

Internally Headed Relative clauses

-The complexities of a sentence within a sentence

Stina Hinderson



LUND
UNIVERSITY

Bachelor's thesis

Japanese Linguistics

Supervisor: Lars Larm

Lund University

Center for Language and Literature, Japanese Studies

Spring semester 2016

Abstract

This paper focuses on the use of relative clauses, specifically internally headed relative clauses in Japanese. Previous research on different types of relative clauses occurring in Japanese is also presented. The main purpose of the thesis is to give an up to date analysis of the understanding of relative clauses. A survey was carried out to further research at what point sentences with relative clauses get too complex. The survey gathered 40 valid responses from all Japanese native speakers. The result of this survey is analyzed and compared with previous research, especially research done by S.-Y. Kuroda. The result of the survey is that there is not a very clear line to be found. The respondents seemed to be able to understand even the more complex sentences, with different types of internally headed relative clauses presented to them. The respondents however agreed that the sentences sound unnatural and too complicated.

Keywords: Japanese, Japanese Linguistics, Internally Headed Relative clauses, Syntax, Relative Clauses, Pragmatics

Acknowledgements

The creation of this bachelor's thesis was dependent on help and discussion with others. Everything from encouragement and sharing ideas when it came to the subject, to translating and helping me find respondents. In no particular order, many thanks especially to Lars Larm, Arthur Holmer, Alice Svedlund and Shuko Takeuchi.

Contents

- Abstract 2
- Acknowledgements 3
- Contents 4
- Abbreviations 5
- 1. Introduction..... 7
- 2. Previous research 9
 - 2.1 Introduction..... 9
 - 2.2 Relative clauses without gaps 9
 - 2.3 No/Ga conversion..... 11
 - 2.4 Internally headed relative clauses..... 11
 - 2.5 Internally headed relative clauses in past tense 13
 - 2.6 Unnatural internally headed relative clauses..... 14
- 3. Internally headed relative clauses..... 16
 - 3.1 Introduction..... 16
 - 3.2 Methodology 16
 - 3.3 Error sources 17
 - 3.4 Relative clauses 18
 - 3.5 Internally headed relative clauses..... 19
 - 3.6 Internally headed relative clauses in past tense containing a time adverb 20
 - 3.7 Internally headed relative clauses containing –teoku..... 22
- 4. Analysis..... 26
- 5. Concluding remarks..... 29
- References..... 30
- Appendix 1) The survey 31
- Appendix 2) The answers 34

Abbreviations

Acc	Accusative marker
Cond	Conditional
Dat	Dative marker
Gen	Genitive marker
Ger	Gerund
Hon	Honorific marker
Instr	Instrumental marker
Loc	Loactive marker
Neg	Negative marker
Nmlz	Nominalizer
Nom	Nominative marker
Obj	Object
Qp	Question particle
Sfp	Sentence-final particle
Top	Topical marker
v.	Verb

Conventions

Unless otherwise noted the sentences used as examples are my own.

Romanization

Throughout this paper the modified Hepburn system of Romanization is used to transcribe Japanese vocabulary. Place names and words that are considered to be part of the English vocabulary follow their English spelling unless they are used within the Japanese sentences. Romanized Japanese from other sources has been altered for the sake of consistency.

1. Introduction

1.1 The topic

Sentences with a relative clause in Japanese generally consist of a clause which describes a following (noun phrase) head. This clause can be a verb phrase which in turn with the head, in most cases could be considered a sentence. The internally headed relative clauses has its noun phrase contained within the relative clause, instead of after, as is the usual case with relative clauses.

1.2 Objectives

The purpose of this thesis is to research the perception of relative clauses and specifically internally headed relative clauses. For non-linguists and native Japanese speakers the way that some of the relative clauses are formed can easily get too complex and would be considered non-grammatical and/or too difficult to understand. The main purpose of this thesis is therefore to identify where this limit of complexity is, if there is one. Finding such a limit would provide help as a guideline to know in which cases usage of these type of sentences should be avoided. It would also be of value for Japanese foreign language students, to avoid using such phrases as there are clear differences between relative clauses in Japanese and in for example English. The research in this thesis is partially done by analyzing the result of a conducted survey, which is trying to outline where the limit to when a relative clause gets too complex to be understood. How this survey was constructed and conducted is described in the methodology and main body of this thesis.

1.3 Relative clauses

While not unique to Japanese, relative clauses differ compared to other languages. As Tsujimura (2013) writes in her chapter on Syntax, there are many other different ways to modify nouns in Japanese, and relative clauses are but one way of doing it. She points out that albeit this is the case, regarding the relative clauses, there is still “a number of interesting types and characteristics that are internal to Japanese” (2013, page 285). One of these noted distinctions that Tsujimura (2013) brings up is between English and Japanese relative clauses. In English there is a word connecting the head noun and relative clause, a so called relative

pronoun. Examples of said relative pronoun could be “which” or “that” etc. depending on the type of relative clause, whereas in Japanese such a word does not exist:

1. Taroo-ga hahaoya-ga tukutta susi-o tabeta.

Taro-Nom Mother-Nom made sushi-Acc ate

“Taro ate the sushi that his mother made.” (Tsuji-mura, 2013 page 285)

In the example above after the relative clause “hahaoya ga tukutta” (his mother made), there is no relative pronoun in other words such word as “that” and the relative clause is thereby connected directly to the head noun. (Hasegawa, 2014)

Another clear distinction is the syntactical order, which is the reverse of that in English. In Japanese the relative clause precedes the head and in English it is the head that precedes the relative clause. Tsujimura (2013) explains that this is naturally because of the syntactical word order. Japanese is a so called SOV-language where the verb is in the end of sentence, while English is a SVO-language. This is also the nature of other SOV-languages and not at all unique to Japanese.

However, this thesis focus is on “Internally headed relative clauses”. This is a type of relative clause that does not exist in English, and is only found in very few languages which also need to have a similar syntactical order as Japanese. Examples of this would be Korean, and Lakhota (an indigenous language spoken in North America), both of these languages are so called SOV-languages. Tsujimura (2013) defines internally headed relative clauses as a clause where the head of the noun phrase is contained within the relative clause. Using the following as an example:

2. Taroo-wa [ringo-ga sara-no ue-ni atta]-no-o totte, poketto ni ireta.

Taro-Top apple-Nom plate-Gen top-at was-one-Acc took pocket-to put in

“Taro picked up an apple which was on a plate and put it in a pocket”

(Tsuji-mura 2013 p. 292)

In this sentence “apple” (ringo) can be considered the head of the relative clause. There is also no set position for the noun phrase and the semantic interpretation can therefore vary as sentences containing several nouns get more complex.

2. Previous research

2.1 Introduction

The previous research within the field of relative clauses in Japanese have had much focus on dividing them into different groups and defining the differences. With relative clauses there is already much difference compared to relative clauses in other languages.

