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Professor Timothy Stowell, Chair

This dissertation deals with syntactic properties of Japanese verbal stems, called renyoo-kei in traditional Japanese linguistics, in a variety of morphological and syntactic constructions. While the renyoo-kei is an infected form of the verb, it also shows both nominal and verbal properties. This "verbal noun" is a morphologically "nominalized" form of the verb and can accompany its argument structure. Furthermore, in various syntactic constructions, it assigns either verbal Cases (nominative/accusative) or nominal Case (genitive) to its argument. I argue that the renyoo-kei suffix -i or -∅ heads a functional projection, FP, in which the VP is a complement headed by the verbal root. The surface form of the renyoo-kei is derived via head-to-head verb movement. Following the VP Internal Subject Hypothesis (Kuroda 1989 and Koopman and Sportiche 1991), I propose that the subject of a clause is generated in the specifier position of FP. The nominal/verbal alternation is accounted for by assuming that the renyoo-kei suffix is underspecified with respect to the lexical feature [α N]. Assignment of a positive or negative value for the feature [α N] is determined by its governing head, a process through which the renyoo-kei is recategorized. This recategorization approach to the renyoo-kei allows us to explain various syntactic properties of constructions involving renyoo-kei such as nominal clauses, Ni-purpose clauses, complex predicates, "VP-Preposing" constructions, and subject honorification constructions.

Chapter 1 presents a brief outline of verbal nouns in Japanese, showing the types of verbal nouns and forms of the renyoo-kei. Chapter 2 is a discussion of renyoo-kei nominals, showing that morphologically complex renyoo-kei nominals are complex event nominals (cf. Grimshaw 1990). Chapter 3 presents arguments against previous accounts of Japanese verbal nouns. It will be shown that the lexical feature and epenthetic analyses of the renyoo-kei suffix(es) do not provide a principled account for the morphological and syntactic behavior of verbal nouns. Chapter 4 is concerned with the recategorization analysis of the renyoo-kei and its morphological and syntactic implications. Chapter 4 also offers analyses of the Japanese clausal structure, ECM structure, Case marking, and compares Japanese renyoo-kei with English gerundives. Finally, Chapter 5 deals with subject honorification where the renyoo-kei cooccurs with the honorific prefix o-. In addition to the discussion of the domain and licensing condition of subject honorification, this chapter also presents a light verb analysis of the verbs nar-u 'to become' and su-ru 'to do', which occur in subject and object honorification.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1. VERBAL NOUNS IN JAPANESE

This thesis is concerned with the lexical category "Verbal Noun" which has both nominal and verbal functions in Japanese. This type of lexical category can consist of either an inflected form of the verb or an event noun borrowed from the Chinese language. The existence of the Japanese lexical category of "Verbal Noun", a category which has both verbal and nominal properties, goes against the commonly held assumption that lexical categories can be distinguished by the features [V] and [N]. This assumption is exemplified by Chomsky 1981, who argues that the lexical categories N, V, A and P can be distinguished by specifying a + or – value for the lexical features [V] and [N]. The principle behind establishing the lexical features [V] and [N] lies in the distinction between verbs and nouns, a principle which has been commonly believed in both linguistics and philosophy.

Similarly, in traditional Japanese linguistics, lexical categories have been classified into two major types: yoogen 'verbal' and taigen 'nominal'. Lexical categories that show inflection are characterized as yoogen. Thus, verbs and adjectives are classified as yoogen since they inflect. On the other hand, taigen do not show inflection and thus include lexical categories such as nouns, adjectival nouns and particles. Hence, in both generative grammatical and traditional Japanese grammatical frameworks, the verb-noun distinction has been assumed as a basic criteria to differentiate lexical categories.

The use of the verb-noun distinction to differentiate lexical categories has strong theoretical underpinnings. As Hazout 1991 points out, the distinction between verbs and nouns can be established by both semantic and grammatical criteria: for example, nouns can be semantically identified as referring to the name of a person, thing, or place. Meanwhile, verbs can be characterized as referring to a process, event, or state. Grammatically, nouns can be syntactically identified as lexical categories occurring in certain syntactic contexts such as subject and object positions, the position modified by adjectives and relative clauses, and the head of NP. In addition, nouns are specified for number, gender, and person in languages where such features play an important grammatical function. Equally, verbs can be defined by properties such as occurrence in the head position of VP, modification by adverbials, and ability to assign Case and θ-roles to their arguments.

This dissertation is concerned with Verbal Nouns (hereafter, VNs) in Japanese, a lexical category which raises questions because it does not fit neatly into the commonly held assumption about the nature of lexical categories. Japanese VNs consist of two sets of lexical categories: Sino-Japanese VNs such as those in (1) and Renyoo-kei VNs like those in (2).1

(1)

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{BENKYOO} & \text{'study'} \\
\text{KEIKOKU} & \text{'warning'} \\
\text{HANBAI} & \text{'sales'} \\
\text{AIYOO} & \text{'patronization'}
\end{array}
\]

1 To clarify for the reader whether a particular VN is Sino-Japanese or Renyoo-kei, I will represent Sino-Japanese VNs with italicized capital letters and Renyoo-kei VNs with capital letters.
(2) NORIIRE 'extension (of airline, train service)
KAKITORI 'dictation'
SAKADATI 'handstand'
KUSATORI 'weeding'

Sino-Japanese VNs are syntactically nominal in that they occur in positions ordinarily occupied by nouns. Semantically, however, Sino-Japanese VNs behave as if they are verbs in that the arguments of Sino-Japanese VNs are θ-marked by them as shown in (3).

(3) a. gengogaku-no BENKYOO linguistics-gen. study 'study of linguistics'
b. konpyuutaa-no HANBAI computer-gen. sales 'computer sales'

Renyoo-kei VNs, with which I will be mainly concerned in this thesis, either consist of two verbal stems as exemplified by nori-ire '(lit.)ride-put in' and kaki-tori '(lit.)write-take', or else consist of a verbal stem into which a noun has been incorporated as in saka-dati '(lit.)reverse-stand' and kusa-tori '(lit.)weed-take'. Verb stems occurring in these words are traditionally classified as renyoo-kei, literally meaning the form connecting to a verbal. Since the renyoo-kei are inherently verbs, renyoo-kei VNs can be characterized as "nominalized" forms of verbs. Thus, syntactically, renyoo-kei VNs occur in "nominal" position as shown in (4).

Los=Angeles-to.gen. extension-nom. yesterday be=decided-past
'It was decided to extend service to LA.'
b. Kanji-no KAKITORI-o hazime-ta.
Chinese=characters-gen. dictation-acc. start-past
'We started to dictate Kanji.'

However, renyoo-kei VNs function just like verbs in syntactic contexts, assigning Case and θ-roles as the examples in (4) show. With both verbal and nominal properties, this class of category poses questions about the verb-noun distinction.2

As mentioned above, lexical categories such as verbs, nouns, adjectives, and prepositions have been assumed to be distinguished by the lexical features [±N] and [±V]. Under this assumption, the alternation observed above poses a problem since VNs cannot be simply characterized as having a positive or negative value for the lexical features [N] and [V]. In order to account for nominal properties of the renyoo-kei, the feature [N] must have a positive value whereas verbal properties of the renyoo-kei can be only accounted for if we assume a negative value for the feature [N].

The main goal of this thesis is to provide a principled account for the nominal and verbal alternation of renyoo-kei and Sino-Japanese VNs. I will argue that renyoo-kei nominals can be classified in terms of simplex/complex event nominals (cf. Grimshaw 1990). Simply put, only complex event nominals can accompany argument structure in

---

2 Similar "nominalization" processes are observed in other languages in a somewhat different fashion. In Korean, for instance, the verbal inflectional suffix -ki has the same effect. In English, on the other hand, the gerundive suffix -ing nominalizes verbs.
syntactic contexts. I will analyze the nominal/verbal alternation of verbal nouns in syntactic constructions by assuming a process of "recategorization" (Milsark 1988 for a similar analysis of English gerundives). In particular, I will propose that the renyoo-kei suffix -i or -∅ has the underspecified feature [α N]. The value of α is determined by its governing head. The constructions in question are the "VP-Preposing", Ni-purpose clause, nominal clause, and honorification constructions.

2. The Renyoo-kei Form of the Verb

The renyoo-kei illustrates interesting syntactic behavior. The renyoo-kei form of consonantal verbs consists of the verb stem and the suffix -i. The present tense form is formed with the same root but instead of the suffix -i, it is suffixed by the present tense marker -u as shown in (5a). On the other hand, the renyoo-kei of vocalic verbs is not suffixed with -i, but consists of the verb stem. The present tense form of vocalic verbs is formed by the stem and the present tense marker -ru as in (5b)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{RENYOO-KEI} & \quad \text{PRESENT} & \quad \text{GLOSS} \\
\text{ASOB-I} & \quad \text{asob-u} & \quad \text{'to play'} \\
\text{KOROS-I} & \quad \text{koros-u} & \quad \text{'to kill'} \\
\text{YOM-I} & \quad \text{yom-u} & \quad \text{'to read'} \\
\text{KAER-I} & \quad \text{kaer-u} & \quad \text{'to return'}
\end{align*}\]

b. Vocalic Verbs

\[\begin{align*}
\text{RENYOO-KEI} & \quad \text{PRESENT} & \quad \text{GLOSS} \\
\text{HAZIME} & \quad \text{hazime-ru} & \quad \text{'to begin'} \\
\text{AKI} & \quad \text{aki-ru} & \quad \text{'to be bored, tired of'} \\
\text{OSORE} & \quad \text{osore-ru} & \quad \text{'to be afraid'} \\
\text{TUTOME} & \quad \text{tutome-ru} & \quad \text{'to be employed'}
\end{align*}\]

The renyoo-kei form of both consonantal and vocalic verbs appear both in nominal and verbal contexts. For instance, verbs in (5) can stand alone as nouns as in (6), as a part of a nominal compound as illustrated in (7), and may also appear in complex verbal aspectual predicates such as the inceptive construction expressing 'to start Ving' and the continuative construction 'to keep Ving' as shown in (8)-(9). (The classification of these aspectual constructions are due to Soga 1983.)

\[\begin{align*}
(6) & \quad \text{AS NOUNS:} \\
& \quad a. \quad \text{ASOB-I} & \quad \text{'play, a game'} \\
& \quad b. \quad \text{TUTOME} & \quad \text{'work, a job'}
\end{align*}\]

---

3 Japanese verbs can be roughly classified into three types: irregular, consonantal, and vocalic verbs. Consonantal verbs consist of a root ending in a consonant to which inflectional suffixes such as -a, -i, -u, -e, and -o are attached. Meanwhile, vocalic verbs have a root ending in a vowel -i or -e.

4 For convenience, I refer to this form as the "present tense" form even though semantically, the suffix -u or -ru indicates an imperfect (or incomplete) event with action verbs. Hence, this form is often referred to as "imperfect" form, "non-past" form or, following traditional Japanese linguistics, as syuusi-kei (sentence-ending form or predicate base).
IN NOMINAL COMPOUNDS:

a. ASOB-i-nin
   play-I-person\(^5\) 'a playboy, gambler, tramp'
b. TUTOME-nin
   work-Ø-person 'an office worker, employee'

INCEPTIVE: \(V+hazime\) 'TO START TO \(V\)

a. ASOB-i-hazime-ru 'start to play'
b. TUTOME-hazime-ru 'start to be employed'

CONTINUATIVE: \(V+tuzuke\) 'TO KEEP VING'

a. YOM-i-tuzuke-ru 'keep reading'
b. OSORE-tuzuke-ru 'keep being scared of '

In addition, this form appears in the TE-form of the verb as shown in (10).

\(\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{KOROS-i-te} \\
& \quad \text{kill-I-TE} \\
& \quad \text{'kill (and ...)'}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{HAZIME-te} \\
& \quad \text{begin-Ø-TE} \\
& \quad \text{'start (and ...)'}
\end{align*}\)

The TE-form of the verb also occurs in aspectual verbal constructions such as those in (11).

\(\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{PROGRESSIVE: } \ V-te \ i-ru \quad \text{'BE VING' OR PERFECTIVE 'HAVE V-EN'} \\
& \quad \text{Taroo-wa HANASI-te i-ru.} \\
& \quad \text{Taro-top. speak-TE exist-pres.} \\
& \quad \text{'Taro is speaking.' or 'Taro has spoken.'}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{SUSTENTIVE: } \ V-te \ ok-\text{u} \quad \text{'V IN ADVANCE'} \\
& \quad \text{Taroo-ni HANASI-te ok-\text{u}.} \\
& \quad \text{Taro-dat. speak-TE place-pres.} \\
& \quad \text{'I speak it to Taro in advance.'}
\text{c.} & \quad \text{RESULTATIVE: } \ V-te \ ar-\text{u} \quad \text{'VING HAS BEEN DONE.'} \\
& \quad \text{Kurasu-ga HAZIME-te ar-\text{u}.} \\
& \quad \text{class-nom. start-TE exist-pres.} \\
& \quad \text{'The class has been started.'}
\end{align*}\)

---

\(^5\) In what follows, I use "-\(i\)" to represent the renyoo-kei suffix if present. As shown in (5b) above, when the verb is vocalic, there is no renyoo-kei ending, and I use -Ø to indicate the zero renyoo-kei suffix.
d. TERMINATIVE: \textit{V-te sima-u} 'END UP VING', 'V COMPLETELY'

Benkyoo-ni AKI-te simat-ta.
study-dat. be=bored-TE put=away-past

'I am completely bored with studying.'

In addition, the renyou-kei form of the verb can trigger either nominal Case marking (i.e. genitive) or verbal Case marking (i.e. nominative and accusative) in certain syntactic constructions. For example, in nominal clause constructions such as in (12), either nominal case (i.e. genitive) or verbal case (i.e. nominative/accusative) can be assigned to the arguments of the morphologically complex renyou-kei \textit{utusi-kae} (lit.) transfer-change, to transfuse (liquid).

(12) a. Kenkyuuin-no sono ekitai-no UTUSI-KAE-tyuu-ni,
researcher-gen. that liquid-gen. transfer-change-while-at

kagaku-hannoo-ga oki-ta.
chemical-reaction-nom. occur-past

'At the duration in which the researcher was transfusing the liquid, a chemical reaction occurred.'

b. Kenkyuuin-ga sono ekitai-o UTUSI-KAE-tyuu-ni,
researcher-nom. that liquid-acc. transfer-change-while-at

kagaku-hannoo-ga oki-ta.
chemical-reaction-nom. occur-past

As stated earlier, the main objective of this thesis is to account for the nominal-verbal alternation of the renyou-kei form in the Government and Binding (GB) framework developed in Chomsky 1981, 1982, and 1986b. I will not outline the theoretical framework in this introductory chapter. Relevant theoretical background is provided as needed. For a general theoretical background of GB framework, readers are referred to Chomsky's works cited above and the references cited therein.

3. ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

The discussion of this thesis proceeds as follows: Chapter 2 discusses the properties of renyou-kei nominals and other types of nominals. I will show that morphologically simplex renyou-kei nominals are either result or simplex event nominals (cf. Grimshaw 1990, and Tsujimura 1992). Simplex event nominals do not accompany their argument structure. In addition, morphologically complex renyou-kei nominals are either result or complex event nominals. Being a complex event nominal, this type of nominal can be associated with its argument structure. I will argue against Miyagawa's 1987 claim that the possibility of forming periphrastic verbs is restricted by the "blocking" effect (cf. Arnoff 1976). I will show that periphrastic verb formation with the light verb \textit{su-ru} depends on the availability of argument structure.

Chapter 3 is a review of the analyses previously proposed to account for the nominal and verbal behavior of the renyou-kei. First, I will review the lexical feature analysis of "nominalization" of the renyou-kei, showing that this approach cannot account for the syntactic behavior of the renyou-kei. Secondly, I will examine the status of the renyou-kei suffix \textit{-i} or \textit{Ø}, demonstrating that the renyou-kei suffix is not an Infl (or Tense) element. Furthermore, I will argue against Poser 1984, who claims that the renyou-kei suffix is epenthetic to "fix" an otherwise ungrammatical phonological structure.
Chapter 4 is concerned with the recategorization analysis of the renyoo-kei. In this chapter, I will show that the syntactic behavior of the renyoo-kei can be explained by assuming that the lexical specification of the renyoo-kei suffix contains the underspecified lexical feature [α N]. The renyoo-kei suffix -i or -Ø constitutes the head of a functional projection FP, which is the close equivalent of the English ing-of gerundives. Following Milsark's 1988 analysis of English gerundives, I will argue that the positive or negative value of the underspecified feature [α N] is determined by the lexical feature of its governing head. Then, I will examine several relevant Japanese constructions, proving that the underspecification analysis of the renyoo-kei provides the simplest account for the nominal and verbal behavior of the renyoo-kei in these constructions. Finally, I will argue that the syntactic behavior of the Sino-Japanese verbal noun can be explained by assuming that this type of VN also has the underspecified feature [α N] in its functional head. Once again, a positive or negative value of the underspecified feature [α N] is determined by its governing head.

Chapter 5 deals with subject honorification in which the renyoo-kei is prefixed with the honorific marker o-. I will show, following Aoyagi 1992, that honorific verbs consisting of the prefix o- and the renyoo-kei are subject to the conditions constraining occurrences of VNs. Then, I will argue that the honorific verb is headed by a functional head which projects an FP, just as verbal nouns do. Additionally, I will show that the licensing condition for subject honorification is spec-head agreement between the subject and the head of FP which must hold inside of FP. This analysis provides a simple account for the nominal properties of subject honorification. Verbal properties of the subject honorification construction are attributed to the lexical feature assigned to the head of FP by the verb nar-u 'to become'. I will argue that the verb nar-u is a light verb. The light verb nar-u 'to become' is the "intransitive" counterpart of the light verb su-ru 'to do'. The verb nar-u has the effect of raising the embedded subject. Raising of the embedded subject in subject honorification is directly related to the pragmatic principle which this construction is subject to. As Jacobson 1990 points out, subject honorification is subject to the pragmatic well-formedness condition which requires that reference to agency be avoided. The raising property of the verb nar-u is consistent with this principle. I also examine other types of subject honorification involving the passive morpheme and the copula, showing that the embedded subject in these constructions is also raised to the matrix clause. I conclude that the underspecification analysis provides a principled account for nominal and verbal properties of subject honorification.

In the appendix, I present a brief account for object honorification in the underspecification approach. Contrary to previous analyses (cf. Toribio 1990 and Aoyagi 1992), I argue that the licensing condition of object honorification is also spec-head agreement holding between the subject and the head of FP. This analysis allows us to view the licensing of honorification uniformly, providing a principled account for cases involving a benefactive argument as well as cases containing the subject honorific passive morpheme and suppletive object honorific verb.
CHAPTER 2

TYPES OF RENYOO-KEI NOMINALS

1. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I examine the nominal function of the renyoo-kei form of the verb (or continuative base, or adversial (Shibatani 1990)). As shown below, the renyoo-kei form of the verb can be either verbal or nominal. Previous studies have called the nominal renyoo-kei form the deverbalized noun form; I will use the term renyoo-kei nominals for simplicity. Among renyoo-kei nominals, I will distinguish between renyoo-kei nominals consisting of renyoo-kei of simple verb and those consisting of two renyoo-kei forms. I will refer these as simplex renyoo-kei nominals and complex renyoo-kei nominals, respectively. For example, the nominals in (1) are simplex renyoo-kei nominals and those in (2) are complex renyoo-kei nominals.

(1) SIMPLEX RENYOO-KEI NOMINALS
   a. OYOG-I 'swimming'  
      --- oyog-u 'to swim'
   b. ASOB-I 'play', 'game'  
      --- asob-u 'to play'
   c. YOGORE 'stain', 'dirt'  
      --- yogore-ru 'to get dirty'
   d. IZIME 'bullying'  
      --- izime-ru 'to bully'

(2) COMPLEX RENYOO-KEI NOMINALS
   a. TAT-I-YOM-I 'free reading'  
      --- tat-u 'to stand'
         + yom-u 'to read'
   b. OS-I-UR-I 'pushy sales'  
      --- os-u 'to push'
         + ur-u 'to sell'
   c. UE-ZIN-I 'death by starving'  
      --- uc-ru 'to starve'
         + sin-u 'to die'
   d. TOR-I-SIMAR-I 'control', 'enforcement'  
      --- tor-u 'to take'
         + simar-u 'to close'
   e. SIME-KIR-I 'deadline'  
      --- sime-ru 'to close'
         + kir-u 'to cut'

Semantically, renyoo-kei nominals in general allow both referential noun interpretation under which a nominal refers to an entity or a concept, and eventive noun interpretation where a nominal denotes an act or an event. For instance, the nominal in (1c), yogore, refers to an entity of stain, whereas the nominal in (1a), oyogi, can refer to an event of swimming as well as a sport of swimming.

However, there is a difference with respect to the types of eventive interpretation that these two renyoo-kei nominals receive. In particular, complex renyoo-kei nominals which allow an eventive interpretation can function as Verbal Nouns (VNs). On the other hand, not all simplex renyoo-kei nominals can function as VNs even when they allow an eventive interpretation. Several syntactic behaviors of complex renyoo-kei nominals are directly associated with availability of such interpretation, which syntactically distinguishes them from simplex renyoo-kei nominals. I argue that complex renyoo-kei nominals allowing event interpretation are complex event nominals (Grimshaw 1990, and Tsujimura 1992), whereas simplex renyoo-kei nominals are by nature simple event nominals.
I also discuss the referential noun interpretation which simplex and complex renyoo-kei nominals receive. In order for renyoo-kei forms of verb to behave referential nouns, these renyoo-kei forms undergo a categorial change. Such a categorial change in which inherently verbal renyoo-kei forms behave as referential nouns has been referred to as mismatch (Sugioka 1984), which I will discuss briefly in this chapter.

Renyoo-kei also occurs in nominal compounds in which renyoo-kei is prefixed by an independent noun or a bound morpheme. For instance, the nominals in (3)-(4) are formed in this fashion.

(3) NOMINAL COMPOUNDS FORMED WITH NOUN AND RENYOO-KEI
   a. kusa-TOR-I (weed-take-I) 'weeding'
   b. meron-ZUKUR-I (melon-make-I) 'melon cultivating'

(4) NOMINAL COMPOUNDS FORMED WITH PREFIX AND RENYOO-KEI
   a. ato-OS-I (back-push-I) 'support'
   b. mae-BARA-I (before-pay-I) 'prepay'

It will be shown that these nominals behave as complex event nominals and the availability of this interpretation enables this type of nominal to behave as VNs.

The discussion in this chapter proceeds as follows: In section 2, I examine various types of nominals consisting of renyoo-kei of verbs and their possible interpretation. I show that complex renyoo-kei nominals may allow complex event interpretation in the sense of Grimshaw 1990, whereas every simplex renyoo-kei nominal cannot. Section 3 is devoted to the discussion of renyoo-kei nominal to which a prefix is attached to form nominal compounds. Once again, these nominals are shown to allow complex event interpretation. Section 4 is a discussion about the Verbal Nouns (VNs) and the blocking effect. First, I argue that complex renyoo-kei nominals and nominal compounds behave as VNs due to the availability of complex event interpretation. Then, I discuss the blocking effect which has been considered to govern the possibility of periphrastic verb formation among VNs. However, in light of complex renyoo-kei nominals which violate the blocking effect, I argue that periphrastic verb formation is enabled by the availability of complex event interpretation. Finally, section 5 provides a summary of the chapter as well as pointing out the questions to be discussed in later chapters.

2. TYPES OF RENYOO-KEI NOMINALS

In this section, I examine two types of renyoo-kei nominal: simplex renyoo-kei and complex renyoo-kei. First, I discuss simplex renyoo-kei nominals which consists of the renyoo-kei of simplex verb. Section 2. 1. is a discussion about the forms and semantic properties of simplex renyoo-kei nominals. I point out that renyoo-kei nominals of this type mainly function as referential nouns, but allow an evventive interpretation in certain cases. In section 2. 2., I examine the placement of pitch accent among simplex renyoo-kei nominals. It is shown that despite the segmental similarity, the placement of pitch accent makes a distinction between verbal and nominal renyoo-kei uses; this provides evidence that the renyoo-kei of a verb can be labeled either as a verb or a noun. The different placement of pitch accent is assumed to be the result of different status of lexical categories assigned to each form.

Then, in section 2. 3., I examine complex renyoo-kei nominals. Complex renyoo-kei nominals have a complex internal structure, generally consisting of two renyoo-kei forms. In contrast to simplex renyoo-kei nominals, complex renyoo-kei nominals allow an
event interpretation as well as a non-eventive interpretation. This examination of complex renyoo-kei nominals consists of three parts: renyoo-kei nominals with and without verbal sources, and renyoo-kei forms lacking any nominal interpretation.

2. 1. VERBAL RENYOO-KEI AND SIMPLEX RENYOO-KEI NOMINALS

In her discussion of nominal clauses (cf. Chapter 4), Tsujimura 1992 shows that the renyoo-kei form is subdivided into two categories, verbal and nominal, depending on the syntactic contexts in which the renyoo-kei occurs. Thus, according to Tsujimura’s analysis, when a renyoo-kei form occurs in coordinate structure, it remains as a verb, whereas when it occurs in an argument position, it is considered deverbalized to form a renyoo-kei nominal. Take oyog-i, for example, which is the renyoo-kei form of oyog- 'to swim'. Oyog-i can behave both as a verbal renyoo-kei as in (5) and a renyoo-kei nominal as in (6). The examples in (5) and (6a) are cited from Tsujimura with slight modifications.

(5) OYOG-I 'swim'

John-ga umi-de OYOG-I, Mary-ga kawa-de oyoi-da.
-nom. ocean-at swim-I -nom. river-at swim-past

'John swam in the ocean and Mary swam in the river.'

-top. swim-I-nom. skillful-pres.

'John is good at swimming.'

b. John-no kono recsu-de-no tikarazuyoi OYOG-I-ga
-gen. this race-in-gen. strong swim-I-nom.
mina-o odorok-ase-ta.
everyone-acc. be=surprised-Caus.-past

'John's strong swimming at this race surprised everyone.'

In the examples in (5), oyog-i behaves as a verb which coordinates two clauses. It is evidenced by the verbal Case marking of the agent and the locative phrases, which are marked with -ga (nominative) and -de (locative), respectively.

In contrast, in (6), oyog-i shows all the characteristics of a noun. First, it is Case-marked with the nominative marker -ga; also in (6b), it is modified by an adjective. Furthermore, in (6b), the arguments of oyog-i are marked in the genitive. Semantically, despite oyog- being inherently eventive, the renyoo-kei nominal in (6a) behaves as a referential noun, referring to the sport of 'swimming' and lacking an eventive interpretation. That the renyoo-kei nominal in (6a) lacks the event interpretation is in part supported by the fact that this type of renyoo-kei nominal does not allow modification by modifiers indicating frequency such as tabikasanaru 'repeated(ly taking place)' which force the event reading (cf. Grimshaw 1990).

(7) *John-wa tabikasanaru OYOG-I-ga uma-i.
-top. repeated swim-I-nom. skillful-pres.

"*John is good at repeated swimming.'

On the other hand, when accompanied by its arguments, the renyoo-kei nominal allows the event interpretation as in (6b). Thus, as shown in (8), oyog-i in (6b) is compatible with the modifier tabikasanaru.

(8) John-wa OYOG-I-ga uma-i.
-top. swim-I-nom. skillful-pres.

'John is good at swimming.'
(8) John-no tabikasanaru tikarazuyoi OYOG-I-ga mina-o
       -gen. repeated strong swim-I-nom. everyone-acc.
       odorok-ase-ta.
       be=surprised-Caus.-past
       'John's repeated strong swimming surprised everyone.'

The renyoo-kei nominal in (8) is interpreted as indicating a multiple event. However, as shown in (9a) below, this nominal does not have temporal extent. Oyog-i in (9a) does not allow modification by an aspeccual modifier gozikan 'for five hours'. Compare this example with the sentence in (9b), where the aspeccual modifier modifies the verbal counterpart of oyog-i.

(9) a. *John-no gozikan-no OYOG-I.
       -gen. for=five=hours-gen. swim-I

       -top. for=five=hours swim-past
       'John swam for five hours.'

These behaviors of oyogi correspond those of nominals referred to as simple event nominals such as event, trip, and race. As Grimshaw 1990 shows, a modifier such as frequent can modify plural simple event nominals but not singular ones. Simple event nominals also do not allow aspeccual modifiers. Consider the following examples.

(10) a. The frequent trips/events were a nuisance.

b. *The frequent trip/event was a nuisance.

c. *John's trip in five hours/for five hours was interesting.

d. *The race in five hours/for five hours excited everyone.

There are a number of renyoo-kei which allow a similar event interpretation such as the ones in (11). Note that some renyoo-kei nominals in (11) allow agentive reading, too. I will refer this type of nominal as a simple event nominal, following Grimshaw 1990 and Tsujimura 1992. For more discussion on this subject, see section 2. 3 below.

(11) RENYOO-KEI PRESENT TENSE

a. TETUDA-I 'a help', 'a helper' tetuda-u 'to help'

b. DOMOR-I 'stammering', 'stammerer' domor-u 'to stammer'

c. SABAK-I 'a judgment' sabak-u 'to judge'

d. NOZOK-I 'an act of peeping', 'a peeking Tom' nozok-u 'to peep'

On the other hand, there are a number of renyoo-kei nominals which do not have a simple event reading, such as the examples in (12), which yield only a non-eventive interpretation.
(12)  RENYOO-KEI  PRESENT TENSE

a.  OO-I  'a cover'  oo-u  'to cover'

b.  IK-I  'on one's way to'  ik-u  'to go'

c.  YOM-I  'reading (of a character)'  yom-u  'to read'

d.  HIKAR-I  'light'  hikar-u  'to shine', 'glitter'

As indicated by the English gloss of each of the renyoo-kei nominals in (12), the thematic type of renyoo-kei nominals varies from instrumental as in (12a) through result as in (12d). In these cases, verbs can be reanalyzed as a referential nouns. But none of them allow the event reading which the nominals in (11) allow. I will refer this type of nominal as result nominal.

So far, I have shown how the renyoo-kei form can behave as a nominal. However, it is not always the case that the renyoo-kei of a verb undergoes this "deverbalization" process. There are a number of verbs which resist this process, and the renyoo-kei form of these verbs behave only as verbs. For instance, the renyoo-kei of verbs such as tor-u 'to take' and kik-u 'to listen to' can appear in complex predicates such as the inceptive or continuative construction (cf. Chapter 1) as shown in (13), thus behaving as verbs; however, the renyoo-kei form of these verbs does not function as renyoo-kei nominals as illustrated in (14).

(13)  a.  Taroo-ga syasin-o TORI-hazime-ta.
     -nom. photos-acc. take-start-past
     'Taro started to take pictures.'

     b.  Hanako-wa ongaku-o KIKI-tuzuke-ta.
     -top. music-acc. listen-continue-past.
     'Hanako kept listening to music.'

(14)  a.  *TOR-I  'taking'

     b.  *KIK-I  'listening'

To summarize, renyoo-kei nominals are classified into two types based on semantic and syntactic characteristics: i) those behaving as a noun with event interpretation (simple event nominals) and ii) those behaving as noun without event interpretation (result nominals). It is not always the case, however, that the renyoo-kei form of any verb can behave as a nominal. Rather, I propose that for each renyoo-kei, there is a lexical specification as to whether the renyoo-kei can function as a nominal or not. In the next section, I examine the placement of pitch accent simplex renyoo-kei nominals have and compare it with that which corresponding renyoo-kei verbs have. It will be shown that renyoo-kei nominals constitutes a category independent of verbs with respect to the accent placement.

2. 2. ACCENTUATION

Tsujimura 1992 points out that renyoo-kei nominals and verbal renyoo-kei can be distinguished by examining the placement of pitch accent. Consider the examples in (15), in which the location of the accent is indicated by the diacritic "*". The difference between the renyoo-kei verb and the renyoo-kei nominal is observed in the location of the accent if the verb is accented. As illustrated in (15), the placement of accent in the renyoo-kei of the
accented verbs remains the same as the verbal form. However, the corresponding renyoo-kei nominal forms are accented on the ultima.

(15)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RENYOO-KEI NOMINAL</th>
<th>RENYOO-KEI</th>
<th>PRESENT TENSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. oyog-† 'swimming'</td>
<td>oyog-i</td>
<td>oyog-u 'to swim'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. hanas-† 'speech, story'</td>
<td>hanas-i</td>
<td>hanas-u 'to speak'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. hayar-† 'fashion'</td>
<td>hayar-i</td>
<td>hayar-u 'to become popular'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, let's examine the sentence in (5), which is repeated as (16) with accent placement indicated by (*).

(16)  

John-ga umi-de oyog-i, Mary-ga kawa-de oyog-i-da. 
-nom. ocean-at swim-I -nom. river-at swim-past  
'John swam in the ocean and Mary swam in the river.'

In coordinate structure, the renyoo-kei form of the verb oyog- 'swim' in (15a) appears accented as in (16). This is due to the fact that the renyoo-kei form appearing in coordinate structure must be verbal. Now, compare the renyoo-kei form in (6), repeated here as (17) with (16).

(17)  

a. John-wa oyog-†-ga uma-i. 
-top. swim-I-nom. skillful-pres.  
'John is good at swimming.'

b. John-no kono reesu-de-no tikarazuyoi oyog-†-ga 
-gen. this race-in-gen. strong swim-I-nom. 
mina-o odorok-ase-ta. 
everyone-acc. be=surprised-Caus.-past  
'John's strong swimming at this race surprised everyone.'

In (17), oyog-i has accent on the ultima, indicating that this form is a nominal renyoo-kei. Thus, for accented verbs, the placement of accent is different between verbal and nominal renyoo-kei forms.

In contrast, unaccented verbs in (18) remains unaccented even in renyoo-kei nominals.

(18)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RENYOO-KEI NOMINAL</th>
<th>RENYOO-KEI</th>
<th>PRESENT TENSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. TATAKA-I 'a fight'</td>
<td>TATAKA-I</td>
<td>tataka-u 'to fight'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. KOROS-I 'a murder'</td>
<td>KOROS-I</td>
<td>koros-u 'to kill'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. YAK-I 'temper'</td>
<td>YAK-I</td>
<td>yak-u 'to burn'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For instance, in coordinate structure, the renyoo-kei of the verb tataka- 'fight' in (18a) appears unaccented as in (19).

(19)  

Otoko-tati-wa TATAKA-I, onna-tati-wa uti-o mamot-ta. 
man-pl.-top. fight-I woman-pl.-top. home-acc. defend-past  
'Men fought and women defended houses.'
Furthermore, when *tataka-i* occurs in an argument position, it remains unaccented as shown in (20).

(20) Daigakun-de Nihongun-to Amerikagun-no Ioozima-de-
    graduate=school-in Japanese=army-and American=army-gen. Iwojima-in-
    no TATAKA-i-o kenyuu-site-iru.
    gen. fight-I-acc. research-do-exist=pres.

'I am researching on the fight between the Japanese armed forces and the US armed forces at the Iwojima island.'

Based on such observations, Tsujimura implies that there is a correspondence between verbal and nominal renyoo-kei forms.

Poser 1991, however, demonstrates that the accentuation of renyoo-kei nominals is largely irregular by citing the following examples. The examples in (21) illustrate that there are a number of cases in which the accent falls on the first syllable rather than the ultima.

(21)        | RENYOO-KEI NOMINALS | RENYOO-KEI | PRESENT TENSE
  a.  d̃omor-i 'a stammerer'  dom̃or-i  dom̃or-u 'to stammer'
       | 'stammering'         |            |
  b.  nāgas-i 'strolling
       | musician'            | nagās-i    | nagās-u 'sing from
       |                      |            | door to door'
  c.  tatār-i 'curse'       | tatār-i    | tatār-u 'to curse'

In addition, Poser cites the following cases where a renyoo-kei nominal which has an accented verbal counterpart is not accented.

(22)        | RENYOO-KEI NOMINALS | RENYOO-KEI | PRESENT TENSE
  a.  takuram-i 'plot, plan, trick' takurām-i takurām-u 'to scheme, plan'
  b.  tutusim-i 'discretion' tutusīm-i tutusīm-u 'to be discreet'
  c.  takuwaë-Ø 'store, hoard' takuwaë-Ø takuwaë-ru 'to store, lay in'

Based on these facts, Poser argues that renyoo-kei nominals are derived via the lexical process of nominalization.

The discussion in this section shows that while the pitch accent falls on the identical segment in verbal renyoo-kei form and the present tense form of the corresponding verb but renyoo-kei nominals and their corresponding verb forms may not retain the identical placement of pitch accent. Now, a question arises as to the lexical status of the renyoo-kei form. Are renyoo-kei nominals lexically distinguished from verbal renyoo-kei in the lexicon in such a way that renyoo-kei nominals and verbal renyoo-kei each have separate lexical entries? Or does each renyoo-kei have a single lexical entry being subject to a process by which it surfaces either as a verb or a noun? In either case, the different placement of pitch accent can be accounted for in the following manner: renyoo-kei nominals are all labeled as +N category and therefore, they are subject to accent placement rules somewhat different from the rules that +V categories are subject to.

I will leave the questions open at this moment and examine more renyoo-kei nominals to determine what is the most efficient way to explain the behaviors of renyoo-kei. In the following section, I examine complex renyoo-kei nominals, which consist of
two renyoo-kei forms of verb. It will be shown that complex renyoo-kei nominals can be classified into three ways: referential (or result) nominals, verbal nouns, and verbs.

2. 3. COMPLEX RENYOO-KEI AND ITS NOMINAL USES

So far, I have observed nominal and verbal uses of renyoo-kei which are associated with simplex verbs. In this section, I examine complex renyoo-kei nominals which consist of two renyoo-kei forms of verb. As will be shown, complex renyoo-kei nominals are not always associated with corresponding verb forms (cf. 2. 3. 2). In addition, there is a class of renyoo-kei nominals with corresponding verb forms (cf. 2. 3. 1). Furthermore, there is a class of complex verbs that does not have corresponding complex renyoo-kei nominals (cf. 2. 3. 3).

Before examining these complex renyoo-kei nominals, let's briefly examine the internal composition of complex renyoo-kei nominals. Complex renyoo-kei nominals can be classified into three types depending on the internal composition: i) compounding of two renyoo-kei of verb such as *hakari-uri* (measure-sell) 'selling by the pound', in which two activities denoted by two verbs involved in a compound take place successively ii) so-called *dvandva* compounds such as *iki-ki* (go-come) 'going and coming', 'traffic', in which the head of the compound is assumed to be both the right-hand and left-hand element. (For more discussion of the internal composition of these types of complex renyoo-kei nominals, see Kageyama 1982 and Sugioka 1984) and iii) compounding of two renyoo-kei in which the second verb denotes more or less a spacio-temporal notion, such as *nui-tukeru* (saw-attach) 'saw onto' (cf. Tagashira and Hoff 1986). In any event, each complex renyoo-kei nominal describes an event which consists of two single events combined.

In the following discussion, I distinguish complex renyoo-kei based on whether or not they have verbal and nominal forms. It will be shown that some have both verbal and nominal forms while some have only nominal forms, and some have only verbal forms. In addition, I argue that complex renyoo-kei nominals can be "complex event nominals" (cf. Grimshaw 1990 and Tsujimura 1992) if they allow event interpretation, in contrast to simplex renyoo-kei nominals.

2. 3. 1. COMPLEX RENYOO-KEI WITH VERBAL SOURCE

First, consider the following examples.

(23) a. TOR-I-SIMAR-I take-I-close-I 'control', 'supervision', 'order'

b. MOT-I-KOM-I hold-I-take= in-I 'carrying in'

c. KAS-I-DAS-I lend-I-take= out-I 'lending service'

d. NOR-I-IRE ride-I-pit= in= (-Ø) 'extending the (air)line route into'

e. IRE-KAE put= in= (-Ø)-change= (-Ø) 'replacement'

f. TOR-I-KOWAS-I take-I-break-I 'demolition'
g. HANAS-I-A-I speak-I-meet-I 'discussion', 'negotiation', 'consultation'

(24) a. KAK-I-TOR-I write-I-take-I 'dictation', 'a character writing test'
b. OS-I-IRE push-I-put=® 'a closet'
c. SIME-KIR-I close(®)-cut-I 'a deadline'
d. YOB-I-DAS-I call-I-take=out-I 'paging', 'a summon'
e. UKE-TOR-I receive(®)-take-I 'a receipt'

As Tagashira and Hoff 1986 point out, the renyoo-kei forms in both (23) and (24) have corresponding verbal forms as shown in (25) and (26).

(25) a. tor-i-simar-u take-I-close-pres. 'to control, to supervise'
b. mot-i-kom-u hold-I-take=in-pres. 'to carry in'
c. nor-i-ire-ru ride-I-put=in-pres. 'to extend the air(line) route into'
d. hanasi-a-u speak-meet-pres. 'to discuss', 'to negotiate', 'to talk about'

(26) a. kak-i-tor-u write-I-take-pres. 'to dictate'
b. os-i-ire-ru push-I-put=in-pres. 'to push in', 'to force in'
c. sime-kir-u close(®)-cut-pres. 'to close (the application period, door)'
c. yob-i-das-u call-I-take=out-pres. 'to summon, to page'

The difference between the renyoo-kei nominals in (23) and the ones in (24) is that the former receive only an event interpretation whereas the latter have become referential nouns to express a variety of thematic features as the English glosses in (24) show.

The event interpretation that the renyoo-kei nominals in (23) receive is somewhat different from the event interpretation available for simplex renyoo-kei nominals. Consider the following examples.

(27) a. Keesatu-niyoru tabikasanaru mayaku-no TORISIMARI. police-by repeated narcotics-gen. control

'Repeated control of narcotics by the police'
mayaku-kanren-hanzai-no gensyoo-ni tunagat-ta.
narcotics-related-crime-gen. decrease-to lead-past

'Narcotics control by the police for one month led to decrease of narcotics related crimes.'

The example in (27a) illustrates that the a modifier of frequency can modify the renyoo-kei nominal torisimari 'control'. Such a modification was possible with simplex renyoo-kei nominals such as oyogi 'swimming' as shown in section 2.1. above. In contrast to simplex renyoo-kei nominals, however, complex renyoo-kei nominals allow modification by temporal aspectual phrases such as ikkagetsukan 'for a month', as exemplified in (27b). Recall that this type of modification is not possible with simplex renyoo-kei nominals.

In this connection, let's consider the English examples in (28) and (29).

(28) a. The examination of the patient took two hours.
    b. The assignment of difficult problems caused distress among students.

(29) a. The exam/examination was long.
    b. The assignments were on the table.

The nominals in (28), examination and assignment denote events of examining and assigning, respectively. On the other hand, the nominals in (29) refers to concrete entities. This distinction is clearly observed when these nominals are modified by modifiers which requires the event reading such as frequent and constant. In addition, under the event interpretation, the argument of the nominal must be present (cf. Grimshaw 1990).

(30) a. The frequent examination of the patient is desireable.
    b. *The frequent examination is desirable.
    c. *The frequent exam was long.
    d. The doctor examine *(the patient).

(31) a. The constant assignment of unsolvable problems caused distress among students.
    b. *The constant assignment caused distress among students.
    c. The instructor assigned *(difficult problems).

Now, compare the examples in (28) with the ones in (32), which also denote events.

(32) a. The trip took four weeks.
    b. The event was long.

However, the nominals trip and event do not allow the modification by modifiers such as frequent and constant.
(33)  a. *The frequent trip was a nuisance.
    b. *The constant event is desirable.

Based on such observations, Grimshaw refers to the nominals in (28) as complex event nominals which are associated with the argument structure whereas those in (32) as simple event nominals.

Among several differences these two types of nominals show, only the complex event nominals allow event control (cf. Williams 1985; Lasnik 1988). Consider the examples in (34) and (35), cited from Grimshaw 1990.

(34)  a. The translation of the book in order to make it available to a wider readership.
    b. (The) examination of the patient in order to determine whether or not …

(35)  a. *The translations of the book in order to make it available to a wide readership.
    b. *The exam in order to determine whether or not …

In (34), the controller of the infinitival purpose clause is not the implicit agent. Rather, the event denoted by the nominal itself functions as a controller. In (34a) for example, the event of translating the book enables to be available to a wider readership. On the other hand, event control is not available for result nominals such as translations and exam in (35). Grimshaw argues that only complex event nominals can be associated with argument structure.

Japanese purpose clauses also allow event control but they are different from English in that both event control and agent control are possible. Consider the following examples.

genti-tyoosa-ga okonaware-ta.
on=site-inspection-nom. be=carried=out-past
'An inspection at the site in order to determine the cause of accident was carried out.'

b. [Hatubyou-no mekanizumu-o saguru tame-no] taemanai getting-sick-gen. mechanism-acc. search in=order=to continuous
kenkyuuu-ga nasare-ta.
research-nom. be=performed-past
'A continuous research in order to discover the mechanism of getting ill was carried out.'

In (36a), the controller of the purpose clause is either the implicit agent or the event denoted by the nominals genti-tyoosa 'on site investigation'. Thus, this sentence is interpreted either that an unspecified individual determined the cause of the accident, or that the event of an on-site investigation enabled some individuals to determine the cause of the accident. Similar interpretations are possible in the case of (36b), too.

Complex renyoo-kei nominals allow event control. Consider the examples in (37).
In (37), both event and agent control are possible in this sentence. Thus, this sentence receives interpretations in which the "event" of controlling narcotics enabled the police to show seriousness of eradication of narcotics (event control interpretation) or the police is functioning as the agent of showing seriousness of eradication of narcotics (agent control interpretation).

It is plausible, therefore, to regard complex renyou-kei nominals with event interpretation as complex event nominals. As will be shown below, I assume that when a nominal is interpreted as a complex event nominal, it behaves as a verbal noun (hereafter cited as VN). For more discussion on VNs, see section 4 and references cited therein.

2. 3. 2. RENYOU-KEI NOMINALS WITHOUT VERBAL SOURCE

So far, I have examined cases where complex renyou-kei forms behave both as verbs and nouns. In contrast, the renyou-kei forms in (38) do not have corresponding verbal forms. Consider the following examples.

(38) a. KU-I-NIGE
cat-I-run-away(∅)

'bilking', 'running away without paying after eating'

b. OS-I-UR-I
push-I-sell-I

'the hard sell', 'a pushy salesman'

c. TAT-I-YOM-I
stand-I-read-I

'reading books while standing', 'reading books at the bookstore (without buying them)'

d. TATAK-I-UR-I
beat-I-sell-I

'a sacrifice sale', 'bargain', 'sales technique in which street vendors sells merchandise (often bananas) by beating the table while reducing the selling price'

---

1 Tsujimura 1993 argues that a very limited number of simplex renyou-kei nominals allow complex event nominal interpretation. She argues that simplex renyou-kei nominals such as hodokosi ‘giving (of charity), korasime ‘torturing’, anukai ‘dealing’ and arasoi ‘fighting’ are complex event nominals, citing the availability of event control in purpose clause headed by these nouns. It appears that these nouns also allow modification by aspectual modifiers, though the judgment varies among native speakers. But it should be noted that these nouns are very exceptional and mostly simplex renyou-kei nominals do not behave as complex event nominals.
e.  UE-ZIN-I
    starve(-∅)-die-I
    'starving to death'

f.  MI-GOROS-1²
    see(-∅)-kill-I
    'looking on while someone dies without offering help'

As shown in (39), none of the renyoo-kei nominals in (38) has a corresponding verbal form. Note that these nominals can form verbal counterpart by attaching the light verb su-ru 'do'. This process of forming verbal forms is often referred to as periphrastic verb formaiton (Poser 1992). I will discuss what govern periphrastic verb formation is section 5 below.

(39)  a.  *ku-i-nige-ru
      cat-I-run=away-pres.
      cf. KUINIGE-su-ru
           bilking-do-pres.

      b.  *os-i-ur-u
          push-I-sell-pres.
      cf. OSIURI-su-ru
           force=sales-do-pres.

      c.  *tat-i-yom-u
          stand-I-read-pres.
      cf. TATIYOMI-su-ru
           stand=reading-do-pres.

Yet, semantically, most of the renyoo-kei nominals in (38) receive complex event interpretation. For example, these nominals allow modification by modifiers of frequency and aspectral modifiers as shown in (40).

(40)  a.  Gakusee-tati-no tabikasanaru KUINIGE-ni nayamasaretei-ru.
        students-pl.-gen. repeated bilking-by suffer-pres.
        'We are suffering from repeated students' bilking.'

      b.  Mainiti itizikan-no TATIYOMI-de, sono hon-o
          everyday for=one=hour-gen. free=reading-by that book-acc.
        yomi-oe-ta.
        read-finish-past.
        'I finished reading the book by reading it for one hour at the bookstore everyday.'

Furthermore, event control is attested in the purpose clause with these nominals as in (41). In (41a), for instance, the controller of the purpose clause can be the event of bilking and

---
² As will be discussed below, all the renyoo-kei nominals in (38) except (38f) allow periphrastic verb formation. That the renyoo-kei nominal in (38f) cannot undergo periphrastic verb formation does not undermine my argument that periphrastic verb formation is possible only when the nominal is complex event nominal. The impossibility of periphrastic verb formation with (38f) is attributed to the idiosyncratic property of (38f). Thus, as compared with other nominals listed in (38), the event described by (38f) does not require intentional involvement in the event by participant(s) of the event. In other words, the participant(s) of the event is not Agent (perhaps, Experiencer). Since the light verb su-ru 'do', which heads periphrastic verb, requires Agent (cf. Hayashi 1993), this nominal isn't compatible with periphrastic verb formation.
the sentence receives an interpretation in which intentional bilking makes it possible for an unspecified individual be arrested by the police.

(41)  a. Tada-de tabemono-ni arituk-eru-node, [kantanni keesatu-ni tukamae-free-for food-to get-treated-can-because easily police-by arrest-rare-ru tame-no] itotekina KUINIGE
Pass.-pres in=order=to-gen. intentional bilking
'Because of getting food for free, intentional bilking in order to get arrested by the police'

b. [Atsumatta kyaku-ni hoka-no sinamono-o kawa-se-ru gathered customer-to other-gen. goods-acc. buy-Caus.-pres.
tame-no] banana-no TATAKIURI
in=order=to banana-gen. sacrifice=sale
'Sacrifice sale of banana in order to make customers buy other goods'

Therefore, it is plausible to consider that these nominals are complex event nominals.

Recall that some of these nominals behave as referential nouns. For instance, osiuri in (38b) can refer to a pushy salesman as well as an event of hard selling. Hence, this type of renyoo-kei nominal also undergoes reanalysis. The problem of reanalysis will be discussed in Chapter 3.

As discussed in connection to the examples in (23) above, the availability of the event interpretation is closely related to whether or not renyoo-kei nominals can behave as VNs. As will be discussed below in section 4, all the renyoo-kei nominals in (38) share the morphological, syntactic and semantic characteristics of VNs.

2. 3. 3. RENYOO-KEI WITHOUT NOMINAL USES

In this section, I examine cases where renyoo-kei forms of complex verb do not function as renyoo-kei nominals. Recall that in the previous sections, I have shown that there is a class of complex renyoo-kei forms allowing both verbal and nominal functions and there is a class of complex renyoo-kei forms which lacks verbal function. In either cases, nominal renyoo-kei forms recieve referential and event interpretations. However, the renyoo-kei forms examined in this section lack nominal functions.

First, consider the following examples.

(42)  a. aruk-i-mawar-u
walk-I-go=round-pres.  'to walk around'

b. sikar-i-tuke-ru
scold-I-attach-pres.  'scold harshly'

c. tob-i-agar-i
jump-I-go=up-I  'jump up'

d. hiro-i-atume-ru
pick=up-I-collect-pres.  'pick up and collect'

e. kangae-tuk-u
consider(-∅)-attach-pres.  'come up with an idea'
The complex verbs in (42) are distinct from those in (23) in that the renyoo-kei forms of these complex verbs cannot function as renyoo-kei nominals. Hence, the renyoo-kei in (43) are all unacceptable as renyoo-kei nominals.

(43) a. *ARUK-I-MAWAR-I
    walk-I-go=round-I

b. *SIKAR-I-TUKE
    scold-I-attach(-∅)

c. *TOB-I-AGAR-I
    jump-I-go=up-I.

d. *HIRO-I-ATUME
    pick=up-I-collect(-∅).

e. *KANGAE-TUK-I
    consider(-∅)-attach(-∅).³

The renyoo-kei forms in (43), corresponding to their verbal counterparts in (42) can not be interpreted as nominals. In contexts where the verbal renyoo-kei is required, such as the inceptive construction, the renyoo-kei in (43) can form grammatical sentences as in (44).

    children-nom. walk=around-I-start-past
    'Children started walking around.'

b. Hahaoya-ga kodomo-o SIKARITUKE-hazime-ta.
    mother-nom. children-acc. scold=harshly-start-past
    'The mother started scolding children harshly.'

To summarize so far, the renyoo-kei forms in (23) and (24) have corresponding verb forms. However, these two types of renyoo-kei differ in one respect: those in (23) allows event interpretation whereas those in (24) are assumed to be reanalyzed as referential nouns. On the other hand, the renyoo-kei forms in (38) do not have corresponding verb forms but allow event interpretation. Some of the renyoo-kei nominals of the type in (38) are further reanalyzed as referential nouns. Lastly, there is one class of verbs which do not allow their renyoo-kei to behave as renyoo-kei nominals as in (42).

Now, it becomes evident that both simplex and complex renyoo-kei forms display a similar set of facts: renyoo-kei nominals can be referential nouns and event nouns whereas there are certain numbers of verbs which do not allow their renyoo-kei to become nominals. As far as these facts are concerned, it might be possible to claim that renyoo-kei forms are nominals derived via process of (gerundive) nominalization, particularly in cases where verbal forms and nominal forms semantically correspond each other. Following this nominalization analysis, renyoo-kei nominals can be claimed as "derived" by a morphosyntactic operation, perhaps, suffixation of the renyoo-kei suffix -i or -∅ (for more discussion of this view, see Kageyama 1982 and Poser 1984).

³ One may argue that when a certain class of renyoo-kei is the second element of a compound, the verb may not form a VN (or referential noun). This argument does not hold since there are a number of VNs (or referential nouns) containing the same renyoo-kei as a second element as do the VNs in (43). For example, -tuku/tuki in (43c) can be found in onmou-tuku 'an idea) occur/onmou-tuki 'idea' and -agari/agari in (43c) can be found in nari-agaru 'to become rich from poverty 'nari-agari 'a person who became rich from poverty'.
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However, this view is problematic in light of renyoo-kei nominals in (38), which lack corresponding verbal forms. Under the nominalization analysis, cases such as (38) requires an ad hoc account by stipulating, say, that these cases are lexically listed as VNIs, which consist of two renyoo-kei of existing verbs. These cases, therefore, pose a question as to how renyoo-kei nominals are derived. I will return to this issue in Chapter 3, where I argue that the renyoo-kei form in general does not constitute an independent category. In other words, this form is unspecified with respect to ± values for the features [N] and [V].

In the next section, I examine nominal compounds, in which renyoo-kei forms are prefixed with either an independent noun or a bound morpheme. As in the case of complex renyoo-kei, nominal compounds examined in the following section constitute further evidence that the renyoo-kei is not a product of the morpho-syntactic operation of nominalization.

3. NOMINAL COMPOUNDS

Another usage of renyoo-kei appears when the renyoo-kei is prefixed by either an independent noun or a bound morpheme to form a nominal compound. Whether prefixed by an individual noun or a bound morpheme, nominal compounds formed in this fashion behave similarly to the complex renyoo-kei nominals in (38) above: while nominal compounds do not have corresponding inflected verbal forms, many allow the event interpretation. In addition, some compounds are subject to reanalysis, behaving only as referential nouns.

The discussion in this section proceeds as follows: in section 3. 1., I examine cases where the argument of a transitive renyoo-kei is incorporated in the pre-renyoo-kei position. Section 3. 2. is devoted to the discussion of cases in which intransitive renyoo-kei appear in nominal compounds. Finally, in section 3. 3., I discuss cases involving prefixes which function as the adjunct of the renyoo-kei.

3. 1. NOMINAL COMPOUNDS WITH TRANSITIVE RENYOO-KEI

Let's begin the discussion by considering the following examples of prefixed nominal compounds.

(45) a. kusa-TOR-I weed-take-I 'weeding'
b. kimo-DAMES-I gut-probe-I 'test of courage'
c. suika-WAR-I watermelon-break-I 'watermelon crushing game'
d. sake-ZUKUR-I4 sake-make-I 'brewing'

Each nominal in (45) consists of the renyoo-kei of a transitive verb and its argument which is incorporated in the immediately preceding position. These denote an event expressed by the renyoo-kei which is directed onto the incorporated argument: I refer to these as the

---

4 The renyoo-kei *dames-i* in (45b), *zukur-i* in (45d), and *goros-i* in (46a) have undergone a phonological change when compounding took place. The corresponding verb forms for these renyoo-kei are *tames-u* 'to probe', *tukur-u* 'to make' and *koros-u* 'to kill', respectively.
event reading. For example, the nominal in (45a) indicates an event of picking something which is directed onto weeds.

On the other hand, each prefixed nominal compound in (46) primarily refers to an agent who performs the event described by the renyoo-kei and its argument; I refer to these as the agent reading.

(46)  
  a. hito-GOROS-I  
       person-kill-I  
       'a killer, a murderer'  
       or 'an act of killing (someone) or murdering'  
  b. kaban-MOT-I  
       bag-hold-I  
       'a bag carrier (a person who works for an influential figure as a low-paid intern learning how to run a business) or 'the act of carrying a bag'  
  c. kyaku-HIK-I  
       customer-pull-I  
       'a person who solicit business for a bar, etc. by forcing customers into the bar, etc.' or 'the act of forcing customers into a bar, etc.'  
  d. sake-NOM-I  
       sake-drink-I  
       'a (heavy) drinker, a drunkard'  

In most cases, the nominals in (46) also refers to the event the renyoo-kei and its argument describes (the event reading) but not all prefixed nominal compounds in (46) have the event reading. For instance, the compound in (46a) has both agent and event readings, whereas the one in (46d) only allows the agent reading.

Now, let's consider the prefixed nominal compounds in (47). These nominals are primarily interpreted as instrumental. Thus, they denote objects with which the event described by the renyoo-kei is carried out onto the prefixed noun. Note in addition that it is impossible to interpret them as agentive, but nonetheless the eventive interpretation is available.

(47)  
  a. tume-KIR-I  
       nail-cut-I  
       'a nail clipper' or 'clipping nails'  
  b. hige-SOR-I  
       beard/mustache-shave-I  
       'a shaver' or 'shaving'  
  c. enpitu-KEZUR-I  
       pencil-shave-I  
       'a pencil sharpener' or 'sharpening pencils'  

Thus, the nominals in (45) through (47) are distinguished based on the interpretations that they yield. In general, almost all prefixed nominal compounds containing the transitive verb allow the event reading. In addition, the nominals in (46) allow the agent reading and the ones in (47) allow the instrument reading.

Prefixed nominal compounds formed with transitive renyoo-kei behave similarly to the complex renyoo-kei nominals in (38) in that i) they allow complex eventive interpretation, ii) they do not have inflected verbal counterparts, and iii) periphrastic verb formation is allowed.
First, the interpretation that prefixed nominal compounds receive is complex event interpretation. This can be easily observed in cases where a prefixed nominal compound allows i) modification by a modifier of frequency, ii) the aspectual modifier, and iii) event control. Consider the following examples.

(48) a. Tabikasanaru kusatori-de, yootuu-ga okot-ta rasi. repeated weeding-for back=pain-nom. happen-past it=appears
'Due to repeated weeding, it seems that I got back pain.'

b. Nizikan-ni wataru kimodamesi-de, mina tukare-ta. for=two=hours-dat. extend testing=courage-by everyone tired-past
'Due to the two hours of testing their courage, everyone was exhausted.'

c. [Nakama-ni kuwaeraru koto-o syoomee suru tame-no] member-dat. can=add fact-acc. proof do in=order=to-gen. jyookyuusei-niyoru kimodamesi-ga okonaware-ru. senior=classmate-by courage=testing-nom. be=carried=out-pres.
'Hazing will be carried out by senior classmates in order to prove that they can be granted membership.'

