How many –no s?

- Possessive no occurs in a wide variety of contexts, following DP, PP, non-finite clauses.
- Traditionally, 3 nos have been recognized:
  1) Genitive Case
    a) [John no (kuran no)ude] ‘John’s (car/arm)’
    b) sinrin no halai ‘forest no destruction’
    c) kinn no sinbun ‘NY no hakubutukan’ ‘yesterday’s newspaper’
  2) Attributive Copula / Modifying Marker
    a) Ken no yakusoku ‘Ken’s promise’
    b) tomodati no Ken ‘Ken’s friend’
    c) ni.satu no hon ‘this book no book’
  3) Partitive –no
    a) kono hon no san.satu ‘this book no 3 books’

نظیر’s book 
3 of these books’ (e.g., Kuno 1973)
- no always appears in the same configuration.
  [Loc [.. Pred (–tense) no NP] (e.g., Kitagawa & Ross 1982)

If no accidental homophony, ➔ One (sub)structure for –no.

Two Approaches to Unification
- Modifying marker (Kitagawa & Ross 1982): –no is inserted by the following rule:
  - Mod-insertion Rule
    [dp [..XP (–tense) N] [dp [..XP (–tense) no N]]]
Where the head noun is overtly realized.
- There is no node in the syntax for –no. Created post-syntactically.
  (e.g., in DM, Watanabe 2006, 2010).
- Linker (Den Dirkken & Singhapreecha 2004): It induces DP-internal predicate inversion, similar to linkers like French de, Thai ติ
- Fail to account for the ellipsis patterns and semantic properties of –no-phrases.

Pursuing better empirical coverage …
Our proposal: (Reduced) relative clause

The Ellipsis Patterns

4) a) [Taro no taida]–wa yo i ga [Hanako to
  no taida]–wa yoku nai.
  ‘Taro’s attitude is good, but Hanako’s isn’t.’
  b) [Hare no hi]–wa yo i ga, [ane no hi]–wa
  clear no day top good though rain no top
  orikomu.
  ‘Although clear days are fine, I feel depressed.
  Lit.’ ‘Although clear days are fine, I feel
  depressed on rainy ones.’
- Saito, Lin & Murasugi (2008). . . Only argument no-phrases (and location/time), but not modifiers, can be used to raise to Spec,DP and license ellipsis.
- -no license ellipsis but not Modifying -no.
- Not another proposal captures the facts below.
- Ellipsis is not restricted to argument no-phrases (5a) nor to genitive Case no (5b).

Proposed structure

[dp Pred, no [dp NP, C [. . . NP, Pred, . . .]]]

7) Ken no hon ‘Ken’s book’

Proposal

- no-phrases are (reduced) subject relatives.
  □ no is a type of D (cf. Koike 1999, Whitman 2001)
  □ merging with C[. . .]–ie, Kayne’s (1994) relatives
  □ C[. . .] merges with a complement varying in size, minimally containing a subject predicate SC, and provides an A’ position.
  □ Semantics & syntax depend on the complement structure of C[. . .] (i.e., small clauses, built from (silent) elementary predicates such as, AT, FROM, IN, TO, FOR).
  □ -no has an epp feature requiring a nominal specifier. ➔ “prenominal” relatives

- Ellipsis Generalization

Proposal: Ellipsis is only possible in relatives of a certain size (i.e., where a “focus” region is available): larger than the inflectional & compound regions in Tsai’s (2013) sense.
- Cases not allowing ellipsis are often realized as [N N] compounds in other languages.
  ex. Mandarin: yu-juan ‘rain-day’

Conclusion and Further directions

➔ Towards a minimalist account: Properties must follow from merge, lexical properties of –no and C[. . .] interacting with independently motivated principles.
- no is a type of D introducing a (reduced) subject relative containing small clauses with elementary predicates (and Focus)
- no is in the syntax, not post-syntactic.
- no can form a structure that behaves like compounds with respect to ellipsis.
- Not all elementary predicates seem available (e.g., Cause)
- The reason needs to be explained.
- Ellipsis structure & mechanism need further research, as do Typological differences.
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