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CHAPTER I

Introduction

This chapter is concerned with two matters; the definition of Japanese nominalization, and the categorization of Japanese nominalization. These issues are examined in the light of two treatments of the subject which have appeared in recent years. The first is the very thorough analysis by Seiichi Makino, as presented in his dissertation "Some Aspects of Japanese Nominalizations". The second is that which was outlined by Hideo Teramura in an article entitled "The Syntax of Noun Modification in Japanese".

Makino's Relativizing and non-Relativizing Nominalizations

Makino defines nominalization in the following terms:

"Nominalization is a transformation which converts a sentential structure (embedded at a permissible position in a matrix sentence) into an endocentric noun phrase (or quasi noun)." 3

There are two types of nominalizing processes, which Makino refers to as Relativizing Nominalization (REL-NOM), and non-Relativizing Nominalization (non-REL-NOM). In REL-NOM, a certain noun in a sentence is converted by the transformation into a head noun of a nominalized noun phrase. As an example of this we have the following sentence: 4

1-1. Kyonen mita eiga o mita.

(I saw the film which I had seen last year.)

The phrase kyonen mita eiga is derived from an underlying sentence, eiga o kyonen mita.

Both eiga o kyonen mita and kyonen mita eiga contain the same elements (ignoring the particle o for the moment), but in the former the noun eiga exists as a constituent of a complete sentence, whilst in the latter it is the head of a modified noun phrase which is itself a constituent of the larger complete sentence kyonen mita eiga o mita.

The following sentences contain modified noun phrases derived through non-REL-NOM. 5

---

3. Makino; op cit, page 43.
4. ibid, page 45.
5. ibid, page 45.
1-2. (a) Kodomo ga terebi a miru no koto wa yoku-nai.
   (It is not good for children to watch T.V.)
   (b) Sensei wa kodomo ga terebi o miru no koto o kinjita.
   (The teacher forbade the children to watch T.V.)

In non-REL-NOM a whole sentence is converted by a nominalizer into some kind of abstract noun. In both of the examples above, the sentence kodomo ga terebi o miru has been converted into an "abstract" noun phrase by means of one of the nominalizers no or koto. The morphemes no and koto which appear in 1-2 (a) and (b) are called abstract nominalizers, because they make abstract nominalized clauses (or "abstract nominals"). In addition to these abstract nominalizers, however, Makino distinguishes a large group of words which behave syntactically like no and koto, but which "retain their original full meaning to some degree". These are referred to as "non-abstract nominalizers". An example of a non-abstract nominalizer is the word hazu in the following sentence:

1-3. Tanaka wa hon o kau hazu ga nai.
   (Tanaka is not expected to buy books.)

Non-abstract nominalizers can be distinguished from ordinary nouns in two ways.

6. ibid, page 66, page 105.
7. ibid, page 105.
(a) A non-abstract nominalizer cannot function as an independent noun in a sentence, but must always have a sentential complement. For example:

1-3. Tanaka wa hon o kau hazu ga nai.
1-4. Tanaka wa hon o kau kane ga nai.
(Tanaka has not the money to buy books.)

1-3'. *hazu ga nai.
1-4'. kane ga nai.

As can be seen, the sentence 1-4 is grammatical even without the sentential complement Tanaka wa hon o kau, whilst in 1-3 the sentential complement is obligatory.

(b) Sentences containing non-abstract nominalizers do not have corresponding wh-questions. Thus 1-3 does not have the corresponding wh-question:

1-5. Tanaka wa hon o kau nani ga nai ka?

However, 1-5 would be the corresponding wh-question for 1-4.

The morpheme hazu is a non-abstract nominalizer, therefore, because it always requires a sentential complement, and because it cannot be replaced by a corresponding interrogative pronoun.

8. ibid, page 107.
Teramura's Inner and Outer Relationships

Teramura's paper is concerned with the semantic-syntactic relationships that hold between the modifying phrase and the modified noun within a modified nominal construction. He distinguishes two basic types of modified noun phrase:

1. Those in which the modifying element is derivable from a sentence which contains the same noun as the noun which is modified.

2. Those in which the underlying sentence from which the modifying phrase is derived does not contain the same noun as the modified noun.

In the former type, the relationship which holds between the modified noun and the modifying element is called an "inner relationship"; whilst in the latter it is described as an "outer relationship". Following are examples of inner and outer relationships:

1-6. Hitori de samma o yaku otoko (inner relationship)
   (The man who cooks mackerel by himself.)

1-7. Samma o yaite-iru nioi (outer relationship)
   (The smell of mackerel being cooked.)

1-6'. Otoko ga hitori de samma o yaku.

1-7'. *Nioi o samma o yaite-iru.

---

9. Teramura, op cit, page 64.
10. ibid, page 66.
1-6, which has *otoko* as noun head, is derived from an underlying sentence containing the same noun *otoko* as one of its constituents (1-6'). 1-7, on the other hand, does not have an underlying sentence containing the noun *nico*.

Teramura's "inner" and "outer" relationships and Makino's REL-NOM and non-REL-NOM appear to be different ways of expressing essentially the same concepts. Both acknowledge that there are two types of nominalization in Japanese, and both relate these to the modified noun head and its relationship with the modifying phrase. When the deep structure of the modifying phrase is a sentence containing the same noun as the noun head, we are dealing with an "inner" relationship or "Relativizing Nominalization". When the deep structure of the modifying phrase does not contain the same noun as the noun head, we are dealing with an "outer" relationship or non-Relativizing Nominalization. Let us, however, examine further Makino's notion of non abstract nominalizer.

By adding a predicate to 1-7, we can produce a sentence which, in Makino's terms, is derived through non-REL-NOM.


(I like the smell of fish being cooked.)

1-8'. *nico ga suki da.*

Without the sentential complement *summa o yaite-iru*, 1-8 is ungrammatical. The corresponding wh-question is also of doubtful acceptability.
The word nioi, therefore, meets the requirements of a non abstract nominalizer. Now let us examine the following sentences:

1-9. Dare-ka ga doa o nokku suru oto o kiita.
(I heard someone knocking at the door.)

1-10. Ima kikoeta oto wa kane no oto deshita.
(The sound which we just heard was the sound of a bell.)

In 1-9, oto does not occur as a constituent of the underlying sentence of the modifying phrase dare-ka ga doa o nokku suru, and at the same time meets all the other requirements of a non abstract nominalizer. In 1-10, also, the noun appears to meet Makino's criteria of a non abstract nominalizer, and yet the phrase ima kikoeta oto is deriveable from an underlying sentence containing the same constituents.
In other words, it reflects the inner relationship, or in Makino's terminology, is derived through REL-NOM. Thus we have a noun, which has the characteristics of a non-abstract nominalizer, at the head of a modified noun phrase which is not derived through non-REL-NOM.

The following examples are also of interest.

      (I related to John the news which I had heard yesterday.)

1-12. Kennedy ga korosareta nyuusu o John ni tsutaeta.
      (I related to John the news that Kennedy had been killed.)

1-11'. nyuusu o John ni tsutaeta.
      Kinoo kiita nani o John ni tsutaeta ka?
      Kinoo nyuusu o kiita.

1-12'. nyuusu o John ni tsutaeta.
      *Kennedy ga korosareta nani o John ni tsutaeta ka?
      ga)
      o } korosareta.
      ni )
      de )

1-11 is an example of REL-NOM.

In 1-12, the modified noun phrase Kennedy ga korosareta nyuusu does not have an underlying sentential expression containing the noun nyuusu. Thus 1-12 is not REL-NOM. On the other hand the word nyuusu does not meet the criteria of a nominalizer because it can occur without a sentential complement. Furthermore, it is arguable that the
corresponding wh-question for 1-12 is unacceptable, because it could occur in a situation where the listener had not heard the word nyusu clearly and was asking the speaker to repeat what he had said. What this evidence indicates, however, is that it is possible to have a noun which does not meet the requirements of a nominalizer at the head of a nominalized clause which is not derived through REL-NOM.

It appears, therefore, that the occurrence of a given noun at the head of one or another type of modified noun phrase is not necessarily related to other properties the noun may happen to possess (such as the inability to occur without a sentential complement etc.). In fact, there are a large number of nouns in Japanese which can occur in either type of modified nominal construction. It should be noted, also, that they retain their "original full meaning" not just "to some degree" but entirely, regardless of whether the modified noun phrases in which they appear reflect the inner or the outer relationship.

In this thesis, the term nominalizer will be reserved only for the morphemes koto and no because of their rather special role in Japanese nominalization. We will adopt Makino's general definition of nominalization, but the terminology "REL-NOM" and "non-REL-NOM" will be replaced by "Inner-NOMinalization" and "Outer-NOMinalization" as explained below. These terms are based on Teramura's "inner" and "outer" relationships and are preferred to Makino's because of the association between the latter and English relativization.

11. cf page 3.
12. with the possible exception of koto.
13. cf page 2.
14. The chief difference between Japanese nominalization and English relativization is that the former does not involve relative pronouns, whereas the latter does.
Every sentence containing a sentential expression embedded as a noun phrase must have two underlying sentences. One is the embedded sentence itself (the constituent sentence or C.S.), and the other is the sentence into which it is embedded (the matrix sentence or M.S.).

For example:

   C.S.  Kinoo nyusu o kiita.
   M.S.  Sono nyusu o John ni tsutaeta.

(The determiner sono appears in the M.S. in order to make clear the identity of reference between the noun nyusu in the C.S. and nyusu in the M.S.).

In 1-11, both the C.S. and the M.S. contain the same noun nyusu. In other words, a sentence which contains a modified noun phrase reflecting the inner relationship is always derived from two sentences, each of which has as one of its constituents the same noun as the noun head of the modified noun phrase. Nominalization involves the deletion of the noun in the C.S. by the identical noun in the M.S. Using 1-11 as an example, we can describe roughly the stages of the nominalization process in the following way:

   C.S.  Kinoo nyusu o kiita.
   M.S.  Sono nyusu o John ni tsutaeta.
1. Insertion of the C.S. into the M.S. with concomitant deletion of *sono* (where it occurs).

(Kinoo nyuusu o kiita) nyuusu o John ni tsutaeta.

2. Deletion of noun in C.S. by identical noun in M.S.

(Kinoo kiita) nyuusu o John ni tsutaeta., which is the surface structure of 1-11, Kinoo kiita nyuuusu o John ni tsutaeta.

This type of nominalization process will be referred to as I-NOM.

A sentence which includes a modified noun phrase reflecting the outer relationship is always derived from two sentences, only one of which contains the noun head of the noun phrase as a constituent. This is the M.S.

For example:

1-12. Kennedy ga korosareta nyuusu o John ni tsutaeta.

C.S. Kennedy ga korosareta.

M.S. Sono nyuuusu o John ni tsutaeta.

(The determiner *sono* is a kind of adjectival pronoun standing for the sentence *Kennedy ga korosareta*.)

Insertion of the C.S. into the M.S. with the concomitant deletion of *sono* results in the surface structure of 1-12.

(Kennedy ga korosareta) nyuuusu o John ni tsutaeta.

This type of nominalization process will be referred to as O-NOM.
Subject of the C.S.

There are two rules relating to the subject of a C.S. in both I-NOM and O-NOM.

1. The particle wa may not be inserted after the subject of a C.S. embedded in an M.S.

Thus:

(The cigarettes which I smoke are nice.)

but, * Watashi wa suu tabako wa oishii.

1-14. Roofuufu ga itawari-atte-iru sugata hodo utsukushii mono wa nai.
(There is nothing more beautiful than the sight of an aged couple caring for each other.)

but, * Roofuufu wa itawari-atte-iru sugata hodo utsukushii mono wa nai.

An apparent exception to this rule is the following sentence:

1-15. Taroo wa, Amerika ni itta hanashi o Nikki ni kaita.
(Taroo wrote in his diary the story about his trip to America.)

An examination of the underlying C.S. and M.S. for 1-15 reveals that Taroo is the subject of both.

C.S. Taroo ga Amerika ni itta.

M.S. Taroo ga sono hanashi o Nikki ni kaita.
Since Taroo appears only once in 1-15, it is clear that one occurrence of Taroo has been deleted during the nominalization process. When 1-15 is compared with the following sentence:

1-16. Taroo wa* Amerika ni itta hanashi o watashi wa kiita.

(I heard the story about Taroo's trip to America.)

we find that it is possible to have a pause after Taroo wa in the utterance of 1-15, but not after Taroo ga in the case of 1-16. In 1-16, Taroo is the subject only of the constituent sentence verb itta, and since it can not be followed by a pause, it must be assumed that the pause only follows the subject of the matrix sentence verb. That this is so is shown by the fact that when 1-16 is re-arranged with watashi at the beginning of the sentence, this watashi, which is the subject of the M.S. verb kiita, may be followed by a pause.

1-16'. Watashi wa, Taroo ga Amerika ni itta hanashi o kiita.

Thus, it is the occurrence of Taroo in the C.S. of 1-15 which is deleted.

This phenomenon is related to the rule that deletes the noun in the C.S. identical to the M.S. noun which becomes the head of the modified noun phrase. The two can, in fact, be stated simply as one rule, which is: any noun in the C.S. is deleted by the identical noun in the M.S. The rule restricting the insertion of wa does not apply to the M.S. subject and hence 1-15 is a well-formed sentence.
2. Except under certain conditions, the subject marker *ga* may be replaced by *no* after the subject of a C.S. embedded in an M.S.

Thus:


becomes

1-13'. Watashi no suu tabako wa oishii.

1-14. Roofuuru ga itawari-atte-iru sugata hodo utsukushii mono wa nai.

becomes

1-14'. Roofuuru no itawari-atte-iru sugata hodo utsukushii mono wa nai.

The first condition under which this rule is usually not applied is:

(a) when there is the likelihood of ambiguity arising from the association of *no* with an immediately following noun.

For example:

1-17. Gakusei ga terebi o miru no wa yoku-nai.

becomes

1-17'. Gakusei no terebi o miru no wa yoku-nai.

In 1-17', the sequence *gakusei no terebi* can be interpreted as "the student's T.V.", thus obscuring the fact that *no* is intended
to replace *ga. Instead of the meaning, "It is not good for students to watch T.V." 1-17' would probably be understood as, "It is not good to watch the student's T.V."

The second condition under which the rule is generally not applied is:

(b) when the modifying phrase is relatively long.

This is a stylistic restriction because there is no syntactic device for establishing what is meant by "relatively long". In general, if the modifying phrase contains more than one element additional to the subject and verb, the rule is not applied.

For example:

1-18. Watashi no kono aida tomodachi ni atta kissaten wa yuumei na tokoro da.

(The coffee shop at which I met my friend the other day is a famous place.)

This chapter has been concerned with the general theoretical framework of Japanese nominalization. In Chapter II we proceed to discuss the various sub-categories of I-NOM and O-NOM.
CHAPTER II

Introduction

In the previous chapter, the concepts of I-NOM and O-NOM were introduced. These categories can be further sub-classified according to various criteria which are the subject of this chapter.

