

On the Distinction between Complement and Adjunct in Japanese*

HARADA Yasunari
Assistant Professor
School of Law & Institute for Language Teaching
Waseda University

1 Introduction

Regardless of the differences in theoretical frameworks employed, researchers of natural language syntax have assumed that notions such as ‘complement’ and ‘adjunct’ play an essential role in describing syntactic regularities of English and other languages of the world.

Larson (1988: p.169), for instance, states that “[m]ost theories of grammar draw a fundamental distinction between *arguments* and *adjuncts*. The former are phrases selected by some predicate; the latter are phrases which are unselected, and which function as ‘modifiers’”.

While Larson’s terminology here is somewhat confused, ¹ what he suggests is nonetheless a truism: the distinction between ‘complements’ and ‘adjuncts’, or ‘arguments’ and ‘modifiers’, has been a key concept underlying most theories of grammar. It has been given an increased importance in theoretical studies of natural language syntax in the 1980’s, when discussions concerning ‘argument structures’, which dictate what sort of ‘arguments’ a given lexical entry would demand for its syntactic projections to be grammatical, became a central issue in syntactic descriptions of natural languages.

Although data concerning English strongly suggest that this distinction is a real and important one for a proper description of English grammar, it does not automatically ensure that the same distinction is significant in describing Japanese syntax.

In this note I will focus my attention on the following question: how can one distinguish ‘complements’ and ‘adjuncts’ in Japanese? I will raise several theoretical questions, pointing out relevant examples, with no definitive answers.

2 Complements and Adjuncts in English

In discussing syntax of English, several criteria have often been suggested for establishing the distinction between ‘complements’ and ‘adjuncts’. For instance, Larson (1988: p. 169) notes that “[a]djuncts and arguments are typically identified empirically according to a number of criteria, two major ones being optionality and iterability.” ²

Thus, the fact that (1, b) is ungrammatical while (1, a) is grammatical suggests that *Mary*, or the NP that dominates this word, is a complement to the verb *loves*, whereas both sentences in (2, a) and (2, b) are grammatical, suggesting that *enthusiastically* is an adjunct rather than a complement.

- (1) a. John loves Mary.
b. *John loves.
- (2) a. John runs enthusiastically.
b. John runs.

Iterability, or possibility of iteration of the same syntactic element, rather than iteration of the same string of words, is sometimes considered to be a factor that distinguishes complements and adjuncts. Thus, ungrammaticality of the sentence in (3, b) seems to suggest that the NP following the verb *loves*, namely *Mary*, is its complement rather than its adjunct, while acceptability of (4, b) would be considered to be a factor that indicates that the PPs in question, *in the morning* as well as *during the summer*, function as adjuncts rather than complements to the verb *runs*.

- (3) a. John loves Mary.
b. *John loves Mary that boy.
- (4) a. John runs in the morning.
b. John runs in the morning during the summer.

Sometimes, partially semantic considerations might come into play, such as considerations as to what constitutes the minimal domain for *do so*-proverbalization. It has often been suggested that interpretation of *do so* is sensitive to the syntactic structure of its antecedent verb phrase.

For instance, (5, b) can only mean that “Bill put the vase on the table”, whatever “the vase” may be. Thus, (5, c) is unacceptable, unless both “the table” and “Bill” were located on “the desk” in the situation described.

- (5) a. John put the vase on the table.
b. Bill did so, too.
c. *Bill did so on the desk.

On the other hand, (6, b) can be understood to mean either that “Bill kissed Mary” or that “Bill kissed Mary in the garden”. Thus, the sentence in (6, c) is acceptable in English, meaning that “Bill kissed Mary in the kitchen.”

- (6) a. John kissed Mary in the garden.
b. Bill did so, too.
c. Bill did so in the kitchen.

This difference in pro-verb interpretation is sometimes attributed to the difference in the syntactic status of the PPs involved, i.e. that *on the table* in (5, a) is a complement whereas *in the garden* in (6, a) is an adjunct.

A more interesting distinction is claimed from a slightly different point of view. Very often, we find that dislocation of elements from within an adjunct is more difficult than that from within a complement. Thus, (7, b) is markedly worse than (7, a).³

- (7) a. Who do you think John said that Mary killed ___ ?
 b. *Who do you think John was running in the park when Mary killed ___ ?