The examples in (48a) and (48b) show that nominal compounds in (45) can be modified by a modifier of frequency such as tabikasanaru 'repeatedly taking place' and an aspectual modifier such as nizikan 'for two hours'. Furthermore, the prefixed nominal compound in (48c) allows event control. Hence, the controller of the purpose clause in this example can be the event described by the nominal compounds. These facts indicate that prefixed nominal compounds have the properties of complex event nominals.

Second, as the examples in (49) show, prefixed nominal compounds do not allow inflected verb forms.

(49) a. *kusa-tor-u cf. kusa-TORI-su-ru
weed-take-pres. weed= picking-do-pres. 'to pick weeds'

b. *hito-goros-u cf. hito-GOROSI-su-ru
person-kill-pres. person-kill-do-pres. 'to commit murder'

c. *enpi-tu-kezur-u cf. enpi-KEZURI-su-ru
pencil-shave-pres. pencil-shave-do-pres. 'to sharpen pencils'

As in the case of the complex renyoo-kei nominals in (38), prefixed nominal compounds do not inflect to form their verbal counterparts as shown in (49). Rather, they must form periphrastic verbs in order to function as verbs. Note however that the periphrastic verb form in (50) is unacceptable because the nominal compounds in (46d) allows only the agentive reading.

(50) *sake-NOMI-su-ru sake-drink-do-pres.
'(intended) to drink'

Other than this case, the periphrastic verbs in (45)-(49) are all acceptable while inflected forms are all ungrammatical (cf. Poser 1992). These behaviors of prefix nominal compounds are identical to the complex renyoo-kei nominals without verbal source. I
assume that the possibility of periphrastic verb formation and the availability of complex event interpretation are closely associated in renyoo-kei forms with complex internal structure. For more discussion in this regard, see section 5.

3.2. PREFIXED NOMINAL COMPOUNDS WITH INTRANSITIVE RENYOO-KEI

Prefixed nominal compounds can also be formed with the renyoo-kei of intransitive verb. In this case, the incorporated noun appears to be restricted to the theme argument. Consider the following examples.

(51) a. yo-AKE
    night-open(-Ø)
    'sunrise, dawn'

b. dosha-KUZURE
    earth=and=sand-collapse(-Ø)
    'a washout, landslide'

c. ama-MOR-I
    rain-leak-I
    'leak'

d. hito-TIGA-I
    person-differ-I
    'mistake of identity'

e. huna-YO-I
    ship-intoxicate-I
    'seasickness'

f. otoko-GURU-I
    men-be=insane-I
    'wantonness, running after men'

Take (51f) for example. The prefixed noun otoko 'men' is interpreted as theme, not as agent. Therefore, the nominal compound in (51f) is interpreted as 'individuals who are crazy about men', not as 'men who are crazy'.

Semantically, these compounds in (51) are primarily interpreted as names rather than events. In particular, this interpretation is the only interpretation that the nominal in (51a) can receive. More specifically, the nominal in (51a) is interpreted as the product (hence, the result) of day-breaking. Other compounds in (51) can be both event nominals and result nominals. For example, (51b) refers to the product or result of events of land sliding (result reading) or the event of land sliding itself (event reading). In the same way, the nominal in (51c) refers to the product or result that leaking of rain creates under the result reading, whereas it also can refer to the actual event of leaking of rain. Likewise, the compounds in (51d-f) allow both result and event interpretations.

---

5 There are a few cases in which an agent-like argument is incorporated to form a compound such as in (i).

(i) otoko-NAK-I
    men-cry-I
    'men's cry (man's emotionally weeping despite himself)'

6 Ama is a phonological variant of ame 'rain'. The same phonological change is observed when ame undergoes another compounding such as ama-gasa (lit.) rain-umbrella, ama-gaera 'a tree frog', and ama-yadori (lit.) rain-sheltering, among others.

7 Huna is a phonological variant of hune 'ship'. As in the case of (51b), this word undergoes a phonological change in compounding such as huna-nori 'sailor', huna-tuki-ba 'a wharf', and huna-uta 'boatmen's song'.
As in the cases in (49) and (50) above, when these verbs undergo periphrastic verb formation with the light verb *su-ru* 'do', the difference with respect to the availability of event reading among these compounds can be observed. Consider the examples in (52).

(52) a. *yo-AKE-su-ru
    night-break(-∅)-do
    'a day to break'
    cf. *yoake-ru

b. dosha-KUZURE-su-ru
    earth-collapse-do-pres.
    'landslide to take place'
    cf. *doshakuzure-ru

c. ama-MORI-su-ru
    rain-leak-do
    'to leak'
    cf. *amamori-u

d. hito-TIGAI-su-ru
    preson-mistake=identity-do-pres.
    'to mistake one's identity'
    cf. *hitotiga-u

e. huna-YOI-su-ru
    boat-(sea)sickness-do-pres.
    'to get seasickness'
    cf. *hunayoi-u

f. otoko-GURUI-su-ru
    man-become=crazy-do-pres.
    'to run after men'
    cf. *otokoguru-u

Thus, the nominal compound in (51a) which does not allow event interpretation cannot form a periphrastic verb, whereas other nominals in (51) can undergo periphrastic verb formation due to the availability of event interpretation. Note also that as in the case of nominal compounds formed with transitive renyoo-kei, the nominals in (51) do not have inflected verb forms.

Once again, there is a correlation between the availability of event interpretation and the possibility of modification by modifiers of frequency and aspectual modifiers. Therefore, among the nominal compounds formed with intransitive renyoo-kei, those which allow the event interpretation are compatible with such modifications. Consider the following examples.

(53) a. Taroo-wa tabikasanaru hunaYOI-ni nayamasare-ta.
    -top. repeated seasickness-by be=bothered-past
    'Taro was bothered by repeated seasickness.'

b. Itinenkan-ni wataru amaMORI-de, yuka-ga dame-ni nat-ta.
    for=one=year-dat. extend leak-by floor-nom. bad-dat. become-past
    'The floor was ruined due to the leak that lasted for one year.'

In both cases in (53), modification by modifiers of frequency and aspect yields grammatical sentences.

Because the nominal compounds in (51) denote unintentional events, it is impossible to determine if these nominals are able to have event control with these nominals.
since the purpose clause requires some sort of intentionality in carrying out the event denoted by the nominal. Therefore, in order to determine whether or not these nominals are complex event nominals, another systematic test is necessary.

Such a test can be found in Grimshaw 1990, who argues that complex event nominals do not pluralize which result nominals do, citing the following examples.

(54) a. The assignments were long.

b. *The assignments of the problems took a long time.

The English nominal assignment can be either a result nominal or a complex event nominal. However, when followed by its argument, assignment behaves as a complex event nominal. The plural form of this noun results in ungrammaticality when it cooccurs with its argument as in (54b), showing that complex event nominals cannot be pluralized.

In this connection, consider the following Japanese examples, where the nominal compounds in (51) occur with quantifiers.

(55) a. Tenzyoo-ni aru hutatu-no amaMORI.

ceiling-in exist two-gen. leak

'Two leak spots on the ceiling'

b. *Itizikan-ni wataru hutatu-no amaMORI.

for=one=hour-dat. extend two-gen. leak

(56) a. Ano yama-no tyuu-kuuki ni micu hutatu-no dosyaKUZURE

that mountain-gen. middle-in be=visible two-gen. landslide

'Two remains of landslides which can be seen on the side of the mountain.'

b. *Isyuukan-ni wataru hutatu-no dosyaKUZURE

for=one=week-dat. extend two-gen. landslide

The (b) examples in (55)-(56) are ungrammatical because the quantifier hutatu 'two (objects)' requires that the nominal be interpreted as denoting multiple objects such as kaban 'bag' and hanasi 'a story' rather than events. Because the nominals involved in these examples are interpreted as eventive as they cooccur with aspectual modifiers, the quantifier hutatu is incompatible in these cases.

In contrast to the nominals allowing eventive interpretation, in the (a) examples in (55)-(56), modification of the nominals by the quantifier hutatu 'two objects' produces grammatical sequences. This is because the nominals in these examples are interpreted as referential, referring to results of the events denoted by the renyoo-kei. The nominals in these examples, amamori 'a leak (spot)' and dosyakuzure 'a landslide (site)', are fully compatible with modification by a quantifier of objects such as hutatu.

The discussion above shows that the nominal compounds in (51) can be complex event nominals as well as result nominals. Recall that these nominals form periphrastic verbs whenever they behave complex event nominals. Once again, the possibility of forming periphrastic verb appears to depend on the availability of complex event interpretation.

3. 3. PREFIXED NOMINAL COMPOUNDS WITH INCORPORATED ADJUNCTS

Prefixed nominal compounds can also be formed by incorporating directional phrases as in (57), manner phrases as in (58), and temporal phrases as in (59) into the renyoo-kei form.
(57) a. dohyoo-IR-I
    sumo=ring-enter-I
    'a ceremonial performance of sumo wrestlers'
b. sima-NAGAS-I
    island-send-I
    'exile'c. yoko-NAGAS-I
    side-flow-I
    'illegal sales'

(58) a. boo-YOM-I
    stick-read-I
    'reading in a singsong manner'
b. saka-DAT-I
    upside-down-stand-I
    'a handstand', 'hand standing'c. haya-OKI
    early-wake=up
    'early rising'

(59) a. asa-GAER-I
    morning-return-I
    'playing all night and coming back in the morning'
b. yo-HUKAS-I
    night-stay=up=late-I
    'sitting up late'c. byoo-YOM-I
    second-read-I
    'countdown'

The nominals in (57)-(59) are primarily interpreted as eventive, allowing periphrastic verb formation. As in the case with other nominal compounds, the prefixed nominal compounds with incorporated adjuncts cannot be inflected to form verbal counterparts. As shown in (60), these nominals must be subject to periphrastic verb formation in order to function as verbs.

(60) a. dohyooIR-I-su-ru/*dohyoor-u
    'to perform a ceremonial display of sumo wrestlers'
b. sakaDAT-I-su-ru/*sakadat-u8
    'to stand on one's hands'c. byooYOM-I-su-ru/*byooyom-u
    'to countdown'

In addition, there are also a number of compounds consisting of a spacio-temporal nominal prefix affixed onto the renyoo-kei form. For instance, the productive prefixes *ato-* 'after, back' and *naname-* 'slant' can form the compounds illustrated in (61) and (62), respectively.

(61) a. ato-OS-I
    back-push-I
    'support, encouragement'b. ato-KATAZUKE
    back-clean-(Ø)
    'putting things in order'

8 The inflected form sakadat-u is grammatical under different meaning '(hair) to bristle up, to stand on end because of outrage or anger'.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>ato-MODOR-I back-return-I</td>
<td>'return', 'going backward'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>ato-ZUSAR-I(^9) back-move=backward=slowly-I</td>
<td>'moving backward'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>ato-GAK-I(^10) back-write-pres.</td>
<td>'postscript'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>ato-TOR-I back-take-I</td>
<td>'heir, inheritor'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(62) a. naname-yOM-I slant-read-I | 'quick reading, skimming' |
 b. naname-ARUK-I slant-walk-I | 'crossing the street diagonally' |
 c. ?naname-GAK-I slant-write-I | 'writing in a slanted, sloppy way' |

The precise meaning taken on by each prefixed nominal compound in (61)-(62) is mainly eventive with the exception of ato-gaki 'postscript' and ato-tori 'heir'. Atogaki 'postscript' is a referential noun referring to a product of writing after writing a book or a manuscript (the product/result reading). And so is atotori 'heir', which denotes the agent of taking (the property) after the antecedents' death (the agent reading).

Whether or not a compound can be eventive can be tested by applying periphrastic verb formation. In other words, this test can show the range of possible interpretation of each compound. Only those compounds allowing the event reading form periphrastic verbs whereas those allowing only the agent or product/result reading do not.

(63) a. atoOS-I-su-ru/*atoos-u | 'to support' |
 b. atoKATAZUKE-su-ru/*atokatazuke-ru | 'to clean up' |
 c. atoMODOR-I-su-ru/*atomodor-u | 'to return' |
 d. atoZUSAR-I-su-ru/*atozusar-u | 'to take backward steps' |
 e. ??atoTOR-I-su-ru/*atotor-u | 'to be heir to' |
 f. *atoGAK-I-su-ru/*atogak-u | '*to postscript' |
 cf. atoGAKI-o kaku postscript-acc. write | 'to write a postscript' |

(64) a. naname-YOM-I-su-ru/*naname-yom-u | 'to scan' |
 b. naname-ARUK-I-su-ru/*naname-aruk-u | 'to walk across the street' |
 c. ?naname-GAK-I-su-ru/*naname-gak-u | 'to write in slanted, sloppy manner' |

---

\(^9\) Zusar-i in ato-zusari is not an independent verb.
\(^10\) Gak-i in ato-gaki is derived from kak-i 'writing' after the application of sequential-voicing (cf. Vance 1987).
Since the compounds in (63e and f) do not allow the event interpretation, periphrastic verb formation results in lower acceptability in the case of (63e) and ungrammaticality in (63f).

Nominal compounds formed with incorporated adjuncts can be complex event nominals when they allow eventive interpretation, as evidenced by the fact that they allow event control. Consider the following examples.

dohyooIRI. ceremonial=sumo=performance
'A ceremonial sumo performance by Akebono in order to announce that he became a new grand champion.'

b. [Konsaato-no kippu-o kau-tame-no] mettani-sinai hayaOKI concert-gen. ticket-acc. buy in=order=to-gen. seldom-not=do early=rising
'Rare early rising in order to purchase concert tickets.'

c. [Roketto-o utiageru tame-no] nizikan-ni wataru rocket'acc. launch in=order=to-gen. for=two=hours-dat. extend byyooYOMI
countdown
'Countdown which lasted for two hours in order to launch a rocket.'

d. [Aite-kara subayaku nigeru tame-no] atozUSARI opponent-from quickly run=away in=order=to-gen. backstepping
'Backstepping in order to run away from an opponent quickly.'

All the examples in (65) allow the event control interpretation as well as agent control. For instance, in (65a), the event of the ceremonial sumo performance makes announcement of the new sumo grand champion possible. The fact that event control is possible with these nominals indicates that they are nominals which are associated with the argument structure.

To summarize so far, prefixed nominal compounds are classified into two types: ones which behave as complex event nominals and ones which function as result nominals. Prefix nominal compounds with complex event reading behave in the same fashion as other complex event nominals such as complex renyoo-kei nominals. Thus, they undergo periphrastic verb formation, allow event control, and do not allow modification of objects by quantifiers. Meanwhile, as in the case of renyoo-kei nominals, some prefixed nominal compounds are subject to reanalysis by which nominals consisting of renyoo-kei are reanalyzed as referential nouns. In other words, these renyoo-kei nominals are cases of mismatch (Sugioka 1984). In the following section, I will briefly examine how cases of mismatch has been analyzed.

3.4. A NOTE ON MISMATCH

So far, I have examined several types of nominals formed with the renyoo-kei form of the verb. There are three types of nominals: i) simple renyoo-kei nominals which function as referential nouns (result nominals) or event nominals (simple event nominals),
ii) complex renyoo-kei nominals which behave as result nominals or have characteristics of complex event nominals, and iii) prefixed nominal compounds that behave as result nominals or behave as complex event nominals.

One of the common characteristics of these nominals is that non-eventive interpretation such as agent and product/result readings is available for the inherently eventive renyoo-kei which heads each compound. This change in eventfulness of renyoo-kei nominals has been referred to as mismatch (Sugioka 1984 based on Kageyama 1982).

Sugioka 1984 argues that the notion of VN plays a crucial role in the analysis of renyoo-kei nominals. First, she assumes that all the renyoo-kei nominals are assigned a status of VN. Thus, for instance, renyoo-kei nominals such as tati-yomi 'act of reading while standing' and tori-simari 'act of controlling' are assigned lexical entries as in (67).

(67) a.  [TATI-YOMI]VN, Event       --> 'act of reading while standing'

b.  [TORI-SIMARI]VN, Event       --> 'act of controlling'

With the semantic category lexically listed for each item, each renyoo-kei nominal is assigned relevant interpretation. Hence, nominals in (67) are both interpreted as an event nominals.

Second, Sugioka assumes that mismatch is a result of having a Ø nominal head by which verbal nouns are interpreted as result nouns. For example, sakenomi 'a drunkard' and atogaki 'a postscript' are assumed to have the lexical entries shown in (66). As in the case of (67) above, the interpretation of each compound is an output of an interpretation rule applied to each lexical item according to the semantic category lexically listed for each item. Thus, the nominal in (66) is interpreted as agentive and the one in (66b), as result.

(66) a.  [[sake-NOMI]VN Ø ]N, Agent       --> 'a person who drinks sake'

b.  [[ato-GAKI]VN Ø ]N, Result       --> 'a writing afterward' 'a postscript'

Sugioka's analysis is dependent on the category VN in a crucial way. Yet, the nature of VN is still not clear. In the following section, I will discuss the various behaviors of VNs and examine the previous accounts of them. The issue of mismatch will be discussed again in Chapter 3.

4. VERBAL NOUNS AND RENYOO-KEI

In this section, I discuss the use of renyoo-kei which behaves syntactically as verbal nouns (VNs). In addition, I examine cases in which only verbal renyoo-kei appear. By examining the behaviors of these renyoo-kei in their syntactic contexts, it becomes clear that the various characteristics of renyoo-kei cannot be captured if this form is classified as verb. Rather, this form needs to be characterized as categorically unspecified, therefore, being allowed to function either as a verb and a noun according to the context in which it occurs.

4.1. VERBAL NOUNS

Roughly speaking, VNs are event-denoting nominals. A large number of VNs consist of borrowings from foreign languages such as Chinese and English as shown in
(68). It is widely assumed that VNs turn into periphrastic verbs when a "light" verb su-ru do is attached to it (Kageyama 1982, Miyagawa 1987 and 1989, Shibatani and Kageyama 1988, Grimshaw and Mester 1988, Kageyama and Shibatani 1990, Sugioka 1989, and Hayashi 1994). Thus, the nominals in (68) can be characterized as VNs. In contrast, those in (69) can not, because periphrastic verb formation with su-ru is blocked in these cases.

(68)  a. SHUTTYOO 'business trip'
     a'. SHUTTYOO-suru 'to take a business trip'
     b. SAMPO 'walking'
     b'. SAMPO-suru 'to take a walk'
     c. HOOKOKU 'report'
     c'. HOOKOKU-suru 'to report'
     d. doraibu 'driving'
     d'. doraibu-suru 'to drive', 'to take a car trip'

(69)  a. hon 'book'
     a'. *hon-suru
     b. gakkoo 'school'
     b'. *gakkoo-suru
     c. koohii 'coffee'
     c'. *koohii-suru

In order to occur in the light verb construction, the predicate noun must be associated with argument structure. For example, the VN in (68c) hookoku has a lexical entry as in (70a), which is somehow incorporated to the lexical entry for the light verb su as in (70b) to form a complex predicate hookoku+ su-ru with the lexical entry illustrated in (71). (For slightly different analysis of the light verb construction as in (71), referred to as Argument Transfer, see Grimshaw and Mester 1988 and Hayashi 1994.)

(70)  a. HOOKOKU (Agent, Goal, Theme)
     b. su(-ru) ( ) <acc.>

(71) hookoku ( ) + su-ru (Agent, Goal, Theme) <acc.>

The complex verb in (68a') is derived from the analytic construction hookoku-o suru 'to report' through lexical incorporation (cf. Grimshaw and Mester 1988).

On the other hand, the nouns in (69) are not associated with argument structure. Compare the examples in (72) with (73).

(72)  a. Tanaka-no hon -gen. book 'Tanaka's book'

---

11 For more discussion concerning periphrastic construction consistings of sur' do with VNs, see Miyagawa 1987, Shibatani and Kageyama 1988, Kageyama and Shibatani 1989, and Hayashi 1994.
b. *Tanaka-e-no hon to-gen. book 'a book to Tanaka'
(73) a. syunin-no ziko-no HOOKOKU chief-gen. accident-gen. report 'a report of the accident by the chief'
b. syunin-e-no HOOKOKU chief-to-gen. report 'a report to the chief'

The ungrammaticality of the example in (72b) is due to the fact that the noun hon 'a book' does not have a lexical entry associated with the Goal argument. Meanwhile, the VN hookoku 'a report' has the Goal θ-role in its lexical entry, and as a result, the Goal phrase is properly licensed. Note also the contrast between the (a) examples in (72) and (73). While the genitive NP is understood only as a possessor of a book in (72a), the genitive NP in (73a) is interpreted either as Agent or Theme. This is due to the fact that the VN hookoku has a lexical entry as illustrated in (70a).

4. 2. BLOCKING EFFECT

Periphrastic verb formation is blocked when it involves the renyoo-kei of simple verbs such as those in (18), (21) and (22). Consider the following examples.

(74) a. *TATAKA-I-suru fight-I-do
b. *KOROS-I-suru killing-I-do
c. *TAKURAM-I-suru plot-I-do

The impossibility of incorporation to form periphrastic verbs in (74) has been referred to as "blocking effect" (Arnoff 1976, Miyagawa 1989 and Poser 1991, among others). Namely, periphrastic verb formation is blocked due to the fact that each of the renyoo-kei in (74) has its corresponding inflected verb form as illustrated in (18), (21) and (22).

Complex renyoo-kei, on the contrary, do not seem to be subject to the blocking effect. For example, the renyoo-kei forms in (23) have both inflected and periphrastic verb forms as illustrated in (75).

(75) a. TORISIMARI-su-ru cf. torisimar-u 'to control'
     control-do-pres. control-pres.
     cf. kasidas-u 'to loan'
     cf. noriire-ru 'to extend the air(line) route into'
     Noriire-su-ru extend-do-pres. extend-pres.

However, some complex renyoo-kei forms in (24) may not have periphrastic verb forms.

(76) a. *?KAKITORI-suru cf. kakitor-u 'to dictate'
dictation-do dictate-pres.
b. *OSIIRE-suru cf. osiire-ru 'to push in'
closet-do push=in-pres.
c. *SIMEKIRI-suru cf. simekir-u 'to close deadline'
deadline-do close-pres.

The blocking effect approach fails to account for the (im)possibility of periphrastic verb formation in (75). Thus, it is necessary to account for the possibility of periphrastic verb formation without recourse to the blocking effect so that periphrastic verb formation is allowed for the nominals in (23) but not in (24). Note in addition that this account must answer the following two questions: i) are simplex renyoo-kei nominals and complex renyoo-kei nominals subject to different conditions with respect to periphrastic verb formation? and ii) are there two conditions which govern the possibility of periphrastic verb formation among complex renyoo-kei nominals, one governing the nominals in (23) and one governing the those in (24)?

These questions can be immediately answered by examining the argument structure of renyoo-kei nominals. The different possibilities of periphrastic verb formation in (75) and (76) stems from the difference in the argument structure of the renyoo-kei nominals in question. The renyoo-kei forms in (24) behave as referential nouns, allowing only the result nominal reading, and therefore lack argument structure. Meanwhile, the renyoo-kei forms in (23) allow the complex event interpretation, indicating their association with argument structure. As observed in the previous sections, different readings of these nominals can be easily observed when they occur with modifiers which typically cooccur with the event interpretation. As shown above, modifiers of frequency such as tabikasanaru 'repeatedly taking place') require that the nominal have the complex event reading (cf. Grimshaw 1990) as the contrast between (77) and (78) exemplifies.

(77) a. onazi gakusei-e-no tabikasanaru to sho-no KASIDASI
same student-to-gen. repeated books-gen. loan
'repeated book loan to the same student'

b. keisatü-no tabikasanaru mayaku-no TORISIMARI
police-gen. repeated narcotics-gen. control
'repeated control of narcotics by the police'

(78) a. *?tabikasanaru kanzi-no KAKITORI
repeated Chinese=character-gen. dictation

b. *tabikasanaru huton-no OSIIRE
repeated futon-gen. closet/pushing=in

Hence, it seems plausible to assume that periphrastic verb formation is constrained by whether or not a particular renyoo-kei can be interpreted as a complex event nominal.

In this connection, let's return to VN's such as hookoku 'report' and undoo 'exercise'. As illustrated in (79) below, they allow complex event interpretation, as they can cooccur with frequency and aspectual modifiers. Furthermore, event control is allowed in the purpose clause headed by VN's.

(79) a. Sono ziko-ni kansuru tabikasanaru HOOKOKU
that accident-dat. concern repeated report
'repeated reports on the accident'
b. Entenka-de-no itizikan-ni wataru UNDOO-no under=the=scorching=sun-in-gen. for=one=hour-dat. extend exercise-gen. tame, sisha-ga de-ta.
reason dead=person-nom. appear-past
'Some people died because of exercise which was carried out for one hour under the scorching sun.'
nasare-ta.
be=submitted-past
'A report was filed in order to claim the validity of the police (operation).' 

Once again, the possibility of periphrastic verb formation among VNs of this type is related to the fact that VNs are inherently complex event nominals.

This condition plays an important role in determining the possibility of forming a periphrastic verb with complex renyoo-kei nominals. First, recall that simplex renyoo-kei nominals are inherently simple event nominals. This fact accounts for the impossibility of forming periphrastic verbs with simple renyoo-kei.

Secondly, the renyoo-kei nominals in (38) allow periphrastic verb formation rather freely as illustrated in (80) because these forms are VNs.

(80) a. KUINIGE-suru bilking-do 'to bilk', 'to eat without paying'
b. TATIYOMI-suru free=reading-do 'to read for free', 'to read while standing'
c. TATAKIURI-suru bargain-do 'to sell at discount'

Note also that the nominals in (38) allow complex event interpretation as evidenced by the fact that these VNs can occur with modifiers expressing frequency as in (81).

(81) a. gakusei-tati-no tabikasanaruno raamen-no KUINIGE student-pl.-gen. repeated ramen-gen. bilking 'repeated eating ramen for free by students'
b. kodomo-tati-no honya-de-no tabikasanaruno hon-no TATIYOMI child-pl.-gen. book=store-in-gen. repeated book-gen. free=reading 'repeated free reading of books at the bookstore by children'

Thirdly, the renyoo-kei in (42) do not allow periphrastic verb formation because these forms are never complex event nominals.

(82) a. *ARUKIMAWARI-suru walk=around-do
b. *SIKARITUKE-suru scold=harshly-do
c. *TOBIAGARI-suru
   jump=up-do

Finally, prefixed nominal compounds allow periphrastic verb formation because they are complex event nominals, as discussed in section 3.

In this section, I have shown that what appears to be the result of the blocking effect regarding periphrastic verb formation is in fact accounted for by examining the eventfulness of the renyoo-kei nouns involved. The relevant event interpretation is available if a renyoo-kei functions as a VN.

5. SUMMARY

In this chapter, I have observed several types of nominals formed from the renyoo-kei of the verbs. As shown throughout this chapter, the lexical category of the renyoo-kei form can be either a verb or a noun. In addition, complex nominals consisting of one or more renyoo-kei behave as VNs, which are roughly characterized as nominals with complex eventive interpretation.

In the following chapters, I explore how the shift from verb into noun (either verbal or referential) among renyoo-kei takes place. Previous analyses state that renyoo-kei are lexically specified as verbs and the various occurences of renyoo-kei as nominals are "derived" via a process of nominalization or deverbalization. However, as discussed in this chapter, in the absence of one-to-one correspondence between renyoo-kei and their corresponding verb, it is not always the case that renyoo-kei nominals are "derived". I will argue, then, that the change of a verb into a noun among the renyoo-kei is possible because the lexical feature [N] of the renyoo-kei is underspecified in the lexicon.
CHAPTER 3
MISMATCH AND IDENTITY OF THE RENYOO-KEI FORM

0. INTRODUCTION

This chapter is devoted to examining analyses of renyoo-kei nominals. The main purpose of the discussion is to review the analyses of the nominal and verbal properties of the renyoo-kei form of Japanese verbs, pointing out problems with each analysis. As discussed in the previous chapter, the renyoo-kei form has a dual status, being both nominal and verbal. Most morphologically complex Japanese verbs can function as event nominal as well as verbs.

In this chapter, I will review previous analyses of nominal and verbal behavior of VNs and propose two points: first, the verbal and nominal behavior of VNs cannot be accounted for by a lexical specification assigned at the level of lexicon. I will argue that determining values of the lexical feature [N] is determined in the syntax. Secondly, the stem form of the Japanese verb, renyoo-kei, constitutes a functional projection (FP) which contains a VP headed by a verbal root. This proposal is based on the observation that the renyoo-kei suffix (-i or -Ø) is neither an inflectional element (i.e., head of TP or AspP) nor an element inserted by a phonological epenthesis rule. The details of this analysis will be presented in Chapter 4.

The discussion of this chapter proceeds as follows: sections 1-5 are review of analyses of the "nominalization" process of the renyoo-kei presented by Sugio 1984, Kageyama 1982, and Sugio 1989. In section 1, the definition of mismatch is discussed. Section 2 is a review of Sugio's Ø-head analysis for the process in which a verbal renyoo-kei nominal is reanalyzed as a referential noun. In sections 3-4, I examine several lexical feature analyses of VNs. In section 5, I argue against lexical approaches to define VNs, showing that this approach fails to account for the syntactic behavior of renyoo-kei VNs.

Sections 6 is concerned with the lexical category of the renyoo-kei suffix. In this section, I will show that analyzing the renyoo-kei suffix as a Tense (or INFL) element is untenable. Then, in section 7, I will review Po 1984 who proposes that the renyoo-kei suffix -i is inserted as a process of epenthesis, showing that the epenthesis analysis cannot account for other morphological facts in Japanese.

1. MISMATCH

It has been argued that the source of an agentive or a product/result interpretation in nominal compounds is a result of mismatch between the renyoo-kei form of verb and nominals (Kageyama 1982 and Sugio 1984). This argument is based on the observation that prefixed nominal compounds are headed by inherently verbal renyoo-kei, which function as referential nouns via a process of nominalization. More specifically, compounds of this kind, which are event-denoting VNs, are reanalyzed into (referential) nouns (Ns) denoting an agent, an instrument, a product, a result or a temporal extent. As a result, a mismatch occurs between the event-denoting category VN and the non-eventive category N. Following Kageyama, mismatches of this type are schematically illustrated as follows:

(1) a. [sake-NOMI] VN ---> N (sake-drink) 'a drunkard'
b. [ato-GAKI] VN ---> N (after-write) 'a postscript'
In (1a), the renyoo-kei head, -nomi 'drinking', no longer retains its event interpretation and is reanalyzed as an N denoting an agent who carries out the event of sake-drinking. Likewise, in (1b), the renyoo-kei head -gaki (<--- kaki)\(^1\) 'writing' in the VN is reanalyzed as representing the product/result of writing.

In principle, the same applies to cases of complex renyoo-kei nominals. As observed in the previous chapter, complex renyoo-kei nominals are in general identical to VN whenever they are interpreted as complex event nominals as in (2a), but some complex renyoo-kei nominals are reanalyzed as N when they exclude the event interpretation as in (2b), and some allow both a complex event interpretation and a result noun interpretation, hence functioning both as VN and N as in (2c).

(2)  
   a. Moto-Komi  'act of carrying in'  
   b. Hiki-Dasi   'a drawer' but not 'act of drawing or pulling out'  
   c. Osi-Uri     'the act of pushy sales' and 'a pushy salesman'

These facts indicate that the process of reanalysis applies to complex renyoo-kei nominals forming result nouns as in the case of prefixed nominal compounds.

In addition, the process of reanalysis is assumed to apply to simplex renyoo-kei nominals as in (3), allowing both eventive and non-eventive readings.

(3)  
   a. Asobi       'an event of playing' or 'a game' (<--- asob-u 'to play')  
   b. Yasumi      'an event of taking a break' or 'vacation' (<--- yasum-u 'to rest')  
   c. Hanasi      'an event of speaking' or 'a speech, a story'(<--- hanas-u 'to speak')

For some renyoo-kei nominals, no eventive reading is available as in (4).

(4)  
   a. Owari      'an end'     (<--- owar-u 'to end').  
   b. Simi       'a stain'    (<--- simi-ru 'to be stained')  
   c. Yogore     'a stain'    (<--- yogore-ru 'to get dirty')

As discussed in the previous chapter, simplex renyoo-kei nominals do not allow the complex event interpretation as evidenced by the fact that these do not allow periphrastic verb formation and event control.

2. EMPTY-HEAD ANALYSIS

Sugioka 1984 accounts for cases of mismatch among nominal compounds and complex renyoo-kei nominals by assuming that a Ø-head occupies the head position of these nominals. According to her analysis, the Ø-head is assumed to constitute an N

\(^1\) This process in which a morpheme-initial voiceless consonant undergoes voicing when compounded is referred to as rendaku (sequential voicing). For details of rendaku, see Otsu 1980, Sugioka 1984, and Vance 1987.
category, resulting in nominals containing this head being interpreted as referential nouns. Schematically, Sugiooka's proposal is represented in (5).

(5) a. sake-NOMI-Ø (sake-drink) 'a drunkard'
   b. ato-GAKI-Ø (after-write) 'a postscript'

First, Sugiooka argues that the semantic interpretation of each compound depends on an interpretation rule applied according to the semantic category specified for each lexical item. Thus, the nominals in (5) are assumed to have lexical entries as in (6) and receive an appropriate interpretation based on the semantic categories such as Agent and Result, which are specified for each lexical item.

(6) a. [[sake-NOMI]VN Ø ]N, Agent --> 'a person who drinks sake'
   b. [[ato-GAKI]VN Ø ]N, Result --> 'a writing afterward' 'a postscript'

Sugioka argues that the Ø-head is motivated by the fact that sometimes an overt head can appear in the position where the Ø-head occurs. (The examples in (7) are from Sugiooka 1984 with slight modifications.)

(7) a. tumec-KIRI-basami
    nail-clip-scissors
    'scissors for nails'
   b. mono-HOSI-ba
    thing-dry-place
    'a place for drying laundry'
   c. hi-GURE-doki
    sun-set-time
    'sunset time'

Hence, she argues that cases where a VN is reclassified as an N can be accounted for by assuming a lexical process in which a phonologically null nominal head is attached to the VN.

This approach, however, is not necessary if dual derivation (Valois 1990) is assumed. Under the dual derivation analysis, the event nominal formation is syntactic while result nominals are considered to be derived in the lexicon. Therefore, it is plausible to assume that the renyoo-kei form of the verb has two lexical specifications: one of [+N], which is interpreted as a result noun if needed, and the other underspecified with respect to the feature [±N]. The underspecified lexical entry is assumed to occur in verb position and the ±value of the feature [N] is determined by the governing head. Schematically, the lexical entry for the renyoo-kei form can be roughly represented as in (8).

(8) RENYOO-KEI
   a. [+N]
   b. [α N]

For more details about underspecification of the renyoo-kei form, see Chapter 4.

---

2 More precisely, the head of the renyoo-kei form, i.e. the renyoo-kei suffix is assumed to be underspecified with respect to [±N]. I assume that the renyoo-kei suffix constitutes the head of functional projection (FP). Thus, under this analysis, the head of FP is not pre-determined for its lexical category. The value of this lexical feature is determined configurationally by the governing head.
3. Kageyama’s 1982 Analysis of Nominalization

In this section, I examine Kageyama’s lexical feature analysis of nominalization. In section 3.1, I outline his analysis which uses the lexical feature \([\pm A]\) to distinguish between lexical categories. Section 3.2 is a review of Kageyama’s analysis of nominalization, which assumes that the lexical process of nominalization of verbs. I discuss natural classes among Japanese lexical categories in section 3.3, and I show that the natural classes can be identified without the\([\pm A]\) feature in section 3.4. In addition, Miyagawa’s 1987 argument against Kageyama, outlined in section 3.5, also dispenses with the \([\pm A]\) feature as unnecessary.

3.1. \([\pm A]\) Feature Analysis

Kageyama 1982 proposes the following lexical feature analysis of major lexical categories in Japanese (Kageyama op. cit. p. 218 (5)).

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
& V & N & A \\
\text{VERBS} & + & - & - \\
\text{NOUNS} & - & + & - \\
\text{ADJECTIVES} & - & - & + \\
\text{ANs} & - & + & + \\
\text{VNs} & + & + & - \\
\end{array}
\]

Under Kageyama’s system, the lexical feature \([\pm \text{Adjective}]\) is introduced for Japanese in order to distinguish As, Ns, and ANs because ANs have characteristics of both As and Ns. For instance, the auxiliary suffix \(-\text{rasi(-i)}\) ‘look like, appear’ can be attached to the stem of an N or an AN but not to the stem of a A as shown in (10).

---

3 The lexical features assigned to each lexical category in (9) are somewhat different from those proposed in Chomsky 1981. In particular, Kageyama’s analysis in (9) differs Chomsky’s in i) the feature complex assigned to A(jectives) and ii) no lexical specification for P(repositions/ostpositions). Chomsky’s lexical feature analysis is as in (i) (p. 48):

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
& V & N \\
\text{VERBS} & + & - \\
\text{NOUNS} & - & + \\
\text{ADJECTIVES} & + & + \\
\text{PREPOSITIONS} & - & - \\
\end{array}
\]

Thus, while in Chomsky’s system, adjectives are assigned \([+V, +N]\), Kageyama assumes \([-V, -N, +A]\). In addition, no mention was made regarding Japanese Postpositions in Kageyama’s system whereas Chomsky assumes that Prepositions are \([-V, -N]\), explaining that Prepositions are not lexical categories.
(10) a. N: gakusee-rasii 'looks like a student', 'appears to be a student'
b. AN: osyaberi-rasii 'looks talkative'
c. A: *tanosi-rasii 'looks fun'
cf. tanosi-i-rasii⁴ 'it is said to be fun'

Furthermore, there are other cases in which ANs behave as Ns. For instance, ANs require the copula in the predicate position just as Ns do. Consider the examples in (11)-(12).

(11) a. Taroo-no heya-wa kiree-dat-ta.
    -gen. room-top. clean-be-past.
b. *Taroo-no heya-wa kiree-ta.
    -gen. room-top. clean-past
    'Taro's room was clean.'

(12) a. Taroo-no heya-wa yooma-dat-ta.
    -gen. room-top. western=style=room-be-past.
b. *Taroo-no heya-wa yooma-ta.
    -gen. room-top. western=style=room-past.
    'Taro's room was a western style room'

As shown in (11)-(12), both the AN kiree 'clean' and the N yooma 'a western style room' appear with dat, the past tense form of the copula in the predicate position. If this position is not occupied by the copula, the sentence results in ungrammaticality as the (b) examples illustrate.

This property of ANs is on a par with English adjectives (cf. Miyagawa 1987). English adjectives do not agree with the number and person of the subject and occur with the copula.

(13) a. He is talkative.
b. They are talkative.

Japanese adjectives, however, cannot occur with a copula in the predicate position, particularly in the past tense. As shown in (14b) below, the sentence becomes

---

⁴ As the gloss indicates, -rasii affixed to tensed verb form (including the copula) and adjectives denotes second-hand information or hearsay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V+tense:</th>
<th>N+coupl:</th>
<th>AN+coupl:</th>
<th>A+tense:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>it-ta-rasii</td>
<td>go-past-it=isa=said-pres.</td>
<td>'It is said to have been gone.'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>gakusei-dat-ta-rasii</td>
<td>student-copula-past-it=isa=said-pres.</td>
<td>'It is said to have been a student'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kirei-dat-ta-rasii</td>
<td>clean-copula-past-it=isa=said-pres.</td>
<td>'It is said to have been clean.'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td>tanosi-kat-ta-rasii</td>
<td>fun-KAT-past-it=isa=said-pres.</td>
<td>'It is said to have been fun.'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ungrammatical when the past-tense copula *dat occurs after an A. The past tense of A is indicated by the inflected form -kat-ta as in (14a).\(^5\), \(^6\)

(14) a. Taroo-no heya-wa ooki-kat-ta.
    -gen. room-top. big-KAT-past.

b. *Taroo-no heya-wa ooki(-i)-dat-ta.
    -gen. room-top. big(-pres.-)be-past.

'Taro's room was big.'

---

\(^5\) Japanese adjectives inflect as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stem</th>
<th>present</th>
<th>past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ooki-</td>
<td>ooki-i</td>
<td>ooki-kat-ta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the present tense is indicated by the suffix -i (no relevance to the renyou-kci suffix of verbs) which is attached to the stem. Meanwhile, the past tense form consists of three parts: a stem, an inflectional suffix -kat-, and the past tense suffix -ta. In (14a) below, I indicate the inflectional suffix -kat- with KAT for simplicity.

\(^6\) Note that there are cases in which des-u, the polite form of the copula appears after both imperfect and perfect form of As. Note that the plain form of copula (-da) cannot occur in this context.

(i)  Taroo-no heya-wa ooki-i-des-u*da.
    -gen. room-top. big-pres-be=polite=be=plain-pres.

'Taro's room is big.'

(ii) Taroo-no heya-wa ooki-kat-ta-des-u*da.
    -gen. room-top. big-KAT-past-be=polite=be=plain-pres.

'Taro's room was big.'

In these sentences, des-u does not function as a copula, but as a politeness marker. This is evidenced first by the fact that des-u in sentences in (i) and (ii) is not replaced by its corresponding plain form. If this des-u were a copula, the alternation shown in (iii) could be allowed.

(iii)  Taroo-wa gakusei-des-u/da.
        -top. student-copula=polite/copula=plain

'Taro is a student.'

Secondly, as shown in (iv)-(v), des-u in this context does not inflect according to Tense as the copula would.

(iv)  *Taroo-no heya-wa ooki-i-desi-ta.
      -gen. room-top. big-pres-copula=polite-past

(v)   *Taroo-no heya-wa ooki-kat-ta-desi-ta.
      -gen. room-top. big-KAT-past-copula=polite-past.

In present and past tense sentences, des-u remains as is as in (i) and (ii). These fact indicate that des-u occurring with As functions only as a politeness marker and does not affect the grammaticality of the sentence as evidenced by the fact that both (14a) and (ii) are grammatical. Therefore, it is plausible to assume that the occurrences of des-u in (i) and (ii) are not grammatically necessary. Rather, I assume that des-u in these contexts has only a stylistic function.
However, the inflectional suffixes which As and ANs take are quite different. For instance, in present tense, As take the suffix -i in both the prenominal and predicative positions, whereas ANs take -na in the prenominal position and -da in the predicative position.

(15) AS:
   a. taka-i   hon
      expensive-pres. book  \textit{'an expensive book'}
   b. Kono hon-wa taka-i.
      this book-top. expensive-pres.  \textit{'This book is expensive.'}

(16) ANS:
   a. sizuka-na basyo
      quiet-be=pres. place  \textit{'a quiet place'}
      this place-top. quiet-be=pres.  \textit{'This place is quiet.'}

Ns take the copula -da when they occur in the predicate position in the present tense as shown in (17a). In the prenominal position, however, Ns occur with the genitive marker -no as in (17b), probably due to the Case theoretic requirement.\footnote{Fukui 1986 proposes that genitive marking takes place in the context in (i).}

(17) a. Taroo-wa nihonzin-da.
       \textit{'Taro is a Japanese person.'}
   b. nihonzin-no gakusee
      Japanese-gen. student
      \textit{'a Japanese student'}

It is clear from the observations above that ANs are distinct from As with respect to their syntactic behavior, and that in some cases ANs behave in a fashion syntactically identical to Ns as evidenced by the fact that ANs can occur in most syntactic contexts where Ns occur.

\footnote{Fukui 1986 proposes that genitive marking takes place in the context in (i).}

(i) \hfill [ ___ N ]

This genitive marker -no may also be considered as a form of copula. For instance, the copula of the sentence (ii) is replaced by -no in a relative clause as in (iii).

(ii) Otoosan-ga sensei-da.
    father-nom. teacher-copula=pres.
    \textit{'The father is a teacher.'}

(iii) [otoosan-ga sensei-no ] hito.
     father-nom. teacher-gen. person
     \textit{'A person whose father is a teacher.'}

If the genitive marker -no is the attributive form of copula which occurs only in the prenominal position, -na with AN and -no with N are allomorphs of the copula. For related discussion, see Chapter 5.
While syntactically ANs behave like Ns than like As, ANs can undergo certain morphological operations that As do. One example is the affixation of nominal suffix -sa as illustrated in (18). The nominalization suffix -sa can be attached to As to express the degree in which the state denoted by the adjective holds.  

(18) \[ \begin{align*} &\text{As} & &\text{ANS} \\ &\text{taka-i} & 'tall, high' & sizuka & 'calm' \\ &\text{taka-sa} & 'height' & sizuka-sa & 'calmness' \end{align*} \]

Recall that in Kageyama's framework, AN is assigned \([-V, +N, +A]\), N is specified as \([-V, +N, -A]\) and A is \([-V, -N, +A]\). Kageyama attempts to account for the differences between AN and N by distinguishing them with the \([\pm A]\) feature. Meanwhile, As and ANs are distinguished by the feature \([\pm N]\). The relevant feature matrices are listed in (19).

(19) \[ \begin{align*} &\text{N:} & [+N, & -V, & -A] \\ &\text{AN:} & [+N, & -V, & +A] \\ &\text{A:} & [-N, & -V, & +A] \end{align*} \]

In addition, Kageyama claims that his lexical feature analysis can distinguish Vs, Ns, and VNs. As observed briefly in Chapter 2, VNs share characteristics of Vs and Ns. Compare the examples in (20) with (21).

(20) \[ \begin{align*} &\text{a. } \text{hon-o yom-u.} \\ &\text{book-acc. read-pres.} \\ &'to read a book' \\ &\text{b. } \text{Taro-ga yon-da hon-ni-wa, ...} \\ &\text{-nom. read-past book-in-top.} \\ &'In the book that Taro read, ...' \end{align*} \]

(21) \[ \begin{align*} &\text{a. } \text{Tyooosa-o okona-u.} \\ &\text{investigation-acc. carry=out-pres.} \\ &'to carry out an investigation' \\ &\text{b. } \text{Keeatsu-ga okonat-ta tyoosa-de-wa,...} \\ &\text{police-nom. carry=out-past investigation-by-top.} \\ &'According to the investigation that the police carried out,...' \end{align*} \]

First, both Ns and VNs can be Case-marked. For instance, the accusative case marker -o can be attached to the VN tyoosa 'investigation' in (21a) as well as the referential noun hon 'a book' in (20a). Secondly, both VNs and Ns allow modification by relative clauses as in (21b) and (20b). These facts clearly indicate that VNs occur in the same context as Ns.

On the other hand, in certain contexts, VNs function as Vs. In particular, with respect to Case-assignment to their arguments, VNs can assign Case just as Vs do. For

---

8 For more discussion, see section 3. 2. below.
example, in the *Ni-purpose clause construction* (cf. Saiki 1987 and Chapter 4 for more
discussion), VNs can assign verbal Case to their arguments. Simply, the *Ni-purpose
clause construction consists of a VN marked by *-ni* which must be followed by a verb
expressing the directional event such as going or coming. For example, in (22), the VN
*tyoosa* 'investigation' marked by *-ni* is subcategorized for by a directional verb *yattekaru*
'to come' (all the way). Note that the argument of the VN *sono ziko* 'that accident' is
marked in the accusative as evidenced by the accusative marker *-o* is attached to it.

(22) Keesatu-ga sono ziko-o tyoosa-ni yatteki-ta.
    police-nom. that accident-acc. investigate-for come-past

    'The police came to investigate the incident.'

That the object of the VN in (22) is Case-marked by the VN rather than by the
matrix verb *yatteki-ta* 'came' is evident since the verb *yattekaru* 'to come' does not assign
accusative Case to its argument as shown in (23).

(23) a. Hanako-ga Amerika-o/ni yatteki-ta.
    -nom. America-to/to come-past

    'Hanako came to the US.'

b. *Hanako-ga Amerika-o yatteki-ta.
    -nom. America-acc. come-past

The relevant feature matrices that Kageyama assigns for VN, V, and N are repeated
here as (24).

(24) VN:  [+V,  +N,  −A]
N:       [−V,  +N,  −A]
V:       [+V,  −N,  −A]

Under this system, the verbal characteristics of VNs can be represented by the feature
complex [+V, −A] as both V and VN have these values for [V] and [A]. Vs and VNs are
distinguished, however, by the feature [±N] as VNs are specified for [+N] and Vs [−N].
And the nominal characteristics of VNs are represented by assigning [+N, −A], which is
shared by Ns. Ns and VNs can be distinguished with respect to [±V] feature as Ns have
[−V] and Vs are [+V]. Kageyama argues that the most natural way to account for the six
Japanese lexical categories is to use the lexical feature analysis as in (9).

3.2. LEXICAL NOMINALIZATION

Kageyama analyses nominalization as a lexical process in which deverbal nouns
such as VNs and Ns are derived from Vs. In this regard, let us reexamine the lexical
feature analysis of Kageyama in (9) of which the relevant lexical features are repeated here
as (25).

(25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERBS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOUNS</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VNS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Under Kageyama's analysis, the lexical feature matrices of Vs and VNs differ only with respect to the lexical feature [N]. Hence, Kageyama claims that deverbals are derived via a process of nominalization as in (26).

(26) NOMINALIZATION (Kageyama 1982, p. 223 (15))

\[
[+V, -N, -A] \rightarrow [+N] \\
V \\
VN
\]

According to Kageyama, the lexical feature complex [+V, +N, -A] is derived by the rule in (26). This feature complex is identical to the one he posits for a VN as in (25). Kageyama assumes that the derivation of VNs to be a process of nominalization.

(27) 

V: [+V, -N, -A] \hspace{1cm} VN: [+V, +N, -A]

a. asob- 'play' \hspace{1cm} ---> ASOB-I
b. koros- 'kill' \hspace{1cm} ---> KOROS-I
c. nom- 'drink' \hspace{1cm} ---> NOM-I
d. sagas- 'search' \hspace{1cm} ---> SAGAS-I

I will show in section 5 that a similar nominalization process is in fact a syntactic process, but this syntactic nominalization process applies only to eventive nouns. I will assume the dual lexical entry for (renyoo-kei) VNs in such a way that the renyoo-kei form of the verb has two lexical entries as I show in (8).

3. 3. NATURAL CLASS

Among the lexical categories of Japanese, Vs and As have traditionally been placed in one natural class with N, VN, and AN being place in another. This is due to the fact that Japanese As and Vs inflect according to Tense and Negation, whereas other categories, Ns, ANs, and VNs do not. Consider the following paradigm.

(28) CONJUGATION ACCORDING TO TENSE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>STEM</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>PAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PLAINE/POLITE</td>
<td>PLAIN/POLITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>hon</td>
<td>hon-da/desu</td>
<td>hon-dat-ta/desi-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>kiree</td>
<td>kiree-da/desu</td>
<td>kiree-dat-ta/desi-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN</td>
<td>KENKYUU 'research'</td>
<td>KENKYUU-da/desu</td>
<td>KENKYUU-dat-ta/desi-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V(VOCALIC)</td>
<td>tabe-</td>
<td>tabe-ru/-masu</td>
<td>TABE-ta/masi-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V(CONSONANTAL)</td>
<td>hanas-</td>
<td>hanas-u/ hanas-i-masu</td>
<td>HANAS-1-ta/ hanas-i-masi-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>yasu-</td>
<td>yasu-i/yasu-i-desa</td>
<td>yasu-kat-ta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Traditionally, As and Vs are classified as yoogen 'verbs' whereas Ns, ANs, and VNs are referred to as taigen 'nominals'. Simply, this distinction was made based on whether or not a word inflects. For more details, see below.
(29) **Conjugation According to Negation Present Tense:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>STEM</th>
<th>AFFIRMATIVE</th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>hon</td>
<td>hon-da/hon-desu</td>
<td>hon-zya-nai/ hon-zya-arimasen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>kiree</td>
<td>kiree-da/kiree-desu</td>
<td>kiree-zya-nai/ kiree-zya-arimasen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN</td>
<td>KENKYUU 'research'</td>
<td>KENKYUU-da/ KENKYUU-desu</td>
<td>KENKYUU-zya-nai/ KENKYUU-zya-arimasen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V(VOCALIC)</th>
<th>habe-</th>
<th>habe-nu/habe-masu</th>
<th>Tabe-nai/Tabe-masen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V(CONSONANTAL)</td>
<td>hanas-</td>
<td>hanas-u/hanas-i-masu</td>
<td>Hanas-a-nai/ Hanas-i-masen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>yasu-</td>
<td>yasu-i/yasu-i-desu</td>
<td>Yasu-ku-nai/ Yasu-ku-arimasen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, with respect to the inflection facts, natural classes can be found among lexical categories which do not inflect on one hand (Ns, ANs, and VNs) and among categories which do inflect (Vs and As). In Kageyama's system, [-N] categories are identified as categories that inflect whereas [+N] categories do not inflect.

3. 4. **Argument Against [±A] Feature**

However, closer examination of the data shows that cases which Kageyama attempts to account for by the lexical feature [±A] can be captured without referring to the feature [±A]. For instance, Kageyama argues that both Ns and ANs allow suffixation of -rasii 'appearance' but As do not (cf. (10)). Relevant examples are repeated here as (30).

(30) a. N: gakusei-rasii 'appear to be a student'  
    b. AN: kirei-rasii 'appear to be clean'  
    c. A: *ooki-rasii '(intended) appear to be big'

This is expected since both Ns and ANs are nominal category but A is a verbal category. Thus, this fact can be captured without reference to the feature [±A].

In addition, as discussed earlier, As and ANs allow suffixation of the nominalizing suffix -sa but Ns generally do not (cf. (18)). Relevant examples are in (31).

(31) AS | ANS | Ns  
|------|-----|-----|
| taka-i 'tall, high' | kirei 'clean' | gakusei 'student'  
| taka-sa 'height' | kirei-sa 'cleanliness' | *gakusei-sa |

However, this suffixation has nothing to do with lexical features because nouns denoting attributes of a person may undergo this suffixation. Compare the examples in (32).
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(32) a. kanemoti 'a rich person' ---> kanemoti-sa 'richness'
    b. bizin 'a gorgeous woman' ---> bizin-sa 'gorgeousness'
    c. tensai 'genius' ---> tensai-sa 'geniusness'

Hence, if the suffixation of -sa is conditioned in terms of lexical categories, the fact that the nouns in (32) can undergo this suffixation cannot be accounted for. Recall that the nouns in (32) denote an attribute of a person referred to. Therefore, it seems plausible to assume that the suffixation of -sa is semantically conditioned.

Miyagawa 1987 also shows that Kageyama's stipulation of [±A] is not necessary. Miyagawa argues that ANs behaves just as English As do in that Japanese ANs do not inflect. Therefore, he argues that the [+V, +N] feature complex that is assumed for English As is in fact the feature complex for ANs. He further argues that Japanese As are just [+V] and the [N] feature is unspecified. His suggestion is well-motivated in that English As and Japanese As behave differently because Japanese As inflect and do not occur in a position where Ns do.

Note that the inflection of Japanese adjectives is presumably due to the underlying light verb ar-u 'to exist' (cf. Cho 1994). Cho 1994 provides evidence from two areas: negation and the focus construction. First, in the negative form, As occur either with -nai 'nonexistent', the informal negative form of the verb ar-u, or with -ari-masen 'not exist', a formal negative form of ar-u.

(33) a. Kono heya-wa ooki-ku-na-i.
    this room-top. big-ADV.-nonexistent.-pres.
    'This room is not big.'

b. Kono heya-wa ooki-ku-ari-masen.
    this room-top. big-ADV.-exist-polite=neg=pres.

Secondly, in the focus construction, the verb ar-u occurs in the predicate position. The focus construction is formed with particles such as -wa 'Topic' -sae 'even' and mo 'also' attached to the adverbial form of adjective (or the KU-form of adjective). Consider the examples in (34).

(34) a. Kesyoo-o si-nai-to, Hanako-wa miniku-ku-sae ar-u,
    makeup-acc. do-neg.=pres.-if -top. ugly-ADV.-even exist-pres.
    'If she does not wear a make-up, she is even ugly.'
    cf. Hanako-wa miniku-i.
    -top. ugly-pres.
    'Hanako is ugly.'

b. Sonna otomegokoro-ni sessu-ru-to, kanozyo-wa such maidenly=feelings-to encounter-pres.-if, she-top.
    izirasi-ku-mo ar-u.
    lovely=and=touching-Adv.-even exist-pres.
    'When I see her innocence, she is even lovely and touching.'
    cf. Kanozyo-wa izirasi-i.
    she-top. lovely=and=touching-pres.
    'She is lovely and touching.'
In the examples in (34), the adjective is moved to the focus position (marked by the particles -sae and -mo). The position vacated by the moved adjective is occupied by the verb ar-u. Hence, it is plausible to assume adjectives underlyingly contain the verb ar-u, which is suppressed when not needed.

This assumption is supported by Old Japanese data. In Old Japanese, which is still in use in the formal written style, adjectives inflect in the following manner.

(35)  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ROOT} \quad \text{samu-} \quad \text{'cold'} \\
\text{MIZEN(IRREALIS)} \quad \text{samu-kara} \\
\text{RENYOO(CONTINUATIVE)} \quad \text{samu-kari} \\
\text{SYUUSI(CONCLUSIVE)} \quad \text{samu-si} \\
\text{RENTAI(ATTRIBUTIVE)} \quad \text{samu-karu} \\
\text{IZEN(REALIS)} \quad \text{samu-kere} \\
\text{MEIREI(IMPERATIVE)} \quad \text{samu-kare} \\
\end{array}
\]

Now, compare the Old Japanese forms of the verb ar-u listed in (36).

(36)  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ROOT} \quad \text{ar-} \quad \text{'to be'} \\
\text{MIZEN(IRREALIS)} \quad \text{ar-a} \\
\text{RENYOO(CONTINUATIVE)} \quad \text{ar-i} \\
\text{SYUUSI(CONCLUSIVE)} \quad \text{ar-i} \\
\text{RENTAI(ATTRIBUTIVE)} \quad \text{ar-u} \\
\text{IZEN(REALIS)} \quad \text{a-re} \\
\text{MEIREI(IMPERATIVE)} \quad \text{a-re} \\
\end{array}
\]

Recall that when an adjective is immediately followed by a verb, it must be in the adverbial form, which ends with -ku. In this light, if we compare the endings of OJ adjectives, -kara, -kari, -karu, -kere, and -kare, it is obvious that these endings consist of the adverbial form -ku and the inflected form of OJ verb ar-u. Thus, the inflected forms in (35) can be represented in the following manner.\(^\text{10}\)

(37)  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ROOT} \quad \text{samu-} \quad \text{'cold'} \\
\text{MIZEN(IRREALIS)} \quad \text{samu-ku-ara ---\textgreater samu-kara} \\
\text{RENYOO(CONTINUATIVE)} \quad \text{samu-ku-ari ---\textgreater samu-kari} \\
\text{SYUUSI(CONCLUSIVE)} \quad \text{samu-si} \\
\text{RENTAI(ATTRIBUTIVE)} \quad \text{samu-ku-aru ---\textgreater samu-karu} \\
\text{IZEN(REALIS)} \quad \text{samu-kere} \\
\text{MEIREI(IMPERATIVE)} \quad \text{samu-ku-are ---\textgreater samu-kare} \\
\end{array}
\]

\(^{10}\) The syuusi-kei and mizen-kei forms are probably derived from a different source.
This analysis of the underlying form of ANs is not possible. This means that ANs do not show inflection because they do not contain an underlying suppressed verb such as ar-u. Following Miyagawa, I assume that As are specified as [+V] due to the underlying verb ar-u. Meanwhile, I assume that ANs have the feature matrix [+V, +N] just as English adjectives do. Hence, that the copula is needed for ANs and Ns to occur in predicate position is considered to be due to the [+N] feature. Thus, it is possible to distinguish As and ANs without recourse to the lexical feature [A].

3. 5. MIYAGAWA'S 1987 ARGUMENT AGAINST THE CATEGORY VN

Miyagawa argues against Kageyama's lexical feature analysis to distinguish between VNs and Ns. Miyagawa further argues that no such distinction between VNs and Ns is necessary.11 Arguing that the properties of VNs can be accounted for by the factors external to the lexical features inherent to VNs, he proposes that VNs are analyzed as identical to referential nouns such as enpitu 'pencil' and hon 'book'. Namely, VNs have lexical feature matrix [−V, +N].

The parallel between the lexical feature matrices of VNs and Ns can be observed in their syntactic behavior: first, both VNs and Ns may occur in the subject position and secondly, both may comprise the head of a relative clause as in (38)-(39). ((38a) and (39a) are Miyagawa's (5) and (6)).