I-NOM

In I-NOM, a certain noun in the M.S. becomes the head of the embedded C.S., resulting in the deletion of the identical noun in the C.S. The grammatical status of the noun in the C.S. is always indicated by particles, however when these are deleted this grammatical status ceases to be immediately apparent. The restraints on I-NOM, therefore, depend largely on the degree to which particles can be omitted without entirely obscuring the deep structure relationship between the C.S. noun and the verb. In general, the restraints on I-NOM are least where the particles o, ga, zero, ni, e are involved, but increase with the particles no, de, to, kara.

In the following section, sentences derived through I-NOM have been grouped according to the particle that occurs with the
noun which is deleted from the C.S. Each example is presented in a frame which contains the modifying phrase and the modified noun head. The underlying sentences for each example is given in the appendix.

The different functions of the various particles are generally not distinguished, except where they can be related directly to a restriction on I-NOM.

2-1. NP + o deleted from C.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifying Phrase</th>
<th>Modified Noun Head (N.H.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-1-1. Anata ga suu</td>
<td>TABAKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1-2. Watashi ga otoshita</td>
<td>SAIFU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1-3. Kinoo nonda</td>
<td>UISUKII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1-5. Kimi ga aruite-kita</td>
<td>DOORO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1-6. Watashi ga shuppatsu-shita</td>
<td>EKI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-1-1. The cigarettes which you smoke are really nice.
2-1-2. The teacher found the wallet which I had dropped.
2-1-3. I became quite drunk on the whiskey which I drank yesterday.
2-1-4. The bridge which we just crossed is the famous Gojoo no Ohashi.
2-1-5. The road which you walked along will be closed next year, and made into a highway.
2-1-6. The station from which I left is Shinjuku.
2-2-1. I asked the old lady sitting next to me various things.

2-2-2. Please say a few words to the guests waiting in the reception room.

2-2-3. I, who do not have a car, come by train every day.

2-2-4. Let us try eating the apples which fell off the tree just now.

2-2-5. The roads have become impassable because of the snow which fell yesterday.

2-2-6. What was that sound we heard just then?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifying Phrase</th>
<th>Modified N.H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soba ni suwatte-ita</td>
<td>OBAASAN ni iroiro tazuneta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oosetsuma de matte-iru</td>
<td>OKYAKUSAN ni sukoshi hanashite-kudasai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuruma o motte-i-nai</td>
<td>WATASHI wa mainichi densha de kuru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakki ki kara ochita</td>
<td>RINGO o tabete-miyoo ka?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinoo futta</td>
<td>YUKI de michi ga toore-naku natta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ima kikoeta</td>
<td>OTO wa nan deshoo?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following sentences also have underlying C.S. subjects indicated by *ga*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifying Phrase</th>
<th>Modified N.H.</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-2-7. Yoku kodomo o tataku</td>
<td>HITO</td>
<td>wa hajime kara kodomo o motsu beki de-nai.</td>
<td>wa hajime kara kodomo o motsu beki de-nai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2-8. Sake o nomu</td>
<td>SHUJIN</td>
<td>wa okusan ga kawaii so da.</td>
<td>wa okusan ga kawaii so da.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2-10. Kuruma o motte-i-nai</td>
<td>HITO</td>
<td>wa mainichi densha de kuru.</td>
<td>wa mainichi densha de kuru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2-11. Te o arawa-nai</td>
<td>SEITO</td>
<td>to asoba-nai de-kudasai.</td>
<td>to asoba-nai de-kudasai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2-12. Haha no nai</td>
<td>KODOMO</td>
<td>wa sabishii.</td>
<td>wa sabishii.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-2-7. People who hit their children frequently should not have children to start with.

2-2-8. One feels sorry for wives whose husbands drink.


2-2-10. The people who don't have cars come by train every day.

2-2-11. Don't play with schoolchildren who do not wash their hands.

2-2-12. Children without mothers are lonely.

An examination of the underlying sentences for examples 2-2-7 to 2-2-12 reveals that in each case the C.S. is not strictly grammatical unless the subject is preceded by an indefinite determiner such as *aru*. 
The effect of the modifying phrase in each of 2-2-7 to 2-2-12 shown in the frame is to specify a subset within a universal set. Thus, for example, the matrix predicate hajime kara kodomo o motsu beki de-nai, in 2-2-7, does not refer to the whole set of hito, but only to the subset specified by the modifying phrase yoku kodomo o tataku. In English relativization it is possible to distinguish a universal set from a subset by means of a pause before and after the relative clause.

(a) Students, who rarely study, should not be permitted to enter the library.
(b) Students who rarely study should not be permitted to enter the library.

The terms "non-restrictive relativization" and "restrictive relativization" are used to distinguish between these two different patterns in English. Sentence (a) is an example of non-restrictive relativization, because the relative clause, "who rarely studies", refers to the whole set of students. This sentence can be paraphrased as:

Students rarely study, and they should not be permitted to enter the library.

In (b), which is an example of restrictive relativization, the relative clause, "who rarely study", in fact specifies the subset of students to which the predicate, "should not be permitted to enter the library", refers. It cannot be paraphrased in the same way as (a).

In Japanese there is no formal way (such as a pause) of distinguishing between non-restrictive and restrictive clauses in the surface structure. The distinction, nevertheless, does exist on a deep structural level, although a discussion of all the factors involved is beyond the scope of this thesis. An example of an ambiguous case is the following sentence, which can be interpreted in either a non-restrictive or a restrictive sense.


---

This sentence means either:

(i) People, who have carnal desires, seek salvation in religion.

or (ii) People who have carnal desires seek salvation in religion.

The interpretation in (i) appears to be related to the following underlying C.S. for 2-2-13.

C.S. Ningen ga bonno o motte-iru.

The underlying C.S. of 2-2-13 which is related to the interpretation in (ii) is:

wa

M.S. Aru ningen ga bonno o motte-iru.

The existence of two different underlying C.S.'s for 2-2-13 can further be related to the fact that "having carnal desires" may be considered a characteristic either of all humans, (i), or just a section of humans, (ii). Hence in 2-2-13, the modifying phrase may apply to the whole set of ningen, or it may specify the particular subset to which the predicate refers.

In the case of 2-2-7 to 2-2-12, however, the content of each modifying phrase cannot be said to apply to the whole set represented by each modified noun head. These sentences each have only one interpretation, and therefore only one underlying C.S.

The indefinite determiner aru would be deleted along with the subject noun of the C.S. by the identical noun in the M.S. during the nominalization process.
2-3. NP + zero deleted from C.S.

In Japanese there are two sets of temporal nouns; those which when functioning adverbially require the particle *ni* (see 2-4), and those which do not require the particle *ni*. These two groups can be roughly distinguished in terms of their semantic features. In general, the former (those requiring *ni*) refer to a specific, nameable point or period of time (for example *ku-ji*, nine o'clock; *getsuyoobi*, Monday; *nigatsu*, February), whilst the latter generally denote an unspecified, relative point or period of time (for example, *asita*, tomorrow; *raigetsu*, next month; *kyonen*, last year). Words denoting the seasons may be considered as belonging to either category, although usually they occur without *ni*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifying Phrase</th>
<th>Modified N.H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-3-1. Watashi ga kaimono o shita</td>
<td>KINOO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3-2. Kare ga Nihon ni ita</td>
<td>SAKUNEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3-3. Watashi ga sotsugyoo-suru</td>
<td>RAINEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3-4. Koozan de hataraku</td>
<td>MAINICHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3-5. Ano hito-tachi ga pikunikku ni iku</td>
<td>ASHITA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3-6. Ki-gi ga midori ni naru</td>
<td>HARU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2-3-1. Yesterday, when I went shopping, it was raining.

2-3-2. Last year, when he was in Japan, was a dreadful year.

2-3-3. It looks as if there will be inflation next year when I graduate.

2-3-4. One lives in fear of death every day one works in the mine.

2-3-5. Tomorrow, the day they are going on a picnic, is a school holiday.

2-3-6. We have decided to hold our Graduates' Association picnic in spring when the trees turn green.

2-4. NP + ni deleted from C.S.

One function of the particle ni is to indicate direction, and in this sense it is similar to the particle e.

For example:

Watashi wa Tokyo ni ikimashita.

(I went to Tokyo).

In examples 2-4-1 and 2-4-2, therefore, the noun in the underlying C.S. identical to the modified noun head may occur with either ni or e.

The modified noun heads in examples 2-4-12 to 2-4-14 are temporal nouns of the type that require the particle ni when functioning adverbially.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifying Phrase</th>
<th>Modified N.H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-4-1. Anata ga itta</td>
<td>UMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4-2. Watashi ga sore o oita</td>
<td>TANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4-3. Kimi ga kono e o miseta</td>
<td>OTOKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4-4. Watashi-tachi ga nobotta</td>
<td>YAMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4-5. Sono kiji ga deta</td>
<td>SHIMBUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4-6. Kyonen kakatta</td>
<td>BYOOKI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4-7. Senshuu atta</td>
<td>HITO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4-8. John ga iru</td>
<td>UNDOO-JOO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4-9. Ano teeburu no aru</td>
<td>HEYA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4-10. Sakurada-san ga korosareta</td>
<td>YAKUZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4-11. Watashi ga hon o motte-kite-moratta</td>
<td>TOMODACHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4-12. Chuu-tou-sensoo ga okotta</td>
<td>1967-NEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4-13. Sakura no hana ga sakuh</td>
<td>SHI-GATSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4-14. Watashi ga Nihon ni kita</td>
<td>KOTOSHI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

wa doko desu ka?
wa takai desu.
kara o-miyage o moratta.
no naka de ichiban ookii
no wa Fuji-san desu.
wa moo uri-kiremashita.
de shinda.
wa yuumei-na eiga-haiyu da.
da dare demo tsukaemasu.
wa semai.
wa keimusho ni haitta koto
ga aru.
wa Shinjuku ni sunde-iru.
ni watashi wa Kairei ni ita.
kara kikoo ga yoku narimasu.
wa bukka wa ima hodo
takaku-nakatta.
2-4-1. Where is the beach which you went to?
2-4-2. The shelf on which I put it is high up.
2-4-3. I received a present from the man to whom you showed the picture.
2-4-4. Of all the mountains which we have climbed, Fuji-san is the biggest.
2-4-5. The newspaper in which that article appeared has already sold out.
2-4-6. He died of an illness which he contracted last year.
2-4-7. The person I met last week is a famous movie star.
2-4-8. Anyone may use the playing field where John is (standing).
2-4-9. That room, with the table in it, is small.
2-4-10. The gangster by whom Sakurada-san was killed has spent time in prison.
2-4-11. The friend whom I asked to bring the book lives in Shinjuku.
2-4-12. In 1967, when the Middle East War broke out, I was in Cairo.
2-4-13. The weather improves from April when the cherry trees blossom.
2-4-14. At the beginning of this year, when I came to Japan, prices were not as high as they are now.

In some cases, where the verb of the modifying phrase is transitive, there is the possibility of ambiguity unless the modifying phrase also contains a direct object.

Thus for example:
2-4-15. Watashi ga oita teeburu wa ookii desu.
2-4-16. Watashi ga ireta hako wa doko desu ka?
Sentence 2-4-15 could mean:

(a) The table on which I placed it is large.
(b) The table which I placed (somewhere) is large.

Sentence 2-4-16 could mean:

(a) Where is the box I put it into?
(b) Where is the box which I put (into something)?

The absence of a direct object in the modifying phrases permits two interpretations based on two different underlying C.S.'s for each sentence.

2-4-15.
(a) Watashi ga teeburu o oita.
(b) Watashi ga teeburu ni oita.

2-4-16.
(a) Watashi ga hako o ireta.
(b) Watashi ga hako ni ireta.

Except where the context makes it clear, the only way to avoid this kind of ambiguity when the meaning in (b) is intended is to insert a direct object into the modifying phrase.

For example:

2-4-15'. Watashi ga sore o oita teeburu wa ookii.
(The table on which I placed it is large.)

2-4-16'. Watashi ga sore o oreta hako wa doko desu ka?
(Where is the box I put it into?)
2-5. NF + de deleted from C.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifying Phrase</th>
<th>Modified N.H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-5-1. Anata ga oyogu</td>
<td>UMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5-2. Kodomo-tachi ga asonde-ita</td>
<td>NIWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5-3. Watashi-tachi ga iku</td>
<td>BASU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5-4. Haha ga doresu o koshiraeta</td>
<td>KIJI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5-5. Taroo ga uchi o tateta</td>
<td>KI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5-6. Watashi ga sore o katta</td>
<td>KOGITTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5-7. Shachoo ga soto ni dekaketa</td>
<td>YOOJI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5-8. Nyuusu ga kike-nakatta</td>
<td>ZATSUON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5-9. Kooan-maru ga derare-nakatta</td>
<td>TAIFUU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5-10. John ga gakko ni korare-nakatta</td>
<td>BYOOKI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-5-1. The beach at which you swim is a long way from here, isn't it!
2-5-2. A small bird flew into the garden in which the children were playing.
2-5-3. The bus which we take leaves from there.
2-5-4. The fabric with which mother made the dress is strong material.
2-5-5. The wood with which Taroo built his house is from Hida.
2-5-6. The cheque with which I bought that, I received from father.
2-5-7. The business on which the president left (the office) was only a minor matter.

2-5-8. The static which prevented us from hearing the news was (the result of) jamming by the Soviet Union.

2-5-9. The typhoon which prevented the Kooan-maru from leaving was typhoon No. 11.

2-5-10. The illness which prevented John from coming to school was contagious.

The particle de which indicates quantity

Nominalization can not take place when the noun in the C.S. is followed by the particle de which indicates quantity. Thus:

(a) C.S. Haha to chichi wa futari de eiga o mi ni itta.
    M.S. Futari wa juu-ji ni kaetta.

These cannot be combined in such a way as to produce a sentence containing a modified noun phrase with futari as noun head.

* Haha to chichi ga eiga o mi ni itta futari wa juu-ji ni kaetta.

Similarly with,

(b) C.S. Sensei to seito wa mina de ensoku ni itta.
    M.S. Mina yorokonde-ita.

but,* Sensei to seito ga ensoku ni itta mina yorokonde-ita.
The reason for this is that both futari and mina (and a number of other words which fall into this category) can be subjects. Thus, it is possible to have sentences such as the following:

(c) Eiga o mi ni itta futari wa juu-ji ni kaetta.
(d) Ensoku ni itta mina (wa) yorokonde-ita.

for which the underlying C.S.'s respectively contain futari and mina as subjects.

wa

(c) C.S. Futari ga eiga o mi ni itta.
(d) C.S. Mina (wa) ensoku ni itta.

The ungrammaticalness of (a) and (b) is due to the fact that the C.S. verb appears to have two subjects, one in the surface structure, and the other in the deep structure which is identical to the modified noun head.

The particle de which indicates reason

Nominalization can not take place when the noun in the C.S. is followed by the particle de which indicates reason, and the C.S. verb is in the non-potential negative form.
Hence,

(a) **C.S.** Kooan-maru wa taifuu de de-nakatta.  
**M.S.** Sono taifuu wa taifuu juu-ichi-goo datta.  
but,* Kooan-maru ga de-nakatta taifuu wa taifuu juu-ichi-goo datta.

(b) **C.S.** John wa byooki de gakkoo ni ko-nakatta.  
**M.S.** Sono byooki wa densebyoo datta.  
but,* John ga gakkoo ni ko-nakatta byooki wa densebyoo datta.