One of these distinctions is the existence of internally headed relative clauses, which is found in very few languages outside of Japanese. Within these sentences the head noun is modified by the relative clause which is contained within it. Especially Tsujimura (2013) and Kuroda (1992) have worked on defining these. Even though Kuroda uses the term “Pivot independent relative clauses” it is clear that they refer to the same thing. Another big researcher within this field is Matsumoto (1997) who worked a lot with discussing especially relative clauses without gaps and the phenomenon of *ga/no* conversion within relative clauses. Teramura (1969) also presented the concept of an inner (*uchi*) type and outer (*soto*) type of relationship within relative clauses. Where the inner one means that it is possible to paraphrase the noun head, into the relative clause, making it a complete sentence. With the outer type this is not possible. So by this distinction the inner relationship is syntactically defined while the outer is semantically defined. This concept is argued against by among others Baldwin (1998) and Matsumoto (1997), as Matsumoto present so called truncated noun heads, which are, depending on the pragmatic context, possible to classify as both inner and outer.

2.2 Relative clauses without gaps

Tsujimura (2013) defines one type of sentence with a relative clause as one without “gaps”. In these the modification of the head noun is not in a syntactical way, but a pragmatic and/or semantic one. A requirement for these relative clauses however is that they have to be complete sentences, the subject, marked by a “*ga*” is also inside the relative clause, making it gapless. Matsumoto (1997) argues that a way to distinguish these gapless relative clauses is that with other relative clauses it is possible to convert them to a non-relative paraphrase. An example could be:

3a. [[*hannin ga kane o nusunda*] *ginkoo*] *wa doko desu ka*

Criminal NOM money ACC stole bank TOP where is QP

‘Where is the bank (which) the criminal stole money (from)?’

(Matsumoto 1997)

3b. Hannin ga ginkoo kara kane o nusunda.

Criminal NOM bank ABL (from) money ACC stole

‘The criminal stole money from the bank.’ (Matsumoto 1997)

The sentence above is as shown possible to turn into a non-relative sentence. A relative clause without gaps however is affected by pragmatic or semantic context, making a paraphrase much more difficult:

4. [[genki ga deru] kuruma]

energy NOM rise.up car

‘the car (by driving which) () energy rises’ (Matsumoto 1997)

Matsumoto argues that in this sentence it would not be easy to just choose an appropriate particle, attach it to the head noun and put it in the noun phrase, as was possible in the example above. With another sentence Matsumoto tries to make it a non-relative sentence resulting in the need to paraphrase the sentence quite a bit:

5a. [[atama ga yoku-naru] hon]

Head NOM good-become book

‘the book (by reading which () head gets better’

5b. Kono hon o yomeba atama ga yoku-naru.

This book ACC read.COND head NOM good-become

‘If () read this book, () head gets better.’

In this example the verb read in conditional form had to be added. Matsumoto (1997) therefore further argues that the syntax is of little importance as the verb ‘read’ could be in other conditional forms (yomuto, yondara) without it making any significant difference as the importance lies with the readers understanding of the sentence. Tsujimura (2013), referring to this research by Matsumoto, says that this is proof that “[...] there is always a semantic and/or pragmatic connection between the relative clauses and their heads in sentences with this type of relative clauses.” (page. 290)

2.3 No/Ga conversion

Tsujimura (2013) defines another type of relative clause where the phenomenon “no/ga conversation” is possible. She explains that if there is a relative clause where the noun phrase is marked by the particle “ga” it can be replaced by the particle “no” without any difference in meaning. Tsujimura further uses this sentence as an example:

6a. Taroo-ga [Hanako-ga kaita] e-o hometa.

Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom painted painting-Acc praised

“Taro praised the painting that Hanako drew.”

6b. Taroo-ga [Hanako-no kaita] e-o hometa.

She also brings up that this applies to verbs that otherwise usually mark their direct objects with the particle “ga”. Using this as an example:

7. Sono hito-ga eigo-ga wakaru.

That person-Nom English-Nom understand

“That person understands English.”

8a. [Eigo-ga wakaru] hito-ni kiite kudasai.

English-Nom understand person-to ask please

“Please ask the person who understands English.”

8b. [Eigo-no wakaru] hito-ni kite kudasai.

In the example above there is no real difference in meaning between b. and c. indicating that when the clause is a relative clause the particle “ga” can be switched to “no” without changing the meaning of the sentence.

While the no/ga conversation in Japanese is a field that have been researched before outside of the realm of relative clauses as Harada (1971) points out, they exist only in clausal embedded sentences, which relative clause is an example of.

2.4 Internally headed relative clauses

Internally headed relative clauses refers to sentences where the head noun is modified by the relative clause which it is contained within. An observation that Tsujimura (2013) makes is that the position where the head noun is usually placed, which is after the relative clause, is in the case of an internally headed relative clause, replaced by a “no” (one). This is making it similar to the gapless relative clauses, but with the addition that where the noun phrase is usually found, there is now a “no”, right after the relative clause.

Kuroda (1992, page 196) suggests the following form in Japanese syntax to define internally headed relative clauses:

$$((\dots V-u)_S\text{-no})_{NP}$$

“In which *V* is a predicate (i.e. verb, adjective etc.), *u* is a mark for the ending of a predicate traditionally called the *rentai* (adnominal) form and *no* is a nominalizing complementizer.” This form does not apply to all types of relative clauses, as the *no*-particle, Tsujimura (2013) points out, is not always necessary, but it seems to be vital for the internally headed relative clauses. As can be seen in the example from Tsujimura mentioned in chapter 1.3, where there is no nominalizing complementizer to be found. An explanation for this could be that it replaces the head noun in a regular sentence with a relative clause. Kuroda’s type of relative clauses is by Tsujimura (2013) referred to as internally headed relative clauses and by Kuroda as pivot-independent relative clauses. Using a sentence from Kuroda (1992) as an example:

9. Sono omawari wa gakusei ga CIA no supai o kumihuseta no o uti-korosita

The cop students spy hold-down shoot and kill

‘The cop shot and killed the

{‘Students who held down the CIA spy’

‘CIA spy who the students held down’} (Kuroda 1992)

With this sentence which Tsujimura (2013) also refers to, it is necessary to interpret the sentence pragmatically. As shown by the translation it can be either the students or the spy that gets killed. This is because both “CIA spy” and “students” can be interpreted as the head, as they are both contained within the relative clause. This sentence can therefore be paraphrased into:

10. Sono omawari-wa [CIA no supai-o kumihuseta] gakuseitai-no-o

That cop-Top CIA-Gen spy-Acc hold down students-Gen-Acc

utikorosita.

shot and killed

“The cop shot and killed the students who held down the CIA spy.”

“The cop shot and killed the CIA spy who the students held down.”

(Tsujimura 2013)

Tsujimura (2013) means that this is proof that there is no specific place where the head noun has to be, making these two noun phrases possible. Referring to Kuroda’s (1992) view that either the subject or the object of this sentence can therefore be the head noun. Or as Kuroda (1992) refers to it the “pivot” or “semantic head”.

2.5 Internally headed relative clauses in past tense

Kuroda (1992) points out that one condition for an internally headed relative clause to be accepted is for it to be able to be interpreted in a pragmatic sense so that it is relevant to the matrix clause’s pragmatic content. With regards to sentences with only the relative clauses in past tense and the rest of the sentence in present tense, this causes the informants to have problems accepting and/or understanding the sentences. Kuroda (1992) uses the example:

11. Taroo wa Hanako ga kinoo ringo o katta no o totte, ...

Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom yesterday apple-Acc had bought and...

