes that it is not a violation of Double *o* Constraint in Japanese (cf. Harada 1986 (1973)), since 'pro' is non-overt and thus the case on 'pro' is not realized overtly either.

Tsubomoto's zero-pronoun analysis is compatible with Kuroda's observations concerning the role of lexical and world knowledge in construing the target. Tsubomoto (ibid.:261) notes that identification of the antecedent of a zero pronoun often involves pragmatic knowledge and that the same is true in multiple-target IHR sentences.

Another thing to remark about Tsubomoto's analysis is his account of the case assignment. He makes sure that the IHRC and the zero pronoun are assigned the same case in order to capture the fact that there exists 'case-matching' between the external case-marking on the IHRC and the case-marking required for the role of the target within the main clause. That is, when the IHRC plus *no* is marked by *ga*, then the target NP corresponds to the subject of the main clause; when it is marked by *o*, then the target corresponds to the object of the main clause.

Tsubomoto's contention that only the structural cases can follow an IHRC plus *no* is attacked by Mihara, who gives the following counterexample. Here, the IHRC is externally marked with the ablative, which is an inherent case:

(14) Ablative

zimu-kan wa [[syorui ga mada dekiteinai] no] kara,
secretary TOP papers NOM yet complete-ASP-NEG NMLZ ABL

katazukeyoo to sita.
tried.to.finish

'The paperwork was not done yet, and the secretary decided to finish (it) first.'

(Mihara 1994a:86, (17a))

3.4 Adverbial analyses

Proponents of the adverbial analyses include Mihara (1994a, 1994b) and Murasugi (1994). Their accounts are similar to Tsubomoto's in positing a zero pronoun in the main clause. Their claims, however, differ from Tsubomoto's in arguing that IHRCs are ADVERBIAL clauses rather than dislocated relative clauses. Mihara's and Murasugi's analyses are similar in many ways. I will thus focus on Mihara's analysis in this section.¹²

Citing Kuroda, who points out that IHRCs provide a background to the situation described in the main clause, Mihara contends that IHRCs are adverbial in FUNCTION and that their STRUCTURE should not be analyzed as relative clauses. He thus suggests the following two structures for IHR sentences, depending on whether the IHRC is externally marked by *ga* or something else:

- (15) a. [IP [ADV ... NP_i ...]*no-ga* [IP pro_i ... I]]
 b. [IP ... [VP [ADV ... NP_i ...]*no-o/etc.* [VP pro_i V]] ...]
- NP_i: target
 pro_i: zero pronoun
 ADV: adverbial clause (IHRC)
no: nominalizer

¹² Just like Tsubomoto and proponents of the adverbial analyses, Hoshi (1994) also argues that IHR sentences involve an empty argument NP [e], which is base-generated as an argument of the main predicate. He contends that [e] is generated 'independently of the *no*-phrase', which is a NP nominalized by *no*. He assumes that the *no*-phrase (NP) is introduced by *Merge* (=Generalized Transformation) but does not discuss in detail the nature of the *no*-phrase (NP) (cf. Chomsky 1993, 1994).

Since he posits a zero pronoun just like Tsubomoto, he can account for the ambiguity present in construing the target of IHR sentences, including multiple-target sentences. As for *no* after the IHRC, he analyzes it as a nominalizer and argues that an IHRC plus the nominalizer is syntactically a NP and semantically functions as an adverbial clause. Therefore, to be more precise, ADV plus *no* followed by a postposition in (15) above is rewritten as below:

- (16) [ADV ... NP_i ...]*no-ga/-o/etc.* →
 [NP [CP [IP ... NP_i ...]] [N *no*]]-*ga/-o/etc.*

In contrast to Tsubomoto, Mihara argues that the postposition after the nominalizer in (15) is NOT a structural case: Under the configurations in (15), the IHRC does not have any case assigner and therefore according to the case theory the postposition cannot be a structural case. He thus speculates that it is a NP postposition having a ‘presentational’ function. That is, in addition to the nominative *ga* and the accusative *o*, which he suggests are structural cases, there are other postpositions with no case-theoretic status (Mihara 1994b). He discusses two types of such postpositions: the ‘presentational’ *ga* and *o* occurring in IHR sentences, and *ga* and *o* which require an aboutness condition between the NP they attach to and the subsequent proposition. I will not evaluate this proposal here, except to note that stipulating functionally distinguished NP postpositions in this way might result in proliferation of postpositions (cf. Section 5.2).

Mihara’s account is ambitious in trying to describe the Japanese data as adequately as possible, while at the same time asking whether assumptions

made within the GB framework are compatible with the data. He questions the assumption by previous researchers that IHRCs should have the same structural configuration as EHRCs (cf. (10)). He furthermore casts doubt on GB's premise that all postpositions obey the case theory, on the grounds that there are 'legitimate' postpositions in Japanese which cannot be explained or predicted by the case theory.

In general, there seems to be one problem with the existing adverbial analyses: They ignore an important semantic similarity between EHR and IHR sentences. It is true that IHRCs do not quite fit GB's structural definition of relativization. Semantically, however, EHR and IHR sentences have the same referential structure: In either of them there is NP coreferentiality between the two clauses and the proposition expressed in S1 is construable as a proposition which expresses some information about the target NP referent.

It may be fair to cite the data that Mihara discusses. He is more concerned about accounting for similarities between IHR sentences and the following types of sentences than the relation between EHR and IHR sentences. The following sentences, taken from Mihara (1994a), structurally deviate from the IHR sentences I have discussed so far in one way or another.¹³ In (17a), the 'memo' inside the IHRC (S1) is understood as the direct object of the main predicate (V2), but S1 plus the nominalizer is not followed by the expected accusative case. Example (17b) is interesting for two reasons. First, two NPs in S1, namely, the 'paper' and the 'journal', are

¹³ Mihara gives credit to Tsubomoto for discussing the types of sentences exemplified in (17) along with IHR sentences. Lê (1988), however, also discusses similar types of sentences within a descriptive framework (cf. Martin 1975).

construed as the direct object and the indirect object of V2 respectively. This is in contrast to standard IHR sentences, including multiple-target sentences, in which targets are coreferential with only one argument of V2, not two. Second, even though *ronbun* ‘paper’ inside S1 is construed as satisfying not only the direct object argument of V1 but also that of V2, there is only identity of sense but not identity of reference between the direct object arguments of V1 and V2. That is, the direct object arguments of V1 and V2 both refer to *ronbun* ‘paper’, but they refer to different types, or instances of paper: The direct object of V1 refers to Ujihara’s paper, while that of V2 refers to Todoroki’s paper.¹⁴ In (17c), V2 requires a nominative-marked NP and it is explicitly realized as an anaphoric pronoun within S2:

- (17) a. [murai ni **memo** o nokositeokoo to omotteita] no **ga**,
Murai DAT memo ACC was.thinking.of.leaving NMLZ
sukkari wasuretesimatta.
completely forgot
‘I was thinking of leaving a message for Murai, but I completely forgot.’
- b. todoroki wa, [uzihira ga **ronbun** o **gakkai-si** ni
Todoroki TOP Ujihara NOM paper ACC journal DAT
tookoo siyootositeita] no o, onazi teema de
was.going.to.submit NMLZ same subject on
sakini tookoo sita.
ahead submitted
‘Ujihara was going to submit a paper to a journal, but Todoroki submitted a paper on the same subject before Ujihara did.’
- c. [ima made mi-ugoki ga dekinakatta] no **ga**,
now until body-movement NOM was.unable.to.do NMLZ

¹⁴ I would like to thank Charles J. Fillmore for pointing this out to me.

Chapter 3. Previous accounts of Japanese IHRs

sore ga kyuuni rakuni natta.
that NOM suddenly comfortable became
'Until then I could not move my body, but suddenly it (=moving
my body) became easy.'

(Mihara 1994a:87, (20,22) modified)

Mihara analyzes S1 in (17), indicated by brackets, as an adverbial clause. He moreover argues that these sentences are instances of the same grammatical construction as IHR sentences and analyzes the postpositions *ga* and *o* after S1 as those having a 'presentational' function. I have thus left out the glosses for *ga* and *o* in (17) above. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to examine in detail the types of sentences represented by (17). What is clear is that even if they are to be analyzed as instances of the IHR construction, they cannot be central members of the construction because of the structural peculiarities noted in the previous paragraph. Also, what Mihara does not seem to take into account is the fact that in all of the sentences in (17) there is a concessive relation between the situations described in the two clauses. In typical IHR sentences, in contrast, such a concessive relation between the two situations is often missing. The following two pairs of sentences illustrate the point. Examples (18a) and (19a) represent typical IHR sentences, which exhibit NP coreferentiality between the two clauses and the 'case-matching' phenomenon between the case-marking on S1 and the one required for the target by V2.¹⁵

¹⁵ In addition to the concessive meaning between the two clauses, it may also be argued that (19b) (= (17b)) does not express a temporal sequence relation unlike typical IHR sentences. In this particular sentence, however, it is still possible to regard the situation in which Ujihara thought about submitting a paper to a journal as occurring prior to Todoroki's actual submission of a paper.

Chapter 3. Previous accounts of Japanese IHRs

- (18) a. IHR sentence
 [[midori ga kega o sita] no] ga byooin e
 Midori NOM got.injured NMLZ NOM hospital ALL
 katugikomareta.
 taken
 'Midori got injured, and (she) was taken to a hospital.'
- b. = (17a)
 [murai ni memo o nokositeokoo to omotteita] no ga,
 Murai DAT memo ACC was.thinking.of.leaving NMLZ
 sukkari wasuretesimatta.
 completely forgot
 'I was thinking of leaving a message for Murai, but I completely forgot.'
- (19) a. IHR sentence
 [[kurasu de kukkii o yaita] no] o hukei ni utta.
 class LOC cookies ACC baked NMLZ ACC parents DAT sold
 'We baked cookies in class, and sold (them) to our parents.'
- b. = (17b)
 todoroki wa, [uzihira ga ronbun o gakkaisi ni
 Todoroki TOP Ujihara NOM paper ACC journal DAT
 tookoo siyootositeita] no o, onazi teema de sakini tookoo sita.
 was.going.to.submit NMLZ same subject on ahead submitted
 'Ujihara was going to submit a paper to a journal, but Todoroki submitted a paper on the same subject before Ujihara did.'

Just like Mihara, however, I speculate that studying the relation between IHR sentences and concessive sentences holds a key to revealing the nature of the IHR construction and especially the restricted occurrence of IHR sentences. These matters will be dealt with in Chapter 5.

3.5 Conclusion

In this chapter I reviewed previous analyses of Japanese IHRCs focusing on how they regard the relation between IHRCs and EHRCs.

In his pioneering work, Kuroda proposes his relevancy condition in order to distinguish IHRCs from EHRCs. He contends that IHRCs, but not EHRCs, must be pragmatically interpreted as relevant to the content of the main clause. A condition based on RELEVANCE, however, seems inherently too vague to account for all and only acceptable IHR sentences. I will come back to this issue in Chapter 4 (cf. also Chapter 6). Furthermore, distribution of IHRCs are not only constrained by pragmatics but also by formal factors. In addition to proposing the relevancy condition, Kuroda observes the multiple-target phenomenon, which seems to be unique to Japanese IHRCs and emphasizes the role of semantics and pragmatics in the construal of the target in this construction. That is, the target of IHR sentences are syntactically underdetermined and it is ultimately construed by the hearer using available semantic and pragmatic information.

Among the analyses which I have called the relativization analyses, the movement analyses regard the structural configuration of IHRCs as identical to that of EHRCs. One problem the movement analyses have is accounting for the multiple-target phenomenon: Two NPs which occupy different structural positions would have to be simultaneously moved to one position, which is not allowed in the standard versions of GB.

Tsubomoto's analysis, which is classified as a non-movement analysis, avoids the problem by positing a zero pronoun in the main clause. His

analysis is based on the observation that often the antecedent of a zero pronoun cannot be identified uniquely.

The adverbial analyses in turn completely abandon the idea that IHRCs are relative clauses and instead consider them to be adverbial clauses. Consequently, they do not take into account the fact that EHR and IHR sentences have the same referential structure, i.e. NP coreferentiality between the two clauses.

It seems necessary to admit that Japanese IHRCs do not quite fit GB's structural definition of relativization. IHRCs nevertheless share with EHRCs structural and semantic properties. Syntactically, both an EHRC plus a head noun and an IHRC plus the nominalizer externally function as NPs. Semantically, EHR and IHR sentences have the same referential structure. Nonetheless, IHRCs' function of providing a background situation to the main-clause event departs from the prototypical function of relative clauses, which is to describe a property of the head noun (cf. Comrie 1989). In other words, in order to adequately describe the relation of IHR sentences to EHR sentences, it is necessary to take into consideration syntactic, semantic, and functional properties of the two types of sentences. In the next chapter, I will argue that IHR sentences and EHR sentences have different pragmatic functions.

4. Form-meaning-use correlations of the IHR construction

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the pragmatic function of the IHR construction.¹ As seen in Chapter 3, previous accounts of IHR sentences have often discussed their structure in relation to that of EHR sentences. Researchers have not, however, compared the pragmatics of the two types of sentences but have relied on Kuroda's seminal work on the pragmatics of the IHR construction. I argue that although IHR sentences have the same referential structure as EHR sentences, the two types of sentences have distinct pragmatic characteristics. In particular, by focusing on S1 of each type of sentence, i.e. the IHRC and the EHRC, I show that the IHRC functions to report an event, in the sense of Lambrecht (1986, 1987, 1988a, 1988b, 1994), while the EHRC merely serves to modify the head noun.

Unlike previous researchers, in which structurally well-formed but pragmatically unacceptable sentences are filtered out by grammar-external conditions, I take the view that a grammatical construction is a pairing of syntax with semantics and pragmatics (e.g. Fillmore, Kay and O'Connor 1988,

¹ An earlier and shorter version of this chapter was presented as Ohara 1996. See also Ohara 1994.

