

The Nominative/Genitive Alternation and Subordination in the Japanese Language

Ida Hammar

ida.hammar.ih@gmail.com



LUND UNIVERSITY

Bachelor's thesis
Japanese
Spring term 2015

Lund University
Centre for Languages and Literature, Japanese studies
Supervisor: Arthur Holmer and Rika Hayashi

ABSTRACT

The focus of this paper is the nominative/genitive case alternation phenomenon, often called *ga/no* conversion, which occurs in the Japanese language. In some kinds of subordinate clauses, the nominative case marker *ga* can be replaced with the genitive *no* to mark the subject of a sentence, without causing any particular difference in meaning. A survey concerning said phenomenon has been carried out. The results are examined to find out in which kinds of subordinate clauses the alternation is possible and to analyse semantic differences and frequency of use. The results are also compared to previous research regarding this phenomenon.

Keywords: Nominative, genitive, case, case alternation, *ga/no* conversion, syntax, subordination, Japanese

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincerest gratitude toward a number of kind people without whom the present thesis would have stood no chance of being completed. In no particular order thanks go to Rika Hayashi, Arthur Holmer, Lars Larm, Axel Svahn, Manami Koyanagi and to all the people that answered my survey.

CONTENTS

Abstract and keywords	ii
Acknowledgments	iii
Conventions	vi
Abbreviations	vii
1 Introduction	
1.1 Case marking in Japanese	1
1.2 The topic	3
1.3 Structure	5
2 Previous research	
2.1 Introduction	6
2.2 The characteristics of GNC	6
2.3 The two major approaches to GNC	9
2.4 The development of <i>ga</i> and <i>no</i>	13
2.5 Summary of previous research	15

3	GNC and subordination	
	3.1 Introduction	16
	3.2 Methodology and error sources	16
	3.3 <i>Kara</i> and <i>node</i> -clauses	20
	3.4 Conditional clauses, <i>-ba</i>	23
	3.5 Relative clauses	25
	3.6 <i>To-iu</i> and <i>to-no</i>	28
	3.7 <i>Made</i> and <i>yoru</i>	31
	3.8 Intervening elements	33
	3.8.1 Adverbs	33
	3.8.2 Time, place and with (whom)	36
	3.9 Gender	38
4	Conclusion	
	4.1 Summary	39
	4.2 Concluding remarks	40
	References	42
	Appendix	
	Survey	44
	Answers	53

CONVENTIONS

Glossing

Glossing in this paper essentially conforms to the Leipzig Glossing Rules. A list of abbreviations used in this paper can be found on the next page.

Romanization

The modified Hepburn system of Romanization is used to transcribe Japanese vocabulary throughout this paper. What differs from the original system is as follows: double letters, not macrons, mark long vowels, with the exception being long *e*, which is transcribed as *ei*. Place names and other words now considered to be part of the English lexicon follow their English spellings unless they are used within Japanese sentences, in which they are transcribed to reflect their original Japanese spelling. Romanized Japanese from outside sources has at times been altered for the sake of consistency.

Typographical Conventions

Italics mark non-English vocabulary. Single quotes are used to distinguish translated vocabulary and example sentences. Double quotes are used in all other cases. Boldface highlights the nominative/genitive case alteration in example sentences. Unless otherwise noted, the example sentences are my own.

ABBREVIATIONS

ACC	accusative
ATTR	attributive
C	complementizer
COND	conditional
COP	copula
DAT	dative
GEN	genitive
GER	gerund
LOC	locative
NEG	negative
NOM	nominative
NPST	non-past
PASS	passive
PROG	progressive
PST	past
TOP	topic

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Case marking in Japanese

For the sake of giving context to the topic of the present thesis it might be a good idea to shortly explain how case marking in Japanese functions. Apart from e.g., English, the word order in Japanese is SOV (subject object verb) and the relations of the words in a sentence (case) are marked with particles. Particles are postpositional words mainly attached to noun phrases. They supply various kinds of syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic information. The particles that supply information regarding the relationship between a noun phrase and the predicate are as follows: *ga* (nominative), *o* (accusative), *ni* (dative), *de* (locative/instrumental), *to* (comitative), *kara/ryori* (ablative), *e* (allative). In addition, *no* (genitive), which specifies the relationship between two noun phrases, is also included in this type of particle (Iwasaki 2013:66). The particle *wa* marks topic. Some basic examples are as follows:

(1) *watashi-wa koohii-o non-da.*

I-TOP coffee-ACC drink-PST

‘I drank coffee.’

(2) *Taroo-ga ki-ta.*

Taro-NOM come-PST

‘Taro came.’

(3) [*Hanako-no hon*]

Hanako-GEN book

‘Hanako’s book’

The case marking system in Japanese is similar to that of languages such as Russian or Latin. However, case marking in Japanese has some unique characteristics. In many languages, case is considered to be a part of the noun and it would be unthinkable to present a noun without case. In Japanese, however, it is not that uncommon to omit case particles (usually nominative or accusative), especially in casual conversations. One could say that case particles are a word class of its own. One could also divide the particles in to two groups, case particles and postpositions. Although the two groups are similar, the role that they play in a sentence is quite different. While case particles can be omitted to some extent, omitting postpositions would lead to an ungrammatical sentence. See the comparison made in (4) and (5).

(4) a. ame-(ga) futte-iru.

rain-(NOM) fall-PROG-NPST

‘It is raining.’

b. gohan-(o) tabe-ta?

meal-(ACC) eat-PST

‘Have you eaten?’

(5) a. Taroo-ga kooen-*(de) hon-o yonde-iru.

Taro-NOM park-(LOC) book-ACC read-PROG-NPST

‘Taro is reading a book in the park.’

b. Hanako-ga tomodachi-*(to) sushi-o tabe-ta.

Hanako-NOM friend-(COM) sushi-ACC eat-PST

‘Hanako ate sushi with (her) friend.’

Case particles themselves do not have any specific semantic value, but postpositions do. Case particles are similar to postpositions in that they are monomoraic and always paired together with a noun. A major difference is that postpositions generally contain some kind of meaning. One could translate *de* as “in” or “on” and *to* as “with”. The roles of case particles are determined in a sentence as they indicate which noun that is the subject, object, etc.

1.2 The topic

The topic of the present thesis is the case alternation phenomenon in Japanese called *ga/no* (nominative/genitive) conversion (henceforth, GNC), and its relation with subordinate clauses in the Japanese language. This phenomenon was originally noted by Harada (1971), but has been subsequently discussed by several linguists, such as Shibatani (1975), Inoue (1976), Nakai (1980) Miyagawa (1993), Ura (1993), Watanabe (1996), Nishioka (1998), Ochi (2001), Kikuta (2002), Hiraiwa (2005), Maki and Uchibori (2008) and Miyagawa (2011), among others.

According to Harada (1971), nominative subject marking virtually always leads to a grammatical sentence while genitive subject marking does not, i.e., it has a narrower range of grammatical possibilities. There are still some areas where it is unclear whether the genitive *no* as a subject marker is acceptable or not. The goal of the present thesis is to further examine in what kinds of subordinate clauses GNC is acceptable and how GNC is perceived in the minds of native speakers of Japanese. Nakagawa (1987) suggests that *ga* and *no* differs in style and assumes that written language and formal speech promotes the use of *no*, rather than *ga*.

GNC occurs in embedded contexts, such as adnominal clauses (1), but the genitive *no* cannot occur in main clauses (7).¹

(6) a. Taroo-wa [kinoo Hanako-**ga/no** yon-da] hon-o kari-ta.
Taro-TOP yesterday Hanako-NOM/GEN read-PST book-ACC borrow-PST
'Taro borrowed a book that Hanako read yesterday.'

b. Taroo-wa [kion-**ga/no** takai] kuni-e it-ta.
Taro-TOP temperature-NOM/GEN high country-to go-PST
'Taro went to a country where the temperature is high'

(7) Taroo-**ga/*no** eiga-o mi-ta.
Taro-NOM/GEN movie-ACC watch-PST
'Taro watched a movie.'

¹ This is the case in Tokyo Japanese, however there are dialects in Kyushu where *no* can be used to mark a genitive subject in a main clause. See section 2.4

No as GNC cannot be interpreted as a possessive marker and therefore the genitive *no* in (7) cannot be used to mark a genitive subject. *No* in (7) is not ungrammatical, but rather semantically different from the version that uses nominative subject marking. The genitive *no* in this context will be interpreted as a possessive marker in which the English translation would be ‘(I) watched Taro’s movie’.

As stated above, adnominal clauses are the typical environment where GNC occurs, but recent studies suggests that GNC might be possible in other subordinate clauses (Hiraiwa 2005, Miyagawa 2011). One of the suggested environments where GNC might appear is subordinate clauses headed by *made* ‘until’ or *yor*i ‘than’ (8) (Watanabe 1996, Kikuta 2002, Hiraiwa 2005). Another one is apposition clauses headed by a complementizer such as *to-iu* or *to-no* (9) (Inoue 1976).²

(8) a. Taroo-wa [ame-**ga/?no** yam-u] made ie-ni i-ta.
 Taro-TOP rain-NOM/GEN stop-NPST until home-at be-PST
 ‘Taro was at home until the rain stopped’.

b. Hanako-wa [Taroo-**ga/?no** kat-ta] yori takusan-no hon-o kat-ta.
 Hanako-TOP Taro-NOM/GEN buy-PST than many-GEN book-ACC buy-PST
 ‘Hanako bought more books than Taro did.’

(9) [densha-**ga/?no** okure-ru] -to-iu/to-no shirase
 train-NOM/GEN late-NPST -C notice
 ‘A notice that the train will be late’

² (8) and (9), among other constructions were tested in the survey.

1.3 Structure

This paper is divided into four parts, this chapter being the first one. After clarifying the topic of the present study, previous research on the case alteration phenomenon GNC is introduced. To provide context for the investigation into the nominative/genitive alternation, various aspects touched upon by scholars in the past are presented. This will make up chapter 2. We then move on to chapter 3, which is the core of the present study. Here, the possibility, frequency and semantics of a genitive subject in different subordinate clauses are discussed through the results of the survey. In chapter 4, the results are summarised and presented, this will be the conclusion of the present thesis.