Nominalization is possible, however, when the C.S. verb is in the potential form. (See 2-5-9, 2-5-10.)

2-6. **NP + no** deleted from **C.S.**

In the underlying C.S. of the examples in the frame, there is a noun phrase of the form \(\text{NOUN}_1 + \text{NO} + \text{NOUN}_2\). The M.S. contains a noun identical to \(\text{NOUN}_1\) in the C.S., and it is this noun which becomes the noun head of the modified noun phrase.
### Modifying Phrase | Modified N.H.
---|---
2-6-1. | Musuko ga Amerika ni itta | **SENSEI**
2-6-2. | Shuto ga Kyanbera ni aru | **OOSUTORARIA**
2-6-3. | Haha ga kodomo no mendo o mite-iru | **MIPOJIN**
2-6-4. | Yane ni antena ga notte-iru | **UCHI**
2-6-5. | Ushiro ni ookii-na biru ga tatte-iru | **HIGAKAN**
2-6-6. | Soba ni jidoosha ga tomatte-iru | **MISE**

2-6-1. The teacher whose son went to America is Mr. Tanaka.
2-6-2. Australia, whose capital is Canberra, is a beautiful country.
2-6-3. I feel sorry for the widow whose children my mother is looking after.
2-6-4. My house is next to the house with the antenna on the roof.
2-6-5. The place we are aiming at is the cinema, behind which the tall building is standing.
2-6-6. The shop, beside which the car is parked, is the camera shop.

The restrictions on nominalization where *no* is involved can be stated in general semantic terms. As a rule, the nominalization
transformation is only possible, (a), when the NOUN₂ in the
NOUN₁ + NO + NOUN₂ phrase in the C.S. is a readily identifiable
possession of NOUN₁ (such as a friend, or relative, or, as in 2-6-2,
the capital of a country), and (b), when NOUN₂ is a noun denoting a
location in relation to NOUN₁ (examples 2-6-4 to 2-6-6).

Thus, nominalization can not take place with the following
sentences:

(i) C.S. Tomodachi no Setoo-san ga kita.
M.S. Sono tomodachi to nomi ni itta.
but,* Setoo-san ga kita tomodachi to nomi ni itta.

The phrase *tomodachi no Setoo-san can be paraphrased as *tomodachi dearu
Setoo-san, where Setoo-san is clearly not a "possession" of tomodachi.

(ii) C.S. Eigo no sensei ni atta.
M.S. Eigo wa muzukashii.
but,* Sensei ni atta Eigo wa muzukashii.

The phrase *Eigo no sensei can be paraphrased as *Eigo o oshieru sensei,
where sensei is clearly not a possession of Eigo.

(iii) C.S. Ki no uchi ga tatte-iru.
M.S. Sono ki wa Hida no mono desu.
but,* Uchi ga tatte-iru ki wa Hida no mono desu.
The phrase *ki no uchi* can be paraphrased as *ki de dekita uchi*, where *uchi* is clearly not a possession of *ki*.

(iv) C.S. Watashi wa sensei no kuruma de itta.
M.S. Sono sensei wa okane-mochi da.

but:* Watashi ga kuruma de itta sensei wa okane-mochi da.

The phrase *sensei no kuruma* can be paraphrased as *sensei ga motte-iru kuruma*, where *kuruma* clearly is a possession of *sensei*. We can only surmise that the reason nominalization cannot take place in (iv) is that *kuruma* is not a readily identifiable possession of *sensei* in the same way as *okusan* or *musuko*. In order to express in Japanese the English sentence, "The teacher, whose car I travelled in, is rich", it would be necessary to produce a sentence such as,

Watashi ga kuruma ni nosete-moratta sensei wa okane-mochi da.
(The teacher, whom I got to give me a lift, is rich.)
### Modifying Phrase | Modified N.H.
--- | ---
2-7-1. Shachoo ga issho-ni paatii ni kita ONNA-NO-HITO | wa geisha da.
2-7-2. Bokushi ga issho-ni inotta KAISHUU | wa futatsu no mura kara kita hito-tachi da.
2-7-3. Watashi ga sono jigyoo o issho-ni yatta HITO | wa yuumei-na keizai-gakusha da.
2-7-4. Musuko ga (issho-ni)tawamurete-iru INU | wa korii da.
2-7-5. Kodomo ga (issho-ni) asonde-iru TOMODACHI | wa Suzuki-san no musume desu.
2-7-6. Tomodachi ga kekkon-shita HITO | wa Doitsu-jin da.
2-7-7. Kare ga seiji-teki-ni tsunagatte-iru HITO | wa Satoo Eisaku da.
2-7-8. Kare no haha ga wakareta KODOMO | wa moo ookiku natte-iru.
2-7-9. Watashi no musume ga koosai-suru HITO | wa kane-mochi denakereba dame da.
2-7-1. The woman with whom the company president went to the party is a geisha.

2-7-2. The congregation with whom the minister prayed is composed of people from two villages.

2-7-3. The person with whom I carried out that task is a famous economist.

2-7-4. The dog with which my son is playing is a collie.

2-7-5. The friend with whom my child is playing is Suzuki-san's daughter.

2-7-6. The person with whom my friend got married is a German.

2-7-7. The person with whom he is linked politically is Satoo Eisaku.

2-7-8. The child from whom his mother parted has already grown up.

2-7-9. The person with whom my daughter associates must be rich.

The frame is divided into three sections. Sentences 2-7-1 to 2-7-3 are ungrammatical without the verb modifier issho-ni in the embedded C.S. Where the verb in the C.S. is one of the large group that includes kuru (to come), iku (to go), inoru (to pray), taberu (to eat), yaru (to do), suru (to do), ovoru (to swim) etc. (i.e., verbs which do not normally imply more than one participant), nominalization cannot occur unless issho-ni is present in the C.S.

For example,

C.S. Shachoo wa onna-no-hito to paatii ni kita.

M.S. Sono onna-no-hito wa geisha da.

but,* Shachoo ga paatii ni kita onna-no-hito wa geisha da.
Sentences 2-7-4 and 2-7-5 include the verb modifier issho-ni as an optional element in the embedded C.S. The phrase issho-ni may occur as an optional element when the verb of the C.S. is one of a very small number of verbs which include tawamareru (to play) and asobu (to play). These verbs often imply more than one participant.

Sentences 2-7-6 to 2-7-9 would be ungrammatical if the C.S. included the verb modifier issho-ni. The C.S. verbs in these examples always imply more than one participant. Verbs which belong to this category include tsumagaru (to be linked to), wakareru (to part from), koosai-suru (to associate with), tsuki-au (to keep company with), kekkon-suru (to marry), rikon-suru (to divorce), su (to meet), niru (to resemble).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifying Phrase</th>
<th>Modified N.H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-8-1. Tomodachi ga ochita</td>
<td>HADO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8-2. Watashi ga hon o karita</td>
<td>SENSEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8-3. Yuruyaka-na kaigan-sen ga nobite-iru</td>
<td>INUBOSAKI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8-4. Tateo-yoo no nai kyoofu ga umareta</td>
<td>HASEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8-5. Watashi ga deta</td>
<td>UCHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8-6. Haha ga shuppatsu-shita</td>
<td>KI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

wa san-gai ni aru.
wa Furansu-go o oshiete-iru.
wa Chiba-ken ni aru.
wa 1945-nen, 8-gatsu, 15-nichi deshita.
wa asoko ni aru.
wa Shinjuku desu.
2-8-1. The window from which my friend fell is on the third floor.
2-8-2. The teacher from whom I borrowed the book teaches French.
2-8-3. Inuboosaki, from which the gentle coastline stretches, is in Chiba Prefecture.
2-8-4. The defeat, from which resulted fear beyond compare, occurred on August 15, 1945.
2-8-5. The house from which I left is over there.
2-8-6. The station from which mother departed was Shinjuku.

The underlying C.S.'s for each of these examples contains the noun (identical to the modified noun head) followed by the particle kara, which indicates a source or point of origin. The underlying C.S.'s for 2-8-5 and 2-8-6 could also be:

2-8-5'. Watashi ga uchi o deta.
2-8-6'. Haha ga eki o shuppatsu-shita.

Since, however, it makes little difference to the meaning of such sentences whether the particle is o or kara, there is no ambiguity in the resulting modified noun phrases.

Nominalization is not possible when the C.S. verb is one of the following verbs of motion: iku (to go), kuru (to come), kaeru (to return), modoru (to return), mairu (to come, go).
For example:

(a) C.S. Ani wa Tookyoo kara itta.
    M.S. Tookyoo wa nigiyaka da.

    but,* Ani ga itta Tookyoo wa nigiyaka da.

This sentence is, in fact, grammatical, but it is not related to the C.S. in (a). The C.S. for this sentence is,

    Ani ga Tookyoo ni itta.

(b) C.S. Kare wa Nihon kara kita.
    M.S. Nihon wa tooi kuni da.

    but,* Kare ga kita Nihon wa tooi kuni da.

This sentence is also grammatical, but again the particle in the underlying C.S. is not kara, but ni.

Ambiguity can sometimes arise with the verb kiku, which has the two meanings of "to hear" and "to ask". Thus, for example, the following sentence,

2-3-7. Watashi ga sore o kiita hito wa soko ni iru.

could mean (i) The man from whom I heard it is there.
    (ii) The man of whom I asked it is there.
The underlying C.S. for 2-3-7 could be the same for both interpretations:

C.S. Watashi wa sore o (sono) hito ni kiita.

which is itself ambiguous, having the two meanings,

(i) I heard it from the man.

(ii) I asked it of the man.

There is no way of avoiding this ambiguity once nominalization has taken place even if the underlying C.S. is the unambiguous sentence,

C.S. Watashi ga sore o sono hito kara kiita.

which means, "I heard it from the man".

Thus, at least as far as the verb kiku is concerned, the deletion of particles along with the C.S. noun can have the effect of obscuring the intended meaning.
In O-NOM a certain noun in the M.S. becomes the head of the modified noun phrase which is the embedded C.S. Unlike I-NOM, however, the C.S. does not contain a noun identical to the noun head. Teramura has noted that it is the particular semantic property of the noun head which makes this type of noun modifying construction possible.¹ Two major subdivisions can be made within O-NOM depending on the semantic relationship between the noun head and the C.S. by which it is modified.

1. The modified noun head (a constituent of the underlying M.S.) expresses the content or theme of the C.S. Teramura describes this as a "content-theme relation".² An example of the content-theme relation is seen in the following sentence.

3-1. Jinrui ga tsuki e iku yume no sude-ni jitsugen sareta.

(The dream of man reaching the moon has already been realised.)

A feature of sentences of this kind is that the modified noun phrase can be converted into a topic-predicate type sentence, although this must be further supplemented by koto da, mono da or tokoro da (depending

¹ Teramura, op cit, page 67.
² ibid, page 68.
on the topic noun in question). For example, the modified phrase
jinrui ga tsuki e iku yume can be converted into the sentence,

Yume wa jinrui ga tsuki e iku koto da.

(This sentence is itself derived through 0-NOM.)

2. The modified noun head does not express the content
of the C.S., but of the M.S. or other material completely outside
of the sentence. Teramura calls this a "relative relation". The
following sentences illustrate the relative relation.

3-2. Kare ga seikai ni haitta riyuu wa chichi no ishi o
tsuga-nakereba nara-nakatta kara desu.
(The reason he entered politics was that he had to
follow his father's wishes.)

3-3. Sore wa kare ga seikai ni haitta riyuu desu.
(That is the reason he entered politics.)

In 3-2, riyuu expresses the content of the predicate, not of the
modifying phrase kare ga seikai ni haitta. In 3-3, riyuu expresses
the content of material outside of the sentence altogether.

Where there is a relative relation, the modified noun phrase
can not be converted into a topic-predicate type sentence.

*Riyuu wa kare ga seikai ni haitta koto da.

3. ibid, page 71.
Content-Theme Relation

There are two sub-divisions within the content-theme relation.

(a) The modifying phrase (that is, the C.S.) describes the 'object of conception' expressed in the modified noun. In constructions of this kind, the connecting phrase to yuu is often inserted between the modifying phrase and the modified noun head. The effect of to yuu is to make clear the fact that the noun head expresses the content of the modifying phrase. In some instances, the absence of to yuu can lead to ambiguity. For example, the phrase,

3-4. Mishima ga jisatsu-shita jiken

could mean (i) The Mishima suicide affair.

(ii) The event which led to Mishima's suicide.

The interpretation in (ii) is possible because 3-4 can reflect the inner relationship, having the underlying sentence,

(Sono) jiken de Mishima ga jisatsu-shita.

If the connecting phrase to yuu is inserted between the modifying phrase and the modified noun head jiken, 3-4 is capable of only one interpretation:

3-4'. Mishima ga jisatsu-shita to yuu jiken.

(The Mishima suicide affair.)

4. ibid, page 69.
The insertion of to yuu makes it clear that jiken expresses the content of the modifying phrase.

The connecting phrase to yuu may be inserted optionally (as in 3-4), or obligatorily. The rules governing the optional or obligatory insertion of to yuu depend partly on the structure of the modifying phrase, and partly on the modified noun itself. If the noun head is one of the group of nouns which include jooken (condition), kako (past), iitsutae (saying), tegami (letter), iken (opinion), zentei (premise), kiboo (aspiration) etc., the insertion of to yuu is obligatory. It is also obligatory when the modifying phrase ends in da, dearu, daroo, kamo-shire-nai.

The frames below are divided according to the meaning associated with the modified noun head. In 3-5, the frame contains nouns denoting facts or events. In 3-6, the frame contains nouns which are associated with statements, whilst in 3-7 the nouns in the frame refer to some kind of mental activity. The connecting phrase to yuu is optional where it occurs in parentheses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifying Phrase</th>
<th>Modified N.H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-5-1. Kennedy ga ansatsu-sareta</td>
<td>(to yuu) NYUUSU wa zen-sekai o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>odorokaseta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5-2. Kodomo ga tsume o kami</td>
<td>(to yuu) KUSE wa aijoo no fusoku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o imi-suru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5-3. Mishima Yukio ga jisatsu-shita</td>
<td>(to yuu) JIKEN wa mada mimi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>atarashii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5-4. Nihon ga Amerika no teki-koku</td>
<td>to yuu JIJITSU wa kaeru koto ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>datta</td>
<td>decki-nai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5-5. Ningen ga ikiru ni hitsuyoo-</td>
<td>to yuu JOOKEN ga mitasare-nai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na shokumotsu o motsu</td>
<td>kuni mo sekai ni aru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5-6. Zen-sekai ga o-tagai ni teki</td>
<td>to yuu KAKO wa moo wasurerarera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to natte tatakatta</td>
<td>ru beki da.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3-5-1. The news that Kennedy had been assassinated shook the whole world.
3-5-2. The habit children have of biting their nails signifies a lack of affection.
3-5-3. The Mishima Yukio suicide affair is still fresh in our minds.
3-5-4. The fact that Japan was America's enemy can not be changed.
3-5-5. There are countries in the world where the provision that "human beings should have the essential food to survive" is not fulfilled.