This sentence is supposed to mean that Hanako bought the apple yesterday, while the time when Taro takes the apple is in present time. Kuroda argues that this would be unacceptable because of the past tense in the relative clause. At the same time, he claims that this sentence could be acceptable:

12. Taroo wa ringo ga sara no ue ni atta o totte, poketo ni ireta

Taro-Nom apple-Nom plate-Gen above-Loc-Acc pick up, pocket-Loc put it

Taro picked up an apple which was on a plate and put it in a pocket

Despite the past tense, Kuroda (1992) points out that from a pragmatic perspective the context and plausibility that Taro picks up an apple that has been put on a plate makes it easier to accept. If the sentence contains a time adverb such as “yesterday”, like it did in the first sentence, it is no longer accepted:

13. Taro wa ringo ga kinoo sara no ue ni atta o totte, poketo ni ireta

Taro-Nom apple-Nom yesterday plate-Gen above-Loc-Acc pick up, pocket-Loc
put it

Kuroda (1992) explains this by pointing out that the implication is that apples that were placed there yesterday have to be assumed to stay there until today, which cannot be assumed. This makes the pragmatic aspect of internally headed relative clauses an important one.

2.6 Unnatural internally headed relative clauses

A common problem with the relative clauses is to which extent they are accepted by native speakers. Kuroda (1992) admits that many of his examples could potentially sound unnatural or that they could be too complicated to be understood. With a long sentence such as the following, the content can feel unclear:

14. Zyunsa ga doroboo o kawa no hoo e oitumete itta no ga

Policeman-Nom thief-Acc river-Gen toward-Goal track-down-Gen-Acc went
ikioi amatte hutaritomo kawa no naka e tobikonda
power exceed both-two river-Acc in-Goal jumped

”A policeman was tracking down a thief toward the river, who both, losing control, jumped into the river.” (Kuroda 1992 page 155)

While it can be understandable to native speakers the length and content might sound unnecessary and as if it contains too much information at once. To identify the subject and interpret the sentence without a context can therefore be a difficulty. This is also a problem that Hammar (2015) was faced with, who in her survey on *no/ga* alternation among relative clauses, received similar comments on the internally headed relative clauses. Comments such as “it contains too much information” (Hammar 2015, page 27) was frequent and the

respondents seemed to have problems understanding the content of the sentence. Almost half of her respondents also answered that they considered the sentence with the internally headed relative clause to be unnatural.

Matsumoto (1997) argues that Japanese compared to languages such as English is more demanding when constructing sentence with relative clauses. An explanation for this is the lack of a marker specifying that the clause is a relative one and its relation with the main clause. As mentioned before Japanese does not have a syntax marker like “which” or “that” which would help identify and make the hearer aware of the relation between the clauses. The following sentence which could be interpreted as “where is the stone which bought a book?” would therefore in most cases seem wrong and even grammatically unacceptable:

15. Hon o katta isi wa doko desu ka

Book-Acc bought stone-Top where is Qp

Matsumoto (1997) therefore stresses that the pragmatics and semantics in the sentence becomes much more important in Japanese, for making a sentence sound natural and grammatically correct.

3. Internally headed relative clauses

3.1 Introduction

In this part the result of my own research, is presented. The method used is presented in chapter 3.2 and information about possible error sources is presented in chapter 3.3. The results of the research are discussed in 3.4 and further throughout chapter 3 and in chapter 4 the result is analyzed and summarized.

3.2 Methodology

The main focus of this thesis is the result of a conducted survey (Appendix 1) answered by native Japanese speakers. The example sentences were foremost taken from Tsujimura (2013) and Kuroda (1992). This is to see if Kuroda's assumptions about which type of relative clauses are accepted, and which are not. As the material he gathered is now almost 25 years old, this is also a good reason to see if the language has changed in any way, and if native speakers would be more inclined to accept certain types of internally headed relative clauses or not. One aspect of this is to research if time aspects, for example using adverbials like "yesterday", and if that would make it more difficult to accept or not. This to try and see where the limit is when the sentence is too complex to accept. One of the questions was written with a lacking nominalizing complementizer in a sentence containing an internally headed relative clause. This would make it grammatically incorrect and it is there to see if there are any differences between the grammatically correct ones and whether it is acceptable or not. There are also questions included where the informant has to define which one is the head noun, by explaining what happens in that sentence. These sentences contain a relative clause with two potential head nouns. This is to see how the pragmatic aspect (that one of the ways to interpret the sentence should be more reasonable than the other) affects it, or if both ways are equally accepted.

The survey was created in google forms and linked to the respondents. It was launched on the 18th of April and open for 24 hours. Most of the respondents were contacted through social media, and by contacts with the other respondents. Altogether the survey was completed by

41 informants. One of the responses was omitted as one of the respondents seemed to have submitted the form twice.

The ages of the respondents vary from 18 to 53. The median is however only 21 years old as there is one outlier respondent with the age 53, the second oldest is 24 years old. 8 of the respondent's identity as male and 32 as female.

In the beginning of the survey there was a short text explaining the purpose of the survey and conventions defining the word "natural", which was used many times in the questions. For example, a question could be if they consider the following sentence to be "natural". The word was defined as while they themselves might not use it, it could be used and understood.

3.3 Error sources

When creating the survey, the idea was to have the respondents choose from a list of all the Japanese prefectures. In the end this list was not included and the word 出身 (origin) was used. While most of the respondents did specify which prefecture or even what city they are from, some only wrote "Japan". This does make it more difficult to know if there could be any error sources such as dialectal differences or if relative clauses are used more/less in different parts of Japan. Another potential error source is the fact that the survey received many more respondents from Kyushu than expected. As this area in Japan does have a dialect that differs quite a bit from "standard Japanese" this is something necessary to take into account. While I have found no research suggesting that there would be a difference in how relative clauses and internally headed relative clauses is perceived from the two dialects, the fact that there potentially could be, should still be taken into account.

Another potential error source to take into account is the age of the respondents. As mentioned in the methodology part, most of respondents are around 21 years old. With only one respondent that is in another age category than most of the respondents, this person's answers cannot be regarded as representative for the population of that age as a whole. It is however observable that the respondent's answers do not differ much from most of the other respondents, so would there be a more even age span it is not certain that it would make a huge difference in the answers anyway.

The gender imbalance is also something that is worth taking into account as only 20% of the respondents are male. While there does not seem to be any notable difference in answers between the genders, there could still be a difference if there was a greater gender balance.

As mentioned in the methodology the survey gathered 40 respondents. Given that there was a time limit to write this thesis, this number was settled for. When interpreting the results presented in this thesis, it is important to remember that it only relies on the intuition of these 40 respondents.

3.4 Relative clauses

In question number 1 the respondents had a sentence with a relative clause and had to answer if they thought that it sounded natural and if they understood it. The sentence can be considered a pretty basic sentence with a relative clause as there is nothing unusual about it. This was rather to see if there would be any respondents that considered the syntax unnatural. Since they would in that case certainly consider the following questions with more complex sentence construction such as internally headed relative clauses, unnatural as well. This was therefore to in that case potentially screen any respondents that would write that they did not understand the sentence.