Chapter 4. Form-meaning-use correlations of the IHR construction

Goldberg 1995, Kay and Fillmore 1994, Lakoff 1987, Lambrecht 1994) (cf. Section 1.6); a grammatical construction is thus partly characterized by the pragmatic circumstances under which the sentence is used. Put differently, a grammatical construction can be dedicated to certain pragmatic functions. It is important to stress that I am dealing with only the CONVENTIONALIZED pragmatic constraints and not the CONVERSATIONAL pragmatic constraints, which can be uncovered only by discourse analysis. That is, by conventionalized pragmatic constraints I mean pragmatic functions which DEMAND a certain discourse context, while what I mean by conversational pragmatic constraints are those which are IMPOSED by a discourse context. I analyze the IHR construction as advancing a narrative within a sentence by reporting two events which share a participant (cf. Section 1.3). I furthermore argue that seemingly puzzling structural and semantic properties of the construction correlate with this narrative-advancing function.

I follow Kuroda in assuming that the IHRC and the EHRC are used under different pragmatic circumstances. It may be worth commenting on similarities and differences between the views of grammar underlying Kuroda's analysis and the present analysis. As seen in the last chapter, Kuroda (*ibid.*:147, (6)) proposes the relevancy condition, which says that an acceptable IHRC must be interpreted pragmatically in such a way as to be directly relevant to the pragmatic content of its main clause. He assumes a sharp distinction between grammaticality and acceptability and regards the relevancy condition as a grammar-external condition which IHR sentences must satisfy. Just like the framework that Kuroda assumes, Construction Grammar, on which the present analysis is based, is generative in the sense

that it tries to account for all and only acceptable sentences within a language — the infinite number of expressions that are allowed by the grammar — while attempting to account for the fact that an infinite number of other expressions are ruled out or disallowed. What distinguishes Kuroda's approach and the Construction Grammar approach is that the latter does not make a sharp distinction between grammar and acceptability and views the conditions for felicitous use of a given construction as part of speakers' competence or knowledge of language. Therefore, while Kuroda views acceptability conditions such as his relevancy condition as external to grammar, construction grammarians regard them as a part of grammar which linguists must describe.

The organization of the chapter is as follows. In Section 4.2, I will compare the morphosyntactic properties of IHRCs with those of EHRCs and coordinated clauses and demonstrate that some of the properties of IHRCs resemble coordinated clauses rather than EHRCs. I will resolve this paradox by arguing that IHRCs are like EHRCs in terms of the referential structure, but at the same time they are like coordinated clauses in terms of the discourse structure. I will show that the structural oddities of IHRCs are motivated by their pragmatic function which resembles that of coordinated clauses: IHRCs, like coordinated clauses, assert or report an event. In Section 4.3, I will propose that the pragmatic function of the larger IHR construction should be characterized as narrative-advancing. Finally, in Section 4.4, I will compare the IHR construction with the continuative relative construction in English, which has the same function.

4.2 Pragmatically motivated morphosyntax of IHRCs

Before comparing the morphosyntactic and pragmatic properties of IHRCs with those of EHRCs, let us first briefly examine the semantics of EHR and IHR sentences. Even though EHR and IHR sentences are used under different pragmatic circumstances, they have the same referential structure. That is, they both exhibit NP coreferentiality between the two clauses. Also, the two types of relative clauses are said to have the same propositional content because of the following two features that they share. First, at least one NP referent participates not only in the S1 event but also in the S2 event. Second, the proposition expressed in S1 must be construable as a proposition which expresses some information, whether presupposed or asserted (cf. Section 4.2.1), about the target NP referent.

There are, however, structural differences between the two types of sentences which previous accounts have not taken into account. Focusing on S1, I observe in the following section that the morphosyntactic behavior of IHRCs is distinct from that of EHRCs in some important ways. I assume that different structural properties are correlated with different pragmatic relations. This same assumption also underlies studies by Lambrecht (1994) and Goldberg (1995) (cf. also Schuetze-Coburn 1984). Lambrecht calls alternative sentence structures expressing the same proposition ALLOSENTENCES. By looking at formal contrasts between pairs of allosentences, he examines various pragmatic functions that can be associated with a proposition. Although her emphasis is not on pragmatics, Goldberg (*ibid.*:67) assumes the Principle of No Synonymy, which states that if two

constructions are syntactically distinct, they must be semantically or pragmatically distinct.

4.2.1 The morphosyntax of IHRCs

In Chapter 3, I pointed out that previous accounts have attempted to make IHRCs and EHRCs structurally parallel. While it is true that the two types of relative clauses share structural properties such as the fact that their external syntax is a NP, they also exhibit different structural behavior. Interestingly, when IHRCs display structural behavior different from that of EHRCs, they behave like coordinated clauses. In Japanese, subject case-marking in modifier clauses such as EHRCs can alternate between the nominative *ga* and the genitive *no* as shown in (1a). This phenomenon is called *ga-no* conversion (cf. Harada 1971, Mikami 1972 (1959), Tomoda 1980). Subject case-marking in S1 of clauses coordinated by the clausal conjunction *ga* 'and/but', on the other hand, must be the nominative as in (1b). Example (1c) shows that subjects of IHRCs must take the nominative *ga*, exactly as in S1 of *ga*-coordinated clauses (cf. Kuroda 1992:163).²

² As Kuroda (1992 (1974-77):165) points out, there are syntactic and semantic differences between IHR sentences and sentences in which the subject of S1 is marked by the genitive *no* (*no*-relatives) in Modern Japanese. Nomura (1995:27-8) lists five contrasts between the two types of constructions. First, *no*-relatives do not obey the relevancy condition. Second, they do not exhibit the multiple-target phenomenon. Third, they are usually restrictive. Fourth, the first *no* in *no*-relatives does not always mark the subject of the clause. And finally, the post-relative *no* in *no*-relative sentences is claimed to be pronominal.

Chapter 4. Form-meaning-use correlations of the IHR construction

(1) *ga-no* conversion

a. EHRC (modifier clause)

[[taroo **ga/no** sewa siteita] inu] ga yatto genki ni natta.
 Taro NOM/GEN was.taking.care.of dog NOM finally got.well
 'The dog that Taro was taking care of finally got well.'

b. S1 of *ga*-coordinated clauses

[taroo **ga/*no** inu o sewa siteita] ga, sono inu wa yatto
 NOM/*GEN CONJ that dog TOP
 genki ni natta.
 'Taro was taking care of the dog, and the dog finally got well.'

c. IHRC

[[taroo **ga/*no** inu o sewa siteita] no] ga yatto
 NOM/*GEN NMLZ NOM
 genki ni natta.
 'Taro was taking care of the dog, who finally got well.'

Moreover, S1 of *ga*-coordinated clauses, in contrast to EHRCs, disallows *wh*-questions.³ Although the EHRC in (2a) below allows one of its constituent NPs to be replaced by a *wh*-word, the S1 in (2b) does not:

(2) *wh*-Questions

a. EHRC

[[dare **ga** katte-kita] ringo] o hanako ga
 who NOM buy-ASP-PAST apple ACC Hanako NOM
 tabemasitaka?
 eat-POLITE-PAST-Q
 'Who bought the apple which Hanako ate?'

³ I thank Yoko Hasegawa for pointing out this contrast to me.

b. S1 of *ga*-coordinated clauses

*[dare ga ringo o katte kita] ga hanako ga
NOM CONJ NOM

tabemasitaka?

Intended: 'Who bought the apple, and Hanako ate it?'

IHRCs are subject to the same restriction as S1 of *ga*-coordinated clauses:

c. IHRC

*[[dare ga ringo o katte kita] no] o hanako ga
 NOM NMLZ ACC Hanako NOM

tabemasitaka?

Intended: 'Who bought the apple, and Hanako ate (it)?'

The fact that IHRCs resemble *ga*-coordinated clauses with respect to *ga-no* conversion and *wh*-questions suggests that IHRCs are structurally like coordinated clauses and main clauses.

According to the approach I am adopting, if two constructions exhibit distinct structural properties in spite of having the same referential structure (i.e. semantics), then it can be because of their distinct pragmatic properties. The fact that *ga-no* conversion and *wh*-questions are allowed in EHRCs but not in IHRCs suggests that, unlike EHRCs, IHRCs are not modifier clauses. In Japanese, EHRCs may be used either restrictively or non-restrictively, as mentioned in Section 1.2.2.⁴ Both types of EHRCs modify and describe some property of the head noun referent.

⁴ For a discussion of non-restrictive relative clauses, see Werth 1974. For a detailed discussion of modification, see Bolinger 1967.

The fact that IHRCs behave similarly to S1 of *ga*-coordinated clauses with respect to *ga-no* conversion and *wh*-questions suggests that IHRCs have a pragmatic function similar to that of *ga*-coordinated clauses. What is characteristic of clauses coordinated by *ga* is that not only the predicate of S2 but also that of S1 makes an assertion, in the sense of Lambrecht. He defines presupposition and assertion as follows:

- (3) PRESUPPOSITION: The set of propositions lexico-grammatically evoked in a sentence which the speaker assumes the hearer already knows or is ready to take for granted at the time the sentence is uttered.

ASSERTION: The proposition expressed by a sentence which the hearer is expected to [come to] know or take for granted as a result of hearing the sentence uttered.

(Lambrecht 1994:52,(2.12), bracketed words are mine)

In the sentence below, for example, each of the two clauses coordinated by *ga* makes an assertion: that 'she stared at my face for a while', and that 'she disappeared into the stacks'.

- (4) *ga*-coordinated clauses

kanozyo wa sibaraku boku no kao o miteita ga,
she TOP for.a.while I GEN face ACC stared CONJ

yagate syoko no naka ni kieta.
then stacks GEN inside LOC disappeared

'She stared at my face for a while, and then disappeared into the stacks.'

[Murakami, Haruki]

From the morphosyntactic behavior of IHRCs with respect to *ga-no* conversion and *wh*-questions, which is reminiscent of that of *ga*-coordinated

clauses, it may be hypothesized that the predicate of IHRCs also makes an assertion, in contrast to EHRCs which modify.

4.2.2 The event-reporting pragmatic function of IHRCs

When the predicate of a clause is construed as making an assertion, the clause can be either of the following two types: an event-reporting clause or a topic-comment clause. In what follows I will first describe what event-reporting and topic-comment clauses are and then argue that IHRCs are event-reporting clauses.

Event-reporting sentences report an event or scene. What I mean by 'event' here includes temporally bounded states and situations. Event-reporting sentences have also been called 'neutral description' (Kuno 1972), 'thetic sentences' (Kuroda 1972, Sasse 1987, 1995), and 'sentence-focus structures' (Lambrecht 1987, 1994). Whereas event-reporting sentences have to do prototypically with information about SITUATIONS, topic-comment sentences convey information about ENTITIES.

In Japanese the two types of sentences are distinguished formally by whether or not the so-called topic marker *wa* appears inside the sentence, marking the NP which corresponds to the subject of judgment, namely, the subject of the subject-predicate paradigm, in the philosophical tradition.⁵ In event-reporting sentences *wa* is not allowed. In topic-comment sentences the

⁵ Japanese grammarians use the terms *gensyoo-bun* 'phenomenon sentences' and *handan-bun* 'judgment sentences', corresponding to event-reporting and topic-comment sentences respectively (e.g. Morita 1990, Teramura 1992).

topic expression, i.e. the subject of the subject-predicate paradigm, is marked by *wa* (e.g. Kuno 1972, Kuroda 1972).^{6,7}

Examples (5b) and (6b) are instances of event-reporting and topic-comment sentences respectively. Since event-reporting sentences convey information about situations, they are often used in reply to questions like 'What's the matter?', 'What happened?', and 'Guess what?' as shown in (5). Topic-comment sentences, on the other hand, are about entities, and they may thus be used in reply to 'How's Masako?' or 'What happened to Masako?' as in (6). Since Japanese allows NP ellipsis, answers to these questions would normally not contain explicit topic NPs, as shown by the parentheses in (6b). If answers contain explicit topic expressions, however, then they are marked by *wa*.

- (5) a. Q: doo sita no?
 what happened SFP
 'What's the matter?'
 b. Event-reporting
 A: masako ga iede sita.
 Masako NOM ran.away.from.home
 'Masako ran away from home.'
- (6) a. Q: masako wa doo?
 TOP how

⁶ See Oono 1993 for a hypothesis that the morphosyntactic phenomenon called *kakari musubi* 'bound ending' in Classical Japanese has evolved into the distinction between *ga* and *wa* in Modern Japanese.

⁷ Sometimes, the same expression can be uttered either as an event-reporting sentence or a topic-comment sentence. For example, *buraddo pitto desu* can be uttered as an event-reporting sentence meaning 'Here comes Brad Pitt' or as an answer to the question *dono haiyuu ga ima ninki ga arimasuka?* 'Which actor is popular now?', in which case it is uttered as a topic-comment sentence meaning '(It is) Brad Pitt'.

Chapter 4. Form-meaning-use correlations of the IHR construction

‘How’s Masako?’

b. Topic-comment

A: (masako wa) iede sita.
TOP

‘She ran away from home.’

Supporting evidence for the argument that IHRCs are event-reporting comes from the fact that their syntactic subject NP corresponding to the ‘subject’ of the subject-predicate paradigm is marked by the nominative *ga* and not by *wa*:

- (7) a. taroo wa [[ringo *ga*/**wa* sara no ue ni aru] no] o
Taro TOP apple NOM/TOP plate GEN top LOC exist NMLZ ACC
totte, ...
took-and
‘There was an apple on the table, and Taro picked (it) up, and ...’
(Kuroda, 1992 (1974-77):171, (74))
- b. [[haha *ga*/**wa* seetaa o okutte kureta] no] *ga* kyoo
mother NOM/TOP sweater ACC sent NMLZ NOM today
todoita.
arrived
‘Mother sent me a sweater, and (it) arrived today.’
- c. [[tuma *ga*/**wa* sakana o tuttekita] no] o otto *ga*
wife NOM/TOP fish ACC fished NMLZ ACC husband NOM
ryoori sita.
cooked
‘The wife caught a fish, and the husband cooked (it).’