Chapter 2

Previous research

2.1 Introduction

This chapter is a presentation of previous research on the case alternation phenomenon GNC. GNC occurs in embedded contexts, such as sentential modifiers to nouns, but not in independent clauses. Firstly, an overview of GNC and its characteristics are introduced. In section 2.3 the two major approaches to the syntactic structure of GNC– (Miyagawa 1993, 2011) and Ochi (2001) on one hand, and Watanabe (1996) and Hiraiwa (2005) on the other, are accounted for. The next category presented is this chapter, with the reason being that they were used in a similar way in Old Japanese, the historical use of the case markers nominative *ga* and genitive *no*, touched upon by Frellesvig (2010) and Shibatani (1990), among others, will be presented. Although the present thesis aims to provide a synchronic approach to GNC, a historic overview may provide valuable context as to how GNC functions in Modern Japanese. Lastly, the previous research will be summarised.

2.2 The characteristics of GNC

As previously noted, the case alternation phenomenon GNC was originally discussed by Harada (1971) and has been examined in almost every grammatical paradigm proposed to date by several linguists (see section 1.1). It is well known that not every embedded clause allows for the genitive alteration. Thus, the issue in many studies concerning GNC is to identify where the genitive subject is acceptable. Adnominal clauses are the primary environment where GNC occurs (10).

- (10) Hanako-wa [kinoo imooto-**ga/no** kai-ta] shi-o yon-da.
Hanako-TOP yesterday little.sister-NOM/GEN write-PST poem-ACC read-PST
'Hanako read the poem that her little sister wrote yesterday.'

Adnominal clauses includes both gapped clauses (relative clauses) and gapless clauses that modify a head noun, e.g.,

- (11) [oyu-**ga/no** wa-ku] oto
 water-NOM/GEN boil-NPST sound
 'the sound of boiling water'

Watanabe (1996) states that GNC is not possible in clauses like (12) and (13), which can be explained by transitivity restriction. Transitivity restriction implies that if a direct object exists as an argument of the predicate in an embedded clause, the genitive *no* cannot be used to mark the subject in the same embedded clause. Similarly to the sentence in (7) *no* will be interpreted as a possessive marker (13).

- (12) [Taroo-ga kuruma-o untenshi-ta] toki
 Taro-NOM car-ACC drive-PST time
 'the time that Taro drove the car'

- (13) [Taroo-no kuruma-o untenshi-ta] toki
 Taro-GEN car-ACC drive-PST time
 'the time that drove Taro's car'

There are constructions where an alternation between the case particles *ga* and *no* occurs, that are not necessarily treated as examples of GNC. For instance, Nambu (2014) excludes multiple nominative constructions (14) from his study on case alternation by stating that an NP with the genitive *no* as GNC cannot be interpreted as a possessor and that the syntactic structure of this construction (14) differs from the one for GNC proposed by Hiraiwa (2005) and Miyagawa (2011).³

- (14) Hanako-**ga/*no** neko-ga suki-da.
 Hanako-NOM/GEN cat-NOM like-COP
 'Hanako likes cats.'

³ The syntactic aspects of GNC will be further discussed in section 2.3

Nambu (2014) states that GNC shows the adjacency effect, specifically when the embedded subject is marked by the genitive case particle *no*. Harada (1971) states that the existence of intervening elements between the subject NP and its predicate affects the acceptability of GNC. He insists that more than one intervening element obstruct the use of the genitive *no*. Examples of adjacent and non-adjacent environments are given in (15)⁴.

(15) a. Adjacent environment

John-wa [kinoo Mary-**ga/no** kat-ta] DVD-o mi-ta.
 John-TOP yesterday Mary-NOM/GEN buy-PST DVD-ACC watch-PST
 ‘John watched the DVD that Mary bought yesterday.’

b. Non-adjacent environment

John-wa [kinoo Mary-**ga/?no** denmaaku-de tomodachi-to kat-ta] DVD-o
 John-TOP yesterday Mary-NOM/GEN Denmark-at friend-with buy-PST DVD-ACC
 mi-ta.
 watch-PST
 ‘John watched the DVD that Mary bought with (her) friend in Denmark yesterday.’

Miyagawa (2011) explains the adjacency effect from a perspective of theoretical syntax, but Nambu (2014:46) points out that “...the effect in itself is not clear in that it has not yet been examined empirically in detail but only argued with self-reported intuitive judgements.” He further argues that it is important to establish the adjacency effect from an empirical point of view first, and then from a theoretical point of view. His corpus study indicates that adjacency affects the use of *no* as GNC, but not the use of *ga*.

⁴ [kinoo Mary-no denmaaku-de ka-ta] DVD, however, should be grammatical.

2.3 The two major approaches to GNC

GNC has a long history of syntactic analysis and one could say that there are two major theories that explain the syntactic structure of GNC. The first one is the D-licensing hypothesis (e.g., Miyagawa 2011, Ochi 2001) and the second is the C-licensing hypothesis (e.g., Watanabe 1996, Hiraiwa 2005). The D-licensing hypothesis suggests that the genitive subject as GNC is located in a different syntactic position from the nominative subject, whereas the C-licensing hypothesis claims that the genitive subject and the nominative subject are located in the same place.

The D-licensing by Miyagawa (2011) assumes that there is a structural difference between the nominative and genitive NPs in the case of GNC. This is based on the fact that the genitive subject usually occurs in relative clauses containing a head noun (16a), but not in clauses without a head noun (16b).

(16) a. Taroo-wa [kinoo Naomi-**ga/no** tsukut-ta] soba-o tabe-ta.
Taro-TOP yesterday Naomi-NOM/GEN make-PST noodle-ACC eat-PST
'Taro ate the noodles that Naomi cooked yesterday.'

b. [Kinoo Naomi-**ga/*no** kite-kara], Ken-wa soba-o tabe-ta.
Yesterday Naomi-NOM/GEN come-after Ken-TOP noodle-ACC eat-PST
'After Naomi came yesterday, Ken ate the noodles.'

(Nambu 2014)

The D-licensing approach stipulates that the genitive subject must occur with a head noun with D to be licensed. However, there are examples where the genitive subject may occur without a head noun, e.g., *made* (8a) and *yoru* (8b) clauses. Maki and Uchibori (2008) supports the D-licensing theory by arguing that *made* and *yoru* clauses have a phonologically null N head \emptyset that can be replaced with a lexical item (17). *Teido* and *toki* in (17) are head nouns of the clauses containing GNC. Nambu (2014) suggests that this could imply that structures that contain *made* or *yoru* also, although covertly, contain a DP level and that the genitive subject always occurs within the DP.

(17) a. Taroo-wa [ame-**ga/no** yam-u toki/ Ø made] ie-ni i-ta.
 Taro-TOP rain-NOM/GEN stop-NPST time until home-at be-PST
 ‘Taro was at home until the rain stopped.’

b. Hanako-wa [Taroo-**ga/no** kat-ta teido/ Ø yori] takusan-no hon-o kat-ta.
 Hanako-TOP Taro-NOM/GEN buy-PST degree than many-GEN book-ACC buy-PST
 ‘Hanako bought more books than Taro did.’

Miyagawa (2011) states that the syntactic structure of a clause containing the genitive subject is smaller than the one containing the nominative subject and that the compact nature of a genitive marked clause allows the determiner to license the genitive subject. The D-licensing approach suggests that the nominative structure is a full CP (complementizer phrase), while the genitive structure is a TP (tense phrase), and smaller. In addition, it does not have a CP above it. He also argues that there is no CP in the genitive subject structure and therefore speech act, evaluative and evidential adverbs such as “honestly” and “unfortunately” that supposedly occurs in the CP region of a sentence do not allow for GNC. Modal adverbs, e.g., “probably”, would however be grammatical when the subject is marked by *no* since they occur lower, possibly in the TP region. Miyagawa (2011) states that CP adverbs cannot occur in a clause containing a genitive subject regardless of if it is located to the left or right of the genitive *no* (18)⁵⁶.

(18) a. [saiwai-ni Taroo-**ga/*no** yon-da] hon
 fortunately Taro-NOM/GEN read-PST book
 ‘The book that Taro fortunately read’

b. [kitto Taroo-**ga/no** yon-da] hon
 probably Taro-NOM/GEN read-PST book
 ‘The book that Taro fortunately read’

(Miyagawa 2011)

⁵ Miyagawa (2011) argues that the nominative structure is DP→NP→CP→TP→SubjNOM, while the genitive structure is DP→NP→TP→vP→SubjGEN and the D in the DP is what licenses the genitive subject. Adverbs such as “unfortunately” need a larger structure, i.e., a CP (CP is larger than TP), due to its location in a sentence. On the other hand, Hiraiwa (2005) suggests that the structure is the same for both the nominative and the genitive construction, NP→CP→TP→DP iNOM/GEN, and that the genitive subject is licensed by C in the CP by adding the categorical feature [+N] to C.

⁶ These constructions were tested in the survey.

He further argues that the structural difference between the nominative *ga* and the genitive *no* in the D-licensing hypothesis can explain the adjacency effect on the acceptability of *no* by suggesting that when the genitive subject occurs to the left of a temporal adverb, the subject undergoes unmotivated movement within the syntactical structure, which is uneconomical and thus leads to degradation in acceptability. If the intervening element does not require the genitive subject to move, it is grammatical.

One of the major differences in theoretical assumptions between the two hypotheses is whether the genitive structure contains a CP level or not. The C-licensing approach (Watanabe 1996, Hiraiwa 2005) argues that the choice between nominative and genitive in GNC is optional and that there should be no difference in meaning resulting from choosing one over the other. Hiraiwa (2005) assigns the same syntactical structure to both the nominative and genitive structures, which both contain a CP. Nambu (2013) considers the existence of a CP level in the genitive structure in his corpus research on GNC by investigating *to-iu* and *to-no* apposition clauses. If Miyagawa's (2011) theory is correct, the genitive subject should not occur with *to-iu* and *to-no* as they are treated as complementizers in syntactic literature. Nambu (2013) does however provide evidence that GNC is possible with *to-iu/to-no* clauses by presenting an example from the CSJ corpora⁷ and further argues that if *to-iu/to-no* actually are complementizers, Miyagawa's (2011) D-licensing approach needs to be revised. In the D-licensing approach the absence of CP is crucial for D in the genitive structure to allow GNC to occur. If the genitive structure does contain a CP level, the C-licensing approach would be more appropriate (Nambu 2013). The advocates of the C-licensing approach offer examples of the genitive *no* without a nominal head. Hiraiwa (2005) demonstrates this by using cleft construction and the internally headed relative clause (19).