The example used for Question 1 was taken from Tsujimura (2013) as an example of a relative clause:

16. Sato-sensei ga gakusei-ga kaita ronbun-o yondeiru

Sato-teacher-Nom student-Nom wrote-Acc is reading

Professor Sato is reading the article that the student wrote

Almost all of the respondents answered that they understood the sentence and that it sounded natural. Some did say that it was a bit difficult to understand at first but that they could understand it. Others wrote that they could understand it but that it sounded a bit weird. Some did specify that it sounded natural but that it would sound better without the particle “ga” which could be switched to “wa”. One of the respondents specified that especially in spoken Japanese this sentence would seem natural.

In the second question the respondents had to answer if they perceived another sentence as natural and if they understood it. This sentence does not contain a relative clause but its

syntax is very similar to the first one. The reason for this is that it contains the complementizer “to” (that).

The sentence was taken from Tsujimura (2013)

17. Taroo ga Hanako ga sono gakusei ni atta to itta

Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom that student-Dat met-that said

Taro said that Hanako met the student

With this sentence more of the respondents answered that they thought that it sounded complicated and not natural. Several of them wrote that this was because of the two nominative markers. Plenty of the respondents did write that they understood it but that it sounded unnatural. Some wrote that it was also difficult to understand and that they were not certain of the meaning.

3.5 Internally headed relative clauses

Internally headed relative clauses are found in very few languages outside of Japanese. The head is contained within the relative clause and is similar to the gapless relative clauses. Another aspect sentences that contain an internally headed relative clause has to have is the genitive marker “no”, where there is usually the head of the relative clause.

In question number 3 the respondents were presented with an internally headed relative clause. This sentence was lacking the genitive marker, or nominalizing complementizer as Kuroda (1992) refers to it, making the sentence ungrammatical. They were to write if they understood it and if it sounded natural or not. This was also to make sure to screen respondents who would respond that this sounded natural, in case they would answer that all other questions also sounded natural.

18. Taroo wa ringo ga sara no ue ni atta o totte, poketo ni ireta

Taro-Nom apple-Nom plate-Gen above-Loc-Acc pick up, pocket-Loc put it

All of the respondents wrote that it sounded unnatural. Some added that they could understand it but that it sounded strange. Some even pointed out that it would have been easy to

understand the sentence if it had the missing genitive marker. One of the respondents wrote that the relative clause was easy to understand but not the part after that.

In question number 4 the respondents had to choose from two sentences and pick which one they thought sounded most natural. In these sentences there is a genitive marker which should make it grammatically correct.

19. Taroo wa ringo ga sara no ue ni atta no o totte, poketo ni ireta

Taro-Nom apple-Nom plate-Gen above-Loc-Acc pick up, pocket-Loc put it

Taro picked up an apple which was on a plate and put it in a pocket

20. Taroo wa Hanako ga ringo wo katta no wo totte, poketto ni ireta.

Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom apple-Nom bought-Gen pick up, pocket-Loc
put it

Taro picked up an apple which Hanako bought and put it in a pocket

20% of the respondents chose the second alternative and 80% chose the first alternative. A reason for this could be that in sentence 20. Hanako could potentially be the subject instead of Taro. In sentence 19. there is no such possibility as the apple has to be the object. While both sentences should be equally grammatically correct and therefore natural, the first sentence could be seen as easier to understand and less confusing. Making it more natural sounding.

3.6 Internally headed relative clauses in past tense containing a time adverb

The internally headed relative clauses in past tense with a time adverb such as “yesterday” is according to Kuroda (1992) a sentence native Japanese speakers would not find acceptable. The reason for this is that the readers would have a problem understanding the sentences. This seems to be from a pragmatic perspective as the connection between a past tense in the internally headed relative clause and the rest of the sentence might not naturally seem very likely. Which would make it seem like the relative clause is out of place as it does not have a clear connection with the main clause.

Question 5a had the respondents read the following sentences and write if they interpret the meaning of the sentences differently, and if they considered them sounding natural.

20. Taroo wa Hanako ga kinoo ringo wo katta no wo totte, poketto ni ireta.

Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom yesterday apple-Nom bought-Gen pick up, pocket-Loc put it

Taro picked up an apple which Hanako bought yesterday and put it in a pocket

21. Taroo wa kesa Hanako ga kinoo ringo wo katta no o totte, poketto ni ireta.

Taro-Nom this morning Hanako-Nom yesterday apple-Nom bought-Gen pick up,
pocket-Loc put it

This morning Taro picked up an apple which Hanako bought yesterday and put it in a pocket

22. Taroo wa Hanako ga kinoo ringo wo katte oita no o totte, poketto ni ireta.

Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom yesterday apple-Nom bought-later use in mind-Gen pick up,
pocket-Loc put it

Taro picked up an apple which Hanako bought yesterday with some later use of it in mind, and put it in a pocket

Many of the respondent answered that they understood the sentences but that they sounded a bit unnatural. Others wrote that the first sentence or the third sentence sounded the most natural. This is possibly because there is only one time adverb in them.

Question 5b had the respondents read the same sentences, write who was the one who put the apple in (their) pocket, if they thought all sentences sounded natural and if there were any differences between them. Question 6 made the respondents choose from the following sentences which one they thought sounded most natural.

On the question of which one of the sentences that sounded the most natural, two of the respondents choose the first sentence. They both replied that all three sentences had the same meaning, and another one that they all sounded equally unnatural. Two of the respondents

choose the second alternative. Neither of them gave any comments as to why they thought so. 34 of the respondents (85%) choose the third option. One respondent did not choose any of the options.

The one who did not choose any of the options wrote in the past question that they all generally sounded a bit unnatural. Similar comments were made from the respondents that chose the third sentence. Some specified that they did understand the time adverb and that the use of it meant that it had a different meaning, but that they could generally understand the meaning of the sentence. One specified that the second sentence was the only one where you could get an understanding of when Taro put the apple in his pocket.

There were different comments regarding the content in the sentence. Some thought that it sounded natural but that they had problems completely understanding the content. Most of the respondent however thought that they could understand the content but that it sounded unnatural.

All who commented on who it was that put the apple in (their) pocket, agreed that it was Taro in all sentences.

3.7 Internally headed relative clauses containing –teoku

Just as the result in question 5b and 6 shows, the alternative with “oku” (alternative number three) in it is perceived as the most natural sounding alternative. This is something that Kuroda (1992) also claimed could be the case. The meaning of “oku”, an auxiliary verb, is that the verb it is attached to, is done as a preparation of some sort. An explanation as to why this sentence would be more accepted is that it implies that the apple that Hanako bought was as some sort of preparation or with some sort of purpose. While Taro taking that apple might not have been the purpose it could still paint the picture that this apple was purchased yesterday for some sort of use today. When referring to the same sentence Kuroda (1992) argues that the “oku” thereby implies that there would not be any pragmatic problems for the apple to remain in its position to the moment when Taro comes and takes it. One of the respondents did write that they perceived the first and third sentence as having the same meaning. They did however choose the third option as the most natural sounding one.

In question number seven the respondents were asked to compare another sentence containing “oku” with the above sentence. This sentence was still in past tense but it did not have a time adverb.