It is important to note that *wa* is not allowed in EHRCs either but for a different reason.

(7) ㄷ. EHRC

[[tuma ga/*wa tuttekita] sakana] o otto ga ryoori sita.
 wife NOM/TOP fished fish ACC husband NOM cooked

‘The husband cooked the fish which the wife had caught.’

Prohibition of *wa* in EHRCs is not due to the event-reporting function of EHRCs. Occurrence of *wa* is said to be a ‘main clause’ phenomenon (cf. Kuroda 1972) and this is why *wa* is not allowed in EHRCs, which are categorized as embedded clauses. IHRCs, on the other hand, are structurally different from embedded clauses and similar to coordinated clauses in disallowing *ga-no* conversion and *wh*-questions. It may thus be assumed that the reason why *wa* is disallowed in IHRCs is different from the reason why it is not permitted in EHRCs. *Wa* is disallowed in IHRCs, I argue, because of their event-reporting function. As seen in (6b), simple sentences or main clauses, when they are used as topic-comment sentences, allow their topic expressions to be marked by *wa*. Likewise, S1 of *ga*-coordinated clauses allows NPs to be marked by *wa*:

(8) S1 of *ga*-coordinated clauses

[[tuma ga/wa sakana o tuttekita] ga] otto wa
 wife NOM/TOP fish ACC fished CONJ husband TOP

tabenakatta.

did.not.eat

‘The wife had caught a fish, but the husband did not eat (it).’

We can thus understand why *wa* is not allowed in IHRCs by assuming that they specifically function as event-reporting clauses and not as topic-comment clauses.

Chapter 4. Form-meaning-use correlations of the IHR construction

It has been observed that predicates appearing in event-reporting sentences tend to be dynamic predicates (cf. Kuno 1972, Lambrecht 1994:169). Similarly, the predicates of IHRCs tend to be dynamic. That is, V1 in the IHR construction typically denotes a transitory activity but not a durable state (cf. Tsubomoto 1993, Uchibori 1991, 1992). I find Carlson's distinction between stage-level and individual-level predicates useful in talking about the semantic class of verbs allowed as V1 in the IHR construction (cf. Diesing 1992, Dowty 1979). Stage-level predicates denote temporally bounded situations. Individual-level predicates denote permanent, temporally unbounded states. Stage-level predicates are allowed as V1 in this construction but not individual-level predicates. Example (9b) contains an individual-level predicate denoting a durable state and thus is unacceptable:

- (9) a. Noun modification
 [[sinsetuna] kanrinin] o watasi wa heya e manekiireta.
 kind manager ACC I TOP room ALL invited.inside
 'I invited the kind manager into my room.'
- b. IHRC
 *[[kanrinin ga sinsetuna] no] o watasi wa heya e
 manager NOM kind NMLZ ACC
 manekiireta.
Intended: 'The manager is kind, and I invited (him/her) into my room.'

The sentences in (10) demonstrate that among stative predicates only those that are classified as stage-level predicates qualify as V1 in IHR sentences. The requirement that V1 must be a stage-level predicate in the IHR construction appears to have to do with the fact that such a predicate allows

Chapter 4. Form-meaning-use correlations of the IHR construction

an interpretation in which a situation existed temporarily, ENABLING another event to occur or setting the stage for a subsequent situation.

- (10) a. [[kaityoo o obuti-si ga tugu hanasi mo atta] no]
 president ACC Mr. Obuchi NOM succeed talk ADV existed NMLZ
 o, kekkyoku ozawa-si ga eta.
 ACC in.the.end Mr. Ozawa NOM got
 'There was even talk that Mr. Obuchi would succeed to the position of president, and Mr. Ozawa got (it) in the end.'

[Asahi Newspaper]

- b. [[kodomo no koro no akutaigo ga atama ni nokotteita]
 child GEN days GEN bad.words NOM head LOC remained
 no] ga tui kuti e deta.
 NMLZ NOM by.mistake mouth ALL came.out
 'In her head had remained bad words from her childhood days, and she uttered(them) by mistake.'

[Tanabe, Seiko]

To summarize, the primary function of the IHRC is event-reporting and not modifying the target as it is for EHRCs. By construing the predicate of IHRCs as making an assertion just like the predicate of coordinated clauses, it is possible to understand their morphosyntactic properties, which resemble those of coordinated clauses.

The claim that IHRCs function to report an event is compatible with the fact that *wh*-questions are allowed in EHRCs but not in IHRCs (cf. (2)).⁸ Questioning a constituent of EHRCs helps identify the head noun referent and thus is in accordance with EHRCs' function of modifying the head noun. *Wh*-questions are therefore allowed in EHRCs. In contrast, trying to identify

⁸ Conversations with Kaoru Ohta helped me clarify this point.

the target NP referent by questioning would conflict with IHRCs' primary function of presenting an event as a whole, and *wh*-questions are therefore disallowed in IHRCs.⁹

Furthermore, the unacceptability of (9b) may be seen as motivated by the event-reporting function of the IHRC, since intrinsic or static properties do not qualify as scenes to be reported. Kuroda's relevancy condition, whereby acceptability depends on the IHRC's pragmatic relevance to the main clause, is too vague to account for the semantic restriction on V1 (cf. (7) in Chapter 3). It is not too difficult to imagine a context in which the situations described in the two clauses in (9b) are relevant to each other. For example, it may be that I decided to invite the manager of my apartment for coffee because she is always nice to me. Nonetheless, the sentence is not acceptable. The semantic relation of RELEVANCE cannot account for the fact that V1 in the IHR construction is typically a stage-level predicate. By recognizing the event-reporting function, we can account for the fact that individual-level predicates do not appear as V1 in the IHR construction.

4.3 IHR as a clause-linking narrative-advancing construction

The IHR construction should be characterized as a clause-linking narrative-advancing construction. We saw in Section 1.2.3 that it is a bi-clausal grammatical construction in that the *no*-nominalized S1 cannot be used on its own for reference. Furthermore, the construction in question is a

⁹ This, however, cannot account for the fact that in languages such as English *wh*-questions are disallowed in EHRCs. For an analysis of exceptions to the Coordinate Structure Constraint in terms of Frame-Semantic control (cf. Fillmore 1982, 1985), see Lakoff 1986 (cf. Ross 1967).

Chapter 4. Form-meaning-use correlations of the IHR construction

narrative-advancing in the sense of Fillmore (1989). That is, the construction advances a narrative within a sentence by reporting two situations which share a participant. The referent of the coreferenced NP is the participant shared by the two situations. Also, the two situations typically involves a temporal sequence (Section 1.3). Finally, IHR sentences are typically paraphrasable using the clausal conjunction *ga* 'and':

(11) a. IHR sentence

[[kare ga hon go roku satu o sasidasita] **no**] o
he NOM books five six CL ACC held-out NMLZ ACC
watasi wa uketotta.
I TOP received

'He held out five or six books to me, and I took (them).'

(Lê 1988:17, (22))

b. *ga*-coordinated clauses

[kare ga hon go roku satu o sasidasita] **ga** **sorera o**
CONJ them ACC

watasi wa uketotta.

'He held out five or six books to me, and I took them.'

In (11b) the conjunction *ga* immediately follows S1 and the relevant valence requirement of V2 is explicitly realized in the form of a case-marked pronoun as indicated by the bold type. This paraphrasability confirms the hypothesis that the propositions described in the two clauses of an IHRC sentence are pragmatically on a par in the sense that each of them equally makes an assertion just as in clauses coordinated by *ga*.

4.4 Narrative-advancing constructions in Japanese and English

Let us now compare the IHR construction in Japanese with a construction in English which has a similar function.

4.4.1 The English continuative relative construction

The continuative relative construction in English, discussed by Jespersen (1965 (1924)), McCawley (1981), Lambrecht (1988b), and Fillmore (1989), has a function similar to that of the IHR construction in Japanese. The English continuative relative construction is exemplified in (12):¹⁰

- (12) a. He gave the letter to the clerk, who then copied it.
(Jespersen 1965 (1924):113)
- b. She had quite a long argument with the Lory, who at last turned sulky.
- c. She said it to the Knave of Hearts, who only bowed and smiled in reply.
- d. The Queen began staring at the Hatter, who turned pale and fidgeted.
- (Lewis Carroll *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*)

Lambrecht (ibid.:328) describes the continuative relative as a construction which establishes a temporal link between two states of affairs.¹¹ Unlike

¹⁰ The connective relative in Latin discussed by Robin Lakoff 1984 seems to be similar in function.

¹¹ In defining the continuative relative construction, Lambrecht states that it is a construction which establishes a temporal OR logical link between two states of affairs. Based on this distinction, the following sentence is an instance of the construction:

- (i) The cockroach was very arrogant, which is surprising, since cockroaches are known to be humble beings.

Chapter 4. Form-meaning-use correlations of the IHR construction

restrictive and non-restrictive relatives, continuative relatives advance a narrative within a sentence. Continuative relative sentences are generally paraphrasable as coordinated sentences, using *and* (*then*) and replacing the relative pronoun with an appropriate referential pronoun:

- (13) a. Continuative relative
I gave the form to Mary, **who** immediately lost it.
- b. *and*-conjunction
I gave the form to Mary, **and then she** immediately lost it.

This paraphrasability by *and* (*then*) shows that the order of the two clauses is iconic to the order of events and that each of the two clauses makes an assertion.

4.4.2 Comparison

Let us compare the English continuative relative construction and the Japanese IHR construction with respect to the temporal order of the situations they describe and the target identification mechanisms that they employ.

(Lambrecht 1988b: 328,(28b))

The crucial difference between the sentences in (12) above and (i) is that in the latter the antecedent of the relative pronoun *which* is not an NP but the propositional content of the entire S1. I will thus regard (i) as distinct from the continuative relative construction in which two states of affairs are temporally connected. I will only discuss sentences such as (12) in which the antecedent is an NP rather than the propositional content of the entire S1.

4.4.2.1 Temporal sequence

Just like the Japanese IHR construction, the English continuative relative construction expresses a temporal sequence between two situations. However, whereas the main clause is followed by the relative clause in the English construction, the order of the main clause and the 'relative' clause is reversed in the Japanese construction. Here, the 'relative' clauses are shown in bold:

- (14) a. English continuative relative construction
I took it to my house, **which then burned down.**
- b. Japanese IHR construction
[[tukue no ue ni kaado ga tunde-arui] no] o
desk GEN top LOC cards NOM are-piled-up NMLZ ACC
eriko wa yondemita.
Eriko TOP tried-reading
'Some cards were piled up on the desk, and Eriko tried reading (them).'

(Martin 1975:861)

4.4.2.2 Target identification

Target-identification mechanisms differ in the two constructions in question. In the English continuative relative construction, the target (i.e. the antecedent of the relative pronoun) is structurally marked by its position inside S1 (i.e. the main clause): it occurs at the end of S1 irrespective of the role it plays. Here, targets are shown in bold:

Chapter 4. Form-meaning-use correlations of the IHR construction

- (15) a. 'I see!' said **the Queen**, who then turned to Alice.
b. I punched **John**, who instantly fell down.
c. I gave the ticket to **the ticket-taker**, who then punched a hole in it.

In contrast, in the Japanese IHR construction, the target is not marked by its position in S1. Furthermore, there is no morphosyntactic marking on the target inside S1 to help identify it. It is the semantic and pragmatic information supplied by the main verb and the two clauses that helps the hearer construe the target. The sentences below exemplify this. Again, the targets are indicated in bold:

- (16) a. [[**saihu** ga otiteita] no] o eki-in ga hirotta.
wallet NOM fall-ASP-PAST NMLZACC station-staff NOM picked.up
'There lay a wallet, and a station employee picked (it) up.'
b. [[**zyookyaku** ga **saihu** o otosita] no] o eki-in ga hirotta.
passenger NOM wallet ACC dropped
'A passenger dropped a wallet, and a station employee picked (it) up.'

In both of the sentences in (16), there are two NPs in the relative clause, but the semantics of the main verb *hirotta* 'picked up' allows us to safely construe the target to be *saihu* 'wallet'. Note that *saihu* appears sentence-initially as the subject of S1 in (16a), but sentence-medially as the direct object in (16b). Although the target-identification mechanisms differ in the Japanese and English constructions, in both the two states of affairs are related to each other through a shared participant, namely, the target NP referent.

4.5 Conclusion

I have shown in this chapter that although IHR sentences have the same referential structure as EHR sentences, the pragmatic function of IHRCs is different from that of EHRCs. IHRCs report a scene or event, while EHRCs modify the head noun. The supporting evidence that IHRCs are event-reporting clauses comes from the facts that the so-called topic marker *wa* is not allowed in IHRCs and that V1 tends to be a stage-level predicate.

I have also demonstrated that the structural behavior of IHR sentences resembles that of coordinated sentences in that the subject of S1 does not allow *ga-no* conversion and that it is impossible to question a constituent of S1. Previous accounts have not accounted for these properties. By adopting a framework which regards a grammatical form as partly characterized by the pragmatic circumstances under which the form is used, I have argued that the 'coordination-like' properties of the IHR construction may be seen as structural correlates of its function of advancing a narrative by reporting two events.

Finally, the IHR construction has been compared with the English continuative relative construction. It is striking that the two constructions in the totally unrelated languages are similar in function. Although they both have the function of advancing a narrative, they differ in their clause order and target-identification mechanism. These differences reflect the profound structural differences between the two languages, and this seems to support the claim that the form of a grammatical construction is not determined

solely by its functions but also by structures seated deep within the language in question.

I hope to have shown in this chapter that it is not adequate to regard the IHR construction merely as a secondary relativization strategy in Japanese. It has a specialized function, that of advancing a narrative within a sentence by reporting two events which share a participant, and hence is restricted in use. In fact, in written usage, its occurrence seems to be restricted to certain genres such as news reports and novels, in which reporting events and scenes is common.

