

SENTENTIAL COMPLEMENTATION AND CROSS-CLAUSAL A-DEPENDENCIES IN JAPANESE *

Yuta Tatsumi
Meikai University

1. Introduction

This study focuses on the nature of sentential complementation and Japanese clause-taking predicates. A particular focus will be on the so-called exceptional case-marking (ECM) construction. An example of the ECM construction in Japanese is given in (1). In the present paper, I refer to the relevant construction as the ECM construction rather than the raising-to-object (RTO) construction because the former is the name of the phenomenon, but the latter is the name of a particular analysis.

- (1) Taro-wa [nihon-o anzen da to] omot-teiru.
Taro-TOP Japan-ACC safe COP C think-ASP
'Taro thinks that Japan is safe.'

The ECM construction has received continuous attention in the field of theoretical linguistics. Three types of approaches have been proposed for the ECM construction. The first one is what I refer to as the raising analysis, in which an exceptionally case-marked noun syntactically moves to the matrix clause. The second one is the non-raising analysis, where an exceptionally case-marked noun remains in an embedded clause. The third one is the association analysis. This is similar to the non-raising analysis in that there is no syntactic movement of an exceptionally case-marked noun. However, this analysis assumes that two distinct nominal expressions are base-generated in the matrix and embedded clauses, and the two nominals are associated with each other in syntactic or semantic computations.

A detailed comparison of previous analyses of the ECM construction is not the main focus of the current paper. This paper examines the nature of clause-taking predicates that allow the ECM construction. It has been observed that the ECM construction is allowed in restricted environments. For instance, when a complement clause is interrogative, exceptional case-marking is disallowed (Takemura 1975, Tomoda 1976, Kitagawa 1985).

* I would like to thank the audience of *Comparative Syntax, Semantics, and Language Acquisition 1* at Nanzan University for their help and comments.

(2) Wh-questions (Takemura 1975)

watasi-wa [dare- $\{ga \mid *o\}$ kasikoi daroo ka to] omotta.
 I-TOP who- $\{NOM \mid ACC\}$ smart MOD Q C thought

‘I wondered who was smart.’

(3) Polar questions (Tomoda 1976)

Haruko-wa [Hiroshi- $\{ga \mid *o\}$ buzi kadooka] anzita.
 Haruko-TOP Hiroshi- $\{NOM \mid ACC\}$ safe whether worried

‘Haruko worried whether Hiroshi is safe or not.’

It is important to note that the presence of the Q head (i.e., *ka* and *kadooka*) itself does not block the ECM construction. As shown in (4), exceptional case-marking is possible with non-interrogative *ka*-clauses.

(4) ECM with the non-interrogative *ka* (based on Kuno 1976)

Hanako-wa [Taro- $\{ga \mid o\}$ han-nin ka to] omotteita.
 Hanako-TOP Taro- $\{NOM \mid ACC\}$ culprit Q C think.ASP.PAST

‘John thought that Mary was a culprit.’

Kuno (1976) also observes that only clause-taking verbs that take *to*-clauses allow the ECM construction in Japanese. Kobayashi and Maki (2002) argue that “any transitive verb selecting a *to*-clause as its sole object can “exceptionally Case-mark” the embedded subject” (p.223). Given these previous studies, a naïve expectation would be that the semantic and syntactic types of embedded clauses are crucial for the Japanese ECM construction, and verbs that can take a non-interrogative *to*-clause generally allow the ECM construction. This view further implies that the Japanese ECM construction is not that much “exceptional”; rather, the so-called exceptional case-marking is a general option for the subject of embedded *to*-clauses.

So far, we have focused on the properties of ECM clauses. However, there are also studies focusing on the semantic/syntactic classification of ECM verbs. Pesetsky (1992) proposes six classes of clause-taking verbs as in (5). He reports that only two of them allow the ECM construction in English.

(5) Pesetsky (1992)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| a. Believe-class: ^{OK} ECM | d. Manage-class: *ECM |
| b. Wager-class: *ECM | e. Want-class: ^{OK} ECM |
| c. Hate-class: *ECM | f. Demand-class: *ECM |

Regarding the Japanese ECM construction, Goto (2016) argues that there are two types of predicates that implement exceptional case-marking in syntactically different ways, as represented in (6).