(38)  a. VN: \textit{Benkyoo}-ga hazimaru-u.
study-nom. start-pres.
'The studying will start.'

movie-nom. start-pres.
'The movie will start.'

(39)  a. VN: \textit{Taroo}-ga suki-n\textit{a} \textit{Benkyoo}
Taro-nom. like-be study
'The study that Taro likes.'

b. N: \textit{Taroo}-ga suki-n\textit{a} \textit{Eiga}.
-nom. like-be movie
'The movie that Taro likes.'

Under Miyagawa's assumption, VNs are assumed to have the lexical features [−V, +N]. Assigning the same lexical features to these two categories raises the question of how the different syntactic properties of VNs and Ns are accounted for.

In order to answer this question, Miyagawa argues that these two categories are distinguished by the ability to assign \( \theta \)-roles to their arguments: while VNs can assign \( \theta \)-roles, Ns cannot. For instance, it is possible for the argument of the VN \textit{benkyoo}

---

11 Miyagawa examined exclusively Sino-Japanese VNs such as \textit{benkyoo} 'study' and \textit{kenkyuu} 'research'. Therefore, applying his analysis to Renyoo-kei VNs may not be valid, particularly because there seem to be no case among Sino-Japanese VNs where such VNs trigger a mismatch. But still it is important to examine Miyagawa's analysis because Sino-Japanese VNs and Renyoo-kei VNs have many common syntactic behaviors as discussed in Chapter 2.
'study' to be θ-marked as in (40a) whereas referential nouns such as enpitu 'a pencil' cannot receive a θ-role as shown in (40b).

(40) a. Nihongo-no BENKYOO.  
Japanese-gen. study 'study of Japanese'

b. *Kanzi-no enpitu.  
Chinese-character-gen. pencil (nonsensical)

Miyagawa suggests that the θ-role assigning ability of VNs originates in Chinese verbs. Generally, VNs etymologically contain an internal verbal element. For example, the VN benkyoo in (40a) consists of ben 'diligently' and kyoo 'to force'. Miyagawa adds that VNs and Ns belong to the same category because VNs cannot be inflected like Vs in Japanese.

The verb-like properties of VNs, according to Miyagawa, can be attributed to the "light" verb (or in his terminology, a pro-verb) su-(ru) 'do' which functions as a verbalizing element with a VN (cf. Grimshaw and Mester 1988 and Chapter 5). Miyagawa proposes that the light verb has the following feature specification.

(41) su-ru

[+V, -N]

[N —— ]

In other words, the pro-verb su-ru becomes a verb when attached to a subcategorized noun. In addition, Miyagawa argues that the pro-verb su-ru inherits the θ-role assigning ability from the VN which it attaches to. Thus, Miyagawa attributes the ungrammaticality of the examples in (42b) to the violation of the θ-Criterion (Chomsky 1981).

(42) a. nihongo-o BENKYOO-suru  
Japanese-language-acc. study-do=pres. 'to study Japanese.'

b. *nihongo-o pen-suru  
Japanese-language-acc. pen-do

Since the VN benkyoo 'study' has θ-roles to assign, benkyoo-su-ru can appropriately assign θ-roles to its argument(s) when the verb su-ru inherits the argument structure of the VN. On the other hand, since the referential noun pen 'pen' does not have a θ-role, *pen-su-ru cannot assign any θ-role to its arguments. As a result, nihongo in (42b) does not receive a θ-role, thereby violating the θ-Criterion.

4. SUGIOKA 1989

Sugioka 1989 stipulates the following the lexical feature compositions for Sino-Japanese VNs (SJVN), Complex Renyoo-kei Nominals (CRN), Renyoo-kei VNs (RVN) and Simplex Renyoo-kei Nominals (SRN). (43) is cited from Sugioka's (8).
(43)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ARGUMENT STRUCTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SJVN  'BENKYOO'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRN   'TORISIMARI'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVN   'TATIYOMI'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRN   'OYOGI'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citing the examples in (44)-(47), she claims that all the Nominals in (43) except SRN can sustain their argument structures. She concludes that if a Nominal has the feature [+V], its argument structure is retained. These facts confirm that SJVNs, CRNs, and CVNs are complex event nominals and SRNs are simple event nominals (cf. Grimshaw 1990, Tsujimura 1992 and Chapter 2).

(44)  
**SJVN**  *SOOSA*  'investigation'

a.  keesatu-no ziken-no **SOOSA**
    police-gen. case-gen. investigation
    'the police's investigation of the case'

b.  Keesatu-ga ziken-o **SOOSA-suru**
    police-nom. case-acc. investigation-do=pres.
    'The police will investigate the case.'

(45)  
**CRN**  *NORIIRE*  'starting/extension of the (airline) service'

a.  Zennikkuu-no kokusaisen-e-no **NORIIRE**
    All=Nippon=Airway-gen. international=line-to-gen. extension
    'ANA's expansion into international flight market'

b.  Zennikkuu-ga kokusaisen-e noriire-ru.
    ANA-nom. international=line-to extend-pres.
    'ANA will expand its service into international market,'

(46)  
**RVN**  *TATIYOMI*  'reading while standing'

a.  manga-no **TATIYOMI**
    comics-gen. reading=while=standing
    'free reading (at the bookstore) of comic books'

b.  manga-o TATIYOMI-suru
    comics-acc. reading=while=standing-do=pres.
    'to have a free reading (at the bookstore) of comic books'

(47)  
**SRN**  *SURI*  'pickpocketing'

a.  *genkin-no SURI-1
    cash-gen. pickpocketing-1

b.  genkin-o su-ru
    cash-acc. pickpocket-pres.
    'to pick cash from someone's pocket'
Among the nominals in (44)-(47), only the SRN in (47) does not license its internal argument. Other nominals, however, can cooccur with their arguments marked in the genitive. This contrast indicates that all nominals except SRN can accompany their argument structure.

To summarize the discussion so far, previous approaches to nominalization involving renyoo-kei have assumed that the process was lexical. Among these approaches, Miyagawa 1987 has attributed to the verbal properties of VNs to a light verb and posits that VNs have a lexical feature matrix identical to Ns. However, in Miyagawa's framework, he proposes that the light verb construction is formed as a complex verb in the lexicon. In the following section, I will show that the lexical treatment of VNs fails to capture their syntactic behaviors, demonstrating how a syntactic approach is better able to explain the behavior of VNs. In particular, I will examine cases where the renyoo-kei and Sino-Japnaese VNs function nominally as well as verbally.

5. SYNTACTIC LEXICAL PROCESS

In this section, I will show that lexical features for VNs cannot be determined in the lexicon. This suggests that the lexical process which affects the lexical category of VNs is restricted to cases of mismatch. The data presented in this section indicate that the lexical category of VN must be determined syntactically, and thus lexical approaches proposed by Sugioka, Kageyama, and Miyagawa need to be revised. The syntactic recategorization approach will be proposed in Chapter 4.

First, as pointed out by Kageyama, the renyoo-kei forms derived by the nominalization process in (26) cannot always occur independently as an N or a VN. For example, consider the renyoo-kei form in (27c and d), repeated here as (48). The VNs in (48) may not occur as independent nouns with either a referential or an eventive interpretation. Thus, the renyoo-kei form in (48a) does not mean either 'a drink' or 'the event of drinking'. The same holds for the renyoo-kei form in (48b), which means neither 'a search' nor 'the event of searching'.

(48) \textbf{RENYOO-KEI FORM}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[a.] NOM-I \hspace{1cm} (\textit{<--- nom-u 'to drink'}
  \item[b.] SAGAS-I \hspace{1cm} (\textit{<--- sagas-u 'to search'}
\end{itemize}

However, the renyoo-kei forms in (48) can occur in nominal compounds such as in (49).

(49) a. NOM-I-KU-I \hspace{1cm} 'eating and drinking'

\begin{itemize}
  \item[a.] drink-I-eat-I \hspace{1cm} 'eating and drinking'
  \item[b.] hito-SAGAS-I \hspace{1cm} 'searching for a person'
  \item[person-search-I] \hspace{1cm} 'searching for a person'
\end{itemize}

Furthermore, the renyoo-kei form can occur in \textit{Ni}-purpose clauses in (50) (cf. Saiki 1987). As indicated by the dative marker \textit{-ni}, the position where the renyoo-kei form occur in a Case position.

(50) a. Biiru-o NOM-I-ni ik-u. \hspace{1cm} 'To go to drink beer.'

\begin{itemize}
  \item[beer-acc. drink-I-dat. go-pres.]
\end{itemize}
b. Wasuremono-o SAGAS-i-1-ni ku-ru.
   lost-thing-acc. search-I-dat. come-pres.
   'To come to search for lost items'

These facts show that the renyoo-kei form is not always subject to the
nominalization process in (26) but is still allowed to occur as a part of a nominal or in a
Case position.

Secondly, the renyoo-kei form of a verb is not always reanalyzed as [+N] category. This form of the verb occurs in a Number of (complex) verbal constructions such as
inchoative, sustentive, and terminative constructions (cf. Chapter 1).

(51) a. hon-o YOM-I-hazime-ru
     book-acc. read-I-start-pres.  'to start reading a book'

b. hon-o YOM-I-tuzuke-ru
     book-acc. read-I-continue-pres.  'to keep reading a book'

c. hon-o YOM-I-owar-u
     book-acc. read-I-finish-pres.  'to finish reading a book'

As a part of a complex verb, the renyoo-kei occurring in these compound verbs are
considered to be verbal.

Thirdly, the renyoo-kei form of a verb can occur either as a verbal or a nominal in
the nominal clause construction.12

(52) a. Kikenbutu-o ATUKAI-tyuu-wa tyuu-i ga hituyoo-da.
     explosives-acc. treat-while-top. caution-nom. necessary-copula=pres.
     'While dealing with explosives and combustibles, you need to be cautious.'

b. Kikenbutu-no ATUKAI-tyuu-wa tyuu-i ga hituyoo-da.
     explosives-gen. treat-while-top. caution-nom. necessary-copula=pres.

A Nominal clause is headed by temporal/aspectual nominal suffixes such as -tyuu
'while', -go 'after', and -no ori 'when'. As shown in (53) below, these suffixes are
nominal in nature.

12 As Tsujimura 1992 and Aoyagi 1993 point out, the occurrence of the renyoo-kei in this construction is
subject to a prosodic constraint. This prosodic constraint restricts words with three or fewer mora from
occurring in this construction. For more discussion, see the references cited above and Chapter 5. The
renyoo-kei in (52), atuka-i 'treatment' which corresponds to the infinitive form atuka-u 'to treat', is one of
the four-mora verbs Tsujimura cited in her discussion. The acceptability of sentences such as those in (52)
may vary among native speakers but there is a sharp contrast in acceptability with the sentences such as in
(i), below.

    nom. book-acc. read-I-while-at telephone-nom. ring-past
    'While Taro was reading a book, a telephone rang.'

    gen. book-gen. read-I-while-at telephone-nom. ring-past
As exemplified in (53), nominal clauses headed by -tyuu and -go are marked in the genitive when followed by another noun. Compare these cases with the following examples where an N is followed by another noun.

(54) a. itiniti-no dekigoto
    one=day-gen. happening 'the day's happenings'

b. natuyasumi-no KEEKAKU
    summer=vacation-gen. plan 'summer vacation plan'

There is no syntactic difference in terms of how the genitive marker is attached to the first noun in (53) and in (54). In both cases, the genitive marker -no is inserted in the context of [___ N] (cf. Fukui 1986). Since aspectual nominal suffixes such as -tyuu and -go can occur in a context where genitive Case is assigned, these suffixes are considered to be [+N].

In addition to the renyoo-kei form of verbs, VNs (Sino-Japanese or otherwise) can occur in nominal clauses. In this case, too, both verbal and nominal Case assignment are allowed as exemplified in (55)-(56).

(55) a. Taroo-no nihongo-no BENKYOO-tyuu-ni, ...
    -gen. Japanese=language-gen. study-middle-in

    'In the midst of Taro's studying Japanese,...'

b. Taroo-ga nihongo-o BENKYOO-tyuu-ni, ...
    -nom. Japanese=language-acc. study-middle-in

(56) a. Taroo-no niwa-no kusa-TORI-tyuu-ni...
    -gen. garden-gen. weed-take-middle-in

    'In the midst of Taro's weeding the garden,...'

b. Taroo-ga niwa-de kusa-TORI-tyuu-ni...
    -nom. garden-in. grass-take-middle-in

Furthermore, Ni-purpose clauses allow both verbal Case (i.e. accusative) and nominal Case (i.e. genitive) to be assigned to the internal argument of VN.

(57) a. Keesatu-wa sono ziken-o TYOOSA-ni kono mati-e yatteki-ta.
    police-top. that incident-acc. investigation-for this town-to come-past

    'The police came to this town to investigate the incident.'

    police-top. that incident-gen. investigation-for this town-to come-past

    'The police came to this town to investigate the incident.'
(58) a. Kidootai-ga ihansya-o TORISIMARI-ni tasuu riot=police-nom. violator-acc. control-for many norikonde-ki-ta. get=on=board-come-past

'The riot police came on board to arrest violators.'

b. Kidootai-ga ihansya-no TORISIMARI-ni tasuu riot=police-nom. violator-gen. control-for many norikonde-ki-ta. get=on=board-come-past

'The riot police came on board to arrest violators.'

The direct object of the renyoo-kei VN in the (a) examples of (57) and (58) is marked in the accusative whereas the direct object in the (b) examples is genitively marked.

Recall that Miyagawa 1987 argues that the verb-like properties of VNs can be obtained via the "light" verb su-ru to do. Contrary to what Miyagawa would predict, however, the examples in (55b) and (56b) show that VNs can assign verbal Case without the light verb su-ru. The Ni-purpose clause examples in (57a) and (58a) also suggest that VNs can assign verbal Case.

As observed above, VNs in these examples are headed by a nominal suffix, which is assumed to be non-Case-assignor. Hence, if Miyagawa's assumption that VNs are inherently [+N] and that verb-like properties, such as verbal Case assignment, result from lexical affixation of the light verb to a VN is correct, verbal Cases in nominal clause constructions assigned by a VN needs to be accounted for by another principle.

In addition, Miyagawa claims that the lexical category of VNs is due to their origins. He assumes that Sino-Japanese VNs are [−V, +N] because Sino-Japanese VNs etymologically contains a verbal element. By pointing out that Chinese verbs do not inflect, Miyagawa argues that in order for them to participate in Japanese verbal inflection system, a light verb must be attached to Sino-Japanese VNs. In other words, Miyagawa claims that Chinese origin prevents Sino-Japanese VNs from participating in Japanese verbal inflection.

However, the existence of renyoo-kei VNs poses a question regarding Miyagawa's argument about the lexical category of VNs. Renyoo-kei VNs involve the -i or -Ø suffix which is a part of the verbal inflectional system. They show a great deal of similarity with Sino-Japanese VNs as observed in Chapter 2. In particular, complex renyoo-kei nominals with their verbal counterparts allow attachment of a light verb to form periphrastic verbs such as kasi-dasi 'lending' (cf. kasi-das-u and kasi-dasi-suru), tori-simari 'control' (cf. tori-simaru-u, and tori-simari-suru) and ire-kae 'exchange' (cf. ire-kae-ru or ire-kae-suru). In addition, some simplex verbs with four or more mora such as korasime (cf. korasime-ru 'to punish', hodokos-i (cf. hodokos-u 'to give (in charity)), and atuka-i (cf. atuka-u 'to treat') appear to have the same status as complex renyoo-kei in that they can occur both in nominal and verbal contexts. This means that properties of inflection do not constitute what determines the status of VNs. As discussed in Chapter 2, VNs are interpreted as complex event nominals. This property of VNs is what distinguishes VNs from Ns. Therefore, it seems plausible to treat VNs and Ns differently, despite the fact that examination of syntactic occurrences of VNs leads us to determine the lexical features of VN as [+N, −V]. 13

13 Verbal and nominal Case assignment is observed in the subject honorific construction such as in (i).
To summarize, these examples show that somehow VN's are allowed to retain verbal Case assigning ability as well as nominal Case assigning ability. In other words, the VN's in these examples are analyzed as both [+N] and [-N]: [-N] allows verbal Case marking and [+N], nominals Case marking. The [+N] feature specification is expected from Kageyama's nominalization analysis. However, if the lexical status of VN is predetermined as [+N] in the lexicon by the rule (26), the alternation between verbal and nominal Case marking in these examples requires an ad hoc stipulation to allow VN's to retain the [-N] feature when needed.

In Chapter 4, I will propose a recategorization analysis for these problems, which was originally proposed for English -ing forms by Milšark 1988. In this approach, instead of specifying ±values for the lexical feature [N], VN's are treated as neutral with respect to the [N] feature. The ±values will be determined by what can govern VN's. This way, it will be possible to account for not only the problems discussed so far but also other occurrences of VN's.

6. STATUS OF RENYOO-KEI SUFFIXES

In this section, I discuss the status of the renyoo-kei suffixes -i and -∅. As observed in previous discussion, these suffixes have properties common to both inflectional and derivational suffixes: on the one hand, they involve in forming one inflected form of the verb, the renyoo-kei, without changing the new form's grammatical category and meaning. On the other hand, these suffixes are used to form nominalized forms. The renyoo-kei formation utilizes an inflectional suffix and nominalization utilizes a derivational suffix.

The following discussion shows that the renyoo-kei suffix does not constitute a tense element based on the morphological facts, and that this suffix is not an element phonologically inserted to "fix" ungrammatical syllable structure. This discussion will show that the renyoo-kei suffix is an inflectional element smaller than a tense element and that it has a morphological value. With the behavior of the renyoo-kei form discussed previously in section 5, the discussion in section 6 suggests that the lexical category of the renyoo-kei suffix must be determined in the syntax.

6.1. ARGUMENT AGAINST RENYOO-KEI SUFFIX AS A TENSE ELEMENT

As discussed in Chapter 2, the renyoo-kei of consonantal verbs consists of the stem and the suffix -i. With vocalic verbs, the renyoo-kei is formed with the stem and a

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Sensei-ga hon-o o-TATI-YOMI-ni nat-ta.} \\
& \quad \text{professor-nom. book-acc. honorific-read-stand-dat. become-past} \\
& \quad \text{"The professor read a book (at a bookstore for free)."} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Sensei-no hon-no o-TATI-YOMI- ga mina-ni} \\
& \quad \text{professor-gen. book-gen. honorific-read-nom. everyone-by} \\
& \quad \text{tyuumoku-sare-ta.} \\
& \quad \text{draw-attention-Pass.-past} \\
& \quad \text{"Professor's reading a book (for free at the bookstore) drew everyone's attention."}
\end{align*}
\]

In the examples in (ia), the arguments of the complex renyoo-kei tati-yomi 'lit. stand and read' is marked in the verbal Case marking array (nominative and accusative). In (ib) on the other hand, these arguments are marked in the genitive indicating the nominal Case pattern. For the discussion of subject honorification, see Chapter 5.
phonologically zero (-Ø) suffix. In (59) and (60), I illustrate the relevant inflected forms of consonantal and vocalic verbs.

(59) CONSONANTAL VERBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOT</th>
<th>RENYOO-KEI</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>PAST</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yom-</td>
<td>YOM-I</td>
<td>yom-u</td>
<td>yon-da</td>
<td>'to read'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ik-i</td>
<td>IK-I</td>
<td>ik-u</td>
<td>it-ta</td>
<td>'to go'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(60) VOCALIC VERBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOT</th>
<th>RENYOO-KEI</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>PAST</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sonae-</td>
<td>SONAE-Ø</td>
<td>sonae-ru</td>
<td>sonae-ta</td>
<td>'to equip'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kari-</td>
<td>KARI-Ø</td>
<td>kari-ru</td>
<td>kari-ta</td>
<td>'to borrow'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traditionally, the renyoo-kei suffix has been considered as a part of the inflectional system of Japanese (cf. Shibatani 1990 for discussion). For the sake of argument, suppose that the renyoo-kei suffix -i or -Ø is an element of INFL. In the verbs in (59) above, yom- 'to read' and ik- 'to go', the renyoo-kei suffix and tense marker (-u for present and -tal/-da for past) are in complementary distribution (cf. Yoshida 1991). Thus, it might be possible to posit the structure in (61) for the renyoo-kei. And the complementary distribution between the renyoo-kei suffix and the tense suffix could be accounted for by stating that when the tense element is selected, the renyoo-kei suffix is deleted (cf. Yoshida op. cit.).

(61)

```
    IP
       └── I
            └── VP
                 └── V
                 └── V' -i/-Ø
```

This account, however, immediately runs into a problem. The past tense form of consonantal verbs cooccurs with the renyoo-kei suffix when the root of a verb ends with a sibilant. In addition, the conjunctive form (often referred to as the TE-form), which I assume to be one of the tense marker, consists of the renyoo-kei with the suffix -te in the same context.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(62)</th>
<th>ROOT</th>
<th>RENYOO-KEI</th>
<th>PAST</th>
<th>TE-FORM</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hanas-</td>
<td>HANAS-I</td>
<td>hanas-i-ta</td>
<td>hanas-i-te</td>
<td>'speak'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koros-</td>
<td>KOROS-I</td>
<td>koros-i-ta</td>
<td>koros-i-te</td>
<td>'kill, murder'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yogos-</td>
<td>YOGOS-I</td>
<td>yogos-i-ta</td>
<td>yogos-i-te</td>
<td>'stain, contaminate'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>odos-</td>
<td>ODOS-I</td>
<td>odos-i-ta</td>
<td>odos-i-te</td>
<td>'threaten'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These facts indicate that it is untenable to assume that the renyoo-kei suffix is a tense element.

In Chapter 4, I will argue that the renyoo-kei suffix constitutes the head of a functional projection (FP) which is smaller than TP but larger than VP projections. Under this approach, the past tense form and the TE-form in (62) are easily accounted for. Furthermore, as will be discussed in the following section, the past tense form in (59) can be accounted for by a phonological rule traditionally referred to as onbin (sound euphony). For more discussion, see Chapter 4.

6. 2. EPENTHESIS

6. 2. 1. POSER 1984

Alternatively, the renyoo-kei suffix for consonantal verbs -i can be regarded as epenthetic whereas Ø suffix is attached to vocalic verbs as Poser 1984 argues. In Poser's analysis, the insertion of the suffix -i is carried out by a phonological rule applying only at word boundary. As shown in (63)-(64), since Japanese syllable structure does not permit consonant clusters other than a consonantal geminate (represented by /Q/) or a syllabic nasal (abbreviated as /N/), the concatenation of a bare stem and the past or TE-form morpheme violates this structural constraint.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(63)</th>
<th>a. GEMINATE</th>
<th>/siQpai/</th>
<th>'failure'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/koQki/</td>
<td>'a National flag'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/HaQtori/</td>
<td>a Japanese surname</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/keQsan/</td>
<td>'account settlement'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. SYLLABIC N</td>
<td>siNbuN</td>
<td>'a newspaper'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>giNkoo</td>
<td>'a bank'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>a. PAST TENSE</td>
<td>*hanas-ta</td>
<td>'spoke'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*koros-ta</td>
<td>'killed'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. TE-FORM</td>
<td>*kas-te</td>
<td>'(lit.) lend-te'</td>
<td>cf. kas-i-te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*yos-te</td>
<td>'(lit.) refrain-te'</td>
<td>cf. yos-i-te</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, when the stem of a consonant verb is followed by the past or TE-form morpheme, a rule of epenthesis applies to insert -i, forming the well-formed syllable structure.

Poser op. cit. further points out that the epenthesis rule in question applies in forming complex predicates such as desiderative adjectives using the suffix -tal(-i) 'want to', V-yasu/niku(-i)'easy/hard to V' and the polite form of verb using the polite suffix -mas(-u). (The examples in (65) and (64) are cited from Poser op. cit. pp. 63-4.)
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Vocalic verbs, on the other hand, are not subject to the epenthesis rule because suffixation of the morphemes shown in (65) does not produce a morphologically ungrammatical syllable structure as shown in (66)

Finally, Poser argues that his analysis can explain the absence of the suffix -i in a reduced compounds as exemplified in (67). Reduced compounds differ from regular compounds in that the -i suffix appears in regular compounds if the first element is a consonant verb whereas the -i suffix does not occur in reduced compounds. In reduced compounds, the consonant in the stem final position undergoes morpheme boundary level rules such as gemination and nasalization to derive surface forms. Consider the following examples.

Assuming that all compounds are comprised of concatenated bare stems and that reduced compounds contain only a morpheme boundary, Poser attributes the absence of the -i suffix in reduced compounds to the application morpheme level rules to form grammatical syllable structure so that the application of the word level rule of epenthesis is no longer necessary.

6.2.2. ARGUMENT AGAINST THE EPENTHESIS ANALYSIS

However, the fact that gemination and nasalization occur in reduced compounds does not provide sound support for the epenthesis analysis for occurrence of the -i suffix in the renyoo-kei form. There are cases implying the underlying existence of the -i suffix in consonantal verbs.

First, in old Japanese, the -i suffix of the renyoo-kei form remained in the past tense and the TE-form of verbs as shown in (68).
c. TAT-i-tari 'stood'  KIR-i-tari 'cut'  KAW-i-tari 'bought'
    stand-I-perfective  cut-I-perfective  buy-I-perfective

The modern Japanese counterparts of the verbs in (68b and c) were derived from the
renyoo-kei form through -i ellipsis and the application of nasalization (in tob-i-tari ---> ton-
nda or ton-de) and gemination (all the cases in 68c) (cf. Shibatani 1990). This historical
sound change has been referred to as onbin (sound euphony) as illustrated in (69) (cf.
Vance 1987 and Shibatani 1990 for discussion).14

(69) a. /tob-i-ta/  'flew'
    ELISION OF -I-  tob-ta
    VOICING ASSIMILATION15  tob-da
    NASALIZATION  tom-da
    ASSIMILATION  ton-da
    PHONETIC FORM  [tonda]

b. /tat-i-ta/ 'stood'  /kiri-ta/ 'cut'  /kaw-i-ta/ 'bought'
    ELISION OF -I-  tat-ta  kir-ta  kaw-ta
    ASSIMILATION  -----------  kit-ta  kat-ta
    PHONETIC FORM  [tatta]  [kitta]  [katta]

The cases in which elision of -i- does not occur involve the sibilant -s in stem final position
(there are no consonantal verbs whose stems end with -z and -d), or a vowel as illustrated
in (70). When stem ends with velar -k or -g, no rule affects the -i suffix but the velar gets
deleted as in (71).

(70) a. HANAS-i-ta 'spoke'  b. MI-ta 'saw'  c. TABE-ta 'ate'
    speak-I-past  see-Ø-past  eat-Ø-past

(71) a. /kak-i-ta/ 'wrote'  b. /isog-i-ta/ 'hurried'
    ELISION OF -I-  -----------  -----------
    VOICING ASSIMILATION  -----------  isog-da
    ELISION OF VELAR  ka-i-ta  iso-i-da
    PHONETIC FORM  [kaita]  [isoida]

Secondly, there are cases in which the suffix -i is underlyingly present. In contrast
to the phonological change taking place in past tense and TE-form formation, not all
complex verb forms comprised of a suffix whose initial segment begins with an alveolar
stop (t- or d-) are affected by the rule of onbin (sound euphony). For instance, neither the

14 For simplicity, I illustrate only the past tense cases but the TE-form of the verbs in (69) is derived in
the same manner. Thus, the TE-form of tonda is tende 'fly-TE', tatte is tatte 'stand-TE', kitsue is kitte 'cut-
TE' and katte is katte 'buy-TE'.
15 Voicing assimilation applies when the root of a verb ends with a voiced obstructer. For instance, verbs
such as yom- 'to read', yob- 'to beckon', sin- 'to die' and kog- 'to row' are subject to this rule and the past
tense suffix attached to these verbs are -da, instead of -ta. See also the case in (71b).
desiderative form involving the suffix V-ta(-i) 'want to V' nor the inceptive form involving V-das(-u) 'start to V' undergoes elision of -i and complied with nasalization, gemination or elision of a velar. Consider the examples in (72).

(72) DESIDERATIVE INCEPTIVE

a. TOB-I-ta(-i) 'want to fly' TOB-I-das(-u) 'start to jump'
   NOM-I-ta(-i) 'want to drink' NOM-I-das(-u) 'start to drink'
   SIN-I-ta(-i) 'want to die' SIN-I-das(-u) 'start to die'
   TAT-I-ta(-i) 'want to stand' TAT-I-das(-u) 'start to stand'
   KIR-I-ta(-i) 'want to cut' KIR-I-das(-u) 'start to cut'
   KA-I-ta(-i)16 'want to buy' KA-I-das(-u) 'start to buy'

b. KAK-I-ta(-i) 'want to write' KAK-I-das(-u) 'start to write'
   ISOG-I-ta(-i) 'want to hurry' ISOG-I-das(-u) 'start to hurry'

Of particular importance is the case of the verb sin- 'to die'. Assuming that the-i suffix is later epenthized to "fix" syllable structure of Japanese as suggested by Poser, both *sin-ta- 'want to die' and *sin-das- 'start to die' should be reanalyzed as *siN-ta and *siN-das-, respectively, since Japanese syllable structure allows the syllabic nasal (often represented by /N/) and no violation of Japanese syllable structure occurs. However, the renyoo-kei suffix -i still occurs.

In addition, in cases where gemination and nasalization take place, reduced compound formation is limited to certain cases: it is not possible for every compound to undergo such reduction. Elements which occur in the first position of reduced compounds include but- 'to hit', huk- 'to blow', hum- 'to step on', hik- 'to pull, to hook', ow- 'to chase', tuk- 'to stab', tor- 'to take' and a few others as the examples in (73) show.

(73) REDUCED UNREDUCED 1ST 2ND GLOSS

bukkakeru butikakeru BUT-I 'to hit' kake-ru 'to pour' 'to pour over'
hukkomu hukikomu HUK-I 'to blow' kom-u 'to come in' 'to blow in'
hunzukeru humitukeru HUM-I 'to step on' tuke-ru 'to attach' 'to step on'
hikkakeru *hikikakeru HIK-I 'to pull' kake-ru 'to hook' 'to hook'
okkakeru oikakeru OW-I 'to chase' kake-ru 'to hook' 'to chase'
tukkuru ?*tukkiru TUK-I 'to stab' kir-u 'to cut' 'to cross'
tokkaeru torikaeru TOR-I 'to take' kae-ru 'to change' 'to exchange'

Poser attempts to account for the possibility of reduction by claiming that these compounds contain only a morpheme boundary rather than an internal word boundary since these forms are no longer analyzed as compounds, having been subject to the process of fossilization. Indeed, some of the reduced compounds have acquired specialized meaning in addition to the literal reading of the unreduced counterpart. In particular,

---

16 For an independent reason, -w in kaw- is deleted when followed by the suffix -i, -e, -u, and -o.
compounds involving *hik-u 'to pull' as its first element tends to be reanalyzed so that the resulting reduced compounds have a specialized reading. Note also that some of the unreduced counterparts have ceased to exist in the lexicon of Japanese.

(74) REDUCED GLOSS FIRST/SECOND ELEMENTS UNREduced

hikakarueru 'to pick up a girl' hik-u + kake-ru 'to hook' *hikikakarueru\(^{17}\)
hipparu 'to pull' hik-u + har-u 'to paste' *hikiharu
hittakuru 'to rob' hik-u + takur-u 'to pull' *hikitakuru
hippegasu 'to strip' hik-u + hagas-u 'to strip' hikihagasu

Cases such as (74) are, however, very limited in number and have probably undergone the process of fossilization. The majority of cases involving reduction have corresponding unreduced compounds without any significant semantic difference between reduced and full forms as shown in (73) above.

Furthermore, recall that past tense and TE form formation are assumed to involve gemination and nazalization as part of the onbin phenomena described above. If we assume that the processes of gemination and nazalization occur at the morphological level as Poser claims, then the onbin phenomena would take place at the morphological level. If this were the case, the past tense and TE form suffixes would be regarded as a part of the inflectional morphology since past tense and TE form undergo these phonological processes to derive surface forms. However, this treatment of the past tense suffix -\(\text{ka}\) and the TE form suffix -\(\text{te}\) would be problematic.

One of the major difficulties with treating tense elements as inflectional morphology concerns assignment of the nominative Case (contrary to what Saito 1982, Kuroda 1992, and Yoshida 1991). There is a strong correlation between nominative Case assignment and some sort of Tense/Aspect element. Consider the examples in (75)-(77).

(75) a. Gakusee-ga NAGUR-I-a-u.
   student-nom. hit-I-meet-pres.
   'Students hit(pres.) each other.'

   student-nom. hit-I-meet-past
   'Students hit(past) each other.'

c. Gakusee-ga NAGUR-I-at-te, keganin-ga de-ta.
   student-nom. hit-I-meet-TE injured=person-nom. come=out=past
   'Students hit(past) each other and some were injured.'

   'Students' hitting each other was prohibited.'


\(^{17}\) This form is grammatical if the second element *-kaceru is interpreted as an aspespecially suffix denoting 'be about to start, to begin'. Then, this form means 'be about to start to pull'.
student-nom. hit-I-meet-I-middle-at police-nom. come-past  
'During the time when students were hitting each other, the police arrived.'  
student-gen. hit-I-meet-I-middle-at police-nom. come-past  

The contrast between (75) and (76) illustrates the possibility of nominative Case  
assignment to the agent phrase in tensed and non-tensed clauses. As the ungrammaticality  
in (76a) shows, nominative Case cannot be assigned to the agent phrase when the predicate  
is not tensed. In (76a), the predicate naguriai 'fisticuffs' is a VN not followed by a tense  
suffix; hence nominative marking on the agent NP results in ungrammaticality.  

Meanwhile, when the predicate is tensed as in (75a and b) or when the predicate is  
in TE form followed by a tensed sentence as in (75c), nominative Case assignment is  
possible. Note also that nominative Case assignment is possible when the VN predicate is  
followed by an aspectual nominal such as -tyuu as shown in (77a) (cf. Tsujimura 1992).  

What these examples suggest is that nominative Case assignment to the agent  
phrase is possible when a clause contains some sort of INFL element. These facts cannot  
be accounted for if tense markers (-ta and -(r)u) and the TE form suffix are treated as a part  
of inflectional morphology in the same manner as the renyoo-kei suffix is. This is clear  
because nominative Case assignment is possible in (76a). Instead of treating tense markers  
and the TE form suffix as an inflection, they must be treated in the same manner as  
aspectual nominals such as -tyuu 'while', -go 'after', and -nagara 'while' are treated.18  
In short, I propose that tense markers including the TE form suffix constitute the head of  
Tense P. In addition, I propose that the aspectual nominal constitutes the head of Asp P.  
(For more discussion of the aspectual nominal construction, see Tsujimura 1992 and  
Chapter 4.)  

Treating tense markers -(r)u and -ta) and the TE form suffix as a part of verbal  
morphology also poses serious problems. Shibatani 1990 points out that unlike verbs,  
adjectives, and auxiliary verbs, tense suffixes and TE form suffixes do not inflect.  
Consider the examples in (78)-(79).  

(78)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hanas-a</th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
<th>Hanas-a-nai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hanas-I</td>
<td>PAST/TE-FORM</td>
<td>Hanas-i-ta/te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanas-u</td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
<td>Hanas-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanas-e</td>
<td>IMPERATIVE</td>
<td>Hanas-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanas-o</td>
<td>HORTATIVE</td>
<td>Hanas-oo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(79) a. POLiteness SUFFIX: -MAS(-U)  

| Hanas-I-mas-u | HANAS-I-mas-i-ta/te |

b. CAUSATIVE SUFFIX: -(SA)SE(-RU)  

| Hanas-a-se-ru | Hanas-a-se-ta/te |

---

18 As I will show in Chapter 4, clauses headed by -nagara 'while' behave differently from clauses headed by  
-tyuu 'while' and -go 'after'.
c. PASSIVE SUFFIX: -(RA)RE(-RU)
   hanas-a-re-ru       hanas-a-re-ta/te

d. ASPECTUAL SUFFIX: -DAS(-U) 'TO START'
   HANAS-I-das-u       HANAS-I-das-i-ta/te

e. NEGATIVE SUFFIX: -NA(-i) 'NOT'
   hanas-a-na-i        hanas-a-na-katta/kute

f. DESIDERATIVE SUFFIX: -TA(-i) 'TO WANT'
   HANAS-I-ta-i        HANAS-I-ta-katta/kute

g. TOUGH SUFFIX: -YAS(-i) 'EASY TO V'
   HANAS-I-yasu-i      HANAS-I-yasu-katta/kute

(78) lists five possible inflected forms that the verbal root hanas- 'to speak' can take. As shown in (79a through g), these inflectional suffixes always precede the tense element which is placed at the end of the entire verbal complex. Although inflectional suffixes in principle can appear at the end of a verb in the imperative form and the hortative form as shown in (78), when auxiliary verbs such as -mas (polite marker), -(sa)se (causative marker), and -(ra)re (passive marker), auxiliary aspectual verbs such as -das 'start', and auxiliary adjectives such as -na (negative), -ta (desiderative) and -yas 'easy' follow the verbal root, an inflectional suffix intervenes between the verbal root and the auxiliary element. Note also that these auxiliary elements inflect whereas the tense elements do not. As pointed out above, a tense element always occurs at the end of the verbal complex, following inflectional suffixes. These facts clearly indicate that tense elements must be treated differently from inflectional suffixes.

So far, I have examined the -i epenthesis analysis proposed by Poser and have shown that treating the renyoo-kei suffix -i as epenthetic causes some problems with accounting for various facts about Japanese verbal morphology. Nonetheless, the question remains as to the status of the renyoo-kei suffix. In Chapter 4, I will argue for a underspecification analysis of the renyoo-kei form. I will show that the renyoo-kei suffix head a functional projection which is underspecified with respect to the feature [N].

7. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter, first, by showing that the lexical category of this form is not predetermined in the lexicon, I have shown that nominalization involving the renyoo-kei form cannot be accounted for exclusively as a lexical process. This behavior of the renyoo-kei is similar to Sino-Japanese VNs—in some syntactic contexts, both the renyoo-kei and Sino-Japanese VNs function either as nominal or verbal.

Previous approaches to this problem was not able to account for the behavior of VN adequately. For example, Sugioka's 1984 Ø-head analysis would increase the number of lexical entries. Furthermore, the lexical feature analysis proposed by Kageyama 1982 suffers from problem of justifying the feature [+A]; Miyagawa 1987 argues against positing the [A] feature, and attributes the morpho-syntactic behavior of VNs to the pro- (or light) verb. But this analysis immediately runs into difficulty in accounting for cases not involving the pro-verb. In addition, Sugioka's 1989 stipulation that VNs have the [+V, +N] feature complex faces problems similar to other lexical feature analyses.

Following discussion of previous analyses, I showed how the renyoo-kei suffix is not an element of tense or an element phonologically inserted. These facts suggests that the renyoo-kei suffix has a morphological value.
The discussion in this chapter suggests that the lexical category of the renyoo-kei must be determined in syntax when it functions as a event nominal. I have assumed a dual lexical entry for the renyoo-kei forms: one as [+N] and the other underspecified with respect to the feature [N]. In the next chapter, I will pursue the underspecification analysis of the renyoo-kei form and show the mechanism of VN recategorization. In addition, I will discuss the how the underspecification approach can account for the problems that previous approaches was not able to account for.
CHAPTER 4

UNDERSPECIFICATION ANALYSIS OF THE RENYOO-KEI

0. INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapters, I discussed nominal and verbal behaviors of the renyoo-kei form of the verb and in Chapter 3, I examined previous accounts for these behaviors. In addition, I have shown that the verbal suffix -i is not epenthetic.

In this chapter, I will argue that the suffix -i (or -∅) constitutes a functional head F which heads a functional phrase FP. The nominal and verbal properties of the renyoo-kei form are in essence similar to those of the English gerundive. In particular, the syntactic behavior of renyoo-kei nominals is on a par with that of -ing of gerundives (cf. Milsark 1988). Based on these observations, I propose an underspecification analysis for renyoo-kei forms. More specifically, I argue that the functional head F has two lexical entries: one is with the lexical feature [+N] and the other is with the underspecified lexical feature [α N]. I assume that the ± value of the underspecified feature [α N] is determined by its governing head. When the governing head is [-N], the renyoo-kei is recategorized as a [-N] element. This approach is similar to the double derivation proposed by Valois 1991 for English gerundives. I show that complex event renyoo-kei nominals as well as Sino-Japanese VNPs are derived in syntax whereas result renyoo-kei nominals and simplex event nominals are derived in the lexicon. Result nominals and simplex event renyoo-kei nominals do not undergo syntactic recategorization. Under the underspecification approach, an eventive renyoo-kei can be analyzed either as [+N] or as [-N], depending on its governing head.

In addition, I show that the Case marking facts for both nominal renyoo-kei constructions and verbal renyoo-kei constructions can be straightforwardly accounted for by assuming that the direct object is assigned Case in the spec of VP, as one type of ECM configuration. The realization of such Case is either genitive or accusative, depending on the lexical feature that the renyoo-kei suffix is assigned. This account is in essence on a par with the proposal that Valois 1991 made for English and French event nominals. Furthermore, I argue that the subject is assigned Case in the spec of FP position through a spec-head relation, rather than as a result of head government by I(nfl) (as proposed by Koopman and Sprockie 1991 and Yoshida 1991). This account is supported by the fact that nominative Case marking is dependent on a [+I(nfl)] element.

Finally, I will extend this analysis to Sino-Japanese VNPs. Essentially, these nominals are nouns in the lexicon, but in syntax they are headed by a functional head in the same manner as the eventive renyoo-kei. A number of similarities between renyoo-kei nominals and Sino-Japanese VNPs will be accounted for under the underspecification analysis.

1. DERIVATION OF RENYOO-KEI NOMINALS

In Chapter 2, I showed that the renyoo-kei form of the verb produces two types of event nominals: complex event nominals and simplex event nominals. Complex event nominals are syntactically distinct from simplex event nominals in that they can associate with their argument structure (cf. Grimshaw 1990 and Tsujimura 1992), when occurring in several syntactic contexts. I also showed that complex event nominals occur in a periphrastic verbal form with a light verb *su-ru 'to do'. Furthermore, they form nominal clauses with aspectual nominals such as -tyuu 'while', and allow event control.
In addition, some renyoo-kei nominals yield non-event nominals whose precise meaning varies from agentive through instrumental. This type of nominal can be identified as a result nominal (cf. Grimshaw 1990 and Valois 1991).

1. 1. LEXICAL ENTRIES FOR RENYOO-KEI

The nominal behavior of the renyoo-kei form could simply be associated with the [+N] feature. With this feature, it is expected that the renyoo-kei be characterized as projecting an NP (or DP). However, as observed above, renyoo-kei NPs are somewhat unusual in that while retaining nominal character such as the ability to occur in argument positions, renyoo-kei NPs can assign verbal Case. In particular, most complex event renyoo-kei nominals behave identically to verbs in certain syntactic contexts such as assigning verbal Case and θ-roles to their arguments.

In order to account for these peculiarities of morphologically complex renyoo-kei forms, let's assume that the morphologically complex renyoo-kei is not specified with respect to the feature [±N]. Under this assumption, complex renyoo-kei forms such as tori-simari 'control, supervision' and kui-nige 'bilking, eating without paying' can have lexical entries such as in (1).

(1) a. TORII-SIMARI  i) [+N]  ii) [ø N]
b. KUI-NIGE  i) [+N]  ii) [ø N]

The renyoo-kei form in (1a) has a corresponding verbal form, tori-sima-ru 'to control' whereas the one in (1b) does not. The existence of corresponding verb forms indicates that these renyoo-kei are positively specified for the [V] feature.

According to this analysis, whether a renyoo-kei can function only as a verb or as a noun or a verb depends on the [+N] lexical entry. As pointed out in Chapter 2, the simple renyoo-kei forms of verbs such as yob-u 'to call' and kak-u 'to write' and the complex renyoo-kei forms of verbs such as sikari-tuke-ru 'to harshly scold' and aruki-mawar-u 'to walk around' do not function either as result or as simplex event nominals. Assuming the dual lexical entries, these lexical items lack the nominal reading because they are not specified as [+N].

In contrast, as observed in Chapter 2, some renyoo-kei forms, such as tat-i-yom-i 'reading while standing' and os-i-ur-i 'pushy sales', do not have a corresponding verbal counterpart. However, these renyoo-kei forms also function like verbs in some syntactic contexts. For instance, in the nominal clause construction and subject honorific construction, the renyoo-kei of this type can assign verbal Cases.


'While students were standing and reading books (for free) at the bookstore, that incident occurred.'

1 Dubinsky 1994 independently proposes similar lexical entries for Sino-Japanese VNs. However, he does not deal with the renyoo-kei form of the verb. Also, note that his approach assumes underspecification but is somewhat different from mine in that the value of the underspecified feature [N] is determined by whether a VN occurs in a NP slot or a VP slot, not by its governing head.
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b. Sensei-ga hon-o o-TATI-YOMI-ni nat-ta.
   'The teacher read the book.'

The assignment of the accusative marker -o attached to the argument hon 'book' in (2) indicates that verbal Case is assigned by the renyoo-kei form tati-yomi (lit.) standing-reading'. This fact indicates that the [N] feature of these renyoo-kei forms can be negative even though these renyoo-kei forms do not have corresponding verb forms.

The [+V] feature for these renyoo-kei forms is probably negative since these forms do not have any corresponding verb forms. As observed in Chapter 2, since these renyoo-kei forms lack corresponding verb form, the light verb su-ru is added to form a periphrastic verb. One piece of evidence supporting the assumption that the feature [+V] is specified as negative for this type of renyoo-kei is found in its inability to undergo V-raising to form a complex predicate without the light verb as shown in (3).

       -nom. bookstore-at book-acc. stand-read-start-past

   b. Taro-ga honya-de hon-o TATI-YOMI-si-hazime-ta.
   'Taro started to read books at the bookstore.'

In example (3a), complex predicate formation with the renyoo-kei tati-yomi (lit.) stand-read' and the aspectual verb hazime(-ru) 'to start' fails. When the light verb su-ru 'to do' is inserted between the renyoo-kei and the aspectual verb, the sentence is grammatical. If we assume that the V-raising to a [+V] head requires the feature [+V] (cf. Dubinsky 1994), the failure of complex predicate formation in (3a) can be accounted for.

1. 2. THE STRUCTURE OF RENYOO-KEI NOMINALS

In this section, I will propose the structure of renyoo-kei form. First, I will show that the renyoo-kei nominals have syntactic properties similar to ing-of gerundives in English. Then, I will argue for a dual derivation (cf. Valois 1991) for renyoo-kei nominals, assuming that the renyoo-kei suffix functions as a nominalizing suffix. I will

---

2 The aspectual verb hazime-ru 'to start' is identical in form to a transitive verb hazime-ru 'to start'. When a morphologically complex renyoo-kei allows a nominalized (or deverbalized) form, it may occur as the object of the transitive counterpart of this verb. In this case, the argument of the renyoo-kei form must occur as a genitive phrase.

(i) a. Taro-ga honya-de hon-no TATI-YOMI-o hazime-ta.
        'lit.)Taro started the act of free reading of books at the bookstore.'

   (ii) *Taro-ga kodomo-no SIKARI-TUKE-o hazime-ta.
        -nom. child-gen. scold-attach-acc. start-past
        'lit.)Taro scared the act of harshly scolding children.'

Recall that the morphologically complex renyoo-kei sikari-tuke 'to scold harshly' may not occur as a nominal (cf. Chapter 2).
assume that this renyoo-kei suffix heads a functional projection FP with the lexical entries assumed in (1) above.

1. 2. 1. RENYOO-KEI NOMINALS AND ING-OF GERUNDAVES

Let's begin by considering the examples in (4).

(4) a. Taroo-no hon-no TAT-I-YOM-I
    Taro-gen. book-gen. stand-I-read-I
    'free reading of books by Taro'

b. *Taroo-no kanzi-no *YOM-I
   Taro-gen. Chinese=characters-gen. read-I
   (intended) 'reading of Chinese characters by Taro'

c. *Taroo-no sake-NOM-I
   Taro-gen. sake-drink-I
   (intended) 'sake-drinking by Taro'

In the examples in (4) above, the genitive phrase in (4a) is interpreted as an argument of the nominal while genitive phrases in (4b) and (4c) are not.

These facts indicate that licensing of an external argument takes place only in complex event nominals. Simplex event nominals and result nominals do not license an external argument. In other words, while complex event nominals behave in the same manner as a clause does, the syntactic structure of simplex event nominals and result nominals are more or less similar to non-derived NPs such as hon 'book' and hito 'person'.

This observation is further supported by the fact that simplex event and result nominals in (4b and c) cooccur with demonstratives such as kono 'this' whereas demonstratives may not occur with complex event nominals as shown in (4a).

(5) a. *Kono [hon-no TAT-I-YOM-I]
      this book-gen. stand-I-read-I

b. Kono [kanzi-no YOM-I]
   this Chinese=character-gen. read-I
   'This reading of a Chinese character'

c. Kono [sake-NOM-I]
   this sake-drink-I
   'This drunk (person)'

Hence, it seems plausible to assume that complex event nominals are more or less sentential whereas simplex and result nominals are more or less nominal.

However, there are certain respects in which even complex renyoo-kei nominals do not have sentential characteristics. First, complex renyoo-kei nominals do not cooccur with VP adverbs such as manner adverbs. Consider the examples in (6).

       student-pl.-gen. violent-adv. hit-I-meet-I
       'Students' violent fist-fighting.'
b. *Kodomo-tati-no nigiyaka-ni NOM-I-KU-I
   child-pl.-gen. noisy-adv. drink-I-eat-I

'Children's noisy eating and drinking.'

In the examples in (6a), the manner adverb *hagesi-ku* 'violently' cannot cooccur with
the renyoo-kei nominal naguri-ai 'fist-fighting'. The -ku ending of *hagesi-ku* is the adverbial
form of the adjective *hagesi-i* 'harsh, violent'. Adjectives of this type appear with the
present tense suffix -i in affirmative, attributive contexts. These are exemplified in (7).

(7) a. taka-i hon.
    expensive-pres. book
    'an expensive book'

b. taka-ku ur-u.
    expensive-adv. sell-pres.
    'sell in a high price'

The adjective *nigiyaka* 'noisy' occurring in (6b) is what is often referred to as an adjectival
noun (AN). In prenominal position, an AN must take an inflected copula -na as in (8a)
(cf. (7a)). This form is the attributive form of the AN. In preverbal position, ANs must
occur with -ni as in (8b), which I assume to be the adverbial form of the AN.

(8) a. kirei-na mati
    clean-copula town
    'a clean town'

b. kirei-ni ara-u
    clean-copula wash-pres.
    'wash cleanly'

Returning to the examples in (6), only the attributive form of the adjective is
allowed when an adjective modifies the renyoo-kei as shown in (9). In the examples in
(9a), the attributive form of the adjective occurs in the pre-renyoo-kei position as indicated
by the suffix -i attached to the adjective *hagesi* 'violent'. Similarly, in (9b), the prenominal
suffix -na is attached to the AN *nigiyaka* 'noisy'.

(9) a. Gakusei-tati-no hagesi-i NAGURI-AI
    student-pl.-gen. violent-pres. hit-meet
    'Students' violent fist-fighting.'

b. Kodomo-tati-no nigiyaka-na NOMI-KUI
    child-pl.-gen. noisy-pres. drink-eat
    'Children's noisy eating and drinking.'

Secondly, auxiliary elements such as negative and tense suffixes may not follow the
renyoo-kei predicate.

    student-pl.-gen. violent-pres. hit-I-meet-I-neg.-1
    'Students' not fist-fighting violently'

b. *Kodomo-tati-no nigiyaka-na NOM-I-KU-I-ta
    child-pl.-gen. noisy-pres. drink-I-eat-I-past
    'Children's having eaten and drunk noisily'
Assuming that the negative element heads a projection NegP, following Pollock 1989, the impossibility of attaching a negative element in (10a) or a tense element in (10b) indicates that a functional projection larger than FP (cf. Chapter 3) may not cooccur with a renyou-kei nominal.

The fact in (10a) is consistent with the fact that nominal negation is not normally permitted in Japanese. In English, on the other hand, negative quantifier no can cooccur with a noun as the gloss of (11a) shows.

\[(11) \quad \begin{align*} 
a. & \quad *\text{Nai hon-ga mitukat-ta.} 
& \quad \text{no book-nom. be=found-past.} 
& \quad \text{'No book was found.'} 
\b. & \quad *\text{Hon nai-ga mitukat-ta.} 
& \quad \text{book no-nom. be=found-past} 
\end{align*} \]

Now, compare these Japanese data with the following English gerundives. There are several types of gerundives in English but what is relevant to my discussion are **Poss-\-ing gerundives** and **ing\-of gerundives** (Abney 1987) as in (12) and (13).

\[(12) \quad \text{**Poss-\-ing gerundives**} \quad \begin{align*} 
a. & \quad \text{Everyone was surprised by [Mary's writing a new book].} 
b. & \quad \text{[Horace's carefully describing the bank vault to Max]...} 
c. & \quad *\text{[John's probably being a spy], Bill thought it wise to avoid him.} 
d. & \quad \text{[Horace's having carefully described the bank vault to Max]...} 
e. & \quad \text{[Mary's not marrying John] was no surprise.} 
\end{align*} \]

\[(13) \quad \text{**Ing\-of gerundives**} \quad \begin{align*} 
a. & \quad \text{Everyone was surprised by [Mary's writing of a new book].} 
b. & \quad *\text{[John's loudly singing of the song]...} 
c. & \quad *\text{[John's having sung of the song]...} 
d. & \quad *\text{[Mary's not marrying of John] was no surprise.} 
\end{align*} \]

Both **Poss-\-ing gerundives** and **ing\-of gerundives** can occur in an NP position such as the object of by-phrase. However, these two gerundives differ in that i) the object of the V+ing gets accusative Case in **Poss-\-ing gerundives** whereas it is genitive in **ing\-of gerundives**, ii) as the contrast between (12b) and (13b) shows, **ing\-of gerundives** cannot allow VP adverbs, iii) auxiliaries can cooccur with **Poss-\-ing gerundives** but not with **ing\-of**

---

3 In certain idiomatic phrases, the negation of the type in (11a) is somehow allowed.

\[(i) \quad \text{Nai sode-wa huru-na-i.} 
& \quad \text{no sleeve-top. wave-neg.-pres.} 
& \quad \text{'There is nothing I can do.'} 
\]

\[(ii) \quad \text{Sonna koto-wa nai_koto-wa na-i.} 
& \quad \text{such thing-top. neg. thing-top. neg-pres.} 
& \quad \text{'There are some occasions where such things may happen.'} 
\]
gerundives as the contrast between (12d) and (13c) shows, and iv) negation is allowed in Poss-ing gerundives as in (12e) but not in ing-of gerundives as in (13d).

Of these two types of gerundives, the properties of ing-of gerundives are identical to those of renyoo-kei nominals. Ing-of gerundives display the following characteristics: i) ing-of gerundives do not cooccur with VP-internal adverbials such as manner adverbs, ii) they do not allow aspectual elements and iii) they do not cooccur with negative elements. Renyoo-kei nominals share these properties. As shown in (6), renyoo-kei nominals do not occur with VP-internal adverbials. Furthermore, as the examples in (10) show, neither negation nor tense elements cooccur with the renyoo-kei nominals.

Based on these shared properties, it is plausible to assume that ing-of gerundives and complex event renyoo-kei nominals are structurally similar. However, an adequate account for renyoo-kei nominals must reflect both the eventive (i.e. sentential) and nominal properties of this type of nominal. In what follows, I will lay out the structure of complex event renyoo-kei nominals, showing how the lexical properties of the renyoo-kei form are determined.

1. 2. 2. VALOIS' 1991 ANALYSIS ON NOMINALS

Valois 1991 argues that event and result nominals in English and French can be distinguished by their derivations. Event nominals can accompany their argument structure, and thus have sentential structure. In the meantime, result nominals are similar to NPs which do not have this property. Valois attributes this distinction to how these two types of nominals are derived: event nominals are syntactically derived while result nominals are derived in the lexicon. Furthermore, event nominals are similar to gerundives (cf. Abney 1987 and Valois 1991). Hence, Valois treats gerundives in the same manner as event nominals. In this section, I review Valois' 1991 argument for double derivation.

1. 2. 2. 1. RESULT NOMINALS

First, Valois assumes the structure in (15) for English result and undervived nominals such as in (14).4

(14) Rembrandt's portrait of Aristotle.

---

4 Valois assumes the projection No(un)P for all nominals. The head of NoP is nominalizing suffixes such as -tion and -ing for even nominals and a zero suffix for result nominals.
Valois argues that the direct objects of result and unmeroked nominals optionally receive Case under N' in English. Hence, in the examples in (16), the of-NP gets Case assigned by the head N.

(16)  a. The portrait of Aristotle
      b. The description of the event

On the other hand, the external arguments of these nominals get genitive Case via an affix assigning the pre-nominal genitive Case 's in English. Valois assumes that this affix has its projection, Ca(se) Phrase. Genitive Case assignment is carried out by movement of the external argument to Spec CaP under spec-head agreement. For this reason, the agent NP is interpreted as such when Case marked in the genitive as in (17a). When the agent NP occurs as a post-nominal of-phrase, it is no longer interpreted as the agent as shown in (17b).

(17)  a. Rembrandt's portrait.
      John's description.
      b. The portrait of Rembrandt.  (Rembrandt ≠ agent)
      The description of John        (John ≠ agent)

In addition, since English projects CaP, when the direct object does not get Case, it moves to Spec CaP to receive Case. Note also that the external argument can appear in a
by-phrase. This effect is often referred to as Nominal Passive. Hence, the structure of DP can vary as shown in (18).

(18)  
a. The portrait of Rembrandt  (Rembrandt = object)  
The description of the event  (event = object)  
b. Rembrandt's portrait  (Rembrandt = object)  
The event's description  (event = object)  
c. Rembrandt's portrait of Aristotle  (Rembrandt = agent, Aristotle = object)  
John's description of the event  (John = agent, event = object)  
d. The portrait of Aristotle by Rembrandt  
The description of event by John  
e. Aristotle's portrait by Rembrandt  
The event's description by John  
f. The portrait by Rembrandt  
The description by John

In addition, the impossibility of "double genitive complements" in English can be attributed to the lack of head-raising. Since the head noun does not move up to Num\textsuperscript{0}, examples such as those in (19) cannot be derived in English.

(19)  
*The portrait of Rembrandt of Aristotle

Compare this example with the French equivalent in (20), where no CaP is projected and the head noun portrait 'portrait' moves up to Num\textsuperscript{0} through No\textsuperscript{0}.

(20)  
Le portrait de Rembrandt d' Aristote 
the portrait of Rembrandt of Aristotle

In French, through head movement, case assignment to the direct object occurs in Spec NP and case assignment of the subject takes place at Spec NoP position.

1. 2. 2. 2. EVENT NOMINALS

In contrast, event nominals are assumed to have VP complements; (21) shows this for English event nominals (Valois' (45) p. 81). Derived nominals are subject to verb movement, which moves the verb to the nominalizing affix in No(un)\textsuperscript{0}. 
In English, the external argument of an event nominal can appear as a pre-nominal genitive phrase whereas the theme phrase cannot. This contrast is shown in (22).

(22)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{John's frequent description of the event.}  
\hspace{1em} (\text{cf. The frequent description of the event by John})  
\item \textbf{*The patient's frequent examination ___ irritated him.}  
\hspace{1em} (\text{cf. The frequent examination of the patient irritated him.})
\end{enumerate}

In (22a), the application of verb movement moves the verb to the affix. Then the verb+affix complex assigns case to the direct object (in Spec VP). In the meantime, the application of head-movement of the complex describe + tion to No* enables it to discharge the external θ-role to Spec NoP* as shown by Sportich 1990. And finally, the agent phrase moves to Spec CaP to get genitive Case.

In contrast, (22b) is ungrammatical because the complex examine + tion can assign Case to the direct object. Since the NP the patient gets Case in the direct object position, if this NP gets Case in the head of CaP, it is doubly Case marked, violating the condition of chain formation (Chomsky 1981).

