

## Predication within Japanese Nominals

The main aim of this presentation is to argue that the so-called Japanese genitive marker *no* is not a genuine case marker but a realization of the head of PredP, a projection whose role is to mediate predication relationships (cf. Bowers 1993, Den Dikken 2006, etc.). Assuming that *no*-marking within NPs is different in nature from *no*-marking in the context of “*ga-no* (or nominative-genitive) conversion” (Watanabe 1996), I will set the latter aside in the following discussion.

The examples in (1) contain an “adjectival noun” (henceforth, AN). In (1a), the AN *kirei* is used attributively, or as a prenominal modifier, while in (1b), it is used as a sentential predicate. Assuming with Bowers (1993) that whenever there is predication, there is a category Pred, Nishiyama (1999) claims that the underlying structure of (1b) is (2) (where “ANP” = AN Phrase), and that this underlying structure is shared with example (3). He assumes that when the three heads,  $\text{Pred}^0$ ,  $\text{V}^0$ , and  $\text{T}^0$ , are realized separately, (3) is derived (where  $\text{Pred}^0 = de$ ,  $\text{V}^0 = ar$ ,  $\text{T}^0 = u$ ), and when they are contracted/fused and realized as a single morpheme, (1b) is derived. A serious problem with this analysis arises from the dialectal data in (4), where *ya*, *yatta*, and *katta* are dialectal equivalents for *da* or *datta* (the past tense form of *da*) (cf. Yamakido 2007). These examples show that in some dialects ANPs are accompanied by *na* even when they are used predicatively. However, there is no position where this element can appear in Nishiyama’s analysis, where *da/datta* is assumed to be a realization of  $\text{Pred}^0 + \text{V}^0 + \text{T}^0$  in (2). Maintaining the structure in (2), I propose solving this problem by analyzing *na* in (4) as a realization of  $\text{Pred}^0$ , and assume that this head is empty in standard Japanese (see (1b)). Thus, for example, (4bii) has the structure in (5). (I do not share with Nishiyama the view that (3) has the same underlying structure as (1b).) Now, it seems plausible to extend this PredP analysis of predicative ANs to attributive ANs, since the latter are also *na*-marked. Thus, I propose the structure in (6) for (1a). In this structure, the Spec of the PredP modifier is occupied by a null pronoun co-indexed with the modifiee NP. It is also possible for this position to be occupied by an overt element, as shown in (7) (it is assumed here that Nominative Case licensing in Japanese does not rely on  $\text{I}^0/\text{T}^0$  (see Fukui and Sakai 2003 and references cited therein)). It has been argued in the literature that Japanese relative clauses are licensed through “aboutness,” rather than operator movement, since, for example, they can be “gapless” (e.g., Hoji 1985, Kuno 1973, Murasugi 1991). I assume that modifier PredPs are licensed in the same way.

As shown in (8), when an NP is used as a prenominal modifier, it is usually accompanied by *no*, and such a *no*-marked modifier, like *na*-marked modifiers, can have an overt subject. Examples like (9) reveal that when  $(\text{NP}_{\text{Nom}^+})\text{NP}$  modifies what is called a “formal noun” in traditional grammar, it is followed by *na*. Now, if  $(\text{NP}_{\text{Nom}^+})\text{ANP} + na$  is a PredP, as discussed above, the prenominal modifier in (9) should also be a PredP because it is also *na*-marked. If so, however, it seems unnatural not to analyze the modifiers in (8) as a PredP, since their ingredients are the same as those of the modifier in (9):  $(\text{NP}_{\text{Nom}^+})\text{NP} + \text{particle}$ . Thus, I analyze the examples in (8) as having the structure in (10), where *no* is located under  $\text{Pred}^0$ . I further propose the structure in (12) for the possessor NP in (11). This structure is compatible with Den Dikken’s (1999, 2006) claim that the structure in (13) underlies possessive constructions universally.

*No* is widely assumed, implicitly or explicitly, to be a genitive case marker. A problem with this view is the notorious fact that *no* can be attached to phrases which usually do not need Case, which is illustrated by (14). The analysis being proposed here correctly predicts that as long as other conditions are met, any phrase that can establish a predication relationship with the head noun can be a *no*-marked modifier (see Nishiyama 1999: 198 for examples of *no*-marked CPs, mimetic words, and gerunds). Another problem with the view that *no* is a case marker arises from observations concerning nouns accompanied by a numeral-classifier. Watanabe (2006) convincingly argues that the bracketed parts in (15a) and (15b) form a constituent. If “ $\text{N} > \text{Num} > \text{Cl} > \text{Case}$ ” and “ $\text{N} > \text{Case} > \text{Num} > \text{Cl}$ ” form constituents of the same categorial status, as argued by Watanabe, the assumption that *no* is a realization of genitive Case leads to the prediction that “ $\text{N} > \text{Num} > \text{Cl} > no$ ” and “ $\text{N} > no > \text{Num} > \text{Cl}$ ” behave syntactically in the same way. This prediction is not borne out, however, as shown in (16). The ungrammaticality of (16b) can be explained in a straightforward way under the analysis which assumes that *no* is a Pred head: In a *no*-marked prenominal modifier, nothing can appear between *no* and the head noun (see (12)).