24. Taroo ga Hanako ga ringo wo katte oita no o tabeteshimatta

Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom apple-Gen bought-later use in mind-Gen-Acc ate
regrettably

Taroo regrettably ate the apple that Hanako bought with some purpose in mind.

Most of the respondents answered that this sentence sounded unnatural and was difficult to understand. Around 20% responded that this sentence was easier to understand than the previous one. Some of them however commented that it still sounded as unnatural. Many were also confused by the use of the particle “ga” after the word “Taro” and suggested that it would be easier to understand if this was replaced by another particle such as “wa”. One commented that while what Taro does to the apple differs in this sentence the part about Hanako and buying an apple still has the same meaning.

3.8 Internally headed relative clauses with split pivot

Sentences with an internally headed relative clause is not limited to only having one pivot. This as Kuroda (1992) explains it is due to the fact that there is no set position in the sentence that the head nouns have to have. In sentences with several nouns that could be the head noun and as such modified by the internally headed relative clause, the interpretation of which one of them is most likely to be affected by the relative clause is up to the reader to interpret.

In questions 8 the respondents were asked to explain what happens in a sentence with two potential head nouns. This would mean that the sentence should be able to be interpreted in two ways. Purely pragmatically. They were also asked to specify who gets shot and killed. The sentences below in a) and b) are identic in Japanese, but since the head noun can be either “spy” or “the students” it can be translated into two different ways in English. The question was therefore asked as such to find out what the respondents considered to be the head noun.

25. Sono omawari-wa gakuseitai-ga CIA-no supai-o kumihuseta-no-o

That cop-Top students-Nom CIA-Gen spy-Acc hold down Gen-Acc

utikorosita.

Shot and killed

- a. “The cop shot and killed the students who held down the CIA spy.”
- b. “The cop shot and killed the CIA spy who the students held down.” (Tsujimura 2013)

Among the respondents the majority seemed to interpret it as version a) the spy being shot. Almost as many thought that it was the students being shot. Four of the respondents interpreted the sentence as the police being shot. This last option is not considered by either Tsujimura (2013) or Kuroda (1992) and as no one of the four respondents explained why they chose that option it is unclear why. It is however possible to see a pattern with these respondents writing very short responses on the other questions and these answers should perhaps therefore not be taken too much into account. Another factor could be that the sentence has been getting much more complex being an internally headed relative clause, which might make it too complicated to easily understand. One of the other respondents wrote that this sentence could be interpreted in two ways so they were uncertain of if it was the spy or students that got shot. This is very much strengthening Kuroda’s (1992) theory about it only depending on the pragmatic interpretation and that both cases should be equally possible. In question number 9 the respondents were asked to do the same thing with another sentence with a split pivot. They were to explain what happened and who was the one hiring someone.

26. Taroo-wa binbona gakuseitachi-ga kireina onnanoko o shokaishitekita-no o yatoireta

Taro-Top poor students-Nom beautiful girl-Acc introduce-Gen-Acc hired

“Taro hired the beautiful girl introduced by the poor students.

Kuroda (1992) described a possible pragmatic interpretation as “In a sexist, capitalist society little imagination is required to come up with a situation in which [the sentence] is understood with a ‘poor student’ as the pivot, and another in which ‘pretty girl’ is taken as the pivot.” (Page 155) This example is by Kuroda used in contrast with this sentence:

27. Taroo-wa binbona gakuseitachi o shokaishitekita Hanako o yatoireta

Taro-Top poor students-Acc introduce Hanako-Acc hired

“Taro hired Hanako who had sent a poor student over to him with her recommendation.” (Page 154)

In the above sentence Kuroda (1992) explains that there does not have to be a connection between the action of introducing Taro to the poor students and for Hanako to be hired by him.

A majority of the respondents answered that it was Taro that hired someone. The second most popular option was the beautiful girl. One respondent specifically answered the poor students. The six respondents who specified who it was that Taro hired all wrote the beautiful girl.

The intent for this question was to ask who was hired, which would make more sense as it would reveal who the respondents considered the pivot. This would also strengthen Kuroda’s thesis about the pragmatic impact on how internally headed relative clauses is interpreted. Unfortunately, there was a typo and the question was therefore “who was hiring?” Some of the respondents did however specify who they thought was hiring who, which did provide some information to be interpreted anyway. Since all six of them did write that it was the beautiful girl that Taro hired, this would also strengthen Kuroda’s (1992) explanation about how pragmatism affects the interpretation as while it could be either, the version where it is the beautiful girl that gets hired after introducing the poor students, sounds more likely.

4. Analysis

The first two sentences in Question 1 and 2, one with a relative clause and the second one with a complement clause (which has similar syntax to a sentence with a relative clause), were perceived in different ways. While most respondents seemed to consider the first one grammatically correct and natural the other one was not perceived as such. The second sentence is according to Tsujimura a regular sentence and despite it being a bit long, it should be perceived as grammatically correct. One potential explanation that it was not is because of the nominative particles which without a context would not usually be “ga” two times in a row. This therefore leaves much to the imagination of the respondent. If they could not think of a situation where a sentences like this could be constructed like that, they would consider it ungrammatical. While the first question also had a sentence with two of the same nominalizers in a row, it was clearly considered by a majority that it was natural and grammatically correct. However, since several respondents did point out that it would have sounded better with the first nominalizer being changed, it should not be ruled out as a potential reason for people to consider the second question’s example sentence to be incorrect.

Question 3 and 4 brings up the internally headed relative clauses for the first time in the survey. The sentence in Question 3 lacked the nominalizing complementizer “no” which would make the sentence ungrammatical. This was reflected in the responses as well as all of the respondents wrote that it sounded unnatural. Many answered that they could despite it sounding unnatural, still understand it. This result meant that there were at least not any respondents that just wrote that everything sounded natural or acceptable, which would otherwise possibly undermine the result. In Question 4 where the respondents had to choose between two sentences with an internally headed relative clause, most choose the first option. These sentences both contained the “no” which was missing in the sentence from Question 3. In a later Question they were to comment on this choice but a more interesting Question could have been to make them choose between the sentence from Question 3 and a sentence with an internally headed clause that did contain the nominalizing complementizer.

In Question 5a and 5b the respondents discuss three different sentences. While most answered that they understood it, very few considered them natural-sounding. Some of the respondents did claim that they felt that there was a difference between the sentences but that they could

not identify what this difference was. In Question 6, 85% choose the third sentence to be the most natural sounding one. As some respondents wrote that they felt that the first and third option had the same meaning most of the respondents chose the third option anyway. This would mean that the auxiliary verb “oku” affects the time adverb so that the connection in the sentence is a much clearer one. The second sentence was the one that the fewest choices as the most natural sounding one. A reason behind this could be that there are two time adverbs, one specifying the time when Taro picks up the apple and another one specifying the time when Hanako bought the apple. The time adverb describing Taro’s action does specify that his action was also in the past, which could help to understand Taro’s role in the sentence. In this case as many did specify that the second sentence was the least natural sounding one, it might instead have caused more confusion. It could also be that the sentence with two time adverbs in its internally headed relative clause is the one with too much information. Since all of the respondents who answered wrote that it was Taro who put the apple in his pocket, the sentence itself does not seem to be too complex to understand.