These considerations combine to convince us that there are certainly reasonable ground for distinguishing ‘complements’ and ‘adjuncts’ in English, at least in the case of verbs. ⁴

3 Complements and Adjuncts in Japanese

When discussing grammatical descriptions of Japanese syntax, it is sometimes assumed, without sufficient argumentation one way or the other, that such postpositional phrases that are marked with *ga*, *o* and *ni* are complements whereas other postpositional phrases are adjuncts, or sentence modifiers. It is not always easy, however, to make a comparable distinction in Japanese, even in the case of verbs.

For instance, every ‘complement PP’ in Japanese is ‘optional’ in the sense that they can be omitted from any construction without making the resulting sentence ungrammatical. This is a most well-known fact about Japanese, although transformational grammarians might want to claim that there are ‘traces’ for these ‘deleted’ elements. Thus, all of the strings given in (8) are acceptable sentences in Japanese, given proper contexts. ⁵

- (8) a. Taro-ga Hanako-ni hana-o okutta.
 b. Hanako-ni hana-o okutta.
 c. Taro-ga hana-o okutta.
 d. Taro-ga Hanako-ni okutta.
 e. Taro-ga okutta.
 f. Hanako-ni okutta.
 g. hana-o okutta.
 h. okutta.
- Taro-SBJ Hanako-IOB flower-OBJ sent

‘Complements’ in Japanese are ‘optional’ in the sense just described. However, it might be argued that iterability of elements could serve as a criterion to distinguish between complements and adjuncts in Japanese. For instance, it is difficult to construct acceptable sentences with more than one occurrence of *ga*-marked or *o*-marked PPs, as can be seen in (9), whereas phrases referring to time or place could be easily iterated, as is exemplified in (10).

- (9) a. *Taro-ga Hanako-ga kita.
 Taro-SBJ Hanako-SBJ came
- b. *Taro-ga Hanako-o Megumi-o nagutta.
 Taro-SBJ Hanako-OBJ Megumi-OBJ hit
- (10) a. Taro-ga kino yugata kita.
 Taro-SBJ yesterday evening came

- b. Taro-ga Hanako-o tuyoku hagesiku yusutta.
 Taro-SBJ Hanako-OBJ strongly fervently shook

There are a couple of exceptions to this observation. First, iteration of putative ‘complements’ are possible in cases where reduction of juxtaposition, or ‘coordinately conjoined structures’ without any conjoining words, is involved.⁶

For instance, (11, a) is a perfectly reasonable thing to say in Japanese. A similar reduction occurs in English too, however, as in (11, b), so this does not really count as a counter-example against the ‘iteration’ criterion.

- (11) a. Taro-wa Hanako-o, Ziro-wa Emiko-o nagutta.
 Taro-SBJ Hanako-OBJ Ziro-SBJ Emiko-OBJ hit
 Taro hit Hanako and Ziro Emiko.
 b. John gave a record to Susan and a book to Mary.

Iteration of *ga*-subjects seems to make the sentence bad, as can be seen in (12, b), but strangely enough, another occurrence of a *ga*-marked subject seems to make the string better, as can be seen in (12, c). In this case, some sort of ‘listing’ interpretation seems to be invoked, so this is more like a ‘conjunction reduction’ case and may not constitute a very good counter-example. This suggestion is further verified by the fact that (12, d) is also a reasonable utterance in Japanese.⁷

- (12) a. Taro-ga aruku.
 Taro-SBJ walk
 b. *Taro-ga, Hanako-ga aruku.
 Taro-SBJ Hanako-SBJ walk
 c. ?Taro-ga, Hanako-ga, Saburo-ga, aruku.
 Taro-SBJ Hanako-SBJ Saburo-SBJ walk
 d. Taro-ga, sono-yoko-o Hanako-ga, aruku.
 Taro-SBJ by-his-side Hanako-SBJ walk
 Taro walks and by his side Hanako (walks).

The above examples of iterated subjects may be cases where reduction of juxtaposed sentences are involved; thus they may not pose a serious problem for the claim that complements do not ‘iterate’. However, we can think of the following sort of sentences.

- (13) ?Taro-wa Hanako-ni sono-tegami-o gakkō-ate-ni okutta.
 Taro-SBJ Hanako-GOAL the-letter-THEME school-GOAL sent
 Taro sent the letter to Hanako in care of the school.