3-5-6. The past, in which the countries of the world fought each other as enemies, is something that should be forgotten.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifying Phrase</th>
<th>Modified N.H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-6-1. Kanojo ga o-yome ni iku (to yuu)</td>
<td>HANASHI wa uso datta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6-2. Kare ga shuushoku-shiken ni pasu-shita (to yuu)</td>
<td>SHIRASE wa kazoku o yorokobasetta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6-3. Issho-ni hiru-meshi o taberu (to yuu)</td>
<td>YAKUSOKU o shita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6-4. Rorerai ni utsukushii otome ga arawareru</td>
<td>YITSUTAE wa ooku no hitobito ni shirarete-iru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6-5. Chichi ga shigoto de joopyoo-suru (to yuu)</td>
<td>TEGAMI ga kesa todoita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6-6. Kanojo ga o-yome niiku kamoshire-nai (to yuu)</td>
<td>HANASHI ga atta.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3-6-1. The story that she is going to be married was a lie.

3-6-2. The news that he had passed the vocational exam delighted his family.
3-6-3. We made an appointment to have lunch together.

3-6-4. The legend, telling of a beautiful maiden who appears on the Lorelei, is known to a lot of people.

3-6-5. The letter, saying that father would be coming to Tokyo on business, arrived this morning.

3-6-6. I hear that she may be getting married.

3-7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifying Phrase</th>
<th>Modified N.H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-7-1. Kono semmon-gakkoo o daigaku ni shookaku-saseru</td>
<td>(to yuu) KANGAE wa kare ga dashita mono da.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7-2. Watashi ga shooshin-suru</td>
<td>(to yuu) NOZOMI ga nai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7-3. Shachoo ga sekinin o toru beki da</td>
<td>to yuu IKEN ga dai-tasu datta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7-4. Nihon ga en o kiri-ageru</td>
<td>to yuu ZENTEI no moto ni hanashi wa susumerareta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7-5. Musuko ga kaette-kuru</td>
<td>to yuu KIBOO ga haha-oya o sukutta.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3-7-1. It was he who put forth the idea that this professional school be raised to the status of a university.

3-7-2. There is no hope of my being promoted.

3-7-3. The opinion that the president should take responsibility was held by the majority.
3-7-4. The discussions proceeded on the basis that Japan would revalue the yen.

3-7-5. It was the hope that her son would return that kept the mother alive.

The modified noun phrases in 3-5 to 3-7 can be converted into topic-predicate type sentences supplemented by koto da or mono da (but not tokoro da). For example:

3-5-1. Kennedy ga ansatsu-sareta nyuusu...
   Nyuusu wa Kennedy ga ansatsu-sareta koto da.

3-6-5. Chichi ga shigoto de jookyo-suru to yuu tegami...
   Tegami wa chichi ga jookyo-suru to yuu mono da.

**koto**

Teramura includes koto amongst the nouns which occur in constructions of the content-theme type. It is true that in certain types of constructions koto can be said to express the content of the modifying phrase. For example:

(a) Kare ga Amerika ni itta (to yuu) koto o kiita.
   (I heard that he went to America.)

---

5. Teramura, op cit, page 69.
There are others, however, where this content-theme relation is of little significance. For example:

(b) Roshia-go o hanasu koto ga dekiru.
   (I can speak Russian.)

Furthermore, the insertion of the connecting phrase to_ymu is not always obligatory when the C.S. verb is dearu.

(c) Ano hito ga Roshia-jin dearu koto wa tashika-da.
   (It is certain that he is a Russian.)

For these reasons, and because of its functional similarity to the nominalizing morpheme no both koto and no are treated in a separate category (Chapter IV).

(b) The second type of pattern within the content-theme relation is that in which the modifying phrase refers to the object of perception. 6 Where the phrase to_ymu can be added in these kinds of sentences, it retains its full lexical meaning of "to say" and therefore must be distinguished from the connecting phrase to_ymu which was discussed under (a).

The modified noun in each of these examples has a feature which might be described as physical perceptibility associated with one of the senses of sight, smell or hearing.

6. ibid, page 70.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifying Phrase</th>
<th>Modified N.H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-8-1. Nami ga iwa ni oshi-yosete-iru</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8-2. Watashi ga sukeeto o shite-iru</td>
<td>SHASHIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8-3. Pan ni bataa o tsuketa</td>
<td>NIOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8-4. Roofuufu ga itawari-atte-iru</td>
<td>SUGATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8-5. Koodai-na sabaku ni yuuki ga ochiru</td>
<td>KOOKI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8-6. Kono choookoku wa inu ga hashitte-iru</td>
<td>KATACHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8-7. Dare-ka ga doa o nokku-suru</td>
<td>OTOKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8-8. Burakkku suwan ga oyoide-iru</td>
<td>HAIKEI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3-8-1. The picture of the waves washing against the rocks got first prize.
3-8-2. Did you see the photo of me skating?
3-8-3. I like the smell of butter spread on bread.
3-8-4. There is nothing more beautiful than the sight of an aged couple caring for each other.
3-8-5. The scene of the sun sinking into the vast desert is peculiar to Australia.
3-8-6. This carving is in the shape of a dog running.
3-8-7. I heard the sound of someone knocking at the door.
3-8-8. The background, in which the black swans are swimming, is particularly life-like in this photograph.
When to yuu is inserted between the modifying phrase and the modified noun head in a sentence of the kind in 3-8, it does not have the effect of relating the content of the modifying phrase to the noun, as in 3-5 to 3-7, but retains its original meaning of "to say". For example:

3-8-1'. Nami ga iwa ni oshi-yosete-iru to yuu e ga ittoo ni natta.
(The painting which they say shows the waves washing against the rocks got first prize.)

3-8-2'. Watashi ga sukeeto o shite-iru to yuu shashin o mimashita-ka?
(Have you seen the photograph which is said to show me skating?)

3-8-3'. Pan ni bataa o tsuketa to yuu nioi ga suki da.
(I like the smell which is said to be that of butter spread on bread.)

A case could be made out for considering sentences 3-8-1 and 3-8-2 as examples of I-NOM. According to the criteria which have so far been applied, they would have to be regarded as 0-NOM because the underlying C.S.'s for each do not contain a noun, identical to the modified noun head, as a constituent.

3-8-1. C.S.* E \[\text{ga} \]
\[
\text{nami ga iwa ni oshi-yosete-iru.}
\]

3-8-2. C.S.* Shashin \[\text{ga} \]
\[
\text{watashi ga sukeeto o shite-iru.}
\]
If, however, the combination of particles で + わ are inserted after で and シャシン in the above tentative C.S.'s, they become grammatical sentences.

3-8-1. C.S. で-わに名がいわに押し寄せ-いる。
3-8-2. C.S. シャシンで-わに私があくとおするもし-いる。

This evidence suggests that the underlying C.S.'s for 3-8-1 and 3-8-2 may, in fact, contain a noun identical to the modified noun head, and that the grammatical status of this noun is indicated by で after which わ is obligatorily inserted. Since acceptance of this theory would, however, probably necessitate setting up various levels of deep structure, it would seem simpler, as we have done, to regard 3-8-1 and 3-8-2 as examples of 0-NOM.

The modifying noun phrases in 3-8 can be converted into topic-predicate sentences supplemented by ところだ or ものだ.

3-8-1. 名がいわに押し寄せ-いるも。
   (その)でわに名がいわに押し寄せ-いるところだ。
3-8-3. 床にバタオつけたにおい。
   (その)においに床にバタオつけたものだ。

Relative Relation

Many of the nouns which appear in this type of construction
express some kind of relative relation; a spatial relation, a
temporal relation or a cause and effect relation. More important,
however, is the fact that the modified noun head does not express
the content of the modifying phrase, as in the content-theme relation.
In the relative relation, the modified noun head expresses the
content either of the M.S. or of some statement or proposition which
is not contained in the sentence that includes the modified noun head.
The connecting phrase to you cannot be inserted between the modifying
phrase and the noun head under any circumstances.

3-9. The modified noun head is a spatio-relational noun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifying Phrase</th>
<th>Modified N.H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-9-2. Kanai ga suwatte-ita</td>
<td>USHIRO de kodomo ga mari de asonde-ita.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3-9-1. Yoshida-san lives above us.

3-9-2. The child was playing with a ball behind (the place) where
my wife was sitting.

7. ibid, page 71.
3-9-3. Suddenly, before everyone's eyes, he stood on his head.

3-9-4. There is a river flowing beneath (the place) where we are walking.

3-9-5. There is a motor bicycle travelling to the right of where the car is travelling.

3-9-6. Somebody fell down directly to the left of where I was walking.

Sentences of the type in 3-9, which contain a modified noun phrase with a spatio-relational noun as noun head, can sometimes be ambiguous. The ambiguity arises from the fact that such sentences are theoretically deriveable through either I-NOM or O-NOM, and thus have two different sets of underlying sentences. For example:

3-9-2. Kanai ga suwatte-ita ushiro de kodomo ga mari de asonde-ita.

As a sentence derived through O-NOM, 3-9-2 has the meaning indicated in the translation already given. The underlying sentences are,

C.S. Kanai ga suwatte-ita.

M.S. Sono ushiro de kodomo ga mari de asonde-ita.

As a sentence derived through I-NOM, however, 3-9-2 has the meaning, "My wife was sitting at the back, where the child was playing with a ball." The underlying sentences are:
C.S. Kanai ga ushiro de suwatte-ita.

M.S. Ushiro de kodomo ga mari de asonde-ita.

(Where *ushiro* in the C.S. and *ushiro* in the M.S. have identity of reference.)

It should be noted, however, that sentences of the type in 3-9 are normally interpreted in a way that assumes a derivation through C-NOM.

3-10. The modified noun head expresses a temporal relation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifying Phrase</th>
<th>Modified N.H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-10-1. Newton ga inryoku a hakken-shita</td>
<td>MAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-10-2. Anata ga kaetta sukoshi</td>
<td>ATO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-10-3. Kare ga watashi o tazunete-kita</td>
<td>AKURU-HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-10-4. Watashi ga Tokyoo ni kita</td>
<td>YOKU-NEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3-10-1. (Even) before Newton discovered gravity the Bible had made reference to it.

3-10-2. The teacher came just a short while after you left.

3-10-3. The day after he came to visit me it rained very heavily.

3-10-4. The child was born the year following my arrival in Tokyo.
3-11. The noun head expresses a non-spatial, non-temporal relation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifying Phrase</th>
<th>Modified N.H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-11-1. En no kiri-age ga yookyuu-sareru</td>
<td>HAIKEI ni wa Beikoku no kokusai-shuushi ga aks-ji ni natte-iru jijitsu ga aru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-11-2. Kodomo ga furyooka-suru</td>
<td>GEN'IN wa ooku wa katei ni aru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-11-3. Yushutsu-nyuu ga fukinkoo ni natta</td>
<td>KEKKA wa Nihon wa en no kiri-age o senarareta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-11-4. Kare ga jibun no uchi ni hi o tsuketa</td>
<td>WAKE wa dare mo shira-nai.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3-11-1. Behind the demands for the revaluation of the yen is the fact that the American balance of payments is in the red.

3-11-2. Many of the causes of juvenile delinquency are to be found in the home.

3-11-3. As a result of the imbalance in imports and exports, Japan is being pressed to revalue the yen.

3-11-4. Nobody knows why he set fire to his own house.

It is the semantic properties of a noun which determine the type of construction in which it can occur (content-theme relation or relative relation). As Teramura indicates, however, some nouns may
possess more than one set of semantic properties and thus be capable of occurring in both types of constructions. The word raison (reason) is one such noun.

Relative relation


(The reason I couldn't work was that I had not slept for 24 hours.)

Content-theme relation

3-13. Kare ga 24-jikan nemure-nakatta (to you) raison o watashi wa shoonin deki-nakatta.

(I could not accept the reason that he had not slept for 24 hours.)

The noun raison may also be found in sentences derived through I-NOM. For example:

3-14. Kare ga watashi ni setsumei-shita raison wa shigoto ga amari-nimo okatta to you koto desu.

(The reason he gave me was that there had been too much work to do.)

---

8. ibid, page 73.
Makino treats the morpheme *soo* as a non-abstract nominalizer in sentences such as the following:


*(I heard that Tanaka will study linguistics.)*

Thus, Makino considers the clause *Tanaka ga gengo-gaku o benkyoo-suru* to be a sentence embedded as a noun phrase with *soo* as noun head. There is evidence to suggest, however, that *soo* does not function as a noun.

The distribution of *soo* is extremely limited, being restricted to the following environments:

(a) verb + *soo* + *dearu* (*da*)
(b) adjective + *soo* + *dearu* (*da*)
(c) qualitative noun + *da* + *soo* + *dearu* (*da*)

The fact that *soo* is never followed by a particle, but always occurs before *dearu* or *da*, distinguishes it from nouns in Japanese. Furthermore, the normal morpho-phonemic change of *da* to *na*, in the sequence *da* + noun does not take place with *da* + *soo*.

(i) * Ano hito wa kirei-da hito da.
Ano hito wa kirei-na hito da.

(ii) Ano hito wa kirei-da soo da.
* Ano hito wa kirei-na soo da.

Since soo does not meet the requirements of a noun, 3-15 can not be considered an example of 0-NOM. We would treat soo as a final particle, obligatorily followed by dearu (or da), and having the function of indicating hearsay or second-hand reports.

mono and koto as final particles

A distinction also needs to be made between the functions of mono and koto as nouns, and as final particles. As final particles, both mono and koto impart to sentences in which they occur, meanings which are unrelated to their usual meanings as ordinary nouns. Furthermore, their distribution is limited to the same few environments as soo above.

The final particle mono has a number of uses, such as:

(i) to indicate past habitual activity
Ano toki wa yoku shikarareta mono da.
(In those days I was often scolded.)
(ii) to indicate mild admonition

Gakusei wa motto majime-ni benkyoo-suru mono da.

(Students should study more seriously.)

(iii) to indicate a natural or logical relationship

Ano hito wa kirei-da mono da kara tsunto-shite-iru.

(She is stuck-up because she is pretty.)

In (iii), mono is preceded by da, and not the morpho-phonemic variant form na which normally occurs before nouns. The noun mono, which means "thing", can not be preceded by da, but only na.

Kirei na mono da. (It is a pretty thing.)

Similarly, koto, the final particle, which is used as a kind of intensifier, should be distinguished from the noun koto which means "matter" or "fact".

(a) Taihen-na koto da. (koto = noun)

(It is a dreadful thing.)

(b) Taihen-da koto da. (koto = final particle)

(How dreadful!)

In informal speech, da may be deleted after final particle mono.
It may also be deleted after final particle *koto* in female speech.

*Gakusei wa motto benkyoo suru mono.*

*Taihen da koto.*

In the following chapter, we turn our attention to the nominalizing morphemes *no* and *koto.*
CHAPTER IV

Introduction

In this chapter we examine the role of no and koto in Japanese nominalization. Before presenting the distributional frames, however, it will first be necessary to present a general outline of their functions.

General Function

Both no and koto have the function of converting a sentence, embedded in another sentence, into an abstract noun phrase. By "abstract", we mean that no and koto do not participate as full lexically meaningful units within the resulting noun phrase, but serve rather as the grammatical devices or nominalizers by which sentences are converted into noun phrases. The process involved in this conversion is O-NOM, but because it can not be so readily identified with any of the semantically determined subdivisions suggested by Teramura, it will be treated as a separate category of O-NOM.