We also saw in this chapter that Kuroda's contention that the semantic relation between the two clauses in the construction may be characterized by the notion of RELEVANCE seems too vague to account for the fact that V1 tends to be a stage-level predicate. Indeed, it seems that the notion of ENABLEMENT describes the semantic relation between the two clauses more precisely than RELEVANCE. That is, in the IHR construction, the situation described in S1 sets the stage and enables the S2 event to occur. I will come back to this proposal in Chapter 6.

A recent study of Korean IHRCs argues that they are asserted clauses (Yang 1994). This is similar to my claim about Japanese IHRCs.¹² It may be hypothesized that in languages with both EHRCs and IHRCs making an assertion is an important property of IHRCs. Contrastive analysis of Japanese and Korean thus seems to be a promising way to reveal possible typological characteristics of IHRCs.

¹² See Horie 1993 for differences between IHRCs in Japanese and Korean in terms of the inherent semantics associated with the nominalizers in these constructions.

5. From relativization to clause-linkage

5.1 Introduction

As has been mentioned, the external marking on IHRCs is typically the nominative *ga* or the accusative *o*. IHRCs, moreover, are generally restricted in occurrence. At the end of the last chapter, I suggested that this may be due to the construction's specialized pragmatic function of advancing a narrative within a sentence. This chapter discusses yet another possible reason for the restricted occurrence of IHRCs. It specifically examines the relation of IHR sentences to what I call concessive bi-clausal sentences, in which two clauses are connected by either *no-ga* or *no-o*. I will propose that IHR sentences are being reanalyzed as concessive sentences.

Examination of written texts reveals that there are sentences which closely resemble IHR sentences. The sentences in (1) are taken from a newspaper article, a work of non-fiction, and a work of fiction. Just like S1 in typical IHR sentences, S1 in these sentences is followed by the sequence *no-ga* or *no-o*, as indicated by the bold type. (I have purposely left out the glosses for *no-ga* and *no-o* for the time being. See the next section.)

- (1) a. [rei-nen da to asa-yuu sukooru ga aru] **no ga**,
every-year COP CONJ morning-evening squall NOM exist

Chapter 5. From relativization to clause-linkage

kotosi wa hotondo ame ga huranai.
this-year TOP scarcely rain NOM fall-NEG

'Whereas every year we have a squall in the morning and in the evening, this year it has scarcely rained.'

[Asahi Newspaper]

- b. kare wa [kesseki sita hoo ga ii] no o, muri o siteita.
he TOP absent had.better.be pushed.oneself.too.hard
'Whereas he should have stayed home, he pushed himself too hard.'

(Lê 1988:86, (66))

- c. [saisyō wa noriko ga syutai deatta] no o,
first TOP Noriko NOM leader COP-PAST
itunoma ni ka tatsuo to gyaku no iti ni natta.
eventually Tatsuo COM opposite GEN place DAT became
'At first Noriko was the leader, but eventually (she) got the opposite place from Tatsuo.'

(Lê 1988:85, (59))

If these sentences were to be analyzed as IHR sentences, then they should exhibit the two defining properties of the IHR construction, namely, NP coreferentiality between the two clauses and 'case-matching' between the actual marking on the *no*-nominalized S1 and the one required by V2 for the target NP. These sentences, however, do not exhibit the 'case-matching' phenomenon. Examples (1a) and (1b) lack both NP coreferentiality and 'case-matching'. In (1a), the only valence requirement of V2 is satisfied within S2 by the nominative-marked NP *ame* 'rain (noun)', and there is thus no NP coreferentiality between the two clauses. Consequently, there is no 'case-matching'. In (1b), there is no NP inside S1 which is coreferenced by an argument of V2. V2 *muri o suru* 'push oneself too hard' is a lexically filled idiom and its only valence requirement is the subject, which is satisfied by

kare 'he' within S2. There is thus no 'case-matching' observed in (1b) either. In (1c), there is NP coreferentiality between the clauses but no 'case-matching' is observed. *Noriko* inside S1 is construed as the subject of V2, but the external marking on S1 is *o*, not the expected nominative *ga*.

I will call these types of sentences which do not exhibit the 'case-matching' phenomenon CONCESSIVE SENTENCES, due to the adversative semantic relation between the situations described in the two clauses (see the next section). Concessive sentences such as those above have been argued to be related to IHR sentences, but researchers disagree as to the exact nature of the relation (cf. Lê 1988, Martin 1975, Mihara 1994a).

This chapter first investigates whether the concessive sentences and IHR sentences should be analyzed as instances of the same grammatical construction. I will argue that the concessive clause-linking construction should indeed be recognized separately from the IHR construction. Next, the structural, semantic, and pragmatic properties of the IHR construction and the concessive clause-linking construction are compared. Finally, it will be hypothesized that the IHR construction is being reanalyzed as the concessive clause-linking construction. This hypothesis may account for the limited occurrence of IHRCs.

5.2 The concessive clause-linking construction

Are concessive sentences still considered instances of the same grammatical construction as IHR sentences, in spite of the fact they do not exhibit the 'case-

matching' phenomenon? Some have proposed that the answer is indeed 'yes' (cf. Lê 1988, e.g. Mihara 1994a). Here I will argue against such a view.

First, unlike S1 of IHR sentences, S1 of concessive sentences allows the internal marking of the topic marker *wa*, as shown in (2). Note that in these sentences *wa* is NOT marking the topic NP of S1, i.e. the NP which corresponds to the subject of the subject-predicate paradigm or the entity about which a judgment is made. Rather, *wa* is attached to a time adverbial. Shibatani (1990:276-77) calls an expression which is not the subject of judgment but made 'a focus of contrast' by *wa* a STYLISTIC-TOPIC expression. The *wa*-marked time adverbials in (2) are thus stylistic-topic expressions.

(2) Concessive

- a. [hazime wa kooron datta] no ga,
beginning TOP quarrel COP-PAST
sidai ni bekku wa koohun site kite ne.
gradually Beck TOP got.excited SFP
'At the beginning it was a quarrel, but Beck gradually got excited.'
(Lê 1988:76, (17))
- b. = (1c)
[saisyo wa noriko ga syutai deatta] no o,
first TOP Noriko NOM leader COP-PAST
itunoma ni ka tatuo to gyaku no iti ni natta.
eventually COM opposite GEN place DAT became
'At first Noriko was the leader, but eventually (she) got the opposite place from Tatsuo.'

We saw in (7) in Chapter 4 that *wa* is not allowed to mark the topic NP of S1 in IHR sentences (cf. Chapter 2, (16a)). Example (3) shows that in IHR sentences *wa* cannot be used for marking a stylistic-topic expression either.

(3) IHR

*[[titioya ga mikka mae ni wa okane o
 father NOM three-days ago LOC TOP money ACC
 hurikondeoitekureta] no] o midori wa kyoo hikidasita.
 wired NMLZ ACCMidori TOP today withdrew
Intended: 'Three days ago her father had wired her money, and Midori
 withdrew (it) today.'

The same particle *wa*, when used in two contrasting propositions, has the effect of emphasizing the contrast (Shibatani 1990: 265, 277, cf. Kuno 1973). In the concessive sentences below, *wa* is attached to two phrases, one in each clause, making the phrases foci of contrast. In (4a), the two *wa*-marked adverbials, *mukasi* 'old days' in S1 and *ima* 'now' in S2, are the foci of contrast. In (4b), *wa* is attached to the locative of S1 *amerika de* 'in America' and to the grammatical subject of S2 *watasi* 'I', making them the foci of contrast. It may not be obvious at first why these two phrases are made the foci of contrast. The writer of this essay is a book designer in Japan. She describes about what she thought about when designing this particular book, which was a Japanese translation of a book published first in America. The writer is thus contrasting the ways the book was designed in America by somebody else and in Japan by herself.

(4) Concessive

- a. [mukasi wa iti-nen o hatuka de kurasu yoi otoko
 old.days TOP1 year ACC 20.days work happy guys
 datta] no ga, ima wa iti-nen roku-basyo dearu.
 COP-PAST now TOP1 year 6 tournaments COP
 'Whereas in the old days they [sumo wrestlers] were happy
 fellows working 20 days a year, nowadays there are 6
 tournaments a year.'

[Asahi Newspaper]

- b. kono hon wa [amerika de wa e-hon no ookisa de
 this book TOP America LOCTOP picture-book GEN size COP
 syuppansareta] no o, watasi wa itumo beddo saido ni
 publish-PASS-PAST I TOP always bed side LOC
 okareru hon ni natte hosii to omotta.
 put-PASS book become want CMPL thought
 'Whereas in America this book had been published in the size of
 a picture book, I thought I wanted it to be a book which would
 always be kept by the bed.'

[Asahi Newspaper]

Attaching *wa* to two phrases in S1 and S2 of IHR sentences, on the other hand, results in unacceptable sentences, as shown by (5a') and (5b').

(5) IHR

- a. taroo wa [[kinoo ringo o katte kita] no] o
 Taro TOP yesterday apple ACC bought NMLZ ACC
 kyoo tabeta.
 today ate
 'Taro bought an apple yesterday, and he ate (it) today.'
- a'. *taroo wa [[kinoo wa ringo o katte kita] no] o
 TOP NMLZ ACC
 kyoo wa tabeta.
 TOP
- b. [[taroo ga ringo o katte kita] no] o hanako ga tabeta.
 NOM NMLZACC Hanako NOM ate
 'Taro bought an apple, and Hanako ate (it).'
- b'. *[taroo wa ringo o katte kita] no] o hanako wa tabeta.
 TOP NMLZ ACC TOP

The unacceptability of the contrastive *wa* in IHR sentences suggests that the discourse function of IHR sentences, namely, advancing a narrative

within a sentence, may not be compatible with the discourse function of emphasizing a contrast in propositions. On the other hand, the concessivity expressed by concessive sentences seems congruent with an emphasis on a contrast between propositions.

Furthermore, the concessive construction is CONVENTIONALLY associated with the concessive meaning. The fact that the contrastive *wa* is allowed in concessive sentences by itself does not entail that the meaning of concessivity is conventionalized in these types of sentences. It may be argued that the concessivity found in them is just a CONVERSATIONAL implicature and that the contrastive *wa*, when it is used, strengthens such a reading. The examples below, however, show that the concessive relation is not cancellable and thus is indeed conventionalized in concessive sentences:

- (6) a. [rei-nen da to asa-yuu sukooru ga aru] no ga,
every-year COP CONJ morning-evening squall NOM exist
kotosi wa hotondo ame ga huranai.
this-year TOP scarcely rain NOM fall-NEG
#rei-nen sukooru ga aru kara kotosi hotondo ame ga
because
huranakute toozen dakedo.
follows though
'Whereas every year we have a squall in the morning and in the
evening, this year it has scarcely rained.
#From the fact that we have squall every year it follows that it
has scarcely rained this year, though.'
- b. kare wa [kesseki sita hoo ga ii] no o, muri o siteita.
he TOP absent had.better.be pushed.oneself.too.hard
#kesseki sita hoo ga ii koto to muri o suru koto wa
thing and TOP
muzyunsinai kedo.
conflict-NEG though

'Whereas he should have stayed home, he pushed himself too hard.

#Being in a condition such that one should stay home and pushing oneself too hard do not conflict with each other, though.'

To summarize, concessive sentences differ from IHR sentences in not only failing to exhibit the 'case-matching' phenomenon but also allowing *wa* to mark the stylistic-topic expression inside S1. This shows that concessive sentences are compatible with the function of *wa* in emphasizing a contrast in propositions, while the narrative-advancing function of IHR sentences is not in itself in harmony with the emphasizing force of *wa*. Moreover, the fact that concessiveness is not cancellable shows that the meaning is conventionalized in concessive sentences.

It thus follows that if we regard a form-meaning pair as a grammatical construction, then the concessive clause-linkage must be recognized as a grammatical construction separately from the IHR construction. In the concessive clause-linking construction, the sequences *no-ga* and *no-o* are used as the devices for connecting two clauses. I do not know at this moment whether there exist any semantic or pragmatic differences between concessive sentences with *no-ga* and those with *no-o*. I therefore treat them as instances of the same grammatical construction. The concessive clause-linking construction is thus schematized as follows:

(7) The concessive clause-linking construction

S1 $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} no-ga \\ no-o \end{array} \right\}$ S2

no-ga, no-o: clausal conjunctions (CONJ)

By recognizing the concessive clause-linking construction separately from the IHR construction, we can account for sentences such as those in (1), which express the meaning of concessivity and do not exhibit the ‘case-matching’ phenomenon. By recognizing the IHR construction, on the other hand, we can account for IHRCs whose external marking is other than the nominative *ga* and the accusative *o*: Even though IHRCs are typically marked by the nominative or the accusative, there exist IHRCs marked by other case markers (cf. Section 1.2.1). For example, there are attested examples of IHRCs whose external marking is the allative-marker *e* ‘to’:

(8) Allative-marked IHRC

[[sisya ga doosei o saguri ni kita] no] e
 messenger NOM status ACC came.to.check NMLZ ALL

antonii wa kotae o ataeta.

Anthony TOP reply ACC gave

‘The messenger came to check the status, and Anthony gave a reply to (him).’

[Miyao, Tomiko]

If we posit only the concessive clause-linking construction, in which the clause-linking devices are restricted to *no-ga* and *no-o*, we have no way of accounting for sentences such as (8). The sentence involves no concessivity in meaning. Therefore, it seems reasonable to posit both the IHR construction and the concessive clause-linking construction.

5.3 IHR vs. concessive clause-linkage

If IHR sentences and concessive sentences represent distinct types, what is the relationship between the two? Let us now compare the structural, semantic, and pragmatic properties of the IHR construction and the concessive clause-linking construction.

5.3.1 Structural comparison

Based on the traditional coordination-subordination distinction, IHRCs are categorized as [+dependent, +embedded] (Foley and Van Valin 1984, Van Valin 1993).¹ We saw in Section 1.2.3 that IHRCs cannot be used on their own to refer and must be used in combination with another clause. In this sense, IHRCs are distributionally dependent. Moreover, the *no*-nominalized S1 fills a syntactic valence requirement of V2 and is thus embedded within S2.