- (19) a. [John-**ga/no** shika-rare-ta no]-wa Mary-ni da.
 John-NOM/GEN scold-PASS-PST C-TOP Mary-by COP
 'It is by Mary that John was scolded.'

⁷ Corpus of Spontaneous Japanese, <http://www.ninjal.ac.jp/english/products/csj/>

b. John-ga [sara-no ue-ni ringo-**ga/no** oiteat-ta no]-o katteni tabe-ta.⁸

John-NOM plate-GEN on-DAT apple-NOM/GEN put-PST C-ACC

without.permission eat-PST

‘Without asking, John ate the apple that was on the plate.’

(Hiraiwa 2005)

No in (19) is categorised as C in the cleft construction and in the internally headed relative clause. Thus, both the nominative construction and the genitive construction should contain a CP level. Nambu (2013) argues that the corpus data he presented, as well as examples like (19), supports the claim that both the genitive and nominative structure contain a CP level. Furthermore, the examples in (19) have no space for a NP to assume that there exists a phonologically null N head, as we observed in (17). However, Nambu (2013) also points out that not every complementizer allows for GNC. Harada (1971), among others, states that *no* cannot occur in *to* complementizer clauses as shown in (20).

(20) Taro-wa [kinoo Jiro-**ga/*no** ki-ta] -to omot-ta.

Taro-TOP yesterday Jiro-NOM/GEN come-PST-C think-PST

‘Taro thought that Jiro came yesterday.’

Hiraiwa (2005) suggests that there are “Complementizer Blocking Effects” that block an overt C, e.g., *to*, to occur with the genitive subject. But Nambu (2013) argues that this constraint should not exclude the genitive use with the C head *no* as in (19) and that further research is needed to investigate when overt C heads allow GNC.⁹ To summarise the two hypotheses, the D-licensing approach claims that the syntactic positions of the embedded subject marked by *ga* or *no* are different, while the C-licensing suggests that the syntactic position are the same for both versions.

⁸ The status of *no* in this construction is controversial. It can also be labelled *nominalizer* (e.g., Hasegawa 2014)

⁹ For a more detailed discussion of the two hypotheses, see Maki and Uchibori (2008), Nambu (2013, 2014).

2.4 The development of *ga* and *no*

The genitive case particle *no* is an attributive function that connects one nominal form to another. The semantic relationship between the two may be of various kinds, but one of the most common relationships is the possessor-possessed. The particle *no* has another function, namely that of marking the subject of a nominalized clause. The particle *ga* on the other hand marks the subject of both independent and dependent clauses. In Old Japanese¹⁰, both *ga* and *no* functioned as genitive particles. In Old Japanese, and still in Modern Japanese, *no* also functions as an adnominal form of the copula. The genitive function of *no* is thought to derive in pre-Old Japanese from the function as adnominal copula, but in Old Japanese both functions of *no* were established and fully independent. Both *ga* and *no* were used as a genitive marker, but they developed differently and are used quite differently in Modern Japanese. In Early Middle Japanese, *ga* acquired the function of a conjunctive particle, e.g. ‘and’, ‘but’, ‘as’ and became a nominative case particle in Late Middle Japanese. *No* was still used as a genitive case particle and copula. *No* acquired its additional use as a nominalizer in early Modern Japanese. However, in Early Middle Japanese and in Late Middle Japanese, *no* had more nominative-like functions than *ga*. The particle *ga* has changed more over time than *no* has, but the functions as genitive, nominalizer and nominative are distributed differently in a number of dialects. In some dialects, *no* functions as nominative, whereas *ga* functions as genitive and nominalizer. The functions of *ga* and *no* can be summarised as follows (Frellesvig 2010):

Table 1: Summary of the functions of *ga* and *no*

	Old Japanese	Modern Japanese
<i>no</i>	Copula	Copula
	Genitive	Genitive
		Nominalizer

¹⁰ Linguistic periods (Frellesvig 2010):

Old Japanese	700-800
Early Middle Japanese	800-1200
Late Middle Japanese	1200-1600
Modern Japanese	1600-

<i>ga</i>	Genitive	Nominative
		Conjunctive particle

In Old Japanese, *ga* and *no* had two main functions and both particles were used in both functions. The first one is adnominalization (NP-*ga/no* NP), which is the primary function of the genitive in Japanese. The other one is subject marking (NP-*ga/no* VP). Although *ga* and *no* were used in both of the above-mentioned functions, there were significant differences in the components they could mark. *Ga* was generally more restricted in its use than *no* in the way that *ga* was only used to mark noun phrases referring to humans, personified animals or things while *no* could be used to mark all nouns, including those referring to humans (Frellesvig 2010). From Old Japanese and forward both *ga* and *no* marked the subject of a nominalized clause and the similar modern functions of the two particles are generally believed to be a result of their historical use. Hashimoto (1969) makes the following comparison seen in (21).

- (21) a. wa-ga [michi]
I-GEN road
‘my road’
- b. wa-ga [ik-u michi]
I-GEN go-NPST ATTR road
‘my road to go’
- c. [wa-ga ik-u] michi
I-GEN go-NPST road
‘the road I go’

The old functions of *no* and *ga* are preserved to some extent in Kyushu¹¹, where in a number of dialects *no* is used as the nominative case marker and *ga* as the genitive case marker. In Kumamoto, *no* is used as a neutral nominative particle, e.g. *sensei no korareta* ‘the teacher has come (honorific)’, *jidoosha no kuru zo* ‘the car is coming’, while *ga* is used in a deprecative way towards the referent of the *ga*-marked nominal, e.g., *kodomo-yazu ga*

¹¹ The southernmost island of Japan’s four major islands.

nakiyoru bai 'the brat is crying', *ora ga nakashitattatai* 'I made (him) cry.' However, in some regions in the Miyazaki prefecture the deferential value has been reversed. In Takachihocho, *no* is used to show deference, but in Shinamura, also in the Miyazaki prefecture, *kwanjin no kita* 'the beggar has come', is possible, but not *sensei no korareta* 'the teacher has come (honorific)', indicating that *no* is used for deprecation (Harada 1979) referred to in (Shibatani 1990:356f).

2.5 Summary of previous research

In this chapter the nominative/genitive case alteration phenomenon was introduced. This was done by presenting various aspects touched upon by scholars in the past. Topics as where GNC can and cannot occur as well as the history of the case particles *ga* and *no* were brought up to give a general idea of how the alteration functions in the Japanese language. The main features of the two syntactic theories concerning GNC, the D-licensing hypothesis and the C-licensing hypothesis, were also presented to some extent. GNC has been subject to scrutiny in theoretical syntax since the early 1970's, and has since then, been argued theoretically without substantial evidence from an empirical point of view. Because of this, there are still aspects regarding GNC that is unclear.

By discussing the results of the survey made for the present thesis we attempt to further investigate constructions where the alteration may occur, hoping to contribute to the research on GNC by presenting empirical data. The semantic differences between sentences where the subject is marked by the nominative *ga* respectively *no* will also, if possible, be studied. With this, we proceed to chapter 3, where the survey will be discussed.

Chapter 3

GNC and subordination

3.1 Introduction

The constructions discussed in the present chapter are as seen below:

Section	Construction/clause type
3.3	<i>Kara</i> and <i>node</i> clauses
3.4	Conditional clauses headed by the <i>-ba</i> form of the verb
3.5	Relative clauses
3.6	Apposition clauses headed by <i>to-iu/to-no</i>
3.7	Clauses headed by <i>made</i> or <i>yor</i>
3.8.1	Clauses containing <i>kitto</i> or <i>saiwai-ni</i>
3.8.2	Clauses containing time, place and with (whom)

Lastly, a brief observation regarding gender is made in section 3.9. The aim of the present thesis is to further investigate in what kind of subordinate clauses GNC occurs and, if possible, the semantic differences of *ga* and *no*. Whether a genitive subject is possible or not in the above-mentioned constructions and the underlying explanations for the unacceptability of a *no* marked subject in some constructions are discussed in this chapter. Furthermore, the results suggest that the use of *no* gives a more formal impression than *ga* and evidence supporting the C-licensing hypothesis has been found.

3.2 Methodology and error sources

Since the focus of the present thesis is GNC, a study related to grammar, a substantial amount of respondents is necessary in order to gather reliable data. Therefore it is the opinion of the author that a survey is the most appropriate method regarding the current study. Unfortunately this interferes with the opportunity to discuss the subject on a deeper level where the use of an informant would be ideal. Given the limited time frame to carry

out the present paper, a study on a larger scale, e.g. interviewing a large number of native speakers was deemed impossible. The major problem when creating this survey has been the construction of natural example sentences. Apart from the possibly unnatural uses of *no* it is not desired that the informants find something strange or ungrammatical in the sentences used in the survey. This would make the informants focus less on the case alteration itself and would definitely cause skewed results. In order to avoid this scenario, contact with native speakers has been made for the sake of constructing the survey.

The survey used in the present thesis is divided into two parts. The first one consists of several example sentences containing different kinds of subordinate clauses and a gap where the respondents are asked to choose between either *ga* (nominative) or *no* (genitive). The purpose of this question type is to study which of the two particles that is preferred. (22) is an example taken from the first part of the survey and in this case contains an adnominal clause.

- (22) Hanako-wa kinoo Taroo-() kai-ta e-o mite-ita.
 Hanako-TOP yesterday Taro-NOM/GEN draw-PST painting-ACC watch-PROG-PST
 ‘Hanako looked at the painting that Taro () drew yesterday.’

The second part investigates the acceptability and impression of *no* and *ga* as GNC in different kinds of subordinate clauses. Each sentence appears two times, one time *no* is used as GNC and the next time *ga* marks the subject in the subordinate clause. An example of this question type can be seen in (23). In this sentence *no* was used as GNC.