1. See page 41 ff.
General Characteristics

The findings presented here suggest that there are three major types of constructions containing clauses nominalized by no or koto.

1. Constructions in which the choice of no or koto is fixed by the syntactic environment.

2. Constructions in which the choice of no or koto depends on the semantic interpretation of a particular lexical item in the sentence.

3. Nominalized clauses in which there are no syntactic restrictions on the interchangeability of no and koto.

Where there is a conscious choice of one or the other nominalizer in constructions of type 3, it would not be unreasonable to assume that this is related to the distribution of the nominalizers within constructions of types 1 and 2. In other words, the deliberate choice of, say koto, in a certain situation, where syntactically no might be equally acceptable, could be determined by association with the particular types of constructions in which koto only may occur.

It is necessary, first, to determine the general semantic characteristics of constructions containing nominalized clauses of types 1 and 2. With some exceptions, these can be stated in the
following terms:

(a) The nominalizer koto occurs in sentences which refer to some kind of mental or communicative activity. In other words, the clause nominalized by koto denotes some event or state which is expressed in an abstract, conceptual context.

(b) The nominalizer no occurs in sentences which refer to physically observable events or phenomena. The clause nominalized by no denotes some event or state which is expressed in a concrete, perceptual context.²

Whether an event or state is conceived as abstract or concrete seems to depend largely on the particular lexical items occurring in the M.S. Thus, if the M.S. verb is one which expresses the idea of communication or reporting, the nominalized clause, even if it refers to a physically perceiveable concrete event, will take koto.³ This would seem to be because events themselves can not be communicated, only the fact of their occurrence.

Another difference between no and koto is the way they derive from underlying sentences.

---

2. These findings are corroborated by those of S. Kuno, Page 13 of "Notes on Japanese Grammar, Part 1". The Computation Laboratory of Harvard University, Mathematical Linguistics and Automatic Translation Report No. NSF-27 to The National Science Foundation; Principal Investigator Susumu Kuno, Cambridge, Massachusetts, November 1970.

3. See page 92.
4-1. (a) Anata ga kuru **koto** o shira-nakatta.
   (b) Anata ga kuru **no** o shira-nakatta.

(I didn't know that you were coming.)

The underlying sentences for 4-1 (a) are:

C.S. Anata ga kuru.
M.S. Sono **koto** o shira-nakatta.

Thus, the nominalizer **koto** exists as a lexical constituent of the M.S.

The underlying sentences for 4-1 (b) are:

C.S. Anata ga kuru.
M.S. Sore o shira-nakatta.

The nominalizer **no** does not exist as a constituent of the M.S. To explain the appearance of **no** in sentences such as 4-1 (b), it may be necessary to posit a hypothetical form *sono no* underlying *sore* in the M.S. When the C.S. is inserted in the M.S. *sono* is deleted, leaving **no** at the head of the noun phrase.

This derivational difference between **no** and **koto** could also be related to the distributional difference in constructions of types 1 and 2. In particular, the derivation of **koto** as a lexical item meaning "matter" or "fact" probably accounts for its occurrence in contexts involving abstract conception.
The problem is whether it is possible (a), to identify the linguistic or situational contexts which determine the choice of nominalizer in constructions of type 3, and (b), to capture and describe the differences in nuance, if any, implicit in the use of one or the other nominalizer. Unfortunately, the findings remain a little inconclusive. Of the three informants consulted by the writer, none were able to state consistently what they felt to be the differences in usage between no and koto in constructions where the syntactic context permitted either. The informants, however, agreed that:

(i) use of the nominalizer koto is characteristic of "formal" speech, whilst no is more frequent in "informal", colloquial speech, and (ii) there is a wide range of ideolectic variation even amongst speakers of the standard Tokyo dialect.

"Formal" speech was defined as that which is used by radio and television newsreaders, interviewers, politicians, ministers of religion, and speech-makers in general. It could be said that because such people address themselves to audiences rather than individuals, what they say tends to include a relatively large proportion of generalizations. On the other hand, the utterances of people engaged in informal conversation are related more to what is familiar and immediate, rather than to general concepts and evaluations. In other words, there could be a connection between the nominalizer koto and contexts dealing with generalizations, and between the nominalizer no and contexts concerned with specific or immediate realities. This
certainly appears to be the case in many sentences where the nominalized clause is subject.4

For example, if a teacher, addressing a class of diligent students, wishes to advise them of the possible risks to their health caused by studying very late at night, he would probably say something like:

4-2. Osoku made benkyoo-suru koto wa kenkoo ni yoku-arimasen.

(It is not good for your health to study late at night.)

There is no syntactic restriction on the occurrence of no in 4-2, but koto sounds more natural and certainly more effective.

In a less formal context, a mother observing her son's dedication to study, even late at night, and fearing the effects on his physical well-being, might be prompted to say to him, while he is sitting at his desk:

4-3. Osoku made benkyoo-suru no wa karada ni warui no yo.

(It is not good for you to be studying late.)

There is no syntactic restriction on the occurrence of koto in 4-3, but no sounds natural and familiar. A person of a more conservative and formal disposition might, however, prefer to use koto in 4-3.

Unfortunately, there is no way of distinguishing clearly between ideolect and the general standard of usage.

4. See pages 75-82.
Examples 4-15-24 and 4-15-25 below are constructions of type 3, in that both no and koto are syntactically possible; but if one were forced to make a choice it would probably be no. This is because the nominalized clauses appear to refer to situations which are of immediate concern; in 4-15-24, the possibility of kare leaving the company, and in 4-15-25, the son's waywardness in not seeking permission to go out.

4-15-24. Kare ga kaisha o yameru no (koto) wa kare no higoro no shugi to mujun-shite-iru.

4-15-25. Chichi wa musuko ga mudan de gaishutsu-suru no (koto) ga ki ni i-ra-nai.

If, on the other hand, the nominalized clauses were intended to be expressions of potential eventualities, then koto might be preferable, because the sentences would then be generalizations.

Kuno has also remarked on the fact that, in some instances, the nominalized clause may determine the choice of nominalizer. He cites examples where the nominalized clause contains a proposition which can not be a concrete event. In these sentences, according to Kuno, koto is preferable to no.

---

5. See page 80.

6. In this context *? is to be interpreted as meaning "awkward". All three informants consulted by the writer were agreed that use of no in 4-4 and 4-5 did not result in grammatically unacceptable constructions, but that koto was preferable for stylistic reasons.
4-4. Ningen ga hane no nai nihon-ashi no doobutsu dearu \text{no}^{*?}\text{ koto}\)
wa shuuchi no jijitsu desu.

(It is a well-known fact that man is a wingless, two-legged animal.)

4-5. John ga jussai dearu \text{no}^{*?}\text{ koto}\) wa tashika desu.

(It is certain that John is ten years old.)

It may not be possible to analyse every sentence of type 3 in terms of general versus specific (or, abstract versus concrete), especially those where the grammatical status of the nominalized clause is other than subject. In these instances, one must fall back on the stylistic distinction between "formal" and "informal", tempering it with the acknowledgement that personal, ideelectic factors are also often involved.

The examples to be presented later are arranged according to the grammatical status of the nominalized clause within the sentence, and the nominalizer that occurs with the nominalized clause.

The Pronoun \text{no}\)

The morpheme \text{no} has a function, namely that of a pronoun, which must be distinguished from its role as a nominalizer.\footnote{See Alfonso, A.; Japanese Language Patterns, Sophia University L.L. Center of Applied Linguistics, Volume I, pages 399 ff. Also Makino, op.cit., pages 47 and 48.}
pronoun, no can substitute for a noun at the head of a modified noun phrase, provided the identity of the noun is clear or can be inferred from the general linguistic context. This pronominalizing function of no is possible with both I-NOM and O-NOM. A division can be made between sentences in which the identity of the noun for which no substitutes is revealed not in the sentence itself, but in the general linguistic or situational context, and those in which it can be inferred from the M.S. of the sentence containing the pronoun no. In the latter case, the sentence is almost always of the topic-predicate type, where the predicate contains the verb dearu or one of its variant forms.

(i) The identity of the substituted noun is revealed outside of the sentence.

I-NOM.

Watashi no rajio wa moo kowaremasita.

4-6. Anata ga motte-iru no wa doo desu ka?

(My radio is broken. How is the one which you have?)

The identity of the noun for which no substitutes in 4-6 is clear from the context of the first sentence. No stands for rajio (radio).

4-5'. Anata ga motte-iru rajio wa doo desu ka?

O-NOM.

A man is showing a friend some photographs, and says:

4-7. Watashi ga sukeeto o shite-iru no wa mada misete-i-nai n desu no.

(I haven't shown you the one of me skating yet, have I?)
In this case, the identity of the noun for which no substitutes is clear from the situational context. No stands for shashin (photograph).

4-7'. Watashi ga sukeeto o shite-iru shashin wa mada misete-i-nai n desu ne.

(ii) The identity of the substituted noun can be inferred from the predicate.

I-NOM.

4-8. Kare ga Nihon ni kita no wa 1971-nen deshita.

(It was in 1971 that he came to Japan.)

The predicate 1971-nen deshita suggests that no substitutes for a noun denoting time, in this case the noun toshi (year), because of nen (year).

4-8'. Kare ga Nihon ni kita toshi wa 1971-nen deshita.

O-NOM.

4-9. Seikoo-shita no wa doryoku shita kara desu.

(Your success is due to your efforts.)

In this sentence, the predicate doryoku-shita kara desu gives the reason for the success. The noun for which no substitutes would, therefore, be a word denoting reason, such as riyuu (reason).

4-9'. Seikoo-shita riyuu wa doryoku-shita kara desu.

Another, somewhat different type of construction in which no can be considered to function as a noun substitute or pronoun, is the
following:

4-10. Biiru no tsumetai no o kudasai.

(Cold beer please.)

In this sentence, no stands for biiru, however it is not possible to have a sentence of the form:

*Biiru no tsumetai biiru o kudasai.

Makino suggests that a sentence such as 4-10 is probably derived from an underlying sentence:

Biiru no naka de tsumetai biiru o kudasai.

To obtain the sentence in 4-10, the second occurrence of biiru is replaced by no with a concomitant deletion of naka de. 8

no da

The no which occurs in the clause final sequence no da
(no desaru) presents somewhat of a problem. Makino treats it in the same way as the nominalizer no, 9 although the traditional view has been to regard it as a kind of final particle. Okatsu, in an earlier publication, 10 also suggests that this no should be considered a type

10. Okatsu, Keiichiro; "'No', no iroiro", in Koko bungo kōza (Lectures on the Colloquial Language); Publication No. 3, Meiji Shoin; page 250.
of noun, however his opinion now seems to be that the no in no da is, in fact, a final particle. 11

The strongest evidence for treating the no in no da as the nominalizer no is the fact that a preceding da is always changed into the morpho-phonemic variant na. For example:

4-11. Kore wa hon na no da.
(This is a book.)

If, however, one treats this as a euphonic change rather than a morpho-phonemic change, then it would seem that the no in no da functions similarly to the final particles koto and mono, which have already been discussed. 12 It adds a special kind of emphatic nuance which is not otherwise present in a sentence. 13 The occurrence of the nominalizer no in other environments does not have this effect.

4-12. Ame ga futte-iru n(o) desu.
(The fact is that it is raining.)

Here, no indicates that the sentence is an explanation of something, possibly a reply to a question asking why one is taking one's umbrella.

12. See page 59.
4-13. Watashi wa kyoo no hoo ga tsugoo ga ii n(o) desu.
(From my point of view, today would be the most convenient.)
Here, no adds an assertive element to the statement.

4-14. Sonna koto o shi-nai n(o) desu.
(You should not do that kind of thing.)
Here, no is used to give a mild rebuke or command.

As with the other final particles koto and mono, the da after no may be deleted. This is fairly common in female speech.

4-13'. Watashi wa kyoo no hoo ga ii no.

Unfortunately, however, the arguments for treating no in no da as the nominalizer no, or as the final particle are not really conclusive on either side. Professor Ohitsu gives as one of his reasons for treating no in no da as a final particle the fact that whilst a clause nominalized by no in other environments is intuitively felt to function as a "noun", a clause preceded by the sequence no da is not felt to be a "noun". 14 On the basis of this, we will also adopt the view that no in no da is not the same as the nominalizer no, and treat it as a final particle.

14. Private correspondence,
We now present the various language patterns involving clauses nominalized by no and koto.

4-15. Nominalized clause + ga.

(a) The predicate contains an adjective. In most cases both no and koto are possible, the notable exceptions being those shown in (ii). In the following examples, wa is taken to be a surface form of ga.

(i)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4-15-1. Soko ni iku</th>
<th>NO KOTO</th>
<th>wa abunai.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-15-2. Osoku made benkyoo-suru</td>
<td>NO KOTO</td>
<td>wa kenkoo ni warui.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-15-3. Kare to hanasu</td>
<td>NO KOTO</td>
<td>ga tanoshii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-15-4. Asa kayaku okiru</td>
<td>NO KOTO</td>
<td>wa karada ni yoi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4-15-1. It is dangerous to go there.
4-15-2. It is not good for the health to study late at night.
4-15-3. It is pleasant to talk with him.
4-15-4. It is good for the health to get up early.

In 4-15-1 to 4-15-4 the predicate adjective makes some emotive judgement about the action expressed in the nominalized clause. In the
following examples, however, the adjectives *hayai* (early, fast) and *osoi* (late, slow) do not make emotive judgements (although they do make judgements of a kind). The fact that only *no* is possible in examples 4-15-5 and 4-15-6 is evidence that *no* is associated with concrete events, since abstract concepts can not be considered to go fast or slow.

(ii)

| 4-15-5 | Hana ga saku | NO | *ga osoi*. |
| 4-15-6 | Hana ga chiru | NO | *ga hayai*. |

4-15-5. The flowers take a long time to blossom.

4-15-6. The flowers fall quickly.

Where two clauses containing adjectival predicates are linked by means of the co-ordinating particle *ga*, however, both *no* and *koto* are possible.

4-15-7. Hana wa saku *NO* \(\text{KOTO}\) wa osoi ga chiru *NO* \(\text{KOTO}\) wa hayai.

(b) The predicate includes a qualitative noun (adjectival noun) or a noun followed by *ga*. Both *no* and *koto* are possible, except as stated in (ii).
4-15-8. I like swimming.
4-15-10. The important thing is not to do anything unreasonable.
4-15-11. What I admire about him is the fact that he never shows his feelings outwardly.
4-15-12. His shortcoming is the fact that he is bad-tempered.
4-15-13. It is because of communications satellites that we are able to watch the news in distant countries as it is happening.
(ii) The predicate contains one of the following phrases: atarimae da, toozen da, fushigi ja nai, yuu made mo nai etc., all of which indicate that something occurs as a matter of course, or as a logical consequence of some other event. The nominalized clause takes no.

| 4-15-14 | Yaki-zakana sae tabe-rare-nai no da kara o-sashimi ga tabe-rare-nai | NO | wa atarimae da. |
| 4-15-15 | Jitensha ni sae nore-nai no da kara kuruma o unten-suru koto ga deki-nai | NO | wa yuu made mo nai. |
| 4-15-16 | Watashi wa mada nete-ita no da kara sore o mi-nakatta | NO | wa toozen da. |
| 4-15-17 | Uma ni kakeru kara o-kane ga nai | NO | no fushigi ja nai. |

4-15-14. Since he can't even eat cooked fish, it is only natural that he can't eat o-sashimi.