In Question 7 the respondents had to compare the sentences in 5a and compare them with a sentence that also contained the auxiliary verb “oku”. This sentence did not have a time adverb but was also in past tense. Most of the responses did however consider this sentence to be more unnatural sounding than the past ones. Many of the comments regarding this mentioned the nominative marker “ga” which appears in two places. Much like the sentence in Question 1 and 2, this could have an effect on why the sentence is considered so unnatural. Around 20% considered this sentence to be easier to understand than the previous ones and as not much differs from the lacking time adverb, this could be the reason.

In Question 9 the question was formulated in another way than intended. Unfortunately, this was discovered after the survey was conducted and the intention was to ask what the respondents considered the pivot to be. Fortunately, some of the respondents did respond with what they considered to be the pivot as well, which made the question more unusable. Since the question before also discussed internally headed relative clauses the answers for that sentence made up for the lost ones in the question afterwards. The answers from Question 8, strengthen the theory that the pragmatic aspect has a big impact on the sentences. To this question about half of the respondents choose the spy and the other half chose the students. Therefore, the syntax and the placement of the head in the internally headed relative clause does not seem to impact what is considered the head. Since the questions asked was not only “what happens in this sentence?” but also “who gets shot?”, to some extent this steers the

answer. Many of the respondents only specified who they think got shot, which might as well have been a pure guess amongst three potential subjects. This could be the reason why some of the respondents wrote that it was the police that gets shot, while this is not an option considered by neither Kuroda (1992) nor Tsujimura (2013). Unfortunately, none of the respondents who wrote that it was the police that got shot specified who they got shot by.

Because of some errors made while creating the survey, without them it could have shown a much clearer and better result: With use of other example sentences with a more updated language, such as using the more modern word for police: “警察” (keisatsu) instead of “お巡り” (omawari). With sentences that did not have a lot of extra grammatical forms that could potentially distract and create confusion for the respondents, like not using the same type of nominalizer several times in the same sentence, as this is only in special pragmatic situation where it usually is used.

Also the fact that the question that tried to pin-point any type of dialectic error sources was not conducted properly and that the word used was 出身 (origin), without any option, made the answers where respondents only wrote “Japan” much more difficult to adjust to. Since there were no differences found from the respondents, there is nothing suggesting that there would be such a dialectal difference. However, this could none the less be good to have in mind.

5. Concluding remarks

This thesis was written as an attempt to find a limit for where the complexity of sentences with relative clauses becomes too complex to understand and stop being able to interpret. Previous research on the subject was introduced, which were used as a base of the survey and research conducted. Most of the sentences used in the survey came directly from these sources to test the theories about them being correct or not. In the main part the results of the survey were introduced. In the chapter afterwards the results were analyzed. The vast majority of the respondents understood and considered the sentences with regular relative clauses to be natural. The main focus of the survey was the internally headed relative clauses. While most of the respondents' answers suggested that they understood them and when asked the respondents perceived that they understood the sentences themselves, a clear majority did not consider them to be natural sounding. However even the most complex sentences with a split pivot seemed to be understood by most. Therefore, a conclusion is that sentences with internally headed relative clauses are regarded as unnatural sounding, but in most cases understood by native speakers. Deeming them as unusable is therefore not correct. However, they should be used carefully. Especially with the split pivot type as these are very much up for the imagination of the reader to interpret and can be done so correctly in different ways.

As there were only 40 respondents taking the survey this has to be taken in to account. The research in this thesis is based on their answers. The median age of these respondents is also considerable low and would the age of them be higher, this would most likely affect the outcome of the responses. Kuroda's (1992) example sentences that was used for some of the questions could have been updated and expressed in a more modern way, which potentially distracted the respondents from the sentences or made them more difficult to understand. As one of the questions was formulated in an incorrect way the result from that question differed from what was intended, that made it more difficult to interpret. The results made in this thesis could therefore have been much clearer, as some of the questions' example sentences became more difficult than intended to interpret. Doing the suggested changes, future research can definitely be made on similar topics regarding the relative clauses and internally headed relative clauses.

References

- Baldwin, T. (1998), *The Analysis of Japanese Relative Clauses*, Master thesis, Tokyo Institute of Technology. [Internet] Available from:
<http://people.eng.unimelb.edu.au/tbaldwin/pubs/mthesis.pdf> Cited: 2016-02-10
- Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka and Isaac Gould. 2014. *Interpreting Japanese Head-Internal Relative Clauses*. In Proceedings of the 31st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics, ed. Robert E. Santana-LaBarge, 160-169. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Harada S. I. (1971) *Ga-No Conversation and idiolectical Variations in Japanese Gengo Kenkyu*, vol. 1971 No. 60 [Internet] Available from:
https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/gengo1939/1971/60/1971_60_25/pdf Cited: 2016-03-15
- Hasegawa, Yoko. (2014) *Japanese: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Hammar, Ida (2015) *The Nominative/Genitive Alternation and Subordination in the Japanese Language* BA Thesis, Lund University
- Kato, Shigehiro (1999) *Nihon no kankeibushi no seiritsuyouken (1) senkoukenkyu no seiri to sono mondaiten* (Analysis of Noun-Modifying Structures in Japanese I : Syntactic and Pragmatic Problems). University of Toyama, [Internet] Available from
<http://hdl.handle.net/10110/12893> Cited: 2016-03-16
- Kuroda, S. -Y (1992) *Japanese syntax and semantics* Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrech
- Matsumoto Y. (1997) *Noun-Modifying Constructions in Japanese A frame-semantic approach* SLCS Amsterdam
- Tsujimura, N. (2013) *An introduction to Japanese Linguistics*, 3rd edition. Wiley Blackwell. Chichester

Appendix 1) The survey

The survey conducted was created in google forms. The survey was launched on the 18th of April and was open for 24 hours. In total the survey received 41 responses.

文の中の文

日本語言語学の卒業論文を書くために関係節についての調査を行っています。ご協力いただけたら嬉しく思います。どうぞよろしくお願いします。

出身

性別

女
男
その他

年齢

・自然の意味はこの調査で自分が使わなくても、使えると思う。

1. 以下の例文が分かりますか。自然な言い方だと思いますか。

佐藤先生が学生が書いた論文を読んでいる。

2. 以下の例文が分かりますか。自然な言い方だと思いますか。

太郎が花子とその学生にあったと言った。

3. 以下の例文が分かりますか。自然な言い方だと思いますか

太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったをとって、ポケットに入れた。

4. 以下の例文が分かりますか。どちらが一番自然な言い方だと思いますか。

1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。

2. 太郎は花子がリンゴを買ったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。

5a. 以下の文の内容が何か違いがありますか。全部が自然な言い方だと思いますか。

1. 太郎は花子が昨日リンゴを買ったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。

2. 太郎は今朝花子が昨日リンゴを買ったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。

3. 太郎は花子が昨日リンゴを買っておいたのをとって、ポケットに入れた。

5b. 以下の文の内容が何か違いがありますか。誰がリンゴをポケットにいれました？全部が自然な言い方だと思いますか。

23. 太郎は花子が昨日リンゴを買ったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。

24. 太郎は今朝花子が昨日リンゴを買ったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。

25. 太郎は花子が昨日リンゴを買っておいたのをとって、ポケットに入れた。

6. 以上の例文の中にどちらが一番自然な言い方だと思いますか。

7. 以上の例文が以下の例文を比べるとどうだと思いますか。

太郎が花子がリンゴを買っておいたのを食べてしまった。

8. 以下の例文に何がありました？誰が撃ち殺された？

そのお巡りは学生たちがCIAのスパイを組み伏せたのを撃ち殺した。

9. 以下の例文に何がありました？誰が雇い入れたか。

太郎は貧乏な学生が綺麗な女の子を紹介してきたのを雇い入れた。

ご協力ありがとうございます！

Appendix 2) The answers

In no particular order, these are the answers the survey received.