- (23) John-wa kyonen Tanaka-**no** kai-ta kiji-o yon-da.
 John-TOP last.year Tanaka-GEN write-PST article-ACC read-PST
 ‘John read the article that Tanaka wrote last year’

The respondents were asked to choose one of the following options regarding the possibility of *ga/no* as GNC in different contexts.

1. You use it yourself and you think that other people use it as well.
2. You do not use it yourself but still consider it to be usable.
3. You do not consider the given construction possible.

The respondents were also asked to comment on how the sentence sounds. They could choose more than one of the following options and/or write a comment.

1. Educated
2. Uneducated
3. Bookish/Stuffy
4. Formal
5. Old-fashioned

This kind of method is useful for gathering a substantial amount of data. However, the number of respondents that answered the survey was less than expected. When interpreting the present study it is important to bear in mind that the empirical foundation of the present study strongly relies on the intuitions of only 19 respondents. The following is a list over the respondents that will be used to refer to individual answers in chapter 3.

Table 2: List over the respondents that answered the survey

Respondent	Prefecture	City	Gender	Age	Japanese
A	Aichi	Tokai	Female	19	Native
B	Hiroshima	Kure	Female	27	Native
C	Ibaraki	Mito	Female	23	Native
D	Gifu	Godo	Female	36	Native
E	Gifu	Ginan	Female	20	Native
F	Tokyo	Fuchu	Female	29	Native
G	Mie	Matsusaka	Female	21	Native
H	Yamaguchi	Hofu	Male	23	Native
I	Kanagawa	Yokohama	Male	21	Native
J	Aichi	Ichinomiya	Male	21	Native
K	Shiga	Nagahama	Female	27	Native
L	Kanagawa	Kawasaki	Male	25	Native
M	Hyogo	Kobe	Male	20	Native
N	Osaka	Hirakata	Female	28	Native
O	Kanagawa	Hiratsuka	Female	34	Native

P	Fukushima	Sukagawa	Female	35	Native
Q	Tokyo	Adachi	Male	31	Native
R	Fukushima	Motomiya	Male	39	Native
S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Native

As previously stated the survey is divided into two parts with two types of questions. Dividing the present chapter likewise would be inconsistent and therefore the author has chosen to present this chapter by combining the two question types and sort after clause type. However, before we begin it would be a good idea to elaborate upon how the survey was presented to the respondents. All of the questions, except for the ones testing for *saiwai-ni* ‘fortunately’ and *kitto* ‘probably’ are written in plain form for the sake of focusing on the case alternation itself. The involvement of other forms such as *-desu* or *-masu* would intervene with how the sentence is interpreted regarding formality. The respondents were given the information that it was a survey concerning GNC, as the author wanted them to, once again, be aware of- and focus on the case alternation itself. The categories were mixed so that the respondents would not encounter the same kind of construction in close proximity to each other, which would make the respondents used to a construction and would likely affect the results in a negative way.

The number of respondents is 22. However, among those there were answers that were completely blank and therefore omitted in the list on the previous page, making the total count of useable answers 19. However, in the part asking for the impression of *ga* and *no* in different contexts, the number of respondents varies between 11 and 19. The number of female respondents is 11 while the number of male respondents is 7, making the majority of the respondents female. The age ranges from 19-39, but most of the respondents are in their early to mid-twenties. As we can see in table 1, there is one respondent that answered the survey itself but not the part that asked for personal information.

3.3 *Kara* and *node* clauses

The first constructions presented in this chapter are clauses containing the conjunctions *kara* and *node*. Both express reason or cause. *Kara* is used for reason or cause of the speaker’s volition or opinion and focuses more on the reason itself. *Node* focuses on the resulting effect of an action or situation. Even though they are quite similar in meaning, there might be some differences in how they function grammatically with GNC if they are possible with the genitive subject.

(24) Taroo-wa ruumumeeto-() dekake-ta kara hitori-de bangohan-o tabe-ta.
 Taro-TOP roommate-NOM/GEN go.out-PST because alone-by dinner-ACC eat-PST
 ‘Taro ate dinner alone because (his) roommate had gone out.’

(25) Hanako-wa ruumumeeto-() dekake-ta node hitori-de bangohan-o tabe-ta.
 Hanako-TOP roommate-NOM/GEN go.out-PST because alone-by dinner-ACC eat-PST
 ‘Hanako ate dinner alone because (her) roommate had gone out.’

Table 3: *Kara* and *Node* clauses in question type one

	<i>Kara</i> (24)	<i>Node</i> (25)
<i>ga</i>	100% (19/19)	100% (19/19)
<i>no</i>	0% (0/19)	0% (0/19)

If we look at table 3 we can see that none of the respondents chose *no* to mark the subject in clauses headed by *kara* or *node*, which implies that GNC is not possible in these constructions.

(26) Tanaka-wa dooryoo-**ga/?no** yasun-da kara zangyoo-shinakerebanaranakat-ta.
 Tanaka-TOP colleague-NOM/GEN be.absent-PST because work.overtime-have.to-PST
 ‘Tanaka had to work overtime because (his) colleague was absent.’

Table 4: *Kara* clauses in question type two (26)

	Uses	Natural	Unnatural
<i>ga</i>	89.5% (17/19)	10.5% (2/19)	0% (0/19)
<i>no</i>	0% (0/19)	0% (0/19)	100% (19/19)

- (27) Hanako-wa dooryoo-**ga/?no** yasun-da node zangyoo-shinakerebanaranakat-ta
 Hanako-TOP colleague-NOM/GEN be.absent-PST because work.overtime-have.to-PST
 ‘Hanako had to work overtime because (her) colleague was absent.’

Table 5: *Node* clauses in question type two (27)

	Uses	Natural	Unnatural
<i>ga</i>	94.7% (18/19)	5.3% (1/19)	0% (0/19)
<i>no</i>	0% (0/19)	0% (0/19)	100% (19/19)

The results in table 4 and 5 further confirms that GNC is not possible with either *kara* or *node* as all the respondents considered *no* in these contexts to be unnatural. The majority of the respondents did not comment on why they deem the genitive subject with *kara* or *node* to be unnatural, simply that it is ungrammatical based on their intuition. The reason for the ungrammaticality might lie in the grammatical properties of *kara* and *node*. Miyagawa (To appear) states that if a clause contains non-dependent tense, which *kara* and *node* clauses do, GNC is not possible. Besides, neither *kara* nor *node* can be considered to function as a nominal head, which Miyagawa (2011) argues is crucial for the genitive subject to be licensed. Respondent L comments that he would consider the sentences to be natural if *dooryoo* ‘colleague’ was more specified (28).

- (28) dooryoo-no Tanaka-san-ga yasun-da kara/node...
 colleague-GEN Tanaka-Mr.-NOM be.absent-PST because
 ‘Because (her) colleague Mr.Tanaka was absent...’

In (28) *no* loses its role as a genitive subject marker and instead takes on its attributive form, while *ga* marks the subject, once again proving that GNC is not possible in clauses headed by *kara* or *node*. In conclusion, constructions like (29) and (30) are deemed to be ungrammatical.

(29) *Hanako-wa dooryoo-**no** yasun-da kara zangyoo-shinakerebanaranakat-ta.
 Hanako-TOP colleague-NOM be.absent-PST because work.overtime-have.to-PST
 ‘Hanako had to work overtime because (her) colleague was absent.’

(30) *Hanako-wa dooryoo-**no** yasun-da node zangyoo-shinakerebanaranaka-ta.
 Hanako-TOP colleague-NOM be.absent-PST because work.overtime-have.to-PST
 ‘Hanako had to work overtime because (her) colleague was absent.’

Table 6: Impression of (26), *kara*

	Educated	Uneducated	Bookish/Stuffy	Formal	Old fashioned
<i>ga</i>	61.5% (8/15)	15.4% (2/15)	15.4% (2/15)	23.1% (3/15)	0% (0/15)
<i>no</i>	0% (0/12)	91.7% (11/12)	8.3% (1/12)	0% (0/12)	0% (0/12)

Table 7: impression of (27), *node*

	Educated	Uneducated	Bookish/Stuffy	Formal	Old fashioned
<i>ga</i>	84.6% (11/13)	0% (0/13)	0% (0/13)	15.4% (2/13)	0% (0/13)
<i>no</i>	0% (0/11)	90.9% (10/11)	9.1% (1/11)	0% (0/11)	0% (0/11)

The fact that the majority of the respondents consider the use of *no* in (26) and (27) to sound uneducated is not surprising considering that the genitive subject in this construction leads to ungrammaticality. It is difficult to study the semantic difference between *no* and *ga* in these constructions as a genitive subject makes the sentences ungrammatical.

3.4 Conditional clauses, *-ba*

There are a number of conditional forms in Japanese¹², but *-ba* is said to be one of the “pure” conditional forms and was therefore chosen to be tested in the survey. Given the results in the previous section, this construction is not expected to be possible with GNC.

- (31) Hanako-wa okane-() are-ba natsuyasumi-ni ryokoosu-ru.
 Hanako-TOP money-NOM/GEN have-COND summer.holiday-DAT travel-NPST
 ‘Hanako will travel during the summer holiday if (she) can afford it.’

Table 8: Conditional *-ba* in question type one

	<i>-ba</i> (31)
<i>ga</i>	100% (19/19)
<i>no</i>	0% (0/19)

- (32) Mary-wa ame-**ga/?no** fure-ba sanpo-ni ika-nai.
 Mary-TOP rain-NOM/GEN fall-COND walk-DAT go-NEG-NPST
 ‘If it rains Mary will not go for a walk.’

Table 9: Conditional clauses, *-ba* in question type two (32)

	Uses	Natural	Unnatural
<i>ga</i>	68.4% (13/19)	21.1% (4/19)	10.5% (2/19)
<i>no</i>	0% (0/19)	0% (0/19)	100% (19/19)

The surprising part is that two of the respondents considered the sentence marked by *ga* to be unnatural. This could be due to the fact that *-ba* was combined with the negative form of the verb. However, the results presented in table 8 and 9 confirm our expectations regarding *no*. GNC is not possible in conditional *-ba* clauses and the reason should be the same as the one discussed for *kara* and *node* in section 3.3. Just as *kara* and *node* clauses do,

¹² Other conditional forms in Japanese are *-to*, *nara*, *-tara*.

conditional *-ba* clauses also contain independent tense, making the genitive subject ungrammatical. Respondent B commented on this construction and suggested that *ame-no furu-to* ‘if it rains’ might be possible. This could be dialectal as the respondent is from Hiroshima, which is not far from Kyushu, but it could also mean that not all conditional constructions are ungrammatical with a genitive marked subject. However, that is a topic that needs further investigation. Conditional clauses headed by *-ba* with a genitive subject are deemed to be ungrammatical (33).