Here we have two *ni*-marked PPs. One could always argue that the two PPs have different ‘thematic roles’ and therefore, this does not count as an example of complement iteration. In fact, one is a simple *ni*-phrase while the other is an *ate-ni*-phrase, the latter being a fairly good candidate for an ‘adjunct’. However, we have here another case where ‘iteration’ of ‘complements’ seems to be allowed.

To sum up, those putative criteria for distinguishing complements and adjuncts that worked rather well for English do not work out very clearly in the case of Japanese.

4 Dislocation in Japanese

In the case of English, whether or not an element is allowed to be extracted from within a given construction depends on the ‘complementhood’ and/or ‘adjuncthood’ of various constituents involved. However, a similar syntactic distinction is rather difficult to establish in the case of Japanese. Whether or not dislocation of elements from within a given clause makes the resulting string acceptable in Japanese depends on particular lexical items involved, and also on the semantic and/or pragmatic content of the whole sentence.

4.1 Dislocation from Within Simple Sentences

It is rather difficult to clarify the difference between ‘complements’ and ‘adjuncts’ on the basis of data regarding dislocation in the case of Japanese.

First, let’s see what happens when elements are dislocated from a simple sentence. We see that contrary to what has sometimes been suggested in the transformational literature on this question, dislocation of elements are possible even when the postpositions involved are other than *ga*, *o* or *ni*. However, we find that dislocation of elements that are ‘marked’ with *yori* is definitively unacceptable.⁸

Dislocation of *ga*-marked subjects is possible, both for topicalization as in (14, b) and for relativization as in (14, c), although *ga* and *wa* cannot occur consecutively, as is indicated by the ungrammaticality of (14, b’).

- (14) a. Kono-kantoku-ga *Bladerunner*-o totta.
this-director-SBJ *Bladerunner*-OBJ directed
b. *Bladerunner*-wa kono-kantoku-ga totta.
b’. *Kono-kantoku-ga-wa *Bladerunner*-o totta.
c. [*Bladerunner*-o totta] kantoku
the director that directed *Bladerunner*

The same pattern can be found for verbs (or ‘keiyo-dosi’) which take two *ga*-marked phrases as their ‘complements’. Thus, all sentences in (15) are acceptable, except for (15, b) and (15, b’), where *ga-wa* concatenation occurs, which is disallowed in Japanese.

- (15) a. Ken-wa ringo-ga sukida.
Ken-SBJ apple-THEME like
Ken likes apples.
a’. ringo-wa Ken-ga sukida.
apple-TOPIC Ken-SBJ like
It is Ken that likes apples.
b. *Ken-ga-wa ringo-ga sukida.
b’. *ringo-ga-wa Ken-ga sukida.
c. [Ken-ga sukina] ringo
apples, which Ken likes
c’. [ringo-ga sukina] Ken
Ken, who likes apples

Just as *ga-wa* concatenation is disallowed, so *o-wa* concatenation makes the sentence involved ungrammatical in Japanese. Apart from this restriction, all dislocation in (16) and (17) are possible, although the ‘semantic roles’ of the *o*-marked phrases are, arguably, different in (16) and in (17).

- (16) a. Ken-wa kono-hon-o yonda.
 Ken-SBJ this-book-OBJ read
 b. kono-hon-wa Ken-ga yonda.
 b'. *kono-hon-o-wa Ken-ga yonda.
 c. [Ken-ga yonda] hon
 the book that Ken read
- (17) a. Ken-wa mai-asa kono-koen-o sampo-suru.
 Ken-SBJ every-morning this-park-THEME take-a-walk
 b. kono-koen-wa Ken-ga mai-asa sampo-suru.
 b'. *kono-koen-o-wa Ken-ga mai-asa sampo-suru.
 c. [Ken-ga mai-asa sampo-suru] koen
 the park in which Ken takes a walk every morning

Thus, dislocation of postpositional phrases marked with *ga* and *o* is unproblematic, regardless of their ‘thematic roles’, as far as *ga-wa* or *o-wa* concatenation is not involved. In these examples, topicalization had only one form, because concatenation of *ga* or *o* with *wa* is disallowed.

When we have postpositions other than *ga* or *o*, we have to consider two cases for topicalization. Most of the topicalized sentences where the original postpositions are retained seem acceptable, and grammaticality of those in which the original postpositions are omitted seems to correspond with that of relativized sentences. This is a reasonable consequence if we assume that acceptability of these sentences is largely determined by how ‘recoverable’ the meaning of the omitted postposition is from the context.