- (6) a. “Think”-type predicates (e.g., *omou* ‘think,’ *kanziru* ‘feel’)
 ... [VP NP₁ [VP [CP NP₁ ...] V] V]
 b. “Conclude”-type predicates (e.g., *dantei-suru* ‘conclude,’ *kimetsukeru* ‘assume’)
 ... [VP NP₁ [VP [CP pro₁ ...] V] V]

According to Goto (2016), the “think”-type predicates derive the ECM construction by the movement of an embedded subject to the matrix clause. On the other hand, the “conclude”-type predicates implement exceptional case-marking by semantic coreference between two nouns. Goto (2016) assumes that the characteristics of clause-taking verbs play an important role in the ECM construction.

Based on the previous studies of the Japanese ECM construction, the present paper examines whether there are common properties among clause-taking predicates that allow the ECM construction. This paper is organized as follows: section 2 introduces the main data of the current survey. Section 3 then shows the results of the survey. Section 4 discusses issues regarding the survey results. Section 5 is the summary.

2. Data

In the present survey, I collected 100 clause-taking predicates that can appear with *to*-clauses. It has been observed that there are two types of *to*-clauses. Fujita (2000) observes that two kinds of *to*-clauses can be distinguished by using the proform *soo*.

(7) *To*-complement

Taro-wa [mousiwakearimasen to] zyoosi-ni (soo) ayamatta.
 Taro-TOP sorry.HON C boss-to so apologized
 ‘Taro apologized to his boss, saying “I’m sorry.”’

(8) *To*-adjunct

Taro-wa [mousiwakearimasen to] heya-ni (*soo) haitte-kita.
 Taro-TOP sorry.HON C room-to so enter-came
 ‘Taro came into the room, saying “I’m sorry.”’

In the present paper, I refer to the *to*-clause in (7) as *to*-complements and the one in (8) as *to*-adjuncts. *To*-complements can co-occur with the adverbial proform *soo*, while *to*-adjuncts cannot. The distinction needs to be kept in mind. In the present survey, however, I do not distinguish them, and pseudo-randomly collected clause-taking predicates that can co-occur with a *to*-clause.

The clause-taking predicates are examined based on several syntactic or semantic tests. The first test is the continuation of a true/false statement. The second test is tense alternation of an embedded clause. The third test is the ability to have an overt embedded subject. In what

follows, I introduce details of these tests.

2.1. True/False statements

Based on observation from James Higginbotham, Pesetsky (1992) offers a test to differentiate irrealis complements from propositional complements. As shown in (9)a, a statement about truth or falsity cannot be predicated of irrealis complements, in contrast to complements of *believe-* and *wager-*class verbs given in (9)b.

- (9) a. *Mary wanted Sue to read books, which was true.
 b. Mary believes Bill to read books, which is true. (Pesetsky 1992:27)

I assume that a similar test effectively delineates a classification of Japanese clause-taking verbs. Importantly, the test identifies the semantic properties of an embedded clause, and clause-taking predicates exhibit different outcomes according to the interpretation of an embedded clause. For example, the verb *iwu* ‘say’ allows the continuation of a true/false predicate when the matrix subject and the embedded subject are not coreferential, as in (10). The same predicate disallows the continuation of a true/false predicate when a matrix subject and an embedded subject refer to the same person, as in (11). In this case, John expressed his determination, and the verb *iwu* is interpreted more like *swear* or *declare*.

- (10) John-wa [Mary-ga tabako-o yameru to] itta ga, sore-wa machigai datta.
 John-TOP Mary-NOM tobacco-ACC stop C said but it-TOP false
 COP.PAST

Lit. ‘John said that Mary would stop smoking, but it was false.’

- (11) *John₁-wa [Δ_1 tabako-o yameru to] itta ga, sore-wa machigai datta.
 John-TOP tobacco-ACC stop C said but it-TOP false COP.PAST

Lit. ‘John said that he would stop smoking, but it was false.’

It should be noted that the absence of an overt embedded subject per se is not the cause of the unacceptability of (11). When a to-clause contains a modal expression *yooni*, which typically occurs in control clauses, the true/false continuation becomes infelicitous, even if the embedded clause has an overt subject.