- (33) *Mary-wa ame-**no** fure-ba sanpo-ni ika-nai.
 Mary-TOP rain-NOM/GEN fall-COND walk- go-NEG-NPST
 ‘If it rains Mary will not go for a walk.’

Table 10: Impression of (32), *-ba*

	Educated	Uneducated	Bookish/Stuffy	Formal	Old fashioned
<i>ga</i>	66.7% (8/13)	8.3% (1/13)	8.3% (1/13)	25% (3/13)	0% (0/13)
<i>no</i>	0% (0/11)	90.9% (10/11)	9.1% (1/11)	0% (0/19)	0% (0/19)

The results in table 10 indicate that when a genitive subject leads to ungrammaticality, it also tends to sound uneducated. We observed the same result in the previous section with *kara* and *node*. As conditional clauses headed by *-ba* together with a genitive subject are ungrammatical, it is not possible to study the semantic differences between *ga* and *no* in this context.

3.5 Relative clauses

Now we move on to the next constructions tested in the survey, which are adnominal clauses and internally headed relative clauses. As previously stated, adnominal clauses are the primary environment where GNC occurs and it is therefore expected that the acceptability of this clause type will be quite high. If GNC is possible with the internally headed relative clause¹³ it supports Harada’s (2005) claim that the genitive subject does not necessarily need to have a nominal head to be licensed. It would also provide further evidence that the genitive structure contains a CP level.

(34) Hanako-wa kinoo Taroo-() kai-ta e-o mite-ita.
 Hanako-TOP yesterday Taro-NOM/GEN draw-PST painting-ACC watch-PROG-PST
 ‘Hanako watched the painting that Taro drew yesterday.’

(35) Taroo-wa Hanako-() orenji-o mitekure-ta no-o tabe-ta.
 Taro-TOP Hanako-NOM/GEN orange-ACC peel-PST C-ACC eat-PST
 ‘Taro ate the orange, that Hanako had peeled.’

Table 11: Adnominal clauses, IHRC in question type one

	Adnominal (34)	IHRC (35)
<i>ga</i>	57.9% (11/19)	100% (19/19)
<i>no</i>	42.1% (8/19)	0% (0/19)

The number of respondents that chose *no* over *ga* in the adnominal construction confirms what is already known; that adnominal clauses are the primary environment where GNC occurs. Compared to the other clause types tested in the survey, the adnominal clause is the construction where GNC most commonly occurs. Internally headed relative clauses, on the other hand, seem to be very low in acceptability, if not impossible with the genitive subject.

¹³ This type of relative clause is rare among the world’s languages. The internally headed relative clause has been reported to exist in Diegueño, Korean, Lakota, Navajo, Quechua and Wappo (Hasegawa 2014).

(36) John-wa kyonen Tanaka-**ga/no** kai-ta kiji-o yon-da.
 John-TOP last.year Tanaka-NOM/GEN write-PST article-ACC read-PST
 ‘John read the article that Tanaka wrote last year.’

Table 12: Adnominal clauses in question type two (36)

	Uses	Natural	Unnatural
<i>ga</i>	94.7% (18/19)	5.3% (1/19)	0% (0/19)
<i>no</i>	78.9% (15/19)	21.1% (4/19)	0% (0/19)

Furthermore, there was no respondent who claimed that the *no* marked subject in (36) is unnatural. Compared to other constructions tested in the survey adnominal clauses is the construction that is considered to be the most acceptable with a genitive subject.

(37) Mary-wa John-**ga/?no** DVD-o kashitekure-ta no-o nakushi-ta.
 Mary-TOP John-NOM/GEN DVD-ACC lend-PST C-ACC lose-PST
 ‘Mary lost the DVD, that John had lent (her).’

Table 13: Internally headed relative clause in question type two (37)

	Uses	Natural	Unnatural
<i>ga</i>	36.8% (7/19)	21.1% (4/19)	42.1% (8/19)
<i>no</i>	0% (0/19)	5.3% (1/19)	94.7% (18/19)

The acceptability of a genitive marked subject in the internally headed relative clause is very low. Only one respondent considers the genitive subject to sound natural. That is not sufficient evidence to confirm that GNC is possible in this kind of construction as Hiraiwa (2005) claims. *No* and *o* occurs together in this type of clause, which may play a part in why a genitive subject in the internally headed relative clause is considered to be unnatural. However, the problem does not only lie in the genitive construction, but also in the nominative one as almost half of the respondents consider the internally headed relative clause itself to sound unnatural. There were many comments saying that the meaning of the

sentence (37) is unclear. “It contains too much information.” and “Whose DVD is it?” were common answers. The respondents further stated that the sentence would be natural with both *no* and *ga* if the construction were to be remade into an adnominal clause (38). The possibility of a genitive marked subject occurring in an internally headed relative clause remains unclear.

(38) Mary-wa John-**ga/no** kashitekure-ta DVD-o nakushi-ta.
 Mary-TOP John-NOM/GEN lend-PST DVD-ACC lose-PST
 ‘Mary lost the DVD that John lent (her).’

Table 14: Impression of adnominal clause (36)

	Educated	Uneducated	Bookish/stuffy	Formal	Old fashioned
<i>ga</i>	76.9% (10/13)	7.7 % (1/13)	7.7% (1/13)	7.7% (1/13)	0% (0/13)
<i>no</i>	61.5% (8/14)	7.7% (1/14)	23.1% (3/14)	15.4% (2/14)	0% (0/14)

Table 15: Impression of Internally headed relative clause (37)

	Educated	Uneducated	Bookish/Stuffy	Formal	Old fashioned
<i>ga</i>	41.7% (5/13)	58.3% (7/13)	0% (0/13)	8.3% (1/13)	0% (0/13)
<i>no</i>	0% (0/11)	81.8% (9/11)	9.1% (1/11)	9.1% (1/11)	0% (0/11)

Table 14 and 15 follow the trend that we have observed in previous sections. Ungrammaticality gives an uneducated impression while a grammatical sentence gives an educated impression. In adnominal clauses the use of a genitive subject makes the sentence sound more formal than the nominal one, which follows Nakagawa’s (1987) assumption that *ga* and *no* differs in style. The same thing is observed in the internally headed relative clause despite the fact that the majority of the respondents consider said construction to be ungrammatical. Respondent Q stated (37), “Because it sounds childish, it also sounds uneducated.” This implies that using particles incorrectly or in an unnatural way are mistakes common among Japanese children.

3.6 *To-iu* and *to-no*

As previously mentioned, one of the theoretical differences between the D-licensing hypothesis and the C-licensing hypothesis is whether the genitive structure contains a CP level or not. If Miyagawa's (2011) assumption is correct, as Nambu (2013) pointed out, the genitive *no* should not occur with *to-iu/to-no* clauses since they are treated as complementizers in syntactic literature. The following examples were tested in the survey.

(39) Hanako-wa Mary-() kekkonsu-ru to-iu nyuusu-o kii-te yorokon-da.
 Hanako-TOP Mary-(NOM/GEN) marry-NPST C news-ACC hear-GER be.delighted-PST
 'Hanako was delighted when she heard the news that Mary is getting married.'

(40) Hanako-wa neko-() shin-da to-no shirase-o reisei-ni uketome-ta.
 Hanako-TOP cat-(NOM/GEN) die-PST C news-ACC calmly react-PST
 'Hanako took the news that (her) cat had died calmly.'

Table 16: *to-iu* and *to-no* apposition clauses in question type one

	<i>to-iu</i> (39)	<i>to-no</i> (40)
<i>ga</i>	94.7% (18/19)	100% (19/19)
<i>no</i>	5.3% (1/19)	0% (0/19)

As we can see in the table above, the usage of genitive *no* with *to-iu/to-no* apposition clauses is very low. When asked to choose only one of the particles the majority of the respondents chose *ga*, with only one respondent preferring *no* in clauses headed by *to-iu*. This corresponds with the syntactic analyses by Hiraiwa (2005) and Miyagawa (2011) in that the use of genitive *no* is obstructed when there is an overt C head, e.g., *to-iu* and *to-no*.

(41) John-wa kinoo jishin-**ga/?no** at-ta to-iu nyuusu-o kii-ta.
 John-TOP yesterday earthquake-NOM/GEN be-PST C news-ACC hear-PST
 'John heard the news that there were an earthquake yesterday.'

Table 17: *to-iu* in question type two (41)

	Uses	Natural	Unnatural
<i>ga</i>	94.7% (18/19)	5.3% (1/19)	0% (0/19)
<i>no</i>	0% (0/19)	36.8% (7/19)	63.2% (12/19)

However, in question type two, where the respondents were asked if they consider the construction to be acceptable, even if they do not use it themselves, 36.8% (7/19) of the respondents consider the genitive subject with *to-iu* clauses to be natural. This shows that the genitive subject together with *to-iu* is possible, which is in accordance with Nambu’s (2013) corpus study results. Respondent I stated that (41) with *no* “sounds natural in spoken language.” This implies that a construction with a genitive subject, where the grammaticality of it is unclear, would be more acceptable in spoken language than in written language, as grammatical rules are usually not as strict in casual conversations. The low frequency of the genitive *no* with *to-iu* can be interpreted as degradation of acceptability, but if *to-iu* is a complementizer as suggested in the literature, these results supports Hiraiwa’s (2005) C-licensing hypothesis in that the genitive structure should contain a CP level.

(42) Tanaka-wa densha-**ga**?**no** okure-ru to-no shirase-o kii-te, irairashi-ta.

Tanaka-TOP train-NOM/GEN be.late-NPST C notice-ACC hear-GER be.annoyed-PST

‘Tanaka heard the notice that the train will be late and was annoyed.’