For instance, sentences in (18) are all acceptable, which might be a rather striking result for those who are not familiar with languages like Japanese.⁹

- (18) a. Ken-wa kono-kaisya-kara syarei-o moratteiru
 Ken-SBJ from-this-company fee-OBJ have-received
 b. kono-kaisya-wa Ken-ga syarei-o moratteiru.
 b'. kono-kaisya-kara-wa Ken-ga syarei-o moratteiru.
 c. [Ken-ga syarei-o moratteiru] kaisya
 the company from which Ken has received fee

Dislocation of ‘possessives’ are also possible, as can be seen from the sentences in (19, b) and (19, c). It is rather difficult to see whether (19, b') is possible in the intended sense, because *no* can function as ‘possessive pro-noun phrase’, and (19, b') may be an example of this. Either way, (19, b') is a bit awkward in comparison with (19, b).

- (19) a. Ken-ga sono-ronbun-nohiho-o kaita.

- Ken-SBJ of-that-paper review-OBJ wrote
- b. sono-ronbun-wa Ken-ga hihiyo-o kaita.
 - b'. ?sono-ronbun-no-wa Ken-ga hihiyo-o kaita.
 - c. [Ken-ga hihiyo-o kaita] ronbun
the paper of which Ken wrote a review

Dislocation and omission of the relevant postposition is marginally possible even when the postposition designates 'reason' or 'cause' of an event or action. Thus, topicalization in which *de* is omitted, as in (20, b), is unacceptable for most speakers of Japanese. However, topicalization in which the postposition *de* is retained, as shown in (20, b'), is grammatical. (20, c) is a bit problematic. The sentence itself is admittedly awkward or rather vague in meaning. Moreover, it is rather difficult to get the sentence in the intended sense, namely (21, a), because the string itself is acceptable if the intended meaning is something like (21, b). However, another complication is that sentence like (20, c') is a perfectly reasonable thing to say for the intended sense of (21, a). So we cannot simply say that relativization and topicalization of the phrase in question is not allowed in Japanese on the basis of examples like (20, b) or (20, c).

- (20) a. Ken-ga/wa kono-ziken-de daigaku-o zisyoku-sita.
Ken-SBJ because-of-this-incident university-OBJ resigned
 - b. *kono-ziken-wa Ken-ga daigaku-o zisyoku-sita.
 - b'. kono-ziken-de-wa Ken-ga daigaku-o zisyoku-sita.
 - c. *[Ken-ga daigaku-o zisyoku-sita] ziken
 - c'. [Ken-ga daigaku-o zisyoku-suru-koto-ni-natta] ziken
the incident because of which Ken later had to resign from the university
- (21) a. the incident because of which Ken had to resign from the university
 - b. the incident in which Ken resigned from the university

An example where dislocation is clearly ruled out is given below. We cannot have sentences of the form in (22, b) or (22, c), although sentences of the form in (22, b'), where the postposition *yor*i is retained, are acceptable.

- (22) a. Ken-wa ringo-ga kono-kudamono-yori sukida.
Ken-SBJ apple-THEME than-this-fruit like (prefer)
- b. *kono-kudamono-wa Ken-wa ringo-ga sukida.
- b'. kono-kudamono-yori-wa Ken-wa ringo-ga sukida.
- c. *[Ken-ga ringo-ga sukina] kudamono
the fruit that Ken prefers apples to

An interesting case is where *de* for 'means of transportation' is involved. When the following sentences were discussed in a JPSG-WG session at ICOT, some of the participant claimed that (23, b) and (23, c) are both ungrammatical, while some others claimed that (23, c) is acceptable, whereas (23, b) is unacceptable. Those who felt that the sentence in (23, c) is not grammatical agreed that it is better than those in (22, b) and (22, c), where dislocation of a *yor*i-marked phrase is involved.

- (23) a. Ken-ga kono-zitensya-de daigaku-ni kayou.
 Ken-SBJ with-this-bicycle university-GOAL commute
 b. ?*kono-zitensya-wa Ken-ga daigaku-ni kayou.
 b'. kono-zitensya-de-wa Ken-ga daigaku-ni kayou.
 c. ? [Ken-ga daigaku-ni kayou] zitensya
 the bicycle with which Ken commutes to the university

To sum up, although the extreme cases like sentences involving postposition *yor*i might suggest that we could differentiate ‘complements’ and ‘adjuncts’ on the basis of whether dislocation are allowed for these elements, a closer look reveals that this again is not a very decisive criterion for the Japanese language with respect to the distinction in question.