- (12) *John-wa [Mary-ga heya-ni iru yooni to] negatta ga,
 John-TOP Mary-NOM room-LOC be MOD C hoped but
 sore-wa machigai dat-ta.
 it-TOP false COP-PAST

Lit. ‘John hoped that Mary would be in the room, but it was false.’

It should be noted that the continuation of true/false statements in Japanese picks up predicates

other than the ones that take irrealis complements. For instance, the continuation of true/false statements is incompatible with factive verbs, as in (13).

- (13) *John-wa [Mary-ga sono-toki heya-ni ita to] sitteiru ga,
 John-TOP Mary-NOM that-time room-LOC was C knew but
 sore-wa machigai dat-ta.
 it-TOP false COP-PAST

Lit. ‘John knows that Mary was in the room at that time, but it was false.’

2.2. Tense alternation

The second test is tense alternation in embedded clauses. It has been argued that ECM complements and control complements differ in the feature specification of the T head in an embedded clause (Pesetsky 1992, Ormazabal 1995, Bošković 1997). Fujii (2006) shows that Japanese embedded clauses exhibit similar distinctions. Relevant examples are given in (14) and (15).

- (14) John₁-wa [Δ₁ tabako-o {yameru | *yameta} to] ketsui-sita.
 John-TOP tobacco-ACC stop stopped C decision-did

‘John decided to quit smoking.’

- (15) John₁-wa [Δ₁ tabako-o {yameru | yameta} to] happyoo-sita.
 John-TOP tobacco-ACC stop stopped C announce-did

‘John announced that he would quit smoking.’

I examine whether the availability of tense alternation correlates with exceptional case-marking in Japanese.

2.3. Overt embedded subjects

The last test concerns the realization of an embedded subject. As shown in (16) and (17), clause-taking verbs behave differently in the ability to have an overt embedded subject.

- (16) *John-wa [Mary-ga zettaini warawanai to] chikatta.
 John-TOP Mary-NOM never laugh.NEG C swore

‘John swore that Mary would never laugh.’

- (17) John-wa [Mary-ga zettaini warawanai to] itta.
 John-TOP Mary-NOM never laugh.NEG C said

‘John said that Mary never laughs.’

Note that the resulting sentence sounds natural when an embedded subject refers to the same individual as the matrix subject.

- (18) ?John₁-wa [zibun₁-ga zettaini warawanai to] chikatta.
 John-TOP self-NOM never laugh.NEG C swore

‘John₁ swore that he₁ would never laugh.’

In the current survey, I check whether clause-taking verbs can co-occur with an embedded subject that is not coreferential with the matrix subject.

3. Results

The result of the present survey is summarized in Table 1. Here, each cell is marked with an asterisk when the resulting sentence is ungrammatical.