Table 18: *to-no* in question type two (42)

	Uses	Natural	Unnatural
<i>ga</i>	94.7% (18/19)	5.3% (1/19)	0% (0/19)
<i>no</i>	5.3% (1/19)	10.5% (2/19)	84.2% (16/19)

The acceptability of the genitive subject with *to-no* is considerably lower than the one with *to-iu*. The reason for that could be that the sound *no* occurs two times in close proximity to each other, which might be avoided if there is an alternate form and thus the use of *no* with *to-no* is not preferred.

Table 19: Impression of *to-iu* (41)

	Educated	Uneducated	Bookish/Stuffy	Formal	Old fashioned
<i>ga</i>	61.5% (8/13)	7.7% (1/13)	7.7% (1/13)	23.1% (3/13)	0% (0/13)
<i>no</i>	8.3% (1/12)	58.3% (7/12)	25% (3/12)	0% (0/12)	8.3% (1/12)

Table 20: Impression of *to-no* (42)

	Educated	Uneducated	Bookish/Stuffy	Formal	Old fashioned
<i>ga</i>	37.5% (6/19)	6.3% (1/19)	31.3% (5/19)	43.8% (7/19)	0% (0/19)
<i>no</i>	7.7% (1/13)	76.9% (10/13)	7.7% (1/13)	7.7% (1/13)	0% (0/13)

The same pattern noticed in previous sections can be applied to *ga* and *no* in apposition clauses headed by *to-iu/to-no* as well. The use of *no* with *to-iu/to-no* is deemed to be unnatural by the majority of the respondents and therefore the impression of *no* in (41) and (42) is “uneducated”. In the sentences with a *ga*-marked subject, many of the respondents chose “bookish/stuffy” and “formal”. That is probably not a result of using *ga*, but rather due to the formal nature of the complementizers *to-iu/to-no* themselves.

3.7 *Made* and *Yori*

The next clause type tested in the survey is clauses headed by *made* ‘until’ and *yori* ‘than’ (Watanabe 1996, Kikuta 2002, Hiraiwa 2005).

(43) Taroo-wa ame-() ya-mu made ie-ni i-ta.

Taroo-TOP rain-NOM/GEN stop-NPST until home-at be-PST

‘Taroo was at home until the rain stopped.’

(44) Hanako-wa Taroo-() kat-ta yori takusan-no hon-o kat-ta.

Hanako-TOP Taroo-NOM/GEN buy-PST than many-GEN books-ACC buy-PST

‘Hanako bought more books than Taro did.’

Table 21: *made* and *yori* clauses in question type one

	<i>made</i> (43)	<i>yori</i> (44)
<i>ga</i>	100% (19/19)	89.5% (17/19)
<i>no</i>	0% (0/19)	10.5% (2/19)

At first glance, the genitive subject does not seem likely to occur in clauses headed by *made*. Although low, the construction with a *no* marked subject headed by *yori* appears to be more acceptable.

(45) Takeshi-wa densha-**ga/?no** ku-ru made benchi-ni suwat-tei-ta.

Takeshi-TOP train-NOM/GEN come-NPST until bench-at sit-PROG-PST

‘Takeshi sat on a bench until the train came.’

Table 22: *made* clauses in question type two (45)

	Uses	Natural	Unnatural
<i>ga</i>	94.7% (18/19)	5.3% (1/19)	0% (0/19)
<i>no</i>	0% (0/19)	15.8% (3/19)	84.2% (16/19)

- (46) Mary-wa Takeshi-**ga/?no** tabe-ta yori takusan-no sushi-o tabe-ta.
 Mary-TOP Takeshi-NOM/GEN eat-PST than more-GEN sushi-ACC eat-PST
 ‘Mary ate more sushi than Takeshi did.’

Table 23: *yori* clauses in question type two (46)

	Uses	Natural	Unnatural
<i>ga</i>	68.4% (13/19)	21.1% (4/19)	10.5% (2/19)
<i>no</i>	10.5% (2/19)	52.6% (10/19)	36.8% (7/19)

Even though *made* and *yori* belong to the same category, the acceptability of a genitive subject in a clause headed by *made* is considerably lower than for *yori*. Respondent Q commented the following on (45) with *no*: “It is like reading a text from the Showa period¹⁴ and I feel uncomfortable towards the particle. I cannot tell whether it is grammatical or not, but I do not think this expression sounds natural in modern Japanese.” Whether GNC is truly possible with *made* appears to need further investigation.

In one way, the occurrence of GNC in clauses headed by *made* or *yori* confirms the claim made by advocates for the C-licensing hypothesis (Watanabe 1996, Hiraiwa 2005). GNC can occur in clauses without a nominal head. However, as we discussed in section 2.3, these constructions can be viewed as having a phonologically null nominal head (Maki and Uchibori 2008). The facts above make it difficult to favour one hypothesis over the other.

Table 24: Impression of *made* (45)

	Educated	Uneducated	Bookish/stuffy	Formal	Old fashioned
<i>ga</i>	83.3% (10/12)	8.3%(1/12)	0% (0/12)	8.3% (1/12)	0% (0/12)
<i>no</i>	7.7% (1/15)	69.2% (9/15)	23.1% (3/15)	7.7% (1/15)	7.7% (1/15)

¹⁴ Showa period: 1926-1989

Table 25: Impression of *yor* (46)

	Educated	Uneducated	Bookish/stuffy	Formal	Old fashioned
<i>ga</i>	71.4% (10/14)	0% (0/14)	7.1% (1/14)	21.4% (3/14)	0% (0/14)
<i>no</i>	9.1% (1/12)	72.7% (8/12)	18.2% (2/12)	9.1% (1/12)	0% (0/12)

In clauses headed by *made* or *yor* we can see that the patterns that we have observed so far merge. The *ga*-marked subject is grammatical and thus it sounds educated. The respondents that deem the use of *no* to be ungrammatical also think that the sentence gives an uneducated impression. However, a grammatical use of *no* gives a more bookish/formal impression than *ga*.

3.8 Intervening elements

3.8.1 Adverbs

As discussed earlier, Miyagawa (2011) follows Cinque's (1999) claim that evidential adverbs like *saiwai-ni* 'fortunately' occurs in the CP region of a sentence while modal adverbs like *kitto* 'probably' occurs in the TP region. If Miyagawa's (2011) assumption is correct, GNC should not be licensed in a sentence containing *saiwai-ni*. A genitive subject in a sentence with *kitto* 'probably' should, however, be acceptable.

(47) Sore-wa saiwai-ni Taroo-() yon-da hon desu.
 that-TOP fortunately Taroo-NOM/GEN read-PST book COP
 'That is the book that Taro fortunately read.'

(48) Sore-wa kitto Hanako-() kai-ta kiji desu.
 that-TOP probably Hanako-NOM/GEN write-PST article COP
 'That is the article that Hanako probably wrote.'

Table 26: *saiwai-ni* and *kitto* in question type one

	<i>saiwai-ni</i> (47)	<i>kitto</i> (48)
<i>ga</i>	68.4% (13/19)	78.9% (15/19)
<i>no</i>	31.6% (6/19)	21.1% (4/19)

Surprisingly, GNC does occur in constructions that contain *saiwai-ni* ‘fortunately’, even more so than in constructions containing *kitto* ‘probably’. This strongly contradicts Miyagawa’s (2011) assumption and account on the D-licensing hypothesis. The results in table 26 supports Hiraiwa (2005) in that the genitive structure should contain a CP level in the same way that the occurrence of GNC with *to-*iu** and *to-*no** (discussed in section 3.6) do.

(49) *Kore-wa saiwai-ni John-ga/?no mitsuke-ta kagi desu.*

this-TOP fortunately John-NOM/GEN find-PST key COP

‘This is the key that John fortunately found.’

Table 27: *saiwai-ni* in question type two (49)

	Uses	Natural	Unnatural
<i>ga</i>	89.5% (17/19)	10.5% (2/19)	0% (0/19)
<i>no</i>	57.9% (11/19)	31.6% (6/19)	10.5% (2/19)

(50) *Kore-wa kitto Mary-ga/?no mitsuke-ta kagi desu.*

this-TOP probably Mary-NOM/GEN find-PST key COP

‘This is the key that Mary probably found.’

Table 28: *kitto* in question type two (50)

	Uses	Natural	Unnatural
<i>ga</i>	100% (19/19)	0% (0/19)	0% (0/19)
<i>no</i>	31.6% (6/19)	52.6% (10/19)	15.8% (3/19)

The data in table 27 shows that the use of a genitive subject in a clause with an evidential adverb, e.g., *saiwai-ni* ‘fortunately’ is considered to be very natural. The occurrence of GNC with *kitto* ‘probably’ was, however, expected. Since *saiwai-ni* is said to occur in the CP region of a sentence and is considered to be natural together with a genitive subject, we should consider the possibility that the genitive structure, as well as the nominative structure does, in fact, contain a CP level. The results in the present survey favour the C-licensing hypothesis over the D-licensing hypothesis for the nominative/genitive alternation in Japanese.

Table 29: Impression of *saiwai-ni* (49)

	Educated	Uneducated	Bookish/stuffy	Formal	Old fashioned
<i>ga</i>	66.7% (8/12)	0% (0/12)	8.3% (1/12)	25% (3/12)	0% (0/12)
<i>no</i>	46.2% (6/16)	15.4% (2/16)	53.8% (7/16)	7.7% (1/16)	0% (0/16)

Table: 30: Impression of *kitto* (50)

	Educated	Uneducated	Bookish/stuffy	Formal	Old fashioned
<i>ga</i>	69.2% (9/13)	0% (0/13)	7.7% (1/13)	23.1% (3/13)	0% (0/13)
<i>no</i>	13.3% (2/15)	40% (6/15)	20% (3/15)	20% (3/15)	6.7% (1/15)

Table 29 and 30 follow the pattern that we observed in section 3.5 with the adnominal clause. These results further prove that when a genitive subject leads to a grammatical sentence, it also gives a more bookish and formal impression than the nominative construction. (50) with a genitive subject is the construction that was commented on most by the respondents¹⁵. The following quotes may give us some insight into how a sentence with a *no* marked subject is perceived.

Respondent B: “It makes a (modern) literary impression.”

Respondent C: “When *no* is used instead of *ga*, it gives the impression that a very noble or elderly person is speaking, like the imperial family.”

¹⁵ This may be due to the fact that (50) was the first construction tested in the second part of the survey.