4.2 Dislocation from within Embedded Clauses

Dislocation from within embedded clauses pattern the same with that from simple sentences for the most part. The examples that follow correspond to the ones in the previous section, except for *ga/wa* alterations that are needed in some cases.

Except for the impossibility of *ga-wa* concatenation, dislocation of subjects and OBJECTS of embedded sentences is unproblematic, both for topicalization and relativization. Examples in (24) are cases where the embedded subject is extracted. Examples in (25) show that extraction of either of the *ga*-marked ‘complements’ of *sukida* is possible, as should be expected.

- (24) a. [Kono-kantoku-ga *Bladerunner*-o totta] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 [this-director-SBJ *Bladerunner*-OBJ directed] COMP Hanako-SBJ think
 b. *Bladerunner*-wa [kono-kantoku-ga totta] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 c. [[*Bladerunner*-o totta] to Hanako-ga omotteiru] kantoku
 the director who Hanako thinks directed *Bladerunner*
- (25) a. [Ken-wa ringo-ga sukida] to Hanako-wa omotteiru
 [Ken-SBJ apple-THEME like] COMP Hanako-SBJ think
 Hanako thinks that Ken likes apples.
 a'. [ringo-wa Ken-ga sukida] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 Hanako thinks that it is Ken who likes apples.
 b. ringo-wa [Ken-ga sukida] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 As for apples, Hanako thinks that Ken likes them.
 b'. Ken-wa [ringo-ga sukida] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 As for Ken, Hanako thinks that he likes apples.
 c. [[Ken-ga sukida] to Hanako-ga omotteiru] ringo
 apples, which Hanako thinks that Ken likes
 c'. [[ringo-ga sukida] to Hanako-ga omotteiru] Ken
 Ken, who Hanako thinks likes apples

Similarly, extraction of *o*-marked postpositional phrases out of embedded clauses are unproblematic, regardless of the ‘thematic roles’ involved.

- (26) a. [Ken-ga kono-hon-o yonda] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 [Ken-SBJ this-book-OBJ read] COMP Hanako-SBJ think
 b. kono-hon-wa [Ken-ga yonda] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 c. [[Ken-ga yonda] to Hanako-ga omotteiru] hon
 the book which Hanako thinks that Ken read
- (27) a. [Ken-wa mai-asa kono-koen-o sampo-suru] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 [Ken-SBJ every-morning this-park-THEME take-a-walk] COMP Hanako-SBJ think
 Hanako thinks that Ken takes a walk every morning in this park.
 b. kono-koen-wa [Ken-ga mai-asa sampo-suru] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 c. [[Ken-ga mai-asa sampo-suru] to Hanako-ga omotteiru] koen
 the park in which Hanako thinks that Ken takes a walk every morning

Extraction of ‘complements’ with postpositions other than *ga* or *o* is possible, although in some cases, topicalization and/or relativization are not allowed. This is due to the loss of the original postpositions, so the pattern almost exactly correspond to the cases of extraction from simple sentences. Thus, topicalization and relativization of *kara*-marked phrases out of embedded clauses are unproblematic, as is shown in (28).

- (28) a. [Ken-wa kono-kaisya-kara syarei-o moratteiru] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 [Ken-SBJ from-this-company fee-OBJ have-received] COMP Hanako-SBJ think
 Hanako thinks that Ken has received fee from this company.
 b. kono-kaisya-wa [Ken-ga syarei-o moratteiru] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 b'. kono-kaisya-kara-wa [Ken-ga syarei-o moratteiru] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 c. [[Ken-ga syarei-o moratteiru] to Hanako-ga omotteiru] kaisya
 the company from which Hanako thinks that Ken has received fee

Extraction of ‘possessive’ phrase is possible, although (29, b’) is either awkward or have other than intended meaning/reading.