4-15-15. Since he can not even ride a bicycle, it goes without saying that he can not drive a car.

4-15-16. I was still sleeping so it is only natural that I didn't see it.

4-15-17. It is not at all surprising that he has no money because he gambles on horses.

15. The particle no here is a surface form of ga.
(c) The predicate contains a verb. Sentences of this type are not common in Japanese because only a very limited number of verbs can have a nominalized clause as subject. These include kankei-suru (to be related to), yoru (to depend on), kikoeru (to be heard), mieru (to be seen), wakaru (to understand), chigau (to be different), mujun-suru (to contradict), ki ni iru (to be pleased with), dekiru (to be possible), aru (to occur), suru (combined with adjectival expressions, meaning to cause or make), plus the causative form of some verbs.

(i) The verbs kankei-suru and yoru generally take clauses nominalized by no. In each of the following examples, one natural phenomenon is related to another.

| 4-15-18 | Radio waves are distorted by the spots on the sun. | NO | wa taiyoo no kokuten ni kankei-shite-iru. |
| 4-15-19 | Illness is often dependent on psychological factors. | NO | wa shiba-shiba kibun-teki-na mono ni yoru. |

(ii) The verbs kikoeru and mieru take only clauses nominalized by no. It is such clear examples as the following which provide the
basis for the generalization that no nominalizes clauses in a concrete, perceptual context. Neither kikoeru nor mieru can take abstract nouns as subjects.

| 4-15-20 | Inu ga hoeru | NO | ga kikoeta. |
| 4-15-21 | Kawa de hito ga oyoide-iru | NO | ga mieta. |

4-15-20. I could hear the dog barking.
4-15-21. I could see people swimming in the river.

(iii) The verbs wakaru, chigau, mujun-suru, ki ni iru may take clauses nominalized by either no or koto.

| 4-15-22 | Kare ga soko ni iru | NO | KOTO | ga wakatta. |
| 4-15-23 | Jissai-ni sekai o jibun no me de miru | NO | KOTO | wa eiga o miru no to chigau. |
| 4-15-24 | Kare ga kaisha o yameru | NO | KOTO | wa kare no higoro no shugi to mujun-shite-iru. |
| 4-15-25 | Chichi wa musuko ga mudan de gaishutsu-suru | NO | KOTO | ga ki ni ira-nai. |
4-15-22. I realized that he was there.

4-15-23. Actually seeing the world with one's own eyes is different from seeing (it through) a film.

4-15-24. It would be against his principles for him to leave the company.

4-15-25. The father is displeased with his son for going out without permission.

There is an apparent counter-example in the following sentence:

4-15-26. Wakatte-iru \( \text{NO}^* \) wa oshiete-iru \( \text{NO}^* \) \( \text{KOTO} \) to chigau.

(Understanding is different from teaching.)

The awkwardness of \textbf{no} after \textit{wakatte-iru} in 4-15-26 appears to be due, not to the verbs \textit{wakaru} or \textit{chigau} themselves, but rather to the fact that the verb \textit{wakaru} is in the \textit{-te-iru} form. When a nominalized subject clause containing a verb in the \textit{-te-iru} form has \textbf{no} as head, the predicate is very often an explanation, or a reason for the action expressed in the subject clause. The \textbf{no} in this case appears to be, therefore, not the nominalizer, but the pronoun \textbf{no} which stands for the word \textit{riyuu} (reason). Thus, in the following sentence, either \textbf{no} or \textit{riyuu} may occur, but not \textit{koto}.

\textbf{koto}^*

4-15-27. Wakatte-iru \textit{riyuu} \( \text{NO}^* \) wa yoku benkyo-shita kara da. \textit{no}

(The reason you understand is because you studied thoroughly.)
In 4-15-26, however, the predicate oshieru koto to chigau is not a reason, but a comment. The hearer, nevertheless, expects some kind of explanation after the sequence -te-iru no wa. Hence the strangeness of 4-15-26 if no is used instead of koto.

Either nominalizer is possible if the verb of the subject clause is in the plain present form.

4-15-28. Wakaru NO KOTO wa oshieru NO KOTO to chigau.

(iv) The nominalized clause is the abstract agent of the action expressed in the predicate. Constructions of this kind are rather formal or literary in character. They may also be considered atypical since, in general, Japanese does not permit an inanimate subject to be the agent of an action. In these sentences, the nominalized clause may take only koto.

| 4-15-29. | Ano hito ga kita KOTO | wa kanojo o yorokobaseta. |
| 4-15-32. | Kennedy ga ansatsu-sareta KOTO | wa sekai ni kurai kage o nageta. |

4-15-29. His coming delighted her.
4-15-30. Getting up early makes the breakfast taste nicer.

4-15-31. Having a telephone brightens our lives.

4-15-32. Kennedy's assassination threw a dark shadow across the world.

4-15-33. I can ride a bicycle.

4-15-34. I can speak Russian.

4-15-35. I can play the piano.

4-15-36. He does not know how to use chopsticks.

(v) Two special patterns involving the verbs dekiru (to be able), and aru (to be), occur. Only koto is possible.

The pattern with dekiru is used to express potentiality in Japanese.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4-15-33.</th>
<th>Watashi wa jitensha ni noru</th>
<th>KOTO</th>
<th>ga dekiru.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-15-34.</td>
<td>Roshia-go o hanasu</td>
<td>KOTO</td>
<td>ga dekiru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-15-35.</td>
<td>Piano o hiku</td>
<td>KOTO</td>
<td>ga dekiru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-15-36.</td>
<td>Ano hito wa o-hashio tsukau</td>
<td>KOTO</td>
<td>ga deki-nai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The pattern with aru is used to indicate personal experience.

| 4-15-37 | Watashi wa basu ni noru | KOTO | ga aru. |
| 4-15-38 | Fude de kaku | KOTO | ga aru. |
| 4-15-39 | Asoko ni itta | KOTO | ga aru. |
| 4-15-40 | Chichi wa ichi-do mo o-sake o nonda | KOTO | ga nai. |

4-15-37. I sometimes catch the bus.
4-15-38. I sometimes write with a brush.
4-15-39. I have been there.
4-15-40. My father has never once taken alcohol.

4-16. Nominalized clause + o + verb.

In constructions of this kind, the occurrence of koto or no depends largely on the M.S. verb. The majority of verbs which fall into this category are capable of taking nominalized clauses with either no or koto. A sample of these is shown in (a).

---

16. Makino provides a fairly large list of verbs which can take an object clause nominalized by either koto or no. Makino, op cit, page 76.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-16-1.</td>
<td>Doku ga sono kodomo to dekakeru</td>
<td>KOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16-2.</td>
<td>Anata ga kuru</td>
<td>KOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16-3.</td>
<td>17-seiki no hajime-ni Nihon-seifu wa Nihon-jin ga gaikoku e iku</td>
<td>KOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16-4.</td>
<td>Watashi-tachi wa jishin ga okoru</td>
<td>KOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16-5.</td>
<td>Haha-oya wa musuko ga Toodai ni haitta</td>
<td>KOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16-6.</td>
<td>Ano otoko wa tegami o kaita</td>
<td>KOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16-7.</td>
<td>Kare wa jibun no uchi ni hooka-shita</td>
<td>KOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16-8.</td>
<td>To o shimeru</td>
<td>KOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16-9.</td>
<td>Eiga ni iku</td>
<td>KOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16-10.</td>
<td>Birii ni natta keredomo, isshookemmei yatta</td>
<td>KOTO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>chichi wa kinjita.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-16-1.</td>
<td>o shira-nakatta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16-3.</td>
<td>o fusegu tame-ni hooritsu o seitei-shita. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16-4.</td>
<td>o osorete-iru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16-5.</td>
<td>o jimanshite-iru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16-6.</td>
<td>o hitei-shita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16-7.</td>
<td>o jihaku-shita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16-8.</td>
<td>o wasureta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16-9.</td>
<td>o akirameta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16-10.</td>
<td>o hometa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Makino, page 76, claims that fusegu (to prevent) can only occur with clause nominalized by no. In 4-16-3, however, koto is quite acceptable.
4-16-1. Father forbade me to go out with that child.

4-16-2. I did not know you were coming.

4-16-3. At the beginning of the 17th century, the Japanese government instituted laws to prevent the Japanese people from travelling to foreign countries.

4-16-4. We fear the occurrence of an earthquake.

4-16-5. The mother is proud of the fact that her son has entered Tokyo University.

4-16-6. That man denied having written a letter.

4-16-7. He confessed to having set fire to his own house.

4-16-8. I forgot to close the door.

4-16-9. I abandoned the idea of going to see a film.

4-16-10. He came last, but we still praised him for trying hard.

The verb *kangaeru* (to think) may take either a *koto* or a *no* clause, but there is a subtle difference between the two.

4-16-11. Watashi wa paatii ni iku KOTO o kangaeta.

4-16-12. Watashi wa paatii ni iku NO o kangaeta.

4-16-11. I thought about going to the party.

4-16-12. I had second thoughts about going to the party.

From the translations, it is clear that the verb *kangaeru* has two slightly different interpretations. In 4-16-11, it means "to think about", 
or "consider", whilst in 4-16-12, it means to "reconsider", or "reflect upon". The fact that koto goes with the first interpretation and no with the second is entirely consistent with the stated distributional pattern of these nominalizers in constructions of types 1 and 2. In 4-16-11, the idea of going to the party is being considered as a possibility, in general, abstract terms. In 4-16-12, going to the party is no longer considered merely as a possibility, because the decision to go has, presumably, already been made. It is the concrete realization of the idea which is being reconsidered. For some strange reason, however, when the verb kangaeanosu (to reconsider) is used, both nominalizers are possible.

4-16-13. Watashi wa paatii ni iku no koto o kangaeanoshita.

(I reconsidered going to the party.)

The verb omou (to think) also occurs in constructions of type 2. When it means "to think about", in the sense of "to have an opinion" or "to make an assessment", both koto and no are possible, but when it means "to bear in mind" or "give thought to", only koto is possible.

(i) Kare o waruku omowa-nai.

(I don't think badly of him.)

Kare no koto o waruku omowa-nai.

(I don't think badly of him.)
4-16-14. Kare ga uso o tsuku NO KOTO o waruku omowa-nai.

(I do not think there is anything bad in his telling lies.)

(ii)* Kare o omoe-ba kore gurai no kuroo wa nan demo nai.

Kare no koto o omoe-ba kore gurai no kuroo wa nan demo nai.

(When one thinks about his situation, the hardships we are experiencing are nothing at all.)

4-16-15. Kare ni oya ga nai NO KOTO o omoe-ba kore gurai no kuroo wa nan demo nai.

(When one considers that he does not have any parents, the hardships we are experiencing are nothing at all.)

In (i), omou may take a concrete object, hence both no and koto are possible in 4-16-14. In (ii), however, omou can take only an abstract object which accounts for why only koto is possible in 4-16-15.

(b) The M.S. verb can not take an object clause nominalized by koto, only no. This category includes only a small number of verbs, generally those relating to physical perception, such as miru (to see), nagameru (to watch), and the verb tasukeru (to rescue). These verbs can never take abstract objects.
4-16-16. I saw him get into the car.

4-16-17. I was watching the ships pass by.

4-16-18. I rescued him from drowning.

The verb *kiku* (to hear) has two meanings; "to hear (a sound)" and "to hear (information)". When it has the former meaning it may take a nominalized object clause with *no* only.

4-16-19. *Kane ga natte-iru NO o kiita.*

(I heard the bell ringing.)

When it has the meaning of "to hear (information)" it may take a nominalized object clause with *koto* only.

4-16-20. *Tanaka-san ga moo Tookyoo ni kaetta KOTO o rajio de kiita.*

(I heard on the radio that Tanaka-san had already returned to Tokyo.)

This difference is well illustrated in the following sentences.

4-16-21. *Ano hito ga kurakushon o narasu NO o kiita.*

(I heard him sound the horn.)
In 4-16-21, *kiku* is a verb denoting physical perception by means of the ears.

4-16-22. Ano hito ga yoku kurakushon o narasu KOTO o kiita.
   (I heard that he frequently sounds his horn.)

In 4-16-22, *kiku* does not denote physical perception, but the reception of an idea which is communicated.

The verb *kanjiru* (to feel) normally takes a clause nominalized by *no*. Feeling is a form of physical perception.

4-16-23. Uchi ga yureta NO o kanjita.
   (I felt the house shake.)

When it has the meaning of "to feel through intuition", the verb *kanjiru* may take a clause nominalized by either *koto* or *no*. In this case there is no physical perception.

4-16-24. Watashi wa kare ga soo yuu mae ni kanojo ga shippai-suru
   NO KOTO o kanjita.
   (I felt that she was going to fail even before he told me.)

The verb *matsu* (to wait) normally takes a clause nominalized by *no*.

4-16-25. Tomodachi ga kuru NO o matte-iru.
   (I am waiting for my friend to come.)
The verb *matsu* may, however, take a clause nominalized by either *no* or *koto* when the clause expresses a general idea. Kuno provides the following example:

4-16-26. *Watakushi wa sekai ni heiwa ga otozureru* NO koto) o matte-imasu.

(I am waiting for peace to descend on the world.)

As the translation indicates, this type of sentence belongs to a rather flowery, oratorical style. By using *koto*, the speaker is able to express his aspiration in a more forceful manner than with *no*. Use of *no* in 4-16-26, whilst grammatically acceptable, is stylistically rather weak, because it suggests that "waiting for peace" is as mundane as, say, waiting for a bus.

The following verbs denoting forbearance take object clauses nominalized by *no*; *gaman-suru* (to be patient, control oneself), *shimboo-suru* (to endure).

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-16-27.</td>
<td><em>O-kane o tsukau</em> NO</td>
<td>o <em>gaman-shite-iru</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16-28.</td>
<td><em>Busshi ga nai</em> NO</td>
<td>o <em>shimboo-shite-iru</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4-16-27. I am restraining myself from spending money.
4-16-28. We are putting up with a lack of materials.

---

(c) The M.S. verb can not take an object clause nominalized by no, only koto. The few verbs that belong in this category are generally associated with some form of communication. They include yuu (to say), hanasu (to speak), tsutaeru (to relate), meijiru (to order), kyoosei-suru (to demand), kaku (to write), kitai-suru19 (to expect).

| 4-16-29. | Haha ga korare-nai | KOTO | 0 sensei ni itta. |
| 4-16-31. | Sono hito kara denwa ga atta | KOTO | o tsutaeta. |
| 4-16-32. | Sono hito ni kami o kiru | KOTO | o meijita. |
| 4-16-33. | Nihon ni kaeru | KOTO | o kyoosei-shita. |
| 4-16-34. | Kanojo to kenka-shita | KOTO | o nikki ni kaita. |
| 4-16-35. | Roketto-uchi-age ga seikoo-suru | KOTO | o kitai-shite-iru. |

4-16-29. I told the teacher that mother could not come.  
4-16-30. I mentioned that she was getting married.  
4-16-31. I conveyed (the message) that there had been a phone call from him.  
4-16-32. I ordered him to have his hair cut.  
4-16-33. I compelled him to return to Japan.  
4-16-34. I wrote in my diary about the quarrel with her.  
4-16-35. We are expecting that the rocket-launching will be successful.