The syntactic relation between S1 and S2 of the concessive clause-linking construction, on the other hand, can be described as [+dependent, -embedded]. First, S1 of concessive sentences is distributionally dependent. It cannot stand alone, even though it does not depend on S2 for operators:

- (1') a. *[rei-nen da to asa-yuu sukooru ga aru] no-ga.
 every-year COP CONJ morning-evening squall NOM exist CONJ
 'Whereas every year we have a squall in the morning and in the evening.'

¹ See also Haiman and Thompson 1984, Kuno 1973, Talmy 1978. For discussions of Japanese subordination and coordination using the framework of Role and Reference Grammar, see Hasegawa 1992 and Ohori 1992.

- b. *kare wa [kesseki sita hoo ga ii] no-o.
 he TOP absent had.better.be CONJ
 'Whereas he should have stayed home.'

S1 of concessive sentences is not, however, embedded in S2: S1 is not a syntactic argument of V2 and there is no 'case-matching' between the two clauses. The concessive clause-linking construction is therefore more 'coordination-like' than the IHR construction, which is categorized as [+embedded]. We saw in Section 4.2.1 that IHRCs, even though they are [+embedded] in that they externally function as NPs, structurally behave like coordinated clauses with respect to *ga-no* conversion and *wh*-questions. S1 of concessive sentences exhibits the same 'coordination-like' behavior with respect to the two syntactic processes:

- (9) a. *ga-no* conversion
 [mukasi wa watasi ga/*no ototo o
 old.days TOP I NOM/*GEN younger.brother ACC
 sewasiteita] no-ga, ima de wa imoto ga
 took.care CONJ now TOP younger.sister NOM
 musume no mendoo o mitekureteiru.
 daughter GEN look.after
 'Whereas in the old days I used to take care of my younger brother, nowadays my younger sister looks after my daughter.'
- b. *wh*-Question
 *[mukasi wa watasi ga dare o sewasiteita] no-ga,
 who ACC
 ima de wa imoto ga musume no mendoo o
 mitekureteimasuka?
 look.after-POLITE-Q
Intended: 'Whereas in the old days I used to take care of who, nowadays my younger sister looks after my daughter?'

5.3.2 Semantic comparison

In terms of referential structure, the IHR construction is characterized by NP coreferentiality between the two clauses: The target NP inside S1 not only fills a semantic valence requirement of V1 but also of V2. This NP coreferentiality translates itself in discourse-structure terms as participant continuity. The IHR construction advances a narrative by reporting two events which share a participant and the target NP referent corresponds to the participant shared by the two events.

In concessive sentences NP coreferentiality between the two clauses is not obligatory but can be present. We noted that in (1c), repeated as (10) below, *Noriko* satisfies a semantic valence requirement of not only V1 but also V2, and both S1 and S2 are thus construed as about *Noriko*.

- (10) a. = (1c)
- [saisyō wa **noriko** ga syutai deatta] no-o,
first TOP Noriko NOM leader COP-PAST CONJ
itunoma ni ka tatuo to gyaku no iti ni natta.
eventually COM opposite GEN place DAT became
'At first Noriko was the leader, but eventually (she) got the
opposite place from Tatsuo.'

Even when there is no NP coreferentiality between the two clauses, concessive sentences may contain a grammatical-topic NP, i.e. a *wa*-marked topic NP, whose scope is both S1 and S2. In (10b), the sentence-initial NP *kono hon* 'this book', marked by *wa*, serves as the topic of the entire sentence. The whole sentence is construed as about 'this book' and it is indeed translatable in the form 'this book is such that ...'. In this sense, the topic NP in (10b) is

distinct from stylistic-topic expressions such as those in (2), which merely serve as foci of contrast without being the subject of judgment.²

(10) b. = (4b)

kono hon wa [amerika de wa e-hon no ookisa de
this book TOP America LOC TOP picture-book GEN size COP
syuppansareta] no-o, watasi wa itumo beddo saido ni
publish-PASS-PAST CONJ I TOP always bed side LOC
okareru hon ni natte hosii to omotta.
put-PASS book become want CMPL thought

'Whereas in America this book had been published in the size of a picture book, I thought I wanted it to be a book which would always be kept by the bed.'

It is also possible to identify a discourse topic shared by the two clauses of concessive sentences, even if it is not explicitly realized as a grammatical-topic NP. That is, even when a concessive sentence does not contain a *wa*-marked NP which serves as the subject of judgment, the two clauses in the sentence are construed as about the same thing. In (10c), for example, both of the clauses are about sumo wrestlers:

(10) c. = (4a)

[mukasi wa iti-nen o hatuka de kurasu yoi otoko
old.days TOP 1 year ACC 20.days LOC work happy guys

² Shibatani (1990) notes that 'real' topic and stylistic topic expressions are formally distinguishable, although ambiguous cases may arise. When *wa* attaches directly to a NP, then it is a 'real' topic NP (i.a). When *wa* follows a postpositional phrase or an adverb, then it is a stylistic topic expression (i.b).

- (i) a. NP + *wa* → 'real' topic NP (e.g. (10b))
b. $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{NP + postposition} \\ \text{Adverb} \end{array} \right\} + wa \rightarrow \text{stylistic topic expression (e.g. (2))}$

Chapter 5. From relativization to clause-linkage

datta] no-ga, ima wa iti-nen roku-basyo dearu.
 COP-PAST now TOP 1 year 6 tournaments COP

'Whereas in the old days they [sumo wrestlers] were happy fellows working 20 days a year, nowadays there are 6 tournaments a year.'

The concessive clause-linking construction is thus always characterized by topic continuity (cf. Givón 1983), even though NP coreferentiality between the two clauses is not obligatory. The IHR construction, on the other hand, is characterized by participant continuity, which is a consequence of always having a NP coreferentiality between its clauses.

A temporal sequence is expressed by IHR sentences. It is typically observed in concessive sentences as well. Example (1a) may not seem to involve a temporal sequence at first glance. It may be argued that the sentence has to do with typical and unusual situations. Nonetheless, the sentence may still be said to involve a temporal sequence, since it is about two situations, one typically observed until this year and another taking place in the current year.³ Furthermore, in concessive sentences, the contrastive *wa* often attaches

³ The concessive sentences below, taken from novels, may be counterexamples to the claim. Example (ii.b), however, differs from other concessive sentences we have seen so far, in that it seems to require a presupposed semantic scale for its interpretation. Note that it can be translated into English using the phrase *let alone* (cf. Fillmore, Kay and O'Connor 1988).

- (ii) a. [tetu-kuzu o unten kara tumikomu] no-o, unten e mawatte yoi
 iron-scrap ACC Unten ABL load CONJ ALL may.go
 to yuu kyoka ga nakanaka orinakatta.
 CMPL say permission NOM would.not.come
 'The ship was to load scrap iron at Unten, but the permission to go to Unten would not come soon.'
- (Lê 1988:4, (13))
- b. [haamonika mo obotukanai] no-ga, baiorin wa totemo murida.
 harmonica even little.hope CONJ violin TOP absolutely impossible
 'Whereas there is little hope of my being able to play the harmonica, playing the violin is absolutely impossible for me.' or

to a time adverbial in each of the two clauses, emphasizing a contrast in the situations holding at the two different time frames, as in (4a). Although the contrastive *wa* does not attach to time adverbials in (4b), the sentence still has to do with two different time frames: It contrasts the way a book was designed in America originally and the way its Japanese translation was designed later. Concessive sentences therefore do not express just any kind of contrast in propositions. Rather, they specifically present a contrast involving two different time frames on a temporal axis.

5.3.3 Pragmatic comparison

We saw in Section 4.2.2 that even though IHRCs are embedded inside S2, the structural behavior of IHRCs with respect to *ga-no* conversion and *wh*-questions argues for the view that V1 of IHRCs makes an assertion, just like that of coordinated clauses and main clauses. Since S1 of the concessive clause-linking construction is not embedded inside S2, V1 makes an assertion just like V2. As we saw in the last chapter, when the predicate of a clause makes an assertion, the clause can be construed as either an event-reporting clause or an topic-comment clause (Section 4.2.2). Which type of clause is S1 of the concessive construction? Although it allows the topic marker *wa*, the expressions *wa* attaches to are construed as stylistic-topic expressions, which

‘I can’t even play the harmonica, let alone the violin.’

[Mukoda, Kuniko]

Eve Sweetser pointed out to me that if we analyze the semantics of the concessive clause-linking construction as involving contrasts in mental space, we can also account for the sentences above as well as (4b) (cf. Fauconnier 1994 (1985)).

do not correspond to the topic of topic-comment clauses (e.g. (2), (4) above). I thus analyze S1 of concessive sentences not as a topic-comment clause but as an event-reporting clause. The concessive clause-linking construction therefore resembles the IHR construction in reporting two situations.

5.4 From relativization to clause-linkage

Now we are ready to discuss why IHRCs are restricted in occurrence. I suggest that IHR sentences are being reanalyzed by some speakers as concessive sentences.

5.4.1 The reanalysis hypothesis

Reanalysis is defined by Langacker (1977:58) as a 'change in the structure of an expression or class of expressions that does not involve any immediate or intrinsic modification of its surface structure'. My proposal concerning the reanalysis of the IHR construction involves the following two features. First, the sequence the nominalizer *no* plus a case marker in IHR sentence is reanalyzed as the clause-linking device in concessive sentences. As for the nominative-marked IHRCs, the nominalizer *no* plus the non-conjunctive nominative *ga* is reanalyzed as a clausal conjunction, *no-ga*. Similarly, in the case of the accusative-marked IHRCs, the nominalizer plus the accusative *o* is reanalyzed as a clausal conjunction, *no-o*. Second, S1 of IHR sentences undergoes a change from an embedded clause to a non-embedded clause and all the constituents up to *no-ga* or *no-o* are reanalyzed as belonging to S1 of concessive sentences. At the same time, S2 undergoes a boundary addition, in

that all the constituents occurring after the nominalizer plus a case marker in an IHR sentence are reanalyzed as comprising the S2 of a concessive sentence. The hypothesized processes can thus be schematized as follows. NP_i within S1 in (11a) and (11b) represents the target in the IHR construction.

- (11) a.
$$\begin{array}{c} [[\dots \text{NP}_i \dots \text{V1}]_{\text{S1}} \text{no}] \text{ga} \dots \text{V2}]_{\text{S2}} \\ \text{NMLZ NOM} \\ \rightarrow [\dots \dots \text{V1}]_{\text{S1}} \text{no-ga} [\dots \text{V2}]_{\text{S2}} \\ \text{CONJ} \end{array}$$
- b.
$$\begin{array}{c} [\dots [[\dots \text{NP}_i \dots \text{V1}]_{\text{S1}} \text{no}] o \dots \text{V2}]_{\text{S2}} \\ \text{NMLZ ACC} \\ \rightarrow [\dots \dots \text{V1}]_{\text{S1}} \text{no-o} [\text{V2}]_{\text{S2}} \\ \text{CONJ} \end{array}$$

5.4.2 Arguments for the reanalysis hypothesis

I will give morphological, syntactic, and semantic grounds for arguing for the reanalysis hypothesis.

5.4.2.1 Analogy to other clausal conjunctions

Is it really plausible to speculate that the sequence consisting of a nominalizer and a case marker is being reanalyzed as a clausal conjunction? In what follows I discuss the polyfunctionality of particles *ga* and *o* and the existence of other two-part clausal conjunctions in Modern Japanese, which support the reanalysis hypothesis.

Ga and *o* after nominalized clauses are polyfunctional in Modern Japanese. In addition to being used as case markers, the particles *ga* and *o* may

be used as conjunctive particles, connecting a nominalized clause to another clause.⁴ The conjunctive particles *ga* and *o* appear in combination with certain nominalizers such as *tokoro* – literally ‘place’, or *mono* – literally ‘thing’, in effect forming two-part clausal conjunctions.⁵ The two-part concessive clausal conjunctions *tokoro-ga* and *mono-o* are exemplified below.

(12) a. *tokoro-ga* ⁶

[zibiki de sirabeta] *tokoro-ga*, sono tango wa
dictionary INSTR looked.up CONJ that word TOP

⁴ *Ga* and *o* became polyfunctional during Middle Japanese (1192-1602) (Ishigaki 1955, Konoshima 1966, Nishida 1977, Saeki 1966, Shibatani 1990, Yamazaki 1965). Japanese grammarians generally believe that the nominative *ga* and the accusative *o* gave rise to the concessive conjunctive particles *ga* and *o*. By the time of Late Old Japanese (794-1191), *ga* and *o* came to attach to NPs as case particles. It was also possible for them to follow the nominalized form of a predicate. In Japanese, which has been an OV (verb-final)/postpositional language throughout its history, clause-linking devices appear clause-finally. The position of the case particles, i.e. after a nominalized clause, thus made it possible for them to be reinterpreted as conjunctive particles which link two clauses (cf. Hirose 1992). Genetti (1986, 1991) discusses developments from case markers to clausal conjunctions in various Bodic languages of Tibeto-Burman. The developments from the nominative and accusative case markers to clausal conjunctions, however, seem to be rare cross-linguistically (cf. Ohori 1991).

⁵ See (23) in Chapter 1 for uses of the nominalizer *tokoro* in other related constructions.

⁶ In addition, the conjunctive particle *ga* can also immediately follow a predicate without a nominalizer intervening between them. When *ga* immediately follows an adjective or an adjectival noun, the adjective or adjectival noun is in the conclusive form, not in the attributive form. See also (14) below.

(iii) a. The conclusive form of adjectives and adjectival nouns

kare wa, [keti-da] *ga*, yasasii.
he TOP stingy-cncl. CONJ kind
‘He is stingy but kind.’
cf. kare wa *keti-da*.

stingy-cncl.