	translation	ACC subj.	Nom subj.	tense alter.	T/F		translation	ACC subj.	Nom subj.	tense alter.	T/F		
No.1	アドバイスする	adobaisusuru	*	*	*	*	No.51	言い換える	iikaeru	say-change	ok	ok	ok
No.2	誓う	chikau	*	*	*	*	No.52	言いかける	iikakeru	say-ASP	ok	ok	ok
No.3	計画する	keikakusuru	plan	*	*	*	No.53	言直す	iinaosu	say-fix	ok	ok	ok
No.4	決心する	kessinsuru	decide	*	*	*	No.54	言う	iu	say	ok	ok	ok
No.5	決意する	ketsuisuru	decide	*	*	*	No.55	解釈する	kaisyakusuru	interpret	ok	ok	ok
No.6	決める	kimeru	decide	*	*	*	No.56	書く	kaku	write	ok	ok	ok
No.7	後悔する	kookaisuru	regret	*	*	*	No.57	確信する	kakusinsuru	confirm	ok	ok	ok
No.8	命令する	meireisuru	order	*	*	*	No.58	悲しむ	kanasimu	feelsad	ok	ok	ok
No.9	求める	motomeru	require	*	*	*	No.59	勘違いする	kanchigaisuru	misunderstand	ok	ok	ok
No.10	望む	nozomu	want	*	*	*	No.60	考える	kangaeru	think	ok	ok	ok
No.11	説得する	settokusuru	persuade	*	*	*	No.61	仮定する	kateisuru	suppose	ok	ok	ok
No.12	指定する	siteisuru	designate	*	*	*	No.62	決定する	ketteisuru	decide	ok	ok	ok
No.13	指示する	sizisuru	instruct	*	*	*	No.63	聞く	kiku	hear	ok	ok	ok
No.14	勧める	susumeru	recommend	*	*	*	No.64	告白する	kokuhakusuru	declare	ok	ok	ok
No.15	頼む	tanomu	ask	*	*	*	No.65	答える	kotaeru	answer	ok	ok	ok
No.16	忠告する	tyuukokusuru	warn	*	*	*	No.66	肯定する	kouteisuru	affirm	ok	ok	ok
No.16	約束する	yakusokusuru	promise	*	*	*	No.67	間違える	machigaeru	mistake	ok	ok	ok
No.18	要求する	youkyuusuru	require	*	*	*	No.68	見る	miru	see	ok	ok	ok
No.19	祈る	inoru	pray	ok	ok	*	No.69	認める	mitomeru	recognize	ok	ok	ok
No.20	願う	negau	pray	ok	ok	*	No.70	見積もる	mitsumoru	estimate	ok	ok	ok
No.21	忘れていた	wasureteiru	forgot	ok	ok	*	No.71	嘆く	nageku	regret	ok	ok	ok
No.22	言い当てる	iiaeru	guess	ok	ok	ok	No.72	認識する	ninsikisuru	recognize	ok	ok	ok
No.23	感じる	kanzuru	feel	ok	ok	ok	No.73	疑む	niramu	suspect	ok	ok	ok
No.24	気づく	kidzuku	realize	ok	ok	ok	No.74	述べる	noberu	state	ok	ok	ok
No.25	期待する	kitaisuru	expect	ok	ok	*	No.75	驚く	odoroku	surprise	ok	ok	ok
No.26	見抜く	minuku	see-through	ok	ok	*	No.76	怒る	okoru	be.angry	ok	ok	ok
No.27	思い出す	omoidasu	remember	ok	ok	ok	No.77	思い込む	omoikomu	assume	ok	ok	ok
No.28	理解する	rikaisuru	understand	ok	ok	ok	No.78	思っている	omotteiru	think-ASP	ok	ok	ok
No.29	知る	siru	come to know	ok	ok	ok	No.79	思う	omou	think	ok	ok	ok
No.30	知っている	sitteiru	know	ok	ok	ok	No.80	論じる	ronziru	discuss	ok	ok	ok
No.31	想像する	soozosuru	imagine	ok	ok	ok	No.81	叫ぶ	sakebu	shout	ok	ok	ok
No.32	尋ねる	tazuneru	ask	ok	ok	ok	No.82	錯覚する	sakkakusuru	be.deluded	ok	ok	ok
No.33	わかる	wakaru	understand	ok	ok	ok	No.83	囁く	sasayaku	wisper	ok	ok	ok
No.34	わかっている	wakatteiru	know	ok	ok	*	No.84	宣言する	sengensuru	declare	ok	ok	ok
No.35	明かす	akasu	reveal	ok	ok	ok	No.85	説明する	setsumeisuru	explain	ok	ok	ok
No.36	怪しむ	ayasimu	suspect	ok	ok	ok	No.86	示す	simasu	show	ok	ok	ok
No.37	暴露する	bakurosuru	expose	ok	ok	ok	No.87	信じ込む	sinjikomu	assume	ok	ok	ok
No.38	断言する	dangensuru	assert	ok	ok	ok	No.88	信じる	sinziru	believe	ok	ok	ok
No.39	怒鳴る	donaru	yell	ok	ok	ok	No.89	知らせる	siraseru	inform	ok	ok	ok
No.40	言及する	genkyuusuru	mention	ok	ok	ok	No.90	指摘する	sitekisuru	point.out	ok	ok	ok
No.41	誤解する	gokaisuru	misunderstand	ok	ok	ok	No.91	推測する	suisokusuru	conjecture	ok	ok	ok
No.42	発見する	hakkensuru	discover	ok	ok	ok	No.92	推定する	suiteisuru	presume	ok	ok	ok
No.43	話す	hanasu	speak	ok	ok	ok	No.93	証明する	syoomeisuru	prove	ok	ok	ok
No.44	判断する	handansuru	judge	ok	ok	ok	No.94	主張する	syuypoosuru	claim	ok	ok	ok
No.45	反論する	hanronsuru	argue.against	ok	ok	ok	No.95	呷く	tsubuyaku	grumble	ok	ok	ok
No.46	発表する	happyoosuru	announce	ok	ok	ok	No.96	伝える	tsutaeru	tell	ok	ok	ok
No.47	発言する	hatsugensuru	speak	ok	ok	ok	No.97	疑う	utagau	suspect	ok	ok	ok
No.48	否定する	hiteisuru	deny	ok	ok	ok	No.98	噂する	uwassasuru	gossip	ok	ok	ok
No.49	ほのめかす	honomekasu	hint	ok	ok	ok	No.99	笑う	warau	laugh	ok	ok	ok
No.50	報告する	hookokusuru	report	ok	ok	ok	No.100	喜ぶ	yorokobu	be.pleased	ok	ok	ok