Furthermore, the direct objects of event nominals must be projected, as the ungrammaticality of examples in (23) shows.
(23)  a. *John's frequent description __
    b. *The frequent description __ by John

The ungrammaticality of the examples in (23) is caused by the lack of a direct object. The fact that the direct object cannot be omitted results because event nominals take a VP complement. Namely, the corresponding verb obligatorily takes a direct object, as the corresponding sentences in (24) show.

(24)  a. *John described __.
     (cf. John described the event.)
    b. *The doctor examined __.
     (cf. The doctor examined the patient.)

Hence, it is plausible that the direct object is obligatory in nominalization as well.

1. 2. 2. 3. GERUNDIVES

Valois also argues that English gerundives are similar to event nominals and have structures identical to derived nominals. As discussed above, *poss-ing gerundives and *ing-of gerundives differ in that the former allows CP-like elements whereas the latter does not.

Such differences can be captured by assuming that these two *ing nominals are structurally distinct. In particular, *Poss-ing gerundives project a more CP-like structure with projections such as Infl and Neg. Valois proposes the structure in (25) for *Poss-ing gerundives, where AspP intervenes between VP and NoP.5, 6

---

5 As shown above, NegP may intervene between AspP and NoP.
6 The structures in (25) and (26) are from Valois 1991 (162), on p. 128.
On the other hand, Valois posits the structure in (26) for *ing-of gerundives*, arguing that *ing-of gerundives* have a structure similar to NP, in that there is no functional projection equivalent to Infl and Neg.
The crucial difference between Poss-ing gerundives and ing-of gerundives in supporting the structures in (25) and (26) is that only Poss-ing gerundives assign accusative Case to the direct object. In (25), when the verb moves up to No^0 in order to form V-ing, it must move through Asp^0. In this position, accusative Case is assigned.

On the other hand, in (26), movement of the verb to No^0 does not involve movement through Asp^0 since one property of ing-of gerundives is that they cannot cooccur with aspectual auxiliaries. The genitive Case assigned to the direct object is accounted for in the same manner as genitive marking in event nominals: when the verb moves to No^0 to form a nominal, it assigns genitive Case to the direct object.

1. 2. 4. THE STRUCTURE OF RENYOO-KEI

Let's return to the Japanese verbal inflection system outlined in the previous chapter. As shown in (27), the renyoo-kei suffix -i appears in the past tense form of consonantal verbs when preceded by a sibilant. As discussed in the previous chapter, consonantal verbs with non-sibilant roots undergo a phonological rule called onbin during past tense formation. As a result, the renyoo-kei suffix does not overtly appear in the surface form of the past tense.
(27) **CONSONANTAL VERBS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOT</th>
<th>RENYOO-KEI</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>PAST</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hanas-</td>
<td>HANAS-I</td>
<td>hanas-u</td>
<td>hanas-i-ta</td>
<td>'to speak'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yom-</td>
<td>YOM-I</td>
<td>yom-u</td>
<td>yon-da</td>
<td>'to read'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ik-i</td>
<td>IK-I</td>
<td>ik-u</td>
<td>it-ta</td>
<td>'to go'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Irregular verbs, illustrated in (28), also contain the renyoo-kei suffix -i. In addition, their past tense forms consist of the renyoo-kei and the past tense suffix -ta which is affixed to the renyoo-kei form.

(28) **IRREGULAR VERBS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOT</th>
<th>RENYOO-KEI</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>PAST</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>su-</td>
<td>SI-</td>
<td>su-ru</td>
<td>si-ta</td>
<td>'to do'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku-</td>
<td>KI-</td>
<td>ku-ru</td>
<td>ki-ta</td>
<td>'to come'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, vocalic verbs such as those in (29) do not occur with the renyoo-kei suffix -i. Instead, the renyoo-kei form of this verb class is identical to the root form of the verb. In addition, verbs of this class form the past tense by attaching the past tense suffix -ta to the root as the paradigm in (29) shows.

(29) **VOCALIC VERBS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOT</th>
<th>RENYOO-KEI</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>PAST</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sonae-</td>
<td>SONAE(-Ø)</td>
<td>sonae-ru</td>
<td>sonae-ta</td>
<td>'to equip'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kari-</td>
<td>KARI(-Ø)</td>
<td>kari-ru</td>
<td>kari-ta</td>
<td>'to borrow'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the -i suffix does not occur with vocalic verbs, based on the fact that consonant verbs and irregular verbs both contain the renyoo-kei suffix, it is plausible that vocalic verbs also involve a renyoo-kei suffix. I will represent the renyoo-kei suffix for vocalic verbs as -Ø, which does not have any phonetic realization.

Assuming that all Japanese verbs contain the renyoo-kei suffix, we can presume that the renyoo-kei suffix heads a functional category F (cf. Yoshida 1991). This means that the head of the Japanese verb consists of the verbal root and the renyoo-kei suffix -i or -Ø. As I have shown in Chapter 3, the past tense suffix follows the renyoo-kei suffix, indicating that the renyoo-kei does not represent a tense morpheme and that Japanese has a full-fledged INFL in which tense, aspectual, and perhaps agreement elements occur under the projection of I.\(^7\) Hence, I assume that the renyoo-kei suffix -i or -Ø constitutes the head of a functional projection (FP) distinct from TenseP or AspectP. Furthermore, the verbal stem is formed via application of head movement of the verbal root, which constitutes a head of VP, to the head of F.

Now consider the examples in (30).

\(^7\) For more discussion on the agreement phenomena observed in honorific constructions, see Suzuki 1989 and Chapter 5. Note that Fukui 1986 claims that there is no agreement in Japanese and on this basis he argues that Japanese has defective I(nfl) which functions only as a place-holder of tense markers. Fukui examines data concerning the so-called *sou-su* pro-form and independently concludes that tense elements can appear outside of the projection of V.
(30) a. Taroo-no sono syoohin-no KAI-TUKE
    -gen. that merchandise-gen. buy-attach
'Taro's purchase of the merchandise.'

b. Taroo-ga sono syoohin-o KAI-TUKE-ta.
    -nom. that merchandise-acc. buy-attach-past
'Taro purchased the merchandise.'

The example in (30a) is an NP formed with a renyoo-kei nominal, no projection such as IP or CP is contained since there is no Tense, Aspectual, or Complementizer element. Still, the renyoo-kei nominal has its subject and object.

The tensed counterpart in (30b) contains the same subject and object. Since the examples in (30a) and (30b) are minimally different with respect to Tense, I assume the structure in (31) for Japanese clauses. In this structure, the verb root projects a VP and the renyoo-kei suffix is the head of FP. As mentioned above, the stem (or the renyoo-kei) form of verb is formed by head-movement from V⁰ to F⁰. Furthermore, the tensed form undergoes successive applications of head movement to P⁰ through F⁰.

(31)

```
CP
  \     /  
C'    
     /  
TP    C
     /  
T'    
     /  
FP    T
     /  -(r)u/ta
F     
     /  
VP    F
     /  -i or -Ø
V'    
     /  root
```

The structure in (31), which distinguishes the projection of the renyoo-kei form from that of the tensed form, is supported by the possibility of NPI licensing. The Japanese NPI sika 'only' must be associated with negation in the same clause (cf. Muraki 1978 and Terada 1994). Thus, the following long-distance sika-NEG results in ungrammaticality.
   -only -nom. Japan-to go-neg.-pres. reason-acc. ask-past
   'Only Taro asked the reason why Hanako is going to Japan.'

       -nom. -only Japan-to go-past reason-acc. ask-neg.-past
   'Taro asked the reason why only Hanako went to Japan.'

In the sentences in (32), the embedded (relative) clause is tensed, indicating that the embedded clause constitutes the smallest possible TP. If NEG occurs in the same clause as NPI element, the sentence is grammatical.

   -only -nom. Japan-to go-pres. reason-acc. ask-neg.-past
   'Only Taro asked the reason why Hanako is going to Japan.'

       -nom. -only Japan-to go-neg.-past reason-acc. ask-past
   'Taro asked the reason why only Hanako went to Japan.'

These facts can be accounted for by assuming that NP-sika moves to the spec. of NegP and is licensed by the head of NegP under the spec-head relation. The relevant structure for the NPI licensing is represented as in (34).8

(34)

Hence, the ungrammaticality of the NPI licensing in (32) is attributed to ECP violation. However, long-distance sika-NEG is allowed in the following cases:

---

8 The order among TP and NegP is determined by observation of the following example.

(i) a. tabe-na-i.
   eat-neg.-pres. 'not eat'

   b. *tabe-ru-na-i
   eat-pres.-neg.-pres.
In the examples in (35), the embedded clause is not tensed. Assuming that both causative and (indirect) passive sentences are formed via incorporation, it is plausible to assume that the embedded verb does not have a Tense element. Given this, the clausemate condition of NPI licensing should be revised so that long-distance *sika*-NEG is disallowed only when the embedded verb is IP or larger.

Let us now consider cases where the renyoo-kei is involved in long-distance *sika*-NEG. Given the structure in (31), when the renyoo-kei occurs as an embedded verb, long-distance *sika*-NEG is expected, since the renyoo-kei form constitutes a projection smaller than IP. This prediction is borne out by the following examples.

    -top. wine-only drink-I-start-neg.-past
'Taro started to drink only wine.'

    -top. magazine-only read-I-want-adv. neg.-past
'Hanako wanted to read only magazines.'

In both the inceptive construction in (36a) and the desiderative construction in (36b), the embedded clause must be the renyoo-kei form of verb. In these cases, long-distance *sika*-NEG is permitted, suggesting that the projection of the renyoo-kei form is smaller than that of a tensed clause.9

2. Recategorization Analysis

In section 1.1., I proposed that one of the lexical entries of the renyoo-kei form is underspecified with respect to the feature [+N]. This feature is in fact the feature associated with the renyoo-kei suffix which heads the functional projection FP, as I assumed in the previous section. Based on these assumptions, I argue that the lexical feature [N] of eventive renyoo-kei is determined by the governing head. If the renyoo-kei is governed by a [−N] category, it is specified as [−N]. On the other hand, if the renyoo-kei is either governed by a [+N] category or is not governed, it is assigned [+N].

The nominal/verbal alternation observed in the renyoo-kei form is similar to that of English gerundives in that the lexical category of the verbal root is recategorized by suffixation. In this section, I will first outline the analysis of recategorization of English gerundives proposed by Milsark 1988, who argues that lexical feature of the *-ing* suffix is not inherently specified. In his framework, the positive or negative value of the lexical features [V] and [N] is determined configurationally. I show that a similar process of

---

9 The same is true of the form occurring with causative and passive forms. The inflected form of the verb in these constructions is often identified as *mizen-kei* (irrealis form). However, I will not discuss this matter further.
recategorization occurs in the renyoo-kei. More specifically, the renyoo-kei has an underspecified \([N]\) feature whose positive or negative value is determined by its governing head. Under this analysis, the nominal/verbal alternation of this form is accounted for configurationally.

2. 1. MILSARK 1988

The English \(-ing\) suffix, which forms sentential gerundives as in (37), behaves ambiguously with respect to its category in syntax.

(37) a. Her writing the book so rapidly was astonishing.
   b. It was Iraq's attacking Kuwait that horrified us.
   c. John playing the piano and Fred singing a song were terrifying.

For example, the \(-ing\) suffix functions as i) a productive nominalizing suffix as in (38a), ii) a progressive aspectual affix as in (38b), iii) an adjective-forming affix as in (38c), iv) a verbal participial affix as in (38d) and v) a semi-productive mass noun-forming affix ("object" or "material" sense) as in (38e).

(38) a. Her rapid writing of the book was astonishing.
   b. She was writing the book rapidly.
   c. an unprepossessing individual
   d. I noticed John grinning.
   e. clothing/fencing/writings

These observations led Milsark 1988 to assume \(-ing\), which forms (sentential) gerundives, to be lexically unitary. This analysis would predict that \(-ing\) attaches to verbs to derive complex lexical items of any category: gerundives can be N, V, A, or P. In particular, a gerundive is "subject to a process of free category assumption" (Milsark 1988: p. 621) in the PF component. Through this process, when \(-ing\) affixed to a verb, the verb assumes a combination of \(\pm\)values of two major lexical categories \([N]\) and \([V]\) in the following manner:

(39) \[\begin{array}{c} N: \quad [+N, -V] \\ V: \quad [-N, +V] \\ A: \quad [+N, +V] \\ P: \quad [-N, -V] \end{array}\]

Thus, in Milsark's system, recategorization of gerundives from V to N, to A, and to P are determined by selecting \(+\) or \(-\) for the features \([V]\) and \([N]\). If recategorization does not take place, the gerundive is assumed to be V.

However, if recategorization occurs satisfying the Case Filter of Chomsky 1981, the object of V in a gerundive is Case-marked prior to recategorization to N and A. Furthermore, he assumes that assignment of Case to the entire gerundive by Infl, V or P applies in the PF component. This process eliminates vacuously recategorized (verbal) gerundives and following Case Resistance Principle (cf. Stowell 1981), this process prevents gerundives recategorized to P from occurring in Case-marked positions. In the meantime, Case assignment of nominally recategorized gerundives is carried out, with
instances of nominal gerundive occurring in positions where no Case is assigned being rejected.

In this fashion, V-ing forms can be N, V, A, or P. For example, V-ing in the examples in (40) illustrate nominal gerundives.

(40) NOMINAL GERUNDIVE
   b. Mary regretted reading the book.

That the V-ing in complement position in (40) is an NP is clear from the fact that gerundives in this position are subject to the same syntactic process that other NPs can undergo. Compare the examples in (41) and (42).

(41) a. What John enjoyed was reading the book.
   b. It was reading the book that Mary regretted.
   c. Reading the book was regretted by everyone.

(42) a. What John read was the book.
   b. It was the book that Mary bought.
   c. The book was read by everyone.

In the pseudo-cleft and cleft constructions shown in (41a and b), a gerundive occupies the focus position. These facts show that the V-ing and its object can form a constituent just like the NPs in (42a and b). In addition, a gerundive in (41c) occupies the subject position of the passive construction. This position can be occupied by an NP as shown in (42c). The application of such an "NP test" shows that the gerundives in (40) form the constituent equivalent of an NP.

On the other hand, gerundives in the following examples are instances of vacuously recategorized V-ing.

(43) VERBAL GERUNDIVES
   a. It's a joy walking on the beach.
   b. John quit smoking cigars.

One of the characteristics of verbal gerundives is that verbal gerundives do not allow genitive subjects. Compare the sentences in (44) with (43).

(44) a. *It's a joy John's walking on the beach.
   b. *John quit Bill's smoking cigars.

Milsark argues that the ungrammaticality of genitive subjects in verbal gerundives is due to the fact that verbal gerundives may occur only in Caseless position for Case-theoretic reasons. Following Stowell's Case Resistance Principles, clausal gerundives containing vacuously recategorized verbs may not be Case-assigned. Nominal gerundives, in contrast, allow genitive subjects, as illustrated in (45) along with PRO subjects as in (46).

(45) a. Mary enjoyed John's reading the book.
   b. Mary regretted John's resigning from his position.
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(46) a. Mary enjoyed PRO reading the book.
   b. Mary regretted PRO resigning from her position.

Milsark argues that the occurrence of PRO in (46) are exceptions to the so-called PRO-Theorem. The relevant structures of nominal gerundives are represented in (47) (cited from Milsark's (11)).

(47)

In (47b), recategorization of V-ing into N occurs in the PF component. The resulting structure is identical to (47a): in particular, the relationship between the NP in the specifier position and the gerundive in the head I in (47b) is exactly the same as the subject NP in the spec of NP in (47a). In both cases, the subject NP is governed by N. Hence, the assignment of genitive Case to the NP in the specifier position is expected to proceed in (47b) just as it does in (47a). Since there is no structural distinction between the cases in (45) and (46), it follows that PRO in the specifier position of nominal gerundives is assigned genitive Case.

In contrast, verbal gerundives do not allow genitive subjects. Rather, they must have a PRO subject if they do not occur under an ECM structure where the governing ECM verb assigns accusative Case to the subject of the gerundive.\(^{10}\) First, as illustrated in (44),

\(^{10}\) There are cases in which PRO, genitive, and accusative subjects occur in the subject position of a gerundive (cf. Abney 1987 and Tonoike 1990).

(i) Mary remembered PRO taking a picture.
(ii) Mary remembered John's taking a picture.
(iii) Mary remembered John taking a picture.

It appears that among these three cases, gerundives in (i) and (ii) show nominal properties; passivization of the gerundive is allowed as in (iv) and they can occur in the focus positions of pseudo-cleft construction as shown in (v).

(iv) Passivization:
Taking a picture was remembered by Mary.
 John's taking a picture was remembered by Mary.
 *John taking a picture was remembered by Mary.

(v) Pseudo-cleft:
repeated here as (48), genitive subjects are excluded from the subject position of gerundives.

(48)  a.  *It's a joy John's walking on the beach.
     b.  *John quit Bill's smoking cigars.

The gerundives in (48) are not recategorized as N and hence they do not have the structure in (47b). As discussed above, in the structure in (47b), genitive Case is assigned to the NP in the specifier position in the same manner as genitive Case is assigned to the NP in the specifier position in (47a). Hence, the difference between nominal and verbal gerundives in terms of whether or not they can take a genitive subject simply follows from the fact that the verbal gerundives cannot form a structure identical to the one in (47a). The relevant structure of the gerundives in (48) is the one in (49). In (49), V-ing is not recategorized to N, thus retaining its V category.

(49)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{I'} \\
\text{I} \\
\{V\text{-}ing\}_i \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{t}_i \\
\end{array}
\]

Therefore, the impossibility of a genitive subject in (48) directly follows from the fact that the gerundives in (48) are not recategorized.

Milsark's analysis predicts that gerundives behave as A and P. Although recategorization of gerundives into A and P is not fully productive, there are cases in which "-ing-affixed words are listed lexically listed under their appropriate categorial specifications" (Milsark 1988: p. 616). Following Fabb 1984, Milsark notes that adjectival -ing formation is restricted to psych-verbs such as those in the following examples.\(^{11}\) (The examples in (50) and (51) are cited from Milsark's (6) and (7).)

(50)  a.  a very interesting person
     b.  Mary seems interesting.
     c.  an astonishing event

\(^{11}\) Milsark also notes that there are some marginal exceptions like lasting in the following sentence.

(i)  That relationship seems lasting.
d. It seemed astonishing at the time.

(51) a. *a very talking person
b. *Mary seems talking.
c. *a forgetting person.
d. *John seemed forgetting.

As shown in (51), adjectival -ing formation cannot be applied to semantic classes of verbs other than psych-verbs, illustrating that adjectival -ing formation is semantically motivated. This indicates that adjectival -ing formation is not fully productive.

With respect to prepositional gerundives, Milsark cites the following examples in which -ing forms have prepositional status (Milsark's (5)).

(52) a. We have a number of reservations concerning your application.
b. I have little to say regarding this issue.
c. We spoke with John regarding his application.
d. The committee spoke with John repeatedly concerning his deplorable activities in support of human dignity.

The -ing forms, concerning and regarding in these examples are semantically prepositional. In particular, regarding is not an inflected form of the corresponding verb form as it is in the following ill-formed sentence, showing that the -ing forms in (52) are not reduced relative clauses.

(53) *Our reservations regarded his stupidity

Note that formation of prepositional gerundives is lexically constrained, while formation of adjectival gerundives is semantically motivated.

Even though adjectival and prepositional gerundives are not fully productive, Milsark points out that the lack of productive adjectival and prepositional gerundives does not undermine the assumption that the -ing suffix is a category-neutral affix producing gerundives which can be recategorized to any major lexical category. In Milsark's system, recategorization of gerundives occurs in PF, and the effect of recategorization is relevant only to Case theory. Assuming a slightly strong version of the Case Filter, requiring that all [+N] categories have Case, Milsark suggests that no empirical distinction can be found between nominal and adjectival gerundives on the one hand and between verbal and prepositional gerundives on the other. Therefore, the very limited distribution of adjectival

---

12 Milsark refers to this requirement as Strong Case Filter (SCF) and formalizes it as in (i).

(i) [+N] <==> [+Case]

This filter applies to all [+N] categories, i.e. both nouns and adjectives. He notes that adjectives receive Case through agreement of their maximal projections with the maximal projection of a Cased noun and points out that this assumption is motivated by overt Case morphology appearing on adjectives in inflected languages. This fact in inflected languages once again supports Miyagawa's 1987 assumption that Japanese ANs are more or less equivalent of adjectives in other languages, i.e. [+N, -V] unlike As, which he characterizes as [+V].
and prepositional gerundives does not affect his assumption, since what is required by this
type of gerundive formation is that nominal and adjectival gerundives occur in Cased
positions, whereas verbal and prepositional gerundives are restricted to Caseless positions.
Now that the adjectival gerundives in (50) are in Cased positions and the prepositional
gerundives in (52) occur in Caseless positions, no violation of Case theory is found.

In the following section, I will pursue the possible application of Milsark’s theory
of gerundives to Japanese. I will argue that the functional head of the Japanese renyoo-kei
(the i suffix) resembles the English -ing suffix of gerundives in relevant respects. In
particular, recategorization of renyoo-kei into nominal results from the underspecified
feature [α N] feature of the renyoo-kei head.

2. 2. RECATORIZATION OF THE RENYOO-KEI

In this section, I show that the feature specification of renyoo-kei is determined by
what governs the renyoo-kei. In order to allow the feature complex to be determined by the
governor, I propose an analysis similar to what Milsark 1988 proposes for English
gerundives. More specifically, I argue that the underspecified [N] feature of the head of FP
is determined by its governing head.

2. 2. 1. THE BEHAVIOR OF RENYOO-KEI FORMS

As shown in Chapter 2, it is not always the case that simplex renyoo-kei are used as
nominals. Thus, the renyoo-kei in (54) can stand alone as result nouns, whereas those in
(55) cannot.

(54) PRESENT TENSE          RENYOO-KEI NOMINAL
    yom-u 'to read'          YOM-I 'reading (of a character)'
    hanas-u 'to speak'       HANAS-I 'speech'
    asob-u 'to play'         ASOB-I 'play, game'

(55) PRESENT TENSE          RENYOO-KEI NOMINAL
    mat-u 'to wait'          MAT-I
    ka-u 'to buy'            KA-I
    sin-u 'to die'           SIN-I

The simplex renyoo-kei form participates in aspectual complex predicate formation.
Aspectual verbs such as hazine(-ru) 'to start', das(-u) 'to start', and owar(-u) 'to finish'
and verbs forming complex predicates such as -yami(-u) 'to stop', -tor(u) 'to take' and
-ace(-ru) 'to raise' subcategorize for the renyoo-kei form as the embedded verb. For
example, the renyoo-kei forms of simple verbs appear in constructions such as inceptive
and desiderative constructions.

(56) a. INCEPTIVE
    Tarou-wa hon-o        YOM-I-hazine-ta.

13 In some constructions where the aspectual property of the predicate is altered, the derivation of such
constructions is restricted by the Affectedness Condition. For more details, see Ohta and Sung 1993.
-top. book-acc. read-I-start-past
'Taro started to read a book.'

b. DESIDERATIVE
Hanako-wa hon-ga/o KA-I-ta-i-to omot-ta.
-top. book-nom./acc. buy-I-want-pres.-quot. think-past
'Hanako wanted to buy a book.'

As the examples in (56) show, the renyoo-kei forms in both (54) and (55) can occur in complex predicates. This suggests that the simplex renyoo-kei form is positively specified for the [V] feature in these cases. Cases in (54) where renyoo-kei nominal is allowed are assumed to undergo a process of nominalization in the lexicon, as discussed in Chapter 3.14

As shown in Chapter 2, complex renyoo-kei forms, on the other hand, are placed in three different classifications with respect to nominal/verbal alternation: one class consists of complex renyoo-kei where both verbal and nominal forms are permissible, another class consists of complex renyoo-kei which do not function as verbs, and the third class is comprised of complex renyoo-kei which lack nominal use. (57)-(59) are examples of the renyoo-kei of complex verbs and their lexical specifications for eventive renyoo-kei nominals.

(57) [+V, aN] RENYOO-KEI
    PRESENT TENSE
    tor-i-simar-u 'to control'
    mot-i-kom-u 'to bring in'
    kas-i-das-u 'to lend'
    RENYOO-KEI NOMINAL
    TOR-I-SIMAR-I 'control, supervision'
    MOT-I-KOM-I 'carrying in'
    KAS-I-DAS-I 'lending service'

(58) [-V, aN] RENYOO-KEI
    PRESENT TENSE
    *ku-i-nige-ru
    *os-i-ur-u
    *tat-i-yom-u
    RENYOO-KEI NOMINAL
    KU-I-NIGE 'balking'
    OS-I-UR-I 'a hard sell'
    TAT-I-YOM-I 'reading while standing'

(59) [+V, -N] RENYOO-KEI
    PRESENT TENSE
    aruk-i-mawar-u 'to walk around'
    sikar-i-tuke-ru 'to scold harshly'
    tob-i-agar-u 'to jump up'
    RENYOO-KEI NOMINAL
    *ARUK-I-MAWAR-I
    *SIKAR-I-TUKE
    *TOB-I-AGAR-I

14 'There are some morphologically simplex but semantically complex event nominals such as atuka-i 'dealing, handling', hodokos-i 'giving a charity', korasime 'punishment', and aruso-i 'fight' (cf. Tsujimura 1992). Since these renyoo-kei nominals behave identical to morphologically complex renyoo-kei nominals, I assume these have the lexical entry identical to complex renyoo-kei.
When a complex verb has a corresponding verbal counterpart, its renyoo-kei can form complex predicates, as in (60) and (62), but when a corresponding verbal counterpart does not exist, a renyoo-kei form may not participate in a complex predicate, as in (61).

(60) a. Keesatu-wa mayaku-o TORI-SIMARI-hazime-ta.
   police-top. narcotics-acc. control-start-past
   'The police started controlling narcotics.'

      police-top. narcotics-acc. control-want-pres.-quot. think-TE-exist-pres.
      'The police want to control narcotics.'

      student-pl.-nom. book-acc. stand=read-start-past
      'Students started reading books while standing.'

   b. *Binboo-gakusee-wa itumo KUI-NIGE-ta-i-to omot-te-i-ta.
      poor-students-top. always bilking.want-pres.-quot. think-TE exist-past
      'Poor students always wanted to eat without paying.'

      mother-pl.-top. all=at.once child-acc. scold=harshly-start-past
      'Mothers started scolding their children harshly all at once.'

   b. Otona-tati-wa sono kodomo-o itumo SIKARI-TUKE-ta-i-to
      grownup-pl.-top. that child-acc. always scold=harshly-want-pres.-quot.
      omot-te i-ta.
      think-TE exist-past
      'Grownups always wanted to scold that child harshly.'

The fact that the verbs in (58) do not form complex predicates suggests that this class of verb lacks the [+V] feature since application of V-raising is subject to a condition which requires the feature matching. Nonetheless, the renyoo-kei form of these verbs can function in the same manner as a verb with respect to Case marking as shown in (2), repeated here as (63) for convenience.

(63) a. Gakusei-tati-ga honya-de hon-o TATI-YOMI-tyuu-ni, sono
      student-pl.-nom. bookstore-at book-acc. stand-read-while-at that
      ziken-ga oki-ta.
      incident-nom. occur-past
      'While students were reading books (for free) at the bookstore, that incident occurred.'

   b. Sensei-ga hon-o o-TATI-YOMI-ni nat-ta.
      'The professor read the book.'

In the examples in (63), the complex renyoo-kei form assigns verbal Cases to its arguments. Hence, the subject gets nominative Case and the object is marked in the
accusative. In the nominal clause construction in (63a), the renyoo-kei is governed by the aspectual nominal -tyuu 'while' and in the subject honorification construction, it is governed by the verb na-ru 'to become'. The structure of the nominal clause construction in (63a) can be roughly represented as follows:

\[
\text{AspP} \\
\text{Asp'} \\
\text{FP} \\
\text{Gakusei-tati honya hon tati-yomi -tyuu}
\]

Assuming that an aspectual element has the feature \([-N]\) as an inflectional element, this feature is given to the head of FP in the process of percolation under the government relation. In (63a), the underspecified \([\alpha,N]\) feature of the renyoo-kei nominal tati-yomi ‘(lit.) reading-standing’ is assigned a negative value through this process. Consequently, verbal Case marking of the arguments of this renyoo-kei takes place, deriving the sentence in (63a).

The example in (63a) has a variant in which the argument of the renyoo-kei is marked in the genitive. Consider the example in (65).

\[
\text{Gakusei-tati-no honya-de-no hon-no TATTI-YOMI-tyuu-ni, ... student-pl.-gen. bookstore-at-gen. book-gen. stand-read-while-at 'While students were reading books (for free) at the bookstore, ...'
}\]

The examples in (66) show that the head of an aspectual nominal is lexically \([+N]\), as evidenced by the fact that a nominal clause headed by an aspectual nominal can occur in the Case-position.

\[
\text{(66) a. Koosokudooro-o/no UNTEN-tyuu-ni inemuri-unten-o si-te highway-acc./gen. drive-while-nom. sleep-drive-acc. do-TE simat-ta, end-up-past 'I ended up falling asleep while driving on the highway.'}
\]

---

15 For the government relation between the renyoo-kei and the verb na-ru, see Chapter 5.
16 I classify aspectual nominal suffixes such as -tyuu 'while', -go 'after' and -no sai 'when' as the head of AspP for their semantic function. Syntactically, the aspectual nominal suffixes are nominal but since they function as a type of temporal marker, I use this terminology to distinguish them from other nominals such as NPs and DPs.
b. Yamada-sensyu-no/ga RENSYUU-tyuu-o otozure-ta.
   -athlete-gen./nom. training-while-acc. visit-past

   'During the interval when Yamada was training, we visited him.'

In the examples in (66), the nominal clauses headed by -tyuu 'while' can be Case-marked, indicating that these clauses are in Case position. Since the head of a nominal clause can occur in Case position, it must be [+N].

Returning to the example in (65), genitive marking on the arguments of the renyoo-kei is due to the [+N] feature assigned by the head of AspP. Namely, the [+N] feature of the head of AspP is given to the head of FP in the process of percolation, triggering nominal Case marking.

The same analysis holds for the renyoo-kei forms in (57) and (59). Recall that the renyoo-kei in (57) can function as renyoo-kei nominals, while those in (59) cannot. This difference is attributed to their lexical entry. Namely, the former has an underspecified feature [α N] whereas the latter lacks this lexical entries. Then it is expected that when occurring in a nominal clause, only the former allows both verbal and nominal Case assignments while the latter does not. This prediction is borne out by the contrast in the examples in (67a) and (67b).

(67)  a. Keisatu-ga/no mayaku-o/no TORI-SIMARI-tyuu-ni, ...
       police-nom./gen. narcotics-acc./gen. control-while-at

       'While the police are controlling narcotics, …'

   b. Hahaoya-ga/*no kodomo-o/*no SIKARI-TUKE-no-sai-ni, ...
      mother-nom./*gen. child-acc./*gen. scold-attach-gen.-when-at

      'When the mother is scolding the child, …'

In the example in (67b), nominal Case marking (i.e. genitive) is not permitted, while both verbal and nominal Case markings are possible in (67a). The impossibility of nominal Case marking in (67b) is due to the lack of the underspecified [α N] feature.

In this connection, let's consider clauses headed by -nagara 'while'. Nagara-clauses require a renyoo-kei form of verb in the predicate position, as the example in (68) show. In this sense, the nagara-clause resembles the nominal clause construction.17

(68)   Taroo-wa hon-o YOMI-nagara, razio-o kii-ta.
       -top. book-acc. read-while radio-acc. listen-past

       'While reading a book, Taro listened to the radio.'

However, renyoo-kei forms lacking the [+V] feature may not occur in this position. Furthermore, Sino-Japanese VNs are also excluded in the predicate position of -nagara clauses. Consider the examples in (69).

---

17 Note that contrary to the nominal clause construction, there is no prosodic condition in the nagara-clause.
The sentences in (69) become grammatical when the renyou-kei form of the light verb *su(-ru) 'to do' is attached to the nominals in the predicate position.

This fact shows that the nagara-clause allows only a [+V] element in the predicate position. Now, consider the examples in (71), where the renyou-kei forms have a [+V] lexical entry. In this case, the renyou-kei can occur in the predicate position without the light verb. As the contrast between (71a) and (71b) shows, no genitive marking on the argument of the renyou-kei is permitted.

The impossibility of nominal Case marking in the example in (71b) can be accounted for by assuming the recategorization of the renyou-kei form. Contrary to the nominal clause, let's assume that the head of clause, nagara 'while', lacks [+N] feature. Then, the underspecified feature [α N] of the renyou-kei form in (71b) is given only a negative value by the governing head. Since no [+N] feature is assigned to the renyou-kei, nominal Case marking is disallowed. This assumption is borne out by the fact that nagara 'while' may not occur in the Case-position as exemplified by the example in (72).
   -top. that -acc. write-copy-while-at that fact-at notice-past
   'Taro noticed the fact while copying the memo by hand.'

      student-pl.-top. study-do-while-acc. visit-past
   'During the time when the students were studying, we visited them.'

The ungrammaticality of the examples in (69) is explained by assuming that the
[+V] feature is required for head-movement. Assuming that the head of the clause -nagara
is a [+V] lexical item, the lexical item without [+V] may not be subject to movement to
form a word. Since the renyoo-kei and Sino-Japanese VN in these cases do not have the
[+V] feature, the sentence is ruled ungrammatical.

3. FURTHER SUPPORT FOR RECATEGORIZATION

In this section, I discuss how recategorization of renyoo-kei takes place in other
constructions. First, I examine complex predicates such as inceptive and desiderative
constructions. Then, occurrences of renyoo-kei in Ni-purpose clauses (cf. Saiki 1987) and
in VP-preposing (cf. Yoshida 1991) are examined. In all, results indicate that assuming
recategorization for renyoo-kei provides a simple and principled account for the
occurrences of the renyoo-kei in these constructions.

3. 1. COMPLEX PREDICATES

One of the most frequent occurrences of renyoo-kei is in aspectual complex
predicates such as the inchoative, terminative, and sustentive constructions.18 These
complex predicates are formed with the renyoo-kei form of the verb and an aspectual verb
such as hazime-ru 'to start', owar-u 'to finish', and tudek-ru 'to continue' as exemplified
by the following examples.

(73) a. Taroo-ga hon-o YOM-I-hazime-ta.
   -nom. book-acc. read-I-start-past
   'Taro started reading a book.'

      -nom. letter-acc. write-I-finish-past
   'Hanako finished writing a letter.'

   c. Ziroo-ga uta-o UTA-I-tuzuke-ta.
      -nom. song-acc. sing-I-continue-past
   'Jiro continued to sing songs.'

   Note that the direct object of the embedded verb is marked in the accusative,
   irrespective of the nature of the aspectual verb. For instance, the aspectual verb in (73b)
   is unaccusative as the examples in (74) show.

---

18 This terminology is from Soga 1983.
(74)  a.  Kurasu-ga gozi-ni owat-ta.
class-nom. five=0'clock-at finish-past
'The class ended at five.'

b.  *Kurasu-o gozi-ni owat-ta.
class-acc. five=0'clock-at finish-past

c.  Kurasu-o gozi-ni oe-ta.
class-acc. five=0'clock finish-past
'I finished the class at five.'

As the contrast between (74a) and (74b) shows, the theme NP kurasu 'class' must occur as
the subject with the verb owar(-u) 'to finish'. *Owar(-u)'s transitive counterpart oe(-ru)
must be used when the theme NP appears as the direct object.

In (73b), the direct object of the embedded verb is marked in the accusative. It is
plausible to assume that accusative Case is assigned by the embedded verb kak(-u) 'to
write' because the aspectual verb is unaccusative. This fact indicates that the embedded
renyoo-kei functions as a verb (or having the [+V] feature) which is assumed to be the
condition necessary for the head-movement to proceed (cf. Dubinsky 1994).

The following examples involving complex renyoo-kei support the assumption that
the embedded verb must have the [+V] feature identical to the matrix verb. Consider the
following examples.

(75)  a.  Biru-o TORI-KOWASI-hazime-ta.
buiding-acc. take-break-start-past
'They started demolishing the building.'

buiding-acc. take-break-do-start-past

(76)  a.  *Hon-o TATI-YOMI-hazime-ta.
book-acc. stand-read-start-past
'I started reading while standing.'

b.  Hon-o TATI-YOMI-si-hazime-ta.
book-acc. stand-read-do-start-past

Recall that the inflected verb form of the renyoo-kei in (75a) is tori-kowasi(-u), while the
renyoo-kei form in (76a) does not inflect and consequently, must take a periphrastic form
with the light verb su-ru 'to do'. As I have assumed above, this difference is directly
related to the lexical category of these renyoo-kei. Thus, the renyoo-kei in (75a) is [+V]
whereas the one in (76) is not. Since the renyoo-kei tori-kowasi 'tearing down' has the
[+V] feature that matches with the feature of the aspectual verb [+V], head-movement is
permitted.

On the other hand, when the complex renyoo-kei in (76), tati-yomi 'lit. standing
reading' occurs in an aspectual complex predicate, it must be followed by the light verb
su-ru so that the head of the complex tati-yomi-su-ru 'to read while standing' has the [+V]
feature. This option is also available for the complex renyoo-kei in (75) as exemplified in
(75b). In this case, I assume that the light verb su(-ru) provides the [+V] feature enabling
head-movement.

Returning to the lexical feature [±N], the behavior of complex renyoo-kei in
complex predicates such as in (75)-(76) suggests that the lexical feature [N] is
underspecified for complex renyoo-kei. First, aspectual verbs do not allow nominal and verbal alternation. These verbs may undergo a non-productive morphological process and may occur as a part of some result nominals. Consider the following examples.

(77) a. (*hon-no) KAKI-HAZIME
    book-gen. write-start(-∅) 'beginning of a written material'

b. (*piano-no) NARAI-HAZIME
    piano-gen. learn-start(-∅) 'beginning of learning'

c. (*zassi-no) YOMI-OWAR-I
    magazine-gen. read-finish-I 'end of reading'

(78) a. *NE-HAZIME
    sleep-start(-∅) 'beginning of sleeping'

b. *MI-HAZIME
    see-start(-∅) 'beginning of seeing'

(79) a. UTAI-HAZIME-wa yuukuri-dat-ta-ga, UTAI-OWARI-wa hayaku
    sing-start-top. slow-copula-past-but sing-end-top. quickly
    nat-ta.
    become-past
    'The beginning of the song was slow but the ending got quick.'

b. NARAI-HAZIME-ni kiso-o sikkari mi-ni tuke-sase-rare-ta.
    learn-start-at fundamentals-acq. firmly body-to attach-caus.-pass.-past
    'I was made to master the basics at the beginning (of learning it).'</n
The renyoo-kei in a complex predicate may not accompany its argument as shown in (77), suggesting that these nominals function either as result nominals or simplex event nominals but not as complex event nominals. Furthermore, some complex predicates may not allow

---

19 As far as I know, it is not possible to use the sustentive aspectual verb tuduke(-ru) 'to continue' in result nominal formation. For instance, result nominals such as the following are all ungrammatical:

?*hataraki-tuzuke 'continuous working', ?*warai-tuduke 'continuous laughing', and ?*yomi-tuduke
'continuous reading.'

20 There are some apparent counter-examples to this statement involving the aspectual verb -das(-u). This verb has the inherent meaning of 'to push out', 'to produce' and in its aspectual use it means 'to (suddenly) start'. Consider the following examples.

(i) Kodomo-no TOBI-DASI-ni tuuni si-ro.
    child-gen jump-DASU-to caution do-imp.
    'Watch out for children jumping out (onto the traffic).'</n
(ii) Tegami-no KAKI-DASI-wa itumo kimat-te i-ru.
    letter-gen. write-DASU-top. always decide-TE exist-pres.
    'The beginning of a letter is always the same.'

In the example in (i), the verb -dasu is not aspectual. Instead, this verb expresses its inherent meaning of coming out. The same verb in the example in (ii) is, however, aspectual but the compound kaki-dasi 'lit. write-start' does not refer to an event of starting to write. It denotes the beginning part of a letter.
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renyoo-kei nominal forms as shown in (78). The examples in (79) show that these complex renyoo-kei nominals can occur in the argument position.

The fact that the renyoo-kei form of an aspectual complex verb may not function as a complex event nominal suggests that renyoo-kei nominal of this type are derived in the lexicon. Note that the head of a complex verb is the aspectual verb. Lack of the properties of complex event nominals can be ascribed to lack of the underspecified feature [α N] on the head of this complex. This in turn means that the aspectual verb is not underspecified. This is not surprising since the aspectual verb is not morphologically complex. As observed above, most morphologically simplex verbs lack this feature.

Now, compare the sentences in (77)-(79) with the renyoo-kei nominal form of the complex predicates in (75) and (76). The renyoo-kei forms of (75)-(76) also may not occur as complex event nominals, as evidenced by their inability to accompany the argument structure.

(80) a. *Biru-no TORI-KOWASI-(si)-hazime building-gen. take-break-(do-)start(-Ø)
   '(intended) The beginning of demolishing a building'

b. *Hon-no TATI-YOMI-(si)-hazime book-gen. stand-read-(do-)start(-Ø)
   '(intended) The beginning of reading a book for free'

The ungrammaticality of the examples in (80) is once again accounted for by assuming that the head of the entire complex, i.e. the aspectual verb, lacks the underspecified feature [α N]. Since the head lacks this feature, the entire complex must be interpreted either as a result nominal or as a simplex event nominal, which may not accompany the argument structure of the embedded verb. As shown above in connection to the examples in (78), result nominal formation and simplex event nominal formation are lexically controlled. As far as I know, renyoo-kei of this type may not occur either as a result nominal or as a simplex event nominal.21

Assuming the recategorization analysis of the renyoo-kei form, lack of complex renyoo-kei nominals among aspectual complex predicates is accounted for in a simple and principled way. Aspectual verbs are not underspecified for the [N] feature. This means that the lexical entries of aspectual verbs are assumed to be represented as in (81).

(81) a. [+N] b. [−N]

21 Even though the verb kappara-‘u ‘to rob, to snatch’ is not morphologically complex, it has more than three moras, satisfying the prosodic condition for morphologically simplex complex renyoo-kei nominals. The renyoo-kei of complex verbs involving this verb appear to function as result or simplex event nominals.

(i) (*saifi-no) kapparai-hazime wallet-gen. rob-start(-Ø)  'beginning of robbing'

(ii) Kapparai-hazime-no koro-wa, nankai-mo sippai-si-ta.
    rob-start-gen. time-top. many=times-even failure-do-past
    'When I started to rob, I failed many times.'

But this type of complex renyoo-kei nominal appears to be extremely rare.
The lexical entry in (81a) is relevant to the lexical process of result or simplex nominal formation. Since aspectual verbs occur as a part of complex verbs as in (73), the one in (81b) is also necessary.

As discussed above, morphologically complex renyoo-kei have the underspecified feature [α N]. When occurring as the first element of a complex verb, the value of α is determined by the lexical features of the aspectual verb which governs it. Since the aspectual verb has a negative value for the feature [N], the entire complex receives a negative value for this feature. Failure to assign a positive value to the feature [N] results in the unavailability of complex event nominals of this type.

3. 2. Ni-Purpose Clauses

The re categorization analysis of the renyoo-kei form also provides a simple and principle account for occurrences of renyoo-kei in the Ni-purpose clause construction (cf. Saiki 1987 who refers to this construction as "Subcategorized Purpose Clause"). When a purpose clause occurs with a directional/motion verb such as ik(-u) 'to go', ku(-ru) 'to come', kaer(-u) 'to return', and tati-yor(-u) 'to drop by', the purpose clause can be marked by the dative marker -ni.\(^{22}\) If the predicate consists of a native Japanese verb, the predicate of the purpose clause can be the renyoo-kei form; otherwise, the predicate must be a Sino-Japanese VN. Note that the embedded verb cannot be tensed.

(82) a. Hanako-wa [hon-o KA-I]-ni Tookyo-e it-ta.
   -top. book-acc. buy-I-for Tokyo-to go-past
   'Hanako went to Tokyo for the purpose of buying books'

b. Garasuya-ga [kowareta madogarasu-o TORI-KAE]-ni ki-ta.
   glass=shop-nom. broken window=glass-acc. take-change-for come-past
   'A glass repairman came to replace the broken glass.'

c. Ziroo-wa [hon-o TATI-YOM-I]-ni honya-e tati-yot-ta.
   -top. book-acc. stand-read-I-for bookstore-to stand-come=by-past
   'Ziroo dropped into a bookstore to read a book for free.'

(83) a. Taroo-wa [eigo-o BENKYOO]-ni Amerika-e ki-ta.
   -top. English-acc. study-to come-past
   'Taro came to the US to study English.'

b. Hanako-ga [hoogen-o TYOOSA]-ni nanbu-e it-ta.
   -nom. dialect-acc. research-for south-to go-past
   'Hanako went to the South to research the dialect.'

In this construction, the direct object of the renyoo-kei form of the verb can be marked in the genitive as well as in the accusative when the renyoo-kei is morphologically

\(^{22}\) Otherwise, purpose clauses are marked by the nominal expression tame-ni 'for the sake of'. Note that this type of purpose clause has a structure identical to a relative clause as in (i).

(i) Nihon-e ik-u tame-ni hon-o kat-ta.
   Japan-to go-pres. sake-for book-acc. buy-past
   'For the purpose of going to Japan, I bought a book.'
complex as shown in (84). The same holds for the cases where a Sino-Japanese VN occupies the predicate position of the purpose clause as in (85).

(84) a. Garasuya-ga [kowareta madogarasu-no TORI-KAE]-ni ki-ta.
glass=shop-nom. broken window=glass-gen. take-change-for come-past
   'A glass repairman came to replace the broken glass.'

b. Ziroo-wa [hon-no TATT-YOM]-ni honya-e tati-yot-ta.
   -top. book-gen. stand-read-I-for bookstore-to stand-come=by-past
   'Ziro dropped into a bookstore to read a book for free.'

(85) a. Taroo-wa [eigo-no BENKYOO]-ni Amerika-e ki-ta.
   -top. English-gen. study-to -to come-past
   'Taro came to the US to study English.'

b. Hanako-ga [hoogen-no TYOOSA]-ni nanbu-e it-ta.
   -nom. dialect-gen. research-for south-to go-past
   'Hanako went to the South to research the dialect.'

Given the underspecification analysis for morphologically complex renyoo-kei, the accusative/genitive alternation of the direct object in the purpose clause in (84) follows from the positive or negative value assigned to the underspecified lexical feature [α N]. Assuming that the dative marker -ni attached to the purpose clause projects a P(ostpositional)P, accusative/Case assignment to the argument of renyoo-kei results from the assignment of a negative value to the underspecified feature [N] from the head of PP which is assumed to be [+V, −N].

Genitive marking of the argument of the renyoo-kei, on the other hand, is carried out in the following manner: since only a [+N] element can receive Case, the underspecified feature [N] of the renyoo-kei suffix which is the head of FP is given a positive value. Consequently, the entire renyoo-kei is recategorized as nominal with genitive Case thus being assigned to its argument. The recategorization of renyoo-kei motivated by Case-theoretic reasons is not unusual considering the case such as (86).

   -top. that building-gen. take-break-I-acc. start-past
   'Taro attempted to tear down the building.'

b. Hanako-wa kyonen-mo eigo-no BENKYOO-o kokoromi-ta.
   -top. last=year-also English-gen. study-acc. attempt-acc.
   'Hanako tried to study English last year, too.'

23 In this respect, the dative marker -ni in this construction similar to English for in that English for can take a verbal element in its complement as in (i) as well as a nominal element as in (ii).

(i) For not having eaten for a long time, John's health has been considerably deteriorated.

(ii) For their students, professors made every effort possible.
In the examples in (86), the direct object of the renyou-kei nominal in (86a) and the Sino-Japanese VN in (86b) are marked in the genitive. The genitive marking in these examples is due to the positive value assigned to the underspecified feature [α N] of the renyou-kei (or Sino-Japanese VN\(^{24}\)) for Case reasons. For example, in (86a), the verb *kokoromi-ru* 'attempt' has Case to discharge as a transitive verb. Because Case is assigned to a noun, in order to discharge the accusative Case, the renyou-kei in the argument position needs to be nominal. Due to this Case-theoretic requirement, a positive value is assigned to the underspecified feature [N], allowing Case to be discharged.

For the sake of argument, suppose a negative value were assigned to the underspecified feature [α N] of the renyou-kei under the government relation between the renyou-kei suffix and the verb *kokoromi(-ru)* 'attempt'. Then, the FP headed by the renyou-kei in the object position would be interpreted as verbal, assigning the accusative Case to its own argument biru 'building'. Furthermore, since the FP in the direct object position is verbal, no Case would be assigned to it (cf. the Case resistance principle Stowell 1981). The sentence derived through this process is shown in (87).

(87)    *Taroo-wa sono biru-o TORI-KOWAS-I dokoromi-ta.
        -top. that building-acc. take-break-I attempt-past

'Taro attempted to tear down the building.'

Because the matrix verb *kokoromi(-ru)* cannot form a complex predicate with the embedded verb,\(^{25}\) the argument of this verb is Caseless with no θ-role assigned. This results in violation of the θ-Criterion.

In contrast, when a morphologically simplex renyou-kei appears in the predicate position of the purpose clause, no genitive marking is allowed as the ungrammaticality of the examples in (88) shows.

(88) a.  *Hanako-wa [hon-no KA-1]-ni Tookyou-e it-ta.
       -top. book-gen. buy-I-for Tokyo-to go-past

' Hanako went to Tokyo for the purpose of buying books'

b.  *Taroo-wa [sain-no MORA-1]-ni modot-te ki-ta.
       -top. autograph-gen. receive-I-for return-TE come-past

'Taro returned for the purpose of getting an autograph.'

There is a straightforward account for the impossibility of the genitive marking in (88). Since morphologically simplex verbs lack the underspecified feature [N], no recategorization takes place. Hence, the renyou-kei in (88) is considered to be [−N], not allowing nominal Case marking on the argument.

3. 3. VP PREPOSING

The renyou-kei form of the verb appears when the verb and its argument are placed in a focus position. The focus position is marked by a focus markers such as the topic marker-*wa*, -*sae* 'even', -*mo* 'also', and -*made* 'as far as'. The predicate position where

\(^{24}\) For details about Sino-Japanese VNs, see section 5 below.

\(^{25}\) Complex predicate formation is restricted to aspectual verbs.
the tense marker occurs is occupied by the pro-verb su-ru 'to do'. This construction is identified as VP-preposing (Yoshida 1991). Consider the following examples.

(89) a. Taroo-wa [nihon-de hon-o KA-1]-wa si-ta-ga, mada yon-de
i-na-i.
exist-neg.-pres.

'(lit.) As for the act of buying books, Taroo did it in Japan, he hasn't read them yet.'
'It is true that Taro bought a book in Japan but he hasn't read it yet.'

b. Ikura [kirat-te i-te-mo, tuma-o KOROS-1]-made su-ru
however hate-TE exist-TE-even wife-acc. kill-I-as=|far=as do-pres.
koto-wa na-i-to omo-u.
fact-top. neg.-I-quot. think-pres.

'(lit.) No matter how much he hates his wife, to go as far as the act of
killing her, I think there is no need to do it.'
'No matter how much he hates her, I think he shouldn't go as far as to kill
his wife.'

c. Hanako-wa [Amerika-e IK-1]-sae si-tagara-na-i.
-top. -to go-I-even do-appear=to=want-neg.-pres.

'(lit.) Even going to the US, Hanako does not want to do.'
' Hanako does not want even to go to the US.'

In the examples in (89), the verb in the focus position is in the renyoo-kei form (as indicated by the -i suffix) followed by a focus marker (-wa, -made, and -sae). The predicate position is occupied by the pro-verb su-ru which is affixed by a Tense marker. Following Yoshida 1991, I assume that the verb is "preposed" along with its argument. The arguments of the "preposed" verb must be also preposed as the ungrammaticality of the following examples shows.

(90) a. *Taroo-wa [KA-1]-wa nihon-de hon-o si-ta-ga, ...

b. *...koros-i-made tuma-o su-ru koto-wa na-i-to omo-u.
kill-I-as=|far=as wife-acc. do-pres. fact-top. neg.-I-quot. think-pres.

c. *Hanako-wa [ik-1]-sae Amerika-e si-tagara-na-i.
-top. go-I-even -to do-appear=to=want-neg.-pres.

It appears that the preposed argument and verb can occur in front of the subject or the topic of the sentence although the acceptability is slightly lower than in cases where the subject or the topic phrase occur in front of the preposed elements. When the subject is marked in the nominative, it receives the focus reading, which is equivalent to the clefted element in English.

(91) a. (Nihon-de hon-o KA-1]-wa Taroo-wa/-ga si-ta-ga, ...
Japan-in book-acc. buy-I-top. -top/-nom. do-past-but yet

'It is true that Taro bought a book in Japan but ...'
b. (?)[Amerika-e 1k-1]-sae Hanako-wa/-ga si-tagara-na-i.
       -to go-I-even -top/-nom. do-appear=to=want-neg.-pres.

'Hanako does not want even to go to the US.'

Since the renyoo-kei occurs in the preposed phrase independent of the tense marker, let's assume that preposing affects FP, not IP or VP. In this sense, preposing involved in (89) should be called FP-Preposing, but for simplicity I will continue to refer to this type of preposing as VP-Preposing. The derivation of the example in (89a) proceeds as illustrated in (92).

(92) a. [Focus P Ø [IP Taroo [FP nihon-de hon-o ka-i] -ta]]-ga,...

b. [Focus P [FP nihon-de hon-o ka-i] [IP Taroo [TI t1 -ta]]-ga,...

The pro-verb su-ru 'to do' is inserted in the position vacated by the preposed FP in the head position of IP to realize Tense as an instance of DO-support in Japanese.26 The VP-Preposing construction can be formed with morphologically complex renyoo-kei and Sino-Japanese VN as exemplified in (93)-(94).27

(93) a. Sono toyoukan-wa hon-o KASI-DASI-sae si-te i-na-i.
       that library-top. book-acc. lend-push=even do-TE exist-neg.-pres.

'That library doesn't even loan books.'

b. Gakusei-ta7i-wa hon-o TATI-YOMI-made si-ta.
       student-pl-top. book-acc. stand-read-as=far=as do-past

'Students did so far as to read books for free.'

---

26 Cho 1994 argues against the DO-support analysis in favor of the Light Verb DO analysis based on the VP-Deletion cases. He argues that the pro-verb su-ru is base-generated in this position and in non-focus sentences is phonologically merged to the stem. He also notes that "VP-Preposing" cases can be accounted for equally by both the DO-support analysis and the Light Verb analysis. I assume that when a syntactic operation applies leaving a tense element behind, the pro-verb su-ru is inserted as an instance of DO-support. On the other hand, when the entire verb complex including the tense element is affected by a syntactic operation, no DO-support is triggered. For instance, the following sentence is derived by applying deletion of the complex consisting of the verb stem+tense.

(i) Taroo-ga nihongo-o Ø, sosite Mary-ga ce-go o hanas-i-ta.

'Taro spoke Japanese, and Mary, English.'

In (i), gapping is applied to delete the entire verbal complex, leaving no tense element behind. In contrast, substituting the VP by soo 'so' triggers DO-support as in (ii).

(ii) Taroo-ga Amerika-e 1k-1, shihanatu noti-ni, Hanako-mo soo-s-i-ta.
       -nom. -to go-I while later-in -also so-do-I-past

'Taro went to the US and after a while, Hanako did so, too.'

Hence, it is plausible to assume that the occurrence of the pro-verb su(-ru) in the VP-Preposing construction is an instance of DO-support which is applied when a tense element is left behind by a syntactic operation.

27 For the analysis of Sino-Japanese VN in this construction, see section 5.
c. Sono hahaoya-wa kodomo-o SIKARI-TUKE-mo si-nakat-ta. 
that mother-top. child-acc. scold-attach-even do-neg.-past
'The mother didn't even scold their child.'

(94) a. Keisatsu-wa yoogisya-o TAHJO-made si-ta-ga, kenzikyoku-wa 
police-top. suspect-acc. arrest-as=far=as do-past-but DA’s=office-top.
kiso-wa si-nakat-ta. 
prosecution-top. do-neg.-past
'The police did so far as to arrest the suspect but the DA’s office didn’t 
prosecuted him/her.'

b. Sono otoko-wa nihongo-o RIKAI-wa si-ta-ga, hans-i-wa 
si-nakat-ta. 
do-neg.-past
'The man did understand Japanese but didn’t speak it.'

The direct object of the renyoo-kei in (93) can be marked in the genitive if the 
renyoo-kei is the type which is assumed to have an [α N] lexical feature. Thus, the 
sentence in (93c) does not allow genitive marking on the argument since the renyoo-kei 
does not allow nominal and verbal alternation (cf. Chapter 2). Consider the example in 
(95).

(95) a. Sono tosyokan-wa hon-no KASI-DASI-sae si-te i-na-i. 
that library-top. book-gen. lend-push=out-even do-TE exist-neg.-pres.
'That library doesn’t even loan books.'

b. Gakusei-tati-wa hon-no TATTI-YOMI-made si-ta. 
student-pl.-top. book-gen. stand-read-as=far=as do-past
'Students did so far as to read books for free.'

c. Hanako-wa gekizyou-e-no tabemono-no MOTI-KOMI-sae si-ta. 
-top. theater-to-gen. food-gen. carry-in-even do-past
'Hanako even carried food inside the theater.'

d. *Sono hahaya-wa kodomo-no SIKARI-TUKE-mo si-nakat-ta. 
that mother-top. child-gen. scold-attach-even do-neg.-past
'The mother didn’t even scold her child.'

The arguments of the renyoo-kei in (95a-c) can be marked in the genitive since the renyoo-kei 
can function either as a nominal as a verbal. In contrast, the renyoo-kei in (95d) does 
not function as a nominal. Hence, genitive marking for the argument is not allowed.
The same applies to morphologically simplex renyoo-kei. Since morphologically 
simplex renyoo-kei are assumed not to have the underspecified feature [α N], the argument 
of the renyoo-kei may not get genitive marking. Compare the examples in (96) with those 
in (89).
(96) a. *Taro-wa nihon-de-no hon-no KA-I-wa si-ta-ga, ...

'It is true that Taro bought a book in Japan but he hasn’t read it yet.'

b. *Ikura kirat-te i-te-mo, uma-no KOROS-I-made su-ru
however hate-TE exist-TE-even wife-gen. kill-I-as=far-as do-pres.
koto-wa na-i-to omo-u.
fact-top. neg.-I-quotation think-pres.

'No matter how much he hates her, I think he shouldn’t go as far as to kill
his wife.'

top. -to-gen. go-I-even do-appear=to want-neg.-do-pres.

'Hanako does not want even to go to the US.'

(95d) and (96) are ungrammatical because the (unincorporated) periphrastic verb in
the form of (97) is not available for the verbs in these sentences.

(97) Subject-wa/ga [(Place-e/de-no) Object-no Renyoo-kei]-o su-ru.

As observed in Chapter 2, the class of verb involved in the sentences in (95d) may not
allow the periphrastic form as shown in (98).

child-gen. scold-attach-acc. do-pres. 'to scold children harshly'

b. *mati-no ARUKI-MAWARI-o su-ru.
town-gen. walk-go=around-acc. do-pres. 'to walk around the city'

Furthermore, the renyoo-kei of morphologically simplex verbs may not appear in
periphrastic verb form as shown in (99).

(99) PRESENT TENSE FORM  RENYOO-KEI  PERIPHRASTIC FORM  GLOSS
a. ka-u  KA-I  *ka-i(-o) su-ru  to buy
b. yom-u  YOM-I  *yom-i(-o) su-ru  to read
c. tabe-ru  TABE-Ø  *tabe(-o) su-ru  to eat
d. mi-ru  MI-Ø  *mi(-o) su-ru  to see

The assumption that there is a correlation between availability of periphrastic verb
form and the possibility of genitive marking of arguments in the VP-Preposing construction
is supported by the cases involving Sino-Japanese VNs. Uchida and Nakayama 1993
point out that Sino-Japanese VNs denoting Achievement and State in the sense of Vendler
1967 may not occur in the form of unincorporated periphrastic verbs. This means that
Sino-Japanese VNs denoting Achievement in (100) and State in (101) cannot cooccur with
the accusative marker.28

28 The examples in (100)-(101) are cited from Miyagawa 1994. Note also that judgments listed here are
Uchida and Nakayama’s 1993 and that judgments vary among native speakers.
In contrast, Sino-Japanese VNs denoting Accomplishment as in (102) and Activity as in (103) may allow accusative marking on Sino-Japanese VNs.