- (29) a. [Ken-ga sono-ronbun-no hihyo-o kaita] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 [Ken-SBJ of-that-paper review-OBJ wrote] COMP Hanako-SBJ think
 Hanako thinks that Ken wrote a review of the paper.
 b. sono-ronbun-wa [Ken-ga hihyo-o kaita] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 b'. ?sono-ronbun-no-wa [Ken-ga hihyo-o kaita] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 c. [[Ken-ga hihyo-o kaita] to Hanako-ga omotteiru] ronbun
 the paper of which Hanako thinks that Ken wrote a review

A slightly more complicated case is where *de*-marked phrases for ‘reason’ or ‘rationale’ is involved. Sentence in (30, b) is almost completely incomprehensible and it is difficult to interpret the one in (30, c) in the intended sense, although this could be acceptable in the unintended interpretation shown in (31). In spite of this, it is rather difficult to say whether dislocation of *de*-marked phrases in itself is disallowed in Japanese, because sentences like (30, b’) or (30, c’) sound far better, at least to the present writer. It might simply be that the more straightforward interpretation as suggested in (31) exclude the intended interpretation of the sentences in question.

- (30) a. [Ken-wa kono-ziken-de daigaku-o zisyoku-sita] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 [Ken-SBJ because-of-this-incident university-OBJ resigned] COMP Hanako-SBJ think
 Hanako thinks that Ken resigned from the university because of this incident
 b. *kono-ziken-wa [Ken-ga daigaku-o zisyoku-sita] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 b'. ?kono-ziken-de-wa [Ken-ga daigaku-o zisyoku-sita] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 c. *[[Ken-ga daigaku-o zisyoku-sita] to Hanako-ga omotteiru] ziken
 the incident because of which Hanako thinks that Ken resigned from the university
 c'. ?[[Ken-ga daigaku-o zisyoku-suru-koto-ni-natta] to Hanako-ga omotteiru] ziken
 the incident because of which Hanako thinks that Ken later had to resign from the university

(31) the incident in which Hanako thinks that Ken resigned from the university

Extraction of *yori*-marked phrases are impossible unless *yori* is retained, as should be expected.

- (32) a. [Ken-wa ringo-ga kono-kudamono-yori sukida]to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 [Ken-SBJ apple-THEME than-this-fruit prefer] COMP Hanako-SBJ think
 b. *kono-kudamono-wa [Ken-wa ringo-ga sukida] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 b'. kono-kudamono-yori-wa [Ken-wa ringo-ga sukida] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 c. *[[Ken-ga ringo-ga sukida] to Hanako-ga omotteiru] kudamono
 the fruit that Hanako thinks that Ken prefers apples to

Extraction of *de*-marked phrases which designate means of transportation seems to be affected by idiolectal differences and pattern the same as extraction from simple sentences.

- (33) a. [Ken-ga kono-zitensya-de daigaku-ni kayou] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 [Ken-SBJ with-this-bicycle university-GOAL commute] COMP Hanako-SBJ think
 Hanako thinks that Ken commutes to the university with this bicycle.
 b. ?kono-zitensya-wa [Ken-ga daigaku-ni kayou] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 b'. kono-zitensya-de-wa [[Ken-ga daigaku-ni kayou] to Hanako-wa omotteiru.
 c. ?[[Ken-ga daigaku-ni kayou] to Hanako-ga omotteiru] zitensya
 the bicycle with which Hanako thinks that Ken commutes to the university

To sum up, extraction from embedded clauses do not show distinct property of its own and pattern more or less the same as extraction from simple sentences.

4.3 Dislocation from within Relative Clauses

A more interesting case can be found where dislocation from within relative clauses is involved. At first glance, extraction out of relative clauses seems disallowed in Japanese, just as in English. However, a closer investigation reveals that we cannot simply say that dislocation out of relative clauses itself makes the sentence in question unacceptable.

Let's take a look at the examples in (34) first. The example in (34, b) seems to suggest that dislocation from within a relative clause makes the sentence rather incomprehensible and ungrammatical. However, if we change the example into something like (34, d) thereby introducing some sense of quantification, the resulting sentence seems quite sensible and acceptable. Although we do not have a definitive explanation of why sentence in (34, b) is unacceptable, we have to admit

that dislocation from within a relative clause itself does not contribute too strongly in making the resulting sentence unacceptable.