Table 1

34 predicates out of 100 (34%) disallow the continuation of true/false statements. Among those predicates, 21 predicates (21/34, 62%) do not allow tense alternation in embedded clauses. Lastly, 18 predicates out of the predicates that disallow tense alternation cannot overtly realize a nominative embedded subject. Importantly, table 1 shows that the predicates that cannot co-occur with an overt nominative embedded subject do not allow exceptionally case-marked

subjects. The generalization is thus that predicates that can co-occur with a *to*-clause allow the ECM construction in Japanese if they can include an overt subject phrase.

Furthermore, Table 1 shows an implicational hierarchy regarding the ECM predicates. If a clause-taking predicate disallows the ECM construction, *to*-clauses appearing with the same predicate never allows tense alternation. Similarly, if a *to*-clause disallows tense alternation, it must disallow the continuation of a true/false statement.

4. Discussion

The results summarized in Table 1 have some implications for theoretical approaches to the Japanese ECM construction. Firstly, it seems difficult to maintain a naïve interpretation of Kobayashi and Maki's (2002) analysis, in which all predicates that can appear with a *to*-clause generally allow the ECM construction. In the present survey, 18 predicates never allow the ECM construction but can still occur with a *to*-clause. Moreover, all of the 18 predicates can take a *to*-complement. (Recall the distinction between *to*-complements and *to*-adjunct discussed in section 2.) We must explain why these 18 predicates cannot license the ECM construction.

We cannot simply claim that the 18 predicates are control predicates based solely on the fact that they do not allow tense alternation. This is because three predicates never allow tense alternation but still can license the ECM construction: *inor(-u)* 'pray,' *nega(-u)* 'wish' and *wasurer(-u)* 'forget.' According to Fujii (2006), these predicates exhibit a property of control predicates. However, they can still license the ECM construction, as shown in (19) and (20).

- (19) John-wa [Mary- $\{ga \mid o\}$ buzi dearu yooni to] {*inotta* | *negatta*}.
 John-TOP Mary- $\{NOM \mid ACC\}$ safe COP MOD C {prayed | wished}
 'John {prayed/wished} that Mary would be safe.'

- (20) John-wa [Mary- $\{ga \mid o\}$ kikonsya da to] *wasure-teita*.
 John-TOP Mary- $\{NOM \mid ACC\}$ married.person COP C forget-ASP.PAST
 'John had forgotten that Mary was married.'

Whatever the theoretical analysis of the Japanese ECM construction, we need to explain why the 18 predicates never license the ECM construction in contrast to the other clause-taking predicates.

Before concluding the present paper, some caveats regarding the results of the survey are in order here. As Kusumoto (2017) discussed, the verb *setsumei-suru* 'explanation-do' can assign an accusative case to a nominal explanandum argument, which expresses a situation to be explained. A relevant example is given in (21). In addition, the same verb can take *to*-complement, as shown in (22). (See Saito (2015) for similar data.)

- (21) Taro-wa [Hanako-ga chikoku-sita koto]-o setsumei-sita.
 Taro-TOP Hanako-NOM late-did thing-ACC explanation-did

‘Taro explained that the reason for his tardiness was because the bus was late.’

- (22) Taro-wa [basu-ga okureta to] setsumei-sita.
 Taro-TOP bus-NOM delayed C explanation-did

Lit. ‘Taro explained that the bus was late.’