Respondent Q: “This construction appears a lot in literature for children. It gives an old impression. If you look at it from my age (31) the majority of stories for children were written during the Showa-period.”

The quotes from the respondents above confirm the pattern observed in sentences with *no* that are grammatical. However, the impression “uneducated” was also quite common in (50). Respondent I stated (again) that: “If one uses *no* in this context, it sounds like spoken language.” and thus, the impression is also “uneducated”.

3.8.2 Time, place and with (whom)

As discussed in section 2.2, Harada (1971) claims that the existence of intervening elements between the subject NP and its predicate affects the acceptability of GNC and insists that more than one intervening element obstruct the use of the genitive *no*.

(51) Taroo-wa kyonen Hanako-() kankoku-de tomodachi-to kat-ta DVD-o kari-ta.
 Taroo-TOP last.year Hanako-NOM/GEN Korea-in friend-with buy-PST DVD-ACC borrow- PST
 ‘Taro borrowed the DVD that Hanako bought with (her) friend in Korea last year.’

(52) Mary-wa senshuu Hanako-**ga/?no** tookyoo-de Taroo-to kat-ta hon-o yon-da.
 Mary-TOP last.week Hanako-NOM/GEN Tokyo-in Taro-with buy-PST book-ACC read-PST
 ‘Mary read the book that Hanako bought with (her) friend in Tokyo last week.’

Table 31: Adnominal clause + intervening elements (51)

	Adnominal +Intervening elements
<i>ga</i>	100% (19/19)
<i>no</i>	0% (0/19)

Table 32: Adnominal clause + intervening elements (52)

	Uses	Natural	Unnatural
<i>ga</i>	89.5% (17/19)	10.5% (2/19)	0% (0/19)
<i>no</i>	0% (0/19)	10.5% (2/19)	89.5% (17/19)

The low frequency of the genitive subject in clauses with more than one intervening element confirms Harada's (1971) claim and that adjacency affects the acceptability of GNC. However, the genitive *no* is not completely impossible in constructions like (42). Respondent I stated that if one adds a comma between *Hanako no* and *tookyoo* the sentence would sound more natural. Respondent L (one of the respondents that consider this construction to be unnatural) stated that the use of *no* in this construction sounds like Hanako is the possessor of Tokyo. "One might think that *Hanako no tookyoo* 'Hanako's Tokyo' is the name of the shop where the book was bought." Yet again, we observe that *no* loses its role as a subject marker and instead becomes a possessive marker.

Table 33: Impression of adnominal clause + intervening elements (52)

	Educated	Uneducated	Bookish/Stuffy	Formal	Old fashioned
<i>ga</i>	60% (9/15)	6.7% (1/15)	6.7% (1/15)	26.7% (4/15)	0% (0/15)
<i>no</i>	16.7% (2/12)	75% (9/12)	8.3% (1/12)	0% (0/12)	0% (0/12)

Once again, the impression of *no* (52) follows the pattern as we have observed in the other constructions where the genitive marked subject leads to a degradation in acceptability, namely that the use of a genitive subject gives an uneducated impression. In addition, a sentence that contains a great deal of information tends to be perceived as more formal.

3.9 Gender

Factors such as gender or age could affect the use of *no* as GNC. If age affects the use of GNC cannot be studied in this paper since the average age of the respondents is quite low (19-39 years old with the majority being in their low or mid-twenties). Ide and Yoshida (2001) argue that females generally use formal variants more often than males in Japanese. If the pattern we observed in previous sections is correct, we predict that the use of *no* is higher among female speakers than male speakers. Table 34 shows the frequency of *ga* and *no* in question type one and as predicted, *no* was more common among the female speakers (i.e., *no* is more formal).

Table 34: Gender and *ga* and *no* as GNC in question type one

	Female	Male
<i>ga</i>	88.6% (117/132)	95.2% (80/84)
<i>no</i>	11.4% (15/132)	4.8% (4/84)

Chapter 4

Conclusion

4.1 Summary

The constructions where a genitive subject may occur that was described and discussed in the present thesis can be divided into three categories in the following way:

Constructions where GNC occurs	Constructions where GNC cannot occur	Constructions where the occurrence of GNC is unlikely
Adnominal clauses	Conjunction: <i>kara</i>	IHRC ¹⁶
Complementizer <i>to-iu</i>	Conjunction: <i>node</i>	Complementizer <i>to-no</i>
<i>yorī</i> ‘than’	Conditional clause, <i>-ba</i>	<i>made</i> ‘until’
Evidential adverb: <i>saiwai-ni</i> ‘fortunately’		Adnominal clause with more than one intervening element
Modal adverb: <i>kitto</i> ‘probably’		

The discussion in chapter 3 is largely in accordance with the previous research regarding GNC. However, the results of the survey favour the C-licensing hypothesis over the D-licensing hypothesis in that the genitive marked subject might occur together with complementizers such as *to-iu/to-no*. In addition, *saiwai-ni* ‘fortunately’, an adverb that is said to occur in the CP region of a sentence was also deemed to be possible with a genitive subject, which provides evidence to support Harada’s (2005) claim that both the genitive structure and the nominative structure must contain a CP level.

¹⁶ Internally headed relative clause

In the constructions where the use of a genitive subject leads to a grammatical sentence, *no* tends to sound more formal than *ga*. To some of the respondents, the use of *no* also makes the sentence sound like it is a part of a novel or other literary work, indicating that *no* is used more in written language, like Nakagawa (1987) predicted. The use of *no* was higher among the female respondents, and if the assumption that a *no* marked subject gives a formal impression is correct, it supports the claim that female speakers use formal variants to a higher degree than male speakers.

4.2 Concluding remarks

The present thesis has been an attempt to further investigate in what kind of subordinate clauses GNC can occur and also the difference in style between *ga* and *no*. Although various scholars have touched upon the topic in the past, GNC has to the knowledge of the author, mainly been discussed in theoretical syntax without much evidence from an empirical point of view. A number of constructions where the alternation might occur have been investigated with the goal of determining where said phenomenon is deemed to be possible. In order to account for constructions that are unlikely or still under discussion, the investigation has been conducted through a survey aimed at native speakers of the Japanese language. While the results discussed in chapter 3 has proven to be quite interesting, it should not be taken as a complete account on the possibilities of GNC, as the choice of method had its shortcomings. Firstly, by spreading the survey through social media and friends, the average age of the respondents is quite low and can therefore not be representative of the Japanese population as a whole. It is suspected that the results would have been slightly different if the average age was higher. Secondly, the number of respondents was fewer than expected. If the survey were to be conducted on a larger scale, further evidence for the results discussed in the present paper could be given. In addition, the options between usage, natural and unnatural in the acceptability judgement task could have been replaced with a wider range of options as the data felt somewhat lacking at times. Nambu (2014) used a scale of 1-5 where 1 stood for “very unnatural” and 5 for “very natural”. Conducting the survey in a similar way could have given clearer results.

While an attempt to investigate the semantic differences between *ga* and *no* has been made, one should keep in mind that Japanese is a language that heavily depends on context, which makes it difficult to analyse the particles without being affected by other elements in a sentence. A different approach for studying the semantic differences between *ga* and *no* (if it is possible at all) would be preferable. In hindsight, the five categories set for investigating the impression of *ga* and *no* might not have been the best choice. Because of this, the number of answers drastically dropped in that part of the survey. It appears that some of the respondents did not consider the choices to be applicable for the topic and simply skipped the questions concerning impression. To omit the five categories and instead ask the respondents themselves to write about their impression of the sentence would perhaps be a better method.

As for potential topics for further research, some aspects regarding GNC still remain unclear. The constructions where a genitive subject is considered unlikely to occur needs more empirical evidence to truly decide whether the alteration is possible or not. The D-licensing hypothesis and the C-licensing hypothesis both have their strengths and weaknesses, but given the constant “battle” between the advocates of each hypothesis, it is clear that the nominative structure and the genitive structure needs to be investigated further from an empirical point of view. It would also be interesting to study the alternation not only from a native speaker’s perspective, but also from the perspective of a learner. Questions like what common mistakes are and why may contribute to the research on the complex nature of GNC from a cross-linguistic point of view.

References

- Frellesvig, Bjarke. 2010. *A History of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harada, Shin-ichi. 1971. Ga-no conversion and ideolectical variations in Japanese. *Gengo Kenkyuu* 60:25-38.
- Hasegawa, Yoko. 2014. *Japanese: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hashimoto, S. 1996. *Joshi jodooshi no kenkyuu*. [A study of particles and auxiliaries] Tokyo: Iwanami.
- Hiraiwa, Ken. 2005. Dimensions of symmetry in syntax: Agreement and clausal architecture. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Ide, Sachiko and Yoshida Megumi. 2001. Sociolinguistics: Honorifics and Gender Differences. In *The Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*. Tsujimura, Natsuko (ed). Blackwell Publishing
- Inoue, Kazuko. 1976. *Henkei bunpoo-to nihongo* [Transformational grammar and Japanese]. Tokyou, Taishukan.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi. 2013. *Japanese: Revised edition*. Amsterdam : John Benjamins Pub. Co., cop.
- Kikuta, Chiharu. 2002. *Ga-no kootai gensho-no hihaseitekibunseki: Jutsugorentaikei-no meishisei* [Ga-No conversion in a new light: A non-derivational, mixed category analysis]. *Doshisha Studies in English* 74:93-136.
- Maki, Hideki and Uchibori, Asako. 2008. Ga/no conversion. In *The oxford Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, ed. Shigeru Miyagawa and Mamoru Saito, 192-216. Oxford University Press.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2011. Genitive subjects in Altaic and specification of phase. *Special Lingua volume*, ed. Jaklin Kornfilt and John Whitman.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. (To appear). Strong uniformity and ga/no conversion*. *English linguistics*. Journal of the English Society of Japan. MIT.
http://web.mit.edu/miyagawa/www/pdfs/ga-no_StrongUniformity_EL.pdf

- Nakagawa, Yoshio. 1987. GA-NO Conversion in Japanese Particles. *Bulletin of the Kyoto University of Foreign Studies* 28
- Nambu, Satoshi. 2013. Nominative/Genitive alteration in Japanese: Theoretical implications of a quantitative study.
http://www.academia.edu/967210/Nominative_Genitive_alteration_in_Japanese_Theoretical_implications_of_a_quantitative_study
- Nambu, Satoshi. (2014). On the Use of Case Particles in Japanese: Corpus and Experimental. PhD dissertation, Osaka University.
- Ochi, Masao. 2001. Move F and Ga/no conversion in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 10:247-286.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1990. The languages of Japan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Watanabe, Akira. 1996. Nominative-genitive conversion and agreement in Japanese: A cross-linguistic perspective. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 5:373-410.