- (34) a. Naomi-wa [sono-hon-o yonda] otoko-ni atta.
 Naomi-SBJ [this-book-SBJ read] man-IOB met
 Naomi met a man who read this book.
- b. *[Naomi-ga [yonda] otoko-ni atta] hon
 the book which Naomi met a man who read
- c. Naomi-wa [sono-hon-o yonda] hito-o ozei sitteiru.
 Naomi-SBJ [this-book-SBJ read] people-IOB a-lot know
 Naomi met a lot of people who read this book.
- d. [Naomi-ga [yonda] hito-o ozei sitteiru] hon
 the book which Naomi knows a lot of people who read

It has sometimes been suggested that quantification might be an important factor in this respect. For instance, although (35, b) is not very bad, there is a distinctive difference in acceptability between this example in (35, b) on the one hand and the examples like (35, c) or (35, d) on the other. The latter cases involve some sense of quantification, which may be the reason for why these sound better.

- (35) a. Naomi-wa [sono-kantoku-ga totta] eiga-o mita.
 Naomi-SBJ [that-director-SBJ directed] film-OBJ saw
 Naomi saw films which that director took.
- b. ?[Naomi-ga [totta] eiga-o mita] kantoku
 the director who Naomi saw films (he) took
- c. [Naomi-ga [totta] eiga-o zembu mita] kantoku
 [Naomi-SBJ[directed] films all saw] director
 the director who Naomi saw all films which (he) took
- d. [Naomi-ga [totta] eiga-o mita-koto-ga-arui] kantoku
 the director who Naomi have seen some films which (he) took

A similar distinction can be found when complements other than ‘subjects’ or ‘OBJECTS’ are involved in dislocation. Sentence in (36, d) is far better than that in (36, b).¹⁰

- (36) a. Naomi-wa [sono-kaisyā-kara syare-i-o moratta] otoko-ni atta.
 Naomi-SBJ [this-company-SOURCE fee-OBJ received] man-IOB met
 Naomi met a man who received fee from this company.
- b. *[Naomi-ga [syare-i-o moratta] otoko-ni atta] kaisyā
 the company which Naomi met a man who received fee from
- c. Naomi-wa [sono-kaisyā-kara syare-i-o moratta] hito-o ozei sitteiru.
 Naomi-SBJ [this-company-SOURCE fee-OBJ received] people-IOB a-lot know

- Naomi knows a lot of people who received fee from this company
- d. [Naomi-ga [syarei-o moratta] hito-o ozei sitteiru] kaisya
the company which Naomi knows a lot of people who received fee from

In sum, although in some cases, extraction from within a relative clause results in a lower acceptability, sentences with almost the same construction are conceivable in which extraction from within a relative clause does not affect its acceptability. Thus, a reasonable conclusion that we can draw is that the restriction involved is more or less semantic in nature. We will have to conclude that in Japanese syntax, extraction from within a relative clause in itself is not prohibited.

5 Conclusion

We have seen various examples of Japanese sentences to verify if data regarding dislocation gives clues by which to distinguish ‘complements’ and ‘adjuncts’. However, what we found was idiosyncrasy of each sentence and word. Even extraction from within a relative clause is possible, although not all sentences with such constructions are acceptable in Japanese. Thus, as far as Japanese is concerned, it is rather difficult to find any definitive way to distinguish ‘complements’ and ‘adjuncts’.

This does not mean, of course, that the conventional distinction in syntactic study of English grammar is of no use in describing Japanese. However, we cannot take concepts and terminology established with respect to English and then apply them blindly to the study of Japanese. While grammatical concepts such as ‘phrase structure’, ‘complement’, ‘adjunct’ and so on should play a central role in the description of Japanese grammar, we have to be beware if the concepts established for English applies in the study of Japanese, or have to be reconstructed to be of as much use in describing Japanese grammar.

Notes

*This paper is based on an informal talk I gave at the symposium on the argument structure of Korean and Japanese in the sixth Korea-Japan Joint Linguistic Conference held in Sophia University on December 29th, 1989. My assignment at the symposium was to give a brief overview of how ‘argument structure’ is to be dealt with in terms of the grammatical formalisms of GPSG/HPSG/JPSG and then go on to discuss problems particular to Japanese. This paper is an attempt to reformulate the latter half of my discussion. Tutorial discussion that roughly corresponds to the former part of my talk will be published shortly (Harada: forthcoming). The data on Japanese dislocation phenomena is partly based on the result of the study conducted by JPSG-WG at ICOT. I would like to express my gratitude to each and every member of ICOT WG and to those who participated in the symposium. This study is partly supported by Waseda University Grant for Special Research Projects (89A-96).