Given that Japanese has this kind of clause-taking predicates, which can take nominal and clausal arguments, one may consider including such a predicate in the data set may ruin the results of the survey because the configuration in (23), where nominal and clausal arguments co-occur in a single sentence, would be possible. (Note also that Table 1 contains the verb *setsumei-suru*.)

- (23) Subj NP-o [... to] setsumei-sita.

In this respect, I checked whether an exceptionally case-marked subject can appear after a *to*-clause. If a nominal phrase followed by the accusative case particle is independent of a *to*-clause, the word order of the two phrases should be changeable by scrambling. However, this prediction is not borne out, as shown in (25).

- (24) Taro-wa Aiko-ni [Mary-o tadano tomodachi da to] setsumei-sita.
 Taro-TOP Aiko-to Mary-ACC just friend COP C explanation-did

‘Taro explained to Hanako that Mary was just a friend.’

- (25) ?*Taro-wa Aiko-ni [tadano tomodachi da to] Mary-o setsumei-sita.
 Taro-TOP Aiko-to just friend COP C Mary-ACC explanation-did

‘Taro explained to Hanako that Mary was just a friend.’

Note that when the nominal expression *koto* is inserted before the accusative case particle, the resulting sentence is acceptable, as in (26).

- (26) Taro-wa Aiko-ni [tadano tomodachi da to][Mary-no koto]-o setsumei-sita.
 Taro-TOP Aiko-to just friend COP C Mary-GEN thing-ACC explanation-did

‘Taro explained to Hanako that Mary was just a friend.’

In general, when an exceptionally case-marked subject is followed by *koto*, the resulting sentence tends to become acceptable for many native speakers. However, the amelioration effect may arise because the sentence is analyzed as a double object construction like the one in (26). Given this, the present survey checked only cases where exceptional case-marking

attaches to a bare nominal argument. Furthermore, I marked OK in Table 1 only when clause-taking predicates can license the ECM construction with a fixed word order, excluding the double object construction like the one in (26).

5. Conclusion

This study focuses on the nature of sentential complementation and the Japanese ECM construction. In particular, I examined whether there are common properties among clause-taking predicates that allow the ECM construction. Although I did not offer a theoretical analysis of the data, the present study revealed some issues we must explain. Firstly, exceptional case-marking is not a general phenomenon observed with predicates that can take *to*-clauses. Secondly, the present paper observed an implicational hierarchy among clause-taking predicates. If a clause-taking predicate disallows the ECM construction, *to*-clauses appearing with the same predicate never allows tense alternation. Similarly, if a *to*-clause disallows tense alternation, it must disallow the continuation of a true/false statement.

References

- Bošković, Ž. (1997) *The syntax of nonfinite complementation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. and H. Lasnik. (1993) "The theory of principles and parameters," In Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld, and Theo Vennemann, eds., *Syntax: An international handbook of contemporary research*, 506-569. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Fujii, T. (2006) *Some Theoretical Issues in Japanese Control*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland.
- Fujita, Y. (2000) *Kokugo inyoo koobun no kenkyuu [A study of the quotative structure in Japanese]*. Osaka: Izumi Shoin.
- Goto, S. (2016) "Two types of accusative subjects in Japanese," *Japanese/Korean linguistics 23*, Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Kobayashi, K. and H. Maki (2002) "A Non-Exceptional Approach to Exceptional Case-Marking in Japanese," *English Linguistics* 19, 211-238.
- Kuno, S. (1976) "Subject raising," In Shibatani Masayoshi, eds., *Syntax and semantics: Japanese generative grammar*, New York: Academic Press, 17-49.
- Kusumoto, K. (2017) "Clause-embedding in Japanese: *to* vs. *koto* alternation," *Jimibun ronkyu : humanities review* 67, 49-77.
- Ormazabal, J. (1995) *The syntax of complementation: On the connection between syntactic structure and selection*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Pesetsky, D. (1992) *Zero syntax: Part II*. unpublished ms., MIT.
- Saito, M. (2015) "Notes on the Referential Transparency of Perception and Factive Verb Complements," *Nanzan Linguistics* 10, 21-42.
- Takemura, K. (1975) "Subject raising and meaning in Japanese," *Papers in Japanese Linguistics* 4, 181-189.
- Tomoda, E. K. (1976) "Raising and point of view: Evidence from Japanese," *Papers in Japanese Linguistics* 5, 361-376.