One might claim that the problems discussed so far can also be circumvented by assuming that *no* is a “linker,” being inserted to mark a prenominal modifier (cf. Sells 1998, Watanabe 2006; see also Kitagawa and Ross 1982). Under the view that *no* is a “linker,” however, the status of *na* is far from clear. We saw above that although it usually attaches to an ANP to create a prenominal modifier, it also attaches to an NP when the modifiee is a formal noun. Example (17) shows that in the latter context, it also attaches to a PP. Thus, if *no* is regarded as a “linker,” *na* should also be. If so, however, the fact that in some dialects this particle appears even in a non-prenominal context would be mysterious (see (4)).

To sum up, it has been argued in this presentation, among others, that the so-called Japanese genitive marker *no* is not a case marker (or a “linker”), but a realization of the head of PredP.

## Examples

- (1) a. *attributive use of an AN*  
 kirei-**na** hito  
 beautiful-NA person  
 'beautiful person'
- b. *predicative use of an AN*  
 Hanako-ga kirei-da.  
 H.-Nom beautiful-DA  
 'Hanako is beautiful.'
- (2)
- ```

      T'
     / \
    VP  T
   /  \
  PredP V
 /  \
NP  Pred'
Hanako-ga
      /  \
     ANP Pred
      kirei
  
```
- (3) Hanako-ga kirei-de ar-u.  
 H.-Nom beautiful-DE AR-Nonpast  
 'Hanako is beautiful.'
- (4) a. *Hiroshima dialect (Kandori 1982)*  
 i. Umi-ga sizuka-**na**. ii. Umi-ga sizuka-**na**-katta. cf. sizuka-**na** umi  
 sea-Nom calm-NA sea-Nom calm-NA-KATTA calm-NA sea  
 'The sea is calm.' 'The sea was calm.' 'calm sea'
- b. *(Apparently extinct) Kyoto dialect (Umegaki 1946)*  
 i. Umi-ga sizuka-**na**-ya. ii. Umi-ga sizuka-**na**-yatta. cf. sizuka-**na** umi  
 sea-Nom calm-NA-YA sea-Nom calm-NA-YATTA calm-NA sea  
 'The sea is calm.' 'The sea was calm.' 'calm sea'
- (5) [TP[VP[<sub>PredP</sub> umi-ga [<sub>Pred'</sub> [<sub>ANP</sub> sizuka] na(=Pred<sup>0</sup>)] ya(=V<sup>0</sup>)] -ta(=T<sup>0</sup>)] (cf. (4bii))
- (6) [NP [<sub>PredP</sub> *pro*<sub>i</sub> [<sub>Pred'</sub> [<sub>ANP</sub> kirei] na(=Pred<sup>0</sup>)]]] [<sub>NP</sub> hito<sub>i</sub>] (cf. (1a))
- (7) [<sub>PredP</sub> hahaoya-ga kirei-**na**] hito  
 mother-Nom beautiful-NA person  
 'person whose mother is beautiful'
- (8) a. gakusei-**no** hito b. [otooto-ga gakusei-**no**] hito  
 student-NO person brother-Nom student-NO person  
 'person who is a student' 'person whose brother is a student'
- (9) [John-ga gakusei-**na**] koto-wa akiraka da.  
 J.-Nom student-NA thing-Top clear DA  
 'It's clear that John is a student.'
- (10) [NP [<sub>PredP</sub> *pro*<sub>i</sub>/otooto-ga [<sub>Pred'</sub> [NP gakusei] no(=Pred<sup>0</sup>)]]] [<sub>NP</sub> hito<sub>i</sub>] (cf. (8a)&(8b))
- (11) Taroo-no hon  
 T.-NO book  
 'Taroo's book'
- (12) [<sub>PredP</sub> *pro*<sub>i</sub> [<sub>Pred'</sub> [PP [NP Taroo]  $\emptyset_{\text{dat}}$ (=P<sup>0</sup>)] no(=Pred<sup>0</sup>)]]] hon<sub>i</sub> (cf. (11))  $\emptyset_{\text{dat}}$  = null dative P
- (13) [<sub>PredP</sub> POSSESSUM [<sub>Pred'</sub> Pred [PP P<sub>dat</sub> POSSESSOR]]]
- (14) [PP Tokyo-kara]-**no** hito  
 T.-from-NO person  
 'person from Tokyo'
- (15) a. *N>Num>Cl>Case*  
 Taroo-ga [hon 3-satu-o] katta.  
 T.-Nom book 3-Cl-Acc bought  
 'Taroo bought three books.'
- b. *N>Case>Num>Cl*  
 Taroo-ga [hon-o 3-satu] katta.  
 T.-Nom book-Acc 3-Cl bought  
 'Taroo bought three books.'
- (16) a. *N>Num>Cl>no*  
 [gakusei 3-nin-**no**] kuruma  
 student 3-Cl-NO car  
 'three students' car'
- b. *N>no>Num>Cl*  
 \*[gakusei-**no** 3-nin]kuruma  
 student-NO 3-Cl car  
 'three student's car'
- (17) [Taroo-ga kita-no-ga [PP Tokyo-kara]-**na**] koto-wa akiraka-da.  
 T.-Nom came-NO-Nom T.-from-NA thing-Top clear-DA  
 'It is clear that Taroo came from Tokyo.'

## Selected References

- Dikken, Marcel den. 1999. On the structural representation of possession and agreement: The case of (anti-)agreement in Hungarian possessed nominal phrases. In *Crossing boundaries: Theoretical advances in Central and Eastern European languages*, ed. István Kenesei, 137-178. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Yamakido, Hiroko. 2007. The nature of adjectival inflection in Japanese. In *MIT working papers in linguistics* 54, 365-377. MITWPL, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.