¹As far as I can tell, ‘argumenthood’ is distinctively a ‘semantic’ notion, whereas ‘adjuncthood’ is more syntactic in nature.

²Here again, Larson's terminology is somewhat disturbing. What he means by iterability, apparently, is possibility of recurrence of more than one phrase of the same type or function in a given sentence, rather than that of the same string.

³However, in some dialect and/or idiolect at least, dislocation from within a subordinate clause is possible given reasonable context. Inoue (1976: pp. 184.) notes that there is a dialect in English in which (i, b) is allowed.

- (i) a. You will cry when you see the movie.
- b. *That's a movie that you will cry when you see.
- c. That's a movie that you will cry when you see it.

Similarly, I cited the example in (ii) elsewhere (Harada: 1988).

(ii) These are the things I will be very unhappy if you break.

⁴The story, of course, is not that simple, even for English. For instance, if you consider the case of noun phrases, the distinction that we discussed here is not that clear. Also, in the case of sentence modifiers, it is often claimed that iteration of the same sort of adjunct makes the sentence sound rather awkward.

⁵Symbols such as 'SBJ' and 'OBJ' are given in the glosses for example Japanese sentences that follow in order to give the readers who do not speak the language some rough idea of the meaning of the sentences and words discussed. They are not intended to signify the exact 'thematic roles' of the phrases involved. Note in this connection that I assume that *wa* is used to mark subjects in ordinary matrix sentences without involving topicalization in some cases.

⁶See Harada (1981) for some discussion of conjunction reduction and related constructions in English. Also, see Harada (1990) for some informal discussion of related constructions in Japanese.

⁷See Harada (1990).

⁸Inoue (1976), considering a similar set of examples, gives basically the same observation, although the grammaticality judgment she gives to each sentence differs in various minor aspects from the one given here.

⁹Preference between (37, b) and (37, b') may differ among speakers of Japanese and also depends heavily on context in which the utterance is made.

¹⁰This sentence itself is acceptable in the following sense.

- (i) The company in which Naomi met the man who had received fee.

REFERENCES

- Gunji, Takao (1987) *Japanese Phrase Structure Grammar: A Unification-based Approach*, Dordrecht, D. Reidel.
- Harada, Y. (1981) "Reduced Coordination and Transformations — a review of current approaches to semantic regularities", *Linguistic Research*, Tokyo University English Linguistics Association, No. 1.
- Harada, Yasunari (1989, a) "Current Topics in JPSG", *Humanitas*, No. 27, The Waseda University Law Association, Tokyo.

- Harada, Yasunari (1989, b) “On Island Constraints — A phrase Structure Grammar Perspective”, *Islands in Syntax*, Hasida, K., Gunji, T., Nakajima, H., Ikeuchi, M., Ishikawa, A. and Harada Y., ICOT Technical Memorandum, TM-0813, Institute for New Generation Computer Technology.
- Harada, Y. (1990) “Reduced Juxtaposition in Japanese”, paper presented at the Joint Workshop of NLU-WG & PSG-WG, ICOT, Tokyo.
- Harada, Y. (forthcoming) “Phrase Structure Grammar and ‘Argument Structure’ — Subcategorization and Semantic Role Assignment from a Lexicalist Point of View —”, (In Japanese), *Bulletin of the Institute of Language Teaching*, the Institute of Language Teaching, Waseda University.
- Harada, Y., T. Gunji, H. Miyoshi, H. Sirai, and K. Hasida (1989) “JPSG — A Phrase Structure Grammar for Japanese”, *Advances in Software Science and Technology*, 1.
- Inoue, Kazuko (1976) *Henkei Bumpo to Nihongo (Transformations and the Japanese Language)*, in Japanese, Taisyukan Syoten, Tokyo.
- Larson, Richard, K. (1988) “Implicit Argument in Situation Semantics”, *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 11, 169-201.
- Pollard, C. and Sag, I. A. (1987) *Information-Based Syntax and Semantics*, CSLI Lecture Notes 13, Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University.
- Williams, Edwin (1981) “Argument Structure and Morphology”, *The Linguistic Review*, 1, 81-114.

How to get in touch with the author

1. postal address: 1-6-1, Nishi-Waseda, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo, Japan
2. e-mail address: harada@wucc.waseda.ac.jp, harada@csli.stanford.edu