‘He is stingy.’

b. The attributive form of adjectives and adjectival nouns

*kare wa, [keti-na] *ga*, yasasii.
stingy-attr.

cf. [[keti-na] hito]
stingy-attr. person
‘Stingy person’

Chapter 5. From relativization to clause-linkage

deteinakatta.

exist-NEG-PAST

‘I looked in the dictionary, but that word was not there.’

b. *mono-o*

[damatteokeba ii] **mono-o**, hontoo no koto o itte

had.better.keep.quiet CONJ true GEN thing ACC told-and

sikarareta.

got.scolded

‘I should have kept quiet, but I told the truth and got scolded.’

The nominalizer *no* can be the first part of such a two-part clausal conjunction. I have in mind the concessive clausal conjunction *noni* ‘although’, which is generally believed to derive from the nominalizer *no* plus a clausal conjunction *ni* (Konoshima 1966, *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten*). *Noni* started out as a two-part clausal conjunction and later lexicalized into a clausal conjunction through the mechanism of boundary loss. It is now listed as a lexeme in dictionaries (cf. Langacker 1977).

(13) Concessive clausal conjunction *noni* ‘although’

[sonnani kanemotide mo nai] **noni**, zidoosya o san-dai motteiru.

that.much rich EMPH NEG although car ACC 3-CL have

‘Although he is not so rich, he owns three cars.’

Given the existence of the clausal conjunction *noni* ‘although’, which started out as a two-part clausal conjunction consisting of *no* and a conjunctive particle, and the two-part clausal conjunctions *tokoro-ga* and *mono-o*, in which *ga* and *o* function as conjunctive particles, it seems

possible to hypothesize that *no-ga* and *no-o* are being reanalyzed as two-part clausal conjunctions perhaps by analogy.⁷

5.4.2.2 Constructional simplicity

If it is possible to suppose that such a reanalysis is taking place, what are the motivations for it? It has been suggested in the literature that languages will tend to change so as to maximize optimality. Although tendencies toward various types of optimality will often conflict with one another, some types of optimality can be regarded as tendencies in the direction of greater simplicity (Hopper and Traugott 1993:63-67, Langacker 1977:102). Langacker (*ibid.*:107) proposes constructional simplicity as one such type of language optimality. According to him, there is a tendency for marked constructions to give way to more commonplace ones and for the intrinsic complexity to be reduced.

Two kinds of discrepancies between form and meaning exist in the IHR construction. First, syntactically the entire *no*-nominalized S1 satisfies one of the syntactic requirements of V2, as can be seen by the fact that the case marking on the nominalized S1 correspond to the case marking required for a valence requirement of V2. Semantically, however, a NP inside S1 corresponds to a valence requirement of V2. In other words, there is a syntax-semantics 'mismatch' in the IHR construction (cf. Hirose and Otori 1992, Ohara 1992).

⁷ Horie (1993b) suggests that *no-ga* and *no-o* are on their way to lexicalization as clausal conjunctions.

Second, although structurally the *no*-nominalized S1 is embedded within S2, functionally S1 is 'coordination-like' in that it makes an assertion just like main clauses. There is thus a discrepancy between its structure and function. Because of these discrepancies between form and meaning, the IHR construction can be regarded as a marked construction. Reanalysis as the concessive clause-linking construction reduces the complexity. First, in the concessive clause-linking construction, S1 is not a syntactic valence requirement of V2. Consequently, there is no syntax-semantics mismatch in this construction. Second, unlike the IHR construction, the syntactic relation of S1 to S2 in the concessive clause-linking construction is [-embedded], yet the function of S1 is event-reporting, just like S1 of the IHR construction. That is, both the structure and function of the concessive clause-linking construction are 'coordination-like' and there is no discrepancy observed between its structure and function.

5.4.2.3 From the temporal to the logical domain

The proposed reanalysis is accompanied by a semantic change. Whereas the IHR construction advances a narrative within a sentence, the concessive clause-linking construction expresses a contrast between two propositions. In other words, while the meaning of the IHR construction has to do with the temporal domain, the meaning of the concessive clause-linking construction crucially involves the logical domain. It is thus possible to characterize the semantic change associated with the reanalysis as a change from a meaning in the one domain to the other. This kind of semantic change is commonly

observed in grammaticalization (Hopper and Traugott 1993, Sweetser 1990, Traugott 1989, *inter alia*).⁸

It was also observed in Section 5.3.2 that even though concessivity is conventionalized in the concessive clause-linking construction, a temporal sequence relation typically obtains between its two clauses. It has been known that when a form undergoes grammaticalization, some traces of its original meanings tend to adhere to it ('persistence') (Hopper and Traugott 1993). The persistence of temporal sequence relation observed in the concessive clause-linking construction is compatible with the hypothesis that the IHR construction is being grammaticalized into the concessive construction.

5.4.3 Similar changes and constructions

It must be mentioned that the proposed change from [+embedded] to [-embedded] is in contrast to the general directionality of change observed in grammaticalization. The majority of change observed may be characterized as shifting from more to less paratactic clause combining (Hopper and Traugott 1993, Ohori 1992, Traugott 1996). There are, however, some counterexamples, suggesting that the reanalysis of the IHR construction is not implausible. Yo Matsumoto (1988) discusses a development in the opposite direction, i.e. from less to more paratactic clause combining, which has occurred in the history of Japanese. In (14a) below, *ga* 'but' is a weakly concessive clausal conjunction,

⁸ Here, I am using the term grammaticalization to refer to linguistic processes whereby items become more grammatical. That is, linguistic changes characterized as grammaticalization not only pertain to lexical items becoming grammatical items but also grammatical items becoming more grammatical. In this sense, a grammatical construction becoming another is also regarded as grammaticalization (cf. Hopper and Traugott 1993, Traugott 1996).

connecting two clauses within a sentence (cf. Footnote 6). The whole sequence is analyzed as constituting one sentence, since the sentence-final particle *yo* 'you know' can appear only at the end of the entire sequence. *Ga* in (14b), on the other hand, is not a clausal conjunction: Instead of connecting two clauses, it connects two sentences. The sentence-final particle *yo* thus occurs not only at the end of the sequence but also immediately before the conjunction *ga*.

- (14) a. taroo wa wakai *ga*, yoku yaru (*yo*).
Taro TOP young but well do SFP
'Taro is young, but he does a good job.'
- b. taroo wa wakai (*yo*). *Ga*, yoku yaru (*yo*).
SFP But SFP
'Taro is young. But he does a good job.'

(Yo Matsumoto 1988:340, (1))

The historical data suggests that the sentence conjunction *ga*, exemplified in (14b), developed from the clausal conjunction *ga* in (14a), not vice versa. The change is thus characterized as from less to more paratactic, that is, the opposite of the general tendency in grammaticalization.

Holland (1984) discusses developments from the 'adjoined' relative clause to various clausal conjunctions in Early Indo-European. He characterizes the relative clause as follows. 'The basic structure of the relative sentences which are to be reconstructed to Indo-European is bipartite, consisting of a preposed relative clause followed by a resumptive clause. The relativized noun stands in the preposed clause accompanied by a relative adjective, and it is referred to in the following clause by an anaphoric element

(including zero) ... Thus, the basic function of the relative in these languages stands in sharp contrast to that of the relative in a language like Modern English, where the principal function of relativization is nominal modification. These structures are basically correlative, ...' (ibid.:617-8). He furthermore notes that, as preposed clauses, the clauses containing relative conjunctions will have provided a temporal or causal starting point for the following clause. The clausal conjunctions derived from such relative structure also have a bipartite structure. He writes, '(t)he principle difference between them [the relative structure and the relative-derived 'conjunctions'] consists in the absence of the co-referenced noun' (bracketed words are mine). The development from the IHR construction to the concessive clause-linking construction that I am hypothesizing seems parallel to the developments from the 'adjoined' relative clause to the clausal conjunctions in Early Indo-European.

If the reanalysis hypothesis is correct, then it means that the IHR construction is being replaced by a construction whose referential structure is somewhat similar to that of adjoined relative clauses in Walbiri (cf. Hale 1976). Keenan (1985:166) notes that Walbiri does not have a relative clause *per se*, but rather a more general bi-clausal construction which can function in a way equivalent to a relative clause when the clause contains a zero pronoun coreferential to a NP in the 'main' clause. If the clause introduced by *kuja*, basically meaning 'when', contains a zero anaphora which is coreferential with a NP in the preceding 'main' clause, then the 'when' clause can be translated either as a temporal clause or as a relative clause (15a). If this

coreferentiality is not present, then the 'when' clause can only be translated as a temporal adverbial (15b).

(15) Walbiri adjoined relative clauses

- a. Ngarrka-ngku ka marlu luwa-rni kuja ka
man-ERG AUX kangaroo shoot-NPAST when AUX
marna nga-rni.
grass eat-NPAST
'The man is shooting the kangaroo which is eating grass.' or
'The man is shooting the kangaroo while it is eating grass.'
- b. Ngarrka-ngku ka marlu luwa-rni kuja ka
wardapi palkamani karnta-ngku.
goanna catch woman-ERG
'The man is shooting the kangaroo while the woman is catching the goanna.'

(Keenan 1985:166, (61))

We saw in this chapter that NP coreferentiality is not obligatory in the concessive clause-linking construction, just like Walbiri adjoined relative clauses. The concessive clause-linking construction in Japanese, however, does not merely express a temporal sequence between two situations. In addition, the construction has the conventionalized meaning of concessivity.

5.5 Conclusion

I argued in this chapter that the concessive clause-linking construction should be distinguished from the IHR construction, due to its lack of the 'case-matching' phenomenon and its conventionalized meaning of concessivity. After comparing the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic

properties of the two constructions, I proposed that the IHR construction may be being reanalyzed as the concessive clause-linking construction, which may account for the restricted occurrence of IHRCs.

The reanalysis hypothesis was discussed from three perspectives. First, given the polyfunctionality of *ga* and *o* after a nominalized clause and the existence of other two-part clausal conjunctions, it may be hypothesized that *no-ga* and *no-o* are being reanalyzed as two-part clausal conjunctions by analogy. Second, the IHR construction exhibits two kinds of discrepancies between its form and meaning. The concessive clause-linking construction, on the other hand, does not involve such discrepancies between form and meaning. It is thus possible to speculate that the reanalysis is taking place in order to reduce constructional complexity. Third, the semantic change associated with the reanalysis may be characterized as a change from a meaning in the temporal domain to another in the logical domain, which is a general tendency of semantic change involved in grammaticalization.

An in-depth corpus and statistical study of diachronic data is necessary in order to evaluate the reanalysis hypothesis presented in this chapter.⁹ In any case, I hope to have shown that the concessive clause-linking construction possesses structural, semantic, and pragmatic properties which are closely related to but are distinct from those of the IHR construction.

⁹ See Kaiser 1991, Kuroda 1992 (1974-77), and Modini 1993a,b for discussions on IHRCs in Classical Japanese.

6. Conclusion

This work has been concerned with describing and accounting for the nature of the IHR construction in Modern Japanese, focusing on its narrative-advancing use. I have examined IHR sentences in comparison with EHR sentences, coordinated sentences, and concessive sentences. This chapter will summarize the findings and discuss some of the implications of the analysis presented in this thesis.

The IHR construction is characterized by two properties, namely, NP coreferentiality between the two clauses and 'case-matching' between the external case-marking on S1 and the case-marking required by V2 for the coreferenced NP. Commonly accepted properties of IHRCs which are not seen in EHRCs include: the restricted external marking, the multiple-target phenomenon, and structural resemblance to complement clauses.

Comparison with IHRCs in other languages in Chapter 2 revealed that Japanese IHRCs are similar to IHRCs in other languages in externally functioning as NPs and structurally resembling complement clauses. Furthermore, just like those languages with IHRCs, Japanese utilizes nominalized clauses in various constructions, has SOV word order, and is a pro-drop language. However, the restricted external marking, the temporal sequence relation described in the two clauses, and the multiple-target

phenomenon that Japanese IHRCs exhibit have not been reported for IHRCs in other languages.

As shown in Chapter 3, an important research question concerning the IHR construction in Modern Japanese has been how to account for the relation between IHRCs and EHRCs. The multiple-target phenomenon observed in the IHR construction argues against a purely structural analysis. Rather, it is more adequate to assume that in this construction syntax underdetermines the target within S1 and semantic and pragmatic information help construe it. Also, in order to adequately describe relations between IHRCs and EHRCs, it is necessary to compare their syntax, semantics, and pragmatics, and in particular, their referential and discourse structures.

I rejected the view that IHR is merely a secondary relativization strategy in Japanese and extended Kuroda's insight that IHRCs and EHRCs are used under different pragmatic circumstances. I characterized the IHR construction as typically narrative-advancing in reporting two events which share a participant. I adopted the Construction Grammar approach, which views a grammatical construction as a pairing of syntax with semantics and pragmatics. This approach regards the structural properties of constructions as reflecting to a certain degree pragmatic relations under which the constructions are used. Syntactically, IHRCs and EHRCs externally function as NPs. Semantically, the two types of relative clauses have the same referential structure. I argued in Chapter 4 that pragmatically, however, they have different discourse functions. IHRCs assert or report an event, while EHRCs modify the head noun and describe a property of the head noun referent. Supporting evidence for the claim comes from the fact that in some

important ways the structural behavior of IHRCs resembles that of coordinated clauses rather than EHRCs. IHRCs share with coordinated clauses the pragmatic function of making an assertion. Under the constructional approach, the structural behavior of IHRCs which resembles that of coordinated clauses may be seen as a structural correlate of IHRCs' function of making an assertion.

Another important question pertaining to the IHR construction is how to account for the fact that IHRCs are limited in occurrence. I suggested that this may be due to the specialized function of the IHR construction in advancing a narrative within a sentence. Also, there seems to be a structural reason for the restricted occurrence: I hypothesized in Chapter 5 that the IHR construction may be being reanalyzed as a concessive clause-linking construction, which is characterized by concessivity and topic continuity between two clauses. The concessive construction is constructionally simpler than the IHR construction, and it is plausible that the nominalizer and a case particle are being reanalyzed as a clausal conjunction by analogy to existing two-part clausal conjunctions which developed from a nominalizer and a case particle.