Now, genitive marking of arguments in the VP-Preposing construction is possible only when the unincorporated periphrastic form is available. Compare the examples in (104) and (105). 29

??Sono mati-no SENGYO-wa si-ta-ga, ... that town-gen. occupation-top. do-past-but 'It is true that they occupied the town, but ...'

29 As stated in the previous footnote, judgments of the examples in (100)-(101) vary among native speakers. For instance, among the list in (100)-(101), hakken-o su-ru 'to discover', rikai-o su-ru 'to understand', and hansei-o su-ru 'to reflect' are accepted by some native speakers. For these speakers, when an unincorporated periphrastic form is accepted, corresponding VP-Preposing sentence is also accepted. The judgments in (104) and (105) are mine and the acceptability of these sentences reflects my judgment of unincorporated form. This fact supports my analysis that when an unincorporated form does not exist, no VP-Preposing is allowed.
b. *?Nihongo-no RIKAI-wa si-ta-ga, ...
   Japanese-gen. comprehension-top. do-past-but
   'It is true that they understood Japanese, but …'

c. *Kono kuruma-no AIYOO-wa si-ta-ga, ...
   this car-gen. use=regularly-top. do-past-but
   'It is true that I used this car regularly, but …'

(105) a. Gengogaku-no KENKYUU-wa si-ta-ga, ...
   linguistics-gen. research-top. do-past-but
   'It is true that I did research in linguistics, but …'

b. Heya-no SOOZI-wa si-ta-ga, ...
   room-gen. cleaning-top. do-past-but
   'It is true that I cleaned the room but …'

c. Kuruma-no UNTEN-wa si-ta-ga, ...
   car-gen. driving-top. do-past-but
   'It is true that I drove a car, but …'

The examples in (104) contain Sino-Japanese VNs listed in (100)-(101) which do not allow an unincorporated periphrastic verb form. With these VNs in the predicate position, the argument of the VN cannot get genitive Case in the VP-Preposing construction. On the other hand, when the VN allows an unincorporated periphrastic verb form, the argument of the VN can be marked in the genitive as in (105). This fact indicates that genitive marking of the argument in the VP-Preposing construction is contingent on the availability of an unincorporated periphrastic verb structure such as in (97).

Given this correlation, let's assume that the sentences in (89), (93), and (94) on the one hand involve VP-Preposing and those in (95), (96), (104), and (105) on the other involve Topicalization of the phrase containing renyoo-kei or Sino-Japanese VN. Both are separate instances of move a. Clearly, the former involves movement of a verbal element, as the verbal Case marking on the argument of renyoo-kei and Sino-Japanese VN indicates. As illustrated in (92) above, the movement is applied to FP which leaves a trace in the position adjacent to the Tense element. Since Tense is a bound morpheme, the pro-verb su-ru is inserted to the position vacated by the movement.

In contrast, the movement involved in examples in (95), (96), (104) and (105) appears to be one type of topicalization of the object of periphrastic verb form. First, the preposed renyoo-kei or Sino-Japanese VN forms a unincorporated periphrastic verb form. This means that the renyoo-kei or Sino-Japanese VN is marked in the accusative. Secondly, the elements subject to this movement form a nominal, as evidenced by the nominal (i.e. genitive) Case marking on the argument of renyoo-kei and Sino-Japanese VN. Thirdly, underlyingly the verb su-ru occurs with the preposed renyoo-kei or Sino-Japanese VN. As a result, there is no need for DO-support. In order to account for these facts, I assume that the accusative renyoo-kei nominal or Sino-Japanese VN is marked by a focus markers (such as -wa, -sae, and -made) and undergoes movement. Schematically, these two movements are illustrated as in (106) and (107), respectively.

(106) VP-PREPOSING

a. [Focus P Ø [IP [FP X Renyoo-kei/Sino-Japanese VN] -Tense]]

b. [Focus P [FP X Renyoo-kei/S-J VN]i-wa/sae/made [IP [T ti-Tense]]]
(107) TOPICALIZATION OF RENYOO-KEI/SINO-JAPANESE VN PHRASE

a. \[ \text{Focus P} \varnothing [\text{IP} \{ \text{FP} \text{ Renyoo-kei/Sino-Japanese VN]-o su-Tense }\}] \]

b. \[ \text{Focus P} \{ \text{FP} \text{ Renyoo-kei/S-J VN}\}-wa/sae/made [\text{IP} \{ \text{t} \text{t} \text{su-Tense }\}] \]

In (106), the FP is assumed to be recategorized as \([-N]\), triggering verbal Case marking. The recategorization is assumed to be carried out by the governing head I, which is assumed to be specified for a \([-N]\) feature. In contrast, I assume that the FP in (107) is recategorized to be \([+N]\). This is due to the fact that the FP occurs in a position where a \([+N]\) element occurs. Since the verb \(su-ru\) 'to do' has to discharge Case, the complement position must be occupied by a \([+N]\) element. If the complement position is occupied by a \([-N]\) element, no Case is assigned due to the Case-resistance principle. This results in violation of visibility condition and consequently in a \(\emptyset\)-criterion violation. Hence, the head of FP is assumed to be occupied by a \([+N]\) element to avoid \(\emptyset\)-criterion violation, and as a result, the arguments of the renyoo-kei or Sino-Japanese VN get nominal Case.

With this in mind, let's return to the cases where both verbal and nominal Case markings are possible in the VP-Preposing cases. Consider the examples in (95a-c), repeated here as (108) with slight modification.

(108) a. Sono tosyokan-wa [\text{FP} \text{ hon-no KASI-DASI]-sae si-te that library-top. book-gen. lend-push=out-even do-TE j-na-i. exist-neg.-pres.}

' That library doesn't even loan books.'

b. Gakusei-tati-wa [\text{FP} \text{ hon-no TATI-YOMI]-made si-ta. student-pl.-top. book-gen. stand-read-as=far=as do-past]

'Students did so far as to read books for free.'

c. Hanako-wa [\text{FP} \text{ gekizyo-e-no tabemono-no MOTI-KOMI]-sae si-ta. theater-to-gen. food-gen. carry-in-even do-past]

'Hanako even carried food inside the theater.'

In the examples in (108), the renyoo-kei in the head of FP has the underspecified feature \([\emptyset N]\). As mentioned above, the renyoo-kei in these cases must receive a positive value for the underspecified feature \([\emptyset N]\) in order to carry out nominal Case marking. Case marking here is carried out because of Case requirements just as in the case of the Ni-Purpose Clause construction discussed in the previous section.

The failure of nominal Case marking in (95d), repeated here as (109), and in (96), repeated here as (110), is due to lack of the underspecified feature \([\emptyset N]\).

(109) *Sono hohaoya-wa kodomo-no SIKARI-TUKE-mo si-nakat-ta. that mother-top. child-gen. scold-attach-even do-neg.-past

'The mother didn't even scold their child.'
(110) a. *Taro-wa nihon-de-no hon-no KA-i-wa si-ta-ga, ...  
'It is true that Taro bought a book in Japan but he hasn't read it yet.'

b. *Ikura kirat-te i-te-mo, tuma-no KOROS-I-made su-ru  
however hate-TE exist-TE-even wife-gen. kill-I-as=far=as do-pres.
koto-wa na-i-to omo-u.  
fact-top. neg.-I-quot. think-pres.
'No matter how much he hates her, I think he shouldn't do as far as killing his wife.'

-top. -to-gen. go-I-even do-appear=to=want-neg.-pres.
'Hanako does not want even to go to the US.'

Since the renyoo-kei in (109) and (110) do not have the [α N] lexical entry, they cannot receive the [+N] feature via recategorization. Consequently, renyoo-kei of this type do not allow nominal Case marking.30

Now, let's turn to the cases where verbal Case is assigned to the argument of the renyoo-kei in (93), repeated here as (111).

(111) a. Sono tosoyokan-wa hon-o KASI-DASI-sae si-te i-na-i.  
that library-top. book-acc. lend-push=out-even do-TE exist-neg.-pres.
'That library doesn't even loan books.'

b. Gakusci-tati-wa hon-o TATI-YOMI-made si-ta.  
student-pl-top. book-acc. stand-read-as=far=as do-past
'Students did so far as to read books for free.'

c. Sono hahayya-wa kodomo-o SIKARI-TUKE-mo si-nakat-ta.  
that mother-top. child-acc. scold-attach-even do-neg.-past
'The mother didn't even scold their child.'

The renyoo-kei in (111a and b) are underspecified for the [N] feature. In this case, a negative value is assigned to the feature [α N] under the government relationship between

---

30 Tsujimura 1992 notes that simplex renyoo-kei with three or more mora can behave just like complex renyoo-kei. For instance, simplex renyoo-kei such as atuka-i (←--- atuka-u 'to deal, handle, sell') and hodokos-i (←--- hodokos-u 'to give as a charity') occur in the nominal clause construction. By the same token, it is predicted that renyoo-kei with three or mora can undergo VP-Preposing with the arguments of renyoo-kei having nominal Case. This prediction is borne out by the following examples.

(i) (?)Zassi-no ATUKAI-sae si-te i-na-i.  
magazine-gen. handle-even do-te exist-neg.-pres.
'They don't even sell magazines.'

(ii) (?)Ano sisetu-de-wa, megumarenai hito-e-no tabemono-no HODOKOSI-sae si-te-i-ru.  
that institution-in-top. unfortunate people-to-gen. food-gen. charity-even do-TE exist-pres.
'In that institution, they go as far as giving food to unfortunate people.'
the Tense marker and the renyoo-kei suffix in the head position of FP. In turn, the renyoo-kei having received the [–N] feature, assigns verbal Case to its argument, deriving the Case pattern observed in (111a and b). As mentioned above, the pro-verb su-ru is inserted as an instance of DO-support in the position where the moved FP is base-generated, substituting a trace.

However, the underspecification is involved in (111c), where the argument of the renyoo-kei receives verbal Case since the renyoo-kei in this example is inherently [–N]. The same applies to cases where morphologically simplex renyoo-kei are involved as in (89), repeated here as (112) for convenience.


'It is true that Taro bought a book in Japan but he hasn’t read it yet.'

b. Ikura kirat-te i-te-mo, tuma-o KOROS-I-made su-ru koto-wa however hate-TE exist-TE-even wife-acc. kill-I-as=far=as do-pres. fact-top. na-i-to omo-u. neg-1-quot. think-pres.

'No matter how much he hates her, I think he shouldn’t go as far as killing his wife.'


' Hanako does not want even to go to the US.'

In these cases, due to the [–N] feature inherently assigned to the renyoo-kei, only verbal Case marking is permitted.31

4. CASE MARKING IN JAPANESE CLAUSES

In section 1.2., I pointed out that syntactically renyoo-kei nominals behave identically to ing-of gerundive nominals. I have proposed that the renyoo-kei form of the verb consists of the verbal root and the functional head F. I have also assumed two sets of lexical entries for the renyoo-kei suffix: a unitary feature for [N] (i.e. [+N] or [–N]) and an underspecified feature [α N]. In most cases, when a renyoo-kei is morphologically complex, the head F is assumed to have the underspecified lexical feature [α N]. The value

31 As discussed in the previous footnote, cases where simplex renyoo-kei with three or mora are involved allow verbal Case marking as in (i) and (ii).

(i) Ano mise-de-wa, tabemono-o ATUKAI-sae si-te-i-na-i. that shop-in-top. food-acc. handle-even do-TE exist-neg-pres.

'That shop doesn’t even sell food.'

(ii) Ano sisei-de-wa, megumarena hito-e tabemono-o HODOKOSI-sae si-te-i-ru. that institution-in-top. unfortunate people-to food-acc. charity-even do-TE exist-pres.

'In that institution, they go as far as giving food to unfortunate people.'
of a is syntactically determined by the governing head. In contrast, the value of the feature \([\alpha N]\) is negative when a renyoo-kei is either of the class disallowing the nominal/verbal alternation or is morphologically simplex.\(^{32}\) All renyoo-kei occurrences as non-event and simplex event nominals can be attributed to the \([+N]\) feature and the process by which these nominals are derived is in the lexicon. In this section, I discuss how Case is assigned to the arguments of renyoo-kei both in clauses and nominals.

As proposed in section 1.2.2.4., I assume the structure of the renyoo-kei form to be roughly as in (113) below. In (113), the verb root moves up to the head of F to form the renyoo-kei.

(113)

```
    TP
     ↘
      T

    FP
     ↘
      T

    F' (r)u/ta/te or aspectual nominal

    VP
     ↘
      F

    V' -i or -Ø

    NP
    ↘
     V

    root
```

Assuming this structure, I can account for a cluster of Case marking facts concerning the direct object and the subject in sentences involving renyoo-kei forms. I argue that the subject gets nominative Case in the spec of TP position when the clause is tensed or headed by an aspect marker, whereas genitive Case is assigned to the subject position in the spec of FP when the clause is tenseless. In both cases, the case assignment to the subject is carried out through the spec-head relation. On the other hand, Case assignment to the direct object takes place in the spec of VP through head-government by F. The head F can be either verbal or nominal depending on what governs it. When the clause is tensed, the maximal projection of F is governed by T. In this configuration, the feature \([-N]\) is assigned to the underspecified head F. In this case, accusative Case is assigned to the direct object. In the meantime, when the maximal projection of F is not governed, the feature matrix of the head F is assumed to be \([+N]\). Then, genitive Case is assigned to the direct object.

\(^{32}\) With some exceptions. See previous footnotes and Chapter 5, section 4.4.
4. 1. ECM VERBS IN JAPANESE

Before discussing the Case marking facts in verbal and nominal renyoo-kei, let's examine some relevant cases. Compare the examples in (114) and (115).

      -top.    -nom. innocence-copula-quot. say-past/predict-do-past
' Hanako said/predicted that Taro is innocent.'

      -top.    -acc. innocence-copula-quot. say-past/predict-do-past
' Hanako said/predicted that Taro is innocent.'

      -top.    -nom. innocence-copula-quot. think-put=in-past
' Hanako was convinced that Taro was innocent.'

      -top.    -acc. innocence-copula-quot. think-put=in-past
' Hanako was convinced that Taro was innocent.'

The examples in (115) illustrate that the embedded subject of the complement of a verb omoi-kon- 'to convince oneself' can be either nominative or accusative. As shown in (114), in the complement of the verb it- 'to say' or yogen-su 'to predict', the accusative subject is not permitted.

Regarding the nominative embedded subject, I have suggested in the previous section that nominative Case assignment is carried out in the Spec of TP position through the spec-head relation. This means that when the embedded clause is tensed, the verbal complex consisting of the verbal root and the renyoo-kei suffix moves to the head of TP. Subsequently, the subject is moved to the Spec of TP position to receive Case and nominative Case is assigned to the subject.

On the other hand, the accusative embedded subject in (115b) requires an explanation. As the contrast between (114b) and (115b) shows, the accusative Case marking in the embedded subject is permissible only when the matrix verb is an exceptional Case marking (ECM) verb such as omow- 'to think, to consider', sinzi- 'to believe', and kanzi-ru 'to feel'. Additional examples are given in (116).

      -top.    -nom./acc. beautiful-copula-quot. think-past
'Taro thought Hanako to be beautiful.'

      -top.    -nom./acc. innocent-copula-quot. believe-TE-exist-past
'Taro believed Hanako to be innocent.'

c. Taro-o [Hanako-ga/omosiro-i-to] kanzi-ta.
      -top.    -nom./acc. funny-pres.-quot. feel-past
'Taro felt Hanako to be funny.'

Furthermore, this exceptional Case pattern is observed only when the embedded clause contains a raising verb da 'be' such as in (115) and (116a and b) or an adjectival predicate
as in (116c). Thus, the sentences in (117) are ungrammatical with an accusative embedded subject.

(117) a. Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga/*o it-ta-to] omot-ta.\textsuperscript{33} 
        -top. -nom./acc. go-past-quot. think-past
        'Taro thought Hanako to have gone (there).'

b. Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga/*o sin-da-to] sinzi-te i-ta.\textsuperscript{34} 
        -top. -nom./acc. die-past-quot. believe-TE-exist-past
        'Taro had believed Hanako to have been dead.'

        -top. -nom./acc. run-TE-exist-pres.-quot. feel-past
        'Taro felt Hanako to be running.'

Since the embedded predicates in (115b) and (116) are not transitive, it is plausible to assume that the matrix verb assigns accusative Case to the embedded subject.

However, it is impossible to claim that the application of CP deletion enables the accusative Case marking in (115b) and (116), as it does in the cases involving English ECM verbs, because all the grammatical examples of the accusative embedded subject in (115) and (116) involve a complementizer-like element -to in the embedded clause. This complementizer-like element is obligatory, as the example in (118) shows.

        -top. -nom./acc. beautiful-copula think-past

One possible account for the accusative embedded subject in the complement of ECM verbs in Japanese is to assume that ECM verbs in Japanese have the property of incorporating the complementizer-like element -to into the matrix verb, nullifying the barrierhood of CP. When the embedded clause contains the copula da, CP projection remains intact. This assumption may be supported by cases such as (119) and (120): in (119), the embedded clause contains the past tense of the copula, dat-ta, which appears to block incorporation of the complementizer-like element to.

        -top. -nom. beautiful-copula-past-quot. think-past
        'Taro though Hanako to be beautiful.'

\textsuperscript{33} Note that when the embedded clause is perfective with V-te i-ru, accusative subject is allowed.

(i) Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga/o nihon-e it-te i-ru to] omot-ta. 
    -top. -nom./acc. Japan-to go-TE exist-pres.-comp. think-past
    'Taro thinks Hanako to have gone to Japan.'

\textsuperscript{34} Note that this sentence with accusative embedded subject improves when the embedded predicate is perfective with V-te sima-ta 'to end up Ving' as in (i).

(i) Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga/o sin-de simat-ta-to] sinzi-te-i-ta. 
    -top. -nom./acc. die-TE end=up-past-comp. believe-TE exist-past
    'Taro was believing Hanako to have been dead.'
b. ??Taroo-wa Hanako-o kiree-dat-ta-to omot-ta.
   -top. -acc. beautiful-copula-past-quot. think-past

The sentence in (119b) is marginal, showing that the past tense, unlike the present tense, always constitutes the head of TP, blocking ECM because perhaps of minimality. Thus, it can be stated that when the embedded clause has the present tense copula, the complementizer-like element incorporates at LF.

In (120), on the other hand, the accusative embedded subject is marginal when more than one complementizer-like element appears in the embedded clause.

(120) a. Hanako-wa issyun [Taroo-ga hontoo-ni yasasi-i-no-ka-to]
   -top. momentarily -nom. in-reality kind-pres.-Q-Q-quot.
   kanzi-ta/omot-ta.
   feel-past/think-past

   'In that moment, Hanako felt/thought that Taro was really kind (contrary to her expectation).'

b. ?*Hanako-wa issyun [Taroo-o hontoo-ni yasasi-i-no-ka-to]
   -top. momentarily -acc. in-reality kind-pres.-Q-Q-quot.
   kanzi-ta/omot-ta.
   feel-past/think-past

In the example in (120b), two complementizer-like elements such as -no (question) and -ka (question) appear to prevent -to (quotation) from incorporating. As a result, it is difficult to invoke the effect of the ECM verbs. This is perhaps because of the minimality effect. The unacceptability of the accusative subject in (120b) shows that the effect of the ECM verbs in Japanese is probably related to whether or not the complementizer -to is incorporated into the matrix verb.

Schematically, these cases can be represented as in (121).

---

35 Stowell (p. c.) notes that ECM complements in English have no tense. Hence, ECM is blocked when there is a tense element because of minimality. This accounts for the impossibility of ECM in (120), too. However, I will this issue open for further study.
In the structure in (121b), the embedded subject originates somewhere inside V' under the assumption that the copula is a raising verb (Stowell 1978, and Heggie 1988). Then, the embedded subject can move to several positions in order to receive Case: i) Spec of embedded VP, ii) Spec of embedded TP, or iii) Spec of matrix VP. The first option is untenable for an obvious reason. Since the raising verb da cannot discharge accusative Case, when the embedded subject moves into the Spec of the embedded VP, the accusative Case isn't assigned in this position.

The second option, by which the embedded subject is moved to Spec of the embedded TP, also runs into a problem immediately. The spec position of the embedded TP is an A-position, where nominative Case is assigned. As discussed previously, since the embedded clause is a tensed clause, the spec of TP is already a nominative Case position. It is not possible to permit dual Case assignment by stipulating that one Case position be the Case position for other Case. Thus, the second option is not plausible.

Then, the next closest position to which the NP can move up is the Spec of matrix VP position. As outlined in the previous section, I assume that the verbal root moves to the functional head F to form the renyoo-kei. Hence, the only way in which the embedded subject is Case assigned can be to assume that Case is assigned at the spec position of the matrix VP by head-government.

Now, in order to examine the validity of this assumption, compare the example in (115) with its nominal counterpart in (122).
(122) a. Hanako-niyoru [Taroo-ga muzitu-da-to-no]
    -by -nom. innocence-copula-quot.-gen.
    omoi-komi-ga mina-o toowaku-sase-ta.
    think-put=in-nom. everyone-acc. perplexed-caus.-past
    'Hanako's conviction that Taro is innocent perplexed everyone.'

b. *Hanako-niyoru [Taroo-o muzitu-da-to-no]
    -by -acc. innocence-copula-quot.-gen.
    omoi-komi-ga mina-o toowaku-sase-ta.
    think-put=in-nom.everyone-acc. perplexed-caus.-past

c. Hanako-niyoru [Taroo-no muzitu-da-to-no]
    -by -gen. innocence-copula-quot.-gen.
    omoi-komi-ga mina-o toowaku-sase-ta.
    think-put=in-nom.everyone-acc. perplexed-caus.-past

The embedded subject in (122) can be either nominative or genitive. Comparison of the verbal ECM case and the nominal ECM case reveals that genitive Case is assigned to the embedded subject in (122c) in place of the accusative Case in the nominal construction in (115b). In both cases, the nominative embedded subject is fully grammatical. Therefore, the difference between the examples involving Cases other than nominative is identified as one of tense: while the ECM verb in (115b) is tensed, the one in (122c) is not.

Assuming that verbal or nominal ECM verbs have the same effect in optionally allowing incorporation of the complimentizer -to and nullifying the barrierhood of CP as an exception, the genitive Case assigned to the embedded subject in (122c) can be accounted for in the same way as the verbal ECM cases like (115b). When the barrierhood of CP is nullified by the ECM nominal, the embedded subject moves to a Case position. The closest possible position for the embedded subject to move into is Spec of the matrix VP. Assuming that this position is a Case position, the genitive Case marking in this position can be easily accounted for by stating that the head of FP consists of the verbal root and the renyoo-kei suffix -i which constitute a [-V, +N] feature complex.

The contrast between (115) and (122) implies that NP moved to Spec of VP is Case-marked by head-government. When the matrix ECM verb is tensed, the moved NP gets accusative Case whereas genitive Case is assigned to the moved NP when the matrix ECM verb is not tensed.

So far, I have argued that the embedded subject of the complement clause of an ECM structure is assigned (exceptional) Case in the Spec position of the matrix VP through head-government by the functional head F. In the following subsection, I will show that in other cases involving the renyoo-kei, the Spec of VP is the place where Case is assigned to the direct object (for a similar assumption, see Valois 1991). In addition, I will argue that when the renyoo-kei is verbal, the Case assigned to the direct object is accusative whereas when it is nominal, the direct object gets genitive Case.

4.2. CASE MARKING IN THE RENYOO-KEI

Returning to the structure in (113), repeated here as (123), let's assume that the direct object of the verb gets Case in the Spec VP position (for a similar analysis, see Valois 1991).
In the previous section, I argued that the Spec position of VP can be an A-position in connection to the ECM cases in (115) and (122). When the verbal root moves up to the head of FP to form a renyoo-kei nominal for Case-theoretic reasons, the direct object moves to the Spec of VP. In this position, the direct object gets genitive Case, if the underspecified feature of the renyoo-kei suffix in the head of FP is assigned a positive value. This Case assignment is possible because in the structure in (123), VP is selected by F and therefore does not constitute a barrier for government by F. On the other hand, the direct object gets accusative Case in this position when the functional head gets the feature [−N] from the governing head. For example, when the head F is governed by a tense marker which subcategorizes for a verbal element, it receives the feature [−N], assigning verbal Case.

Recall that in the nominal clause construction in (124), the direct object can appear in the accusative as well as the genitive.

(124) a. Keisatsu-ga mayaku-o TORI-SIMAR-tyuu-ni …
   police-nom. narcotics-acc. take-close-midst-in
   'While the police were controlling narcotics, …'

b. Keisatsu-no mayaku-no TORI-SIMARI-tyuu-ni …
   police-gen. narcotics-gen. take-close-midst-in

The fact that the direct object in the nominal clause construction can receive either accusative or genitive Case in the same position can be accounted for quite straightforwardly by assuming that the direct object gets Case, accusative or genitive, in the same position. As mentioned above, since the head of nominal clause is assumed to have the feature [+Asp], optionally it assigns a negative value to the feature [α N] of the functional head -i, allowing accusative Case marking to the direct object of a renyoo-kei predicate in Spec. V. On the other hand, when this option is not executed, the feature
assigned to the functional head is [+N] because the aspectual nominal head is syntactically a noun. Then, the direct object of a renyoo-kei predicate gets genitive Case.

Turning to the subject, let’s assume that Spec F is the position where the external argument is base-generated. As observed above, nominative Case is assigned only in a tensed or nominal clause headed by a [+Asp] head. It is plausible to assume that nominative Case is assigned to the subject via the spec-head relation. This implies that the subject is moved to the Spec I position to receive nominative Case.

The renyoo-kei is formed via verb-movement: the verb root moves up to the functional head F, forming the renyoo-kei. When the renyoo-kei form functions as a complex event nominal, the verbal complex consisting of the root and the renyoo-kei suffix undergoes no further movement beyond this position. In this case, since no tense or aspectual element governs the functional head, a positive value is given to the underspecified feature [α N] as a default process. In a nominal clause, since the head is syntactically [+N], the renyoo-kei head receives a positive value to the underspecified feature [α N], under the government relation. In this manner, the subject gets genitive Case via spec-head relation in the spec position of FP.

The structure resulting from this affixation looks roughly like the one in (125).

(125)

```
           FP
           /   \
          /     \F' \
        /       \\
     VP       F [-V, +N]
           / \     /
          /   \   /
         /     \  \
        NP'       root \ or -∅

           / \     /
          /   \   /
         /     \  \
        t_i      t_j
```

The structure in (125) resembles a context in which the genitive Case marker -no is ordinarily assigned. In Japanese, genitive Case is assumed to be assigned iteratively to arguments in the left position higher than the head noun in NPs. Compare the structure in (125) with the structure in which a non-derived noun occurs with its possessor NP as in (126).

(126) a. Hanako-no Taroo-e-no tegami
     -gen. -to-gen. letter
     'a letter by Hanako to Taro'

b. Syusyoo-no kokkai-de-no enzetu
     prime-minister-gen. national=diet-in-gen. speech
     'a speech by the prime minister in the National Diet'
In the NPs in (126), the agent phrase and the directional or locative phrase are both marked in the genitive. Genitive Case assignment is possible because these phrases occur to the left of the head noun. Schematically, the structure of (126b) can be represented as in (127).

(127)

```
NP
  Spec
  N'
  syusyoo
  kokkai-de
  N
  enzetu
```

A comparison of (127) and (125) reveals that the relationship between the head and its spec in these structures is identical. Assuming that the functional head F in (125) receives a [+N] feature, the subject in the spec of FP is expected to receive Genitive Case in (125), just as the subject in (126) does.

For the sake of argument, suppose that the external argument of renyoo-kei nominal is base-generated under Spec of V in the structure in (125). Assuming that genitive marking on the external argument is carried out by the spec-head relation, in order to account for genitive marking in renyoo-kei nominals, the external argument needs to be moved to the Spec. F.\textsuperscript{36} This is because in the Spec. VP position, the external argument cannot establish a spec-head relation between the position occupied by the functional head F to which the verbal root moves in order to form the renyoo-kei.

Hence, assuming the clause structure in (123) allows us to account for various facts about Case marking in tensed clauses, nominal clauses, and renyoo-kei nominals.

4. 3. THE \textsc{I}NTERNAL STRUCTURE OF COMPLEX RENYOO-KEI FORMS

Throughout the discussion, I have not distinguished between the complex renyoo-kei and the simplex renyoo-kei with respect to their internal structure. Thus, I have tacitly assumed that the root of complex renyoo-kei occupies the root position identical to simplex renyoo-kei forms. In this section, I briefly discuss how complex renyoo-kei forms are derived.

I have proposed above that the renyoo-kei form of verbs consist of the verbal root and the renyoo-kei suffix -i or -∅, which constitutes the head of the functional category F. In this regard, consider the following complex renyoo-kei nominals.

(128) a. TOR-I-SIMAR-I 'control'
b. NOR-I-IRE-∅ 'extension (of airline, train, or bus service)'
c. IK-I-KI (lit.) going and coming'

\textsuperscript{36} After examining the VP-preposing facts, Yoshida 1991 argues that the functional head is the nominative Case assignor. For the analysis of VP preposing in my framework, see section 3. 4. above.
d. AGE-Ø-SAGE-Ø 'lit. raising and lowering'
e. MI-Ø-OTOS-I 'oversight'

The renyoo-kei nominals in (128) show that any combination of renyoo-kei is in principle permitted. Thus, the first element of the compounds can be a consonantal verb as in (128a, b and c) or a vocalic verb as in (128d and e). The second element can also be a consonantal verb as in (128a and e), a vocalic verb as in (128b and d), or an irregular verb as in (128c).\(^{37}\)

Now, a question arises as to how the renyoo-kei suffix is attached to the first element of the compounds in (128). When the first element is a consonantal verb, the renyoo-kei suffix -i must be realized, as the ungrammaticality of the examples in (129) shows.

(129) a. *tor-simar-i 'control'
    b. *nor-ire-Ø 'extension (of airline, train, or bus service)'
    c. *ik-ki 'lit. going and coming'

For the sake of argument, let's assume that the compound verb is derived by concatenating two FPs. This hypothesis is devised to account for the renyoo-kei suffix occurring after the first element of a compound verb. Thus, instead of assuming that the verbal roots are concatenated to form a compound, this hypothesis states that the two renyoo-kei forms are combined.

However, this hypothesis immediately runs into problems. First, since each FP can assign \(\theta\)-roles under this hypothesis, it would be difficult to account for why a compound cannot retain, say, two different subjects. The examples in (130) and (134) are ungrammatical.

(130) *Taro-ga Hanako-ga sono deeta-o MI-OTOSI-ta.
     -nom.       -nom. that data-acc. see-Ø-drop-past
     '*Taro Hanako overlooked that data.'

(131) *Nihonkookuu-no Zennikkuu-no Rosu-e-no
     Japan=Airline-gen. All=Nippon=Airline-gen. Los=Angeles-to-gen.
     NOR-I-IRE
     ride-I-enter
     '*Japan Airline's All Nippon Airline's service extension to LA.'

Secondly, compounding of two FPs is very unusual compared with other types of compounding involving the renyoo-kei. When a renyoo-kei is involved in incorporation to form a compound, the incorporated element must occupy X\(^0\) rather than XP. The examples in (132) are the renyoo-kei compounds where the direct object is incorporated into a renyoo-kei of the verb. But the incorporated direct object is restricted to N\(^0\) rather than an NP, as the contrast between (132a/c) and (132 b/d) shows.

---

\(^{37}\) It is an accidental gap that there is no case in which the first element of a compound consists of an irregular verb.
(132) a. yuki-MATUR-I
    snow-worship-I 'snow festival'

b. *tumetai-yuki-MATUR-I
   cold-snow-worship-I '*cold-snow festival'

c. hara-KIR-I
   stomach-cut-I 'harakiri, cutting one's stomach'

d. *kono-hara-KIR-I
   this-stomach-cut-I '*this stomach cutting'

Hence, the hypothesis that a complex renyoo-kei consists of two concatenated full renyoo-kei forms (i.e. FPs) is not tenable.

Instead, let's assume that the each verbal root involved in this type of compound is governed by the functional head F, and the renyoo-kei suffix in the first element of a compound is realized as a spell-out of the feature assigned by the functional head. The compound in (128a), for example, is derived by the structure in (133) in which two verbal roots are governed by a functional head F.

(133)

```
    FP
     └── F
        └── VP
            └── F
                └── V
                    └── V
                        └── tor-
                        └── simar-
```

The first verb and the second verb are compounded, through a morphological process in the lexicon. After compounding is complete, the derived structure look likes the one in (134), where the two verbal roots form the head of VP.
When the complex verb is moved to form the renyoo-kei, whether lexically or syntactically, the feature of the functional head is distributed to both verbal roots, creating the well-formed *tor-i-simar-i* 'control'.

Under this assumption, since there is only one functional head F, it is possible to account for why only one subject is allowed. Furthermore, the incorporation involved in deriving (134) from (133) only affects the head V.

Finally, let's examine the inflected forms of consonantal verbs. As discussed above, a number of renyoo-kei compounds can be either verbal or nominal. The verbal renyoo-kei shows inflection depending on the type of suffix or auxiliary verb attached to it. Thus, the renyoo-kei compound in (128a) inflects as in (135).

(135)

TOR-I-SIMAR-I

| a. tor-i-simar-a-na-i     | 'not to control' |

| b. tor-i-simar-u         | 'to control'     |
| take-I-close-pres.       |                  |

| c. tor-i-simar-e-ba      | 'if control'     |
| take-I-close-E-if        |                  |

| d. tor-i-simar-o-o       | 'let's control'  |
| take-I-close-O-hortative |                  |

| e. tor-i-simar-i-mas-u   | 'to control (polite)' |
| take-I-close-I-polite-pres |                |

As shown in (135), when inflected, other verbal suffixes, -a, -u, -e, and -o, are affixed.

In order to account for the inflectional properties of consonantal verbs, I assume that the inflectional suffixes -a, -u, -e and -o are attached to the renyoo-kei form. In other words, I treat the renyoo-kei form as a stem for other inflected forms. The disappearance of the renyoo-kei suffix -i in (135a-d) is accounted for by a rule of metathesis through which the renyoo-kei suffix is replaced by these suffixes. Schematically, the inflection of consonantal verbs can be represented as in (136).
(136) \[ xp[fp[vp\text{verb root} -i] -a/u/e/o] \]

The status of the lexical category XP in (136) is perhaps IP due to the fact that the suffix \(-u\) represents the present tense form. However, I will leave open the question of whether or not inflectional suffixes other than the present tense suffix \(-u\) belong to IP.

In this connection, note that the first element of the inflected form in (135) remains \(-i\). This indicates that inflectional suffixes other than the renyoo-kei suffix are attached after verbal compounding takes place. Under the assumption that the feature of the functional head is percolated into the first element, if these suffixes occupy the place where the renyoo-kei suffix occurs (i.e. the head of FP), then, it would be expected that the other inflectional suffix occur after the first element. However, none of the following examples are well-formed.

(137) a. *tor-a-simar-na-i 'not control'
   b. *tor-u-simar-u 'to control'
   c. *tor-e-simar-e-ba 'if/when X controls'
   d. *tor-o-simer-o-o 'let's control'

Therefore, under the assumption that the feature of the renyoo-kei suffix is percolated onto the first element of the compound, inflectional suffixes other than the renyoo-kei suffix must be outside of FP, so that the features of these suffixes do not percolate.

5. SINO-JAPANESE VERBAL NOUNS

In the previous sections, I have defended the validity of the underspecification approach to renyoo-kei nominals. As discussed in the previous chapter, Sino-Japanese VN is complex renyoo-kei nominals have properties similar to those of complex renyoo-kei nominals. For instance, both Sino-Japanese VN and complex renyoo-kei nominals occur in nominal clauses and ni-purpose clauses. Furthermore, these nominals can undergo VP-Preposing, leaving the light verb su(-ru) 'to do' on which Tense is realized.

In this section, I argue that syntactic properties of Sino-Japanese VN can be accounted for by assuming the underspecified feature \([\alpha N]\) just as for the morphologically complex renyoo-kei. More specifically, contrary to what has been proposed for Sino-Japanese VN, which regard this type of VN as NP with eventive interpretation, I propose that Sino-Japanese VN are subcategorized for by a functional head which is underspecified for the lexical feature \([N]\). The value of the underspecified feature \([N]\) is assumed to be structurally determined just as in the case of renyoo-kei nominals.

5. 1. STRUCTURE OF SINO-JAPANESE VN

First of all, I assume the structure for Sino-Japanese VN to be as illustrated in (138). Just as in the case of renyoo-kei nominals, I assume that Sino-Japanese VN are subcategorized for the functional head F. This head, though not phonetically realized, is

---

38 Although I lumped together all the inflectional suffixes in (136), it does not mean that the suffixes \(-a, -u, -e,\) and \(-o\) occupies in an identical position. As will be shown in the following chapter, perhaps the irrealis suffix \(-a\) is projected lower than the conclusive suffix \(-u\), which I assume to occur in the head of TP. I am not in the position to discuss other suffixes \(-e\) and \(-o\), leaving it for the further study.

39 For a similar analysis, see Dubinsky 1994.
underspecified for the lexical feature \([\alpha \text{ N}]\). Thus, I am once again assuming a lexical entry for Sino-Japanese VNs as in (139).

(138) **STRUCTURE OF SINO-JAPANESE VNS:**

```
  IP
    I'
      FP
        F
          XP
            F
              X'
                \(\emptyset\)
                  X
```

Sino-Japanese VN

(139) **LEXICAL ENTRY FOR SINO-JAPANESE VNS:**

a. \([+\text{N}]\)  
b. \([\alpha \text{ N}]\)

While the lexical category of renyou-kei can easily be identified as V, that of Sino-Japanese VNs must be N since it does not inflect. However, I left the category of the Sino-Japanese VN unspecified in the structure (138) since syntactic behavior of the Sino-Japanese VN indicates that it may be categorized as either V or N. I assume that the lexical category of Sino-Japanese VNs is determined structurally just as the morphologically complex renyou-kei is. Thus, either a positive or negative value is assigned to the underspecified lexical feature \([\text{N}]\) by its governing head.

The structure in (138) is in principle identical to the structure assumed for morphologically complex renyou-kei forms. The only difference between Sino-Japanese VN and renyou-kei VN is that the former contains a head F which is intrinsically \(\emptyset\) while the latter has inflectional suffixes -i or -\(\emptyset\) as a head F depending on the type of verb. This is because VN does not have morphological inflection. Nonetheless, a large number of syntactic similarities between Sino-Japanese VNs and complex renyou-kei nominals indicate that these two types of VNs need to be treated equally. Assuming the structure in (138) enables us to account for syntactic behaviors of Sino-Japanese VNs which are identical to renyou-kei VNs.

**5. 2. SYNTACTIC PROPERTIES OF SINO-JAPANESE VNS**

First, in the examples in (140b) and (141b), a Sino-Japanese VN *hookoku* 'report' and a renyou-kei nominal *tatiyomi* 'reading while standing' are incorporated into the light verb *su-ru* to form a verb from their corresponding periphrastic counterparts in (140a) and (141a), respectively.
(140) **SINO-JAPANESE VN:**

'I reported the accident to the police.'


(141) **RENYOO-KEI NOMINAL:**

'I read book for free at the bookstore.'


Secondly, Sino-Japanese VNs shares Case marking properties with complex renyoo-kei nominals as listed in (142)-(143): both verbal and nominal Case marking are allowed in nominal clause constructions consisting of Sino-Japanese and renyoo-kei VNs (as in (142)) and the Ni-purpose clauses as in (143).

(142) **NOMINAL CLAUSE CONSTRUCTION**

**SINO-JAPANESE VN:**

a. Daitooryoo-no nihon-no HOOMON-tyuu-ni, ... president-gen. Japan-gen. visit-middle-in 
'While the president was visiting Japan, ...'

b. Daitooryoo-ga nihon-o HOOMON-tyuu-ni, ... president-nom. Japan-acc. visit-middle-in

**RENYOO-KEI NOMINAL:**

c. Gakusee-tati-no hon-no TATI-YOMI-tyuu-ni, ... student-pl.-gen. book-gen. stand-read-middle-in 
'While students were reading books (for free at the bookstore/without sitting) ...'

d. Gakusee-tati-ga hon-o TATI-YOMI-tyuu-ni, ... student-pl.-nom. book-acc. stand-read-middle-in

(143) **NI-PURPOSE CLAUSE**

**SINO-JAPANESE VN:**

'Children came to the US to study English.'
RENYYOO-KEI NOMINALS:

b. Keezi-ga [hannin-no/o TORI-SIRABE]-ni heya-ni hait-te
detective-nom. suspect-gen./acc. take-investigate-for room-to enter=TE
ki-ta.
come-past

'A detective came into the room to interview the suspect.'

Furthermore, when "VP-preposing" is applied to predicates containing Sino-Japanese VN, the light verb su-ru replaces the trace left by the movement. In addition, nominal and verbal Case marking is possible for the arguments of Sino-Japanese VN.

(144) VP-PREPOSING

SINO-JAPANESE VN:

a. Taroo-wa buturigaku-o BENKYOO-si-ta.
   -top. physics-acc. study-do-past

'Taro studied physics.'

b. Taroo-wa [buturigaku-o/no BENKYOO]-sae si-ta.
   -top. physics-acc./gen. study-even do-past

'Taro even studied physics.'

The same holds for the complex renyoo-kei nominals as shown in (145).

(145) RENYYOO-KEI NOMINALS:

   student-pl.-nom. book-acc. stand=read-do-past

'Students read books (for free at the bookstore/without sitting).'

b. [Hon-o/no TATTIYOMI]-sae gakusee-tati-wa si-ta.
   book-acc./gen. stand=read-even student-pl.-top. do-past

'Even reading books (for free at the bookstore/without sitting), students
did.'

These syntactic behaviors of Sino-Japanese VN can plausibly be accounted for if we assume that Sino-Japanese VN and renyoo-kei VN are comprised of the same constituents.

First, in the nominal clause construction, verbal Case marking is carried out when the underspecified feature [α N] of the functional head F is assigned a negative value by virtue of the government relation with the aspectual nominal, which is assumed to be [−N]. On the other hand, a positive value is assigned to the functional head F by the [+N] feature of the aspecual nominal as it is syntactically [+N]. In this case, the Case assigned to the arguments of VN is genitive as a result of nominal Case assignment.

Secondly, in the Ni-purpose clause in (143a), when a negative value is assigned to the underspecified [N] feature of the functional head of the Sino-Japanese VN under the government relation with the postposition -ni, verbal Case marking takes place since the postposition is assumed to be [−N]. On the other hand, a positive value may be given to the functional head because the Sino-Japanese VN occurs in complement position of the
postposition. Since the postposition has to discharge Case, the complement position needs to be occupied by a [+N] element in order to satisfy the θ-criterion. Hence, the postposition assigns a positive value is assigned to the functional head. Being [+N], the argument of the Sino-Japanese VN receives genitive Case as a result of nominal Case marking.

Thirdly, in (144b), the application of "VP-preposing" results in movement of the object of VN and VN. In the renyoo-kei nominal in (145b), the same constituents are subject to this same rule. Recall that the entire FP, not just the VP is moved by the application of VP-preposing as evidenced by the fact that the functional head -i is attached to the renyoo-kei moved by this rule. The pro-verb su-ru is inserted in the position vacated by this movement.

Now, let's assume that the FP is moved by VP-Preposing even when the predicate is a Sino-Japanese VN. With the Sino-Japanese VN, benkyoo 'study', both verbal and nominal Case markings to the arguments of VN are possible. Nominal Case marking follows from the fact that this VN allows both incorporated and unincorporated periphrastic forms as shown in (146).

(146) a. buturigaku-o BENKYOO-su-ru
  physics-acc. study-do-pres. 'to study physics'

b. buturigaku-no BENKYOO-o su-ru
  physics-gen. study-acc. do-pres. 'to study physics'

Thus, nominal Case marking is due to the availability of the structure in (146b). As discussed in section 3. 4. above, when this structure is not available, nominal Case marking on the argument of the Sino-Japanese VN is not possible. Nominal Case marking observed in (144b) takes place when the underspecified feature [α N] of the functional head receives a positive value for a Case-theoretic reason. Since the Sino-Japanese VN occurs in an argument position, it must receive Case in order to satisfy the θ-criterion. For this reason, a positive value is given to the [N] feature. Consequently, nominal Case marking occurs.

Verbal Case marking, on the other hand, is carried out when the underspecified [N] feature of the functional head receives a negative value under government by the light verb su(-ru) (or alternatively the tense element). In this structure, since the Sino-Japanese VN is [-N], verbal Case marking is carried out.

6. SUMMARY

To summarize this chapter, first of all, I have shown that the problems which remain unsolved under previous analyses can be naturally accounted for by the hypothesis that the renyoo-kei form of verb is not specified with respect to the ±values of the lexical feature [N]. This "underspecification" hypothesis has been put forward by Milsark 1988 in accounting for English gerundives. Having reviewed Milsark's account for English gerundives, I have proposed a dual derivation for renyoo-kei nominals, following Valois' 1991 analysis for English and French nominals. Thus, complex event renyoo-kei and Sino-Japanese VN are syntactically derived whereas simplex event nominals and "reanalyzed" (result) nominals are formed in the lexicon. Furthermore, complex event nominals are comprised of the verbal root and the functional head F. This functional head is underspecified for the [±N] feature whose value is determined by what governs it.

Secondly, I have shown that the underspecification approach to Japanese VN can account for several syntactic properties of morphologically complex renyoo-kei such as
availability of both nominal and verbal Case marking in the nominal clause construction, 
Ni-purpose clauses and the applicability of VP-preposing.

Thirdly, I have argued that the renyoo-kei suffix -i or -∅ heads the functional 
projection FP and have shown how Case marking of the arguments of renyoo-kei is 
carried out. In addition, I have suggested that morphologically complex renyoo-kei are 
formed in the lexicon as a concatenated verbal roots. Then, the feature of renyoo-kei suffix 
is percolated to each root to derive the surface form.

Finally, I have shown that the underspecification analysis can be extended to Sino-
Japanese VNs. Sino-Japanese VNs have properties identical to morphologically complex 
renyoo-kei and by assuming that the Sino-Japanese VN has a covert functional head like 
the renyoo-kei, these properties can be accounted for in a straightforward manner.

In the following Chapter, I will discuss other morphological and syntactic 
constructions involving the renyoo-kei form to support my hypothesis that the renyoo-kei 
form is underspecified and the morpho-syntactic properties of these constructions naturally 
follow if we assume the underspecification of the renyoo-kei.
CHAPTER 5

SUBJECT HONORIFICATION

0. INTRODUCTION

In previous chapters, I maintained the dual-derivation of renyoo-kei nominals: result renyoo-kei nominals (such as agentive and instrumental renyoo-kei nominals) are derived in the lexicon whereas complex eventive renyoo-kei nominals are derived in the syntax. In addition, I proposed a recategorization analysis for event renyoo-kei nominals and Sino-Japanese VNs in which renyoo-kei nominals consist of a verbal root and a functional head whose lexical specification with respect to the \( \pm \) value of the [N] feature is not inherently determined. One advantage of this analysis is that both nominal and verbal behaviors of renyoo-kei such as in the nominal clause construction, VP-Preposing, \( Ni \)-purpose clauses can be accounted for quite straightforwardly.

In this chapter, I will turn to subject honorification, one of the verbal renyoo-kei constructions. In subject honorification, it is extremely difficult to distinguish "verbal" and "nominal" renyoo-kei constructions. As observed in the previous chapter, in both "verbal" and "nominal" renyoo-kei constructions, Verbal Case marking of the arguments of renyoo-kei is possible. As nouns, the renyoo-kei form can occur in the argument position of the matrix verb. Consider the following examples.

\( \begin{align*}
(1) \quad & a. \quad \text{Tanaka-san-ga syatyo-o ni nat-ta.} \\
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either as nominal for its syntactic context or as verbal for its event interpretation and verbal Case assigning ability.

In this way, no clear line can be drawn between nominal and verbal renyoo-kei. As will become obvious, subject honorification allows verbal renyoo-kei to assign only verbal Case while occurring in a syntactic position where nouns may also appear. In the subject honorification construction, nominal and verbal Case marking depends on whether the case assignor (i.e. the renyoo-kei or Sino-Japanese VN) is governed by a tensed element.

The discussion in this chapter proceeds as follow: in section 1, I will outline subject honorification. The discussion includes honorific verb forms, the structural requirements of subject honorification, and the lexical category of honorific verbs. Section 2 is devoted to examining nominal and verbal characteristics of honorific verbs. I will point out that nominal characteristics of honorific verbs are mainly due to the renyoo-kei which is included in honorific verb constructions. In section 3, I will examine Suzuki’s 1989 analysis, which treats the renyoo-kei head as [+N] Infl. I will first outline Suzuki’s analysis and then discuss several problems with his arguments. Section 4 is a discussion of similarities between honorific verbs and VNs, which have originally pointed out by Aoyagi 1993. I will argue that the similarities between honorific verbs and VNs can be accounted for by treating honorific verbs as one form of VN. In section 5, I will propose a recategorization analysis for honorific verbs, like the analysis I have presented for renyoo-kei and Sino-Japanese VNs. In addition, I will argue that the relevant notion for licensing subject honorifics is a spec-head relation. Furthermore, I will show that the verb nar(-u) 'to become' involved in periphrastic subject honorification is a type of "light" verb in that its argument structure is incomplete. I will show that this verb is analyzed as a raising verb, and explain how application of raising to the embedded subject has pragmatic relevance. In section 6, I will discuss other types of subject honorification in which the surface form is derived via application of raising to the embedded subject. Section 7 is a summary of the discussion in this chapter.

1. THE PERIPHRASTIC SUBJECT HONORIFIC CONSTRUCTION

In this section, I will outline the notion of 'honorification' in Japanese and discuss the periphrastic subject honorific construction. Honorification in Japanese is used when the speaker wants to demonstrate deference to a person of a higher social standing who is referred to in the sentence or is being addressed.

Honorification is marked on the predicate. Depending on whether the subject or non-subject is deferential, there are two types of honorification: subject honorification and object honorification.1 Subject honorification is an exalting expression and denotes that the subject of the sentence is either higher in social standing or is an out-group member to the speaker of the sentence. On the other hand, object honorification is a condescending expression and denotes that the subject of the sentence is either lower in social standing or

---

1 As Harada 1976 points out, object honorification is possible even if the object is not stated in a sentence. In this sense, this terminology is misleading since the target of honorification can be someone to whom the event denoted by the verb is directed. Consider the following sentence.

(i) Titi-wa hon-o o-YOMI-si-ta.
father-top. book-acc. lion.-read-do-past
'Ve read a book.'

In the example in (i), the implicit recipient (or benefactor) of the event is deferential. I will, however, continue to use this terminology for simplicity.
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is an in-group member to the speaker in relation to the person to whom the event or state denoted by the predicate is directed.

The honorific form of verb is either in suppletive form or is periphrastically constructed. For example, verbs such as *ik(-u)* 'to go', *ku(-ru)* 'to come', *i(-ru)* 'to be, to exist', *tabe(-ru)* 'to eat', and *mi(-ru)* 'to see' have suppletive subject and object honorific forms, whereas the honorific form of verbs such as *yom(-u)* 'to read', *kak(-u)* 'to write', and *hanas(-u)* 'to speak' are periphrastically constructed by the use of *o*- ... *-ni nar(-u)* (subject honorification) and *o*- ... *suri* (object honorification).²

(3) SUPPLETIVE FORMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAIN</th>
<th>SUBJECT HONORIFIC</th>
<th>OBJECT HONORIFIC</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ik-u</td>
<td>irassyar-u</td>
<td>mair-u</td>
<td>to go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ku-ru</td>
<td>irassyar-u</td>
<td>mair-u</td>
<td>to come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. i-ru</td>
<td>irassyar-u</td>
<td>or-u</td>
<td>to exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. tabe-ru</td>
<td>mesiagar-u</td>
<td>itadak-u</td>
<td>to eat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) PERIPHRASTIC FORMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAIN</th>
<th>SUBJECT HONORIFIC</th>
<th>OBJECT HONORIFIC</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. yom-u</td>
<td>o-YOMI-ni nar(-u)</td>
<td>o-YOMI-suru</td>
<td>to read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. kak-u</td>
<td>o-KAKI-ni nar(-u)</td>
<td>o-KAKI-suru</td>
<td>to write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. hanas-u</td>
<td>o-HANASI-ni nar(-u)</td>
<td>o-HANASI-suru</td>
<td>to speak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the periphrastic honorific forms in (4) contain the renyoo-kei form of the verb in both subject and object honorific forms.

The choice of subject and object honorifics is controlled by the subject of the sentence (cf. Harada 1976 and Shibatani 1978). The subject is sub-classified into [+plain]. When it is [-plain], it is further subdivided into [+honorific]. In a simplex sentence, when the subject is [+honorific], the subject honorific form of the verb is licensed, whereas when the subject is [-honorific], the object honorific form of the verb is licensed. Consider the sentences in (5)-(7).³

(5) a. Taroo-ga hon-o yon-da.
   -nom. book-acc. read-past
   'Taro read the book.'

---

² There are more forms of this type with a slightly different formality expressed. For more details, see Harada 1976.

³ The sentences with # indicate that these sentences are not acceptable without context. For instance, the sentence in (6)c is acceptable either when the referent of the subject is considered to be lower in social standing than the person to whom the event denoted by the verb is directed or when the subject belongs to the group identical to the speaker of the sentence and the event denoted by the verb is directed to a person or people belonging to a group distinct from the one that the speaker of the sentence belongs to, requiring differentiating the status of the two groups. Similarly, the sentence in (7b) would be acceptable when uttered in a context requiring that the speaker treat his/her own father distinctly from another's.
b. #Taroo-ga hon-o o-YOMI-ni nat-ta.  
   -nom. book-acc. hon.-read-dat. become-past

c. #Taroo-ga hon-o o-YOMI-si-ta.  
   -nom. book-acc. hon.-read-do-past

(6) a. #Fujimori-sensei-ga hon-o yon-da.  
   -professor-nom. book-acc. read-past

   'Professor Fujimori read the book.'

b. Fujimori-sensei-ga hon-o o-YOMI-ni nat-ta.  
   -professor-nom. book-acc. hon.-read-dat. become-past

c. #Fujimori-sensei-ga hon-o o-YOMI-si-ta.  

(7) a. #Titi-ga sensei-ni at-ta.  
   my=father-nom. book-dat. meet-past

   'My father met the teacher.'

b. #Titi-ga sensei-ni o-Al-ni nat-ta.  
   my=father-nom. teacher-dat. hon.-meet-dat. become-past

c. Titi-ga sensei-ni o-Al-si-ta.  
   my=father-nom. teacher-dat. hon.-meet-do-past

The sentences in (5) indicate that a [+plain] subject such as Taroo does not trigger honorification. As the examples in (5b and c) show, both subject and object honorification are unacceptable, unless the subject of the sentence, Taroo, is understood as [−plain]. The sentences in (6) and (7) illustrate that with a [−plain] subject, the feature ±honorific can determine which honorification is permissible. The example in (6b) demonstrates that the [+honorific] subject triggers subject honorific, whereas object honorific is allowed when the subject is [−honorific] as in (7c).

2. Lexical Category of Verbs in The Periphrastic Honorific Construction

In this section, I will examine the lexical category status of the renyo-o-kei occurring in the periphrastic honorific construction. I will argue that the NP-like characteristics and sentential characteristics of the renyo-o-kei in the periphrastic honorific construction are accounted for by the [+N] status of the renyo-o-kei head -i (or -Ø).

As pointed out above, the periphrastic honorific form of verb is formed with the renyo-o-kei. Other inflected forms of the verb cannot occur in either subject or object periphrastic honorific verbs as shown in (8).
(8) **FORM** | **SUBJECT HONORIFIC** | **OBJECT HONORIFIC** | **GLOSS**
--- | --- | --- | ---
*mizen* | kak-a | *o-kaka-ni nar-u* | *o-kaka-su-ru* | to write
*renyoo* | KAK-i | o-KAKI-ni nar-u | o-KAKI-su-ru |
*syuusi* | kak-u | *o-kaku-ni nar-u* | *o-kaku-su-ru* |
*katei* | kak-e | *o-kake-ni nar-u* | *o-kake-su-ru* |
*sikoo* | kak-o | *o-kako-ni nar-u* | *o-kako-su-ru* |

Inflection of subject and object honorific verbs occurs on *nar(-u)* 'to become' and *su(-ru)* 'to do', respectively. The renyoo-kei form involved in these honorific forms does not inflect.

(9) **FORM** | **SUBJECT HONORIFIC** | **OBJECT HONORIFIC** | **GLOSS**
--- | --- | --- | ---
*mizen* | o-KAKI-ni nar-a | o-KAKI-si | to write
*renyoo* | o-KAKI-ni nar-i | o-KAKI-si |
*syuusi* | o-KAKI-ni nar-u | o-KAKI-su-ru |
*katei* | o-KAKI-ni nar-e | o-KAKI-su-re |
*sikoo* | o-KAKI-ni nar-o | o-KAKI-si-yoo |

Previously, the renyoo-kei form occurring in subject honorific constructions has been treated as either an NP or a S (for instance, Suzuki 1989 and Toribio 1990). In the following subsections, I will examine the previous analyses of the subject honorific forms, and argue that the sentential and NP-like status of the renyoo-kei in this construction can be accounted for by simply assuming the recategorization analysis of the renyoo-kei discussed in the previous chapter. In other words, I will maintain that the renyoo-kei head -i (or -Ø) in subject honorification is [+N], and within this projection subject honorification is licensed. Subsequently, this [+N] head is recategorized as [-N] when it is governed by a higher verb.

2.1. NP-LIKE BEHAVIORS IN THE SUBJECT HONORIFIC CONSTRUCTION

Let's begin the discussion with an examination of the NP-like behaviors of the renyoo-kei form contained in the subject honorific construction. First, one obvious NP-like characteristic of the renyoo-kei in this construction is that the renyoo-kei is directly followed by the dative particle *-ni*. As shown in (1) above, the verb *nar(-u)* 'to become' takes an NP complement expressing Goal which is marked in the dative. The dative marker for the Goal argument is obligatory with the verb *nar(-u)*, as the contrast in (10) shows.

---

4 I will refer to each inflected form by the name traditionally used in Japanese linguistics. Roughly each form is translated into English as follows: *renyoo*=adverbial, continuative*, *syuusi*=conclusive*, *mizen*=irrealis, imperfect*, *katei*=hypothetical, subjunctive*, and *sikoo*=cohortative*. Note that there are other forms: *rentai*=attributive*, which is identical to the *syuusi* form but occurs in a prenominal position and *meirei*=imperative*, which is identical to the *katei* form and is used as an order or a command. Obviously, these terminology reflect both the syntactic and semantic criteria by which each form is classified.
(10)  a.  Taroo-wa syatyooni nat-ta.
     -top. company=president-dat. become-past
     'Taro became a company president.'

     -top. company=president become-past

The same holds true of the subject honorific sentence. Thus, in the examples in (11), the sentence is ungrammatical if the dative marker is deleted.

     professor-nom. sake-acc. hon.-drink-dat. become-past
     'The professor drank sake.'

   b.  *Sensei-ga sake-o o-NOMI nat-ta.
     professor-nom. sake-acc. hon.-drink become-past

The ungrammaticality of the sentence in (10b) is attributed to a violation of Case theory. In this connection, compare the sentence in (12) where a ditransitive verb age(-ru) 'to give' licenses a Goal NP marked in the dative by the particle -ni, with the sentence in (13) in which a Goal NP is not marked in the dative.

(12)  Taroo-wa Hanako-ni hon(-o) age-ta-no.
     -top. -dat. book(-acc.) give-past-SP
     'Taro gave Hanako a book.'