19. Some speakers may permit an object clause nominalized by no with the verb kitai-suru, particularly in informal speech, however koto is by far the more normal.
4-17. Nominalized clause + ni.

(a) Three patterns involving the verbs suru, maru and aru, in which only the nominalizer koto may occur.

(i) suru

This pattern is used to indicate a conscious decision. The verb in C.S. may be present or past.

| 4-17-1. | Kore kara zettai ano hito ni awa-nai | KOTO | ni shita. |
| 4-17-2. | John wa shigoto o yameru | KOTO | ni shita. |
| 4-17-3. | Kare mo hansei-shite-iru node, kondo no koto wa nakatta | KOTO | ni shite-yaroo. |
| 4-17-4. | Baa ni itta ga, tsuma ga urusai node, buchoo to hanashite-ita | KOTO | ni shita. |

4-17-1. I have decided never to see that person again.
4-17-2. John decided to give up the job.
4-17-3. Since he is also having second thoughts about it, why don't we pretend that nothing happened.
4-17-4. He had actually gone to a bar, but knowing that his wife was likely to nag, he decided to make out that he had been talking with the section chief.
(ii) naru

This pattern is used to indicate an involuntary outcome.

| 4-17-5. | Mary wa shujutsu o suru | KOTO | ni natta. |
| 4-17-6. | Ano hito wa gakkoo de Doitsu-go o oshieru | KOTO | ni natte-iru. |
| 4-17-7. | Kondo Amerika ni ike-ba sekai o mawatta | KOTO | ni naru. |
| 4-17-8. | San-gatsu ni naru to go-nen no saigetsu o gaikoku de sugoshita | KOTO | ni naru. |

4-17-5. It was decided that Mary should have an operation.
4-17-6. It has turned out that he will be teaching German at the school.
4-17-7. When we go to America, it will mean that we have been right around the world.
4-17-8. Come March, we will have spent five years overseas.

(iii) aru

The ni which occurs in this pattern is the same as the ni which indicates location in sentences such as:

Hon wa koko ni aru.
(The book is here.)

In the following examples, both the subject and the location are abstract nouns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4-17-9.</th>
<th>Daigaku-kyoiku wa jinkaku o keisei-suru KOTO ni aru.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-17-10.</td>
<td>Kokuren no sonzai wa sekai no heiwa, chitsujo o mamoru KOTO ni aru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-17-11.</td>
<td>Orimpikku no igi wa shutsu-joo-suru KOTO ni aru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-17-12.</td>
<td>Cha-no-yu no kokoro wa seishin o tooitsu-suru KOTO ni aru.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4-17-9. The (value of) university education is in human character building.

4-17-10. The United Nations exists to maintain peace and order in the world.

4-17-11. The meaning of Olympic is to participate.

4-17-12. The spirit of the Tea Ceremony is mental concentration.

(b) The particle ni indicates a purpose or goal. The ni which appears in the following examples is the same as that which occurs in sentences such as:

Kare ni o-miyage o katta.
(I bought a present for him.)

(i) Only no is possible. The M.S. may contain a verb, adjective or qualitative noun.
4-17-13. Oosaka ni iku

4-17-14. Watashi wa kanji o oboeru

4-17-15. Koko wa sumu

4-17-16. Kono kooen wa sampo-suru

4-17-17. Uchi o tateru

4-17-18. Oosaka ni iku

4-17-19. Kanji o oboeru

4-17-13. I bought a ticket to Osaka.

4-17-14. I study until late every day in an attempt to learn kanji.

4-17-15. This is a convenient place for living.

4-17-16. This park is good for taking a walk.

(ii) Both koto and no are possible. The M.S. may not contain an adjective or qualitative noun.

4-17-17. We spend money to build a house.

4-17-18. We take time to go to Osaka.

4-17-19. We exert ourselves to learn kanji.
Makino suggests that the reason koto is possible in (ii) but not in (i) is because the C.S. and M.S. of sentences in (ii) are more closely tied than those of (i). This is shown by the fact that the C.S. and M.S. of sentences in (ii) can not be linked disjunctively by means of -te-kara, whilst those in (i) can, where the M.S. contains a verb. In sentences where the disjunctive linking is possible, koto may not occur, but where the linking is not possible, both no and koto may occur. Thus:

Kippu o katte-kara Osaka ni iku.
hence 4-17-13. Osaka ni iku NO
               KOTO* ni kippu o kau.

but: *Jikan o kakete-kara Osaka ni iku.
hence 4-17-18. Osaka ni iku NO
                   KOTO) ni jikan o kakeru.

The following sentences, however, appear to be exceptions to this rule.

*Watashi wa mainichi osoku made benkyoo-shite-kara kanji o oboeru.
but: 4-17-14. Watashi wa kanji o oboeru NO
              KOTO* ni mainichi osoku made benkyoo-suru.

*Jikan ga kakatte-kara Osaka ni iku.
but: 4-17-20. Osaka ni iku NO
            KOTO* ni jikan ga kakaru.
In 4-17-14 and 4-17-20 only no is possible despite the fact that the C.S. and M.S. in these sentences can not be linked disjunctively by means of -te-kara. The problem seems to arise because the verbs in the M.S. of 4-17-14 and 4-17-20 respectively are intransitive. Makino's rule, therefore, needs to be further qualified by adding that when the M.S. and C.S. can not be linked disjunctively, the nominalized clause can take koto only when the M.S. contains a transitive verb.

(c) The particle ni in these examples indicates neither abstract location nor purpose. Either koto or no may occur, however the use of no sometimes results in slight ambiguity. This is because the sequence no + ni is indistinguishable from the particle noni which links clauses expressing contrary ideas.

| 4-17-21. | Kare wa gakkoo ni iku | NO KOTO | ni kyoomi o oboe-hajimeta. |
| 4-17-22. | Ano hito ga kita | NO KOTO | ni kanojo wa kansha-shite-iru. |
| 4-17-23. | Kare kara o-kane o morau | NO KOTO | ni tsuwi no ishiki o kanjiru. |
| 4-17-24. | Nihon wa naga-nen no aida mommoo o nakusu | NO KOTO | ni chikara o irete-kita. |

4-17-21. He has begun to take an interest in going to school.
4-17-22. She is grateful to him for having come.
4-17-23. I feel guilty about taking money from him.
4-17-24. Over a period of many years Japan has devoted itself to the task of eliminating illiteracy.

Use of no is likely to lead to ambiguity in sentences where the M.S. verb is in the negative, or where the M.S. expresses a negative or adverse reaction. For example:

4-17-25. Ano hito ga kita NO ni kanojo wa kansha-shite-i-nai.

4-17-26. Kare kara o-kane o morau NO ni tsunami no ishiki o kanji-nai.

4-17-27. Ano hito ga kita NO ni kanojo wa hara o tateta.

The first translation of each example assumes that NO is the same as KOTO. The second translation assumes the sequence no + ni to be the particle noni.

4-17-25. She is not grateful to him for coming. or
Even though he has come she is not grateful.

4-17-26. I feel no sense of guilt at taking money from him. or
Even though I receive money from him I feel no sense of guilt.

4-17-27. She got angry at him for coming. or
She got angry even though he came.

(d) The M.S. contains the verb de-su (to happen to meet), de-kawasu (to encounter, run into). Only no may occur with the
nominalized clause.

| 4-17-28. | Kare ga mon kara deru | NO | ni de-atta. |
| 4-17-29. | Kanai ga depaato ni haitte-kuru | NO | ni de-kuwashita. |

4-17-28. I met him coming out through the gate.

4-17-29. I chanced to meet my wife as she was coming into the department store.

4-18. Nominalized clause + de.

In these constructions de is generally used to indicate a cause, basis or reason. At first sight, it appears that the clause which takes de can be nominalized by no or koto. If no is used, however, the sequence no + de becomes, in fact, the particle node which is used to link two clauses expressing cause and effect respectively. Although node is probably derived historically from a combination of the nominalizer no plus the particle de, its treatment as a separate independent particle is now standard practice. There are also some instances, for example 4-18-4 below, where node can not replace koto + de. For these reasons,

20. In 4-17-28 and 4-17-29, no may be replaced by tokoro without altering the meaning in any way. It could be argued, therefore, that no in these examples is the pronoun no which substitutes for tokoro.
we shall consider that a clause followed by de can only be nominalized by koto.

| 4-18-1. | Yoru hayaku neru | KOTo | de taijuu ga fueta. |
| 4-18-2. | Ano hito ga kita | KOTo | de kanojo no byooki wa yoku natta. |
| 4-18-3. | Daigaku ni iku | KOTo | de ki ga magireru. |
| 4-18-4. | Kare kara o-kane o morau | KOTo | de oshoku no nakama-iri o shita. |
| 4-18-5. | Tsuma ga uchi o deta | KOTo | de kare-ra no kekkon ga hakai-shita. |
| 4-18-6. | Mainichi kusuri o nomu | KOTo | de kanojo no hossa wa osamatta. |
| 4-18-7. | Ano gakuen wa kiritsu ga genkaku-na | KOTo | de yuumei-da. |

4-18-1. By going to bed early I have put on weight.
4-18-2. With his arrival she began to recover.
4-18-3. I forget my worries by attending university.
4-18-4. By receiving money from him I became one of the corrupted.
4-18-5. Their marriage broke up with the wife walking out.
4-18-6. By taking medicine every day her fits were brought under control.
4-18-7. That school is notorious for the strictness of its rules.

4-19. Nominalized clause + kara

Two different functions of kara need to be distinguished.

(a) kara which indicates a starting point.
Gakkoo kara eki made aruite-itta.

(I walked from the school to the station.)

(b) Kara which indicates the basis for a deduction.

Kore-ra no jijitsu kara handan-suru to....

(Judging from these facts....)

(a) A clause followed by kara which indicates a starting point can be nominalized by either no or koto, although for stylistic reasons koto is normally preferred.

| 4-19-1. | Shokuji o ataeru | NO KOTO | kara shituke o suru no koto made oya no tsutome wa ookii. |
| 4-19-2. | Shuuushoku no sewa o suru | NO KOTO | kara yome no shokai made oji wa iiroiro to yoku mendoo o mite-kureta. |
| 4-19-3. | Hoikusho o setsuritsu-suru | NO KOTO | kara yoorooin o setsuritsu-suru no made Sueeden no shakai-hoshoo wa jitsu-ni migoto-da. |

4-19-1. From providing food, to providing discipline, the duties of the parent are great.

4-19-2. From helping me find a job, to finding me a wife, I owe a lot to my uncle for the various ways he has looked after me.

4-19-3. From the erection of nurseries, to the establishment of old people's homes, social welfare in Sweden is certainly marvellous.
(b) A clause followed by *kara* which indicates the basis for a deduction can only be nominalized by *koto*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4-19-4</th>
<th>Kare ga tsuma no warukuchi o yuu</th>
<th>KOTO</th>
<th>kara kare-ra no kekkon no kiki ga ukagawareru.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-19-5</td>
<td>Musuko ga gaihaku o kasaneru</td>
<td>KOTO</td>
<td>kara haha wa musuko ni fushin o idaki-hajimeta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-19-6</td>
<td>Furansu no kitte ga hatte-aru</td>
<td>KOTO</td>
<td>kara kare ga Furansu ni iru koto ga wakatta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-19-7</td>
<td>Shachoo ga sugata o keshita</td>
<td>KOTO</td>
<td>kara kaisha no fushin ga akiraka ni natta.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4-19-4. From the way he speaks ill of his wife one suspects that their marriage has reached a crisis.

4-19-5. With her son spending so many nights out, the mother began to harbour doubts about him.

4-19-6. I realised that he was in France from the fact that there were French stamps (on the letter).

4-19-7. The disappearance of the president made it clear that the company was in bad shape.

4-20. Nominalized clause + *to*.

Three types of *to* need to be distinguished.
(a) The particle to which links nouns.

Pan to keeki to, dochira ga suki desu ka?
(Which do you like, bread or cake?)

(b) The particle to which occurs with certain verbs or qualitative nouns, such as chigau (to differ), onaji (same) etc.

Pan wa keeki to chigau.
(Bread is different from cake.)

(c) The particle to which indicates the content of a statement or supposition. This to is normally not attached directly to a noun, except where the noun is a nominalized clause. (See frame below.)

(a) Nominalized clauses linked by to may have no or koto as head, although the use of koto is definitely "formal".

| 4-20-1 | Umi ni iku | NO KOTO | to yama ni iku | NO KOTO | to dochira ga suki desu ka? |
| 4-20-2 | Taijuu ga fueru | NO KOTO | to amai mono o gaman-suru | NO KOTO | to dochira ga tsurai desu ka? |
| 4-20-3 | Supoetsu o miru | NO KOTO | to jibun de yaru | NO KOTO | to de-wa dochira ni juujitsu-kan ga arimasu ka? |
4-20-1. Which do you like, going to the sea or going to the beach?
4-20-2. Which is more difficult to bear, putting on weight or foregoing sweet things?
4-20-3. Which is more satisfying, watching sport or playing it yourself?

(b) In these constructions the nominalized clause may have either no or koto as noun head.

| 4-20-4. | Jissai-ni sekai o jibun no me de miru no koto) wa eiga o miru | NO KOTO | to chigau. |
| 4-20-5. | Sore wa hidoi; shikei o senkoku-sareta | NO KOTO | to onaji da. |

4-20-4. Seeing the world with one's own eyes is different from seeing (it through) a film.
4-20-5. That is terrible; it is like being sentenced to death.

(c) In constructions where to signals "content", the clause which expresses the content may be nominalized only by koto, not no. The verb which follows to is usually one of the following three; suru, naru, yaru.
4-20-6. Shutsuba o yameru koto wa
    haiboku o mitometa KOTO to naru.

4-20-7. Shukketsu no henji ga nai
    node kare wa ko-nai KOTO to shiyoo.

4-20-8. Nan demo katte-yaru koto
    ga kodomo o kawaigatte-iru KOTO to wa ie-nai.

4-20-6. Withdrawing one's candidature will be taken as an admission of
defeat.

4-20-7. Since he has not replied whether he will be attending or not,
    let us assume that he will not be coming.

4-20-8. Buying anything for one's child can not be taken as showing
    love for the child.

4-21. Nominalized clause + no.

A nominalized clause followed by the particle no always has
koto as noun head. The noun which follows the particle no is usually
an abstract noun of quality.

4-21-1. Kusuri o muyami-ni fukuyoo-suru KOTO
          no kiken-sei wa kako
          ssuen-rai ikuta no
          zasshi ni tori-agerarete-kita.

4-21-2. Hageshii kootsuu-mahi no naka
          de kuruma no kazu o seigen-suru KOTO
          no juuyoo-sei wa mohaya
          ikkoku no yoyuu no
          yurusare-nai hodo dearu
4-21-1. The dangers of administering medicine indiscriminately have been taken up by quite a number of journals over the past few years.