21	女	佐賀県武雄市	自然だと思 う。	自然だと思 う。	「太郎は皿の上にあつたリンゴをとって、ポケットに入れた。」のほう が自然。	2. 太郎は花子がリンゴを買ったの をとって、ポケットに入れた。	3が最も自然。1と2は太郎がいつ とつたのかという ことが示されている か、示されていない かの違い。「太郎は花子が昨日買 ったリンゴをとって、ポケットに入 れた。」や「太郎は花子が昨日買	1～3ともポ ケットに入れたのは 太郎。	3	上の例文は太郎が行 った行動を表す動詞 が2つあり、下の例 文は太郎の行動を示 す動詞が1つある。 意味が違う。	スパイが撃ち殺され た。
----	---	--------	-------------	-------------	--	-------------------------------------	--	----------------------------	---	---	-----------------

							ったリンゴを今朝とって、ポケットに入れた。」のほうがわかりやすい。				
20	女	日本	はい	いいえ	いいえ	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	1が一番自然。内容はあまり変わらないように感じる。	どれも太郎がポケットにリンゴを入れている。全部不自然ではない。	1	この例文から、リンゴを取るべき、食べるべきではないことがわかった。	学生たちが撃ち殺された。
20	女	福岡	わかるけど自然ではない。会話のなかではそこまで疑問に	わかるけど自然ではない。	自然ではないと思う。「を」がおかしい。	2. 太郎は花子がリンゴを買ったのをとって、ポケットに入	1,花子が昨日買ったリンゴをとって。が自然だと思う2,今朝太郎は花子が昨日買ったリンゴをとって。が自然だと思う。3,花子が昨日買っておい		3	さっきの文よりはわかるが、やはり「が」の使い方が	スパイか学生かわからない。この文章では、両方なきがする。

			は思わないと思うが、書いてみると不自然。			れた。	たりんごをとって。が自然だと思う。		おいしい。		
21	男	島根	わかる。自然。	わかる。自然ではない。	わかる。自然ではない。	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	2は今朝の話だとわかる。すべて自然ではない。	とつたのは太郎。自然ではない。	3	大差ない。	学生たち
21	男	スウェーデン、マルメ	自然です	自然です	不自然です	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	三番は一番自然だと思います	三番一番自然、太郎がりんごをポケットに入れた	3	このほうが自然だと思います	お巡り
21	女	日本	自然な言い方ではない。	自然な言い方ではない。	自然な言い方ではない。	2. 太郎は花子がリンゴを買	この中では3が最も自然な言	太郎	3	上の文よりはわかりや	スパイ

						ったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	い方。			すい。	
22	男	福岡	わかる。自然だと思う。	わかる。自然だと思う。	わかる。自然だと思わない。	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	3がわかりやすい。「買った」よりも「買っておいた」のほうが自然に感じる。	3がわかりやすい。	3	3とあまり変わらないが、一番理解しやすいかも。	お巡りがスパイを撃ち殺した。スパイ。
20	女	静岡	理解できるが、自然ではない。	分かりにくい。	全然わからない。	2. 太郎は花子がリンゴを買ったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	2だけ詳しい時間帯をいっている。3は分かりやすい。		3	太郎が悪いことをしたと思う。	学生
21	女	佐賀県唐津市	わかる	自然ではないと思う	わからない	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の	3のみわかる	1,2は意味がわからない	3	この分だとリンゴはい	スパイ

						上にあつたのをとって、ポケットに入れた。		い。 3の文からとつたのは太郎だとわかる。		つものなかわからない	
21	女	佐賀県鳥栖市	分かる。少し分かりにくいですが、まあまあ自然だと思う。	分かるが、不自然	分かるが、不自然	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあつたのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	1つ目、2つ目は不自然。	太郎。 3つ目だけ自然	3	分かりにくい	お巡り
22	女	福岡県	分かる	太郎は、の方が自然だと思う	自然な言い方ではない	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあつたのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	1. 花子が昨日買ったリンゴを、の方が自然 2. 今朝と花子の方に句点があつた方が分かりやすい 3.1	太郎	3	分かりにくい	学生たちが撃ち殺されたようにとれる

							よりは自然				
21	女	福岡県	自然な言い方だと思うが、分かりにくい。佐藤先生は学生が書いた論文を読んでいる。	自然な言い方だと思わない。太郎は花子とその学生にあったと言った。	自然な言い方だと思わない。太郎は皿の上にあたりんごをとって、ポケットに入れた。	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	すべて自然な言い方ではない。1 太郎は花子が昨日買ったりんごをとって、ポケットに入れた。2 太郎は今朝、花子が昨日買ったりんごをとって、ポケットに入れた。3 太郎は花子が昨日買ったりんご	すべて自然な言い方ではない。すべてりんごをとったのは太郎。	3	自然な言い方ではない。太郎は花子がおいたリンゴを食べてしまった。	CIA のスパイが撃ち殺された。そのお巡りは、学生たちが組み伏せた CIA のスパイを、撃ち殺した。

							をとって、ポケットに入れた。				
53	女	佐賀県	わかりませんが、「が」が続くので「佐藤先生は」が自然だと思います	わかりにくいと思います。言った言葉には「」で囲んだ方がいいし、太郎は「花子はその学生にあった」と言った。という風に「が」が2回続かない方がいいです。	わかりません。「太郎は皿の上にあったリングをとって、ポケットに入れた。」がわかりやすいです。	1. 太郎はリングが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	1と3は同じ内容と考えていと思うが、2はポケットにいれたのが今朝と限定されている。3つの文とも自然な言い方ではない。	太郎がリングをポケットに入れた。全部自然な言い方ではない。	3	上の例文は、下の例文よりわかりにくいと思います。	CIA のスパイが撃ち殺された。

22	女	福岡	学生の、の方が良い。	分かりにくいです。	あったのを、の方が分かりやすいです。	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	同じような意味だと思います。	太郎。	3	とっただけではなく、食べている。	スパイ
22	男	日本	思う	「太郎が」より、「太郎は」のほうが自然だと思う	思わない	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	2がちょっとだけおいしいと思う	太郎	3	不自然	学生
21	女	福岡県	分かる。思わない。	分かる。思わない。	分かる。思わない。	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	違いあり。思わない。	違いあり。太郎。思わない。	3	不自然。	お巡り。

21	女		思う	思わない	思わない	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	違いあり、思わない	違いなし 太郎思わない	3	意味が違う。	わからない
21	女	福岡県北九州市	思う	思う	思わない	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	3	ある	3	違和感が少ない	スパイ
22	女	長野県	思わない	思わない	思わない	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	単語の順番が違う。3つとも自然ないかただと思わない。	太郎	3	主語が分かりにくい	お巡り