(13)  *Taroo-wa Hanako-O hon(-o) age-ta-no.
     -top. book(-acc.) give-past-SP

While the accusative marker -o may or may not occur (for the optionality of the accusative marker, see Saito 1985) as shown in (12), the Goal argument must be marked by the dative marker -ni, as the ungrammaticality of (13) illustrates. The ungrammaticality of the sentence in (13) is accounted for by the Case theory requirement that an NP occur in a Case position. Dative Case must be morphologically realized as a dative marker -ni on the NP occurring in a Case position in a manner specified in (14).

(14)  ___-ni

Therefore, the ungrammaticality of the sentence in (10b) and (13) can be attributed to the fact that the dative NP does not appear in a Case position.

Returning to the sentences in (11), the comparison between the sentences in (11a) and (11b) shows that the ungrammaticality of (11b) follows from the fact that the XP headed by the honorific verb o-nomi 'honorific-drink' fails to appear in Case position. Since the ungrammaticality of (11b) is accounted for by Case theory, it is plausible to

---

5 SP stands for sentential particle. Sentential particles in general function as affective markers which convey the speaker's attitude toward the addressee, such as interrogation, asking confirmation, or showing the unchallengeability of a statement. In addition, sentential particles occur frequently in an informal style of utterances. The sentential particle -no in (12) functions to show a certain degree of unchallengeability of the statement. I added this particle in order to avoid unnaturalness of the sentence, although the sentence is fully grammatical without it.
assume that the constituent *o-renyoo-kei* in the subject honorific construction occurs in the NP position.\(^6\)

Another piece of evidence showing the NP-like status of the *o-renyoo-kei* constituent of subject honorification is found in the distribution of the genitive marker *-no* (cf. Suzuki 1989). When an NP modifies another NP, the modifying NP is ordinarily marked in the genitive. In the meantime, when a modifier is verbal (both verb and adjective), no genitive marker is inserted. Compare the examples in (15)-(17).

(15) a. Nihongo-no hon
Japanese=language-gen. book
'a Japanese book'

b. *Nihongo-∅ hon.
Japanese=language book

(16) a. Hyoosi-ga aka-i hon,
cover-nom. red-pres. book
'a book whose cover is red'

b. *Hyoosi-ga aka-i-no hon.
cover-nom. red-pres.-gen. book

(17) a. Taroo-ga kat-ta hon.\(^7\)
-nom. buy-past book
'a book which Taro bought'

b. *Taroo-ga kat-ta-no hon.
-nom. buy-past-gen. book

As the contrast in (15) shows, when an NP is used as a modifier, the genitive marker *-no* must be attached, whereas adjectival and verbal modifiers may not occur with the genitive marker as the ungrammaticality of the examples in (16b) and (17b) show.

Now, the honorific verb *o-renyoo-kei* occurs with the genitive marker *-no* when it appears in modifier position. Consider the examples in (18).

(18) a. Yamada-sensei-ga o-YOMI-no hon.
-professor-nom. hon.-read-gen. book
'A book which Professor Yamada is reading.'

b. *Yamada-sensei-ga o-YOMI hon.
-professor-nom. hon.-read book

In (18a), the honorific verb *o-yomi* 'honorific-read' occurs in prenominal position and it is marked by the genitive marker *-no*. When the genitive marker is deleted as in (18b), the sentence becomes ungrammatical, illustrating that honorific forms in prenominal position behave in a manner identical to NPs.

---

\(^6\) Alternatively, the ungrammaticality of sentences like (10b), (11b), and (13) is accounted for by stating that dative Case is not discharged, thus resulting in a \(\emptyset\)-criterion violation.

\(^7\) In this sentence, the subject of the relative clause can be marked in the genitive as a result of "GA/NO conversion". For more details on this rule, see Ohta 1987.
Thirdly, the honorific verb o-renyoo-kei can occur in pre-copula position. This construction denotes progressive aspect (cf. section 6. 1. below). Thus, the sentence in (19a) is a synonymous to the sentence in (19b).

    company=president-nom. hon.-wait-copula=pres.
    'The company president is waiting.'

b. Syatyoo-ga o-MATI-ni nat-te i-ru.
    company=president-nom. hon.-wait-dat. become-TE exist-pres.

The pre-copula position where the honorific verb o-mati 'honorific-wait' occurs in (19a) is occupied by [+N] lexical items such as NPs and Adjectival Nouns (henceforth abbreviated as AN) as shown in (20).8

(20) a. Sono otoko-wa nihonzin-da.
    'The man is Japanese.'

b. Sono mati-wa sizuka-da.
    that town-top. quiet-copula=pres.
    'The town is quiet.'

When the pre-copula position is occupied by a verb, ungrammaticality results as shown in (21).9

(21) a. *Sono otoko-wa hon-o yom-u-da.
    'The man will read a book.'

    that town-top. crowded-exist-past-copula=pres.
    'The town was crowded.'

When an adjective occurs in this position, the present tense polite form of copula, -des-u, is the only form allowed as exemplified in (22).

(22) a. Kono uti-wa taka-i-des-u.
    this house-top. expensive-pres.-copula=polite-pres.
    'This house is expensive.'

    this house-top. expensive-pres.-coupla=pres.

---

8 For the [+N] status of Adjectival Nouns, see Miyagawa 1987. For an opposing view, see Ohkado 1991.
9 In non-standard style, particularly in the "rustic" style often observed in plays, cartoons, and folk tales, verbs may occur in pre-copula position. To my ear, this style is somewhat artificial and as far as I know, no native speakers from rural areas speak in this style.
The copula in this position does not inflect to show tense or negation, functioning merely as a politeness marker. Tense and negation of adjectives are marked on the adjective, not on the copula. In contrast, with NPs and ANs, the copula inflects to indicate tense, negation, and politeness as the contrast between (23) and (24) shows.

(23) WITH ADJECTIVES:

   this book-top. big-KAT-past-copula-pres.
   'This book was big.'

b. Kono hon-wa ooki-ku-na-i-des-u.
   this book-top. big-KU-neg.-pres.-copula-pres.
   'This book is not big.'

c. Kono hon-wa ook-i.
   this book-top. big-pres.
   'This book is big (informal).'

d. Kono hon-wa ook-i-des-u.
   this book-top. big-pres.-copula-pres.
   'This book is big (formal).'

(24) WITH NPS AND ANS:

a. Sono otoko-wa nihonzin/sizuka-dat-ta.
   that man-top. Japanese/quiet-copula-past
   'That man was Japanese/quiet.'

b. Sono otoko-wa nihonzin/sizuka-zya-na-i.\(^\text{10}\)
   'That man is not Japanese/quiet.'

c. Sono otoko-wa nihonzin/sizuka-da.
   'That man is Japanese/quiet (informal).'

d. Sono otoko-wa nihonzin/sizuka-des-u.
   that man-top. Japanese/quiet-copula-pres.
   'That man is Japanese/quiet (formal).'

Therefore, the example in (19a) shows that the honorific verb o+renyoo-kei in the subject honorific construction behaves as an NP.

\(^{10}\) The copula in pre-negative position, -zya, is a contracted form of the copula -da and the topic marker -wa. The non-contracted form -de-wa also yields a grammatical sentence.

(i) Sono otoko-wa nihonzin/sizuka-de-wa-na-i.
   'That man is not Japanese/quiet.'
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Fourth, Miyagawa 1987 and Ohkado 1991 independently argue that the nominal suffix -soo 'likelihood, appearance' can only be attached to [+V] elements. Thus, in the following examples, this suffix yields grammatical forms with verbs and adjectives but not with nouns.

(25) VERB+SOO
   a. Ame-ga huri-soo-da.
      rain-nom. fall-appearance-copula=pres.
      'It appears to rain.'
      again earthquake-nom. happen-appearance-copula=pres.
      'It is likely that there will be an earthquake again.'

(26) ADJECTIVE+SOO
      this car-top. very expensive-appearance-copula=pres.
      'This car appears to be very expensive.'
   b. Rosu-wa totemo abuna-soo-da.
      LA-top. very dangerous-appearance-copula=pres.
      'It appears that LA is very dangerous.'

(27) *NOUN+SOO
   a. *Ano otoko-wa nihonzin-soo-da.
      'It appears that the man is a Japanese.'

---

There are, however, a few exceptions. If a noun denotes an entity which serves as a criteria for measuring the degree of quality such as richness, beauty, and difficulty, the suffix -soo can even be attached to a noun. For example, the following examples are all grammatical.

(i) Kono mondai-wa nanmon-soo-da.
    this question-top. difficult=question-appearance-copula=pres.
    'This question appears to be a tough question.'

(ii) Ano hito-wa kanemoti-soo-da.
    that person-top. rich=person-appearance-copula=pres.
    'That person appears to be rich.'

By the same token, the suffix -soo can occur with adjectival nouns whose categorial status is almost identical to nouns which has adjectival semantic properties.

(iv) Kono mati-wa sizuka-soo-da.
     this town-top. quiet-appearance-copula=pres.
     'This town appears to be quiet.'

This implies that whether or not the suffix -soo may be attached is semantically rather than syntactically determined.

11 There are, however, a few exceptions. If a noun denotes an entity which serves as a criteria for measuring the degree of quality such as richness, beauty, and difficulty, the suffix -soo can even be attached to a noun. For example, the following examples are all grammatical.
   that person-top. child-appearance-copula=pres.
   'That person appears to be a child.'

The suffix -soo cannot occur with the o+renyoo-kei of the subject honorific form.

    -professor-top. hon.-speak-appearance-copula=pres.
    'Professor Yamada appears to speak.'

    -professor-top. speak-appearance-copula=pres.

b. *Syatyoo-wa hon-o o-YOMI-soo-
   company=president-top. book-acc. hon.-read-appearance-
   da.
   copula=pres.
   'The company president appears to read a book.'

cf. Syatyoo-wa hon-o YOMI-soo-da.

Thus, the constituent o+renyoo-kei behaves like an NP with respect to the suffixication of -soo, too.

Finally, the honorific verb o+renyoo-kei does not participate in complex predicate formation such as those involving the adjectival suffixes -ta-(i) 'want' and -yasu-(i) 'easy'. These adjectival suffixes subcategorize for the renyoo-kei form of the verb as shown in (29) (cf. Ohta 1991).

    car-nom. buy-I-want-pres.
    'I want to buy a car'

b. Kono pen-ga KAK-I-yasu-i.
   this -nom. write-I-easy-pres.
   'This pen is easy to write with.'

If the honorific verb o+renyoo-kei were a verb, then complex predicates like in (29) should be well-formed. However, a complex predicate cannot be formed with an honorific verb as the ungrammaticality of (30) shows.

(30) a. *Sensei-ga kuruma-ga o-KA-I-ta-i to omot-te
    professor-nom. car-nom. hon.-buy-I-want-pres. quot. think-TE
    i-ru.
    exist-pres.
    'Professor wants to buy a car.'
cf. a'. Sensei-ga kuruma-ga o-KA-i-ni NAR-i-ta-i to
omot-te i-ru.
think-TE exist-pres.

b. *Okyakusama-ni-wa kono kaban-no hoo-ga o-TUKA-I-yasu-
customer(polite)-for-top. this bag-gen. direction-nom. hon.-use-I-easy-
i to omoi-mas-u-ga...
pres. quot. think-polite-pres.-but
'I think this bag is easier for you to use.'
cf. b'. Okyakusama-ni-wa kono kaban-no hoo-ga o-TUKA-I-ni
customer(polite)-for-top. this bag-gen. direction-nom. hon.-use-I-dat.
NAR-I-yasu-i to omoi-mas-u-ga...
become-I-easy-pres. quot. think-polite-pres.-but

As shown in (30a and b), adjectival suffixes cannot be directly affixed to the
honorable verb o+renyoo-kei; in order to form a grammatical sentence, adjectival suffixes
require the renyoo-kei form of the verb nar-i 'to become', which in turn requires dative
marking on the renyoo-kei of the honorific form. This fact indicates that the honorific verb
o+renyoo-kei does not behave as a full-fledged verb.

2.2. SENTENCE-LIKE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECT HONORIFIC CONSTRUCTION

Thus far, I have examined cases where the honorific verb o+renyoo-kei in the
subject honorific construction behaves similarly to NPs. However, there are cases which
cast doubt on an analysis that treats the honorific verb o+renyoo-kei used in subject
honoration as an NP.

First of all, the arguments of renyoo-kei occurring in the subject honorific
construction receive Verbal case marking as shown in (31).

(31) a. Yamada-sensei-ga hon-o o-KA1-ni nat-ta.
     -professor-nom. book-acc. hon.-buy-dat. become-past
     'Professor Yamada bought a book.'
     company=president-nom. car-dat. hon.-ride-dat. become-past
     'The company president got in the car.'

The direct object gets accusative Case in (31a) and the Goal argument is marked in the
dative in (31b). These facts indicate that the renyoo-kei form in this construction still
retains the ability to assign Verbal Case to its arguments as if it is [-N].

For the sake of argument, let's suppose that a renyoo-kei in the subject honorific
construction loses its verbal property and is recategorized as [+N]. Then, the verbal Cases
assigned to its arguments in (31) cannot be accounted for, since a [+N] category does not
assign verbal Case to its arguments unless it occurs in the aspectual nominal construction.
(32)  a. *Peter-ga onseigaku-o KENKYUU.\textsuperscript{12} 
    -nom. phonetics-acc. research
    'Peter's research on phonetics.'
  b. Peter-no onseigaku-no KENKYUU.
    -gen. phonetics-gen. research
  c. Peter-ga onseigaku-o KENKYUU-si-ta.
    -nom. phonetics-acc. research-do-past
    'Peter did research on phonetics.'
  d. Peter-ga onseigaku-o KENKYUU-tyuu-ni, ...
    -nom. phonetics-acc. research-while-in
    'While Peter was doing research on phonetics, ...'
  e. Peter-no onseigaku-no KENKYUU-tyuu-ni, ...
    -gen. phonetics-gen. research-while-in

The paradigm in (32) shows that Sino-Japanese NPs such as *kenkyuu 'research' do not assign verbal Case to their arguments unless they are governed by either the light verb su(-ru) 'to do' as in (32c)\textsuperscript{13} or an aspectual nominal such as -tyuu 'while' as in (32d). In contrast, nominal Case marking in (32b) and in the aspectual nominal construction in (32e) yields fully grammatical sentences.

The same facts hold for renyoo-kei nominals such as uchiage (lit.) to hit and raise', 'to launch'. Consider the following paradigm (which is partly cited from Suzuki 1989).

(33)  a. *Nasa-ga roketto-o UCHIAGE.
    NASA-nom. rocket-acc. launch
    'NASA's launch of a rocket.'
  b. Nasa-no roketto-no UCHIAGE.
    NASA-gen. rocket-gen. launch
  c. Nasa-ga roketto-o UCHIAGE-ta.
    NASA-nom. rocket-acc. launch-past
    'NASA launched a rocket.'
  d. Nasa-ga roketto-o UCHIAGE-no-sai, ...
    NASA-nom. rocket-acc. launch-gen.-when
    'When NASA launched a rocket, ...'
  e. Nasa-no roketto-no UCHIAGE-no-sai-ni, ...
    NASA-gen. rocket-gen. launch-gen.-when-at

The renyoo-kei nominal uchiage 'launch' can be marked for tense as in (33c). When this renyoo-kei is marked for tense or suffixed with aspectual nominals such as -no-sai 'when', verbal Case marking is allowed for its arguments. However, only nominal Case marking is possible when it occurs independently as the contrast in (33a) and (33b) shows.

\textsuperscript{12} This sentence and the sentence in (33a) are acceptable as headlines in the newspaper, magazines, etc.
\textsuperscript{13} For "light" verbs, see Grimshaw and Mester 1988, Hayashi 1994, Cho 1994, and section 5.3.1. below.
Returning to the Case marking facts in (31), if the honorific verb o+renyoo-kei in subject honorification is [+N], the possibility of verbal Case marking in (31) can not be accounted for since the [+N] category does not have Case-assigning ability.

Secondly, the honorific verb o+renyoo-kei cannot occur in the focus position of the cleft construction (cf. Harada 1976).

    professor-top. president-dat. become-past

    'Professor Yamada became president of the university.'

    -professor-nom. become-past-one-top. president-copula=pres.

    'What Professor Yamada has become is the president of the university.'

    professor-top. hon.-return-dat. become-past

    'Professor Yamada has gone home.'

    professor-nom. become-past-one-top. hon.-return-copula=pres.

    (=*What Professor Yamada did was go home. ')

The dative NP in (34a) can be clefted whereas the constituent marked in the dative in (35a), viz. o+renyoo-kei, cannot occur in the focus position in the cleft sentence.

Finally, Harada 1976 argues that the honorific verb o+renyoo-kei cannot undergo ellipsis under anaphoric relation.

    -top. American-person-dat. become-polite-past Q

    'Did Taro become a US citizen?'

    Ee, nari-masi-ta.
    Yes become-polite-past

    'Yes, he did.'

b. Fujimori-sensei-wa o-KAERI-ni nari-masi-ta ka.
    professor-top. hon.-return-dat. become-polite-past Q

    'Did Professor Fujimori return?'

    *Ee, nari-masi-ta.
    Yes become-polite-past.

    cf. Ee, o-KAERI-ni nari-masi-ta.
    Yes hon.-return-dat. become-polite-past

The impossibility of the response in (36b) is perhaps due to the application of deletion to a constituent which cannot be semantically recoverable.

In this connection, consider the examples in (37) where the rule of gapping is applied successfully to either the verb nar(-u) 'to become' alone or to the entire subject honorific predicate.
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   'Professor Yamada read a book and Professor Suzuki wrote a letter.'

   'Professor Yamada played the piano, and Professor Suzuki, the violin.'

The gapping examples in (37) show that the honorific verb o+renyoo-kei, which is followed by the dative marker -ni, and the verb nar(-u) 'to become' do not combine to form a word.

Consider the example in (38) where the causative form of the verb cannot be gapped when only the causative suffix is left behind. Note that the causative suffix -(sa)se is attached to the irrealis (or mizen-kei) form of verb. The irrealis form of consonant verbs such as yom(-u) 'to read' and kak(-u) 'to write' consist of the root and the suffix -a (cf. (8) above, and Shibatani 1990 for more detail).

   'Taro made children read books, and Hanako made children write a letter.'

I assume that the impossibility of gapping in the causative construction, leaving the bound morpheme -(sa)se, is due to the fact that the causative suffix and irrealis form of the verb form a 'word'.

The degree of being a word can be measured by inserting an adverb between two elements forming a predicate. In this respect, the subject honorific form allows occurrence of an adverb between the honorific verb o+renyoo-kei and the dative marker ni and the verb nar(-u) 'to become' although the acceptability declines to a certain degree. However, there is a considerable difference in terms of grammaticality between the subject honorific construction and the causative construction when an adverb is inserted between the embedded verb and matrix verb -(sa)se. Thus, compare the examples in (39).

(39) a. (?)Yamada-sensei-wa piano-o o-HIKI-ni totuzen nat-ta. -professor-top. -acc. hon.-play-dat. suddenly become-past
   'Professor Yamada suddenly played the piano.'

   'Taro suddenly made Hanako read the book.'

To summarize so far, the properties of the o+renyoo-kei in the subject honorific construction are listed in (40).
(40) a. \(o+\text{renyoo-kei}\) occurs in Case position
b. \(o+\text{renyoo-kei}\) can be assigned genitive Case\(^{14}\)
c. \(o+\text{renyoo-kei}\) occurs pre-copula position
d. \(o+\text{renyoo-kei}\) behaves as [-V] category with respect to the suffix -soo
e. \(o+\text{renyoo-kei}\) cannot be affixed by adjectival suffixes such as -\(\text{ta-}\)i and -\(\text{yasu-}\)i
f. verbal Case is marked for the arguments of the renyoo-kei
g. \(o+\text{renyoo-kei}\) cannot be clefted
h. \(o+\text{renyoo-kei}\) cannot be deleted under anaphoric relations

There facts indicate that the renyoo-kei form occurring in the subject honorific construction has both nominal and verbal characteristics.

3. THE [+N] INFL ANALYSIS OF RENYOO-KEI

In this section, I will examine the [+N] Infl analysis of Suzuki 1989, who claims that subject honorification involves a DP which contains a [+N] Infl. This [+N] Infl is identified as the renyoo-kei head -i\(\text{o}\). After reviewing Suzuki's argument, I will point out some problems with the [+N] Infl analysis of renyoo-kei.

3. 1. SUZUKI 'S 1989 ANALYSIS OF SUBJECT HONORIFICATION

In order to account for the nominal properties of the renyoo-kei, Suzuki 1989 treats the renyoo-kei form of the verb occurring in the subject honorific construction as constituting a DP and proposes the structure in (42) for the subject honorific sentence in (41). (I have slightly modified the structure in (42).)

(41) Sensei-ga tegami-o o-KAKI-ni nar-u.
     professor-nom. letter-acc. hon.-write-dat. become-pres.
     'The professor will write a letter.'

---

\(^{14}\) This description of the occurrence of -\(\text{no}\) may not be accurate. Instead of the genitive marker, I will argue that the this is a form of copula occurring in pre-nominal position. Therefore, the characteristic in (40b) is identical to the characteristic listed in (40c). For more details, see Aoyagi 1993.
Positing the structure shown in (42) has apparent advantages in that while verbal Case marking for the direct object of the verb is allowed in the lowest VP, the honorific form of the verb o-kak-i 'honorific-write-I' is assigned the feature [+N] because the renyoo-kei suffix -i is [+N].

Suzuki argues that the honorific prefix o- is attached to X0 categories citing the following examples.

(43) a. [N tegami] letter
    b. o-[N tegami] hon. letter
    c. [NP nagai o-[N tegami]] long hon. letter
    d. *o-[NP nagai tegami] hon. long letter

(44) a. [A utukusi-] beautiful
    b. o-[A utukusi-] hon. beautiful
    c. [AP totemo o-[A utukusi-]] very hon. beautiful
    d. *o-[AP totemo utukusi-] hon. very beautiful

(45) a. [V nom-] drink
    b. o-[V nom-] hon. drink
    c. [VP koohii-o o-[V nom-]] coffee-acc. hon. drink
    d. *o-[VP koohii-o nom-] hon. coffee-acc. drink
Therefore, the honorific form of the verb in (41) is formed via verb movement of the verb root into the head position of I.

3. 2. PROBLEMS WITH SUZUKI'S ANALYSIS

3. 2. 1. THE DOMAIN OF SUBJECT HONORIFICATION

Aside from the verb movement analysis of honorific verb formation, Suzuki's account immediately faces some problems. First of all, there are cases where nominal Case marking occurs in the subject honorification when the honorific verb o+renyoo-kei is not followed by the verbs -ni nar(-u)/da 'become/copula'. Consider the examples in (46).

(46)  a. Sensei-gata-no o-HANASAI-wa muda-dat-ta
     professor-pl.=polite-gen. hon.-discuss-top. vain-copula-past
     yoo-des-u-ne.
     appearance-copula=polite-pres -SP
     'It appears that the discussion among the professors was in vain.'

     b. Okyakusama-no o-KAIAGE-no syoohin-no
     customer=polite-gen. hon.-purchase-gen. merchandise-gen.
     o-TORIKAE-o o-KOTOWARI-si-te-i-mas-u.
     hon.-exchange-top. hon.-refuse-do-TE-exist-polite-pres.
     'We refuse to exchange the merchandise that the customers purchased.'

     c. Miraa-sensei-no nihongo-no rekisi-nituite-no
     o-HANASI-ga Roisu-hooru-de okonaw-are-ta.
     hon.-speech-nom. Royce-Hall-in carry=out-pass.-past
     'Professor Miller's talk on the history of the Japanese language was held in Royce Hall.'

In the examples in (46), the underlined honorific forms do not occur in the context -ni nar(-u) or -da. Note that the arguments of the honorific verbs in these examples receive genitive Case. For instance, the Agent NP in (46a), sensei-gata 'professor-pl.(polite)' is marked in the genitive and the Theme NP in (46b) syoohin 'merchandise' is also marked in the genitive. In addition, the Theme NP in (46c) nihongo-no rekisi 'the history of the Japanese language' is followed by the postposition -nituite 'about' and the entire phrase nihongo-no rekisi-nituite 'about the history of the Japanese language' is marked in the genitive.

These examples indicate that the verbal Case marking triggered by the predicate o+renyoo-kei-ni nar(-u) or o+renyoo-kei da is restricted to cases where the o+renyoo-kei occurs as a dative argument of the verb nar(-u) or is placed in pre-copula position such as in (41). More specifically, when the honorific verb occurs in another argument position, only nominal Case marking is allowed. This is clearly shown in the ungrammaticality of the examples in (47), which correspond to the examples in (46) with arguments marked in the verbal Cases such as nominative and accusative.
(47) a. *Sensei-gata-ga  o-HANASIAI-wa muda-dat-ta
   professor-pl.=polite-nom. hon.-discuss-top. vain-copula-past
   yoo-des-u-ne.
   appearance-copula=polite-pres SP

   'It appears that the discussion among the professors was in vain.'

b. *Okyakusama-ga  o-KAIAGE-no syoohin-o
   customer=polite-nom. hon.-purchase-gen. merchandise-acc.
   o-TORIKAI-o  o-KOTOWARI-si-te-i-mas-u.
   hon.-exchange-top. hon.-refuse-do-TE-exist-polite-pres.

   'We refuse to exchange the merchandise that customers purchased.'

c. *Mira-seisai-ga
   nihongo-no rekisi-nituite
   Miller-professor-nom. Japanese=language-gen. history-about
   o-HANASAI-ga Roisu-hooru-de okonaw-are-ta.
   hon.-speech-nom. Royce-Hall-in carry=out-pass.-past

   'Professor Miller's talk on the history of the Japanese language was held in Royce Hall.'

Secondly, in the structure which Suzuki proposes in (42), the subject NP licensing subject honorification is treated as a subject of the verb nar(-u). In the lowest IP, the subject position is occupied by FRO which is interpreted as coreferential to the subject of the higher IP.

There is, however, evidence showing that the domain in which subject honorification is licensed is the DP in Suzuki's structure. Consider the examples in (48).

(48) a. Minasama-no  sono ken-nituite-no  o-TOIAWASE-ni-wa,
   everyone(polite)-gen. that incident-about-gen. hon.-inquire-dat.-top.
   ima-wa o-kotae-si-kane-mas-u.
   now-top. hon.-answer-do-impossible-polite-pres.

   'We cannot respond to everyone's inquiry on that incident.'

a'. Minasama-ga
   sono ken-nituite  o-TOIAWASE-ni nat-te
   everyone(polite)-nom. that incident-about hon.-inquire-dat. become-TE
   i-mas-u-ga...
   exist-polite-pres.-but

   'Everyone is inquiring about the incident but ...'

b. Okyakusama-no  kamera, bideo-nado-no  o-MOTIKOMI-wa kataku
   audience(polite)-gen. camera video-so=on-gen. hon.-carry=in-top. strictly
   o-kotowari si-mas-u.
   hon.-refuse do-polite-pres.

   'The bringing of cameras, videos, etc. by audience is strictly prohibited.'
b'. Okyakusama-ga kamera, video-nado-o o-MOTIKOMI-ni audience(polite)-nom. camera video-so=on-acc. hon.-carry=in-dat.
nar-u koto-wa...15
become-pres. fact-top.

'That customers will bring in cameras, video, and so on is ...'

The underlined nominal clauses in (48a) and (48b) consist of the subject which licenses subject honorification, an honorific verb and its arguments. Compared with the corresponding sentential subject honorification in (48a' and b'), subject honorification is licensed by the same subject in both (48a and b). This fact indicates that the domain in which subject honorification occurs must be inside the DP in Suzuki's sense, not inside the matrix IP. This means that the subject which licenses subject honorification must be in the Spec. of lower IP in his framework. Therefore, the structure given in (42) must be revised so that the embedded subject position is occupied by the NP triggering subject honorification instead of by PRO.

3. 2. 2. THE STATUS OF THE HONORIFIC PREFIX

The other problem with Suzuki's analysis is the status of the honorific prefix. In (42), Suzuki posits the honorific prefix to be an element of Infl. First of all, Suzuki's analysis requires infixation of the verb root when the honorific verb o-renyoo-kei is formed. Infixation is uncommon in Japanese, and if the verb movement forming the honorific verb is a process of infixation, it requires an ad hoc requirement just for honorific verb formation.16

As Aoyagi 1993 observes, there is a parallelism between VNPs and honorific verbs. As I will show in section 4 below, this parallelism can be captured if, as I assumed for VNPs, the honorific verb is treated as lexically derived and base-generated in the position where the verbal root occurs (cf. Chapter 4).

In the following sections, I will examine the shared properties commonly observed between honorific verbs and VNPs (in section 4) and present an argument for licensing condition of honorific verbs in terms of Spec-Head Agreement (in section 5. 2.).

4. HONORIFIC VERBS AND VNPs

4. 1. NOMINAL AND VERBAL PROPERTIES

So far, I have examined the subject honorific construction, a construction whose predicate consists of the prefix o- followed by the renyoo-kei. As shown in section 1. 2. above, the honorific verb o-renyoo-kei has both nominal and verbal characteristics. These properties of honorific verbs resemble VNPs since, as discussed in previous chapters, VNPs generally behave nominally and verbally. In particular, the properties of honorific verbs

15 Note that this sentence cannot be paraphrased with the copula in place of -ni nar-u 'dat. become-pres'. This is probably because the sentence in (48b') does not have progressive interpretation.

16 Toribio 1990 argues, independently of Suzuki 1989, that subject honorification involves a DP in the dative argument position of the verb narr(-u) 'to become'. The difference between Toribio and Suzuki is that the former treats the prefix o- in the subject honorific as a morphological spell-out of the honorific features of the subject in the specifier position of DP. Because honorific verbs and Sino-Japanese VNPs behave similarly, as compared to the "bare" renyoo-kei (cf. section 4 below), it seems that Toribio's analysis requires some revision. For more discussion, see section 4 below.
listed in (40) are mostly shared by VNs. Consider the examples in (49) in which the Sino-Japanese VN *kenkyuu* 'research' a) occurs in a Case-position and a pre-copula position, b) cannot be suffixed by the nominal suffix *-soo* 'appearance', c) cannot be suffixed by adjectival suffixes and d) assigns Verbal Case when followed by the light verb *suru* 'to do'.

(49) a. Taroo-ga gengogaku-no *KENKYUU*-o okonat-ta.
   -nom. linguistics-gen. research-acc. carry=out-past
   'Taro did research in linguistics.'

   b. Kore-ga Taroo-no *KENKYUU*-da.
      this-nom. -gen. research-copula=pres.
      'This is Taro's research.'

   c. *Ano hito-no kyoomi-wa gengogaku-no *KENKYUU*-soo
      that person-gen. interest-top. linguistics-gen. research-appearance
      da. copula=pres.
      'That person's interest appears to be research in linguistics.'

   d. *Boku-wa gengogaku-o *KENKYUU*-ta-i.
      I-top. linguistics-acc. research-want-pres.
      'I want to do research on linguistics.'

   cf. d'. Boku-wa gengogaku-o *KENKYUU*-si-ta-i.
      I-top. linguistics-acc. research-do(=I)-want-pres.

   e. Hanako-ga gengogaku-o *KENKYUU*-si-ta.
      -nom. linguistics-acc. research-do-past
      'Hanako did a research on linguistics.'

Furthermore, the subject honorific construction can be formed with Sino-Japanese VNs. When Sino-Japanese VNs occur in the subject honorific construction, the honorific prefix is generally *go-*.

(50) a. Kurinton-daitooryoo-ga sinsaiti-o
    go-*SISATU-
    Clinton-president-nom. earthquake=stricken=area-acc. hon.-inspection
    ni nat-te i-ru
    dat. become-TE exist-pres.
    'President Clinton is inspecting areas damaged by earthquake.'

   or a'. ... go-*SISATU*-da.
   hon.-inspection-copula=pres.

---

17 See Aoyagi 1993 for a similar conclusion.
18 In general, it can be said that the honorific form of Sino-Japanese VNs are prefixed with *go-* and native Japanese verbs or *renyou-ki* VNs are prefixed by *o-* although there are cases which do not fall into this generalization. For instance, the native word *motomotomo* 'indeed', 'reasonable' is prefixed by *go-* in honorific form as in *go-motomotomo* 'you are right'. On the other hand, Sino-Japanese VNs such as *sewa* 'care' take *o-* as the honorific prefix as in *o-sewa* 'care'. For more details, see Harada 1976 pp. 503-506.
Stowell-doctor-nom. new theory-acc. hon.-publication-dat. become-past
'Dr. Stowell published a new theory.'

In the examples in (50), Sino-Japanese VNs such as sisatu 'inspection' and happyoo 'publication, announcement' occur in the context go-...-ni nar(-u)'honorific-...-dat.
become(-pres.).'

As in the case of subject honorification involving the renyoo-kei form of the verb,
Sino-Japanese VNs can be the head of an NP in which subject honorification is triggered.

(51) a. Kurinton-daitooryoo-no sinsaiti-no go-SISATU.
Clinton-president-gen. earthquake=stricken=area-gen. hon.-inspection
'An inspection of earthquake stricken areas by President Clinton.'

b. Sutoueru-hakase-no sin-iron-no go-HAPPYOO.
Stowell-doctor-gen. new-theory-gen. hon.-publication
'Publication of a new theory by Dr. Stowell.'

The examples in (51) show that subject honorification is triggered even inside of the DP in
Suzuki's structure in (42). Recall that the examples in (48) illustrate that subject
honorification occurs inside of the same domain, indicating parallelism between Sino-
Japanese VNs and the honorific verbs.

4. 2. POTENTIAL SUFFIXATION

Aoyagi 1993 provides further evidence illustrating the parallelism between honorific
verbs and VNs. His examples involve the potential suffixes -(rar)e and -deki 'can'. The
choice between these two suffixes is determined by the etymology of the verb to which the
suffix is attached. Thus, the former is selected for native verbs and complex verbs whereas
the latter is selected for Sino-Japanese VNs and renyoo-kei VNs.19 As shown in the
examples in (52)-(53), only the potential suffix -(rar)e can be attached to native verbs and
complex verbs.

 'Ziroo can speak French.'

b. Ikkagetu-de kono biru-ga tor-i-kowas-e-ru.
 one=month-in this building-nom. take-I-break-potential-pres.
 'We can destroy this building in one month.'


b. *Ikkagetu-de kono biru-ga tor-i-kowas-deeki-ru.
 one=month-in this building-nom. take-I-break-potential-pres.

---

19 Renyoo-kei VNs are those which I listed as Complex Renyoo-kei Nominals without a Verbal Source in
Chapter 2. Recall that this type of VN cannot occur as a verb unless it is incorporated into a light verb.
In contrast, the suffix -(rar)e cannot be attached to Sino-Japanese VNs and renyoo-kei VNs. Only -deki(-ru) can be affixed to these VNs, as illustrated by the examples in (54)-(55).

(54)  
a. Nihon-de-wa kono hon-ga mada KOONYUU-deki-ru.
'You can buy this book in Japan even now.'

b. Kono honya-de-wa ziyuu-ni TAT-I-YOM-I-deki-ru.
'You can read freely in this bookstore without paying.'

(55)  
a. *Nihon-de-wa kono hon-ga mada KOONYUU-rare-ru.

b. *Kono honya-de-wa ziyuu-ni tat-i-yom-e-ru.
this bookstore-top. free-adv. stand-I-read-potential-pres.

Now, let's consider honorific verbs. As shown in (56)-(57), the acceptability of the potential form of honorific verbs involving -deki(-ru) is significantly better than those involving -(rar)e.20

(56)  
a. ??Sensei-wa takusan sake-ga o-nom-e-ni nat-ta.
professor-top. much sake-nom. hon.-drink-potential-dat. become-past
'Professor was able to drink a lot.'

b. *Syatyoo-wa itudemo o-dekake-(ra)re-ni nar-u.
company=president-top. anytime hon.-go=out-pot.-dat. become-pres.
'The president can go out any time.'

(57)  
a. Sensei-wa takusan sake-ga o-NOMI-deki-ru.
professor-top. much sake-nom. hon.-drink-pot.-pres.
'Professor can drink a lot.'

b. Syatyoo-wa itudemo o-DEKAKE-deki-ru.
company=president-top. anytime hon.-go=out-pot.-pres.
'The president can go out any time.'

---

20 It has been pointed out by Harada 1976, Kuno 1982, and Aoyagi 1993, that the honorific form of consonant verbs somehow accept suffixation of the potential morpheme -e. On the other hand, the honorific form of vocalic verbs in general does not allow suffixation of the potential morpheme -(ra)re. Therefore, the sentence in (56a) is more acceptable to native speakers than the one in (56b). Aoyagi op. cit. implies that the different degree of acceptability might be related to the length of the suffix but no clear explanation is available. Note also that the shortened potential suffix -re has been increasingly used for vocalic verbs these days, replacing the long form -rare. Compare this shortened suffix and the suffix used for consonant verbs -e. It seems unlikely that the length has effect on different acceptability between (56a) and (56b) since the shortened suffixes -re and the suffix -e do not significantly differ in terms of length.
The contrast between the examples in (56) and those in (57) shows that honorific verbs behave identical to VNs with respect to the choice of the potential suffix. Therefore, it is plausible to assume that the honorific verbs are categorically similar to VNs.

4. 3. NOMINAL CLAUSES

VNs and honorific verbs exhibit nearly parallel behavior in the nominal clause construction (cf. Shibatani 1990, Shibatani and Kageyama 1988, Tsujimura 1992 and Aoyagi 1993. Also see Chapter 2). Details aside, a nominal clause consists of a clause headed by an aspectual nominal such as -tyuu 'while', -no go 'after', -no sai 'when', and -no ori 'when'. Generally speaking, Sino-Japanese VNs can occur in the predicate position of a nominal clause. Thus, the Sino-Japanese word taisai 'stay', whose VN status can be established by the fact that it occurs in the context --su(-ru) 'to do --', can occur in a nominal clause as in (58b). In contrast, another Sino-Japanese word such as kenkoo 'health' cannot, because it does not function as a VN as shown in (59).

(58)  
The children will stay in Japan.'

b. Kodomotati-ga nihon-ni TAIZAI-tyuu, taihen osewa-ni  
nari-masi-ta.  
become-polite-past  
'Thank you very much for your kindness while our children stayed in Japan.'

(59)  
children-nom. health-do-pres.  
'(intended) The children are healthy'

children-nom. healthy-while-in often go=out-past thing copula=pres.  
'(intended) We used to go out when the children were healthy.'

In addition, complex renyoo-kei nominals generally occur in this construction as shown in (60).

(60)  
a. Kaban-no nakami-o IRE-KAE-tyuu-ni, otosite simat-ta  
bag-gen. content-acc. take=change-while-in drop-TE end=up-past  
rasi-i.  
appearance-pres.  
'It appears that the I dropped it while I was changing contents of the bag.'

b. Kono sinamono-o TORI-ATUKAI-no-sai-ni-wa, zyuubun  
this merchandise-acc. take-handle-gen.-when-in-top. extremely  
ki-o tuke-te kudasai.  
attention-acc. attach-TE please=give=me  
'Please be extremely careful when you handle this merchandise.'
The nominal clause construction can be formed with honorific verbs when the honorific verbs consist of four or more morae (cf. section 4.4 below for more details of the prosodic constraint). In the predicate position of a nominal clause, both \textit{o-renyoo-kei} and \textit{go/o+Sino-Japanese VN} can occur as shown in (61).


'While the Professor was talking about Japanese history, s/he introduced a new theory.'

gather-pass

'When Dr. Yamada gave a lecture, a large audience gathered.'

In this sense, honorific verbs behave identically to VNs.

4.4. PROSODIC CONSTRAINT

The occurrence of the renyoo-kei in the nominal clause construction is subject to a strict prosodic restriction. Tsujimura 1992 argues that any renyoo-kei occurring in the predicate position of a nominal clause must consist of at least four morae (or be two feet) long. Tsujimura's argument is based on the contrast observed in examples such as those in (62).


-nom. sea-in swim-I-while-in shark-nom. appear-past

'While Taro was swimming in the ocean, a shark appeared.'

b. (?):Reskuuyutai-in-ga ookyutecate-o HODOKOS-I-tyuu-ni,

injured-top. die-TE end-up-past

'While a rescue worker was performing first aid, the injured person died.'

The predicate of nominal clause in the example in (62a) consists of three morae (\textit{o-yo-gi}); it may not occur in this construction. However, (62b) which has a four-mora renyoo-kei in the nominal clause shows higher acceptability.

When renyoo-kei of verbs consisting of three morae are prefixed with the honorific marker \textit{o-}, sentences such as those in (62a) are greatly improved. Consider the pairs in (63) and (64) below.

\textsuperscript{21} This sentence contains the passive morpheme \textit{-sa}re, but the passive morpheme as used in this sentence is another way to show honorification. For more details, see section 6 below.
   -nom. sea-in swim-1-while-in shark-nom. appear-past
   'While Taro was swimming in the ocean, a shark appeared.'

   b. *Hanako-ga kyookai-de INOR-I-tyuu-ni, yume-ga kanae-rare-
      -nom. church-in pray-1-while-in dream-nom. come=true-pass-
      ta yoo-na ki-ga si-ta. past appearance-attr. feeling-nom. do-past
      'Hanako felt as if her dream came true while she was praying in the
      church.'

(64) a. (?)Sensei-ga umi-de 0-OYOG-I-tyuu-ni, same-ga araware-ta.
   -nom. sea-in hon.-swim-1-while-in shark-nom. appear-past
   'While the professor was swimming in the ocean, a shark appeared.'

   b. (?)Sensei-ga kyookai-de 0-INOR-I-tyuu-ni, yume-ga kanae-
      -nom. church-in hon-pray-1-while-in dream-nom. come=ture-
      rare-ta yoo-na ki-ga si-ta. pass.-past appearance-attr. feeling-nom. do-past
      'The professor felt as if his dream came true while he was praying in the
      church.'

As compared with the examples in (63), the acceptability of the examples in (64) is
significantly higher. In (64), the predicate position of nominal clause is occupied by a
renyoo-kei prefixed with the honorific marker 0-. As shown in (63), the corresponding
renyoo-kei consist of three morae. Hence, adding an honorific marker turns a three-morae
renyoo-kei to a four-morae word. As a result, the honorific verb satisfies the prosodic
constraint on the predicate occurring nominal clause.22

Aoyagi 1993 points out that in nominal subject honorification constructions such as
those in (48) above, the honorific verb must obey a prosodic constraint which the verb in
the nominal clause construction obyes. Compare the following contrast in (65) and (66).

---

22 This constraint applies only to lexically derived words. It is widely assumed (for example, Kuno 1982,
Hasegawa 1988, and Terada 1990) that complex predicates such as passive and causative are derived in
syntax. Thus, suffixes involved in such a syntactic suffixion do not improve the acceptability of the
sentence involving verbs consisting of less than four morae. For instance, the following examples are all
ungrammatical.

(i) *Sensei-no gakusei-no umi-de-no oyoga-se-tyuu-ni, ...
   teacher-gen. student-gen. ocean-in-gen. swim-Caus.-while-at
   'At the duration in which the teacher made students swim in the ocean, ...'

(ii) *Yamada-sensei-niyoru hon-no o-kaka-re.
    'the book's being written by Prof. Yamada.'
(65) a. *Yamada-sensei-no amerika-e-no o-TATI-no okage-de, sigoto-
professor-gen. America-to-gen. hon.-leave-gen. due=to work-
ga tyyudan-sa-re-te simat-ta.
nom. interrupt-do-pass.-TE end=up
'Due to Professor Yamada's departure to the US, the work was
interrupted.'

b. *Tymusukii-sensei-no atarasii hon-no o-KAKI-ga tyyumoku-
Chomsky-professor-gen. new book-gen. hon.-write-nom. attention-
sa-re-te i-ru.
do-pass-TE exist-pres.
'(intended) Professor Chomsky’s writing of a new book is drawing public
attention.'

(66) a. Kenzi-no zizitukankei-no o-SIRABE-ga yatto
prosecutor-gen. factual-relation-gen. hon.-investigate-nom. finally
owat-ta.
finish-past
'Prosecutor's investigation of factual relation finally came to end.'

b. Syatyoo-no enkai-e-no o-SASOI-o kotowar-u
circumstance-dat.-top. go=well-neg.-past
company=president-gen. party-to-gen. hon.-invite-acc. turn=down-pres.
wake-ni-wa ika-nakat-ta.
'I could not possibly turn down the company president's invitation to the
party.'

In the examples in (65), honorific verbs consisting of three mora (o-ta-ti and o-ka-ki) result
in ungrammaticality when they occur in the nominal subject honorific construction. On the
other hand, four morae honorific verbs such as o-sirabe 'hon.-investigate' and o-sasoi
'hon.-invite' can occur in this construction.

That the sentences in (65) are ruled out by a prosodic constraint is clearly shown by
the following examples where semantically related verbs with four or more morae are
allowed in this construction. Thus, o-kaeri 'hon.-return', which is an antonym of o-tati
'hon.-leave', can occur as the predicate of nominal subject honorification as in (67a). In
addition, nominal subject honorification allows a five mora verb o-arawasi 'hon.-write (and
publish)', which is a synonym of o-kaki 'hon.-write', in the predicate position as shown in
(67b).

(67) a. Tennooheika-no nihon-e-no o-KAERI-ga
taihen okurc-te i-ru.
extremely be=delayed-TE exist-pres.
'Emperor's returning to Japan has been extremely delayed.'
b. Sutoueru-hakase-no atarasii hon-no o-ARAWASI-ga taihen
   Stowell-doctor-gen. new book-gen. hon.-publish-nom. extremely
   matinozomare-te i-ru.
   be=longed=for-TE exist-pres.

   'Dr. Stowell's publishing his new book has extremely been longed for.'

As shown by these examples, honorific verbs and VNs are subject to the same prosodic restriction when appearing in a clause headed by a nominal. This fact also suggests that honorific verbs and VNs have the same properties.

Now that I have shown that the honorific verbs and VNs are categorically similar, in the following section I will show that honorific verb o+renyoo-kei occurs in the same position as VNs and is subject to recategorization just as renyoo-kei VNs are. Furthermore, I will argue that the periphrastic subject honorific construction can be analyzed as one type of light verb construction.23

5. RECATEGORIZATION AND THE LIGHT VERB ANALYSIS OF SUBJECT HONORIFICATION

In this section, I will discuss a syntactic structure in which the honorific verb is base-generated. As shown in the previous section, the honorific verb o+renyoo-kei has properties identical to Sino-Japanese and renyoo-kei VNs. I will argue that the honorific verb is base-generated as such and the prefix o- is subject to the spec-head agreement (cf. Toribio 1990).24 In addition, I will argue that the honorific verb is subject to recategorization in the same manner as renyoo-kei and VNs are. Furthermore, I will argue that the verb nar(-u) 'to become' occurring in the periphrastic subject honorific form is a light verb with a very minimum semantic contribution to the interpretation of the sentence.

23 There are some result nominals consisting of the honorific prefix and a renyoo-kei as listed in (i).

(i)
   a. o-TUTOME
      hon.-work
      'one's work'
   b. o-SARAI
      hon.-review
      'a review'
   c. o-SYABERI
      hon.-chat
      'a person with big mouth'
   d. o-MAMORI
      hon.-protect
      'a charm'
   e. o-KAESI
      hon.-return
      'a return gift'

Of 22 examples that I found in a dictionary, there is only one instance in which a passive or causative suffix is involved.

(ii)
   a. o-YOBA-RE
      hon.-call-Pass.
      'an invitation, a party'
   b. o-MOTA-SE
      hon.-carry-Caus.
      'a cake, fruit or a snack served for a guest which the guest brought as a gift'

These examples may potentially pose a problem for my analysis which forms honorific verbs in the lexicon. But cases such as in (ii) are so scarce that these words may have been derived via some sort of back-formation of a syntactically derived word.

24 Aoyagi 1993 argues that the honorific prefix -o is a subject agreement marker.
5.1. Recategorization

Recall that in previous chapter, I argued that both the renyoo-kei form and the VN are headed by a functional head. The subject of the verb occurs in Spec position of this functional projection. The object of the verb, on the other hand, is base-generated under V and is Case-marked in the Spec. of VP. Case assignment of the subject is dependent on whether the predicate is tensed or not. If the predicate is tensed or headed by a [+Asp] NP, the subject is raised to the Spec. of IP in order to receive nominative Case, while if not tensed nor headed by [+Asp] NP, it remains in situ and receives genitive Case.

With this in mind, let's consider the examples in (68), which are cited from Aoyagi 1993 (his (47a and b)).

(68) a. Sono syain-wa syatyyoo-no nanae-no
     that company=employee-top. company=president-gen. name-gen.
o-TAZUNE-o musi-si-ta.
     hon.-inquire-acc. neglect-do-past

'The employee neglected the president's inquiry about his name.'

b. Okyakusama-e-no sinamono-no o-TODOKE-ga taihen
     customer(polite)-to-gen. merchandise-gen. hon.-deliver-nom. extremely
     okure-ta.
     delay-past

'Delivery of merchandise to customers was delayed considerably.'

The predicate position of the underlined nominal clause in (68) is occupied by the renyoo-kei form of the verb which is prefixed with the honorific marker o-. Note that in the nominal clauses in (68), nominal Case, i.e. genitive Case is assigned to the arguments of the renyoo-kei. This fact indicates that the underlined clauses in (68) are nominal. It is important to point out that subject honorification occurs in nominal clauses headed by the renyoo-kei.

In this connection, recall that the possibility of subject honorification is identical in nominal clauses headed by a Sino-Japanese or renyoo-kei VN. First, consider the examples in (51) once again, which are repeated here as (69) for simplicity. In these sentences, the heads of the nominal clauses are Sino-Japanese VNs.

(69) a. Kurinton-daitooryoo-no sinsaiti-no go-SISATU.
     Clinton-president-gen. earthquake=stricken=area-gen. hon.-inspection

     'An inspection of earthquake stricken areas by President Clinton.'

b. Sutoueru-hakase-no sin-riron-no go-HAPPYOO.
     Stowell-doctor-gen. new-theory-gen. hon.-publication

     'Publication of a new theory by Dr. Stowell.'

Note that the arguments of the Sino-Japanese VNs are marked in the genitive, indicating that the clause in which the arguments occur is nominal.

Secondly, consider the examples in (48), repeated here as (70) for convenience. In these sentences, the subject honorification is allowed in nominal clauses headed by renyoo-kei VN. Thus, consider the examples in (48) once again, repeated here as (70) for convenience.
In order to account for these facts, I assume that the domain in which subject honorification occurs is inside of the FP with the subject in the spec of FP licensing subject honorification. This is schematically illustrated in (71).

(71)

In the structure in (71), the verbal head V undergoes head-movement to F to form a renyoo-kei or VN. When the subject is [+honorific], the honorific prefix o- or go- can occur.

Now, let's return to the properties listed in (40), which are repeated here as (72) for convenience.

(72)  

a. o+renyoo-kei occurs in Case position  
b. o+renyoo-kei can be assigned genitive Case  
c. o+renyoo-kei occurs pre-copula position  
d. o+renyoo-kei behaves as [-V] category with respect to the suffix-soo  
e. o+renyoo-kei cannot be affixed by adjectival suffixes such as -tai and -yasui  
f. verbal Case is marked for the arguments of the renyoo-kei
g. $o+renyoo-kei$ cannot be clefted

h. $o+renyoo-kei$ cannot be deleted under anaphoric relation

The properties of honorific verbs listed in (72a-c) are concerned with the honorific verb's NP-like characteristics and the rest of the properties in (72) describes verb-like properties of honorific verbs. Among the properties listed in (72), all of the verbal properties of honorific verbs involve the entire predicate $o+renyoo-kei-ni nar(-u)$. For instance, as listed in (72f), verbal Case assignment takes place only when the entire periphrastic subject honorific predicate occupies the predicate position of a sentence. In nominal subject honorific sentences, where -ni nar(-u) is never involved, only nominal Case marking is possible. This contrast is exemplified by the following pair of sentences.

(73) a. **SENTENTIAL SUBJECT HONORIFICATION:**

Okyakusama-ga sinamono-o $o$-TORIKAE-ni nat-ta.
customer(polite)-nom. merchandise-acc. hon.-exchange-dat. become-past

'The customer exchanged the merchandise.'

b. **NOMINAL SUBJECT HONORIFICATION:**

[Okyakusama-no/*ga sinamono-no/*o $o$-TORIKAE]-wa
customer(polite)-gen./*nom. merchandise-gen./*acc. hon.-exchange-top.
o-KOTOWARI-si-te i-mas-u.
hon.-refuse-do-TE exist-polite-pres.

'We are refusing the customer's exchange of merchandise.'

In addition, application of the rules of clefting (cf. (72g)) and deletion under anaphoric relation (cf. (72h)) of the honorific verb are blocked when these rules affect the honorific verb in the sentential subject honorific construction.

On the other hand, all of the NP-like characteristics of periphrastic subject honorific predicate listed in (72) are concerned only with FP in (71). Thus, the constituent occurring in Case position is $o+renyoo-kei$ (cf. (72a)) and the same constituent appears in pre-copula position (cf. (72b and c)). In addition, the question of attaching the suffix -soo 'appearance' (cf. (72d)) and -ta-i and -yasu-i (cf. (72e)) is concerned only with the honorific verb $o+renyoo-kei$. These facts imply that all the NP-like properties hold at FP in (71) and verb-like properties are obtained when -ni nar(-u) is attached to FP.

In order to account for the nominal and verbal properties of periphrastic subject honorification, let's assume that the FP in this construction is derived via recategorization of the FP as outlined in Chapter 4. Under this analysis, the head of FP has the underspecified lexical specification of [$\alpha$ N]. I propose that the honorific verb $o+renyoo-kei$ or $go/o+Sino-Japanese$ VN is underspecified with respect to the feature [N]. Furthermore, I propose that all constraints required to form a grammatical subject honorification sentence are met in FP.

The nominal and verbal properties obtained in periphrastic subject honorification are accounted for in the following manner: the nominal properties are derived when no higher verbal element governing the FP is selected. Under this configuration, the head of FP is interpreted as [+N]. When incorporated into the functional head, $o+verbal$ root or $o/go+VN$ is assigned the [+N] feature. In other words, when the FP in (71) appears in an argument position without a governing head, the entire FP is recategorized as an NP.

On the other hand, if there is a verbal element governing FP, the head of FP is recategorized as [−N], "verbalizing" the FP. When $o+verbal$ root or $o/go+VN$ is
incorporated into the functional head, by feature percolation, the feature assigned to the entire verbal complex is [-N]. Consequently, the entire verbal complex functions as a verb, triggering verbal Case marking to the arguments. Schematically, this can be illustrated as in (74).

(74)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{FP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{FP} \\
\text{Subject} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{... o+verbal root} \\
or \text{... o/go-VN} \\
\text{F} \\
\text{[+V, -N]} \\
\text{F} \\
\text{F'} \\
\text{I} \\
\end{array}
\]

Subsequently, the verb nar(-u) 'to become' is moved to I through the higher F to receive tense. Furthermore, the subject of the lower FP is raised to the Spec. of IP to receive nominative Case under the Spec-Head relation.

Two questions immediately come to mind in connection with this recategorization analysis of the subject honorific construction. These questions are i) how are the structural requirements for subject honorification met? and ii) how is verbalizing of FP carried out even though the FP is marked in the dative in sentential subject honorification? In section 5. 2., I will argue that the prefix o- and go- in subject honorification is an agreement marker which is licensed by the spec-head relation. To answer the second question, in section 5. 3., I will argue that the verb nar(-u) 'to become' occurring in the verbal subject honorific construction is a "light" verb in that it has a Case-grid but not a θ-grid for its object (cf. Grimshaw and Mester 1988: 205).

5.2. AGREEMENT OF HONORIFIC VERBS

5.2.1. Clausemate Condition

First, let's examine the status of the honorific prefix o- and go-. Despite a large number of studies on honorification, the status of honorific prefixes is still unclear. It has been argued that a subject honorific verb must have a [+honorific] subject which must occur as a "clausemate" to the honorific verb (Kuno 1973, 1982, Harada 1976, Shibatani 1978, and Inoue 1976, among others). Thus, consider the simplex sentence in (75).
   -professor-nom.  -dat. hon.-meet-dat. become-past
   'Professor Yamada met Hanako.'

b. #Hanako-ga Yamada-sensei-ni o-AI-ni nat-ta.
   -nom.  -professor-dat. hon.-meet-dat. become-past
   'Hanako met Professor Yamada.'

In the sentence in (75a), the speaker of this sentence demonstrate deference to subject of the sentence, Yamada-sensei 'Professor Yamada'. The predicate o-ai-ni nat-ta 'hon.-meet-dat. become-past' indicates such deference. Thus, the unacceptability of the sentence in (75b) results form the failure of the speaker to demonstrate deference because the [+plain] subject, Hanako, is predicated of by a deferential predicate.

The clausemate requirement also holds in an embedded sentence. Thus, compare the pairs of sentences in (76)-(77).

(76) a. Hanako-ga [Yamada-sensei-ga heya-ni o-MODORI-ni
   -nom.  -professor-nom. room-to hon.-return-dat.
   nat-ta to] it-ta.
   become-past quot. say-past
   'Hanako said that Professor Yamada has returned to his room.'

b. #Yamada-sensei-ga [Hanako-ga heya-ni o-MODORI-ni
   -professor-nom.  -nom. room-to hon.-return-dat.
   nat-ta to] it-ta.
   become-past quot. say-past
   'Professor Yamada said that Hanako has returned to her room.'

(77) a. #Hanako-ga [Yamada-sensei-ga heya-ni modot-ta to
   -nom.  -professor-nom. room-to return-past Q
   o-II-ni nat-ta.
   hon.-say-dat. become-past
   'Hanako said that Professor Yamada has returned to his room.'

b. Yamada-sensei-ga [Hanako-ga heya-ni modot-ta to
   -professor-nom.  -nom. room-to return-past Q
   o-II-ni nat-ta.
   hon.-say-dat. become-past
   'Professor Yamada said that Hanako has returned to her room.'

The examples in (76) show that the honorific verb must have a [+honorific] subject in the clause that minimally contains it. The unacceptability of the example in (76b) follows from the fact that the embedded clause does not have such a subject. This indicates that the matrix [+honorific] subject cannot license the honorific verb in the embedded clause.

However, the sentences in (77a) show that the embedded subject cannot license an honorific verb in the matrix clause. In order for an honorific verb in the matrix clause to be licit, it must have a [+honorific] subject in the matrix clause.
The same holds for complex predicates such as the causative construction. Causative sentences in Japanese are assumed to be derived via head-movement of the verb (cf. Shibatani 1978, 1990, and Inoue 1976, among others.) Thus, the causative sentence in (78a) is derived from an underlying structure such as that in (78b).

(78) a. Taroo-wa Hanako-ni sake-o noma-se-ta.
   -top.  -dat.  -acc. drink-caus.-past
   'Taro made Hanako drink sake.'

b. Taroo [Hanako sake nom] sase-ta
   sake drink caus.-past

In the underlying structure in (78b), Taroo is the subject of the causative suffix -sase and Hanako is the subject of the embedded verb noma 'to drink'.

Since there are two subjects in causative sentences like that in (78), it is predicted that both subjects can trigger subject honorification. This prediction is borne out. Consider the sentences in (79).

(79) a. Hanako-ga [Yamada-sensei-ni sake-o o-NOMI-ni nara]-
   -nom. -professor-dat. -acc. hon.-drink-dat. become-
   se-ta.
   caus.-past
   'Hanako made Professor Yamada drink sake.'

b. #Hanako-ga [Yamada-sensei-ni sake-o o-noma]-se-ni
   nat-ta.26
   become-past

25 This analysis is often referred to as "predicate raising". For opponents of the verb-movement analysis, see Miyagawa 1980 and Framer 1984.

26 Since the honorific subject is in the matrix clause, the honorific prefix is assumed to be base-generated with the causative suffix -sase. Then, the surface order o-noma-se may pose a question, particularly with respect to the relative order between the honorific prefix and incorporated embedded verb. I assume that this order is subject to a surface constraint on placement of the honorific prefix when the embedded verb is incorporated. This surface constraint is stated as follows:

(i) The honorific prefix o- must be placed at the beginning of the verbal complex.

This constraint appears to be operative whenever a suffixal matrix verb is involved as shown in (ii)-(iii).