4-21-2. The necessity of limiting the number of cars in places where bottle-necks occur can not be overlooked for another moment.

4-22. Nominalized clause + だ。

As has already been indicated, we do not consider にない in the sequence にない + だ to be the same as the nominalizer に। 21 Further evidence for this claim can be seen in the following examples, where にない can not replace こと under any circumstances before だ。

| 4-22-1. | Rikai-deki-nai にない koto) wa Cook-sencho ga genjuumin ni korosareta | こと だ。 |
| 4-22-2. | Gaichi no seikatsu de ichiban tsurai にない koto) wa hitori yamai no toko ni fusu | こと だ。 |
| 4-22-3. | Yuuigi-na kaigi datta ga; tada zannen-na にない koto) wa tsuuyaku-nashi de susumerare-nakatta | こと だ。 |
| 4-22-4. | Wakara-nai にない koto) wa imada-ni kono aka-ji no taisaku ga nasarete-i-nai | こと だ。 |

21. See page 72.
4-22-1. What I can not understand is why Captain Cook was killed by the natives.

4-22-2. The most unpleasant thing that can happen to one while one is living overseas is to be laid up ill in bed.

4-22-3. It was a meaningful conference, but the unfortunate thing was that it could not proceed without interpreters.

4-22-4. What I can not understand is why there is still no plan to bring us out of debt.

It should be noted that in 4-22, where it is indicated that either no or koto may occur, the relationship between the noun head (i.e. no or koto) and the modifying phrase is actually an inner relationship. The no here is, therefore, not the nominalizer no, but the pronoun no, standing for the lexical noun koto.

A note on to yuu

The connecting phrase to yuu has already been mentioned in regard to constructions of the content-theme type in O-NOM. The insertion of to yuu is also possible in some patterns involving clauses nominalized by no and koto. The distribution of to yuu may be stated as follows:

22. See page 44.
1. It may be inserted between the modifying phrase and the nominalizer *koto*, but in some instances, only under special conditions.

2. It may be inserted between the modifying phrase and the nominalizer *no*, except where the nominalized clause is followed by the particles *o* and *ni*, or where the construction is of the type in 4-15-5, 4-15-6, 4-15-20, 4-15-21.

Two broad functions of *to_yuu* need to be distinguished. The first is that which is associated with constructions of the content-theme type. In these constructions, *to_yuu* serves as a linking device between a modifying phrase and the noun head which expresses the content or theme of the modifying phrase. This may be called the content-theme *to_yuu*. It occurs mainly in sentences involving mental activity or communication.

4-16-7. Kare wa jibun no uchi ni hooke-shita (*to_yuu*) no koto) o jihaku-shita.

4-19-5. Musuko ga gaihaku o kasaneru (*to_yuu*) koto kara haha wa musuko ni fushin o idaki-hajimeta.

The second function of *to_yuu*, which often overlaps with the first, is perhaps best described as an explanatory function. In the following sentences, *to_yuu* does not merely relate the modifying
phrase to the noun head, but also relates the whole nominalized clause to the wider linguistic context. The nominalized clause expresses an explanation or outcome of some event or fact. When it appears in sentences not connected with communication or mental activity, the phrase to you can be said to have this explanatory function. For example:

A: Sooshoku-dezainaa no Tanaka-san no uchi wa, kakatta hiyoo wa sore hodo demo nai noni, zuibun rippa-na uchi na n desutte.

B: Sorya, ano hito wa jibun de dezain-shi, chotte-shita kagu nara jibun de tsukaru to you koto ga dekiru n desu mono.

A: I hear that the house of the interior decorator, Mr. Tanaka, is quite magnificent despite the fact that it cost very little to build.

B: Yes, but that is because he was able to design it and make the smaller pieces of furniture by himself.

Itoko wa kaisha no shigoto de Amerika ni iku toka, ika-nai toka itte-imashita ga, kekkyoku konkai wa yameru to you koto ni natta soo desu.

(My cousin was saying something about going to America on business, but from what I can understand, it has turned out that he won't be going this time after all.)
In 4-23, the clause containing to yuu is an explanation of why Tanaka-san was able to build his house so cheaply. In 4-24, the phrase which modifies koto expresses the outcome of the deliberations over whether the cousin would be going to America or not. It should be noted that the insertion of to yuu would be most unusual in the following sentences, where the nominalized clause is not related to a wider linguistic context.

**? Kare wa kagu o tsukuru to yuu koto ga dekiru.

**? Sore o yameru to yuu koto ni natta.

The connecting phrase to yuu must be distinguished from the verb yuu which means "to say".

4-25. Ano okusan no koodoo o mite-mire-ba, kare ga wakare-tai to yuu no mo muri wa nai.

(When one looks at the way his wife behaves, it is not surprising that he says he wishes to leave her.)

In 4-25, the sequence to yuu does not function as a connecting device between the modifying phrase and the nominalizer no, but is actually part of the modifying phrase itself. The subject of yuu is the pronoun kare (he) and the modifying phrase can be paraphrased as:

Wakare-tai to kare ga yuu.
Where ́to yuu functions as a content-theme relating phrase, or as an explanation relating phrase, the particle ́to and the verb yuu must always occur contiguously. Thus, we must consider the ́to yuu in 4-25 differently from that which occurs in 4-16-7, 4-19-5, 4-23 and 4-24.
CONCLUSION

Nominalization in Japanese involves two distinct embedding processes which we have called "Inner NOMinalization" and "Outer NOMinalization". As stated in the preface, our primary concern has been to examine the various types of constructions which owe their derivation to one or the other of these processes. We can summarize the different categories into which the examples are divided as follows:

1. I-NOM

The underlying constituent sentence contains a noun identical to the modified noun head. The grammatical status of this noun in the C.S. may be indicated by one of the following particles.

2-1. 0 2-5. de
2-2. ga 2-6. no
2-3. zero 2-7. to
2-4. ni 2-8. kara

2. O-NOM

The underlying constituent sentence does not contain a noun identical to the noun head. There are three main divisions:
(i) Content-theme relationship. The noun head expresses the content of the modifying phrase.

3-5 to 3-7. The modifying phrase expresses the object of conception.

3-8. The modifying phrase expresses the object of perception.

(ii) Relative relationship. The noun head does not express the content of the modifying phrase. (3-9 to 3-11.)

(iii) The noun head is one of the nominalizers *no* or *koto*.

The grammatical status of the nominalized clause within the sentence may be indicated by one of the following particles:

4-15. *ga*  
4-19. *kara*

4-16. *o*  
4-20. *to*

4-17. *ni*  
4-21. *no*

4-18. *de*  
4-22. *zero + da*

Within the sub-categories 4-15 to 4-22, there are further divisions based on the occurrence of nominalizers in particular contexts.

Where *no* and *koto* are syntactically interchangeable, it is difficult to establish universal rules regarding usage. Ignoring the ever-present factor of ideolectic variation, however, we can say that:
(a) The nominalizer *koto* is mostly used in general statements. The mood created by the use of *koto* is rather formal, or expressed differently, the use of *koto* is considered to be characteristic of "formal" speech.

(b) The nominalizer *no* is generally used in statements referring to what is immediate and specific. It is considered less "formal" than *koto*.

If it were possible to devise meaningful criteria by which to distinguish between "formal" and "informal" moods, or styles of speech, a statistical survey of the usage of *no* and *koto* might be able to establish definitely which of the two sets of factors, formal-informal versus general-specific, is primary in determining such usage. On the assumption that the usage is related semantically to the distributional patterns of *no* and *koto* in contexts where they are not interchangeable, we would have to conclude that it is the latter set of factors. On the basis of the feelings expressed by the informants, however, we would also have to admit that both sets of factors probably overlap to a considerable extent.
APPENDIX TO CHAPTER II

Underlying sentences for 2-1.

2-1-1. C.S. Anata ga tabako o suu.
M.S. Sono tabako wa hontoo-ni oishii ne.

2-1-2. C.S. Watashi ga saifu o otoshita.
M.S. Sono saifu o sensei ga mitsuketa.

2-1-3. C.S. Kinoo uisukii o nonda.
M.S. Sono uisukii de daibu yopparatta.

2-1-4. C.S. Watashi-tachi ga sakki hashi o watatta.
M.S. Sono hashi ga yuumei-na Gojoo no Oobashi da.

2-1-5. C.S. Kimi ga dooro o aruite-kita.
M.S. Sono dooro wa rainen fuusa-sarete,atarashii kosoku
dooro ni naru.

2-1-6. C.S. Watashi ga eki o shuppatsu shita.
M.S. Sono eki wa Shinjuku desu.

Underlying sentences for 2-2.

2-2-1. C.S. Soba ni obaasan ga suwatte-ita.
M.S. Sono obaasan ni iroiro tazuneta.

2-2-2. C.S. Osotsuma de okyakusan ga matte-iru.
M.S. Sono okyakusan ni sukoshi hanashite-kudasai.

M.S. Watashi wa mainichi densha de kuru.
2-2-4. C.S. Sakki ki kara *ringo ga* ochita.
   M.S. Sono ringo o tabete-miyoo ka?

2-2-5. C.S. Kino *yuki ga* futta.
   M.S. Sono yuki de michi ga toore-naku natta.

2-2-6. C.S. Ima *oto ga* kikoeta.
   M.S. Sono oto wa nan deshoo?

**Underlying sentences for 2-3.**

2-3-1. C.S. *Kino watashi ga* kaimono o shita.
   M.S. Kino wa ame-furi deshita.

2-3-2. C.S. *Sakunen kare ga* Nihon ni ita.
   M.S. Sakunen wa taihen-na toshi datta.

2-3-3. C.S. *Rainen watashi ga* sotsugyou-suru.
   M.S. Rainen wa infure ni nari-soo da.

2-3-4. C.S. *Mainichi koozan de* hataraku.
   M.S. Mainichi wa shimu omoi desu.

2-3-5. C.S. *Ashita ano hito-tachi ga* pikunikku ni iku.
   M.S. Ashita wa gakkoo no yasumi no hi da.

2-3-6. C.S. *Haru ki-gi ga* midori ni naru.
   M.S. Haru ni ware-ware no doosookai no pikunikku o suru
   koto ni shite-iru.

**Underlying sentences for 2-4.**

2-4-1. C.S. Anata ga umi ni itta.
   M.S. Sono umi wa doko desu ka?
2-4-2. C.S. Watashi ga sore o tana ni oita.
   M.S. Sono tana wa takai desu.

2-4-3. C.S. Kimi ga kono e o otoko ni miseta.
   M.S. Sono otoko kara o-miyage o moratta.

2-4-4. C.S. Watashi-tachi ga yama ni nobotta.
   M.S. Sono yama no naka de ichiban ookii no wa Fuji-san desu.

2-4-5. C.S. Sono kiji ga shimbun ni deta.
   M.S. Sono shimbun wa moo uri-kiremasita.

2-4-6. C.S. Kyonen byooki ni kakatta.
   M.S. Sono byooki de shinda.

2-4-7. C.S. Senshuu (aru) hito ni atta.
   M.S. Sono hito wa yuumei-na eiga-haiyan desu.

2-4-8. C.S. John ga undoo-joo ni iru.
   M.S. Sono undoo-joo wa dare demo tsukaemasu.

2-4-9. C.S. Ano heya ni teeburu ga aru.
   M.S. Sono heya wa semai.

2-4-10. C.S. Sakurada-san ga yakuza ni korosareta.
   M.S. Sono yakuza wa keimusho ni haitta koto ga aru.

2-4-11. C.S. Watashi ga tomodachi ni hon o motte-kite-moratta.
   M.S. Sono tomodachi wa Shinjuku ni sunde-iru.

2-4-12. C.S. Chuutoo-sensoo ga 1967-nen ni okotta.
   M.S. 1967-nen ni watashi wa Kairo ni ita.

2-4-13. C.S. Sakura no hana ga shi-gatsu ni saku.
   M.S. Shi-gatsu kara kikoo ga yoku narimasu.
2-4-14. C.S. Watashi ga kotoshi no hajime-ni Nihon ni kita.
M.S. Kotoshi no hajime wa bukka wa ima hodo takaku-nakatta.

Underlying sentences for 2-6.

2-6-1. C.S. Sensei no musuko ga Amerika ni itta.
M.S. Sono sensei wa Tanaka-san desu.
2-6-2. C.S. Oosutoraria no shuto ga Kyanbera ni aru.
M.S. Oosutoraria wa utsukushii kuni desu.
2-6-3. C.S. Haha ga miboojin no kodomo no mendoo o mite-iru.
M.S. Sono miboojin wa kawaii-na hito da.
2-6-4. C.S. Uchi no yane ni antena ga notte-iru.
M.S. Sono uchi no soba ni watashi no uchi ga aru.
2-6-5. C.S. Eigakan no ushiro ni ookii-na biru ga tatte-iru.
M.S. Sono eigakan ga mokuteki no tokoro da.
2-6-6. C.S. Mise no soba ni jidoosha ga tomatte-iru.
M.S. Sono mise ga kamera-ya da.

Underlying sentences for 2-7.

2-7-1. C.S. Shachoo ga onna-no-hito to issho-ni paatii ni itta.
M.S. Sono onna-no-hito wa geisha da.
2-7-2. C.S. Bokushi ga kaishuu to issho-ni inotta.
M.S. Sono kaishuu wa futatsu no mura kara kita hito-tachi da.
2-7-3. C.S. Watashi ga sono jigyoo o (aru) hito to issho-ni yatta.
M.S. Sono hito wa yuuuei-na keizai-gakusha da.
2-7-4. C.S. Musuko ga inu to (issho-ni) tawamurete-iru.
M.S. Sono inu wa korii da.

2-7-5. C.S. Kodomo ga tomodachi to (issho-ni) asonde-iru.
M.S. Sono tomodachi wa Suzuki-san no musume desu.

2-7-6. C.S. Tomodachi ga (aru) hito to kekkon-shita.
M.S. Sono hito wa Doitsu-jin da.

2-7-7. C.S. Kare ga seiji-teki-ni (aru) hito to tsunagatte-iru.
M.S. Sono hito wa Sato Eisaku da.

2-7-8. C.S. Kare no haba ga kodomo to wakareta.
M.S. Sono kodomo wa moo ookiku natte-iru.

2-7-9. C.S. Watashi no musume ga (aru) hito to koosai-suru.
M.S. Sono hito wa kane-mochi de-nakereba dame da.

Underlying sentences for 2-8.

2-8-1. C.S. Tomodachi ga mado kara ochita.
M.S. Sono mado wa san-gai ni aru.

2-8-2. C.S. Watashi ga sensei kara hon o karita.
M.S. Sono sensei wa Furansu-go ooshi-te-iru.

M.S. Inuboosaki wa Chiba-ken ni aru.

2-8-4. C.S. Tatoe-yoo no nai kyoofu ga haisen kara umareta.
M.S. Sono haisen wa 1945-nen, 8-gatsu, 15-nichi deshita.
2-8-5. C.S. Watashi ga uchi kara deta.
M.S. Sono uchi wa asoko ni aru.

2-8-6. C.S. Haha ga eki kara shuppatsu-shita.
M.S. Sono eki wa Shinjuku desu.
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