24	女	日本	分かる。口語として自然。	分かる。口語として自然。	意味は分かる。不自然。	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	リンゴを買ったと、リンゴを買っておいたの違い。3の文は、1.2の文に比べて花子がリンゴを買ったという単純行為を言っているのではなく、わざわざ買ったという印象を受ける。1.3の文が自然。	太郎がリンゴをポケットに入れた。日時を近くに並べられると混乱するが、文意は分かる。	3	主語がはっきりしない。	お巡りさんがスパイを撃ち殺した。
21	女	福岡県	はい	いいえ	いいえ	1. 太郎は	わかりま	太郎	3	文章がご	学生

						リンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	せん。			ちやごちやしている	
23	女	福岡県	はい。質問文についてですが、以下の例文は普段の会話に使用する際に自然な言葉または意味の伝わる言葉だと思いますか？の方がいいと思います	いいえ。	いいえ。	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	全部、意味がわかりません。	太郎全部、文脈がおかしいです。	3	主語と述語がおかしい。質問文についてですが、はいいいえで答えられる質問にしてください。そうでなければ、答えに選択肢が欲しいです。	CIA。主語と述語がおかしいです。また、例文の意味がわかりません。お巡りという言葉は日本ではあまり使わないので、警察官または、おまわりさんを使用した方がいいと思います。質問文ですが、以下の例文について回答して下さい。撃ち殺されたのは誰ですか？の方がいいと思います。

			ます。								しかし、例文に生死を問うような質問は入れない方がいいと思います。
21	女	Japan	意味はわかるが自然な言い方ではないと思う。この場合、佐藤先生の今の動作を表しているので、「佐藤先生は～以下同文」に変更したほうが良いと思う。	意味はわかるが自然な言い方ではないと思う。この場合は太郎と花子をひとつの主語として考えるべきであるので、「太郎と花子が」に変更したほうが自然な言い方になると	意味はわかるが自然な言い方ではないと思う。主語を並べると不自然なので、「太郎は皿の上りんごがあった～以下同文」に変更すると良いと思う。	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのを使って、ポケットに入れた。	どれも主語と述語がバラバラで読みにくい文に感じる。	どれも同じ内容と思う。	1	こっこのほうがわかりやすい。	CIA のスパイを撃ち殺した

				思う。							
22	男	日本 (長崎)	yes	no	no	2. 太郎は花子がリンゴを買ったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	「昨日」の位置がおかしい		2	が、は、などの助詞が使い分けられてない	学生
20	女	日本	自然	ちょっと不自然	不自然	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	3つ目は自然。あとは不自然。リンゴを買ったのを取ってが不自然。買ったリンゴをとっての方が◎	太郎、全体的に少し不自然			CIA がおまわりによって殺された
18	女	日本	思わない	思わない	思わない	2. 太郎は花子がリンゴを買ったのを	思わない	太郎 思わない	3	主語が2つある	お巡り

						とって、ポケットに入れた。					
22	女	福岡県	思う	思わない	思わない	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	思わない	思わない	3	自然だと思う	学生
21	女	日本	分かるし、自然な言い方だと思う。	分かるが、自然な言い方だと思わない。	分かるが、自然な言い方だと思わない。	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	1と3はほぼ同じ内容だと思う。全部自然だと思わない。	1と3はほぼ同じ内容。太郎がポケットに入れた。全部自然とは思わない。	3	主語が分かりにくい。	学生たちが撃ち殺された。
21	女	日本	思う	思う	思わない	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。			3	分かりにくい	CIA
21	女	日本熊本県	自然だど	自然だど	自然だど	1. 太郎はリン	違いはなく、	あまりかわら	3	分かりにくい	スパイ

			思わない	思わない	思わない	ゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	自然だと思う	ない、太郎、自然だと思う			
21	女	JAPAN	思います。	よく分からない。不自然だと思う。	不自然だと思う。	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	3以外不自然だと思う。	リンゴをポケットに入れたのは太郎。全部不自然だと思う。	3	以外の例文は意味は分かるけど"が"が多くてわかりにくい。	CIA のスパイ
21	男	日本佐賀	分かるが違和感を感じる	わかりにくい	わからない	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	昨日買ったりんごをとって、が適切だと思われる	太郎不自然	3	〇〇が、の言葉が二度続くのは間違いではないが、不自然でありそのような言い方	CIA のスパイ

										はできるだけ避ける	
21	男	福岡	分かります。自然ではないと思います。	分かります。自然ではないです。	分かりません。	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	1と2は太郎がとったのが分からなくて、3はリンゴをとったのが分かるような気がします。	全部太郎がポケットに入れた。花子が昨日買っておいしたリンゴとするのが自然な気がします。	3	これまでと同じで食べたのが何かはつきり分かりません。	スパイ
21	女	神奈川県	自然	自然	分かるけど不自然	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	2番の今朝だけ意味が異なり、言い方は全部不自然	ポケットに入れたのは全て太郎	3	意味はわかるけど、上の例文と同じく不自然	学生たちが撃ち殺された
21	男	佐賀県	思います。	思います。	思いません。	2. 太郎は花子がリンゴを買	全文、「昨日買っておい	りんごを取ったのは、太郎	3	あまり変わりはないです。	学生たちを撃ち殺した。

						ったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	たりごとって」なら正確な文になります。	だと思いますが、全文正確にすれば間違いなく伝わると思います。		この文章では、「花子がりんごを買っていた」という行為を食べてしまったという意味になります。	
21	女	佐賀県	分かる。自然。	分かる。不自然。	分からない。不自然。	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	同じ。3。	太郎。すべて変。	3	わかりやすい。	スパイ
20	女	福岡県	分かりませんが、自然ではありません	分かりませんが自然ではありません	分かりませんが、自然ではありません	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にあったのをと	2番だけ太郎がいつポケットに入れたのか	2番だけ太郎がいつポケットに入れたの	3	”が”という助詞が2つ続いているため違和	CIA のスパイ

						って、ポケットに入れた。	が判断できる違いがあります。全て自然ではありません。	かが判断できる違いがあります。太郎がリンゴをポケットに入れました。自然ではありません。		感じます。	
21	女	福岡	自然ではないが通じる	自然ではないが通じる	不自然で意味が分かりづらい	1. 太郎はリンゴが皿の上にとって、ポケットに入れた。	太郎がポケットに入れた	3	主語の助詞がおかしい	スパイが殺された	
21	女	日本	わかる。思う。	思わない。	思わない。	2. 太郎は花子がリンゴを買ったのをとって、ポケットに入れた。	2	2	分からない。	スパイ	
22	女	三重	はい。ただ、	大丈夫だと思うけ	「太郎は皿の上に	1. 太郎はリンゴが	意味は同じだとわかりますが、3が	3	自然だと思ひ	学生たちが撃ち殺された	

			「佐藤先生は」でも大丈夫だと思います。	ど、「花子は」のほうかな気がします。	あつたりんごをとって」のほうかな気がします	皿の上にあつたをとって、ポケットに入れた。	1番自然な気がします。		ます。	
--	--	--	---------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-------------	--	-----	--