(ii) o-SIKAR-ARE-ni nar-u
    hon.-scold-pass.-dat. become-pres. 'to be scolded'
    but not *sika-o-rare-ni nar-u

(iii) o-YOM-E-ni nar-u
    hon.-read-potential-dat. become-pres. 'to be able to read'
    but not *yomi-o-rare-ni nar-u.
c. Yamada-sensei-ga [Hanako-ni sake-o o-noma]-se-ni
   nat-ta.
   become-past

   'Professor Yamada made Hanako drink sake.'

d. #Yamada-sensei-ga [Hanako-ni sake-o o-NOMI-ni nara]-
   -professor-nom. -dat. -acc. hon.-drink-dat. become-
   se-ta.
   caus.-past

The unacceptability of the examples in (79b) is accounted for by requiring that the entire honorific predicate o+renyo-kei-ni nar(-u) occur in the same clause as the [+honorific] subject. Since only a portion of the entire honorific predicate remains in embedded clause where the [+honorific] subject occurs, this sentence is unacceptable. The deferential predicate o-noma-se-ni nar(-u) 'hon.-drink-caus.-dat. become' is in the matrix clause whereas [+honorific] subject is in the embedded clause. In contrast, in the example in (79a), both [+honorific] subject and honorific predicate o-nomi-ni nar- are in the embedded clause. Hence, the sentence is grammatical.

The contrast illustrated in (79c) and (79d) can be accounted for in the same manner. Both the [+honorific] subject and honorific predicate occur in the matrix clause in (79c), and therefore the sentence is grammatical. On the other hand, in (79d), the embedded clause contains the honorific predicate while the [+honorific] subject is in the matrix clause, thus resulting in ungrammaticality.

Since the honorific prefix needs to be licensed within its minimal clause, this "clausemate" condition on subject honorification can be restated descriptively as in (80).

(80) RULE OF SUBJECT HONORIFICATION:
An honorific verb must occur with a clausemate [+honorific] subject

5. 2. 2. AN AGREEMENT ANALYSIS OF SUBJECT HONORIFICATION

The clausemate requirement in (80) has been analyzed in terms of agreement. Toribio 1990 deals with the requirement of subject honorific under the spec-head relation. Assuming the structure in (82) for the sentence in (81), she argues that the subject of the Pr(edicate)P raises to Spec D while the verb moves to the head of PrP assigning a θ-role to the subject.

(81) Yamada-sensei-ga o-WARA-I-ni nat-ta.
   -professor-nom. hon.-laugh-I-dat. become-past

   'Professor Yamada laughed.'
Then, the verb moves up to the head D where the renyoo-kei suffix \(-i\) (or \(-\emptyset\))\(^{27}\) is attached to the verb. The subject raises to Spec D and licenses subject honorification under the spec-head relationship. Due to the raising verb \(nar(-u)\) 'to become', the subject moves to the matrix subject position (Spec of TP) spec-to-spec to receive Case.

Adopting Toribio's analysis that subject honorification is one form of agreement, in what follows, I will revise her analysis in the present term and provide some more arguments for the spec-head agreement analysis of subject honorification.\(^{28}\)

---

\(^{27}\) Toribio assumes that the renyoo-kei suffix is a nominalizing suffix.

\(^{28}\) In object honorific, the same prefix is used. In this construction, too, what is crucial is the existence of a [-honorific] subject. There appear to be cases where a non-subject plays a role in determining the grammaticality of the sentence in this construction such as in (i), where the referent of the direct object is considered to be lower in terms of his/her social standing than that of the subject, but higher than that of the speaker (cf. Harada 1976, Toribio 1990, and Aoyagi 1993). Based on the ungrammaticality of (i), it has been argued that object honorification requires [+honorific] object.

\[ (i) \quad \text{gakuyoo-ga} \quad \text{tetugakuka-no} \quad \text{Yamada-sensei-o} \quad \text{o-MUKAE-si-university=book-president-nom. department=of=philosophy-gen. -Prof.-acc. hon.-welcome-do-ta. past} \]

'The president of the university welcomed Professor Yamada of the Department of Philosophy.'
First, in Toribio's analysis, the embedded clause (=PrP in the structure in (82)) occurs in the complement position of the head of D. As discussed previously, the renyoo-kei suffix can behave either as nominal or verbal. Furthermore, as observed in section 4, there are several similarities between honorific verbs and VNs. Hence, I will assume the structure in (71) (repeated here as (83) for convenience) where the renyoo-kei suffix does not constitute a head of nominal categories such as D and N. Instead, I assume that the embedded verb in subject honorification is underspecified for its [N] feature. For the recategorization of the honorific verb, see section 5.4. below.

\[
(83)
\]

In the configuration in (83), the head of V raises to the head of FP to get the renyoo-kei suffix. If the subject in the Spec of F has the feature [+honorific], under the spec-head relationship, the honorific verb o+renyoo-kei or o/go+VN is licensed.

As Toribio assumes, the matrix verb nar(-u) 'to become' is a raising verb (cf. 5.3.2. below for discussion). Consequently, licensing of the honorific verb can take place both at the embedded level and the matrix level. The examples in (84) show that subject honorification is possible for both embedded verbs and matrix verbs.\(^29\)

\[
(84)\begin{align*}
a. & \text{ Fujimori-sensei-ga hon-o o-YOM-I-ni nara-re-ta.} \\
& \text{-professor-nom. book-acc. hon.-read-1-dat. become-pass.-past} \\
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
b. & \text{ Fujimori-sensei-ga hon-o o-YOM-I-ni o-NAR-I-} \\
& \text{-Prof.-nom. book-acc. hon.-read-1-dat. hon.-become-I-} \\
& \text{ da. copula=pres.}
\end{align*}
\]

---

Note, however, that the subject of the object honorific sentence in (i) is [+honorific] as compared to the object. I assume that the existence of [+honorific] subject in (i) is the cause of ungrammaticality rather than the fact that there is no [+honorific] object occurring in this sentence. For more discussion, see Appendix.

\(^29\) The sentences in (84) may sound overdone for some native speakers. However, these sentences are all grammatical. Note also that the passive morpheme \(-\text{traire}\) can mark subject honorification (cf. section 6 below).
c. Fujimori-sensei-ga hon-o o-YOM-I-ni o-NAR-I-
   -Prof.-nom. book-acc. hon.-read-I-dat. hon.-become-I-
   ni-nat-ta.
dat.-become-past
d. Fujimori-sensei-ga hon-o o-YOM-I-ni o-NAR-I-
   -Prof.-nom. book-acc. hon.-read-I-dat. hon.-become-I-
   ni nara-re-ta.
dat. become-pass.-past

'Professor Fujimori read a book.'

In the examples in (84), subject honorification can occur on the matrix verb nar(-u) 'to become'. This indicates that an embedded subject with the feature [+honorific] licenses an honorific verb in both embedded and matrix clauses.

5.2.2. CONSEQUENCES OF THE AGREEMENT ACCOUNT OF SUBJECT HONORIFICATION

The agreement account for subject honorification has several advantages. First, as observed above, subject honorification can be triggered at the FP level when no higher verb nar(-u) 'to become' is selected. The examples in (85) illustrate such cases.

(85) a. Daitooryoo-no Yoshinori-no o-MIMA-I-ga hoodoo-s-are-ta.
   -gen. hon.-visit-I-nom. report-do-pass.-past
   president-gen.
   'The president's visit to Yoshinori was reported.'

b. Sensei-no oototo-(e)-no o-HAGEMAS-I-ni kansya-
   professor-gen. yonger=brother-(to)-gen. hon.-encourage-to thank-
   -si-te i-ru.
   do-TE exist-pres.
   'We are grateful for the professor's encouraging my younger brother.'

In (85), o+verbal root, which is base-generated under V in (83), is moved to the functional head F position as an instance of head-movement to form the renyoo-kei o-mima-i 'hon.-
   visit-I' and o-hagemas-i 'hon.-encourage-I'. Since the subject is base-generated in the specifier position of FP, the subject licenses the honorific verb in the functional head
   position F. The direct object of the renyoo-kei in (85), on the other hand, may not license the honorific verb since it remains inside VP in (62).

Secondly, subject honorification occurs in NPs and APs as well (Harada 1976 and
   Toribio 1990). Consider the following examples.

(86) NOMINAL HONORIFICATION:

   -professor-gen. hon.-sickness-top. how copula-pres. Q
   'How is Professor Fujimori's sickness?'

b. Syatyou-no o-tosi-o sit-te i-masu ka.
   company=president-gen. hon.-age-acc. know-TE exist-polite Q
   'Do you know the age of the president?'

166
ADJECTIVAL HONORIFICATION:

a. Fujimori-sensei-wa mada o-waka-i noni ...
   -professor-top. still hon.-young-pres. despite
   'Despite that Professor Fujimori is still young, ...'

b. Syatyoo-wa Hanako-ga o-suki-da kara...
   company=president-top. -nom. hon.-like-copula=pres. because
   'The president likes Hanako so...'

In both nominal honorification and adjectival honorification, the sentence is grammatical if the honorific verb occurs inside the maximal projection of the head containing the [+honorific] subject. Therefore, the account for subject honorification in the spec-head relationship makes it possible to provide a principled account for its occurrences in CP (o+renyoo-kei-ni nar-u), in FP (o+renyoo-kei), in NP (o/go+N) and in AP (o+Adj).

5. 3. LIGHT VERBS AND THE VERB NARU IN SUBJECT HONORIFICATION

In this section, I will argue that the verb nar(-u) 'to become' appearing in subject honorification is a "light" verb. A light verb can be characterized as "thematically incomplete" (cf. Grimshaw and Mester 1988) in that its object NP is subcategorized for by the verb and Case is assigned to the object NP but no θ-role is assigned to the object.30 I will argue that the verb involved in subject honorification, nar(-u) 'to become', is a "light" verb and that sentential subject honorification is subject to complex predicate formation, which yields the light verb construction at LF. In section 5. 3. 1., I will first review Grimshaw and Mester's analysis on the light verb suru 'to do' and extend their analysis to another light verb suru construction involving a Goal phrase. Then, in section 5. 3. 2., I will examine syntactic and semantic properties of the verb nar(-u) 'to become'. I will show that there are two types of verb nar(-u): a "light" nar(-u) and a "heavy" nar(-u) just as in its semantic transitive counterpart suru. I will argue that the verb nar(-u) occurring in subject honorification is "light" in the sense that the argument structure of this verb is supplemented by the embedded clause at LF.

5. 3. 1. LIGHT VERBS

The Japanese verb suru 'to do' can be either "heavy" or "light" (in the sense of Grimshaw and Mester 1988 and Miyagawa 1989). Light suru can cooccur with a θ-transparent object NP which assigns θ-roles outside of its maximal projection. In contrast, heavy suru must occur with a θ-opaque object NP which does not. Thus, in the light suru construction, the arguments of the θ-opaque NP must occur inside of its maximal projection. Consider the examples in (88).

30 Hayashi 1994 proposes an analysis slightly different from this characterization. In her framework, a "light" verb can also have its own argument structure. Hoshi and Saito 1993, adopting Grimshaw and Mester's 1988 argument transfer analysis, argue that the light verb construction is formed at LF showing that the light verb and the VN in the argument position do not form a word at the syntactic level. In what follows, I will adopt Hoshi and Saito's position that Argument Transfer takes place at LF. For more details, see section 5. 3. 1. below.
(88) a. Taroo-ga nihon-e *RYOKOO-o* si-ta.  
   -nom. Japan-to travel-acc. do-past  
   'Taro traveled in Japan.'

   b. Hanako-ga Taroo-to *KUTIGENKA-o* si-ta.  
   -nom. -with quarrel-acc. do-past  
   'Hanako had an argument with Taro.'

The object NPs in the examples in (88), *ryokoo 'travel' and kikoku '*return='to='native='land'* appear to contribute to the θ-marking of their arguments. In other words, the verb *suru* does not influence the number and type of arguments occurring in (88). Hence, even when the verb *suru* does not follow, the object NP in (88) occurs in an NP (or DP) as illustrated in (89).

(89) a. Taroo-no nihon-e-no *RYOKOO*.  
   -gen. Japan-to-gen. travel  
   'Taro's trip to Japan.'

   b. Hanako-no Taroo-to-no *KUTIGENKA*.  
   -gen. -with-gen. quarrel  
   'Hanako's argument with Taro.'

Therefore, it is plausible to assume that the θ-role of the arguments in (88) is assigned by the object NP. And since the verb *suru* in these examples is not involved in assigning θ-roles to its arguments, it is characterized as a "light" verb.

A "heavy" *suru*, on the other hand, assigns θ-roles to its arguments. This means that when a θ-transparent NP occurs with a heavy *suru*, the arguments of the NP must appear inside of the NP. Compare the examples in (90) with those in (88).

(90) a. Taroo-ga [Nihon-e-no *RYOKOO-o*] si-ta.  
   -nom. Japan-to-gen. travel-acc do-past  
   'Taro traveled to Japan.'

   b. Hanako-ga [Taroo-to-no *KUTIGENKA-o*] si-ta.  
   -nom. -with-gen. quarrel-acc. do-past  
   'Hanako had an argument with Taro.'

In the examples in (90), the arguments of the θ-transparent NPs, *ryokoo 'trip' and kutigenka 'a quarrel', are marked in the genitive, indicating that the Goal argument *Nihon-e* in (90a) and the Commutative argument *Taroo-to 'with Taro'* in (90b) are inside of the NP headed by the θ-transparent NP.

The same holds for cases where the NPs in (89) appear with other heavy verbs such as *yame(-ru)'to quit, to give up'. Thus, in the following examples in (91) and (92), the oblique arguments may not occur outside of the NP headed by *ryokoo 'travel' and kutigenka 'quarrel', respectively.
    -nom. Japan-to-gen. trip-acc. quit=past
    'Taro gave up a trip to Japan.'

      -nom. Japan-to trip-acc. quit=past

    -nom. -with-gen. quarrel-acc. quit=past
    'Hanako stopped arguing with Taro.'

   b. *Hanako-ga Taro-to KUTIGENKA-o yame-ta.
      -nom. -with quarrel-acc. give=up=past

Furthermore, the difference between a heavy verb and a light verb can be observed in connection to the applicability of topicalization. Consider the examples in (93).\(^{31}\)

(93) a. *Nihon-e RYOKOO-wa Taroo-ga si-ta.
      Japan-to trip-top. -nom. do=past
      'As for a trip to Japan, Taro did.'

      Japan-to-gen. trip-top. -nom. give=up=pas/d do=past
      'As for a trip to Japan, Taro gave up/did it.'

While topicalization of a \(\theta\)-opaque NP is allowed in a heavy verb sentence as shown in (93b), topicalization of a \(\theta\)-transparent NP in a light verb sentence is not allowed as shown in (93a).

In addition, there is a difference with respect to the possibility of (pseudo-) cleft formation between a sentence involving heavy suru and one involving light suru. The Japanese (pseudo-) cleft construction is formed by placing a nominalized focused element in the topic position. Non-focused elements occur in pre-copula position. Consider the following pair of sentences.

(94) a. Taroo-ga si-ta no-wa Nihon-e-no RYOKOO-da.
      'What Taro did was a trip to Japan.'

      -nom. do=past NOM.-top. Japan-to trip-copula=pres.

---

\(^{31}\) The topicalization in question here is not topicalization in situ. Cf. Saito 1985. If the Theme argument is topicalized in situ, the sentence in (93a) is acceptable.

(i) Taroo-ga nihon-e RYOKOO-wa si-ta.
    -nom. Japan-to travel-top. do=past
    'As for travel, John did to Japan.'
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In the sentence in (94a), the pre-copula position is occupied by the NP *Nihon-e-no ryokoo 'a trip to Japan'. As evidenced by the genitive marking on the Goal phrase, the verb in the focus position is the heavy verb *suru.

On the other hand, in (94b), pre-copula position is occupied by a Goal phrase and an NP. The Goal NP is not marked in the genitive, indicating that this phrase and the following NP do not form an NP. The θ-role of the Goal phrase in this sentence is assumed to be assigned by the following NP, indicating that the verb in the focus position is the light verb *suru. The ungrammaticality of this sentence suggests that the light verb cannot occupy the focus position of the (pseudo-) cleft construction in Japanese.

Finally, the heavy verb *suru requires an agentive subject whereas there is no such restriction for light *suru since it does not participate in θ-role assignment. Compare the examples in (95).

     airplane-nom. airport-to-gen. landing-ac. do-past
     'The airplane did the landing at the airport.'

   b. Hikooki-ga kuukoo-e TYAKURIKU-o si-ta.
      airplane-nom. airport-to landing-ac. do-past
      'Airplane landed at the airport.'

The sentence in (95a) involves heavy *suru and the latter, light *suru as evidenced by whether or not genitive marking on the Goal phrase is possible. Since heavy *suru requires an agentive subject, the sentence is ungrammatical with a non-agentive subject such as hikooki 'airplane'.

Grimshaw and Mester 1988 argue that the light verb *suru does not have its own argument structure but it can assign accusative Case to the direct object. Thus, the lexical entry for light *suru is defined as in (96).

(96) *suru, V; (       ) <acc>

θ-marking in a sentence such as in (88a) is carried out by transferring the argument structure of the θ-transparent NP, which Grimshaw and Mester refer to as Argument Transfer. Thus, Argument Transfer for (88a) proceeds as follows.

(97) a. ryokoo (Agent, Goal, Theme)

   b. *suru (       ) <acc>

   c. ryokoo (Theme) + *suru (Agent, Goal)

Argument Transfer applies to input in (97a and b) yielding the result in (97c). Consequently, the Theme-role is assigned NP-internally and the verb *suru assigns Agent and Goal roles to the outside NP.

Poser 1991 argues that there is some evidence showing that Argument Transfer does not occur in the lexicon. First, the Japanese whether construction consists of Verb1-tense-ka, Verb1-negative-tense-ka32 as shown in (98).

32 Ka is a sentence-ending particle indicating a question. Note also that in this construction, the verb is repeated in the negative form.
write-past-Q  write-neg.-past-Q  know-neg.-pres.
'I don't know whether or not s/he wrote.'

The repeated verb cannot be replaced by the negative form of the pro-verb suru 'to do' as in (99).

write-past-Q  do-neg.-past-Q  know-neg.-pres.
'I don't know whether or not s/he wrote.'

With the incorporated light verb construction, the repeated second verb can be suru as the example in (100b) shows.

(100)  a.  SEIKOO-si-ta-ka,  SEIKOO-si-nakat-ta-ka  wakara-na-i.
'I don't know whether or not s/he succeeded.


The ungrammaticality of (99) reveals that ellipsis involving in the whether construction cannot delete part of a syntactically incorporated phrase. The fact that (100b) is grammatical indicates that the periphrastic light verb construction can be analyzed into a VN and the light verb in the syntax.

Similar tests of constituency can be found in conjunction and deletion across sentence boundaries. In conjunction, the Sino-Japanese VN in the second conjunct can be deleted under identity, leaving the light verb suru, as illustrated in (101), which is cited from Poser 1991 (his (64)).

(101)    Taroo-wa  itumo  SEIKOO  su-ru-ga,  Hanako-wa  tokidoki-sika
-top. always   success do-pres.-but     -top. sometimes-only
Ø si-na-i.
do-neg.-pres.
'Taro always succeeds but Hanko does only occasionally.'

In addition, a similar fact can be obtained in a Too-clause, in which the Sino-Japanese VN can be deleted under identity with a constituent in the first clause. Consider the examples in (102), which are cited from Poser 1991 (his (65) and (66)).

-top. success do-past     -too success do-past
'Taro succeeded. Jiro succeeded, too.'

-top. success do-past     -too Ø do-past
'Taro succeeded. Jiro did, too.'
In (102b), the Sino-Japanese VN *seikou* 'success' is deleted under identity, leaving the light verb *suru*. The verb *suru* in this example is not a pro-verb as evidenced by cases in which a verb such as *kak*(u) 'to write' may not be replaced by the verb *suru*.

    -top. letter-acc. write-past -top letter-acc. write-past
    'Taro wrote a letter. Jiro wrote a letter, too.'

    -top. letter-acc. write-past -top letter-acc. do-past
    'Taro wrote a letter. Jiro did, too.'

These facts indicate that periphrastic verb formation must occur after the syntax so that in the syntax, the VN and the light verb *suru* are still analyzable. Poser concludes that periphrastic verb formation takes place at LF and that the process by which θ-role assigning ability is transferred to the light verb must be carried out in LF.

Furthermore, Hoshi and Saito 1993 raise a question about the level in which Argument Transfer takes place. Grimshaw and Mester argue that Argument Transfer occurs in the lexicon. Hoshi and Saito point out some problems with this assumption. Consider the examples in (104), cited from Hoshi and Saito 1993: 58.

(104) a. *John-ni/e [Mary-no toti-no ZYOOTO]-o si-ta.
    -to/to -gen. land-gen. transfer-acc do-past
    'Mary transferred a piece of land to John.'

    -nom. land-acc. -to-gen. transfer-acc. do-past

c. Mary-ga John-ni/e [toti-no ZYOOTO]-o si-ta.
    -nom. -to/to land-gen. transfer-acc. do-past

According to Grimshaw and Mester's analysis, the Sino-Japanese VN *zyooto* 'transfer' is required to have two different outputs of Argument Transfer for the cases in (104a) and (104b) as illustrated in (105).

(105) a. *zyooto* (Agent (Goal (Theme) ) ), *suru* ( ) <acc.> ... input

b. *zyooto* (Agent (Theme) ), *suru* (Goal) <acc.> ... (= (104a))

c. *zyooto* (Goal), *suru* (Agent (Theme) ) <acc.> ... (= (104b))

If the operations in (105) were lexical, these operations would create two distinct θ-role assignors: the Sino-Japanese VN *zyooto* 'transfer' and the light verb *suru* 'to do'. Despite Grimshaw and Mester's claim that Argument Transfer observes the Thematic Hierarchy, it is not plausible to assume that two distinct θ-role assignors obey the order of the Thematic Hierarchy.

In contrast, if we assume LF incorporation, this is no longer a problem. Under this assumption, θ-role assignment in (104c) obeys the Thematic Hierarchy since there is only one θ-role assignor, i.e. Sino-Japanese VN *zyooto* 'transfer'. Thus, in (104c), first the Theme-role is assigned to *toti* 'land' and then, LF movement raises the VN to the light verb
suru, assigning the Goal-role to John(-ni/e). Finally, Mary receives the Agent-role. This θ-role assignment is consistent with the Thematic Hierarchy.

In the meantime, in the derivation of (104a) and (104b), the order of θ-role assignment does not follow the hierarchy. For instance, zoooto assigns the Agent-role first within NP in (104), then at LF other θ-roles are discharged. In (104b), on the other hand, before discharging the Theme-role, the Goal-role must be discharged inside the NP. In this fashion, a principled account for cases such as (104) can be provided by assuming LF incorporation and LF Argument Transfer.

Note that the Theme argument in (97) can be incorporated into suru to form sentences such as (106a and b) (cf. Hayashi 1994).

(106) a. Taroo-ga nihon-e RYOKOO-si-ta.
       -nom. Japan-to trip-do-past
      'Taro traveled to Japan.'

    b. Hanako-ga Taro-to KUTIGENKA-si-ta.
       -nom. -with quarrel-do-past
      'Hanako had an argument with Taro.'

Although the possibility of incorporation varies from lexical item to lexical item, it appears that only complex event nominals can be incorporated (cf. Chapter 2).

What is relevant to the present discussion is that the argument structure of incorporated nouns is transferred to the verb suru. The verbal complex derived via incorporation assigns θ-roles the arguments of the incorporated noun as the contrast in (106) and (107) illustrates.

       -nom. Japan-to-gen. trip-do-past

    b. *Hanako-ga [Taro-to-no kutigenka]-si-ta.
       -nom. -with-gen. quarrel-do-past

(107) is ungrammatical because the genitive Case is assigned to the oblique arguments of the incorporated noun. This shows that the incorporated noun no longer remains inside the projection of the NP. If the incorporated noun was inside the NP, the sentences in (107) would have been saved. On the other hand, the grammaticality of (106), where oblique arguments are not marked in the genitive, implies that the oblique argument is no longer inside of the NP and is assigned a θ-role by the verbal complex.

Incorporation of the noun is not limited to the Theme argument. As the following examples illustrate, the Goal argument is also incorporated. (The examples in (108) and (109) are cited from Hayashi 1994.)

       -top. next=year-till trip-acc. postponement-do-past
      'Yamada postponed the trip until next year.'

    b. Yamada-wa rainen-made RYOKOO-o enki-ni si-ta.
       -top. next=year-till trip-acc. postponement-dat. do-past
(109) a. Kumiai-wa touzen sutoraiki-o tyuusi-si-ta.
worker's-union-top. suddenly strike-acc. cancellation-do-past
'The union suddenly canceled the strike'

b. Kumiai-wa touzen sutoraiki-o tyuusi-ni si-ta.
worker's-union-top. suddenly strike-acc. cancellation-dat. do-past

I assume that the constructions in (108) and (109) are also instances of the light verb construction. This assumption is supported by the fact that topicalization and clefting of the θ-transparent object (in this case a Goal NP) is not permitted.

postponement-dat.-top. -nom. next=year-till trip-acc. do-past

cancellation-dat.-top. union-nom. suddenly strike-acc. do-past

(111) a. *Yamada-ga si-ta no-wa rainen-made RYOKOO-o
-nom. do-past NOM.-top. next=year-until trip-acc.
enki-da.
postponement-copula=pres.
'What Yamada did was to postpone the trip until next year.'

b. *Kumiai-ga si-ta no-wa touzen sutoraiki-o tyuusi-
union-nom. do-past NOM.-top. suddenly strike-acc. cancellation-
da.
copula=pres.
What the union did is to cancel the strike suddenly.'

Semantically, the dative phrase in (108b) and (109b) represents the result of a change in state of the accusative phrase. Thus, the accusative phrase in (108b) ryokoo 'trip' is changed so that it is postponed and the one in (109b), sutoraiki 'worker's strike' is turned into cancellation. In other words, the accusative phrases and dative phrases in (108) and (109) have a relationship in which the accusative phrase is the subject and the dative phrase is its complement in the copulative structure as in (112). The relationship between these two phrases is, therefore, characterized as a Theme-Goal relationship.

trip-nom. postponement-copula=pres./dat. become-past
'The trip has been postponed.'

strike-nom. cancellation-copula=pres./dat. become-past
'The strike has been canceled.'

Note that the order among Theme NP and Goal NP cannot be reversed.

postponement-nom. trip-copula=pres./dat. become-past
cancellation-nom. strike-copula=pres./dat. become-past

I assume that the accusative and dative NPs in (108) and (109) constitute a small clause in that the accusative NP is predicated of by the dative NP.

The relationship between the accusative and dative NPs in (108) and (109) is quite different from those found in ditransitive sentences such as (114a) or locative constructions such as in (114b) (cf. Takezawa 1993). In (114a), the dative NP represents a Goal to which the event of giving is directed. In (114b), on the other hand, it indicates a Location where the referent of direct object is placed.

(114) a. Taroo-ga hon-o Hanako-ni age-ta.
   -nom. book-acc. -dat. give-past
   'Taro gave Hanako a book.'

   b. Kazuo-ga hon-o yuka-ni o-i-ta.
      -nom. book-acc. floor-on put-past
      'Kazuo put a book on the floor.'

In these sentences, numeral quantifiers (NQs) can float to the position after the dative NP.

(115) a. Taroo-ga hon-o Hanako-ni san-satu age-ta.
   -nom. book-acc. -dat. three-volume give-past
   'Taro gave Hanako three books.'

   b. Kazuo-ga hon-o yuka-ni san-satu o-i-ta.
      -nom. book-acc. floor-on three-volume put-past
      'Kazuo put three books on the floor.'

The classifier -satu is used only for bound objects such as books, notebooks, and magazines. Therefore, the numeral quantifier sansatu in (115) must be associated with the NP hon-o.

In contrast, no NQ float can be observed in sentences such as (108b) and (109b) (cf. Takezawa 1993).

(116) a. Kootyoo-wa gakusei-o san-nin HOOKOOSYOBUN-ni si-ta.
   principal-top. student-acc. three-people expel-dat. do-past
   'The principal expelled three students.'

   b. *Kootyoo-wa gakusei-o HOOKOOSYOBUN-ni san-nin si-ta.
      principal-top. student-acc. three-people expel-dat. three-people do-past

   company-top. employee-acc. three-people fire-dat. do-past
   'The company fired three employees.'

      company-top. employee-acc. fire-dat. three-people do-past

Assuming that NQ float is possible if the NP linked to the NQ is generated in the position adjacent to the NQ (cf. Takezawa 1993), the impossibility of NQ float in the (b) sentences
in (116) and (117) can be attributed to the fact that the Theme NPs in these sentences are base-generated in the position adjacent to the NQ. On the other hand, the Theme NPs in the sentences in (115) are base-generated in the position where a "floated" NQ occurs and then undergo the rule of scrambling to derive the surface order. Schematically, the base generated structure for (115) is represented as in (118a) and that of (116) can be illustrated in (118b).

(118) a. \[ (115) \rightarrow \ldots [ NP_{i-1} \text{ NP-ni } \text{ NQ}_{t_{i}} ] \ldots \]

b. \[ (116b)/(117b) \rightarrow \ldots [ NP-o \text{ NQ } \text{ NP-ni } ] \ldots \]

By assuming that a small clause is involved in this construction, it is predicted that the θ-role of the accusative phrase is not assigned by the verb *suru*. This prediction is borne out. Consider the sentences in (119) and (120). The ungrammaticality of (120) is due to the fact that the dative phrase in (119) is omitted. This means that the accusative NP in (119) is not an argument of the verb *suru*. Moreover, the verb *suru* in (119) does not have a θ-grid for the Theme NP.

(119) a. Yamada-wa musuko-o bengosi-ni si-ta.
   -top. son-acc. lawyer-dat. do-past
   'Yamada made his son a lawyer.'

b. Hanako-wa kami-o muda-ni si-ta.
   -top. paper-acc. waste-dat. do-past
   'Hanako wasted paper.'

(120) a. *Yamada-wa musuko-o si-ta.
   -top. son-acc. do-past

b. *Hanako-wa kami-o si-ta.
   -top. paper-acc. do-past

In addition, in the complement position of the small clause, adjectives may occur. When this adjective is an adjectival noun (AN), it is marked in the dative as in (121a). Meanwhile, the adverbial form of adjective occurs when the adjective occurring in the complement position of a small clause is not AN, as in (121b).

(121) a. Yamada-wa heya-o kirei-ni si-ta.
   -top. room-acc. clean-dat. do-past
   'Yamada made the room clean.'

b. Hanako-wa isu-o taka-ku si-ta.
   -top. chair-acc. high-adv. do-past
   'Hanako made the chair high.'

In the examples in (121), Theme NPs are predicated of by the adjective in the complement position of a small clause. Without an adjective in this position, the sentence is ungrammatical.

(122) a. *Yamada-wa heya-o si-ta.
   -top. room-acc. do-past
b. *Hanako-wa isu-o si-ta.  
   -top. chair-acc. do-past

Note that the verb *suru* in this construction is also "light" in that the assignment of Theme-role is assumed to have resulted from Argument Transfer. The verb *suru* does not have a θ-grid for a Theme NP, as the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (120) and (122) show. In this sense, the argument structure of the verb *suru* is incomplete.

LF-incorporation derives the argument structure for (108b), represented in (123).

(123) a. enki (Theme, Goal)
   b. ryokoo (   )
   c. suru (Agent,      ) <acc>, (<dat>)
   d. ryokoo (   ) + enki (Goal) + suru (Agent, Theme) <acc>, (<dat>)

As a result of LF-incorporation, Theme and Goal roles are assigned by the light verb *suru.*

The light verb *suru* allows a dative argument in the following construction involving a nominalized embedded clause. This construction expresses a decision made by the matrix subject that results in the event denoted by the embedded clause being carried out. The dative marker is attached to the nominalized embedded clause to indicate the Goal to which the decision is directed.

(124) a. Taroo-ga [rainen nihon-ni ik-u koto]-ni si-ta.  
   -nom. next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact-dat. do-past
   'Taro decided to go to Japan next year.'
   b. Hanako-ga [asita tobei-su-ru koto]-ni si-ta.  
   -nom. tomorrow go-to=America-do-pres. fact-dat. do-past
   'Hanako decided to go to the US tomorrow.'

The embedded subject in (124) can be a PRO or an anaphor *zibun* 'self' referring to the matrix subject as shown in (125).33

---

33 The difference between the (125a) and (125b) can be found when there is a higher subject. Consider the following examples.

(i) Hanako1-wa Taroo2-ga [PRO+1] [rainen nihon-ni ik-u koto]-ni si-ta-to it-ta.  
   -top. -nom. next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact-dat. do-past-quot. say-past
   'Hanako1 said that Taroo2 decided to PRO+1 go to Japan next year.'

(ii) Hanako1-wa Taroo2-ga [zibun+1]-ga [rainen nihon-ni ik-u koto]-ni si-ta-to it-ta.  
    -top. -nom. -nom. next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact-dat. do-past-quot. say-past
    '(lit.) Hanako1 said that Taroo2 decided *self+1* to go to Japan next year.'

When the embedded dative clause has a PRO subject, it only refers to the subject of the verb *si-ta* 'did'. In contrast, the reflexive embedded subject can be anaphoric to either the subject of *si-ta* 'did' or the subject of *it-ta* 'said'.
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(125) a. Taroo-ga [PRO rainen nihon-ni ik-u koto]-ni si-ta.
   -nom. next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact-dat. do-past
   'Taro decided to go to Japan next year.'

   b. Taroo-ga [zibun-ga rainen nihon-ni ik-u koto]-ni si-ta.
      -nom. self-nom. next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact-dat. do-past
      'Taro decided to go to Japan next year.'

In addition, the embedded subject may be distinct from the matrix subject.

(126) Taroo-ga [Yamada-ga rainen nihon-ni ik-u koto]-ni si-ta.
      -nom. -nom. next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact-dat. do-past
      'Taro decided that Yamada would go to Japan next year.'

In this connection, the embedded subject can be marked in the accusative. Consider the sentence in (127).

(127) Taroo-ga Yamada-o rainen nihon-ni ik-u koto-ni si-ta.
      -nom. -acc. next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact-dat. do-past
      'Taro decided that Yamada will go to Japan next year.'

The accusative embedded subject is not always permitted. Compare the sentence in (127) with the sentence in (128b).

(128) a. Taroo-wa Hanako-ga syatyoo-ni a-u koto-ni si-ta.
       -top. -nom. president-dat. meet-pres. fact-dat. do-past
       'Taro decided that Hanako would see the president.'

      -top. -acc. president-dat. meet-pres. fact-dat. do-past

It appears that the possibility of marking the embedded subject in the accusative is restricted to cases where the embedded subject has a Theme-role. The ungrammaticality of the sentence in (128b) is perhaps attributed to the fact that the embedded subject is assigned an Agent-role.

The accusative subject in (127) is still an embedded subject because it triggers subject honorification in the embedded clause. Compare the sentences in (129), where both the nominative embedded subject and the accusative embedded subject trigger subject honorification in the embedded clause.

(129) a. Taroo-ga [Yamada-sensei-ga rainen nihon-ni o-ideni-ni
      nom. professor-nom. next=year Japan-to hon.-go-dat.
      nar-u koto]-ni si-ta.
      become-pres. fact-dat. do-past
      'Taro decided that Professor Yamada will go to Japan next year.'

   b. Taroo-ga Yamada-sensei-o rainen nihon-ni o-ideni-ni
      nom. professor-acc. next=year Japan-to hon.-go-dat.
      nar-u koto]-ni si-ta.
      become-pres. fact-dat. do-past
This indicates that the embedded subject can be "raised" to the accusative position just as the ECM cases. ECM is possible only when the embedded subject has a Theme-role as the English examples in (130) show.\textsuperscript{34}

(130)  
a. Mary believes him to have gone to Japan.  
b. John thought her to be intelligent.  
c. *Mary believes him to cook dinner.  
d. *John thought her to play tennis.

This fact implies that the verb suru involved in this construction acquires an ability to license a Theme phrase only when a certain θ-role is provided by the embedded clause. Assuming that the verb suru has the lexical entry listed in (123c) and that the Theme argument is transferred as in the case of (108b), this fact can be accounted for by Argument Transfer. The impossibility of transferring the Agent-role is probably due to the verb suru already having the Agent-role in its lexical entry.

To summarize so far, I have examined Grimshaw and Mester's argument for treating the verb suru in (108b) and (109b) as a "light" verb. A light verb, by definition, either lacks any argument structure in its lexical entry or has an incomplete argument structure. In order for the light verb to assign θ-roles to its arguments, the argument structure of the object NP is transferred (or incorporated). In addition, the same analysis can be applied to the verb suru with a Goal NP. In this case, the argument structure of the Goal NP is transferred to the argument structure of the light verb along with the Theme-role of the subject of the small clause.

5. 3. 2. THE LIGHT VERB ANALYSIS OF SUBJEC T HONORIFICATION

In this section, I will argue that the verb nar(-u) in subject honorification has a clausal complement. Following Takezawa 1993, I will argue that the dative Case marker -ni marking the complement of the verb nar(-u) is not the same -ni which marks locative phrases or Goal NPs in the ditransitive structure. Instead, the verb nar(-u) takes a clausal complement ("secondary predicate" in Takezawa op. cit.) and the surface subject is base-generated as the subject of the clausal complement. Semantically, the verb nar(-u) in subject honorification is identical to the verb nar(-u) with an embedded clause which has its own argument structure. I will show that this verb is "light" in that the argument structure of the verb nar(-u) is supplemented by the argument structure of the embedded clause. I will also show that there are several syntactic and semantic differences between light nar(-u) and heavy nar(-u).

5. 3. 2. 1. THE VERB NARU

Let's start the discussion by comparing the sentences in (131) with those in (124). The verb involved in (131) is nar(-u) 'to become', and semantically the sentences in (131) are similar to those in (124) except that the decision is made by someone other than the subject of the sentence. In other words, the sentence in (131) is non-agentive whereas the sentence in (124) is agentive.

\textsuperscript{34} The sentences in (130c and d) are grammatical with the habitual interpretation.
(131) a. Taroo-wa rainen nihon-ni ik-u koto-ni nat-ta.
   -top. next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact-dat. become-past
   '(lit.) It has become that Taro will go to Japan next year.'
   'It has been decided that Taro will go to Japan next year.'

b. Hanako-wa asita tobei-su-ru koto-ni nat-ta.
   -top. tomorrow go=to=Amercia-do-pres. fact-dat. become-past
   '(lit.) It has become that Hanako will go to the US tomorrow.'
   'It has been decided that Hanako will go to the US tomorrow.'

In this sense, the verb nar(-u) in (131) might be characterized as an intransitive counterpart of the verb suru in (124).

Compared with the use of the verb nar(-u) in (132) below, the predicate in (131) has a slightly different meaning from the sentence in (132).

(132) a. Taroo-wa sensei-ni nat-ta.
   -top. teacher-dat. become-past
   'Taro became a teacher.'

b. Heya-ga kirei-ni nat-ta.
   room-top. clean-dat. become-past
   'The room became clean.'

In the sentences in (132), the verb nar(-u) denotes a change of state. Thus, in (132a), the subject Taroo underwent a change from a non-teacher state to a teacher state. Likewise, the sentence in (132b) denotes a change of the room from a non-clean state to a clean state.

For convenience, I will refer to nar(-u)-sentences such as those in (132) as the Nominal-Goal nar(-u) construction and those in (131) as the Predicative-Goal nar(-u) construction.

The subject and dative phrase in (131) cannot be subject and complement of a copula. Compare the ungrammaticality of (134) with the grammaticality of (133), which corresponds to the sentences in (132).

(133) a. Taroo-wa sensei-da.
   -top. teacher-copula=pres.

b. Heya-ga kirei-da.
   room-nom. clean-copula=pres.

   -top. next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact-copula=pres.

   -top. tomorrow go=to=Amercia-do-pres. fact-copula=pres.

The change expressed in the sentences in (131) is realized through a decision whereas in the examples in (132), the status or state of the subject of the sentence is changed. Furthermore, the subject and dative phrase in (131) do not have the relationship of the subject and complement of the copula shown in (134).
Secondly, the nominalized dative phrase in (131) may not allow any subject other than the matrix subject.\(^{35}\) Thus, the sentences in (135) are ruled out.

(135) a. *Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga rainen nihon-e ik-u koto]-ni nat-ta.
   -top. -nom. next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact-dat. become-past

b. *Hanako-wa [Ziroo-ga asita tobei-su-ru koto]-ni
   -top. -nom. tomorrow go=to=America-do-pres. fact-dat.
   nat-ta.
   become-past

(135) is ungrammatical because the matrix subject and embedded subject are different.

5. 3. 2. 2. SUBJECT POSITION OF THE VERB NARU

In the previous section, I have pointed out that the subject of the Predicative-Goal nar(-u) construction must be identical to the subject of the embedded clause. This is confirmed by subject honorification and NPI (negative polarity item) licensing.

First, compare the sentences in (136) and (137) where subject honorification is applied to the Predicate-Goal nar(-u) sentences in (131) and the Nominal-Goal nar(-u) sentences in (132).

(136) a. Sensei-wa raigetu nihon-e o-TATI-ni nar-u koto-ni
   teacher-top. next=month Japan-to hon.-leave-dat. become-pres. fact-dat.
   nat-ta.
   become-past
   'It has been decided that the professor will leave for Japan next month.'

b. Sensei-wa raigetu nihon-e tat-u koto-ni o-NARI-
   teacher-top. next=month Japan-to leave-pres. fact-dat. hon.-become-
   da/ni nat-ta.
   copula=pres./become-past
   'It has been decided that the professor will leave for Japan next month.'

(137) a. Sensei-wa taihen o-genki-ni nat-ta.
   professor-top. extremely hon.-healthy-dat. become-past
   'The professor became extremely healthy.'

---

\(^{35}\) There are, however, cases where the matrix clause may have a subject different from the embedded subject. In this case, the embedded subject must have an "aboutness" relation such as kinship with the matrix subject. For instance, the following sentences are acceptable.

(i) a. Taroo-wa [ototo-ga rainen nihon-e ik-u koto]-ni nat-ta.
   -top. younger=brother-nom. next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact dat. become-past
   '(lit.) As for Taro, it has been decided that his younger brother will go to Japan next year.'

b. Hanako-wa [zyoosi-ga asita TOBEI-su-ru koto]-ni nat-ta.
   -top. boss-nom. tomorrow go=to=the=US-do-pres. fact dat. become-past
   '(lit.) As for Hanako, it has been decided that her boss will go to the US tomorrow.'
b. Senssei-wa taihen genki-ni o-nari-da
   professor-top. extremely healthy-dat. hon.-become-copula=pres./dat.
   nat-ta.
   become-past
   "The professor became extremely healthy."

Recall that subject honorification is allowed when a [+honorific] subject has a spec-
head relation with the honorific verb (cf. section 5.2.2. above). In (136a), subject
honorification occurs in the embedded clause, changing the form of the embedded verb tatsu
'to leave' into o-tati-ni nar(-u) 'hon.-leave-dat. become'. This indicates that the embedded
verb is in the head position of the embedded clause, allowing spec-head agreement with the
embedded subject.

Subject honorification can also be licensed with the matrix verb nar(-u) as the
example in (136b) shows. Thus, the matrix verb nar(-u) is changed into o-nari-da or
o-nari-ni nar(-u). This shows that the [+honorific] subject is in the matrix clause in order
to establish a spec-head relation with the matrix verb.

In the apparently identical structure in (137), the same distribution of subject
honorification is obtained: as in (137a), the honorific prefix o- is attached to the an AN
genki 'healthy' in the complement position of the verb nar(-u). Assuming that the honorific
prefix attached to the AN must satisfy the same structural requirement as the one prefixed
onto the verb, the subject sensei 'professor' in (137a) must be in a position which holds a
spec-head relation with the predicate position of the embedded clause.

Moreover, as in (137b), the verb nar(-u) can be changed into the subject honorific
form. Thus, the verb nar(-u) 'become' is altered to o-nari-da or o-nari-ni natta, as in
(136b) above. This indicates that the subject of the sentence is in the spec. position of the
matrix clause headed by the verb nar(-u).

The fact that the embedded subject can license subject honorification as in (137a)
suggests that what appears to be the subject of the verb nar(-u) is in fact base-generated in
the embedded subject position. Furthermore, the same subject can license subject
honorification at the matrix level, implying that the embedded subject is somehow "raised"
into the matrix subject position.

Moreover, cases involving NPI (negative polarity item) further support the
assumption that the subject in (138) can be both the embedded subject and the matrix
subject. The case in question involves the Japanese NPI -sika 'only'. Roughly, -sika,
which is attached to an NP, requires a negative element within the same clause. More
specifically, NP-sika moves to the Spec of NegP in order to be licensed by the spec-head
relation (cf. Chapter 4). If no NegP is available within the clause where NP-sika occurs,
NP-sika must move to a higher clause, resulting in an ECP violation. Thus, the sentences
in (138) are grammatical since the NegP occurs in the same clause as the NP-sika whereas
the examples in (139) are not since these sentences do not have a NegP in the same clause
as the NP-sika.

(138) a. Taroo-sika [Hanako-ga Ziroo-ga suki-dal]-to
   -only -nom. -nom. like-copula=pres.-quot.
   iwa-nakat-ta.
   say-neg.-past
   'Only Taro said that Hanako liked Jiro.'
b. Taroo-ga [Hanako-sika Ziroo-ga suki-zya-na-i]-to it-ta.
   nom. only nom. like-copula-neg.-pres.-quot. say-past

'Taro said that only Hanako liked Jiro.'

(139) a. *Taroo-sika [Hanako-ga Ziroo-ga suki-zya-na-i]-to
    only nom. nom. like-copula-neg.-pres.-quot.
    it-ta.
say-past

b. *Taroo-ga [Hanako-sika Ziroo-ga suki-da]-to
    nom. only nom. like-copula=pres.-quot.
iwa-nakat-ta.
say-neg.-past

With this in mind, consider the examples in (140) and (141).

(140) a. Taroo-sika rainen nihon-ni ika-na-i koto-ni nat-ta.
    only next=year Japan-to go-neg.-pres. fact-dat. become-past

'It was decided that only Taro will go to Japan next year.'

b. Taroo-sika rainen nihon-ni ik-u koto-ni nara-nakat-ta.
    only next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact-dat. become-neg.-past

'It was decided that only Taro will go to Japan next year.'

(141) a. Higaisya-tati-sika soko-de hitoban sugosa-na-i koto-ni
    victim-pl.-only there-in one=night spend-neg.-pres. fact-dat.
    nat-ta.
    become-past

'It has been decided that only victims will stay there overnight.'

b. Higaisya-tati-sika soko-de hitoban sugos-u koto-ni
    victim-pl.-only there-in one=night spend-pres. fact-dat.
    nara-nakat-ta.
    become-neg.-past

'It has been decided that only victims will stay there overnight.'

If the subject NPs to which -sika is attached in the (a) sentences of (140) and (141) were
the matrix clause, the sentences would be ungrammatical as violations of the clausemate
condition. Contrary to this prediction, the NPI occurring in the subject position of the
embedded clause yields grammatical sentence, indicating that the subject in these sentences
are in the embedded clause. Thus, NPI in the embedded subject position is licensed by
satisfying the clausemate condition at the embedded clause. On the other hand, a negative
element in the matrix clause also licenses NPI in the subject position as in the (b) sentences
of (140) and (141). This fact suggests that the subjects in these sentences are "raised" to
the matrix subject position if the assumption that the verb nar(-u) does not select the matrix
subject is correct.

Now, compare the cases in (141) with the examples in (142).
   -nom.  -only visit-do-Neg.-pres. fact-dat. become-past
   'It's been decided that Taro visit only Hanako.'

   -nom.  -only visit-do-pres. fact-dat. become-neg.-past

In the examples in (142), the object of the embedded verb is attached with -sika. In this case, when NegP is in the matrix clause, the sentence is ungrammatical. The ungrammaticality of the example in (142b) indicates that the object does not undergo raising in the nar(-u) construction.

To illustrate schematically, these facts all indicate that the verb nar(-u) base-generates either one of the following structures.

(143) a.=(131)  Ø₁-ga [NP₁-ga ... V-u koto]-ni nar-u.
   b.=(132)  Ø₁-ga [NP₁-ga NP]-ni nar-u.

Simply put, what appears to be the matrix subject in (131) and (132) is an argument of the embedded verb. (For a similar analysis of the verb nar(-u) as a "secondary predicate", see Takezawa 1993.) For more discussion on the subject position of the verb nar(-u), see the next section.

5. 3. 2. 3. RAISING OF THE EMBEDDED SUBJECT

In the previous section, I argue that what appears to be the surface subject is base-generated in the embedded clause, which is a finite or a small clause. I then assume that the embedded subject is raised to the matrix subject position. This analysis does not pose any problems as far as non-finite embedded clauses such as (132b) are concerned. Since the embedded subject is not in the subject position of a small clause, a non-Case position, NP movement to the matrix subject position does not violate the commonly-held view on the constraint on A-chain formation (Sportiche 1983, Bouchard 1984), which requires that the head of an A-chain be in a non-Case position and the tail of an A-chain be in a Case-marked position. For instance, the contrast in (144) is accounted for by this constraint because the trace in (144b) is doubly Case marked whereas the trace in (144a) is not.

(144) a. John₁ seems t₁ to like Mary.
   b. *John₁ seems that t₁ likes Mary.

However, in the nar(-u) construction with the finite embedded clause, NP-movement of the embedded subject violates the Case-motivated constraint of A-chain formation. Schematically, the derivation of this construction is represented in (153a), repeated here as (145).

(145)  Taroo-ga₁ [t₁ rainen nihon-ni ik-u koto]-ni-wa nat-ta.
   -nom.  next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact-dat.-top. become-past

Since the embedded subject is in a Case position, raising this NP to the matrix subject position violates the constraint on this version of A-chain formation, since the matrix subject position is also a Case-marked position.

In addition, the trace left by NP-movement of the embedded subject is not bound in the embedded clause. Since the embedded clause is tensed, Infl in the embedded clause
would be the governor of $t_i$ in the structure in (145) and the embedded clause would constitute its governing category. This trace is not bound in the embedded clause, resulting in a violation of Binding Condition (A), which requires that an anaphor be bound in its governing category.

However, there are cases where violation of Binding Condition (A) does not seem to create a serious problem in Japanese. Consider the sentences in (146).

(146)  a. Taroo$_i$-ga [ zibunzisiri$_i$-ga SEIKOO-suru-to ] omot-te i-ta.
   -nom. self-nom. success-do-quot. think-TE exist-past
   '(lit.) Taroo$_i$ was thinking that self$_i$ would succeed.'

   b. Hanako-to Kazuko$_i$-ga [ kanozyorazisiri$_i$-ga sore-o MOTIKAET-ta-
   -nom. themselves-nom. that-acc. bring=back-past-
   -to ] it-ta.
   -quot. say-past
   '(lit.) Hanako and Kazuko$_i$ said that they themselves$_i$ brought it back.'

In the sentences in (146), the reflexives in the embedded subject position are bound by the subject of the matrix clause. This is an apparent violation of Binding Condition (A). Yoshimura 1992, following Huang 1982 and Aoun 1984, attributes these apparent violations of Condition (A) to the lack of AGR in Japanese. Thus, the accessible SUBJECT for the reflexive in (146) cannot be the embedded AGR but must be the matrix subject. This implies that the governing category of an anaphor in the embedded subject position in Japanese is the matrix clause. Hence, the binding of a nominative trace left by NP-movement in the Predicative-Goal nar(-u) construction does not violate Condition (A) for an independent reason.

Now, let's turn to the question of violation of A-chain formation. Lasnik 1985 and Lasnik and Uriagereka 1988, argue that the constraint on A-chain formation must be redefined in terms of local A-binding, instead of the Case approach. Consider Lasnik's examples in (147).

(147)  a. *Bill tried [ [ John$_i$ to seem [ that he$_i$ likes $t_i$ ] ] ].

   b. *Bill tried [ [ John$_i$ to be believed [ that he$_i$ likes $t_i$ ] ] ].

NP movement in the examples in (147) does not violate Binding Condition (A), which requires that an anaphor be bound in its governing category. The governing category of the trace of NP in (147) is the most embedded clause, and the trace is bound by he in that embedded clause.

Moreover, the sentences in (147) cannot be ruled out as ungrammatical on the grounds that the trace is doubly Case marked because the A-chain formed by NP-movement (John, $t$) involves only one Case-marked position, namely the position occupied by the trace.

Lasnik also points out that the cases such as (144) can be accounted for by stipulating that NP-trace may not occur in a Case-marked position, but this approach still fails to account for the ungrammaticality of the sentence in (148).

(148)  a. *John$_i$ is believed [ that he$_i$ is proud $t_i$ ].

   b. *John$_i$ seems [ that he$_i$ is proud $t_i$ ].

In the examples in (148), the chain contains only one Case-marked position, namely the matrix subject position, and the trace of John is not Case-marked.
Based on these observations on illicit NP-movement, Lasnik proposes that A-movement is constrained by local A-binding stated as in (149) (Lasnik's 1985 (27) with a slight modification).

(149) If $\alpha_i$ and $\alpha_{i+1}$ are successive links in an A-chain, then $\alpha_i$ locally A-binds $\alpha_{i+1}$

Following the constraint in (149), Lasnik argues that the "illicit NP-movement" in (148) is ruled out on the grounds that the A-chain (John, t ) does not constitutes a successive link. This is because the intervening embedded subject he prevents the matrix subject John from locally binding its trace.

In light of the local A-binding constraint in (149), the A-chain formed through NP-movement involved in (145) does not violate this condition. Since no binder intervenes between the moved NP and its trace, the condition in (149) is not violated in the derivation of the structure in (145). Hence, raising applied to the embedded subject in the derivation of the Predicative-Goal nar(-u) construction is a licit movement in Japanese.

5. 3. 2. 4. SOME DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TWO NARU CONSTRUCTIONS

Now, let's examine semantics of the Predicative-Goal nar(-u) construction in (131). As a point of departure, compare the decision-suru construction in (124), repeated here as (150), with (131), repeated here as (151).

(150) a. Taroo-ga rainen nihon-ni ik-u koto-ni si-ta.  
    -nom. next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact-dat. do-past
    'Taro decided to go to Japan next year.'

b. Hanako-ga asita TOBEI-su-ru koto-ni si-ta.  
    -nom. tomorrow go=to=America-do-pres. fact-dat. do-past
    'Hanako decided to go to the US tomorrow.'

(151) a. Taroo-wa raien nihon-ni ik-u koto-ni nat-ta.  
    -top. next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact-dat. become-past
    'It has been decided that Taro will go to Japan next year.'

b. Hanako-wa asita TOBEI-su-ru koto-ni nat-ta.  
    -top. tomorrow go=to=America-do-pres. fact-dat. become-past
    'It has been decided that Hanako will go to the US tomorrow.'

The sentences in (150) and (151) both express a decision to initiate the event denoted by the embedded clause. As mentioned earlier, the difference between these two types of constructions is that while the decision was made by the referent of the subject in the decision-suru construction in (150), it was made by someone other than the subject in the decision-nar(-u) construction in (151). Other than the agency of decision-making, these two constructions are identical. More specifically, in (150), the agent of the verb suru is the one who initiates the decision-making. In contrast, no such argument exists in (151). In more functional terms, the decision-nar(-u) construction implies that the decision made by someone else may not be changed or challenged, whereas the decision-suru construction indicates the subject's involvement in coming to a decision. In this sense, the
sentences in (151) are similar to passives or unaccusatives, in that the agency of the person who makes the decision is downplayed.

In Japanese, there are a number of transitive-intransitive verb pairs that have a relationship similar to the pair suru and nar(-u) (cf. Jacobson 1992). The sentences in (150a) and (151a) can be paraphrased using the transitive-intransitive pair kimeru 'to decide' and kimaru 'to be decided' as in (152).

(152) a. Taroo-ga rainen nihon-ni ik-u koto-ni kime-ta.  
   -nom. next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact-dat. decide-past  
   'Taro decided to go to Japan next year.'

b. Taroo-ga rainen nihon-ni ik-u koto-ni kimat-ta.  
   -nom. next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact-dat. be=decided-past  
   'It has been decided that Taro will go to Japan next year.'

In this sense, the verbs suru and nar(-u) can be characterized as a transitive-intransitive pair. Of particular interest to the present discussion is that the verb nar(-u) does not project its own agentive subject for being (semantically, at least) intransitive. The observation in the previous section that the embedded subject can be "raised" into the matrix subject position of nar(-u) probably follows from this fact.

In addition, assignment of θ-roles to the arguments of (151) is not carried out directly by the verb nar(-u). In the sentences in (151), application of topicalization to the dative phrase is restricted.

   next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact-dat.-top. -nom. become-past

   tomorrow go=to=America-do-pres. fact-dat.-top. -nom. become-past

As mentioned early in (93), Grimshaw and Mester 1988 have pointed out that topicalization of a θ-transparent NP is not permitted.

Applicability of topicalization and clefting to the Nominal-Goal construction such as in (132) varies depending on the lexical category of the Goal phrase. When this position is occupied by a noun, topicalization and clefting of the dative phrase do not affect acceptability of the sentence. In contrast, when an adjectival noun (AN) or an adjective occupies this position, the sentence becomes marginal at best. Thus, compare the sentences in (154) and (155) on the one hand and (156) and (157) on the other.\(^{36}\)

\(^{36}\) It appears that distinction of the predicate types in (154)/(155) and (156)/(157) must be refined further. For instance, VNs in the dative position ordinarily reject either topicalization or cleft formation. (cf. (163) below). Consider the following examples.

(i)  Taroo-ga byooki-ni nat-ta.  
     -nom. sick-dat. become-past  
     'Taro got sick.'

(ii) *Byooki-ni-wa Taroo-ga nat-ta.  
     sick-dat.-top. -nom. become-past  
     'As for sickness, Taro became.'
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(154) **TOPICALIZATION:**

a. Sensei-ni-wa Taroo-ga nat-ta.
    teacher-dat.-top. -nom. become-past
    'As for the teacher, Taro became one.'

b. Syusyoo-ni-wa Hata-si-ga nat-ta.
    prime=министр-top. -Mr.-nom. become-past
    'As for the prime minister, Mr. Hata became one.'

(155) **CLEFT:**

a. Taroo-ga nat-ta no-wa sensei-da.
    -nom. become-past NOM.-top. teacher-copula=pres.
    'What Taro has become is a teacher.'

b. Hata-si-ga nat-ta no-wa syusyoo-da.
    -Mr.-nom. become-past NOM.-top. prime=министр-copula=pres.
    'What Mr. Hata has become is the prime minister.'

(156) **TOPICALIZATION:**

    clean-dat.-top. room-nom. become-past
    '(lit.) As for being clean, the room became.'

b. *Kawai-ku-wa Hanako-ga nat-ta.
    cute-adv.-top. -nom. become-past
    '(lit.) As for being cute, Hanako became.'

(157) **CLEFT:**

    room-nom. become-past NOM.-top. clean(-dat.)-copula=pres.

    -nom. become-past NOM.-top. cute-adv.-copula=pres.

One possible way to account for the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (153), (156) and (157) is to have recourse to violation of the proper-binding principle (Koster 1978). Under the assumption that what appears to be the subject of the verb *nar(-u)* is in fact the subject of the embedded clause as in (143a), application of topicalization moves the embedded clause with the trace of the raised subject.

Returning to the sentences in (153), impossibility of topicalization in (153) is not specific to the application of topicalization. Other syntactic operations that move the dative phrase such as clefting are also restricted.

(iii) ??Taroo-ga nat-ta-no-wa byooki-da.
    -nom. become-past-NOM.-top. sick-copula=pres.
    'What Taro became is sickness.'
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(158) a. *Taroo-ga nat-ta no-wa rainen nihon-ni ik-u
   -nom. become-past NOM.-top. next=year Japan-to go-pres.
koto-da.
   fact-copula=pres.
   '(lit.) What Taro has become is that he will go to Japan next year.'

b. *Hanako-ga nat-ta no-wa asita TOBEI-su-ru
   -nom. become-past NOM.-top. tomorrow go=to=the=US-do-pres.
koto-da.
   fact-copula=pres.
   '(lit.) What Hanako has become is that she will go to the US tomorrow.'