6.1 Structural underdetermination

We saw in Chapter 2 that morphosyntactic underdetermination of the target inside S1 is a characteristic of IHRCs cross-linguistically and not restricted to Japanese IHRCs. The multiple-target phenomenon exhibited by Japanese

IHRCs such as the following, however, turned out to be lacking in IHRCs in other languages.

(1) The multiple-target phenomenon

[[midori ga akanboo o dakiageyoo to siteiru] no] o
Midori NOM baby ACC try.to.lift.up-ASP-NPAST NMLZ ACC

taroo wa hutari-tomo okizarinisita.

Taro TOP two-people-both left.behind

'Midori was trying to lift up the baby in her arms, and Taro left the two of them behind.'

I argued for the view that in the IHR construction syntax underdetermines the possible range of target, and the target is ultimately construed by available semantic and pragmatic information. This is reminiscent of Yoshiko Matsumoto's findings on noun-modifying clauses in Japanese (1988, 1993), which I have been calling EHRCs following the convention in the literature. Noun-modifying clauses such as (2) cannot be explained by a structural analysis based on coreference between the head noun and a gap in the modifying clause. In (2), there is no syntactic position inside the modifying clause for the head noun to occupy.

(2) Noun modifying clause

[[atama ga yokunaru] hon]
head NOM becomes better book

'the book (by reading which) (one's) head becomes better.'

Matsumoto contends that the head noun and the modifying clause are, however, semantically and pragmatically linked.¹ The denotatum of the head noun is identified as a possible participant in the frame evoked by the linguistic elements of the modifying clause (cf. Fillmore 1982, 1985, Fillmore and Atkins 1994a,b, *inter alia*). In the case of the IHR construction, the target is construed by the frames evoked by the two clauses. The IHR construction thus provides another example of a construction in Japanese in which semantics and pragmatics play an important role.

6.2 On the semantic relation of ENABLEMENT

I pointed out in Chapter 3 that Kuroda's relevancy condition, which says that in the IHR construction S1 must be interpreted pragmatically in such a way as to be directly relevant to the pragmatic content of S2, is inherently vague. It is possible to think of a context in which two situations are relevant to each other, but nonetheless, there are many pairs of situations which cannot be expressed by the construction. In (3a), for example, it may be that the reason why I invited the student to my office was that the student is smart and I wanted to discuss something with him/her. The two situations described in the sentence may thus be construed as relevant to each other, but it is nevertheless unacceptable. I proposed at the end of Chapter 4 that the notion of ENABLEMENT characterizes the semantic relation between the two clauses in this construction more precisely than the notion of RELEVANCE. That is, in the

¹ Akiba (1978) argues that syntactically definable relative clauses did not exist in Old Japanese (9th and 10th centuries) either. This suggests that the phenomenon of syntactic underdetermination is a fundamental property of the grammar of Japanese.

IHR construction, the first situation described in S1 enables the second situation to occur, or sets the stage for the subsequent situation. In (3b), the situation in which the bright student was talking with people outside my office enabled me to invite him/her to my office, and the sentence is acceptable. In other words, the situation in which the student was talking was a necessary condition for my inviting him/her.

- (3) a. *[gakusei ga yuusyuna] no] o kenkyusitu e yonda.
 student NOM bright NMLZ ACC office ALL invited
 Intended: 'The student is bright, and I invited (him/her) to my office.'
- b. [[yuusyuna gakusei ga rooka de hito to hanasiteiru]
 bright student NOM corridor LOC people COM talk-ASP-NPAST
 no] o kenkyusitu e yonda.
 NMLZ ACC office ALL invited
 'The bright student was talking with others in the corridor, and I invited (him/her) to my office.'

It may be argued that the relation of CAUSE-RESULT characterizes the semantic relation between the two clauses in the IHR construction even more precisely than the notion of ENABLEMENT.² It is not, however, difficult to find IHR sentences in which the first clause is not necessarily a CAUSE of the S2 event. In (4), for example, your sending me a birthday card does not always result in its arriving today. That is, the fact that you sent me a card is not a sufficient condition for the card to arrive today.

- (4) [[otanzoobi kaado o okutteudasatta] no] ga kyoo tukimasita.
 birthday card ACC sent.POLITE NMLZ NOMtoday arrived.POLITE

² I would like to thank Yoko Hasegawa for discussing this point with me.

'You kindly sent me a birthday card, and (it) arrived today.'

ENABLEMENT may be paraphrased as CAUSE TO BE POSSIBLE or MAKE IT POSSIBLE.³ In this sense, semantic relations characterized as ENABLEMENT include situations described as CAUSE-RESULT. The notion of ENABLEMENT, however, can also cover cases such as (4). I thus contend that the CAUSE-RESULT relation is too narrow and RELEVANCE is too broad and that the notion of ENABLEMENT captures the IHR construction better than CAUSE-RESULT or RELEVANCE.

The IHR construction is not the only clause-linking construction in Japanese in which the ENABLEMENT relation is involved. Other such constructions include *te*-linkage (Hasegawa 1992, In press), *tokoro*-linkage (Ohara 1995), and *to*-linkage (Fujii 1991, 1993a, 1993b, 1993c), exemplified in (5). In *te*-linkage, two clauses are connected by a verbal suffix *-te*. In *tokoro*-linkage and *to*-linkage, clauses are linked by clausal conjunctions *tokoro* and *to* respectively. In all of the sentences in (5), the situation described in S1 establishes a temporal setting for the subsequent event.

(5) a. *Te*-linkage

zyon ga uti e kite, okane o nusunda.
John NOM home ALL come-TE money ACC stole
'John came to our house and stole money.'

b. *Tokoro*-linkage

sensei ni densi-meeru o dasita tokoro, sassoku henzi o
teacher DAT e-mail ACC sent CONJ immediately reply ACC

³ I would like to thank Charles J. Fillmore for suggesting this to me.

itadaita.

got.POLITE

'I sent my professor an e-mail, and I immediately got a reply.'

c. *To-linkage*

uti o deru to, ame ga hurihazimeta.

home ACC get.out CONJ rain NOM started.to.rain

'I left home, and it started to rain.'

The uses of the IHR construction and these constructions, however, overlap only partially. The areas of semantic and pragmatic overlap between the IHR construction and other clause-linking constructions which express ENABLEMENT thus merit further investigation to the extent that they are considered part of native speakers' knowledge of the language.

6.3 Toward a semantic typology of IHRCs

I pointed out in Chapter 2 that previous accounts of IHRCs in other languages have focused on analyzing their structure. What has not been revealed is whether IHRCs in languages with both IHRCs and EHRCs (e.g. Quechua, Navajo, etc.) exhibit semantic properties different from those of EHRCs. In this respect, it is striking that IHRCs in Korean, which has both types of relative clauses, are asserted clauses, just like IHRCs in Japanese (cf. Yang 1994). Therefore, it may be possible to hypothesize that IHRCs assert, while EHRCs modify, in languages with both EHRCs and IHRCs. It is hoped that this study will stimulate typologically oriented semantic analyses of IHRCs in other languages.

This work, in conclusion, has demonstrated the usefulness of a particular approach in dealing with complex linguistic phenomena such as those involved in the IHR construction in Japanese. The Construction Grammar approach, which regards subtle semantic and pragmatic factors as an important part of the characterization of grammatical constructions, has enabled us to make a good deal of sense of the interactions between the syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of the IHR construction and to show how the construction is related to the EHR construction, the concessive construction, and clausal coordination.

Bibliography

- Akiba, Katsue. 1978. A Non-Relative Analysis of So-Called Relative Clauses. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4.1-10.
- Andrews, Avery D. 1985 (1975). *Studies in the syntax of relative and comparative clauses*. New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1967. Adjectives in English: attribution and predication. *Lingua* 18.1-34.
- Bonneau, José. 1992. The structure of internally headed relative clauses: implications for configurationality. McGill University. Ph. D. dissertation.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris Publication.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. The view from Building 20. ed. by Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser 1-52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1994. Bare phrase structure. MIT, MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics.
- Cole, Peter. 1987. The structure of internally headed relative clauses. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5.277-302.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. 2nd edition, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Croft, William. 1991. *Syntactic categories and grammatical relations: the cognitive organization of information*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Culy, Christopher. 1989. Relative clauses in Bambara: Internally headed or correlative? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Washington D. C.
- Culy, Christopher Douglas. 1990. The syntax and semantics of internally headed relative clauses. Stanford University. Ph. D. dissertation.
- Diesing, Molly. 1992. Indefinites. *Linguistic Inquiry Monographs*. vol. 20. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Dowty, David R. 1979. Word Meaning and Montague Grammar: The Semantics of Verbs and Times in Generative Semantics and in Montague's PTQ. *Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy*. vol. 7. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 1994. Internally-Headed Relative Clauses in Japanese ARE Internally-Headed. SUNY at Buffalo, ms.
- Fauconnier, Gilles. 1994 (1985). *Mental Spaces: Aspects of Meaning Construction in Natural Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1982. Frame Semantics. *Linguistics in The Morning Calm*. ed. by The Linguistic Society of Korea 111-137. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1985. Frames and the Semantics of Understanding. *Quaderni di Semantica* 6.222-253.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1989. *On Grammatical Constructions*. University of California, Berkeley.
- Fillmore, Charles J. , and Beryl T. Atkins. 1994a. Toward a Frame-Based Lexicon: The Semantics of RISK and its Neighbors. *Frames and Fields*. ed. by Adrienne Lehrer and Eva Kittay. Erlbaum Publishers.
- Fillmore, Charles J., and B. T. S. Atkins. 1994b. Starting where the dictionaries stop: the challenge of corpus lexicography. *Computational Approaches to the Lexicon*. ed. by B. T. S. Atkins and A. Zampolli 349-393. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Fillmore, Charles J.; Paul Kay; and Mary Catherine O'Connor. 1988. Regularity and Idiomaticity in Grammatical Constructions: The case of *Let Alone*. *Language* 64.501-538.
- Foley, William A., and Robert D. Van Valin. 1984. Functional syntax and universal grammar. *Cambridge studies in linguistics*. vol. 38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fried, Mirjam. 1995. Grammatical Subject and Its Role in the Grammar of Case Languages. University of California, Berkeley. Ph.D. dissertation.
- Fujii, Seiko Yamaguchi. 1991. Frame-setting Constructions in Japanese: When Conditionals Interact with Temporals. Paper presented at the Second International Cognitive Linguistics Conference (ICLA) at Santa Cruz, California.
- Fujii, Seiko Yamaguchi. 1993a. On the Clause-Linking *to* Construction in Japanese. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*. ed. by Patricia M. Clancy, vol. 2. 3-19. Stanford: Stanford Linguistics Association.
- Fujii, Seiko Yamaguchi. 1993b. The Use and Learning of Clause-linkage: Case Studies in Japanese and English Conditionals. University of California, Berkeley. Ph.D. dissertation.
- Fujii, Seiko Yamaguchi. 1993c. The use and learning of temporal clause-linkage in Japanese and English. *Current Issues in European Second Language Acquisition Research*. ed. by Bernhard Ketteman and Wilfred Wieden 279-291. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.
- Genetti, Carol. 1986. The Development of Subordinators from Postpositions in Bodic Languages. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 12.387-400.
- Genetti, Carol. 1991. From Postposition to Subordinator in Newari. *Approaches to grammaticalization*. ed. by Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine, vol. 2. 227-255. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Givón, T. 1983. Topic continuity in discourse: A quantitative cross-language study. *Typological studies in language (TSL)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: a constructional grammar approach to argument structure*. *Cognitive Theory of Language and Culture*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gorbet, Larry. 1977. Headless relatives in the Southwest: Are they related? *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 3.270-278.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 1994. *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory*. 2nd edition, *Blackwell Textbook in Linguistics*. vol. 1. Oxford UK & Cambridge USA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Haiman, John, and Sandra Thompson. 1984. 'Subordination' in universal grammar. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 10.510-523.
- Hale, Kenneth. 1976. The adjoined relative clause in Australia. *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*. ed. by R.M.W. Dixon, vol. 22. 78-105. New Jersey: Humanities Press Inc.
- Hale, Kenneth, and Chisato Kitagawa. 1976-77. A counter to Counter-Equi. *Papers in Japanese Linguistics* 5.41-61.
- Harada, S.I. 1971. Ga-No Conversion and Idiolectal Variations in Japanese. *Gengo Kenkyuu* 60.
- Harada, S. I. 1986 (1973). Counter Equi NP Deletion. *Papers in Japanese Linguistics* 11.157-201.
- Hasegawa, Yoko. 1988. *Internal Headed Relatives in Japanese*. University of California, Berkeley, ms.
- Hasegawa, Yoko. 1992. *Syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of TE-linkage in Japanese*. University of California, Berkeley. Ph.D. dissertation.
- Hasegawa, Yoko. In press. The (Non-Vacuous) Semantics of TE-Linkage in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Heim, Irene. 1982. *The semantics of definite and indefinite noun phrases*. University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Ph.D. dissertation.
- Hirose, Kyoko. 1992. The Historical development of the homophonous particles *ga* in Japanese. *Clause-combining in Japanese: The Second Annual Report to NTT, Japan*. ed. by Charles J. Fillmore, Seiko

- Yamaguchi Fujii, Yoko Hasegawa, Kyoko Hirose, and Katsuya Kinjo.
University of California, Berkeley.
- Hirose, Kyoko, and Toshio Ohori. 1992. Japanese internally headed relative clauses revisited. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Philadelphia.
- Holland, Gary. 1984. Subordination and Relativization in Early Indo-European. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 10.609-622.
- Hopper, Paul J., and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge textbooks in linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horie, Kaoru. 1993a. A Cross-linguistic study of perception and cognition verb complements: a cognitive perspective. University of Southern California. Ph.D. dissertation.
- Horie, Kaoru. 1993b. From zero to overt nominalizer *no*: a syntactic change in Japanese. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 3. ed. by Choi Soonja 305-321. Stanford: CSLI.
- Horie, Kaoru. 1993c. Where Japanese and Korean disagree: Head Internal Relatives. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Los Angeles.
- Hoshi, Koji. 1994. The Head-internal relative clause in Japanese: an empty head noun approach. 5th Japanese/Korean Linguistics Conference.
- Ikegami, Yoshihiko. 1991. 'DO-language' and 'BECOME-language': Two contrasting types of linguistic representation. *The empire of signs: semiotic essays on Japanese culture*. ed. by Yoshihiko Ikegami 285-326. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ishigaki, Kenji. 1955. *Joshi no rekishiteki kenkyū*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Ishii, Yasuo. 1988. Head-internal relative clauses in Japanese. *ESCOL* '88:234-245.
- Itô, Junko. 1986. Head-Movement at LF and PF: The Syntax of Head-Internal Relatives in Japanese. *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 11.109-138.