Appendix

Survey

The survey was created by the author in Google Forms (www.google.com/forms/about/) and was spread through facebook (www.facebook.com). The survey was launched on the 31st of march 2015 and closed on the 7th of april 2015.

ガ・ノ交替

日本語言語学の卒業論文を書くためにガ・ノ交替と従属節についての調査を行っています。
ご協力いただけたらうれしく思います。どうぞよろしくお願いいたします。

出身地など

以下の四つの質問は統計的にまとめるために必要となりますので必ずお答えください。

都道府県

市

性別

男
女

年齢

以下の例文を読んで、（ ）に入る適切な助詞はどちらですか。【が】と【の】から必ずどちらか一つを選んで下さい。

1. 花子は昨日太郎（ ）描いた絵を見ていた。

の
が

2. 太郎は雨（ ）やむまで家にいた。

の
が

3. 花子は猫（ ）死んだとの知らせを冷静に受け止めた。

の
が

4. 太郎はルームメート（ ）出かけたから一人で晩ご飯を食べた。

の
が

5. 花子は太郎（ ）買ったよりたくさんの本を買った。

の
が

6. それは幸いに太郎（ ）読んだ本です。

の
が

7. 花子はお金（ ）あれば夏休みに旅行する。

の
が

8. 太郎は花子（ ）オレンジを剥いてくれたのを食べた。

の
が

9. 花子はルームメート（ ）出かけたので一人で晩ご飯を食べた。

の
が

10. 太郎は去年花子（ ）韓国で友達と買ったDVDを借りた。

の
が

11. 花子はメアリー（ ）結婚するという話を聞いて喜んだ。

の
が

12. それはきっと花子（ ）書いた記事です。

の
が

以下に【が】と【の】を使った例文があります。それぞれの場合はどうのように聞こえますか？複数選んでもいいです。

【使用】は自分でも、他の人でも使うと思う場合

【自然】は自分が使わなくても、使えると思う場合

【不自然】は使えないと思う場合

他のオプションは自分にとって、ある例文の助詞はどのように聞こえるかというオプションです。自分の思うことがリストに入っていない場合【選択した理由やコメント】という所を書いてください。できるだけ質問の選択した理由やコメントも書いてください。

13. これはきっとメアリーの見つけたかぎです。

使用
自然
不自然

13.

学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

13. 選択した理由やコメント

14. 田中は電車が遅れるとの知らせを聞いて、イライラした。

使用
自然
不自然

14.

学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

14. 選択した理由やコメント

15. メアリーはジョンがDVDを貸してくれたのをなくした。

使用
自然
不自然

15.

学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

15.選択した理由やコメント

16. たけしは電車の来るまでベンチに座っていた。

使用
自然
不自然

16.

学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

16.選択した理由やコメント

17. メアリーは先週花子が東京で太郎と買った本を読んだ。

使用
自然
不自然

17.

学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

17.選択した理由やコメント

18. メアリーはたけしが食べたよりたくさんの寿司を食べた。

使用
自然
不自然

18.

学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

18.選択した理由やコメント

19. ジョンは昨日地震のあったというニュースを聞いた。

使用
自然
不自然

19.

学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

19.選択した理由やコメント

20. これはきっとメアリーが見つけたかぎです。

使用
自然
不自然

20.

学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

20.選択した理由やコメント

21. メアリーはジョンのDVDを貸してくれたのをなくした。

使用
自然
不自然

21.

学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

21.選択した理由やコメント

22. メアリーは雨が降れば散歩に行かない。

使用
自然
不自然

22.

学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

22.選択した理由やコメント

23. 田中は電車の遅れるとの知らせを聞いて、イライラした。

使用
自然
不自然

23.

学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

23.選択した理由やコメント

24. 田中は同僚が休んだから、残業しなければならなかった。

使用
自然
不自然

24.

学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

23.選択した理由やコメント

25. ジョンは去年田中の書いた記事を読んだ。

使用

- 自然
不自然
25. 学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

25.選択した理由やコメント

26. これは幸いにジョンの見たかぎです。

- 使用
自然
不自然
26. 学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

26.選択した理由やコメント

27. ジョンは昨日地震があったというニュースを聞いた。

- 使用
自然
不自然
27. 学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

27.選択した理由やコメント

28. たけしは電車が来るまでベンチに座っていた。

- 使用
自然
不自然

28.

学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

28.選択した理由やコメント

29. メアリーは雨の降れば散歩に行かない。

自然
使用
不自然

29.

学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

29.選択した理由やコメント

30. 花子は同僚の休んだので残業しなければならなかった。

使用
自然
不自然

30.

学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

30.選択した理由やコメント

31. メアリーは先週花子の東京で太郎と買った本を読んだ。

使用
自然
不自然

31.

学がある
学がない

固い
フォーマル
古い

31.選択した理由やコメント

32 田中は同僚の休んだから、残業しなけりばならなかつた。

使用
自然
不自然

32.

学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

32.選択した理由やコメント

33. これは幸いにジョンが見つけたかぎです。

使用
自然
不自然

33.

学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

33.選択した理由やコメント

34. ジョンは去年田中が書いた記事を読んだ。

使用
自然
不自然

34.

学がある
学がない

固い
フォーマル
古い

34.選択した理由やコメント

35. メアリーはたけしの食べたよりたくさんの寿司を食べた。

使用
自然
不自然

35.

学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

35.選択した理由やコメント

36. 花子は同僚が休んだので残業しなけりばならなかつた。

使用
自然
不自然

36.

学がある
学がない
固い
フォーマル
古い

36.選択した理由やコメント

Answers

Paired with the “name” of each respondent, the answers to the survey are as follows:

Response	出身地	性別	年齢	1. 花子は昨日太郎 () を見た番を見つけた。また家にいた。	2. 太郎は番 () やびだとの知らせても冷静に受 () け止めた。	3. 花子は番 () さん、太郎はホームマーケット () 買った。	4. 太郎はホームマーケット () 買った。	5. 花子は太郎 () 買った。	6. 花子は番 () さん、それは早い太郎 () 買った。	7. 花子は番 () さん、それは早い太郎 () 買った。	8. 太郎は花子 () さん、それは早い太郎 () 買った。	9. 花子はホームマーケット () 買った。	10. 太郎は花子 () さん、それは早い太郎 () 買った。	11. 花子はホームマーケット () 買った。	12. それほど花子 () 買った。
A	愛知県 東海市	女	19	が	が	が	の	の	が	が	が	が	が	が	の
B	広島県 呉	女	27	が	が	が	の	の	が	が	が	が	が	が	の
C	茨城県 水戸市	女	23	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が
D	岐阜県 安八郡神戸町	女	36	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が
E	岐阜県 岐阜市	女	20	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が
F	東京都 府中市	女	29	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が
G	三重県 松阪市	女	21	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が
H	山口県 防府市	男	23	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が
I	神奈川県 横浜市中区	男	21	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が
J	愛知県 一宮市	男	21	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が
K	滋賀県 長浜市	女	27	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が
L	神奈川県 川崎市	男	25	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が
M	兵庫県 神戸市	男	20	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が
N	大阪府 枚方市	女	28	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が
O	神奈川県 平塚市	女	34	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が
P	福井県 須賀川市	女	35	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が	が
Q	東京都 足立区	男	31	が	が	が	の	の	が	が	が	が	が	が	が
R	福井県 本宮市	男	39	が	が	が	の	の	が	が	が	が	が	が	が
S				の	が	が	の	の	が	が	が	が	が	が	が

13.	これはきつてマリーの肩づけたかぎです。	使用	自然	この「は」は「マリー」の肩づけたかぎです。	使用	自然	
14.	田中は電車が遅れると知らせて聞いて、「アライ」した。	使用	自然	「アライ」は「アライ」が「アライ」した。	使用	自然	
15.	マリーはジョンがDVDを聞いてくれたのをなした。	使用	自然	「マリー」は「ジョン」が「DVD」を聞いてくれたのをなした。	使用	自然	
16.	「は」は電車の遅れをまで「マリー」に聞いていた。	使用	自然	「は」は「マリー」に「マリー」に聞いていた。	使用	自然	
17.	マリーは先週花子が買った本を買った本を贈った。	使用	自然	「マリー」は「先週花子が買った本」を買った本を贈った。	使用	自然	
18.	マリーはなげが買った本を買った本を買った。	使用	自然	「マリー」は「なげ」が買った本を買った本を買った。	使用	自然	

花子は同僚の木村のために残業しなげなほならなかった。	自然	学がない	31 ヴァリエは先週花子の東京で太郎と買った本を読んだ。	自然	学がない	32 田中は同僚の木村だから、残業しなげなほならなかった。	自然	学がない	33 これは幸いにジョンが見つけたかまです。	自然	学がある	34 ジョンは去年田中の書いた記事を読んだ。	自然	学がある	35 ヴァリエはたけのこの食べたよりたけのこの寿司を食べた。	自然	学がない	
「の」ではなく「が」が正しいと思う。	不自然	学がない		不自然	学がない		不自然	学がない		不自然	学がある		不自然	学がある		自然	学がない	

花子は同僚が休んだので
残業しなければならなかつ
た。

使用 学がある

使用 学がある

正しい文法は「が」だと思
うが、話し言葉などでは意
味が通じるので

使用 学がある

使用 自然 学がある

使用

「が」の方が正しいと思う

使用 学がある 正しいと思う。

「普通」という選択肢があ
れば選んでいました。話し
言葉では自然だと思います

使用 学がある 適切な表現だと思います。

使用

よく使われる

メアリーはだけの食べた
(寿司)よりたくさん食べ
た

使用 フォーナル 自然です

使用 学がある

使用
使用

学がある

子供っぽい。

使用

学がある

使用
使用

学がある
フォーナル

24.にはあつた不自然な「あ
」が無くなったので学があ
るように見える。