Note also that the sentences in (150) do not undergo topicalization or clefting of the nominalized dative phrase.

   next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact-dat.-top. -nom. do-past

b. *Asita TOBEI-su-ru koto-ni-wa Hanako-ga si-ta.
   tomorrow go=to=America-do-pres. fact-dat.-top. -nom. do-past

(160) a. *Taroo-ga si-ta no-wa rainen nihon-ni ik-u
   -nom. do-past NOM.-top. next=year Japan-to go-pres.
koto-da.
   fact-copula=pres.

b. *Hanako-ga si-ta no-wa asita TOBEI-su-ru
   -nom. do-past NOM.-top. tomorrow go=to=the=US-do-pres.
koto-da.
   fact-copula=pres.

I assume that the impossibility of topicalization and clefting of dative phrases in (159) and
(160) is due to the existence of a light verb suru. By the same token, assuming that the
sentences in (151) involves the "light" verb nar(-u), the inapplicability of topicalization in
this case can be accounted for in a principled way.

Thus, topicalization in (153a) is applied to a structure such as that in (161a),
deriving the structure in (161b), with cleft formation applied to (153a) deriving the
structure in (161c).

(161) a. Taroo-ga; [t₁ rainen nihon-ni ik-u koto]-ni-wa nat-ta.
   -nom. next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact-dat.-top. become-past

b. [t₁ rainen nihon-ni ik-u koto]-ni-wa Taroo-ga t₂ nat-ta.

c. [Taroo-ga; t₁ nat-ta no]-wa [t₁ rainen nihon-ni ik-u koto]-da.

In order to derive sentences such as the one in (153a), the embedded clause in
(161a) is moved leftward. The resulting structure in (161b) is in violation of the proper-
binding principle since the trace left behind by the subject cannot be properly bound. On
the other hand, the cleft sentence in (161a) is derived via rightward movement of the
embedded clause applied to the structure in (161a). In the resulting structure in (161c), the
trace left behind by the subject is not properly bound.
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However, this analysis fails to account for the grammaticality of the sentences in (154) and (155). From the base-generated structure in (132), raising of the subject of a small clause, topicalization, or clefting of a dative NP would derive a structure in which the proper-binding principle is violated in a manner illustrated in (162).

(162) a. SUBJECT RAISING:
Tarooi-ga [ t_1 sensei ]-ni-wa nat-ta.

b. TOPICALIZATION OF DATIVE NP:
[ t_1 sensei ]-ni-wa Tarooi-ga [ t_1 ] nat-ta.

c. CLEFT FORMATION OF DATIVE NP:
[Tarooi-ga t_1 nat-ta-no]-wa [ t_1 sensei ]-j-da.

Since the trace of the embedded subject is not properly bound in (162b and c), these structures violate the proper-binding principle. However, the sentence is grammatical, suggesting that the derivation of (154) and (155) is different from that of (153), (156), (157), (158), (159) and (160).

5. 3. 2. 5. THE LIGHT VERB ANALYSIS OF VERB NARU

In this section, I will propose a light verb analysis of the verb nar(-u) in connection to the occurrence of this verb in sentences such as (153). In contrast, I will show that the same verb nar(-u) in the sentences in (154) is an instance of heavy nar(-u). The distinction between light nar(-u) and heavy nar(-u) is that the former cannot assign any θ-role to its arguments while the latter can. Assuming this analysis, the proper-binding principle violation effect can be reduced to Argument Transfer.

Notice that the Goal phrase in Predicative-Goal nar(-u) sentences in (153), (158), (159), (160) and Nominal-Goal nar(-u) sentences in (156) and (157) has its own argument structure whereas the Goal phrase of the Nominal-Goal nar(-u) sentences in (154) and (155) does not. In this connection, compare the sentences in (154) with the examples in (163). The example in (163a) contains a VN as the dative argument of the verb nar(-u). In this sentence, topicalization and clefting of the dative NP are not permitted as shown in (163b) and (163c), respectively.

this incident-nom. good lesson-dat. become-past

'This incident gave me a good lesson.'

b. *Ii BENKYOO-ni-wa kono dekigoto-ga nat-ta.
good lesson-dat.-top. this incident-nom. become-past

this incident-nom. become-past NOM.-top. good lesson-copula-pres.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the VN has its own argument structure. In contrast, referential nouns such as sensei 'teacher' and syusyoo 'prime minister' do not. Thus, it is plausible to assume that topicalization of the dative NP in nar(-u)-sentences is not permitted when the dative NP has its own argument structure.

Now, let's examine cases where topicalization or cleft formation is allowed. These cases are similar to (154) and (155) because they contain a dative NP without its own argument structure. I assume that a sentence such as (154) involves "heavy" nar(-u). In
this case, the subject of the sentence is θ-marked by the verb nar(-u) since no θ-role is assigned by the NP in the predicate position of the small clause. This means that the subject of the sentence is projected as such in the D-structure, dispensing with the application of raising. Schematically, the derivation of a sentence such as (154) proceeds as in (164).

(164) a. BASE-GENERATED STRUCTURE:
Tarooigi-ga [ PRO1 sensei ]-ni nat-ta.
b. TOPICALIZATION OF DATIVE PHRASE:
[ PRO1 sensei ]-ni-wa Tarooigi-ga nat-ta.

In contrast, cases where topicalization or cleft formation of the dative argument is not allowed are accounted for by assuming that the verb nar(-u) is a light verb and Argument Transfer takes place at LF. For instance, in deriving a sentence such as (153a), the syntax produces the structure in (165a) via raising of the embedded subject to the matrix subject. Then, application of topicalization of the dative phrase yields the structure in (165b).

(165) a. Tarooigi-ga [ t1 rainen nihon-ni ik-u koto]-ni nat-ta.
   -nom. next=year Japan-to go-pres. fact -dat become-past

b. [ t1 rainen nihon-ni ik-u koto]j-ni-wa Tarooigi-ga t2 nat-ta.

Since the verb involved in (165) is a light verb, raising of the embedded subject leaves a trace in the subject position of the embedded clause. When topicalization or cleft formation moves the embedded clause, this trace is not properly governed.

In this way, assuming the "light" verb analysis for the verb nar(-u) in (153) provides a principled account for violation of the proper binding principle in these sentence. On the other hand, by assuming that the verb involved in (154) is "heavy" nar(-u), no violation of the proper-biding principle is predicted because raising to the embedded subject is not applied.37

5. 3. 2. 6. LEXICAL ENTRIES FOR LIGHT AND HEAVY NARU

I have shown that there is a distinction between light and heavy nar(-u). In this section, I will discuss lexical entries for each type of nar(-u).

As shown above, sentences involving the verb nar(-u) can be divided into two types: the Nominal-Goal nar(-u) construction and the Predicative-Goal nar(-u)

---
37 Application of topicalization and clefting in the light suru constructions appears to be also constrained by the same principle as the examples in (i) and (ii) show.

(i) *Nihongo-o \textit{BENKYOO}-wa Taroo-ga si-ta.
   Japanese=language-acc. study-top. -nom. do-past
   'As for studying Japanese, Taro did.'

(ii) *Taroo-ga si-ta no-wa nihongo-o \textit{BENKYOO} da.
   'What Taro did was study the Japanese language.'
construction. The former involves non-thematic NPs as a Goal phrase as in (154). The latter involves a thematic NP (such as a VN), adjectival or verbal predicate as a Goal phrase. As seen above, the Nominal-Goal nar(-u) construction appears to assign both Theme- and Goal-roles to its arguments. On the other hand, the Predicative-Goal nar(-u) construction appears only to assign the Goal-role, with the Theme-role being "transferred" from the embedded predicate.

I assume that the verb nar(-u) occurring in the Predicative-Goal nar(-u) construction has a lexical entry as illustrated in (166).

(166)  

    nar(-u) (       , Goal) <dat>

In (166), the verb nar(-u) does not project its own subject. What appears to be the subject of this verb is in fact base-generated as the subject of either the embedded clause or the subject of a small clause (see section 5.3.2.3, above). Since the thematic structure of this verb is incomplete, I assume that nar(-u) with this lexical entry is "light".

On the other hand, the Nominal-Goal nar(-u) construction is assumed to contain the "heavy" nar(-u) verb with the following lexical entry.

(167)  

    nar(-u) (Theme, Goal) <dat>

In this case, a small clause occurs as the embedded clause. However, the NP in the predicate position of the small clause does not assign a θ-role and the subject of the small clause receives a θ-role from the verb nar(-u). Semantically, the verb nar(-u) in (167) is not "light" because it contributes to interpretation of the sentence denoting a change in state of the Theme NP to the state denoted by the Goal phrase.

5.4. **Naru in Subject Honorification**

Having argued that the verb nar(-u) has two lexical entries as in (166) and (167), let's return to subject honorification. In sentential subject honorification, the verb nar(-u) marks the FP in the dative. The domain in which subject honorification occurs is within this FP. Now the question is what type of nar(-u) is involved in subject honorification.

Pragmatically, use of the verb nar(-u) in subject honorification is considered to be one instance of a "spontaneous" mode of expression. This mode of expression can be characterized as "avoid[ing] any reference to the intentionality, and therefore responsibility, of a person for his or her actions (Jacobson 1992: 127)." 39 In other words, by using the

---

38 In the previous section, I classified nar(-u) sentences involving adjectives (A) and adjectival nouns (AN) in the place of Goal phrase as Nominal-Goal nar(-u) constructions. As shown above, this classification needs to be revised since As and ANs have their argument structures. In what follows, I refer to nar(-u) constructions involving a Goal (or perhaps Result) phrase with an argument structure as the Predicative-Goal nar(-u) construction.

39 Jacobson op. cit. further suggests that the use of passive morphology in subject honorification follows from the same pragmatic principle. First of all, note that the honorific passive construction only allows subject honorification. Secondly, it is generally assumed that the passive construction in Japanese involves an embedded clause (cf. Kuno 1973 and Shibatani 1978, among others). For instance, in the sentence (i), the subject of the passive sentence is [+H].

(i)  

Yamada-sensei-ga hon-o kaka-re-ta.  
profs-nom. book-acc. write-past  
'Professor Yamada wrote a book.'
verb *nar(-u)*, the speaker can establish that the event which a [+honorific] agent carries out is not challenged by the speaker or the hearer to the effect that the agent of the event cannot be regarded as assuming the responsibility for his/her action.

I have already discussed cases where the avoidance of reference to intentionality is expressed, in the Predicative-Goal *nar(-u)* construction like (151) where the verb *nar(-u)* is used with a nominalized clausal complement. I have shown that, as compared to the corresponding transitive counterparts in (150), the sentences in (151) do not explicitly express the agency of a decision-maker whereas those in (150) do. The pragmatic effect of reference to agency is that of attributing "responsibility to a person for his or her actions in a way which could be construed as accusatory (Jacobson *ibid.*)." The sentences in (151) do not express the intentionality of anyone for a decision. Jacobson classifies the mode of expression employed in (150) as the "transitive" mode, while that of (151) is classified as the "spontaneous mode". In this sense, the verb *nar(-u)* in (151) and in subject honorification have a similar semantic or pragmatic function. Based on this similarity, I will assume that the verb *nar(-u)* occurring in subject honorification is the one in (166).

By assuming that the verb *nar(-u)* in sentential subject honorification has the lexical entry in (166), it is predicted that sentential subject honorification displays syntactic characteristics identical to the structure in (151): sentential subject honorific sentences do not allow the application of topicalization to the dative phrase, and NPI is licensed in the matrix clause as a result of "raising" of the subject of FP. These predictions are immediately borne out by the following examples. First, topicalization cannot move the dative phrase in front of the subject as in (168) (cf. (153)).

(168) a.  Fujimori-sensei-ga gengogaku-no hon-o o-KAKI-ni

         nat-ta.
         become-past

         'Professor Fujimori wrote a linguistics book.'

This sentence is considered to be derived from the following structure by the application of "raising" to the embedded subject (cf. Toribio 1990).

(ii)  [ Ø [ Yamada-sensei hon kak ] rare-ta]

Compare the honorific passive construction with cases where a potential verb occurs in subject honorification.

(iii)  Sensei-ga mie-masi-ta.
         teacher-nom. be=visible-polite-past

         'The teacher came.'

In (iii), the verb *mie-ru* 'be visible' is construed as a deferential expression, denoting coming/arriving of a person. This verb is a spontaneous predicate as opposed to an intentional predicate. Jacobson argues that the use of spontaneous predicates such as potential predicates achieve the pragmatic effect of avoidance of direct reference to the agency of a person. Viewing subject honorification from this point of view, the use of passive morphology, which causes redirecting agenthood to an adjunct, can achieve the same pragmatic effect. Thus, in the sentence in (i), the passive predicate downplays the intentionality of the subject and as a result, the sentence denotes "Professor Yamada's writing of a book happened" rather than "Professor Yamada did book-writing." For more discussion, see section 6.2. below.
b. *Gengogaku-no hon-o o-KAKI-ni Fujimori-sensei-ga
nat-ta.
became-past

Secondly, NPI is licensed in the matrix clause (cf. (140b) and (141b)).

professor-only hon.-speak-dat. become-neg.-past
'Only the professor spoke.'

-professor-only book-acc. hon.-publish-dat. become-neg.-past
'Only Professor Yamada published a book.'

Since FP cannot project a negative phrase, it is not possible to examine whether or not NPI licensing occurs within FP. As discussed above, FP is the minimal domain in which subject honorification occurs. Thus, as shown in (170), nominal subject honorification corresponding to (169) may not contain an NPI such as -sika.

(170) a. *Sensei-sika-no o-HANASI.
professor-only-gen. hon.-speak

b. *Yamada-kyoozyu-sika-no hon-no go-SYUPPAN.
-professor-only-gen. book-gen. hon.-publish

However, since NPI licensing is possible in sentential subject honorification, it is plausible to assume that the NP-sika (169) is "raised" to the matrix subject position from the embedded subject position inside FP. In this configuration, the negative element that licenses NPI is in the matrix clause, and the subject+sika must be in the matrix clause (more specifically, the Spec position of NegP) in order to satisfy the clausalmate condition. To schematically illustrate, NPI licensing proceeds as in (171).

(171) a. [ Ø [FP subject-sika ... o-RENYOO-KEI ]-ni nara-na-i ] [+H]

b. [ subject-sika ] [FP ti ... o-RENYOO-KEI ]-ni nara-na-i ] [+H]

In (171a), the condition for NPI licensing is not met since NPI sika and negative na-i do not form a clausalmate. When the embedded subject is raised to the matrix subject position as shown in (171b), the condition is satisfied.

Thus far, I have shown that the verb nar(-u) in sentential subject honorification has properties identical to (166). In addition, I have shown that in sentential subject honorification, the subject of FP which is embedded in the dative argument position of the verb nar(-u) is "raised" to the matrix subject position.

I assume that the verb nar(-u) in (166) is "light" in that its argument structure is not complete. This is in fact desirable since a subject honorification sentence does not have any inherent sense of the verb nar(-u) denoting a change of state. As I pointed out above, in subject honorification, the verb nar(-u) contributes by adding the pragmatic effect of avoiding direct reference to the agency of a person when it cooccurs with a sentential
complement in the dative argument position. To schematically illustrate syntactic derivation, subject honorification involves the process shown in (172).

(172)  a.  [ Ø [FP Subject ... o-RENYOO-KEI/go-VN]-ni nar-u ]
       [+H]
     b.  [ Subjecti [FP ti ... o-RENYOO-KEI/go-VN]-ni nar-u]
       [+H]

LF-incorporation transfers the argument structure of the embedded renyoo-kei or VN to the light verb. For instance, in LF, the light verb nar(-u) in (168a) receives the Agent and Goal-roles in the manner illustrated in (173).

(173)  a.  o-kaki (Agent, Theme)
     b.  hon (]
     c.  nar(-u) (, Goal) <dat.>
     d.  hon () + o-kaki (Theme) + nar(-u) (Agent, Goal) <dat.>

Now, let's return once again to the discussion of how FP is recategorized when it occurs as an argument of the verb nar(-u). Consider the examples in (174).

(174)  a.  Okyakusama-no syoohin-no o-TORIKAЕ-wa deki-
customer(polite)-gen. merchandise-gen. hon.-exchange-top. can=do-
kane-mas-u. not=possible-polite-pres.
'(lit.) The customer's exchange of merchandise is not possible.'
     b.  Yamada-sensei-no gengogaku-no hon-no go-SYUPPAN-o
kinen-si-ta paatti-ga okonawa-re-ta.
        commemorate-do-past party-nom. carry=out-pass.-past
'A party commemorating Professor Yamada's publication of a linguistics
book was held.'
     c.  Sutoueru-sensei-no atarasii riron-ni tui-te-no go-KOOGI-
        Stowell-professor-gen. new theory-dat. concern-TE-gen. hon-lecture-
i ma-ni at-ta.
dat. interval-dat. meet-past
'I was on time for Professor Stowell's lecture on a new theory.'

The examples in (175) are of sentential subject honorification corresponding to nominal subject honorification in (174).

(175)  a.  Okyakusama-ga syoohin-o o-TORIKAЕ-ni nat-ta.
customer(polite)-nom. merchandise-acc. hon-exchange-dat. become-past
'The customer exchanged the merchandise.'
b. Yamada-sensei-ga gengogaku-no hon-o go-SYUPPAN-ni
   nat-ta.
   become-past
   'Professor Yamada published a linguistics book.'

c. Sutouen-sensei-ga atarasii riron-ni tui-te go-KOOGI-ni
   Stowell-professor-nom. new theory-dat. concern-TE hon.-lecture-dat.
   nat-ta.
   become-past
   'Professor Stowell lectured on a new theory.'

The difference between the sentences in (174) and (175) is that the arguments of the sentences in (175) receive verbal Cases whereas those in (174) get genitive Case. Note that the FP of the examples in (174) can occur in topic position as in (174a), in direct object position as in (174b), and in a position marked in the dative by the phrasal verb ma-ni-a-u ('lit. time-to-meet-pres.', 'to be on time' as in (174c). In these cases, the FP in which subject honorification takes place behaves as an NP.

On the other hand, when FP occurs as a complement of the verb nar(-u), it functions as a VP in which the direct object of the verb is marked in the accusative as in (175a and b) and the oblique argument marked -ni tui-te 'about' is no longer marked in the genitive as in (175c). I argued that the FP embedded in the dative argument position contributes to the argument structure of the verb nar(-u). Thus, it is plausible to regard the honorific verb within FP and the verb nar(-u) as forming a complex predicate at LF when LF-incorporation occurs.

I assume that complex predicate formation as described above enables the verb nar(-u) to "govern" the embedded FP. As shown in Chapter 4, once a government relationship is established between FP and its [-N] governing head, the negative value is assigned to the unspecified feature [N] of the head of FP under government and this feature matrix percolates down to the head of FP. Consequently, the head of FP behaves as [+V, -N], triggering Verbal case marking to its argument. In addition, since the verb nar(-u) does not project its own subject, the subject position is available for the subject of FP to be raised. In this position, the subject of FP gets nominative Case. As I have argued earlier, honorific verbs, in particular the honorific prefixes o- or go-, must be licensed inside of FP under the spec-head relationship. This means that application of raising to subject is due to a purely Case-theoretic reason as opposed to the claim presented by Toribio 1990 who argues that the raising is motivated by agreement between the subject and honorific verb.

To sum up, I have shown that the verb nar(-u) involving subject honorification is "light" in that its argument structure is incomplete and the argument of FP which contains an honorific verb is transferred to form a complex predicate at LF. This analysis is consistent with other occurrences of the verb nar(-u), particularly the one in which the verb nar(-u) has only the pragmatic effect of "avoidance of reference to the agency of a person (Jacobson 1992)" observed in sentences such as those in (151). Syntactically, the verb nar(-u) is a "raising" verb which does not project its own subject. I have argued that what appears to be the subject of this verb is either the subject of an embedded clause or a small clause. Furthermore, raising of the subject of FP involved in deriving subject honorification sentences is triggered purely for a Case-theoretic reason.
6. OTHER SUBJECT HONORIFICATION CONSTRUCTIONS

In this section, I will show that other subject honorification constructions have similar properties as the one involving the verb nar(-u). Such constructions are the copulative subject honorification and honorific passive constructions. I will argue that the copulative subject honorification construction involves recategorization of FP. In addition, since the copula is also a raising verb, the subject of FP is raised to the subject position of the copula. In the honorific passive construction, on the other hand, no honorific verb is involved. I will argue that this is due to the fact that in this construction, subject honorification is possible only when the embedded subject is "raised" to the matrix subject position. In any event, subject honorification of this type also involves a raising operation providing support for the relationship between this syntactic operation and its pragmatic effect.

6.1. THE COPULATIVE SUBJECT HONORIFICATION CONSTRUCTION

In section 1.2, I have pointed out that sentential subject honorification can be formed with the copula in place of the verb nar(-u) as shown in (19). This construction differs from cases with the verb nar(-u) in that it only expresses the progressive aspect. For example, the following sentences are construed as describing an on-going event performed by the subject.

(176) a. Fujimori-sensei-ga sono ziken-ni tui-te
   -professor-nom. that incident-dat. concern-TE
   o-HANASI-da.
   hon-speak-coupla=pres.
   'Professor Fujimori is speaking.'

b. Yamada-kyoozyu-ga gokai-no kanzya-o
   -professor-nom. fifth=floor-gen. patient-acc.
   go-KAISIN-dat-ta.40
   hon.-doctor's=visit=to=his=patient-coupla=past
   'Professor Yamada was visiting his/her patients on the fifth floor.'

As in the case of subject honorification involving the verb nar(-u), verbal Case marking in the copulative subject honorification construction is associated with the

40 When a Sino-Japanese VN occurs in this construction, it may be subject to a certain aspectual constraint. For instance, the Sino-Japanese VN benkyoo 'study' may not be allowed to occur in this context unless it is suffixed with an aspectual suffix such as -tyuu 'while'.

(i) *Hasegawa-kyoozyu-wa o-BENKYOO-da.
   -professor-top. hon-study-coupla=pres.

(ii) Hasegawa-kyoozyu-wa o-BENKYOO-tyuu-da.
    -professor-top. hon-study-while-coupla=pres.
    'Professor Hasegawa is studying.'

This constraint appears to apply according to the degree of eventfulness of the Sino-Japanese VN. However, I will leave this matter open. Note that this constraint applies neither to Native-Japanese VNs nor to renyoo-kei verbs.
existence of the copula. Thus, the sentences in (176) become ungrammatical if no copula follows the honorific verbs.

(177) a. *Fujimori-sensei-ga sono ziken-ni tui-te o-HANASI
       -professor-nom. that incident-dat. concern-TE hon-speak

       '(intended) Professor Fujimori's speech on the incident'

   b. *Yamada-kyoozyu-ga gokai-no kanzya-o go-
       -professor-nom. fifth=floor-gen. patient-acc. hon.-

       KAI SIN
doctor's=visit=to=his=patient

       '(intended) Professor Yamada's visit to his/her patients on the fifth floor.'

The arguments of the honorific verbs in (177) must be marked in the genitive instead.

(178) a. Fujimori-sensei-no sono ziken-ni tui-te-no o-HANASI
       -professor-gen. that incident-dat. concern-TE-gen. hon-speak

       'Professor Fujimori's speech on the incident'

   b. Yamada-kyoozyu-no gokai-no kanzya-no go-
       -professor-gen. fifth=floor-gen. patient-gen. hon.-

       KAI SIN
doctor's=visit=to=his=patient

       'Professor Yamada's visit to his/her patients on the fifth floor.'

These facts show that the copulative subject honorification construction involves FP just as in the case of sentential subject honorification with the verb nar(-u). As shown in (178), subject honorification is possible without the copula, indicating once again that the minimal domain where subject honorification is triggered is FP.

I assume that cases where the arguments of the honorific verb receive verbal Case marking as in (176) are other instances where recategorization of FP takes place. In this case, recategorization is triggered by the copula, which has the feature matrix [-N]. Assuming that the copula is a "raising" verb (cf. Stowell 1978, Heggie 1988, and Terada 1994), copulative subject honorification sentences are derived from the structure in (179) where FP occurs as a complement of the copula.

(179)  [ Ø [FP subject ... o-RENYOO-KEI/go/o-VN] da ]
       [+H]

Under the government relationship between the copula and FP, the embedded FP gets the feature matrix of the copula, with this feature matrix percolating down to the head of FP, triggering verbal Case marking to the arguments of honorific verb. Meanwhile, the subject is raised to the matrix subject position where nominative Case is assigned. This analysis predicts that the NPI in the subject position is licensed by the copula. This prediction is borne out by the examples in (180).

(180) a. Yamada-sensei-sika hon-o o-YOMI-zya-na-i.

       'Only Professor Yamada is reading a book.'
b. Donatasama-mo sono ziken-ni tui-te nani-mo o-KIKI-
no=one(polite)-even that incident-dat. concern-TE nothing-even hon-hear-
yza-na-i rasi-i.
copula-negative-pres. appearance-pres.
'It appears that nobody has heard anything about that incident.'

In the examples in (180), NPIs in the subject position are licensed by the matrix negative predicate. This clearly shows that the subject in sentential copulative subject honorification sentences occupies the subject position of the copula.

In this section, I have shown that the copulative subject honorification construction has the same internal structure as subject honorification sentences where the verb nar(-u) is used as a predicate. In addition, this construction involves recategorization of FP which defines the minimal domain in which subject honorification is triggered and the subject of this construction is 'raised' to the subject position of copula. Finally, I would like to point out once again that raising of the subject of FP in the formation of subject honorification has a pragmatic effect of "avoidance of reference to the agency of a person". Thus, as in the cases with the verb nar(-u), copulative subject honorification involves the identical process, turning the sentence structure expressing "an event of Y by X happens/happened" from the structure in which "X does/did the event of Y" (cf. Jacobson 1992).

6. 2. THE HONORIFIC PASSIVE CONSTRUCTION

In this section, I will discuss the honorific passive construction where the passive morpheme -rare is used to mark deference to the subject of the sentence. For instance, consider the examples in (181).

(181) a. Yamada-sensei-ga hon-o yoma-re-ta.
profit-nom. book-acc. read-pass.-past
'Professor Yamada read the book.'

b. Syatyoo-ga nihon-ni ika-re-ta.
company-pres-nom. Japan-to go-pass.-past
'The president went to Japan.'

These passive sentences are interpreted as expressing deference to the subject of the sentence in the unmarked interpretation. This construction does not carry any "passive" meaning even though the predicate of this construction contains the passive morpheme.

Compare these sentences with the direct passive sentences in (182) and the indirect passive sentences in (183), which are interpreted as denoting "passive" senses. (Cf. Kuno 1973, Inoue 1976, and Shibatan 1978, among others.)

(182) a. Taroo-ga dareka-ni korosa-re-ta.
-nom. someone-dat. kill-pass.-past
'Taro was killed by someone.'

b. Hon-ga sensei-ni-yotte watasa-re-ta.
book-nom. teacher-dat.-by hand=put-pass.-past
'Books were distributed by the teacher.'
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(183) a. Yamada-wa ame-ni hura-re-ta.
   -top. rain-by fall-pass.-past
   'Yamada was inconvenienced by raining.'

b. Hanako-wa tomodati-ni kat-te oi-ta wain-o noma-re-ta.
   -top. friend-by buy-TE put-past wine-acc. drink-pass.-past
   'Hanako was inconvenienced by her friend's drinking wine that she had
   bought.'

Semantically, the indirect passive construction denotes the subject's adverse
reaction to the event denoted by the verb. Thus, the subject in the sentences in (183) are
understood as adversely affected by the event. In contrast, this adversative interpretation is
not inherent in the direct passive construction. Availability of such an interpretation fully
depends on the choice of the verb. Hence, in (182a), adversative involvement is expressed
due to the verb koros- 'to kill' whereas such an interpretation is not necessarily conveyed in
(182b) with the verb watas- 'to hand out'.

Syntactic differences between these two construction are i) the indirect passive can
be formed with intransitive verbs such as those in (183a) and ii) no Case-absorption takes
place in the indirect passive as evidence by the fact that the direct object may occur in
indirect passive constructions like those in (183b).

As mentioned above, the passive morpheme in the honorific passive construction
does not have the properties of "regular" (or "direct") passivization. For example, the
honorific passive construction does not have the property of Case-absorption which
motivates raising of the embedded subject.

This property of the passive morpheme, on the other hand, is identical to that of
"indirect" (or "adversity") passive with one notable difference. While the subject of the
indirect passive construction receives a θ-role, the subject position of the honorific passive
does not receive any θ-role, just as in direct passivization. I will argue that the passive
morpheme in the honorific passive construction has properties found in both direct and
indirect passivization. These properties of honorific passivization enable raising of the
embedded subject. As I have argued earlier, sentential honorification must involve raising
of the embedded subject in order to satisfy the pragmatic requirements of subject
honorification.

In section 6.2.1, I will discuss properties of the passive morpheme involved in the
honorific passive construction by comparing them with the properties of the passive
morpheme in direct and indirect passivization. In section 6.2.2, I will show how raising
of the embedded subject occurs in the honorific passive construction.

6.2.1. Passive Morphology in the Honorific Passive Construction

The Japanese passive construction has been analyzed as a process of complex
predicate formation. In simple terms, both direct and indirect passives are derived via
Verb-Raising (cf. Hasegawa 1988 and Terada 1990). It has been proposed that while
Verb-Raising occurs in syntax in the derivation of the direct passive, the indirect passive is
derived via PF Verb Raising. Schematically, the derivation of direct and indirect passives
can be illustrated as in (184)-(185).41

(184) **DIRECT PASSIVIZATION:**

a. D-structure: \[ \emptyset [ \ NP_1 \ NP_2 \ V ] \text{ rare } \]

b. S-structure: \[ NP_{2i}\text{-nom.} [ NP_1\text{-dat.} \ t_i \ t_j ] \ V_j\text{-rare} \]

(185) **INDIRECT PASSIVIZATION:**

a. D-structure: \[ NP_1 [ NP_2 (NP_3) \ V ] \text{ rare } \]

b. S-structure: \[ NP_1 [ NP_2 (NP_3) \ V ] \text{ rare } \]

c. PF: \[ NP_1 [ NP_2 (NP_3) \ t_i ] \ V_i\text{-rare} \]

This difference directly follows from the fact that the lexical entry of the direct passive morpheme is distinct from that of the indirect passive morpheme. These lexical entries are shown in (186).\(^{42}\)

(186) a. direct passive morpheme: (Theme)

b. indirect passive morpheme: (Experiencer, Source, (Theme))

In other words, the passive morphology involved in the indirect passive has the ability to assign a \(\theta\)-role to its subject position whereas the direct passive morpheme is more or less unaccusative in that no \(\theta\)-role is assigned to the subject position.

Returning to the honorific passive construction, semantically, no adversative involvement of the subject is expressed. In (181a), for instance, the subject, *Yamada-sei* 'Professor Yamada' is not adversely affected by (someone's) reading the book.\(^{43}\) The sentence in (181a) is identical in its truth-value to the sentence in (187) except that deference to the subject is expressed in (181a).

(187) *Yamada-sei-ga hon-o yon-da.*

-professor-nom. book-acc. read-past

'Professor Yamada read the book.'

Hence, it is plausible to assume that the passive morpheme involved in honorific passivization does not assign a \(\theta\)-role to the subject of the passive verb. In this respect, the honorific passive morpheme appears to be identical to the direct passive morpheme.

Syntactically, on the other hand, the passive morpheme in the honorific passive behaves in the same manner as the indirect passive morpheme. As is clear from the sentences in (181), the direct object of the embedded verb is accusatively marked. Comparing this with direct passive cases, it is clear that no Case-absorption is triggered in either indirect or honorific passive constructions.

Hence, the syntactic and semantic properties of the honorific passive morpheme imply that the honorific passive construction involves a passive morpheme which does not assign a subject \(\theta\)-role and does not trigger Case-absorption.


\(^{43}\) With the appropriate context, this interpretation is possible.
6. 2. 2. THE RAISING ANALYSIS OF THE HONORIFIC PASSIVE CONSTRUCTION

In the preceding section, I have shown that the passive morpheme in the honorific passive construction has some properties of the direct passive morpheme and some properties of the indirect passive morpheme. In this section, I will argue for a raising analysis of the honorific passive construction.\(^{44}\)

First, recall that the Japanese passive construction is derived through the process of complex predicate formation. This means that both indirect and direct passives underlyingly have a biclausal structure. In direct passives, the surface subject originates as an internal argument of the verb, and is raised for Case-theoretic reasons.\(^{45}\) In this respect, let's consider the subject of honorific passive sentences.

(188) a. Yamada-sensei-ga hahaoya-ni awa-re-ta.
    professor-nom. mother-dat. meet-pass.-past
    'Professor Yamada met my mother.'

    -nom. -Prof.-dat. book-acc. give-pass.-past
    'Taro gave a book to Prof. Yamada.'

    mother-nom. -Prof.-dat. meet-pass.-past
    'Mother met Prof. Yamada.'

The examples in (188) show that in order to interpret these sentences as subject honorification, the subject of the verb must be [+H]. As the ungrammaticality of the examples in (188b) and (188c) indicates, a [-H] subject is not permitted in honorific passive sentences.

Semantically, the [+H] subject in (188a) is the agent of the event denoted by the verb to which the passive morpheme is attached. This subject is not the internal argument of the verb as in the direct passive, nor is it the subject of the indirect passive morpheme as no adversative meaning is expressed. Assuming that the Japanese passive construction has a biclausal structure, it is plausible to regard the subject of the honorific passive as an embedded subject. Thus, the sentence in (188a) is derived from the underlying structure in (189).

(189) \[ \left[ \emptyset [Yamada-sensei \quad hahaoya \quad aw] \right] \cdot rares] -ta\]
    -professor mother meet pass. past

However, there is evidence showing that the surface subject of this construction is in the subject position of the matrix clause. Consider the sentences in (190).

---

\(^{44}\) Toribio 1990 tacitly assumes that the honorific passive morpheme triggers raising.

\(^{45}\) Hasegawa 1988 does not specifically attribute NP-movement in passive sentences to Case-absorption by the passive morpheme (cf. Jeaggl 1986 and Baker, Johnson, and Roberts 1989). She argues that NP-movement of the object is needed due to Verb Raising since the raised embedded verb cannot Case-mark its object. On the other hand, Terada 1990 proposes that the passive morpheme is an unaccusative. I will not go into the details of this issue.
(190) Yamada-sensei-sika soko-ni ko-rare-nakat-ta.
     -professor-only there-to come-pass.-neg.-past

'Only Prof. Yamada came there.'

In (190), NPI -sika 'only' is licensed by the negative -nakat- which follows the passive morpheme -rare. Assuming a biclausal D-structure for the Japanese passive construction, this fact shows that the subject with -sika must be in the matrix clause in order to have a structure in which NPI and the negative element are clausemates.

Hence, the subject of an honorific passive sentence must be in the matrix subject position in S-structure. I assume that the embedded subject undergoes raising to the matrix subject position. Derivation of the honorific passive construction is schematically illustrated in (191).

(191) D-structure: [ Ø [ NP (NP) V ] -rare ]
     S-structure: [ NP₁ [ t₁ (NP) t₂ ] V₂-rare ]

NP-movement in (191) is possible because the passive morpheme involved in the honorific passive construction has properties of both the indirect passive and the direct passive. First, either the honorific passive morpheme nor the indirect passive morpheme absorb internal Case. As a result, the internal argument is not forced to move to the matrix subject position to receive Case. Secondly, the honorific passive morpheme does not assign a θ-role to the subject position, as the direct passive does, allowing movement of an NP with a θ-role to this position.

In the honorific passive construction, these two properties of passive morphemes permit the embedded subject to the matrix subject position. Thus, since the passive morpheme -rare in this construction does not assign a θ-role to its subject, the moved embedded subject NP will not receive two θ-roles. In addition, the internal argument of the verb, if any, is assigned Case by the embedded verb since no Case-absorption occurs. Furthermore, the A-chain created by NP-movement does not violate binding condition (A) or the constraint on A-chain formation. Since the governing category for the nominative anaphor (t₁ in (191)) is the matrix clause, it is bound in its governing category. The A-chain formed by the movement does not violate the constraint on A-chain formation since no intervening binder exists between the matrix subject position and the embedded subject position.

7. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I have examined subject honorification in light of the FP analysis of the renyou-kei form. First, I examined the internal structure of periphrastic subject honorific forms, showing that honorific verbs consist of the honorific prefix ₀- and the renyou-kei form. Secondly, nominal and verbal properties of honorific verbs were discussed. I argued that the nominal properties of honorific verbs are parallel with VNs with honorific verbs having the same internal structure as VNs. This means that honorific verbs are comprised of the honorific prefix ₀- and the verb root and that this complex constitutes a complement of the functional head -i (or -Ø). More specifically, the maximal projection of an honorific verb is FP as in the case of the renyou-kei form of verb and VNs. Thirdly, I have argued that subject honorification is licensed within FP and that the licensing of subject honorification is a form of spec-head agreement. This analysis has two consequences: i) the honorific prefix ₀- or go- is regarded as an agreement marker and ii)
the verb *nar(-u)* 'to become' involved in sentential subject honorific sentences is treated as a "light" verb.

My analysis of honorific prefixes is descriptively desirable because it makes possible an account of subject honorification in nominals. Furthermore, this analysis has theoretical significance in that Japanese displays agreement phenomena in a manner slightly different from the "forced agreement" languages such as English and French (cf. Kuroda 1989). In particular, subject honorification does not involve notions such as person, gender, and number, which are commonly regarded as elements of agreement.

The "light" verb analysis of the verb *nar(-u)* is directly associated with the assumption that verbal behaviors of the honorific verb are always contingent on the occurrence of the verb *nar(-u)*. Without the verb *nar(-u)*, the FP consisting of the honorific verb behaves as a nominal. When this FP is governed by the verb *nar(-u)*, the verbal properties of honorific verbs are observed. This means that the verb *nar(-u)* involved in subject honorification functions as a governing head which triggers recategorization of FP. In section 5.3., I discussed the properties of "light" verbs and argued that the syntactic and semantic properties of the verb *nar(-u)* can be accounted for under the assumption that this verb is a "light" verb. Furthermore, this analysis is consistent with the analysis of the renyou-kei presented in the previous chapter. The periphrastic honorific verb contain the renyou-kei of the Sino-Japanese VN, which I analyzed as involving the functional projection FP. By assuming underspecification of the lexical feature [N] for the head of F, I provide a principled account for the nominal and verbal properties of honorific verbs.

The "light" verb analysis of the verb *nar(-u)* has another consequence. Since this verb does not project its own subject position, it must trigger raising of the embedded subject to fill the subject position. I argued that the raising involved in the derivation of subject honorification is both syntactically and pragmatically motivated. As Jacobson 1992 argues, the process of "intransitivizing" has the pragmatic effect of avoiding reference to the agency of the person. This intransitivization is carried out by the process of externalization of an internal argument as in unaccusative structures. In the case of the verb *nar(-u)*, the process of intransitivization is accomplished by raising the embedded subject to the matrix subject position. This can be observed in a comparison of the verb *nar(-u)* 'to become' with *suru* 'to do'. Thus, application of raising has the pragmatic consequence of avoiding direct reference to the agent.

Finally, I examined other types of subject honorification: copulative honorification and the honorific passive construction. In both cases, raising is applied to the embedded subject, satisfying the pragmatic requirement of subject honorification.
APPENDIX: OBJECT HONORIFICATION

Object honorification is an humbling expression in which the subject of the sentence is described as socially inferior to the person occurring in non-subject positions in view of the speaker of the sentence. The effect of object honorification is to humble the subject and consequently, the non-subject is exalted. As observed in Chapter 5, there are suppletive object honorific forms and periphrastic object honorific forms of the verb, depending on the lexical item.¹

(1) SUPPLETIVE FORMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAIN FORM</th>
<th>OBJECT HONORIFIC</th>
<th>ENGLISH GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mi-ru</td>
<td>haiken-su-ru</td>
<td>to see, watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kik-u</td>
<td>haityoo-su-ru</td>
<td>to hear, listen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>su-ru</td>
<td>ukaga-u</td>
<td>to ask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-ru</td>
<td>itadak-u</td>
<td>to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ik-u</td>
<td>or-u</td>
<td>to exist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) PERIPHRACTIC FORMS: O+RENYOO-KEI+SU-RU²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAIN FORM</th>
<th>OBJECT HONORIFIC</th>
<th>ENGLISH GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tanom-u</td>
<td>o-TANOMI-su-ru</td>
<td>to request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-u</td>
<td>o-AI-su-ru</td>
<td>to meet, see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hanas-u</td>
<td>o-HANASI-su-ru</td>
<td>to speak, talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okur-u</td>
<td>o-OKURI-su-ru</td>
<td>to send</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The object honorific form of a periphrastic verb involving a (Sino-Japanese) VN consists of the honorific prefix o- or go- and a VN which is followed by the verb su-ru 'to do'.³

¹ Harada 1976 distinguishes what have traditionally been classified as kenzyoogo (humble words) into two types: object honorifics and performative honorifics. Performative honorifics are what have traditionally been classified as teeneego (polite words) which do not either exalt or humble the subject. He refers to only verbs accompanying a [+human] (direct or indirect) object as object honorifics, and those not accompanying such an object as performative honorifics. This classification, however, poses a problem since obviously even a verb which does not accompany an object has the effect of humbling the subject when occurring as kenzyoogo. For this reason, I will not make any distinction among kenzyoogo and will refer the kenzyoogo form as the object honorific form.

² The form itas-u 'to do', a suppletive object honorific form of su-ru 'to do', can occur in the place of su-ru. The resulting form o+reneyoo-kei+itas-u is preferred in a more formal and careful speech style.

³ Object honorific forms of this type may allow the accusative marker to be attached to the VN. This option is available since Sino-Japanese VNs and the majority of morphologically complex renyoo-kei VNs allow nominal use as discussed in Chapter 2. When a morphologically complex renyoo-kei does not function as a nominal, this option is not available as shown in (i).
(3) **PLAIN** | **OBJECT HONORIFICS** | **ENGLISH GLOSS**
---|---|---
RENRAKU(-o) su-ru & go-RENRAKU(-o)-su-ru & to inform
HOOKOKU(-o) su-ru & go-HOOKOKU(-o) su-ru & to report
YAKUSOKU(-o) su-ru & o-YAKUSOKU(-o) su-ru & to promise
SITAKU(-o) su-ru & o-SITAKU(-o)-su-ru & to prepare
YOBIDASI-o su-ru & o-YOBIDASI(-o)-su-ru & to page
MIOKURI-o su-ru & o-MIOKURI(-o)-su-ru & to see off

The subject of an object honorific sentence is [-honorific] in relation to the "recipient of the event" denoted by the verb. For example, consider the following examples.

(4) a. Titi-ga sensei-o o-TASUKE-si-ta.
my=father-nom. teacher-acc. hon.-help-do-past
'My father helped the professor.'
my=mother-nom. teacher-to letter-acc. hon.-hand-do-past
'My mother handed a letter to the professor.'
c. Ani-ga syatyoo-ni o-Al-si-ta.
my=older=brother-nom. president-to hon.-meet-do-past
'My older brother met the president (of the company).'
d. Watasi-ga (sensei-no kawari-ni) sono sasoi-o o-KOTOWARI-si-ta.
teacher-gen. substitute-for that invitation-acc. hon.-decline-
do-past
'I turned down the invitation for the professor.'

As shown in the examples in (4), the recipient of the event can be the direct object, indirect object, Goal-phrase, benefactive, or implicit benefactive NP. But, if there is no "beneficiary" interpretation available, the sentence becomes ungrammatical. The following examples are cited from Harada 1976.

professor-gen. nephew-dat. hon.-be=equivalent-
do-polite-pres.
'I happen to be a nephew of Professor Yamada.'
   'I believe in God.'

The contrast between (4) and (5) suggests that object honorific sentences are constrained by a semantic (or pragmatic) restriction which requires that there be an argument, overt or covert, which is interpreted as a [+honorific] "beneficiary" of the event denoted by the predicate.

It is possible that an inherently [+honorific] subject may occur in an object honorific sentence as in (6).

(6) a. Butyoo-wa syatyoo-o o-MIOKURI-si-ta.
   section-chief-top. president-acc. hon.-see=off-do-past
   'The section chief saw the president off.'

b. Syatyoo-ga o-AI-si-mas-u.
   president-nom. hon.-meet-do-polite-pres.
   'Our president will see you.'

In order for object honorification to be licensed, cases such as those in (6) must contain an extra [+honorific] argument, overtly or covertly, in non-subject position. Such an argument is understood as "socially superior to the subject" in the view of the speaker of the sentence. As a result, the subject of such sentences is reanalyzed as [–honorific]. For instance, in (6a), the speaker identifies the president of the company as "socially superior" to the section chief. By the same token, the speaker of the sentence in (6b) recognizes the addressee as "socially superior" to his/her own company's president.

As the following example shows, when such a reanalysis is not allowed, the sentence becomes unacceptable.

(7) *Ane-wa ani-o o-TASUKE-si-ta.
    my=older=sister-top. my=older=brother-acc. hon.-help-do-past
    'My older sister helped my older brother.'

Sentences such as those in (7) contain a subject and a non-subject which are "socially superior" to the speaker. However, since referents of these NPs, in this case the immediate senior family members, are not interpreted as [+honorific] in present day Japanese, object honorification is not licensed.

Note also that there is no case in which both the subject and recipient of the event are exalted or humbled. As the examples in (8) show, only the subject is exalted by subject honorification and only the subject is humbled by object honorification.

(8) a. Yamada-syatyoo-ga Geitu-syatyoo-o kuukoo-de o-MIOKURI-ni
   president-nom. Gates-president-acc. airport-at hon.-see=off-dat.
   nai-ta.
   become-past
   'President Yamada saw President Gates off at the airport.'
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b. Yamada-syatoo-ga Geitu-syatyo-o kuukoo-de o-MIOKURI
   president-nom. Gates-president-acc. airport-at hon.-see=off
   si-ta.
do-past
'Present Yamada saw President Gates off at the airport.'

The difference between the sentences in (8a) and (8b) is observed in how the speaker shows deference to the subject. In (8a), the speaker exalts the subject as socially superior to him/her by the use of subject honorification. The effect of subject honorification is that the speaker treats the subject as belonging to a social group that s/he does not belong to.

In contrast, in (8b), using object honorification, the speaker describes the subject as socially inferior to the object of the sentence. In this case, the speaker treats the subject as belonging to his or her own group, and the object as belonging to a different group.

The above discussion shows that the feature [+honorific] on the subject NP is relevant to honorification. When the subject is [+honorific], subject honorification is licensed, and when it is [-honorific], object honorification is permitted.

Let's suppose that object honorification is also licensed within the FP just as subject honorification is. Then, it is predicted that there are cases in which object honorification is licensed inside FP without the verb su-ru 'to do'. This prediction is borne out by the examples in (9).

(9) a. Okyakusama-e-no sinamono-no o-HIKIWATASI-wa, customer(polite)-to-gen. merchandise-gen. hon.-handing=over-top.
   go-kai-de okonat-te i-ru.
five-floor-on be=carried=out-TE exist-pres.

'Handing over the merchandise to customers is being carried out on the fifth floor.'

b. Sensei-to-no o-HANASI-de, humeina ten-ga hakkiri si-ta.
teacher-with-gen. hon.-speak-by uncertain point-nom. clearly do-past

'After talking with the teacher, unclear points became clear.'

c. Okyakusama-no o-YOBIDASI-o moosage-mas-u.
customer(polite)-gen. hon.-page-acc. announce(humble)-polite-pres.

'I am announcing the paging of a customer.'

---

4 There seems to be some restriction on the thematic type of non-subjects. As evidenced by the examples in (9), the target of object honorification is likely to be a benefactor of the event denoted by the predicate. If there is no such interpretation, object honorification may not be allowed even when a non-subject is marked with postpositions such as -e 'to' and -to 'with'.

(i) ?*Kurinton-daiooroo-e-no go-KAIKEN-ga yurus-are-ta.
   Clinton-president-to-gen. hon.-meeting-nom. permit-pass.-past
   'Meeting President Clinton was permitted.'

(ii) ?*Murayama-syusyoo-to-no go-KAIAN-ga ituka okonawa-re-qt.
   prime-minister-with-gen. hon.-interview-nom. fifth carry=out-pass.-past
   'An interview with Prime Minister Murayama was carried out on the 5th.'
d. Kinoo sensei-no o-MIOKURI-ni kuukoo-e dekake-ta.
yesterday teacher-gen. hon.-see=off for airport-to go=out-past
'Yesterday, I went to the airport for the purpose of seeing off the professor.'

(10) a. Syatyoo-e-no go-RENAKU-ga taihen okure-te
president-to-gen. hon.-notification-nom. extremely be=delayed-TE
simat-ta.
end=up-past
'Notifying to the president has ended up being extremely delayed.'

b. Sensei-e-no go-HOOKOKU-o wasure-ta.
teacher-to-gen. hon.-report-acc. forget-past
'I forgot to report to the professor.'

c. Okyakusama-e-no go-SYOOKAI-o musuko-ni
customer(polite)-to-gen. hon.-introduction-acc. my=son-dat.
sase-ta.
do=Caus.-past
'I had my son introduce the guests.'

Let's also assume that the licensing condition of object honorification is spec-head agreement. Previous analyses of object honorification assume that the agreement licensing object honorification is held between the object and the honorific verb. For instance, Toribio 1990 assumes the structure in (12) for the sentence in (11).^5

(11) Ootoo-ga sensei-o o-TASUKE-si-ta.
my=younger=brother-nom. teacher-acc. hon.-help-do-past
'My younger brother helped his teacher.'

---

^5 In Toribio's analysis, the renyoo-kei suffix constitutes the head of DP based on the observation that the renyoo-kei form can behave as a noun.
First of all, in her analysis, the renyoo-kei suffix is assumed to constitute a head of DP. Secondly, she assumes that the object undergoes the head-to-head movement to the Spec D where it licenses the honorific verb under a spec-head relation. She claims that the raising of the object over the PRO subject does not violate the Specified Subject Condition because the Spec D is an $\check{A}$-position. Furthermore, she claims that movement of the object across the PrP boundary is possible because Japanese PrP (equivalent of IP) is defective.

In the structure in (12), Toribio assumes tacitly that the verb su-ru 'to do' in object honorific is not a raising verb. This in turn means that the subject of the object honorific sentence is a $\theta$-argument. Her analysis is supported by the following NPI test.6

    only Japan-to go-pres. fact-dat. do-neg.-past
    'Only Taro decided to go to Japan.'

    b.  [Taroo-sika nihon-e ika-na-i koto]-ni si-ta.
        only Japan-to go-neg.-pres. fact-dat. do-past
        'We decided that only Taro will go to Japan.'

---

6 Recall that the verb su-ru in the construction in (13) allows occurrences of two distinct subjects in both the matrix and the embedded clause. Cf. Chapter 5.
In the examples in (13), the subject with sika 'only' yields a different interpretation, depending on whether the negative element occurs in the embedded or matrix clause. When the negative occurs as a part of the matrix verb, the NP-sika allows a wide scope reading in which the subject is understood as the matrix subject as in (13a). This is due to the "clausemate" condition which Japanese NPI must obey.

On the other hand, when the negative occurs in the embedded clause, the NP-sika has a narrow scope interpretation as in (13b). This shows that the "light" verb su-ru 'to do' does not allow the raising of the embedded subject unlike the "light" verb na-ru 'to become' involved in subject honorification (cf. Chapter 5).

Consider the following object honorification sentence.

    I-only teacher-acc. hon.-help do-neg.-past

    'Only I helped the professor.'

The NPI test shows that the NP-sika in the subject position of an object honorific sentence allows a wide scope reading. Since the subject NP must satisfy the clausemate condition in order to receive this interpretation, it is plausible to assume that the subject in an object honorific sentence is in the matrix subject position.

However, Toribio's raising analysis of object honorification in which the object raises to the spec position to license spec-head agreement is not tenable. First of all, the spec position of the renyou-kei suffix (Toribio's spec of DP position, and my spec of FP position) is assumed to be occupied by the subject of the embedded clause. Therefore, this position is not available for the raised object.7

Secondly, by allowing raising of [+honorific] elements, the raising analysis must allow the raising of a non-object for the cases where the non-object (such as a Goal phrase) licenses object honorification as the examples in (4) show. In addition, there is a case in which the [+honorific] element occurs as the possessor of an NP as in (15).

(15) Titi-wa Yamada-sensei-no koe-o KIKI-si-ta.
    my=father-top. -professor-gen. voice-acc. hon.-hear-do-past

    'My father heard Prof. Yamada's voice.'

In the sentence (15), the [+honorific] element is the possessor of the NP koe 'voice' which licenses object honorification. In order for the object to license object honorific verb under Toribio's system, the entire NP Yamada-sensei-no koe 'Prof. Yamada's voice' is expected to have the [+honorific] feature. However, as pointed out above, only [+human] NPs can license honorification. Hence, her system is required to have a convention by which a [+honorific] NP in the spec position of NP can trigger spec-head agreement.

Thirdly, there are a limited number of cases in which the subject of the sentence licenses both subject and object honorification. For instance, consider the following examples.

---

7 She argues that the subject position is the spec of PrP and the spec of DP is still available for the raising of the object. As the discussion in Chapters 4 and 5 reveals, however, there is strong evidence against analyzing the renyou-kei suffix as functioning only as a nominalizer.

211
(16)  a. Yamada-butoo-ga Tanaka-syatoo-ni sono hon-o
division=chief-nom. president-to that book-acc.
sasiage-rare-ta.
give(humble)-Pass.-past
'Mr. Yamada, a division chief, gave the book to Mr. Tanaka, the president
of the company.'

b. Yamada-huzin-ga Tennoheika-ni o-me-ni kakar-are-ta.
madam-nom. Emperor-dat. hon.-eye-dat. hung-Pass.-past
'Madam Yamada met the Emperor.'

The sentences in (16) involves a suppletive form of the humble form (i.e. object honorific verb) followed by the passive morpheme. As observed in Chapter 5, the passive morpheme can be used for subject honorification. In these sentences, the passive morpheme functions in subject honorification because it is not licensed as a subject honorification marker if the subject of the sentence in [–honorific]. Compare the sentences in (16b) and (17).

(17)  *Watasi-ga Tennoheika-ni o-me-ni kakar-are-ta.
      I-nom. Emperor-dat. hon.-eye-dat. hung-Pass.-past
'I met the Emperor.'

The sentence such as in (16) is possible when both the subject and non-subject are inherently [+honorific].

Let's assume that the passive morpheme in subject honorification triggers raising of the subject as discussed in Chapter 5. Then, the subject of the sentence is raised to the spec of IP (or TP) and the object honorific verb is raised to the head position of I (or T). Assuming that the licensing of honorification takes place at LF, the licensing of object honorific verbs cannot be carried out by an non-subject because the non-subject in these sentences cannot move to a spec position of I, which is already occupied by the subject.

This problem is resolved if the licensing of object honorification is carried out by a requirement stating that the subject of object honorification must have the feature [–honorific]. If it is possible that a noun can be both [+honorific] and [–honorific] in relation to other noun, the honorification patterns in sentences such as in (16) can be accounted for straightforwardly. First, through this requirement, the subject of the sentence is assigned the feature [–honorific]. The subject position is occupied by an inherently [±honorific] noun, in relation to the other [+honorific] nouns in the same sentence. Secondly, the object honorification is licensed by the subject which is assigned the feature [–honorific]. The subject is in the spec of TP and the object honorific verb is in the head position of T. Under the spec-head relationship, the object honorific verb is licensed. Lastly, the passive morpheme is licensed as a subject honorific marker by the [+honorific] feature of the subject under the spec-head relation.

Since it is necessary to assume that the feature [–honorific] plays a role in licensing object honorification in order to account for sentences such as those in (16), it seems plausible to assume that object honorification is licensed by a [–honorific] subject, rather than a [+honorific] non-subject. In addition, it is necessary to assume a convention by which the feature [–honorific] is assigned to the subject or the non-subject when there are more than one [+honorific] NPs.

Returning to the sentences in (9)-(10), repeated here as (18)-(19), the licensing of the object honorific verb is carried out by the PRO subject of FP since the verb su-ru 'to do' does not allow raising of the embedded subject.
a. Okyakusama-e-no sinamono-no o-HIKIWATASI-wa, customer(polite)-to-gen. merchandise-gen. hon.-handing=over-top. go-kai-de okonat-te i-ru. five-floor-on be=carried=out-TE exist-pres.

'Handing over the merchandise to customers is being carried out on the fifth floor.'

b. Sensei-to-no o-HANASI-de, humeina ten-ga hakkiri si-ta. teacher-with-gen. hon.-speak-by uncertain point-nom. clearly do-past

'After talking with the teacher, unclear points became clear.'

c. Okyakusama-no o-YOBIDASI-o moosiage-mas-u. customer(polite)-gen. hon.-page-acc. announce(humble)-polite-pres.

'I am announcing a paging of a customer.'

d. Kinoo sensei-no o-MIOKURI-ni kuukoo-e dekake-ta. yesterday teacher-gen. hon.-see=off-for airport-to go=out-past

'Yesterday, I went to the airport for the purpose of seeing off the professor.'

a. Syatyoo-e-no go-RENRAKU-ga taihen okure-te president-to-gen. hon.-notification-nom. extremely be=delayed-TE simat-ta. end=up-past

'Notifying the president has ended up being extremely delayed.'

b. Sensei-e-no go-HOOKOKU-o wasure-ta. teacher-to-gen. hon.-report-acc. forget-past

'I forgot to report to the professor.'

c. Okyakusama-e-no go-SYOOKAI-o musuko-ni customer(polite)-to-gen. hon.-introduction-acc. my=son-dat. sase-ta. do=Caus.-past

'I had my son introduce guests.'

All the sentences in (18)-(19) implicitly refer to the speaker of the sentence, which is [-honorific] as compared to the non-subject of these sentences. Under this interpretation, an object honorific verb is licensed in these cases.

Finally, Toribio notes that the approach in which the object raises to the spec position can provide a simple account for the cases such as in (20).\(^8\)

\(^8\) Judgment on grammaticality is Toribio's. For more discussion, see below.
'Talked to my younger brother about the teacher.'
b. Watasi-wa sensei-ni ootoo-no koto-o o-HANASI-I-top. teacher-to my=younger=brother-gen. thing-acc. hon.-speak-si-ta. do-past
'Talked to the teacher about my younger brother.'

Assuming the structure in (21), she claims that the movement of direct object violates the Subjacency condition.

(21)

However, the unacceptability of the sentences in (20) does not appear to result from syntactic factors. Rather, the unacceptability is due to semantic (or pragmatic) reasons. For instance, in a context where a [+honorific] direct object is interpreted as receiving some benefit from the event denoted by the predicate, a sentence with a structure similar to the one in (20) is fully acceptable. Consider the following sentence.

(22) Watasi-wa ootoo-ni sensei-no dengen-o I-top. my=younger=brother-to teacher-gen. message-acc.
o-TUTAE-si-te ki-masi-ta.
hon.-convey-do-TE come-polite-past
'(lit.) I went to convey your (=teacher's) message to my younger brother and came back.'
In the sentence in (22), the direct object is understood as the beneficiary of the event of my conveying the teacher's message to the speaker's younger brother. Given such an interpretation, under Toribio's analysis, in which the object honorific verb o-tutae-si-ta 'conveyed' must be licensed by the direct object under the spec-head relationship, this sentence is expected be ruled out as Subjacency violation. Since the sentence in (22) is acceptable under an interpretation where the possessor of the direct object is the target of object honorification, the licensing condition of object honorification should not refer to the syntactic position of direct object. I will not explore in detail, but the implication of the discussion above strongly supports the existence of some sort of semantic well-formedness condition on object honorification.

To summarize, I have shown that object honorification can be licensed within FP by a [−honorific] subject. The verb su-ru 'to do' which follows in the periphrastic form does not allow raising of the subject as the verb nar-u 'to become' in subject honorification. In nominal object honorification, the licensing subject is PRO which refers to the speaker of the sentence. I argue that licensing of the object honorific verb is carried out by the [−honorific] subject under the spec-head relationship. Finally, I argue against Toribio's analysis in which the spec-head relationship in question holds between the object and object honorific verb and suggest that there is a convention by which the beneficiary object is "selected" as the target of object honorification.
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