- Jespersen, Otto. 1965 (1924). *The Philosophy of grammar*. New York: Norton & Company.
- Jhang, Sea-Eun. 1994. Headed nominalizations in Korean: Relative clauses, clefts, and comparatives. Simon Fraser University. Ph. D. dissertation.
- Josephs, Lewis S. 1976. Complementation. *Syntax and Semantics 5: Japanese Generative Grammar*. ed. by Masayoshi Shibatani 307-369. New York: Academic Press.
- Kaiser, Stefan. 1991. *Circumnominal Relative Clauses in Classical Japanese: An Historical Study*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrasowitz.
- Kay, Paul, and Charles J. Fillmore. 1994. Grammatical Constructions and Linguistic Generalizations: the *What's X doing Y?* Construction. University of California, Berkeley, ms.
- Keenan, Edward L. 1985. Relative clauses. *Language typology and syntactic description*. ed. by Timothy Shopen, vol. 2. 141-170. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keenan, Edward L., and Bernard Comrie. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8.63-99.
- Kirsner, Robert S., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1976. The role of pragmatic inference in semantics: a study of sensory verb complements in English. *glossa* 10.2.200-240.
- Koenig, Jean-Pierre. 1993. Linking constructions *vs.* linking rules: evidence from French. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 19.217-231.
- Konoshima, Masatoshi. 1966. *Kokugo joshi no kenkyuu - joshi shi no sobyo* (A study of particles). Tokyo: Ohusha.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1972. Functional sentence perspective: A case study from Japanese and English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3.269-320.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1972. The categorical and the thetic judgment. *Foundations of language* 9.153-185.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1992. Japanese syntax and semantics: collected papers. *Studies in natural language and linguistic theory*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1992 (1974-77). Pivot-independent relativization in Japanese. *Japanese syntax and semantics: collected papers*. 114-174. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1992 (1983). A Remark on Certain Constructions with the Word *naka* in Japanese. *Japanese syntax and semantics: collected papers*. 175-182. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Lakoff, George. 1986. Frame Semantic Control of the Coordinate Structure Constraint. *Proceedings of the Twenty-second Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. Papers from the Parasession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Theory*. 152-167.
- Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, Robin. 1984. The pragmatics of subordination. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 10.481-492.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1986. Pragmatically motivated syntax: Presentational cleft constructions in spoken French. *Proceedings of the Twenty-second Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. Papers from the Parasession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Theory*. 115-126.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1987. Sentence focus, information structure, and the thetic-categorical distinction. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 13.366-382.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1988a. Presentational cleft constructions in spoken French. *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*. ed. by John Haiman and Sandra A. Thompson 135-179. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1988b. There was a farmer had a dog: Syntactic amalgams revisited. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 14.319-339.

- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. Information structure and sentence form. Cambridge studies in linguistics. vol. 71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1977. Syntactic Reanalysis. Mechanisms of Syntactic Change. ed. by Charles N. Li 57-139. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1991. Foundations of cognitive grammar. vol. 2: Descriptive Application. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Lê, Văn Cù. 1988. 'NO' ni yoru bun umekomi no koozoo to hyoogen no kinoo (The Structure and function of sentence embedded by *no*). Frontier series Nihongo kenkyu sosho. vol. 2. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1984. Der Relativsatz. Typologie seiner Strukturen - Theorie seiner Funktionen - Kompendium seiner Grammatik. Language Universals Series 3. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Li, Charles N., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1978. Relativization Strategies in Wappo. Berkeley Linguistics Society 4.106-113.
- Lichtenberk, Frantisek. 1991. Semantic Change and Heterosemy in Grammaticalization. Language 67.3.475-509.
- Martin, Samuel. 1975. A Reference Grammar of Japanese. New Haven: Yale University.
- Matisoff, James A. 1972. Lahu Nominalization, Relativization, and Genitivization. Syntax and semantics. ed. by John P. Kimbal, vol. 1. 237-257. New York and London: Seminar Press.
- Matsumoto, Yo. 1988. From Bound Grammatical Markers to Free Discourse Markers: History of Some Japanese Connectives. Berkeley Linguistics Society 14. 340-351.
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 1988. Grammar and semantics of adnominal clauses in Japanese. University of California, Berkeley. Ph.D. dissertation.
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 1993. Nihongo meisi-ku koozoo no goyooron-teki koosatu (A Pragmatic account of Japanese adnominal clause construction). Nihongogaku 12.11.101-114.

- McCawley, James D. 1976. Relativization. *Syntax and Semantics*. ed. by Masayoshi Shibatani, vol. 5. 295-306. San Diego: Academic Press, Inc.
- McCawley, James D. 1981. The syntax and semantics of English relative clauses. *Lingua* 53.99-14.
- McCawley, James D. 1992. Notes on Japanese Syntax. ms.
- Michaelis, Laura A. 1994. A Case of Constructional Polysemy in Latin. *Studies in Language*.
- Mihara, Ken-ichi. 1994a. Iwayuru shuyōbu naizaigata kankeisetsu ni suite (On so-called internally headed relative clauses). *Nihongogaku* .7.80-92.
- Mihara, Ken-ichi. 1994b. On the Proper Treatment of Postpositions in Japanese. *Current Topics in English and Japanese*. ed. by M. Nakamura 131-150. Tokyo: Hitsuji Shobō.
- Mikami, Akira. 1972 (1959). *Zoku gendai gohō josetsu* (A study of modern usage): Shugo haishi ron. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Modini, Paul. 1993a. Old Japanese raising and internally-headed relative clauses. *Folia linguistica historica*.
- Modini, Paul. 1993b. Review on KAISER Stefan *Circumnominal Relative Clauses in Classical Japanese. An Historical Study*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1991. *Cahiers de Linguistique Asie Orientale* XXII.1.125-132.
- Momiyama, Yosuke. 1992. Tagigo no bunseki: Kukan kara jikan e (An analysis of polysemy: from space to time). *Nihongo kenkyu to nihongo kyoiku*. ed. by Hiroko Kakkenbusshu 185-199. Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Morita, Yoshiyuki. 1990. *Nihongo-gaku to Nihongo-Kyooiku* (A study of Japanese and Japanese Language Education). 1st Edition. Tokyo: Bonjinsha.
- Murasugi, Keiko. 1994. Head-internal relative clauses as adjunct pure complex NPs. *Synchronic and diachronic approaches to language: A festschrift for Toshio Nakao on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday*. ed. by S. Chiba . Tokyo: Liber Press.

- Nakau, Minoru. 1973. Sentential complementation in Japanese. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Nakau, Minoru. 1976. Tense, aspect, and modality. *Syntax and Semantics 5: Japanese Generative Grammar*. ed. by Masayoshi Shibatani 421-482. New York: Academic Press.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1984. Another typology of relatives. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 10.524-541.
- Nihon Kokugo Daijiten (Unabridged Dictionary of Japanese). 1974. Tokyo: Shogakukan.
- Nishida, N. 1977. *Joshi (Auxiliaries) 1. Bunpo (Grammar) II*. Iwanami Kooza Nihongo vol. 7. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Nishigauchi, Taisuke. 1990. Quantification in the Theory of Grammar. *Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy*. vol. 37. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Nomura, Masuhiro. 1995. Internally-headed relative clauses and other related constructions in Japanese: A cognitive grammatical approach. University of California, San Diego, Qualifying Exam. June 1, 1995.
- Noonan, Michael. 1985. Complementation. *Language typology and syntactic description: Complex constructions*. ed. by Timothy Shopen, vol. 2. 42-140. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ohara, Kyoko Hirose. 1992. On Japanese internally headed relative clauses. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 18.100-108.
- Ohara, Kyoko Hirose. 1994a. An event-reporting relative construction in Japanese. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 20.260-272.
- Ohara, Kyoko Hirose. 1994b. Japanese pseudo-relatives: are they internally headed relativization? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Boston.
- Ohara, Kyoko Hirose. 1995. What's in a place? Extended uses of a physical-world noun in Japanese. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 21.237-251.

- Ohara, Kyoko Hirose. 1996. The conventionalized function of Japanese internally headed relativization: A constructional account. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, San Diego.
- Ohori, Toshio. 1991. Case Markers and Clause Linkage: Toward a Semantic Typology. Paper presented at the Second International Cognitive Linguistics Association Conference (ICLA) at Santa Cruz, California.
- Ohori, Toshio. 1992. Diachrony in Clause Linkage and Related Issues. University of California at Berkeley. Ph. D. dissertation.
- Ohori, Toshio. 1995. Problems of Japanese IHRCs: Argument Linking and Reference Tracking. *Language, Information, Text* 2.89-108.
- Oono, Susumu. 1993. *Kakari musubi no kenkyuu* (A study of bound ending). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Park, Jeong-Woon. 1994. Morphological causatives in Korean: Problems in grammatical polysemy and constructional relations. University of California, Berkeley. Ph.D. dissertation.
- Perlmutter, David M., and John Robert Ross. 1970. Relative clauses with split antecedents. *Linguistic Inquiry* 1.350.
- Platero, Paul. 1974. The Navaho relative clause. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 40.3.202-246.
- Pollard, Carl, and Ivan A. Sag. 1994. *Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ross, John R. 1967. Constraints on variable in syntax. MIT. Ph.D. dissertation.
- Saeki, B. 1966. *Jodai Kokugohoo Kenkyuu* (A study of Old Japanese). Tokyo: Daitoo Bunka Daigaku Tokyo Kenkyusho.
- Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 1987. Thethetic/categorical distinction revisited. *Linguistics* 25.511-580.
- Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 1995. Language-specific *vs.* universal notions of "function": A case study and its theoretical implications. Paper

presented at the annual meeting of the International Conference on Functional Approaches to Grammar, Albuquerque.

- Schuetze-Coburn, Stephan. 1984. On the borders of subordination: Signaling relative clauses in spoken German. *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 10.650-659.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1990. *The languages of Japan*. Cambridge Language Surveys. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shopen, Timothy, (ed.) 1985. *Language typology and syntactic description*. vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sperber, Dan, and Deirdre Wilson. 1995. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. 2nd edition, Oxford & Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics. vol. 54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Takubo, Yukinori. 1984. Gendai Nihongo no Basho o arawasu Meishi rui ni tsuite (On Place Nouns in Modern Japanese). *Nihongo, nihon bunka* (Japanese Language and Culture) .12.89-117.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1978. Relations between subordination and coordination. *Universals of Human Language*. ed. by Joseph Greenberg, vol. 4. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Tanaka, Akio. 1977. Jushi (Auxiliaries) 3. *Bunpō* (Grammar) II. Iwanami Koza Nihongo vol. 7. 359-454. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Teramura, Hideo. 1992. *Teramura Hideo ronbun shū hihongo bunpō hen* (Selected papers - Grammar of Japanese). vol. 1. Tokyo Japan: Kuroshio Shuppan.
- Tomoda, Etsuko. 1980. *Ga/no kootai-henkei to meishi rashisa ni tsuite* (On *ga-no* conversion and nouniness). *Musashino Daigaku Kiyoo* 17.101-105.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1989. On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: an example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language* 65.1.31-55.

- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1996. The development of discourse markers: Implications for a theory of grammaticalization. Stanford University, Talk given at Linguistic Colloquium, University of California, Berkeley.
- Tsubomoto, Atsuro. 1991. Shuyōbu naizai gata kankei setsu (Internally headed relative clauses). *Gendai eigo gaku no ayumi* (Advances in Modern English Linguistics). ed. by Yasui Minoru Hakase Koki Kinen Ronbun Shū Henshū Iin Kai 253-262. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Tsubomoto, Atsuro. 1993. Kankeisetsu to giji kankeisetsu - jookyoo to chikaku (Relative clauses and pseudo relative clauses: Situation and perception). *Nihongogaku* 12.2.76-87.
- Uchibori, Asako. 1991. Head-internal relatives in Japanese. *Kansai Linguistics Society* 11. 81-90.
- Uchibori, Asako. 1992. Head-internal relatives and null operator binding. University of Connecticut, ms.
- Uchio, K. 1973. Joshi no Hensen (Developments of particles). *Joshi* (Particles). *Hinshibetsu Nihonbunpoo Kooza* (Parts of speech in the grammar of Japanese). vol. 1 ed. by K. Suzuki and T. Hayashi, Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.
- Van Valin, Robert D., Jr., (ed.) 1993. *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar*. Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Watanabe, Akira. 1991. Wh-In-Situ, Subjacency, and Chain Formation. MIT, ms.
- Watanabe, Akira. 1992. Subjacency and S-structure movement of *wh*-in-situ. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 1.255-291.
- Werth, Paul. 1974. Some thoughts on non-restrictive relatives. *Linguistics* 14.2.33-67.
- Williamson, Janis S. 1987. An Indefinite Restriction for Relative Clauses in Lakota. *The representation of (In)definiteness*. ed. by E. Reuland & A. ter Meulen. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bibliography

- Yamazaki, Yoshiyuki. 1965. *Nihongo no bunpoo kinoo ni kansuru taikeiteki kenkyuu* (A systematic study of grammatical functions of Japanese). Tokyo: Kazama Shobo.
- Yang, Byong-seon. 1994. *Morphosyntactic Phenomena of Korean in Role and Reference Grammar: Psych-Verb Constructions, Inflectional Verb Morphemes, Complex Sentences, and Relative Clauses*. Seoul: Hankuk Publishers.